Kalopsidha: forty-six years after SIMA volume 2

Jennifer M. Webb

A report on the excavations at Kalopsidha *Tsoupidhi Chiflik* was published by Paul Åström in the second volume of SIMA (Åström 1966). My own copy, which has been in my possession since 1974 (the year in which I first met Paul), is now frayed and missing its back cover. In focusing on this volume, the first of over 40 which Paul authored, co-authored or edited for SIMA, my intention is to trace the history of this site within and beyond the SIMA corpus – with respect to both the archaeological record and its interpretation – and to consider the enduring value of site reports and those who support their publication. Kalopsidha was occupied through most of the Bronze Age. It is typical of many sites in Cyprus which have been investigated over many years and unevenly published. Kalopsidha is also located in the occupied area of Cyprus and currently inaccessible for further excavation or survey. The SIMA report on Kalopsidha forms the greater part of a volume devoted to Åström’s excavations in 1959 at Kalopsidha and Ayios Iakovos (Åström 1966: 7–143). In addition to the description of the site and finds, it contains chapters by Åström on Cypriot Bronze Age pot marks (Part III) and Middle and Late Cypriot Plain White Hand-made ware relief bands (Part IV), each of which provides a corpus of all material available at that time. There are also 11 specialist reports and the description of the tombs and discussion of Bronze Age pottery include ‘comments’ by Merrillees and Popham. The publication stands out as an early example of a multidisciplinary site report and a testament to the collaborative spirit which Paul always showed toward other scholars.

Kalopsidha was Åström’s first excavation in Cyprus. He had completed his doctorate at Lund University the previous year and taken up his post as Director of the Swedish Institute at Athens, a position

Figure 1. Map of Cyprus showing sites mentioned in the text
he held until 1963. Work was carried out under the patronage of His Majesty King Gustaf VI Adolf and the auspices of the Swedish Cyprus Expedition. Although the volume was ready to go to press in September 1962, due to a lack of funds it appeared only in 1966 and then thanks to support received from subscribers to SIMA, which Åström founded in 1962. A quick look at the list of SIMA publications (see this volume) shows, however, that, following the publication of volume 1 by Ålin in SIMA’s founding year, as many as ten volumes were published in 1964, almost all of which deal with the Aegean. Why these volumes were sent to the press ahead of Paul’s own is not recorded but it is again not difficult to see his generosity at work here. In any case, Excavations at Kalopsidha and Ayios Iakovos in Cyprus, while listed as volume 2, was the twelfth SIMA volume published and, with the exception of Davis and Webster’s slim volume on The Cesnola Terracottas in the Stanford University Museum, the first on Cyprus.

Kalopsidha

The Bronze Age settlement at Kalopsidha is located toward the eastern end of the central lowlands of Cyprus, midway between Nicosia and Famagusta and 2km southwest of the modern village (Fig. 1). It was discovered by Myres in 1894, who investigated part of the settlement and a number of Early Cypriot (EC) and Middle Cypriot (MC) tombs (Myres 1897). Gjerstad excavated a MC house in 1924 (Gjerstad 1926: 27–37). Åström’s excavations in 1958 focused on the recovery of Late Cypriot (LC) material. The results of these excavations are summarised below.

The tombs

Myres excavated 32 tombs in five areas, designated Sites A–E (Fig. 2). These were only briefly published (Myres 1897). Åström made a concerted effort to collect information about them and provide a list of finds (Åström 1966: 7–8, 12–37). Unfortunately, only a small number of the latter could be traced in the Cyprus Museum and the descriptions and sketches in Myres’ field notebook were not always helpful. Relatively few objects from Myres’ excavations, therefore, are described in detail or illustrated in Åström 1966. Fifty-three vessels and other objects from Tombs 2, 8, 9, 11, 19, 20, 21, 26 and 27 were, however, acquired by the

Figure 2. Plan of Kalopsidha showing the location of Sites A–C and Trenches 1–9 (after Åström 1966: fig. 6)
Ashmolean Museum and are documented by Frankel in SIMA volume 20:7 (Frankel 1983: 93–98, nos 860–913).

