Aegean and Cypriot wares were the most widely traded ceramics in the Eastern Mediterranean (at least by sea) during the Bronze Age. However, their distribution and typologies are usually considered separately, prohibiting meaningful comparisons. This paper attempts a comparative examination of their quantities, repertoires, and contexts of deposition in Egypt and the Levant, as well as the mutual exchanges between the Aegean and Cyprus. In terms of chronology, it is demonstrated that while Cypriot vessels were exported en masse to Egypt and the Levant from the later part of the MBA onwards, Aegean ceramics became common only in the mid-14th century BC. In terms of repertoires, it becomes clear that while Cypriot exports included transport containers already from the 18th or 17th century BC, the few Aegean vessels that found their way to the East prior to 1400 BC were primarily for drinking and pouring. Aegean transport containers were systematically exported only from LH IIIA2 onwards (i.e. in the Mycenaean palatial period). These findings suggest the existence of two quite independent networks of maritime trade, and raise questions about the degree of integration of Aegean polities into the Eastern Mediterranean trade system.

Introduction
Because of their widespread presence in foreign lands, Aegean and Cypriot ceramics have been extensively used for studying Mediterranean interactions in the 2nd millennium BC. Although their role in trade is far from clear, their geographic and chronological distribution has allowed scholars to trace ancient sea routes, and observe fluctuations in the intensity of contacts between regions. Curiously, however, Aegean and Cypriot ceramic exports are rarely examined together, at least in a systematic way (e.g. Huckle 2005; Bell 2006; Hesse 2008). As a result, we know little about their relative frequency per region and period, and the extent to which their repertoires and contexts of use coincided or differed.

1 For a detailed discussion, see Sherratt 1999, esp. 175-178.
The lack of a comparative framework poses a number of problems. Given that Aegean and Cypriot vases were the most widely traded ceramics in the 2nd millennium BC (at least by sea) and were often deposited in common contexts, their chronological, morphological, and contextual associations should be considered crucial for evaluating their economic, social, or cultural importance (Bell 2006, 7, 30). Yet, among scholars who have taken the painstaking effort to study the diffusion and function of Aegean or Cypriot pottery overseas diachronically, few have tried to treat them in parallel even in a concise way. And although we have a general knowledge of the facts that Aegean pottery became common in the Eastern Mediterranean only in the 14th and 13th century, and that Cypriot exports outnumbered Aegean ones in most sites, the paucity of quantitative and qualitative data does not allow for more refined observations.

The present paper attempts to address this issue in a synthetic way. It focuses on Egypt and the Levant, i.e. the areas which received the greatest amounts of Aegean and Cypriot ceramics during the 2nd millennium BC, and examines in a comparative way aspects of quantity, form, and contexts. Mutual exchanges between Cyprus and the Aegean are also considered in detail; by contrast, there is only passing reference to evidence from Anatolia and Italy, where the aggregate of Aegean and Cypriot imports was considerably smaller.

No systematic attempt is made to differentiate between Minoan and Mycenaean pottery or between regional Cypriot wares. The aim of the paper is to examine what was exported from the Aegean and Cyprus by sea in each period and in which direction, not to identify production centres. It is my working hypothesis that, up to an advanced stage of the LBA, the Aegean formed a distinct network of exchanges (at least for pottery vessels), which was largely unrelated to the circuit comprising Cyprus, the Levant, and Egypt. When, finally, the two networks merged, Aegean and Cypriot ceramics co-existed only for a brief period of time in the same contexts. This is the hypothesis I will try to test against the available data.

Methodological and chronological issues

The study will follow a predominantly Aegean perspective. The chronological framework I will use in order to group finds and trace patterns and changes over time corresponds closely to major stages of social and political evolution in the Aegean. This is a conscious choice: my primary aim is to explore how successive...
Aegean politics responded to the challenge of economic interaction with the east (at least in terms of pottery trade), and how this may affect our understanding of maritime exchanges in the Eastern Mediterranean. I am aware, of course, that employing a regional chronology for the study of an inter-regional phenomenon is arbitrary. A different chronological grouping, based on developments in another region, might produce slightly different patterns. Yet, for lack of a ‘Pan-Mediterranean’ chronology, one is obliged to start from a regional system of relative dating and seek reliable synchronisms with other areas. The Aegean has a major advantage in that respect: its pottery can be more closely dated in stylistic terms than Cypriot wares, thus providing a sound basis for chronological correlations among different regions even when stratigraphic information is minimal. For these reasons, I will divide my study in four major chronological stages:

1. the period of the rise of palace societies in Minoan Crete (Minoan Protopalatial period, MM IB – IIB in Aegean ceramic terms, i.e. roughly the 19th and 18th centuries BC);
2. the period of the second Minoan palaces and the emergence of the Mycenaean culture on mainland Greece (Minoan Neopalatial period, MM III – LM IB/LH II A, ca. the 17th and 16th centuries BC);
3. the period following the LM IB destructions in Crete (after which Knossos remained the sole palatial centre in the Aegean) and before the appearance of Mycenaean palaces on mainland Greece (LM II/LH IIB – LM/LH IIIA1, ca. the 15th and first half of 14th centuries BC);
4. the Mycenaean palatial period (LM/LH IIIA2 – IIIB, ca. the second half of the 14th and the 13th centuries BC).


---

6 Some scholars identify ‘proto-palaces’ in that period, but this is largely based on architectural style, layout, or decoration, see Wright 2006. Evidence of complex administrative and economic functions associated with centralized state organization is only available for the architectural complexes (i.e. ‘palaces’) which were built at Pylos, Mycenae, and Thebes in the following LH IIIA2-B period: Darque 2005, 336-339, 372-374, 404.
7 For a recent overview of developments in the 2nd millennium BC Aegean, see Shelmerdine 2008.
8 The following chronological abbreviations are used in this table and throughout the paper: Aegean: MM = Middle Minoan; LM = Late Minoan; LH = Late Helladic; Cyprus: MC = Middle Cypriot; LC = Late Cypriot; Levant: MB = Middle Bronze; LB = Late Bronze; Egypt: SIP = Second Intermediate Period.

---
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The present chronological system corresponds with the one used in Eriksson's 2007 study of Cyprus' overseas relations as follows: Stage 2 = Eriksson's Phases 1, 2, and the earlier part of 3; Stage 3 = the later part of Eriksson's Phase 3 and Phase 4; Stage 4 = Eriksson's Phases 5-7. See Eriksson 2007.

The LC IB phase cannot be subdivided stratigraphically; the terms 'earlier part?' and 'later part?' are used here only to indicate that the phase straddles the border between Stage 2 and Stage 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Aegean</th>
<th>Cyprus</th>
<th>Levant</th>
<th>Egypt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM IB-MM II A</td>
<td>MM III</td>
<td>MC II-H II</td>
<td>MB IA</td>
<td>XII-XIIIth dynasty - SIP/early Hyksos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM II B</td>
<td>MC III</td>
<td>MB II A/B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Aegean</th>
<th>Cyprus</th>
<th>Levant</th>
<th>Egypt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LM IA/LH I</td>
<td>LM IB/LH II A</td>
<td>LC IA:2</td>
<td>LB I early (LB IA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM IB/LH II A</td>
<td></td>
<td>LC IB [earlier part?]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>Aegean</th>
<th>Cyprus</th>
<th>Levant</th>
<th>Egypt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LM/LH III A2</td>
<td>LC IIA</td>
<td>LB HA early</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 4</th>
<th>Aegean</th>
<th>Cyprus</th>
<th>Levant</th>
<th>Egypt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LM/LH III A2</td>
<td>LM/LH III B</td>
<td>LC IIB</td>
<td>LB HA late</td>
<td>late XVIIIth dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM/LH III B</td>
<td>LC IIC</td>
<td>LB IIB</td>
<td>XI Xth dynasty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arguments in support of these synchronisms will be presented in the relevant sections. Questions of absolute dating will not be addressed since they do not affect directly the present study\footnote{The arguments developed in this study are based on ceramic synchronisms and relative chronology. The lasting debate about the date of the Thera eruption (and its impact on the relative chronology of the late MBA and the early LBA) does not affect the discussion, as the period in question is fully contained in the chronologically broader Stage 2; for recent contributions to the Thera debate see Warburton 2009.}. I will first examine the development of Aegean and Cypriot pottery trade separately, and then attempt diachronic comparisons. Due to space limitations, I will avoid extensive references to original excavation reports; instead, I will refer to recent reviews which offer full bibliographic details.

The approach adopted here straddles traditional divisions between MBA and LBA Aegean pottery or between Minoan and Mycenaean wares\footnote{A change which is sometimes concealed by the use of the unhelpful term ‘LH II’ in relevant studies; this term places two periods of very different character in the Aegean artificially under the same ‘umbrella’, sc. LH IA, which falls within the Cretan ‘Neopalatial period’ when mainland Greece was still of peripheral importance to Aegean economy, and LH IIIB, which followed the collapse of the Minoan palatial system and marked the beginning of Mycenaean cultural and economic expansion in the Aegean.}, and attempts – among others – to identify changes that took place from LM IB/LH IIA to LM II/LH IIB (i.e. before and after the collapse of the sophisticated administrative system of Neopalatial Crete, or Stages 2 and 3 of our chronological system\footnote{Leonard 1994; a number of recent additions to the inventory are also included in Table 4.}). This is why I found it necessary to integrate all Aegean exports of Stage 2 in Tables 1-3, and to provide a list of safe and probable exports to the Levant in Stage 3 (Table 4), as this crucial period is not illuminated sufficiently in Leonard’s 1994 seminal study\footnote{Stage 1: Kemp/Merrillees 1980 (Egypt); MacGillivray 1998, 102-109; Sørensen 2008 (Cyprus), 2009 (Levant); Stage 4: Leonard 1994; Van Wijngaarden 2002; Judas 2010.}. Stage 3 exports to other regions are either too few (Egypt) or too many to allow for tabulation (Cyprus), and Stages 1 and 4 have been extensively treated in the past\footnote{Merrillees 1968; Oren 1969; 2001; Åström 1972a, 206-240; 1972c, 709-754; Gittlen 1977; 1981; Johnson 1982; Bergoffen 1989; Maguire 1990; 2009.}. As for Cypriot exports, they have been sufficiently documented and charted for almost all periods\footnote{Leonard 1994; anumber of recent additions to the inventory are also included in Table 4.}. The single figure of the study (Fig. 1a + 1b) provides a comparative table of common pottery forms exported from the Aegean and Cyprus in the various chronological stages.

Throughout the paper, a distinction will be made between vases which were exported for their own sake, e.g. drinking and pouring vessels, and those which were exported for their contents, i.e. containers. Although such forms as large jugs, kraters, and bowls are technically containers, they could not have been used for the transportation of potted goods; therefore, they will be listed with drinking and pouring vessels (sometimes referred to as ‘tableware’). When necessary, a further distinction will be made between wide-mouthed containers (e.g. Aegean alabastra and piriform jars), which were likely used for the transportation of vis-
cous substances, and narrow-mouthed ones (e.g. Cypriot juglets and flasks, Aegean stirrup jars and flasks), which were used for the transportation of liquids. The latter will be referred to as ‘transport containers for liquids’ or TCL.

