

Marking Pottery in the Cypriot Hinterland: Examining Potmarks from the Late Bronze Age Farming Settlement at Arediou

Abstract

This paper explores the evidence for marking pottery at Arediou, a Late Bronze Age farming settlement in the Cypriot hinterland. Three potmarks were discovered at the site in the course of excavations, adding to current knowledge of the practice of marking pottery on Cyprus and how this was embedded within the island's socio-political and economic organization during the later second millennium BCE. Although the quantity is small, the diversity of wares, forms, and sign types is intriguing; this corresponds to patterns of marking observed elsewhere on the island and in the Late Bronze Age eastern Mediterranean generally. From the perspective of potmark studies, their rural provenience is what makes the Arediou corpus significant. It broadens the question of where and why potmarks had relevance and raises the question of the bounds of literacy and how the rural hinterland was embedded within wider exchange networks in the Late Bronze Age.

Excavations at Arediou-*Vouppes*, Cyprus have revealed evidence of a Late Bronze Age (LBA) farming settlement. Located in the northern foothills of the Troodos Mountains (fig. 1), Arediou was dominated by a substantial courtyard house (Building 1) adjacent to a large sunken room (Room 103) with a probable ritual function (Steel 2016; 2021; 2023: 182–3). To the north there was a large storage facility (Building 2) and a single tomb was excavated at the eastern limits of the site (Steel 2016: 520–2). Fieldwalking indicates the settlement extended some 100m to the north, where walls associated with LBA pottery were identified (Steel 2016: fig. 4). Substantial quantities of imported pottery (Steel 2022; 2023) demonstrate that Arediou was integrated within eastern Mediterranean trade networks (cf. Murray 2023). Two-thirds derived from the Aegean, while Maritime Transport amphorae (otherwise termed Canaanite jars) and occasional Egyptian amphorae make up the remainder. These were scattered throughout the site, with a concentration in Building 1 and Room 103, suggesting some centralized control over their distribution within the settlement. Three potmarks have been identified at Arediou: a large Minoan coarse-ware stirrup jar handle with an incompletely preserved incised inscription, the handle of a transport amphora with an incised mark, and a small Mycenaean stirrup jar with a mark painted under its base (table 1; Steel 2022). In all respects the inscription and marks are congruent with the patterns of marking these wares and shapes elsewhere on the island, and in the LBA eastern Mediterranean generally (Hirschfeld 2008; Donnelly and Polig 2022). Although the quantity of marked pottery appears small, it supports the general observation that any LBA site on Cyprus will yield some potmarks; they are rare but always present, even in the rural hinterland, far from the babble of the cosmopolitan, urban coast.

<Figure 1 and Table 1 around here>

A MARKED MARITIME TRANSPORT CONTAINER

A handle (AV01-01-03; fig. 2) with an incised mark was found in the floor deposit of Room 103. The handle has been identified as coming from a Maritime Transport container, based on macroscopic examination. Worn and fragmentary sherds from similar vessels were found in significant quantities at Arediou, concentrated around with Room 103 and Building 1 (Steel 2022: 92), suggesting centralized control over their distribution and use. Numerous fabric categories for this amphora type have been identified with multiple places of manufacture on and off the island (Georgiou 2014; Cateloy 2022; CompAS). Most Maritime Transport containers, and indeed LBA amphorae generally, are unmarked, other than potters' marks in the form of finger indentations lightly impressed into the top of handles (Pulak and Matheny 2021: 28–32; Georgiou et al. 2025: 64–65). These are not readily visible, except to the most observant, and are certainly under-recorded in the published record. This potmark is typical of vessels that are otherwise marked, in that it is incised into the handle, relatively large-scale, and aligned parallel to the vertical axis of the handle. Their placement, size, and depth of incision suggest that these marks were intended to be readily visible. The excavator suggests AV01-01-03 was incised after firing (Steel 2022: 92); however, we note the challenges in discriminating between marks cut into leather-hard or fired clay,

even when looking at the incisions through a magnifying hand lens. This challenge is exacerbated when the clay surface is worn, as is frequently the case with handles which project and are therefore especially liable to damage. As yet there is no objective way to determine this and at best one can offer a subjective interpretation of observations. Differing opinions about the mark incised into the handle of a coarse-ware stirrup jar from Kourion-*Bamboula* (Daniel 1941: 277, fig. 16/82, 278, no. 82) illustrate potential shortcomings. Palaima et al. (1984) suggest this was made before firing, while Hirschfeld (1999: 37–8; 2008: 128) identifies the mark as having been made post firing. With respect to AV06-01-03, there is no doubt that the fabric was very hard at time of cutting, as grits are sliced and not dragged or pushed into the matrix. Experience suggests this mark was likely cut after firing, but this is not a certainty and the mark could have been incised at any point from pottery workshop to use at Arediou.

<Figure 2 around here>

The mark incised into AV01-01-03 comprises a cross placed between two sloping vertical lines that almost meet at the apex to form an arrow. Comparison with other amphora handles incised with more complex marks, whose orientation is otherwise known, suggests that this is how this mark is intended to be “read”, i.e. with its top pointing toward the top of the handle. This mark resembles a sign of the Cypro-Minoan syllabary (CM 025; Ferrara 2012: 255, table 5.10; Donnelly and Polig 2022: 28). CM 025 appears in an inscription, comprising at least five signs, incised into the shoulder of a pithos from Enkomi (fig. 3; table 2), and it is cut twice into the handle of a plain ware jug found in a tomb at Hala Sultan Tekke (fig. 4). A third instance of this mark in the context of an inscription on pottery is the two-sign sequence incised into an amphora handle from Tiryns (table 2). Davis et al. (2023) make a convincing argument for identifying this inscription as Cypro-Minoan.

