

## V. OUTSIDE CYPRUS: OTHER LATE CYPRIOT WARES IN FOREIGN CONTEXTS – ISSUES OF SYNCHRONISM

---

In this Chapter, we shall examine some of the more significant overseas finds of Cypriot ceramics other than WS from the Late Cypriot era. This will assist us in determining chronological synchronisms for the Late Bronze Age. It is an essential part of the wider exercise of examining the material evidence pertaining to the relations between Cyprus and other regions of the eastern Mediterranean. We thus seek to add to the detailed analysis of the nature and development of PWS, WS I and WS II that we have given in the preceding Chapters. In this chapter, we need to tie key information together in relation to the finding of Cypriot wares outside of the island, especially in Egypt, the Levantine region, in the Aegean, and in Anatolia. The main ceramic wares that we will be concerned with are: Proto Base-ring, Base-ring I and Red Lustrous Wheel-made.

### 1. FROM LOCAL PROTO BASE-RING TO INTERNATIONAL BASE-RING I

In discussing the ‘intra-island barrier’ thesis (see Chapters I.5, III.8), an issue arises about the origin of Proto Base-ring in the northwest of Cyprus and its relationship to Base-ring I. PBR and PWS had been used, along with Proto Monochrome, as indicators of cultural change and as markers for the beginning of the Late Cypriot period – LC IA:1. Most archaeologists consider them as the start of a tradition that has its “creation in the north-west to center of the island.”<sup>218</sup>

There were certain interesting events surrounding the identification and definition of Proto Base-ring ware. After the Myrtou *Stephania* excavations of 1951, some vessels presented at least two dilemmas for their discoverers: (1) there were vessels in typical BR I fabric, but which were without the feature of a base-ring. As they could hardly be classified as BR I, the prefix Proto came into use and was applied to them. The fabric which typifies Base-ring I is a grey core ‘metallic’ like fabric; (2) there were vessels that were the same as these base-ringless types mentioned above, but which were made in the soft clays typical of the Middle Cypriot White Painted series. They

were classified as PBR. It was then assumed that PBR was the predecessor of BR I.

The general view then arose that BR I developed later and was distributed throughout Cyprus and overseas. In her paper on Proto Base-ring ware, EAMES (1994) made some interesting observations which challenged this view.<sup>219</sup> She (*ibid.*, 140) does reaffirm that PBR is “a product of the north-west, particularly the Black Slip and Red Slip fabrics”, in agreement with HENNESSY (1963, 49) and MERRILLEES (1965, 141–2). However, EAMES (*ibid.*,) goes on to claim that PBR was only a regional variant of BR I, and is not earlier than, but contemporary with, BR I. Her study questions whether PBR ware is a significant Cypriot ware for the establishment of the chronology of the very beginning of the Late Bronze Age on Cyprus.

In her work, EAMES (*ibid.*, 129) sets out to test whether or not “PBR Ware represents an early, formative stage of BR I ware.” As we have seen, PBR was one of the fabrics that ÅSTRÖM (1972b, 758) had used to subdivide LC IA into an earlier and later phase (PBR being earlier and BR I later). EAMES (*ibid.*,) wanted to test the validity of STEWART’S (1974, 62–3) and Åström’s views about the precedence of PBR over BR I and thus the validity of Åström’s subdivision of the LC IA period. Interestingly, HENNESSY (1963, 49) had earlier concluded that the evidence that PBR preceded BR I was slight and that it had a floruit parallel to that of BR I; however he did not develop the argument further.

There are a number of reasons why Eames does not succeed in her attack on Åström on this issue. For example, she cites Åström’s use of “the appearance of PBR, Proto White Slip, Monochrome and White Painted VI” as indicators of the LC IA:1 period. Yet ÅSTRÖM (1972c, 46, 47) also used the appearance of Black Slip IV and V, Proto Monochrome and Bichrome Wheel-made Wares. Eames does not refer to these wares, especially Bichrome Wheel-made, the first appearance of which is quite important, although we acknowledge it had a long life, at least down to LC IB.

---

<sup>218</sup> MANNING, SEWELL and HERSCHER 2002, 100.

<sup>219</sup> I discussed these issues in detail with Sam during 1993. She was hoping to publish the follow up to her 1994 paper on

---

the foreign occurrences and chronology of PBR, but due to other archaeological commitments, she was unable to do so prior to her tragic death in 2003.

Eames' interpretation of the evidence at *Toumba tou Skourou* is problematic. The first deposit (Square C 12 of the Mound) does not support her thesis: she (*ibid.*, 132, 135 – table 3) accepts that PBR is recorded, and that there is no BR I (or White Slip I). In House D, PBR was found together with WS I, but this was said by the excavators to appear earlier than BR I at the site, (see VERMEULE and WOLSKY 1990, 393). Only in House B and C did PBR appear together with BR I and WS I (EAMES 1995, 135 – table 3). EAMES does not challenge the excavators' dates for each of the deposits. Yet, despite the fact that PBR does occur without BR I in two contexts in the settlement and in some of the tombs, EAMES (*ibid.*, 138) prefers to disregard the excavators opinion that PBR is earlier than BR I, and instead considers that they “provide little convincing evidence in favour of PBR ware preceding BR I.”

The way she deals with this issue of the PBR/BR I transition leads EAMES (*ibid.*, 140) to the conclusion that “Åström's division of the LC IA period into two phases must be seen as questionable.” Whilst her reasoning is sound, and we should question strongly the validity of a relative chronological scheme derived from disturbed or unstratified tombs, there is other evidence which supports Åström's subdivision. His sequence was based largely on the settlement evidence from Enkomi and Episkopi *Bamboula*, and indeed, supplemented by tombs – many of which do have clear, undisturbed sequences.

The issue raised by EAMES can be resolved with an alternative explanation. PBR did arise in a particular region and, whilst it had a largely local distribution, is found all over the island, particularly BR fabric (*ibid.*, 131 – fig. 3). After a period of time, a similar ware BR I arose (probably in the same region), but was distributed throughout the island and overseas. The BR I period is thus differentiated, not only because of the change in appearance, but also because of the more extensive distribution throughout Cyprus and internationally. Our suggestion ties in with the following conclusion from KNAPP and CHERRY (1994, 160), which appears to sum up the basis of the relationship between PBR and BR I:

From a developmental perspective, and with the clear exception of Base Ring ware, it has been argued that Pro BA [MB–LB] pottery exhibits less

regional diversity or technological and stylistic variability than Pre BA [Early Bronze Age] pottery. In other words, it is thought that pottery production increased and became more standardized as local and foreign demand picked up; the assessment of Base Ring ware concurs with such a scenario. Essentially this is the argument of MERRILLEES (1965: 147–48) and ARTZY (1985b), an example of consumer-driven demand-side economics.

But what of the claim that PBR only appeared in the northwest of Cyprus? This claim has been contested by more recent evidence. Thus, in the Manchester NAA project, seven sherds of the Middle Cypriot fabric – Drab Polished Blue Core ware – from Episkopi *Phaneromeni*, fell into the classification of the majority of BR ware (BRYAN *et al.*, 1998).<sup>220</sup> As a MC predecessor of BR ware, their location in the south coast (where HERSCHER 2001, 16 says they are relatively rare at *Phaneromeni*) again challenges the ‘intra-island barrier’ theory. This is because the view that PBR is a creation of the northwest alone was another part of the ‘intra-island barrier’ story. PBR distribution was thought to be of a similar pattern to that proposed for PWS and WS I ‘RL’, namely that it did not arrive in eastern Cyprus for some considerable period of time after it first appears.<sup>221</sup> As with White Slip, the evidence seems to suggest that in relation to PBR this is not the case. Thus HERSCHER (2001, 19) views the PBR or ‘developmental stage’ as having “occurred more or less simultaneously at a number of different sites in different parts of Cyprus (possibly, for example, at *Toumba tou Skourou* and *Ayios Iakovos* as well)...” We agree with this view. In addition to the south coast, PBR is found in the east in Ayios Iakovos Tomb 8 (ÅSTRÖM 1972b, 686); Enkomi (Swedish) Tomb 8 (*ibid.*, 681); Enkomi (French) Tomb 110 (*ibid.*, 678); the last of which can be dated to LC IA:1 only. Whilst further study of this issue is warranted, it would be difficult to postulate a significant time lapse between the appearance of PBR in the northwest with its appearance in the east. Again the ‘intra-island barrier’ thesis is found wanting (see especially the distribution of Base-ring fabric PBR in EAMES 1994, 131, fig. 3-Base Ring Fabric).

