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ABSTRACT

Cypriot Continuation Through the Crisis Years: an Analysis on Late Bronze Age Cypriot Ceramics

A thesis presented to the Graduate Program in Ancient Greek and Roman Studies

Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
Brandeis University
Waltham, Massachusetts

By Katherine Riggs

The Late Bronze Age collapse was a defining event in our understanding of Bronze Age and Early Iron Age culture. Although research still leans to the idea of a Mediterranean-wide societal collapse, some Late Bronze Age sites show evidence of continuation through the Collapse and subsequent Crisis Years (1250-1050 BCE). One such site is the island of Cyprus. This thesis argues for a continuation of Cyprus’s culture, occupation of Late Bronze Age cities, and foreign trade connections by examining Cypriot ceramics, one of Cyprus’s largest exports. The continuation of certain types of ceramics, their quality, and the production and distribution of Cypriot ceramics argue for the continuation of Cypriot culture, occupation, and trade throughout the Crisis Years, when other civilizations collapsed. The forms, quality of decoration, and production of ceramic assemblages from three sites—Enkomi, Kition, and Idalion—are used in this analysis. The ceramic assemblages of three comparative sites—Mycenae, Tel Dor, and Ayios Sozomenos—act as comparisons to Cypriot ceramics to reinforce this thesis’s argument for continuation.
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Introduction

The collapse of the Late Bronze Age was significant event in our understanding of Bronze Age culture. Researchers once believed that the collapse was a swift event attributed to a series of violent destructions by the Sea Peoples in the 12th century BCE, and in the aftermath nearly all culture disappeared. In light of recent research, it is now widely accepted that the collapse was a long decline of civilization, lasting from 1250 BCE to 1050 BCE\(^1\), with multiple factors that finally climaxed in destruction and collapse. This research has also opened the possibility of continuation of some cities and civilizations, such as Megiddo or Ashkelon.\(^2\) With this idea in mind, Cyprus should be considered a “survivor” of the Late Bronze Age collapse. Cypriot ceramics produced during the “Crisis Years”\(^3\) are strong evidence for this argument. As one of the island’s most prominent exports, Cypriot ceramics signal not only a continuation of goods that stay true to Cypriot culture and production standards, but a continuation of trade connections and occupation of Cypriot sites. This thesis examines Cypriot ceramics from the Crisis Years by evaluating their forms, decorations, and functions, to identify the continuation of Cypriot craftsmanship and distribution of ceramics outside of Cyprus.

---

2 Theories of collapse and continuation for Levantine sites are lengthily discussed in “Crisis in Context: The End of the Late Bronze Age in the Eastern Mediterranean,” by Knapp and Manning.
3 This is a term used by Langutt, Finkelstein, and Litt to describe the period between 1250-1050 BCE, the time period that encompasses both the LBA Collapse and subsequent fallout period after. I use the term “Crisis Years” to describe this period throughout the thesis.
The Late Bronze Age witnessed a surge in connectivity and wealth among several civilizations in the Near East, Aegean, and Levant. Throughout the Late Bronze Age, new urban centers were either built or ones from previous periods expanded to fit their growing populations and administrative needs. Every civilization in the Late Bronze Age were connected either commercially or politically. Correspondence between kingdoms, such as those found in the Amarna Letters, reveal political relationships were firmly established in the Late Bronze Age. Letters between the king of Alashiya and the Pharaoh suggest that Cyprus was a vassal kingdom to Egypt. The amount of cultural material found in foreign contexts support a complex network of trade throughout the Mediterranean. Cypriot pottery was found throughout the Levant, Egypt, and Crete. Within Cyprus, a great amount of Aegean pottery, luxurious goods from Egypt, and Syro-Palestinian storage ceramics are found in several urban centers and tombs. Shipwrecks like the Uluburun, which carried gifts and goods from several sites in the Mediterranean, suggest that this was a complex trade network where multiple polities worked with each other, rather than just one kingdom directly trading with another.

---

4 Egypt, Anatolia, multiple urban centers in the Levant, the Mycenaean, and Cyprus were the central civilizations in this connectivity.
5 Texts as far back as the Mari and Alalakh attribute the copper trade to Alashiya. There is no known other source of copper as large as the mines on Cyprus, therefore the island has been connected to at least a kingdom on Cyprus.
6 Further reading can be done with, Barry M. Gittlen's "The Cultural and Chronological Implications of the Cypro-Palestinian Trade during the Late Bronze Age," 1981.
7 Further reading can be done with Celia J. Bergoffen, "Overland Trade in Northern Sinai: The Evidence of Late Cypriot Pottery," 1991.
8 Further reading can be done with, "A Middle Cypriot Jug from Cyprus in Kommos, Crete," Pamela J. Russell, 2015.
With its natural resources and position in the Mediterranean, Cyprus was put in a prominent position for trade. The primary export of Cyprus was copper, a metal used in the making of bronze, which was in large demand during this period. In addition, the island of Cyprus is located closely to the coasts of Anatolia and Syria, making it a prime stopping point for traders before they made their way to their final destinations. These two factors allowed Cyprus to become heavily involved in the connectivity of the Late Bronze Age. These connections promulgated Cypriot pottery through the Mediterranean, until it also became a popular export with copper.9

Once the Crisis Years began, the Mediterranean relied heavily on globalization for its economy. Should one entity of this connectivity fall, the rest would supposedly suffer the consequences, and collapse as well. Researchers support this domino effect theory not only by the evidence of destruction and abandonment of several sites, but the primary textual resources from several ancient authors.

Before the theory of a systems collapse, in which multiple factors caused a slow collapse that climaxed in the 12th century BCE, was accepted for the downfall of the Mediterranean in the Late Bronze Age (LBA), researchers relied on the inscriptions by the Pharaohs Merenptah and Ramses III, who detailed the invasions of a group known as the Sea Peoples, a marauding party of “invaders” made up from a variety of ethnic groups, that swept across the region. In 1177 BCE, Ramses III explained that several civilizations already fell to the Sea Peoples by the time they reached Egypt. He listed these other polities

---

as “Hatti, Kode, Carchemish, Arzawa, Alashiya, and on...”. Not only do these reports detail the people possibly responsible for the collapse, but detail the possible destruction of kingdoms such as Alashiya.

Multiple large cities across the Mediterranean do show evidence of a violent destruction and appear to have collapsed. The Hittite kingdom completely disintegrated into individual polities that abandoned their capitals. The Mycenaeans also abandoned their urban centers, moved to smaller settlements, cut off their trade networks, and their craftsmanship and language disappeared as Greece fell into the “Dark Ages.” Smaller kingdoms and several cities of the Levant were destroyed, with some experiencing long term abandonments. A more detailed discussion of the LBA collapse and subsequent fallout is in Chapter 2 of this thesis.

Cyprus shows some signs of destruction during this time period. There are stratigraphic phases across the island that feature fallen walls of buildings, which researchers such as Dikaios and Karageorghis considered to be signs of invasions and abandonment of the sites for an extended period. However, the fallen mudbricks of these buildings correspond with several similar stratigraphic phases across the Mediterranean, and the characteristics of the fallen mudbricks suggest that there was a series of earthquakes during the Crisis Years. There is also no evidence of any battles, weaponry, or fortifications used against an invading party at any Cypriot site.

---

Despite discounting the destruction levels of Cypriot sites, recent research still seems hesitant to determine that Cyprus was an exception to the collapse narrative. This is in the face of evidence of a continuation of Cypriot culture on its ceramics, trade connections to the Near East, and the building up of current and new cities, rather than abandonment due to destruction.

With ceramic data this thesis attempts to determine what characteristics of Cypriot pottery are makers for Cypriot culture and influence. How the ceramics change throughout the Crisis Years can reveal how Cypriot culture changed or disappeared and how the manufacture of ceramics was affected by the events of the LBA collapse. The context of this pottery, such as the quantity and where it appears with each new level of occupation, provides a chronology for individual sites and their continued occupation, in addition to its trade contacts if any foreign ceramics appear in the assemblage.

The ceramic data being examined is focused on three Cypriot sites: Enkomi, Kition, and Idalion. These sites were chosen primarily for their evidence of pottery workshops, which has been purported by Mountjoy and Mommsen’s neutron activation analysis (NAA)\(^1\) as well as excavations at Idalion.\(^2\) The sites were also chosen for their chronologies and activity within the Crisis Years. Enkomi, first built as a small harbor town in the Middle Cypriot, was the largest and likely most important city on Cyprus during the

\(^{1}\) Neutron activation analysis is the measure of the elemental composition pattern of pottery, to pinpoint its provenance. The elemental composition of pottery is unique enough to connect it to a certain clay bed without any doubt. The clay beds on Cyprus differ enough that the pottery can be specifically connected to a site (Enkomi, Kition, etc), rather than a region. Mountjoy and Mommsen specifically analyzed Aegean Style pottery from Cyprus and several Eastern Mediterranean sites. The sample from Idalion was determined to be too small to comfortably connect any sherds found outside of Cyprus to Idalion, so use of this analysis will center around Enkomi and Kition.

\(^{2}\) Pithoi workshops were found by Maria Hadjicosti’s excavations of the site in the 1990s.
whole of the Late Bronze Age. As a large administrative and trade center, it experienced the most contact with foreign influences. In addition, as a capital city, it is the site that would most likely be targeted for an invasion. Kition was built up in the late 14th and 13th centuries BCE and occupied throughout the Crisis Years and onwards. It quickly followed Enkomi’s example and became a large urban center by the 13th century BCE. Ceramics at the site suggest continued trade connections, specifically in the Eastern Mediterranean. Idalion was built likely by the 13th century BCE but completed and continuously occupied by the 12th century BCE onwards. Like Kition, its ceramic data suggests that the site was involved with foreign trade, in addition to several industrial complexes found at the site. The ceramic data of Idalion reveals a continuation of Cypriot culture through its pottery.

The three sites chosen for my research have been heavily excavated since the beginning of the 20th century CE. Direct access to Late Bronze Age Cypriot pottery is not possible for this thesis. In place of studying the ceramic data personally, I will use the excavation reports of these sites in my analysis. The excavation reports detail the ceramic data in each level of occupation. The types and influences that are introduced and phased out, their standard of production, and when they occupy each level can all be gathered from these excavation reports. In addition, ceramic data from tombs and art collections are also used in this thesis, though only to a limited extent.

13 Vassos Karageorghis, Ancient Cyprus, 28.
14 The presence of Eastern Mediterranean ceramics, i.e. Canaanite jars, at Cypriot sites, and vice versa, support the continuation of trade between the two areas.
All of these sites primarily detail the transitions and continuations of Cypriot pottery during the LBA collapse and Crisis Years. Cypriot pottery was, after copper, one of the largest exports that left Cyprus. Specifically in the Eastern Mediterranean, Cypriot pottery was increasingly popular throughout the Late Bronze Age. The Cypriot pottery was well-made, pictorial,\textsuperscript{16} decorative, innovative. Many types of Cypriot pottery, which are detailed in a typology at the beginning of Chapter 3, have no parallels during this period. Cypriot culture is shown most through its craftsmanship. There are motifs and shapes that had been part of the typology since the Middle Cypriot, when ceramics across the island homogenized. A continuation of this pottery heavily suggests a continuation of Cypriot culture, commerce, and occupation of sites, which several collapsed sites do not share.

First, there must be an understanding of the connectivity and activity of Cyprus and its strongest foreign connections during the Late Bronze Age, and how the Late Bronze Age affected those connections. Chapter 1 details Cypriot ceramics, economy, and foreign relations in the Late Bronze Age. It will also describe the LBA collapse, both by textual and archaeological evidence, and how it affected each of the civilizations directly involved with Cyprus. This is to understand how Cyprus could have collapsed if we believe the narratives by the Pharaohs and corresponding letters from Near Eastern sources.

\textsuperscript{16} Syro-Palestinian pottery did not feature any pictorial motifs from the Middle Bronze Age until Bichrome Ware, setting apart the Cypriot pictorial pottery and making it more attractive for decoration.
Chapter 1: Cyprus in the Late Bronze Age, and the Collapse

This chapter details the historical background to Cyprus (figure 1) in the Late Bronze Age Collapse. The Late Bronze Age was a period of heightened connectivity in the Mediterranean that would not be matched until the Roman Empire. This connectivity, both commercial and political, brought most civilizations a period of high prosperity and power. Cyprus was not excluded from the benefits of the Late Bronze Age. Several wealthy cities were built on the coast, and, as a stop for nearly every trade route, they had a rich variety of foreign goods and contacts. The island’s own exports centered around copper and Cypriot ceramics. I will first discuss Cyprus’s economy and connections to several civilizations (Egyptians, Hittites, and peoples of the Syro-Palestinian coast) that helped define its status as a trade partner and target for control.

