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Foreword

The present volume is a tribute to the memory of an internationally acclaimed scholar and long-time friend of Cyprus; it is published by the Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation as a token of our gratitude for his invaluable contribution to the field of Cypriot archaeology. During a crucial period, when there was no formal university programme on the history and archaeology of Cyprus anywhere in the world, Professor J. N. Coldstream had taken it upon himself to show through his teaching, research and publications the significance of Cypriot material culture as a vital component of Mediterranean archaeology. In recognition of his work, Professor Coldstream was invited in 1986 by the Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation to give the Second Annual Lecture on the History and Archaeology of Cyprus. This institution, the first that was formally approved by the Board of Directors, and the oldest of the Foundation’s annual activities, was initiated in 1985 with a lecture by the late Jean Poulloux, the French archaeologist whose name has been inextricably linked with the excavations of Salamis. At the time, Cyprus was trying desperately to heal some of the open wounds (still open today) inflicted by the invasion of 1974: the occupation of territories had led to the loss of archives and libraries, monuments and sites of primary cultural and archaeo-historical value. Given annually by a distinguished personality in the field of history and/or archaeology, the Annual Lecture and its publication were part of a policy, the explicit target of which was to remedy these vast loses by updating the study of the cultural profile of the island with scientifically first rate papers. Each lecture was published as an elegant booklet that was widely distributed to
libraries in Cyprus and, above all, to academic institutions overseas. In 2003, 18 years and 18 published Annual Lectures later, the Foundation's Board of Directors recognized that the institution had served its purpose well, but it had also completed its cycle.

Founded in 1993, the Archaeological Research Unit of the University of Cyprus — first directed by Vassos Karageorghis and subsequently, and to this day, by Demetrios Michaelides — has gradually incorporated Cypriot archaeology within a highly specialized academic environment: international conferences, symposia and cycles of weekly lectures complement the teaching and enhance the research programmes of the Department of History and Archaeology; at the same time, they remain open to the international archaeological community and equally to the interested public — as the events sponsored by the Cultural foundation always were and will always be.

In view of these dramatically positive developments that are a result of the establishment of the University of Cyprus, the Board of Directors decided that the time had come to establish a closer synergy with the Archaeological Research Unit — as the Bank of Cyprus had already done with the University of Cyprus at large. The specific area, which requires a joint effort, is recognized by both parties: Cypriot studies may be thriving today but they are in great need of funds for publications and they also require assistance in the distribution of new publications. With this objective in mind, the Cultural Foundation has, with great pleasure, undertaken to publish and distribute the proceedings of the Workshop that was organized by the Archaeological Research Unit in memory of J.N. Coldstream (1927–2008). We look forward to a long, scientifically sound and fruitful collaboration that will enrich Cypriot studies with new and original works by senior as well as young scholars.

Lefki Michaelidou
Director, Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation
On the 13th of December 2010, a small group of Early Iron Age specialists from Greece and Cyprus, who represent two generations of Greek scholars that have followed in the footsteps of Professor J. N. Coldstream, met at the Archaeological Research Unit of the University of Cyprus to honour his memory. With this meeting, the University of Cyprus and especially the members of the Archaeological Research Unit, which in the last decade has become the base of the School of Cypriot Archaeology, wished to acknowledge a major debt owed to the late Professor Coldstream: in the 1990s, as chairman or member of many selection committees, Coldstream played a decisive role in electing the first professors of archaeology for the Department of History and Archaeology. This alone would have been reason enough to devote a Workshop in his memory. There was, however, a less obvious but more intimate purpose behind the meeting—which is reflected in, and should also explain, the choice of speakers—as we wished to pay tribute to aspects of his academic contribution that have had a long-term impact on the archaeology of Cyprus and also on the careers of his Cypriot students. His productive and creative association with Cyprus, from where he regularly harvested a rich collection of data, which he would then share with his circle of ‘disciples’, fostered the opening of channels of communication and collaboration between Greek colleagues working in the Early Iron Age of Greece and Cyprus.

Many years before the establishment of the University of Cyprus (1992), where the field of Cypriot archaeology finally found a long-deserved home in the Ar-
chaeological Research Unit of the Department of History and Archaeology, Nicolas Coldstream, Professor of Aegean Archaeology at Bedford College, London (from 1975), and then Yates Professor of Classical Archaeology at University College, London (as of 1983), was the only university teacher in Europe to have introduced regular undergraduate courses and graduate seminars on the archaeology of Cyprus. Not many scholars, other than a few ‘natives’ who were struggling to specialise and also stay in Cypriot archaeology in the ’70s and ’80s (especially doctoral candidates and post-doctoral researchers, like some of my Cypriot colleagues and myself), are able to look back and appreciate the significance of Nicolas’s pioneering academic agenda: he steadfastly, and against the temporal and geographical constraints of the established Classical Archaeology tradition, considered Cyprus an integral part of Aegean studies, in as much as he saw the Aegean not in isolation but as the central part of the Mediterranean world. He taught, and lived by, this credo to the end: he would travel on either side of the Aegean to study Greek pottery that appeared in assemblages in the Levant, in Italy, or elsewhere. He always kept one step ahead of everybody else as he had an unmatched ability to sew every new piece of evidence onto a big canvas — where he mapped the multidirectional movements of artefacts, ideas and influences that speak of human contacts and are the stuff from which we can begin to approach the history of our shared Mediterranean landscape in the early first millennium BC.

The Mycenaean Seminar, which he ran so diligently in the Institute of Classical Studies in London for many years, was not confined geographically or chronologically to the Mycenaean culture or even to the archaeology of Greece: it was the venue he used so that scholars would lecture in London on research projects that concerned the whole of the Central and East Mediterranean in the Bronze Age and Early Iron Age. Thus, promising young archaeologists of many nationalities who had found a haven in his classes and in his tutoring were also urged to rise to the podium of the Mycenaean Seminar, to present their research and defend their interpretations. But Nicolas’s tutorial method was not confined to the Institute; he was a master in developing academic ‘togetherness’ — or what one could perhaps describe better as good manners and good company in the social practice of archaeology. Those privileged to know him would agree that organising social gatherings, as a rule in his home, was an integral part of Nicolas’s scholarly modus operandi. In this, his spouse Nicky Coldstream was his devoted accomplice; nobody can possibly overlook her contribution. Herself a formidable Mediaeval archaeologist, Nicky deserves an honorary degree in Aegean studies, not only for her exquisite drawings of the pottery that Nicolas would study and publish but also for using her cooking skills to prepare what must certainly have
amounted to a monumentally long list of dinners at their historic house, blessed by the young Mozart, at 180 Ebury Street. There, shy and reserved juniors came to sit next to, and converse with, senior scholars — and each other. Was it not this that the Greek Symposium was all about? With the Cyprus University Workshop we attempted to emulate a gathering of old and new symposiasts who cherish the spiritual bonds that Nicolas nurtured between his students and himself, and likewise among his students.

Like dozens of Nicolas’s one time students who are today distinguished scholars, Nota Kourou (University of Athens), Alexander Mazarakis Ainian (University of Thessaly), Irene Lemos (University of Oxford), Vasiliki Kassianidou (University of Cyprus) and Maria Iacovou (University of Cyprus), the five Greek professors who were asked to convene the Workshop (their number was kept to a minimum so as to give more time and scope to the second generation), had the good fortune to study and/or work with Nicolas; but the primary force that brought us together was the fact that it is through Nicolas that, since the 1980s, we have come to know and respect each other. It was Nicolas who showed us, by his own example, that we needed each other’s knowledge and first-hand experience of the intricacies of all matters Aegean and Cypriot. The years went by, but mutual trust carried on; we have often relied on each other’s regional expertise; we have also referred to each other, and exchanged, promising students who have helped to open up the Cypro-Aegean web of communication and sustain a lively archaeological dialogue. The result is an energetic and highly mobile second generation of young Early Iron Age scholars from Greece and Cyprus who can bridge the geographical — and academic — distance between the archaeologies of a central Mediterranean region (the Aegean) and an eastern one (the island of Cyprus) with an insightful understanding of regional differences and a sensitive appreciation of local identities.