A brief comment on geographical denominations is also necessary. Although the terms ‘Aegean’, ‘Levant’, ‘Cyprus’, and ‘Egypt’ are standard in archaeological literature on Mediterranean exchanges, one should bear in mind that not all these areas constituted coherent cultural, social, or political entities. The Aegean and the Levant in particular were characterized by considerable diversity, both environmental and cultural, and consisted of several independent polities, whose relations among themselves and with larger Mediterranean states are far from clear.

Thus, when speaking of exchanges between any of these areas we should not make the mistake to presume that we are dealing with centrally administered phenomena or, even, that our geographical concepts were meaningful to societies with more localized and ‘fragmented’ perceptions of space (Manning/Hulin 2005, 275-276). For the purposes of this study, such denominations should be understood as useful analytical abstractions which help us describe areas of regular and continuous interaction, beyond the limits of which one can start looking for ‘interregional’ or ‘international’ exchanges of less systematic character.

**Aegean pottery abroad**

**Stage 1**

**Egypt**

Kemp and Merrillees have listed ca. 50 Middle Minoan ceramic finds from Egypt (Kemp/Merrillees 1980). Among them, an unusual jug from Qubbet el-Hawa tomb 88 and a composite vessel from Lisht may have been the earliest imports, dating to MM IB. The rest of the fragments from El-Haraga, Lisht, and Kahun date to MM II A, later rather than earlier (MacGillivray 1998, 104-105). Most belong to bridge-spouted jars decorated in Classical Kamares style. Other forms include cups, bowls, and unspecified ‘closed vessels’. The material from Kahun and Lisht came probably from domestic dumps, while that of El-Haraga came from cemeteries.

A bridge-spouted jar from Abydos tomb 416 most probably dates to MM IIB; its context covers the XIIth and XIIIth dynasty (Kemp/Merrillees 1980, 174; MacGillivray 1998, 105). More important chronologically is a MM IIB Kamares

17 For useful remarks on the use and function of pottery vessels see Leonard 1981; Tournavitou 1992.

18 For the Aegean see Shelmerdine 2008; for the Levant see Van de Mieroop 2007, 163-170.

19 MacGillivray 1998, 103 (Qubbet el-Hawa), 104 (Lisht, no. Li1); Kemp and Merrillees (1980, 215) are sceptical about the Cretan provenance of the Qubbet el-Hawa vase.

20 Although all sherds were found in rubbish fills, Kemp/Merrillees 1980, 4-6 (Lisht), 23 (El-Haraga), 81 (Kahun).
cup found stratified at Tell el-Dabca level G/4 (Walberg 1991; MacGillivray 1995; 1998, 105), which synchronises with the early XIIIth dynasty in Egypt and MB IIA in the Levant (Hein 2009, 30, fig. 4.1). Other synchronisms for that period are less reliable21. A sherd from a bridge-spouted jar of possible MM II date found at Karnak in a Tuthmose I context is also of little chronological value22.

Levant

Among the ca. 50 vases listed by Sørensen in her review of Minoan imports in the Levant, less than 20 can be safely attributed to the Protopalatial period23. They are mostly Kamares cups and bridge-spouted jars. A MM IIA cup from Sidon, found in a MB IIA early deposit (MacGillivray 2008) was probably the earliest import. Other vessels (cups and bridge-spouted jars) from Ugarit, Qatna, Byblos, and Beirut, previously dated to MM IIA24, have been re-assigned by MacGillivray to MM IIB (or, in some cases, to early MM IIIA)25. Of chronological importance is a MM IIB cup found at Ashkelon, as it comes from Gate 1, Phase 14/Gate 2, Phase 13, which synchronize with levels G/4 and G/1-3 at Tell el-Dab'a, and, thus, with the early XIIIth dynasty and the Levantine MB IIA26. Two sherds from a possible Kamares open vase, found in the MB IIA Stratum 3 of the lower city of Hazor, has been tentatively dated to MM IIB or IIIA (Dothan et alii 2000), but neither its provenance nor its stratigraphic position can be considered secure27. A sherd from a large vessel (pithos?) with three inscribed Minoan signs (Linear A or Hieroglyphic), found together with late MC pottery in a MB IIB level (K4a) at Haror, has been considered an import, but petrography has failed to confirm its Cretan provenance (Oren et alii 1996). ‘Middle Minoan’ or ‘Kamares’ sherds are also reported from Ain Shems/Beth Shemesh and Hama, but no details are available about them, and at least one is not verified (Sørensen 2009, 37-38 cat. nos AS 01, 41 Hm 01).

21 For the jug found at Qubbet el-Hawa: see MacGillivray 1998, 103; Merrillees 2003, 342-343; for the rest of the Egyptian contexts see Kemp/Merrillees 1980, 4-6 (Lisht), 56-57 (El-Haraga), and 102 (Kahun).
23 Sørensen 2009, cat. nos Ak01, Bb01-06, Br01, Qt01, Sd01, Ug01-06.
25 MacGillivray 1998, 105-106; 2008, 48; according to the recent re-investigation of MB A strata at Ugarit, it seems that (at least some of) the MM IIB cups come from MB IIA levels: Al-Maqdissi 2008, 54.
26 Stager 2002; for stratigraphic synchronisms between Ashkelon and Tell el-Dab’a see Bietak et alii 2008; for the correlation of Tell el-Dab’a stratum G with the early XIIIth dynasty and MB IIA see Hein 2009, 30 fig. 4.1.
27 For the Minoan or non-Minoan provenance of the Hazor vase see Betancourt 1997; MacGillivray 1998, 105; Merrillees 2003, 342; Sørensen 2009, 42 cat. no. Hz 01. For its inclusion in Stratum 3, see the description in Dothan et alii 2000, 2: “Although the exact provenance of the sherd under discussion is not mentioned in the publication, it seems to belong to the top phase of Stratum 3, the uppermost layer defined in the room”. No justification is provided for the attribution of the sherd in this stratum.
Cyprus

The earliest Aegean vase found in Cyprus is an EM III/MM IA bridge-spouted jar from Lapithos tomb 806A (EC IIIB or MC I context: Cadogan 1983, 513 with references). The only Protopalatial ceramic import known to date is a MM IB/IIA cup from the MC IA late (or MC I middle-late) ‘Tomb of the Seafarer’ at Karmi\(^\text{15}\). Sørensen lists two possible MM sherds from Kourion and Enkomi (Sørensen 2008, cat. nos 3 and 15); the Kourion sherd, however, has been explicitly rejected by Catling and Karageorghis\(^{16}\).

Stage 2

Egypt

The few Aegean vessels of that period found in Egypt are listed in Table 1. No MM III and LM IA examples are safely identified (Betancourt 1997, 429). A sherd (possibly from a bridge-spouted jug) from an early XVIIIth dynasty context (Ahmose-Amenhotep I) in the ‘Artisans’ Quarter’ at Memphis, Kom Rabia may be an exception, as it could date either to LM IA or IB. It is the only Aegean vessel found in a domestic context of that period. A few more LM IB/LH II A examples come from early XVIIIth dynasty tombs. They include alabastra, a piriform jar, a squat jug, two cups, a ‘bowl’, and a few non-diagnostic sherds. The ‘LM I’ dating of a few sherds from a fort at Kerma is inconclusive\(^{17}\). A number of Aegean vessels of that period (mostly alabastra), now in museums and private collections, are also said to come from Egypt but contextual information is lacking and their provenance is uncertain\(^{18}\).

Levant

In the Levant, Aegean pottery of Neopalatial date has been found in more than 10 sites, albeit in very small numbers. All known finds are listed in Table 2. They include 12 drinking and pouring vessels (cups/goblets and bridge-spouted jars), 6 containers (mostly alabastra and several unspecified pieces, some of them decorated in the Marine Style). Of special interest is the LH II A/B Palace Style jar found at the Amman temple (one of the earliest large size vessels travelling to the east), where however it may have been deposited at a much later stage\(^{19}\). MM III and LM IA pottery is extremely rare, if at all present. A sherd from Kabri and another from Alalakh are the only possible examples. The Alalakh piece is chronologically problematic, as it comes from the temple level V, which dates to the 15th century, between Tuthmose I and

---

\(^{15}\) This find allows also for an indirect synchronism with Levantine MB II A: Saltz 1977, 53; Cadogan 1983, 514.

\(^{16}\) Catling/Karageorghis 1960, 125, where it is stressed that the sherd belongs to a BR I vase.

\(^{17}\) For other possible Minoan sherds from Kerma see Hankey 1993, 113 cat. no. 76.