The second part of the chapter focuses on the Late Bronze Age collapse and its aftermath. Theories of the Late Bronze Age collapse will be presented, as well as the dismissal of the Sea Peoples as the lone cause of the collapse, also helping to dismiss ideas of complete destruction on Cyprus. How the collapse affected each civilization could have directly harmed Cyprus as well, so this chapter also details how each of Cyprus’s main connections were affected by the collapse.
Figure 1 Late Bronze Age map (found on Wikipedia, 2019)
Cyprus in the Late Bronze Age

The island of Cyprus is geographically in the center of multiple trade networks used in the Late Bronze Age. Its northern coast is only 43 miles away from Anatolia and 60 miles from modern day Syria, making it an easily accessible island for migrations and, eventually, economic interactions. Its coast lines allowed for multiple ports to be built and used by the participants of these trade networks, if only as a stepping stone to their final destinations. The island stretches 138 miles in length, and 60 miles in width, both at maximum. The Kyrenia mountains range in the north while the Troodos Mountains occupy the central and the western parts of the island, making interaction between the eastern and western sides of the island difficult, but rivers allowed access between the coast cities and the mines of the mountains. Most of the copper mines that made Cyprus lie in the Troodos Mountains.\(^\text{17}\)

By the Middle Cypriot III (1750-1650 BCE), Cyprus was already involved in some trade with the Syro-Palestinian coast. By the 18\(^{th}\) and 17\(^{th}\) centuries BCE, tablets from Alalakh and Mari named “Alashiya,” as a copper-trading partner. Karageorghis speculated metallurgical trade was driven by the production of tin-bronze, and obviously the increased use of bronze in this period. Small harbor towns that carried out this trade included Enkomi, although at this point it was under the influence of the nearby site Kalopsidha.\(^\text{18}\) At the end of the Middle Cypriot III, Cyprus was already known for its trade networks, and prosperity began to show in rich grave goods at several sites. Foreign influence on Cypriot culture also made its mark in the Middle Cypriot. Different geometric patterns were painted onto White Painted II wares, and some featured molds of

\(^{18}\) Ibid.
anthropomorphic figures on the rims and handles (figure 2). These techniques are attributed to the Syro-Palestinians that traded with Cyprus, and it marks the beginning of diversity in Cypriot ceramics, while at the same time creating a homogenous culture for the island. These types of geometric decorations are consistently featured on Cypriot pottery since the Middle Bronze Age.

Figure 2 White Painted Ware with anthropomorphic figure riding ram (Karageorghis, 1981)

19 Ibid, 49-50.
The commerce and foreign influences of the Middle Cypriot was a set up for Cyprus to capitalize on in the Late Bronze Age/Late Cypriot period (1650-1050 BCE). The amount of trade, connectivity, and economic prosperity far surpassed that of the Middle Cypriot. Building projects suddenly increased across the island. Although all types of settlements—agricultural villages, mining towns, and the urban centers on the coast—grew in numbers and size, it was the coastal harbor towns that Cyprus’s economy depended on.\(^20\)

Coastal harbor towns of the Middle Cypriot became the new administrative urban centers of the island. Cities such as Hala Sultan Tekke, Maroni, and Toumba tou Skourou became major centers for international trade and foreign influence. It was Enkomi, though, that dominated the scene, likely because of its closer proximity to Cyprus’s contacts in the Eastern Mediterranean. The city’s fortresses were torn down and rebuilt (although there has been no evidence from the end of the Middle Cypriot III or Late Cypriot I that would suggest raids or any other cause that made the building projects necessary), and the city itself grew larger in size to support its increasing population and administrative centers. Enkomi’s growth allowed it to supplant Kalopsidha as the “capital” of Cyprus.\(^21\)

Neither Enkomi’s nor any other urban center’s administrative authority can be applied to the whole island. Throughout the Late Bronze Age, there is no clear evidence for the political structure of Cyprus. Researchers are still unsure how large the kingdom of Alashiya was. It could apply strictly to Enkomi’s city limits, or it could have spread to its surrounding cities. A central authority for the whole of the island could not be put in place.

\(^{20}\) Ibid, 51.
\(^{21}\) Ibid.
because the Troodos mountains in the center of the island were difficult to traverse, therefore contact was limited between the eastern and western sides of the island.\textsuperscript{22}

Enkomi’s authority over the trade systems and economy is more evident. The city was a powerhouse of production and trade of copper. During the Late Bronze Age, the coastal urban centers received unrefined copper ores straight from the mining villages and worked on the metal in the cities’ own workshops. Each city had its own copper refinery, making Cypriot urban centers the site of copper production and trade. The popularity of copper made Enkomi the largest trading hub of LBA Cyprus. As a result, the city had a variety of luxury goods and wares, including a variety of both local and imported pottery. This created a new power dynamic, and it was clear that the elites had taken over the urban centers.\textsuperscript{23} By taking over the copper trade, Enkomi created a hierarchy within the settlements, with coastal, elite cities at the top, and the agricultural and mining sites below them.

At Enkomi, hundreds of tombs were found with rich objects. Tomb 12 featured hundreds of objects, including a wealth of gold jewelry and diadems, multiple Egyptian objects, and Mycenaean ceramics imported from the Aegean.\textsuperscript{24} Although the tombs were reused throughout the Late Bronze Age, which makes the objects’ context as either heirlooms or original grave goods uncertain, they are examples of the elite class’s wealth.

\textsuperscript{22} Louise Steele, “THE LATE CYPRIOT CERAMIC PRODUCTION: HIERARCHY OR HETERARCHY?” 107
\textsuperscript{24} “Enkomi,” British Museum Website, https://www.britishmuseum.org/research/publications/online_research_catalogues/ancient_cyprus_british_museum/enkomi/introduction.aspx. Thousands of objects in the British Museum’s collection from Enkomi is featured on their website. Each object was assigned a symbol that corresponded to the tomb it was found in.
The wealth and connectivity of Cyprus largely came from its copper trade. Copper was Cyprus’s most lucrative export to the Mediterranean. Cypriot economy began to rely so much on the copper trade that it bled into the people’s very culture, including their religion. They created deities dedicated to the metal. The Ashlar Building of Enkomi had one room dedicated as a sanctuary to the “Horned God,” as named by researchers. The most famous statue of this god is made of bronze, and at 55 cm. tall, it is the largest of its kind. There is another sanctuary from the Late Cypriot III at Enkomi for what has been named the “Ingot God.” He is fully armored and carries a shield and spear while standing on a copper ingot. He has been interpreted as a protector of the copper mines. A goddess has been found with the Ingot God, and she also stands on a copper ingot, nude. This has been interpreted as a goddess for the fertility of the copper mines. Ingots were used as votives at this sanctuary.\(^\text{25}\) The Cypriots made a clear association with metallurgy to their religion.

Second to the copper exchange was the Cypriot ceramic exchange. There was an increase in the exchange of Cypriot ceramics during The Late Bronze Age, with White Slip and Base Ring wares being the most widespread. White Slip ware started in the Late Cypriot I, and dominated the ceramic trade until it was phased out in the Late Cypriot IIC. It was a simple style in which the ceramic types (typically bowls, jugs, and tankards), were covered in a thick white slip. It was then typically painted with linear and geometric motifs with brown or orange paint\(^\text{26}\) (figure 4).

\(^{25}\) Karageorghis, *Ancient Cyprus*, 56
The other popular ceramic type was Base Ring Ware I and II. Base Ring Ware was made to imitate metal vessels. The surface was dark and made to look metallic (figure 3). They had ring bases, giving the type its name, and their decorations varied. Jugs such as the one in figure 3 had long necks, and moldings used as decoration to imitate rope on the vessel.27 Interestingly, both popular ceramics were handmade, despite the wheel being used at the same time on Cyprus.28

The two above ceramic types were not the only ones made by Cypriots. There was also Monochrome Ware, White Shaved Ware, Bucchero Ware, Red and Black Lustrous Wheel-made Wares, Red and Black Slip Wares, Bichrome Wheel-made Ware and, growing in popularity in the Late Cypriot III, Plain White Wheel-made Ware.29 These wares had

---
27 Sjoqvist, Problems, 38-42.
28 Karageorghis, Ancient Cyprus, 55.
29 Eric Sjoqvist, Problems, 30-74.
brief moments of popularity, but none as lasting as Base Ring Wares and White Slip Wares. The wide and lasting distribution of Base Ring and White Slip Wares are evidence of Cypriot connectivity to several civilizations all across the Mediterranean, both directly and indirectly.

Locally, in addition to these wares, imported pottery from Syria, the Levant and Egypt were all found in Cypriot sites. These groups of imports were in small quantities when compared to the large amount of Mycenaean pottery that was imported in the 14th and 13th centuries BCE. Before the Late Bronze Age collapse, which would devastate the Mycenaeans and their economy (this will be discussed later in the thesis), it is believed that this pottery was imported from the Aegean, rather than just imitated by local Cypriot potters.30 Throughout the Crisis Years, however, Cypriot potters took over the production of Mycenaean-style pottery.

Cypriot Foreign Relations

This section details Cyprus’s relations with four civilizations that it interacted with the most, the Egyptians, the Hittites, the Syro-Palestinian coast, and the Mycenaeans. The political connections Cyprus had to these groups are evident through the multiple correspondences sent to and from the king of Alashiya, or about the kingdom of Alashiya. The exchange of material culture, made evident by the foreign goods that appear in Cyprus and vice versa, signifies the commercial connections these civilizations made with Cyprus. The relationships between Cyprus and these civilizations define its commercial and

30 Karageorghis, *Ancient Cyprus*, 55.
political standings in the Late Bronze Age, and what connections Cyprus could have lost during the LBA collapse.

The largest kingdom Cyprus connected to was Egypt. Egypt exerted control over Cyprus by the 14th century BCE. There are several fragments from the Amarna Letters, a collection of letters and administrative documents from the city of Amarna during the Amarna period (1353-1336 BCE), that are correspondence between the “kings” of Alashiya and several Pharaohs. In all of these letters, the king of Alashiya refers to the Pharaoh as “the king of Egypt, my brother,” which alludes to some sort of political respect between the two rulers. Despite this kind greeting, the letters reveal that there were occasional contentions between the two rulers, and that perhaps Alashiya served as a vassal to Egypt.  

In several letters, the king of Alashiya refers to the many gifts of copper and other various goods to the Pharaoh, as the Pharaoh apparently requested. The king of Alashiya usually asks for the Pharaoh to reciprocate with his own gifts. We are not sure how often the Pharaoh sent his own gifts to Cyprus, but there are two letters where the king asks why the Pharaoh has not sent anything back.

There are also instances where the king was forced to reassure the Pharaoh of his loyalty. In one letter, the lines read, “You have not been put (on the same level) with the king of Hatti or the king of Shankhar. Whatever greeting-gift he (my brother) sends me, I for my part send back to you double.” In another letter, the king responds to an accusation

---

from the Pharaoh that Cypriot men were raiding lands with “men of Lukki,” who are possibly the Lycians. He insists that his men would never do such a thing, but if the Pharaoh catches them then he may punish them as he pleases.33

Finally, there is a message where the king of Alashiya begs for help from the Pharaoh when raiding parties come to Cyprus from the Near East. It is in this letter that suggests Cyprus is a vassal of Egypt in the 14th century. The king says that “Aziru” is at war with him. Aziru attacked Alashiya with his allies, who are one man named “Yapah-Hadda” and the rulers of “Tyre, Beirut, and Sidon.” The king pleads to the Pharaoh, saying, “May the king give thought to his city and his servant; my peasantry long only to desert... I have sent [...] a messenger of mine time and again... For what reason is your loyal servant so treated? For service to you!... [The king must] send a garrison [to protect] yo[ur loya]l [servant....]... Who will be loyal were I to die?”34 This is the last piece of correspondence between the king and the Pharaoh listed in Sources. Alashiya is listed in several topographical inscriptions for several Pharaohs, though, and was listed in the famous inscription by Ramses III about the Sea Peoples.35

There was some trade interaction between Cyprus and Egypt. However, a large amount of this trade is restricted to the Sinai region. It is only in rare assemblages that Late Cypriot pottery is found in the mainland of Egypt, such as those vessels that contained gifts to the Pharaoh. In the Sinai area and Southern Canaan, both under Egypt’s rule in the Late Bronze Age, Cypriot pottery dominates the ceramic assemblages of several sites. Egyptian

33 Ibid, 23.
34 Ibid, 25.
rule over parts of Canaan resulted in some more interaction between Egypt and Cyprus, but it is still limited to Palestine and not Egypt itself. Some Egyptian pottery and imitation pottery has been found in Cyprus, such as mentioned above in Tomb 12 at Enkomi, but this appears to be limited to individual choices rather than a full exchange of ceramic goods.

The relationship between Cyprus and the Hittite kingdom suggests that there was a flux of control between the Hittites and Egypt. Several documents from Hittite archives mention a relationship with Cyprus based on tribute to the Hittite rulers. These letters make the control over Cyprus more complicated than the Amarna Letters suggest. There is a report from the 15th century BCE from Arnuwanda I’s envoy. It states that he gave one of Arnuwanda’s vassals a tablet, informing the vassal to cease raids on Alashiya because the land belonged to the king. In a letter from the Hittite kingdom to the ruler of Alashiya, asking why that ruler has not written to the Hittite king and that there is tribute owed.

The Hittites must have lost control of Cyprus at some point, as Tudhaliya IV records his attack on Alashiya and conquering it for his own. “I captured [the king of Alashiya], together with his wives, his sons, [and his...] I drew [up] all the goods, [together with the silver], gold, copper, and all the civilian captives, and [I brought] them home to Hattusa. But [I subjugated] the land of Alashiya in place and made it a tributary...”