In one way or another, the eight second generation representatives who were invited to the Workshop belong to this energetic category (the order of names follows the order of papers in the volume). Antonia Livieratou, now in the 9th Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities in the Museum of Thebes, did her doctoral thesis in the University of Edinburgh with Lemos on the transition from the Late Bronze to the Early Iron Age in the Argolid and Central Greece. George Papasavvas, Associate Professor of Classical Archaeology in the University of Cyprus — therefore, a senior member of the second generation — is the Cretan student of Kourou, who came to Cyprus via Germany to do his doctoral research on an intriguing subject (the thesis was finished in Cyprus at the newly established Archaeological Research Unit), which was subsequently defended in the Univer-
University of Athens and has since been published by the Leventis Foundation (Χάλκινοι Υποστάτες από την Κύπρο και την Κρήτη, Nicosia 2001). Antonis Kotsonas is another formidable student of Lemos, who did his doctoral thesis in the University of Edinburgh on ceramic styles in Iron Age Crete, and is now an active post-doctoral researcher at the Amsterdam Archaeological Centre. Giorgos Bourogiannis, who was also urged to look towards Cyprus by Kourou, received his doctoral title from the University of Athens, worked for the British Museum and is now post-doctoral research fellow, responsible for the Cypriot collection, in the Medelhavsmuseet at Stockholm. Anna Satraki, my doctoral student since 2005, was claimed by the Department of Antiquities of Cyprus soon after she had defended her thesis: since 2011, she has been Archaeological Officer responsible for the Larnaca district. As I write this Introduction, Satraki’s monograph, Κύπριοι Βασιλείς από τον Κόσμα μέχρι το Νικοκρέοντα, is being released by the University of Athens in the Archaiognosia publication series. This concise interpretation of the political organization of Cyprus from the Late Bronze Age to the end of the Cypro-Classical period will serve for many years as the most up to date research guide and history textbook for teachers and students alike. Where Satraki ends, Giorgos Papantoniou, another one of our cherished University of Cyprus students that went on to earn his doctoral title under the guidance of Christine Morris in the Department of Classics at Trinity College Dublin (where he is currently a post-doctoral researcher), picks up the thread: his masterful, Religion and Social Transformations in Cyprus: From the Cypriot Basileis to the Hellenistic Strategos (Leiden 2012) will appear in the Mnemosyne Series of Brill any time now. Anna Georgiadou, the youngest of all contributors, is an Athenian turned Cypriot ceramic expert: after she had devoted her MA thesis to the problem of Cypro-Geometric II — her point of departure was Nicola’s paper, ‘On chronology: the CG II mystery and its sequel’ (in Iacovou, M. and Michaelides, D. (eds), Cyprus. The Historicity of the Geometric Horizon. University of Cyprus, Nicosia, 1999, 109–18) — she came from Aix-en-Provence to Cyprus where, for the last four years, she has been studying Cypro-Geometric assemblages from all over the island. Georgiadou’s doctoral thesis (‘Les ateliers de la production céramique de la période Géométrique à Chypre (XIe – VIIIe s. av. J.-C.’), which will be submitted jointly to the Universities of Aix-en-Provence and Athens, will serve as a much-needed handbook of the Cypro-Geometric pottery, but it will also present a challenging codification of regional ceramic ‘fingerprints’. Manolis Mikrakis, is another student of Kourou, who found his way to Cyprus, where he has been working for the Department of Antiquities; in his dissertation, which was defended in 2006 at the University of Heidelberg, Mikrakis dealt with string instruments and the performance of music in the Aegean and Cyprus during the Bronze and Early Iron Ages.
Livieratou and Bourogiannis were unable to fly to Cyprus for the meeting but they submitted their contributions for publication in the volume. Conversely, when due to other pressing commitments, Lemos announced that she could not meet the deadline for the submission of her contribution, ‘After Nicolas what? The future of Iron Age studies in the Aegean and the Eastern Mediterranean’, we decided to accommodate a ninth ‘second generation’ paper by Vicky Vlachou, who did her doctoral dissertation with Kourou on the Geometric pottery from Oropos, excavated by Mazarakis Ainian.

The Workshop was opened by the Director of the Archaeological Research Unit, Professor Demetrios Michaelides in the presence of our guest of honour: Dr Nicky Coldstream. It was addressed by the Director of Antiquities of Cyprus, Dr Maria Hadjicosti, who on the previous day had kindly escorted the speakers and other guests on a study trip that included Amathus and the Limassol District Museum, where Nicolas, always accompanied by Nicky, had spent time working on the publication of some of the earliest Aegean imports to Cyprus. The Director of the Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation, Mrs Lefki Michaelides, spoke next and promised to have the Workshop’s proceedings published in recognition of Professor Coldstream’s early association with the Foundation: back in 1986, he gave the Second Annual Lecture on the History and Archaeology of Cyprus, on The Originality of Cypriot Art. Little did I know as I returned to Cyprus at the end of 1986 from post-doctoral research under Nicolas’s aegis at the Institute (made possible through a BSA Centenary Bursary), that the author of the first book I would edit—as part of my ‘handle-it-all’ administrative duties at the newly established Cultural Foundation—was going to be Professor Coldstream. Published in Nicosia in 1987 as a pamphlet, The Originality of Cypriot Art has since been cited in hundreds of works and, not surprisingly, it has also found its place in many of the papers in this volume.

Professor Vassos Karageorghis, old friend and associate of Nicolas, talked with understandable emotion of ‘Nicolas Coldstream: The man, the scholar’ (the content of his contribution was published in CCEC 38 (2008), 13–16). Dr Despina Pilides, one-time student of Coldstream and now Curator of Antiquities in the Department of Antiquities of Cyprus, gave a lively presentation of Nicolas as teacher and academic advisor. Her contribution, ‘John Nicolas Coldstream: A personal appreciation of his legacy’, is a most appropriate opening paper for the volume.

The invited speakers had not been asked to address a specific research problem but instead to present research topics they were currently working on and wanted
to share. Thus, the papers do not necessarily ‘talk to each other’; they stand on their own and, had they been presented as individual seminars at the Institute in London some years ago, we trust that Nicolas would have been there. This created a minor problem, but a problem nonetheless: the papers’ order of presentation in the volume. It was easy to put Pilides’s contribution first; it was also reasonable to choose to continue with Kourou’s ‘Phoenicia, Cyprus and the Aegean in the Early Iron Age: J.N. Coldstream’s contribution and the current state of research’. After that, however, I had to improvise: I introduced a (quasi) geographical approach starting from the north Aegean, with Mazarakis Ainian’s ‘Euboean mobility towards the north: new evidence from the Sporades’, and moving south, first on the Greek mainland, with Livieratou’s paper, ‘Phokis and East Lokris in the light of interregional contacts at the transition from the Late Bronze to the Early Iron Age’, and then on to Crete: Papasavvas’s ‘Cretan bronze stands of Cypriot types from sanctuaries and cemeteries: Cretan society in the Early Iron Age’ and Kotsonas’s ‘“Cretan-Cypriot” and “Cypro-Phoenician” complexities in the archaeology of interaction between Crete and Cyprus’ fuelled the endlessly fruitful dialogue between the two megalonisoi. I then inserted Bourogiannis’s ‘Pondering the Cypro-Phoenician conundrum. The Aegean view of a bewildering term’, so as to begin to sail towards Cyprus and the East. The next five papers are studies firmly rooted in Cyprus. They are Iacovou’s ‘External and internal migrations during the 12th century BC. Setting the stage for an economically successful Early Iron Age’; Kassianidou’s ‘The origin and use of metals in Iron Age Cyprus’; Satraki’s ‘Cypriot polities in the Early Iron Age’; Papantoniou’s ‘Cypriot sanctuaries and religion in the Early Iron Age: views from before and after’; and Georgiadou’s ‘La production céramique de Kition au Chypro-Géométrique I’.

I decided to end the volume with two contributions upon which Nicolas would have looked with a twinkle in his eyes because of their pictorial theme: Vlachou’s ‘Aspects of hunting in early Greece and Cyprus: a re-examination of the ‘comb motif’, and Mikrakis’s ‘The “originality of ancient Cypriot art” and the individuality of performing practices in protohistoric Cyprus’. When Nicolas dealt with pictorial pottery, he allowed himself to express joy and humour and became one with the ancient potter-painter. ‘Nicolas’s scholarship’, writes Gerald Cadogan in ‘Nicolas Coldstream (1927–2008)’, commenting on his unforgettable description of the ‘hippalektryon’ vessel, ‘was and is human and humane, often humorous, blessed with a probing eye […], imaginative and empathetic in his speculations about what the ancient artists, craftsmen, merchants and patrons thought and chose …’ (BSA 104 (2009), 1–8). I left the paper by Mikrakis to the end because it is a tribute to Nicolas the passionate piano player, who would have a lot in com-
mon with Mikrakis in terms of musical interests; also, because the title and content of the paper is an elegy to the lecture Nicolas gave in Nicosia in 1986.

We asked two very special and long-time friends of Nicky and Nicolas to be chairpersons at the Workshop, and we thank them for the eagerness with which they accepted. Robert Merrillees, who had travelled with his wife Helen to Cyprus to share the experience of the meeting with Nicky and the rest of us, chaired the morning session with his well known gusto. Nadia Charalambidou, a Cypriot scholar of Modern Greek literature, who had known Nicolas and attended his classes in the early 1970s, chaired the last session, and gave a touching farewell note, after which Professor Michaelides asked our guest of honour to the podium. It was then that Nicky had the Workshop’s last word, and as she did I realised that Nicolas and Nicky were last in Cyprus together in the late autumn of 2006 for the conference, _Parallel Lives, Ancient Island Societies in Crete and Cyprus_, which was jointly organised by the British School at Athens and the Universities of Crete and Cyprus. In fact, the picture on our frontispiece shows Nicolas addressing the Conference with his lecture, ‘Cypriot kingdoms, Cretan city-states: what parallels?’, which will appear posthumously, and almost certainly simultaneously with the present volume (in _BSA Studies 20_ (2012), edited by G. Cadogan, M. Iacovou, K. Kopaka and J. Whitley).

