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Abstract

The people of early Iron Age Cyprus worshipped at sanctuaries where a sacred tree was the focus of their rituals. The tree was closely associated with a goddess thought to inhabit the natural landscape in which the fields and settlements grew, and in which the people lived and worked.

This thesis explores why the tree of life was the central symbol of Cypriot Iron Age rituals, covering the period from the end of the Bronze Age to 500 B.C. Although the tree of the goddess has been studied as an artistic motif, and ceramic material from Cyprus has been studied scientifically, material carrying the motif has never been studied within a fully contextualised archaeology that queries its prevalence in Cypriot material culture, its role within the sanctuaries and necropolises of the city kingdoms and the meanings the material carried in those places. This research project addresses the complex, abstract, iconography of the Geometric and Archaic material in a methodical and theoretical manner, and with respect to the local and regional landscape settlement contexts from which it was recovered. The study takes a fresh, postcolonial approach and follows contextualizing, multiscalar methods towards an improved understanding of cultural structures, meanings and individual events. Old concepts of race and fixed groups are discarded in favour of a more nuanced approach that sees individual identities as constantly changing and material culture as both a driver and an indicator of social hybridisation.

This research also serves as a vehicle to study a controversial transitional phase in East Mediterranean history, when the ancient agricultural empires gave way to the poleis and colonial systems of the maritime networks. Although the emergence of a ‘great divide’ between east and west has been postulated for this period, the alliances and cultural exchanges that preceded this transformation have not yet been adequately explored in mainstream academic histories. This research focussing on Iron Age Cyprus illuminates regional interaction between African, Levantine and Aegean cultures, and shows that the island existed within a continuous and contiguous cultural milieu that stretched from the Nile to Athens.
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This section details the chronological scheme and conventions that were adhered to during the study. The abbreviations B.C. and A.D. were used throughout. The chronology of the Cypro-Archaic period was built on a chronology and typology originally developed by the Swedish archaeologist Ernst Gjerstad, and while the absolute dates have been adjusted somewhat since his time, the basic pottery types still relate to the periods in question as they did during the 1930s and 1940s. The chronology and period scheme has variously been defined as is shown below (Figure 1).

The chronology used for this study will follow the chronology as laid out in the Louvre publication (Hermary et al. 1992), which is also that used by the current Amathus excavations team for the Archaic Period (Hermary and Fourrier 2006: 49). The most important aspect of this chronology with respect to this study is that it revises the start of CAI to 750 B.C. from 700 B.C. The absolute chronology is therefore revised from Gjerstad’s scheme (Gjerstad 1948; 1960), whereas the relationship between the ceramic typologies and designated periods remain unchanged. Adjacent regions and languages also have different conventions as are shown in the table of chronologies below. Comparable periods can and do start and finish at different times in different areas, and different national conventions exist even for the major subdivisions. In this study the Iron Age constitutes 1050 B.C. to 480 B.C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late Cypriot Bronze 1</td>
<td>1600-1400</td>
<td>1600-1450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Cypriot Bronze 2</td>
<td>1400-1200</td>
<td>1450-1200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Cypriot Bronze 3a</td>
<td>1200-1050</td>
<td>1200-1050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Cypriot Bronze 3b</td>
<td>-1050</td>
<td>-1050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypro Geometric 1</td>
<td>1050-950</td>
<td>1050-950</td>
<td>1050-950</td>
<td>1050-950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypro Geometric 2</td>
<td>950-850</td>
<td>950-850</td>
<td>950-850</td>
<td>950-850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypro Geometric 3</td>
<td>850-725</td>
<td>850-750</td>
<td>850-750</td>
<td>850-700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypro-Archaic 1</td>
<td>725-600</td>
<td>750-600 (revised)</td>
<td>700-600</td>
<td>725-600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypro-Archaic 2</td>
<td>600-475</td>
<td>600-475</td>
<td>600-475</td>
<td>600-475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypro- Classical 1</td>
<td>475-400</td>
<td>480-400</td>
<td>475-400</td>
<td>475-400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypro- Classical 2</td>
<td>400-325</td>
<td>400-310</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>400-323</td>
<td>400-325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 1 Chronological conventions](image-url)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Characteristic Pottery</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Israel Palestine</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late Cypriot I</td>
<td></td>
<td>1650/1600</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Cypriot II</td>
<td>Pastoral Style</td>
<td>1475/1400-1200</td>
<td>Dates De Geus</td>
<td>Dates NY Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Cypriot III</td>
<td></td>
<td>1200-1050 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Cypriot IIIA</td>
<td>White Painted Wheelmade III</td>
<td>1200-1125 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>IA 1200-1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Cypriot IIIB (Bronze Age)</td>
<td>Proto White Painted</td>
<td>1125-1050 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>IB 1150-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypro-Geometric I (Start of Iron Age)</td>
<td>White Painted I Plain White I Black Slip I</td>
<td>1050-950 B.C.</td>
<td>IIA 1000-925</td>
<td>Proto-Geometric 1050-900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypro-Geometric II</td>
<td>White Painted II Bichrome II Plain White II Black Slip II</td>
<td>950-850 B.C.</td>
<td>IIB 925-720</td>
<td>Geometric 900-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypro-Classical I</td>
<td>White Painted VI Bichrome VI Plain White VI Black Slip VI Red Slip IV Black on Red IV Bichrome Red III Black &amp; Grey Lustrous I Stroke Polished I</td>
<td>480-400 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The source for the Cypriot chronology is the catalogue of Cypriot antiquities for the Louvre (Hermary et al. 1992: Tableau Chronologique). This broadly agrees with the chronological table in Peltenburg’s work (Peltenburg 1989) except that there the end of Cypro-Archaic II is given as 475 B.C. The Israeli chronology is from Towns in Ancient Israel and the Southern Levant (De Geus 2003: 5), while the Greek Mainland chronology is derived from the standard New York Metropolitan Museum timeline online.
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Chapter 1. Introduction to the study

The decision to undertake this PhD project grew out of my earlier research into the history of engineering, mathematics and science (Lightbody 2008aa; Lightbody 2008bb). Through the course of those investigations I reached preliminary conclusions, also identified by other authors (Morris 1994; Said 1994; Said 1995), that the significant contribution of the ‘Oriental’ empires of Antiquity in laying the foundations of Classical Greek and ‘European’ culture have not been fully recognized or represented in academic publications and popular western media. Broadly, this omission is the result of the way in which traditional western scholarship has developed (Trigger 1990), and a growing body of new archaeological and textual evidence increasingly conflicts with more traditional narratives and interpretations. The situation is now being rectified by more rigorous analyses, syntheses and clear discussions that detail how the transition from the ancient civilizations to the Classical world actually took place. This study of the Cypriot Iron Age fits within that intellectual, chronological and geographical context. Its primary objective is to reinforce and enhance traditional narratives by placing the Cypriot sanctuaries, city-kings and trees of life within that transitional phase.

Already in his trans-regional work of 1893, ‘Kypros, the Bible and Homer’, the German archaeologist Max Ohnefalsch Richter wrote “A comparison of the representations…..makes it all the more probable that as a matter of fact the Ionic capital took its rise from the lotus blossom and the Egyptian lotus capital, though Assyrian, Hittite and Asia Minor forms contributed to its development. …. The pure Greek form developed from Cyprio-Graeco-Phoenician which in their turn were preceded by Egyptian forms” (Ohnefalsch-Richter 1893: 476). This study aims to update and build on those preliminary conclusions, that Classical Greek architecture was developed out of Iron and Bronze Age precursor orders from the east Mediterranean, including from Cyprus. This aspect has been addressed since Ohnefalsch Richter’s time (Betancourt 1977; Livingston 2000; Franklin 2011), but the information is still fragmented and not fully contextualised.

Over the course of the 20th century, and through the first decade of the 21st century, a growing body of archaeological and epigraphic evidence has been uncovered that demonstrates how the transition from the proto-historical Bronze Age to the historical Iron Age world actually took place (Hadjisavvas 1986; Livingston 2000; Champion 2001; Leriou 2002; Sherratt 2003; Iacovou 2005a; Fantalkin 2006; Kelder 2010). This evidence is slowly being organized and disseminated, and is beginning to influence how academia understands the more ancient history and foundations of western culture. One of the main changes is that it has been shown that Western culture has its origins in Egypt, Mesopotamia, the Levant, Anatolia and even Cyprus, rather than beginning in Classical Greece alone. Associated changes are taking place in the underlying social and political structures of the West. This study began in 2007 when the president of the USA was a right wing conservative embroiled in a neo-colonial invasion of Mesopotamia. Just like the Egyptian Pharaoh Ramesses II and the Roman General Crassus before him, that president was quickly bogged down in a political and military quagmire. Eventually, out of this Mesopotamian milieu emerged a new, more liberal and partly African American president; fitting the bill as a postcolonial representative of the people and of the ‘new West’.

This research takes place within that still-emerging political and postcolonial context, in a world that is becoming more open to discourse about race and diversity. One of its aims is to contribute to the on-going
transition from the colonial to the postcolonial era. Its philosophy is progressive, not reactionary. I adopt a postcolonial theoretical approach and I am convinced that it can move academia forwards to a better understanding of the past. This approach has already been applied effectively on Cyprus (Given 1998; Given 2002; Steel 2004; Counts 2008; Knapp 2008; Counts 2010). It is post-processual and contextualizing, and aims to combine the best analytical approaches from the social sciences, such as the ‘longue durée’ system of Fernand Braudel, with recognition of the contribution of individual agents in shaping history at the ‘événemental’ (events) level. The approach breaks the archaeology free of misleading concepts of race, ethnicity and religion that were never actually fixed categories. Accepting the reality that people’s identities and beliefs change continually allows us to discard flawed ideas of defined groups or original pure forms, and see the material culture within a more complex and varied historical landscape, populated by a whole variety of different people, often interacting and often engaged in ritual activity.

This dissertation summarizes these new theoretical approaches and concepts in Chapter 2: ‘postcolonial theory in archaeology’. It aims to identify and use the best and most practical theoretical concepts as a basis on which to interpret the empirical evidence. The emphasis is on an effective interpretation of the past, and only at the very end will any theoretical lessons learned be discussed. In the postcolonial world, facts and figures are still king, and the context tells us who the kings were.

The importance of the individual in shaping the past also highlights the importance of making this individual study relevant in the present, and of drawing significant and hopefully influential conclusions out of the research. As a subject, archaeology can become somewhat detached from everyday life in the present, and at times descends into arcane discussions. If archaeology is worth pursuing professionally, however, then it should not resemble stamp collecting or flower arranging. It should uncover useful lessons about how to improve our understanding of the past, and show how this knowledge can improve our world in the future. As Braudel said of his own research, “It will perhaps prove that history can do more than study walled gardens” (Braudel 1995: 22).

This project is located within that contemporary intellectual context. At the more specific and local level it focuses on Cyprus during the Iron Age and was carried out from Glasgow in Scotland. These were practical choices made due to the significant history of Cypriot archaeology and scholarship based at the University of Glasgow. That context, as well as my own engineering background, drew my masters research towards a study of the Archaic tomb architecture of Cyprus (Westholm 1941; Rupp 1988; Christou 1996). I published the results of that study in an article detailing the regional context of the technical systems used to design and build the tombs (Lightbody 2008a), and I also began to locate the proto-Aeolic capital motifs (Figure 2) that were associated with that tomb architecture within their Levantine, Greek and Egyptian contexts (Figure 88), something that has only been partially addressed before (Betancourt 1977; Phillips 2002; Petit 2008; Franklin 2011), and which showed potential for a more comprehensive theory and method based study.

In 2007, I therefore decided to proceed with a more formal PhD study of these capitals and the associated motifs, sometimes referred to as representing the ‘tree of life’, and focusing on the transitional period between the end of the Bronze Age and the start of the Classical Period. The tree of life has previously been studied as an artistic motif, but never within a fully contextualised archaeology that attempts to understand why it was so prevalent in Cypriot Iron Age material culture, what role that material played within the sanctuaries, settlements and necropolises of the so-called ‘city kingdoms’ of the island, and what meanings the symbol carried for the communities that lived and worked there.
Many significant books, journal articles and book chapters relating to the tree of life, the associated capitals and trees in the east Mediterranean region in Antiquity have been published and have been used as source material for this study. The most significant publications are listed below, along with a classification of the approaches that the studies have taken:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Publication theme</th>
<th>Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-Richter</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Trees as sacred symbols in ANE</td>
<td>Art History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Mycenaean tree and pillar cults</td>
<td>Art History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Connections Egyptian and Minoan plant motifs</td>
<td>Art History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danthine</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>The date palm and the sacred tree</td>
<td>Art History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>The sacred tree on Palestine pottery</td>
<td>Art History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gjerstad</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Bichrome pottery decoration trees</td>
<td>Art History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windengren</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>King and tree of life ANE religion</td>
<td>Philology/Art History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>The tree of life in myth</td>
<td>Art History/Mysticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bettancourt</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>The Aeolic style in architecture</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meiggs</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Trees and timber in the ancient world</td>
<td>Philology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kepinski</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>The stylised tree of life east Asia</td>
<td>Art History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiseman</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Discussion of Mesopotamian palace gardens</td>
<td>Philology/Art History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linder</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Khorsabad timber transport reliefs</td>
<td>Art History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meekers</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Tree of life Cypriot LBA cylinder seals</td>
<td>Art History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hestrin</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>The Lachich Ewer and the goddess</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shefton</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Phoenician tree of life</td>
<td>Art History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nielsen</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Biblical texts and tree metaphors</td>
<td>Philology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangberg</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Tree species and the bible</td>
<td>Philology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronach</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>The garden of ANE as political statement</td>
<td>Archaeology/Art History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Cypriot rural tree sanctuaries</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parpalo</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Assyrian tree of life as Jewish religious symbol</td>
<td>Mysticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Sacred trees Assyrian reliefs and kingship</td>
<td>Art History</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The titles below have been abbreviated – for full titles see reference section)
Taylor 1995 Asherah, Menorah and sacred tree Art History/Philology
Bloch 1995 The cedar and the palm tree Philology
Keel 1998 Goddesses and trees and biblical mysticism Art History
Winter 1999 Akkadian symbolic mountain scenes Art History
Thomason 2001 N Syrian landscapes in Neo Assyrian art Art History
Burnet 2004 Forest resource utilization in Antiquity Archaeology
Ulbrich 2005 Worship of Anat and Astarte Cypriot sanctuaries Archaeology
Bushnell 2005 The wild goat and tree icon Art History
Dever 2005 Did god have a wife? ANE goddesses and the bible Archaeology
Feldman 2006 Tree of life in LBA international period Art History
Giovin 2007 Assyrian sacred tree and historiography of Art History/Philology
Petit 2008 Tree of life and ionic capitals architecture Archaeology
Stein 2009 Winged sun disks and tree symbols LBA Hittite Art History
Ziffer 2010 West Asiatic tree goddesses Art History/Archaeology
Franklin 2011 From Megiddo to Tamassos Ionic capitals Archaeology

Most have been art historical in nature or have focused on the tree of life’s religious meaning as an abstracted symbol (Ohnefalsch-Richter 1893; Danthine 1937; Widengren 1951; James 1968; Kepinski 1982; Wiseman 1983; Meekers 1987; Parpalo 1993; Bloch 1995; Taylor 1995; Othmar 1998; Winter 1999; Thomason 2001; Bushnell 2005; Giovin 2007; Stein 2009; Ziffer 2010). Early material-related studies engaged in culture-historical ‘motif tracking’, as though the symbol had a pure, original form and meaning from which all later versions were descended. Other studies have examined the economic and material significance of trees in the region and their uses (Meiggs 1982; Linder 1986; Tångberg 1989; Burnet 2004). Yet more studies have begun to address the symbol within its ritual and archaeological contexts (Evans 1901; Hestrin 1987; Stronach 1990; Wright 1992b; Dever 2005; Ulbrich 2005), and others have studied its significance in architecture (Betancourt 1977; Petit 2008; Franklin 2011). In my opinion, while there are many excellent publications that cover many aspects of the symbol and the history of the region, none of these studies have fully appreciated how central a role the tree and its associated concepts played in shaping the ritual sanctuaries, settlements and cultural topographies of the region. As a result, they have not appreciated how and why the tree forms were adapted, hybridised and utilized to respond to the changing events experienced by the towns and villages of Iron Age Cyprus. By approaching the subject theoretically and methodically we can put the motif and the sanctuaries of Cyprus within a much grander regional landscape context that stretched from Memphis to Athens and from Khorsabad to Crete.

The tree of life, the capitals and the fertility goddesses were integral to the cultures of the people who lived around the east Mediterranean Iron Age sea. Confluences of interconnections stretched from the temples of Egypt to the Temple of Solomon and from Mesopotamia to Classical Greece. The sanctuaries of Cyprus form a good standpoint from which to investigate, understand and recreate the transitional events that turned the ancient imperial, palatial world into one dominated by the colonies and cities of the Phoenicians and the Greeks. This study takes Iron Age Cyprus as a starting point. By applying theory and methodology I attempt to reconstruct the lives of the people who believed in the power of these symbols, and who used them daily within their sanctuaries, settlements and in the wider landscape. During the creation of this thesis I attempted to imagine the places and the people who lived and worked within this landscape; from the lazy priest who tended the cult, to the obedient water carriers bringing libations in decorated jugs, to the toughened and sun burnt workers carrying copper ore on carts down to the smoking workshops on the edge of town. On the island of Cyprus, one can still encounter the noise of the past, which has perhaps not
changed as much as one might expect. Although there were surely no teenagers on mopeds interrupting the soundscape of Iron Age Cyprus, the morning cacophony of cockerels crowing, dogs barking and donkeys braying was probably as familiar to the inhabitants of the city kingdoms as it is to the inhabitants of Cypriot villages today. The sharp clang of a blacksmith’s hammer, the voice of a Phoenician merchant and the divine lyre playing within the sanctuary (Franklin 2009) require a little more imagination, but these are the contexts that the tree of life appeared within.

It is not possible to give definitive answers about what species the sacred tree of life usually was or was intended to be. This is partly due to difficulties translating botanical terms, as well as the variety of botanical species, sub species and poetic license in artwork. Representations and texts from across the Ancient Near East show that various species were used as sacred trees or plants, including fig trees, acacias, date palms, olive trees, cypresses, pines, planes and cedars, while attributes of other plants such as the papyrus reed and lotus flower were also incorporated into some scenes and designs. No one tree type predominated as a representation of the goddess, nevertheless, the date palm was frequently represented, and the large bunches of fruits it produced did influence the forms of the artwork (Porter 1993). It is not within the scope of this work, however, to trace all of the variations and examples of this symbol and the various species used through time, or to interpret the associated agricultural processes. That art historical path has been taken many times, and although it provides a great deal of understanding of botany and agriculture, it does little to reveal the tree’s ritual meanings for the inhabitants of the settlements. The symbolism was already widespread across the Ancient Near East by the end of the 4th millennium B.C., and was a common theme from Elam in the east, to Mari, to Middle Assyria and to the Mycenaean world in the west (Evans 1901; Bushnell 2005; Ziffer 2010). In this study, while specific cases with specific meanings will be discussed, I have concluded that by the Iron Age the symbols had become schematised to such an extent that they bore little resemblance to individual real plants. Certain elements and certain forms did preserve specific meanings, but the new hybridised types comprised several of these at once, perhaps deliberately, in order to obscure specific attribution.

Ideas of hybridisation and botanical species clearly fit well within a system where trees were used as symbols with social meaning, and where iconographic change paralleled social change. This conceptual approach, where meanings and groups constantly change and evolve, is the one taken in this study, rather than attempting to attribute fixed meanings or essentialized pure forms where none existed. The study does not reject traditional art historical narratives, and it draws heavily on the extensive body of information already compiled. It also draws heavily on existing authoritative works detailing the history and archaeology of Cyprus. Although many of these works take a traditional approach, they were produced by established figures with a great deal of experience in the field on Cyprus, such as Gjerstad, Karageorghis, Maier, Yon, Hermary, Christou and Hadjisavvas, and so I have referred to them extensively. While Karageorghis was not as ‘Homer-struck’ as Schliemann (Leriou 2002: 11), after identifying similarities between remains found at the royal tombs at Salamis and Homeric burial customs he admitted that “Book 23 of the Iliad was, from then on, our Bible” (Karageorghis 1999: 117). When reading these established volumes, then, the postcolonial archaeologist needs to be conscious of the historiography of the subject, treat the interpretations judiciously, and act to conserve the positive elements of these monumental works. For example, Ulbrich considers Karageorghis’s 1982 summary of the Phoenician influence on Cyprus still 'the most concise survey' of this matter (Karageorghis 1982; Ulbrich 2005: 198). In addition to these traditional syntheses, more recent works have proved to be invaluable general resources, with more balanced discussions and conclusions (Given 1991; Steel 1993; Reyes 1994; Steel 2004; Hermary and Fourrier 2006), and have been referred to throughout.
Now that the wider context and theoretical location of the study has been outlined, the two specific research questions asked were as follows:

1/ Can postcolonial theory be applied methodically, rigorously and effectively in archaeology?

At the time this research project began, there were a limited number of archaeological studies and excavations that were explicitly postcolonial. It was not clear how postcolonial theory should be applied in practice. One of objectives of this study was to develop a more rigorous methodology, and to test the application of this methodology.

2/ Can a postcolonial archaeology of the tree of life provide a better understanding of the Iron Age cultural transitions of Cyprus and the east Mediterranean region?

The fundamental structures of Iron Age east Mediterranean society underwent major changes from the end of the Bronze Age to the Classical Period. Simultaneous changes are evidenced in the material culture and architecture. Can postcolonial archaeology explain these changes? Hybridisation, change in underlying social structures and the significance of unique anomalies are key concepts of postcolonial theory and analysis. As will be discussed in the theory section, the study is both local and regional in scope, and this multiscalar approach is part of the postcolonial method.

These are the broad questions that were asked, and I will argue that, based on the evidence and conclusions drawn, the answers to both of these questions are yes. By applying the new methodology during three consecutive case studies, I successfully uncovered, tested and consolidated a hypothesis that reveals the underlying cosmological beliefs of the Cypriot city kingdoms, and shows how they expressed their cosmology within their artwork, their rituals, and within the cultic topography of their settlements.

Ritual and iconography preserved and re-enforced fundamental ideas in the minds of the proto-literate members of the community, such as moral, social, organizational and practical concepts. The division between the secular and the sacred we perceive today was not present on Iron Age Cyprus. The ‘king’ or head of the ruling family was the head priest of the cult as well as being in charge of agriculture, industry, commerce and the military (Maier 1989b). Gods and goddesses were invoked in tasks as mundane as building defensive walls, and as profound as the issues surrounding life, death and the afterlife.

That cosmology was older than the Cypriot Iron Age, and this deep *longue durée* context must be understood first in order to interpret the changing anomalies and iconographic details of the rituals that took place on that underlying structure. In this dissertation, and based on recommendations from postcolonial theory applied in archaeological projects by others elsewhere, a multiscalar approach was taken that respects the material context at every level, from the ancient, region wide cosmology, to the daily caprices of the local artist.

The region and time period studied is LCIII and Iron Age Cyprus, from ca. 1200 B.C. to ca. 500 B.C. The conventions used to subdivide this transitional phase are outlined on pages 10 and 11, and this period has proved almost ideal for applying, testing and developing the new methods built on postcolonial concepts. The liminal status of Cyprus in Antiquity, as the ‘meeting place between east and west’, persists up to the present day. This means that it remains on the frontier of modern academic research as well as on the frontier between geopolitical zones of influence. The complexity of the scholarship that has been produced over the years regarding Cyprus evidences that border status and means that studying the region is both challenging and rewarding.
The communities on Cyprus underwent profound changes during the time period in question. They evolved from being Late Bronze Age agricultural redistribution centres, involved in some international exchange, with a limited number of monumental stone buildings including proto-palatial features, to rural ‘myth and ritual’ based defended settlements at the turn of the Iron Age, and eventually expanded into proto-literate, semi-rural, semi-urban towns with their own monetary systems by the end of the Archaic period. Once an understanding of the underlying deep cosmology or social structure was developed, this study traced out how changes were expressed in the material culture as the settlements evolved. In Chapter 8 an attempt is made to link specific iconographic and material developments to contemporaneous historical events. The symbols were part of a language of ritual. Once the grammar and the script are understood, the individual words and sentences can be deciphered.
Chapter 2. Postcolonial theory in archaeology

2.1. Introduction

In what ways can postcolonial archaeological theory improve how we approach, interpret and understand material culture and its associated social meanings?

The specific purpose of this chapter is to detail the major concepts from postcolonial theory in archaeology that are of use to the present study. Once identified, these new approaches are used to shape and design the material cultural analysis methodology for this PhD project. The importance of methodology in complex archaeological interpretation has been discussed at length (Trigger 1990; Morris 1994: 29; Hodder 2000; Clarke 2005c: 11 & 23; van Dommelen 2006a: 112; Knapp 2008: 30), and it is accepted that it must be founded on solid theoretical principles.

This thesis follows a set structure of chapters: theory, methodology, three case studies and final discussions. After this introduction, section 2.2 of this theory chapter summarizes what colonial archaeology was at a general level and why it existed. Section 2.3 then identifies the problematic ideologies that colonial archaeology has left behind within traditional narratives, such as polarized concepts and absolute fixed categories of race or language that must be discarded by modern archaeologists. Once free of these old ideological constraints, section 2.4 begins to bring together the new postcolonial, theoretical concepts that are taken on to shape the methodology in Chapter 3. Sections 2.4 and 2.5 of this chapter explore how the new postcolonial concepts can be used to better investigate cultural change as it is manifested in material culture. Based on these theoretical discussions, a set of specific recommendations is defined in section 2.6, which is taken forwards into the methodological design stage. These determined the form of the overall methodological system that was designed for the project and which the project followed. The methodology was applied through three case studies that make up Chapters 4, 5 and 6, which address, interpret and develop better understandings of the material culture from Iron Age Cyprus.

The theoretical recommendations specified how the material culture, settlements and landscapes were to be treated conceptually in the case studies, in order to best interpret and understand the meanings these things and places carried or were assigned. The abstract theoretical concepts of postcolonial archaeology defined in this chapter form the foundations of the practical methodology that is designed in Chapter 3 and applied to the investigation and interpretation of the material culture in Chapters 4 through 9. The new postcolonial concepts are the result of theoretical lessons learned from the recent colonial past as well lessons learned on archaeological excavation projects, and include relatively new abstract concepts such as ‘material cultural hybridisation’ and multiscalar analysis.

Postcolonial archaeological theory, and this chapter, therefore, consists of two distinct but inter-related strands. The first targets flaws within the traditional colonial narratives, such as biased assumptions, polarized or racist perceptions, and false premises arising from politicised agendas that were used to interpret the material culture of the region in the past two centuries.

The second aspect of postcolonial archaeological theory applied here is to develop improved theoretical concepts and methods based on lessons learned from the flawed colonial ideologies. These improved concepts and methods are used to interpret existing and new archaeological data from the more ancient
colonial and contact situations that arose at the end of the Bronze Age and during the Iron Age, in and around Cyprus.

In fact, what postcolonial archaeological theory does is to release the interpretations of material culture from the restrictions of colonial ideology. By applying new abstract, complex, fluid and multi-faceted concepts, postcolonial archaeological theory does not reject empirical scientific evidence, but seeks to address and interpret the material cultural data in a more sophisticated and subtle manner, and in a manner that sees through the biases, limitations and restrictions of more traditional academic cognitive structures and colonial ideologies.

In order to understand why there was a need for this postcolonial perspective, the next section will outline what colonial archaeology was.

2.2. Colonialism and colonial archaeology

Postcolonial scholarship is scholarship that is modern, and which is aware of the problems stemming from the West's colonial past in which much of the known world was dominated and exploited as a matter of policy (Gosden 2001; Gosden 2004: 18). Taking an approach that brings postcolonial theory into archaeology means moving forwards to a new viewpoint on the past, that takes into account the many lessons learned from this colonial period of world history (Jones 1997: 40). By understanding the problems of the old fashioned, over simplified, black and white, 'colonial' view of the world, where it was assumed that "the West" was inherently superior, we can start to view the past from a fresh and more complex perspective. This new perspective is the 'postcolonial' view of the past.

Trigger defined colonial archaeology as archaeology that was developed in countries outside Europe whose indigenous population was partially replaced or dominated by European settlers, or where Europeans were economically dominant for extended periods of time. Archaeology was employed by these colonizers as a way to connect with and establish control over the distant past of the lands they were conquering. At the same time, their sophisticated investigations served to contrast and emphasize the primitiveness and the lack of accomplishment of the local people they were supplanting. In this way they were able to justify their poor treatment of the locals and lay claim to the land (Trigger 2003: 74).

This brief section is not intended to be an in-depth summary of colonialist archaeology or orientalism in any way, and is only designed to be a brief summary of the main themes and problems with colonial archaeologies and the orientalist perspective as they related to this study. This is undertaken so as to show the necessity of taking active measures to break free from the restrictions and flaws of these old ideologies and their associated scholarship. Many detailed deconstructions of traditional colonial narratives already exist (Bernal 1987; Arnold 1990; Morris 1994; Roberts 1994; Said 1994; Leriou 2002; Galaty and Watkinson 2004; Kokkinidou and Nikolaidou 2004; Dietler 2005) that are effectively all in part colonial discourse analyses of the type first explicitly advocated by Edward Said (Said 1995). This section is, however, only intended to discuss the main abstract general themes arising from these studies.

Late 19th and early 20th century academia was notable for the promotion and support of an inter-related complex of expansionist, colonialist, nationalist and racist ideologies that have distorted our historical narratives at fundamental levels (Gosden 2001: 242). One of the most reactionary forces of these times,
nationalism, responded to growing pressure for international social change from the ‘working classes’ by creating centralized nation states based on constructed, idealized, identities. Nationalism also supported expansion into foreign countries for national glory and gain when necessary, and was supported by a movement shaping perceptions of ‘the east’ now known as ‘orientalism’. To justify colonial actions, nationalism and orientalism both promoted idealized, ‘essentialized’ representations of complex historical and social situations. Once suitably filtered, these versions of events could be used in academic and popular media to give expansionist groups political leverage, and lend a perceived legitimacy to colonizing forces and invasions. These deliberate ideological movements supported colonialism, and in particular the colonization of ‘the east’, or ‘the orient’. They adopted polarized and oversimplified interpretations of issues in preference to complex and informed judgments. Many groups adopted these interpretations in order to influence public opinion to their advantage at all levels, from popular to academic. These essentialized ideologies then became integrated into new histories of peoples at home and across the colonized and imperial globe.

In effect, histories of the past, as well as perceptions of the present, were interpreted and presented as consisting of clear-cut situations existing between specific fixed groups, where each group was ranked according to theories of separate races and social classes, and with an apparently ‘natural’ hierarchy of dominance or superiority existing between them (Jones 1997: 40; Ferguson 2007: lii).

Much of this ideology was originally developed in European governmental and academic institutions in support of political goals and to maintain or seize power locally and abroad. The concept of ‘the orient’ was in itself a complex ideological construct, but the durability of artificial concepts such as this can be seen, for example, in the arbitrary geographical and ideological division between Europe and Asia, which are in fact one single landmass.

Artificial ‘essentialized’ - but apparently natural and scientific concepts such as this were used to justify the European colonization and then imperial expansion into the ‘east’ and Africa (Stone 1988; Pakenham 1992). This was enacted through a whole structure of related basic dualist concepts, all legitimising the ‘masculine, active, European penetration’ of the feminine, passive east (cf. Given 2002; Karabell 2004: 146). By lending a perception of scientific legitimacy to the colonizing movement, with its accompanying military forces, the invasion of foreign countries could be justified to the populations at home as well as abroad. In Europe, the communication of this ideology to the populace took place through a supportive nationalist media and through articles in the many popular journals of the time (cf. Crosthwait 1909). By portraying the colonial movement as beneficial to the colonized as well as to the colonizers, invasion and colonization were promoted as morally desirable and economically sensible policies (Counts 2008: 4).

Following the example of Napoleon’s first orientalist expedition into Egypt and the subsequent survey and monumental publication of the archaeological remains (Said 1995: 87; Russel 2001), the military and academic colonialists of the latter half of the 19th century published new histories, travel guides, geographical surveys, maps and new interpretations of local archaeology, which became an integral part of the ideologies of racial hierarchies and orientalism (van Dommelen 2002: 126). Archaeology and archaeological survey were an integral part of the colonialist, imperial expansion and hegemonic process (Jacobson and Cobbing 2005; Home 2006). The first triangulation survey and detailed map of Cyprus was produced in 1882 by the English officer H. Kitchener, just after the island was officially occupied in the name of the British Empire, in 1878. As the colonizers collected, surveyed, drew, named and listed the conquered
lands, they gradually took possession of them ideologically as well, and apparently with scientific justification and backing.

Colonial era archaeological interpretations, and archaeological data from geographical areas that were subject to colonial and imperial rule, are therefore highly susceptible to biased and politicised interpretations, and are therefore often, if not always, in need of careful re-interpretation. The original interpretations were often used to legitimise or de-legitimise the historical rights of groups of people in order to dominate or take possession of a land, according to the preferences of the colonial rulers (cf. Given 2001). With postcolonial archaeology, however, these flawed concepts surviving from 19th and 20th century political preoccupations are to be completely re-thought rather than ignored, and the lessons learned from these events form the basis for new and improved approaches (van Dommelen 2002: 127).

2.3. Escaping from polarized ideologies

“From this perspective, a number of key postcolonial themes can be identified [including]...The awareness that colonial situations cannot be reduced to neat dualist representations of colonizers versus colonized, because there are always many groups and communities that find themselves to varying degrees between these extremes.” (van Dommelen 2006a)

According to postcolonial theory, traditional publications which assumed that people's 'race', ethnicity, identity, nation or language were fixed, unchanging absolutes, are now to be addressed and deconstructed directly rather than being accepted as factual but dated, or avoided as flawed (Counts 2008). To escape from the controlling ideology of colonial era archaeologies, new archaeological data must be interpreted with reference to more nuanced concepts such as acculturation (Jones 1997: 34; Knapp 2008: 53), changing, fluid ethnicity and social identity (Jones 1997: 64, 91; Knapp 2008: 31, 35), and also with reference to new concepts such as cultural hybridisation (van Dommelen 2006a: 118; Knapp 2008: 57), ambiguity and ambivalence (van Dommelen 2002: 129). Similarly, the traditional narratives must be reinterpreted with reference to the same.

New interpretations of actual contact situations from the distant past that can be described as 'colonial' can make use of the modern understanding of colonialism, and of the lessons learned from recent problematic colonial experiences, when apparently straightforward military, financial or political interactions have been confounded by complex realities on the ground. The full complexity of contact situations from the past must therefore be represented, rather than essentialized misrepresentations of them. The new approaches understand that colonial encounters are often a two (or more) way learning experiences, and that imagined social boundaries are rarely as impenetrable as simple ideologies would suggest. This is an attempt to move away from the black and white thinking of colonial times, where 'superior conquerors', generally European, would 'civilize' the 'primitive natives', generally oriental, or at least provide them with colonial rule.

By moving away from the idea of fixed groups that can be referred to as “the colonizers” or “the colonized”, it is possible to examine the idea and reality of overlaps between these supposedly separate groups. The concept that we are starting with any two 'pure' forms of culture or ending with any single new one is discarded in favour of an understanding that groups are never homogeneous, are always altered through interaction, and that changes take place continually in all groups and individuals. The basis of postcolonial
theory is an understanding of the complexity and variation of interaction within evolving cultures. Postcolonial theory in archaeology rejects the whole concept of any original, unchanging or pure cultural forms (van Dommelen 2006a: 138), and this principle extends to material culture as well. The flawed culture-historical approach tended to attribute specific symbols or material styles to particular groups. The understanding was that these were indigenous characteristics of certain racial types that could be used as signifiers of ethnicity.

Concepts of fixed, separate groups or ‘essentialized forms’ are therefore riddled with dangers (Jones 1997: 26). An approach where homogeneous oversimplified generalizations are made based on flawed logic must be abandoned in favour of one that contextualises individual examples and interprets them as part of an ongoing process of cultural change. In Chapter 8 of this thesis, individual artefacts are placed in sequence, considered together and used to build up a better picture of a more complex and varying regional history, described in terms of the new concepts to be outlined in the next section.

2.4. Postcolonial archaeological theory - a new vocabulary

"...postcolonial studies now routinely invoke hybridity as a conceptual tool for implementing the postcolonial critique of the dualist concepts of colonialism....." (Maier 1985).

Postcolonial archaeological theory consists of a complex repertoire of alternative voices and concepts that aim to interpret and represent the past more realistically and subtly (Gosden 2001; van Dommelen 2006a: 104; Counts 2008: 12). There are several main concepts within postcolonial archaeological theory that are all important and relevant to any analysis of human and material cultural contact situations. All of these concepts are inter-related, and each one requires careful definition, so that they can be fully understood when applying them. Because each definition depends in part on the definition of the other concepts, I include all of the main concepts in a general discussion of mechanisms of colonial and cultural contact and the impact of this on material culture.

Not all of the approaches taken by postcolonial archaeologists have been included here, but most of the major concepts and authorities are covered and included to some extent, while the more arcane and politicised discussions are omitted. In general, these new postcolonial concepts supersede and replace those whereby specific fixed human groups or races were associated with specific fixed material cultural forms, and whereby cultural change could only be caused by invasion and domination by a ‘superior’ culture.

Replacing the idea of fixed races are ideas of flexible ethnicity and local identity, whereby a group is defined by its learned cultural habits, or habitus, at any time (Jones 1997: 91). This habitus is similar to ethnicity in that it is not a biologically inherited trait, but a set of social rules, behaviours, beliefs and habits that together form a coherent structure of knowledge. Unlike race, habitus is not a genetic issue, and aspects of group culture can be learned and passed to and from others outside any group. Culture is not therefore a fixed absolute category, but is a fluid and changing body of knowledge. Feelings of ethnic affiliation and identity can, however, fluctuate from fluid to rigid depending on the particular cultural situation at any one time. A change from fluid to rigid has been proposed for the Mediterranean Iron Age period covered in this study (Gosden 2004), as internationally minded traders closed ranks and increasingly associated themselves with particular polities and territories.
As different cultures meet due to invasion or migration or trade or colonization, different material cultures come together. New ethnicities or cultures evolve from this interaction of people and material. They are referred to as hybridised cultures, and the material culture that is produced in these hybridised societies is referred to as hybridised material culture. The particular processes of hybridisation are, however, generally complex and difficult to interpret unless they are understood from within their cultural contexts.

It is the way in which these new material forms develop that is key to postcolonial archaeological theory and methodology. The new forms, rather than being simple proportional mixtures of different styles or techniques, are in fact new and original products, influenced by the changing ideologies and technologies that lie behind the simple material forms (Counts 2008: 14). They are the product of the hybridisation of deep cultural differences by the people or societies, rather than simple summations of quantities of material or additions of new decorative patterns alongside existing ones. The changes in material forms reflect the specific ways in which individuals resolved cultural differences and hybridised new common cultural material at the time.

Movements of people often produce social stresses and pose complex social questions about differences when other groups are encountered. The ways in which cultures are hybridised over time depends on how groups or individuals involved decided to combine different cultural characteristics. Different traditions, technologies, artistic styles, manufacturing methods, or use patterns can all be brought together and combined in many different ways, and observing the ways in which these complexities are brought together can facilitate better understanding of the social and cultural issues in the minds of the artisans. A methodical study of contextualised material can yield real archaeological understanding.

Different functional or stylistic characteristics could, for example, be accepted, rejected, negotiated, resisted, elaborated or simplified, according to the meanings attributed to them or ideas associated with them at the time. The potential for change and the directions of change are, however, determined by what is socially and technically feasible. To use Hodder’s terminology, manufactured items are entangled objects, with forms that can change but in ways which are limited and restrained by multiple co-dependencies within the new cultural situations, systems or structures in which they exist (Hodder 2012: 40). Change is possible, but it happens in particular ways limited by what is feasible within the context.

Within these limits, the new forms are understood to be unique combinations of different complex symbols, styles, traditions, techniques, materials and methods, and the ways in which they have been brought together and combined into new forms is understood to reveal the social forces at work at the time (Jones 1997: 110) and the meanings carried within the different cultural structures.

The specific and unique ways in which the symbols, styles, techniques, and methods are combined into new forms are understood by identifying what are referred to as ‘ambiguities’ in the way in which existing ideas are incorporated into the new forms (van Dommelen 2002: 129). These new objects are products of the ‘third space’, another new ideological concept that escapes from polarized oversimplifications by acknowledging the evolution and existence of shared cultural forms and territories, even in apparently two sided contact situations (Counts 2008: 14). This ‘third space’ does not equate in any way to a new third racial mix or new breed, and neither does it refer to a specific geographical or physical space, although there could well be a geographical correspondence between where different cultural groups physically meet and interact, and the evolution of new hybridised cultural forms (van Dommelen 2006b: 138).
The cultural third space is one of the major new concepts that is of use in postcolonial archaeological theory, and highlights the ‘in-betweeness’ of people, their actions, their shared material and territorial spaces in colonial and contact situations (van Dommelen 2006a: 111; Knapp 2008: 47). Colonisation and colonial interaction occurs where objects and people break out of their purely local value systems and introduce new material culture to other groups (Gosden 2004: 39). For the period covered by this study there are reasonably distinct phases where the results of ‘break outs’ from adjacent regions results in new material coming into Cyprus. The new material culture can be seen in the archaeological record of the island and interpreted historically. Following initial periods of more intense interaction, the situation in the city kingdoms corresponds most closely with Gosden’s ‘shared cultural milieu’ model (Gosden 2004: 41). Nevertheless, ‘pots are not people’, and so functional and stylistic variation alone should not be mapped directly onto ethnicities, but alongside evidence of changing settlement patterns and architecture, material variation and decoration can be understood as being one result of active communication and cultural interaction (Jones 1997: 113). For Late Bronze and Iron Age Cyprus, influxes of new styles can usually be distinguished in the archaeological record, and it is the subsequent internal hybridisation of new styles with existing ones that reveals the mechanisms of underlying cultural change which created new traditional styles.

Over time, postcolonial archaeological theory envisages these meetings of groups as interactions of cultures, resulting in the exchange of culture but also the creation of new cultures. New material cultural forms are an important expression of this evolution. Rather than a one-way flow of cultural complexity, or a straightforward proportional mixing, the incomers change the ‘natives’ and are simultaneously changed by the ‘natives’, and together they produce new hybridised cultural forms. These reflexive responses, exchanges, and evolutions of culture can be due to ongoing trade, new shared rituals, shared domestic or industrial spaces or even violent interactions, but it is the two-way nature of the encounter that is the important point of differentiation from the traditional model, leading to an understanding of the evolution of entirely new hybridised forms. It is this ongoing underlying cultural evolution that changes the traditional forms of the island into ‘new traditional forms’.

‘Ambiguity’ can be identified when cultural structures are taken away from the old narratives of binary opposition and racial classification, and it is this new ambiguity, and its role in the creation of fresh cultural forms that is of interest to postcolonial archaeological theorists. These more complex cultural situations are referred to as entanglements of material culture, and they result in the production of new entangled objects. The deconstruction or disentanglement of the meanings and dependencies incorporated within the life of these particular objects allows the postcolonial archaeologist to begin to interpret the particular cultural contact situations in which they were produced and used.

During this careful deconstruction and interpretation process, the identification of any ‘revealed slips of the tongue’ or ‘loose ends in construction’ can help to throw light on the evolution of the society of the past (Gosden 1999: 199). In this study, iconographic details that at first sight seemed irrelevant but anomalous, on further inspection often provided a vital clue to the whole. Several such cases are discussed in Chapter 8.

Group cultures do exist, cultural differences also exist, but groups and individuals are constantly meeting, interacting, changing and producing new solutions to old problems.

Hybridisation is best understood as an on-going process that is the result of normal human activity, whereby different people and different groups constantly move and meet, interact, react and evolve on a daily basis.
Extending an understanding of the normal human hybridisation process to periods when notably large changes to the normal movements of people were seen (due for example to natural disasters, colonization, invasion, or technological or military developments), can let us understand the new material styles and forms that developed from them. Using postcolonial archaeological theory to deconstruct the objects produced at the time means that this can take place from within a more realistic conceptual and contextual framework that can produce a more nuanced and realistically descriptive interpretation of the past.

More particularly local deconstructions must be attempted in order to identify particular ambiguities within particular local cultural systems, structures or entanglements, but to do this we must understand what a cultural system, structure or entanglement will look like.

Before approaching the case studies, it was unclear what a structure would actually look like or how it could be identified, and so several cases from elsewhere were studied to learn what approaches could be taken and how material should be read to reveal underlying structures. A notable example of a structural analysis is the discussion of the social cosmology encompassed in Berber houses, by the French anthropologist/sociologist Pierre Bourdieu. This provided a useful example of the application of structuralism and post-structuralism to material culture (Bourdieu 2000: 493), and revealed examples of binary pairings of concepts that were expressed within the architecture, such as parts of the house that were dedicated to males or females. The essential distinction between cooked and uncooked, indoors and outdoors, and the symbolic significance of thresholds were other structured aspects identified in these studies (Tilley 1990: 66). Structures, however, are not universally significant or applicable, but are particular, locally constructed and context related. The structures in the present study were not expected to resemble those of a Berber house, but the methodical analysis was expected to follow some of the same logical steps, and demonstrate that the people of Iron Age Cyprus did live within a society and cosmology that they schematised.

Ideas from the ‘myth and ritual’ school of comparative religion and anthropology were also considered as potentially of use. Societies of the Ancient Near East, and the early Israelite and early Greek religions, have been considered ‘myth and ritual’ based, where these two are closely interconnected and promote a cultural system or ritual pattern, an ἱερός λόγος, usually based on ideas of annual sacrifice and agricultural rebirth (Brandon 1998: 395). For Iron Age Cyprus, for example, it could be said that a proto-literate ‘myth and ritual’ based society, focussed on rural sanctuaries and animals began nucleating into a hierarchical city centred system, with increasingly literate elites, who codified state religion and customs around a pair of centralised anthropomorphic deities. The now mature discussions of the ‘myth and ritual theory’, however, have been criticised for being overly culture-historical in nature, seeking pure original forms, and for being concerned with the vague complexities of myths rather than the factual realities of life in the past (Segal 2004: 61). In these respects they are not particularly useful for dealing with archaeological material. The general term ‘myth and ritual’, however, remains useful and recognises a probable relationship between cultic practices, ritual material and structured mythical stories. It is used, like the term ‘folk religion’, to differentiate the early Iron Age culture on Cyprus from other structured cultural forms, such as the Bronze Age international palatial elite cultures (Feldman 2006), or later communities based on a ‘book religion’ (Dever 2005: 49 & 90) or codified laws (Gargarin 2008). Similar terms such as ‘the heroizing horizon’ of the early Greek colonial ‘system’ are attempts to convey the essence of particular coherent cultural structures (Morris 2000: 272; Gosden 2004: 69). These models will be discussed in the case studies and concluding chapters, but there will be no attempt to classify sites according to artificially imposed systems.
A third structural approach expected to be of use was an analysis that took ‘totemism’ into account. A totem is a natural object or a representation of a natural object or animate being, such as an animal or bird, assumed as an emblem of a clan, family or group. A totemic system can be analysed structurally through the construction of a ‘totemic operator’. This is an analytical breakdown of a totemic sign system, for example one based on a seal, a bear and an eagle, that can develop over time. The natural abilities and characteristics of the animals are useful vehicles for expressing social ideas, and the large number of variables inherent in the characteristics of any living animal, or even plant, allow for a variety of expressions to be represented by one basic form (Tilley 1990: 34). At a simplistic level, an eagle could be an aggressive eagle with large talons in times when war was imminent, or a round eagle at rest in times when an abundance of surplus was seen as especially desirable. Different specific sub-species such as red eagles and black eagles can become important depending on the level of social differentiation required.

The totemic analysis approach was potentially useful, but was treated judiciously when considering hybridisation. There was a temptation to relate the combination of several different species of plants in iconography to the idea of genetic hybridisation, and to attribute this process to conscious choices made by the sculptors and architects to express hybridised group ideas through hybrid plants, but this direct metaphor is misleading. It is clear that papyrus plants and date palms were never cross bred in Antiquity, while their iconographic elements do appear together. The new decorative forms, which developed from pre-existing forms, were not genetically evolved forms. They were new, socially structured, forms composed of elements from the older forms, re-combined into new expressions. Rather than being a new genetic mix, the new forms are cobbled together, ad-hoc, expressions of bits of the old forms, produced in a process referred to in structuralism as ‘bricolage’ (Tilley 1990: 26). This is something akin to a process of artistic DIY, and this is in fact where the word is derived from. It is not, however, a random process, and the artistic choices made are expected to reflect socially relevant issues in some coherent manner. Eventually, some different forms may indeed be synthesised into new forms more akin to real hybrids. By changing emphasis, later forms can retain memory of the different earlier forms that they were resolved from, or the artist can deliberately mask or omit references to the original sources for social reasons. “The purpose has been to demonstrate the manner in which a structural analysis generating an underlying grammar of design relations can be a powerful aid to approaching meaning in what otherwise appears to be an incoherent mass of random depictions” (Tilley 1990: 74). Totemism was certainly an aspect of Iron Age Cyprus, perhaps most clearly evidenced in the different emblems adopted for the coinage of the different city kingdoms, but the extent to which architectural capitals and tree motifs became associated with different places or groups, or were used as signs of group identity or ethnicity, is a more complex issue. It is worth noting, however, that certain architectural orders such as the Ionic, Doric and Corinthian did take on specific associations with specific groups of people and places in the Classical Greek world, but it is not the aim of the methodology here to attribute symbols to ethnicities in a culture historical manner, or to impose artificial interpretive systems. The aim is rather to build up a picture of how the material was used and changed within its contexts, in part due to cultural hybridisation, and then to interpret the structured underlying meanings that guided these processes and ways. The influence of local factors and internal social stresses on design change is expected to be as relevant as attribution to an abstracted, region wide totemic system.

Although based on the structuralist analytical approaches first popularised by Lévi-Strauss, the approach taken here is effectively post-structural in nature (Lévi-Strauss 1967). This means that while it is based on the identification and delineation of logical structures in which the material was perceived to exist, the process through which this is identified is more of a discursive dialogue with the data, rather than an outright statement of the existence of any such structure. The more rigid structuralist and cultural systems
approaches have been criticised by Tilley in his discussion of structuralism and post-structuralism. This includes a discussion of the development of Lévi-Strauss’s methods by the philosopher Paul Ricoeur, which is particularly relevant to this study (Tilley 1990: 57).

Ricoeur emphasises the importance of combining a hermeneutic, reflexive approach with the structuralist approach, which produces something akin to the post-structuralist, post-processual methodology that is used here. It concords with the importance placed on the hermeneutic approach by Ian Hodder. In fact, post-structural themes have influenced a wide range of subject matters including archaeology, so that it is quite possible to integrate postcolonial archaeological theory with post-structuralism and hermeneutics.

The structural analysis investigates the deeper levels of social life, and can be compared to Braudel’s *longue durée* scale of analysis. Structures are not consciously followed, but are ingrained within the cosmology and material of the settlements at every level. They are the underlying patterns of daily life, the rituals and the habits. In some respects they can be equated to ethnicity or habitus, but they are complex and entangled with the settlements. They are embedded in the material, the architecture and the cultic landscape. To use a common metaphor, the structures are the underlying rules of grammar in the language of the culture.

This unspoken language forms a hidden series of signs that constituted reality in the past. We cannot understand the words of this language until we have some idea of what the language is, and it is only through gradually familiarising ourselves with the world in which the material existed that we can come to understand what the meanings behind the words and the language were. This is the post-structural approach advocated by Ricoeur and Hodder amongst others, and it is through this gradual reflexive process of familiarisation with the local landscape and settlement contexts in which the material artefacts existed that we can approach an understanding of the underlying social meanings they carried and expressed, and the changes that took place over long periods of time.

The structures are not complex, rational, intellectual creations but they do make sense. They are deep seated schemes of concepts that bring together the most profound desires and necessities of life, survival, and emotions. What we are looking for are multi-sensory coherences of signs across different material domains (Hodder 2012: 125), and the details and slips of the tongue that reveal the stresses within those coherent systems.

“....by complying with colonial norms and standards and by simultaneously hanging on to certain indigenous perceptions, people develop new cultural norms of their own and effectively 'invent' new traditions that are peculiar to each specific contact situation. It is important to note that this means that neither colonial norms nor indigenous traditions somehow survive in the new colonial context 'in disguise' but that both give way to an entirely new way of doing things and perceiving meanings and that this 'new way' is peculiar to each specific colonial situation” (van Dommelen 2006b: 138).

Alternative explanations for cultural change that do not resort to racial invasions or one way impositions have now been developing over several decades (Renfrew 1973; Jones 1997: 34). The paradigm was common in Cypriot archaeology, which has been described as suffering from ‘invasion syndrome’ (Merrillees 1975: 37). It is now well understood that autonomous complex cultures can and did develop systematically and locally and that they can change over time without outside intervention. The reasons that wide variations develop in material cultural forms have been discussed (Trigger 1990: 312), and local responses to regional changes must be considered part of the mechanism of change.
To understand how and why changes took place, the archaeologist needs to understand how the social forces and the material form changes are interrelated, whilst being conscious that ethnicity, social identity and material culture do not relate in fixed universal ways. The situation is complicated because there are also mechanisms of resistance to change that are not often identified within traditional enquiries, but which are nevertheless important factors within the postcolonial archaeological approach. The interaction between forces of change, and resistance to change, is a process that has been usefully addressed within analyses of hybridisation of groups. Expressions of resistance may manifest themselves as iconoclasm, graffiti or the complete omission of unwanted symbols and meanings. The resolution of these opposing forces is partly responsible for producing the new hybrid forms, and this aspect is brought into the discussion in Chapter 8.

Rather than an art-historical approach or a culture-historical one, postcolonial archaeological theory works on the basis that new forms and symbols are not just simple combinations or mixtures of existing and incoming patterns into new forms, or due to functional and technical improvements on earlier forms, but are complex and deliberate new expressions of existing, traditional, forms and meanings. The existing traditional forms are shaped by individual artisans, responding to the social stresses of change and inertia present at the time, into new traditional forms. By addressing the role the material played within functional or ritual taskscape within the wider regional context, a fuller understanding of the social forces, ideas and meanings bearing down on the artisan when making the object can be approached. Only through a systematic and holistic approach to interpreting wider patterns of social forces and meanings can an approach like this truly be said to be archaeology, rather than art history or well-informed speculation. In fact, it is this type of theoretical rigour behind the study of material culture in archaeology that makes it academically very robust (Clarke 2005b: 82).

Colonial era archaeologies have been criticized for seeking original forms and allocating people and material cultural to categories that are seen as fixed. These are often culture-historical in nature and influenced by crude racist ideas, but postcolonial archaeology is still some way from providing a panacea that can right all the wrongs of the past. As Gosden puts it, we are not yet postcolonial, but carry the hope that we can become so (Gosden 2001: 263).

Nevertheless, to develop better methodology the postcolonial archaeologist needs to be aware of some of the down sides of post-modern and postcolonial theory. Postcolonial approaches have been criticized for suggesting that there is only subjectivity and no real scientific objectivity. They have also been criticized for their tendency to reject all suggestions of universal models in favor of only local instances. The evidence becomes entirely anecdotal rather than empirical and statistical. Gosden refers to ongoing tension between the global ambitions of the enlightenment thinkers and new multi-vocal responses providing local alternatives for the post-modern era (Gosden 2001: 252). He asks if it is possible to cling on to some hope for a common understanding of humanity as a whole, yet also enter into a genuine understanding of other cultures. It is clear that if postcolonial theory intends to remain at all scientific, we need to become more aware of the history of our subject and its intellectual legacies (Gosden 2001: 259), but the question is if this is enough to repair the damage.

Critics of now traditional colonial discourse analyses have accused practitioners of being more concerned with deconstructing the traditional discourse, or providing an alternative interpretation rather than recreating a contextualised reality on the ground (van Dommelen and Rowlands 2012: 21). Advocates of the postcolonial philosophy can appear to be more concerned with revisiting and dismantling Western representations rather than approaching the extra-textual reality. van Dommelen counters that it is precisely
because postcolonial archaeology can avoid the text and encounter the material directly, in its material surroundings and in its every day and ritual contexts, that the extra-textual reality can indeed be approached. Postcolonial theory in archaeology sees material as a media through which cultural communication was taking place without recourse to discourse, and so past cultural realities can be ground-truthed through their material culture and surroundings. Similarly, van Dommelen has questioned the efficacy of Gosden’s wide categories of colonial interaction (shared cultural milieu, middle ground and terra nullius), which effectively describe the societies involved but tell us little about the actual processes of cultural and colonial interaction and hybridization (van Dommelen and Rowlands 2012: 24).

The latest approaches highlight the importance of understanding the material within the cultural spaces and places where it was used. Sustained co-presence of people and physical material resulted in cultural hybridization, through shared practice and physical contact. Patterns on hybridized ceramic vessels should not be considered as mixes of different traditions, but integral aspects of the habitus, practice, ritual and functional contexts in which the material was used. They are part of their material surroundings and inter-related with the other things in the same material space. Decorated vessels were partly symbolic but were also material parts of the material world, in which different people lived and interacted.

Hybridity is the concept that has come to dominate postcolonial theory in archaeology (van Dommelen and Rowlands 2012: 27) because of its constructivist concept of identity and potential to provide more complex and alternative interpretations of colonial situations, which have previously been perceived as clashes of fundamentally incompatible cultures. The concept of hybridization acknowledges that over time, people who live together can be encouraged or may indeed be forced to share and adopt foreign cultural practices (van Dommelen and Rowlands 2012: 28), and the material they share and use will reflect that process. Perhaps operating at a subconscious level over periods of sustained contact, material communicates without recourse to discourse.

The creation and use of shared culture in material form requires that it is part of both cultures, and so it becomes the new culture. This process of cultural hybridization takes place in the spaces of sustained contact, which can be referred to as third spaces (van Dommelen and Rowlands 2012: 28). This continual process of hybridization is one of the drivers of cultural change, and it is indeed proposed that this is a universal process of human nature, but the unique ways in which the process takes place in each case depends of the unique structures of those cultures that are interfacing and enmeshing in the third space. This is the progressive approach that this study takes, and it negotiates the extremes of modernism and postmodernism to reach a more effective understanding of our intellectual legacies as well as the ancient past.

Hodder admits that we do not yet fully understand how people and things are inter-related and dependent on each other. There is not yet an all-encompassing coherent theory that can be described as scientific or anthropological (Hodder 2011: 173). Postcolonial theory is not a single sub-field, but a series of overlapping areas that cover the local and the global (Gosden 2001: 252). Hodder admits failure to achieve a synthesis for now, but he considers that the different approaches can ultimately prove complimentary and that one synthetic and integrative approach will eventually be possible. It is not the case that postcolonial theory has failed entirely; it is the case that it has not yet progressed enough. Only by becoming more effective and more refined can it eventually succeed.
2.5. Importance of context

Riva (2006: 115) has discussed the importance of not treating artefacts or architectural features outwith the context of the other artefacts they were found with, or without respect to the known developmental history of the artefacts and architecture associated with them.

Studies of cultural contact and cultural change have concluded that it is usually necessary to study an entire region in some detail in order to understand what is happening at any specific part (Gosden 2004: 20). Patterns in one area are not necessarily representative of an entire region, and a growing body of evidence suggests that much larger samples than had been hitherto thought are necessary before they are representative of a whole, whilst regularities in cultural systems have generally been overestimated (Trigger 1990: 312).

It has been successfully argued that it is possible to ‘focus on local practices in order to look at and understand apparently supra-regional phenomenon’ (Riva 2006: 114), and it is this theoretical association between individual micro-contexts and the macroscopic view that is a central pillar of the methodology that is designed for this project.

The immediate site context, local context and regional contexts are all relevant when interpreting the meanings associated with artefacts during their useful lifespan. Objects have often been treated in isolation of archaeological context, particularly in art historical analyses, whereas to fully interpret meaning the archaeologist must also understand associated routine practices occurring within the same contextual spaces (van Dommelen 2006b: 150).

A postcolonial archaeological focus on specific local contexts, taskscapes or cultic spaces, with special attention paid to unique and ambiguous variations and idiosyncrasies, allows the postcolonial archaeologist to address one of the problems with the processual approach, which was an inability to address the micro scale (Hodder 1999; Hodder 2000). Processual archaeological method was criticized for being unable to deal with the particular event or the individual, the archaeological moment. Hodder has argued that archaeological interpretation should not concern itself so much with long-term processes but rather the long term narrative should comprise many individual moments. This is the approach that is taken in the Chapter 8 discussion of this work (Clarke 2005a: 5).

The importance of a multiscalar approach has already been noted in early works applying postcolonial theory to archaeology, such as a study of frontier societies which stated: “By employing a multiscalar approach, synthetic research can be undertaken that considers the mediation of the world system at the local level” (Lightfoot and Martinez 1995: 478). Following Braudel’s example, they also extended this approach into the temporal domain: “We also need to employ multi-scalar approaches that consider different temporal scales of analysis in frontier contexts directed at the microhistory of individuals and events and at the macrohistory of long term processes or the longue durée” (Lightfoot and Martinez 1995: 477).

Braudel devised and applied a research and writing system that he described as a historical language. His system organises the analysis of places or cultures into different temporal scales, and his preferred system was the tripartite longue durée, conjunctures, événements system which became an essential guide to historians. This is not a theory as such but a methodological approach that considers how shorter term
events are often determined by longer term factors such as climatic or geological changes or medium term economic and political changes, in an overlapping stratigraphy of temporal dependencies. He explained how he developed his system for his first and probably greatest work, *The Mediterranean in the Age of Philip II*:

“So it was that I consciously set forth in search of an historical language - the most profound I could grasp or invent - in order to present unchanging (or at least very slowly changing) conditions which stubbornly assert themselves over and over again. And my book, is organized on several different temporal scales moving from the unchanging to the fleeting occurrence. For me, even today, these are the lines that delimit and give form to every historical landscape” (McNeill 1998).

The intermediate scale, the *conjunctures* refer to economic, political or cultural structures that are underpinned by the long longue durée yet can also be changed, to some extent, by every day événements. This level and this concept relates closely to the idea of the cultural structure that are identified in this research. These structures or conjunctures are particular confluences of events that form particular and distinctive cultural forms, which survive as a coherent entity for a while at least. To understand the form of these ever-changing structures at one point in time the historian and the archaeologist must consider the context of the cultural structure with respect to different temporal and geographic scales.

But archaeological context does not simply mean a chronological relation or geographical location. The context in which any material culture existed or is found must also be understood from the point of view of the functional or symbolic role it played within technical, economic or ritual systems, and within an ongoing historical developmental of these processes. Several postcolonial archaeological studies have already incorporated this approach (cf. van Dommelen 2006b; Counts 2008; Knapp 2008).

To understand the context in which the material culture existed, the archaeologist must understand the technical, social or ritual belief systems in which the material was created and used, rather than treating the artefact as an isolated piece of material. The archaeologist must try to describe how these particular systems worked and responded to hybridisation, without assuming that they were inevitable or universal processes (Knapp 2008: 64). The significance or meaning that an object carried depends on the meanings held by an observer at any one instant (Lemonnier 1989: 156; van Dommelen 2006a: 119) and the context in which it was used, as well as the meanings that were attributed to it by its maker.

It is this flexible nature of meaning and how it relates to material culture and its contexts that makes interpretation of forms and symbols difficult, and makes it impossible to attach any permanent or universal significance to any form or symbol.

An effective postcolonial archaeological approach must therefore attend to the immediate context in which the object or architecture existed, and the local context in which it was being used, as well as the wider regional systems in which it was created and existed.
2.6. Recommendations

To be applicable in a methodical way, these wide-ranging theoretical concepts must be refined down to a manageable and clear set of recommended concepts to be taken forwards and used to shape the methodology design process. The main conclusions arising from the review of the key themes from postcolonial archaeological theory are as follows:

1. FLUID GROUP IDENTITIES:

People and material represented in the archaeological record should not be considered as belonging to specific unchanging groups, whether conceived races or fixed essentialized cultures. It should be assumed that social identities and cultural norms continually change through time, in part due to contact and interaction with external groups but also due to resolution of internal social stresses. People, groups and communities existed at varying degrees between what were previously assumed to be polarized extremes. Careful attention should be paid to the vocabulary, taxonomy, typology, classifications and categories used throughout the project to avoid being drawn back into essentialized ideologies.

2. HYBRIDISATION:

The material culture produced as the result of contact, interaction and the mixing of people and groups with different social identities or ethnicities should be considered to be hybridised material culture. As such, it should not be thought of as a simple proportional mixture of different precursor styles or techniques of production, but to be a new and original form, based on its precursors, but unique in its own way. Complex social stresses produce reflexive forces of reaction, resistance, negotiation, acceptance, elaboration, simplification, rejection, acceptance or adoption, and so the process of material cultural hybridisation should be considered part of the wider social hybridisation process, and not as a simple or stand-alone material process.

3. CONTEXTS:

The new material culture must not be treated separately from its contexts, either from its immediate archaeological context, or from its regional context with respect to comparable material and historical development data known from elsewhere. Contexts should be analysed at multiple scales of study, both spatially and chronologically.

4. SYSTEMS:

Material culture must be understood to have been an important aspect of complex systems of commerce, industry, technology, ritual and everyday social interaction in the past. The logic and operation of these structures and systems must therefore be understood before the role that the material culture played within them can be understood. It is the patterns of variation and change within these complex systems, and the impact and expression of hybridisation within them, which throw light on the societies whose cultures are under examination. The coherent conceptual systems of signs are expected to make sense, to express fundamental ideas and to be expressed across different but inter-related material domains.
5. AMBIGUITIES AND AMBIVALENCE:

Ambiguous characteristics or ambivalent idiosyncrasies observed in the material cultural record in fact reveal the social forces at work as they manipulated, resolved and hybridised the different meanings associated with the manufacture and use of new objects or architecture. Even slight changes to traditional forms are significant, and may reveal the ways in which the artisan resolved different social forces into new traditions. These details can only be understood from within the traditional structures and systems of the society.

