



UCL

Kypriōn Politeia

**The political and administrative systems of the
classical Cypriot city-kingdoms**

Beatrice Pestarino

University College London

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor in Philosophy

To my parents Paola and Giampiero.

DECLARATION OF AUTHORSHIP

I, Beatrice Pestarino, declare that this thesis and the work presented in it is entirely my own. Where I have consulted the work of others, this is always clearly stated.

Signed: Beatrice Pestarino

Date: 04/01/2021

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The path toward this thesis has been circuitous. Its completion is also thanks to the special people who supported me during my way. Foremost, I would like to thank my supervisors Hans Van Wees and Paola Ceccarelli, with the addition of Julietta Steinhauer. This would not have been achieved without their help. Their advice is invaluable and their contributions fundamental to the final version of the thesis.

I would like to thank everyone who helped somehow to improve my knowledge on the subject or to get access to books or pdf articles during the pandemic of covid-19, amongst them: Artemis Karnava, José Zamora López, Maria Giulia Amadasi, Christian Körner and Yannick Vernet. A special mention should go to Michele Bianconi whose advice is a consistent source of inspiration and whose patience infinite. Finally, I would like to thank my sponsor, Leventis Foundation.

During my path, I had the great and irreplaceable support of the wonderful ICS/PGWiP crew: Anna Lucia Furlan, Francesca Bologna, Francesca Modini, Giulia Maltagliati, Sara de Martin – who has been a great advisor on Theognis – Kely Tzortzopoulou, Matt Ward, Orestis Mitintzis, Martina Russo, Will Cole, Jordan Mitchell, Ted Szadzinski, Valentina Barrile, Cristiana Lucidi, Dies van der Linde, and more specifically, Tim Brady, Justin Yoo, Katie Shields, Barbara Roberts and most of all Karolina Frank – though I still do not deserve a folder in her computer – who have been my language advisors.

I would also like to thank the UCL History Department colleagues: Anastazja Grudnicka, Cristina Mestre – and the *kynegoi* – Sotiris Peithis and those who became a third family, that one from London: Natalia Gandara (and Victor Salinas), Karolina Frank and Alfred Hinrichsen who provide a consistent support 24/24h and to whom I will always be infinitely grateful.

Also, my deepest thanks go to my ‘famiglia Pisana’ which constantly helps me: Gaia Barbieri, Silvia Lai and Marta Capano, Angela Cossu, and Michele Bianconi who also became part of the PGWiP crew; thank you for walking me through my London trip.

Finally, my PhD would not have been possible without the consistent economic and psychological support of my parents Paola and Giampiero; all this would not exist without them. This thesis started under ominous auspices, with an illness, and ended up in the middle of a pandemic in an *annus horribilis*; however, I could not be more grateful for all that I received in between.

ABSTRACT

The thesis aims to reconstruct the political and administrative systems of the Cypriot city-kingdoms during the classical period. It analyses inscriptions, some specific case studies, written in a variety of languages such as Cypriot-syllabic Greek, Eteocypriot and Phoenician. New textual readings and a fresh interpretation of the content of these documents show that the Cypriot city-states shared similar political and administrative systems. The administrative one was strictly connected to the exploitation of the island's resources. It managed the collection, processing and sale of local products. They could come from the land of the king or from the land of private citizens, who may have received their territory as gift by the sovereign. Products' processing and storage took place in palaces and administrative buildings – located in both the centre and periphery of the city-states – where officials and specialised workers were employed. Some case studies show that these offices were hierarchical and hereditary.

The political system, on the contrary to the administrative one, differs more amongst the polities: some magistracies are specific to some city-kingdoms and never attested in others. Furthermore, this system has seen more changes over the years, particularly during the fifth and fourth century BC. New offices developed beyond the king, and *polis* and 'M (people) started to appear in governmental inscriptions. The *polis* or the 'M became contractors along with the sovereigns in agreements concerning the management of the city-states. This may suggest the development of more 'republican' institutions beyond the king, perhaps assemblies. The thesis concludes that one of the reasons of this development was the reform of the administration of the Achaemenid Empire to which Cyprus belonged during the classical period. The local population may have requested a greater representation in light of the new tax, the *phoros*, that the city-states had to pay to the Great King.

IMPACT STATEMENT

This thesis is the first work which analyses the political and administrative systems of classical Cyprus in detail; it focuses on Cypriot magistracies, offices and political institutions beyond the sovereigns. Also, this is the first work based on some of the most recent archaeological reports and epigraphic materials which have allowed a clearer global vision of what the island's economic and administrative system was. The reconstruction of this system, which has never been attempted earlier, fills a significant gap in the study of the Ancient Mediterranean World. Not only is this a crucial step forward in Cypriot studies but it also provides new bases to better investigate the development of political systems in the Mediterranean in the Early Iron Age, the role of Cyprus in the relationship between Greeks and Persians (a crucial topic in the discipline of Ancient History), the island's political transformations from end of the city-kingdoms to the Ptolemaic domination, and the relationships amongst Mediterranean communities. For instance, the thesis faces topics such as the overlapping of religious cults and the multilingualism. Therefore, its interdisciplinary character raises historical-archaeological and linguistic questions of interest to scholars specialised in both Greek and Ancient Near-East studies from Prehistory to Hellenism.

Furthermore, this thesis concerns the cultural heritage of Cyprus, which has been partially destroyed after the Turkish military invasion of the island in 1974. In response to a coup d'état organised by the Greek military Junta in order to obtain the *enosis*, the union of Cyprus to Greece, Turkey invaded the island and occupied the Northern territory. This affected the preservation of the Cypriot cultural heritage, particularly in the Northern side where Salamis and Enkomi, two important archaeological sites, are located. The conflict ended up with the partition of Cyprus along a Green line monitored by the UN. After the invasion, several Cypriot Greeks were forced to move from Northern Cyprus to the Southern part of the island meanwhile, Turkish Cypriots immigrated to the Northern zone. The EU commission of Human Rights condemned the invasion as deprivation of liberty and because of preventing the return of Greek Cypriot refugees to their properties. But after almost 50 years, Cyprus is still divided into the Southern Republic of Cyprus and the Northern Turkish Republic of

Cyprus – which is not recognised internationally. This partially affected the results of this thesis. Several archaeological data come from the excavations of the Southern part of the island and only a few from the North, creating a disproportion. Therefore, this thesis reflects and consequently stresses the problems related to the current Cypriot political situation – despite the intervention of the UN, no agreement has been reached in light of the unification or of the official partition of Cyprus. It also addresses the importance of the conservation and protection of cultural heritage in times of conflicts/post-conflicts and the positive economic and social role that its preservation may have in rebuilding and recovery these affected areas.

Table of Contents

DECLARATION OF AUTHORSHIP	3
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	4
ABSTRACT	5
IMPACT STATEMENT	6
INTRODUCTION	10
In Search of the lost Kypriōn Politeia.....	10
i.1 Nomina nuda.....	10
i.2 Basic Concepts	12
i.3 The development of the Cypriot city-kingsdoms.....	14
i.4 Historiography	19
i.5 Sources and methodology.....	22
CHAPTER 1	28
Setting the scene: king, elite and people.....	28
1.1 The persistence of kingship and royal ideology	28
1.2 The elite and the wanaktes.....	32
1.3 Schooling the elite, Cypriot education and political leadership	38
1.4 A Cypriot secret police	42
1.5 Δῆμος and πόλις in the Cypriot city-kingsdoms	45
1.5 ‘I do solemnly swear...’: an oath of allegiance as testimony of Cypriot royal supremacy	53
Conclusion	56
CHAPTER 2	57
The Idalion bronze tablet.....	57
Cypriot political and administrative institutions in the fifth and fourth centuries BC	57
2.1 Establishing the chronology	57
2.2 The eponymous magistrate and the polis: institutional representatives beyond the king	62
2.3 Territories, land-registers and legal owners in the Cypriot city-states	69
2.4 The Cypriot land of the king.....	81
CHAPTER 3	87
The administration of the central palace.....	87
3.1 The rab soferim, chief of scribes, and his staff in Kition.....	87
3.1.1 The chief of scribes.....	103
3.1.2 The scribes	110
3.2 RB ḪZ‘NM and RB SRSRM, other palace officials?	116
CHAPTER 4	119

The role of Carians and their ‘interpreter’ in the Kition administration.....	119
4.1 The Cypriot epigraphic attestations of KRSY and MLŞ (H)KRSYM	119
4.2 The KRSYM in the Mediterranean and Near East	122
4.3 Carians in Cyprus	131
4.4 The MLŞ HKRSYM, not only an interpreter	139
CHAPTER 5	146
Administrative officials on the periphery of the Cypriot city-states: the Bulwer tablet	146
CHAPTER 6	173
Religious-civil officials between the centre and periphery in Cypriot Syllabic Greek and Phoenician inscriptions	173
6.1 Hunting for wolves: a civic-religious magistracy in the central administration of Paphos	173
6.2 Civic-religious governors in the peripheral territory of the city-states, the cases of Paphos and Lapethos	195
CONCLUSION.....	211
The Kypriion Politeia regained.....	211
ii.1 The consistency of the Cypriot administrative system.....	211
ii.2 The development of the classical Cypriot political system between Achaemenid and Greek influences	218
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	235

INTRODUCTION

In Search of the lost *Kypriōn Politeia*

i.1 *Nomina nuda*

‘*Stat rosa pristina nomine, nomina nuda tenemus*’, ‘the old rose remains only in its name; we possess bare names’. The attentive reader will have recognised the quotation from one of the most famous novels of the twentieth century, Umberto Eco’s *The name of the Rose*. These few words outline effectively the problem that we face when we try to reconstruct the political-administrative system of Cyprus in the classical period. Literary sources provide very minimal information on the subject and we stand with a handful of *nomina nuda*, bare names, in our hands. But here too, there is a lost manuscript that would be extremely interesting to read. This is not, however, the second book of Aristotle’s *Poetics*, as in the novel, but one of the several constitutions written by Aristotle – or better, by one of the members of his school – the *Κυπρίων Πολιτεία*, the ‘Cypriots’ constitution’. Harpocration’s lexicon mentions it.¹ It states that in Cyprus, the sons and brothers of the king were called ἄνακτες and his sisters and wives ἄνασσαι. They appear in the lexicon as a peculiarity of the island – confirmed by the inscriptions, as we shall see. The *Suda* provides another *nomen nudum*. Under the entry *τίαρα*, the author notes that Theophrastus wrote a treaty on the Cypriot kingship ‘*Περὶ βασιλείας Κυπρίων*’.² Evidently, the Cypriot politico-administrative structure attracted the curiosity of Greek philosophers and historians, particularly in Aristotelian circles. But what was the constitution of the Cypriots and why did it arouse interest? What was the political-administrative system of Cyprus during the classical period? Were there other officials and magistrates beyond the βασιλεύς, and the ἄνακτες and ἄνασσαι? How did the system develop over the centuries?

¹ Harp. F 203 ed. Dindorf 1853, 32.

² *Suda* v. *τίαρα*; according to Whitehead (2008), however, the *Suda* might bear the text ‘*Θεόφραστος δ’ ἐν τῷ Περὶ βασιλείας, Κυπρίων τὴν κίταριν*’ instead of ‘*Θεόφραστος δ’ ἐν τῷ Περὶ βασιλείας Κυπρίων τὴν κίταριν*’. In that case, Theophrastus’ work would deal with the ‘*basileia*’ at more general level.

Surviving literary Greek sources provide information only on specific historical events which involved Cyprus – for instance, the Ionian revolt, Cimon’s victory and death in Kition, or Evagoras’ deeds. Evagoras’ biography is primarily inferred from Isocrates’ speeches, which are works of controversial historical reliability, while other literary texts give short accounts and rarely focus on the Cypriot political-administrative structure.³ The paucity of literary sources forces us to look at other testimonies. Archaeological reports provide essential information on Cyprus’ material culture and resources, and in particular on the exploitation of copper mines and trade in this material which was essential to the Cypriot economy.⁴ From Prehistory until Late Antiquity, the island’s prosperity depended mainly on its natural resources.⁵ The main centres of Alashiya – as Cyprus was called during the Bronze Age in the El-Amarna letters and in other texts written in Semitic languages – such as Enkomi, one of the principal cities located close to the current Salamis/Famagusta, were the main Mediterranean exporters of copper from which bronze weapons and vessels were produced.⁶ As Kassianidou pointed out, during the Iron Age, the use of bronze did not stop: although iron was commonly employed to create daily objects, valuable vessels and other prestigious artefacts were made out of bronze.⁷ Consequently, Cypriot copper continued to be exploited and remained one of the main economic resources during the archaic and classical periods.⁸

This thesis will show that recent discoveries and new readings of well-known texts, combined with archaeological and literary evidence, allow a much

³ Hdt. 5.116-117; Thuc. 1.112; Plut. *Cim.* 19.1; Isocr. 9; 2; 3; Diod. 13.106.6; 15. 1.19; 16.40-46; Lys. 6.26-28; And. 1.4; 2.20-21; Wallinga 1984, 401-437; Maier 1968, 86-93; Maier 1985, 32-39; Alexiou 2015, 47-61.

⁴ Kassianidou 2013, 49-82; Kassianidou 2016, 71-88. The Troodos Mountains consist of Ophiolite, the same material as the Oceanic crust. Tectonic movements have lifted up the original crust, generating the Troodos. Part of the Ophiolite consists of pillow lava, in turn composed by deposits of copper; on the exploitation of the copper during the Iron Age see Peege *et al.* 2018, *passim*.

⁵ For recent information on Alashiya during the Late Bronze period see Hadjisavvas 2017, *passim*; Knapp 2013, 34-42; Knapp 2008, 298-345.

⁶ For the Semitic name of Cyprus see Amadasi, Zamora López 2018, 77-97; the island was still called Alashiya by Kitians in the fourth-third century BC, according to an *ostrakon* found in the Idalion archive. For the name of Ancient Cyprus see Goren, Bunimovitz, Finkelstein, Na’aman 2003, 233-255; Leclant 1980, 131-135. On the El Amarna letters, see Westbrook 2000, 377-382 and Knapp 2008, 324-341; for the exploitation of copper during the Bronze Age see Ferrara, Bell 2016, 1009-1021; Kassianidou 2017, 111-134; for Cyprus during the Bronze Age, see Knapp 2013, *passim*; Georgiou 2015, 129-145.

⁷ Kassianidou 2013, 53.

⁸ Kassianidou 2013, 36-45; Kassianidou 2016, 79-90.

fuller reconstruction of the classical Cypriot political-administrative system than has previously been attempted.⁹ But before immersing ourselves in these documents, and explaining why some inscriptions have been chosen and analysed rather than others, some points should be clarified.

The archaeological and epigraphic data quickly reveal two striking features of Cyprus: the island's subdivision into city-kingdoms or city-states and the presence of several languages and writing systems – for instance, syllabic Cypriot-Greek, alphabetic Greek, syllabic 'Eteocypriot', an autochthonous language, Phoenician – employed by Cypriot governments and inhabitants, which makes Cyprus a multilingual environment. This raises a further question. Since the governments of the Cypriot city-states adopted different languages in their administrations and public decrees, did they share a similar political-administrative system or were they substantially different, and if so, in what ways? This study aims to answer these questions through the study of key epigraphic texts.

i.2 Basic Concepts

Before embarking on the analysis of primary sources and historiography, the terminology adopted above deserves some remarks. We have used terms such as 'Eteocypriot' or 'Phoenician'. Their history and their ethnic implications are controversial. The term 'Eteocypriot', for example, was coined by Johannes Friedrich in 1932 in analogy to the term Eteocretan used to describe the autochthonous languages of Crete.¹⁰ But the presence of an Eteocypriot language and culture is not universally accepted. Since archaeological data never show the presence of a distinctive 'indigenous' culture and all the Eteocypriot inscriptions are dated to the fourth century BC – though their chronology is currently under review – the existence of an autochthonous population has been challenged.¹¹ Reyes, for instance, considered the 'Eteocypriot' language as a local Amathusian phenomenon limited to the fourth century BC, while Given claimed that 'Eteocypriot' language and culture were

⁹ Contrast the sceptical comments of Markou 2011, 50-51.

¹⁰ Friedrich 1932, 49-52; Steele 2013, 101; on the Eteocretans see Duhoux 1982, *passim*; Duhoux 2010, 39-75; Steele 2013, 122-132.

¹¹ For new studies on the Eteocypriot texts see Perna 2018, 213-220; Karnava 2018, 201-212.

a mere British invention to combat Greek nationalism during the thirties of the 20th century.¹²

Given's postcolonial theory has roots in the UK colonisation of Cyprus; its consequences are still visibly perceptible and partially affect the study of Ancient Cyprus.¹³ The island is currently divided between the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus – internationally recognised only by Turkey – and the Republic of Cyprus in the South, separated by a buffer zone controlled by the United Nations.¹⁴ This has a significant impact on the study of the territory of the island and on archaeological campaigns. The sites of the southern coast – for instance, Amathus, Kition, Kourion, Paphos – have been intensively excavated and analysed, but we know little about the sites of Northern Cyprus. Consequently, although this work analyses the political and administrative systems of all the classical city-states, some have been privileged over others. For example, although Salamis – located in Northern Cyprus – is probably one of the most famous Iron Age Cypriot polities, we have access to few data for the classical period.¹⁵ Moreover, Salaminian Cypriot syllabic inscriptions are few, less than 40 and mostly fragmentary; the number of alphabetic Greek texts is limited too. Therefore, the comparison between the structures of government of this city and those of other coastal cities, for example Kition, is mainly based on literary sources.¹⁶

Just like 'Eteocypriot', the term 'Phoenician' has ethnic and political implications. In this work, it is mostly employed as linguistic label. A few exceptions concern the name of the months of a calendar and a common Levantine ceremony of *egersis*, 'resurrection', practised in Cyprus.¹⁷ The analysis of some Phoenician documents will demonstrate that the political-administrative system of Kition and Lapethos, two classical city-states which adopted Phoenician language in their administration, was not significantly

¹² Reyes 1994, 13-22; Given 1998, 3-29; Petit 1999, 108-120; Egetmeyer 2010b, 69-90.

¹³ Xypolia 2017, *passim*.

¹⁴ Since 1964, Nicosia is divided in two parts according to the decision made by the British peace force. It still holds the sad distinction of being the last divided capital in Europe. The division was consolidated in 1974, when Turkish troops invaded the island in response to a Greek coup d'état which aimed to depose the president Makarios. This resulted into a civil war followed by the geographic partition of Cyprus – and a massive internal migration of the inhabitants.

¹⁵ Recently, Rogge, Ioannou, Mavrojannis (2019) tried to refresh the study of this city-kingdom.

¹⁶ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Salamis n°1-38; Chavane, Yon 1978; Pouilloux *et al.* 1987.

¹⁷ Stieglitz 1998, 211-221; Zamora López 2018, 65-85.

different from that of other Cypriot polities. As Quinn has argued, ‘Phoenician’ is in any case a label used by outsiders, while the inhabitants of various ‘Phoenician’ cities identified themselves primarily as citizens of particular city-states – or collectively as ‘Canaanites’.¹⁸ To some extent, this applies to the Cypriot city-states too, as we shall see, particularly during the archaic and classical periods.¹⁹ The use of the term ‘Phoenician’ related to the Cypriot city-kings, therefore, is conventional.

Finally, the definition of ‘city-states’ deserves a closer examination. We have called the Cypriot centres ‘city-states’, ‘city-kings’ or ‘polities’. The term ‘kings’ has always been avoided since this suggests large territorial states – and this is not the case with the Cypriot centres. The term city-state defines a small independent country divided into centre and periphery, and organisationally linked to the central government. This term is more suitable for Cyprus. Since a king, *basileus* or *melek*, ruled over these city-states, they may also be called city-kings. Iacovou claims that Greek literary sources usually name them *poleis* since Greek authors found similarities between the structures of Cypriot governments and those of *poleis*.²⁰ To what extent the Cypriot city-kings were similar to Greek *poleis* is a matter of debate and will be discussed in detail in the following chapters. Along with ‘city-states’ and ‘city-kings’, Cypriot classical centres are also called *politias* in the sense of ‘politically organised societies’ or ‘states as political entities’.²¹

i.3 The development of the Cypriot city-kings

During the archaic and classical periods, an uncertain number of city-kings featured in Cyprus’ topography. Such a fragmentation might be an Iron Age innovation since Bronze Age documents – principally the El-Amarna letters – testify to the presence of a main centre – perhaps Enkomi or Alassa, in the south-western area – with a king who probably ruled over the whole island or acted as *primus inter pares*.²² The *terminus ante quem* for the development of the

¹⁸ Quinn 2018, 202; Iacovou 2006, 27-59; Aubet 2001, 12; Aubet 2009, 22.

¹⁹ Quinn 2018, 201-208; Steele 2018, 148; Körner 2019, 59-76.

²⁰ Iacovou 2013, 16 n. 2; a full discussion of the term employed to define the Cypriot classical cities is provided in Iacovou 2014, 96-117.

²¹ *OD* 3604.

²² Knapp 2008, 324-341; Voskos, Knapp 2008, 659-684; Knapp 2013, 432-484. The political-administrative system of Bronze Age Cyprus is debated. Three different models have been

Cypriot city-states has been fixed according to two Neo-Assyrian documents, the Sargon stele (709-707 BC) and the Esarhaddon prism (673-672 BC).²³ Both list the names and the kings of current Cypriot city-states. According to these documents, the number of the polities changed from seven, mentioned in the Sargon stele – although this might be a conventional number – to ten, listed in the prism.²⁴ They are: Chytroi, Idalion, Salamis, Paphos, Soloi, Kourion, Tamassos, Qarthadesh, Ledra and Nuria.²⁵ Ten city-states are also attested in the classical numismatic and epigraphic record, six of which coincide with those mentioned in the prism: Idalion, Salamis, Paphos, Soloi, Kourion and Tamassos. To these are added Kition, Amathus, Marion and Lapethos. Idalion and Tamassos lost their independence respectively around 450 BC and before 341 BC.²⁶ But they are not unique instances: the same happened to Ledra and Chytroi. The independence of yet another city, Golgoi, has always been disputed because no source mentions it even though the city was a significant religious centre in the classical era.²⁷ Ledra and Chytroi almost disappear in classical documents. Greek syllabic inscriptions show that in Chytroi there was an important sanctuary dedicated to the Paphian Goddess, the main female divinity of the island; they do not provide, however, the name of any local king.²⁸ A coin from a Cypriot monetary treasure dated before 500 BC might bear the name of a king of Ledra – but its interpretation is controversial.²⁹

As Iacovou has argued, these city-states lost their independence because of their geographical location. They were landlocked and in the absence of a

proposed: the oldest one – which is now widely rejected – claimed the existence of a unique great power (16th-13th cent. BC) whose capital was located in the mountains close to the copper mines; a second model proposes a unique power whose capital, however, changed over the years – first it was settled in Enkomi and perhaps later on in Alassa; finally, a third model posits the existence of a *primus inter pares* among several rulers of Bronze Age Cyprus; Goren *et. al.* 2003, 233-255.

²³ On the Sargon stele see Yon 2004, n°4001; the stele has been discovered in Cyprus; see Yon 2004, n°39; Yon 1995, 159-168; Malbrand-Labat 1995, 169-179; Radner 2010, 429-449; Saporetti 1976, 86-87; Yon 1987, 361-362; Reyes 1994, 24-25; Cannavò 2007-2011, 179-190; Cannavò 2010, 169-196; Cannavò 2018b, 240-264.

²⁴ For the meaning of number seven, see Salem, Salem 2000, 85-106.

²⁵ Iacovou 2006b, 318-320.

²⁶ Yon 2004, n°1002 = Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, A2 = CIS I, 10 where Pummayatou of Kition was king of Kition, Idalion and Tamassos; see Yon 2004b, 119-123; for an eventual abolition of the independence of Kourion see Satraki 2012, 424.

²⁷ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Golgoi n° 1-67.

²⁸ For some instances see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Chytroi n° 1-7; 9-12 = ICS 234-240; 242-245. On Cypriot Aphrodite see Karageorghis J. 2005, 163-226; Bachvarova 2016, 323-330; Breitenberger 2007, 8-13; Budin 2004, 95-145; Budin 2008, *passim*.

²⁹ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Ledra n° 5; Pilides, Destrooper-Georghiades 2008, 316-332.

harbour were unable to engage in trade.³⁰ This caused their progressive disappearance.³¹ Tamassos was the only exception until the very end of the fourth century BC. It was extremely rich in copper since it was located almost on top of the pillow deposits, as confirmed by archaeological surveys.³² It is plausible that Iron Age Tamassos survived and prospered because it entered into trade agreements with the two biggest powers of the island, Salamis and Kition.³³

As far as Qarthadesh – one of the ‘Phoenician’ city-states of the Assyrian texts – is concerned, scholars still debate whether it may correspond to one of the centres of the classical period. Since Kition and Amathus are not attested in the Assyrian testimonies, both are plausible options. Some scholars claim that Kition was initially a colony of Tyre and that it gained independence only in the classical age, when local kings started to strike coins.³⁴ Therefore, according to them, Kition may be the Qarhtadesh, ‘New City’, mentioned in the prism, since Tyrian colonies usually bear this name. By contrast, other scholars identify Amathus as Qarthadesh.³⁵ According to Hermary, the presence of Phoenician pottery in the earliest layers of the city is so prominent that Amathus was

³⁰ Iacovou 2013, 15-47.

³¹ Iacovou has discussed more than once the different numbers of the Cypriot city-states; Iacovou 2014, 96-98; 2013 15-47; Iacovou, Counts 2013, 1-13. She points out that along with the geographical locations, wars rendered instable the number of the city-states. (Iacovou 2014, 97; Iacovou 2007, 467-468).

³² Kassianidou 2013, 36-45; moreover, the *Odyssey* mentions Tamassos, probably the Cypriot centre, as place where one may look for bronze to exchange with iron: 11.183-184, ‘πλέων ἐπὶ οἴνοπα πόντον ἐπ’ ἀλλοθρόους ἀνθρώπους / ἐς Τεμέσην μετὰ χαλκόν, ἄγω δ’ αἶθωνα σίδηρον’, ‘sailing on the wine-coloured sea towards people who speak different languages, towards Tamassos rich in copper, I bring sparkling iron instead’. Most manuscripts bear the *lectio* Τεμέσην. However, in the lexicon *Ethnika*, Steph. Byz. quotes this verse twice with two different *lectiones*: Τεμέσην – entry ΤΕΜΕΣΗ, identified as an Italian city – and Ταμέσην – entry ΤΑΜΑΣΟΣ, Tamassos in Cyprus (Billierbeck, Hartmann 2016, T 10; 250-251; T 86, 290-291), though Stephanus rejected it as potential candidate for the city of *Od.* 1.184. Its identification has been controversial since antiquity. Strabo located it in Italy (6.5.1); his testimony has been followed by Davies (1928-1930, 74-85), Biraschi (1982, 29-39) *De Sensi Sestito* (2015, 9-32 with bibliography); for different interpretations see Kassianidou 2004, 33-46; Gray 1954, 1-15; Heubeck, West S., Hainsworth 1981, 212.

³³ It is also conceivable that Kition and Salamis were contending for the ownership of Tamassos mines (Kassianidou 2016, 71-88).

³⁴ Masson, Sznycer 1972, 73-78; Yon 2004, 19-22.

³⁵ Teixidor 1975, 125; Lipinski 1983, 209-234; Lipinski 2004, 46; Katzeinstein 1973, 85; Hermary 1996, 223-229; Steele 2013, 177; Petit 2015, 353-375. The location of Nuria is problematic too; see Smith (2018, 167) who proposed Marion. Some scholars proposed a connection between the Cypriot Nuria and Nora in Sardinia, claiming that the text of the famous stele found at the Italian site (9th-8th cent. BC) explicitly mentions a link with Kition (Yon 2004, n°17 = *CIS* I 144 = *KAI* 46; Dupont-Sommer 1948, 16-17; Peckham 1972, 457-468; Gibson 1982, 25-28, n°11; Masson, Sznycer 1972, 75; for information on the Phoenician settlement in Nora see Bonetto 2019, 64-69).

plausibly founded by Phoenicians.³⁶ However, we cannot exclude that the Cypriot Qarthadesh was independent only for a short time – as was the case with Cythroi and Ledra – and had become subject to one of the other kingdoms by the classical period. It is also remarkable that Qarthadesh, despite its Phoenician name, had according to the Esarhaddon prism a king named Damusi, which suggests Greek origins.³⁷

Despite the uncertainty of all this information, it is clear that the number of the city-kingdoms changed over the centuries. They competed to improve their wealth trying to exploit resources of neighbouring territories such as copper mines, forest, and agricultural land. Inscriptions provide some examples. The Idalion Bronze tablet – a famous Cypriot document, one of the first case studies analysed below – shows that Kitians attacked Idalion to gain possession of its territory.³⁸ Information on rivalries and clashes comes also from the Kourion treasure, excavated by Cesnola.³⁹ Two bracelets and a bowl bear the names of two Paphian kings; conceivably, the treasure consisted of war spoils stolen from Paphos by the Kourians.⁴⁰

Although we cannot precisely define how many city-kingdoms developed, we can try to establish when and how they came about. As Iacovou suggested, the development of the Cypriot city-states may be subdivided into three phases.⁴¹ The first one runs from the 11th to the 8th century BC. Greeks landed on Cyprus as refugees after the collapse of palatial society (1250-1100 BC).⁴² During the first and second geometric period (1050-850 BC), Cyprus partially suffered the economic downturn that heavily affected other areas of the Mediterranean. Its commercial enterprises however continued; in order to overcome difficulties, new coastal cities were settled as harbours, such as Kourion and later on Amathus, and new commercial strategies developed.⁴³ A

³⁶ Hermary 2005, 11-18; 25-28; Bikai 1987, 50-52.

³⁷ Yon 2004, n°39 l.11.

³⁸ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Idalion n°1 = ICS 217.

³⁹ Cesnola 1877, 43.

⁴⁰ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Kourion n° 1; 2 = ICS 176; 177 (these documents will be analysed in detail in the following chapter).

⁴¹ Iacovou 2014b, 795-824.

⁴² Cline 2014, *passim*; Voskos, Knapp 2008, 659-684; Iacovou 2014c, 660-674. For the ‘Aegeanization’ of the island see Iacovou 2014d, 118. The ‘development of monumental sacred and defensive structures’ testifies to the new presence of the Greeks; see Knapp 2008, 41-50; Iacovou 2012b, 207-227; Iacovou 2008, 625-657.

⁴³ Iacovou 2014b, 798; South 2002, 59-72.

few Bronze Age centres survived the crisis such as Kition, Paphos, and initially Enkomi which was then abandoned because of the silting of its harbour basin on the river Pedeios.⁴⁴ The inhabitants founded a new city on the coast, Salamis, with a new harbour. The archaic and classical centres therefore developed out of both old and new settlements and, as Snodgrass and Iacovou have pointed out, survivals played a significant role in this process.⁴⁵ Snodgrass and Iacovou have stressed elements of continuity from the Late Bronze Age to the Iron Age, a continuity reflected also by the adoption of the Cypriot writing system, as shown in the following pages.

The Assyrian sources describe the start of the second phase, from the late eighth century BC until the late sixth century BC. When Cyprus became part of the Neo-Assyrian Empire, its integration was essentially economic.⁴⁶ But the new trading network, which was based on the exploitation and exportation of metals and raw materials, promoted the consolidation of Cypriot kings' authority in peripheral territories through the proliferation of extra-urban sanctuaries where they dedicated huge sculptures in clay and stone to legitimise their power and to protect the copper routes.⁴⁷

Scholars still debate whether, at the end of the archaic period, Cyprus was forced to pay a tribute to Egypt. According to Herodotus and Diodorus, Amasis conquered Cyprus and imposed a tax.⁴⁸ Cannavò and other scholars have accepted these testimonies as true, others have challenged them.⁴⁹ Undoubtedly, Egyptianized limestone sculptures were a major characteristic of Cypriot art during the sixth century BC and contacts between Egypt and Cyprus were particularly intense, also thanks to the *emporion* that Cypriot craftsmen established in Naukratis.⁵⁰ However, Reyes and Iacovou have argued that such a bloom of Egyptian iconography on Cyprus does not necessarily imply that the Saite dynasty dominated the island.⁵¹ Moreover, the interpretation of the famous

⁴⁴ Iacovou 2002, 77-83.

⁴⁵ Iacovou 2014b, 799; Snodgrass 1994, 167-173.

⁴⁶ Cannavò 2015; Cannavò 2003, 139-158; Iacovou 2014b, 809-810.

⁴⁷ Iacovou 2013c, 275-291; Iacovou 2014b, 809; Hermary 1989, 180-196; Fourrier 2007, 101-122; Satraki 2013, 123-144.

⁴⁸ Hdt. 2.82.2; Diod. 1.68.6.

⁴⁹ Cannavò 2015, *ibid.*

⁵⁰ Davis 1980, 7-19; Iacovou 2014b, 810; Reyes 1994, 49-60; Hermary 2001, 27-38; Hermary 1985, 657-708; Fourrier 2001, 39-54; Petit 1995, 131-147; Markoe 1990, 111-122.

⁵¹ Iacovou 2014b, 809-811; Reyes 1994, 78.

Amasis stele – which has traditionally been considered the main source on this topic – is still controversial. According to Leahy, for instance, it does not show connections between Cyprus and Egypt.⁵² This argument deserves further examination but it seems that no source other than the Greek historians testifies that the island became part of the Egyptian kingdom.

The third and final stage goes from the late sixth to the late fourth centuries BC. In this period, Cyprus was conquered by Cambyses II and became part of the Achaemenid Empire.⁵³ The *Kypriōn Politeia* written by the Pseudo-Aristotle probably described the political-administrative system of the Cypriot city-kings in these years, before Ptolemy I conquered the island.⁵⁴ It is this system that will be analysed in what follows, mainly through new data from inscriptions. These will show how the Cypriot city-kings were organised and to what extent they were influenced by the Achaemenid administration.

i.4 Historiography

In 2008, Anna Cannavò wrote an article on the *status quaestionis* of the development of the Cypriot city-states and their political system, a ‘unique Cypriot phenomenon’.⁵⁵ As Carlier states in his masterpiece *La royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre*, until the nineties, no specific study existed on this topic.⁵⁶ Although Cyprus attracted the attention of many scholars focused on its early history, only a few studies concentrated on the political-administrative system of the city-states during the classical period.⁵⁷ Among them, it is worth mentioning Reyes’ *Archaic Cyprus*, which also analyses the Cypriot

⁵² This document celebrates Amasis’ victory over Apries who is said to be the owner of *iw* – from which Greek soldiers came – a term that has been translated by the editors (Edel 1978, 13-20; Daressy 1900, 1-9) as ‘island’ and identified as Cyprus on the basis of another passage of Diodorus (1.68.1); this states that Apries subdued Cypriots and Phoenicians in a military expedition. Herodotus mentions the same event but without naming Cyprus (2.161.2). But as Leahy (1988, 183-199) pointed out, *iw* might also mean a location surrounded by water, perhaps a description of Memphis where Apries was based. Moreover, Cyprus is normally called not ‘island’ but Alashiya in ancient Egyptian texts – and also in Phoenician inscriptions until the beginning of the third century BC at least, as recently demonstrated by an *ostrakon* (Amadasi, Zamora López 2018, 77-97). Finally, Cannavò has pointed out that a Babylonian inscription from the BM might mention Cyprus among the allies of Amasis, and not of Apries. If so, it is very likely that Cyprus was an ally of Amasis in the last stages of the war against the Babylonians but not a tributary location of the kingdom (Cannavò 2008b, 137-158).