If we still believe Tudhaliya’s claim, then the Hittites still could not keep control of Cyprus, possibly due to the Late Bronze Age collapse. Suppiluliuma II had his own

---

37 *Sources*, 45.
38 Ibid.
39 Ibid, 46.
confrontations with Alashiya, although his inscription does not state if he was attempting to control the island again or just engaging them in battle for a separate reason. “Then I, Suppiluliuma, Great King, quickly [embarked upon?] the sea. And the ships of Alashiya met me in battle at sea three times. I eliminated them. I captured the ships and set them afire at sea. When I reached dry land once more, then the enemy from the land of Alashiya came against me [for battle] in droves. I [fought against] them.” The inscription suggests that Suppiluliuma returned to his own land and fought the people from Alashiya there, rather than on the island. Unfortunately, the rest of this inscription is too fragmented to know.40

Despite this claim by Arnuwanda I and then Tudhaliya IV, there is no evidence yet found in Cyprus that suggests the Hittites ever controlled Cypriot commerce or administration. There is no increase of Cypriot goods to the Hittites and no correspondence between the two kingdoms that discuss their relationship as a vassal kingdom like there was for Egypt. There could have well been a battle but any evidence of conflict in Cyprus from this time period has yet to surface. It was theorized by Schaeffer and Dikaios that the conflict with Suppiluliuma could have caused the destruction layer of Level IIB/IIIA at Enkomi, which is contemporary with the years that Suppiluliuma41. However, the destruction of this layer better fits an earthquake than an invasion, and again there is no sign of conflict for Suppiluliuma’s time period.

There are very few Hittite objects found in Cyprus. This is not a phenomenon specific to Cyprus. When compared to Egyptian, Aegean, and Cypriot art and trade, Hittite

40 Ibid, 47.
41 Dikaios, Enkomi, 525.
culture is rarely prevalent in foreign contexts. Metallurgy was likely the most common exchange between the two polities, but the only evidence is circumstantial. Mirko Novak notes that not only are Hittite exports difficult to find in foreign areas, but so are goods that were imported into the Hittite cities. Novak has two theories for this. The first, that the goods imported into the Hittite kingdom were moved during the systematic collapse and abandonment of the Hittite cities. This theory does not explain why so few imports, even sherds of pottery, would be left behind. The second theory is that the Hittite struggles with the Mycenaean would have greatly decreased the amount of Aegean pottery coming to Anatolia.42 Consequentially, because of the strong trade network between the Aegean and Cyprus, this also could have made Hittite trade more difficult with Cyprus, despite its attempt at control of the island in the 13th century. These circumstances left the Hittite kingdom and Cyprus with just a political relationship, although it was a strong, tumultuous relationship at that.

The Syro-Palestinian coast and Levant have some of the earliest trade contact with Cyprus. Again, this is evident as early as the Middle Cypriot, when Near Eastern influences show up in the ceramic finds of Cypriot cities. For example, both areas created Red Burnished Ware in the Middle Cypriot (figure 5). For the Late Bronze Age specifically, the ceramics of Cyprus and Syro-Palestinian cities are often blended in scholarship. This is likely because of the strong prominence that Cypriot ceramics took in the Late Bronze Age,

as Base Ring, Bichrome Wheel-made, and White Slip Wares began to appear in several large Levantine cities.\textsuperscript{43} The appearance of Cypriot ceramics in the Levant and Syro-Palestinian coasts during the Crisis Years is discussed in much greater detail in the following chapter. The trade connections are also evident in several letters from the Mari and Ugarit that list goods coming from Alashiya.\textsuperscript{44}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{Red Polished Ware from Cyprus (Karageorghis, 1981)}
\end{figure}

The connection between the Near East and Cyprus is not just commercial. As with the Egyptians and Hittites, there is a great amount of correspondence between the Cypriot and Ugarit kingdoms. This relationship appears to be different from how it was with the Egyptian and Hittite rulers. In these letters, the rulers refer to each other as brothers, or

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{43} Karageorghis, \textit{Ancient Cyprus}, 55.
\textsuperscript{44} Wallace, \textit{Sources on Cyprus}, 17-19, 36-39.
\end{flushright}
occasionally the King of Ugarit refers to the King of Alashiya as “my father.” In return, the King of Alashiya appears to call the King of Ugarit “my son.” These letters from the Ugarit are fragmented and not wholly understood, however, and because the kingdom of Alashiya is still clouded, we are not sure what the context behind these greetings are. Regardless, neither ruler appears to demand tribute from each other or reassurance of loyalty. Instead, there are blessings upon each other’s houses and exchanges of advice for their rulership.

Cyprus’s relationship with the Aegean appears to only be commercial. Like Cyprus, there is no clear rulership or political organization found for the Mycenaean, and consequently there is no correspondence found between the two civilizations. There are very few Minoan objects found on Cyprus, and vice versa. This is unsurprising since trade between the Aegean and Cyprus only began to take full effect in the 14th century BCE, after the collapse of the “Palatial Period” and Minoan culture. The Mycenaean supplanted the Minoans and used the Minoans’ trade networks to advance their own commercial activities.

Evidence of Mycenaean-Cypriot trade exists on Cyprus and the Greek mainland. The island served as a stopping point for the Mycenaean as they made their way to their other connections in the Near East. As the Mycenaean began to dominate the commercial markets of the Mediterranean, their goods (particularly, their ceramics) were spread throughout the region. In the 14th and 13th centuries BCE, the Mycenaean ceramics found in Cyprus were imports (figure 6). The amount of interaction between the two civilizations

and the limit of the Mycenaean-style ceramics to elite tombs both suggest that these were imported ceramics. In addition, there are differences in the paints of the imported pottery and local Cypriot imitations. The paint of the imported pottery was glossier, while the Cypriot pottery used a matte paint. Once the collapse and Crisis Years came into effect, craftsmanship, and therefore the importation, of Mycenaean ceramics dramatically decreased. This led to the rise of Cypriot made Mycenaean ceramics, possibly because of migrations from the Aegean to Cyprus as a response to the collapse of the Mycenaean cities. By the 12th and 11th centuries, the Mycenaean ceramics found in Cyprus were made locally. These ceramics, and the causes behind their makings, are detailed in length in the following chapter.

48 Karageorghis, Ancient Cyprus, 55.
Figure 6 Mycenaean Imported Pottery, Tomb 12 of Enkomi (British Museum Online Collection)
The Collapse of the Late Bronze Age and Cyprus

The connections among all of these different civilizations created a great dependence on that connectivity. If one civilization, and their economy, should fall, so would the rest. This is exactly what happened in the Late Bronze Age collapse. This section discusses the connections and relationships of Egypt, Anatolia, the Syro-Palestinian Coast, and the Aegean, and the Late Bronze Age collapse.

Cyprus was a piece in the middle of all connections made in the Late Bronze Age. All these other civilizations were connected both by trade and political correspondence. For example, Amenhotep III’s funerary temple had several statue bases with topographical lists of areas the Egyptians had contact with. Know as the “Aegean List,” it is the most well-known and heavily researched of these topographical lists. Cline and Hankey have explained their own theories that the Aegean list serves as an itinerary of a trip taken by Amenhotep III’s ambassadors. Whether or not this theory is true, it does make a case for all the connections on these lists. There were also lists for the Near Eastern cities, Anatolian cities, Syro-Palestinian cities, and Levantine cities. Alashiya is featured on some of these topographical lists.

There are other examples of this strong connectivity between the different Mediterranean cultures. An obvious one is the Uluburun Shipwreck, which possibly first set off from a Syro-Palestinian or Cypriot harbor. The goods found in the ancient ship came from several stops in the Mediterranean, and they were all considered luxurious finds.

---

There were copper ingots from Cyprus, Egyptian jewelry and scarabs inscribed with names of the royal family, Canaanite glass beads, and much more. The wealth of the goods in the wreck suggests that the ship carried gifts to exchange between the Mediterranean rulers.\textsuperscript{51}

The most commonly cited sources for the Late Bronze Age collapse are the inscriptions of the Egyptian Pharaohs in the 13\textsuperscript{th} and 12\textsuperscript{th} centuries BCE that refer to the Sea Peoples and their destruction of multiple Late Bronze Age kingdoms. The first came from the military Pharaoh, Ramses II. In 1274 BCE, Ramses II defeated the Hittites for control of Qadesh. He had his victory inscribed, and in that inscription, it is believed that the Hittites’ allies are the Sea Peoples, and that he fought against these peoples before and defeated them on Egyptian soil.\textsuperscript{52}

The second inscription is from Merenptah in the late 13\textsuperscript{th} century BCE. Merenptah’s inscription details his victory over the Libyan chief, Mereye, and his allies in the fifth year of his reign (1209 BCE). These allies are made of a variety of peoples that Merenptah names as the Ekwesh, Teresh, Lukka, Sherden, and Shekelesh. He claims he slew 6,000 of these peoples, despite their descriptions appearing to show the people attempting to settle in Egypt,\textsuperscript{53} which alone calls into question the theory of a violent collapse done by the Sea Peoples.

The Sea Peoples return during the reign of Ramses III. It is in this inscription, the same one that included Alashiya as one of the destroyed kingdoms referenced earlier, that the devastating effects of the Sea Peoples in the rest of the Mediterranean is described:

\textsuperscript{51} Cline, 1177 BCE, 80-81.
\textsuperscript{52} Wallace, Sources, 48.
\textsuperscript{53} Ibid.
The foreign countries conspired in their islands. All at once the lands were removed and scattered in the fray. No land could resist their arms, from Hatti, Kode, Carchemish, Arzawa, and Alashiya on - being cut off at one time. A camp was set up in Amurru. They desolated its people and its land was like that which had never existed. They were coming forward toward Egypt, while the flame was prepared for them. Their confederation was the Peleset, Tjeker, Shekelesh, Denen, and Weshesh, lands united. They laid their hands upon the lands as far as the circuit of the earth, their hearts were confident and trusting as they said "Our plans will succeed!"54

Although the destruction of Alashiya/Cyprus is contested in this thesis, the other civilizations listed in the inscription, and the rest of the Mediterranean, suffered in the Late Bronze Age collapse. Large, important cities such as Hattusa, Mycenae, Pylos, Byblos, Tarsus, Qadesh, Ashkelon, and Ugarit all appeared to have been destroyed by the Sea Peoples, beginning in the late 13th century BCE.55 The Sea Peoples’ invasion of Egypt has been dated to 1177 BCE, and that is considered a pivotal year for Late Bronze Age collapse.

Recent research suggests that the Sea Peoples and their violent invasions were not the only causes for the Late Bronze Age collapse. The theory now widely accepted behind the LBA collapse is that all these factors worked together to create one large, long catastrophe in the Crisis Years, referred to as the Systems Collapse theory. This research reveals other factors that could have led to a widespread and nonlinear collapse. Several of these factors are environmental, which in turn could cause distress and, as a response to that distress, destruction. For most civilizations, especially those in contact with Cyprus, the effects were devastating.

One of these environmental causes is a series of earthquakes. Cline cites studies by archaeoseismologists, who believe that a series of earthquakes hit the Mediterranean

---

54 Ibid.
55 Cline, 1177 BCE, 141-142.
between 1225 BCE and 1175 BCE. This time period coincides with the destruction of several sites, supposedly by the Sea Peoples. There are some differences between the signs of destruction as done by people and destruction by natural disasters. In earthquake destroyed cities, there is a lack of weapons used in battle, and the destroyed walls usually smash what is in their surroundings, sometimes people. Cline describes several skeletons found at Mycenae and Tiryns, two cities supposedly destroyed by the Sea Peoples at the same time, that clearly show the people died from a wall collapsing on them suddenly. Walls at Kition are similar. Pottery and other material finds crushed underneath fallen walls suggest that this destruction was sudden.\(^\text{56}\)

Several tests across the Mediterranean have produced evidence of a drought during the Crisis Years, which could have been one of the causes of collapse. Pollen data from Northern Syria, the Salt Lake that Kition was built next to in Cyprus, Lake Voulkaria in Western Greece, and the Soreq Cave in Israel all show evidence of a more arid climate, a noticeable drop in precipitation, and a cool in the temperature towards the end of the Late Bronze Age.\(^\text{57}\) These conditions create not only drought, but famine as a result. Cooler temperatures and lack in precipitation ruined conditions for agriculture. Several Amarna Letters from the Hittites further prove a shortage of food during the collapse. One Hittite queen wrote to Ramses II “I have no grain in my land.” Another Hittite official writes that there was famine in the land.\(^\text{58}\) Interestingly, there is no additional correspondence or textual sources about other regions suffering from a famine. This could be for several reasons.

\(^{56}\) Ibid, 86-88.  
\(^{57}\) Ibid, 145-146.  
reasons, such as better access to their own agricultural resources, better access to Egypt’s resources as a vassal state, or because of the tensions between Egypt and the Hittite kingdom.\(^{59}\)

Egypt was considered one of the few survivors of the LBA collapse. When compared to the other civilizations that disappeared during the collapse, this is true. Ramses III claimed on his inscription that he defeated the Sea Peoples, when all other civilizations supposedly fell to them. The Twentieth Dynasty, the dynasty that Ramses III belonged to, lasted until the death of Ramses XI in 1070 and perhaps Egypt’s empire was too large, ancient, and powerful to truly collapse.