The international character of the distribution of BR I is a matter of great importance. This is illus-

<sup>220</sup> The sherds were examined by the author in 1994. I also benefited greatly from discussions with the late Vin Robinson and Alex Hoffman of Manchester University.

<sup>221</sup> This south coast area is actually included within the “western cultural zone during Late Cypriote IA” by MANNING, SEWELL and HERSCHER (2002, 100, after MERRILLEES 1985).

trated by the contexts of its discovery outside of Cyprus, especially Egypt (see section below).

## 2. ON THE SIGNIFICANCE OF BR I POTTERY IN EGYPT

The distribution of BR I in Egypt provides further evidence of the links between Cyprus and Egypt during the Late Bronze Age. Of great significance is the fact that a large number of burials in Egypt with examples of Cypriot BR I juglets, can be dated within the reign of Thutmose III. This observation needs to be combined with my earlier work on RLW-m ware (ERIKSSON 1993) and also with MERRILLEES (1968) invaluable study, both of which demonstrated that many of the contexts in Egypt, (which often included BR I), could be dated exclusively to the reign of Thutmose III (see next subsection). The BR I ware here forms a repetitive synchronism, with usually intact vessels that suggest little time had elapsed between their manufacture and final deposition. All this confirms the view that there was a major increase of these Cypriot wares into Egypt at this time. This is important material evidence which provides the key to the archaeological definition of the LC IB sequence – that is from the beginning of the Hatshepsut – Thutmose III joint reign.

We should note that, as early as 1926, the Swedish archaeologist, E. GJERSTAD (1926, 333), dated BR I predominantly to the reign of Thutmose III. However, he felt that one context (Gurob Tomb 27) gave the evidence for dating its first appearance in Egypt to around the time of Amenhotep I (1514–1493). From this, he posited a slightly earlier start for the ware in Cyprus, approximately around the time of the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> Dynasty (the period we have identified as LC IA:2).

Notwithstanding this individual case, most archaeologists agree that it was during LC IB (Thutmose III period), that BR I reached its peak in Egypt. Thus for example, OREN (1969, 143), could not find any “...reason for supporting a pre-Thutmose III date for any of the Base Ring specimens found on Egyptian soil.”

However, in contradiction to this, MERRILLEES (1968, 191) presented a very different view. He believes that he can demonstrate that BR I should be

dated in Egypt already in the last part of the Second Intermediate or Hyksos Period. I (ERIKSSON 2001c) have elsewhere argued against such a dating for Base Ring I in Egypt, based on the evidence currently available.<sup>222</sup> Our position is supported by OREN (1969, 143, 148) for this reason: A number of deposits in Egypt with BR I dated by Merrillees to a transitional SIP/XVIII A date have been examined by OREN (1969, 148) who considered them to be unreliable. Thus, in one of these tombs dated by MERRILLEES (1968, 90, Deir Rifa 6) to SIP/XVIII A, there was also found Blue Painted ware, which is not dated before Thutmose III,<sup>223</sup> and usually dated to Amenhotep II or perhaps later.

In any event, the resolution of this debate on the dating of the first appearances of BR I does not constitute a problem for our general chronology. If it is ultimately demonstrated that the initial appearance of BR I is in the later part of the Second Intermediate period, which also encompasses the first Late Cypriot period (LC IA:1), this would still be consistent with our definitions in Chapter I.2. We indicated there that, in our view, WS I did not begin at the same time as BR I. As we have further argued in Chapter III.1, WS I began just before the start of the New Kingdom in Egypt and defines the start of the LC IA:2 period. We have further argued that PWS wares began earlier than BR I and we used the first appearances of PWS to define the start of the LC IA:1. From this it follows logically that BR I probably began sometime between the beginning of LC IA:1 and the start of LC IA:2. Thus, the discovery of early appearances of BR I does not require us to re-evaluate the starting point of the LC IA:2 period, which itself is defined here in terms of the first appearance of WS I and not the earliest BR I. MERRILLEES’ determined that the first appearance of BR I in Egypt was during late SIP and thus (provided that it is sometime within the LC IA:1 period) this remains a possibility. However, we note all OREN’s (1969) opposing arguments here.

This discussion has emphasized the fact that BR I had a long life cycle – with significant appearances, possibly during LC IA:1, in LC IA:2 and LC IB. Irrespective of the dating of its first appearance, we should not, however, lose sight of the fact that the big

<sup>222</sup> See above, my comments about the BR I vessel from Kom Rabi’a, Memphis.

<sup>223</sup> A sherd of Blue Painted, usually not dated before the reign

of Thutmose III, occurs at Kom Rabi’a between the contexts with the BR I juglet base and the one with the LM IB sherd.

majority of BR I finds are during the period of Thutmosis III. This further supports our general chronological schema and the historical conclusions especially in relation to Period 3 (see Chapter VII.3). Furthermore, that BR I finds are spread out over a long period and over a number of chronological phases shows the extraordinary continuity of LBA Cypriot wares, and not just the White Slip series.

### 3. BR I EVIDENCE IN EGYPT RELATING TO HISTORICAL PERIOD 3 – LC IB

When considering Late Cypriot wares other than White Slip, there is some important additional evidence from Egypt which relates to BR I. A small mixed group of objects which arose from the 1899–1900 and 1912–13 excavations at Abydos are preserved in the Nicholson Museum, Sydney (ERIKSSON 2005). There were a number of tombs investigated, including two which were numbered D 114 in both seasons. From both tombs, there are examples of local pottery, copper/bronze implements and weapons, jewellery and imported BR I vessels from Cyprus. Significantly, both sets of tombs also contained inscribed material with the throne name of the pharaoh Thutmosis III.

Consider first the few contents from the Abydos D114 tomb, as excavated by MACE (see MERRILLEES 1968, 109). There is no need to doubt an association between the BR I lentoid flask (Nicholson Museum, Sydney: Inv. No. 62.672) with the inscribed material of Thutmosis III. This association is also indicated in the Peet and Loat Tomb D 114 material, where there is the presence of painted jugs, together with BR I ware and again inscribed objects bearing the cartouche of Thutmosis III (see *ibid.*).

In addition to these two tombs, there are other tombs at Abydos, where a solid connection between Cypriot wares of the Late Cypriot I period such as BR I and RLW-m with inscribed material of Thutmosis III can be demonstrated (MERRILLEES *ibid.*, 95–118; ERIKSSON 2005). It should be noted that this association between RLW-m and BR at the time of Thutmosis III is not restricted to Abydos, but occurs in burials at other sites in Egypt. Examples can be found at Zawyet el-Aryan, El Riqqa, Maidum, Kahun and Sedment (ERIKSSON 2001c). Thus, at Zawyet el Aryan in Tomb Z 330, a single body was placed in a tomb, along with offerings which included six BR I vessels, a RLW-m spindle bottle and a silver and electrum ring with a scarab of Thutmosis III (*id.*, 1993, 89 with refs). In a burial at El Riqqa, Cemetery C1 Tomb 296, two coffins were placed. In one, there was a BR I juglet and in the other, a scarab

of Thutmosis III, and the remaining gifts suggest both burials were made during the reign of this pharaoh (MERRILLEES 1968, 31). At Maidum, in Mastaba 17 Tomb 261, there is a little disturbed coffin burial which contains BR I, RLW-m and a scarab again with the prenomen of Thutmosis III (ERIKSSON 1993, 88 with refs). A similar association can be observed at nearby Kahun.

In the Tomb of Maket, made famous because of the imported Late Helladic IIB jar from Greece found in Coffin No. 9, we can note a similar situation. In this tomb, there are 12 coffin burials and among the contents of the individual burials are BR I vessels while in other coffins, there are scarabs of Thutmosis III. Despite the fact that scarabs of Thutmosis I and Thutmosis II were found in the sifted debris from the Main Chamber, the contents of all the coffin burials indicate that they all were placed in the tomb during the reign of Thutmosis III. This is a position that I have previously argued for as the earliest coffin cannot be dated before the time of this pharaoh, and neither can the later coffin containing the Late Helladic IIB jar (*id.*, 1992, 184–6; 1993, 85–8). Finally, at Sedment, in two burials, the association between BR I and inscribed material of Thutmosis III can also be noted (MERRILLEES 1968, 60–1, 65–6 with refs).

