

Editor's Foreword

When my father, Hector Catling, died on February 15th, 2013, it became my responsibility as his academic executor to bring to publication his work on the Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age cemeteries at Kouklia, which he had been entrusted with as long ago as 1958 and had been working on until only a few weeks before his death. Now, seven years later and nearly seventy years since the first tombs at Kouklia were excavated, I can only express my regrets for the further delay in this long-awaited publication, resulting from the demands of other responsibilities and commitments. The text he left was far from being the full publication originally envisaged, in that it lacks the full analytical treatment of the finds and discussion of their wider Cypriot context that he had planned. However, it is also to a large extent complete in the presentation of the tombs and their contents, as far as this was possible, with catalogues of the inventoried finds and their extensive illustration in photographs and drawings. So, although in some senses only a fragment of the work once intended, the essentials of the publication will be found here, and it is left for other scholars to draw upon this for further analysis of the material and its place within the broader scope of Cypriot archaeology.

As will emerge from the reading of the author's own Introduction and other passages in this work, the study of the cemeteries and their contents has had an unhappy history, which has been a significant factor in the lengthy delays to their publication. The finds were distributed among no fewer than six museums (Kouklia, Nicosia, St Andrews, Liverpool, Birmingham, and Sydney), those in the last of which he was never able to study in person. Large parts of the excavation records (notebooks, field drawings and photographs) were likewise dispersed and scattered, some of which were only recovered as late as December 2009, even more apparently lost. In addition, there was a lengthy dispute over the publication rights for the main body of the material, which obstructed access to the excavation records and frustrated much earlier progress on its study. Although the catalogues of the inventoried finds are as complete as was possible in the circumstances, there was a certain number of objects which could never be located, whether through loss, damage and decay of fragile materials (mainly bronze and ivory), or separation at a very early stage from the main body of finds for conservation purposes in the Cyprus museum in Nicosia; some of these items may turn up in the future or have already done so unknown to the author.

As editor of the text as it was left in 2013, I have confined myself to what seemed essential, mainly to ensure a greater degree of consistency in the presentation of the catalogues.

A small number of incomplete or repetitive sections of discussion have been removed. I have made no attempt to add to the text, other than where some greater clarity was required, nor have I augmented the rather sparse references to comparative material, not least because I lack the necessary qualifications. It is clear from a thick file of notes left by the author, that it was his intention to supply much richer referencing of this kind. For one of the most prolific categories of pottery represented in the cemeteries, the author has continued to employ the term 'Decorated Late Cypriot III Ware' (DLC III), which I am given to understand has been abandoned by many in favour of the term 'White Painted Wheel-made III Ware'. As this is simply a question of terminology, there should be no cause for confusion.

The archival materials that were in my father's possession in 2013, including his own notebooks and inventory cards, have been deposited with the Liverpool World Museum, successor to the Liverpool City Museum which had been one of the original patrons of the Kouklia-Palaepaphos excavations. It is a matter for regret that the archive remains scattered between a number of institutions in different countries.

Since 2013, several important publications bearing on the subject matter of this volume have appeared. Here we may note V. Karageorghis and E. Raptou, *Palaepaphos-Skales. Tombs of the Late Cypriot III B and Cypro-Geometric Periods (Excavations of 2008 and 2011)* (Nicosia, 2016) and the monumental P. A. Mountjoy, *Decorated Pottery in Cyprus and Philistia in the 12th Century BC. Cypriot IIIC and Philistine IIIC* (Vienna, 2018). From 2006 until the present day, there has also been a programme of survey and excavation at the site conducted by the Palaepaphos Urban Landscape Project (PULP) directed by Maria Iacovou, though its results mainly relate to its post-Bronze Age occupation, in particular to the Archaic and Classical periods (see <https://ucy.ac.cy/pulp>).

I am most grateful to the editors of BAR Publishing for agreeing to publish this volume, especially when consideration is given to its incomplete state. I would like to thank Jacqueline Senior, Ruth Fisher and Lisa Eaton in particular for their help and patience. I am also grateful to the two anonymous referees for their comments and support for this publication. Thanks are due to Joanna Smith for providing photographs of the cylinder seal illustrated in Appendix 2 and for elucidating some of the references in the original text of the Appendix.

