

CONSTRUCTING AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL NARRATIVE:
THE HELLENIZATION OF CYPRUS

Natasha (Anastasia) Leriou

Department of Ancient History & Archaeology, University of Birmingham,
Edgbaston, Birmingham B15 2TT, UK.

NatashaHB@hotmail.com

This paper focuses on an archaeological narrative that has received plenty of criticism lately and is regarded by some scholars as a series of *factoids*: the Mycenaean colonization and subsequent hellenization of Cyprus during the transitional period from the latest phase of the Late Bronze to the Early Iron Age. After a brief presentation of the current version of the narrative and the methodological problems associated with it, the discussion will go back in time to the first half of the 19th century, when the earliest academic references to the colonization theory were made. By following the narrative's gradual development until the present day, I will attempt to elucidate the reasons and circumstances, academic and other, that led historians and archaeologists to build and subsequently adopt this narrative, which besides its many problems, is still widely accepted.

Since its establishment as a systematic discipline, archaeology has been communicated through accounts that archaeologists produce about the physical remains of the past that they have discovered, collected and carefully recorded. These accounts, which I am going to call *archaeological narratives*, either focus on the material itself (descriptions, classifications and typologies) or employ it in order to elucidate the past, thus serving archaeology's ultimate purpose. Nowadays, we have realized that the latter may be achieved through many different ways, as the past has many different aspects and dimensions (Renfrew and Bahn 2000). However, it was not so long ago that many archaeologists thought, as some still do, that their main task was to establish a series of historical events, a sequence of facts that occurred in a specific area during a specific time-period. The more detailed, precise and objective these narratives were, the better (Snodgrass 1983: 142-143, 145-146).

Objectivity, however, is particularly hard to obtain within the field of a humanistic discipline (made *by* people, *for* people) like archaeology. The various sociological, cultural, political and ethnic biases that the researchers and their societies carry, significantly affect the archaeological narratives they produce as the fragmentary condition of the physical remains of the past allows ample space for hypotheses, assumptions and speculations. When repeated frequently, historical reconstructions based on mere speculation, guesses or misunderstandings are eventually taken for incontrovertible, historical facts. Maier calls them *factoids*¹ (Maier 1985: 32; Goring 1995: 103) and states: "there is something unbiological about such factoids: the tendency to get stronger the longer they live is one of their most insidious qualities. Factoids occur in all branches of scholarship and many are of course still well disguised -their complete discovery would create havoc in the subjects concerned. Archaeology, converted from treasure hunting into a historical discipline, is for obvious reasons prone to create a number of factoids" (Maier 1985: 32).

This paper focuses on an archaeological narrative that has received plenty of criticism lately and is regarded by some scholars as a series of *factoids* (Maier 1986; 1996; Sherratt 1992): the Mycenaean colonization² and subsequent hellenization of Cyprus during the transitional period from the latest phase of the Late Bronze to the Early Iron Age. After a brief presentation of the current version of the narrative and the methodological problems associated with it, I will go back in time to the first half of the 19th century, when the earliest academic references to the colonization theory were made. By following the narrative's gradual development until the present day, I will attempt to elucidate the reasons and circumstances, academic or other, that led historians and archaeologists to build and subsequently adopt this narrative, which despite its many problems, is still widely accepted.

I. THE MYCENAEAN COLONIZATION OF CYPRUS NARRATIVE: A BRIEF DESCRIPTION

Should one wish to learn about the ethnic identity of the Cypriot society during the Early Iron Age, he/ she would discover that almost all books, popular or academic, on Cypriot (Hill 1949: 82-94; Catling 1966: 64-73; Åström 1972a: 775-781; Demetriou 1987; Karageorghis 1968; 63-70; 1976a: 144-153; 1978: 58-71; 1981: 62-70; 1982: 82-113; 1990: 35-46; 1990a: 1997: 255-285; 1998: 39-60; Coldstream 1990: 47-51:

Kyrris 1996: 44-71) and Greek ancient history (Desborough-Hammond 1962: 4-5; Desborough 1964: 196-205; 1972: 55-56; Snodgrass 1971: 29, 314, 316-317, 365; Karageorghis 1971a: 350-352; Bury-Meiggs 1975: 62-63; Coldstream 1979: 67-68; Boardman 1980: 38; Osborne 1996: 22; Bournia-Simantoni 1997: 16-17, 18-19) supply us with the very same story: the island had been hellenized towards the end of the Late Bronze Age by numerous immigrants from the Aegean. The formulation of this hypothesis goes back to the early 19th century. Since then it has entered a process of endless modification and refinement as more and more archaeological finds are being unearthed, new interpretative theories are developed and applied and the socio-political circumstances of the island significantly altered. The investigation of this process constitutes the main objective of the present study (part III).

The current version of the narrative³ advocates two successive waves of Aegean immigrants that occurred during the course of Late Cypriot⁴ III (1200-1050 BC⁵), which was the final phase of the Late Bronze Age in Cyprus. The preceding LCII (1400-1200 BC) was a period of great prosperity and intensive contacts with countries in the Eastern and Central Mediterranean, which were based primarily on the development of the copper-trade. The exceptionally rich material culture attests to the cosmopolitan character of the period. The population had grown considerably and lived either in villages in the countryside or in large urban settlements, which had been built mainly in the coastal areas of the island. LCIIIC (1300-1200 BC) is characterised by the establishment of more important centres with monumental architecture, most of which were associated with metallurgy and the exploitation of copper (Karageorghis 1990: 2; Karageorghis 1990a: 22-35; 1997: 243-255; 1998: 28-38; Iacovou 1999: 3-4).

The thriving LCIIIC period ended with a series of catastrophes and/ or abandonments, which have been observed in most settlement-sites and are considered as part of the general upheaval that caused the collapse of the *Hochkulturen* of the Eastern Mediterranean and is usually associated with the action of the Sea Peoples. This is the time of the fall of the Mycenaean palaces in mainland Greece and the subsequent arrival of the first wave of Mycenaean settlers, who have recently been argued to be a branch of the Sea Peoples. (Muhly 1984: 51-53; Mazar 1988: 255-257; Karageorghis 1990: 3-26; 1992; 1998: 39; 2000: 255; Iacovou 1999: 4-5; Betancourt 2000).

The LCIIIA (1200-1100 BC) levels have yielded considerable numbers of locally produced Mycenaean pots, which belong to a style widely known in bibliography as *Mycenaean IIIC:1b*, and are regarded as irrefutable evidence for the presence of Mycenaean settlers on the island. Further novel features have been observed in the material culture of the island (cyclopean walls, large bath- and hearth-rooms and stepped capitals). However no significant cultural break between LCIIIC and LCIIIA may be observed. Although no new sites were established, some of the abandoned ones were rebuilt and eventually reoccupied. The majority of the LCIIIA settlements were destroyed in the course of the 12th century (Karageorghis 1990: 27-30; 1992: 80-81; 1997: 255-272; 1998: 39-56; 1998a; 1998b; 2000; Iacovou 1989:52-55; 1994: 150; 1999: 5-6).

The similarity of the phenomena that characterise the LCIIIA period, particularly its first half, with the *historical events* that occurred in Palestine during the same period has been strongly emphasised. The series of destructions that ended the Canaanite city-states and the subsequent appearance of locally produced Mycenaean IIIC:1b pottery in large quantities are regarded as results of the same cause: the action of the Aegean (at least partly) Sea Peoples (Mazar 1985: 1988: 1991:

Dothan 1982: 289-296; Dothan and Dothan 1992: 191-198; Burdajewicz 1990; Karageorghis 1992: 81; Iacovou 1995: 99; 1998: 335-336).

During the first half of the following century (LCIIIB: 1100-1050 BC) new settlements were founded by a second, definitely more extensive influx of Mycenaeans, which is basically attested by

- the introduction of a new tomb-type: chamber tombs with long *dromoi* and small squarish/ rectangular chambers bearing close affinities to Mycenaean graves,
- many Mycenaean elements in the shape- and decoration-repertoire of the of the Proto-White Painted ceramic style, that appeared at the beginning of LCIIIB,
- various architectural features and artefacts of Aegean origin or inspiration and most importantly

- the introduction of the Greek language

(Karageorghis 1990: 30-32; 1998: 56-60; 1997: 272-285; 1998: 56-60; Iacovou 1999: 7-14).

The new settlements coincide in location with the capitals of the ancient kingdoms of Cyprus, which according to the foundation myths, were established by Greek heroes that came to Cyprus after the Trojan War (section IIIa). Thus the foundation of the Cypriot kingdoms is generally placed within the course of the 11th century (Iacovou 1994; 1995: 100-104; 1999: 9-10, 14-19; Courtois 1997: 290) although the earliest written reference to them would take us down to 709 BC, when the Assyrian king Sargon II erected a stele commemorating his victory over the seven kings of Ia (Cyprus) at the town of Kition (Reyes 1994: 50-56; Gjerstad 1948, 449-451; Steel 1993: 147-148). Consequently the 11th century has been regarded as the beginning of a long and extremely significant procedure: the hellenization of Cyprus (Karageorghis 1994).

Many variations on the details of the above narrative have been suggested. These are usually the result of differences in the classification and the interpretation of the various classes of material evidence (Karageorghis 1992; 1994; Rupp 1998: 213). Moreover during the last twenty years various aspects of the narrative have been questioned on methodological grounds (part II). Nevertheless nobody has yet clearly suggested that a movement of Aegean peoples to Cyprus during the end of the Late Bronze Age never took place.

The only radical reconsideration of the Mycenaean colonization hypothesis, at least of a part of it, has been proposed by Rupp (1985; 1987; 1988; 1998), who has focused his research mainly on the processes that resulted in the formation of the Cypriot kingdoms. Rupp argues that there was a significant decrease in the complexity of the political organisation of the island between the 12th and 8th centuries BC. After systematic analysis of the archaeological record he has concluded that during this period the island was not divided in monarchical states but covered by a regional network of chiefdoms (Rupp 1987: 147-149; 1998: 214-215). Based on the sharp increase of settlement-sites observed around the middle of the 8th century (Rupp 1987: 149-151) and the more or less synchronous and sudden appearance of monumental built tombs throughout the island (Rupp 1985; 1987: 15), Rupp suggests that the state-based political system that characterized Cyprus during the Cypro-Archaic and Classical periods emerged during the final decades of the Cypro-Geometric III (850-750 BC) period. The rise in the number of sanctuaries (Rupp 1987: 152) as well as the relatively more widespread use of the Cypro-Syllabic script (Rupp 1987: 151), which occurred during the Cypro-Archaic period (750-475 BC) have been used as corroborative evidence. The process of the kingdoms' formation is viewed as an internal affair instigated by the expansion of the state societies in the

Levant and Mesopotamia, mainly the Phoenicians, that started as early as the 10th century (Rupp 1987: 153-156; 1998: 216-218). The foundation myths mentioned above are explained as the result of ancient political manipulation: “Many of these Cypriot *arriviste* monarchs apparently concocted ancient heroic pedigrees in order to claim they were, in fact, Achaean bluebloods” (Rupp 1998: 218-19).

