

Die Ägypter werden von den Karaimen als *Micrili* bezeichnet von hebr. *Micri* 'Ägypten', Chaldäer — *Kasdimli* hebr. *Kasdim*, Meder — *Madaĵli* hebr. *Madaĵ*, Hethiter — *Xitili* hebr. *Hiti*, Amoriter — *Emorili* hebr. *Emori*, Araber — *Aravli* hebr. 'Aravi, Muhammedaner — *Išmael eli* 'Ismaels Volk' hebr. *Jišmael*, Griechen — *Javan* hebr. *Jawan*, Beduinen — *Midbarēi* hebr. *midbar* 'Wüste' + -ēi Suffix der Berufsbezeichnung.

Bei den Karaimen von Halitsch (Halicz) finden wir folgende Ethnonyme: für die Russen — *Kemec*, für die Juden — *Čufut* und Spottname *Kutur* 'Grind', was scheint ein Abklatsch von poln. *parch* zu sein.

Die Karaimen von Halitsch nennen die Neger *Kara guflu* 'mit schwarzem Körper' (*kara* 'schwarz', hebr. *guf* 'Körper').

Die Karaimen von Krim in der Stadt Eupatoria bezeichnen dortige Tataren — *Nogajlar* 'Nogaier', in Teodosia — *Tatarlar*. In Baghtschesarai tragen hiesige Tataren den Namen *Musulmantar* 'Muhammedaner' und die Steppentataren — *Nogajlar*.

Die Krimkaraimen nennen die Russen — *Kazak*, die Griechen — *Urum*, die Armenier — *Ermeni*, die Juden — *Čufut*.

Wie es aus dem angeführten Material ersichtlich ist, liefert die regionale Ethnonymie viel Interessantes für Ethnographie, Geschichte und Kultur.

COMPTE — RENDUS

ZDZISŁAW J. KAPERA

PROBLEMS OF ANCIENT CYPRUS
INPROCEEDINGS OF THE 1ST INTERNATIONAL
CONGRESS OF CYPRIOT STUDIES

In vol. XII, 1970, pp. 349—352 of the *Folia Orientalia* I have reviewed the special issue of the *Cyprus To-Day* prepared on the occasion of the 1st International Congress of Cypriot Studies held in Nicosia in 1969. I can now present, with great pleasure, the first volume of the published results of the work of Ancient Section of the Congress. It has been edited by V. Karageorghis and A. Christodoulou from the Cypriot Department of Antiquities *. The other volumes on the medieval and modern periods also appeared.

The volume under review contains in the first part the official addresses of the first day of the Congress (April 14th, 1969), and in the second part 39 papers read or offered to the Congress. Most of them deal with the archaeology and history of ancient Cyprus, but some are connected with philology and philosophy.

The official materials of the opening of the Congress cover pp. V—XXV. At the beginning we can find the address of His Beatitude the President of the Republic Archbishop Makarios in which he congratulated the Society of Cypriot Studies on organising the Congress and welcomed 360 scholars from 24 countries. He said that *the participation in this congress of a large number of scientists from many countries is evidence of the interest which Cyprus arouses from the historic, the archaeological, the ethnological, the cultural and from other aspects. With an eight-thousand-year history, monuments of an ancient civilisation and evidence of an evenful historical course and evolution, this island offers indeed many fields for research and study.* He expressed his hope that the studies, papers and communications will constitute a profoundly serious and valuable contribution to Cypriot research.

H. E. Dr. Constantinos Spyridakis, then Minister of Education

* ΠΡΑΚΤΙΚΑ ΤΟΥ ΠΡΩΤΟΥ ΔΙΕΘΝΟΥΣ ΚΥΠΡΟΛΟΓΙΚΟΥ ΣΥΝΕΔΡΙΟΥ (ΔΕΥΚΩΣΙΑ, 14—19 ΑΠΡΙΛΙΟΥ 1969), ΤΟΜΟΣ Α', ΑΡΧΑΙΟΝ ΤΜΗΜΑ, Ed. by V. Karageorghis and A. Christodoulou, Nicosia 1972, small 4°, pp. XXV, (2), 288, and XXXVII pls. Published by the Society of Cypriot Studies. On sale by Zeno Booksellers and Publishers, London. Price: £. 10. 50 p.

of Cyprus and President of the Society of Cypriot Studies, stated in his address that the Congress was being held in the 33rd year of the existence of the Society, but, he said *this Conference is not in any way connected with a historical event or anniversary*. The participants *have come together with one and only express purpose. To help promote studies and research on Cyprus*. Then he briefly described the history of studies and research on Cyprus since antiquity up till now. He started with *The Politeia of Cypriots* by Aristoteles and mentioned many Greek, Roman and Byzantine writers, as well as the relations of medieval travellers collected by C. D. Cobham and Mogabgab. The Cypriot studies proper were born in the 19th century. The names like L. P. di Cesnola, M. Ohnefalsch-Richter, J. L. Myres and from the Greek side the name of A. Sakellarios stood at the beginning. After the plundering of ancient sites by General Cesnola the first scientific research was done by the British Museum in 1891, and the establishment of the archaeological museum took place in 1908. The excavations by the first curator of this museum, M. Markides and his small publications are the first contributions to the archaeology of Cyprus by a Cypriot. All these were the pioneers.

