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Ancient migration or ancient mobility?
Perspectives from Cyprus

Anastasia Christophilopoulou
The Fitzwilliam Museum

ABSTRACT

This paper addresses the topic of population movement and mobility by closely examining a specific period of antiquity and a specific area, which was the central node in the system. The period under examination is the Iron Age (ca 1200–600 BC) in the Eastern Mediterranean, when, arguably, sweeping movements between the Aegean and the Near East, but also dynamic individual and entrepreneurial movement occurred, while the focus area is the region of Cyprus-Cilicia.

The aim of this paper is to study the evidence for people moving in, to, and through the Cyprus-Cilicia area during the Iron Age; and to use this to draw conclusions about the nature of population movements at this time. We approach the subject with a wide lens perspective, incorporating evidence from archaeology, material culture studies and ancient history; addressing two core questions: socio-political changes in the Mediterranean and their influence on Cypriot activity overseas, and how did Cypriot connections with each area differ? Finally, we hope this paper will generate a discussion on the implications of mobility and migration through history up to the present day.

INTRODUCTION

Issues of population movement and mobility during the Iron Age (ca 1200–600 BC) in the Eastern Mediterranean are of considerable importance. In this paper we examine evidence for population movement and mobility (or the absence of) in the combined region of Cyprus-Cilicia; the crucial crossroads between the Levantine city-states and Mesopotamian empires on the one hand (and onward to the rest of the Near East), and the emerging polities of Anatolia and the Aegean on the other (and onward to the rest of the Mediterranean and continental Europe).

Questions of mobility and a framing of the Mediterranean regions based on connectivity, rather than disciplinary and modern political boundaries, as well as a diachronic consideration of migration, are central to Being an Islander, a four-year research project resident at the University of Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, which aims to elucidate what defines island identity versus mainland identity in the Mediterranean.¹ Under the aegis of this project, we also explore the topics of migration and mobility during the Iron Age, with an emphasis on

¹ The research project Being an Islander: Art and Identity of the Large Mediterranean Islands 2019–2023 aims to elucidate what defines island identity in the Mediterranean, by exploring how insularity affected and shaped cultural identities using the examples of ancient Crete, Cyprus and Sardinia. Research is being undertaken by a team of eight specialists. For full information see: https://beta.fitz.ms/research/projects/being-an-islander-art-and-identity-of-the-large-mediterranean-islands
the regions of Cyprus and Cilicia, aiming to highlight various historical situations in which insularity worked to diminish boundaries and promote a sense of “all around connectivity”.

I begin with a very brief survey of polities and communities during the Iron Age in the two regions, before discussing evidence of interaction between them and considering broader questions of insularity and mobility in the wider region.

THE VIEW FROM CYPRUS

In Cyprus, archaeological evidence has revealed the existence of several settlements with a leading role during the Early Iron Age (EIA). The politico-economic segmentation of the island continued after the Late Bronze Age (LBA) with sites, either at a small distance from the coast (e.g. Kition) or inland (e.g. Alasia), developing into leading administrative centres. Archaeological research has demonstrated that material and cultural continuities and discontinuities define the relationship of the EIA (ca 1125–707 BC) with the preceding period.

By the start of the Cypro-Archaic (CA) period (ca 750–ca 480 BC), although settlement evidence remains poor, royal inscriptions and coins struck by state leaders constitute a remarkable guide for the identification of the polities of this period. While we need to be cautious when employing methodological models tailored for the “international era” of the LBA states to the EIA evidence, fundamental settlement continuities define the transition from the LBA to the EIA. Several sites that were not abandoned and continued to accommodate urban settlements in the Iron Age, and others established late in the LBA with continuous habitation into the Cypro-Geometric (CG) period, testify to this.