Rupp does not reject the hypothesis that there was a migratory movement of Mycenaeans to Cyprus during the 12th and 11th centuries (Rupp 1998: 219). Nevertheless he does not regard it as critical for the socio-political developments that occurred during the course of the Early Iron Age. Furthermore he finds the current colonization narrative as unreliable and inconclusive: “From my perspective this defence of the standard historical reconstruction is based to a great extent on what should be called *factoids* relating to Iron Age Cyprus. Unfortunately the present skewed nature of the archaeological record for this period (i.e. an over-emphasis on burial assemblages, finds from sanctuaries and *works of art* without adequate provenance information) hinders the discussion” (Rupp 1998: 211).

Rupp’s iconoclastic theory has received extremely limited acknowledgement (Rupp 1998: 211). Only Snodgrass (1987: 103-108), Steel (1993) and recently Iacovou (1999: 26 endnote 113) have openly criticised it. The great majority of researchers seem reluctant even to enter a discussion of views defying “conventional wisdom” (Rupp 1998: 209), which, however, constitutes the subject of this paper. A critique of Rupp’s views, although particularly challenging to the present author, will therefore not be included in this study.

II. THE MYCENAEAN COLONIZATION OF CYPRUS NARRATIVE: THE PROBLEMS

The admittedly attractive hypothesis of the Mycenaean colonization encompasses various methodological problems, which have been underlined by many researchers during the last twenty years. Although brief, the summary provided above suffices to demonstrate that what constitutes its basis is the infamous and erroneous equation between *pots* (artefacts/ material culture) and *peoples* (ethnic groups), which has been seriously questioned in recent years on both anthropological and archaeological terms. According to Susan Sherratt, its roots lie in the development of the European nation state and its corporate (ethnic, linguistic and cultural) identity in the early modern period. “The practice of defining cultures in the contexts of prehistoric Europe has been aggravated by notions of race, ethnicity and language in a largely historically-minded vision of prehistory in which wars and battles, invasions, colonial enterprises and political coups leap up directly from buried tombs and potsherds which are themselves imagined as in some sense speaking distinct languages and carrying their own racial genes” (Sherratt 1992: 316-317).

Does it really take a Mycenaean to use or even to make a Mycenaean pot? Consequently the main objection lies in the use of certain groups of artifacts, pottery in particular, as *criteria* for the presence of a Greek ethnic group in 12th/ 11th century Cyprus. Excavated remains are fragmentary and static while the concept of ethnic identity is fluid and particularly elusive. Ethnic and cultural boundaries are socially constructed and therefore dynamic, infinitely variable and not always archaeologically tangible. As Hall has demonstrated it is entirely possible for cultural contacts,

including processes as migrations and invasions, to occur with virtually no perceptible change in the material record (Hall 1997: 111-142).

The direct translation of artifacts into historical events led researchers to another widely criticised equation: that of absolute/ *historical* with relative/ *stylistic* time. We cannot possibly regard all destructions that occurred while a particular ware was in use, i.e. within a particular stylistic phase, which corresponds to a period of thirty-fifty years in Cypriot Late Bronze Age, as synchronous. If we do make this error, however, it is fairly easy to jump from this point to a further assumption: these *synchronous events* were most probably the result of the *same cause*. Maier believes that this tendency “is clearly but subconsciously influenced by an event orientated view of history focussed far too exclusively on wars and migrations. It is also conditioned by a contortion of our chronological perspective, which makes a span of 50 or 70 years in the 12th century seem a very short period” (Maier 1986: 317; 1994: 306-307).

As a consequence of the above fundamental errors various problems of practical nature have arisen: numerous mistakes concerning the classification of the material culture, pottery in particular, have been made. As the colonization theory is largely based on the interpretation of certain categories of artifacts, archaeologists have tried to define the boundaries of these categories as clearly as they could. This is usually a very difficult task: material culture is not the product of programmed machines; it is the result of human activity, which can be planned, organised and imitative but also spontaneous and innovative. Kling, for example, has demonstrated that the so-called Mycenaean IIC:1b pottery, that has been regarded as the trademark of the Mycenaean immigrants, cannot always be distinguished from the rest of the local painted Mycenaeanizing wares (Kling 1989; 1991).

More assumptions and practical misunderstandings have emerged through the uncritical association of some Aegean or even *un-Aegean* looking groups of artifacts/ architectural features with the immigrants. An example: the rectangular capitals with stepped sides, that have been found in most of the major Late Cypriot sites and dated around the end of the 13th century. For this reason they are thought to have been connected with the Mycenaean (Karageorghis 1971) although no parallels have been recovered anywhere in the Aegean. Nevertheless every time the Cypriot soil reveals such a capital, it is usually reported as evidence for monumental construction built by the Mycenaean (Karageorghis-Maier 1984: 99-101).

The above observations have instigated a series of studies, including my own research, that have dismissed the use of artifacts as “defining criteria” of ethnic identity; artifacts can, however, be used as “emblemic indicia” of ethnic boundaries in the similar way as language and religion (Hall 1997: 20-1). What we archaeologists have to do is to “illuminate the ways in which ethnic groups actively employed material culture in making boundaries that have already been discursively constructed” (Hall 1997: 142).

III. THE MYCENAEAN COLONIZATION OF CYPRUS NARRATIVE: HOW IT WAS CONSTRUCTED

What follows is a brief account of how the colonization narrative was formulated and developed through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The earliest academic references to it, dating around the mid-nineteenth century, were based on literary

sources and did not involve any archaeological evidence. Almost half a century later the first scientific study of the available archaeological material provided tangible support to for the colonization hypothesis. Since then it has been modified and refined under the light of the numerous archaeological discoveries of that occurred in the course of the twentieth century. It reached its final form, which was outlined in part I, during the 90s.

Although criticized during the last twenty years, the colonization narrative has never been significantly altered or systematically reconsidered. On the contrary it is being referred to by many researchers and appears in numerous textbooks thus demonstrating a typical *factoidal* behaviour. By following its gradual development, I wish to cast some light on the circumstances, under which it was so firmly established.

a. The earliest References to the Mycenaean Colonization of Cyprus: the Foundation Myths

The earliest reference to the Achaean colonization of Cyprus dates as early as Herodotus' "Historiae": in book V it is mentioned that the kingdom of Kourion was founded by people from the Argolid (5.113). Some seven centuries later Pausanias reported that Paphos was established by Agapenor, the legendary king of Tegea, who was driven to the western coast of Cyprus by a storm while on his way home after the sack of Troy (8.5.2-3). Several similar references describing the foundation of the Cypriot kingdoms by Greek heroes after the Trojan War may be found in the texts of various Greek and Roman authors the latest being Stephanos Byzantios (Gjerstad 1944; Hadjiioannou 1971: 46-67; Fortin 1980; Demetriou 1989: 88-93; Steel 1993: 147-148; Vanschoonwinkel 1994: 121-124).

b. Nineteenth Century Historians and the Foundation Myths

During the first half of the 19th century the earliest academic attempts to compile a general history of the island were made. In 1841 the German classicist W. Engel published a monograph on Cyprus, containing information about the geography (*Erstes Buch*), the history (*Zweites Buch*) as well as the religion and the myths of the island with special emphasis on the cult of Aphrodite (*Drittes Buch*). Engel started his history from the ancient times (*Älteste Geschichte*) and went as far as the Middle Ages and Modern History. He stated that the island had been colonized by the Greeks and subsequently hellenized. This conclusion was supported by a detailed account of the foundation myths mentioned above. Engel was thus the first researcher to produce a more or less complete collection of them (Engel 1841: 210-229). Some forty-five years later a similar but not as detailed list of the foundation myths appeared in the studies of another classicist from Germany, Enmann, who investigated the cult of Aphrodite on the island and suggested that it was introduced by the Greek colonists (Enmann 1886; 1887). Furthermore, the colonization narrative together with extensive or more concise lists of the relevant myths are also to be found in late 19th-early 20th century accounts of the history of the Greek world, in the chapter on the expansion of the Greeks after the Trojan War and the coming of the Dorians (Hoffmann 1841: 1272-1300; Busolt 1893:318-322; Beloch 1893: 50-52).

The fact that all studies mentioned above were based almost exclusively on textual references is hardly surprising. As the principles and methods of archaeology were at elementary level, backing up literary information with archaeological data

was not considered essential. Cypriot archaeology, in particular, was at its infancy and consequently the available archaeological information was very limited (Marangou 1986: 310-314; Balandier 2001: 4-6). According to Dowden the “historical approach toward the myths”, that is using myths as reliable historical sources, was a common practice in historical research during this early period, especially as far as ancient tribal migrations were concerned (Dowden 1992: 23-24).

The conclusions reached through the study of ancient written sources were firmly corroborated by linguistics: the existence of a Greek dialect in ancient Cyprus was detected through the numerous Greek inscriptions, either in the Cypriot Syllabary or the Greek alphabet, that were scattered all over the island together with a limited number of inscriptions in the local Eteocypriot language (sections IIIf-g). Researchers concluded that the colonists from the Aegean planted their language in the local population and since then the Greek language was spoken regularly by the Cypriots, or at least by a part of them (Meister 1882: 125-131; Hoffmann 1891: 7-8; Thumb 1909: 282).

The hypothesis of a Greek colonization of Cyprus was particularly welcome in a period characterised by the strong and ever-growing European fascination with Greek antiquity. The rediscovery of the latter was initiated during the 17th century when the first European scholars, mainly French and English, undertook travels to Greece in order to search for the remains of her glorious past (Constantine 1984: xii, 7-65; Etienne-Etienne 1990: 34-41; Shanks 1996: 55-56). However the great shift of interest from Rome to Greece did not occur before the mid-18th century. The idealization of Greek antiquity was given a powerful boost by the revolutionary work of the German Johann Joachim Winckelmann. Through a stylistic examination of Greek statues, he demonstrated the superiority and perfection of Greek art/civilization. Roman art, on the other hand, was characterized as decadent and imitative (Constantine 1984: 104-27; Etienne-Etienne 1990: 60-61; Shanks 1996: 56-58). Winckelmann’s ideas were highly influential: numerous artists, poets, novelists, historians, philologists, philosophers, teachers, politicians etc. were deeply affected by them and a remarkably strong classical tradition, particularly evident in higher education, was eventually established in Germany (Shanks 1996: 68). Ian Morris and other researchers have proposed that Winckelmann’s great impact should be viewed as a result of Protestant Germany’s cultural resistance to France, the self-proclaimed new Rome (Morris 1994: 16-17; Shanks 1996: 58).

