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ABSTRACT

Making Sense of Figurines in Bronze Age Cyprus:
A Comprehensive Analysis of Cypriot Ceramic Figurative Material from
EC I – LC IIIA (c.2300BC – c.1100BC)

Daisy-Kate Knox, University of Manchester

Prehistoric figurines have long proven evocative objects, and those of Bronze Age Cyprus have captivated researchers for more than a century. Much of this attention, however, has focussed on appraising the aesthetic characteristics, particularly of human figurines and using them to ascribe names to Bronze Age Cypriot deities. Most studies ignore animal figurines and less visually appealing, fragmentary or schematic examples; socially-situated analyses have also been particularly rare. However, the potential of these enigmatic objects to illuminate the society which made and used them has not gone unnoticed by archaeologists and calls have been made for a comprehensive, contextual investigation. This thesis undertook to provide such a study, aiming not only to interpret the function and significance of the figurines themselves but to consider the implications of these interpretations for the nature of the Bronze Age Cypriot society.

The project has collated a detailed database of all 1790 known figurines from this period, including representations of humans, animals and inanimate objects, depicted as independent figurines, figurative vessels and vessels decorated with miniature figurines. These are predominantly ceramic but those few stone and metal variations of established ceramic categories have also been included. This varied material has been organised into a transparent, comprehensive typology and subjected to rigorous iconographical and contextual analyses. The interpretations to which these analyses have led have been informed by a diverse theoretical basis drawn from art-history, philosophy and archaeology, and situated on a firm understanding of the socio-cultural context of Bronze Age Cyprus. Investigations into the symbolic connotations and practical use of each figurine type have proven fruitful. Significant new findings include the hitherto unrecognised importance of textile imagery in the Early-Middle Bronze Age, evidence for the ritual breakage of Plank Figurines and a complex interplay of homogenisation and variation within the Late Cypriot figurine record.

Finally, diachronic transformations in the forms, meanings and usage of figurines have been carefully evaluated to consider their implications for the changing socio-cultural landscape of Cyprus throughout the Bronze Age. Alterations in the criteria chosen to display group identity, a combination of continuity and change in ritual practices and sustained, close contacts with a wide sphere of external communities are just some of the trends and issues which figurines have been able to elucidate. Principally, this study demonstrates that nuanced, systematic investigation of this rich body of figurines holds significant potential to inform interpretations not only of the figurines themselves but also of their dynamic and complex Bronze Age Cypriot context.
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Map 1: Bronze Age sites on Cyprus at which figurines have been found.
MAKING SENSE OF FIGURINES IN BRONZE AGE CYPRUS

A Comprehensive Analysis of Cypriot Ceramic Figurative Material from EC I – LC IIIA (c.2300BC – c.1100BC)

INTRODUCTION

The figurines of Bronze Age Cyprus first came to the attention of the fledgling archaeological community during the historical revival of the late nineteenth century. Figurines uncovered during this prolific period constitute a significant proportion of those available for study today and the actions and opinions of early archaeological explorers have influenced the intellectual fate of these objects to an extraordinary degree. Victorian preoccupations with human figurines over animals, females over males, ‘fine’ examples over fragments are the shadows behind those figurines singled out for attention in the centuries which followed. Likewise, suggestions of deities or toys devised by these pioneers to explain the peculiar figurines they had found became the unquestioned assumptions of later interpretations.

Scholars have long recognised the capacity of figurines to provide evidence for investigations into past societies, from the iteration of and belief systems behind ritual practices to the expressions and implications of prehistoric gender identities. Yet these potentially lucrative studies are fundamentally weakened by their dependence upon these deep-rooted assumptions and a general failure to comprehend the entire corpus of figurine material. This problem has not gone unnoticed. In 1976, Catling highlighted the fact that “a detailed study of terracottas in Cyprus throughout the Bronze Age has yet to be made”.¹ More than thirty years later, Knapp repeated his concerns, calling for “focussed, contextual and quantitative research” into the figurines of Bronze Age Cyprus.² This study accepts that challenge.

Its first aim is to collect, organise and enumerate all known examples of the broad spectrum of ceramic figurine material from Bronze Age Cyprus. This currently comprises 1790 objects including human and animal figurines and figurative vessels, models of inanimate objects and vessels decorated with miniature figurines. The information collected, which is contained in a Database (included on disc) and displayed in detailed typological analysis presented in Appendix I, forms the

¹ Catling 1976:73
² Knapp 2008:184; similar concerns were voiced by Orphanides (1991:40).
comprehensive foundation on which this study is based. In addition, it is intended to be a useful resource for all scholars who wish to conduct future research using Bronze Age Cypriot figurines.

Thorough investigation of these figurines, however, could never end with the establishment of this essential corpus of material, thus the bulk of this study concerns interpretation. The second and most important aim, therefore, is to investigate diachronic change in the styles, functions and significance of Bronze Age Cypriot figurines and how these might relate to the socio-cultural climate of the island as it developed through this dynamic period of pre- and proto-history. In order to achieve this, a deliberately broad chronological range has been chosen, including material from the Philia facies at the beginning of the Bronze Age (c.2300 BC) to the transition with the Iron Age at the end of LC IIIA (c.1100 BC).3 Using a straightforward methodological system, specifically designed to be rigorous and thorough, incorporating systematic analysis of stylistic, physical and contextual aspects, this study will first chart the development of figurines through time. Interpretation will be offered for each figurine type, and overall trends in the sort of figurines in circulation, the manner and situations in which they were made and used will be investigated. Finally, these patterns and interpretations will be used to investigate diachronic change in three crucial areas of Bronze Age Cypriot society – (1) ritual practices, (2) economic and cultural relationships between different areas of the island and external polities and (3) socio-political organisation and the negotiation of group identities.

Bronze Age Cypriot figurines have so far failed to benefit from the developments in method and theory being made in the twin disciplines of archaeology and anthropology. Figurine studies which make successful use of these new ideas have focussed almost entirely on the inception of figurine use during very early prehistory. The continuing development of these objects in contexts already well-acquainted with the concept of figurines has proven of little interest. This study will be underpinned by a thorough understanding of these developments and seek to put into practice the most relevant aspects of modern aestheticism, contextualism and materiality to provide a holistic, supportable and socially-situated investigation of figurine use in Bronze Age Cyprus. It is through this combination of a comprehensive dataset, rigorous analyses and theoretical awareness that this study aims to ‘make sense’ of Bronze Age Cypriot figurines.

Part I (The Study of Figurines) provides a thorough evaluation of the theoretical and methodological foundation on which this study will stand, assessing key trends in figurine study from around the world, existing scholarship concerning Bronze Age Cypriot figurines and associated discourses. Part II (Methodology) details the methodological framework which will be

---

3 See Part II.B.4 for discussion of issues concerning the relative and absolute chronology of the Cypriot Bronze Age.
used in this study. It also outlines the problems inherent in the study of this material and the contextual background of Bronze Age Cyprus in which it was created. Part III (Variations & Diachronic Change) presents the findings of the analysis of all figurine types chronologically and Part IV (The Socio-Cultural Landscape of Bronze Age Cyprus) presents a summary of this interpretation and its implications for our understanding of ritual practices, external relations and social organisation of Bronze Age Cypriot society.
Figurines are uniquely evocative objects. They elicit emotional responses from those who see them in a way quite unlike almost any other class of artefact. In the foreword to her study of Jaina Figurines from South America, for example, Miller recounts the extreme reaction of the Swedish archaeologist Erik Sjöqvist upon first encountering these objects, recalling how these “graceful and elegant little works” had “moved him”.\(^4\) Likewise, the story with which Bailey opens his *Prehistoric Figurines* recounts the disproportionate excitement caused amongst his excavators by the discovery of a “small, badly preserved fragment of a clay female figurine”.\(^5\) Indeed it was the curious, esoteric appeal of Bronze Age figurines which initially drew my attention to Cypriot archaeology and they have maintained their fascination ever since. Making sense of these figurines, however, invokes an extraordinary array of complex theoretical and methodological issues.

Every group of figurines, of course, is manifestly different. Each encompasses its own range of research problems, specific to factors such as the size of sample to be investigated, the scope of the project or what supporting evidence may be available. Yet there is also an ostensible coherence not only in the way in which figurines have been studied and interpreted across the world but also between the form and composition of the figurine corpora. The vast majority are apparently composed mainly of female figurines, with lesser proportions of animals, mostly bulls, and very small numbers of male figures. Proponents of Heidegger’s theories on universality would argue that these similarities are a natural result of a common underlying human nature which drives diverse peoples to create comparable objects.\(^6\) A more pragmatic explanation, on the other hand, is the concept that whatever area or time frame scholars examine, they share, to some extent, a common interpretative heritage. They identify similar traits within their material and interpret these in similar ways because that is what their culture and education has taught them to do. Nevertheless, many of the methodological and interpretive trends and frustrations involved in interpreting figurines remain largely constant. Existing scholarship on Bronze Age Cypriot

\(^4\) Miller 1975:7

\(^5\) Bailey 2005:1

\(^6\) Heidegger 1971:15-86; See Lesure 2011:10-25 for a comprehensive discussion of the impact of universalism on figurine studies.
Figurines represent in microcosm the wider world of pre- and proto-historic figurine studies from almost every geographical area.

This section, therefore, will not only examine existing research which has been conducted on the figurines of Bronze Age Cyprus but also draw examples from the vast body of literature on pre- and protohistoric figurines from across the world. It will consider the impact of wider developments from disciplines such as archaeology, art history and anthropology including the crucial discourses of aestheticism, the pervasive ‘Goddess Theory’, symbolism theory, the utilisation of science and statistics in the study of material culture and multifaceted contextualisation. By scrutinizing the theoretical and methodological heritage of the present study in this way, it will be possible to identify the problems and possibilities inherent in the study of figurines which will ultimately inform the methodology to be used in the present study.
Since the earliest discovery of pre- and proto-historic figurines across the world, scholars have appraised them as ‘art’ and most major studies of Bronze Age Cypriot figurines include that telling word in their titles.\textsuperscript{7} Figurines have been assessed according to such factors as how faithfully they represent their supposed subject or the apparent quality of their craftsmanship; they have been considered ‘beautiful’ or ‘ugly’, ‘primitive’ or ‘adept’ and evaluated on the style and ability of their ‘artists’. This phenomenon is not confined to the early years of figurine studies but remains prevalent even in relatively modern scholarship. Canby, for instance, speaks of the “awesome majesty and power” of Bronze Age Hittite stag figurines;\textsuperscript{8} Chowdhry ponders on an anonymous coroplast in third century BC Bangladesh who “satisfied their artistic urge” by creating figurines;\textsuperscript{9} and Getz-Preziosi marvels at how the style and skill of the Cycladic sculptor she has “rescued from total anonymity” and named the “Goulandris Master” developed over his “career”.\textsuperscript{10} In Cyprus, descriptions of Bronze Age figurines repeat such phrases as “rudely executed” or “crudely modelled” with frequency from Cesnola to V. Karageorghis and beyond.\textsuperscript{11} There can be no doubt that figurines have been and are still considered ‘works of art’ and that this categorisation has had indelible consequences for the way in which scholars have chosen to approach them.

\section{Aestheticism & Bias}

This trend has put these ancient objects at the mercy of the vicissitudes of modern fashion. For although figurines have always been considered ‘art’ in some sense, they have certainly not always been regarded as ‘good’. When the first significant examples of figurines from Europe, for instance, began to appear around the eighteenth century, they simply could not compete with the wonders which the Classical world had to offer. Even when they found their way into museum collections, the catalogues invariably described them as curiosities, dismissed as “grotesque”, “primitive” and even “repulsively ugly”.\textsuperscript{12} The “tyranny of the Renaissance”, whose strict admiration for Classical naturalism shaped our definition of ‘beauty’ for several centuries, simply

\textsuperscript{7} e.g. The Art of Ancient Cyprus (Morris 1985) or The Coroplastic Art of Ancient Cyprus (Karageorghis 1991a; 1993)
\textsuperscript{8} Canby 1989:111
\textsuperscript{9} Chowdhry 2000:2
\textsuperscript{10} Getz-Preziosi 1984:45-8; 1987:80-2
\textsuperscript{11} E.g. Cesnola 1877:93; Myres 1914:331; Karageorghis 1991a:11
\textsuperscript{12} E.g. on Cycladic figurines, Pryce 1928:1; Wolters 1891:47 (German “abstoßend häßliche”)
would not allow early scholars to understand such bizarre objects. Indeed much of the aesthetic-driven research conducted on the figurines of Bronze Age Cyprus assumes an underlying evolutionary progression in form and technique towards this Classical ideal. J. Karageorghis, for example, describes the Plank Figurine type as a “humble figurine, maladroit et grossière” which continues to develop through the centuries to become, in the Late Cypriot period, “la figure de fécondité par excellence”. There is little evidence, however, that this assumed drive towards naturalism held any relevance in a Bronze Age Cypriot context, particularly as the Early-Middle Cypriot period saw the concurrent production of both flat, Plank Figurines and more ‘naturalistic’ humans modelled in the round.

As the artistic revolution of the early twentieth century took hold and aesthetic tastes altered, people began to look to ‘primitive’ objects, such as prehistoric figurines and non-Western sculpture for new ideas. This sea-change in the world of modern art had a profound effect on the fortunes of those objects. Consider, for instance, the case of Cycladic figurines (e.g. Fig 1). The various examples scattered around the famous museums of Europe provided inspiration for young sculptors like Brancusi and Moore who were transfixed by the clean, simplistic shapes, the stylish minimalism of these ancient revolutionaries. As these modern sculptures became more popular, so too did their ancient counterparts. Although other figurine types did not experience this sudden popularity to such an extreme degree as those of the Cyclades, nonetheless, this transformation in modern artistic taste brought with it a huge increase in esteem across the board. Suddenly it became acceptable to include ancient figurines in the canon of ‘great works’, no longer to be abhorred, but to be desired.

This desire, however, had serious practical consequences for the fate of these objects, since the more admired a style became, the more valuable its examples and the more incentive there was to loot archaeological sites in search of lucrative spoils. Esteem for Bronze Age Cypriot figurines, which will be examined in full in Part IIB.5, has had a negative effect on the material currently available for study. In particular, many of the earlier figurines have been separated from the details of their original provenance. They may be attributed to a site or general locality, but mention of exact findspots or archaeological contexts is notably rare. Even the validity of the site attribution itself can sometimes be called into question. Yet the effect on this dataset rather pales in comparison to the devastating consequences of connoisseurship on the far more well-known

---

13 Renfrew 2003:58-64
14 J. Karageorghis 1977:69
15 Goodman 1976:34-9; see Merrillees 1980:182 for a thorough criticism of the use of this concept in the Bronze Age. Even Karageorghis (1991:50) explicitly eschews the idea that Plank Figurines were a “primitive form of naturalism”, considering them instead to have been replicas of wooden anthropomorphs.
16 For a full account of the modern history of Cycladic figurines see Gill & Chippendale 1993:604-8.
17 For a detailed account of the influence of Cycladic figurines on Modernist sculpture see Sachini 1984.
figurines from areas such as Egypt and the Cyclades.\textsuperscript{18} In their extensive study on the latter case, Gill and Chippendale ably demonstrated how those figurines have become trapped between the opposing concerns of connoisseurs and modern archaeologists.\textsuperscript{19} As the desires of the former have been allowed to prevail, ancient sites have been looted and destroyed, the figurines stripped of the context which gave them meaning and that context deprived of material which is essential for it to be understood.

The acceptance of pre- and proto-historic figurines into the mainstream canon of ‘great works of art’ also brought with it a different kind of decontextualisation. The most important characteristic of these objects was not considered to be their function and significance within the culture that made them, rather it was their place within a grand historical narrative of ‘man as image-maker’.\textsuperscript{20} Their aesthetic qualities and how these had influenced later artists became of paramount importance and contextual study was supplanted by “subjective fascination with the artefact per se”.\textsuperscript{21} The way in which figurines are displayed in galleries and on the printed page has been heavily influenced by this paradigm. The objects which are to be displayed or illustrated are frequently chosen solely on their “current exhibitionary value”, how closely they match our aesthetic ideal and how well they illustrate the development of style through history.\textsuperscript{22} Thus complete figurines are favoured, broken figurines are seamlessly mended and fragments ignored completely. V.Karageorghis’ mammoth “Coroplastic Art” volumes, for example, the most extensive catalogue of Bronze Age Cypriot figurines to date, deal almost exclusively with complete or near complete examples. By selecting figurines in this way, their visual appeal is privileged over any functional characteristics they may have had and vital information about the way in which figurines were actually used is overlooked. Presented in this sterile, contrived manner they are, rather inevitably, divorced from the context that had originally given them meaning.

The degree of importance that has been placed on this kind of aesthetic appeal is demonstrated again by the much-beleaguered Cycladic figurines. By the 1960s, archaeologists had begun to realise that their apparent plain white appearance (Fig 1) was a false impression. Traces of long-worn paint, known as ‘ghosts’, almost entirely invisible to the naked eye, revealed that their original form had been highly decorated (Fig 2).\textsuperscript{23} Nevertheless, even today many museums display their plain white Cycladic

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.3\textwidth]{fig1.png}
\caption{Cycladic Figurine (Goulandris Collection No. 252)}
\end{figure}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{18} Gill & Chippendale 1993  \\
\textsuperscript{19} Gill & Chippendale 1993:601-2  \\
\textsuperscript{20} Preziosi 1998:14  \\
\textsuperscript{21} Bartel 1981:73  \\
\textsuperscript{22} Preziosi 1998:14  \\
\textsuperscript{23} Hendrix 2003
\end{flushright}
figurines, standing upright on small, angled feet that would never have supported them, with little or no reference to their hidden, painted past. The emphasis which has been placed on modern aesthetic values has left us with a manufactured image of ancient figurines, far removed from their original significance. Fascinating possibilities about how the figurine may have been handled, touched or otherwise engaged with on a physical as well as visual plane are unnoticed when a figurine becomes a work of art to be admired from a distance. The accession of these objects into the world of art proper was dependant on their ability to empathise with the zeitgeist of an era which was not their own. Consequently, their ancient reality became less important than an illusion which would correspond more closely to modern artistic ideals.

This particular strand of art historical discourse has had a largely detrimental effect on the development of the study of ancient figurines. By allowing the prevailing aesthetic tastes of the modern era to influence the way in which the ancient objects are interpreted, it has not only encouraged a particular kind of detached, aesthetic-driven scholarship, but also led to preconceptions on the function of such figurines and even their very form. Placing little emphasis on the social and historical context from which the figurines came, it has been commonly assumed that a piece of art can, and perhaps should, be appraised on its own merits alone. Although some scholars believe that art historical discourses have a crucial role to play in elucidating context, this type of acontextual study is the source of much of the criticism levelled by archaeologists on the use of art history for the study of ancient objects.24

For many, the visual aspect of these objects has remained inevitably paramount. One need only glance at the front covers of many historical and archaeological books to see that figurines can provide a much needed illustration for otherwise remote, faceless prehistoric societies. Fig 3 shows several such texts for Bronze Age Cyprus, most of which barely mention the figurine

24 e.g. Kelly 2003:xi, 200-4, contra e.g. Hodder 1986:120
shown. In some sense, this practice is understandable. Those who study the past do so in order to learn about ancient people – the way they lived and died, what they built and what they believed. In a way, they wish to know those people and what better way to do this than to see them? Yet this has had several important implications for the nature of figurine study. Firstly, humans appear to be inherently fascinated by their own image, as the considerable interest in activities such as facial reconstruction of ancient skulls and artefacts such as burial masks and mummies exemplifies. This may account, at least in part, for the markedly disproportionate interest in anthropomorphic figurines when compared to their often-overlooked, zoomorphic counterparts.

In Bronze Age Cypriot figurine scholarship, focussed assessments of zoomorphic figurines are few and far between. Little has been written to date on those of the Early-Middle Cypriot period and for the Late Cypriot, a short Prolegomena by Catling, advising future study of bull figurines, and a detailed consideration of Bull-shaped vessels by Nys stand alone. Similarly, Early-Middle Cypriot models of inanimate objects have been the subject of only one concentrated study.

Instead, a significant bias exists towards the Early-Middle Cypriot anthropomorphic figurines. The so-called “Scenic Compositions” have received considerable attention but it is the contemporary Plank Figurines (Fig 4) which have attracted the vast majority of interest. Since only a handful of Early-Middle Cypriot animal figurines and object models exist, for instance, this preference is partially a reflection of the composition of the figurine record itself. Yet large numbers of Late Cypriot zoomorphs for example, demonstrate that this alone cannot account for the fascination with Plank Figurines. The disproportionate interest in anthropomorphs across figurine scholarship has not only limited investigation of models of animals and objects but also failed to address the interaction between different types of contemporary figurine. The resultant gaps in our appreciation of the figurine landscape have rendered our understanding of how and why figurines were created woefully incomplete.

This fascination with the human image has also encouraged the connection between the reality of an ancient society and the image with which we have chosen to illustrate it to be taken rather too literally. This sort of simplistic interpretation is best illustrated by the common belief that the physical appearance of an anthropomorph is directly indicative of the ethnic composition of the
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society which created it and can be used to determine the race of this community. In their study of figurines from the Indus Valley, for instance, Tripathi & Srivastava consider that the characteristics of their figurines recall those of Egyptians, Sumerians and Semites and thus that the community of the area must include these ethnicities.\textsuperscript{29} Similarly, the presence of Mycenaean in Cypriot society, for example, is often supported by the supposed Aegean characteristics of some Bronze Age figurines.\textsuperscript{30} Not only does this sort of interpretation carry a familiar reliance on aesthetics, but it also depends heavily on subjective judgements about these physical attributes. It chooses which features should be characteristic of the appearance or style of which ethnic group and then decides that these features directly indicate the people that created them. Although it may be possible to identify traits specific to the ‘art’ of particular cultures, the stance of Egyptian figurines with one leg in front of the other, for instance, it is unrealistic to interpret them in this manner. Any number of factors may have led to the existence of these characteristics on particular figurines – a conscious decision, for example, to imitate the characteristics of an external style, unintentional adoption of certain new aspects due to increased external contact, accidental resemblance due to depiction of a similar subject, independent development in local fashions, or something else entirely. Each of these possibilities has intriguing consequences for the nature of that society which are simply ignored by interpreting the physical characteristics of figurines in this over-simplistic, purely illustrative manner.

Encouragingly, the use of figurines as illustrations of the past begins to re-contextualise these objects. Yet its simplistic, subjective evaluation of physical characteristics assumes that ancient figurines can be understood in a very straightforward manner. Some studies carry this idea to its extreme, presuming figurines to be in some sense so familiar that they require no complex interpretation. Such studies blithely label figurines toys, deities, or even toys of deities, providing no evidence to support these assumptions.\textsuperscript{31} This simplistic assessment also tends to halt further evaluation of figurines and their role in the society which created them. Such has been the case, for example, for Late Cypriot anthropomorphs (Fig 5) which, despite surviving in relatively significant numbers, have not received the detailed

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Late Cypriot anthropomorphs, EAF.HST.01 and FAF.Drt.01 (D-K Knox, Larnaca Museum)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{29} Tripathi & Srivastava 1994:184
\textsuperscript{30} e.g. the Horned God (Dikaios 1969:528) or Flathead Figurines (Karageorghis & Karageorghis 2002:272)
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consideration afforded to their peculiar, plank-shaped predecessor. Almost universally agreed to be standardised representations of a fertility goddess, one can find little active discussion of the evidence for or against this concept; their interpretation has been considered a “fait accompli”.

The limiting effect of this discourse is unfortunate. Even if these simplistic evaluations were correct, they should not constitute the end of the investigation as they still hold useful interpretive value.

The pervasive legacy of aestheticism has taught the value of a balanced appreciation of the visual aspect for the study of figurines. Building on these lessons, the present study will seek to avoid stylistic value judgements and superficial interpretations whilst not ignoring the physical characteristics of the figurines under investigation. Furthermore, it will counteract the privileging of anthropomorphic objects and aesthetically-pleasing examples to provide a comprehensive study of those figurines which existed together.

2 ‘Goddess Theory’: Gender & Divinity

When Arthur Evans first encountered the figurines of Minoan Crete, he strongly resisted any attempt even to label them ‘idols’, but by the time he published Knossos he had changed his mind, asserting that they must represent a deity known as the ‘Great Mother’. Evans, like so many who followed him, had been infected by the incredible phenomenon known as ‘Goddess Theory’. Despite massive and vigorous criticism, this incredibly pervasive theory remains implicit in many, relatively recent studies of figurines across the world. It would not be an exaggeration to say that no single interpretive movement has had a more dramatic and lasting effect on the development of figurine studies than this compulsion to identify all figurines as representations of a female deity, a universal ‘Mother Goddess’.

It is generally agreed that the origin of this hypothesis lies in the emergent discipline of late nineteenth century psychoanalysis, specifically in the work of Bachofen. He introduced the idea that women held central social and political roles in prehistoric societies due to their verifiable relationship to their offspring. Likewise, he believed that the figurines of this period were part of
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the worship of the predominant deity, a fertility goddess in the manner of a “primitive Demeter”. This interpretation was conceived and developed in the androcentric, monotheistic ‘Golden Age’ of Victorian Europe.\(^{38}\) It was an essentially misogynistic theory which perceived this matriarchal period as the unfortunate primitive precursor to the superior, modern, patriarchal society in which Bachofen lived.\(^{39}\) Amongst his influential followers were numerous psychologists, notably Jung, who managed to elevate the ‘goddess’ still further until she became “an eternal ‘archetype’ independent from, predating and influencing human society” – the ultimate universalist concept.\(^{40}\)

By the mid-twentieth century, however, and the advent of feminism, this originally androcentric theory was commandeered to reveal a new picture of a prehistoric feminist utopia, the archetypal “past that never was present”.\(^{41}\) The familiar naked, female figurines became a symbol of female power, of sexual and social liberation. Chief among the proponents of this new version of the movement was archaeologist Marija Gimbutas, whose name quickly became synonymous with it. She developed the theory with regard to the figurines of Palaeolithic and Neolithic “Old Europe”, a vast area encompassing modern Hungary, parts of Austria, the Balkans including Greece, Crete, part of Italy and Sicily.\(^{42}\) Drawing together a huge variety of material, she argued for the existence of an ancient and deep-rooted cult of the Mother Goddess in this area, the figurehead of the contemporaneous matriarchal society. This peaceful system was dislodged, she proposed, at the end of the Neolithic by invading, patriarchal Indo-Europeans, but somehow managed to survive in the supposedly non-violent society of Minoan Crete.

Gimbutas’ work has several fundamental theoretical and methodological problems which exemplify the shortcomings of ‘Goddess Theory’ as a movement and for which it has been widely and thoroughly criticised.\(^{43}\) Firstly the massive geographical and temporal scope of her study illustrates the tendency to conflate material from completely different geographical and temporal contexts and interpret it in exactly the same way. Secondly Gimbutas chooses particular, often decontextualised images and examples, demonstrating an inherently selective use of evidence: it is clear that Goddess Theorists favour the naked, female images which correspond easily with their overarching model, and explain away or ignore the rest of the figurine record, including males and animals, which do not. Finally there is a huge interpretive leap between the evidence which Gimbutas presents and the conclusions which she reaches, bridged by apparently nothing

\(^{38}\) Hamilton 1996:282-5  
\(^{39}\) Hamilton 1996:282; 284  
\(^{40}\) Goodison & Morris 1998:8  
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\(^{42}\) Gimbutas 1974; 1989; 1991  
more than a fervent belief in the ‘Goddess’ herself. This “imaginative suggestion” which seems to be provided by the psychoanalytical basis of ‘Goddess Theory’ is one of its most vehemently criticised aspects. 

Cypriot figurines have long been considered images of female fertility, depicting a ‘mother goddess’ equivalent to Astarte or Inanna-Ishtar of the contemporary Near East or a nameless forerunner to the Aphrodite so synonymous with the island in later history. The same anthropomorphs which Cesnola described in 1877 as “images of the Cyprian Venus” form the evidence for J.Karageorghis’ “Grande Déesse de la fécondité” a century later. In all such identifications, offered for Plank Figurines and Late Cypriot anthropomorphs in equal measure, the influence of ‘Goddess Theory’ is keenly felt. The consequences for our understanding of Bronze Age Cyprus and its figurines are particularly apparent in the use of these objects in the study of gender roles and ritual practices.

2a  **Figurines and the Female**

The most pervasive gender-related issue for the figurines of Bronze Age Cyprus, however, is the underlying assumption that all major anthropomorphic figurine types are female which crucially has led many scholars to ignore the sexually ambiguous form of Plank Figurines. In contrast to their Late Cypriot counterparts, which clearly display gender-specific anatomical details, Plank Figurines are not naked, show no genitals or female ‘curves’ and include breasts on only a small proportion of examples. Nevertheless, Frankel & Tamvaki accept without debate that “all known plank idols are female” and this sentiment is echoed in the work of des Gagniers, J.Karageorghis, V.Karageorghis, a Campo and many others. Even those scholars who recognise the dearth of female-specific characteristics often find it difficult to see beyond the pervasive assumption of femininity. a Campo, for instance, while acknowledging that only an insignificant proportion of Plank Figurines included breasts, chose to explain them as a ‘redundant feature’, an unnecessary elaboration which emphasised a characteristic already obvious to Bronze Age Cypriots, rather than consider that the figurines may never have been intended to be overtly female.
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Many theories rest on the identification of Plank Figurines as female. Some are fairly traditional, reminiscent of those put forward for figurines across the world. The notion of figurines as fertility charms, for example, to be used by women as a plea for healthy offspring, is extremely common. Morris, amongst others, proposes this use for anthropomorphic figurines throughout the Bronze Age.\textsuperscript{50} He also refines the idea to suggest that double-necked Plank Figurines could represent a desire for twins and those which carry children a request for a further birth soon after the last, although even he retains some scepticism over these particular propositions.\textsuperscript{51} Washbourne’s thesis also argues forcefully for the identification of Plank Figurines as a goddess of fertility.\textsuperscript{52} Considering, erroneously, that Plank Figurines were solely connected with funerary ritual, she extends this connection with fertility to apply to all similarly-decorated ceramic vessels found in tombs.\textsuperscript{53} Using copious cross-cultural references from predominantly Near Eastern myths, and placing great emphasis on this similarity in decoration, she contends that these vessels symbolised the “wombs” from which the dead would be reborn into the afterlife.\textsuperscript{54} This rather extreme proposition is ultimately based on the unquestioned presumption of the female gender of Plank Figurines. Along with a surprising dearth of quantitative evidence and an over-reliance on comparisons with cultures far removed from Cyprus and its Bronze Age, it is this failure to consider the ambiguous gender of Plank Figurines which ultimately destabilises Washbourne’s thesis.

Other scholars have used the purported female gender of Plank Figurines to conjecture interpretations based on the proposed roles of women in prehistoric societies. J. Karageorghis, for example, suggests that Plank Figurines represent what she sees as the critical points of women’s lives – the occasion of marriage and the rearing of children.\textsuperscript{55} From this interpretation, and in clear homage to Gimbutas, she deduces that Early Cypriot society was primarily matriarchal, based on a woman’s ability bear children. Bolger has more recently adopted this idea using figurine evidence to highlight the differences she perceived between Chalcolithic and Bronze Age society.\textsuperscript{56} She offers contrasting interpretations of Chalcolithic stone and clay figurines depicting woman as “genetrix”, biological birth-giver, against those few Plank Figurines which hold infants depicting woman as “mater”, social mother who cares for young children.\textsuperscript{57} Setting this reading of female figurines within anthropological comparisons, Bolger envisages a Chalcolithic feminist
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Utopia, in which women’s prized fertility afforded them significant social power, giving way to a patriarchal Bronze Age society where women were increasingly subjugated and excluded from political and social influence. Whilst her use of figurines to explore the nature of the society which created them is commendable, Bolger’s theories are weakened by her selective use of evidence. Like a Campo, she acknowledges the dubious gender of many Plank Figurines but chooses simply to exclude from her appraisal the majority of the corpus, those whose gender is not obvious, as well as the many contemporary, non-plank anthropomorphs which conduct a range of activities.

Whilst also maintaining the female gender of Plank Figurines, a Campo’s own work refutes the connection with fertility. Instead, she reinterprets an earlier suggestion by Flourentzos that the double-necked figurines (Fig 6) represented ‘hieros gamos’, or ‘divine marriage’ between a god and goddess. She considered this subgroup another ‘redundant feature’ which implied a symbolic link to human marriage, emphasising the importance of ‘marriageable’ women, and extrapolated this to suggest a system of organised exogamy for the Early-Middle Bronze Age. Thus the presumed female gender of Plank Figurines led a Campo to interpret the type as reflecting “a concern with female status based on marriage and lineage”, probably made by women themselves and presented to their new family on marriage. Like many before it, this potentially interesting proposal is undermined by a Campo’s failure to question adequately the evidence for the female gender of Plank Figurines.

Some scholars of Bronze Age Cyprus, however, have challenged the assumption of femininity for anthropomorphic figurines. Merrillees recognised the “rarity of unequivocal sexual differentiation” amongst the corpus; Morris admitted that “the majority of figures give no hint of gender” and both suggested that the breasts on some examples could have been male. Even Ohnefalsch-Richter considered that some of his examples were hermaphroditic. Yet these are rare voices amongst the crowd of supporters who adhere to the female interpretation. Relatively recent developments in Post-processual archaeological theory, however, have encouraged some new perspectives. Gender theorists, for example, have made earnest attempts to “engender”
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anthropomorphic figurines. Some gender theorists have simply adopted the supposed female figurines as a rare, tangible link to prehistoric women, an opportunity to repopulate the past with those ignored by traditional, androcentric archaeology. Others, however, have seized the opportunity to think outside the limits of clear-cut binary gender and explore the ambiguity of Plank Figurines in particular to address wider social issues for the Bronze Age. MacLachlan, for example, embraced the idea that the gender of these objects may have been deliberately ambiguous and suggested that a single figurine carrying an infant may represent the whole ‘nuclear family’ of man, woman and child. Similarly, Ribeiro considered that the apparently genderless figures on contemporary Scenic Compositions may represent a ‘third sex’, prepubescent children. Although little information is currently available to support either theory, their use of ethnographic analogy and modern gender theory enables them to move beyond traditional approaches and assumptions.

Outside the confines of this ‘engendering’ discourse, however, the drive to circumvent the preconceptions of the past has pushed many scholars to avoid allocating any gender to figurines at all. Knapp & Meskell’s evaluation of Plank Figurines, for example, explores “meanings which do not single out sex as the prime characteristic”. By stepping away from the fascination with a gender which is not clearly depicted, they were able to consider the features which were, particularly the elaborate and, in their opinion, highly variable decoration. They posited that the complex web of symbolism carried within this decoration may have been used to depict individuals of any gender. Talalay & Cullen also criticised the limiting effect of assigning gender to Plank Figurines, proposing instead that the figures should be seen as deliberately sexually ambiguous. They saw an “iconographic fluidity” in these objects which allowed them to become ideological “palimpsests”, carrying different symbolic emphasis throughout their cycle of use and ultimately portraying group identity. These intriguing suggestions liberate the study of anthropomorphic figurines from weather-worn discussions of female fertility and open new avenues of research including the display and negotiation of identities. Yet, as Lesure’s evaluation warns, to ignore gender completely may be unnecessarily overcautious and cause scholars to miss crucial insights into the representational repertoire.
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The idiosyncratic form of many prehistoric figurines and their frustratingly obscure function and significance has encouraged most researchers to suggest an association with ritual practices as the most likely explanation for the existence of these objects. This tendency is apparent both amongst those who subscribe to the principles of ‘Goddess Theory’ and those who consciously seek to counter it. The frequent use of terms such as ‘idol’ and even ‘icon’ as virtually synonymous with ‘figurine’ demonstrates how embedded this association has become. Although some deliberately chose these terms, intending their full meaning, others have applied them without feeling the need to comment on their interpretative connotations. Such blithe use of this loaded terminology glosses over the complexities inherent in locating, defining and understanding ritual practices in prehistoric societies.

For Bronze Age Cypriot figurines, the influence of ‘Goddess Theory’ has encouraged the restrictive quest to identify figurines as specific named deities, particularly the various guises of the ‘mother goddess.’ The identification of Bronze Age Cypriot figurines as deities has a long history. In the late nineteenth century, for example, Ohnefalsch-Richter envisaged a gradual shift from aniconic, dendromorphic idols in the pre-Bronze Age to fully-formed anthropomorphic deities in the Late Cypriot period, with Plank Figurines forming a convenient step between the two. In support of this theory, he used comparisons with images on Bronze Age sealstones as well as examples of later, semi-anthropomorphic deities such as Dionysus. More than a century on, evidence drawn from cultures outside Cyprus remains one of the key sources for those who seek to identify figurines from the pre-literate Bronze Age as named deities.

Such deductions are most prevalent for the small number of metal figurines which remain from this context. The majority of scholarship which exists regarding the “Horned God” statuette (Fig 7) found in Enkomi’s Area I, for example, centres on stylistic comparisons with figurines and written evidence from neighbouring cultures. Dikaios first suggested that its headdress and outstretched forearm were Syrian in style and that the overall pose was Egyptian; using gods mentioned in the Amarna letters, he identified the statue as Nergal. Later, a new statue found in Laconia and a Fourth
Century inscription from Tamassos led him to consider the face and musculature rather Mycenaean, and re-identify the Horned God as Apollo-Alasiotas. A Hellenistic pithos from Pyla inspired his final identification Apollo-Kereates – and many scholars followed suit.

The various forms of the fertility goddess have undoubtedly proven the most common identification of Bronze Age Cypriot figurines. This is unsurprising given the influence of ‘Goddess Theory’ and the complex political history of Cyprus which has encouraged the pursuit of a modern island identity partly founded on the long history of Cypriot Aphrodite. Both J. Karageorghis and Washbourne, for example, compare the ornate decoration of Plank Figurines with descriptions of the clothing of Near Eastern Inanna-Ishtar and identify them as representations of that deity. Washbourne specifically compares the diagonal lines on the front of many examples as the Near Eastern ‘tudittu’, a jewellery item mentioned in written descriptions of Inanna-Ishtar although the lack of any known visual representations of the tudittu undermines this argument. Those who have identified the Early-Middle Bronze Age anthropomorphs with Aphrodite-like deities see a direct evolution of this same deity through the figurines of the Late Bronze Age and into the historical period. Most scholars, however, allocate the first depiction of a deity on Cyprus to the Late Cypriot period. On similar comparative evidence as described above, and with particular attention to the deities on the Ugaritic tablet supposedly listing all those worshipped in Alashiya, these are also normally identified as fertility goddesses. So pervasive is this reasoning that Earring figurines are invariably referred to as “Astarte Figures” in catalogues and reports.

There are several problems inherent both in pursuing these lines of argument and the evidence on which they are usually based. This sort of cross-cultural comparison is racked with theoretical and methodological issues. For even if the stylistic attributes being compared were identical, which they seldom are, determining a verifiable connection between the two cultures being compared and then proving that an object or similar stylistic trait held the same symbolism in both contexts is extremely difficult. Whilst it is clear that at least an economic relationship existed between Cyprus and the Near East in the Late Bronze Age, there is little to suggest whether beliefs and ritual practices also travelled. Moreover, this fascination with using figurines to name
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Cypriot deities stunts any potentially more enlightening research into the validity of identifying particular figurine types as deities at all and the way in which these objects may have practically functioned in a ritual scenario.

The fundamental aims of ‘Goddess Theory’, and each of the problems identified above, are inextricably linked to the Universalist discourse. The theory relies on an underlying conviction that all figurines can be explained as expressions of the same, intrinsic human beliefs and values. In practice, however, it is clear that figurines from different contexts probably represented contrasting social mores. Even figurines within the same cultural context may have held diverse significance depending on countless factors, such as the person who was using them, the time or place in which they were used or deposited. Some theories may be appropriate to more than one context, but, for the most part, each requires separate investigations which will probably reach distinct conclusions. Schafer’s study of figurines from the Lower Pecos region in Texas, for instance, dismisses the possibility that anthropomorphic figurines may have been used in human fertility rites as he surmises that the survival of the culture at that time depended on having a low population density. Instead, he proposes their use in “increase cults for nonhuman economic resources”, the human figurine standing in for the animal or plant to which it referred. This idea is in stark contrast to the fertility rituals conjectured for figurines elsewhere in the world but makes sense in the specific context with which Schafer is concerned. To ignore this diversity in favour of an impossible quest for universalism is not only essentially untenable, but also damaging to the study of figurines.

Of course, it is not impossible that some anthropomorphic figurines were in fact images of fertility goddesses as so many scholars believe. However, it is interesting to consider the corresponding reluctance to explain their zoomorphic counterparts, usually found in similar locations and crafted with a comparable level of detail, as remnants of a system of animal worship. This disparity underlines the unavoidable influence of the modern, western religious experiences of many scholars on their interpretations of past material, just one of the many “cultural filters” through which all such assessments inevitably pass.

The investigation of ritual activities in past societies is an interpretive minefield which has become in recent years a keenly debated topic amongst archaeologists and beyond. The present study seeks a balanced approach which ascribes as few preconceptions as possible and is ever mindful
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of the specific socio-cultural contexts under investigation. It defines ritual practices as repetitive activities or ceremonies performed to evoke supernatural forces for practical or symbolic purposes.\textsuperscript{90} This includes public or private observances and rites conducted both in general everyday life and surrounding significant human events, such as birth or death. The possibility that some figurines were used in these ritual activities cannot be ignored but nor should it be assumed that every figurine type encountered must have held ritual significance. Ethnographic studies of current ritual practices highlight the possibility that a clear delineation between ritual and secular objects or space may never have existed in many prehistoric societies.\textsuperscript{91} For figurines, this highlights the fact that the area in which figurines were found cannot be automatically interpreted as specific ritual space; and equally it cannot be assumed that because figurines were found in an apparently ordinary domestic area, they must have held no ritual significance. Even modern Christians are as likely to have a cross in the kitchen as in the chapel. This study employs a holistic approach combining contextual, physical and iconographical investigations in order to investigate the iteration and significance of any ritual practices in which figurines may have been involved.

\section{The Search for Meaning in Art}

Not every theory on the interpretation of art is similarly superficial or intransigent. On the contrary, some scholars have been strongly influenced by philosophical and anthropological theories concerning what ‘art’ really \textit{means}, and more specifically, the concept of art as communication. This discourse, which places great importance on original cultural context, holds that art, either passively or deliberately, conveys messages to those who view it, via a system of known symbols, concerning the society in which it was created; if one could only decipher these symbols, then the messages could be understood, the art ‘read’ just like a language and the “visible [would become] legible”.\textsuperscript{92} Such theories echo emphatically throughout the history of the interpretation of ancient figurines, in Rethemiotakis’ study of Minoan figurines, for instance, or in Schafer’s work on those of the Texan Lower Pecos region.\textsuperscript{93} In fact, almost every study which attempts the interpretation of figurines has been influenced to some extent by the idea that art communicates messages, whether or not the theory is explicitly referenced.
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This approach has a long history within the study of art, ultimately deriving from the ‘structural anthropology’ of Lévi-Strauss. He devised a system, drawn from de Saussure’s ‘structural linguistics’, which explained every aspect of a culture as the expression of an underlying cognitive system. Leroi-Gourhan took this theory and applied it specifically to ancient ‘art’, in his case the cave art of Palaeolithic France, thus codifying the analogy of art as a “direct illustration” of human ideology. It is clear that if this theory is taken at face value, it is equally prone to the problems of over-simplistic interpretation which have been criticised above. Indeed this has proven to be the case in much figurine scholarship, particularly in attempts at understanding the ubiquitous naked, female anthropomorphs. Their common associations with sexuality and fertility are often based purely on modern criteria. In our world, the symbol of a naked, female form may well indicate such factors, although this is not always the case, but we cannot assume that the symbolism carried these implications in any ancient context.

Most modern symbolism theory, however, recognises that material culture does not represent an uncomplicated mirror of ancient society, but maintains that a relationship nonetheless exists. Gamble, for instance, acknowledges that scholars are very unlikely ever to be able to decipher the symbolic messages themselves. Instead, he proposes that simply identifying patterns in the symbolism could help to elucidate the nature and scale of the systems of communication across a region. Within the study of figurines, several scholars have made overt use of symbolism theory. Verpoorte’s thesis on Pavlovian figurines, for example, explicitly references the influence of French structural anthropology. He uses this theory to move beyond the question of what these figurines represent and consider instead what they may indicate about the nature of Upper Palaeolithic Dolní Věstonice. Similarly Petty bases part of her investigation of figurines from Umm el-Marra in Syria on the principles of iconology developed by Panofsky. The latter theorised that works of art carry three levels of meaning: “primary or natural meaning”, that is the subject that is depicted; “secondary or conventional meaning”, or what was intended or understood in the original cultural context; and “intrinsic meaning”, namely the underlying symbolic repertoire which the artwork uses. Petty admits that it is not always easy to apply a theory that was developed for Renaissance art to that of the ancient world. The abundance of supporting evidence and wealth of established information which exists for well-known historical...
periods is simply not available in a prehistoric context. There is a clear and present danger that scholars will either ignore this difficulty, falling back on the simplistic method discussed above or attempt to fill in the gaps with implicit intuitive leaps, described elsewhere as “a kind of bungee jump into the land of fantasy”.  

Some scholars have little sympathy with the sorts of arguments put forward by symbolism theories. They fear that such intangible ponderings, far from advancing our knowledge of prehistoric figurines, may cause us rather to “wander into the realms of...imaginative reconstruction.” Those who reject the use of symbolism theory in the study of figurines and other ‘art’ objects, point out that not everything must necessarily hold deeper, intrinsic meaning: some patterns were added simply as decoration, some objects created for no more profound purpose than practice or fun. Even V.Karageorghis, who has published countless works on Cypriot figurines, has warned against becoming entangled in complicated attempts to find weighty meaning in every intricacy and in so doing, losing sight of the bigger picture. Symbolism theory, then, must be applied with an objective caution which acknowledges the difficulties in discerning meaning from ancient iconography along with the possibility that such meaning was never intended. This principle will underpin its use in the present study which will pursue the possibility that usage patterns identified in iconography may be interpreted to reveal information about the society without necessarily understanding the symbolism involved.

***

Underlying almost every piece of scholarship on ancient figurines is one critical assumption, that figurines are art. This assumption has indisputably shaped the interpretation of these objects, but is it really feasible to classify ancient figurines in this manner? This question is inextricably linked to the fundamental and controversial issue of the definition of ‘art’. Scholars from various fields have debated this point for centuries, not only artists and art historians themselves, but philosophers, psychologists, and, of course, archaeologists. Although there has been no official consensus, some common ground underpins this discussion. Firstly there is the idea of the artist as an ‘outsider’ and his art as reflective, or even subversive of the society to which he is peripheral. Then there is the concept of art as “beauty without purpose”, entirely separate
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from the functional world, but where the ‘image’ is paramount.\textsuperscript{110} Finally, ‘art’ is a clearly separate field, and to be an ‘artist’ is a singular vocation.\textsuperscript{111} These characteristics evidently underlie the attitude to ancient figurines which has been discussed above, yet this definition of ‘art’ is inevitably subjective, most likely codified in Renaissance Europe.\textsuperscript{112}

The term ‘art’ as we now understand it, then, is probably simply not applicable to prehistory. It is known, for instance, that in the Classical world, the Greek \textit{τέχνη} and the Latin \textit{ars} were much closer to our concept of ‘craft’ or ‘trade’ than to what we now define as ‘art’. Until the twentieth century, there remained a stark division between activities that were considered as craft, and those which were deemed ‘art’ proper, or ‘high art’.\textsuperscript{113} It was the opposition of ‘\textit{ars gratia artis}’ versus functional image-making; of the painter versus the decorator, the sculptor versus the stone-mason, the coroplast versus the potter. These oppositions, which still exist to some extent in the modern world, were imbued with implications of quality and social status: in the former sphere we find the ‘masters’, celebrated for their ‘masterpieces’, in the latter the low-status tradesmen. Prehistoric figurines, along with all objects that did not conform to the rigid vision of what ‘art’ should be, would have found themselves firmly part of the latter group. This category is closer to the way in which most archaeologists now envisage their creation than the modern concept of the ‘artist’. It seems unlikely, for instance, that they were made by dedicated ‘artists’ as a deliberate commentary on society, but probably in the same workshops and by the same people as pottery vessels. Nor is it plausible to consider that aesthetic concerns were their only purpose. Yet the unfortunate derogatory value judgements which have been placed on the idea of ‘craft’ are not particularly helpful.

Some scholars have chosen to use alternative words in which to describe ancient figurines. Terms like ‘material culture’, ‘representation’ or simply ‘image’ or ‘image-making’ have all been used almost interchangeably.\textsuperscript{114} These certainly circumvent the particular connotations which a word like ‘art’ carries, but in essence they only serve to disguise the problem. By avoiding the term, they also avoid explicitly tackling the implications and assumptions which remain inherent in their studies.\textsuperscript{115} For each of these terms is similarly problematic. ‘Image’ and ‘representation’, which ostensibly cover the same range of material, are just as subjective as ‘art’ itself, equally imbued with ethnocentric assumptions on the purpose of the objects they describe. They presuppose that the object must refer to, or stand in for, something else, that it is only a substitute for or depiction

\textsuperscript{110} For discussion of this Platonic notion, see Verpoorte 2001:16.
\textsuperscript{111} E.g. Heidegger 1971:56-76; Verporte 2001:16
\textsuperscript{112} Renfrew 2003:58-64
\textsuperscript{113} Ingold 1996:249-93; Preziosi 1998:14
\textsuperscript{114} E.g. Nordbladh 1978:66: who explicitly chooses ‘image’ over ‘art’
\textsuperscript{115} Cf Verpoorte 2001:16
of something real. ‘Material culture’, on the other hand is an extremely broad category, almost as non-specific as a word like ‘object’. It fails to capture the particular visual aspect of the material which, even if it was not the primary feature, was certainly a characteristic which sets it apart from other objects. We cannot avoid categorising the ancient world on our own terms. Even apparently benign labels such as ‘vessels’ or ‘tools’ are in some sense culturally defined and we can never be sure that our categories really capture genuine ancient material groups. Objectivity may be our ultimate ideal, but in reality the best we can hope for is that our subjectivity is as minimal and explicit as possible. At least by consciously using the term ‘art’, if only as a working category, the implications which it carries are plain to see and investigation can be allowed to continue.

Within any archaeological discussion of ‘art’ there exists a constant struggle to appreciate the significance of its visual aspect whilst remaining as objective as possible. In their modern context, pre- and proto-historic figurines are visual media, displayed and appreciated according to our particular aesthetic standards, appraised for the accomplishment of their craftsmanship or composition; they are inescapably ‘art’. Despite the negative consequences which have unfortunately resulted from this classification, it is not inherently damaging to consider figurines in this way. However, this is only acceptable when two important points are acknowledged: that our concept of ‘art’ is culturally-determined and may bear little if any resemblance to that of the original socio-cultural context of the object; and that, although its creator may have striven for the object to be “well-made and ‘good to look at’”, beauty and admiration were most probably not the original motivations for its creation. In essence, we can ‘redefine’ prehistoric figurines as ‘art’ in a modern, Western sense, providing we realise that they were not always so. On this premise, the present study will appreciate and evaluate the evidently important visual aspects of Bronze Age Cypriot figurines while fully cognisant of these crucial issues.

116 Cf. Meskell et al 2008:141
117 See e.g. Gosden 2001 for an evaluation of this struggle.
118 Gosden 2001:165
119 Renfrew 2003:77
During the 1960s and 1970s, in line with contemporary developments in Processual Archaeology, several studies appeared which challenged the customary disorganised, aesthetic-driven figurine work of the previous decades. Scholars like Ucko, French and Renfrew sought a comprehensive, systematic methodology by which to make sense of the full range of figurines from their chosen areas. At the time, such an approach was rather radical. It criticised the unfounded stylistic judgements, selective use of examples and, above all, disregard for context which had characterised the majority of preceding scholarship. Significantly, it initiated a sea-change in the way figurines were conceived: no longer were they works of art to be wondered at and judged on their physical attributes, now they were ‘data’ to be analysed and interrogated like any other class of artefacts. This new perspective revolutionised the study of figurines, encouraging researchers to organise material into typological systems, embrace new scientific and statistical techniques and above all, consider the context in which the figurine had been discovered. These pioneering methodologies, however, generated a new collection of difficulties, both in their practical execution and their theoretical intentions.

1 **Datasets & Typologies**

“What we observe is not nature itself, but nature exposed to our method of questioning.”

Superseding the aesthetic concerns of previous scholarship significantly broadened the range of examples available for study. Scholars were now free to include fragmentary figurines ignored by those seeking aesthetically pleasing examples, as well as the animal, male or apparently unsexed figurines which proved equally uninteresting to the likes of the ‘Goddess Theorists’. However, this freedom presented twin problems of defining the chronological, geographical and material boundaries of a coherent dataset and of establishing suitable typologies with which to organise it for interpretation.
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Defining Investigative Boundaries

The aesthetically orientated, art historical approaches discussed above, which aimed to use figurines as part of a grand narrative of world iconographical history, were content to study vast ranges of examples from widely different geographical and temporal contexts. As the criticism received by scholars such as Gimbutas has shown, such simplistic, broad focus studies, which give little importance to the impact of individual contexts, are considered methodologically unsound. Many scholars who have opposed this discourse have chosen a much narrower focus for their investigations. Bailey, for instance, has studied figurines from the Late Chalcolithic tell at Golyamo Delchevo and Meskell has focussed on the famous site of Çatalhöyük.122 Both studies seek, amongst other things, to understand the development of figurine use over time and compare and contrast the contexts of different figurines across a single site. Others, however, equally committed to the systematic, contextual investigation of figurines, have demonstrated that studies with a wider geographical or temporal remit may also be revealing. If a group of sites appear to be part of a connected, cultural system, sharing styles of material culture, and plausibly even some kind of political relationship, then it makes clear sense to study the figurines from this whole area as a coherent set. French’s re-evaluation of figurines from the Mycenaean Bronze Age, for instance, or Renfrew’s study of Early Cycladic figurines follow this model with considerable success.123 This system is most enlightening when it manages to gain an overarching picture of the development in style and function of figurines across the cultural area whilst not overlooking the possibility of site-specific variations in this pattern.

Some systematic studies also investigate figurines from several separate geographical areas, and evaluate them as independent case studies. This sort of approach, which often combines the single and multi-site methods described above, appears to be most successful when a new methodology for the study of figurines is being presented. Ucko’s highly lauded thesis, for instance, assesses figurines from diverse contexts including Predynastic Egypt and Neolithic Knossos, in order to argue against the prevailing contemporary definitions of figurines.124 Likewise, Bartel’s study of Neolithic figurines, which aimed to trial a multivariate approach, incorporated examples from Knossos in Crete, Hacilar and Çatalhöyük in Anatolia, as well as several sites in mainland Greece and Yugoslavia.125 Most recently, Lesure’s study has directly tackled the issues involved in comparing distant figurine datasets.126 His thorough evaluation of traditional figurine analysis led him to develop and test what he described as a “contextual

122 Bailey 1994; e.g. Meskell 1998, 2007
123 Renfrew 1969; French 1971
124 Ucko 1968
125 Bartel 1981
126 Lesure 2011
method [working] in the service of universalism”. His findings suggest against easy cross-cultural explanations for his test case, the “femaleness of figurines”, but his considered method, focussing on contextual comparison of the “use” of figurines rather than their overtly similar physical characteristics, presents a positive framework on which successful comparative analyses may be built. Each of these methodology-based comparative studies manages to address figurines from unrelated geographical areas whilst remaining rigorous and systematic. This has been achieved because each different site or culturally coherent area was evaluated as a separate, context-specific case study and comparison based on systematically evaluated, analytical systems. Providing the methodology chosen is appropriate to the questions asked, therefore, and the geographical, temporal or theoretical boundaries of a study are logically and explicitly delineated, many different scales of figurine analysis are equally achievable.

A similarly controversial issue exists in defining what material should be included in the category of ‘figurine’ and whether ‘figurine’ should constitute a separate category at all. Few scholars have explicitly defined their understanding of the term ‘figurine’, or, more importantly, what material they may have excluded from this category. As Part IA.1 has described, many concentrate solely on anthropomorphs, disregarding zoomorphs or object models. Such a definition is plausible but those scholars rarely mention the co-existence of other small, three-dimensional representations. Objects which appear to combine obvious practical function with representation, such as zoomorphic vessels, are also frequently excluded. Within Bronze Age Cypriot figurine studies, in addition to the ubiquitous anthropomorphic bias, most scholars choose to cover only one figurative type. Such concealed restriction of the ‘figurine’ category leaves the reader with the impression that the chosen figurine type exists alone when they may in fact be only one part of a wider tradition of related representation, Morrey’s “constituents of a single system of symbols”.

Some scholars have criticised the “special” nature of ‘figurine’ as a category. Hendrix, for instance, considers the term tainted and derogatory and Meskell argues that it encourages a particular kind of rash, superficial reasoning. Bailey’s study, however, explores the peculiar allure of figurines
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which sets them apart from both two dimensional images and non-representational objects.\textsuperscript{132} Although he focuses particularly on anthropomorphic figurines, his meticulous deconstruction of the psychological effect of miniaturism, three-dimensionality and manipulation of the human form demonstrates the curious impact of these objects on human beings. Certainly, the definition of ‘figurine’ is burdened by acres of preconception but they remain a distinct set of objects whose representational aspect is evident but whose symbolic meaning and practical function is obscure. This alone justifies their existence as a group to be studied on their own merit.

Defining the boundaries of a study, both in terms of the area and the types of objects to be included, is an essential preliminary step in any methodical investigation. Each of these definitions, however, cannot avoid an element of subjectivity. What defines the geographical and chronological limits of a ‘culture’, for example or what objects belong to the category to be examined, are necessarily determined, at least in part, by judgements made in the present about material from the distant past. However, providing these boundaries are made as explicit and logical as possible, tailored specifically for the research questions at hand, then systematic, comprehensive investigation of figurines, unencumbered by the limitations of the aesthetic discourse remains possible. The boundaries to be applied in the present study, which undertakes to define figurines as broadly as possible, are defined in Part IIA.1.

\textit{1b Systems of Categorisation}

Whatever the scope of the survey undertaken, scholars seeking a rigorous approach have aimed to create sensible, comprehensive typologies which chart the development of figurines through time and space. For the figurines of Bronze Age Cyprus, however, such a large number of conflicting typologies have been created that this process has proven far from beneficial to our understanding of the corpus. Each of the thirteen major classificatory systems devised to date include different groups of material, have been arranged on different criteria to varying levels of complexity and include little or no reference to each other.\textsuperscript{133} This situation, which has led to the suggestions that certain Bronze Age Cypriot figurines almost actively resist logical classification, exemplifies many of the theoretical and methodological difficulties involved in the creation of typologies and their use as a tool for interpretation.\textsuperscript{134}

The most analytically valuable typologies must find a balance in the degree to which the material under investigation is divided. Some classifications of Early-Middle Cypriot anthropomorphs, for

\textsuperscript{132} Bailey 2005  
\textsuperscript{133} Merrillees 1988:42; see Table 4 for an overview of these classificatory systems.  
\textsuperscript{134} e.g. Karageorghis 1991a:ix-x on Early – Middle Bronze Age figurines
example, incorporate thirty or more categories, some covering only one known example. Over-complicated systems like these divide the material to such a degree that any meaningful patterns may be obscured. They become little more use to interpretation than simple catalogues. Conversely, more simplistic systems using few, broad categories can direct focus to the ‘big picture’ without becoming mired in stylistic minutiae. Yet typologies which are too broad may also disguise important characteristics of the dataset. Begg, for instance, employs a tripartite system to organise Late Cypriot human and animal figurines. This inexact system fails to highlight many major variations in form, particularly between the Earring and Flathead anthropomorphs and the vessel and figurine versions of Base Ring Bull. Consequently, his conclusions overlook key dissimilarities in function and significance which these different forms should have indicated.

In addition to the complexity of the typology, the criteria on which it is based have also proven controversial and directly affect the success of the typology and the sorts of interpretations to which it may lead. The majority of typologies for Bronze Age Cypriot figurines are arranged according to the system commonly used to classify pottery: firstly on the basis of ceramic ware, then according to general shape and specific morphological features. This system was pioneered, as so much of Bronze Age Cypriot archaeology, by the Swedish Cyprus Expedition (hereafter SCE), beginning as a rudimentary addition to the overall ceramic typology. Stewart initially included figurines as subgroups in his Early Cypriot pottery categories, probably delimited by overall shape but with no additional descriptions and few, unlabelled illustrations to add clarity. This obscure, impractical method was improved by L. and P. Åström who allotted separate sections to ‘terracottas’ in their Late and Middle Cypriot volumes. Drawings and photographs remain scarce and poorly-labelled, in stark contrast to the well-illustrated ceramic classifications of the same volumes, yet the addition of short descriptions and copious references help elucidate the Åströms’ ware-based systems.

Several other scholars followed the SCE’s lead and created typologies arranged by ceramic ware then morphological features, each covering a slightly different corpus of figurines and including
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varying numbers of alternate categories.\textsuperscript{141} Such systems privilege the material aspects of figurines and their relationship with contemporary pottery wares, highlighting issues such as how, where and by whom they were manufactured. However, by separating similar figurines made in different wares, they can dilute our understanding of the popularity of a single image type and potentially group unrelated figurines which have coincidently similar fabric. Furthermore, as the idiosyncratic decoration of most figurines demonstrates, existing ceramic subgroups are frequently either difficult to assign or simply irrelevant to the material. The apparently Base Ring Late Cypriot anthropomorphs, for instance, fit comfortably into neither subgroup of this ware and most Plank Figurines cannot be sensibly divided among the many versions of Red Polished ware.\textsuperscript{142}

Mogelonsky vehemently criticised ware-based typologies and the integrity of traditional fabric designations made without chemical analyses.\textsuperscript{143} She also highlighted the difficulty of comparing supposedly similar wares from different sites and the resultant impact on any intra-island comparisons made on the foundation of ware-based typologies. As an alternative, she established her own typological system based on outward appearance, specifically the cross-section and the silhouette of the figurine.\textsuperscript{144} Shape-based typologies such as this have the advantage of focussing on visible features, the most immediate aspect of the figurine for both Bronze Age and modern viewers. Whilst visual features may be obvious to identify, however, it may not always be possible to deduce their relative importance to the original users and determining which features to delineate can often be somewhat subjective. Flourentzos’ shape-based typology, for example, divides the Plank Figurines with which he is concerned according to the features he considers denote their gender, defining figurines with breasts and carrying infants as female and those with none of these features male.\textsuperscript{145} Such controversial and presumptive deductions simply do not provide a sound basis on which to base a typology.\textsuperscript{146}

Merrillees also criticised the categorisation of figurines on “non-functional criteria” such as ware and morphological minutiae.\textsuperscript{147} Although he discussed stylistic features such as the number of ear piercings or whether the figurine was independent or attached to a vessel, in detail throughout
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his own categorisation, these were never assigned official subcategories. Merrillees appears to have considered such features useful in defining sequences and variations but inadequate for exploring the function or significance of a figurine. In a variation of the shape-based typology, he favoured a system arranged on the activity apparently performed by the figurine, juxtaposing two main categories, “operative” and “static”. The former was divided according to the type of activity (Table 1), the latter according to whether the figurine was alone or carried an infant.\(^{148}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Merrillees’ “Operative” subgroups</th>
<th>Orphanides’ “Active” Subgroups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ploughing</td>
<td>Ploughing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadmaking</td>
<td>Breadmaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples</td>
<td>(no equivalent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctuaries</td>
<td>Gatherings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whimsical</td>
<td>(no equivalent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riding Horses</td>
<td>Attending Animals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Similarities between the Activity-based systems of Merrillees 1980 and Orphanides 1988

Orphanides’ activity-based typology owes much to that of Merrillees, and Table 1 shows the many similarities particularly within his “active” category and the latter’s “Operative” group.\(^{149}\) Developments can be seen however, in the wider timespan of Orphanides’ material, which required the addition of his “Riding Horses” category, and his decision to supplant Merrillees’ “Sanctuaries” and “Whimsical” categories by the less loaded notion of “Gatherings”. Such activity-based typologies emphasise characteristics presumed to be most relevant to the figurine’s function, yet the identification of such features is unavoidably subjective. It relies firstly on the author’s ability to recognise what activity is being conducted when the fragmentary state of many examples and the often obscure iconographical conventions make recognition frequently difficult. Figures on the side of the “Sevres Jar” for instance, have been variously identified as making bread, washing clothes or even smelting copper.\(^{150}\) This method also presumes that these activities were central to the meaning of the figurine, relegating other, supposedly ‘non-functional’ morphological characteristics to secondary importance. Such segregation risks that features actually crucial to the symbolism of the object fail to be sufficiently appreciated. Nonetheless, in a discipline where the creation of complex typologies is frequently seen as an end in itself, the activity-based system represents a positive move towards using classification as a tool for interpretation.