Five chamber tombs at Site A (Tombs 1–5) contained only Red Polished (RP) pottery ‘of unusually soft and soapy clay and with rude and heavy forms’ (Åström 1966: 12). At Site B, c. 45m north of Site A on a ‘slope nearer the road’, Tombs 6–19 were found collapsed. At Site C, to the northeast of Site B and connected to it by a low hill, Tombs 20–28 and 32 were located in an area which ‘included the whole east and north brow of the ridge on which the settlement was exposed’ (Åström 1966: 12). The tombs here had also collapsed and were filled with earth and broken pottery. A single intact tomb (Tomb 29) was excavated at Site D, on a ridge ‘west of the chiflik’. At Site E, southwest of the chiflik, Tombs 30 and 31 were found empty. Tombs, which Myres believed to be the earliest at Kalopsidha, were also noted on the plateau east of Sites A and B. Three tombs were excavated by Åström: Tomb 35 east of Trench 7, Tomb 33 at Daoutis and Tomb 34 in Trench 3.

Tomb 1 was ‘very small’ and contained only three plain RP vessels. Tomb 2 produced some 17 RP vessels, including seven incised flasks. One of the latter, now in the Ashmolean, is identified as RP III but could be slightly earlier (Frankel 1983: 93, no. 860, pl. 27; note that a fragmentary WP amphora is not certainly from this tomb, Åström 1966: 13, 17; Frankel 1983: 93, no. 861). The only vessel from Tomb 3 located by Åström is a small conical bowl with a flat base and four grooved rim projections (Åström 1966: 14, fig. 130, CM A97). Described as having a ‘red slip with black patches’, it may now be identified as Red Polished I–II Mottled (RPm I–II) ware (Georgiou et al. 2011: 280–288). The shape, described by Åström as ‘a new type for the Early Cypriote corpus’, is comparable to RPm I–II bowls recovered more recently in Phases C and D at Marki, as well as at Psematismenos, Kalavasos, Sotira, Pyla and elsewhere (Frankel & Webb 2006: 108–109; Georgiou et al. 2011: 194–203; MacLaurin 2007: 221–222). Åström proposed a date of EC I–II. A similar date may be suggested for the remainder of the tomb group, which is said to have included other bowls ‘with notched projections on the rim’ and ‘small bottles ... with incised ornaments’ (Åström 1966: 14, citing Myres 1897: 141). Tomb 5 also produced a small flat-based conical bowl with a pierced lug of RPm I–II – again with good parallels at Marki and elsewhere – and an incised black-topped RP flask dated by Stewart to EC I (Åström 1966: 14, fig. 5, row 1:2, bottom row 1, CM A22; Stewart & Åström 1992: 66, pl. VIII.5, CM A388) (Fig. 3). Other vessels from Tomb 5, including an amphora with a pointed base, suggest reuse in MC I or II (Åström 1966: 14, n. 23, fig. 7, row 1:3).

Tomb 5 also produced a RP model depicting a rectangular floor and a vertical wall with three vertical panels and a cross-bar (Åström 1966: 14–15, fig. 5, bottom right, CM A1923; Karageorghis 1970: 12–13, pl. V.1–2; 1991: 143, pl. CIII.3–4) (Fig. 4). It is clearly related to two ‘shrine models’ acquired at Kotsiati in 1970 (but probably from Marki) (Karageorghis 1970, 1991: 142–143, pls CII.2–3, CIII.1–2) – but lacks the female figure and jar which appear before the three vertical panels, each surmounted by a horned animal head, on the Kotsiatis models. The panels on the Kalopsidha model once projected above the wall and probably also supported animal heads. It was dated by Stewart to MC III (see Åström 1966: 15). Åström (1966: 15), however, notes that none of the vessels in the tomb are later than MC I. Given the evidence for an EC I or EC II burial in Tomb 5, an earlier date may also be proposed. This is of interest, given the similarities noted in a recent SIMA volume between the carved dromos features of Karmi Palealona Tomb 6 and the ‘shrine models’ (Webb et al. 2009: 243–244. See also Webb & Frankel 2010: 191–193). The dating of Palealona Tomb 6 to EC I–II (Webb et al. 2009: 131–132) shows that these iconographic and architectural

Figure 3. RP I flask (CM A388) from Kalopsidha Tomb 5 (drawn by C. Carigiet)

Figure 4. RP model (CM A1923) from Kalopsidha Tomb 5 (after Morris 1985: fig. 498)
concepts have an earlier history on the island, making an EC I or II date for the Kalopsidha model entirely possible.