It was within this cultural and academic milieu that Engel and Enmann compiled their studies of the history and religion of ancient Cyprus. Their meticulous study of the ancient sources led them to the conclusion that Cyprus had been colonised by the Greeks after the Trojan War. This scenario fitted very well into the general idea that European, particularly German, scholars had about ancient Greeks: they were superior, highly civilized humans, who would be more than able to “visit” less sophisticated peoples in remote places like Cyprus and establish colonies. It is no coincidence that all scholars mentioned in the first part of this section were Germans.

c. The Beginnings of Archaeological Research in Cyprus

Before the 19th century archaeology in Cyprus was confined to chance discoveries resulting from tomb- and site- robbing, which was practised both by the locals and the foreign visitors. Treasure hunting became more frequent during the course of the 19th century. A lively trade started developing around the middle of the century, as Cypriot antiquities were gradually becoming more popular among private

collectors and Western museums. The whole process was initiated and promoted by various foreign consuls and officials based on Cyprus, who were organizing archaeological explorations and excavations all over the island as well as urging the villagers to seek, collect, and provide them with antiquities (Marangou 1986: 310-314; Goring 1988: 1-3; Tatton-Brown 1998; 2001; Åström 2000: 8-12; Balandier 2001).

These antiquarians would sometimes, as in the case of the notorious Luigi Palma di Cesnola (Cesnola 1878; Goring 1988: 10-13; Åström 2000: 9-10; Karageorghis, Mertens and Rose 2000: 3-8), publish descriptions of their explorations and finds. However they would rarely go into any kind of classification and interpretation of the collected material. Such an organized study was, of course, not to be expected at that early stage when Cypriot archaeology was as yet far from a systematic discipline. Furthermore, given the early state of Mycenaean studies at that time (Vasilikou 1995: 1-4; Fitton 1995; Fitton 2001: 149), it would be too early for any associations of the Mycenaean/ Mycenaeanizing material found on the island with the Achaean colonization hypothesis.

The first antiquarian to attempt a more systematic study was Thomas Backhouse Sandwith, who classified Cypriot pottery and attempted a distinction between Bronze and Iron Age vases. He also established a relative chronology on the basis of the various groups of wares he distinguished (Sandwith 1877; Goring 1988: 13-15; Merrillees 2001). In an effort to explain the presence of red-figured vases at Salamis(,) Sandwith suggested that “Salamis was a Greek colony and the arts were introduced from Greece herself” (Sandwith 1877: 137). Strangely enough he did not make any reference to the foundation myths and one may assume that he was not familiar with them. However, he must have been aware of the myths as well as the colonization hypothesis in a rather general way, as the latter was a well-established story among classicists and historians since the first half of the 19th century. Luigi Palma di Cesnola, for example, referred frequently to them throughout his book (Cesnola 1878: 199; 219-220; 234; 298-299)

d. Identification of Aegean Cultural Elements within the Cypriot Context

Cypriot archaeology became more systematic and organized during the last decades of the 19th century, particularly after 1878, when Great Britain undertook the administration of the island (Hunt 1990a; Balandier 2001: 8-10). In 1883 the Cyprus Museum was established (Marangou 1986: 315-316; Goring 1989: 22-23). Excavations, which acquired a more scientific character, increased in number and, hence, resulted into the accumulation of a considerable amount of material (Marangou 1986: 315-319; Goring 1988: 17-24). Among the latter there was a relatively large number of Mycenaean pots. These were first identified by Furtwängler and Löschke as early as 1886, who recorded thirty-seven pots and added that there were many more in several private collections all over the island (Furtwängler-Löschke 1886: 24-31).

They did not go as far as investigating the origin of these pots and most probably assumed that they were Aegean imports. The study of Mycenaean pottery had not yet reached the sophistication required for the distinction of regional styles and imitations. All that early researchers, such as Furtwängler and Löschke, could say was that this pottery was made in Late Bronze Age Mainland Greece. However they neither speculated about how it reached the island of Cyprus nor did they connect it with colonists from the Aegean. The reasons for this rather surprising omission in the light of the then current views is not clear. The hypothesis that Furtwängler and

Löschke were totally unfamiliar with the theory of the Greek colonization of Cyprus seems highly improbable given their German academic background.

Whatever the case, Furtwängler and Löschke's contribution was of great importance: the identification of pottery from the Aegean within Cypriot contexts would soon (section IIIe) offer material support to the colonization hypothesis in a period when all archaeologists would accept without any hesitation the equation between pots and peoples. As it will be demonstrated in the following sections, from this point onwards and until the present day Mycenaean and Mycenaeanizing pottery found in Cyprus has played the leading role in the construction, modification and refinement of the colonization narrative.

e. Sir John L. Myres/ the First "Scientific" Classification of Cypriot Antiquities

The very first scholar to clearly and directly associate the Mycenaean/ Mycenaean-looking pottery found within Cypriot contexts with the Achaean colonization of the island was Sir John Linton Myres (Megaw 1988: 282-283; Karageorghis 1989: 18-20; Åström 2000: 12-13; Koelsch 1995). During the last decade of the 19th century Myres, a promising young student at the British School of Athens, went to Cyprus to supervise some of the British excavations. In 1894 he was asked by the High Commissioner (= the British Governor) to examine, classify and organize the ever growing collection of antiquities in the Cyprus Museum. Myres' work with the collaboration of Max Ohnefalsch-Richter⁶ (Marangou 1986: 317; Krpata 1992) resulted in the first scholarly catalogue of the material in the Cyprus Museum (Myres and Ohnefalsch-Richter 1899). This catalogue constitutes the earliest major and scientific classification of the Cypriot material, which was further refined in the guidebook to the famous Cesnola collection in the Metropolitan Museum of Art that was published fifteen years later (Myres 1914; Karageorghis, Mertens and Rose 2000: 8).

Through extensive study Myres became highly familiar with the Cypriot antiquities. Being an archaeologist with a strong Aegean background, he identified large quantities of "genuine"⁷ Mycenaean pots and other Aegean artifacts and focused almost exclusively on the problem of their provenance: they could have been manufactured in Mainland Greece, Rhodes or Crete or in Cyprus itself by Mycenaean potters. The last hypothesis seemed more probable as there were some Cypriot peculiarities in the shape repertory of the vases. Thus ignoring completely the role of trade, Myres regarded these vases as the tangible result of/ proof for the colonization of the island by people from the shores and the islands of the Aegean Sea and Crete at the time of the collapse of the Minoan world around 1400. These populations "brought with them their own remarkable culture and industries" (Myres and Ohnefalsch-Richter 1899: 40, 180-182, 183-186; Myres 1914: xxx-xxxii, 45-46, 374). His strong belief in the historicity of the mythological information, for which he would be criticised by later researchers (Myres 1930: 297-299; Gjerstad 1944: 1 footnote 1), left no space for doubts that the legendary Achaean colonization of Cyprus had actually occurred.

Through Myres' fundamental work, the primordial equation of pots/ artifacts/ material culture with people/ ethnic groups was implemented within the context of Cypriot archaeology. The Achaean colonization of Cyprus was promoted from a theoretical reconstruction based on intangible evidence to an established archaeological fact. Myres admired the Greek World and devoted his life to the study of its culture (Myres 1930). Like Engel, Enmann and the rest of their German fellow-

scholars he believed deeply in the superiority of the Greeks, which would have made the colonization of Cyprus a simple venture. This idea was firmly corroborated by ancient literature and also by the archaeological material, which was however examined last and through the already sizeable colonization lens.

Myres' conclusions illustrate perfectly the above-mentioned historical approach towards the myths (section IIIb). The physical remains of the past, if there were any available, would simply have to fit into the already constructed historical scenario. Another typical example of this attitude is the initiation and development during the 19th century of the research into the heroic age of Early Greece as a result of the rising interest in Greek mythology and particularly in the Homeric poems (Fitton 1995: 41-46). In other words it was the very same attitude that urged Homer-struck Schliemann to identify the settlement at Hissarlik with the legendary Troy (Fitton 1995: 46-103) as that that placed the foundation myths on the basis of the construction of the colonisation theory.

The strong *hellenocentric* character of Myres' scholarship should be viewed against the background of 19th century British classicism. Myres was born in Preston/Lancashire at 1869. He studied and later taught at the University of Oxford in a period when, as mentioned above (section IIIb), Western Europe was trying to revive ancient Greece. Britain was also actively involved in this intellectual movement: degrees focusing on the ancient Greek language, literature and history were established in Oxford and Cambridge as early as 1807 and 1824 respectively. The same subjects became central in upper and upper-middle class secondary education (Morris 1994: 19; Hingley 1996: 137). The British Museum, as well as the other big museums in Britain, had a strong interest in acquiring antiquities from Greece (Etienne-Etienne 1990: 67-75; Whitley 2000: 34-37). Neo-classical architecture was very popular and Greece became the source of inspiration for numerous British artists and writers (Turner 1981; Clarke 1989).

f. British Colonialism and Hellenized Cyprus

The classical past played a special role for Britain as it offered ample excuse for her colonial activity: Winckelmann and many others after him regarded ancient Greece as the childhood of Europe. Ancient Greeks were the spiritual and intellectual ancestors of Europeans, who eventually thought themselves as the descendants of an ideal and superior civilization (Herzfeld 1987:1; Shanks 1996: 82-86). This assumption was widely used to legitimize European colonialism in places with a supposed primitive, inferior civilization. The aim of colonial archaeology is to substantiate the existence of a "huge" cultural gap between the colonizers and the native population. This is achieved through the systematic glorification of the past of the former and the simultaneous demonstration of the primitiveness and lack of accomplishments of the latter (Trigger 1984: 360-363).

The case of Cyprus was particularly complicated as the greater part of its population were Greek Cypriots⁸, who consciously related themselves to Greece and its glorious past. Cyprus had been under Turkish occupation since 1571 (Hunt 1990). When Britain undertook the island's administration in 1878 the Greek Cypriots reacted with great enthusiasm. They regarded Britain as a great philhellenic power that would liberate them from the "barbaric" Turkish yoke and help them unite with mother Greece (Knapp-Antoniadou 1998: 21). When Sir Garnet Wolseley, the first High Commissioner, arrived at Larnaca he was welcomed warmly by Sophronios, the Archbishop of Kition, who declared: "We accept the change of government inasmuch

as we trust Great Britain will help Cyprus, as it did the Ionian islands, to be united with mother Greece, with which it is naturally connected” (cited in Hunt 1990a: 265).

At the beginning the British colonizers made no attempt to belittle the natives’ past, but rather tried to emphasize its Greek character as much as possible. Myres, the first scholar to interpret Cypriot antiquities as the product of Mycenaean colonization, not only was British but had also been employed by the High Commission. His conclusions immediately became widely accepted by almost all the researchers working in Cyprus, the great majority of whom were of British nationality. Cypriot archaeology was literally in the hands of the colonial authority, who showed strong interest in protecting and conserving the island’s heritage through a series of laws controlling excavation and prohibiting massive exportation of antiquities (Karageorghis 1985a: 1-2; Marangou 1986: 319-322; Goring 1989: 21-22). In 1887 the British School of Athens together with the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic studies and the University of Cambridge founded the Cyprus Exploration Fund, which supported financially various research-projects including Myres’ study (Megaw 1988: 281; Goring 1989: 22-23; Knapp-Antoniadou 1998: 30).