\(^{19}\) Kalogeropoulos (2005, 395-397) favours a LH II B date for the palatial jar.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Context (form: date)</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kerma</td>
<td>Room at the base to the 'Lower Deir' (Hyksos)</td>
<td>? (shards)</td>
<td>LM I</td>
<td>Kemp/Merrillees 1980, 244-245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedment/Gurob/Lahun</td>
<td>Tomb 137 (early XVIIIth dynasty)</td>
<td>alabastron, tall</td>
<td>LM IB</td>
<td>Kemp/Merrillees 1980, 226-227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedment</td>
<td>Tomb 328 A.07 (disturbed Middle Kingdom (Hyksos deposit)</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>LM IB</td>
<td>Kemp/Merrillees 1980, 226-232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abydos Tomb 631 A.08</td>
<td>closed vessel</td>
<td>LM IB/LH IA</td>
<td>Kemp/Merrillees 1980, 233-240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurob Tomb 245 (early XVIIIth dynasty)</td>
<td>alabastron (FS 82)</td>
<td>LH IA</td>
<td>Kemp/Merrillees 1980, 242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saqqara Tomb NE.1 (early Thutmose III)</td>
<td>alabastron (FS 82)</td>
<td>LH IA</td>
<td>Kemp/Merrillees 1980, 253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dra Abu al-Naga (Thebes) Tomb (Hatshepsut – Thutmose III)</td>
<td>alabastron (FS 20/21)</td>
<td>LH IA</td>
<td>Kemp/Merrillees 1980, 253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusir</td>
<td>cup (FS 2/11)</td>
<td>LH IA</td>
<td>Kemp/Merrillees 1980, 253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stubbings 1951, 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Tableware (4): 2 cups; 1 bowl; 1 bridge-spouted jar; Containers (6): 4 alabastra; 1 pithoid jar; 1 closed vessel; Unidentified 1]
Table 2. Levant: Aegean ceramic imports of Stage 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kabri</td>
<td>Palace, loc. 2024, related to floor 703</td>
<td>? (sherd, polychrome decoration)</td>
<td>MM III?</td>
<td>Sørensen 2009, 42 no. K361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Grave V (LB II-III/B)</td>
<td>? (sherd, zig-zag decoration)</td>
<td>LM I?</td>
<td>Sørensen 2009, 45 no. Ud60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minot el-Beda</td>
<td>Near tomb IV</td>
<td>? (sherd from Palace Style jar?)</td>
<td>LM IB/LH IA</td>
<td>Leonard 2009, 33 no. Bb09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiror</td>
<td>Area A, Loc. 170</td>
<td>? (sherd)</td>
<td>LM IB/LH IA</td>
<td>Leonard 2009, 42 no. Hb02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megiddo</td>
<td>Stratum unknown, East Slope, square S29</td>
<td>? (sherd)</td>
<td>LM IB</td>
<td>Leonard 2009, 197 no. Hb09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Halil</td>
<td>Semi-globular cup (FS 219)</td>
<td></td>
<td>LM IB/LH IA</td>
<td>Leonard 1994, 96 no. 1448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gezer</td>
<td>Near the palace, in II 28</td>
<td></td>
<td>LM IB/LH IA</td>
<td>Leonard 1994, 134 no. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lachish</td>
<td>Area GE 1, Loc. 485</td>
<td>? (sherd, Marine Style decoration)</td>
<td>LM IB/LH IA</td>
<td>Leonard 1994, 128 no. Hb09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Fosse Temple I, near the altar</td>
<td>steamed cup (FS 254)</td>
<td>LM IB/LH IA</td>
<td>Leonard 1994, 197 no. LM 12a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell el-Ajaul</td>
<td>Palace, building S</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LM IB/LH IA</td>
<td>Leonard 2009, 43 no. Sk01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Sukas</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>LM IB/LH IA</td>
<td>Leonard 2009, 44 no. P001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashkelon</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>LM IB/LH IA</td>
<td>Leonard 2009, 43 no. Sk01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Table ware (12): 10 cups/goblets; 2 bridge-spouted jars; Containers (6): 4 alabastra; 1 Palace Style jar; Unidentified: 11]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enkomi</td>
<td>Area III, room 115 (level IB early), e1793/2</td>
<td>semi-globular cup</td>
<td>LH/LM IA</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 178-179 no. 19; van Wijngaarden 2002, 364 no. 930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area III, room 118 (level IB early), e1805/1</td>
<td>semi-globular cup</td>
<td>LH/LM IA</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 179 no. 20; van Wijngaarden 2002, 364 no. 931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area III, room 114 (level IB advanced), e1021</td>
<td>rounded alabastron</td>
<td>LH/LM IA</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 179 no. 21; van Wijngaarden 2002, 364 no. 932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British tomb 40</td>
<td>small handled cup</td>
<td>LH/IA/LM IB</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 179-180 no. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area III, room 5 (level IB)</td>
<td>collar-necked jar</td>
<td>LM IB</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 180 no. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarter 4E (LC IB)</td>
<td>cup??</td>
<td>LH/IA/LM IB</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 177-178 no. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area III, room 115 (level IA end)</td>
<td>&quot;closed vessel&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;MM&quot;</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 177-178 no. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area III, room 117 (level IB end)</td>
<td>storage jar</td>
<td>&quot;MM&quot;</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 180 no. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayia Irini</td>
<td>Tomb 3.29 (LC IA–IB)</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>LM/LH IA</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 178 no. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomb 3.16 (LC IA–IB)</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>LM/LH IA</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 178 no. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomb 3.15 (LC IA–IB)</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>LM/LH IA</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 178 no. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomb beneath SE angle of fortification (LC IB)</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 180 no. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomb beneath SE angle of fortification (LC IB)</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 180 no. 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomb 1 (485), chamber 1, (MC–LC IB)</td>
<td>jug, coarse ware</td>
<td>LM IA early</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 174 no. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomb 1 (496), chamber 1, (MC–LC IB)</td>
<td>jug, coarse ware</td>
<td>LM IA early</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 174 no. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomb 1 (414), chambers 1 and 3, (MC–LC IB)</td>
<td>jug (&quot;flowerpot&quot;)</td>
<td>LM IA</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 175 no. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomb 1 (499), chamber 1, (MC–LC IB)</td>
<td>cap</td>
<td>LM IA</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 175 no. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomb 1 (500), chamber 1, (MC–LC IB)</td>
<td>cap</td>
<td>LM IA</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 175 no. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomb 1 (44A), chamber 1 and 3 and central part, (MC–LC IB)</td>
<td>cap</td>
<td>LM IA</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 175-177 no. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomb 1 (48B), chambers 1 and 3 and central part, (MC–LC IB)</td>
<td>cap</td>
<td>LM IA</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 176 no. 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3. Cyprus: Aegean ceramic imports of Stage 2 (continuation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomb I (498), chamber 1, (MC–LC I B)</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>LM IA</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 176 no. 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomb I (494), chamber 1, (MC–LC I B)</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>LM IA</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 177 no. 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomb I (495), chamber 3, (MC–LC I B)</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>LM IA</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 177 no. 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomb I (497), chamber 1, (MC–LC I B)</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>LM IA</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 177 no. 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square J 16, over hole down into tomb 1, chamber 1</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>LM IA late</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 182-183 no. 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5 surface, close to wall N of house A</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>LM IA or LM III?</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 184 no. 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomb III (34), niche 14</td>
<td>jar</td>
<td>LM IA</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 180 no. 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16 east, surface, N of E and of E-W 4 (P 844)</td>
<td>jar</td>
<td>LM IA or LM III</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 184 no. 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limassol area</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomb (LC I-II)</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>LM IB</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 181 no. 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vournes M11, 12:8813, Vournes 1a (LC I)</td>
<td>jar or jug</td>
<td>LM IA</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 180-181 no. 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomb 1</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>LM I or LH IIB</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 184 no. 39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terenouda tomb 105, chamber O (LC IIIA early)</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>LM I?</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 182 no. 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evesti, well TE Y1 (LC III)</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>LM IA</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 182 no. 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terenouda tomb 105, pit C</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>LM I?</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 184 no. 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hala Sultan Tekke</td>
<td>Surface find</td>
<td>Palace style pithead jar?</td>
<td>LM I/II/LH IIA</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 184 no. 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomb IV?</td>
<td>? (large vessel)</td>
<td>LM IA</td>
<td>Sørensen 2008, 182 no. 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Tableware (28 or 29): 24 or 25 cups; 2 bowls; 2 jugs; Containers (9): 2 alabastra; 7 jars; 1 closed vessel; Other (1): 1 unidentified form ('large vessel').
Amenhotep I \(^{33}\). The Kabri piece, if confirmed to be well stratified, will provide a welcome addition to the currently unsafe MM III synchronisms \(^{34}\). As for later pieces, of chronological value are the LM IB bridge-spouted jar from Ta’anek, found in a LB I context indirectly dated to the 23rd year of Tuthmose’s III reign, and the LH IIA/B stemmed cup from Lachish, found at Fosse Temple I, which was built after the campaign of Tuthmose III in the 23rd year of his reign \(^{35}\).

Cyprus

Cyprus has yielded ca. 40 vases of Neopalatial date. Sørensen and Van Wijngaarden have reviewed the available evidence, which is summarized in Table 3. No vases safely dated to MM III have been identified \(^{36}\). By contrast, LM IA/LH I and LM IB/LH IIA examples are found in sufficient numbers, although most come from collective tombs used over long periods of time, and only a few from settlements. They include a large number of drinking vessels (25 or 26 cups, mostly Minoan, bowls, and jugs), and 9 wide-mouthed containers (with two possible cases of coarse ware storage jars, a Minoan ‘flowerpot’, and a possible Palace Style jar).

Eriksson has analysed the contexts of Aegean imports in Cyprus and concluded that LM IA (and, thus, LH I) overlaps partly with LC IA:1 and mainly with LC IA:2, while LM IB/LH IIA synchronises roughly with LC IB (Eriksson 2007, 173-176). LC IA:1 falls within the Hyksos’ reign and ends by the time they were expelled from Egypt (Eriksson 2007, 194-196); LC IA:2 (and, thus, the later part of LM IA) is contemporary with the earlier part of the XVIIIth dynasty; the transition to LC IB (and, thus, LM IB/LH IIA) takes place approximately at the time of the accession of Tuthmose III to the throne (Eriksson 2007, 200-201). Although her analysis relies heavily on funerary contexts from collective tombs used over a very long time (e.g. the MC-LC IB tomb I at Tounta tou Skourou and the tombs at Palaepaphos Teratsoudia), the cumulative value of the evidence she presents is substantial.

Stage 3

Egypt

There is very little evidence of Aegean ceramic imports in Egypt at this stage. A LH IIB squat jug from the Tomb of Maket at Kahun offers a correlation with the later part of Tuthmose’s III reign (Hankey/Tuffnel 1973; Warren/Hankey 1989, ATP/48/16: Woolley 1955, 370 (where he notes that temple contexts are not secure and may contain objects of very different dates); for the dating of level V see Bergoffen 2005, 58-63.  

The piece has been recently excavated. For available synchronisms between MM III, the late XIIIth dynasty and the Hyksos period, and Levantine MB IIB see Warren/Hankey 1989, 135-137; for objections see Hankey/Leonard 1998, 30-31; Betancourt 1997, 429.  

For the date of the Lachish cup see Warren/Hankey 1989, 142-144 (LH IIA); MacDonald 2001, 530 (LH IIB).  

As a result, the correlation of that period with Cypriot chronology is based exclusively on a few MC III vases from the Aegean (see below) and non-ceramic evidence: Sørensen 2008, 157.
Hankey lists Saqqara, Gurob, and Gourneh (Thebes) in her catalogue of sites with LH IIB pottery (Hankey 1993, 113-114). A piriform jar from Deir el-Medina is said to belong to ‘LH II’ (Bell 1982, 154). Beth Ann Judas, in her recent PhD thesis, adds to the list two LH IIIA1 (IIIA/B) stirrup jars and a LH IIIA1 sherd from Amara West (Judas 2010, 671); she also dates a stirrup jar from Abydos, a stirrup jar and an alabastron from Sesebi, a jug from Rifeh and 17 vases from Marsa Matruh to LH IIIA38. However, only two cups from the latter site are dated to LH IIIA1 or IIIA1-A2 early by the excavators, the rest being almost exclusively LH IIIA2-B39. Although no safe conclusions can be drawn at the current state of research, Hankey’s remark that “no regular commerce followed [after LM IB/LH IIA] until LH/LM IIIA2” (Hankey 1993, 110) seems justified.

Levant

Aegean imports in the Levant increased slightly during that phase. Table 4a lists all examples which can be safely attributed to this period. Table 4b lists vases which may belong to this stage. Altogether a little more than 50 vases from ca. 20 sites can be safely or possibly dated to Stage 3. Among the secure LM II/LH IIB – LM/LH IIIA1 examples, there are 15 containers (including 8 alabastra and one coarse ware stirrup jar), 11 tableware vessels (cups, goblets, and one amphoroid krater) 2 rhyta, and 6 non-diagnostic pieces. Among the LH IIIA1-2 and IIIA examples, there are 16 containers (mostly piriform jars, alabastra, stirrup jars), 5 tableware vessels (including three amphoroid kraters), one rhyton, and one lid. The majority of the vessels come from domestic contexts and only a few (mostly alabastra) from tombs (Van Wijngaarden 2002, 116-117). Approximately 600 vases have been ascribed an undifferentiated ‘LH IIIA-B’ or ‘LM IIIA-B’ date by Leonard; among them, ca. 200 are stirrup jars, ca. 35 straight-sided alabastra, ca. 75 amphoroid kraters, and ca. 10 flasks, i.e. shapes which either are not attested otherwise in LH IIIA1 contexts or occur more frequently in LH IIIA2 (Leonard 1994). This, in combination with the overall picture of Aegean trade with the Levant in Stage 3, makes it more probable that they belong to Stage 4.