⁵³ Briant 2002, 51; Tuplin 1996, 9-65.

⁵⁴ Diod. 19.59.61.

⁵⁵ Cannavò 2008, 38-46; Iacovou 2006b, 330.

⁵⁶ Carlier 1984, 6.

⁵⁷ For some examples see Knapp 2013, *passim*; Peltenburg 1996, 17-43.

governments at the beginning of the fifth century BC, Raptou's *Athènes et Chypre à l'époque perse (6e - 4e siècles av. J.-C)* and Tuplin's *Achaemenid studies*, which contains a section dedicated to classical Cyprus.⁵⁸

These scholars have tended to focus on the development of the city-kingsdoms rather than on their internal political-administrative structure. Developmental studies may be subdivided into two branches: a 'colonialist' interpretation, which claims that the development of the city-states was due to the 'colonisation' of the island by foreign populations between the 11th century and the 9th century BC;⁵⁹ and the 'autochthonous' interpretation, which states that the Cypriot city-states developed independently and were a specific local phenomenon due to the unique geo-political conditions of the island.⁶⁰ Scholars who embrace the first theory are in turn subdivided into those who suppose that this development was triggered by Mycenaean Greek migrations and those who suppose that it was due to Near-Eastern influences and to the establishment of Phoenicians. During the first decades of the twentieth century, the first 'colonialist' approach was predominant so that the Cypriot city-kingsdoms were considered city-states of Mycenaean typology.⁶¹ Scholars argued that the Mycenaean brought several elements of Greek culture – for example the language – to the island where they implanted their traditional palatial political-economic system. Gjerstad, one of the first 'scientific' archaeologists who excavated on Cyprus during the thirties endorsed this theory and added that on the island, the Cypriot-Mycenaean politico-economic system was influenced by the Phoenicians, a situation which contributed to turning it into a Near-Eastern-style autocratic kingship.⁶²

Gjerstad's model, however, is not based on solid evidence; it relies on a Greek legend which states that Agapenor, king of Arcadia, founded Paphos coming back from Troy and brought Greek-Arcadian language and culture to Cyprus.⁶³ During the eighties, the finding of a Paphian inscribed *obelos*, acknowledged as the earliest Cypriot-syllabic attestation, was considered the

⁵⁸ Reyes 1994, *passim*; Raptou 1999, 223-250; Tuplin 1996, 9-65.

⁵⁹ Gjerstad 1948, 430-500.

⁶⁰ Iacovou 2007, 461-475; Iacovou 2008, 625-657; Iacovou 2014a, 660-674.

⁶¹ For the Mycenaean Greek 'colonisation' see Gjerstad 1948, 435-500; Hatzopoulos 2014, 217-233; Georgiadou 2010, 141-203; Hatzopoulos, Georgiadou 2013, 203-2010.

⁶² Gjerstad 1948, 430-500; Cannavò 2015c, 161-177; Cannavò 2008, 40.

⁶³ Paus. 8.5.2.

confirmation to Gjerstad's thesis that the Greek 'colonisation' started from Paphos; but scholars have recently demonstrated that this *obelos* is one of the last texts written in local Cypro-Minoan language and not a Cypriot Greek document.⁶⁴ Therefore, it cannot be related to the legend of Agapenor nor even to the Mycenaean migration.

But the Mycenaean colonial theory had been challenged well before the emergence of these new data. In 1987, Rupp proposed a new model for the development of the Cypriot city-kingdoms which had a significant impact on the scholarship. According to Rupp, the Cypriot polities developed from the 9th century BC onwards, when Phoenicians settled on the island.⁶⁵ Thanks to this phenomenon, Cyprus would have left the 'Dark Ages' and entered into a new 'preparatory' phase of development later reinforced by trade with the Neo-Assyrian Empire, when the Cypriot centres finally developed into 'true urban settlements'.⁶⁶ Rupp's theory has been recently dusted off by Thierry Petit who associated the development of Cypriot polities to that of Levantine city-states.⁶⁷

Two innovative elements of Rupp's analysis were in sharp contrast to Gjerstad's previous theory: the Levantine origins of the Cypriot city-states – which was only briefly taken into account during the first amateur excavations of the nineteenth century – and their 'late' development dated after the 9th century BC.⁶⁸ Although this analysis, too, is based on unsolid historical evidence – and Rupp's theory has been openly rejected – it deserves credit for opening up a debate. Against Rupp's proposal, scholars have argued that when the Assyrians conquered Cyprus, the city-states' political system was already well established, very likely before the 9th century BC.⁶⁹

As Zournatzi noted, none of the models of the eighties and nineties was very convincing.⁷⁰ But in recent decades, several other studies have contributed to establishing the distinctiveness of the Cypriot system – Iacovou in particular

⁶⁴ Olivier 2013, 17; Egetmeyer 2013, 107-131.

⁶⁵ Rupp 1987, 151-156.

⁶⁶ Rupp created a map of the island where the city-states were subdivided by straight borders, shaped geometrically but indeed without any historical reliability; Cannavò 2008, 38; Rupp 1987, 166-168.

⁶⁷ Petit 2013, 23-49; Petit 2019, *passim*.

⁶⁸ For nineteenth-century studies on Cyprus see Cannavò 2012, 423-457.

⁶⁹ Iacovou 2006b, 315-33.

⁷⁰ Zournatzi 1996, 154-179.

has highlighted the uniqueness of this phenomenon at length –⁷¹ and to definitively shelve the colonialist approach so that the arrival of Greeks to Cyprus is now labelled ‘Hellenization’ rather than ‘colonisation’.⁷²

Recent archaeological studies focus on the exploitation of Cypriot natural sources. For instance, they show that copper mines were still exploited in the classical period. Vassiliki Kassianidou contributed to making progress in this field through archaeological surveys conducted in the Troodos Mountains.⁷³ Finally, scholars focused on the role of extra-urban sanctuaries showing that they connected city-states’ centres and peripheries, as the following chapters will demonstrate.⁷⁴ Other recent works on the Cypriot political-administrative system are Satraki’s *Κύπριοι Βασιλείς απο τον Κόσμοσo μέχρι το Νικοκρέοντα*, which analyses the development of the Cypriot city-states and the Cypriot kingship from the Late Bronze age until the late classical period, and Körner’s studies on the influence of the Assyrian and Achaemenid dominations on Cyprus’ political administrative institutions.⁷⁵ They are mainly based on the study of literary sources and focus on the international policy of the city-kingdoms and the relationship between local kings and their ‘Near East masters’ rather than on the internal political-administrative system of the Cypriot centres.

i.5 Sources and methodology

The first *recueil* of Cypriot syllabic inscriptions is *ICS, Inscriptions Chypriotes Syllabiques*, edited by Masson in 1963 and re-edited in 1983 with new texts. Egetmeyer significantly contributed to our understanding of Cypriot language and syllabic texts by publishing his grammar of the Cypriot dialect.⁷⁶ The grammar provides a linguistic analysis of the epigraphic attestations. It is subdivided in two volumes, of which the second is a collection of all the syllabic inscriptions known until 2010. This is one of the main tools used to investigate the case studies of this thesis. Finally, first Consani and recently Steele have

⁷¹ Iacovou 2013, 15-47.

⁷² Voskos, Knapp 2008, 659-684.

⁷³ Kassianidou 2016, 71-88.

⁷⁴ Papantoniou, Vionis 2019, 40-69; Fourrier 2013, 103-122; Iacovou 2019, 204-234; Iacovou 2017, 317-329.

⁷⁵ Satraki 2012, *passim*; Körner 2016, 25-49; Körner 2017, *passim*.

⁷⁶ Egetmeyer 2010, voll. I, II. The new corpus *IG XV* with all the Cypriot syllabic and alphabetic Greek inscriptions is now in preparation (Karnava, Perna, Egetmeyer 2020, forthcoming; Egetmeyer, Karnava, Landenius Enegren, Perna 2017, 31-44; 45-54).

focused on the socio-linguistic features of the Cypriot inscriptions in their analyses of bilingual and digraphic texts.⁷⁷

As far as the Phoenician texts are concerned, most are published in *CIS, Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, and *KAI, Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften*.⁷⁸ New epigraphic discoveries have been published and analysed by Amadasi in several archaeological reports since the seventies – for example, with Karageorghis, in *Fouilles de Kition III* – and by Yon in *Kition Bamboula V*.⁷⁹ Such a variety of languages and studies allows us to introduce the other main feature of classical Cyprus, multilingualism. This is central to my research since the inscriptions that I will be studying are written in different languages. Cyprus, in fact, has been a vivid multilingual environment at least since the 11th century BC – but perhaps even earlier.

Most of the analysed documents are in Cypriot Greek, a local variety similar to the Mycenaean dialect. The Cypriot Greek dialect also shares linguistic features with the Arcadian dialect, a rather conservative language: for instance the closing of /e/ and /o/ into /i/ and /u/ or the genitive singulars of the first declension in *-/au/*.⁸⁰ Cypriot Greek inscriptions are written in a peculiar syllabary which developed along with the city-kingdoms. This syllabic system is the legacy of an old script employed to write Cypro-Minoan documents which are not deciphered yet. They are written in the same language from which Eteocypriot derives.⁸¹

When Greek refugees landed on the island in the Early Iron Age, they started to employ the Late Bronze Age Cypriot writing system in order to write their own language. This is a significant element of continuity. Such continuity has been proved through a careful re-examination of some documents that were initially interpreted as Cypriot-syllabic Greek inscriptions. One of them is the famous *obelos* of Opheltas – already mentioned in the previous pages – which

⁷⁷ Consani 1988, 35-70; Steele 2013, *passim*; Steele 2018, *passim*.

⁷⁸ Renan *et al.*, 1867; Donner, Rölling 1962-1978.

⁷⁹ Yon 2004, *passim*; Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, *passim*.

⁸⁰ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 52-118 §23-118.

⁸¹ It is possible that more than one local language was written through this writing system; Ferrara 2013, 49-76; the Cypriot-Minoan scripts may be subdivided in CM1, CM2, CM3; at least two of them, CM1 CM2, recorded two different languages. (Duhoux 2009, 39-75). This happened also in the classical period as it will be shown in following pages. (Ferrara 2012, 20-45).

bears the text *o-pe-le-ta-u*, the name of the owner in genitive case.⁸² It was read as the first inscription written in Cypriot syllabic Greek and therefore considered the *terminus ante quem* for the use of the Greek-syllabic writing system on the island. But recently, scholars proved that it might be one of the last inscriptions written in Cypro-Minoan.⁸³ The same has been proved for texts inscribed on two bronze bowls, dated to Cypriot-Geometric I, from Paphos and Skales. In all these instances, the syllabic signs can belong to both Cypro-Minoan and Cypriot-syllabic writings, confirming a close connection between the two scripts.⁸⁴

Some scholars claim that the Cypriot syllabic writing system developed in Paphos since the signs of the Paphian script are closer to the signs of Cypro-Minoan because of their shape and of their writing from left to right.⁸⁵ Other information on the history of the Paphian writing system and on its political implications will be provided in the following chapters. For now, it is important to stress that in all the other Cypriot polities, Cypriot Greek was written from right to left probably because of the influence of Semitic languages – especially Phoenician.⁸⁶

The Cypriot syllabic writing system is also employed to write two local languages: Eteocypriot, and a specific idiom from Golgoi, called Golgian by Egetmeyer, a language mostly unknown and attested exclusively in the fourth century BC.⁸⁷ Most of the Eteocypriot documents come from Amathus and are dated to the classical period, although their dating criteria are under review.⁸⁸ A very few archaic Eteocypriot texts also come from Kourion and Paphos.⁸⁹ Finally, it is worth noting that the Eteocypriot syllabic signs have phonetic correspondence with the signs of Cypriot syllabic Greek documents, as has been demonstrated by the analysis of anthroponyms.

⁸² Olivier 2013, 7-26; Egetmeyer 2013, 107-132.

⁸³ Olivier 2013, 16-18; Masson, Masson 1983, 411; Karageorghis 1983, 60.

⁸⁴ Egetmeyer 2017, 180-221. Silvia Ferrara's project 'Inscribe' aims to clarify the relationship between Cypro-Minoan and Linear A and investigates the birth of writing systems (Ferrara, Valério 2020).

⁸⁵ Olivier 2013, 7-26; Iacovou 2013b, 133-152.

⁸⁶ Steele 2013b, 1-6.

⁸⁷ Egetmeyer 2012, 427-434.

⁸⁸ For the debate on Eteocypriot see Egetmeyer 2010b, 69-90.

⁸⁹ Perna 2018, 213-220; Karnava 2018, 201-212.

Phoenician was also spoken and written in Cyprus, particularly in Kition, Idalion – once the Kitians conquered it – and Lapethos, although it was probably also widespread in the other centres.⁹⁰ Some scholars claimed that Cyprus had its own local Phoenician dialect because of some distinctive features that recur in most Phoenician Cypriot documents. Among them, it is worth mentioning the prosthetic *aleph* in front of the demonstrative pronoun *Z* or the demonstrative pronoun and the article employed together.⁹¹ However, as Steele pointed out, this linguistic evidence is not enough to confirm the existence of a Cypriot Phoenician language.⁹²

Finally, during the classical period, Attic Greek, written in alphabetic script, started to appear in official inscriptions. It is attested in Cyprus since the sixth century BC but exclusively on *ostraka* used as receipts in the Amathusian administration.⁹³ Evagoras I, king of Salamis (411-374 BC), is the first who employed alphabetic Greek in official royal documents as well as in the legends of his coins.⁹⁴ Concretely, the analysis of the Cypriot syllabic texts – Greek and Eteocypriot – consists of deciphering and reading the syllabic signs from photos collected in Masson's *ICS* or, more frequently, through the autopsy of the finds in museums. These documents were written for various purposes on different materials. The famous Idalion tablet, for example, is of bronze, in accordance with the common practice of writing juridical texts on bronze tablets and depositing them in temples. The Bulwer tablet, another famous document, is of clay – it was engraved when the tablet was more than 70 % dry – and was very likely part of a local archive, as will be demonstrated. Most of the syllabic texts that I analyse, however, are monumental decrees or epitaphs written on stone and publicly displayed. Syllabic signs' shapes and traits may evolve over the centuries – the idiosyncrasies of the Paphian syllabary have been mentioned above – and a direct autopsy of the documents has allowed the identification of palaeographic peculiarities for each city-state⁹⁵.

⁹⁰ Quantitative data on Cypriot Phoenician texts may be found in Steele 2013, 179, although based on an imprecise chronology.

⁹¹ For more features see Steele 2013, 195-200; Krahmalkov 2001, 8-12.

⁹² Steele 2013, 195-201.

⁹³ Aupert 2003, 107-121.

⁹⁴ Markou 2011, 81-86.

⁹⁵ Olivier 2013, 7-26; Steele 2013b, 1-6. For instance, Massimo Perna recently pointed out the value of the Amathusian sign *we* (Perna 2018, 213-220).

All this information is crucial for the analysis of the case studies that follow. Written in different languages and coming from various Cypriot locations, these documents provide data on the Cypriot political-administrative structure. They show how this system developed and whether or not it was the same in all the polities. Initially, these documents are dated and read through a philological approach. Along with traditional readings, I have also proposed a few reconstructions of text in *lacunae* – always taking into account the peculiarities of the languages.⁹⁶ Thanks to these new interpretations, some of their contents are significantly changed, and reveal elements of the Cypriot political-administrative system previously ignored.

I adopted the same methodology to analyse Phoenician documents. They are inscribed on *ostraka*, gypsum tablets and monumental stones. Their palaeography has been accurately studied by the editors, Amadasi and recently Zamora López.⁹⁷ Most of their readings have been accepted. In what follows, however, I will suggest significantly different interpretations of the contents of these documents, particularly the Kition accounts traditionally attributed to the temple of Astarte but now to the local palace.

Furthermore, these key studies have been framed in a historical-political context and compared with information from Near-Eastern and Greek textual sources and archaeological data. Some epigraphic documents reflect cultural and political choices dictated by the attempts of the Cypriots to take advantage of the international political scene to increase their power and expand their possessions on the island. For instance, some Cypriot centres, particularly Salamis and Kition, mediated between Persia and the Greek *poleis* during the Peloponnesian war. Evagoras I played a significant role in these power games; in order to strengthen favourable links with Athens, he promoted the Hellenization of Salamis' customs and introduced alphabetic Greek in coin legends and decrees.⁹⁸

Each chapter – six in total– focuses on one or more case studies. The first chapter provides an overview of the society and main institutions of the

⁹⁶ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, *passim*; Steele 2013, 173-234.

⁹⁷ Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, *passim*; Amadasi, Zamora López 2016, 187-193; Amadasi 2017, 275-284.

⁹⁸ Steele 2018, 224-226; Körner 2016, 40-41; Giuffrida 1996, 589-627.

Cypriot city-states through the analysis of the syllabic attestations of *wanax* and *basileus*. The second chapter concerns the most famous and longest Cypriot inscription, the Idalion Bronze tablet. The next two chapters are based on Phoenician documents concerning officials employed in the palaces of Kition and Idalion and these city-states' military forces. Chapter 3 offers a new interpretation of some accounts from Kition previously related to the temple of Astarte. Chapter 4 discusses the employment of Carian mercenaries in the military harbour of Kition. The fifth chapter analyses the Bulwer tablet. I argue that this document may be related to a local administrative hub. The sixth chapter reconstructs the duties of magistrates from Paphos and Lapethos. It shows that the main religious and administrative offices overlapped in these city-kingdoms. Finally, the *Conclusion* identifies differences and similarities among the city-states and explore whether being under the umbrella of the Achaemenid Empire affected their political system and if so, to what extent. This analysis will allow us to get as close as possible to the political-administrative structure once described in the *Kypriōn politeia*.

Setting the scene: king, elite and people

1.1 The persistence of kingship and royal ideology

The archaeological evidence suggests that already in the ninth century BC the Cypriot city-states had a king at the head of a politico-administrative structure. The first attestation of the term *pa-si-le-u-se*, the Cypriot Greek term for βασιλεύς, comes however only later, in the seventh century BC, from a silver bowl and a pair of gold bracelets which are part of the Kourion treasure raided by Cesnola in the nineteenth century.⁹⁹ They belonged to Akestor and Etewardros, respectively, both kings of Paphos.¹⁰⁰ The names Akestor and Etewardros also appear in the Assyrian text of Esarhaddon's prism: Etwandros, king of Paphos, is perhaps the same person mentioned in the bracelets, but Akestor is said to be king of Idalion.¹⁰¹ In the late eighth century BC, the Sargon stele also referred to the rulers of Cypriot states as 'kings'.¹⁰²

Cypriot kingship probably emerged in the ninth century BC, when official monumental buildings, royal palaces and sanctuaries started to appear on the island.¹⁰³ During the eleventh-tenth century BC, tombs included valuable burial gifts; this was a widespread phenomenon which led scholars to infer that during the early years of the Geometric period there was no single dominant ruler but a broader elite.¹⁰⁴ The situation changed from Cypriot Geometric II – 950-900BC – when tombs no longer had the same widespread abundance of precious objects. Moreover, in the ninth century BC – Cypriot Geometric III – the first Cypriot monumental building, the palace of Amathus, was

⁹⁹ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Kourion n°1 = ICS 176a-b; Mitford 1971, 10; Masson 1984, 74-76; Masson, Mitford 1986, 8; in his edition (2010), Egetmeyer also mentions two similar bracelets found in Caria, which are inscribed too; see Zahlhaas, Neumann 1994, 163; Cesnola 1877, 304-308; 352-389; Satraki 2010, 391. For the discussion on the origin of the Cypriot *pa-si-le-u-se* see Iacovou 2006b, 315-335; Iacovou 2013b, 133-152; Masson 1992, 27-29.

¹⁰⁰ Buchholz, Matthäus 2004, 124-125. See also Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Kourion n°6-7 = ICS 180a-b; Karageorghis 2000, n°299; Mitford 1971, 376; Mitford 1963, 27-30; Karageorghis, Mitford 1964, 67-76.

¹⁰¹ Iacovou 2006b, 317-320; Masson 1992, 27-29; Saporetti 1976, 83-88; Lipinski 1991, 58-64; Cannavò 2007, 179-190; Cannavò 2010, 169-196; Cannavò 2018b, 249.

¹⁰² Yon 2004, n° 4001.

¹⁰³ Satraki 2013, 125.

¹⁰⁴ Satraki 2013, 125; Janes 2013, 145-168, who analyses funerary goods and the change in burial practices from the eleventh to the fourth century BC.

established.¹⁰⁵ All these data allow the supposition that from the ninth century BC, one elite family prevailed over the others and kingship emerged and consolidated itself.

The power and authority of the βασιλεύς was initially shown by great burial gifts and, at a later stage, through monumental statues.¹⁰⁶ An example may be the colossal statue of a bearded figure with a helmet from Golgoi, which bears the syllabic sequence *ta-mo-pa* on the left shoulder. Scholars have debated whether this statue represents a priest or a king, or perhaps a priest-king.¹⁰⁷ Cypriot kings played a dual role as both sovereigns and chief priests, as we shall see. The emergence of such statues has been linked to the proliferation of extra-urban sanctuaries that helped to legitimise royal power in the peripheral territories of the city-kingdoms and to spread the royal ideology.¹⁰⁸ Statues would have guaranteed a prominent royal presence in temples.¹⁰⁹

Undoubtedly, royal iconographic representations, monumental buildings and the public display of inscriptions – decrees, dedications and coin legends – continued to advertise the sovereign’s highest political and religious authority in the city-states during the archaic and classical periods.¹¹⁰ The distinctive features of the Cypriot kings attracted the attention of ancient Greek scholars. Herodotus, Theophrastus and Phylarchus testify that the *tiara* or *mitra* or *kitaris/kidaris* – sometimes also called *kurbasia* – was a distinctive symbol of the Cypriot kingship. This specific headgear is often shown in local iconographic representations, for instance in the famous sarcophagus from Amathus.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁵ Satraki 2013, 125; Petit 2001, 53-75; Hermary 1999, 55-67.

¹⁰⁶ Satraki 2013, 125.

¹⁰⁷ Satraki 2013, 125; Karageorghis *et al.* 2000, 109-110; Cesnola 1877, 143; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Golgoi n°3 = *ICS* 262.

¹⁰⁸ Papantoniou, Bourogiannis 2018; Satraki 2013, 132-133; Fourrier 2013, 103-122; Iacovou 2006b, 315-335; Iacovou 2019, 219-220.

¹⁰⁹ Satraki 2013, 131.

¹¹⁰ Satraki 2013, 130-131; Papantoniou 2016, 73-108; Averett 2015, 3-45 on upper-class’ religious performances; Iacovou 2013b, 133-152.

¹¹¹ Karageorghis 2000 *et al.*, n°330; Hermary, Mertens 2014, 353-363, n°490; *Suda* v. *τίαρα*, see introduction footnote n° 2; Hdt 7.90, ‘τὰς μὲν κεφαλὰς εἰλίχαιτο μίτρησι οἱ βασιλέες αὐτῶν’, ‘their kings wore *mitrai* wrapped around their heads’; Phylarch. *FGrH* 81 F22; *τίαρα* is related to *κυρβάσια*, the Persian headgear, in the scholia to Plato’s *Republic*. (*sch. vet.* 553C, Greene 1938, 260 = Theophr. 602 *FHS&G*) and in the scholia to Aristophanes, *Av.* 487 (Holwerda 1991, 82 n° 487a); for analyses of the terms *tiara*, *mitra*, *kurbasia* and *kitaris/kidaris* in Greek sources and Near-East iconography see Berndt 2020, 65-79; Tuplin 2007, 67-97; Satraki 2013, 132; Hermary 1981, 74-83; Petit 2004, 49-96; Mylonas 1998, 144-145; Karageorghis 1990b, 1-5;

Greek sources seem to confuse these terms.¹¹² According to Tuplin, *tiara*, *kitaris* and *kurbasia* were used interchangeably to name the same typology of headgear, a soft hat that only the king could wear upright; *kitaris* and *kurbasia* would be Greek loan words from respectively Semitic and Iranian.¹¹³ However, he also pointed out that some texts mention *kitaris* as part of the *tiara*, perhaps a band worn by the sovereigns under the headgear. It is plausible that the headgear worn by the central figure in the sarcophagus from Amathus, probably the king, is what the Greek sources have in mind.¹¹⁴

Some elements of Cypriot royal ideology and propaganda appeared excessive to the Greeks.¹¹⁵ For instance, a passage from Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistai*, which quotes a work of Clearchus from Soloi on flattery, portrays Cypriot kingship negatively. Clearchus defines men who appreciate flattery as thoughtless and foolish. To provide an example, he tells the story of a Cypriot sovereign who surrounded himself with flatterers taking part in feasts and banquets.¹¹⁶ Such indulgent behaviour, which made the Cypriot sovereigns famous, is perhaps the reason why Duris accused the king of Tamassos, Pasikypros, of *asōtia*, intemperance, and why Clearchus testifies that Nicocles of Salamis competed with Strato of Sidon in organising Lucullan banquets.¹¹⁷

Karageorghis 1995, 6-7, pl. XLVI; Fourrier 2007, 56 for archaeological iconographic testimonies from Kition.

¹¹² Tuplin 2007, 68-71. Berndt (2020, 68) accepted de Pauw's emendation of Hdt. 7.90 according to which the Cypriot king wore *mitrai* and common Cypriots wore *kidaris/kitaris* (see Pollux 10.162). – and not *chitonas* as suggested by other editors; de Pauw's reading is accepted in Rosén's Teubner edition but rejected in Hude's Oxford edition. According to Berndt, *kidaris/kitaris* would be a common soft headgear widespread amongst the Cypriots. Generally, on the headgear of the Persian calvary see Wilson 2015, 134-135 on Hdt. 7.84.

¹¹³ *Kitaris* is attested in Ex. 28.4; Ctes. *FGrH* 688 F 15; Hesch. κ 2806 in the Cypriot form κίτταρις (Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 234 §258; 194 §209); on the etymology and connection with the Hebrew KTR, *keter*, crown, see Chantraine 1968-80, 529; Salvesen 1998, 67-73; Salvesen 1999, 35-46 (with reference to Esther 1:11; 2:17; 6:8) who linked the etymology of KTR to the camels' hump (*katar* in Arabic); for an Iranian etymology from **tagabar* 'who bears the crown' see Périkhanian (1971, 169-174).

¹¹⁴ The iconography of the Cypriot *tiara*, *mitra* and soft hat has been analysed by Young who focused on a group of small terracotta statuettes from the sanctuary of Apollo Hylates in Kourion (Young, Young 1955, 195-211). It is plausible that Cypriot members of the elite wore specific headgears, very likely the non-royal *tiara*, *kitaris*, *kurbasia* mentioned in the Greek texts – for instance, Hdt. 1.132 for *tiara* or Hdt.5.49 for *kurbasia*; see Tuplin 2007, n. 15; Xen. *Cyr.* 8.3.13, where Cyrus' kinsmen, συγγενεῖς, wore a *diadēma*.

¹¹⁵ In Greek literature, *mitrai* and Oriental headgears are signs of upper class' ἀβροσύνη, 'magnificence', appreciated in the archaic elegy (Kurke 1992, 91-120; Caciagli 2016, 424-448) but disparaged as 'luxury' by some authors of the fifth and fourth centuries BC (e.g. in Hdt. 1.71.4).

¹¹⁶ Athen. *Deipn.* 6.255 = Clerach. fr. 19 Wehrli.

¹¹⁷ Athen. *Deipn.* 12.531c; Athen., *Deipn.* 4.167c = Duris *FGrH* (BNJ) 76 F 4.

The reliability of these literary sources is questionable, but their testimony might reflect an unusually high level of display of wealth by Cypriot sovereigns. According to the text of one of the Phoenician *ostraka* of the Idalion archive, some of the expenses of the Kition/Idalion court were for the *marzeah*, a well-established Levantine institution, a banquet that involved drinking wine and eating meat.¹¹⁸ Its meaning varied according to the place and the culture involved, but it is likely that the king and members of the upper class were personally involved in the ritual, the cost of which was paid for by the central administration.¹¹⁹ This practice may have contributed to legitimising the political and religious authority of the sovereign and of the court – as more fully explained in the following pages.

Dvorjetsky supposed that a scene represented on a Phoenician bronze bowl from Salamis – dated to the seventh century BC – could show a *marzeah* banquet.¹²⁰ If so, the *marzeah* was known and perhaps practised in other Cypriot city-states, not only in Kition, and the Greek authors were talking about similar banquets in which the Cypriot sovereigns were involved. According to Karageorghis, the outer register of the artefact analysed by Dvorjetsky is very similar to that of a fragment of another bowl excavated by Cesnola, part of the Kourion treasure and dated to the seventh century BC too.¹²¹ The Kourion bowl's fragment shows a table with fruits on it, amphorae, musicians, women bearing offerings in both hands, all elements which recall a banquet scene. A man and a woman recline and face each other. Above the woman, a Cypriot syllabic text bears the signs *ku-po-ro-me-to-u-sa*.¹²² Initially, this sequence was

¹¹⁸ Amadasi 2017, 281; Amadasi, Zamora López 2018b, 199-203; the *ostrakon* bears the text: '1. TN L'ŠTR WM 2. LQRT BMRZH ' 3. KL SP/R 1', 'give to Astarte and Melqart in the *marzeah* food (?) SP/R 1'. Generally on the *marzeah* see Greenfield 1974, 450-455; Alavoine 2000, 1-23; Miralles-Macià 2007, *passim*; Na'aman 2015, 215-22; Nijboer associated the *marzeah* to the Greek *symposion* and to the Latin *symposium* (2013, 95-125); Carter 1997, 72-112; Karageorghis 2007, 257-262.

¹¹⁹ Amadasi, Zamora López 2018b, 187-188.

¹²⁰ Amadasi, Zamora López 2018b, 187-214, for all the other attestations of *marzeah*; Ravasco 2006, 391-403 for the etymology; see Dvorjetski (2016, 17-39) who provided a list of all the possible *marzeah* attested in different cultures and period. On the Phoenician bowl from Salamis see Karageorghis (1993, 7-8) who argues that the bowl was made by local Cypriot craftsmen. On the relation between the *marzeah* and the Greek *symposion* see also Dvorjetski (2016, 29) who mentions a possible *marzeah* in Petra described by Strabo as *symposion* (Strab. 16.4.26). See Baslez, (2019, 96-114, specifically 105), for the overlap between the *thiasos* and the *marzeah* in Piraeus.

¹²¹ Karageorghis 1999, 13-20; Karageorghis *et al.* 2000, n°307.

¹²² Here and in the whole thesis, I have underlined syllabic signs and alphabetic Greek letters when the reading is not clear.

interpreted by Masson as *ku-po-ro-ta-le-u*, a genitive of the proper name Κυπροθάλης. Following an examination of a photograph of the bowl, Neumann reinterpreted the text as *ku-po-ro-me-to-u-sa*, Κυπρομέδουσα, '(she) who reigns on Cyprus'.¹²³ Adopting this reading, Hermary supposed that the female figure on the bowl was a deity, perhaps the female divine protector of Cyprus, for whom the iconography would have been more suitable.¹²⁴ Over the head of the male figure, another text appears,]*le-we-se*, probably the end of the word *pa-si]-le-we-se*. According to this interpretation, the king participates in a banquet with the main female divinity of Cyprus – called *wanassa* in fourth-century Paphian inscriptions – of whom he was the main priest.¹²⁵

Satraki argues that these bowls were a 'visual means' for the manifestation of the power of the sovereigns.¹²⁶ We may suppose that the ritual of celebrating a banquet in which the king took part was a manifestation of the authority of the king not only in the archaic period, when the bowls were created, but also during the classical age, since both literary and epigraphic classical sources still mention it.¹²⁷

1.2 The elite and the *wanaktes*

The authority of the king goes hand in hand with that of other members of local elites who apparently held the highest roles in the city-states after the sovereign. One of them was the *wanax*. As noted in the *Introduction*, the *lexicon* of Harpocration states that according to Ps. Aristotle's *Kypriōn Politeia* 'the sons of the king and his brothers were called *anaktes*, his sisters and wives *anassai*'.¹²⁸ Isocrates' *Evagoras* confirms that one of the sons of the king became *basileus* and the others *anaktes*, and adds that the king's daughters, too,

¹²³Egetmeyer vol. II, Kourion n°4 = ICS 179; Egetmeyer, however, does not accept Neumann's reading and states that the text remains dubious; Markoe 1985, 175-177; Neumann 1999, 33-35; Karageorghis 1999, 13-20; Hendrix 1999, 21-33; Hermary 2000, 67-78.

¹²⁴ Hermary 2000, 67-78.

¹²⁵ E.g. Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Paphos n°2 = ICS 7; on this point see Karageorghis J. 2005, 174-189; Karageorghis J. 1998, 109-119.

¹²⁶ Satraki 2013, 130.

¹²⁷ For further iconographic testimonies of banquets in Cyprus see Hermary, Mertens 2014, 396 n°491. On the Golgoi sarcophagus, a bearded figure on a chariot may be a leading representative of the local élite or even a king, probably the same individual represented in the banquet scene on the long side of the same sarcophagus.

¹²⁸ Harp. F 203, ed. Dindorf 1853, 32, mms E, T = fr. 532 Gigon = fr. 526 Rose; Poldrugo 2001, 21-51.

were called *anassai*.¹²⁹ However, Cypriot inscriptions show that we should not infer from Isocrates and Ps. Aristotle that (*w*)*anax* was a title reserved for members of the royal family. This term is attested in a bilingual dedication from Idalion, written in Phoenician and Cypriot-syllabic Greek, dated to 388 BC, when Milkyaton was king of Kition and Idalion.¹³⁰ The text is inscribed on the base of a marble statuette found in the temple of Apollo and dedicated by a member of the elite called Baalrom. In the Phoenician text, Baalrom is called 'DN, lord or prince, in the sequence 'SML] 'Z 'Š YTN WYṬN' 'DN B'LR[M] [BN 'BDMLK...', 'this statue which has been dedicated by the prince Baalrom, son of Abdmilik...'. Meanwhile, in the Cypriot syllabic text, he is called *wanax*: '...to-na-ti-ri-ja-ta-ne | to-te-ka-te-se-ta-se | o-wa-na-xe-[-6?]-o-a-pi-ti-mi-li-ko-ne...', 'this statue which has been dedicated by the *wanax* son of Abdmilik'.¹³¹ The name of the dedicant may have been omitted in the Greek-syllabic text to avoid emphasizing the Phoenician origins of the *wanax*: not many years had passed since Kition had conquered Idalion.¹³² The crucial point here is that we can infer from the mention of Abdmilik without a title that Baalrom's father was not a king – indeed, Milkyaton was the current sovereign.¹³³ This suggests that *wanax* was a title held more widely by members of the upper class.