Despite all of this, the Egyptians still faced some harsh effects of the collapse. They retreated from their rule of Canaan, allowing the Israelites to fill the power vacuum at the beginning of the Iron Age. They lost all their trade and political connections, cutting off their tributary and political gifts. Their agriculture suffered from the same drought and crop failure when the Nile did not flood as high as normal, and the country fell into famine. This caused civil unrest in the first recorded labor strike in human history, taking place just in Year 29 of Ramses III’s reign. The Pharaoh’s power declined, although the Twentieth Dynasty lingered, and by Ramses XI the Pharaoh title lost all its power except in name to the priesthood of Amun. After Ramses XI’s death, the kingdom declined into the Third Intermediate Period (1070-664 BCE), and would never recover the previous level of power it owned.\(^{60}\)

\(^{59}\) Langgut, Finkelstein, Litt, “Climate and LBA Collapse,” 165.

Evidence of what exactly happened to the Hittite kingdom is severely limited, other than the textual sources that have been translated. In addition to the letters from the Hittite queen and official mentioned earlier, in which state famine has taken Hattis, there are other letters confirming the drought. One comes from Merneptah, stating that he has sent grain to the Hittites to keep them alive. Using the language and tone of these letters, it appears that the famine grew dire in the Crisis Years. How the ruling class ceased to exist in Hatti has never had any explanation. There are no records found to date of the kings that ruled during the Crisis Years, if there were any at all.

Archaeological evidence of the Hittite sites is also limited. In addition to the material evidence of the drought, excavations of several sites have revealed that several important Hittite cities experienced violent destructions. Multiple sites have a burnt layer dated to the collapse and invasions of the Sea Peoples. It is not clear, though, if this destruction came from the Sea Peoples, another foreign invasion, or civil unrest as a consequence of the famine. Most Hittite sites were abandoned during the Crisis Years, and the new sites created smaller polities referred to as “Neo-Hittites.” The Hittites and their experiences in the Late Bronze Age collapse are a much clearer case study for a societal and economic collapse.

The rest of the Near East experienced different effects of the collapse, depending on the civilization. Some civilizations, such as the Assyrians, were able to use the collapse to their advantage and grow their influence. Ugarit, however, has both textual and clear archaeological evidence of its destruction at the hands of foreign invaders. Several letters

---

found at Ugarit give a timeline of the attacks on Ugarit. The first is a plea to the king of Alasiya: “My father, behold, the enemy's ships came [here]; my cities(?) were burned, and they did evil things in my country. Does my father not know that all my troops and chariots(?) are in the land of Hatti, and all my ships are in the land of Lukka? ... Thus, the country is abandoned to itself.” A governor of Alashiya did reply to the ruler, but he claimed he would not aid Ugarit because those enemies attacking were actually people from Ugarit. This claim by Alashiya was not confirmed, but the city of Carchemish did send troops to Ugarit's aid. Unfortunately, another letter from Ugarit said the help came too late: “When your messenger arrived, the army was humiliated, and the city was sacked. Our food in the threshing floors was burnt and the vineyards were also destroyed. Our city is sacked. May you know it! May you know it!62”

Excavations at Ugarit confirmed their own claims of destruction. The destruction layers excavated at the site revealed only Mycenaean IIIB pottery, and none later. This makes Ugarit's destruction contemporary with the battles by Merneptah in Egypt.63

If we accept the theory of destruction by the Sea Peoples, then clearly Cyprus should have collapsed at a period corresponding with the rest of the Mediterranean’s collapse. The above examples of several civilizations explain the characteristics of a collapsed society. A civilization that has collapsed has been cut off from their trade connections, abandoned their cities for new and smaller settlements, lost their rulership and elite class, all but stops manufacturing luxury goods for export, and, for some but not all, suffered violent invasions and destructions. Chapter 3 details Cyprus and Cypriot ceramics during the Crisis Years

62 Wallace, Sources, 38.
63 Ibid.
and how it supports that Cyprus does not fit the collapse narrative like the above examples. Cypriot ceramics prove the continuation of the island's economy, manufacture, and culture.
Chapter 3: Analysis on Cypriot Pottery from the Crisis Years

This chapter will study the ceramic data of each site—Enkomi, Kition, and Idalion—and their contexts. There is a small variety of contexts for these ceramics, from tombs to domestic households to production centers. I will review the styles, quality of decoration,\(^{64}\) types, their possible foreign influences, and the chronologies of the ceramics. In addition, there are comparanda sites that have similar assemblages\(^{65}\) to Cyprus and support the arguments for Cyprus’s economic stability and continuation in the Crisis Years. These sites are Mycenae, Tel Dor, and a Middle to Late Bronze Age Cypriot site called Ayios Sozomenos Kakaskolin. The same characteristics of these foreign assemblages will be studied in this chapter. The aim of this thesis is to examine the ceramic finds of these sites and use them as evidence for Cyprus’s survival of the Late Bronze Age collapse. Along with the copper trade, Cypriot ceramics were a large part of the civilization’s economy.

Numerous types of Cypriot pottery appear in the Late Bronze Age and the subsequent Crisis Years. These types are Base Ring I and II Ware, White Slip I and II Ware, Bucchero Ware, White Painted and Proto-White Painted Ware, Bichrome Ware, Monochrome Ware, White Shaved Ware, and Red Lustrous Wheel-Made Wares. Of these

\(^{64}\) By “quality of decoration,” I am studying the continuation of Cypriot motifs and pictorial decorations, as only Cypriot and Mycenaean ceramics are the only pictorial ceramics that are popularly exported in the LBA and Crisis Years. The deterioration of Mycenaean pottery’s motifs into concentric bands and wavy lines were a sign of the collapse of Mycenaean craftsmanship and society. I apply the same principle to Cypriot pottery.

\(^{65}\) The assemblages of the comparative sites have either local Cypriot types or Mycenaean types made in Cyprus, or both.
types, Base Ring and White Slip are the most popular ceramics in both local and foreign assemblages of tableware and decorative ware.

Base Ring I and II Ware were made to imitate metal vessels. The surface was dark and usually covered with a thin lustrous slip to recreate the shine of metal. All types had ring bases, giving the type its name, but the shapes and types of vessels varies from bowls to bull-shaped vases. Jugs, which are the type most often found in foreign assemblages, are decorated with long and exaggerated necks and spouts and thin walls. Their decorations were made to look like rope on the vessel (see, figure 3 from Ch. 2). The other shapes, such as the bowls and vases, did not have these rope decorations, instead leaving the decoration plain.

White Slip I and II Ware were a type of pictorial pottery. Its production was relatively standardized when compared to Base Ring Ware. As the name suggests, the ceramics were dipped into a thick, matte, white slip. Different geometric motifs were then painted on the vessels, in either orange or brown colors. The motifs were typically chains of geometric shapes, such as lozenges, ladders, or stacked chevrons, vertically down the body of the vessel. The shapes were restricted to bowls and jugs, with bowls being the more popular of the two.

Two more pictorial types of pottery that were relatively prevalent after Base Ring and White Slip wares are Bichrome and White Painted/Proto White Painted Wares. Bichrome is commonly found as imports in Syro-Palestinian assemblages. Until neutron activation analysis of the pottery proved otherwise, it was originally believed that Bichrome was a Syro-Palestinian innovation. Bichrome Ware is decorated with several
different motifs painted on with two colors of paint. The most prominent shape of this vessel during this time period are lentoid flasks.

White Painted Wares were similar to White Slip Wares. The surface is also covered with a matte white slip and painted on. However, this type is not produced until much later in the Late Bronze Age. Its decorations and shapes are also considerably different. The shapes are restricted to large vases and tankards, and decorations could be as simple as vertical lines down the body or as complicated as several geometric chains overlapping each other.

The other wares produced in the time periods—Bucchero, Red Lustrous Wheel-made, White Shaved, and Monochrome—are produced in considerably less quantities. The types are either phased out quickly or barely overlap from the Middle Cypriot, when they were featured in assemblages more often. They will be mentioned as often as necessary, specifically in the excavation reports of each site, but they will not be discussed in detail because they do not represent the continuation of Cypriot culture and commerce.

Due to a migration of Mycenaean people to Cyprus, Mycenaean ceramics were prevalent on Cyprus during the Crisis Years. Mycenaean pottery is pictorial with its own set of motifs that are characteristic to the Aegean. A prevalent image is the chariot scene. Most of the larger pictorial scenes feature sea creatures, such as shells and octopi. Other decorations typical for Mycenaean pottery were spirals, wave lines, bull/ox hides, flowers, ivy leaves, and the scale and dot design. Rude/Pastoral pottery appeared starting in the 12th century BCE and featured scenes of pastoral animals, usually bulls, in landscape scenes. Granary Class was one of the final types of Mycenaean pictorial pottery to be
introduced before the disappearance of Mycenaean craftsmanship. Its painted figures are simple when compared to the earlier Mycenaean types. Instead of detailed figures, Granary Class only featured large dark bands and wavy lines on the body of the vessels.

Although earlier Aegean types were imported onto the island before the collapse, Mycenaean IIIB wares are the first types to be made locally in Cyprus. This trend would continue through the Crisis Years, until Aegean types were finally phased out of popularity. Mycenaean IIIB, all parts of IIIC, Granary Class, and Rude/Pastoral were all featured in Cypriot assemblages.

For each site, excavations and their reports are the most beneficial to this research, as the excavators are the first ones to see these ceramics in their original contexts. These excavation reports also provide architectural and level context for each ceramic find and help create a timeline for those sites and ceramics. Not all finds and ceramics are published or described in great detail, though. Therefore, other contexts, such as tombs and outside collections, are also beneficial and will be used for their information. It should be noted, however, that tombs could have disturbed contexts. In addition, finds from tombs and collections can be biased towards elite graves and luxury goods. Therefore, it is important to keep in mind that these other resources are only supplementary, and do not provide a whole picture of a site or assemblage.

Site Analyses

Enkomi
Table 1: Enkomi’s stratigraphic phases, with the pottery types represented in the levels. Types are presented in order from most to least prominent in the assemblage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IIC</td>
<td>1125-1050</td>
<td>White Slip, Base Ring, Proto-White Painted Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Myc. IIC Ib, Myc. IIC Ib, Granary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All types severely decreased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIB</td>
<td>1190-1125</td>
<td>Myc. IIC Ib, Granary Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White Slip, Base Ring, Monochrome, White Shaved Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIA</td>
<td>1230-1190</td>
<td>Myc. IIIB, Myc. IIIC Ib, Rude/Pastoral, wares are made in Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Base Ring, Plain Wares (pithoi), White Slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIB</td>
<td>1300-1230</td>
<td>Myc. IIIA, IIIA2, IIIB, Rude/Pastoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White Slip, Base Ring, Monochrome, White Shaved Ware, Plain Wares</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enkomi was built up into a large capital city in the LC II. The city is currently less than 3 kilometers away from the east coast and it was built on the Mesaoria. The size of the city is partially marked by the Fortification Wall built in the LC IIC/IIIA. The western terrain extends to the mouth of a small river. The city’s size was approximately 400 meters in length and 350 meters in width. South is also the Pedieos River but access to it from Enkomi has now silted into a marsh. These river accesses allowed Enkomi access to inter-island trade and the copper mines of the Troodos Mountains.  

---

most on its port and trade contacts, becoming so prosperous that Claude F. Schaeffer believed it to be Alashiya, the kingdom referred to in the Amarna Letters that has been collectively attributed to Cyprus.67

The first excavations began in Enkomi in 1897, under A. Murray for the British Museum. Murray focused on clearing the tombs of Enkomi, which revealed a great amount of imported Mycenaean goods. Not all tombs had the same goods, but they all had different types of pottery within them. All the types of Late Bronze Age pottery listed above were represented in the tombs, alongside thousands of foreign and rich, luxury objects, including gold jewelry (figure 7). Although most tombs that were first found by A. Murray had a range of grave objects that date back to the 17th century BCE, some objects could be dated as late as the 11th century.68 Multiple tombs included objects both from the beginning and end of this time period. This is likely due to the reuse of tombs in the later periods of the Late Bronze Age. The British Museum does not explain which tombs may have been reused, and presents all of the objects together as belonging to one burial for each tomb. Knowing that these tombs were used for multiple internments during occupation makes me hesitant to use them as true representations of the peoples and economy of Enkomi during the Crisis Years. Despite this, it is still worth noting that of the objects found in the tombs, the

---

67 As referenced before, this conclusion has been made by the association of Alashiya with the copper trade by several textual sources, such as the Mari and Ugaritic records of trade.
68 “Enkomi,” British Museum Website.
majority were dated between the late 14th century BCE and the mid-11th century BCE, the period when the Mediterranean was at its peak in connectivity and prosperity.

Figure 7 Objects from Tomb 12: an imported Egyptian glazed bowl, a golden bead, golden mouthpiece, Ivory Knife handle (British Museum Online Collection)
The first excavations\textsuperscript{69} done in length were a joint French-Cypriot expedition lasting from 1934 until the Turkish invasion in 1974. The excavations as detailed by Schaeffer and Dikaios unearthed pottery examples found in several layers contemporary with the Late Bronze Age Crisis Years. Dikaios and the Cypriot Department of Antiquities published several volumes on their excavations at Enkomi, providing an excellent attention to detail to their finds and stratigraphy levels. Each of these levels and their ceramic finds are listed below, beginning with Level IIB as it is the first level that falls in the thesis's research period. There is a large range of ceramic types, both Cypriot and Mycenaean.\textsuperscript{70} These pottery examples are telling for cultural continuity at Enkomi, but also show some transitional styles that are evident of more Aegean influence at Cyprus for a period of time.