A small chamber tomb clandestinely excavated at Site A in 1960 was identified as Tomb 36 (Åström 1966: 36, fig. 9). A collection of pots confiscated by police at Akhna in 1961 is likely to have come from this tomb. They include three flat-based conical RPm I–II bowls with vertical lugs as well as later vessels – suggesting a date of EC I or II with reuse in MC I (Åström 1966: 36–37, fig. 8).

The assemblages from Site B are characterised by the presence of poorly made juglets of RP IV with more or less pronounced pointed bases (Åström 1966: figs 5, row 2:1–2, 11, 46, 48; Frankel 1983: 94, nos 862, 865–868, pls 27–28). Tombs 8, 12, 14 and 18–19 are dated to MC II–III; Tomb 16 to MC I–II and Tombs 9, 13 and 17 to MC III (Åström 1966: 17, 23–25, 30). Tomb 11, which contained vessels of RP IV, WP IV and V, Black Slip, Red-on-Black and Plain White Wheelmade wares and two imported Black Burnished ware juglets (Åström 1966: 19–22, fig. 10; Frankel 1983: 95–96, nos 876–887, pls 28–29), was dated by Stewart to MC III–LC I (Åström 1966: 385) and by Åström to the latter half of MC III (1966: 22, 30). The Site B (and Site C) tombs also contained a significant number of bronze or copper artefacts, including daggers, rings, tweezers, pins and axes.

At Site C Tomb 20 produced two unusual decorated RP bowls, possibly made by the same potter (Frankel 1983: 96, no. 892, pl. 29; Åström 1966: 25–26, fig. 12). These are dated by Frankel to MC II–III and by Åström to MC I or II. Otherwise the material is similar to that from Site B, with suggested dates of MC I–II (Tomb 21–22, 24), MC II–III (Tomb 23, 31–32) and MC III (Tomb 25–28) (Åström 1966: 30). Tomb 29 at Site D contained a single bowl. It was not traced but the tomb is dated by Åström to MC I–II (1966: 28, 30). At Site E two tombs were found empty but ‘scraps of rough painted pottery and red ware’ (Myres 1897: 143; Åström 1966: 28) suggest a MC date.

The partly looted chamber tomb, Tomb 33, at Daoutis produced a WP amphora dated by Åström to MC I–II (1966: 30, fig. 63). The chronology of Tomb 34, a shallow pit tomb found below a MC III house in Trench 3, is more problematic. Nine objects included several round-based lugless bowls, apparently in mottled RP, one or more hard-fired incised BP or black-topped RP flasks and a pierced vertical lug from a conical or tulip-shaped bowl. This assemblage was dated to late EC I (EC IC) by Merrillees (1966: 31–35, figs 1, 39–40) and to the Philia/EC transition by Webb and Frankel (1999: 12). We have, however, more recently proposed an EC II date (Georgiou et al. 2011: 298, Table 5.1). Finally, a Red Slip ‘bottle’ from Tomb 35, located between Åström’s Trenches 6 and 7, suggests a date within MC for this tomb (Åström 1966: 35, fig. 63, row 2:5).

The settlement

The excavations of 1894
Myres excavated a small area of settlement remains ‘at the hill C’ where he found masses of broken pottery, a 2–3 inch thick layer of ‘cockle shells’ and a stone wall (Åström 1966: 7). His finds are briefly described by Åström (1966: 7–8) and nine objects acquired by the Ashmolean are documented by Frankel, along with sherd material collected by Catling in 1951, all of which is of MC II–III or later date (Frankel 1983: 99–106, nos 914–1106. See also Åström 1966: 11). Additional stray finds went to the Museum of Classical Antiquities at Lund (Åström 1966: 9). Material from the settlement included ‘a rude saucer or crucible of coarse clay warped by excessive firing’ (Myres 1897: 139, fig. 4.20), which both Åström and Frankel identify as a lamp, and ‘fragments of furnace-slags’ (Åström 1966: 8; see also Åström 1972: 157, 225 and Frankel 1983: 99, no. 916, pl. 31). Another object identified as a crucible in the Medelhavsmuseet comes from a tray containing material either from Alambra or Kalopsidha (Stewart 1962: fig. 90.1; Webb & Frankel 2012: 111).

