

POCA 2007

POCA 2007:
Postgraduate Cypriot Archaeology Conference

Edited by

Skevi Christodoulou and Anna Satraki

**CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS**

P U B L I S H I N G

POCA 2007: Postgraduate Cypriot Archaeology Conference,
Edited by Skevi Christodoulou and Anna Satraki

This book first published 2010

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2010 by Skevi Christodoulou and Anna Satraki and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-2571-9, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-2571-9

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures	vii
List of Tables	xiv
List of Appendices.....	xv
Preface	xvi
Petition.....	xx
List of Abbreviations	xxiii
From Typology to Population Genetics: Biodistance in Cyprus	1
<i>Nathan K. Harper</i>	
Chasing Johnny One-Flake: Recent Fieldwork into Hunter-Gatherer Movements across Cyprus <i>Sandra Rosendahl and Carole McCartney</i>	39
Lithics in Context: Formation Processes at Ayia Varvara-Asprokremnos <i>Carole McCartney and Marianna Ktori</i>	57
Plain Wares - What's in a name? How do they look? Where do they come from? How were they made? Why study plain wares? <i>Ariane Jacobs</i>	75
Cypriot and Levantine cooking pots during the Late Bronze-Iron Age period: a social perspective <i>Federica Spagnoli</i>	99
Discussing Bronze Age Cypriot Iconography: Three Case Studies <i>Angelos Papadopoulos</i>	127

The Background of the Cypriot Ram God's Iconography <i>Kathrin Kleibl</i>	145
Between <i>Iadnana</i> and <i>Kittim</i> : Eastern Views of Archaic Cyprus <i>Anna Cannavò</i>	169
The Archaeology of the Cypriot <i>Basileis</i> : Manifestations of Royal Authority in Iron Age Cyprus <i>Anna Satraki</i>	197
Some Thoughts about the Civic Community in Archaic and Classical Cyprus <i>Sidonie Lejeune</i>	219
Core-formed Glass Vessels on Cyprus Reconsidered <i>Peter Cosyns and Karin Nys</i>	231
In Research of Nea Paphos' Lighthouse: New and Old Theories Concerning its Existence and Location <i>Dimitris Vitas</i>	263
Epigraphic Evidence on Baths and Water Supply in Hellenistic and Roman Cyprus <i>Skevi Christodoulou</i>	281
Mediaeval and Post-Mediaeval Graffiti in the Churches of Cyprus <i>Mia Gaia Trentin</i>	297
The Social Value of Decoration in Cyprus under Ottoman Rule: Ceramic Decoration in Churches <i>Iosif Hadjikyriakos</i>	323
The Paphos Mosaics: Results of a Preliminary Condition Survey <i>Niki Savvides</i>	337
Contributors	355

LIST OF FIGURES

- Fig. 1-1: Plot of CAN1 and CAN2 accounting for 67% of variation
- Fig. 1-2: Plot of CAN1 and CAN2 accounting for 54% of variation
- Fig. 1-3: A plot of observed phenotypic variance against genetic distance from the centroid. The line represents the expected regression of these two variables. Samples falling below the line can be considered to have very little external gene flow. Samples above the line show more than average external gene flow
- Fig. 1-4: Plot of first two principal components of the scaled unbiased R-matrix. The first PC accounts for 44% of variation while the second PC accounts for 36%
- Fig. 2-1: Map of Cyprus with selected sites from the Akrotiri Phase to the Late Aceramic Neolithic (Khirokitia Culture)
- Fig. 2-2: An outline of the theoretical chronology of the process of Landscape Learning depending on the presence of a resident population in the new territory. The initial colonisation of Cyprus would have been reasonably slow but aided by the relatively high environmental similarity to the potential Levantine homeland. Persisting homeland contact is considered to be delaying factor in the process of familiarising oneself with a new landscape (Adapted from Meltzer 2003, 225)
- Fig. 2-3: Chert Source and Quarry distribution along the boundary zone between the chert-carrying Lefkara belt and the Pillow Lava zone
- Fig. 2-4: Distribution of Sites and Quarries in the EENC survey area
- Fig. 3-1: Map of Cyprus showing location of EENC project area and the site of Ayia Varvara-Asprorkemnos
- Fig. 3-2: Location of trenches sampled
- Fig. 3-3: Abraded ceramics from Ayia Varvara-Asprokremnos (Photo: Carole McCartney)
- Fig. 4-1: Base fragment with gritty underground from Alassa-Pano *Mandilaris* (Kourion Museum. Photo: Ariane Jacobs)
- Fig. 4-2: Wheel made base fragment with gritty underground from Alassa-Pano *Mandilaris* (Kourion Museum. Photo: Ariane Jacobs)
- Fig. 4-3: Body fragment with voids from Alassa-Pano *Mandilaris* (Kourion Museum. Photo: Ariane Jacobs)
- Fig. 4-4: Rim fragment with elongated voids aligned horizontally from Alassa-Pano *Mandilaris* (Kourion Museum. Photo: Ariane Jacobs)
- Fig. 5-1: Cooking pot *Type 1* from Hazor, *stratum* XIII, 13th century BC (Photo: Yadin *et al.*, pl. CLXIII:2, scale 1:5)
- Fig. 5-2: Cooking pot *Type 2a* from Hazor, *strata* VII-VI, 9th - first half of 8th century BC (Photo: Yadin *et al.*, pl. CCXV:9, scale 1:5)