We should note that the pattern is repeated, even outside Egypt. Thus, recent excavations at Tell Heboua in the western Sinai have produced tombs with BR I and RLW-m and none of these was dated prior to the middle of the 18<sup>th</sup> Dynasty, or specifically between the reigns of Thutmosis IV–Amenophis III, largely on the basis of the associated Egyptian pottery (ASTON 1996, 179). We have known for some time that there are a significant number of burials in Egypt with examples of Cypriot BR I juglets, which can be dated within the reign of Thutmosis III (here 1479–1425 BC). All this further confirms the amazing continuity of BR I and of the strong links between Egypt and Cyprus – even during tumultuous historical events. As has been (ERIKSSON 2001c, 52; 2005) stated: “such a repetitive synchronism, with usually intact vessels that suggest little time had elapsed between their manufacture and final deposition, strongly supports the view that they were a common import at this time.” We thus have a specific challenge before us – to understand the historical situation in Egypt and the eastern Mediterranean so as to explain why products from Cyprus (which are now largely represented by the pottery) could have become such a common find in Egyptian New Kingdom burials, especially during

the reign of Thutmosis III. We shall take up this issue in Chapter VII.3.

#### 4. THE CHRONOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE OF RED LUSTROUS WHEEL-MADE WARES

As indicated in the Introduction, my thesis that RLW-m ware was produced on Cyprus and distributed throughout the Mediterranean is a key feature of the overall analysis in this book. In Chapter IV.6, we outlined its relationship with the White Slip series. However, the importance of RLW-m extends far beyond its association with White Slip. I outlined the comprehensive account in my PhD thesis, later published in 1993 as a monograph under the title *Red Lustrous Wheel-made Ware*. In the Introduction to that book, I (ERIKSSON 1993, 3) outlined the scope and importance of the RLW-m wares:

The study of the distribution of RLW-m ware throughout the Near East during the LBA is one that enables many cross references to be made between Cyprus and the surrounding lands where it has been found. The earliest recorded occurrences, mainly spindle bottles, in Egypt, Palestine and Syria allow for synchronisms to be made with LC IA:2, which is when it is first recorded in Cyprus... As it is found over such a wide area of the eastern Mediterranean during the ca 300 year period of its manufacture, this allows for valuable cross referencing between sites. This is based on a close detailed examination of the contexts in which the ware occurs in Cyprus, Egypt, Palestine, Syria, the 'Amuq, Anatolia, Crete and Rhodes.

The discovery of RLW-m ware vessels over such a broad area helps to identify and/or confirm the existence of relations, either direct or indirect, between the areas where it has been found and Cyprus. With the Cypro-Minoan texts still waiting to be deciphered and references to the island in Akkadian and Hittite texts disputed, the archaeological record is all important to the study of its history. As a product of Cyprus that was clearly valued in its homeland and abroad, as finds in tomb and temple contexts attest, it adds to the growing body of knowledge concerning the changing nature of the foreign relations of the island during the course of the LBA.

Originally RLW-m wares appeared in Egypt, Canaan and the Aegean. However, they later played an important role in Anatolia and the Amuq. The major evidence of RLW-m in Egypt is from the reign of Thutmosis III; it is to this time that the majority of RLW-m finds are ascribed. An event of great significance is the fact that after this time,

RLW-m ware appears only sporadically in Egyptian contexts; and it seems to be completely absent from Tell el-Amarna.

From Egypt, the RLW-m spindle bottle is of major chronological significance. It is found in many tombs, for example, Tomb NE 1 at Saqqara where it is associated with LH IIA pottery (see Chapter III.10.d). The spindle bottle form commences at the beginning of the ware's production, probably late in LC IA:2. There are several variants of this form, some of which have shorter chronological ranges. Other shapes of RLW-m, such as the pilgrim flasks and arm shaped vessels, appear later and in a range of countries.

It is important to compare the situation of RLW-m in Egypt with that of Canaan. The latter society only has a small quantity of RLW-m ware when compared with the number of RLW-m spindle bottles exported to Egypt – during the period from the reign of Amenhotep I to Thutmosis III. In Egypt, these bottles were frequently included amongst tomb offerings. In Canaan for the same period, LB I, there are only a few contexts which contained spindle bottles; yet other LC IA:2 and LC IB pottery is otherwise well represented. From the evidence compiled by Merrillees for Egypt and by Gittlen for Canaan/Palestine, it would seem that there was a particular demand for contemporary Cypriot pottery in both areas, but not necessarily for the same wares. The reasons for the greater popularity of RLW-m in Egypt are not yet known. However, the rarity of RLW-m ware in Canaan does suggest that it is unlikely that it and other LC wares in Egypt reached there via an overland route which passed through Canaan, as has sometimes been suggested. The links between Cyprus and Egypt at this time appear to be mostly direct trade.

In addition to Canaan and Egypt, RLW-m wares are found in the Aegean region. The links of Cyprus with the Aegean are thus also illustrated through RLW-m ware (ERIKSSON 2003, 414–6, table 1).

It is interesting to note that the association between RLW-m with Aegean material really only begins in Historical period 3 – LC IB (see *ibid.*, 414). Later, in Historical Periods 4 and 5, we have the synchronism between RLW-m and LH/LM IIIA:1/IIIA:2 pottery (*ibid.*, 415–6). Finally, RLW-m appears with LH IIIB pottery in Historical Periods 6–7, only ending when LH IIIC:1 pottery is current (ERIKSSON 1993). Two points are worth emphasizing. Firstly, RLW-m is found with Aegean pot-

tery in a number of countries (Cyprus, Egypt, Canaan, Syria and the islands of Crete and Rhodes), but not in Mainland Greece. Secondly, as we move into historical Period 4 (when RLW-m is most abundant), RLW-m is still found with Aegean pottery, but not in Egypt. These ceramic changes are in our view indications of the dramatic events in Egypt during periods 4 and 5 which led to significant transformations of its relations with other societies in the whole region (see Chapter VII.4 and VII.5). The contexts in which RLW-m is found together with Mycenaean pottery in Cyprus are discussed in greater detail in Chapter VI.7.

The most dramatic contrast with Egypt, however, is seen when we compare its RLW-m wares with the large amounts of the ware found in Anatolia. Not only is the chronological range of RLW-m ware vastly different in Anatolia and Egypt, but there is also difference in the shapes that occur within each region. In Egypt, it is the spindle bottle that is the predominant shape, with only a few bowl sherds, pilgrim flasks and one fragment of an arm-shaped vessel. On the other hand, in Anatolia, it is the arm-shaped vessel that is predominant, with spindle bottles, (mostly of a type not recorded in Egypt), pilgrim flasks and some bowl sherds. These large amounts of RLW-m appear in the Hittite lands at a time when this ware is beginning to disappear from Egyptian contexts. The importance of RLW-m ware in the analysis of the relations between Anatolia and Cyprus is explained thus by Ian TODD (2001, 212–3):

One of the more intriguing problems posed by the relations between Cyprus and Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age concerns the origins of Red Lustrous Wheelmade ware. While it has usually been considered in the past as a mainland product, perhaps Syrian, ERIKSSON (1993) has demonstrated that Cyprus is the most likely candidate. If this conclusion is accepted, then the relations between Cyprus and the mainland have to be viewed in an entirely different light, at least with reference to Anatolia....instead of only one or two stray Cypriote sherds being found on the major sites within the Hittite region, there would be a considerable amount of evidence for contact between this northern plateau region, especially Boğazköy, and the island. (For a comprehensive account of RLW-m distribution in Anatolia and the Amuq see Chapter V.9).

The dominant message from my study (ERIKSSON 1993) was thus: the distribution of RLW-m ware establishes that at least some part of Cyprus was in interaction with the Hittites by the time of

Suppiluliuma I. It is a fascinating historical question as to whether this link was based on trade, or whether it was based on some form of alliance of convenience. Given that Cyprus is still the most likely source of RLW-m (see Introduction), the change in the direction of distribution, from a southwards pattern to one that is almost exclusively northwards, provides important archaeological evidence which further supplements the historical picture of events in Egypt, Syria/Canaan and Anatolia at this time – especially during the reigns of Amenhotep III and Akhenaton.

The ceramics, together with other documents that have been discovered (such as the Hittite texts), suggest that, from Suppiluliuma I onwards, the Hittites became very active in pursuing their interests in Alashiya (Cyprus). For example, evidence shows that the Hittites began using Cyprus as a place of banishment as early as the reign of Suppiluliuma I (Sjöqvist 1940, 201). Throughout this time and right into the Amarna period, we may fairly assume that the island retained her independence – as is illustrated by the fact that the king of Alashiya was not averse to asking for gifts to be sent in return for his support (Åström 1972b, 773).