In editing the volume I decided that there was no point in trying to create another list of Coldstream’s publications as this has been admirably compiled by two eminent colleagues in two parts: the first can be found in the Festschrift _Klados: Essays in Honour of J.N. Coldstream_ (Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies Supplement 63, 1995), which was edited by Christine Morris; the second, which completes the first with Coldstream’s publications that appeared after _Klados_, was recently compiled by Alan Johnston in an invaluable memoir published in the _Proceedings of the British Academy_ 166 (2010), 103–116. I did think, however, of putting together a Cyprus bibliography of Nicolas but soon realised that it would have been against Nicolas’s own approach to try to isolate the Cypriot (and maybe also Levantine) papers, when in fact Cyprus and the Eastern Mediterranean played their part in almost every article and book he published. As Robert Merrillees remarked in ‘Nicolas Coldstream: a personal reminiscence’ (in _CCEC_ 38 (2008) 17–18), ‘Only he could have got away with linking Cyprus to all of its compass points’. Robert was referring to Nicolas’s last public address about Cyprus, the lecture he gave in London at the inauguration of the A.G. Leventis Gallery of Cypriot Antiquities in 2007, which was entitled, ‘Cypriot interconnections – North, East, South and West’. Finally, I should add that the Chronological Table
I express heartfelt thanks to Alan Johnston and Nicky Coldstream for guidance during the preparatory stages of the Workshop, and for sharing important inside information with me that spared me not a few embarrassing errors. My gratitude goes to another life-long teacher not only because he once again stood by me, this time when writing the Introduction, but also because it was he, Gerald Cadogan, who had first introduced me to Nicolas and Nicky Coldstream in the early years of the 1980s in the Stratigraphical Museum at Knossos.

I was fortunate not to have to shoulder alone the organisation of the Workshop: as on many previous occasions, my colleagues at the Archaeological Research Unit, Vasiliki Kassianidou, Demetrios Michaelides and Giorgos Papasavvas shared the burden with me, and we all relied on the assistance of Irida Chrysafi, who was the Unit’s secretary at the time. The meeting and the journeys of those of our guests that had to come from abroad were financed by the University of Cyprus, and the speakers’ dinner by the Cyprus Tourist Organisation. I should also like to thank Dr Pilides for her immediate response to my request for new and good quality illustrations of Greek imports from Amathus which, in the able hands of a book...
designer as finicky and as creative as Akis Ioannides, were made into a book cover that Nicolas would have certainly loved. This book has acquired physical substance due to the combined efforts of Lefki Michaelidou, who is directing the Cultural Foundation’s publication programme, Akis Ioannides, who is enamoured with the art of book design and Ian Todd, a distinguished archaeologist, who accepted to read, correct and improve the English, and in one case the French, text (and references) of 14 papers written by Greeks; I thank him for his patience and kindness! It was my privilege to work with all three of them on this volume.

As I submit the proceedings to be printed, it seems to me that a wonderful cycle, in which Nicolas was vigilantly following the careers of many of his Greek students, has come to a close. We shall be blessed if we can do half as much for our students. *Syndedemenoi* is the title of the Greek edition of a fascinating book by Nicholas Christakis and James Fowler, which was originally published in 2009 with the meaningful title, *Connected – The Surprising Power of our Social Networks and how they Shape our Lives* (Little, Brown and Co.). When I came across it in 2011, I immediately knew what I would like one to remember when reading this Introduction about Nicolas the symposiast and his brood of Greek symposiasts: the reader should not try to seek in the volume a well-defined connecting theme, other than the general one of *Cyprus and the Aegean in the Early Iron Age*; it is primarily the authors of the papers that form the connection: the first generation was connected through Nicolas, while the students of Nicolas’s students form the second generation and relate to each other through their teachers. Together we continue to celebrate the lasting impact of his legacy. Consequently, the papers in this volume are a collection of *cameos* submitted to the memory of a beloved teacher that built the network which brought us together.

Maria Iacovou
Summer 2012
Abbreviations

**Bibliographic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Archäologischer Anzeiger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>Athens Annals of Archaeology, Ἀρχαιολογικά Ανάλεκτα εξ Αθηνῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASOR</td>
<td>Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADelt</td>
<td>Άρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEphem</td>
<td>Άρχαιολογική Εφημερίς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJA</td>
<td>American Journal of Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Archaeological Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARDA</td>
<td>Annual Report of the (Director of the) Department of Antiquities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASAtene</td>
<td>Annuario della Scuola archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni italiane in Oriente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWE</td>
<td>Ancient West and East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAR, Int. Ser.</td>
<td>British Archaeological Reports, International Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASOR</td>
<td>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCH</td>
<td>Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICS</td>
<td>Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA</td>
<td>Annual of the British School at Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA Studies</td>
<td>British School at Athens Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCEC</td>
<td>Cahiers du Centre d’Études Chypriotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIAnt</td>
<td>Classical Antiquity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*JHS* Journal of Hellenic Studies  
*JMA* Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology  
*Med. Arch.* Mediterranean Archaeology  
*OJA* Oxford Journal of Archaeology  
*PAE* Πρακτικά της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας  
*PBSR* Papers of the British School at Rome  
*PBF* Prähistorische Bronzefunde  
*RA* Revue Archéologique  
*RDAC* Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus  
*SCE* Swedish Cyprus Expedition  
*SIMA* Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology  
*SMEA* Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici  
*WA* World Archaeology  

**Chronological**  
The main terms are in some cases preceded by E (Early), M (Middle), L (Late), S (Sub)  

- **BA** Bronze Age  
- **LC** Late Cypriot  
- **LH** Late Helladic  
- **SM** Submycenaean  
- **IA** Iron Age  
- **PG** Protogeometric  
- **G** Geometric  
- **EO** Early Orientalising
## Chronological table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CYPRUS</th>
<th>CRETE</th>
<th>GREEK MAINLAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>Late Cypriot IIB</td>
<td>Late Helladic IIIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>Late Cypriot IIC</td>
<td>Late Minoan IIIB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250</td>
<td></td>
<td>Late Helladic IIIB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>Late Cypriot IIIA</td>
<td>Late Minoan IIIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150</td>
<td></td>
<td>Late Helladic IIIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>Late Cypriot IIIB</td>
<td>Subminoan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050</td>
<td>Cypro-Geometric I</td>
<td>Early Proto-Geometric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Cypro-Geometric II</td>
<td>Middle Proto-Geometric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950</td>
<td>Cypro-Geometric III</td>
<td>Late Proto-Geometric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
<td>Early Geometric*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850</td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Geometric*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td>Late Geometric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>Cypro-Archaic I</td>
<td>Late Geometric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td>Archaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td>Cypro-Archaic II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>Cypro-Classical I</td>
<td>Classical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Cypro-Classical II</td>
<td>Classical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Coincides with the Sub-Protogeometric (I – III) phases of Euboea and related areas.
‘Creto-Cypriot’ and ‘Cypro-Phoenician’ complexities in the archaeology of interaction between Crete and Cyprus

Antonis Kotsonas

ABSTRACT
This paper engages with many of the complexities involved in drawing socio-economic inferences on the basis of the dissemination of ceramic style. Discussion is centered on the importation and imitation of Cypriot pottery in Crete of the Early Iron Age. Nicholas Coldstream’s meticulous discussion of this pottery is revisited and qualified in the light of recent work on the archaeology of Crete and new approaches to stylistic dissemination. Emphasis is placed on the terms used to designate the imitations of Cypriot pottery produced in Crete and the criteria for distinguishing between Cypriot imports and Cretan imitations. I further review the distribution of the two classes within Crete, establish major centres of production and assess the modes of interaction through which the Cretan copies came to be produced.

Introduction: Nicolas Coldstream and the archaeology of interaction between Crete and Cyprus
Long before island archaeology was given the attention it deserves in literature, Nicolas Coldstream was practicing it extensively through study and fieldwork across the Mediterranean: on Cyprus, Crete, Euboea, Kythera and Pithekousai (Cadogan 2009, 4–7). The ceramic contacts between the largest of these islands, Crete and Cyprus, apparently formed a subject which was very dear to him (Cadogan 2009, 6), a subject to which he returned on several occasions in his long and prolific career (Coldstream 1979; 1982, 268; 1984; 1986, 323–24; 1996,
Because of this, I find that a paper revisiting, updating and theorizing this contribution of Coldstream is particularly fitting in the context of a conference celebrating the legacy of the scholar. The emphasis of this conference on Coldstream’s work in Cyprus and the Aegean further provides an ideal setting for my paper on Crete and Cyprus. This is not the first time I have commented on the subject (Kotsonas 2008, 65–69; 2011a; forthcoming), but I have much new to report in the light of ongoing (2010–2011) studies of pottery from Knossos and other Cretan sites, the results of recent analytical projects, fresh discoveries in Crete and Cyprus, as well as current scholarship on the modes of interaction. Not all of the interpretations presented below agree with those put forward by Nicolas Coldstream. Obviously, this does nothing to diminish the legacy he bequeathed; instead, it illustrates the notable extent to which my work — like the work of almost everyone working on the Early Iron Age in the Greek world — draws inspiration from this legacy to stimulate archaeological discourse.

