

THE ROLE OF CYPRUS AND THE MYCENAEAN / GREEK PRESENCE IN THE ISLAND FROM THE END OF BRONZE AGE TO THE FIRST PHASES OF IRON AGE

by ANNA MARGHERITA JASINK

1. Introduction

In the period following the fall of Mycenaean palaces, of the Hittite empire and of the small states in Syro-Palestinian areas a likely new role for Cyprus seems to open. The island not only maintains its peculiar position as key point for trade but also becomes the cross-road for people who stop in Cyprus, often only provisionally, moving from and towards other countries. Moreover, its role in the field of copper and iron metallurgy and its trade reaches the top¹. We will concentrate on three different aspects which may be connected to enlighten a picture of the whole period, although such a connection is in principle hazardous, such aspects being based on different sources and requiring different methodological approaches: we are referring to archaeological finds, later historical or legendary texts and Cypriote scripts. The fragmentary picture that comes out is, however, rich of possibilities of comparison and intersection and may be a starting point for new researches.

We will analyse in detail the Greece→Cyprus, Anatolian→Cyprus routes², furthermore comparing the “western” impact on Cyprus with eastern (Phoenician and, concerning only the last phases, Assyrian) connections and influences, extending in consequence our research to some aspects of the Archaic period, which seems difficult to separate from the previous ones. Confining the attention to the 12th century, i.e. the beginning of the period of our research, while in the surrounding areas clear changes in cultural sphere and political powers are well recognizable, in Cyprus it is better to speak of changes which occur in a different span of time according to the various areas of the island, forming a sort of puzzle; these changes in many cases develop slowly and not always with a real gap.

Some preliminary remarks about the special role of Cyprus in these periods seem necessary. In the island a generalized crisis may not be uniformly recognized between LC III A (this is the first period we are going to consider) and the Archaic period (CA I-II). On the contrary, a constant development, even if not recognizable in the whole area and with discontinuities at the beginning, includes IIIB (ca. 1125/1100-1050)³ and geometric period CG I-III (ca. 1050-750). Perhaps a definition as

¹ Sherratt 1994, *passim*.

² On the role of Anatolia in these routes and its links with Cyprus see a deeper analysis in Jasink 2011 (forthcoming).

³ The length of LC IIIB has not been clearly defined, except its end around 1050 BC. Surely a lot of changes are included in this discussed phase, but it seems possible to define it generally as a transition phase, in spite of the various interpretations of its material features, to be considered inside the different geographical regions of Cyprus (for a discussion on these problems see Catling 1994). When we speak

“whole area” is not appropriate, because in Cyprus we have to deal, already from the previous ages, with regional entities, which may encounter with each other to form superstructures, either of political or of cultural character, but in most cases maintaining proper features with different time evolution. Even considering as a basic point such an interpretation of the Cypriot reality, a general process of continuity may be seen as the main difference between Cyprus and other Late Bronze Age / starting Iron Age surrounding Mediterranean areas, where a generalized collapse and a subsequent disruption is evident, followed by the appearing of new models of culture⁴. Also in Cyprus many settlements were abandoned, but in other ones a transition without particular changes in their culture may be recognized⁵. Later, when the Cypro-Archaic powers emerge, the adopted writing is again a Linear script and neither a cuneiform or alphabetic one; the language is chiefly Greek⁶, although the political and cultural influence is almost derived by the Near Eastern areas. In consequence, a real break between second and first millennium is difficult to sustain and a research approach to find a bridge between the two periods seems very fruitful.

2. Mycenaeans and Greeks: a sequel instead of a disrupt in the material culture

It's of primary importance to stress how in the 12th century in Cyprus the main fine wares of Late Cypriot Period as Base Ring and White Slip wares, which were

of “eleventh century”, in fact, we are dealing with two distinct phases, LC IIIB and CG IA (ca. 1125-1000), characterized by the new Proto-White Painted / White-Painted ware and by the chamber tombs with *dromos* (see below).

⁴ In Greece, a first disruption is evident after the collapse of the palatial entities, although a Mycenaean culture, no more “palatial” but still based on a Mycenaean manufacture, is well attested: even if the central organization became absent (the writing in fact disappeared), the craftsmen's shops went on to work, partly moving abroad (*in primis* to Cyprus). At the end of LH IIIC this process concludes and with the Geometric period a new age begins, where the “Dorian” element exceeds leading to the *polis* institution and to the Greek civilization (Cultraro 2006: 243-258; about analogous changes in Crete and the peculiar character of the island see Iakovou 2008: 627-628). In Anatolia the Hittite power collapses around the first decade of the 12th century: in the central part of the area a sure break is recognizable, while in the south-western areas new small powers begin to appear, and their culture and writing/language seem, at least partially, the direct offspring of the Hittite ones (Desideri-Jasink 1990; Jasink 1995). In southern Syria and Palestine the situation is very complex, but surely new elements contribute to change the cultures of the area, mainly the entrance of Arameans and the development of some coastal urban centres devoted to sea-trade, i.e. the Phoenicians (a still exhaustive monograph on this subject is represented by Klengel 1992: 181-218, in particular).

⁵ Iakovou 2008: 631. While, e.g., Palaipaphos, Kition, Hale Sultan Tekke and Enkomi survived during the 12th century, other centres as Amathus and Salamis seem founded only starting from LC IIIB (see Vanshoonwinkel 1994 and n. 11 below). A further interesting example may be furnished by Idalion where, according to the excavations of the Department of the Antiquities of Cyprus undertaken since the last years of the 20th century AC., a Cypriot centre has been localized from LC IIC at least to first phase of CG period, i.e. to the end of the 11th century BC (Hadjicosti 1997:50-53). The role of Idalion as a metallurgic centre (for both copper and iron), likely connected to the harbours of Kition and Enkomi, has been stressed by all the authors, and exactly in these periods of changes its industrial installations confirm its vitality.

⁶ About the use of the Linear writing for a second autochthonous language (Eteocypriot) see in the following.

exported abroad in the whole oriental Mediterranean and Aegean, were no more produced; instead, a local, wheel-made production of Mycenaean shapes begins to increase, becoming the main Cypriot production of the period, and also typical Cypriot shapes are painted adopting Mycenaean styles and decorative schemes, the wheel-made pottery completely replacing the hand-made one⁷; however, the continuity in the other aspects of the Cypriot culture is undeniable, while a series of apparently novel elements seem to have appeared, as a matter of fact, before LC IIIA⁸.

One of the most relevant changes in the following period seems represented by a lack of continuity in tomb use, even where the respective settlements are not abandoned. During LC IIIB people use not only new cemetery sites but also a new type of graves, the chamber-tomb with a *dromos*⁹. As to the ceramics, we assist to the predominance of a new ware: the Proto-White Painted, which has been often found in these new cemeteries¹⁰. Surely in the course of the 11th century many changes happened in Cyprus and many sites were abandoned or became less relevant with respect to previously minor or new founded settlements¹¹. However, we have no proof to attribute such changes expressly to the Greek element as a foreign cultural pattern; they seem rather based on autochthonous events in which also Aegean/Greek people took a part but not the most relevant one. It is interesting to stress how in Cyprus, when some ceramic shape falls and is replaced from others (some of the new ones being also of Near Eastern origin), immediately it spreads along the whole island. The ceramic repertoire still represents an evidence of continuity, developing the Iron Age ceramic from the last Late Bronze Age repertoire¹². Also coarse ware pots are produced with the wheel¹³ and no new significant shape and decoration appear while a high standardisation seems proved¹⁴: the Greek element is mixing without disruption with the Cypriot one¹⁵.