By the time of LC IIB (historical period 5), RLW-m was no longer exported to Egypt, is on the decline in Canaan and even Syria, and at this stage there appear to be no recorded occurrences in the Aegean after LH/LM IIIA:1. Yet it is continuing to appear strongly in Anatolia. The historical significance of these issues is further discussed in Chapter VII.4 and VII.5.

##### 5. THE DISCOVERIES AT UGARIT (RAS SHAMRA) AND THE LINKS WITH CYPRUS

In earlier parts of this book (for example, the second part of Chapter III), we have seen that, from the very beginning of LC IA:2, a substantial amount of WS I appears at Tell el-ʿAjjul. However, the links with Cyprus and the Canaanite societies extended far beyond this centre to other parts of Syria/Canaan/Jordan. It was during the LC IB period that the links between Cyprus and the Canaanite societies became much stronger, especially with the town of Ugarit (Ras Shamra).

Our knowledge of Canaanite culture during this whole Second Millennium BC was extensively revealed with the sensational discovery of Ras Shamra (ancient Ugarit). The extraordinary collection of material from this site, as exposed, for example, by VIROLLEAUD (1929) SCHAEFFER (1939; 1949), NOUGAYROL *et al.*, (1968), SAADÉ (1979),

YON (2006) and many others, provides an insight into the history of the Canaanite peoples living in Syria and indirectly gives us much information about the culture in Canaan. The tablets and the other evidence reveal a substantial civilization, even as early as the Middle Cypriot period.

As we move into the Late Cypriot period, the wealth of material uncovered dramatically increases. In addition to the buildings, we find tombs, pottery and most important of all the thousands of tablets which reveal different types of writing and a sophisticated and intellectual culture. As SAADE (1979, 70–71) explains:

The cultural level of Ugarit is revealed to us by the texts. From them, it can be deduced that this was an intellectual centre of the greatest importance. The existence of schools and scribes is attested by numerous documents of scholarly character. These scribes did not only show great skill in the art of engraving signs in clay; they can also be seen paying attention to all sorts of dictionaries that enabled them to familiarise themselves with foreign languages and to translate them with ease. It must not be forgotten that it is to one of them that we owe the invention of the alphabetic system of writing that was used for the language spoken by the mostly Canaanite population of the town.

Amongst the findings at Ras Shamra, there were significant wares from Cyprus – although these were intermixed with other foreign objects. For example, SAADE (*ibid.*, 116) reports on a temple in Ugarit in which were found “several hundred lamps (including Canaanite pinched spout lamps), a large number of vases amongst which were ‘bil-bils’ of the Cypriote type and many scarabs often bearing hieroglyphs.”

Scholars who have studied the material have concluded that there were extensive links between Cyprus and Ugarit at this time of the LBA. It is generally accepted that the then Cypriots were probably the largest grouping in the town, next to the Canaanite and the Hurrians. “Besides the Canaanites, who in the 14<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> centuries continued to form the major part of the population, there was an appreciable number of Hurrians. Commercial activity had, however attracted other people. The Cypriot element must surely have been considerable, if not in Ugarit itself, then at least in the port town” (*ibid.*, 75). It is also very significant that we discover Cypriot style funerary practices and the associated artefacts in Ras Shamra. An early investigator, VIROLLEAUD (1929, 308), has stated:

The influence which seems to be dominant, if not at Ras Shamra itself, then, at least, at the near-by necropolis of Minet el Beida, is that of the island of Cyprus. The graves of Minet el Beida are of Cypriote shape and construction, and the funeral equipment largely consists of bases of painted baked clay of which is distinctly and almost totally Cypriote.

The Cypriot material, however, was only a small part of the voluminous material discovered at Ras Shamra. The whole collection is invaluable for our general understanding of the events and cultures of the Late Bronze Age. For example, the libraries discovered show that in Ugarit there were genuine scholars and men of letters. The nature of the documents proves, in fact, that the town included ‘encyclopaedists’ desirous of owning learned texts that could inform them about various domains of knowledge, such as the ‘humanists’ taking an interest in the classical works of Babylonian literature. Ugarit thus proves that the Canaanites were not only people of business, trade and navigation.

The writings are in several different languages which includes traditional Sumerian, Akkadian, and the language which seems specific to that region, Ugaritic; this latter is based on a Semitic-Hebrew type alphabet. SCHAEFFER (1939, 35) considers this as “among the first alphabets to be composed, and actually is the earliest yet known.” This script contained only thirty different characters; it was used to transmit a very important message. “As it is, the Ras Shamra texts reveal a literature of a high moral tone, tempered with order and justice” (*ibid.*, 59). Interestingly, this language has been compared to a Cypriot script, which developed several centuries later. This was not Cypro-Minoan which existed at that time – although a few texts in Cypro-Minoan have been found at Ugarit.

The many texts in these languages, provide a wealth of information about the whole history, primarily of the Canaanites, but also of developments in Egypt, the Hittite Empire and the Hurrians/Mittanians at this time (and a few items on Cyprus). A major consequence of all the discoveries of Ras Shamra is that we have had to upgrade our concept of the level of technological and cultural development which had been achieved in the Levant and Syria in the first part of the Late Bronze Age. Because of the intimate relationship which came to exist between Ugarit and Cyprus, as we move further into the Late Bronze Age, this indirectly supports the view that the culture of

Cyprus itself must have also achieved a level of significant artistic and intellectual development. One wonders whether one day we may discover documents in Cyprus similar to those at Ras Shamra.

The discoveries at Ras Shamra also raise some important questions about the interconnection between Ugarit and Cyprus. What is however beyond dispute is that there were very extensive trading links between the Cypriots and the people of Ugarit from this LC IB period (and possibly earlier). As SAADÉ (1979, 111) says:

In the two rooms (No 8 and 9) of the north site the excavation turned up an important collection of written documents, which constitute the Archives of the SOUTH Palace. There are in particular texts relating to the maritime commerce that Ugarit engaged in with the island of Cyprus, Egypt and Syro-Palestinian coast.

The Ras Shamra documents provide important historical information, which we shall draw on in Chapter VII. For example, in relation to our Historical period 3, at the time of the Syrian campaigns of Thutmose III, an Egyptian garrison was installed at Ugarit, as we also learn from a stele found at Karnak. The excavations also revealed fragments of alabaster vases with cartouches of the name of this pharaoh. Furthermore, it is known that a revolt broke out at Ugarit in the time of Amenhotep II (1427–1401 BC), who retook it.

As we shall see when we discuss the historical periods 4 and 5 in Chapter VII, the documents of Ras Shamra reveal that Ugarit went on to become a substantial centre of civilization in the northern Levant. It was considered a prize by the major surrounding empires – the Hittites, the Hurrians and the Egyptians – and there was much conflict over the control of it. By the time of Period 7, the Ras Shamra documents reveal that the king of Ugarit was writing to the king of Alashiya (Cyprus) in reverent terms, asking for his help and guidance to save Ugarit (see Chapter VII.4 to VII.7).

## 6. CERAMIC EVIDENCE OF THE LINKS BETWEEN CYPRUS AND JORDAN

One of the largest collections of late Middle Bronze IIC and Late Bronze I pottery from a multi-chambered tomb was discovered in Tomb 62, at Pella

in Jordan.<sup>224</sup> Amongst the local plain, Chocolate on White and White Slip wares there was a small, but significant, collection of fourteen Cypriot vessels characteristic of the Late Cypriot IA:1–IB periods. These wares are Black Lustrous Wheel-made, RLW-m and a rare find outside of Cyprus, a PBR (Red Slip) bowl (ERIKSSON 2001b, with further references). Their presence in this tomb reveals a connection between Cyprus with the East Side of the Jordan River.

The context of this Cypriot pottery allows us to draw conclusions about the cultural synchronisation between the two areas at a time of tremendous political change. This is revealed because the tomb also produced royal name scarabs of Ya<sup>c</sup>ammu-Nebuserre – a minor Hyksos ruler; Khamose – last ruler of the Theban 17<sup>th</sup> Dynasty; and of his contemporary, Apophis-Auserre – the penultimate ruler of the 15<sup>th</sup> Dynasty Hyksos, who were expelled from the Delta of Egypt by Khamose's brother Ahmose. (For historical details, see Chapter VII.1)

An initial analysis could give the impression that the Late Cypriot pottery in Tomb 62 belongs to the horizon of the end Second Intermediate Period. However, a detailed analysis shows that the different pieces represent a transition period of no more than 150 years – a period marked by significant changes in the political and cultural ties of the site (*ibid.*). These extend from just before the expulsion of the Hyksos from Egypt, until the time when Thutmose III claims to have conquered the Pella area and established Egyptian dominance there.