Cypriot administrative centres, such as Palaepaphos and Kition, were not abandoned and continued to accommodate urban settlements. Idalion was established late in the LBA (the Swedish Cyprus Expedition posited a Late Cypriot (LC) III, 1200–1050 BC, foundation for the structures on the west acropolis, and an occupation consisting of a fortified settlement with a shrine) and in the Iron Age acquired the status of a leading regional centre. The thriving LBA urban settlement of Enkomi gradually relocated towards the end of LC IIIA (ca 1200–1150 BC) to Salamis, the city that was destined to become an Iron Age metropolis. Like Salamis, new settlements emerged throughout the island, such as Kourion, Amathus Marion and Soloi. Most of the newly founded sites of the EIA were in command of natural harbours and indicate that the economy continued to be based on sea-borne trade and that the inception of the Age of Iron did not end the copper industry.

Equally, Cypriot pottery and its circulation abroad imply that Cypriot harbours continued to participate in trade networks in the Mediterranean during the EIA, maintaining contact with sites to the east, almost without interruption. Looking westwards, during the 12th century BC contacts with the Aegean were reduced progressively and, finally, before the beginning of the 11th century, they appear to have been interrupted. Crete seems to be the main exception here. During the 11th century BC, Cypriot luxury metalwork objects similar to those

---

2 Horden and Purcell 2000, 225: for relevant discussion, see also D’Agata in this volume.
5 Feldman 2018.
6 Iacovou 2007, 466.
7 Hadjicosti 1999, 35–54; Gaber 2008, 54.
8 Yon 1999, 17.
11 Bell 2006; Mountjoy 2018, 179–96.
12 Iacovou 2020, 247–72: for a recent discussion on Cypriot imports and links to the Aegean and the central Mediterranean, see also Zervaki in this volume.
deposited in rich CG I tombs at Palaepaphos, Salamis, Amathus and Lapithos were placed in Cretan tombs. This led to the suggestion that connections between the two islands exclusively involved the elite levels of the respective societies. However, these contacts seem more to be one-way exports of Cypriot artefacts to a specific area and should not be described as interconnections.

THE VIEW FROM CILICIA

The Limonlu River naturally divided ancient Cilicia into Cilicia Trachaea (Rough Cilicia) and Cilicia Pedias (Plain Cilicia). Cilicia Trachaea is a rugged mountain district formed by the spurs of Taurus, a feature that, in classical times, made the coast a string of havens for pirates. Plain Cilicia (Κιλικία Πεδιάς; Assyrian Que), to the east, is an alluvial fan covering approximately 8000 sq. km and one of the most fertile regions in modern-day Turkey (Fig. 1). Natural passes through the mountains give access to the neighbouring regions, e.g., the Göksu Valley connects Plain to Rough Cilicia. While the influence of the Assyrian empire in Cilicia before the 8th century BC needs to be assessed in the context of the manifold intercultural contacts in the region, around the late 8th and beginning of the 7th century BC Cilicia became subject to the Assyrians. Under the Persians (from the 6th to the 4th centuries BC), the district enjoyed semi-autonomous status until it came successively under Macedonian and Seleucid rule. In the 1st century BC, Cilicia became a Roman province and the city of Salamis became part of the Roman administration of the region of Cilicia during the Roman period.

The fertile alluvial plain (Cilicia Pedias) allows both dry farming and irrigation agriculture, which have supported a dense settlement pattern since the Neolithic period. Archaeological exploration of the area, as well as research on the relevance of the archaeological picture of Cyprus to that of Cilicia, started in the 1930s, when Gjerstad conducted surveys looking for parallels to what he had found in Cyprus. The archaeological richness of the region has been well known since the early excavations at Tarsus Gözlükule, Kinet Höyük, Mersin-Yumuktepe, Kazanlı Höyük, Sirkeli Höyük, Karatepe Aslantaş and Tatarlı Höyük as well as in Misis. New data has been steadily accumulating, providing insights into the cultural history and archaeology of the Cilician plain. These include the results of a number of recent workshops which have established a solid Cilician chronology, based on a thorough comparative stratigraphy of all old and newly investigated sites.