⁷ Cadogan 1993: 95-96.

⁸ Iacovou 2008: 631-632.

⁹ On the new tomb features and related funerary practises during LC IIIB and CG IA see Vanschoonwinkel 1994: 117-120, with references.

¹⁰ Iacovou 1989: 54-57. The author stresses how this ware represents "the product of an intense amalgamation process that occurred in LC IIIA... a ware that healed the existing ceramic polymorphy"; Id. 1991.

¹¹ Specifically: a) the abandon of Enkomi and of Halan Sultan Tekke and the foundation of Salamis and the growth of Kition; b) the end of the existence of *Alassa/Pano Mandilari* and *Episkopi/Bamboula* along the Kouris river, from one side, and the end of *Kalavasos/Ayios Dimitrios* and *Maroni/Vournes* along the Vasilikos river, from the other, followed by the foundation of *Amathus* and *Kurion* in the south-western coast of the island; c) the growth of *Paphos* – all events to be dated along the 11th century –; about these changes see a good synthesis with related bibliography in Iacovou 2008: 635-639.

¹² Iacovou 1988.

¹³ This could indicate that the "areas of ceramic manufacture had moved from the domestic arena to specialist workshops" (Steel 1994: 239).

¹⁴ Steel 1994, *passim*.

¹⁵ For a different explanation of the Cypriote changes during 12th and 11th centuries see Wanschoonwinkel 1994: 109, who resumes a common hypothesis – which, however, in the last years had lost some credibility – of two waves of "Achaean" colonisation, the first at the beginning of the 12th and the second during the 11th century. About the question of correlation between the themes of immigration and archaeology see the methodological contribute by Sherratt 1992.

At the beginning of the Iron Age, the new grave pattern characterizing the Cypro-Geometric period derives from the Aegean area, but it's very interesting to stress how again this practise spreads on the whole island, involving settlements which according to the tradition have been founded by autochthonous groups¹⁶.

Going on with the Cypro-Geometric culture, it seems to remain homogeneous (with the entrance of new¹⁷ Phoenician elements¹⁸), even if for the first three centuries of the first millennium we have no many archaeological finds and when the Archaic period, i.e. a much better known period, begins, no great innovations seem to appear in the culture of the island.

3. Myths and legends

"Colonial" episodes are not attested in Cyprus at the beginning of LC IIIA either on the basis of new settlements or on evidence in the material culture. However, to the following period, i.e. during the 12th-11th centuries, three Greek legends have been dated back, which have a long tradition both in Greek and Roman literature, and probably reflect the entry of "new" cultures in Cyprus if not immigrations. It seems interesting to recall at the beginning of our short analysis the link between the three places named together by Tacitus, which, as a matter of fact, are interested to different legends and, most of all, to different historical events, both in time and in space: Tacitus (Annals III, 62, 5)¹⁹ *"The Cypriote followed with an appeal for three shrines. The oldest erected by their founder Aerias²⁰ to the Paphian Venus; the second by his son Amathus to the Amathusian Venus; and a third by Teucer, exiled by the anger of his father Telamon, to Jove of Salamis"*.

a. The first two towns are linked with each other through the personage of Kinyras, who was, according to some legends, the ruler of Paphos, and whose subjects, turned away by Agapenor, founded Amathus. The reason for our interest toward Kinyras is that, in spite of the numerous controversies and discrepancies about this personage, he seems to represent an autochthonous element in contraposition with the foreign ones²¹. In the most ancient sources Kinyras is not yet linked to a specific place of Cyprus: in Homer (Iliad 11, 19-23), we find the description of the wonderful cuirass²² sent to Agamemnon by Kinyras, king of Cyprus, as a hospitality gift. The message by Homer may be very important to collo-

¹⁶ See the case of Amathus (Iacovou 2002) and a discussion about its foundation in §3.

¹⁷ Also in this case, that even being in some aspects parallel to our research we may not examine in detail, a sort of continuity with the Bronze Age Canaanite relations with Cyprus may be stressed (Bikai 1994). See §4.

¹⁸ The Phoenician manufactures but especially the inscriptions seem to circulate on the whole island (Lipinski 2004: 42-46).

¹⁹ English translation by I. Jackson, The Loeb Classical Library, 1959: 621-623.

²⁰ The same Tacitus (Histories II, 3) doubts of the existence of a king with this name, that could be he name of the deity.

²¹ Baurain 1980 gives a synthesis of the whole corpus of legends about Kinyras and the different interpretations.

²² For a discussion about the Cypriot ivory object found in Enkomi and dated likely to LC IIIA and the possibility that the cuirass used by Agamemnon at Troy was a Cypriot masterpiece see Baurain 1980: 295-298 with bibliography.

cate a chronological period where Kinyras ruled: it seems at the end of the 13th century or the beginning of the 12th, probably contemporaneous to the disruption of the Mycenaean palatial era. We follow the opinion that in the LBA not a single kingdom dominated on the whole island, but various rulers governed in harmony in Cyprus, where a net of interchanges was very prosperous, linking the Troodos caves, the trade ways by land and by river, and the harbours with international trade. Probably Kinyras was ruling in the south-western part of the island. Unfortunately his name cannot offer any help to the problem of his origin: it likely seems to be connected to the Semitic common noun – *knr* – which represents a sort of lyre (cf. Akkadian *kinnaru* and Phoenician *kinnûr*) but that is attested also as a personal name in Linear B tablets (*ki-nu-ra*).

The most ancient temple found in Palaipaphos (Temple I) dates back to ca. 1200 BC²³. According to the Greek legend furnished in detail by Pausanias (VIII 5, 2-3), it was the Arcadian hero Agapenor who returning from Troy founded the town and the temple. However, it is possible, as we hinted at above, even if at the moment it remains only at a hypothetical level, that beyond the LBA tombs found in the same area also a LBA city existed before the Greek conquest where Kinyriades lived, with an autochthonous cult devoted to a great female deity; the “Achaean” tradition superimposed giving relevance to the religious aspect, which could also justify the foundation²⁴.

We consider relevant also the legend which connects the Paphian cults to Cilicia, with respect to the divination’s arts, that the Cilician Tamiras²⁵ would have introduced and that became a supplementary part in the religious feasts. In our opinion, this link between Cilicia and Paphos reflects the close connection between the two countries, which is attested by the Cypro-Mycenaean ware of LH IIIC well represented in Cilicia²⁶, and can be taken as one of the aspects of the centrality of Cyprus in this period in the context of the movements of people between Greece, western Anatolia and southern Anatolia.

Concerning the Greek foundation at Palaipaphos, this is the only case where an archaeological finding seems to proof the legend: we are dealing with the famous obelisk discovered in a tomb of the great necropolis of Skales, one of the most extensive CG I cemeteries in Cyprus, where for the first time in the island a Greek noun, in genitive case, according to the tradition of the Arcadian dialect, is attested²⁷.

²³ Around Palaipaphos different necropolis areas belonging to various phases of LBA have been recovered and together with other scattered material they may constitute an evidence for the existence of a settlement before the 12th century.

²⁴ With regard to this point, it seems of interest to recall a following passage by Pausania (VIII 53,7), in which Laodicea, Agapenor’s daughter, establishes in Tegea - the native land of Agapenor and the main city of Arcadia - a temple devoted to Paphian Aphrodite (see the commentary to this passage by Panayotou-Triantaphyllopoulou 2006: 655, about the osmosis between Cypriot and Achaean traditions).