During the last decade of the 19th century the British Museum conducted a series of excavations at sites like Kourion, Enkomi and Maroni, which were chosen for their association with the Mycenaean/ Greek world (Evans 1900). Steel maintains that these excavations established irrevocably the connection between the Aegean and Cyprus during the Late Bronze Age. She goes as far as suggesting that much of the confusion and misunderstanding concerning the hellenization of Cyprus is a result of these early British excavators who “too readily ascribed a Mycenaean identity to their Late Bronze Age finds” while almost totally ignoring the indigenous development during the same period (Steel 2001: 163-164).

The British attitude towards the past as well as the antiquities of Cyprus may be viewed as one aspect of a more general scheme to establish a good rapport with the colonized population, which was officially still under the sovereignty of the Turks. Unlike the latter, the British were (= thought and/ or presented themselves as) liberal philhellenists, bearers of justice and equality (Given 1997: 11-12). This policy was mainly reflected in the remarkable autonomy that the Cypriots, both Greek and Turkish, were enjoying in the field of education⁹. They were entitled to manage their schools, appoint teachers of their choice, compile the curricula and choose or even produce schoolbooks (Hunt 1990a: 266-67; Pavlides 1993: 244-248; Merrillees 1993: 4-5; Given 1997: 64-65).

The Greek Cypriots used these liberties wisely to reinforce their Hellenic identity thus supporting the ever-growing nationalistic movement demanding *enosis* with Greece: they followed the curricula and used the books of the Greek schools and very frequently appointed Greek teachers. Consequently Greek Cypriot students were being taught classical Greek language and literature, Greek history and geography (Hill 1952: 492-493). This *hellenocentrism* in Cypriot education was particularly evident in the architecture of school buildings, which acquired neo-classical characteristics like columnar facades, pediments, sculptured decoration etc. (Given 1997: 66-69). The Pancyprian Gymnasium in Nicosia, constructed in 1893, was the best example of this architecture and was thus considered the flagship of Greek education in Cyprus (Given 1997: 67 fig. 1).

The ever-growing Cypriot nationalism, which culminated in the burning down of the Government House at Nicosia in 1931 (Hill 1952: 548; Hunt 1990a: 270-273; Pavlides 1993: 297-304), urged the British to undertake drastic action. Their liberal educational policy became more controlled and centralized, while further measures

preventing straightforward association with the Greek world were taken, e.g. the flying of the Greek flag was prohibited (Hill 1952: 553, 556; Given 1997: 65, 69-71). Given has proposed that this climate of political unrest caused by the development of the Cypriot nationalism urged the colonial authority to consider ways of minimising the connection of the island's early history with ancient Greece, as the Greek Cypriot intelligentsia drew upon it in order to legitimise its demands (Peristianes 1910; Zannetos 1910: 102-218; Given 1998:3-4; 12-15).

The only possible way that this could be achieved was through the identification of an ancient autochthonous population that had remained largely unaffected by more recent colonization and immigration and would thus make ancient Cyprus look less Hellenic. The coincidence of the discovery of the *Eteocypriots*¹⁰ by the Swedish scholars that had been excavating on the island since 1927 (section IIIg) must have been a happy one (Given 1998: 18-20). Nevertheless it should be emphasized that it does not seem to have been anything more than that. The evidence does not suffice to support the possibility of a conscious collaboration between the colonial authority and the Swedish expedition in order to manipulate the ethnic identity of the Cypriots according to the best interest of the former. However, both the Swedes and the British administrators were coming from the same intellectual background that supported the superiority of the ancient Greek/ Western world over the Orient.

g. The Swedish Cyprus Expedition

Although excavations in Cyprus were relatively systematic by the early 20s, it was the Swedish Cyprus Expedition (1927-31) that established Cypriot Archaeology as a scientific discipline (Gjerstad 1933; Westholm 1994; Windblach 1997; Åström 2000: 14-18). The Swedes, under the leadership of Einar Gjerstad (Åström 1971: 35-37, 1985, 1994; Karageorghis 1985), came in Cyprus with clear, although rather optimistic, scientific targets. They conducted numerous excavations and surveys all over the island in order to “determine the main historical outlines, with a periodic division that could be compared to with those of nearby countries, and elucidate the chronology of Cyprus until the Christian era” (Westholm 1994: 7-8). Through their fieldwork they introduced a new approach towards archaeological material that was based on stratification and chronological associations. Their results were published in four massive volumes that still remain the basic reference for Cypriot antiquity.

Einar Gjerstad had a particular interest in the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages. Together with Erik Sjöqvist (Åström 1971:72), they managed to work out the sequence of events of the 12th and 11th century (Gjerstad 1926; 1944; 1944a; 1948; Sjöqvist 1940). Another Swede, Arne Furumark (Åström 1971:33), contributed significantly towards the study of the latest phases of the Late Bronze Age (Furumark 1944). Their basic research tool was the detailed analysis of pottery. Gjerstad believed the pottery may be regarded as the most positive evidence for connections between different cultures as it is “fragile and of little value and therefore unsuitable as an exchange article and is not carried too far from the place of manufacture: it proves the closest and direct relations. Whole and precious things often pass from hand to hand: in themselves consequently they only give evidence of indirect relations, but on the other hand they may supplement the evidence given by pottery” (Gjerstad 1926: 292). In other words *pots equal peoples*.

Gjerstad's methodology was very similar to the one used by Myres. Both researchers positioned pottery analysis in the center of their study as the key to

identifying different ethnic groups. Their results, however, were different. Myres had proposed that all Mycenaean pots, the earliest of which dated from the 14th century BC, had been locally produced; he consequently placed the date of the Mycenaean colonisation as early as the 14th century BC. His conclusions were based on the relatively limited amount of archaeological data that was available during the period he worked. The Swedes, on the other hand, had excavated a remarkable amount of material, which allowed ample space for observation and comparison. They suspected that the large amount of Aegean pottery could not have been wholly produced on Cyprus and therefore focused on the question of its provenance. Was it imported, the result of trade or was it produced locally, the product of immigrants from the Aegean? After careful observation and scrutiny, which resulted into detailed typologies of the Late Bronze/ Early Iron Age wares (Gjerstad 1926: 88-228, 1960; Sjöquist 1940: 28-97; Furumark 1944), Gjerstad, Sjöquist and Furumark managed to establish some distinctions between the imported and the local ceramic products. According to their estimations the earlier Aegean pottery was imported and therefore Myres' suggestion for a 14th century colonization from the Aegean was proved to be invalid. Furthermore the local wares of the 12th and 11th centuries demonstrated a considerable fusion of Aegean and Cypriot elements, which led them to the conclusion that the colonization must have occurred during this time (Gjerstad 1926: 218-220, 326-329; 1948: 428-429; Sjöquist 1940: 96-97, 205-208; Furumark 1944: 234-239; 262-265).

The colonization hypothesis was thoroughly reconsidered, but never questioned. Gjerstad and his colleagues felt that some of the arguments used by earlier researchers were not based on secure archaeological data and thus required re-examination. They undertook this task meticulously, as their ultimate purpose was to establish a "healthy", assumption-free Archaeology of Cyprus based on pure archaeological data. An example of this attitude is Gjerstad's article on the foundation myths, where after criticising Myres' historical approach towards the myths he attempts a new critical examination in order to distinguish the original and therefore trustworthy myths (Gjerstad 1944).

Elucidating the details of the colonization narrative was one of the major objectives of the Swedish Cyprus Expedition. At the same time they were interested in the interaction between the newcomers and the native population. Were the Mycenaean ruthless invaders or had they come in peace? Did the native Cypriots resist them? Did they maintain their identity or were they absorbed by the Greek culture? After a thorough study of the material culture of Early Iron Age Cyprus Gjerstad concluded that as soon as they arrived, the newcomers became the "*Herrscherklasse*" and imposed their culture on the natives (Gjerstad 1933: 267-68; 1980: 44-47). In the final publication of the Expedition's results he stated:

the Mycenaean *colonists* and conquerors were the *lords* of the country, but the descendants of the Late Bronze Age inhabitants, whom we may call the Eteocyprians, formed the majority of the population, and for some time parts of the island still remained entirely Eteocyprian. No foundation legends refer to cities in the interior of the island or to places on the south coast between Kurion in the West and Salamis in the East. In the interior of the island there were "*barbarian*", i.e. Eteocyprian cities at least down to the Classical period [Gjerstad 1948: 429, italics mine].

What led Gjerstad to the above conclusions seems to have been his academic view of the Greek civilization as a superior one rather than the excavated material.

which cannot support any kind of strict distinction between the newcomers and the *urkyprisch* indigenous peoples. The latter's presence is substantiated mainly by a relatively small group of indecipherable inscriptions, which were assumed to have been produced by them (Given 1998: 18-20). On the basis of the concentration of these inscriptions in the area of Amathus, Gjerstad and his colleagues concluded that after the arrival of the Mycenaeans the Eteocypriots concentrated in an ethnic pocket in the city of Amathus.

The Swedes' eagerness to identify and study the indigenous population and its culture must have made them particularly welcome by the British administrators of the island. Ronald Storrs, the High Commissioner during that period, supported the Swedish research in any possible way. He helped with land appropriation, provided police to guard excavation sites and even went as far as changing the Antiquities Law so that the excavators could take a proportion of the finds to Sweden (Storrs 1945: 491; Given 1998: 16). The Swedes, on the other hand "considered themselves objective scholars who used scientific procedures to establish historical truth. Nonetheless they were clearly sympathetic to the colonial regime and were working in the same general European ideological system of cultural history and racial hierarchy" (Given 1998: 16). Einar Gjerstad, the leader of the expedition, is responsible for the establishment and systematic use of the term "Eteocypriots" in parallel with/ opposition to the term "Greeks of Cyprus". His belief in racial hierarchy as well as his classical education had led him to the conclusion that the mythical colonization of Cyprus by the superior Greeks was an incontrovertible historical fact (Gjerstad 1933: 267-268).

h. New Discoveries: Sinda and Enkomi/ the Identification of Locally Produced "Mycenaean IIIC:1b" Ware in Cypriot Contexts

Through the Swedish Cyprus Expedition's fundamental work the field of Cypriot archaeology attracted the attention and interest of numerous researchers and institutions, thus gaining an international character (Knapp-Antoniadou 1998: 30). In 1935 the Department of Antiquities was founded. Finally a local, specialized institution would protect and preserve the antiquities, establish local museums throughout the island and conduct excavations. The first director of the Department was A.H.S. Megaw, a Dubliner educated at the University of Cambridge. He was assisted by a Cypriot archaeologist, Porphyrios Dikaios (Åström 1971: 27-29; Karageorghis 1972; Nicolaou 1973; Ieromonachou 1979), who was given the post of the curator (Dikaios 1961: ix-xvi; Marangou 1986: 331-332).