Richard Catling
June, 2020

Preface

This book is published posthumously. The author, Hector Catling (1924-2013), died before he could finish the manuscript. It is thanks to the time-consuming and meticulous editing of his son, Richard Catling, and the interest and care of the staff of BAR Publishing (Oxford) that the volume is now seeing the light.

My friendship with Hector originated in 1968, when he became the supervisor of my doctoral thesis in Oxford. We met weekly for three years and then went our separate ways, he to Athens, I to Amsterdam. We kept in touch, and I took part in 1973 and 1974 in the first two campaigns of his excavations at the Bronze Age settlement and later sanctuary known as the Menelaion near Sparta in Laconia. Later he invited me to co-direct the Laconia Survey from 1983-1989.

Our contacts intensified when, after eighteen remarkable years as Director of the British School at Athens, he and his wife Elizabeth returned to England in 1989 and settled in Langford, a village not far from Oxford. Later, disaster struck: Elizabeth, to whom he was married for 52 years, died in 2000. However, he overcame this blow and, sustained by his children and grand-children, continued to bring the projects he had undertaken to publication.

Hector and I communicated via phone calls and letters and I stayed with him several times a year. He was then working on the first volume of the publication of his Menelaion excavations, a truly huge and daunting task. After years of offering assistance and of prodding on my part, he let me read most of his text in draft. Subsequently, he also let me help him correct the massive proofs. The book appeared in 2009.

Hector had no time to lose. So he concentrated on *Menelaion* volume II and completed his chapters for it. It was only then that he took up an old commitment to publish the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age cemeteries at Kouklia (Palaepaphos) in Cyprus, which had been dug by British scholars in 1951-1954 and form the subject of this book. Hector let me read sections of text written in long-hand. Next, they were sent to Sue Sadler who typed them out on the computer. At this time his heart began to fail and I witnessed his decline. With the financial support of Malcolm Wiener and the Institute for Aegean Prehistory, Mélanie Steiner and Sheila Raven made speed to prepare the drawings and photographs for publication. Helen Hatcher came to take dictation. Hector continued to work on the text of the book until only a few weeks before his death on 15 February 2013. He was then 88.

I see Hector as he was for so many years: tall, erect and lean, his piercing eyes beside his sharp, aquiline nose. A formidable persona, scholar and administrator, Commander of the British Empire, mentally and physically resilient. But there was another persona too: the loving husband and devoted family man, and the true friend, teacher and counsellor.

And now his long-awaited, last publication is with us. As his son Richard in his editorial Preface and Hector himself in the Acknowledgements and Introduction make clear, there are compelling reasons why it has taken so long. The text Hector left lacks the planned concluding section, in which the tombs and the various categories of finds were to be discussed in their wider Cypriot context. At the same time, much is included in this clear and systematic presentation of primary archaeological material: the description of the tombs and their contents, amply illustrated by photographs and drawings, as well as detailed treatment of the burial customs. All in all, the volume is a “must-read” for anybody interested in the archaeology of Cyprus and, more generally, in funerary archaeology.

Joost Crouwel
(Emeritus Professor of Aegean Archaeology at the
University of Amsterdam)
April, 2020

For much more information about Hector Catling’s life and achievements, see the two memoirs by Tony Spawforth, the first of which was published in his Festschrift of 1992 (*ΦΙΛΟΛΑΚΩΝ. Lakonian Studies in honour of Hector Catling*, edited by Jan Motyka Sanders (London) pp. xiii-xvii), the second in 2014 (*Annual of the British School at Athens* 109, pp. 1-2).