There are multiple spaces in Enkomi that prove a continuation of Mycenaean culture through the Crisis Years. For example, Schaeffer notes that several architectural spaces still included Mycenaean IIIC pottery, such as the “Ashlar Building” found in QW4. Given the evidence from other sites, and research of other pottery examples, this pottery was likely local to Cyprus.\textsuperscript{71} In the following section, which detail some of the notable finds of Dikaios’s levels, there are several examples of both imported and local ceramic types, and

\textsuperscript{69} Between the British Museum and the French-Cypriot excavations, some excavations were done by the Swedish Cyprus Expedition in the 1920s. However, these excavations in Enkomi were limited to the tombs, and do not add any addition information than what the British Museum produced before it.

\textsuperscript{70} As according to the multiple descriptions of each level by Dikaios, described below. Please also refer to figures of stratigraphy and pottery percentages for each level.

\textsuperscript{71} Mountjoy and Mommsen’s Neutron Activation Analysis is strictly about Aegean types made in Cyprus. Their sample on Cyprus and in foreign assemblages connect the Aegean types made in the Crisis Years to the sites they were made at in Cyprus.
the stratigraphy for these fragments show a slow progression from imported to local types dominating the scene.\textsuperscript{72}

Level IIB is dated to the Late Cypriot IIC, specifically from 1300-1230. This does put some of the finds outside of the time period this thesis focuses on, but remains relative to provide a context to the ceramics that are relevant to my research period. In addition, the Late Cypriot IIC is said to end with a destruction layer that would fall into the bounds of the collapse and my research period.\textsuperscript{73} The ceramics from this period give some insight to this supposed destruction that Enkomi suffered.

Level IIB produced pottery primarily belonging to the Middle Cypriot, the Late Cypriot, and Mycenaean types. In the Late Cypriot assemblages, Monochrome Ware, Base Ring I and II, White Slip I and II, Painted Wheel-made ware, White Shaved Ware, Red Lustrous Wheel-made Ware, Black Lustrous Ware, and Plan Hand-made Ware are represented.\textsuperscript{74}

White Slip II Ware dominated the assemblage, with bowls of types 2a and 2b (figure 8) appearing the most often in the level. These bowls were decorated with both local and Mycenaean influences. Some fragments were decorated with a chain of stacked chevrons, a local type of painting (figure 9). Others were painted with scale and dot decorations, a Mycenaean style of painting (figure 10). Furumark placed scale and dot painting in the Mycenaean IIIB period, and Dikaios assumes this bowl was decorated by a Cypriot potter

\textsuperscript{74} Ibid, 242-244.
just copying one of the Mycenaean wares that were increasingly imported to the island during this period, starting the transition to Mycenaean influence dominating Enkomi’s pottery.  

Figure 8 Sherds of White Slip Wares from Level IIB

Figure 10 Fragment with chain of stacked chevrons and cross hatchings (Dikaios, 1969-1971)

Figure 9 Scale and dot design on a fragment (Dikaios, 1969-1971)

---

75 Ibid, 244.
Several fragments of the Painted Wheel Made Ware have decorations attributed to Syro-Palestinian influence, according to Dikaios. These fragments featured more geometric designs, primarily more lattices, wavy bands around the rims, and chained lozenges, and naturalistic designs such as birds (figure 11). Looking at Dikaios's plates for the Middle Cypriot ceramics and their designs, I notice some similarity between those and the Painted Wheel Made fragments (figure 12). Although the influence for these designs originally comes from the Near East, and should be credited as such, this pottery should be considered a continuation of local Cypriot art because of its longstanding use and adoption by Cypriot artisans.

Figure 11 Sherd featuring bird motif, with chained lozenges on left (Dikaios, 1969-1971)

76 Ibid.
The Mycenaean pottery of Level IIB ranges from Mycenaean IIB to IIIB, but types IIIA and IIIA: 2 are the most common. All these ceramics are decorated with typical scenes for Mycenaean pottery in the Late Bronze Age. Several fragments were parts of chariot scenes, a popular motif for the Mycenaean at the end of the Late Bronze Age (figure 13). The full range of characteristic Mycenaean painted motifs were found on all of this pottery (figure 14). In addition, the fragment of a bell krater in “Rude/Pastoral” style was found in Area III of Level IIB. It appears there are multiple bulls painted, with a tree in front of one, in which Dikaios calls “in the finest Mycenaean style (figure 15).”

---

77 Ibid, 246.
Figure 13 Fragments of chariot scenes. Above, a horse. Right, the wheel of the chariot (Dikaios, 1969-1971)
Figure 14 Several fragments with Mycenaean motifs. From top left to right: squiggly lines, swirls, ox hide, leaves. Bottom: scale and dot designs and rosettes. (Dikaios, 1969-1971)
Dikaios did not determine if these fragments were made in Cyprus or the Aegean. In the plates, some fragments’ paints seem glossy while others are matte. Imported ceramics were known to have glossier paints applied, and Cypriot ceramics had matte paint. In addition, some Mycenaean IIIB dishes were found with strap-like handles, a Cypriot type. It is most likely that the assemblage was a mix of imported ceramics and Mycenaean-style imitations made locally.78

Level IIIA (dated by Dikaios as 1230/20—1190) is where Dikaios marks the first appearance of Mycenaean pottery made in Cyprus, which he calls “Mycenaean Derivative styles” and “Decorated Late Cypriot III Ware.” “Mycenaean Derivative” and “Decorated Late Cypriot III” are both styles of painted pottery that are either imitations of Mycenaean wares

78 Ibid.
or heavily influenced by Mycenaean wares. Research since Dikaios’s excavations have shied away from these terms, and instead categorize these fragments with Mycenaean wares. Other Late Cypriot types included in the level’s assemblage are Monochrome Ware, White Shaved Ware, Base Ring I and II Wares, White Slip I and II Wares, Bichrome Ware, Red Lustrous Wheel-Made Ware, and Plain Wares, both handmade and wheel-made. A fragment of Middle Cypriot pottery was also in the assemblage, but Dikaios dismisses it as an outlier since the levels succeeded each other without interruption.\textsuperscript{79}

There is an overall decrease in local Cypriot types in Level IIIA. Base Ring II Ware is still prevalent with several fragments, but White Slip Wares have shrunk considerably in the assemblage. The decorations of these fragments are simple painted bands. Plain Wares have a large presence in Level IIIA. The Plain Handmade Wares are mostly fragments of pithoi. Even some of these wares were under some Mycenaean influence. The rim of one fragment has a relief pattern of a foliate band. Another rim has a row of circles impressed on to it, which could come from Cretan influence\textsuperscript{80} (figure 16). Other pithoi were decorated with patterns that have been used since the LC II, although Dikaios noted that the pithoi of Level IIIA reached “technical excellence.”\textsuperscript{81}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{79} Ibid, 250.
\textsuperscript{80} This does not argue for the Minoans or a relationship with Crete separately from the Mycenaean, as by the Crisis Years the Mycenaean had taken control of Crete.
\textsuperscript{81} Ibid.
\end{flushright}
The assemblage of Level IIIA gave way to Mycenaean pottery types. Overall, Mycenaean pottery took up nearly 46% of decorated wares in the total assemblage. Most of these types are Mycenaean IIIC: Ib, but the assemblage includes Mycenaean IIIA: 2 and a fair amount of Mycenaean IIIB types as well.\textsuperscript{82} Fragments of Mycenaean IIIB and IIIC: Ib pottery are found in the original floors of the Ashlar Building. Specifically, the finds of Mycenaean IIIC: Ib under the south sector of the building prove the sector was built after the central sector, which the excavators allude to a sign of destruction in Enkomi. This also

\textsuperscript{82} Dikaios, \textit{Enkomi, Vol. 2}, 561.
occurs at the south-west and east sectors. Several fragments were found in the foundations and mortar of Level IIIA’s buildings.

The fragments show no decline of the quality in paint, decoration, or materials. Spirals are the most often mentioned decorations on the Mycenaean IIIC: Ib pottery. The types of Mycenaean pottery appear to mostly stay true to their Aegean origins. Rude/Pastoral types are also included in the assemblage, in limited quantities like it was in Level IIB.83

Dikaios describes some fragments of Mycenaean IIIC: Ib from the overlying floors of Level IIIA as buff, with coarser fabric, and a switch from a dull red to brown paints. This follows descriptions of Mycenaean types made in Cyprus. Dikaios does not make any distinctions between the locally made Mycenaean types and the imported types except for vessels he considers “drab” or show a clear hybridization with local Cypriot types, such as a Mycenaean vessel type being decorated with only Cypriot motifs. Several Mycenaean fragments are also described with geometrical patterns painted on their designs. The geometrical patterns are similar to those chain lozenges and ladders belonging to Cypriot types described earlier. On the floors of the buildings there are some fragments that Dikaios claims are Late Minoan fabric, which is unexpected because the Minoan trade decreased considerably by the 14th century BCE. However, the fragments are limited to a few decorated stirrup jars.84

84 Ibid, 255.
Level IIIB (1190-1125 BCE) shows the local Cypriot types decrease even more. Plain Wares made up the most of the Cypriot assemblage again. Despite the shrinking amounts of Cypriot types, the fragments still show a continuation of quality that matches the previous standards. Dikaios does not make any notes for a decline in the wares durability or paintings.

Level IIIB reveals more changes in the Mycenaean types. There are small decoration changes on the vessels, such as a bell-shaped bowl that has a lozenge painted where a triglyph would normally go. Another fragment features a group of chevrons replacing that triglyph. Bell-kraters also show chains of lattice lozenges, solid triangles, and panels of chevrons. These geometric shapes are characteristic of Cypriot decorations. Hybridization of the two cultures’ decorations marks Level IIIB.

Level IIIB is the beginning of Mycenaean IIIC: Ic and Granary Style in the assemblage. The Granary Style fragments of this level are contemporary with ones in Mycenae right before their own destruction. Designs are mostly limited to wavy lines painted on the vessels, but the vessel types range from cups to amphorae (figure 17). Dikaios claims this level is a great period of Granary Style, despite the simplified decorations compared to the earlier Mycenaean III types.\textsuperscript{85}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{85} Ibid, 256-258.
\end{flushright}
Fragments of Rude/Pastoral style increase in this level, belonging still to Mycenaean IIIB types. This style almost wholly represents the Mycenaean IIIB in this level, as Mycenaean IIIC: Ib and Ic dominate the assemblage. Close Style also appears more clearly and frequently in Level IIIB. In previous levels Dikaios would only refer to some vessels as a predecessor to Close Style. This type on this level is also contemporary with Mycenae’s assemblages, and the increase possibly marks the beginning of the migrations of Mycenaes to Cyprus.

Bell shaped vessels are again the targets of hybridization of Cypriot and Mycenaean decoration styles, in increasing amounts. Lozenges and chevrons continue to appear on the vessels alongside spirals and roses. A new decoration featured is a bird that has been attributed to Syro-Palestinian influence. Several bell-kraters feature the Syro-Palestinian bird attacking a fish (figure 18). The scene is featured often on Bichrome pottery in the Late

---

86 Ibid, 257.
Bronze Age, before Crisis Years. The types of vessels that these motifs were painted on, and the decoration on the bird, however, are attributed to Mycenaean tradition. Wavy lines are often added to the vessels with this decoration.\(^8^7\)

\(^8^7\) Ibid, 258.
Level IIIC is marked with a severe decrease in all pottery types. Level IIIC is dated to the second half of the LC IIIB, from 1125 to 1075 BCE. This is a period when the settlement of Enkomi is nearly abandoned for its neighbor, Salamis. The reasons behind this abandonment could be as simple as the harbor at Enkomi silting up.\textsuperscript{88} There are no signs of destruction or sudden abandonment noted by Dikaios.

Late Cypriot styles are represented only by White Slip II Ware, Bucchero Ware, Plain Wheel-made Ware. Mycenaean styles are represented by Mycenaean III B (although these fragments are probably similar to the Middle Cypriot styles in the earlier levels, in that they were mixed up in the level), Mycenaean IIIC: Ib, and Mycenaean IIIC: ic, including Granary Class, styles. None of these fragments are particularly telling, as they continue the trends set forth in the earlier levels. The Mycenaean styles’ decorations were, again, a hybrid with Cypriot styles. The only divergent that Dikaios notes is that some Mycenaean IIIC: Ic fragments are foreshadowing Proto-White Painted Pottery types.\textsuperscript{89}

An interesting comparison can be made in the quality of the Mycenaean pottery of Cyprus, and that pottery found at Mycenae itself. Dikaios noted that the pottery from Level IIIB, which he dated as LC IIIA-IIIB, was in the same Close Style and Granary Class that was found at the granary of the Citadel at Mycenae.\textsuperscript{90} Close and Granary styles were used right before the destruction at Mycenae, which lends more credence to the theory of Mycenaean refugees in Cyprus. In addition, Mountjoy and Mommsen’s NAA included some sherds of Rude/Pastoral styles, also popular to Mycenae. The analysis of these sherds link them to

\textsuperscript{89} Ibid, 262.
\textsuperscript{90} Ibid, 256.
Enkomi and Kition, again proving that Aegean styles, specifically styles that were not made for exports, suddenly grew on the island.91

The pottery at Mycenae before its destruction, however, is noticeably in poorer condition than that found in Cyprus. The final floors of the Citadel had a large deposit of pottery, both burnt from the destruction and not, that can represent the type and decorations of Mycenaean pottery local to the Aegean due to the preserved stratification it was found in.