By deconstructing and pulling apart the meanings behind the new hybridised material forms, and by paying attention to the ‘revealed slips of the tongue’ or the ‘loose ends in construction’ identifiable in these new ‘entangled objects’, we can better understand the interaction and evolution of the groups and peoples of the past. Details that at first sight may seem irrelevant may on further inspection provide a vital clue to the whole (Knapp 2008: 58).
2.7. Conclusion

Postcolonial archaeological theory releases the interpretation of material culture from the restrictions of colonial ideology, with its ingrained vocabulary of artificial racial hierarchies and oversimplified binary concepts. By learning lessons from the problems stemming from colonial era ideology, and by using new concepts that arise from a better understanding of the colonial past, postcolonial archaeological theory can improve how we approach, interpret and understand material culture and its associated social meanings.

The postcolonial archaeologist must consider that material cultural changes are driven by the artisans. The craft-worker resolves internal social stresses on the one hand and responds to new imported material forms on the other. The resultant hybridised material culture resolves cultural differences and produces new traditional forms. To understand such changes the postcolonial archaeologist must first understand the coherent conceptual structure of the artisan’s world, and this can best be revealed by studying it through multiple scales of context, spatially and chronologically. Once the structured grammar of signs can be perceived, the apparently ambivalent twists and flourishes of the artisan’s hand will be understood. Particularly in pre-literate societies, these artistic choices were cultural statements. They indicated the changes in cultural direction that would be followed towards new traditional forms.

The theoretical recommendations defined in section 2.6 will now be used to design a rigorous methodology with which to investigate the material culture and landscape data from the city kingdoms. In this way, abstract theoretical concepts of postcolonial archaeology defined in the discussions here will become an integral part of the systematic practical methodology applied to the interpretation of the material culture and the archaeological record from Iron Age Cyprus.

Eventually, in the concluding Chapter 9, the theory itself will be revisited in order to identify potential areas where the project can contribute to postcolonial theory and best archaeological practice.
Chapter 3. Methodology

3.1. Introduction

In this chapter the development of the methodology used for the project is described. Theoretical recommendations were made in the previous chapter, but they are not methodology. For the project to be both methodical and based on theory, the recommendations have to be incorporated into the project methodology at a fundamental level and in a systematic manner. It is also desirable for the methodology to conform to established UK PhD methodology, whereby the research project and thesis structure usually follow the following format: theory > methodology > data collection > analysis/discussion > conclusions. This traditional structure is in itself not theoretically problematic, while there are other approaches possible, such as carrying out the theoretical analysis at the end of the project, as is normally the case in Germany (Ulbrich 2008).

The problem of translating theoretical concepts into practical methodology has been addressed at length by Hodder. His views were referenced during the development of the structure for this project:

“Interpretation has to be sensitive to the particular as well as to the general. Imposing general rules without careful evaluation of their relevance to the local situation is clearly inadequate. There is thus a need to focus on archaeological method... ...Rigidity of approach is unlikely to be able to accommodate diversity in the topic of study. An approach is needed which can reflect upon itself, probe its own taken-for-granted assumptions, and adapt to changing circumstance... ...I wish to begin to explore the possibilities for a reflexive method in archaeology... ...What methods can be used in order to enhance these characteristics of archaeological enquiry?” (Hodder 1999: 79)

So the methodology must be rigorous and reflective, but not rigid. This project is not empirical, although it uses empirical evidence and logical argument. It is an archaeological study, not art history, and so it must follow the scientific method: investigate > hypothesise > test hypothesis. The scientific method appears processual, but the core of the system is effectively postcolonial, as it is data led rather than being one where preconceived classifications are imposed on data. It is the application of the scientific method that determines the effectiveness of the outcome. In this study there are few numerical tests of archaeometrical values, such as measurable physical quantities, but proposed models are tested by comparing anticipated archaeological evidence with actual archaeology recovered at sites. Hodder’s ideas and the hypothesis > test sequence point to an iterative, reflexive and reflective process, that can approach the reality of the past through a series of thoughtful and tentative steps. It points to a data-led, iterative, qualitative evaluation method.

Following theoretical recommendation no. 1 from the previous chapter, the methodology must not impose ideas of fixed unchanging groups on the analysis. Classification, allocation or attribution must be avoided or at least delayed as long as possible. The methodology should focus on the archaeological material in the first instance, and not on processing the data according to artificially imposed systems. The emphasis here is not on pretending to develop supposedly objective methods that will arrive unerringly at supposedly absolutely correct interpretations. The emphasis here is on following a methodology whereby a better interpretation of the complex meanings represented by the evidence from Iron Age Cyprus is allowed to slowly and
systematically develop out of the data. Again, this points to an iterative, cyclic approach which responds to the data uncovered at each step.

Within the field of interpretative analysis this sort of iterative process is referred to as heuristic and hermeneutic (Tilley 1990; Trigger 1990). “After travelling round the hermeneutic spiral, the excavator ends up in a different place – led there at least in part by the data that have been encountered” (Hodder 1999: 51).

A broad comparative framework in the form of a hermeneutic cycle, based on repeated local case studies, was therefore conceived for the study. The methodology was devised to represent the process through which the study takes place and develops. It applies Hodder’s reflexive methodology to the developing interpretation of the archaeology, through a heuristic cycle of case studies (Figure 3).

![Basic conceptual methodological process scheme flowchart](image)

The cycle was also applied reflexively, as the choice of which city kingdom to study at each iteration was made based on the nascent conclusions arising out of the previous one/s. The choice was delayed until the
conclusions of the previous case study were drawn, and so it could respond to the data and meanings being uncovered in order to better test emerging hypotheses and answer the research questions by selecting a city kingdom with an appropriate cultural/archaeological profile. The focus of each case study and the themes addressed were also altered depending on the conclusions previously drawn and the evolution of the research questions. Many of these ideas, such as the reflexive approach and treating the archaeological process as a fluid system rather than a rigid mechanical process, follow Hodder (1999: 80).

To further incorporate theoretical recommendation no. 1, no classificatory system was included within the methodology:

“...at a heuristic level archaeologists have been debating the epistemic implications of imposed taxonomies for decades... ...It can be argued that all classification and the subsequent taxonomies we create, whether in archaeology or the world at large, are constructs that serve context-specific purposes” (Meskell 2004: 58).

Rather than develop a methodology based around empirical metrics or established typologies and imposed taxonomies, the approach taken here treats the lack of any rigid classificatory system as a strength.

This methodology placed the emphasis on the archaeology recovered from the sites. Priority was given to material with known provenances and recorded contexts so that the interpretative process could be rooted in the archaeology and the settlement and the landscape, rather than abstract categories or processes, or pre-existing interpretations.

In response to recommendation no. 2 from the previous chapter, racial or cultural classifications were avoided as far as possible, and a more multicultural language and thought process were employed. The fundamental interpretive concept maintained throughout was that change in material culture reflects cultural hybridisation and internal social change rather than always being the result of ‘invasion syndrome’ (Merrillees 1975: 37).

Whilst systematic, the intention was not to develop a rigid methodology that incorporates a processual analysis, or claims to be able to arrive at absolute statements of incontrovertible fact. This process allows the material to be considered in a dialectic manner, and in a way that is supported by theory, but not dictated by theory. The picture is one that slowly develops over time in a gradual and fluid manner. This cyclical process, eventually based on a series of three case studies, forms the backbone of the research process.

This methodology is the formalization and development of good archaeological method, practice and experience. It is the formalization of what can be referred to as a common sense approach based on experience and trial and error. The intention was not to develop an entirely new, arcane or overly complex methodology, but to develop a sensible, transparent, repeatable and organised system, based on sound experience, in which a rigorous investigation of the material culture can take place and from which significant conclusions can be drawn about the past.

As is shown (Figure 5), the system also has the potential to change itself reflexively. At the end of each case study, an evaluation of the methodology was made, and any potentially useful improvements were incorporated into the case studies that followed. Ultimately, it is even possible that theoretical and methodological lessons learned from this study can be fed back reflexively into the wider world of post-processual archaeology.
3.2. Integrating the multiscalar contextual approach

Recommendation no. 3 of the theory chapter was that material should not be treated away from its contexts, either from the immediate archaeological context or the known regional contexts. The advantages of a contextualised approach have already been touched on in the previous section, where its use as a means to avoid imposing artificial abstract concepts on the material was mentioned. The incorporation of various scales of context has also been discussed at length by archaeological theorists (Trigger 1990: 348; Hodder 1999: 129; Jones 2002: 72). The theoretical discussions indicate that a multiscalar contextual approach is the most effective way towards representative interpretations, and so this was incorporated into the methodology. Multiscalar contextualizing approaches have been used successfully in some well-known archaeological projects, such as in Hodder’s excavations at Çatalhöyük (Hodder 1999: 129).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Survey Projects in Mediterranean Region</th>
<th>Survey Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biferno Valley Project, Molise</td>
<td>1974-1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemea Valley Archaeological Project</td>
<td>1983-1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argolid Exploration Project</td>
<td>1979-1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pylos Regional Archaeological Project</td>
<td>1990-1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Korinthia Archaeological Survey</td>
<td>1997-2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rough Cilicia Archaeological Survey Project</td>
<td>1996-present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kythira Island Project</td>
<td>1998-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia Paliokhora Kythera Archaeological Survey</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Shala Valley Project</td>
<td>2005-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saronic Harbours Exploration Project</td>
<td>2007-2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Landscape Survey Projects in Cyprus               |                      |
| Catling                                          | 1955-1957            |
| Vasilikos Valley Survey Project                   | 1976-1989            |
| The Archaeological Survey of Paphos               | 1976                 |
| Australian Cyprus Expedition                      | 1990-2000            |
| Maroni Valley Archaeological Survey Project       | 1990-1996            |
| Sydney Cyprus Survey Project                      | 1992-1997            |
| Lomba Archaeological Project: Western Cyprus Survey| 1976-2000            |
| Troodos Archaeological and Environmental Survey Project | 2000-2004         |
| Pyla-Koutsopetria Archaeological Project          | 2003-2013            |
| The Kouris River Valley Survey Project            | 2007                 |
| The Prassio-Mesorotitis Archaeological Expedition  | 2009-2013            |
| The Palaipaphos Urban Landscape Project           | 2006-2010            |

Figure 4 List of notable landscape field survey projects in Mediterranean and Aegean regions

This multiscalar analysis takes place against an impressive backdrop of landscape field survey projects (Figure 4) in the Mediterranean region that have been developed over the past 40 years (Dyson 1982; Hitchner 1994; Knapp 1997; Iacovou 2004). In the late 1960s Trigger first proposed that settlement patterns should be analysed at three different scales or levels; buildings, communities and regions (Trigger 1967). In the 1970s Ward Perkins and Barker began to utilise intensive field survey with statistical sample collection in Italy on the Biferno Valley Project, organised from the British School of Rome. Thereafter, a whole series of wide ranging landscape survey projects were implemented, often involving interdisciplinary teams and addressing multiple periods of time. In Cyprus, Hector Catling first carried out wider area surveys in the 1950s and
continued to publish settlement pattern studies including a topographical survey of the Yalias Valley around Idalion in 1982 (Catling 1982). Between 1976 and 1989 Ian Todd brought transect sampling techniques to Cyprus in the Vasilikos Valley Project. Very large scale transect sampling methods were introduced to Cyprus with the Sydney Cyprus Survey Project (SCSP 1992-2003) (Given and Knapp 2003) and the Troodos Archaeological and Environmental Survey Project (TAESP 2000-2004), which also included interdisciplinary studies of topography, geology and geobotany to give a holistic view of the areas studied in conjunction with GIS (Given et al. 2013a; Given et al. 2013b).

While this current study draws on all of those projects, they were of a different magnitude and nature to this survey. This project is focussed on careful interpretation and theoretical analysis of pre-existing information, combined with rapid GIS data representations and a limited application of traditional field walking. It is an interpretative process that approaches and synthesises information, allowing structures and meanings to emerge and be identified, without utilising extensive data collection frameworks, processual models or anticipating empirical conclusions.

The subdivision of contextual scales chosen was initially as follows. This choice was based on an estimation of the maximum extents of the regional analysis required, the approximate form of Cyprus and a factor of ten between scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual Level</th>
<th>Maximum Physical Extents:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Level</td>
<td>2000 x 1000 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Level</td>
<td>200 x 100 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingdom Level</td>
<td>20 x 10 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site/settlement Level</td>
<td>2 x 1 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctuary/Necropolis/Quarter Level</td>
<td>200 x 100 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Structure Level</td>
<td>20 x 10 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Artefacts Level</td>
<td>2 x 1 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The multiscalar analysis of these levels forms the core of each case study chapter. Individual numbered sections in each chapter are devoted to outlining the analysis carried out at each level, in the order detailed above. As this was a new methodology, the geographical areas and subdivisions were expected to be altered through the study, but it proved to be a useful initial breakdown. For the second and third case studies it was decided that the number of levels should be reduced slightly, but the use of many levels did serve to force the implementation of the research to be methodical, and to include all areas and scales. As will be discussed, this methodical approach identified geographical areas that had not been extensively investigated and which proved to be significant and relevant to the study, such as the Hatay and the Philistine lands.

It was not possible to consider all of the material culture uncovered from the Iron Age across the region, so that at the wider geographical levels the material culture can only be considered more selectively. Once down at the level of specific local artefacts, however, the material can be considered in much more detail. There is effectively an inversely proportional relationship between the depth and detail in which the material can be examined, and the physical geographic area and volume of cultural material it hosted. Each chosen
case site only represents the hub of a multiscalar study. The archaeology of the city kingdoms was not just a collection of isolated stand-alone artefacts and structures. They were part of a much larger, now extinct, local and regional cultural system that the archaeologist must try and reconstruct.

It may seem that the end result of this approach may be a study that is too superficial at the widest level, and not in-depth enough at the most focussed level, however, what it loses in sheer quantity of data covered at any individual level it gains in quality of interpretation, as the consideration of the evidence at each level allows a better understanding of the evidence at adjacent levels, and as a whole, to take place. This interaction of multiscalar interpretations made at the various levels allowed a more balanced understanding of the evidence as a whole to develop, and it was therefore possible to identify important and anomalous artefacts that were subsequently examined in more detail.

These multiples scales were incorporated into the cyclic system as is shown in (Figure 5) to produce a fully developed, hermeneutic, multiscalar methodology, that was designed to avoid imposing pre-conceived classifications, and which is rooted in the local and regional archaeology rather than abstract, artificial and imposed concepts. The practical application of the multiscalar analysis utilized here does not include intensive transect sampling, but utilises several different technical methods to process information, which are now detailed below.

At the widest, regional level, detailed maps were produced on which significant data was plotted such as find spots of architectural capitals and significant tell settlements that utilised tree of life iconography (cf. Figure 88 & Figure 75). These maps were produced using Adobe Illustrator CS4 for the image processing and Microsoft Paint as a rapid editor and text annotator. Location data was also recorded on Google Earth Version 6.1. The maps were added to the project digital online website (www.arky.eu/Home.htm) which was built on Microsoft FrontPage version 4.0.2., and which allows local and regional data to be made available and compared rapidly, in conjunction with the Google+ photo viewer. Investigation of the regional area was enhanced through utilisation of synthetic regional studies of the tree of life and material culture incorporating the motif, such as Betancourt’s study of the Aeolic style in architecture (Betancourt 1977), and Dothan’s study of Philistine archaeology (Dothan 1982). Finally, regionally significant sites and landscapes were visited on the ground during research trips to southern Turkey and Egypt.

A similar approach was taken for the island level contextual study. As well as the case study sites, many other parts of the island were visited over the project research period. Direct familiarity with the topography and the archaeology was facilitated by on site visits, and this was supported with documentary research into island level studies. Often, the archaeological remains of structures uncovered during excavation have been abandoned or backfilled, but the sites retain vestiges of the archaeological investigations as well as the anthropogenic changes made when the city kingdoms were inhabited. These visible remains can be researched in conjunction with the excavation reports and synthetic studies. In 2010 I also participated in excavation of the Archaic ‘lower town east’ settlement at Idalion in order to familiarize myself with the physical preservation of the sites, and the archaeology of mudbrick constructions. Over the course of six separate periods on the island covering a total of 5 months, I was often based at the CAARI institute which allowed island-wide landscape exploration, fieldwork and documentary research to take place simultaneously and reflexively.

At the kingdom level, familiarity with the landscape was facilitated through study by motor vehicle. The area covered by the kingdom level study is 20 x 10km, or 200 square kilometres, so it is a substantial area to cover. This work was carried out in conjunction with Garmin Etrex GPS track recording, and recorded routes
were mapped onto Google Earth. Desk based research was carried out simultaneously from the project base at CAARI in Nicosia, and this meant that known sites of local archaeological significance could be targeted during the landscape coverage. Extensive digital photography recorded the landscape types and topographical features encountered during the investigations. The aim of this level of survey was only to identify and review known sites of geological and archaeological significance, to record them on the project maps and to develop an overview of the local landscape.

At the site level, traditional field walking was employed extensively. Traditional field walking has been employed by many of the best archaeologists in the past, and some such as Flinders Petrie walked many

Figure 5 The fully developed hermeneutic, multiscalar project methodology
miles every day in order to cover and investigate archaeological landscapes, and to identify sites of special interest. While documents, maps and aerial satellite photographs are helpful ways to get to know the general geography of a site, real familiarity with the landscape can only be achieved by actually being on the landscape and moving over, through and in it. This may take place at different times of year in different weather conditions, and while the flora and fauna are in various states of seasonal growth. Even field walking at different times of day can be of use, when the sun is at different positions in the sky, to allow an appreciation of the relative visibility and attributes of different parts of the landscape to develop.

The walking was at times physically challenging due to the topography, tough maquis vegetation and heat, however it proved invaluable as a means to provide a firm basis for understanding the landscapes of the city kingdoms, the earth works and standing structures and the locations of the many tombs. The topography and the many important natural features and resources were the initial focus at this level, and these aspects shaped the cultural use of the landscape in fundamental ways.

The initial intention of the field walking then was to cover the whole of the designated areas in a semi-systematic fashion. Grid walking in a rectilinear fashion was neither desirable nor possible due to the topography and flora and lack of an extensive project team. Part of the initial objective of the task was to understand the physical landscape as the people of the past did, and so the focus was on establishing the functional routes across the landscape that would have been used in the past. Travelling through the landscape and trying to understand why certain routes were used allowed a picture of what the different functions of the different areas of the settlement had been. Clearly, fresh water, agricultural land, access to the sea and elevated ground were of importance. By field walking in conjunction with documentary research it was possible to work in an iterative fashion with the archaeological reports, and build up a feel for the layout, topography and history of the sites, and the development of the city kingdoms through time.

The position of all of the major anthropogenic features and built structures on the landscape at this level were located and recorded. The semi-systematic traditional field walking was enhanced by way of a Garmin eTrex handheld GPS, which was used to record movement tracks across the site and record the position of designated waypoint markings or ‘points of special interest’ (POSIs). A notebook was used in conjunction with the way-pointing and tracking in order to record details about the significance of the POSIs, and about where photographs and panoramas had been taken. This was mainly basic archaeological field survey methodology, but in conjunction with the detailed track and point recording using GPS this meant that extensive post-field work processing and analysis of the data could be carried out.

The POSIs were either localised archaeological features or prominent topographical points where panoramic photographs were taken. Initially of special interest to this study were the Archaic tombs and their architecture, so POSIs were often tombs, with details regarding the basic features of the tomb recorded in the notebook, so that the designated number systems from various excavation reports could be linked to physical remains where possible. During the post-field work analysis the data collected from the field walking in the Garmin eTrex H GPS was downloaded to PC. This track and waypoint data was then overlaid onto special maps that had been calibrated absolutely to the global mapping base using the mapping software package Ozi Explorer version 3.95.3. Later in the project this data was moved directly to Google Earth.

This meant that all of the tracks and the POSI waypoints could be analysed with respect to satellite and aerial photographs and archaeological excavation plans at various scales, allowing real familiarity with the landscape and topography to develop. Aerial photographs of the city kingdoms were obtained from the
Cypriot Lands and Survey department in Nicosia, while satellite images taken from Google Earth generally provided a useful level of detail. This allowed the field walking data to be cross referenced with the corresponding archaeological data from the various archaeological reports and plans, and allowed an identification and understanding of significant parts of the cultural landscape to develop.

There were two other theoretical and methodological approaches that influenced the site level field walking. Firstly, all known archaeology dating to the Iron Age was deliberately targeted. In general, the remains from that period are either ritual, defensive or mortuary structures, as these leave the most enduring physical evidence in the landscape. Ritual activity tends to produce substantial anthropogenic change through repeated action over long periods of time, and it is often associated with significant natural features in the landscape such as peaks, caves and springs. These elements were targeted in the field walks and recorded in detail. These special features in the landscape are presented in the case studies along with more focussed maps, plans and digital photography.

Secondly, the field walking was also deliberately de-targeted at times, in order to deliberately include all parts of the landscape in the research objectively, including those parts that have not been focussed on in previous studies. It was through this wider ranging de-targeted field walk sampling of the landscape that the ritual significance of elevated sites became evident. Once this phenomenon had been established (for reasons that are outlined in the case studies) hilltop and mountain summit ‘viewsheds’ were produced allowing the significance of these sites as ritual and mortuary locations, and for landscape control to be evaluated and researched in more detail. The limits of visibility from key points in the landscape were calculated and plotted using digital elevation model (DEM) data derived from the Space Shuttle 2000 year mission SRTM (shuttle radar topography mission), and with a 100m resolution. This data is made available at no cost to the public by NASA. Hilltop height and name data was added to this from the Geonames.org database, and the ‘visibility cloak’ was then calculated and generated from these data sets on a platform based on Google Maps and the WGS84 planisphere geometry through the ‘HeyWhatsThat.com’ online software package. The field of topographical viewshed study is now relatively automated, and proved to be a useful tool for analysing the landscapes.

At the quarter level, parts of the settlements with specific functions such as the necropolises, city walls or sanctuaries were examined on site, and were mapped, planned and photographed in conjunction with the GPS location system. This part of the study operated in close coordination with the individual structure level study, as the remains of built structures and groups of built tombs were often parts of more extensive complexes or parts of areas of extended settlement. For this study it was generally not possible to excavate these levels, although at Idalion the lower city excavations did reveal new parts of the settlement during the course of the project. Most of the structures at this level were in a post excavation state. All of the artefacts and diagnostic architectural details had been removed to museums and in many cases they have been published with scale plans that could be re-used for new site maps and plans. These new plans were produced by sourcing contours for the topography from existing maps and plans, or from Google Earth DEMs (Digital Elevation Model data) where existing contour maps were not available. The individual structure plan illustrations from excavation reports were then copied over onto the quarter site plans with topography, and the new images were processed through Adobe Illustrator CS4 and Microsoft Paint as a rapid editor and for text annotation. Almost all of the detail at these two levels could be studied and recorded.

At the individual artefact level, a catalogue was produced for each of the case study sites. Items decorated with the tree of life motif or closely related iconographic details were included, recorded and depicted. The
majority of the items are ceramic vessels with painted decoration, but there are also a substantial number of carved stone items such as steles and capitals, and cast bronze items. The choice of artefacts to include was determined by what was available in museums, what was published in excavation reports, what had survived and what criteria were used to select what should be included and what should be omitted. In general, any item with a tree or floral motif was included. Items with prominent triangles were also included, as these were known to be closely associated with the tree of life if not totally synonymous with it. The final catalogues include 109 items from Cyprus. More items could have been included by expanding the selection criteria, but this was considered an appropriate corpus of examples, particularly when the artefact level is only one part of the multi-scalar analysis. These catalogues are included in appendices 10.4, 10.5 and 10.6, while an additional catalogue was included for the comparable material from Crete in appendix 10.7. Artefacts from each site are designated catalogue numbers with a three letter site code designator followed by a unique number. The codes are as follows: CAM for Amathus, CID for Idalion, CPA for Palaepaphos and CRE for Crete. The catalogue data and illustrations are also made available through the online website for this project which allows rapid access and comparison of artefacts.

Artefact illustrations were produced by manually line drawing (pencil and ink on film) from photographs of artefacts, sketches of artefacts or existing drawings of artefacts which were then digitised through a Nokia Carl Zeiss 5MP camera. These digitised illustrations were then processed through Canon ZoomBrowser version EX 6.1 to remove visual clutter and leave a clean line drawing in TIF format. The TIF images were finally processed through Adobe Illustrator CS4 to smooth the line drawings. The final illustrations are suitable for publishing and are free from copyright restrictions. This concludes the description of the multi-scale methodology.

3.3. Integrating a structural analysis

Theoretical recommendation no. 4 was that information gathered during the multiscalar investigation should be interpreted through a structural analysis. This is not a physical structure, but a coherent set of concepts, processes or a system that was understood and followed by the people of Iron Age Cyprus as constituting daily life. The definition of a social structure is not fixed or universal, and imposing preconceived ideas onto the data must be avoided. Like the antiquarians of the 19th century, the people of the past sought to simplify and schematise their world in order to make it comprehensible and communicable at a social level. Rather than imposing artificial schemes from the present, it is the schemes of ideas from the past that must be uncovered in order to understand the role that the material played within those societies (Tilley 1990; Hodder 1992). We are looking for the particular structures that shaped the society and the material culture at a fundamental level.

The structural study examines artistic details and graphical symbols used on the material culture, and it is expected that they will reflect concepts used across different domains of everyday life, from the landscape to architecture and in different multi-sensory ways. Related colours, materials, textures, forms or functions may be expressed in individual artefacts. Common aspects will be seen in the architecture and be present in the landscape, the seascape and even in the sky above. The particular structure followed in the city kingdoms could be as much a ritualised cosmology as part of the fundamental physical requirement of everyday life, but all of the domains must express an aspect of a coherent group of ideas that inter-relate
and make sense. In the context of this study, a symbol is a graphical mark, shape or character used to signify something else. It usually derives part of its meaning from the structure in which it appears, as much as from its own details. For example, a symbol representing a lion on a shield would signify courage and strength in warfare, and the pairing of function and symbol makes sense when both are associated. The identification of a coherent structure, cosmology or object entanglement is a semiotic or syntactic analysis, identifying the meaning in the systems of signs, but it is not art historical. The conclusions drawn will show that many of the signs used by the inhabitants of the city kingdoms were themselves rooted in the landscape, and that there is a dialogue between the portable material culture and the cultic landscape of the living environment that reveals the meaning. During the period in question, Cyprus was emerging from the pre-literate era into the proto-literate era, and signs and symbols were becoming increasingly important. The boundary between art and written symbol was indistinct and often non existent. In some ways it is almost possible to read the artwork when the context or structure is understood.

The structural analyses were incorporated in each case study and in the final discussions in Chapters 7, 8 and 9. The structure effectively emerged out of the material investigations as the city kingdoms were explored. Once the case studies were complete, a further regional contextualisation study allowed nascent ideas regarding a putative structure to be consolidated by comparison with the many regional parallels. Theoretical recommendation no. 4 therefore appears twice on the completed flow chart (Figure 5), in initial and combined forms.

3.4. The metanarrative

The final recommendation of the theory chapter, recommendation no. 5, was that an analysis focusing on anomalies and ambiguities in the material culture should be incorporated into the methodology in order to understand cultural hybridisation and change through time. To extend the linguistic metaphor used above, while the structural analysis identifies the deep underlying grammar of the society, the final analysis must look at the individual words, the phrasing and the changing accents of the cultural expressions and make sense of them. The roles, statements and expressions of the individuals are addressed, and the individual stories of their pasts can be reconstructed into a continuous history of the island. As the metanarrative constructs a chronological sequence of individual ‘events’, it integrates the multiple individual moments into a long duration narrative. This approach was recommended in the theory chapter, recommendation no. 3, which emphasised the importance of multiple chronological contextual scales, so in fact the metanarrative satisfies two of the theoretical recommendations.

Languages change over time, and so do the phrasings of material culture at the level of individual expressions. Changes in the underlying repertoire of the iconography (Tilley 1990: 70) signify changes in the structure, but these are made up of many small changes that take place in the shorter term. The archaeologist should be able to establish the shape of the structure at any one time, but remain aware that the structure will have a different form at different times.

A focus on particular short term, local material and contexts, with special attention paid to unique and ambiguous variations and idiosyncrasies, allows the postcolonial archaeologist to address one of the problems with the processual approach, which was its inability to address the micro scale (Hodder 1999; Hodder 2000).
“Archaeological method was criticised for being unable to deal with the particular – the individual, the archaeological moment…. Hodder recently argued that archaeological interpretation should not concern itself so much with long-term processes but rather the long term narrative should be comprised of many individual moments” (Clarke 2005a: 5).

Through time then, history should be built up from a sequence of moments. This process should eventually provide us with a sequence of ‘determinated historically and contextually situated structures’ (Tilley 1990: 65). This ‘metanarrative’ is what is produced in Chapter 8 for this project. It is effectively the final overarching discussion synthesising all of the data and understanding into one diachronic narrative. Individual examples of contextualised evidence are examined in detail to show what was occurring at each moment, and the individual examples are placed in a chronological sequence that runs from the end of the Bronze Age to the end of the Archaic Period. The individual examples are examined in detail, and placed within a wider narrative that tracks the underlying changes in the social structures.

The sequence of moments, however, is not just a passage from one structural state to another. Humanity produces itself by human praxis (Tilley 1990). The individual reacts to situations experienced in unique and sometimes unpredictable ways that can intentionally, and also inadvertently, alter the track of normal events, and the form of the new underlying structure. It is these altering events that are of interest in the final analysis, and the material that is produced during these socially significant moments is the hybridised material that is of interest. It is not just a mixing of precursor elements; it is the production of new and unique designs by an individual; designs which resolve and reconcile influences from precursor materials, events and social interactions.

This metanarrative analysis of small but influential ambiguities and ambivalences in the expressions of material culture can be compared with Braudel’s conjunctures, confluences of events, and individual événements that are the visible froth on the deep waves of history, but these details often prove to be the most informative of expressions and indicate the new direction that will be followed thereafter.

Symbols carry related ideas in the minds of the maker and the observer and they can be difficult to interpret, but when we do understand them properly, within their proper context and as part of a system of ideas related to material surroundings, they can reveal information about the thoughts in the minds of the makers and users of the material. They reflect both the issues of immediate concern to the people, and the deepest cosmological structures of their society.

Several authors have tackled the issue of meaning within iconography, and some of the most applicable studies address the decoration of pottery (Iacovou 1991; Hodder 1997). Most of these regard decoration as meaningful (Faust 2006). Their theories maintain that social and political concerns are expressed through the material culture and the iconography that it carries, and that this can be understood best when we understand how the material was made and used within its local landscape and settlement contexts. The theory maintains that different cultural styles can be indicative of different ethnicities (Faust 2006: 43) and that ethnic differences will be negotiated, reconciled and consolidated into new forms through the manipulation of symbolic gestures. The theory holds that the artwork makes statements that can be read like a proto-literate text when the ‘language’ of the communication is known. Most ‘messages’ are directed to the group itself, and affirm the existing social order, share messages concerning internal relations, reaffirm society’s values and ethics. The decoration is not an explicit statement of ethnicity, it is a low tech means of communicating and sharing society’s values with the individual (Faust 2006: 44) and it is therefore
an inadvertent record of ethnicity. Only when the symbolism is directed externally will there be a more explicit statement of ethnicity and group identity.

Real or artificial cultural ‘differences’ can be deliberately entrenched, codified and crystallised through symbols, often by creating polarised dichotomies, binary pairs, that are easy to communicate but which may bear little resemblance to reality. This is effectively prejudicing situations based on preconceived interpretations of social situations and artificial mental structures, and may be done in order to control a situation, further a particular agenda, or deliberately prevent integration in order to retain a social advantage or dominance.

So there are many ways in which social concerns can influence iconography and be influenced by iconography, and the difficulty is in correctly interpreting what is seen in a way which genuinely reveals what occupied the mind of the artisan who made it and the observers who interacted with it. It is only by learning and referring to the deeper metaphorical contexts in the artwork of the culture that we can understand the ‘language’ of the iconography and understand what the details are ‘saying’.

Specific theoretical criteria with which the symbolism is interpreted within the metanarrative are set out here:

Firstly, ideas of affiliation and loyalty with family and neighbours will result in the inclusion and sharing of symbolic elements associated with the shared culture and traditions.

Secondly, ideas of affiliation with acknowledged elites, rulers or beneficial external alliances will result in the appropriation and incorporated of the symbols of the ‘other’ into new motifs hybridised with existing ones.

Thirdly, new people will be visible in the archaeological record through their differing material cultural and iconographic forms, whether brought through immigration or imports. Over time, social relationships and alliances will result in the merging of elements associated with the new culture, and eventually, they are completely hybridised with existing themes to form new hybrid forms. These new forms re-enforce the new alliance, the new affiliation and the integration of the groups through their shared material culture. This process operates within a new shared social ‘third space’, in between the previously separate groups, and into which both groups eventually move.

Fourthly and conversely, animosity will result in the rejection of symbols associated with new enemies, threats or competitors. Existing symbols may be reinforced in the face of growing threats, and may also result in the exaggeration of elements that are known to be specifically not associated with the threat, in an act of resistance and defiance. This is often the case at frontiers where groups meet and interact. This may be blatantly expressed in the case of a dominant group, and might also lead to iconoclasm or proscription where the symbols of the ‘other’ are destroyed or defaced. In the case of an oppressed minority, symbolic resistance may be masked and hidden in a way that subtly rejects the symbolism of the dominant social group. This can lead to ambiguities, anomalies and ‘entangled objects’ that are complex and difficult to understand. Rejection of dominant motifs by oppressed minorities can also be done through subversive methods, such as through the use of graffiti or vandalism. Symbols identified with enemies or threats or competitors may be deliberately omitted (Faust 2006: 43) or defaced.

Through an appreciation of the structures and contexts in which the material was used, we have a better chance of identifying crucial details that relate to underlying social issues, social stresses and individual events. Differences can be reconciled and resolved in part through the process of hybridisation and the use
of new shared material culture. Details that at first sight may seem irrelevant may on further inspection provide a vital clue to the whole.

3.5. Conclusions of methodology chapter

In conclusion, the specific recommendations of the theory chapter, as well as a wider post-structural philosophy, have been designed into the methodology at a fundamental level. A cyclic, hermeneutic approach, which includes a structural analysis applied in a discursive manner, and a metanarrative of individual details, is intended to allow data led investigations to uncover a real representation of the tree of life in Iron Age Cyprus and its wider regional context.

The methodology is made up of a sequence of three case studies, each one focusing on a single ‘city kingdom’ settlement of Iron Age Cyprus. The choice of sites is made sequentially and in response to the conclusions of previous case study/studies.

The investigation applies a multiscalar methodology to each city kingdom, looking at the examples of the tree of life in all archaeological contexts, from the tombs to the sanctuaries, to the built structures of the settlements as well as the local and regional landscapes. The investigations included site visits, semi-systematic field walking and mapping of the landscape at local and regional levels, and cataloguing, but not classification, of artefacts.

Each case study concluded with an initial structural and ambiguity analysis. An understanding of the underlying structures of the past, and the changes in the structures through time, developed as the study progresses through the consecutive case studies. The case studies are followed in Chapter 7 by a regional level contextualizing survey that develops and consolidates the nascent conclusions regarding underlying structures on Cyprus. Chapter 7 was an extension of the methodological system added for reasons that are discussed at the start of that chapter.

Finally, a diachronic metanarrative presents a sequence of detailed examples of the material recovered, discussed within contexts, that show how specific events and social stresses influenced the ways in which the individual artists manufactured and decorated the new cultural material, and slowly hybridised different intersecting influences to produce new forms and new cultural directions.

Whereas the case studies and regional contextualizing survey in Chapter 7 address the coherent conceptual structure underlying the cultures of the region, the final discussion in Chapter 8 focuses more on the artistic details and the graphical symbols used by those cultures. The conclusions drawn will show that many of the signs used by the inhabitants of the city kingdoms were themselves rooted in the landscape, and so by participating in a dialogue between the material culture and the landscape we can begin to understand the specific meanings that were being expressed in the material by those who made and used it, in a living environment.
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Chapter 4. Case study 1: Amathus: seed of Kinyras

4.1. Introduction to case study of Amathus

This chapter reports the results of the multiscalar case study of the ancient city kingdom of Amathus, which is located on the south coast of Cyprus. The fieldwork and research took place during 2009, and were followed up with return visits in 2010 and 2011. The chapter describes how the methodology was applied to study Amathus, how the data was collected during the study, and how the analysis and conclusions developed out of that data.

The choice of Amathus as the first case study site was originally made in order to evaluate the level of Egyptian influence on the city kingdom. This decision grew out of the same context as the overall PhD study, in order to evaluate the extent to which traditional interpretations agreed or conflicted with the archaeological record, and may have contained biased interpretations. My own masters level study (Lightbody 2006) formed a foundation for this PhD, and the results indicated that the level of Egyptian influence and interaction with the island may have been underestimated in mainstream narratives, in part due to the biases of colonial era scholarship. The choice of Amathus as a case study was therefore intended to allow this proposition to be evaluated more thoroughly.

The focus of the research was on the tree of life, but it did not stand alone. As the research progressed it became clear that the tree was part of a set of inter-related symbols. These symbols were utilised in relation to each other, and in relation to the sanctuary of Aphrodite/Anat on the acropolis, and in relation to the wider settlement and landscape. The Cypriot tree of life iconography was derived from more ancient symbols such as palms, lotuses and papyrus plants, and it was also closely related to other ancient symbols that became part of the Amathusian symbolic repertoire, such as winged sphinxes, bulls, lions, griffins and Hathor heads. Decorated thrones, decorated repoussé plates and sarcophagi carried all of these motifs. The case study showed that the way in which the Amathusians used the material culture bearing these motifs, within the landscape and within their architecture, tombs and material culture, expressed the underlying meanings that they carried.

The case study is made up of seven multiscalar sub-studies, starting from the regional scope and eventually homing in on individual artefacts. Each of the sub-studies is in effect a small article discussing Amathus, but with a different geographical scope. Although the scope of the regional and island level studies will be the same for each case study city kingdom chosen, as they share a common regional context, the regional outlook or cultural orientation of the different city kingdoms proved to be surprisingly varied, and brought up quite different sets of regional issues in each case.

The Amathus case study drew heavily on the publications of the École Française d’Athènes, who have carried out excavations on the acropolis since 1975. Their ‘big dig’ approach for the excavation on the acropolis has yielded a substantial, well analysed and representative body of diagnostic material that is invaluable to any study of ancient Amathus. Their work, which has been continuing for several decades, has been of very high standards technically, as have their extensive publications, but there was certainly room for additional interpretation of the data within a postcolonial framework. The case study also drew on many studies of Iron Age Cyprus that include Amathus as one of the Iron Age city kingdoms, as well as the regional studies of adjacent areas, and local and regional studies of the tree of life.
The research was carried out systematically, based on the theory and methodology chapters, and the data collected was interpreted within the process developed there. Although systematic, the intention of this study was not to mechanically describe the landscape, or artefacts from Amathus that carry the tree or flower of life motif, but to facilitate an improved discussion and understanding of the structures of daily life followed by the people of Amathus in the Iron Age, and to identify what role the tree of life played within that context.
4.2. Multiscalar analysis

4.2.1. Regional level analysis: 2000 x 1000 km

The first of the multiscalar analyses was at the regional level, which covers an area of 2000 by 1000 km. The analysis at this level was primarily desk based research, drawing on existing scholarship and publications. This section describes the results of that research. It starts with a summary of the most significant regional issues that impacted on Archaic Cypriot society and Amathus, and then advances to an initial analysis of the meanings and use of the tree or flower of life on columns, capitals and portable artefacts through the period and across the region in question.

The extents of the geographical area representing the ‘regional context’ were 2000 km from east to west by 1000 km north to south, and this includes parts of the continents of Europe, Asia and Africa (Figure 6). The area covered stretches from Athens in the north-west to the Egyptian Delta and Cairo/Memphis in the south. The area also includes the islands of Crete and Aegina, Libya and the Sinai Peninsula, southern and western Anatolia, the Cyclades and Dodecanese archipelagos, Rhodes, the Levant and western Mesopotamia. At this scale it is clear why Cyprus has often been referred to as the ‘meeting place between east and west’. It lies between many important geopolitical regions, and was in contact with all of these areas during the Iron Age. Its position was even more significant in Antiquity, as maritime transport was one of the principle means of communication and for transporting heavy goods over long distances.

![Figure 6 Map of regional level area of study with simplified cultural labels (author's illustration)](image)

The first task was to identify the major regional drivers of cultural change that affected the society on Archaic Cyprus, and to examine how these issues related to the artistic and architectural changes and trends. The objective was not to dissect the history of the period in all its minute detail, but to identify the main mechanisms of change that influenced the society, material culture and architecture in the region around
Amathus, Cyprus and the east Mediterranean during the Cypro-Geometric (1050-750 B.C.) and Archaic Periods (750-480 B.C.).

Amathus was very much an Iron Age product of regional events. It was first established during the early tenth century B.C., on the south coast, in order to control the harbour (Hermary 1999; Iacovou 2005b: 28). Unlike certain other city kingdoms there was no Late Bronze Age precursor settlement or structures at the site, and an early CGI tomb seems to provide the first sign of activity (Hermary 1994; Hermary and Fourrier 2006: 21). There is no Mycenaean foundation myth for Amathus, and it was reputedly inhabited by autochthonous ‘Eteocypriots’ (Pseudo-Skylax, 103), a derivative population related to the LBA dynasty of Kinyras from Palaepaphos. It may have appeared in the Assyrian records of 673/672 B.C. as a city kingdom with the name of Nure, although this attribution is uncertain (Steel 1993: 147). The city kingdom of Amathus followed the chronology and pattern of Iron Age expansion also seen at Palaepaphos, where 19 settlement components (farmstead, settlement, cemetery etc.) appear in the archaeological record of the Cypro Geometric period, followed by an increase to 40 for the Cypro-Archaic period (Sorenson and Rupp 1993: 255). This gives some sort of empirical measure that demonstrates the magnitude of expansion. For the Cypro-Geometric period comparison of these areas is valid. The homogeneity of Geometric pottery styles across the island attests to extensive internal interaction and common cultural profiles (Gjerstad 1979; Iacovou 2005b: 29).

According to the written sources above, the original population at Amathus consisted of Geometric islanders, but it was on the coast for a reason: to interact with the regional maritime trade routes that passed along the south coast of Cyprus. The archaeology of Amathus points to a close relationship with the Phoenician ports of the southern Levant (Gjerstad 1979; Hermary 1987), as well as to contacts with Aegean, in particular Euboia (Iacovou 2005b: 29), and eastern Greece, where the many vessels decorated with the wild goat style found at Amathus originated. Iacovou states that Amathus’s overseas exchanges are attested in a ‘truly extravagant manner’ (Iacovou 2005b: 29). There is also extensive evidence of Egyptian interaction in the material (Karageorghis et al. 1991), and many Egyptian themed amulets were excavated from the tombs of Amathus, including figures of Bes and Osiris, wadjet eyes and scarabs.

The most comprehensive study of Archaic Cyprus within its regional context was Reyes’s evaluation of the textual and archaeological evidence (Reyes 1994). Although focused on Cyprus, the study examined the regional context and contacts extensively. As Reyes summarised in the introduction, his work was in turn built on the conclusions, chronologies and typologies established by Gjerstad in the 1930s. The Swedish Cyprus Expedition excavated on a scale never before seen on Cyprus (Reyes 1994: 6), and first developed a reliable chronology at that time. Based on all of these and other works relating to adjacent regions (Dothan 1982; Morkot 2000; Stern 2003; Harrison 2009), I identified the major drivers of regional cultural change over the time period in question. These were firstly, the economic revival of the Syro-Hittite, Phoenician and Israelite kingdoms on the Levant during CGII, signalling the end of the ‘dark age’. Amathus was first established during this period of renaissance, probably due to recovering Phoenician long distance trade. This period was followed by the rise and expansion of the Neo-Assyrians to the Mediterranean coast. The resulting impact of this on the Levant led to increasing westward expansion of Phoenician trade and colonisation. As a result of this, and particularly by the Cypro-Archaic I Period, Amathus developed rapidly, and seems to have begun producing valuable metal bowls, probably as tribute for the Assyrians. During the Cypro-Archaic II Period, the regional context of Amathus changed again, as the east Mediterranean became a zone dominated by an Archaic alliance between Egypt and Greece, which developed in response to the continuing belligerence of the Mesopotamian empires. Carian mercenaries fought for the Egyptian army,
and the Egyptian pharaoh made alliances with Samos, but this mutual pact was ended by the rise and domination of the Persians at the end of the Archaic Period, 525-500 B.C.

Timeline of events impacting on Amathus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000 B.C.</td>
<td>First tomb and first signs of birth of Amathus as a regional settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950-870 B.C.</td>
<td>Revival of Syro-Hittite city kingdoms, recovery of Phoenician trade, rise of Israel and Judah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>870-810 B.C.</td>
<td>First oppressive expansion of Neo-Assyrian Empire and Phoenician westward expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810-725 B.C.</td>
<td>Phoenician trade and expansion continues, and rebellion against weaker Neo-Assyria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725-650 B.C.</td>
<td>Second oppressive expansion of Neo-Assyria and accelerated westward Phoenician trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650 – 525 B.C.</td>
<td>Archaic alliance between Egypt, Greece, Cyprus against Mesopotamian empires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525 – 500 B.C.</td>
<td>Decline of Cyprus under Persians (end of this study)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The major regional factors initiating and encouraging the development of Amathus as a settlement were therefore Assyrian mainland belligerence, Phoenician maritime expansion, and a thirst for tribute. The increased economic activity led directly to an increase in the population and wealth of Amathus, which was in proximity to copper, agricultural and timber resources as well as being a useful maritime port.

The earlier Iron Age Syro-Hittite/Phoenician/Israelite/Egyptian rule over the Levant was first superseded by emerging Assyrian influence in the ninth century, but apart from a few isolated artefacts and the official record of the ten Cypriot city Kingdoms submitting and paying tribute to Sargon II ca. 720 B.C., there is limited evidence of Assyrian cultural influence on Cyprus itself (Reyes 1994: 61). While there was little significant direct Assyrian influence on Cyprus, the external Assyrian pressure on the mainland Phoenician kingdoms was undoubtedly a significant factor in the development of Amathus, encouraging Phoenician expansion towards the west, right through the ninth, eighth and seventh centuries (Castro 2006: 84). It is this mercantile and colonial movement that first brought the proto-Aeolic style of capitals to Amathus, from the Levant. While the first signs of activity date to CGI, The first evidence for human occupation on the acropolis of Amathus dates to the eighth century B.C., during late Cypro-Geometric III (Aupert 1996: 99).

Phoenician activity on Cyprus was marked by the construction of a new temple at Kition on the foundations of the Bronze Age precursor. This took place ca. 850 B.C. (Gjerstad 1979: 233), just around the time of the battle of Qarqar on the Levant (853 B.C.), when the Assyrians were becoming increasingly disruptive and intrusive, and Levantine settlements were forming wide ranging alliances to attempt to stop their advance. Aubet carefully assessed the variables encouraging Phoenician westward expansion, including the Assyrian
pressure from the east and the associated economic requirement to import metals from the west, both to provide tribute to Assyria and as a means of ensuring Phoenician economic strength and independence (Aubet 1997: 50-76). As a result of increased interaction with the Phoenicians and increasing demands to manufacture luxury tribute items, the ninth through sixth centuries also coincided with a rapid development of the Amathusian artistic repertoire. Gjerstad considered the eight to sixth centuries B.C. to have been when Cypriot art reached its ‘meridian and summer of maturity’, a view supported by Reyes (Reyes 1994: 6).

Ca. 725 B.C. saw the return of influence from Egypt on the Levant and on Cyprus under the 25th dynasty Kushite kings, who instigated the Late Period renaissance. Their influence provided some resistance against the Assyrians, until the sack of Egyptian Thebes by the Assyrians in 665 B.C. Egyptian influence nevertheless returned during the 26th Dynasty, first with the pharaoh Psamtik (664-610 B.C.), who threw off Assyrian influence, formed an alliance with the Lydians and recruited Carians and Greek mercenaries (Burkert 1992: 14). The pharaoh Amasis II, a Philhellenic pharaoh, continued with the policy of rapprochement between the Greeks of the Aegean and the Egyptians, perhaps in response to growing Neo-Babylonian hegemony on the Levant, after they had defeated the Assyrians. The position of Cyprus during this complicated period is significant, and increased evidence of ‘Egyptianising’ influence is significant, particularly when considered in the light of the statement by Herodotus that Cyprus was brought under direct Egyptian rule during the reign of Amasis ca. 550 B.C. Reyes sees the relationship between Egypt and Cyprus for most of the sixth century B.C. as a mutually advantageous one, rather than one of asymmetric dominance. A close alliance between Egypt and Greece involving Cyprus would seem to be strategically and historically logical, as it gave Egypt access to copper, timber and mercenaries from the north. According to Egyptian documentation from 613 B.C., the Phoenician coast became an Egyptian dependency governed by a principal authority directly responsible to the Pharaoh (Markoe 2000: 45). Regionally, with respect to Egypt during the Cypro-Archaic period, several towns on the Nile Delta became influential. Those of note include Sais, Tanis and Daphnae. Ca. 570 B.C. the pharaoh Amasis took measures to regulate Greek activity in Egypt and established Naukratis as an official port of call for the Greeks. Cities such as Miletus were able to build their own temples at Naukratis (Herodotus Histories II, 78-79).

At the start of the sixth century B.C., the Neo-Babylonians recovered power again in Mesopotamia under Nebuchadnezzar II and invaded the Levant. By the second quarter of the century, the Levant became a dependency of the Babylonians, and so the strategic importance of Cyprus to the Egyptians may have intensified. The revival of Egypt during the 26th dynasty and its increasing influence on Cyprus during the late seventh and sixth centuries B.C. is evidenced in the appearance of Hathor head capitals, while the invasion of the Persians after 525 B.C. may be the reason for their equally rapid disappearance. Hathor capitals are not seen in the Classical Greek world, although the origins of Aphrodite and Athena have been traced back, in part, to Hathor, as well as to Anat and Astarte, and she was closely associated with the copper industry of the Sinai and Cyprus (Ulbrich 2005, see also Al-Ahram issue 936).

The rapid rise of the Achaemenid Persian Empire after 539 B.C. and the defeat of Egypt at the Battle of Pelusium on the Nile Delta in 525 B.C. saw the demise of the Egyptian 26th dynasty under the Philhellenic Pharaoh Amasis. This was followed by the subsequent submission of Cyprus to the Persians in 490 B.C., after participation in the failed Ionian revolt, and this effectively forms the terminating date for this study.

Within that developmental sequence, most notably between 750 and 550 B.C., Cyprus played a significant role in the history of the region, and the symbols and iconography of the tree of life were an active and significant part of the culture of the island. The symbols were incorporated into the buildings housing the
institutions built by the city rulers and priesthood, including within the city kingdom of Amathus. The rituals carried out at the sanctuary on the acropolis expressed the structured symbolism behind the institutions that developed during this period, and the tree of life played a central role.

Figure 7 LBA papyrus, palm and lotus form column capitals from Egyptian New Kingdom (author’s illustration)

As referred to at the start of this chapter, my Masters study focussed on the architecture and the capital designs, and the proto-Aeolic architectural order. Proto-Aeolic Architecture is a term used to refer to an architectural style or order of architecture which is geographically and chronologically distinct from the other more widely known movements, such as the Ionic, Doric and Corinthian. The Aeolic classification refers to a class of artefacts that were first recovered from the northwest Anatolian coast in the region called Aeolia in Antiquity. These capitals were recognised as being of an earlier group which was distinct from the later Classical orders, and became known as Aeolic capitals. It was also understood that these capitals were themselves derived from even earlier capitals known from the east Mediterranean, and so that group of designs, included those on Cyprus, became known as proto-Aeolic. The area from which they were recovered is from the Levant, Cyprus and East Anatolia, as well as further west, where the order spread through the actions of merchants and colonists.

My Masters level study indicated that the design of these proto-Aeolic capitals, and the typical Ionic capital which eventually developed out of these earlier orders, with its scroll-form volutes, were ideologically and stylistically related to Bronze Age Egyptian precursors. The Egyptian Bronze Age capitals were styled on papyrus plants and bundles of papyrus (Figure 7). My thesis was that the Ionic capitals, and some of the Cypriot capital elements, represented papyrus, in the form of rolls of papyrus paper as well as long curled papyrus reed stems.

Since that study, I have become aware of figurines from Cyprus that support my conclusion. The statues show Cypriot scribes in a pose similar to both Egyptian and Mesopotamian prototypes. The scribes are not shown sitting cross legged like Old Kingdom Egyptian scribes, but on a chair with the scroll on their laps, in the style of the architect and scribe Imhotep from Egypt, who was often and uniquely represented in this way (Figure 8). The writing medium represented is clearly intended to be ink on papyrus, rather than clay impressions or ink writings on ostraca, such as are found in Idalion. The ends of the papyrus sheets are rolled up in spirals on either side of the scribe’s lap. Writing in ink on papyrus was probably integral to Phoenician record keeping, although other mediums such as ostraca writing were used (Smith 2009: 30). The earliest Cypriot example of a scribe statue is from the Cypro-Archaic Period, perhaps from Amathus according to Karageorghis (Karageorghis 2002: 222; Vandenabeele 2009: 127). The spirals are a form known from the Egyptian statues of scribes, while a precursor from Mesopotamia dates back to 2,100 B.C. and shows the
King Gudea of Lagash sitting in a similar pose, although with a tablet and not papyrus. Vandenabeele suggests the Cypriot examples show architectural plans drawn on the papyrus, something that was also seen on Gudea’s tablet. It seems that the style was derived from both Egyptian and Mesopotamian precursors, but that the writing technique shown was certainly ink on papyrus scroll, typically Phoenician and Egyptian. The association of architects and papyrus with the double spiralled scroll is also significant when considering the development of the Ionic architectural order after this time.

The masters study concluded that the primary meaning of the flower or tree of life and the proto-Aeolic capitals was one of ‘papyrus’, and while this conclusion is still partially supported by this new case study, it is now with the caveat that this was just one of the underlying and older meanings, but not the whole meaning during the Cypriot Iron Age. The origins of papyriform and lotus flower decorated columns lie in Egypt, and this can be most clearly seen in the hieroglyphs associated with these (Figure 9). At the most fundamental level the papyriform stone column was a stone skeuomorph of a bundle of papyrus stalks, originally used to support roofs in the Delta region of Egypt, where structural wood was not available. The words associated with these signs refer to halls of columns, and the idea of fertile abundant growth of the Nile Delta.

The papyrus plant and the architecture of the Nile Delta did have a substantial influence on the architectural iconography of the tree of life in Cyprus, but architecture was not the only cultural class or artistic tradition that carried this motif. Flowers and trees had been represented on portable material culture across the region from the Bronze Age and before (Figure 10), and as the Amathus case study progressed it became clear that the situation was more complex than simply one of unidirectional influence from Egypt to Cyprus. The Cypriot trees of life hybridised several different artistic and technical traditions.

The study of the tree of life within this level of geographical regional context initially utilised existing regional studies of proto-Aeolic art and architecture, and regional studies of the Phoenician culture (Betancourt 1977; Shefton 1989; Aubet 1997; Markoe 2000; Petit 2008), but it gradually branched out to include representations of the tree of life on more portable classes of material, such as seals, ivories and ceramics (Loud 1939; Meekers 1987; Bushnell 2005), as well as archaeological information from excavations of Bronze Age sites further afield such as Mari, where evidence of the use of the tree of life as a decorative motif rather than an architectural column has survived (Giovino 2007; Ziffer 2010: 417). In Mesopotamia, the tree...
of life had a long history, and followed a different tradition, one closely related to the cultivation of the date palm tree (Giovino 2007: 27).

It became clear that the Egyptian tradition of column architecture was not the only influential cultural movement, and that there were different sets of older traditions in different regions. The tree of life appeared on Late Bronze Age ceramics and seals from the Aegean (Evans 1901), on Late Bronze Age ivories from Megiddo, on ivories from Ugarit, and on many items from Bronze Age Mesopotamia. In these cases, however, the motif did not appear on top of architectural columns or as a stele, but was used as a decorative device, or in emblematic scenes with pairs of supporting animals (Figure 10).

The major regional study of the Iron Age proto-Aeolic capitals was published by Betancourt in 1977. In that work he discussed how the growth and varied development of the capitals was related to political situations and the geographical locations (Betancourt 1977: 48). The wider historical context must be considered when interpreting the material. Several excellent general historical summaries of the Iron Age east Mediterranean already exist that provide a wider historical context (Markoe 2000), and more specific studies cover limited classes of material or specific themes across the region, such as the capitals in Betancourt’s work, or associated material culture such as fine ashlar masonry, ivories (Loud 1939; Feldman 2009) or decorated bronze and silver bowls (Markoe 1985; Shefton 1989; Wright 1992a; Petit 2008). It is clear, however, that
underlying meanings cannot be derived from iconographic art-historical analyses alone, and these must be carried out in conjunction with the archaeology and landscape context.

As well as with date palms and papyrus reeds, the tree on the Levant was certainly associated with a fertility goddess. This has been convincingly argued by Hestrin, who has showed examples where trees, triangles and goddesses are closely associated or are interchangeable (Hestrin 1987; Ziffer 2010). This iconographic milieu is substantially different to the context out of which the Egyptian capitals grew, and although complex, the subject has been extensively researched due to its biblical connections. Deities from Bronze Age Ugarit continued to play a prominent role in the Iron Age Levantine pantheon. The virgin war goddess Anat in particular played a prominent role on Cyprus, and the syncretism of Anat, Astarte, Aphrodite, Hathor and Athena is noteworthy, particularly as the proto-Aeolic architectural capitals are thought to have represented the goddesses (Daszewski 1989; Budin 2005; Ulbrich 2005). This association between goddesses and architectural capitals is supported by the Hathor head capitals first seen at Deir el-Bahri in Egyptian Thebes, then later at the early Iron Age Temple of Serabit on the Sinai, and on Iron Age Cyprus, including from Cypro-Archaic Amathus.

The tree or flower of life on Iron Age Cyprus grew out of this ancient regional architectural and artistic background, and the styles and meanings carried by the artistic and architectural features continued to evolve during the Iron Age. Existing works studying these symbols show how they related to the history of the region (Shefton 1989; Petit 2008), but not within a fully modern theoretical structure and a fully contextualised archaeology.

The enduring association between the capitals and goddesses was also demonstrated in the Aegean world of the sixth century B.C. There the ‘Caryatids’ were statues of women serving as architectural columns, reflecting the rejoicing maidens of Karyai, who danced as Astarte around their walnut trees with baskets of live reeds on their heads, as if they were living plants. The hybridised regional ideas are clearly expressed in that ritual.

![Figure 10 Mycenaean bowl with sphinxes, tree](Murray et al. 1900: 8; Higgins 1967: 116) (author’s illustration)

This association between plants, goddesses, columns and people will be elaborated later in the analysis section, where it is proposed that the idea of new cities and buildings growing up was metaphorically associated with the growth of plants, flowers, trees and people.

The one significant motif not present in Bronze Age architecture or capitals was the prominent central triangle. The earliest use of the central triangle in an architectural capital was not from Egypt, but from Iron Age Samaria in Israel where it was combined with the Bronze Age spiral volutes. Capitals similar to this type appeared on Archaic Cyprus, but do not appear before the Archaic Period. Samaria, where they were first
found, became the capital of Israel around about 850 B.C. and Israel reached its maximum territorial extent since the days of the united monarchy about 750 B.C. (Markoe 2000: 41). A coalition stretching from Cilicia in the north to Israel in the south was powerful enough to confront Assyria at Qarqar on the Orontes river in 853 B.C., forcing Assyria to postpone the campaign (Knapp 1988: 222). Between 825 and 750 B.C. Assyria sunk to its lowest point (Knapp 1988: 224).

Figure 11 Proto-Aeolic capital developed in Iron Age Israel ca. 950 B.C. (author’s illustration)

Betancourt considers the proto-Aeolic capitals to have originated in early Iron Age Israel, during the Solomonic reign, ca. 950 B.C. (Betancourt 1977: 44; Shiloh 1979)(Figure 11). He accepts the biblical passages referring to Hiram of Tyre, who was brought from Phoenicia to design the first temple in Jerusalem (Betancourt 1977: 46). Connections between Egypt and the Levant at this time are also evidenced. Egyptian royal diplomatic marriages with Israel and Syria were commonplace, Levantine gods were adopted into the Egyptian pantheon, such as Astarte and Anat, and vice versa, and syncretism was the norm rather than the exception.

As this capital type did not exist in the Cypro-Geometric artistic repertoire, it seems that the Cypro-Archaic proto-Aeolic capitals at Amathus, Idalion and Palaepaphos were derived from southern Levantine precursors brought into Cyprus. It is likely that elements of the Amathusian beliefs and rituals were also influenced by Levantine traditions.

The triangular capitals with the spiral volutes (ca. 800 B.C.) were related to the goddess, but rather than being statues of a goddess they were a symbolic logo representing the goddess. They were certainly not simply decorative, and adorned entrances to important buildings including temples and tombs.

In the later Punic world triangular topped funerary steles continued to play a significant role, as did the triangular ‘sign of Tanit’ (Figure 88), while the triangular pediment of the typical Greek temple, which first developed during the Archaic and early Classical periods, may have been based on the Archaic precursors from the Levant, such as the Cypriot proto-Aeolic shrines reconstructed by Betancourt in 1971 (Betancourt 1971; Reyes 1994: 29). The architecture of the Amathus Cesnola sarcophagus, which imitates a temple, has a triangular pediment at either end, whereas earlier Phoenician sarcophagi such as that of king Ahiram of Byblos, which most scholars date to ca. 1000 B.C., are elaborate and imitate buildings, but do not show an apexed lid or pediments at the ends (Cook 1991). This provides some evidence that the two triangular architectural developments were linked in some way, but the triangle never appeared as a prominent element in Greek capital designs, such as in the Ionic, Doric and Corinthian orders.

The spiral, however, did appear in Classical Greek architecture, and it too had an older and wider regional context, as a significant and commonly used motif in the Minoan world. It was first adopted into the Egyptian artistic repertoire during the New Kingdom ‘international period’, when trans-Mediterranean trade
first became extensive. It was never part of the Egyptian canon during Old or Middle Kingdoms, but appeared frequently in New Kingdom tomb decoration. Spirals were a common decorative motif on Minoan Thera, at Knossos and at Mycenae, and ‘palace style’ amphorae and pithoi were often decorated with papyrus plants with elaborately spiralled leaves (Evans 1928: §54 Influence of Natural and Other Designs), perhaps indicative of contact with the Nile Delta region during that time (Figure 88).

The connections between history and art, relating to goddesses, cultural contact, regional geography and local flora and fauna, demonstrate that artistic and architectural motifs were not just decorative but were symbolically linked to the development of cultures and communities (Figure 12). The symbols were not passive signs, but were an integral and active part of the communities that produced them.

![Figure 12 Unique lotus form proto-Italic Limestone capital from Kition (Ohnefalsch-Richter 1893: CXCVII) (author's illustration)](image)

This section has summarised the state of the regional context as it was at the start of this PhD, however, my understanding of the meanings associated with these designs developed once the landscape contexts were taken into account.

Now that the significant historical movements have been summarised at the regional level, the following sections will show how the symbolism was expressed and employed at more localised scales.
4.2.2. Island level analysis: 200 x 100 km

The foundations of the city kingdom system of Cyprus were established at the end of the Bronze Age. The consolidation of communities in a few defended settlements at that time, mostly on the southern coast, foreshadowed the city kingdoms of the later Geometric and Archaic Periods (Steel 2004: 212). This occurred during the eleventh and tenth centuries, not later (Iacovou 2005b: 23). Seven city kingdoms were mentioned on the Assyrian stele of Sargon II found at Larnaka/Kition, while ten are listed by name in 673/672 B.C., during the reign of Esarhaddon (Iacovou 2005b: 24). Rupp has proposed up to 13 city kingdoms, and defined approximated limits for the territorial extents of each kingdom, however, these are only speculative and there is no evidence of fixed territorial divisions on the island from the Iron Age (Rupp 1989: 347) (Figure 13).

There have been many excavations and studies of Iron Age sites and society published by many of the most authoritative Cypriot archaeologists. A few of the more significant are referred to below:

- Cesnola 1870s Excavations of Iron Age tombs including at Amathus
- O-Richter 1890s Excavations of Tamassos Archaic sanctuary and other IA sites
- Murray 1900s British Museum excavations of IA sites, notably Salamis
- Gjerstad 1930s & 1940s Swedish Cyprus Expedition establishes IA chronology, many sites
- Westholm 1940 Studies of built tombs
- Catling 1950s Palaeapaphos tomb excavations
- Karageorghis 1960s Excavations of Salamis tombs
- Karageorghis 1970s Excavations of Kition temple and tombs
- Maier 1970s & 1980s Excavation of Palaeapaphos temple and ‘siege’ mound
- Christou 1980s Iron Age tombs
- Hadjisavvas 1980s Iron Age tombs at Kition
- Given 1990s Studies of city kingdoms and their symbolism
- Reyes 1990s Studies of Archaic Cyprus and inter-regional connections
- Steel 1990s & 2000s Studies of Iron Age city kingdoms and their material culture
- Rupp 1990s Studies of the emergence of IA city kingdoms, processual approach
- Wright 1990s Studies of Cypriot IA architecture, temples and tombs
- Hadjicosti 1990s Excavations at Idalion
- Hermary 1990s & 2000s The sanctuary of Aphrodite at Amathus and tombs
- Smith 2000s Excavations of iron age sanctuary, Ayios Irini
- Ulbrich 2000s Studies of Iron Age sanctuaries across the island
- Iacovou 2005 Urbanisation of city kingdoms
- Gaber 1990s & 2000s Excavations at Idalion, domestic quarters
- Counts 2010 Studies of Iron Age votive statues from sanctuaries

What constituted a typical Cypriot city kingdom, if there were one, and what level of communication existed between different city kingdoms and between the kingdoms and the hinterlands? The political institutions of the palace and the temple or sanctuary were common elements, although these are typically Phoenician as much as they are typically Cypriot (Aubet 1997: 128). Maier refers to the oriental priest-kings who ruled the kingdoms, often under the aegis of the Assyrians or Tyre in the case of Kition and Idalion (Maier 1989b; Maier 1989a). The position of high priest was generally hereditary and family hierarchies were maintained from the start. Rather than the island wide authority of a unitary state, the city kingdom system was a series
of territorial monarchies operating from capital settlements first established in the eleventh and tenth centuries B.C. (Iacovou 2005b). These emerged slowly from the remnants of the Bronze Age ‘rather than springing fully armed out of the head of Zeus’ on the arrival of the Assyrians on the Levant (Iacovou 2005b: 37).