Introduction

The Liverpool City Museum/St Andrews University Expedition to Palaepaphos of the years 1950-1955, led by J. H. Iliffe (for Liverpool) and T. B. Mitford (for St Andrews), has undergone numerous vicissitudes, the consequences of which have been long delays in the presentation of the final published reports. The work of the Expedition, after an interval of more than ten years, was resumed under the direction of Professor Dr Franz Georg Maier, first for the University of Konstanz, latterly for the University of Zurich. This second phase of research at Palaepaphos has enjoyed the support of the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, which also undertook responsibility for the publication of the results of this more recent work in a series of volumes under the general title of *Ausgrabungen in Alt-Paphos auf Cypern*. The present volume publishes the results of research undertaken entirely during the first, British phase. It offers a description of the Late Bronze Age tombs and graves excavated at the localities Asproyi, Evreti, Kaminia and Marcello, together with a commentary on funerary architecture and burial ritual at Palaepaphos, and a review of the classes of grave offerings that were recovered. Appended to this central theme are descriptions of two Early Iron Age chamber tombs at Skales, excavated by the Expedition in 1951, and a miscellany of Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age tombs found in the immediate vicinity (at Laonas and Xylinos) and in the wider neighbourhood (at Timi, Ayios Epiphianos, near Archimandrita, and Ayia Varvara) and excavated by the British Expedition at the request of the Department of Antiquities.

As the principal author of this volume, which deals with fieldwork that took place well over 50 years ago, it might be expected that I should have been a member of that first British phase, but I was not. The background to my involvement will be found in the Acknowledgments. The relevant facts concerning my involvement are my visit to Kouklia during the 1952 season when G. R. H. Wright was winding up his work on the Evreti cemetery, my unofficial work in the second half of 1952 assisting Wright in the production of an interim report on his season's work, and, finally, the invitation from Mitford in 1958 to publish all the tombs found by the Expedition.

As explained elsewhere, only in the 1966-67 academic year when I had sabbatical leave from my duties in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, could I undertake a period of sustained work on this material, including visits to Cyprus (Nicosia and Kouklia), St Andrews, Liverpool and Birmingham among whose Museums the material had been divided in accordance with the terms of the pre-1960 Cyprus Antiquities legislation. The contents of one tomb

(Asproyi Tomb IV) allocated to the University of Sydney's Nicholson Museum was out of reach of autopsy, but drawings and photographs were eventually obtained. Very great difficulty was experienced in obtaining access to the essential parts of the excavation archive. This unforeseen complication frustrated my expectation that I should have completed the bulk of the work by the end of my sabbatical leave. I returned to a very busy time of curating and teaching at the Ashmolean which thwarted regular and constructive work on Palaepaphos. In 1971, I moved to Athens where for eighteen years I served as Director of the British School, years that were fully occupied by my duties, the institution's fieldwork and regular publication. I returned to England in 1989 on retirement, with outstanding obligations to make substantial contributions to major publications concerning the work of the British School at Athens. It was not until 2007 that I was to return to Palaepaphos, after an interval approaching forty years. I believe that the most useful part of this study concerns the Late Cypriot cemeteries excavated by the British Expedition and suspect that it is particularly the long delay in the presentation of this part of the 1950-55 work that has so deeply disappointed colleagues who have specialised in study of the Late Cypriot Bronze Age. But enough of apologies – *qui s'excuse, s'accuse*.

The account of the Asproyi cemetery, one tomb of which (Tomb I) was excavated in 1951 and briefly reported in *Liverpool Bulletin* 2:1-2 (1952) p. 49, comprises descriptions of eleven tombs (I, II, III, IV, V, VI and VIA, VII, IX, X, XI) excavated by T. B. Mitford and E. M. Hunter. The account of the Evreti cemetery, almost wholly excavated in 1952 by G. R. H. Wright except for Tombs XII-XIV dug by T. B. Mitford and E. M. Hunter, actually comprises descriptions of eleven tombs (IIIA and IIIB, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV). These two cemeteries comprised small chamber tombs. Kaminia, however, was a cemetery of earth inhumations (graves) numbered continuously I to XXI, the last being seen by the excavators as two separate graves and numbered XXIA and XXIB accordingly. Again, direction of the excavation was shared between T. B. Mitford and E. M. Hunter. The single, damaged chamber tomb, Marcello Tomb I was excavated under the siege mound, having been cut through in the digging the city's defences in Archaic times. The circumstances of discovery, the excavation of the tomb and the description of its remaining contents have already been described in F. G. Maier, *Nordost-Tor und persische Belagerungsrampe in Alt-Paphos (Alt-Paphos 6*. Mainz, 2008) pp. 195-216. This fragment of a tomb contributes to an important review of burial practices in Late Cypriot Palaepaphos, and I have decided to republish it here, not

least because it was included in the material Mitford asked me to publish in 1958.