In the 20th century a great step forward was made by the Swedish Cyprus Expedition headed by Einar Gjerstad. It carried out excavations all over the island. The work *brought about a real revolution in Cypriology and laid the firm foundation of Cypriot archaeology*. K. Spyridakis especially referred to archeology because in his opinion *it is the prime historical source*. As it was said by the President of the Republic thanks to archaeological research the history of the island now covers a period of eight thousand years. K. Spyridakis mentioned nearly all archaeological missions of our century (including the Polish group) and expressed to all of them the warmest thanks and gratitude of Cyprus and Cypriots.

In his general review K. Spyridakis mentioned also the interest in Byzantine Cyprus, in the folklore and language of the island and reminded the audience of the names of G. Soteriou, M. Ohnefalsch-Richter, S. Menardos. He stressed the value of the monumental work of G. Hill on the whole history of Cyprus and of that of J. Hackett on the history of Cypriot church.

At the end of this address K. Spyridakis called special attention to the role of Cypriots in Cyprus research. He described the achievements of the *Department of Antiquities*, the *Society of Cypriot Studies* and the *Cyprus Research Center*. In the speaker's opinion, the Cypriots *have won for themselves a most satisfactory position in the international effort*. Their ambition *is to render Cyprus despite its size, not only the centre for Cyprus research, but a place which can radiate culture to the whole Eastern Mediterranean like in the days of Evagoras I of Salamis (411 — 374 B. C.)*.

The opening session was also addressed by 23 representatives of various Universities, Academies and Scientific Organizations from many countries of Europe, Asia and even America. Some of these addresses are included in the reviewed volume (cf. pp. XIV—XXIV).

The second part of the volume contains the papers read in the Ancient Section of the Congress from 14 till 19 April 1969. It begins with an interesting article by P. Aström on *Finger-Prints in the Bronze Age Pottery* (cf. pp. 1—3). Besides the known finger-print from Kalopsidha the Author presents new examples from Athens (the Areopagus Hill) and from Enkomi. He tries to evaluate the use of a study of ancient finger-prints. If archaeologists paid attention to them it might be possible one day to *establish a register ... where individual potters are isolated and illustrated...* The value of such an undertaking is manifold, especially concerning origins of exported pottery, attribution of different pots to the same potter and in determining relative and absolute chronology.

G. Cadogan (*Cypriot Objects in the Bronze Age Aegean and Their Importance*, pp. 5—13) lists all Cypriot imports to the Aegean: pottery, objects of stone, copper, bronze, iron, gold, faience, and seals. He has used also Linear B sources. The list is a short one but in spite of this it is possible to establish two phases, each lasting from 100 to 150 years. The first phase lasted from Late Minoan I till the fall of Knossos, and the second occurred at the end of Bronze Age: Late Helladic/Late Minoan III. In the first phase Cypriot imports are found in Crete and on the islands under its cultural influence. In the second phase Cypriot objects occur in Attica, the Argolid and in Crete. In the Author's opinion *Cyprus did not on the whole have luxury products to send to the Aegean or luxury raw materials, ... nor did Cyprus have much influence on Minoan and Mycenaean culture. But its copper was essential to the Aegean...* (p. 13).

J. N. Coldstream offers a few remarks concerning *Cypro-Aegean Exchanges in the 9th and 8th Centuries B. C.* (pp. 15—22) basing mainly on a study of pottery. In the 9th c. B. C. contacts of the Aegean Greeks with Cyprus *are no more than sporadic, but from the later 9th c. onwards, the east-west commerce takes a livelier turn*. (p. 13). The most interesting problem touched on by J. N. Coldstream is the question if the Royal tombs of Salamis and Paphos of the Homeric characteristic type are a survival or a revival of Achaean customs. Since there is so little positive evidence for survival, so — in the Author's opinion — *it is very likely that this sudden veneration of Mycenaean heroes was caused by the circulation of the Homeric epic. ... The greatest gift to Cyprus from the Aegean..., was the diffusion of the Homeric poems in the late eight century, which inspired the people of Salamis and Paphos to honour their rulers with a manner of burial which recalled in detail the funeral rites already immortalized in the Homeric poems.* (cf. pp. 20f). As a comment on the

cited statement we can add that in Tamassos we can find the same custom, too (cf. O. Masson, *Kypriaka, I. Recherches sur les antiquités de Tamassos*, BCH 88, 1964, pp. 213—232 and H.-G. Buchholz, *Tamassos, Zypern, 1970—1972*, AA 1973, pp. 322—338).