- Fig. 5-3: Cooking pot *Type 2a* from Lachish, level IV, 9th century BC (Photo: Zimhoni 1997, fig. 3.37:7, scale 1:5)
- Fig. 5-4: Cooking pot *Type 2a.1* from Tell Arqa, phase K, Late Bronze II (Photo: Thalmann et al., pl. 121:3, scale 1:5)
- Fig. 5-5: *Type 2a* cooking pot from Kition-*Kathari*, Late Cypriot IIIB:2-Cypro Geometric I (Karageorghis and Demas 1984b, pl. CLVII: 2000. Larnaka District Archaeological Museum. Photo: Federica Spagnoli)
- Fig. 5-6: *Type 2a* cooking pot from the Necropolis of Palaepaphos-*Skales*, T.80, second half of 9th century BC (Photo: Karageorghis 1983, fig. CLIV:61, scale 1:5)
- Fig. 5-7: *Type 2b* from Tell Aitun, level I, second half of 9th century BC (photo: Zimhoni 1985, fig. 4.5:11, scale 1:5)
- Fig. 5-8: Cooking pot *Type 3a* from the Necropolis of Morphou-*Toumba tou Skourou*, T.VI, Late Cypriot IIA (Vermeule and Wolsky 1990, P1106. Cyprus Museum, Nicosia. Photo: Federica Spagnoli)
- Fig. 5-9: Cooking pot *Type 3a* from the Necropolis of Morphou-*Toumba tou Skourou*, T.V, Late Cypriot IIA (Vermeule and Wolsky 1990, P954-N. Cyprus Museum, Nicosia. Photo: Federica Spagnoli)
- Fig. 5-10: Cooking pot *Type 3a* from Pyla-*Kokkinokremos*, Late Cypriot IIC-III A (Karageorghis and Demas 1984a, pl. XX:102. Larnaka District Archaeological Museum. Photo: Federica Spagnoli)
- Fig. 5-11: Hand-made cooking pot *Type 3b* from Alassa-*Pano Mandilaris*, Late Cypriot IIIA (Excavations 1984, n. 67. Limassol District Archaeological Museum. Photo: Federica Spagnoli)
- Fig. 5-12: Hand-made cooking pot *Type 3b* from Kalavastos-*Ayios Dhimitrios*, Late Cypriot IIIA (K-AD 1918. Larnaka District Archaeological Museum. Photo: Federica Spagnoli)
- Fig. 5-13: Hand-made cooking pot *Type 3b* from Pyla-*Kokkinokremos*, Late Cypriot IIC-III A (Karageorghis and Demas 1984a, pl. XX:102. Larnaka District Archaeological Museum. Photo: Federica Spagnoli)
- Fig. 5-14: Red-Polished Ware cooking pot from Alambra-*Mouttes*, Early Cypriot I-Middle Cypriot II (Barlow 1982, fig. 12:B70. Cyprus Museum, Nicosia. Photo: Federica Spagnoli)
- Fig. 5-15: Wheel made cooking pot *Type 3b* from Kition, floor IV, Late Cypriot IIC (Karageorghis and Demas 1984b, 89, pl. CVIII:457. Larnaka District Archaeological Museum. Photo: Federica Spagnoli)
- Fig. 5-16: Wheel made cooking pot *Type 3b* from Enkomi, level IIIA, Late Cypriot IIIA (Photo: Dikaïos 1969, pl. 121:27, no. inv. 3874/3, scale 1:5)
- Fig. 5-17: Wheel made cooking pot *Type 3b* from Hala Sultan Tekke, Late Cypriot IIB-C (Åström et al. 1983, fig. 409:1787. Larnaka District Archaeological Museum. Photo: Federica Spagnoli)
- Fig. 5-18: Cooking jugs from the Sanctuary of Athienou, stratum II, Late Cypriot IIIA (Photo: Dothan and Ben Tor 1983, pl. 33:1-2, scale 1:5)
- Fig. 5-19: Wheel made cooking pot *Type 3b* from Maa-*Paleokastro*, Floor I (Karageorghis and Demas 1988, pl. LXXX:358. Paphos District Archaeological Museum. Photo: Federica Spagnoli)

- Fig. 5-20: Cooking pot *Type 3b* from Tel Miqne-Ekron, level IB, 7th century BC (Photo: Gitin 1989, fig. 2.13:12, scale 1:5)
- Fig. 5-21: Cooking jug (*Type 3c*) from Maa-*Paleokastro*, Floor II, Late Cypriot IIIA (Karageorghis and Demas 1988, pl. LXX:425. Paphos District Archaeological Museum. Photo: Federica Spagnoli)
- Fig. 5-22: Cooking pot *Type 3b* from Lachish, level II, end of 7th century BC (Photo: Aharoni 1975, pl. 47:19, scale 1:5)
- Fig. 5-23: Cooking jug from Kition-*Kathari*, floor I, Cypro-Geometric I (Photo: Karageorghis and Demas 1984b, pl. LV:318, scale 1:5)
- Fig. 5-24: Cooking jug from the Necropolis of Palaepaphos-*Skales*, T.49, Cypro-Geometric IA-B (Photo: Karageorghis 1983, pl. LXXXVII:177, scale 1:5)
- Fig. 5-25: Cooking jug from Ashdod, level XIIIa, 12th century BC (Photo: Dothan and Ben-Shlomo, fig. 23:6, scale 1:5)
- Fig. 5-26: Cooking jug from Tel Miqne-Ekron, level VIIA, 12th century BC (Photo: Meehl, Dothan and Gitin 2006, fig. 3.12:5, scale 1:5)
- Fig. 5-27: Cooking jug *Type 3.c.1* from Megiddo, level K-4, Iron Age IB (Photo: Ariei 2006, fig. 13.59:7, scale 1:5)
- Fig. 5-28: Cooking jug *Type 3.c.1* from Sarepta, substratum D1, Iron Age IB-IIA (Photo: Anderson 1988, pl. 33:10, scale 1:5)
- Fig. 5-29: Cooking jug *Type 3.c.1* from Taanach, level IIB, second half of 10th century BC (Photo: Rast 1978, fig. 67:3, scale 1:5)
- Fig. 5-30: Two-handled cooking jug *Type 3.c.1* from Tel Mevorach, level VII, second half of 10th century BC (Photo: Stern 1978, fig. 13:14, scale 1:5)
- Fig. 5-31: Small cooking jug from Tell Beit Mirsim, level A, end of 7th century BC (Photo: Albright 1941-1943, pl. 17:8, scale 1:5)
- Fig. 6-1: Map of the sites mentioned in the text
- Fig. 6-2: Gold diadem with embossed decoration of figure-of-eight shields from Hala Sultan Tekke (London, British Museum. Photo: The British Museum compass, collections online. 2000.
http://www.britishmuseum.org/explore/highlights/highlight_image.aspx?image=ps337271.jpg&retpage=18076. Accessed on 14 May 2008)
- Fig. 6-3: Three golden beads in the shape of figure-of-eight shields allegedly from Pyla (Larnaka Museum. Photo: Karageorghis 2002a: 83, fig. 162)
- Fig. 6-4: Ivory mirror handle from Enkomi with a man versus a griffin scene (London, British Museum. Photo: D'Albiac 1992: 110, fig. 1a)
- Fig. 6-5: Ivory pyxis from Enkomi with a man versus a griffin scene (London, British Museum. Photo: Krzyszkowska 1992, 238, fig. a)
- Fig. 6-6: A wall painting fragment from Mycenae showing an individual with a boar's tusk helmet carrying a griffin (Athens, National Archaeological Museum. Photo: Angelos Papadopoulos)
- Fig. 6-7: Large fragment with possible boxers (London, British Museum. Photo: Vermeule and Karageorghis 1982, V.29)
- Fig. 7-1a: Ram-headed statuette *Type A*, from Golgoi (Metropolitan Museum New York. Photo: Buchholz 1991, pl. 10.4)
- Fig. 7-1b: Ram-headed statuette *Type A*, from Lindos (Photo: Blinkenberg 1931)
- Fig. 7-2: Ram-headed statuette *Type A*, from Apollo (Photo: Berges 2006, pl. II.3)