Tarsus (Gözlükule) was excavated in the late 1930s and again after World War II by Goldman, revealing a quantity of Aegean-type material, found mostly in post-Hittite levels. Further work was undertaken after 1974 with the aim of assessing the Tarsus material and establishing the relationship between the Aegean-type wares and the local material but these efforts did not prove very successful. Garstang conducted surveys at Kazanlı Höyük and a small test excavation in the late 1930s, in which evidence of Helladic and Hellado-Cilician wares of the 12th century BC was found.

14 Matthäus 1998, 141.
15 Novák et al. 2017, 151.
17 Fox 2009, 216.
18 Karageorghis 1969.
19 Gjerstad 1934, 155–203.
20 Gjerstad 1934, 155–203; French 2013, 479–85.
22 Novák et al. 2017, 152.
Kilise Tepe, a mound that dominates the valley of the River Göksu, is a site that offers a prime opportunity to monitor the changing relationship between the Anatolian interior and the coast at different periods of time. Postgate led a rescue excavation in the 1990s, while a second phase of the project was conducted jointly by the Universities of Cambridge and Newcastle until 2012. Late Iron Age occupation revealed around the southeast and southwest areas of the Stele Building was associated with a number of kilns, one containing a mass of homogeneous ceramics in the style of Cypriot “White Painted (WP) IV” and “Plain White (PW) IV”, dated around 700–650 BC. Petrographic analysis of these assemblages confirmed that they were made on site. However, the compressed stratification of the area made it impossible to understand the exact sequence of events during the half millennium before 650 BC on the site.

Kinet Höyük is a steep, triangular mound, located on the modern seashore at the rear of Iskenderun Bay (İskenderun Körfezi). Excavations were conducted on the mound’s top, slopes and in its immediate periphery by a Bilkent University (Ankara) project from 1992–2012, revealing continuous occupation from the Early Bronze Age to the Late Iron Age and also evidence of Hellenistic and Medieval occupation. By the late 11th or early 10th century, Kinet reached an urban format and was re-integrated into a common Cypro-Cilician culture that marked the onset of the Middle Iron Age in this region.

30 Gates 2013, 488.
The EIA (Phase III.3) period at Kinet Höyük, a phase that is predominantly non-architectural, has produced excavated pottery which includes local variants of Late Helladic (LH) IIIC, as well as CG I/II and other 11th-century ceramic material.\(^\text{31}\) The Middle Iron Age period (Phase III.2) produced some CG II–III vessels and CG III imports dated around the 9th and early 8th centuries BC. The late 8th century BC period revealed monumental architecture associated with Cypro-Cilician pottery and destruction levels associated with Euboean imports. During the last phase, Aegeanising types and imports from the Aegean but not from Cyprus characterise the ceramic assemblage.\(^\text{32}\)

The picture emerging from sites such as Tarsus Gözlükule, Kilise Tepe and Kinet Höyük is that they hold key evidence for our understanding of Cilicia’s economic interaction in the Eastern Mediterranean and with Cyprus in particular. The excavated data so far suggest limited imports from the Aegean and possibly Cyprus during the period of the Late Hittite Empire (1400–1200 BC) in Cilicia and a significant increase during the 12th and 11th centuries BC when LH IIIC pottery was also produced locally.\(^\text{33}\) The relatively narrow trade may have been the result of a positive restriction by authorities, a situation that seems to correspond with evidence from western Anatolia.\(^\text{34}\)

**EVIDENCE OF INTERACTION BETWEEN CYPRUS AND CILICIA DURING THE IRON AGE**

In this section, we present evidence for the interaction between Cyprus and Cilicia during the Iron Age, as well as a few later examples that help to frame the debate. We are interested in whether this interaction can be understood by assuming that the two regions shared cultural characteristics or practices, based on architectural evidence and material culture.