Myres identified at least two occupation phases, an early one in which RP ware was predominant; and a later one with ‘degenerate red ware, foreign Egyptian imports and painted ware’ (Åström 1966: 8). For Åström (1966: 8) these two phases corresponded with the EC and MC periods. He further proposed that the finds from Site C ‘suggest that there was a local pottery factory’ and that ‘some metallurgical work may also have been carried out there’ (Åström 1966: 8). It is not entirely clear on what basis Åström posited the existence of a pottery factory, beyond the recovery of two shallow stone saucers stained with a red pigment exactly, according to Myres ‘like that on the red pottery from the tombs’ (Myres 1897: 139, fig. 4.19; Åström 1966: 8; Frankel 1983: 99, nos 919–910, pls 31–32); and a polished oval stone, identified as an ‘axe, pestle or pot polisher’ (Åström 1966: 8. See Myres 1897: 140, fig. 4.8; Frankel 1983: 99, no. 921, pl. 32).

The excavations of 1924
Gjerstad’s excavations in 1924 also focused on Site C. He uncovered a multi-roomed house measuring c. 15 by 12m, built over the remains of an earlier (unexcavated) structure (Gjerstad 1926: 27–37, fig. 3. See also Åström 1966: 8–10; 1972: 1–3, 164–72, 204–205, figs 1–2) (Fig. 5a). Considerable quantities of material remained on the floors, suggesting relatively rapid abandonment and allowing Gjerstad to identify room function with some confidence. The majority of the finds belonged to Stratum 2, which appears to have been the main phase of use (Åström 1966: 139–140, n. 7). A central room, Room 5, produced evidence for cooking, large numbers of domestic vessels and two querns. In the belief that intensive use of fire could only have taken place in an unroofed space, Gjerstad identified this as an open inner court. In
Room 6, effectively an extension of Room 5, a lime concrete feature with a central cavity was identified as a secondary hearth for warmth and light or an altar. The room produced storage and table vessels and was identified as the ‘salle de reception’. Rooms to the south and east, also accessed from Room 5, were identified as storage/work areas (Rooms 9–11) and a sleeping room (Room 8), and Rooms 4 and 7, which open onto unexcavated space to the west, as stables or out-houses. Gjerstad (1980: 65) later, however, suggested that these rooms ‘were in all probability shops’ (see also Wright 1992: 74). A semi-enclosed area north of Room 5 does not appear to have been considered part of the house unit; although Gjerstad later referred to this space as an ‘outer court’ (Gjerstad 1980: 64).

Gjerstad identified the building as a merchant’s house, on the basis of quantities of wheel-made vessels believed to be imports from Syria. Its construction and use were attributed to MC III (Gjerstad 1926: 36). More recent analyses of the ceramic material, however, suggest a date, at least for final abandonment, in LC IA (Aström 2001: 135; Crewe 2007: 51–52, Table 8.2; 2010: 66). Aström, Gjerstad and Stewart’s differing views on the chronology of the seven strata identified more broadly at Site C are summarised in tabular form in Aström 1966: 9 (for a discussion of the complex problems involved see Barlow 1985 and Crewe 2007: 51–52). Stewart’s proposed dates are somewhat later than those of Gjerstad and Aström for Strata 6–1, with a date of MC III–LC I for the last two phases (Strata 2–1). All three agreed, however, on a date for the earliest deposits (Stratum 7) in early EC III. Finds were sent to the Museum of Mediterranean Antiquities (now the Medelhavsmuseet) and representative sherd material also deposited in the Seminar for Classical Archaeology and Ancient History at Uppsala and the Department of Archaeology at the University of Sydney (now housed in the Nicholson Museum) (Aström 1966: 8–10, n. 9; Webb 2001: 12).