Cyprus

The corpus of Aegean pottery in Cyprus remained modest in that period. Åström in his 1972 catalogue listed ca. 65 vases safely and another ca. 40 possibly attributed to this stage37. These numbers have increased since, but not much. In 2002, Van Wijngaarden listed 14 sites as having yielded Aegean pottery of that stage;

13 Judas 2010, 535-537 (Marsa Matruh), 590 (Rifeh), 594 (Abydos), 675 (Sesebi); a conical rhyton FS 199 is ascribed to LH IIIA (573), but according to Koehl this is a LH IIIA2 early example: Koehl 2006, 345.
14 Nos 7.3 and 7.7 (possibly erroneously identified as a jar): Russel 2002, 6-8.
among them, Enkomi is the most prolific one, having yielded ca. 30 containers (mostly pithoid and piriform jars, and alabastra) and ca. 20 tableware (mainly cups and an amphoroid krater). Vases from other sites include mostly containers (alabastra, piriform jars, and a few LH IIIA1 stirrup jars) and a small number of cups, kylikes, and other open shapes; most of the LH IIb-IIIA1 vases found in Cyprus come from tombs, and only a few from settlements (Van Wijngaarden 2002, 186-187, 191-192).

Stage 4
The period provides good synchronisms: LH IIIA2 coincides with the later part of the XVIIIth dynasty, mainly late Amenhotep III and the Amarna period, and LH IIIB with the XIXth dynasty. In Cypriot terms, the period synchronizes with the later part of LC IIa, LC IIb and LC IIC; in Levantine terms, the period coincides largely with LB IIa late and LB IIb.

Egypt
The number of Aegean imports in Egypt increased dramatically at this stage. Hankey lists 25 and Judas more than 30 Egyptian and Nubian sites which have yielded LH IIIA2 and B pottery. Amarna is the most prolific one with 1600-2000 sherds dating almost exclusively to LH IIIA2. Other sites with large amounts of Aegean material include Deir el-Medina, with up to 120 pots (some LH IIIA2 late but most LH IIIB: Bell 1982), Saqqara, with ca. 30 LH IIIA2, A2-B1 and B vases (Hankey/Aston 1995), Qantir, with ca. 100 LH IIIB(?) sherds (Mountjoy/Mormesen 2001), and Gurob with ca. 50 LH IIIA2-B imports (Bell 1985; Judas 2010, 256). Aegean trade with Egypt may have decreased or changed character in the later part of the LH IIIB (Hankey 1993, 112; Kelder 2010, 136-137) stresses that Mycenaean pottery of post-Amarna date appears mostly in administrative centres (e.g. Qantir and perhaps Memphis). The Aegean repertoire in Egypt consists almost exclusively of containers. Stirrup jars predominate everywhere (e.g. 47 out of ca. 100 vases at Qantir, 18 out of 25

18 Van Wijngaarden 2002, 346-374, catalogue V (Mycenaean pottery at Enkomi) includes: LH IIb: 2 vases (2 rounded alabastra); LH IIb/IIIA1: 7 vases (3 alabastra, 2 piriform jars, 2 stemmed cups); LH IIIA1 25 vases (7 pithoid and piriform jars, 5 alabastra, 1 small handleless jar, 7 shallow cups, 2 stemmed cups/goblets, 1 amphoroid krater, 1 deep krater, 1 jug); LH IIIA1-2: 18 vases (9 piriform jars, 1 alabastron, 8 shallow cups).
19 For the Amarna period see Hankey 1997; although reasonable doubts have been raised about the date of the abandonment of Akhetaten (modern El-Amarna) and thus, the value of the Mycenaean material, the synchronism has been largely accepted by scholars in the face of additional evidence: see Bell 1985; Warren/Hankey 1989, 149-151.
21 Hankey 1993, 113-114 (noting that the sites which have yielded late Mycenaean pottery may be up to 45); Judas 2010.
22 Hankey 1973; 1997; the sherds may correspond to 200-300 vases: Kelder 2010, 130 esp. note 20.
vases at Saqqara), except for Amarna, where flasks are more popular. Coarse ware stirrup jars (FS 164) are common in the coastal sites of Marsa Matruh and Zawiyet Umm el-Rakham (Russel 2002, 2, 7-8; Snape 2003, 67-68), but rare in inland sites (Mountjoy/Mommsen 2001, 141). Open vessels are very rare, consisting mostly of cups and extremely few kraters (Judas 2010, 244-245), only one or two of which bear pictorial decoration. As for rhyta, only a LM IIIA2 early example from Gurob and 5 LH IIIA2 specimens from Amarna are known (Koehl 2006, 345). The rarity of open vessels, however, may be partly due to excavation bias, as few settlements have been explored in Egypt (Hankey 1993, 112).

Levant

As for the Levant, Leonard’s 1994 catalogue remains the best testimony to the great change that took place in Aegean pottery trade from LH IIIA2 onwards. In contrast to less than 60 vessels listed for the periods LH I-IIIA1, more than 1300 pots are attributed to LH IIIA2, IIIA2-B, and IIIB, and ca. 600 to LH IIIA-B. Among them, there are more than 1000 containers (with stirrup jars amounting to almost 60%), ca. 600 drinking and pouring vessels (mostly cups, kraters, and bowls), and ca. 80 rhyta. To these, we should add ca. 430 LH IIIA2-B pieces recently published from Ugarit and Minet el-Beida; they include ca. 240 containers and ‘closed vessels’ (with stirrup jars making for almost 65%), ca. 180 drinking and pouring vessels, and other ‘open’ forms (among which amphoroid kraters are the commonest with 56 examples), and 15 rhyta. More LH IIIA2-B vases are now published from Tell el-Ajjul, Ugarit, Alalakh, Tell Kazel, Kamid el-Loz, Tell Arqa, Sidon, Aphhek, Tell Tweini, and Tell Dan. Altogether, more than 100 Levantine sites have yielded pottery of LH IIIA2-B date. In those cases where a distinction between LH IIIA2 early and late has been attempted (e.g. at Sarepta, Alalakh, Tell Abu Hawam, Tell Kazel, and Marsa Matruh), IIIA2 early vases are

---

45 Comprising almost 35% of the assemblage: Hankey 1973, 30; Koehl 2005, 418-419.
46 An unprovenanced LH IIIA2-B example is said to come from Tell el-Maqdam: Vermeule/Karegeorghis 1982, 201 no. V24; a sherd from Qantir may belong to a LH IIIB example: Mountjoy/Mommsen 2001, 148-149
47 Ca. 640 stirrup jars (including ca. 20 FS 164), ca. 150 piriform jars, ca. 130 flasks, ca. 105 alabastra.
48 Ca. 240 cups, ca. 180 kraters, ca. 145 bowls, ca. 30 jugs.
49 Leonard 1994, see also Gilmour 1992, 125 table 2.
50 The total number is 496, but only ca. 440 were previously unrecorded, among which only a few can be dated earlier or later than LH IIIA2-B; the remaining ca. 60 pieces had been included in earlier lists: Hirschfeld 2000.
51 Hirschfeld 2000, 71-72.
This may suggest that Mycenaean pottery in the Levant increased only in the later part of LH IIIA2. LH IIIA2-B pottery comes from both settlement and funerary contexts. In sites with large amounts of imports, such as Ugarit and Tell Abu Hawam, ‘dinner vessels’ are more numerous than containers, while in sites with smaller amounts of Mycenaean vases, stirrup and piriform jars are more common; in funerary contexts, containers (stirrup jars, flasks, piriform jars, alabastra) predominate. Amphoroid kraters are much more common in domestic contexts, while kylikes occur in all contextual types (domestic, ritual, funerary).

Cyprus

Cyprus also received a wave of Mycenaean vases from LH IIIA2 onwards. Åström’s 1972 catalogue remains the most comprehensive account, large enough still to be considered statistically valid. Alongside 100-120 vases dating to LH I-III A1, he attributes 109 vases to LH IIIA2a, 170 to LH IIIA2a-b, 160 to LH IIIA2b, 915 to LH IIIA2-B, and 721 to LH IIIB. Those figures have increased greatly since 1972. In 2002, Van Wijngaarden listed more than 70 sites as having yielded LH IIIA2-B pottery, and recorded more than 1460 specimens from Enkomi (less than 60 being earlier than LH IIIA2), and “at least as much” from Hala Sultan Tekke. In general, coastal settlements have the greatest share of Mycenaean imports, while most inland sites have less than 100 specimens each (Van Wijngaarden 2002, 183 and catalogue 1). As in the Levant, a considerable increase can be observed in the earlier part of LH IIIA2, to be followed by a real influx in LH IIIA2 late-B, perhaps with a small recession in LH IIIB. The Mycenaean repertoire at Cyprus is more varied than in the Levant (Gilmour 1992, 114-115 and table 1). Containers prevail, with piriform and stirrup jars being the most common forms, followed by alabastra and flasks; among tableware, cups predominate, followed by amphoroid and bell kraters, jugs, shallow bowls, and kylikes (Gilmour 1992, 125 table 2). Containers are mostly found at tombs, tableware in both funerary and domestic contexts (the shallow bowl being

...extremely rare or absent, while IIIA2 late are abundant. This may suggest that Mycenaean pottery in the Levant increased only in the later part of LH IIIA2. LH IIIA2-B pottery comes from both settlement and funerary contexts. In sites with large amounts of imports, such as Ugarit and Tell Abu Hawam, ‘dinner vessels’ are more numerous than containers, while in sites with smaller amounts of Mycenaean vases, stirrup and piriform jars are more common; in funerary contexts, containers (stirrup jars, flasks, piriform jars, alabastra) predominate. Amphoroid kraters are much more common in domestic contexts, while kylikes occur in all contextual types (domestic, ritual, funerary).
the most common open shape in burials). Cretan imports are rare, but include most of the numerous coarse ware stirrup jars found at Enkomi, Kourion, Kition, Hala Sultan Tekke, and other sites. Contexts are usually domestic, although several examples have been found in tombs (Van Wijngaarden 2002, 196-197; Cadogan 2005, 318).

Cypriot pottery abroad 58

Stage 1

Levant

The circulation of Middle Cypriot pottery overseas has been studied by several scholars 59. According to most accounts, the earliest exports are to be found in the Levant 60. Maguire lists a handful of jugs and juglets and a couple of bowls decorated in WP PL, WP CL, and other early WP styles as possibly coming from MB IIA levels at Akko, Ain Shems (Beth Shemesh), and Tell Jerishe 61. At least two WP PL vases come from secure MB IIA levels at Tel Nami (Artzy/Marcus 1992, 105-106). At Ashkelon, two WP CL jugs were found in the street of Gate I, Phase 14, which synchronises with the end of level H and level G/4 at Tell el-Dab'a, and the early XIIIth dynasty 62. Similar types of vases are reported from MB IIA/B levels at Achzib, Ginosar, and Megiddo (stratum XIII) 63. Johnson has attributed one more WP CL jug from Beit Mirsim (strata G-F) to MB IIA, and 15 jugs and juglets from Dhahrait el Humraita to MB IIA/B 64: the latter cemetery, however, spans a wide range from MB IIA to the LBA, and Cypriot imports cannot be dated with precision (Maguire 2009, 49).