J.-C. Courtois (*Chypre et l'Europe Préhistorique à la fin de l'Age du Bronze. Données nouvelles sur le Monde Mycénien Finissant*, pp. 23—33) resumed his observations concerning relations between prehistoric Europe (at the beginning of the period of the „Champs d'Urnes”) and the East Mediterranean countries and particularly Cyprus. Basing mainly on the distribution of bronze objects (cf. map on p. 33), he postulates two waves of the „conquerors” provided with new arms and coming to Cyprus from Central Europe through Italy, the Adriatic Sea, Mycenaean Greece, Mycenaeanised islands (The Cyclades, Naxos, Dodekanese, Kos). The first wave came about 1200 B. C. (that is at the end of the Late Cypriot Bronze Age and the beginning of the Iron Age in Cyprus) with the pottery called Mycenaean III C : 1. The second one came in the 11th c. B. C. (Iron I) and marked its presence by new settlements for example in Salamis, Kourion, Lapithos and Idalion, while the Enkomi and Kition settlements continued.

W. A. Daszewski presents *Polish Excavations at Kato (Nea) Paphos, 1965—1968* (pp. 35—39). They were conducted in the area of the ancient city, near the sea-shore, just south of the well-known *House of Dionysos* with the beautiful mosaics. Fragments of the town's buildings from the end of 4th c. B. C. (the beginning of the Hellenistic period) till the 7 c. A. D. (Late Roman-Early Byzantine period) were discovered. A part of the *official residence* with a *private one* beneath was uncovered. Of the many important finds the following deserve special attention: 1. A deposit of 13 silver coins from the end of 4th c. B. C. discovered on bedrock. It provides an additional argument for the early Hellenistic origins of the city (cf. Z. J. Kapera, *Les origines de Néa Paphos*, Études et Travaux II, Varsovie 1968, pp. 129—141); 2. The abundance of marble sculptures (among them 2 statuettes of Asclepios, one from the 2nd c. B. C. and the other from the Severan period); 3. A gem (a ring stone) with an incised eagle and the legionary insignia of the XV Legion Apollinaris. W. A. Daszewski supposes that *some legionaries of this Legion... accompanied Titus when... he stopped at Paphos in A. D. 69 to visit the sanctuary of Aphrodite at Palaepaphos and consulted the goddess about his future* (p. 39); 4. Mosaic pavements. Nota bene it was only in 1969 that the famous Theseus Mosaic was found (Cf. W. A. Daszewski, *New finds from Paphos, II*, ILN Sept. 6, 1969, pp. 26f).

J. des Gagniers (*Soloi. Fouilles de l'Université Laval, Québec*, pp. 41—49) describes the site of Soloi and presents the history of the city from its origins till the Mediaeval times in the light of written sources. The development of Soloi was connected directly with the

neighbouring copper mine in Skouriotissa. The number of known records about Roman Soloi is small, and because of this we should like to call the reader's attention to the relation of *Galenus* about his visit in Soloi and Skouriotissa mine (cf. *De antidotis* 2 = ed. Kühn 14, p. 7; Z. J. Kapera, *Der Bergbau im antiken Zypern*, Bibliotheca Classica Orientalis 14, 1969, pp. 346f).

In the second part of his lecture J. des Gagniers gives an account of the Canadian excavations in Soloi from the year 1964 onwards. From the literary sources we know that Solon suggested to Philokypros, the king of Aipeia, the transferring of the capital to the future Soloi. Owing to recent tomb finds the origins of Soloi can be set two centuries back, to the Cypro-Geometric period. The Christian basilica of the dimensions 52,5 m by 30,6 m. remains the most impressive of the Canadian discoveries.

M. Dothan presents the *Relations between Cyprus and the Philistine Coast in the Late Bronze Age* (*Tel Mor, Ashdod*) (pp. 51—56) basing on pottery excavated at Tel Mor, the harbour town and Tel Ashdod, the inland city of the Late Canaanite Ashdod kingdom. The Cypriot imports at Tel Mor were especially frequent in 15th and 14th c. B. C. The relations continued later and on a jug handle from the 13th c. B. C. we can even recognize an incised Cypro-Minoan sign. The impact of Cypriot pottery was still strong enough to produce local imitations at the end of 13th c. B. C.

In the city of Ashdod traces of relations with Cyprus have been found in the Late Bronze Age and early Philistine strata. A stone stamp with undeciphered signs, possibly Cypro-Minoan, and pottery observations support the possibility that at least some of the Philistines came, to Ashdod directly from Cyprus and not later than during the prevalence of the Mycenaean III C 1 style (p. 54). This took place in the first quarter of the 12th century B. C. In the appendix to the lecture we can find some very interesting results of a neutron activation analysis of the Ashdod pottery. *The Mycenaean III C ware was imitated at Ashdod by potters closely familiar with and with intimate knowledge of this ware* (p. 56). It is worth adding that a full report of this research (I. Perlman, F. Asaro, J. D. Frierman, *Provenience Studies of Pottery employing Neutron Activation Analysis*) appeared in: M. Dothan, *Ashdod II—III*, Jerusalem 1971 (= *Atiqot*. English Series IX—X), pp. 216—219, table I.