This interaction is mostly manifested by the presence of Cypriot Iron Age WP and Bichrome wares in Cilicia. The long timespan of Cypriot WP Ware (1050–300 BC) has largely been interpreted chronologically rather than in a regionally meaningful way.\(^\text{35}\) As examples of this ware typically occur from the Karpas Peninsula to the Troodos and from there to the west coast, more work that integrates contextual and petrographic studies is needed to clarify regional sub-groups of this large ware family.

Cilicia shows evidence of contact with Cyprus through a variety of imported Cypriot shapes found locally (open and closed forms, bowls, jugs, footed cups, amphorae and amphoriskoi). Large quantities of WP ware at Kinet Höyük suggest extensive local production in imitation of Cypriot Iron Age styles until the 8th century BC, while later the influence seems to shift to Aegean types.\(^\text{36}\) The cultural assemblage of Kinet Höyük’s initial Iron Age settlement indicates a departure from its LBA urban structure, which was oriented around harbours and maritime business. Instead, the site seems to have been newly occupied by a population for whom animal processing was a major activity.\(^\text{37}\) The arrival of Kinet Höyük’s pastoralists can be linked to the breakdown of formal territorial boundaries along the Hittite Empire’s southeast periphery after 1200 BC.\(^\text{38}\)

Another typological category relevant to the interaction of Cyprus and Cilicia is the so-called “basket-handle” amphora spanning the 7th to the 3rd centuries BC. “Basket-handle” amphorae originated in Cyprus and for a long time were considered purely Cypriot. However, it seems that they were also manufactured in Rough Cilicia.


\(^{32}\) Novák et al. 2017, 180.


\(^{36}\) Karacic and Osborne 2016.


\(^{38}\) Sader 2000, 72–5.
and perhaps other centres, such as Phoenicia, the southern coast of Israel and Alexandria. While the Egyptian “basket-handle” containers are easily recognised by their fabric, other fabrics and therefore regions of production are difficult to distinguish. They typically carried olive oil and wine as well as occasionally solid foods and, while more integrated pottery and residue analysis is needed in order to understand the relationship between transport vessels and the movement and interaction of people in this region, we can assume that wine or olive oil transported in these containers was produced in the Cypro-Cilician area.

Other isolated types of material also testify to this interaction. At the Fitzwilliam Museum a scaraboid stamp seal featuring a fish-man accompanied by a Cypriot (Greek) syllabic inscription, dated around the 7th to the 5th centuries BC, was discovered in Cilicia (Fig. 2). The inscription is incorporated into the object’s decoration, next to the fish-man’s head. The owner of the seal is named as Philos. Common seals, such as this example, were associated with different social classes and are indicative of the identity of craftsmen or, more generally, of people with high mobility across the Cyprus-Cilicia region. Another isolated example is a sherd containing a short Cypro-syllabic inscription discovered during the 2007 excavations at Kilise Tepe. The sherd was part of a shallow bowl with incised signs on the interior, just below the rim, linked to an Iron Age deposit containing WP IV pottery. In the 8th century BC, the region’s multicultural character – unified under the rule of the dynasty of Mopsos – was reflected in bilingual inscriptions written both in Indo-European hieroglyphic Luwian and West Semitic Phoenician.

Three further examples of bilingual inscriptions from Cilicia and Cyprus help advance the discussion on the interactions of the two regions. The first one is the Karatepe bilingual inscription, also known as the Azatiwada inscription, written in Phoenician and Luwian languages and dated to the 8th century BC. The second example is

---

41 Postgate 2017.
the Çineköy inscription, another Hieroglyphic Luwian-Phoenician bilingual inscription, discovered near Çine, Adana, also dated to the 8th century BC.¹⁴ Both the Karatepe and Çineköy inscriptions trace the activities of the kings of ancient Adana from the “house of Mopsos”.¹⁵