Ugarit has yielded numerous MC vases, but stratigraphic information is imprecise. Maguire lists more than 50 examples, including RP, WP PL, WP CL, and WP V jugs and juglets, and RoB bowls, which, however, come either from collective tombs with a long history of use or from vaguely dated MB levels 65. It is,

---

58 Cypriot wares are presented with their abbreviated names, listed in note 8 and this volume, page 12.
59 For Egypt see Merrillees 1968; Karageorghis 1995; for Palestine see Johnson 1982; for Anatolia see Åström 1989; for Lebanon see Karageorghis 2008; for the Eastern Mediterranean as a whole see Åström 1972a; Maguire 1990; 2009.
60 Evidence of pre-MBA ceramic exports is very limited: see Knapp 1990, 149, 152.
61 Maguire 2009, cat. nos AIS 503, AKK 621-638, JER 709-711, 713-716, NAMI 802-808.
62 Stager 2002, 357-359; for stratigraphic synchronisms between Ashkelon and Tell el-Dab'a see Bietak et al. 2008.
63 Maguire 2009, cat. nos. ACH 500, GIN 692, MEG 756, 770, 771, 773.
64 Johnson 1982, 63, Table I; see also Saltz 1977, 58; Maguire 2009, 204-206 (DHA 652-664), 220 (TBM 799).
65 Maguire 2009, cat. nos. RSH 414-467 (however, ca. 160 sherds were listed in an earlier version of this work, Maguire 1990, cat. nos. RSH 321-484).
Table 4a. Levant: Aegean ceramic imports safely dated to Stage 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>REFERENCE, SITE, AND VESSEL TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LH II or LH IA-B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Leonard 1994, 361: Alalakh, rounded alabastron FS 82; 1599: Lachish, goblet FS 254; 2038: Tell Abu Hawam, unidentifiable form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Containers (15): 8 alabastra (FS 82, 83, 84); 2 piriform jars (FS 31); 2 squat jugs (FS 87); 1 small handleless jar (FS 77); 1 piriform jar (FS 16); 1 coarse ware stirrup jar (FS 164); Tableware (11): 4 semi-globular cups (FS 219); 2 goblets (FS 254); 2 stemmed cups (FS 255); 1 Vaphio cup (FS 224); 1 cup (Minoan); 1 amphoroid krater (FS 53-55); Other (8): 2 kylikes; 6 unidentifiable forms
Table 4b. Levant: Aegean ceramic imports possibly dated to Stage 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>REFERENCE, SITE, AND VESSEL TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[Containers (36): 4 piriform jars (FS 31, 44, 48), 2 piriform jars (Minoan); 4 alabastra (FS 94, 95); 1 alabastron (Minoan); 4 stirrup jars (FS 166); 1 handle jar (FS 77). Tableware (5): 3 amphoroid lekythoi (FS 52, 55); 1 semi-globular cup (FS 220); 1 jug. Other (2): 1 conical rhyton (FS 99); 1 lid]
Figs. 1a and 1b. Main Aegean (left) and Cypriot (right) pottery exports in Stages 1–4 (the most common forms highlighted = grey (source: author).
Fig. 1b. Cypriot Pottery.
thus, hard to determine whether importation started in MB IIA, although it is not improbable at all\(^6\).

**Egypt**

The earliest Cypriot imports in Egypt come from levels G and F at Tell el-Dab\(\acute{a}\), which fall within the XIIth dynasty and synchronise with the later part of MB IIA and the transition to MB IIB (Hein 2009, 30, fig. 4.1; Maguire 2009, 84). They include \(ca\). 20 sherds (mostly from jugs and juglets) decorated in WP PL, WP CL, and other WP styles, as well as a RoB jug (Maguire 2009, 41, table 3). Otherwise, MC pottery seems to have been very rare in Egypt. Merrillees lists a few WP PL and WP CL jugs and juglets, and none is claimed to come from contexts predating MB IIB in the Levant (Merrillees 1968, 145-146; 2002; Maguire 2009, 44).

**Aegean**

There is no safely testified presence of Cypriot imports in the Aegean in that period. Two pieces of a RP III amphora from Knossos come from an uncertain context (Lambrou-Phillipson 1990, 85), while a couple of bowls and a flask from Kommos are only tentatively ascribed a possible Cypriot provenance (Van de Moortel 2006, 641-642).

**Stage 2**

**Levant**

The circulation of Cypriot pottery in the Levant became systematic in MB IIB and IIC. According to Maguire, more than 35 sites have yielded Cypriot vases of that date (Maguire 2009, 89-90, catalogue). In several cases, Cypriot material was found stratified in MB IIB and IIC levels, e.g. at Meggido (strata XII-X, \(ca\). 15 vases), Tell Mavorakh (strata XIII-XII, \(ca\). 10 vases), Hazor (strata 3-4, \(ca\). 10 vases), Kabri (\(ca\). 15 vases), Lachish (\(ca\). 10 vases); many more sites have yielded early Cypriot material (WP PL, WP CL, WP V and RoB) from graves of the same period (Johnson 1982, 63, table 1; Maguire 2009, catalogue). Ugarit was a major recipient of Cypriot wares in MB IIB and IIC (see above, Stage 1). In Tell el-Ajjul, Sarepta, Tell Sukas, Tell Arqa, Tyre, and Qatna, the rarity of early MC wares (WP PL and WP CL) suggests that Cypriot ceramics started arriving at a slightly later date, perhaps closer to the MB/LB transition\(^6\). At Tell el-Ajjul, no less than 115 MC sherd have been recovered from levels of that date (Maguire 2009, cat. nos. Ajj 506-620). A number of Proto White Slip (PWS) vases have

\(^6\) In a preliminary report on the re-examination of MBA levels at Ugarit, Al-Maqdissi mentions Cypriot material from Sondage 16, which dates to the local phases ‘Ugarit moyen 1 and 2’; Al-Maqdissi 2008, 63; UM 1 and 2 are tentatively dated to MB I and IIA; Mallet 2008, 75.

\(^6\) Maguire 2009, 49. In general, it seems that WP PL and WP CL occur mostly in MB IIA-B levels, and WP V and MC III – LC IA wares in levels assigned to MB IIC and transitional MB/LB I: Maguire 2009, 84.
been also found in MB II levels at Tell el-Ajjul, Meggido, Ashkelon, and a few more sites (Oren 2001). Since PWS is taken to define the beginning of the LBA in Cyprus (Eriksson 2003, 419), it seems that LC IA:1 overlapped partly with the Second Intermediate Period, especially the Hyksos period. According to Maguire, the repertoire of MC III and incipient LC I pottery in the Levant (and the Nile Delta) consists mostly of small containers (juglets and small jugs with narrow necks), larger jugs, fewer bowls and other open shapes, and a small number of large storage vessels (pithoi). Cypriot wares are common in tombs throughout the Eastern Mediterranean, whereas their presence in settlement contexts is less consistent (Maguire 2009, 49-53).

Cypriot imports increase slightly in LB I, which starts with the rise of the XVIIIth dynasty and synchronizes with the beginning of LC IA:2. The repertoire changes, though, and becomes more diversified and specialized. WP styles decrease and new wares appear, including Monochrome, WS, Bichrome, BR, and, later, RLWM and White Shaved. WS and Monochrome are primarily used for open shapes (mostly bowls), BR for juglets and jugs, and less frequently for cups, bull vases, tankards, and kraters, RLWM for spinning bottles and less frequently for arm-shaped vessels and flasks, and White Shaved for juglets.

According to Gitten, LB I Palestinian contexts dated “prior to the campaigns of Tuthmose III” (i.e. before the 23rd year of his reign), contain relatively small quantities of Cypriot pottery (PBR, BR I, PWS, and WS I). He dates to that period contexts which have no WS II, BR II, or White Shaved: these were exported for the first time in LB IB, when the circulation of Cypriot pottery increased considerably. Oren stresses also that widely exported wares, such as BR II and WS II, appear only in very late LB I contexts in Palestine (Oren 1969, 127-128, 135). He also observes that early LB I contexts contain a considerable amount of WP VI and Monochrome, while BR I appears later, probably by the beginning of Tuthmose’s reign (Oren 1969, 145).

Quantitative data is unfortunately limited. Bergoffen stresses that the overall distribution of Cypriot imports in Palestine was thin in that phase (Bergoffen 1989, 281-282). However, ‘thin distribution’ for Cypriot imports has a different meaning than for Aegean ones. In Palestine alone, Gitten records 260 Cypriot vases from LB I funerary and settlement contexts in ca. 10 sites; more than half of them belong

---

44 As suggested in Eriksson 2003, 419-420; see also Oren 2001, 142.
45 Eriksson 2003, 420-421; 2007, 30, 196; the synchronism is also supported by the recent excavations at Tell el-Ajjul: Fischer 2003.
46 Åström 1972b; for the definition and chronology of the various wares see also Pilides 1992; Åström 2001; Eriksson 1993; Karageorghis 2001.
47 Gitten 1981, 50; Eriksson, however, argues strongly in favour of a LC IIA:1 date (equivalent to LM/LH IIIA1 and LB IIA early) for the beginning of WS II production: Eriksson 2007, 134-136.
48 See, for example, Bergoffen 2001 for BR vases in MC IIC-LB I contexts at Tell Ajjul, and Bergoffen 2002 for WS I vases in MC IIC-LB I contexts in the Levant, Egypt, and the Aegean.
to open forms (mostly bowls)\textsuperscript{73}. Moreover, the recent re-investigation of Tell el-Ajjul has yielded 177 Cypriot sherds from level H5, which is dated to MB/LB, equivalent to LC IA:2-B and the early XVIIIth dynasty (Fischer 2003, 273).

**Egypt**

In Egypt, Cypriot imports increased considerably in that period. Tell el-Dab'a has yielded many examples stratified in MB IIB and IIC levels (stratum E/1: 27 vases, stratum D/3: 51 vases, stratum D/2: 49 vases). Earlier levels contained a high proportion of WP CL and WP PL, while D/2 was characterised by greater variety, including vases in WP V-VI, RoB, RP, BS, Bichrome, and Plain ware, as well as few example of PWS (which provide the crucial synchronism between LC IA:1 and stratum D/2, late SIP)\textsuperscript{74}. Beyond Tell el-Dab'a, considerable amounts of late MC and early LC pottery have been found in more than 25 Egyptian sites dating to the later part of the SIP and the early XVIIIth dynasty (Merrillees ‘‘XVIIIth dynasty A and B’’): at least 160 vessels are dated to the period between the SIP and ‘‘XVIIIth dynasty A’’, while at least 120 share a wider range including ‘‘XVIIIth dynasty B’’. They come almost exclusively from graves and include mostly BR I juglets, RLWM spinning bottles, and BR I double juglets and flasks\textsuperscript{75}. Other forms are rare and open vessels are almost entirely lacking. In general, the Cypriot ceramic repertoire in Egypt is much more restricted than in the Levant (Bergoffen 1989, 232). One has, however, to bear in mind that few settlement contexts of that period have been published from Egypt.

**Aegean**

Cypriot pottery of that period is rare in other areas. In the Aegean, Cypriot vessels of that date have been discovered in a few contexts in Crete, the Cyclades, and the western Anatolian coast. Kommos has yielded ca. 20 pieces, including a WP CL juglet in MM III levels, and several PRB jugs, a RS jug, a BR I jug/tankard, a WP Wheelmade tankard, a Monochrome closed vessel, a RLWM spinning bottle, and a Plain White krater from LM IA and IB contexts (Watrous 1992; Rutter, 1999, 2006, 653-658). Other finds include a WP PL jug from Zakros (MM III-LM IA context), a possible RoB jug from Malia (MM III-LM IB), four WP sherds from Pseira (LM IB), RLWM spinning bottles from Gournia (LM IB) and Ialysos (LB IA/B), a few WS I bowls from LM IA or LM IA-B contexts from

\textsuperscript{73} Gitten 1977, tables 64 and 65; Bergoffen also stresses that bowls made up more than 50\% of Cypriot imports in southern Canaan during LB IA: Bergoffen 1989, 282.