<Figures 3 and 4 around here>

In contrast to these inscriptions, the Arediou mark is a singleton and the question arises whether it should be understood as a Cypro-Minoan sign or if it derives from another notational or writing system. The mark is simple in form and its identification with CM 025 could be coincidental. Nor do the other vases or contexts where this mark appears as a singleton compel an identification with Cypriot writing. The mark appears on vases that were certainly made and used on Cyprus (table 2), for example, incised into a Wash Ware handle from Kourion-*Bamboula*. But it also appears on the handles of Aegean vases, some found on Cyprus and thus perhaps incised after reaching the island (e.g. piriform jars from a disturbed context at Kourion-*Bamboula* and Kition Tomb 4+5), while others, found outside the island (e.g. a large fine-ware stirrup jar from Tell Abu Hawam, Israel) have no intrinsic connection to Cyprus or Cypriot writing. Aegean vases also carry painted renditions of this mark, including a Mycenaean piriform jar from the aforementioned tomb at Hala Sultan Tekke and a small Mycenaean stirrup jar from Lapithos Tomb 2. Unlike the incised marks, the painted marks appear on the lower bodies (and possibly under the base of the stirrup jar), where they would be barely visible at stance. The closest parallel is the same mark incised into an amphora handle from a LC IIIB context at Enkomi (table 2). Whether incised or painted, prominently visible, or relatively hidden, this mark, found on Cypriot and Aegean vases on and off Cyprus, either represents widespread use of a Cypro-Minoan sign, or was a simple form independently devised for use in several different marking systems, or perhaps a combination.

<Table 2 around here>

Hirschfeld has maintained that single marks should only be identified as writing signs when they can be shown to be part of a marking system demonstrably connected with a writing system; so, for example, the marks incised into Aegean pottery reflect a single recording system based in familiarity with the Cypro-Minoan script (Hirschfeld 1992; 1993; but see Donnelly 2022, who argues for other parameters). In contrast, the marks incised into the bases of Red Lustrous Wheelmade spindle bottles reflect a different marking system, not associated with Cypro-Minoan writing (Hirschfeld 2014b). The diversity of mark-types (not only in terms of shape, but also size, manner of incision, and location on the handle) on amphorae indicates the existence of more than one marking system. No one has yet clearly defined those various marking systems nor identified which, if any, are based on Cypro-Minoan signs (Hirschfeld 2014b). At present, the most that can be said of the mark incised into AV06-01-03 is that it has the same

form as CM 025, but cannot be firmly identified as a textual sign, much less specifically Cypro-Minoan. Sometimes a mark is simply a mark. The most unusual feature of this mark is its findspot, in a performative ritual space used for feasting (Steel 2021; 2023); however, it is unclear whether this has significance for the meaning and/or function of the sign or is simply coincidence.

AN INSCRIBED MINOAN STIRRUP JAR

The disc and partial handle from a Late Minoan IIB coarse-ware stirrup jar, joined from two sherds (AV06-01-01; fig. 5), was found in fieldwalking north of the main excavation area. These jars were used for the bulk transport of a liquid commodity, presumably olive oil or perhaps wine, but given complications of identifying the initial contents due to their probable repeated reuse this has not been substantiated by residue analysis (Ben Shlomo et al. 2011: 335). This is one of at least 65 known coarse-ware stirrup jars with incised marks found in the East Mediterranean, half from Cyprus, a quarter from Crete or the Greek mainland, and the rest from Syria, Israel, Egypt, and the Uluburun and Cape Gelidonya shipwrecks. Of the 22 transport stirrup jars found in the Northern Levant, between Ugarit and Sarepta, around half have evidence for marks on their handles (Ben Shlomo et al. 2011: 336–7). This distribution is intriguing, particularly the concentration at Minet el Beidha, Ras Shamra, and Ras Ibn Hani, given the close cultural and economic ties linking Cyprus and Ugarit (Steel 2013: 30–40; Knapp 2024: 65–76), and perhaps illustrates shared marking practices. Most of these jars, including AV06-01-01, are made of a fabric visually identifiable as the “oatmeal ware” typical of Cretan manufacture, though only a few have had that provenience confirmed by scientific analysis. The excavator identified the marks made on the Arediou stirrup jar as having been incised after firing (Steel 2009: 139), as seems likely on analogy with other incised marks on coarse-ware stirrup jars. Like the marked amphora, this transport vessel could have been marked at any point from pottery workshop to use at Arediou. Minoan pottery, typically amphoroid kraters and transport stirrups, is found in small quantities scattered throughout the site, suggesting that despite its rarity its distribution was not controlled and Minoan pottery was incorporated within various daily practices (Steel 2022: 90).

<Figure 5 around here>

An arrowhead-shaped mark and a second partially preserved mark are incised along the vertical axis of the handle (fig. 6). This is the only attested instance of an arrowhead-shaped mark incised into a coarse-ware stirrup jar. The arrowhead with three equal-length legs is common in the corpus of incised and painted marks on LBA Mediterranean pottery; the variant here, with lengthened central prong, is less frequent, but is attested on a range of fabrics and shapes widely distributed throughout the Mediterranean (table 3). Because the handle was found at an inland site on Cyprus, and because the mark and its ceramic context are typical of Cypriot marking practices, it is plausible to suggest that this mark was incised on the island, by a Cypriot, and even to identify it as a sign of writing, CM 028. Alternatively, Steel has considered the possibility that this mark, incised into a vase originating in Mycenaean Crete, might rather have been cut there using the local Linear B script (Steel 2009: 139). There is an arrowhead-shaped sign in the Linear B syllabary, *ti*, though it differs from the mark in that the central element is disconnected from the body. In any case, the mark itself is too simple to validate either hypothesis. Absent a definitive identification with a script sign, the proper context for understanding the value of this mark is not the singular vase or sign but the greater pattern of incised marks and Aegean vases. Incised marks on Aegean vases are indicative of Cypriot, not Aegean, marking practices (Hirschfeld 1992; 1993).