Ceramic contacts between Cyprus and Crete are not a development of the Early Iron Age; they have a long tradition extending back to the dawn of the Middle Bronze Age, around 2000 BC (Catling and Karageorghis 1960; Cadogan 1979; Popham 1979; Kanta 1980, 309–13; Iacovou 1988, 82–84; Rutter and Van de Moortel 2006, 653–58; Højen Sørensen 2008; Tomlinson, Rutter and Hoffmann 2010). Apparently, however, these contacts were deeply transformed from around the turn of the first millennium. In a nutshell, ceramic exchange between the two islands was bidirectional in the Bronze Age, with Crete being the main exporter. Conversely, from around 1000 BC — and throughout the Early Iron Age — exchange was basically unidirectional with Cyprus exporting to Crete (Kotsonas 2008, 284–87). Many prominent scholars assert that there is not a single piece of Cretan Early Iron Age pottery in Cyprus and the Near East (Boardman 1979, 264; Coldstream 1982, 273; Boardman 1999, 271; Jones 2000, 148; Coldstream 2008, 382; Osborne 2009, 64; Whitley 2010, 170; Kourou forthcoming). This assertion, however, begs some qualification in the light of a few finds published in the last two decades (Fig. 1; Kotsonas 2008, 286, 288). These finds include the first Cretan vase of the Early Iron Age to have been identified in Cyprus. The piece comes from tomb 646 in Amathus and is a neckless jar with a lid dating to the late 8th century (Flourentzos 2004, 206, 213 no. 124: 1a+1b). Having examined the vase myself, I think that its dark reddish, slightly micaceous fabric and its style suggest a provenance somewhere on the periphery of central Crete, perhaps in the Pediada district. In addition to this, two Cretan vases of the first half of the 7th century have been found further east, in coastal Turkey/Syria: a lid at Al Mina (Schaus
and Benson 1995, 3–4, pl. 1.4) and an aryballos at Ras el Bassit (Courbin 1986, 193–94, fig. 19; 1991, 261–62, fig. 6). Apparently, this thin scatter occurs on sites which are renowned for the amount of Greek pottery they have yielded.

The three Cretan exports mentioned are obviously too important to be left out of the discussion, but they do not overturn the current impression of unilateral ceramic exchange between Crete and Cyprus. Cypriot pottery is found in Crete in considerable amounts; imports date from the late 9th to the 7th century and occur on a number of sites (Kotsonas 2008, 284–88). A sizeable group of Cypriot pouring vessels of the Black-on-Red, White Painted and Bichrome wares is known from Knossos (Brock 1957, 190; Coldstream 1984, 123–31; 1996, 406–08; Jones 2000, 219–21, 233; probably false reference, 238–42), while a smaller assemblage of Black-on-Red pouring vessels has been found in Eleutherna (Kotsonas 2008, 284–87, with more oinochoai and lekythia reported in the press after the last few seasons; see, for example, Evely 2007–2008, 111). Most of the Cypriot pieces found at Kommos are coarse storage vessels (Johnston 1993, 370; Callaghan and Johnston 2000, 298–99; Johnston 2005, 358–59 nos 179–81, 372 no. 234; possibly also: 348 no. 140, 361 no. 184), while a single unguent vase has turned up in Kavousi (Τσιποπούλου 2005, 96, no. H718). On the other hand, the proposed identification of Cypriot vases in Vrokastro (Jones 2000, 268) is unreliable and the suggested Cypriot piece from Anavlochos (Τσιποπούλου 2005, 42, no. 2) is probably Phoenician. In any case, the impact of Cypriot pottery, particularly the Black-on-Red and Black Slip wares, on Cretan pouring vessels is identifiable throughout the 10th to 7th centuries and is particularly strong during the late 8th and the 7th centuries, at which time Cretan copies of Cypriot Black-on-Red can be identified in many sites, which extend from the central-west to the eastern part of the island (Kotsonas 2008, 68, 286; see also below). This picture—especially regarding the number and the distribution of Cypriot imports—is expected to be considerably enriched by the results of the ongoing (2010–2012) project ‘Kypriaka in Crete’, which is directed by V. Karageorghis and A. Kanta and covers the Late Bronze Age to the end of the Archaic period.

Terminology and Mediterranean archaeology: revisiting ‘Creto-Cypriot’ and ‘Cypro-Phoenician’

One of the many contributions of Nicolas Coldstream to the study of the pottery links between Crete and Cyprus was the establishment of the term ‘Creto-Cypriot’ for Cretan pottery which imitates Cypriot wares. The term ‘Creto-Cypriot’ was first—and only once—used by J. K. Brock (1957, 158) to refer to a class of Cretan unguent vases with circle decoration, which follow Cypriot Black-on-Red proto-
types. Brock preferred the designation 'Cypriot type' for other shapes and types of vessels based on Cypriot models. Coldstream originally retained Brock’s restricted use of the term, also using slightly different versions of it, like ‘Cretocypriaca’ (Coldstream 1984) and ‘Creto-Cypriot’ (Coldstream 1986, 324). Later, however, in his monumental publication of the pottery from the Knossos North Cemetery (Coldstream 1996), he established ‘Creto-Cypriot’ as an overarching term for all Cretan copies of Cypriot Black-on-Red (though not for the copies of Black Slip). By doing so, Coldstream effectively brought together a range of shapes and types. This choice has never been called into question; on the contrary, it has been accepted by several scholars who study Cretan pottery (Τσιποπούλου 1985, 44; Σταμπολίδης and Καρέτσου (eds) 1998, 170 nos 152–3, 172–6 nos 161–70; Callaghan and Johnston 2000, 237 no. 248, 242 no. 290; Stampolidis (ed.) 2003, 261–62 nos 151, 153, 155; Τσιποπούλου 2005, 406; Ρεθεμιωτάκης and Εγγλέζου 2010, 141–42), including myself (Kotsonas 2008; 2011a; forthcoming).

Archaeologists working in Cyprus have not been equally comfortable with the term. V. Karageorghis and M. Iacovou have independently encouraged me in recent years to revisit ‘Creto-Cypriot’ and the conference volume at hand provided a good opportunity to do so. As far as I know, the reluctance of scholars working in Cyprus to accept the term has never been expressed in print. V. Karageorghis has made a reference to the term, but without embracing it (Karageorghis 2006, 82). It is fair to assume that this reluctance is informed by the much broader discussion over the related term ‘Cypro-Phoenician’, a term which occurs in Cypriot and Near Eastern archaeology, but has generally not been used for pottery found in Crete (the sole exceptions being: Sherratt and Sherratt 1993, 365 and mostly Wallace 2010, 205, 206, 210, 217, criticized in Kotsonas 2011b). It is reasonable to think that ‘Creto-Cypriot’ was modelled after ‘Cypro-Phoenician’, especially since the two terms largely refer to the Black-on-Red ware; there is, however, no explicit reference for this in published literature. The designation ‘Cypro-Phoenician’ has long been used for the Black-on-Red pottery of the Early Iron Age, which is found in abundance in Cyprus and the Levant (Schreiber 2003; Bourogiannis, this volume). Until fairly recently, this pottery was of unsettled provenance and this uncertainty was reflected in the actual term ‘Cypro-Phoenician’. Analytical work has established, however, that although the original inspiration for the Black-on-Red technique reached Cyprus from the Levantine coast, the homonymous ware was produced on the island beginning in the late 10th century BC and was exported to the Levant (and elsewhere), where it was occasionally imitated. Accordingly, there is no reason to maintain the term ‘Cypro-Phoenician’ for the Cypriot Black-on-Red pottery; on the contrary the term is now—rightly—seen as deeply misleading (Iacovou 2004, 61–62; Bourogiannis, this volume).
'Creto-Cypriot' does not share the complexities of the term 'Cypro-Phoenician'. Brock, Coldstream and all others who have used the term 'Creto-Cypriot' are very explicit in noting that this material was produced on Crete, not on Cyprus (or further east). Only Humfry Payne (1927–28, 256, nos 119–22), who was the first to publish Cretan copies of Cypriot Black-on-Red, was confused over their provenance. Thanks to differences in fabric, technique and style recognized and documented meticulously by Coldstream (particularly 1984), scholars working on Crete have easily distinguished between actual imports and imitations (see also below). Because of this, discussions of the term 'Creto-Cypriot' have always entailed a sharp distinction between Cypriot vases and their Cretan imitations.