The greatest personality in Cypriot archaeology Professor Einar Gjerstad, offers a corrected classification of the whole series of Cypriot decorated metal bowls starting with those of the Proto-Cypriot style till the Cypro-Greek style, 8th-6th c. B. C. (Cf. *Additions and Corrections*, pp. 61—67). In the second part of his lecture Professor Gjerstad gives additional examples of the architecture type of the first palace of Vouni (called the *liwan house* or the *tarma house*). The similarities

between palace of Vouni and archaic buildings from Asia Minor, Palestine and Etruria prove that *the Cypriot architecture... forms an integral part of a wide cultural context* (p. 67). In connection with the remarks of Professor Gjerstad I should like to remind another opinion concerning the architecture of the first palace of Vouni. Ju. A. Savel'ev (*Dvorec v Vuni na Kipre*, Vestnik Drevnej Istorii 1965, No 2, pp. 79—86) stressed the importance of its links with the native Cypriot tradition of the II millennium B. C.

V. Karageorghis describes the present state of Cypriot archaeology (*Archaeology of Cyprus to-day*, pp. 69—75). He reminds the main persons and their achievements in the one-hundred-year-old discipline. He mentions pioneers in this field like Max Ohnefalsch-Richter and Sir J. L. Myres, *The history of the modern Cypriot archaeology started in 1926... with the hard and systematic work... of Einar Gjerstad*. His great achievement is that he took ancient Cyprus out of its apparent isolation, he portrayed vividly the particularities of its physiognomy, and offered it to the world of scholarship in a magnum opus... the second part of the 4th volume of the Swedish Cyprus Expedition. What is more Gjerstad brought out in relief the Kyprios Charakter... from the beginning to the middle of the first millennium, offering Cyprus both to the Classicists and the Orientalists, yet protecting her individuality (italics mine, Z. K.) (pp. 69—70). After the Swedish complex excavations much was done in Cypriot archaeology by C. F. A. Schaeffer and P. Dikaios. After the IInd World War there was... a danger that Cyprus should fall again into an oblivion..., but great changes in the approach to the study of archaeology helped the island not only keep its firm stand but to increase its importance to an unprecedented high degree (p. 71). Then V. Karageorghis emphasizes the crucial importance of Cyprus in this new Mediterranean archaeology. Studies of the Neolithic culture of Cyprus have been revived. Cyprus continuously holds a particularly important position in the works on the Late Bronze Age in the Mediterranean and especially those concerning Mycenaeans. Excavations of the Iron Age sites have given some spectacular results recently (Salamis, Kition, Soloi, Palaepaphos). Impressive complexes of public buildings at a number of Roman and Early Byzantine sites have been discovered, which not only increase our knowledge about Roman architecture, Roman art and social history (with information from inscriptions) but help also the promotion of cultural tourism (pp. 73—74). The Cypriot Department of Antiquities never ignored later periods. The underwater excavations which started with the Kyrenia wreck offer new possibilities of research. At the end of the lecture V. Karageorghis states that he and the Department of Antiquities try to make Cyprus a pleasant place for archaeological research to which colleagues from all nations will come to collaborate in a friendly and cordial manner. Having had the pleasure of visiting Cyprus in 1969 I can say that the statement

welcome to Cyprus and come again is not a conventional formula, but a warm-hearted invitation.

V. E. G. Kenna deals in his lecture with *The Role of Cyprus in Preserving the Aegean Tradition at the End of the Bronze Age* (pp. 77—79). He stresses that an archaeologist who likes to approach the Bronze Age Aegean, should add to his studies of Classical Greece the Cypriot studies. In this way he would be better equipped to understand the Bronze Age in Aegean.

Then the Author presents some observations concerning the glyptic of the Late Bronze Age and of the 8th and 7th c. B. C. It is striking that Cyprus preserves purer Aegean styles more consistently than Helladic Greece. In the Author's opinion after the explosion of Thera craftsmen left East Crete for Cyprus and the Levant area. This was the reason why the so vital Aegean styles from that area survived (pp. 78—79). The keeping of older Aegean styles by Cyprus influenced the 8th and 7th c. Eastern Phoenician scarab seals. Owing to these seals Cyprus played a vital part in the beginning of Greek art.

J. Leclant presents the results of the first bibliographical and museum research carried out by himself and his staff working on Egyptian materials from Cyprus (*Remarques préliminaire sur le matériel égyptien et égyptisant recueilli à Chypre*, pp. 81—84). The material is arranged chronologically from the Early Bronze Age to the Roman period. The literary sources are also taken into consideration when presenting Cypro-Egyptian relations.

F. G. Maier describes *Recent Discoveries at Kouklia (Old Paphos)* (pp. 93—102). The German expedition on this site continues the works of the Liverpool Museums and the University of St. Andrews headed by T. B. Mitford and J. H. Iliffe in the years 1950—1955. During 1966—1968 the main target of the German mission was the North-East Gate on the Marcello Hill (Site A). It was situated close to the western flank of a large Persian siege ramp dated from the Ionian Revolt. The recent excavations of the gate have uncovered 400 years of the mount's history (starting from 700 B. C.) and given an important contribution to the study of Greek type fortifications. The German mission also continues excavations in Late Bronze Age cemeteries and collects materials for the archaeological map of the area of Old Paphos. The cemeteries at Evreti, Asproyi, Kaminia and recently at Lakkos tous Skarnou have produced evidence for a considerable Late Bronze Age settlement. Old Paphos was at that time one of the island's important and wealthy centres, where the potter's and ivory carver's (and possibly the goldsmith's) craft flourished. The first wave of Achaean settlers came there around 1200 B.C., and the second wave at the end of the 12th and the beginning of the 11th century. At the Lakkos cemetery as well as at Xerolimini we can observe an important change of burial customs. The continued peaceful occupation of Kouklia

from the Late Cypriot period through the Cypro-Geometric has recently been definitely confirmed.