<Figure 6 and Table 3 around here>

The trace of a second incised mark on the Arediou handle is significant, indicating this is an inscription, “[a] group of at least two signs” as defined by Godart and Olivier (1978: 34, though see Olivier 2007: 16 and Ferrara 2012: 17–19 for discussions of the difficulty of definition). In spite of the minimal preservation, it is clear from the alignment, size, and depth of the incision that the vertical stroke is part of a sign intended as a complement to the “arrowhead”. Purely on the basis of vase origin and sign-form, this might be a Linear B inscription, for *ti* begins many Mycenaean words. But in terms of Linear B writing practices, this inscribed vase would be unique. The only two other examples of coarse-ware stirrup jars with multiple signs per handle are both idiosyncratic and neither provides a good comparison for our inscription. A complete jar from a LM IIIA:2 shrine at Amnisos, Crete (Haskell et al. 2011: 134 AMO1) has two signs

incised into one handle. However, it appears from the only published image of the marks that they are aligned horizontally (Schäfer 1992: 190, pl. 52:3) rather than the columnar vertical arrangement more usual for handles of any kind of LBA vase carrying more than one sign. A coarse-ware stirrup jar found in the temple storerooms at Zawiyet Umm el-Rackam, Egypt (Snape 2003: 68, fig. 4) has the same sign repeated on both handles, as is common for coarse-ware stirrup jars marked on both handles; additionally, one handle has a second sign, clearly inscribed by a different tool and presumably by a different person, for a different purpose than the doubled sign. Bearing in mind our observation on Cypriot marking habits above, the Arediou inscription is more likely Cypro-Minoan writing, with the arrowhead-shaped sign identified as CM 028. Unfortunately, this identification finds no corroboration in the limited repertoire of Cypro-Minoan inscriptions. There are five instances in which CM 028 is attested as an initial sign, on three Mycenaean vases from Kition (fig. 7) and on two tablets from Enkomi (table 4). In none of these is the following sign characterized by a vertical extending upward. It can be further specified that the vertical potentially fits only six Cypro-Minoan signs CM 004-009 and 030.

<Figure 7 and Table 4 around here>

The Arediou inscription cannot be read due to its fragmentary preservation and the fact that Cypro-Minoan remains undeciphered. Hirschfeld (1996; 2001) has suggested that the signs incised into the handles of Aegean pottery reflect a marking system devised by merchants familiar with the Cypro-Minoan signary and Donnelly (2024) further explores the mercantile connections of writers of Cypro-Minoan. Ferrara and Bell (2016) contend that similar short Cypro-Minoan inscriptions might have functioned as a form of commodity branding, signaling the quality of copper merchandise. Concerns about quality and authenticity might similarly apply to the contents of a transport stirrup jar embedded in long-distance exchange.

PAINTED MARKS ON MYCENAEAN POTTERY

Around 57% of the imports at Arediou are Mycenaean. The sherds largely came from drinking sets (Kraters and shallow bowls) or stirrup jars. For the most part, these are very worn, fragmentary, and scattered throughout the site, suggesting Mycenaean vases were repeatedly used and broken in daily life (Steel 2023: 87–89). Only one complete Mycenaean vessel has been found at Arediou: a stirrup jar in Tomb 1 (**AV06-01-06**; fig. 8). This has an “X” painted under its base (fig. 9). As is typical of painted marks on Mycenaean pottery found on Cyprus and the Levant, the mark paint is matt, thin, and washy; likewise, it is of a different hue and consistency than the painted decoration. In some cases it is evident that the mark was painted over the decoration; in the particular case of AV06-01-06, it was difficult to determine whether this holds true. What is clear generally is that marks were applied separately from the decoration and, in some cases, after the vase had been decorated, but there is no objective means for determining whether painted marks were applied pre- or post-firing. This is of absolute significance as it makes all the difference in determining whether a mark had relevance to production or post-production functions. At this point it is impossible to say.

<Figures 8 and 9 around here>

With reference specifically to Aegean vases exported to Cyprus and the Levant, painted marks are usually located under the base, on the lower body, or inside the vase; i.e. placed so that they are inconspicuous when the vase is set at stance. A person needed to handle the vase – turn it over or look inside – to see the mark(s). On the other hand, the large and wide brush used to paint the strokes made the marks easy to see, once looked for. They were meant to be *conspicuous within their inconspicuous location*. The difference in visibility between the incised marks (readily conspicuous) and painted marks (conspicuous only upon examination) surely indicates different reasons for marking, whatever these may have been. Another distinction between painted and incised marks is the kinds of vases marked. Broadly speaking, although with significant exceptions (table 5), incised marks are found on large, closed containers while painted marks appear on the smaller variants of those forms, in addition to a broader range of open and closed shapes. The three marked vases from Arediou conform to this pattern: the transport jars with incised marks on the handles and a small stirrup jar with a mark painted under its base.