- Fig. 7-3: Statuette with ram-horns Type B, from sanctuary/Golgoi (Metropolitan Museum New York. Photo: Kathrin Kleibl)
- Fig. 7-4: Statuette with ram-horns Type B, from Cyprus. (Photo: Ohnefalsch-Richter 1893, 195 fig. 169)
- Fig. 7-5: Statuette with ram-horns and cornucopia Type B, from Cyprus. (Brock University, Collection of Cypriot Antiquities Inv. S-75-1. Photo: Buchholz 1991, 119, no. 47a, pl. 15.1)
- Fig. 7-6: Fragment of a thymiaterion with a ram god support, from Tamassos. (Nicosia, Cyprus Museum, Inv. 407/1975. Photo: Buchholz 1991, 120 no. 53, pl. 16.4)
- Fig. 7-7: Ram-sphinx, from Amun sanctuary/Karnak, Egypt (Photo: Kathrin Kleibl)
- Fig. 7-8: Relief from Medinet Habu, Egypt (Photo: R. Busch, *Kupfer für Europa. Bergbau und Handel auf Zypern. Ausstellungskatalog Hamburg, Helms-Museum*, 1999, 97, pl. 2)
- Fig. 7-9: Statuette of Amun with a ram head, of unknown provenance (Paris, Louvre. Photo: Pamminger 1992, pl. III)
- Fig. 7-10: Statuette of Amun with a ram head, of unknown provenance. (Strasbourg, University Collection. Photo: Spiegelberg 1927, pl. a-c)
- Fig. 7-11: Coin with head of Apollo Karneios, from Metapont (Wien, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Museums. Photo: Website)
- Fig. 9-1: Map with sites mentioned in the text
- Fig. 9-2: Ayia Moni region. The pillow lavas that contain the copper ores are shown in light grey
- Fig. 9-3: Silver siglos of king Evagoras I (Photo: Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation)
- Fig. 9-4: Silver siglos of Idalion, c. 475 BC (Photo: Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation)
- Fig. 9-5: Silver siglos of Lapethos, c. 425 BC (Photo: Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation)
- Fig. 9-6: Silver didrachm of king Epipalos, 4th century BC (Photo: Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation)
- Fig. 9-7: Bilingual (Greek and Eteocypriot) and digraphic (alphabet and syllabary) inscription of king Androcles (Limassol District Museum AM 649. Photo: Masson and Hermayr 1982, no. 66)
- Fig. 11-1: The quantity of registered Cypriot core-formed vessels per main vessel shape within the three groups together
- Fig. 11-2: Distribution map of the core-formed vessels on Cyprus. List of sites: 1. Akanthou; 2. Akourdalia; 3. Amathous; 4. Aphendrika; 5. Athienou; 6. Idalion; 7. Karpasia; 8. Kition; 9. Kouklia; 10. Kourion; 11. Keryneia; 12. Marion; 13. Maroni; 14. Paphos; 15. Pomos; 16. Salamis; 17. Soloi
- Fig. 11-3: Typology of core-formed vessels from Cyprus (pie-charts per group connected with illustrations of the discussed types). Pie 1: Mediterranean group I: 34 ex.: alabastra (McClellan II.A.iv; viii; xi; xiii) - amphoriskoi (McClellan II.C.i; vii; ix) - aryballoi (McClellan II.D.iv) - oinochoai (McClellan II.E.ii); Pie 2: Mediterranean group II: 14 ex.: alabastra (McClellan

III.A.vii; x; xi) - amphoriskoi (McClellan III.B.ii) - hydriskai (McClellan III.E.i) - oinochoai (McClellan III.F.ii) - unguentaria (McClellan III.G.i); Pie 3: Mediterranean group III: 133 ex.: alabastra (McClellan IV.A.ii; iii; iv) – amphoriskoi (McClellan IV.B.i; ii; vi; vii; ix; x; xi) - unguentaria (McClellan IV.C.i; ii) [illustrations based on drawings from Harden 1981; Grose 1989]

Fig. 11-4: From the blobs at the rim and the shoulder can be construed the starting point of the glass trail, but also how many times the glassworker turned the rod in his hand and whether the application did go smoothly or not (District Museum, Limassol - LM 1009. Photo: Peter Cosyns)

Fig. 11-5: 1) Museum August Kestner aryballos 1893.8; 2) Museum August Kestner aryballos L2.1993.74; 3) Museum August Kestner miniature aryballos 1934.292; 4) Museum August Kestner oinochoè L2.1993.2 (Drawings: Peter Cosyns)

Fig. 11-6: (left) A carinated alabastron with a hole in the lower part of the body, making the object useless as a recipient (Cyprus Museum, Nicosia - D 1853. Photo: Peter Cosyns); (middle) a useless discoid foot stand of an amphoriskos with ovoid body and S-shaped handles (Cyprus Museum, Nicosia - D 1836. Photo: Peter Cosyns); (right) a carinated alabastron from tomb 147 in Amathous showing a reparation of the wall by insertion of a blob of blue translucent glass after the finishing of the vessel seeing that the white opaque glass trails were covered (District Museum, Limassol - LM 556/5. Photo: Peter Cosyns)

Fig. 12-1: General plan of Nea Paphos. Upon it are marked all the proposed locations for the lighthouse: 1. Maloutena promontory, 2. octagonal tower, 3a. Fanari hill, 3b. Panayia Theoskepasti, 3c. Fabrika hill, 4. Harbour (Photo: Leonard *et al.* 1995, 237, fig 1)

Fig. 12-2: The octagonal tower within the confines of the Villa of Theseus (Photo: Google Earth)

Fig. 12-3: Octagonal tower. Photo taken from SE (Photo: Dimitris Vitas)

Fig. 12-4: Rock-cut steps on the east side of the Fanari hill, belonging probably to the crepidoma of a temple that stood upon the hill (Photo: Mlynarczyk 1990, pl. XXIII, fig. 47a)

Fig. 12-5: Church of Panayia Theoskepasti. The church stands upon a former construction, probably a defending tower, flanking the city's eastern gate (Photo: Dimitris Vitas)

Fig. 12-6: Plan of the SE part of the Fabrika hill with the foundations of a building, probably the temple of Aphrodite Paphia (Photo: Mlynarczyk 1985, 291, fig. 2)

Fig. 12-7: The harbour of Nea Paphos. The dotted line marks the conjectured extent of the ancient harbour (Photo: Hohlfelder 1995, 200, fig. 3)

Fig. 12-8: The formation of two separate basins within the natural embayment of Paphos' harbour, caused by a natural bedrock ridge (Leonard *et al.* 1998, 151, fig. 4)

Fig. 12-9: The submerged terminus of the eastern breakwater. One of the columns is evident upon the mound of debris (Photo: Hohlfelder and Leonard 1993, 55, fig. 8)