A conceptual division between the lower town around the sheltered port and the sanctuary on the acropolis was a feature of Phoenician colonies (Markoe 2000: 68), and this seems to be reflected at Amathus. The Cypriot acropolises developed city walls during the Archaic Period (Balandier 2000). At Amathus the entire acropolis and the port were entirely surrounded by walls (Aupert 1996: 89), although the ones standing today mostly date from later periods. Like Kition, Amathus had a sheltered harbour cut into the coast line, although in the case of Kition the acropolis was only a handful of metres above the port. Differences in settlement populations and size are also of importance. The indications are that Salamis and Kition were in general larger and wealthier kingdoms than Amathus, although during the late Cypro-Archaic period Amathus was certainly a significant polity.

Metals such as silver, iron and of course copper were of particular importance to the economy of Cyprus (Burkert 1992: 11). Amathus, Tamassos, Marion, Soloi, Kition, Idalion and Salamis were all involved with the reprocessing of ore and the trade in copper. The fine silver bowl in the British Museum (CAM 11) is thought to have been manufactured in Amathus, and it attests to the skill of the Amathusian artisans. The Cesnola Sarcophagus and the fine ashlar-built tombs are certainly of indigenous manufacture, and attest to the sophistication of the Cypriot city kingdoms during the Cypro-Archaic period. In some respects the evidence suggests a higher level of sophistication than mainland Phoenician sites during the later Archaic Period,
although it is not clear if this is a result of the differential rates of survival due to the widespread destruction of archaeology in and around the mainland ports.

Despite the homogeneity of the ceramic material from the city kingdoms during the Geometric Period (Gjerstad 1979: 251; Iacovou 2005b: 29), the most notable aspect of this level of multiscalar study during the Archaic Period was that it was not particularly enlightening from a historical or archaeological standpoint. The island as an independent entity is mostly relevant to modern political and academic conceptual structures whereas in the past, while the inhabitants were clearly aware that Cyprus was an island, it was of little practical relevance to the people of Archaic Amathus who had a primarily sea orientated outlook. The Troodos Mountains and hilly terrain of Cyprus outside the Mesaoria Plain could be traversed by foot or on horseback, but these obstacles served primarily as barriers to communication rather than facilitating transport.

Reyes arrived at a similar conclusion regarding the benefits of studying the relations between city kingdom in his chapter on Cypro-Archaic internal communications (Reyes 1994: 101-121 & 153). This negative finding is nevertheless a finding, and so it is a useful conclusion to be drawn from the multiscalar analysis, and will be assessed with respect to the methodology at the end of the chapter.

The main languages spoken in the city kingdoms were Arcado-Cypriot Greek, Phoenician, and possibly an undeciphered language referred to as Eteocypriot, although the existence and nature of the latter has been disputed (Given 1998; Steele 2009). The script used during the Iron Age was similar to the Cypro-Minoan script used during the Cypriot Bronze Age, and during the Iron Age it was used to write Greek as well as the undeciphered Eteocypriot writing, mainly from Amathus. When used during the Iron Age, this is known as Cypro-syllabic script. The Phoenician alphabet was also used on the island at this time.

The language and ethnicity of the Amathusians, and the existence or otherwise of Eteocypriots at Amathus has been hotly discussed in recent decades (Maier 1985; Given 1998; Petit 1999; Leriou 2002; Steele 2009), but whatever the true answers to the linguistic questions posed, the Cypriots did not develop the extensive record keeping of centralised bureaucracies, either in the Bronze Age or the Iron Age (Iacovou 2005b: 21). The island followed some of the same regional cultural developmental patterns as larger neighbours on the mainland but it did so in its own, rather more rural and perhaps ‘old fashioned’ ways. The Cypro-syllabic script, for example, became more widely used just as the Greek script (developed out of its Phoenician predecessors) was beginning to flourish around the Aegean. Sherratt notes that the Cypro-syllabic script in some ways reflects the older cuneiform styles of writing (Sherratt 2003: 277), with impressed forms rather than the lapidary forms of the Greek and Phoenicians which could be scratched out rapidly on stone or metal, or the cursive writing of ink on papyrus being introduced from the Nile. This is one of the first signs that although Cyprus existed within a regional context, it did retain some unique variety, and perhaps an insular identity of its own.

Cyprus also has a unique geological background which is worth summarising at this analytical level as it influenced the culture of the island quite directly. Cyprus is also a meeting place between continents. The mountain ranges of Cyprus are volcanic fold-mountains, formed by the collision of the Eurasian and African tectonic plates, to the north and south, which began around 90 million years B.P. As the plates collided, the African plate was subducted down below Cyprus, back into the mantle, while the Eurasian plate was pushed and folded up, and magma escaped along the intersection zone forming the Troodos range. As the plates continued to come together, a secondary episode further north in the Eurasian plate produced the Kyrenia range, while further activity at the intersection with the African plate produced the Mamonia Zone to the
south, with its complex and highly deformed geological outcrops. This continues to produce seismic instability to date.

Cyprus is now the third largest Mediterranean island, with a surface area of 9,251 sq. km. The island is divided into four main geological zones; The Pentadaktylos (Kyrenia) zone (n), the Troodos ophiolite complex (central w), the Mammonea zone of outcrops in the Paphos area (sw), and the zone of autochthonous sedimentary rocks (Mesaoria and southern foothills of Troodos) (Figure 14).

The mountain ranges are of volcanic rock formed from magma and crust and reaching up to Mount Olympus at 1,952m, while the periphery of the Troodos area is characterized by pillow lavas which formed around the edge of the magma formations. This is where copper and other valuable ores are found, and so the geology of Cyprus has a very direct link to its history, economy and culture.

Due to fractures in the hard mountain rock, cracks radiating down the valleys from the central range also serve as aquifers, feeding subterranean water from the perennial rivers of the mountains, down under the alluvial plains of Paphos, Akrotiri and east and west Mesaoria. The Mesaoria plain itself is alluvial and based on sedimentary rock that formed on the sandy sea floor of the ancient Mediterranean, before the whole island was raised up due to the tectonic plate impacts and resulting uplift. Similarly, the southern Troodos foothills and the mountains above Amathus are partly sedimentary rock from the ancient seabed, uplifted by the volcanic rock further north. This process was complete by around 2Ma B.P, at the end of the Pleistocene (cf. Republic of Cyprus, Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources and Environment Geological Survey Department website).

Figure 14 Main geological zones and significant LBA and IA sites near Amathus (author’s illustration)
4.2.3. Kingdom level analysis: 20 x 10 km

Working with satellite photographs, maps, GPS and documentary sources, I studied the landscape around Amathus in summer 2009. The main natural features were recorded and the main settlement choice factors were investigated and analysed.

The hill on which Amathus sits and the foothills immediately north of Amathus are ancient seabed, uplifted at the end of the Pleistocene. The mountains 2 to 4kms further north constituted an interface zone between this ancient seabed and the magma and crust being forced up from below to form the Troodos range. This interface zone is where the pillow lavas and their copper ore deposits were formed, and some of these deposits fall within the ‘kingdom level’ zone of this study. The Platies Mine shown (Figure 15) was worked in Antiquity, and into the 20th century until 1965, by which time a total of 45,000 tons of ore had been extracted. The modern ore is relatively low grade (1%). It is difficult to establish what quality of ore was available in Antiquity as higher grade ore would have been extracted preferentially. The Late Bronze Age site of Kalavasos, located 15.4 km east of Amathus in the Vasilikos River valley, was certainly a centre of the copper industry. In the mountains that flank the valley, 7km north of Kalavasos, there is another area of disused copper mines, and so the copper industry was present in the mountains around Amathus (Todd 2004: 6).

As well as copper, there are useful agricultural resources in the area. The Akrotiri aquifer to the west of Amathus and the coastal plain at Limassol provided extensive high quality agrarian land, and there is a smaller cultivated area directly to the north of the acropolis, running along behind the coastal mounds of Amathus and its two neighbouring hills. In addition, the Vasilikos valley to the east has high quality agrarian land. Amathus is positioned between these two areas, and it is notable that other city kingdom sites on the coasts also seem to be at the end of coastal plains, such as Paphos and Kourion, rather than positioned at central locations. This phenomenon is also seen on the mainland at sites such as at Yumuktepe at Mersin, which is at the western limit of the Cilician Plain. It may be then that Amathus was strategically positioned at

![Diagram of kingdom level area of study 20km by 10km. Copper mines at north of area covered (author's illustration)](image-url)
this location to guard one or both of the coastal plains from travellers moving along the coast. Another aspect of the site that suggests defence and vigilance is the good visibility coverage from the site. Viewshed analysis demonstrates the very effective strategic location of Amathus for overseeing coastal traffic arriving from both the west and the east by land and by sea (Figure 16). In addition, the coastal agricultural land on the east side of the Akrotiri Peninsula is visible from the acropolis, and so the evidence suggests that Amathus was guarding those lands, as well as serving as a port and point of access to the copper ores in the mountains. Some of the peaks of the mountains containing the ores are visible from the acropolis, as are shown by the red triangles below.

The attributes of the site location are fundamentally different to the Late Bronze Age sites in the area, such as Kalavasos Ayios Dhimitrios, which was built on low lying flat land at the lowest point in the valley, and Alassa, which was built at an elevated position, but many kilometres from the coast. This indicates a fundamentally different culture with fundamentally different priorities, as will be discussed in Chapters 7 and 8. As usual on Cyprus, water was important at Amathus, and there is evidence of an aqueduct system that brought water from springs in the foothills to the base of the acropolis, as well as oversized water containers and cisterns.

Amathus was not inhabited before the Iron Age, but earlier Neolithic and Bronze Age tombs demonstrate that the wider area was populated to some extent. Iacovou describes Iron Age Amathus as a site with ‘no prehistory’ (Iacovou 1994: 155).
4.2.4. Settlement level analysis: 2 x 1 km

At this level the investigation became substantially ground-based with intensive site field walking and recording of architectural and natural features. Documentary sources were also referenced extensively. The settlement of Amathus was based around an acropolis where the temple of Aphrodite was built (Figure 17). The temple was constructed during the Hellenistic Period, while a small sanctuary area was first established and used during the Archaic Period at that location (1). A palace and gateway were constructed as early as CGIII (Hermary 1999: 55) further down the slope (2), and a defensive wall was added across the whole southern slope during the CAII (Balandier 2000). The acropolis summit is ca. 75-80m above sea level, and sits between two lower and less well defined hills, one of 55m in height to the west and another, Vikles Hill, of 65m to the east.

The field work did not include any intrusive or destructive excavation, but was based on intensive semi-systematic field walking of the landscape, resulting in a limited number of more focussed individual building/structure surveys that will be described in the next level of the multiscalar analysis. The intension was not to target any specific ‘thing’ in the landscape. The exercise allowed the process to act as a catalyst towards developing a better understanding of the context in which the material culture was produced, used and found, thus allowing an understanding of the meanings carried by the material culture in the past to develop. The objective was to appreciate the ‘cultural landscape’ as well as the physical topography.

![Figure 17](image-url) Plan of the area around the acropolis and temple of Aphrodite at Amathus (author’s diagram)

The intensive field walking of Amathus took place in June 2009. The first conclusion that became clear during the field walking was that Amathus is not an Iron Age settlement. It is a multi-period settlement. The cultural landscape is a palimpsest of evidence of human activity, evidenced by Neolithic flint tool fragments and 21st century tourist waste alike. The earliest evidence of the Iron Age settlement, however, comes from the
earliest of the tombs in the west necropolis, Tomb 521 (Figure 17). This contained many vessels dating to CGI, the later half of the 11th century B.C., 1050-1000 B.C., or the first half of the tenth century B.C., 1000-950 B.C. (Iacovou 1994: 155). The vessels include juglets decorated with moulded bulls and goddesses, made of the typical White Painted I Cypro-Geometric pottery, and very similar in material and decoration to items found across the island (Figure 91) and across the region. These types of symbols are thought to be characteristic of vessels used in libation rituals (Dothan 1982: 222), and so it is reasonable to assume that the female figures on these juglets represent fertility goddesses. A very close comparanda was found in tomb 76 at Palaepaphos Skales; item no. 114 (Karageorghis 1981: 118). The designs include several hatched and chequered triangle motifs, and a box-pyxis (similar in form to a small ossuary) decorated with a tree motif CAM17 (Karageorghis and Iacovou 1990: 85); possibly the earliest tree of life motif to be recorded from Amathus (Karageorghis and Iacovou 1990: PIXI)(Figure 18). Iacovou considers that the community that built this tomb belonged to a nascent settlement that had been moved to Amathus deliberately (Iacovou 1994: 156) and according to plan from somewhere else. This concords with Hermary’s observations that ancient texts recording that Amathus was founded by Paphian relations of Kinyras, the traditional, semi-mythical, ruler of Bronze Age Cyprus, may be based in fact (Hermary 1999: 58).

Despite the similarities in the assemblages, it should be noted that the architectural style of these early tombs differs substantially from the architecture of the tombs at Palaepaphos Skales, but their form may be a function of their construction location, down near the shore in a zone of sandy rubble where deeper rock cut tombs could not be built (Figure 17), rather than an indicator of different cultural practices.

Any archaeological study of Amathus is greatly facilitated by the range of high quality publications available. After Cesnola’s first rather confusing records of his excavations, when the famous Classical Period sarcophagus was recovered, many tombs in the eastern and western necropolises were excavated by the British Museum team (Murray et al. 1900: 81-126). The Swedish Cyprus Expedition excavated more tombs in the western necropolis in April-May 1930, and published these in SCE, Vol II text, from pages 1 to 141 (Gjerstad et al. 1935b). Most of these were in a field of tombs known as Loures tous Anemous about 400m to the west of the acropolis, thus named because the shore is so exposed by the south winds (Gjerstad et al. 1935b: 4)(marked Anemos Tombs on diagram). Ceramics recovered from the tombs are listed numerically according to Gjerstad’s chronology and typology, which provided a useful basis from which to work from,
although some adjustments have been proposed and made in recent publications (Figure 1). The range and quality of the volumes relating to the acropolis is also excellent, and additional tombs were excavated in both necropoleis. Six separate volumes published the results of the excavations of the tombs uncovered during the construction of new roads and hotels to the west of Amathus. These excavations were joint projects of the École Francaise d’Athènes and the Cypriot Department of Antiquities. Tomb 521 was published as part of those excavations (Hermary 1981; Aupert and Hellman 1984; Laffineur 1986; Karageorghis et al. 1987a; Karageorghis et al. 1987b; Karageorghis et al. 1989; Karageorghis et al. 1991; Hermary 2000; Hermary and Fourrier 2006). More recent analysis of the Geometric and Archaic period tombs includes the recent PhD study by Sarah Janes of the University of Glasgow (Janes 2008). This provided comprehensive information about the pottery assemblages and the chronologies assigned to the tombs during the late Cypro-Geometric. Annual papers reporting the excavations appeared in the BCH, volumes 105/1980, 106/1981 and BCH 130 (2006). Pierre Aupert also published an excellent guide book devoted to Amathus that drew on the information gathered from the excavations (Aupert 1996).

After the early evidence from ten tombs in close chronological and geographical proximity to Tomb 521 (Hermary 1999: 57), there is a ‘massive outburst’ of CGII-III burial groups, dating 950-750 B.C. In this period 17 tombs were built in the west necropolis and nine in the east acropolis, and the imported material in these tombs has been interpreted as demonstrating that Amathus was a port of call on the Euboean to Tyre trade route (Coldstream 1988: 43) that passed along the southern coast of the island.

Figure 19 GPS tracks recording some of the intensive field walking routes and waypoints. Note important access route between acropolis and hill to west (author’s diagram, satellite photography courtesy Google Earth)

These documents and excavations provide extensive background, but only intensive field walking allowed the information to be put in context. The area of 2 million square metres or 200 hectares was covered over a fortnight in June 2009 (Figure 19). Return visits were made to the site in the summer months of 2010 and 2011 to revisit particular aspects of interest.
At this level it was possible to appreciate why Amathus was chosen as a location to develop a new settlement. At the most fundamental level this was a practical choice; and it was not solely based on the availability of a port. Firstly, there is good agricultural land, still in use, behind the acropolis, and a significant water channel running between the acropolis and the hill to the west that allows crops to be grown on the land. The elevated land of the acropolis is also easily defended, with cliffs and extremely obstructive thorny plants around the north, west and east sides. It is possibly that these thorny plants were deliberately cultivated at these peripheral areas for their obstructive/defensive characteristics, as they require much less effort to put in place than solid walls, yet impede movement across the landscape. The acropolis provides excellent visibility to the south, east and west, as the viewshed demonstrated, and panorama photographs were obtained to examine this aspect. The agricultural land behind the acropolis cannot be seen from the sea and is protected from the coastal winds, and so it is strategically well placed.

![Figure 20 Bronze Age chamber tomb in hilltop west of Amathus acropolis. Hole 0.6m wide (author’s photograph)](image)

Although Leriou considers that there is no evidence of occupation in the area before the Iron Age, the tops of the hills along the coast here are peppered with chamber tombs and caves that may date back to the Bronze Age or before (Hermary and Fourrier 2006: 22). They resemble those found elsewhere on the island, such as those found at Souskiou Laona, which were also cut into the summit of a small hill and which date to the Chalcolithic Period. During the fieldwalking the hilltops to the east and west of the acropolis were included in the survey. The adjacent hilltops may give some idea of what the acropolis summit looked like before the period of permanent occupation commenced. The chamber tombs and caves on these hills would have provided excellent temporary shelter and a commanding position in the landscape, and similar caves and old tombs may have provided the first focal points for ritual activity on the acropolis at Amathus.

On the summit of the acropolis, Hermary considers that this is precisely what happened, where a cult was established and practiced focussing on a tomb which had been refilled with material dating to CAI (Hermary 1994; Hermary 1999: 56). This has been putatively identified as the tomb of Ariane (Aupert 1996: 130).

One final aspect of the settlement level landscape proved to be significant, and this is the verdant gorge running through between the acropolis and its neighbour to the west (Figure 19). This is still the route through which many of the paths through the landscape pass. It concentrates and conducts the local
hydrology (surface water when rain falls as well as sub-surface water) through between the hills to the sea. This route is now dammed to extract all the water for agriculture, but it still provides an access route from the port and the sea to the agricultural land behind the acropolis. The significance of this type of feature is discussed later during the Palaepaphos case study (6.2.4), and its appearance as a decorative landscape feature on LBA/early IA ceramics is proposed in (8.3), LCIIIIB/CGI.
4.2.5. Quarter level area analysis: 200 x 100 m

At this level of the study the tombs in the necropolises were initially targeted as having potentially diagnostic value, but in fact their architecture is relatively simple, most of the standing structures date to later periods and my Masters level study that preceded this work has already investigated these extensively (Lightbody 2008a). The assemblages from the tombs around Amathus have been removed and that material is addressed in the artefact level analysis. There was little of immediate value in the necropolises with respect to the tree of life iconography, and the tombs are therefore not addressed in this section.

The material recovered from the acropolis has provided the most significant information about regular ritual activity rather than rituals associated with the afterlife.

A ceramic deposit (left of (Figure 21) label C) found near the palace building contained fragments dating to CGIA, around 1050-1000 B.C., but the remains of the sanctuary, like the tomb mentioned above, date to the Cypro-Archaic Period. This was when Amathus really began to expand. The Archaic remains on the acropolis have been detailed on the plan below, and the later architectural structures have been removed for clarity (Figure 21). One of the objectives of the field walking was to study these early features.

![Figure 21 Acropolis summit 200m x 100m rectangle (grey) and 50 x 30m area detail with CG and CA features noted including the giant limestone bowl at arrow 3 (author’s diagram derived from (Hermary and Fourrier 2006))](image)

While the Archaic structural remains in this location were much less substantial than those of the Hellenistic period, they may have constituted the spiritual centre of the ancient city kingdom and may have survived for this reason. At this location is a grotto cave (photo arrow 1 (Figure 21) and (Figure 23) left) that was filled
with decorated ceramic vessels and walled off at the end of CAII. 10m to the west of the grotto, two perpendicular rows of slotted stones lead up to a sacrificial altar and may constitute the remains of an enclosure, perhaps for a sacred tree and sacrificial animals (photo arrow 2 (Figure 23) right). A giant bowl (photo arrow 3 (Figure 22)) provides the most visible site marker and it may have provided a practical function as a water container, holding 6000 litres for the sanctuary. Hermary estimates that this bowl dates from ca. 650-600 B.C. (Hermary and Fourrier 2006: 28); the start of CAII (Figure 22).

The plan (Figure 21) shows the positions of these three main features at this location, and the directions of the photographs taken of these are those of the arrows marked 1, 2 and 3 (Figure 22) and (Figure 23).

The identification of the importance of these features was only achieved due to the systematic approach taken towards understanding the landscape, and recognition of the fundamental importance of the summits of the elevated land. Other notable parts of the acropolis that show evidence of archaic construction are the palace, two towers on the defensive wall further down the hillside, perhaps flanking the Archaic entrance,

Figure 22 Early CAII vase with bull and tree decorated handles on the acropolis at Amathus (replica). Arrow view direction 3 in diagram (Figure 21) above (author’s photograph)
4.2.6. Individual structure level analysis: 20 x 10 m

The individual ‘structures’ constituting the archaic shrine on the acropolis are shown below and they fall within the 20m x 10m rectangle shown (Figure 21). The cave on the left is known as the ‘grotto’, and it was walled off at the end of CAII and remained sealed until uncovered during the French excavations. The material found there had not been disturbed since it was deposited and so it was in a secure archaeological context.

Figure 23 The Archaic features: grotto arrow view direction 1 in (Figure 21) left, remaining angled foundation walls of sacrificial enclosure arrow view direction 2 right (large wall is later) (author’s photographs)

The second significant feature of this area was the small altar with slotted rows of stones leading up to it. These have also been dated to the Cypro-Archaic period, and may have constituted an enclosure and/or where votive steles were erected (Reyes 1994: 39), bearing the tree of life. Several such proto-Aeolic capitals/steles are currently in the Limassol Museum, although their exact find locations have never been recorded. These votive capitals were not just architectural features, but were dedicated in sanctuaries and necropolises. The proximity of this feature to the bothros cave may not have been by chance, as will be discussed. The altar was also a significant feature of this area, and sacrifice is known to have been a significant aspect of Phoenician religion (Markoe 2000: 135) and also Greek. Fourier suspects that an early archaic cult that developed around the tomb to the north was later elaborated at this new grotto and sanctuary (Hermary and Fourrier 2006: 23). The material in the grotto assemblage is therefore associated with the cult.

The identification of the importance of this area of the acropolis, and a growing appreciation that the features, and the material they contained, were all related to each other, allowed an analysis of their significance and an interpretation of the meanings they carried to take place. The interpretation section of this chapter will discuss these meanings, while the section that follows will look at individual artefacts from these features that carried the tree of life.
4.2.7. Artefact level analysis: 2 x 1m or less

The artefacts from Amathus have been compiled into a catalogue in appendix 10.4 and an interactive online interface that allows rapid access and comparison of all of the information, photographs and maps to take place. All artefacts from Amathus are designated a CAM - - reference number.

This was the smallest physical scale context of the case study and it included all of the individual artefacts that carry the tree or flower of life from Amathus from the periods in question, whether or not they are from a known specific provenance or not. The material from specific contexts, however, was given priority and proved to be more useful than material with no context, as information on how the material was used contributed to a developing understanding of meanings being expressed.

![Figure 24 AM1554 / CAM12 White painted amphora with tree of life and bull motifs (author’s illustration)](image)

The ancient Cypro-Archaic grotto (Figure 23) excavated in 1987/1988 on top of the acropolis gave the first indication of the way in which the tree or flower of life may have been used and understood at the time. What was found there was votive material bearing the tree or flower, deliberately buried in the soil in the cave, close to the foundations of the later temple. Vessels decorated with typical motifs were made locally, brought up the hill to the shrine or sanctuary, offered to the goddess and were later interred in the soil of the sacred area. Fragments of several vessels were found in the cave including the pieces of a large white painted amphora or amphoroid crater that have been reconstructed in part and are now on display in the Limassol Museum (AM1554 – CAM12) (Figure 24).

The reconstructed fragments show a prominent scene with the tree of life in a typical Archaic form being challenged or worshiped by a bull with its horns lowered. The meanings of this scene were at first not particularly clear to me, and the composition did not seem to be particularly unusual, resembling older precursor arrangements from the Late Bronze Age (Figure 27). Understanding the context in which AM1554 was used, however, throws light on the rituals that were observed at Amathus and the ways in which these motifs were understood and used.

The act of planting this material decorated with the tree of the goddess, on the summit of the hill, is reminiscent of the replanting of a flower or a tree. Caves are known to have been associated with the
goddess (Markoe 2000: 125), and so it would have been an appropriate place to inter material bearing the motif. Repeated visits and the ritual deposition of votive offerings in this way would have reinforced the impression that this was a special place, and the home of the goddess, and perhaps the place where a sacred tree grew. The ‘planting’ of trees of life in the foundations of the sanctuary and the later temple is a powerful symbolic act.

![Figure 25 Handle of the giant limestone bowl on summit of acropolis. Inscription around handle (CAM2) (author’s photograph)](image)

Two huge solid limestone bowls were placed nearby to the east, and support a proposition that this part of the acropolis hill was considered the most sacred point in the landscape of the city kingdom (Figure 22). Only one survived intact (CAM2) and has been replaced by a replica.

Common themes are seen in the iconography of both the large amphoroid crater AM1554 (CAM12) and the giant bowl (Figure 25). Both are large vessels; both carry short inscriptions; both were decorated with trees or flowers of life as well as with bulls. The upper shoulder fragments of the large amphoroid crater AM1554 were recovered from the cave. The crater shows a bull with lowered head pointing its horns at a tree or flower of life. On the elaborate handles of the giant bowls we see a similar set of symbols, with the bulls in a similar posture albeit less threatening, while the trees of life are more formal that the version shown on the crater. The similarity is nevertheless striking, even to the extent that both are vessels for carrying liquids, most likely water or wine. Female hydrophoroi or water carriers are known to have formed a significant part of Phoenician temple rituals, offering ritual libations (Markoe 2000: 122), and so for these vessels to carry a similar set of motifs seemed significant.

Considering the bull motif in more detail proved useful. Bucranial shrines were typical of Bronze Age Cyprus, whereas during the Iron Age statuettes of priests wearing bull head masks were common (Karageorghis 1971). Protomes made from shaped skulls forming masks with real horns have been found at other temple sites on Cyprus, in contexts alongside offerings to Astarte (Karageorghis 1971: 262). Cults and rituals associated with bulls took place all around the ancient Mediterranean (Figure 27). The earliest public open
air sanctuary or ‘high place’, dating to the 12th century B.C. from ancient Israel, near Dothan, is in fact known as the ‘Bull Site’ because a well preserved bronze bull statue of Anatolian style was found there (Dever 2005: 136). Dever also notes that the principal epithet of the god in 14th and 13th century B.C. texts from Ugarit is ‘Bull-El’, and that a similar figurine was found at Hazor in a 14th century ‘Canaanite’ context. The significance of the bull was therefore recognised. CAI tomb 521 already discussed, included juglets decorated with the bull, a goddess carrying a water vessel, a tree and the central geometric triangle motif.

The central triangle motif also appears on two proto-Aeolic capitals or steles from Amathus (CAM30, CAM31). The significance of the triangle has already been discussed, and here the more Phoenician symbol of the full and crescent moon is shown inside the triangle, emphasising the connection with the goddess. These date to the sixth century B.C. and have no detailed provenance. The erection of votive steles decorated with the tree of life above the cave where the fragments of votive vessels bearing the tree were ‘planted’, however, would have been a powerful symbolical act and metaphor for the establishment of a city cult centred on a sanctuary. The way in which the steles at Amathus are depicted, as versions of the earlier Levantine precursors but with new outgrowths, still attached to the older triangles below, also has potential symbolic significance. This metaphorical aspect is discussed in Chapters 7 and 8.

Bothroi were generally used as to redeposit excess temple votive statues and offerings, and are sometimes referred to as favissae (Markoe 2000: 123). In this case, however, the grotto is quite a substantial cave and does not seem to have been simply a pit or trench cut to store temple clutter. Caves and natural caverns were typically associated with the goddess Astarte and it is likely that this cave on the summit of the hill is part of the cult location that formed a focus for the later temple site (Hermary and Fourrier 2006: 22).

Other ceramic vessels and fragments from Amathus show the tree of life and flowers of life in various forms, from extreme Geometric styles (CAM17), to elaborately arranged but incongruous Archaic styles (CAMS & CAM6), to more hybridised later Archaic forms (CAM19, 24, 25, 26). The evolution of the iconography over time is discussed in more depth in the final discussion Chapter 8, but the general changes follow a sequence where the austere and homogeneous geometric style was quite suddenly influenced by colourful and elaborate Phoenician designs at the start of the Archaic Period. By the end of the Archaic Period the styles had been successfully reconciled, and hybridised into more balanced forms.
Notable metal items from Amathus that incorporated tree of life motifs include the fine repoussé plate or bowl, a shield boss and gold funerary diadem pieces, demonstrating the developed metal crafting skills present in Archaic Amathus (CAM 11, 16, 20, 21, 22, 23). The plates or bowls (Figure 93), which were probably created as tribute for the Assyrians, are discussed in more detail in Chapter 8 (Markoe 1985).

The final indigenous development of significance at Amathus is the appearance of many Hathor head stone capitals and as ceramic decorative motifs, during the sixth century B.C. These attest to the rapprochement between Egypt and the Aegean at the time that involved Cyprus. They may also be related to the copper industry which was present on the Sinai and near Amathus (CAM7, 8, 9, 32) and which was traditionally overseen by Hathor (see Al-Ahram issue 936), mistress of turquoise and copper.

Imported vessels also include many of the ‘wild goat’ style, characteristic of the east Aegean and Rhodian Archaic Period (CAM34 – CA37), again attesting to westward connections.

The final artefact of note is an Archaic amphora CAM38 with a motif that recalls the concepts identified as significant during this first case study (Figure 28). The central panel of the vessel is decorated with a motif of
trees growing out of a mound. This is clearly supportive of a proposal where vessels bearing the sacred tree were deliberately planted in the summit of the acropolis. The steles and perhaps a real tree may have grown up at that sacred point in the landscape and the topography. This mound form is similar to many other significant examples that are discussed in the following chapters of this study, and its meanings are drawn out of the contexts.

This concludes the brief survey of the most relevant artefacts from Amathus. Full details of the selected artefacts are given in the appendix 10.4. The next section will now discuss the material within its various multiscalar contexts and conceptual structures.
Analysis of the evidence led to a hypothesis that the material was being used in a particular way with respect to the landscape, in a way which expressed the underlying metaphorical structures that were being followed.

The initial hypothesis was that summits of hills were particularly significant, that the caves and tombs were associated with the goddess, and that the bull motif was somehow related to the tree of life in a particularly significant way. The cult also utilised various vessels that contained the all-important libation water for tending sacred trees in the sanctuary, as well as providing potable water storage for those tending the cult (Markoe 2000: 122).

The sanctuary on the acropolis was centred on a typical Astarte cave. It also resembles typical Phoenician and Israelite high places, or *bama*, known from the Old Testament (Jeremiah 2:20)(Markoe 2000: 126), which were enclosed areas around a cultic altar or shrine or baetyl. Parallels exist from places as significant as Jerusalem, where ‘Cave 1’ just south of the Temple Mount, excavated by Kenyon in the 1960s, yielded 1200 pottery vessels, and dozens of zoomorphic and female figurines. This is considered to have served a cultic purpose as a shrine or chapel, and was not simply a favissa for storing ritually pure temple objects (Dever 2005: 155). The date of the Jerusalem cave is late seventh century B.C., so is comparable in date to the time when the cave in Amathus was sealed.

The grotto was originally a natural cave hollowed out of the crumbly limestone on the summit (Hermary and Fourrier 2006: 22). Once this had been filled with material over the Cypro-Archaic I and II periods, it was walled off and closed right at the end of the sixth century B.C. The sanctuary was subsequently sacked and destroyed at the same time as the palace was sacked, probably in the years that followed the failed Ionian Revolt. Later Hellenistic and Roman temples were subsequently built adjacent to and around this area on the summit of the hill, but not directly over the grotto or the remains of the adjacent sacrificial altar area.

Enough remnants of the Cypro-Archaic Period have survived to allow the cult observed here to be reconstructed to some extent. The area includes the walled off grotto cave, the sacrificial altar area with its own small bothros cache, two rows of shaped rectilinear stones with slots, some curved dug out channels perhaps for libation waters, and the raised area which included the giant Archaic bowls. The sacrificial altar has survived as it was later rebuilt into a nearby wall.

By considering the individual artefacts within their wider archaeological and historical contexts and within the cultural landscape it is possible to reconstruct a narrative that describes the ways in which the material bearing the tree of life was understood and used by the ancient people who lived in and visited Amathus.

Ideas of fertility and rebirth predominate. Astarte is in part a fertility goddess. The tree or flower of life is shown alongside the scarab beetle Kheper on the plate from Amathus (CAM11) and lotus flowers appear frequently (CAM7, CAM10, CAM31). Lotus flowers were associated with life and the water on which they grew, Kheper was associated with solar rebirth in Egypt while the ugly and bestial god Bes, who also appears, was associated with fertility. The ideas of fertility and rebirth fit well within a metaphorical structure where the tree of life was associated with the new colony and its sanctuary, and also with the funerary traditions, necropolises and tombs, where a belief in an afterlife was expressed. The symbol of the bull must also be considered within this context. Bes and the bull are clearly male symbols rather than being manifestations of the goddess and so the male/female symbols may act as a binary pair.
As well as being associated with the goddess, trees were important symbols for the craft workers of the time and this may have extended to all crafts rather than just crafts using wood directly. The Sidonians were reputed to have been the master lumberjacks of their age (Gunter 2009: 158), while on Cyprus the additional pressure of fuel required for the industrial smelting of copper would have increased the value of wood and trees. Recent studies related to TAESP survey area north of the Troodos Mountains suggest that during the Archaic period the pressure on wood supplies was so high that Spiny Burnet was used extensively as a fuel for smelting (Unwin 2013).

While Amathus seems to have been founded by Cypriots, it interacted with the Phoenicians extensively from the start of the Archaic Period. The deportation policies of the Assyrians resulted in Levantine skills being taken back to the Assyrian homelands, but it would also have contributed to a movement westwards to escape the oppressive and disruptive policies. Skilled artisans were in demand. Craft workers educated in useful ‘Tekhnai’ would have been capable of relocating themselves, and communities such as Athens actively sought to attract skilled workers (Burkert 1992: 11 - 23). The Assyrian military and political pressure from the east, and the resulting mobility of artisans was an enduring characteristic of the eighth through sixth centuries B.C., and the influence of this must be taken into consideration when interpreting the meanings expressed through the symbolism of the material culture of the time. The accelerated development of Amathus during this period must be related to this regional context.

The landscape, material and motifs then seem to be evidencing an eastern Mediterranean sanctuary cult, centred on a prominent hill, and utilising motifs of trees, bulls, goddesses, flowers and triangles, as well as more identifiable Egyptianising themes later in the Archaic Period. This structured set of ideas centred on a cult of fertility that was related to the establishment and maintenance of the fertility and the health of the community. This cult was centred on a tree. The deliberate nature of the establishment of Amathus as a new settlement, and the metaphor of plantation does suggest allusion to an ideology of colonisation. As well as being related to Cyprus and possibly stemming from Palaepaphos, elements of Amathus clearly indicate associate with maritime merchant ritual activity.

Finally, returning to the intensive landscape survey, the field walking methodology yielded one of the most notable discoveries of the project; a surface find that provided supporting information about the ritual deposition of votive objects at the sanctuary. The artefact proved to be a small limestone throne with figures of sphinxes flanking the sides. As the heads of the beasts are missing it is assumed that they were sphinxes based on typical comparanda known from elsewhere (Markoe 2000: 123), including most significantly, the full size throne of Astarte at Eshmun in Sidon. The throne at Eshmun also has winged sphinxes supporting the sides, also missing their heads. In biblical archaeology and based on biblical texts they are known as cherubim or cherubs (Dever 2005: 165). This small limestone statuette was found on the collapsed rubble fill of the defensive wall on the southern slope below the acropolis. The statuette was given to the French team who were working on the Acropolis towards the end of the field walking project, and it was incorporated into their artefact recording and processing system as artefact AM-3437 or CAM1 in this study.

A similar but larger figurine has been recovered from the east necropolis, but none have been found on the acropolis itself. The find location of this example is significant, as these statuettes were often offered as votives at Phoenician temples. The image of a throne supported by winged sphinxes, or lions, represented the emplacement of the deity (Markoe 2000: 123), and while they were often associated with Astarte or the ‘lion lady’ (Dever 2005: 166) they were offered empty, perhaps as it was not considered proper to produce
an image of the goddess, just as the aniconic baetyls served as a ‘home of the gods’ rather than as images of the gods themselves (Markoe 2000: 125).

This sort of ritual activity was probably part of the appropriation of Phoenician places by way of association with home ports, particularly Sidon (Aubet 1997: 130). The placement of these thrones signifies the placement and maintenance of the goddess at the new site, but may also associate the new site with the home of the visitor on the mainland.

This limestone throne is not a tree of life, but it did act as a catalyst for studying the rituals and beliefs of the inhabitants of Amathus in the local landscape and in the surrounding regions, and as a catalyst for discussing the rituals and beliefs carried out by the local inhabitants and visitors. In researching this piece in more depth it became apparent that many figurines had been found in the remains of ancient Amathus, excavated by the French team (Hermary 2000), particularly around the fortified entrance through the defensive wall into the sanctuary area of the acropolis. Many broken pieces were found alongside cinders demonstrating the use of fire offerings with statuettes to the goddess. This votive was probably originally deposited around the entrance to the sanctuary, rather than on the top of the acropolis, and was then reused as fill for the defensive wall. Other sites from Cyprus, notably Idalion (Gaber 2008), provide evidence that statuettes associated with gods and goddesses were deliberately reused in defensive temenos walls. This attests to a widespread superstitious ritual belief that the artefacts and the gods and goddesses they contained would provide strength to the walls, and provide sacred protection for the buildings and the people that lived behind the walls.

Reused material, often architectural, particularly when displayed in certain fashions, is properly referred to as ‘spolia’. Studies of spolia and the processes of reuse have been made, as it is a common and widespread phenomenon (Papalexandrou 2003; Kinney 2006; Gaber 2008: 60). The bulk of the defensive wall at the section where the statuette was found dates to the Late Roman period, and so the re-use of material at that time has no direct relevance to the study of the much earlier Cypro-Archaic period, but it serves as a reminder of the continuity of use at the site through multiple phases of occupation, and that memories of earlier periods can cross the modern and often arbitrary chronological subdivisions of periods imposed on the past.

A Phoenician dedicatory inscription from Idalion, found by Ohnefalsch-Richter in 1887 built into the walls of the nearby medieval chapel of Agios Giorgios, and now displayed on the wall of the new Idalion Museum, is of particular interest in illustrating the use of spolia as well as the underlying beliefs of inhabitants of the city kingdoms. Dating to between 479-449 B.C., it states that in “The month merpa’in in year III of his reign Baalmalek, king of Kition and Idalion, gave and dedicated this temenos wall, on behalf of Azbaal, son of
Baalmalek, king of Kition to his lady Anat, because she heard.” (Museum artefact number MA16). This is significant and relevant to Amathus as it shows the importance of dedicating walls, rather than buildings as would be more familiar to us today. The integrity and strength of defensive walls was of utmost importance in the middle centuries of the first millennium B.C. as they were the first line of defence in the face of the many wars and invasions of the time.

The wall provided a conceptual separation between the sacred area within and the profane world without. Fourier notes that all of the pottery sherds found in the grotto at Amathus, as well as other bothroi on the summit, seem to contain only locally produced Amathusian pottery (Hermary and Fourrier 2006). She also notes that, in contrast, votive material found lower down the slope at the palace, dating from this period, is much more varied in provenance, with material from elsewhere including Greece and mainland Phoenicia. This suggests that while the cult may have been influenced by Phoenician ideas, the sanctuary itself may have been reserved for the local priesthood who chose locally manufactured vessels for their ritual offerings and sacrifices.
4.4. Conclusions of Amathus case study

The multiscalar study of the tree of life at Amathus provided early indication of the existence of a metaphorical structure of connected ideas. The new sanctuaries and colonies were possibly seen as plantations, outgrowths and new variations of precursor kingdoms on Cyprus and the mainland. This was expressed architecturally and artistically through symbols and installations on the landscape, and the fertility and health of the community was maintained by ritual activity at the elevated sanctuary on the acropolis.

The history of the foundation and development of Amathus can be traced through the development of the iconography on the material culture. By understanding the way in which it was used symbolically within the cultural landscape we can understand the meanings that were being expressed. The natural resources and features of the site led to the initiation of ritual activity on the hill during the Cypro-Geometric Period, which eventually focussed around a cave of the goddess, and perhaps a sacred, living, tree. Large limestone votive steles bearing the tree of life were erected at the site during a rapid and creative period of growth during the Cypro-Archaic Period, when the Amathusians came into more frequent contact with the Levant and the Aegean. Over time, the combination of influences resulted in the gradual formalising of the Amathusian artistic repertoire, and this was complete by the late Cypro-Archaic period. The Cesnola Sarcophagus provides the most developed and formal example of the tree of life from the island (Figure 98). The introduction of new Egyptianising themes, such as the Hathor capitals during the late Cypro-Archaic II period, must be related to the return to strength of the Egyptian culture during the 26th dynasty, and they also represent the concept of the goddess being present in architectural features.

At this point in the study the methodology had produced provisional evidence for a metaphorical structure expressed through architectural and artistic symbolism as well as through ritual activity in the cultural landscape. In the following case studies this provisional hypothesis was tested, refined and consolidated through comparison with other bodies of material evidence.
Chapter 5. Case study 2. Idalion: twin peaks

5.1. Introduction to case study of Idalion

This second case study applies the same methodology first developed in Chapter 3. It was applied reflexively and refined in response to the results of the first case study at Amathus. The main reflexive changes made were a reduction in the number of multiscalar contexts from seven to six. This situation developed in order to simplify the process, and yet retain the coverage of contextual scales. The choice of site, Idalion, was also made reflexively, and the main themes addressed were influenced by the results of the study of Amathus.

The number of geographical scales was reduced from seven to six for practical reasons by removing the quarter level survey (200x100m). The complexity of the analysis was reduced with no loss of effectiveness; by studying several different individual structures (20x10m) within the whole of the settlement area (2x1km), the quarter levels were effectively accounted for in the discussion anyway. Neither the archaeology nor the discussions adhere strictly to the arbitrary dimensions originally chosen for the spatial scope at each level, and so by realising that multiple structures can be examined across the settlement area if required, and discussed together if necessary, it became clear that the system could be simplified once at the local levels. The multiscalar analysis should not be seen as a scientifically empirical, rigid or statistical system, but a method of organising the study and information to make it comprehensible. Fernand Braudel who originally devised the historical analysis at different temporal scales encountered problems when he tried to force his analyses into a ‘scientific straightjacket’ (McNeill 1998: 07), and so part of the reflexivity of this research is to acknowledge that the methodology is a research system only, and not a hard science. Similarly, the artefact level analysis does not correspond to one specific 2x1m area, because artefacts are included in the catalogues that were recovered from locations all over the settlement areas. One way to conceptualise this system is to consider the regional scale analysis as the high branches on the research tree, spread out and moving over a wide area, while the local study and the individual artefacts are the tendrils, roots and runners of the analysis, deeply embedded and spread through the micro-scale contexts, and not homing down to a point. Overall, the objective of the analysis should be to devote equal effort to each level so that the density of information for each scale, and the resulting discussion, is comparable in duration and depth. The concentration of study should increase as the area of the study decreases.

The Idalion field work, survey and museum-based research for Idalion took place over the summer of 2010 and this was followed up with additional survey in summer 2011.

The results of the Idalion case study are substantially different from those of Amathus, but the evidence reinforced the initial conclusions drawn regarding structural factors influencing settlement and ritual patterns. I tested the preliminary hypothesis indicating the existence of a structure relating bulls as symbols with hilltop sanctuaries, caves and ritual material associated with the tree of life, and again the evidence indicated its existence at Idalion. In addition, important new knowledge about these issues developed during the course of the case study.

The choice of Idalion as a focus for the second case study was made based on several considerations. Amathus had provided a good opportunity to study Phoenician influences on the island, and a study of Kition was potentially covering the same ground again. The south coast sites were potentially too similar to
Amathus to provide useful comparison and contrast at this stage, and so an inland site was preferred. Idalion is also built on hills, so that this aspect could be studied again. Finally, most of the elaborate proto-Aeolic capitals recovered from the island are thought to have originated there.

The inland location also provided an opportunity to study the significance of real trees. The use of the tree of life as a focus for the Iron Age cults made sense within a metaphorical structure, but the importance placed on trees still needed to be understood and the explanation elaborated. The practical significance of trees in the landscape around Idalion was therefore addressed, as were the ritual activities associated with trees within the city. The terrain around Idalion allowed the issues of hills and mountains to be considered along with the trees, and the relationship between trees and topography was studied to establish if it was of particular significance.

Idalion was one of the largest city kingdoms of Cyprus, and it attained a higher level of complexity and organisation than sites such as Amathus. Evaluation of elite symbolism associated with the tree of life at this site suggests that it was adopted by the rulers as a symbol of authority as well as vitality. The increasing visibility of references to papyrus plants will also be discussed within this context, and related to meta-scale regional cultural changes taking place in elite political structures, writing technology and military activity.

In general, by studying the archaeology carefully, we can see that many traditional ritual practices, some dating back to the Bronze Age, shaped the community at Idalion, but through time, new technologies and new political contexts changed the underlying structure of the society. The ways in which these social stresses appeared in the material culture can be interpreted, outlined and detailed once the meanings carried by the different symbols are untangled and understood.

As it emerged as a city kingdom during the Cypro-Geometric Period (Gaber 2008: 61), Idalion was a protoliterate, myth and ritual-based society. The objective of this chapter is to interpret and understand how the structure of the society was expressed and communicated through symbols and material culture, and how it began to change through the Iron Age. By understanding these processes we can start to understand how issues of cultural hybridisation and syncretism, group interaction and identity were managed and expressed by the inhabitants of ancient Idalion in their material creations and possessions.

The ancient Cypriot city kingdom of Idalion sits on the southern edge of the Mesaoria Plain, and to the east of the foothills of the Troodos mountain range. It consists of two main hilltops surrounded by a large defensive wall that encompasses a 100 acre area of the lower town. The enclosed area stretches north from the two hills towards the Yalias River, and provides excellent visibility over the Mesaoria plain to the imposing Kyrenia mountain range running along the northern coast of the island.

The hill to the west, known as Ambelleri or Ampileri, is the principal acropolis of the site, and contained rich tombs, the administrative centre or palace, a temple building usually attributed to Athena/Anat, defensive towers and walls, and industrial areas on the northern slopes. The acropolis to the east is known as Mouti tou Arvili, and was primarily the site of a sanctuary, also dedicated to a goddess usually described as Aphrodite. The sanctuary consisted of an open temenos enclosure with a northerly aspect, possibly containing a grove of sacred trees and with temple buildings on the slope leading down to the north. On the lower slopes was another temple area, usually attributed to Adonis (Gaber 2008: 60).

The landscape around Idalion was famously fertile in antiquity (Stager et al. 1974: XXII), and while the Yalias River is dry in the summer months, water can be obtained easily from wells, and would have been stored in
cisterns across the town. The condition of the landscape will be discussed in more detail, but in general the acropolises are surrounded by good arable land, albeit with a stony soil. Farming would have been grain based, supplemented with vegetables and fruit. Vines and olives provided wine and olive oil, while sheep, goats, pigs and cattle supplied meat.

There is no evidence from the archaeology of Idalion that copper production or copper working was a substantial industry on the site, but given the size of the city and its proximity to the copper mining and production centres to the east and west, the trade in copper through Idalion was undoubtedly an important function of the city, particularly as it served as a stopover on the route to the coast at Kition (Hadjicosti 1997: 49).

Excavation of the city has been carried out since at least the time of Cesnola, who was followed by Hamilton Lang, Ohnefalsch Richter, the SCE and the American Expedition to Idalion. The Lycoming College teams under Dr Pamela Gaber continue to excavate the ‘lower town east’ area and the CDOA excavations of the western acropolis administrative buildings under Dr Maria Hadjicosti continue to uncover substantial new structures to date.
5.2. Multiscalar analysis of Idalion

5.2.1. Regional level analysis

This regional level analysis begins with a warning that traditional group terms such as Assyrians, Hittites and so on are used more extensively at this scale of analysis, for the simple reason that most of the wider synthetic studies available tend to be older and more traditional studies, and so it is most difficult to break away from monolithic cultural labels at this level. At the more local levels, more focussed, more modern archaeological reports are more widely available, and more nuanced discussions can be achieved.

At the regional level, the importance of forests and sacred high places in the landscape was considered in some depth. One of the conclusions from the first case study was recognition that consideration of the regional context had largely ignored the coastal regions to the northeast of Cyprus in favour of areas dominated by the Greeks, Phoenicians and Egyptians. Special attention was therefore paid reflexively to the use of the tree of life motif in the regions to the northeast of Cyprus, in the periods contemporary with early Iron Age Cyprus. In the first few centuries of the first millennium B.C. this mainland area was dominated by the Syro-Hittites, sometimes also known as the Neo-Hittites. Further inland and to the south were the Aramean settlements, but there was substantial commonality between these cultures in their iconography and beliefs. The significance of the Syro-Hittites to Cyprus is substantial, as they constitute a partial continuity of the Late Bronze Age culture of the area which included Ugarit. Unlike Ugarit, which was destroyed at the end of the Bronze Age, the city of Carchemish further inland survived intact and continuously through into the Iron Age. New Syro-Hittite cities often reused abandoned Bronze Age tells (Wilkinson 2003: 133) and included palace and temple complexes with monumental ashlar architecture. Characteristic features of the monumental structures often included rows of elaborately carved orthostatic reliefs flanking the entrances to the main buildings and temples. In this respect they resemble the LBA administrative buildings and temples from Cyprus, where dressed stone orthostats and ashlers with dressed margins defined areas of particularly high status and significance (Douglas-Fisher 2007).

![Figure 30 Reliefs with the tree of life from Syro-Hittite monumental entrance masonry (author’s illustrations)](image)

The drawings of reliefs (from left to right) above are compiled from the entrances to Syro-Hittite monumental buildings at Karatepe, Carchemish and Gaziantep Zergama (Belkis, near Carchemish). The importance and frequent appearance of the tree of life motif may be because the timber industry in these areas was always significant. The area was always one where timber was available and in demand, and some of the long history of this industry has been documented, as far back as the 3rd millennium B.C. In the tales of Gilgamesh, for example, he defeats the great guardian of the mountain forests known as Humbaba (Hansman 1976: 35), and steals timber. Hansman concluded that the ‘land of the living’ of the tale (2,500
B.C.) is to be located to the east of Sumer and that if the tale actually has a historical basis, Gilgamesh journeyed there for ‘erin’-timber, possibly to be identified as *juniperus excelsa*, a species of Juniper tree. By the period of Sargon of Akkad (2,250 B.C.), the erin-trees in the east had been largely cut down, and new sources were sought in the west. The demand for timber in the north east Mediterranean mountain ranges, from cities in Mesopotamia where there were few trees, therefore had a very ancient history. These long mountain timbers were used for the construction of elite monumental buildings, and so taller trees and longer timbers were specifically associated with elites.

![Diagram of mountain ranges and significant natural features of the Levant](image)

**Figure 31 Mountain ranges and significant natural features of the Levant (author’s diagram)**

Forest guardians and tales of raiders stealing timber along the Lebanon Mountains demonstrate the importance of guarding wood supplies on the mainland where demand was high, and serve as a reminder of the importance of the Cypriot wood reserves. According to the inscriptionsal evidence, later rulers of Assyria, Babylonia and Persia brought ‘erin’ trees from the following regions (Hansman 1976: 32):

- **Shalmaneser III**: (858-824 B.C.) Mt. Amanus (North Levant).
- **Sargon II**: (721-705 B.C.) Mt. Amanus (North Levant).
- **Sennacherib**: (704-681 B.C.) Mt. Amanus and Mt. Hermon (in Eastern Lebanon).
- **Assurbanipal**: (668-631 B.C.) Mt. Lebanon and Mt. Hermon (in Eastern Lebanon).
- **Nebuchadrezzar II**: (605-562 B.C.) Mt. Lebanon and Mt. Hermon (in Eastern Lebanon).
- **Darius I**: (520-485 B.C.) Mt. Lebanon.

As can be seen from this list, the sources of wood gradually moved south over the course of the four centuries from 850 – 450 B.C. The simplest explanation for this movement is that the quality and quantity of timber available in the north declined as it was cut down, and so the Mesopotamians were moving further south to find timber as time passed.
A useful new study (Klinge 2010) documents these varying levels of demand and the destruction of timber resources, and the different levels of exploitation on the mainland and Cyprus, albeit for the Late Bronze Age. The study compared seed to charcoal ratios in burnt copper smelting fuel samples from the Levant and Cyprus (Politiko Troullia), and these clearly showed a large discrepancy in proportions, with the Cypriot samples showing a ratio of 0.35 compared to mainland samples of between 0.97-2.37. This shows that whole pieces of wood were used as fuel on Cyprus, whereas the fuel on the mainland contained more seeds indicating the use of chaff and dung as fuel. Chaff and dung use on the mainland suggests that wood was scarce, probably due to over consumption of the resources for construction and smelting purposes.

This high demand and limited supply of tall trees explains in part why the tree of life was such a frequently used motif on all sorts of artefacts from the Bronze Age and earlier and why trees were valued and became associated with elites. The scenes on the Syro-Hittite reliefs nevertheless include other familiar motifs from the Bronze Age, such as opposing bulls and opposing rams (Figure 32). The opposing bulls around a sacred tree scene is a familiar motif from Canaanite material culture, and from Mycenaean amphorae decoration (Karageorghis 1977), some of which have been found on Cyprus and as far a field as the eastern Sinai desert (Dever 2005: 163).

The tree of life or sacred tree certainly pre-dates the Syro-Hittite culture, however, the objective of this discussion is not to trace a linear history of a motif in a traditional art historical manner (Parpalo 1993), but to understand that these Syro-Hittite scenes were part of the wider elite cultural context of the region, which was itself derived from a Bronze Age artistic repertoire, sometimes referred to as the ‘international style’ (Feldman 2006; Smith 2009). The group of elite motifs were related to the industries and resources that the regional landscape supported as well as to regional art, ritual and beliefs.

While similar scenes are found on vessels all over the region, the way in which the tree is portrayed on the stone architectural reliefs from the Syro-Hittite settlements of the northern Levant is quite different to the way the tree of life capitals developed in the architecture of the southern Levant. There are different architectural traditions although with common elements. There are no monumental orthostatic reliefs in buildings from the southern Levant, and it seems that building technologies in the south and north were quite different on a number of levels. Similarly, there are no capitals with oversized central triangles found in the early Iron Age material from the north.

Figure 32 Opposing bulls and sacred tree from the monumental entrance to Karatepe (author’s illustration)
Trees then were an important resource on the Levant, and the finest trees grew on the mountains at high altitudes (Meiggs 1982: 54). Mountains were closely linked to forests and trees and in this context the 1,700m high Mount Aqraa, on the mainland coast opposite east Cyprus, is highly significant (Figure 33). It was a widely known sacred mountain where the goddess Anat and the storm god Baal were thought to have lived, as well as the patron deity of woodworkers. In the Bronze Age it was known as the ‘throne of Baal’ and was a landmark for sailors on their way from the southern Anatolian coast or Cyprus to Ugarit (Kohlmeyer 2009: 190). This mountain was sacred to the Hurrians, the Hittites and the inhabitants of Ugarit just to the south of it, and it has retained this sacred status right through into Hellenistic and Christian times. An inscription from Iron Age Cyprus on the stele of Sargon II mentions ‘Baal of the mountain’ (Smith 2009: 11). El, the Canaanite high god, was said to be enthroned at the foot of Mount Aqraa, at the place of the ‘source of the floods’ (Dever 2005), where the headwaters of the ‘two deeps’ was found, where salt and fresh waters met.

Mount Aqraa is almost visible from Idalion, and is certainly visible from the Kyrenian mountain range in the north of the island. In Antiquity it must have been a well known regional landmark, even on Cyprus. The name of mount Aqraa may well be related to the common epithet Aphrodite Acraea ‘Aphrodite of the heights’.

In order to study the physical attributes of this prominent mountain top, a ‘viewshed’ was produced for this site showing the extents of the visibility from the mountain. This also served to illustrate the visibility of the mountain top from surrounding areas, and therefore the visibility of any beacon on it, from the surrounding regions. A huge mound of ash on the summit suggests that it was the site of beacon fires.

The viewshed (Figure 34) demonstrates that the mountain truly dominates the northern Levant, including the north east coast of Cyprus, and its proximity to Late Bronze Age Ugarit suggests that it may have played a significant role in controlling navigation around the region for many centuries as well as a ritual focal centre. This sacred mountain and its relationship with Ugarit, the great coastal city that traded with Bronze Age Enkomi, highlights the importance of studying the north eastern mainland coast near Cyprus. Visibility from the top in almost every direction stretches as far as 200km, and as well as a huge area of the Mediterranean

Figure 33 Mt Saphon or Aqraa (courtesy Google Earth with attribution)
Sea in excess of 10,000 sq km in area, the mountain overlooks the Cilician Plain to the north and the Aleppo Plateau towards Mesopotamia.

The picture that emerges from the regional study is that high places, including mountains and their forests, were conceptually linked to the gods, elites, the control of territory and valuable resources. They played a role in controlling the landscape and perhaps served as sites where beacon communication with distant sanctuaries and settlements through visible lines of sight could take place. These elevated sites provided a high level presence associated with the gods, but had more to do with a living and ruling elite who were using symbolism related to their control of materials useful for constructing elite monumental buildings.

The basic tree of life symbol was therefore closely related to elite culture, but the details of the trees and flowers were also significant. The details in the regional iconography changed substantially after the arrival of the Assyrians on the Levant, as the Syro-Hittite settlements were over-ran and the lands to the north east of Cyprus became less of an influence on the island’s culture. Nevertheless, the association between elites, high places and trees remained, and these concepts became hybridised into the new elite symbolism of the Cypro-Archaic period.

Figure 34 Viewshed from Mount Aqraa (areas visible from mountain highlighted in red) (author’s diagram) see methodology chapter for attribution and acknowledgements
Many aspects of the tree of life and associated iconography indicate that cultic symbols were often associated with elites and the control of rituals, material and wealth. For example, my Masters level study of the meanings carried by spirals indicated that they were certainly related to papyrus plants, from the Bronze Age onwards. The ‘palace style’ vases from Minoan Crete and the ‘papyrus painter’ vases from Rhodes include vessels decorated with heavily voluted spirals of papyrus plant stems. It is though that these reflect increasing trade with Egypt through the Nile Delta at the time, where the papyrus plants grew (Evans 1928: §54).

In the previous case study the associations of the meanings carried by papyrus in Egyptian hieroglyphics were shown to be associated with fecundity, life, vegetation, greenery, as well as with papyriform architectural columns and the columned forecourts of temples (Figure 9). As can be seen from the Karatepe orthostatic reliefs (Figure 30) and from the capitals from Amathus (Figure 26), Kition (Figure 12) and those from Idalion discussed later in the this chapter, spirals were increasingly combined with sacred tree iconography in the new capital designs of the adjacent regions and Archaic Cyprus.

The association of the spiral with papyriform capital designs is supported by another significant development on Cyprus during the Archaic period, which was the appearance of votive statues representing Cypriot scribes.

These have been studied in a recent article which indicated that the earliest known Cypriot scribe figurine dates to the Cypro-Archaic period and was found in Amathus (Vandenabeele 2009). Several other similar figurines have been found on Cyprus and by the Classical period they are fully developed (Figure 8). While reminiscent of the typical and more ancient Egyptian figurines showing the scribe, god and architect Imhotep, they are dressed in non-Egyptian clothing, and are Cypriot in origin. These are of interest for two reasons. Firstly, they evidence the appearance of a new writing medium on Cyprus, ink on papyrus paper, and secondly, the rolled form of the papyrus paper sheets on the statuettes’ knees shows that scribes typically used papyrus paper in spiral rolls. The link between the ideas of papyrus paper, roll spirals, papyrus plants and the papyriform columns supports a proposal that the volutes on the capitals were increasingly associated with papyrus (paper and plants).

Why would elites have wanted to associate themselves with papyrus plants and paper as well as sacred trees?

The complex answer indicates that significant changes were beginning to take place in the social structure of Iron Age Cyprus, which reflected similar changes taking place in cities across the region during the Cypro-Archaic period when these statues were made, and, particularly in the Greek cities of the Aegean.

It seems these changes were closely associated with a gradual social evolution from a proto-literate society based on ritual symbolism and metaphor and focussed around a tree, towards a more literate ‘book based’ elite society organised around the written word. Similar changes were taking place at this time in Judah and in Greece. The ramifications of these changes were profound. The structural changes that took place on Cyprus are compared to these regional changes in Chapter 8.

Increasing literacy eventually resulted in written constitutions and laws, standardised belief systems, a recorded and canonised liturgy, as well an enhanced ability to trade and account for goods and to communicate regionally and internationally. Sherratt has noted that the adoption of writing across a contemporary society such as Greece was initially connected with the spread of traditional myths in written
form (Homer) rather than any other factor (Sherratt 2003). It was in part the change in the way core mythical beliefs were communicated that drove the changes in other sectors of society and encouraged the adoption of new writing systems in a new local form. Similarly, the change from ‘folk religion’ to ‘book religion’ in ancient Israel has been noted at around this same period, and has been linked to the Deuteronomistic reforms and suppression of cults during the late seventh century B.C. (Dever 2005: 49 & 90). In effect, the increasing use of a written language lead to the crystallisation of ideologies, the development of new organisational systems and the centralisation of local and regional power around elite settlements.

During the Archaic Period the elites increasingly identified with the written word and with the papyrus paper technology that facilitated writing, as well as with the stone columned architecture also adopted from Egypt at the time. Bronze Age Cyprus never developed a centralised bureaucracy (Iacovou 2005b: 21), but it is clear from elsewhere that writing facilitated control of surplus and the domination of communities and there is no reason to imagine that the elites of Idalion were not equally able to exploit this aspect of written language.

It is no surprise then that the increasing importance of core industries like timber production and the use of new writing technology would be reflected in the elite architecture, symbolism, monuments and votive statues of the period. Nevertheless, there are no examples of the Cypro-syllabic script used at Idalion written on papyrus, and the one extended text is in fact the bronze example recovered from the west acropolis which simulates a writing tablet rather than a papyrus scroll. The evidence in fact seems to be somewhat ambiguous. The Idalionites were keen to adopt the symbols of the new elites, yet reluctant to use the new systems or let go of their own more traditional methods.

An attempt was made in this section to hybridize a continuous regional discussion of elite symbolism as it related to trees, mountains and then papyrus symbolism. In later chapters more evidence for this link and more information about the associated meanings will be brought in to the analysis.

5.2.2. Island level analysis

The island level study of Cyprus in this case study focussed on reconstructing the state of the Cypriot forests during the early Iron Age in some detail. As was discussed above, the ubiquity of the tree of life in iconography and ritual in part reflected the importance of real timber resources across the region.

The woodlands of Cyprus were extensive and seem to have survived intact for longer and more substantially than the forests on the mainland. This was surely in part due to the difficulty of accessing and exporting timber from the island. Serious deforestation is documented later in the Roman Period but it only started to reach significant levels during the late Archaic/Classical periods. Recent reports from the Troodos Archaeological and Environmental Survey Project (TAESP), which studied a 160-sq km landscape in the northern Troodos Mountains of Cyprus between 2000 and 2004 yielded significant information related to the forests during the Iron Age (Unwin 2013).

In Vol 1, Chapter 4, the condition of timber and other vegetation as fuel resources is modelled with reference to their use in copper ore smelting operations, Unwin quotes Eratosthenes (275–195 BC) in Strabo’s Geography, stating that: ‘In ancient times the plains were thickly overgrown with forests, and therefore they were covered with woods and not cultivated; that the mines helped a little against this, since the people would cut down the trees to burn the copper and the silver’ (Strabo 14.6.5, translated Jones
But what did Eratosthenes mean by ‘ancient times’? Given the additional information below, and given that historical records would only have existed from the time that writing arrived in Greece, it seems likely that the quote was effectively referencing the early Iron Age.

This agrees with the information already discussed from Bronze Age Politico which suggests Cyprus did not suffer the same shortage as the mainland (Klinge 2010: 2627).

Figure 35 Viewshed from the east acropolis of Idalion (areas visible highlighted in red) (author’s diagram)
Late Bronze Age settlements all over the region and across Cyprus were abandoned after the disruption that has been linked to the phenomenon popularly known as the invasions of the ‘Sea Peoples’, and while the identity of these peoples and the causes of the destruction are still being debated, it can reasonably be assumed that extensive industrial use of wood resources declined for many decades if not centuries at the end of the Bronze Age, and so a substantial degree of woodland recovery can be assumed after any significant deforestation during the Bronze Age. It can therefore be assumed that wood stocks on Cyprus were substantially intact by the start of the Iron Age and the Geometric period, and evidence from the charcoal analysis in the TAESP project report supports this (Ntinou 2013).