<Table 5 around here>

Painted marks of the wide, washy type are extremely rare and almost exclusively associated with Aegean decorated pottery found in the eastern Mediterranean. We know of approximately 60 small decorated Aegean stirrup jars with painted marks under their bases and six on their lower bodies, half of which were found on Cyprus. Most of the rest are from the Levantine coast, and eight are from Egypt. The common traits of the mark application (matt washy paint, broad brushstrokes, inconspicuous location) suggest that this is a cohesive marking system; nonetheless, the parameters which made it possible to identify the incised marks on Aegean pottery as examples of a single marking system based on the Cypro-Minoan script are not readily apparent for the painted marks. Based on distribution, the development and/or employment of this marking system was likely associated with Cyprus or Cypriots, and at least a half-dozen examples of painted Cypro-Minoan inscriptions suggest that their painters, at least, were cognizant of the Cypriot script (Hirschfeld 2014; 2019). A Mycenaean stirrup jar from a tomb at Enkomi (table 6) provides a close parallel to AV06-06-01, both in terms of the mark and the vessel. Otherwise, the use of X as a potmark, either painted or incised, is not nearly as common as one might expect. This may be partially a matter of perception: X's with acute angles are easily identifiable, but if the X has right angles, only its orientation differentiates it from a cross, and intended mark orientation can be impossible to determine when the mark appears under the base or on a fragmentary body sherd. Crosses are common, before or after firing, painted or incised, on a range of wares and shapes but there are only a few other instances of painted X's on Mycenaean pottery, a painted X on the body of an amphorae from Hala Sultan Tekke, and an X incised into the handle of an amphora from Maa-Palaeokastro (table 6).

<Table 6 around here>

While almost a quarter of the known Mycenaean vases with painted marks have undefined contexts, most were found in tombs, like AV06-06-01. It is also true that the great preponderance of these large, dilute, painted marks are found on Aegean vases, so it is tempting to try to find meaning in the correlation of painted marks, Aegean pottery, and funerary contexts. However, this association may well be a matter of preservation rather than a meaningful pattern. The marks *appear* to be rather ephemeral, i.e. easily rubbed or flaked off in the course of normal use and handling. It has, of course, not been possible to test this, as museums are understandably reluctant to allow their objects, especially those with marks or writing, to be subjected to wear and tear! If this is indeed true, it would follow that painted marks are more likely to be preserved in protected environments, such as tombs. It is also true that Mycenaean pottery was a prized component of funerary deposits. So the relatively large proportion of painted marks from tomb contexts and on Aegean vases may be a result of depositional practices and environments rather than a reflection of ancient usage. The exceptions – the small number of vases from non-funerary contexts, such as a Mycenaean pictorial krater found in settlement context at Pyla-Kokkinokremos (Hirschfeld 2014a: 171–2) and on non-Aegean vases (table 5) – may in fact be indicative of the rule.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF POTMARKS AT AREDIUO

Marked ceramics circulated widely throughout LBA Cyprus but the information conveyed by potmarks and who understood those messages remains elusive. Cypriots certainly had need or desire to notate a small selection of the pithoi, amphoras, plain jugs and jars, Mycenaean vases, and occasional other shapes or wares used for personal, religious, funerary, industrial, storage, transport, or exchange purposes in their towns and villages. The fact that several distinctive systems can be identified points to diverse reasons for marking. The vast majority of marks were readily conspicuous and placed on closed vessels and there appears to be some still-undefined connection with Cypro-Minoan writing. These patterns raise questions of valency and literacy of potmarks at Arediou and other sites in the Cypriot hinterland, such as Apliki (Hirschfeld 2007), Sanida, and Katydata, that were clearly embedded in the island's economic networks. The differences in form, application, and findspots of the three potmarks from Arediou imply that they reached and were used at the site independently. Although the number appears small, we should bear in mind that only a small area of the site has been excavated and further fieldwork might well reveal more marked pottery. To better understand the significance of these potmarks, we need to consider whether they had valence at the site or if they ended up there arbitrarily (Steel 2009: 143). The identification of place of production, pre- or post-firing application of the marks, and archaeological context are all significant; unfortunately, none of these are decisive. The two marked Aegean vases are both imports and the amphora's place of production is unidentified. Post-firing marks (if indeed these are) may have been made at any point *after* production and *before* arriving at Arediou, and there are no clear functional associations

apparent between any mark and its context, or for the marks collectively, and the site as a whole. Whether we can make a link between these potmarks and LBA writing systems, and from this extrapolate if they are indicative of literacy at Arediou (Steel and McCartney 2008: 21; Steel 2009: 143), is complex; it first requires that the marks be understood as signs of writing and specifically as Cypro-Minoan, the script most likely to be understood in the backcountry of Cyprus. This premise is not certain for any of the Arediou marks and Hirschfeld (1993) cautions against the assumption that a potmark need necessarily be identified with Cypro-Minoan. The marks painted under the Mycenaean stirrup jar and incised into the amphora handle are signs of notational systems but cannot be definitively identified with any specific script. Only the marks cut into the handle of the Minoan stirrup jar are likely to be a Cypro-Minoan inscription. While Veters suggests that the use of individual Cypro-Minoan signs to mark pottery might indicate a form of “literacy-awareness” or “sign recognition” (2011: 9; see also, Sherratt 2003; Donnelly 2024) by some members of society, the appearance of writing does not necessarily mean anyone at Arediou could *read* it. The inscription might have been inscribed and intended for eyes at any point along its journey from Crete to Cyprus’ interior. Nonetheless, alongside substantial quantities of imported pottery, the presence of diverse marked pottery, plausible evidence for the use of Cypro-Minoan signs, and one inscription, all point to the site’s integration within the economic and administrative structures that developed on Cyprus during the LBA and link Arediou to wider trade networks in the East Mediterranean.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many thanks to the team members who took part in fieldwork at Cyprus, in particular the students from the University of Wales Trinity Saint David. Financial support for the project came from ASOR, the Council for British Research in the Levant, Institute of Aegean Prehistory, the Prehistoric Society, and the Society of Antiquaries, London. We are grateful to the staff of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus, especially Eftychia Zachariou and Despo Pilides. Work would not have been possible in Arediou without the welcome and hospitality of the villagers of Arediou, in particular Papa Petros Photiou, Maria Vasileiou, and Andreas Petevenou. Thank you to the reviewers for their insightful comments of our reviewers. Addressing them has significantly improved the quality of our contribution. Thank you to Eloise Govier for her artist’s reconstruction of Arediou. Particular thanks are due to Steve Thomas, for his photography, his continued help and support, and for reading various drafts of our paper.