- Fig. 12-10: Plan of the western end of eastern breakwater with the locations of the columns marked upon it (Photo: Hohlfelder 1995, 200, fig. 4)
- Fig. 13-1: Mosaic inscription in the Annex of Eustolios at Kourion (Photo: Skevi Christodoulou)
- Fig. 13-2: Mosaic panel from Mansoura (Photo: Michaelides 1992, fig. 40)
- Fig. 14-1: Memorial graffito in the dormitory in Bellapays Abbey (Photo: Mia Gaia Trentin)
- Fig. 14-2: Ship graffito of a galley in Bellapays Abbey (Photo: Mia Gaia Trentin)
- Fig. 14-3: Graffiti on the church entrance door in Bellapays Abbey (Photo: Mia Gaia Trentin)
- Fig. 14-4: Figurative graffito at Ayios Neophytos, Paphos (Photo: Mia Gaia Trentin)
- Fig. 14-5: Alphabetical and figurative graffiti in Ayia Paraskevi, Yeroskipou (Photo: Mia Gaia Trentin)
- Fig. 14-6: Alphabetical and figurative graffiti in Ayia Sophia, Nicosia (Photo: Mia Gaia Trentin)
- Fig. 14-7: Alphabetical graffiti in Ayios Dimitrianos, Dali (Photo: Mia Gaia Trentin)
- Fig. 14-8: Alphabetical graffiti in Panayia tou Araka, Lagoudera (Photo: Mia Gaia Trentin)
- Fig. 14-9: Alphabetical graffiti in Panayia Iamatiki, Arakapas (Photo: Mia Gaia Trentin)
- Fig. 14-10: Figurative graffiti in Palaia Enkleistra, Kouklia (Photo: Mia Gaia Trentin)
- Fig. 14-11: Alphabetical graffito in the Royal Chapel, Pyrga (Photo: Mia Gaia Trentin)
- Fig. 15-1: Archangelos Michael, Koma tou Yialou (Photo: Iosif Hadjikyriakos)
- Fig. 15-2: Ayios Iakovos, Trikomo (Photo: Iosif Hadjikyriakos)
- Fig. 15-3: Ayia Anna, Paralimni (Photo: Iosif Hadjikyriakos)
- Fig. 15-4: Ayios Dhimitrios, Leonarisso (Photo: Iosif Hadjikyriakos)
- Fig. 15-5: Private house, Paralimni (Photo: Iosif Hadjikyriakos)
- Fig. 15-6a: *Taches Noires* plate, 18th century, Albissola-Italy (Photo: Iosif Hadjikyriakos)
- Fig. 15-6b: Faience plate with Arlecchino, 17th century, Montelupo Fiorentino-Italy (Photo: Iosif Hadjikyriakos)
- Fig. 15-6c: Slip ware plate with floral decoration, 17th -18th century, Çanakkale-Turkey (Photo: Iosif Hadjikyriakos)
- Fig. 15-6d: Faience *Cavolo e spirale* plate, 18th century, Montelupo Fiorentino-Italy (Photo: Iosif Hadjikyriakos)
- Fig. 15-6e: Marmorisé plate, 17th century, North Italy (Photo: Iosif Hadjikyriakos)
- Fig. 15-6f: Faience plate, 19th century, Maastricht, Flanders (Photo: Iosif Hadjikyriakos)
- Fig. 15-6g: Plate, 16th century, Liguria-Italy (Photo: Iosif Hadjikyriakos)
- Fig. 15-6h: Faience Plate with a hero of the Greek revolution, 19th century, South France (Photo: Iosif Hadjikyriakos)
- Fig. 15-7: Plate with graffito decoration, 17th century, Veneto-Italy (Photo: Iosif Hadjikyriakos)

- Fig. 15-8: Porcelain plate with floral decorations and sacred Islamic inscriptions, 19th century, Europe (Photo: Iosif Hadjikyriakos)
- Fig. 16-1: Map of Paphos showing the main domestic structures with mosaic floors (Photo: Department of Antiquities of Cyprus)
- Fig. 16-2: Close up of an area of the West Portico mosaic in the House of Dionysus (Room 16) where lime concretions were removed using a hammer and a chisel in the 1960s (Photo: Niki Savvides)
- Fig. 16-3a: Close up of an area of the West Portico mosaic in the House of Dionysus (Room 16) showing surface erosion caused by the use of acid in 1964 to remove lime concretions from the mosaic's surface (Photo: Niki Savvides)
- Fig. 16-3b: Close up of an eroded area of the Dionysiac Procession panel in the House of Dionysus (Room 4), a result of the use of cleaning interventions with acid in the 1960s (Photo: Niki Savvides)
- Fig. 16-4: Drawing of some of the mosaics in the House of Dionysus following their excavation with respective photographs of their present condition after their conservation/restoration (Photos: Niki Savvides. Drawing: after Kondoleon 1995). a: Vintage Panel (Room 4a); b: Narcissus Mosaic (Room 2); c: Four Seasons Mosaic (Room 3); d: Peacock Mosaic (Room 14)
- Fig. 16-5: The current shelter of the House of Dionysus from NW (Photo: Niki Savvides)
- Fig. 16-6: The enclosure over the House of Aion. The excavated remains outside the enclosure have been excavated after its construction. The enclosure gives the false impression that the House is only confined within its walls (Photo: Niki Savvides)
- Fig. 16-7: The various shelters in the Villa of Theseus, which were removed in the late 1990s (Photo: John D. Stewart 1996)
- Fig. 16-8: Recorded conditions of exposed mosaics: a: flaking and fractures; b: erosion; c: cracks and plant growth; d: microbiological growth; e: erosion; f: loss/lacunae (Photo: Niki Savvides)
- Fig. 16-9: Recorded conditions of enclosed mosaics: a: erosion; b: erosion and flaking; c: bulging and cracks; d: pitting; e: salts; f: subsidence and cracks (Photo: Niki Savvides)

LIST OF TABLES

- Table 1-1: Sites, sample sizes and sources for data utilised
- Table 1-2: Measurement codes and definitions used for canonical discriminant analysis
- Table 1-3: Group means and standard deviations for uncorrected measurements
- Table 1-4: Mahalanobis distances for all groups. Significant distances ($p < 0.01$) are starred
- Table 1-5: Significant canonical axes and proportion of variation for each function.
- Table 1-6: Total canonical structure for the transformed variables
- Table 1-7: Sites, sample sizes, time period and source for data used in R-matrix analysis
- Table 1-8: Relethford-Blangero results including distances from regional phenotypic centroid, Observed phenotypic variance, expected phenotypic variance, and residual phenotypic variance
- Table 1-9: Minimum genetic distances between sites as derived from the unbiased R-matrix
- Table 2-1: List of sites identified and investigated by the EENC survey since 2005
- Table 3-1: Ayia Varvara-*Asprokremmos* finds by excavated context from trenches 1, 2 and 3. Contexts are listed in descending order through the stratigraphic sequence of each trench. The dashed lines correspond to likely breaks in the sequences within each trench with plough zone context marked in bold (Data for trench 12 is at present incomplete pending further excavation of this area of the site and is therefore not included)
- Table 3-2: Average percentages of selected variables across context groupings in trenches 1, 2, 3 and 12
- Table 3-3: Average percentages of blade versus flake cores for each of the context groups belonging to trenches 1, 2, 3 and 12
- Table 4-1: Historical research on Plain Wares
- Table 4-2: Co-relation between fabric types and inclusions
- Table 5-1: Cooking pots in Cyprus and the Levant
- Table 7-1: Type A (20 statuettes)
- Table 7-2: Type B (53 statuettes)
- Table 7-3: Type A and B (73 statuettes)
- Table 11-1: The amount of vessels and types from known provenance (data from other regions than Cyprus are based on McClellan 1984, 395-411)
- Table 14-1: Coastal sites with graffiti
- Table 14-2: Inland sites with graffiti
- Table 15-1: Ceramic decoration in churches