²⁵ Tacitus, Histories II, 3 : *Fama recentior tradit a Cinyra sacratum templum deamque ipsam conceptam mari huc adpulsam; sed scientiam artemque haruspicum accitam et Cilicem Tamiram intulisse.*

²⁶ Jasink and Bombardieri 2008: 30-31 (on Plain Cilicia).

²⁷ See in the following §7.

b. The “re-foundation” of Paphos by Agapenor turned out the Kinyrians – Kinyras in fact did not help Agamemnon in the war against Troy –, and the old inhabitants installed in Amathus, founding there a new town²⁸. The first archaeological findings in this area date back to the transition from LC IIIB to CG IA²⁹: this would be the period when some Cypriot people took refuge there, founding a new city that became the symbol of the Cypriot culture. In this town a language defined Eteocypriot was spoken and written: the script is the same syllabic script that was used in Cyprus for the Greek language as well, next to the alphabetic one, but the language remains up to now unknown. True inscriptions in Eteocypriot have been found almost exclusively³⁰ at Amathus, with the exception of some fragments just from Paphos! I don’t contrast the idea by Iacovou³¹ that the linguistic peculiarity of Amathus is not reflected in the material culture of the site and in the political sphere, but the linguistic fact often is a different phenomenon as to these aspects. In this case in particular, the Cypriot culture is representative of a mixing of elements: but if the Cypriotes who founded Amathus arrived from a center as Palaipaphos, where the last culture belonging to the Bronze Age was in use, there is no difficulty to understand why just in this new place a sort of conservatism is maintained, linked to the speaking sphere. If the Eteocypriot is the autochthonous language of Cypriot people, the same as previously written in Cypro-Minoan script, it is absorbed and disappears in the centres where a continuity with the new speaking is acting, while it remains the prevailing language just in a new centre that begins to live with its peculiar ancient roots, that represent in fact the only different element in its culture, which in general adapts to the customs of the other Early Iron Age polities. However, in some way, the Cypriot people maintains a memory of his roots, and the posterity recalls Amathus as the unique city of Cypriot origin (and I am almost sure that is not only a question of legend!).

To conclude on Amathus, a hypothesis sustained by Baurain³² cannot be discarded: the name of Amathus could have been, as an alternative³³, both the *Kinyreia* recalled in several traditions (as an ancient name just of Amathus or, better, of a pool of centres later become independent) and the *Nu-ri-ja* listed among ten Cypriote kingdoms, together with the respective king, by the Assyrian kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal (7th century BC), a name which hypothetically may be joined to a

²⁸ According to the Greek historian Theopompus from Chios (350-300 BC) – only excerpts of his work survive in Photius codices (9th century AC) – the Amathusians were the descendents of the people of Kinyras, expelled by the Greeks who accompanied Agamemnon and conquered Cyprus, returning from Troy.

²⁹ Aupert 1997: 19-23; Iacovou 2002: 105.

³⁰ We may add an inscription from Kourion, two of unknown provenance and one from Abydos (Egypt). See references in Egetmeyer 2009: 72, which represents an exhaustive and reliable work about Eteocypriote.

³¹ Iacovou 1989: 57.

³² Baurain 1981.

³³ We recall also the hypothesis (Aupert 1997: 24) according to which the place name *Kartihadasti* (the Phoenician name *Qart hadašt* “new town”), listed in the Assyrian inscriptions of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal, could be referred to Amathus rather than to Kition (see below, §4), on the basis of archaeological proofs testifying a Phoenician necropolis dated back to the end of the CG – first CA period (Christou 1993: 752) and the likely provenance from the area of Limassol of a Phoenician inscription dedicated to Ba’al of Lebanon dated to the 8th century (O. Masson 1985; Lipinski 2004: 49).

precedent sign, if interpreted not as *KI/URU* = city (with a determinative value) but as the syllabogram *kin*, forming the new name *Kinnuria* = Kinyreia³⁴.

In the same period - or a little later - of the foundation of Amathus in the region to the east of Kouris river and of Limassol, beyond the later Akrotiri peninsula, another centre might have been founded next to the river bank: Kourion, replacing the abandoned area of the lower Kouris valley (Episkopi/*Bamboula*). In the Greek legends it is generically asserted that Kourion³⁵ is an Argive foundation (Herodotus V 113; Strabon XIV 6, 3), without any chronological specification: the most interesting element is that the eponymous hero, Koureus, would be the son of Kinyras (Stephan of Byzantium, s.v. Kourion), the two sites of Amathus and Kourion being linked, as the most ancient archaeological findings seem to proof. In fact, in the area of Kourion only one tomb belongs to LC IIIB, while the cemetery of *Kaloriziki* seems in use from CG 1³⁶; no corresponding architectural feature has been found, and the remains of the site of Kourion belong to a very later period³⁷. However, it seems of big interest the analysis that Diana Buitron-Olivier made³⁸ related to the Sanctuary of Apollo, one mile west of Kourion city, founded during the Archaic Period. The author stresses the desire by the founders of some kind of continuity with the Bronze Age, revealed by the fragments of an Early Bronze Age jar that probably had just the function of a link to the past for the new site. Moreover, the small figures of gold and silver bulls provide parallels with the votive offers at Kato Syme in Crete of the 2nd millennium. This research of contact with the past and, specifically, with an Aegean past, if the analysis is true, supports our thesis of a continuity in Cyprus of the Aegean/Greek characters, maintained also at a conscious level³⁹.

c. The third centre, together with Paphos and Amathus, which received a great attention by ancient authors is undoubtedly Salamis. Its foundation seems strictly connected with the abandon of Enkomi, the two cities having perhaps the same name⁴⁰.

³⁴ Another interpretation which identifies *nu-ri-ja* with Marium, a centre on the north-western coast of the island, is presented in Lipinski 2004: 62.75.

³⁵ We recall that the first mention of the place-name Kurion is attested in the Esarhaddon prism, i.e. in a Neo-Assyrian inscription of the first half of the 7th century, where "Damasu king of Kuri" is named.

³⁶ Iacovou 1989: 56.

³⁷ Chrisou 1994, with references; Masson 1984 and Buitron-Olivier 1997: 28-31, with a detailed comment about the so-called "Treasure of Curium" brought by Luigi Palma de Cesnola to the Metropolitan Museum, in the light of the subsequent discoveries around Kurion. If the objects collected by Cesnola really came from the area of Kurion, it seems possible that already in the 11th century BC a main settlement existed.

³⁸ Buitron-Olivier 1997: 32-33.

³⁹ On the other side, an evidence for a continuity with a non-Greek but indigenous past is stressed by Buitron-Olivier 1997: 31-32, who recalls six-rock cut inscriptions from the surroundings of Kurion (Yerakarka and At Meydan), dating to a late period - the 6th century BC - yielding some personal names which, according to Mitford 1971: 19-34, are likely non-Greek and written with signs perhaps belonging to the Paphian syllabary variety.