Thus the scarabs and the Cypriot pottery discovered in Tomb 62, apparently exactly parallel the first three of our seven historical periods in the changing nature of political and cultural development of Cyprus in the Late Bronze Age. Firstly, as already referred to, the royal name scarabs link the site with the last part of the Second Intermediate Period, prior to when the Hyksos are expelled from Egypt into Canaan (Period 1 = LC IA:1). This is supported by some of the local pottery which is typical of the Middle Bronze IIC/Late Bronze I transition. Secondly, some of the Cypriot pottery (BLW-m and PBR) is likely to have been imported to Pella at the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> Dynasty, when Ahmose's successors undertook military campaigns as far north as Syria,

<sup>224</sup> I was fortunate to be working at Pella when this tomb, with its RLW-m and other Late Cypriot wares, was discovered. I am most grateful to J.B. Hennessy (previous Pella Direc-

tor) and S.J. Bourke (current Pella Director) for permission to discuss this material.



but seem not to have attacked Pella (Period 2 = LC IA:2). Thirdly, the RLW-m and the majority of the BL are identified with the period after Thutmose III conquers the whole region – including for the first time, Pella itself (Period 3 = LC IB). The events of these three periods are outlined in Chapter VII, sections (1) (2) and (3) respectively.

It was argued that the RLW-m spindle bottle in Tomb 62 is most likely to be from the later period of Thutmose III. This view is supported by the fact that Pella is listed under the conquests of Thutmose III in the Topographical lists on the Temple of Amon at Karnak (SMITH 1973, 24). The pharaoh claims (see *ibid.*) that Pella and the other conquests “had never been trodden before by any of the kings of Lower Egypt apart from his majesty...” The inclusion of Pella into the Egyptian world sphere may be the reason why, at the end of the Palestinian Late Bronze I, an ‘administrative/palatial residence’ type structure was constructed at the site (BOURKE 1997, 108). It seems that it was after this conquest that the RLW-m spindle bottle and perhaps some of the associated BLW-m Cypriot wares arrived in Pella and were then deposited in Tomb 62.

#### 7. SOME OTHER CYPRIOT FINDS IN CANAAN

In 1977, GITTLEIN presented his thesis on *Studies in the Late Cypriote Pottery found in Palestine*. We have not re-examined all of the contexts he used here. Since then there have been more detailed studies of Late Cypriot pottery at the old and new excavations at Tell el-<sup>c</sup>Ajjul (e.g. BERGOFFEN 1989, 2001a, 2002; FISCHER 2001b, 2003; FISCHER and SADEQ 1999, 1999b, 2001). Also, OREN (2001) has presented more up to date analysis of PWS and WS I in Canaan. Therefore, apart from passing references throughout this text to significant contexts in Canaan where White Slip wares are recorded, we have not dealt with every occurrence. However, there are two sites in Canaan that are of chronological significance and where mixtures of Cypriot wares were found.

##### (a) Burial Cave I.10A, Gezer

A number of Cypriot ceramics were found in this burial, which gave further support for a general synchronism between LM IB, LC IB and the reign of Thutmose III. Some of the grave goods from Burial Cave I.10A at Gezer were as follows: Firstly, in the Lower Phase, a locally manufactured ceramic sarcophagus was considered by the excavator to copy a form of Cretan sarcophagus of MM II/LM I date (SEGER 1988, 52, pl. 17:15). The period of use for the Lower Phase of the tomb is said to cover the time

from the latter part of the reign of Thutmose III until towards the end of the reign of Amenhotep II. This was in part confirmed by the five scarabs recorded throughout the layer, which included one of ‘anra’ type, two bearing the prenomen of Thutmose III and one bearing the prenomen of Amenhotep II (*ibid.*, 51).

Secondly, from our point of view, the importance of this tomb is that scattered throughout the layer, there were 48 Cypriot vessels. Summarized briefly, these included: one RLW-m spindle bottle; a PBR jug; 32 BR I vessels; five BR II vessels; three Monochrome vessels; a WP VI spouted vessel and five White Shaved pieces (*ibid.*, pls. 17–30). The bulk of this pottery clearly relates to a LC IB date, but the small quantities of BR II and White Shaved wares should be dated to LC IIA:1. This LC IB–LC IIA:1 range of the Cypriot pottery is in agreement with the range from the reign of Thutmose III to early Amenhotep III suggested by the other finds. The cave thus clearly illustrates these phases of the Late Cypriot I–II sequence. The Cypriot wares were important in this chronological assessment.

##### (b) Structure I of the Fosse Temple, Lachish

Cypriot ceramics illustrative of these two LC IB–LC IIA:1 periods were also found at Lachish. The evidence suggests that, from the end of the reign of Thutmose III down to the beginning of the reign of Amenhotep III, Structure I of the Fosse Temple at Lachish was in use. From near the altar of the temple, a LH IIA one handled kylix decorated with ivy leaf motif was recorded, (see ERIKSSON 1993, fig. 32). The key point here is that it was found in association with a group of Cypriot pottery vessels, which included a RLW-m spindle bottle, a WS I–II ‘LL’ bowl with wavy line round rim, and two WS I–II ‘LL’ with dotted rim bowls (see above Chapter IV.6.c). We should note, however, that a PWS sherd (TUFNELL, INGE and HARDING 1940, pl. LXIV, 1) and a WS I bichrome ‘FWL’ (*ibid.*, pl. LXIV, 4) were also found in the Temple area and could possibly be attributed to Structure I.

The excavators dated Structure I from the reign of Thutmose III until the reign of Amenhotep III. This end date was determined because of the discovery of a plaque bearing the prenomen of Amenhotep III, which was found on top of the south wall of Room D, Structure I. It appears that it was at this time that the levelling of Structure I and building of Structure II took place (*ibid.*, 69).

A suggestion has been made by WARREN and HANKEY (1989, 144) that Structure I was not constructed,

until the period of peace that followed the Year 23 campaign of Thutmosis III. They use the evidence to make a synchronism between the pottery style LH IIA and the time of Thutmosis III. However, an alternative explanation is that Structure I was in use right down until the time that Structure II was constructed – early in the reign of Amenhotep III. The matter is further complicated by the following: because of its association near the altar (with several other more or less intact vessels), the one handled kylix probably does not belong to the earliest use of this structure, but more towards the end of the structure's life.

In conclusion, because of the extended use of Structure I of the Fosse Temple, this kylix, would demonstrate the survival of this style into the reign of Amenhotep II, or even as late as the beginning of the reign of Amenhotep III. This is consistent with the chronological range of those Cypriot wares found together with the kylix. The interesting issue is: What were the historical circumstances, which gave, rise to the appearance to the Cypriot wares? Clearly they provide further evidence of the links between Cyprus, and Canaan at this time; these links will be further discussed in Chapter VII.3 and VII.4.

#### 8. WHITE SLIP AND OTHER CYPRIOT POTTERY AT ALALAKH

In a study for the SCIEM 2000 Project, BERGOFFEN (2003; 2005), presents the most informative account to date of the Cypriot pottery recorded by Sir. L. WOOLLEY during his excavations at Tell Atchana on the Orontes, or ancient Alalakh. The site has produced what appears to be a mass of Cypriot pottery through the various Late Bronze Age levels at the site. Bergoffen, who has previously studied the distribution of Cypriot Pottery in Canaan and Egypt (*id.*, 1989), concludes that the Cypriot imports were less common at Alalakh than at coastal sites. Nevertheless, it is certainly exceptional to have such an extensive and varied collection of White Slip at an inland site. Indeed, as BERGOFFEN (1989; 2003; 2005, 50) herself observes, as a general rule, apart from coastal sites like Tell el-<sup>c</sup>Ajjul, and Ugarit, “individual sites have rarely yielded more than a dozen sherds.”