The term *wanax* is also attested in an inscription from Soloi.¹³⁴ Dated to the fourth century BC, it is probably a dedication of the *wanax* Stasias, son of Stasikrates: *o-wa-na-xe | sa-ta-si-ja-se sa-ta-si-ka-ra-te-o-se*. Masson claimed that this Stasikrates is the same *basileus* Stasikrates mentioned in another Solian

¹²⁹ Isocr. 9.72.

¹³⁰ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Idalion n° 4 = *ICS* 220 = Yon 2004, n°69 = *CIS* I 89; Steele 2018, 179-183; Ohnefalsch-Richter 1888, 63-64; Steele 2013, 203-204; Consani 1988, 35-60; Bianco 2015, 57-58; Gaber, Dever 1995, 85-113. This inscription allowed the decipherment of the Cypriot syllabic Greek through the comparison of formulas and names attested in the two texts.

¹³¹ On the overlap of the cult of Apollo with Resheph in Cyprus and the epithet Amyklos see Bennett 1980, 330-333; Lipinski 1987, 87-99; West 1997, 55; Münnich 2013, 253; Blažek 2017, 643-662; Vernet (2015) explains that the epithet Amyklos is the Hellenised version of the Phoenician Mikal, widespread in the Near-East. The Greek text also mentions five intercalary days, *epagomenoi*, added at the end of the year, like those used in Levantine and Egyptian calendars to correct temporal errors (Consani 1988, 44-45; Poldrugo 2001, 31; Stieglitz 1998, 211-221).

¹³² On this point Consani 1988, 44-45; Steele 2018, 181.

¹³³ Scholars pointed out that Milkyaton's father, Baalrom has never been a king since he is mentioned in the text of Milkyaton's trophy with no title (Yon, Sznycer 1992, 156-165; Kuhrt 2007, 245, footnote n°5). Kuhrt also suggests that Milkyaton's father may be the same Baalrom quoted in the bilingual inscription from Idalion.

¹³⁴ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Soloi n°1 = *ICS* 211.

digraphic inscription, written in alphabetic and Cypriot syllabic Greek. This is dated to 350-325 BC and there king Stasikrates is said to be son of a *basileus* called Stasias.¹³⁵ Egetmeyer, who re-edited the texts, agreed with Masson's interpretation and claimed that the *wanax* Stasias may have been the son of the king Stasikrates; this Stasias would have been named after his grandfather, the king Stasias.¹³⁶ However, Stasikrates mentioned in the first inscription is named without a title, which makes it unlikely that he was a king. It is more plausible that the first Stasias, like Baalrom, held the title of *wanax* since he was a member of the local elite, perhaps of the royal family, and he had the same name of the previous king. This would imply that not only sons and brothers of the king were *wanakes* – as attested by literary sources – but also more distant relatives of the king or members of the upper class in general.

Another instance is a Cypriot syllabic inscription from Golgoi – one of a few examples of syllabic texts in verses, specifically hexameters – dated to the fourth century BC and inscribed on a bas-relief with the image of a bearded divinity, perhaps Zeus, and the images of Apollo and Hermes.¹³⁷ The text bears the term *wanax* in the first line as vocative, although partially reconstructed in *lacuna* in the form *wa-]na-xe*. Scholars debate whether the term simply indicates 'lord', perhaps the god Apollo, or a *wanax* member of the elite.¹³⁸ The inscription reads:

(1) *ka-i-re-te / ka-ra-si-ti / [wa]-na-xe / ka-po-ti / we-po-me-ka / me-po-te- we-i-se-se*

(2) *te-o-i-se / po-ro-[a-ta]-na-to-i-se / e-re-ra-me-na / pa-ta-ko-ra-sa-to-se*

(3) *o-wo-ka-re-ti / e-pi-si-ta-i-se / a-to-ro-po / te-o-i / a-le-tu-ka-ke-re /*

¹³⁵ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Soloi n°2 = *ICS* 212; this inscription was found in Larnaca but very likely, it was originally from Soloi and was moved in the Roman period; Steele 2018, 227; Consani 1990, 63-79.

¹³⁶ Egetmeyer 2002b, 260-264; Steele 2018, 227-228.

¹³⁷ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Golgoi n° 5 = *ICS* 264; on the metric analysis of the inscription cf. Neumann 1974, 146-155; Neumann 1996, 44-46; Guion 1996, 74-75; Hansen 1989, n° 868, 266-268. Another example of syllabic text in verse might be the Golgian epitaph of Aristokretes dated to 325 BC (Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II Golgoi n° 2 = *ICS* 261). For a list of other possible syllabic inscriptions written in verse see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 571 §724).

¹³⁸ For the interpretation of *wanax* as 'lord' or the main divinity represented in the relief, see Counts 2014, 285-298; Karageorghis 2000, n°414; Hermary, Maertens 2014, 326 n°455. Hermary suggested dating the monument to the late Hellenistic period on the basis of its iconography.

(4) *te-o-i / ku-me-re-na-i-pa-ta / ta-a-to-ro-po-i / po-ro-ne-o-i / ka-i-re-te.*

‘1. Greetings! Eat, *wanax*, and drink! Never say a great word. 2. To the immortal gods; whatever they desire (is) available to them in abundance. 3. The god does not pay attention to man but what happens is what must happen. 4. The gods govern everything that men think. Greetings!’¹³⁹

Although some editors agree that this is a dedication on a votive relief, more likely, we are probably facing a funerary inscription, a funerary epigram written in verses and starting with ‘*chairete*’, an imperative employed by the deceased to address who passes-by. This is a common practice in this typology of monuments and their content is often full of *gnōmai*, as we shall see.¹⁴⁰ If we interpreted this text as a dedication, as other editors did, and if we supposed that the vocative *wa-na-xe* addressed a deity, the dedicant would give moral advice to a deity, which is a highly implausible circumstance.¹⁴¹ Therefore, it is more plausible that this is a funerary inscription and that the deceased, probably a member of the upper class, is addressing a fellow member of the royal family or of the local elite who held the title of *wanax*. The text exhorts him to ‘drink and eat’, perhaps in *symposia* – for instance, as that represented in a contemporary Golgian sarcophagus – in which upper-class members took part. In these *symposia*, he learned principles of leadership by discussing with other nobles and putting into practice the lessons of *gnōmai*. As advised by the first line of the Golgian inscription, the *wanax* must be moderate and not speak big words, which certainly is a suitable advice for a young member of the elite but hardly appropriate for a god.¹⁴²

¹³⁹ *Ka-i-re-te* is an imperative of the verb *χαίρω*, ‘rejoice!’ or ‘greetings!’; this is also repeated as last word of line 4 in ring composition (Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 465 §582, 520 §649). It is followed by other two imperatives, *ka-ra-si-ti* and *ka-po-ti*, respectively an athematic form of the verb **grasmi*, ‘to eat’, in the second person singular and *καὶ πῶθι*, *ka-po-ti*, imperative of *πίνω*, to drink (Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 458 §578; 520 §649; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 195 §211). The last words may be read as *Ἐέπο(μ) μέγα μήποτε Φεί<π>ης*, according to Neumann (1974, 146-155) and Egetmeyer’s interpretation. They accept the correction *Φεί<π>ης* instead of the original *Φείης*. The scribe would have mistaken the end of the verse and written *-se-se*, thus *we-i-se-se*, instead of *-pe-se* as in *we-i-pe-se*.

¹⁴⁰ Tsagalis 2008, 9-62.

¹⁴¹ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Golgoi n° 5 = *ICS* 264; by contrast, Stavrou (2015) states that this is a funerary text; see also Voskos 1997 vol. II, 75.

¹⁴² Hermay, Martens 2014, 363-370, n°491; 149 n° 243.

The term *wanax* occurs also in two other inscriptions. It is not clear whether an *ostrakon* from Idalion, damaged in the upper part, mentions one of the local *wanaktes* – hence it should be interpreted as a title –, or simply mentions an anthroponym ending in – *wanaks*, such as Aristowanax.¹⁴³ Finally, a bowl from Ledra belonged to a local *wanax* and bears the text *wa-na-xe-ti-ma-se-e-mi*, ‘I am the *wanax* Timas’. Brought to light in a complex of cisterns only partially excavated, it is dated to the fourth century BC thanks to a coin found in the most recent layer which has provided the *terminus ante quem* of the site.¹⁴⁴

Returning to Greek literary sources, one may notice that Isocrates’ and Aristotle’s testimonies do not exclude that *wanaktes* were members of a broader elite. They state that members of the royal family bear this title but this does not imply that it was their exclusive prerogative. Clearchus from Soloi is another source to consider; this author mentions Cypriot *wanaktes* in his work *Gergithius*, – a work about ‘flattery’ named after Gergithius, one of the flatterers of Alexander – quoted by Athenaeus.¹⁴⁵ He describes a form of Cypriot secret police – first developed in Salamis, according to the author, and further discussed below – whose ‘agents’ report every day to the so called *anaktes*.¹⁴⁶ If these *anaktes* were exclusively members of the royal family, the agents would have excluded the king in reporting information and prioritised king’s sons and brothers. But this seems unlikely. More probably, Clearchus meant that the ‘agents’ reported to a socio-political elite, known collectively as *anaktes*.

Two elements emerge from the analyses of literary and epigraphic testimonies. Firstly, the *wanaktes* were members of the upper class and not only sons and brothers of the kings. Secondly, their presence is attested in Golgoi, Idalion, Soloi, Ledra and Salamis, and thus, very likely on the whole island. All this leads to the conclusion that *wanax* was a widespread honorific title, that might be translated as ‘lord’, and is not attached to a specific office. In the city-

¹⁴³ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Idalion n° 20; Masson 1992b, 120; the form attested in the *ostrakon* is a genitive *wa-na-ko-to-se*.

¹⁴⁴ The coin, although it is highly corroded, has been dated to 332-330 BC. Thus, the bowl should be dated to before this decade; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Ledra n°5; Olivier, Pilides 2008, 338.

¹⁴⁵ Athen. *Deipn.* 6.255-257 = Clear. fr. 19 Wehrli

¹⁴⁶ Athen. *Deipn.* 6.256a = Clear. fr. 19 Wehrli. ‘ἐκάστης ἡμέρας πρὸς τοὺς καλουμένους ἄνακτας’.

states which adopted Phoenician as administrative language, the equivalent figure was called 'DN, as the Idalion bilingual inscription demonstrates, and not surprisingly, 'DN is usually attested in Phoenician texts to indicate 'lord' rather than a distinct office.¹⁴⁷ The presence of these *wanaktes*, 'lords', suggests that the Cypriot elite was setting itself far above the common people.¹⁴⁸ This scenario distinguishes the Cypriot socio-political structure from that of the Greek *poleis*. There, members of local elites gained the titles of *agathoi*, *esthloi*, *chrēstoi*, *kalokagathoi* by merit, at least in principle. It is this superior merit that allowed them to gain their superior status. By contrast, the Cypriot *wanaktes* had superior power but it is not specified how they gained it.¹⁴⁹ Moreover, in classical Cyprus, the lack of distinction in title between members of the royal family and members of the upper class may suggest that the king was not high above the elite of *wanaktes*. Some of them were probably courtiers who may have supported the sovereign and helped preserve the government by advising the king in taking decisions.

Kourion is the only city-state which may be an exception since it shows a distinctive nomenclature for the members of the royal family. In this city, the title of '*pasilewatase*' is attested in the genitive form *pa-si-le-wa-ta-u*, inscribed on a silver bowl dated to the archaic period; this is a hapax used to indicate a member of the royal family.¹⁵⁰ Although Kourion may have distinguished royalty from other members of the elite, it is not clear whether such a distinction – if it existed – was preserved during the classical period too.¹⁵¹ By contrast, we

¹⁴⁷ Krahmalkov 2000, 34-35, who however translated the Cypriot term *wanax* as king; for a list of the attestations cf. *DNWSI* s. '*dn*', 15-17.

¹⁴⁸ The privileged status of the elite is evident in burial goods of the archaic and classical periods; see Karageorghis 1973, 601-689; Matthäus 2007, 211-230; Hermary, Mertens 2013, 353-370; Childs 2012, 91-106; Georgiou 2009, 113-139.

¹⁴⁹ For the Greek elite see Ma 2016, 395-418.

¹⁵⁰ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Kourion n° 3 = *ICS* 178; Mitford 1971, n° 14; Markoe 1985, 149-156.

¹⁵¹ The independence of Kourion in the fourth century BC is still discussed, and so is the presence of a king and of members of the royal family. Although scholars have pointed out that Diodorus' account does not mention this city-kingdom in the narration of Cypriot events from Alexander's arrival until Ptolemy's conquest (Diod. 18-20) and that this may mean that it was not independent anymore, it appears among the Cypriot centres which sent two *theōrodokoi*, Pasicrates and Themistagoras, to Nemea in the late fourth century BC (*SEG* XXVI, 331). Satraki (2012, 264-266; 277) has convincingly affirmed that Pasicrates was king of Kourion since in the Nemea list the other Cypriot *theōrodokoi* were Nicocreon king of Salamis and Stasicrates king of Soloi. She pointed out that some Kourion silver coins, dated to the late fourth century BC, bear the legend ΠΑΣΙ-, and also that a Pasicrates, king of Kourion, participated in the Tyre siege as an ally of Alexander according to Arrian (*Anab.* 2.22); Destrooper-Georgiades 2004,

may notice that the title of *wanax* is attested only in classical sources and never appears in archaic testimonies, although this is not enough to exclude that it was also employed earlier.

Unfortunately, inscriptions are not equally informative about the female members of the royal family. The only syllabic text which mentions a royal female figure, the mother of a king, *-pa-si-le-wo-se / ma-to-ro-se*, is inscribed on a sarcophagus of uncertain provenance dated to the fourth century BC, of which only a fragment survives.¹⁵² The term *wanassa* appears on Paphian inscriptions but always to indicate the Cypriot Goddess and never the queen or a female member of the royal family. These occurrences, all dated to the fourth century BC, concern the king of Paphos, called the priest of the *wanassa*.¹⁵³ In this case, the title *wanassa* preserved its ancient religious use for the goddess of fertility whose cult, during the classical period, overlapped with that of Aphrodite.¹⁵⁴

1.3 Schooling the elite, Cypriot education and political leadership

The analysis of the testimonies cited above has highlighted the distance between the elite of *wanaktes* and the common people and, on the contrary, its proximity with the king. Likely, the elite was involved in the government of the city-states supporting the sovereign or, in some cases, contributing to his dethronement in favour of another ruler.¹⁵⁵ In the fifth and fourth centuries BC, the ruling upper class of Cyprus seemed to progressively welcome Greek, or rather Athenian, education, which aimed at forging leadership skills. This certainly happened because of the increasing contacts with Greece. However, the Athenian *paideia* also fulfilled the need of the Cypriot elites of legitimising their authority and privileged status.

During the fifth and fourth centuries BC, moral principles as expressed in *gnōmai* were an important part of the Athenian education and a prerequisite

37-42; for different interpretations see Xydopoulos 2016, 173-191; Perlman 2000, 269-272; Miller 1988, 147-163.

¹⁵² Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, uncertain origin n° 8 = *ICS* 344; Mitford 1961b, 41-42.

¹⁵³ For some example see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Paphos n° 2 = *ICS* 7; n° 8 = *ICS* 16; n°9 = *ICS* 17.

¹⁵⁴ Sometimes, the main female divinity was named simply as Paphian or Golgian since her main sanctuaries were located in Paphos and Golgoi; on the Cypriot goddess see Karageorghis J. 2005; Karageorghis J. 1998, 109-119; Young 2005, 23-44; Iacovou 2019, 204-234.

¹⁵⁵ For some examples see Isocr. 9.20-33; Giuffrida 1996, 594-596; Körner 2019, 331-332.

for political success and power.¹⁵⁶ These *gnōmai*, which probably spread by both oral and written traditions, provide constructive patterns and norms to observe, particularly suitable for moulding political leaders.¹⁵⁷ Amongst gnostic authors, Theognis was one of the most popular within the Athenian upper class. His elegies were considered of great pedagogic value and were often quoted in other literary sources. For example, in Aristophanes' *Birds*, Peisetairos claims that he did not give bad advice to his son since he learned from nobles. Aristophanes was alluding to Theognis' elegies 1.27-28, where Cyrnus is advised to learn from noble men, ἀγαθοί, as he did already as a child, 'Κύρν', ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγαθῶν παῖς ἔτ' ἐὼν ἔμαθον.¹⁵⁸ A few years later, Plato's *Meno* provides another instance.¹⁵⁹ Socrates quotes some Theognidean verses (1.33-36) calling young people to drink and dine sitting with the nobles from whom they will learn 'noble things'.¹⁶⁰

Nobles who gather in a symposiastic context and Socrates' invitation to drink immediately recall the content of the hexametric inscription from Golgoi analysed in the previous pages. As anticipated above, this funerary inscription is full of *gnōmai*: these are generally used in Greek epigraphic culture as communication means between the commissioner of the inscription and who passes by. Their context should be common to both 'ends of the communicative spectrum' – in these cases to members of the Cypriot upper class.¹⁶¹ Neumann associated the first line of the Golgian epitaph with some of Theognis' verses where the author urges his addressee to be modest: 'μήποτε, Κύρν', ἀγορᾶσθαι ἔπος μέγα: οἶδε γὰρ οὐδεὶς / ἀνθρώπων ὅ τι νύξ χημέρη ἀνδρὶ τελεῖ (Thgn. 1.159-160), 'never talk big, Cyrnus, for no one knows what a day or night will bring to pass for a man'.¹⁶² As Egetmeyer pointed out, three words of the

¹⁵⁶ Tuplin 2018, 13-55; 35; Thucydides has highlighted this concept in the famous Periclean Funeral speech, in turn full of *gnōmai*; Thuc. 2.41-42; Tompkins 2013, 447-464; Greenwood 2006, 23-24; see also Ephor. *FGrH* 70 F 119 = Strab. 9.2.3.

¹⁵⁷ Bartol 2019, 129-147.

¹⁵⁸ Thgn. 1.28; Bartol 2019, 129-147; Ar. *Av.* 1362-1363, 'οὐ κακῶς ὑποθήσομαι'.

¹⁵⁹ Bartol 2019, 141; Plat. *Men.* 95d and Thgn. 1. 33-34, 'καὶ μετὰ τοῖσιν πίνε καὶ ἔσθιτε, καὶ μετὰ τοῖσιν / ἕζε, 'drink and dine with them, sit with them'; Gerber 1999, 178.

¹⁶⁰ For further references on the reception of Theognis in the fifth-fourth century BC in Athens see De Martin forthcoming, particularly footnote n°6, and personal communication.

¹⁶¹ Tsagalis 2008, 38.

¹⁶² Thgn. 1.159; Gerber 1999, 196; Neumann 1974, 146-155; see also Bannier 1917, 1446 - 1448; Beattie 1958, 138-146; the invitation to drink may be associated to Thgn. 1.33-36, the same verses which are quoted in Plat. *Men.* 95d; the invitation to 'not speak big' may be

metrical inscription are also mentioned in Theognis' elegy, μήποτε, ἔπος, μέγα.¹⁶³ Very likely, whoever commissioned the Golgian text had good knowledge of Theognis' *corpus* and was a highly educated individual who was able to substitute the verb ἀγορᾶσθαι mentioned in the Theognidean verses with Φεί<π>ης in order to create a deliberate *figura etymologica*.¹⁶⁴ The following verses corroborate this hypothesis: they may also refer to an elegy by Theognis. The second line – ‘*te-o-i-se / po-ro-[a-ta]-na-to-i-se / e-re-ra-me-na / pa-ta-ko-ra-sa-to-se*’, ‘for the immortal gods whatever they desire (is) available in abundance’ – may be compared with Theognis' elegy ‘ἔμπεδον δ' ὄλβον ἔχουσιν ἀπήμονα’, ‘but for all that they have a prosperity free from harm’.¹⁶⁵ Similar is the content of the third line.

Moreover, the last line of the inscription may also contain *gnōmai*. It reads: ‘*te-o-i / ku-me-re-na-i-pa-ta / ta-a-to-ro-po-i / po-ro-ne-o-i / ka-i-re-te*’ (θεοὶ κυβέρναί πά(ν)τα, τὰ ἄ(ν)θρωποι φρονέωι. Χαίρετε): ‘the gods rule everything that men think. Greetings’. Egetmeyer claims that these verses quote Presocratic philosophers such as Anaximandros or Parmenides, who used the verb κυβερνάω in similar contexts.¹⁶⁶ In *Physics*, Aristotle cites Anaximandros who claims that the ἄπειρον, the beginning of all things, contains and rules, ‘κυβερνᾶν’, everything.¹⁶⁷ Meanwhile, Simplicius quotes Parmenides's verses: ‘ἐν δὲ μέσῳ τούτων δαίμων ἢ πάντα κυβερναῖ’, ‘in the middle of these things, there is a *daimōn* who directs everything’.¹⁶⁸

Conceivably, gnomic elegiac compositions became a key part of nobles' education not only in Athens – as Aristophanes and Plato show – but also in Cyprus, particularly but perhaps not only in the fourth century BC.¹⁶⁹ The works of the two philosophers mentioned in the text, Anaximandros and Parmenides,

associated to Thgn. 1.365-366, where the author advises to speak mild words and to act cautiously in *symposia*.

¹⁶³ Egetmeyer 1998, 93-95.

¹⁶⁴ Egetmeyer 1998, 94.

¹⁶⁵ Thgn. 1.383; Gerber 1999, 29.

¹⁶⁶ The Cypriot form **kumernāmi* is debated. According to Egetmeyer (2010 vol. I, 467 §584), it should be a third person plural of an athematic form, different from the thematic κυβερνάω; Neumann 1974, 146-147; Neumann 1987, 64-69; Neumann 1992, 188.

¹⁶⁷ DK A 15 Anaximan. = Arist. *Phys.* Γ 4.203b6, ‘καὶ περιέχειν ἅπαντα καὶ πάντα κυβερνᾶν’.

¹⁶⁸ DK B 12 Parm. = Simp. *Phys.* 39.12.

¹⁶⁹ Bartol 2019, 140.

may have been part of the education of the Cypriot upper class too.¹⁷⁰ Since the author of this inscription demonstrates sensitivity to contemporary Greek literary trends, he was plausibly a member of the elite schooled according to the Athenian cultural *vogue*.¹⁷¹ Not surprisingly, this dedication comes from Golgoi, a peripheral settlement of Salamis' city-kingdom which underwent a more intense process of Hellenization because of Evagoras I's pro-Athenian policy.¹⁷² In *Nicocles*, Isocrates himself, who had spent time in the Salaminian court as preceptor of Nicocles, Evagoras' son, and contributed to the spread of the fundamentals of his Athenian education, explicitly exhorted the prince to read Theognis' elegies.¹⁷³ The Athenian *paideia* was plausibly promoted in Salamis' peripheral settlements too, thus in Golgoi, amongst courtiers and members of the upper class as a resource for teaching leadership through *gnōmai*. By showing himself knowledgeable of the code of conduct in *symposia*, theatres and, as Hobden affirmed, of the 'challenges' of political actions and authorities, the deceased of the Golgian inscription demonstrated that he legitimately fulfilled his role as representative of the leading elite and of the government.¹⁷⁴

But such a symposiastic setting was not unfamiliar to Cypriot culture – as shown above, Cypriot kings manifested their powers through banquet scenes; therefore, politics in banquets was not a prerogative of Greek circles. Near-

¹⁷⁰ However, it is also plausible that the last syllabic verse of the inscription reflects Theognidean poetry too, perhaps inspired by verses 1.373-376 where Zeus is said to rule over everything knowing well the heart and the mind of every man, or by verses 1.403-405, where the *daimōn* drives men towards difficulties ὄντινα δαίμων πρόφρων εἰς μεγάλην ἀμπλακίην παράγει. Cf. Thgn. 1.373-376; 401-406, Gerber 1999, 228; 230.

¹⁷¹ Some epigrams from Paphos – epitaphs and dedications written in hexameters or elegiac couplets, predominantly in alphabetic Greek – also demonstrate that in the fourth century BC, the Cypriot elite endured a strong process of Hellenization in language and culture (e.g. Cayla 2018, 318 n°223 or 4-15 n°2, n. 440, where πύργων ἀμφ[έ]θετο στέφανον mentioned in the inscription can be compare with Anacr. Fr 100 ed. Gentili '[...] ἀπὸ μὲν πόλεως στέφανος [...]'). Probably, the use of the Greek *koine* spread first among the elites as well as the Greek *paideia*, and secondly, it reached the lower strata of the population (Cayla 2018, 67; 125; Egertmeyer 2010 vol. I, 561 §724).

¹⁷² Gennadiou 2019, 360; see also Fourrier (2013, 108-111) who however argues that during the archaic period, Golgoi was part of the territory of Idalion.

¹⁷³ Isocr. 3.28; 3.43; Poldrugo 2001, 43. For the importance of education in Isocrates' Cypriot speeches see Isocr. 3.1-9; Crick 2015, 171-179; Isocr. 9.75-79; Alexiou 2015, 56-57; Collins Edward 2010, 387-388. Isocrates also contributed to strengthen links between Evagoras and Athenian political representatives. For example, Isocrates was linked to Timotheus (15.117) and consequently to his father Conon, the Athenian general who moved to Salamis after the defeat at Aegospotami (405 BC) (Xen. *Hel.*2.1; Diod. 13.6; Nep. 1-3). For the honours reserved to Evagoras by Athens cf. *IG* I³ 113.

¹⁷⁴ Hobden 2013, 159.

Eastern traditions provide further examples. Common Near-Eastern convivial settings celebrate the king's glory and power.¹⁷⁵ For instance, in the Babylonian epic poem *Enuma Elish*, the victory of the king of gods Marduk is celebrated in a banquet;¹⁷⁶ and another famous banquet was organised by Ashurbanipal II to commemorate the completion of his palace in Nimrud.¹⁷⁷ Several Greek authors have reused this 'banquet' motif inherited by Near-Eastern sources and tales. Herodotus and Xenophon, for instance, employed it as historiographical tool especially to describe episodes of Achaemenid court life.¹⁷⁸ Often these stories concern gods, heroes or kings who struggle to control their dominion in convivial gatherings – what Hobden defines as 'politics in action' – which may have echoed the experience of Archaic drinking companions in the *symposia* described by Theognis' elegies.¹⁷⁹ *Theognidea*'s readers were probably familiar with these topics and traditions, especially in Cyprus where links with the Near-Eastern culture were stronger than in Greece. Therefore, since the commissioner of the Golgian dedication showed himself aware of how to behave in banquets by offering advice in the form of *gnōmai* to a *wanax*, 'lord', a fellow upper-class member, he validated his leading status according to a wider tradition, not exclusively Greek, with which Theognidean advice fits perfectly.

1.4 A Cypriot secret police

One of the roles of the *wanaktes*, according to Clearchus, was to receive reports from *Gerginoi* and order investigations by *Promalanges*. They were two 'families' of flatterers, κόλακες, of which each Cypriot monarch made use. According to Clearchus' tale, this investigative body, a sort of secret police, originated in Salamis. The *Gerginoi* supposedly descended from Trojans who were brought to Cyprus as captives by Teucer and acted as spies; they secretly mingled with the population in the streets and in the markets where they 'keep their ears open', ὠτακουστοῦσι, and reported information to the *wanaktes* every day.¹⁸⁰ The *Promalanges*, ἐρευνηταί, 'investigators', investigated some of the

¹⁷⁵ Bowie 2003, 99-109 with several examples.

¹⁷⁶ Vanstiphout 1992, 9-22.

¹⁷⁷ Grayson 1991, 288-293.

¹⁷⁸ Hobden 2013, 159-170 with several examples.

¹⁷⁹ Hobden 2013, 164.

¹⁸⁰ Athen. *Deipn.* 6.256 = Clear. fr. 19 Wehrli.

Gerginoi's reports if it was necessary. All the members of this secret police were covered by anonymity.

Clearchus' account probably has an aetiological character. The alleged Salaminian origins of this secret police as well as the *Gerginoi*'s descent from Teucer's slaves may be linked to the Salaminian royal propaganda at that time. The Salaminian dynasty, in fact, claimed to descend from Teucer and during the fourth century BC a dynastic cult connected to the mythical hero Teucer was probably established in this city-state.¹⁸¹ This is not surprising since in the classical and Hellenistic periods, each Cypriot dynasty claimed to have Greek origins related to one of the heroes who fought in the Trojan War – Evagoras, king of Salamis claimed descent from Teucer himself – or to have autochthonous origins related to Kinyras.¹⁸² This shift from Greek to local roots depended on the political needs of the moment and will be analysed in chapter six.¹⁸³

Clearchus welcomed the role of the Salaminian flatterers and despite portraying them as descended from Teucer's slaves, he called them εὐγενεῖς, 'of noble origins' (τὸ τῶν εὐγενῶν κολάκων γένος). They are described as 'reputable flatterers', 'ἐλλόγισμοι κόλακες', who were proud of the honours that the king paid to them. This section of Clearchus' tale may reflect some true elements of the Cypriot courts. Although the author does not provide more information on the honours reserved for these κόλακες, the palace administration conceivably paid for their maintenance since they worked for the government as 'intelligence'. But what real condition did Clearchus' account attempt to describe? Accounts found in the Idalion archive, written on *ostraka*, attest to the presence of individuals called ῥῆΜ, 'men', whose roles may be similar to that of the 'king's men' in Near Eastern palaces.¹⁸⁴ King's men were dependants of the palace such as specialised workers, artisans, cult officials, administrators, military specialists, nobles; they were men of a high social stratus but not always economically free since the palace controlled their

¹⁸¹ Baurain 2011, 121-155; Baurian 2014, 137-166; Cannavò 2015, 235-247; Giuffrida 1996, 616-617.

¹⁸² Isoc. 3.28; 8.18-19.

¹⁸³ Cayla 2018, 62-64.

¹⁸⁴ Amadasi 2017, 278; Briant 2002, 302-356; Rowe 2002, 1-19; Liverani, 1971, 329-356; Kuhrt 1995, 302; Pfoh 2016, 11.

livelihood. They were part of a hierarchical organisation headed by an elite which was supported by the king through land-grants. We might suppose that Clearchus' tale aims to describe a similar scenario. *Gerginoi* and *Promalanges* and all the Cypriot κόλακες may be a literary transposition of a sort of king's men who were employed in the Cypriot courts. The *wanaktes* mentioned by Clearchus were probably similar to the elite which headed the hierarchical system of the king's men. In the following chapters, the analysis of some case studies which concern land donations, administrative workers employed in the palace and military specialists will corroborate this theory. Moreover, inscriptions show that most of the administrative offices, plausibly held by palace employees, were hereditary.¹⁸⁵ Clearchus' account may emphasize this aspect when the author defines the Cypriot κόλακες as offspring, descendants from a single lineage.

If *Gerginoi* and *Promalanges* were a sort of king's men employed in the palace, their roles as members of a secret police may not be so implausible. King's men who acted as 'spies' were employed in the Achaemenid Empire – of which Cyprus was part – and, as Yon pointed out, the roles played by the Cypriot *Gerginoi* and *Promalanges* may be similar.¹⁸⁶ The Achaemenid secret agents were called 'Ears and Eyes of the king' and carried out a supervisory office especially in the peripheral areas of the Empire. These 'agents' are attested in several Greek sources. For instance, Xenophon testifies that Cyrus had the support of these 'Ears and Eyes', ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ τὰ βασιλέως ὄτα, a support repaid with gifts and honours – just as *Gerginoi* and *Promalanges* received honours from Cypriot kings in exchange for their service.¹⁸⁷ Ps. Aristotle and Pollux call them ὠτάκουσται, a term similar to the verb ὠτακουστοῦσι employed by Clearchus to describe the *Gerginoi*'s performance.¹⁸⁸ The presence of a similar institution in Cyprus may be confirmed by a scholion to the *Iliad* by Eustathius; it explains that in Cyprus, the *wanaktes* were members of a glorious order and that they were told every

¹⁸⁵ For instance, see Yon 2004, n° 1075 = Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 96-100, B 45.

¹⁸⁶ Briant 2002, 343-344.

¹⁸⁷ Xen. *Cyr.* 8.2.10; Xenophon and later authors testify to the presence of several ears and eyes of the king. However, other Greek sources attest to only one 'Eye' (Hdt. 1.114.1; Aesch. *Pers.* 978; Ar. *Achar.* 91; Plut. *Art.* 12.1-3; Xen, *Cyr.* 8.6.16; Hirsch 1985, 131-139; Balcer 1977, 252-263.

¹⁸⁸ Arist. *Mund.* 6.9; Poll 2.37.

relevant piece of news by the ὠτάκουσται on a daily basis.¹⁸⁹ Finally, a passage of *To Nicocles* testifies to the presence of ‘flatterers’ in the Salaminian court. Isocrates exhorts Nicocles to distinguish between the flatterers and the loyal servants and to listen carefully to what the men say to each other. According to Poldrugo, these lines may refer to the Cypriot ‘secret police’ too.¹⁹⁰ If a similar ‘intelligence organ’ existed, it allowed the Cypriot king and elite to monitor public opinion in order to prevent riots or conspiracies against the kingship. By controlling the subjects, the ‘secret police’ connected the king and the elite to the common inhabitants; it was one of the probably few government bodies which may have bridged the gap between the upper class and the local population.

1.5 Δῆμος and πόλις in the Cypriot city-kingdoms

Epigraphic documents, all dated to the fifth and fourth centuries BC, may confirm the presence of bodies of government beyond the king. One of the principal testimonies is the Idalion Bronze tablet, which will be discussed in detail in the following chapter. It includes the phrase *a-po-to-li-se e-ta-li-we-se*, ‘the *polis* of the Idalians’, which apparently was entitled to take important decisions along with the king.¹⁹¹ Other inscriptions reveal the existence of similar political institutions in other Cypriot city-kingdoms. One is a decree promulgated by king *-k]retes* of Kourion.¹⁹² The document is dated to 500-450 BC on the basis of palaeography. It is written in Paphian syllabary with the exception of the sign *ko* which is written according to the traditional syllabic system.¹⁹³ This allows us to fix the *terminus ante quem* of the inscription to the middle of the fifth century BC since the Paphian syllabary was employed in some Kourion documents during the archaic period and no longer used in the classical age.¹⁹⁴ The inscription consists of the following three lines: 1. *J-re-te-*

¹⁸⁹ Scholion to Hom. *Il.* 13.582 by Eustathius and T; Bowra 1934, 59.

¹⁹⁰ Poldrugo 2001, 40.

¹⁹¹ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Idalion n°1 = *ICS* 217; Georgiadou 2010, 151 with comments.

¹⁹² Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Kourion n°7 = *ICS* 108b; the inscription was found in the acropolis of Kourion close to the Basilica. In the upper part, it shows two indentations of identical shape, a sign that it was probably reused during the Hellenistic and Roman periods as part of some architectural structure (Karageorghis, Mitford 1964, 67-68).

¹⁹³ Karageorghis, Mitford 1964, 67-76.