LIST OF APPENDICES

4-1. Pottery record sheet: *Alassa-Pano Mandilaris*

4-2. Inclusion record sheet: *Alassa-Pano Mandilaris*

11.1. List of core-formed vessels in Cyprus not reported in McClellan 1984 (reference of used typology). Some pieces remain unmentioned in the list because they are registered as discarded and/or remain undeterminable like two pieces from Amathous (Harden 1981, 63, no. 93; 68, no. 122), or there was no opportunity to study unpublished material like some pieces in Cyprus Museum, Nicosia and Fitzwilliam William Museum, Cambridge

11.2. List for Cypriote core-formed vessels (McClellan 1984; Harden 1981; Grose 1989)

11.3. List of measured volumes of core-formed vessels

PREFACE

The idea to hold a conference for postgraduate students and young scholars conducting research on Cypriot Archaeology was inspired in 2001 by Dr Kirsi Lorenz, at the time a PhD student at the University of Cambridge and now currently Research Coordinator at the Cyprus Institute. At the early stages of the Postgraduate Cypriot Archaeology (POCA) Conference, the meetings were largely informal in character and were addressed to postgraduate students mostly from the United Kingdom. The turning point in the history of POCA was the conference held at Trinity College in Dublin, in 2005, which served to transform the idea of POCA and established it as an international gathering of postgraduate students and young researchers working on Cypriot Archaeology. The main organiser in Dublin, Dr Giorgos Papantoniou, at the time a PhD student at Trinity College, was responsible for the first publication of the proceedings of that year's POCA meeting. The volume was completed and published in 2008 with ten important contributions on Cypriot Archaeology by graduate students and young scholars.

The University of Cyprus has been supporting the institution of POCA from its earliest stages. Professors Demetrios Michaelides and Maria Iacovou were the key speakers in 2002 and 2005 respectively. Furthermore, Cypriot students studying at the University of Cyprus and other European and American Universities have regularly participated in the POCA annual conferences since 2004. In 2006, during a productive meeting at the University of Edinburgh, the postgraduate students of the University of Cyprus decided for the first time to undertake the organisation of this major event. Our motive at the time was to promote Cypriot archaeology at an international level and also to provide the opportunity to Cypriot students of the University of Cyprus to present their work and thus contribute to the better understanding of Cypriot archaeology. It was a great pleasure that we realised that we have fulfilled our goal.

POCA 2007 would not have taken place without the generous financial support of the Department of History and Archaeology of the University of Cyprus. We would especially like to thank the then President of the Department, Professor Theodoros Mavrogiannis, and the Director of the Archaeological Research Unit, Professor Demetrios Michaelides, for their

valuable contribution towards securing the necessary funds to meet the financial needs of this conference and also for their valuable guidance throughout the preparation and organisation of POCA 2007.

The conference took place in Nicosia between the 18th to 21st October 2007. The keynote lecture was delivered by Professor James D. Muhly entitled "*Ten kings of the land of Iadnana in the midst of the sea*": *Greeks and 'Ionians' in Early Iron Age Cyprus*. Professor Muhly's lecture was very successful and well attended. We extend to Professor Muhly our warmest thanks and gratitude for kindly accepting our invitation. During his inspiring lecture, Professor Muhly expressed the wish for the return of the Stele of Sargon, presently at the Staatlichen Museen of Berlin, back to Cyprus. This request took the form of a petition, which was signed by the editors, authors and professors of the Department of History and Archaeology of the University of Cyprus and it is included in the volume. A copy of the petition has been sent to the Staatlichen Museen.

The conference encompassed 24 presentations by postgraduate students and young researchers from a number of Institutions and Universities in the United Kingdom, France, Italy, Belgium, Germany and the United States. The papers, which were organised chronologically in eight sessions, extended over millennia of Cyprus' history, from the earliest prehistory to the medieval period. They comprised archaeological, anthropological and palaeopathological approaches to the material culture of ancient Cyprus. A lively discussion followed each paper.

Our truly international meeting was further enhanced by the significant and active presence of the professors of the Department of History and Archaeology. They also provided us with ideas and guidance during the entire year of preparation. Special thanks is also owed to the chairpersons of each session who not only adapted themselves impeccably to the subject of speakers but entered into the spirit of the conference and contributed in their own way to making it constructive and beneficial. Archaeologists of the Department of Antiquities, directors of field projects on Cyprus, other leading experts and a number of undergraduate students also attended the meetings. Many thanks are also due to Dr Sabine Rogge, who kindly accepted to address the concluding remarks.

The success of the conference owed a great deal to the generosity of the Cyprus Tourism Organisation. We were able to provide dinner for our guests after the end of the conference in addition to an excursion to Kourion and the Troodos mountains (Omodos region) the following day.

Given that many of the papers made original and new contributions to their subject areas as they were based on the ongoing PhD research of the authors, the decision to publish the proceedings was therefore taken during

the conference. The papers were all subject to peer-review. We would also like to express our gratitude to the 19 anonymous referees, leading experts in their fields, for providing constructive reviews and valuable comments on every paper that was submitted for publishing. We would also like to thank Dr Andrew Philip Souter for correcting and proof-reading the papers and Professor Demetrios Michaelides for providing the necessary financial support. The volume was edited by us in order to produce a coherent and significant work that provides unique views into the island's history.

The first paper (Nathan K. Harper) deals with the study of biodistance in archaeology and provides case studies from Cypriot sites. The second paper (Sandra Rosendahl and Carole McCartney) explores the earliest colonisation of Cyprus and stresses the need to acknowledge small, limited-activity sites in order to understand the complexity of the earliest man-created landscapes on the island. The third paper (Carole McCartney and Marianna Ktori) discusses the formation processes of lithic material in a new site, currently excavated at Ayia Varvara. The following two papers discuss two frequent but often neglected classes of ceramic material. Ariane Jacobs presents part of her ongoing PhD research on the Late Cypriot Plain Wares and introduces preliminary results of her study of the material originating from the excavations at the Late Cypriot urban settlement at Alassa. Federica Spagnoli argues that the study of cooking pots can be used as an indicator of cultural and social changes in Cyprus and the Levant between the Late Bronze and the Iron Age. The discussion on the prehistory of the island closes with a paper (Angelos Papadopoulos) on Cypriot Bronze Age iconography especially in relation to warfare.