By the 13th century, Mycenae was already showing signs of distress, and this is evident even in its pottery. In his report for the 1939 excavations at Mycenae, Wace describes the Granary class pottery found at the site, and includes the plates of some of this pottery, making it easy to compare to the assemblages found at Enkomi. Although it is still decorated, an important take away is the type of motifs used on the Aegean pottery. The Mycenaeeans, known for their complex motifs with chariots, bulls, and fish on their pottery, as described in the typology above, moved to more geometric styles before the collapse was over. This pottery, such as a krater found in front of a terrace wall, does not appear to be in good, sustainable quality.92

French further lays out the different pottery sherds from the Granary, and notes the clear differences between even the LH IIIA and the LH IIIB and IIIC designs. By LH IIIB at

92 A. J. B. Wace, "Excavations at Mycenae, 1939," The Annual of the British School at Athens 45, (1950): 229-235, doi: . The interpretations of the pottery pictured on the plates are my own, and I am only comparing to those plates and descriptions found in Dikaioi's excavation reports, Sjoqvist's analyses in Problems, and the figures from the British Museum's catalogues.
Mycenae, linear motifs dominated the pottery. Certain shapes, specifically kylixes, are erased from the scene, and Deep Bowls took their place. Enkomi, on the other hand, had several examples of continuation for the more complex motifs of figures and chariot scenes, as seen in the figures above.

In the LH IIIC, the artistic value of Mycenaean pottery drastically declined. Although some figures and decorations were still painted on ceramics, they were uniform and rigid. Wares were not held to the same standard as they were before the collapse. This applied to the plainware as well. Burnished and handmade pottery suddenly took over assemblages at several Mycenaen sites, including Mycenae. Deger-Jalkotzy claims this pottery in notably poor quality even compared to the coarse household wares of the Mycenaens. It is unclear if this pottery was a foreign influence brought by migrations or invaders, but the pottery is made locally to the Mycenaean sites.

Despite the disappearance of Mycenaean pottery in the Aegean, the levels of occupation at Enkomi show a continuation of the pottery and Mycenaean culture on Cyprus. The ceramic assemblages found in the levels preceding the collapse are evident of a strong connection between the Mycenaens and Cyprus. Dikaios notes, as he describes the pottery finds of the several levels he excavated, that in each new level there is an increased percentage of Mycenaen pottery found in the assemblages. Level IIA is the first level that shows the sudden increase. Floors IX and VII, dated to the mid-14th century BCE, show a

---


nearly doubled amount of Mycenaean IIIA pottery, compared to the immediately preceding floors. By Level IIB, dated to 1300-1230 BCE, Mycenaean IIIB pottery took up 50% of the assemblage found near the Fortification Wall of Enkomi. In addition to these levels, multiple tombs that were not reused are dated before the Crisis Years have a large amount of Mycenaean pottery and goods in them.\footnote{Dikaios, 525.}

Hadjicosti suggests that this could be related to the Cypriots’ changing culture and influence, rather than the Mycenaeans themselves. Several factors argue against this idea. The sharp and sudden increase of Mycenaean ceramics in the 13\textsuperscript{th} and 12\textsuperscript{th} centuries BCE strongly support a migration to Cyprus. This is due to both Mycenaean styles, motifs, and shapes taking over the assemblage, rather than just some decorative elements bleeding into Cypriot styles and shapes. In addition, this increase of pottery during this time period is an event isolated to Cyprus.\footnote{Brief research into areas such as Rhodes and Crete did not reveal any similar phenomenon that suggests Mycenaean migration to those sites.} More likely, Mycenaean peoples migrated to the island and continued to make their own pottery styles and shapes, as they were used to. Several studies of the steadily increasing appearance of Mycenaean fine ware and coarse ware have thoroughly detailed the evidence that support a peaceful Aegean migration to Cyprus.

A recent argument for the debate of Mycenaean migration is the cook ware that appears on Cyprus during the Crisis Years. Cook ware was largely ignored until recently, usually only being marked in reports as “coarse ware.” Jung details the marked change of Cypriot cook ware during the Crisis Years. Up to the LC III, local Cypriot cook ware types were still in use, and they followed a typical uniform of design. Cypriot cook ware was fired

\footnote{Jung, “Cooking Vessels from LBA Cyprus,” 1}
hard, wide-mouthed, globular with a deep round bottom, and had one or two handles which had various positions. At the end of LC IIC, there was a change in the assemblages. Dikaios noted new “coarse wares” that were stratigraphically related to the building of Level IIIA, following a destruction layer from LC IIC, were excavated. Found in assemblages that still included Cypriot cook ware, Mycenaean cooking amphorae (Furumark Type 66) and cooking jugs (Furumark Type 65) appeared in the same layers, showing that these two types were used at the same time.98

The Aegean cook wares were used contemporary to Mycenaean III pottery which surged in the LC IIIA. Multiple levels at Enkomi were built along with the growth of Mycenaean pottery in Cyprus. Mountjoy determined that the typological change also came with a change in the formation technique. Jung does not state what this new technique could be, but it broke from the typical handmade techniques previously used with Cypriot cook ware. The clay of the Mycenaean types had fewer inclusions than the local cook wares.99

There are clear differences in the pottery between Enkomi (and Cyprus as a whole) and Mycenae. The Mycenaean of Greece notably declined and collapsed in the Late Bronze Age. Mycenae is a prime example of a site that truly suffered from the LBA collapse. The site was destroyed, the population suffered and moved, their trade connections disappeared, and, most importantly to this thesis, their ceramics, both household wares and fine wares, were not only different but declined in quality and artistic design. To compare, Enkomi

98 Ibid, 3, 6-9
99 Ibid, 9
seemed to have carried on the Mycenaean culture and craftsmanship through the refugees that migrated there.

Cypriot pottery was included in every level of Enkomi, alongside the Mycenaean pottery until it was phased out. The Cypriot pottery did not change in terms of decoration or styles, although new types were introduced during this period. The decrease of any pottery in the late levels of Enkomi, from the Early Iron Age, do suggest an abandonment of the site, which would coincide with the founding of Salamis nearby. However, those levels do not suggest a sudden abandonment or violent destruction of Enkomi that would have prompted the abandonment. The analysis of Kition, in the following section, does not suggest that abandonment of sites were an island-wide phenomenon.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Pottery Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floor II, Floor I</td>
<td>Proto White Painted, Bichrome Ware, White Painted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor IIII-II</td>
<td>Proto White Painted, Mycenaean IIIC, White Slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor III</td>
<td>Mycenaean IIIC IC, Plain White Wares, Pithoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor IIIIA-III</td>
<td>Mycenaean IIIC IC, White Slip, Base Ring, Plain White “Canaanite” Jars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor IIIIA:</td>
<td>Mycenaean IIIC: 1C, Myc. IIIIB, Few sherds of Plain White Wares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor IV-IIIIA:</td>
<td>Myc. IIIIB, Myc. IIIC: 1C (Cypriot made), White Slip, Base Ring, “Canaanite” Jars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor IV:</td>
<td>Mycenaean IIIB, Rude/Pastoral, White Slip, Base Ring, “Canaanite” Jars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kition was a site continuously occupied from the end of the Late Bronze Age, through the Crisis Years, up to the 4th century BCE, and therefore is an excellent case study for the continuation of Cypriot prosperity and culture in the Crisis Years. The settlement of Kition lies under modern day Larnaca, on the southeast coast of Cyprus. The city was built on a low plateau, only 10 meters above sea level, with a wall that followed the perimeter. It was only 500 meters from the coastline and its bay provided ideal conditions for a harbor to be built. In addition to international trade it likely had strong trade connections due to its proximity to inland waterways. Hala Sultan Tekke was situated just on the other side of the Salt Lake, and both Idalion and Enkomi could be reached by the Gialis River. Two copper mines at Troulli and Kalavassos were in close proximity as well, making them easily accessible to Kition for refinement and trade. The site of Kition had a maximum width of 600 meters, and length of 1500 meters. The true size of the city is still unknown, due to some of the site still buried under the modern city.\textsuperscript{100}

The rise of Kition as a city and its economy is suggested to be due to a breakdown of the centralized authority once owned by Enkomi and the other large coastal cities that held power in the Late Bronze Age. This does not imply that Enkomi necessarily declined, but that other coastal cities (Maroni, Hala Sultan Tekke, as some additional examples) took Enkomi’s example and followed it, creating independent economies all over the island. Kition had the same access to riverways that connected them to copper mining sites and the Troodos Mountains, and evidence of copper ore-processing and refinement are found at the site.\textsuperscript{101}

\textsuperscript{100} Vassos Karageorghis, \textit{Kition}, 2.
\textsuperscript{101} Knapp, Held, Manning, “Prehistory of Cyprus,” 427-428.
Excavations performed by the British and Swedish at the turn of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century CE produced minimal results.\textsuperscript{102} It was not until a building project in Larnaca in 1957 produced more Late Bronze Age sherds and architectural remains that a proper excavation, under Cyprus’s Department of Antiquities and Vassos Karageorghis, began.\textsuperscript{103} The volumes produced by Karageorghis’s excavations are not as detailed in their lists of finds and discussions as Dikaios’s reports, but the trends of different pottery types are recorded in each level of occupation.

The cultural influence of Kition’s pottery is similar to Enkomi’s. Several tombs from the Late Bronze Age included goods and pottery fragments of Mycenaean styles. The range of these Mycenaean styles match the assemblages of Enkomi’s levels, with Mycenaean IIIB being the most common style found in the tombs. Several Aegean motifs are painted on this pottery, including spirals, pastoral scenes, sea creatures, foliage, and scale and dot designs. Other than some vessels which had some bands painted, hybridization between Cypriot and Mycenaean decorations are rare finds in the tombs.\textsuperscript{104}

The prominence of Mycenaean pottery found in both the tombs and occupation levels suggest that the refugee migration reached Kition as it was founded. Mycenaean IIIB wares were found at the earliest floors of Kition, and, like at Enkomi, Aegean types were

\textsuperscript{102} British authorities levelled a hill to drain a marsh located at Kition, and in doing so revealed thousands of pieces of debris associated with the site. The Swedish Expedition performed limited excavations at the site, and only produced Phoenician relics. The Expedition did not excavate further and claimed Kition’s earliest occupation was with the Phoenicians between the 9\textsuperscript{th} to 8\textsuperscript{th} centuries BCE. Karageorghis, \textit{Kition}, 3.

\textsuperscript{103} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{104} Karageorghis, \textit{Kition}, this information has been gathered by studying the hundreds of plates of pottery that Karageorghis includes in his volumes.
also featured in the cookware. Unlike the levels at Enkomi, though, Mycenaean wares do not overwhelm the local Cypriot types in any floors.

Although Mycenaean wares took up nearly one third of the ceramic finds in these tombs, known as Tombs 4, 5, and 9, they were also mixed with local Cypriot Wares. Tombs 4 and 5 include several White Slip Ware bowls (figure 19) in their assemblages. Tomb 9 features the largest amount, and most impressively painted, Mycenaean styles (figure 20). The amount of the Mycenaean IIIB and IIIC styles in these tombs is likely linked to Mycenaean refugees settling in Kition as well as Enkomi. Because of this migration, the Mycenaean styles of Tombs 4, 5, and 9 are certainly made in Cyprus.\footnote{Ibid, 15.}
Figure 19 White Slip Bowls from Kition tombs (Karageorghis, 1976)
Figure 20 Mycenaean vessels found in Kition Tombs (Karageorghis, 1976)
Karageorghis split up the excavation site into Area I and Area II. Due to the modern occupation lying on top of the remains of Kition, Karageorghis's excavation of Area I was restricted to a smaller plot of land that only measured 22x17m. Fortunately, Area II was located further from the urban area of Larnaca, allowing Karageorghis to excavate an area of 5,265m. All of the floors between Area I and II correspond with each other, with each starting at Floor IV. Karageorghis determined that Floor IV was the earliest level of occupation of Kition. The earliest sherds on the floor are Mycenaean IIIB and Late Cypriot IIC wares, dating the first occupation of Kition to the 13th century BCE.\footnote{Vassos Karageorghis, \textit{Excavations at Kition, V. The Pre-Phoenician Levels: I}, (Nicosia: 1985, The Department of Antiquities, Cyprus), 1.}

Floor IV of Area I features mostly small sherds, but of both Mycenaean IIIB and Rude/Pastoral types and local Cypriot wares, including Base Ring II, White Slip II, and Plain White Wheelmade wares. A notable amount of pithoi sherds were found in Area I, as well as what Karageorghis calls “Canaanite Jars,” a storage jar of torpedo shape found often in the Levant.\footnote{Ibid, 92.} Floor IV is the one floor where Area I and Area II differ greatly. Floor IV of Area II includes a great number of Mycenaean IIIB sherds of very fine quality drinking vessels. Figures such as octopi, human figures, and murex shells were featured on chalices and rhytons.\footnote{Ibid, 92.}

Floor IV-IIIA\footnote{This is the name Karageorghis gave to the floors in between the levels of occupation. In his preface, Karageorghis only clarified this term, but did not define what these floors are to the levels of occupation. Due to the name, I assume that he believed them to be transition floors between the levels of occupation.} reveals an increase in Mycenaean types of pottery. The largest amount in the assemblage is Mycenaean IIIB, but this level also shows the introduction of
Mycenaean IIIC: 1 into the assemblage. Karageorghis only notes that Mycenaean IIIC: 1 is the first Aegean type to be made locally on Cyprus. With the increase of Mycenaean types in the assemblage, local Cypriot types slowly decrease, but Base Ring II Ware and White Slip II Ware are still present. There are no other local Cypriot types in this level.\textsuperscript{110}