As part of the TAESP survey, charcoal samples from metallurgical (smelting) sites were collected and analysed to identify the woody plant species that were originally burned. As well as showing the species used, these samples can be carbon dated to show what species were used during each period.

In the samples, various plants have been identified; Cyprus pine was mostly used during the Bronze Age and the Late Geometric period and the Late Roman period, whereas olive, oak, thorny burnet, maple, and Pistacia wood were only supplementary, however, during the Archaic period the charcoal results at Politiko Kokkinorotsos document a quite different picture: evergreen oak and thorny burnet are the main fuel source, while Cyprus pinewood was used to a lesser degree. The proportions of the identified taxa (species) used as smelting fuel seem to discriminate between the Bronze Age, Late Geometric and Late Roman sites on one hand and the Archaic Period site on the other.

The report concluded that this cannot be explained in relation to the function or the activities taking place at the sites, since they are very similar to the other sites, but that this difference indicates different environmental conditions, where pines were less abundant and other formations, with oaks and other shrubs, prevailing. The Archaic assemblage closely resembles formations of a more open character growing towards the Mesaoria plain. Evergreen oaks grow in maquis, commonly on dry hillsides, together with junipers, hawthorns, rock-roses, thorny burnet and other Mediterranean shrubs of the pulses family. The majority of these can be identified in the charcoal samples and therefore represent the Archaic assemblage. The report postulates that a different type of vegetation therefore grew in the Politiko area during the Archaic Period, and that this may be the result of human exploitation of the Cypriot pine resources, to the extent that the environmental composition had been changed significantly.

These data suggest that a very substantial quantity of forest resources were used during the Archaic Period, and when considered alongside parallel evidence of developments in architecture, writing and metal working skills, this evidences Archaic Period economic activity and development. Gaber represents the city kingdom during the seventh century B.C. as a place with sufficient wealth to erect monumental buildings made from vast quantities of sandstone brought to the site and expertly dressed. Idalion was a thriving, wealthy town whose population was already highly specialised (Gaber 2008: 58). The area enclosed by the fortifications was 100 acres and Stager estimated the population at eight to ten thousand people by the end of the Archaic Period, so it was a very significant settlement (Gaber 2008: 55).

The Greeks referred to the Kings of Cyprus as ‘superintendents of the woodlands’ and the forests were invaluable for the construction of ships and temples. High quality timber was internationally tradable. Wood quantities required to smelt the tons of copper produced on Cyprus were huge, and there may have been a combined export timber and domestic fuel system, whereby the structurally useful wood was cut away from the rest that was used for fuel. Burnet (1997: 60) comments on the connection between Apollo Hylates (of the woodlands – at Kourion) and woodland management, and proposes that the local environment suggests
the existence of a forest canopy in the past. Kourion, or any of the other southern ports, may also have served as an end point for return trips to Egypt, which lacked any sort of structural wood resources, and which, during the period when the Levant was dominated by the Babylonians and then Persians in the sixth century B.C., would not have had access to its traditional Levantine coastal resources (Burnet 1997: 66). The invasion of the island by the pharaoh Amasis during the sixth century B.C. (Reyes 1994: 77) may have been a strategic attempt to secure naval timber resources.

We can imagine then, the city kingdom of Idalion in the Archaic Period sitting within a landscape that had recently been cleared of trees, and where more widespread agriculture was taking place. The value placed on trees at this time may have risen substantially, remaining forest resources may have come under the protection of elites, and these were reflected in the architecture and iconography of the settlement and sanctuaries.

With respect to the topography of the city and the island, Idalion occupies a prominent position. The whole town enclosed within the walls is at a surprisingly high altitude. Even the lowest point of the Yalias River as it passes through the town is over 200m above sea level. The northern and southern summits of the east acropolis are at 270 and 312m above sea level, while the west acropolis is at 265m above sea level. Local visibility from Idalion is excellent, particularly north across the Mesaoria plain towards the Kyrenia range. Panoramic photographs were taken from each summit, and the analysis was enhanced by way of a viewshed which revealed the full extents of the area visible from the east acropolis (Figure 35). At a practical level, the agricultural land immediately to the north of the settlement could have been well controlled from both hilltops, right across the fertile valley stretching out from the Yalias River bed, and down to the main Mesaoria Plain to the northeast. The view to the south is also good, but only when the observer moves to the extreme south of the two acropolises and the view is then limited by the hills to the south. The city buildings are largely gathered to the northern side of the hills, suggesting a somewhat defensive posture with respect the south and the road from Kition which emerges from the range of hills in this direction. This arrangement perhaps reflects the political orientation of the inhabitants of Idalion with respect to Kition, and the narrow gap between the acropolises through which the Kition road arrives could be easily controlled from either side. Further east and west are more hills which would have restricted the possibility of hostile groups from the south coast circumnavigating and outflanking these defences.

The viewshed was calculated from the highest point of the east acropolis and the ‘visibility cloak’ shows the excellent coverage of the land from this point. More distant mountain tops are visible in all directions, especially to the north. The whole Kyrenia range is visible from Idalion, with the mountain named Sina Oros, at the east end being fully 58 km distant.

It is clear that the landscape visibility to the northwest, north and northeast is outstanding, and so further consideration was given to locations of hilltop sanctuaries in the visible area. There are significant and visible sanctuaries to the northeast of Idalion, notably at the eastern end of the Kyrenia range where there was a hilltop sanctuary to Aphrodite Acraea, ‘of the heights’, recorded by Strabo in his periplus description of a voyage around Cyprus (Geography 14,6,3): "Then to a city Carpasia, with a harbour. It is situated opposite the promontory Sarpedon; and the passage from Carpasia across the isthmus to the Carpasian Islands and the southern sea is thirty stadia. Then to a promontory and mountain. The mountain peak is called Olympus; and it has a temple of Aphrodite Acraea, which cannot be entered or seen by women. Off it, and near it, lie the Cleides, and also several other islands; and then one comes to the Carpasian Islands; and, after these, to Salamis, where Aristus the historian was born. Then to Arsinoe, a city and harbor. Then to another harbour,
Leucolla. Then to a promontory, Pedalium, above which lies a hill that is rugged, high, trapezium-shaped, and sacred to Aphrodite, whereto the distance from the Cleides is six hundred stadia. Then comes the coasting-voyage to Citium, which for the most part is sinuous and rough.”

Modern publications invariably mistake the summit referred to as Mount Olympus here for Mount Olympus in the Troodos range, whereas the description clearly refers to a top visible from the sea on the northeast of the island, and in fact there is a summit at the eastern end of the Kyrenia range still called Mount Olympus. This is 47km from Idalion and 700m in altitude (lat 35.35 long 33.745). The port on the north coast below was called Aphrodisias. It should be noted that in Antiquity accurate heights for mountains were not available and so absolute heights are not particularly historically significant. It was often the most prominent tops that became significant and ritualised rather than the highest tops, which were often not so prominent or surrounded by other high mountains making visibility relatively poor, to or from the summits. The significance of a top can be evaluated either by viewing it from below for its prominence, or for its attributes as a viewpoint from the summit, rather than its absolute height.

The topography and forest resources of the island as they related to Idalion were both significant themes to research, and these themes continued to be prominent at more detailed levels of study.

5.2.3. Kingdom level analysis

Study of the city kingdom, on the ground, took place over seven weeks during the summer of 2010. The work consisted of field walking and landscape familiarisation by vehicle and on foot as well as excavation of part of the lower city in conjunction with the Lycoming College (Pennsylvania, USA) field school. The Lycoming team under Pamela Gaber continues the work first started by the American Expedition to Idalion in the 1970s, and working alongside the team provided useful information about the condition of the archaeology on the site, as well as the history of the excavations. Several field trips with the team included meeting with excavators such as Maria Hadjicosti of the CDOA, who provided valuable first hand information about the latest archaeological data being derived from the site. This all provided wider context to the study and allowed rapid familiarisation with the site.

During the course of the field work GPS track and point data was collected and panoramic photographs were taken at points of special interest. Significant landscape anthropogenic and natural landscape features were studied and recorded. The GPS allowed the field walking to be tracked and recorded, meaning that any areas that had been missed could be targeted on the next field walk, and areas of particular interest could be identified. Significant points of special interest were waypointed, and any existing survey datums that were found were recorded and used for locating published plans from the American Expedition reports.

Documentary research at the kingdom level took place at the CAARI library alongside the field work, and aerial and satellite photographs were obtained for the site. Significant documentary resources were studied and summarised, such as the reports which covered the basic natural landscape of the city kingdom, and significant archaeological sites in the area (Figure 36).

The landscape around the Yalias valley was studied extensively by the Archaeological Survey Department of the Department of Antiquities in 1957. They presented the land around Idalion at the start of the Iron Age as
a relatively heavily forested region. Bronze Age settlements utilised the lighter sedimentary soils on the top of the plateaus as arable land, while the river eroded valleys were filled with heavier alluvial soils and heavy vegetation that would have been difficult to slash and burn. As opposed to the open and clear areas of grain fields represented today, the area at the start of the Iron Age would have been very heavily forested, with isolated farmsteads spread out around the city location (Catling 1982: 233). The hiatus in significant settlement between the end of the Bronze Age and the start of the Iron Age was as long as 200 years according to this study, so that settlement of a level likely to impact substantially on the forests of the region was not present before the Archaic Period, and the recovery of any deforested areas after the Bronze Age should be envisaged. Also noted was the importance of wells as the main means to irrigate any farmed land, as no significant spring, running or standing water is available in the summer months. These would have been used in conjunction with multiple water storage cisterns.

The most significant extant settlement in the area other than Idalion was the Bronze Age settlement on the plateau to the north. This settlement at Kafkalia (Figure 36) had been noted as an area of Bronze Age tombs during archaeological survey of the area undertaken by Ohnefalsch-Richter and published in ‘the Owl’ (Ohnefalsch-Richter 1888), although the actual site of the settlement, on top of the plateau or ‘mesa’ and perhaps extending along the eastern slope of the plateau all the way to Ayios Sozomenos, was not identified by his team. The fortified town on top of the plateau was, however, identified by Overbeck and Swiny. They excavated it and showed it to have been a substantial settlement on the high plateau outcrop, surrounded
by a defensive wall system. The site has impressive visibility over the Yallas valley towards the south and directly towards the hilltops where Idalion was later founded, and it seems likely that both sites were similarly positioned to control the same valley between them, albeit from opposing directions (Overbeck and Swiny 1972). The American Expedition to Idalion carried out archaeological survey in the Ayios Sozomenos area in 1974, and in more recent years deep trial trenches have been dug along the slopes of the plateau. The archaeology uncovered suggests that significant remains of Late Bronze Age settlements are to be found all along the slopes of the mesa, from Kafkalia to Ayios Sozomenos, albeit now covered by fluvial deposits (Devillers et al. 2004).

Gaber has suggested that this was the Bronze Age ‘parent’ of Iron Age Idalion (Gaber 2008: 61), and a few fragments of Geometric pottery mixed in with the predominantly Bronze Age assemblage suggest that there may have been some continuity of occupation at the site and contemporaneity with Iron Age Idalion.

As well as this site there are several other rural sanctuaries around the area (Karageorghis 1979), and many rich tombs have been identified and excavated all around the fringes of the valley. The valley would have been heavily forested at the start of the Iron Age, but the evidence of economic activity and development suggests that it would have been cleared through the Archaic Period, and larger areas would have been given over to arable farming and livestock. Over time and thanks to the natural resources of the area, Idalion developed a reputation for being somewhat Idyllic location and very fertile.

One significant question arising from the kingdom level study was to ask why the focal point of settlement and farming activity in the valley moved south from Kafkalia to Idalion. The most notable difference between the two sites is that one (Kafkalia and associated settlement) was established on and alongside a flat mesa plateau and alongside a river, and the other (Idalion) was built on a prominent hilltop site. This is a significant change in interaction with the landscape and may be related to new and defensive posture being adopted as a result of the Late Bronze Age disruption, as well as the adoption of new ritual landscape use patterns (‘high places’).

At this stage of the discussion, however, the fact that the two sites were directly visible from one another across the main valley (they are almost directly north and south of each other), their proximity (5km apart) and evidence of contemporaneous activity suggests there must have been a relationship between the sites at some level. While the majority of the structures at Idalion date from the Iron Age, there is evidence of a small fortified Late Bronze Age building and shrine on the west acropolis, and evidence of industrial buildings has recently been uncovered on the lower northern slopes, dating back to Late Bronze Age II or III (Hadjicosti 1997: 49). The positioning of a small lookout tower on this hill would have been useful for defending and controlling the southern approaches to the Yalias Valley. Late Bronze Age tombs have also been found on the summit, reminiscent of the situation on the acropolis at Amathus, and perhaps also related to a mythical ‘heroic’ past (Hadjicosti 1997: 54). As already mentioned, the orientation of the main areas of settlement at Iron Age Idalion, on the northern slope of the hill, may highlight its general orientation towards Kition in the south. The defensive position or ‘stance’ of Idalion towards the south and Kition suggests a level of wariness, and the position of the hilltop at the centre of a range of hills running east to west, on the southern edge of the main valley suggests it was placed here as an outpost of Kafkalia, protecting the valley on the main road to the south. The orientation and defensive formation of the city walls around the city, built during Cypro-Archaic I and II (Balandier 2000), strongly supports the existence and continuity of this defensive attitude towards the south.
Gaber writes that there is little doubt that Kition wanted possession of Idalion (and Tamassos) because of its role in the copper trade. To control the processing centre was to control the copper itself right from the mines to the port, so Idalion was in a prime location and would have been under threat due to its enviable position (Gaber 2008: 56).

Finally, in the contexts of viewsheds, mountains and the Bronze Age precursors of the city, it is possible that there was a retrospective relationship between Idalion and the Kafkalia area, and perhaps even with the whole Mesaoria plain and the Kyrenia mountains beyond. Idalion provides a fantastic vantage point over these areas of central Cyprus, and as well as being useful for controlling daily activity in the region, the ancient towns, landscape features and ranges of mountains may have been associated with Bronze Age ancestors. Gaber called the Bronze Age settlement at Kafkalia/Ayios Sozomenos the ‘parent’ of Idalion, and she has also noted the possibility that much of the high quality stone used for constructing Archaic Idalion was brought from the foothills of the Kyrenia range (Gaber 2008: 57), perhaps in a symbolic act associated with the places in question.

Whereas Amathus looked to its family relationship with Kinyras for retrospective legitimation, Idalion literally looked back to its Bronze Age parent in the landscape of central Cyprus. This idea of legitimation through demonstrated continuity with the past will be discussed in more detail in Chapters 7 and 8, and I will argue that it was also present in the iconography of the tree of life.

In conclusion, Idalion was carefully placed in the landscape, and several significant practical and ritual factors determined its position. By looking at more detailed levels in the next sections the underlying structures and changes taking place will be described and analysed.

5.2.4. Settlement level analysis

The GPS track record of one day’s foot survey, on 22/07/2010, is shown above (Figure 37). This was one of several walkovers in the area, while only one is shown for clarity. In addition, different parts of the site were covered in more detail during four weeks of excavation from 21/06/2010 until 12/07/2010, which included excavation at the Cypro-Archaic ‘lower city south’ and the Hellenistic/Roman water tank feature just to the east of the main road between the two acropolises.

The major natural features of the city itself are of course the two acropolises, of Ambelleri to the west and Mouti tou Arvilli to the east. The main difference between the two acropolises is that the western acropolis is heavily fortified and was primarily functional in nature, whereas the eastern acropolis appears to have been primarily a cult area. The precise find spots of the proto-Aeolic steles are not known, but a fragment of one was found (Stager et al. 1974: 58) on the northern slope of the west acropolis, which approximates to the position of the main route of entry into the fortified area of the upper town. It is not clear if the east acropolis sanctuary should be attributed to any specific goddess, and there is confusion surrounding the identities of the goddesses, whether it was Wanassa, the mistress of the animals, Baalat, Anat, Astarte, Ishtar, Aphrodite, Qadesh, Asherah or Hathor or all or some of these. Even experts on this subject are confused. Dever writes “…the great Goddess of Canaan, under many guises. As we have seen she goes by several, perhaps local, names: Asherah, Anat, Astarte, Elath, or Ba’alat” (Dever 2005: 185). There is evidence of local variation, and it has been proposed that the Phoenician colonies generally had their own pairs of
male and female deities that were in some ways unique or typical of that place. It is not within the scope of this chapter to fully address this extremely complex issue, but it is discussed in more detail in Chapters 7 and 8.

The other major natural feature of the site is the valley between the two hills, where the main road arrived from ancient Kition. The two acropolises on either side clearly control the arrival of this road very effectively and the western acropolis in particularly would have provided an excellent position from which to oversee and defend against any hostile approaches along this road.

![Figure 37 Satellite view of the ancient city of Idalion with GPS field walk track overlaid (author’s diagram)](image)

The blue line on the diagram above shows the path of the defensive wall that was built around the city through the Cypro-Archaic Period (Balandier 2000), but substantially enlarged ca. 500 B.C. This impressive wall followed the natural contours of the two acropolises to maximise the defensive attributes of the site, and encompassed an area of 0.4 sq. km (100 acres/40 hectares). Stager estimated the population contained within this enclosed area at eight to ten thousand people (Stager and Walker 1989: 462). This is a significantly large population, and it has also been noted that Idalion appears first in the kings list of Esarhaddon from ca. 673/2 BC in Khorsabad. It may be that as the first city kingdom mentioned on the prism of Esarhaddon, Idalion enjoyed a certain pre-eminence on Cyprus (Reyes 1994: 25). Finally, according to the Assyrian records the number of city kingdoms on Cyprus apparently increased by three in the forty year period before the erection of this stele, as the stele of Sargon II from Kition dating to about 707 B.C. refers to only seven kings of Cyprus (Reyes 1994: 51). Although some authors have attributed a sacred symbolism to this number rather than historical significance, a real increase at that time would fit well within a scenario where mainland refugees, fleeing the growing Assyrian oppression and disruption on the mainland, were increasing the population and wealth of Cyprus, and perhaps helping to establish new colonies and city kingdoms. Ulbrich maps possible city kingdom settlement number increases and territorial changes in her PhD (Ulbrich 2008).
In conclusion, the city survey and archaeological excavations at Idalion indicate that the settlement was very large in comparison to its contemporary Archaic Cypriot towns, and hosted a population much more substantial than Amathus. The archaeology demonstrated that the architecture consisted of mudbrick superstructures over stone foundation walls, and that the Archaic site plan has therefore been substantially preserved by the collapse, sedimentation and consolidation of the mudbrick into a solid layer over time.

5.2.5. Individual structure level analysis

The preservation of stone foundation walls under subsided mudbrick layers meant that several significant Late Bronze Age, Geometric and Archaic period structures survived and were excavated.

In 1928 Einar Gjerstad and the Swedish Cyprus Expedition team extensively excavated the structures at the summit of the west acropolis of Ambelleri. They uncovered substantial remnants of a fortified building with a shrine. The earliest phases of activity found were tombs and a possible small fortified structure with a shrine dating back to the Late Cypriot Bronze Age III (Gjerstad et al. 1935b: 462). This showed that the acropolis was not virgin territory when the Iron Age inhabitants of Idalion started to build there more extensively, and that there was contemporaneity with Late Bronze Age Kafkalia. Gjerstad identified the site as having been an open temenos of the goddess Anat-Athena during the Cypro-Geometric I and II periods (ca. 1050-850 B.C.), and there is no evidence of substantial construction work being carried out during those first two centuries of the Iron Age. The building of monumental architecture including fortifications resumed during the Cypro-Geometric III (ca. 850-750 B.C.) and continued through the Cypro-Archaic Period, culminating in the huge defensive wall built around the whole city by ca. 500 B.C. (Gaber 2008: 61).

**West acropolis - Bull cult room**

By the time the Swedish team arrived in the 1920s, excavations on the west acropolis had already uncovered a cache of decorated Cypro-Archaic bowls including the silver plate now in the Louvre (CID 10), and an inscribed bronze tablet with a Greek inscription in Cypro-syllabic script (Powell 2011: 146) ca. 480 B.C. Their new excavations uncovered a continuous stretch of buildings with substantial walls, mostly mudbrick on stone foundations, with a fortified rampart on the west side of the west acropolis. The excavated building complex stretched 40m north to south and almost reached the southern most point and peak of the
Ambelleri hill. Most significantly for this study, the earliest phase of construction in this sector (period 1), dating to Cypro-Geometric IIIA (Gjerstad et al. 1935b: 624) (c.850-800 B.C.) included a room numbered by them as XXXIV (square K6) that was described as a ‘cult-house’ as it had an altar in the north corner (105). In this phase and in this cult house were found five terracotta bull figurines (SCE numbers 445, 452, 455, 463, 477) buried in the floor in a ‘main deposit’ (Gjerstad et al. 1935b: 517 & 593), along with jugs, coloured pebbles, a stone mace head, chisel axe of basalt, glass beads, spindle whorls, bronze rings and pins, earrings of gold, while nearby were carbonised remains of olive stones and wood, and a mortar. Gjerstad concluded that this is evidence of votives being dedicated to a now unseen cult object. In the context of this study however, the evidence of bull figurines being dedicated in the earliest phases of this new architectural structure is of interest, and the assemblage shows parallels with the ‘vase aux taureaux’ found interred on the summit of the acropolis at Amathus, indicating the significance of bulls to these hilltop cults. Given the early level that these votives were found, it is possible that they were a foundation deposit in the new complex and shrine.

Other significant parallels support the statement by Gaber that the “features of worship discovered at this site have more in common with Israelite and Canaanite cult practices than with anything known from the Aegean world” (Gaber 2008: 60). The bull figurines are a phenomenon known from many Levantine sanctuaries dating back to the Bronze Age. They are recognised as being styled in representation of the ‘Zebu’ species of southern Asia. The earliest ‘bamah’ ‘high place’ open air hilltop sanctuary known from the southern Levant, near Samaria, is now known as the ‘bull site’ because of a bronze model of a Zebu bull found there dating to the 12th century B.C., (Iron Age I in the holy land chronological convention). Other items found in the Bull Site enclosure were an altar, 12th century B.C. pottery, fragments of a terracotta incense burner or offering stand, some pieces of bronze and silver jewellery, cooking pots and bowls and animal bones. This assemblage is not dissimilar to the assemblage from Idalion above. Other comparanda include a bronze bull found in a 14th century B.C. context at Hazor; bull figurines and reliefs are known from the Hittite world (Bryce 2002: 192) and Syro-Hittite cultures. Several bull figurines were recovered from Ugarit, a bull in gold leaf was discovered in a Phoenician temple in Byblos, another from Ashkelon, and all are reminiscent of the proscribed biblical ‘golden calf’ and the associated cult (Mazar 1982; Ahlstrom 1990; Dever 2005: 136).

Figure 39 Bull figurine in terracotta from west acropolis now in Idalion Museum (author’s illustration)

These Levantine sites are also sites where some of the earliest Iron Age proto-Aeolic volute capitals with triangle were found, so the possibility of a relationship between the two was still considered plausible at this stage of the study.

In conclusion, it seems that the bull figurines were an important aspect of the very earliest stages of construction on the site, and this is related to the evidence from Amathus that the interment of items
related to the bull and tree were associated with the foundation and establishment of new cult sites and settlements. While there may not have been a formal foundation ceremony, the act of burying figurines of this sort would have had a powerfully symbolic aspect.

![Figure 40 Fortified structure on west acropolis with bull cult room, two views at different scales (author's diagram)](image)

5.2.6. Artefact level analysis

Just to the south of the bull cult room, and almost at the topographical summit of the acropolis, the Swedish team found a large deposit of many Cypro-Archaic vessels buried in the top of the acropolis. This may have been a bothros for excess votive vessels from the cult room, or votive vessels may have been assembled around and outside the cult room. The details of this deposit are described along with the artefacts below.

To study the individual artefacts carrying the tree of life at Idalion, I compiled a catalogue and entered it into a digital interactive interface. Individual identification numbers starting CID were allocated to each piece, and details of material, find spot, current location and publication references were recorded. This is made available in appendix 10.5. Each of the 25 pieces were studied individually, and then in conjunction with the other pieces and in relation to their archaeological context, but priority must be given to the impressive examples of proto-Aeolic capitals from Idalion, none of which came from a recorded archaeological context.

One significant aspect of these capitals and an aspect that is common in other material from the settlement is the widespread depiction of lotus flowers. As well as being common motifs on the ceramics and being commonly held in the hands of statuettes of goddesses, these are prominent on the volute capitals where
they seem to spring out of the basic proto-Aeolic capital below (Figure 41 left). The basic form with its volutes and central triangle originated in early Iron Age Israel or Phoenicia (e.g. Samaria, Hazor and possibly also the coastal ports where little archaeology survives), whereas these elaborate forms from Cyprus are unknown on the mainland. The lotus flowers represented life and fecundity and were associated with rebirth. Perhaps influenced by Egyptian iconography, where the child Horus was born from a lotus flower, the symbol certainly spread to the Levant by the end of the Bronze Age, and was used especially in funerary contexts. Chains of lotus flowers adorned sarcophagi, such as that of king Ahiram discovered in Byblos and dating to ca. 1000 B.C. (Cook 1991).

The lotus flower seems to have been particularly significant to the iconography of Idalion. The designs on the capitals decorated with them which were recovered from the site (probably from the east acropolis) are particularly elaborate (Figure 41). The meanings of the designs were considered from a postcolonial standpoint where symbols have social significance and can be interpreted correctly if the ‘grammar’ and ‘vocabulary’ of the symbolic language can be understood. The most significant new aspect of these designs, in comparison to earlier examples from elsewhere, are that many of the lotus flowers emerge from a mound shaped formation on top of the basic volute and triangle design, and in many ways the lotus flowers, and the mound itself, seem to be an outgrowth from the basic shape. The arrangements also appear to be in two distinct parts, so that the upper parts are almost a separate design from the basic shape below from which they sprout (Figure 42).

Considering the motif as made up of different pieces and arranged according to a rational conceptual ‘vocabulary’, the mound form seems remarkably reminiscent of the idea of a ‘high place’ on a hill or mountain, so that the metaphor here may be expressing the concept that Idalion is a new offshoot of older traditional hilltop sites from elsewhere, or from an earlier site at this location, and that it is a ‘high place’ growing on a hill dedicated to the goddess. While it is based on the older form, it is a new and vibrant offshoot of the established traditions.

The foundation of a high place ‘bamah’ sanctuary like this may have been a ritual act, but it also had a practical significance with respect to the defensive attributes of establishing sites on high places. After the destruction, disruption and decline of the Late Bronze Age, where numerous substantial administrative centres/palaces on flat ground disappeared on Cyprus, such as Enkomi and Kalavassos, the significance of high places may have been more than simply a ritual one, and the tradition may have acquired a practical relevance for any new colonies and city kingdoms. The form of the up-turned volutes on either side of the
mounds also suggests a defensive and protective posture perhaps recalling the protective walls (Figure 42) around the acropolis, while the form of some of the ‘flowers’ (Figure 41 right), in fact resemble planted spears. In this respect it is notable that bronze spear stands were recovered from Idalion and other city kingdom sites (Ulbrich 2005: 200), and spear heads were found interred in the west acropolis summit at Idalion. This is just one interpretation of the symbolism of the mound and high places, but postcolonial theory suggests that expressions and changes in material culture, including symbolism are a partial articulation of social stresses and important issues of concern. Proto-literate society is understood to have operated on a symbolic-structural system, especially in the time before written constitutions, religion or laws were available, so that obvious visual symbols would have been an effective and necessary means of communicating moderately complex ideas through the elite and to citizens alike.

Figure 42 Volute capitals from east acropolis of Idalion in Dali Museum and Berlin (author’s illustration)

Another aspect of the lotus was perhaps that it was understood by the ancient Cypriots as not being of the same tradition as the voluted capitals or the Canaanite sacred trees and high places, being from Egypt, yet there was some attempt to hybridise the symbol into the artistic repertoire of the Idalion tradition. This was also noted at Amathus, where the lotus eventually became thoroughly hybridised into the Archaic ceramic decorative designs, and this aspect will be addressed more fully in Chapter 8.

Perhaps the most significant example of the lotus being hybridised into the material culture of Idalion is on the coinage of the city kingdom (CID 1). One side of the coins included a symbol of a voluted spiral and lotus design combined in a rather incongruous manner. Unlike at Amathus where the integration of contrasting floral forms on the ceramic vessel designs was subtle and completed, the Idalion coin design is more like two different parts grafted together (Figure 43). The lotus is prominent, as are the spirals, while there is no central triangle. This omission also needs to be addressed. After comparison of the artefacts from Idalion and Amathus, it appears that the triangle was progressively dropped towards the Classical Period, when the coins were made. It is possible that it was no longer used because it was not used in the architecture or on the coinage of the Late Archaic and Classical Aegean world, where coinage and other new and complex social systems were developing. Due to the growing pre-eminence of the Greeks at that time, the capital form with central triangle may have been seen as ‘old fashioned’; increasingly associated with the earlier Iron Age sanctuaries of the east Mediterranean and with the Phoenicians, rather than the new and powerful Greek cities to the west. Even the elaborate Classical era trees of life on the Cesnola Sarcophagus from Amathus have less prominent triangles (Figure 98). This aspect will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 8, but a situation whereby Idalion was less willing to show support for, or affiliation with, Phoenician aspects of
society, and more keen to express support for Greek aspects, may provide a plausible explanation for why
the central triangle was not shown on the later coinage.

Figure 43 Coin of Idalion (author’s illustration) See also CID1

It has already been suggested that the lotus was associated with Egypt, while the spirals on the coin are
certainly another significant element. Other artefacts from Idalion enhance this discussion. A bronze
palmette (Figure 8) (Idalion Museum MAI270, CID 7) decorated with a lotus form and volute pattern, which
was part of a horse front band, is of a type that has been found in more complete examples elsewhere on
Cyprus (cf. Ohnefalsch-Richter 1893: Vol II Plates: 70 No2, No1, 75; Karageorghis 1963: 265-300, 272;
Karageorghis 1967b: CXIV, CXXVII, CXXXIX, CXL; Karageorghis 1974: Pl CXVII, CXVIII; Flourentzos 2009). These
took a standardised form that often included lotus and papyrus symbols, and the complete item would
probably have been similar to the comparanda when complete (Figure 44). These formed part of the
funerary equipment for the corsege horses often involved in the burial of city elites. The horses were
deliberately sacrified in the typical Archaic Period burials so that this equipment and the symbols it carried
are related to the funerary rituals and afterlife beliefs of the inhabitants of Idalion and Archaic Cyprus. The
comparanda from Tamassos, Salamis and Palaepaphos are more complete than the example from Idalion,
but very similar. They carry the clear hieroglyphic determinative for papyrus, which was used both for the
plant and papyriform columns. They also include lotus flowers and the tree of life palmette itself.

Figure 44 Horse front bands from tombs at Salamis and Tamassos and hieroglyphs (author’s illustration)
Clearly this is elite symbolism and the lotus is closely related to the volutes and papyrus iconography, which is also associated with elites, as was discussed in the regional section of this chapter (5.2.1).

The lotus flower appears on the decoration of one of the silver plates from Idalion now in the Louvre (CID 10), as do sacred trees. Other artefacts with lotus and palmette designs include necklaces and stamp seals (CID 8, 9, 11) and the very large deposit of ceramic vessels excavated by the Swedish Cyprus Expedition mentioned above.

These were excavated close to the bull figurine cult room described in the previous section (squares G-H : 6-7) and were decorated with a whole variety of designs incorporating the lotus flowers and the tree of life; the central Geometric triangle and the surrounding motifs (Gjerstad et al. 1935b: 598).

These vessels were buried in a large deposit that may have been a bothros for excess votive material from the cult room, possibly hung on the walls, or they may have been vessels that were deposited outside and around the cult room, given the large number that were put there. They were found in a large pit dug down through an early ‘period 6’ floor, dating absolutely to the second and third quarters of Cypro-Archaic II (Gjerstad et al. 1935b: 625), ca. 570-510 B.C. This is substantially later than the earlier evidence of the bull cult room, but their proximity to this shrine means that they were probably deposits related to this same sacred place. Some of the designs (i534 and i564) (Figure 45 left) include geometric aspects that recall the patterns on vessels from the earlier period at Idalion. Tomb 3 excavated by the Swedish team in the lower city provided a large assemblage of vessels dating to the Cypro-Geometric I and II. These were decorated with highly geometric designs with butterfly crosses and hatched and chequered designs typical of the Geometric Period across the island, and with substantially fewer floral designs than are seen in the Cypro-Archaic II vessels from the top of the west acropolis. The increasing use of more elaborate floral designs (Figure 46) is not a function of the difference in context between votive and funerary assemblages, but reflects substantial change in the iconography used across the city kingdom through the two or three centuries separating the deposit of the different vessels. Nevertheless, despite the changes, the Geometric crosses, triangles and hatching were incorporated into the floral designs in some respect, or alternatively, one could equally say that the floral designs were incorporated into the Geometric tradition. The chequered central triangle seems to have become in part a hybridised and geometricised version of the volute capitals that were used by this time, during Cypro-Archaic II (Figure 48), as well as reflecting the existing use of the triangle in early Geometric vessels. This is a good example of how different traditions and meanings were changing and hybridising as well as showing continuity.
The final example below was excavated from close to the chapel of St George around 200m north east of the west acropolis. Tomb 2 was excavated by a Swedish team and published in 1965 (Karageorghis 1965). It contained a fine group of CGI pottery with striking geometric designs, including stirrup jars, belly handled amphorae and a ring kernoi. The most significant object for this study is a convex kalathos bowl (CiD24) decorated with a distinctive scene of mounds with partially triangulated forms on an exterior band, and with a band of fully geometric hatched triangles running around the exposed convex interior (Karageorghis 1965: 189). This vessel demonstrates that the mound and triangle forms date back as far as CGI at Idalion, long before the Archaic Period when the elaborate capitals and floral vessels developed. Within the context of this study it is proposed that these motifs were closely related to the landscape of Idalion and in particular to the hills which were such a prominent feature of the local area, where the acropolises were part of an extended defensive line of hills running along the southern side of the river valley. As has already been mentioned, the more distant hills and mountains were also a prominent element of the island landscape from the perspective of Idalion and may have held special ritual significance. The Kyrenia mountain range is clearly visible from the acropolises, and it forms a vast long band of jagged summits running along the northern horizon, not unlike the pattern on this vessel. The Bronze Age precursor site at Kafkalia is also visible in this direction and I suggest that the local cultural landscape is reflected in this material culture.

The pottery in this tomb provided some of the earliest examples of Proto White Painted ware on the island, and it is part of a group of tombs that have been found across Cyprus dating to LCIIIB, CGI. The pottery is
remarkably homogeneous, and it is thought to be associated with an elite cultural group that was establishing new settlements as centers of power across the island at the time. The mound and triangle forms are therefore not uniquely associated with Idalion, but in this particular iteration they may represent the local landscape which was considered especially significant within a region wide cosmology. These vessels may belong to the people who established Idalion as the centre of the Iron Age city kingdom, and while it may be the local landscape that is reflected in this material, it is clear that the triangle and the mound motifs were of significance to this group across the island.
5.3. Data, analysis and interpretation integrated

The interpretation of the overall themes and information produced by the Idalion case study differs substantially from the conclusions drawn from Amathus. While Amathus introduced the idea of a conceptual structure based around elevated sanctuaries and settlements and ancient symbols of bulls and trees, the Idalion case study demonstrated how these were co-opted and cultivated by the elite.

The elites fostered an identity associated with mountains, high places, gods and goddesses, and they identified with the valuable resources that supported them. These resources included the trees on the mountains, which were used to produce copper, build elite structures and ships, and papyrus paper, which related to their ability to organise these projects and run the city.

The elite also defended their way of life, by centralising their communities on defended hilltops, building walls around them and their elaborate public tree emblems included symbols of spears protruding from the summits of their sacred mounds.

As well as the elite group, all of the people would have been involved in the daily rituals. Offering libations, votives and sacrifices at the sanctuaries ensured the continuity, stability and vitality of the community. These rituals are evidenced in the archaeology and ceramic vessels from the earliest substantial phase of Iron Age Idalion, Cypro-Geometric IIIC as well as in the Archaic deposits. Continuity with the past was also expressed through retrospective legitimation by association with precursor settlements, both though the symbolism and in the location of the settlement.

The later phases suggest a more complex evolution where symbols relating to Egypt were brought in more explicitly, notably the papyrus and lotus, and the central triangle was gradually phased out. These changes are more difficult to interpret and understand, but it is possible that underlying political changes meant that Cypriots were leaning towards Greece and Egypt as allies and away from the Levant and the Phoenicians. Gaber, however, considers it wrong and dated to imagine a clash of ancient city-states along ethnic lines (Gaber 2008: 54). She represents ancient Idalion as a place where Eteocypriots who spoke a non-Greek language lived alongside Phoenician speakers and Greek speakers, right into Hellenistic and even Roman times.

Towards the end of the Archaic Period the elite were beginning to adopt the symbols of the new writing systems based on papyrus paper, although they retained their own systems for actual use. This ambiguity will be discussed in more depth in Chapter 8.
5.4. Conclusions of Idalion case study

In conclusion then, this case study showed how the ritual structures inherited by early Idalion were cultivated to create a fully developed city kingdom, perhaps with written laws and history, and certainly with its own coinage.

The elite associated themselves with the practical significance of timber supplies for construction and fuel, with high places as sacred vantage points and for defence, and with writing for communication and trade. These issues were expressed through symbols and rituals that worked together as an integrated ideological structure, and the tree of life played a central role in this system. The structure reflected both daily life as well as the history of the community, so that the symbolism of the trees and goddesses, bulls and mountains contained elements of myth as well as practical significance.

Issues of identity were managed and expressed through the symbolism, material culture and ritual. The association of different parts of the artistic repertoire with different regions and different peoples seems likely, and by emphasising, minimising or omitting various aspects, the artists could express ideas of alliance, affiliation, affinity, support or enmity. The ideas were not expressed explicitly, however, and the archaeologist must interpret the iconography carefully and be alert for ‘social masking’, where ideas are expressed through ambiguous metaphor or in disguised form. The more obvious examples of these meaningful associations are the inclusion of the lotus flower during a period of growing affinity with Egypt, while the omission of the triangle towards the end of the Archaic Period may reflect growing feelings of enmity towards the Phoenicians, who had sided with the Persians, or it may simply represent a feeling that the Levantine rural sanctuaries and the Geometric artistic forms were ‘old fashioned’.

Idalion underwent a period of rapid growth starting in the Cypro-Geometric IIIC (ca. 850-800 B.C.) and continuing to the end of the Cypro-Archaic Period. The organisational structure of Idalion changed from one that was based on a proto-literate myth and ritual-based structure towards being one that was based on a literate elite and a centralised social structure. The change, however, was in some ways one of appearance (Figure 48), and was never fully consolidated. Idalion remained in many ways a rural community.

Figure 48 Elaborate bichrome IV vessels from Idalion with tree motifs (author’s illustration)
Chapter 6. Case study 3. Palaepaphos: In Arcadia

6.1. Introduction to case study of Palaepaphos

The choice of the third and final case study followed on from the analysis of the first two case studies, and the ancient city kingdom of Palaepaphos was chosen as the focus. Two ‘reflection’ factors influenced this decision. The first was the issue of continuity and legitimation by association with the past, which emerged as a theme that concerned the inhabitants of Amathus and Idalion. Palaepaphos is often considered to evidence unbroken continuity of occupation from the Late Bronze Age into the Iron Age (Karageorghis 1983a: 370)(Figure 49), and so its archaeology can enhance this discussion regarding attitudes and links to the past as well as illuminating the origins of the Iron Age city kingdoms. Secondly, as the Phoenician, Egyptian and Syro-Hittite cultural influences on the island have been reviewed previously in the present study, a re-evaluation of the island’s westward connections, which are well evidenced at Palaepaphos, was considered desirable and appropriate.

The previous two case studies demonstrated that elements of Late Bronze Age Cypriot culture endured into the Iron Age, and that cultural interaction and trade with cultures based to the east of Cyprus were extensive, and more significant than the traditional Mycenaean colonisation narrative had suggested. The choice of Palaepaphos as a case study therefore allowed the influence of the cultures based to the west to be more judiciously re-evaluated, against an archaeological backdrop of ‘indigenous’ Cypriot and Levantine settlements, rather than within the traditional Homeric narrative paradigm (Ohnefalsch-Richter 1893; Tsountas and Manatt 1897; Fitton 2001; Leriou 2002).

Ancient Paphos was an Iron Age city kingdom on the southwest coast with its administrative and ritual centre located 1.5km inland at Kouklia Palaepaphos. It had its origins in the Late Bronze Age, and the local area evidences occupation stretching further back, through the Middle and Early Bronze Ages into the Chalcolithic Period, and even into the PPNB. The famous Temple of Aphrodite sits at 83m altitude on a promontory at the end of a limestone ridge that stretches north east all the way up the foothills and into the southern slopes of the Troodos Mountain range (Figure 55). The temple overlooks a long fertile stretch of coastal agricultural lands on a low deposited terrace area, mostly below 50m in altitude. These terraces are aquifer fed from the Troodos Mountains, and this water source is intermittently supplemented from the three main river valleys running out onto the coastal plain from the north, the most eastern one of which, the Dhiarizos River, runs north to south, just 800m to the west of Kouklia Palaepaphos.

There have been several relevant site excavations, rescue excavations and archaeological surveys of this area that have yielded material that was produced synchronously or pre-dates the target period of this study, and is therefore relevant to it. The first archaeological team to visit the area was the Cyprus Excavation Fund who carried out three months of excavation work around the Temple of Aphrodite at Kouklia Palaepaphos in 1888 (Hogarth et al. 1888). Many decades later, the Koukla Expedition of the University of St Andrews and Liverpool Museums carried out four weeks of cleaning work and excavations at the temple, including trenching to the west of the temple. They also identified the Marchello Hill fortifications and a feature which they interpreted as a siege mound or ramp, 800m north east of the temple, in 1952-1955 (Mitford and Iliffe 1951; Maier 1967), and a palatial building constructed of fine dressed margin ashlars at Hadji Abdoullah. This was originally dated to the Achaemenid Period. One of the excavators on that project, F.G. Maier, returned
to the site between 1966 and 1984 with funding from the German Archaeological Institute. His team excavated the fortifications and the so-called siege ramp, and examined other areas within the supposed city walls to try and identify domestic or industrial settlement evidence. Although this objective was not fully realised, they excavated several significant tombs, cleared wells of debris evidence, and developed the chronological profile and sequences of the site’s occupation.

30 km further west, at the other end of the Paphian agricultural lands, the Late Bronze Age coastal site of Maa *Palaekastro* was excavated by the Department of Antiquities in 1954, by Dikaios, and then from 1979-1986 by Karageorghis (Karageorghis and Demas 1988b: Vols 1-3, See also BCH Vols 104-110)(Figure 55). The nearby Chalcolithic sites in the Ktima Lowlands area were excavated by the University of Edinburgh’s Lemba Archaeological Project from 1979-1992, and more recently, an Early-Middle Bronze Age site called Kissonerga *Skalia* has been excavated by a University of Manchester team (Crewe et al. 2007).

Both the Ktima Lowlands and Kouklia were included in a 1976 CDOA archaeological survey of the area (Hadjisavvas 1976), and this survey identified an extensive cluster of Chalcolithic settlements and necropolises at Souskiou *Laona*, just 2.5 km north of the Late Bronze Age Temple of Aphrodite.

Sporadic Bronze Age, Geometric, Archaic, Hellenistic and Roman tombs covered the ridge and promontory around Kouklia *Palaepaphos*. Rescue excavations have been carried out frequently (Karageorghis 1967a; Karageorghis 1983a; Karageorghis 1990; Christou et al. 2006), and continue to this day, most notably within the large Kouklia *Skales* cemetery where many Early Geometric tombs have been found and recently excavated.

The landscape around the temple, the agricultural plain to the west and the river valleys were surveyed more intensively by the Canadian Palaepaphos Survey (Rupp 1981; Sorenson and Rupp 1993), and they located many clusters of ceramic fragments that indicated additional settlement and activity in the area. This information has been utilised during the ongoing work by the Chalcolithic Souskiou *Laona* project of the University of Edinburgh (Peltenburg et al. 2006).

In the Iron Age settlement area proper, the Palaepaphos Urban Landscape Project (Iacovou 2008) has carried out extensive new geophysical survey work to identify remnants of domestic structures or of industrial activity. They have excavated again at the Marchello Hill location, where extensive areas remained unexcavated, and which have recently come under threat from planned modern construction projects.

The main timeline of datable phases relating to the evolution of the Iron Age city kingdom can be summarised as follows:

**1400-1200 B.C.** International period: Increase in Aegean/Cretan/Levantine/Egyptian foreign trade past Palaepaphos; initial LBA settlement, foundation and expansion around Kouklia

**1230-1200 B.C.** Period of disruption: Establishment (Maier 1975; Crewe et al. 2007), expansion, two phases of occupation, and abandonment of Maa *Palaekastro*

**1200 B.C.** Foundation and construction of LBA sanctuary at Kouklia

**1200-1125 B.C.** (LCIIIA) Continuity of occupation evidenced by fragments of LCIIIA in wells, possible immigration phase from the Aegean or Crete

950-850 B.C.  (CGII) Slow consolidation of Geometric culture

850-600 B.C.  (CGIII/CAI) Phoenician trade increases, following Assyrian domination of mainland

600-540 B.C.  (CAII) Recovery of Egyptian hegemony, Greek, Ionian trade with Egypt

540-490 B.C.  Construction of Marchello fort, settlement disrupted by Persians?

The necropolises and wells around the sanctuary of Palaepaphos provide datable evidence that the settlement was continuously occupied from the Late Bronze Age into the Iron Age (Figure 49). There is still a lack of continuous stratigraphic sequences and there is certainly evidence of decline but not a break in activity. The mortuary data may not reflect settlement population or prosperity directly for a number of reasons, but it is likely that it does reflect these to some significant extent, and it demonstrates that the site’s early Iron Age history differs substantially from those of the other two case study sites. Similarly, the evidence at Palaepaphos points to a relatively peaceful transition into the Geometric Period (Maier and Karageorghis 1984: 126; Maier and Wartburg 1985: 152), unlike elsewhere on Cyprus and around the east Mediterranean (Kaniewski et al. 2011). The evidence suggests that LCIII/early Iron Age Palaepaphos was one the principal settlements on Cyprus at the time, particularly after Enkomi and Ugarit had been destroyed, and that it remained significantly wealthy despite the regional disruption.

---

**Figure 49 Number of tombs excavated per period and site after Janes (2008: Fig 5.1) (author’s diagram)**

The start of this period saw a colonial phase when newly displaced settlers arrived from the Aegean or Crete and settled across the island including at Palaepaphos. The decline in foreign trade over the tenth, ninth and eighth centuries B.C. corresponds to the partial regional ‘dark age’ (Maier and Karageorghis 1984: 152), or at least a decline in economic activity (Figure 49). This does not necessarily equate to a reduction in overall population and there are signs that the wealth of Paphos was maintained, particular in the Skales cemetery assemblages. This CGI period of consolidation was followed by the recovery of trade during the Phoenician
expansion of the Late Cypro-Geometric and Cypro-Archaic I periods, following the rise and Assyrian domination of the mainland, and possibly also of Cyprus by 700 B.C., but the tomb data suggests that Paphos did not profit from the economic upturn to the same degree as Amathus. The decline of Assyrian power by 600 B.C. was followed by the recovery of Egyptian influence over the Levant and Cyprus during Cypro-Archaic II Period, before the rise in Persian power led to the serious disruption of Paphos by the Persians in 490 B.C., including a possible invasion of Palaepaphos following the Ionian Revolt. Our case study ends at that date.

Historical sources relating to the foundation of the city kingdom are of limited use as there are several conflicting stories, all of them asserting different origins. Nevertheless, based on a wider body of evidence, Palaepaphos seems to have been ruled by a line of traditional ‘priest kings’, the Kinyrad dynasty, who reputedly maintained a Bronze Age political and religious model (Maier 1989b). The acropolis, with the Temple of Aphrodite, continued to act as the regional centre of power for the south western part of the Island well into the Iron Age. The sanctuary maintained its sacred status even after the settlement was moved 16km west to Kato Paphos near modern Paphos, and even into the Late Roman Period.

The multiscalar case study analysis of Ancient Paphos will try to reconcile the contextualised archaeological and historical evidence summarised above with a landscape survey of the terrain. As the scale continues down to the artefact level, the study will increasingly focus on the tree of life motif, and the meanings it communicated for the inhabitants of the city kingdom.
6.2. Multiscalar analysis of Palaepaphos

6.2.1. Regional level analysis

Following the extensive regional discussions that developed out of the first two case studies, the intention was to limit the Palaepaphos case study to a more focussed and local survey. Nevertheless, an extensive regional discussion again developed out of the data collected in this chapter, and the full analysis is detailed in Chapters 7 and 8. The section here and the section that follows, however, will be limited to a short discussion of the geography, geology and climate of the region and a brief outline of one the most significant periods of regional interconnections for Palaepaphos, the LCIII period, when contact between Cyprus and the west was extensive.

Paphos is the most physically isolated of the city kingdoms from the mainland, and from the rest of the island. This characteristic is one that can be observed in its material culture and history at several levels. Paphos maintained a degree of independence perhaps more than anywhere else on the island, and it was not until the Ptolemaic Period that it was disbanded as a political entity. Nevertheless, its location allowed it to look and trade to the east and west, and it shows links with the Aegean world as well as the Levantine world, perhaps in more equal measures than the other city kingdoms.

The establishment of the Late Bronze Age temple of Aphrodite at the site coincided with the now well-documented collapse of the 1190s B.C. (Kaniewski et al. 2011). There is surely enough evidence available now to directly relate the historical events recorded at the end of LCII with the archaeology of the city kingdom of Paphos, and this chapter is more concerned with correlating the sequence of events that followed this with the archaeology and the material culture.

Looking to the west from Palaepaphos, there is evidence of interaction with Rhodes, the Aegean and Crete, and in this context the neighbouring Cypriot LBA site of Maa Palaekastro, is highly significant. This defended coastal settlement, located on a peninsula between two sheltered bays, was established almost contemporaneously with the construction of the monumental sanctuary building at Kouklia Palaepaphos (the settlement at Palaepaphos was already in use). The material recovered from the Maa coastal site clearly demonstrates interaction with other regions via the sea (Maier and Wartburg 1985: 151), and the relationship between the archaeology and artefacts recovered from this site and the archaeology of Kouklia Palaepaphos will be discussed in the later sections of this chapter.

The evidence of contact between this part of Cyprus and Crete and the Aegean is perhaps most clear seen in the LCIIIA period. LCIIIA bell shaped bowls with antithetical spirals from Maa can be compared easily with LMIIIC bowls from Crete (Popham 1979: 189), locally made Philistine type 1 bowls and Mycenaean MCIIC imports from Ashdod in Palestine (Dothan 1982: 103-104) and WPWMIII vases from Palaepaphos Evreti well III (Steel 2004: 192). These ceramics have been taken to be manifestations of the incoming culture of the Achaeans and Sea Peoples (Dothan 1982: 217), but at Palaepaphos there is strong evidence for continuity of already established links and common traditions (Steel 2004: 193), suggesting a slower period of hybridisation of local and Aegean influences rather than an abrupt invasion of elites. Paphos remained wealthy into the LCIIIA period as the rich gold work of Evreti tomb KTE VIII clearly demonstrates (Catling 1968; Maier and Karageorghis 1984: 70), but soon after this immigration phase, links between Cyprus, Crete and the Aegean dwindled into insignificance (Coldstream 1979: 257), and it was not until the late Geometric...
and Archaic periods that connections were re-established, but this time with Euboea and Attica (Coldstream 1979: 263). Nevertheless, the contacts with Crete during the LCIII period are of interest as the Geometric and Archaic material shows many of the same motifs that are seen in Geometric and Archaic Cypriot material, but this may be due to parallel developments derived from common origins rather than evidence of ongoing contact. The Cretan material bearing the symbolism of the tree of life from Knossos is examined and discussed in more detail in section 7.7 and is catalogued in appendix 10.7.

The shortest distance west and north from Palaepaphos to the mainland coast of Anatolia is around 180 km by sea, while the distance by sea from the Palaepaphos district to the Levant, at Beirut, is 270 km.

The prevailing winds at this location generally favour an easterly direction of travel (Murray 1995), while the shortest route to the mainland is to the west and north. Paphos is therefore well balanced between the western and the eastern cultural and economic areas of the Aegean and the Levant.

Prevailing winds along the south coast of Cyprus are mostly from the west and northwest, particularly from June to November when east and south-easterly winds are exceptional. However, from December to May there are intermittent periods when easterly and north-easterly winds would have made travel from east to west along the south coast of Cyprus to Palaepaphos and beyond feasible, although still challenging (Murray 1995: 41-42).
6.2.2. Island level analysis

Paphos is located on the south western coast of Cyprus, and although well balanced between regional zones, its relative isolation from the wider regional geography and mainland economies explains in part why its history differs substantially from the other city kingdoms on the island (Figure 13). It is also separated from the Mesaoria plain by the substantial obstacle that is the Troodos Mountain range. Even the coastal land routes to the northwest and east are over ridges and valleys making travel on foot outwith the city kingdom an extremely challenging prospect. Overland transport of heavy goods to the larger ports on the east coast would not have been feasible. The primary objective of the island level study of Paphos was to establish how these logistical factors impacted on the industrial functions of the city.

There is evidence of copper working from the city, and copper slag has been found (Maier and Wartburg 1985: 148 & 155), but the question of whether copper working was a primary function of the city kingdom is more complex. The copper industry was clearly an important one to Cyprus, but there were other reasons to establish city kingdoms, for defence or as entrepôts, and other occupations that were industrial in scale, such as the timber supply industry and grain agriculture.

At the island level there are several zones around the edges of the Troodos massif where suitable pillow lavas are exposed and copper ore is present and can be mined. The economic viability of mining these ores depended in part on the percentage of their metallic content, but it also depended on other factors such as their relative proximity to timber resources for smelting, and their relative proximity to the transport routes via the sea. The challenge of transporting such heavy cargo over difficult terrain would have been significant, even after the bulk ore was smelted and formed into copper oxhide ingots.

There is a lower pillow lava seam (where copper can be found) with exposed outcrops 10km to the north of Palaepaphos, but I was able to establish that these are not copper ore bearing. They do contain economically significant bodies of Chromium ore that have been mined commercially, most notably at Ktima and Ayia Varvara just north and northeast of modern Paphos (Bear 1963: 105), but no copper. The closest copper ore bearing pillow lavas are in fact more than 25km to the north east of Paphos at altitudes in excess of 500m, north of Kedares. Although these ore bodies are technically viable and have been mined, their viability in antiquity would not have been good compared to other outcrops that were mined more successfully on the island, such as at Skourioutissa and Maroni-Vournes.

The diagram below (Figure 50) compares the logistical factors relating to the ore body north of the city kingdom of Palaepaphos with that of the intensively worked Skourioutissa mines on the north side of the Troodos Mountains. This graph compares the routes down which ore or copper would have to be transported and it shows that the scale of the task was much more substantial at Palaepaphos than at Skourioutissa. This therefore provides evidence that Palaepaphos was not primarily founded for the mining, production and trade of copper, but may instead have been established and developed based on a wider range of factors that will be considered in the following sections.

The diagram compares two sectional profiles of hypothetical transport journeys, from the mines down to the sea (moving from upper right to lower left), down which copper ore and copper had to be transported. The longer strip of the diagram shows the section profile of the transport route from the Kedares mine above Palaepaphos, down to Palaepaphos, and then down to the sea by the most direct route. The sanctuary is shown on its own outcrop mound, en route to the sea. The shorter, but steeper route on the left shows the
elevations and distances of the route down which ore from Skourioutissa must have been taken in Antiquity to reach the sea. The contrasting logistical challenges demonstrate that the effort required to transport ore from the Palaepaphos Kedares mines to the sea is much greater than at Skourioutissa. This would have directly influenced the economic viability of mining these deposits. Based on this evidence, it does not seem that Palaepaphos was established to be a settlement primarily concerned with the copper mining industry, although it may have been involved in its transport and trade along the coast from elsewhere.

![Figure 50 Comparative proximity of two ore bodies to sea (left axis height above sea level, lower axis dist. from sea) (author’s diagram)](image)

6.2.3. Kingdom level analysis

The administrative and ritual centre of the city kingdom of Ancient Paphos is situated at Palaepaphos 1.5km from the coast, on a promontory at the end of a limestone ridge sloping down from the southern foothills of the Troodos Mountain range.

The temple sits at 83m above sea level and overlooks an extensive area of agricultural land located on a sedimentary and rain-wash deposited terrace beside the Mediterranean Sea. This coastal agricultural terrace stretches along the south western edge of the Troodos foothills for 35km (Figure 55). A series of valleys enters the northern side of this plain between the ridges, and some of these bring rivers with relatively high quantities of water to the area, albeit on a seasonal and weather related basis. These include from east to west, the Dhiarizos, the Xeropotamos and Ezousa rivers, and each of these has its own aquifer system of groundwater hydrology. In addition, the plain as a whole functions as an aquifer area, as the height of the adjacent mountains and the higher rainfall above means that the water table pressure pushes fresh water and moisture down into the soil of the sedimentary plain from the north. The total aquifer area is 110 km² and wells can extract water where required. The land is therefore very good for agriculture, and it continues to be used in this way despite the encroachment of modern urban expansion (Savvides 2001).

The climate in the Paphos district is also more moderate than inland, and its exposed aspect to the south west means that it receives substantially more breezes than elsewhere on the island’s coast, something that the new wind turbine farm to the northeast of Palaepaphos attests to. The temperature here is on average 5 degrees C lower in summer, and 5 degrees C higher in winter, than the respective average temperatures in the central areas of the island (Christou 2008: 7).

Investigation of the city kingdom at this multiscalar level took place in June 2011. Field survey work included ten days of landscape investigation, involving travel around the district in order to develop first hand
knowledge of the topography, geology and archaeology of the area as a whole. Any sites of special archaeological interest were identified or targeted and examined with walkover survey, and any unusual natural, geological or topographical features were examined and noted. Each landscape survey trip was recorded with GPS tracking, and three of the site survey trips are shown in the diagram below (Figure 51).

Each landscape survey trip was concerned with a different aspect of the city kingdom. The green route for example focussed on the area within the supposed city walls, close to the temple, the Marchello gate and adjacent cemeteries. The blue route was concerned with examining significant necropolises and areas of pre-Iron Age settlement north of Palaepaphos, and then on the coastal plane where localised evidence of possible settlement activity was found during the Canadian Palaepaphos Survey (Sorenson and Rupp: 32 settlement 83-D-1). The geological area survey (not shown) established that there are no copper ore bodies within 20 km of the city kingdom, but serpentinite outcrops were identified in the local pillow lava seam 7.8 km to the north-northwest of the city (Figure 52). These outcrops showed evidence of small scale mining, and may have been a source of the ritually significant blue and green coloured rock sometimes used in the manufacture of Chalcolithic cruciform figurines and axe heads, alongside the more familiar picrolite recovered from riverbeds. This serpentinite is thought to be one of the reasons that this area was considered an attractive place to settle for prehistoric ceramic peoples (Sorenson and Rupp 1993: 255).

![Figure 51 GPS trace of site field survey routes with points of significance marked (author’s map and data)](image-url)

Investigation of the cultures that lived in the area before the Iron Age was one aspect of the study considered of value, given the importance placed on the past by the inhabitants of the other case study sites. The people may have formed part of the cultural ancestry of the Iron Age community. With respect to the Chalcolithic inhabitants of the area, the Souskiou Laona ridge (Figure 55) at flag markers 227 and 228 (Figure 51) is an area of special significance. The remains of three Chalcolithic cemeteries and an area of domestic structures have been found around the small ridge of about 1km running SW to NE alongside the Dhiarizos river valley, and so an effort was made to establish why this area was considered so attractive. This is located
2km N-NE of the Bronze and Iron Age sanctuary and is referred to as Souskiou-Vathyrokas/Laona (Christou et al. 2006; Peltenburg et al. 2006). It was a densely populated agricultural settlement with several significant cemeteries, including at marker 228 in (Figure 51); see also (Figure 53).

![Figure 52 Serpentine outcrop and samples from 1.2 km north of (new) Choletria (author’s photograph)](image)

The proximity of this site to Kouklia Palaepaphos was of potential significance, and while there is no clear evidence of an unbroken continuity of occupation in the area (Maier and Karageorghis 1984: 46), particularly during the Early Bronze Age transition from the 3rd to 2nd millennium B.C. (Chalcolithic-Middle Cypriot), there is evidence that the temple may have been positioned with regards to the remains of two rock cut pits that may have been the remains of earlier Chalcolithic houses (Maier and Wartburg 1985: 145). This recalls the situation at Amathus and Idalion where later settlements were established at sites of existing structures or burials. When associated with tombs this phenomenon has been referred to in the Greek world as a hero cult, however, the specific association of this site with the Homeric narrative may be misleading.

The possible foundation of the temple at a location where older rock cut pits existed nevertheless echoes the conclusions drawn from the earlier case studies, that hilltop caves and tombs were ritually significant.

Two other nearby sites also indicate this. At marker 224, 1.2 km west of the Souskiou Ridge, a deep valley or gorge full of abundant vegetation has rock cut chambers cut into the south wall of the escarpment. These caves are now associated with Christianity and are described as monastic cells or hermitages, as an asketerio or enkleistra (Figure 53 right).

These caves, 3.2km north of Palaepaphos, now have a small chapel built nearby (marker 226) dedicated to Saint Konstantinos, and so this area is still considered ritually significant. I was unable to confirm that the caves were used by the people from the nearby Chalcolithic, Bronze and Iron Age settlements (Hadjisavvas 1976: 230, settlement 10 and cemetery 11), but evidence of continuous use of ancient sacred sites is strong enough to propose that this gorge has been a place of significance in the landscape since the Chalcolithic period, and including the Iron Age. There are three practical reasons that this site would have been frequented. Firstly, the high wall of the escarpment is on the south side of the valley, so that it provides excellent protection and shade from the sun and heat through the middle of the day. Secondly, the depth of the vegetation indicates a substantial water supply to this small valley, so that fresh water may be accessed by shallow well even when it is not flowing above ground. Finally, the steep wall of the cliff is made of limestone, and so it is relatively easy to cut chambers to provide further protection from rain or wind, as well
as from the sun. In summary, the caves provide excellent temporary summer shelters for people escaping excessive temperatures lower down the valley and on the plain.

The second area evidencing familiar long term patterns of landscape use is the necropolis built on the summit of the ridge (marker 228). The main cemetery at Souskiou Laona is positioned right at the summit of the ridge (Figure 53 left), showing that the Chalcolithic people already considered this aspect of cemetery location and mortuary practice to be ritually significant. Many picrolite figurines were found in the tombs of this area, some cruciform, while the tombs were rather unusual bottle shaped pits (Maier and Wartburg 1985: 24).

The use of hilltops and plateaus for settlements as well as cemeteries was a common tradition of the Chalcolithic period (Maier and Wartburg 1985: 24), and rock cut tombs are found elsewhere on hilltops on Cyprus such as on the summit west of the acropolis of Amathus. Fragments of fertility figurines resembling more complete versions from the island were also found, and in conclusion Maier and Wartburg were satisfied that a local Chalcolithic religious tradition developed here that later became the Iron Age cult of the goddess Aphrodite (Maier and Wartburg 1985: 145).

In light of the conclusions from this topographical and landscape survey, and from the first two case studies, that ‘high places’ or hilltops were of special ritual and practical significance to the people of Iron Age Cyprus, I decided to produce viewsheds and panoramic photographs for the Kouklia Palaepaphos sanctuary location. The Late Bronze Age temple is located at a high point on the ridge overlooking the coastal agricultural strip. The viewshed from the temple site is shown below (Figure 54). In this diagram the temple location is marked + and all of the land and sea that is visible from the temple site is coloured in red.

![Figure 53 Chalcolithic tombs on summit at Souskiou and gorge and caves at marker 224 (author’s photographs)](image)

The agricultural fields can be seen as an area of patchwork squares along the coast. From this diagram it is clear that a very large proportion of the agricultural land is directly visible from the temple site and that a very substantial area of the sea to the east and west is also visible. These two aspects of the site’s location demonstrate that Palaepaphos was very well positioned at a strategically advantageous point in the landscape. This also indicates that the two main advantages of the location relate directly to two of the
major industrial or economic functions of the city kingdom, which were as a centre for agriculture and for sea trade. The temple location therefore had practical attributes as well as ritual significance.

The temple is at a high point on the ridge promontory, rather than being on an isolated hilltop, but the Paphians were clearly concerned with positioning other buildings at high points in the landscape as well. This conclusion is confirmed and reinforced by the fact that both the Marchello Hill gate and the Hadji Abdoullah palace were also placed at neighbouring local high points on the group of ridges clustered around the central gully just east of Palaepaphos. In fact, all of the substantial built structures, the temple, the Marchello gate and the Hadji Abdoullah palace are at local high spots in the landscape.

The next aspect of the temple site considered was its relationship with the other Late Bronze Age settlements in the district, the most significant of which was the coastal port settlement at Maa Palaekastro.

Although Maa is not visible from Palaepaphos, the temple looks along to it from the east. Maa Palaekastro is located at the far west end of the agricultural plain, down on the edge of the sea on a peninsula, whereas Palaepaphos was placed at the end of a ridge and slightly inland. These opposing stances may have a significance that reflected their differing functions as well as the social relationship between the inhabitants of both sites.

Figure 54 Viewshed diagram produced for the Palaepaphos temple location marked + (author’s illustration)
Maa is positioned at the western end of the 35km stretch of agricultural land in the ‘Ktima Lowlands’ area (Figure 55), which hosts a cluster of important archaeological sites including Chalcolithic Lemba. The relationship between Kouklia Palaepaphos and Maa Palaekastro is of interest and relevant to the cultural ancestry of the Iron Age community as the coastal settlement at Maa was inhabited contemporaneously with the temple site.