After the foundation of the Department of Antiquities research became more systematic. The uncovering of the sites of Sinda and Enkomi during the 40s and 50s respectively had an enormous impact in the firmer establishment of the colonization narrative. Sinda, a small inland settlement in the Mesaoria plain excavated by Arne Furumark (section IIIg), produced large amounts of a "pure" Mycenaean ware that was clearly locally produced. This pottery, classified as Mycenaean IIIC:1b by Furumark, was typical in Greece during the period 1200-1150 (Furumark 1965: 100, 1972: 541-75, 1972a: 110-15; Kling 1989). At Sinda it was found in association with the reoccupation level that was covering an extended destruction layer. The settlement had been destroyed and consequently repaired. The people who repaired it were producing and using the Mycenaean IIIC:1b ware (Furumark 1965).

A quite similar picture emerged during excavations at Enkomi in Eastern Cyprus, conducted by the French mission in collaboration with Dikaios and the

Department of Antiquities. According to Dikaios, Enkomi was destroyed around 1230 BC. The date of the destruction was estimated on the basis of ceramic evidence (Dikaios 1971:511). A short time after its destruction the town was repaired and reoccupied: the reoccupation level is characterized by the introduction of locally produced Mycenaean IIIC:1b style pottery, which was first identified in Enkomi by Porphyrios Dikaios (Dikaios 1967; 1969; 1971).

Both Furumark and Dikaios associated the Mycenaean IIIC:1b pottery, which was coming up in impressively large numbers, with an extended influx of people from the Aegean. They were not certain whether that the newcomers were also to be held responsible for the destruction of the settlements or not. The Mycenaeans' involvement in the subsequent rebuilding, repairing and general reorganizing of the towns was undisputed. Dikaios correlated the destruction of Enkomi with the destruction of Troy VIIa (while Mycenaean IIIB style pottery was still in use) and the consequent but slightly later (Mycenaean IIIC:1b) arrival of Achaean heroes on the island as colonists (Dikaios 1971: 512-520).

The results of the excavations at Enkomi and Sinda promoted the colonization narrative into an established archaeological fact beyond doubt. Such was the enthusiasm of the archaeologists that they completely ignored the fact that Furumark had excavated only a small proportion of the settlement at Sinda and that Enkomi had not been fully investigated. Mycenaean IIIC:1b pottery from several other sites throughout the island added further strength to the argument (Kling 1989:1).

i. Vassos Karageorghis

Since the excavation of Enkomi the hellenization hypothesis has been developed and refined gradually, particularly under the light of more discoveries during the 60s and the 70s. It received a remarkably powerful boost when Vassos Karageorghis (Åström 1971: 44-47, 85, 2000: 24-25; Ieromonachou 1992; Hatzioannou 1992) became director of the Department of Antiquities at 1963, three years after the establishment of the independent Republic of Cyprus (Hunt 1990b). Karageorghis had a strong classical/ Hellenic background. Born in 1929, he grew up in a period when the demand for *enosis* with Greece was particularly intense (Hunt 1990a: 273-279). He studied at the Pancyprrian Gymnasium of Nicosia that provided him with a classical education. The latter constituted the basis for the construction of his *hellenocentric* identity, which is evident everywhere in his written work.

Karageorghis, however, is not only a Greek Cypriot with a strong ethnic identity. He is also an inspired man, who wanted to promote Cypriot archaeology abroad and therefore placed much emphasis on the Greekness of the Cypriot culture in order to make it look more interesting and attractive to foreign archaeological institutions. Prestigious Greek antiquities seemed to be the main focus of research while Cypriot studies were more or less underdeveloped. He systematized archaeological activity and organised excavations at numerous sites throughout the island, many of which he conducted himself. Additionally, he strongly encouraged foreign missions to start research projects. Having himself a strong interest in the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages he excavated some very important sites like Salamis (Karageorghis 1969), Kition (Karageorghis 1976; Karageorghis and Demas 1985), the fortified outposts at Maa-*Palaeokastro* (Karageorghis and Demas 1988) and Pyla-*Kokkinokremmos* (Karageorghis and Demas 1984), the eleventh century cemeteries of Palaepaphos-*Skales* (Karageorghis 1983) and Alaas (Karageorghis 1975) and many

others. The results of these excavations were ingeniously employed in modifying and refining the hellenization hypothesis.

Karageorghis' efforts were intensified after the Turkish invasion in 1974 (Hunt 1990b: 289-90). Since the early 70s he has organised several international conferences, most of them concentrating on the relations between Cyprus and the Aegean throughout antiquity (Karageorghis 1973, 1979, 1986, 1991, 1994a; Karageorghis and Michaelides 1995; Karageorghis and Stampolides 1998). He has also participated in numerous colloquia with enthusiastic papers focusing on the transitional period between the Late Bronze and the Early Iron Age and the hellenisation of Cyprus. Being a prolific writer he has produced a significant number of books and articles on (among many others) the same topic.

CONCLUSIONS-EPILOGUE

In a stimulating article published recently, Silberman (1998) has effectively demonstrated the close connection between contemporary social ideology and archaeological interpretation. He achieved this through an analysis of the construction of narratives focusing on role of the Sea Peoples in the collapse of the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean civilizations, which were developed during the Victorian period. This inevitable connection is also particularly evident in the development of the Mycenaean colonization of Cyprus narrative, which was outlined above.

The narrative's long history from the mid-19th century until the present day was followed in an effort to highlight the social factors that determined its development. Although limited, due to lack of space and for the sake of clarity, this analysis¹¹ has shown that political considerations and academic trends have played a major role. Furthermore the archaeological evidence, usually squeezed into pre-existing historical constructions, often illuminated from very specific angles, and sometimes even completely ignored, has not always been the prime source of inspiration. That is why the colonization narrative is lately regarded by more and more researchers as an unstable *house of cards*¹².

The object of my doctoral research is the narrative's thorough reconsideration. I chose this subject because I felt that the role of politics and other non-academic factors have played a too prominent role in the narrative's construction. My initial, over-optimistic purpose was to remove the manipulated surface and reveal the pure archaeological substratum, free of political, ethnic and cultural preconceptions and assumptions. Now, after spending a considerable amount of time researching it, I have realized that my primary aim cannot be achieved. As the account of the construction of the narrative in part III has demonstrated, the connection between politics and the practice of archaeology resembles the Gordian knot (Kohl and Fawcett 1995). Cyprus belongs to one of the most politically charged regions and international politics have been determining its history since antiquity (Knapp-Antoniadou 1998).

Archaeologists are not hermits; they live within dynamic societies, with which they interact in many different ways. Even if we invented ways of penetrating through other researchers' biases, it would be absolutely impossible to neutralize our own. So will we not be able to use the evidence in order to construct something more reliable than a *house of cards*? I believe that being conscious of our biases and consequently "warning" the other researchers as well as the public about them will lend considerable strength to our constructions. So here I go: I am investigating the Greek

presence in Cyprus; I am Greek; I did my BA degree in the University of Athens and then I came to the UK for postgraduate studies. My supervisor is English; I have lived so far for four years in Birmingham, England. I visit Cyprus frequently and I have many Cypriot friends.

All these facts, among numerous others which cannot be listed here, construct my identity, which should be bore in mind by anybody going though my version of the colonization narrative that will constitute the concluding chapter of my thesis. This new narrative will not necessarily be a better one; it will however be an open one as opposed to the close, dogmatic narrative that is currently available. Being aware of the weaknesses of its discipline and the biases of its writer, it will *suggest* rather than *impose*.

Acknowledgements. I would like to express my deep gratitude to the Greek Archaeological Committee (UK), Matti Egon and the A.G.Leventis Foundation for sponsoring my doctoral research. Furthermore I would like to thank the organisers of this conference for inviting me to give a paper and the University of Stanford whose financial support enabled me to participate in the *Narrative Pasts / Past Narratives* Conference. Many thanks are due to Drs Maria Iacovou (University of Cyprus) and Susan Sherratt (Ashmolean Museum, Oxford) for the stimulating discussions and invaluable advice. I also wish to thank my anonymous reviewer whose comments and suggestions strengthened considerably the arguments presented here. Many of the ideas in this article are the products of long discussions with my supervisor Dr Ken Wardle (University of Birmingham, UK), to whom I am grateful for the academic guidance and general support he has provided me during my study.

REFERENCES CITED

- Åström, P.
1971 *Who's who in Cypriot Archaeology. Biographical and bibliographical note.* Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology Vol.23. P.Åström's Förlag, Göteborg.
1972 *The Swedish Cyprus Expedition, Volume IV (1D): The Late Cypriote Bronze Age: The Late Cypriote Bronze Age: relative and absolute chronology, foreign relations, historical conclusions.* Swedish Cyprus Expedition, Lund.
- Åström, P. (editor)
1994 *The fantastic years on Cyprus. The Swedish Cyprus Expedition and its members.* Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology Pocket Book No.79. P.Åström's Förlag, Jonsered.
- Åström, P.
1994a "Cyprus is Alpha and Omega for me"; Einar Gjerstad. In *The fantastic years on Cyprus. The Swedish Cyprus Expedition and its members*, edited by P.Åström, pp. 24-32. Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology Pocket Book No.79. P.Åström's Förlag, Jonsered.
1985 Einar Gjerstad's Cypriot publications. A bibliography by Paul Åström. *Archaeologia Cypria* 1: 9-14.
2000 *A century of international cyprological research.* Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation, Nicosia.
- Balandier, C.
2001 Cyprus, a new archaeological frontier in the XIXth century: the struggle of European museums for Cypriot antiquities. In *Cyprus in the 19th century AD. Fact, Fancy and Fiction. Papers of the 22nd British Museum Classical Colloquium, December 1998*, edited by V.Tatton-Brown, pp. 3-12. Oxbow books, Oxford.
- Beloch, K.J.
1893 *Griechische Geschichte, Volume I: Bis auf die sophistische bewegung und den peloponnesischen Krieg.* Trübner, Strassburg.
- Betancourt, P.P.
2000 The Aegean and the origin of the Sea Peoples. In *The Sea Peoples and their world: a reassessment*, edited by E.D.Oren, pp.297-303. University Museum Monograph 108. University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- Boardman, J
1980 *The Greeks overseas; their early colonies and trade.* 3rd ed. Thames and Hudson, London.
- Bournia-Simantoni, E.
1997 *Arhaiologia ton proimon ellinikon hronon. Oi aiones tis diamorfosis (1050-600 p.Ch.).* Institutou tou Vivliou-A.Kardamitsa, Athens.
- Burdajewicz, M.
1990 *The Aegean Sea Peoples and religious architecture in the Eastern Mediterranean at the close of the Late Bronze Age.* BAR International Series 558. BAR, Oxford.
- Bury, J.B. and Meiggs, R.