REFERENCES

- Åström, Paul. 1966. *Excavations at Kalopsidha and Ayios Iakovos in Cyprus*, SIMA 2. Lund: Åströms Förlag.
- Åström, Paul, David Bailey, and Vassos Karageorghis. 1976. *Hala Sultan Tekke 1: Excavations 1897–1971*. Göteborg: Åströms Förlag.
- Åström, P. 1989. *Hala Sultan Teke 9: Trenches 1972–1987*. Göteborg: Åströms Förlag.
- Balensi, Jacqueline. 1980. *Les fouilles R.W. Hamilton à Tell Abu Hawam. Niveaux IV et V*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Palais Universitaire de Strasbourg.
- Ben-Shlomo, David, Eleni Nodarou and Jeremy B. Rutter. 2011. Transport Stirrup Jars from the Southern Levant: New Light on Minoan Trade in the East Mediterranean, *American Journal of Archaeology* 115: 329–53.
- Cateloy, Cydrisse. 2022. *La mesure des échanges en Méditerrané orientale: les amphores levantine de l’âge du Bronze moyen et récent à l’étude*. PhD Thesis. Université de Paris.
- Cline, Eric 1994. *Sailing the Wine-Dark Sea: International Trade and the Late Bronze Age Aegean*. Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research.
- CompAS <https://www.ucy.ac.cy/compas/>
- Daniel, John Franklin. 1941. Prolegomena to the Cypro-Minoan Script. *American Journal of Archaeology* 45: 249–82.
- Davis, Brent, Joseph Maran, Susanne Prillwitz, Soňa Wirghová. 2023. A Canaanite jar with Cypro-Minoan inscription from Tiryns: TIRY Avas 001. *Kadmos* 62 (1/2): 1–32.
- Demas, Martha and Vassos Karageorghis. 1988. *Excavations at Maa-Palaeokastro 1979–1986*. Nicosia. Department of Antiquities
- Dikaios, Porphyrios. 1969–1971. *Enkomi Excavations 1948–1958*, Mainz: von Zabern.

- Donnelly, Cassandra M. 2022. Cypro-Minoan and its Potmarks and Vessel Inscriptions as Challenges to Aegean Scripts Corpora. Pp. 49–73 in *Writing Around the Ancient Mediterranean Practices and Adaptations*, eds. Philippa M. Steele and Philip J. Boyes. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Donnelly, Cassandra M. 2024. *Cypro-Minoan and its Writers at Home and Overseas*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Cassandra M. Donnelly and Martina Polig 2022. Between Frustration and Progression: An Integrated Cypro-Minoan Signary and Its Paleographic Diversity. *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici Nuova Serie 8*: 41–62.
- Ferrara, Silvia. 2012. *Cypro-Minoan Inscriptions I: Analysis*. Oxford: OUP.
- Ferrara, Silvia. 2013. *Cypro-Minoan Inscriptions II: The Corpus*. Oxford: OUP
- Ferrara, Silvia and Carol Bell. 2016. Tracing Copper in the Cypro-Minoan Script. *Antiquity* 90: 1009–21.
- Georgiou, Artemis. 2011. Pyla-Kokkinokremos, Maa-Palaeokastro and the Settlement Histories of Cyprus in the Twelfth Century BC. PhD Dissertation, Oxford.
- Georgiou, A. 2014. Appendix III: The Canaanite Jars. Pp 175–87 in *Pyla Kokkinokremos: A Late 13th century BC Fortified Settlement in Cyprus: Excavations 2010–2011*, eds. Vassos Karageorghis and Anastasia Kanta. SIMA 141. Uppsala: Åströms Förlag.
- Georgiou, Artemis, Anna Georgiadou, Cassandra M. Donnelly, Sabine Fourrier 2025. Maritime Transport Containers from Late Bronze Age – Early Iron Age Cyprus: Preliminary Results from the Excavations at Kition-Bamboula. Pp. 51-75 in *Levantine and Phoenician Commercial Amphorae between East and West: Patterns of Innovation (16th-7th Centuries BCE)*, eds. Massimo Botto and Tatiana Pedrazzi.
- Transformations and Crises in the Mediterranean 2. Rome: CNR – Istituto di Scienze del Patrimonio Culturale.
- Godart, Louis et Jean-Pierre Olivier. 1978. *Fouilles exécutées à Mallia: Le Quartier Mu I: Introduction générale, écriture hiéroglyphique crétoise. Études Crétoises XXIII*. Paris: Geuthner.
- Haskell, Halford, Richard Jones, Peter Day, and John Killen. 2011. *Transport Stirrup Jars of the Bronze Age Aegean and East Mediterranean*. Philadelphia: INSTAP.
- Hirschfeld, Nicolle. 1992. Cypriot Marks on Mycenaean Pottery. Pp. 315–19 *Mykenaiika: BCH Supplement 25*, ed. J.-P. Olivier.
- Hirschfeld, Nicolle. 1993. Incised Marks (Post-Firing) on Aegean Wares. Pp. 311–18 in *Wace and Blegen: Pottery as Evidence for Trade in the Late Bronze Age Aegean*, ed. Carole Zerner. Amsterdam: Gieben
- Hirschfeld, Nicolle. 1996. Cypriots in the Mycenaean Aegean. Pp. 289–97 in *Atti e memorie del Secondo Congresso Internazionale di Micenologia I*, eds. Ernesto de Miro, Louis Godart and Anna Sacconi. Rome: Gruppo Editoriale Internazionale
- Hirschfeld, Nicolle. 1999. Potmarks of the Late Bronze Age Eastern Mediterranean. PhD Dissertation, University of Texas.
- Hirschfeld, Nicolle. 2001. Cypriots to the West? The Evidence of their Potmarks. Pp. 121–9 in *Italy and Cyprus in Antiquity 1500–450 BC*, eds. Larissa Bonfante and Vassos Karageorghis. Nicosia: Severis Foundation.
- Hirschfeld, Nicolle. 2006. Vases Marked for Exchange: The Not-So-Special Case of Pictorial Pottery. Pp. 83–96 in *Pictorial Pursuits: Figurative Painting on Mycenaean and Geometric Pottery*, eds. Eva Rystedt and Berit Wells Stockholm: Svenska Institutet i Athen.
- Hirschfeld, Nicolle. 2007. Chapter Five: Marked Objects from Apliki *Karamallos*. Pp. 253–68 in *Joan Du Plat Taylor's Excavations at the Late Bronze Age Mining Settlement at Apliki Karamallos, Cyprus*, eds. Barbara Kling and John Muhly. SIMA 134:1-2, Sävedalen: Åströms Förlag.
- Hirschfeld, Nicolle. 2008. How and Why Potmarks Matter, *Near Eastern Archaeology* 71(1–2), 120–9.
- Hirschfeld, Nicolle. 2014a. Marked pottery at Pyla-Kokkinokremos, 2010–2011. Pp. 169–73 in *Pyla Kokkinokremos: A Late 13th century BC Fortified Settlement in Cyprus: Excavations 2010–2011*, eds. Vassos Karageorghis and Anastasia Kanta. SIMA 141. Uppsala: Åströms Förlag.
- Hirschfeld, Nicolle. 2014b. Signs of Writing? Red Lustrous Wheelmade Vases and Ashkelon Amphorae. Pp. 261–9 in *Ke-ra-me-ja: Studies Presented to Cynthia W. Shelmerdine*, eds. Dimitri Nakassis, Joann Gulizio and Sarah James. Philadelphia: INSTAP.
- Hirschfeld, Nicolle. 2019. Marked pottery found by the British Museum expedition to Egkomi, 1896. Pp. 135-154 in *The Tombs of Egkomi: British Museum Excavations*, ed. Despina Pilides. Nicosia: Department of Antiquities, Cyprus.
- Hult, Gunnel. 1981. *Hala Sultan Tekke 7: Excavations in Area 8 in 1977*. Göteborg: Åströms Förlag.
- Karageorghis, Vassos. 1974. *Excavations at Kition I. The Tombs*. Nicosia: Department of Archaeology.