Kathrin Kleibl discusses the evidence concerning the Cypriot Ram God and introduces new approaches to iconography and foreign influence. Anna Cannavò presents the Near Eastern textual sources (Neo-Assyrian, Biblical, Hebrew) that reveal Near Eastern perceptions of the island's identity in the Archaic period. The next two papers deal with the political configuration of the Cypriot kingdoms. Anna Satraki explores the means through which the Cypriot *Basileis* manifested their power in the form of royal inscriptions, coinage and royal sculpture. Sidonie Lejeune examines three inscriptions dealing with citizen body and tries to identify the distinctive characteristics of the Cypriot political structures during the era of the kingdoms. Peter Cosyns and Karin Nys review the research on core-formed glass vessels in Cyprus and present some preliminary results of their study of the Cypriot material. Dimitris Vitas examines old theories concerning the existence and the location of Nea Paphos' lighthouse and suggests new interpretations and ideas. Skevi Christodoulou presents the epigraphic evidence on baths and water supply in Hellenistic and Roman

Cyprus. Issues concerning the Latin and Ottoman periods are touched upon by two authors. Mia Gaia Trentin presents a research project that catalogues the graffiti in the churches of Cyprus and some preliminary results from her study of the graffiti. Iosif Hadjikyriakos studies the ceramic decoration in the interior of the churches of Cyprus, a unique phenomenon in the Mediterranean and explores its social connotations. Finally, Niki Savvides closes the volume with some results on a preliminary condition survey concerning the Paphos mosaics.

We feel that the Proceedings of POCA 2007 combine to form a homogeneous volume that comprises a modern and comprehensive approach to the various fields of study of Cypriot history and archaeology. We would like to thank all the participants for their patience and cooperation. They enthusiastically attended all events scheduled by the Organising Committee and contributed to the success of the Conference. We are grateful to all the people and institutions involved with the first international Conference organised by postgraduate students of the Department of History and Archaeology and the publication of this first volume. With the continuous support of the University of Cyprus and our professors we anticipate that this achievement will make a valuable contribution for understanding and appreciating the archaeology of Cyprus and stimulate further discussion.

—Anna Satraki and Skevi Christodoulou

PETITION

In the year 707 BC seven Cypriot leaders offered voluntarily their submission to the Assyrian king Sargon II. Sargon then ordered that a stele be erected at the port town of Kition. The stele depicted the profile of his majestic image and was inscribed with his magnificent deeds in the Near East:

“I caused to inscribe upon a stele the victory and the conquests of my hands which, by the strength of the great gods, I achieved over all my enemies, and left it for the future in the land of Ia, a district of the land of Yadnana”.

The stele, which must have stood at Kition for centuries, is the only Neo-Assyrian document ever to have been found in Cyprus and the only Neo-Assyrian monument that has ever crossed the western frontiers of the continent. It was removed from Cyprus in AD 1845 and was soon afterwards (1846) purchased by the National Museums in Berlin, where it is since displayed in solitude, away from its cultural context, which is the *land of Ia*.

Because this unique monument remains to this day the earliest and foremost evidence regarding the Iron Age kingdoms (*βασίλεια*) of Cyprus,

we, the undersigned, organizers and contributors of the POCA 2007 Conference, request the return of the Stele of Sargon to *the land of Ia*. We thereby most strongly appeal to you, the National Museums in Berlin, for a gesture of goodwill and scholarly comradeship:

Please, return this unique historical monument to the Republic of Cyprus.

Professor Emeritus James D. Muhly
University of Pennsylvania
Dr Polymnia Muhly

Professor Demetrios Michaelides
Director of the Archaeological Research Unit, University of Cyprus

- Professor Maria Iacovou
Department of History and Archaeology, University of Cyprus
- Professor Euphrosyne Rizopoulou-Egoumenidou
Department of History and Archaeology, University of Cyprus
- Associate Professor Vassiliki Kassianidou
Department of History and Archaeology, University of Cyprus
- Assistant Professor Ourania Kouka
Department of History and Archaeology, University of Cyprus
- Assistant Professor Angel Nicolaou-Konnari
Department of History and Archaeology, University of Cyprus
- Assistant Professor Petros Papapolyviou
Department of History and Archaeology, University of Cyprus
- Assistant Professor Georghios Papasavvas
Department of History and Archaeology, University of Cyprus
- Assistant Professor Maria G. Parani
Department of History and Archaeology, University of Cyprus
- Lecturer Athanasios Vionis
Department of History and Archaeology, University of Cyprus
- Skevi Christodoulou
Department of History and Archaeology, University of Cyprus
- Anna Satraki
Department of History and Archaeology, University of Cyprus
- Nathan K. Harper
Wiener Laboratory, American School of Classical Studies, Athens
- Sandra Rosendahl
Council for British Research in the Levant (CBRL) and University of Leicester
- Marianna Ktori
Department of History and Archaeology, University of Cyprus
- Ariane Jacobs
Mediterranean Archaeological Research Institute, Vrije Universiteit Brussel
- Federica Spagnoli
University of Rome "La Sapienza"
- Dr Angelos Papadopoulos
Research Associate (Enkomi Project), Department of Antiquities, Cyprus
- Anna Cannavò
Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée « Jean Pouilloux »
- Sidonie Lejeune
University of Paris Ouest-Nanterre