Albeit from a much later period (389 BC), I would like to discuss the previous two inscriptions in relation to another case of a bilingual inscription from Cyprus – the inscription from the Sanctuary of Reshef-Apollo at the city of Idalion. The inscription, now in the collection of the British Museum, is a statue base bearing writing in Phoenician (top) and Cypriot Syllabic (bottom) (Fig. 3). Both texts record the dedication of a statue by Lord Baalrom son of Abdimilk in the fourth year of the reign of King Milkyaton of Kition and Idalion. The statue is offered to Reshef in the Phoenician text and to Apollo in the Greek text.¹⁶ The site of Idalion, influenced by both Greek-speaking and Phoenician-speaking areas, initially produced inscriptions in Greek and later also in Phoenician. The Idalion inscription dates from the reign of king Milkyaton, when the city was a thriving settlement with an ethnically mixed population sharing cult places.

Looking at the above, it remains difficult to present firm evidence for Cyprus-Cilicia interactions during the Iron Age. Some researchers have suggested the existence of a koiné between the plains of Cilicia and Cyprus, but this cannot be proven based on the evidence we currently possess.¹⁷ Imported Cypriot pottery is rare, and none has been discovered in funerary contexts in Cilicia. More material needs to be analysed from other contexts and sites in order to establish the percentage of Cypriot imports versus local imitations; more studies are needed to better understand the role of Cypriot imitations in Rough Cilicia, as well as the role of pottery in interregional

---

¹⁴ Hawkins 2017, 211–16.
¹⁷ Novák 2010, 408.
exchange between Cyprus and Cilicia in general.\footnote{Karacic and Osborne 2016.} Moreover, further work is needed to establish patterns of new burial customs (e.g. rock cut tombs with long \textit{dromoi}) that appear in Cilicia at the time and suggest the arrival of new customs.\footnote{Knapp 2008.}

\section*{CONCLUSIONS}

Cyprus has long been a focus of debate in terms of settlement evolution and socio-political organisation during the Iron Age. Research in Cilicia is quickly adapting to addressing the same topics and a growing community of researchers is examining these themes across the two shores. However, migration and the hybridisation of cultures across Cyprus and Cilicia still need to be considered more deeply and applied to the changing body of evidence. One reason for the reluctance to address these topics is the overemphasis on the large migrations from the western Aegean to the eastern Aegean during the EIA.\footnote{Huxley 1966; Hodos 2009, 221–41; Mac Sweeney 2016, 411–12.}

It has also been suggested that the mainland of Cilicia and the island of Cyprus may be understood as a single integrated region during the EIA, or operating under a cultural koiné, based on cultural commonalities shared across the two regions.\footnote{Mac Sweeney 2016, 411–28.} These interpretations, however, can be challenged, given how limited the supporting evidence is.

Others have argued that the prevailing trend in Cyprus already during the 11th century BC represents a new kind of elite identity and that the identities of migrants and local peoples were therefore altered because of cultural encounters and mixings – social processes here defined as aspects of hybridisation. This makes the visibility of any other migrants or migrant communities even more difficult. The widespread use of Proto White Painted (PWP) pottery in EIA Cyprus reflects an amalgamation of Cypriot and Aegean trends, and along with new mortuary traditions may represent the migrants’ attempts to adopt a local Cypriot identity.\footnote{Knapp 2008.}

Whether we consider it from an island or a mainland perspective, the theme of migration in archaeology remains divisive and elusive. In fact, it remains divisive in other disciplines as well, whether we examine the phenomenon in an organised and substantial way, or observe it in a “random walk” (to use the term first introduced by Pearson in 1905) or a “Brownian motion” way (borrowing the term from the study of population movements in sociology).\footnote{Pearson 1905, 294–342.} In its modern sense, there is not a universally accepted definition for migration; or rather, there are many definitions of human migration. For instance, migration can be defined as the process of moving, either across a defined border or within a state; it is a population movement, encompassing any kind of movement of people, whatever its length, composition and causes; it includes migration of refugees, displaced persons and economic migrants.\footnote{Opeskin et al. 2012, 18–22; Knapp 2021.} One could argue that the scale and synthesis of possible migration in the context of the EIA Cyprus–Cilicia region was far more linear than the paradigms of modern day migrations.