E. J. Peltenburg offered to the Congress a lecture *On the Classification of Faience Vases from the Late Bronze Age Cyprus* (pp. 129—136). As previously listed in his thesis *Western Asiatic Glazed Vessels of the Second Millennium B. C.* there are over one hundred and thirty Cypriot faience vases (or fragments) from the period of the Late Bronze Age. He classified them now into two groups: *Egyptian* or Egyptianizing (with a sub-division into monochrome and polychrome) and *Western Asiatic* (of the North Levantine and International Western Asiatic styles). The famous Kition rhyton of Aegean shape and Levantine decoration is classified as an Egyptian Polychrome vase *because of the faience-working technique used to fashion it* (p. 132).

M. W. Prausnitz presents his remarks on *Red-Polished and Black-on-Red Wares at Akhziv* (pp. 151—156). The sub-title of the lecture *Israel and Cyprus in the Early-Middle Iron Age* explains what exactly this ware offers to Cypriot scholarship. Excavations during the years 1958—1963 at Akhziv revealed *two distinct and separate yet contemporaneous burial grounds* dated from the end of the 11th till beginning of the 7th c. B. C. Following the Author's observations we can trace the transformation of the early rustic pottery group into elegant Sidonian pottery. This was the result of contact between Canaanite and Israeli cultures. M. W. Prausnitz says: *while we have tried to show mainly the connections of the Akhziv pottery with Cyprus, we must also consider the archaeological evidence from mainland sites* (Beth Shan, Hazor, Megiddo).

C. F. A. Schaeffer presents some observations on the Late Bronze Age in Cyprus in connection with his excavations at Enkomi (*Dernières Découvertes Archéologiques à Enkomi-Alasia*, pp. 157—162). In his opinion the so-called Mycenaean III C : 1 pottery is in fact post-Mycenaean. He names it Cypriot Iron I. The latest Mycenaean pottery from Cyprus connected with Argolis and named the *rude* and *close* styles can be identified as the pottery of the Mycenaean refugees from the end of 13 c. B. C. The pottery of the Cypriot Iron I is connected with the Peoples of the Sea. In the light of the Ras Shamra historical sources their invasion of Cyprus took place circa 1185 B. C. We can recognize many Philistines among the Peoples of the Sea. They had settled in the Mycenaean cities abandoned due to drought spell and earthquake. As a result of later earthquake Enkomi was evacuated and a new city was built in the neighbourhood at the end of the 13th or even in 12th c. B. C.

C. F. A. Schaeffer stresses that the Peoples of the Sea were the first on the island to build real sanctuaries and to erect statues of their gods (in copper or bronze). What is more their gods were not of Achaean or Aegean origins. The Peoples of the Sea (apparently of European

origin) inhabiting Enkomi seem to have been the first to borrow from Syria and Palestine, called even to-day the *coast of gods*, their religious ideology and the organization of cult.

T. F. Watkins presents some remarks which arise from work carried out by him in Philia-Drakos (Cf. *Cypriot Neolithic Chronology and the Pottery from Philia-Drakos A*, pp. 167—174). In his opinion P. Dikaïos' chronology of the Neolithic period needs some corrections. It is possible now to fill the gap in Dikaïos' time-chart. Without going into details we should stress after Watkins, that the Sotira culture has received its Cypriot ancestor in Philia and that this ancestor is one thousand years older! The origins of the Philia culture are still to be found.

G. R. H. Wright offers his opinion concerning *A Nabataean Capital in the Salamis Gymnasium and its Possible Background* (pp. 175—178). The occurrence of the so-called Nabataean capitals (or *Bossenform*) is known from the regions which were inhabited by the Nabataeans, and they are often closely associated with Nabataean inscriptions which indicate that they flourished in the first century of the Christian era and continued to be employed in the second (p. 175). The Author demonstrates that both the model and the manner of the Nabataean Capitals were common to the late Hellenistic Art World, perhaps centred on Alexandria (p. 165). To-day it is difficult to say whether the Nabataean capital from Salamis Gymnasium constitutes one of the very rare evidences of the wider dispersal of this form in the Alexandrian Architectural Province or whether it is an example of the existence of a Nabataean community in Cyprus, as such communities were present for example in Miletus, Delos, Cos, Beirut and Saida.