Peter Cosyns

Department Art Sciences and Archaeology, Vrije Universiteit Brussel

Dimitris Vitas

Department of History and Archaeology, University of Cyprus

Mia Gaia Trentin

Ca'Foscari University, Venice

Iosif Hadjikyriakos

Ca'Foscari University, Venice

Niki Savvides

PhD Candidate, University College of London

Dr Giorgos Papantoniou

IRCHSS Government of Ireland Postdoctoral Fellow, Department of

Classics, Trinity College Dublin

Maria Dikomitou

Research Fellow, Archaeological Research Unit, University of Cyprus

Artemis Georgiou

PhD Candidate, Oxford University

Alexia Louca

Librarian, Archaeological Research Unit

Evi Karyda

PhD Candidate, University of Cyprus

Dr Savvas Neocleous

Trinity College Dublin

Anna Georgiadou

PhD Candidate, Aix en Provence

Rania Michael

PhD Candidate, Pontificio Instituto di Archeologia Cristiana

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AA</i>	<i>Archäologischer Anzeiger</i>
<i>AASOR</i>	Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research
<i>Aegeum</i>	Aegaeum: Annales d'archéologie égéenne de l'Université de Liège
<i>AfO</i>	Archiv für Orientforschung
<i>AJA</i>	American Journal of Archaeology
<i>AmerAnt</i>	American Antiquity
<i>Annales ESC</i>	Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations
<i>ANRW</i>	H. Temporini (ed.), <i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i> , Berlin 1972–
<i>ARDAC</i>	Annual Report of the Director of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus
<i>BAR Int. Ser.</i>	British Archaeological Reports, International Series
<i>BASOR</i>	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research
<i>BCH</i>	Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique
<i>BÉFAR</i>	Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome
<i>BICS</i>	Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London
<i>BSA</i>	Annual of the British School at Athens
<i>BSFE</i>	Bulletin de la Société Française d'Égyptologie
<i>CCEC</i>	Cahier du Centre d'Études Chypriotes
<i>CMS</i>	Corpus der minoischen und mykenischen Siegel
<i>CRAI</i>	Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres [Paris]
<i>FGrHist</i>	F. Jacoby, <i>Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> (Berlin 1923-)
<i>IEJ</i>	Israel Exploration Journal
<i>IJNA</i>	International Journal of Nautical Archaeology and Underwater Exploration
<i>JHS</i>	Journal of Hellenic Studies
<i>JMA</i>	Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology
<i>JNES</i>	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
<i>MÉFRA</i>	Mélanges de l'École française de Rome, Antiquité
<i>MHR</i>	Mediterranean Historical Review
<i>OGIS</i>	Orientis Graeci inscriptiones selectae

<i>OpAth</i>	Opuscula Atheniensia
<i>OpArch</i>	Opuscula Archaeologica
<i>Qedem</i>	Qedem. Monographs of the Institute of Archaeology, Hebrew University of Jerusalem
<i>RAss</i>	Revue d'Assyriologie
<i>RB</i>	Revue Biblique
<i>RDAC</i>	Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus
<i>RN</i>	Revue numismatique
<i>RSF</i>	Rivista di Studi Fenici
<i>SEG</i>	Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum
<i>SIMA</i>	Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology
<i>WO</i>	Die Welt des Orients
<i>ZA</i>	Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie
<i>ZÄS</i>	Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde

FROM TYPOLOGY TO POPULATION GENETICS: BIODISTANCE IN CYPRUS

NATHAN K. HARPER

Introduction

Studies in biological anthropology in Cyprus and the wider eastern Mediterranean are often overlooked. For one, studies of material culture through an art historical, economic or functional approach have maintained preeminence as a means of investigating cultural development and change. Human skeletal remains themselves are often very fragmentary and the recording and excavation of these remains is very time consuming and can be seen as a hindrance slowing the archaeological work¹. When skeletal remains are analysed and reported it is often in an appendix without wider synthesis and dissemination. Since 2000, there have been very few publications concerning human skeletal material from Cyprus in prominent biological anthropology journals².

The current theoretical stance of bioarchaeological³ research states that the human body and its remains can be used to reconstruct many biological and social processes within past populations⁴. In her seminal 1977 work outlining American bioarchaeological theory, Buikstra provides five research goals on which biological anthropologists and archaeologists

¹ Bush and Zvelebil 1991.

² F. Le Mort's analysis of the demographic profile of the subadults from Khirokitia is an exception. American Journal of Physical Anthropology, International Journal of Osteoarchaeology, Human Biology, and Human Evolution are major English language outlets for biological anthropology research. European anthropological journals include Anthropologie, Anthropologischer Anzeiger and Bulletins et Mémoires de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris.

³ In North America the term "bioarchaeology" refers to the study of human rather than faunal or botanical remains

⁴ Buikstra and Beck 2006; Larsen 1997.

can collaborate⁵. The list of topics highlighted by Buikstra includes, but is not limited to, burial programmes and social organisation, daily activities and division of labour, paleodemography including past population size and population density, population movement and genetic relationships and finally diet and disease. Buikstra also suggests that these topics should be addressed in a sequence to insure that the differences or similarities seen in cemetery populations are not the cause of a selective burial programme or genetic predisposition to disease⁶.

Due to the relatively insignificant part that biological anthropology studies have played in the development of theory within Cypriot archaeology, there are many facets of the biology of ancient Cypriots that are poorly developed or entirely unknown. Basic questions concerning growth and development, diet and health and paleodemography are little understood. How these groups are adapted to their environment and the process and origins of genetic diseases, specifically thalassemia are, as of yet, unresolved⁷. One aspect that has received more attention than others is the relationship of ancient Cypriot groups to others in the eastern Mediterranean. The current paper describes the history, methods and conclusions within the study of biodistance in Cyprus. The first section will discuss the history of biodistance studies from cranial typological analyses to model-free statistical biodistance studies to more recent model-bound quantitative statistical genetic studies. The history of these studies will then be discussed for Cyprus and case studies will be presented.

Biodistance

From its earliest days anthropology has been concerned with examining the relationships and kinship among and between the groups under study. Understanding how and why groups of people are related provides one of the clearest frameworks for understanding cultural difference and change. Biological distance or *biodistance* is the measurement and interpretation of relatedness or divergence between populations or subgroups of populations based on polygenic skeletal and dental traits⁸. The most basic assumption of all biodistance studies is that populations sharing attributes are more closely related than populations showing great differences in the same attributes⁹.

⁵ Buikstra 1977, 67.

⁶ Buikstra 1977, 70.

⁷ See Angel 1972a.

⁸ Buikstra *et al.* 1990, 1.

⁹ Larsen 1997.

The attributes under analysis for the bioarchaeologist are derived from the skeleton and the dentition. These variables can either be metric, derived from linear measurements of bone or tooth, or non-metric, discrete skeletal or dental traits that vary in presence or degree of expression. Biodistance studies are heavy in mathematical theory and statistics and the statistical methods used for metric and non-metric traits vary. For this paper only metric traits will be discussed¹⁰.

The stated goal of biodistance studies is to describe the genetic variation between and among groups and the role this variation plays in population structure and history. The metric variables derived from the skeleton are measures of the *phenotype*, the total physical appearance (in this case size and shape) of an organism which is determined in part by both underlying genetic and environmental components. This differs from the *genotype* which is the presence of particular alleles at specified loci in an organism.

Linear measurements between clearly identified landmarks on the cranium or dentition have been the historically preferred method for quantifying the phenotype. The identified landmarks are determined largely based on ease of identification and replicability rather than any functional or developmental reason. Despite this, traditional measures of cranial size and shape suggest genetically neutral traits rather than those influenced by selective evolutionary pressures. There is a level of *plastic* change that can be seen in some groups that have recently transitioned from hunting and gathering to an agricultural lifestyle that is not related to adaptive genetic response¹¹. Despite the historical research suggesting that cranial size and shape can change in as little as one generation, recent statistical studies indicate that the major component controlling cranial shape is genetic¹².