No matter its definition, migration remains a crucial characteristic of both the ancient and modern worlds. Today migration is a defining global issue and documenting it requires examining both quantitative and qualitative aspects, many of them interdisciplinary by nature. Recent evidence of large-scale migrations shows that, when these flows are undocumented, it is very hard to prove that they happened, as they leave very little ma-
Two recently documented examples of migration to the Aegean from the Near East testify to this situation. Migrants arriving at the Moria migrant camp in Lesbos, Greece, reached 20,000 persons in February 2020. The camp was originally built as temporary accommodation with a maximum capacity of 3,100. These latest figures include more than 1,000 unaccompanied minors, while a similar situation emerges for the migrant camp of Karatepe, also on the island of Lesbos. When a devastating fire broke out at the Moria camp in September 2020, leaving 13,000 migrants without shelter, the destroyed camp was dismantled within days and the migrants were relocated to different temporary facilities. These recently documented examples indicate that even large-scale migrations and population movements leave very little material traces. This observation, paired with the fact that ancient migrations were not accompanied by modern-day statistics and a large digital footprint, shows that our ability to construe the scale of ancient migrations based on architecture, material culture or textual remains alone can be considerably flawed.

Another contemporary example is the wave of Cypriot immigrants to the United Kingdom, that started in 1902 and increased dramatically during 1955–1959, when violence on the island intensified during the anti-colonial struggles. Today, the exact size of the Greek Cypriot expatriate community is difficult to determine, as is any concrete evidence of the ethnolinguistic character of the community versus the wider population. Language is a key characteristic here, because, although these heritage communities still proclaim it as an important part of their island identity, it is almost completely assimilated, as English with certain Cypriot idioms is the main form of communication. Looking back to the examples of the Çineköy and Idalion bilingual inscriptions, it appears that strong material and linguistic evidence may appear in the archaeological record to be indisputable proof of the presence of a foreign/migrant, culturally or ethnically different group, but could have been perceived by the contemporary population as already part of their local, hybrid and shared identity. Secondly, a migrant community may project strong cultural ties and memory with the motherland, while no longer displaying material or linguistic evidence of these affinities. This is demonstrated by the contemporary example of the Cypriot heritage community and urges us to think it could be more prominent in the case of past societies, where the absence of clear material culture makes the presence of migrants even more invisible to us. This assumption leads us to consider a bigger question. To what extent does material culture distribution correlate to the actual movement of people? We also need to consider the type of material culture people carry when they relocate, as these kinds of artefacts may not always indicate the presence of incoming groups in the archaeological record (e.g., portable artefacts).

Following Knapp’s suggestion that the rich Mediterranean archaeological record, and within that the Cypriot in particular, could benefit enormously from comparative approaches that engage deeper research issues and priorities around insularity, connectivity and migration, I argue that the use of contemporary examples, helping us to rethink our understanding of migration and ancient migrant communities, may be of benefit. In order to better understand processes of population movements and migrations in the ancient world, particularly where we lack concrete evidence of how exactly these might have taken place, we need to think of migration in a broader diachronic context, including introducing analogies from contemporary waves of migration.

Moving away from longstanding assumptions of equal rates of cultural progress and change between mainlands and islands and, conversely, in the EIA to the Classical Cypriot horizon, the insistence on focusing on
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Greek and Phoenician “colonisation” episodes, we also need to pay attention to the influence migrant groups or individuals had in vibrant Cypriot centres, like Enkomi, Paphos and Kition. These groups were neither invaders nor colonists but they subsequently contributed a lot in producing hybridised identities across the island. The key to understanding the elusive interactions of Cyprus with the Near East and Cilicia, in particular, also lies in reconceptualising peoples’ movements and memories in terms of connectivity, maritime interactions, materiality and co-presence.
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