Gjerstad’s house was identified by Wright (1992: 73–74, 311) as belonging to the Hofhaus (i.e. central courtyard) tradition, with rooms set around the sides of a four square block and circulation by way of a central open space (Room 5). Room 5, however, was identified as a central court on the grounds that extensive use of fire could only have taken place in an unroofed area. Given the routine presence of cooking hearths in roofed units excavated more recently at Marki and Sotira, this is no longer convincing (see Webb 2009: 255–256). Rooms 5 and 6 at Kalopsidha are, in fact, better viewed as a single functional unit equivalent to the main hearth rooms found in all well preserved compounds at Marki (Frankel & Webb 2006). The large semi-enclosed space to the north of Room 5 may, however, be identified as a courtyard (Webb 2009: fig. 3b) (Fig. 5b). This brings the Kalopsidha house into line with the majority of house compounds at Marki, where a single entrance provided access to a fully or partly enclosed courtyard and subsequently to two, three or more roofed interior rooms either located side-by-side or one behind the other. On this reading Units 1 and 2 lead off the courtyard and may be seen as storage areas or animal pens (they produced no finds), while Rooms 4 and 7, which cannot be accessed from the courtyard or inner rooms, may belong to another compound to the west.

Gjerstad also excavated a trench (4x4m) 500m southeast of Site C where he recovered predominantly MC III and some LC I material (1926: 272–273).

The excavations of 1959

The purpose of Aström’s excavations was to provide a stratigraphic sequence for the LC period (Aström 1966: 37). Trenches 1–5 were opened c. 450m south of Site C. Trenches 1–2 and 4–5 (each 5x1m) yielded no walls and only a few sherds, mostly of MC date, while two rooms of a MC III house were partially excavated in the slightly larger (8x1m) Trench 3 (Aström 1966: 40–48, figs 21–31, 42–45). Both rooms contained pithoi, suggesting that they were storerooms in a larger complex. The house is probably contemporary with the main phase (Stratum 2) of Gjerstad’s house at Site C. Both appear to have been destroyed and burnt.
before the end of MC III (Åström 1966: 47–48). While Gjerstad’s house was reoccupied briefly, however, the Trench 3 building was not.

Trenches 6 and 7 (5x1m) were opened in the same general area as Trenches 1–5. Once again no walls were found and the bulk of material was of late MC date. Among material collected ‘on the hill West of trench 3’ by Åström in 1959, however, is an incised RP sherd which Åström identified as being ‘among the earliest sherds from Kalopsidha’ (1966: 11, fig. 5, bottom row: 2). It comes from a closed vessel of EC II date and may have reached Kalopsidha from the north coast (Merrillees 1966: 11).

Trenches 8 and 9 were opened at locality Koufos. Both produced LC material (Åström 1966: 39, 48–115; Hult 1975; Sjödin 1988). Judging from the distribution and density of surface finds, Åström estimated that settlement here occupied ‘a small area no more than 40–50 metres in diameter’ (Åström 1966: 48). No intact building remains were found but stones and boulders from disintegrated walls suggest a structure of considerable size. Trench 8 (5x1m) produced only a small quantity of sherds, while Trench 9 (5x1m) produced 223,000 sherds from fabrics ranging in date from MC III through LC I and II to an admixture of LC II and Iron Age material. The nature of the finds prompted Åström to describe Trench 9 as ‘a dump outside a settlement where remains of meals and broken pots were discarded’ (1966: 48). A large proportion of the pottery, however, belonged to unevenly modelled miniature juglets and cups of coarse fragile manufacture (Fig. 6). Åström initially suggested that these served ‘for pouring fluid copper into moulds’ (1966: 74), but later proposed their use as votives (1987). An offering stand of PWW-m II was also found, similar to examples from cult buildings at Athienou, Myrtou and Ayia Irini (Åström 1966: 76, fig. 88; Dothan & Ben-Tor 1983: fig. 11.20; du Plat Taylor et al. 1957: 56, 335; Gjerstad et al. 1934: pl. CLXXXVII.1). The remaining material consisted of small bronzes, lumps of ore and slag, unfinished metal fragments, a stone mould and crucibles (Watkins 1966; Bachmann 1976). The finished objects were highly fragmentary and have the appearance of scrap metal. A considerable number of bone fragments, predominantly of immature sheep/goat, were also recovered (Gejvall 1966: 128).