In a series of Tables, BERGOFFEN (2005, 49, tables III–V) lists the occurrence of Cypriot White Slip at the site through Levels VI–II. Of great significance is the fact that at Alalakh, no PWS or WS I ‘Rope Lattice’ style pottery is found. Hence Alalakh does not tie in

with other places outside of Cyprus, where we have the appearance of these significant early WS styles. (As we have seen, PWS and WS I ‘RL’ have been found at Tell el-Dab<sup>c</sup>a in the Nile Delta and at Tell el-<sup>c</sup>Ajjul in southern Canaan). The picture thus emerges that there is “hardly any sign of the MC III–LC IA import repertoire” (BERGOFFEN 2003, 403). Furthermore, WS I ‘FWL’, (and also ‘FDR’, ‘PL’) are hardly attested to at Alalakh, according to BERGOFFEN (2001a, 154). Overall, BERGOFFEN (*ibid.*) comes to the conclusion: “...what limited evidence we have shows that WS and BR imports began to arrive during level V. In Canaan, such items became common from the time of Thutmosis III on.” The general lowering of the date of Level V and of the Level VB palace, believed to be constructed by Idrimi, would make Level V largely contemporary with the reign of Thutmosis III. A date range for Level VB of between ca 1445–1415 BC proposed by BERGOFFEN (2003, 406, n.95a), means its destruction (by Tudhaliya II?) falls within the reign of Amenhotep II (see Table 12). The Cypriot ceramic evidence alone indicates this. Thus, a date for Level IV starting in the mid 15<sup>th</sup> century BC can no longer be sustained; although BERGOFFEN (2003, 400) refers to the Level IV Cypriot ceramic assemblage as one that “fits LC IB – LC IIA ca 1450–1360). Heinz’s (cited in BERGOFFEN 2003, 399; 2005, 62, n. 434) lowering of the date of Level VI B, which she equates with the start of the 18<sup>th</sup> Dynasty based on comparative evidence which linked up with Tell el-Dab<sup>c</sup>a, fits in very well with the lowering of the dates of Level V and IV.

Unfortunately, there are problems in relation to the findings in each of these levels in Alalakh. Beginning with Level VII, any occurrences of Late Cypriot pottery attributed by the excavator to this level are no longer accepted.<sup>225</sup> A WS I ‘FWL’ late bowl (BERGOFFEN 2005, 53, table VII, WS4, 97, pl. 38c) was originally attributed to Level VII (see writing on vessel) but is redated by BERGOFFEN (*ibid.*) to Level VI. BERGOFFEN (*ibid.*, 50) felt that there was no difficulty in attributing this WS I ‘FWL’ to level VI – provided that it “...did belong to the end of the period, level VIB” (see above about the dating of Level VIB with the start of the 18<sup>th</sup> Dynasty). However, the problem we have with this fragmentary bowl is that it should be classified as ‘FWL’ late or what we consider to be typical of LC IB (Chapter III.12.a). Note particularly the close comparison with the WS I ‘FWL’ late from the Level IV Palace (*ibid.*, 53, table VII, WS22, 99, pl. 39d).

<sup>225</sup> See also ERIKSSON (1993, 121) where I discussed some of the problems with the recorded Level VII occurrence of

RLW-m ware. Although as BERGOFFEN (2003, 403) points out, it may be a locally produced type.

In general we are sceptical of the two attributions of WS I to Level VI, which leaves us with the earliest occurrence for classic WS I ‘FWL’ at Alalakh in a House context attributed to Level V (*ibid.*, 53, table VII, WS7, 98, pl. 38d). Whilst this is not problematic, it is difficult to accept the attribution to the same level of a grave (39/46) with a WS I–II bottle (*ibid.*, WE10, 100, pl. 50d). Its position in grid square M10 of the excavation places it right in the middle of Room 9 of the Level VII palace (WOOLLEY 1955, fig. 35). Five of the remaining six WS I–WS II wares which are attributed to Level IV Palace stratigraphy (see BERGOFFEN 2005, 49, table V), are in fact in the adjacent grid square – N13. Hence, while attributing this bottle to Level V is possible, it should be treated with caution.

In fact, most of the pre-Level V occurrences of WS I are somewhat dubious as their provenance remains unknown (*ibid.*, 53, table VII, WS 6, WS 10–12). We should also note the possibility that a WS I ‘FXH’ dotted rim sherd was labelled as coming from the Level IV temple area (*id.*, 2003, 404, fig. 5:row 1,1; 2005, 54, table VII, WE2, 100, pl. 38d). This style of WS I is later in the WS I series (see Chapter III.12.b, Table 1B). When it was found at Episkopi *Bamboula*, BENSON (1961, 66), like POPHAM (1972a, 441) before him, considered it to be a degeneration of the WS I decorative style.<sup>226</sup>

Turning now to WS II (BERGOFFEN 2005, 49, table VI), the record of hemispherical bowls in Levels VI and VI–V, where no specific provenience is given, is also suspect. The attribution to Level VB of a WS II ‘LLDR’ krater found ‘below the pavement of the Niqmepa palace, so Level VB’, was recorded by Woolley (BERGOFFEN 2003, fig. 9; *id.*, 2005, 48, 53, table VII, no. WT83, 105, pl. 50c). BERGOFFEN (2005, 52) then reaches the controversial conclusion, which is agreement with GITTLEN (1977, 439) and OREN (2006, 288): “The appearance of WS II in level VB parallels its first appearance in Canaan during LB I.” This WS I ‘LLDR’ krater is thus used by BERGOFFEN (*ibid.*) to support the lowering of the date of the subsequent Level IV Niqmepa Palace, on the basis that its presence indicates that Level VB ‘did not end before the third quarter of the 15<sup>th</sup> century’. We agree with this conclusion, and refer to ÅSTRÖM’S (1972b, 760) classification that LC IIA:1 has begun somewhere around the time of Amenhotep II (see Chapter I.2). However, we note that this is still an

early date for this type of rim motif, which is typical of the later Amarna period contexts.

On the other hand, one of the most useful and secure contexts at Alalakh is the Level IV Palace. BERGOFFEN (2005, 13) states that: “For Cypriot chronology, the palace IV assemblage is particularly important because ... the building was in use for a fairly short period ... from ca. 1425/20–1380/75. The lower dates adopted here for palace IV support Åström’s absolute date for the beginning of LC IIA in ca. 1425/15.” Given Bergoffen’s use of Kitchen’s dates for the New Kingdom this requires a requisite lowering of Åström’s absolute dates, as we have done here, by about 10 years. From this palace, BERGOFFEN (*ibid.*, table VII) records WS I ‘FWL’ late (WS 22, WS 39), WS II early ‘LLFL’ (*id.*, 2003, 407, fig. 10; 2005, WE7, 100, pl. 42a), and typical WS II ‘LL’ (WT 2, 3, 7, 78, 81) and ‘LLHC’ style (WT 13, 14, 15, 16, 75). Because WS II is one of the latest styles from this level, this evidence at Level IV Alalakh in our view fits very neatly into the categories we have adopted for the first part of White Slip II development, that is, LC IIA:1 and LC IIA:2.

Furthermore, in both Levels III and II at Alalakh, there are six entries of WS II from each of these levels noted by BERGOFFEN (2005, 54, table VII). This *prima facie* is again consistent with our general categories of LC IIB, and possibly part of LC IIC. By Level I no Cypriot pottery is found at the site (*ibid.*).

In overall terms and notwithstanding some of the difficulties with the site stated above, the lengthy and continuous links between Cyprus and Alalakh – as represented in the various levels – suggests important historical ties between the two societies (for more details see *ibid.*). This is interesting because, for much of the Late Bronze Age, the rulers of Alalakh were independent of the coastal Canaanite kingdoms. Yet the Cypriots managed to have strong links with both groups. We shall have more to say on this in the next section, dealing with the Amuq.

## 9. A SURVEY OF LATE CYPRIOT POTTERY IN ANATOLIA AND THE AMUQ

As mentioned in the Introduction, the premise that Red Lustrous Wheel-made ware was produced exclusively in Cyprus and was exported from there, is of great importance in understanding the links between Cyprus and other surrounding lands (see Tables 11

<sup>226</sup> This style was also found at Palaepaphos *Teratsoudhia* (see Table 9 above). See specifically Tomb 105 Chamber B (v) in KARAGEORGHIS (1990, pl. 7).

and 12). This matter, however, becomes of critical importance, when we come to Anatolia, as Ian TODD (2001) has noted. During this time, the role of White Slip becomes secondary to RLW-m, although it is still important. As explained in my 1993 PhD thesis (ERIKSSON 1993, 134), the evidence suggests that the Hittites were especially fond of the RLW-m ware and we find it throughout most of Anatolia – with increasing frequency from the reign of Suppiluliuma I onwards.

It is interesting that the arm-shaped vessels were particularly favoured by the Hittites. Alongside the spindle bottles they were sent to Anatolia, not only because of their forms but, more importantly, for their contents – the substance and quality of which were identified with the ware itself. The nature of the contents would have been immediately recognisable due to the distinctive containers. That the vessels and contents were valued by the Hittites is apparent due to their presence in temple areas. For example at Bogazköy/Hattusa, the presence of RLW-m ware arm-shaped vessels and spindle bottles, along with local libation vessels, were seen as evidence for emphasizing the sacred character of the buildings in which they were found. Even the ware by itself may have appealed to the Hittites, as it possessed a familiar finish and technique which only the finest of the Hittite red burnished wares came close to achieving at this time.