Besides the lectures abstracted also two following papers in Greek deal with Cypriot archaeology. In the opinion of A. Pieridou, *Archaïologikai Endeikseis peri ton Scheseon tes Kyprou meta ton Anatolikon Choron kata ten Protogeometriken Periodon* (*Archaeological indications about the relations of Cyprus with oriental countries during the Proto-Geometric period*, pp. 137—140) relations of Cyprus with Palestine, Syria and Phoenicia had continued since the Bronze Age and became even closer during the Proto-Geometric period. G. G. Tzedakis, *Kypriake Kerameike ste Dytike Krete* (*Cypriot Pottery in West Crete*, pp. 163—166) deals with the relations between Crete and Cyprus in the Late Minoan III a/b. They were closer than was believed until recently. Archaeological findings show that one of the Minoan centres of Crete, Kydonia, had close contacts and commercial exchanges with the centres of the South-East coast of Cyprus.

In the reviewed volume only two articles deal with numismatics of Cyprus. E. Mathiopolou-Tornaritou presents some remarks on the coins of the Lapithos Kingdom: *Kai palin ta Nomismata ton Basileon 'Andr... kai Demonikou tes Lapethou* (*Once more the coins*

of the Kings 'Andr... and Demonikou of Lapithos, pp. 85—91). In the opinion of the Author there is a close connection between them and several sculptural prototypes, possibly with Athena Medici.

K. Nicolaou describes in his lecture the *Discovery of a Ptolemaic Mint at Nea Paphos* (pp. 121—124). In 1964 he uncovered a workshop from the Hellenistic period in which metal had been cast. The discovery was made in the north-western corner of the House of Dionysos mentioned previously. Large amounts of ashes, fragments of clay moulds, copper and iron slag, bronze coins and flans, stone moulds for the casting of flans and blanks were found in the room. More moulds and coins were found in the neighbourhood. 8 small limestone moulds are the most important of the objects found there. In this moulds the flans were cast en chapelet, i.e. a series of moulds were made on one side of the stone slab and a channel was drawn from mould to mould to allow the metal to pass from one to the other. In the discovery described we have for the first time a possibility to observe the technique of casting blanks en chapelet and it is a direct confirmation, that Nea Paphos, besides Salamis, Kition (and probably Amathus) was an important center of Ptolemaic mint. Let us record that in 1964 K. Nicolaou discovered a big hoard of 2.482 silver Ptolemaic tetradrachms in the same House of Dionysos.

Four articles in the *Proceedings* are connected with Cypriot epigraphy. H. Geiss contributed a lecture *Ist das Verfahren legitim, Silbenverte der kyprischen Zeichen auf ähnliche oder Formengleiche Linear B-Zeichen zu Übertragen?* (pp. 57—60). E. Masson presented the results of her observations on the Cypro-Minoan texts (*Remarques sur Certains Groupes de Signes en Chypro-Minoen*, pp. 103—106) known mainly from Enkomi. The texts can be divided into two groups, which can correspond to two as yet undeciphered languages. The first group includes the great cylinder from Enkomi and clay balls, and inscriptions on the metal vases. The second group includes fragments of tablets. The differences between the two groups are connected with the ductus of the script, the frequency and the display of the signs. In the Author's opinion in the 13th c. B.C. two different languages were spoken in Cyprus. One was used by the natives. The second one by foreign elements. But this interpretation may be false. The Author reminds us that in classical Cyprus at the same time one syllabic script was used for Eteocypriot and Cypriot Greek. In our opinion the most important of the Author's observations is that the linguistic research confirms the general picture of the situation on the island in 13th c. B.C. which has been obtained from excavations.

O. Masson gives some remarks on the separation of words in the Cypriot syllabic epigraphy (*Remarques sur l'Epigraphie Chypriote Syllabique: Les Procédés de Séparation des Mots*, pp. 107—110). He reminds us that the same writing convention can be found in Linear A and B.

It existed also in Cypro-Minoan scripts. But this situation was changed in Cypriot syllabic epigraphy. It is only in longer texts that we can observe point(s), word-final and text-final vertical strokes, spacing etc. Detailed observations (concerning also sgraffiti) are included in this important lecture.

I. Michaelidou-Nicolaou gives a *Contribution to the Prosopography of Roman Salamis* (pp. 125—127). Basing on the text of a fragmentary statue-base found in Salamis in 1964 at the locality *Sklinitzia* she supposes that T(?) Fl(avios) Boethos mentioned there was appointed to act temporarily as procurator of Cyprus in A.D. 163—166. In her opinion procurator Boethos from Salamis is to be identified with Flavios Boethos of Ptolemais (PIR 229).

J. Pouilloux presents the results of his research on a Greek inscription found at the Gymnasium of Salamis (Room 6 on the north side) in 1968. (*Deux amis: Le Stratège Diogénès fils de Nouménios et le Gymnasiarque Stasicratès fils de Stasicratès*, pp. 141—150). Basing on the internal data of the inscription compared with the known facts of the late Ptolemaic period, he dates the text to the year 38 B.C. The Salamis inscription throws more light on the relations between Cilicia and Cyprus at the time.

Five articles in the *Proceedings* are connected with history of Cyprus. R. S. Merrillees on a few occasions has expressed the opinion that the available data or rather absence of it from Cyprus, is already sufficiently conclusive to reject the claim that Cyprus and Alasia were the same... (p. 112).