There is good reason to believe that Palaepaphos was a settlement, a town perhaps, that grew to great importance during the Late Cypriot period, continuing through the Early Iron Age into the Archaic and Classical periods. It is less well known than other major Late Cypriot settlements, not least because its history of constant occupation has contributed to our very imperfect knowledge of it in the Late Cypriot period. Its importance as a centre for the cult of Aphrodite ensured that it survived the decision to transfer its civil administration of southwest Cyprus to Nea Paphos, which retains its administrative importance to the present. The only clue to its erstwhile grandeur in the Late Cypriot period is provided by the massively built but fragmentary ashlar shell thought to be all that remains of the sanctuary of this date, cheek by jowl with the equally fragmentary architectural remains of the Roman version of Aphrodite's shrine.

Some sense of the importance of Late Cypriot Palaepaphos comes from the very wide distribution of its burial sites. V. Karageorghis, in his *Tombs at Palaepaphos* (Nicosia, 1990), describes what he sees as the great arc of the Late Cypriot cemeteries starting in the north-east at Xerolimni, where an accidentally discovered LC IIIB tomb was cleared in 1966, moving south-east to Marcello and beyond it, Mantissa (Karageorghis, *Nouveaux Documents* pp. 157-84). Close to the south of Mantissa are Kaminia, Asproyi, and Evreti; due east, widening the arc is Lakkos tou Skarinou. Dropping further south are Teratsoudhia and Eliomylia, reported by Karageorghis and Michaelides in *Tombs at Palaepaphos*. Some distance south of Eliomylia is the large cemetery of Early Iron Age chamber tombs at Skales, whose origins must go as far back as LC IIIB. Here, in 1951, Basil Hennessy excavated two tombs for the British Expedition. In 1983, Karageorghis would, in a rescue excavation, dig another 57 tombs, showing the cemetery's use lasting into the full Iron Age.

It is perfectly possible that other groups of tombs await discovery within this "funerary arc". From what is known of the contents of these tombs, the majority should be attributed to the LC IIC-LC IIIA-LC IIIB periods. But there are well-furnished burials that are no later than LC IB, with residual material that probably illustrates still earlier use. There is evidence of activity in the Palaepaphos area in Middle Cypriot III (F. G. Maier, 'New evidence for the early history of Palaepaphos', *BSA* 78 (1983) 229-33), but it is not as solid as one would like.

It is particularly difficult to determine whether the image drawn from the cemeteries so far explored presents a more or less accurate picture of the fluctuating prosperity of Palaepaphos, which seems to have had a fairly good beginning, but to have tailed off during LC IIA and IIB, gathering strength rapidly in LC IIC, carried over very vigorously into LC IIIA, then weakened but survived through LC IIIB, lasting without interruption into and

through the Iron Age. During this period of mixed fortune, Palaepaphos seems to have been well integrated into the culture and economy of regions to the east and north-east, but it has to be admitted that there is no positive evidence for any industrial involvement in the copper business.

From the outset, events have conspired to prevent study of the Asproyi, Evreti, Kaminia and Marcello tombs taking the right approach. I have to confess to the chief responsibility for this decades-long failure with respect to the Palaepaphos cemeteries. If there is a single, overreaching reason for this failure, it is probably to be found in the dazzling richness of some of the grave goods recovered by Wright's 1952 Evreti excavations. This experience ensured that the importance of the Asproyi, Kaminia and Marcello cemeteries was measured to a large degree by comparison of their funerary offerings with the Evreti Tomb VIII assemblage. By concentrating on this aspect of the results, questions failed to be asked about the tombs as tombs, the cemeteries as cemeteries, and their relationship(s) with the wider, contemporary funerary scene in Late Bronze Age Cyprus.