The Koufos assemblage closely resembles that later uncovered on a low hillock at Athienou Bamboulari tis Kaukouninas, c. 25km southwest of Kalopsidha (Dothan & Ben-Tor 1983; Webb 1999: 21–29). Here the poorly preserved remains of a rectangular court bordered by small rooms were associated with some 10,000 vessels, mostly miniature juglets and bowls, and over 300kg of metallic waste. The presence of the latter led the excavators to propose that Athienou was established to meet the needs of a specialised cult related to the extraction and processing of copper ore located on a communication route from one or more ore bodies in the Troodos to refinery and transhipment points on the east coast. More recently, the Athienou material has been interpreted as evidence of feasting (Karageorghis 2011) and, more specifically, as the remains of work feasts held periodically to motivate a labour force involved in the transport of copper or roasting conglomerate (Spigelman 2012). The contents of Trench 9 suggest the presence of a similar complex at Koufos (see Webb 1999: 113–116). The cult building at Athienou was not situated within the confines of a settlement. Likewise Åström was unable to locate domestic remains with which his proposed dump might have been associated. The two sites are also similar in size and Crewe (2010: 66) has recently pointed to the high number of painted wares in Trench 9 as further evidence of a non-domestic function. As the majority of pottery and bronzes are dated by Åström to LC I–IIA (and by Crewe to LC I, 2010: 66. See also Merrillees 1971), the Koufos assemblage may be regarded as contemporary with the earlier years of Athienou Stratum III. The latter continued until the end of LC IIC. Koufos, however, went into decline after LC IB.

Discussion

Occupation at Kalopsidha appears to have begun in EC I or EC II. Tombs 3, 5 and 36 at Site A date to EC I or II, with reuse in MC I or somewhat later. Tomb 34, excavated in Trench 3, is of EC II date, suggesting a second burial area c. 450m northeast of the cemetery at Site A. Myres’ suggestion that tombs observed on the plateau east of Sites A and B are earlier than
those at Site A (and thus the earliest at Kalopsidha) cannot be verified. There is, however, no evidence for Philia EC use of the site. The location of the EC I–II settlement is not known. As neither the investigations at Site C, nor Trenches 1–9 produced material of this date, it does not appear to have been in areas occupied in EC III and MC times. It may have been closer to Site A, perhaps between Site A and Trench 3, where the only early RP surface sherd was found (‘on the hill West of trench 3’). The absence of EC III burials is puzzling. There is, however, also relatively little evidence for occupation at this time. While a small amount of EC III material was found in the earliest stratum (Stratum 7) under Gjerstad’s house, no EC III or MC I material was recovered in Trenches 1–9. None of the tombs at Sites B and C, D and E are earlier than MC I and most were probably in use in MC II and III. Åström (1966: 22) suggested that Site B was the necropolis for settlements located at Site C and in the area of Trench 3.

This suggests small-scale occupation at Kalopsidha from EC I or II to MC I, with considerable settlement growth in MC II and III. A rapid expansion in settlement size is also indicated in the MC period for Deneia. At this site, however, the increase in tomb construction occurred in MC I, a century or so earlier than at Kalopsidha, and was clearly tied to the expanding fortunes of Lapithos on the north coast (Frankel & Webb 2007: 150–161). Settlement growth is also visible in EC III and MC I at Bellapais Vounous and Karmi in the north (Georgiou 2007: 213–214, 219–220, Table 10.1) and at Nicosia Ayia Paraskevi, Kaimakli and other localities in the Nicosia area of the central lowlands (Georgiou 2007: 281–285, Table 10.5). This phase of regional expansion was followed by significant site abandonment in late MC III and across the MC III/LC IA transition on the north coast and southern flanks of the Kyrenia Range (Georgiou 2007: 448–454, 465–468, figs 13.1–13.3). Deneia also began to decline toward the end of MC III and the cutting of new tombs ceased altogether before the transition to LC IA. In the Morphou Bay area, however, new coastal or near coastal sites were established in MC III at Ayia Irini Palaeokastro, Morphou Toumba tou Skouro and Pendayia. On the south and southeast coasts a similar series of new settlements was established at Hala Sultan Tekke, Maroni, Kavdha and elsewhere.