⁴⁰ This hypothesis seems favoured by the spontaneous and progressive abandon of Enkomi in favour of a new settlement founded next to the coast, to which just the same name might have been given. The possible presence of the noun Salamis in the famous list at Medinet Habou, dated at the beginning of the 12th century, has not to be completely refused. We are dealing with the various cities

The first author to speak about its founder as Teukros⁴¹ was Euripides (Helen, 144-150), but the kernel of the legend and its link with the history is probably represented by an effective arrival at Enkomi of some people coming from Anatolia in the first half of the 12th century – Teukrians/Tjekker? – in a moment when Enkomi was already waned with respect to the main city of Enkomi. Enkomi flourished along the whole Late Cypriot Age I-II, with again a new development during LC IIIA, that seems to finish only after the building of Sanctuary of the Ingot God, which went on during LC IIIB while the rest of the town was abandoned. In the course of the peopling of the new settlement, i.e. the “new” Salamis, of which we have archaeological signs only in contemporary with the final abandon of Enkomi⁴², already too distant from the coast-line because of the alluvial deposits from the Pedieos river estuary and forced to be replaced by a new harbour, it is possible that foreign people from the west arrived again, bringing new elements of the sub-Mycenaean or proto-geometric culture⁴³; but this is only a hypothesis to fill the hiatus of one hundred years between myths (either Teukrians or Teukros) and archaeological proofs. However, and this appears as the main fact concerning the general view of our work, no break seems to exist between Mycenaean culture and Greek culture even in this eastern area of Cyprus.

4. The Phoenician and Assyrian impact: a different role of the Near-East in contrast with the Greek one

The Phoenicians. It is undoubted that during the Iron Age, from its beginning and with a progressive impact, at least some regions of Cyprus were “Phoenicianized” and “Assyrianized”. We put these expressions into quotation marks because, in fact, we believe that Cyprus accepts foreign elements in its own culture, but always

in which Brugsch 1877: 603, followed by numerous scholars during the last two centuries, recognized Cypriot settlements: SRMSK, KTN, IMR, SR, RTR, identified with Salamis, Kition, Marion, Soloi and Idalion, respectively. *Saramaski* should represent a vocalized transcription of SRMSK: in fact, the final KI could be considered as an erroneous addition to the noun, being simply the determinative KI of place-names according to cuneiform writing (cf. Helk 1971: 235). If the identification is correct, the same name of the Cypriot Salamis would be pre-Greek; other links have been proposed with the pan-Semitic root *šlm*, already attested in Ugaritic tablets (Yon 1980b: 79 and n. 33 with references). About Salamis and its history and archaeology see in particular the various contributions in the Lyon Meeting in 1978 (Yon 1980a).

⁴¹ Teukros presents a particular genealogy according to the majority of legends (the first one dating back to Homer), which define him as son of Telamon king of Aegina but having as mother Hesione daughter of the Trojan king Laomedon: as a consequence, he is linked both to Greece and to Anatolia. For the legends about the foundation of Salamis by Teukros see Wanshoonwinkel 1994: 295-301 with bibliography. We stress only two points: 1) according to Pausanias I 3.2, Teukros received as wife the daughter of Kinyras and this fact links not only the Greek to the autochthonous element, but also two sites far away as Salamis and Amathus; 2) according to Vergilius, Aeneis I 619-626, Teukros was helped by the king of Sidon, Belos, while founding Salamis; this sounds as an attempt to link Greek and Phoenician elements. We agree with Iacovou 2008: 649 on the hypothesis that “the move away from the disused harbour facilities of Old Salamis to the harbour of New Salamis was a joint venture of Greek, Phoenician and indigenous people”.

⁴² Probably the sanctuary excavated by the French team since 1974 at Salamis replaces the shrine of the Ingot God (Iacovou 1989: 55).

⁴³ The sporadic findings cannot be dated before the 11th century, and they rest on virgin soil (Yon 1980b: 76-77).

maintaining a specific autonomy and, apart the case of the Greek culture, which is integrating with the Cypriote one, only from a political point of view the island loses its complete independence. As to the first people, the Phoenicians, the impact appears mainly of economic order, linked to the trade activity that the Phoenician centers began to carry on in this Age. It seems of interest that the first attestations of Phoenician ware have been found in the necropolis of *Skales*⁴⁴, linked to Palaipaphos, that is considered just from this period a “Greek” city. In the *Skales* tombs so many bronze and iron objects were found⁴⁵ that we may recognize in Palaipaphos one of the most attractive trade harbours for the metal industry. The wealth of the tombs, with many Near Eastern luxuries, is a proof of the trade activities of its inhabitants. However, we are inclined to believe that the presence of these Phoenician objects may be considered as one of the various evidences that Cyprus was never removed by the trade routes which involved the Aegean and the eastern Mediterranean even, and overall, just in that period of instability between the 2nd and the 1st millennium BC, when other Mediterranean countries had a much worse political and economic situation. We may not recognize already a Phoenician presence in the island, but simply a trade exchange following the traditional routes and almost managed by Cypriot merchants.

In any case, during this span of time it seems of interest to recall the Egyptian Tale of Wen-Amon⁴⁶, dated to the first half of the 11th century – obviously keeping in mind that we are dealing with a tale –, where the protagonist, sailing on a ship belonging to the king of Byblos, Tjekker⁴⁷-Ba'al, is pushed from the wind to the sea-coasts of Alashiya. This tale may represent an evidence of the central role of Cyprus (accepting its identification with Alashiya) in the eastern Mediterranean basin, and “Canaanite” ships continue to arrive to its harbours. But it seems too early to speak about a Phoenician presence on the island.

This presence may be assumed only by the most ancient Phoenician text occurring in Cyprus: it is a Phoenician funerary inscription of the early 9th century⁴⁸, and this in fact deems a proof of a Phoenician settlement in the island at least in the second part of the 10th century. In consequence, the main difference with the Greek settlement in Cyprus is caused, in our opinion, by a gap of time between the 2nd and the 1st millennium that precedes the Phoenician arrival in Cyprus⁴⁹ – even if some

⁴⁴ Karageorghis 1983.

⁴⁵ Sherratt 1994: 93-97, with a list of the weapons/tools found at *Skales* (following Karageorghis 1983).

⁴⁶ Bresciani 1999: 597-604; Marino 2009: 135-139.

⁴⁷ We stress how the Tjekker (this is the name of one of the sea-peoples in the list of Medinet-Habu) likely settled in the area of the harbour of Dor, the first halting-place in the journey of Wen-Amon: perhaps, coming from Anatolia, if they may be identified with Teukrians, partly stopped in Cyprus, at Enkomi (see above). The name of the king of Byblos is a composed (place+god) noun.

⁴⁸ Lipinski 2004: 42-44.

⁴⁹ The remarkable findings in Cyprus since the 2nd (or 3th!) millennium of Levantine import goods, and the exchanges between the two areas, are on a very different plan with respect to the following permanent presence of Phoenician peoples, even if coming from the same area of the previous traders. It is not the case for Mycenaean and Greeks, because the Phoenicians of the first millennium have completely changed the cultural face belonging to their “ancestors”. Seaports as Byblos, Sidon, Tyre, have a new consciousness of their sailor experience, while their links with the inland territory don't

Phoenician objects have already been traded on the island, but simply following the previous Late Bronze Age routes –: such a gap doesn't occur between the Mycenaean and the Greek impact, the second to be simply considered in a continuous sequence with the first one⁵⁰. Moreover, for the Phoenicians, Cyprus represents a sort of composite intermediate landing – where they may even stop and settle – to reach finally toward the north the new Anatolian centres formed after the fall of the Hittite power (Cilicia too may be considered in the same way an intermediate landing) and toward the west the countries in the western Mediterranean area (the seaport of Kommos in Creta seems to have this role of intermediary too).