\textsuperscript{74} Hein 2009; Maguire 2009, 36-39 and 41 table 3; for the chronological synchronism between LC IA:1, stratum D/2 and late SIP, see idem 34, and Eriksson 2003, 418; 2007, 194.

\textsuperscript{75} ‘‘XVIIIth A’’ includes Ahmose-Tuthmose II, ‘‘XVIIIth B’’ includes Hatshepsut and Tuthmose III; for the chronological subdivision of the XVIIIth dynasty see Merrillees 1968, 4.

\textsuperscript{76} Merrillees 1968; Bergoffen 1989, 285; Oren, however, believes that most of the Cypriot finds dated by Merrillees to ‘‘XVIIIth A’’ cannot be earlier than the reign of Tuthmose III (‘‘XVIIIth B’’): Oren 1969, 146-149.
Phylakopi, Ialysos, and Thera (possibly Akrotiri), two BR I jugs and a spinning bottle from Ialysos (LB IA/B: Karageorghis/Marketou 2006, 459-460), a BR I juglet from Tilos (unknown findspot), and a PWS bowl from Miletus (Todd 2001, 207).

Stage 3
Levant
The amount of Cypriot imports in the Levant increased considerably in the later part of LB I, which coincides with the beginning of our Stage 3. LB IIA was the peak of Cypriot export trade to Palestine. Types which had started arriving here during LB IB (BR II, WS II?, RLWM, and White Shaved) became very common, and new ones (Bucchero) appeared (Gittlen 1981, 50-51); BR bull vases were probably first exported in that period, too. Eriksson stresses that “the massive expansion in the exports of WS II to most of the societies of the Eastern Mediterranean” took place in LC IIA:1 (contemporary with LH IIIA1: Eriksson 2007, 222). Levantine contexts are difficult to date independently, which is why quantification of Cypriot imports at this stage is not easy. If, however, we take the distribution of wares characteristic of LB IB and IIA as an indicator, we may draw a broad picture of the Cypriot pottery trade in this period. According to Åström, BR II vases are present in 9 Syrian and 26 Palestinian sites, White Shaved in 7 Syrian and 19 Palestinian sites, and Bucchero in 10 Levantine sites. As for WS II (which, however, was extensively imported in LB IIB as well), it enjoyed a wider distribution: Gittlen lists 28 sites from Palestine, and Yon ca. 10 sites from Syria and Lebanon (Gittlen 1977, map 14; Yon 2001). As for quantities, it may be useful to mention that among the ca. 1000 LC vessels recovered during Petrie’s excavations at Tell el-Ajul most came from LB I and IIA (but not 13th century BC) levels. They include ca. 100 RoB/RoR and ca. 60 Monochrome bowls, ca. 60 BR I jugs and juglets, ca. 30 BR I bowls, ca. 200 BR II juglets and jugs, ca. 30 White Shaved juglets, ca. 180 PWS and WS I bowls, and ca. 60 WS II bowls. Gittlen records a total of ca. 790 vessels found in LB II A levels in ca. 20 Palestinian sites; more than 70% of them come from funerary contexts, with an overwhelming majority of BR jugs and juglets (Gittlen 1977 tables 64 and 65).

78 Stampolidis et alii 2011, 256 cat. no. 19 (text by I. Nikolalopoulou).
79 Gittlen 1981, 50; Oren has also suggested that the vast majority of BR I exports date to the reign of Tuthmosis III, i.e. middle-late LB I: Oren 1969, 143-145. A number of earlier (MB IIIC-LB IA) contexts from Tell Ajul, where BR pottery has been found are listed in Bergoffen 2001.
80 Nys 2001, 96, 101, where it is stressed that bull vases were first exported in LC IIA:1 to the Levant.
81 Åström 1972c, 738-754; according to Gittlen, White Shaved may have been manufactured specifically for the export market: Gittlen 1977, 517-518.
82 Bergoffen 1989, catalogue and 153-157 for the chronology of the site.
Egypt
It has long been observed that Cypriot pottery enjoyed its widest popularity in Egypt at the time of Tuthmose III, when hundreds of vases were deposited in tombs\(^83\). After that, there was a decline in imports up to Amenhhotep III, and even during his reign Cypriot wares were relatively few\(^84\). Bergoffen observes a decrease of about 40% from BR I to BR II imports, the first identified in more than 35 sites, the second in less than 20 (Bergoffen 1989, 230). This decline has been variously attributed to tensions between Egypt and the Mitanni or the rising Hittite Empire in the later part of the 15th century BC\(^85\). Closed forms continued to predominate in this period.

Aegean
As for the Aegean, the amount of Cypriot imports did not increase substantially. At Kommos, a Plain White juglet and a Monochrome bowl have been found in a LM II context\(^86\). Another 11 vessels (among which 8 WS II bowls and a pithos) come from secure LM IIIA1 contexts, and a few more (mostly WS II bowls) from ‘LM IIIA’ ones. A RLWM spinning bottle has been found in a LM IIIA1 context at Trianda, and a WS II bowl in a ‘LM IIIA’ context at Chania\(^87\). A small number of Cypriot sherds have also been found in Troy levels VIe-VIIg (Äström 1980, 24). So far, no Cypriot pottery of that period has been identified in the Cyclades and mainland Greece.

Stage 4
Levant
Cypriot pottery remained common in the Levant until the end of the 14th century BC. Gittlen stresses that LB IIA was the period of the greatest popularity of BR I and II, White Shaved, WS II, and Buccheri pottery in Palestine, although BR I went out of fashion early in this phase (perhaps by the end of our Stage 3, i.e. the mid-14th century BC). By LB IIB, most of those wares ceased to be imported (Gittlen 1977, 517-518; 1981, 51). He notes, however, a significant increase of imports in domestic contexts during LB IIB: out of 514 vases recorded, 382 come from settlements, with more than 50% belonging to open forms (mostly WS II bowls)\(^88\). Bergoffen also observes that Cypriot export trade with southern Canaan reached a peak in the 14th century BC, but decreased sharply in

---

\(^{83}\) Oren 1969, 143; Bergoffen 1989, 311-312; Eriksson 2007, 31, 157, 213-214; for the repertoire of shapes see above, Stage 2.

\(^{84}\) Merrillees 1968, 198, 201; see, however, Karageorghis 1995 for a different opinion.


\(^{86}\) Rutter 1999, 168 (C3560), 170 (C9859).


\(^{88}\) In total, WS II vases have been found in more than 25 sites: Gittlen 1977, 520, tables 64 and 65, and map 14.
the following century; at the same time the range of types exported was reduced (Bergoffen 1989, 211-212).

On the other hand, in the northern Levant Cypriot pottery continued to be imported in significant quantities until the end of the LBA. Yon has listed several 13th century BC contexts with Cypriot imports, and Monchambert has published ca. 160 Cypriot vessels (among which many BR II jugs, White Shaved juglets, and WS II bowls) found in late 14th and 13th century BC houses at Ugarit together with ca. 120 Mycenaean pots (most of LH IIIB date: Yon 2001; Monchambert 2004).

**Egypt**

In Egypt, the Amarna period was the last time Cypriot imports were present in meaningful amounts. Amarna itself has produced ca. 200 sherds, almost exclusively from settlement contexts. Most of them are BR II juglets, with fewer flasks and some WS II bowls (Merrillees 1968, 201). Other than that, there are only a few imports from that period and circulation seems to decline sharply in the post-Amarna era (13th century BC). Merrillees believes that the importation of Cypriot pottery ceased after Akhenaten, while Bergoffen suggests that there were a few imports and allows for the possibility that more remain unpublished (Merrillees 1968, 202; Bergoffen 1989, 211-212, 224).

**Aegean**

In the Aegean, there was only a slight increase in Cypriot imports, a few of which reached mainland Greece for the first time. Cline lists ca. 30 and Rutter an extra ca. 15 imports in LH/LM IIIA2-B contexts, most of which are from Kommos, and the rest from Ialysos, Chania, and Tiryns⁴⁹. A few more vessels dating to ‘LH/LM III’, ‘LH/LM IIIA’, or ‘LH/LM IIIA1-2’ are known from Katsamba, Hagia Irini, Chania, and Kommos⁵⁰. The repertoire consists mainly of WS II bowls, a few BR I and White Shaved juglets, a BR I, a BR II and a Monochrome bowl, and several PWWM pithoi and other open vessels. Fragments of WS II bowls have also been found at Aegina in ‘Late Mycenaean’ levels dating “until LH IIIIB” (Felten 2007, 19-20, fig. 14). A few BR II, WS II, and RLWM vases have been found at Troy level VIIb and later (Aström 1980, 24; Todd 2001, 206-207).

**Shipwrecks**

As for shipwrecks, the cargo of the Ulu Burun ship, which dates to LH IIIA2, contained at least 135 Cypriot vases, including 35 White Shaved juglets, 29 WS


II and 19 BR II bowls, and 10 pithoi. The LH IIIB cargo of Cape Gelidonya contained a handful of Cypriot pots. Finally, the late LH IIIB Point Iria wreck contained 8 LC IIIC/IIIA vases, including 4 pithoi\textsuperscript{91}.

**Discussion**

**Quantities**

What becomes obvious from the preceding analysis is that Cypriot pottery circulating in the Eastern Mediterranean during Stages 1-3 vastly outnumbered Aegean ceramic exports. In total, less than 200 Aegean vases from the Levant and Egypt can be dated prior to LH IIIA2. Stage 1 pottery (Minoan Protopalatial) is represented mostly by isolated examples in ca. 10 Levantine and ca. 5 Egyptian sites. Stage 2 vases (Minoan Neopalatial and Early Mycenaean) have been found in ca. 10 Levantine and less than 10 Egyptian sites, and Stage 3 vases in ca. 20 Levantine and less than 10 Egyptian sites. To these numbers, we should add a vase from Cyprus in Stage 1\textsuperscript{92}, ca. 40 vases from ca. 10 Cypriot sites in Stage 2, and 60-100 vases from ca. 15 sites in Stage 3\textsuperscript{93}. In contrast, more than 800 Cypriot vases and sherds have been recovered from MB levels in ca. 35 Levantine and Egyptian sites\textsuperscript{94} (although those dated safely to Stage 1 are limited), and many more hundreds from LB I and IIA contexts. LB IIA (largely coinciding with our Stage 3 and the earlier part of Stage 4) was the peak in Cypriot pottery trade. This peak clearly predates the influx of Aegean vases in the east, as it starts at least as early as LC II A:1 (LH IIIA1) and possibly earlier. The small amounts of Aegean pottery exported to the Eastern Mediterranean prior to Stage 4 argue against them having any significant economic impact on local societies (although they may have been socially valued i.e. as exotica\textsuperscript{95}). Aegean imports reached the critical mass to be considered economically meaningful only in the later part of LH IIIA2: pottery of LH IIIA2 late - IIIB date is known from ca. 100 Levantine, ca. 70 Cypriot, and ca. 30 Egyptian sites (although few of them have yielded more than 10 vases: Van Wijngaarden 2002, 17-18). This suggests that, so far as pottery is concerned, Aegean involvement in the Eastern Mediterranean trade networks was minimal prior to the rise of the Mycenaean palatial system in mainland Greece.