\(^{148}\) The mysterious subcategory “whimsical” includes the famous figure shown peering over the wall into the Vounous Bowl (SMF.Vou.01)

\(^{149}\) Orphanides 1988:187

\(^{150}\) Karageorghis 1991b
As typologies become more subjective, however, there is a danger that the interpretations to which they lead may become self-fulfilling, necessarily confirming the assumptions on which the typology has been created. Begg, for example, chose categories based on supposed place of manufacture and reached a conclusion suggesting ideological differences between figurines made in different places.\(^{151}\) Likewise, Merrillees’ activity-based system demonstrated alternative meanings for static and animated figurines.\(^{152}\) Typologies aim to present a detached, scientific appraisal of information, a neutral framework from which to form new ideas. Yet, as Bolger observed, too often they reflect the preconceptions of the scholars who designed them, able only to illustrate the author’s existing theories rather than stimulate new interpretive discoveries.\(^{153}\) In light of these warnings, the typology created for the present study aims to identify genuinely coherent types through straightforward, balanced categorisation and build interpretations from this foundation.\(^{154}\)

2 Science & Statistics

Once it became feasible to consider figurines as archaeological ‘data’ their study opened up to a succession of different statistical and scientific techniques. Each of these aimed to produce clear, verifiable, often numerical information through which to create a more solid foundation for the interpretation of figurines. Faltering attempts to inject the rigours of scientific analyses into Bronze Age Cypriot figurine study were made, for instance, by Orphanides. Although his methodology ultimately cannot distance itself from the supposition he criticises so vehemently and his failure to apply it to actual figurines weakens it further, his work at least demonstrates the intention to state clear hypotheses and test them in a detached manner.\(^{155}\) It was hoped, not only in the field of figurine studies but also in the wider world of archaeology, that this new drive towards science and mathematics would overcome the subjectivity and selectiveness which had characterised the preceding methodologies. Hindsight has shown, however, that this aim was only partially achieved and that the new techniques were not without their theoretical drawbacks.

Statistical methodologies, most notably multivariate analyses, have been employed with the intention of discovering mathematically significant patterns within bodies of figurines and the assemblages in which they have been found. a Campo’s study of Chalcolithic and Early-Middle Cypriot figurines, for instance, incorporated a number of statistical analyses including

\(^{151}\) Begg 1991:53-4

\(^{152}\) Merrillees 1980:181-3

\(^{153}\) Bolger 2003:100

\(^{154}\) The methodology used to create the typology is described in Part IID.1.

\(^{155}\) Orphanides 1991:40
Multidimensional Scaling, Cramer’s V, Chi-squared and Fischer’s Exact.\textsuperscript{156} Similarly Bailey used Cluster Analysis in his study of Chalcolithic figurines from Golyamo Delchevo to investigate, amongst other factors, trends in the spatial organisation of gender at the site;\textsuperscript{157} and Bartel based his cross-cultural evaluation of Neolithic figurines on a combination of Factor and Discriminate Analyses.\textsuperscript{158} Such studies share some positive points, each managing to use clearly stated, comprehensive information to generate repeatable results which are directly applicable to their initial research questions. Thus they clearly provide a healthy alternative to a purely visual, unsystematic evaluation of figurines

Even statistical techniques, however, cannot divorce themselves completely from the subjectivity of the archaeologist. Before any multivariate analysis can begin, the scholar must choose what features of the material under investigation they believe may be significant. In the case of a figurine this may be its gender, for instance, the places where it is decorated or the manner of that decoration.\textsuperscript{159} The possibilities are virtually endless but the process of choosing them correctly is crucial for the outcome of the analysis. If too many or too few variables are chosen there is a danger that any potential patterns may be obscured or simply invisible. They must also be directly related to the research question: there is no point asking questions about gender, for instance, if that is not one of the variables included in the analysis. Yet narrowing the variables in this manner presumes that we can already detect which features were important for the question being asked. In reality, however, as, for example the discussions of gender and anthropomorphism above demonstrate, this is far from straightforward.\textsuperscript{160}

Similarly, once the mathematical analysis has been completed, choices must be made as to which patterns are more or less important. a Campo, for example, stresses the apparent significance of face marks on those figures with elaborate dresses, but dismisses the correlation between multi-necked figures and lack of decoration as coincidental.\textsuperscript{161} This demonstrates the ease with which purportedly detached, mathematical analyses can be manipulated to suit the conclusions often already decided upon. Statistical analyses such as these have great potential to reveal otherwise hidden facets of the material, providing that the focus remains firmly on interpretation as an ultimate goal. Disappointingly, a Campo’s final evaluation never refers to her statistical work, offering only generalised interpretations which owe nothing to the complex exercise in mathematics and computer programming that forms the majority of her book.

\hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{156} a Campo 1994:122-4
\textsuperscript{157} Bailey 1994
\textsuperscript{158} Bartel 1981
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In addition to statistical analyses, some archaeologists have used modern scientific techniques to investigate various groups of figurines. Many techniques involve complex chemical analyses such as neutron activation study or x-ray fluorescence. The former, for example, has helped to reveal the clay sources used for figurines which were produced in the Athenian Agora.\(^{162}\) Such techniques can be invaluable, not only in determining the provenance of clays, but also, for instance, in identifying the pigments in painted decoration or the produce stored in particular vessels.\(^{163}\) There is certainly a great deal of potential contained in techniques such as these, providing sufficient usable samples survive.

However, in the study of figurines, the use of these scientific methods remains limited. The reason for this is fairly understandable – the paradigm shift from ‘work of art’ to ‘archaeological datum’ is not yet complete, and will probably never be so. Techniques such as neutron activation and certain types of x-ray fluorescence, mentioned above, or thin-section petrographic analysis, all require samples to be taken from the object itself. This might be perfectly acceptable for a sherd, for instance, but a figurine remains something special. For the most part, it is simply unthinkable to take a sample from a ‘work of art’; instead its visual integrity must be maintained at all costs. There remains, therefore, a reluctance to subject figurines to any process which might be remotely invasive. Even those techniques, such as ED-X-ray fluorescence, which only scan the surface of the object, but would require it to be taken from the museum in which it was kept are only allowed in special circumstances.

Other, less destructive, observational techniques hold perhaps more workable potential for figurine studies as they currently stand. Ongoing work on the figurines of Çatalhöyük provides a good example of the use of non-destructive, visual petrographic analysis on figurines which may help to elucidate clay sources without damaging the material.\(^ {164}\) Such a method, however, whilst enlightening, is really only viable on recently excavated, damaged figurines as repaired or intact examples rarely reveal their fabric with the sort of clarity necessary for this analysis. Goring’s close, microscopic examination of wear patterns on Chalcolithic Cypriot figurines has proven very useful in determining the way in which the objects were used and handled.\(^ {165}\) Although she also focusses on a recently excavated corpus, a similar observational technique, focussing on the outer surface of the object, could be applied more widely to museum objects studied on the premises. Similarly, high resolution digital photography of figurines could also be beneficial. It not only facilitates the continued study of objects away from the museum, but also helps to reveal details.
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of the manufacture and condition of the object which may not be apparent to the naked eye.\textsuperscript{166}

The recent Stanford Figurines project represents another benefit that the use of modern imaging can bring to the study of figurines.\textsuperscript{167} Through the use of photography and video capture, it seeks to free figurines from sterile museum or catalogue environments and to engage with them as objects in a way which might help overcome the detached, aesthetic judgments of the past.\textsuperscript{168}

The majority of scientific analyses mentioned above require time, skills and resources beyond the scope of the current project. Every effort, however, has been made to examine figurines at first hand and obtain good quality photographs for ongoing study.\textsuperscript{169}

3 \textbf{Figurines in Context}

One of the main criticisms levied at traditional, aesthetic-driven figurine studies is their general disregard for the context of the object. Scholars working with virtually every body of prehistoric figurines across the world have justifiably complained that without context, these objects can never be properly understood.\textsuperscript{170} This deceptively simple term encompasses several different scales, from the micro-context or exact find position of the object to the social or macro-context, the object’s place within the culture which made it. Although it is commonly agreed that each of these contexts holds great interpretive potential, their significance and how they should properly be evaluated continues to be debated by archaeologists.\textsuperscript{171} Historically, it has been assumed that depositional context could provide an unambiguous reflection of the past; that objects could be used simplistically to explain the place in which they were found and, conversely, that this place directly indicated how and why the object was used. Both assumptions have inherent theoretical issues yet both have strong echoes in existing interpretations of figurines in their contexts.

One use of context in figurine studies calls on supposed familiarity and easy interpretation of figurines to elucidate their depositional locations. When Mellaart uncovered figurines at Çatalhöyük, for example, his assumption that they must represent goddesses led him to identify their find contexts as shrines.\textsuperscript{172} Similarly, figurines found in burials have long been used to deduce the sex of the deceased. Cesnola, for example, believed that the presence of female figurines indicated a woman, whereas the presence of charioteer figurines suggested a man. The

\textsuperscript{166} See e.g. P. Åström 2007b on the recovery of fingerprints using digital imaging.
\textsuperscript{167} www.figurines.stanford.edu
\textsuperscript{168} Meskell 2007
\textsuperscript{169} See Part IIA.2
\textsuperscript{170} E.g. Renfrew 1969; French 1971; Downey 2003:8; Petty 2006:2-4
\textsuperscript{171} See e.g. Papaconstantinou 2006
\textsuperscript{172} Meskell 1998:47-9, 60-2; 2007:141; 2008
same deduction was used by J.Karageorghis a century later.\textsuperscript{173} Conversely, the SCE used similar reasoning to reach the opposite conclusion – that female figurines indicated a male burial.\textsuperscript{174} This variation reflects opposing views on the interpretation of figurines: Cesnola and J.Karageorghis considered them to represent a goddess and believed that goddesses belonged with females; Åström, on the other hand, favours the idea that they represented substitute wives or female attendants in the manner of the Egyptian Ushbati figures, serving their deceased master into the afterlife, something more relevant to a male burial.\textsuperscript{175} These opposing meanings, drawn from the same theory and put to work on the same set of material, demonstrate with clarity the subjectivity of this sort of ‘contextual’ study.\textsuperscript{176}

Nonetheless, some studies have successfully used figurines to investigate the context from which they came, usually by focussing on the wider, historical and social contexts of their objects. They investigate the figurines’ place within larger geographical and chronological schema to consider a range of diachronic topics such as population movement or even changing fashions in hair and clothing.\textsuperscript{177} These broader contextual studies integrate figurines fully into mainstream archaeological investigations of sites, areas and time periods which have traditionally eschewed art objects in favour of more obviously utilitarian ceramic or metal objects.\textsuperscript{178} Additionally, these studies, all of which chart changing stylistic features of figurines across time and space, also highlight something of a paradox within contextual methodologies. Although they grew from a desire to counteract the aesthetic-driven scholarship of the past, they cannot but engage with their physical characteristics and make similar judgements on their relative importance. Re-contextualising figurines secures them as archaeologically useful objects but it cannot and should not circumvent the hazards and potential contained within the study of their visual aspect.

Some figurine studies have also called upon depositional contexts to aid in interpreting the meaning of the objects themselves but this too has suffered from over-simplification. It has been assumed, for instance, that a figurine found in a tomb must have had a specifically funerary significance, representing a deity of the afterlife, perhaps, or a concubine to keep the deceased

\textsuperscript{173} Cesnola 1877:93-4. Note also his dubious assertion that all the tombs he opened at Alambra contained only a single burial. J. Karageorghis 1977:56-7
\textsuperscript{174} E.g. P.Åström 1972:254; See also Merrillees 1980:179. Note that little osteological work has yet been carried out on burials of this period save a single male skeleton from Lapithos Tomb 307B (Gjerstad 1934:63) whose sex was deduced by anatomical means. It is possible that this discovery influenced Åström’s opinions on the matter.
\textsuperscript{175} P.Åström 1972:254, 275; cf. Orphanides 1983:45. Hamilton (2002:384-6) has condemned as anachronistic the assumptions implicit in this view – the rather Victorian ideas that men’s sexual appetites can barely be restrained, even in the afterlife, and the implication that women’s role in society was primarily servile.
\textsuperscript{176} See also Meskell (2007) for the impact of this subjectivity on the excavation of figurines at Çatalhöyük.
\textsuperscript{177} e.g. Pasternak 2007; Cook 1992
\textsuperscript{178} see also McCartney 2006
company. Such explanations are offered with frequency for Bronze Age Cypriot figurines where, until recent decades, many types were found exclusively in tombs.\(^{179}\) Somewhat surprisingly, however, similar explanations continue to be offered even after extensive settlement excavation in the latter decades of the last century revealed that figurines also had lives before the grave.\(^{180}\) Talalay & Cullen, for example, writing in 2002, still believed that “the role [Plank Figurines] played in mortuary ritual [was] central to interpretation”.\(^{181}\) While such explanations demonstrate a willingness to engage with the depositional context of the figurine to reach an interpretation, they also show a reluctance to consider that this ‘context’ probably represents only part of the story.

Some interesting work has recently been conducted, however, to develop what is known as the “chaîne opératoire” approach with regard to figurines. This discourse recognises that the ‘final resting place’ of an object has been determined by countless, complex ‘formation processes’, which led the object from its position within a living society to its discovery by excavation.\(^{182}\) The figurine in a tomb was probably put there at the end of its life but this does not necessarily indicate that its meaning had always been or was ever specifically funerary. On the contrary, it may have had a long, varied life before this final deposition, just as the human occupant of the tomb would have done. One can probably be fairly certain that a figurine found in a tomb context was deposited deliberately, but this is not always easy to determine. Objects from settlement contexts, for example, may have been accidentally or deliberately discarded, lost or abandoned, or equally they may have been placed there intentionally. Moreover, objects could have been subject to any combination of these factors, discarded but for a socially significant reason, for instance, quite different to our modern concept of ‘useless rubbish’. Studies such as that on the figurines of prehistoric Dolnoslav in Bulgaria, build on this theoretical complication of depositional context to investigate use-wear and breakage to determine how the meaning, form and function of figurines may have changed throughout their use-life.\(^{183}\) The Dolnoslav study sought to “re-fit” figurine fragments found in diverse parts of the site and to evaluate whether or not the breakage and deposition of these fragments was deliberate. Their interpretation, which revealed likely intentionality behind their breakage and deposition, relied heavily on a proper appreciation of the complexities of their depositional contexts.

\(^{179}\) For Bronze Age Cypriot figurines see e.g. Myres 1914:330; P.Åström 1972:25; Merrillees 1980:184; Belgiorno 1984:15-7; Orphanides 1983:45, 1988:199.
\(^{180}\) Figurines were found in the settlement excavations of e.g. Enkomi (Dikaios 1969-71), Kition (Karageorghis & Demas 1985), Alambra-Mouttes (Coleman et al 1996), Marki-Alonia (Frankel & Webb 1996, 2006).
\(^{181}\) Talalay & Cullen 2002:190
\(^{182}\) Cameron 2006:23-4
\(^{183}\) Gaydarska et al 2007
The Dolnoslav study also highlights the contextual advantages of studying figurines from a single, recently-excavated site. Such studies have the benefit of the most up-to-date excavation techniques and theoretical discourses which record and evaluate the smallest levels of archaeological context. Properly understanding the find-position of the figurine, the soil matrix surrounding it and its relationship with material found alongside provides the best opportunity to reconstruct this micro-context and use it to aid interpretation. Unfortunately, the importance of these micro-contexts has only been identified in the last few decades and techniques for best recovering and recording them only recently developed.\(^\text{184}\) Thus, only those scholars studying figurines from current or very recently excavated sites can make use of the smallest scale of context.

A further advantage enjoyed by these privileged few is first-hand knowledge of the excavation methodologies which uncovered the figurines. Many scholars who study a large body of objects such as figurines must deal with material excavated from diverse sites, at different times and in whose recovery they have played no personal role. Each excavation project which has uncovered a figurine did so with a distinct notion of what aspects of context it considered important. The distant scholar has no control over the processes of recording and publishing which are vital to a proper appreciation of the object’s micro-context. It is no longer possible to make a personal decision on the ground as to whether a context is closed or contaminated, primary or secondary, well preserved or otherwise. Instead it is necessary to rely on the contextual information provided in the excavation reports and a degree of measured trust in what the excavator has determined.\(^\text{185}\)

Despite these difficulties and complexities, a proper, nuanced examination of the depositional contexts of figurines provides important clues about their function and significance which can enhance and solidify interpretations. In such an investigation, straightforward assumptions must be treated with caution, variations embraced, rather than ignored and the context of the few must not be allowed to determine the significance of the whole type. Similarly, macro-contexts expose a dual potential in figurine studies, not only to interpret the figurines themselves but also to be valuable in the quest to understand aspects of the culture which made them. The present study will engage carefully with whatever contexts the figurines have been lucky enough to maintain.

\(^{\text{184}}\) Webb 2006; Papaconstantinou 2006:8-16
\(^{\text{185}}\) Webb 2006:115
Towards a Materiality of Figurines

Defining figurines as ‘data’ has many advantages, not least the drive towards full and rigorous investigation of their properties which releases them from the limitations imposed by aestheticism, but it also carries many difficulties. Firstly, it has disguised the inescapable vagaries of figurine investigation in scientific terminology which offers the illusion of detachment while still incorporating the inevitable subjectivity of interpretation. Secondly, it has proved in some ways almost as limiting for the investigation of figurines as the aesthetic discourse criticised above. Too often scholars working in this arena have become embroiled in the technicalities of their studies, content to make conclusions on the efficacy of their methods rather than aim to understand their material properly. Objects have been reduced to categories, numbers and statistics, their ‘special’ meanings and social significance analysed away.

The very recent incorporation of the anthropological discourse of ‘materiality’ into figurine studies has slowly begun to overcome this difficulty. This complex, philosophical concept, championed by Miller, encourages scholars to engage with objects as ‘material things’ and to consider concurrently the material, social and spiritual ‘worlds’ of past societies. Nakamura, for example, under the precept of materiality, invokes anthropological and philosophical thought to move beyond a purely functional examination of Neo-Assyrian figurines and explore the world of magic in which these objects were involved. Her study demonstrates the potential of this discourse to advance traditional figurine study from descriptions and simplistic, reflective interpretations to insightful examinations of the experience of being in a society and using those objects.

Although Nakamura’s study is one of very few which explicitly reference materiality, several others have been conducted with similar methods and aims. These tend to be broad-focus studies completed in the last decade using bodies of figurines in their examination of diverse concepts such as warfare, magic, religion or gender. Each study is helped by the principles of materiality to look beyond the objects and investigate the world of which they were a part. However, such investigations would be impossible without an existing functional, contextual interpretation for the figurines. Nakamura’s study, for instance, was successful in part because the interpretation of the context and figurines she chose was well-supported by archaeological and textual evidence. The materiality discourse, then, provides a third step for figurines, from art objects to be appraised, through data to be analysed, towards true ‘artefacts’ of the society which
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186 Miller 2005: 1-50; Meskell 2005: 1-7
187 Nakamura 2005
188 see also e.g. Herva & Ikäheimo 2002
189 E.g. Alberti 2001; Byrne 2004; Papadopoulos 2006; Voigt 2007
created them, to be ‘thought through’ and used in holistic considerations of the thoughts, fears and beliefs of those who made and used them. Each stage must build on the last to establish as far as possible a methodologically rounded and theoretically developed investigation of figurines.

***

The theoretical and methodological nuances involved in the study of pre- and proto-historic figurines are complex and wide-ranging, touching on myriad debates from the philosophy of human behaviour to the use of science in archaeology. This discussion has highlighted the academic history which has led to the peculiar trends and preconceptions which pervade figurine studies in order to ensure that the present study learns from the mistakes and successes of the past. The methodology presented in Part II and enacted in Part III, therefore, will combine thorough investigation of the visual, physical and contextual aspects of figurines in rigorous, practical processes. Ever mindful of the theoretical preconceptions which may lurk behind every appraisal of such provocative objects, the results of this analysis, given in Part III, will explore the changing characteristics, function and significances of figurines through the Bronze Age. Drawing on a combination of the aesthetic, contextual and materialist discourses discussed in this section, Part IV will consider the implications of these findings for our understanding of Bronze Age Cypriot society by focussing on three areas:

- Ritual practices
- Economic and cultural contacts between areas of Cyprus and neighbouring polities
- Socio-political organisation of the island and the negotiation of individual and group identities

Above all, this study aspires to appreciate figurines as both art and material in equal measure, embracing the difficulties and possibilities of both.\textsuperscript{190}

\textsuperscript{190} Gosden 2001
PART II

METHODOLOGY: BACKGROUND, PROBLEMS & ANALYSES

The preceding section has established the methodological and interpretive foundation on which this project stands. Furthermore, it has demonstrated the many complex challenges which face those scholars who chose to study figurines and highlighted some of the snares into which they can fall. Ever mindful of these cautionary tales, therefore, this project sets out to produce a new methodology for the study of prehistoric figurines, which incorporates a clear, focussed and logical structure and which can produce accurate, verifiable and meaningful results.

To this end, I propose an intentionally straightforward system, underpinned by four key principles: that the study of figurines should be (A) systematic and comprehensive, (B) transparent and realistic (C) socially situated and contextual and (D) rigorous.

A. Systematic and comprehensive

Too often conclusions about figurines have been based on only a small portion of the actual evidence. Many, particularly older studies take into account only the most attractive or widely-known pieces, or those which survive virtually complete; even recent, more inclusive studies tend to confine themselves to a particular type or time period with Early-Middle Cypriot anthropomorphs proving most popular. Furthermore, a modern ethical unease with the use of unprovenanced objects, which abound within figurine groups, has resulted in the majority of studies ignoring such examples completely. All of these factors have led to conclusions about the whole corpus which are founded on limited, non-representative samples, ignoring the wealth of other three-dimensional representational material which co-exists and the tradition of representation which precedes or follows. This project seeks to surmount these limitations by exploring as wide and comprehensive a corpus as is feasible – that is every type of three-dimensional representation made or found on Cyprus throughout the Bronze Age. To achieve this, sources have been systematically searched in order to establish a database recording as much information as possible about every example currently known and with the facility to extend as further examples are discovered. All conclusions about the function and significance of figurines in Bronze Age Cyprus are based on this comprehensive foundation. The first part of this section (II.A - Material under Investigation) explains how this corpus has been chosen and collated.
B.  **Transparent and realistic**

However thoroughly the collection of data has been conducted, the study of ancient material and cultures is unavoidably based on an incomplete sample of what originally existed. Every group of archaeological material carries its own range of problems and biases affecting the scope and quality of information available for study; the figurines of Bronze Age Cyprus are certainly no exception. If these problems are ignored, they may skew the data, geographically or chronologically for instance, obscuring genuine patterns and creating false ones in a way that cannot easily be detected from the end result. In order to safeguard against such distortions, this project has carefully investigated and made explicit each factor which impacts upon the nature of the dataset and any subsequent conclusions which may be drawn from it. For Bronze Age Cypriot figurines, these factors fall into two distinct groups. Firstly, there are those difficulties which affect all archaeological material from that area and time period: perennial problems inherent in the preservation and recovery of artefacts and the use of material from early excavations, as well as the particular political turmoil which has blighted the island’s recent history. Secondly, there are problems relevant specifically to the study of figurines, notably the crucial matter of provenance and connoisseurship. In both cases frank discussion of these problems and potential biases makes clear what can realistically be achieved by the project and ensures that those conclusions made are as fair as currently possible. The second part of this section (II.B – *Problems Affecting the Dataset*) considers the impact of all of these problems on the study of Bronze Age Cypriot figurines.

C.  **Socially Situated and Contextual**

Figurines did not spring from nowhere into the museum cabinets of the Victorian world. Rather they were created, developed and used as part of the socio-cultural environment of a specific place in a specific time. It is simply impossible to offer a reasonable interpretation of these objects without proper consideration of the contexts from which they came. Moreover, a socially-situated investigation offers the opportunity of another level of interpretation: not only can it furnish a nuanced understanding of the figurines themselves but also enable figurines to provide evidence to illuminate the nature of the society which created them. Figurines can possess several levels of context – from the specific room or tomb in which they were found to the wider Eastern Mediterranean Bronze Age world as well as their position within the long prehistoric tradition of figurine use on Cyprus. Each of these contexts presents particular clues which can aid this multi-layered interpretation. To ensure that all avenues of evidence have been exploited, this project has analysed all available contextual information, seeking to understand how Bronze Age Cypriot...
figurines were specific to that society, how styles and practices originated and developed, and what factors may have driven them. This analysis, therefore, is set against a dual background: the typological history of Cypriot figurines from the Aceramic Neolithic to the Iron Age; and the socio-political milieu of the complex and varied island society and Eastern Mediterranean network of trading parties of which they were a part. The third part of this section (II.C – *Bronze Age Cypriot Figurines in their Contexts*) outlines current opinion on the socio-cultural context of Bronze Age Cyprus and provides the typological background of figurine use on the island before this period.

D. **Rigorous Analysis**

The final principle on which this methodology has been created is that any analysis should be conducted in a rigorous, systematic manner. With these criteria in mind, the core analysis consisted of five major stages: typology, chronology, geography, physical analysis and context. Each of these elements combined to produce interrogative data which can enlighten not only the meaning of the figurines themselves but also the nature of the Bronze Age Cypriot society to which they belong. The last part of this section (II.D – *Rigorous Analyses*) describes the specific methodologies employed in each of the five stages of core analysis.

The results of the analysis itself are presented in three parts. The raw data for each figurine type is presented in Appendix I. This includes the evidence concerning chronological and geographical distributions, descriptions of the shape and decoration of each figurine type, the processes of manufacture and the materials from which they were made, their size range and their condition. Part III outlines the key features of the Bronze Age Cypriot figurine record chronologically and offers interpretations of the figurines themselves. The implications of these interpretations for our understanding of figurines and the wider society in which they were made are dealt with in Part IV.
II.A THE MATERIAL UNDER INVESTIGATION

1 Defining the Dataset

This study is concerned with figurines from the c.1200 year period of the Bronze Age on the island of Cyprus, beginning with the Philia facies c.2300 BC and stretching to the end of LC IIIA c. 1100BC before the transition to the Iron Age. Although there is some debate over the political and social unity of Cyprus at any given point in prehistory, as well as over the precise beginning and end of the Bronze Age, the chronological and geographical scope of the project have obvious boundaries. The objects investigated, however, require further definition.

1a What is a Figurine?

Superficially, the definition of the word ‘figurine’ appears unambiguous, yet within much existing scholarship has been understood in a variety of ways. Many studies use a very narrow interpretation of the term, confining their work to representational objects with apparently no quotidian purpose, some limiting it even further to those of anthropomorphic appearance. Others use the word interchangeably with a range of other diverse terms, some relatively innocuous, such as ‘figure’ or ‘statuette’, others, like ‘idol’ or ‘icon’, rather more loaded. Those few scholars who have given due consideration to the term ‘figurine’ have defined it as any “three-dimensional representation”. It is this broadly inclusive definition which I follow in this study, yet some discussion of what it means in practical terms remains essential.

Firstly, it must be acknowledged that modern categories devised to organise ancient material can never hope to represent genuine divisions which would have been meaningful to contemporary people. The traditional grouping of “figurines” is particularly reliant on our modern perception that representations of other things, especially humans, must always have deserved singular attention. This has led us to believe that they would have been treated differently than supposedly commonplace, utilitarian objects, and must consequently be analysed differently. Meskell has expressed justifiable concerns over this tendency to treat figurines as a “special” category, criticising in particular the narrow nature of the object types which have traditionally
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191 See Part IB.1a for full discussion of these debates.
192 See especially Bailey 2005:15, 26-44. NB: There is some debate over the suitability of the term ‘representation’ which may also appear somewhat presumptive. However, I feel it is the most apt term available for this body of material and therefore will be used, albeit with caution, in this study. For more see Meskell 2008:140-1; 2007:137.
been considered ‘figurines’. Since it is simply impossible to reconstruct the complete Bronze Age artefact category in which figurines belong, this project aims for the next best option. Whilst recognising that the grouping is based on modern terms, it seeks to avoid counterintuitive limitations to the material under study and consequently strives for the broadest definition of figurines possible – that is any three-dimensional representation. For Bronze Age Cyprus, this includes a multifaceted range of material (Fig 8).

Although single anthropomorphs (e.g. top row, central images) and to a lesser extent single zoomorphs are fairly uncontentious members of the “figurine” category, other classes illustrated in Fig 8 are more controversial. Those objects which appear to have a quotidian function are frequently excluded from studies of figurines for this reason – the owl shaped rattle (bottom row, second from left) and the pyxis lid in the form of a ‘slab figure’ (middle row, second from right), for example; likewise the anthropomorphic vessels (bottom row, second from right) and zoomorphic vessels (top row, far right) so often separated from their very similar, but apparently non-functional counterparts. Those objects, like the Early Cypriot Knife and Sheath Models (top row, far left), depicting inanimate objects, rather than humans or animals are also frequently
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193 Meskell 2007:137
194 E.g. Catling 1976:71-2; Karageorghis 1993:19
ignored, perhaps because what they represent, and consequently their meaning, is assumed to be obvious.\textsuperscript{195} The contentious Comb/brush Model (middle row, far right) is a case in point. Usually considered to be a model of an object it has seldom been included in studies of figurines; however, since its reinterpretation as a highly schematic human figure by Desmond Morris, it has recently become more popular.\textsuperscript{196} The often complex scenic models, such as the Bucranial Wall (bottom row, far left) and bread-making model (bottom row, far right) have received a great deal of attention in the scholarship, usually admired as great masterpieces of Bronze Age art. However, they, along with the vessels decorated with single or small groups of attached figures, are rarely explored alongside more standard figurines, even though they are essentially groups of those same figurines arranged in miniature tableaux.

Those objects included in the category of ‘figurines’ used in this project have, therefore, been defined. They are three-dimensional representations of anthropomorphs, zoomorphs and inanimate objects, overtly functional or otherwise, single representations or groups, independent or attached to vessels.\textsuperscript{197} Ceramic material is by far the most abundant but those few stone and metal figurines which are stylistically related to the main defined types will also be included.\textsuperscript{198} By investigating this wide collection of objects concurrently, and using related two-dimensional iconographical material as comparative evidence, it is hoped that the very real difficulties concerning unnecessarily limited samples and interpretations which have characterised much of the earlier scholarship have been overcome and little pertinent information has been overlooked.

As discussed above, ancient figurines are generally assumed to be consistently “special” but what this varied corpus of objects might truly represent is actually rather difficult to envisage from such a chronological and cultural distance. Consideration of what might be subsumed into this broad “figurine” category in a modern Western context, however, can offer some interesting insight into what the Bronze Age Cypriot figurative record might really encompass. Fig 9 shows some of the modern objects which might be called “figurines” under this project’s definition of the term.

\textsuperscript{195} They are commonly considered to be substitutes for the metal originals too valuable to deposit in tombs but given the not uncommon presence of their bronze equivalent often in the same contexts this is clearly far from resolved. See Part III.2-3 for a full discussion.

\textsuperscript{196} Morris 1985:138-9; see also Karageorghis 1991a:45-6; see Part III.3 for my own re-interpretation of this type.

\textsuperscript{197} In other contexts this definition of “figurines” might easily incorporate representations of other things, such as plant life or fantastical creatures, but this list comprises only those known to have existed in Bronze Age Cyprus.

\textsuperscript{198} Clearly imported figurative material such as gold or ivory figurines or faience zoomorphic vessels, however, have been excluded as they represent wholly different ideological and symbolic repertoires, processes of manufacture and travel and thus warrant further investigation outside the scope of the present study.
Fig 9: Modern objects which may be considered “figurines”

(left-right – Top row: Toby Jug, Piggy Bank, garden gnome, gingerbread man; Bottom row: teddy bear, Lladro miniature, chess piece, Dr Who action figure, wedding cake decorations [D-K.Knox])

This comparison illustrates that what has survived is unlikely to be a complete picture of figurine use in Bronze Age Cyprus. It seems reasonable that some three-dimensional representation would have been made in organic materials. Objects like the gingerbread man (top row, far right), for example, made of temporary, or in this case, edible material would undoubtedly have perished in the intervening 4000 years and thus disappeared from the figurine record. Unfortunately, it is impossible to guess what object types might have been lost and we can only acknowledge that they probably existed.

The variety of modern objects included in the “figurine” definition also demonstrates that simply because objects share a category, it cannot be assumed that their meanings and significances will also correspond. The modern group, and by analogy the ancient group too, are far from homogenous. The former ranges from the Lladro miniature (bottom row, second from left) – a purely ornamental depiction of a familiar subject – through the Piggy Bank (top row, second from left), which is essentially a zoomorphic vessel with a practical as well as illustrative function, to the Wedding Cake Figures (bottom row, far right) whose use and meaning is inextricably linked to a specific ‘rite of passage’ occasion. The Bronze Age Cypriot corpus is also likely to encompass similarly varied object types.

Perhaps most importantly, the modern figurines also emphasise the importance of contextual analysis for striving towards an understanding of the meaning and social significance of their ancient counterparts. The Toby Jug (top row, far left), for instance, is an anthropomorphic vessel whose form is based on a cultural joke, which only those with inside knowledge of the culture in question can understand. Although the teddy bear (bottom row, far left) and the Dr Who action
figure (bottom row, second from right) are ‘just’ toys, even they hold culturally specific references that would not be discernible from the object in isolation. The gnome (top row, second from right) presents a particularly interesting example of how meaning and significance can change as an object or type travels from one place and time to another. In late nineteenth century Germany, the context in which the type was devised, the gnome referred to local mythology and was seen as an emblem of luck. In present-day British society, however, gnomes have lost that original symbolism and retain only a decorative or comedic value combined with particular connotations of personal taste or social class. Finally, the chess piece (bottom row, centre) makes manifest the importance of identifying other, related objects for discerning meaning: without the other pieces, and without the board, the highly ritualised activity in which this object is involved would remain firmly out of reach.

The corpus of material under investigation in this project, therefore, is complex and diverse. Some may share similar meanings and functions, others may not; some may be relevant to particular people, places or events wherever they are found, while others may change their significance as they move from one context to another. Yet all are ‘special’, bound together by the simple, broad, common definition of three-dimensional representations, and a shared potential for fascinating insight into Bronze Age Cypriot society.

1b Anthropomorphism and zoomorphism: when is a vessel, not just a vessel?

There is one further aspect of the dataset which has yet to be defined: by what criteria should an object be judged anthropomorphic or zoomorphic? And when can resemblance to something else be dismissed as purely accidental? This is a problem relevant to all objects but it is by far the most pertinent within the category whose first definition is as ‘vessels’. In some cases, the designation is patently obvious. The Base Ring Bull in Fig 10, for instance, is clearly a vessel in bovine shape; likewise, the Flathead Bottle in Fig 11 was evidently designed to resemble the human form.
However, for many other examples this distinction is far from clear-cut. Those objects commonly referred to as “bird askoi” (Fig 12) for example, have in reality only a very slight suggestion of ornithomorphic shape, usually nothing more than an elliptical body, making their standard description extremely difficult to justify. Within the corpus of so-called anthropomorphic vessels, there is a similar problem of identification. Three-quarters of the objects listed in Belgiorno’s account of such objects, for instance, have extremely fleeting anthropomorphic features. Although most prevalent within the vessel class, the problem of identification is not confined to it. Figurines such as Fig 13 which only loosely resemble the human form but are easily categorised as such are not uncommon.

It is interesting to consider the impact of the phenomenon of pareidolia in this context. This is our innate psychological tendency to perceive resemblances, particularly to the human form, in purely random shapes. It accounts for “the man in the moon”, for example, and many visions of the Virgin Mary in inanimate objects.  It may also account for many unremarkable Bronze Age Cypriot objects being ascribed anthropomorphic or even zoomorphic characteristics where none were intended. Since Bronze Age Cypriot people presumably also experienced this trait, they may have seen anthropomorphic or zoomorphic shape in those same objects, but the concept of what makes an image anthropomorphic, for instance, is somewhat culturally determined. From a modern, Western perspective, we look for biologically diagnostic characteristics – facial features, limbs, head. Yet comparative ethnographic studies have shown that not all cultures require these attributes and may just as easily consider inanimate objects which are not at all humanoid in shape as anthropomorphic. There are probably objects which the modern viewer would never class as anthropomorphic or zoomorphic but which would have been obviously so to a Bronze Age Cypriot person, based on criteria we cannot possibly guess. Although it is impossible to account for such objects, it may be possible to overcome pareidolic predispositions and

---

199 e.g. Sagan 1995
200 Ucko & Rosenfeld 1972
201 Verpoorte 2001:37
categorisations based on nothing more than personal belief in a passing resemblance. To achieve this, I have established a clear basis on which discernible anthropomorphism and zoomorphism can be defined. This takes the form of a series of distinct criteria. Objects which include a complete anthropomorphic or zoomorphic protome are automatically included (such as Fig 15 and Fig 14).

![Fig 15](15.jpg) (left) TAV.TTS.01 (Karageorghis 1976:No.113)

![Fig 14](14.jpg) (right) BZD.Kaz.01 (Nicolaou & Nicolaou 1989:Pl.XXVIII)

Otherwise, only objects which display at least two of the following characteristics have included:

1. Limbs (human or animal) in the form of arms, wings and/or legs which are decorated/shaped in such a way that they are more than simply convenient supports for the object.

2. Key facial features (comprising eyes and nose and/or mouth). Note that it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between a vessel which is envisaged as the anthropomorph and a vessel which has a face added as stand-alone relief decoration. An appropriate position for the face (such as on the top of a spout) should also be considered.

3. Additional facial features (such as eyebrows, or particularly ears)

4. Additional bodily features (such as tail or genitals for zoomorphic objects or navel, breasts or genitals for anthropomorphic objects)

5. Unmistakeably suggestive shape (such as the presence of moulded buttocks or shoulders)

The overall impression of the object should also be taken into account. It is possible that those objects which this system excludes but which display one of the above criteria may be a related form of the same system of imagery. Whilst it is accepted that this system can never be perfect, it is designed to be as sensible and inclusive as possible.

***
These, then, are the criteria on which material has been chosen to be part of this study. They are intended to be broad enough so that relevant patterns and features are not lost but definitive enough to form a logical and coherent group. Such a definition is an essential preliminary step before the relevant information could be collated and the analyses begin.

2 Collecting the Data

The methodology employed in collecting the information for this study has been underpinned by the principle that the investigation should be both systematic and comprehensive. Information about all published figurines has been collected using a combination of museum catalogues, excavation reports and relevant secondary literature. Every source used in the collection is listed in the bibliography and referenced in the individual entries for each figurine.²⁰² Inevitably, not all the required information was available for every figurine from published sources alone. Personal visits to museum collections have enabled me both to supplement this information with personal examination and to acquaint myself thoroughly with the characteristics of each type of figurine.

Ideally, I would have wished to examine every figurine included in this study first-hand. Unfortunately, this has not proven practically possible. There are currently 1208 provenanced objects in the database, widely dispersed across the entire world. Some of these figurines cannot currently be located within the museums which house them. The objects from Myrtou-Pigadhes, for example, in the Cyprus Museum are currently in need of cataloguing (hundreds of unnumbered trays containing hundreds of unlabelled sherds) and it has proven impossible to identify individual fragments without restudying the entire collection. Others have apparently been lost or destroyed in the time since their discovery. Still other figurines reside in museums which are currently inaccessible, most notably those in the collections of Northern Cyprus.²⁰³ By far the most significant hindrance to this endeavour, however, has been the time and money required to conduct it, regrettably far beyond the scope of a doctoral budget. Nonetheless, it has been possible for me to view a representative range of material in England and Cyprus, totalling 221 objects (some 20% of the total provenanced corpus). This has been more than sufficient to provide me with a good understanding of the general trends within the types and supplement much needed information about some of the most useful objects from well-provenanced sources.

²⁰² I would like to note that without the efforts of Karageorghis (1991,1993), Mogelonsky (1988), Morris (1985), and the Swedish Cyprus Expedition (Stewart 1962, L. Åström 1972, P.Åström 1972) the task of collecting this material would have been immeasurably more difficult.
²⁰³ see Part IIB.5b
Where first-hand information has not been available, a number of techniques have been used to ensure that the information collected is as accurate and comprehensive as possible. Extensive cross-checking between as many different sources as available has been used to verify the accuracy of information about each figurine. Errors or discrepancies in published information are not uncommon but it is usually possible to trace misinformation back to its source and correct the problem. It should be acknowledged, however, that minor factual errors which could not be identified may still exist within the dataset.

The collection of as much pictorial information on each example as possible provided a second safeguard against inaccuracy and missing information. In most cases this took the form of line drawings or photographs, usually showing only the front surface of the figurine. In some cases, discrepancies between illustrations in different publications have revealed interesting cautionary information about the post-excavation life of the figurine as well as the artistic licence employed by some illustrators, particularly in earlier publications.

A Plank Figurine from Lapithos, Tomb 201 provides an interesting example (Fig 16). In the original drawing by Myres in 1946, the figurine has a complete left neck and the right neck is only slightly damaged. In the photograph taken by Karageorghis in 1991, however, the left neck is more fragmentary, the left ear is missing and the right head is now very badly damaged. Without the original drawing, it would have been impossible to determine important details such as the presence of pierced ears. When I viewed this figurine myself in February 2009, it had deteriorated even further. From the disjointed pieces in the box, it was only possible to reconstruct the left neck, the right neck having crumbled virtually to dust.

Drawings, however, particularly from early publications, cannot always be trusted to give a fair image of the object they depict. The illustration from Cesnola (Fig 17, left) appears to show an Earring figurine which would have held an infant in its protruding arms with the head at the left hand side.
This would be highly unusual as the vast majority of similar figurines hold their infant with the head on the right hand side. It is clear from the later photograph, however (Fig 17, right), that the drawing, perhaps copied from a negative image, has flipped the figurine along the vertical axis.\(^\text{204}\)

Other incidences of mistakes in the drawings are more difficult to verify. This image from Perrot & Chipiez in 1885 (Fig 18), for example, shows an Earring Figurine holding a disc. This composition, although common in Iron Age Cypriot figurines, is unparalleled within the rest of the Bronze Age corpus. It seems likely that some licence has been taken in this drawing, either by the artist or perhaps by an early restorer. Since no other illustrations of this figurine exist and its current whereabouts are unknown, it is impossible to be certain either way.

All the examples discussed so far have concerned anthropomorphic figurines. This is not a deliberate bias on my part, rather a reflection of a bias which has existed within the scholarship for some time. Since the anthropomorphic figurines have been studied to a far greater extent than their zoomorphic counterparts, there are simply more illustrations present in the publications. The consequences of this are twofold: whilst more publications usually mean that more information is easily available about the anthropomorphs, there are more instances of ambiguity or discrepancy.\(^\text{205}\) Nevertheless, illustrations have proven useful, albeit in a slightly different way, for the study of the zoomorphic objects. There is a tendency within the scholarship, for example to refer to both Late Cypriot Base Ring Bull vessels and figurines as “rhyta” regardless of their different forms. As the descriptions offered frequently lack detail, particularly in earlier catalogues and excavation reports, the illustrations are often the only source by which to make this most crucial distinction. Similarly, since many objects of varying levels of resemblance to animals are frequently described as “zoomorphic askoi”, the illustration often provides the only opportunity to assess whether such objects fulfil the criteria for true zoomorphism set out in Part II.1b.

\(^{204}\)Whilst it is possible that photograph has been flipped, rather than the drawing, since several other photographs exist, taken at different times by different scholars (e.g. Karageorghis 1993:Pl. IV.5), it can be assumed in this case that it is the drawing which is at fault. See also a similar situation for PAF.NON.39 on which Merrillees expounds in 1988:178-9.

\(^{205}\)The same can also be said for anthropomorphs considered more or less “fine” examples and have consequently received far more attention.
Choosing what to record and storing the data

Every Bronze Age Cypriot figurine which has come to light during the extensive investigations described above has been entered into my own bespoke MS Access database, included here on a separate disc, gathering every known example together for the first time. Two tables have been created within the database, one to record provenanced examples which are the focus of most elements of this study, and one to record unprovenanced examples which have been necessarily used in a more limited capacity (see Part IIB.5b). In general, more detail has been recorded on the Provenanced table as this study will rely heavily on contextual analysis of these objects. For each figurine, both tables record its current location, overall shape and type and all known publication references. In the Provenanced table, as much detail as possible about the circumstances of discovery of each figurine was collected, including the excavator, site, specific findspot, associated objects and stratigraphy. Both tables also include details of the stylistic and decorative features by which it may be possible to determine regional preference or chronological development of the types. Likewise, the material of each figurine and the techniques used to manufacture it have been recorded in order to elucidate technologies used and to detect variation within the types as well as similarity between them and with objects outside the figurine corpus. Information about the physical condition – any damage, wear or restoration – has been included for both provenanced and unprovenanced objects, albeit in more detail in the case of the former. Finally major measurements (including height, length, thickness at various points) have been recorded for every figurine possible. Where it has been possible to examine figurines in person, certain minor measurements have also been recorded (such as the height of ears and diameter of any piercings or the diameter of the spouts and rims on vessels). It has not been possible to collect enough of these measurements to be useful in any analyses for the present study, but they have been included in the database in case they should be of use in any future work. Illustrations have also been included where possible for each figurine, particularly the provenanced examples, comprising published drawings and photographs and those taken during my research visits. Sample database entry pages are illustrated in Fig 19.

For simple referencing, each figurine in the database has been given a unique index number which includes information about its type and the site at which it was found. A key to this indexing system can be found below (Fig 20). Once in the database, the information about each figurine can be easily viewed and edited and is completely searchable by any terms including site, current location, type and material. This systematic collation of data has greatly facilitated the

---

206 Every effort has been made to ensure that this database is as comprehensive and inclusive as possible for material discovered up to and including 2011. However, I acknowledge that a small number of examples from this large dataset may have slipped through the net.
retrieval of information as well as each of the analyses which have been conducted and will be
described in Part IID.

Fig 19: Sample database entry pages (Top: Provenanced Figurines, first page; Bottom: Unprovenanced Figurines)
### Three-letter Typological Code

1st letter = Typological Abbreviation  
2nd letter = Subject Depicted  
(Z=zoomorph,  
I=animal,  
M=mixture of the above)  
3rd letter = Type of Object (F=figure,  
V=vessel, D=Vessel with attached figures) 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st letter</th>
<th>Typological Abbreviation</th>
<th>2nd letter</th>
<th>Subject Depicted</th>
<th>3rd letter</th>
<th>Type of Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ach</td>
<td>Achna</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agh</td>
<td>Aghirda</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ak</td>
<td>Akaki</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akh</td>
<td>Akhera</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akn</td>
<td>Akanthou</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ala</td>
<td>Alaoas</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al</td>
<td>Alambra-Mouttes/*(general)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APM</td>
<td>Alassa-Pano Manaldares</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arn</td>
<td>Arahosus</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amb</td>
<td>Ambelikou-Aletris</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ang</td>
<td>Angastina-Voumos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ap</td>
<td>Apikli-Karamallos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ars</td>
<td>Arpera</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ars</td>
<td>Arsos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ath</td>
<td>Athanaros</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AyD</td>
<td>Ayios Demetrios</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AyR</td>
<td>Ayia Irini</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APH</td>
<td>Ayia Phyla-Hioni</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayl</td>
<td>Ayios Iakovas Melia/*(general)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATS</td>
<td>Ayios Theodoros Soleas Alonia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT</td>
<td>Ayios Theodoros Tenta</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BcB</td>
<td>Bademog Boghaz</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bab</td>
<td>Bogaz</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cha</td>
<td>Chatos (purchased)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdA</td>
<td>Dhal/Idalon</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Dhekelia-Steno</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhe</td>
<td>Dhenia-KoKallia/*(general)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRT</td>
<td>Dromolaxia-Trypes</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enk</td>
<td>Enkomis</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epi</td>
<td>Episkopi-Bamboula/*Phanomeni</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evd</td>
<td>Evdhismoi-Stymouli</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal</td>
<td>Galinoporni</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST</td>
<td>Hala Sultan Tekke</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdP</td>
<td>Idalire-Potamia</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kav</td>
<td>Kalavasos (Village)</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kad</td>
<td>Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimitrios</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kma</td>
<td>Kalavasos-Mavrovouni</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPC</td>
<td>Kalavasos Panayia Church</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kao</td>
<td>Kalokhorio</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kals</td>
<td>Kalpssida</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krk</td>
<td>Karmi-Lamtsa</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kar</td>
<td>Karmi-Paleolona</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kat</td>
<td>Katykhatas-Linou</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kav</td>
<td>Kazakhani-Ayios Andronikos</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kho</td>
<td>Khoulou</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kid</td>
<td>Kidasi-Foutsi</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Kition</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kla</td>
<td>Kladhia-Tremithos</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Two-digit identification number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3-letter Site Abbreviation</th>
<th>2-digit Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achna</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aghirda</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akaki</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akhera</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akanthou</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaoas</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alambra-Mouttes/*(general)</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alassa-Pano Manaldares</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arpera</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsos</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athanaros</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayios Demetrios</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayia Irini</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayia Phyla-Hioni</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayios Iakovas Melia/*(general)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayios Theodoros Soleas Alonia</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayios Theodoros Tenta</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bademog Boghaz</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogaz</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatos (purchased)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhal/Idalon</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhekelia-Steno</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhenia-KoKallia/*(general)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dromolaxia-Trypes</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enkomis</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episkopi-Bamboula/*Phanomeni</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evdhismoi-Stymouli</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galinoporni</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hala Sultan Tekke</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idalire-Potamia</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalavasos (Village)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimitrios</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalavasos-Mavrovouni</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalavasos Panayia Church</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalokhorio</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalpssida</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karmi-Lamtsa</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karmi-Paleolona</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katykhatas-Linou</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhani-Ayios Andronikos</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khoulou</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidasi-Foutsi</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kition</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kladhia-Tremithos</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 20: Key to abbreviations used in the database
II.B  PROBLEMS AFFECTING THE DATASET

The figurine record of Bronze Age Cyprus is no more complete than any other set of material from an ancient context. Natural processes and the activities of humans have undoubtedly changed and diminished the range and amount of material currently available to study. Similarly, not all material which has survived in the ground has yet been brought to light through excavation or otherwise. Furthermore, that which has been discovered has not always been brought to academic or public attention through adequate publication. The following section outlines the issues and biases which have influenced the quantity and quality of evidence available for this study of the figurines of Bronze Age Cyprus.

1  Preservation Bias

It is well known that the ravages of time have left the surviving Cypriot Bronze Age remains regrettably incomplete. Natural taphonomic processes have caused a great deal of damage thereby reducing the areas in which figurines might have been found. Such processes have had a detrimental effect on both the extent of sites which survive and also the integrity of the objects and stratigraphy which can be recovered. Surface erosion has particularly damaged those sites situated on high plateaux and cliff edges. A significant part of Alambra-Mouttes, for example, has fallen away to the valley below and the hilltop on which Dhali-Kafkallia is located has been continuously denuded over the centuries so that the depth of material remaining above the bedrock is now remarkably small.\(^{207}\) The effects of underground erosion, often the result of the collapse of protective structures and the influx of water and of equivalent damage by ground movement and the progress of tree roots, are fairly widespread. Although they affect all site types, they are perhaps most pronounced within multi-burial tombs where it is frequently impossible to reconstruct individual assemblages within disturbed and confused, eroded remains.\(^{208}\) Determining the original position of a figurine within a settlement or tomb, therefore, as well as the range of objects which were perhaps deliberately deposited alongside it, cannot always be accomplished with any certainty.

The effects of natural taphonomic processes are not confined to the extent and integrity of sites. It is recognised that certain materials are less likely to survive in the ground. Sadly Cyprus has no large areas of peat bog or frozen tundra which might preserve organic material intact so textiles, wood, basketry and human skin and hair are almost entirely missing from the Bronze Age Cypriot

\(^{207}\) Coleman et al 1996:4-5; Overbeck & Swiny 1972:24-31
\(^{208}\) Keswani 2004:23-4
material record. Figurines made from such materials as well as potentially related patterns and images which might have existed on these media no longer survive. Similarly the small number of known objects made from unfired or low-fired clay most likely represents only a fraction of that particularly fragile, original corpus. Furthermore, in certain areas, particularly those of limestone geology, the preservation of buried bone is poor. Bone figurines from this period are currently unattested, but this remains significant for the current study. Skeletons from these regions are unlikely to survive in sufficiently good condition to determine gender, age or mode of death, all of which could help determine the sector of society to which the use of particular figurines was relevant.

The activities of humans on Cyprus have also had a substantial impact on the preservation of the Bronze Age remains. Illicit looting has been prolific on the island for many centuries and continues to be a problem in the present day. Although it is impossible to estimate the full extent of this clandestine activity, virtually every site currently known through excavation has suffered some disruption from looters. The pits dug to locate valuable antiquities disrupt and destroy the remains through which they pass and the objects they take are usually lost to archaeology. Comparable in scale and impact to the activities of looters are the investigations of Cyprus’ earliest archaeological explorers in the early nineteenth century. Seldom conducted in a scientific manner and almost never published, these operations ploughed through immeasurable amounts of stratigraphical material to reach the tombs containing the treasures they sought. It is estimated, for example, that Cesnola alone opened more than 10,000 tombs on the island during his short time as American consul. Since figurines have long been considered interesting, desirable objects, they have proven popular amongst both looters and early archaeologists. It is impossible to predict the number of figurines uncovered in this manner that are currently in private hands. The resulting loss of provenance for those objects whose whereabouts are known will be discussed in Part IIB.5b.

Redevelopment of Cyprus’ land for agriculture, infrastructure and accommodation has disturbed and destroyed a great deal of Bronze Age material. The pace of this redevelopment has increased exponentially in recent years, particularly as the tourist industry has prospered. It is difficult to estimate what has been lost to new building but the Department of Antiquities has been called upon to conduct numerous rescue excavations. Whilst these have revealed often hitherto unknown sites and forced the recovery of much material that would otherwise have remained hidden, it is at the expense of full-scale, long-term excavations that would ultimately provide far more detailed contextual information about Bronze Age Cyprus.

\[209\] Keswani 2004:24
\[210\] Arda, Knapp & Webb 2005:9
Overbuilding on ancient sites is not an activity restricted to modern Cypriots. Many Bronze Age settlements were inhabited for several centuries and each new generation of occupants tended to modify the form and layout of the buildings and site. Such activities have been particularly detrimental for the remains of the Philia facies at sites such as Marki-Alonia, and MC III-LC I material at sites like Enkomi, which frequently formed the first of many occupation layers.211 Bronze Age people also had other significant effects on what they left behind. Earlier burials within multi-burial tombs, for example, were frequently, either accidentally or intentionally, moved or tidied to make way for the next, and more elaborate secondary burial practices including disarticulation of the skeletons are also known to have occurred.212 In settlements, it is sometimes evident that rooms and buildings have been deliberately cleared when the structure was abandoned leaving little trace of how it might have been utilised.213 Such curation activities make it difficult to reconstruct the specific domestic and funerary environments in which figurines were used. They may also have contributed to the high frequency of settlement figurines found in secondary contexts of fill or discard.

2 Excavation Bias

In addition to biases in the preservation of sites and material, there have also been differential levels of excavation in different areas of the island. In the earlier half of the twentieth century, there was a bias towards the exploration of sites in the North of Cyprus, as the highly influential Swedish Cyprus Expedition focussed almost entirely on this area. Following the political turmoil and ultimate division of the island in 1974, however, areas north of the “Green Line” have become inaccessible to archaeologists and excavation has been necessarily limited to the South. In some ways, this has helped to redress the earlier imbalance, yet it has also created its own additional disparity. All excavations in the North of the island have been conducted using theory and methods which are at best thirty-five years old. All modern excavations, with the new techniques and theory which these encompass, concentrate on one portion of the island alone. Consequently, just as the level of detail recorded and the research questions behind early excavations are not directly analogous to their modern equivalents, material from the two areas of Cyprus is no longer completely comparable; thus a geographical dimension has been added to what is elsewhere a purely chronological problem. For the present study, this situation may skew

211 See Part II.B.4 for discussion of particular chronological layers which are more or less visible in the archaeological record. For Marki-Alonia see Frankel & Webb 1996, 2006; For Enkomi see especially Dikaios 1969-71
212 Keswani 2004:23-4, 88-104
213 Especially at Early-Middle Cypriot sites e.g. Marki-Alonia (Frankel & Webb 1996)
any apparent geographical patterns evident in the material. An early preference for excavating tombs, for instance, has meant that the only significant groups of Early-Middle Cypriot figurines from settlement contexts come from sites excavated in the South of the island in the last twenty years.

The events of 1974 also have some ramifications for what material is currently available for study. Some collections of antiquities were looted or lost completely during the turmoil. The whereabouts of the vast majority of the extensive Hadjiprodromou collection, formerly housed in Famagusta, for example, are currently unknown. Of the 2000 objects originally collected, many of which were figurines, 40 have been returned to Mr Hadjiprodromou, some are on display in the museum of Apostle Barnabas Monastery in Turkish Famagusta, whilst the rest are presumed to have been disposed of on foreign art markets. Similarly Emily Vermeule gives a moving account of the unfortunate fate of some of the material from Morphou-Toumba tou Skourou which was being excavated at the time of the fighting in 1974. Furthermore, although material from many Northern sites was transferred to the Cyprus Museum soon after its excavation, some projects, such as that at Morphou-Toumba tou Skourou, stored much of it in the local museums. Although this material may still be there, it is currently inaccessible to scholars.

This study draws information from many sites, explored at distant times, by different excavators and to varying levels of detail. The material and information gained from these projects will not always be completely comparable, nor indeed has it always been published to the same extent. Whilst some, such as Kition, have detailed, final reports of their excavations, including catalogues, maps and interpretations, others, like the excavations at Dhekelia-Steno, are known only from footnotes. Other sites, notably the French explorations at Enkomi and the long-term project at Hala Sultan Tekke, have been published in such a sketchy, confusing manner that pertinent information is difficult, if not impossible, to glean. Although material known from these sites can be included in the catalogue, it cannot be determined if all figurines excavated are mentioned and little contextual information can be ascertained.

Differing levels of excavation and publication also contribute to a related problem: the tendency for several “key sites” to assume prominence due to the exceptional amount of excavation which has taken place there and the subsequent detailed publication of the results. In the Early-Middle Bronze Age, the North Coast cemeteries of Bellapais-Vounous and Lapithos-Vrysi tou Barba stand

214 Hadjiprodromou 2000  
215 Vermeule & Wolsky 1990:1-7  
216 For Kition, see Karageorghis & Demas 1985; for Dhekelia-Steno, see Megaw 1956.  
out as they have been explored in considerable detail; contemporary sites in the South West of the island, however, have been largely ignored until recent years. Historically, this discrepancy has given the impression that the most concentrated, complex Early-Middle Cypriot occupation was located in the North of the island and that the West and the Karpas peninsular were largely unoccupied. However it is clear from survey work and excavation that this is probably a false picture. For the Late Bronze Age, it is Enkomi which appears to predominate, and the North of the island which has little to offer. It is not possible to be certain that this admittedly prosperous site was truly exceptional, particularly given the preponderance of other, larger sites of similar wealth most of which have simply not yet been fully explored. Such pre-eminent sites also tend to produce the largest numbers of figurines and give the impression of being the geographical heartland of certain types. Whilst this may well have been the case, the possible distorting influence of this excavation bias should not be discounted.

3 Issues of Identification

Unless it has originated from particularly well-preserved contexts, material found through excavation is usually fragmentary. For the predominantly ceramic figurines and figurative objects concerning this study, this is particularly significant. Whilst a miniature ceramic anthropomorphic head would be unmistakeably identified as a figurine, sherds of other types might not be so easily recognised. Leg or horn fragments of zoomorphic objects, for example, have often been misinterpreted as handle fragments from vessels; and it is virtually impossible to determine whether or not a body sherd might come from a vessel which was figurative in form or decorated by the addition of miniature figures, usually positioned around the rim or on the upper shoulder.

Even if the fragment is clearly from a figurine, a small sherd is easily missed, either in the ground or during the process of interpretation after the excavation. Herscher, for example, recently identified two Plank Figurine fragments within the sherd material of the Pennsylvania University excavations at Lapithos, some thirty years after their completion. It is simply impossible to estimate how many other fragments may have been similarly forgotten. Consequently, certain types of figurative object, particularly those in vessel form or with plastic, figurative decoration, as well as small fragments of all types, are likely to be underrepresented in the current dataset. It is more likely that figurine fragments will be misidentified if either they are of a less familiar, non-
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218 For Vounous see Dikaios 1940, Stewart & Stewart 1950, Dunn-Vaturi 2003; for Lapithos see Gjerstäd et al 1934, Myres 1940-45, Herscher 1978.
219 E.g. Sydney Cyprus Survey Project (Given & Knapp 2003) and ongoing excavations at Kissonerga-Skalia (Crewe et al 2008). See also Catling 1962 for a detailed picture of Bronze Age settlement patterns.
220 E. Herscher pers. comm. 27 Feb 2007; publication forthcoming
canonical type, or they occur in sites which have not previously produced figurines. It is plausible then, that geographical and typological patterns may be skewed on this account, yet, for the same reason, this bias is likely to be slight as it will not significantly affect the larger, well-defined types and more prolific sites.

In addition to the problems concerning the identification of figurines themselves, there is also some difficulty involved in accurately identifying the ware of the ceramic examples. Establishing the ware of a figurine correctly can provide important evidence concerning the period of use of that type and in determining its relationship to non-figurative ceramic vessels. In practice, however, this can be somewhat difficult to achieve. Since it is generally not deemed appropriate to clip a figurine to reveal its fabric, cataloguers and excavators, particularly those conducting missions prior to the last twenty years, have, for the most part, identified the ware of a figurine by surface appearance alone. Unfortunately, this method can miss some of the complexities of pottery wares revealed only by close examination of the internal fabric, only achieved in this instance on fragmentary examples from recent excavations. This has undoubtedly led to some misidentifications of ware. Moreover, it has not been possible to explore potential similarities and differences in the fabric of these ceramic objects which may have revealed intriguing information about the care and skill with which each was made and the source of its material in relation to the eventual depositional context of the figurine.

There is also much debate, for example, over the exact relationship between the wares of the figurines and those of non-figurative vessels apparently made of similar material. Although the Base Ring Bull vessels and figurines have long been labelled Base Ring II, for example, this assignation has been called into question. Catling has argued that although the fabric of the bull vessels can be considered Base Ring II, that of the bull figurines is not comparable. He goes on to argue that despite “superficial” similarities, this difference in fabric makes it impossible to suggest that they are from the same iconographical tradition. He has based his conclusions, it seems, predominantly on the surface appearance and decoration of the objects, citing the white paint on dark background as a key feature of Base Ring II which the vessels show and the figurines do not. Close inspection of these types, however, shows that there is no such clear distinction in either decoration or fabric and in fact neither fit comfortably into the Base Ring II canon. Indeed, although the iconographical features of both figurines and vessels are fairly analogous, the fabrics vary considerably even with the types.

---


222 Nys 2001:96. For more on the fabric of Base Ring Bulls see Part III.4.
Similar debates exist over figurines of other ceramic wares which cannot always be fitted appropriately into fabric schemes developed to incorporate the features and decoration of ceramic vessels alone. Whilst it is clear that relating figurines to the broad ceramic style to which they belong is important to illuminate their chronology and circumstances of manufacture, it is questionable whether figurines should ever be made to fit into the minutiae of such schemes which do not take into account their particular features. Whereas the fabric of the Base Ring bull vessels and figurines is clearly part of the Base Ring tradition, for example, it does not really help the analysis to force them into Base Ring I or Base Ring II, neither of which properly describe them. For the purposes of this study, therefore, every ceramic example will first be assigned a broad ceramic ware (e.g. Red Polished ware). If it is clear that the features of their fabric and decoration completely fit into a particular subcategory, then this will also be assigned (e.g. Red Polished III ware). However, if it is not possible to allot a figurine to an existing ceramic category then its material will be given the suffix “fig” to make clear that this is the case. Since, therefore, the Base Ring Bull Figurines and Vessels discussed above do not fit the existing Base Ring ware subdivisions, they have been labelled “Base Ring (fig)”.

4 Chronology

Several problems are encountered when attempting to establish accurate chronology for Bronze Age Cypriot figurine types. One of the most fundamental is ensuring that the project’s chronology is internally coherent. The objects under investigation have originated from multiple excavations, conducted by different teams at various points over more than a century. Each of these projects dated their material on potentially diverse criteria not always apparent from the excavation report. There is also a related problem whereby the assumed floreat of the figurine type has been used to date the context in which a figurine was found. Using that context as evidence for the date range of the figurine type thus becomes terminally cyclical. It is unfortunately far beyond the scope of this study to attempt to re-assess the internal chronology of every one of the 135 sites which have figurines. Instead, the study must rely on the dates provided by the excavators, modified where applicable by more recent reassessments proposed by other scholars. Moreover I have ensured that I am aware wherever possible of the criteria on which a context has been dated in order to guard against cyclical conclusions.
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223 Notably Red Polished and White Painted ware
224 See Vaughan 1991 for a proposed new typology for Base Ring ware which unfortunately has yet to incorporate the figurines sufficiently into its scheme.
225 For example Merrillees 1971 which has reassessed many LC I sites.
There are also some wider issues which affect the visibility of certain chronological periods in the archaeological record of Bronze Age Cyprus, as well as the apparent contemporaneity of those periods across the island. Some periods have been preserved in less detail somewhat accidentally, simply on account of their place in the socio-political history of Cyprus. Those periods which come at the very end of the occupation of a site, for example, form the uppermost layer and are more likely to be damaged or destroyed by subsequent surface activity such as ploughing or the retrieval of material for later building projects. Similarly, those periods which tend to form the first layer of occupation are often badly damaged by subsequent overbuilding (see above). Periods particularly affected by these issues include the Philia facies at the very beginning of the Bronze Age, and LC IIIA-B at the end. The transitional MC III-LC I period is doubly affected and particularly difficult to identify in the archaeological record. Figurines attributed to this period rarely come from highly stratified contexts and it is likely that they are generally underrepresented in the figurine record.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Chronology</th>
<th>Traditional Scheme</th>
<th>Absolute Chronology in years BC (after Merrillees 1992 and Manning et al 2001)</th>
<th>Broad terms used in this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PreBA I</td>
<td>Philia</td>
<td>2500-2300 (Early Cypriot Bronze Age)</td>
<td>Philia facies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EC I</td>
<td>2300-2150 (EC I)</td>
<td>Earliest Bronze Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EC II</td>
<td>2150-2100 (EC II)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EC IIIA</td>
<td>2100-2025 (EC IIIA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreBA II</td>
<td>EC IIIB</td>
<td>2025-1950 (Middle Cypriot Bronze Age)</td>
<td>Early-Middle Bronze Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC I</td>
<td>1950-1850 (MC I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC II</td>
<td>1850-1750 (MC II)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProBA I</td>
<td>MC III</td>
<td>1750-1650 (Late Cypriot Bronze Age)</td>
<td>Middle to Late Transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC IA</td>
<td>1650-1550 (LC IA)</td>
<td>Late Bronze Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC IB</td>
<td>1550-1425 (LC IB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProBA II</td>
<td>LC II A</td>
<td>1425-1375 (Late Cypriot Bronze Age)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC IIB</td>
<td>1375-1330 (Late Cypriot Bronze Age)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC IIC</td>
<td>1330-1200 (Late Cypriot Bronze Age)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProBA III</td>
<td>LC III A</td>
<td>1200-1100 (Late Cypriot Bronze Age)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC III B</td>
<td>1100-1050 (Late Cypriot Bronze Age)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC III C / CG I</td>
<td>1050-1000 (Late Cypriot Bronze Age)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Bronze Age Cypriot Chronology

Finally, both the relative and the absolute chronology of Bronze Age Cyprus remain contentious subjects. The traditional tripartite system for relative chronology (Early, Middle and Late Cypriot, along with their subdivisions) was established by members of the Swedish Cyprus Expedition, based largely on broad changes in pottery wares and styles observed during their excavations. Many scholars have since criticised the arbitrary nature of this system, particularly the smaller subdivisions such as EC IIIA and EC IIB, pointing out that they frequently fail to reflect major
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changes in the socio-political climate of the island and may, in fact, obscure the evidence for such changes.\textsuperscript{227} To attempt to overcome this weakness, Knapp proposed an alternative system with generally broader periods, dividing the Bronze Age into Prehistoric and Protohistoric.\textsuperscript{228} However this alternative has also been criticised on similar grounds.\textsuperscript{229} The vast majority of sites from which this project has drawn its material employ the traditional terminology for relative chronology thus the study has little choice but to make use of them. The figurine record itself, however, falls into five major chronological sections (Table 2). These apparently represent important chronological divisions in the material under investigation and it is these terms which will be employed predominantly in the discussion.