Apart from the first literary attestations whose provenance is not clear, in the following the Phoenician impact seems located especially in the southeastern coasts. One main center is recognized in Kition⁵¹, which, according to many modern scholars, would be the same Kartihadasti, ruled by Damusi, listed in the Prism Inscription by Esarhaddon of Assyria (673/2 BC)⁵². If we want to go back to the earlier phases of the life of Kition, we find a prosperous site during LC IIIA-B, as we may infer from the sanctuaries in the district of *Kathari* and the rich tombs of the necropolis, next to the settlement of *Bamboula*. Around 1050 a great disaster happened (probably caused by a natural rather than by a human event); Kition was rebuilt, but around 1000 BC the city was almost completely abandoned. However, after a span of time that we are not yet able to estimate, the site was again settled, and at least from the 9th century Kition became a main harbour linked to Phoenician traders. The majority of Phoenician inscriptions found in Cyprus come from Kition, even if they date to later periods⁵³.

However, the Phoenician impact on Cyprus is unclear and it has also been supposed that Phoenician lived in commercial communities next to local people⁵⁴.

exist anymore. In consequence, their permanent presence in Cyprus represents a novelty and is only a new element which adds to a situation where the Mycenaean/Greek tradition, together with the local one, has already imposed itself. Very interesting the methodological approach of Niemeyer 2006 to the Phoenician model of overseas settlement and presence, differing from the Greek model; we are obviously interested in the first stage of this expansion, based almost on economic characters.

⁵⁰ It is true that in continental Greece no LC IIIB – CG I pottery has been found (Iacovou 1994: 159), but this depends on the Greece situation. The same happens concerning Palestine: no direct trade seems attested during LC IIIB (Mazar 1991: 102), but already since CG I the trade seems assured.

⁵¹ On the history of Kition, which we are going to summarize, see Yon 1997 with references.

⁵² On the alternative explanation of the place name Kartihadasti as referred to Amathus, see above, n. 33.

⁵³ The first inscription is a dedication to Astarte on a bowl found in Temple I of *Kathari* (Guzzo Amadasi 1977: D 21) and dates back to the 8th century, but the majority of the inscriptions belongs to the 4th century BC.

⁵⁴ As underlined by Lipinski 2004: 46, it is difficult to determine the exact nature of the about twenty settlements where at least one Phoenician inscription has been found. Surely, both Sidon and Tyre had a strong power on some of them, while other had become independent from their motherland. On this question, it is of interest a limestone stele from Kaloriziki (Kurion) – i.e. in the south-western coasts of Cyprus –, datable to the 7th century BC, bearing a bilingual funerary inscription, in Cypriote syllabic (Paphian signary) and Phoenician (Karageorghis 1970: 226. 229-231; Masson, Szyner 1972: 88-91 and Pl. VII; Masson 1984: 81-82). In spite of its very fragmentary condition, at least on the Phoenician text an indication about the identity of the deceased man may be read: “....cr]af[tsman at Curium, Sido[nian” Lipinski 2004: 55-56.

Also concerning Kition, Yon stresses that “the difference of the Cypro-Phoenician people of Kition from other Cypriots of the island is perhaps more linguistic than cultural”⁵⁵. Surely Phoenician pottery spread all over the island, although differences in its features according to the various areas both of discovery and of provenance have been often underlined. Kition seems linked to Tyre, but the relations with its “metropolis” began strainer from the end of the 8th century BC, as we know by the Assyrian inscriptions of Sargon II and Sennacherib and from Greek texts as well⁵⁶.

The Assyrians. We may only touch on this problem, because the first mention of Cyprus in the Assyrian texts dates back to the end of the 8th century, at the beginning of the Archaic period. But it is important to stress its impact on Cyprus because, on one side, it involves the Phoenicians who change, even if apparently slightly, their relations with the island, but, on the other side, it leaves untouched the Greek presence and its social and cultural impact on Cyprus. However, in one way, something moves and a new Cypro-Archaic *élite* seems to emerge after this “new entrance”, recognizing some aspect of the Assyrian culture as relevant⁵⁷. We go briefly to analyze these considerations.

The first impact of Assyrians on Cyprus, according to the written sources, is dated to 709/707 BC, when Sargon II conquers Yadanana⁵⁸ and asks tributes from seven local kings of the district of Ia'. Two factors are of main relevance for our analysis: the intervention of the Assyrian king (even not by person but through one of his high officers), that is requested by Shilta, king of Tyre, who surely takes aboard on his ships the Assyrian army; the erection of an Assyrian stele on a mountain⁵⁹ next to Kition⁶⁰, such a location being likely chosen both for the strong presence of a Phoenician community at Kition and for its main position among the Cypriot settlements on the international trade routes.

⁵⁵ Yon, *cit.*: 11.

⁵⁶ Yon, *cit.*: 12 with references.

⁵⁷ Bombardieri, Marino 2009.

⁵⁸ About the origin of this name and its possible links with Adana (i.e. “the island –YA – in front of the Adana land”), which we may identify with Cilicia Plain, in that period known as the (Neo-)Hittite state of Qwe (named in the Karatepe bilingual as Adana/Dnny kingdom), see Jasink 2011 (forthcoming).

⁵⁹ “I set it up [on] Ba'il-hurri [the mountain], located [at the top] of the land of Adnana” (transl. by Malbran-Labat 1994: 169-179). The location of the stele in a position which is not accessible for a large public is not a problem, because already from the 3rd millennium BC several kings of various Near-eastern states used to put their most “ideological” monuments – i.e. both stelae and other monumental reliefs – not only along boundaries and frequented routes of communications, but just in inaccessible places (we may think of many famous Hittite reliefs along the boundaries of the reign of Hatti and its vassals that only shortly, and not fully, have been discovered). I am inclined to suppose that the reason is not only the will to preserve these monuments from disruptions, but an ideological choice that identifies the king with his ancestors or descendants – and in some case it may be with the divinity – and doesn't need that the normal people sees them. Many other types of monuments are well accessible to people and the kings have no doubt about their recognized royalty.

⁶⁰ The provenance of the stele – discovered in 1845 and now in the Vorderasiatisches Museum in Berlin – is uncertain: either from Idalion or, more likely, from Kition if the identification of the “mountain” with the mountain North-East of Larnaca is correct (Na'aman 2001: 361).

Probably, the impact of the Assyrian Empire over the whole eastern Mediterranean, with its system of both tributes and annexations⁶⁰, for the first phase of the archaic period was a successful political strategy. Concerning Cyprus, the various regional powers of the island felt more sure with respect to the previous arrival of Phoenicians: they became, after the Assyrian control on the Mediterranean, a sort of intermediaries and Cyprus could take advantage for its internal economy being involved in a profitable system of exchanges. No sure object of Assyrian provenance has been found in Cyprus for these period, but the “spread of Assyrian-like motifs in the figurative Archaic art of Archaic Cyprus appears widely evident. These motifs are mixed with other different provenance elements, creating at least the composite style which is the main feature of a wide eastern koiné”⁶².

In the Kition stele, in Neo-Assyrian cuneiform script, the individual names of the kings and of the kingdoms of Ia’ are not given, but from the later list on the prism of Esarhaddon, mentioning ten Yادنana kings which gave their tribute for the reconstruction of the palace of Nineveh (673/672 BC)⁶³, and from an almost identical list of allies of Assurbanipal in a royal inscription graved on a clay cylinder (referring likely to events of 664 BC)⁶⁴, we read both the place and the personal name of each of them. The majority of the names of the kings may be interpreted as Greek names⁶⁵, just beginning from the Idalium king, *e-ki-iš-tu-ra* Ἀκεστῶρ⁶⁶. Even if the Greek influence becomes strongly evident through the archaeological and textual data only in a second phase of Archaic Cyprus, I suppose that already in the first above described phase Greek “occupation” doesn’t know any continuity solution since the proto-geometric period, because these Greeks have in fact become the “autochthonous” people of Cyprus, mixed to the previous inhabitants, who spoken an unknown language – perhaps it could deal with two different languages as well – recognizable on the south of the island through the scanty documents written in the so-called Eteocypriot, probably a heritage of the Cypro-Minoan language of the 2nd millennium. The third group, the Phoenicians, remains, on the contrary, “foreign” people, which maintain a proper individuality, only relatively mixing with the other group(s).