¹⁹⁴ Kagan 2000, 39-40; for the independence of Kourion in the fourth century BC see footnote n°48.

se / o-sa-ta-[2.]-i-ni-se / o-ko-ri-o / pa-si-le-[3,]-ta-mo-te-ro-ne / ta-te / e-te-mi-[. The first part of the decree is translated as ‘the king of Kourion, ...-k]retes, son of Stasi- [...]’. Plausibly, the father of the king was not a king in turn, otherwise the title would have appeared in the text; instead, Stasi-[was likely a member of the upper class. The second part of the inscription uses the term *ta-mo-te-ro-ne*, a noun adjective probably related to the noun *dāmos*, ‘people’.¹⁹⁵ According to Egetmeyer, the suffix *-teron* is a plural genitive and has an independent value, not comparative.¹⁹⁶ *Ta-mo-te-ro-ne* can be translated as ‘those who belonged to the people’, as Egetmeyer has proposed. The word *e-te-mi [-* has been interpreted as a sigmatic aorist of the verb $\theta\epsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ and translated as ‘... decided’; the whole sequence might mean: ‘the king decided these things on behalf of those who are of the people’.¹⁹⁷ Lejeune proposed to identify the king *]re-te-se* as subject of the verb *e-te-mi-[* pointing out that although the sovereign established *ta-te* ‘these things’, the decision may have been taken by mutual agreement with the people or perhaps with representatives of the local population.¹⁹⁸ According to these readings, the inscription has been interpreted as a juridical document in which the king issued a decree concerning the inhabitants of Kourion. The text is however damaged and its interpretation is mostly based on reconstructions; therefore, it is difficult to establish whether the population had any role in the decision-making, as in Idalion.

But why are the Idalians mentioned as *a-po-to-li-se-i-ta-li-e-we-se*, ‘the city of the Idalians’ in the Bronze tablet, whereas, in Kourion the population seems to be called *dāmos*? Was there a difference between the Cypriot *polis* and the Cypriot *dāmos*? Clearly, the difference does not depend on the chronology since the two documents should be dated to the same years. But a new interpretation of the term *ta-mo-te-ro-ne* may provide an explanation. We may also read the sequence simply as ‘the king... decided among the *dāmoterōi*’. But who were the *dāmoterōi*? In ancient Greek, the term *dāmos*, indicates not

¹⁹⁵ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 271-272 §301; 298, §339.

¹⁹⁶ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 298-299 §339; in Mycenaean, a term with a similar ending is attested, *wa-na-ka-te-ro*; it is translated as ‘of the wanax’. Tsagrakis 2016, 201-216; Petrakis 2016, 62; Schwyzer 1950, 183 who linked this form to the archaism $\delta\eta\mu\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ used in the Hellenistic poetry.

¹⁹⁷ A similar reading has been proposed by Lejeune S. (2010, 219-230).

¹⁹⁸ Lejeune S. 2010, 222; the verb is reconstructed as *e-te-mi-sa-to/tu*, an aorist middle form. Egetmeyer 2010 vol I, 491 §605; see Mitford 1971, n°218; Masson 1983, 180b; Stylianou 1992, 405; Gallavotti 1977, 160-163.

only ‘population’ but also ‘territory’, or better, part of the territory, a ‘district’. The territories of the Cypriot city-states were subdivided into geographical areas, as the Bronze tablet clearly shows – and as we will see in the next chapter – but, very likely, they were also subdivided into administrative districts, as attested in inscriptions from Lapethos.¹⁹⁹ Therefore, the Kourion *dāmoteroi* may have been representatives of the population or of local territories/districts *dāmoi*. Not surprisingly, *dāmos* has this meaning also in Mycenaean Greek, to which the Cypriot dialect is very close.²⁰⁰

Πόλις, *po-to-li-se*, may be the favourite Cypriot Greek term used to identify the inhabitants of the city-states in the fifth and fourth centuries BC. The term πόλις appears in several Cypriot decrees during the Hellenistic period under the Ptolemies and the Romans as a product of further Hellenization.²⁰¹ The Cypriot alphabetic Greek inscriptions provide several examples. However, very few texts dating to before 312 BC – when the Ptolemies conquered the island – use the term *polis*. As said above, the word appears in the Idalion Bronze tablet and in a bilingual Eteocypriot-alphabetic Greek honorific decree in honour of Ariston, found in Amathus at the beginning of the twentieth century.²⁰² This inscription presents two problems: one is the date still debated by scholars; the other is the content and syntax of the Eteocypriot text. Both these arguments may shed some light on Amathus’ political institutions during

¹⁹⁹ These inscriptions will be analysed in chapter 6; Honeyman 1940, 57-67; Van den Branden 1964, 245-261; Szyner 1988, 59-61; Steele 2013, 189-191. Other similar examples come from Cypriot graffiti from Egypt. They show names followed by patronymics and by toponyms, perhaps the *dāmoi* from which the mercenaries came (Masson 1981, 252-284; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Egypt n°97; Heubeck 1976, 255, 257, 261).

²⁰⁰ On the Mycenaean *dāmos* see Lejeune 1972b, 135-154; Killen 2008, 157-200; for the etymology of *dāmos* see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 271-272 §301. The term *dāmos* is attested very rarely in the Cypriot *corpora*. It however appears in an *ostrakon* from Golgoi (Karageorghis 1970b, 269-272; Karageorghis 1971, 403-406; Karageorghis 1972, 1073-1074; Karageorghis 1973, 673; Masson 1989, 156-167 (with pictures) which bears lists of accounts and expenses from private houses and a calendar. It is not clear whether they concern proper names starting and ending in *-damos-*, the noun *dāmos* in nominative, which may indicate ‘people’ or ‘district’, or the adverb τῆμος repeated twice, perhaps to indicate ‘time after time’. This might be the most plausible option since the repetition of temporal adverbs was common in the Cypriot syllabic accounts (see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, 9 = ICS 318 *a-ma-ti a-ma-ti*, ‘day after day’; see also the Mycenaean *we-te-i we-te-i*, ‘year after year’ in PY Fr 1184).

²⁰¹ For some instances see Pouilloux *et al.* 1987, n°99; Cayla 2018, n°74 = Nicolaou 1991, 200 n° 21; n° 94.

²⁰² Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Amathus n°7 = ICS 196; Masson 1957, 61-80. Steele 2013, 105. The inscription is currently lost; Perna 2018, 213-220; Karnava 2018, 201-212.

the fourth century BC and provide further information on the Cypriot meaning of the term πόλις before the advent of the Ptolemaic domination.²⁰³

The first two lines of this decree, located at the top of the stone in a prestigious position, are written in Cypriot syllabary in the local Eteocypriot language. A sign separates this text from the following Greek alphabetic one which is shorter and apparently less informative.²⁰⁴ The alphabetic Greek text reads: ‘Ἡ πόλις Ἀμαθουσίῳν Ἀρίστωνᾶ, Ἀριστώνακτος εὐπατρίδην’, ‘The city-state of the Amathusians to Ariston, son of Aristonax of noble origins’. The Eteocypriot text might mention the ‘polis of Amathusians’ too. But this following discussion should be cautiously evaluated since our knowledge of the Eteocypriot language does not allow us to reach definitive conclusions. It reads: (1) *a-na | ma-to-ri | u-mi-e-sa- ∞ i-mu-ku-la-i-la-sa-na | a-ri-si-to-no-se | a-ra-to-wa-na-ka-so-we?-o-se* (2) *ke-ra-ke-re-tu-lo-se |/? ta-ka- ∞ na-•-•-so-ti | a-lo | ka-i-li-po-ti*. The second line is still obscure and the first one has given rise to many interpretations. Quattordio Moreschini tried to compare the sequence *a-na | ma-to-ri | u-mi-e-sa- ∞ i-mu-ku-la-i-la-sa-na* with the Greek formula of the Idalion bronze tablet *a-po-to-li-se e-ta-li-e-we-se*.²⁰⁵ Finally, she interpreted *u-mi-e-sa-i mu-ku-la-i-la-sa-na* as the Eteocypriot name of Amathus, *Amuklai*, perhaps of Semitic origins. Scholars have rarely accepted these proposals and always with reservations. Some agree that *u-mi-e-sa- ∞ i-mu-ku-la-i-la-sa-na* may conceal the autochthonous name of Amathus. If so, the Eteocypriot text would confirm that the city of Amathus honoured Ariston.²⁰⁶

The two texts, however, do not mention any king. This might be because they were written after the Ptolemies conquered the island, when Cypriot kings were overthrown. Building on Masson and Mitford’s views, Consani claimed that the bilingual decree shows a political reaction against Androcles’ regime

²⁰³ The inscription was found on the Acropolis of Amathous in 1913 and it has been used as a starting point to decipher some Eteocypriot words through the comparison of the content of the two texts. See Masson 1983, 206-207.

²⁰⁴ Consani 1988, 53.

²⁰⁵ Quattordio Moreschini 1988, 221-226. She endorsed Deroy’s theory in which *a-na* would be an article or a demonstrative pronoun and *ma-to-ri* should be the equivalent of πόλις. He translated it as ‘une portion de territoire soumise à l’autorité d’une communauté urbaine’, see Deroy 1956, 91-92; Petit 1997, 244-271.

²⁰⁶ But as Steele affirmed, ‘the isolation of a word in a sequence does not provide good basis for drawing parallels’. Therefore, we should be cautious. Steele 2013, 127; Petit 1997-1998, 251; on the name of Amathus, see Scafa 1993, 517-528; Scafa 1996, 159-163.

which had been distinctively ‘philhellene’.²⁰⁷ He pointed out that one of Androcles’ two bilingual inscriptions mentions a *thēsauros* dedicated by the king to the divinity. This practice was a common Greek one.²⁰⁸ In the other text, Androcles calls the Cyprian goddess by the Greek name ‘Aphrodite’. Moreover, the king dedicated crowns in the sanctuary of Delphi, which is another common Greek custom.²⁰⁹ Consani argued that the new ‘republican’ regime, or rather the oligarchic one – probably the most influent families kept control over the city – which was established after the death of Androcles needed to legitimise its power by promoting the values of an indigenous tradition, as shown by the Eteocyriot text, in sharp contrast to the ‘Hellenism’ of the previous sovereign.

However, we may advance some objections. Androcles’ policy reflects a general tendency of the last Cypriot sovereigns – Nicocles of Paphos provides an instance too – who Hellenised their customs according to an international process sped up by Alexander’s arrival.²¹⁰ Petit fixed the *terminus post quem* of the inscription to the arrival of Alexander in Cyprus in 332BC. He claimed that in Amathus, in official inscriptions, the alphabetic Greek would not appear before this event since this city-state had always used Eteocyriot in its official monumental texts.²¹¹ Moreover, in the bilingual decree, the privileged position of the Eteocyriot suggests that this centre still needed to show its autochthonous origins, probably to keep its independence.²¹² This must have happened before the conquest by the Ptolemies in 312-311BC – the date that Petit indicates as *terminus ante quem* for the decree. In Nea-Paphos, king Nicocles had to face the same dichotomy between innovation and tradition; thus, it is conceivable that the decree was composed when his contemporary Amathusian counterpart, king Androcles, was ruling.

²⁰⁷ Masson, Hermary 1982, 235-242.

²⁰⁸ On the Greek *thēsauroi* see Lykke 2017, 205-227; Fourrier, Hermary 2006, 152.

²⁰⁹ Consani 1988, 52.

²¹⁰ Mehel 1996, 127-152; Papantoniou 2013, 33-57.

²¹¹ Petit 2007, 100-101; some *ostraka* from the palace of Amathus, dated to the sixth century BC, show accounts and receipts in alphabetic Greek; see Aupert 2003, 107-121; Petit 1991, 481-495).

²¹² This was probably a general phenomenon of the end of the fourth century BC. During these years, another autochthonous language appears in some syllabic inscriptions from Golgoi, called Golgian, of which nothing is known. This language may have emerged because local inhabitants needed to stress their autochthonous origins in order to keep their independence after Alexander’s arrival. See Egetmeyer 2012, 427-434.

Moreover, the palaeographical analysis of the Greek letters allows us to date the document to the fourth century BC by comparison with two other Amathusian bilingual Eteocypriot-Greek dedications made by king Androcles to the Cyprian goddess. In both these dedications, the Eteocypriot text is located above the Greek one – but it is shorter than the Greek text and less accurate. These dedications are dated to 315-312 BC according to the stratigraphic analysis of the excavated layers.²¹³ These dedications show that Androcles was the last king of Amathus.

Therefore, the bilingual decree may have been issued by the *polis* of Amathus while still under the rule of a king, Androcles, who however is not mentioned in the text. Scholars have tried to understand the reasons for the missing name of the king. Petit pointed out that honorific decrees which were issued only by the inhabitants of a city instead of by both the king – or satrap – and the population are attested in Lycia and Caria under the Hekatomnid dynasty.²¹⁴ Petit claimed that, in all these centres, the sovereigns may take decisions, perhaps assisted by local institutions, although only the local inhabitants and their assemblies are mentioned in the decrees probably because of the necessity of gaining the support of the local population.²¹⁵ Petit's analysis focuses on the political scene of Asia Minor where political institutions below the king were deeply rooted in the structure of societies and had a high level of

²¹³ Masson, Hermery 1982, 237-244; Hellmann, Hermery 1980, 259-272; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Amathus n°17-18 = *ICS* 196d-e; Hansen 1989, n°873. The first inscription bears the Eteocypriot text]-i-te-o[. Although the sequence *i-te-o* might concern the Greek word θεός in genitive, it is very unlikely that a digraphic (Cypriot-syllabic and alphabetic Greek) inscription was written in Amathus where Eteocypriot has always been predominant. (Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Amathus n° 17). The Greek part of the inscription bears the text: 'Θησαυρόν Κυπρία και [...] -θέως ει[κόνα] μορ[φ]ῆ[ς] υιοῦ τήνδε ἀνέθηκε Αν[δ]ροκλής βασιλεύς', 'the king Androcles consecrated the *thēsauros* to Cypriot goddess and this image of the appearance of his son [...] -theus'. See Hellmann, Hermery 1980, 262; Hermery 1989b, 858; Steele 2013, 114. The Greek text is in elegiac couplets; perhaps the Eteocypriot part was in elegiac couplet too. For the uses of the *thēsauroi* during the late classical period see Kaminski 1991, 63-181 (related to oracular cults and warrior gods and heroes); Fourier, Hermery 2006, 152-154. As far as the other dedication is concerned (Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Amathus n°18 = *ICS* 196e), the Eteocypriot-Amathusian part bears the text]-ro-ko-ra-?-a-to-ro-ke-le-we-se-e-ro-ko-ro-[; meanwhile the Greek text might be reconstructed as 'Β[ασιλεύς Ανδροκλής [approx. 27 letters] Ὀρ[ε]σθέως και Ανδραγόρου Κυπρία Ἀφροδίτη', 'The king Androcles... of Orestis and Andragoras to the Cyprian Aphrodite'. See Hermery, Masson 1982, 238; Steele 2013, 113. The Eteocypriot text of the second inscription bears the sequence -ro-ko-ra, which Steele identified as the Eteocypriot Amathusian form for king. It should be the equivalent of the Greek βασιλεύς (Steele 2013, 129).

²¹⁴ Petit 2007, 100; see also *Syll.*³ n°167; *Syll.*² n°573 = *SEG* XV, 665 = Hornblower 1982, n°M4; Dupont-Sommer 1979, 129-178.

²¹⁵ Petit 2007, 100.

decision-making power – very different from the Cypriot one, where local kings preserved a higher degree of independence than the Carian *dynastai* who depended on Achaemenid rule.

Nevertheless, Amathus’ political system might show some similarities. In the bilingual decree for Ariston, the absence of the king may have been the product of a planned political choice. We may suppose that the king of Amathus wanted to please the Amathusians and let them appear alone in the decrees; he may have given them a considerable freedom of choice, perhaps more than the kings in other Cypriot city-states.²¹⁶

Alternatively, Amathusian decrees do usually not show the name of the king. The Amathusian upper class and kings had Greek names – it is still unclear if this was due to the Greek origins of the elite unlike most of the local native inhabitants or to the prestige that a Greek name had for them – but no Greek names appear in any of the other Eteocypriot documents, except for a text engraved on a lintel of a monumental tomb.²¹⁷ Either none of the ancient Eteocypriot inscriptions was an official decree, despite the layout, or in Amathus official decrees did not usually bear the name of the king.

The one exception, the inscription on the tomb’s lintel reads in line 2: ‘
**•-ma /?/ ta-ki /?/ e-ro-ko-ro /? ko // sa-o-na-sa-ko-ra-no-ti /?/ te-ja // XX II we-
 ro-ra // o-na-sa-ko-ra-ke // pa-po-no // a-sa-to-wa-na-ka-so-we**’.²¹⁸ According

²¹⁶ According to Petit, in this decree the term εὐπατρίδης may mean ‘member of the upper-class’ (Petit 2007, 102; Masson 1983, 207; Steele 2013, 128; for εὐπατρίδης in Athens see Sealey 1962, 512-514).

²¹⁷ Petit 2007, 101; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Amathus n°6 = ICS 195; Steele 2013, 106-108; Steele 2013, 164; Hermay 2005, 20. Steele pointed out that we are not be able to read Eteocypriot names. However, we are able to recognise specific non-Greek suffixes related to anthroponyms and they always appear only with syllabic signs that can be identified as Greek names. Sittig 1914, 194-202; Pedersen 1930, 962-969; Pedersen 1938, 161-165. Generally, Amathusian coins bear Greek names, written in Cypriot syllabary – though an exception might be the suffix *-so* in the name *pu-ro-wo-so* (Markou 2018, 221-290). Along with this inscription, the lintel also bears another text written by a different hand. See Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Amathus n°5 = ICS 194. The date of the text is controversial. It has been apparently reused in a tomb dated to the classical period. Some scholars, therefore, dated the text to the archaic era. However, this is not possible to prove.

²¹⁸ I have adopted here the new reading of Massimo Perna, in bold (Perna 2018, 213-220). Thanks to his new interpretation, a sign previously read as *ko* has been identified as *we*, H, often attested in the suffix of the patronymics *o-we-o*. Perna’s new reading let us to identify a new anthroponym *ko-i-ro-so-we-o* attested in line 3 and 4. Although this name is not attested in Classical Greek, it is common in Mycenaean and attested in Homer too. Thus, this might be a local anthroponym preserved over the years, a legacy from an original Greek-Mycenaean name rather than the first Eteocypriot anthroponym that scholars have been able to recognise. For the traditional reading *-o-ko-o* see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Amathus n°5 = ICS 194.

to Petit, the term *e-ro-ko-ro* may indicate king. He notices that *e-ro-ko-ro* is also attested in one of the bilingual dedication of Androcles after the name of the king]*ro-ko-ra*•*a-to-ro-ke-le-we-se-e-ro-ko-ro*].²¹⁹ In the epitaph, *e-ro-ko-ro* may be related to the name *o-na-sa-ko-ra-no-ti* – where Onesagoras would be the name of the king and *a-no-ti* a preposition similar to *a-na*, frequently attested at the beginning of the ‘Eteocypriot’ texts.²²⁰ If we want to go further, one may notice that in the same line, another word which mentions Onesagoras is preceded by a number *XXII*, *XX II we-ro-ra // o-na-sa-ko-ra-ke*. After this sequence, the text bears *pa-po-no // a-sa-to-wa-na-ka-so-we*, which is read as a patronymic.²²¹ If this interpretation is correct, perhaps we might be facing a dating formula with the number 22, perhaps the 22^o year of reign of king Onesagoras, followed by his genealogy – ‘son of Astowanax’. If so, in Amathus, the name of the king would appear only in dating formulas and direct dedications made by the sovereigns as it happened in other areas of the Achaemenid Empire such as Caria and Lycia.²²²

Unfortunately, this last point remains impossible to prove since our knowledge of the Eteocypriot language is still at a very early stage. It is evident, however, that at the end of the fourth century BC, Amathus, like other city-kingsdoms, had political institutions beyond the kingship, which most likely developed before the end of the reign of Androcles, the last king of Amathus. It is not clear whether the decision to honour Ariston had been taken by an assembly of Amathusians. If so, in the bilingual decree, *πόλις* would indicate the community of the Amathusians who decided, perhaps in an assembly, to celebrate Ariston. However, the extent of the *πόλις*’ decision-making power is unclear.

²¹⁹ Petit 1995b, 57-58; Petit 1997-1998, 249-250; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Amathus n°18 = *ICS* 196e; by contrast, Steele claims that the noun *-]ro-ko-ra*, which precedes the name Androcles, may be the Eteocypriot term meaning ‘king’ (see Steele 2013, 129).

²²⁰ Steele 2013, 125-127; *a-no-ti* is also attested in *ICS* 194. *A-na* is a ‘diagnostic feature’ to understand whether an inscription is Eteocypriot but unfortunately, its meaning is still controversial. See Masson E. 1979, 408; Masson 1983, 205-206; Aupert 1996, 40; Pedersen 1930, 963; Scafa 1993, 518; Egetmeyer 2010b, 85-87; Hermary, Masson 1990, 214 about a Cypriot-Egyptian graffito with *a-na*.

²²¹ Steele 2013, 132; for the analysis of the Eteocypriot patronymic and its occurrences see Steele 2013, 134.

²²² The new reading of Perna strengthens us to identify *ka-ra-ke-re-tu-lo-se* as equivalent of *ἐπατρίδης*, a title also mentioned in the bilingual decree quoted above.

It is remarkable that very few documents dated to the fourth century BC use the term *polis*: probably two written in syllabary, one in Greek, and perhaps another in Eteocypriot. This might indicate that the authority of the king and that of a powerful upper class counted for most in the government of the city-states at the expense of other governing institutions which did not hold substantial roles. The role of the *polis* conceivably increased when the Cypriot city-kingdoms disappeared. Other documents dated to the end of the fourth century BC, that will be analysed in the following paragraphs, may lead to this conclusion.

1.5 ‘I do solemnly swear...’: an oath of allegiance as testimony of Cypriot royal supremacy

Having established that the classical Cypriot city-kingdoms were likely to have had other governmental bodies beyond the king, we need to better understand the extent to which citizens were effectively represented and whether they had true decision-making power. Although the local population appears in official decrees and as a contracting party in the donation of territories along with the βασιλεύς in the Idalion Bronze tablet, as we shall see, it seems that the sovereign preserved his power effectively.²²³ In this regard, some suggestions come from a Paphian inscription. The document is dated between 325 and 309 BC since it was written in the peculiar Paphian syllabary introduced by Nicocles, which will be analysed in detail in the final chapter.²²⁴ These years were critical for the king; he tried to keep his city-kingdom independent against the Diadochi who were fighting to own and subjugate the island and its city-states.²²⁵ We should take into account such a historical-political background when we attempt to interpret the inscription.

The text of the inscription consists of seven lines but it is rather damaged since it is written on a marble stone broken off on the top right.²²⁶ However, the last two lines are almost totally intact and this has allowed scholars to easily

²²³ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Idalion n°1 = *ICS* 217; a detailed discussion will follow in the next chapter.

²²⁴ Olivier 2013, 7-26.

²²⁵ Diod. 20.21.

²²⁶ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Paphos n° 3 = *ICS* 8; Mitford 1961, 577-578; Masson 1980b, 76-78.

understand the main topic of the document. Lines 6 and 7 state that [*ta-se —/?-o-mo-mo-ko-ne / to-no-ro-ko-ne to-te ma-na-i e-ko* (7) [*to-no-ro-ko-ne-to-te* ‘δας] ὁμώμοκον τὸν ὄρκον τό(ν)δε μὰ ναὶ ἐγὼ 7 [τὸν ὄρκον τό(ν)δε]. According to some previous editors, namely Egetmeyer and Masson, the sequences should be translated as ‘I have sworn this oath; may I (observe?) this oath’. Although the translation of the last part is still controversial, it is clear that the main content of the inscription is an oath, *to-no-ro-ko-ne*. This noun is preceded by *o-mo-mo-ko-ne*, a hapax pluperfect of the verb ὀμνῶμι, which is always used in an oath-making context.²²⁷ This prompted the editor to read the sequence *ma na-i* as two words which would correspond to the Attic Greek μὰ ναί, a formula frequently attested in oaths.²²⁸

Taking a step back to the beginning of the text, the first line is completely lost and impossible to reconstruct. The second line, at the very end, after a lacuna of 23 signs, shows the word *pa]-si-le-wo-se*, in genitive, ‘of the king’. According to this, we may conclude that this is probably an oath for the king and very likely a loyalty oath.

The following lines may confirm this theory. Line 3 presents, at the very end too, *me-te / to-po-le-mi-o-ne /*, ‘and not the enemy’, in accusative, followed by a lacuna of two or three signs. Line 4 starts with a lacuna of 12 signs followed by *me* and a further lacuna of two more signs. The line ends with *ka-sa-i-me-ta-ne me-te \pa-si-le*. The previous editors suggest that we read it as ‘ξαι με(?) τάν(ν)ε (?) μήτε βασιλή-’, perhaps too many words since this sequence leaves no room for the vertical trait that appears in all the other lines. The text seems to present several sentences which start with μήτε, a conjunction that can be followed by an optative. Therefore, I propose to reconstruct the last sign of line 3 as [*to*] or [*to-ne*] and the sequence of line 4 as [*e-pi-o-ta-ne me-te tu-na-i-me-ta*] *me-[te te]-ka-sa-i-me-ta-ne*, [ἐπίοντα μήτε δυνάμεθ’ ἄν] μή[τε δε]ξαίμεθ’ ἄν μήτε βασιλή-, ‘if we may not endure and withstand the onslaught of the enemy, and if the king...’, where both the verbs are aorist optatives.²²⁹

²²⁷ Sommerstein 2014, 76-85.

²²⁸ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 552 §696.

²²⁹ Masson (1980, 65-80) supposed that the lacuna consists of 12 signs but, according to the image of the inscription, it is more plausible to suppose a lacuna of maximum 10 signs. Therefore, we could also integrate the text without the first μήτε. However, if we interpret the syllables *-ta-ne* as -θ’ ἄν, ‘if’, at the end of the verb, we must suppose that the traditional Cypriot

Moreover, the sequence ‘δέχομαι τοὺς πολεμίους ἐπιόντας’ is frequently attested in historical Greek texts.²³⁰ The following lines concern the sons and the brothers of the king but their interpretation is still controversial.

During the last years of the fourth century BC, the Paphian court was preparing for an eventual attack of an enemy. In case the situation turned unfavourable, the king probably asked one or more members of the upper class to take an oath of loyalty to the king. These events may be related to the accounts of Diodorus and Polyaeus, who claimed that Nicocles secretly made an alliance with Antigonus in order to get rid of Ptolemy. This triggered the reaction of the king of Egypt who sent Agreos and Kallikrates to besiege Nicocles’ palace.²³¹ The Cypriot city-states were facing critical moments and their independence was endangered; thus, the king of Paphos might have been concerned about the loyalty of his subjects and probably asked them to take an oath.²³² This shows that the authority of the king was in danger but that the sovereign still had the power to impose a coercive oath. This was the prelude to the end of the Cypriot city-kingdoms, when the *polis* started to gain ground with its institutions and its representatives.

Finally, a dedication found in the sanctuary of Palaipaphos, written in verse, praises the *polis* of Paphos and at the same time, the king. The *polis* is called εὐρύχορος, ‘with wide spaces’, a Homeric epithet.²³³ According to Cayla’s commentary on the inscription, it particularly fits with the greatness of this city-kingdom divided between old and new capitals and ruled under the ὄρμη, ‘the impulse’, of Nicocles celebrating his authority.²³⁴ But although the term *polis* appears in a Cypriot classical decree and a legal agreement, which

form *e-ke* or *ke*, ‘if’, (Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 552, §695, §696) has been substituted by the Greek attic form of the κοινή.

²³⁰ Hdt. 3.54; 8.28; Id. 7.77; in the Cypriot inscription, line five, *J-mo-i pa-te-ne e-ka-si-ke-ne-to-se e-pa-i*, is also problematic. It is usually translated as ‘suffering because of brothers or because of sons’ but the content is not clear (Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Paphos n°3; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 211 §232).

²³¹ Polyaeus 8.48; this information comes mainly from Diodorus’ account (Diod. 20.21). However, the text presents several philological problems which should be properly discussed in an appropriate place. Most of the manuscripts, in fact, confound Nicocles of Paphos with Nikokreon of Salamis. See Markou 2011, 291 with bibliography; Chavane, Yon 1978, 304-305.

²³² Faraone 2005, 142.

²³³ Cf. *e.g.* Il. 2.498.

²³⁴ Cayla 2018, n°2; Voskos 1997, 248-251; Voskos 2000, 171-181; Hansen 1989, n° 869.

could perhaps be read as an opening towards more ‘republican’ institutions, the sovereign’s leadership and authority was indisputable.²³⁵

The analysis so far allows us to define the fundamental features of the classical Cypriot *polis*: it was a small politically autonomous city-state that, although ruled by a king, showed a sense of community as emerges from the epigraphic documents. The population may have been represented by local institutions, which will be more fully analysed in the following chapters. However, their legislative authority seems to be limited compared to those of the sovereign and of the upper class.

Conclusion

Kingship was a consistent feature of Cypriot city-states. Despite the presence of more ‘republican’ institutions such as the *polis* in classical inscriptions, the power of the king was stable and longstanding. Cypriot *basileis* were supported by an elite of well-educated nobles and members of the royal family called *wanaktes*. This upper class was set far above the lower strata of the society. It probably took part in the government of the city-states by advising the king in taking his decisions. These *wanaktes* may have also headed an ‘intelligence body’ constituted of palace employees who reported information collected in markets and streets to the highest members of the court. This secret police allowed the king and the upper class to gather information about public opinion in order to prevent riots and conspiracies that may have undermined the stability of the government. At the same time, king and elite may have shared at least some of their power with local bodies and citizen assemblies.

²³⁵ Mehl 2016, 51-64; although the content of Mehl’s studies is substantially different, he also concludes that the power of the Cypriot kings remained stable; Körner 2020, 153-162, particularly 159-60.

The Idalion bronze tablet

Cypriot political and administrative institutions in the fifth and fourth centuries BC

2.1 Establishing the chronology

The Idalion bronze tablet is the most significant document of the Cypriot-syllabic corpus. It is a bronze *tabula ansata* (about 21x14 cm), inscribed with 31 lines, 16 on the *recto* and 15 on the *verso*. It was found by local farmers during amateur excavations on the Amplieri hill in Idalion along with weapons and other bronze objects, but not *in situ*. As lines 27-28 of the text state, it should originally have been located in the temple of Athena to confer legal value to the document.²³⁶ Because of its shape and quality, it is likely that the bronze was displayed to the public and not kept in the temple's archive.²³⁷ The tablet concerns the allocation of lands in perpetual usufruct to Onasilos, a physician, and to his family. This juridical text is useful to reconstruct the political-administrative system of Idalion. Moreover, since it is the longest document written in syllabary, it provides a vivid example of the Greek Cypriot grammar and lexicon.²³⁸

Before focusing on Idalion's political and administrative systems, we must date the document. The first lines mention a siege conducted by Kitians and Persians at the expense of the Idalians, *o-te / ta-po-to-li-ne-e-ta-li-o-ne / ka-te-wo-ro-ko-ne-ma-to-i / ka-se-ke-ti-e-we-se*, 'when the Medes (Persians) and

²³⁶ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Idalion n° 1= ICS 217; for other editions of the tablet see, for instance, Schwyzer 1923, n°679 and Georgiadou 2010, 145; Georgiadou 2015; Cowgill 1961, 343-365; Adrados 1972, 79-86; Rosen 1982, 932; Quattordio Moreschini 1988, 221-226; Lejeune 1994, 3-5; Schmitt 1995, 1-4; Egetmeyer 1993, 39-59; Egetmeyer 2004, 101-113. According to Masson (1983, 233-235), the document was found before 1850 by Hadjigiorkis, the owner of the field in Amplieri. Peretié, the French chancellor of Beirut, bought the land of the farmer Hadjigiorkis. He also organised the sale of the tablet and of other objects to Honoré-Albert de Luynes. In 1862, Luynes' collection was moved to the Cabinet des Médailles in Paris, where the tablet is still held (inv. Bronzes n°2297); see Georgiadou 2010, 144.

²³⁷ Often, legal documents were written on bronze but stored in temples' archives and not displayed, as in the case of the Bulwer tablet – though a clay tablet – discussed in the following chapters.

²³⁸ Egetmeyer 2004, 101-113; Egetmeyer 2006, 707-712; Egetmeyer 1993, 39-59; Cowgill 1964, 343-365; Colvin 2007, 86-92.

Kitians had the city of Idalion under siege'.²³⁹ When did the siege occur? Georgiadou has provided a summary of the *status quaestionis* on the date of the tablet. She claims that it should be dated to the first quarter of the fifth century BC. According to the information provided by coins and a couple of Phoenician inscriptions, the Kitians conquered Idalion during the reign of Ozibaal, who is cited in those texts as king of both Kition and Idalion.²⁴⁰ This date establishes the *terminus ante quem* of the bronze tablet. According to the content of the Bronze, Idalion is still an independent city-state when the document was written since the siege had not been successful.²⁴¹

But when did Ozibaal subject Idalion? Scholars agree that the sanctuary of Athena in the acropolis, where the tablet was stored, was destroyed when the city-kingdom was conquered by the Kitians and never rebuilt.²⁴² The Swedish expedition – the first ‘scientific’ archaeological excavation conducted in this city-state – dated the destruction of the sanctuary to 470 BC. Swedish archaeologists pointed out that the absence of a specific kind of ceramic – VI class – in some layers shows that the building stopped being occupied at the end of the Cypriot archaic period.²⁴³ According to Georgiadou and Hermary, these archaeological data still provide the most plausible evidence to date the conquest of the city-state.²⁴⁴ These data disagree, however, with the information coming from the numismatic record as analysed by Markou. She tried to establish the chronology of the reign of Ozibaal by studying some coins found in monetary treasures along with Ozibaal’s coins and particularly some of Ozibaal’s overstruck coins which originally came from Aegina and Athens and were subsequently reused in Kition.²⁴⁵ This typology of Athenian and Aeginetan coins is dated to 457-446 BC.²⁴⁶ Hoards found in other locations all over the

²³⁹ “Ὅτε τὰ(ν) πόλιν Ἰδάλιον κατέφορον Μᾶδοι κὰς ΚετιῆΦες”. The term Μᾶδοι is also attested in an *ostrakon* from Idalion, see Egetmeyer 2008, 997-1020. For κατέφορον see footnote 267.

²⁴⁰ Markou 2011, 74-75; Yon 2004, n° 45-46; Teixidor 1972, 433-434; Honeyman 1939, 104-106, n° 3-7; Peckham 1968, 17.

²⁴¹ Georgiadou 2010, 162.

²⁴² Gjerstad 1935, 460-463; Gjerstad 1948, 480-81; Gjerstad 1979, 240.

²⁴³ Gjerstad 1935, 618-828; Gjerstad 1948, 479-481; Gjerstad 1979, 240. Gjerstad changed his mind several times on the date of the Idalion Bronze tablet; Georgiadou 2010, 162-163

²⁴⁴ Georgiadou 2010, 163; Hermary 2005b, 99-126; Ulbrich 2011, 183-210.

²⁴⁵ Markou 2011, 76; Amandry 1984, 58-65; Amandry, 1997, 35-44.