The absolute chronology of the Cypriot Bronze Age was originally established in the traditional manner, on the evidence of local ceramic typologies, imported objects on the island and Cypriot objects in extra-island contexts. This system has many drawbacks, not least the paucity of imported objects in the Early-Middle Bronze Age and at best can provide a \textit{terminus ante quem} for the context concerned. The unreliability of this method and the vague dates it has suggested have rendered it subsequently difficult to associate each individual period accurately within its wider Eastern Mediterranean contemporaries. Recent progress in securing dates for major regional events, most notably the volcanic eruption on Thera, have been combined with local radiocarbon dating in an attempt to make the absolute dates for the Cypriot Bronze Age more secure, although debate still continues over the exact location of each relative period in history.\textsuperscript{230}

The absolute chronology used in this project (Table 2) is based on a combination of the most recent, focussed re-evaluations. Where a dispute exists, an average value has been taken in order that any chronological charts created to understand the progression of figurine styles as described in Part IID.2, should not be confused by alternative dates. It is acknowledged that this dating is in a state of flux and it is hoped that it will be possible to adjust findings accordingly as new, more definite chronological information emerges.

5 \textit{The Provenance Problem}

The discovery of Bronze Age Cypriot figurines has a long and varied history, stretching back at least as far as the mid-nineteenth century. Although early archaeological explorers vehemently derided these objects as ‘grotesque’, ‘primitive’ and ‘crude’, nevertheless they could not disguise
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\textsuperscript{230} Manning 2001; Manning et al 2001; Merrillees 2002
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their obvious fascination. Both Cesnola and Ohnefalsch-Richter published multiple drawings and photographs of these figurines as well as lengthy treatises on their identification in each of their most influential publications. Interest in these objects had been piqued, for both archaeologists and collectors alike. In the proceeding century, hundreds more Cypriot Bronze Age figurines came to light, some through legitimate, well-published excavation, but many through the illegal activity of looters. Examples found their way into the most renowned public museums across the world and took centre stage in many private collections of antiquities, particularly those of Cypriot or Greek origin such as that of the Pierides or Zintilis families. This study, just like many others which address a body of material unearthed over such a time span, must confront the fact that a significant proportion of the extant corpus has lost its original provenance. The following will consider the ethical and practical issues surrounding the use of unprovenanced material and assess the specific impact of unprovenanced examples on the study of Bronze Age Cypriot figurines.

5a Unprovenanced Material – Ethics and Practicalities

The use of unprovenanced material is surrounded by an ethical minefield far too vast to be considered in full here. However, it is important at least to outline both sides of the argument before navigating my own path through it for the figurines of Bronze Age Cyprus. For one side of the debate, it seems, the ideal is not to use unprovenanced objects at all. As Gill & Chippendale have convincingly argued, to use them in a scholarly context is to legitimize the collections and belittle the detrimental effect their procurement has had on the archaeological record as a whole. Moreover, if serious scholars study and publish private collections of antiquities with dubious origins they may even be helping their owners to profit further from these activities and encouraging the practice to continue. However, if those same scholars refuse to study unprovenanced collections, they send a clear message that such objects are taboo and their methods of acquisition frowned upon. This is the stance taken by the Archaeological Institute of

231 Ohnefalsch-Richter’s Kypros, die Biebel und Homer (1893) and Cesnola’s Cyprus (1877)
232 The former can be seen in the Pierides museums in Larnaca and Nicosia (see Karageorghis 1991c and 2002); the latter is currently on loan to the Goulandris Museum, Athens (see Lubsen-Admiraal 2003 and www.cycladic.gr).
233 There has been some confusion over the specific meaning of the word “provenance”. For this study, I take the simplest definition and consider unprovenanced material to be objects with no known origin whatsoever. It should be noted, however, that the most ethically dubious material is that uncovered from illegal sources after the establishment of the UNESCO convention on illicit antiquities in 1970. This represents the official point at which collecting such objects became morally and legally wrong.
234 Gill & Chippendale 1993; see also Brodie 2005
America which refuses to admit papers based on previously unpublished material with no known provenance.\textsuperscript{235}

On the other hand, however, it could be argued that since these objects exist, they should be used. As some have pointed out, not to do so would be to deny a significant part of the extant corpus and would result in a deliberately incomplete, subjective investigation.\textsuperscript{236} Wilfully ignoring unprovenanced examples damages the intellectual integrity of the scholarship far more than it bothers those involved in the procurement and trade of illicit antiquities. To refuse to study or publish unprovenanced objects one knows to exist is, in essence, almost ‘anti-scholarly’. The damage of removing an object from its provenance has already been done; to ignore it completely in academic studies is, in essence, to exacerbate the already significant intellectual consequences of that damage. Moreover, such exclusion does no harm to the looters, traders and collectors who presumably neither know nor care whether their objects can be of academic use.

Each side of this debate has some convincing arguments, both intellectually and ethically, but there are also other, practical issues to consider. It is often difficult, for example, to verify the authenticity of a figurine with little or no recorded background. The figurine in Fig 21, from the Ishiguro collection in Japan, was used without issue by Merrillees in his study on Late Cypriot mother and child figurines.\textsuperscript{237} Just three years later, however, Karageorghis viewed the object and proclaimed it “without any doubt a fake”.\textsuperscript{238} The unusual shape of the ears, enlarged, reptilian eyes, steatopygia and swollen stomach are just some of the unusual characteristics which combine to condemn this particular figurine. Yet even this fooled a respected scholar of the Cypriot Bronze Age.

\textsuperscript{235} e.g. American Journal of Archaeology frontispiece and Norman 2005
\textsuperscript{236} See e.g. Shanks 2004; Buttrey 2007
\textsuperscript{237} Merrillees 1988: 53; Ill 15-18
\textsuperscript{238} Karageorghis 1993:8
Other unprovenanced examples prove even more difficult to authenticate with any certainty. This apparent Earring figurine (Fig 22), sold at Christie’s in 2007, appears to be unusually shaped, particularly in the hips and legs. Its arm gesture with hand on hip is unparalleled and it is made of an atypical, pale material. Certainly there is no other example of an Earring figurine, provenanced or otherwise, of quite this form. Yet flattened, solid examples do exist, and some of the other features – the baby, earrings and breasts – remain plausible. Similarly, there is a very credible fragmentary White Painted ware Plank Figurine now in the British Museum, whose decoration and other features do not seem out of place within the corpus. However, at 17cm for the head alone, it is more than twice the size of every other known example. How can we be certain that objects like these are truly genuine?

Occasionally, further investigations may be able to verify the authenticity of dubious pieces. The seven chalk Plank Figurines from the Zintilis collection, for example, did not originate from a controlled excavation and are therefore difficult to authenticate. Although their shape is similar to the clay examples (Fig 23) and there is some evidence that they were decorated with similar geometric patterns, their size and material is not directly paralleled amongst those objects with verified provenances. However, when Lubsen-Admiraal explored the area in which it was claimed the figurines had originated, she discovered a selection of looted Early-Middle Cypriot tombs and fragmentary stone Plank Figurines scattered all over the surface, thus confirming as far as is possible, the origin and authenticity of the Zintilis figurines. For the majority of unprovenanced figurines, however, this sort of additional contextual information cannot be recovered. Chemical analysis may perhaps help to illuminate the origin of some, but this is seldom possible on objects which are frequently in private ownership, and even this would not assist in authenticating unprovenanced figurines made of stone.
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240 This case also highlights how objects with dubious provenance are almost as problematic as those with none (see below, Table 3).
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242 See Lubsen-Admiraal 2009 for her account of the explorations around Kidasi-Foutsi and subsequent conclusions of the stone Plank Figurines. See also Webb & Frankel 2001 for an account of further attempts to establish the origin of unprovenanced figurines by stylistic and material analogy with those of known provenance.
The ethical and practical arguments for and against the scholarly use of unprovenanced material are equally persuasive. In this study, therefore I have chosen a compromise. From a purely academic point of view, objects from secure, datable contexts provide the most compelling evidence and therefore, these provide the backbone of this study. Wherever possible, provenanced examples alone are used to support points and illustrate trends. Although I have not sought to study any unprovenanced material first hand, I have collated and enumerated those examples which have already been brought to public attention through publication. These have been used alongside the provenanced examples to investigate the frequency and significance of stylistic traits. However, when characteristics are observed on unprovenanced examples which are not represented in the provenanced corpus, these will be noted, with caution.

5b Provenance Status Analysis

In virtually every part of the world, the actions of looters have robbed a significant portion of extant antiquities of their provenance; a problem compounded in Cyprus, as discussed above, by extensive and poorly published early excavation activities. In order to gauge the impact of unprovenanced or poorly provenanced material within the Bronze Age Cypriot figurine corpus, it is necessary first to establish how serious the problem really is. Moreover, an appropriate and plausible methodology for studying a body of material can only be implemented once a detailed picture of all the available data has been established. To these ends, I have conducted a survey of the level of provenance available for all known examples of Bronze Age Cypriot figurines. From the outset, it was clear that there is no simple distinction between those figurines with provenance and those without it. Rather, within the former category, several levels of provenance exist, each of which facilitate different types of study. I have devised a system by which to rate each figurine according to the level of detail available regarding its findspot. This “provenance status” then determines the sort of analyses in which this figurine could conceivably be used (Table 3).
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243 I include in this those objects which appear in auction sale catalogues and other non-academic publications frequently omitted from this definition.

244 Principally by the likes of Cesnola or Ohnefalsch-Richter, although these two at least recorded some of what they had found in publications (see n.231).
The system takes into account not only what is known about the circumstances of the object’s discovery, but also the amount of information about their findspots currently available to researchers. In some ways, lack of detailed publication can be as detrimental to the material record as unauthorised excavation. Thus, an object which comes from a controlled excavation which has been fully published so that it is possible to ascertain not only where within the site the object was found but also what other objects were found with it would be rated “high”. Contrarily, an object from a similarly controlled excavation which has not been properly published and for which it is not possible to do more than simply label the findspot, would only be rated “medium”. As new material regarding completed excavations is published, some objects may move up the provenance scale, but nothing will generally move down.
The methods by which the provenanced and unprovenanced objects have been collated have been described in Part IIA.2. Inevitably the resulting list of unprovenanced examples in particular is probably not exhaustive. It is impossible to determine how many clandestine pieces remain unpublished in private hands. However, recent efforts, notably by Karageorghis and the Cypriote Antiquities series (SIMA XX) published by P.Åström, to encourage the publication of diverse museum and major private collections have made considerable progress in this regard.

Furthermore, although every effort has been made to eliminate duplicates in the list, it has proven difficult to exclude them completely as auction sale catalogues in particular do not always give full references or descriptions. Nevertheless, the numbers of unprovenanced examples mentioned below should be regarded as the best estimate possible at the current time.

Chart 1 and Chart 2 highlight several important characteristics of the Bronze Age Cypriot figurine dataset. Firstly, figurines with some known provenance account for more than half of the extant examples for every period and every type. Moreover, most categories, with the exception of anthropomorphic vessels of all periods, have a significant proportion of examples with a high provenance status.

---

245 To a lesser extent, the Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum series and the collations made by the Swedish Cyprus Expedition (Volume IV) have also proven invaluable.

246 Certain types of object have been excluded from the numbers given in this chart: figurines which are said to come from “Cyprus” but for which no parallels are currently known from secure, Bronze Age contexts have not been included since it cannot be ascertained with certainty that they originate from this period; similarly, although Mycenaean and Near Eastern figurines and local copies of these types have been found in stratified Bronze Age contexts within Cyprus, it is impossible to determine whether unprovenanced examples also originated from Cyprus or from one of the many Aegean, Egyptian or Near Eastern contexts in which they were also common and consequently they too have been excluded from this chart.
It is also interesting that there is some variation in the proportions of provenanced and unprovenanced objects for each category. Only 19% of zoomorphic figurines, for instance, are unprovenanced and more than 64% have high provenance status. This is probably a consequence of the extensive and generally well-published excavations at sites such as Marki-Alonia and Enkomi from which the majority originate. Similarly, the relative unpopularity of zoomorphic objects when compared to anthropomorphic objects has most probably influenced this pattern. Anthropomorphic vessels, on the other hand, which proved exceptions to the general trend mentioned above, are extremely rare with only 41 examples known. The difficulty of identifying such objects from fragments discussed in Part IIB.3 has doubtless contributed to this rarity, causing them to be generally underrepresented in the corpus.

In general, then, the situation is rather encouraging with 67% of all known figurines having some sort of provenance and 46% coming from properly excavated, well documented contexts. Moreover, there is some evidence to suggest that the situation is improving further. Several thorough, modern excavations on Cypriot Bronze Age sites are conducted and published each year. Most recently, for example, Cradleboard fragments have been found at the settlement site of Politiko-Troullia in 2007, Base Ring bull fragments at Arediou-Vouppes in 2008 and a Plaque figurine fragment at Kissonerga-Skalia in 2010.247 Similarly, several sites excavated in previous decades are in the process of being properly published: volumes on Ambelikou-Aletri, Phlamoudhi-Vounari, and Apliki-Karamalos, for instance, have already appeared.248 As new

247 Pers. comm. 2009-2010: Falconer&Fall (Politiko-Troullia), Steel (Arediou-Vouppes), Crewe (Kissonerga-Skalia)
248 Dunn-Vaturi (forthcoming) (Ambelikou-Aletri); Smith ed. 2008 (Phlamoudhi-Vounari); Kling & Muhly 2007 (Apliki-Karamalos)
information such as this continues to emerge, the proportions of well provenanced figurines will improve.

5c Esteem for Bronze Age Cypriot Figurines – Reality and Consequences

The peculiar figurines of the Cypriot Bronze Age continue to be held in some esteem in modern Cyprus and the world beyond. For collectors of antiquities, the market value of these objects remains significant. The figurine pictured here (Fig 24), for instance, sold at Christie’s, New York in 2006 for $28,800 and the same auction house sold an Earring Figurine the following year for $22,500. For those with less to spend, many different replicas, in varying styles and quality are available in countless outlets from the souvenir shops of the major museums to the tourist streets of Larnaca. However, to keep this situation in perspective, it is clear that esteem for Bronze Age Cypriot figurines has never reached the extremes enjoyed, or endured, by the likes of Cycladic figurines. Those continue to realise hundreds of thousands of dollars at auction, sometimes even in excess of a million dollars and it has been estimated that less than 10% of the total known corpus of Cycladic figurines come from controlled excavation.249 Nevertheless, the comparatively moderate popularity of Bronze Age Cypriot figurines has had several significant consequences for their study.

The first, of course, is the practice of looting archaeological sites, which has long been encouraged by modern demand for ancient objects.250 As discussed in the previous section, the activities of unscrupulous people attempting to make money from this popularity have divorced at least 33% of extant Bronze Age figurines from their contexts. These objects can no longer be used in the vast majority of analyses aiming to discover their function and significance within Bronze Age society. What is more, the contexts themselves have been severely damaged by this illegal activity. Recent publications have revealed the terrible extent of the damage to looted landscapes around important Bronze Age sites such as Marki and Dhenia, for example, which has seriously jeopardised attempts to reconstruct them.251

In contrast, the second consequence of esteem for Bronze Age Cypriot figurines is more of a double-edged sword. It is an unfortunate fact that until fairly recent years, excavators placed varying levels of importance on different categories of artefact. In Cyprus, some, such as imported

249 E.g. Lot 27, Sotheby’s NY, 10th December 2008; see Gill & Chippendale 1993:624
250 For a discussion of the current state of looting in Cyprus, see Gill and Fehlmann (www.lootingmatters.blogspot).
251 Sneddon 2002
Mycenaean pottery or objects of bronze, were highly regarded, carefully recorded, drawn and eventually stored or displayed in museums. Others, particularly undecorated, locally-made, Cypriot pottery and coarsewares, were considered less desirable. As a consequence, these were seldom recorded in detail, if at all, and often discarded on the site itself. Fortunately for the present study, figurines appear to fall into the former category. As esteemed objects, valued not for their material but for their form and presumed connection to ritual activity, there is some evidence to suggest that they were protected to a certain degree from the attrition suffered by other types of artefact. The prominent position they enjoy in the works of Cesnola and Ohnefalsch-Richter as noted above, for instance, as well as their significant presence in early museum collections in Cyprus and abroad are testament to this.

However, the picture is not entirely positive. Firstly, although the figurine itself may have been preserved, its context, which may have included objects of a less sought-after nature, remains incomplete at best. Secondly, not every type of figurine was equally shielded. Fragmentary figurines, for example, did not enjoy the same level of post-excavation respect as their more intact, and thus visually appealing counterparts. This bias towards complete figurines continues even in recent studies on the topic. Karageorghis’ mammoth Coroplastic Art volumes, for instance, include only a tiny number of Bronze Age figurines where less than half the object is preserved.252 Similarly, even those figurines which were recorded and taken from these excavations did not necessarily stay protected for long. Some were given or sold to private parties and have subsequently disappeared from public view. Others that made it to museums had not necessarily reached safety. Only recently, a box of objects from Ohnefalsch-Richter’s excavations at Phoenikais-Laxia, containing at least one figurine, was discovered in a cupboard in the British Museum, labelled at some point during the intervening century as “to be disposed of”.

The final consequence of esteem for Bronze Age Cypriot figurines is an intellectual one, perhaps best described as the ‘curse of Aphrodite’. Much of the tourism industry of modern Cyprus is founded on its image as the “Island of Love” and its reputation as the birthplace of Aphrodite.253 Cyprus has been rated the number one destination for the more than 50,000 British couples who marry abroad each year since 2008 and countless more chose the island for their honeymoons. This romantic tourism is worth significant money to the island, contributing up to 10% of their GNP.254 It is doubtless in the interests of the Cyprus Tourism Organisation (CTO) to promote the association of Cyprus with romance. By pushing Aphrodite further back into the history of the

252 Karageorghis 1991a features seven fragmentary figurines; 1993 features twenty-three (excluding complete figurines detached from vessels).
253 See e.g. Given 2002:419 for Aphrodite as Cyprus’ “Goddess of Tourism”
254 Source: Mintel.com; www.visitcyprus.biz
island, it is possible to embed her ever more deeply into its national identity. Ancient figurines form an important part of this agenda. In 2005, for example, the CTO collaborated with the A.G. Leventis Foundation to publish *Kypris: The Aphrodite of Cyprus.*\(^{255}\) This book, covering a wide range of historical and archaeological information, traced the origin of Aphrodite, albeit by a different name, the eponymous ‘Kypris’, back to 3000 BC and the Chalcolithic figurines of the Paphos region. On its way, it also incorporated all Bronze Age anthropomorphic figurines, identifying each different type as yet another manifestation of the same goddess. This interpretation has little basis in archaeological reality yet it is still prevalent in academic circles and promoted as fact to lay audiences. Figurines thus become invested with a modern agenda which has little connection to their original function or significance.

***

Overall, however, the problems of provenance for Bronze Age Cypriot figurines are not insurmountable. Contrary to the opinions of some scholars, unprovenanced figurines can be used, albeit with caution and due consideration of the ethical issues involved. Most importantly, the majority of extant examples are provenanced to some degree and analyses of their patterns and characteristics are more than possible. For this study, then, there is certainly cause to be optimistic.

\(^{255}\) J.Karageorghis 2005
II.C BRONZE AGE CYPRIOT FIGURINES IN THEIR CONTEXTS

This project has twin aims: to offer interpretations of the many different types of figurine which existed on Bronze Age Cyprus and to use these interpretations to consider the nature of the society in which they were created and used. These aims cannot be achieved without establishing what is currently known about that society and understanding how this corpus fits in to the broader context of figurine use on the island before the Bronze Age. This chapter, therefore, sets out first the socio-cultural and then the typological contexts to which the figurines under investigation belong.

1 Socio-Cultural Context: Cyprus in the Bronze Age

The following section will provide a summary outline of the major characteristics and transformations in the socio-cultural landscape of Cyprus over the c.1200 years of the Bronze Age. Due to the high degree of regionalism, particularly in the earlier phases, disparate areas of the island experienced change at slightly different times and in diverse ways and this discussion must cover general trends only. What follows will focus particularly on the controversies and characteristics which will be considered in Part IV from the point of view of the figurine record.

The Cypriot Bronze Age is generally accepted to have been heralded by the chronologically ill-defined cultural phenomenon known as the Philia facies. This appears to have overlapped partially with the Late Chalcolithic and Early Cypriot periods, c.2500 BC – c.2300 BC and taken hold only in particular areas of the island. The Philia facies and EC I witnessed gradual yet substantial changes from the settlement patterns and ways of life established in earlier Cypriot prehistory. These included a move from circular to rectilinear, agglomerative settlement architecture and a change from intra-mural, single burial in pit graves to extra-mural cemeteries comprising multiple burial, rock-cut, chamber tombs. New artefact types attest to significant transformations in manufacturing including a marked increase in metallurgical activity, new Red Polished ware ceramics and innovations in the technologies of textile production. Advances in agriculture leading to the increased exploitation of land were also encouraged by the introduction of the sole-ard plough and new or re-introduced domesticated animals such as cattle and donkeys. Such changes have led many to locate the Cypriot secondary products revolution during

256 For a discussion of what regionalism has meant for Cypriot archaeology see Frankel 2009.
257 For the use of the term “facies” rather than “phase” to define this material see Webb & Frankel 1999:4.
258 See Frankel & Webb 1999 for a full appraisal of Philia innovations and material culture.
259 Swiny 1989; Keswani 2004:37-42
the Early Bronze Age. It is widely agreed that this package of innovations, which set Bronze Age Cyprus apart from the Chalcolithic, arrived on the island due to influences derived from the mainland. Webb & Frankel have argued in detail that these were transported to Cyprus by permanent settlers from southern Anatolia, whose cultural mores and technological knowledge eventually amalgamated with indigenous traditions to form what became the Early Cypriot period proper c.2300 BC. Others, however, suggest that most of these changes may be accounted for by indigenous development which drew on influences and ideas gained from initially haphazard and wide ranging contacts with external communities, including Anatolia and the Levant. Evidence for the validity of these theories from the Early-Middle Cypriot figurine record is considered in Part IV.B.

Particular controversy exists over the social organisation of Cyprus during the Early-Middle Bronze Age, due in part to the conflicting nature of the available evidence. Some have proposed an egalitarian system with no clear status differentiation within communities and no recognisable inter-site hierarchy. This is particularly supported by the settlements of this period, which are all fairly small, accommodating no more than 500 people in undifferentiated, mud-brick dwellings. These settlements were variously located to suggest a mixed economy, taking advantage of good agricultural land as well as the abundant copper resources which began to be exploited during this period. The significant Northern cemeteries at Bellapais-Vounous and Lapithos-Vrysi tou Barba are as yet the only known coastal communities of this period. The burials at these sites often contained numerous objects, including ordinary and elaborate ceramics, metal items, more so in Lapithos than Vounous, and very occasionally imported objects. Keswani has contended that this material attests to the central role of expensive funerary ritual in the negotiation of status and identity during the Early-Middle Bronze Age. It has also been argued that this ritual practice, which would have included extensive communal feasting activities as well as the deposition of grave goods, escalated over time and eventually spread across the whole island by EC III. Crucially, Keswani has argued that, rather than demonstrating the emergence of an enduring, hereditary elite, these social strategies were initially predicated on acquired wealth.

260 Knapp 1990; Manning 1993; see also e.g. Sherratt 1981; Halstead & Isaakidou 2011 for general discussion of the secondary products revolution.
261 Webb & Frankel 1999; see also e.g. Stewart 1962; Catling 1971
263 E.g. Swiny 1989; Davies 1997;
265 Dikaios 1940; Stewart & Stewart 1950; Dunn-Vaturi 2003 (Vounous), Gjerstad et al 1934; Herscher 1978 (Lapithos)
266 Keswani 2004:38, 74-8
267 Webb & Frankel 2008
encouraging in particular the exploitation of copper resources and attempts at foreign trade.\textsuperscript{268}

The primacy of the metal industry for displaying status, enabling the accumulation of wealth and driving social and economic developments is a recurring theme in many studies of the Cypriot Bronze Age which has been thoroughly discussed but remained largely unchallenged.\textsuperscript{269} Using a new interpretation of Early-Middle Bronze Age figurine symbolism, Part IV.C presents a possible alternative mechanism by which status may have been acquired and displayed.

The suite of material culture, settlement and burial patterns so characteristic of the Early-Middle Bronze Age began to disintegrate during MC II, as many of the previously important centres fell out of use. MC III – LC I demonstrated several significant changes. Although burial continued to take place in rock-cut chamber tombs in extramural cemeteries, these cemeteries now tended to be smaller, comprising no more than fifteen tombs. The tombs themselves attest to significant intensification and some alteration of funerary rituals.\textsuperscript{270} Some, such as Tomb 1 at Pendayia-Mandres, contained large numbers of burials with relatively small numbers of accompanying goods.\textsuperscript{271} Others demonstrate an increase in the number of more elaborate, precious and exotic objects deposited in graves, particularly in the amount of bronze weaponry.\textsuperscript{272} A new phenomenon of fortified sites of various sizes and forms also arose at this time. These were situated in prominent, visible positions, frequently low hill plateaux and occurred on previously unoccupied sites in the North, Central and Eastern parts of the island. The range of structures, none of which have any known architectural precursors in earlier Cypriot traditions, comprise an array of uses from smaller, thick-walled watch-towers or keeps such as Ayios Sozomenos-Glyka Vrysis to larger, probably temporarily occupied enclosures like Dhali-Kafkalla.\textsuperscript{273} The settlement landscape was further transformed by the abandonment of earlier settlements and the founding of several new sites.\textsuperscript{274} Many of these, such as Morphou-Toumba tou Skourou, were small towns, staging specialised production activities including metal and ceramic manufacture, and participating in trading activities with polities outside the island.\textsuperscript{275} Escalating economic engagement with external communities is attested by a sudden upsurge in the amount of Cypriot objects found outside the island and the apparent desirability of Levantine imports, such as

\textsuperscript{268} Keswani 2005:382-91
\textsuperscript{270} Keswani 2004:89
\textsuperscript{271} E.g. Kalopsidha (Karageorghis 1965:14-70)
\textsuperscript{272} Philip 1991
\textsuperscript{273} Knox 2004; Peltenburg 2008. See also Fortin 1995 (\textit{Glyka Vrysis}) and Overbeck & Swiny 1972 (Dhali-Kafkalla)
\textsuperscript{274} Åström 1966
\textsuperscript{275} Knapp & Cherry 1994; Keswani & Knapp 2003; See also Vermeule & Wolsky 1990 (\textit{Toumba tou Skourou})
socketed axes or warrior belts, on Cyprus itself. The appearance of the toponym “Alashiya”, generally agreed to represent Cyprus, or part thereof, in the archives of Babylon and Mari, also confirms the island’s emergence into the wider world of the Eastern Mediterranean trading networks. Since the textual references invariably associate Alashiya with copper, this also underlines the increasing importance of the metals trade during MC III – LC I.

The mechanisms behind these significant changes have been the subject of much debate. Some have posited considerable social unrest caused by various indigenous and possibly intrusive groups competing for control of the island’s renowned copper resources. The theory that heavily populated tombs such as Tomb 1 at Pendayia-Mandres were the mass burials of victims of this ‘copper war’ is now largely debunked. However, many still hold that the fort sites may represent a defensive network, built to guard against civil unrest or invasions from the East and to control access to copper ores. In this scenario, the increased amounts of weaponry deposited in graves, including the imported, Levantine types mentioned above, has been interpreted as the rise of a warrior ideology either as a result of actual military engagement or as a form of posturing by armed elite groups within a kind of Bronze Age Cypriot Cold War. Alternative readings of this evidence shy away from suggesting outright conflict but continue to stress the importance of competition between peer groups on Cyprus during MC III – LC I. The ‘mass burials’ have been re-interpreted as evidence for heightened secondary burial practices amidst a general climate of escalating elaboration and expenditure in funerary ritual. In addition, the larger enclosure sites have been explained as deliberately visible sites used by emergent authorities to establish their prominence through the central storage of supplies or the gathering of increasing local populations for communal activities. Finally, it has been suggested that the Levantine imported weaponry may have been used by some groups to establish status and identity through the emulation of practices from the East. The MC III – LC I figurine record, which is markedly different from those of the surrounding periods, offers some insights into these possibilities which is explored in Parts IV.A and C.

---
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By the beginning of LC II, the socio-cultural climate of Cyprus had altered once again. Many enclosure sites were abandoned and at the few, such as Enkomi, which continued in use, the fortification walls were removed. Economic activity and trading relationships with external communities escalated considerably during LC II – III. Imported objects known from this period are more than twice as common as during MC III – LC I and significant amounts of Cypriot raw materials and ceramics have been found across the Near East, Aegean and even as far away as Sicily and Sardinia. Part IV.B considers the implications of the distribution and stylistic forms of Late Cypriot figurines for the practical nature of some of these trading relationships. Imported objects, particularly precious metals, ivories, faience and Mycenaean ceramics, were deposited in burials as an important marker of social status and identity. Markedly increased status differentiation and something of a wealth divide is also attested in the LC II – IIA burial record as tombs range from smaller, less elaborate affairs, such as Cypriot Tomb 19 at Enkomi which included few grave goods mostly comprising local pottery, to massive, ostentatiously wealthy tombs such as British Tomb 93 at the same site. In addition, although extramural cemeteries still occurred, these tended to be small and tombs located within settlements became increasingly common. The role of figurines for the negotiation of identity both in burial and settlements during LC II – III is discussed in Part IV.C.

The settlement landscape of LC II – III was populated by a range of sites of various sizes and purposes. Various specialist sites are known, including Myrtou-Pigadhes, dedicated to ritual practices, a specialist ceramic production site at Sanidha-Moutti tou Ayiou Serkou and a copper smelting site at Politiko-Phorades. These attest not only to the escalation of the specialist production activities noted in the preceding period but also the first appearance of permanent, built, non-funerary ritual space in Bronze Age Cyprus. Such specialist activities are also attested in designated areas within the confines of larger settlements including the coastal urban centres such as Enkomi and Kition. Although the identification of ritual space in such a situation is notoriously controversial, Webb’s comprehensive study has defined a range of ritual areas for LC II – IIIA. Activities attested at such sites appear to include feasting and animal sacrifice, the offering of votive objects and practices such as divination. Some sites also show a spatial
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proximity to copper-working facilities leading some to propose a practical or ideological relationship between the two activities. Although the range of cult paraphernalia found at each of these ritual spaces is fairly comparable, there is little correlation between their physical forms and the nuances of ritual practices in the daily life of Bronze Age Cypriots remains obscure. Part IV.A considers the insight offered by new interpretations of Late Cypriot figurines for the nature of some of these ritual practices.

Most agree that some sort of site hierarchy would have existed between the different types of site. The most extensive model is that proposed by Knapp which explains a complex system in which smaller and specialist sites ultimately subordinate to one or more large urban centres. Controversy exists, however, over the socio-political relationships between these larger towns, with the principal debate centring on opposing heterarchical and hierarchical models. Some have argued that each urban centre would have controlled its own defined territory and complement of specialist sites, pursuing its own political trajectory and economic contacts. The fact that many of these sites attest to a comparable range of activities such as small-scale administration, central storage, craft production and ritual practices as well as large, apparently public buildings and impressive, monumental architecture has been cited in support of this theory. Others, however, contend that Cyprus may have been approaching political and cultural hegemony during LC II – III with much of its territory under the control of a single ruler or elite group. This notion is particularly supported by textual evidence which confirms that ‘Alashiya’ had a strong, political presence in international trade and a single entity in control of the majority of resources and trading contacts. The location of this superior site is most frequently attributed to Enkomi, whose wealth and architecture hint at political importance but whose relatively small size suggests against it. Alternatively, it may be significant that many of the ‘Alashiya tablets’ have been tied petrographically to one of the South Coast centres such as Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimitrios or Alassa-Paliotaverna. Unfortunately, the relatively limited exploration of these sites in comparison to Enkomi leaves the attribution vague. With evidence on both sides compelling, this controversy remains unresolved and the contribution of detailed examination of the figurine record to this debate is explored in Part IV.C.

The catastrophic events of the latter years of the twelfth century BC, which heralded the end of the Bronze Age for the surrounding areas, particularly the Aegean world, did not leave Cyprus
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unchased. Whether due to the actions of the controversial Sea Peoples or other causes, LC IIIB saw dramatic alterations in the socio-cultural landscape of the island across almost every arena. The majority of known settlements had been abandoned by the end of LC IIIA and new focal areas established. Styles of pottery, metalwork and other materials were also transformed. Burial was once again focussed in spatially segregated necropoleis and new tomb architecture, including chamber tombs of apparently Mycenaean origin, was incorporated.\(^{299}\) Transformations in the location and structure of ritual activities complete the picture of change in LC IIIB which heralded the new Early Iron Age phase.\(^{300}\) Particularly significant changes in the figurine record which are discussed in detail in Parts III.F and IV, define this juncture as an appropriate point to end the current analysis.

2 Typological Context: Cypriot Figurines Before and After the Bronze Age

A full re-appraisal of pre-Bronze Age figurine use is beyond the scope of the present study. Instead, this section is designed to stress the singularity of Bronze Age figurine use and highlight the lacuna in our knowledge concerning Late Chalcolithic and Philia figurine material which has clear implications for the identification of any indigenous precursors to the Early Bronze Age figurine tradition.

Two small fragments, one of baked clay and one stone, discovered in 2009 at late Pre-Pottery Neolithic A Ayia Vavara-Asprokremnos, represent the earliest known figurines on Cyprus (Fig 25).\(^{301}\) From the following Pre-Pottery Neolithic B period, the site of Shillourokambos provides a handful of diverse figurative objects including a plaster anthropomorphic head, a feline head of serpentine, apparently intended to be mounted on a wall, an incised anthropomorphic picrolite pebble and a possible stone boat model.\(^{302}\) Only around 30 figurines are currently known from the rest of the Cypriot Neolithic and most of these are in fragmentary condition.\(^{303}\) They are generally between 10 and 20cm high and made from solid stone, although a small number of clay fragments are also known. Their form appears to depict a highly schematic, anthropomorphic shape. Although no gender characteristics are depicted on the
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majority of examples, some appear to have a phallic neck. All Neolithic figurines which originate from controlled excavations have been found in settlement contexts, either on the floors of buildings or in refuse areas. To date, no examples have been discovered in mortuary contexts. Unfortunately, these contexts can offer little information regarding the way in which Neolithic figurines were used. Due to the small numbers of examples known and the apparent dearth of supporting evidence, no thorough investigation of this corpus has yet been published.

By contrast, the Cypriot Chalcolithic has produced several hundred figurines which have been and continue to be the subject of great academic interest. Examples known from this period are generally less schematic and more recognisable in form than their Neolithic counterparts. They are found in both clay and stone in roughly equal proportions. The majority of Chalcolithic representation remains anthropomorphic although small numbers of zoomorphic figurines also exist. In addition, there are at least two vessels in anthropomorphic form known from Souskiou-Vathyrkakas which appear to have been deliberately broken prior to deposition.

The most familiar figurine type from this period is undoubtedly the cruciform anthropomorph. More than 100 examples of this form are known, predominantly made from picrolite and discovered in Middle Chalcolithic contexts. Although they clearly represent a coherent iconographical type, there is considerable variation in their size and form. Many were probably worn as pendants, as illustrated by the unusually detailed example from Yialia which wears a smaller version of itself around its neck (Fig 26). Those of known provenance have been found in both tombs and settlements at sites such as Souskiou-Vathyrkakas. The meaning of these figurines is the subject of some debate between those who support traditional interpretations associated with fertility and those who see no iconographic or contextual evidence to support such a notion.

The interpretation of many contemporary clay figurines, on the other hand, is less contentious. Although a large proportion of these figurines is fragmentary, thus obscuring the detail of their

---

304 E.g. an andesite example from Khrokitia (Dikaios 1953:PL.XCV; Morris 1985:fig 106) or a limestone example from Sotira-Arkolies (Swiny & Swiny 1983:Pl.VI:1-4; Morris 1985:fig 109)
305 However, Winkelmann 2011 unpublished PhD thesis will provide a thorough re-examination of Neolithic and Chalcolithic figurative material.
307 Bolger 2006
308 Cyprus Museum 1934/III-2/2, J.Karageorghis 1977:Pl.8a; Morris 1985:Fig 158
309 Goring 2006
310 For more detailed discussion of the meaning of cruciform figurines see above n.305
original form, those which have survived almost intact appear to depict females engaged in activities such as expressing breast milk and giving birth, clearly connected to the rearing of young infants. These figurines generally have quite detailed painted decoration showing both decorative and anatomical features. Those of known provenance originate solely from settlement habitation contexts, rather than burials, suggesting that they may have been in everyday use. This supposition is supported by their often fragmentary condition and apparent abrasion patterns on many examples indicating frequent handling.

The birthing figures and cruciforms represent the most well-known examples of a rich and varied repertoire of figurine use and manufacture on Cyprus during the Early and Middle Chalcolithic. By the Late Chalcolithic, however, this grand tradition of anthropomorphic and zoomorphic representation had begun a terminal decline. The end of this period represents a significant hiatus in the figurine record of Prehistoric Cyprus. Elements of continuity or overlap with the Bronze Age are alluded to by the infrequent occurrence of similar objects, such as annular pendants, in Late Chalcolithic and Philia contexts. For the time being, however, the evidence remains elusive and any iconographic or symbolic relationship between the Chalcolithic styles and the re-emergent three dimensional representation of the Philia facies remains obscure.
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II.D RIGOROUS ANALYSES

The following section outlines the five stages of analysis which the material under investigation has undergone. For each stage, the methods used are described and any pertinent methodological or theoretical issues discussed. Illustrations of the broad, overall results of each analysis are included in this section but details of these results and their implications for our understanding of Bronze Age Cypriot figurines and their contexts will be discussed in Parts III and IV. Raw data used for the analyses of each figurine type is displayed in the Database and summarised in Appendix I.

1 Creating a Typology

The first step towards understanding such a large and varied collection of material is to organise it sensibly. Many disparate typologies have been proposed by which the figurines of Bronze Age Cyprus might be arranged. The confusion which this has caused (see Part IB.1b) has not been beneficial to the study of figurines and I do not wish to exacerbate the problem by creating yet another version. However, none of the systems so far proposed are wholly suitable for the type of analysis with which this study is concerned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>No. of Categories</th>
<th>Basis of Typology</th>
<th>Typological Scope*</th>
<th>Chronological Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merrillees 1980</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>A, F</td>
<td>EC, MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Campo 1994</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>A, F</td>
<td>EC, MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florentzos 1975</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Gender/Shape</td>
<td>A, F</td>
<td>EC, MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgiorno 1984</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Shape/Ware</td>
<td>A, F</td>
<td>EC, MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mogelonsky 1988</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>A, Z, I</td>
<td>EC, MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orphanides 1988</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>A, F</td>
<td>EC, MC, LC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Karageorghis 1977</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Shape/Ware</td>
<td>A, F</td>
<td>EC, MC, LC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myres 1914</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ware</td>
<td>A, Z, I</td>
<td>F, V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE 1962/1972</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Ware/Shape</td>
<td>A, Z, I</td>
<td>F, V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Karageorghis 1991a/1993</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Ware/Shape</td>
<td>A, Z, I</td>
<td>F, some V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb 1999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>A, Z</td>
<td>F, V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begg 1991</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>A, Z</td>
<td>F, V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Major typological systems developed for Bronze Age Cypriot figurines (* = A: Anthropomorphs; Z: Zoomorphs; I: Inanimate Objects; F: Figurines; V: Vessels)

As Table 4 shows, they vary widely as regards the types of material they cover and their chronological range, with the Early-Middle Cypriot anthropomorphs receiving the most attention. These systems also differ according to the basic criteria on which they are arranged, although those based on ware and shape are most common. The most striking variation, however, is in the
number of categories in which often identical material has been divided. For the widest chronological and typological range, for instance, the number of categories varies between six and fifty, though it should be noted that even this range does not incorporate every type of 3-dimensional representation covered in this study.

I have felt it necessary, therefore, to propose the following alternative typology (outlined in Fig 27, detailed in Appendix I). However, I have also included a concordance table at the end of the Appendix (Table 23) which relates my categories to those of the three most influential typological systems to date – those of the Swedish Cyprus Expedition, Karageorghis and Morris.\textsuperscript{314} It is hoped that this will facilitate further study and make the new typology more accessible to scholars familiar with these previous systems.

This typology differs from those which have been created in the past in three critical points:

1. \textit{It is a comprehensive system}.

   It includes within its framework both anthropomorphic and zoomorphic figurines and vessels, including those attached to vessels, alongside models of inanimate objects from the Early Bronze Age right through to LC IIIA. It is hoped that this will reveal relationships between similar imagery displayed through different media and elucidate the changing dynamics of figurine creation over time in a way that more specialised typologies simply cannot accomplish.

2. \textit{It is organised primarily by shape, with material taking secondary place}.

   The difficulty of correctly determining the material of a ceramic figurine and the related problem of comfortably assigning those objects into the subdivisions of ware categories has been discussed in Part IIB.3. It is impossible for us to deduce the criteria by which Bronze Age Cypriots would have divided their figurines. However, it is clear that the shape and outward physical appearance of the object would have been visible to everyone whereas its internal fabric need only have been known by the person who made it. Those typologies which organise by ware as a first criterion separate objects which otherwise possess extremely similar iconography and must, therefore, be part of a related scheme of expression. It is acknowledged, however, that changes in fabric could be extremely significant for the function and significance of the figurine, so to facilitate comparison across similar wares, the different materials from which each type has been made have been identified and stated.

explicitly both in the Database and in the description of each type given in Appendix 1.

3. *Every category has been given a descriptive name, rather than simply a number or letter code.*

This has been done in an effort to keep the typology as open and plain as possible, both for those who specialise in figurines and for those who do not. It has been a common weakness of several previous typologies, particularly those with large numbers of categories, that it is not possible to tell from first glance what binds a group of objects together. A designation such as “Type 1-la”, for instance, may be logical and accurate but it tells the reader nothing about the nature of the category without reference to a complex index section. Although I have also supplied a typological code – three letters shown in brackets after the typological name – as a convenient abbreviation and to distinguish objects in the database (see Fig 20 for a full explanation of these codes), only the Type Name will be used in the main discussion sections of this study.

In general, I have sought to keep this typology as broad as possible. Endless subdivisions, whilst they may have perfectly valid criteria, confuse the material and obscure overarching similarities. Where major secondary differences exist within the larger categories, however, in form or material for instance, these have been made explicit within the description and taken into account in distribution patterns. Full explanation of each of the types and their characteristics can be found in Appendix 1. The basic format of the typology is shown in the diagram (Fig 27).

---

315 This category belongs the typology of Mogelonsky and refers to a figurine with no added anatomical details, rectangular in section, freestanding, not holding a cradleboard (Mogelonsky 1988:32-6).
Fig 27: Typological key
Defining the Chronological Progression of Types

One of the most interesting questions regarding the figurine record of Bronze Age Cyprus is how styles and preferences for different types of representation changed over such a significant period of time and how this might relate to concurrent socio-cultural changes occurring on the island. To assess this, it is necessary to obtain an accurate chronology for each different figurine type. To date, most figurine types have not been considered in sufficient detail for a chronological range to have been proposed at all. Those which have, generally the most common types of figurine, have traditionally been dated purely stylistically, resulting in broad assumptions regarding their floreats. Whilst dating a figurine type using its stylistic attributes and material can give an indication of the period in which it was in use, the chronology can only be considered most accurate if this is combined with as much contextual information for the type as possible.

For this study, therefore, the chronological progression of types has been established by considering two forms of evidence – the dated contexts in which figurines have been found and the known period of use of the material from which they were made. Both sources incorporate some theoretical caveats. Firstly, there are the many problems associated with identifying the relative and absolute chronology of an archaeological context as discussed in Part IIB.4. Secondly, the find context of an object is only the end of its story. It does not necessarily reveal where and when an object was made or used, only where and when it was deposited or abandoned. This final context may not truly reflect the period when the object was in common use. It is not impossible that some remained in use over generations or were retained as heirloom pieces. Similarly, others may have been moved from their original place of deposition at a much later date, either through looting or curation, or as part of secondary burial practices or veneration of distant ancestors. It is generally near impossible to discern exactly what processes an object has undergone before it is excavated and how these might affect the relevance of its context for dating the figurine type to which it belongs. For the most part, it should be possible to minimise this problem by studying a wide range of evidence and systematically identifying possible anomalous contexts. However, in some cases, particularly for types with a small number of examples, this effect may be more difficult to see.

The issues associated with the use of ceramic ware categories when dealing with figurines have been discussed in Part IIB.3. Those difficulties in accurately assigning a figurine to a specific subdivision of a ware type mean that only broad categories, necessarily associated with longer periods of time, can be used to help establish their chronology. Similarly, the dating of even the broad categories of certain ceramic wares remains the subject of debate and a satisfactory system
covering the whole of Bronze Age Cyprus has not yet been reached. Furthermore, even when the floreat of a ceramic ware has been established as accurately as possible, it is not necessarily the case that the figurine use should coincide with it exactly. As we have seen with the case of Base Ring bulls (above, Part IIB.3), the fabric of figurines is frequently slightly different from the non-figurative vessels apparently made in that same ware. It is possible that this difference may sometimes have held a chronological dimension. Perhaps the figurine may have either pioneered a fabric or retained the use of an otherwise out-dated fabric for symbolic or economic reasons not currently understood. Unfortunately, since the large-scale fabric analysis of ceramic figurines alongside their non-figurative vessel counterparts is beyond the scope of this project, this issue cannot currently be directly addressed. However, the problems involved in the use of both ceramics and contexts in deducing the chronological progression of figurine types should not prove a barrier to the endeavour. Provided that as much evidence as possible is studied together, the chronological ranges determined for each figurine type should remain a fair indication of the time during which they were manufactured and used.

Chart 3: Proportions of Provenanced Examples from Datable Contexts (types with 10 or more provenanced examples)

Accepting the limitations described above, therefore, the primary indications of the chronological spread of a figurine type are provided by those objects which originate from single-period contexts.

---

316 See e.g. Maguire 1991; Samuelson 1993; Eriksson 2009 for ongoing debate over the classification of White Painted ware and Vaughan 1991, 2001 on Base Ring ware.
contexts. Ideally, dating would always begin with this information but regrettably this is not always possible. Chart 3 shows the level of contextual information available for each of the 21 types identified for which at least ten provenanced examples are known. Of these types, only three have this level of chronological information available for half or more of their examples. Practically, therefore, more chronological evidence is required to establish the dating of this material. Most well-provenanced figurines originate from multi-period contexts, frequently tombs used over a long period of time whose contents have become muddled in the intervening centuries. Although these can provide only a range of possible dates for each figurine, they are nonetheless useful indications. They are also more plentiful with eighteen of the 21 types drawing most of their examples from these broadly dateable contexts.

In some cases, it has been necessary to make refinements to the chronological range using the ceramic wares from which each type is made. This is particularly necessary for those types which are not well represented in dateable contexts. Several categories have no contextually datable examples at all and the only option is to attempt dating based on their material and stylistic attributes alone. No Flathead vessels (FAV) for instance, come from securely dateable contexts. Their stylistic similarity to Flathead Figurines (FAF) suggests a chronology close to that type but their wheelmade fabric which is similar to both Base Ring and Bichrome Wheelmade ware, but probably part of the White Painted Wheelmade III group, suggests a slightly later, LC IIIA+ date. Although, as discussed above, this is not ideal, it at least provides an indication of when the type may have been in use.

Information regarding the period of use of ceramic wares has also been beneficial in identifying and discounting anomalous dates suggested by single-period contexts and to narrow down date ranges provided by multi-period contexts. The Earring figurine fragment EAF.Phil.01, for instance, was found in debris covering a Cypro-Archaic threshing floor. This might initially suggest that the type continued long after the Bronze Age, yet its Base Ring material is not attested after LC III and as it is the only example from a later period, it can sensibly be disregarded as anomalous. Likewise, Fat Zoomorph FZV.Kaz.03, originates from Tomb 2B at Kazaphani, which can only be dated to between LC IA and LC III. The fact that this object is of White Painted V ware, which is not attested after LC I, combined with the fact that those objects in its category which retain a single-
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317 The remaining 24 types with fewer than ten provenanced examples have been excluded from this chart to avoid a false impression of the abundance of dateable contexts.
318 Note that types whose chronological span has been determined entirely on stylistic or material grounds have been given a dashed line on chronology Chart 6 and discussion of the reasoning used is included in Appendix 1.
319 Al-Radi 1983:28-9; Horowitz 2008:80
period context date to MC III – LC IA, suggests that the upper limit of this range can also be safely ruled out when dating the Fat Zoomorph (FZV) category.\textsuperscript{320}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{chart4.png}
\caption{Chart 4: Chronology of Fat Zoomorphs (FZV)}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{chart5.png}
\caption{Chart 5: Chronology of Base Ring Bull Vessels (BZV)}
\end{figure}

Chart 4 and Chart 5 illustrate how these three types of evidence have been used in parallel to establish rationalised date ranges for every figurine type. Each vertical line represents the dates suggested by a figurine from a single or multi-period context; the shaded box indicates the currently agreed limits of the ceramic ware(s) in which the type was found. Similar charts for all those types with five or more datable examples will be shown in Appendix I.

The resulting chronological progression of all Bronze Age Cypriot figurine types, shown here in Chart 6, provides the most accurate picture currently available of the diachronic change in figurine types across the Cypriot Bronze Age. It is unfortunate that the numbers of examples of each figurine type from closely-dateable contexts remain generally small. Even for the best represented types, they cannot provide the sort of clarity which might elucidate, for instance, how individual stylistic traits emerged within a single figurine type, or reveal any chronological discrepancy between their appearance in settlements as opposed to tombs. Nor is it currently possible, for example, to recognise a chronological spread from a site of origin. Nevertheless, the overall chronological progression is invaluable for revealing how types and preferences changed through the Bronze Age. It is now possible to explore, for example, how each style was influenced by what had gone before or identify styles which appear to have no obvious indigenous source. It is also possible to consider how each period of the Bronze Age was expressed in the figurine record and how this differed from the styles and preferences shown in other periods. Diachronic change in the figurines of Bronze Age Cyprus and how this might illuminate concurrent socio-political changes on the island is discussed in detail in Parts III and IV.

\textsuperscript{320} Merrillees 2002
Chart 6: Chronology of Bronze Age Cypriot Figurines

Chart: Chronology of Bronze Age Cyprus

Approx. Years BC

1100 - 1100
1200 - 1200
1300 - 1300
1400 - 1400
1500 - 1500
1600 - 1600
1700 - 1700
1800 - 1800
1900 - 1900
2000 - 2000
2100 - 2100
2200 - 2200
2300 - 2300

Late Bronze Age Proper (LC II - IIIA)

Middle - Late Bronze Age Transition (MC III - LC I)

Early - Middle Bronze Age (EC III - MC II)

Earliest Bronze Age (EC I - II)

(NB: Line drawings are for reference only and are not to scale; dotted lines denote chronologies based entirely on fabric.)
This essential stage of the analyses is intended to provide an understanding of how each figurine type was distributed geographically around the island and beyond. This can illuminate the possible heartland of each type and whether they were locally or centrally produced and distributed, as well as how they might have travelled. In addition, it also opens up the study of figurines to wider areas of study, including the possible existence of socio-cultural regionalism or homogeneity within Cyprus, the interaction between individual sites and areas of the island and the relationships between parts of Cyprus and particular extra-island communities, whether through trading, economic or social connections. When combined with the chronological analyses described above, this reveals an illuminating picture of the way in which the socio-political organisation of the island and its internal and external relationships changed and developed over time.

Geographical patterns, however, perhaps more than any other, are acutely affected by the many excavation and preservation biases discussed in Part IIB.1-2. Fortunately, these biases are also arguably the most easily recognised and accounted for during analysis. Encouragingly, information relating to the geographical distribution of figurines in Bronze Age Cyprus is relatively plentiful as 67% of known Bronze Age figurines retain information regarding the site at which the object was found.\textsuperscript{321} This information is plentiful enough to facilitate the investigation not only of how widespread each type of figurine was, but also how different stylistic traits within those types were distributed. This level of information offers fascinating insight into the modes of production

\textsuperscript{321} 1203 objects out of a total of 1790.
of these figurines – whether particular traits could be tied to specific regions or sites within the island, or whether any types could have been mass-produced to a standard design, as well as if each type was likely to have been made on a site-by-site basis by individual household potters, or whether there is any evidence that specialist workshops for the production of figurines may have been established.

The key evidence for this analysis has been relatively simple to collate. Each site at which figurines have been found belongs to a particular geographic region on Cyprus (or outside it). These regions have no fixed boundaries and are only roughly defined based on apparent cultural regionalism in prehistoric Cyprus (Map 2). Nevertheless, they provide a useful indication of the areas in which each type of figurine has been found and enable broad trends in the distribution of each type to be considered. Chart 7 shows the proportion of figurines from each broad chronological period found in each region. The exact proportions shown are inevitably influenced by the excavation bias detailed in Part IIB.2, such that the North coast and Eastern Mesaoria may be slightly over-represented. Nonetheless, it demonstrates how the figurine dominance of the North Coast area during the Earliest Bronze Age gradually broke down to an increasingly even distribution across the island. It also highlights the introduction and slight increase in figurines found outside of Cyprus in the Late Bronze Age.

![Chart 7: Distribution of figurines through time by broad geographical region]

The identification of such broad patterns is extremely enlightening but it provides only part of the picture. A more detailed, visual representation of the geographical distribution of the various types of figurines can be found by displaying the numbers of each type at each site on maps. Taking into account the biases discussed in Part IIB.1-2, this can reveal interesting information.
about the use of each figurine type. If most examples of a type cluster towards a single site, for example, this may represent its geographical heartland. By combining this analysis with that of stylistic traits, it is then possible to consider whether any features which are not found on all figurines of a particular type, such as pierced ears on Plank Figurines, could be associated with a particular area or site, as a regional or site-specific variation within the type.

In addition to the find-spot of each figurine, it is also useful to consider its material and manufacturing techniques. It is often the case that particular wares, decorative styles or production methods have been tied to specific areas of the island on the evidence of the far more plentiful ceramic vessels. It is known, for instance, that impressed circle decoration on Red/Drab Polished ware is characteristic of South Coast pottery in the Early-Middle Bronze Age, and that Red-on-Black ware was made almost entirely in the Karpas/Eastern Mesaoria. Should figurines using area-specific materials or techniques occur outside these areas, then, it is possible to consider how they came to be there – whether by focussed trade, for example, movement of population or some other means. Study of these stylistic features may also be able to return a geographical heartland to a type which has few provenanced examples. This is particularly apparent in the case of the Plaque figurines, which have only two provenanced examples – from Kissonerga-Skalia and Ayios Iakovos-Melia. Although the former is local Drab Polished ware, the latter and the majority of unprovenanced examples are Plain White ware, suggesting an eastern origin for the type.

The evidence of chronology, materials, and stylistic traits and techniques, therefore, can be used in combination with geographical distributions not only to investigate where each figurine type was made and used across the island but also to elucidate the complex relationships between different areas of the island and with external communities. The number of different maps that can be drawn to represent the geographical distribution of all figurine types across c.1200 years of the Bronze Age is considerable. What sort of map is most useful depends on the specific question being asked of the data. An investigation into how each type of figurine was used during LC I would require a map showing all figurines in use in that period, whereas the question of whether figurines found outside the island were associated with particular areas of the island could only be illuminated by a map which combined those types which left Cyprus. Pertinent distribution maps will be used throughout Part III of this study.

322 It is acknowledged that the use of information regarding ceramic wares for geographical analysis is affected by the same problems of identification and variability described in Part IIB.3.

323 QAF.Ska.01 and QAF.Ayl.01
The physical appearance of figurines, often entirely disconnected from their contexts, has provided the basis for the majority of their study to date. Their form is undoubtedly their most immediate and striking feature but its study must be integrated into the contextual analyses described in the rest of this section in order to provide a comprehensive and socially-situated interpretation. Exploration of the physical characteristics of Bronze Age Cypriot figurines in this thesis takes two distinct forms: firstly the shape of the figurine and its stylistic attributes and secondly its physical condition and patterns of wear or breakage. Both of these provide important opportunities to investigate the way in which figurines were used and the purpose for which they were created; both also require careful, systematic investigation.

For the analysis of stylistic attributes, it is not sufficient to deduce the meaning of an entire figurine type from characteristics present on only a small number of its examples. It would not be viable, for instance, to conclude that a certain type were representations of mothers and connected to fertility, for example, solely on the evidence of one figurine holding a baby or one with breasts. Such potentially illuminating attributes must be quantified and rationalised. Only if a significant proportion of the type shows these features can they be considered anything more than anomalous or secondary variations. Even if a feature is determined to be important in this way, its implications for the meaning of the object cannot necessarily be taken at face value. Without more information on the importance of particular symbols in the original context, a luxury which is sadly rare for prehistoric societies, no matter how careful the investigation is, these features can only ever be tentatively interpreted.

Nonetheless, stylistic analysis holds great potential. In the broadest sense, consideration of the physical form of each figurine type elucidates which elements were considered important to depict and thus essential to the meaning of the object, and which were either less important or simply so implicit as to be understood without the need for depiction. This sort of study also reveals skeuomorphic elements which might indicate that the type was originally made from a different material. It has been proposed that Plank Figurines may once have been wooden, for example, and the existence of a single Bronze example of the usually clay Base Ring Bull figurine is intriguing. Furthermore, similarities between the form of Cypriot figurines or elements thereof and those of figurines from outside Cyprus could illuminate cultural relationships between different areas of the island and external communities.

For each figurine type, the study of stylistic attributes has identified features and variations in the form of the object – such as pierced ears or arms held by the sides – and enumerate how frequently each attribute or variation occurs. It was then determined whether these attributes
are major or minor components of the form. In this case, major characteristics are taken to be those occurring in more than 50% of the examples of a particular type; those represented in less than 25% of the examples are automatically considered minor; those attributes which constitute between 25% and 50% have been assessed on an individual basis to assess whether they should be considered important in that particular case. Major attributes have been used in combination with other features to help illuminate the possible identification or function of the figurine type. Minor attributes are unlikely to influence the interpretation of the whole group but have still been investigated. In particular, attempts have been made to establish whether such uncommon attributes might represent specific regional or chronological variations, or whether combinations of minor characteristics might provide important clues as to the origin or interpretation of the figurine type.

![Fig 28: Various forms of Plank Imagery. Left: Figurine (PAF.Lap.04, D-K.Knox, Cyprus Museum); Middle, Top: Relief Decoration (from Photta, Karageorghis 1991a:Pl.CXXXI.2-3); Middle Bottom, Left: Attached to Vessel (JMD.PaD.01, D-K.Knox, Fitzwilliam Museum); Middle Bottom, Right: Incised Decoration (Pierides Collection, Larnaca); Right: As Vessel Handle (CAD.Vou.02, Karageorghis 1976:No.37)](image)

Finally, it is important to remember that Bronze Age Cypriot figurines were part of a continuum of iconographic representation. In some cases, similar imagery can be traced across different media, from figurines and vessels to two-dimensional relief and painted decoration. Plank Figurines, for instance, exist in their independent figurine form and as plastic decoration attached to various types of vessel. In addition there are also two known two-dimensional representations of the

---

324 It is acknowledged that this system is somewhat arbitrary and that the sample of objects currently available for study may not represent a true spectrum of what originally existed. However, it is necessary to impose some limits in order to make analysis possible; furthermore, there is room for manoeuvre in this system and each case has been considered individually. The criteria used for each particular deduction will always be made clear (see Part III and Appendix I).
same image as relief and incised decoration on ceramic vessels (Fig 28). Consideration of the imagery which falls outside of the ‘figurine’ category, therefore, could provide vital comparative evidence for their interpretation. Where possible, comparable imagery on vessels, seals, and architectural remains has been examined and incorporated into the analysis of each appropriate figurine type.

Where appropriate, comparisons have also been made with figurine types from the contemporary Near East, Egypt and Aegean in order to assess the possibility of stylistic similarities in the figurine record and what this may reveal about economic and cultural relationships between Cyprus and its neighbours. However, this endeavour comes with several caveats. Firstly, it is not always easy to obtain an accurate picture of the range of figurines which existed in these external locations. Similar biases towards attractive anthropomorphs discussed in Part IB.1a also exist in the scholarship on these contexts and comprehensive studies are rare. French’s work on the Mycenaean figurines, for example, Renfrew’s on those of the Cyclades and Badre’s exploration of Syrian anthropomorphs are particularly useful. However, the most recent of these studies is already thirty years old and none covers the full timespan of the Bronze Age. Especially problematic is the absence of a comprehensive study of the human and animal figurines in use over the vast area of Anatolia and the Levantine littoral. Until these substantial projects have been completed, it will not be possible to conduct a detailed comparison between Cypriot figurines and those of the Near East and what can currently be gleaned will necessarily be incomplete.

Furthermore, when similarities are observed, these must be approached with caution. Some basic resemblances, particularly within zoomorphic imagery, for example, may be coincidental, on account of the similar subject matter being represented, and thus not indicate any stylistic relationship. Apparently genuine concordances also require nuanced interpretation to consider how and why this similarity may have occurred and where the original inspiration may have arisen. Each situation should be considered on its own merits and it must not be assumed that the influence always originated outside of Cyprus or vice versa. Similarly, it should not be assumed that similar imagery held comparable meaning or significance in different contexts. Those correspondences which have been identified will be discussed in detail in Part III and possible implications for our understanding of Cyprus’ relationships with its neighbours in Part IV.

The analysis of the physical condition of figurines is similarly illuminating but must be conducted in an equally cautious manner. Considering whether any patterns of wear or damage exist, for example, may indicate which area(s) of the figurine were subjected to the most attention, as was
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325 French 1971; Renfrew 1969; Badre 1980
the case, for instance, in Goring’s study of Chalcolithic Cypriot figurines. Likewise, particular pieces which are frequently broken might suggest deliberate destruction of the object. Just as in the study of stylistic attributes, however, one or two isolated examples of a particular type of damage or breakage cannot be used to conjecture the way an entire type was treated. Significant proportions of examples, defined as above, must show the same characteristic for it to be considered an indication of the deliberate use of a figurine type. Again, possible chronological and geographical variations in the way similar objects were used must also be taken into account. Although part of the same broad type, figurines at different sites or owned by different people may not necessarily have been used in quite the same way or for quite the same purpose. It may have been the custom for occupants of Marki-Alonia, for example, to burn broken animal figurines, whereas occupants of Lapithos might have chosen to bury them. Similarly, there may have been some further variation within the types regarding the way in which individual figurines were used. Some large examples of Base Ring Bull Vessels from Angastina-Vounos may have been used as display pieces or symbolic archetypes, rarely touched, whereas similar vessels from other settlement contexts could have been in use every day and thus received far more wear.

Another problem concerns the interpretation of apparent patterns of visible wear or damage. Whilst some sections of abrasion may be the result of the way an object was used during its lifetime, others may have been caused by taphonomic processes after the object was deposited. It is often difficult to distinguish between true use-wear and this post-depositional damage. For ceramic vessels, logic based on how the object was assumed to be used is often enlisted to determine the origin of patches of damage: it is reasonable for a jug to have a worn handle, for example, as this would have been used to pick it up. Since we know little about how figurines were used – in fact this is the very quandary that use-wear analysis will be employed to address – such a strategy is difficult to implement in this case. Consideration of the depositional conditions of the object may help. If all objects from a particular tomb show surface abrasion on one side, for instance, it is likely that the tomb had been waterlogged at some point and the damage occurred as a result. However, such information is rarely available in any detail. Instead, it may be most prudent to employ Dugay’s suggestion that severe wear, concentrated on an entire section of an object – one whole face of a figurine, for instance – is most likely to have been caused by conditions in the ground, whereas lighter, more concentrated wear repeated on many examples of the same object type, is most likely to represent true use-wear.