As for the quantitative relation between Aegean and Cypriot wares in Stage 4, the evidence is not conclusive. Bergoffen and Gittlen have suggested that Cypriot...
imports decreased markedly in LB II B (coinciding with LH II B and the 13th century BC), certainly in Egypt and probably in the southern Levant, perhaps being displaced by competing Mycenaean products. This would suggest a very brief chronological overlap of Aegean and Cypriot ceramic exports in the later part of the 14th century BC. However, the situation may have been more complicated—at least in the Levantine coast. Recent excavation reports suggest that, with few exceptions (mainly the sites of Ugarit and Tell Abu Hawam), Aegean ceramics remained relatively uncommon here, and may have been outnumbered by Cypriot wares even in the later parts of the LBA. At Tell el-Ajjul recent fieldwork has produced large amounts of late LBA Cypriot pottery as opposed to minimum numbers of Aegean imports. A similar pattern is observed at Tell Arqa and Tell Kazel, and is also known from Sarepta and Hazor (Koehl 1985; Hesse 2008, 229-238). At Tell Dan, Mycenaean vessels are slightly more numerous than contemporary wares from Cyprus, which however were imported until the very end of the LBA. At Alalakh, on the other hand, Cypriot imports seem to diminish by the time Aegean ones start to increase. Obviously further research on the volume and typology of late 14th and 13th century BC Cypriot ceramic exports to the Levant is necessary before we can draw safe conclusions about their quantitative and qualitative relation to Mycenaean wares.

Repertoires and contexts (Fig. 1a + 1b)
Small transport containers for liquids (TCL) constituted a major component of

---

97 At least 1000 Mycenaean sherds have been found at Ugarit and 700 at Tell Abu Hawam, mostly of LH IIIA2-B date; Cypriot pottery, however, was being imported in both sites long before the appearance of Aegean vessels and remained numerous even in the later part of the LBA; see Yon 2001; Balensi 1985; 2004; Bell 2006, 41, 46-47.
98 Where old excavations had produced ca. 1000 LC sherds and less than 75 Mycenaean ones, mostly LH IIIA2-B: Steel 2002.
99 Fischer 2003: Level H1 (LB II A/B, LC IIB/C) produced only one LH II B piriform jar against 199 Cypriot sherds; Level H2 (LB II /II A, LC II A/B) yielded four possible Aegean sherds against 232 Cypriot imports; earlier levels (H7-H4, MB IIC – LB IA-A/B) produced ca. 400 Cypriot sherds and no Aegean imports.
100 Charaf-Mullins 2006, 174-175; level 11 yielded 11 LH IIIA2-B/C vessels and 141 Cypriot imports; level 12 yielded six LH IIIA2-B vessels and 89 Cypriot imports; level 13 (late MB-early LB) produced 50 Cypriot and no Aegean imports.
101 Badre 2006; LH IIA late – IIIB early strata (Area IV, level 6) have yielded large concentrations of Cypriot pottery and "no significant amounts" of Mycenaean sherds, while in LH IIIB middle to late strata (Area IV, level 5, Area II, level 6), Cypriot pottery decreases but still outweighs Mycenaean imports (which however increase from the previous period).
102 Ben-Dov 2001, 273-309; note that Cypriot pottery is present here since MB II (Stratum X), while Aegean vessels appear only in LB II (Stratum VII).
103 Woolley 1955, 369-376; Crouwel/Morris 1985; Koehl 2005; the majority of Cypriot imports (in total more than 400 vessels) came from level IV, and only ca. 30 sherds from levels III and II; Aegean material (amounting to less than 90 vessels, mostly of LH IIIA2 date) was concentrated in the later levels III and II.
Cypriot pottery trade throughout the examined periods. Maguire has shown that, by MB IIB-C, large amounts of WP juglets and jugs with narrow necks were exported to the Levant and the Nile Delta, where they were frequently deposited in graves together with small jugs from other Eastern Mediterranean cultures (Levantine Red Polished, Red Burnished and Bichrome, and Levantine/Egyptian Tell el-Yahudiyyeh). Emphasis on small TCL in that period may reflect an increasing appreciation for perfumed oils and other ‘precious commodities’ (perhaps associated with funerary practices) in the Eastern Mediterranean and the Near East.'''

In the early LBA, Cypriot TCL almost totally replaced non-Cypriot ones in Levantine and Egyptian contexts. The latter ceased to be produced (except for Red Burnished) for reasons which are not yet clear.''' At the same time, Cypriot wares started to diversify. Small TCL were now made in various styles (mainly WP VI, Bichrome, BR, and RLWM) and in a few new shapes (e.g. ‘poppy juglets’, double juglets, flasks, spinning bottles), while the number of open forms, especially bowls produced in Monochrome, WP VI, RoB, BR I, and WS, increased. As a rule, containers were common in burial contexts, bowls in domestic ones.''' This change has been taken to indicate increasing specialization in production, perhaps as a result of a more conscious interest in foreign ‘markets’ (Gittlen 1981, 52-53; Maguire 2009, 64-66).

By contrast, Aegean exports seem to have been less varied and certainly did not include TCL until an advanced stage of the LBA.''' Stage 1 Aegean pottery sent to the east consisted mostly of Kamares cups and bridge-spouted jars, i.e. high-quality tableware, with only minimum presence of other shapes.''' In Stage 2, open vases (mostly decorated cups) prevailed, especially in Cyprus, where they were largely deposited in tombs. In Egypt and the Levant, there were a few wide-mouthed containers, namely alabastra and piriform jars probably intended for viscous substances (e.g. ungents, ointments, honey)’''' but at least in the Levant they were mostly used in domestic contexts. In Stage 3, a few new forms were added to the repertoire, and the earliest TCL (stirrup jars), rhyta, and amphoroid kraters appeared, albeit in tiny numbers.

106 According to Gittlen, jugs and juglets represent 84% of Late Cypriot pottery from funerary contexts in Palestine, while bowls and kraters 61% of the pottery from domestic contexts: Gittlen 1981, 52 fig. 1; yet, open forms may have been more common in funerary contexts during LB I than later: Oren 1969, 128-130. Cypriot vases were extensively used in LBA burials: at Tell el-Ajul, out of ca. 310 LB tombs, more than 60% contained Cypriot vessels while in Egypt 70% of all LC pottery came from tombs: Bergoffen 1989, 227, 260-261.
107 For the function of various Aegean pottery types see Leonard 1981; Tournavitou 1992.
108 See Koehl 2008a, where it is stressed that out of 22 Kamares vases found so far in the Levant, 16 are cups, 5 bridge-spouted jars, and only one is a coarse-ware jar.
109 For the possible contents of such vessels see Leonard 1981, 92-94; Koehl 2008b, 271.
In view of the above, it seems rather improbable that any kind of *functional overlap* between Aegean and Cypriot imports existed until the later part of Stage 3. As for any *contextual overlap*, this was probably coincidental. Bergoffen has stressed that the co-existence of Aegean and Cypriot wares in some early (pre-Stage 4) contexts was due to the ubiquitous presence of the latter, rather than the result of similar economic or social factors dictating their distribution (Bergoffen 1989, 279-280). Given that Cypriot trade with the Levant had fully developed since the later part of the MBA and with Egypt since the start of the LBA, I can only see the few Aegean vases which arrived here during Stages 2 and 3 as minor additions to largely Cypriot cargoes.

A functional and contextual overlap may have existed only in Stage 4, when small and medium-size Aegean TCL made their way to the east in bulk. Bergoffen believes that an increase in Cypriot containers over open forms in the later part of the LBA may have been associated with the appearance of Mycenaean stirrup jars and flasks in the same contexts (Bergoffen 1989, 282-283). This, of course, presupposes that Aegean and Cypriot containers held similar goods and were ‘competitive’ in foreign markets, a reasonable hypothesis which, however, cannot be verified without content analyses. Contextual studies may also be helpful as they can reveal to what degree those containers co-existed or were mutually exclusive. On the other hand, we should not forget that Aegean imports in the Levant and Cyprus during Stage 4 included large quantities of piriform jars, *alabastra*, and open ‘dinner’ vessels (e.g. amphoroid *kraters* with pictorial decoration and cups of various types) for which there are no close (indigenous) Cypriot equivalents. Therefore, more comparative studies on a local level are necessary before safe conclusions about functional overlapping (and thus ‘competition’) can be drawn.

Special mention should be made of Egypt, because of the overwhelming presence of containers, both Aegean and Cypriot (with the exception of Stage 1, when the small Aegean inventory comprised mostly cups and bridge-spouted jars). In Merrillees’ 1968 study of Cypriot imports, out of *ca.* 700 entries, open vases (bowls and tankards) account for less than 30 examples. Similarly, in Judas’ 2010 study of Aegean LBA imports, out of a total of *ca.* 1650 listed entries, drinking...

---

110 This conforms with theories advocating an active role for Cypriot merchants in disseminating Aegean pottery to the east, which have been formulated upon the overall distribution of Aegean and Cypriot ceramics and the presence of Cypriot pot-marks on Mycenaean vases: see Hankey 1967, 146-147; Hirschfeld 1999; note, however, that the evidence of pot-marks comes mainly from Stage 4 (LH IIIA2-B) material.

111 Bell’s comparative study of Aegean and Cypriot pottery in selected Levantine contexts is not enlightening on this aspect, as it focuses mostly on quantitative issues and variations in depositional practices among different areas (or ‘zones’) of the Levantine littoral: Bell 2006, chapter 3.

112 Although several of those shapes were extensively imitated in Cyprus in the later part of the 13th century BC: Sherratt 1991, 192-193.
and pouring vessels account for ca. 70 safely identified examples. Vessels of possible ritual/symbolic use (Aegean rhyta and Cypriot bull vases) were also rare (Koehl 2006, 345; Nys 2001, 98). Apparently, Egyptian markets were primarily interested in potted goods. Since Cypriot imports consist mostly of BR I juglets deposited in Stage 2 and 3 contexts (see above) and Aegean ones of Mycenaean LH IIIA2-B (i.e. Stage 4) stirrup jars, it is possible that there was very little chronological overlap between them, although further comparative research is necessary on the subject. This observation, in combination with the rarity of Cypriot pot-marks on Mycenaean vessels from Egypt, may cast doubts on the assumed role of Cypriot merchants for the dissemination of Aegean pottery (see above, note 110) – at least in Egypt – and may also necessitate a reconsideration of standard views on trading routes in Stage 4.

Possible implications for the character of maritime trade
Since there is no consensus as to whether the circulation of pottery in the MBA and LBA Mediterranean was an independent enterprise or subordinate to trade in metals and other precious materials, ceramic evidence should be used with great caution if inferences about the nature of maritime exchanges are to be made. With this in mind, I suggest that a possible implication of this study is that Mediterranean exchanges prior to Stage 4 should be better viewed from a regional rather than an ‘international’ perspective. We have seen that contacts between Cyprus, the Levant, and Egypt increased considerably during Stage 2. We know, also, that by the same time Minoan, Cycladic, and Helladic vases started travelling extensively within the Aegean, and that Mycenaean traders ventured across the Adriatic from LH I onwards, most probably to reach the metal-rich areas of the Aeolian islands and Vivara, where hundreds of Early Mycenaean vases, both open and closed, have been found. Despite increased mobility at the sea, however, very little pottery was exchanged between these two areas, i.e. the 

---

113 The most common shapes being stirrup jars (582), flasks (511), piriform jars (47), and alabastra (31); Judas 2010, 244-245; figures in Judas’ study should be used with caution, as they are not entirely consistent throughout the thesis (see, for example, page 798); such inconsistencies, however, do not seriously affect the statistical value of her conclusions. Note, also, that the large number of Aegean imports in Egypt is mainly due to the Amarna finds, which in Judas’ study account for ca. 1230 entries.