- Masson, Emily. 1974. Appendix II. Signes chypro-minoens isolés, graves ou peints. Pp. 145–7 in *Excavations at Kition I. The Tombs*, ed. Karageorghis 1974: Nicosia: Department of Archaeology.
- Knapp, A. Bernard. 2024. *Cyprus and Ugarit: Connecting Material and Mercantile Worlds*. Leiden: Sidestone Press.
- Masson, Emilia 1988. Appendix V. Marques chypro-minoennes à Maa-Palaeokastro. Pp. 399–400 in *Excavations at Maa-Palaeokastro 1979–1986*, Martha Demas and Vassos Karageorghis eds. Nicosia: Department of Archaeology.
- Murray, Sarah. 2023. Eastern Mediterranean Bronze Age Trade in Archaeological Perspective: A Review of Interpretative and Empirical Developments. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 31: 395–447.
- Pieridou, Angeliki. 1966. A Tomb-Group from Lapithos “Ayia Anastasia”. *Reports of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus*: 1–12.
- Olivier, Jean-Pierre. 2007. *Édition Holistique des Textes Chypro-Minoens*. Biblioteca di ‘Pasiphae’, Collana di filologia e antichità egee VI. Pisa and Rome: Fabrizio Serra.
- Pulak, Cemal and Rachel Matheny 2021. The Canaanite Pottery Assemblage from the Late Bronze Age Uluburun Shipwreck. *TINA: Maritime Archaeology Periodical* 15: 14–61.
- Schäfer, J. 1992. *Amnisos. Nach den archäologischen, historischen un epigraphischen Zeugnissen des Altertums und der Neuzeit*. Berlin: Gebr. Mann.
- Schaeffer, Claude. 1949. *Ugaritica II. Nouvelles études relatives aux découvertes de Ras Shamra*. Paris: Geuthner.
- Sherratt, Susan. 2003. Visible Writing: Questions of Script and Identity in Early Iron Age Greece and Cyprus. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 22(3): 225–242.
- Smith, Joanna. 2012. Seals, Scripts, and Politics at Late Bronze Age Kourion. *American Journal of Archaeology* 116(1): 39–103.
- Snape, Steven 2003. Zawiyet Umm el-Rakham and Egyptian Foreign Trade. Pp. 63–70. in *PLOES...Sea Routes...Interconnections in the Mediterranean 16th–6th c. BC.*, eds. Nicholas Stampolides and Vassos Karageorghis. Athens: Leventis Foundation.
- Snape, Steven and Penelope Wilson. 2007. *Zawiyet Umm el-Rakham I: The Temple and Chapels* Bolton: Rutherford Press.
- Steel, Louise 2009. Exploring Regional Settlement on Cyprus in the Late Bronze Age: The Rural Hinterland. Pp. 135–45 in *The Formation of Cyprus in the 2nd Millennium BC. Studies in Regionalism During the Middle and Late Bronze Ages*, ed. Irmgard Hein. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press.
- Steel, Louise. 2013. *Materiality and Consumption in the Bronze Age Mediterranean*. London: Routledge.
- Steel, Louise. 2016. Exploring Aredhiou: New Light on the Rural Communities of the Cypriot Hinterland during the Late Bronze Age. *American Journal of Archaeology* 120(4): 511–36. DOI: 10.3764/aja.120.4.0511
- Steel, Louise. 2021. Hospitality or Heterotopia: What Happened in Room 103 at Aredhiou? Pp. 105–18 in *All Things Cypriot: Studies on Ancient Environment, Technology, and Society in Honor of Stuart Swiny*, eds. Zuzana Chovanec and Walter Crist, Boston: ASOR.
- Steel, Louise 2022. Agencement, Matter Flows and Itinerary of Object in the Bronze Age East Mediterranean: A New Materialities Approach to Globalization. Pp. 81–102 in *Globalization and Transculturality from Antiquity to the Pre-Modern World*, eds. Serena Autiero and Matthew Cobb, London: Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9781003096269-4.
- Steel, L. 2023. Mycenaean Pottery from the Cypriot Hinterland: Luxuries, Commodities or Oddities? Pp. 179–205 in *The Lady of Pottery: Ceramic Studies Presented to Penelope A. Mountjoy in Acknowledgement of Her Outstanding Scholarship*, eds. Anna-Lucia d’Agata and Peter Pavúk, SMEA NS, Supplement 3.
- Steel, Louise and Carole McCartney. 2008. Survey at Aredhiou-Vouppes (Lithosouros): A Late Bronze Age Agricultural Settlement on Cyprus. A Preliminary Analysis of the Material Culture Assemblages. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 351: 9–37.
- Steel, Louise and Steve Thomas. 2008. Excavations at Aredhiou-Vouppes (Lithosouros), Cyprus. An Interim Report on Excavations 2005–2006. *Reports of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus*: 227–49.
- Stubbings, Frank. 1951. *Mycenaean Pottery from the Levant*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Vermeule, Emily and Vassos Karageorghis. 1982. *Mycenaean Pictorial Vase Painting*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Vetters, Melissa. 2011. A Clay Ball with a Cypro-Minoan Inscription from Tiryns. *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 2: 1–49.