These two Late Bronze Age sites, Maa and Palaepaphos, were positioned at opposing ends of the contiguous agricultural lands that formed the Iron Age city kingdom. Unlike Palaepaphos, however, Maa was destroyed and abandoned at the end of the Bronze Age, but there is evidence that the settlers of Maa subsequently moved to Palaepaphos, or at least were buried there (Maier and Wartburg 1985: 151).

The intermediate phase, LCIII, between the end of LCII and the start of CGI is a complex one for Cyprus, but the archaeological material from this period at Palaepaphos is enlightening. The evolution of cemetery use patterns and associated broad ceramic classes must be discussed here, whereas a detailed discussion of the new iconographies that developed on the pottery is reserved for the artefact discussion level later in this chapter.

The pottery of LCIIIA recovered from Palaepaphos demonstrates continuity with types already being introduced and locally produced in LCIIIC. These styles can be grouped under the umbrella term White Painted Wheelmade III (WPWMIII). This class strongly resembles early Myc. IIIC pottery and it is thought that the fabrication technique and associated styles were adopted from the Aegean precursors of the Late Bronze Age (Steel 1994: 239). As already mentioned in the regional discussion above, there are strong similarities between some distinctive skyphoi or bell shaped bowls or vases with antithetical spirals found at Palaepaphos and those from Maa (Figure 89) dating to the transitional LCII/LCIII period, from before Maa was abandoned around 1200 B.C. These both resemble contemporary vessels from the Philistine areas of the southern Levant (Dothan 1982: 99) (Figure 79).

These vessels at Maa are identified as an imported style of pottery brought into Cyprus and then manufactured locally by Mycenaean immigrants at the start of the 12th century B.C. (Steel 1994; Steel 2004: 192). This is contemporaneous with the construction of Maa and the foundation of the temple at Kouklia, and it demonstrates the continuity and changes that took place as Palaepaphos moved through into the LCIIIA period, after the disruptive period at the end of the Aegean Bronze Age.

Palaepaphos survived this period but Maa did not. After the abandonment of Maa at this time, the styles and decoration of the LCIIIA pottery at Palaepaphos continued to be strongly influenced by the middle Myc.IIIC styles for the rest of the LCIIIA, but by the LCIIIB period it seems that the Aegean region had started to become isolated from Cyprus, and the LCIIIB pottery is largely a derivative of LCIIIA pottery rather than resembling contemporaneous late Myc.IIIC and Submycenaean styles of the Aegean. This information has been used to support a proposal that there was substantial Mycenaean migration into the Paphos area and into Cyprus in general during the LCIIIA period, but that by LCIIIB the migrants had settled down with the local population. Steel considers that this interaction is better characterised as the continuous hybridisation of Aegean influences with local Cypriot traditions (Steel 2004: 193) rather than a sudden invasion, but the end result of this was the development of a hybrid, Cypriot, early Iron Age style that was remarkably homogeneous throughout the island (Steel 1994: 240). This homogeneity suggests that the sites that subsequently became the city kingdoms of Cyprus did not become isolated from each other, although they became separated from the Aegean. It is not possible to suggest which, if any, of the early city kingdoms of Cyprus was a leader or innovator of the new generic style (Steel 1994: 241), but it is possible to say that
Palaepaphos was one of the principal trading sites of the CGI period (Karageorghis 1983a: 371), in part due to the demise of Ugarit at the end of the Bronze Age and the subsequent impact on Enkomi/Salamis.

LCIIIB saw a change in cemetery location and type at Palaepaphos. The old sites were mostly abandoned and new cemeteries were established well outside the main settlement area and on hillsides rather than hilltops, such as at Palaepaphos Xerolimni and Lakos tou Skarnou (Maier 1970: 79; Iacovou 1991: 203). Proto-White Painted ware pottery was another new, derivative, local, development of Cyprus during this LCIIIB period (Iacovou 1988; Iacovou 1991; Steel 1994). Some tombs continued to be built on the tops of the ridge north of the sanctuary, such as the well published tomb 1966 (Karageorghis 1967a) (Figure 57) which contained 43 of the new Proto White Painted ware vessels, several of which retained typically Mycenaean forms such as the stirrup jars and belly handled amphorae, forms which slowly disappeared during the CG period. The new architectural form of tomb 1996 has been associated with the last wave of Mycenaean immigration into and across Cyprus (Karageorghis 1967a: 4), but the Proto White Painted pottery style within it has been described as an amalgam of local and Aegean styles (Iacovou 1991: 204) and so this tomb is a fine example from the LCIIIB transitional period when cultural hybridisation was at its most intense. The decoration of the vessels is influenced by middle Myc. IIIIC iconography, but here the designs become highly abstract and include only the very prominent triangles and wavy lined bands that went on to become characteristics of the Cypro Geometric period pottery, and they include almost no pictorial decoration.

During the LCIIIB and very early Geometric Period, further developments took place in the mortuary practices at Kouklia Palepaphos, most notably with the inauguration of the cemetery at Skales which became the site of many CGI tombs with substantial assemblages of funerary goods indicating the maintenance of relatively high levels of wealth. Here the cemetery was moved down onto the sea-facing hillside slopes of

Figure 55 Terrace/plain between Palaepaphos (lower right) and Maa (upper left) & settlements (C=Chalcolithic) (author’s illustration)
the ridge adjacent to the temple promontory (Figure 57). A range of Proto White Painted and White Painted I stirrup jars with formalised triangles and wavy line motifs show continuity from the LCIIIB and LCIIIA precursors and the pottery will be examined in more detail in the following sections. These extramural tombs were built with the new architectural style featuring a dromos and chamber, cut into the side of the hillside at Skales (Karageorghis 1983a: 3). These are very different to the pits cut into the hilltops as seen in the earlier sites and again this style has been attributed to Mycenaean influences, despite the fact that by the time this cemetery was in use there is little evidence for continuing contact with the Aegean (Karageorghis 1983a: 372).

At Palaepaphos we can trace continuity of occupation, immigration and subsequent cultural hybridisation taking place over the Bronze Age/Iron Age horizon, and perceive the first dawning of the Iron Age city kingdoms. This transitional period laid the foundations of the Cypriot city-kingdom political formations of the Iron Age across the island, and so in this respect the case study of Palaepaphos has been extremely helpful for understanding the early history and chronology of the island as a whole.

![Figure 56 Landscape around city kingdom. Port area was where Dhiarizos meets sea (author’s illustration)](image)

In conclusion, the landscape survey of the Paphos district indicated that Kouklia Palaepaphos was a carefully located agricultural resource management centre, founded on local traditions dating back to the Bronze Age and even Chalcolithic periods, as well as new cultural traditions arriving from the sea. Late Bronze Age Palaepaphos may have benefited from the international period trade networks as well as the disruption that took place as this trade system collapsed around 1200 B.C. Palaepaphos may have been involved in copper working, but it was not a major centre for copper production.
The landscape level evidence suggests that a population from Maa migrated to Palaepaphos after the abandonment and destruction of their settlement. The new community of local and immigrant peoples at Palaepaphos gradually hybridised their cultures during LCIIIA and LCIIIB, thereby sowing the seeds of the Iron Age city kingdom. The Iron Age history of the town will be discussed in the following sections.

6.2.4. Settlement level analysis

Unlike the disasters that befell other settlements on Cyprus from the 11th century B.C. onwards, there was no complete economic breakdown at Palaepaphos (Figure 49) (Iacovou 2008: 267) and the well stocked cemetery of Skales suggests wealth levels were maintained. The origins of the Iron Age polity developed out of both local and foreign precursor cultures, but by the early Iron Age Palaepaphos functioned as the kingdom of a Greek speaking dynasty (Iacovou 2008: 272) ruled by the Kinyrad kings (Maier and Wartburg 1985: 152).

Apart from the temple which will be examined in the next section, there are two other monumental buildings in the city kingdom that were constructed during the Iron Age period covered by this study. Both are situated on the top of ridges to the north and east, at Marchello and Hadjiabdoulla, and both of these are thought to have been fortified administrative or military structures rather than ritual centres (Figure 56) (although there may have been an extramural sanctuary near Marchello).

Until recently, the administrative building at Hadjiabdoulla was thought to have been built as a palace by the Persians after they invaded and destroyed the city through a gateway in the city wall at Marchello. The invasion was thought to have included the construction of a siege ramp to take over the city gate, but more recent investigations undertaken by the Palaepaphos Urban Landscape Project of the University of Cyprus have concluded that there was no continuous city wall (personal communication M. Iacovou 9/6/2011), and that there is evidence of earlier occupation at the site of the supposed Persian administrative building. The ramifications of this are that, rather than being integral parts of a large wall around a contiguous settlement, the structures were isolated but strategically defendable and positioned at high points on the ridges around the Loures Stream valley.

The sanctuary was on the lowest but most southerly ridge to the south west (83m altitude), while the Marchello fortified structure was to the north (114m), and the Hadjiabdoulla fortified administrative building was to the east (110m). Based on the new interpretations, the Palaepaphians seem to have opted for a sanctuary overlooked by fortified monumental structures at the high points in the nearby landscape. Together, these overlooked the temple, the still-elusive settlement, the agricultural plain, the port area on the coast, and far along the coast to the east and west (Figure 54). The siege of the city ‘gate’ may in fact have been a siege of a small fortress or tower.

These three structures are valuable archaeological resources, but they throw less light on the Iron Age than may be expected. The standing architecture of the temple dates to either the Late Bronze Age or to the Roman and Medieval periods. Likewise, the archaeology excavated from the Marchello Hill fort dates mostly to the very end of the Cypro-Archaic Period. The artefacts recovered from the excavations are useful for understanding the profile of the material culture of Palaepaphos at the end of the period covered by this study, around 480 B.C., but they are not particularly useful for understanding the origins, development and
hybridisation of the early Iron Age communities and their material culture. The feature previously interpreted as a siege ramp at the Marchello Hill fort is well known for the number of artefacts found deposited into the fill, and these will be discussed in the artefact level section, but with respect to understanding the period between the end of the Bronze Age and the Archaic Period, it is the tombs of Palaepaphos that provide the most informative body of evidence.

Figure 57 Geographical distribution of tombs around Palaepaphos (author's map)

Hundreds of tombs have been excavated in the area from the Late Bronze and Iron Ages, including a very substantial built structure at Arkalou. The largest cemetery is, however, at Skales and it includes tombs from the early Geometric through to the Archaic Period. Fifty five tombs and a pyre were excavated by the Department of Antiquities in 1979 and 1980 (Karageorghis 1983a), and since the year 2000 many dozens of
tombs have been excavated in rescue missions. These are currently unpublished. Some of the artefacts from the tombs at Skales and the iconography that they carry will be discussed in the following sections.

The architecture of these tombs and their location in the landscape is significant (Figure 57). The geographical distribution of tombs around Palaepaphos is widespread but not random. The choice of location corresponds in some respects with the period in which they were built. The variation in choice of location is understood to reflect differing mortuary traditions followed during those periods. While the Chalcolithic cemeteries already discussed were located on and around the summits of ridges near Souskiou, the great majority of the Bronze Age tombs were grouped around the centre gully of the Loures watercourse, and are thought to have been within the domestic settlement area of the town.

The Geometric and Archaic Period tombs are almost all to the south eastern side of the site, mainly on the far side of the Loures watercourse, across from the sanctuary (Karageorghis 1983a: 5; Maier and Karageorghis 1984: 121). These are considered extramural necropolises and are mostly built into the sides of the hills.

This parallels the landscape use patterns at Amathus, where the main Archaic cemetery is found on an adjoining sea-facing hill to the east of the sanctuary acropolis. The Geometric and Archaic tombs at Palaepaphos are also grouped together and positioned down the sides of the ridges, not on top. This change in mortuary practice to a new form of extramural tomb architecture included the addition of substantial dromos entrances, usually aligned with the other tomb entrances in the necropolis, and rectilinear rock cut chambers. Again, this parallels the situation seen in many of the tombs at Amathus.

Common traditions have already been noted between the cemetery at Skales and the earliest tombs at Amathus. The assemblage in the early Geometric tomb 521 at Amathus (Chapter 4.2.4) closely matches collections of artefacts from this cemetery (Karageorghis and Iacovou 1990), although the tomb architecture in those cases seems to have been adapted for the more sandy Anemos necropolis environment closer to the sea where rock cut chambers could not be constructed (Gjerstad et al. 1935b: 134). Finally, the strategic location of the settlement and acropolis at Amathus, at the eastern end of the coastal agricultural plain, closely mirrors the location of the Palaepaphos settlement, which overlooks the east end of the coastal plain at Paphos. These are indications that similar factors and conceptual structures were at work in both areas, shaping underlying landscape and settlement use choices and patterns. The ideological factors underlying these settlement and cemetery location choices are discussed in Chapter 7, but it is clear that it is useful to study the landscape, settlement and cemeteries alongside the artefacts found within them, and that they are all closely interlinked.
6.2.5. Individual structure level analysis

The Late Bronze Age temple of Aphrodite at Kouklia Paleapaphos was widely known in Antiquity. Several surviving Greek and Roman texts refer to it and to events and people associated with it. This study will focus on the archaeology of the structure rather than its recorded history, and on a remarkable artefact that was uncovered during its excavation in 1975 (Maier 1976: 96).

The Late Bronze Age temple is known as Sanctuary 1 and it consisted of two adjoining rectangular structures. To the south was an open temenos court surrounded by massive ‘Cyclopean’ walls of slab-shaped orthostats standing on end (Figure 58), and this was adjoined to the north by the remains of a more typical Late Bronze Age Cypriot hall with a roof supported on squared stone pillars. The walls of this room were built of finely cut dressed margin ashlar blocks of a type that has been found at Alassa, Kalavasos Aghios Dhimitrios and Kition (Hadjisavvas 1989; South 1992). The potentially ‘hybridised’ complex is orientated along a north south alignment, with the probable entrance to the south, facing out over the flat agricultural lands below and down to the sea.

The construction of this substantial temple was made possible due to the nucleation and expansion of the population there during the LCIIC/LCIIIA, which equates to the middle to late 12th century B.C. (Iacovou 2008: 270). The incipient urban settlement was originally established in MCIII/LCI, around 1,600 B.C., but the sanctuary was built and the settlement expanded substantially around the same time that many of the more traditional Bronze Age centres were in decline or were destroyed, right at the end of the Bronze Age. Unlike those primarily agricultural centres involved with the large scale storage and redistribution of surplus, such as Alassa and Kalavasos Aghios Dhimitrios, the sanctuary at Palaepaphos also functioned as an emporion (Iacovou 2008: 264) linked to the maritime trade networks.

The unusual mix of architectural styles in the Bronze Age sanctuary is notably similar to the combination seen on the promontory of Maa Palaekastro, where dressed margin ashlar buildings are protected on the landward side by two solid ‘Cyclopean’ walls built from rough hewn stones erected on edge. The similarity may be significant, and when viewed against the backdrop of other changing architectural and funerary traditions, it seems plausible that the unusual Cyclopean wall at Palaepaphos is related to the arrival of Aegean immigrants in the district at Maa Palaekastro. Perhaps the combined and contrasting architectural styles of the temple walls can even be related to the two main groups that were meeting at that time. The orientation of the halls, with the more typically Cypriot hall placed inland of the more typically foreign temenos area may reflect the social and geographical structure of different indigenous and foreign groups in the community. The fact that the shrine to the goddess is thought to have been erected directly at the interface between the two halls is perhaps also indicative of the social situation at the time. This would be a good example of ritual and material culture serving as a manifestation and expression of deep cultural issues, but it is difficult to demonstrate this explicitly.

The Bronze Age sanctuary or temple on the acropolis was most extensively investigated by the Swiss-German expedition team under the direction of F.G. Maier from 1973 to 1979. They identified that only a very limited part of the architecture dated to the Late Bronze Age, and of this, very little stratified evidence could be extracted due to the fact that the structure was built directly onto shallow bedrock at this location. The site had been cleared to solid rock at construction and any stratigraphy that had accumulated since that
time had been removed or had eroded already. Nevertheless, several notable features of the architecture at this location have been identified.

As was previously mentioned in this chapter (Maier and Wartburg 1985: 145), two rock cut pits were found ‘below the hall’ that resembled Chalcolithic house pits excavated at Kalavassos Tenta. It is notable that the Bronze Age sanctuary was founded at a hilltop location where large pre-existing and ancient pits were already in existence. This echoes the situation with the acropolises at Amathus and Idalion where Iron Age sanctuaries were established on top of earlier rock cut tombs and small caves. This also echoes and reinforces the conclusions from previous case studies; that caves and tombs were considered significant landscape features, and may have had connection to deep-seated ritual belief systems.

![Figure 58 Megalithic walls of sanctuary at Palaepaphos and view to southeast (author’s photograph)](image)

During the clearing of the northern Late Bronze Age hall of Sanctuary 1 a discovery was made of an artefact still in situ (Figure 59). Buried up to its neck in a rock cut pit was a very large Late Cypriot II/III storage jar. At 1.5m in height and 1.32m in diameter it is one of the largest vessels of its type so far found in Cyprus (Maier and Karageorghis 1984: 96). It was carefully buried in reddish clay and was complete apart from its rim, which was cut off by a later wall. Due to the fragments of Late Cypriot II/III vessels found inside, it had clearly been in situ since the Late Bronze Age.

As well as the distinctive ‘wavy line’ pattern surrounding it, the handle was decorated with a cylinder seal frieze of 5cm in height, applied when the clay was still wet (Figure 60). The seal impression includes a variety of typically Late Bronze Age icons from the end of the international period, including a winged sphinx, a bull and a tree of life motif. This combination would not seem particularly remarkable were it not for the fact that larger vessels decorated with the tree of life and bull motifs, on and around the handles, have already been identified as ritually significant at the sanctuaries of Idalion (5.4)(Figure 48) and Amathus (4.2.7)(Figure 25). Other large vessels decorated with tree of life designs around the handles have been found at the
entrance to sanctuaries such as at Golgoi (Cesnola 1877: 145), so this vessel surely had a ritual significance at the heart of the sanctuary beyond its capacity as a simple storage jar.

Studies of the tree of life on Cypriot Bronze Age cylinder seals show that it was a very commonly used motif (Kepinski 1982; Meekers 1987). The use of seals to decorate or label pottery was known during the Late Bronze Age and is sometimes regarded as a northern Levantine tradition (Porada 1988).

![Figure 59 Approximate find spot of Late Cypriot pithos with seal markings (looking south) (author's photograph)](image)

This large vessel, its decoration and the way in which it was used point to similarities between the ritual activities at the Bronze Age sanctuary at Palaepaphos and the ritual activities reconstructed for the Iron Age inhabitants Amathus and Idalion. Palaepaphos is one of the few sites on Cyprus where cultural continuity is evidenced from the Bronze Age into the Geometric and Archaic periods (Karageorghis 1983a: 370). The continued interaction evidenced at Palaepaphos means that it would have been one of the polities where social differences between the immigrants and the locals were raised and resolved, thus contributing to the remarkably homogeneous material culture evidenced across the island during the subsequent LCIIB and into the Geometric Period (Gjerstad 1979: 232; Steel 1994: 240; Iacovou 2005b: 29). This hybridisation seems to have taken place rapidly at first, during the LCIIIA, and the new hybrid traditions were then consolidated during the quieter centuries of the Cypro-Geometric Period, elsewhere known as the ‘dark ages’ of LCIIB and CGI, when Cyprus was less exposed to external influences or perturbations.

So far, the surveys of the regional and local landscape, and the temple and tomb architecture have allowed a good broad understanding of the historical backdrop and the early development of the Iron Age city kingdom to develop, but as the artefact level is approached, it becomes increasingly clear that the iconography on individual artefacts can be carefully interpreted against this backdrop to extract further information, particularly regarding rituals and beliefs. A deeper understanding of the meanings carried by
the iconography and the material culture can throw further light on the history and culture of the sanctuary and the city kingdom as a whole, just as the converse holds true.

Figure 60 Late Cypriot II/III storage jar from sanctuary 1 CPA38 (Author’s illustration)
6.2.6. Artefact level analysis

Forty-five artefacts were identified and compiled into the catalogue that lists notable examples of tree of life iconography from the city kingdom of Palaepaphos (Chapter 10.6), and associated abstract iconography. All of the artefacts were excavated from the Paphos district. As there is a degree of continuity from the Late Cypriot Bronze Age into the Iron Age seen at Palaepaphos that is not evidenced at Amathus or Idalion, significant artefacts from the very end of the Bronze Age and the very early Geometric Period have been included in the catalogue to allow a fuller understanding of the development of the Iron Age iconography and ritual belief system to be developed. This section will briefly present significant artefacts in chronological order.

The first and earliest piece catalogued is CPA43 (Figure 61), a large ‘Mycenaean’ pictorial style or pastoral style krater excavated from Palaepaphos (Gumbatas 1989), and dating from the 13th or 12th centuries B.C. (LHIIIA-B). This shows a formalised motif with two opposing bulls around a tree of life. The floral style of the tree decoration is reminiscent of the Rhodian ‘papyrus painter’ vases of this period (cf. Louvre CA1584), and it also echoes earlier Minoan ‘palace style’ vessels, and decoration on vessels from cultures based all around the northern Levant, such as the Mitannian Nuzi wares, and Nuzi palace mural decoration.

This style of vase is usually identified as Mycenaean, but the iconography was derived from a wider ‘international style’ canon of art, and arguments continue as to whether this type was imported to Cyprus from the Mycenaean Aegean, or, more likely, manufactured on Cyprus following adoption of Aegean styles at the end of the international period (Knapp 2008: 256). In this context it should be described as a decorated Late Cypriot II krater. This scene and its style of execution is a typical Late Bronze Age arrangement, and it is a product of the wide ranging trade network that had hybridised themes during the international period (Feldman 2006) and which included Cyprus. It is precisely because of the hybridised and generic aspects of this vessel that it is difficult to definitively designate it ethnically, and the Mycenaean attribution should therefore be treated with caution.

Figure 61 Pastoral style ‘Mycenaean’ amphoroid krater from Palaepaphos CPA43 (author’s illustration)
Another fragment of pastoral style pottery CPA05 showing a bull with horns lowered at a tree of life was excavated from Koukla Ευρέτι tomb KD202 (Maier and Karageorghis 1984: 59). The Late Bronze Age pithos CPA38 from the temple, already discussed in the previous section, is contemporary with this fragment. A proto-white painted bowl in the museum at Palaepaphos CPA04 from Xylinos also carries a more simplified and stylised version of the tree of life flanked by caprids (Karageorghis et al. 1997: Pl XX). This dates to the very early Cypro Geometric Period.

It is clear then that the tree flanked by opposing animals was a typical motif at the end of the Bronze Age and into the Iron Age, and these examples from Koukla are joined by a remarkable decorated pithos fragment CPA44 from Maa Palaeokastro (Porada 1988)(Figure 62). This fragment was excavated in room 85A (area III) of the settlement and is decorated with a relief frieze of a type not dissimilar to that found on the large pithos from Palaepaphos. On the Palaepaphos pithos CPA38, however, the relief frieze seal impression on the handle was made with a regular cylinder seal, whereas in this case from Maa it was made with a large rolled mould made for the specific purpose of decorating pithoi.

Figure 62 Pithos relief frieze fragment 264 from Maa Palaeokastro CPA44 (author’s illustration)

The fragments are decorated with a classic Bronze Age scene of two caprids climbing up to a tree of life, which was especially popular on Cyprus (Bushnell 2005). Less typically, the scene includes two triangular hills depicted on either side of the base of the main tree, with additional trees growing from them. The central
tree is notable for the bump portrayed at the bottom, which Porada associates with the bases of olive trees from which new shoots are cut to produce new plants. She considers this mound is notable and significant within the context of fertility (Porada 1988: 303). The decoration on this fragment will be discussed in more detail in the following section.

The next group of vessels carrying significant iconography, following chronological order, are all from the very large Geometric and Archaic Period Skales cemetery, east of the temple acropolis and on the lower slopes of the ridges where they meet the agricultural plain. Many of the vessels in the tombs there carried abstract designs with variations on the theme of a patterned central triangle, particularly the stirrup jars and belly handled amporhoid kraters, and as the discussion that follows will show this triangle must be associated with the goddess and tree of life motifs as well as with the mounds, hills and the mortuary practices of the time. Many of the vessels (CPA 8 through 11, 14, 15, 18, 20 through 24, 26 and 29 through 35) show the motif of a stylised triangle with an arch shaped mound inside, some versions with the lower part filled in black as if showing a tunnel or hole or cave, and some with pairs of these arches or mounds side by side. These triangles and triangles with arch shapes are also seen on the earlier LCIIIIB examples in tomb 1966 (Karageorghis 1967a: 13) and see also CPA39 and CPA40.

Good examples of this decorative motif on stirrup jars, although without apparent provenance and in proto-bichrome, are a pair of LCIII stirrup jars currently in the Severis Gallery of the Leventis Collection Museum in Nicosia (A-2009-0.388 & 392) (Figure 63).

Figure 63 Proto-bichrome ware LCIII stirrup jar for holding perfume or aromatic oils (author's photograph)
Although the triangles are all very similar, there is some variation, and this detail can be used to extract and understand the meanings being expressed in the iconography, as will be discussed in the following section. Some of the more demonstrative variations are displayed here (Figure 64, Figure 65).

In her detailed study of the development of Proto White Painted ware during the 11th century B.C., Iacovou (1988: 48) studied similar arrangements of multiples of these triangular motifs and concluded that they are ‘mountain ranges’ drawn in relief. This conclusion was supported by the existence of several examples where animals and people are shown juxtaposed against such a landscape background consisting of a row of mountains (Iacovou 1988: Fig 36.). A single triangle can therefore be reasonably associated with a single mountain, hill or mound. This concurs with the conclusions of the present study, but it does not address the arch shapes within the triangles. However, if Iacovou is correct to relate the triangles to mountains, then surely the arch shaped holes within the mountains can reasonably be related to tomb entrances or caves in the hillsides at Palaepaphos, particularly when the vessels have been recovered directly from tomb contexts.
Although this second aspect is more difficult to support, additional evidence that the triangles represented sacred mountains or acropolis mounds, and were closely related to the tree and goddess iconographies will be presented and discussed in the following sections and chapters.

Two Geometric vessels from the Skales cemetery, CPA12 and CPA19, include simple depictions of trees with leaves in a more naturalistic style, while a pair of Bichrome juglets CPA03 and CPA06, both now in the Palaepaphos museum, are apparently later in date, probably CAI, and display more formalised and symbolic forms of the tree alongside concentric circle motifs.

In CAI there are apparently fewer vessels excavated overall from the city, particularly those showing the tree of life, but it is unclear if this is a function of the publication history of the site, an antiquities trade that tended not to record provenance systematically, or if there was actually less material manufactured during the Archaic Period. Likewise, occurrences (Bushnell 2005: 74) of typical pictorial scenes such as the ‘wild goat and tree icon’ fell off during the Geometric Period. It may be the case that economic slowdown had taken its toll on Paphos during the CGII Period due to decline in overseas trade, and the empirical evidence does point this way (Figure 49). One item of note from the Archaic Period, when luxury goods make a reappearance, is a pair of elaborate but now heavily corroded horse front bands CPA36 found in a tomb context (Karageorghis 1963: 272), of a CAII type that is already known in more complete forms from Idalion, Tamassos (Figure 44) and Salamis. These are decorated with formalised tree of life motifs and would have been part of the paraphernalia associated with the tradition of sacrificing horses at the end of important funeral ceremonies, as is seen at the Archaic built tombs of Salamis. The iconography is associated with the elite groups.

The rest of the significant material listed in the catalogue was excavated from the fill of the supposed siege ramp, and therefore dates from the end of CAII or slightly earlier. The ramp was thought to have been built at the time of the Persian invasion of Cyprus following the failed Ionian Revolt, so that this fixed the construction of the ramp to around 498 B.C. (Maier and Wartburg 1985: 155), but recent excavations by Iacouvou have undermined this theory and chronology (see 6.2.4).

Whatever its original purpose, the fill contained several fine architectural fragments including a good example of the basic proto-Aeolic capital with a central triangle CPA07 (Figure 71c), a lotus form column capital CPA02 of a type similar to, although more simplified than, those known from Tanis in the Egyptian Delta (Phillips 2002: 144), and CPA42, a fragment of a door lintel or frame from a tomb entrance adorned with a row of finely cut trees of life with volutes (Figure 66). These will all be discussed in more detail in the following section, although it is worth noting that this final piece resembles the carved rows of trees or flowers that decorate the doorways of the Archaic built tombs at Tamassos (Figure 95). This again indicates a level of homogeneity and formalisation of styles in Cypriot architecture at that time, a situation which parallels the island-wide evidence from portable artefacts such as the horse front bands and even earlier Geometric ceramics.

As well as architectural fragments, the fill of the ‘siege ramp’ contained several statue fragments. One of these was adorned with a representation of an apron or kilt decorated with a tree of life motif CPA01. This is quite an unusual design to find on a stone statue, but recalls the patterns on the aprons of several terracotta statues excavated from Cyprus and must have represented actual decorative patterns used on clothing including on armour. The pattern includes many lotus flowers, a motif which may have become increasingly common due to increasing contact with the Egyptian culture during the Late Archaic Period.
Figure 66 Stone fragment of entrance frame decorated with voluted trees of life CPA42 (author’s illustration)

Egyptian influence is also apparent on another statue from the siege works, alluding to the rapprochement between Cypriot and Egyptian cultures that took place towards the end of the Archaic Period. The significance of the decorative motif on this statue head, within the context of this research, was only recognised late in the study. The head is from the end of Cypro-Archaic II (CPA45) and was excavated from the siege works on the Marchello Hill. It is usually described as the head of a ‘priest-king’ and is now in the Liverpool World Museum (Figure 68). His helmet is in Egyptianising double crown style, with winged uraeus and solar disk, but the inner part of the crown is decorated with a pattern of hill-mounds or scales. This motif is discussed in detail later in this thesis, where it is suggests that these represent hills. Based on this discussion, he considered himself the ‘king of the hill’, and the hill was the acropolis of Palaepaphos.
This artefact section concludes with an example of the tree of life found on a piece of real armour rather than a representation of armour. The motif is embossed on a very fine bronze helmet recovered from the fill of the Marchello Hill fort. The decorative tree symbol was placed centrally on the forehead of the helmet while smaller versions were added on the cheek plates. These are now difficult to see due to corrosion but the designs can be copied to reveal the elegant patterns, including lions as well as the trees of life (Figure 68). Clearly, motifs representing life, strength and courage are appropriate for a warrior’s helmet.

The wide variety of material contexts on which the tree is portraying indicates the important, complex and wide ranging meanings it carried. In the following section the discussion will attempt to draw together all of the examples into one narrative that conveys the broad meanings carried by the motif. The discussion will also attempt to trace out the changes the motif and its meanings went through between the end of the Late Bronze Age, through the Geometric Period and right up to the end of the Cypro-Archaic Period of the Iron Age.

Figure 68 Bronze helmet from Marchello Hill CPA37 (author’s Illustration)
6.3. Data, analysis and interpretation integrated

The picture that emerges from the data set is that it reflects the established historical sequence of events for the city kingdom rather well, particularly when the changes in the iconography are properly interpreted. The iconography at the end of the Bronze Age was originally derived from the trans-regional traditions of the palace-based tribute exchange economy of the period, with its generic regional ‘international style’, but it shows increasing Mycenaean influences towards the end of the Bronze Age, most notably in the mortuary traditions. The tree of life motif was an integral part of the recognised canon of artistic symbols used within the elite palace exchange system, but the motifs were more generally used on Late Bronze Age material, such as on the pastoral style ‘Mycenaean’ krater CPA43. As an early indicator of imminent changes, the relief scene with the caprids on CPA44 is the first identified example of triangles, trees and mounds appearing together, as they frequently do in later times (Figure 69 right). The rest of the arrangement on CPA44 is largely typical, so this modification perhaps signals a first shift in ideology as well as iconography, and perhaps shows a new hybrid manifestation of the traditional symbols, combined in a new way to express the new cultural situation that was emerging.

![Figure 69 Mounds with trees a-d ‘Nestor’s Cup’ Italy (750-700 B.C.), Archaic Idalion, Geometric triangle and LBA Maa (author’s illustration)](image)

The association of triangles and mounds is also visible in the triangular decoration on the LCIII B stirrup jars and CGI amphoroid kraters from Skales. Several variations of this symbol are shown in the previous section, but perhaps the most demonstrative example of the association of a triangle with a mound or hill is on a contemporary Proto-White Painted ware vase (Brehme et al. 2001: 55. Ant. 32793). This was recovered from Lapiethos on the north coast of the island and was in Berlin Museum although it is now lost (Iacovou 1988: 15) (Figure 70). While not from Palaepaphos, this vessel throws light on what the symbols from Skales are representing. The conclusion drawn from this piece must be that in these cases the symbolism represents a tomb or cave in a hillside, and its entrance.

If this association and derived meaning is correct, the new geographical cemetery location and architectural style of the Skales tombs can therefore be related to the new iconography on the stirrup jars and kraters placed within those tombs, and furthermore, it can be related to the overall change in mortuary practices. As was shown in the previous landscape analysis sections, the Skales cemetery differs substantially in its landscape context from the Bronze Age and Chalcolithic precursors nearby. The tombs are in an isolated group some way east of the settlement and are cut into the hillside facing the sea. Many have an entrance passage dromos rather than being dug down into the hilltop summits as was the case in earlier periods.
Nevertheless, the pithos fragment from Maa shows that the triangular hill was not always drawn with an arched tomb entrance form against it and so it should not be exclusively identified with cemeteries. The establishment of the sanctuary on the hilltop at Palaepaphos also does not seem to have been directly associated with an existing cemetery, although it may have been associated with existing pits from Chalcolithic houses (Maier and Wartburg 1985: 145). Iconography uniting hills, trees and triangles was not exclusively associated with mortuary architecture and was also displayed in sanctuaries. As the large pithos at Palaepaphos and the giant bowl on the acropolis at Amathus show, the tree of life iconography was applied to vessels used within the living sanctuaries as well as on funerary vessels. The triangle with the mound or hill form became hybridised with the tree and goddess symbols as is seen on the steles and vessels from Amathus and Idalion (Figure 28; Figure 41), and this package of symbols was not necessarily just associated with funerary architecture or burial tumuli, and could be associated with the hill of the sanctuary or the acropolis itself.

The tradition of establishing a sanctuary of the goddess on a hilltop may be derived from regional settlement patterns already in place at the end of the Bronze Age rather than newly introduced mortuary practices, while the iconography may have hybridised elements of both.

There are four regional traditions that may have influenced the selection of the Palaepaphos ridge as a place to construct a sanctuary and build a temple:

The use of hilltops for cemeteries was traditional in Bronze Age and Chalcolithic Cyprus
The use of tells for settlement was traditional in the Syro-Hittite world
The use of ‘refuge settlements’ became typical in Crete at the end of the Bronze Age
The use of ‘high places’ for sanctuaries was traditional on the Levant

As the temple at Palaepaphos was built onto the bedrock it is clearly not a tell. It is also not positioned on top of one of the large hilltop cemeteries, although there are isolated Bronze Age tombs in the area. It fits most easily within the context of the last two definitions, which means that it corresponds to the ‘high place’ sanctuaries of the Levantine world and to the refuge sites of the Aegean world. The most satisfactory
conclusion is that it was positioned as the result of both of these regional influences. Visualising how this scenario would have developed historically, the inhabitants of Maa Palaekastro moved up into the foothills around Palaepaphos due to the coastal disruption at the end of the Bronze Age, to join the local inhabitants of the area who had already established a settlement and perhaps outdoor sanctuary at a strategic and ritually significant location in the landscape. The expansion of the sanctuary, the abandonment of Maa and the development of new mortuary practices can therefore be related to the evolving community and changing iconography that developed at this time. It have argued that the triangle and mound forms can be related to the sanctuaries and the tomb architecture, and it has been argued elsewhere that they can be directly related to the symbols of the goddess herself (Hestrin 1987). Late Bronze Age terracotta fertility figurines have been recovered from the sanctuary (Figure 71a)(Maier and Karageorghis 1984: 103), and the pubic area of these is often decorated with a design of cross hatching, very similar to the way in which some of the triangles are depicted on the Skales tomb vessels (Figure 64, Figure 65), with a hatched area surrounded by a triangle of tripled lines. This area of the body is obviously related to fertility, and so this similarity has to be considered of significance and related to the structured ideology of the group of closely related symbols.
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**Figure 71 Examples of triangles associated with the goddess at Palaepaphos (a-d) (author’s illustrations)**

Also from Late Bronze Age Palaepaphos, a Proto-White Painted ware pictorial ‘dinos’ carries a scene of dancing goddesses (Flourentzos 2006: 170). The way in which the figures are portrayed (Figure 71b) recalls both the ‘goddess with the upraised arms’ figurine style of supposed Cretan origin (Karageorghis 2001). In the Philistine contexts, Dothan has referred to similar statuettes as ‘mourning figurines’ but she also connects them to Aegean traditions (Dothan 1982: 237). Finally, the baetyl that became a traditional sign of the goddess at Palaepaphos (Karageorghis 1992) again show a similar shape. The conical and triangular forms of the ‘upraised arm’ figurines, and of the dancing figures on the dinos all reflect the form of the typical baetyl shown on a later Roman coin (Figure 71d), one of which was recovered from the sanctuary and which is now kept in the Cyprus Museum in Nicosia (Maier and Karageorghis 1984: 100). This tradition of aniconism is thought to date back to the Bronze Age, so an association between the similar forms is reasonable and must be noted (Zeman 2005). A strong case for the identification of triangles and goddesses has been developed in recent years (Hestrin 1987; Ziffer 2010) due to its significance to biblical archaeology and the Asherah of the Bible.

The association between triangles, baetys and goddesses, hilltops and tumuli, caves and tombs, trees and sanctuaries seems complex, but this sort of belief system expressed and enmeshed some of the most fundamental ideas of life and death (Maier and Karageorghis 1984), and about the idealised landscape in which the inhabitants of Palaepaphos lived and died. The iconographic repertoire included the trees of life
and other icons, very ancient symbols already, but ones which were utilised once again within a new ideological system that reflected the changing lifestyle and new practices of the inhabitants of the city kingdom. The development of this revised repertoire of symbols was possibly no more conscious or deliberate than the development of the generic ‘international style’ of the Bronze Age had been, but the society that used it, based around hilltop sanctuaries rather than organised palaces, was significantly different.

The idea of fertility was at the very core of this society, and the importance placed on the regeneration and fertility of these new, more secure, hilltop polities, may reflect the level of destruction that had taken place at the end of the Bronze Age. The mound represented fertility, and this expressed several overlapping concepts, perhaps most effectively expressed through the mound at the foot of the olive tree on the relief from Maa, from which offshoots are cut to produce new plants (Porada 1988).

The tree and the triangle were first seen united on these fragments. This new hybrid combination became a central motif of the monumental architecture of the sanctuaries on the Levant and on Cyprus, beginning in the tenth and ninth centuries B.C. and it became most prominent during the Cypro-Archaic Period. The Archaic capital type is evidenced at Palaeapaphos by the limestone proto-Aeolic capital CPA07 (Figure 71c), which is a simple example of the type more elaborately expressed in versions recovered from Idalion, Amathus and Tamassos.

These motifs were used to decorate the sanctuaries on the acropolises as well as the vessels used in the sanctuaries and necropolises. Hydrophoroi or ‘water bearers’ offered libations with these vessels, and shallow bowls called phialai were thrown into cultic pools or basins (Markoe 2000: 122). A temple attendant called a ‘water master’ is recorded at Kition. Massive bowls with tree of life decoration are known from Amathus and Golgoi (Cesnola 1877: 145), and may be related to the large pithos found in the temple at Palaeapaphos.

Many of the classic Bronze Age scenes fell out of use during the Geometric Period, but the tree of life was revived during the Iron Age, and reappeared in a new, more vigorous form. During the CAII it was hybridised with Egyptianising elements, such as the lotus and the papyrus forms, and the later forms are evidenced on the material from Marchello Hill.

Finally, the mound shape with new vegetation springing forth is also visible in the stone relief fragment from the Marchello fort (Figure 66). The fact that this piece was found within a phase of destruction reflects a secondary reality that was perhaps inadvertently expressed in the iconography. Destruction and death happen, but life continues, and settlements can be re-used and re-established elsewhere.

The metaphorical association between settlement rebirth, the afterlife and tree iconography is discussed in more depth in the following chapter.
6.4. Conclusions of Palaepaphos case study

The tree of life iconography from Palaepaphos can be interpreted within the regional and local archaeological and iconographic contexts. Study of ceramic types, cemetery use and landscape survey can throw light on the historical and iconographic changes that took place during the Late Bronze and Iron Ages within the city kingdom. Study of the iconography of the trees, bulls and caprids shows that while these were derived from older, regional traditions, they developed specific new meanings particular to the city kingdom context over the LCIII period, from approximately 1200 to 1050 B.C.

In the Paphos district, the widely evidenced period of disruption at the end of the Bronze Age was followed by a period of immigration, hybridisation and then consolidation during the regional economic downturn of the ‘dark age’. Only a few settlements on Cyprus or in neighbouring lands survived the disruption, but the settlement at Palaepaphos did, and it entered the Geometric Period with a new hybrid population derived from indigenous and foreign people.

Although it survived into the Iron Age, the settlement that established itself at the sanctuary does not seem to have been particularly large, and several pieces of evidence point to this. There are fewer monumental built tombs at Palaepaphos than at the other city kingdoms of the island. There are fewer tumuli than elsewhere within the other city kingdoms of the island. There is less evidence of domestic structures than elsewhere. There is less evidence of an extensive copper industry than elsewhere. There are fewer elaborate Archaic vessels found. The port facilities do not seem to have been large enough to be identifiable now. This is in spite of it not being extensively built over, in contrast to Kition which was extensively built over, but which retains evidence of city walls, a major port and many built tombs.

The evidence points to the fact that, although it was a relatively prosperous survivor of the Late Bronze Age collapse, rather than developing into a large rich Iron Age city kingdom, Palaepaphos remained a rural settlement maintaining an ancient ritual tradition, exposed to and open to passing maritime trade and traffic, and managed by a local family who acted as the rulers and priests of the small settlement and its temple. Rather than a large city surrounded by city walls, this was a small settlement that left little trace above ground besides the Bronze Age sanctuary, a small fort and a palace building.

Nevertheless, what can be perceived as we track the development of this community across the Bronze Age/Iron Age interface is a transition between one cultural model and another, and between one structured ideology and another. The change from the older international period model to the city kingdom model was via a period of disruption, consolidation and rural hybridisation. The tree of life iconography evolved from one state into another, and the changing representations reflected the social structural evolution in the wider community. This was probably not a conscious process, but a slow rearrangement of pre-existing cultural symbols into a new and useful package of ideas. These matched the new demands of the community, and could be understood, learned and taught through a new shared material culture and ritualised belief system.

This structured ideology crystallised through the Geometric Period and it was an ideology shared with the other Geometric settlements on the island (Gjerstad 1979: 232; Iacovou 2005b: 29). Although Palaepaphos was a relatively small settlement, it developed early in the Iron Age and was one of the primary settlements of the Island during the early Iron Age (Karageorghis 1983a: 371). By the time the mainland maritime trade
networks were re-established and expanding again during the Late Geometric and Early Archaic Periods, the island’s material culture had consolidated into a more formalised style. In the subsequent period the Late Archaic style also became widespread across Cyprus, and Palaepaphos again became a familiar member of the maritime trade networks of the period, as well as a city kingdom of Cyprus.

Paphos was in contact with the maritime traders of the international period, and with the Mycenaean/Philistine warriors, traders and refugees who survived its collapse. The displacement of people and military action that had taken place across wide areas of the East Mediterranean at the end of the Bronze Age means that isolated or fixed ethnicities were probably not strictly maintained, and so the community that established itself at Maa Palaeokastro was most likely an eclectic mix of people, including people from the Aegean, from Cyprus, refugees and traders from the Levant and even travellers or refugees from Egypt. This small population may have subsequently moved to Palaepaphos and been augmented by another group of immigrants who arrived directly from the Aegean over the course of LCIII A.

After the destruction of Maa, perhaps due to this second wave of immigration, the evidence suggests that the survivors joined the established community on the ridge at Palaepaphos, and the subsequent hybridisation of their material cultures formed the foundations of the Iron Age settlement, reflecting similar transitions taking place elsewhere on the island.

The archaeological evidence from Palaepaphos is most instructive for the very beginning and the very end of the period covered in this study. Although a continuous historical narrative cannot be well developed based on the evidence from Palaepaphos alone, its archaeology does fill in gaps in the narrative derived from the other city kingdom case studies, and it is particularly helpful with respect to the origins of the city kingdoms. Similarly, the other city kingdoms can help to fill in some of the lost history of Iron Age Palaepaphos.

The final flourished of the Cypro-Archaic II Period are visible in the artefacts excavated from the siege works on the Marchello Hill. The artefacts found there support the arguments developed from the previous case studies regarding the significance of the motifs in question.

In the following chapters the nascent conclusions drawn from all these case studies will be developed further, and in the penultimate chapter an attempt will be made to compose a continuous narrative running from the end of LCII to the end of CAII.
Chapter 7. Regional contextualisation survey

7.1. Introduction to the survey

This chapter comprises a contextualising discussion demonstrating that the tells and hilltop towns of the mainland followed a comparable landscape settlement pattern to that evidenced for Iron Age Cyprus, with some caveats which will be detailed and explained. The discussion covers the landscapes and also references key pieces of material culture derived from the sites which demonstrate that a common underlying ritual belief system was shaping the settlement location choices and landscape use patterns in both areas.

The regional cosmology was dominated by a pair of deities; a goddess of fertility often represented by the tree of life, and a god of virility often represented by a bull or bull man. The iconography that was created for these sacred places must be understood in order to correctly interpret the cultic topography, and vice versa. Once this cultural backdrop has been characterised for the mainland regions and Crete, Chapter 8 will return to Cyprus, where a more detailed understanding of the situation on the island will be developed.

This contextualizing regional survey (Figure 75) was not initially envisaged as part of the research project. After reflection and in response to initial feedback regarding the overall hypothesis emerging out of the case studies, it was deemed necessary to verify and consolidate the preliminary hypothesis. One method of providing support for the hypothesis for Cyprus was to demonstrate that comparable evidence existed in adjacent regions. Familiarity with the landscape settlement patterns of Cyprus's regional neighbours was a prerequisite of any comparative study, and any subsequent in-depth discussions of the situation on Cyprus. This regional survey served to verify the proposal that settlement mounds and sacred mountains were very much part of the regional cultural context in which Iron Age Cyprus exited. This longue durée level discussion is wide ranging both geographically and chronologically. A solid case is constructed that illustrates the deeper cultural background and structured landscape settlement traditions in which the Cypriot city kingdoms developed.

The traditional landscape settlement pattern was characterised by the use of strategically located hilltops and the re-use of tells. This settlement type proved to be widespread and had consistent characteristics (Figure 75). The basic statistics of the tell sites were eventually compiled into a table for ease of location in appendix 10.2. The relative sizes of the settlements were also recorded but vary substantially depending on a number of local factors.

In the discussion that follows I build a case that a typical Iron Age regional settlement model developed within a structured cosmology. An understanding of the underlying belief system can help to explain how and why the tree of life became the central symbol of this ancient system.
7.2. Cilicia and Syrian coasts

Desk based research showed that some academic research has already identified mounds and high places as ritually significant for the Cypriot Iron Age, and comparisons have already been made with the landscape settlement patterns on the Levant (Wright 1992b), but the ideological aspects, such as the association between the tree of life and sacred mountains (Winter 1999), have only been touched upon.

An opportunity and requirement to investigate this regional settlement pattern in more detail resulted in a planned research expedition to the northeast Levant. This is an area that had been somewhat neglected in the existing body of scholarship relating to Cyprus, for political reasons, and had by extension been somewhat neglected in the documentary research for this project. Some authors such as Reyes have addressed the history and material culture of the mainland with respect to Geometric and Archaic Cyprus, but additional investigation of the archaeology of the settlements and landscapes of the area was required (Reyes 1994).

I conducted a research trip to the Çukurova region of Turkey, ancient Cilicia and Hatay in August 2011. The Syrian coast was not accessible due to the ongoing military and humanitarian situation in that country. The region I visited included the Turkish provinces of Mersin, Adana, Hatay and Osmaniye. Mersin, Adana and Hatay provinces border onto the Mediterranean Sea, with Adana and Hatay flanking the Gulf of Issus/Iskanderun on the northwest and southeast (Figure 72). The visit to the region facilitated my familiarity with the natural landscape, the cultural landscape use patterns and the archaeology of the Iron Age sites there. The results of the investigations were extremely positive and the many cultural parallels identified threw light on the contemporaneous situations on Cyprus.

Broadly, a distinct Early Iron Age settlement type is evidenced in Cilicia, on the Amuq Plain and down the Syrian coast to the port of Tripoli in Lebanon (Figure 72, Figure 75). This settlement pattern is homogeneous and consists of defended tell settlement mounds with flattened tops, overlooking, and in proximity to, significant rivers. These rivers descend from inland mountain ranges to cross the sedimentary plains where the tells are situated. Thanks to the massive mountain ranges and the rainfall they collect, the plains are well watered fertile arable lands, with fresh water river supplies and natural irrigation by aquifer action. The plains, however, are not continuous, and are separated by long mountain ranges and long lengths of the coastline where the mountains reach right down to the sea, creating natural inlets, harbours and headlands, and obstructing movement by land. The most significant tells will be discussed in the following section. Basic dimensions are included in the text, on the tell survey plan (Figure 75) and are compiled in appendix 10.2. It is remarkable how ubiquitous and homogeneous these sites were, and how much they dominated the Early Iron Age landscape. It is argued that the reason the Early Iron Age people revived and re-using these tell sites may have been as much for their associations with elite ideology as for their defensive attributes. The Early Iron Age emphasis on elite symbolism in temples suggests that this was at least partly the case.

In summary, the emergence of the Early Iron Age mainland kingdoms centred on these tells paralleled the development of the city kingdoms on Cyprus, however, the subsequent impact of the Assyrians on the Levant and eventually across Cilicia meant that the Early Iron Age tell kingdoms of the mainland ceased to exist between ca. 850 and 700 B.C., or became vassals of the Assyrian Empire, while the city kingdoms of Cyprus survived and flourished during the Archaic Period (Sadar 2000; Wilkinson 2003).
Cilicia is a large fertile coastal plain surrounded by several imposing mountain ranges, with passes or ‘gates’ cutting through them leading into neighbouring regions; north to the Anatolian centre, east to Mesopotamia and south to Syria. Cyprus likewise has a mixture of plains, coasts and prominent mountain ranges, but unlike Cyprus there are several very large rivers that cross the plains here, bringing water down from the Taurus Mountain range in the north and through the valleys flanking the Amanus Mountain Range to the east. The Cilician Plain adjoins the Plain of Issus and both are punctuated with fortified elevated sites that overlook and controlled the trade and transport routes that crossed here in Antiquity. These routes included both the roads and the rivers, and one of the most important products of the region, timber, was moved by river whenever possible (Linder 1986).

At the westernmost end of the Cilician Plain is the city of Mersin (Figure 72 top left). This place marks the start of the region of Κιλικία Πεδιάς, Cilicia Pedias; Flat or Smooth Cilicia. It is the location of the archaeologically significant tell of Yumuktepe; a substantial tumulus now in the western suburbs of the modern city. It stands 60m from the river Müftü, 2km from the sea and is relatively small and rounded for a tell, measuring only 170m by 100m and rising only 8m above the plain, but it has an extensive history of occupation dating from the Neolithic (Caneva 2004). It was an integral part of the Hittite vassal kingdom of Kizzuwatna that ruled the area and was later associated with the Neo-Hittite state ‘Que’ which ruled the western Cilician plain from Adana, 60km further east, This area fell under the rule of the Assyrians ca. 730 B.C, but regained a degree of independence after the death of Sargon II in 705 B.C.

At the start of the Iron Age the main language spoken in Cilicia and neighbouring Hatay to the south was Luwian. This language had predominated in Hattusa, the capital of the Hittites until the destruction of the city around 1200 B.C. Many aspects of the culture of Iron Age Cilicia are related to the Hittite culture,
although derived from it rather than being a direct continuation of it (Mellaart 1978: 79). The ‘new’ culture that came to inhabit this area during the Early Iron Age is known as the Neo-Hittite, Syro-Hittite, Luwian or Luwian-Aramean culture. Although the political structures differed from the Hittite empire precursors, aspects of Hittite art and language, belief system and ritual practice were retained and regenerated in modified forms.

The re-development of the Early Iron Age kingdoms in this region probably followed a pattern similar to that in the regions slightly farther to the south and east where the Aramaeans predominated. In this region, survey shows that only Carchemish substantially survived the destruction at the end of the Bronze Age (Sadar 2000: 61), although there was some continuity at Ain Dara and Aleppo. During the 11th and 10th centuries B.C. the many disparate and small rural settlements west of the Euphrates were joined by new power centres and kingdoms in the region that often re-used tell sites that had been abandoned at the end of the Bronze Age (Wilkinson 2003: 133).

Many Early Iron Age tell or hilltop settlements across Cilicia and Hatay have been excavated and continue to be excavated. All are built on anthropogenic tells or natural hilltops known as tepes (hills) or höyükts (mounds). Sites were invariably positioned on mounds overlooking and controlling the main river routes through the plains. Although there is an essential difference between a tell and a natural hilltop, I argue that the same practical and ritual factors instigated the re-use of both during the Early Iron Age.

In the centre of the Cilician Plain is Sirkeli Höyük, one of the largest settlement mounds in the region but one which has not been extensively excavated (Ahrens et al. 2008). It is built on a natural mound shaped outcrop at the north eastern end of the small mountain ridge, the Nur Dağ, which protrudes up from the plain here for about 15km. In this way its location resembles that of Palaepaphos, being on a natural prominence rather than on a tell. This was a Hittite site during the Late Bronze Age and it was also occupied during the Iron Age. Phrygian and Phoenician artefacts attest to the multicultural connections that this area had.

In the foothills of the Taurus Mountains, 60km further upstream, the defended settlement mound of Karatepe (‘the black hill’) overlooks the Ceyhan River. This site was also under the control of the Iron Age ruler based at Tepebag in Adana who used Karatepe as a stronghold to oversee the valley routes through the mountains. Karatepe is home to several impressive Syro-Hittite palatial buildings which include extensive
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and elaborate reliefs and statues. Like other Hittite and Syro-Hittite sites such as Alalakh and Tel-Halaf, the reliefs are carved on upstanding short orthostats that lined the entrances and main passages of the buildings at floor level. Many examples are still in situ and the iconographic set includes bulls, bull men, and trees of life as well as Hittite derived sphinxes and lions in the more cumbersome Syro-Hittite artistic style. The tree of life appears several times in the scenes (Figure 73), as in the example on the left where it is quite formalised, resembling an early Archaic style. The second regional survey diagram shows how this example compares to the varieties of tree of life capitals and associated motifs across the region (Figure 88).

These eighth century B.C. examples of the tree of life from this Syro-Hittite region do not include central triangles, and the volutes are in a tight circular form similar to the Archaic capitals of Aeolia and Ionia on the west coast of Anatolia rather than those wide ovoid forms from the southern Levant or Cyprus. The large ‘sunrise fan’ form at the top (Figure 73 left), however, more resembles this fan element on the Late Bronze Age precursors from Ugarit and Megiddo. The form seems to have survived the end of the Bronze Age and reappeared on the Early Iron Age versions found at sites such as at Tel Halaf (Figure 88). In this respect the sunrise fan shape seems to ‘belong’ to the north eastern part of the Levant and shows continuity from the Late Bronze Age. Lotus flowers also appear on this piece in their canonical form, although roughly shaped. The most interesting aspect of the scene with the opposing bulls (Figure 73 right) is that it that the central tree is substituted with a triangle in a form most reminiscent of a baetyl rather than a tree. These reliefs date to the eighth century B.C., shortly before Karatepe was over-run by the Assyrians.

100km to the south, through the Syrian Gates (Figure 72), is the point where the great Orontes River arrives onto the Plain of Amuq/Antioch, and turns to the west and the coast. There are located the twin sites of Tel Tayinat and Alalakh (Tell-Atchana). These controlled the arrival of the river onto the plain. At the end of the Bronze Age two of the major power centres in the area, Ugarit and Alalakh were completely destroyed. The region and these sites slowly revived as the lands and kingdoms of the Syro-Hittites, or Neo-Hittites (1200-800 B.C.). Tel Tayinat and Alalakh are 1km apart and less than 1km from the banks of the Orontes River (Harrison 2009), and both are therefore well positioned to oversee the entrance to, and exit from, the ‘Syrian Gates’ and from the Orontes Valley to the south.

50km up the valley to the south and again demonstrating the consistent regional landscape settlement pattern is Qarqar; a massive round tell on the plain beside the Orontes. This was the location of two crucial battles between the Assyrian king and twelve tribes from the southern Levant in 853 B.C. Qarqar is at a pivotal location as the river runs north to here through the long valley that runs up the inland Levant behind the Bargylus mountain range. According to the Kurkh Monolith (BM 118884) set up by Assyrian king Shalmaneser III, twelve kings from the Levant stood against the Assyrian king here at Qarqar in 853 B.C., with troops from Israel, Byblos and Egypt. They would have arrived here after travelling up the valley from the south and through the Homs Gap from the coast. The Assyrian king defeated the armies of this southern alliance and destroyed the settlement on the tell. This signalled the abandonment of the tell and the beginning of a long period of Assyrian oppression and domination of the Levant that lasted until ca. 700 B.C.

While the tell sites on the mainland were mainly destroyed and abandoned after the Early Iron Age, the city kingdoms of Cyprus experienced a significant economic upturn following this period. The island may have served as a provincial safe haven for refugees and skilled artisans fleeing the coast during and following the events described above. This will be discussed in more detail below.

Two main routes run from this northern Levantine region into Mesopotamia. One passes to the north and the other to the south, past several tell sites that are particularly notable. The temple mound at Ain-Dara,
50km to the east, is known as the ‘acropolis of the tell’. Ain Dara temple was a substantial structure overlooking the Afrin River. The temple was built on the highest point of the tell and is well known for the magnificent examples of Syro-Hittite reliefs and monumental statuary which are still substantially in situ. Like Karatepe, many of the reliefs line entrance ways and passages on low level orthostats, but they date from ca. 900 B.C., slightly earlier than those at Karatepe. Ain Dara evidences some continuity from the Bronze Age, but after its Early Iron Age revival it fell out of use around the end of the eighth century B.C., ca. 740 B.C., probably due to the second wave of Assyrian invasions. The reliefs and statuary include the familiar repertoire of elite motifs: bull men, lions and winged sphinxes.

40km south east of Ain Dara is Aleppo. It is a particularly impressive archaeological site and is currently undergoing excavation (or at least it was before the current civil war) and producing remarkable new reliefs also dating to ca. 900 B.C. from the ‘Temple of the Storm God’ (Kohlmeyer 2009) on the citadel. Although its origins lie further back in the Bronze Age, the temple and tell were revived around 1100 B.C. New rows of reliefs on low set orthostats, like those at Karatepe and Ain Dara, were added around 900 B.C. They include many depictions of bull men and the storm god. The culture of Aleppo was substantially Syro-Hittite, but this was southeast of the main Syro-Hittite territory and here the culture was increasingly converged with that of the Aramean peoples. In the early eighth century B.C., a century or two after its revival, the temple was renovated and the reliefs installed. Like most of the other tell sites in this area Aleppo was subsequently conquered by the Assyrians shortly after, but survived as a vassal of the Assyrian Empire.

The temples of Ain Dara and Aleppo are examples of a type of Early Iron Age temple that was an intermediate stage between the Late Bronze Age oriental precursors at Ugarit and Kition and the later Phoenician and Greek temples. This early Iron Age temple construction phase ceased in the northern Levant due to Assyrian incursions, but it continued in the south, for example at Jerusalem and at Tyre (Josephus Antiquities 8.5.3). The Early Iron Age temples were built at the highest points on the acropolises, and this tradition of building sacred places on hilltops and mounds is therefore clearly evidenced on the Levant just as it is on Cyprus.

Early Iron Age temple construction was abandoned in the Northern Levant and Upper Mesopotamia due to the Assyrians, and so too were most of the tell sites. The preferred location for settlements became the bases of tells or out in smaller agricultural settlements on the plains (Wilkinson 2003: 135). There is evidence that this change in landscape settlement use patterns was due to Assyrian policy, whereby construction on tells was discouraged. One letter to Assyrian king Sargon specifically advises that “the people living on tells should come down and build at the bottom” (Fales 1990: 111). This may have been due to the defensive and symbolic attributes of tells, which meant that they were positions of power in the landscape that could pose a threat to the emperor (Wilkinson 2003: 133).

The massive round mound of Zincirli, ancient Sam’al (Figure 72) guarded the northern route between Mesopotamia and the Levant. Its remains sit on a tell 10m above the plain and surrounded by a massive defensive wall 650m in diameter. Like Aleppo, the people were Syro-Hittite and Aramean and the city ruled its own area from here (Schloen and Fink 2009). In 2008 a large stele with a figure standing by a tree of life was found on an orthostat just outside the city walls to the south. This is now thought to have been one of several such blocks that lined a processional way to a small extramural temple or sanctuary (Schloen and Fink 2009: 216). If so, this is one of the few extramural sanctuaries known on the mainland (Wright 1992b: 276) unlike on Cyprus where there were many (Ulbrich 2005: 105). Similarities have been noted between the style of the artwork on these steles and those of Carchemish, 120km inland. Carchemish is further up the
overland route to Mesopotamia but had substantial cultural links with Zincirli during the Early Iron Age. The tree is shown on the diagram (Figure 88). It is rather unusual, but does include several segments stacked vertically in a similar way to precursors from Late Bronze Age Ugarit and Megiddo, which I refer to as ‘double deck’ types. I argue that this symbolism of multiple segments may be related to the repeated reuse of the tell settlements in this area, as they went through multiple phases of destruction and regeneration. This iconographic ideology is discussed in more detail below.

Inland and further east from Zincirli, the rainfall decreases rapidly. On the way to Mesopotamia, after 60km is firstly the mound of Gaziantep, 140m in diameter and 4m above the plain, but the great mound of Carchemish, 60km further on, is a much more substantial structure and was built right on the banks of the Euphrates. This was the capital of its region and overlooked a confluence of the Euphrates and a tributary. Particularly at Carchemish, there is evidence of continuity of occupation from the Bronze Age into the Iron Age (Akkermans and Schwartz 2003: 361), possibly due to its distance from the coastal disruption associated with the Sea Peoples, but the region was one of the first to fall under the influence of Assyria in the ninth century B.C. (Hogarth 1914; Woolley 1921; Woolley and Barnett 1952; Wilkinson et al. 2011). The town was excavated in the 1920s by the British Museum and many low set orthostats with reliefs including scenes with bulls and the tree of life were found (See Chapter 3, reliefs illustration).

The last stop before Mesopotamia proper, after another 160km, is Tel-Halaf, a Syro-Hittite mound overlooking the Khabur River near modern Ra-al-Ayn. The base of the south wall of king Kapara’s palace here was lined with a series of 187 relief panels (Figure 74) made of alternating red ochre painted limestone and black basalt blocks with scenes including bull men, trees of life, flying solar discs and winged sphinxes and griffons. On the left of (Figure 74) is a scene of a date palm being harvested, while the central tree shown has up and down turned volutes and multiple segments, and resembles the version from Zincirli as well as the LBA precursors from Ugarit and Megiddo. A second example from Tel Halaf shown on the diagram (Figure 88) is similar in form, and repeats the multiple segment, or ‘double deck’ form of the early versions.

All of these settlements were built on substantial and prominent mounds, some of them fortified, all of them overlooking important rivers and land routes, and all of them near good arable plains. Statuary and orthostatic reliefs were in the distinctive Syro-Hittite style and were present at all of these sites, and some of them incorporated temples built at the high points on the tells and extramural sanctuaries.
Back down at the Mediterranean coast, south west of Tel-Tayinat and Alalakh, is the great sacred mountain of Mt Aqraa, the home of the god Ba’al and goddess Anat. Its commanding location overlooks the northeast corner of the Mediterranean Sea.

40km south of its summit, within line of sight visibility, was the Bronze Age tell and port of Ugarit. Its Temple of Ba’al was built on the highest point of the wide tell within an acropolis quarter standing 10m above the surrounding plain, and with a palace and lower town on the eastern, sea facing side, about 4-5m above the plain. It is 80m from a small river and 800m from the current sea coast where there is a sandy sheltered bay inlet serving as a port. Ugarit was variously under the control of Hattusa and Egypt during the Late Bronze Age, but it was eventually destroyed during the Sea Peoples phase, and it was never revived. Al-Mina, on the northern side of Mount Aqraa was the closest candidate to be considered as a replacement for Ugarit, but it was predominantly a Greek settlement whereas Ugarit was a busy cosmopolitan, commercial and industrial town where the predominant language was Ugaritic, a Semitic tongue, and where the Bronze Age temple was prominent.

The bull appeared frequently in the material culture of Bronze Age Ugarit (Sharpe 2006: 43). Repoussé gold bowls found here included encircling scenes of bulls and trees of life in a way similar to the designs seen on Iron Age silver bowls from Amathus and Idalion on Cyprus (Louvre AO 1720 & Aleppo 5472) (Yon 2006: 164). Bull rhytons were used in rituals for libations in the temples of Ugarit, and in Ugarit these were primarily sourced from the Mycenaean world (Yon 2006: 151). The bull continued to be a major symbol of power across the region. The Hittite ruler in Hattusa was most closely identified with the bull at the end of the Bronze Age, but the bull was used as an abstract symbol of power and authority from Mount Amanus ‘Bull Mountain’ in the north to Ugarit in the south, where the senior god El was known by the epithet ‘the bull’ (Curtis 1985: 113 & 114). The god Baal was closely identified with the bull, as well as with mountains, weather and in particular storms. The continuity and recurrence of the same themes of the bull, mountains and storm gods is well attested in the archaeology. The tree of life also appears several times in the portable material culture of Ugarit such as on the ivories recovered from the royal palace, now in the Damascus Museum (RS 16.056 & 28.031) (Yon 2006: 136) (Figure 78).