114 Hirschfeld has recorded only 13-15 marked Aegean vessels from Egypt “out of perhaps a thousand LH/LM III sherds and vases”: Hirschfeld 1999, 211-213.

115 For a detailed discussion on the problem of trading routes see Sauvage 2013, chapter 6.


117 We should stress here that apart from small containers from Cyprus, the Levant, and Egypt, considerable quantities of Canaanite jars also circulated from MB IIA; see, for example, the evidence from Tell el-Dab’a, where Canaanite jars formed the vast majority of MB II ceramic imports: Aston 2002; Kopećzyk 2008.


Eastern Mediterranean and the Aegean/Adriatic interface. This may suggest that we are dealing with two distinct and rather unrelated circuits of exchange. Whether this concerns pottery alone or applies to other types of traded goods is not clear. We know that non-ceramic imports in the Aegean during the Minoan Neopalatial period included only a few Cypriot and Levantine items as opposed to several Egyptian luxuries, an imbalance which has been taken to indicate direct, perhaps high-level relations between Egypt and Minoan Crete (the main recipient of imports in the Aegean at the time)\(^\text{120}\). Non-ceramic Aegean exports to the Levant were also very limited (Lambrou-Phillipson 1990, 69-70, 80; Sørensen 2009); yet some textual evidence and the Minoan-style frescoes at Alalakh and Kabri (and Tell el-Dab’a) seem to suggest interaction on the highest level\(^\text{121}\). As for Cyprus, a relative increase in Minoan pottery and non-ceramic imports in LM IA, and the possible derivation of the Cypro-Minoan script from Linear A have been taken to reflect closer links with Crete\(^\text{122}\), but evidence is far from conclusive\(^\text{123}\). To sum up, a wider Aegean involvement in the Eastern Mediterranean circuit of exchanges (and vice versa) at this stage is not supported by pottery data. Non-ceramic evidence may allude to direct links with other Eastern Mediterranean elites, but their nature and frequency are far from clear.

The two regional networks may have started to interact more closely in Stage 3, as suggested by: a) a slight increase of Aegean ceramic imports in Cyprus and the Levant (but not in Egypt); b) an even less impressive increase of Cypriot and Levantine pottery in the Aegean\(^\text{124}\); and c) the evidence from coastal emporia like Kommos (where Levantine, Cypriot, Egyptian, and Italian vases have been found together in LH IIIA1 levels\(^\text{125}\)), and Marsa Matruh (where some Aegean and Cypriot material may date to LH IIIA1\(^\text{126}\)), which may indicate the opening of new southerly routes to the west. Yet, if we consider the sheer amounts of Cypriot and Canaanite vessels circulating in the Levant and Egypt at the same time\(^\text{127}\), and the wide distribution of Mycenaean pottery in the Aegean from LH IIIB/IIIA1 onwards (Mountjoy 1999, 24-27), the volume of ceramic exchanges between the two networks seems too small to have had a real economic impact on either end of the

\(^{120}\) Cline 1994, 92; 1999, 118-119; Phillips 2008, 244-245; note than among the 93 Canaanite jars found in the LBA Aegean, only seven come from safe LM IA-B contexts: Cline 1994, cat. nos. 325, 328-330, 385-387.

\(^{121}\) Most recently Sorensen 2009; textual evidence, however, comes exclusively from 18th century Mari and most probably predates Stage 2.

\(^{122}\) Cadogan 2005, 314-316; Graziadio 2005; see also Van Wijngaarden 2007, 459-461; Catling has suggested links between Cyprus and Thera: Catling 1980, 11-12.

\(^{123}\) Not the least because many LM IA imports come from a single tomb at Toumba tou Skourou (tomb I): Sorensen 2008, 158.

\(^{124}\) Less than 10 Cypriot and Levantine ceramic imports are listed by Cline as coming from safe LM II/LH IIIA1 contexts other than Kommos: Cline 1994, tables 65 and 66; for Kommos see following note.

\(^{125}\) Watrous 1992, 157-164.


\(^{127}\) For the wide distribution of Canaanite jars see Killebrew 2007.
chain. The small quantities of non-ceramic orientalia arriving at the Aegean in the same time (Cline 1994, passim) may point to a similar conclusion. International exchanges increased evidently in Stage 4. The Ulu Burun and Cape Gelidonya cargoes and the considerable number of orientalia found in the Aegean suggest more regular contact with the east. Yet, in terms of pottery, a striking imbalance appears: by contrast to thousands of Aegean containers and dining vessels travelling eastwards, relatively small amounts of oriental pottery circulated in the west. Cline lists ca. 70 Cypriot and Levantine vessels (mostly Canaanite jars) from Aegean contexts of that period. Even if we add the 135 Cypriot and 149 Canaanite jars from Ulu Burun, figures are still much lower than those of Aegean exports to the east (and this will hold true even if we assume that many more Cypriot sherds remain unrecognized in Aegean contexts). As for Cypriot products travelling further west (Italy, Sicily, and Sardinia), they were surprisingly few in number too. If we also take into account the possible decline of Cypriot export trade to Egypt and Palestine in the 13th century BC, the rather small numbers of Cypriot and Aegean ceramics in Anatolia in that period, and the fact that Italy did not experience an influx of Aegean vessels in LH IIIA2-B comparable to that seen in Cyprus and the Levant (Van Wijngaarden 2002, 262), I believe there are good grounds to suggest that the sharp increase of Aegean ceramic exports to the east in Stage 4 was not so much the result of an overall increase in the circulation of potted goods by sea, but the outcome of a sustained (and apparently successful) Mycenaean effort to penetrate the profitable oriental markets – no matter whether this took the form of an independent enterprise or was conducted through Cypriot middlemen (see above, note 110).

The standardization of Aegean TCL in that period and the concurrent specialization of Mycenaean palatial economy in products long appreciated in the east (e.g. perfumed oils and wine) were probably related to such an attempt. The same is

---

126 For a discussion on the relatively small number and distribution of oriental imports in the Aegean in Stage 3 see Papadimitriou/Kriga 2012, 14-16.

127 Mostly in Mycenaean palatial sites and at the Cretan harbour of Kommos: Cline 1994, 16 table 6, 19 table 9.

128 Cline 1994, tables 65 and 66 (numbers refer only to LH/LM IIIA2, IIIA2-B and IIIB contexts, not to undistinguishable LH/LM IIIA-B or LH/LM III ones).


130 Vagnetti 2001, where it is also stressed that Cypriot ceramic trade with Italy, Sicily, and Sardinia was limited to the later part of the LBA (Stage 4 or LH IIIA2-B); metal imports (oxide ingots) in Sardinia are also not earlier than LH IIIB: Lo Schiavo 2001; for Aegean imports see Vagnetti 1993; Van Wijngaarden 2002.


132 For the sharp rise in the number of standardized containers in that period see Mountjoy 1999, 30-32; for the production of perfumed oil in the LH IIIA2-B Aegean see Foster 1974; Shelmerdine 1985; Fappas 2010 (Fappas is right to suggest that the production of perfumes was not an exclusively palatial affair: Fappas 2010, 321-323; the number of small containers produced in areas without known "palatial" buildings, such as Rhodes, is also considerable: Mountjoy 1999, 983-985); for wine, see Palmer 1994 (including references to earlier, Minoan, production).
true for the attested production of fine tableware with pictorial decoration exclusively for export purposes in workshops located in the Argolid from LH IIIA2 onwards (Sherratt 1999, 166-167). The latter may have been instrumental for the success of Aegean trade with Cyprus and the Levant. Indeed, while the possible disruption in Egypto-Cypriot relations after the Amarna period may have left a gap to be filled by Mycenaean potted goods in Egyptian markets, in Cyprus itself and the Levant (at least its northern part, which retained close relations with the island until the end of the LBA), the Mycenaeans may have needed something more than better packaging of common products in order to gain a competing edge over the long-standing Cypriot wares. It is possible that this ‘something’ was found in the introduction of a novel kind of imagery consisting of compositional figured scenes – a kind of art previously restricted to elite contexts – on a common medium like pottery. The aristocratic connotations of pictorial vases (especially chariot kraters, which were very popular in Cyprus, frequent in the Levant, but virtually absent in Egypt) has been stressed by several scholars. Some have even suggested that the production of chariot kraters reflects a kind of Mycenaean ‘marketing strategy’, addressing the ideological needs of urban ‘sub-elites’ (Sherratt 1999, 187-188; Dabney 2007). This seems highly probable, although the fact that the pictorial style became so popular in a major centre of ceramic trade like Cyprus and was actively emulated by local potters at the end of the LBA may suggest that the new form of artistic expression had wider cultural implications, which are not yet fully appreciated.

The noted imbalance in the circulation of pottery in Stage 4 seems to recast questions concerning the goods that were exchanged for Aegean vases and the overall frequency of ‘international’ commercial enterprises (for ships will not have sailed in one direction only), making further research necessary (see also Manning/Hulin 2005, 282-286). Future studies should try, among others, to integrate ceramic and non-ceramic data in order to offer a wider perspective of LBA.

---

135 For the possible reasons of such a disruption see Merrillees 1968, 202; Eriksson 2007, 32-33.
136 For earlier pictorial scenes on pottery and other media from Cyprus see Papadopoulos 2011, 174. Sealstones were the only known objects (other than Mycenaean pottery) with representational iconography that circulated widely in the Eastern Mediterranean during the Late Bronze Age; the rest of the (movable) objects that carried compositional imagery were luxurious and largely restricted to elite contexts (ivory items and fittings, metal vessels and weapons, gold appliqués, etc.): see Feldman 2006.
137 Cyprus was the main recipient of Mycenaean pictorial vases beyond the Aegean. In a 1982 catalogue, it accounts for ca. 260 examples out of a total of ca. 320 found around the Eastern Mediterranean: Vermeule/Karageorghis 1982. It was also the first place in the Eastern Mediterranean where pictorial vessels were exported in LH IIIA1: Vermeule/Karageorghis 1982, 7.
138 Which, otherwise, has produced the largest number of chariot representations in the Late Bronze Age: Feldman/Sauvage 2010, 162.
trade patterns in the Mediterranean, taking also into account organizational differences between Egypt, which was politically centralized and had a few entry points for imported goods, and the Levant, which had a very long coastline and consisted of many states with varied degree of dependence upon the empires of the Hittites, Mitanni, and Egypt.

The aim of this paper was to outline major developments in the circulation of Aegean and Cypriot pottery and formulate questions arising from their comparative examination. It has been suggested that for most of the 2nd millennium BC, maritime circulation of pottery took place along distinct regional circuits of exchange. The Eastern Mediterranean circuit was largely dominated by Cypriot wares, with only sporadic Aegean presence of minor economic significance. It was only in Stage 4 (LH IIIA2-B, the Mycenaean palatial period) that Aegean vessels started arriving there regularly, although it is clear that they did not manage to displace or even outnumber Cypriot products everywhere. The belated Aegean involvement in the East may not have been the result of an overall ‘internationalization’ in pottery trade but of a largely unilateral attempt by the newly emerged Mycenaean states to penetrate a long-established and profitable exchange network, in a maritime economy which may have retained its strong regional character until the very end of the LBA.
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