Although clear in meaning, 'Creto-Cypriot' is admittedly not clear in name; this is particularly so in the eyes of scholars working elsewhere in the Mediterranean and here lies the problem with this term. Current developments in the study of the Mediterranean (see particularly Horden and Purcell 2000; recent literature cited in Kotsonas 2008, 233, n. 1894) involve the collapse of traditional disciplinary divisions and increased emphasis on the study of comparable phenomena in different parts of the region. This inevitably brings about a strong need for clarity and consistency in terminology; and the term 'Creto-Cypriot' does not score well in both. The term is quite opaque to non-experts and at the same time finds no match in the terms scholars—including Coldstream himself—use to refer to copies of Cypriot Black-on-Red produced elsewhere in the Aegean (particularly in Rhodes and Cos) and the Eastern Mediterranean (Coldstream 1969, 1998; Bourogiannis 2000; Schreiber 2003, 293–306; Bourogiannis 2009; Bourogiannis, this volume). It is fair to say that the comparable reactions of two neighbouring Aegean regions—but also of other distant lands—towards Cypriot Black-on-Red should not be termed very differently. In the light of this—and for the shake of terminological clarity and consistency and at the expense of brevity—I argue that the term 'Creto-Cypriot', which has served Cretan archaeology for three decades, should give way to more descriptive terms, such as Cretan copies of this or the other Cypriot ware.

Kition to Knossos: two Cypriot wares in Early Iron Age Crete
Coldstream (1986, 324) hypothesized a link between Kition and Knossos with reference to the manufacture of Cretan copies of Cypriot Black-on-Red. I find it hard to identify a specific link between the two sites (cf. Bourogiannis, this volume), but I use 'Kition to Knossos' in my title as a metonym for Cyprus and Crete.

A considerable number of imports and/or imitations of three Cypriot wares have hitherto been identified in Early Iron Age Crete. Because one of these wares,
Cypriot Bichrome, is only represented by three pieces in Knossos (Coldstream 1984, 127; 1996, 353, 407), it receives very limited attention below. Another ware, Cypriot Black Slip, is only represented by imitations, while Cypriot Black-on-Red is represented by several imports and a score of imitations (see below). In the following paragraphs I revisit Coldstream’s suggestions over this pottery and their reception by other scholars in the light of recent work on Cretan pottery and new approaches towards the dissemination of ceramic style. My aim is a) to define the characteristics of the local imitations and the features that distinguish them from actual imports; b) to illustrate the distribution of the two classes within Crete and establish major centres of production; c) to refine the chronology of the Cretan copies; d) to assess the modes of interaction through which these copies came to be produced.

One note of caution should be made already at this stage; the distinction between imports and local imitations has always been important in archaeology but it received special attention in scholarship on Early Iron Age Crete during the 1990s (Hoffman 1997; Σταμπολίδης and Καρέτσου (eds) 1998). G. L. Hoffman (1997, 185, n. 117) embarked at that time on a project on imports and imitations of Cypriot ceramics in Crete, but this apparently did not result in any publication. In any case, behind the distinction between import and imitation lies the notion of authenticity, which is a modern construct not necessarily applicable to antiquity (Van Wijngaarden 2008). It remains unclear whether Cretans of the Early Iron Age were in a position to distinguish import from imitation; I have already noted that a scholar of the status of Humfry Payne was apparently not able to do so in the late 1920s. There are further reasons to consider that the distinction between import and local imitation was not particularly valid to some Cretans of the Early Iron Age. For example, tomb 292 in Knossos yielded several Cypriot Black-on-Red imports and was also prolific in Cretan copies (Coldstream 1996, 353, 406–08; contrast tomb 285 which was only rich in imports). It therefore appears that at least some of the Cretan consumers of the pottery in question perceived no sharp division between the analytical categories of import and imitation (this issue is further discussed in Antoniadis forthcomig).

Cretan copies of Cypriot Black Slip
Nicolas Coldstream (1979, 257–58) was the first to realize that a class of curious Cretan juglets of the Early Iron Age (Fig. 2), which were previously assumed to have a Minoan pedigree (Payne 1927–28, 251–52 nos 88–89), were in fact local copies of Cypriot Black Slip. These juglets — with the notable exception of a piece from Pantanassa mentioned below — are made in a coarse red, micaceous fabric.
Macroscopically, this fabric looks consistent and therefore raises the possibility of a single centre or area of production, a point to which I return below. The shape and size of the juglets is fairly consistent but far from standardized. The body is often decorated with vertical ribs or less commonly grooves and can also be plain (the plain juglets do not really resemble the Cypriot vases). Grooves also occur on Black Slip juglets of the Cypriot Early Iron Age, while ribs appear on their Bronze Age, Base Ring prototypes. These Bronze Age vases are taken to imitate the capsule of *papaver somniferum* and thus advertise their content, which has been confirmed to be liquid opium (Coldstream 1979, 258–59; 2003, 466; 2008, 477). It is unclear whether the Cypriot and Cretan pieces of the Early Iron Age also contained opium, but Antonis Vassilakis has preserved for residue analysis a Cretan juglet, which was recently excavated in a tomb in Kavrochori, west of Heraklion (Βασιλάκης forthcoming). The fabric and the decoration of the Cretan juglets in question are matched on a few vessels of other shapes. These include an amphoriskos from Dreros (Τσιποπούλου 1985, 40–41; 2005, 59 no. ΗΔ2, 358; van Effenterre 2009, 129 no. 21), the body fragment of a similar piece from the same site (van Effenterre 2009, 129, pl. II no. 3), as well as an unpublished bird vase from the Metaxas Collection. The bird-vase, along with a juglet of the class in question, is only known from an exhibition of a part of the collection in Athens in 2006 (acquisition nos 899 and 822 respectively). These two vases are of unknown context, but their state of preservation suggests they come from tombs, like all the other juglets and the amphoriskoi known to date.

The many juglets of this type found in the Knossos North Cemetery were originally dated to the second half of the 9th and the beginning of the 8th century (Coldstream 1996, 346–47). A few years later Coldstream (2000) revisited the date of these vases and concluded that they appear already in the early 10th century; this has recently been confirmed by a find from a tomb at Pantanassa in central-west Crete, which is confidently assigned to around 1000 BC (Τέγου 2001, 129, 143 no. 6. Karageorghis 2006, 81–82). Unfortunately, these developments have been overlooked by many archaeologists working on Crete, who persist in dating these juglets to the second half of the 9th and the beginning of the 8th century (Σταμπολίδης and Καρέτσου (eds) 1998, 160–62 nos 123–130; Stampolidis (ed.) 2003, 253 nos 111–113; Englezou 2004, 427; Τσιποπούλου 2005, 59 no. ΗΔ2, 121 no. Η3694, 358; Ρεθεμιωτάκης and Εγγλέζου 2010, 135; Boileau and Whitley 2010, 238, 241; Whitley and Boileau forthcoming). It is, therefore, essential to emphasize that this material has a date range which is much broader than originally assumed and extends from around 1000 to around 800 BC. There are few indications that this pottery was produced beyond ca. 800 BC. Well 12 in the Knossos Unexplored Mansion, which has provided material dating from around 600 BC
(Coldstream and Sackett 1978, 49–60), yielded the necks of two jugs, which are slightly larger than the earlier pieces (Fig. 3), but share with them two peculiar features: the coarse red, micaceous fabric and the incisions on the neck (these fragments are unpublished, as is much more pottery from well 12 made in the same fabric). Likewise, the cemetery of Dreros, at which the two amphoriskoi mentioned above were found, does not contain much that is earlier than the 8th century (Τσιποπούλου 1985, 41; Τσιποπούλου 2005, 55–56. But see van Effenterre 2009) and one of these amphoriskoi (the fragmentary example) was found in a tomb which dates to the first half of the 8th century (van Effenterre 2009, 83, tombe 21). This evidence suggests revising not only the upper, but also the lower limit for the production of this pottery.

Coldstream (2000) argued that the Cretan vases were produced in the workshop of an immigrant Cypriot potter working in East Crete. This interpretation has largely escaped attention but I have noted that both the involvement of a Cypriot potter and the localization of production in East Crete is questionable (Kotsonas 2008, 65; 2011a, 139–41; forthcoming, 242–4). Coldstream (2000, 467) identified the involvement of the potter in the replacement of ribs for grooves, which, he thought, was aimed at reviving a more accurate depiction of the poppy capsule to advertise the contents of the vase, which was supposedly opium. Nonetheless, the switch from one mode of decoration to the other is not clear-cut. A couple of vases with grooves come from early 10th century contexts at Knossos and Pantanassa (Brock 1957, 14, no. 92; Coldstream 2000, 468, fig. 2 tomb no. VI; Téyou 2001, 129, 143, no. 6, with grooves also occurring on a different juglet from the same tomb, no. 1), but a third example with grooves dates no earlier than the late 9th century (Brock 1957, 51, no. 509; Coldstream 2000, 468, fig. 2, tomb no. X). Ribs do occur on most 9th century juglets, but up to three examples with this sort of decoration may date as early as the 10th century (Coldstream 2000, 468, fig. 2). In short, there was no clear shift from grooves to ribs in the decoration of the juglets. Further complications arise from the fact that, according to the traditional chronology, Cypriot potters abandoned ribs in favour of grooves roughly half a century before the appearance of the earliest Cretan examples of the class (Coldstream 1979, 257–58; 2000, 468). Lastly, it remains possible that Cretan potters introduced ribs without the direct aid of a Cypriot colleague of theirs (a point also made in Coldstream 1979, 258).