- 1974 *A history of Greece to the death of Alexander the Great*. 4th ed. Macmillan, London.
- Busolt, G.
1893 *Griechische Geschichte bis zur Schlacht bei Chaeronia*, Vol. I. F.A.Perthes, Gotha.
- Catling, H.W.
1966 *Cyprus in the Neolithic and Bronze Age periods*. Revised Cambridge Ancient History Vol. 43. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
1980 *Cyprus and the West 1600-1050 BC*. Ian Sanders Memorial Lecture for the year 1979. Department of Prehistory and Archaeology, University of Sheffield, Sheffield.
- Cesnola, L.P.Di
1878 *Cyprus: its ancient cities, tombs and temples. A narrative of researches and excavations during ten years' residence in that island*. Harper, New York.
- Clarke, G.W. (editor)
1989 *Rediscovering Hellenism: the Hellenic inheritance and the English imagination*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Coldstream, J.N.C.
1979 *Geometric Greece*. 2nd ed. Methuen, London.
1985 Archaeology in Cyprus 1960-1985: The Geometric and Archaic Periods. In *Archaeology in Cyprus 1960-1985*, edited by V.Karageorghis, pp.47-59. Department of Antiquities, Cyprus, Nicosia.
1990 Early Iron Age (Cypro-Geometric); the rise of the ancient kingdoms c. 1100-700 BC. In *Footprints in Cyprus*, edited by D.Hunt, pp.47-64. Trigraph, London.
- Constantine, D.
1984 *Early Greek travellers and the Hellenic ideal*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Courtois, J.-C.
1997 I Geometriki epohi (1050-telos tou 8ou aionos p.Ch.). Translated by G.Spanos. In *Istoria tis Kyprou, Volume I: Arhaia Kypros, Part A: Fysikogeografiki eisagogi, proistorikoi hronoi, sheseis pros omorous horous*, edited by T.Papadopoulos, pp. 287-349. Idryma Arhiepiskopou Makariou III, Nicosia.
- Demetriou, A.
1987 Afixi ton proton Ellinon kai I Proimi Epohi tou Sidirou stin Kypro 1220-750 p.Ch. *Arhaiologia* 23: 26-31.
1989 *Cypro-Aegean relations in the Early Iron Age*. Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology Vol.83. P.Åström's Förlag, Göteborg.
- Desborough, V.R.d'A.
1964 *The last Mycenaeans and their successors; an archaeological survey c.1200-c.1000 BC*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
1972 *The Greek Dark Ages*. Ernst Benn, London.
1962 *The end of the Mycenaean civilisation and the Dark Age*. Revised Cambridge Ancient History Vol. 13. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Dikaios, P.
1961 *A guide to the Cyprus Museum*. Department of Antiquities, Cyprus, Nicosia.
1967 Excavations and historical background: Enkomi in Cyprus. *Journal of Historical Studies*: 41-49.

- 1969 *Enkomi Excavations 1948-1958, Volume I: The architectural remains, the tombs*. Von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein.
- 1971 *Enkomi Excavations 1948-1958, Volume II: Chronology, summary and conclusions, catalogue, appendices*. Von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein.
- Dothan, T.
1982 *The Philistines and their material culture*. Israel Exploration Society, Jerusalem.
- Dothan, T. and M. Dothan
1992 *People of the Sea. The search for the Philistines*. Macmillan, New York-Oxford-Singapore-Sydney-Toronto.
- Dowden, K.
1992 *The uses of Greek mythology*. Routledge, London-New York.
- Engel, W.H.
1841 *Kypros. Eine Monographie*. G. Reimer, Berlin.
- Enmann, A.
1886 *Kypros und der Ursprung des Aphroditenkultus*. Mémoires de l'Acad. imp. des sciences de St. Petersburg 34, series 13. Petersburg.
- Enmann, A.
1887 *Kritische Versuche zur ältesten griechischen Geschichte I, Kypros und der Ursprung des Aphroditenkultus*. Stuttgart.
- Etienne, R. -Etienne, F.
1992 *The search for ancient Greece*. Translated by A. Zielonka. Thames & Hudson, London.
- Evans, A.J.
1900 Mycenaean Cyprus as illustrated in the British Museum excavations. *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 30: 199-220.
- Fitton, J.L.
1995 *The discovery of the Greek Bronze Age*. British Museum Press, London.
2001 Excavations in Cyprus and the Mycenaean question. In *Cyprus in the 19th century AD. Fact, Fancy and Fiction. Papers of the 22nd British Museum Classical Colloquium, December 1998*, edited by V. Tatton-Brown, pp. 149-152. Oxbow books, Oxford.
- Fortin, M.
1980 Fondation de villes grecques a Chypre: legendes et decouvertes archeologiques. In *Mélanges d'études anciennes offerts à Maurice Lebel*, edited by J.-B. Caron, M. Fortin and G. Maloney, pp. 25-44. Éditions du Sphinx, Québec.
- Friedrich, J.
1932 *Kleinasiatische Sprachdenkmäler*. Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen 163. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Furtwängler, A. and G. Löschke
1886 *Mykenischen Vasen. Vorhellenischen Thongefässe aus dem Gebiet des Mittelmeeres*. Asher, Berlin.
- Furumark, A.
1944 The Mycenaean III C pottery and its relation to Cypriot fabrics. *Opuscula Archaeologica* 3:194-265.
1965 The excavations at Sinda. Some historical results. *Opuscula Atheniensiensia* 6: 99-116.

- 1972 *Mycenaean Pottery I: analysis and classification*. Skrifter utgivna av Svenska institutet i Athen 40, 20, Stockholm. Originally published 1941, Kungl. Vitterhets, historie och antikvitets akademien, Stockholm.
- 1972a *Pottery II: chronology*. Skrifter utgivna av Svenska institutet i Athen 40, 20, Stockholm. Originally published 1941, Kungl. Vitterhets, historie och antikvitets akademien, Stockholm.
- Given, M.
- 1997 Star of the Parthenon, Cypriot melange: education and representation in colonial Cyprus. *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 7(1): 59-82.
- 1998 Inventing the Eteocypriots: imperialist Archaeology and the manipulation of ethnic identity. *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 11(1): 3-29.
- Gjerstad, E.
- 1926 *Studies on Prehistoric Cyprus*. Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift, Uppsala.
- 1933 Die schwedischen Ausgrabungen auf Cypern. *Die Antike* 9: 261-281.
- 1944 The colonisation of Cyprus in Greek legend. *Opuscula Archaeologica* 3: 107-123.
- 1944a The initial date of the Cypriot Iron Age. *Opuscula Archaeologica* 3: 73-106.
- 1948 *The Swedish Cyprus Expedition, Volume IV(2): The Cypro-Geometric, Cypro-Achaic and Cypro-Classical periods*. The Swedish Cyprus Expedition, Stockholm.
- 1960 Pottery Types: Cypro-Geometric to Cypro-Classical. *Opuscula Atheniensiaca* 3: 105-122.
- Goring, E.
- 1988 *A mischievous pastime; digging in Cyprus in the 19th century*. National Museums of Scotland-Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation, Edinburgh.
- 1995 The Kourion sceptre: some facts and factoids. In *Klados; essays in honour of J.N.Coldstream*, edited by C.Morris, pp.103-10. Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies Supplement 63. London.
- Hadjiioannou, K.
- 1971 *I arhaia Kypros eis tas hellenikas pigas. Volume I: Ta thryloumena, historia and ethnologia apo ton proistorikon hronon mehri tou 395 m.Chr.* Ekdoseis Ieras Arhiepiskopis Kyprou, Nicosia.
- 1992 Vassos Karageorghis. *Kypriakai Spoudai* 54-55: 1-6.
- Hall, J.
- 1997 *Ethnic identity in Greek antiquity*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Herzfeld, M.
- 1987 *Anthropology through the looking-glass: critical ethnography in the margins of Europe*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Hill, G.F.
- 1949 *A history of Cyprus, Volume I: To the conquest by Richard Lion-Heart*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- 1952 *A history of Cyprus, Volume IV: the Ottoman province, the British colony. 1571-1948*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Hingley, R.
- 1996 The shared moral purposes of two empires and the origin of Romano-British archaeology. In *Nationalism and Archaeology*, edited by J.A. Atkinson, I. Banks and J.O'Sullivan, pp.135-42. Cruithne Press, Glasgow.
- Hofmann, O.

- 1891 *Die griechischen Dialekte in ihren historischen Zusammenhänge, Volume I: Der süd-archaische Dialekt*. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht's Verlag, Göttingen.
- Hofmann, S.F.W.
- 1841 *Griehendland und die Griechen im Alterthum, Volume VI: Die Inseln und Kolonien der Griechen*. Dyk'schen Buchhandlung, Leipzig.
- Hunt, D.
- 1990 The Turkish period, 1571-1878. In *Footprints in Cyprus*, edited by D.Hunt, pp.226-54. Trigraph, London.
- 1990a The British period, 1878-1960. In *Footprints in Cyprus*, edited by D.Hunt, pp.255-79. Trigraph, London.
- 1990b Independence and invasion, 1960-. In *Footprints in Cyprus*, edited by D.Hunt, pp.280-90. Trigraph, London.
- Iacovou, M.
- 1989 Society and settlement in Late Cypriot III. In *Early Society in Cyprus*, edited by E.Peltenburg, pp.52-59. Edinburgh University Press-National Museum of Schotland- The A.G.Leventis Foundation, Edinburgh.
- 1991 Proto-White Painted pottery: a classification of the ware. In *Cypriot Ceramics: reading the prehistoric record*, edited by J.Barlow, D.L.Bolger and B.Kling, pp.199-205. University Museum Monograph 74. University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- 1994 The topography of 11th century BC Cyprus. In *Proceedings of the International Symposium "Cyprus in the 11th Century BC"*, edited by V.Karageorghis, pp. 149-156. The A.G. Leventis Foundation, Nicosia.
- 1995 Kypriaki Protoistoria. I Kypros prin apo ta vasileia. *Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus*: 95-110.
- 1998 Philistia and Cyprus in the 11th century: from a similar prehistory to a diverse protohistory. In *Mediterranean Peoples in transition, thirteen to early tenth centuries BCE*, edited by S.Gitin, A.Mazar and E.Stern, pp. 332-344. Israel Exploration Society, Jerusalem.
- 1999 The Greek exodus to Cyprus: the antiquity of Hellenism. *Mediterranean Historical Review* 14 (2): 1-28.
- Ieromonachou, L.
- 1979 Bibliography of Porphyrios Dikaios. In *Studies presented in memory of Porphyrios Dikaios*, edited by V.Karageorghis, pp. 216-218. Department of Antiquities, Cyprus, Nicosia.
- 1992 List of publications by Vassos Karageorghis. *Kypriakai Spoudai* 54-55: 7-20.
- Karageorghis, V.
- 1968 *Chypre*. Archaeologia Mundi. Geneva: Nagel
- 1969 *Salamis in Cyprus, Homeric, Hellenistic and Roman*. Thames & Hudson, London.
- 1971 Notes on some Mycenaean capitals. *Archaeologika Analekta Athenon*: 101-107.
- 1971a O Kypriakos politismos tes Mykenaikes periodou. In *Istoria tou Ellenikou Ethnous, vol I Proistoria kai Protoistoria, e auge tou politismou (mehri tou 1100 p.Ch.)*, pp. 338-52. Ekdotike Athenon, Athens.
- 1972 Porphyrios Dikaios. *Kadmos* 11: 177-79.
- (editor)