²⁴⁶ Markou 2011, 76; Destrooper-Georgiades 2002, 351-368. For the first typology of coins see Destrooper-Georgiades 2002b, 8. On the second typology from Aegina see Noe 1954, 90; Picard 1978, 330-333; Destrooper-Georgiades 1996, 103-109, who specified that there are at least 9

Mediterranean – which also have some coins of Ozibaal – confirm this chronology.²⁴⁷

Further proof comes from more recent excavations conducted by Stager and Walker. Their archaeological reports date the massive destruction of the houses of Idalion's lower city – very likely due the conquest of the Kitians – to 450 BC; plausibly, the temple of Athena suffered the same fate.²⁴⁸ A few finds of the previous Swedish excavation might also confirm this. Gjerstad found some post-archaic coins in the most recent layer of the sanctuary but he dismissed them as intrusive. However, they can be taken as evidence for the destruction of the sanctuary in the classical period.²⁴⁹ According to these data, the *terminus ante quem* of the tablet may be established to 450 BC since both archaeological and epigraphic records lead to this conclusion: the tablet was written during the first fifty years of the fifth century BC. But when precisely?

Scholars have often related the siege to historical events which involve the intervention of the Persians since they are mentioned in the text.²⁵⁰ One obvious candidate is the Ionian Revolt, 499-494 BC, in which – according to

coins of Ozibaal overstruck on Aegina's coins with sea or ground turtles. See also Mattingly 1989, 60.

²⁴⁷ Markou 2011, 77 with bibliography and table of the date of the other treasures.

²⁴⁸ Stager and Walker (1989) also hypothesised that these houses were close to fortifications built after 475 BC, which however were not destroyed by the Kitians since they used them in turn to defend the city. This statement has been challenged by other scholars (see Georgiadou 2010, 163; Hadjicosti 1997, 54-60) who affirmed that Cypriots usually fortified only the main palace and not the lower city. See also Maier 1985, 34-36; Stager, Walker 1989, 462-465; Georgiadou 2010, 164; for the inhabited centre in Idalion see Gaber 2018, 1-16 and Gaber 2008, 52-63. For a different interpretation on a possible siege of Idalion see Lipinski 2004, 90-91).

²⁴⁹ Alin 1978, 91-109; Stager, Walker 1989, 464. Moreover, although the initial archaeological reports of the excavation of the Idalion palace – organised by the Department of Antiquities of Cyprus – dated the main building from the fifth to the fourth century BC, one of the *ostraka* found in the palace's archive should be unequivocally dated to the Hellenistic period since it mentions Antigonos as ruler of the island. Therefore, we might assume that generally, a lower chronology of the site is more plausible. Hadjicosti 1995, 25-31; Hadjicosti 1997, 49-73 and particularly 60 where she claims that the complex is dated to the early classical period; Hadjicosti 1999, 35-54; Amadasi, Zamora López 2018, 77-97 for the *ostrakon*.

²⁵⁰ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Idalion n° 1 l. 1 = ICS 217 l.1. On the different dates proposed for the tablet see ICS 217 (470 BC) and Georgiadou 2010, 159 (498 BC) who also provides an analysis of all the following studies; Meyer 1901-1902, 305 (499-498 BC); Gjerstad 1935, 625 (499-498 BC); Gjerstad 1948, 479-480 (478-470 BC); Gjerstad 1979, 240 (499-498 BC); Spyridakis 1937, 77 (477-470 BC); Maier 1985, 4; Stylianou 1989, (498-470BC); Karageorghis 1990, 149 (479-450 BC); Collombier 1991, 34 (478-470 BC) but Collombier 1995, 381 (499 BC); Petit 1991b, 163 (499-498BC); Yon 1992, 245 (479-470BC); Yon 2004b, 116 (470BC); Tuplin 1996, 45 (478 BC); Hermary 2005b, 101 (first half of the fifth century BC); Raptou 1999, 228 (first half of the fifth century); Tatton-Brown 2002, 245 (478-445 BC); Hatzopoulos 2011, 499-507 (499-498 BC); Hill 1940, 155 (450-445 BC); Meiggs 1972, 484 (450 BC); Destrooper-Georgiades 1985, 102 (after 470 BC); Stager, Walker 1989, 464 (second half of the fifth century BC).

Herodotus' account – all the Cypriot polities, with the exception of Amathus, took part.²⁵¹

Stylianou indeed suggested that the Idalion siege was related to these events and dated it to 498 BC.²⁵² He argued that the Persians in response to the Ionian Revolt besieged Idalion, a Greek Cypriot πόλις which had rebelled, and were helped by the Kitians. Another possible date is in the period 478-470 BC. According to Thucydides, in 478 BC Pausanias led an allied Greek fleet against the island to take possession of some territories ruled by the Persian Empire.²⁵³ Gjerstad and Masson assumed that the Kitians took advantage of such a political climate and, with the support of the Achaemenids, started an aggressive campaign against the closest 'Greek' Cypriot city-state to gain possession of its territory.²⁵⁴

By contrast, Spyridakis proposed a more recent date.²⁵⁵ He claimed that the presence of 'democratic' magistracies in the Bronze tablet was due to an Athenian influence, developed after the campaigns of the Delian league, and particularly after the expedition to Cyprus led by Cimon in 450 BC.²⁵⁶ Spyridakis dated the tablet to 470 BC but, as Georgiadou claimed, 450 BC would have been a date more compatible with his analysis. However, as we shall see, none of the 'democratic elements' needs to be specifically related to the Athenian 'democracy'.

In order to decide the most plausible of these dates, we must set other chronological limits. A further numismatic analysis might provide the *terminus post quem* of the siege. The last emission of coins from Idalion shows a sphinx with the head of Athena, the patron deity of the city, with lotus flowers and the

²⁵¹ Hdt. 5.104.1-3 Κύπριοι δὲ ἑθελονταί σφι πάντες προσεγένοντο πλὴν Ἀμαθουσίων: 'All the Cyprians of their own free will joined them, except the people of Amathus;' and 12-15; 5.108.2; 109-112.2-6. See Nenci 1994, 313; 315-316; 317-324 who however offers an outdated comment; Stylianou 1989, 425; Karageorghis 2004, 1-7; for a different interpretation see Tuplin 1996, 77.

²⁵² Stylianou 1989, 375-530 (498-470 BC).

²⁵³ Thuc. 1.94.1-2; Diod. 11.44.1-2; Plut. *Arist.* 23; Plut. *Kim.* 6; Hornblower 1991, 140-141; Gomme 1945, who dated the expedition to 477 BC. On Pausanias' ambition see Jaffe 2017, 125-127; Cawkwell 2005, 126 where he pointed out that, apparently, no Persian naval force challenged this expedition.

²⁵⁴ Georgiadou 2010, 169-170; Petit 1991b, 163-166; Meyer 1901, 198-200; Tuplin 1996, 44-45; Stylianou 1989, 375-530.

²⁵⁵ Spyridakis 1937, 75-77; on this point see also Georgiadou 2010, 162.

²⁵⁶ Parker 1976, 30-38; Diod. 12.3-4 – who perhaps followed Ephorus; Thuc. 1.112.2-4; Plut. *Cim.* 18-19.1; Isocr. 8.86; *Suda* s. Κίμων. For minor sources see Parker 1976, 30 n. 4; Barnes 1953-1954, 163-176 for a different chronological analysis.

syllable *sa* as legend.²⁵⁷ According to Destrooper-Georgiades, *sa* might indicate the beginning of the name Stasikypros in Cypriot syllabic.²⁵⁸ This emission was dated to 470 BC or later according to stratigraphic analysis and also because none of these coins is present in the Larnaca treasure which was buried between 480-470 BC. Therefore, it is plausible that the *sa* coins were struck in a later period.²⁵⁹ Of course *sa* might be the first syllable of a different, unattested royal name but since archaeological evidence dates the end of the independence of Idalion to 450BC it seems more than just a coincidence that during the last 20 years of independence, some Idalion coins bear the legend *sa* which corresponds to the beginning of the name *Stasikypros*, the king mentioned in the Idalion Tablet.²⁶⁰ If these coins bear the legend of king Stasikypros, the siege should be dated between 470 and 450 BC.

Within the timeframe we have thus established, another relevant historical event may have triggered the Achaemenid military intervention in Idalion. Greek sources describe the Eurymedon battle as a complete defeat for the Achaemenid fleet. Ephorus highlights Cimon's success when he attacked the Achaemenid ships before they received 'Phoenician' reinforcements from Cyprus, 80 ships which were supposed to join the 350 Persian ships.²⁶¹ After such a failure, the Achaemenids were keen to counteract the defeat by strengthening the position of their Cypriot allies. The resources of this city-state would have increased Kition's wealth and prosperity and consequently, facilitated the construction and maintenance of triremes and of the *neōria*, the military harbour, at Kition.²⁶²

²⁵⁷ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Idalion n°13-14 = *ICS* 228; Georgiadou 2010, 165-167.

²⁵⁸ Destrooper-Georgiades 1985, 102 n°42; Destrooper-Georgiades 1984, 141-144; Destrooper-Georgiades 2002, 353; Hill 1940, 155.

²⁵⁹ Georgiadou 2010, 166; *IGCH* n°1272; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, 882-883; also the coins of Baalmalik I are not attested in the Larnaca treasure; see Destrooper-Georgiades 1984, 159 n°140; Kraay 1976, 301-306; Gjerstad 1979, 240; Amandry 1986, 37-38; for the Idalian coins see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Idalion n°13-14 = *ICS* 228; Masson 1996, 37-39 on the name of the city Idalion on these coins; Gjerstad 1979, 240 n°1; more recently Kagan 1999, 33-44 who compared the legend with the name of Idalion with that of some coins from Kourion; on the iconography with the sphinx see Sheedy 1999, 281-284.

²⁶⁰ Markou 2011, 285 for other legends with names starting with *sa*- see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 41-42.

²⁶¹ Ephor. *FGrH* 70 F191; Thuc. 1.100; Plut. *Cim.* 12.2; Diod 11.62. The battle was a great Greek success by land and by sea, see Paus.10.15.3; Hornblower 1991, 152 with all the bibliography; Green P. 2010, 65-66; for a very detailed commentary see Gomme 1945, 286-295.

²⁶² This topic will be fully developed in the following chapters; meanwhile see Sourisseau, Yon 2010, 57-67.

Unfortunately, the date of the Eurymedon battle is still controversial. Generally, it is dated between 469BC and 466BC.²⁶³ Therefore we may assume that the siege mentioned in the tablet took place between 469/66BC and 450BC. This date agrees with the archaeological and epigraphic data, and also with the numismatic data if we accept that *sa* in the legend of the Idalion coins is related to Stasikypros, and with the information from literary sources.

2.2 The eponymous magistrate and the *polis*: institutional representatives beyond the king

Scholars usually divide the text of the tablet into four sections: the reason for the agreement; the payment for Onasilos and his brothers; the payment exclusively for Onasilos; and final additional guarantees such as the protection of Athena and the curse formula against those who do not respect the agreement.²⁶⁴ More precisely, the first and second payment for Onasilos and his brothers and for Onasilos alone might be subdivided in turn into announced payment, real payment and penalty clause.²⁶⁵ The first lines appear as a narrative account more than as the beginning of a legal agreement; they read:

1. o-te | ta-po-to-li-ne-e-ta-li-o-ne | ka-te-wo-ro-ko-ne-ma-to-i | ka-se-ke-ti-e-we-se | i-to-i | pi-lo-ku-po-ro-ne-we-te-i-to-o-na-sa-ko 2.ra-u | pa-si-le-u-se | sa-ta-si-ku-po-ro-se | ka-se-a-po-to-li-se | e-ta-li-e-we-se | a-no-ko-ne-o-na-si-lo-ne | to-no-na-si-ku-po 3.ro-ne-to-ni-ja-te-ra-ne | ka-se | to-se | ka-si-ke-ne-to-se | i-ja-sa-ta-i | to-se | a-to-ro-po-se | to-se | i-ta-i | ma-ka-i | i-ki 4.ma-me-no-se | a-ne-u | mi-si-to-ne ...

‘When the Medes (Persians) and the Kitians besieged the city of Idalion, in the year of Philokypros, son of Onasagoras, king Stasikypros and the city of the Idalians called the physician Onasilos, son of Onasikypros, and his brothers, to treat people who were wounded in the battle, without payment...’.

²⁶³ Hornblower (1991, 151-154) dated the battle to 467 BC since it should have happened before the siege of Thasos (Diod. 11-70; Thuc. 1.100.2-101.3; Plutarch, *Cim* 14.2) very likely dated to 465BC and after the siege of Naxos. On the discussion about the chronological order of these events, see Hornblower 1991, 153; by contrast, Cawkwell (2005, 127) dated the Eurymedon battle to 469 BC.

²⁶⁴ Egetmeyer 2010, vol. II, Idalion n°1 = *ICS* 217: Egetmeyer 1993, 58; Georgiadou 2010, 148-150; Georgiadou 2015.

²⁶⁵ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Idalion n°1 with comments.

The structure of this text is different from the usual one of Greek legal documents. As Georgiadou noticed, Greek legal texts show a concise formula beginning with ἐπί followed by the name of the eponymous archon in genitive or as an absolute genitive.²⁶⁶ By contrast, the bronze tablet bears the temporal conjunction ὅτε followed by an aorist, a construction which is very close to the incipit of historical accounts.²⁶⁷ This construction looks very Cypriot. But, as is common practice in decrees, documents and historical accounts, too, the first lines do mention an eponymous magistrate called Philokypros, son of Onesagoras, *pi-lo-ku-po-ro-ne we-te-i-to-o-na-sa-ko ra-u*.²⁶⁸ The presence of this official might suggest that a complex system of magistracies existed in Idalion during the classical period, and perhaps in other Cypriot city-states too. For instance, in the following chapters, I will argue that the same office appears also in another Cypriot-syllabic document called the Bulwer tablet.²⁶⁹

Scholars debate whether the presence of this magistracy was due to the influence of Greek political institutions – and to the so-called ‘Hellenization’ of the island, which considerably advanced after the fifth century BC – or whether it was a local Cypriot political office, either specific to Idalion and perhaps Salamis – as the Bulwer tablet might demonstrate – or widespread in all the Cypriot city-states.²⁷⁰ According to ancient Greek sources, a significant

²⁶⁶ On the Cypriot ὅτε see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 446 §567; Georgiadou 2010, 148-149; she notes that a similar beginning is shown by the Greek text of the trilingual inscription of Xanthos in Lycia (fourth century BC, Metzger *et al.* 1979); see also Hatzopoulos, Georgiadou 2013, 203-210; Colvin (2007, 88). It is not clear if the Cypriot dialect has [h].

²⁶⁷ On the verb κατέφορον, 3rd person plural of the aorist of *καταφέρω, ‘press hard’ see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 481-482 §598; Egetmeyer 2004, 103. The interpretation of this verbal form is controversial. Because it is preceded by ὅτε – ὅτε + aorist is a common Greek construction –, and because of the sense of text, it is probably a thematic aorist. Its aspect is punctual. However, in all the other Greek dialects, the aorist of the verb is sigmatic e.g. ἔρξαν with a different apophonic grade. See also Egetmeyer (2004, 102-103) who initially proposed to read it as an imperfect. Schwyzer (1939, 777 n°6, but also Masson 1983, 266) suggested to translate it as a pluperfect; this is however very unlikely, as demonstrated by Katz (2008, 21 n°46).

²⁶⁸ For the analysis of the anthroponym of the tablet see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Idalion n°1, and vol. I, 318-374 §362-453; Masson 1983, 279-281. Generally on the Cypriot onomastics, Scarpanti 2014, *passim*.

²⁶⁹ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Akanthou n°1 l.1 = *ICS* 327 l.1.

²⁷⁰ Georgiadou 2010, 150. She listed a series of Greek inscriptions – coming from Epirus and Macedonia – which bear both the name of the king and that of the eponym archon; however, as she noticed, they are all dated to later periods (e.g. *SEG* XV.384; *SEG* XXXVII.525; *SEG* XLVIII.676; *SEG* XII.373; Spyridakis 1937, 75-77).

eponymous magistrate was the Athenian *archōn*.²⁷¹ He was the chief of the state who held civil and juridical offices.²⁷² His power, however, decreased over the years so that his role became similar to that of a secretary during the Hellenistic period.²⁷³ Eponymous officials were widespread also in other Greek *poleis* in Doris, Chalcis and Illyria.²⁷⁴ Along with eponymous *archontes*, eponymous priests are attested too, particularly during the Hellenistic period in Olynthos and Torone, and, as we shall see, in Cyprus too, specifically in Lapethos.²⁷⁵

Is the eponymous magistrate at Idalion a product of the contacts between the island and the Greek communities of the Mediterranean world? During the fifth century BC, Cypriots introduced Greek deities into their pantheon increasing the ‘Hellenization’ of their customs – although, at the beginning of the Iron Age, the upper class of the Cypriot polities was already particularly keen on its presumed or real Greek status.²⁷⁶ There is however no reason to suppose that this magistracy was introduced during the first twenty years of the century, after the Ionian revolt, the event to which historians usually trace back the growth of the ‘Greek traditions’ on the island.²⁷⁷ Eponymous magistracies may have been well-established before the fifth century, because they are not uniquely Greek but widely attested.²⁷⁸

Other instances of eponymous magistrates come from the Near East and particularly from Assyria.²⁷⁹ Several documents attest that eponymous chronicles, with names of eponymous magistrates, were used in official documents which, for instance, may concern the length of a debt or of an

²⁷¹ Arist. *Ath.* 3; 8.1-2; 22.5; 55-9; 63-6.

²⁷² *OCD* s. archon; Stockton 1990, 108-111; a precise account of the duties of the Athenian archon comes from Arist. *Ath.* 55-56.

²⁷³ Osborne 2006, 69-80.

²⁷⁴ Sherk 1990, 231-295; Sherk 1993, 267-295; Samuel 1972, 51-52; 196-197.

²⁷⁵ *KAI* 43; Lipinski 2004, 84; Parmentier 1987, 403-409.

²⁷⁶ This has been shown by the onomastic, particularly in Amathus (Steele 2013, 146-159 and Karnava *personal communication*, to whom I am grateful; Perna 2018, 213-220) and by the funerary goods of the Salamis necropolis (Karageorghis 1974, *passim*). On the introduction of Greek divinities, see Vernet 2015.

²⁷⁷ Zournatzi 2005, 47-73; Vernet 2015. See above Stylianou 1989, 375-530; Gerogiadou 2010, 150; Cawkwell 2005, 125.

²⁷⁸ By contrast, in Kition and Lapethos, the date of the decrees was established on the base of the years of reign of the *melek*; such a system might be a legacy from Levantine city-states. For some examples see Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, A29 = Yon 2004, n°1029; Amadasi, Karageorghis, A3 = Yon 2004, n°1003.

²⁷⁹ Millard 1997 *passim*; Stratford 2015, 301-324, with an analysis on *REL*. Lists of eponyms are also attested in Mari *MEC*; Charpin, Ziegler 2003, 34, 83, 212 (for some examples); Nahm 2013, 350 - 372 with bibliography.

ownership or of restoration works. Several tablets provide a list of *limmim*, eponymous magistrates – singular *limmu* – who presided over local institutions – for instance the City Hall, *bit alim* or *bit limmim*, the most relevant economic and administrative institution of the Assyrian city-states – and held other civil offices.²⁸⁰ Generally, the eponymous officials were members of the local elite or elders.²⁸¹ In the Assyrian chronicles, dated between 900 and 612 BC, the eponyms were governors – this seems to be the most attested title –, commanders or members of the palace who held important roles such as chiefs of the palace, palace heralds, and chief butlers. In the seventh century BC, lists becomes more varied and shows also chief viziers, a chief eunuch, a revenue officer, a colonel and a chief judge.²⁸² Since the office of the eponymous magistrate was widespread in the Near East earlier than in Greece, as Millard pointed out, we may suppose that either the Cypriot magistracy developed independently along with the city-states between the Late Bronze Age and Iron Age or that it was a Near-Eastern legacy – perhaps from the Assyrian domination.²⁸³ This last case, however, is less plausible since the Assyrian domination apparently had a minimal influence on the Cypriot political-administrative system – although Assyrian intervention did promote a closer connection between the centre and periphery of the city-states, as we shall see.²⁸⁴

As anticipated above, the presence of this eponym prompted scholars to question what political or administrative roles he played – apart from giving his name to the year. In the Near East, the eponyms presided over the main economic institutions of the city-state, such as the City Hall which exported goods and collected taxes, and, amongst several tasks, the eponym may have

²⁸⁰ Karlsson 2013, 1 who states that the ‘eponymous’ played a role in the government of the city-state, not only ruled by the king but also by an assembly (*alum*); Faist 2010, 16.

²⁸¹ Larsen 2015, 123-130; the author claims that occasionally, the same person could be elected as *limmu* twice. Each family of the elite had its own member who was a candidate to become the eponymous magistrate. See Stockwell 2010, 128; Aubet 2001, 146; Markoe 2005, 101. The Assyrian *limmu* acted on behalf of the city being in charge of the ‘Office of the city’, also called ‘Office of the Eponym’ *bet limmim* or ‘City Hall’, *bet alim*; Larsen 2015, 126.

²⁸² Millard 1997, *passim*; it seems that during the last 50 years of crises of the Assyrian Empire, also the chef, the chief of scribes, the chief of the musicians became eponyms, very likely members of the court, close to the king.

²⁸³ Georgiadou 2010, 174; Millard 1997, 63-79.

²⁸⁴ Cannavò 2015f, Cannavò 2007, 179-190.

presided over an assembly.²⁸⁵ Near-Eastern councils of advisors and assemblies were also filled with members of the upper class.²⁸⁶ In Cyprus, literary sources attest to the presence of an elite, which helped the king to deliberate; the same emerges from epigraphic documents. This applies to all city-states, although at different levels.²⁸⁷ Therefore, a sort of council or assembly perhaps existed in Idalion too and a deeper analysis of the tablet may help to better understand the roles played by Philokypros.

The following lines of the tablet may suggest the presence of some ‘republican’ institutions in Idalion. Scholars notice that both the king Stasikypros and the city of Idalion – or ‘of the Idalians’ – *pa-si-le-u-se sa-ta-si-ku-po-ro-se ka-se-a-po-to-li-se e-ta-li-e-we-se* sent Onasilos to take care of the wounded soldiers. Although short, the sequence *po-to-li-se e-ta-li-e-we-se* presents some translation problems. It consists of two nominatives which follow one after the other where we would ordinarily expect the ethnic in the genitive. Because of this, scholars have questioned whether the ethnic was related to the term *polis* or to the king. A plausible explanation comes from some Cretan parallels that were noted by Masson and Schwyzer. One of the parallels comes from an inscription from Gortyn which reads: ‘ἡ πόλις οἱ Γορτύνιοι’, ‘the city, the Gortynians’.²⁸⁸ Georgiadou added another Gortynian inscription, dated c. 350-250 BC, which bears the same text, although much of it is reconstructed in lacuna. Finally, Egetmeyer noted a third inscription from Gortyn where a sequence of nominatives occurs: ‘τὸ κοινὸν οἱ ‘Ριττένοι’ ‘the *koinon*, the Rhittenoι’.²⁸⁹ All these parallels show that a sequence of nominatives is attested also in other Greek areas of the Mediterranean. Thus, the substantive *e-ta-li-e-we-se* may be considered as an expansion of *po-to-li-se*.²⁹⁰

The formula *pa-si-le-u-se ka-se-a-po-to-li-se e-ta-li-e-we-se*, where both the king and the city, *polis*, are mentioned, is repeated six times in the text: in line 2, where the king and the *polis* of the Idalians called the physician Onasilos;

²⁸⁵ Faist 2010, 16-17.

²⁸⁶ Orlin 1970, 47-48, 68 n.195.

²⁸⁷ See chapter 1.

²⁸⁸ *IC IV* 298-299, n° 233, Masson 1983, 239; Schwyzer 1923, 330.

²⁸⁹ *IC IV* 183-187 n° 80, Egetmeyer 1993, 49-50; Jeffery, Morpurgo Davis 1970, 118-154; Guarducci 1967, 85 n. 4; 97 n. 3, 101 n° 5.

²⁹⁰ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, 634 ‘et la ville – les Idaliens –’; Georgiadou 2010, 151; Egetmeyer 1993, 39-59.

in line 4, where the text states that both the king and the *polis* of the Idalians decided to donate a silver talent to the physician and to his brothers; in line 7, where the king and the *polis* decided to replace the amount of money with the king's territories instead; in lines 14-15, where the king and the *polis* decided to give a supplementary gratification to Onasilos, which turned out to be replaced by other king's territories, a decision which was always made by both the king and the *polis* in line 16. Finally, in line 27, both parties decided to deposit the document in the temple of Athena. All of these instances lead to the probable conclusion that the king did not always make decisions alone but rather, in specific circumstances, in agreement with the inhabitants of Idalion who were contractors on equal terms in the juridical document. Thus, at least politically, in fifth-century Idalion, the inhabitants had some decision-making power. This has allowed scholars to assume that, in the classical period, Idalion had a sort of 'constitutional monarchy', where both the sovereign and the population had a say on important decisions.²⁹¹ This implies that a governing body existed which – to what extent is not clear – represented the population of Idalion. Perhaps this was an assembly presided over by the eponym.

The following lines of the Idalion tablet highlight the dichotomy between the *polis* and the sovereign. Lines 4-13 concern the payment of Onasilos and his brothers. The text reads:

4. *ka-sa-pa-i | e-u-we-re-ta-sa-tu | pa-si-le-u-se | ka-se | a-po-to-li-se | o-na-si*
 5. *lo-i | ka-se | to-i-se | ka-si-ke-ne-to-i-se | a-ti-to-mi-si-to-ne | ka-a-ti | ta-*
u-ke-ro-ne | to-we-na-i | e-xe-to-i | 6. wo-i-ko-i | to-i-pa-si-le-wo-se | ka-se | e-
xe-ta-i-po-to-li-wi | a-ra-ku-ro | ta I ta

'And so, the king and the city agreed to give Onasilos and his brothers, instead of payment and additional gratuity, a talent of silver from the House of the king and from the city'.

The silver talent initially promised to Onasilos must be taken *e-xe- to-i wo-i-ko-i to-i -pa-si-le-wo-se ka-se e-xe ta-i po-to-li-wi*, from both the house of the king,

²⁹¹ Georgiadou 2010, 172; Spyridakis 1973, 72; 1974, 24-25

i.e. the palace, and the city. This might suggest that the sovereign was not the only owner of the goods of the state but that a city fund existed, probably created through taxes paid by the Idalians. Thus, the population of Idalion also owned a common fund to cover the expenses that the city had to face.

Under Achaemenid rule, city-states had complex systems of collection for different taxes. Greek sources record a simplified version of the Achaemenid tributes as usually subdivided between *syntaxeis*, special contributions, and *phoroi*, regular taxes. Generally, the *phoroi* were taxes paid on the land of the king through agricultural products or sometimes via currency.²⁹² An example of one of these taxes, for animals that lived on the king's land, is recorded in the tablets of the Persepolis archive and shows that a *baziš*, 'the king's share', was paid.²⁹³ By contrast, the *syntaxeis* were secondary contributions which were paid, for instance, on sales, contracts, annuities. The *phoros* was paid to the royal administration while the *syntaxeis* were paid to the local government and may have been used to pay for civic and military expenses.²⁹⁴

It is not unreasonable to suppose that a similar subdivision may have also existed in the classical Cypriot city-states where contributions were probably subdivided between taxes paid to the king through the products of the territory – the analysis of the following documents, particularly of the Bulwer tablet, may provide some examples – and secondary taxes, tributes paid to the city conceivably in silver, which became part of the public fund.²⁹⁵

²⁹² This terminology appears in Herodotus and other Greek sources; see Hdt. 3.89; 97 and Ps. Arist. *Oec.* 2. with Tuplin 2011, 39-64; Corsaro 1985, 73-95; Corsaro 1983, 523-548; Tuplin 1987, 109-166; Joannès 1990, 173-189; Tuplin 1996, 40-47; Briant 2002, 388-471, Stolper 2006, 223-260; Jursa 2011, 441-448. The tablets of the Persepolis archive and other first-hand evidence show a very complex terminology used for different tributes; see Kebler 2015; there was a tax on the transport of goods raised at city gates (*mūšu* tax), at bridges (*miksu* tax), and in harbours (*kāru* tax). They consisted of a percentage of the transported goods always paid in silver; Jursa 2010, 246; Jursa 2011, 174; Joannès 1990, 185.

²⁹³ Kebler 2015.

²⁹⁴ Corsaro 1985, 88.

²⁹⁵ A part of the tax proceeds – it is not clear if only from the city fund or from both the city fund and the royal estate – was used to pay taxes to the Persian Empire. As a fragment of Ctesias states, Evagoras, in his capacity as king, was in charge of the payment of this tax, 'καὶ βασιλεῖ παρὰ Ἐυαγόρα φόρος'; see Ctes. 688 F 30. The fragment concerns the confrontation which lasted from 385 BC to 376 BC between the king of Persia Artaxerxes and Evagoras, whose relationship was mediated by Ctesias.

2.3 Territories, land-registers and legal owners in the Cypriot city-states

The following lines (6-9) of the tablet record how the territory of Idalion was subdivided and who the legal owners of the land were. They concern the actual payment that the king and the city granted to Onasilos and his brothers.²⁹⁶ The text reads:

e-tu-wa-no-i-nu | *a-ti-to* 7. *a-ra-ku-ro-ne* | *to-te* | *to-ta-la-to-ne* | *pa-si-le-u-se* |
ka-se | *a-po-to-li-se* | *o-na-si-lo-i* | *ka-se* | *to-i-se* | *ka-si* 8. *ke-ne-to-i-se* | *a-pu-*
ta-i | *ga ?-i* | *ta-i-pa-si-le-wo-se* | *ta-i-to-i-ro-ni* | *to-i* | *a-la-pi-ri-ja-ta-i* | *to-ko-*
ro-ne 9. *to-ni-to-i* | *e-le-i* | *to-ka-ra-u-o-me-no-ne* | *o-ka-to-se* | *a-la-wo* | *ka-se*
| *ta-te-re-ki-ni-ja* | *ta-e-pi-o-ta* 10. *pa-ta* | *e-ke-ne* | *pa-no-ni-o-ne* | *u-wa-i-se*
| *za ?-ne* | *a-te-le-ne* |

‘But instead of that silver talent, the king and the city gave to Onasilos and his brothers a plot of land (*to-ko-ro-ne*, χῶρον) in the land of the king (τᾶι γᾶ(?)ι τᾶι βασιλῆφος), which is located in the cadastral district (οἰρών) of Alampria, that is in a wet lowland (*to-i* / *e-le-*, ἔλει), that adjoins the orchard (*a-la-wo*, ἄλαω) of Onkas –, and all the new plants which were there, to possess them with absolute right over them, forever, without taxes.’

The precise details that outline the boundaries of the land immediately stand out. So does the varied vocabulary used to describe different areas of the territory of Idalion. This meticulous description suggests the presence of a cadastre where the owners of the lands – or those who had the land in usufruct – as well as the size and function of the lots, and their borders, were recorded. This is even more striking in lines 14-23. Instead of an additional gratuity – four silver *pelekeis* and two double *minas* –, the king and the city of Idalion allocate the following to Onasilos:

²⁹⁶ *E-tu-wa-no-i-nu* – as well as *e-to-ko-i-nu* in l.16 – presented some translations problems. Here, I follow Cowgill’s interpretation (1964, 344-365) who read the two verbs as plural indicative aorist ἔδωσαν from *ἔδοσαν (l.6) and as singular indicative ἔδωκ’ (l.16) followed by the particles οἴ(v) (= οὖν) and v; see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 504 §626; for other interpretations see Masson 1983, 267-271; Meier-Brügger 1993, 129-130; see also Georgiadou 2010, 151-152; Egetmeyer 1993, 39-59; Egetmeyer 2004, 103-106; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 439 §560 and 455 §575).

ga ?-i / ta-i-pa-si-le-wo-se / ta-i-ma-la-ni-ja 18. *i / ta-i / pe-ti-ja-i* |; *to-ko-ro-ne* (χῶρον) | *to-ka-ra-u-zo-me-no-ne / a-me-ni-ja / a-la-wo* (ἄλαω) *ka-se / ta-te-re* 19. *ki-ni-ja / ta-e-pi-o-ta / pa-ta* | *to-po-e-ko-me-no-ne / po-se / to-ro-wo* | *to-tu-ru-mi-o-ne / ka-se / po* (κάπος) 20. *se / ta-ni-e-re-wi-ja-ne / ta-se / a-ta-na-se* | *to-ka-po-ne / to-ni-si-mi-to-se / a-ro-u-ra* (ἄρουρα) 21. *i-to-ti-we-i-te-mi-se / o-a-ra-ma-ne-u-se-e-ke / a-la-wo, to-po-e-ko-me-no-ne* | *po-se / pa-sa-ko-ra* 22. *ne / to-no-na-sa-ko-ra-u / ka-se / ta-te-re-ki-ni-ja / ta-e-pi-o-ta / pa-ta* | *e-ke-ne / pa-no-ni-o-se / u* 23. *wa-i-se / ga ?-ne / a-te-li-ja / i-o-ta*.

‘part of the land of the king which is in the valley of Malania: the plot of land that adjoins the orchard of Amenias and all the new plants there, which reaches the river Drymios and the sanctuary of Athena; and the garden that is in the arable land (wheat field) of Simmis – the one that Diweithemis the Armaneus had as orchard contiguous with that of Pasagoras, son of Onasagoras – and all the new plants there, to possess with absolute right over them, forever, without taxes’.

Here again, the analysis of the vocabulary shows specific nomenclature for the different uses of the land. Some of the words seem to be technical terms which may well have been used in a cadastre. This was probably part of the local administration from which the Idalion bronze has drawn the technical language. Along with the territory of the king *ga ?-i / ta-i-pa-si-le-wo-se* – as we shall see – we may identify three specific terms to indicate the land:

a) *(t)o-i-ro-ni* (nominative **o-i-ro-ne*) whose most plausible translation is ‘cadastral district’. It is attested only in the bronze tablet, in line 8 and in line 31, in the additional guaranties added to the documents, where it is followed by the adjective *to-i / e-ta-li-e-wi / i-o-si* ‘of Idalion’. According to Egetmeyer, this is the dative of the word **oirōn*, which is used in the tablet to indicate two different districts, that of Alampria and that of Idalion.²⁹⁷ A glossa by Hesychius might prove that this is a ‘cadastral district’ more than an ‘administrative district’ since it states that οἰρών was ‘a straight line from the measurement of

²⁹⁷ See l.8 and l.31 of the tablet.

land'.²⁹⁸ This definition links the word specifically to the measure of the land.²⁹⁹ A very late lexicon by Theognost (ninth century AD) is the only other source which mentions this term. According to this, οἰρῶν is 'the furrow traced by the plow'. Generally, furrows can also be used to define boundaries of fields; thus, we might suppose that a semantic shift happened from the measurement of a field or of the boundaries of a field to the furrow traced in a field to indicate the boundaries.³⁰⁰

b) *a-la-wo*. According to Egetmeyer, there is no unanimity on the spelling of this term which should correspond to the attic ἀλωή. According to a glossa by Hesychius, it must be a κῆπος, a garden. However, since the noun κᾶπος is attested in the Idalion Bronze, it is plausible that *a-la-wo* is another specific cadastral term to indicate a small lot of land, very likely an orchard.³⁰¹ Onkas was the owner or the usufructuary of the orchard close to the new χῶρον of Onasilos. Since the physician was allowed to benefit from fruits and products of his new land, it is conceivable that part of his new field was an orchard too.

c) *a-ro-u-ra*, which is a generic Greek term to indicate arable land but attested in the Egyptian papyri as measure of the land, 100 cubits square.³⁰² A gloss by Hesychius mentions it as 'σωρὸς σίτου σὺν ἀχύροις', in Cyprus, 'a pile of grain with straws'. Perhaps in Cyprus, *a-ro-u-ra* was a technical cadastral term to indicate a wheat/straw field or an arable field.³⁰³

There are two other terms found in the tablet that indicate parts of the land: χῶρον, 'plot of land', and κᾶπος, 'garden'; they are however more general and also attested in other Cypriot inscriptions. For instance, κᾶπος appears in an

²⁹⁸ In the following chapters, the subdivision of the territory of Lapethos will be analysed too.