I am indebted to I. TODD (2001) for his development of my observations on RLW-m and the links he makes with other Cypriot wares, especially White Slip. His own analysis includes reference to some of my observations about other Cypriot wares found in context with RLW-m. In this discussion, we shall use TODD's categorization of the six geographical regions in Anatolia and seek to summarize and supplement his observations.

### **(1.) The West Coast (from NE Aegean southwards to the Ulu Burun shipwreck off Kaş)**

The most significant discoveries were near Troy, as TODD (2001, 207) observes:

Two White Slip II bowls and a Base-ring II jar or rhyton occurred in Troy VI<sup>f</sup>; eight White Slip II bowls and one Base-ring II jug or juglet occurred in VI<sup>h</sup>. Two White Slip II bowls are ascribed to late VI, and five to VI<sup>h</sup>/VIIa. Eight White Slip II bowls were found in VIIa and one in VIIb. To these finds should be added two further examples of WS II, published originally by Dörpfeld, mentioned recently by MERRILLEES and KRATA (1997 with references). Two fragments which may belong to

RLW-m arm-shaped vessels are catalogued by ERIKSSON from Troy VI (1993, 132).

In my 1993 work, the following observations were made about these RLW-m vessels (*ibid.*, 132, n. 10), which are worth recalling:

From Troy, on the western coast of Anatolia, two fragments (Cat. Nos. 1170–1) that may belong to arm-shaped vessels were recorded. They are described as not being of local Trojan manufacture and as having a fine terracotta-red clay and a rich red slip which is a good indicator that they are RLW-m ware, (see Blegen *et al.*, 1953, 282). They came from Level VI whose lower limit can be placed towards the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> century B.C.

### **(2.) The South Coast (from the Ulu Burun wreck eastwards to the Iskenderun region, including the Cilician plain)**

The most significant site in the region was at Tarsus, although small samples of WS II were found at Yumuktepe Mersin, Kabarsa and Kinet Hoyuk. In relation to Tarsus, TODD (2001, 207) says:

According to ÅSTRÖM (1980, 26, with reference to GOLDMAN 1956, 205, 220, fig. 329:1248–1252) five White Slip II bowl sherds were found, together with sherds of a Base-ring vessel and a Monochrome deep bowl or krater. ÅSTRÖM dates the Monochrome bowl to LC IB–IIB1. The White Slip II bowls are all of LC II type and were found in LB II contexts. ERIKSSON lists five RLW-m vessels or fragments thereof at the same site (1993, 132–33) and remarks on the small quantity found there. Mycenaean pottery was also found at Tarsus.

Specifically, I had remarked on the RLW-m ware from Tarsus thus (ERIKSSON 1993, 132):

A RLW-m ware pointed base jug [*ibid.*, no 82] from a LB II level belongs to a type whose distribution ranges from Cyprus to the central Anatolian Plateau. Also of LB II date are two RLW-m ware stand fragments from pilgrim flasks [*ibid.*, nos. 920–1]. From the Hittite temple, probably to be dated to the 13<sup>th</sup> century BC, two fragments of RLW-m ware arm-shaped vessels [*ibid.*, nos. 1166–7] were found. The small quantity of the ware recorded from this site is inconsistent with the numbers found in the Hittite capital.

### **(3.) The Göksu (Calycadnus) Valley (leading from the south coast up to the central Anatolian plateau)**

Excavations in this region have not produced evidence of White Slip ware, yet there are significant quantities of Red Lustrous, (see TODD 2001, 208;

ERIKSSON 1993, 132). TODD (2001, 208) draws the following conclusion from the RLW-m evidence:

If Eriksson's suggestion that RLWM ware was manufactured in Cyprus is correct, given the northern distribution of the ware on the central Anatolian plateau at the major Hittite centres, the Göksu valley must have played an important role in the northward trade in ceramics. This seems to be reflected in the comparative frequency with which RLWM occurs in the valley. It is unlikely to be coincidental that the site with one of the highest percentages of RLWM in Cyprus compared with other wares (if not the highest percentage) is Kazaphani-*Ayios Andronikos* (NICOLAOU and NICOLAOU 1989) on the north coast of the island, almost opposite the Göksu delta. This evidence seems to suggest that the Göksu route rather than the Cilician Gates may have been the more important route for contacts between Cyprus and central Anatolia.

These are important conclusions which further support my 1993 analysis. It should be noted here that KNAPPET (2002) now also believes that RLW-m was produced in at least one location in Cyprus, probably within the area of Kazaphani *Ayios Andronikos*. This locality had been suggested earlier (ERIKSSON 1993, 147).

TODD (2001, 208) is also of the view that the Göksu Valley played a significant historical role, as revealed by Hittite records. These records refer to the city of Tarhuntassa, which some have located in the Göksu Valley. The records indicate that the Hittite capital was moved from Bogazköy to Tarhuntassa by Muwatalli II. This was probably only for a short time and was most likely due to the extended military campaigns in Syria that Muwatalli waged against the Egyptians under Rameses II (see Chapter VII.7). TODD (*ibid.*) also suggests that: "Relations between Tarhuntassa and Hatti seem to have deteriorated and Suppiluliuma II, the last known ruler at Hattusa, conquered the southern city."

#### (4.) The Amuq Plain

In the Amuq Plain, the most important site was Tell Atchana. As we discussed in the preceding section, the Cypriot pottery from this site has been extensively studied by BERGOFFEN (2003; 2005). Earlier, TODD (2001, 209) observed that: "Comparatively large quantities of White Slip and Base-ring wares were found at the site (WOOLLEY 1955, 354–69); see also GATES (1987)." He noted WOOLLEY's (*ibid.*, 361) remark that: "...for household use the milk bowl, whether of White Slip I or White Slip II ware, was the standard bowl at Atchana in the fifteenth century B.C." TODD also

refers to my earlier work (ERIKSSON 1993), where most of Chapter VIII on The 'Amuq discusses the findings at the mound of Tell Atchana, the ancient city of Alalakh (see section V.8). There, the following historical observations were made in relation to this material at Alalakh (ERIKSSON 1993, 119–121):

RLW-m ware is not recorded in Egypt until the reign of Amenhotep I and this may be contemporary with its first appearance at Alalakh in Level Vb. The prevalence of the ware in Level Vb and early Level IV burials, sometimes in association with other LC I pottery, indicates that these levels are equivalent in time with the period in Egypt from the early XVIII<sup>th</sup> Dynasty down to the end of the reign of Thutmosis III. This correlation also suggests that the Level VII occurrence should be re-examined.

Given that the end date of Level Vb is now considered to be associated with a military foray (Tudhaliya II's sack of Aleppo?) that occurred probably during the reign of Amenhotep II, the Level Vb occurrences of RLW-m fit in with its greatest period of export to Egypt i.e., during the reign of Thutmosis III.

Regarding the Level VII occurrence of RLW-m ware, as BERGOFFEN (2003, 403) suggested it could be a locally produced version. Cypriot RLW-m ware does not otherwise appear at the site until towards the end of Level V. For the period from Level Vb into early Level IV, RLW-m is found only in funerary contexts – to judge by the published account (see also BERGOFFEN 2005). This period, from Vb to early IV, is now considered to be largely contemporary with the mid 18<sup>th</sup> Dynasty in Egypt, the transition from Level Vb to Level IV now being placed about the middle of the reign of Amenhotep II (see BERGOFFEN 2003, 406, n. 95a). It is interesting that RLW-m does not appear in settlement contexts until Level IV. Perhaps, with this in mind, the Level Vb contexts should be re-examined, as it is possible they may have been cut from the later level IV. Level Vb occurrences of RLW-m would be dated to the reign of Thutmosis III. The transition to Level IV would be more or less in line with the start of the LC IIA:1 period. This fits in with the discovery of RLW-m arm-shaped vessels in House 37, this structure having a longer life than the Niqmepa palace, which was probably destroyed in the reign of Niqmepa's successor – Ilim-ilimma II (Table 12). The long arm-shaped vessel does not appear in the RLW-m repertoire until LC IIA:2 (ERIKSSON 1993, 40). The comparative popularity of the ware at the site of Alalakh during Level Vb–IV, and its final appearance in Level II, is more analogous to the situation in Anatolia than Egypt (cf ERIKSSON *ibid.*, 127).