That this happened is made less surprising in the face of the sheer volume of funerary material, which has had to be processed and reduced to publishable form. The four sites between them produced nearly 1,150 inventoried items. These are chiefly, but by no means exclusively, ceramic; there are also gold, silver, bronze, and iron items as well as objects of stone, semi-precious stone, glass, paste, faience, ivory and bone. The majority of these offerings are fully at home in the taxonomy of the many categories of artefact in circulation in Late Bronze Age Cyprus. The list of *exotica* amid the Palaepaphos funerary offerings may, proportionately, be shorter than equivalent lists from contemporary major settlements, but the variety of such *exotica* does not seriously vary as between Palaepaphos and the rest of the island.

As we shall see in greater detail elsewhere in this volume, south-west Cyprus, with Palaepaphos at its centre, should have been much more conspicuous in the archaeological literature for a particular form of chamber tomb, use of which, with minor variations, extended as far east as Alassa. Typical features are a small chamber (sometimes more than one) approached by a very short *dromos*/pit giving access through a modest *stomion*. Each chamber is distinguished by a relatively deep and narrow pit or cist, usually immediately accessible from the *stomion*, often, but not always, extending to the back of the chamber; there is no chamber floor as such. The cist is surrounded by "benches", usually on three sides, which are used for the deposition of skeletal remains and funerary gifts. So, too, is the cist. It is very unusual for the skeletal remains to be recognizable as the macerated bones of primary burials. The cist is usually employed as the receptacle for burial remains apparently swept up from the benches when there is otherwise inadequate space for additions to the contents of the tomb chamber.

The Kaminia cemetery marks a distinct contrast to this tomb type. Its 22 individual earth graves (“pits”) can, with some imagination, be seen to be composed of four groups, in each of which the graves are dug close together. Superficially, each grave represents the undisturbed inhumation of an individual, accompanied by a varying, but limited, number of offerings. Some graves contain odd skeletal parts, which, self-evidently, do not belong to the obvious occupier. Originally, confronted by the very clear differences between the chamber tomb cemeteries, Asproyi and Evreti, on the one hand and the earth graves of Kaminia, on the other, I was satisfied with the simplistic explanation that two distinct cultural traditions must be represented by what apparently were quite different methods of disposing of the dead. This view was given a kind of respectability by the late date of the funeral gifts in the Kaminia graves, as though here was a burial ground of an intrusive community whose grave goods seemed to set them apart from the occupants of the chamber tombs. Such an interpretation was deceptive, as virtually everything in the Kaminia graves finds its close *comparandum* among the contents of the chamber tombs (although the reverse is not true)

So how were these graves used in the LC IIC-III period? The almost complete absence of articulated skeletal remains in the chamber tombs may well signify rather more than the harmful consequences of disturbance and/or looting. There could be a systematic explanation at the heart of this phenomenon, in which the practice of secondary burial might potentially provide the key. The Kaminia complex was certainly designed for primary burials, though there were, here and there, unexplained cranial and other skeletal fragments, which might be all that remained of a primary burial after it had otherwise been removed for secondary burial elsewhere. This notion, in its turn, leads to the possibility, strengthened by the propinquity of Asproyi, Evreti and Kaminia, that Kaminia had been the site for the primary burials destined to end in one of the neighbouring chamber tombs as secondary burials.

The general lines of my new interpretation are that Late Cypriot burial at Palaepaphos was a two stage process, the stages taking place at different locations: Stage 1, when the newly dead were buried in individual earth dug pit graves; Stage 2, after an interval that experience showed was of sufficient duration, the bodies, by now reduced to skeletons, were exhumed, the bones gathered up and transferred to a chamber in one of the nearby cemeteries of small chamber tombs which typify Palaepaphos and the surrounding area throughout the Late Cypriot period. So I have come to believe that Kaminia is a burial ground used for primary burials. I further believe that there must have been some external reason which prevented the community from completing the burial process for the individuals whose remains were found in the graves of Kaminia. Asproyi and Evreti are no great distance from Kaminia; it could well be that, in normal circumstances, either or both were the ultimate recipients for the macerated

bones of erstwhile occupants of the Kaminia graves. This change of interpretation on my part means that the general observation of Mitford and Hunter that “several of the graves had been used more than once” was nearer the truth than the general thrust of my recensions which had been to argue that individual graves had, in some cases, been dug dangerously close to other graves.