⁶¹ Obviously there is a very different impact between the remote countries, where only request of tributes is enough for the Assyrian emperor but the whole political and social local order is maintained, and the conquered countries where the institution of a governor and a radical deportation is carried out, cancelling the autochthonous identities. But both the Phoenician cities and Cyprus may be included in the first category, even if for different reasons: the firsts because they are too useful with their ships to the empire to allow that their autonomy and identity were lost; the second, because it was out of the routes by land and only through the Phoenician ship could be reached, and in fact it was far away from the real interests of Assyrians, excluding an ideological power.

⁶² Bombardieri and Marino 2009: 114.

⁶³ Borger 1956: 60, lines 63-71.

⁶⁴ Borger 1996: 119, C II 50-59 and 112; cf. Reyes 1994: 58-60.

⁶⁵ Lipinski 2004: 62-76.

⁶⁶ Lipinski 2004: 62, stresses how the Greek royal names are transcribed in Neo-Assyrian following features of spoken Phoenician, revealing in consequence a “Phoenician intermediate agent”.

5. Script and language: the continuity of a Linear writing

As we stressed above, the script mainly used in Cyprus is a syllabic linear one⁶⁷ which, even applied to more than one language and changing some of its features during the Iron Age, establishes a true link from the Late Bronze Age to the Classical period. The Cypro-Minoan script or, better, the Linear-Cypriot script of the Late Cypriot Period, surely depends at some level on the Linear A writing, but the language used is a Cypriot language. In our opinion, the creation of the writing as well is based on precise autochthonous choices, which are linked to the Cypriot iconography⁶⁸, and Linear A is preferred to cuneiform script also for the resemblance of its signs to some symbols or signs carved on Cypriot ware and other objects. The presence of Mycenaean craftsmen during the LBA I-II and of Mycenaean communities during LBA III makes certainly the Mycenaean Greek dialect well known in Cyprus but, in these periods, the script remains linked to Linear A and to the previous native land language. It is only a hypothesis that few new signs appear as derived from Linear B and some old signs get a shape which is more similar to this latter signary as well⁶⁹; on the contrary, it seems possible that the strong exchanges with the Near-eastern countries and the contact with cuneiform script produce a few progressive contemporary change in the signs of the script, when tablets similar to the oriental ones were used⁷⁰. In any case, the writing still perpetuates the original Cypriot language. The Cypro-Minoan survives in Cyprus till the 11th century, not belonging, as in the Aegean, to the exclusive competence of palatial functionaries, but being an expression of a larger range of use. The arrival of "other" people different in some way from Mycenaeans but equally speaking a Greek dialect and linked to their predecessors and "ancestors" by traditions and culture, i.e. the Greeks, makes another gradual change in the writing: the native dialect is likely retained (Eteocypriot) and probably confined to the south-western area of the island⁷¹, but adopting the same syllabic linear script which spreads over the whole island for a language that is not linked to linear B and Mycenaean Greek but to a Greek dialect still with archaic features (Arcado-Cypriot)⁷². This syllabary is likely an adaptation, through a series of readjustments, of the old local script to the new linguistic needs and only much later the alphabetic Greek appears as well, when Phoenician and Assyrian cuneiform writing are already attested since a long time in the island⁷³. The possible point of intersection between the two Cypriot syllabaries,

⁶⁷ Among the last contributions dealing with Cypriote syllabaries we recall (with references therein): Olivier 2008, Panayotou-Triantaphyllopoulou 2006; Id. 2008; Duhoux 2009; Perna 2010.

⁶⁸ Jasink and Bombardieri 2011 (forthcoming).

⁶⁹ See Palaima 1989b: 53, who stresses how any influence from the Linear B script on Cypro-Minoan was late and secondary.

⁷⁰ Palaima 1989a: 155-156, however, denies every "cuneiformization" in Cypro-Minoan signs. See also Panayotou-Triantaphyllopoulou 2003: 209.

⁷¹ See above, § 3.

⁷² About the origin of the Arcadian dialect and its comparison both with Mycenaean and Cypriot see Morpurgo Davies 1992; Dubois 1997; about the connections between Arcado-Cypriot and Panphiliian dialect see Panayotou-Triantaphyllopoulou 2006: 656-657; Jasink 2011 (forthcoming).

⁷³ In fact, with the possible exclusion of the "Opheltas inscription" (see below), this new Cypriot syllabary goes back at least to the eighth century, while the Greek alphabet was not in use in the island till the sixth century and in a very limited way before the end of the fifth century. The Cypriot syllabary is attested as far as the end of the third century BC.

the one⁷⁴ of the 2nd and the other⁷⁵ of the 1st millennium BC, may be likely individualized in those few sites where a continuity of habitation has been attested⁷⁶. It seems particularly interesting the use of Arcado-Cypriot dialect in Cyprus, because it may explain as well the link between Cypriots and Mycenaeans/Greeks: we may in a sense consider the Greeks which landed in Cyprus at the end of the second / the beginning of the first millennium as the descendants of the Mycenaeans. A real distinction between Mycenaeans, Achaeans and early Greeks is difficult to perceive. Perhaps it is not by chance that the famous inscription on the obelos from Palaipaphos, dated between 1050-950 (Cypro-Geometric I period), could have been written either in Cypro-Minoan (being the latest attestation of this script) or in "Greek" syllabary (being the oldest example of this script attested in the 1st millennium BC)⁷⁷; anyway, it testifies the completeness of the development of the written signs forms⁷⁸.

If this reconstruction is valid, we are not able to see a real break in the evolving of writing and language during the Iron Age with respect to the situation of the second millennium, but rather an evolution⁷⁹. The writing/linguistic problems seem another face of the same question that affects the change between Mycenaean and Greek people and culture which follow one after the other in Cyprus, without a real break as well.

⁷⁴ In the three variants CM 1, 2 and 3.

⁷⁵ Where two varieties – a Paphian and a "common" signary – may be distinguished.

⁷⁶ Iakovou 2008: 632-633 rightly hypothesizes a main role for the city of Paphos.

⁷⁷ See Olivier 2007: 243 (text ## 170), for his interpretation of the five symbols on the bronze *obelos* from Paphos dated to CG I as belonging to the Cypro-Minoan script, although forming the Greek word *o-pe-le-ta-u* (the Arcado-Cypriot genitive case of the proper noun Opheltas). More cautious Perna 2010, who in a convincing way admits the difficulty to attribute this inscription to one of the two syllabaries rather than to the other. On the various previous interpretations of the "Opheltas inscription" see Perna's up-to-date contribution with references.

⁷⁸ Egetmeyer 2009: 81-82.