²⁹⁹ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 270-271 §299; Hsch. ο 389, 'ἡ ἐκ τῆς καταμετρήσεως τῆς γῆς εὐθυωρία'.

³⁰⁰ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 271 §299 with bibliography; *Anecdota Graeca* 1835, tome II 38, l. 31-32.

³⁰¹ Georgiadou 2010, 150; Georgiadou 2015, Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 246-247 §273; Beekes 1971, 350-352; Chantraine 1962, 224; for the meaning see *SEG* XLIII.311; Helly 2004, 265-301; Kloekhorst 2008, 272-273.

³⁰² For some examples see Hdt. 2.168; *OGIS* 90.30; *POxy*.45.12.

³⁰³ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 123 §124 with bibliography for the etymology; Hsch. α 7383.

inscription from Salamis – dated to the classical period – engraved on a stone that marked the border of the field of Karinos.³⁰⁴

It is not surprising that registers existed where land owners or sharecroppers were recorded. Plausibly, they also existed in Idalion whose administrative system was very complex as is shown by the administrative documents of the Idalion archive: more than 700 *ostraka* and tablets, written in Phoenician and Cypriot-syllabic Greek, that will be discussed in the following chapters.³⁰⁵ A diagnostic feature indicating the presence of cadastres – along with a technical nomenclature – is the detailed description of the boundaries of the land, as shown in the Idalion Bronze.³⁰⁶ Unfortunately, the Cypriot syllabic corpus does not contain any other long texts that would allow us to prove the presence of other land-registers outside of Idalion. But it is very likely that they were widespread in all the city-states. Some elucidations might come from a Hellenistic cadastral document from Amathus, dated to c. 190-140 BC.³⁰⁷ The inscription was found in the agora of Amathus, where it had been re-used as base for a door. According to the editors, the document concerns the assignment of cleruchies to veterans.³⁰⁸ It is not a private document, but rather a monumental inscription displayed to the public. Thus, the allocation of the land should have affected the city. This document consists of 13 lines, which are very difficult to read. They bear a list of anthroponyms in nominative form followed by patronymics, a figure and the name of one or more places or lots of land in genitive case, such as κρήνων, λίμνων, Σαλαμίνας ὁδοῦ.³⁰⁹ They are followed in turn by four groups of numbers from 1 to 30. According to Aupert, these numbers may potentially be related to maps kept in a local Amathusian cadastre. During the Hellenistic period, the Cypriot cities adopted a homogenous and Hellenised political-administrative system; however, Aupert has suggested two reasons why this cadastre may have been a legacy of a previous local land register that was already in use since the Iron Age.

³⁰⁴ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Salamis n° 7 = ICS 316; Masson 1980, 182; Masson 1987, 12; the inscription was found in a field close to St. Katherine chapel, in the countryside.

³⁰⁵ On the Idalion archive see Amadasi, Zamora López 2016, 187-193; Amadasi 2017, 275-284.

³⁰⁶ Uchitel 2005, 478.

³⁰⁷ Aupert, Florentzos 2008, 311-346; the inscription has been dated according to the palaeographic analysis see Aupert, Florentzos 2008, 312; for a comparison Mitford, Nicolaou 1974, n°4 and Pouilloux 1987, n°66.

³⁰⁸ Aupert, Florentzos 2008, 332 with bibliography.

³⁰⁹ Aupert, Florentzos 2008, 324 and 338.

Firstly, although Cyprus was under Ptolemaic rule during the second century BC, in the Amathusian text the description of the land appears as more detailed than that of the usual Hellenistic Egyptian land-registers, or at least it shows a different layout.³¹⁰ According to Aupert, the closest parallel to the document comes from Iasos, in Caria.³¹¹ He compares the Amathus inscription with a decree dated to 367-354 BC which concerns the exile of conspirators who acted against Mausolos. Their properties were confiscated and sold. Several lines list the new buyers, the location of the lands, the name of the old owners and the money paid. A second part of the text lists a group of lots numbered from one to ten, with the names of the buyers and the sale prices. The numbers cited in the inscription from Iasos – as perhaps those in Amathus – might be linked to a register with drawn maps, numerated as shown in the text.³¹² Aupert claims that since the Carian and Amathusian decrees both shared a common structure, although dated to different periods, their recording system might come from a similar model. Moreover, most of the toponyms of the Amathusian document are local; very likely, they were ‘Eteocypriot’ passed down over the years.³¹³ According to Aupert, it might mean that a similar system of recording lands and boundaries had existed in Amathus at least since the Achaemenids dominated the island.³¹⁴ Land registers were, in fact, also used in Babylonia and in Achaemenid Persia where taxes were established on the basis of the size of the land recorded in cadastres.³¹⁵ According to these data, we might suppose that the Cypriot city-states used a cadastre perhaps to calculate the quantity and kind of products and taxes that the administrative palaces expected to receive from the territories.

The tablet also provides information on the nature of the land’s tenure and on the status of the Idalians who occupied it. The first $\chi\tilde{\omega}\rho\omicron\nu$ allocated to Onasilos and his brothers was set in a wet lowland which bordered with the orchard of Onkas. Onkas’ orchard was also part of the king’s land, and Onkas owned it

³¹⁰ Déléage 1934, 83-111; Aupert, Flourentzos 2008, 311-346.

³¹¹ Blümel 1985, 7-12, Nr. 1-218.

³¹² Aupert, Flourentzos 2008, 346.

³¹³ Aupert, Flourentzos 2008, 326; Petit, Péchoux, Aupert 1991, 780.

³¹⁴ Aupert, Flourentzos 2008, 334.

³¹⁵ Kebler 2015. It seems also that private owners could sell their own land. A tax on the sale was introduced on the base of the size of the land.

permanently. Plausibly Idalians, perhaps members of the upper class, managed the king's land; some of them were beneficiaries of grants, like Onasilos, while others may have been sharecroppers or tenants.

More precisely, according to the text, the king and the city gave Onasilos and his brothers *ta-te-re-ki-ni-ja / ta-e-pi-o-ta pa-ta*, 'all the new plants which were there' (ll. 9-19; 22). It is possible that the fruit trees had recently been purpose-planted before the land was allocated. This sequence is followed by a juridical formula '*e-ke-ne pa-no-ni-o-ne* – or *pa-no-ni-o-se* – / *u-wa-i-se / za ?-ne / a-te-le-ne*' which has been translated and interpreted in different ways. It appears two times in the text, in line 10 and in lines 22-23. In it, *e-ke-ne*, 'to have', is the infinitive form of ἔχω.³¹⁶ *Pa-no-ni-o-ne* is a hapax and very likely a singular masculine accusative, while the second form *pa-no-ni-o-se* should be the plural accusative *panoniō(n)s*. It is clear that we face a legal clause with a specific Cypriot terminology. Scholars agree that *pa-no-ni-o-ne* is a compound word derived from πᾶν and a second element.³¹⁷ Some have linked this second component to the verb ὠνέομαι, 'to sell'.³¹⁸ If so, the word should be translated as the 'full right to sell' or the 'full rights to sell'. According to this interpretation, Onasilos and his brothers would have the right to sell products of the king's land, perhaps fruits of the 'new plants' and to earn from them.³¹⁹ An alternative and arguably better translation, however, implies that whilst Onasilos may have been authorised to use the land's products, he was not allowed to sell them. According to Egetmeyer – and several other scholars – the compound word is formed using ὀνίνημι, 'to use', instead.³²⁰ There are various reasons to believe this hypothesis. Firstly, ὀνίνημι shares the root with several anthroponyms attested in Cyprus starting with *Ovā-*;³²¹ so, it would not be unusual in the Cypriot Greek dialect. Secondly, there are parallels in Mycenaean texts from Pylos which bear similar terms in analogous contexts.³²² They are PY

³¹⁶ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 460-461 §580.

³¹⁷ Schwyzer 1939, 437; Risch 1974, 228.

³¹⁸ Schwyzer 1923, 445; Initially, *ICS* (first edition) 240-244. According to Egetmeyer, another term was used to indicate a 'sell' in Hellenistic Cyprus, 'παμπρασία', from πέρνημι. But as Georgiadou claimed, this term specifically means 'liquidation of products in stock'; Georgiadou 2010, 155; Mitford 1980, 199-204, n° 201.

³¹⁹ Stüber 2000, 137.

³²⁰ Lejeune 1964, 108 n° 110; Chadwick 1972, 29; *ICS*, 415; Egetmeyer 1992, s. *pa-no-ni-o-ne*; 1993, 51; Egetmeyer 2004, 106-109; Georgiadou 2010, 154-155.

³²¹ Egetmeyer 2004, 106-109; Scarpanti 2006, 155-192; Scarpanti 2014, 61.

³²² Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 305 §348; Leukart 1975, 100-101, Jiménez Delgado 2005, 43-50.

279 and PY Ep 704 which concern parcels of land over which two priestesses claimed to have full right, *e-to-ni-jo*, according to the wish of the divinity.³²³ The Cypriot-Greek juridical term *pa-no-ni-o-ne* kept the same meaning and second member of the compound of *e-to-ni-jo*.³²⁴

The last part of the legal clause, *u-wa-i-se / za ?-ne / a-te-le-ne*, further stresses Onasilos' full rights over the property. The translation of *u-wa-i-se / za ?-ne*, a hapax which will be discussed in the following chapters and attested in lines 10 and 22-23 and 28 in the additional guarantees, is controversial. It might be interpreted as 'forever on the earth'. In this case, *za ?-ne* should be read as *ga ?-ne* since the syllabic sign *za/ga* is the same used to write *ga-ne*, the king's land. But the sequence may also be translated as 'for the duration of his life'. In this second case, the syllable questioned should be read as *za*, as suggested by Masson, and *za-ne* interpreted as an accusative form of a noun derived from ζᾶω, to live.³²⁵ *U-wa-i-se* might be an adverb related to αἰών, 'time'.

The discussion of the meaning of these terms is complex, as is the reading of the syllabic sign *za/ga*. However, according to the context, it would be more appropriate to interpret *u-wa-i-se / za ?-ne* as a temporal adverbial sequence 'forever' rather than 'forever on the earth'. This is particularly evident in line 28. The king and the πόλις placed the document in the temple of Athena '*su-no-ro-ko-i-se / me-lu-sa-i / ta-se / we-re-ta-se / ta-sa-te*' with the vows not to dissolve the arrangements / *u-wa-i-se / za ?-ne*, 'forever'. Finally, the term *a-te-le-ne*, 'without taxes' confirms that Onasilos and his family did not pay any tax to the government, more precisely to the 'house of the king', for exploiting the land.³²⁶

From this, it is possible to conclude that in Idalion, some of the land of the king may have been allocated to private citizens. They had full rights over

³²³*E-to-ni-jo*, 'full right', is opposed to *o-na-to/o-na-ta*, simple right of usufruct – on which we will focus in the following pages; Bennett, Oliver 1973, 126-176.

³²⁴In Cypriot dialect, πᾶν replaces ἔτι.

³²⁵*ICS* 217. For the debate and summary of various interpretations see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 442-444 §564-565; Schwyzer 1939, 631, n. 2; Peters 1980, 63; Peters 2002, 121-123; Watkins proposed 'forever on the earth', in Peters 1980; Pinault 2000, 63; *ICS*, 240-241; Hamp 1953, 240-243; Fränkel 1950, 142-144; Puhvel 1954, 454-456; Southern 1999, 135, n. 120; Perpillou 1987, 201-202. On the term *ga-ne* see Willi 2008, 169-194; Weiss 1995, 151-154; Lejeune 1954, 68-78; Egetmeyer 1993b, 145-155.

³²⁶Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 409 §510 with bibliography; this form is a Cypriot peculiarity; see Seiler 1958, 50; Hodot 1990, 120-121; Meissner 2006, 181; Schwyzer 1939, 579.

the land in perpetuity to use and exploit it as they saw fit without tax liabilities as did their descendants.

The second assignment to Onasilos also consisted of a *ka-po-se*, a garden located in the ἄρουρα – a land that can be cultivated – of Simmis, which previously was the orchard of Diweithemis of Armania.³²⁷ Either Simmis obtained full rights, *pa-no-ni-o-ne*, over part of the king's land as Onasilos did in order to cultivate it with grain, or Simmis already owned the land having inherited it from her parents. This is particularly useful to better understand the role of women in Cyprus.³²⁸ If, as Egetmeyer suggests, Simmis should be interpreted as a feminine anthroponym, Cypriot women would have had a certain degree of independence and could have also been landowners.³²⁹ We may suppose that Diweithemis' right of exploiting part of Simmis' land as orchard was probably approved by the government; it would have registered this information in the local cadastre and eventually, calculated the taxes that Diweithemis and Simmis needed to pay. Once Diweithemis died or left, and his usufruct right decayed, the *kāpos* resulted available and the king and the *polis* decided to assign it to Onasilos.

Idalians who received part of the territories of the king with *pa-no-ni-o-ne* must have been elite and influential members of society. As Onasilos and his brothers were a family of physicians – perhaps court physicians employed in the palace – who aided the city-state, they were deemed worthy enough to receive the king and the *polis*' donation. Possibly, Onasilos played a role similar to that of the Hellenistic kingdoms' ἀρχιατρός, as Georgiadou suggested.³³⁰ Although

³²⁷ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, Idalion n°217 = ICS 217 ll. 20-21.

³²⁸ In the Cypriot inscriptions of the classical period, female names appear frequently in both Phoenician and Cypriot-syllabic epitaphs; see Bazemore (2002, 416) who concentrates on the Cypriot-syllabic text.

³²⁹ This interpretation has been challenged by Fourrier (2002, 143) and Georgiadou (2010, 181) who claim that it is more plausible that Simmis was a toponym. But a group of similar names with stem *-is/-idos* is attested in other inscriptions too, see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 359 §434 with occurrences and Scarpanti 2014, 119.

³³⁰ Georgiadou 2010, 191-193. Although the term *archiatros* does not appear in the inscriptions before the second century BC, court physicians, who held important roles, are attested in the Achaemenid period. For instance, Herodotus states that Democedes from Croton was the greatest physician at the court of Darius; thanks of his services, he became close to the king even though had initially been enslaved by him (3.125-137): 'τότε δὴ ὁ Δημοκίδης ἐν τοῖσι Σούσοισι ἐξησάμενος Δαρεῖον οἶκόν τε μέγιστον εἶχε', 'and since he cured Darius, Democedes had a marvellous house in Sousa' very likely a donation made by the king; see also 3.130.4 and 3.132.1: 'ἦν δὲ μέγιστον πρῆγμα Δημοκίδης παρὰ βασιλέϊ', 'Democedes had a great importance to the king.' Although this is a well attested fictional pattern (see Esther, Joseph and Daniel in the Bible), it is plausible that physicians gained high positions in the court; see Hofstetter 1978,

he already held an institutional position in the court, he may have been called to help in the siege, a dangerous and unusual circumstance. Therefore, he received a particular reward.

Other examples from Cyprus exist. An alphabetic Greek inscription from Paphos mentions a physician called Phaitas, son of Demassagoras from Tenedos. This is a funerary epigram written in elegiac couplets, dated to the end of the fourth century or to the beginning of the third century BC on the basis of its textual layout and palaeography. Cayla dates it to the end of the fourth century BC, during the reign of king Nicocles of Paphos, since, in the same years, very similar epigrams are attested. Most of them were dedicated to Nicocles by members of the upper class. Among them, the new Greek education spread widely. This triggered a novel trend of writing epigrams and dedications in verses – as shown in the first chapter. This corroborates the theory that Phaitas was a member of the elite and as court physician was close to the king as probably was Onasilos.³³¹

So far, the Idalion tablet has shown examples of non-tax paying usufructuaries – Onasilos and his relatives – who had a certain degree of independence. Another Cypriot-syllabic inscription might concern the rent – or the payment for the usufruct – of a plot of land probably leased by a private citizen.

This inscription, which is of juridical character, comes from Pyla, a village near Larnaca/Kition. However, since the text has been written in syllabic script, we may assume that it was still part of the neighbouring territory of Salamis administrated by Cypriot Greeks.³³² It can be dated to the fourth century BC, particularly from palaeographic analysis and linguistic features that do not

46-47 n°79; Griffith 1987, 37-5; Demont 2018, 175-196 on diseases in Herodotus. Ctesias held a similar position in the Persian court: see Ctes. *FGrH* 688 T3; Llewellyn-Jones, Robson 2010, 12-17; Huyse 1990, 141-148. For physicians in ancient Cyprus see Michaelidis 2009, 93-106. Generally, on the *ιατρός* in the Greek world see Samama 2003, particularly 49-55.

³³¹ Cayla 2018, n°224 = *SEG* XXX, n°1636; Samama 2003, n°371; Voskos 1997, E18; Hansen 1989, n°717; Wilhem 1980, 53-54 n° 68; Mitford 1961, 9 n°16. As the editor noticed, although the inscription consists of only 4 lines, it is full of literary references starting from the incipit 'Ἡ χρόνος ἐνίκα τόνδε...'; Theocr. 7.1. Other physicians are attested in Paphian inscriptions but dated to the Hellenistic and Roman periods (Cayla 2018, n°176; 219).

³³² According to archaeological reports, Pyla might belong to the city-state of Kition since terracottas of clear Kitian style were found in this centre. Because of this evident Kitian influence, we may suppose that this was a border city (Fourrier 2007, 59-61; Gennadiou 2019, 360).

show the presence of /w/ F.³³³ The layout is poor but bears signs in what appears to be *stoichedon*. The content of this text is not totally clear although the syllabic signs are very readable. The first line reports the name of the subject/ tenant *a-ri-si-to-ma-ko-se*, Aristomachos. The second line bears ‘*e-ke-ra-to to-ko-ro to-ne*’, ‘he was making use of this plot of land’. The verb *e-ke-ra-to* is a recent Cypriot formation of the verb *χράομαι* which means ‘take advantage of’ or ‘benefit from’.³³⁴ In order to enforce the fact that he was the only recipient, the following line presents *a-u-to a-ta-u-to*, a construction which probably corresponds to *αὐτός ἑαυτῷ*, ‘he for himself’.³³⁵ According to the following lines, Aristomachos was living in an *o-i-ko-na-o-ne* ‘house’ of the *χῶρον*. He was permanently settled there in a ‘*ta-la-mo-to-ne*’ ‘room’ or ‘dwelling place’. However, he did not pay a tax or rent – it is not clear from the text which of the two is meant – for the abovementioned ‘*ta-la-mo-to-ne*’ as he was supposed to do. Therefore, Aristomachos was forced to pay for his residence, according to the law.³³⁶

Since the document was publicly displayed, it is plausible that all the inhabitants had a common interest in Aristomachos’ payment. As in the Idalion bronze, the community seems to be involved in the management of the territory of the city-state. Although the text does not mention a king or a *polis*, it is plausible that a taxation system for renting or leasing existed also in the city-state to which Aristomachos’ *oikos* belonged, very likely Salamis. This may have been one of the sources which supplemented the city fund.

³³³ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Pyla n°3 = ICS 306 = Yon 2004, n°2510; other linguistic features are the dropping of *ι* in line 4, dropping of the *-ς* at the end of the words in ll. 3-4-8 eg. *a-u-to* for *a-u-to-se*; *it-te-ka* for *i-te-ka-se*.

³³⁴ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 467 §584. The form is an imperfect and it is a recent formation, different from the Arcadian *χρέεσθαι* (Dubois 1986, vol. II 304).

³³⁵ For the Cypriot reflexive pronoun see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 440 §561 with bibliography. A form *weauto* is attested in Salamiou (ICS 92.3; Neumann 2004, 113-114). The form of Pyla is similar to a Boeotian one *ἄσωντῷ* (Beattie 1959, 169-172; Neumann 1993, 46, n°25). For the double pronouns see Schwyzer 1939, 606-608 and 613; Petit 1999, 373.

³³⁶ The vocabulary is specific. In Cyprus, *o-i-ko-se* indicates a country house, perhaps a farm from which several agricultural products come – such as olive oil or wine. Similar examples come from two inscriptions from Kafizin and from Golgoi (Egetmeyer 2010, vol. II, Kafizin n°57-58 = Mitford 1980, n°266b, n°267b; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Golgoi n°40 = ICS 299). The dwelling place of Aristomachos has been called *ta-la-mo-se* probably to distinguish it from *o-i-ko-se*, meanwhile his permanent installation in the ‘farm’ is defined as ‘*o-i-ki-si*’.

This document and the Idalion bronze tablet show that Cypriot city-states had specific laws according to which Cypriot landowners or usufructuaries had rights and duties on their lots of land.³³⁷ In the case of the Idalion bronze tablet, however, the importance and legal value of the document must have been substantial for two reasons. The first one is the material and the shape of the table – a bronze *tabula ansata* with handles – which stress the importance of the content. The second one is its display in the main temple of Athena, the poliad goddess.³³⁸ It is not surprising that the city-god must approve and confirm the legal value of the document since in Idalion, as well as in other Cypriot centres, the government, responsible for enforcing the laws, was under the protection of the main divinity of the city. The king, in fact, was also the main priest of the city-state.³³⁹

During the fourth century BC, the practice of writing legal documents on bronze tablets and of locating them in temples was generally widespread in the Greek world.³⁴⁰ In Cyprus, it might depend on the process of Hellenization which affected the island and other areas of the Mediterranean from the fifth century BC. But in the Near East too, official legal documents were located in temples in order to be protected and approved by the divinity.³⁴¹ The deity was witness and legal guarantor of the documents.³⁴²

³³⁷ According to Isocrates' speeches (e.g. 9.28-32) the king established the law, at least in Salamis.

³³⁸ On the cult of Athena in Idalion see Bianco, Bonnet 2016, 159-164.

³³⁹ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Paphos n°1; 2 = *ICS* 6-7; Satraki 2013, 123-144; specifically in Idalion see Georgiadou 2010, 181-182; Hermary 2005b, 99-126; Tatton-Brown 2002, 243-256. Petit 1996, 97-119; Maier 1989, 376-391. This feature allows to associate the Cypriot kings with the Phoenician sovereigns; Luraghi 1998, 35.

³⁴⁰ For different names of these tablets in inscriptions see *χάλκωμα* in *I.Trach.Aeg.* E168,1 1.42; *πίναξ χαλκοῦς* in Epidauron and Elaia (*IG* IV 1² 63 1.8; *Syll.*³, 694); Avram 2009, 219 with bibliography, and finally, *δελτός* as the tablet is defined in the text.

³⁴¹ Slanski 2003 *passim*; Brinkman 1964-, 1-47; Salvini 2008, 136 n°93; Cannavò 2018b, 240-264; Paulus 2017, 229-244; e.g. the *kudurru* had a very similar function.

³⁴² This procedure becomes even more common during the Roman era when decrees and treaties were always engraved on bronzes and very often placed in temples Avram 2009, 211-223; as Zamora López (2015, 29-45) pointed out, the use of *ex-voto* dedications in bronze is frequently attested on the island – also thanks to several inscriptions which describe the objects – more than in other Mediterranean locations. It is probably due to large amount of copper that the Cypriots had. According to this, they dedicated altars and statues in bronze, a very expensive material; see Zamora's bibliography and case studies. In the Cypriot syllabic texts, an epitaph of uncertain origins – perhaps from Marion – attests to the presence of a *ti-mo to-ka-la-ko-wo- []-ko* interpreted as, *Τίμω τῷ χαλκοφοργῶ*, Timos, the bronze artisan. See Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, uncertain origins n°6 = *ICS* 341a; Masson 1977b, 156.

The Idalion government was particularly concerned about showing the approval of Athena so that her consent was added as guarantee clause in the contract: *i-te / ta-ta-la-to-ne / ta-te / ta-we pi-ja / ta-te / i-na-la-li-si-me-na* 27. *pa-si-le-u-se / ka-se / a-po-to-li-se / ka-te-ti-ja-ne / i-ta-ti-o-ne / ta-na-ta-na-ne / ta-ne-pe-re* 28. *ta-li-o-ne / su-no-ro-ko-i-se / me-lu-sa-i / ta-se / we-re-ta-se / ta-sa-te / u-wa-i-se / ga ?-ne*, ‘And this tablet, which is inscribed with these words, the king and the city submitted to the goddess Athena who is in Idalion, with vows not to violate these terms, ever’.

As briefly anticipated above, the Bronze provides penalty clauses for those who do not respect the agreement. The clauses follow the description of the allocations of the land and state that *e-ke / si-se / o-na-si-lo-ne / e-to-se* 11. *ka-si-ke-ne-to-se / e-to-se / pa-i-ta-se / to-pa-i-to-ne / to-no-na-si-ku-po-ro-ne / e-xe-to-i / ko-ro-i / to-i-te* 12. *e-xe / o-ru-xe / i-te-pa-i / o-e-xe / o-ru-xe / pe-i-se-i-o-na-si-lo-i / ka-se / to-i-se / ka-si-ke-ne-to-i* 13. *se / e-to-i-se / pa-i-si / to-na-ra-ku-ro-ne / to-te / a-ra-ku-ro / ta I ta* ‘ever someone evicts Onasilos or his brothers or Onasikypros’ children’s children from that piece of land, then, he who will expel them shall pay Onasilos and his brothers or their children the following amount: a talent of silver’ or in lines 25-26, ‘*a-ra-ku-ro* 26. *ne-pe III pe II ti-e*, ‘4 silver *pelekeis* and two double *mnas* of Idalion’. They corresponded to the value of the land.³⁴³

Moreover, in the section of the additional guarantees, other elements regulate the perpetual usufruct of the land. The section claims that Onasilos and his family have the *pa-no-ni-o-ne*, the full right over the plots of land forever, as long as they live in the Idalion city-state, or better in the *(t)o-i-ro-ni*, in the ‘cadastral area’ of Idalion. We might suppose that in the event they had decided to move, their perpetual free usufruct and their *pa-no-ni-o-ne* would have lapsed. In such circumstances, the property conceivably reverted to being the land of the king, ready to be given in usufruct to other Idalians.³⁴⁴

³⁴³ Georgiadou 2010, 148.

³⁴⁴ Unfortunately, no document states this precisely. We know, however, that the law of each city-state was strictly applied within the borders of that ‘kingdom’. The only exception was fourth-century Salamis because of the relationship between Evagoras and Athens. The king obtained the Athenian citizenship meanwhile the Salaminians obtained the *epigamia* right, as literary sources testify. In Lysias’ speech *On the property of Aristophanes*, Aristophanes, son of Nicophemus – a military official who landed in Cyprus with Conon and established in Salamis where he also got married and had a daughter – was accused by his father in law to have stolen some goods of the family’s fortune. (Lys. 19; Medda 1995 vol. II, 126-129). However, it is

2.4 The Cypriot land of the king

According to the Idalion Bronze tablet, part of the territory of the Cypriot city-states – probably a substantial part – belonged to the king.³⁴⁵ These territories may have been given in perpetual usufruct through generations for free – as in the case of Onasilos’ family – or perhaps leased in usufruct to private citizens who, however, needed to pay rent. The new perpetual usufructuaries may obtained full right over them, *pa-no-ni-o-ne*.

Greek literary sources might confirm that the king owned part of the territory of the city-state. According to Theophrastus’ *Historia Plantarum*, the king was responsible for the exploitation of the forests that he owned.³⁴⁶ According to Strabo, wood from the kings’ forests was used to build ships and to smelt metals, particularly copper.³⁴⁷ As Markou pointed out, it is plausible that copper mines belonged to the king too and that the major economic transactions were based on decisions made by the king.³⁴⁸

The origin and nature of this land tenure system have given rise to a debate among scholars. Does it develop along with the Cypriot city-states? Has it been influenced by other systems – Greek or Near-Eastern – or did it develop

seems that in the calculation of the proprieties of Aristophanes and of the fortune he inherited, Nicophemus’ Cypriot properties were not included ‘καὶ οὐ προσλογιζόμεθα ὅσα αὐτὸς ἐν Κύπρῳ ἔσχε Νικόφημος’, (Lys. 9.44). But they should have been included in the account if effectively the *epigamia*’s right existed between Athens and Salamis as Isocrates affirms (Isocr. 9.50). Also the place and the date of the court trial are controversial, as well as the reason why Nicophemus was condemned (Medda 1995, 136-163; Raptou 1999, 158-160; Chavane, Yon 1978, 304-306; Pouilloux 1975, 118). For Evagoras’ citizenship see *IG I² .113 (SEG X.127; XII.38)*; Osborne 1972, 55-56; Lewis, Stourd 1979, 189-193; *IG II² 717*; Raptou 1999, 160-163; in the same speech, Lysias states that Conon’s testament was written in Cyprus in the presence of two witnesses and had legal value in Athens (Medda 1995, 150, who dated the testament to 389 BC; on the Athenian Law see Harrison 1968, 153-155). Similar controversies concern the role played by Andocides in Kition and Salamis. It is still not clear why Andocides received a δωρεὰ of territories, probably similar to that received by Onesilos, and in which city-state these lands were. Also this point should be clarified in another appropriate space. (Lys. 6.6; 26-27; And. *On the Mysteries*, 4).

³⁴⁵ Generally, for the debate of the *chōra basilikē* and whether the king was the owner of the whole territory of his kingdom see Corsaro 1983, 523-548; Corsaro 1980, 1163-1219.

³⁴⁶ Theoph. 5.8.1; Markou 2011, 64; for the exploitation of the Cypriot wood see Cannavò 2007, 179-190; Meiggs 1982, 379; 381; 397.

³⁴⁷ Strab. 14.6.5.

³⁴⁸ Raptou 1996, 256. On this point see And. 2.20-21 and Markou (2011, 64) who quoted the *Suda* s. Ρύκου Κριθοπομπία, the sending of the corn by Roikos, king of Amathus to Athens. See chapter one and Douris in Ath. *Depon.* 4.167c = *FGrH* 76 F 4, ‘... ἀπέδοτο δι’ ἄσσωτιαν πενήκοντα ταλάντων Πινυμάτωνι τῷ Κιτιεῖ ἅμα τὸ χωρίον καὶ τὴν αὐτοῦ βασιλείαν’. It is plausible to suppose that ideologically, the king was the owner of his kingdom but that, practically, he had his own properties as well as other private citizens had (see Corsaro 1985, 73-95).

by itself? Georgiadou and Hatzopoulos associate the Cypriot land distribution to a Mycenaean system, a legacy from the Mycenaean palatial structure. They compared the content of the Idalion bronze tablet with that of a group of tablets from Pylos – some of them have been mentioned above as featuring the term *e-to-ni-jo* – which have been interpreted as cadastral documents although they are probably legal records. These documents concern lots of land of a Pylian province called *Pa-ki-ja-na*, which, according to several scholars, were subdivided into ‘private’ and ‘public’ lots. More specifically, the tablets show personal names of owners of *ko-to-na*, large estates, and of holders of *o-na-to*, small lots of land attached to them.³⁴⁹ *Ktoinā* (plural of *ko-to-na*) are in turn subdivided between *ko-to-na ki-ti-me-na* and *ke-ke me-na ko-to-na*.³⁵⁰ Since this second typology of *ko-to-na* seems to ‘be leased’ by a specific person (PN1) from the *dāmos* ‘*pa-ro to da-mo*’, scholars claimed that *ke-ke-me-na ko-to-na* were public estates; meanwhile, the first *ko-to-na ki-ti-me-na* were private estates since they seemed ‘to be leased’ from a second private individual, *pa-ro* PN2. This allowed Hatzopoulos and Georgiadou to compare the Pylian *ke-ke-me-na ko-to-na* with the lots of land received by Onasilos. Since the *polis* of the Idalians was involved in the agreement, as was the *dāmos* of Pylos, they concluded that Onasilos’ land should have been public too as it was in the case of the *ke-ke-me-na ko-to-na*.

However, several objections may be advanced. Firstly, as Uchitel pointed out, in the Pylos tablets the term *pa-ro + dative* means ‘at’, ‘at the disposal of’, ‘under the control of’ and not ‘from’ as several scholars initially thought.³⁵¹ Therefore, the *ke-ke-me-na ko-to-na* were not public estates leased by the *dāmos* but they were under the control of the *dāmos*, which, in this case, would not be the lender. Secondly, as Uchitel affirmed, in the Pylos tablets there is no evidence that a ‘central authority controlled the lands registered in these records’. No text specifies that the central palace – ruled by the *wanax* – owned

³⁴⁹ As Uchitel pointed out, the documents are not land registers but legal documents. If they were cadastral document, the size of the fields would be written down as well as the description of the borders; Uchitel 2005, 478; Adrados 1972, 79-86.

³⁵⁰ For the meaning of these terms see Carpenter 1983, 81-88; Duhoux 1976, 7-27; Dunkel 1981, 18-29.

³⁵¹ Uchitel associated the meaning of *pa-ro* to that of *o-pi* in some Knossos tablets. (Uchitel 2005, 477; Killen 1968, 640-641).

the Pylos land.³⁵² It rather controlled, or at least administrated and recorded, the details of the relationships between the holders of the large estates and those who cultivated the land, i.e. workers – perhaps forced labour – who had a small portion of that land as maintenance in exchange for their work.³⁵³ Finally, as anticipated above, other striking differences between the Mycenaean system and the Cypriot one were the coexistence of palace authority, temple authority and *dāmos*, which were mutually independent – while in Cyprus they were combined to a certain extent – and the presence of a specific *te-me-no wa-na-ka-te-ro* (PY Er 312), the ‘territory of the king’, which was in turn independent and different from the *ko-to-na* and *o-na-to*.³⁵⁴ Moreover, in the whole corpus of Mycenaean tablets, the *wanax* never donated his territories. In the tablet quoted above, where the priestess *E-ri-ta* states that she has full right on the land that she exploits, the *dāmos* – not the *wanax* or the palace – objected to her right.³⁵⁵

Some scholars have claimed that the Homeric poems showed donations of king’s territories made by the king himself to members of the upper class, identifying it as a Greek practice;³⁵⁶ but this is not true.³⁵⁷ The king may offer a dwelling place, wealth, the hand of his daughter, even the control over some *poleis*, but land is allocated by the community rather than the king.³⁵⁸ This is evident in three passages of the Iliad: when the Lycians, not the king, gave to Bellerophon a plot of land and an orchard; when Meleager was offered a plot of land in Calydon by the local inhabitants; when Achilles asked Aeneas whether

³⁵² By contrast, Del Freo (2017, 105-119) claims that the texts are too obscure to be fully interpreted. De Fidio (2017, 121-139) points out that amongst the Mycenaean words linked to the root of δίδωμι the term *dōron* lacks.