In Floor IIIA, Dikaios claims that there are no Local Cypriot types other than Plain White Wheel-made Wares in the assemblage of Area I. There are Mycenaean IIIB\textsuperscript{111} and an increasing amount of Mycenaean IIIC: 1 types, in addition to an increasing amount of Canaanite Jars.\textsuperscript{112} There is a similar phenomenon at Area II. White Shaved Ware adds to the local Cypriot assemblage with three jugs, and a smaller amount of White Slip II and Base Ring II are still present in the floor.\textsuperscript{113}

In Floor IIIA-Floor III there was a sudden reappearance of local types in the assemblage, including Base Ring II, White Slip II, and Plain White Wares. The local types are still outnumbered by Mycenaean IIIC: 1 wares. Karageorghis notes pithos fragments of this level match fragments found at Enkomi\textsuperscript{114}, which suggests that the two urban centers are receiving goods from one redistribution center. Area II only differs in the appearance of Middle Cypriot pottery, which is attributed to a possible tomb looting.\textsuperscript{115}

\textsuperscript{110} Ibid, 17, 95-96.
\textsuperscript{111} Because Karageorghis still does not specifically define the Mycenaean IIIB types of this period as local Cypriot creations, it is assumed he still believed these wares to come from the Aegean. Mountjoy and Mommsen’s neutron activation analysis argues against this theory. Their samples from within Kition connect these types to the clay bed associated with Kition. In addition, most of the Cypriot-made Aegean types exported to foreign civilizations actually came from Kition.
\textsuperscript{112} Ibid, 21.
\textsuperscript{113} Ibid, 111.
\textsuperscript{114} Ibid, 25.
\textsuperscript{115} Ibid, 119.
Floor III’s assemblage is dominated by Mycenaean IIIC: 1 wares. The local pottery is primarily represented by Plain White Wheel-made Ware and pithoi sherds. Base Ring and White Slip sherds are still included in the assemblage in very small quantities. Karageorghis claims this level reveals more trade between Kition and the Syro-Palestinian coast, with several Syrian imports.\textsuperscript{116} However, he did not note which fragments he believed to be imported, and my examination of the plates could not identify any fragments that supported his claim.

Beginning at Floor III-Floor II, the Mycenaean-style ceramics are phased out with the Late Cypriot II local ceramics. Proto White Painted ware is introduced to the assemblage. The amount of Proto White Painted ware increases in Floor II as the Mycenaean types continue to phase out. In particular, there is a Proto White Painted kernos in Floor II that resembles one found in a tomb in Idalion. The kernos is painted with chains of lozenges, a common motif used on Cypriot pottery. Floor II is the level that Cypriot ceramics and culture reclaim their prominence in the assemblage.\textsuperscript{117}

Floors II-I and I lead into the beginning of the Iron Age and new Cypriot types of pottery. Although few sherds of Late Cypriot II types are still found in the assemblages, the Mycenaean types have disappeared from the groups. Proto White Painted ware, White Painted ware, Bichrome ware, and Black Slip ware are found in these two levels, marking the beginning of the Iron Age and Cypro-Geometric without any interruptions of occupation at Kition.

\textsuperscript{116} Ibid, 28, 127.
\textsuperscript{117} Ibid, 32-33, 35, 136-144.
Several times in his publications for Kition, Karageorghis argues that some levels in Kition show signs of brief abandonments, and quick rebuilding of the site after each abandonment. A main example is Late Floor II, built after what Karageorghis referred to as a “sacking” in the 12th century. Although Karageorghis claims that there was a sacking, he does not offer any evidence to confirm this. Considering Karageorghis also retracted his support for the multiple destructions theory at Enkomi, perhaps this “sacking” should also be re-evaluated. This level at Kition does match the transition between Level IIB and Level IIIA in Enkomi, the level of the possible earthquake that ruined some of the city. Kition likely suffered from the same earthquake. This would not suggest that the residents would abandon Kition, but only that they would have to rebuild the structures that were ruined in the earthquake.

The floor was quickly rebuilt after this “destruction” level. The pottery changes on this floor. Pottery was found that was painted in Aegean style, but with enough stylistic differences to show that this pottery was Cypriot, along with several sherds of Proto-White Painted Pottery. The styles and hybridization between the Cypriot and Mycenaean decorations make this assemblage similar to the one found at Enkomi. The pottery of Later Floor II also match the pottery of the Granary Citadel from Mycenae, again providing evidence of Mycenaean migrants to Cyprus during this period.118

Kition’s sanctuary structures appear to have been spared from any distress in the domestic parts of the city, and are the best evidence for a continuation of occupation at the site. The temples at the site are not only continuously built and rebuilt throughout the

---

118 Karageorghis, Kition 26.
Crisis Years, but there is enough evidence for burnt ceramics, contemporary with these layers as well, to prove that there was activity at the site from the Late Bronze Age collapse to the Early Iron Age. Mycenaean III pottery sherds of very fine quality were found at Temple 2, and Temple 4 included Plain White Painted I wares, supporting this range of occupation.\(^{119}\)

By the 11\(^{\text{th}}\) century, pottery at Kition began to feature local Cypriot styles primarily again, ousting the Mycenaean styles as the Aegean settlers were finally enveloped into Cypriot culture. The ceramics that replace the Aegean types closely resemble the local Cypriot styles that began in the Middle Cypriot. Since some local Cypriot types remained throughout the Crisis Years, and some hybridization occurred on the Aegean pottery, it is clear that Cypriot ceramics were a constant on the island, despite the temporary Aegean trend during the Crisis Years.

In their neutron activation analysis of foreign assemblages, Mountjoy and Mommsen conclude that most of the Mycenaean type vessels came from Kition. Samples taken from several foreign assemblages in the Eastern Mediterranean reveal the extensive distribution of Kition’s pottery. The analysis attributed pottery from Beth’shean, Megiddo, and even Qantir to Kition. Mycenaean pottery found in Tel Dor was attributed to Kition as well.\(^{120}\) This is significant to Mountjoy and Mommsen, and they claimed that Cypriot made pottery left Cyprus through Kition, and entered the Levant through Tel Dor. This supports a strong

\(^{119}\) Ibid, 47-50.
\(^{120}\) Mountjoy and Mommsen, “Neutron Activation Analysis of 11 Cypriot Sites,” 446-447.
relationship between Kition and Tel Dor, and with that a relationship between the Cypriots and Phoenicians, who colonized Kition by the 10th century BCE.\textsuperscript{121}

During the Crisis Years, the Phoenicians filled the vacuum of the disappearing trade connections of the Mediterranean. Phoenician merchants restructured the trade routes used in the Late Bronze Age by their collapsed neighbors and used the routes that were still profitable. They applied the same tactics to the goods that were imported and exported by focusing on locally sourced manufactured goods and raw materials to export and receiving necessities such as copper in return. The need for copper drew the Phoenicians to Cyprus, which kept the island's trade connections and economy afloat.\textsuperscript{122}

More evidence of this trade could be found at the site of Tel Dor, located in the north of modern Israel. The city was located right on the coast, with easy access to a harbor. Phoenician influence is heavy as early as the close of the Late Bronze Age. Pottery assemblages date Dor's connection with Cyprus to the Late Bronze Age. This settlement included several types of pottery from Cyprus, contemporary with all of the sites discussed in this thesis.

Tel Dor has been consistently excavated since 1980, first under the direction of Ephraim Stern and then Ilan Sharon and Ayelet Gilboa. Dor is an unlikely resource for Phoenician culture. The original Phoenician cities, such as Tyre, have only been excavated to a limited extent due to the current modern occupation on top of the sites and the

\textsuperscript{121} Ibid, 487.
political turmoil of their modern nations. Excavations at Dor revealed material culture that was contemporary with several Phoenician sites north of Dor, leading researchers to conclude that Dor was a Phoenician city. The site and finds are closely dated to our earliest chronology for the civilization, and as such is one of the best sites to study early Phoenician material culture and economy.\textsuperscript{123} The Phoenicians’ economic prosperity in trade allowed them to create thriving urban centers, Tel Dor being one of them. This benefitted the Cypriot economy greatly, as the Phoenicians began to also use the island as a stopping point for its trade connections to the western Mediterranean.

Excavations at Dor in the 1990s revealed occupation layers of the Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age settlements. The excavations also produced evidence of a strong connection between Dor, and therefore the Phoenicians, and Cyprus. In their 1999 excavation report, Stern, Gilboa, and Sharon detail a small sample of fragments from imported ceramics. Three of these fragments are from a Mycenaean IIIC type krater. Under examination the krater was revealed to actually be White Painted Wheelmade III ware from Cyprus, another example of hybridization of Cypriot and Mycenaean ceramics.\textsuperscript{124}

Other types of pottery found at the site were Base Ring Ware II, which was the most common type found at Dor, White Shaved Ware, White Slip Wares, Plain Painted Wheelmade Wares, and Monochrome Wares. There were also 32 ceramics found in Aegean style,

\textsuperscript{123} Bell, “Phoenician Trade,” 2
originating from Cyprus. There are multiple Aegean types, with the most being Mycenaean IIIB/C types.\textsuperscript{125}

The Cypriot imports found at Dor, even the Aegean style ones, are different in their motif styles. They lack figures, instead being painted with rings, ladders, and crisscross hatches, and these decorations are minimal. The pottery suggests that Cypriot artisans were not producing only copies of Mycenaean type pottery for export but blending the Mycenaean types with Cypriot decorations that were still valued by the Eastern Mediterranean.

Idalion

Idalion was close to the center of Cyprus and the Troodos Mountains. This gave the site easy access to the copper mines of the mountains, but no direct access to the sea. Instead, it had the Yialias River as a water source. The river connected Idalion to several sites, as far as Enkomi and Kition. The Bronze Age settlement likely began in the plateaus to the north and northwest of the river bank.

Idalion’s history in the Late Bronze Age Crisis Years is currently still clouded, due to a Late Cypriot settlement only being confirmed by excavations in the last 20 years. Although the Swedish Expedition was the first to determine that Idalion was settled so early, evidence for this date was spotty, and therefore not accepted, until new excavations under Maria Hadjicosti opened from 1991-1995 and Pamela Gaber’s ongoing excavations with Lycoming College. It was in these excavations that Late Cypriot architectural elements

\textsuperscript{125} Ibid.
were finally found, with pottery contemporary to each level. Unfortunately, unlike the Enkomi and Kition, Idalion’s excavation reports are extremely limited and not have been published in length yet. In their articles about Idalion, Hadjicosti and Gaber confirm that Idalion was consistently occupied and active from 1200 BCE to the Roman Period, albeit without any specifics about their ceramic and architectural finds. Therefore, outside resources from Cesnola’s Collection of Cypriot Art and Mountjoy and Mommsen’s analysis are used as supplementary information.

Previously, the only evidence for such an early settlement at Idalion was found in the city’s tombs. Luigi Palma di Cesnola claimed to have cleared out some 3,000 tombs from Cyprus, including those found at Idalion, and those grave goods are now in his collection. Cesnola’s collection is currently located at the Metropolitan Museum in New York, and decades ago Vassos Karageorghis studied the collection personally to evaluate and give it some sort of provenance. For these reasons I feel that the collection is reliable, at least as much as it can be in this context, to be used as a resource in this research. While I acknowledge the bias that some of these materials represent, that these goods presented in the collection are likely the best from the Collection and therefore cannot provide a full picture of the Cypriots that first occupied Idalion, these goods still provide to be useful signs of trade and signs of social complexity, and are far too interesting to ignore. The evidence of such luxurious goods also suggests the status of Idalion, which should have been expected to be dismal as its founding coincided with the “Dark Ages” of Greece and the rest of the Mediterranean.
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Several pieces from the Collection that supposedly hail from Idalion are unlike those from Kition and Enkomi at this same time. These pieces include a terracotta head, of which another similar head possibly exists somewhere, a bull-shaped askos in Base Ring II style, a trick vase in the shape of an askos in Proto White Painted style, a kernos with a ram (figure 21), a Mycenaean IIc:1b style krater (figure 22), and a tripod made in the earliest form of Bichrome Ware. These goods are exceptionally well made, especially for a newly formed city from the Crisis Years. The trick vase, for example, is particularly notable for its clever design of merging the ram’s horns with the basket handle.127

Figure 21 Ram Kernos from the Idalion tombs (Karageorghis, 2000)

Figure 22 Mycenaean Krater from Idalion tombs (Karageorghis, 2000)

---

The pottery of Idalion is also different from the previous sites as it is the first clear sign of a local, Cypriot culture living and thriving in the city. While there are still some Mycenaean styles and influences being used, such as the above mentioned Mycenaean IIIC krater, these decorations and styles are still clearly Cypriot. On the krater, there are ladders, and crisscross sections, and half of the vessel is pigmented. The ram kernos is similar to ceramic finds of the Middle Cypriot, and is decorated with lozenges all around its body, a prevalent motif on Cypriot pictorial pottery. Without the detailed excavation reports from Hadjicosti and Gaber, it cannot be determined if Idalion avoided the Mycenaean influence in its own pottery production.