In his lecture presented to the Congress he attempts to substantiate his case and proposes an alternative identification (*Alasia*, pp. 111—119). He confronts the literary sources and inscriptions of the 18th to 12th c. B.C., from Anatolia, north Syria, Mesopotamia and Egypt with the archaeological evidence from Cyprus, and concludes that neither Enkomi nor any part of Cyprus can have been Alasia, even if allowance is made for the incomplete state of the archaeological record. And then he states: *Though it is even more definite that Ras Shamra was not Alasia either, the city bearing that name must in its history and culture have very closely resembled ancient Ugarit. This is a strong argument for locating Alasia on the north Syrian coast, and furthermore not too far distant from Ras Shamra itself, as the numerous references to the place in clay tablets found at Ras Shamra indicate that Ugarit had a detailed knowledge of the city* (p. 118). In his opinion the area which best suits all the known geographical, economic and historical factors delimiting Alasia's location is the Gulf of Iskanderun, perhaps centred on some site such as Kinet Hoyuk, whose period of occupation goes back to the Middle Bronze Age, and which is said to be the most impressive mound in the coastal region (p. 118). In the postscript R. S. Merrillees cites the letter of S. Williams, who proposes to identify Alasia rather

with Sabouni to the mouth of the Orontes, as there is lack of Egyptian material from Kinet Huyuk.

Also J. D. Muhly presents his opinion concerning the identification of Alasia in the reviewed volume (*The Land of Alashiya: References to Alashiya in the Texts of the Second Millennium B.C. and the History of Cyprus in the Late Bronze Age*, pp. 201—219). In general he disagrees with the objections against the identification of Alasia with Cyprus published recently by H. W. Catling (*Cyprus in the Neolithic, and Bronze Age Periods*, Cambridge 1966, pp. 58—62), who has been supported by some other scholars (cf. the lecture of R. S. Merrillees). Also the suggestion to extend the range of the term beyond Cyprus (to include also North Syria) is rejected. Through a careful analysis of the Mari, Egyptian, Ras Shamra and Boghazkeui texts J. D. Muhly supports strongly the identification of Alashiya with Cyprus. The only modification of the generally accepted view should be that Alashiya ought to refer to the entire island, not only to Enkomi. The detailed discussion of chosen references from different ancient archives helps the Author to clarify the position of Alashiya in the political world of the Late Bronze Age. It seems that in fact these references make it clear that the identification of Alashiya with Cyprus can no longer be doubted. Let us note that the problem, which still is not solved conclusively was discussed again in the article of P. Åström, *Some Aspects of the Late Cypriote Bronze Age*, Report of the Department of Antiquities Cyprus, 1972, Nicosia 1972, pp. 46—57; id., *The Swedish Cyprus Expedition*, Vol. IV. Part 1 D, Lund 1972, pp. 772 ff; Y. Lynn Holmes, *The Location of Alasia*, Journal of the American Oriental Society 91, 1971, pp. 426—429; O. Masson, *A propos de l'île d'Alasia*, Kadmos, 12, 1973, pp. 98—99; P. Dikaios, *Enkomi. Excavations 1948—1958*, Vol. II, Mainz 1971, pp. 534 ff.

The communication *Remarks on the Early History of the Paphos Kingdom* (pp. 191—199), which was sent to the Secretary of the Congress by Z. J. Kapera offers a confrontation between the legendary tales about Kinyras and the Achaeans (cf. Apollod., *Ep.* III, 9 and Eustathius, *Scholia Hom. Il.* XI, 20) with the image of the Late Bronze Age Cyprus as suggested by the results of excavations. Further the author analyses the onomastic material thus trying to extract historical data from the legend.

Special attention is paid to the armour-plate which Kinyras supposedly presented to Agamemnon. Its description by Homer fits a type of armour known in the Middle East since the fifteenth century B.C. The number of fifty ships promised by Kinyras to the Achaeans (mentioned by ancient authors) seems to testify to the wealth of Cyprus; on the other hand, this wealth has been confirmed by the results of recent excavations. Kinyras sent only one warship with forty-nine clay models to Achaeans at the end. On this point author states that

the necropolis in Amathus, where Agamemnon was to remove Kinyras from Paphos, contains some clay-made ship models, which somehow recalls the cited legend.

In the second part of the communication Z. Kapera goes on to examine the etymology of the name of Kinyras as well as of that of son of Mygdalion. The linguistic analysis of the name Kinyras permits, with a great deal of probability, to trace it back to the Ugaritic term KNR, denoting the god of the lyre tree, which would be in conformity with the information transmitted by mythographers who considered Kinyras to have been a musician by profession. The name of Mygdalion, too, seems to point to a non-Cypriot origin, presumably a West-Semitic one. There is some possibility that the two men were Phoenicians (in the sense of „people inhabiting Canaan”) or rather connected with the Phoenicians.

The results of the communication permit us to elucidate an episode from the history of the Late Bronze Age Cyprus. It seems that Kinyras the legendary ruler of the Eteocypriots, attempted to neutralize the Achaean influences in the south-west region of the island, but he had to surrender. The Mycenaean settlement in Maa north of Ktima as well as the Mycenaean colony in Old Paphos confirm the possibility of trouble a native ruler might have had with the colonists.