- 1973 *Acts of the International Archaeological Symposium "The Mycenaeans in the Eastern Mediterranean"*, Nicosia 27th March-2nd April 1972. Department of Antiquities, Cyprus, Nicosia.
- 1975 *Alaas. A Protogeometric necropolis in Cyprus*. Department of Antiquities, Cyprus, Nicosia.
- 1976 *Kition, Mycenaean and Phoenician discoveries in Cyprus*. Thames & Hudson, London.
- 1976a *O politismos tis Proistorikis Kyprou*. Ekdotiki Athinon, Athens.
- 1978 *Arhaia Kypros*. Morfotiko Idryma Ethnikis Trapezis, Athens.
- (editor)
- 1979 *Acts of the International Archaeological Symposium "The relations between Cyprus and Crete, ca. 2000-500 BC"*, Nicosia 16th April –22nd April 1978. Department of Antiquities, Cyprus, Nicosia.
- 1981 *Ancient Cyprus. 7,000 years of Art and Archaeology*. Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge and London
- 1982 *Cyprus from the Stone Age to the Romans*. Thames & Hudson, London.
- 1983 *Palaepaphos-Skales: an Iron Age cemetery in Cyprus*. Ausgrabungen in Alt-Paphos auf Zypern 3. Universitätsverlag, Constanz.
- 1985 O Einar Gjerstad kai e Kypriake Archaologia. *Archaeologia Cypria* 1: 3-8.
- 1985a The Cyprus Department of Antiquities, 1935-1985. In *Archaeology in Cyprus 1960-1985*, edited by V.Karageorghis, pp.1-10. The A.G.Leventis Foundation, Nicosia
- (editor)
- 1986 *Acts of the International Archaeological Symposium "Cyprus between the Orient and the Occident"*, Nicosia 8–14 September 1985. Department of Antiquities, Cyprus, Nicosia.
- 1990 The Late Bronze Age (Late Cypriot), c.1600-1050 BC. In *Footprints in Cyprus*, edited by D.Hunt, pp.22-46. Trigraph, London.
- 1990a *The End of the Late Bronze Age in Cyprus*. Pierides Foundation, Cyprus, Larnaca.
- (editor)
- 1991 *Proceedings of an International Symposium "The Civilisations of the Aegean and their diffusion in Cyprus and the Eastern Mediterranean 2000-600 BC"*, 18-24 September 1989. Pierides Foundation, Larnaca.
- 1992 The crisis years: Cyprus. In *The crisis years: the 12th century BC. From beyond the Danube to the Tigris*, edited by W.A.Ward and M.S.Joukowsky, pp.79-86. Kendall/ Hunt, Dubuque, Iowa.
- 1994 The Prehistory of an Ethnogenesis. In *Proceedings of the International Symposium "Cyprus in the 11th Century BC"*, edited by V.Karageorghis, pp.1-9. A.G. Foundation, Nicosia.
- (editor)
- 1994a *Proceedings of the International Symposium "Cyprus in the 11th century"*, Nicosia 30-31 October 1993. The A.G.Leventis Foundation, Nicosia.
- 1997 I Ysteri Halkokratia. In *Istoria tis Kyprou, Volume I: Arhaia Kypros, Part A: Fysikogeografiki eisagogi, proistorikoi hronoi, sheseis pros omorous horous*, edited by T.Papadopoulos, pp. 237-285. Idryma Arhiepiskopou Makariou III, Nicosia.
- 1998 *Cypriot Archaeology today; achievements and perspectives*. Department of Archaeology, University of Glasgow, Glasgow.

- 1998a Hearths and bathtubs in Cyprus: a “Sea Peoples” innovations? In *Mediterranean Peoples in transition, thirteen to early tenth centuries BCE*, edited by S.Gitin, A.Mazar and E.Stern, pp.276-282. Israel Exploration Society, Jerusalem.
- 1998b Mycenaean “Acropoleis” in the Aegean and Cyprus: some comparisons. In *The Aegean and the Orient in the 2nd millennium; Proceedings of the 50th Anniversary Symposium Cincinnati, 18-20 April 1997*, edited by E.H.Cline and D.Harris-Cline, pp.127-136. AEGEUM 18. Université de Liège, Histoire de l'art et archéologie de la Grèce antique, Liège.
- 2000 Cultural innovations in Cyprus relating to the Sea Peoples. In *The Sea Peoples and their world: a reassessment*, edited by E.D.Oren, pp.255-279. University Museum Monograph 108. University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- Karageorghis, V. and M.Demas
 1984 *Pyla-Kokkinokremmos*. Department of Antiquities, Cyprus, Nicosia.
 1985 *Excavations at Kition, Volume V (1): The pre-Phoenician levels*. Department of Antiquities, Cyprus, Nicosia.
 1988 *Excavations at Maa-Palaeokastro 1979-1986*. Department of Antiquities, Cyprus, Nicosia.
- Karageorghis, V. and F.G. Maier
 1984 *Paphos, history and archaeology*. The A.G.Leventis Foundation, Nicosia.
- Karageorghis, V., R.Mertens, and R.E.Rose
 2000 Ancient art from Cyprus. The Cesnola Collection in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
- Karageorghis, V. and D.Michaelides (editors)
 1995 *Proceedings of the International Symposium Cyprus and the sea*. University of Cyprus, Nicosia.
- Karageorghis, V. and N.Chr.Stampolidis (editors)
 1998 *Eastern Mediterranean Cyprus-Dodecanese-Crete 16th-6th century BC, Proceedings of the International Symposium held at Rethymnon-Crete in May 1997*. University of Crete, Rethymnon- The A.G.Leventis Foundation, Athens.
- Kling, B.
 1989 *Mycenaean IIC:1b pottery in and related pottery in Cyprus*. Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology Vol. 88. P.Åström's Förlag, Göteborg.
 1991 A terminology for the Matte-Painted Wheelmade pottery of Late Cypriot IIC-III A. In *Cypriot Ceramics: reading the prehistoric record*, edited by J.Barlow, D.L.Bolger and B.Kling, pp.181-184. University Museum Monograph 74. University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- Knapp, A.B. and S.Antoniadou,
 1998 Archaeology, politics and the cultural heritage of Cyprus. In *Archaeology under fire*, edited by L.Meskell, pp.13-43. Routledge, London-New York.
- Koelsch, W.A.
 1995 John Linton Myres 1860-1954. *Geographers: Biobibliographical Studies* 16: 53-62.
- Kohl, P.L. and C.Fawcett,
 1995 Archaeology in the service of the state: theoretical considerations. In *Nationalism, politics and the practice of Archaeology*, edited by P.L.Kohl and C.Fawcett, pp.3-18. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Krdata. M.

- 1992 Max Hermann Ohnefalsch-Richter, bibliography and biographical remarks.
Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus: 337-341.
- Kyrris, C.
1996 *History of Cyprus*. Lampoussa publications, Nicosia.
- Maier, F.G.
1985 Factoids in Ancient History: the case of fifth century Cyprus. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 105: 32-39.
- Maier, F.G.
1986 Kinyras and Agapenor. In *Acts of the International Symposium Cyprus between the Orient and the Occident*, edited by V. Karageorghis, pp.311-320. Department of Antiquities, Cyprus, Nicosia.
- Maier, F.G.
1996 Griechische Einwanderungen nach Cypern in der späten Bronzezeit: Legenden und Realitäten. In *Hellenische Mythologie/ Vorgeschichte; die Hellenen und ihre Nachbarn von der Vorgeschichte bis zur klassischen Periode; Tagung 9.-11.12.1994 Ohlstadt/Oberbayern – Deutschland*, edited by N.Dimoudis-A.Kyriatsoulis, pp. 299-316. DZA Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft, Altenburg.
- Mailer, N.
1973 *Marilyn: a biography*. Hodder & Stoughton, London.
- Marangou, A.
1986 E Kypriake Arhaiologia kai oi xenes apostoles 1878-1955. In *Kypriaka 1878-1955*, edited by G.K.Ioannides, pp.309-339. Dialexeis Laikou Panepistemiou 2. Ekdoseis Demou Lefkosias, Nicosia.
- Mazar, A.
1985 The emergence of the Philistine material culture. *Israel Exploration Journal* 35: 95-107.
1988 Some aspects of the “Sea Peoples” settlement. In *Society and economy in the Eastern Mediterranean (c.1500-1000BC). Proceedings of the international symposium held at the University of Haifa from the 28th of April to the 2nd of May 1985*, edited by M.Heltzer and E.Lipinski, pp. 250-260. *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 23. Departement Oriëntalistiek Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, Leuven.
1991 Comments on the nature of the relations between Cyprus and Palestine during the 12th-11th centuries BC. In *Proceedings of an international symposium “The civilisations of the Aegean and their diffusion in Cyprus and the Eastern Mediterranean, 2000-600 BC”, 18-24 September 1989*, edited by V.Karageorghis, pp. 95-107. Pierides Foundation, Larnaca
- Meister, R.
1882 *Die griechischen Dialekte*, Volume II. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.
- Megaw, A.H.S.
1988 The British School at Athens and Cyprus. *Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus: 281-286.*
- Merrillees, R.S.
1993 The languages of Cyprus. *Centre d’Etudes Chypriotes, Cahier* 20: 3-17.
- Merrillees, R.S.
2000 Max Ohnefalsch-Richter and the British. In *Periplus. Festschrift für Hans-Günter Buchholz zu seinem achtzigsten Geburtstag am 24. Dezember 1999*,