A similar problem exists when attempting to distinguish between accidental or deliberate patterns of breakage. It is important, for instance, to consider how the shape of the object may
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326 Goring 1992
327 Dugay 1996
have invited certain accidental damage. The long, protruding horns on bull figurines, for example, are notoriously fragile. It is easy to imagine that these were frequently broken accidentally during the ordinary course of their use; furthermore it would be difficult to argue a case for deliberate breakage of a particular figurine type if the only broken part was such a delicate component. Conversely, the broad, solid body of a Plank Figurine might take some force to break and thus it could be more reasonably argued that damage in this area could have been deliberate. In addition to the differential explanations for breakage, the form and material of the figurine may influence the visibility of any surface wear. Whereas abrasion of the slip on highly lustrous, Red Polished objects may be obvious to the naked eye, the same wear on an un-slipped or matt slipped Base Ring object is likely to be more difficult to see. This differential visibility should be taken into account when attempting to identify and interpret wear patterns on figurines.

When conducted prudently, however, investigation of the physical condition of different figurine types could be highly illuminating. It may help to clarify, for example, whether any were made specifically for funerary use and thus carry a particularly mortuary significance. Likewise, if they have had a longer life, condition analysis, together with contextual analysis which will be detailed below, may illuminate their value to their Bronze Age owners: whether they were treasured possessions throughout their use-life – perhaps mended in antiquity or disposed of in particular ways or places – or whether it was appropriate simply to discard them once broken. Identifying patterns of breakage may also reveal whether a particular figurine type was symbolically destroyed prior to deposition which may indicate its connection to sympathetic magic or particular ritual activities.

The clearest evidence for any patterns of use-wear which might exist on figurines would undoubtedly be uncovered through thorough, detailed, microscopic analysis of each figurine. Unfortunately this sort of large-scale, scientific investigation deserves a project in its own right and, due to restraints of time and practicalities of access to significant numbers of figurines, could not be conducted as part of the present study. Instead, for those figurines which it has been possible to study in person, high-quality photographs have been taken and details of wear visible to the naked eye have been recorded. In addition, the testimony of excavators and cataloguers who have handled the figurines as well as published photographs have been incorporated. The latter are useful in the case of breakages, restoration and missing parts but less so in the exploration of wear as they are not usually reproduced in particularly high quality. As a result, most figurine types have provided reasonable evidence for breakages, fragment types and missing parts but few have substantial evidence for use-wear. It is unlikely, therefore, that information on where a figurine may have been repeatedly handled or touched, for example, will be forthcoming for every type. Nonetheless, evidence for deliberate or accidental breakage, lifetime repairs and
methods of ultimate disposal will be far more apparent and equally useful in determining the way in which each figurine type may have functioned.

Wherever possible, therefore, the database has recorded whether each part of the figurine is worn, damaged (minor damage such as small chips), partial (more serious damage resulting in the loss of half or more of the part), repaired, restored (either in antiquity or after excavation), or missing. Where this information was unavailable, this has also been recorded so that genuine negative evidence can be taken into account. For each figurine type, this information has been enumerated and examined to determine whether any significant patterns exist. The potential cause of any such patterns has then been considered and interpreted taking into account all those caveats described above.

5 Contextual Analysis

The contexts in which figurines have been found hold enormous potential to reveal the manner in which they were used, by whom and for what purpose. Unfortunately, good contextual evidence for Bronze Age Cypriot figurines is not always available. Only those rated “high” on the provenance status table can be considered in this analysis and those rated “high – stratified” which provide the best information. The sample for this analysis, then, is necessarily reduced but at 836 figurines, 46% of the total known, it remains more than useable.

In the first stage of this analysis, the find context of each figurine has been broadly defined as tomb, settlement, or rarely and somewhat controversially, ritual space. For each figurine type, the overall numbers of examples from each of these context categories has been enumerated. This broad division may give some preliminary indications of possible function. If all examples of a particular type have been found in tombs, for example this may suggest a mortuary function, or if they all originated from ritual space, this might indicate their use in non-funerary ritual activities. However, such broad conclusions must take into account two limiting factors. Firstly the excavation and preservation biases explained in Part IIB.1-2 have an impact on the kinds of context which are more or less likely to have survived and to have been excavated. Secondly, the identification of the context type is not always straightforward, particularly in the case of ritual sites which will be discussed below. It is also necessary to consider what the find context of a figurine actually represents. As discussed in Part IIB.3, in essence this is only the object’s “final resting place” in which it was deposited or abandoned and not necessarily the place in which the object was used.

Designations of ritual space are based on Webb’s 1999 evaluation.
Furthermore, similar figurines may have been discarded at various stages of their use life according to accidental circumstances which simply cannot be known. The life story of a figurine or type, from manufacture to final deposition, can never be told from a single find context. Only when this is considered as part of a pattern, however, across many examples and various sites, can it help illuminate the manner in which these objects may have been used. Such broad contextual studies should also make it possible to discern differences in the way in which figurines of different types or various examples of the same type may have been used in relation to their position in the geographical and chronological spectrum.

Certainly the easiest context to identify and theoretically one of the more straightforward to analyse is the tomb. For an intact tomb with a single burial, one is presented with a group of objects deliberately brought together and deposited with the deceased, a snapshot of life and death at that point in time. Superficially, this is the ideal evidence, yet the reality is somewhat more complex. Firstly, this sort of clear-cut burial is seldom available for Bronze Age Cyprus where multiple burial was commonplace. In such circumstances, even when a tomb is intact, it is not always possible to tell which objects belonged to which burial, or if such a distinction was ever intended. When these tombs have been damaged or looted, the task is even more difficult and compounded by the impossibility of predicting what might be missing. Likewise, the practice of secondary treatment of the dead, and re-interment or rearrangement of remains obfuscates the original assemblage, as well as what may have been added or removed, even further. Even with the best possible evidence, it is necessary to decipher the purpose for which each object was intended, whether gifts to the deceased, for example, offerings to deities, supplies for a presumed afterlife or accoutrements for the funeral itself and subsequent visits to the tomb. These interpretations are complex and controversial and deserve several theses in their own right.\textsuperscript{329}

Here the focus must remain on what the features and contents of the tombs containing figurines can suggest about the meaning of figurine type and the way in which it was used. Investigation of burial contexts has considered both the physical and material aspects of the tombs to determine whether tombs containing figurines, or particular figurine types, were somehow distinctive. External variables include their shape, size and architectural features. Keswani’s mammoth study of Bronze Age Cypriot burial practice, which includes tables listing these features for all published tombs, has been extremely useful for this part of the analysis.\textsuperscript{330} The location and types of figurines has also been mapped across the cemetery to determine whether tombs containing

\textsuperscript{329} See, for example, the work of Keswani 2004.

\textsuperscript{330} Keswani 2004
particular figurines may have been spatially segregated and, where possible, the position of the figurine within the tomb has also been considered.

Exhaustive study of tomb assemblages has also been conducted in order to determine whether figurines tend to be deposited in tombs which contain particular objects or groups of objects. Such a correlation may indicate a practical or symbolic alliance between the figurine and the object(s). If one figurine type was always found in burials with weaponry, for instance, and similar weaponry was not generally found in graves without this figurine, then it may be plausible to suggest that those who used this figurine also used weaponry. This figurine type, then, might plausibly have been associated with warfare or military prowess, or more general wealth and status.

The following object groups, based on Webb’s list of key object types deposited in Bronze Age mortuary assemblages, have been tested:

- Weapons – dagger, sword, arrowhead, macehead
- Tools (general) – scraper, awl, axe, spatula, rubber, whetstone, knife, chisel, pestle, mortar
- Tools (textiles) – spindlewhorl, loomweight, needle
- Tools (personal grooming) – tweezers, razor
- Personal Adornment – pin, ring, earring, necklace, bracelet
- Capacity Vessels – large jar/jug, pithos, large amphora
- Small Vessels – bowl, jug, juglet, dish
- Complex Vessels – kernos, composite vessel, offering stand, rhyton, miniature vessel
- Imported objects

Statistically significant correlations have been sought using the $\chi^2$ distribution, chosen specifically as it considers the presence/absence of two variables, namely figurines and the test object(s). A system which considered the amount of figurines/test objects in any tomb would not have been appropriate in this case as the generally small numbers of figurines and the changing amounts of goods deposited in tombs of longer use would have skewed the results considerably. To ensure the validity of this investigation and assuage the issue of multi-burial tombs where individual assemblages cannot easily be distinguished, all tombs have been considered as whole units and only tombs of the same general chronological period have been compared. Clearly looted tombs

---

331 Webb 1992:90
332 $\chi^2$ conducted on the following basis: $H_0 = \text{no relationship between figurines and the test object(s)}, H_1 = \text{a relationship exists between figurines and the test object(s)}$, Degree of freedom = 1, critical value for 0.05% = 3.84: $H_0$ would be rejected in favour of $H_1$ if the value of $\chi^2$ exceeds this critical value. See Shennan 1997:104-26 for the use of this test in archaeology.
have also been omitted. Nonetheless, it is acknowledged that the vagaries of the burial record continue to pose a problem to this analysis and its results will therefore be taken as indications, to be supported by other evidence rather than definitive patterns in their own right.

Differences in burial practices and figurine deposition between the Early-Middle and Late Bronze Age have determined that the analysis of tomb contexts in those periods be conducted in a slightly different manner. Unfortunately, given the paucity of preserved, excavated and published MC III – LC I contexts, tomb analysis has not been possible for this period. For the Early-Middle Bronze Age, however, the large extensively excavated, well-published necropoleis at Lapithos-Vrysi tou Barba and Bellapais-Vounous account for the majority of figurines known and provide two case studies. Since both sites are on the North coast of the island, it is acknowledged that patterns observed there may not account for figurine use across the island but they nonetheless cover the bulk of figurine activity during this period. All tombs in these cemeteries, with and without figurines, have been investigated together to produce as complete a picture as possible of the scale and character of their deposition.

For LC II-IIIA, complete cemetery analysis is more problematic as figurines of the same type tend to be spread in small numbers over many distant sites. Consequently, for the majority of cemeteries, statistical analyses are not viable as the occurrences of each type are insufficient to reveal significant patterns. Only Enkomi, which has 47 known figurines distributed across 23 tombs, offers a viable case study. However, the nineteenth-century British excavations at Enkomi, from which the vast majority of figurines have derived, were never recorded with sufficient detail or clarity for this analysis to be possible.\footnote{The recent digitisation of the objects from these excavations by the British Museum (http://www.britishmuseum.org/system_pages/holding_area/ancient_cyprus_british_museum.aspx) and Cyprus Museum (www.enkomicm.org) have greatly improved their accessibility. Regrettably, in this case, inconsistencies in the notebooks, particularly where they refer briefly to figurines found in tombs to which no such objects are currently registered, present a confused picture and ultimately undermine any attempts to assess figurine use across the site using these tombs alone.} In lieu of analysing the material from specific cemeteries, therefore, and acknowledging the possibility of regional differences in figurine use, an overview analysis of all well-preserved, excavated and published tombs known for the period has been conducted. This has examined the external attributes detailed above as well as the overall wealth and presence of imported items and various bronze objects in order to investigate general patterns in the location and manner of deposition of Late Cypriot figurine types across the island.

The available sample of evidence for settlement contexts is rather more haphazard than that of tombs and as such, more difficult to approach. The ideal situation – a series of Bronze Age Cypriot Pompeis – simply does not exist. Instead, in a single building, various rooms will probably have been cleared, re-arranged, tidied, looted or collapsed and this pattern will be repeated at random
across the building complex and the site as a whole. Often it is possible to identify fixtures and material which might indicate the possible function of a room or complex as industrial, domestic, storage or even ritual, although the latter, as will be discussed below, is somewhat controversial, but the excavator is rarely able to be more specific. Additionally, the spaces between buildings are particularly difficult to interpret. Nevertheless, the contextual study of figurines in settlements can be conducted in a comparable way to that of tombs. Overall patterns concerning the sort of places in which examples of each figurine type have been found were determined first. Then, more specific information was sought on the rooms in which particular figurines types have been found and the material deposited alongside them. Every site for which pertinent information has been published has been examined. For the Early-Middle Bronze Age, Marki-Alonia and Alambra-Mouttes provide the bulk of information and the negative evidence from Early Cypriot Sotira-Kaminoudhia which has no figurines will also be taken into account. For the Late Bronze Age, a wide range of sites, including Enkomi, Kiton, Kourion-Bamboula and Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimitrios, have been utilised.

For each site, the findspots and types of figurine have been mapped across the space to determine any patterns in the manner of deposition of each type as well as the interaction or differentiation between figurine types. For primary contexts, where figurines have been found on floors, it is possible to look at the features of the space – whether covered or open-air, for example, its possible function and the other objects found in the same space. For secondary contexts, it is necessary to consider firstly what the context might be – fill between floors, for example, debris from above, debris from abandonment, midden or fill under a first floor and possible foundation area – and then how the figurine may have ended up there, whether accidentally or deliberately, and in what condition. When all instances of each figurine type within each case study have been determined, it may then be possible to identify any overall or site-specific pattern in the way in which they were used. Ultimately, it is possible to consider what these patterns might suggest about the function and value of those figurine types in that specific context and beyond.

The final context type, ritual space, provides the most complex and difficult situation for analysis. First of all, the identification of ‘sanctuaries’ or areas of ritual activity within sites of other use is extremely controversial. Since figurines are often used as evidence to support such

334 Frankel & Webb 1996, 2006 (Marki-Alonia); Coleman et al 1996 (Alambra-Mouttes); Swiny et al 2003; Swiny 2008 (Sotira-Kaminoudhia)
335 Dikaios 1969-71 (Enkomi); Karageorghis & Demas 1985 (Kiton); Benson 1972 (Kourion-Bamboula); I am grateful to Alison South for providing me with unpublished information about the find contexts of figurines from Kalavasos Ayios-Dhimitrios.
336 See e.g. Webb 1999
identification, it is important to avoid cyclical interpretations when dealing with those examples apparently discovered in ritual areas. Although it may be possible to conjecture that a figurine found in a ritual context was involved in ritual activity, this conjecture is worthless if the context was originally classified due to the presence of that same figurine. It is therefore necessary to verify the criteria on which an area has been identified as ritual space and ensure that evidence exists apart from the presence of figurines.

Furthermore, sites of categorical ritual purpose are rare in Bronze Age Cyprus. For the Early-Middle Bronze Age, no such sites are currently known. It is possible that these have simply not yet been discovered. However, it is equally feasible that ritual activity did not take place in permanent or semi-permanent built structures at this time or that the paraphernalia used in such activity cannot currently be distinguished in the archaeological record. For LC IIA-III A, a small number of ritual sites have been identified – sanctuaries of the Horned God and Ingot God at Enkomi, Area II at Kition and the site at Myrtou-Pigadhes. In cases where figurines have been found in these or similarly ritual sites, analysis may proceed in a comparable way to that of examples found in settlements. It is possible to evaluate the sort of location in which they have been found – on a bench, for example, or discarded in a bothros – and the other objects found alongside them. This evidence may give an indication as to how the figurines had been used during their lifetimes as well as how it was deemed appropriate to dispose of them. In addition, it is interesting to consider whether any known ritual places are apparently completely devoid of figurines and what implications this may have for the common interpretations of such objects as depictions of deities for ritual use.

***

Each of these five analyses supplies valuable information regarding the meanings and functions of Bronze Age Cypriot figurines but none can tell the whole story alone. Although these analyses must be conducted separately, they will be interpreted in combination so that each deduction may inform the next and all conclusions can take advantage of as wide a range of evidence as possible. The raw data on which each analysis is based for individual figurine types are documented in the Database and Appendix I. The results of this combined approach and the conclusions it has revealed regarding the diachronic progression of figurine use in Cyprus during the Bronze Age will be discussed in Part III. The implications of these findings for our understanding of various issues regarding the nature of Bronze Age Cypriot society will be examined in Part IV.

337 Webb’s list of likely ritual sites (1999:Table 1) has been used to identify ritual space in this analysis.
PART III

VARIATIONS AND DIACHRONIC CHANGE

IN THE FIGURINE RECORD OF BRONZE AGE CYPRUS

The large, detailed database constructed during the first stage of this project makes it possible, for the first time in the study of Bronze Age Cyprus, to conduct a comprehensive examination of the way in which figurine styles and usage developed throughout the period. The following chapter provides a detailed interpretation of all EC I – LC IIIA figurine types, arranged according to the major chronological phases indicated by the figurine record itself and including notes on the Philia facies and LC IIIB which frame this period:

A  Philia Facies  pre EC I (some overlap with LChal)
B  Earliest Bronze Age  EC I – EC II
C  Early – Middle Bronze Age  EC III – MC II
D  Middle – Late Bronze Age Transition  MC III – LC I
E  Late Bronze Age Proper  LC IIA – LC IIIA
F  Bronze – Iron Age Transition  LC IIIB

Relative chronological divisions such as those used here are necessarily fluid, based on many diverse factors which may change as new evidence comes to light and new analyses are completed. The overall relative chronology currently in use for Cyprus reflects perceivable changes in material culture through time. The specific chronological groupings used in this chapter also reflect manifest changes in the styles and use of figurines during the Bronze Age. Given the limitations of relative chronologies and the general issues for the Bronze Age Cypriot case, discussed in full in Part IIB.4, this section will concentrate on broad changes whilst referring to any apparently more specific shifts with due caution. The following charts illustrate some of these broad changes in figurative representation which are revealed only by comprehensive study of the figurine record of the entire Bronze Age.
Chart 8: Changing scale of figurine use by broad chronological period

Chart 8 demonstrates the changes in scale of figurine use through time. To account for the different lengths of the broad chronological periods used, the overall number of figurines known for each period has been divided by the number of years estimated for that period. This provides a notional value for “no. of figurines per year” which can be sensibly compared across the entire timespan.\(^{338}\) Taking into account the differing amounts of evidence available and the varying visibility of each period discussed in Part II.B.4, figurine use in Cyprus appears to have increased steadily through the Early Bronze Age, peaking in the Early-Middle Bronze Age. The Transitional period saw a significant decrease in the deposition of figurines, followed by a sudden peak in the Late Bronze Age and gradual increase towards the transition of the Bronze and Iron Ages.

\(^{338}\) Including both provenanced and unprovenanced objects; Timespans used: Philia (100 years), Earliest Bronze Age (200 years), Early-Middle (350 years), Transitional (300 years), Late Bronze (350 years), Late-Iron Transition (50 years).
Chart 9 and Chart 10 illustrate some of the more detailed diachronic changes identified in this study, both in the subject chosen and the way in which it is represented. In both charts, percentages have been used to neutralise the evident differences in numbers of figurines known for each period. Some of the most significant changes evident on Chart 9 include the reintroduction of anthropomorphic imagery in the Early-Middle Bronze Age and its sudden decline in the Transitional and Late Bronze Ages. On Chart 10 the faltering decline of vessels with attached miniatures throughout the period and the sudden reduction in independent figurines in favour of figurative vessels during the Transitional period are particularly prominent. These and other changes will be discussed in depth throughout the rest of this section.

This diachronic summary and the detailed interpretations which will follow in this section are based on the collated evidence of each analysis as described in Part IID. The raw data and individual analysis results for each figurine type are recorded in the database and presented in Appendix I. The implications of these interpretations for the nature of Bronze Age Cypriot society will be summarised and expanded in Part IV.
III.A  PROLOGUE:  PHILIA FACIES

Six small fragments, in relatively poor condition, attest to at least some figurine use during the Philia Facies. All are made in Philia fabrics, decorated with geometric, incised or painted marks. Unfortunately, none is large enough to show the form of the figurine in any detail and it is not possible to discern whether they form a coherent type. At least one torso fragment (Fig 29) is unequivocally anthropomorphic, but the rest are too poorly preserved for definitive classification. Given their low-fired, fragile material, these figurines may be the few lucky survivors of a larger tradition of Philia figurine use. What little can be discerned about their distributions suggests that this may have had more in common with Chalcolithic figurine traditions than those of the following Bronze Age. Although several Philia necropoleis have been excavated, every figurine has come from a settlement context – one from Southwest Coast Sotira-Kaminoudhia and five from Phases B and C at central Marki-Alonia. These locations, coupled with the use of anthropomorphic imagery, draw a stark contrast against the pattern of figurine deposition evident in EC I.

III.B  EARLIEST BRONZE AGE (EC I – EC II)

EC I saw the inception of the first definable figurine ‘types’ in Bronze Age Cyprus. Restricted to animals and inanimate objects, these were depicted in miniature on the rims of large, deep and stemmed bowls (Fig 30) or as independent models of inanimate objects. The following list shows the figurine types identifiable in the Earliest Bronze Age. Four types are attested in EC I – II only; an additional five (italicised) were apparently introduced during EC II and generally continue in use later into the Early-Middle Bronze Age:

339 Annular pendants from Sotira-Kaminoudhia have been ascribed human features (Swiny 2003:236, Frankel & Webb 2006:242-3) but are not, in my view anthropomorphic and have, therefore, been excluded from this study. See Part IIA.1b for this project’s definition of anthropomorphic and zoomorphic.


341 The chronology of these introductions is based on the earliest known deposition of each figurine type. It is acknowledged that the extant examples do not represent the entire original corpus and thus the full date range during which they were used may not be known. It is possible, therefore, that several of these early types were roughly contemporaneous. See Part IID.2 for a full discussion of the chronological analysis.
The majority of this early figurative representation was conceived as part of the explosion of decorated ceramics associated with the North Coast style zone and is found predominantly in the tombs of Bellapais-Vounous. Decorated Multi-necked Jugs, however, provide a notable exception. Although largely unprovenanced, this group comprises examples in Red Polished South Coast ware and Drab Polished ware, both characteristic of the South and West of the island and the single provenanced example is also from this area (Episkopi-Phaneromeni). In the absence of further, excavated examples, this South-West figurine use remains obscure. Nonetheless, it highlights the probability that the well-attested Vounous corpus, which provides the bulk of evidence available for this period and will be the focus of the discussion in this section, did not stand alone.

EC I figurative material appears to have been part of a continuum of symbolic representation, attested iconographically by the hilt projections under the rims of four Decorated Deep Bowls (Fig 32) which clearly resemble Knife Models (Fig 32). As no North Coast settlements inhabited during EC I have ever been excavated, it is unsurprising that every figurine with known provenance was found in a tomb. Although future settlement excavation may change this pattern, current evidence suggests that these objects were created specifically for funerary use. No evidence of use-wear is discernible on the surfaces of any

---

342 The term “Decorated Vessels” will be used to describe those vessels which have miniature figurines and protomes decorating their rims and upper bodies. A single Decorated Jug (QMD.Vou.03) dates to EC I but since the majority of this type come later contexts, they will be dealt with in Part III.C.

343 DMD.Vou.01, 03, 04 and 05
Decorated Vessels or Object Models. Instead, their decoration is generally crisp and many are extremely well-preserved. In addition, the awkward, fragile form of Decorated Vessels and the considerable effort invested in their manufacture and detailed decoration suggest that quotidian use would have been impractical and unlikely. Practical function for Object Models is also difficult to conceive. It has been suggested that the hollow Horn Models may have been used as vessels. However, their heavy weight, thick walls and limited interior space make this unfeasible and the lack of wear to either rims or suspension holes also suggests against it. It seems likely, then, that the figurative objects of the Earliest Bronze Age were created specifically for deposition in tombs at Vounous. This stands in contrast to most other grave goods of the period which were in long-term use before deposition, thus underlining their ‘special’ nature and specific association with burial.

The form of these figurative objects offers some clues regarding their role within the funerary ritual. The rim decoration on Decorated Vessels can be read as somewhat self-reflecting. Miniature bowls on the rims of Bowl/Animal Vessels (Fig 33), for instance, and miniature jugs which feature on Decorated Jugs, may plausibly refer to the parent vessel and its part in the burial activities. Similarly, the other protomes and miniatures may also represent elements of that funerary ritual, including vessels and animals which may have been used in communal feasting and would eventually be deposited in the tomb. The single unprovenanced Bowl/Animal Vessel (BMD.NON.01) provides clear supporting evidence (Fig 34). The inclusion of a bird, which does not appear in provenanced iconography before EC III, may suggest this is a slightly later piece, or possibly not from Vounous. Nonetheless, the two bucranial pillars, attested in EC I – II carved dromoi as well as EC III – MC I Scenic Models, are widely agreed to have been part of the cult.

---

344 It should be acknowledged that if a vessel had been used as a decorative or otherwise special piece within a settlement, it might have existed there for some time without having been touched or used in such a way that would leave a visible trace on the object. This scenario, however, would be impossible to posit without physical evidence of such vessels within a settlement context. For now, therefore, it will simply be noted as a currently unsupported alternative.
345 Mogolonsky 1988:256
346 Dugay 1996; Webb & Frankel 2010:197
347 See Webb & Frankel 2008 for evidence for EC I – II feasting activities.
furniture of funerary ritual in the Early Bronze Age. Their inclusion alongside the vessels and animals on BMD.NON.01 clearly situates their symbolism within this burial activity.

Although it is sometimes difficult to identify particularly smaller protomes, it appears that the range of animals depicted on EC I – II Decorated Vessels is fairly homogenous, almost exclusively comprising horned animals (Chart 11). Bulls are most common, accounting for 53% of depicted animals, but goats, rams and other quadrupeds are also present. Faunal material found at Vounous was never examined in detail but it appears that cattle bones were most numerous with sheep and goat also present. This corresponds well with the proportions depicted on Decorated Vessels and supports the idea that these objects portrayed elements of the burial ritual. Contemporary domestic faunal assemblages from Sotira-Kaminoudhia and Marki-Alonia have been closely studied. Despite the geographical distance of these sites from Vounous, the similar proportions of animals found at both settlements point to island-wide differentiation in the use of animals in domestic and funerary contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(EC I – II)</th>
<th>Figurative Representation (%)</th>
<th>Overall Proportions of Bone at Marki-Alonia (%)</th>
<th>Suggested contribution of animals to meat supply at Marki-Alonia (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caprines</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Comparison of zoomorphic representation and domestic faunal remains during EC I – II (final two columns after Croft 2006:Text Tables 9.1, 9.3)

Comparison between the figurative representation at Vounous and the faunal remains at Marki-Alonia (Table 5) shows several discrepancies. The figurative corpus includes a much smaller proportion of deer than the domestic assemblage, perhaps suggesting that the iconography of hunting was of little importance. This stands in contrast to the Late Cypriot period where imported Mycenaean chariot craters underline the prestige associations of this activity. Most strikingly, however, cattle are depicted on Decorated Vessels in much more significant

---

348 Webb & Frankel 2010:188-91
349 Stubbings 1950
350 Croft 2003, 2006; See also Steel 2004a:131, Table 5.3 for general Early-Middle Bronze Age faunal data which also corresponds to this pattern.
351 Due to the impossibility of differentiating the majority of sheep and goat bones, these have been grouped together here as “caprines” in both faunal and figurative calculations.
proportions than they would appear in settlements. These features underline the association of Decorated Vessels with burial ritual and highlight the elevated symbolic significance of cattle in this context.

The difference in figurative composition between Bowl/Animal Vessels and Decorated Deep Bowls (Fig 35) may indicate some variation in elements of the funerary ritual. These vessels are decorated with animal protomes, sometimes difficult to identify but apparently including bulls, goats and rams. The accompanying incised circular projections, unique to this type but recalling incised features on other large vessels, have been interpreted as ‘sun-disks’. Their habitual appearance on Decorated Deep Bowls in pairs, however, makes this identification questionable. It is possible that they depict wooden cart wheels but the absence of any surviving examples of such an object is equally problematic. Regardless, their prevalence on this type underscores its difference and may suggest that those who used it concentrated on a different version or element of the funerary ritual language. This differentiation is supported by the separation of figurine types revealed by detailed study of the tombs from Vounous’ two burial areas (A and B).

There can be little doubt that this cemetery was the home of figurative representation during the Earliest Bronze Age: Decorated Deep Bowls, Bowl/Animal Vessels, Knife/Sheath Models and Spindle Models all originate solely from Vounous and no figurines are attested elsewhere before EC II. Overtly, there is little to distinguish tombs which contain figurines from those which do not. Figurine tombs are not spatially segregated and they do not stand out due to their size, wealth or tomb architecture. Remarkably, however, there is a clear separation of figurine types within the cemetery. Inanimate Object Models and Decorated Vessels are almost never found together in the same tomb and most contain only a single distinct type (Table 6). In Vounous A, thirteen of the seventeen figurine tombs contain only one type. At least two of the four remaining figurine tombs (Tombs 153, 161, 111 and 87A), which include two types of Decorated Vessel, had been used for two separate burials and it is quite possible that each figurative vessel was part of a distinct assemblage. In Vounous B, the tombs were generally in use over much longer periods and

352 The L-shaped projection on DMD.Vou.01 has previously been identified as a bird. However, given its unusual form and inward-facing position, this seems unlikely. Instead, it might be better identified as the end or “protome” of a plough, as depicted in the Vounous Ploughing Scene (SMF.Vou.01). The fragmentary projections on BMD.Vou.03 might be interpreted in a similar manner.
353 Stewart 1962:293
354 Horn Models and Decorated Jugs from undatable contexts do occur in other areas of the island but these are stylistically more comfortably dated to EC III at the earliest. The unusual EC II-MC I Miniature Zoomorphs (MZF) will be discussed below.
more likely to have been used for multiple burials, as was the case, for instance in Tombs 29 and 132. Nevertheless, of the ten figurine tombs containing EC II material, eight include only one figurine type, thus confirming the overall pattern of single-type deposition.³⁵⁵

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery</th>
<th>Tomb</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Burials</th>
<th>Inanimate Object Models</th>
<th>Decorated Vessels (EC I – II)</th>
<th>Later Figurines</th>
<th>No. of Vessels</th>
<th>No. of CU Objects</th>
<th>Area of Tomb (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>164A</td>
<td>EC IC late</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HIF</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>EC IB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>KIF, SIF</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>EC IC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>WIF</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>164B</td>
<td>EC IC late</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>WIF</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>160A</td>
<td>EC IB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BMD (2), XZD (2)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>EC I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>BMD, UZD</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>81B</td>
<td>EC IB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DMD</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>EC IB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DMD</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>EC I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DMD</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>EC IB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DMD</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>160B</td>
<td>EC IB-C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DMD</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>EC IB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DMD (2), QMD</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>EC IC early</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>DMD, BMD, XZD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>87A</td>
<td>EC IB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DMD, UZD</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XZD (2)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>EC I?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>XZD (3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>EC II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>UZD</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>EC II</td>
<td>2?</td>
<td>KIF, SIF</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>EC II</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>KIF, SIF</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>EC II early</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>HIF</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>EC II-III A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>KIF (2), SIF, HIF</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>EC II+</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>KIF, SIF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>EC II-III A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CIF (2)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>EC II-III</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>CIF</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>EC II-III B/MC I</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>KIF, SIF, WIF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>EC II – MC I</td>
<td>9+</td>
<td>HIF (2)</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Figurine Tombs at Vounous (dates, sizes and quantities after Schaeffer 1936, Dikaios 1938, Stewart & Stewart 1950, Keswani 2004:Tables 4.7a-c)

This clear separation of figurine types at Vounous, coupled with the fact that only 40% of EC I – II tombs at the site contained them, indicates that particular figurine types were neither part of a generally proscribed burial ritual corpus nor selected at random.³⁵⁶ Instead they were chosen deliberately for their specific relevance to a particular burial. It is not currently possible to

³⁵⁵ Although Tombs 29, 36 and 71 also include additional figurines, these are of types unattested in single-period contexts before EC IIIA and can therefore be assumed to have accompanied later burials.

³⁵⁶ 36% of Vounous A tombs and 43% of EC II burials at Vounous B included figurines. Although looting activities cannot be excluded here, the majority of tombs used in this calculation appeared intact at excavation.
postulate on what criteria this choice may have been made. Detailed examination of Vounous’ skeletal remains, which might have revealed differentiation according to age, gender, occupation or even manner of death, was unfortunately never conducted. Examination of the objects habitually found with particular figurine types shows no obvious correlations and the number of tombs containing each type is too small to allow statistically conclusive investigation. Furthermore, the choice may have been based on unknowable factors such as the day on which the death or burial took place, the person(s) who organised the burial or even simply individual taste. Nonetheless, this segregation crucially illustrates the varied nature of burial ritual at EC I – II Vounous and hints at the important role played by figurines in the negotiation of individual and group identities in the mortuary sphere which will be expanded in Part IV.B3.

Knife/Sheath Models represent the vanguard of a tradition of depicting inanimate objects in clay which took hold in the proceeding period and continued until the end of MC I. Each of these types appears to have been a life-size, non-functional, skeuomorphic representation of an object originally made in another material. For the most part, it is simple to determine what the model was intended to represent and the type names chosen are self-explanatory. Knife/Sheath Models are replicas of small wooden-handled, Copper Alloy tool knives and their accompanying leather sheaths. Similarly, Spindle Models (Fig 36) represent original Copper Alloy spindles and Horn Models, which will be discussed in Part III.C, most probably depicted cattle horns.

Whilst their identification is not problematic, the reasoning behind their depiction and deposition has proven more debatable. It has long been proposed that Knife/Sheath Models were deposited as a cheaper substitute for their more valuable metal originals. However, the existence of Copper alloy knives in contemporary tombs at Vounous, and in at least one case (Tomb 45) in the same tomb as the ceramic version, undermines this supposition. Crucially, however, this interpretation fails to recognise that elaborate ceramics made specifically for the grave may have been symbolically and materially valuable objects in their own right and metals may not necessarily have been of primary importance at EC I – II Vounous. The unsuitability of this parsimonious explanation for Knife/Sheath Models is emphasised by the wider Early-Middle Cypriot tradition of ceramic Object Models of which they were a part. Although Knife and Spindle Models imitated metal objects, Comb, Horn, Table and Footstool Models depicted items of horn

---

357 With the exception of the controversial Comb Model discussed in Part III.C
358 Although these objects are sometimes referred to as “Dagger and Sheath Models”, the connotations of weaponry inherent in this title are inappropriate as these small blades seem far more likely to have been used as multi-purpose tools (Morris 1985:256, Karageorghis 1991a:113-4).
359 See Webb 2002 for a comparable, contemporary metal spindle.
360 Morris 1985:256; Karageorghis 1991a:113-4; Merrillees 2009
361 Webb & Frankel 2010:201
and wood which no-one has proposed would be too valuable for burial deposition. It is more likely that the creation and deposition of these Object Models carried distinct symbolic significance either to the deceased or to the person(s) who deposited them. Simplistic associations are tempting and cannot currently be disproved — Spindle Models may have been appropriate for someone involved in the creation of textiles, for instance, or Knife/Sheath Models for those who used such tools in the preparation of animal skins, perhaps. Regardless, their intricate forms and considered deposition in particular graves secure their symbolic role in the expression of identity within burial ritual at EC I – II Vounous.

During EC II, a new type disturbed the established patterns of the fledgling figurine record. Two of the 28 Miniature Zoomorphs (MZF), which continued in use into MC I were found in contexts dating to EC II. These examples, remarkable for their discovery in the Central island settlement of Marki-Alonia, hint at a wider system of figurine use during the Earliest Bronze Age outside the tombs of Vounous. The small, undecorated Miniature Zoomorphs, probably representing bulls, were made of low fired or unfired clay and survive in especially fragmentary condition (Fig 37). The recovery of these fragile objects at Marki is the fortuitous result of the careful excavation and detailed publication of rare EC I – II occupation levels. They present the possibility that the local manufacture and domestic use of rough modelled, zoomorphic figurines across the island, intimated for EC III – MC I, actually began in the earlier Bronze Age. If further excavation of contemporary settlements confirms this pattern, it will offer important mitigating evidence for the iconographic exclusivity of Vounous during this period which coincides well with the probable South-West use of Decorated Multi-necked Jugs. However, the fact that no figurines have been found at contemporary Sotira-Kaminoudhia, the only other extensively excavated settlement of this period, cautions against projecting a pattern of hidden figurine use across the whole island. Currently, a regional distinction both in the types of figurine used and the contexts of deposition clearly distinguishes the Vounous corpus from the Marki fragments. The absence of Vounous figurine types from EC I – II tombs excavated in the Central Island, along with the localised nature of non-figurative material of this period, underscore the regional disjunction which will continue into the Early-Middle Bronze Age.

362 MZF.Mrk.12 on a floor and MZF.Mrk.24 in construction material (Frankel & Webb 2006:158)
363 See Part III.C for a discussion of this for EC III – MC I.
364 Webb & Frankel 2008:288
III.C EARLY – MIDDLE BRONZE AGE (EC III – MC II)

The onset of EC III saw the beginning of a significant process of expansion both in the number of figurines and variety of types as well as the geographical spread of figurine use. The most characteristic Vounous types – Decorated Deep Bowls, Bowl/Animal Vessels and Knife/Sheath Models – had disappeared by the end of EC II. Those introduced in later EC II – Horn and Comb Models and Miniature Zoomorphs– were joined by at least ten new types in EC IIIA and a further six by MC I (italicised):

- **Decorated Vessels:** Bird Bowls (OZD), Scenic Vessels (SMD), Plank Composite Vessels (CAD), Plank/Animal Jugs (JMD) and Plank/Animal Pyxides (YMD), Anthropomorphic Wishbone Handles (WAD) and Hilt/Spout Bowls (HMD)

- **Zoomorphic Figurines:** Freestanding Zoomorphs (FZF), String-hole Zoomorphs (SZF)

- **Inanimate Object Models:** Table (TIF) and Footstool (FIF) Models

- **Mixed Compositions:** Scenic Models (SMF), Bucranial Walls (WMF)

- **Anthropomorphic Vessels:** Early Anthropomorphic Vessels (EAV)

- **Anthropomorphic Figurines:** Plank Figurines (PAF), Cradleboard Figurines (CAF)

This range of new figurine types brought considerable iconographical changes, including the first anthropomorphic types and the extensive representational phenomenon known collectively as

Map 3: EC III - MC I Iconography occurring at Vounous and other sites (North/Central style zone)
Plank imagery. Significantly, they also represent a transformation in the physical landscape of figurine use as it gradually filtered away from Vounous and spread across the island. Vestiges of the site’s former iconographic singularity remained as Bird Bowls and Comb Models were still found exclusively at Vounous. However, types which had apparently originated there, such as Horn Models or Decorated Jugs, now spread to other North Coast and Central sites (Map 3). Other types which occurred at Vounous but cannot currently be proven to have originated there are also found almost exclusively in these two areas. This is a clear manifestation of a burgeoning EC III – MC I style zone incorporating the North Coast and the Centre of the island.

The geographic concentrations of several other new types demonstrate further, discrete figurative style zones for this period. Independent zoomorphic figurines show a regional focus in the centre of the island, with three of four provenanced Freestanding Zoomorphs and eleven of seventeen String-hole Zoomorphs found at Nicosia-Ayia Paraskevi.

![Fig 38: l-r: Limassol zone - EAV.Yia.01 (des Gagniers & Karageorghis 1976:Pl.XXII.3), Vounous Zone - EAV.Vou.02 (Dunn-Vaturi 2003:Pl.XXV), Kalavasos Zone - EAV.Kla.01 (British Museum Online Catalogue)](image)

Similar stylistic regionalism is even apparent within more widespread EC III – MC I types. Early Anthropomorphic Vessels, for example, exist in three, distinctly regional forms (Fig 38). Those from the Limassol area are generally amphorae with miniature vessels on top of the handles; those from Vounous are large jugs with narrow relief decoration; those from the South Coast area around Kalavasos, are squat bottles decorated with small pierced lugs across the body. All versions have similar facial features on the upper part of the neck but the type of vessel, decoration and method of anthropomorphisation are specific to the area in which they were found. This clear stylistic regionalism during EC III – MC I shows that as figurine use spread across the island, each area established its own, local figurative preferences which became, whether deliberately or accidentally, characteristic of that region.

365 Limassol Zone (EAV.Lim.01, EAV.Pyr.01-02, EAV.Vor.01, EAV.Yia.01 and possibly EAV.Als.01 which is reportedly an amphora but little further detail could be discovered about its form); Vounous Zone (EAV.Vou.01-03); Kalavasos Zone (EAV.Kal.01, EAV.Kla.01).
Amidst this regional milieu, the new language of Plank imagery was by far the most prevalent and widespread form of figurative representation in this period. Yet even within this extensive corpus, corresponding local variations, apparently predicated upon earlier stylistic trends, are apparent (Map 4). The majority (82%) of vessels with attached Plank Figurines, for example, were found on the North Coast with Vounous, the EC I – II heartland of Decorated Vessels, providing 46%.

Similarly, the majority of known stone Plank Figurines come from Kidasi-Foutsì in the South West, an area intimately connected with the Chalcolithic manufacture of stone figurines and pendants and the only area of the island to continue using this material into the Bronze Age. Central island sites were also the focus of much innovation in Plank design, providing the majority of Plank Figurines with modelled arms (12 of 17) and relief decoration (7 of 8) although no local stylistic roots are currently discernible for this trend. Plank imagery also provides evidence for the North Coast/Central style zone suggested elsewhere as those figurines with multiple heads occur exclusively at Lapithos-Vrysi tou Barba and Dhenia-Kafkalla. The former site, where the largest

---

366 28 provenanced vessels with attached Planks are known, including Plank Composite, Plank/Animal Jug, Plank/Animal Pyxis and Detached Planks (PAD): 13 from Vounous, 7 from Lapithos, 2 from Nicosia-Ayia Paraskevi, 2 from Marki and 1 each from Pano Dikomo, Karmi-Lapatsa, Limassol and Aghirda.

367 None of these stone Plank Figurines originated from controlled excavation but have been provenanced by the Zintl collection to this looted EC III – MC I cemetery in the Dhiarizos Valley. Investigations by Lubsen-Admiraal (2009) have confirmed many similar, fragmentary stone Plank Figurines still on the surface at this site so this provenance seems reasonable. Note that a further stone Plank Figurine has been excavated at Politiko-Troullia during the 2011 season (Falconer pers. comm. 9 Sep 2011).

368 Of 23 provenanced examples, 19 were found at Lapithos and 4 at Dhenia.
amount of Plank Imagery was discovered, including at least one example of every major stylistic variation, was apparently the nucleus of this new and most pervasive iconographic tradition of EC III – MC I.

In an echo of the previous period, most types in use during EC III – MC I, including all Object Models and Decorated Vessels (except Wishbone Handles), derive exclusively from tombs. The continued geographical clustering of these types at *Vounous*, together with their lack of significant surface wear and intricate, impractical shapes implies their sustained association with funerary ritual. Object Models generally represent continuity in burial practice at *Vounous* during EC III – MC II. The four types known to have been in use during this period clearly form part of the same phenomenon as earlier Knife/Sheath Models, portraying life-sized, ceramic representations of objects of other materials. Their continued deposition in discrete tomb assemblages suggests that Object Models held similar significance and comparable associations with the expression of individual or group identity from EC I to MC II. However, the two best known Object Models of the later period demonstrate the use of more widespread symbolism.

Both Horn and Comb Models use relatively pervasive iconography, apparent first at *Vounous* but also occurring in other areas of the island. Horn Models (Fig 39), are the only Object Model figurine also found outside *Vounous*, discovered at the Central necropoleis of Nicosia-Ayia Paraskevi and possibly Dhali-Kafkalla. Although all provenanced Comb Models were found at *Vounous*, the appearance of the Comb motif incised and in relief on several vessels and figurines from diverse sites, attest to the widespread and varied depiction of this symbolism (Fig 40). As no comparable example of a cattle horn has yet been found in a contemporary context, Horn Models have occasionally been identified as drinking vessels in their own right. However, these heavy, thick-walled objects with generally only partially hollowed interiors are far more credibly understood as models of horns which may have perhaps originally been used as vessels themselves. Horn Models are clearly associated with the widely-known symbolic use of bull imagery attested variously within the figurine corpus, as will be

---

369 Karageorghis 1991a:106-8 also lists an unprovenanced spoon, gaming board, mouthpiece and two ladles amongst the Red Polished models of this period. However, as Karageorghis himself admits (1991:108), all these objects are most likely interpreted as usable ceramics, rather than symbolic replicas and therefore have not been included in this study.

370 See Part III.B for this practice in EC I – II.

371 Plank Figurines: 14 of which 8 are provenanced (two from Dhenia-Kafkalla (PAF.Dhe.03 and 08), five from Lapithos-Vrysi tou Barba (PAF.Lap.05, 09, 10, 18, 19) and one from *Vounous* (PAF.Vou.02)). Relief Vessels: 2 of which one is provenanced (Marki-Vounaros (Karageorghis 1991a:168)); Incised Vessels: at least 4 of which 1 is provenanced (Kition (Morris 1985:141, fig 205-6)).

discussed below, and beyond. However, the identification of Comb Models and motifs, however, has proven far more debatable.

Given their presence on Plank Figurines, Washbourne has drawn on comparative evidence from depictions of women in Egypt and Mesopotamia and proposed that Comb Models replicate counterweights for heavy necklaces. However, neither original counterweights, nor any necklaces heavy enough to have required such a device have ever been found in EC II – MC I Cyprus. In addition, if Comb Models, like other Object Models, were faithful replicas of their originals, the piercing in the top would have been too small in all but two cases to accommodate anything wider than a single, narrow string. Finally, although most Comb motifs on Plank Figurines are placed in the centre of the back, exactly where a counterweight would fall, at least two known examples have the motif in the centre of the front. Washbourne considers this, as well as the Comb motifs on vessels, evidence that the iconography had gained a symbolic value beyond its practical use. Although there is little evidence to support Washbourne’s premise that Comb Models portray counterweights and her related claim that the motif’s symbolic value was connected to fertility and the worship of a Bronze Age Cypriot, proto-Aphrodite, the variety of media on which the motif appears does support the importance of its symbolism.

Doubtless the most controversial interpretation of Comb Models is Morris’ suggestion that they be identified not as Object Models, but as anthropomorphic figurines. Comparing their shape to a small, unprovenanced subgroup of picrolite pendants which he believed to be Chalcolithic, he argues that the distinctive shape originated as a variation of the cruciform figurine tradition, equally anthropomorphic but with the distended form of a pregnant woman. These pendants, however, cannot be dated with any certainty and could easily be contemporary, Early-Middle

---

373 See e.g. Frankel & Webb 2006:157; Swiny 2008:43
374 Washbourne 2000b:82-90
375 Morris 1985:138-141; see also Karageorghis 1991a:45-9
376 Morris 1985:Pl.175
Cypriot manifestations of Comb imagery, portrayed on local media perhaps most suited to the South West of the island which also produced the unusual stone Plank Figurines. Furthermore, the arms and heads identified by Morris on several incised Comb motifs, can be easily explained as depictions of the fish-tail terminals which exist on several Comb Models.\(^{377}\) The best evidence Morris cites is a single, unprovenanced Red Polished Ware jug showing the only known depictions of the Comb motif which apparently includes eyes.\(^{378}\) However, this alone is insufficient to support his identification or his familiar supposition that the Comb motif eventually became a symbol of fertility.

Attempting to assign anthropomorphic status to a type with no unequivocal humanoid features is ultimately untenable. As an Object Model, Combs are consistent with the prevailing trends of figurative representation at their introduction in EC II Vounous. The most plausible explanation of these objects is arguably the most obvious – that they represent combs or brushes, the narrow neck portraying the handle and the multiple vertical lines the bristles. Peltenburg’s contention that they represented carding combs used in the preparation of textiles presents the most compelling possibility.\(^{379}\) This explanation or perhaps a similar suggestion identifying Comb Models as beaters used in tapestry weaving, is appropriate not only for the size and shape of the model but also the economic and social developments of the secondary products revolution, widely agreed to have been established in Cyprus during the Early-Middle Bronze Age.\(^{380}\) This brought with it an increased capacity to exploit animals not only for their meat but also their materials, crucially for the manufacture of textiles. Although precious little cloth survives from this period, the importance of textiles is attested not least by the frequent deposition of decorated spindle whorls and copper pins in tombs, the elaborate incised clothing of Plank Figurines and the Spindle Models discussed above.\(^{381}\) The Knives portrayed by the Knife Models could even plausibly have been used for shearing or skinning and many of the scenes depicted on Scenic Models and Vessels (discussed below) may portray the dyeing of textiles. In this case, the symbolism of the Comb Model may have been predicated on status, either indicating the lucrative economic production of textiles or the resources necessary for the wearing of impressive clothing.

\(^{377}\) Morris 1985:141, fig 205-6

\(^{378}\) The jug was sold at Christie’s London on 14 Dec 1983 (lot 275) but its current whereabouts are not known (Morris 1985:139-140, fig 193-4).

\(^{379}\) Peltenburg 1981:23


\(^{381}\) For cloth see Åström 1965; Pieridou 1967; Webb 2002
The habitual presence of miniature bowls on the rims of the most common new Decorated Vessel, the Bird Bowl (Fig 41), and the appearance of hilt projections on Hilt/Spout Bowls also underline the continuation with EC I – II representational practices demonstrated in the Object Model group. In significant contrast, however, EC III – MC I Decorated Vessels show a clear shift in the types of animal chosen for depiction. During the preceding period, almost every zoomorphic miniature and protome which decorated a vessel represented a horned animal. In EC III – MC I, however, 70% of all zoomorphs attached to vessels were birds. Newly introduced in this period, ornithomorphic miniature figurines and protomes feature on 86% of all Decorated Vessels incorporating animals.\(^{382}\)

This transformation in focus, perhaps also attested by the concurrent appearance of so-called “bird askoi” which are not sufficiently zoomorphic for inclusion in the present study, is especially significant as it implies a corresponding alteration in the burial ritual depicted by these vessels.\(^{383}\)

The limited faunal information available for Vounous indicates no perceptible alteration in the amount or type of animal bones found inside burial chambers between EC I – MC II.\(^{384}\) Although small, fragile bird bones are unlikely to have survived in significant numbers or been recognised in the rudimentary study conducted on the Vounous material, it is possible that this iconographical shift represents an added or altered element of the ritual conducted outside the tomb.\(^{385}\) Evidence for concurrent increases in secondary burial activities, particularly at North Coast sites may be significant here. Clear disarticulation of bones and shallow pits at nearby Lapithos, tentatively interpreted as temporary burial sites, may both be related to the defleshing of corpses prior to interment within chamber tombs.\(^{386}\) Such a task could have been performed effectively by scavenging birds, such as Cyprus’ native, crag-dwelling Griffon Vulture whose S-shaped neck bears a striking resemblance to many ornithomorphic depictions found on contemporary Decorated Vessels.

\(^{382}\) Figures based on all EC III – MC I vessels with attached animal figurines (OZD, HMD, JMD, YMD, QMD, UMD and XZD). For miscellaneous types, only examples definitely assignable to EC III – MC I on material or contextual grounds have been included. In total, this comprised 43 provenanced and unprovenanced vessels, of which 37 included birds. These vessels featured a total of 122 attached animals (not including those now missing and thus unidentifiable) of which 86 were birds.

\(^{383}\) See Part IIA.1b for the criteria on which objects have been categorised as anthropomorphic or zoomorphic in this study.

\(^{384}\) Keswani 2004:67

\(^{385}\) Croft 2006:275 on the recognition of bird bones

\(^{386}\) Keswani 2004:42-9
The specific ritual symbolism of these Decorated Vessels is highlighted by the fact that contemporary Zoomorphic Figurines did not share their preference for bird imagery. Of the 72 known examples, only one (SZF.AyP.05) can definitively be identified as ornithomorphic, the rest depicting a more familiar range of quadrupeds with an emphasis on bulls (Chart 12, Table 7). This different iconographic range may indicate alternative symbolic significance for Zoomorphic Figurines, outside the specific, burial ritual associations of Decorated Vessels. This is further supported by the condition and find-locations of Zoomorphic Figurines which indicate their use in both burial and domestic settings.

Although the few Freestanding and String-hole Zoomorphs with known finds spots were discovered in tombs, many show surface wear and damage consistent with prolonged use before deposition. FZF.Pyl.01, for instance, an unusually large and decorated example (Fig 43), has localised patches of wear and chipping, particularly to the head and the edges of the saddle, which cannot be wholly explained by taphonomic processes. Similarly, the central lug on several String-hole Zoomorphs has broken through (Fig 42). Although these, like every other Zoomorphic Figurine 387

The single Freestanding ram is part of an unusual figurine with two opposing animal heads sharing the same body (FZF.NON.06). For convenience the ram and its opposing bull head have been listed here.

387 The single Freestanding ram is part of an unusual figurine with two opposing animal heads sharing the same body (FZF.NON.06). For convenience the ram and its opposing bull head have been listed here.

388 These objects (UZF) were almost certainly either String-hole or Freestanding Zoomorphs but their fragmentary condition precludes definite attribution to either type.
type of this period, could have been stably supported by its own legs, the addition of this pierced horizontal lug on the back implies that this type was intended to hang. Although it is possible that they were suspended within a tomb, such a practice is attested only in a single isolated case from the Late Bronze Age. The broken lugs are more likely explained as a result of prolonged, mobile suspension in a more frequented, possibly settlement context.

Although Miniature Zoomorphs continue to be the only type found in exclusively settlement contexts during this period, there is some indication that they formed part of a wider tradition of domestic zoomorphic figurine use. The generally poor condition of Miniature Zoomorphs and the fact that the 28 examples of this type are spread over a period of almost 400 years suggests that what survives may be only a fraction of the original corpus from that site. Furthermore, isolated fragments of small, solid, undecorated zoomorphs also occur within settlement contexts at Alambra and Hala Sultan Tekke. If the String-hole and Freestanding Zoomorphs also represent objects which started life in domestic use, then this would represent a long, particularly Central Island practice, such as that known from Chalcolithic and Early Bronze Age Anatolia. This stylistically diverse collection of figurines may indicate that each site had its own local zoomorphic figurine forms, Miniature Zoomorphs being Marki-Alonia’s unusually well-attested version. As such, only this site can provide evidence for the possible use of these local, domestic zoomorphs. The find contexts of Miniature Zoomorphs are mostly secondary fill or refuse with the few found on floors apparently lying in nondescript domestic areas. Together with their worn, broken conditions, this clearly indicates that they were used to destruction and discarded when broken. Mogelonsky has argued for the use of Miniature Zoomorphs in domestic ritual but her evidence remains inconclusive. It has been suggested that the holes at the tops of Horn and Comb Models implies that they were intended for suspension (e.g. Karageorghis 1991:46). However, the lack of damage or wear to any of these holes suggests that they were never used for continuous, mobile suspension. Moreover, the piercings on at least two Comb Models (CIF.Vou.03-04) were never perforated all the way through and would therefore have been non-functional. These holes are most likely skeuomorphic vestiges, implying that the original object would have been suspended but the model itself would not.

389 It has been suggested that the holes at the tops of Horn and Comb Models implies that they were intended for suspension (e.g. Karageorghis 1991:46). However, the lack of damage or wear to any of these holes suggests that they were never used for continuous, mobile suspension. Moreover, the piercings on at least two Comb Models (CIF.Vou.03-04) were never perforated all the way through and would therefore have been non-functional. These holes are most likely skeuomorphic vestiges, implying that the original object would have been suspended but the model itself would not.
390 Tomb 66 at Enkomi (Crewe 2009a)
391 UZF.Ala.01 and UZF.HST.01
392 Moorby 2004:183; Frankel & Webb 2006:157
393 Frankel & Webb 2006:157-8
deliberate, ritual breakage. However, the relatively fragile nature of these narrow protrusions compared to the solid squat bodies, along with similarly frequent breakage to tails and legs makes accidental breakage more plausible. Perhaps more indicative of ritual disposal is her evidence of burning on the surface of 60% of examples. However, since these objects were mostly made of unbaked or low-fired clay, those which were burnt would be more likely to survive, thus making this statistic no more than an accident of preservation. For now, therefore, the function and significance of domestic zoomorphs remains unresolved.

The introduction of Plank imagery was one of the most significant developments in the Early-Middle Cypriot figurine record. Evidenced not only in independent Plank Figurines but also Plank Composite Vessels, Plank/Animal Jugs and Plank/Animal Pyxides (Fig 44, centre), this imagery forms the bulk of figurative material from EC III – MC II. The enigmatic Plank form, usually a simple combination of two rectangles but also found with multiple necks (Fig 44, left), semi-circular ears or carrying a cradled infant (Fig 44, right), has also proven especially popular for figurine researchers, receiving far more attention than every other Cypriot figurine type combined. Plank imagery is first attested in EC IIIA and spread rapidly around the North Coast and Central Island areas. Several sites in these regions, including Marki-Alonia, Lapithos and Vounous, have Plank Figurines and vessels in EC IIIA levels and there is currently no evidence to suggest a specific site of origin for this phenomenon. Although datable contexts in the South/South West are rare, Plank Figurine fragments from Episkopi-Phaneromeni Settlement A and Limassol Tomb 2 suggest that the ceramic imagery may have reached this area only in limited numbers and towards the end of the Middle Bronze Age. Limited Early-Middle Bronze Age settlement excavation in this area may be obscuring earlier evidence but the dearth of examples at Sotira-Kaminoudhia again cautions against this assumption. Nonetheless, the EC III – MC I stone Plank tradition attested at Kidasi-Foutsi may suggest that similar imagery was being used earlier in the South West, albeit in a different iteration. Available chronological information is sufficient to

Fig 44: Examples of Plank Imagery: left-right - PAF.Lap.10 (D-K.Knox, Cyprus Museum), YMD.Vou.01 (Karageorghis 1976:No.62), PAF.Lap.22 (D-K.Knox, Cyprus Museum),
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394 The Plank motif is also attested incised on the base of an unprovenanced small bowl from the Pierides Collection, Larnaca (DigMaster Online Database) and in relief on the shoulder of a jug from Photta (CM 1969/1-21/1; Karageorghis 1991a:164, XIII.4).
suggest that vessels with attached Plank Figurines began in the earliest part of the range, in EC III and had fallen from use by MC I, perhaps coinciding with the abandonment of Vounous cemetery with which they had been clearly associated. Plank Figurines with multiple heads (Fig 44, left) and those in White Painted ware are not attested before MC II and it is likely that these represent later variants of the standard form. Features such as ears and small arms are attested throughout the period and appear to have become part of the standard repertoire early on.

The stylistic origin of Plank Figurines has long been a matter for debate. There are no obvious predecessors in previous anthropomorphic imagery of the Middle Chalcolithic and the few Philia figurines which bridge the temporal gap offer little insight. Parallels drawn with non-Cypriot schematic anthropomorphic figurines, particularly from Anatolia, are not especially convincing, as all differ in shape, medium, decoration and overall composition. Ultimately, however, it is unnecessary to look very far for stylistic, and presumably symbolic, origins for Plank imagery. Close scrutiny of the Bronze Age figurine record of Cyprus reveals distinctly Cypriot developments which combined to produce this striking iconographic phenomenon. The interpretive leap made in the concept behind Bergoffen’s theory on Plank Figurines provides the key to recognising the indigenous iconographic precursors of this imagery. She believes that Plank Figurines were representations of actual cradleboards used in Early-Middle Bronze Age Cyprus, given human features to emphasise their “numinous quality”. The content of her theory is unconvincing. The most serious issue, which Bergoffen seeks to minimise, is the stylistic difference between the proposed original cradleboard and the Plank Figurine as its model, most notably the lack of a cradle arch on the latter. This departure from faithful representation is unparalleled by the other contemporary Object Models and choosing not to depict this key element would have been a highly unusual choice. Bergoffen’s justification, that the meaning was clear without this supposedly redundant, impractical feature, is reminiscent of old arguments in support of a female gender for Plank Figurines (see below) and correspondingly implausible. Furthermore, the three supposedly anthropomorphised cradleboard representations which she cites in support of her theory – CAF.NON.04, CAF.NON.05, and CAF.Lap.01 (Fig 45) – are not representative of the corpus as a whole. The only example with provenance was found in a particularly late MC III context, Tomb 15 at Lapithos-Vrysi tou Barba. It

395 Flourentzos 1975:32 favours an Anatolian origin; Karageorghis 1991a:51-2 favours an undisclosed Cypriot origin but details many, dissimilar influences from Anatolia, Palestine and Greece, suggesting the type was “known in the Aegean and Anatolia” (1991:51).
396 Bergoffen 2009
397 Bergoffen 2009:63-73
398 Bergoffen 2009:70-1
has no stylistic parallels within earlier examples and appears to be a singular late variation, fundamentally different from the rest of its type.

Bergoffen’s theory that Plank Figurines are anthropomorphised representations of cradleboards, therefore, is not well-supported by the iconographic evidence it cites and remains ultimately untenable. The essential proposal, however, to consider Plank Figurines not as “objectified humans” but as “humanised objects”, is more persuasive. As anthropomorphs, Plank Figurines are juxtaposed against the rest of the Early-Middle Cypriot figurine corpus and against all other, more naturalistic anthropomorphic representation known from this period and the proceeding Late Bronze Age. As models of objects, however, they fit in to a tradition which began in EC I and continues throughout the Early-Middle Cypriot period. Plank Figurines, therefore, most probably resulted from a combination of two distinct, indigenous, iconographical trends. Firstly, there is the long tradition of representing inanimate objects in clay, known since the Knife/Sheath Models of EC I and exemplified during this period by the Horn, Comb, Table and Footstool Models. Secondly there is the phenomenon of representing the human form through the personification of inanimate objects which appears to have begun during EC II. This is attested by a small number of isolated discoveries including the carving in the dromos of Tomb 1 at Karmi-Palaeolona, which may well be the personification of an architectural feature and a small number of anthropomorphised lugs such as that on an unprovenanced large bowl, DMD.NON.01. During EC III – MC I, it is clearly demonstrated by Early Anthropomorphic Vessels which humanise jugs or amphorae and Anthropomorphic Wishbone Handles, which decorate the handles of small bowls with human features (Fig 46). In both cases, anthropomorphic appearance is achieved in much the same way, by the addition of eyes, nose and ears onto a pre-existing part of the object of suggestive shape. These facial features, apparently the core elements required by Early-Middle Bronze Age Cypriots to indicate the human form, are the only features which attest to the anthropomorphic nature of Plank Figurines.

Plank Figurines, therefore, represent the logical next stage of development, building from these iconographical trends. From the practical objects, like jugs and bowls, which have been given anthropomorphic features and the objects, such as horns and knives, whose originals have been
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399 Bergoffen 2009:64
400 Webb et al 2009:128-34; Fig 3.40
401 Some hobs of the EC III – MC I period, discovered at Marki-Alonia (Frankel & Webb 2006:17-21) and other sites, have been labelled anthropomorphic and as such would fit in with this scheme of adding human features to inanimate objects. However, their only apparently human feature is a small central lump which could be interpreted as a nose. This is insufficient for them to be included in the present study.
quite faithfully represented in clay, grew a type which signified an extra layer of conceit, a copy of an original whose features have then been anthropomorphised. This extra layer of symbolism, together with the unusual shape of these objects has presented an interpretative barrier preventing the recognition of the indigenous iconographical context of Plank Figurines. Faced with an Early Anthropomorphic Vessel, for example, the key question for interpretation is not why this woman has been portrayed with a spout and handle, but why this jug has a face. Plank Figurines have never been addressed in this way because, unlike the vessels, their practical function cannot easily be deciphered, thus interpretation has focused inevitably on the more recognisable, anthropomorphic aspect. The object on which the Plank form was modelled is a matter for speculation. No contemporary objects of comparable shape survive to offer any clues so it is likely that the original was made from organic material. Possibilities include a flat paddle, perhaps to be used in the making of bread or to aid in hand weaving but the issue remains inconclusive.

Although many theories have been proposed regarding the Plank phenomenon, the practical manner in which they were used has never been properly addressed. Vague suggestions that they may have been suspended by their pierced ears or worn about the person in a specially designed pocket are simply not borne out by the evidence. Only 47% actually have pierced ears, most of which are small and fragile and, as Karageorghis rightly points out, Plank Figurines could easily have been provided with a central suspension hole if this had been necessary for use. Whilst the evidence cannot completely preclude the wearing of these objects, the large size of most examples, whose average height is 25cm, and the significant weight of many, such as PAF.Lap.26 (Fig 47) which was 3.6cm thick and 12.3 cm wide, would have rendered such an endeavour highly impractical. Several pieces of evidence offer clues as to how Plank Figurines were displayed and used.

Firstly, Plank Figurines are decorated on the back and front as well as the narrow side and top edges, suggesting that they were to be viewed on all sides. They could only be seen from so many angles if they were constantly handled or if they stood independently, without having to lean or lie on another surface. Plank Figurines are not tactile objects. Their average width of 9.6cm, rising to 20.6cm at the upper edge of the range, makes holding them comfortably in the hand somewhat difficult. Their narrow shape, however, would not allow them to support themselves so there must have been another option.
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403 E.g. Morris 1985:161-2
404 Karageorghis 1991a:49
On every example currently known, the decoration ends several centimetres above the bottom of the figurine. This is striking on an object otherwise so carefully decorated and implies that this base area was not meant to be seen. When Plank Figurines are displayed on vessels, however, they always stand vertically, either singly or in opposing pairs, and their decoration always continues to the vessel surface (Fig 48): the plain base of these otherwise faithful representations of the larger figurines cannot be seen. In addition to this, the most consistent pattern of wear visible on Plank Figurines shows the base of the object frequently missing or in a distinctly poorer state of repair than the rest of the figurine (Fig 49). This is consistent with an area which had been buried in soft, presumably damp soil for some time. Overall, therefore, the evidence suggests that Plank Figurines may have been habitually pushed a few centimetres into soft ground so that they could stand vertically without additional help.