The greatest challenge towards the identification of some of these Cretan vases as the work of a Cypriot potter comes from their technological characteristics, which do not match those found on the Cypriot material. Unlike their Cypriot Black Slip prototypes, which are fine ware pieces, all Cretan imitations — with the exception of the abovementioned early vase from Pantanassa — are produced in
a coarse fabric. The Bronze Age predecessors of the Cypriot Black Slip pieces were made in coarse ware, but they were also fired in reducing conditions (Coldstream 1979, 258; 2000, 464–6), unlike the Cretan vases. Moreover, the Cretan examples—excluding the Pantanassa piece—do not reproduce the black slip, which gave the Cypriot vases their name. In short, the argument for a Cypriot potter necessitates that this individual abandoned some of the most essential manufacturing techniques to which (s)he was accustomed, a possibility which is highly unlikely. Current ethnographic and archaeological literature on this subject (Dietler and Herbich 1998; Gosselain 2000; David and Kramer 2001, 145–57; Broodbank and Kyriazi 2007, 247–48. For Early Iron Age Crete in particular see: Hoffman 1997, 16–7; Kotsonas 2011a, 136–7) has shown that although potters do experiment and adjust their choices, they mostly do so with reference to the most visible part of their work, namely its style. However, technological choices, especially those which develop through long training or depend on motor habits, are not easily abandoned, particularly since they remain largely invisible to consumers.

This line of argument supports my conclusion that the Cretan vases are unlikely to have been produced by a Cypriot craftsman.

The inspiration for the Cretan copies of Cypriot Black Slip should, in my view, be sought in actual Cypriot imports. This mode could well explain the loose adherence of nearly all Cretan examples to their Cypriot prototypes. Admittedly, no Cypriot Black Slip import has hitherto been identified in Crete, but this may well be due to the hazards of excavation. An earlier, Cypriot Base Ring handmade vessel of roughly similar shape has been located in a 14th century context at Kommos (Rutter and Van de Moortel 2006, 528, 586, 657, no. 56e/10). By drawing attention to the find from Kommos I do not wish to suggest that the Cretan Early Iron Age pieces were inspired by Cypriot Base Ring; the two classes are clearly set apart by a few centuries and there are differences in technique and also in the form of the lip. What the Kommos piece does show, however, is that Cypriot coarse juglets with rib decoration were reaching Crete in the Late Bronze Age.

Localizing the production area(s) of the Cretan copies of Cypriot Black Slip is far from easy. Payne (1927–28, 251–52 nos 88–89) argued in favour of east Crete and Coldstream (2000, 466–67) reported that, according to P. Day, the fabric of these pieces does not exist in the area surrounding Knossos, but is matched in the coarse wares of Kavousi. I confirm that the fabric of these juglets shows a macroscopic resemblance with fabrics in Kavousi and also Azoria, but fabrics from the Mirabello area generally show a composition which is dissimilar (E. Nodarou personal communication). One project of chemical analysis did not lend support to the case for Kavousi (Τσιποπούλου 2005, 545–46) and another produced no concrete results on the subject (Liddy 1996, 473, 478–79, sample P131).
What is more, it has recently been suggested — on the basis of petrographic analysis — that the fabric of these vessels is unlikely to be Cretan and could well be Cycladic (Boileau and Whitley 2010, 233–34, 241; Whitley and Boileau forthcoming). The composition of the fabric is admittedly peculiar to Cretan pottery, but the individual components represented are not rare in the island’s geology (E. Nodarou personal communication). The case for an off-island provenance of the fabric is, however, hard to believe because the supposed Cycladic source has not been traced and no products made in this fabric are known from outside Crete. On the contrary, the juglets in question are widely found in central Crete (see below) and they even occur on sites which lie at some distance from the coast and are not renowned for their links with overseas (see below). The possibility that clay was brought to Crete (Coldstream 2001, 61; Boileau and Whitley 2010, 241; Whitley and Boileau forthcoming) is also hard to believe because it involves the convoluted scenario that some Cretans imported coarse clay from the Cyclades (or elsewhere) to produce copies of vases from Cyprus which were originally made in fine clay. Besides, the fabric in question is very well-represented in one of the very few Knossian Early Iron Age contexts where much coarse ware pottery has been kept, namely the Unexplored Mansion well 12 (Coldstream and Sackett 1978, 49–60).

It is reasonable to assume (but remains to be fully confirmed) that most of the vases in question were produced in one or more manufacturing centres in central Crete and the relevant clay beds have simply been missed by geological prospection which is far from satisfactory. I suspect that these clay beds lie in the vicinity of Lyktos (Kotsonas 2011a, 141; forthcoming, 243–44) because the fabric of the Late Classical and Hellenistic pottery from this site (Erickson 2002, 47–48 n. 21, 71 n. 69; Erickson 2010, 34–35) is macroscopically identical to the fabric of the Early Iron Age juglets. The argument which claims that the fabric of Lyktos and the Pediada does not match — at a macroscopic level — the fabric of the juglets in question (Boileau and Whitley 2010, 233; Whitley and Boileau forthcoming) is unsupported. I see a close correspondence between the two, at least at the macroscopic level; this can be confirmed by material stored in the Stratigraphic Museum of Knossos, which involves many of the juglets found in the Knossos North Cemetery, as well as a 5th century vase which has previously been identified as an import from Lyktos (Erickson 2010, 35, n. 59). The proposed identification of Lyktos as a major production centre of this pottery is further supported by the central position this site occupies in the distribution pattern of these juglets (Fig. 4), which have turned up in Kavousi, Dreros, Afrati, Rhytont, Kourtes, Prinis, Knossos (Coldstream 2000, 467; Σταμπολίδης and Καρέτσου (eds) 1998, 160–62, nos 123, 125–128, 130; Kotsonas forthcoming, 243–44), and recently in Eltyna (Englezou...
The case for Lyktos, however, remains insecure, given that the Early Iron Age pottery of the site is basically unknown. In any case, the production of this pottery was not entirely centralized, as suggested by the westernmost of the finds from Pantanassa (Tέγου 2001, 129, 143 no. 6), which is considerably different in fabric and style from all other examples known from Crete.

**Cretan copies of Cypriot Black-on-Red**

This body of material was probably Coldstream’s favourite (1979, 261–62; 1982, 268; 1984; 1986, 323–24; 1998, 256–59; 2000, 463–64; 2001, 40, 42; 2003, 272, 383, 402; 2006, 51; 2008, 250, 253, 256, 382). The material consists of lekythia and – to a lesser extent – aryballoi, oinochoai and alabastra made in fine fabric and displaying a polished surface which is otherwise very rare on Cretan pottery of the Early Iron Age (Fig. 5). My work suggests that, unlike the clay body and surface of the Cypriot originals, which is light red and red respectively (Munsell 2000, mostly 2.5YR 6/6 for the clay body and 10R 5/8 for the surface), the clay body and surface of the Cretan copies is light red, pink or reddish-yellow (mostly 2.5YR 6/6 to 7/6 or 5YR 7/4 to 7/6 or 10R 6/6 for the clay body and 7.5YR 7/6 to 7/4 or 5YR 7/4 to 6/4 for the surface). Only very rarely does the surface of the Cretan pots approximate — but, significantly, does not match — the deep red surface seen on Cypriot pieces (a case in point for this approximation is the surface of the Knossian lekythia mentioned in Coldstream 1996, 353, type Ci, which is red to light red, 2.5YR 6/6 to 5/6 or 6/8). The decoration of both Cypriot imports and Cretan imitations is basically limited to horizontal bands and concentric circles, with the two sets of patterns occasionally intersecting.