I have only recently had access to Priscilla Keswani’s *Mortuary Ritual in Bronze Age Cyprus* (London, 2007) despite being aware of it for a long time. It presents an invaluable combination of raw information and interpretive ideas. So far as the relevant published evidence available to her was concerned, she has made a very thorough account and analysis of it. She has reviewed the evidence in two main tranches – first her chapter 4 ‘The Early and Middle Bronze Age’ (pp. 37-83), finally her chapter 5 ‘The Late Bronze Age’ (pp. 84-144). These chapters, at the heart of her study, are essentially descriptive. In that sense they are valuable indications of the ways in which Late Cypriot Palaepaphos differs from the island’s other regions, and the extent to which Palaepaphos shares in a common tradition for the treatment of its dead. Not least because of the long delay in the publication of the 1951-1954 excavations at Kouklia, Keswani’s knowledge of the mortuary practices in the south-west are slight by comparison with her mastery of the evidence from east Cyprus (Enkomi, Ayios Iakovos, Melia, Korovia, for example), and her knowledge of south coast practices (Kition, Hala Sultan Tekke, Maroni, Kalavassos, Episkopi) is concerned. But her research has taken her to Alassa and to Yeroskipou, and she well understands, for instance, that distinctive features of tomb architecture that we report for some of the Palaepaphos cemeteries are to be found in the general region.

Keswani has seen and emphasized the fact that there is abundant evidence for the secondary treatment of the dead in Bronze Age Cyprus, and has made a great contribution to our understanding of this treatment. She points out, and indeed she might more strongly have emphasized, that some secondary treatment has tended over the years to be misunderstood by excavators who see it as evidence of “disturbance” in an otherwise untouched burial assemblage. It is possible that Keswani underestimates how difficult it can be for excavators in the field, when studying *in situ* skeletal remains, to distinguish between a poorly preserved, undisturbed primary burial, secondary remains arranged in some sort of order, and the state to which an individual skeleton can be reduced by robbing. But the point she has made about Bronze Age burial practice in Cyprus is a very important one. Secondary treatment of the remains of the dead are commonplace, though there was uncertainty in Keswani’s mind about the location(s) at which the remains of the dead were treated in this particular fashion.

It is an article of faith with Keswani that, during the Bronze Age, death and burial were used by the survivors – those most closely related to the deceased by ties of blood

and/or the ties of friendship and association – not so much as expressions of sorrow for the death, and as marks of love, honour and respect, but as occasions for ostentatious display. I agree that may have been seen as a useful by-product of the death and the ceremonies that followed, but that such a motive was the over-riding element smacks of a modern disbelief in the importance of the ceremonies for the dead.

Keswani has some difficulty in relating the number of individuals buried in the cemeteries belonging to an ancient settlement about which a great deal is known. There seem never to be enough individuals recovered from an excavated cemetery associated with a known settlement. I believe it is an unprofitable exercise, trying to make two very different sets of data harmonize with modern expectations. The variables and unknowables are too many and various for there to be any hope of reconciling the two wholly different strands of evidence. I am unable to follow Keswani in attributing so important a role to burial in Bronze Age Cyprus that makes it to have been a constantly operating catalyst responsible for the evolution of Cyprus as an increasingly powerful and prosperous centre of human development. Let us agree, there was a *post hoc, propterea hoc* element, but increasing mortuary sophistication was, surely, the result of the evolution of the living, among the living, with ends to be enjoyed by the living, who were empowered thereby to treat their dead more lavishly; I cannot believe it was the other way around.