Surviving evidence provides a complex picture of the use-life of Plank Figurines. Of the 110 whose context type is known, 69 were found in tombs and 41 in settlements, suggesting a relatively even distribution between the two contexts. The tomb examples were placed deliberately in a context of great meaning and presumably prestige. In Lapithos-Vrysi tou Barba Tomb 306, Chamber A, a skull found, apparently in situ, in conjunction with the remains of a bead necklace, was resting on Plank Figurine PAF.Lap.21. It appears that this figurine was set up adjacent to the head of the deceased. This, unfortunately unique survival, offers the tantalising proposition that this close spatial relationship reflected an ideological association between the figurine and the person it accompanied.
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405 Gjerstad et al 1934:60
The physical condition of examples from burials suggests that some were pristine objects, made specifically for the tomb (Fig 50). The wear observable on other examples can mostly be explained by post-depositional factors. The figurines from Myres’ excavations at Lapithos-Vrysi tou Barba, for example, have been especially affected by the conditions of the tombs, becoming soft and brittle, and continuing to decay in the century after excavation, such that many formerly complete examples are now simply boxes of fragments. In those cases where use-wear is discernible, it is confined to the bases of the figurines, as discussed above, the side edges and noses, possibly indicating that these areas were regularly touched during the figurine’s life before the grave.

Rare examples of mend holes on PAF.Mrk.09 and PAF.Lap.29 (Fig 51) also imply that these were valued objects, in use for some time. Although objects excavated from settlements are generally of poorer condition than those from tombs, the highly fragmentary state of every Plank Figurine found in a cemetery is striking. The majority were found discarded in refuse, fill or general building rubble and those few apparently in situ were in rooms of general domestic use. The same objects deposited with care in the mortuary sphere required no preferential disposal in the world of the living.

Since the best known EC III – MC I cemeteries are on the North coast and the most extensively excavated and published settlements in the centre of the island, this divergence in the treatment of Plank Figurines in settlements and cemeteries may be a manifestation of regional variation in their use. However, it is more likely that Plank Figurines were part of a more general trend of tomb deposition witnessed in this period. Dugay has convincingly argued that the majority of objects deposited in Early-Middle Cypriot graves, however finely decorated or apparently “special”, had probably already been used in the settlement. Even if some were made newly for the deceased, it seems certain that the burial record reflected the same selection of objects as the settlement record for this period. Plank Figurines, then, were not primarily associated either with funerary ritual or with everyday domestic activities. Instead, they were associated specifically with the single, key element which connected those two arenas – people. It is possible that they would have accompanied particular people during their ordinary lives in the settlement, perhaps set up
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406 See Part IIA.2.
407 Dugay 1996
in the corner of a mudbrick room, occasionally brushed past or touched on the nose. As the figurine wore out or was broken, it was repaired then eventually discarded when repair was no longer possible. Indeed, even the most beloved objects end up on the rubbish heap eventually and this need not be an indication that Plank Figurines were not important during their use-life. When their owners died, perhaps that same figurine, or another made specifically for the occasion, accompanied them to their grave.

It is apparent, however, that not every inhabitant of EC III – MC I Cyprus would have had their own Plank Figurine. Taking into account processes of attrition as well as the fact that they were not used in every area of the island, a total of 209 Plank Figurines known from a period of c.350 years is not a large number. The possibility that Plank Figurines were owned by larger groups such as households or family units cannot currently be established due to the small numbers of figurines known from primary settlement contexts. Similarly, no differentiation according to wealth, status or gender is discernible within settlement contexts during this period. Within the burial arena, however, statistical analyses of assemblages amongst the Swedish Tombs at the most prolific Plank Figurine cemetery, Lapithos-Vrysi tou Barba reveal possible differentiation (Table 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Variable</th>
<th>χ² Value</th>
<th>Correlation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precious Metal</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Object Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools-General</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools-Textiles</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools-Grooming</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Adornment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Vessels</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Vessels</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex Vessels</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imported Objects</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Tomb Assemblage Analysis at Lapithos (χ² values of more than 3.84 show a significant correlation with less than a 0.05% chance that it occurred accidentally)

There is an indication that tombs containing Plank Figurines are more likely to contain objects of Bronze, including weapons and tools, than those which do not. This suggests that they were generally placed in copper-rich tombs, although the absence of a corresponding correlation with precious metal or imported objects implies that this may not have been a straightforward association with material wealth. A particular correlation was also noted between the deposition of Plank Figurines and that of spindle whorls and other textile tools. The corresponding lack of correlation with personal adornment items may suggest that this association was particularly with the technology, rather than the wearing of decorated textiles. A similar ideological association is
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408 See Part IID.5 for the methodology of these analyses. Although other tombs are known from Lapithos, currently only those excavated by the Swedish Cyprus Expedition (Gjerstad 1934) are published in sufficient detail for these purposes.
suggested by the iconographic relationship between Plank imagery and Comb motifs described above and it may also be significant that one of the few tombs at Vounous B which contained Object Models alongside other figurine types (Tomb 71) included a Comb Model, a Plank Figurine and a Plank Composite Vessel. Plank imagery, therefore, may have also been particularly relevant to those, possibly symbolically or materially powerful people with access to substantial copper resources and who made and/or used decorated textiles.

The symbolism of Plank Figurines has been much debated with the familiar interpretation of female fertility goddess being by far the most pervasive theory. However, their austere, rectangular form with very few anatomical details makes any symbolic connections with fertility unsound. This shape is diametrically opposed to the naked, over-endowed, clearly female figurines of Neolithic central Europe, for example, or indeed the birthing figurines of Chalcolithic Cyprus which have a far more obvious stylistic association with human female fertility. Similarly, their widely-assumed female gender is actually rather difficult to support iconographically. Only 29% have small, relief cones which have usually been interpreted as breasts. These cones, however, are often placed quite far apart or some way down the body in rather unnatural positions (Fig 52).

This, coupled with the incised semi-circular lines running between them on some examples, such as PAF.Lap.08, suggest that they could equally represent a feature of clothing or jewellery rather than anatomy. The 2% of Plank Figurines holding infants have also been considered female but the association of woman-and-child as opposed to man-and-child may not necessarily have been as pervasive in Bronze Age Cypriot society as elsewhere. Moreover, the majority (69%) of Plank Figurines have no obvious gender-specific features. Whilst it is possible that female gender was obvious to a contemporary audience through another iconographical element which can no longer be properly deciphered, this seems a rather obscure and unnecessary assumption to make. On the contrary, their lack of obvious gendered characteristics more likely implies that displaying the gender of a Plank Figurine, if, indeed, they were ever conceived to have a specific, consistent gender at all, was simply not important.

409 See Part I.A2.
412 Note the potentially male figure which holds an unfortunately damaged object which may be an infant (TAF.NON.04) which provides at least the possibility of man-and-child images in Bronze Age Cyprus.
413 C.f. Knapp & Meskell 1997
Furthermore, no contextual evidence currently exists to suggest an association with either gender within tombs or elsewhere and theories, such as a Campo’s contention that they were used as tokens in female exogamy, which rely on this distinction are untenable.\(^{414}\)

![Chart 13: Breakage of clay Plank Figurines](chart13.png)

Although the iconographical evidence paints a damning picture for the female fertility idol theory, there is some indication that Plank Figurines were important enough to have been ritually broken (Chart 13). At least 38 figurines have a single, slightly diagonal break across the lower part of the torso which has been mended post excavation (Fig 53). This implies that both parts of the figurine were found together, usually in a tomb and thus were probably broken in situ. In addition, a clean break such as this, across the widest part of these solid figurines could only have been achieved by deliberate snapping. A further 49 figurines showing a clean break across the torso but where the other fragment has not been preserved hint that this practice may have been quite prevalent. Those provenanced examples which show this feature were all discovered in tombs. Whilst this may be a consequence of the generally poor condition of settlement examples, it may also suggest that involvement in funerary ritual was a natural end to the use-life of the Plank Figurine, just as the humans who had made and used it. This is supported by the tomb assemblage analyses at Lapithos which revealed that tombs with Plank Figurines were more likely to contain Complex Vessels than those with no figurines. Furthermore on a small number of Plank/Animal Jugs and Pyxides, the usual Plank Figurine is replaced by a bird, calling to mind the particular burial ritual connotations of ornithomorphic imagery attested on contemporary Decorated Vessels. The breakage patterns apparent within the Plank Figurine corpus, therefore, may have been motivated by specifically funerary rituals. This deliberate snapping may have been the equivalent

\(^{414}\) a Campo 1994; note that this theory is further undermined by stylistic regionalism of Plank Figurines discussed above which suggests against these objects habitually travelling outside their place of origin.
of the ritual ‘killing’ of Plank Figurines on their placement within tombs as attested in some, particularly metal objects from this period.\textsuperscript{415}

The limited but striking trend of Scenic Compositions during EC III – MC I generally fits well with the broader figurative climate of the island. Nine independent Scenic Models and nineteen scenes attached to the shoulders of large vessels are known from this period.\textsuperscript{416} Although most examples are unique, the types are broadly regional with Bucranial Wall Models known only from Kotchati and Kalopsidha, Scenic Models appearing only at Vounous and Scenic Vessels clustering in the centre of the island with a small number of outlying examples from Vounous and Kalavasos. The few well provenanced examples have all been found in tombs but it is not clear whether the scenes they portray are specifically funerary. The resemblance between Bucranial Walls and the tripartite decoration on some carved dromoi walls has been well established and the notion that these objects depict ritual visitation of tombs is plausible.\textsuperscript{417} The appearance of the tripartite motif on SMF.Vou.01, known as the Vounous Bowl, also situates this scene in a ritual setting, possibly outside a tomb.\textsuperscript{418} The other scenes, however, which incorporate human, animal and other modelled features are more diverse, portraying people involved in what appear to be everyday activities, apparently including ploughing, riding donkeys, pressing grapes and making bread.

One model (Fig 54) which has yet to be satisfactorily explained introduces a new possible activity into the repertoire. Previously interpreted as vendors or pottery sellers, this scene may in fact depict people engaged in the dyeing of textiles, each in a separate large vat as attested in many traditional dyeing processes across the world. Many other tableaux could also plausibly portray stages in the dyeing process attested in Mediterranean, Egyptian and Levantine prehistory.\textsuperscript{419} Those, such as SMD.NON.07, for example, currently interpreted as washing scenes, may depict rinsing of the dyed fabric and even those considered to show grape pressing, such as SMD.Pyr.01

\textsuperscript{415} Keswani 2004:75
\textsuperscript{416} A further Scenic Composition has been excavated at Nicosia-Ayia Paraskevi during the 2011 season and is currently undergoing restoration prior to publication (G. Georgiou pers. comm. 4 Sep 2011).
\textsuperscript{417} E.g. Frankel & Tamvaki 1973; Webb & Frankel 2010:188-91
\textsuperscript{418} Karageorghis 1991a:140-1, Peltenburg 1994
\textsuperscript{419} Barber 1991:239-46
(Fig 55) may in fact depict the channelled tubs into which plausibly precious dyes would be saved for reuse.

Such iconographic emphasis on the dyeing of fabrics corresponds well with the symbolic associations of Comb Models and Plank Figurines with textile production and further highlights the importance of this enigmatic economy for Early-Middle Bronze Age Cyprus. It is generally agreed that innovative textile technologies reached Cyprus in the Early Bronze Age as part of a package of Anatolian material culture. There is no reason to propose an external origin for Comb or Spindle Models, Plank Figurines or Scenic Models and indeed, no plausible Anatolian parallels are available. Nevertheless, it is possible that this apparent outburst of textile-related imagery was inspired by the social consequences of these new transformative technologies.

EC III – MC I witnessed a number of significant developments in the figurine record of Bronze Age Cyprus. Iconographically, there was a shift towards the depiction of birds and considerable escalation of anthropomorphic imagery, as well as the fascinating range of Plank imagery. Changes were also seen in the geographical distribution of figurines as the dominance of Vounous waned and figurine use spread across the island, manifest in distinctive, local forms. At the end of MC I, however, there was a dramatic reduction in the numbers of figurines and variety of types in use on Cyprus. Most known types, including all Object Models and Decorated Vessels, had fallen out of use by the end of MC I. The Miniature Zoomorphs peculiar to Marki-Alonia and the pre-eminent Plank Figurines continued into MC II but disappeared during this period. Only four examples of EC III – MC I figurines can be attributed to MC II – III: Tomb 8 at Nicosia-Ayia-Paraskevi contained two String-hole Zoomorphs (SZF.Ayp.01 and 04) and two Cradleboard Figurines were deposited in Lapithos-Vrysi tou Barba Tomb 15 (CAF.Lap.01) and Tomb 316 (CAF.Lap.03). Only the Early Anthropomorphic Vessel appeared to continue in highly sporadic use from EC IIIA to the end of LC I, but this type is not particularly homogenous and changed significantly with each new period. MC II, therefore, represents a significant disjunction in the figurine record of Bronze Age Cyprus, across which very little which had been characteristic of the EC III – MC I repertoire survived.

420 Webb 2002:370
III.D  MIDDLE – LATE BRONZE AGE TRANSITION (MC III – LC I)

The demise of Plank imagery, Scenic Compositions, Object Models and bird imagery which had typified the Early-Middle Bronze Age seems to have been relatively abrupt, prefiguring a noticeable wane, if not actual hiatus in figurative representation during MC II. The figurine types which emerged in MC III – LC I demonstrate a complicated picture of indigenous developments and experimentation, resulting in a figurine corpus of a conspicuously different character. Distinctive changes can be seen in both the subject matter favoured for depiction and the method chosen to depict it as the following new types were introduced:

- Decorated Vessels: Person/Spout Jugs (SAD), MC Composite Vessels (MAD), Protome Jugs (PMD), Dog Vessels (DZD)
- Zoomorphic Vessels: Hole-mouth Zoomorphs (HZV), Rectangular Zoomorphs (RZV), Fat Zoomorphs (FZV), Flat-base Zoomorphs (LZV), Cylindrical Zoomorphs (CZV)
- Anthropomorphic Figurine: Transitional Anthropomorphs (TAF), Plaque Figurines (QAF)

The enthusiasm for anthropomorphic representation which had flourished during the preceding period, was significantly overshadowed by zoomorphic imagery in MC III – LC I. The Early-Middle Bronze Age corpus had comprised 28% zoomorphs and 59% anthropomorphs. During this period, however, the proportions were reversed as zoomorphs accounted for some 73% of known figurines and anthropomorphs only 26% (Chart 9). Although there are several different forms of anthropomorphic representation apparent during this period, they are very few in number, totalling just 21 figurines and 33 miniatures attached individually to vessels. Allied with the increase in zoomorphic imagery, there was a huge escalation in the proportions of Figurative Vessels, rising from just 6% of the total corpus during EC III – MC I to a significant 52% during MC III – LC I (Chart 10). This was predominantly accounted for by the five new Zoomorphic Vessel types, of which Rectangular Zoomorphs were in use throughout the period, Hole-mouth Zoomorphs are not attested after MC III and Fat, Flat-base and Cylindrical Zoomorphs are not known before LC I.421

Along with the new dominance of zoomorphic imagery, the animals depicted also present a clear departure from the traditions of the previous period. The variety of animals portrayed on MC III – LC I figurative objects is considerably more evenly and widely distributed than previously attested, showing no clear preference for any particular animal type (Chart 14).

---
421 Note that this period has particularly few high-stratified contexts and a significant proportion of unprovenanced examples (86 unprovenanced of 227 known examples, i.e. 38%) making the actual chronology of these introductions somewhat tentative (see Part IIB.1).
Studies of contemporary faunal remains at Korovia-Nitovikla on the Karpas Peninsula, Kalopsidha in the Eastern Mesaoria and Kissonerga-Skalia in the South West suggest an island-wide, principal reliance on ovi-caprids, particularly exploited for their secondary products. Even in combination, the ram, sheep and goat depictions on the figurative material of MC III–LC I cannot begin to match this dominance. This suggests that the figurines were not intended to reflect the general reality of domestic animal husbandry. Instead they may have been chosen for their symbolic importance, although the lack of emphasis on bull representations during MC III–LC I is striking.

Some zoomorphic types of this period appear to favour a particular species (Chart 15). Dog Vessels, for instance, are almost all decorated with their eponymous zoomorph; Rectangular Zoomorphs all depict the same quadruped with tufty tail which may have been a sheep; most

---

422 Gejvall in Åström et al 1966:128-32 (Kalopsidha), Larje in Hult 1992:166-75 (Korovia-Nitovikla), Crewe et al 2008 (Kissonerga-Skalia), Spiegelman 2008 (comparison); the contemporary faunal remains at Phlamoudhi-Vounari (Heese et al in Al-Radi 1983:116-8) which appear to represent feasting rather than an ordinary settlement assemblage, also show a comparable ovi-caprid dominance.
Hole-mouth Zoomorphs depict bulls; Fat Zoomorphs show mainly stags or bulls whereas Flat-base Zoomorphs most frequently portray rams.

Map 5: Distribution of MC III - LC I types showing regional clustering

Most new MC III – LC I types follow the pattern of regionally-specific representation seen in the previous period (Map 5). Rectangular Zoomorphs (highlighted in red), for example, cluster towards the East of the island and Fat Zoomorphs (highlighted in green) in the centre; Dog Vessels are known predominantly from Morphou-Toumba tou Skourou. The differentiation in preferred animal in these geographically clustered types may suggest that this imagery was being used to express group identities, by choosing specific local symbolism expressed in similar ways. An increasing importance of animal-based wealth and an attendant need to display this may have contributed to the popularity of zoomorphic imagery in this period. Each zoomorphic type may have referred to the dominant occupation or pastime of the group who used them; each animal choice may have represented an advertisement of “what we have” or “what we value”. The general variety of animals and zoomorphic types in use during MC III – LC I, however, suggests that there was, as yet, no island-wide consensus on which animal was most significant and no common iconographical language.
The new preference for Figurative Vessels over independent figurines supports the practical use of this imagery in plausibly communal ritual activities. The unusual Hole-mouth Zoomorphs (Fig 56, right) may hint at the origin of presenting figurative imagery in vessel form during MC III. This type is closely related to String-hole Zoomorphs (Fig 56, left) used between MC I and MC III, both representing animals with small, horizontal lugs on their backs. Crucially, however, Hole-mouth Zoomorphs have a large, circular hole in the front of the neck. Combined with the lug, this gives the impression of practical vessel features yet it is unlikely that most Hole-mouth Zoomorphs ever actually functioned in this way. For the most part, the handle is small and could not easily be used for pouring. Similarly, the hole is often large and low down, making filling difficult and severely limiting the potential capacity of the vessel.

Whilst it is possible that the hole was a practical measure to ensure successful firing as suggested by Herscher, the similarity with String-hole Zoomorphs which include no such feature makes this improbable. Furthermore, if the hole had been a necessary, manufacturing feature, it would have been very easy to conceal it beneath the torso of the figurine, as was the norm, for instance, for the hollow, Late Cypriot Base Ring Bull Figurine, thus maintaining the appearance of the object. On the contrary, it seems to have been important that the Hole-mouth Zoomorph had the appearance of a vessel, even if it could not actually have been used. As such, it represents a transitional experiment, re-imagining a familiar type in the newly popular, vessel form of the Middle-Late Bronze Age transition.

Most MC III – LC I figurative objects, however, which may have been slightly later in date, could have functioned well as practical vessels. Unlike their elaborate, fragile predecessors, the Decorated Vessels of this period are unencumbered by their plastic decoration. They generally feature only one, occasionally two miniatures either placed

---
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on the shoulder or used as part of the vessel in a way that would not compromise its usefulness, as, for example, on Dog Vessels where the eponymous animal stands opposite or in place of the handle (Fig 57).

Similarly, the majority of Figurative Vessel forms, particularly the Fat, Rectangular and Cylindrical Zoomorphs, are viable, practical forms, with large, central handles and raised, pourable spouts. There is also evidence that some examples were designed specifically with functionality in mind, even when this compromised the zoomorphic character of the vessel. Rectangular Zoomorphs (Fig 58), which frequently lose their animal faces in favour of a large spout opening, provide the most extreme example of this tendency.

Many MC III – LC I zoomorphic vessels are of comparable forms. Virtually all types are jugs or closable pouring vessels with a long, often cutaway, always trefoil spout with an average inner diameter of 1.5cm. Although most types vary quite considerably in size, they could all plausibly have been used for storing and decanting low to medium volumes of liquid. Even the Dog Vessels which, as generally larger, open vessels, provide an exception to this pattern, could have been used in similar practices. No residue analysis has ever been attempted on Figurative or Decorated Vessels so their possible contents remain mysterious. However, it is not inconceivable that they may have formed part of communal drinking activities.

The vast majority of these Vessels, like all MC III – LC I figurative objects, originated from burial contexts. This might suggest that the Figurative Vessels were specifically associated with funerary ritual. However, MC III – LC I settlements are particularly poorly represented in the excavated record. So far just a handful of well-preserved settlements of this period are known and only very small sections of these have been excavated. Significantly, small numbers of figurines have been found at almost every one of these settlements: three fragmentary figures from Morphou-Toumba tou Skourou, a Rectangular Zoomorph and a fragment from Kalopsidha and a Plaque Figurine from Kissonerga-Skalia. There is reason to suspect, therefore, that the apparent preference for funerary deposition of figurines during MC III – LC I is an illusion, caused by this significant lacuna in excavated evidence and exacerbated by the large proportion of poorly provenanced objects from this period.

424 See Part IIB.2 for these issues.
425 XAD.Kal.01, RZV.Kal.01 (Kalopsidha) UAF.TTS.01, XAD.TTS.01, XZD.TTS.01 (Toumba tou Skourou), QAF.Ska.01 (Kissonerga-Skalia)
The wear patterns evident on many Figurative Vessels and Decorated Vessels also suggest a period of use before their final deposition. Much of the wear observed on those examples whose condition could be assessed affected one entire side of the vessel and was most likely due to post-depositional factors. On examples of every type, however, spout rims were chipped and damaged and particular concentrations of wear were apparent on handles and, on larger specimens, the front of the neck where a hand might have braced the vessel during pouring (Fig 59). Such characteristics are indicative of vessels in repeated use, not made specifically for deposition in the tomb, or used in a single, particular burial ritual.

Although the burial deposition of figurines which had been in prior use is not new, the non-burial use of Decorated Vessels represents a significant departure from previous practices. Most significantly, Figurative Vessels of this kind are unknown in Bronze Age Cyprus before MC III. In the merchant cities of neighbouring Anatolia and the Levant, however, a zoomorphic vessel tradition had been underway for centuries. No extra-island examples, which were manifest in many different local forms across this vast area of the mainland, are exactly comparable to the new Cypriot versions so this is not a simple case of an intrusive foreign type. Instead, this new idea of figurine use may have formed part of the package of Eastern material culture and practices which were becoming ever more significant in Cyprus during this period of escalating economic relationships.

Increasing contacts with external communities are also attested in this period by the first appearance of Cypriot-made figurines outside the island. Just five MC III – LC I figurines have been found at three sites down the Levantine coast: a single Hole-mouth Zoomorph at Jaffa; one Rectangular Zoomorph at Ugarit and three at Gezer. These few objects represent a major new facet of figurine use during this period which will continue to be attested in the Later Bronze Age. All MC III – LC I exported figurines have been discovered in settlements although given the incomplete publication of these early twentieth century excavations, little more can currently be said about their exact contexts. As it stands, it seems likely that these few objects were not specifically traded but may have travelled outside of Cyprus as gifts or souvenirs collected by foreign traders or as the personal possessions of Cypriot merchants who sailed to the Levant.

Little systematic investigation has yet been conducted on the zoomorphic vessels of Anatolia and the Levant and most are generally assumed to have been associated with unspecified ritual practice. In Cyprus, in the absence of good contextual information, the style and condition of the

426 Canby 1989:111; Kulakoğlu 1999; Sagona & Zimmansky 2009:244
zoomorphic Figurative and Decorated Vessels suggests that they were used in communal drinking activities outside of single burial situations. The form of the vessel and the imagery upon them was plausibly specific to the identity of particular groups and, in effect, “piggy-backed” on practical objects as a convenient vehicle for symbolic display. These significant iconographical and functional transformations in figurine use correspond with those attested in the contemporary burial record, which indicates increasing imported and copied objects and the use of status symbolism away from the burial arena.427

The small MC III – LC I anthropomorphic corpus also demonstrates an unresolved combination of latent iconographic continuity and experimentation with external stylistic inspirations. There is also some indication that these two processes may have occurred in geographically distinct regions. Vestiges of the once dominant Plank tradition are discernible in two types, both of which appear to cluster in the North Coast, North West and Central Island areas.

Protome Jugs (Fig 60, right), which feature both animals and human protomes, fit comfortably into MC III – LC I styles in both shape and material. However, the basic form of the object and the position of the protome are clearly reminiscent of EC III – MC I Plank/Animal Jugs (Fig 60, left). The pristine condition of all known Plank/Animal Jugs and evident use-wear on most Protome Jugs, however, suggests that these clearly related types were not used in the same way. Similar stylistic continuity with the Plank tradition is apparent in the small, poorly-provenanced group of Transitional Anthropomorphs. Although the type comprises a diverse range of materials and decorative styles, the common traits which bind them have grown directly from their Plank predecessors.

An unprovenanced example (Fig 61) demonstrates the basic Plank form, somewhat naturalised by the addition of small legs, relief mouth simplified decoration. During MC III – LC I, the varied Transitional Anthropomorphs demonstrate a concern amongst certain groups, to preserve the familiar Plank imagery and mutate it into a form which had not yet been completely agreed upon. The maintenance of exaggerated, pierced ears and the addition of a relief navel, suggesting the depiction of a naked body, however, are important features which will continue to be part of anthropomorphic iconography throughout the Late Bronze Age.

427 Keswani 2004:142-3, 154
Anthropomorphic imagery in the East and Karpas was equally experimental but appears to have drawn inspiration from outside Cyprus. Plaque figurines (Fig 62) are as poorly-provenanced as Transitional Anthropomorphs but the predominant use of Plain White ware indicates an apparently LC I date and a geographic focus in the East.\textsuperscript{428} The pierced ears of this form call to mind the Plank tradition. However, their plain appearance, raised facial features and genitals rendered with a single vertical incision surrounded by impressed circles have no obvious indigenous inspiration. The clearest parallels come from assorted third and second millennium Levantine figurines such as those from Tel Chuera or Alalakh.\textsuperscript{429}

The eight known Person/Spout Vessels and two MC Composite Vessels (Fig 63) are also not well provenanced but appear to cluster in the East and Karpas. Their unusual anthropomorphic miniatures have a rounded headdress or hairstyle and hold one arm diagonally between the breasts and the other across the chest in a form hitherto unknown in Cyprus. This gesture is attested, however, at several sites across the mainland Levant, such as Tel Judaidah or Tel Chuera.\textsuperscript{430}

Neither these vessels nor Plaque Figurines, however, appear to be direct copies of any specific Eastern type, or to have characteristics peculiar to a single site or area outside Cyprus. Instead, they are an amalgam of stylistic ideas drawn from external cultures and put together in a peculiarly Cypriot way. This sort of iconographic development does not suggest focussed settlement on Cyprus by specific foreign groups, but a widening sphere of closer contact with a range of different communities.

The anthropomorphic corpus, therefore, shows an apparent divide within the island in the scale to which external stylistic inspiration was incorporated into local iconography. The old North and Central Island heartland of Plank imagery became the home of types which drew on this familiar, local tradition. In the East and Karpas, however, new forms engaged with stylistic ideas from the Levant and Anatolia. Within the zoomorphic material, external influences were felt across the island. However, a similar divide is attested by Rectangular Zoomorphs, the most common type found outside Cyprus, which also clustered in the Eastern Mesaoria. Regional preference for particular figurine types is especially strong during MC III – LC I and suggests the increasing use of

\textsuperscript{428} Crewe 2009b
\textsuperscript{429} Badre 1980:243, 290-1; Pl.XVIII.27, XXXII9-14, XXXIII.18
\textsuperscript{430} Badre 1980:259, 296-7; Pl.XXIII.22, XXXIV.31-5
these objects to display the group identities of small, local groups. Some types even appear to have been associated specifically with a single site. Of the 31 extant Dog Vessels, for example, 28 were found at Morphou-Toumba tou Skourou. Such extreme localism may easily have resulted in certain types being partially or completely absent from the archaeological record as it currently stands if their focal sites have not been uncovered.

There are some complications to this nonetheless evident iconographic regionalism. Much figurine use during this period is concentrated in the North West and Central areas with the sites of Toumba tou Skourou and Dhali providing the most varied and numerous collections of figurines. At the former site, examples of four different types – Dog Vessels, Early Anthropomorphic Vessels, Flat-base Zoomorphs and Protome Vessels – have all been discovered. Given the pottery manufacturing facilities known from this site, it is possible that Toumba tou Skourou was a production centre supplying many, disparate groups. However, since the objects were discovered in tombs with evidence of wear, it is more likely that these two sites represent central deposition locations. This may suggest that people from various local areas were involved in ritual activities at regionally important centres, perhaps arranged around the burial of locally important people.

This interplay of regionalism and connectivity, continuity and change characterises the figurine record of MC III – LC I. The proliferation of new forms evident during this period demonstrate a gradual yet definitive transition, with distinct, regional groups consciously manipulating and developing familiar iconographical trends of the previous period and integrating new ideas from the mainland. Functionally, figurine use appears to have shifted emphasis from Independent Figurines towards Figurative and Decorated Vessels plausibly used in communal drinking activities at which local group identities could be displayed and reaffirmed. Iconographically, types are small with none exceeding 31 examples, and most having fewer than ten, each probably in use only for a short time during the period. Most are also closely related and it has proven particularly difficult to draw satisfactory typological boundaries between them.

Fat Zoomorphs and Flat-base Zoomorphs, for instance, differ only in the presence of legs and only the location of the spout discerns Flat-base Zoomorphs from Protome Jugs. A particularly clear example of this typological blurring is apparent by PMD.Kyt.01 (Fig 64), a Protome Jug whose unusual inclusion of tail gives it the appearance of a Flat-base Zoomorph. This confusion and abundance of small, related, regionally-specific figurine types echoes developments within
contemporary ceramics which had yet to consolidate into the new standard forms of LC II.\(^{431}\) Although not a single figurine type current in MC III – LC I continued in use beyond the end of LC I, this period bore witness to the iconographical origin of some of the most dominant forms of the following period.

\(^{431}\) Herscher 2001a
III.E LATE BRONZE AGE (LC IIA – LC IIIA)

The beginning of LC IIA marks the most significant fission in the figurine record of Bronze Age Cyprus, across which no figurine type apparently continued. This period also represents by far the most prolific level of figurine use across the Cypriot Bronze Age (Chart 8). While this may be a consequence of increasing population within the island itself, it may also imply that the use of figurines was more popular and certainly more widespread in Cyprus than ever before. Ten new figurine types were introduced during LC II and two in LC IIIA (italicised):  

- Decorated Vessels: Base Ring Bull Protome Vessels (BZD)  
- Zoomorphic Vessels: Owl Rattles (OZV), Base Ring Bull Vessels (BZV)  
- Zoomorphic Figurines: Base Ring Bull Figurines (BZF), Buff Painted Bulls (PZF)  
- Anthropomorphic Figurines: Earring Figurines (EAF), Flathead Figurines (FAF), Seated Flatheads (SAF), Late Cypriot Cradleboards (LAF)  
- Mixed Figurines: Bull Leader Figurines (BMF)  
- Object Models: Boat Models (BIF)  
- Anthropomorphic Vessels: Flathead Bottles (FAV)  

Some echoes of MC III – LC I trends can be seen in this new corpus as zoomorphs continue to account for 67% of the overall corpus (Chart 9). Principally, however, these types demonstrate a return to Early-Middle Cypriot traditions. Independent Figurines once again became dominant and even limited numbers of Object Models reappeared. The preferred choice of animal depicted by zoomorphic objects also reached consensus during the Late Bronze Age. Bulls resumed prominence, now representing an overwhelming 81% of the total zoomorphic corpus (Chart 16).

Bovine imagery had long been symbolically significant on Cyprus and accounted for the largest proportion of zoomorphic imagery from EC I – MC II. The hiatus of this tradition in MC III – LC I is striking and its reappearance in LC II – IIIA perhaps indicative of a return to past customs following the iconographical and social turmoil of the previous period.

---

432 For the slightly ambiguous evidence for the chronology of Owl Rattles, see below.  
433 All these types were introduced in LC IIA with the exception of Base Ring Bull Figurines which appear to be a slightly later, LC IIC introduction.  
434 Of the 904 figurines known from LC IIA – LC IIIA, 607 have been identified as zoomorphic.
LC II also saw considerable homogenisation of the figurine record as the many, diverse forms of MC III – LC I evolved and consolidated into more canonical, characteristically Late Bronze Age types. A general stylistic convergence, similar to that seen in the wider ceramic material, is also attested by physical and technical similarities across different types of figurine.

On Earring, Flathead, Seated Flathead, Bull Leader and Base Ring Bull Figurines as well as Base Ring Bull Vessels and Protomes, for example, the eyes are rendered using the same technique of an applied pellet with an incised inner circle (Fig 65). Likewise, the folded ears of Base Ring Bulls are also found on Flathead and Seated Flathead Figurines. Bull Leader Figurines provide a very tangible connection between the forms as they combine a Base Ring Bull Figurine and a male rendered in Flathead form on a single object.

Similarities are also apparent in the techniques used in the manufacture of various figurine types. Legs and arms are attached in a comparable way to the handles of pottery vessels, by pushing the hollow limb through the body of the figurine and folding over the ends on the inside (Fig 66). This use of techniques already established in the manufacture of vessels reaffirms that these figurines were most probably made by potters themselves or by artisans trained in pottery-making. Finally, the predominance of Base Ring ware also unites many Late Cypriot types as 70% of figurines were

---

435 See below for the interpretive implications of this similarity.
made in some variation of this fabric.⁴³⁶ Where the fabric has been observed, it appears to be of similar fineness and composition. However, the surface appearance achieved on each type is actually rather different and varies even within examples of the same type.

In general, Base Ring Bull Protomes and Vessels tend to look most similar to contemporary non-figurative Base Ring II vessels, with a dark brown or black, semi-lustrous surface finish and white painted decoration (Fig 67, left). Anthropomorphs, on the other hand, have a much paler, buff surface, perhaps chosen deliberately to render skin-tone (Fig 67, right). They are decorated with incisions or with red and black painted lines, neither of which are well attested in the Base Ring vessel corpus.

There are two significant exceptions to the stylistic and material homogeneity of the Late Cypriot figurine record. The function of White Painted VI Owl Rattles (Fig 68), with their ornithomorphic heads and loose internal pebbles, is obscure.⁴³⁷ Despite its name, this object was probably not used as a toy. Its breakable, ceramic form was unlikely to survive the sort of vigorous rattling to which a small child would doubtless have subjected it and such an object could have more sensibly been made from wood. The pebbles were, however, certainly intended to create sound by gentle shaking, perhaps intended for musical, ritual or apotropaic reasons. It is likely that this type was made with specific impetus from the neighbouring Levant. It bears a striking resemblance to contemporary White Shaved juglets, apparently made specifically for export to Palestine.⁴³⁸ Furthermore, whilst no other rattles are known from Bronze Age Cyprus, they are relatively abundant in the Levant.⁴³⁹ Owl Rattles themselves have also been found in small numbers at Qubeibe, Lachish and Gezer, in tombs with significant amounts of Cypriot imports and imitations.⁴⁴⁰ On Cyprus, they are also

⁴³⁶ Of 945 known figurines from LC II A – III A, the fabric of 660 examples has been identified as part of the Base Ring tradition. A recent move to rename the figurine fabric “Brown Ware” for some examples (Karageorghis & Karageorghis 2002) has not been followed here as it separates the figurines unnecessarily from the related ceramic tradition.

⁴³⁷ Help in identifying this ware was kindly provided by L. Maguire (pers. comm. 10 March 2009). For more on White Painted VI ware, see Maguire 2009.

⁴³⁸ Gittlen 1981:53-4

⁴³⁹ Braun 2002:98-107

⁴⁴⁰ Burial cave, Qubeibe (Ben-Arie et al 1993:81); Burial Cave 502, Lachish and Burial Cave 30, Gezer (Gonen 1992:127, 146-7)
found in tombs, clustering toward the East of the island, which are otherwise undistinguished from contemporary Cypriot burial assemblages. This twin use of Owl Rattles suggests a limited incorporation of specifically Levantine burial ritual into Cypriot practices by small enclaves of probably Cypriot people, both on the island and the Levantine coast.

Boat Models, the only other LC II – IIIA figurine type not made of Base Ring ware, also demonstrate a heightened enthusiasm for maritime travel. This minimal revival of the Early-Middle Bronze Age Object Model tradition is known from a total of seven examples, from tombs at the coastal sites of Maroni, Kazaphani and possibly Enkomi during LC II and then again at Sinda at the end of the Bronze Age in LC IIIA. Somewhat surprisingly for an island people, Bronze Age Cypriot iconography almost never depicted marine motifs, creatures or objects. Although the numbers of boat models are not large, their existence at all, alongside a handful of roughly contemporary boat graffiti at Kition, Area II, is testament to the importance of maritime contact during this period.

This external outlook is also attested by the small but increased number of Cypriot figurines found outside the island during LC II-IIIa. A few examples of every type except Boat Models have been found abroad, predominantly on the Levantine coast (Table 9, Map 6). Only Base Ring Bulls have been found in Egypt and in the Aegean, at the cemetery of ilaysos-Macra Vouno on Rhodes. There is no clear “export style” amongst any of the types attested outside Cyprus. Even within the larger Base Ring Bull group, the full range of sizes, decorative elements and degrees of elaboration is represented. The majority of these figurines were discovered in early excavations which have been at best only partially published and little information is consequently available about their findspots. It is clear, however, that all figurine types were found in both settlement and burial contexts, predominantly between LB IIA – B, the floreat of Bronze Age Cypriot exports to the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Egypt</th>
<th>Levant</th>
<th>Aegean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earring Figurines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flathead Figurines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels (indeterminate)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figurines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protomes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR Horse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owl Rattle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Model</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Distribution of LC II - III Figurine Types outside Cyprus

441 A small number of exceptions include an Early-Middle Cypriot figurine apparently depicting a turtle (FZF.NON.08) and one imported, Late Bronze Age fish vessel (LZV.Enk.01). Small amounts of imported Aegean pottery featuring marine designs are vastly outnumbered by the far more popular chariot motifs.

442 Webb 1999:302-3
In both contexts, they were usually found alongside other imported vessels and figurines of Cypriot and Mycenaean origin.

The scattered nature of these figurines and their predominant presence in tombs containing many other Cypriot objects, suggests that some may have travelled with Cypriot people, perhaps merchants, working temporarily overseas or more permanent migrants who settled outside the island but retained certain objects from their homeland. However, there is reason to suspect that others were created specifically for export. The handful of known Base Ring Horses (highlighted in green), for example, made in the style of Base Ring Bulls, depict an animal generally unpopular on Cyprus but with strong iconographic importance on the mainland. Similarly, Base Ring Bull

---

443 Gittlen 1981:51
444 Moorey 2004:148-9, 154
Protomes (highlighted in red) found at Ugarit combine distinctly Levantine vessel shapes with the very Cypriot bull protome (Fig 69).

Base Ring Bull Protomes are rare and heterogenous, apparently representing experimentation with the standard Base Ring Bull form. On Cyprus, both this type and Base Ring Horses apparently developed at Kazaphani-Ayios Andronikos, whose large, varied range of examples this secures it as an important site for zoomorphic Decorated and Figurative Vessels from MC III through to LC IIIA. It is possible that this site was responsible for some of the exports found outside Cyprus but only petrographic analysis may resolve this possibility.

Doubtless the most prominent Late Cypriot figurines are the interrelated collection of Base Ring figurine types, comprising Earring and Flathead Figurines, the array of Base Ring Bull imagery and the two much rarer types – Base Ring Horses and Bull Leader Figurines. The following section will consider the function and significance of the three major Base Ring forms and the collective implications of their contextual and geographical distributions.

Base Ring Bull Vessels (Fig 70) and Protomes (Fig 69) which began during LC IIA were the ultimate resolution of the plethora of Decorated and Figurative Vessels of the previous period. Base Ring Bull Vessels are by far the most numerous of all Bronze Age Cypriot figurine types, with at least 214 verified examples currently known. Stably supported by their own legs, their practical, central handles and wide, accessible filling holes leave little doubt that they were made with functionality as well as form in mind.

Clear concentrations of wear on the fronts of the handles of many examples (Fig 71), as well as general minor damage to the majority, indicate the recurrent, practical use of Base Ring Bull

---

445 The 42 figurines from Kazaphani-Ayios Andronikos include Base Ring Bull Vessels and Protome Jugs, Base Ring Horses, Bull Leader, Boat Model, Fat Zoomorphs, Protome Jugs and Rectangular Zoomorphs.

446 Catling (1976:71-2) suggested that Base Ring Bull Vessels began in LC I on the evidence of two examples in Ayios Iakovos-Melia Tomb 14. However, the dating of this tomb has since been called into question (L Crewe pers. comm. 7 Jun 2011) and has therefore been omitted from the chronological analysis of this type, pending re-study. The remaining contextual information indicates that this type was introduced no earlier than LC IIA (see also Nys 2001:96-7).

447 To date 214 examples have been positively identified as Base Ring Bull Vessels and only 33 as Base Ring Bull Figurines. There are also a further 113 examples (BZU) which are too fragmentary to determine whether they came from figurines or vessels.
Vessels. Concretions obstructing the spouts of some, such as BZV.HST.02 and adhering to the inside of many, also testify to the efficacy of these vessels for pouring liquids.

There is no visible staining and residue analysis, which is beyond the scope of this project, has not yet been conducted to suggest the possible contents of Base Ring Bull Vessels but their distinctive form and the relatively small capacity of the majority of examples imply that this was a valuable liquid. A connection with status is also suggested by the considerable variation in their size, ranging from 8cm to 24.5cm in length. The larger examples, which are generally more elaborately detailed, would also have had greater capacity for whatever was habitually stored inside and plausibly represent more prestigious objects than their smaller, plainer counterparts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Settlement (%)</th>
<th>Ritual Space (%)</th>
<th>Tomb (%)</th>
<th>Unknown (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Ring Bull Vessel (BZV)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Ring Bull (indeterminate) (BZU)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZV + BZU</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Ring Bull Figurine (BZF)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Distribution of BR Bull imagery across different context types

It is possible that Base Ring Bull Vessels were used in communal drinking activities comparable to those proposed for the zoomorphic forms of the previous period. The majority of clearly identified examples (65%) have been found in tombs. However, it is likely that the difficulty in correctly identifying body fragments discussed in Part IIB.3, and the particular problem in distinguishing between small fragments of Base Ring Bull Vessels and Figurines have caused this type to be severely underrepresented in the settlement record. Table 10 shows the overall contextual distribution of Base Ring Bull Vessels and Figurines, including those fragments whose identity cannot be categorically determined. When combined with the contexts of the Base Ring Bull (Indeterminate) category, many of which probably come from vessels, the apparent burial bias is somewhat redressed.

It seems likely, then, that the activity in which Base Ring Bull Vessels were used and the symbolism encompassed by Base Ring Bull imagery were equally meaningful both for the living

---

448 Of the 117 provenanced Base Ring Bull Vessels, 76 have been found in tombs, 20 in settlements and 21 in findspots of unknown type.
and the dead.\textsuperscript{449} Within settlements, most examples have been found in layers of fill or construction material and no objects definitely identified as Base Ring Bull Vessels have been found in apparently primary contexts. Of the small number of indeterminate examples from floor layers, only one comes from a situation whose purpose may be ascertained. BZU.Kit.01 was found in Area I, Room 39 (floor IV), which appears to have been an industrial area housing a furnace for the processing of copper.\textsuperscript{450} A similarly small number of Base Ring Bull Figurines come from potentially meaningful contexts. BZF.KoB.01 was found in an underground storage room under Area D, Level A at Kourion-\textit{Bamboula}, alongside several other figurines including two Flatheads and two Mycenaean figurines;\textsuperscript{451} BZF.KaD.03 was found in the SW room of Building XV at Kalavasos-\textit{Ayios Dhimitrios}, alongside a pithos, stone grinders, a loomweight and a gypsum weight.\textsuperscript{452} These few primary contexts offer no more than an interesting hint of a connection to areas of industry and craft production. At best the settlement evidence indicates that these objects were used to destruction and afforded no special treatment at the end of their use-lives.

A small number of Base Ring Bull Figurines (Fig 72) and indeterminate fragments have been found in ritual space: BZF.Ayr.01 and BZU.Ayr.01 in Room V of the Central Cult House at Ayia Irini; BZF.Ida.01 and BZU.Ida.01 in K7 in the Cult House at Idalion.\textsuperscript{453} Such discoveries are atypical for indigenous LC II – IIIA figurines and highlight the important transitional role played by this type in the development of Cypriot figurine use throughout this period. Some have argued that the generally paler appearance and differences in form and decoration suggest that the Figurines were not related to the rest of the Base Ring Bull corpus.\textsuperscript{454} The variability of surface appearance within Base Ring figurines has been discussed above and pale and dark examples exist in both Base Ring Bull Figurine and Vessel types. Furthermore, there are many similarities in the physical form of the two types, both in overall shape and the rendering of particular details such as the applied pellet eyes and modelled tail.\textsuperscript{455} Catling also perceived a marked increase in naturalistic representation amongst Base Ring Bull

\textsuperscript{449} contra Catling 1971:72 and Nys 2001:100
\textsuperscript{450} Karageorghis & Demas 1985:5-9
\textsuperscript{451} Benson 1972:33-5
\textsuperscript{452} A. South pers. comm. 20 Feb 2009
\textsuperscript{453} Catling 1971:72 lists several others. Some are from areas no longer believed to be of ritual significance (e.g. Enkomi Area III). The published descriptions of two other fragments (No.s 7 and 19) do not record canonical Base Ring Bull characteristics so their identification is in doubt. Unfortunately both are now lost and cannot be re-examined.
\textsuperscript{454} Catling 1976:71-2; Karageorghis 1993:19; contra Webb 1999:216 who believes the Figurines and Vessels must be related.
\textsuperscript{455} These similarities are admitted by Karageorghis 1993:19 who dismisses them as “superficial”.
Figurines with modelled dewlap, shoulder hump and genitals far more common.\textsuperscript{456} However, the evidence suggests that these features were also present in small numbers amongst Base Ring Bull Vessels and remain rare amongst their figurine counterparts. Modelled genitals, for example, appear on three Base Ring Bull Vessels and one Base Ring Bull Figurine only.\textsuperscript{457} Moreover, some Base Ring Bull Vessels, such as BZV.Kaz.01 (Fig 70), have far more elaborate anatomical details than any Figurines. The lack of handle, pouring spout and rim on Base Ring Bull Figurines do not indicate that these objects are symbolically unrelated to the Vessels. They do, however, suggest a different practical function.

Base Ring Bull Figurines are not attested in single-period contexts before LC IIC and most likely represent a later variant of the corpus. Innovative coroplasts, perhaps in the South Coast area which provided ten of the twenty-six provenanced examples, took elements of the Vessel, such as the shape and eye style and very occasionally the painted decoration as on BZF.Enk.07, and created a new version of a current symbol. This new type was no longer required in practical pouring activities but the makers nonetheless sought to channel the symbolism of the Vessel form. Similarly, the new form was appropriate for limited deposition in ritual space but nonetheless retained the twin settlement/cemetery deposition of the earlier form. Base Ring Bull Figurines were an evolutionary step which foreshadowed the functional and depositional character of the Buff Painted Bulls, discussed below, which would ultimately replace Base Ring Bull Vessels as the dominant LC IIIA zoomorphic form.

Where the Late Cypriot zoomorphic repertoire was clearly dominated by Base Ring Bull imagery, the anthropomorphic sphere was shared by two main types – Earring (Fig 73) and Flathead Figurines (Fig 74). It is commonly held that Earring Figurines were introduced during the fifteenth century and Flatheads during the thirteenth century with the types overlapping only for a brief period in LCIIIC.\textsuperscript{458} Contextual information gathered by this study, however, indicates that Earrings

\textsuperscript{456} Catling 1976:72
\textsuperscript{457} BZV.Kaz.01, 12 and 14 and BZF.Cha.01. Modelled genitals are also found on Bronze Bull BZF.Kat.01.
\textsuperscript{458} See e.g. Courtois 1984:78-80; Webb 1999:209-10; J.Karageorghis 2005
and Flatheads were most probably completely contemporary, both introduced in LC IIA and continuing in use through to the end of LC IIIA. The recognition that these two anthropomorphic types were used contemporaneously raises interesting questions about their functional and symbolic relationship.

Although stylistically distinct, Earring and Flathead Figurines share many similar characteristics. Both represent naked, female forms with relief cone breasts and decorated pubic triangles. Both have small, pointed feet and would never have supported themselves standing upright. Their plain backs were probably not meant for view as even their decorative neck rings are either not completed or completed very roughly at the back. It seems likely, therefore, that they would have been displayed lying supine (Fig 75).

Both Earring and Flathead Figurines are similar in size, appearing in a hollow version of approximately 20cm in length and a smaller, solid version, an average of 14cm long. The reason for these dual, hollow and solid forms is unclear. Since they both appear in contexts from LC IIA to LC IIIA, there is no reason to believe they were a chronological, stylistic development. There is no apparent geographic preference for either version, nor do their contexts suggest any alternative mode of use. It may be significant that the smaller, solid version fits comfortably into the hand (Fig 76) and would have been more portable and more durable than its larger, hollow equivalent. In an increasingly interconnected island, perhaps these were designed with travel in mind.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Settlement (%)</th>
<th>Ritual Space (%)</th>
<th>Tomb (%)</th>
<th>Unknown (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earring</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flathead</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Distribution of Earring and Flathead Figurines across different contexts

Flathead and Earring Figurines have also survived in strikingly similar numbers with 111 examples of the former and 112 of the latter currently known. Just like Base Ring Bull imagery, both types are also distributed fairly evenly across settlements and tombs implying that they too were equally relevant for use by the living and accompanying the dead (Table 11). The single example apparently from ritual space is FAF.MyP.03 from Myrtou-Pigadhes. It is not published in detail, there is no illustration and it could not be examined thus it cannot be verified whether this really

459 For full information on this chronological evidence, see Appendix I.
was a Flathead Figurine. In settlements, most Earring and Flathead Figurines have been found between floors in layers of fill or construction. Table 12 lists those possibly from primary contexts, many of which appear to be manufacturing areas, containing copper slag, pounders, grinders, querns, loomweights and spindle whorls, pits and furnaces. In some cases, particularly those containing other figurine fragments, these may have been the locations in which the figurines were made. However, others seem particularly associated with the processing of copper, rather than the manufacture of ceramics and these hint that the figurines may have been specifically relevant either to these tasks or the people who performed them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figurine</th>
<th>Findspot</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Excavator’s Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAF.Enk.12</td>
<td>Enkomi, Area III, Room 77 (floor VII)</td>
<td>copper slag, furnace and tools suggesting copper workshop</td>
<td>Workshop Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAF.Enk.10</td>
<td>Enkomi, Area III, Room 13 (floor VI)</td>
<td>pits and close to cistern</td>
<td>Workshop Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAF.Kit.01</td>
<td>Kition, Area I, Rooms 43-43A (floor IV)</td>
<td>open courtyard area, with loomweights, close to copper installations</td>
<td>Workshop Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAF.San.01</td>
<td>Sanida, A14, 3.1</td>
<td>part of ceramics manufacturing area</td>
<td>Workshop Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF.Enk.06</td>
<td>Enkomi, Area I, debris over floor IV</td>
<td>with loomweight, haematite weight, spindle whorl, Cypriot and Aegean ceramic sherds</td>
<td>Workshop Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAF.Enk.16</td>
<td>Enkomi, Area III, Room 55, (debris over floor III)</td>
<td>Close to large crucible but preservation confused here</td>
<td>Workshop Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAF.Kit.01</td>
<td>Kition, Area I, Room 44, (floor IV)</td>
<td>with Mycenaean figurine, steatite cylinder seal, loomweight, rubber, faience vessel and three craters. Poor preservation; close to 3 copper installations</td>
<td>Workshop/ General Domestic Area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAF.KoB.04</td>
<td>Kourion-Bamboula, Area A, Level D</td>
<td>with LC IIIIB Horse figurine, BR Bull</td>
<td>General Domestic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAF.KoB.02</td>
<td>Kourion-Bamboula, Area A, Level D</td>
<td>Cellar area; with 2 Mycenaean figurines, 2 miscellaneous figurines, 1 BR Bull fragment, storage jars, stone tools, spindle whorls, objects inscribed with Cypro-Minoan script; Area very disturbed.</td>
<td>Storage Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAF.Apl.01</td>
<td>Apliki-Karamallos, House A, Room B</td>
<td>In ash layer above floor with BR Bull fragment, miscellaneous figurine fragment, copper slag, stone pounder, cylinder seals, bronzes, tools, pottery</td>
<td>Workshop Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAF.TTS.01</td>
<td>Morphou-Toumba Tou Skourou, House D (upper floor)</td>
<td>with small black bull's head, loomweight, spindle whorl; open-air room with pit, basin, coarse pottery, close to kiln</td>
<td>Workshop Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAF.Maa.01</td>
<td>Maa-Palaeokastro, Courtyard B (debris above floor I)</td>
<td>Open-air space; with Canaanite Jar, quern and sherds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Apparently Primary Settlement Contexts of Earring and Flathead figurines with published interpretations

460 Although this fragment is probably in the Cyprus Museum, the material from Myrtou-Pigadhes is in need of cataloguing and the figurines could not be located in 2009.
Similarities in the form and contexts of Earring and Flathead Figurines suggest that these two, contemporary types functioned in similar ways, yet they are nonetheless distinct. The most obvious differences are stylistic. Earring Figurines have large, semi-circular pierced ears which protrude from either side of the small, angular face. The resulting squashed face has encouraged them to be described as “bird-faced”\(^{461}\). Although this is not usually intended to suggest any connection with ornithomorphic imagery, it is potentially misleading and will not be used here. Flathead Figurines on the other hand, have small, pinched ears, similar to those of the Base Ring Bull corpus. The tops of their heads are flattened and usually painted with a black band which continues around the back of the head, possibly indicating hair or head gear.

Both can be traced iconographically through the heterogenous, somewhat experimental Transitional Anthropomorphs of MC III – LC I, to the Plank tradition as their common stylistic ancestor (Fig 77).\(^{462}\) The most distinctive, eponymous characteristics of Earring and Flathead Figurines were already apparent in these earlier types: pierced ears, albeit smaller, exist on 85% of Plank Figurines and several Transitional Anthropomorphs, such as TAF.Ala.01 or TAF.Ala.02; the flattened head is obvious in the general Plank iconography as well as TAF.AyP.02 or TAF.Mrk.01, amongst others. However, what influenced these and other latent features to become so prominent in the Late Cypriot forms and how and why this raggle-taggle group of MC III – LC I anthropomorphs became canonised into the two distinct Earring and Flathead types, has proven a matter of some debate. Stylistic influences from outside Cyprus have been cited as the most likely additional influence on the development of indigenous types. Earring Figurines are usually

\(^{461}\) E.g. Webb 1999:209; Knapp 2008:175-7

\(^{462}\) See also Karageorghis 1993:21.
considered to echo the form of so-called Astarte figurines from the Levant.\textsuperscript{463} Flathead Figurines, on the other hand, have been attributed to the influence of Mycenaean shapes.\textsuperscript{464}

The Near Eastern female figurine type which most closely resembles Cypriot Earring Figurines (Fig 79), is Badre’s Orontes MAI “type classique” (Fig 79), predominantly from Northern Syria, and ultimately deriving from Mesopotamian prototypes.\textsuperscript{465} These forms share certain important characteristics: both are naked females with breasts and incised pubic area; both have squashed faces, pierced ears and necklaces. However, Earring Figurines are certainly not wholesale copies of this type. The Syrian examples never appear either hollow or holding an infant, as many Cypriot Earring Figurines do, but they always wear a pierced headdress which is never seen on Cyprus. Although the Syrian type may well have provided a stylistic influence, chronological information available suggests that it was in use between c.2300 – 2000 BC and not seen at all after Middle Bronze II. By the Late Bronze Age, most Levantine sites had moved on to ubiquitous, quite different, mould-made female anthropomorphs. The Orontes MAI “type classique”, therefore, predates even Transitional Anthropomorphs by several centuries. This chronological disjunction suggests that the stylistic influence may have been passed on via memory or rare heirloom pieces, rather than regular, sustained contact with mainland figurine types.\textsuperscript{466}

The proposed Aegean influence on Flathead Figurines is far more doubtful. Stylistic similarities are far from pronounced and confined almost entirely to a vague resemblance between the Cypriot type’s flattened head (Fig 81) and the polos headdress of some Mycenaean anthropomorphs (Fig

\textsuperscript{463} e.g. Karageorghis 1993:21; Webb 1999:211; Budin 2003:143-4
\textsuperscript{464} e.g. Karageorghis & Karageorghis 2002:272; Bolger 2003:91-2; J.Karageorghis 2006
\textsuperscript{465} Badre 1980:45-51, 134-6
\textsuperscript{466} See also Budin 2003:199-241 who uses written records to bridge this chronological disjunction.
Parallels have also been drawn between rare seated Mycenaean figurines and Cypriot Seated Flatheads. Differences, however, far outweigh any passing similarities. Mycenaean figurines are never hollow and have narrow, squashed faces quite unlike the round, anatomical faces of the Flatheads. They are also clothed from head to toe and support themselves standing upright on a conical base; Cypriot Flatheads are naked and cannot stand alone. Chronological issues compound this dearth of stylistic similarities as current evidence indicates that these Mycenaean anthropomorphs do not appear on the mainland prior to LH IIIA, around 1390 BC. This would suggest that Flathead Figurines actually pre-date Mycenaean Psi figurines by almost a century.

Overall, there seems no convincing reason to draw stylistic parallels between Flathead Figurines and those of the Aegean. Instead, there is an alternative possibility. Although the flattened head top is generally considered the most remarkable feature of this type, two other, particularly interesting characteristics may hint at their origin and perhaps their purpose. The similarity between the pinched ears of Flathead Figurines and those of the contemporary Base Ring Bull repertoire has been mentioned above. In fact, the only other place that ears of this kind are seen is on bovine representations and they do not appear on any other Cypriot anthropomorphic types. They are so distinct, in fact, that it may be plausible to suggest that the ears of Flathead Figurines were deliberately intended to resemble those of bulls. In addition, painted or modelled hair curls, another feature unique to this type, appear on 43 of the 49 Flathead

---

467 The polos is a common feature on many Mycenaean Phi, Psi and Tau-type anthropomorphic figurines. For more information on these types, whose names are broadly derived from the shape of their arms, see French 1971:103, 108-112.

468 There is some controversy over the absolute dating of the Bronze Age Aegean (see e.g. Wiener 2003 for full debate) but all current proposals suggest a date between 1425 and 1360 BC. For more on the chronology of Mycenaean figurines see French 1971.

469 The rare Bull Leader Figurines also suggest an association between Flathead Figurines and Base Ring Bull Imagery.
Figurines on which this area can be assessed.\textsuperscript{470} Taken together, these characteristics are unmistakeably reminiscent of pictorial representations of the Egyptian goddess, Hathor.

Egyptian cultural and trading contact with Cyprus is well-known during the Late Bronze Age. A significant amount of Aegyptiaca has been discovered in Late Cypriot contexts and vice versa and Cyprus, or “Alashiya”, is mentioned in several contemporary Egyptian and Levantine written records.\textsuperscript{471} Peltenburg has also recently argued that LC II Cyprus consumed an unusually high concentration of Egyptian Common Faience bowls, whose imagery and use within Egypt at least, is primarily associated with Hathor.\textsuperscript{472} Clearly Flathead Figurines do not represent direct copies of existing Egyptian representations. However, the features described above suggest that known characteristics of that Egyptian deity may have been transmitted, not by visual examples but through oral communication, as has been argued elsewhere for the proliferation of distinct types of Centaur imagery throughout the Near East.\textsuperscript{473} Flathead Figurines, then, would be a local, Cypriot version with bovine ears and hair curls rendered in distinctly Cypriot ways, but with the intention to represent something akin to Egyptian Hathor.

If an intended resemblance to Hathor is accepted, further deductions may be made on the function of Flathead Figurines. Peltenburg has pointed out in his study of Egyptian Common Faience Bowls on Cyprus that on the Levantine coast and in Egypt itself Hathor was “closely identified with copper-mining”.\textsuperscript{474} Although contextual evidence for the use of Flathead Figurines on Cyprus is limited, what exists points to a spatial association with the paraphernalia of copper processing (Table 12). In addition, there is more than a passing resemblance between Flathead Figurines and the apparently twelfth century Cypriot Bronze females (Fig 82).\textsuperscript{475}

Both types are apparently naked with flat heads, pinched, protruding ears and curled hair. Their arms are held in similar gestures and the eyes on ZAF.Nic.01 are particularly similar to those of

\textsuperscript{470} 49 examples preserve the head and have either published photographs and/or descriptions or have been viewed in person. Of these, six had no curls, six had modelled curls and thirty-seven had painted curls. It was not possible to discern the presence or absence of curls in a further fifty-two fragmentary or incompletely published examples.

\textsuperscript{471} E.g. Jacobsson 1994, Eriksson 1995; For the identification of Alashiya see Knapp 2008:300-24
\textsuperscript{472} Peltenburg 2007
\textsuperscript{473} Shear 2002
\textsuperscript{474} Peltenburg 2007:384
\textsuperscript{475} ZAF.Nic.01 is also known as the “Bairaktar Bronze”, ZAF.NON.01 as the “Bomford Figurine” or “Astarte-on-the-Ingot”. This similarity was noted by Catling (1971) although he makes no distinction between Flathead and Earring Figurines. He also noted a resemblance between the bronze figurines and the female heads depicted on a bronze stand from Enkomi Tomb 97 (British Museum 1897,04-01.1296).
Flathead Figurines. There are, of course, variations, some of which may be explained by the difference in media. The extended curls on the bronze versions, for example, would have been too fragile to include on a clay figurine. The heavy necklace worn by the bronze figurine is also absent from most clay examples although it is depicted on a single unprovenanced figurine (FAF.NON.09). It is also not impossible that the clay figurines wore a similar necklace of organic material which has not survived. The associations of these Bronze figurines with the copper trade are clear, particularly as at least one (ZAF.NON.01) stands on a miniature copper ingot.\textsuperscript{476}

The possibility of a connection between the copper industry, figurines and Bronze Age Cypriot ritual practices has been frequently debated.\textsuperscript{477} This interpretation of Flathead Figurines, however, for the first time, presents a systematic combination of stylistic and contextual evidence to support this claim for a ceramic figurine type. The physical association between Flatheads and Egyptian Hathor, together with their resemblance to the female Bronzes and, most of all, their spatial association with copper-processing facilities within settlements, indicates that these figurines may have been connected specifically with those who worked within the copper industry. This argument does not suggest that the figurines necessarily represented deities to the Cypriot people. Indeed, given the absence of built temple facilities and other ritual paraphernalia akin to those associated with the worship of Hathor in Egypt and the Levant, it is unlikely that Flathead Figurines were part of any cult which functioned in a comparable way. In fact, the similarity between the findspots of Flathead and Earring figurines may indicate that both functioned in a peculiarly Cypriot way, relevant to both burial contexts and those of domestic industry.

It is likely, then, that the major characteristics of Earring and Flathead Figurines grew from Cypriot forms ultimately traceable back to the Plank Figurine. External influences, most probably from the East, became entangled with these indigenous styles and helped to shape the types which emerged in LC IIA. In another echo of the Plank Tradition, both Earrings and Flatheads were equally likely to have been used to destruction in settlements or deposited with care in tombs and no verifiable examples of either type come from designated areas of ritual space. This pattern of deposition is also seen in Base Ring Bull Vessels and the practical use and symbolic function of these three types appears to have been part of comparable traditions. However, analysis of Late Cypriot figurines found in tombs reveals that 73\% of tombs in which figurines were known to have

\textsuperscript{476} Although the bases of the other figurines are missing, their otherwise comparable forms may suggest that they would also have been ingots.

\textsuperscript{477} E.g. Catling 1971; Bolger 2003; Kassianidou 2005
been deposited contained only one type (Table 13). The spatial segregation of figurine types witnessed in the Early-Middle Cypriot burial record evidently continued into the Late Bronze Age, again suggesting that each type was relevant to specific people and that a choice was made as to which figurine was appropriate to deposit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Tombs</th>
<th>% of Figurine Tombs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tombs with 1 Figurine Type</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tombs with 2 Figurine Types</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tombs with 3 Figurine Types</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Number and percentage of figurine tombs containing one or more figurine types

The relative proportions of each figurine type within burials reflect the general trends seen in their overall surviving numbers. Base Ring Bull imagery was the most popular type deposited in LC II – IIIA tombs, outnumbering both Earring and Flathead Figurines two to one (Table 14, Table 15). Whilst this may reflect a disparity in the scale of use of each type, two tombs containing matching pairs of Base Ring Bull Vessels present the tentative possibility that this type may have been habitually used in twos. Such a practice would make them doubly likely to survive in looted or damaged tombs and at least partially account for the larger surviving numbers. Nonetheless some additional popularity for Base Ring Bull imagery remains likely.

Assessing the overall popularity of LC IIA – IIIA figurines within burials is difficult. It is necessary to contend with factors such as the practice of multiple burial and the activities of looters, many of which are impossible to quantify. Nonetheless, analysis of the information gathered by Keswani’s extensive study of Late Cypriot burials, the largest dataset currently available, indicates that tombs with and without figurines occur in roughly even proportions. Counts taken for individual sites and excavation programmes, however, show proportions of tombs containing figurines ranging from less than a fifth at the Kourion necropoleis, to almost two-thirds at Maroni-Tsaroukkas (Table 16).

Table 14 (left): Total Numbers of Figurine Tombs by Type
Table 15 (below): No. of Tombs containing Base Ring Bull Imagery, broken down by type

Assessing the overall popularity of LC IIA – IIIA figurines within burials is difficult. It is necessary to contend with factors such as the practice of multiple burial and the activities of looters, many of which are impossible to quantify. Nonetheless, analysis of the information gathered by Keswani’s extensive study of Late Cypriot burials, the largest dataset currently available, indicates that tombs with and without figurines occur in roughly even proportions. Counts taken for individual sites and excavation programmes, however, show proportions of tombs containing figurines ranging from less than a fifth at the Kourion necropoleis, to almost two-thirds at Maroni-Tsaroukkas (Table 16).