The similarity between import and imitation is, in this case, not confined to style, but also extends to aspects of the manufacturing technology (Coldstream 1979, 261–62; 1984, 132; Τουποτούλου 1985, 44; Coldstream 1996, 353; Kotsonas 2008, 67–68). Nonetheless, the distinction between the two bodies of material is not difficult through conventional study or the application of analytical techniques. Chemical analyses of examples from Knossos (Coldstream 1996, 353; Liddy 1996, 476) and East Crete (Τουποτούλου 1985, 44; Τουποτούλου 2005, 545) have confirmed local production, even if in distinct fabrics. Also, petrographic analysis has shown that in Sybrita (D’Agata and Boileau 2009, 194) and Eleutherna (Kotsonas 2008, 66–67; Nodarou 2008) Cretan copies of Cypriot Black-on-Red were made in a fabric which is extensively used by local potters. In Eleutherna, however, three more Cretan fabrics are represented among the relevant material which was found at the site and was sampled for analysis.
There is scope for distinguishing between Cypriot imports and Cretan imitations by non-analytical means as well. As already mentioned, the first Cretan copies of Cypriot Black-on-Red found in Crete were taken for Cypriot originals (Payne 1927–28, 256, nos 119–122). However, James Brock (1957) had no problem in distinguishing imports from imitations and Nicolas Coldstream (1984, 128–33; 1996, 353–54) established a set of criteria for this purpose on the basis of differences in fabric, technique and style. Coldstream noted that the Knossian vases are made in a fabric which is often harder than that seen on Cypriot examples. The Cretan pieces in general show a polished surface and, unlike their Cypriot counterparts, carry no slip. Also, the surface colour of the Cretan vases is lighter than that of the Cypriot vases. Furthermore, the Knossian lekythia of the 8th century stand on a flat base surrounded by a band, while the Cypriot examples made at the time normally have a disc foot without any band (Fig. 6). These criteria have proved to be quite solid and the doubts expressed briefly by A. Demetriou (1989, 17) are unsubstantiated. Two new criteria are proposed here to supplement those put forward by Coldstream with reference to the Cretan copies of Cypriot Black-on-Red juglets: a) The Cypriot pieces exhibit a slim band well above the neck ridge and between this feature and the rim; this band is, however, missing from the Cretan copies (Kotsonas 2008, 173). b) The Cretan copies are more thick-walled and hence considerably heavier than their Cypriot prototypes. This is clearly illustrated by the following comparison between a Cypriot and a Cretan piece found in Knossos (nos 292.97 and 218.41 respectively, discussed in Coldstream 1996, 353, 407). Although the dimensions of the two are basically identical (height: 11.3 cm; maximum diameter 7.1–7.2 cm), the former weighs 85 gr. and the latter 145 gr. Knossian vases can become finer through time, but they are still considerably heavier than the Cypriot types. It is indicative that a late 8th century example (Coldstream 1996, 353 no. 61.1), with dimensions comparable to those of the aforementioned pieces (height: 11.4 cm; maximum diameter 7.5 cm) weighs 121 gr.

Imports of Cypriot Black-on-Red are known to have reached Crete in the second half of the 9th century; before the end of that century the first local imitations also appeared. The 9th century date is flimsily documented in Knossos (Coldstream 1972, 91, no. 57; 1984, 131, 132; 1996, 353), but has recently been confirmed by finds from Eleutherna (Fig. 7; Kotsonas 2008, 65–66, 284–87). Imports and imitations persisted into the 7th century, with imports diminishing after the beginning of that century and local imitations surviving to its end (Kotsonas 2008, 65–66, 284–87). The end of the production of the ware in the late 7th century ties in with the demise of the production of Cretan pottery in general (Boardman 1979, 268; Kotsonas 2008, 334) and requires no special explanation.
The shape repertoire of the Cypriot Black-on-Red imports in Crete basically includes trefoil-lipped jugs and juglets; other shapes are extremely rare (Kotsonas 2008, 284–87). Cretan imitations include a much wider repertoire of both local and Cypriot shapes: small and large lekythoi, aryballoi, oinochoai and alabastra (Coldstream 1984; Τσιποπούλου 1985; Coldstream 1996; Σταμπολίδης and Καρέτσου (eds) 1998, 168–80; Kotsonas 2008). Both imports and imitations are mostly—although not exclusively—known from tombs. The repertoire of closed, mostly slow-pouring vessels has generated a general consensus in considering that it was the content of these vases, presumably perfumed oil, which made them so popular in Crete and beyond (Schreiber 2003, 56–81). This widespread assumption is very reasonable but has never been tested. A few years ago several samples from the cemetery of Eleutherna were submitted for residue analysis at the INSTAP Study Center, but results remain unpublished.

The spatial and temporal distribution of imports and imitations of Cypriot Black-on-Red in Crete can be divided into two broad phases, which are naturally not separated by any sharp line (Kotsonas 2008, 67–69; forthcoming, 244–45). This division is possible thanks to our good understanding of the chronology of the material (established in Coldstream 1984; 1996). In the first phase, which covers the end of the 9th and the early 8th century, the production and circulation of the ware was limited; it is currently documented only in Knossos and Eleutherna. Archaeological science confirms local production in Knossos (Coldstream 1996, 353; Liddy 1996, 476), but in Eleutherna the early pieces are made in fabrics which are different from those used extensively by local potters; these fabrics could be imported from elsewhere in Crete (Kotsonas 2008, 66–67; Nodarou 2008). The only Black-on-Red pottery shape manufactured on the island during this period was the lekythion/juglet. This shape, however, had an enormous impact on local ceramics and nearly all lekythia produced in Crete after the beginning of the 8th century and throughout the 7th copy Cypriot Black-on-Red prototypes. The shape was closely tied with the foreign ware for over one century and a half.

The second phase in the production of the ware in Crete commences at around the mid-8th century and lasts until the late 7th. In this phase the repertoire of the Cretan copies of Cypriot Black-on-Red is not limited to lekythia, but also includes oinochoai, aryballoi and alabastra. Relying on an assessment of the distribution of the ware throughout Crete that I have presented elsewhere (Kotsonas 2008, 164–65, 170–74, 181–83), I assume that the number of production sites increased considerably. This is confirmed by archaeological science, which documents local production of the ware in Eleutherna (Kotsonas 2008, 66–67; Nodarou 2008), Sybrita (D’Agata and Boileau 2009, 194) and Kavousi (Τσιποπούλου 2005, 545) during this period. The distribution of the ware also exploded. Cretan copies of
Cypriot Black-on-Red vases are known from most Cretan sites ranging from Sybrita in the west to Sitia in the east. The paucity of finds in west Crete is perhaps not accidental, given that other Cypriot influence is identifiable on some pottery from this area (Tzedakis 1979). The popularity of the ware in this second phase was certainly facilitated by the importation of Cypriot Black-on-Red pieces to more sites such as Kavousi (Τσιποπούλου 2005, 96, H718), but was, in my view, mostly fuelled by the circulation of Cretan imitations within the island (examples are given in Kotsonas 2008, 69; forthcoming, 245). After all, this is apparently the heyday for the circulation of Cretan pottery within Crete (Kotsonas 2008, 236–56). The mobility of potters/painters is certainly an alternative interpretation, which cannot, however, presently be substantiated.

It remains difficult to comprehend the mode(s) for the original introduction of the ware. Coldstream proposed that copies of Cypriot Black-on-Red were made in Knossos by local potters to order for the bottling of unguents produced by a small factory manned by immigrant Phoenicians (Coldstream 1979, 261–62; 1982, 268; 1984, 137; 1986, 323–24; 1998, 256–59; 2000, 463–64; 2003, 383; 2006, 50–51). Coldstream’s interpretation of the Cypriot Black-on-Red ware on Crete has been widely accepted in current literature, including studies of Cypriot pottery abroad (Karageorghis 2006, 82) and studies of Crete’s relations with the Near East (Morris 1992, 157), as well as overviews of the Mediterranean economy in this period (Sherratt and Sherratt 1993, 365). However, scepticism over this interpretation has grown in recent years (Jones 1993; Hoffman 1997, 176–85; Bourogiannis 2000, 17–18; Jones 2000, 121; Schreiber 2003, 293–306; Stampolidis and Kotsonas 2006, 343; Kotsonas 2008, 67; Bourogiannis 2009, 121–22; Wallace 2010, 211; Kotsonas 2011a, 141–44; Kotsonas forthcoming, 244–46). Criticism is centred on both the economic mechanism envisaged by Coldstream and his assertion that Phoenicians were supervising the Knossian production. Further evidence which does not fully comply with the unguent factory interpretation lies in the variety that has recently been identified in the capacity of these vases (Τσατσάκη 2004, 505–07, 562; as noted in Kotsonas 2008, 67, n. 461; Kotsonas forthcoming, 245). No less problematic is an alternative scenario, which suggests that the unguents contained in the pots were not produced in Knossos but were imported by Phoenicians in bulk and bottled there (Sherratt and Sherratt 1993, 365; Hoffman 1997, 182–84; both based on Frankenstein 1979, 276). The problem here lies in the apparent neglect of the assumed, very sophisticated enterprise for exporting (Schreiber 2003, 302–03). Only a few Cretan copies of Cypriot Black-on-Red — which are not necessarily Knossian (contra Coldstream 1998, 257) — travelled overseas and these basically went no further than the Cyclades (Coldstream 2008, 382, n. 1–3). None of these vessels can be associated with the Phoenicians by con-
text, with the possible exception of a single piece found at Pontecagnanco in Campania (for the identification of this vase as Cretan see Kotsonas 2008, 68; forthcoming, 245–46).

Both critics and supporters of Coldstream’s interpretation have missed an important adjustment he made on a central part of his argument. The scholar argued that the Cretan copies of Cypriot Black-on-Red are more likely ‘to have been made by Cretan potters than by immigrants’ (Coldstream 1984, 137) on the basis of the ‘lumpish and ungainly look’ of the lekythia known from early excavations particularly in the cemetery of Fortetsa (Coldstream 1979, 261–62). Later, however, after the excavations of the Knossos North Cemetery, which brought to light ‘almost exact local copies, closer to the originals than any of the Creto-Cypriot class in F [Fortetsa]’ (Coldstream 1996, 419; cf. Coldstream 1984, 137), Coldstream associated those closer copies — and not their unaccomplished counterparts — with the unguent factory (Coldstream 1984, 137). This adjustment of the original argument undermines to an extent the assumption for the production of this pottery by Cretan potters and opens the possibility for the involvement of Cypriot craftsmen; this possibility is explored in the paragraphs that follow.