³⁵³ Uchitel 2005, 484-485; he compared the Mycenaean system with the Hittite one. He found a parallel in the relationship between the landlords and the workers but he affirmed that the main difference consists in the absence of king’s land in Mycenaean documents. This is not surprising since Hittite land tenure system was probably influenced by a Near-Eastern model, where the land of the king and donations of the land of the king are frequently attested.

³⁵⁴ Killen 2008, 157-200.

³⁵⁵ The *dāmos* claims that she only has an *o-na-to* of *kekeimena* land. One should also bears in mind that Mycenaean city-states might show differences in their administration. As Bennet pointed out, Pylos seems to have had a formal provincial subdivision which is not attested in Knossos (Bennet 2017, 151-174).

³⁵⁶ E.g. Qviller 1981, 109-155.

³⁵⁷ One case in which a king donates a *klēros* occurs in the Odyssey (*Od.* 14.98), where Odysseus gave part of his land to Eumaeus, who, however, is mentioned there as servant, *oikeus*, or as a sharecropper, not as upper class’s member. In *Il.* 9.262 Agamemnon gives seven cities to his daughter in dowry but not directly to Achilles, who was supposed to marry her.

³⁵⁸ For some examples of similar donation see Qviller 1981, 132-135.

Trojans had promised him a lot of land. In all these instances, the population allocated the land.³⁵⁹

This practice differs from that described in the Idalion tablet; therefore, it is difficult to associate a Greek-Mycenaean system to that described in the Bronze. Onasilos was supposed to receive a payment in silver given from both the king and the *polis* in agreement. This becomes evident when analysing lines 5-6. The initial donation to Onasilos and his brothers consists of one talent which should come *e-xe-to-i /6. wo-i-ko-i / to-i-pa-si-le-wo-se / ka-se / e-xe-ta-i-po-to-li-wi* ‘from the house of the king and from the *polis*’. The terminology is specific and a clear distinction is made between the fund of the king’s house and that of the *polis*. However, the actual payment consisted of a plot of land and this land came from the king’s land. We may assume that the land of the king was most of the territory of the city-state and therefore, it is the ‘city’ which still paid along with the king. If we assume that the king owns only limited royal estates and offered to take the whole expenditure by himself, there would be no reason to mention the *polis* in the agreement. Its presence may be explained as the development of more ‘republican’ institutions in the classical period – the reasons of this development will be analysed in the *Conclusion* of the thesis.

Therefore, Cypriot donations of king’s territories probably reflect a local model rather than a Mycenaean or Homeric one. Uchitel’s analysis further stresses this point:³⁶⁰ the relationship between the Mycenaean owners of the *ko-to-na* and the workers of the *o-na-to* is very similar to that described by some Hittite tablets. However, the biggest difference consists in the ‘donation of the land’ made by the king, from whom the landowners received the lots, a salient element of the Hittite texts, therefore of a Near-Eastern system, but absent from the Mycenaean ones.

Several other examples, contemporaneous with the bronze tablet or preceding it, may be provided. For instance, an Achaemenid document from the archive of Murašû (BE 9 102) states that the land held by the *ustabaru* Bēl-bullissu, a royal ‘household official’, was a royal donation (*nidinti šarri*).³⁶¹ In

³⁵⁹ Qviller 1981, 132-135; see *Il*, 6.191; 9.576; 20-184.

³⁶⁰ Uchitel 2005, 480-482.

³⁶¹ *FuB* 14 21; Pirngruber 2017, 54; Stolper 1995, 217-238, text 55; *YBC* 11562; Stolper 2007, 243-284. According to Pirngruber, an *ustabaru* was a member of the royal family who could receive a territory from the king as gift. He however acted as an absent owner. His territories

BE 99 a bow-fief is described as a *nidinti šarri*, royal gift, as well as the field owned by the secretary of the Babylonian satrap (BE 9 48). Other royal land-grants required the payment of a tax as in the case of Arsames' land-grant in Egypt.³⁶²

Another parallel comes from a Phoenician inscription found in Cilicia dated to the end of the seventh century BC.³⁶³ It shows that a system of 'donations' and reallocation of the land was not unusual in the Near East and in Cilicia before the Achaemenid domination, under the Neo-Assyrian Empire.³⁶⁴ The donation of territories was made by a high-level magistrate, the *suken* – a magistracy also attested in Cyprus during the archaic period – who acted on behalf of the king and gave a plot of land and vineyards to his servant.³⁶⁵

These examples from Near-Eastern archive documents and inscriptions show that the king's land was donated to members of the upper class or of the royal family who in turn may have reallocated their properties sometimes through the use of an intermediary. This system is well attested under the Achaemenid Empire, and this is plausibly a legacy from the Assyrian political-administrative structure – and inherited by the Hellenistic kingdoms later on.³⁶⁶ It seems close to that described in the bronze tablet since the king could donate land estates to members of the elites who eventually reallocated or rented them – as in the case of Simmis whose territory was exploited by Diweithemis as orchard.

were rent out by a *paqdu* who was in charge of the collection of the rent. On their role see Boiy 2004, 196, 209, 219.

³⁶² AD 1, 2, 4, 6-8; Tuplin 1987, 135-136; for some examples coming from the Greek sources see Hdt. 3.132; 6.41; 8.85; Xenoph. *Cyr.* 8.10; Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.13.

³⁶³ The inscription was found in Cebel Ires Dağı during the 1980s but not *in situ*. It is an irregular prism with three inscribed surfaces. Since there are no traces of 'intentional cutting or projections', it was probably located on a separate base (Mosca, Russel 1987, 2-4).

³⁶⁴ Mosca Russel 1987, 1-28. Going further, according to the tablet *PRU* III, 16.141, in Ugarit, a certain Yarimmu received land from the king for his wedding.

³⁶⁵ For similar examples under the Achaemenid Empire see Tuplin 1987, 136-140. On the Phoenician *suken* see Manfredi 2003, 339-341 with bibliography; Garbini 1977, 81-89; Xella 1995, 239-266. In Cyprus, the term is attested on two bronze bowls dated to the archaic period. The *suken* of the new city Qartadesh, servant of Hiram, dedicated them to Baal of Lebanon; *CIS* 15 = *KAI* 31; Steele 2013, 231; Yon 2004, 52; Lipinski 2004, 26. The location of Qartadesh is disputed. According to Masson and Sznycer (1972, 78), it is likely that these bowls came from Limassol district. This would allocate Qartadesh in the Limassol area. Lipinski accepted this hypothesis (1983, 210-218); Katzenstein 1973, 207-208; Tadmor 1994, 186-188; Steele proposed Amathus as Qartadesh, 'the new city', following Hermary's archaeological records (Steele 2013, 231). By contrast, Yon proposed Kition (2004, 52). On the debate see Petit 2015, 353-357.

³⁶⁶ Briant 2002, 432- 544; Capdetrey 2007, *passim*.

All in all, the bronze tablet, probably dated between 469-450, shows that Idalion had some civic institutions beyond the figure of the βασιλεύς during the classical period. The *polis* of the Idalians had some decisional power on major matters such as the donation of the king's land to the physician Onasilos and to his brothers. Perhaps, these decisions were taken in an assembly presided by an eponymous magistrate, an office attested in the bronze tablet and very likely also in another famous Cypriot document, the Bulwer tablet – that will be discussed in chapter 5. But this evidence does not establish that this system had its roots in an exclusively Greek development of the city-states.

In Cyprus, the king owned his own territory which probably included forests and mines whose copper was also processed in central palaces, as well as other industrial activities – for instance purple production – and which were also the main administrative centres as shown by the excavations conducted in Idalion and Ancient Paphos.³⁶⁷ The king could donate some lots to members of the upper class. The usufruct could be in perpetuity. In this case, the new owners had full right, *pa-no-ni-o-ne*, on their properties without tax liabilities. This information was accurately registered in local cadastres along with boundaries and names of the owners of neighbouring lots – private owners or beneficiaries of royal gifts.

This places the figures of the Cypriot rulers economically above any other Cypriots. Their monarchical authority ruled over territories, industrial resources – principally copper mines and wood – and their management.³⁶⁸ Although in Idalion, the '*polis* of the Idalians' was a contracting party along with the king and had decisional power, the authority of the sovereign seems to be superior. As well as being recognised as the first political and religious authority in the city-state, he controlled significant economic resources and we may assume that his decisional power weighed more than that of the *polis*.

³⁶⁷ Markou 2011, 64 and footnote 111 above; Hadjicosti 2017, 257-274; for the recent excavations of Laona and Hadjiabdoulla palace and administrative centre with storages and industrial rooms in Ancient Paphos see Iacovou 2019, 223-225.

³⁶⁸ Iacovou 2008, 650; Iacovou 2019, 222-225.

The administration of the central palace

3.1 The *rab soferim*, chief of scribes, and his staff in Kition

In order to better understand the administrative structure of the Cypriot city-states, it is worth investigating some specific case studies concerning officials and specialised workers who were employed in the central palace. Significant examples come from several Phoenician inscriptions from Kition. Almost all the officials attested in the Kition Phoenician texts bear the title of ‘chief’, *rab*, which implies that they were in charge of a number of subordinates and they were probably employed in the palace administration, as we shall see.³⁶⁹ Amongst them, the *rab soferim*, RB SPRM, chief of scribes, is the most frequent title. It is attested three times in Kition, on a funerary stele, in a dedicatory inscription to the god Eshmun, and in the accounts supposedly belonging to the local temple of Astarte.

The funerary inscription is the epitaph of Mittun-‘Astart dated to the fourth century BC, found in Larnaca, in the Agios Georghios necropolis.³⁷⁰ It reads: ‘LMTN’ŠTRT BN ‘ZRYHW BN MTN BN ŠLM RB HSPRM’, ‘Mittun-‘Astart, son of ‘Azar-Yahou, son of Mittun, son of Shillem, chief of the scribes’.

The second text, the stele to Eshmun, was dedicated by ‘BD’, Abdu, son of KLKY, Kilikay.³⁷¹ It was found in Kiti (Larnaca District) during the 1970s, in the vicinity of the church of Panayia Angeloktistos and dated to 320-319 BC since it contains the traditional Phoenician dating formula with the 42nd regency year of Pumayyaton, king of Kition and Idalion.³⁷² The inscription reads:

³⁶⁹ Generally, on Kition during the Iron Age see Fourier 2016, 19-139; Fourier 2019. See Yon 1989, 363-375 and Sznycer 1985, 79-86 for an overview of the offices mentioned in the following pages.

³⁷⁰ Yon 2004, n°1131; Hadjisavvas, Dupont-Sommer, Lozachmeur 1984, 101. This document was found in 1979 during the excavation of the NW area of Agios Gerghios Necropolis (for more details see Yon 2004, 195-201). Recently, an analysis of the Kition necropoleis has been published by Cannavò, Fourier, Rabot (2018); they concentrate particularly on the sites of Pervolia and Tourapi. Some of the epitaphs mentioned in the following pages come from these necropoleis. See also Hadjisavvas 2014 vol. II, *passim*; Hadjisavvas 2012 vol. I, *passim*.

³⁷¹ The vocalisation is uncertain.

³⁷² According to some other reports, previously, it was built into the church tower; see Nicolaou 1973, 425; Yon 2004, n°1030 = Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 45-48, A 30; Consani 1988, 35-60; Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 45. YRH ’TNM, *yereah haetanim* is a month name which appears often in Cyprus, usually considered a period between September and October (*ICS*, 215 and *KAI* 41, 1; Stieglitz 1998, 211-221). This is the most recent monumental inscription related

1. [B]YRH 'TNM BŠNT 42 LMLK PMYYTN MLK KTY W'DYL
BN MLK MLKYTN MLK
2. [KT]Y W'DYL SML'Z 'Š NDR WYTN' 'BD' BN KLKY BN 'BD'
BN ŠMR RB
3. [SP]RM 'L BNY 'L KLKY L'DNY L'ŠMN K ŠM' QL YBRKN

In the month of 'TNM in the forty-second year of king Pumayyaton, king of Kition and Idalion, son of king Milkyaton, king of Kition and Idalion, this image (has been) dedicated and erected by Abdu, son of KLKY, son of Abdu, son of Shamir, chief of scribes, for his son, for KLKY, to his god Eshmun, because he listened to (his) voice, may he bless us (me).

In line 3, the conjecture [SP]RM is almost certain because of the width of the gap. Although some scholars proposed the restitution [SRS]RM, chief of brokers, in analogy with an office mentioned in another Kition inscription, there is not enough space to conjecture one more letter;³⁷³ the *ductus* is regular, with characters of the same size.³⁷⁴

Although these texts are very short, some problems have been encountered in the translation. The following analysis may help to better understand who the *rab soferim* were and how prestigious their office was in the city-state.

Undoubtedly, these texts attest to the presence of a *rab soferim* in Kition. But grammatically, the term RB SPRM could be related either to the deceased/devotee or to the deceased/devotee's great grandfather. The term RB SPSRM is always expressed in a direct genitival relationship which is indicated by a *nomen regens*, BN, son, in the construct state followed by the *nomen rectum*, the name of the ancestor.³⁷⁵ In the absence of specific cases, it is difficult

to Pummayaton. For an overview of the chronology of his kingship see Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 12-14, A1/2, A 2/2.

³⁷³ Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 46-100, B45 = Yon 2004, n°1075. This inscription will be translated and analysed in the following pages.

³⁷⁴ Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 44.

³⁷⁵ Krahmalkov 2001, 140-143.

to determine to whom *rab soferim* refers. Usually, the construct state relationship – which can be expressed by nominative and genitive in languages which employ cases – should be direct and nothing should intervene between *nomen regens* and *nomen rectum*. According to Amadasi, in the Phoenician corpus from Kition, there is a general tendency for titles to follow the name of the person who holds them. For this reason, the previous editors preferred to identify the great grandfather as the *rab soferim*. However, when reading Phoenician inscriptions in general, we may notice that some exceptions are allowed, particularly in relation to governing nouns.³⁷⁶ These exceptions also occur in a chain of construct states which presents the name of the dedicator or deceased, the name of the father (BN, *son* + father's proper name) and the office or position held by the deceased or dedicator, which usually is a governing noun, the new *nomen regens*, followed by the new *nomen rectum* in genitival relationship, the new governed noun. Sometimes, these exceptions also appear in the Kition *corpus*, where ancestors' genealogies are particularly varied. The following case studies may help us better understand to whom the title of *rab soferim* refers.

Besides the pattern '*name + title + father + familiar genealogy*', (BD' KHN RŠP HŠ BN YKNŠ-LM BN 'ŠMN'DN, *Bd'*, *priest of Reshep, son of Yanikshalom, son of Eshmunadon*) – which is attested only once in Kition – we may identify some funerary and dedicatory inscriptions related to women, where the name of the husband or of the father is followed by the office they held and occasionally by the woman's genealogy.³⁷⁷ In quoting these inscriptions, I follow the conventions of Amadasi's edition. The funerary stele B9 presents the name of a woman, followed by her husband's name and the position he held (*woman + husband + husband's title*).³⁷⁸ In B31, the father's name and the office he held appear before the mention of the woman's husband, followed by a genealogy, which could be related to either the father or the

³⁷⁶ Krahmalkov 2001, 140-141. With this expression, grammars usually indicate *nomina regentia*.

³⁷⁷ Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 14-15, A2 = Yon 2004, n°1002 = CIS I, 10.

³⁷⁸ Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 60-61, B9 = Yon 2004, n°1039 = CIS I, 64, 'T'R' 'ŠT MLKYTN RB HRS', 'Tara, wife of Milkyaton, artisan chief'.

partner (*woman + father+ father's title + husband + genealogy*).³⁷⁹ In the dedication A1, the name of the woman/devotee is followed by the name of her husband and the position he held while her genealogy appears only subsequently; in this case, the genealogy is clearly related to her father (*woman + husband + husband's title + woman's father + father's genealogy*).³⁸⁰ These inscriptions fit the trend of mentioning first the person who held the most important position in the woman's family. However, they do not provide any clear example that indicates a direct link between the person who held the title and the following genealogy composed of a list of ancestors devoid of titles probably because they did not hold any office. Although in all these cases the title follows directly the name of the official who held it, the genealogy does not seem clearly related to the official. Different is the case of a woman whose ancestor was 'chief of the inspectors', RB ḤZ'NM, *rab hazanim*. She is mentioned in the same inscription which also concerns a *rab sarsourim*, RB SRSRM, chief of the commercial agents. The same title is repeated every time someone in the family held it after the anthroponym, up to the sixth generation of ancestors (*deceased + deceased's title+ ancestor + ancestor's title etc...*). The woman, Ashmazabaal, is the wife of the deceased; she is mentioned along with her genealogy, father and grandfather, followed by the title (*mother + father + grandfather + title*). The identification of who the RB ḤZ'NM was – and which tasks he performed – presents the same problem as understanding who the *rab soferim* was – this will be discussed in the following pages. We may conclude that one of Ashmazabaal's ancestors held the office but we are still not able to say who among them.³⁸¹

These examples demonstrate that there was not one unique pattern of combining the genealogy and title of ancestors but they do not suggest any particular solution. More insights come from another peculiar case. It shows that

³⁷⁹ Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 76-78, B 31 = Yon 2004, n°1061 = CIS I, 47. [L'TH]D BT 'BD'S[MN H] ŠPT 'ŠT GRMLQRT, B[N']ŠMN'ZR, 'For 'THD, daughter of Abdueshmun the *suffet*, wife of Geramelqart, son of Eshmunazar'.

³⁸⁰ Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 12-13, A 1 = Yon 2004, n°1001 = CIS I, 11 lost. [...]ll.2-3 Y'S 'ŠT B'LL/TYNT 'B[D BT 'JŠTRT [B]T ŠM' BN B'L... [...], 'Yash, wife of B'LL/TYNT, servant of the temple of Astarte, daughter of Shamay, son of Ball' [...].

³⁸¹ Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 96-100, B 45 = Yon 2004, n° 1075, 184, = RES 1026. [...]ll.1-2; 4 'RŠ RB SRSRM L'BY LPRSY RB SRSRM [...] WL'MY LŠMZBL, BT B'LRM BN MLKYTN BN 'ZR RB ḤZ, 'Arish, chief of inspectors, for his father Persay, chief of commercial agents [...] and for his mother Shamazabal, daughter of Baalrom, son of Milkyaton, son of Azar, chief of the inspectors.' This inscription is analysed in detail in the following pages.

the same text could express genealogy in different ways in the genitival relationship. In the inscription F1 an interpreter is mentioned followed by his father's name and then by the office he held[...] RŠP YTN BN 'ZRTB'L MLŠ HKRSYM [...] (ll. 2-3) '*Reshephyaton son of Arzatabaal, Interpreter of 'Carians'*'. In this case both Reshephyaton and Arzatabaal may be the interpreter. A few lines later, he appears in a genealogy where his son is mentioned, followed by the interpreter's name and then by the title, 'DNŠMŠ BN RŠPYTN MLŠ K[RS]YM, '*Adonshamash, son of Reshepyaton, interpreter of 'Carians'*'.³⁸² Scholars and editors agree in identifying Reshepyaton as the interpreter in both the cases because in two other contemporary inscriptions the title is always related to this name, although in one of them it has been partially reconstructed in lacuna.³⁸³ It can hardly be a coincidence in all these attestations.³⁸⁴ We may assume that there was no standard criterion for listing titles in a chain of construct cases in this inscription. Another Phoenician Cypriot inscription found in Lapethos, dated to the Hellenistic period, presents the name of an official, followed by his father's name and by the title that the official held, [PRM BN] GR'ŠTRT, MQM'LM, '*PRM son of Gerashtart, 'awakener of the gods'*'.³⁸⁵

In conclusion, providing a translation that matches a specific pattern is problematic. In one instance, the title follows directly the person who held it and then the genealogy appears; but in other instances it has been proved that the father's name may be inserted between the person who held the office and their title; further instances remain ambiguous.

According to this brief analysis, nothing excludes that the devotee or the deceased may have held the title of *rab soferim* instead of the last ancestors mentioned in the genealogy. Therefore, in both the inscriptions that I considered, I propose to identify Mittun-'Astart and Abdu, respectively the deceased and the devotee, as *rab soferim*, chief of scribes.³⁸⁶ It is more likely

³⁸² Amadasi 1977, 178-184 F1 = Yon 2004, n° 1125 = *CIS I*, 88. The inscription is dated to 389 BC. Next chapter will analyse this office in detail.

³⁸³ Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 23, A9 = Yon 2004, n° 1009 = *CIS I*, 22.

³⁸⁴ Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 88-90 B40 = Yon 2004 n° 1070 = *CIS I*, 44. For another attestation of the 'Interpreter of 'Carians'' see Amadasi 2015, 343-344.

³⁸⁵ Steele 2013, 190-191; chapter 6 concerns specifically the MQM 'LM (Zamora López 2018, 65-85).

³⁸⁶ Hadjisavvas, Dupont-Sommer, Lozachmeur 1984, 104.

that the deceased and the devotee bore the title of chief of scribes rather than that their families held no titles after their great-grandfathers. Their title gave them prestige and consequently they wanted it mentioned in their epitaph/dedicatory inscription.³⁸⁷ By contrast, as we shall see in the following pages, in the list of accounts from Kition only the scribe's name is recorded since the document was drawn up for a different purpose, in order to set up accounts and expenses limited to the administration.

The title of RB SPRM, *rab soferim*, chief of scribes, appears also in the third document, a list of accounts found in Kition (side A, line 14), dated to the fifth and fourth centuries BC and supposedly belonging to the temple of Astarte.³⁸⁸ 'BD'ŠMN, Abduashmun received a reward in coins, three QR and [QP'], for having worked for the institution as chief of scribes. This mention is part of a gypsum tablet found on Bamboula hill and first published by Ohnefalsch-Richter.³⁸⁹ It is painted with black ink on two sides and damaged in the lower part of face A.³⁹⁰ The first word of face A, *TKLT*, **taklīt*, 'sum' or 'total', proves that this is an accounting document with a list of expenses and payments to workers related to an institution.³⁹¹ Line 14, which mentions the chief of scribes, reads:

14. A L'BD'ŠMN RB SPRM ŠLḤ BYM Z QR 3 W Q[P']

'For Abduashmun, chief of scribes sent off on this day 3 QR and Q[P]'

³⁸⁷ Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 97.

³⁸⁸ Yon 2004, n° 1078; Yon 2004, 209-210 for an update on the historiography. For the debate on the date see Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 103-126, C1, = *KAI* 37 = *CIS* I, 86; Teixidor 1969, 46; Masson, Szzynger 1972, 21-68; Teixidor 1972, 423-424, n°124; Magnanini 1973, 109-111, n°83; Schmitz 2013, 189-229.

³⁸⁹ *CIS* I, 86 A-B = *KAI* 37; Masson, Szzynger 1972, 21.

³⁹⁰ The top of face A matches with the right side of face B and the right side of face A corresponds to the top of face B. Consequently, face A has more lines, 17, compared with the 12 of the other face. After a first palaeographical analysis, we may state that in part B, letters are larger than those in face A, and they have been written by two different hands, since they present clear differences, in particular for *ḥeth*, *lamed* and *samek*. According to Masson and Szzynger, part A is probably more recent, and should be dated to the fourth century BC. Masson, Szzynger 1972, 24-25.

³⁹¹ Scholars suggest that the reading of this word should be related to the root of *KLY*, perhaps total; see Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 106.

The presence of scribes is not surprising in an institutional environment, in particular if we consider that their work is related to the palace or to the temple.³⁹² They might have been employed for counting and writing. In Semitic languages, the term ‘scribe’ SPR, (Hebrew *sōper*), comes from a verb which originally means ‘counting’ and only later ‘writing’ in North West Semitic and Arabic/Central Semitic idioms and probably in Phoenician too. But where did these scribes work in Cyprus and what were their main tasks?

The first two inscriptions clearly testify that a chief of scribes existed but they do not provide any information on where he performed his tasks. By contrast, the list of accounts can help to define where he worked and to prove that he was an administrative official. The list was commonly believed to show the accounts of the temple of Astarte but it has recently been suggested that it may refer to the management of the palace in Kition.³⁹³ Hermary has been the first to put a question mark on the nature of the document.³⁹⁴ For years, this tablet has been considered the most important evidence for male and female sacred prostitution on the island related to the cult of Astarte/ Aphrodite.³⁹⁵ In its initial publication in the nineteenth century, it was immediately related to the temple of Astarte, since the temple is mentioned in line 4A: LBNM ’Š BN ‘ŠTRT K/BT QP’ 1 (or QR 1),³⁹⁶ ‘for the architects who build the temple of Astarte in Kition (?) 1 QP’’. All the other people listed in the tablet were considered employees of the temple, such as magistrates, barbers, singers, functionaries, artisans, sacrificers, slaves and shepherds.

³⁹² Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 114.

³⁹³ Hermary 2014, 248-253, followed by Amadasi, Zamora López 2018b, 202.

³⁹⁴ Also Ribichini (2004, 60) noticed that no clear element indicates whether they were male prostitutes but he did not provide any other interpretation.

³⁹⁵ Masson, Sznycer 1972, 19-68; Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 103-126; Amadasi 2004, 209-211; Schmitz 2013, 189-229 for a different interpretation concerning an embassy in Sicily. On the cult and myth of the sacred prostitution see Budin (2008, 14-47; 58-92) where the author pointed out that Herodotus contributed to spread the myth of the Near-Eastern sacred prostitution. Moreover, we might notice that generally, scholars were inclined to associate Cyprus with sacred prostitution. For instance, a *plaquette* found in Kition, traditionally called ‘la dame à la fenêtre’, showing a woman in front of a window, was interpreted as one of the sacred prostitutes of the temple; Callot (2002, 185-190), however, has convincingly argued that the *plaquette* shows a divinity.

³⁹⁶ CIS I, 86 A-B; Amadasi 1977, 108; QR seems to be the highest value and P’ the lowest (Manfredi 1987, 81-87). The values will be discussed in the following pages. See Masson, Sznycer 1972, 38 for the role played by the architects. The text should concern a secondary restoration, probably related to a small area of the temple.

Among them, young unmarried girls appear in line 9B, some of them involved in a sacrifice L'MT WL'LMT 22 BZBH, 'for the young girls and the 22 young girls in the sacrifice'.³⁹⁷ The young girls have been considered prostitutes since in biblical texts often the term 'LM, *alma*, indicates a young girl ready to perform a sexual act; however, there is no explicit evidence in the tablet that they were related to a temple environment. In lines 15A and 10B, KLBM, *kalebim*, dogs, are mentioned along with WLGRM, *gurim*, lions. LKLBM WLGRM QR 3 WP' 3, 'For dogs and small lions 3 QR and 3 P'. Scholars have interpreted these 'dogs' and 'lions' as references to male prostitutes. The term GRM literally indicates 'lion cubs' but scholars have preferred to translate it as 'cubs' or 'cats',³⁹⁸ in analogy with the dogs mentioned before.³⁹⁹ In *CIS*, they were already considered *scorta virilia*, equivalent of the Greek *hierodouloi*, young boys who practised sacred prostitution, associated with Aphrodite and Venus' temple as well as with the Near-Eastern Astarte and Ishtar's cults.⁴⁰⁰ However, I shall argue that there is no clear evidence of their relationship with the temple of Astarte and that their alleged performance as male prostitutes is based on an over-interpretation of two simple terms indicating animals, unusual in the context of worship.⁴⁰¹ The discovery of a temple of Astarte in Kition-Kathari in the seventies played a fundamental role in spreading the previous interpretation of the accounts.⁴⁰² Most of the scholars involved in the study and translation of the tablet considered the new discovery as the effective confirmation that the expense list belonged to that temple.⁴⁰³

However, as Hermary suggests, a new perspective in reading the accounts should be considered in view of the discovery of the royal palace and its archive, or at any rate an important administrative building, in Idalion

³⁹⁷ Masson, Sznycer 1972, 64; Schmitz 2013, 193; Hermary 2014, 249.

³⁹⁸ Heltzer 1987, 387.

³⁹⁹ Masson, Sznycer 1972, 27-28 and 65-68; Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 106 and 119; Amadasi 2004, 185; Ribichini 2004, 60; Schmitz 2013, 98.

⁴⁰⁰ Masson, Sznycer 1972, 26-54; Hermary 2014, 249.

⁴⁰¹ Animals are also mentioned in Mycenaean tablets from Thebes. Although scholars argued that they may have been part of rituals, the interpretation of these tablets is controversial. See Aravantinos 2010, 51-72 with bibliography. Moreover, the association of these animals with those mentioned in the Kition tablet might be anachronistic.

⁴⁰² Masson, Sznycer 1972, 21; Karageorghis, Demas 1985, planimetry.

⁴⁰³ Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 103-126, C1.

Ampilieri by Hadjicosti's excavations.⁴⁰⁴ In most cases, the 733 *ostraka* and tablets found in the palace present accounts and lists of expenses similar to those of the Kition tablet, all related to the administration of the palace where they were found. Most are written in Phoenician, the administrative language of Idalion after it was conquered by Kition, but 31 are written in Cypriot-syllabic Greek.⁴⁰⁵ Although most of these documents are still unpublished, Amadasi and Zamora López have analysed their content. According to them, the texts may be dated from the fifth to the third centuries BC and the administrative and economic organisation that they reveal did not change over the years, from the Achaemenid to the Hellenistic periods.⁴⁰⁶

Some of them record distributions of oil, ŠMN, and wine, YN; their quantity was often indicated as RB'M, a quarter, or KWT, the name of a specific container.⁴⁰⁷ These *ostraka* also show lists of anthroponyms – Phoenician or Greek transliterated in Phoenician script – preceded by the preposition L, 'to', as in the list of accounts from Kition and in other documents found between the temple of Kition Bamboula and the military harbour.⁴⁰⁸ According to Amadasi, the men listed in the documents were workers or officials paid by the administration. Some of them probably held significant offices, as in the case of Abdsid and Abdmelqart, 'BDŠD W'BDMLQRT, who are often mentioned together along with a specific number of KWT of oil.⁴⁰⁹ A third typology of texts consists of lists of names preceded by the verb to give, YTN, in its imperative form from TN, followed by L, 'to'. They probably record deliveries or movements of goods for particular occasions and show numbers at the end. Conceivably, these lists were also accounts.⁴¹⁰

⁴⁰⁴ Hadjicosti 2017, 257-274.

⁴⁰⁵ Egetmeyer 2008b, 997-1020; Egetmeyer 2010 vol II, Idalion n° 18; 20-24; Amadasi, Zamora López 2018, 77-97; Amadasi, Zamora López 2018b, 187-214; Amadasi 2017, 274-284; Amadasi, Zamora López 2016, 187-193.

⁴⁰⁶ Amadasi, Zamora López 2016, 188-190.

⁴⁰⁷ Amadasi 2017, 278; for an example: 20 KWT and 10 RB'M (ID A 443).

⁴⁰⁸ Amadasi 2015, 335-345.

⁴⁰⁹ 'Men', 'ŠM, are also mentioned in these *ostraka*; see chapter 1.

⁴¹⁰ Amadasi 2017, 281. The archive contains an *ostrakon* with the name of Cyprus, still called Alashiya in the fourth century BC (Amadasi, Zamora López 2018, 77-97), one which mentions the *marzeah*, as highlighted in the previous chapters (Amadasi, Zamora López 2018b, 187-214) and a letter to the gods, very similar to the Hebrew letters from Arad or Lachis (KAI 50).

A few of the Cypriot-Syllabic Greek tablets and *ostraka* have been translated by Egetmeyer.⁴¹¹ One consists of ten lines on the *recto* and three on the *verso* and shows a list of accounts and expenses with numbers and abbreviations among which payments to τοῖς ἐπὶ βαλάνοις, probably gatekeepers in the palace.

[...] *recto* 4 to-i-se- e-pi-pa-la-no-i-se me 4 te 3

[...] *verso* a-pu-tu-so-mo

[...] *recto* 4 τοῖς ἐπὶ βαλάνοις με 4 τε 3

[...] *verso* ἀπύδυσμο(v)

recto: ‘To the men in charge of bolt-pins 4 *me* and 3 *te*’; *verso*: ‘salary.’⁴¹²

Men who held a similar function are also mentioned in the tablet of accounts from Kition, along with other officials, (5A) LDRKM WL’DMM ’Š ‘L DL QŠR 20[?, ‘for officials (?) and gatekeepers 20...’.⁴¹³ The term *balanos* indicates a precise kind of key, the bolt-pins, which was widespread in the Near-East and probably present also in Cyprus in the Phoenician palace environment.⁴¹⁴ The similarity between the documents from Idalion and the Kition accounts seems clear; hence, they may have been all related to the palace administrative system.

In the accounts from Kition, almost all the personnel employed and paid may be associated to either palace or temple. But what confirmed the reference to the temple was the presence of ‘dogs and small lions’ which have been interpreted by scholars as *hierodouloi* and consequently linked to a temple. However, according to Hermary, we should read them simply as common animals, used to protect the palace along with a garrison or used for hunting.⁴¹⁵

⁴¹¹ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Idalion n°18; n°20-24; Egetmeyer 2008, 997-1020. This article is a prelude to the publication of the 31 *ostraka* in Cypriot-syllabic scripts. It is based on a few notes that Masson wrote several years before, when the archive was discovered (Masson 1992b, 113-122).

⁴¹² Aen. 20.1-5 who uses the word βάλανος to indicate the bolt-pin.

⁴¹³ However, this interpretation should be reviewed through a new analysis of the text along with the offices held by the other workers and magistrates mentioned in the tablet.

⁴¹⁴ It is described in *DNP*, vol. 11, v. *Schloss* with occurrences (Hurshmann, Volker 2006, 186-190).

⁴¹⁵ Hermary 2014, 250-253.

During the Hellenistic period, alphabetic inscriptions from Salamis and Kition attest to the presence of κυνηγέται or κυνηγοί, once mentioned along with a φρούραρχος;⁴¹⁶ they might confirm the presence of dogs for hunting and defending the palaces in Cyprus, a hypothesis corroborated by the existence of a Cypriot ἀρχικυνηγός, who appears in Cypriot alphabetic inscriptions.⁴¹⁷ It is not clear, however, if a dedication concerning Berenike, Ptolemy III Evergetes' wife, written on the base of a statue, testifies the presence of κυνηγέται or κυνηγοί in Kition. The φρούραρχος Posidippos is the dedicant. He was chief of garrisons located in local fortress and in Kition. The inscription, which was found in Larnaca in 1972, is now lost; its reading is controversial.⁴¹⁸ The last words of the text are unclear. Along with Posidippos other officials celebrate Berenike. One *lectio* identifies these officials as 'οἱ <σ>υνηγεμ<ό>ν[εξ]'. According to this interpretation, the text would be:

[Βασίλισσαν Β]ερενίκην τὴν βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου[υ τοῦ Πτολεμαίου]
 [ἀδελφὴν καὶ γ]υναῖκα Ποσειδίππος φρούραρχο[ς καὶ ἡγεμῶν τῶν ἐπί]
 [τῆς ἄκρας?] καὶ κατὰ Κίτιον καὶ Βοίσκος καὶ οἱ <σ>υνηγεμ<ό>ν[εξ]

[To Queen B]erenike, [sister and w]ife of king Ptolemy, [son of Ptolemy],
 Posidippos the Phourarcho[s, commander of those in the fortress] and at
 Kition and Boskos and the 'fellow commanders'.⁴¹⁹

According to Dittenberger, however, the *lectio* κυνηγ[έται] should be preferred to (σ)υνηγεμ(ό)ν[εξ].⁴²⁰ K had been commonly read by all the first readers and only Visconti reconsidered it as Σ, very likely to render clear the meaning of the text.⁴²¹ This inscription had been also published earlier in *CIG* with another *lectio* 'οἱ κυνηγ[οί]' – instead of 'οἱ κυνηγέται' – according to Boeckh's text.⁴²²

⁴¹⁶ E.g. Pouilloux *et al.* 1987, n°363 = *SEG* XXX, 1654.