South of Ugarit, down the coast, the Plain of Jebleh opens up with Tell Sukas adjacent to the sea at the outflow point of a river. It shows evidence of Iron Age activity and also two destruction phases, one dating to the Assyrian invasions, the other to the Neo-Babylonian or Persian invasions around 300 years later. Tell Tweini is 5km further south and was extensively urbanised during the Iron Age. 7km inland from Tell Tweini is Tell Siyannu. These tells overlook the very fertile coastal plain, and are close to the rivers that flow down to the sea here. 50km further south, the last 35km along a rocky coast with no plain, and directly opposite ancient Kition on Cyprus are the ports of Arvad/Amrit and Tripoli. Between these two ports runs the Plain of Akkar, overlooked by Tel Kazel and Tell Arqa. According to the Kurkh Monolith mentioned above, the king of Tel Arqa sent 10,000 soldiers to the Battle of Qarqar to fight the Assyrians (Figure 75).

The Island of Arvad here marks a change in settlement pattern that runs south from here on the coast. Arvad stood on the northernmost fringes of the Phoenician coastal lands, and was influential from the Bronze Age onwards. Although it was sacked by the Sea Peoples it became powerful again during the Early Iron Age, and was another of the cities that stood against Assyria at the Battle of Qarqar. After defeat at that battle, Arvad came under the control of Assyria but retained a degree of independence as a provider of tribute through trade. This part of the coast was a key point through which the tramp routes coming from the western Mediterranean met the land routes going up to Mesopotamia, first passing up through the Gate of Homs and
then passing through the Orontes Valley. Arvad would have been directly in the line of the ‘Korsabad to Cadiz’ trade route (Lane-Fox 2008).

Further to the south the coastal plains narrow as the mountains of Lebanon reach down to the sea. Tripoli, Byblos, Sidon and Tyre punctuate the coastline and the settlement pattern is quite different to the typical tell type of the plains further north. The Phoenician settlements were coastal ports, peninsulas, small islands and harbours with towns surrounding them. They were seaward looking nodes at the east end of a great Mediterranean Sea network. Like the tells of Syria and southern Anatolia, the Phoenician ports were subjugated by the Assyrians from the ninth century B.C. and were required to supply tribute. Discussions of the impact of this on the Phoenician colonial expansion west indicate that it was a major factor, but not the initiating factor (Fantalkin 2006: 201). The Phoenicians already had colonies and a network in place by the time the Assyrians arrived, and while this pre-existing system did allow Phoenicians to emigrate west away from oppression, it also allowed the Levantine ports to enter into long term taxation and tribute arrangements with the Assyrian Empire. In this way the Assyrian Empire became linked to the Mediterranean Sea network through the Levantine ports. Cyprus was also brought into this ever expanding web of tribute and raw materials as will be discussed in the following section.

In summary, the Early Iron Age emergence of tell based kingdoms on the mainland plains mirrored the emergence of the city kingdoms on Early Iron Age Cyprus in many respects, but after the arrival of the Assyrians on the mainland and the rise of the Phoenician trade network the histories of the two areas diverged.

By the Geometric and Archaic Periods, the tells of the northern Levantine mainland coast had been destroyed, disbanded or went into decline as Assyrian vassals, while the city kingdoms of Cyprus, particularly those that could be used as ports, became increasingly entwined with the Phoenicians maritime and mercantile culture that was undergoing rapid expansion.
Figure 75 Distribution of LBA and IA tell sites in proximity to Cyprus. See appendix 10.2 for dimensions and detailed locations (author’s diagram).
7.3. Phoenicia, Israel, Judah, the Pentapolis and the Mountains of Lebanon

This section of the discussion covers a much wider geographical area compared even to the first half of this chapter, which surveyed the coastal regions immediately around Cyprus. For this reason it will focus only on particularly significant sites and the main themes, such as the trees, mounds and the symbols of the goddesses and bulls. An effort is made to keep the discussion tied to the archaeology through analysing specific sites rather than discussing regional cultures too generally. In this section, I will also start to build a case, a hypothesis, to show that the tree of life, and trees in general, were common metaphors used by the people throughout the Ancient Near East, for people, communities and tell settlements. The trees represented the people just as the trees were representative of the goddesses that these communities honoured. This metaphor extended to the artwork and the language used as well as the landscape. By understanding this metaphorical structure we can better understand the meanings being expressed through the tree symbols, the variations seen in the details of each version of the symbol and how the landscape settlement patterns and cultic topography related to these concepts.

Inland of the Phoenician ports, the tell sites of ancient Israel and Judah show common cultural connections with those of the northern Levant, particularly with the Aramean kingdoms, but their culture was less influenced by the remnants of the Hittite world with its distinctive material culture and artistic styles. Tell sites were used widely (Figure 72) but they do not overlook such extensive agricultural plains or winding rivers as are found in the northern Levant. Jerusalem, Jericho and Samaria are in fact on relatively unobtrusive natural rises rather than prominent tells. The lack of significant rivers makes the settlement landscape location choices made there somewhat similar to those made on Cyprus, and like Cyprus the rivers were certainly not navigable.

The iconography of the city kingdoms such as Iron Age Samaria and Hazor from before they were destroyed by the Assyrians, included prominent architectural capitals or free standing steles (Franklin 2011) with the tree of life motif. These were the earliest stone examples of the proto-Aeolic or proto-Ionic order and were the first to include the central isosceles triangle. The designs were formal and austere, with the central triangle and down turned volutes, and they resemble some of the earliest versions from Iron Age Cyprus (Figure 76; see appendix 10.3 for source references).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hazor</td>
<td>9th c. B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megiddo</td>
<td>10th/8th c. B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samaria</td>
<td>9th/8th c. B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>8th/7th c. B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medeibiyeh</td>
<td>9th/7th c. B.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 76 Iron Age proto-Aeolic capitals (not to scale) from Israel and Judah also on Figure 75 (author's illustration)
The prevalence of these tree motifs may in part have been related to the proximity of these sites to the major sources of timber. The settlements were centred on Canaanite ‘high places’ (Dever 2005: 139). The mudbrick and stone buildings constructed at these sites utilised substantial quantities of cedar wood timbers, as is indicated, for example, by two huge basalt column bases at the entrance to the palace at Hazor on which cedar columns would have stood (Silberman and Small 1997: 122). The bible provides supporting references for the importance of the cedars in the forests of Lebanon, such as (2 Chronicles 1:15) in which the building of the Temple of Solomon is described. God first promises everything that Solomon asks for, and so “The king made silver and gold as common in Jerusalem as stones, and cedar as plentiful as sycamore-fig trees in the foothills”. Then Solomon sent this message to Hiram king of Tyre “Send me cedar logs as you did for my father David when you sent him cedar to build a palace to live in” (2 Chronicles 2:3). Hiram obliges and replies “And we will cut all the logs that you need from Lebanon and we will float them as rafts by sea down to Joppa. You can take them up to Jerusalem” (2 Chronicles 2:16). In the first quote the foothills are described as places where sycamores were typically abundant rather than cedars, and this is because the very tallest cedars normally grow best at higher altitudes (Meiggs 1982: 54). Above 1,200m the tallest conifers, cedars, and firs such as Juniper excelsa grow up to and beyond 25m in height, and cedars continue to grow at altitudes up to up to almost 2000m. Firs grew in numbers above this height, but it was the cedar that was most valued for its fine grain, scent, rot resistance and above all, great height (Meiggs 1982: 55).

The western side of the Mountains of Lebanon are the most exposed to the winds from the Mediterranean Sea which carry the moisture and rains inland, and so the cedar trees grew best above the Phoenician ports rather than on the eastern side of the mountains, for example in the Jordan Valley north of Israel or into the Bekaa Valley beyond (Meiggs 1982: 52). Nevertheless, Israel and Judah did use extensive quantities of cedar wood for the construction of temples and palaces as these biblical quotes show, and it was not only these kingdoms that were interested in the cedar.

Figure 77 Deportation scene from relief of Lachish now in British Museum (author’s photograph)

Tell Hazor and Tel Dan are the most northerly of the Iron Age Israelite tells, and the architecture at Hazor has been verified as similar in layout to that at Megiddo and Gezer, indicating common planning (Finkelstein and
Silberman 2001). During the Early Iron Age, Hazor was the largest of the Biblical era cities, being 10 times the size of Jerusalem in the time of David and Solomon. The acropolis incorporated a cultic high place and was fortified. Hazor suffered repeated invasions, from the Arameans and then Assyrians, until it was eventually destroyed and the inhabitants deported in 732 B.C. Tel Dan also incorporated a banah high place platform surrounded by finely cut dressed margin cut stone blocks, and according to the bible, this is the site at which a golden calf (1 Kings 12:29)(Dever 2005: 139), an effigy of the god, was set up. Additional altars were built at new high places, and priests were installed there and instructed to carry out worship and ritual sacrifice (1 Kings 12:31 & 32). The Assyrian invasions of these northern sites marked the end of the Early Iron Age revival and the beginning of the era of deportation and captivity for the inhabitants of the Israelite kingdoms. Over the next few decades most of the city kingdoms of Israel and then Judah were subjugated by Assyria, and the inhabitants deported as a matter of state policy. This domination of the Levant by the Assyrians also led to the subjugation of the Phoenicians, the taxation of their trade and their use as suppliers of tribute, some of which was obtained from Cyprus (Fantalkin 2006). The Assyrians influenced the social structures of the Levant at a profound level, and may have created a ‘great divide’ between the Greeks and Phoenicians at this time (Fantalkin 2006: 205).

In the south, the Tel Lachish deportations took place after a failed revolt against Assyrian rule, probably in 701 B.C. This was depicted on the walls of the temple of Sargon II at Khorsabad on reliefs now in the British Museum (particularly slab 9 of room XXXVI, British Museum, WA 124908) (Figure 77). The reliefs show the people of Hazor being deported against a background of scale patterned mounds showing the mountainous terrain (Linder 1986: 280). The foothills, however, are covered by carefully tended fruit trees including vines while larger trees, probably cedars, are shown above, growing from the summits of the hills. The juxtaposition of the deported people against this backdrop of fruit, mounds and trees shows what pre-occupied the Assyrians. These themes, I will argue, are representative of deeper metaphorical roots being expressed, juxtaposing uprooted people with trees, booty with the fruit and the cedars, just like the goods shown on the heavily laden people being carried back to Assyria.

Two examples from the Late Bronze Age material from Tel el-Megiddo and Ugarit illustrate how these metaphors may have had older roots, and could become quite complex. The massive fortified Tell el-Megiddo was famously besieged and then sacked by the pharaoh Tuthmosis III ca. 1457 B.C., but it was revived and then continued in use through into the Iron Age. The illustration of the tree on the left below (Figure 78) comes from the later Bronze Age context when the settlement had been revived (Betancourt 1977: pl 19). The iconographic arrangement shows one part of the plant springing up out of a lower part, on top of a long straight intermediate stem. I have used the terms ‘multiple segments’ and ‘double deck’ for this. I argue that this was a metaphor for the tell settlement model, where each succeeding generation builds on top of the previous one. This interpretation may seem speculative, but in the version on the right from Ugarit, almost contemporaneous with the Megiddo example, the base is shown in a rather peculiar convoluted way (Yon 2006: 136). The significance of the way in which the bases of some of these plant motifs was depicted has been noted previously (Porada 1988; Franklin 2011: 132). This was because the reproductive horticultural methods used for creating new olive trees and date palms required that new offshoots were cut away from the bases of the existing plants, leaving distinctive patterns that were also reflected in their artworks. Metaphorical meanings from the horticultural world, carried by the tree motifs, could therefore have been extended to the ways in which tells could be rebuilt and reused, while separate colonies could be established, with groups or offshoots taken away from existing polities. Interpretations can therefore become complex.
It is worth remembering that the inhabitants of these rural sites were not literate, and were more familiar with agricultural methods than most western people are today. The people who lived on the tells were well aware that they were effectively living on the remains of the past, and they may have gained legitimacy by emphasising direct connection to that history, and a continuing unbroken lineage. Their iconography reflected these social and political concerns and their sacred trees, tended in sacred enclosures, did gain material sustenance by reusing the material content of the tells as soil in which to grow. Several similar Late Bronze Age ivories which show ‘stacked’ trees of life were recovered from the excavations of Tel el Megiddo (Loud 1939: PI6, PI19, PI34; Feldman 2009).

Figure 78 Trees of life from Late Bronze Age Tel el Megiddo (Loud 1939; Feldman 2009) and Ugarit (Yon 2006) showing multiple layered/stacked designs and distinctive root formation on right (author’s illustration)

Timber was one of the primary economic concerns of the Assyrian Empire in the west. The giant cedars had taken on a symbolic value as they became closely associated with the palaces and temples, and therefore with the elites of the Levant and Assyria. The temples of Israel and Judah were closely related to those of the northern Levant, of Ain Dara and Aleppo, and the tree of life was one of the central symbols of all of these monumentalised sites.

Once the Levant had been conquered, the Assyrians certainly sought to maintain control of the timber supplies, in part to prevent its sale and export to Egypt, but also to utilise themselves. A letter from an Assyrian governor based in Tyre tells how his tax collectors kept watch over all the quays along the coastal foothills of the Mountains of Lebanon, and taxed any wood that was brought down to the sea ports, despite some resistance in Sidon from the natives. He allowed the work to continue as long as the wood was not sold to the Egyptians or the Palestinians (Meiggs 1982: 75).

The settlements of Israel and Judah were primarily tell or hilltop sites. Although they were formidable in some respects, they were not at all on the same scale as the great cities of Mesopotamia, Egypt and even of Syria. To the people who inhabited those great cities, the fortified urban agrarian sites of Palestine, Ancient Israel and Judah were hardly more than towns (Lapp 1975: 2). Unlike the tells of the northern Levant, the inland tells of the southern Levant did not have access to great quantities of fresh water, and the plains were limited in size and rocky. In this respect they more closely resembled the settlements of Iron Age Cyprus.

One final area should be noted here, and that is the Pentapolis area occupied by the Aegean Philistines from the early 12th century onwards (Dothan 1982), at the southern end of the Levant. This area was very dry, had limited alluvial plains and there were few prominent mounds on the sandy littoral. Tel es-Safi, however, was one substantial Philistine mound settlement, and although no stone architectural capitals have been found
at these sites there is evidence from the pottery that suggests some of their motifs may have influenced the early proto-Aeolic and proto-Ionic capital designs.

The examples below provide evidence that the first proto-Aeolic / proto-Ionic capital motif emerged from this new social and iconographic milieu, in either the Philistine Pentapolis of the southern Levant or perhaps the closely related Paphian coast of Cyprus at this time (late LCIII/ early LCIIIB). Two type 1 bowls dating from the second half of the 12th century or the 11th century B.C., from Ashkelon and Tel es Safi within the Pentapolis area of the southern Levant are decorated with a motif referred to as an antithetical stemmed spiral and tongue motif (Dothan 1982: 207) (Figure 79). In the example on the right it is combined with spirals to produce a form very similar to the first proto-Aeolic capitals. Two circles with central dots are included on the example on the left from Ashkelon and are positioned with respect to the top chevron triangle just as they are in the pairs of ‘oculus’ circles on some of the early stone capitals (cf. Medibiyeh in Figure 88, Figure 76). It may be that the first capitals followed this design, or it may be that the designs on the bowls were influenced by the forms of the first capitals, but either way, there are strong iconographic similarities that indicate the forms originated from this context.

![Figure 79 Philistine bell shaped bowls from southern Levant (author’s illustration)](image)

All of these southern Levantine settlements were small, but their culture was influential for a while, before the Assyrian invasions. Most significantly for this study, they seem to have been able to influence the culture of Iron Age Cyprus with their distinctive triangular voluted capitals, albeit it perhaps indirectly through Phoenician intermediaries.

The establishment of the Philistine settlements first took place on the southern Levant during the late 12th and 11th centuries. The Onomasticon of Amenemope from ca. 1100 B.C. states that three groups of Sea People settled at Ashkelon, Ashdod and Gaza, but maritime movement of people declined and direct contact with Cyprus and the Mycenaean world was lost, and the designs on the ceramic vessels became more schematised over time (Dothan 1982: 96).

An iconographic relationship clearly existed between the southern Levant and Cyprus during the Late Geometric Period of the Iron Age, ca. 800-600 B.C., but the precise mechanism of contact is still difficult to determine. This situation is exasperated by the lack of archaeological evidence from the intermediate Phoenician coastal sites, which have tended to become overbuilt, and the archaeology destroyed through their continued use as working ports.
7.4. Mesopotamia

Mesopotamia had access to forest resources to the north in the Zagros Mountains, and exploited these, but by the Neo-Assyrian period deforestation and resistance from the Hurrians to the north meant that Assyria looked west for its wood. At first it was the Amanus Mountains of the northern Levant that were the prime location for the cedars used in Mesopotamia (Hansman 1976: 72). The closer proximity of this northern mountain range to Assyria was the primary factor making this area preferable, rather than the more famous Mountains of Lebanon in the south. Worked timber would have been dragged and carted across via Alalakh and Aleppo to the Euphrates, and then shipped down river to the building sites, perhaps via centralised timber depots (Linder 1986: 275). A relief showing the building of the palace of Sargon II at Khorsabad, now in the Louvre, shows logs being transported by ship for the construction of the palace in 716-713 B.C. The smaller logs are being carried onboard and the longer ones are pulled behind in the water (Linder 1986). In the centre of the scene is a tell-like island in the middle of the river, on a scale patterned hill with a palace or temple of pillared construction on its summit. It is unclear if this scene represents the shipment of timber from Phoenicia, up the Mediterranean coast and up the Orontes to Alalakh, to be carried over the plains to the Euphrates and Mesopotamia, or if it represents timber from the Amanus mountains being brought via river to Alalakh, and then transported up and over to the Euphrates (Linder 1986). Either way, it gives a glimpse into the extent to which this activity was a central aspect of the monumental construction of the power centres of the Assyrian Empire and how the giant timbers became associated with elites.

The most common application of the timbers was for the monumental doors and roof beams of the temples and palaces (Meiggs 1982: 78). Unlike the Archaic temples of the Greeks that developed shortly afterwards, and which followed the Egyptian model of stone architecture, Mesopotamian temples had huge thick mudbrick walls that supported wide horizontal beams above (Meiggs 1982: 79). The bases of the walls were lined with cut stone orthostats such as is familiar from Ain Dara and Aleppo, and the foundation were of stone, but the mudbrick walls had no vertical stone pillars or wooden columns to support the roof, and the long cedar beams were used only to span the roof horizontally (Meiggs 1982: 81). Huge quantities of cedar wood timbers were used, and frequent visits were made to the Amanus Mountains. Tiglath-Pileser cut logs of cedar and other timbers on the Amanus Mountains at the end of a campaign ca. 1180 B.C., Shalmeneser II cut cedars there during four campaigns in the west ca. 835 B.C., and also claimed an annual tribute of 300 cedar logs from a prince during his reign (Meiggs 1982: 74). Esarhaddon summoned twenty-two princes from Syria, the Levantine coast and Cyprus to send levies for the construction of Nineveh. “Great beams and tall trunks of cedar from Mount Sirara and Mount Lebanon, I had them dragged out of the mountains with toil and pain. Long cedar beams I stretched over it for its roof, door leaves of cypress whose scent is sweet, I covered with a sheathing of silver and copper and hung them in its entrances” (Meiggs 1982: 77).

The temples and palaces were built on top of wide mounds that overlooked the plain of the Tigris. These huge flat platforms had ziggurats and temples built at the highest points on the available topography, and they were elaborately decorated with reliefs and ivory clad furniture that frequently included the tree of life motif. At the northwest palace of Nimrud the tree of life appeared no less than 96 times in the reliefs (Porter 1993: 129). The illustration above (Figure 80) shows a design reconstructed for this study based on an ivory panel recovered from the remnants of Nimrud, now in the Legion of Honor Museum of Fine Arts, San Francisco. It resembles other ivories from Nimrud as well as from the Phoenician coast. The ivory itself was from African elephants so the appearance of Egyptianising themes in these pieces, and in the décor of
the palaces, is a result of the interaction between these areas that was taking place at the time. It is thought that most of the Ivories at Nimrud were manufactured in Phoenicia, but a substantial subset with a distinctive style may have been made in Syria (Winter 1976; Herrman 1988). They continued a tradition of prestige ivory carving that was part of the Late Bronze Age palatial network luxury exchange system, yet these were probably manufactured and exchanged by independent artisans for profit, as part of the new trade network system that developed in order to satisfy the Assyrian king’s thirst for tribute.

Figure 80 Reconstructed design based on an ivory from Nimrud now in the Legion of Honor Museum of Fine Arts, San Francisco. Accession number 1980.54.4 (author’s reconstruction and illustration)

As well as the ivories, very fine reliefs were made for the Assyrian palaces, perhaps by craftsmen brought to the sites as a result of forced deportations from elsewhere in the empire including the Levant. The relief shown (Figure 81) of paired eagle headed protective spirits flanking a tree of life, now in the British Museum (WA 124583), also came from Nimrud’s northwest palace. It includes a good example of the typically Assyrian style of representing the tree of life. This distinctive form may hold metaphorical significance and allusions to the political and mythical context in which it was made. The bible throws more documentary light on the artistic meanings and metaphorical contexts that were current the time. (Ezekiel 31:3) tells us to “Consider Assyria, once a cedar in Lebanon.....it towered high”. (Ezekiel 31:4) “The waters nourished it, deep springs made it grow tall, their streams flowed, all around its base, it sent their channels to all the trees of the field”. Ezekiel (31:10-13) then rejoices as Assyria is ‘cut down to size’ by the Neo-Babylonians. The reference to the channels or streams being sent out to all of the other trees of the field is an interesting allusion, and it works metaphorically if the other ‘trees’ were analogous to settlements under Assyrian rule. The channels would then be maritime or riverine communication routes, linking the settlements under Assyria’s dominion, although this is perhaps stretching the metaphor into the realms of speculation and it may have a simpler horticultural significance.

The elaborate Assyrian tree in the reliefs was a physically present structure within the temples (Giovino 2007), but if the metaphor was understood as is being considered here, its distinctive form would have essentially represented the Assyrian concept of their empire, with a strong central trunk, perhaps symbolising the core Assyrian cities of Assur, Nimrud, Khorsabad, and Nineveh, aligned north and south on the Tigris. The peripheral settlements of the empire are arranged around the outer perimeter, but linked to
each other and to the core through sinuous riverine links. Each conquered settlement is therefore represented as just another homogenous blossom of the Assyrian tree. If the links indeed represented water, this would help to explain their undulating forms between the different elements on the relief, and this form does resemble the conventional way in which waves were depicted on the Assyrian reliefs, such as in the scene showing logs being transported on water to Khorsabad. Nevertheless, they may simply represent twisted branches or irrigation channels. According to Porter (1993: 133) the winged guardians are engaged in pollination of the female date palm tree by brushing it with flower clusters from male trees. The clusters are dipped in water buckets first so that the pollen will stick, and so this is also effectively offering libations to ensure the longevity, fertility and health of the imperial tree. These libations were also intended to awaken the gods. Ishtar is recalled to life by being sprinkled with the waters of life (Widengren 1951: 15), or in some cases it is Tammuz, the god of vegetation who is revived (Widengren 1951: 48).

Figure 81 Relief of protective spirits and tree of life from Nimrud (author’s illustration)

These mythologies and analogies point to deeper, and older, cosmologies that were a region-wide phenomenon. As well as the tree and waters of life, the mound also held a central place within the cultic topography of the Assyrians. Tells had been the characteristic settlement model of the Mesopotamian cultures since prehistoric times, and mounds took on a ritual significance perhaps most elaborately expressed through the ziggurats. The temples of Mesopotamia were built around a central cosmological model that included the ‘abzu’, a holy well which was an extension of the holy waters of the underworld, and the ‘duku’ which represented a sacred, primeval mound (Johnston 2004: 253). The temples often had ritual basins representing the ‘abzu waters’ that have close parallels with the ‘seas’ of the biblical Temple of Solomon which stood on ‘twelve brazen bulls’ (1. Kings 7:23, Jeremiah 52:20), and which, it was argued in the Amathus chapter, are also paralleled by the oversized vessels decorated with the trees of life and bulls at the Iron Age Cypriot sanctuaries. In Mesopotamian mythology Gilgamesh’s odyssey included an appearance by the Bull of Heaven, and a journey through a great cedar forest that grows on a pair of sacred mountains. In the Akkadian version this forest is explicitly associated with the mountains above Lebanon ‘Kur Libanu’ (Tigay 2002: 78).
In Nippur the temple of the god Enlil was known as the ‘house of the mountain’ (George 1993), while an epithet of Enlil was ‘the great mountain’. In the new capital at Khorsabad, a sacred royal garden was constructed by Sargon II around 710 B.C. to which trees from all the corners of the empire were brought, perhaps in a metaphor of hegemony that deliberately reflected the policy of enforced deportations and relocations that were taking place across the conquered territory. The garden contained aromatic plants from Hatay, and ‘fruit trees from every mountain’, almonds, apples and medlars were brought back even ‘through snow and ice’ (Lane-Fox 2008: 27). Widengren wrote of this cultic topography that the Assyrian King was the possessor of the garden of paradise, situated on the mountain of the gods which is described in the Epic of Gilgamesh (Widengren 1951: 11). He is described as a sacred gardener (Widengren 1951: 13), or the farmer (Widengren 1951: 19) and fulfilled the functions of a gardener at the temple grove in which the cultic tree was planted. In the centre of the garden stood a pavilion that looked up at a giant man made mound planted with cedars and cypresses, and which was modelled after a foreign landscape, possibly the Amanus Mountains in north Syria that were of such interest to the Mesopotamians. The semi-mythical hanging gardens of Babylon (Finkel 2002: 38) and the garden of Eden in the bible may have followed this tradition. Other scholars have studied the garden and mountain topographies of Mesopotamian sacred landscapes (Wiseman 1983; Stronach 1990; Winter 1999; Thomason 2001).

The juxtaposition of forests, gardens, human resources and settlements gives some insight into the mentality of the Assyrian Empire and of the city kingdoms of the period. Peoples were often described as being uprooted, or cut down due to the actions of the Assyrians, and botanical metaphors were widely employed, such as Egypt’s ‘broken reed’ (2 Kings 18:21), an epithet and metaphor for the Kushite pharaoh who failed to defend Samaria from Assyria. The victory stele of Assyrian emperor Esarhaddon from 671 B.C. includes the line: ‘The root of Kush I tore up from Egypt and not one of them remained to submit to me’. The management of the empire was carried out as if re-arranging plants in a garden, and trees were uprooted and cut down when required.

As well as sacred mounds, trees of life and water from the underworld, bulls were also a ubiquitous presence in the Assyrian palaces. A pair of colossal human-headed winged bulls carved out of solid blocks of alabaster, called lamassu, guarded the entrances at Sargon II’s palace in Khorsabad (BM ME 118809), while colossal double headed bull protomes adorned the capitals in the great halls of the Persian cities of Persepolis and Darius’s winter palace at Susa, built c.a. 500 B.C. Underneath the Persian palace at Susa the remains of the earlier Elamite palace of the 12th century B.C. have revealed that it too was adorned with clay reliefs showing

![Figure 82 Susa, Elamite palace relief of 12th c. B.C. (Louvre sb 14390 & 14391) (author’s illustration)](image-url)
bull men and goddesses tending to date palm trees. Some of these panels are now on display in the Louvre (Figure 82).

The Assyrian Empire was a powerful political and military force, but it was ruthless. When Assyria finally declined and its king died, the prophet Isaiah remembered the exploitation of Lebanon and Palestine. “The LORD has broken the rod of the wicked, the sceptre of the rulers, which in anger struck down peoples with unceasing blows, and in fury subdued nations with relentless aggression. The whole world has rest and is at peace, they break into cries of joy. The pines themselves and the cedars of Lebanon exult over you. Since you have been laid low, they say, no man comes up to fell us” (Isaiah 14: 5-8).

7.5. Egypt

The tree was a common motif in Egyptian iconography from the earliest times (Aufrère 2005). A fragmented palette from the Late Predynastic period (ca. 3,100 B.C.) shows a pair of long necked gazelles eating from a date palm (Spencer 1993: 54, 55) London BM 20791, Oxford Ashmolean 1892.1171 (top piece) (Figure 83).

Egypt always had a chronic shortage of structural wood, and for this reason it traditionally imported cedars from Lebanon for large projects. The Delta was a fertile, well watered region, but the soft, marshy, silty soil was not suitable for tall trees (Meiggs 1982: 40). Egypt’s meagre forests could not provide timber for ships, and it is perhaps due to the shortage of tall timbers that Egypt’s architectural style of stone column building first developed (Deglin 2012). Assyria took steps to prevent timber being exported from the Levant to Egypt. This monopolisation of resources can explain why the Pharaoh Amasis was keen to occupy Cyprus in the mid sixth century B.C. (Reyes 1994: 77). The importance of wood for naval fleets was growing by that time and the cedar forests of Cyprus remained relatively intact compared to those of the mainland (cf. Chapter 5.2.1).

Sacred trees were associated with the west bank necropolises of Egypt, particularly of Thebes, where fruit-bearing trees such as date palms and sycamores provided offering gifts for the deceased. Trees were often portrayed as places from which the goddesses of the necropolises would emerge to meet the mourners. The feminine goddess of beauty and love, Hathor, and the sky goddess Nut were the two most commonly portrayed goddesses shown in this context, with both sometimes represented as a cow emerging from the tree. The tombs of Tuthmosis III, Arinefer, Sennedjem and Pashedu show such scenes, as do steles (cf. Harmakhis’s stele, 22nd Dynasty, Cairo TR.25.12.24.20 and the Berlin stele of Kamose 7291, 20th Dynasty) and coffins (cf. Nespawershefi, Fitzwilliam E.1.1822, 21st Dynasty, Thebes). There were many cultural connections made between New Kingdom Egypt and the Levant during the Late Bronze Age. A manifestation of the Levantine fertility goddess is seen on steles from the Delta and Deir el-Medina in Thebes, where craft workers from the Delta were sent. She was known as Qadesh and was sometimes named as Qadesh-Astarte-Anat (Lycourinos 2011: 200).

Other aspects of Egyptian culture evidence the themes discussed here. The Apis bull was a particularly powerful symbol in Egypt during the Late Period (664-332 B.C.). Vast cemeteries were installed at Saqqara near the earliest pyramids for this bovine manifestation of the god of rebirth and the afterlife, who was interred in a stone sarcophagus after a long life being worshipped in the temples. During the Ptolemaic Period an anthropomorphic version of the god Apis was syncretised with Osiris to produce a hybrid Greco-Egyptian bull-man god called Serapis. Likewise, one of the common epithets for the pharaoh was ‘the mighty bull’ and he was adorned with a bull’s tail in ritual scenes. In a context contemporaneous with Iron Age
Cyprus, the Nubian ‘black pharaohs’ of Kush who ruled Egypt from 747 B.C. to 660 B.C. called their pharaoh the ‘bull of the two lands’ (Morkot 2000: 198).

The mound was also a prominent theme in Egyptian cosmology and settlement architecture. Temples and towns were often built on mounds in the fields of Egypt beside the Nile. These places are referred to as Koms in Arabic. A revetted ceremonial mound known as Kom el-Ahmar, the red mound, was a feature of the most famous Predynastic centre of Egyptian culture and power at Hierakonpolis, the city of the Hawk (McNamara 2008). These ‘high sands’ (Arnold 2003: 110) or mounds were associated with creation myths as the places which first emerged from the watery chaos at the beginning of time (Oakes and Gahlin 2003: 148). Each ‘nome’ had its own tree covered mound dedicated to Osiris, the god of the afterlife and rebirth (Koemoth 1994; Kemp 2005b: 80). Perhaps most impressive was the great mound with trees that covered the Osireion at Abydos (Cooney 2000: 40). The hieroglyph for mound ‘iat’ shows a schematised semicircular mound with three stylised triangular trees growing from it.

A relief from the great temple at Karnak perhaps demonstrates a hybridisation of Levantine and Nilotic themes. This is from a shrine of Taharqa (Figure 84), the Kushite pharaoh who was in conflict with Assyria ca. 680 B.C. The scene shows an acacia tree growing up from a sacred mound. To the left of the tree and mound, the pharaoh’s wife (not shown here) is shown shooting arrows across the sacred lake of the temple. Behind the pharaoh’s wife is the sacred mound with the tree growing up from it (shown above). In Egypt, the goddesses Neith and Anat were typically shown with bows and arrows, and both were associated with the Levant, so that this scene seems to be invoking Levantine cults as well as Egyptian tradition. The pharaoh’s wife represents the goddess protecting the tree of life on the mound (Cooney 2000: 31; Morkot 2000: 242). Hieroglyphic texts explain that this monument was centred on the cenotaph mound of the primeval ancestors and Osiris which was considered to be located at that place in Karnak. This mound was connected to the primeval waters known to the Egyptians as Nun, which were the springs from which creation and new life appeared (Cooney 2000: 26). The shrine functioned as a place to host a daily ritual of morning solar
rebirth for the royal patron god Amun. The belief system shows close parallels with those of the contemporaneous Mesopotamian cities already discussed above, as well as with the settlement and sanctuary patterns of Iron Age Cyprus and the Levant.

The new burial mounds and pyramid fields constructed in Nubia from ca. 850 B.C. are architectural, temporal and cosmological comparanda for the tumulus tombs of Anatolia and Cyprus that also appeared during the Archaic Period. The royal burial ground of el-Kurru contained around ten tumuli and twenty small pyramids dating from the mid 1st millennium B.C.

Postulating a cultural connection between this area and Cyprus may at first seem far fetched, but Kush was not an isolated culture of the distant south. The Kushite pharaohs who ruled Egypt from 750-663 B.C. were in close contact with their neighbours on the Levant. They fought alongside them against Assyria and were likewise forced to retreat by the Assyrian Empire. The common beliefs relating to tells, water, life, trees and rebirth expressed in all of these cultures are significant and can throw light on the situation on Cyprus.

There are two tells of note in the Delta region that are represented on the survey map (Figure 75); Tanis and Tel el-Balamun. Both of these were occupied during the early Iron Age and were of substantial scale.

The Kushite pharaohs regarded several mountains and mounds as sacred, and they also built tumuli and pyramids. Their most sacred mountain was Gebel Barkal, ‘throne of the two lands’ and home of the god Amun since New Kingdom times (Morkot 2000: 138). At the royal burial ground nearby, el-Kurru, the Kushite pharaohs began a new phase of tumulus and pyramid tomb building as early as 850 B.C. Mountains at Abu Simbel and El-Qurn at Thebes were considered sacred and the home of their gods including Hathor the cow goddess and Amun.

Ultimately the Kushite pharaohs were the proverbial broken reeds, and this may in part have been due to their lack of access to large structural timbers and wood resources for ship building and copper smelting.
This meant that the Kushite pharaohs could not hold out against the might and brutality of the Assyrian Empire, and their fate may have served to encourage the 26th Dynasty pharaohs to be more active in this respect.

They retreated south to Kush, but preserved some aspects of pharaonic culture for many centuries. An omphalos stone (Figure 85) from the second century B.C. or perhaps even later, was recovered from the great temple of Amun at Gebel Barkal during the excavations there in 1916 (Steindorff 1938). This icon represents the mound of Gebel Barkal. It is a sacred stone of a type similar to a baetyl or the other omphalos ‘navels’ that marked the sacred places of the Greek and Mesopotamian temples and oracles of the period.

The iconography of this omphalos hybridizes the symbolism of the mound with a parade of worshipping gods and goddesses. Along with two representations of the pharaoh adorned with his bull’s tail, they protect the central shrine space. A small cult statue of Amun would have been placed there and the whole arrangement is founded on an encircling band of open and closed palm trees, resembling more typical patterns of alternating lotus flowers and buds, supports the scene from below.

It is clear then that mounds, sacred trees and bulls were fundamental elements of Egyptian cult from the earliest to the latest pharaonic era.
7.6. Central and Western Anatolia

In the far north of the area covered by this study, the kings of Phrygia/Mushki in central Anatolia were also resisting Assyrian hegemony and also started building burial tumuli for their kings at Gordion. Gordion was the capital of the Iron Age successor state in the area that had emerged after the collapse of the Hittite empire, and the population was further expanded by the immigration of Greek speaking peoples from the Aegean. Construction work on the citadel developed on a monumental scale from ca. 950-800 B.C., and a tradition of tumulus tomb construction developed towards the end of this period (Luke In Press). The earliest elite burial mound is datable to ca. 850 B.C. These tumuli are notable as they show similarities to, and are contemporaneous with, the Archaic tumuli at Salamis on Cyprus, as well as the tumuli in Egypt described above, in Kush/Nubia. There are around 100 tumuli in total near Gordion, with the largest, Tumulus MM, having a height of over 50m and a diameter of 300m. This Phrygian tradition then seems to have been adopted by the Lydians at Bin Tepe, the ‘valley of a thousand mounds’ (somewhat over 100 in fact), which became the burial place for the Lydian kings of Sardis from ca. 650 - 600 B.C. Hundreds more tumuli were eventually built, scattered all around the valley within a 50km radius of the ancient capital city.

Munn (2006: 206) relates the symbolism of these mounds and the nearby waters of Lake Marmara, ‘the Gygaean Lake’, to the widespread cosmology of mounds as places of creation and perpetual regeneration of life and which had its origins in Hittite and Sumerian mythology. Hittite texts relating to Cyprus talk of the king building a sanctuary for his father on the ‘everlasting peak’, or the ‘eternal peak’ in Anatolia to celebrate his successful sea battle, invasion and imposition of tribute on the island (Guterbock 1967: 79), so the Hittite tradition of sacred mountains was already long established by the Iron Age. Furniture and provisions were included in the burial chambers of the Anatolian tumuli suggesting that a concept of rebirth and afterlife existed in these cultures, something that they had in common with Egypt and perhaps also with Iron Age Cyprus. Petit (2008) has argued that the tree of life and the Iron Age burials on Cyprus indicate a belief in resurrection and an afterlife.

Although it is not strictly within the scope of this short survey, these traditions were also echoed on the opposite side of the Aegean and must be mentioned. Homer’s Iliad tells of a burial mound for Andromache’s father which was covered with exquisite elm trees (Lane-Fox 2008: 55). A tumulus was to be raised, visible from the wine-dark sea, for the Greek champion whom Hector planned to kill. The Euboian Toumba mound at Lefkandi is also significant as it was built by the first Aegean Iron Age maritime travellers, who laid out the first threads of the colonial networks that stretched as far east as Cyprus and their colony at Al-Mina on the north Syrian coast (Popham et al. 1993).

On the south west coast of Turkey the Greek speaking Iron Age inhabitants of Caria appropriated Mount Latmos as their sacred mountain. It was already a site that had been associated with the Anatolian storm and mountain gods since prehistoric times, and for the Greek speakers it became the home of Zeus Akraios (Peschlow-Bindokat 2009: 61). The mountain held several sacred caves and sanctuaries, and an iconic stone outcrop standing on the summit was thought to be the home of the gods.

The coastal lands of Caria and Ionia, which was immediately to the north of Caria (Figure 86), were where significant city ports developed during the Iron Age with maritime connections to the Levant and Egypt (Fantalkin 2006), and it is in these cities that significant developments in Archaic architectural design were made, including the next steps in the development of the Ionic architectural order. Miletus was considered
an Ionian city in Caria, and it was one of the Ionian League that dominated the southern half of the Anatolian Aegean coast. It was located on a prominent mound, strategically chosen in a similar way to the Anatolian, Syrian and Cypriot models, overlooking a river flowing over the fertile coastal plain into an open and sheltered sea port, which has since silted over. The settlement stands on a natural mound called Kalabaktepe and a small archaic distyle in ante temple was built here in the second half of the sixth century B.C.

This was one of many such temples that were springing up on mounds along the coast here in the sixth century B.C. and which were heavily influenced by oriental architectural styles and building techniques (Livingston 2000), from the Levant, Egypt and Cyprus (Figure 86). The Ionic architectural style developed in this region, probably first at Ephesus. It differed substantially from the more severe Doric style of the Greek mainland to the west. Many arboreal capital designs flourished on the coast here as well as in the Aeolic region of the north Anatolian coast, but it was the Ionic style that evolved into the typical form still familiar today, and which eventually jumped west to the Greek mainland to join the Doric and Corinthian orders. The first example of the Ionic capital was probably created for the great Archaic temple of Artemis at Ephesus ca. 550 B.C., which became one of the wonders of the ancient world. This sort of stone temple building was strongly influenced by Greek Lydian and Carian contact with Saite Egypt, through Sais and Naukratis in the Egyptian Delta where the Ionians were allowed to build their own temple (Herodotus Histories Book 2 : 128) and where stone columns, walls and roofs were likewise employed, unlike the typical architecture of Mesopotamia which was based on mudbrick and wood. This close relationship with the Egyptians developed out of a military alliance in the second half of the seventh century B.C., first under the pharaoh Psamtik (Fantalkin 2006: 203) and continuing in the following century under Amasis II (Briant 2002: 52)(Herodotus III.39). These pharaohs oversaw a renaissance in Egyptian culture that took place following the destruction that the Assyrians had wrought as they pushed the Kushite pharaohs south. The 25th dynasty Kushite rulers
had in fact initiated this renaissance after the ‘dark ages’ of the Third Intermediate Period, and the 26th
dynasty Saite Period was likewise one of flourishing economic and cultural developments (Morkot 2000) and
organisational reforms. Contact with Greece and Cyprus intensified at this time, and the Anatolian coast
benefited from the technical and artistic knowledge that the traders and mercenaries brought back from
Egypt. The Ionic order was a product of these east Mediterranean interactions, and the order spread across
the Archaic Greek world from the west Anatolian region.

The capitals of Caria and Ionia were more elaborate than the capitals of Aeolia further north, and this may
indicate a degree of influence in the south from neighbouring Cyprus, where the vegetal designs were highly
exuberant. On the other hand, the central triangle, such a prominent feature of the southern Levantine and
Cypriot capitals, did not make an appearance in any of the Anatolian Ionic and Aeolic capital designs. Some
of the reasons for these omissions have been mentioned and will be discussed in the following section, but
the strong links between the Ionic and Egyptian architectural styles indicated that this was the prime channel
of interaction for these cities and Cyprus was perhaps simply overlooked. The Cypriot artistic styles were
therefore bypassed, but there may also have a symbolic social reason for rejecting the triangle, that related
to a growing division between the Greco-Egyptian world and the Phoenician-Persian world, which has been
referred to as ‘a great divide’ (Fantalkin 2006: 205) between east and west.

In Archaic Cyprus there was no Archaic monumental temple construction phase, although Late Bronze Age
temples at Kition and Palaepaphos were rebuilt and reused to some extent.

The story of Pythagoras is worth recalling here as anecdotal evidence. He was a resident of Samos where his
mother was born. His father was a merchant from Tyre. During his travels in search of knowledge he visited
Miletus where the Greek philosopher Thales advised him to go to study mathematics in the Egyptian
temples. In 535 B.C. Polycrates, the dictator of Samos was in alliance with Egypt, and at that time Pythagoras
went to study at the temple of Thebes where he stayed for ten years. The life of Pythagoras is a useful case
study as it reveals the mechanisms of artistic, technical and cultural transmission across the Mediterranean
Sea during the Archaic Period (For biographical details of Pythagoras see Porphyry, Life of Pythagoras,
Iamblichus, Life of Pythagoras and Diogenes Laertius, Lives of Eminent philosophers).

The last of the coastal plain acropolis settlements included here was possibly one that was used as an
intermediate port between the Aegean and Cyprus. The city of Aspendos is on the central southern coast of
Anatolia, on the Plain of Antalya. Its very substantial tell settlement mound, now known as the acropolis of
Aspendos, is located within 500m of the Eurydemon/Köprüçay River, which was navigable in Antiquity all the
way from the sea. Unfortunately, however, there is little in the way of recorded history or published Iron Age
archaeology regarding this site.
7.7 Crete

On Crete, the Late Bronze Age saw a proliferation of peak sanctuaries (Wallace 2010) with sacred caves in which the predominant votive offerings, particularly in the more remote sanctuaries, were clay bovid figurines of bulls, oxen and cows, probably associated with fertility rites (Jones 1999: 39). Mount Ida, the highest peak of Crete, was associated with the mother of the gods, while its sacred Idian Cave was reputed to be the birthplace of Zeus.

Another common type of sanctuary was the tree sanctuary, as it was across the Mycenaean world. Tree and pillar cults were commonly depicted on cylinder seals (Evans 1901; Jones 1999; Nowicki 2000). Arthur Evans discussed the iconography of the Palace of Minos in his publication of the Minoan complex at Knossos, and noted the significant occurrences of triads of trees in the iconography of the decorated palace style ceramic vessels, in forms that recall later arrangements from Maa and Amathus (Figure 62, Figure 28) (Evans 1928: §54 Influence of Natural and Other Designs). In the Bronze Age palaces such as Knossos, the bull was a subject of veneration and was depicted in murals and statuettes showing bulls and bull leaping.

The valley of the Kairatos River on the north coast, where the palace of Minos at Knossos was built during the Bronze Age, is the area of Crete which evidences a landscape and cemeteries most comparable to those of the city-kingdoms of Cyprus. The remains of the palace are at an elevation of 100m, but are situated low down in the valley in a location more comparable to that of Late Bronze Age Kalavassos Ayios-Dhimitrios on Cyprus, although the Knossos palace is a substantially larger structure. The river bed runs south to north past the palace on the east side, and continues 5.2km north to the port of Heraklion, on the coast just east of where the Minoan port was located.

After the demise of the Bronze Age culture, the area around the palace was re-inhabited during the Iron Age. The chronology of the site and Iron Age Crete is as follows (Coldstream 2001: 22) (Figure 87).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Date B.C.</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late Minoan Bronze Age III C</td>
<td>1200-1100 (post palatial)</td>
<td>LMIIIIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subminoan BA</td>
<td>1100-1000</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subminoan/Early Proto Geometric IA</td>
<td>1000-970</td>
<td>SM/EPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Proto-Geometric IA</td>
<td>1000/970-920</td>
<td>EPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Proto-Geometric IA</td>
<td>920-875</td>
<td>MPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Proto-Geometric IA</td>
<td>875-840</td>
<td>LPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proto-Geometric IA B IA</td>
<td>840-810</td>
<td>PGB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Geometric IA</td>
<td>810-790</td>
<td>EG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Geometric IA</td>
<td>790-745</td>
<td>MG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Geometric IA</td>
<td>745-710</td>
<td>LG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Geometric/Early Orientalising IA</td>
<td>710-700</td>
<td>LG/EO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Orientalising IA</td>
<td>700-670</td>
<td>EO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-Late Orientalising IA</td>
<td>670-630</td>
<td>MO-LO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaic IA</td>
<td>630-510</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 87 Cretan Iron Age Chronological Periodisation**

Two substantial Iron Age cemeteries, the Teké Cemetery and the Medical Faculty Cemetery, have been excavated in an area 1200m N-NW of the palace. These cemeteries as a group are referred to as the Knossos North Cemetery, and the tombs and their assemblages have been well published by Coldstream et al.
The Late Minoan IIIA and IIIB periods were characterized by ongoing contact between Cyprus and Crete, evidenced by many Cretan vessels found on Cyprus (Popham 1979; Yon 1979), but by post palatial LMIIIc (1200-1100), the impact of Cretan styles on Cyprus seems to have become negligible (Popham 1979: 1990). There is evidence that Crete adopted the same antithetical spiral bowl motif types, also seen at Maa Palaeokastro. These are thought to be Mycenaean in inspiration and also resemble the Philistine examples from the southern Levant (Popham 1979: 189 Figs. 8.1, 8.2. 8.3. 8.4) (See the discussion of the Sea Peoples Section 8.3. Late Cypriot IIIA & IIIB, 1200-1050 B.C., Figure 79, Figure 89).

The Proto-Geometric assemblages in the tombs bear comparison with the contemporary assemblages of Cyprus, but this kinship is thought to reflect the common Subminoan and Submycenaean ancestry of both groups rather than direct connections at the time (Boardman 1979: 257). The stirrup jars of the Subminoan period (1100-1000 B.C.) are comparable with those of the contemporary phases of the Skales cemetery. Jar T40.21 (CCR01) is decorated with hatched triangles on the shoulders in a way very similar to examples found on Cyprus, but soon after the new immigrants settled down on Cyprus, westward trade dwindled away to insignificance (Coldstream 1979: 257) and there is little evidence of revival before 900 B.C. (Iacovou 1994: 159).

The triangles on the shoulders of vessels continue into the Cretan Proto-Geometric B (840-810 B.C.) period, for example as shown on the juglet T175.58 (CCR03). During the Middle Proto-Geometric Period figures and animals appear on some designs. The hunters with schematised triangular bodies on the krater Tomb F.1. (920-875 B.C.) (CCR02) bear some comparison with those on the box pyxis at Amathus CAM17, but for the period 950-800 B.C. there is still little evidence for direct links (Coldstream 1979: 256).

During the Proto-Geometric B/Early Geometric phase (840-790 B.C.), the art of Crete entered what is considered to be the most remarkable phase of Cretan Iron Age vase painting. Several vessels from the period were decorated with elaborate tall trees of life in sinuous and spiralled forms. The painter, whose hand can be identified in several different pieces, has come to be known as the Tree Painter. The flat sided pithos T107.114 (CCR05) is a prime example of this style, and in that case the tall trees on triangular bases and with birds on top are accompanied by a pair of goddesses, one thought to represent the goddess arriving in spring, and the other the goddess departing in winter. This iconography clearly has metaphorical significance in a tomb context. T283.11 (CCR04) and T292.114 are other examples of these prominent tall tree types, which stretch vertically up the full height of the pithoi. T292.114 has 15 such trees in columns all around the vessel.

In later periods the Cretan repertoire returned to the horizontal banded format typically found decorating the pottery of the Late Geometric, Orientalising and Archaic Periods all around the East Mediterranean. Direct evidence of connections with Cyprus are, however, still lacking, and it may be that the Cretan trade with the Near East was in fact bypassing Cyprus, perhaps due to Cyprus’s proximity to, and relations with, the Assyrian Empire (Boardman 1979: 267) and then Persians (cf. Section 8.7). The Cretan trees then took on a more elaborate and complex form such as those on T292.40, a four handled pithos dating to the Late
Geometric / Early Orientalising periods (710-700 B.C.), but were perhaps still roughly executed at this point in time. A hydria with a choroplastic bull head spout T107.8 (CCR07) reminds us of the continuing significance of this animal on Crete during the Iron Age. The motif is paired with elaborate tree of life panels, recalling the frequent pairing of these symbols on Cyprus. Fragments of an Early Orientalising trichrome pithos T292.185 (700-670 B.C.) (CCR08) on a tripod base demonstrate the increasing formality as well as complexity of material from this period, with lotus flowers and oriental style birds re-appearing indication trade with the east, as also on T306.33, and followed by the small complex motif on T60.29 (670-650 B.C.)(CCR10). An Orientalising Period faience phiale libation bowl with caprids and a tree of life on a band running around its exterior recalls the designs of the bronze and silver bowls becoming more commonly traded around the East Mediterranean at this time, and it also resembles a similar faience version from Idalion on Cyprus, CID14.

Towards the Middle Orientalising and Late Orientalising Period (670-630 B.C.) the vessels became finer. The tree motifs appeared with more formalized spiral volutes in a form similar to the early architectural capital designs that were emerging, such as on the polychrome pithos T285.27 (CCR13), the aryballos T292.37 (CCR11) and the conical lid T60.25 (CCR09).

More formalised and typically Orientalising lotus flower chains appear in the Middle to Late Orientalising Period, with alternating buds and blossoms, as they do on two fine examples of imported Wild Goat vessels T34.18 and T56.11 which also date to this period, around 630 B.C.

Trees of life remained a prominent theme in the Late Orientalising Period, such as shown on T40.22 (CCR12), a small alabastron juglet with a complex tree of life motif. Very fine red and blue polychrome kraters on tripod bases were produced during this later period, such as T285.27 (CCR13), which includes elegantly stylized birds, lotus flowers and voluted tree element patterns.

After this sophisticated period the number of tombs dropped off sharply during the Archaic Period (630-510 B.C.) and the cemeteries were not used extensively in the second half of the 1st Millennium B.C. Evidence suggests that Crete become an inward looking and declining society during the Archaic Period, and contact with the rest of the Greek world was diminishing. Only a few of the main sites seem to have survived as late as 600 B.C. (Boardman 1979: 268).

In the wider landscape around the settlement, while there is no prominent city kingdom acropolis of the type seen on Iron Age Cyprus, there is a very prominent sacred mountain visible from these sites. 'Mount Juktas', a sacred mountain also once thought to be the home of Zeus, stands prominently at the head of the Kairatos valley, 6.3km to the S-SE of Knossos. Bronze Age structures have been excavated at the foot of the 800m high prominence. One can actually see the face of Zeus in this mountain, quite clearly silhouetted on the horizon, with a forehead, nose and chin formed by the rocky outcrops. The mountain contains many sacred caves, one of which was also reputed to be the tomb of Zeus, while the Knosano Gorge, to the northeast is particularly verdant and sometimes referred to as ‘paradise’.

This brief investigation of Iron Age Crete brings the wider regional survey of landscape settlement patterns to a close. The intention of this chapter was to consolidate the hypothesis that motifs associated with mountains, hills, bulls and trees of life were integral parts of a coherent cultural system that was region wide and ancient, and which survived into the Iron Age. In the following chapter the focus of the discussion returns to Cyprus. The ways in which the Cypriot model differs from the mainland and Cretan patterns will first be discussed, and then the reaction of this underlying system to specifically Iron Age events will be examined in detail.
Chapter 8. The iconographic-historic metanarrative

8.1. Introduction to the discussion

In this chapter the focus of the discussion returns to Cyprus, and I construct a *metanarrative* that interprets how the changes observed in the Cypriot material culture related to the historical and chronological contexts in which it was manufactured and used. In order to achieve this, the discussion chapter synthesizes, interprets and elaborates on the results of the three case studies, and the regional survey. After a brief introductory section summarising how the cultic topography of the island differs from the mainland model, an overarching diachronic narrative is constructed for Cyprus that explains how historical *conjunctures* (confluences of complimentary trends) and *événements* (unique events) related to changes in the iconography. This *metanarrative* reveals that the underlying structure of Cypriot Iron Age society underwent distinct phases of change. Through these phases, the material culture served to negotiate, consolidate, reconcile and hybridise cultural difference into new resultant forms. These changing forms are coherent and meaningful when they are interpreted from within the cultural system.

The recommendations of the theory chapter are applied here to help interpret the material culture, and anomalous or ambiguous details in the artefacts which cannot be easily explained within existing models are identified and analysed. In all three case studies anomalous details were identified in the iconography of the material culture, and by using examples from all three case studies I argue that the small anomalies, details and ambiguities did indeed have cultural and historical significance. They allude to efforts made by the artisans to hybridise contrasting cultural traditions into new and more harmonious repertoires that better suited emerging ways of life, and even expressed more explicit messages such as support for oppressed neighbours. The evolution of these iconographies can only be successfully explained by referring to historical developments taking place within each city kingdom and across the region. In this respect, the following examples successfully verified the theoretical hypotheses and the methodology of this study. The historical summary will be punctuated with demonstrative examples illustrating how the iconography correlated with the social changes that were taking place. The examples also illustrate how the material played a role in initiating and consolidating those social changes.

As discussed in the theory chapter, symbols are graphical forms that are associated with ideas in the minds of the artist and the observer. Iconographies can become associated with certain people, ethnicities, places or abstract ideas. Their manifestation in durable material form gives them a temporal resilience; they are not ephemeral like words or gestures, and so the iconography is usually concerned with expressing longer term concerns.

The meanings carried by the iconography on Cyprus were drawn out of the archaeology in the case studies, and in order to ensure that discussion of these concepts is logical and rigorous, the theoretical and methodological recommendations made in Chapter 3.4. will be carefully followed.

For example, ideas of affiliation and loyalty with family and neighbours will result in the inclusion and sharing of symbols. Ideas of affiliation with acknowledged elites, rulers or beneficial external alliances will result in the appropriation and incorporated of the symbols of the ‘other’. New immigrations of people will be visible in the archaeological record through their differing material cultural and iconographic forms. New shared
forms re-enforce new alliances, or conversely, animosity will result in the rejection of symbols associated with new enemies, threats or competitors. Existing symbols may be reinforced in the face of growing threats, or this may lead to iconoclasm or proscription where the symbols of the ‘other’ are destroyed or defaced in acts of graffiti or vandalism. Symbols identified with enemies or threats or competitors may be deliberately omitted (Faust 2006: 43) or defaced.

Group identities can therefore be shared, promoted, imposed and rejected through the manipulation of iconography. This can be expressed locally and internally, or communicated externally through the trade and exchange of portable material culture, and this can be done blatantly, subtly or ambiguously.

After a brief section that addresses how the cultic topography of the city kingdoms varied from the typical mainland forms, the section that follows will present a metanarrative that summarises how changes in the motifs relating to the tree of life correlated with these local landscape use patterns and with historical trends and events that impacted on the sites. The metanarrative will follow sequential chronological order from the end of the Bronze Age to the end of the Cypro-Archaic Period, and includes detailed and demonstrative examples from the iconographic repertoire of the material culture.

The general meanings of the themes are now clear, but the more particular meanings conveyed in each individual arrangement were carried in the details of the decoration; in the composition and in the combinations of symbols. We can finally hear what the artisans were saying through their inter-twined embellishments, flourishes and the accents of their works.
8.2. Cyprus and its cultic topography

It was useful to revisit the wider regional context before this discussion of the landscape settlement patterns on Cyprus. This keeps the discussions rooted in the archaeology of the period and the region and not locked within isolated academic discussions. The discussion in the previous chapter established that there was a region wide and common cultural background, with profound cosmological roots in which Iron Age Cyprus developed.

Before embarking on the diachronic metanarrative, this first section will characterise how the deep cosmology manifested itself on Cyprus and what local factors interacted with it to shape the resulting landscape settlement patterns particular to the island.

The landscape use patterns were determined by choices based on practical experience as well as the cultic topographical cosmology, and both of these built up over the longue durée and were interrelated. The cosmology of the trees and mounds shaped the typical landscape settlement pattern, but the Iron Age settlement choices were also shaped by particular local factors.

Votive foundation deposits and bothroi on the summits at Amathus and Idalion show that ritual activity was practised extensively during the early phases of the city kingdoms. Unlike the mainland sites, Palaepaphos, Idalion and Amathus were not built on tells, but at prominent elevated positions overlooking fertile plains with some level of water resources. These choices show that some of the same practical and cosmological concerns were being considered.

This landscape settlement model of Iron Age Cyprus was fundamentally different to that of Late Bronze Age Cyprus. The low level, agricultural-based settlements with some palatial features typical of the Late Bronze Age at Enkomi and Kalavassos Ayios-Dhimitrios, for example, were not at all tell like. Better comparanda for those are Mediterranean island sites such as at Knossos and Phaistos on Crete, although those settlements are substantially larger. There was a clear change in landscape settlement use patterns from the Bronze Age to the Iron Age on Cyprus, but unlike the mainland where there were pre-existing tells that could be re-used, there were no Bronze Age tells to reuse on Iron Age Cyprus. Nevertheless, the Cypriots did move to or reused more elevated sites. Steel (2004: 190) describes this as synoicism; the gathering of the population within a smaller number of apparently defensible settlements, primarily along the south coast of the island.

Did this signal a change in the ethnic cultural profile of the inhabitants of Iron Age Cyprus, or does it only indicate a change in their belief system, as they slowly recovered from the disasters of the end of the Bronze Age and adopted a new way of living? This question will be addressed in the metanarrative that follows.

There are several practical factors that influenced the landscape settlement profile of Cyprus so that it differed from the mainland. Firstly, Cyprus was undoubtedly in communication with the cultures around it, but the sea was not an irrelevancy. It controlled and limited the way in which the mainland interacted with Cyprus and it would have restricted the numbers of people who had access to Cyprus to those who could sail or commandeer ships. Until the advent of large naval fleets towards the second half of the 1st millennium B.C., the sea would have offered Cyprus a degree of protection from invasion that was not possible on the mainland, where the huge standing army of the Assyrians moved from place to place rapidly. As a result, the island’s culture remained insular.
This maritime protection perhaps explains why the Iron Age hilltop sites that grew up on Cyprus after the destruction of the Sea People did not become heavily fortified against organised armies until the Archaic Period (Balandier 2000). They had become more aware of the defensive qualities of elevated sites but they did not consider themselves to be threatened imminently in the way that the sites on the mainland were. The ritual aspects of the mounds may have been as significant as the practical defensive attributes.

Secondly, the availability of freshwater on Cyprus differed significantly from the mainland. The shortage of good water sources determined where settlements could be located and limited the size of the populations within those settlements. Despite the construction of cisterns, wells and the use of ceramic vessel technology to store water, there was never an abundance of fresh water for agriculture on Cyprus, particularly through the summer months. When compared with Mesopotamia, the Nile Valley and the coastal alluvial plains crossed by the Orontes and other rivers of the mainland, the landscape of Cyprus perhaps most strongly resembled the landscape of Palestine where water was also scarce.

One final differential factor adversely affecting the landscape settlement patterns of Iron Age Cyprus may have been the plagues that were recorded as having seriously impacted on Cyprus during the Late Bronze Age. The ‘hand of Nergal’, a euphemism for plague, is mentioned in the Amarna letters as having devastated the land of Alashiya. It may have played a role in severely reducing the population size on Cyprus towards the end of the Bronze Age (Stieglitz 1987: 47). These are important practical issues and facts to consider when trying to properly characterise, describe and eventually classify the city kingdoms of Cyprus. One of the conclusions of the Palaepaphos case study (Chapter 6.4) was that “Iron Age Palaepaphos was a rural settlement retaining an ancient ritual tradition…..and managed by a local family who acted as the rulers and priests of the small settlement and its temple”. This approach, emphasising the comparatively limited size of these settlements, must be reiterated in the light of the regional tell survey. The phrase ‘city kingdoms’ is really a misnomer and is even misleading. Taking the above factors into considerations as well as an improved understanding of the tells, it is clear that the settlements of Iron Age Cyprus were not in the same league as the real ‘cities’ of the mainland, and their rulers were hardly kings. Nineveh, Babylon and Assur all had populations exceeding 100,000 during the Cypro-Archaic Period, while Miletus had a population around 50,000 in 650 B.C. (Chandler 1987). By way of comparison, Idalion, one of the largest city kingdoms of Cyprus, had a population at the end of the Archaic Period of just 8-10,000 people (Gaber 2008: 55), while Jerusalem in the comparable landscape of the southern Levant had a population of up to 15,000 (Finkelstein and Silberman 2001: 306).

There were fundamental differences between the landscape settlement patterns of the Cypriot city kingdoms and the settlements on the mainland coast and islands to the west. The Cypriot sites were located near rivers, but they are not navigable. The purpose was not to control trade along the rivers, as was the case on the coastal plains of Anatolia and Syria, but to utilise their fresh water for drinking and irrigation. The Cypriot sites of Palaepaphos, Kourion, Amathus, Kition and Salamis were positioned close to the coasts to engage with the maritime networks. Amathus and Palaepaphos provide commanding views of the sea along the coasts, as their viewsheds demonstrated, but the sites were also rural agricultural settlements overlooking fertile plains. The sites were also industrial. The main materials being controlled during the Geometric and Cypro-Archaic I periods were copper ore and processed copper, rather than timber, but by Cypro-Archaic II the timber industry had become a significant component of the economy. The inland settlements were well positioned close to the overland routes for moving materials from the mountains to the sea. Finally, the sites were also artisanal. Some of the products manufactured on Iron Age Cyprus display
a high degree of technical artistic skill, most notably the ceramics, but also the metal bowls, if indeed they were manufactured on the island, as is considered likely (Markoe 1985).

Another notable aspect of the landscape settlement location choices made that was identified during the fieldwork was retrospective legitimation by association with the Late Bronze Age precursor settlements and pre-existing sites of ritual significance. This does not necessarily mean that the inhabitants of the Iron Age settlements were directly descended from the Bronze Age inhabitants, but it does suggest that they were keen to reference some threads of continuity. Idalion faces across the Yalias Valley towards the Bronze Age settlement on the flat mesa plateau north of Ayios Sozomenos. Similarly, Palaepaphos is built on Chalcolithic foundations and adjacent to Bronze Age cemeteries, while the sanctuary at Amathus was founded next to an early Iron Age summit rock cut chamber tomb. Other sites such as Kourion and Salamis were built close to Bronze Age precursor sites such as Episkopi Bamboula and Enkomi, but in more defensible positions. This proximity may indicate a desire to link back to the past, but the new settlements were very different in character, and seem to have been modelled to a different pattern. Tells were not re-used on Cyprus because none had developed during the Bronze Age, because that was not the typical settlement model of the period. Once the Iron Age hilltops had been inhabited for several centuries, however, such as at Idalion, they did effectively become tells. Current excavations at Idalion have revealed monumental Phoenician era structures buried several metres deep, so that the western ‘acropolis’ could legitimately now be referred to as Tell el-Idalion.

At the start of the Cypro-Archaic Period there was no tell and no stone temple on the acropolises at Idalion or at Amathus. The sacred areas were most probably small open rural sanctuaries with enclosures, altars, sacred trees and subsidiary structures (Wright 1992b: 271). The closest parallels between settlements on Cyprus and the mainland were with the bamah high places of early Iron Age Palestine, and two of the major scholars of the Cypriot Iron Age concur on this point (Wright 1992b: 282; Gaber 2008: 60). These were small rural sanctuary settlements built on raised mounds, around sacred groves, and incorporating decorated steles with tree of life motifs and sacred trees. Many capitals with triangles and volutes were found at the southern Levantine sites, and like the capitals at the Cypriot sites they do not seem to have been used as structural column tops for supporting the roofs of monumental temple buildings such as developed around the Aegean, but were free standing votive steles at the sacred enclosures, or decorated orthostats used structurally at the entrances to subsidiary buildings (Franklin 2011: 138).

The settlements of Iron Age Cyprus can be classified as multifunctional semi-rural semi-urban sanctuary towns. They had industrial and agricultural functions and were built up around sacred groves where rural rituals, familiar from the early Iron Age Levant, were carried out by local families as they had been for many centuries. The physical and political isolation of the sites from the mainland, however, did allow them to develop a degree of complexity independently of the mainland and a quite unique material cultural profile. The settlements developed some strengths as artisanal production centres.