The increasing size and import of Kalopsidha in late MC II and MC III may be viewed within the context of these regional shifts. Of relatively little significance in the EC period and MC I, the eastern Mesoasia grew in importance in late MC II and MC III as the focus shifted away from the north coast (Driessen & Frankel 2012: 66–67). New or expanded inland, near coastal and coastal foundations are particularly numerous and settlement growth is also visible at Ayios Sozomenos, Politiko, Athienou, Sinda, Stylli, Marathovouno, Angastina, Kouklia Petrales and Milia (Georgiou 2007: Tables 10.4–10.5). The geopolitical configuration of the island in late MC III has long been attributed to an increasing external demand for Cypriot copper (see Knapp 2008: 134–137 with references). This reorganisation led also to the abandonment of inland villages like Marki and Alambra in MC II, probably in favour of large settlements operating within more centralised regional networks.

A close connection between Kalopsidha and Enkomi, founded in late MC III or LC IA on the coast 11km to the northeast, has long been argued, although views on the nature and significance of this connection vary considerably. Åström noted burnt floors in Gjerstad’s house (Stratum 2) and the house in Trench 3 and suggested a link between a late MC III destruction at Kalopsidha and the foundation of Enkomi. ‘Was Kalopsidha destroyed by people who then settled at Enkomi, or did the people from Kalopsidha move from their homes to Enkomi?’ (Åström 1966: 140). The subsequent dating of the final stratum of Gjerstad’s house to LC IA indicates, however, that Kalopsidha was not entirely abandoned following the foundation of Enkomi. Some continuation of occupation, even on a diminished scale, also negates the suggestion that the material from Trench 9 derived from ‘a new settlement, contemporary with the foundation of Enkomi at the end of Middle Cypriote III’ (Åström 1966: 140).

The presence of imported pottery in Gjerstad’s house, including at least 26 Canaanite amphorae (Crewe 2010: 68), and of Cypriot pottery of distinctive eastern Mesoasia styles at Ras Shamra and elsewhere in Syria led Åström to suggest that ‘Kalopsidhians ... established a trading factory at Ras Shamra’ and even that eastern Cyprus and coastal Syria were ‘united in one form or other’ (Åström 1966: 139). A recent discussion by Crewe (2010) has also focused on Kalopsidha’s role in eastern Mediterranean trade, following Maguire’s study of Cypriot pottery from Tell el-Dab’a and elsewhere in Egypt and the Levant (Maguire 2009). Crewe notes Maguire’s caveat that the observation that the majority of Cypriot imports at Tell el-Dab’a are of WP handmade styles best known from Kalopsidha should be ‘read’ in conjunction with the fact that Kalopsidha is one of few relatively well excavated sites in the eastern Mesoasia (Crewe 2010: 68; Maguire 2009: 27). She nevertheless argues for a major role for Kalopsidha in the production and distribution, in particular, of White Painted (WP) Pendent Line and Crossed Line Style jugs and juglets. She suggests that these vessels contained precious oils or perfume and that both commodity and containers were produced at Kalopsidha for export via a ‘gateway’ community at Enkomi (2010: 69). She proposes, also, that Trench 9 represents ‘the debris of a “packaging” centre’, indeed that Kalopsidha was an ‘international production centre’, making perfumed oils for use in mortuary ritual in both Cyprus and the Levant (Crewe 2010: 69).
The WP Pendent Line, Cross Line and Alternating Broad and Wavy Line Style pottery at Tell el-Dab’a and elsewhere may indeed be compared with the WP assemblage from Kalopsidha. Maguire, however, notes parallels also from Enkomi, Kythrea, Galinoporni, Arpera, Alaminos and Deneia and, further, that some material at Tell el-Dab’a is comparable to styles which specifically do not appear at Kalopsidha (2009: 27–29, 87). Similarly, the WP V found in Egypt and the Levant is of eastern Cypriot styles with parallels at Kalopsidha, but also at Kythrea, Politiko, Ayios Iakovos, Galinoporni and Enkomi (Maguire 2009: 31–32). Indeed almost all categories of pottery from almost every part of Cyprus are represented at Tell el-Dab’a, leading Maguire to propose either that boats hopped round the coast picking up cargo from various ports and their immediate hinterland, or that sites such as Kalopsidha or Enkomi acted as a conduit for commodities from a variety of sources (2009: 37).