Yon, Marguerite and Annie Caubet. 1985. *Kition-Bamboula III: Le sondage L–N 13 (Bronze récent et Géométrique I)*. Paris: Recherche sur les Civilisations.

CAPTIONS

Banner: Artist's impression of Arediou-*Vouppes*. Drawing Eloise Govier.

Alt Text: Color drawing showing women in foreground grinding grain in building courtyard in front of mudbrick buildings.

Figure 1. Map of Cyprus showing location of Arediou-*Vouppes* and sites mentioned in text. Drawing Louise Steel.

Alt Text: Color map of Cyprus showing location of Arediou in centre of island.

Figure 2. AV06-01-03: amphora handle. Photo Steve Thomas.

Alt Text: Color photo showing detail of potmark inscribed on amphora handle.

Figure 3. Pithos fragment from Enkomi with inscription, CM 025 marked in red. After Ferrara 2013: 157, Cat. No. 108.

Alt Text: Drawing of five-sign inscription on pithos sherd with CM 025 marked in red.

Figure 4. Plain white wheelmade jug handle, Hala Sultan Tekke. Photo Nicolle Hirschfeld.

Alt Text: Color photo showing detail of two potmarks inscribed on a Plain ware jug handle.

Figure 5. AV06-01-01: Minoan stirrup jar handle. Photo Steve Thomas.

Alt Text: Color photo of the false neck and handle of a Minoan stirrup jar.

Figure 6. Detail of inscription marked in red on AV06-01-01. Drawing Alison South.

Alt Text: Drawing showing two-sign inscription marked in red on handle of Minoan stirrup jar.

Figure 7. Inscriptions on base of Mycenaean vessels from Kition, with CM 028 marked in red. After Ferrara 2013: 187, 189–90; Cat. Nos. 132–134.

Alt Text: Drawing of two-sign inscription on the base of three Mycenaean vases, with CM 028 marked in red.

Figure 8. AV06-01-06: Mycenaean stirrup jar. Photo Steve Thomas.

Alt Text: Colour photo of Mycenaean stirrup jar.

Figure 9. Painted mark on base of AV06-01-06. Photo Steve Thomas.

Alt Text: Colour photo showing painted X sign on base of Mycenaean stirrup jar.

Table 1: Potmarks from Arediou

Registration Number	Location and Context	Description	Potmark Identification	Associated Finds and Pottery	References
AV06-01-03	1069/998 Floor level of Room 103 [context 103]	Handle of a Maritime Transport amphora, with single incised mark Dimensions: Length of handle 6.7cm	Incised sign, CM 025?	Copper (alloy) ring (AV08-08-01), Base Ring bull fragment. Sherds: five Mycenaean shallow bowl rims and five body sherds, Levantine platter bowl (AV06-01-08), two lamp fragments, cooking ware, Plain ware, pithos, Base Ring juglets, White Slip bowls, Monochrome, WPWM III, Red Lustrous flask, White Slip dipper	Fig. 2; Steel and Thomas 2008: 241, fig. 23; Steel 2009: 141; Steel 2022: 92, fig. 4.5/3
AV06-01-01	Field 1265 (1923 cadastral map sheet XXIX sheet 56) Surface find	Disk and partial handle from a Late Minoan IIIB “oatmeal ware” stirrup jar, joined from two sherds. Dimensions: Length of handle 5.2 cm; Diameter false disc 3.6 cm	Incised inscription marked along the vertical axis of the handle: arrowhead-shaped mark (CM 028?) and traces of a second vertical stroke		Figs. 5–6; Steel and Thomas 2008: 229 fig. 2d; Steel 2022: 90, fig. 4.4/2
AV06-01-06	1147/1006 Tomb 1, burial level [context 83]	Complete Mycenaean stirrup jar. FS 171, FM 19 Dimensions: Height 10cm; maximum diameter 13cm; baes diameter 5.4cm; diameter of false disc 2.5 cm; diameter of spout rim 2cm.	Painted sign (X) in washy matt red paint on base	Black Slip jug (AV06-01-05); copper (alloy) spear (AV06-08-02)	Figs. 8–9; Steel and Thomas 2008, 242 fig. 26; Steel 2009: 143 fig. 8; Steel 2022: 88, fig. 4.4/1