In the following section some examples will be examined that demonstrate what occupied the minds of the artisans, and what they were trying to express and achieve with their designs. These examples also show how the artisans responded to the various phases, trends and events of the Iron Age.
Figure 88 Distribution of ANE and Aegean architectural capitals and steles. See appendix 10.3 for sources of reference material (author’s illustration)
8.3. Late Cypriot IIIA & IIIB, 1200-1050 B.C.

**LCII/LCIIIA**

Broadly, the development of the Iron Age iconography on Cyprus progressed in fairly distinct phases. The earliest detailed phase covered by the scope of this study begins towards the end of the Bronze Age, LCII, in the 13th century B.C., when a new monumental temple was constructed on the prominent ridge overlooking the coastal plain at Palaepaphos. Towards the end of that century, a new coastal settlement was also established on a peninsula 25km to the west of the Late Bronze Age temple, at Maa Palaekastro (Figure 55). Karageorghis and Demas (1988b) concluded that the settlement was probably established by people from the Aegean (Steel 2004: 187; Yasur-Landau 2010: 150). Possible reasons for settling there are that the people were refugees, traders or raiders in the east Mediterranean region, and perhaps all of these, and the peninsula provided excellent anchorages near to useful agricultural and mineral resources. The postulated relationship of these people to groups referred to as the Sea Peoples as well as to the traders of the final years of the international period and the Philistines needs to be considered as plausible. Their pottery was characteristic of the Mycenaean LHIIIB style, and included bell shaped bowls with antithetical spiral motifs (Steel 2004: 192), separated by a vertical band. These bowls were also common in Philistine pottery (Dothan 1982: 99), and the typical designs of both assemblages included pictorial scenes. The fact that these people existed at Maa is undisputed. The reasons for what happened at the end of the century are less clear. The coastal settlement went through two phases of occupation during the last 30 years of the 13th century B.C., from ca. 1230 to 1200 B.C. It was burnt down once, and then rebuilt, and then abandoned again around the same time as multiple Bronze Age settlement sites around Cyprus were destroyed or abandoned. This phase, which impacted on settlements all around the northeast Mediterranean region, has been attributed to the Sea Peoples and has recently been C14 dated to ca. 1220 to 1190 B.C. on Cyprus (Kaniewski et al. 2011: 6). There is now hard scientific evidence to support the historical evidence from Hittite texts (Guterbock 1967: 73), the Ras Shamra texts (RS 34.129, RS 20.238, RS 20.18)(Yasur-Landau 2010: 110), the relief texts on the walls of the Medinet Habu temple of Ramesses III in Thebes (Dothan 1982: 4), and the Harris Papyrus, all of which refer to rogue ships which were attacking the ports of the east Mediterranean in the early 12th century B.C. Egyptian sources refer to them as a collective of peoples while the Hittite sources describe fighting with ships based on Cyprus (Guterbock 1967).

The impressed ceramic design from Maa Palaekastro (see Chapter 6.2.6)(Figure 62) provided the first example of the triangle, tree and mounds being depicted all together in one hybrid composition, and it dates to this period of change. This new hybrid concept was possibly initiated in the Paphos district at the end of the Bronze Age. Trees on mounds had been depicted much earlier, but not trees on triangular mounds.

This example from Maa Palaekastro may signal the earliest signs of the more geometric decoration of the LCII and LCIIIA Aegean being hybridised with the tree of life and caprids scene familiar from Late Bronze Age Cyprus (Bushnell 2005), and on the mainland to the east. The earliest part of the Iron Age is characterised by continued hybridisation of these new Aegean influences with local Cypriot traditions (Steel 2004: 193), and not in a way that would support any claim of widespread Mycenaean invasions and independent Mycenaean foundations of city kingdoms. The people who settled were significantly mobile and relatively wealthy. There is even evidence of Egyptian techniques in the rich cloisonné gold work from this period (Catling 1968; Maier and Karageorghis 1984: 67). A likely scenario is that many of the remnants of the Sea Peoples, migrants and
the traders mainly coming from the Late Bronze Age Aegean, but who were used to travelling down to the southern Levantine coasts and even into the Egyptian Delta, stayed on the coasts of Cyprus as the dust settled on the 12th century B.C., and interacted with the relatively small local populations. At this time the hinterlands of Cyprus were abandoned, and the majority of the population gathered and consolidated around a few defended south coast urban centres (Steel 2004: 190).

Bowls and small decorated fragments from the coastal site of Maa Palaekastro suggest that Cyprus was in contact with the southern Levant as well as the Aegean world during LCII/LCIIIA period. The bowl on the left (Figure 89) shows antithetical spirals combined with central triangles, while the small fragment lower left shows a piece that may have carried a design very similar to those on the first stone capitals, with central triangle and volutes. Betancourt maintains that the transition to stone capitals first took place on the Syro-Palestinian coast (Betancourt 1977: 21), and some of the earliest versions come from towns close to or within the Philistines’ Pentapolis area. The Maa bowls are very similar to the Philistine Type 1 Bowls from the tells of the southern Levant (Figure 79) and provide evidence that the Paphian coast was in contact with the Philistine coast at this time, and that the very first proto-Aeolic / proto-Ionic capital motifs emerged from this new social and iconographic milieu during and following LCIIIA (Dothan 1982: 207). Crete adopted the same antithetical spiral bowl motif types also seen at Maa Palaekastro. These are all thought to be partly Aegean in inspiration and resemble the Philistine examples from the southern Levant (Popham 1979: 189)(Figure 79, Figure 89). The populations who brought these vessels came from a wide area including Mycenae, Phylakopi, Tiryns, Miletus as well as the Dodecanese and as far south as Phaistos in southern Crete (Yasur-Landa 2010: 329). Contemporary examples suggesting a common population have been recovered from the settlement at Palaepaphos. These White Painted Wheelmade III vases, recovered from the well context at Paleapaphos Evreti (Steel 2004: 192) also demonstrate that the city was continuously occupied through LCIII.

Figure 89 Bowls with spirals from Maa Palaekastro (author’s illustrations)

In conclusion, the evidence from the Paphos district indicates that the coast of Cyprus was in contact with the Philistines, Mycenaeans, Sea Peoples and Cretans at the end of the Bronze Age. Some of this disparate group of people settled at Palaepaphos and elsewhere on the island (McFadden and Sjöqvist 1954), and some settled in the Pentapolis on the southern Levant. The common material culture and iconography influenced all of these areas, and motifs of spirals, triangles and trees hybridised into a new set of forms and
symbols that varied from those used in the Late Bronze Age international period. Soon after the new immigrants settled down on Cyprus, westward trade dwindled away to insignificance (Coldstream 1979: 257) and there is little evidence of revival before 900 B.C. (Iacovou 1994: 159).

**LCIII B**

The LCIII B period, 1125-1050 B.C., is characterised by new, local development of the Proto-White Painted ware pottery which turns up in tombs and nascent city kingdom sites across the island. This type is a derivative of the regional White Painted Wheelmade III type of middle Myc.IIIC, and although it resembles the contemporary submycenaean pottery of late Myc.IIIC and subminoan pottery, it is though that this is because all these types were derived from common ancestry rather than providing evidence of ongoing contact. After being hybridised with more local motifs, the new Cypriot iconography became widespread and homogeneous on this new Proto White Painted ware pottery, attesting to ongoing and vigorous communication between polities across the island, if not with sites overseas. There are several notable tombs that date to this LCIII B period which contained comparable material, from Palaepaphos (Karageorghis 1967a), Idalion (Karageorghis 1965), Lapithos, Salamis (Yon 1971) and Alaas. The decoration on the pottery in these LCIII B tombs became highly schematised and linear, and pictorial motifs are very rare. Traditional Mycenaean forms such as the stirrup jar and belly handled amphorae continued to be produced throughout LCIII B and into the early CGI. Around the end of this period a new style of extramural cemetery appeared at Palaepaphos and it included many tombs filled with this new type of pottery.

**LCIII B/CGI**

Palaepaphos *Skales* is one of the largest cemeteries of Cyprus dating to the LCIII B/CGI period and it demonstrates that the people of Palaepaphos remained relatively wealthy as they transitioned into the CGI period. The new style of pottery found here featured many stirrup jars that were similar in style, but simpler and eventually more austere than the bowls described above, and their decoration became more schematised than the LHIII B Mycenaean pottery and Pastoral style pottery produced around the Aegean ca. 1300-1190 B.C. It was more comparable with the sub-Mycenaean pottery of LHIIIC2 and the Aegean Proto-Geometric Period (ca. 1100-900 B.C.) that was being produced contemporaneously, and it continues to bear comparison with Philistine vessels such as the type III stirrup jars that developed during the third period (1050-975 B.C.) (Dothan 1982: 96). The most common decorative motif on the Philistine stirrup jars at this time, on the upper register band, consisted of dome shaped concentric semicircles (Dothan 1982: 123) and this is very similar to those motifs seen on vessels from Palaepaphos *Skales* (CPA 34,35). On Cyprus the triangle motif was commonly added over the mound shapes (CPA 20-33) but there are also good CGI examples of mounds with no triangles such as from Idalion (CID24). Cypriot decorative motifs became more schematised and simplified as maritime movement of people declined and contact with the wider world was lost, just as occurred in the Philistine territories of the southern Levant (Dothan 1982: 96). The *Skales* cemetery also introduced a new kind of tomb architecture, rock cut chambers installed into the slopes on the sides of the hill around the acropolis of the sanctuary rather than on the summits as was the case during the Bronze Age. The evidence points to the probability that these tombs were based on Aegean traditions (Steel 2004: 211).

The architecture of these tombs at Skales and the large volume of pottery they contained provided an excellent opportunity to apply an iconographic/historic analysis to the interpretation of decoration (Figure 90).
As has already been discussed in the Palaepaphos case study above (Chapter 6.2.3) (Figure 63, Figure 64), many of the stirrup jars in the tombs exhibited a schematised motif which was repeated and quite uniform. This consisted of cross hatched, equilateral triangles with mound shapes within them. It was proposed in the case study that these reflected a traditional tumulus or hillside burial concept and the associated ideas of the goddess that the tomb owners, builders and artisans worshipped. The semicircular holes drawn in the triangles reinforce that interpretation, as they resemble tomb entrances, while other contemporaneous examples from Lapithos in particular, which include more detail, also support this interpretation. The wavy line band (below the scene) on the comparable example above from Lapithos adds to the impression that the mound shapes represent tombs or hills (Iacovou 1988: 48) in the landscape, as in this case they are being depicted as built within sight of the sea, or being viewed from the sea. Proto White Painted vessel Berlin Ant. 32793 (Figure 90) is especially informative in this context as the ‘abstract and pictorial’ (Brehme et al. 2001: 54) motif can plausibly be interpreted as representing a whole landscape of mounds, tombs, and the animal perhaps most associated with Cyprus at the time, the caprid or wild goat (Bushnell 2005), all seen from the sea. The squares above are plausibly interpreted as abstract representations of the sun and the moon or clouds. This evidence is clearly supportive of an archaeological approach that anticipates that the cultural landscape will be reflected in the material culture that is produced and used within it. In this case the observer or artist’s point of view is from the sea, and if these vessels were the product of a people whose coastal territory was primarily controlled from the sea, such as would be expected from descendents or remnants of a sea people or maritime traders, then the iconography fits the cultural context very well.

From the sea, the most prominent anthropomorphic features visible would have been the large tells. Prominent burial tumuli, mounds, acropolises or mountains may also have been given cultural and territorial significance as landmarks by associating them with gods, goddesses or deified ancestors who were, or were reputed to have been, buried on or in them. A good example of this is with the summit tomb at Amathus which the excavators have suggested may be the one that became associated with Ariadne (Aupert 1997: 19), and which was reputed to have been established there by Theseus who came in from the sea. The main point here is that mounds would have had particular significance for people used to perceiving landscapes and navigating from ships at sea.

Again, the Philistine pottery supports these interpretations. Contemporary type III stirrup jars included concentric semicircle motifs that resemble those at Skales with the additional triangle. Others were decorated with the distinctive scale pattern that became the conventional sign indicating hilly terrain, right
through to the end of the Neo-Assyrian period and beyond (Linder 1986: 280). This confirms the hypothesis that these motifs represented mounds, tumuli or hills. Pieces carrying this specific hill-scale motif also appeared at Maal Palaekastro linking the concept to Cyprus (Figure 89 lower left PI XC).

Similarly, the Philistine bowls with a vertical column of chevrons (Figure 79) between pairs of the mound shapes may represent a river, or trees in a valley, or perhaps more holistically, the green strip of a fertile watered river channel running between two hills. Chevrons in this form recall the v shapes of a ship’s wake or the patterns of ripples in a flowing stream, so this association with moving water is plausible. This symbolism seems to be representing an idealised landscape from the perspective of a people who were used to living along the coasts of hilly dry terrain, where river valleys would cut through to the sea bringing fertile water, creating verdant paths of relatively abundant growth and allowing agriculture to take place nearby. Defensible mounds adjacent to these paths could be used for settlement. The importance of this type of natural valley in the landscape has already been indicated by the Palaepaphos case study (Chapter 6.2.3), where there is a verdant gorge 3.3 km northeast of the temple with ritual significance. At Amathus, a deep verdant valley runs between the acropolis and the neighbouring hill to the west, and leads through between them from the sea to a flat agricultural plain behind the mounds. Likewise at Idalion, an important route runs between the east and west acropolises, and this important landscape feature is perhaps being represented in the CGI stirrup jar CID23. These valleys would have been considered appropriate and even idyllic places to live, and constituted part of the idealised cosmological model that shaped the landscape settlement patterns of the time.

If this morphology links the ceramic vessels to the first capitals (Figure 79) then the association between the distinctive iconography and the fertility goddesses is made. In this way the symbols of the goddess were shaped by the idealised landscape cosmology which in turn influenced the development of new proto-Aeolic architectural forms that were used within that landscape. The iconographic changes are therefore coherent and logical when understood from within the cultural system.

In general on the Philistine vessels, these schematised landscape scenes of sky, hills, mounds and rivers were added on the top register of the decoration, around the shoulders of the vessels, while closer and more pictorial scenes of trees and animals, often birds or bulls, were shown on the middle bands, while the sea including wavy line bands and fish was often shown below on the lowest band. This layered register convention may have been followed on the Cypriot vessels to some extent, but the representations were highly schematised.

Finally, as well as the goddess of fertility, the male symbol of virility, the bulls, continued to play a prominent role in Cypriot cults and material culture (Iacovou 1988: 62). Horns of consecration were found at Enkomi and Paphos (Steel 2004: 203) as well as bucra nia and figurines of bull-horned gods. Bull figurines were found in some quantity in the LCII/LCIIIA cult buildings, including at Enkomi, Kition and Idalion, as was discussed in Chapter 5 (Steel 2004: 205), and small juglets with plastic moulded bull decoration were found in the assemblages from Palaepaphos Skales and in Amathus tomb 521 (Figure 91), also decorated with the triangle motif (Karageorghis 1981: 118, T76 No. 114),
8.4. Cypro-Geometric I &II, 1050, 950, 850 B.C.

Cyprus entered a 200 year period, the Cypro-Geometric I and Cypro-Geometric II, characterised by lowered social and political complexity, with increasing economic austerity and artistic aestheticism, in which it became somewhat isolated from mainland events and remained relatively peaceful. Connection with the Aegean was lost almost entirely (Popham 1985) while connection with the Levant continued but at a lower level (Steel 2004: 210). At Kition, although the Bronze Age temple had remained occupied through from the Bronze Age, it was abandoned ca. 1000 B.C. (Gjerstad 1979: 231).

The foundation of several city kingdoms on the island dates back to the end of the Bronze Age, and this period is marked archaeologically by elite burials and small defensive structures underlying the later architecture. This suggests that there was nucleation at new hilltop sites as a response to invasion or internal violence, and that these formed the nucleus of the Iron Age urban sites (Steel 2004: 190). This was similar to the way in which refuge sites developed in Crete in response to similar widespread events (Nowicki 2000), although the change may have been influenced by new ritual concerns as well as defensive tactics. At Amathus (Chapter 4) the settlement was established around a hilltop location that was a virgin site apart from one earlier burial. The first signs of Iron Age settlement at this site are tombs with geometric and oriental material which first appeared around 1050 B.C. The pottery styles of early Amathus were similar to the designs of the LCIII/CGI at Palaepaphos and this indicates a close connection between Palaepaphos and Amathus. Small juglets with plastic moulded bull decorations in tomb 521 (Karageorghis and Iacovou 1990: pl VII) are very similar to versions from Palaepaphos Skales (Figure 91). Two of the major scholars of the Cypriot Iron Age concur that it is likely that the Amathus settlement was derived from the settlement at Palaepaphos (Iacovou 1994: 156; Hermary 1999: 58)

Figure 91 Choroplastic bull figurine juglets from Amathus tomb 521 and Palaepaphos Skales

The Geometric decorative style of the whole island was substantially similar to the hybrid motifs and techniques that are evidenced at Palaepaphos during the LCIII and CGI periods, indicating that a high level of communication was maintained within and around the island despite the decline of extra-island trade. The CGI ring kernos from Idalion (CID25) is easily comparable with the juglets above, and these are all thought to have been libation vessels associated with rituals and cult, indicating a common island culture. The city kingdoms subsequently consolidated and grew slowly through the Geometric Period, and the distinctive
Cypro-Geometric style of pottery decoration became homogeneous across the island (Gjerstad 1979: 232; Iacovou 2005b).

The basic geometric forms evolved to become characteristic of the eponymous Cypro-Geometric period styles of CGI and CGII. They are characterised by extremely schematised designs and very austere, mainly rectilinear, patterns such as stark black ‘butterfly triangles’, Maltese crosses, concentric circles and above all, the hatched and chequered triangles with triple parallel lines around them. Although the meanings behind the symbols may have been retained, they became even more codified and geometricised than the designs on earlier ceramics from Palaepaphos Skales and the Mycenaean pastoral and pictorial style pottery designs that preceded both (Mycenaean IIIa and IIIb). The hatched triangles which were schematised versions of the tree of the goddess, as well as possibly signifying the tomb or sanctuary mound, nevertheless remained unchanged.

Over the early Geometric Period, I and II, the Cypriot island was somewhat isolated from the mainland. In his review of the excavation reports Popham remarked on the remarkable lack of evidence of continued contact with the Aegean within the CGII and CGIII period Palaepaphos Skales assemblages (Popham 1985). During this hiatus, the new geometric designs slowly consolidated into new typical and formalised designs, and were shared across the island. This evolved into a distinctively Cypriot Geometric form that was relatively homogeneous (cf. CPA8). The Bichrome style of decoration also developed during this period (I-III), perhaps due to a level of contact with the Levant. The pottery was geometric, usually lacked pictorial decoration, but was aesthetically attractive and well made on a wheel. There are no spiral floral motifs or lotus flowers in the iconographic repertoire of this period. Towards the end of this period small rural sanctuaries started to become more common and more extensive.

The Geometric style of pottery became prevalent, and was found extensively in early Amathus and at Idalion. Other motifs that developed were concentric circles and encircling bands of parallel lines. The thorough integration and slow consolidation of styles was responsible for the homogeneous and austere Geometric style of pottery decoration that became widespread across Cyprus. This may have been accompanied by thorough social hybridisation of the previously separate groups of incomers and locals, and the sharing of new common forms may have been a driver of this hybridisation process. This phase is therefore a key phase in the narrative, when Iron Age Cyprus developed its own shared identity and shared material culture.

Over this period the pottery developed distinctively from the types and decoration seen on the mainland, although the Geometric Black on Red ware pottery of the Phoenician Levant also demonstrate that communication with the Levant was maintained.

8.5. Cypro-Geometric III, 850 – 750 B.C.

The ‘dark age’, a period of relative calm for Cyprus, was brought to an end by the Assyrian invasion of Syria between 854 and 836 B.C. The Battle of Qarqar in 853 B.C. was one of the first serious clashes, when an allied army consisting of forces from almost every tell kingdom around the east Mediterranean Levantine coast, plus the Egyptians, fought against, and was defeated by, Shalmaneser III of Assyria. The defeated allies included Egyptians, Israelites, Phoenicians, Cilicians and Syro-Hittites. This marked a sea change in fortunes for the Levant and Cyprus.
Perhaps in response to the disruption on the mainland from the Assyrians, the Phoenician presence in Kition was revived and the temple was rebuilt around 850 B.C. (Gjerstad 1979). Pygmalion, the King of Tyre from 831-785 B.C., shifted his economic focus to the Mediterranean Sea from the lands to the east, and also set up the new Phoenician port at Carthage at this time (Cross 1972: 18). Perhaps due to this new economic impetus, the city kingdoms of Cyprus emerge with renewed vigour. By the start of the Cypro-Archaic period, 750 B.C., the established set-up of city kingdoms known from Assyrian sources was already in place (Counts 2008: 16). It is plausible that the growing threats from the Assyrians on the mainland coast opposite Cyprus, starting around 850 B.C., forced the Tyrians to look to the sea and the islands for help and materials for tribute (Fantalkin 2006: 201), and made the nascent towns at re-used Late Bronze Age refuge sites and sanctuaries on Cyprus more attractive places of settlement and ports of call again. This time, however, the settlements developed into more permanent places of occupation with local Cypriot families in charge.

By the end of the preceding period many rural sanctuaries had grown up across the island in which animal votive figurines were offered to local gods and goddesses (Young and Young 1955; Smith 1997), but as the end of the Geometric Period approached, the larger part of the population was nucleated into the nascent city kingdoms, and their names first appear in the historical records of the Assyrian Empire in 707 B.C. The urban settlements started to grow during this earliest phase of the Phoenician Iron Age expansion out into the Mediterranean, and this accelerated under the pressure of the Assyrians from the mid ninth century B.C. onwards. An inscription from Kition from around 800 B.C. mentions Idalion, indicating that the inhabitants of Kiton were already making inroads into Cyprus rather than just using it as a stopover, probably to source copper from the inland deposits (Gjerstad 1979: 237). This period marks a new phase of cultural interaction for Cyprus.

A bronze bowl from Idalion (CID13) dating to this period evidences the cultural exchanges that were beginning to take place again, this time through the Phoenician links. On the left of the illustration (Figure 92) is part of a scene from the sarcophagus of Ahiram from Byblos which is conventionally dated to ca. 1000 B.C. On the right is a scene on the artefact from Idalion which is the earliest metal bowl found from Cyprus, dating from 825-750 B.C. This ‘offering table’ arrangement had its roots in Egyptian New Kingdom tomb murals, but there are visible parallels between the style of these two scenes from the Phoenician mainland and from Cyprus, particularly in the forms of the table, the flowers and serving utensils being held by the king and his companion. These demonstrate the arrival of mainland, Phoenician, influence in the heart of Cyprus.

Figure 92 Comparison of motifs. Sarcophagus of Ahiram, left, and bowl from Idalion CID13, right (author’s illustration)
The depiction of the lotus is worth looking at in more detail here. It was used in its canonical form on the lotus frieze around the Ahiram sarcophagus (Figure 92 left). This key symbol attests to the close artistic and ideological links between Byblos and Egypt, where the flower was considered to be a symbol of rebirth and creation (Kemp 2005a: 27). It was often paired with the papyrus plant motif. Philistine pottery also used the motif, but it did not appear in Cypriot material until later in the Iron Age. In the Archaic Period the lotus flower became a central motif of Cypriot iconography, but at this early stage (Figure 92 right) it had not yet been adopted properly, and the way in which the flower is drawn in the example on the right from Idalion shows that the Cypriot artists, if this bowl was indeed produced on Cyprus, were not yet conscious of the canonical form that the lotus should take. Phoenician motifs then were starting to come into Cyprus by the end of the ninth century, but they had still to be properly hybridised with the Cypriot Geometric designs. Similarly, there was no still no sign of the proto-Aeolic style of architecture that had become typical in the sanctuaries of the southern Levant by this time, but that was about to change.

8.6. Cypro-Archaic I, 750 – 600 B.C.

By 750 B.C. the city kingdoms were expanding rapidly and the territory of Cyprus was divided between them, while rural sanctuaries interspersed the agricultural landscape and clustered along the industrial communication routes. The majority of the Cypriot population was probably nucleated into, and around, the defended hilltop settlements by 750 B.C. due to the increasing disruption on the mainland and resulting political and economic tensions between city kingdoms on the island itself. For the whole of the eighth century B.C. and in particular towards the end, the mainland was under the control of the Assyrians who demanded tribute and discouraged revolt. After the arrival of Tiglath Pileser III, who came to power in 745 B.C., the Assyrian rule became ever more oppressive (Aubet 1997: 55; Fantalkin 2006: 201).

Over the course of the Cypro-Archaic I period the iconography on Cyprus changed very substantially, but it is difficult to tie the motif changes to specific historical events or an absolute chronology through the pottery alone. The ceramic chronologies established from the archaeology of Cyprus are not of sufficiently high resolution to achieve this, and the chronological conventions and typologies are based on wide subdivisions such as CAI, which covers a 150 year period in which great changes took place.

A better option is firstly to refer to the fine bronze and silver bowls, for which a more suitable chronology has been developed (Markoe 1985). If Markoe’s chronology is correct, the very fine Period III bowls were produced by the Phoenicians on the mainland and on Cyprus from around 710 to 675 B.C. During this time, almost the whole of the Levant was under Assyrian hegemony and was required to provide tribute. If they refused, they were attacked by the standing Assyrian army. Samaria on the mainland revolted under king Hoshea (2 Kings 17:4). It was subsequently destroyed in 722 B.C. and the population deported to Assyria. Cyprus was also paying tribute by 707 B.C., but this may have been to avoid invasion rather than as a result of it, and it may have been a political decision rather than a military one. The stele of Sargon II has been called the only genuine Assyrian object to be recovered from Cyprus (Reyes 1994: 65).

The demand for tribute is the most likely driver for the unprecedented increase in technological and artistic sophistication seen on these metal bowls. There is no documentary or archaeological evidence of any Assyrian invasion of Cyprus, and the Assyrians may have lacked the means to mount a full scale maritime
invasion. This would have left Cyprus in a relatively protected and enviable position, but it was still on the periphery of the zone of brutal and widespread events taking place on the mainland, and so may have been utilised as a safe haven. The Phoenicians in particular under their king Luli (Elulaios) attempted to revolt against the Assyrians again and again during this period, but without success. The Assyrians besieged Tyre in 724 B.C. for four years, then again in 701 B.C., and yet again after the defeat of Egypt in 663 B.C., while in 705 B.C. the Tyrians attempted to free Kition of any presence the Assyrians may have had there to elicit tribute (Aubet 1997: 58).

The Taylor Prism in the British Museum tells of the destruction of Judah in 691 B.C., when 46 cities were destroyed and 200,000 people were deported (BM ME 91032). The Assyrian Empire was brutal and demanded large quantities of annual tribute. It is probably for this reason that the manufacture of fine bronze and silver bowls and the associated artistic styles developed so rapidly over this period, as a means to satiate the Assyrian demands for valuable and fine items.

The bowls (CAM11, CID10, CID12, CID13) were made with a typically Phoenician repertoire of symbols, mixing local motifs with Assyrianising and Egyptianising themes such as sphinxes, lotus flowers, winged griffins and trees of life. The examples from Idalion (CID10 and CID12) are very fine and are of the period III type, dating to 710-675 B.C. (Markoe 1985: 150). They show the motif of the tree of life in a form that is starting to resemble its Cypro-Archaic, proto-Aeolic form seen later on Cyprus, and it is possible to say that the fully elaborate tree of life iconography started to flourish by the beginning of the seventh century B.C. on Cyprus. The elaborate trees on the bowls of this period do not include the large triangles common on Cypriot ceramics and on the capitals from Israel and Judah. The trees on the bowls are in fact closer in style to the double deck Bronze Age precursors that had survived in the northern Levant and in the region between Syria and Mesopotamia (Figure 78 & Figure 76).

A period III bowl from Amathus (CAM11) from this period is most demonstrative of the meanings and relates the iconography with historical events of the time. Its outer decorative band shows a very realistic scene of a siege of a citadel, with defenders and attackers in mortal combat, while the soldiers at the rear of the attack also take time out to cut down tall trees with their double headed axes (Figure 93 left). Based on the conclusions above suggesting that the cutting down of trees was understood to be a metaphor for the destruction of peoples and communities, the symbolism is clear. It is a powerful attestation that the people of Cyprus were well aware of the events that were taking place on the mainland at the time and of what the symbolism was saying. They understood that cutting down healthy trees was a metaphor for destruction and killing, but they could not express that directly on material destined as Assyrian tribute. Given the widespread distribution of these bowls it has to be considered whether or not the artisans were also aware that these bowls would pass through many hands and cities as tribute, and so the iconography may have been addressed to foreign as well as local elites, such as those at Idalion. On the inner decorative band is an alternative set of symbols running underneath the main scene which shows gods, goddesses and trees of life depicted. One of the most elaborate trees is aligned directly under the city being attacked, and it is being tended to, almost as if to express divine support for that city via the deity manifested by the tree of life. This bowl is perhaps expressing a message of resistance and support in the face of Assyrian aggression.

Using the metal bowls to cross-date the arrival of more elaborate tree of life forms, it is possible to say that the Cypro-Archaic iconographic repertoire began to develop rapidly at the end of the eighth century B.C., during the period of Assyrian domination, and certainly before the steady decline of Assyrian power in the second half of the seventh century B.C.
The metal bowls also show that the elaborate tree motif appeared on Cyprus before the Assyrian decline, and was therefore roughly contemporaneous with the appearance of the riotous ‘free field’ trees of life on pottery which represented the steles in a different medium (Figure 94). These are usually dated to 750-600 B.C. The vase below shows a very elaborate tree with a central triangle. This may have been artistic hybridisation of geometric and elaborate motifs by the artist or it may have been a geometric representation of a real stele with a central triangle. The proto-Aeolic capitals were probably free standing steles, and seem to have been first brought to Cyprus from the mainland during the CAI. They became integral parts of the existing sanctuaries that were set up within the urban centres and which followed a pre-existing tradition of tree worship on Cyprus. So this period, the seventh century B.C., saw the arrival of the earliest proto-Aeolic capitals, with central triangle and volutes, from the southern Levant where they had first developed.

![Figure 93 Period III metal bowl from Amathus CAM11 - BM WAA ANE 123053 (author's illustration)](image)

As well as through the action of coastal Phoenician merchants seeking materials for tribute, the introduction of the more elaborate iconography was perhaps also the result of immigrant refugees from the inland Levant who were escaping the Assyrian oppression, and bringing their rituals, urban and rural, with them. They would have brought their artistic styles, including Egyptianising themes of the lotus flower, the symbol associated with water, life and rebirth, and their obsession with trees with them. Being from the lands around the mountains of Lebanon this is not surprising, for the practical industrial tradition of timber processing as well as the deeper significance the tree symbol had taken on regionally. Nevertheless, there is little direct evidence for a link between Cyprus and the inland rural settlements of the southern Levant beyond the iconographic similarities of the proto-Aeolic architecture and an appropriate historical background.

The potters of Cyprus were used to producing very austere geometric designs, but seem to have attempted to integrate the new and elaborate Phoenician motifs into their artwork. They developed schematised versions of the new flower and tree forms, and painted them in bright bichrome colours (Figure 94). Why might they have done this? A parallel situation to what was happening on Cyprus at the end of the eighth
century may be what occurred in Samaria in the ninth century B.C. At that time, Ahab the king of the Jews married Jezebel, the daughter of the king of Tyre, who was also the high priest of Astarte. Jezebel was likewise a priestess of Astarte and was familiar with the love and fertility rites and dancing that accompanied the annual harvest and procreation rituals. When she took this cult to Samaria with her and imposed it on the population, an intense political and religious struggle ensued (1 & 2 Kings). The people of Samaria were shocked by her outrageously decadent and cosmopolitan behaviour, which contrasted with their own rural and aesthetic cult of Yaweh. This created a cultural clash that may have some parallels with the situation that would have arisen on Cyprus. The free field style perhaps gives some insight into the dramatic impact that the Phoenician rituals and their version of the cult of the goddess and tree of life may have had on Cyprus. The jug below from Kition perhaps depicts the first attempts by the Cypriot potters to try and deal with the cultural intersections that were taking place, and shows their first attempts to try and hybridise them into something manageable and recognisable to the Cypriots. The familiar geometric chequered triangle is set at the centre of the scene below. The rest of the composition is quite disaggregated but appears to be a geometric style attempt to draw a proto-Aeolic capital with its volutes and floral frills. This is an attempt to hybridise different iconographic styles, but it is not yet complete and is in fact far from harmonious.

Figure 94 Freefield Bichrome IV (750-600 B.C.) jug from Kition NY Met 74.51.509 (author’s illustration & photograph)

These free field vessels developed alongside the much more formal Geometric designs that preceded them and which continued to be produced, but it was not until the following CAII period that the two iconographic traditions were finally fully integrated. Eventually, perhaps during and after the quieter decades of the Assyrian decline, ca. 650-590 B.C., the two contrasting styles, austere geometric Cypriot and elaborate and colourful Phoenician, hybridised into the more formal and composed Bichrome V and BoR V forms of the end of the Cypro-Archaic period.
The final iconographic-historic example for CAI relates to the symbol of the bull. It was ubiquitous during the Bronze Age all across the region, from Crete to Hattusa as well as on Cyprus (Steel 2004: 203), and the motif persisted in the early Iron Age material on Cyprus, such as in the foundation deposits of the bull cult room at Idalion (Figure 38, Figure 40). It is again seen in the iconography of the late CGIII/early CAI vase aux taureaux (CAM12) from Amathus and on the giant bowl there which dates to CAII (CAM02).

After being frequently seen paired or juxtaposed with the tree of life during the late Cypro-Geometric and Early Cypro-Archaic Periods, however, it seems to have begun to lose its prominence in the later Archaic material from Cyprus. Empirical evidence from the rural sanctuaries at Kourion Apollo Hylates and Ayia Irini demonstrates that it was originally the prevalent Iron Age animal theme choice for votives, from somewhat before 750 B.C until around 650 B.C., when it went into decline compared to other votive animals. At Ayia Irini they are not found after 560 B.C. (Gjerstad et al. 1935b: 812), while at Kourion the animals are most popular as votives during the eighth century B.C. and cease around the early sixth (Young and Young 1955: 42). Evidence from the corpus of bronze and silver bowls supports this decline. Bull file registers are characteristic of several period I and II bowls in Markoe’s catalogue, and this covers the period 825 – 700 B.C. While there are only three bowls from Cyprus that date to this earlier period, one of them features bulls. In period III there is only one out of the twelve bowls from Cyprus that show bulls, while in period IV, 675-625 B.C., there are none from nine examples from Cyprus.

Why might this be? There are several plausible and perhaps inter-related reasons why this situation may have emerged. For the early Iron Age Cypriots the bull was probably most associated with their own Bronze Age past as well as with the kingship of the Hittite and Syro-Hittite cultures of the nearby coasts. After the Syro-Hittite lands were conquered by the Assyrians, however, the symbol may have lost some of its potency and may also have became more closely associated with the Assyrians, and in particular, with the Assyrian king. It was, for example, the dominant symbol of protection at the entrances to their palaces, while the Assyrian king was typically shown with bull horned headgear in reliefs. Similarly, other sources confirm religious parallels where the bull as god became superseded and even proscribed. Around the end of the eighth century B.C. the bible recounts that sacred calves came to be considered dangerous signs of superseded, backwards, rural and foreign religions (2 Kings 18), and the suppression of these primitive foreign gods accompanied a move towards more centralised and organised, local, royal power.

Evidence from Cyprus shows some parallels with the biblical scenarios. Over this same period, from the eighth to the sixth century B.C., related city cult changes took place such as a move towards more anthropomorphic deities, in keeping with the Greek model of religion that was developing contemporaneously. Deities such as the master of the animals became more popular at sanctuaries. This may have been associated with increasing social complexity and caused by the developing and increasingly literate elites of the city kingdoms of Cyprus. Just as was happening on the Levant, political and defence related reforms were taking place in the face of Assyrian aggression. A move was being made towards a more city-centred cult, based around an anthropomorphic female goddess and anthropomorphic male god, while a simultaneous move was taking place away from older, rural motifs that were perhaps considered backwards, brutal and associated with imperial oppression and the Assyrian king. The bull appeared in earlier contexts in the cities, during the eighth century B.C., but it started to lose prominence after that time. It went from being ubiquitous during the Late Bronze Age to rare by the end of the Archaic Period. At the sanctuary of Ayia Irini there were 47 bull figurines recovered dating up to the start of the Cypro-Archaic Period, and only 6 from after that time (Gjerstad et al. 1935b: 812). Likewise, the magnificent Cesnola
Sarcophagus of the early Classical Period (CAM10) is decorated with prominent figures of the goddess and the Egyptian fertility god Bes, but no bulls at all.

The loss of the Syro-Hittite world and the widespread use of the symbol of the bull as a guardian of the Assyrian palaces suggest that it may have lost potency in the eyes of the Cypriots and become specifically associated with the Assyrians, kingship, and their unthinking brutality. The Cypriots, members of a society that perceived the Assyrians as a danger, a threat, as enemies or as competitors, may have begun to remove the bull symbol from their iconographic repertoire as an act of rejection of the Assyrians, with their primitive model of imperial kingship. Bull figurines appear in rural sanctuaries, but most of these date from the earlier Iron Age contexts (Young and Young 1955: 2), and while they do also appear at the start of the Archaic Period in some contexts, their depictions are somewhat ambiguous in presentation. For example, the vase aux taureaux (ca. 750-700 B.C.) from Amathus shows the bull with its horns dipped in an almost threatening manner at the tree of life. This is an arrangement that was seen in earlier eras, but the position of the horns is directly at the centre of the tree in this case, rather than being dipped in honour and submission. This seems to reflect a growing ambiguity between the idea of animalistic, potentially dangerous, virility and a more cultured, civilised idea of fertility and prosperity.

There is one prominent bull that dates to the CAII period, and that is the bull on the handle of the giant limestone bowl at Amathus. Yet even here it looks contained and restrained by the tree of life decorating the handle around it, as though it has been tamed by it rather than being in the more dominant and triumphant poses of previous eras. It is perhaps notable that by the time this bowl was made the Assyrian Empire had been destroyed, and so rather than celebrating masculine virility it may be celebrating the taming of the brutal by the civilised and the cultured, although this is extending the metaphorical interpretation into the realms of speculation. Similarly, some of the bull mask figurines of priests wear bucranial masks, while some show them in the act of lifting them, as though they were in the act of removing a cloak of primitive zoomorphic ritual. Other evidence from the rural sanctuaries shows a move towards more anthropomorphic gods (Aupert 1997: 24), such as the growing prominence of the master of the lions, who appeared in the second half of the sixth century B.C. and remained popular throughout the fifth (Counts 2008: 15).

Did the master of the animals, sometimes compared to Heracles, usurp the central male role from the bull as a more civilised, anthropomorphic, less Assyrian, symbol of virility and masculinity?

It is proposed here that this is precisely what happened on Archaic Cyprus, as a myth and ritual-based society focussed on rural sanctuaries and animals began nucleating into a hierarchical city-centred system, with increasingly literate elites who were beginning to codify state religion and customs around a pair of centralised anthropomorphic deities, who personified the settlement.

Animal symbols were not indiscriminately rejected, and the bull does seem to have been singled out. Other mythical parallels feature a bull being killed as a representative of aggression, such as Gilgamesh, who killed the bull of heaven after Astarte had released it to kill him in an act of revenge, while Theseus, the founder of Athens, killed the brutal Minotaur. It also seems that the lion usurped the bull’s role to some extent. Later Phoenician scarab seals frequently show scenes with lions killing bulls, and in this respect it is notable that the Iron Age Greek style bronze helmet found at Palaepaphos (CID37) was decorated with a motif of lions not bulls. Similarly, the shield boss from Amathus shows a circular band of lions and trees of life (CAM16).

The master of the lions, or more generically the master of the animals, was known from earlier eras, just like the tree of life was, but his revival on Cyprus took place in the first half of the sixth century B.C. On the
earliest Cypriot coins from the sixth century B.C. Amathus and Kourion adopted the symbol of the lion, as well as including the master of the lions on the reverse. In the Assyrian palaces, by way of contrast, relief scenes frequently showed lion hunting and the killing of lions *en masse*. This was a prominent Assyrian theme during the mid seventh century B.C., such as on the stunningly gruesome series of reliefs from the palace of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh built around 645 B.C. (Strommenger 1964: 260), and now in the British Museum.

A statue at Athienou discovered recently is a hybridised figure of the Egyptian god Bes wearing a lion skin cloak (Counts 2008). This demonstrates how concepts of virility from different cultural backgrounds could be brought together, and perhaps reflects the political and military thoughts of its makers at the time, as they faced Assyrian and Babylonian threats and fostered links with Egypt and the Aegean (Fantalkin 2006: 203).

8.7. Cypro-Archaic II, 600 – 480 B.C.

The decoration on the new hybrid Cypriot CAII pottery types eventually became more formalised and precise and incorporated all of the artistic traditions in a harmonious manner. The illustration below shows how the different iconographies were progressively hybridised over time in a way that can be tracked (Figure 96). Rather than being wiped out by the new mainland designs, the Geometric iconography slowly hybridised with the Phoenician iconography in new and well thought out ways. In the example below the canonical form lotus flower (3) is gradually incorporated with the Geometric designs (1&2) by way of a CAI intermediate stage, where the lotus flower was overlaid (5) or appended (6) rather than being integrated. By CAII the different conventions had been thoroughly hybridised (see appendix 10.4 for motif source references).

The stone architecture reflected this new and more harmonious phase of ceramic decoration, and the decorative band inside the very fine built tomb 1 at Tamassos dates to this period (Figure 95). The different precursor styles and elements had been fully hybridised, with central triangle, up and down turned volutes, mound forms and sunrise fan all included together in a sophisticated design.

![Figure 95 Decorative motif band from tomb 1 at Tamassos (author’s illustration)](image)

The Egyptians were keen to foster links with Cyprus during the sixth century B.C., probably to secure access to the Cypriot timber resources as well as gain an intermediate stopover en route to their new found allies on the east coast of the Aegean. The Grecophile pharaoh Amasis took some degree of control over Cyprus from around 570 or 560 B.C. to ca. 525 B.C. (Reyes 1994: 77) and offered tributes to Greek sanctuaries in the Aegean and at Rhodes. At Idalion, the symbols of choice for the first coins were a lotus form flower of life
and a winged sphinx (CID01), perhaps reflecting the rapprochement of Cyprus and Egypt and the southern Levant at the time. At Amathus, the numbers of Egyptian style amulets in the tombs increased and most importantly, the large Hathor head capitals that would have been prominent and public Egyptianising symbols (CAM08 & CAM09) were introduced at several sites on Cyprus. At Paphos too there was an increase in Egyptianising material most clearly evidenced by the styles of the stone statues recovered from the Marchello fort (CPA01).

The symbol of the lotus was completely hybridised with the geometric symbol of the ‘butterfly triangles’ (No. 1 in Figure 96) and the goddess triangle (2) at this time. This is most attractively seen on the very fine bichrome amphoroid kraters included in elite burials, along with Egyptianising amulets, from a tomb near Amathus (CAM24, 25, 26). The ‘lotus cross’ (No. 7 in Figure 96) demonstrates the incorporation of Egyptian and Phoenician motifs into the artistic repertoire at even the most intimate of levels, the mortuary context. It points to an alliance with Egypt that was considered important and enduring, and to a common belief in a goddess and the afterlife.

![Figure 96 Progressive integration and hybridisation of different styles of motifs (author’s illustration)](image)

Cyprus came under Egyptian control for some decades, from ca. 570 or 560 B.C. until 525 B.C., although it was not oppressed in the Assyrian manner (Reyes 1994: 78). As had been mentioned, this was perhaps in order to secure timber supplies for Egypt and secure trade routes to the Aegean where the pharaoh Amasis II made dedications at the temples of Lindos and Samos, and where he also made an alliance with king Croesus of Lydia and then Polycrates of Samos.

During the final period covered by this study, at the end of the sixth century B.C., before the Persian invasion of Cyprus, the elite on Cyprus, like those around the Aegean, became more literate, and the political management of the city kingdoms probably started to become more codified and document based, rather than based on the proto-literate myth and ritual structures that had been in existence previously. The increasing use of papyrus paper, rather than the tablet based system, is evidenced by the appearance of Cypriot-made scribe statuettes holding rolls of papyrus at this time (cf. Chapter 5 Idalion) (Vandenabeele
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Hieroglyphs signifying papyrus, also a sign of life, appeared on metal items such as the bronze horse front bands, so that it was more than simply a raw material.

It was argued in the Amathus study (4.2.1) that the form of the Aegean Ionic capital was influenced by the form of rolls of papyrus paper, as these became linked to the temples and the elites who were increasingly recording and controlling the society through writing on papyrus. According to Herodotus Egyptian papyrus paper was in use in Greece during the fifth century B.C. (Herodotus Histories V, 58.). Papyrus was also grown and used for paper in Syria, so the Phoenicians, who brought goods from all countries to Greece, possibly brought papyrus as paper to Greece, either from Egypt or from other sources. Theophrastus (Hist. plant. IV, 10) states that papyrus grew in Syria, while by the time of Pliny (Nat. Hist.) he describes it also as a native plant of the Niger and Euphrates.

This new material technology and the political organisation it supported was an inter-related part of a profound series of shifts in the structure of east Mediterranean society. One closely associated new systematic development was the production of coinage, and the new paper recording system would have worked closely alongside the coinage system.

Political and cultural reforms began earlier in the Levantine region but were of a more religious character. As has been mentioned, Hezekiah removed foreign deities from the temples in Jerusalem, destroyed the rural high places and centralised religion on the city (2 Kings 18) around 700 B.C. Similarly, but more secularly, Draco in Athens first produced a written legislation in 621 B.C. and Solon the Lawmaker introduced what amounted to constitutional reforms ca. 595 B.C. (Gargarin 2008). The changes in the CAII Cypriot city kingdoms fit between these two extremes geographically, chronologically and culturally.

Cyprus did modify its religious character towards a more anthropogenic Greek model, less rural in character and more city-focussed, and the built tomb architecture did become sophisticated. The city kingdoms also adopted coinage and probably began keeping more records on papyrus. Defensive walls were added around the towns during the Archaic Period (Balandier 2000).

The increasing effort to encourage loyalty to the cities and not to older rural and foreign gods also resulted in the formalisation of styles that reflected the consolidation of the city. Religious beliefs and iconography reflected this gradual evolution from myth and ritual-based settlements to cities with codified customs, and this was carried out in the face of Assyrian aggression and oppression. There was an attempt to form alliances, prepare defences and organise the populaces and resources in the most effective ways to prevent the Assyrians taking control of the cities.

In eastern and western Greece the iconography and architecture of the institutions that enacted these reforms reflected and helped to communicate these issues of fundamental importance. Elite symbols of the scribes on which the laws were codified, the papyrus scrolls of the legislators, were merged with the pre-existing symbols of the city; the trees of life of the goddess and the symbolism of the great cedar columns of the temples, inherited from the orient but executed in the Egyptian style with stone built columns. The architecture of the temples on the acropolises included a forests of columns; trees of life with scrolls of papyrus adorning the capitals. These became the symbols of the elite new rulers of Ephesus, Miletus and Athens, and they referred to the structures which ensured their freedom from oppression through the written constitution and effective managements of the city and its alliances. New goddesses, Athena of the City, Athena Polias (Ἀθηνᾶ Πολιάς) and Aphrodite of all the People, Aphrodite Pandemos, (Ἀφροδίτη Πάνδημος), became the personification of the city, and of the unity of the Attic region under one central
power, Athens. The early Athenian foundation myths have already been discussed, but the sacred olive tree on the acropolis should be recalled here, while comparable symbols on coins including from Cyprus actually showed a goddess wearing a crown that was the citadel of the city (Brehme et al. 2001: 163).

The settlements on Cyprus, however, seems to have retained a more rural and cultic character and there were no great Archaic temples built. The symbolism that developed remained eastern Mediterranean in character and predominantly arboreal and floral. The most notable aspects of the symbolism of the Cypro-Archaic steles developed in the sixth century B.C. were that they hybridised several related ritual aspects. The hatched equilateral triangles from the Cypriot Geometric designs endured through to the CAII and became hybridised with the central triangle of the more floral and arboreal capital emblems that had arrived from the east; in particular from the south eastern Levant where the tree and goddess imagery was most active. This morphological combination process is shown in (Figure 97).

The mound shape that was familiar from Palaepaphos and Lapithos was added on top of the triangles of the capitals to form the new compound proto-Aeolic capitals that became so characteristic of Cypro-Archaic II Iron Age Cyprus. Aspects of the ‘sunrise-fan’ embellishment of the Syro-Hittite areas were also incorporated. The triangles were juxtaposed and merged together, perhaps reflecting an awareness of the common meanings underlying the two forms, and perhaps referencing the earlier contacts between Cyprus and the southern Levant through the Philistines. A statement of common origins or reference to an older relationship would have helped to integrate the populations by finding a common cause and common history. Finally at the top of the combined motif a new outburst of fertile growth springs forth. In metaphorical terms this is a positive statement of hope for the future of the city, and its new hybrid population.

![Figure 97 Hybridisation of S Levantine (lower L) and Cypro-Aegean motifs (upper L) (author’s illustration)](image)

The society on Cyprus retained rural sanctuaries as a major form of worship, and this situation persisted beyond the Archaic Period (Wright 1992b: 274). Unlike the Greek cities where education, the military, business and cult became highly organised and complex, the situation on Cyprus never really evolved far.
past the rural provincial phase. All of the budding developments were brought to a halt by the Persian invasions and the failed Ionian revolt.

Cyprus always retained a liminal status, somewhat separate from all the realms of the Assyrians, Greeks, Phoenicians, Hittites and Egyptians and it was often bypassed entirely. It retained its own semi-rural semi-urban character and a smaller population than equivalent mainland sites, but it did produce the occasional distinctive and sophisticated cultural efflorescence.

Elaborate iconography reflecting the colourful flourishing of the city kingdoms that took place during those two hundred years of the Cypro-Archaic period can still be seen in the high quality designs such as those on the Cesnola Sarcophagus (Figure 98) and on the well composed bichrome ceramic vessels.

The Archaic blooming was ephemeral, and Cyprus reverted into a rural backwater after its failed efforts during the Ionian Revolt. For a while it had looked like it would develop into a powerful place in its own right, but its part was as a supporting actor to the main events. Other places like Athens, Sparta, Corinth and Carthage became important cities in their own right, and Cyprus never really developed or made a permanent mark, militarily or culturally. Its goddess of fertility was the most significant spiritual and cultic contribution that it nurtured and passed on from the east to the western Greeks.

![Tree of life design from the Cesnola Sarcophagus CAM10 (author's illustration)](image-url)
8.8. Conclusions of the final discussion chapter

In conclusion, when the material culture is considered within its ritual contexts, cultic topographies and regional landscapes it can be properly characterised and interpreted. The changes in iconography can then be understood with respect to historical phases and events.

The artisans who produced the material culture hybridised differences. New shared forms may have served as a driver for social hybridisation as well as a response to it. Cyprus and the region underwent several distinct phases punctuated by different historical trends and events, from the end of the Bronze Age into the Iron Age. These phases brought Cyprus into contact with different people, contrasting material cultures and new economic systems. Each time, the artisans hybridised the new motifs with their own, ever changing, assemblage of symbols. The underlying cultural structures guided the changes on the surface, and so they were coherent and logical statements when understood from within. Finally, the underlying structures also changed, more slowly, as the society underwent profound long term change.

Throughout the period covered by this study, the tree of the goddess was a metaphor for the health and fertility of the communities. The city centred cults of the Archaic period increasingly focussed on the goddess as a defender of the city. Depending on local particularities, there were also elements in the sanctuaries associated with the male aspect of the cult, such as a standing pillar or pole, a bucranium or statues of the master of the animals. Some evidence points to pairs of small standing stones like steles in private houses that reflected a ‘cult of the paired deities’ (Gaber 2008: 61). The tree of life also served as a symbol of rebirth for the afterlife, and decorated vessels containing provisions for the deceased were placed in tombs.

The period covered began in the aftermath of the disasters of the Late Bronze Age. As the dust settled, the remnants of a defunct maritime culture hybridised their culture with local communities of islanders. During the Geometric Period Cyprus became somewhat isolated from the mainland, and the material culture developed a comparatively homogeneous and austere geometric character. This situation was interrupted by an influx of more complex and cosmopolitan Phoenician cults with more elaborate artistic styles during the late ninth, eighth and early seventh centuries B.C. The Cypriot artisans experimented with these different artistic repertoires during the seventh century B.C., and by the sixth century B.C. they had successfully hybridised them into more composed and homogeneous designs again. These incorporated and expressed the more exuberant flourishes of the Phoenician material as well as the geometricity of the earlier Cypriot material, and eventually included the Egyptianising influences of the Cypro-Archaic II period.

The Cypriot sanctuaries followed some of the same tell-like settlement location choices as other northeast Mediterranean cultures, but most closely resembled the rural sanctuaries of Palestine; in their landscape settlement location, architectural layouts and cultic iconography (Wright 1992b: 282; Gaber 2008: 60), and while the Levantine sites were taken over by the Assyrian Empire, the Cypriot sites retained this rural character right through to the end of the Archaic Period and beyond (Wright 1992b: 274). Their artistic styles flourished during the Archaic Period, but the sanctuaries did not develop into acropolises with stone temples as was the case with the larger cities and colonies of the Greeks. Instead, Cyprus served as a safe haven from the oppressive Assyrian policies on the mainland, and after the decline of the Assyrian Empire it gradually settled back into its more rural habits. They co-opted elite symbolism, but they were fundamentally rural sites.
Only the arrival of the Persians disrupted this relatively prosperous and peaceful period for Cyprus. It had remained isolated from much of the mainland violence during the ninth to sixth centuries B.C. but the Ionian revolt brought a great deal of discord and violence to Cyprus, and it never recovered from the impact of the failed venture. During that period the city kingdoms of Cyprus were forced to take side along pseudo-ethnic lines that were essentially Persian/Phoenician versus Greek/Egyptian, and there have been suggestions of a ‘great divide’ that developed at the time (Fantalkin 2006: 205). It may be for this reason that the Amathusians refused to identify themselves as either Greeks or Phoenicians, and resorted to claiming ethnic decent from a third party, the now contentious Eteocypriots (Given 1998; Petit 1999; Karageorghis 2001).

In reality, notions of ethnicity were less defined than they have tended to be portrayed in modern scholarship (Gaber 2008: 54). The material culture shows that group identities changed continuously in response to changing population movements and were often shared widely. Contrasting traditions tended to be integrated over time to produce completely new and unique material culture that did not belong to either precursor group. Language was also no barrier and was not a marker of ethnicity.

Cyprus was but one branch on the tree of life, but the theory and methodology of this study have revealed that the island’s artisans added a few leaves to the branches and a few pages to the story of the tree. Eventually, the archaeological process has produced glimpses of an ephemeral and colourful flowering of the symbols of the goddess in the islands’ rural sanctuaries.

Unlike colonial era publications which promoted nationalist or racist agendas of choice (Grant 1917; Champion 2001); and which reached grandiose conclusions and claimed hitherto unmatched revelations, this study is content with a genuine and successful attempt to understand the Cypriot Iron Age as it actually was. There was a temptation towards the end of the study to reach some sort of glorious conclusion and write a eulogy for the city kingdoms, but in fact the evidence pointed somewhere else. The so called city kingdoms of Cyprus were rather small, ephemeral and less impressive communities than their nomenclature would suggest. They were unique and even special in some respects, but ultimately, their main attributes were as safe havens, off the beaten track of the empires.
Chapter 9. Conclusions and recommendations

There were several historical conclusions drawn from the study, but priority must be given to evaluating how effectively the two research questions were answered. The first question asked was: can postcolonial theory be applied methodically, rigorously and effectively in archaeology. The answer to this, I now believe, is yes it can. Significant new information and new understanding emerged through the theory and methodology applied in this project. Towards the end of the final case study I began to have real confidence that the structured landscape and settlement use patterns, and the interpretations of the iconography emerging from the study, were real and representative of the Cypriot Iron Age past.

The study benefited from reflexive methodology, an important aspect of the postcolonial approach, in several respects. In early autumn 2011 I presented the preliminary conclusions in a public forum, and initially met some resistance and a little scepticism towards the new interpretations. I therefore undertook a further phase of research and a process of consolidation, outlined in Chapter 7. I believe the project benefited substantially from this additional and more focussed study. The ideas regarding the cultural structures were consolidated by comparison with many regional parallels, and the discussion was developed into a more coherent case that can now be presented convincingly. The additional research phase gave me confidence that the conceptual structures revealed were real, and represented a coherent system that the inhabitants of the city kingdoms were familiar with.

Adapting the geographical scope of the multiscalar studies also proved to be useful and allowed the archaeology to shape the study rather than vice versa. The multiscalar system should not be artificially imposed but should respond to human concepts of defined territories, such as ‘enclosure’, ‘sanctuary’ and ‘kingdom’, as well as to the archaeological and geographical realities. The ability to adjust the thematic focus of the multiscalar studies to follow certain concepts is also useful, and allows the investigation to develop new understandings rather than re-examine established issues. Adapting methodology judiciously makes methodology more effective, and so this reflexive aspect should always exist within research systems from the theoretical level onwards.

The postcolonial methodology also meant avoiding artificial concepts of fixed races or groups, and this helped to highlight the reality that distinct ethnicities do not appear in the archaeology. There are no boundaries between people other than geographical separation. Even where texts attest to differing names of gods and goddesses, these cannot be used to categorize the people who wrote the names. As Keel notes, we should not strive for exclusive and strict identifications. At different places and times the symbols could be attributed to different goddesses (Keel 1998: 38). Dever concurs that many different local names were used for the same deities (Dever 2005: 185), while Ulbrich talks of an elusive distinctions between Anat and Astarte (Ulbrich 2005: 199), and a multi faceted and strangely elusive Great Goddess of Cyprus (Ulbrich 2005: 205). Similarly, various languages did exist, but these were no more indicative of separate ethnicities or races than the different artistic motifs were. Languages can be learned; people, particularly children, rapidly become bilingual, and languages can be hybridised into a patois, creoles or koines. The identification of another Cypriot Iron Age language was proposed as recently as 2011 (Egetmeyer 2011).

It is perhaps the people who are bilingual (or more) in the languages, scripts and artistic traditions that occupy the social ‘third space’ who are most active in the field of cultural hybridisation, as they slip back and forth from one culture to another, dissolving invisible boundaries and merging contrasting cultural
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structures. This process was a characteristic of Cyprus. The fluid identities of gods and people indicate a society where syncretism and hybridisation were the norm rather than the exception, and the artisans of Cyprus participated in this process.

Methodological suggestions for future developments of a more practical nature are as follows. Full catalogues, based on the traditional volumes such as the SCE reports, should be made available online with the current locations of artefacts from the excavations. Museum catalogue numbers and photographs should be included. These should be linked to the existing publications where possible, as they already form the historical basis and structure for academic research, and they should also be put online. Many of the pieces from the SCE are in the Stockholm Museum of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Antiquities (Medelhavsmuseet), but they currently have no online catalogue. Similarly, the collections of antiquities in Cypriot museums should be made available as online catalogues, as photography is not permitted in the museum and the photography permit application process is not streamlined. The catalogue from this study will remain online, but more extensive and comprehensive international projects should be initiated.

The final methodological issue is how to make the postcolonial approach more applicable at the project level without requiring an in-depth theoretical background. In this respect, the five theoretical recommendations summarised in Chapter 3 are useful:

- Fluid identities: Remember that the individuals and people being studied always had fluid identities
- Hybridisation: Consider hybridisation of difference as one driver of material cultural change
- Contextualisation: Study material within wider archaeological, geographical and chronological contexts
- Systems: Consider the material as part of a cultural system
- Details: Study the details of the material as these express individual social concerns

These recommendations should be disseminated to archaeologists working in various fields to establish how easily they can be applied, how useful they are and if they can be improved. The intention of the theory chapter was to identify theory that could be applied practically and effectively, and to develop an applicable methodology from that theory. The flow charts from the methodology chapter could also prove useful to illustrate how an iterative and reflexive research system can work, and this system should be tested in other ‘real life’ situations. Measures should therefore be taken to establish if this theory and methodology could be more widely and effectively applied. The significance of the multiscalar methodology with respect to landscape archaeology should also be investigated and evaluated, in conjunction with established specialists in that field. The systemic approach seems to be well suited to utilise the rapidly developing, widely available and publically accessible geographical GIS systems such as Bing Maps and Google Earth.

The second research question asked was: can a postcolonial archaeology of the tree of life provide a better understanding of the Iron Age cultural transitions of Cyprus and the east Mediterranean region?

While the first question was concerned with the theory and methodology, this second question is concerned with the practical results of the research conducted on the actual archaeology, and its ability to develop a better understanding of the cultural systems and their changes through time.

The postcolonial study of the motif in context revealed that the tree of the goddess was the central symbol of a deep, region wide, more ancient cosmology. A metaphorical system based on mountains, bulls, trees of the goddess and the waters of life constituted the underlying reality of the east Mediterranean region. The male and female aspects of the rural cults were associated with ensuring the ongoing fertility and virility of
the city kingdoms. Many of the sanctuaries were built at prominent elevated locations in the landscape which had sacred association with the goddess. Small fenced off temenos areas on the summits, around caves and tombs, contained altars for sacrifices, a tree of life, votives and decorated libation vessels. The elevated locations had close parallels with Levantine comparanda; the bamah or biblical 'high place'. This cultural comparison has been made by several notable Cypriot archaeologists, from Ohnefalsch Richter, in Chapters 2 and 3 of *Kypros, the Bible and Homer* (Ohnefalsch-Richter 1893; Ulbrich 2001: 101), to Wright (Wright 1992b) and Gaber (Gaber 2008: 60). The settlements that built up around these sanctuaries could serve as defensive sites and as a focus for towns with populations that grew to as large as 10,000 people.

The material culture of these island people reflected their idealised rural, urban and maritime landscapes. Decorative motifs on ceramic vessels included Geometric mountains, rivers and sea, the flora, fauna, sun, moon and clouds above. More naturalistic Archaic themes included the people who lived in the communities and the sacred goddess they worshipped.

Fundamental changes in the underlying structures of the regional settlements were paralleled by coherent changes in the iconography.

The major structural changes evidenced were the demise of the agricultural sub-palatial systems of the Late Bronze Age, the slow emergence of the rural myth and ritual sanctuaries of the Geometric Period, and then the economic growth of urban centres during the Archaic Period.

The Archaic changes on Cyprus paralleled similar developments on the mainland, where rural cults were suppressed in favour of city-focussed religions, laws and liturgies were codified and anthropomorphic gods replaced the old rural motifs. The empires also underwent change. The tree of life iconography of the Assyrian palaces demonstrate that the empire still considered itself an agricultural empire until the mid seventh century B.C., when reliefs show a change to military scenes (Porter 1993: 139). In Egypt, the cultural renaissance begun during the 25th Dynasty cultural renaissance was continued during the 26th Dynasty with reforms to canons of art and measurement systems (Lightbody 2008a). During that time period, Greco-Egyptian alliances were formed and eastern Greek mercenaries were increasingly employed in the Egyptian armies (Fantalkin 2006: 203). The Archaic Greek poleis of the Aegean codified laws and developed advanced political systems, and increased their expenditure on military defences.

These rapid developments seen around the eight-century B.C. Aegean have been interpreted as a ‘structural revolution’ (Snodgrass 1980; Morris 2005). Many of the reforms undertaken were intended to increase the strength of the cities, and so the focus was put on the urban cults rather than rural sanctuaries. The symbol of the goddess was increasingly associated with the defence of the cities, for example, an inscription from the Classical Period from 10km south of Lapithos refers to ‘Anat, fortress of the living’ (Ulbrich 2005: 201), alongside a Greek equivalent, Athena Soteira Nike, ‘Athena, the victorious savoir’. A Cypriot coin from the period shows a goddess with a citadel for a crown (Brehme et al. 2001: 163). Defence became an increasingly prominent concern across the region as the Assyrians grew more destructive. During the Archaic Period, city walls were added to many of the main settlements on Cyprus (Balandier 2000) in anticipation of invasion and disruption.

The growing influence of written text as a tool of political organization at that time should not be underestimated (Sherratt 2003), and this extends to the organization of military forces and city defences. Figurines of scribes appeared in Cyprus in small numbers towards the end of the Archaic Period (Vandenabeele 2009) attesting to the increasing use of writing, papyrus and to links with Egypt. The stone
columned architecture of the Archaic and Classical temples of the Aegean increasingly followed the Egyptian construction techniques and attest to Egyptian technological transfer to Greece through Greek communities at Tanis, Sais and Naukratis (Fantalkin 2006: 203). The tree of life, papyrus spirals and lotus flower motifs had already been used in Cypriot Geometric and Archaic sanctuaries and settlements, but in the Aegean they hybridised the symbols into the great papyrus scrolled ionic capitals of the Late Archaic and Classical Greek temples, first in Ephesus and then later in Athens. These emblems were not just artistic decoration; they carried profound metaphors about the hopes and futures of the cities and the organisational systems of their rulers.

Cyprus played a part within this wider regional context of destruction, revival, resistance and reform, but its situation in some respects remained separate, unique and retrospective. During much of the Geometric and Archaic periods Cyprus seems to have served as a third space; a neutral, semi-rural, semi-urban sanctuary island, that was protected by the sea from the worst excesses of the Assyrians. Ulbrich notes that Cyprus is the only place in the Mediterranean where the cult of Anat is clearly attested epigraphically in the Iron Age (Ulbrich 2005: 200). The Cypriots mined, manufactured and sent fine and valuable tribute to the Assyrians, but built defensive structures around their towns (Balandier 2000). This period also brought new people to the island, mostly from the Levant, and the Cypriots’ tendency to hybridise culture can be seen again in the material from this period. The austere schematised decoration of the Cypro-Geometric Period was hybridised with the more cosmopolitan, colourful and elaborate material from the Levantine, mercantile port cities.