⁷⁹ Iakovou 2008: 634, proposes the theory that the Greek language and scripture was imposed by Greek "migrants" in a long period, because although being less in number they were able to access to positions of prestige in a society which, however, was socially and economically superior. This may have occurred in many cases: I recall two examples in other areas, the first concerning the encounter of people with different languages but without their own script, the second in which only the arriving people doesn't have a proper writing. In the first case, Hittites, arriving in Anatolia during the last phases of the third millennium, imposed themselves to Hattians (e.c. De Martino 2003: 30-32, with references) and their language spread over the whole Anatolia, the Hattic language being restricted to the religious sphere; the adopted script was not a native script but the cuneiform, and only later Hittites evolved their own script, the Anatolian Hieroglyphic. However, an opposite result may be supposed in the second case, concerning the "Mopsos' dynasty", which was ruling on the Neo-Hittite state of Que (this name appearing according to the Assyrian sources) in Cilicia: Mopsos probably arrived there during the 12th century from western Anatolia, but although imposing his power over Cilicia, the inscriptions of his descendants in the 8th-7th centuries are in local Luwian Hieroglyphic and in Phoenician, and nothing of the previous cultural patrimony of Mopsos seems retained (Jasink-Marino 2007; Jasink 2011). Going back to Cyprus, we may suppose that the adoption of Greek language is in some way linked to an ideological connection Mycenaeans-Greeks: to this, the further above-mentioned reasons may be joined.

6. The self-expression of Cyprus as a “multi-cultural” specific area / Conclusions

From the analysis offered in our contribution two main features seem to emerge. The first is the specific trait of Cypriot culture as a sort of multi-cultural melting pot, which is able to maintain its peculiar characters adding, on occasion, new features coming from the outside, accepted as improvements for the island but in a brief span of time becoming part of the autochthonous development. Not only the cultural influence but also the permanent settlement of foreign people are inserted in the context of the island and contribute to produce a continuous transformation in the various characters forming the constituting traits of the island. This mixture of inside and outside elements may be found both in the material culture and in the religious sphere, while for the writing evidence the autochthonous elements go on to predominate.

The second emerging feature is the different approach of the island towards the Aegean cultures in comparison with the Near-eastern cultures during the Bronze Age, and towards Greeks from one side and Phoenicians and Assyrians from the other during the Iron Age. Since their adopting a script more similar to Cretan Linear A than to Levantine cuneiform, the Cypriotes give in my opinion a sign of their “closeness” – and not from a geographical point of view! – with these western cultures, even if our hypothesis that the origin of the Cypriot script has a strong autochthonous basis is taken into account. When the Mycenaean culture replaces the Minoan one, it is possible that Cypriot elites consider the property of Mycenaean vessels a sort of status symbol⁸⁰. The little by little entrance of individuals or relatively small Mycenaean groups – rather than following migration phenomena – causes a mixture in the Cypriot people, which goes on without abrupt gap with the entrance of Greek groups. The Near-eastern cultural elements may amalgamate into the Cypriot culture, but this never happens concerning the people. First Canaanite entities and later Phoenicians and Assyrians maintain their foreign features, although in some cases not on a political or cultural level; but only Greeks, also before their political power on Cyprus, are really mixed with Cypriots. It is very interesting how, also in a period where Greek alphabetic script ranges along the Mediterranean countries, in Cyprus both Eteocypriot (limited to few regions) and Greek language, extended to the whole island, are written in a linear syllabary. I agree with Panayotou-Triantaphyllopoulou hypothesis, according to which “l’écriture syllabique, unique dans le monde grec de l’alphabet, a été investie d’une valeur idéologique indéniable, comme porteuse des valeurs ancestrales et même plus, comme signe d’identité”⁸¹. Such an interpretation perfectly completes and concludes our analysis about the self-expression of Cyprus.

Anna Margherita Jasink
Dip. Scienza Antichità
Piazza Brunelleschi, 4
I – 50121 Firenze

⁸⁰ Karageorghis 2002: 45.

⁸¹ Panayotou-Triantaphyllopoulou 2006: 655.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aupert, P. 1997 – “Amathus during the First Iron Age”, *BASOR* 308 (November): 19-25.
- Baurain, C. 1980 – “KINYRAS. La fin de l'âge du Bronze à Chypre et la tradition antique”, *BCH* 104: 277-308.
- Baurain, C. 1981 – “Un autre nom pour Amathonte de Chypre?”, *BCH* 105: 361-372.
- Bikai, P. 1994 – “The Phoenicians and Cyprus”, in *Cyprus in the 11th Century B.C.*: 31-36.
- Bombardieri, L., Jasink, A.M. 2011 – “Decorative repertoires and script-signs: a complex “origin” for the writing system in Cyprus?”, *Kadmos* (forthcoming).
- Bombardieri, L., Marino, M. 2009 – “Patterns of Assyrian influence in Cypriote society during the Archaic Period”, in *SOMA 2008. Proceedings of the XII Symposium on Mediterranean Archaeology, Famagusta, 5-8-March 2008* (BAR International Series 1909): 109-119.
- Borger, R. 1956 – *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons, Königs von Assyrien* (AfO Beiheft 9), Graz 1956.
- Borger, R. 1996 – *Beiträge zum Inschriftenwerk Assurbanipals*, Wiesbaden.
- Bresciani, E. 1999 – *Letteratura e poesia dell'Antico Egitto*, Torino.
- Brugsch, H. 1877 – *Geschichte Aegyptens*. Leipzig.
- Buitron-Oliver, D. 1997 – “Kourion: the Evidence for the Kingdom from the 11th to the 6th Century B.C.”, *BASOR* 308 (November): 27-35.
- Cadogan, G. 1993 – “Cyprus, Mycenaean Pottery, Trade and Colonisation”, in (C. Zerner ed.) *Wace and Blegen: Pottery as Evidence for Trade in the Aegean Bronze Age, 1939-1989*. Amsterdam: 91-99.
- Catling, H.W. 1994 – “Cyprus in the 11th century B.C. – An end or a beginning?”, in *Cyprus in the 11th Century B.C.*: 133-140.
- Cyprus in the 11th Century B.C.* (V. Karageorghis ed.) Proceedings of the International Symposium, Nicosia 30-31 October 1993. Nicosia 1994.
- Christou, D. 1993 “Chronique des fouilles et découvertes archéologiques à Chypre en 1992”, *BCH* 117: 719-755.
- Christou, D. 1994 – “Kourion in the 11th century”, in *Cyprus in the 11th Century B.C.*: 177-187.
- Cultraro, M. 2006 – *I Micenei. Archeologia, storia, società dei Greci prima di Omero*, Roma.
- De Martino, S. 2003 – *Gli Ittiti*, Roma.
- Desideri, P., Jasink, A.M. 1990 – *Cilicia. Dall'età di Kizzuwatna alla conquista macedone*. Firenze.
- Dubois, L. 1997 [1998] – “L'arcadien et le chypriote: deux dialects cousins”, *Cahiers du Centre d'Études Chypriotes* 27: 83-91.
- Duhoux, Y. 2009 – “Eteocypriot and Cypro-Minoan 1-3”, *Kadmos* 48: 39-75.
- Egetmeyer, M. 2009 – “The Recent Debate on Eteocypriote People and Language”, *Pasiphae* 3:69-90.
- Guzzo Amadasi, M.G.G. 1977 – *Excavations at Kition, Vol. 3; Inscriptions phéniciennes*. Nicosia.
- Hadjicosti, M. 1997 – “The Kingdom of Idalion in the Light of New Evidence”, *BASOR* 308 (November): 49-63.
- Helck, W. 1971 – *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jart. v. Chr.*, Wiesbaden.
- Iacovou, M. 1988 – *The Pictorial Pottery of Eleventh Century BC Cyprus* (SIMA 78). Göteborg.
- Iacovou, M. 1989 – Society and settlements in Late Cypriot III”, in (E. Peltenburg ed.) *Early Society in Cyprus*. Edinburgh.
- Iacovou, M. 1991 – “Proto-White Painted Pottery: A Classification of the Ware”, in (J.A.Barlow, D.L.Bolger, B.Kling eds.) *Cypriot Ceramics: Reading the Prehistoric Record*. Philadelphia: 199-205.
- Iacovou, M. 1994 – “The topography of 11th century B.C.”, in *Cyprus in the 11th Century B.C.*: 149-164.
- Iacovou, M. 2002 – “Amathous: an Early Iron Age policy in Cyprus. The chronology of its foundation”, *RDAC*: 101-122.