After re-examination of RLW-m at Alalakh and other sites in the ‘Amuq, I (*ibid.*, 127) drew the following general conclusion in relation to the ‘Amuq as a whole:

The numbers recorded clearly indicate that it is not of regional manufacture but was being brought in from somewhere else. Thus, the earlier claim by AMIRAN (1957, 97, n. 33) that the spindle bottle was “so abundant in the ‘Amuq sites” must be reconsidered because whilst it is well represented in Levels Vb–IV at Alalakh there is little other evidence. Indeed, the quantity found at sites like Alalakh and Çatal Hüyük suggested to GATES (1982, 135, n. 43) that they were “not native to the ‘Amuq.

**(5.) The Central Anatolian plateau (including the Konya Plain, northwards to Ankara and the Hittite homeland)**

Boğazköy is the central site here; it was the centre of the new Hittite empire and the site at which the key decisions were made by the Emperors (see Chapter VII.4 and VII.5). TODD (*ibid.*, 210) says the following about the Cypriot wares in this region:

ÅSTRÖM (1980, 26) lists the discovery by Unger in 1932 of sherds of a Base-ring II bowl here (see also SJÖQVIST 1940, 175). CLINE (1991, 3, n. 4; 1994, 70) mentions the occurrence of White Slip, but this may now be considered to be erroneous. DIKAIOS (1961, 31) mentions that Cypriote monochrome ware was found here in small quantities, but, as Åström states, this needs verification. A fragment of a copper ingot of Cypriote type has also been found (MAQUEEN 1986, 97). In contrast to these scattered finds, comparatively large quantities of RLWM vessels have been found. ERIKSSON (1993, 131) lists approximately 22 spindle bottles, almost 100 arm-shaped vessels, one jug and two pilgrim flasks in addition to some fragments. These, however, form only a small proportion of the ceramic total from the site, and the ware is to be regarded as foreign to the site (*ibid.*, 129).

We can now add to this the following information about recent excavations at Boğazköy. KNAPPETT (2002) reports: “Yet a rather dramatic discovery in 2000–2001 has changed the picture substantially; excavations by Dr. Jürgen Seeher at Boğazköy, the Hittite capital Hattusha, have unearthed thousands of RLWm ware sherds, found dumped into large artificial ponds, probably from nearby temple complexes. Previously, Eriksson had recorded 22 spindle bottles and c.100 arm-shaped vessels at Boğazköy; now the amount of RLWm ware from this single site rivals that found from the whole of Cyprus.” This

substantially changes the picture; however, I believe this still reflects the strong trade relations between the Hittites and Cyprus, as I would still contend that RLW-m ware is of Cypriot origin (contra KNAPPETT 2000, but see his changed position in *id.*, 2002).

Turning now to the remainder of this region, the other site of interest is Maşat Hüyük, 116 km ENE of Boğazköy, at which some White Slip and some RLW-m were found. But these were very small, compared to the large number of Aegean imports. TODD (*ibid.*, 210–11) remarks that “very few actual Cypriote artefacts have been found on other central Anatolian sites.” However, he notes the following (*ibid.*, 211)

ERIKSSON (1993, 131) reports small numbers of RLWM vessels at Alişar Hüyük, Alaca Hüyük, Eskişarpar and Kültepe (Kayseri); the context of Kültepe (Karum II) is, however, too early, and the details of this occurrence need to be verified. A large RLWM spindle bottle has also been found recently at Kuşaklı Hüyük. The site lies east of Ankara, between Yozgat and Sorgun. The vessel was found in a temple context in association with a bathtub (MÜLLER-KARPE 1995, 19 and Abb. 18). Eriksson also mentions the occurrence of RLWM vessels at Porsük Höyük (see PELON 1970, 279 for location; the same site as Zeive H. II in MELLAART 1963) in the Ulukışla area on the north side of the Taurus Mountains (*ibid.*, 133), including a fine spindle bottle with a Cypro-Minoan pot mark, two other fragmentary spindle bottles and an arm-shaped vessel fragment. Leaving these vessels aside, DUPRÉ (1983, 26) states that no Cypriot wares at all have been found on the site.

**(6.) Eastern and South-eastern Anatolia**

This region has produced very little Cypriot material so far, except for some RLW-m identified in my thesis. At Tepecik there were several sherds of an arm-shaped vessel (ERIKSSON 1993, 130). At Korucutepe in the Keban Dam area, there were ten vessels catalogued comprising a large jug, a spindle bottle and several arm-shaped vessels (*ibid.*, 1993, 132). TODD (*ibid.*, 211) says: “Cypriote wares have not, to the knowledge of the writer, been found in south-eastern Anatolia. The area is not mentioned by ERIKSSON (1993) with reference to RLWM ware.” However, we should not rule out the very real possibility that continuing new discoveries in Anatolia may alter this picture considerably in the future. There can be no doubt that much needs to be excavated and analysed. This may add significantly to the story of the links between Cyprus and the Hittite Empire during the late Bronze Age.

## 10. CONCLUSIONS FROM THE EVIDENCE OF CYPRIOT CERAMICS AND ANATOLIA

Nevertheless, we can draw some general conclusions from the evidence to this point. In 1993 I made the following general observations about the links between Cyprus and the Anatolian region, which seems to flow from a summation of the ceramic/archaeological evidence (ERIKSSON, *ibid.*, 133–4):

The historical and archaeological record combine to show that the appearance of RLW-m ware in the Hittite heartland began only after Shuppiluliumas I began his military campaigns which lead to the Hittite domination of the surrounding lands of Ishuwa, Arzawa, and Kizzuwatna, and during which he gained a foothold in North Syria. This movement coincided with the demise of Egyptian control in the north of Syria and Shuppiluliumas clearly “exploited the neglect of Egyptian interests in Syria under the ageing Amenhotep III and, to an even greater extent, profited from the military inactivity of the next Egyptian pharaoh Amenhotep IV” (BITTEL 1970, 121). By this time in Egypt and Nubia RLW-m ware had almost entirely disappeared from the archaeological record, there being only a small percentage of the recorded occurrences that can be dated to the late XVIII<sup>th</sup> and XIX<sup>th</sup> Dynasties.

The change in distribution of RLW-m from Egypt towards Anatolia is a matter of great historical interest. We discuss this in Chapter VII.4 and VII.5. However the picture is complex; it extends beyond the fact that the Hittite empire increased its power and control. There is also the fact that RLW-m only occurs in contexts dated to the time of the New Hittite Empire at two sites, Alalakh and Ras Shamra in north Syria.

The following explanation for the relative absence of RLW-m in Syria as compared to Anatolia was presented (ERIKSSON 1993, 133–4):

As a Cypriot product it seems likely that the ware was being mainly transported to Kizzuwatna and further into Anatolia directly from the island without going via northern Syrian sites.... it is perhaps futile to expect there to be an even distribution of

goods as the quantity of RLW-m ware in Anatolia may be the result of a specific demand for the vessel and its contents which could not be fulfilled by any other product. In respect of this one may note that during the time that RLW-m ware was exported to Egypt during the early to mid-XVIII<sup>th</sup> Dynasty hardly any WS I pottery was to be found, whilst it was, at that time, represented in both Palestine and Syria.

The key issue in accepting these conclusions is the assumption that the homeland of the RLW-m ware is indeed Cyprus. TODD supports this general thesis by providing corroborative evidence that RLW-m was not indigenous to the Hittite Empire. He quotes a personal communication from Jürgen Seeher, who took over the Directorship of the Boğazköy excavations in 1994. He says in a footnote (TODD 2001, 210, n. 10):

Dr. Seeher (pers. comm.) considers the idea that RLW-m ware is foreign to Hattusha as reasonable since it is restricted almost completely to two types of vessel (spindle bottles and libation arms). He states, however, that there are some arm-shaped vessels made of local wares. He confirms that RLW-m does not occur after the desertion of the Hittite capital, for instance in a recently excavated Dark Age settlement (ca. 1180/1150–10<sup>th</sup> century BC) where no such sherds were found.

TODD (*ibid.*) accepts our general thesis that the change in the distribution of RLW-m from Egypt to Anatolia represents a significant political transformation in relations with Cyprus (see Chapter VII.4 and VII.5). He goes on, in his account, to raise questions as to how specifically goods, such as RLW-m ceramics, entered into the Anatolian Hittite Empire from Cyprus. The answer will not only come solely from excavations, but also from a more comprehensive understanding of the relations between the Hittite Empire and Cyprus during this time. As we shall see in Chapter VII, especially sections (4)–(7), – we are fortunate that there are some important historical documents relating to the events of this time in Anatolia. New archaeological investigations will no doubt uncover more on the relations with Cyprus.