Archaic Cyprus evolved in response to the new influences but did not reach the level of complexity achieved by the Greek cities. The settlements became semi-urban, but retained a semi-rural character. The artisans continued to hybridise contrasting styles in new ways, with influences from the Levant, the Aegean and the Nile Delta, as well as from Mesopotamia. The towns were smaller than those on the mainland, but it would be wrong to dismiss Cyprus as a backwater or a cul-de-sac of history. Iron Age Cyprus should not be seen as just a stepping stone, half way along the grand ‘Ex Oriente Lux’ highway of civilization, sweeping from the Levant to Greece, but as an alternative region, where many diverse cultures and people met and made some
striking cultural statements, most colourfully seen in the floral capitals, embossed metal bowls and fine ceramics of the island (Figure 99). The new interpretations of these works of art can increase our appreciation of their historical significance.

It was the theory and methodology of this research project that allowed an appreciation of these deep cultural issues to become apparent and develop. In this respect the answer to the second research question is yes, a postcolonial archaeology of the tree of life can provide a better understanding of the Iron Age cultural transitions of Cyprus and the east Mediterranean region.

The final contribution of this work to the field of Mediterranean archaeology was to place the Cypriot proto-Aeolic steles within one continuous historical narrative that stretched from Bronze Age Egypt, the Levant and Mesopotamia, to Iron Age Cyprus, and which culminated in the Classical Aegean.

I believe that this thesis demonstrated that continuity and therefore made a significant contribution to the wider field of knowledge concerning these highly symbolic decorative elements.

In the introduction, Chapter 1, I outlined how this research intends to help fill a lacuna of understanding within traditional scholarship concerned with the region. The contribution made by the communities of the Ancient Near East, Egypt and Africa to the development of the Classical world has not been appropriately recognized; however, progress is being made. In the month leading up to the submission of this PhD a Bryn Mawr Classical Review of a publication provocatively entitled ‘African Athena’ appeared. This reviewed the proceedings of a conference of the same name held at the University of Warwick in November 2008 (Orrells et al. 2011). The conference was organised around the long running ‘Black Athena’ debate that developed during the 1990s and continued through the 2000s. This debate was based on the thesis of Martin Bernal that Athena was a manifestation of the east Mediterranean and Egyptian fertility goddess. He argued that this reality had been omitted from mainstream scholarship due to fundamental problems within academia stemming from racism, nationalism and the developmental history of the Classics (Bernal 1987). His deconstruction of the problems within the existing body of scholarship was influential, and similar approaches were subsequently taken by other academics (Trigger 1984; Morris 1994; Marchand 1996; Champion 2001). The controversy arose because his reconstruction of what he surmised to be the real historical development was less convincing. The conference organizers stated that they were not concerned with the veracity of Bernal’s thesis, but rather with “the implications both of the juxtaposition of African and classical cultures in intellectual history, and of the absences of that juxtaposition” (Orrells et al. 2011: 3). The reviewer concluded that “The essays in the first section demonstrate how a critical attitude that is informed, if not entirely convinced, by Black Athena can lead a scholar to productive avenues of analysis” (Lecznar 2012).

This PhD provides what was called for in the aftermath of the Black Athena debate. It shows how the trees of life and floral capitals worked as deeply embedded metaphors within the cultural systems of the Ancient Near East and the Aegean. It shows how the Classical architectural orders grew out of that more ancient context. This postcolonial study is intended to fill a gap in the academic edifice with a new interpretation of the past, based on the idea that hybridisation of differences was a constant driver of cultural change. The hybridising tree of the goddess must be grafted back in where it belongs, as a central pillar in a new history of ancient Mediterranean. Above all, the proto-Aeolic capitals of Cyprus can provide well needed support for more integrated histories, at the ancient crossing place between east and west.
Appendices

10.1. Introduction

These appendices include a tell survey data table (10.2) with statistics recording the dimensions and locations of the sites discussed in Chapter 7. This is followed by an appendix (10.3) listing the sources of the capital and tree designs shown on the regional survey map (Figure 75). At the bottom of the second page is a shorter list of the sources for the floral motifs shown in (Figure 96).

The rest of the chapter (10.4, 10.5, 10.6 and 10.7) comprises a database of selected artefacts recovered from the Cypriot case study sites and the Knossos Valley of Crete that carry the tree or flower of life, or related iconography closely associated with the goddess, and which date to the LCIII, Cypro-Geometric and Cypro-Archaic periods or LMIIIC, Geometric and Orientalising periods for Crete. The inclusion or exclusion of material may occasionally appear arbitrary, but each case is discussed individually, explaining the logic behind the choice, and the relevance of the piece.

Each artefact has been designated a unique reference number for the study (CAM for artefacts from Amathus, CAI for artefacts from Idalion, CPA for artefacts from Palaepaphos and CCR for artefacts from Crete), and all of the relevant information regarding the material has been recorded, including current location, material, find spot where known, references in archaeological reports and other publications. Illustrations are included for each piece.

All of the illustrations and photographs in the catalogue are the property and products of the author. Individual figure numbers are not provided for the small illustrations as each one has a unique catalogue number.

This database of artefacts has also been incorporated into the interactive web based interface allowing quick access to all of the information, photographs and maps. The database was initially compiled on MS Excel, but was then integrated with MS Front Page, and it has now been published to the web allowing online access.

The database is available online at http://www.arky.eu/Home.htm
### 10.2. Tell survey - approximate dimensions of tells

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Extents</th>
<th>Height above plain</th>
<th>Lat° N</th>
<th>Long° E</th>
<th>Area (Hectares)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palaepaphos</td>
<td>900x700m</td>
<td>40m</td>
<td>34.70</td>
<td>32.57</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amathus</td>
<td>180x250m</td>
<td>60m</td>
<td>34.71</td>
<td>33.14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idalion west</td>
<td>200x100m</td>
<td>20m</td>
<td>35.01</td>
<td>33.42</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miletus kalabaktepe</td>
<td>220x220m</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td>37.52</td>
<td>27.26</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspendos</td>
<td>800x400m</td>
<td>40m</td>
<td>36.94</td>
<td>31.17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mersin Yumuktepe</td>
<td>170x100m</td>
<td>8m</td>
<td>36.80</td>
<td>34.60</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirleki Hoyuk</td>
<td>300x200m</td>
<td>24m</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>35.74</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karatepe</td>
<td>330x180m</td>
<td>70m</td>
<td>37.29</td>
<td>36.25</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinciri</td>
<td>650m dia</td>
<td>10m</td>
<td>37.10</td>
<td>36.67</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaziantepe</td>
<td>140m dia</td>
<td>4m</td>
<td>37.06</td>
<td>37.38</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ain Dara</td>
<td>500x350m</td>
<td>10m</td>
<td>36.45</td>
<td>36.85</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arpad</td>
<td>250x233m</td>
<td>20m</td>
<td>36.47</td>
<td>37.09</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel Tayinat</td>
<td>400x300m</td>
<td>10m</td>
<td>36.24</td>
<td>36.37</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel Atchana</td>
<td>500x250m</td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>36.23</td>
<td>36.38</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleppo</td>
<td>280x140m</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td>36.19</td>
<td>37.16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugarit</td>
<td>540x400m</td>
<td>5-10m</td>
<td>35.60</td>
<td>35.78</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qarqar</td>
<td>200m dia</td>
<td>15m</td>
<td>35.74</td>
<td>36.33</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carchemish</td>
<td>240x60m</td>
<td>20m</td>
<td>36.83</td>
<td>38.01</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel Halaf</td>
<td>Undefined</td>
<td>10m</td>
<td>36.62</td>
<td>40.03</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel Suskas</td>
<td>320x300m</td>
<td>15m</td>
<td>35.41</td>
<td>35.91</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel Twenei</td>
<td>250x250m</td>
<td>10m</td>
<td>35.37</td>
<td>35.93</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel Kezel</td>
<td>220x220m</td>
<td>16m</td>
<td>34.70</td>
<td>35.98</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel Arqa</td>
<td>200x100m</td>
<td>20m</td>
<td>34.53</td>
<td>36.04</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel Dan</td>
<td>270x240m</td>
<td>15m</td>
<td>33.23</td>
<td>35.65</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazor</td>
<td>450x170m</td>
<td>20m</td>
<td>33.01</td>
<td>35.56</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel el-Megiddo</td>
<td>270x140m</td>
<td>15m</td>
<td>32.58</td>
<td>35.18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel Dothan</td>
<td>250x180m</td>
<td>54m</td>
<td>32.41</td>
<td>35.23</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel Gezer</td>
<td>500x180m</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td>31.85</td>
<td>34.92</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lachich</td>
<td>270x380m</td>
<td>40m</td>
<td>31.56</td>
<td>34.84</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be’er Sheba</td>
<td>140x140m</td>
<td>10m</td>
<td>31.24</td>
<td>34.84</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel es-Safi</td>
<td>400x150m</td>
<td>15m</td>
<td>31.70</td>
<td>34.84</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel el-Balamun</td>
<td>650x450m</td>
<td>15m</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>31.57</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanis</td>
<td>1000x900m</td>
<td>15m</td>
<td>30.97</td>
<td>31.88</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khorsabad</td>
<td>350x300m</td>
<td>10m</td>
<td>36.51</td>
<td>43.22</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nineveh</td>
<td>760x460m</td>
<td>15m</td>
<td>36.35</td>
<td>43.15</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimrud</td>
<td>620x325m</td>
<td>20m</td>
<td>36.09</td>
<td>43.32</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assur</td>
<td>600x600m</td>
<td>25m</td>
<td>35.45</td>
<td>43.26</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susa</td>
<td>1200x900m</td>
<td>10m</td>
<td>32.18</td>
<td>48.24</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harran</td>
<td>1200x900m</td>
<td>15m</td>
<td>36.86</td>
<td>39.03</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 10.3. Capital survey map & figure Index

This index provides references for the capitals and motifs shown on the plan (Figure 88)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Find spot</th>
<th>Current location</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Catalogue no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susa Elam</td>
<td>Louvre</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sb 14391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>Staatliche Museen zu Berlin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimrud</td>
<td>British Museum</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>WA 124583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel Halaf left</td>
<td>British Museum</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>WA117110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel Halaf right</td>
<td>Pergamon Museum, Berlin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zincirli</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Schloen and Fink: 215)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugarit</td>
<td>Damascus Museum</td>
<td>(Yon 2006: 136)</td>
<td>RS 16.056 &amp; 28.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karatepe</td>
<td>In situ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Syro-Hittite</td>
<td>Ankara Museum</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Smyrna</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Betancourt 1977: fig. 20)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alazeytin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Betancourt 1977: fig. 16)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larisa</td>
<td>Archy. Museum of Istanbul</td>
<td>(Betancourt 1977: pl. 42, fig. 43)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesus 1</td>
<td>British Museum</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesus 2</td>
<td>British Museum</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klopedi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Betancourt 1977: pl.49/fig. 41)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mytilene</td>
<td>Archy. Museum of Istanbul</td>
<td>(Betancourt 1977: pl. 50)</td>
<td>no. 985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eressos</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Betancourt 1977: pl. 51, fig. 43)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neandria 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Betancourt 1977: fig. 25)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neandria 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Betancourt 1977: fig. 32)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kavala</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Betancourt 1977: pl. 59)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens 2</td>
<td>Erechtheion In situ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphi</td>
<td>In situ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paros</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Betancourt 1977: fig. 46)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delos</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Betancourt 1977: fig. 45)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadis</td>
<td>Museo Provincal Cadiz</td>
<td>(Betancourt 1977: pl. 28)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carthage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrene</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Betancourt 1977: fig. 50)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Phillips 2002: 9, 127)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Phillips 2002: 97, 116, 17)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Phillips 2002: 53, 57)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt 4</td>
<td>Karnak in situ</td>
<td>(Phillips 2002: 96)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt 5</td>
<td>Tutankhamun artefacts</td>
<td>(Carter 1972: 184)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt Hathor 1</td>
<td>Thebes Hatshepsut</td>
<td>(Phillips 2002: 88, 21)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt Hathor 2</td>
<td>Serabit el-Kadim</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medibiyeh</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Betancourt 1977: pl. 25)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megiddo 1 LBA</td>
<td>Oriental Inst. Chicago</td>
<td>(Betancourt 1977: pl. 19)</td>
<td>b2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Catalogue No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megiddo 2 IA</td>
<td>Oriental Inst. Chicago</td>
<td>(Betancourt 1977: pl 10)</td>
<td>3657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Betancourt 1977: pl. 4)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samaria</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Betancourt 1977: pl. 15)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>Israel Mus. of Ant. Jerusalem</td>
<td>(Betancourt 1977: pl. 21)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amathus left</td>
<td>New York Met.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74.51.2453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapithos</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ant. 32793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golgoi</td>
<td>New York Net.</td>
<td>(Betancourt 1977: pl. 20)</td>
<td>74.51.2493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Ohnefalsch-Richter 1893: pl. CXCVII)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idalion 1 lower right</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idalion 2 lower center</td>
<td>Dali Museum</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MAI3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idalion 3 upper right</td>
<td>Dali Museum</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MAI1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idalion 4 centre left</td>
<td>Dali Museum</td>
<td>(Reyes 1994: pl. 10)</td>
<td>MAI10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amathus</td>
<td>Limassol Museum</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>My cat. CAM35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amathus Hathor</td>
<td>Limassol Museum</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>My cat. CAM09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamassos</td>
<td>In situ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tomb 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crete</td>
<td>Sarcophagus Boston MFA</td>
<td>2011.319a-b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chapter 8.7 Figure 96 references.**

1. (Hermary and Fourrier 2006: Planche 27)
2. (Gjerstad et al. 1935a: PI XXXVII)
3. Ahiram Sarcophagus (Cook 1991)
4. (Gjerstad et al. 1935a: Amathus T15, PI XXIII and PLI)
5. (Karageorghis 1970: T105 Pl CLXXXI for comparanda)
6. New York Metropolitan Museum 74.51.509 from Kition
7. Amathus, BCH 100, 1979, pp918, WPIV
10.4. Catalogue of selected artefacts from Amathus

(All illustrations and photographs are products and property of the author)

| CAM1 | **Miniature votive throne flanked by sphinxes**  
Limassol Museum  
Cypro-Archaic I/II  
AM3437  
Limestone  
This small limestone statuette dates to the late Cypro-Archaic period based on its design (Markoe 2000: 123). Compare to the full size throne of Astarte at Eshmun in Sidon. Often associated with Astarte, they were offered empty as a throne for the goddess. This legitimised the Phoenician colonies by way of association with home ports, particularly Sidon (Aubet 1997: 130) (NB: the original heads are missing). Found during field walk for this project. |
| CAM2 | **Oversized limestone bowl**  
Louvre  
Cypro-Archaic II  
AO 22897  
Limestone  
This oversized vessel is carved out of one solid piece of limestone and is now in the Louvre. Two elaborate handles are in the form of inverted U shapes, with each end terminating in an inverted tree of life. The trees are designed in a very formalised style, with twin volutes, central triangle and large fan shaped palmettes typical of the architectural capitals. The inverted flower is often found at the interfaces between the handles and the body of ceramic and metal vessels from this period. The inscription on the handle is still partially legible, and reads a-na, possible related to the goddess Anat. This combination of signs is found on other vessels from the site (CAM12) and seems to have been significant (Hermay 1981: 83; Hermay and Masson 1990: 214; Petit 1999: 112). Acquired by Louvre 1865. |
| CAM3 | **Two bronze mirrors with voluted decoration on handle**  
These objects were found in tomb 84 of the English excavations described by Murray, Smith and Walters in Excavations in Cyprus (Murray et al. 1900: pg 102 fig. 40). The mirrors have voluted handles similar to the proto-Aeolic capital designs produced during the Late Archaic and Classical periods across the region. The use of plant forms for handles stems back to the Egyptian Bronze Age where papyrus forms were used for mirror handles. These volutes are circular spirals and are not in the style of the elongated elliptical tree of life volutes from the versions with central triangles. |
**CAM4**  
**Miniature amphoroid krater with lotus flower**  
British Museum  
Cypro-Archaic I/II  
White painted ware  
(Gjerstad 1948: fig. L. no.103b)  
(Murray et al. 1900: 104)

This vase is the best complete example from Amathus of the white painted geometric-influenced style of Cypro-Archaic ceramic designs. It is heavily influenced by the geometric style as well as lotus form motifs from the Levant and Egypt, and hybridises both forms. The central panel contains a chequered diamond shape related to the triangle of the goddess.

**CAM5**  
**Amphora with prothesis scene**  
British Museum  
C855  
Cypro Archaic II  
Bichrome V  
(Murray et al. 1900: 105)  
(Cook 1979: 28)

This Bichrome V painted amphora of height 0.241m is now held in the British museum. It is decorated with large lotus flowers around the base and with a symposium scene where large trees provide shade for the reclining subjects who are being served liquid in drinking vessels. As this vessel was found in tomb 129 it seems that this may be a ‘prothesis’ scene meant to show the deceased enjoying the afterlife. This is quite an elaborate scene to be shown on what is essentially a simple white painted amphora; the decoration is complex but naive. According to Burkert (1992: 19) this scene was originally a typical oriental composition, while Reyes (1994: 111) notes that the Amathusian artistic technique used to decorate it was influenced by the Attic black figure style (Reyes 1994: plate 32). The reverse is adorned with a Hathor head, indicative of the increased contact with Egypt at that time. This agrees with its late sixth century B.C. designation.

**CAM6**  
**Hathor head bichrome amphoroid crater with rosettes and lotus motif**  
CAII British Museum  
C855  
(Murray et al. 1900: 105)

This is a highly ornate bichrome amphoroid crater now in the collection of the British Museum. The painted design includes an elaborate tree of life with voluted offshoots, a Hathor head, rosettes and a chain of lotus flowers. The vessel does not include decorative aspects related to the early Archaic or Geometric periods such as the triangles and diamond chequered effect panels. In several respects this vessel resembles the bichrome krater CA33, such as with respect to the rosettes and the lack of older motifs, and the significance of this issue should be examined. Less rural more cosmopolitan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAM7</th>
<th>Hathor capital painted vessel with lotus flowers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cypro-Archaic II 600-480 B.C. Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bichrome V/Amathus black figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Hermary et al. 1992: 92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Aupert 1996: 38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This fragment is of a style indicative of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>influence of the Attic black figure ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>style on Amathusian artwork of the late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cypro-Archaic. The inclusion of the Hathor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>capital also suggests a date of the mid to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>late sixth century when Egyptian influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on Cyprus was most direct and significant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAM8</th>
<th>Hathor head capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limassol Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cypro Archaic II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Hermary 2000: Pl83, Pl84, cat. 969 : 144-148)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BCH 108 pg 970 fig. 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Aupert 1996: 187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The capitals include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>many traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Egyptian royal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>motifs such as the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>uraeus set into the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>false door motif.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above is a composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>including a lotus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>flower, snakes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a winged sun disk,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and rosette flowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>traditionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>associated with royalty or nobility. The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sides of the capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>have a volute spiral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>arrangement. Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the whole capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resembles Egyptian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Kingdom precursors, but they also</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resemble Hathor headed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sistrums and the design may have been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>been based on one of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>these more portable items rather than an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>actual Egyptian Hathor capital. The lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tresses would have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>been curled up as CAM9, in a form that clearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>demonstrates the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>association between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>capital volutes and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the goddess. This</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>capital was found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reused as spolia in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the foundations of one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leading up to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sanctuary near the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>palace.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAM9</th>
<th>Hathor Capital Limestone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limassol Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cypro Archaic II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Hermary 2000: Pl. 87, cat. 972)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This capital has many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>features in common with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAM8 but is simpler and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more heavily damaged. It</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>has a uraeus in a false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>door surmounted by a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>winged sun disk flanked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by two snakes. The false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>door is flanked by a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pair of voluted spirals,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and the tresses of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>goddess are curled up in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a volute style. The whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assembly sits on a large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lotus flower decorated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>block with the top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>curved down on either</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>side of the bust. Again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>this piece is reminiscent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of a sistrum rather than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a real Egyptian architectural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>capital. It is unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as to how these were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>actually used, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>whether they may have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>been votive sculptures,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or mounted on a pole as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>decorative features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rather than structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elements, or whether they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>were used as steles at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ground level rather than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elevated in the buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This capital was found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reused as spolia in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>foundations of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Byzantine church on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>summit of the acropolis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CAM10 | Elaborate polychrome sarcophagus from Cesnola collection  
Metropolitan Museum  
Late Cypro-Archaic II  
74.51.2453  
(Hermary 1981: pg74 Pl 15-18, cat. 80)  
(Aupert 1996: 47)  
(Hendrix 2001)  
This is a highly decorated and colourfully painted limestone sarcophagus in the form of a temple of the period, with an apsed roof. It is 1.575m x 2.366m x 0.978m in size and was taken to New York in 1872 or 1873 by Luigi Palma de Cesnola. Early Cypro-Classical period c.475 B.C., designed in the form of the roof of a Greek, Lycian or Etruscan temple of the era (Hendrix 2001: 44). Compare to Hiram Sarcophagus band of lotus flowers. The corners of the sarcophagus are in the form of four broad square legs or piers and are adorned with vertically repeated tree of life motif elements. These trees are effectively towers of flowers. The individual parts alternate between the formal double volutes with central triangle as seen on Iron Age Levantine capitals and the more ornate wide spread flower type more typically seen on the metal plates, or ceramic vessels (cf. CAM11). A band of lotus flowers and buds runs the full length of the sarcophagus, similar to that on the lower band of CAM6 and with a much earlier precursor on the Ahiram sarcophagus. Cesnola suggested this scene may have had links to the Persian satrapy where wall relief carvings of scenes such as this were common. Prothesis and hunting scenes appear on an almost contemporary sarcophagus from Golgoi that is also in the Cesnola collection at the Metropolitan Museum (74.51.2451). |
| CAM11 | Silver plate with Egyptianizing themes  
British Museum  
Silver  
Cypro-Archaic I  
ANE 123054  
(Cook 1979: 27; Laffineur 1986: 179)  
(Myres 1933; Aupert 1996: 33)  
(Markoe 1985: 172, fig. 248/249 cat. CY4)  
This fine but fragmentary small silver plate of diameter 18.7 cm shows a scene of a town under attack around the outer ring, and perhaps reflects the Assyrian campaigns on the mainland at the time. The central tree of life on the middle band is positioned directly below the citadel shown on the outer band. This bowl was probably manufactured in Amathus. |
| CAM12 | Large fragment of amphoroid crater with bull and tree of life scene  
Limassol Museum  
Early Cypro-Archaic I.  
AM1554  
White painted/pseudo-bichrome ware  
(Hermary and Fourrier 2006: fig. 325, Planche 52)  
BCH 112, pg 862 report of 1987 work  
This large piece of an amphoroid crater was |
reassembled from fragments excavated on the acropolis, and is known as the ‘vase aux taureaux’. It was found in pieces in the grotto cave of the sanctuary area of the temple complex. Masson and Hermary have dated it to 8th century B.C., and as it is also designated Cypro-Archaic I it was deposited near the start (750-700 B.C.) of the time that this cave was in use (750-480 B.C) (Hermary and Masson 1982: 115). The material is referred to as ‘pseudo-bichrome’ ware, as the light terracotta ceramic was painted in two different paints of very similar colour. The shoulders of the vase included pairs of bulls with horns lowered, on one side facing a tree of life and on the other an inscription, the meaning of which is unclear. The tree of life is drawn in a way that suggests the artist was not used to drawing the symbol, yet it has elements that are clearly similar to the Amathusian capitals and the older voluted Levantine capitals with the central triangles. Echoes Late Mycenaean and Geometric themes rather than Iron Age Levantine styles.

**CAM13 Upper part of a limestone votive stele showing woman in window**  
Limestone  
Cypro-Archaic I/II  
(Murray et al. 1900: 93)  
(Hermary 1981: 73, Plate 14(79))  
This fragment of a limestone statue includes a decorative voluted floral motif that may be related to the goddess. The statue is damaged, but may have been a limestone votive statue used as a stele and representing a naos or shrine with statue. This was found during the English excavations at the end of the 19th century in tomb 56.

**CAM14 Engraved bronze mirror with tree motif**  
(Murray et al. 1900: 103, fig. 149)  
This is an engraved bronze mirror with a tree motif. The style of the tree is as a palm with fringed leaves. This may indicate northern Levantine design influence. It has been noted in studies of ivories that northern Levantine motifs more commonly included fringed designs, referred to as being from the “flame and frond” school (Gunter 2009: 97)

**CAM15 Fragments of bichrome vessel with tree of life from grotto**  
Cypro-Archaic I  
(Hermary and Fourrier 2006: Planche 31, 124)  
These fragments are from a vessel closely related to CAM12. The tree of life on this vessel is drawn hand very similar to the larger amphoroid krater, although in this case a bird is shown rather than the bull motif. The fabric and decoration is in Cypro-Archaic I Bichrome IV style.
Bronze shield boss with lions and trees of life
British Museum
Early 5th century B.C.
ME135591
(Perrot and Chipiez 1885: 421)
(Myres 1933: 25-39)
(Cesnola 1877)
This bronze shield boss was found by Cesnola in the same tomb as the polychrome sarcophagus CAM10. It was also found with the silver plate CAM11. Well hybridised symbolic repertoire, derived from the east Mediterranean Bronze Age iconography, but with additional and new meanings more significant to the Archaic Period in which it was made.

Decorated panel from box-pyxis
Cypro-Geometric IB/II
Tomb 521 Amathus Anemos
(Karageorghis et al. 1987b: 65, plate L)
From box-pyxis decoration from Anemos necropolis

Decorated sherd with joined lotus and triangle design
Cypro-Archaic I 750-600 B.C.
BCH 1977, 101 pg 799
Fragment from excavations - lotus cross on white painted IV fragment
This is similar is artistic style to the complete amphoroid crater CA4 and the design on the fragment is a good example of the hybridised geometric/lotus flower with the petals angulated to fit in with the cross shape. The material is white painted ware. This was found on the terrace of the acropolis and is described in the BCH report from 1975. As well as the strongly stylised lotus flower, the design includes concentric circles, net effect chequered diamond design, parallel lines at right angles, and possibly fringed effect similar to wheat stalk.

Decorated sherd from excavations hybrid lotus triangle
Cypro-Archaic I 750-600 B.C.
BCH 1976, 100 pg 918
White painted IV fragment
This piece is similar to fragment CAM18 and also similar to the complete amphoroid crater CAM4. As well as the stylised lotus flower it includes a net effect chequered diamond design, parallel lines at right angles, but is simpler that CAM18 as the flower is reflected across the cross shape so that the other side is the same although facing in the opposite direction.

Gold embossed diadem strip
Limassol Museum
Cypro Archaic I/II
T172/40
(Karageorghis et al. 1989: 23, Planche VII)
Gold
This diadem strip is one of several found in and around Amathus and in tombs elsewhere on Cyprus. It follows a tradition dating back to the Bronze Age (Laffineur 1986: 23). The diadems are not functional items and are only
added to the burial assemblage as decorative attire for the deceased. They are placed across and around the forehead, and include floral motifs of palmettes, volutes and rosettes. This example includes an unusually shaped palmette. The bands are manufactured by imprinting (embossed - repoussage) the motif on the gold with a moulded stamp, and then repeating the design several times along the band. The association with these palmettes and the deceased supports interpretations that attribute a ritual significance to the symbols, and its association with life and rebirth.

**CAM21**  
**Gold embossed diadem strip 2**  
Limassol Museum  
Cypro Archaic I/II  
T354/25  
(Karageorghis et al. 1989: 23, plate VIII)  
The Necropolis of Amathonte VI pg 24 Plate VIII Gold  
This is one of several funerary bands manufactured especially for placing around the forehead of the deceased. This design is an unusually shaped palmette with the offshoots curled into volute shapes (Laffineur 1986).

**CAM22**  
**Bronze mirror with miniature voluted capital on stem**  
Limassol Museum?  
Cypro-Archaic II  
T283/91  
(Chavane 1990: 13, cat. 79)  
This is a bronze mirror similar to those two catalogued here as CAM3. It was recovered during the French excavations from tomb 283. The handle is decorated with a miniature voluted capital where it joins with the mirror surface. The volute is well developed and formalised, and is further flanked by floral palmette style decoration. The spiral is rolled into an approximately circular shape, rather than an elongated trajectory seen in the Levantine influenced capitals with central triangle. The mirror style probably follows mirror design traditions rather than reflecting the development of the tree of life motif in other classes of material culture.

**CAM23**  
**Embossed diadem silver strip with palmette symbol**  
Berlin Staatliche Museum  
Cypro-Archaic II  
Silver  
(Laffineur 1986: 16, cat. 10)  
Stamped silver diadem strip with elaborate alternating palmette and lotus bud chain motif. Obtained in late 19th century, probably from Amathus. The general impression given by the design is that it is well developed and formalised, suggesting a late Archaic or early Classical date.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAM24</td>
<td><strong>Black on Red ware amphora decorated with lotus cross</strong></td>
<td>Limassol Museum Kantou</td>
<td>750 B.C.</td>
<td>86 T9/14 Large Black on Red ware amphoroid krater on display in Limassol Museum marked as 750 B.C. From tombs around Amathus. Design includes hybrid geometric lotus cross as well as stalk of tree of life. Right hand side rear of main room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM25</td>
<td><strong>Bichrome Amphora Lotus cross</strong></td>
<td>Limassol Museum</td>
<td>750-480 B.C.</td>
<td>371/48 Large amphoroid krater in bichrome IV or V style, including repeated hybridised lotus cross motif. Left of CA24. Complex handle design with central reinforcement strip.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM26</td>
<td><strong>Bichrome Amphora Lotus cross</strong></td>
<td>Limassol Museum</td>
<td>750-600 B.C.</td>
<td>LM466/1 Large amphoroid krater in painted bichrome fabric with very large repeated hybridised lotus cross motif panels around widest part of body of vessel. Complex handle design. Left of above CA25 in museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM27</td>
<td><strong>Small amphora bichrome lotus cross</strong></td>
<td>Cypro Archaic I/II</td>
<td>Unknown cat. No.</td>
<td>Limassol Museum In cabinet Hybridised lotus form and central hatched triangle design on one side; simple naturalistic central tree on reverse. Small lozenge tree band design around neck.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM28</td>
<td><strong>Small amphora black on beige with lotus cross and rosettes</strong></td>
<td>Limassol Museum</td>
<td>Cypro Archaic I/II</td>
<td>in cabinet Small amphora in beige fabric with black painted design of lotus cross. In cabinet at rear of main museum room. Hybridised lotus form and central hatched triangle design on one side, rosettes usually associated with rulers or deities around neck.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CAM29 | Small oinochoe with bird scene and tree of life lotus papyrus scene  
CA1 750-600 B.C.  
LM 863/36  
This white painted vessel is decorated in a free field style with bird designs reminiscent of east Aegean geometric influences. It also includes a chain of lotus flowers of Levantine and Egyptianizing influence. It also includes a plant or foliage resembling a bush of papyrus plants, and the spout is decorated with a dot like an eye that was a popular motif during the Geometric Period. |
|---|---|
| CAM30 | Proto Aeolic capital 1 left  
Limassol Museum  
6th century B.C.  
This is a large proto-Aeolic capital from Amathus now in the Limassol Museum and listed as dating from the sixth century B.C. The triangle is surmounted by a mound shaped a little like a sunrise. This is relatively unusual, and again it is made up of three thin arcs. Above this foliage is sprouting. The central foliage flowers are simply carved in this case. Above the whole arrangement is a broad straight beam stretching the full width, and made up of three layers. |
| CAM31 | Proto Aeolic capital 2 right  
Limassol Museum  
6th century B.C.  
This capital is similar to capital CAM30 but has some significant differences. It has a pair of large volutes either side of a prominent central triangle. In the triangle is the symbol of the goddess; an upturned moon shaped crescent and a disc. The basic triangle with volutes is surmounted by an elaborate outgrown of foliage in the form of additional spread out mini volutes, and a chain of lotus flowers between. |
| CAM32 | Hathor number 2  
Limassol Museum  
Cypro Archaic II  
Museum back wall left  
Bust of goddess with aegis pectoral. Uraeus in framed architectural facade above. Similar to design of sistrum. Possibly imitated design of these more portable items rather than architectural capitals. Evidence of increasing Egyptian influence of Cyprus during Cypro-Archaic II. |
| CAM33 | Crater bichrome from Swedish Cyprus excavations W  
(Gjerstad et al. 1935a: Ila, Plate II)  
Cypro Archaic II  
Bichrome V ware  
This Cypriot bichrome crater was one of the finest vessels recovered by the Swedish Cyprus expedition. It is of white fabric vividly coloured in black and orange paint in the bichrome style. The iconography is not particularly typical of Amathus and elements such as the |
rosettes suggest it is a Late Archaic period product. The tree of life at the centre of the decoration is not styled in a typical manner, and the whole arrangement gives the impression of being produced by a skilled novice or a foreigner unfamiliar with the fairly formal iconography of the region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAM34</th>
<th>Rhodian or SW Anatolian oinochoe fragments 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Gjerstad 1977: PlVII, 74, 76, PlVI, cat. 100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These are fragments of an oinochoe vase in typical Rhodian or East Greek ‘wild goat’ style. The type is very distinctive and its manufacture is often located to Rhodes. Cat CA35 is similar. The excavations in 1976 indicated that these were part of a group of votive offerings recovered from ‘terrace 0’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAM35</th>
<th>Rhodian or SW Anatolian oinochoe fragments 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhodian ware (Gjerstad 1977: PlVIII, 74, 77, cat. 101-109, )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These are fragments of an oinochoe vase in typical Rhodian or Eastern Greek ‘wild goat’ style. The type is very distinctive. Cat CAM34 is similar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAM36</th>
<th>East Aegean Crater fragments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late Archaic Technique ‘mixed’ (Gjerstad 1977: PlXI, 76, 77, 28, cat. 119-122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These are fragments of a crater adorned with thickly painted black decoration including sphinxes and lotus flowers. A Greek ‘key’ border is also included. This style strongly resembles designs from the area around Miletus and Samos, as well as from Naukratis on the Delta in Egypt where traders from these areas were posted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAM37</th>
<th>Fragments of Attic black figure cup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Gjerstad 1977: PlXXI, 83, 84, cat. 209-223)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These fragments show a small tree or flower of life with rounded volutes and a central fan of petals. The rest of the vase is decorated in the black figure style. Its Attic origins are a useful reminder of Amathusian contacts with the west Aegean as well as the east.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CAM38 | **Amphora with mound and tree scene**  
| Cypro-Archaic  
| (Fourrier 2009: 100)  
| Geometric depiction of mound with triplet of trees growing up. Format recalls Late Bronze Age precursors where triple trees were common (Evans 1928) and CPA44. Similar in styles to CAM4. Clear statement of mound and tree ideology. |

| CAM39 | **Embossed metal label with opposing caprids around tree**  
| (Gjerstad et al. 1935a: IIa, Pl. XXIV)  
| Amathus T18, no. 42  
| Very stylised design intended to fit tag and to suit repoussé manufacturing techniques. Recalls designs from cylinder seals. |
### 10.5. Catalogue of selected artefacts from Idalion

| CID1 | **Silver tetradrachm coin with tree of life and winged sphinx**  
Cypro-classical ca. 460 B.C.  
Idalion Archaeological Museum  
Hybridised flower with spirals and lotus flower appended. Ivy leaf and astragalos. Winged sphinx on reverse. The motifs on this coin indicate stylistic associations with Classical Greek and Greco-Egyptian world of the Late Archaic period rather than Cypro-Archaic styles. This shows the increasing influence of the Greek poleis at that time. There is no capital with central triangle or Hathor. |
| CID2 | **Decorated proto-Aeolic capital**  
Idalion Archaeological Museum  
Cypro-Archaic II  
MAI 1  
| CID3 | **Decorated proto-Aeolic capital**  
Idalion Archaeological Museum  
MAI 2  
| CID4 | **Decorated proto-Aeolic capital**  
Idalion Archaeological Museum  
MAI 3  
Volute capital/stele with vegetal offshoots over standard capital below. Papyrus/palmettes, spear offshoots and mound shapes above. Hybridisation of Early Iron Age Levantine austere form with elaborate Egyptianising elements. |
| CID5 | **Decorated proto-Aeolic capital**  
Idalion Archaeological Museum  
MAI 10  
Unique capital showing combination of Syrian flame and frond stylistic influences representing grain sheafs, lotus form triangle arrangement below, up and down turned volutes recalling earliest Ionic order examples. See also Figure 12 for comparanda. Characteristic of experimental Cypro-Archaic II period. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CID</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CID6 | Decorated proto-Aeolic capital                                       | Berlin  
Voluted capital/stele with vegetal offshoots over standard capital below. Papyrus/palmettes, spear offshoots and mound shapes above. Hybridisation of Early Iron Age Levantine austere form with elaborate Egyptianising elements. Symbols of goddess and stylised Hathor |
| CID7 | Bronze fragment of palmette decoration from horse front band         | Idalion Archaeological Museum  
MAI 270  
Hybrid lotus and palmette form. See Figure 12 for comparable form. Late Archaic Egyptianising and Aeolic palmette influences. Development of basic proto-Aeolic form. No exaggerated central triangle. |
| CID8 | Seal with tree of life palmette motif                               | Cypro-Archaic I/II  
(Gjerstad et al. 1935a: IIb, PL CLXX, cat1493)  
This small tree is similar in form to the architectural capitals, and includes a sunrise fan form familiar in the NE Levant (Figure 73) as well as formalised volutes springing from mound shape. No central triangle. This recalls NE Levant mainland designs as well Cypro-Archaic designs. See also (Figure 78). |
| CID9 | Bronze shield boss peripheric band                                  | (Gjerstad et al. 1935a: IIb, PL. CLXXV)  
Lotus form frieze design decorating perimeter of shield. Simple arched leaves/petals and central buds. No central triangles. |
| CID10| Silver/electrum decorated plate                                     | Louvre  
Cypro-Archaic I  
N3455 AO 20134  
(Markoe 1985: 170: 244, 255)  
Bowl. This bowl is dated to period III of Markoe's classification, dating from 710 to 675 B.C. This is bowl Cy2 in his catalogue. This period was the high point in the production of these bowls. Repoussé. Central scene of pharaoh in smiting pose with mace over prisoners. Winged solar disc and Horus falcon type show Egyptianising influence. This period coincides with 25th dynasty Kushite rule in Egypt when the Assyrian Empire was being challenged on Levant. Dominant winged sphinxes and master of animals killing lions and winged griffins suggests themes of resistance again Assyrian rule. Trees prominent on both bands. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CID11</td>
<td><strong>Necklace with motif on pendant</strong></td>
<td>Tomb 2, approx 800m NW of W acropolis&lt;br&gt;Gold and silver&lt;br&gt;(Karageorghis 1964: 28-84, 70, PIV, 1)&lt;br&gt;Stacked layer form flower with central mounds.&lt;br&gt;Compare (Figure 78). Northern Levantine influences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID12</td>
<td><strong>Decorated electrum plate</strong></td>
<td>Louvre&lt;br&gt;N 3454 AO 20135&lt;br&gt;(Markoe 1985: 169, 242, 243)&lt;br&gt;This bowl is dated to period III of Markoe's classification, dating from 710 to 675 B.C. This is bowl Cy1 in his catalogue. Highly elaborate designs with fully ornate tree of life around central flower designs. Winged warrior kills lions and griffins. Camels and horse procession around outer band. Tall trees on outer band. Possible reflecting movements of people and animals overland at this time due to Assyrian disruption. Ornate Cypro-Phoenician style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID13</td>
<td><strong>Bronze decorated plate</strong></td>
<td>NY Met&lt;br&gt;74.51.5700&lt;br&gt;(Cesnola 1877: 101; Perrot and Chipiez 1885: 270, fig. 206; Ohnefalsch-Richter 1893: 45, 46; Markoe 1985: 171, 246, 247)&lt;br&gt;Decorated with offering table scene and dancers. This bowl is dated to period I of Markoe's classification, dating from 825-750 B.C. This is bowl Cy3 in his catalogue. Early example of Levantine designs being hybridised with Cypro-Geometric style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID14</td>
<td><strong>Faience decorated plate</strong></td>
<td>(Perrot and Chipiez 1885: 271, fig. 207)&lt;br&gt;(Cesnola 1877: 101)&lt;br&gt;Scene of bull running through papyrus field. Reminiscent of delta hunting scenes from Egypt. Egyptianising style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID15</td>
<td><strong>Bichrome IV Vase</strong></td>
<td>From west acropolis&lt;br&gt;(Gjerstad et al. 1935a: Ib, PL CLXVI, i534)&lt;br&gt;Colourful vase with central Cypriot geometric triangle hybridised with Levantine and Egyptianising lotus floral motifs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID</td>
<td>Bichrome IV Vase</td>
<td>From west acropolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID16</td>
<td>Bichrome IV Vase</td>
<td>From west acropolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID17</td>
<td>Bichrome IV Vase</td>
<td>From west acropolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID18</td>
<td>Bichrome IV Vase</td>
<td>From west acropolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID19</td>
<td>Bichrome IV Vase</td>
<td>From west acropolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID20</td>
<td>Bichrome IV Vase</td>
<td>From west acropolis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Highly stylised band of schematised lotus flowers. Geometric concentric circles decoration.
- Central tree design hybridising lotus form with geometric triangle elements. Flanked by opposing birds. Experimental and original design.
- Well proportion frieze design incorporating canonical lotus form from Levant and Egypt into a schematised geometric design. Disparate elements well hybridised.
- Complex frieze of alternating inverted and upright lotus flowers in canonical Levantine and Egyptian style. Triangular form from Cypro-Geometric designs is retained in novel format. Geometric concentric circles decoration.
| CID21 | **Bichrome IV Vase**  
From west acropolis  
(Gjerstad et al. 1935a: Pl CLXVIII, i684).  
Design shows substantial continuity of Cypro-Geometric central triangle motif, with highly schematised lotus form plants to either side. Possible an early example of these vessels showing early phase of hybridisation with Levantine forms that became more prominent through Cypro-Archaic Period. |
| CID22 | **Bichrome IV Vase**  
From west acropolis  
(Gjerstad et al. 1935a: Pl CLXVIII, i771)  
Complex frieze utilising elements of lotus form in new scheme. Slightly disaggregated design. Geometric concentric circles decoration. |
| CID23 | **Stirrup jar**  
Cypro geometric I  
Tomb 2, Idalion Ayios Georgios  
vessel no. 7  
(Karageorghis 1965: Page 188, PL XIV 6, fig. 47/7)  
Stirrup jar decorated with twin mounds and chevron pattern between, perhaps resembling twin acropolises of Idalion with verdant strip or route between. Reverse is decorated with triangular shaped mound. |
| CID24 | **Concave open bowl**  
Cypro geometric I  
Tomb 2, Idalion Ayios Georgios  
vessel no. 2  
(Karageorghis 1965: PI XIV, fig. 46, page 186)  
Concave open bowl with handles. Decoration of mounds resembling range of hills around Idalion and acropolises. Interior is decorated with band of hatched triangle motifs. |
| CID25 | **Ring Kernos with caprid head and libation vessels**  
Cypro geometric I  
Tomb 2, Idalion Ayios Georgios  
vessel no. 1  
(Karageorghis 1965: fig. 46, PL XIV, page 186) |
### 10.6. Catalogue of selected artefacts from Palaepaphos

| CPA1 | **Limestone decorated apron fragment from male statue**  
Museum of Sanctuary of Aphrodite, Kouklia  
Cypro-Archaic II  
Limestone  
This is a fragment of a full sized statue of a human. It was recovered from the Martello fort. This is from the apron of the figure which was decorated with tree of life and lotus bud designs. Similar to warriors' aprons that have been found on statues elsewhere on the island notably from Ayia Irini terracotta figures.  |
| CPA2 | **Lotus-form capital**  
Museum of Sanctuary of Aphrodite, Kouklia  
Cypro-Archaic II  
Limestone  
This is an unusual and unique capital designed in the form of a wide open lotus flower bud. It was found in the fill of the Marchello fort. Shows Egyptianising influence on Paphos in Late Archaic Period.  |
| CPA3 | **Bichrome oinochoe with tree of life decoration.**  
Museum of Sanctuary of Aphrodite, Kouklia  
Cypro-Archaic II  
Unique and well schematised proto-Aeolic tree of life above with schematised rosette below. Well integrated with geometric concentric circles decoration.  |
| CPA4 | **Proto white painted ware bowl with opposing caprids around a tree of life**  
Museum of Sanctuary of Aphrodite, Kouklia  
Early Geometric tomb no. 132  
Palaepaphos Xylinos  
(Flourentzos 1997: PI XXXV)  
(Karageorghis et al. 1997: PI XX)  
(Bushnell 2005: 73)  |
| CPA5 | **Fragment of decorated pottery with bull and tree motif**  
Museum of Sanctuary of Aphrodite, Kouklia  
Mycenaean IIIB pottery  
Typical arrangement of bull opposing tree of life. This scene is echoed in Geometric and Archaic forms cf. CAM12 as well as orthostats from Karatepe on mainland (Figure 32)  
Black on grey/white slip  
(Maier and Karageorghis 1984: 59) |
| CPA6 | **Bichrome oinochoe with schematised tree/fish motif**  
Museum of Sanctuary of Aphrodite, Kouklia  
Similar to CPA3 but simpler design. Tree form also resembles fish form. This is probably not accidental and is repeated in CPA16. |
| CPA7 | **Limestone proto-Aeolic capital from Marchello**  
Museum of Sanctuary of Aphrodite, Kouklia  
Cypro-Archaic  
(Maier and Karageorghis 1984: 191)  
(Mitford and Iliffe 1951: 51-66)  
Good example of basic proto-Aeolic capital design with exaggerated central triangle. Similar to early Levantine examples. Limestone. From Marchello excavations. |
| CPA8 | **Skyphoi bowl of white painted I ware with geometric pattern**  
Cypro-Geometric I  
Skales  
(Karageorghis 1983b: Pl XXII, fig. XLIX, T43, vessel 68)  
Bowl with shallow body, convex sides, flat rim, two opposed horizontal wishbone handles at rim. Prominent geometric chequered triangles symbolic of tree and goddess. Shows no sign of external mainland influences.  
Buff brownish clay, slip of lighter colour, matt black paint.  
Base is also decorated with a narrow band flanked by parallel lines and filled with a chain of latticed lozenges. Horizontal bands surround this panel running around the base of the vessel. |
| CPA9 | **Amphora of white painted I ware.**  
Cypro-Geometric I  
Skales  
(Karageorghis 1983b: Pl XXVII, fig. LII, T44, vessel 80)  
Fragmentary amphora of white painted I ware. Decorated with schematised landscape including mountains and possible sun and moon above; wavy sea below. Shows no sign of external mainland influences. Ovoid body, concave neck, flat everted rim, two opposed horizontal loop handles on shoulders, base ring. Height 34cm, mouth diameter 14.5cm. Buff brownish clay, slip of a lighter colour, matt black paint. Shoulder zone is decorated with five large triangles, one framed and filled with a lattice design, two filled with a lattice design, two with chequered tangent triangles, three horizontal wavy bands on either side of the body between handles. Horizontal bands around, group of transversal strokes on rim, paint on handles, knobs and foot. |
| CPA10 | **Oinochoe of white painted I ware**  
Cypro-Geometric I  
Skales  
(Karageorghis 1983b: Pl XXVIII, fig. LIV, T44, vessel 12)  
Jug of white painted I ware. Typical schematised decoration including triangles. Shows no sign of external mainland influences. Depressed biconical body, concave neck, trefoil spout, ridge around neckline, flat handle from rim to shoulder, splaying foot. Height 17.8cm, Buff clay tempered with grits of various colours. Slip of the same colour, matt black paint. Shoulder zone is decorated with four framed, latticed triangles, horizontal bands around body. Zig zag bands on handle. |
| CPA11 | **Askos of proto white painted ware**  
LCIII/CGI  
Skales  
(Karageorghis 1983b: Pl XXXV, fig. LXI, T44, vessel 30)  
Askos of proto white painted ware body. Typical schematised geometric decoration including triangles. Shows no sign of external mainland influences. Conical upper part with knob at centre, concave side spout with funnel shaped mouth, basket style handle. Prominent geometric chequered triangles symbolic of tree and goddess. Height 13cm. Buff-brownish clay tempered with grits of various colours. Slip of a lighter colour, matt orange to dark brown paint. Decorated with four large triangles on shoulders, two chequered, two hatched. Horizontal bands on lower half, thin and one thick towards base. Reminiscent of Mycenaean stirrup jars. |
### CPA12  Krater with naïve tree design
**Skales**  
White painted III,  
Cypro Geometric III  
(Karageorghis 1983b: PI XLIV, T46, krater 61)  
Simply decorated krater with naturalistic but naïve tree at centre of neck band. Occasional concentric circle decoration.

![Krater with naïve tree design](image)

### CPA13  Krater decorated with stylized lotus flower motif
**Skales**  
White painted I  
Cypro-Geometric I  
(Karageorghis 1983b: PI XLVII, T48, krater 28)  
Early example of lotus form being hybridised with butterfly cross floral motif. Compare with similar motif on CAM12 and CPA27, and also later forms on CAM 26, 27, 28. This is the first sign of hybridisation of Levantine influences after geometric period of relative isolation.

![Krater decorated with stylized lotus flower motif](image)

### CPA14  Krater decorated with wavy line motif and triangles
**Skales**  
White painted I  
Cypro geometric I  
(Karageorghis 1983b: PI LI, T49, krater 31)  
Prominent geometric hatched triangles symbolic of tree and goddess. Wavy line sea motif band below. Shows no sign of external mainland influences. Pair of lugs on shoulders.

![Krater decorated with wavy line motif and triangles](image)

### CPA15  Goddess water strainer juglet
**Skales**  
Proto white pained ware  
LCIIIb  
(Maier and Karageorghis 1984: 140)  
(Karageorghis 1983b: PI LIV, T49, jug 53)  
Prominent geometric hatched triangles symbolic of tree and goddess. Shows no sign of external mainland influences. Mound shapes around waist of decorative band. Possible attempt to depict anthropomorphic features with mound shapes.

![Goddess water strainer juglet](image)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPA16</th>
<th>Juglet/flask with single handle and tree/fish motif</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bichrome I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cypro geometric I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Karageorghis 1983b: Pl LV, T49, jug 69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly geometric design with tree or fish symbol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ambiguity of design is likely to be deliberate and shows association of symbols. Shows no sign of external mainland influences. Compare to CPA6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPA17</th>
<th>Cylinder seal with master of animals, trees and bucrania</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LCI/III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late 15\textsuperscript{th} century B.C. around 1400 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Karageorghis 1983b: Pl CXX, T71, seal 1a) page 407 for discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steatite. Elaborate frieze including master of animals surrounded by a pair of caprids, and a griffin headed figure with palm trees. Bucrania depicted at top of scene. Repertoire of symbols significant and associated with rulers. Stamp of ownership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPA18</th>
<th>Goddess water strainer juglet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proto white painted ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LCIIIb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Karageorghis 1983b: Pl CXLIV, T78, jug 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prominent geometric hatched triangles symbolic of tree and goddess. Shows no sign of external mainland influences. Attest to association of water and life, emphasised by wavy line water motif around neck.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPA19</th>
<th>Two handled bowl with base and simple tree motif</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Karageorghis 1983b: Pl CLXV, T82, bowl 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Austere and schematised tree of life on two handed bowl. Difficult to interpret beyond basic symbolism of tree of life. Compare to CPA28.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CPA20 | Krater with hatched and chequered triangle motif and spiral handles  
Skales  
(Karageorghis 1983b: PL CLXIX, T83, krater 94)  
Prominent geometric hatched and chequered triangles symbolic of tree and goddess. Shows no sign of external mainland influences. Good example of Cypro-Geometric ceramics. |
| CPA21 | Amphoroid krater with wavy line motif, hatched triangles and arches  
(Karageorghis 1983b: PL CLXXXI, T85, krater 61)  
White painted I  
Cypro geometric I  
Prominent geometric hatched triangles symbolic of tree and goddess. Shows no sign of external mainland influences. Simple landscape scene intended, emphasised by mound arches in triangles, associating tree and mountain and tomb/cave ideologies. Wavy line seascape motif below. |
| CPA22 | Amphoroid krater with wavy line motif, hatched triangles and arches  
Proto white painted ware  
LCIIIb  
(Karageorghis 1983b: PL CLXXXI, T85, krater 83)  
Prominent geometric hatched triangles symbolic of tree and goddess. Shows no sign of external mainland influences. Simple landscape scene intended, emphasised by mound arches in triangles, associating tree and mountain and tomb/cave ideologies. Wavy line seascape motif below. Twin diamond lozenges possibly representing sun or clouds. |
| CPA23 | Krater with wavy line motif, hatched triangles and arches  
Skales. Proto white painted ware. LCIIIb  
(Karageorghis 1983b: PL CLXXXI, T85, krater 60)  
Prominent geometric hatched triangles symbolic of tree and goddess. Shows no sign of external mainland influences. Simple landscape scene intended, emphasised by mound arches in triangles, associating tree and mountain and tomb/cave ideologies. Wavy line skyscape above representing clouds. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPA24</th>
<th>Amphoroid Krater with hatched triangles, and rain motif</th>
<th><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skales</td>
<td>White painted I, Cypro Geometric I (Karageorghis 1983b: PI CLXXIV, T89, krater 45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prominent geometric hatched triangles symbolic of tree and goddess. Complex designs possibly implying dense foliage in landscape and indicating verdant and fertile landscape. Symbol above possibly represents rainfall on schematised landscape. Shows no sign of external mainland influences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPA25</th>
<th>Krater with bull motif</th>
<th><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skales</td>
<td>White painted I, Cypro geometric I (Karageorghis 1983b: PI CCL, T48, krater 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Krater decorated with simple bull motif arrangement around neck. Shows no sign of external mainland influences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPA26</th>
<th>Krater with wavy line motif and large hatched triangles</th>
<th><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skales</td>
<td>Proto white painted/White painted I LCIIib/Cypro geometric I (Karageorghis 1983b: PI CXLIX, T78, 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Krater with spout (spout on reverse not shown here). Prominent geometric hatched triangles symbolic of tree and goddess. Highly schematised but follows typical landscape representation rules. Wavy line cloud skyscape above. Dark triangle at centre emphasises association with goddess. Shows no sign of external mainland influences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPA27</th>
<th>Krater with lotus cross design</th>
<th><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skales</td>
<td>White painted II, Cypro geometric II (Karageorghis 1983b: PI CLVI, T80, krater 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early example of lotus form being hybridised with butterfly cross floral motif. Compare with similar motif on CAM12 and CPA13, and also later forms on CAM 26, 27, 28. This is the first sign of hybridisation of Levantine influences after geometric period of relative isolation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPA28</th>
<th>Bowl with twin handles and central tree motif</th>
<th><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skales</td>
<td>White painted II, Cypro geometric II (Karageorghis 1983b: PI CLXV, fig. CLXI, T82, krater 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CPA29 | **Amphoroid Krater with wavy line motif, hatched triangles and arches**  
Scales  
White painted I, Cypro geometric I.  
(Karageorghis 1983b: Pl. CLXXVI, T85, krater 61)  
Prominent geometric hatched triangles symbolic of tree and goddess. Wavy line seascape motif below. Arched mound shape in triangles representing cave or tomb. Shows no sign of external mainland influences. |
|---|---|
| CPA30 | **Krater with wavy line motif, hatched triangles and arch motifs**  
(Karageorghis 1983b: PL CLXXVII, fig. CLXXIII, T85, krater 60)  
Prominent geometric hatched triangles symbolic of tree and goddess in landscape. Highly schematised but follows typical landscape representation rules. Wavy line cloud skyscape above. Shows no sign of external mainland influences. Arched forms in triangles represent cave or tomb entrances. |
| CPA31 | **Krater with wavy line motifs and hatched triangles**  
Proto white painted ware, LCIIIb  
(Karageorghis 1983b: Pl. CLXXVII, fig. CLXXIII, T85, krater 67)  
Prominent geometric hatched triangles symbolic of tree and goddess in landscape. Highly schematised but follows typical landscape representation rules. Wavy line cloud skyscape above mounds. Shows no sign of external mainland influences. |
| CPA32 | **Krater with wavy line motif and hatched triangles**  
(Karageorghis 1983b: Pl. CLXXVII, fig. CLXX IV, T85, krater 24)  
Prominent geometric hatched triangles symbolic of tree and goddess as well as mounds. Shows no sign of external mainland influences. Wavy line cloud skyscape above mounds. |
| CPA33 | **Krater with complex hatched triangles and ‘rain’ motif**  
Scales  
White painted I  
Cypro Geometric I  
(Karageorghis 1983b: PL CLXXXIV, fig. XXXIII, krater 45)  
Prominent geometric hatched triangles symbolic of tree and goddess. Shows no sign of external mainland influences. Dense hatching possibly represents verdant growth in schematised landscape. Symbol above possibly represents rainfall in verdant schematised landscape of the goddess. |
| CPA34 | Stirrup jar with hatched triangles and arch motifs  
Skales  
Proto white painted ware  
LCIIIb  
(Karageorghis 1983b: PL CLXXXV, fig. CLXXXVIII, T89, krater 74)  
Prominent geometric hatched triangles symbolic of tree and goddess in landscape. Mound forms in triangles possibly represent entrances to tombs or caves. Echoes sub geometric precursor forms from Aegean. |
| CPA35 | Amphoroid Krater with wavy line motif, hatched triangles and arches  
Skales  
White painted I  
Cypro Geometric I  
(Karageorghis 1983b: PL CXIII, fig. CXV, T91, krater 5)  
Prominent geometric hatched triangles symbolic of tree and goddess. Shows no sign of external mainland influences. Wavy line seascape motif below. Mound forms in triangles possibly represent entrances to tombs or caves. |
| CPA36 | Horse front bank with palmette decoration and goddess symbols  
Cypro-Archaic  
(Maier and Karageorghis 1984: 169)  
(Karageorghis 1963: 272)  
Typical Cypriot horse front band with symbols of goddess and palmetted design. See also (Figure 44). |
| CPA37 | Bronze helmet from Marchello fort  
Cypro-Archaic II (Maier and Karageorghis 1984: 198, fig. 181) Fine helmet with unique tree palmette design in centre of forehead and lions on cheek plates. Form of foliage is unique and combines lotus form, volutes and palm fan but no central triangle. This reflects the decline of the central triangle towards the end of the Archaic Period as the rural forms were dropped in favour of Aegean poleis forms. |
CPA38 Large pithos with wavy band motif and complex seal impression on handle
Museum of Sanctuary of Aphrodite, Kouklia
Late Cypriot III Bronze Age
Hall of sanctuary 1.
(Maier and Karageorghis 1984: 95, fig 79)

One of the largest pithoi from this period. See also (Figure 60). Handle is decorated with impressed seal design representing tree flanked by winged sphinxed. Late Bronze Age repertoire of symbols dating back to international period. Symbols possibly also include bull or lion attacking victim. Prominent wavy line motif around centre of vessel reminiscent of pithoi from Crete.

CPA39 Stirrup jar decorated with geometric triangle motif and bands
Museum of Sanctuary of Aphrodite, Kouklia
LCIIIb
Proto-white painted ware from Kouklia Kato Alonia
(Maier and Karageorghis 1984: 125, fig. 104) Prominent geometric hatched triangles symbolic of tree and goddess. Reminiscent of sub-Geometric precursor designs from the Aegean.

CPA40 Stirrup jar decorated with geometric triangle motif with arches
Museum of Sanctuary of Aphrodite, Kouklia
Proto white painted ware
LCIIIb
Kouklia-Kamina KTK I 6.
(Maier and Karageorghis 1984: 124, fig. 103) Prominent geometric hatched triangles symbolic of tree and goddess. Arched mounds in triangles suggest tomb or cave entrances in hillsides.

CPA41 A Unique Iron Age Pictorial Dinos from Paphos
(Flourentzos 2006: 169-171)
Frieze design of dancing women in the form of the goddess with the upraised arms. Possibly influence by Cretan precursors. Goddesses are represented in triangular forms.
| CPA42 | **Carved stone door frame with tree motif band**  
Cypro-Archaic  
(Maier 1969: Plate 2, photo 1) Second smaller fragment in same publication. Comparanda for inside of tomb 1 Tamassos (Figure 95). Highly formalised tree palmettes with central mound and sunrise fan form. Compares favourably with Figure 95 although central triangle is not included. This indicates late Archaic provenance. Compare also with tree designs on metal bowls. |
| CPA43 | **Crater with opposing bulls around tree of life**  
Cypriot crater 13th-12th century B.C. Paphos (Gimbutas 1989)  
Late Bronze Age Mycenaean style pictorial krater with a pair of bulls flanking schematised tree of life. Compare to CPAS and CAM12 for continuity of motifs into Iron Age. Shows early signs of Levantine influence on Geometric artistic tradition. |
| CPA44 | **Impressed pithos relief scene with caprids and tree**  
LCII/III  
(Karageorghis and Demas 1988a)  
(Porada 1988: 303)  
Late Bronze Age seal impression from pithos. Design includes finely detailed arrangement of opposing caprids around a tree of life. Details of roots and triangular mounds suggest some thought has gone into the depiction on this piece and they carry significant aspects. Possible early examples of triangular form being associated with mounds and trees. Cosmological allusions may be expressed here. Early hybridisation of naturalistic and geometric elements. |
| CPA45 | **Head of a priest-king**  
Late Cypro Archaic II  
Excavated from the siege works at Palaeapphos Marchello Hill.  
Liverpool World Museum 56.219.  
Egyptian influenced double crown style head gear with mound scales motif decorating inner part, and a band with feathered wings, winged uraeus and solar disk motif. Bear is decorated in spiral technique derived from Hittite and Assyrian styles. Eyes and features are in Archaic Greco-Egyptian style. Hint of an archaic smile. |
10.7. Catalogue of selected artefacts from Crete

These pieces from Crete are arranged into chronological order of manufacture. The conventional chronological periodization is based on that used in the four volumes of Coldstream and Catling's (1996) books *Knossos North Cemetery Early Greek Tombs*. Volumes I-IV. London: The British School at Athens. See the table after the catalogue for chronology. All of the citations below refer to those publications.

**NB** some of these pieces are shown in a virtually reconstructed state rather than the original recovered state. See above publication for original state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCR1</th>
<th><strong>Subminoan Period</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stirrup Jar decorated with hatched triangles similar to those found at Palaepaphos Skales. Reddish brown clay dark brown paint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fig. 84. Page 88. Plate 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomb 40.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCR2</th>
<th><strong>Midde Proto Geometric Period</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Krater decorated with tree of life and butterfly crosses and triangulated hunting man with spear and wicker shield. Animals including hare, dog and caprid shown on reverse. Large windmill sail centred in concentric circles motifs. Compare to pyxis Amathus (CAM17). Red brown clay coffee brown surface red black paint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fig 59. Plate 48. Page 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomb F.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCR3</th>
<th><strong>Proto Geometric B Period</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fig 120. Page 188.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomb 175.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR4</td>
<td><strong>Proto Geometric B Period</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elaborate straight sided pithos with repeated tall tree of life motifs on triangular bases, with birds on top intermittently, and with spiralled leaves. Segment chequered millsail band around shoulder. Cream slip.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fig 133. Page 233. Plate 212.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomb 283.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCR5</th>
<th><strong>Proto Geometric B - Early Geometric Period</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flat sided pithos. Pair of goddesses with upraised arms by the Tree Painter. One thought to represent spring, the other winter. Flanked by elaborate trees of life with birds on top. Goddess is on a wheeled platform. One tree on reverse appears to be a date palm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fig 109, Plate 155, Pages 155 and 316.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomb 107. 114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCR6</th>
<th><strong>Middle Geometric II Period</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page 264, Fig. 145.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomb 292.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CCR7 | **Early Orientalising Period**  
|      | Plate 148, Page 151.  
|      | Tomb 107.8 |

| CCR8 | **Early Orientalising Period**  
|      | Polychrome trichrome pithos fragments. Tree of life element chain motif.  
|      | Page 268, Fig 149.  
|      | T292.185 |

| CCR9 | **Early Orientalising Period**  
|      | Decorated lid with elaborate tree of life chain motif encircling band.  
|      | Plate 115. Page 102.  
<p>|      | Tomb 60.25 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCR10</th>
<th><strong>Middle Orientalising Period</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fragment of pithos with three tree of life panels. Other example has triangles top and bottom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fig 92, Page 103.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomb 60.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCR11</th>
<th><strong>Late Orientalising Period</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aryballos fragment with lotus bows and tree of life. Central mound on top of tree with protuberances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fig. 139, Plate 220, Page 244..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomb 292.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCR12</th>
<th><strong>Late Orientalising Period</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alabastron with small tree of life motif panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plate 105. Fig. 85. Page 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T40.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCR13</th>
<th><strong>Late Orientalising Period</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Polychrome red and blue painted Pithos. Elaborate tree of life decoration and lotus styled opposing birds. Interlacing panels and Greek key design on top band. Tripod base and pair of loop handles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fig. 139, Page 244, Plate 220.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomb 285.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cretan Iron Age chronological conventions for use with above table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Date B.C.</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late Minoan Bronze Age III C</td>
<td>1200-1100 (post palatial)</td>
<td>LMIII/PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subminoan BA</td>
<td>1100-1000</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subminoan/EarlyProtoGeometric IA</td>
<td>1000-970</td>
<td>SM/EPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Proto-Geometric IA</td>
<td>1000/970-920</td>
<td>EPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Proto-Geometric IA</td>
<td>920-875</td>
<td>MPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Proto-Geometric IA</td>
<td>875-840</td>
<td>LPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proto-Geometric B IA</td>
<td>840-810</td>
<td>PGB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Geometric IA</td>
<td>810-790</td>
<td>EG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Geometric IA</td>
<td>790-745</td>
<td>MG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Geometric IA</td>
<td>745-710</td>
<td>LG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Geometric/Early Orientalising IA</td>
<td>710-700</td>
<td>LG/EO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Orientalising IA</td>
<td>700-670</td>
<td>EO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-Late Orientalising IA</td>
<td>670-630</td>
<td>MO-LO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaic IA</td>
<td>630-510</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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