478 In these calculations, Base Ring Bull Imagery (including Figurines, Vessels, Decorated Vessels and indeterminate fragments) has been treated as a whole on account of the large proportion of sherds which could not be allotted to a particular type. If the types are separated and BZU, BZF, BZV and BZD are treated individually, however, the overall trend still stands as 62 tombs would contain one type, 31 two types and 3 three types of figurine.

479 BZV.KAd.03-04 in Tomb 11, Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimitrios and BZV.Ang.01-02 in Tomb 1, Angastina-Vounos

480 Keswani 2004:Tables 5.8, 5.9a-d, 5.11, 5.13
These varying proportions, together with the similarity of the proportions at the two Kourion burial grounds, may reflect differential popularity in the use of figurines at various sites across the island. When this information is broken down into individual figurine types (Table 17), most sites show roughly comparable proportions of Earring and Flathead Figurines and a generally higher proportion of Base Ring Bull imagery. Although there is still variation amongst the sites, it is clear that the proportion of tombs which include any of the figurine types measured here is often somewhat higher than Webb’s estimate of less than 5%.[481] Overall, it seems that the deposition of figurines was not a general requirement of the burial ritual of LC IIA – IIA Cyprus, but was nonetheless popular amongst a scattered minority.

Table 16: Proportions of tombs within Late Cypriot burial sites, containing figurines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LC IIA – IIA Tombs</th>
<th>No. of Tombs with:</th>
<th>Approximate proportion of tombs containing figurines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>No Figurines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enkomi</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalavasos Ayios-Dhimitrios</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kourion-Bamboula</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katydha</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kourion (British Museum Excavations)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maroni (British Museum Excavations)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island-wide estimate based on all tombs listed in Keswani 2004: Tables 5.8, 5.9a-d, 5.11, 5.13</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: Proportions of Tombs at LC Burial Sites containing particular Figurine Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LC IIA – IIA Tombs</th>
<th>No. of Tombs with:</th>
<th>Earring Figurine(s)</th>
<th>Flathead Figurine(s)</th>
<th>BR Bull imagery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>No Figurines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enkomi</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6 (10%)</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimitrios</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kourion Bamboula</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katydha</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 (25%)</td>
<td>4 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kourion (British Museum Excavations)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maroni (British Museum Excavations)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>4 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island-wide estimate based on all tombs listed in Keswani 2004: Tables 5.8, 5.9a-d, 5.11, 5.13</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>19 (10%)</td>
<td>25 (13%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What criteria differentiated those who used Late Cypriot figurines or particular figurine types has been the subject of some debate. [482] The difficulty in assigning individual assemblages in multi-tomb assemblages as well as a general lack of interest in skeletal remains in early excavations has limited the amount of information available concerning the age and gender of those buried with figurines but at present there is no indication of division according to these criteria. [483] Other factors, however, can be more confidently addressed. Evaluation of the tomb assemblages in

---

which figurines occur shows no differentiation according to wealth as demonstrated by the number of objects deposited and the presence and amount of precious materials and imported objects. \(^{484}\) Base Ring Bull Vessels are found in both the very rich Tomb 21 and the relatively unimpressive Tomb 1 at Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimitrios; similarly Flathead Figurines occur in both the ostentatiously wealthy Swedish Tomb 3 and the unremarkable Swedish Tomb 19 at Enkomi.\(^{485}\) There is, therefore, no evidence to suggest that any of these figurine types or the general deposition of figurines was predicated on the personal wealth of the deceased or their mourners.

The key to the ideological separation of the two anthropomorphic types may be revealed by their eponymous stylistic differences and the possibility that these reflected actual physical differences in the appearances of Bronze Age Cypriot women. Pierced ears, so prominent on Earring Figurines (Fig 83), are well attested in Bronze Age Cyprus, both iconographically and in the recovery of large numbers of metal earrings throughout the period. In the Late Bronze Age, certainly multiple, possibly large gauge ear piercing would have been an obvious marker of identity. This could have occurred at any point during the life of the woman and been augmented, highlighted or ignored at will. The heavy earring sets discovered in Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimitrios Tomb 11 also present the possibility that earrings may have been an overt yet, coded marker of specific wealth.\(^{486}\) In this tomb, two sets were discovered, apparently in situ, comprising six plain gold hoop earrings each. Both sets conformed to a known weight standard of 10.8g, where one set added up to a total weight of six units and the other four units. Not only would these earrings have been very heavy to wear and possibly have led to permanent stretching of the ear with prolonged use, their conformity to this weight standard suggests that they may have been used as a sort of visible currency, signalling the wealth of the wearer with mathematical precision.

The rounded, flattened head of Flathead Figurines, formed with care from a separate piece of clay, has a distinctive ridge along the front edge (Fig 84). This ridge, as well as the unusual head shape is characteristic of

---


\(^{485}\) Keswani 2004:123-4; 131-2

\(^{486}\) Goring 1989:103-4
a skull deliberately shaped by post-bregmatic flattening. Cradleboarding in prehistoric Cyprus and the accidental plagiocephaly which this encouraged are well attested throughout the Bronze Age, both osteologically and in the iconography of infants on Plank imagery and Cradleboards. The rare Late Cypriot Cradleboard Figurines further demonstrate the continuation of this practice into the Late Bronze Age.\textsuperscript{487} Post-bregmatic flattening, a deliberate modification achieved in infancy by cradleboarding with a flat object strapped to the head (Fig 85), was specific to Late Bronze Age Cyprus.\textsuperscript{488} Attested with varying frequency at different sites across the island, this practice would have left a permanent indication of the infant life of the person, an inescapable marker of identity.\textsuperscript{489}

Earring and Flathead Figurines, therefore, may reflect two distinct methods of demonstrating group affiliation and identity in Late Bronze Age Cyprus and may have been used exclusively by members of those groups. It is also possible that these physical differences had once been demonstrable geographically. Although both types are widely distributed across the island, there is some indication of vestigial regional differentiation. In the far West of the island, at sites such as Maa-Palaeokastro and Palaepaphos, only Flathead Figurines have been found; in the far East on the Karpas peninsula, on the other hand, at Phlamoushti-Vounari, Bogaz and Yialousa, there are only Earring Figurines. Since there are many sites between these two extremes which have both types of figurine, this is far from conclusive. Nonetheless, the spatial segregation within burials and the social implications of the physical appearance of these objects support the ideological differentiation of those who used Earring and Flathead Figurines on the grounds of kinship or social group.

\textsuperscript{487} Although only two examples are known, they are very similar, from distant sites and not particularly well made, perhaps suggesting that they represent a larger tradition which has not survived well.

\textsuperscript{488} Bolger 2003:141-4; Lorentz 2005:46-7, 2009:93-4

\textsuperscript{489} Several examinations of Late Cypriot modified skulls have been conducted (e.g. Fürst 1933; Angel 1972; Schwartz 1974) but the quantity of material remaining is insufficient to consider whether Flathead Figurines generally occur in tombs with post-bregmatically flattened heads.

\textsuperscript{487} Although only two examples are known, they are very similar, from distant sites and not particularly well made, perhaps suggesting that they represent a larger tradition which has not survived well.

\textsuperscript{488} Bolger 2003:141-4; Lorentz 2005:46-7, 2009:93-4

\textsuperscript{489} Several examinations of Late Cypriot modified skulls have been conducted (e.g. Fürst 1933; Angel 1972; Schwartz 1974) but the quantity of material remaining is insufficient to consider whether Flathead Figurines generally occur in tombs with post-bregmatically flattened heads.
The geographical intermingling of these anthropomorphic types as well as Base Ring Bull imagery appears to have resulted from comparable modes of production and travel of LC II – IIIA figurines. Although there is clearly a canon style for each type, there is also considerable variation in the rendering and presence of minor details and decorative elements, as illustrated in Fig 86 for Earring Figurines.\textsuperscript{490} This level of variation on otherwise, fairly simple, minimally-decorated objects, together with the generally small numbers of each type which survive (111 Earring Figurines, 112 Flathead Figurines and at least 214 Base Ring Bull Vessels, all distributed over a period of at least 300 years) makes it unlikely that Late Cypriot figurines were standardised and mass-produced, as has often been assumed.\textsuperscript{491}

Amidst this variation, however, several pairs and small groups of almost identical examples can be identified (Fig 87), the most visibly compelling of which are listed in Table 18. Although these groups are not numerous, it should be remembered that what remains is only a sample of those figurines which were made and used in Bronze Age Cyprus. To find any matches at all in such a dataset is surely significant. Critically, the component members of these groups are rarely found in the same context and most comprise examples from distant sites as well some whose provenance is no longer known.\textsuperscript{492} This juxtaposition of stylistic diversity and similarity within each of these three major figurine types suggests that many different coroplasts or workshops created their own versions based on a similar mental template of what elements and form they should have. The existence of matching groups implies that unlike Plank Figurines of the earlier Bronze Age, Late Cypriot figurines were probably not made individually, by particular households as the need arose, rather they were formed and fired in small batches.

\textsuperscript{490} See Appendix 1
\textsuperscript{491} E.g. Karageorghis 1993:1-2, 21. Note that the number of Base Ring Bull Vessels may be closer to 328 if all indeterminate fragments were included.
\textsuperscript{492} The only exceptions are Base Ring Bull groups 3 and 4, discussed above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group Features</th>
<th>Known Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flathead Figurines</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>hollow, straight arms, modelled curls</td>
<td>FAF.Enk.10, FAF.AyP.01,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FAF.Enk.01, FAF.NON.01,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FAF.NON.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>hollow, angular face, exaggerated, vertical fingers</td>
<td>FAF.DrT.01, FAF.ATS.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>hollow, round navel, long body, small hands high up, small pubic triangle</td>
<td>FAF.Mar.04, FAF.Enk.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>hollow, round navel, both hands curving up, left to touch breasts in centre</td>
<td>FAF.Pal.02, FAF.Ang.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earring Figurines</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>solid, upright infant, one hand above the other</td>
<td>EAF.Sko.01, EAF.Yia.01,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EAF.AyP.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>hollow, upright infant, three piercings</td>
<td>EAF.Enk.04, EAF.L-Tyr.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>hollow, upright infant, crossed diagonals with double underline on chest</td>
<td>EAF.Enk.15, EAF.NON.01,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EAF.Ko8.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>solid, incised horizontals on stomach, arms folding back horizontally to cover breasts</td>
<td>EAF.NON.39, EAF.Enk.05,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EAF.Mar.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Ring Bull Vessels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>c. 11.5cm high, eyelet on muzzle, dark grey/black surface, no painted decoration</td>
<td>BZV.L-TeA.01, BZV.Kaz.18, BZV.Ang.01,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BZV.Ang.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>large, spiral eyes, horizontal herringbone decoration, modelled feet, raised rim</td>
<td>BZV.Kaz.01, BZV.NON.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>black surface, vertical herringbone decoration, upright head</td>
<td>BZV.KAd.03, BZV.KAd.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>brown-black surface, groups of parallels decoration, forward slanting handle, c.14.5cm high</td>
<td>BZV.Kaz.07, BZV.Ayl.05,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BZV.Kaz.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>wide neck, large head, incised vertical with diagonal dashes either side on forehead, eyelet</td>
<td>BZV.L-TAH.02, BZV.L-Heb.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Significant groups of stylistically similar Late Cypriot figurines

The scattered deposition of these batches, however, along with the lack of discernible regional clustering of particular stylistic features, indicates that they were not necessarily used within the area local to manufacture but travelled across the island to various distant sites. Either the figurines were acquired by visitors to their site of manufacture who took them with them when they left or they may have been made for local people who subsequently travelled away from their home, perhaps in search of itinerant work. Petrographic analysis, beyond the scope of the present study, would help to elucidate the complex mechanisms which contributed to the dissemination of Late Cypriot figurines. Nevertheless, the present evidence suggests that once separate kinship or social groups who used figurines were increasingly intermingled as the population of Late Bronze Age Cyprus became more willing or able to travel within the island.
The considerable upheaval which took place on the island at the junction of LC IIC to LC IIIA is also apparent in the figurine record, which characterises LC IIIA as a time of transition. Although Earring and Flathead Figurines continued in use, Owl Rattles, Base Ring Horses, Bull and Rider Figurines and Base Ring Bull Protomes all fell out of use at the end of LC IIC and Base Ring Bull imagery went into terminal decline, finally disappearing during LC IIIA. Two new figurine types were introduced at this point, Flathead Bottles (FAV) and Buff Painted Bulls (PZF), both of which have clear connections with earlier LC II forms. The former (Fig 88) are stylistically related to Flathead Figurines, sharing their head shape and facial details. Although no examples are known from dateable contexts, their style and material suggests that they were made in LC IIIA – IIIB. In contrast to the figurines, however, Flathead Bottles are clothed in decorated outfits. This particularly unusual characteristic for Late Cypriot figurines may have been chosen specifically for use in a non-Cypriot context which valued practical figurative vessels over figurines and clothed images over naked ones. It may be significant that half the known provenanced examples of this uncommon type come from the Levant although no direct parallels for the form are currently known from this area. Regardless of their inspiration, Flathead Bottles provided the prototype for Early Iron Age Proto-White Painted and White Painted I ware anthropomorphic bottles referred to by Karageorghis as Bottle-Shaped Figurines.

Buff Painted Bulls (Fig 89) are by far the most numerous group, introduced towards the end of LC IIC, flourishing in LC IIIA and continuing in use until the end of the Bronze Age. The pivotal role of Base Ring Bull Figurines in developing the earlier Vessel type stylistically and functionally into Buff Painted Bulls has been suggested above. A variety of characteristics within the Base Ring Bull Figurine corpus demonstrate a link with both of these types (Fig 90).

493 Karageorghis 1993:15, 24 considers their material to be a wheelmade version of Base Ring Ware, with pale buff surface and decorated in similar bichromatic colours to the Flathead Figurines. T Kiely (pers. comm. 9 Oct 2009), however, considers that their fabric is part of the White Painted Wheelmade III ware tradition (followed here). This difference in opinion may itself illustrate the transitional nature of this type. 494 Karageorghis 1993:62-4
The painted decoration on BZF.Enk.07 and the incised pellet eyes on both that figurine and BZF.Ayr.01 are familiar from the Base Ring Bull Vessel canon. The incised decoration on the forehead of the latter and its paler surface colour, on the other hand, are more common amongst Buff Painted Bulls. Likewise, certain Buff Painted Bulls, particularly those within the ‘cylindrical’ subgroup, are more similar to Base Ring Bull Figurines than their more ‘naturalistic’ counterparts. Contextual information is not currently sufficient to fix this stylistic development chronologically but an overlap during LC IIC – IIIC between the latter stages of the Base Ring Bull Vessels, the floreat of the Base Ring Bull Figurines and the beginning of the Buff Painted Bull tradition is apparent. It seems likely that it formed part of a gradual change in the way in which figurines were used during this period, which probably took place faltering, at different times at distant sites across the island.

This evolution eventually saw Buff Painted Bulls emerge as the new preferred type. Examples of this new type all depict bulls in a pale, buff-cream material; most include genitals and shoulder hump and are decorated with black or dark orange paint. Buff Painted Bulls, however, never showed the stylistic homogeneity of their Base Ring predecessors and there is considerable variation in style, decoration and size. The three major subgroups which can be identified – miniature, cylindrical and naturalistic – appear to have regional centres of popularity.

Naturalistic bulls, for example, are most commonly found at Sinda, whereas miniature and cylindrical bulls occur in their highest numbers at Enkomi. In contrast to Base Ring Bull Vessels, this distinct, localised stylistic variation is likely to indicate that this type was made on a local, perhaps even individual, household basis to no particular required form.

Overall, Buff Painted Bulls are almost always found in settlement or, crucially sanctuary contexts. However, fourteen of the 25 examples identified as naturalistic were found in burial contexts.

495 These bulls are frequently described as Plain White, Plain Ware or Plain Ware Painted (e.g. Karageorghis 1993:35,43) although the fabric is quite fine and very different to Plain Ware utilitarian ceramics of this period. Those wheelmade examples fit well in the White Painted Wheelmade III category but it is clear that the handmade examples, which are mostly solid and could not easily have been made on the wheel, used the same material and decorative style. Consequently, after discussion with A. Georgiou (pers. comm. 14 Feb 2012) Buff Painted Bulls have here been labelled White Painted Wheelmade III (fig) in order to highlight their similarity and their apparent relationship with contemporary ceramic production.

496 See Appendix I for a full description of these variations.
Although this may appear to suggest a differential depositional pattern between the subgroups, it is significant that all of these examples came from a single tomb, Tomb 1 at Sinda.\textsuperscript{497} Consequently this seems to suggest an anomalous situation, specific to this group of figurines at this site, which is not reflected by the rest of the type.\textsuperscript{498} Beyond this, there is no distinction between the depositional contexts of the major subgroups of Buff Painted Bulls. Settlement contexts provided 45% of the provenanced examples, mostly from areas of general domestic character, storage areas and courtyards.\textsuperscript{499} This recalls the sort of contexts in which Base Ring Bull imagery was generally found and in at least one case, the two types have been found together.\textsuperscript{500}

The most striking development in the deposition of the Buff Painted Bull, however, is its presence in verified ritual spaces, a circumstance not seen before in the figurine record of Bronze Age Cyprus. A significant proportion (31%) of Buff Painted Bulls was discovered in areas more or less certainly identifiable as ritual space.\textsuperscript{501} Whilst some doubt may remain over the identification of Alassa-Pano Mandilares Room Π, and Hala Sultan Tekke Area 8, whose ritual assignations were based in no small part on the presence of the very figurines under discussion, many other contexts are less easily disputed.\textsuperscript{502} Buff Painted Bulls have been found at Idalion-Ambeleri, Ayia Irini and Kition-Kathari Area II. At these sites, they have been found in areas used for the storage or disposal of ritual paraphernalia, such as Court C (PZF.Kit.07) and the pit in Room 5a (PZF.Kit.10) of Kiton Area II, Floor III. Moreover, they have also been found within spaces thought to have been used for the enactment of ritual activities, close to Altar F in Temenos A at Kition (PZF.Kit.01), for example, or within the Cult House at Idalion (PZF.Ida.02-04). For the first time in the Bronze Age figurine record, there is clear evidence of the use of figurines in ritual activity outside the burial arena. This represents a major departure from the traditions of domestic and funerary deposition seen in previous periods and foreshadows the manner in which figurines would be used in the proceeding Early Iron Age. Indeed, the Buff Painted Bull type itself, which continued in use into LC IIIB, appears to have been directly related to the bull figurines in use at the beginning of the Iron Age.

\textsuperscript{497} PZF.Sin.01-04, 06-14, 16-18
\textsuperscript{498} Given the absence of human remains in this tomb, Furumark suggested that it had been used not for burial but as ritual space in Period I and as a refuse area in Periods II - III (1965:105-6). Webb doubts this ritual assignation which is based largely on the presence of the Buff Painted Bulls under discussion (1999:143-4). However, apart from a poorly published suggestion of a Buff Painted Bull from French Tomb 5 at Enkomi (PZF.Enk.03, Coche de la Ferte 1951:21), the Sinda examples represent the only occurrence of this figurine type in a supposedly funerary context. Given the anomalous nature of this assemblage, perhaps the possibility that Sinda Tomb 1 may have been used as an underground storage area for ritual and domestic objects in a similar way to the cellar under Area D, Level A in Kourion-Bamboula, deserves further investigation. This is, however, beyond the scope of this thesis.
\textsuperscript{499} Of the 84 provenanced examples, 38 were found in settlements.
\textsuperscript{500} PZF.KAd.01 and BZU.KAd.09 by a post pad in Building VIII, A57
\textsuperscript{501} 26 of 84 provenanced examples were found in “ritual space” identified on the basis of Webb 1999.
\textsuperscript{502} For a critical discussion of the ritual nature of these two sites, see Webb 1999:122-5, 127-30.
This crucial change in depositional contexts invites exploration of the practical manner in which these new figurines may have been used. Their presence in ritual contexts may imply their use as votive offerings or even as focal images for cult activity. The wide range of sizes attested in the Buff Painted Bull corpus, from 3.5cm to 37cm in length, might seem to support the use of particular examples for both these purposes. However, examples are fairly evenly spread across this range, as the normal distribution shown in Chart 17 demonstrates and this suggests against any deliberate differentiation in size and function. Instead, it seems more likely that the size of the figurine was dependant on how large and elaborate, and thus how visibly striking, the maker wished it to be, rather than on the function for which it was created. This implies that Buff Painted Bulls were probably all made for a similar purpose in which they were intended to be seen, plausibly in a public setting.

It seems most usual for Buff Painted Bulls to be found in small multiples within their depositional contexts. In Room Π at Alassa, for example, at least five examples were uncovered and at least three were found in Square K7 of the cult house at Idalion-Ambeleri. Likewise a pair was found in Well 7, Area III at Enkomi and a small group of miniature Buff Painted Bulls in a well in Room 5, Area I of the same site. Similarly fifteen examples were excavated together from Sinda Tomb 1, although the anomalous nature of this context has already been discussed. Each of these groups comprises stylistically similar figurines but each group is distinct from the rest in appearance. This implies that the groups did not consist of individual offerings, brought by different people at different points to a specific place, rather that they were placed there as a group from a single source. This group similarity in addition to the relatively small numbers in each context appears to

---

503 It is acknowledged that the small sample available from which to create this chart (23 examples) may have skewed the distribution. However, it is hoped that the large size ranges used in the histogram (5cm intervals) will help to counteract this and present a reasonable estimation of the original size distribution of Buff Painted Bulls.
504 PZF.APM.04-08 and PZF.Ida.02-04
505 PZF.Enk.15,22 and PZF.Enk.33
argue against the use of Buff Painted Bulls as individual votive objects. Instead, they may have been part of the ritual paraphernalia arranged by those in control of the space.

Of the 84 provenanced examples of Buff Painted Bulls currently known from this period, 52 (62%) are fragmentary; of the remainder, only sixteen are almost completely intact. This high level of breakage may be a consequence of their depositional circumstances since tomb contexts would be more likely to preserve complete objects. Indeed, most of the sixteen intact examples originate from Sinda Tomb 1. It would be easy to imagine that a hollow figurine with fragile protrusions as horns and limbs could easily succumb to the taphonomic processes present in a non-funerary environment. However, many of the damaged figurines are large and solid and it would take some force to break such an object across its thick neck or torso as is the case on many examples. The possibility that these figurines have been broken deliberately, therefore, cannot be completely excluded. Such activity would presage the ritual breakage of figurines which appears to have become common during LC IIIB and continued into the Iron Age.

In addition to the new local figurine types, LC IIIA on Cyprus also saw an influx of figurines in Mycenaean shapes (Fig 91). For the most part, it is not possible to determine whether particular figurines were imported from the Aegean or made on Cyprus without the use of petrographic analysis. If some were locally-made, they were clearly intended to be visually indistinguishable from the originals. At least one locally-made example is known and it is most likely that both local and imported versions co-existed during this period. In total, 81 provenanced Mycenaean or Mycenaean-style figurines are known from the Late Cypriot period. They were first attested on Cyprus during LC IIB, with a single example (AZF.Kit.02) from Kition, Area I, Floor IV. A small number are also attributable to LC IIC but the majority of these figurines, at least 36 examples, belong to LC IIIA. They comprise roughly equal numbers of human and animal images, representing all known Mycenaean types.

506 There are an additional seven examples which are not fragmentary but have more missing parts than just the horns and a final nine whose condition could not be determined.
507 Another fairly intact example (PZF.Psi.01) is purported to have come from Psilatos and may well have originated in a looted tomb.
508 Karageorghis & Caubet 1996; Åström et al 1983:200
509 Since it is not possible to determine whether unprovenanced examples were discovered in Cyprus or elsewhere, none could be included in this study. Given the obvious appeal of such objects to looters, it is likely that the overall number of Mycenaean figurines known from Cyprus is a considerable underestimate.
While Mycenaean pottery of this period is relatively widespread around the island, the figurines cluster in the South East, particularly at Enkomi, Kition and Hala Sultan Tekke. Only isolated examples are known from elsewhere in the island (Map 7). This local concentration of Mycenaean figurines may indicate that particular sections of the community based in this area were using these objects. Whether these sections were Mycenaean settlers or local Cypriots choosing to express themselves via Aegean symbolism, is difficult to determine. Contextually, most of the figurines, 55 examples, were found in settlement contexts, in areas of varying usage including storage, copper-working, bathrooms and general domestic space. There seems to have been no distinction between anthropomorphic and zoomorphic figurines and both were frequently found together. The thirteen examples found in tombs also comprise both types but in this context, most burials have only a single Mycenaean figurine within their assemblage. The singular deposit in pit h, Temenos A at Kition which included at least eight Mycenaean anthropomorphs is the only example of such figurines within verifiably ritual space.\(^{510}\)

This contextual distribution is largely comparable to the way in which Mycenaean figurines were deposited in the Aegean and this may imply that the figurines were being used in similar ways in both locations.\(^{511}\) The numbers, however, are many orders of magnitude smaller. Even taking into account the unknowable number of unprovenanced Mycenaean figurines which came from Cyprus, the 27 Mycenaean figurines known from Enkomi, the largest site group, cannot begin to

---

\(^{510}\) There are a further five examples whose findspot type could not be determined.

\(^{511}\) French 1971:107-8
match the more than 1100 figurines found within the settlement at Mycenae. If these figurines are indicative of a Mycenaean or Mycenaeanising faction within Late Cypriot society, this faction is localised and tiny, plausibly comprising no more than a few households at each site.

Despite their small numbers, however, Mycenaean figurines in Cyprus are particularly significant as they are the only imported figurine type on the island during the Late Cypriot period. Apart from a small number of metal objects, no figurines from Egypt or the Near East are known from Cyprus. This appears to represent a generally Eastward direction of figurine movement during this period as Cypriot figurines themselves are found in the Levant, but not in the Aegean. Whether or not Mycenaean figurines moved with Mycenaean people, this directionality may have been determined by the increasing integration of Aegean objects and lifeways during the political upheaval of the final stages of the Cypriot Bronze Age. The beginning of what would become significant and lasting alterations, many with apparent Mycenaean impetus are in evidence across the island during LC IIC-IIIA, in the changing apparatus of food preparation, for example, or in the disappearance of the chamber tomb in favour of shaft graves lined with stone. These changes seem to have occurred gradually and at different rates and levels at various sites, a situation which chimes well with the regional clustering of Mycenaean figurines and the localised styles of Buff Painted Bulls.

LC IIIA bore witness to the final decline of the canonical anthropomorphic and zoomorphic types of the earlier Late Bronze Age. The Buff Painted Bulls which replaced them were a stylistically fragmented group which also demonstrated a profound transformation in the way in which figurines were used and deposited. The significant change during LC IIC – IIIA to figurine use from the zoomorphic vessel form which had dominated since MC III most likely suggests that while the symbolism and iconography remained important, the practical activity in which the vessels had been used lost its significance. Perhaps communal drinking involving zoomorphic vessels were one of the many traditionally Bronze Age Cypriot practices which were eventually overshadowed by Aegean-inspired activities.

\[\text{French 1971:107}\]
\[\text{Keswani 2004:159-60; Jung 2011}\]
By the end of LC IIIA, only Buff Painted Bulls and rare Flathead Bottles remained to recall the shapes and traditions of Bronze Age figurine use. The figurine record of LC IIIB was considerably at odds to the rest of the Bronze Age in almost every way. Several new figurine types were introduced, such as ring dance models, known from the Sanctuary of the Ingot God, wall brackets with bovine protomes, or Wheeled Animals which have also been found at Enkomi. Not only did these new forms bear little or no resemblance to what had gone before, but the number of figurines known also increased exponentially. Most importantly, the contexts in which figurines were found shifted away from the equal combination of burial and ordinary domestic situations common in many types from the Early-Middle Bronze Age, towards almost exclusive deposition within designate ritual areas. Furthermore, the vast majority of these figurines appear to have been ritually broken prior to deposition, a practice attested only rarely and never on this scale during the Bronze Age proper.

These characteristics represent a clear transformation in both the forms and the usage of figurines during LC IIIB. Although the origin of some of these new features may be traced in developments made during LC IIIA, there is, nonetheless, a clear iconographic and functional fission at the beginning of LC IIIB which provides a logical place to end this analysis. It is acknowledged that many, very justifiable criticisms have been made of analyses which end at LC IIIA. Whilst there is certainly merit in studying this fascinating period of transition, the present study cannot ignore such a strong, clear break in the figurine record. In this case, therefore, it makes methodological sense to conclude this longue durée study of figurines throughout the Bronze Age of Cyprus at the natural end of Bronze Age figurine practice, the end of LC IIIA. In the future, it is hoped that a detailed, systematic study such as this may be conducted into the rich, fascinating corpus of figurines from LC IIIB and on into the Early Iron Age. It may then be possible to combine these two studies and provide further insight into the socio-cultural nature of Cyprus at this transformative junction. However, these extensive projects are beyond the scope of this thesis.

This section has described the major diachronic trends and developments of the figurine record over the c.1200 years from EC I to LC IIIA revealed by close analysis of the chronological, geographical, iconographic, physical and contextual evidence. Part IV will summarise these trends and explore their implications for our understanding of Bronze Age Cypriot society.

---

514 E.g. Iacovou 2008:625-7
515 Such a study concerning the “goddess with upraised arms” anthropomorphs in Cyprus and Crete is currently underway as a doctoral project by K. Zeman-Wiśniewska, Trinity College, Dublin.
The previous section has presented socially-situated interpretations for each figurine type identified by this study, founded on the comprehensive database and rigorous analyses described in Part II. These have demonstrated complex, diachronic changes in the iconography, form and practical use of Cypriot figurines from EC I – LC IIIA. In the Earliest Bronze Age, figurine use was most visible in the tombs of Vounous and Decorated Vessels in particular demonstrated strong symbolic and contextual relationships with burial ritual. This study has recognised that in EC III – MC I, whilst the association with burial remained strong, the dominant iconography of these vessels metamorphosed from horned animals to ornithomorphic imagery. Decorated Vessels and Object Models deposited in tombs at Vounous and Lapithos have been shown by this analysis to be clearly differentiated, with different types rarely appearing together in one tomb. This same segregation continued to be manifest in the deposition of figurine types within burials well into the Late Bronze Age.

Zoomorphic figurines in the settlement at Marki-Alonia, known from EC II – MC I present the possibility of a wider tradition of using small, rough-modelled quadrupeds in domestic contexts, similar to that known from the contemporary Near East. The small size and low or unfired quality of these objects, however, together with the general paucity of detailed settlement excavations from this period, leave this practice poorly represented. In contrast to contemporary Decorated Vessels, EC III – MC II zoomorphic figurines maintained a preference for depicting horned animals. The zoomorphic material of MC III – LC I demonstrated substantial diversity in the animals chosen for depiction but by LC IIA bovine imagery had become manifestly predominant.

Significantly, it has been argued here that textile production provided the catalyst for an array of Early-Middle Cypriot symbolism including Comb and Spindle Models and many Scenic Compositions. Their iconography and association with textile tools in burials at Lapithos also connects the ideology of Plank Figurines to this elusive industry. Furthermore, this thesis has contended that the remarkable phenomenon of Plank imagery was born during this period from an idiosyncratic combination of increased interest in anthropomorphic representation and an escalation of the Object Model tradition. This Plank imagery established several new conventions in figurine use. Iconographically, the pierced ears and flattened head can still be seen in the
anthropomorphs of the Late Bronze Age. Likewise, their equal importance in both domestic and funerary contexts is echoed in every major Cypriot figurine type through to LC IIIA.

Even amidst this pervasive Plank imagery, the Early-Middle Bronze Age showed the consolidation of distinct, local style zones as a common language of figurine use spread across the island. The display of these regional iconographic variations intensified during the Middle-Late Bronze Age Transition and some types, such as Dog Vessels, appear to have been specifically associated with single sites. However, figurines did travel during this period, around the island and beyond, presaging the widespread mixing of distinct types witnessed in the Late Bronze Age. The disparate zoomorphic imagery characteristic of MC III – LC I was most commonly displayed on small-medium sized vessels, probably used in communal drinking activities outside the confines of specific burials. The continuation of this practice in the Late Bronze Age is demonstrated by Base Ring Bull Vessels, the iconographic culmination of developments from the preceding period.

The Late Cypriot figurine record showed a complex combination of homogenisation and internal diversity as Base Ring Bull Vessels and the two anthropomorphic types of similar material came to the fore. This study has shown that the potential ideological relationship between ceramic figurines and copper working is most clearly suggested by contextual and symbolic aspects of Flathead Figurines. Notably, it has also demonstrated that although both Earring and Flathead types drew some iconographical inspiration from Cyprus’ Eastern neighbours, their ultimate forms and apparent practical use remained distinctly indigenous. Many iconographical and functional traditions of the figurine record, which had been established for much of the Bronze Age, began a gradual yet terminal decline in LC IIC – IIIA. The influence of imported and copied Mycenaean figurines, known predominantly from LC IIIA, is clear in the ubiquitous Goddesses with Upraised Arms of LC IIIB and later. Similarly, Buff Painted Bulls of this period were no longer deposited equally in settlement and cemetery contexts, but were now concentrated in settlements, in domestic and designated ritual space. With the onset of the Iron Age, such functional idiosyncrasies of Bronze Age Cypriot figurine use disappeared along with the pierced ears and flattened heads which had been characteristic of Cypriot anthropomorphs for almost 1000 years.

Each of the developments defined by this study was a facet or a consequence of the changing socio-political and cultural landscapes of the island across this dynamic c.1200 year period. This section considers the implications of these developments for our understanding of the contexts in which Cypriot Bronze Age figurines were made and used. It is divided into three main themes, each dealing with a connected but nonetheless distinct area of Bronze Age Cypriot society – ritual practices, economic and cultural relationships with communities outside Cyprus and finally, socio-political organisation of the island and the display and negotiation of group identities.
IV.A FIGURINES, SYMBOLISM AND RITUAL PRACTICES

For Bronze Age Cyprus, as for most prehistoric contexts, an association with ritual practices is the single most common explanation offered to justify the existence of figurines. Their presumed ritual connotations are frequently founded solely on their esoteric function and significance yet, if verified, they establish figurines as a matchless resource for exploring this most arcane area of archaeological research. The combined iconographical, physical and contextual analyses completed in this study provide the most comprehensive investigation yet of the evidence for the involvement of Bronze Age Cypriot figurines in burial, communal and domestic ritual practices. No attempt has been made here either to identify particular figurines as representations of deities, or to use them to ascribe names to a Bronze Age Cypriot pantheon. Although such endeavours have proven popular in the past, they have failed to unlock the potential of figurines to illuminate the practical and ideological heart of Bronze Age Cypriot ritual practices. This section will examine the role of figurines in these three identifiable, overlapping spheres of ritual practice and consider the consequences of their interpretation for the changing nature of these activities throughout the Bronze Age.

The mortuary arena provides the most enduring and clearly delineated Bronze Age Cypriot ritual context. Funerary rites and the burial of the dead have been well established as a socially and symbolically crucial activity on the island throughout the Bronze Age but particularly during the Early-Middle Cypriot period. Keswani stressed the importance during this phase of lasting, formalised funeral systems, showing visible associations with ancestral groups and evident investment of labour and resource, intensifying towards MC II. For the most part, the figurine record does not contradict this picture. The elaborate, fragile EC I – MC II Decorated Vessels, designed and manufactured specifically for burial, attest to dedicated material and symbolic mortuary expenditure. Likewise, the continued deposition of these and Object Models at Vounous for the duration of this period demonstrate extraordinary longevity in the overall categories of symbolic objects chosen for use in this ritual.

However, the abrupt and thorough change from horned animal imagery on EC I – II Decorated Vessels to previously unknown, ornithomorphic imagery in EC III highlights a significant paradigm shift in North Coast burial ritual at this juncture. Although a package of developments in mortuary ritual at Vounous in EC III – MC I have been identified, this significant iconographical alteration

516 See Part IA.2b for the definition of ritual practices used in this study.
517 The only possible exception to this is the interpretation of Flathead Figurines with reference to Hathoric imagery. I do not, however, contend that Late Bronze Age Cypriots necessarily knew this figurine as Hathor.
518 Keswani 2004:150-4; Webb & Frankel 2010
519 Keswani 2004:151
and its implications have not yet been recognised. It implies an element added to the funerary ritual which was important enough for preferential depiction on Decorated Vessels. An apparent change in the treatment of the corpse, from the clearing and removal of earlier burials to their deliberate retention within tombs used over many generations may be significant. This could have necessitated a more expedient method of defleshing the body prior to permanent interment, feasibly accomplished by controlled exposure to the attentions of scavenging birds. Such a change, certainly striking enough to warrant depiction on funerary vessels, would have embedded ornithomorphic imagery in the symbolic repertoire of EC III – MC II mortuary ritual.

The fact that miniature birds were used interchangeably with Plank protomes on Plank/Animal Pyxides and Plank/Animal Jugs at Vounous, then, stresses the funerary significance of Plank Figurines in this context. However, it is also clear that Plank imagery was not confined to mortuary ritual as the worn condition of many examples and the presence of Plank Figurines in settlements attests. Instead, their dual relevance manifests a tradition of figurine use in both domestic and funerary contexts which would endure until the end of the Bronze Age. The possible discovery at the settlement of Marki-Alonia of a plaster installation similar to the decorated tomb façades depicted on Bucranial Wall Models and discovered, for instance, at Karmi-Palealona Tomb 6, provides tentative evidence that other areas of ritual practice also took place in both burial and domestic contexts during EC II – MC II. In the figurine record, this trend is most apparent in anthropomorphic figurines and zoomorphic vessels until LC IIIA but it is not impossible that other types were also used in this way. Any domestic use of Object Models, for example, found predominantly at Vounous, could never be uncovered without the excavation of a settlement connected with this cemetery.

No simple association, therefore, either with burial ritual, beliefs and deities connected with the afterlife, or indeed with distinctly domestic ritual, could ever completely explain the significance of symbolism found in both contexts. Instead, the figurines are best understood as ideologically connected with “people”, equally relevant to both the living and the dead, used during their lifetimes in the places they lived and worked before following them to the grave. Such an association with “people” may also account for the clear separation of figurine types chosen to accompany particular burials. The object, in some sense, reflected who the deceased was, expressing their specific, individual beliefs and identity and displaying their group allegiance. The implications of this connection for the role of figurines in the negotiation and display of identities will be expanded in Part IV.C.
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520 Webb & Frankel 2010:206, Table 3
521 Keswani 2004:42-9; Webb & Frankel 2010:194
522 Frankel & Webb 2006:26, 75-6; a possible domestic ritual area has also been identified at Sotira-Kaminoudhia (Swiny 2008:48-50).
Plank Figurines provide some of the most compelling evidence for the practical ritual use of a figurine type during the Cypriot Bronze Age. These were clearly objects of value, generally made of fine fabric, highly decorated and deposited with care in tombs, with some examples apparently newly-made for the occasion. They are also the only type known to have been mended in antiquity. Furthermore, Plank Figurines were displayed in a visibly striking manner, standing up, rooted into the ground for sufficient time to cause lasting marks on the body of the figurine itself. Since ceramic examples were an average of 22cm high and stone examples a significant 53cm, erect Plank Figurines would have doubtless provided an arresting spectacle in both settlements and tombs. Finally, the horizontal or slightly diagonal break across the torsos of at least 44% of Plank Figurines attests to a widespread, although not universal practice of deliberate breakage by snapping the object in two. This repeated, purposeful destruction in a plausibly proscribed manner speaks of the ritual ‘killing’ of an object of symbolic significance at the end of its life.

Despite prevailing opinions, there is no iconographical or contextual evidence to suggest that human or animal fertility provided the symbolic basis on which the clear significance of Plank imagery was predicated. Their form places no emphasis on gender-specific characteristics: only 28% include breasts and none show genitalia or even the natural curves of the body. Instead, their meaning is likely to have been connected to the unfortunately as yet unidentified original object on which their form was based. Less ambiguously, the contextual association of Plank Figurines with textile tools in burials at Lapithos and a concomitant iconographic relationship with Comb Models and elaborate clothing suggest that these objects may have been connected to the pervasive ideology of textile production during EC III – MC I. The possible ethnic origins and gender bias of Early Cypriot textile innovations have been fully explored. The symbolic importance of textile production, however, and its evident economic and social significance during the Early-Middle Bronze Age, have been entirely overlooked. The implications of this for the negotiation of status and group identity during this period will be explored in Part IV.C.

When the dominance of the Plank form diminished towards the end of MC II, the fragmented Transitional Anthropomorphs continued its iconographic legacy. This dissolute type eventually combined with stylistic elements borrowed from outside Cyprus and resolved into the bipartite Earring and Flathead tradition of the Late Bronze Age. The physical forms of these Late Cypriot anthropomorphs were certainly indirectly influenced by iconographic traditions of the Near East – Earring Figurines by Badre’s Orontes MAI “type classique” figurines from Northern Syria and Flathead Figurines by Hathoric imagery ultimately deriving from Egypt. Nevertheless, their

523 Contra e.g. J. Karageorghis 1977, 2005; Morris 1985: Washbourne 2000a, 2000b. See also Part IA.2
525 E.g. Webb & Frankel 1999; Smith 2002; Bolger 2003:70-6
conspicuous absence from segregated ritual space suggests against their use in any characteristically Levantine or Egyptian cultic practices. Instead, the dual domestic and funerary contexts of these later anthropomorphs attest to continuity in the location of ritual practices with Early-Middle Cypriot traditions. However, this should not be seen as an indication that either the iteration or the ideological and symbolic basis of these practices had also continued unchanged. Unlike for Plank Figurines, there is no evidence to suggest that Late Cypriot anthropomorphs were displayed erect. Conversely, their small, angled feet and undecorated backs imply that they lay down or, particularly in the case of the smaller, solid versions, were held in the hand. Furthermore, the form of Earring and Flathead Figurines shows no recollection of the original object which had inspired Plank imagery, instead placing evident emphasis on the naked, female body. Whereas explicit gendering had been largely irrelevant to Plank Figurines, MC III – LC I anthropomorphs began to experiment with gendered imagery. Several Transitional Anthropomorphs show ambiguous or dual gender and the depiction of female genitalia is characteristic of Plaque Figurines. By LC II, a consensus had been reached and, with the exception of two male anthropomorphs forming part of Bull Leader Figurines, every single ceramic figurine known until LC IIIB is manifestly female. This concentration on the naked female body certainly makes their involvement in fertility rituals of some kind more likely.

The stylistic association of Flathead Figurines both with Hathoric iconography and Cypriot Bronze female statuettes which stood on miniature copper ingots implies that, in their case, this connection may have been specifically directed towards copper production. This is further supported by the few primary settlement contexts of Flathead Figurines which have predominantly been identified as small-scale manufacturing areas. This package of admittedly piecemeal evidence provides the most compelling case for the use of figurines in the worship of a deity in Bronze Age Cyprus. Given the similarity in their chronological and contextual circumstances, it is tempting to suggest a comparable significance for Earring Figurines and this remains possible. However no comparable bronzes have yet been discovered and the apparent association with Levantine Astarte imagery is complicated by chronological disjunction and the poor provenance of the majority of Syrian figurines known. The significance of the stylistic differences between Earring and Flathead Figurines and its possible association with the expression of group identity will be discussed in Part IV.C.

Base Ring Bull Vessels, the most numerous of the three major Late Cypriot figurine types, were also associated contextually with manufacturing areas. Their vessel form, however, implies their
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526 Contra J.Karageorghis 2005:227
527 In contrast to the expectations of Knapp 2008:185
528 Badre 1980:45-51. Further examples from controlled excavations uncovered since Badre’s study have not yet been subject to detailed study.
practical use in a rather different form of ritual activity involving the pouring of liquids, possibly connected to communal drinking. Feasting and communal drinking practices, particularly in relation to burial ritual, have a long history on Cyprus. They are attested during EC I at the tombs of *Vounous* and in various forms until the end of the Bronze Age. The involvement of zoomorphic vessels in these practices began with the diverse array of types which dominated the figurine record during MC III – LC I. Little is currently understood about the contexts and mode of use of zoomorphic vessels in Anatolia, where inspiration for this Cypriot development may well have originated. On Cyprus, in the absence of chemical analyses to confirm the liquid habitually contained within these vessels, their size and elaboration can only suggest that it was a prized substance, most likely for use under special circumstances. However, the established notion that Base Ring Bull Vessels at least were used primarily in burial ritual is not supported by the evidence. Use-wear apparent on both these and MC III – LC I zoomorphic vessels, together with the joint settlement and cemetery contexts of Base Ring Bull Vessels suggest that they would not have been employed in a single burial feasting scenario but used recurrently prior to deposition, possibly as part of both burial and non-burial activities.

In LC IIA, there is evidence for the first time in Bronze Age Cyprus of organised, communal ritual activities at clearly delineated, built structures of specialised, non-burial ritual use. At these new sites, however, the three major Late Cypriot figurine types and the rituals in which they were involved had no place. Earring Figurines, Flathead Figurines and Base Ring Bull Vessels maintained their idiosyncratic dual settlement/cemetery contexts, standing as testament to far older, Bronze Age Cypriot ritual practices stretching back to the Early Bronze Age. These new ritual locations marked the beginning of the end for traditional Bronze Age Cypriot figurine use and heralded the emergence of a new ritual system which would distinguish the Early Iron Age. New types which developed during LC IIC – IIIA, including Mycenaean or Mycenaean-style figurines and Buff Painted Bulls, straddled the divide between old and new ritual practices and appeared in all three contexts at settlements, burials and ritual spaces. The metamorphosis of Base Ring Bull Vessels into Base Ring Bull Figurines and ultimately Buff Painted Bulls presumably also marked the demise of the use of figurative imagery in ritual liquid pouring activities. The ritual landscape of the Early Iron Age centred on this designated ritual space and required a new range of figurine types for its activities. Along with the first appearance of supernatural creatures in the figurine record in the form of the bicephalic ‘centaur’ figurines, LC IIIB saw a plethora of small, often fairly rudimentary anthropomorphic and zoomorphic figurines replace the Bronze Age types and associated ritual practices altogether.
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529 E.g. Steel 2004b; Webb & Frankel 2008
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531 See Part IIC.1.
As a small island in close proximity to the mainland Near East and lying at the centre of long-distance trading paths between the Aegean, Egypt and the Levant, Cyprus’ economic and socio-cultural landscape has not developed in isolation. Contact between Cyprus and its neighbours throughout the Bronze Age is undisputed but the manner of that contact and the scale of its impact have proven controversial. Fervently debated topics include the influence of cultural contact and possible population movement from Southwest Anatolia at the inception of the Early Bronze Age, from the Levantine coast at the beginning of the Late Bronze Age and from the Aegean during LC IIC – IIIA. Similarly contentious is the question of whether deliberate, economic activities with polities outside the island were controlled by the indigenous Cypriot population or initiated by external exploitation of Cyprus’ obvious resources. This analysis has viewed the figurine record from many different perspectives, as art objects, cultural material, craft products and ritual paraphernalia. All of these define figurative material as potentially demonstrative of kinship, social or ethnic group identity and as such, establish them as useful evidence in assessing external cultural and economic contacts. This section will explore the insights offered by the nuanced stylistic, geographical and contextual analysis of the figurine record into the nature of the relationships between Bronze Age Cypriot sites and communities outside the island.

It has been widely accepted that Cyprus’ deliberate, economic exports began in a limited capacity during MC III – LC I as exploitation of local copper resources began to increase. As the Bronze Age progressed, this trading activity was extended until the island was fully embroiled in the socio-political and economic landscape of the wider Eastern Mediterranean. Broadly, the figurine record does not contradict this pattern. No Cypriot figurines have been found outside the island before MC III – LC I when a tiny number reached the Levantine littoral. This number remained small but steadily increased throughout the Late Bronze Age. The LC II – IIIA evidence suggests limited attempts to modify existing Cypriot figurine types for export to the Levant. Base Ring Horses, Base Ring Bull Protomes and later Flathead Bottles were all rare variations of more established Cypriot types incorporating Levantine features; all are known in small, but similar numbers both on Cyprus and the Levant (Table 19). The strong resemblance of Owl Rattles to widely-exported White Shaved juglets and the absence of any clear indigenous stimulus for their creation suggests that these may also have been part of the same phenomenon.
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532 See Part IIC.1 for discussion of and references for these debates.
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Table 19: Bronze Age Cypriot figurine types possibly designed for export to the Levant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>No. in Cyprus</th>
<th>Cypriot sites</th>
<th>No. in Levant</th>
<th>Levantine sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owl Rattle (OZV)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Enkomi (6), Angastina (3), Dhekelia-Steno, Kaimakli-Evretadhés, Maroni-Tsaroukkas, Pyla</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Qubeibeh (2), Gezer, Lachish, Tel el-Hesi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Ring Horse (HZF)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kazaphani (2), Kalokhorio</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ugarit, Tell Abu Hawam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Ring Bull Protome (BZD)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kazaphani (3), Katydhata, Dhali, Kourion, Amathus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ugarit (2), Tell El-Amarna, Tell Safi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flathead Bottle (FAV)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dhali, Enkomi, Larnaca</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ugarit (2), Gezer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these represents a niche type, created by Cypriots with the Levantine context in mind. Their small numbers and, particularly in the case of the Base Ring types, their heterogenous shapes, suggest that this occurred somewhat haphazardly, either as fulfilment of specific individual requests from Levantine recipients or as ultimately failed entrepreneurial ventures. Owl Rattles are likely to be underrepresented since their broken form is indistinguishable from the far more common White Shaved juglets. Consequently, they have the potential to represent the most numerous, or most successful Cypriot figurine export type. This coincides well with the pattern of focussed trading between Cyprus and the Levant attested by other ceramic wares.\(^{534}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>No. of Cypriot Figurines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ugarit</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lachish</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alalakh</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Abu Hawam</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gezer</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebron</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell el Ajul</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quibeibeh</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megiddo</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heliopolis</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ialysos Mavra-Vouno</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A single Cypriot figurine is known from the following sites: Beth Shemesh, Deir Al-Balah, Jaffa, Shiqmona, Tel Batash, Tel Mor, Tell Abu Zureiq, Tell es-Safi, Tell Kazel, Tell Ta‘Annek, Tell Zakariya, Tyre, El Amarna

Table 20: Extra-island sites at which Cypriot figurines have been found

Whilst it is understood that the presence of figurines can never be simply and directly related to the presence of Cypriot people, several characteristics imply that some may have travelled as personal possessions. Only a relatively small number of figurines have been found outside the island – a total of 86 across the entire Bronze Age, comprising ten different types. These are never found in vast quantities at single sites (Table 20). Just fourteen figurines have been found at Ugarit, the most abundant site and most have far fewer. Together with the absence of any known local imitations of these Cypriot types, this renders unlikely the Levantine adoption of Cypriot practices, either by cultural influence or the influx of long-term settler communities. Similarly, since there is no indication that Cypriot figurines occurred exclusively in markedly high status contexts either on the island or elsewhere, their use in elite gift exchange practices appears equally improbable. However, it is evident that Base Ring Bull Vessels found outside Cyprus occur

\(^{534}\) Gittlen 1981; Prag 1985; Bergoffen 1991
particularly in contexts which also contained numerous other products of Cypriot origin. These contexts also represent a combination of funerary and settlement locations comparable to those in which Base Ring Bull Vessels have been found on Cyprus. Their modes of use in these foreign contexts, therefore, may not have been far removed from the way they would have functioned on the island on which they were made. This similarity stands in marked contrast to the opposing contexts and apparent use of Cypriot objects found elsewhere which are known to have been deliberately exported. The occurrence of many Cypriot figurines outside the island, then, most likely attests to small numbers of temporary Cypriot migrants.

The location of Cypriot figurines in the Near East and Egypt generally coincide closely with the distribution of other Cypriot products during the Late Bronze Age. Pottery and raw materials of Cypriot and Near Eastern origin have also been found in quantities in the Aegean and it seems likely that trade with this area was free flowing during the Late Bronze Age. Striking, however, is the complete absence of Cypriot figurines in the Aegean. Indeed, the three Base Ring Bull Vessels found on Rhodes are the only examples which did not travel East or South East. This eastward directionality, specific to ceramic figurine travel in this area during the Bronze Age (Map 8), is underscored by the fact that figurines of Mycenaean origin are found in Cyprus but no ceramic figurines of Near Eastern origin are known to have reached the island during this period. The mechanisms by which ceramic figurines were travelling in the Late Bronze Age may partly
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536 Cf Mee 1982:22 who suggested that Ialysos-Macrα Vounara Tomb 86 housed a Cypriot merchant who had died there unexpectedly.
537 Compare e.g. Schreiber 2003:52; Map 16 to Map 6 in this thesis.
explain this pattern as it is likely that experimental marketing would be targeted at the closest, most familiar customers. A further, notable characteristic of the general Eastward movement of Late Bronze Age ceramic figurines, however, is that for the duration of the Bronze Age, not a single ceramic figurine originating from Anatolia, the Levant or Egypt has ever been found on Cyprus. This stands in contrast to the small but significant number of metal figurines of Near Eastern origin known from Late Cypriot contexts. Such rare, valuable items were plausibly part of a system of elite gift exchange which operated quite independently of the mechanisms governing the movement of their ceramic counterparts. These absences remain striking and it may be fruitful for future research to consider whether other object types might display a similar pattern.

A comparison of the characteristics of Mycenaean figurines which reached Cyprus and Cypriot figurines in the Near East (Table 21) reveals that most probably travelled under comparable circumstances, as the possessions of temporary migrants. Both represented the full range of figurine types used in their places of origin and both are deposited in similar contexts. However, the comparison also reveals very different ultimate trajectories for these migrant figurines and their users which underline the volatile political situation of the Eastern Mediterranean during the twelfth century BC.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Known</th>
<th>Cypriot Figurines in the Near East</th>
<th>Mycenaean Figurines in Cyprus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types</td>
<td>Zoomorphs and Anthropomorphs, Vessels and Figurines</td>
<td>Zoomorphs and Anthropomorphs, Vessels and Figurines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floreat</td>
<td>LC IIA – IIIA</td>
<td>LC IIC – IIIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find Contexts</td>
<td>Similar to place of origin</td>
<td>Similar to place of origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Imitations</td>
<td>None known</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence on new local types</td>
<td>None known</td>
<td>Yes – Goddess with Upraised Arms (LC IIIB+)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21: Comparison of Imported and Exported Late Bronze Age Figurines

Local imitations of Mycenaean figurines are evident and many of their stylistic features ultimately became entwined with emergent Cypriot figurine types of the Early Iron Age. Additional Mycenaean inspiration may have been unnecessary for the small, schematised zoomorphs known from the Early Iron Age since the Base Ring Bull corpus and Buff Painted Bulls provide ample indigenous inspiration. The influence of Mycenaean Phi types on Early Iron Age Cypriot Goddesses with Upraised Arms, however, is undeniable. Contrastingly, however, there is currently no evidence to suggest that mobile Cypriot figurines had any influence on the development of

539 E.g. silver Hittite stag figurine from Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimitrios Tomb 12 (Larnaca Museum K-AD 1599, South 1997:163; PI.XVI) or Egyptian figure bronze with gold leaf from Trench 11, Zone 65 at Enkomi (Louvre Museum AM 2120, Caubet et al 1981:CKY86)

540 For more on the Aegean in this period see e.g. Sherratt 1998; Deger-Jalkotzy 2003; Dickinson 2010.

541 Contra Webb 1999:218
Levantine figurine styles. This difference suggests that the small, Aegean migrant community, geographically focussed in the South and East, may have remained longer and become more integrated in Cyprus than the Cypriot migrants in the Levant. The motivation of the original migrations may have been economic or even simply exploratory, stimulated by the global atmosphere of the Eastern Mediterranean in the Late Bronze Age. Perhaps escalating instability in the Aegean during the twelfth century BC made it dangerous or undesirable for the migrants to return from Cyprus; that same trouble which would lead to the collapse of polities in the Levant may have ushered the demise of the Cypriot migrants in that area or, more optimistically, have motivated their swifter return to the relative safety of their home island.

The appropriation of Near Eastern tropes into the iconographical and practical development of Cypriot ceramic figurines was complex, sustained and generally indirect. No external style was ever faithfully copied in Bronze Age Cyprus until the Aegeanising figurines of LC IIIA. The Hathoric dimension of Late Cypriot Flathead Figurines was clearly derived from secondary, probably reported contact with the imagery of that goddess either in Egypt or the Levant and incorporated in a distinctly Cypriot manner. The similarities between Syrian anthropomorphs and Earring Figurines, however, demonstrate a long process of cultural exchange between these regions. Many features of Earring Figurines, including their pierced ears and the frequent crossed diagonal pattern seen on the chest, are common to different figurine types from various areas of the Levant, Anatolia and even deeper into the mainland during this period. In Cyprus pierced ears were already present on Early-Middle Cypriot anthropomorphic figurines and vessels and crossed diagonals continue to be seen on anthropomorphic figurines well into the Iron Age. This speaks of concurrent development in the fashions of anthropomorphic representation, and plausibly personal clothing and jewellery trends in Cyprus and the mainland, although the chronological lag between the Orontes MAI “type classique” and Earring Figurines may imply that these styles took some time to reach the somewhat liminal Cyprus. This could only have occurred as a result of consistent contact between areas ensuring concordant changes, neither one copying or influenced by the other but nonetheless developing together.

External influences on Early-Middle Cypriot figurines are more difficult to assess. The absence of substantial figurative material from the Late Chalcolithic and Philia Facies, which may partially be

---

542 However, this material is currently in need of revision. The only wide-ranging study currently extant is Badre’s (1980) work which covers Syrian anthropomorphs only and comprises many unprovenanced or poorly provenanced examples. The numerous figurines discovered in controlled excavations in the intervening decades have not yet been comprehensively examined.

543 Crossed Diagonals feature in Bronze and Iron Age figurines from several areas including Anatolia (e.g. Renfrew 1969:Pl.3c) and Syria (e.g. Badre 1980:Pl.I.20, III.68-70, IX.2, XIV.75, XXVII.19).

544 See Crewe 2012 for the presence of similar archaisms in MC III – LC I imitations of early Middle Bronze Age Levantine ceramics.
a result of the fragile nature of ceramic figurines from this period, obscures any possible indigenous inspiration for the styles of the Earliest Bronze Age. As yet, no direct, stylistic equivalents of any Early-Middle Cypriot figurines are known from Anatolia or elsewhere and there is currently no reason to suggest that the styles were not distinctly Cypriot. It is possible that the domestic use of small zoomorphic figurines attested at Marki-Alonia during EC III – MC II and the introduction of zoomorphic vessels in MC III may have been inspired by practices attested in Anatolia. Again, however, the figurine types which these practices encouraged were markedly different to any known mainland examples. If Anatolian communities did settle on Cyprus at the beginning of the Bronze Age, they neither brought their ceramic figurines with them nor made new versions alike enough to be recognisable.545

However, it is significant that those elements introduced by the Philia Facies which endured longest into the Early-Middle Bronze Age feature prominently in the iconographic repertoire of these periods. Hook-tang weapons, textile technology, cattle and equids account for the vast majority of ceramic figurine symbolism of Object Models, Decorated Vessels and Plank Imagery between EC I – MC II.546 This may have been a response to the significant socio-cultural impact of these innovations on Cyprus but may also have signalled the beginning of Cyprus’ lasting incorporation into broader socio-cultural systems extant on the nearby mainland. It is clear that the textile production technology in use during the Early-Middle Cypriot period, for example, was part of a wider, Anatolian and Eurasian tradition.547 Similarly, the Early-Middle Cypriot burial record, with which the figurative objects of this period were intimately connected, has been shown to have similarities with systems at Palestinian sites.548 Throughout the Bronze Age, many similarities in styles and practices can be attributed to long term contacts and related yet distinct development of representational trends on Cyprus and the mainland. Overall, therefore, the Bronze Age Cypriot figurine record demonstrates wide-ranging, sustained and complex cultural relationships with the Near East from the Earliest Bronze Age to LC IIIA.

545 However, see Frankel & Webb 1999:40 who doubt that any founder communities would ever be archaeologically visible.
546 These enduring innovations were identified by Frankel & Webb 1999:32-4.
548 Stiebing 1971; Keswani 2004:55
IV.C FIGURINES, SOCIO-POLITICAL ORGANISATION AND THE NEGOTIATION OF GROUP IDENTITIES

The changing socio-political organisation of Bronze Age Cyprus has proven particularly controversial to discern from the material record available.\textsuperscript{549} For the Early-Middle Bronze Age, settlement evidence appears to show a relatively egalitarian situation with no indication of hierarchies either within or between sites.\textsuperscript{550} The burial record has been interpreted to suggest that status was ascribed rather than inherited until EC III whereupon kinship and allegiance with ancestors was of considerable importance and remained so for the rest of the Bronze Age.\textsuperscript{551} For the Late Cypriot period, debate centres on the relative hierarchies of the new urban centres, the possibility of distinct elite groups within those centres and the question of whether any single site could ever have been in overall control.\textsuperscript{552} The Bronze Age Cypriot figurine record holds significant, and as yet largely untapped potential as a resource from which to explore this complex and controversial socio-political landscape through its specific relationship with group identity.

Several factors combine to establish the importance of Bronze Age Cypriot figurines in this area. During the first half of the Bronze Age, many types and styles were specific to particular regions of the island and even to single sites, promoting the possibility of an association, whether deliberate or accidental, with local groups. This is underlined by the frequent involvement of these symbolic objects in significant communal activities such as funerary rituals or group feasting at which publicly affirming group identities and status was of central importance.\textsuperscript{553} Most strikingly, the segregation of figurine types in the burial arena throughout the Bronze Age demonstrates a degree of selectivity not otherwise readily apparent in the material record. Not every tomb had a figurine at all and in those that did, a single type was chosen from all those in contemporary use. This specificity and variation in figurine use within burial suggests that, although much of Bronze Age Cypriot funerary ritual was probably conducted according to a proscribed system, there was also a significant element of personal choice in what was included. Although the variability of the burial record obscures for the most part the exact criteria on which this choice was made, it is reasonable to presume that it was based on the identity or status of the deceased and/or those conducting the burial.\textsuperscript{554} Since tombs with figurines are indistinguishable architecturally or

\textsuperscript{549} See Part IIC.1 for a more detailed discussion of current theories on socio-political organisation during this period.
\textsuperscript{550} Steel 2004a:130-1
\textsuperscript{551} Keswani 2005:359-62; Webb & Frankel 2010:198-200
\textsuperscript{552} E.g. Keswani 1996; Peltenburg 1996; Manning 1998; Webb 2005
\textsuperscript{553} E.g. Keswani 2005; Webb & Frankel 2008
\textsuperscript{554} Keswani 2005:341.
spatially from those without, this underlines the importance of the funerary ritual itself, rather than its visible footprint, for the demonstration of this identity.

The clear association of many Bronze Age Cypriot figurine types with the display and negotiation of group identity and social position within the wider community means that significant diachronic changes in their use and styles may indicate concomitant changes in the power structure or socio-cultural allegiances on Cyprus. Similarly, the existence of related sets of imagery across different areas of the island may imply social or economic connections between distant places or deliberate referencing of a dominant image type by smaller groups in order to boost their social standing or actual power. This section will consider the implications of observable transformations in the figurine record for our understanding of the changing socio-political climate of Cyprus during the Bronze Age.

Studies of the broader ceramic record have shown that Cyprus at the beginning of the Bronze Age largely comprised isolated sites or regions. These became increasingly embroiled as the period progressed and culminated in the more culturally integrated island of the Late Bronze Age.\(^{555}\) This was punctuated by junctions of significant social upheaval, in particular the transition from the Middle to Late Bronze Age. Overall, changes in the geographical distributions of figurine types and styles coincide with this picture. Consideration of specific iconographic and functional transformations, however, offers insight into the possible socio-economic mechanisms which may have underpinned these developments. EC I – II figurine use is markedly dislocated across the island as the known clusters of figurines in the North Coast and elsewhere appear completely unrelated in style and usage. This demonstrates that there was little significant interaction between these culturally distinct areas of the island.\(^{556}\) Moreover, it suggests that there was little interest during this period in using figurative material to compete on a community level. In contrast, from EC III to LC I the figurine record shows burgeoning communal languages of representation, manifest in distinctly localised variations. These demonstrate increasing engagement between distant regions of the island and an escalating interest in communicating, and possibly competing with other communities through the use and manipulation of comparable imagery.

During EC III – MC II, the iconography of choice across the island was clearly rooted in the figurative material of the North Coast. Early Anthropomorphic Vessels, Comb imagery and, most prominently, the Plank phenomenon are all attested across the island in distinctly localised forms. Particular variations of Plank imagery, for instance, are traceable in the South West, Central Island


\(^{556}\) See e.g. Herscher 1991; Webb & Frankel 2006:105-6 on the cultural singularity of the North Coast during this period.
and at Vounous, and Early Anthropomorphic Vessels appear in at least three regional forms centring on Vounous, Kalavasos and Limassol. Lapithos was evidently the nexus for the extensive Plank tradition. Plank Figurines are by far the most numerous at this site and examples of almost every local variation have been found there. It has been argued elsewhere, predominantly on ceramic evidence, that those buried at Lapithos maintained extensive cultural or economic contacts with much of the island and the prevalence of Lapithos’ imagery elsewhere in Cyprus supports this notion. Since variations associated with the rest of the North Coast and Central Island sites were all found there, the most direct contacts were probably with these areas. The existence at both Vounous and Lapithos of stone Plank Figurines characteristic of the South West, however, stresses the wide-ranging networks of sites during this period and the fact that geographic distance was no longer a permanent barrier. Crucially, however, the popularity of Plank imagery also implies that those communities which came across Lapithos’ system of representation thought it desirable or beneficial to emulate it. The communities of Lapithos with which Plank imagery was associated, therefore, appear to have become more and more visibly pre-eminent during EC III – MC II. Yet the other regions who decided to adopt or reference the Plank imagery of Lapithos also sought to maintain their own individuality by reinterpreting the tradition in their distinctly local ways.