Evidence of Idalion’s pottery can still be gleaned from Hadjicosti’s and Gaber’s several, smaller publications about their finds. Hadjicosti’s excavations discovered a pithoi manufacturing complex.128 This was significant as the excavations of Enkomi and Kition do not detail any similar complexes. Mountjoy and Mommsen’s analysis does confirm that Enkomi and Kition manufactured their own pottery, but manufacturing complexes were either not discussed or not discovered by the excavators. Gaber’s excavations have revealed two sanctuaries that were built by the 12th century BCE. In one article, she included a photo of several sherds found in depository pits for one of these sanctuaries.129 She does not name their types, and the sherds are too small to identify what vessel shapes they belong to. The pictorial decorations on the sherds, however, do allow me to identify some sherds as Bichrome Ware and White Painted Ware.

128 Pamela Gaber, “Urbanization on Cyprus: The View from Idalion,” 11.
129 Ibid, 9.
There may also be evidence of Idalion producing Mycenaean type pottery. Idalion’s sample for Mountjoy and Mommsen’s neutron activation analysis was too small to confidently assign an elemental makeup to Idalion that could be connected with sherds of foreign assemblages. The sample was assigned as type “X077” instead of officially naming it after Idalion, although the researchers did affirm that this type likely only belongs to Idalion. Mountjoy and Mommsen were able to conclude that sherds found in Anatolia have the same makeup as X077. Therefore, it is likely that Idalion also produced fine pottery made for exports, despite lacking direct access to the coast for trade. Instead, the Yialias River provided access to the coastal urban centers to and from Idalion.

As explained earlier, Enkomi created a sort of settlement hierarchy, where it could source copper from smaller sites close to the mines, then refine and trade the copper from the coast. Idalion could have been one of the lower tiered sites that moved copper to Enkomi. In Mountjoy and Mommsen’s analysis, fragments found in Idalion of Aegean pottery mostly originated from Enkomi, with several other fragments originating from Kition, suggesting that a strong relationship between the three sites existed. Michael Brown suggests that Idalion’s access to Enkomi and Kition, combined with its proximity to the Troodos Mountains and copper mines, make it a prime location for a redistribution center of resources. The Yialias River directly led to both Enkomi and Kition. These inter-island connections could have also opened the path for Idalion to trade with foreign influences.
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A short distance from Idalion is the settlement of Ayios Sozomenos, where occupation likely began in the Middle Cypriot and ended by the 12th century BCE. Excavations by Michael Brown and Dr. Despina Pilides revealed the activities of the settlement and its connection to Idalion. It had already been assumed that there was some sort of Bronze Age Settlement at the site, as a series of tombs had been found beforehand but no settlement to match them. Given its proximity to Idalion and chronology of its pottery, it is clear that this site was the parent settlement to Idalion.

Like Idalion, excavation reports for Ayios Sozomenos have yet to be published in length. Pilides’s preliminary reports have only been published on Archaeology.wiki. Connections between the ceramics at Ayios Sozomenos and Idalion can still be drawn from the limited information. Most ceramics found at Ayios Sozomenos come from the Middle Cypriot period, but there are enough Late Cypriot and even a couple Proto-Geometric period sherds that overlap with Idalion’s founding date to keep the site contemporary with Idalion’s beginning.133 There was a continuation of Ayios Sozomenos’s manufacturing complexes at Idalion. Evidence of a pithoi manufacturing complex was also found at Ayios Sozomenos, in addition to a manufacturing complex with White Slip and Plain White Wares.134 This complex argues for the production of fine ceramics at Idalion, since there was a continuation of pithoi production at both sites. Although it is not known why the people of Ayios Sozomenos moved to Idalion, there are no reports from Ayios Sozomenos that suggest a destruction which would have prompted the move to Idalion.

Each site analyzed provide different pieces of evidence that support the continuation of Cyprus through the Crisis Years. At Enkomi, there is an overwhelming amount of pottery in every level of occupation. These assemblages are a mix of Mycenaean and Local Cypriot types, with the Mycenaean-style pottery dominating the assemblage for a short period until it was phased out by the continuation of local Cypriot types. No signs of Enkomi’s abandonment over a violent destruction could be found, despite Dikaios’s claim that one happened for a short period. Kition also lacked the evidence of any periods of abandonment, with constant occupation of every level and contemporary pottery found with it. Neutron activation analysis connected Kition to the Eastern Mediterranean in several assemblages, indicating that there was a trade network continuing through the Crisis Years. Idalion was a site of continuous production and redistribution, and overwhelming task for a site that should have suffered from a collapse of society and economy. Each location’s comparative site reinforces the evidence of Cypriot continuation. The following chapter lengthily discusses the results of the analyses and its significance to this thesis.
Conclusion

The aim of this thesis was to examine the ceramic data of three Cypriot sites from the Late Bronze Age to determine Cypriot continuation through the LBA collapse. The pottery’s decoration styles, the quality of those decorations, forms, and functions of each site—Enkomi, Kition, and Idalion—detail the continuation of Cypriot culture through its craftsmanship, its trade networks and connections with the Eastern Mediterranean, and occupation of sites through the Crisis Years.

The ceramic assemblages of Enkomi support a continuous production of Cypriot style ceramics alongside the temporary prevalence of Mycenaean style pottery made in Cyprus. Although the Mycenaean pottery dominated the assemblages of a couple levels of Enkomi, Cypriot style ceramics were still produced in large numbers, in addition to the hybridization of Cypriot and Mycenaean styles. After the earthquake destruction of Level IIB, the assemblages were still contemporary with the floor before the destruction, implying that occupation was consistent through every level. No ceramic production centers were identified in Dikaios’s excavation reports, but the neutron activation analysis my Mountjoy and Mommsen indicates that Enkomi produced a large amount of pottery that was distributed in both inter-island and outer-island trade.

The neutron activation analysis also attributed large amounts of sherds of Aegean style pottery to Kition. The site produced a large amount of pottery to be exported to its foreign contacts, through Dor and to the Levant at least, supporting the continuation of
trade networks with the Eastern Mediterranean and the start of a relationship with the Phoenicians. The large scale production of Aegean style pottery accounts for the dominance of Mycenaean IIIB/C types in the assemblages of Kition, which would be phased out contemporarily with Enkomi. The pottery consistently appears in every level of occupation in Areas I and II, indicating that there was continuous occupation at Kition, despite Karageorghis’s insistence that these levels experienced short periods of abandonment. No evidence to support several periods of abandonment could be identified, specifically in the period corresponding with Enkomi. This argues that the abandonment of Enkomi was not an island-wide event, as Kition was continuously occupied from the Late Bronze Age to the 4th century BCE.

Evidence of the ceramic data from Idalion is minimal until the reports from Gaber and Hadjicosti are finally published and made accessible to the public. However, several items of evidence from their articles, supplemented by Idalion’s tombs and the neutron activation analysis, support the existence of good quality pottery, production, and involvement in trade in Idalion. Pieces from Cesnola’s collection feature prominent Cypriot styles of vessels and decorations. The ram kernos, for example, is a continuation of chains of lozenges and the prominence of animals in the vessel shapes. This example can be compared to Middle Cypriot pottery pieces, which feature the same geometric motifs and animals on the handle.

Evidence of fine ware production at Idalion has not yet been identified. A complex for pithoi manufacturing has been found, though, and its connection to Ayios Sozomenos suggests that a production site for other ceramics could be at Idalion. Fine ware has still
been identified at Idalion, primarily from Enkomi, which supports a network of inter-island trade and redistribution from Idalion to the coastal urban centers that connected with foreign trade networks. Idalion is not a case of continuous occupation, since its founding began during the Crisis Years. The building up of a large scale site such as Idalion does support a complex network of inter-island trade, which could have been difficult, if not impossible, to organize if Cypriot urban centers and trade broke down and collapsed.

The comparative sites of this thesis also support continuous occupation and Cypriot art on Cyprus. Mycenae’s assemblages are contemporary with several layers in Enkomi and Kition, until the transition of Mycenaean craftsmanship moved to Cyprus, supporting the theory of a peaceful migration of Mycenaean refugees to the island. Mycenae and Mycenaean craftsmanship also serve as a case study of collapse that can be compared to Cyprus. Assemblages of abandoned pottery found in destroyed structures are evidence of Mycenae’s abandonment during the LBA collapse. The Mycenaeans abandoned their urban centers after the destructions and collapse, and migrated to smaller settlements in the hills. There was a shift of the origin of Mycenaean pottery found in foreign assemblages. In light of trade networks being cut off from the Aegean, Cyprus took over the production of Mycenaean ceramics and exported them. Deger-Jalkotzy suggested that Cyprus still offered a complex social system and a high level of material culture production while the rest of the Mediterranean collapsed. This could be due to Cyprus’s continuous trade connections with the Eastern Mediterranean. Mycenaean artisans were able to take advantage of the stable social complexity and economy of Cyprus and continued to make their wares.
Tel Dor’s assemblages support the continuation of Cypriot trade and the value of Cypriot ceramics. Mountjoy and Mommsen's neutron activation analysis claims that the majority of the Aegean style ceramics found in the Eastern Mediterranean originated from Kition, and that Kition and Tel Dor were entry points for the trade network between Cyprus and the Levant. This argues for continuous and large-scale productions of pottery at Kition throughout the Crisis Years and beyond.

The excavations at Tel Dor revealed several types of Cypriot ceramics that came to the site during the Crisis Years. Cypriot ceramics at Tel Dor greatly outnumber the Aegean style ceramics in the assemblages. This ratio is not restricted to Dor, as excavations of Tel El-Ajjul reveal that Cypriot ceramics outnumbered Aegean ceramics 1000:1. This phenomenon began in the Late Bronze Age and continued throughout the Crisis Years, suggesting that the lack of Aegean ceramics is not only attributed to the collapse of the Mycenaeans. The number of Cypriot ceramics clearly held more significance for the Eastern Mediterranean. The excavations of Tel Dor also argued that a trade relationship between Cyprus and Dor began in the Late Bronze Age, and then continued through the Crisis Years. This relationship connected the Phoenicians to Cyprus as well and cultivated their trade partnership, which eventually caused Cypriot goods to be distributed to the Western Mediterranean as well.

Although the excavations and ceramic data of Ayios Sozomenos is limited, it still supports a continuous industrial and commercial complex on Cyprus. Ayios Sozomenos’s occupation dates back to the Middle Cypriot, making it a site that promotes the continuation of Cypriot culture from that earlier period to the Crisis Years at Idalion.
Evidence of ceramic production of both fine and plain wares were found at the site, and the continuation of pithoi production at least has been confirmed at Idalion. The reason to abandon Ayios Sozomenos in favor of Idalion is still unknown, but there is no evidence found in either the pottery or occupation levels that suggest this was a sudden abandonment or any violent destruction of Ayios Sozomenos. The pottery ranges even to the Late Cypriot IIIC, which overlaps with the occupation of Idalion. Idalion assumed Ayios Sozomenos’s role as a redistribution and ceramic production center, making the site a continuation of Cypriot production of those ceramics.

The analysis of the ceramic data from the previous chapter brings a new narrative to light of Cyprus in the Crisis Years. Despite the brief popularity of Mycenaean styles, the local Cypriot types and culture continues through until the Mycenaean culture is finally consumed by the local culture. The prominence of Cypriot ceramics in foreign assemblages prove not only that their pottery manufacture was still valuable, but that their trade connections hold through the Crisis Years. This is likely due to a combination of factors: the continuation of Mycenaean culture and goods manufactured on Cyprus, the trade connections picked up by the Phoenicians and their use of Cyprus, and the continued value and influence of Cypriot ceramics in the Near East.

The ceramic data also argues against an abandonment of a site due to destruction. Although Enkomi was abandoned by the late 11th century BCE, and Idalion was founded by the abandonment of Ayios Sozomenos, there is no evidence of the migrations being prompted by a destruction or invasion of peoples. Every level of occupation of each site immediately succeeds each other with contemporary pottery to match, concluding that
there was never a gap period between occupation periods, even after the earthquakes of the Late Cypriot IIC/IIIA. Once Enkomi was finally abandoned, it was likely only due to logistical issues such as their harbor silting up, rather than a forced abandonment due to destruction. When the data is compared to that of Mycenae and their signs of collapse and abandonment of sites, it is clear that Cyprus never faced even similar issues of collapse. Undoubtedly, Cyprus was affected by the LBA collapse to an extent, such as the loss of its Aegean trade networks. The consequences of the LBA collapse were not enough to cause Cyprus to collapse as well, separating it from the idea that the collapse was a domino effect from one civilization to another.

Further research can, and should, be done to support Cypriot continuation. Ceramics were chosen for this thesis because it was a prominent craft and trade item for Cyprus and Cypriot culture. A deterioration in Cypriot ceramics would have been devastating to Cypriot culture. However, other pieces of evidence such as architectural structures and the continuous copper trade argue for Cypriot continuation as well. I also believe that further research could be done for Cyprus in the Early Iron Age. The continuation of culture and economy gave Cyprus a head start to rebuild the trade networks of the Mediterranean and expand them to the far west while the Aegean recovered from the LBA collapse. Cypriot continuation and the Early Iron Age could reveal Cyprus's prominence as a trade partner between the east and west at a time when those trade connections were severely lacking.

135 Marisa Ruiz-Galvez discusses Cypriot trade in the Late Bronze Age with Sardinia and Iberia in her chapter “Before the Gates of Tartessos: Indigenous Knowledge and Exchange Networks in the Late Bronze Age Far West,” in The Cambridge Prehistory of the Bronze and Iron Age Mediterranean, 2015.
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