- Iacovou, M. 2008 – “Cultural and Political Configurations in Iron Age Cyprus: the Sequel to a Protohistoric Episode”, *AJA* 112: 625-657.
- Jasink, A.M. 1995 – *Gli stati neo-ittiti. Analisi delle fonti scritte e sintesi storica* (Studia Mediterranea 10), Pavia.
- Jasink, A.M. 2011 – “Anatolia and Cyprus between Greek legends and history at the end of the 2nd Millennium BC.: antecedents of the Iron Age Development”, *do-so-mo* 9 (forthcoming).
- Jasink, A.M., Bombardieri, L. 2008 – “Assyrians, Phoenicians, Cypriots and Greeks: the co-existence of foreign cultural influences in the Çukurova Plain during the Iron Age”, *Olba* 16: 23-56.
- Karageorghis, V. 1970 – “*Chronique des fouilles et découvertes archéologiques à Chypre en 1969*: 7. Episkopy, «Curium House»”, *BCH* 94: 226-231.
- Karageorghis, V. 1983 – *Palaepaphos-Skales. An Iron Age cemetery in Cyprus* (Ausgrabungen in Alt-Paphos aus Cypern 3), Konstanz.
- Karageorghis, V. 2002 – *Cipro. Crocevia del Mediterraneo orientale 1600-500 a.C.*, Milano.
- Klengel, H. 1992 – *Syria: 3000 to 300 B.C. A Handbook of Political History*. Berlin.
- Lipinski, E. 2004 – *Itineraria Phoenicia*. Studia Phoenicia 18, Louvain.
- Marino, M.G. 2009 – *Cipro nell'Età del Bronzo. Tra autonomia creativa e influenze esterne*. PhD thesis, University of Florence.
- Masson, O. 1983 – *Les inscriptions chypriotes syllabiques*. Paris.
- Masson, O. 1984 – “Kypriaka XVI. Notes sur le “Trésor de Curium””, *BCH* 108: 77-83.
- Masson, O. 1985 – “La dédicace de Baʿal du Liban (CIS I,5) et sa provenance probable de la région de Limassol”, *Semitica* 35: 33-46.
- Masson, O., Sznycer, M. 1972 – *Recherches sur les Phéniciens à Chypre*, Genève.
- Mazar, A. 1991 – “Comments on the Nature of the Relations between Cyprus and Palestine during the 12th-11th Centuries B.C.” in (V. Karageorghis ed.) *The Civilizations of the Aegean and their Diffusion in Cyprus and the Eastern Mediterranean, 2000-600 B.C.*. Proceedings of an International Symposium, Larnaca: 95-104.
- Mitford, T.B. 1971 – *The Inscriptions of Kourion*. Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society 83. Philadelphia.
- Morpurgo Davies, A. 1992 – “Mycenaean, Arcadian, Cyprian and some questions of method in dialectology”, in (J.-P. Olivier ed.) *Mykenaiika*. Aktes du IX^e Colloque international sur les textes mycéniens et égéens organisé par le Centre de l'Antiquité Grecque et Romaine de la Fondation Hellénique des Recherches Scientifiques et l'École française d'Athènes, Athènes, 2-6 octobre 1990. Paris (*BCH* Suppl. XXV): 415-432.
- Niemayer, H.G. 2006 – “The Phoenicians in the Mediterranean. Between Expansion and Colonisation: A Non-Greek Model of Overseas Settlement and Presence”, in (G.R.Tsetskhladze ed.) *Greek Colonisation. An Account of Greek Colonies and other Settlements overseas*, Vol. 1. Leiden-Boston: 143-168.
- Palaima, T.G. 1989a – “Cypro-Minoan scripts: problems of historical context”, in (Y. Duhoux, T.G. Palaima, J. Bennet eds.) *Problems in decipherment (BCILL 49)*: 121-187.
- Palaima, T.G. 1989b – “Ideograms and Supplementals and Regional Interaction among Aegean and Cypriote Scripts”, *Minos* 24: 29-54.
- Olivier, J.-P., 2008 – “Les syllabaires chypriotes des deuxième et premier millénaires avant notre ère. État des questions”, in (A. Saccani, M. Del Frio ... V. ART PANAYOTOU): 605-619.
- Panayotou-Triantaphyllopoulou, A. 2003 – “Crète Minoenne et Chypre: La transmission et la diffusion d'une écriture linéaire”, in (Y. Duhoux ed.) *Briciaka. A Tribute to W.C. Brice* (Cretan Studies 9). Amsterdam: 211-216.
- Panayotou-Triantaphyllopoulou, A. 2006 – “Languages and scripts in Ancient Cyprus”, in (J. Chrysostomides, Ch. Dendrinos eds.) *Sweet Land Lectures on the History and Culture of Cyprus*. Camberley: 61-75.
- Panayotou-Triantaphyllopoulou, A. 2008 – “Les écritures chypriotes et la présence mycénienne à Chypre”, in (A. Saccani, M. Del Frio, L. Godart, M. Negri eds.) *Colloquium Romanum. Atti del XII Colloquio Internazionale di Micenologia, Roma 20-25 febbraio 2006* (Pasiphae II), Pisa-Roma: 651-658.

- Perna, M. 2010 – “Nuove ricerche nel campo delle scritture sillabiche cipriote del secondo e primo millennio a.C.”, in (A.M. Jasink, L. Bombardieri eds.), *Researches in Cypriote History and Archaeology*. Proceedings of the meeting held in Florence, April 29th-30th 2009. Firenze (Periploi 2, forthcoming).
- Reyes, A.T. 1994 – *Archaic Cyprus. A Study of the Textual and Archaeological Evidence*. Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology. Oxford.
- Sherratt, S. 1992 – “Immigration and archaeology: some indirect reflections”, in *Acta Cypria*. Acts of an International Congress of Cypriote Archaeology held in Göteborg on 22-24 August: 316-347.
- Sherratt, S. 1994 – “Commerce, iron and ideology: Metallurgic innovation in 12th-11th century Cyprus”, in *Cyprus in the 11th Century B.C.*: 1994: 59-106.
- Steel, L. 1994 – “Pottery production in Cyprus in the 11th century B.C.”, in *Cyprus in the 11th Century B.C.*: 239-246.
- Vanschoonwinkel, J. 1991 – *L'Egéé et la Méditerranée orientale à la fin du IIe millénaire: Témoignages archéologiques et sources écrites*. Archeologia Transatlantica 9. Louvain-la-Neuve and Providence R.I.
- Vanschoonwinkel, J. 1994 – “La présence grecque à Chypre au XI^e siècle av. J.-C.”, in *Cyprus in the 11th Century B.C.*: 109-131.
- Yon, M. 1980a - *Salamine de Chypre: Histoire and Archéologie* (M. Yon ed.). Colloques Internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique 578, Lyon 13-17 mars 1978. Paris.
- Yon, M. 1980b – “La fondation de Salamine” in Yon 1980a: 71-80.
- Yon, M. 1997 – “Kition in the Tenth to Fourth Centuries B.C.”, *BASOR* 308 (November): 9-17.

MAP OF CYPRUS

0 50 km