Coldstream (1969) assumed that Phoenician potters/painters were involved in the production of Black-on-Red in Rhodes, but not in Cos or Crete (contra Bourogiannis 2000, 19–20 for Cos). In the case of Crete, he briefly explored the possibility of Cypriot potters/painters producing some of the local close copies of Cypriot lekythia, but rejected it (Coldstream 1984, 137). In the case of a Black-on-Red oinochoe and a Bichrome lekythos, however, he noted: ‘They must surely have been made by immigrant potters trained in the Cypro-Levantine tradition’ (Coldstream 1984, 137; for these vases see respectively Coldstream 1984, 127–28 nos 15 and 10; 1996, 347 no. 60.22, 353 no. 283.24). It is unfortunate that the scholar never returned to this point, which has anyway been overlooked by critics (a reference in passing is made in Hoffman 1997, 178, n. 98). As I have previously noted (Kotsonas 2011a, 142), the oinochoe (which is fragmentary) is not only the closest and earliest, but also the most sophisticated Cretan copy of the Cypriot Black-on-Red trefoil-lipped jug. Having examined the vase myself (Fig. 8), I confirm that it is very thin-walled and much lighter than other Knossian oinochoai (but comparable to Cypriot trefoil-lipped jugs like the equally fragmentary 175.52, for which see Coldstream 1996, 406); only the difference in fabric and the lack of any slip set this vase apart from Cypriot originals. Coldstream’s attribution of the oinochoe to a Cypriot potter/painter finds further support in the complexities involved in the rendering of its decorative scheme. This scheme comprises diverse groups of concentric circles of varying number, which were in all probability rendered by more than one pivoted multiple brush. The rendering of such a complex
decorative scheme on the curving body of an oinochoe could only have been achieved by an experienced painter; yet no vase with equally complex circle decoration is represented in the extensive ceramic record of Early Iron Age Knossos. In fact, the use of different multiple brushes for the decoration of a single vase remains rare on Cretan (Kotsonas 2008, 57) and other Greek ceramics (Papadopoulos, Vedder and Schreiber 1998, 545, n. 67) of the same period, but is not uncommon on Cypriot pottery of similar date. Likewise, the Bichrome lekythos mentioned above not only involves the copying of a foreign style, but also of a foreign decorative technique otherwise not documented in Crete. On these grounds, I conclude that Coldstream’s attribution of the two pieces in question to Cypriot hands is reliable (see also Kotsonas 2008, 69; 2011a, 141–44). The same hands could have contributed to the increase in the popularity of the Black-on-Red ware among the Cretans.

The identification of work by at least one immigrant Cypriot potter/painter residing in Knossos for a period of unknown length begs the question whether this individual also produced some of the Knossian close copies of the Cypriot Black-on-Red lekythia. I have elsewhere considered this scenario possible (Kotsonas 2011a, 144), but I am far less confident after studying much more material. There are several reasons for doubt. Firstly, the neck of many Cretan pieces is broader than that of the Cypriot originals. Secondly, unlike the Cypriot vases, the Cretan copies carry no slip; they show a polished surface instead (Coldstream 1984, 132; 1996, 353). Thirdly, the surface colour of the close copies never really matches that of the originals (contra Coldstream 1984, 132; 1996, 353, with reference to vases nos. 61.1 and 175.60. Only the light red (2.5YR 6/6) surface colour of the former vase comes close to — but still does not match — the surface colour of the Cypriot pieces). Fourthly, unlike most of the Knossian and other Cretan pieces which show a line or band surrounding the base, the Cypriot vases have this part of the body undecorated (Coldstream 1984, 132; 1996, 353). Some of these discrepancies, like the surface colour and the application of the slip, may depend on the properties of the raw materials available in Knossos (note that the oinochoe attributed to a Cypriot potter/painter working in Knossos carries no slip as well). Overall, however, there are too many differences in detail between the Cypriot juglets and their Knossian copies (whether close or not), to allow for the reliable attribution of any of the copies to an immigrant potter/painter. This conclusion obviously applies to the material that is currently known and could be revised in the light of future discoveries, especially of Knossian copies of Cypriot Black-on-Red dating from the late 9th century; these early copies are presently very poorly documented.
Conclusions

The study of Cypriot pottery in Crete clearly engages with many of the complexities involved in drawing socio-economic inferences on the basis of the dissemination of artefact style. It is therefore hardly surprising that this subject attracted the attention of Nicolas Coldstream on many occasions. This review has reaffirmed the value of Coldstream’s meticulous work on the relevant material, and has also opened new perspectives and introduced fresh interpretations in the discourse over Cypriot pottery in Crete.

One of the main arguments put forward in this paper regards the abandonment of the term ‘Creto-Cypriot’, which is used for pottery of Cypriot style produced in Crete. Although probably inspired by the comparable term ‘Cypro-Phoenician’, ‘Creto-Cypriot’ does not share the problems of the former term, hence its popularity among Cretan archaeologists. It remains, however, an oddity to non-experts and is not easily reconciled with existing terminology for the copies of Cypriot pottery produced elsewhere in the Aegean and the Eastern Mediterranean. I have therefore expressed a preference for more descriptive designations.

The identification of Cypriot imports in Crete and of Cretan copies of the Cypriot Black Slip and Black-on-Red wares is part of the enduring legacy of Nicolas Coldstream. Building on this legacy, I have elsewhere published relevant pottery from Eleutherna (Kotsonas 2008, 284–87) and have here drawn attention to the identification of the first Cretan Early Iron Age vase in Cyprus (Flourentzos 2004, 206, 213 no. 124 (1a+1b)). Moreover, I have proposed a few new criteria for distinguishing between Cypriot imports and Cretan imitations, while noting at the same time that this distinction may not have been fixed in the eyes of some Cretans of the Early Iron Age.

My analysis also revealed notable patterns in the spatial and temporal distribution of the Cretan copies of Cypriot pottery. On this basis, I argued for a remarkable intensification in the production and distribution of this pottery from around the mid-8th century. Modes of production and distribution were further discussed with reference to existing arguments for the involvement of Cypriots and/or Phoenicians in the production of Cretan copies of Cypriot Black-on-Red and Black Slip. I emphasized the limitations which are embedded in drawing complex inferences, such as immigration, on the basis of ceramic style alone, and at the same time hinted at the problem of fully depending on archaeological science. I personally opt for an integrated approach towards the study of material culture and therefore believe that convincing identification of the work of immigrant potters should rely on a combination of traditional stylistic analysis with applications of archaeological science, the contribution of ethnoarchaeology and the study of historical and archaeological context (cf. Kotsonas 2011a). Pursuing this line of
inquiry, I have here argued against any notable involvement of Cypriot potters and Phoenician traders in the production of the Cretan copies of Black Slip and Black-on-Red wares. Generalizing from the present case studies, I conclude that an integrated approach is essential for modern research on material culture in general and ceramic analysis in particular, and can contribute immensely to the archaeology of interaction in the Mediterranean of the 1st millennium BC.
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FIG. 1. Cretan exports to Cyprus and coastal Syria/Turkey; neckless jar with lid from Amathus (after Flourentzos 2004, 227, pl. XI.1a+1b with permission from the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus); lid fragment from Al Mina (after Schaus and Benson 1995, pl. 1.4 with permission from The University Museum, Philadelphia); aryballos from Ras el Bassit (after Courbin 1986, 194, fig. 19).

FIG. 2. Cretan copies of Cypriot Black Slip (Knossos North Cemetery tomb Q, nos 27–28 and 31; reproduced with permission from the British School at Athens).

FIG. 3. Cretan copy of Cypriot Black Slip (Knossos North Cemetery tomb 287, no. 30) together with three unpublished neck fragments from two similar jugs from Unexplored Mansion well 12 (photo by the author; published with permission from the British School at Athens and Hugh Sackett).

FIG. 4. Map of Crete showing the distribution of Cretan copies of Cypriot Black Slip (drawn by the author).

FIG. 5. Family photo of Cypriot Black-on-Red and Cretan relatives (Knossos North Cemetery tombs 292 and 218 nos 292.111, 292.97. Cypriot, 218.88, 292.35, 218.41, 218.6, 292.51. Cypriot, 218.80) (photo by the author; published with permission from the British School at Athens).

FIG. 6. Cypriot Black-on-Red juglets imported to Knossos (Knossos North Cemetery tomb 285 nos 45 and 49) and local close imitations (Knossos North Cemetery tomb 218 nos 6 and 41) (reproduced with permission from the British School at Athens).


FIG. 8. Oinochoe of Black-on-Red style manufactured in Knossos (Knossos North Cemetery tomb 60 no. 22). (Photo by the author; published with permission from the British School at Athens).
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