Cranial Typology

For historical and archaeological sampling reasons the cranium has been the main focus of biodistance studies. The first typologists investigated cranial shape and size as a means to taxonomically classify “racial” groups. This was based on the earliest taxonomies derived from the *Scala Naturae* or Great Chain of Being which ranked all things from

¹⁰ For a review of skeletal and dental non-metric traits, see Berry and Berry 1967; Finnegan 1978; Hauser and De Stefano 1989; Turner *et al.* 1997.

¹¹ Carlson and Van Gerven 1977; Gonz  les-Jos   *et al.* 2006; Gravlee *et al.* 2003.

¹² Boas 1910; Sparks and Jantz 2003; Relethford 2004; Roseman 2004.

God (the highest) to rocks (the lowest). Carolus Linnaeus the great taxonomist of the 18th century recognised four human races based on skin colour (white, red, yellow, and black) and physiognomy, including facial prognathism (projection). Cranial typologists saw western Europeans as the standard against which to judge all other groups. Studies of the cranium became quantified mostly as a means of judging cranial capacity as a proxy for intelligence. These biometricians thought that difference between types and intelligence could be quantified statistically, using one or two variables. Once again, western European groups were considered superior. This White-Black or more accurately, White-Other dichotomy generally remained the standard until the mid-20th century¹³.

While typological analyses were preeminent, anthropology and specifically biodistance played a central role in the development of statistical methods. Karl Pearson developed statistical tests such as the Chi-Square Test, Pearson's r for correlation of variables (product moment coefficient) and his Coefficient of Racial Likeness (a distance measure) were based on anthropometric and skeletal datasets¹⁴. Pearson's journal, *Biometrika*, started in 1901, became the major voice for statistical analyses of human variation and inheritance.

Even with the advent of 'biometrical' analyses the typological bent was still apparent. This was most visible in the use of indices.

"...crude dimensions are not often racially significant in the individual, and their value for this purpose is somewhat questionable even when the means of groups and the variabilities are calculated. For this reason it has long been customary for anthropologists to calculate indices which express the relation of one dimension to another as a percentage"¹⁵.

Indices were calculated for most measurements of the craniofacial skeleton providing a tri-partite system for classifying size and shape. The most common index used was the cranial index, a ratio of the breadth of skull to its length. The range and the terms given to the tri-partite classification were dolichocrany (narrow or long headed) for an index up to 74.99, mesocrany (average or medium) between 75 to 79.99 and brachycrany (broad or round head) from 80¹⁶. This was repeated for the nose (nasal breadth to height, leptorrhiny, mesorrhiny, and platyrrhiny), the eye orbit (orbit height to breadth, chamaechonchy, mesochonchy,

¹³ Cook 2006.

¹⁴ Howells 1969.

¹⁵ Hooton 1926, 77.

¹⁶ Bass 1987.

hypsiconchy) and many other characteristics of the cranium. The racial types developed during these years were largely arbitrary, based on traits the researcher saw as important for differentiating between types and the reasoning was largely circular.

For the typologist the individual was the unit of analysis, variability was unaccounted for and individuals showing multiple typological traits were shoehorned into a group. This was born of the essentialist idea that racial groups with a “pure racial strain” or core region interacted with other core races on the edges of their ranges and formed many hybrids between races. For archaeological populations, differences in types were explained as the intrusion of groups from other “racial centres”. Migrations of groups were the only explanatory model for those following typological methods. This fitted well within the diffusionist, culture area school in anthropology of the time.

Multivariate Craniometric Studies

The last major anthropological biodistance studies utilising typology were found in the mid-1950s and early 1970s at the same time as statistical biodistance studies based in anthropological statistics and genetics were being developed. There was a paradigmatic shift in human skeletal studies at the beginning of the 1950s as a response to the “New Archaeology”. The “New Physical Anthropology”, sought to answer questions concerning biological processes in human populations rather than the description of individuals or racial types¹⁷. One of the major driving forces behind a change from typological to populational thinking was the new evolutionary synthesis focusing on genotypes, phenotypes and populational level analysis. The works of biologists Sewell Wright¹⁸, J.B.S. Haldane¹⁹, R.A. Fisher²⁰ and Theodosius Dobzhansky²¹ provided the foundation on which quantitative population genetics was built.

W.W. Howells was one of the first anthropologists to apply multivariate statistics to biodistance studies of populations. He saw the transition from univariate to multivariate statistics as a “transition from Pearsonian to Fisherian statistics”²². Univariate statistics could only address differences in variation of one or two variables or measurements

¹⁷ Washburn 1951.

¹⁸ Wright 1969.

¹⁹ Haldane 1932.

²⁰ Fisher 1930.

²¹ Dobzhansky 1937.

²² Howells 1969.

of a cranium or tooth. What were being tested were the measurements and not the cranium or tooth as a biological unit within a collection of units that can be considered a population.

Though sampling methods, transformation of raw variables and pooling of groups and sexes has been treated differently by many investigators the most common multivariate statistics utilised in biodistance studies are principal component analysis (PCA)²³ and canonical discriminant analysis (CDA)²⁴. Both statistical analyses seek to reduce many variables into a new set of variables that explains the majority of the variation seen in and between the groups under analysis. PCA does not require any *a priori* grouping of the samples. For PCA the total sample under analysis is grouped and a variable accounting for a maximum of variation is derived as a linear function of the original variables. The new set of variables in a PCA maximises the proportion of variation for the variables within the total sample for each new principal component. The first component explains the majority of the variation. With each successive component less and less variation is explained.

In canonical discriminant analysis the main goal is to test which variables distinguish between two or more *a priori* groups. The first canonical discriminant function gives each individual a score based on the function of the new transformed variables. The mean score for all of the individuals within an *a priori* group represents the sample centroid. Groups are placed along a line that accounts for all of the variability contained in the function and a sectioning point is given that best separates the groups. For three or more groups the dimensions are expanded and can include two or three lines of orientation and allowing for a visual estimation of distance between swarms of individuals within populations. With both PCA and CVA, graphical plotting in multidimensional space is important to understanding the differences between individuals and population centroids in space.

The main statistical method of measuring the biodistance between populations is the D^2 or Mahalanobis' generalised distance. Mahalanobis was an Indian statistician that worked in Pearson's laboratory in England and critiqued the Coefficient of Racial Likeness, stating that the magnitude of divergence between populations was affected by sample sizes²⁵. Mahalanobis' distance measure is a weighted Euclidean distance measure

²³ For a more detailed discussion of principal components analysis in anthropology, see Corruccini 1975; Andrews and Williams 1973.

²⁴ For discussions of canonical discriminant analysis, see Giles and Elliot 1965; Howells 1966; Crichton 1966.

²⁵ Ghosh and Majumder 1995.