Table 2: Comparanda for AV06-01-03 (CM 025)

Site	Reference
Incised signs	
Enkomi: pithos shoulder, ENKO Avas 001	Fig. 3; Ferrara 2013: Cat. No. 108
Enkomi: amphora handle, Inv. 3847/2	Dikaios 1969–1971: 770, 891, pls. 175/8, 319/120
Tiryas: amphora handle, TIRY Avas 001	Davis et al. 2023
Kourion-Bamboula: Wash ware handle, G30	Smith 2012: 84, no. 8
Hala Sultan Tekke: plain white wheelmade jug, HALA Avas 001	Fig. 4; Ferrara 2013: Cat. No. 122
Kourion-Bamboula, Mycenaean piriform jar, G48	Smith 2012: 86 no. 32
Kition Tomb 4+5/107, Mycenaean piriform jar	Karageorghis 1974: 21, Masson 1974: 145, no. A5, 147 fig.1e, pls. XV, XXXVII
Tell Abu Hawam: Mycenaean stirrup jar, PAM 47-1615/1	Balensi 1980: 56, 429, 436, 555, No. 226, pl. 32:10, 75, 147:24
Hala Sultan Tekke Tomb 1/51: Mycenaean piriform jar	Åström et al. 1976: 74 no. 51, 133 no. 18, 134, fig. 125/18, pls. LIV, LXVIII
Lapithos Tomb 2: Mycenaean stirrup jar	Pieridou 1966: 9 no. 98b, pl. I: 3–4

Table 3: Pottery Marked with “Arrowhead” sign (CM028?)

Site	Object	References
Maa-Paleokastro	Single mark incised into a Plain White Wheelmade jug handle (no 133). Identified by Masson as Cypro-Minoan 28, but Georgiou (2011) states “Its identification as the Cypro-Minoan sign no. 28 is tentative, since there is an additional oblique line incised [not pictured].”	Demas and Karageorghis 1988: pls. C, CCVII; Masson 1988: 399, II:7, pl. B/7; Georgiou 2011: Table 57, M91
Kition-Bamboula	KEF-103: single mark incised into an amphora handle. The orientation of this mark is reversed from the usual, in which the legs of the “arrowhead” splay toward the base of the handle.	Yon and Caubet 1985: 179, figs. 80, 83
Ugarit (acropolis)	Single mark incised before firing into a body sherd	Schaeffer 1949: 228 no. 4
Hala Sultan Tekke	F6525: partially preserved mark incised (before firing, according to the excavator) into a fragmentary handle from a Mycenaean (three-handled piriform?) jar	Åström 1989: 79, fig. 160
Cannatella, Italy	Single mark incised into a Mycenaean amphora handle (no. 235)	Hirschfeld 2001: 121–2
Kition Tomb 4+5*, KITI Avas 003	No. 108: a two-sign sequence incised into the base of a Mycenaean bell-shaped krater	Fig. 7; table 4; Ferrara 2013: Cat. No. 132 (see Table 4)
Kition Tomb 4+5*, KITI Avas 004	No. 110: a two-sign sequence incised into the base of a Mycenaean jug	Fig. 7; table 4; Ferrara 2013: Cat. No. 133
Kition Tomb 4+5*, KITI Avas 005	No. 207: a two-sign sequence incised into the base of a Mycenaean jug	Fig. 7; table 4; Ferrara 2013: Cat. No. 134

*All three have the same combination of marks, though the order is reversed on No. 110

Table 4: Two Sign Inscriptions Starting With CM 028

Site	Object	Inscription	Reference
Kition Tomb 4+5, KITI Avas 003	Mycenaean bell-shaped krater	CM 028 + CM027	Fig. 7; table 3; Ferrara 2013: Cat. No. 132
Kition Tomb 4+ 5, KITI Avas 004	Mycenaean jug	CM 027 + CM028 (reversed order)	Fig. 7; table 3; Ferrara 2013: Cat. No. 133
Kition Tomb 4+5, KITI Avas 005	Mycenaean jug	CM 028 + CM027	Fig. 7; table 3; Ferrara 2013: Cat. No. 134
Enkomi (Area 1, Quartier 4W, room 46), ENKO Atab 004	Clay tablet: side A, line 10	CM 028 + CM021 + CM017	Ferrara 2013: Cat. No. 209
Enkomi (Area 1, Quartier 4E), on road surface, ENKO Atab 003	Clay tablet: side B line 5	CM 028 + CM110	Ferrara 2013: Cat. No. 208

Table 5: Amphorae with Painted Marks

Site	Reference
Mycenae No. 54-601 (Nauplion 11454)	Catloy 2022, no. 22; Cline 1994: 170, No. 308
Hala Sultan Tekke F1200+	Hult 1981: 27, 31, 76, fig. 63
Enkomi 718/7	Dikaios 1969–1971: 596, pls. 77/23, 125/4
Zawiyet Umm el-Rakham C3.4	Snape and Wilson 2007: 60, fig. 3.22

Table 6: Examples of “X” pot mark

Site and Vessel	Reference
Enkomi Tomb 6, stirrup jar (FS172?) (painted)	Åström 1966: 176, incorrectly cited as no. 52; Stubbings 1951: 47 (A13); Daniel 1941: L281, Class III:1a
Klavdia (BM C412), bell-shaped krater (painted – on base)	Vermeule and Karageorghis 1982: 204, V.62
Hala Sultan Tekke (F1200+), amphora (painted)	Hult 1981: 27, 31, 76, fig. 63
Maa <i>Palaeokastro</i> , amphora (incised)	Georgiou 2011: M177; Demas and Karageorghis 1988: 192, 400, pls. CXLV, CCXXXVIII