This study has argued that the major North Coast figurine types were symbolically founded on the production and use of textiles. The tools of the industry were portrayed in Spindle Models and Comb Models and motifs; several Scenic Models and Vessels have also been reinterpreted here as depictions of the processes involved in dyeing fabric. Textile symbolism is also emphasised on Plank Figurines by the inclusion of Comb motifs on several examples and by the decorated clothing depicted on the majority. The association of Plank Figurines with this trope is also underlined by their spatial association with textile tools within burials at Lapithos. In combination, and together with the large numbers of decorated spindle whorls deposited in Early-Middle Cypriot tombs, the figurine record presents a substantial package of textile-related symbolism which appears to have underpinned the display of identity during this period. The objects and activities involved in the production of textiles were deemed of particular importance, suggesting that the power of this symbolism was not founded purely on the visible results of the endeavour – the elaborate clothing and materials which would have been obvious indications of allegiance and status. Instead, it seems that the economic activity of manufacturing textiles was of greater significance and may well have underpinned the power base of those groups who created and displayed these pervasive figurative objects.

557 Frankel 1974; Webb 2009
558 For detailed review of Early-Middle Cypriot spindle whorls see Crewe 1998
Most studies of the Bronze Age Cypriot socio-economic climate inevitably focus on the exploitation and acquisition of copper as the primary activity through which wealth and status was gained.\textsuperscript{559} The possibility of power and identity based instead on the production of elaborate textiles has been overlooked, largely, perhaps, due to the fragility and subsequent scarcity of its products in excavation in contrast to durable, omnipresent metals. This industry would have been complex and extensive, involving the acquisition of crops and animals for raw materials, spinning these to create threads, collecting precious dyes, completing the unpleasant and possibly dangerous process of dyeing and finally weaving and sewing the dyed threads into a finished piece.\textsuperscript{560} The evident importance of textile symbolism recognised by this study presents the likelihood that groups at Lapithos and elsewhere may have founded their status on this enigmatic industry. Exploration of this possibility would prove a fruitful avenue of future research.

With the abandonment of first Vounous then Lapithos cemeteries at the end of the Middle Bronze Age, the Plank tradition was decimated and the majority of this textile imagery disappeared completely. The textile wealth which had probably held Lapithos’ groups in prominence had dissolved by MC III and its symbolism was no longer appropriate. Instead, a new contrasting, communal language of figurative representation emerged, founded on zoomorphic pouring vessels. This new figurine repertoire was once again distinctly regional but nevertheless based on a common set of rules governing the style and manner of depiction. Overall, the MC III – LC I figurine record demonstrates the broad, East/West cultural division of the island noted by many researchers who have investigated this period.\textsuperscript{561} The only exported figurines are types, such as Rectangular Zoomorphs, which cluster in the East of the island. Similarly, most types distinctive of Western Cyprus appear to have been connected to Morphou-Toumba tou Skourou. The possibility that this site was a hub of figurative vessel production emphasises the emergence of specialist ceramic manufacturing sites during LC I, rendering the sustained presence of localised figurine types all the more deliberate. In contrast, the centre of the island, at which the majority of types are attested, appears to have been a nexus of communication through which much long-distance communication would have passed.\textsuperscript{562} Significantly, the limited Transitional Anthropmorphs which helped to transform the vestiges of Plank imagery into Late Cypriot Earring and Flathead Figurines, were also predominantly found in Central sites. This supports the idea that this area was somewhat shielded from the upheaval of the rest of the island during MC III – LC I, thanks to

\textsuperscript{559} E.g. Manning 1993; Frankel & Webb 2001:38-41; Keswani 2004:38, 149-50; Knapp 2008:74-8, 129, 348; See also Crewe 2012 for possible MC III – LC I mechanisms of status assertion not based on the symbolic and economic supremacy of copper.

\textsuperscript{560} See Barber 1991 for a detailed account of the processes involved in this industry in prehistory.

\textsuperscript{561} E.g. Manning et al 2002

\textsuperscript{562} C.f. Georgiou 2009
its ability to act as such a hub. In addition, the figurine record of this period further demonstrates a thriving network of inter-island economic and cultural connections, both through its common representational language and in isolated appearances of types outside their characteristic regional zone. Some of these, such as the zoomorphic vessel in Red-on-Black ware found at Kalopsidha (UZV.Kal.01), outside its Karpas heartland, attest to the movement of actual objects. The fragmentary Plaque Figurine from Kissonerga-Skalia, on the other hand, made of local, Drab Polished ware but in a type most commonly made of Plain White ware characteristic of the East of the island, perhaps speaks of more targeted, competitive contacts with distant sites.

Most significant, however, are the sweeping transformations in figurine types and styles of representation. By MC III, the symbolism of textiles was no longer considered a potent marker by which to define group identity and status and the ritual activities in which Plank Figurines were involved had been overshadowed. The new pouring vessels were plausibly involved in practices of communal drinking at which several communities may have gathered, possibly at large sites such as the contemporary ‘forts’ or enclosures. Groups who took part in these activities took the opportunity to display their group allegiance through the type of figurative vessel used. The manner of these activities and the symbolism employed in them may have been part of the broader move to emulate elite practices encountered in communities of the mainland Near East. In contemporary Anatolia, for example, many independent, urban sites, situated on low tells, surrounded by enceinte walls, engaged in extensive, far-reaching trading activities. Each site also used locally distinctive, zoomorphic vessels. It is possible that some Cypriot communities were engaging in similar, smaller-scale, competitive identity negotiation, building walled sites on low, natural hill plateaux and using their own, new forms of zoomorphic imagery on pouring vessels. Contextual study of Figurative and Decorated Vessels from the Near East and Anatolia in comparison to the Cypriot material would help to clarify these apparent similarities in function and significance and offer essential insight into this much-debated period in Cyprus’ history.

The ultimate emergence of Base Ring Bull Vessels in LC IIA did not represent a simple reproduction of any single LC I local form and thus one particular group gaining ideological or social supremacy over the rest. Instead, it was an amalgamation of figurative ideas presented during the earlier period, the culmination of a long process of cultural homogenisation in which each, still separate group, came to use similar imagery for the same practice. Similarly, Earring

563 Georgiou 2009:66
564 Merrillees 1979:119
565 A Plain White Handmade pithos found at Kissonerga-Skalia in 2011, of Eastern style but also made in local Drab Polished ware, provides additional evidence for trade links between the South West and the East of the island (L.Crewe pers. comm. 18 Mar 2012).
566 See e.g. Philip 1991:93
567 Sagona & Zimmansky 2009:225
and Flathead Figurines derive from the canonisation of the eclectic MC III – LC I anthropomorphs. These three types, however, remained separate and demonstrate internal stylistic variation in a way which would not occur in standardised, mass-produced systems of representation. The continuing segregation of these types in burial assemblages underlines the possibility that they were probably still associated with particular social or kinship groups. The diverse forms of Earring and Flathead Figurines and their implications for actual, physical manifestations of status identified in this study may suggest that certain groups were calling on opposing symbolic bases through which to display their identities. If Flathead Figurines reference women whose heads were deliberately shaped in infancy, this implies a group allegiance defined at birth, by kinship or heredity which could neither be acquired nor surrendered in adulthood. Earring Figurines, on the other hand, may be connected to the practice of wearing multiple, heavy, precious metal earrings as a marker of status. As the earring sets from Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimitrios Tomb 11 suggest, the wearing of such earrings may have been a recognisable and calculable expression of wealth. Piercings can be added, however, and earrings added or removed at any time during a person’s life. This wealth and this particular manner of expressing it may be acquired, augmented or lost at any given point. If Flathead Figurines stood for inherited wealth, perhaps Earring Figurines represented the “nouveaux riches”.

These oppositions, together with the different external elements in their iconography, suggest that they may have been used by separate groups who based their identities on different criteria. Base Ring Bull Vessels may represent another group who valued communal drinking practices and zoomorphic imagery and, of course, not every group would have used figurines at all. Unlike the stylistic variations of the past, however, these types were not constrained to any particular region. Instead, their modes of production and distribution, illustrated by matching pairs and groups found at distant sites, are indicative of an integrated, island-wide, cultural network. At many sites, particularly the larger, urban centres, all figurine types were represented, suggesting a series of intermingled communities in which those of different kinship or other social affiliations conducted their lives and buried their dead side by side. In some sites, particularly in the East, the small cluster of Mycenaean figurines may suggest that some of these groups maintained ethnic identities from outside the island.

568 Contra Karageorghis 1993:1-2, 21
More than three times as many Late Cypriot figurines have been found at Enkomi as at the next most abundant site (Table 22).\textsuperscript{569} Although this is partially accounted for by its extensive excavation and subsequent publication, both by the excavators and the museums in which its objects are housed, this disproportion remains striking. The range of figurine types found at Enkomi is comparable to that found elsewhere on the island and each is represented in relatively even proportions. There is, therefore, no reason to suspect that styles specific to Enkomi were iconographically dominant in this period, as those of Lapithos had been in the Early-Middle Bronze Age. Equally, it is apparent that Enkomi was probably comparable in size, if not slightly small than Maroni and Hala Sultan Tekke so the elevated figurine use cannot be explained by a larger population.\textsuperscript{570} This considerable number of figurines may instead suggest that the need for overt signalling of group identity was more important at Enkomi than at any other site. This might help to characterise Enkomi as the thriving, bustling capital, politically and socially superior to the majority of the island argued for and against in equal measure in existing scholarship.\textsuperscript{571}

The final disappearance of Base Ring Bull Imagery, Earring and Flathead Figurines during LC IIIA marked another, significant transformation in the manner in which group identity was displayed and the symbolism on which this display was predicated. Further consideration of the mechanisms behind this transformation cannot be sensibly considered until a similarly detailed study of the manifestly non-Bronze Age system of small, schematic figurines emerging in LC IIIB and the subsequent Early Iron Age tradition which it prefaced. That, however, is a question for another thesis.\textsuperscript{572}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{569} It should be noted that the numbers of figurines known for Maroni will certainly rise on publication of its final excavation volume in the near future (D. Sewell pers. comm. 5 Feb 2010).
\textsuperscript{570} Knapp 2008:140, Figure 24
\textsuperscript{571} E.g. Peltenburg 1996; Knapp 2008:339-41; contra e.g. Keswani 1996; Manning 1998:53
\textsuperscript{572} Work on this material is currently being conducted by K. Zeman-Wiśniewska, Trinity College Dublin.}
This project set out to provide the “focussed, contextual and quantitative research” which has long been missing from the study of Bronze Age Cypriot figurines. It has collated an extensive, detailed database including all known ceramic representations of humans, animals and inanimate objects, depicted as independent figurines, Decorated and Figurative Vessels. The straightforward typology defined here is the only system yet devised which encompasses the full range of figurative material, some 1790 provenanced and unprovenanced objects. Together, the database and the typology have established a confident, comprehensive basis both for the present thesis and for any future studies or excavations which encounter Bronze Age Cypriot figurines. On the one hand, the combined system of rigorous contextual and iconographic analyses developed in this project has enabled focussed, detailed and substantiated interpretations to be offered for every figurine type identified by the typology. On the other hand, one of the key advantages of this project has been its broad material and chronological focus. By investigating every ceramic figurine type in contemporary use, rather than privileging a single type or form, it has been possible to establish a full picture of the interconnected function and significance of these objects at each stage of the Bronze Age. In addition, the longue durée approach, covering c.1200 years from the beginning of the Bronze Age in EC I to the end of Bronze Age figurine use in LC IIIA, has made it possible to identify and interpret significant diachronic changes in the styles and usage of figurines. This has been a crucial factor in the final part of this project which has used figurines as evidence to explore the dynamic and changing Bronze Age Cypriot socio-cultural climate in which they were made and used.

Several important developments in the symbolic basis and practical function of figurines have been identified in this project, many of which have been shown to have considerable consequences for our understanding of Bronze Age Cypriot society. A number of areas of potential future research have also been recognised which would enhance interpretations of the figurines themselves, their contexts and their socio-cultural implications. Scientific studies, which have never been attempted on Cypriot ceramic figurines, would add considerably to our understanding of their manufacture and use. Non-destructive petrographic analysis, for example, could elucidate the origin of the matching groups of Late Cypriot figurines or the heartland of each distinctive MC III – LC I zoomorphic vessel type. It may also enable some of the unprovenanced material to be tied to a place of manufacture. Equally, residue analysis, especially on zoomorphic vessels could reveal with more certainty the liquid habitually contained within

---

573 Knapp 2008:184
them and clarify whether the substance was always the same or whether it may have varied according to type. The technicalities and destructive nature of this analysis, however, would probably preclude the use of museum examples and this would therefore require the cooperation of excavators to set aside suitable sherds as they are uncovered.

Comprehensive studies of ceramic figurines outside the chronological and geographical boundaries of this study, conducted with similar methodological rigour, would also be beneficial. On Cyprus, further, careful excavation of Philia settlements may reveal additional examples which would help to clarify any indigenous origin for Early Cypriot figurines. Particularly crucial, however, is the need for a better, contextual understanding of figurines from Bronze Age Anatolia and the Near East, if the iconographical relationship between Cyprus and its neighbours is to be fully appreciated. The current, piecemeal situation makes it especially difficult to identify any specific iconographic or functional parallels which may have existed or to discover any reverse influence from Cypriot figurines on those of the surrounding areas. The geographical area of this project and the numbers of figurines involved would be vast and it would probably be best accomplished as a collaborative endeavour. The many figurines uncovered by systematic excavations in these areas over the last few decades, which have never been subject to wholesale investigation, suggest that contextual analysis would prove incredibly fruitful.

Finally, some of the most significant discoveries made by this thesis deserve additional investigation in focussed projects of their own. In particular, the hitherto unrecognised significance of textile production in the symbolism of Early-Middle Bronze Age Cyprus presents the possibility that textile wealth was an important economic driving force for the rise of elites during this period. There is a considerable amount of evidence available for this overtly enigmatic industry. Studies have been completed, for example, on spindle whorls, loom weights and spindles and the processes used in textile creation. Furthermore, the locations of some weaving and dyeing activities have been excavated at Marki-Alonia, for instance, and Pyrgos-Mavroraki. Combination of these and additional studies on the raw materials and practical execution of this industry could sensibly be used to explore the socio-economic implications of a thriving Early-Middle Cypriot textile industry. This would provide a valuable alternative to the perceived dominance of metals in the development of Cypriot society.

This project has encompassed many contrasting methodological and theoretical concerns, maintaining detailed evaluations amidst broad perspective and unravelling the complexities of figurine use whilst also using those complexities to elucidate the society from which they came.

---

575 Frankel & Webb 1996, 2006; Belgiorno 2009
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Above all, it has walked the narrow line between appreciating figurines as symbolically-loaded, visually-striking ‘art’ objects and investigating them analytically as material things, made and used in a dynamic and changing society. In so doing, it is hoped that this project has made significant strides towards ‘making sense’ of figurines in Bronze Age Cyprus.
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APPENDIX 1

TYPE BY TYPE ANALYSIS

This reference section gives detailed, quantitative and descriptive information about each type as defined by this project. The information on chronology, geography, context, physical characteristics and condition set out here was collected using the methodology described in Part II. It summarises the raw data on which the analyses and interpretations in Parts III and IV are based and should be used in conjunction with the Database.

Notes

- A figurine is defined as ‘fragmentary’ if half or less of the object survives.
- Numbers in brackets (n) show the number of provenanced examples which display the trait described. Unprovenanced examples have been included in the calculations for size ranges, materials and stylistic features; such mixed samples are denoted thus: {n}.
- All tallies are given in figures for clarity
- “Dates” records the range of use as indicated by the system described in Part IID.2.
- For a detailed description of the abbreviations and labelling system used here see Part IID.1.
- The difficulty in determining the ceramic ware subcategories for figurines has been described in Part IIB.3. Here only the major divisions are used with subcategories indicated only where there is no ambiguity.
- This Appendix is organised according to the Typological Key, given in Part II and repeated here (Fig 92) for convenience.
- A concordance chart with the three best known existing systems has been provided at the end (Table 23).

Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONS</th>
<th>POTTERY WARES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>Red Polished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Coast</td>
<td>Drab Polished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>WP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karpas</td>
<td>White Painted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>BR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Mesaoria Plain and Coast</td>
<td>Base Ring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Island</td>
<td>Black Slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>BP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast</td>
<td>Black Polished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>PWHM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>Plain White Handmade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev</td>
<td>RS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levant</td>
<td>Red Slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egy</td>
<td>Bichr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>White Painted (Bichrome)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeg</td>
<td>RonB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean</td>
<td>Red on Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WPWM III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Painted Wheelmade III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig 92: Typological key

* Categories in italics represent types which cannot be included in the main analysis for revisions explained in Appendix 1: those labelled miscellaneous comprise figures which cannot be fitted into the typological system due to fragmentation, insufficient available information or, rarely, unique form.
Cradleboard Figurines (CAF)  
(Fig 93, Fig 94, Chart 18)

18 provenanced examples (of which 10 are fragmentary)
12 recorded unprovenanced examples (of which 1 is fragmentary)

Dates: EC III – MC III

Context: Settlement (9) Tomb (5) Uncertain (4)

Regions: C (13) NC (3) K (1) SC (1)

Material: RP {18} WP {12} [inc WP III {1} WP III-IV {1} WP V {1}]

Size: Height – between 9.6cm and 28.3cm [mean = 16.7cm]

Shape: These solid, handmade figurines are characterised by their flat, rectangular shape and one or two distinctive semicircular cradle arches at one end. Under each cradle arch a small anthropomorph is created from a rolled pellet of clay with incised facial features. The figure is often covered partially with a layer of clay which merges its base into the main body of the cradle and gives the impression of the figure lying under covers.

Decoration: Covered with geometric patterns, either incised and lime-filled on the RP examples or painted on the WP examples.

Variations: Examples of this type can incorporate either one or two small pellet anthropomorphs beneath individual cradle arches. On 2 examples (CAF.Ayl.01 and CAF.Ida.01), the arms of this anthropomorph are visible and what appear to be legs are also visible on the former. A further example (CAF.Lap.01) has large modelled arms, as if the entire “cradle” is anthropomorphised. This perhaps represents some iconographical overlap between the Plank figurine tradition and the cradleboards. CAF.NON.12, which apparently has large semi-circular, single-pierced ears added to the sides of the cradleboard, may also exemplify such an overlap.
Condition: Many examples are significantly worn. Coupled with their presence in settlement contexts, this suggests a prolonged, pre-funerary use-life. However, the small number of extant examples reveal no patterns of use-wear or deliberate, pre-depositional breakage. The broken cradle arches which exist on several examples can be attributed to the obvious frailty of this protruding feature, rather than to any deliberate breakage act. Although the fragments are mostly mid-torso sections, this too is probably not significant as the lower torso could easily be mistaken for the more common Plank Figurines (PAF); only those which are rounded or elliptical in section might be readily identified as cradleboards.
Plank Figurines (PAF)  
*(Fig 95, Fig 96, Chart 19, Chart 20)*

134 provenanced examples (of which 70 are fragmentary)
74 recorded unprovenanced examples (of which 10 are fragmentary)

Dates: EC III – MC II

Context: Tomb (68) Settlement (41) Uncertain (25)

Regions: C (70) NC (50) SW (11) NW (3)

Material: RP {179} WP {10} *(of which WP II (1), WP II/III (2), WP IV (1)),
Stone {13} *(of which chalk (3), Gypsum (2), limestone (1), alabaster (1))*,
DP{2} RS {2} BP{1} ? {1}

Size: Height (clay) – between 8.8cm and 33.6cm [mean = 22.1cm]
Width (clay) – between 3cm and 20.6cm [mean = 9.6cm]
Thickness (clay) – between 0.5cm and 3.8cm [mean = 1.3cm]
Height (stone) – between 22cm and 81cm [mean = 53cm]

Shape: The basic form of these solid, handmade figurines comprises one large rectangle representing the torso, with one smaller rectangle on top of this, representing the head and neck. Facial features are usually indicated by a raised bump in the middle of the head for the nose and two small depressions above it on either side, presumably for eyes. The majority (82) have no additional modelled features but when these occur they are in relief.
Decoration: All Plank Figurines are highly decorated. The manner of decoration varies according to ware – painted on WP and some stone examples, incised and lime-filled on RP, BP and DP figurines. Most are decorated on the front and back, head and torso and many have decoration on the narrow edges at the sides and top. The patterns are varied and no two Plank Figurines are decorated in exactly the same way. However, the overall design scheme is fairly standard (Fig 96).

Variations: A small number {7} conflate the torso and the head/neck features in a single rectangle. Others have slight projections at the side of the upper torso, giving the shoulders an almost triangular shape {15}. Given that at least 2 examples (PAF.NON.59 and 64) have these projections above relief arms, it is possible that they represent clothing features rather than vestigial arms.

---

Fig 96: Plank figurine design scheme showing most common decorative elements

---
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Some examples include additional modelled features: arms, either in relief against the body, {21}, holding a babe-in-arms {10}, as short projections, protruding out from the shoulders and down {15}; low relief cones to indicate breasts {60}; semicircular ears, protruding from the sides of the head and pierced either once {47}, twice {14}, three times {11}, four times {6} or five times {3} – there are also some which clearly had pierced ears but for which it is no longer possible to determine the number of piercings {11}; a small number of Plank figures {10} hold an infant in a cradleboard in their arms, facing towards the left of the figure.

The majority of Plank figures have only one neck, however there are some examples which have more: of those which have two necks {19}, most have a face on each neck {11}, but some share one face at the centre of the top joining edge {4}, on the rest it is impossible to determine {4}; of those which have three necks {2}, PAF.Kri.03 shares a single, central face and PAF.Dhe.13 has a face on each neck.\footnote{Myres (1946:fig5, Pl.26.2) includes another object from Lapithos-Vrysi tou Barba, Tomb 201 in his group of figurines. Although similar to a 3-necked Plank figurine, it is probably the handle of a complex vessel.}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{chart20.png}
\caption{Chart 20: Plank figurine fragments (showing number of examples)}
\end{figure}

The 80 fragmentary examples have been identified as shown in Chart 20.

Overall, this represents c.29% head fragments and 52% torso fragments. Taking into account that torso fragments are more difficult to identify and therefore more often overlooked and given that the torso is approximately double the size of the head, this distribution alone suggests nothing more than accidental breakage.
Within the 53 near complete examples whose condition can be determined, there appears to be no common pattern to the damage sustained by each object. Some, such as PAF.Lap.05 or PAF.Vou.02, appear to be in remarkably good condition with no noticeable damage or ware. These may have been made specifically for the context in which they were deposited, or kept away from touch or accident during their pre-deposition life and thus remained pristine.

Most PAFs, however, have some damage to the extremities of the object and/or wear to the surface. Some of the poorer conditions can be explained by the way the figurine lay in the ground – the concretions on PAF.Lap.31, for example. However, alongside the high number of fragmentary PAFs, wear to the noses and edges in particular suggest that many figurines were used and handled for some time before deposition.

At least 5 examples (PAF.Aka.01, PAF.Dhe.11, PAF.Lap.32, PAF.Mrk.04, PAF.Mrk.05) seem to have been blackened by fire. Unfortunately, there is no correlation in the style or context of these objects and these must currently, therefore, be treated as isolated accidents.

The clearest evidence for deliberate breakage within the PAF group is provided by at least 87 figurines from a variety of sites, often in otherwise good condition, with only a single break (eg. PAF.Lap.22; PAF.Amb.01; PAF.Dhe.08). This break has frequently been repaired post-excavation and is most commonly found across the upper chest or mid torso. Although this is not apparent on every figurine, there is reason to suggest deliberate snapping of these objects in at least some cases.

Notes: Plank imagery also appears as miniature figurines attached to vessels (PAD, JMD, YMD). There is a single known vessel on which a Plank Figurine has been incised. Unfortunately, this RP/BP bowl, from the Pierides Collection in Larnaca, has no provenance. However, it does raise the possibility that Plank imagery was not originally confined to the stone and clay figurines which have survived.
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Transitional Anthropomorph (TAF)

6 provenanced examples
6 recorded unprovenanced examples

Dates: MC II – LC I (on material and stylistic as no datable contexts are available)\textsuperscript{579}

Context: Tomb (3) Uncertain (3)

Regions: C (5) SW (1)


Size: Height – between 10.3cm and 35.5cm [mean = 22.5cm]

Shape: This heterogenous group are all handmade with flattened, elongated bodies, arms, legs and pierced ears. Eyes are rendered by depressions and noses protrude above a horizontal incision for the mouth.

Decoration: Most examples have some decoration, usually in bands across the body, incised or painted according to ware.

Variations: Each figurine within this group is unique, although bound by the description above. Three examples carry an infant in a cradleboard; a further example (TAF.NON.04) also carries an object which may be an infant without a cradleboard but lacks its head for certain identification. Three examples have a rounded, almost cylindrical body and some have low relief cone breasts [7].

Condition: All of these objects are damaged in some way, usually with an arm or foot missing. However, there is no reason to suggest that this was caused by anything other than accidental breakage since there is no evident pattern. Information regarding surface wear could not be determined for this type.

\textsuperscript{579} It appears likely that the solid, RP III example holding a cradled infant (TAF.Mrk.01) represents the earliest of the group and the hollow, Black Slip example (TAF.Ala.02) one of the latest.
Plaque Figurines (QAF)

2 provenanced examples (of which 1 is fragmentary)
7 recorded unprovenanced examples

Dates: LC I (based on material alone as no stratified examples exist)

Context: Settlement (1) Tomb (1)

Regions: K (1) SW (1)

Material: PWHM (7) RS (1) DP (1)

Size: Height – between 10.7cm and 18.5cm [mean = 15.2cm]

Shape: These handmade, solid objects have long, rectangular bodies and heads of similar width which incorporate large pierced ears. Breasts are shown in low relief and female genitalia rendered by a small incision surrounded by impressed circles or dots. Faces widen to the centre to indicate the nose and eyes are small depressions.

Decoration: Limited decoration is provided by impressed circles or dots around the neck (3).

Variations: On 4 examples, legs are indicated by a short, vertical incision. Separated legs are shown on 2 examples. QAF.Ayl.01 has no pierced ears.

Condition: Little information could be discerned about the condition of these objects.
**Earring Figurines (EAF)**

(Fig 101, Fig 103, Fig 102, Chart 21)

59 provenanced examples (of which 18 are fragmentary)\(^{580}\)

53 recorded unprovenanced examples (of which 2 are fragmentary)

Dates: LC IIA – IIIA

Context: Tomb (24) Settlement (18) Uncertain (17)

Regions: E (16) C (15) NW (9) SC (7) Lev (6) SW (3) NC (1) K (2)

Material: BR fig\(^{581}\) \{112\}

Size: Height (Hollow) – between 15.7cm and 29cm [mean = 20.1cm]

(Solid) – between 11.5cm and 16.3cm [mean = 13.7cm]

Shape: These handmade figurines have distinctive, large, semi-circular, ears, with multiple piercings and associated earrings, protruding from either side of their roughly rectangular head. On the front of the head, in the centre is a prominent, triangular nose, either side of which are eyes made from applied pellets with incised circles. The neck is roughly cylindrical, leading to a body which usually widens significantly towards the hips. Narrow, cylindrical arms protrude from the shoulders; breasts are rendered by relief cones. Fingers are indicated by long incised dashes on the hands. The body tapers again from the hips as the legs lead down to the feet. There is a deep groove between the legs which appear to have been made in two independent sections.

---

\(^{580}\) An additional 5 fragmentary BR anthropomorphs (BAF) can only be broadly attributed to either the EAF or FAF categories due to their limited size (mostly foot and leg fragments).

\(^{581}\) Although commonly referred to as Base Ring II, it is now generally accepted that figurines cannot be strictly tied to either category and appear instead to be a separate variant of Base Ring ware. For clarity I have called this BR fig, Note that when Decorated and Figurative Vessel forms are more readily accepted as Base Ring II and have been described as such where appropriate (see Part IID.1 for more detail).
The feet are shown by a slight widening of the leg, often in an almost fish-tail shape.

Decoration:

All decoration on these figurines is done by incisions; there is no paint present. The pubic triangle (Fig 102, G) is represented by a straight line border, filled with herringbone dashes (with some variation in the number of border lines and the pattern of the dashes).

The eyebrows are rendered by a band of incised diagonals across the forehead.

At the front of the neck (Fig 102, B), the majority of these objects have multiple incised horizontals numbering: two {20}, three {39}, four {5}, five {3}, six {1} or seven {1}. A small number of examples {3} show a different pattern of lines at the neck, consisting of a single-framed band of diagonal dashes. On 3, it is clear that no neck decoration was ever present. There are 37 examples on which it is not possible to determine the type of neck decoration. On a small number of figurines, these lines are continued around the back of the neck, otherwise the back lacks any decoration.

Some figurines {33} have additional incised decoration on their torso (Fig 102, D). This consists either of two lines crossing between the breasts {8}, single or...
multiple horizontal lines {13}, a combination of the two {10} or other individual patterns {2}. There are 31 figurines with no torso decoration but on 48 examples it is impossible to tell.

Variations: These figurines exist in both hollow {55} and solid {39} forms.

There is a significant amount of variation in the number of piercings in each ear and in the number and type of earrings which occupy them (Fig 102, A). The majority of examples (on which the ears survive) have two piercings in each ear {58}, but there are some which have three {6}. On those examples where the piercings remain intact, there is also variation in the number and type of earrings present. The majority {31} have hoop earrings, made of a single band of clay, bent and joined into a circle but very occasionally {4} they appear to have stud earrings, formed from pellets of clay with incised circles in a similar fashion to the rendering of the eyes. On 1 example (EAF.Kat.02), the studs are pierced with a small central hole. The significant variation in the number and positioning of the hoop earrings is most probably heavily influenced by ancient breakage and modern restoration.

A number of examples carry a baby {49} (Fig 102, E). The heads of the babies are circular, pinched sideways so that the nose is portrayed by the shape of the head. The eyes are incised circles on the sides of the head. The body widens slightly towards the bottom; small arms come from the shoulder area; the fingers are rendered by short incised dashes; the base is surrounded by short incised vertical dashes which probably represent the bottom edge of a garment, rather than the toes of the baby. For the most part, the babies sit, fairly upright, on the right hand side of the figure, surrounded by its right arm {18}; on some, the baby is lying down horizontally, held by both arms in the centre of the figurine {5}; on others it is positioned in the middle, arms outstretched {7}, in a such a position that they were originally described as a birds with outstretched wings; finally a group of solid figurines {7} apparently hold a very small, rudimentary infant squashed between their breasts. On several figurines the baby is broken or missing and its original position consequently uncertain {12}. 
In addition EAF.Ala.01 appears to hold a vessel (but this may be reconstruction) and EAF.Ala.03 a disc (but this is likely to be artistic licence in the drawing by Perrot & Chipiez as discussed in Part IIA.2).

Some examples {14} have a navel in the centre of their stomach (Fig 102, F), either in the form of a circular hole (6), a circular depression (1), or a raised circle or pellet, surrounded by an incision, almost giving the impression of a button (7). On one of the latter, there are tiny incised dashes decorating the edge of the raised circle (EAF.Kat.02). Portraying the navel, however, appears to have been the exception, rather than the rule as it is clear on most examples that no navel was ever present.

On 6 unusual examples, the knees are clearly marked with small applied pellets (Fig 102, H). There are also a small number on which a slightly raised lump midway down the leg appears to give the impression of a knee (2).

There is some variation in the position of the arms and hands (Fig 102, C): most examples are broadly similar, with arms bent at the elbow and hands meeting on the stomach, below the breasts; a small number have alternative positions such as hands on hips (EAF.Kat.01 & EAF.AyP.01).

EAF.Kyt.01 purportedly had a nose ring but this remains unconfirmed as the figurine is lost.

Condition: Of the 18 fragmentary examples, 5 are heads, 3 lower torso and legs, 2 torso, 4 head and upper torso, 1 lower torso, 1 baby and 4 uncertain. No preference is apparent for any particular body part.

There are 35 provenanced examples for which information on their physical condition is available. Of these, 12 have no notable damage. Amongst the rest, the most commonly damaged or missing parts are the ears and arms and feet which protrude from the body and are most easily broken. This pattern of damage does not suggest deliberate breakage of one or more parts but rather sustained physical use over a period of time leading to general wear and tear.
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**Flathead Figurines (FAF)**  
*(Fig 104, Fig 106, Fig 105, Chart 22, Chart 23)*

- 76 provenanced examples (of which 46 are fragmentary)\(^{582}\)
- 34 recorded unprovenanced examples (of which 4 are fragmentary)

**Dates:** LC II – LC IIIB

**Material:** BR fig [110]

**Size:**
- Height (Solid) – between 11.3cm and 15.9cm [mean = 14.0cm]
- (Hollow) – between 18cm and 22.8cm [mean = 20.5cm]

**Context:**
- Tomb (37)
- Settlement (32)
- Uncertain (6)
- Ritual Space (1)

**Regions:**
- E (24)
- SC (16)
- C (11)
- NW (11)
- SW (11)
- Lev (3)

**Shape:** These handmade figurines have a distinctive, disc-shaped head top, which protrudes over the back of the neck-line, attached in a separate piece. From the front, their faces are roughly triangular, narrowing sharply to pointed chins. The eyes are applied pellets with incised circles; a fairly large, triangular nose protrudes between them, frequently with two small incised dashes on its underside, representing nostrils; beneath this, the mouth is presented by a small incised horizontal dash. At the sides of the head, usually positioned just below the level of the eyes, are medium-sized, folded ears, similar to those found on Base Ring Bull imagery.

The vast majority have two low conical relief breasts on the upper third of the body. The arms are rounded, beginning at the shoulders and terminating in paddle-shaped hands, on which short incised dashes represent the fingers.

---

\(^{582}\) It is possible that some of the 21 head fragments may in fact be part of either SAF (if solid) or FAV (if hollow) objects instead. As it is impossible to determine this from such fragments, they have been included in this larger category as most likely.
The body widens from the neck towards the hips, remains wide in the pubic area then tapers sharply towards the bottom of the legs. The legs have a relatively even width but taper slightly towards the feet; they appear to be created from two separate pieces of clay, joined together with a deep groove between them. At the bottom, the legs widen slightly to represent feet. Toes are rendered by incisions, in a similar way to the fingers. Frequently, the undersides and backs of the feet are shaped to represent the instep and heel.

Decoration: The top of the head is painted in black/brown paint, from just behind the forehead, to the back of the head, above the ears. On some examples (35), it is clear that the paint continues down the sides of the head, in the manner of curved sideburns (Fig 105, A); on others, these sideburns are represented in curls of relief clay (6); on 5 examples it is clear that no sideburns were ever present.

On 63 examples, painted lines are visible at the neck (Fig 105, B), and on 33 of these, it is possible to discern the pattern: for the most part there are three, either in red-black-red (32) or black-red-black (11); less frequently there are different patterns (5) – consisting of either only one or two lines or including a
third line which dips to a point in the centre, sometimes all the way down to the navel. On 2 very unusual examples, the neck lines are incised rather than painted.

The pubic triangle is highlighted by incisions and painted over in black/brown paint (Fig 105, E). On most examples this includes an infill pattern of dashes or herringbone incisions but on some solid examples there is no additional incision.

Variations: This type of figurine exists both as a hollow object (64) and as a solid object (22).

There is a clear variation on the position of the hands and arms (Fig 105, C). The majority have bent arms, usually with hands placed on the upper stomach, below the breasts (16), or with hands touching the underside of the breasts (11), but occasionally with hands upturned between the breasts (2) or with hands placed on the breasts (1). There are also a small number of figurines with straight arms, with hands by the sides (2).

Some of these figurines include indication of a navel (Fig 105, D) on the lower torso (34) usually in the form of a roughly circular hole (29), but less commonly as a painted mark (FAF.Ida.02), a depression (FAF.AyP.01) or incised circle (FAF.NON.09). On 23 examples it is clear that no navel was ever represented.

Occasionally, there is additional decoration in the form of painted stripes on the outer surface of the arms: on 2 examples, in solid black along the length of the arm (FAF.Ang.01 and FAF.AyP.02), or, on FAF.Pal.01, in short, red, transverse dashes at the top of the arm.

Condition: The 50 fragmentary examples have been identified in Chart 23. The dominance of head and head & upper torso fragments is striking. Some may belong to SAF or FAV types, and it is possible that some small torso fragments may have been missed in excavation. However, the proportion is still significant and may suggest that particular importance was afforded to this part of the figurine.

All examples for which condition could be assessed were in reasonable but not pristine condition, consistent with objects both used to destruction and deposited in better condition in tombs.
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Chart 23: Identification of Flathead Figurine fragments
Seated Flatheads (SAF)  

(Fig 107)

7 provenanced examples (of which 3 are fragmentary)\(^{583}\)
5 recorded unprovenanced examples

![Image of Seated Flatheads](SAF.Mar.01 (D-K.Knox, Cyrus Museum))

Dates: LC IIA – LC IIIA (the one single-period context is dated to LC IIC)

Context: Tomb (3) Settlement (2) Uncertain (2)

Regions: E (3) SC (3) NW (1)

Material: BR fig \{12\}

Size: Height – between 8.3cm and 12.7cm [mean = 10.3cm]
Length – between 9.3cm and 11.4cm [mean = 10.4cm]

Shape: These figurines represent a significant variation from the standard Flathead Figurines. Their legs are bent at the hips to a 90 degree angle, curving down at the knee. They are supported at the back by two additional peg-like struts, positioned diagonally. Otherwise, their appearance is comparable to that of the Flathead Figurines.

Variations: One very unusual example holds an infant (SAF.NON.05) – this is the only example of this style associated with a baby.

Painted bands at the neck can take the form of three in red-black-red \{4\}, or two red and black \{2\}.

Condition: The few figurines of this type which survive reveal no patterns of wear or breakage.

\(^{583}\) See note to FAF section
Late Cypriot Cradleboard Figurines (LAF) (Fig 108, Fig 109)

*2 provenanced examples*

**Date:** LC II?

**Context:** Tomb (1) Uncertain (1)

**Regions:** SC (1) SW (1)

**Material:** BR fig (2)

**Size:**
- Height – 8.4cm and 9.7cm
- Width – 3cm and 3.1cm

**Shape:** Both extant examples of this type are solid and handmade. They are constructed from four strips of rolled clay joined together by several smaller strips placed across them. One end of the object terminates in a rectangular cradle arch, constructed of further strips of clay. An anthropomorph, also constructed of long, rolled strips of clay, lies towards one end of the object, with the head directly under the cradle arch. The head is of pinched clay, creating a prominent, pointed nose, with impressed circles presenting the eyes. These examples are almost identical.

**Decoration:** There is no decoration evident.

**Condition:** Both are in reasonably good condition except that LAF.Kou.01 has a broken cradle arch.

**Notes:** The heads of these anthropomorphs give the impression of infants, particularly at the head as they strongly resemble those carried by certain EAFs. However, with so few examples it is difficult to say more.
Miscellaneous Anthropomorphs (UAF): There are 24 remaining provenanced anthropomorphic figurines which are either unique or too fragmentary to be allocated to any of the other categories. Arranged by approximate chronology, these consist of:

**Philia Facies:** 1 very small fragment from Marki-Alonia⁵⁸⁴

**Early-Middle:** 2 WP fragments from Nicosia-Ayia Paraskevi and 1 from Politiko-Troullia whose details are not yet published.

**Transitional:** 1 object, now lost, from Morphou-Toumba tou Skourou

**Late:** 19 examples, mostly from Enkomi. There is also a single unprovenanced Base Ring figurine resembling a seated infant which is reminiscent enough of EAF and FAF styles to be included in the database despite having no provenanced parallel.

Unidentified Base Ring Anthropomorphs (BAF): There are 5 Base Ring anthropomorphs which were too fragmentary to be definitively assigned to either Flathead or Earring types.

Mycenaean Anthropomorphs (AAF): There are 37 Mycenaean or Mycenaean style anthropomorphs (Psi and Tau types) provenanced to Cyprus which may be imported or locally-made copies.

Bronze Anthropomorphs (ZAF): There are also 11 provenanced Late Cypriot bronze anthropomorphs, equally divided between settlement and tomb contexts, which do not form any kind of coherent stylistic category or fit wholly into an existing category. 4 come from the East, 3 from the South west and 1 each from the South Coast and Central Island areas. Many have similarities with known clay types and were almost made on the island.

⁵⁸⁴ In addition to this, there are 4 other Philia fragments from Marki-Alonia and 1 from Sotira-Kaminoudhia which cannot be categorically identified as either anthropomorphic, zoomorphic or object model and have, therefore, been labelled UUF in the database.
Early Anthropomorphic Vessels (EAV)  

*Fig 110, Fig 111*

17 provenanced examples (of which 1 is fragmentary)
13 recorded unprovenanced examples

Dates: EC III – LC I

Context: Tomb (14) Uncertain (3)

Regions: SC (5) NC (4) C (4) E (1) SW (1) K (1) NW (1)

Material: RP {16} DP {1} BR I {1} WP V {9} Bichr {1} RonB {1} BS {1}

Size: Height – between 9.5cm and 61cm [mean = 20.8cm]

Shape: All vessels in this category have anthropomorphic facial features on the upper part of their necks. The eyes are rendered by small depressions placed either side of a protruding relief nose; on either side of the neck are applied semicircles of clay representing ears, very similar to those on some Plank Figurines.

Decoration: These vessels are decorated either with incised, relief or painted bands on the neck and body as appropriate for the ware; there are 4 examples where the decorative style cannot be determined. Lines on the upper body are often semicircular in form and appear to represent necklaces; those on the neck are often zigzag or wavy verticals and, given the precedent of the decoration on Plank Figurines, were perhaps intended to represent hair.

Variations: There is some variation in the shape of these vessels: some appear to be amphorae with globular bodies, rounded bases and wide, cylindrical necks with slightly flaring rims; some examples are jugs with biconical or ovoid bodies, rounded bases and narrow cylindrical necks with everted rims; some are similar jugs with the addition of three or four feet on the bottom; one further jug (EAV.TTS.01) has a high ring base; 2 examples are ring vessels with three feet and a cylindrical neck protruding from one side; one unusual example (EAV.NON.01) is a tulip bowl with a long, relief nose on one outer edge and one (EAV.NON.02) is a small bottle.

---

585 There is also a unique unprovenanced amphora (UAD.NON.03) which has anthropomorphic features on the neck as well as two Plank Figurines standing on the shoulders, facing outwards. As this object appears to fall between several categories and has no other parallels, it has not been included here.
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One example (EAV.NON.05) has modelled relief arms from the shoulder of the vessel, curving down the sides to the bottom of the body. EAV.TTS.01 has small stump-like protrusions from its shoulders which may also be intended to represent arms; this vessel is also unusual as it has painted circles with central dots to represent the eyes, rather than depressions and a modelled chin which delineates the head from the rest of the vessel neck.

The number of times the ears are pierced also varies somewhat with either four {3}, three {5}, two {4}, one {11} or no {2} holes. At least 3 examples have relief hoop earrings on the side of the vessel neck and 2 have separate hoop earrings hanging from their lowest piercing. In general, the minor detail of the facial features on these vessels is fairly individual.

Condition: Most of these vessels are in fairly good condition, although many have superficial damage to edges or protrusions. Details of wear could not be determined for this type. It should be noted that fragmentary vessels which did not preserve any or enough of the neck area would not be recognised as anthropomorphic and thus this type may be severely underrepresented.

Notes: This is the only category which bridges the hiatus between the Early-Middle Cypriot and the MC III – LC I transitional period. Although the choice of ceramic wares certainly changes in the latter phase, the overall style of these objects and the function to which they could have been put remains consistent. Thus it was not feasible to split the category along chronological lines.
**Flathead Bottles (FAV)**

*(Fig 112)*

*6 provenanced examples (of which 3 are fragmentary)*

*4 recorded unprovenanced examples*

**Dates:** LC IIIA+ (As no examples exist from datable contexts, the fabric and the stylistic similarity to Flathead figurines suggest this date.)

**Context:** Tomb (1) Uncertain (5)

**Regions:** Lev (3) E (1) SC (1) C (1)

**Material:** WPWM III fig {10}586

**Size:** Height – between 14.5cm and 16cm [mean=15.4cm]

**Shape:** These vessels have wheelmade bodies and facial details with clear parallels in Flathead types, applied afterwards by hand. Eyes are applied pellets with incised circles and black paint on the pupils; protruding noses in the centre of the face have incised nostrils; small, red painted incision for the mouth; small, folded ears; relief strips for eyebrows, overpainted in black. On top of the head is a funnel, often painted in black, with narrow, central spout and flaring rim. A short neck leads from the face to the vessel’s body which is cylindrical, flaring slightly towards a flat, circular base. Narrow arms come from the shoulders, terminating in flat hands, fingers rendered by incisions; these mostly rest on the body under the breasts, curving upwards. Breasts are low relief cones.

**Decoration:** These vessels share the red and black painted triple neck ring of Flathead Figurines. Where the pattern can be determined, this is alternating red-black-red stripes. Unlike their figurine counterparts, however, they are also decorated with extensive painted patterns over their bodies. This comprises a series of vertical, single-framed bands of zigzags or herringbone pattern and a single vertical band of zigzags around the base.

**Variations:** A single example has arms falling straight by the sides of the figurine (FAV.NON.03).

---

586 There is some discrepancy over the material of these vessels. Since it is a wheelmade, buff material with creamy slip, I have followed T. Kiely (pers. comm. 9 Oct 2009) in attributing them to part of the WPWM III tradition. However, their relationship with Flathead figurines should not be overlooked.
Condition: Wear on the paintwork around the torso of these vessels and chips to the rim on the top of the head suggest that, rather than being display pieces, they were handled and used.
Wishbone Handle (WAD)\textsuperscript{587} (Fig 113)

5 provenanced examples (of which 4 are detached)
2 recorded unprovenanced examples

Dates: MC I-II

Context: Settlement (2) Tomb (2) Uncertain (1)

Regions: C (4) SC (1)

Material: RP {4} WP III – IV {2} BS {1}

Size: Height (of handle): between 5.5cm and 7.7cm [mean 6.6cm]

Shape: The single example which is not detached (WAD.Mak.01) occurs on the side of a hemispherical bowl with a ring base and three lug projections around the rim.

The apex of the wishbone takes the form of an anthropomorphic head, with eyes, nose and mouth indicated by depressions.

Decoration: Lime-filled incisions or painted lines decorate the prongs of the wishbone.

Variations: The heads of these handles are all slightly different in form: WAD.Mak.01 has a rounded head; the heads of WAD.AyP.01 and WAD.Ala.01 are divided into two, diverging projections with the addition of a protruding modelled nose; the latter also has semicircular, pierced ears.

Condition: Most examples are fragmentary and their use outside burial is unquestioned.

Notes: The anthropomorphic nature of these handles is sometimes difficult to determine: WAD.NON.02 was identified by Karageorghis (1991) as a ram but its resemblance to the rest of this corpus is too striking to ignore and makes this suggestion unlikely.

\textsuperscript{587} It should be noted that the small numbers of objects in each of the **D types (vessels with plastic figurine decoration) are most likely underestimates as figurines are attached to only a small part of the vessel body and thus fragments of the rest could not recognised as these types.
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**PAF Composite (CAD)**

(Fig 114)

4 provenanced examples

Dates: EC II – MC I

Context: Tomb (4 – Vounous)

Regions: NC (4)

Material: RP (3) BP (1)

Size: Height: between 34cm and 46cm [mean = 39cm]

Shape: These vessels consist of four small, hemispherical bowls joined with a tall, central, rectangular handle. The handle has two main vertical struts, joined by horizontal struts at the base and centre and by the shoulders of a Plank Figurine at the top.

The figurine has a tall, narrow, rectangular neck, with facial features at the top. The eyes and mouth are depicted by depressions and the nose protrudes in the centre. Semi-circular ears on the side of the head are each pierced once.

Decoration: Incised, lime-filled geometric decoration covers the figurine and the handle but is absent from the bowls.

Variations: The Black Polished example (CAD.Vou.04) is rather different in shape from the rest: it has only two bowls, deeper than usual and decorated with incised patterns, and no tall handle. However, the nature of the vessel and positioning of the Plank Figurine make it sufficiently similar for inclusion in this category.

On 2 examples, the Plank Figurine has narrow legs with modelled knees and feet. The legs stem from the base of the body and stand on the central horizontal strut of the handle. One figurine (CAD.Vou.03) has small modelled breasts and holds an infant in modelled arms.

Condition: These objects are all in reasonable condition although some have restoration on the tall handles. No information on wear could be ascertained.

Notes: Similar vessels exist with conjoined bowls and elaborate handles but without figurines. These are also clustered in Vounous during EC III – MC I.

---

588 Plank figurines also appear attached to jugs and pyxides (JMD, YMD). In addition, there are 6 provenanced and 3 unprovenanced examples (labelled PAD in the database) which have become detached from their respective vessels.
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Person/Spout Jug (SAD)  (Fig 115)

4 provenanced examples

4 recorded unprovenanced examples

Dates: No examples exist from datable contexts but stylistic and technical indications suggest c. MC III – LC I

Context: Uncertain (4)

Regions: C (3) E (1)

Material: WP V {8}

Size: Height – between 14.2cm – 18.2cm [mean = 16.4cm]

Shape: These vessels have a slightly flattened, elongated ovoid body, tapering towards a splaying base foot. At the top, there are two cylindrical necks, one of which terminates in a cutaway spout, the other in a figurine. Between the two necks is a vertical strap handle running from the top of the body to the upper mid body.

The figurine is fairly flat in profile, with a rounded head, widening into the body with no separate definition for the neck. The eyes are rendered by depressions either side of the protruding modelled nose, which opens into a deep horizontal incision on the end which may represent the mouth. Two applied cones on the chest depict the breasts. The arms are positioned with one holding the elbow area of the other which is upturned between the breasts to meet the chin. Incisions represent the fingers.

Decoration: The body of the vessel is covered with vertical bands of decoration in matt red to dark brown paint, with solid paint covering the foot. The figurine has painted bands on its arms and chest and vertical stokes on its forehead.

Condition: All examples have damage to the spout and worn paint, particularly on the upper part of the body. On the one example which could be observed (SAD.Ida.01, Fig 115) this concentrated on the upper part of the handle and the side of the body with the figurine.

Note that UAF.NON.03 – a miscellaneous anthropomorph of WP ware with legs instead of vessel body but with one anthropomorphic head on the left and possible spout (broken) on the right – bares a significant resemblance to the objects in this category.
**MC Composite Jug (MAD)**: There are 2 composite vessels (MAD.Ang.01 and MAD.Gal.01) apparently from the MC III period, each with an anthropomorph standing between the bodies of the jugs. Although the overall style of the figurines on these vessels are comparable (features such as breasts with central depressions and the position of the arms underneath these breasts), the vessels themselves are rather different in size, shape and material (one RonB, one WP V). For this reason, along with the limited number of examples, this category cannot be included in detailed analysis. It is interesting to note, however, the similarity between the figurines seen here and those found in the Person/Spout Jug category.

**Detached Anthropomorphs (XAD)**: There are an additional 11 anthropomorphs which have become detached from their vessels and cannot be subsumed into the above categories. These comprise 8 from the Early-Middle Bronze Age and 3 from MC III – LC I.

**Detached Planks (PAD)**: There are 6 provenanced and 4 unprovenanced miniature Plank Figurines detached from vessels.

**Miscellaneous Vessels with Anthropomorphs (UAD)**: There are 6 provenanced and 5 unprovenanced vessels with attached anthropomorphs which do not fit securely into these categories: 9 from the Early-Middle Bronze Age, 4 from MC III – LC I.
### Scenic Model (SMF)

(Fig 116)

2 provenanced examples

4 recorded unprovenanced examples

#### Dates:
The single datable example came from a tomb dated to EC III – MC I and the material and style of the remaining examples concur.

#### Context:
Tomb (1) Uncertain (1)

#### Regions:
NC (2)

#### Material:
RP (4) RS (1) WP II (1)

#### Size:
Variable

#### Shape:
This group comprises independent models which portray miniature anthropomorphs, zoomorphs and objects arranged in tableaux. The anthropomorphs have protruding noses, modelled semi-circular ears, eyes rendered by depressions and relief arms. Some wear relief bands around their necks or heads and some have pierced ears but never earrings. The zoomorphs are usually horned quadrupeds, probably bulls but quadrupeds without horns, perhaps sheep, also feature.

#### Decoration:
Apart from the relief elements, these objects are not decorated.

#### Variations:
Each object in this group is unique. Their subject matter can be summarised thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Number</th>
<th>Activity (tentative)</th>
<th>Composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMF.Vou.01</td>
<td>Ploughing scene</td>
<td>Atop flat, five-legged platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMF.Vou.02</td>
<td>Ritual gathering</td>
<td>In circular bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMF.NON.01</td>
<td>Bread making/ pottery making/ textile dyeing</td>
<td>Around elliptical trough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMF.NON.02</td>
<td>Pottery sellers/ textile dyeing</td>
<td>On narrow, rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMF.NON.03</td>
<td>Boat</td>
<td>In elliptical bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMF.NON.04</td>
<td>Wine pressing/textile dyeing</td>
<td>In shallow four-legged bowl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Condition:
These fragile scenes all have some damage and at least SMF.Vou.02 has been reconstructed and restored. It was not possible to consider wear patterns on these objects.
Bull Leader Figurines (BMF) (Fig 117)

2 examples (of which 1 is fragmentary)\textsuperscript{590}

Dates: The settlement example is unstratified; the other comes from a LC I – LC II context tomb.

Context: Settlement (1) Tomb (1)

Regions: SC (1) NC (1)

Material: BR fig (2)

Size: The single complete example (BMF.Kaz.01) is 12cm in height; the other was clearly a larger object as the legs of the human figure alone measure 9.6cm in height.

Shape: A human figurine is positioned to one side of a bull, adjacent to its neck with its hands around its horns. In the single complete example, the feet of the human do not touch the ground when the bull is standing, giving the impression that it is hanging on to the bull’s horns. The human’s body is flat in section, widening slightly at the hips then tapering towards the ankles and widening again to denote the feet. Cylindrical arms protrude from the shoulders, reaching around the bull’s horns, with fingers rendered by incisions. There is a modelled penis in the middle of the pelvic area. The head, face and ears are identical to those of the Flathead Figurines. The bull is identical in style to those with incised faces from the Base Ring Bull Figurine type. It has low relief knees at the front and modelled snout; the eyes are applied pellets with incised circles. Cylindrical horns rise from the top of the head, curving slightly inwards.

Decoration: The human figurine has pairs of incised lines on three sides of the pelvic area, covered in black paint. There is also black paint on the pupils. The bull has an incised herringbone pattern on the front of its head with groups of incised horizontals on either side as well as under the eyes and on the neck.

Condition: Beyond the fragmentary state of BMF.HST.01, nothing can be discerned about the condition of these two objects.

\textsuperscript{590} A bronze example, apparently from Arsos (BMF.Ars.01) which is very similar to this category but has not been included as the style is not completely comparable. This type provides a tangible link between the Flathead Figurine style and the incised Base Ring Bull figurines.
Horse and Rider Figurines (HMF): No provenanced examples of this type exist so it cannot be included as a major category in this analysis. However, it has been included in this list as 5 unprovenanced Base Ring horses with riders are known and have been included in the database. Base Ring horses of a similar type but without riders will be described below.
MIXED ANTHROPOMORHS/ZOOMORPHS – DECORATION ATTACHED TO VESSELS

**Scenic Vessel (SMD)**

(Fig 118)

7 provenanced examples

12 recorded unprovenanced examples (of which 6 are fragmentary)

Dates: MC II on two datable contexts but material and forms could be EC III – MC II

Context: Tomb (3) Uncertain (4)

Regions: C (4) NC (1) SW (1) SC (1)

Material: RP (16) DP (2) RS (1)

Size:

Height: between 25.2cm and 46.5cm [mean = 42.6cm]

Diameter: between 28cm and 42.5cm [mean = 35.4cm]

Shape:

These anthropomorphic and zoomorphic tableaux are attached to the shoulders of large vessels, often intertwined with their practical features (e.g. leaning on the walls, holding the handles).

Decoration:

Apart from the relief elements, these objects have no additional decoration.

Variations:

The type of vessel on which these scenes are found is most commonly a deep bowl (8) of which 4 examples have double spouts. Scenes also occur on multi-necked jugs (2), one single-necked jug and one amphora.

The scenes themselves are complex and varied with the most common elements including people standing at a trough (6), donkeys laden with panniers (4) and people sitting on benches (4).

Condition:

Most examples have received some damage, been mended from pieces or are otherwise fragmentary. This is unsurprising in such large, fragile objects. It was not possible to consider wear patterns on these objects.
MIXED ANTHROPOMORHS/ZOOMORPHS – DECORATION ATTACHED TO VESSELS

Plank/Bird Jug (JMD) (Fig 119)

10 provenanced examples (of which 1 is fragmentary)
9 recorded unprovenanced examples

Dates: EC IIIB (EC IIIA – MC II in multi-period contexts)

Context: Tomb (10)

Regions: NC (10)

Material: RP {19}

Size: Height (Jug): between 14.4cm and 49.4cm [mean = 22.7cm]
Height (Figurine): between 1.8cm and 7cm [mean = 3.7cm]

Shape: These jugs have globular bodies with rounded bases. A cylindrical neck leads to a circular spout with wide, flaring rim and a vertical strap handle runs from rim to shoulder. The outward-facing figurine stands on the shoulder, opposite the handle.

Decoration: Incised, lime-filled geometric decoration covers the vessel. Although there is some variation in the composition of the pattern, certain motifs – notably multiple concentric circles joined by multiple parallel lines – are found on every example. On most, the Plank Figurine stands in the centre of one such group.

Variations: The majority have a single, limbless Plank Figurine. However, there are some exceptions: the figurine on JMD.Vou.01 and JMD.Vou.03 is split at the bottom, almost giving the impression of two short, rectangular legs; on JMD.Vou.03 and JMD.NON.05 the figurine holds a cradled infant. JMD.NON.01 has two Plank Figurines on the shoulder, either side of the handle, with a knob lug opposite the handle in the usual position of a figurine. JMD.Vou.04 and JMD.NON.09 show a bird protome instead of a Plank; the former faces outwards with an s-shaped neck and rectangular wings, the latter faces sideways and its wings are more indistinct.

3 examples have double spouts and 3 have the handle running from the shoulder to mid neck, instead of the rim.

Condition: Although some have been mended from fragments post excavation, most have pristine decoration and show no signs of wear.
**Plank/Animal Pyxis (YMD)**

(Fig 120, Fig 121)

8 provenanced examples

6 recorded unprovenanced examples

Dates: EC III – MC I

Context: Tomb (5)    Uncertain (3)

Regions: NC (6)    SW (1)    C (1)

Material: RP {12}    DP {1}    RS {1}

Size:

Height – between 13.0cm and 25cm [mean = 18.2cm]

Length – between 20.5cm and 37.7cm [mean = 30.1cm]

Shape: These vessels usually have a squat, ovoid body with a flat base. The rectangular opening in the centre of the top is covered by a flat, rectangular or elliptical lid.

The figurines are either positioned as a pair, with one standing at each narrow end or as a group of four with one at each corner.

Decoration: The body and lid of the pyxis as well as the attached figurines are covered in incised, lime-filled geometric patterns.

Variations: Each pyxis in this category has a slightly different combination of plastic decoration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Attached decoration</th>
<th>No. of examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plank Figurines</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird and Bull</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird and Plank Figurine</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird and Stag</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Plank Figurines are mostly standard but some carry a cradled infant (2).

Condition: Although most of these large objects have received damage to their bodies, most are otherwise in good condition, the decoration is crisp and no wear is apparent.
MIXED ANTHROPOMORPHS/ZOOMORPHS – DECORATION ATTACHED TO VESSELS

Protome Jug (PMD)  

(Fig 122, Fig 123)

17 provenanced examples
6 recorded unprovenanced examples (of which 1 is fragmentary)

Dates:  
MC III – LC I

Context:  
Tomb (13) Uncertain (4)

Regions:  
NW (9) C (5) NC (2) SW (1)

Material:  
WP V/VI {21} BS {2 – almost identical}

Size:  
Height (Bottle Jug) – between 14.4cm and 37cm [mean = 21.4cm]
Height (Globular Jug) – between 10cm and 24.8cm [mean = 17.5cm]

Shape:  
These vessels have a flat base, cylindrical neck and cutaway spout with a flat strap handle running from mid-neck to the shoulder. A figurine or protome rises from the shoulder of the vessel opposite this handle.

Decoration:  
Panels of geometric decoration cover the bodies of these vessels with stripes on the necks. The patterns are incised on the Black Slip examples and painted in matt orange to dark brown/black on the others. The protomes are also covered in striped decoration.

Variations:  
There is some variation in the shape of the body of the vessel in this category, dividing it into two main types – bottle jugs with elongated bodies (8) and globular or biconical jugs with rounded bodies (13). In addition, 2 examples have a splaying foot rather than a flat base and their bodies taper more visibly towards the bottom to accommodate this.

One vessel (PMD.Kyt.01) varies in form slightly from the rest as its protome is set at some distance from the centrally-positioned neck, and it has a short, modelled tail protruding from the opposite side. This, even more than the others in this category, has significant parallels with the Flat-base Zoomorphs.

Another unusual example (PMD.NON.05) has two additional dog protomes standing on the shoulder either side of the spout. There also is clearly some stylistic relationship between this category and Dog Vessels.
Several animal types are represented amongst the protomes, some of which are difficult to identify but appear to comprise:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stag</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bull</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goat</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ram</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition: All of these vessels have visibly worn paint, some of which has probably been caused by taphonomic processes. Some, however, appears to cluster around the handle and front of the body, suggesting the vessels had been in use for some time prior to deposition.

**Miscellaneous vessels with mixed Anthropomorphic and Zoomorphic attached decoration (UMD):** There are 3 such provenanced vessels whose unique form means that they do not fit with the categories above. One (UMD.AyP.01) is an unusual ring vessel from the E-MC period, with human and bird protomes alternating with miniature deep bowls around the rim; UMD.Vou.01 is an oval pyxis, also from the E-MC period, with two opposed horse and rider figures on the narrow edges; UMD.TTS.01 is MC III – LC I jug with a human figure on one shoulder and a bull on the other which is stylistically related to the PMD category.
Miniature Zoomorphs (MZF)  
(Fig 124, Chart 24)

28 provenanced examples (of which 8 are fragmentary)

Dates:  
EC II – MC II

Context:  
Settlement (28 – all)
Marki-Alonia

Regions:  
C (28)

Material:  
Coarse? (28)

Size:  
Height – between 1.6cm and 4 cm [mean = 2.9cm]
Length – between 1.9cm and 4.8cm [mean = 3.4cm]

Shape:  
These small, handmade, solid zoomorphs are roughly modelled with slightly rounded bodies, short pinches of clay for legs, short cylindrical horns, applied clay tail. Eyes are indicated by small depressions and mouth by a short incision on a small, modelled snout. On some it is possible to discern nostril depressions.

Decoration:  
Almost all of these objects are undecorated but one (MZF.Mrk.25) has impressed circles on its rear edge.

Variations:  
This fairly homogenous category has no major variations. Half have been identified as bulls (14); one unusual example (MZF.Mrk.16) has been labelled a ram, although its fragmentary condition makes correct identification very difficult: the remaining 13 examples could not be identified with any certainty.

Condition:  
All examples are broken in some way and missing at least part of their horns (with the exception of 2 examples which are themselves horn fragments). Most are also missing their tails and one or more legs and a significant proportion are merely fragments preserving only the head or torso. This seems to suggest that rather than the horns being singled out and deliberately removed prior to deposition, these objects were simply used to destruction and discarded when no longer useable. The excavation report describes 4 of these objects as having been blackened by fire (MZF.Mrk.04, 21, 23 and 25).
Freestanding Zoomorph (FZF)  

4 provenanced examples (of which 1 is fragmentary)\(^{591}\)
7 recorded unprovenanced examples

Dates: EC III – MC I
Context: Tomb (2) Uncertain (2)
Regions: C (3) SC (1)
Material: RP {8} RS {1} BP {1} Coarse? {1}
Size: Height – between 3.2cm and 11.9cm [mean = 7.1cm]

Length – between 6.4cm and 21cm [mean= 12.1cm]

Shape: This category comprises handmade, solid zoomorphic figurines which stand well unsupported. Limited anatomical details, notably the eyes and mouth, are marked by incisions or depressions.

Decoration: For the most part these objects have very little decoration: 7 examples have none; FZF.AyP.01 has some minor elaboration to indicate the spine in pinched clay; the remaining examples have evenly spaced bands of incised decoration across the body.

Variations: Several different animals are represented in this category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bull</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turtle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition: On the few examples for which details of the physical condition have been available, localised patches of wear, particularly to the face, and minor damage to the edges are apparent, possibly indicating pre-depositional use.

\(^{591}\) XZD.Vou.11 and XZD.Vou.12 could theoretically belong to this category. However, given their uncharacteristic early date (EC IB) and their clear similarity to the zoomorphs which stand on the rim of Bowl/Animal vessel BMD.Vou.01, it seems more likely that they were in fact detached from a similar stemmed bowl. Indeed Stewart proposed that they belonged to Vounous Tomb 160A.13 (BMD.Vou.03; Stewart & Stewart 1950:208). For these reasons they have not been included in this category and the first appearance of Independent zoomorphic figurines is the Miniature Zoomorph (MZF) no earlier than EC II.