G. A. Papantoniou offers *Some Conclusions from Herodotus' information about Cyprus* (pp. 221—224). The first point deals with the remark of Herodotus that Amasis „was the first man who conquered Cyprus, and subjected it to the payment of tribute” (Hist. II, 182.2). In the opinion of G. A. Papantoniou this statement is true, as Cyprus had not been conquered either by Sargon II and his successors or by Apries. What is more, gifts... sent annually, or from time to time, to the king of Assyria, or booty taken by Apries cannot be regarded, according to Herodotus, as a payment of tribute (p. 223).

The second passage interpreted by G. A. Papantoniou is connected with the Cypriot attitude towards the Persian Empire at the moment of the Ionians' rebellion in Asia Minor. He stresses the use of the words *prôteron* and *tôte* in Herodotus V, 104.2, as a reference to an active, not passive, revolt proved as such by the expedition to Sardes and the burning of that city.

M. L. Chaumont gives some observations on the position of Cyprus in the Persian Empire (*Chypre dans l'Empire Perse Achéménide*, pp. 179—189). In her opinion the island entered under the authority of Persians probably in the year 526 B. C. during the rule of Cambyses. It was included into the satrapy named *Ebirnâri* (in the Neo-Babylonian) or *Abarnahara* (in the Aramean language). Both terms mean *across the river* (Euphratus). Later this satrapy received the name of *the fifth satrapy*, it extended from Cilicia to Egypt and included Syria, Palestina, Phoenicia and Cyprus. Cyprus was placed under the su-

periority of the governor of the satrapy, who resided in one of the Phoenician or Syrian cities. The seven local dynasties of Cyprus were directly subordinated to the governor, not to the Great King. So, in the opinion of M. L. Chaumont, Cyprus was in a different situation, compared for example with that of the Cilician kings, who were direct tributaries of the Great King. Anyhow, basing on coin findings, it seems that Cyprus had a very extensive autonomy.

Among the Cypriot kings of the Persian period only Evagoras from Salamis had the prestige and authority to fight for a change of his position. He wanted to be recognized as a real *Basileus*. He accepted only a form of dependence which left him autonomy. It is necessary to stress that we do not possess any coin of Evagoras which would be reminiscent of Persian hegemony. And what is more, he even struck golden pieces, which was an exclusive privilege of his sovereign.

Five lectures in the reviewed volume are devoted to stoicism and especially to the philosophy and logic of Zeno of Citium (cf. K. Ch. Grollios, *Mia Prospatheia Praktikes Epharmoges tes Politeias ton „Spoudaion”*, pp. 231—246; I. N. Theodoracopoulos, *He Philosophia tou Zenonos*, pp. 247—252; K. P. Michaelides, *He Ennoia tou Logou kata ton Herakleiton kai tous Stoikous*, pp. 253—258; K. Hadjiste-fanou, *Ho Sophos para tois Stoikois*, pp. 265—269 and B. Tatakis, *La Logique Stoicienne et la Nouvelle Logique Contemporaine*, pp. 259—264) B. Tatakis observes the existence of different logical systems to-day just as it was at the time of stoics, and tries to answer the question what need caused the pluralism. In this context he stressed the importance of Zeno's logic in the history of human thought and logic and the fact that it was a logic of propositions not of terms.

Finally, we have to mention two lectures on the Isocrates speeches on Evagoras (cf. M. M. Kokolakis, *Ho Isokratous „Evagoras” kai he Chronologesis ton Kypriakon Logon*, pp. 271—281 and Th. St. Tzannetatos, *Oi pros Kyprious Logoi tou Isokratous. Kritike kai Hermeneutike Ekdosis auton*, pp. 283—286), and a lecture of R. F. Willetts concerning *Arcado-Cypriot Traces in the Ancient Cretan Dialect* (pp. 225—229). In his opinion old traditions in cult and mythology, connected with the Achaeans, emphasize the probability that the Arcado-Cypriot traces in the ancient Cretan dialect were pre-Doric survivals. These survivals have been found in the epigraphic evidence from the cities of central Crete. They may be puzzling if studied in isolation but they can assume a rather wider interest when placed in the proper and broader context.

*

The 1st International Congress of the Cypriot Studies held in 1969 was a milestone in the history of Cypriot research. It documented a real increase in number of scholars interested in the history and

archaeology of the island. They offered papers concerning all periods of the ancient history of Cyprus. They stressed its contacts with the neighbouring countries. They showed different aspects of its life in the antiquity. They underlined the contribution of the Cypriot people to European and World culture.

The second meeting of scholars in Nicosia had been planned for the period 15—21 September of 1974. Unfortunately the Society of Cypriot Studies had to postpone the Congress as a result of the tragic events in Cyprus brought about by the Turkish invasion during July—August 1974. By occupying 40% of the total territory, by expelling nearly 200.000 people from their homes, Turkey caused an unprecedented and unimaginable tragedy to Cyprus.