- edited by P. Åström and D.Sürenhagen, pp.107-117. *Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology* 127. P.Åström's Förlag, Jonsered.
- Merrillees, R.S.
2001 T.B.Sandwith and the beginnings of Cypriote archaeology. In *Cyprus in the 19th century AD. Fact, Fancy and Fiction. Papers of the 22nd British Museum Classical Colloquium, December 1998*, edited by V.Tatton-Brown, pp. 222-235. Oxbow books, Oxford.
- Mountjoy, P.A.
1993 *Mycenaean pottery. An Introduction*. Oxford University Committee for Archaeology, Oxford.
- Morris, I.
1994 Archaeologies of Greece. In *Classical Greece: ancient histories and modern archaeologies*, edited by I.Morris, pp.8-47. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Muhly, J.D.
1984 The role of the Sea Peoples in Cyprus during the LCIII period. In *Cyprus at the close of the Late Bronze Age*, edited by V.Karageorghis and J.D.Muhly, pp. 39-55. The A.G.Leventis Foundation, Nicosia.
- Myres, J.L.
1914 *Handbook of the Cesnola Collection of antiquities from Cyprus*. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
- Myres, J.L.
1930 *Who were the Greeks?* University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Myres, J.L. and M.Ohnefalsch-Richter
1899 *A catalogue of the Cyprus Museum with a chronicle of excavations undertaken since the British occupation and introductory notes on Cypriot Archaeology*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Nicolaou, K.
1973 Porfyrios Dikaios. *Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus: 226-229*.
- Osborne, R.
1996 *Greece in the making, 1200-479 BC*. London and New York, Routledge.
- Pavrides, A.
1993 *Istoria tis nisou Kyprou, Volume 4, Apo to 1571 mehri to 1964*. Philokypros, Nicosia
- Peristianes, I.K.
1910 *Geniki istoria tis nisou Kyprou apo ton arhaiotaton hronon mehri tis agglakis katohis*. Phoni tis Kyprou, Nicosia.
- Renfrew, C. and P.Bahn
2000 *Archaeology: theories, methods and practice*. 3rd ed. Thames & Hudson, London.
- Reyes, A.T.
1994 *Archaic Cyprus; a study of the textual and archaeological evidence*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Rupp, D.W.
1985 Prolegomena to a study of stratification and social organisation in Iron Age Cyprus. In *Status, social organisation and stratification: current archaeological reconstructions*, edited by M.Thompson, M.Y.Garcia and F.J.Keene, pp.119-130. The Archaeological Association of the University of Calgarv. Calgarv.

- 1987 Vive le roi: the emergence of the state in Iron Age Cyprus. In *Western Cyprus: Connections. An archaeological symposium held at Brock University, St.Catharines, Ontario, Canada, March 21-22, 1986*, edited by D.W.Rupp, pp.147-168. Studies In Mediterranean Archaeology 77. Paul Åströms Förlag, Göteborg.
- 1988 The Royal tombs at Salamis (Cyprus): ideological messages of power and authority. *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 1: 111-139.
- 1998 The seven kings of the land of Ia', a district of Ia-ad-na-na: Achaean bluebloods, Cypriot parvenus or both?. In *STEFANOS. Studies in honour of Brunilde Sismondo*, edited by K.J.Hortswick and M.C.Sturgeon, pp.209-222. University Museum Monograph 100. University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- Rysted, E. (editor)
1994 *The Swedish Cyprus Expedition: the living past*. Medelhavsmuseet Memoir 9. Medelhavsmuseet, Stockholm.
- Sandwith, T.B.
1877 On the different styles of pottery found in ancient tombs in the island of Cyprus. *Archaeologia* 45: 127-142.
- Shanks, M.
1996 *Classical Archaeology of Greece. Experiences of the discipline*. Routledge, London and New York.
- Sherratt, E.S.
1992 Immigration and Archaeology: some indirect reflections. In *Acta Cypria II, Acts of an International Congress on Cypriot Archaeology held in Goeteborg on 22-24 August 1991*, edited by P.Åström, pp.316-347. P.Åström's Förlag, Jonsered.
- Silberman, N.A.
1998 The Sea Peoples, the Victorians, and us: modern social ideology and changing archaeological interpretation of the Late Bronze Age collapse. In *Mediterranean Peoples in transition, thirteen to early tenth centuries BCE*, edited by S.Gitin, A.Mazar and E.Stern, pp.268-275. Israel Exploration Society, Jerusalem.
- Sjöqvist, E.
1940 *Problems of the Late Cypriot Bronze Age*. The Swedish Cyprus Expedition, Stockholm.
- Snodgrass, A.
1971 *The Dark Age of Greece; an archaeological survey of the eleventh to eighth centuries BC*. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
- Snodgrass, A.
1988 *Cyprus and Early Greek history*. Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation, Nicosia.
- Steel, L.
1993 The establishment of the city kingdoms in Iron Age Cyprus: an archaeological commentary. *Report of the Department of Antiquities Cyprus*: 147-156.
- Steel, L.
2001 The British Museum and the invention of the Cypriot Late Bronze Age. In *Cyprus in the 19th century AD. Fact, Fancy and Fiction. Papers of the 22nd British Museum Classical Colloquium, December 1998*, edited by V.Tatton-Brown. pp. 160-167. Oxbow books. Oxford.

- Storrs, R.
1945 *Orientalisms*. Nicholson & Watson, London.
- Tatton-Brown, V.
1998 The British Museum discovers Cyprus. *Cahier du Centre d' Études Chypriotes* 28: 113-115.
- Tatton-Brown, V.
2001 Excavations in ancient Cyprus: original manuscripts and correspondence in the British Museum. In *Cyprus in the 19th century AD. Fact, Fancy and Fiction. Papers of the 22nd British Museum Classical Colloquium, December 1998*, edited by V.Tatton-Brown, pp. 168-183. Oxbow books, Oxford.
- Thumb, A.
1909 *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*. Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, Heidelberg.
- Trigger, B.
1984 Alternative archaeologies: nationalist, colonialist, imperialist. *Man* 19: 355-370.
- Turner, F.M.
1981 *The Greek heritage in Victorian Britain*. Yale University Press, New Haven -London.
- Vanschoonwinkel, J.
1994 La présence grecque à Chypre au XI^e siècle av. J. -C. In *Proceedings of the International Symposium "Cyprus in the 11th Century BC"*, edited by V.Karageorghis, pp.109-131. The A.G.Leventis Foundation, Nicosia.
- Vasilikou, D.
1995 *O Mykenaikos politismos*. I en Athinai Arhaiologiki Etaireia, Athens.
- Westholm, A.
1994 "The fantastic years on Cyprus"; Swedish archaeological excavations in Cyprus. In *The fantastic years on Cyprus. The Swedish Cyprus Expedition and its members*, edited by P.Åström, pp.7-23. Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology Pocket Book No.79. P.Åström's Förlag, Jonsered.
- Whitley, J.
2000 Why study Greek Archaeology? A brief history of some British rationalizations. In *Les politiques de l'Archéologie du milieu du XIX^e siècle à l'orée du XXI^e. Colloque organisé par l' École française d'Athènes à l'occasion de la célébration du 150^e anniversaire de sa fondation*, edited by R.Étienne, pp.33-42. Champs helléniques modernes at contemporains 2. École française d'Athènes, Athens.
- Windbalch, M.-L. (editor)
1997 *An archaeological adventure in Cyprus: the Swedish Cyprus Expedition 1927-1931; a story told with contemporary photographs and comments*. Medelhavsmuseet, Stockholm.
- Zannetos, F.
1910 *Istoria tis nisou Kyprou apo tis agglidikis katohis mehri simeron*, Vol. I. Filokalia, Larnaca.

NOTES

1. The term was first coined by Norman Mailer, a post-war American novelist, in the introduction of the biography of Marilyn Monroe (Mailer 1973: 18).

2. The movement of groups of Mycenaean to Cyprus around 1200 and during the course of the 11th century has been characterised by many researchers as “colonisation”, while others refer to it as “immigration”, “penetration” etc. For practical reasons the term colonisation will be preferred in this study, as it seems more widely used in bibliography. This, however, does not mean that this term expresses the opinion of the present author concerning the character of this movement.

3. Central to this summary is the chapter on the Late Cypriot period, which is included in the major work on the history of Cyprus published by the Archbishop Makarios III Foundation. It was written by Karageorghis, who is admittedly the most vehement supporter of the hellenisation narrative for the last forty years, and may be regarded to contain the most “official” version of the colonisation narrative (Karageorghis 1997). Additional information has come from Karageorghis’ latest publications (1990; 1990a; 1992; 1998; 2000). Due to the limited space available for the present study, it is not possible to outline the variations, which have been proposed by many researchers on the details of the narrative. A brief summary of these may be found in Rupp 1998: 213-215. See also the proceedings of the international conference on “Cyprus in the 11th century BC”, which was held at Nicosia in October 1993 (Karageorghis 1994a). For an up-to-date discussion of the narrative see Iacovou 1999. Iacovou’s article is fundamental for the present analysis, as it is very comprehensive and most importantly has been compiled by a Cypriot scholar, who has produced a remarkable amount of research on the subject in question and belongs to the mainstream of Early Iron Age Cypriot archaeology. A full list of references to numerous relevant studies is also provided. Earlier studies by Iacovou have also been used (Iacovou 1989; 1994; 1995; 1998).

4. From now on referred to as LC.

5. All chronologies are based on Karageorghis 1990 and 1990a.

6. Although the “Catalogue of the Cyprus Museum” is a product of collaboration between Myres and Ohnefalsch-Richter, the credit for this pioneering study usually goes to the former. Myres was the one who had been originally chosen to carry out the task of scientifically arranging the collections of the Cyprus Museum and subsequently publishing a detailed catalogue of them. Nevertheless Ohnefalsch-Richter, who considered himself an authority in Cypriot Archaeology, offered his assistance in a rather pressing manner at an early stage of the work. Merrillees describes effectively the various problems of this non-harmonious collaboration (Merrillees 2000: 113-115) and concludes that “it was a minor miracle that the Catalogue ever saw the light of day” (Merrillees 2000: 114). The contribution of each author is not clear at all. It seems that they worked together in the Museum preparing the catalogue, which was drafted before Myres left for England to attend to other engagements. Ohnefalsch-Richter stayed in Nicosia in order to complete and revise the catalogue before forwarding it to Myres for publication in Oxford (Merrillees 2000: 14). After comparing the “Catalogue” with the “Handbook of the Cesnola Collection of antiquities from Cyprus”, which was published by Myres in 1914, I have

come to consider him as the principal author of the former especially as far as the introductory notes on Cypriot Archaeology are concerned.

7. As opposed to Cypriot imitations manufactured by local potters (Myres and Ohnefalsch-Richter 1899: 40).

8. According to the British census that took place in 1881 Greek Cypriots constituted 73.9% of the island's population, while Turkish Cypriots 24.1% (Knapp and Antoniadou 1998: table 1.1).

9. I am particularly grateful to Euthymia Alpha, University of Sheffield, who generously provided me with all the information and references concerning the Cypriot nationalistic movement as well as the Cypriot education during the period of the British occupation. Without her contribution this article would not have been complete.

10. The term may be translated as true Cypriots (*eteos* = true) and it is analogous to the Homeric term *Eteocretan* (Odyssey 19.176) that describes the autochthonous inhabitants of Crete. It was first coined by J.Friedrich, who used it to distinguish the autochthonous population of Cyprus from the Greek immigrants (Friedrich 1932: 49).

11. A more detailed form of this account will constitute the introductory chapter to my PhD thesis.

12. I am grateful to my anonymous reviewer for this comparison.