If the link between exported Cypriot pottery and Kalopsidha is not as exclusive as has been claimed, is there any other evidence to suggest that Kalopsidha was a significant pottery (and/or oil or perfume) manufacturing centre? We have already noted that Åström’s proposal that the finds from Site C ‘suggest that there was a local pottery factory’ (1966: 8) is based only on Myres’ recovery of two stone saucers stained with red pigment and a polished stone ‘axe, pestle or pot polisher’ (Åström 1966: 8). With regard to Åström’s own excavations, a careful reading of his (and Huitt and Sjödin’s) description of the ceramic material from Trench 9 reveals only one mention of mis-fired sherds, and then in relation to BS II jugs and not to any of the WP styles which it is suggested were made at Kalopsidha for export to the Levant (1966: 63). This does not, of course, prove that pottery was not made at Kalopsidha. Indeed pottery is likely to have been manufactured in most villages during the Early and Middle Bronze Age (Frankel & Webb 2012). It offers little support, however, for the large-scale production envisaged by both Åström and Crewe.

Also problematic is the fact that the only evidence for ‘settlement’ at Kalopsidha is not exports and proposes a ‘transformation from international production centre to rural sanctuary’ (2010: 69). This ‘conversion’ of the site to a ritual use, she suggests, may have had something to do with the fact that were producing juglets with special substances used in mortuary ritual. She further suggests that the decline of Kalopsidha in LC IB may have been caused by a loss of access to one of the ingredients used for perfumed oil production with a disruption to the trade in imported Canaanite amphorae and their contents at this time (2010: 69). This also runs up against a lack of evidence for ceramic or commodity production at Kalopsidha and the limited indications of occupation (as opposed to ritual use) in the LC period. It should be noted, also, that crudely-made cups and juglets and miniatures were found in all levels of the Trench 9 deposit (Åström 1966: 65–66, 73–74, figs 53, 55, 71–72, 74, 77–78).

Kalopsidha is one of few sites to be investigated in the eastern Mesaoria and Gjerstad’s house is still the only MC III house to be excavated in its entirety. This, together with the enormous quantity of material from Trench 9, accounts for the site’s archaeological importance. Was Kalopsidha, however ‘the old capital of the east Mesaoria’ (Catling 1973: 168), ‘the major town on the south east coast’ prior to the rise of Enkomi (Maguire 2009: 66), ‘the nucleus of a state’ in MC II (Stewart 1962: 299), even perhaps Alasia in MC times (Stewart, see Åström 1972: 277, n. 4)? The presence of MC III houses at Site C and in Trench 3 (c. 500m apart) and a possible ‘street’ and adjacent building alongside Gjerstad’s house suggest at least one substantial or possibly several dispersed areas of settlement. Whether it was significantly larger or more important than other settlements at this time remains, however, to be proven. Did Kalopsidha play a primary role in the production and export of Cypriot WP pottery? This is certainly a possibility for late MC II and MC III, although it is equally likely that Kalopsidha was one of many sites in eastern and southern Cyprus producing pottery which found its way to Egypt and the Levant at this time. It seems unlikely, however, for the LC I period when there is no indication of substantial settlement at the site. Instead, Koufos may have persisted for several hundred years after the abandonment of the excavated structures at Site C and Trench 3 as a ritual location. While some vessels were probably manufactured here – specifically the crudely-fashioned, low-fired miniatures – the bulk of the pottery and metalworking debris may have been brought from elsewhere, as appears to have been the case at Athienou (Kassianidou 2005: 137–138). Both locales may have been set up by Enkomi in the early LC period as part of a hinterland strategy associated with the procurement and transportation of copper. They suggest that large-scale communal participation in ritual performances played a significant role in attempts to build organisational structures in the hinterland.
In the final analysis, however, the limited exposures at Kalopsidha do not provide unequivocal support for any of the proposed scenarios (including my own). This makes the current inaccessibility of the site all the more to be regretted and reaffirms the importance of site reports as the ground upon which all subsequent interpretation must be firmly founded. We are fortunate indeed to have in SIMA a monograph series committed to the publication of site reports and other primary data and owe a very great debt of gratitude to Professor Paul Åström, founder of SIMA and one of its major contributors, and now to his son, Dr Lennart Åström, who has taken up the challenge of continuing his father’s legacy.
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