285
String-Hole Zoomorph (SZF)\textsuperscript{592} (Fig 126)

13 provenanced examples
22 recorded unprovenanced examples

Dates: MC I - III

Context: Tomb (9) Uncertain (4)

Regions: C (11) NW (1) NC (1)

Material: RP {19} WP {8} BP {4} RS {3} ?{1}

Size: Height – between 2.4cm and 26 cm [mean = 10cm]

Length – between 5.3cm and 21cm [mean = 13.5cm]

Description: Medium-sized, handmade, solid zoomorphic figurines in various shapes, with a small vertical lug on the centre of their backs. In general they have a relatively long body with very short, peg legs.

Decoration: Most examples are covered in panels of geometric decoration. 2 have no apparent decoration.

Variations: Apart from the variations in material, a wide range of animals is represented in this category. Although the exact type of animal represented is not always easy to discern, these include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bull</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stag</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 examples (SZF.AyP.03, SZF.Sol.01 and SZF.AyP.07) have suspension lugs immediately behind the head.

Condition: 6 examples have damaged lugs, some of which were probably worn through. Localised patches of wear, particularly to the face, and minor damage to the edges are apparent, possibly indicating pre-depositional use.

\textsuperscript{592} There is a clear stylistic relationship between this group and Hole-Mouth Zoomorphs, some differing only in the crucial presence of a circular hole at the front of the neck.
Base Ring Bull Figurine (BZF)  

(Fig 127, Chart 25)

26 provenanced examples (of which 5 are fragmentary)\(^{593}\)
7 recorded unprovenanced examples (of which 2 are fragmentary)

Dates: LC IIC-IIIA

Context:
- Settlement (11)
- Tomb (11)
- Ritual Space (2)
- Uncertain (2)

Regions:
- SC (10)
- E (8)
- SW (3)
- C (2)
- NW (2)
- Lev (1)

Material:
- BR fig \{32\}
- Bronze \{1\}\(^{594}\)

Size:
- Height – between 7.2cm and 13.8cm [mean = 10.8cm]
- Length – between 8.8cm and 18.5cm [mean = 13.7cm]

Shape:
These handmade, hollow objects have narrow cylindrical bodies, pierced several times on the underside. A modelled tail falls down the centre of the backside, curving to one side. A relatively thick neck leads to the head on which the snout is pointed with modelled end. Eyes are rendered by applied pellets with incised circles, much as the contemporary BR anthropomorphs and zoomorphic vessels.

\(^{593}\) There are an additional 110 provenanced examples and 3 recorded unprovenanced example (labelled BZU in the database) which are clearly Base Ring Bulls but which it has been impossible to identify categorically as either vessels or figurines, since they are either too fragmentary or too little information has been published on their features. The necessary existence of the BZU category means that the distribution of fragment types for the BZF and BZV categories will certainly be incomplete.

\(^{594}\) The bronze example (BZF.Kat.01) is solid and apparently made using lost wax casting. Despite its material and manufacture, it fits well into this category given its overall shape and style. Its size (H=4cm x L=7.1cm) is, however, a little anomalous and has consequently been omitted from the ranges given here.
ZOOMORPHS – FIGURINES

Decoration:  Most examples confine their decoration to incised patterns on the front of the head {13} but some supplement this with solid painted lines or dots on the body {5}. On some {7} it is clear that no decoration was ever present; one unusual example (BZF.Enk.07) has even stripes in white paint across its body and neck in a manner which would not be out of place amongst the BR Bull Vessel category.

Variations:  BZF.Mar.05 has a modelled eyelet on the end of its snout; BZF.Cha.01 has modelled genitals on the underside of its body, as does the bronze figurine BZF.Kat.01. Several examples {5} have an accentuated hump at the shoulder, suggesting that they may represent the zebu as opposed to a generic bull.

Some examples render the eyes by elliptical protrusions with incised detail {3}.

Condition:  Of the 5 fragmentary pieces clearly identifiable as BR Bull Figurines, 4 are heads and one is a head and upper torso. The condition of one example could not be determined from the present available information. The condition of the remaining 21 near complete examples is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Repaired</th>
<th>Damaged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Ear</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Ear</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Horn</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Horn</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torso</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Foreleg</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Foreleg</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Hindleg</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Hindleg</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of figurine parts which are broken is fairly even and does not suggest that any particular area of the object has received special attention.

Note that a Base Ring Bull Figurine with incised head also appears as part of the Bull Leader figurine (BMF).

Catling (1976:72) says that the decoration on these figurines, as opposed to the bull vessels, aims at naturalism and includes features which suggest hair (incisions on the face) and modelled genitals. Although some of the provenanced examples discussed here do show these features, they are by no means the norm. There are also several unincised examples of figurines which very closely resemble the vessels, only without the handle and rim.

---

595 Note that a Base Ring Bull Figurine with incised head also appears as part of the Bull Leader figurine (BMF).
596 Catling (1976:72) says that the decoration on these figurines, as opposed to the bull vessels, aims at naturalism and includes features which suggest hair (incisions on the face) and modelled genitals. Although some of the provenanced examples discussed here do show these features, they are by no means the norm. There are also several unincised examples of figurines which very closely resemble the vessels, only without the handle and rim.
**ZOOMORPHS – FIGURINES**

**Base Ring Horse (HZF)**

(Fig 128)

5 provenanced examples (of which 3 are fragmentary)
5 recorded unprovenanced examples (of which 1 is fragmentary)

Dates: Kazaphani Tomb 2 provides the only datable context for this type, a multi-period date of LC I – IIC.

Context: Tomb (3) Settlement (1) Uncertain (1)

Region: NC (2) Lev (2) SC (1)

Material: BR fig {10}

Size:

Height – between 8cm and 14.2cm [mean = 11.3cm]

Length – between 12.2cm – 19.4cm [mean 15.5cm]

Shape:

These horses have cylindrical bodies which widen slightly at the back legs. Their peg legs taper almost to a point and the tail is depicted in relief in the centre of the backside. The cylindrical neck leads to a modelled snout with a horizontal incision indicating the mouth and painted pellets with incised circles indicating the eyes. Small triangular ears are modelled on the top of the head.

Decoration:

On most examples, dark brown/black matt painted stripes cover the neck and the centre of the body. There is also a raised ridge for the mane running down the centre of the head, decorated with incisions to indicate hair. 3 examples have an additional raised ridge around the neck, one of which (HZF.Kao.01) is decorated with a row of impressed circles. HZF.Kaz.02 has a column of raised circles down one side of its neck; HZF.L-Uga.01 has an incised herringbone pattern along the length of the tail to indicate hairs.

Variations:

As well as the small differences in decoration described above, there is some variation in the proportions of these horses, one (HZF.L-TAH.01) with a notably thinner body, for instance, and one rather wider body (HZF.L-Uga.01) is possibly wheelmade. One example (HZF.Kaz.02) is rather different from the rest: it is a solid head fragments with modelled mouth and protrusions beneath the pellets indicating the eyes.

Condition:

All but 3 of these examples are broken. 3 are detached heads and 4 have missing legs.
Buff Painted Bulls (PZF)  
(Fig 129, Fig 130, Chart 26)

84 provenanced examples (of which 52 are fragmentary)
4 recorded unprovenanced examples

Dates: LC IIC – LC IIIA+

Context:
- Settlement (38)
- Tomb (16)
- Ritual space (26)
- Uncertain (4)

Regions:
- E (48)
- SW (14)
- SC (11)
- C (8)
- NW (3)

Material: WPWM III (fig)\(^{597}\) (88)

Size:
- Length (All) – between 3.5cm and 37cm [mean = 16.1cm]
- Length (Naturalistic)\(^{598}\) – between 6.8cm and 8.6cm [mean = 7.9cm]
- Length (Cylindrical) – between 12cm and 37cm [mean = 21.6cm]
- Length (Miniature) – between 3.5cm and 4cm [mean = 3.7cm]

Shape:
These figurines, made from buff clay with a creamy-white surface depict horned quadrupeds (either standard bulls or, with the addition of a pronounced shoulder-hump, zebu). Eyes are shown by raised protrusions, highlighted by a painted ring and central dot. The tail is modelled in high relief in the centre of the backside, falling usually to one side.

\(^{597}\) The objects in this group have been variously labelled Plain Ware, LC III Decorated, Proto-White Painted and WPWM III. However, on examination of these objects, it is apparent that all examples belong to the same ceramic tradition. Although different figurines fit the characteristics of some of those labels better than others, none satisfactorily describes them. On the advice of A. Georgiou (pers. comm. 14 Feb 2012) they have been included in the WPWM III tradition due to their fabric and decoration. The suffix ‘fig’, as used in the Base Ring figurines, denotes the fact that they do not belong to a canonical subgroup of this ware as currently described but form their own, specific to figurines.

\(^{598}\) PZF.Ayr.01 is in the style of the naturalistic group but its 32cm length is more fitting to the Cylindrical range, thus it has been omitted from the subgroup size ranges as anomalous.
Decoration: With the exception of 10 apparently undecorated examples, all of these objects are painted with matt paint, either dark brown/black or reddish-orange. Where a pattern can be discerned, this takes the form of a haphazard pattern of dots and lines across the body and head {15}, rough cross hatch {10} or even transverse stripes{5} across the same areas. There are two very similar examples (PZF.Enk.15 and 22) which have painted stripes on the neck and head only. Generally the even stripes are confined to the ‘cylindrical’ examples but this is not a hard and fast rule.

One unusual bull (PZF.Enk.21) has a pattern of close-set semi-circles with central dots across the upper part of its back with a framed band of vertical dashes below on either side. The horizontal stripes (two above and one below) which frame the vertical dashes continue down each leg.

A small number of examples {3} have incised decoration, consisting of impressed circles which cover the face; on at least one of these (PZF.Ayr.02) this is in addition to painted stripes on the body (the other – PZF.Kou.01 – is a fragment of the head and forepart only).

On one unusual example (PZF.Psi.01), which appears to be otherwise undecorated, there is an inscription in Cypro-Minoan along the side.

Variations: There are three clear subgroups in this type, mentioned above in the size ranges. The “naturalistic” type {23} has a torso with modelled musculature, narrowing in the centre and widens towards a hump at the shoulder area. The legs are relatively fat, often bent at the knees and modelled to show the muscles, and stand on flattened ends. The neck points forwards and the head forwards, or slightly downwards. The face is modelled in an almost lumpy manner with raised areas at either side and a slight bend in the snout which terminates in modelled lips and depressions for nostrils. The curved horns also point slightly forwards. These are generally handmade and solid. Decoration is usually in the form of painted dots and dashes spread at random across the body.
The larger, “cylindrical” type (25), on the other hand, is more similar to the Base Ring Bulls, with straight, cylindrical torso and wide, upright neck, pointed snout and upright horns which curve inwards. The legs taper to a more pointed end. Though not unheard-of, the shoulder hump is less common in this type. The snout is straighter with a flat end, horizontal incision for mouth and depressions for nostrils. This type seems to exist both in wheelmade and handmade varieties, hollow and solid, although the majority of examples are poorly published and this has consequently not been possible to determine. When decoration exists on this form, it is usually painted stripes across the torso, except on two examples where only the front is painted.

Examples of the “miniature” type (6) tend to be undecorated, solid and handmade, usually modelled in a relatively naturalistic manner for their small size.

Some examples (15) have the penis and testicles depicted in relief on the underside of the body, between the hind legs.

A small number of examples (4) use applied pellets with incised circles to represent the eyes.

Condition: Of the 52 fragmentary PZFs, 29 are torsos, 15 heads, 3 limbs, 3 heads and upper torso, 1 horn and 1 uncertain. There is a clear bias towards torso fragments but since this is the largest part of the figurine, this pattern is not remarkable. Of the 32 near complete objects for which the condition is known, all but one have missing or damaged horns. Most also have damage to one or more legs and the tail. The lack of horns may be significant as it is so widespread and only one detached horn fragment has been found. However, these are clearly the most easily broken parts and small fragments such as partial horns are less likely to be found and correctly identified even in controlled excavation, let alone in the case of chance finds.
**Miscellaneous Zoomorphs (UZF):** There are 14 provenanced and 1 unprovenanced zoomorphic figurines which are either too fragmentary or insufficiently published to assign to a category with any certainty, or whose unique shape does not fit with any other known examples. These have been identified as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Early-Middle Cypriot</th>
<th>Late Cypriot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bull</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mycenaean Zoomorphs (AZF):** 38 Mycenaean zoomorphs have been found in Cyprus which may be imported or locally-made copies.

**Bronze Zoomorphs (ZZF):** There are 3 zoomorphic bronzes which do not form any kind of coherent stylistic category or fit wholly into an existing category.
ZOOMORPHS – VESSELS

Hole-Mouth Zoomorph (HZV) \(^{599}\) (Fig 131, Fig 132)

- **8 provenanced examples**
- **12 recorded unprovenanced examples**

**Dates:** MC II-III: (Estimated from a single dateable tomb from MC II and stylistic indications)

**Context:** Uncertain (6) Tomb (2)

**Regions:** C (3) SW (2) Lev (1) SC (1) NC (1)

**Material:** WP {15} RP {4} DP {1}

**Size:**
- Height – between 4.4cm and 23cm [mean = 10.0cm]
- Length – between 6.8cm and 16.1cm [mean = 11.1cm]

**Shape:** This type of zoomorphic vessel is handmade with solid head and legs and hollow body. The body is roughly conical, tapering to a point at the back, almost as a short, tufty tail. On the wider end of the body, there is a short neck with zoomorphic head; the nose in pointed and eyes represented by depressions. A small vertical lug is placed in the centre of the back. On the front of the body, at the base of the neck is a large round opening, giving this category its name. These vessels are usually supported on three short stumpy legs.

**Decoration:** Most of these vessels are covered in painted geometric decoration, usually cross hatch or groups of parallel lines. One has wavy lines (HZV.AyP.01) and there is a single undecorated example (HZV.AyP.02).

**Variations:** Although it is not always clear what animal is being represented on these vessels, they generally appear to represent:

- Bull 11
- Bird 3
- Uncertain 3
- Deer 1
- Goat 1
- Ram 1

---

\(^{599}\) See n.592 re E-MC Stringhole Zoomorphs.
3 examples appear to have four legs, rather than the more usual three. 3 examples have a slightly larger loop handle in place of the vertical lug. One rather odd example (HZF.NON.10) has a hole in the middle of the forehead instead of mid-neck.

Condition: These vessels generally have some wear to painted surfaces but no major damage to the object. Wear seems to be most obvious on the bodies of the vessels but it has not been possible to establish whether this occurred pre or post deposition.
Rectangular Zoomorph (RZV)

14 provenanced examples (of which 5 are fragmentary)
11 recorded unprovenanced examples

Dates: MC III – LC IB

Context: Tomb (7) Settlement (3)
Uncertain (4)

Regions: Lev (4) NC (4) E (3) C (1) SC (1) NW (1)

Material: WP VI (21) BS (2) Uncertain (2)

Size: Height – between 8cm and 12.5cm [mean = 10.1cm]
Length – between 10.9cm and 17.8cm [mean = 14.8cm]

Shape: These handmade vessels appear in two main types but share several common key characteristics. Their narrow bodies are rounded rectangles with an upright, cylindrical neck. They have very small, stubby legs, placed at each corner and a short, tufty tail at the back. They have a flat strap handle on the top edge.

Decoration: Groups of painted lines cover the body and neck.

Variations: Some examples (4) have a small head with two pointed ears and a small snout. In the centre of the back is a tall spout with slightly flaring rim. The handle is attached to this rim at the back and continues to the rear of the animal. Most examples (20) however, have a trefoil spout in place of the head and a small, almost circular, loop handle in the centre of the back. One unusual example (RZV.Kaz.03) has a trefoil spout at one end and an animal head at the other with a tall loop handle in the middle of the back. This shows the clearest stylistic link with the apparently contemporaneous and clearly related category of Fat Zoomorphs.

Note that there is one single-period context apparently dated to LC IIA at Myrtou-Pigadhes (RZV.MyP.01). Since this is the only one of this period and the excavation material is in need of further study, it has been excluded from the chronological range.

P.Åström 1972 identifies these as WP V-VI transitional but on the advice of Louise Maguire (pers. comm. 10 March 2009), I have designated them WP VI.
Condition: Every example whose condition could be assessed is worn or damaged to some extent. On many, the desurfacing and flaking paint is confined to one side of the object, suggesting it occurred as a result of the object’s position in the tomb. Handles and the front of the vessels, however, show focussed wear on some examples (Fig 133) perhaps indicating repeated practical use. The damage also includes frequent chips to the rim edges, and broken or missing handles which may also have resulted from the use of the object prior to deposition.
Fat Zoomorph (FZV) (Fig 135, Fig 136, Chart 27)

18 provenanced examples (of which 1 is fragmentary)

18 recorded unprovenanced examples

**Dates:** MC III - LC I

**Context:** Tomb (8) Uncertain (10)

**Regions:** C (12) NC (5) NW (1)

**Material:** WP {34} (of which WP V {10}, WP V-VI {3}, WP VI {2}, WP III – IV {1}, WP IV {1}) BS III {2}

**Size:**
- Height: between 8.2cm and 24cm (mean = 13.5cm)
- Diameter: between 8.6cm and 21.9cm (mean = 14.9cm)

**Shape:** These handmade vessels (Fig 135) have large, fat bodies with a central loop handle on the mid back, a tall, cylindrical neck with cutaway or trefoil spout at the top on one side and a zoomorphic head which blends seamlessly into the body on the opposite side. Most have modelled horns and snout and eyes rendered by painted circles with central dots (or depressions in the case of the BS examples)

**Decoration:** Elaborate red/black painted (or incised on the BS examples) panels cover the body, spout and handle of these vessels.

**Variations:** This type is supported by three {17} or four {19} short, peg legs, often square in section.

The protomes of this type represent several different types of animal comprising bull {11}, stag {9} and ram {5}. On 13 examples the animal species could not be discerned.
Condition: These vessels are found in a range of conditions, from fairly pristine to very fragmentary or mended from small fragments. Many examples viewed have chips to the spouts and rims and evidence of surface wear. Some of this was clearly post-depositional, such as the damage to one whole side of FZV.Kaz.02 and 03. However, there was also some more concentrated wear, particularly on the handles and front of the body (e.g. Fig 136) where a hand may have been used to brace the vessel during pouring. This suggests repeated, pre-depositional usage.

Fig 136: FZV.AyP.02 (D-K.Knox, Ashmolean Museum)
Flat-base Zoomorph (LZV)  

**Fig 137**: LZV.TTS.01 (Vermeule 1974:Fig 71B)

11 provenanced examples  
8 recorded unprovenanced examples

**Dates:** Single datable context suggests LC I and materials do not contradict this.

**Context:** Tomb (6) Uncertain (5)

**Regions:** C (7) NW (4)

**Material:** WP {16} (of which WP V-VI {6}, WP V {2}, WP VI {1}) BS III {3}

**Size:**  
Height: between 9.0cm and 15.2cm (mean = 13.3cm)  
Diameter: between 6cm and 15.2cm (mean = 11.5cm)

**Shape:** These handmade vessels (Fig 137) have large, roughly ovoid bodies with a central loop handle on the mid back, a tall, cylindrical neck with cutaway or trefoil spout at the top on one side and an upright zoomorphic neck and head on the opposite side. Most have modelled horns and snout; eyes are rendered by painted circles with central dots (or depressions in the case of the BS examples). The base is flat and round.

**Decoration:** Elaborate red/black painted (or incised on the BS examples) panels cover the body, spout and handle of these vessels.

**Variations:** One example (LZV.Ida.02) has a low ring base and one (LZV.TTS.02) has a biconical body.

The protomes of this type represent several different types of animal comprising ram {9}, goat {2}, bird {2}, stag {2} and bull {1}. On 3 examples the animal species could not be discerned.

**Condition:** These vessels are found in a range of conditions, from fairly pristine to very fragmentary or mended from small fragments. General wear is noted in descriptions of several examples, particularly on the handles, suggesting that the objects had been used before deposition.
Cylindrical/Barrel Zoomorph (CZV) (Fig 138, Fig 139)

2 provenanced examples

Dates: LC I

Context: Tomb (2)

Regions: C (1) SC (1)

Material: BichWM (2)

Size: Height – between 13.7cm and 13.8cm

Length – 16cm for both examples

Shape: These two objects are very similar, with wheelmade, cylindrical bodies, cylindrical necks and four short peg legs. There is a basket handle in the middle to the rear of the back.

Decoration: Red and black painted panels of geometric patterns

Variations: One of these examples (CZV.Mar.01, Fig 139) has a zoomorphic head on the end of its neck with pointed snout and short horns, suggesting it is a bull. There is a circular opening in the end of the snout and the eyes are rendered by applied pellets with a central depression. There is also a high modelled dewlap down the centre of the front edge. Directly behind the head, there is a small opening with a wide raised rim. [note – the composition of this zoomorph, if not its overall appearance, is very similar to that of the BR Bull Vessels]

The other example (CZV.Akh.01, Fig 139) is rather different. At the end of its neck there is a large open spout with what appear to be two small projections on the back edge, perhaps representing horns. Aside from this, there is no head to speak of and no other openings. [note – the composition of this one is more similar to that of the Rectangular Zoomorphs]

Condition: Both examples appear to have some desurfacing but on CZV.Akh.01 at least, this appears to be due to its position in the tomb.
Owl Rattle (OZV) (Fig 140)

18 provenanced examples (of which 2 are fragmentary)\(^\text{602}\)

27 recorded unprovenanced examples

Dates: LC IIA-C\(^\text{603}\)

Context: Tomb (17) Uncertain (1)

Regions: E (9) SC (3) Lev (5) C (1)

Material: WP VI \{45\}\(^\text{604}\)

Size: Height – between 8.9cm and 14.2cm [mean = 11.9cm]

Width – between 5.1cm and 6.3cm [mean = 5.8cm]

Shape: The body of these handmade objects (Fig 140) is ovoid with a pointed base, very similar in shape to the small WP Shaved juglet form. There is a short, cylindrical neck which terminates in an apparently ornithomorphic head, commonly thought to resemble an owl, levelled at the top with pointed ears, protruding to the sides. Two holes are pierced in the front, apparently representing eyes. A strap handle runs from the back of the head at the top to the neck. Inside are several loose pebbles, suggesting that the object was used to make sound.

Decoration: On those examples on which it is possible to discern decoration, this is in black paint and very simple style: one or two horizontal lines around the neck of the object, from which several pendant vertical lines fall. On some examples, there is a horizontal line down the middle of the face which continues to the handle.

Condition: These small objects are generally well-preserved. Isolated examples have damage to the handle, base or ears but no consistent pattern of breakage is apparent. No wear is recorded on any published examples and nothing which could not be accounted for by taphonomic processes was observed on those examples examined.

---

\(^{602}\) It is possible that some fragmentary examples have been misidentified as juglets as the bottom two-thirds of the figurine would be indistinguishable from White Shaved Juglets.

\(^{603}\) Although the fabric of this vessel is also known in LC I, no single period contexts date before LC IIA, the floreat of the similar, White Shaved dipper juglets (Gittlen 1981:51) so this must currently be taken as the lower chronological limit for this type.

\(^{604}\) The material, variously described as White Painted VI ware or White Shaved ware, is more comfortably WP VI (L. Maguire pers. comm. 10 Mar 2009). The surface has been shaped by shaving and covered with a white or cream slip. Where it is possible to view the fabric of the object (3), the clay appears to be pale buff in colour.
Base Ring Bull Vessel (BZV) (Fig 141, Fig 142, Fig 143, Fig 144, Fig 145, Chart 28)

117 provenanced examples (of which 18 are fragmentary)

97 recorded unprovenanced examples (of which 2 are fragmentary)

Dates: LC IIA – LC IIIA

Context: Tomb (76) Settlement (20) Uncertain (21)

Regions: NC (27) SC (23) E (16) Lev (22) C (15) SW (5) K (6) Aeg (3)

Material: BR (fig) {214}

Size:

Height – between 6.7cm and 23cm [mean = 11.7cm]

Length – between 8cm and 24.5cm [mean = 15.3cm]

Shape: These are handmade, hollow vessels of Base Ring fabric (Fig 141). The handle is usually a flat, basket shape, positioned on the mid back to the lower neck; one end terminates in a circular rim on the lower neck of the bull. The snout has a circular opening leading directly through into the main body of the vessel. The eyes are applied circular pellets of clay with an incised circle representing the pupil (cf. FAF and EAF figurines). The ears are small folded pieces of clay applied beneath the horns. The legs are usually peg shaped. The tail is represented in low relief on the rear of the bull; the dewlap is represented in sharp relief on the front. The body is cylindrical, narrowing slightly in the centre and widening again towards the rear. The handle, legs and horns are

---

605 Two examples from Ayios Iakovos-Melia Tomb 14, layer 6, were dated to LC I by the excavator (Sjöqvist 1934:353). However, subsequent examination of the material by L. Crewe (pers. comm. 7 June 2011) suggests that this dating cannot be relied upon at the present time. As these are the only single-context examples placing BZVs in LC I, the beginning of this type has been placed in LC IIA on current evidence.
pushed through the main body for attachment. The legs are hollowed out and splayed on the inside.

Decoration: The majority of examples have decoration in white paint. On some (92), the pattern of this decoration is no longer discernable, due to either fragmentation, surface wear or, in the case of many unprovenanced examples, insufficient published description. Of those whose decoration is clear, the most common pattern is groups of parallel lines (64) probably applied with a multiple brush; some examples have even parallel stripes across the body (24) and others a multiple tree-like pattern (27). Some individual figurines (5) show alternative decorative patterns – BZV.Enk.04 has rectangular boxes filled with stripes on each side, BZV.Lim.01 has pairs of diagonals which converge on the upper back and BZV.NON.11 and BZV.NON.82 have a combination of painted lines and spots across the body. There are 2 examples on which it is clear that no decoration was ever present.

Variations: Although this is a relatively uniform group, there are some variations in the overall shape and proportions of each object.

Unusual additional features include an eyelet on the end of the snout (26), modelled genitals (3), sculpted musculature on the forelegs (BZV.Kaz.13) and eyes rendered with spirals of clay (Fig 143, BZV.Kaz.01 and BZV.NON.16). A number of examples have small modelled turns on the end of the legs, presumably to represent feet.

There is also some variation in the style of rim which is placed on the back of the vessel, towards the neck: whilst most are flush with the body of the vessel, some have a raised rim (35) ranging between a slight lip and a cylindrical neck of a few centimetres in height with modelled rim on the top (Fig 142).

One unique example (BZV.Tam.02) has a bronze ring through the eyelet on top of its muzzle.
Condition: Of the 20 fragments, 12 are heads, 7 torsos and 1 uncertain. Of the 121 complete examples for which condition could be assessed, at least 71 had damage to the horns, 42 to the legs, 35 to the torso, 28 to the head, 30 to the ears and 8 to the handle. This damage pattern is completely explainable from taphonomic processes: the fragile, protruding horns received most damage, followed by the protruding but more solid legs. Most damage appears to have occurred in situ as the majority of breaks have been repaired. No evidence of ritual breakage is apparent.

No example, however, was in perfect condition and general wear, knocks and chips to the bodies and edges were apparent throughout. On several examples, the handle has been smoothed or worn as if from recurrent use (e.g. Fig 145 and Fig 144). It seems likely that most Base Ring Bull Vessels were in frequent use prior to deposition.

Fig 145: BZV.Kaz.05 (D-K.Knox, Cyprus Museum)

Fig 144: BZV.Kaz.08 (D-K.Knox, Cyprus Museum)
**Base Ring Bull (Indeterminate) (BZU):** There are an additional 110 Base Ring Bulls which could not be definitively attributed to either the Vessel or Figurine categories. These are either too fragmentary or not published in sufficient detail to be assigned to a type with any certainty.

**Miscellaneous Zoomorphic Vessels (UZV):** There are a further 15 provenanced and 9 unprovenanced zoomorphic vessels included in the database which cannot be fitted into this typological scheme due either to their fragmentary nature, unavailable descriptions or unique nature: 7 (plus 9 unprovenanced) from the Early-Middle Bronze Age, 3 from the MC III – LC I transitional period and 5 from the Late Bronze Age. They represent the following range of animals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Provenanced</th>
<th>Unprovenanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bull</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer/Stag</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep/Ram</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>1 (imported)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mycenaean Zoomorphic Vessels (AZD):** There are 3 additional zoomorphic vessels which appear to be fragments of imported Mycenaean bull rhyta (all from Enkomi).
ZOOMORPHS – DECORATION ATTACHED TO VESSELS

Decorated Multi-Necked Jug (JZD)  
(Fig 146)

1 provenanced example
8 recorded unprovenanced examples

Dates: The single provenanced example has no datable context but by material and style, these appear to belong within the EC I – II period

Context: Uncertain (1)

Regions: SW (1)

Material: RP {8} [of which RP South Coast {6}] DP {1}

Size: Height – between 18cm and 66 cm [mean = 41.7cm]

Shape: These jugs have an ovoid body with a flat base and two cylindrical necks with slightly flaring rims, rising from the centre at the top. The necks are joined by two or more horizontal bars, evenly spaced between them, on which animal figurines or protomes sit.

Decoration: The jugs are generally covered with geometric incised patterns across the bodies and necks. The incised decoration is in the South Coast style of Red Polished ware patterning and helps to locate the unprovenanced examples to this region.

Variations: There is some variation in the type of animal: birds are most common {6} but there are single examples which include bulls, stags and sheep. The provenanced example has its animal figurine in a slightly different position, standing on the shoulder of the vessel with its forelegs resting on the lowest joining bar. There are also some examples {3} which have additional or their only animals on the shoulder, either side of the handle.

Condition: These all appear to be in good condition and were probably discovered in looted tombs.
ZOOMORPHS – DECORATION ATTACHED TO VESSELS

Bird Bowl (OZD) (Fig 147, Fig 148)

10 provenanced examples

1 recorded unprovenanced example

Dates: EC I – EC III

Context: Tomb (9) Uncertain (1)

Regions: NC (10)

Material: RP {9} Uncertain {2}

Size: Height – between 12cm and 29.2cm [mean = 18.9cm]

Diameter – between 9.5cm and 26cm [mean = 17.5cm]

Shape: This category comprises various types of bowl with bird figurines or protomes attached to the rim. The birds are generally s-shaped with slightly flared wings and eyes indicated by depressions.

Decoration: 4 examples have incised linear decoration on the body of the vessel and one further example (OZD.Vou.08) combines this with two relief bucrania below the rim. OZD.Vou.04 also has relief bucrania under the rim but with no additional incised decoration; OZD.Vou.06 has relief wavy verticals on the body of the vessel. There are 2 examples on which there is no decoration on the body of the vessel and 2 for which it has not been possible to determine the decorative style.

Variations: There is some variation in the shape of the bowl – 2 examples are tulip bowls with pointed bases, 3 are shallow, hemispherical bowls, 2 are stemmed bowls, 2 are deep bowls and there are 2 whose shape could not be determined.

606 It is debatable whether the protomes on the rims of 3 examples which have not been included in this category (UZD.Vou.05, 06 and 07) were ever really intended to resemble birds. They have no eyes indicated and only vaguely ornithomorphic shape and it is my opinion that they were probably simply functionally shaped suspension lugs. However, they are commonly described as birds in publication (especially in Karageorghis 1991a) and so they have been included in the database.
There are also differences in the composition of the rim projections. The majority
{7} feature fully modelled birds: of these, 4 alternate the birds with short,
mushroom shaped lugs (three have birds facing sideways and one inwards); OZD.Vou.09 alternates its two inward-facing birds with two miniature bowls;
OZD.Vou.06 also includes a small ram protome opposite an open spout on the rim; OZD.Vou.04 simply has four inward-facing birds. The remaining examples {2}
feature a pair of opposed bird protomes, facing outwards from the rim of the vessel.

Condition: Most of these vessels are well preserved and all missing portions appear to be accounted for by usual processes of tomb decomposition.
Dog Vessel (DZD) (Fig 149, Chart 29)

30 provenanced examples (of which 5 are fragmentary)
2 recorded unprovenanced examples

Dates: LC IA

Context: Tomb (30)

Regions: NW (29) C (1)

Material: BS V {6} WP VI {26}

Size: Height – between 12.4cm and 19.9cm [mean = 17.1cm]

Width – between 11.4cm and 19cm [mean = 14.5cm]

Shape: Most examples are tankards with biconical bodies, flat bases, cylindrical necks and flaring rims. A strap handle with thumb projection at the top runs from rim to the vessel shoulder. The animals stand with hind legs on the shoulder of the vessel and forelegs on its neck.

Decoration: The vessel is covered in geometric decoration in matt red to dark brown/black paint or incisions in the case of the BS V example. The animals are frequently decorated with stripes.

Variations: Most examples show a single dog opposite the handle (21) but some show a pair, positioned antithetically (5). One shows a dog opposite the handle with a bird figure on top of the handle spur (DZD.TTS.05). Another shows two animals, apparently moufflon, side by side, opposite the handle (DZD.TTS.02). A further example of a moufflon instead of a dog can be found in DZD.TTS.24.

One example is apparently a flask (DZD.Ayr.01) – it is fragmentary but appears to have had a biconical body with narrow, cylindrical neck and funnel spout; another is an amphora (DZD.PoL.01) with an ovoid body, tapering towards a ring base, a narrow cylindrical neck and outcurved rim. It is significant that these 2 variations occur outside its apparent heartland of Morphou-Toumba tou Skourou.

Condition: Most of these objects are incomplete or mended from small fragments. There is some indication of surface wear on some examples but has not been possible to determine whether this is taphonomic or associated with prolonged use.

Chart 29: Datable contexts for Dog Vessels (shaded area denoting floreat of BS V and WP VI)
Base Ring Bull Protomes (BZD) (Fig 152, Fig 150, Fig 151)

11 provenanced examples (of which 1 is fragmentary)
16 recorded unprovenanced examples (of which 1 is fragmentary)

Dates: LCIIA - IIC ? (no examples survive from single-period contexts; only one multi-period context exists – LC IA – IIC)

Context: Tomb (7) Settlement (3) Uncertain (1)

Regions: Lev (4) NC (3) NW (1) C (1) SW (2)

Material: BR {27}

Size: Height – between 9.5cm and 29.5cm [mean = 17.0cm]
Diameter – between 10.5cm and 25cm [mean = 16cm]

Shape: These vessels have a bull’s head and neck protruding from the shoulder in the style of a BR Bull Vessel: the eyes are indicated by applied pellets with incised circles either side of a protruding, roughly cylindrical snout; the horns diverge upwards from the top of the head, tapering to a point and curving slightly inwards at the top; beneath these are two small pinched ears. The bucranial projection is always positioned on the shoulder of the vessel, opposite the handle, facing outwards and appears to provide a pouring spout through the snout.

Decoration: Where decoration exists it is sparse, usually comprising diverging white painted (8) or relief (4) lines down the body of the vessel. 2 further painted examples show slightly different patterns covering their bodies – BZD.NON.16 has large white spots and BZD.NON.10 has a wide hatched pattern. One example
(BZD.Kaz.01) has two narrow bands of incised dashes on the front of the vessel, diagonally from each shoulder then converging in the centre to form a vertical herringbone band. There is some indication that the type of decoration used is determined by the shape of the vessel (see below for variations).

Variations: These protomes are attached to three main types of vessel. The most common is a jug with ovoid body, ring base, cylindrical spout and strap handle from spout to the neck of the protome (11). Several examples have an elliptical body, tapering to a point at either side, ring base, central cylindrical spout and strap handle from spout to the rear of the body (5). 5 examples have a tall, spindle-shaped body, tapering to a point at the base with a small vertical strap handle on the upper shoulder and a central flaring neck with strainer at the top. One unusual example (BZD.Kaz.01) is in the form of a flask with a flattened, lentoid body, the protome protruding from the centre of one long side, the neck of the vessel in the centre at the apex of the body and the handle running behind it from just below the rim to the shoulder of the vessel.

Condition: These survive in both fragmentary and very good condition. Damage to the fragile horns of the bull protomes is common but not omnipresent. No consistent pattern of wear is currently observable.

**BR Zoomorphic Handle (HZD):** There are 3, detached provenanced examples of handles in the shape of bulls which share facial characteristics with the BR Bull Vessel type (Fig 153). They are all from uncertain contexts at Maroni-Tsaroukkas, of comparable size (c.7cm in length) and undecorated. These are the only examples of their kind known and it is not impossible that they came from the same vessel. Consequently they will be not be treated as a separate category in this analysis.
**Detached Zoomorphs (XZD):** There are 24 provenanced and 7 unprovenanced examples of zoomorphic figurines or protomes which are now detached from the vessel to which they originally belonged and cannot, therefore, be classified within this scheme. These comprise 25 from the Early-Middle Bronze Age, 5 from the MC III – LC I period and 1 from the Late Bronze Age. They also include a variety of animal species:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Provenanced</th>
<th>Unprovenanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bull</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stag</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep/Ram</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Miscellaneous Vessels with attached Zoomorphs (UZD):** There are 14 provenanced and 14 unprovenanced examples of vessels with attached zoomorphs which are either unique or for which insufficient information exists to be included in this typology. They comprise 22 from the Early-Middle Bronze Age, 3 from the MC III – LC I period and 3 from the Late Bronze Age.
Decorated Deep Bowls (DMD)  

10 provenanced examples  

1 recorded unprovenanced example

Dates: EC IB-C

Context: Tomb (10)

Regions: NC (10 – all Bellapais-Vounous)

Material: RP {10}

Size: Height (to rim) – between 15.8cm and 23.8cm [mean = 19.0cm]

Shape: These large, deep bowls taper towards a flat base and support multiple, outward-facing, zoomorphic protomes and disc projections on their rims. Most comprise two pairs of discs alternating with one or two horned animal protomes. These animals have depression eyes, either side of a pointed snout on which another pair of depressions suggest the nostrils and a small horizontal dash the mouth.

Decoration: The bodies of all examples are covered in incised geometric decoration. The disc projections have either a pattern of multiple concentric circles or a cart-wheel pattern with outer ring, smaller ring in the centre and multiple spokes radiating between the two. Decoration on the hilt handle comes in the form of incisions.

Variations: These objects are each fairly homogenous, but there is some variation in the species of animal represented, including bulls, rams, and goats as well as the number of disc projections.\textsuperscript{607}

Several examples {5} have additional projections from the side of the vessel, just below the rim, pointing upwards. Of these, 3 have a single triangular projection, recalling the shape of the hilt of a knife; a further example (DMD.Vou.03) also has a cylindrical spout opposite this hilt projection.

\textsuperscript{607} It has been suggested that DMD.Vou.01 features a bird protome. However, this would be highly unusual for this period and its inward-facing stance highly unusual for bowls of this type. I suggest instead that the L-shaped projection may represent the end of a plough, since it bears a striking resemblance to the depiction of that tool on the famous Vounous Plough Model (SMF.Vou.01), although this would still be unique for the period and type.
Several examples (5) have additional projections from the side of the vessel, just below the rim, pointing upwards. Of these, 3 have a single triangular projection, recalling the shape of the hilt of a knife; a further example (DMD.Vou.03) also has a cylindrical spout opposite this hilt projection.

Unusually DMD.NON.01 and DMD.Vou.03 have no rim projections present but instead have zoomorphic protomes attached as tall projections from below the rim.

**Condition:** Most examples are mended from fragments but otherwise well preserved with crisp decoration.
Bowl and Animal Vessel (BMD)  
(Fig 156)

4 provenanced examples  
1 recorded unprovenanced example

Dates: EC IB-C

Context: Tomb (4 – all from Bellapais-Vounous)

Regions: NC (4)

Material: RP {5}

Size: Height (to rim) – between 23.4cm and 52.9cm [mean = 36.4cm]

Shape: This category comprises bowls with long, cylindrical stems, widening towards slightly flaring bases. On their rims are alternating miniature tulip bowls and outward-facing animal protomes. The miniature bowls each have two vertical lugs at their rims and the animals have pointed snouts and eyes rendered by depressions.

Decoration: The bodies of the main vessel and miniature vessels are decorated with incised, lime-filled geometric patterns.

Variations: There is some variation in the length of the stem, as the range of heights above demonstrates. One example (BMD.Vou.04) has nothing more than a high ring base and is also unusual as it has additional protomes on the rims of the miniature bowls positioned around the rim of the main vessel.

Otherwise, the main difference comes in the combination of rim projections: on BMD.Vou.02, two tulip bowls alternate with one ram and one bull protome; BMD.Vou.03 is similar but with the addition of two further fragmentary protomes whose form can no longer be determined; BMD.Vou.01 has three tulip bowls, alternating with three complete animals, two bulls and one stag; BMD.Vou.01 has 2 tulip bowl alternating with bucranial pillars, a bird and a bull figurine.

Condition: All these objects are well preserved.

---

608 These animals are very similar to the pair of Detached Zoomorphs (XZD.Vou.11 and XZD.Vou.12) from Vounous which may in fact be detached from a similar vessel.
MIXED ZOOMORPHS/OBJECTS – DECORATION ATTACHED TO VESSELS

Decorated Jugs (QMD) (Fig 157, Fig 158)

9 provenanced examples (of which 1 is fragmentary)
4 recorded unprovenanced examples

Dates: EC IB – EC IIIB

Context: Tomb (5) Uncertain (4)

Regions: NC (5) C (4)

Material: RP {10} DP {3}

Size: Height: between 24 cm and 71cm [mean = 51.3cm]

Shape: These jugs have ovoid bodies, tapering to slightly pointed bases with central, long cylindrical spouts on the top and handle from mid-neck to shoulder. They are elaborated with miniature animals and vessel models arranged around the shoulder of the jug.

Decoration: Most of these vessels are decorated with relief rings around the neck and occasional short relief bands on the upper body. On 3, the relief ridges are wavy lines. One (CMD.Kot.01) has incised geometric decoration on the body.

Variations: There are two main variations in the style of spout on these vessels – 7 examples have either a single or double cutaway spout and 6 examples have a cylindrical spout with outcurved, flaring rim.

There is also some variation in the combination of animals and vessels on the shoulder of these jugs, including pairs of yoked oxen, sheep or moufflon, miniature bowls and jugs and, in one case (QMD.Lap.01) a pair of Plank Figurines seated on a bench.

Condition: Some examples are in very good condition, others fragmentary or repaired from many small fragments. No indications of consistent wear or deliberate breakage.
MIXED ZOOMORPHS/OBJECTS– DECORATION ATTACHED TO VESSELS

Hilt/Spout Bowls (HMD)  

(Fig 161)

3 provenanced examples

Dates: EC IIIB – MC I

Context: Tomb (2) Uncertain (1)

Regions: NC (2) C (1)

Material: RP (3)

Size: Height: between 40.5cm and 42cm [mean = 41.3cm]

Diameter: between 44cm and 51cm [mean = 47cm]

Shape: This type comprises large, wide bowls decorated with zoomorphic miniatures around the rim. They have a cylindrical spout with flat, protruding rim and a handle in the form of a dagger-hilt projection directly opposite; both the handle and the spout project from below the rim of the vessel and are bridged to the rim itself.

Decoration: These vessels are decorated with a band of disjointed relief decoration a short distance below the rim, consisting either of short wavy lines or horizontal bars with discs at the ends and in the centre. Decoration on the hilt handle comes in the form of relief bars and dots on 2 examples and incised lines and circles on the third (HMD.Mrk.01).

Variations: The 2 Vounous examples are almost identical in form and decoration. The Marki example differs slightly in the style of decoration but most significantly in the choice of rim decoration: in the Vounous examples there are four, inward-facing birds whereas in the Marki example has 6 horned animals laterally placed around the rim and two birds on the spout and hilt connections.

Condition: All 3 known examples very well preserved.

Notes: The similarity between the 2 Vounous examples in particular suggests that they may have been made at the same time, by the same maker. The hilt projection on this type recalls that found on some examples of the EC IC Decorated Deep Bowls (DMD) which came entirely from Vounous.
Knife and Sheath Models (KIF/SIF)

These two model types are generally found together and clearly intended to be pairs. It seems logical, therefore, to treat them as a single type in analyses, although they will be described separately below.

Knife Model (KIF)

7 provenanced examples (of which 2 are fragmentary)
4 recorded unprovenanced examples

Dates: EC IB - II
Context: Tomb (7) – all from Bellapais-Vounous
Regions: NC (7)
Material: RP {11}609
Size: Height – between 15.4cm and 26.5cm [mean= 20.0cm]
Width – between 4.1cm and 5.9cm [mean = 4.9cm]
Shape: These solid, handmade objects have a flattened, triangular hilt with protruding, roughly horizontal hilt guards. A cylindrical shaft leads to a leaf-shaped blade with prominent midrib.
Decoration: There are incised, lime-filled geometric designs on the hilt, hilt guards and shaft. No decoration appears on the blade.
Variations: There is some variation in the shape and angle of the hilt guards. On some examples (2), these are rectangular in section, depicted at a roughly 270 degree angle to the hilt. On others (2), the angle is similar but the guards are triangular in section. On one example (KIF.Vou.02), the rectangular guards are perpendicular to the hilt.

609 These are variously labelled BP or RP due to their mottled appearance but since all examples include some red sections, they fall most suitably within the RP ware.
Condition: All but one example has some damage, ranging between missing tips and generally fragmentary condition. There is no common pattern of breakage observable across this small group.

Sheath Model (SIF)

6 provenanced examples (of which 2 are fragmentary)
7 recorded unprovenanced examples (of which 1 is fragmentary)

Dates: EC IB - II

Context: Tomb (6) – all from Bellapais-Vounous

Regions: NC (6)

Material: RP {13}

Size:
- Height – between 14.8cm and 28.5cm [mean= 21.8cm]
- Width – between 5cm and 6.1cm [mean= 5.5cm]

Shape: This hollow, handmade object is conical in shape, tapering to a point at one end. The opposite end is open, usually slightly elliptical in section.  

Decoration: Incised, lime-filled geometric patterns cover the outer surface of these objects.

Variations: Most of these objects have horizontal or vertical ridges on the surface but the combination and position of these is variable. One example (SIF.Vou.05) has no vertical ridges but one horizontal ridge two-thirds of the way down the object; one example (SIF.Vou.04) has two opposing vertical ridges but no horizontals; another (SIF.Vou.03) has two opposing vertical ridges and a horizontal ridge two-thirds of the way down; two further examples also have both horizontal and vertical ridges but their horizontal ridge is only one-third of the way down the object; there is also one example (SIF.Vou.02) which has no ridges at all.

Condition: The condition of the sheaths is comparable to that of the knives with a range of damage in no consistent pattern.

Similar in shape to HIF type, this too could have been used as a vessel but its contextual association with the KIF type suggests that this was what was meant to go inside it.
### Horn Model (HIF)

*(Fig 161)*

- **14 provenanced examples**
- **5 recorded unprovenanced examples**

**Dates:** EC I C – MC I

**Context:** Tomb (8) Uncertain (6)

**Regions:** NC (8) C (6)

**Material:** RP {16} WP {2} Uncertain{1}

**Size:**
- Height/Length = between 8.8cm and 30cm [mean=17.6cm]
- Maximum diameter = between 3.2cm and 5.3cm [mean= 4.3cm]

**Shape:** These hollow objects are roughly conical in shape, tapering to a point at one end. The other end is open with a circular mouth. Two small circular holes are pierced through the edge close to this open end.

Although this type has been catalogued as a figurine, it should be noted that this open, hollow shape does not preclude use as a vessel.

**Decoration:** Geometric designs all over the surface.

**Variations:** Although these objects are fairly homogenous, there is some variation in their size and also their curvature, ranging from almost vertical examples (e.g. HIF.AyP.03) to those whose shape is so arched that it almost curves back on itself (e.g. HIF.Vou.04). One unusual example depicts a conjoined pair of horns (HIF.NON.05)

**Condition:** No consistent pattern of wear or damage. Most retain clear surface decoration but some (e.g. HIF.AyP.01) are desurfaced along one side consistent with lying flat on the floor of the tomb.
Spindle Model (WIF)

(Fig 162)

3 provenanced examples

Dates: EC IC - EC II

Context: Tomb (3 – all Bellapais-Vounous)

Regions: NC (3)

Material: RP (3)

Size: Length – between 20.3cm and 20.7cm [mean = 20.5cm]

Shape: The 2 spindle models for which a description is available are long, solid, handmade cylinders, tapering to a point at one end. One has an almost biconical termination at the other end (WIF.Vou.01) whereas the other has a flat end and a biconical protrusion c.1/3 of the way down from this (WIF.Vou.02).

Decoration: Incised geometric patterns cover these objects.

Condition: The 2 models for which the condition is apparent have damage. One (WIF.Vou.02) has been mended from many fragments, none of which show signs of wear.

It has been proposed that WIF.Vou.02 may be identified as RP III (Crewe 2004:8) which would indicate a later date than suggested by its apparently EC IC context. However, as there is no further evidence at present to support a redating of Vounous Tomb 92, and the ware identification remains ambiguous, the contextual date of EC IC – II will be accepted until further examples come to light. This early date is also supported by the suggestion that their decorative style indicates that the Spindle Models were made at the same workshop as the Knife/Sheath Models, Decorated Deep Bowls (DMD) and Bowl/Animal Vessels (BMD), none of which has been dated later than EC II (Karageorghis 1991a:114).
Comb Model (CIF)\textsuperscript{612} (Fig 163)

5 provenanced examples

6 recorded unprovenanced examples

Dates: EC II – MC I

Context: Tomb (5 - all Bellapais-Vounous)

Regions: NC (5)

Material: RP \{11\}\textsuperscript{613}

Size: Height – between 6.5 cm and 16.4 cm [mean = 12.5 cm]

Width – between 4 cm and 11.5 cm [mean = 7.1 cm]

Thickness – between 1.2 cm and 1.4 cm [mean = 1.3 cm]

Shape: These are solid, handmade, rectangular objects with a narrow rectangular neck extending from the centre.

Decoration: Decoration is incised and filled with lime. Although the patterns on the neck and upper body of these objects vary, the bottom of the body is always decorated with a close series of long, vertical incisions.

Variations: The end of the narrow, upper section terminates in one of three different ways: rounded with large, central piercing \{2\}; squared with a small central piercing \{4\}; or with a fish-tail shape and small central piercing \{4\}.

Condition: These objects are sturdy, mostly intact and well-preserved. On some examples the top of the hole is worn or broken through indicating that they may have been suspended for a significant time, possibly in motion.

Notes: Comb motifs which strongly resemble these objects also appear incised on some Plank figurines and in relief on at least one vessel fragment.

\textsuperscript{612} Morris (1985:138-41) has argued for these objects to be identified as anthropomorphic figurines but this thesis rejects the proposition (see Part III.C) and has included them in the Object category.

\textsuperscript{613} See note 609
OBJECTS – FIGURINES

Table Model (TIF) (Fig 164)

3 provenanced examples (of which 1 is fragmentary)
1 recorded unprovenanced example

Dates: EC III – MC II

Context: Tomb (3)

Regions: NC (2) C (1)

Material: RP {3} BP {1}

Size: The only complete example with a published size (TIF.Vou.01) is 17cm high by 32cm wide.

Shape: A single, central, hollow, cylindrical stem with a flaring base supports a flat, rectangular horizontal platform. On the platform are three miniature vessels.

Decoration: These objects are decorated with geometric decoration on the upper surface of the platform, the stem and the outer surfaces of the miniature vessels themselves.

Variations: Although there are very few examples from which to draw, it seems there is some variation in the type of miniature vessels which are depicted standing on the table platform. Both have stemmed bowls on either end but one (TIF.Vou.01) shows a double biconical jug in the centre, whereas the other (TIF.Lap.01) shows a jug of a more standard, ovoid shape, with cutaway spout.

Condition: 3 examples appear to be in intact and well-preserved but one (TIF.AyP.01) is broken into large pieces.
Footstool Model (FIF)  

- 1 provenanced example
- 2 recorded unprovenanced examples

Dates: No examples exist from datable contexts.  
Stylistically EC III – MC II?

Context: Uncertain (1)

Regions: NC (1)

Material: RP {2}  BP {1}

Size: There are only two measurements available for each dimension as follows:

- Height – 6.1cm and 14 cm
- Length – 14.3cm and 16cm
- Width – 9.2cm and 10cm

Shape: Four narrow cylindrical legs support a horizontal, rectangular platform.

Decoration: Geometric decoration covers the top of the platform.

Variations: On one example (FIF.AyD.01) the platform curves slightly upwards at the narrow edges. On this example there are also four circular incisions on the platform at the points where the legs join, perhaps representing a skeuomorphic vestige of a wooden stool fixed with pegs.

Condition: Examples are in generally good condition with little damage beyond desurfacing.
OBJECTS – FIGURINES

**Boat Model (BIF)**

*Fig 166, Fig 167*

*5 provenanced examples (of which 2 are fragmentary)*

*1 recorded unprovenanced example*

**Dates:**

LC IIA – LC IIIA

**Context:**

Tomb (5)

**Regions:**

E (2) SC (2) NC (1)

**Material:**

PWHM (3) Uncertain (2)

**Size:**

Height – between 10cm and 23cm [mean = 15.7cm]

Length – between 32cm and 58.7cm [mean = 45.2cm]

**Shape:**

These handmade objects are in the shape of hollow canoes with curved sides and protruding prow and stern. On the interior are modelled fittings, usually including a raised ring, perhaps for the addition of a mast.

**Decoration:**

On the earlier examples (Fig 166), a line of small punctures runs around the entire upper edge. The 2 fragmentary LC IIIA examples (Fig 167) show evidence of black painted stripes.

**Variations:**

Although the overall shape of these models is homogenous, there is some variation in the minor details of the composition. One example (BIF.Kaz.01) has a relief horizontal running around the outside, roughly half way up the hull; another (BIF.Mar.01) has a fork-shaped projection at one end (either stern or prow); and another (BIF.Mar.02) has a medium-sized hole pierced through either side towards one end of the boat, half way up the hull.

**Condition:**

All these models are broken in some way – 2 are mended from fragments, 2 only partially preserved and one with parts of the stern and prow missing.

---

614 It is possible that these objects form two distinct chronological groups: LCII from Maroni and Kazaphani (3) and LC IIIA from Sinda (2, fragmentary). Given the small numbers and overall similarity in form, they will be dealt with here as two variations of the same category.
Bucranial Wall (WMF)  

3 provenanced examples (of which 1 is fragmentary)

Dates: Stylistically EC III – MC I due to Red Polished material and form of anthropomorph but no examples from datable contexts.

Context: Tomb (1) Uncertain (2)

Regions: C (2) E (1)

Material: RP (3)

Size: The 2 complete examples are very similar in size (Height = 22cm and 23.5cm; Width = 14cm and 15.5cm)

Shape: A flat rectangular horizontal platform projects from the base of a large flat, rectangular vertical on which there are three relief pillars connected by 2 middle horizontal relief bars. The pillars are topped by horned animal protomes. An anthropomorph stands at the base of the central pillar in front of a miniature vessel. Two hooked projections pass through the object and are visible on both the back and the front.

Decoration: Apart from the relief features, there is no decoration present.

Variations: These objects are all very similar although WMF.Kot.02 lacks the horizontal bars.

Condition: The 2 intact examples are in very good condition and even the fragile animal horns have received only minor damage. It was not possible to consider wear patterns on these objects.
### Table 23: Typological Concordance Table comparing this system with the three most influential existing typologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE NAME</th>
<th>Morris 1985</th>
<th>SCE (L. Åström IV.1C, P. Åström IV.1B, D. &amp; Stewart IV.1A)615</th>
<th>Karageorghis 1991a/1993</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAF</strong> Crib (cradle)</td>
<td>SF - Plank</td>
<td>1C: III.4</td>
<td>91: C, WHP.C - Crib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PAF</strong> Plank</td>
<td>5a, d, Plank (shoulder, slab, multineck, parental)</td>
<td>1A: XXXIX B a-f, C a - Late Human Figure 1C: I.1-4, 6-7; III.1</td>
<td>91: Ba-j, WHP.Ba-j - Plank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAF</strong> Transitional Anthrop.</td>
<td>5e (part), h - Plank (parental, legged)</td>
<td>1C: I.5; II.1; III.3, 5</td>
<td>91: F - humans with cylindrical bodies; WHP. D, Ea (part), Eb - Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QAF</strong> Plaque</td>
<td>SI - Plank</td>
<td>1C: III.2</td>
<td>91: WHP.Ea (part) - Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EAF</strong> Earring</td>
<td>BB - Public Triangle (earring)</td>
<td>1D: II.2 - 3</td>
<td>93: A - standing nude female with bird face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F/SAF</strong> Flathead/Seated Flathead</td>
<td>8a (part) - Public Triangle (headgear)</td>
<td>1D: II.1; II.4</td>
<td>93: B - standing nude female with normal face; C - nude female, seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAF</strong> LC Crib</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>93: D (part) - Miscellaneous Isolated Humans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EAV</strong> Early Anthrop Vessels</td>
<td>6 (part) - Vessel-shaped figures</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAV</strong> Flap</td>
<td>8a (part) - Public Triangle (headgear)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>93: E - Bottle-shaped Astarte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WAD</strong> Wishbone Handle</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>91: VI (part) - Human figures, protomes or heads, apart from Plank-Shaped Figures attached to Vases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAD</strong> Plank Composite</td>
<td>5g (part) - Plank (attached to vessel)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>91: III - Plank Figures attached to Composite Bowls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAD</strong> Person/Spout</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>IB: WP V ware – E1a</td>
<td>93: WHP IV (part) - Human figurines attached to vases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAD</strong> MC Composite</td>
<td>5g (part) - Plank (attached to vessel)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>93: WHP IV (part) - Human figurines attached to vases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SMF</strong> Scenic Model</td>
<td>Scenic Compositions (part)</td>
<td>1A: XLII-3</td>
<td>9: VII – Models of 'sanctuaries' and other scenes with human figures (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BMF</strong> Bull Leader</td>
<td>8a (part) - Public Triangle (headgear)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>93: G - Human with Bull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HMF</strong> Horse/Rider</td>
<td>Animal Type 3 (part) - Equines</td>
<td>1C: BR II ware - XVI.A Animal-Shaped Vase</td>
<td>93: F - Horse and Rider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SMD</strong> Scenic Vessel</td>
<td>Scenic Compositions (part)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>91: SC – Large Vases with Scenic Compositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JMD</strong> Plank/Animal Jug</td>
<td>5g (part) - Plank (attached to vessel); Animal Type 9 (part) - Birds, Scenic Compositions</td>
<td>1A: IB3f5; IB3f52; IB3d5</td>
<td>91: I - Plank Figures attached to Jugs; XII (part) - Bird figures attached to Vases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YMD</strong> Plank/Animal Pysix</td>
<td>5g (part) - Plank (attached to vessel); Animal Type 9 (part) - Birds, Scenic Compositions</td>
<td>1A: IX C3</td>
<td>91: II - Plank Figures attached to Pyxides; XII (part) - Bird figures attached to vases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PMID</strong> Protome Jug</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>91: WHP.IV - humans attached to vases, WHP.XI - animal protomes attached to vases, BS.X - animals attached to vases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MZF</strong> Miniature</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FZF</strong> Freestanding</td>
<td>Animal Type 1 - Deer, 2 - Cattle, 3 - Equines, 4 - Pigs, 5 - Camels, 6 - Sheep, 8 - Dogs (all part)</td>
<td>1A: XL - Animal Figure - A 1 - boar; B 1-3 - deer; C 1-4 - donkey; D 1-4 - cattle; E 1 - uncertain</td>
<td>91: G, WHP.G (parts) - Freestanding Animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SZF</strong> String-hole</td>
<td>Animal Type 1 - Deer, 2 - Cattle, 3 - Equines, 5 - Camels, 8 - Dogs (all part)</td>
<td>1A: XL - Animal Figure - A 1 - boar; B 1-3 - deer; C 1-4 - donkey; D 1-4 - cattle; E 1 - uncertain</td>
<td>91: G, WHP.G (parts) - Freestanding Animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BZF</strong> Base Ring Bull Figurine</td>
<td>Animal Type 2 (part) - Cattle</td>
<td>1D: Animal Type 1 (part)</td>
<td>93: I - Base Ring Bulls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HZF</strong> Base Ring Horse</td>
<td>Animal Type 3 (part) - Equines</td>
<td>1C: BR II ware - XVI.b</td>
<td>93: H - Horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PZF</strong> Buff Painted Bull</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1D: Animal Type 1 (part); Type 2 (part)</td>
<td>93: O(i) and (ii) - Plain Ware Bulls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

615 It has been particularly difficult to match the ware-based classifications of Decorated Vessels in Volume IV.1A which are often unillustrated and have limited descriptions. Those offered here, therefore, are 'best fit' categories, and may have missed some of the finer nuances.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE NAME</th>
<th>Morris 1985</th>
<th>SCE (L. Åström IV.1C, P.Åström IV.1B,D &amp; Stewart IV.1A)(^{1})</th>
<th>Karageorghis 1991a/1993</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HZV</strong> Hole-mouth Zoomorph</td>
<td>Animal Type 1 (part) - Deer, 2 (part) - Cattle</td>
<td>1B: WP III ware - XI.c,e; WP III-IV Stringhole ware - XV.g; WP IV ware - XVII.d,e; WP IV-VI Cross Line ware - IV.a</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RZV</strong> Rectangular Zoomorph</td>
<td>Animal Type 2 (part) - Cattle</td>
<td>1B: WP V ware - XII.c; IC: WP V-VI ware - XIII.c</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FZV</strong> Fat Zoomorph</td>
<td>Animal Type 2 (part) - Cattle, 6 (part) - Sheep</td>
<td>1B: WP III ware - XI.d; WP III-IV Pendant Line ware - III.b; WP IV ware - XVII.I; WP V ware - XLII.d,e; IC: BichHM ware - VII.b; BS V ware - IX.a; WP V-VI ware - XLIId</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LZV</strong> Flat-base Zoomorph</td>
<td>Animal Type 2 (part) - Cattle, 6 (part) - Sheep</td>
<td>1C: BichHM ware - VII.a; BS V ware - IX.c;b; WP V-VI ware - XIIle</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CZV</strong> Cylindrical Zoomorph</td>
<td>Animal Type 2 (part) - Cattle</td>
<td>IC: BichHM ware - VII.a,b</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OZV</strong> Owl Rattle</td>
<td>Animal Type 9 (part) - Birds</td>
<td>IB: WP VI ware - XIV</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BZV</strong> Base Ring Bull Vessel</td>
<td>Animal Type 2 (part) - Cattle</td>
<td>IC: BR II ware - XVI.b-d</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JZD</strong> Multi-Necked Jug</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>IA: IB1a1</td>
<td>91: X (part) - unidentified animal figures attached to vases; XI (part) - protomes and fountains attached to vases; XII (part) - Bird figures attached to vases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OZD</strong> Bird Bowl</td>
<td>Animal Type 9 (part) - Birds</td>
<td>IA: XIIBe2; XIIb2a</td>
<td>91: XI - Protomes and Fountains attached to vases, XII (part) - Bird figures attached to vessels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DZD</strong> Dog Vessel</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>IB: WP V ware – XIIb; IC: BS III ware - IV.a Amphora with animal-shaped handles from neck to shoulder</td>
<td>91: WHP.X - animals attached to vases, BS.X - animals attached to vessels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BZD</strong> Base Ring Bull Protome Vessel</td>
<td>Animal Type 2 (part) - Cattle</td>
<td>IC: BR I ware - XI; BR II ware - XV; BR II ware - XVII</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DMD</strong> Decorated Deep Bowls</td>
<td>Animal Type 1 (part) - Deer, 2 (part) - Cattle</td>
<td>IA: X A2a-b1</td>
<td>91: VIII (part) - Bulls attached to vases; IX - Stags and wild goats attached to vases; XI (part) - protomes and fountains attached to vases; XII (part) - Bird figures attached to vases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BMD</strong> Bowl/Animal Vessel</td>
<td>Animal Type 1 (part) - Deer, 2 (part) - Cattle</td>
<td>IA: XXIV Ba-c; XXIV H</td>
<td>91: VIII (part) - Bulls attached to vases, XI (part) - protomes and fountains attached to vases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QMD</strong> Decorated Jugs</td>
<td>Animal Type 1 (part) - Deer</td>
<td>IA: I?</td>
<td>91: VIII (part) - bull and ox figures attached to vases, X (part) - unidentified animal figures attached to vases, XII (part) - Bird figures attached to vases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KIF/SIF</strong> Knife/Sheath</td>
<td>Inanimate Type 12 - Metal and Wood Sheathknife; Inanimate Type 13 - Leather Knife-sheath</td>
<td>1A: XXXVII 1-9 - Daggers and Sheaths</td>
<td>91: H(b) - Models of Knives; H(c) - Models of Sheaths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIF</strong> Horn</td>
<td>Inanimate Type 11 - Animal Horn</td>
<td>1A: XXXVIII A 1-4 - Early Horn with Long Body; B 1-3 - Late Horn with Long Body; C 1-7 - Horn with Short Body</td>
<td>91: H(d), WHP.Hd - Models of Horns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WIF</strong> Spindle</td>
<td>Inanimate Type 9 - Spindle</td>
<td>1A: XXXVI a-b - Spindle</td>
<td>91: H(a) (part) - Models of Furniture and Utensils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CIF</strong> Comb</td>
<td>5b - Plank (comb)</td>
<td>1A: XXXV a-c - Brush</td>
<td>91: A - Comb figurines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIF</strong> Table</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1A: XXXIII B a-b - Table with Offerings</td>
<td>91: H(a) (part) - Models of Furniture and Utensils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIF</strong> Footstool/STool</td>
<td>Inanimate Type 4 - Wooden Stool</td>
<td>1A: XXXIII A a - Plain Table</td>
<td>91: H(a) (part) - Models of Furniture and Utensils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIF</strong> Boat</td>
<td>Inanimate Type 14 - Boat</td>
<td>1C: Ship; 1D: Boat</td>
<td>93: T(i) - Models of Ships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WMF</strong> Bucranial Wall</td>
<td>Scenic Compositions (part)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>91: VII - Models of ‘sanctuaries’ and other scenes with human figures (part)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>