⁴¹⁷ E.g. Cayla 2018, n°20 = Mitford 1961, 33 n°88 = *SEG* XIII, 584.

⁴¹⁸ Yon 2004, n°2015, 245 with comments and bibliography. She preferred the *lectio* συνηγεμόνες, considering improbable the presence of κυνηγέται. However, they appear frequently in the Hellenistic period in Ptolemaic inscriptions and several Egyptian papyri dated to the same period, cf. P. Lond. 3 XVII n°582; P. Eleph. Gr. 28 = Chrest. Wilck. 451.

⁴¹⁹ See Roussel, 1930, 25 where he compares them with the Roman *venatores*.

⁴²⁰ *OGIS* n°20, vol. I, 50-51.

⁴²¹ Yon 2004, n° 2015, 245.

⁴²² *CIG* 2614 = *SEG* XX.132; *SEG* XXXI.1348.

Both Boeckh and Dittenberger agree that the *lectio* <σ>σνηγεμ<ό>ν[ες] was conventionally reconstructed without considering the autoptic reading of the text. Thus, it seems more plausible that the last word is κνηγ[έται or κνηγ[οί. But which is more probable? Perhaps the κνηγοί? What is the difference between κνηγέται and κνηγ[οί]? Κνηγέται may be ‘hunters’ who often appear in Greek texts; the role played by the κνηγοί, by contrast, is still controversial. According to Roussel, they probably were a military or paramilitary organisation, particularly widespread in Ptolemaic Egypt.⁴²³ They may have been in charge of leading dogs used as patrol and guard dogs in palaces and fortresses. Some examples come from literary sources and inscriptions. A passage of Aeneas Tacticus tells us that Nicocles of Salamis sent out a force with patrol dogs since he expected the city to be attacked.⁴²⁴ Therefore, dogs lived in Cypriot palaces also before the Ptolemaic rule with their leaders. To better explain the role of the κνηγοί and of the φρούραρχος mentioned in the inscription, we should analyse a passage of Plutarch – already quoted by Roussel – from the *Life of Aratus* where a guard dog was stationed on the walls of Sicyon to warn of an attack. A few lines later a κνηγός is mentioned too, the man in charge of leading and taking care of this dog.⁴²⁵ This might be the function of the κνηγοί mentioned in the Kition inscription.

Κνηγοί are also mentioned in other Hellenistic inscriptions. A couple of texts from Lydia attest to entire settlements dedicated to them; in one of these examples, guard dogs are mentioned along with a φρούραρχος.⁴²⁶ Other two inscriptions from continental Greece show that the office of the κνηγοί could be linked to the cult of Herakles. One of them bears three letters from Demetrios to Harpalos the *epistatēs* of Beoria (248 BC) concerning the management of the temple of Herakles in the city.⁴²⁷ The text states that the messengers who carried the letters were two κνηγοί. The other inscription concerns the change of the colour of the vest of the κνηγοί of Herakles in Demetrias according to the wish

⁴²³ Roussel 1930, 362-363.

⁴²⁴ Forster 1941, 115; Aen. 22.20.

⁴²⁵ Plutarch, *Arat.* 24; Roussel 1930, 364-365.

⁴²⁶ *SEG* LVII, 1150; Herrmann, Malay 2007, 49, 32; *SEG* XXVI, 1306; Sokolowski 1980, 103-106 (I thank Cristina Gonzales Mestre and Riet Van Bremen for their personal comments).

⁴²⁷ Hatzopoulos 1994, 103; Hatzopoulos *et al.* 1998, vol. I n°3; *SEG* XII, 311; *SEG* XLIII, 379.

of king Philip V.⁴²⁸ The analysis of these texts led scholars – particularly Hatzopoulos – to conclude that the *κυνηγοί* were courtiers, members of paramilitary groups in charge of checking fortresses. Perhaps, they also were hunters responsible of guarding the forest where the royal hunt took place,⁴²⁹ in Greece, some of them were selected to become priests of the cult of Herakles.

Finally, a papyrus from the Arsinoite *nome* possibly mentions again the *κυνηγοί*. It clearly concerns a siege; the besieged citizens are encouraged to resist since the *kynēgoi* and the *stratēgos* will arrive soon. Although the term *kynēgoi* is partially reconstructed in lacuna as [κ]νηγοί, it seems plausible that dogs were used as guard on the walls of a besieged city and that their arrival was a significant aid.⁴³⁰ Thus, since the *kynēgoi* were well attested in similar contexts – on fortresses and on walls of cities perhaps along with a *φρούραρχος* – it seems more plausible that the Kition alphabetic inscription concerns them rather than the *kynēgetai*, ‘hunters’, as suggested by Dittenberger.

In light of this analysis, as Hermary suggested, we can suppose that the *kalebim* were actual dogs, probably used even before the Ptolemaic period in Kition for defending the palace or for hunting. They were a major expense, worth recording in the accounts and this suggests that they were kept in large numbers.⁴³¹

Further insights could come from the study of the lion cubs mentioned in the Kition tablet. Hermary considers them simply ‘dog whelps’, following Heltzer’s interpretation.⁴³² However, the term is rarely used to indicate whelps in general, and in different Semitic languages, especially Biblical Hebrew, most of the occurrences refer specifically to lion cubs, as noted by Masson and Sznycer.⁴³³ Thus, the tablet could have recorded expenses for dogs and lion cubs.⁴³⁴ It is likely that in both face A and B KLBM and GRM were animals,

⁴²⁸ Intzesiloglou 2006, 67-77.

⁴²⁹ Woodward 1911-1912, 136 n°7; Hatzopoulos 1994, 102.

⁴³⁰ P. Petr. 2.40. The papyrus needs a fresh comment. While waiting to check the lacuna in person in the British Library, where the papyrus is held, the previous *lectio* has been accepted. A few lines later, an *ἐλεφαντηγός* is mentioned, the ship which transported elephants and in this case, also grain.

⁴³¹ In some Near-Eastern documents, dogs appear along with the amount paid for them by the palace; Farber 2007, 35-64.

⁴³² Hermary 2014, 253; Heltzer 1987, 313, who translates ‘for the dogs and the cubs’.

⁴³³ Masson, Sznycer 1972, 65.

⁴³⁴ Cooke (1903, 65-70, n°20) and Rölling’s readings of the tablet identified GRM with the word *gerim*, which presents the same root of *gur*, and generally indicates ‘hosts’; they interpreted the

dogs and lion whelps, for whose maintenance or purchase the palace spent a substantial amount of money, almost the same in both records, 3QR and 3P' in face A and 3QR and 2P' in face B.

But could lion cubs have been kept in the palace – which paid for their upkeep as it paid the salary of the RB SPSRM and all the other employees mentioned in the Kition tablet? If so, why? Lions are a widespread image in Near-Eastern iconography as well as in Greece, a symbol of royal power and authority;⁴³⁵ they appear in Cyprus on coins, on funerary monuments or simply in small votive statues, sometimes sitting on a support plinth.⁴³⁶ One of the most frequent Cypriot iconographic subject is the 'master of the animals' or 'master of the lions'. For instance, he is represented through limestone statuettes dated to the seventh-fifth century BC holding a club in the right hand and a miniature lion on the left one. According to Counts, the 'master' combines two different iconographic traditions related to the lion:⁴³⁷ he recalls the Near-Eastern/Egyptian lion hunt and, at the same time, he has the lion-skin of Herakles.⁴³⁸

As far as the lion hunt is concerned, the famous Cypriot silver bowl, part of the Kourion treasure of Cesnola's collection held at the Metropolitan Museum, shows a winged deity of Assyrian type felling a rampaging lion with a sword.⁴³⁹ Assyrian reliefs from Nimrud at the British Museum also show royal figures, on chariots or on foot hunting lions and killing them in an artificial arena built in the palace garden.⁴⁴⁰ A similar scene appears in Niniveh on an alabaster

term here as the equivalent to the Latin *clientes*, clients, since they did not consider the presence of small lions as plausible (KAI 37). In order to explain why clients had been included in the accounts along with dogs, they interpreted dogs as servants. Masson and Sznycer had already rejected this interpretation since each line should have included the same category of persons following the pattern of the tablet. Van den Branden considered *gurim* as 'agnelli' (*sic*), lambs, and related the whole line to men who took part in religious ceremonies with lambs and dogs masks (Van den Branden 1966, 259). Peckham followed this interpretation but thought about men dressing lion masks (Peckham 1968, 317); for the use of masks in ritual performances in Cyprus see Averett 2015, 3-45.

⁴³⁵ For a recent interpretation on a common Levant *koiné* on architecture and lion reliefs in the Near-East see Weber 2017, 85-106.

⁴³⁶ Markou 2015, 78-83; Karageorghis 2000 *et al.*, 137, 205; Karageorghis 2005 44, 113-114; Walcher 2009, tafel 19.

⁴³⁷ Counts 2010, 137; Counts 2008, 7-12; for a general overview on Assyrian art and the lion hunt see Matthiae, 1996, *passim*; Lincoln 2003, 139-154. For the representation of the lion hunt as a paradigm in the peripheral areas of the Persian Empire see Poggio 2012, 227-241.

⁴³⁸ A similar iconography also features a Bes found in Amathus; Fourrier, Hermary 2006.

⁴³⁹ Karageorghis *et al.* 2000, 182.

⁴⁴⁰ Barnett, Lorenzini 1975, *passim*; Tuplin 1996, 83-85; Alden 2005, 340.

relief from the North Palace of Assurbanipal (668 – 630 BC), where a lion is released from its cage in order to be hunted in an artificial hunting environment. We may assume that lions were captured wild and then released into an artificial hunting arena.⁴⁴¹ This peculiar Assyrian practice has been inherited by the Achaemenids, who hunted lions riding horses or on chariots in the *paradeisos*, as several iconographic representations suggest.⁴⁴²

Even more relevantly, along with lions being hunted and killed, Assurbanipal's reliefs also show tamed lions which are kept in a garden. A first panel displays a female musician with a feather headdress accompanied by a tamed lion in a park, probably during a procession. A second panel presents a lion and a lioness in a park, probably located in the palace.⁴⁴³ Another famous relief of Sargon's palace from Dur-Sharrukin, Korshabad held at the Louvre shows a male figure who holds a lion cub, a symbolic representation of the royal power.⁴⁴⁴ In view of this evidence, the presence of lions in palaces in Cyprus between the fifth and the fourth century BC, when the island was part of the Persian Empire, does not sound so implausible. Looking at the Persepolis reliefs, the Elamites offer to the great king two lion cubs among the other animals.⁴⁴⁵ Moreover, a passage from Herodotus describes the fight between a lion cub and a puppy dog in the Persian royal palace.⁴⁴⁶

As has been suggested by Alden, lion cubs were probably raised in the palace as symbol of royal authority or to be hunted. In Greek literature, two similes in the *Iliad* describe the kidnapping of lion cubs or the attempt to kidnap them.⁴⁴⁷ In particular, the first simile compares Achilles groaning for Patroclus to a lion robbed of its cubs by a hunter, a scene which several scholars relate to Gilgamesh's mourning for Enkidu, 'like a lioness deprived of her cubs'.⁴⁴⁸ Lion whelps also occur in similes in other Greek literary texts. In Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, Helen is compared to a lion cub which grew up in a family whose members erroneously interpreted its attitude as a sign of meekness; they held it

⁴⁴¹ Alden 2005, 340.

⁴⁴² Chantraine 1968-80, 3, 857.

⁴⁴³ Barnett, Lorenzini 1975, n° 88-90.

⁴⁴⁴ Beyer 1990, 19-21; Albenda 1986, *passim*.

⁴⁴⁵ Alden 2005, 342; Walser 1966, 73.

⁴⁴⁶ Hdt. 3.32, "Ἕλληνας μὲν λέγουσι Καμβύσεα συμβαλεῖν σκύμνον λέοντος σκύλακι κυνός", 'The Greeks say that Cambyses had set a lion cub to fight a puppy dog'.

⁴⁴⁷ *Il.* 18.318-322; *Il.* 17.133-136.

⁴⁴⁸ Alden 2005, 340 with bibliography; West 1997, 341-343; Brinkman 1956, iii 404.

in their arms, gentle and festive, while the animal was driven by a profound instinct for hunger, a sign of looming danger.⁴⁴⁹ We may assume that even in a Greek environment the practice of keeping tamed lions was known.

In conclusion, tamed lion cubs could live in the palace as symbol of royal power.⁴⁵⁰ As they are mentioned along with dogs in the Kition accounts, they could both have been employed in the hunt or kept as tame animals. In any case, they were probably related to the palace environment and were not male prostitutes employed in the temple. Accordingly, the chief of scribes mentioned in these texts is probably also a palace rather than a temple official.

To understand why the temple of Astarte has been mentioned in the tablet and to further prove that the expenses were related to a palace environment instead of to the temple, we should look again at the very recent overview on the state of research of the Phoenician *ostraka* from the palace at Idalion by Amadasi and Zamora López.⁴⁵¹ In some of these administrative *ostraka* places of worship and religious ceremonies are mentioned, along with the *marzeah* related to Astarte and Melqart – as seen in the first chapter.⁴⁵² Some of these *ostraka* may thus present palace expenditure on cult organisation.⁴⁵³ Similarly, the temple of Astarte mentioned in the Kition tablet is not necessarily the location where the records were made and kept but could have been one of the several religious institutions to which the palace made payments for maintenance.

This is even more plausible if we consider that political and religious authority overlapped and therefore, the government was plausibly in charge of cult organisation. Moreover, looking at the Kition tablet, we may notice that Astarte is not the only divinity mentioned in the list. Along with paying for architects who built her temple, the palace administration also paid for 20 artisans who built pillars in the temple of Mekal (13A and 5B). This probably

⁴⁴⁹ Aesch. Ag. 723; Medda 2009, 295-205.

⁴⁵⁰ Aelian (*De Natura Animalium* 12.23) presents a unique instance of tame lions living in a temple; but this is probably a literary construct. In 12.22, Aelian speaks of dogs which lived in a temple in Crete and go mad; he then moves, in the following paragraph, to a temple in Elam, dedicated to Anaitis, in which lions welcome and fawn upon those on their way to the shrine. The choice of locating the lions in the temple could depend on the literary need to compare animals' different behaviours in similar places – cf. the dogs in the previous paragraph.

⁴⁵¹ Amadasi, Zamora López 2016, 187-192; Amadasi, Zamora López 2018b, 187-214.

⁴⁵² McLaughlin 2001, *passim*.

⁴⁵³ Amadasi 2017, 281.

was the same divinity mentioned in the bilingual inscription from Idalion as Reseph-Mikal.⁴⁵⁴ According to this interpretation, the whole tablet should be read from a different perspective, considering all the employees as linked to the palace environment.⁴⁵⁵

3.1.1 The chief of scribes

This long discussion has shown that the chief of scribes was employed in the palace administration rather than in the temple. But what were his main duties? Did the chief of scribes have a direct relationship with the king and his entourage or did he just carry out administrative tasks?

In line 14 of the Kition accounts, RB SPRM is followed by the word ŠLḤ which has given rise to different interpretations. According to Schmitz, who considers ŠLḤ as two separate words, Š LH, the sequence could be translated as ‘chief of the scribes of the tablet’, where Š is the determinative pronoun ‘OF’ expressing the indirect genitive and LH indicates a stone tablet bearing an inscription.⁴⁵⁶ This interpretation is difficult to accept because the pronoun Š is attested only in Punic and never appears in Phoenician.⁴⁵⁷ Moreover, the sequence N1 Š N2, ‘noun1 of noun2’, presented as a syntactic framework used to designate craft specialization, is frequent and well known in Late Punic but without parallels in any Phoenician documents dated from the fifth to third centuries BC.

The term ŠLḤ can be easily related to the root ŠLḤ which indicates ‘to send’ and could be considered as a *pual* perfect 3rd person singular or participle. If we read it as a participle, the verb can be translated as ‘who/which has been sent’.⁴⁵⁸ The same expression is also used in the tablet in line 16 A, [] ŠLḤ BYM Z QR 2 WQ[P, ‘who has been sent off on this day, 2 QR and [] Q’. By accepting this reading, some editors preferred to link the participle to the amount

⁴⁵⁴ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Idalion n°4 = ICS 220 = Yon 2004, n°69.

⁴⁵⁵ Moreover, the ‘Holy Queen’, MLKT QDŠT, mentioned in line 6 face A may be the equivalent of the Cypriot Greek *wanassa*, the ‘queen’ divinity of Cypriot culture, attested in Paphos. Her figure might have overlapped with that of Astarte – as it happened in Paphos with Aphrodite and the *wanassa*.

⁴⁵⁶ Schmitz 2009, 499; Krahmalkov 2000, 461-462.

⁴⁵⁷ Krahmalkov 2000, 451.

⁴⁵⁸ For the 3rd person singular see Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 117; Amadasi followed KAI 37, for which this is a *pual* perfect. She related the verb to the amount described at the end of the line. For the participle, see Dupont-Sommer 1970, 159; Masson, Sznycer 1972, 54 n°4.

described, pointing out that the chief of scribes did not live in the temple and the payment of QR 3 W QP' may have been sent to him. They assumed the same for line 16 A. Their hypothesis was based on the belief that all the other employees lived and worked in the temple of Astarte, with the exceptions of the two figures mentioned in line 14A and 16A. However, a better alternative is to assume that the chief of scribes and the official mentioned in line 16A were 'sent off' on behalf of the palace.

Amongst the scholars who preferred to relate the verb 'to be sent off' to the amount of money instead of to the chief of scribes, Bonnet affirmed that in the text, there is not pronoun Š, 'which', 'that', between the subject – the chief of scribes – and the verb – 'being sent off'.⁴⁵⁹ But the absence of Š could depend on the necessity to note briefly the reason for the expenditure. In fact, Š is reported only in long sentences where it is not obvious what tasks the workers performed. For example, in line 13A, among the several duties that the artisans could have performed, they made specifically the pillars and the pronoun is explicitly present (LḤRŠM 20 'Š P'L). By contrast, where the duty was taken for granted, the pronoun seems to be avoided as in the case of the barbers in line 12A, LGLBM P'LM, where P'LM is a participle – *qal* in this case – as ŠLḤ in the following lines.⁴⁶⁰

But why was the chief of scribes sent off on behalf of the palace? Levantine parallels show that some high-ranking scribes performed ambassadorial duties and became influential advisers to the king. In PRU 19.70, the king and the queen of Ugarit sent a messenger, *mâr-šipiri*, to the Hittite king, 'their father', for giving his regards.⁴⁶¹ The terms indicating the messenger and the scribe are the same, *šipiri*, both based on the common Semitic root SPR.⁴⁶² In Kings II 12, 11 and in Chron. II 24, 11, scribes held a place of honour in the list of great dignitaries as the SPR HMLK, *sôpēr hammelek*, or king's

⁴⁵⁹ Bonnet 1991, 169-171.

⁴⁶⁰ Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 115; Bonnet 1991, 157. Moreover, in Phoenician, the relative pronoun is commonly used with active or passive participles and a relative clause could also be expressed without the use of a relative pronoun, the so called 'virtual relative', both points which grammatically match the translation provided (Krahmalkov 2001, 100-101; for similar interpretations see Dupont-Sommer 1970, 159; Healey 1974, 53-60).

⁴⁶¹ PRU III 19, 70 l. 5.

⁴⁶² Del Olmo Lete, Sanmartin 2015, s. *šipiri*.

secretaries, who sometimes worked in a specific administrative department, the LŠKT SPRM, ‘*secretary bureau*’.⁴⁶³

The term RB SPRM, chief of scribes, is also attested several times in Phoenician-Punic texts.⁴⁶⁴ In the Phoenician administrative system, the scribe may also hold the title of HML’K, *mal’ak*, a sort of ‘agent’ or ‘messenger’, who was sent as an ambassador on behalf of the king. In an inscription dated 625-600 BC, found in Cilicia in Cebel Ires Daği – already mentioned in the second chapter –, a scribe is attested, who worked for a local SKN, *suken*, probably the governor of Ylbš.⁴⁶⁵ He carried out different tasks: he set down the inscription, WHSPR Z ŠT PHL’Š HSPR, but he was also a ‘messenger’, HML’K, *mal’ak*. Therefore, it is not surprising that in the Kition accounts, the chief of scribes may be sent on a mission on behalf of the palace administration. In this case, he played a diplomatic role, instead of being simply a writer, which matches the high remuneration he received.

Although it is only an attempt, Manfredi’s interpretation suggests how high the monthly salary of the *rab soferim* was.⁴⁶⁶ She paired the letters QR, QP’ and P’ with three different coins struck in Kition during the fourth century BC, when Milkyaton was king, assuming that these quantities indicated amounts of money. According to her, QR is a name built on the Semitic root *qarār*, ‘heavy’ or ‘precious’; this was the name of the local silver stater – the stater which bears Heracles on the *recto* and a lion that kills a deer on the *verso*. P’ might be the local obol, the smallest monetary unit; the name would be associated with the Semitic root P’Y ‘to divide’ and it might indicate a fraction. Finally, QP’ should correspond to the third typology of coin used during Milkyaton’s reign, the tetrobol with Heracles on the *recto* and a lion hunting a deer on the *verso*, although the origin of the word QP’ is not clear.⁴⁶⁷ According to Manfredi, it is not surprising that Kition coins followed their own nomenclature. The same happened with contemporary coins of other Cypriot

⁴⁶³ Jer. 36, 12, 20.

⁴⁶⁴ Bonnet 1991, 147-171, who provides a table with all the attestations of scribes and chief of scribes in the Phoenician-Punic world. RB SPRM is attested also in Carthage in the fourth-third century BC in *CIS I* 16051 and twice in Algeria in the second-first century BC (see Sznycer 1987, Const. 43, *EH* 281).

⁴⁶⁵ Mosca, Russel 1987, 1-28.

⁴⁶⁶ Manfredi 1987, 81-87.

⁴⁶⁷ Manfredi 1987, 83-84.

city-states. For instance, in a Hesychian gloss the term ἄγκυρα is said to be the Cypriot term for τριώβολον.⁴⁶⁸ Therefore, if Manfredi's hypothesis is true, we may calculate that the chief of scribes was paid 3 silver staters and some tetrobols for his performance.

Finally, we may notice that the other employee who was 'sent off' – that who was mentioned in line 16 A and perhaps was another palace official – was paid less than the RB SPRM whose salary is particularly valuable, 3 QR, the highest payment along with that for the dogs and lion cubs. Thus, we may conclude that when the RB SPRM was sent off on behalf of the palace, he played a more important role, plausibly diplomatic, than that of other correspondents sent out on a mission. All this evidence confirms that the chief of scribes held prestigious office and was well paid for his performance. He probably was a member of the elite whose duties could include activities related to foreign policy as well as simply writing and accounting. He may have been influential and close to the sovereign.

One of the skills attested for scribes was the ability to know and write various languages, and this would also have been a suitable skill in the Cypriot context, where we expect scribes to be able to write at least Cypriot-syllabic Greek/Eteocypriot and Phoenician.⁴⁶⁹ In almost all the Cypriot inscriptions which have been considered, the scribes can be linked to foreign areas close to the island, with the exceptions of the RB SPRM mentioned in the tablet of the accounts from Kition. In the dedication to Eshmun, the name KLKY appears. KLKY is the son of Abdu, the *rab soferim*, for whom the father dedicated the stele to Eshmun and at the same time, it is the name of Abdu's father, grandfather of the young KLKY. The Phoenician name KLKY is frequently attested in Cyprus and it is also mentioned in one of the *ostraka* of the Idalion archive.⁴⁷⁰ It should be interpreted as an ethnic anthroponym in -y, derived from the toponym Cilicia, equivalent to the Greek Κιλικῆς, - ἄφος. Perhaps, this name might indicate connections with Anatolia.

⁴⁶⁸ Manfredi 1987, 84; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 268 §296; Hesch. α 597.

⁴⁶⁹ Moore 2013; Steele 2018, *passim*.

⁴⁷⁰ GT 1 L'BD' BN KLKY, 'one gat for Abdo, son of Kilikay' = *ID A 1680* (2006); Amadasi 2017, 280. The term GT is probably a Phoenician hapax for 'farm', whose equivalent is only attested in Semitic texts from Ugarit; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 419, §531.

The ethnic turned into a proper name is not infrequent in Phoenician, for instance the adjective ‘Egyptian’, MŠRY, is common in Phoenician inscriptions as a personal name.⁴⁷¹ As Masson demonstrated, the name KLKY is properly Cypriot-Greek: it is often attested in the Cypriot-syllabic *corpus* as well as in Greek alphabetic inscriptions, in particular in the NW area of the island, in the territory of Marion, very close to the Anatolian coast.⁴⁷² In Kition, the name Kilikas is also attested in a dedication to Apollo Magirios, on a base of a statue now lost, on which two texts were inscribed in Cypriot-syllabic and alphabetic Greek.⁴⁷³ KLKY transliterates the Greek *kappa*, as Phoenician *kaph*, which is peculiar to inscriptions from Cyprus, while elsewhere it is Greek *chi*, χ , that is represented by Phoenician *kaph*, and *kappa* by *koph*.⁴⁷⁴ This particular Cypriot phenomenon may be due to the influence of a substrate language; it might be a very plausible circumstance in Cyprus where other indigenous languages were written through the Cypriot-syllabic system.

Cypriot inscriptions often show loans and semantic translations of anthroponyms from Phoenician into Greek, or equivalent names, in particular in the bilingual inscriptions, where Phoenician names were translated into Greek.⁴⁷⁵ The use of equivalent names seems to have been a common tendency among Cypriot Phoenician and Greek bilingual speakers. As has already been noticed by several scholars, material culture demonstrates that Cypriot society was mixed. It absorbed ‘multi-directional influences’ from different cultural groups.⁴⁷⁶ This complexity is shown in the *ostraka* of the Idalion archive where documents are written in Cypriot-syllabic Greek and Phoenician and several

⁴⁷¹ Krahmalkov 2000, 303.

⁴⁷² Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 419 §531; Masson 1968, 9-15; Masson 1974, 157-162; Amadasi 1974, 169-170; Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 46. A different etymology of KLKY has been provided by Garbini, who associated the term to the Greek $\chi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\kappa\eta$, purple, also $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\kappa\eta$, equivalent of the Greek name *Porphyrios* (Garbini, 1975, 15-16); Bonnet 1990, 146-148.

⁴⁷³ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Vouni n°1 = *ICS* 251; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Egypt n°106 (Karnak 37); Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Dhrymou n°4 = *ICS* 87; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Marion n°11; 47 = *ICS* 104; 136; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Mersinaki n°2 = *ICS* 210; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 355 §424.

⁴⁷⁴ For other examples, the toponym Λάρναξ becomes LRNK in *KAI* 43, 9, and in the coin legends of king Δημονίκος, his name is written in Phoenician DMNKS or DMNWKS (Kraay 1976, 387; Tuplin 1996, 46; Lipinski 2004, 80-87; Steele 2018, 170-171). Accordingly, we may assume that the Cypriot Phoenician language, at least after the fifth century BC, does not conform to the general rules for the transposition of voiceless velars from Greek and Latin into Phoenician. See Amadasi 1974, 169; Steele 2013, 201-242.

⁴⁷⁵ Steele 2013, 210-234, with several examples; Amadasi 2007, 207-209; Hadjisavvas, Dupont-Sommer, Lozachmeur 1984, 108-10.

⁴⁷⁶ Steele 2013, 218-219; Yon 1997, 10-11; Yon 2006, 37-61; Yon 2007, 125; Tuplin 1996, 66.

Greek names have been transliterated into Phoenician.⁴⁷⁷ Indeed, families with mixed names are attested in other Phoenician inscriptions, on coins and sometimes in Greek-syllabic texts too. A Phoenician-named son with a Greek named father occurs frequently and the phenomenon could be bidirectional. It is probably the result of inter-marriage or onomastic influences; KLKY may be included in one of these categories. The name may have been introduced from the Greek into Phoenician in Cyprus, as the peculiar outcome of K turned into *kaph* implies; it could have happened in a mixed family.⁴⁷⁸

Thus, the RB SPRM may have been a member of a mixed family – whose son KLKY was named for his grandfather so that there had already been at least two generations of contact/mixing – and perhaps he could have known more than one language; his mother tongue was plausibly Phoenician but he was probably familiar with Cypriot Greek. As said above, the ethnic KLKY refers to Anatolia and Cilicia. A basic level of contact between Cypriot and Anatolian population is demonstrated by the existence in Cypriot Phoenician and Syllabic-Greek inscriptions of other names besides KLKY related to Anatolia such as Manes, Moles and Pigres.⁴⁷⁹ Although this fact does not provide any evidence that our *rab soferim* was able to speak Anatolian languages too, his name could testify that he was in some way related to Anatolia. According to the data obtained from the *corpora* of the Greek inscriptions, the name Kilikas is mentioned once in Asia Minor and 10 times in Cyprus, whereas it appears sporadically in other Mediterranean areas, including the Syro-Levantine coast and Phoenicia. We may suppose that it was a common Cypriot name to indicate someone related to Cilicia. Personal connections with a foreign country could be useful in diplomatic relations and may suggest that one of the functions of the *rab soferim* was to represent the king abroad.

A similar situation is also shown in the epitaph discussed above. In this case, the *rab soferim* seems to have had contacts with Jewish culture. The

⁴⁷⁷ Amadasi 2017, 280.

⁴⁷⁸ Although the evidence supporting the theory that the bilingualism was widespread is relatively limited, bilingual inscriptions, some loanwords and onomastic data attest without doubt a significant level of contacts between Phoenician and Greek speakers and in particular circumstances also between Greek and Eteocypriot or Phoenician speakers and a local undefined substrate language (Steele 2013, 222-224; Steele 2018, 147-196).

⁴⁷⁹ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 383-384 §460; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, uncertain origins n°26 = ICS 360.

epitaph is one of the stelae found in the Agios Georghios necropolis, which consists of sixty-three tombs, dated to the classical period. Six of them contain an inscribed stele, showing officials and workers with genealogies rich with information, significant for onomastic studies as well as for the history of the society of Kition during the fifth and fourth century BC.⁴⁸⁰ According to Yon, the funerary goods, pottery and jewels found in the tombs, along with some titles mentioned in the inscriptions, demonstrate that the deceased belonged to the upper class of Kition.

The first editors, Dupont-Sommer and Lozachmeur, interpreted the thirteen anthroponyms mentioned in these funerary stelae as nine Phoenicians and four Hebrews.⁴⁸¹ This led them to believe that a Jewish community lived in Kition during the fourth century BC and was part of the local elite. But as Sznycer demonstrated, only two of the anthroponyms are undoubtedly Hebrew, among them the name of the ancestor of the *rab soferim*.⁴⁸² The other two names may be either Hebrew or Phoenician. Unfortunately, the other epitaph which clearly shows a Hebrew name does not provide any information on the qualification and titles of the deceased and his ancestors.⁴⁸³ Since it seems that in Cypriot Phoenician inscriptions the common pattern is to provide every evidence of prestigious titles held by family members in order to increase their status, they probably did not play any significant administrative role. In this case, the deceased was called Shillem, and his father 'SPYHW, 'Asaph-Yâhou, 'Yahvé has gathered' whose name is a hapax in Semitic onomastic. By contrast, in the other epitaph mentioned above, the father of the *rab soferim* was called 'ZR YHW, 'Azar-Yahou, 'Yahvè helped him', a name attested several times in the Bible.⁴⁸⁴ These data are not enough to prove the existence of a Jewish community during the classical period in Kition, nor widespread knowledge of the language, but once again, these inscriptions attest that the population was heterogeneous. Again in this case, as well as providing information on the language skills of the chief of scribes, these inscriptions testify that he could

⁴⁸⁰ Yon 2004, 195-196.

⁴⁸¹ Hadjisavvas, Dupont-Sommer, Lozachmeur 1984, 101-116.

⁴⁸² Sznycer 2004, 217-228.

⁴⁸³ Hadjisavvas, Dupont-Sommer, Lozachmeur 1984, 108; Sznycer 2004, 223-224.

⁴⁸⁴ Yon 2004, n°1131; 1134. Generally, on the Agios Georghios inscriptions see Yon 2004, 194-198.

have had some links with the Jews of the Syro-Levantine coast; these links would have been convenient for a diplomatic official.

3.1.2 The scribes

The presence of a chief of scribes involved the existence of a body of scribes subjected to his control. This is also confirmed by an *ostrakon* of White Wheelmade pottery which provides a list of anthroponyms and accounts in all likelihood related to an administrative system.⁴⁸⁵ In line 3, Yon and Amadasi are able to read the term SPRM, *soferim*. The first letter is almost invisible but from what can be read, it may be identified as an S with the shape peculiar to Kition which is found in painted scripts on *ostraka* and accounts tablets.⁴⁸⁶ Since line 5 shows K KLY[, – probably an anthroponym, where the letters KL are followed by an uncertain consonant – we could compare it with the name KLKY, the same anthroponym associated with scribes in the others Kition inscription. The interpretation of KLY[as an anthroponym, however, remains controversial.⁴⁸⁷

But what were the main duties of these scribes? Generally, in the Near-East and Syro-Levantine coast, the main tasks of a scribe were responsibility for the archives and for the creation of calendars and of lists of products as well as payments.⁴⁸⁸ Scribes may work in the palace or in the temple. Traditionally, during the Bronze Age, when the palace system concentrated power in the hands of elites, scribes were trained in professional schools under the control of these two main institutions. They formed a highly qualified group, competent, serving in a period when writing and scripts had become political, as well as administrative tools. With the advent of the alphabetic writing system, the structure was ‘democratised’ and, although not all the population was literate, scribes themselves contributed to spread writing skills. The scribe was a secretary, principally responsible for publishing documents, projecting,

⁴⁸⁵ Yon 2004, n°1094 = Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 143-144, D 15. 1. PĶŠ...[2. 'ŠMN . .[3. ŠPRM B [4. 'BD . . L [5. K KLY [6. 'Š . . P . . B [7. . . . [1. KŠ (?) [2. Eshmoun [3. Scribes [4. Abdu. . . [5. KLKY (?) 6. who. . . [7. (?)

⁴⁸⁶ Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 143.

⁴⁸⁷ Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 144; Amadasi reads it as KKL YTN but the text is very unclear.

⁴⁸⁸ Bonnet 1991, 163-164.

supervising and advertising texts, rather than being merely the executor of material inscriptions.⁴⁸⁹ Kition scribes may have played similar roles.

The Kition accounts and the Idalion *ostraka* imply that in Cyprus one of the scribes' main duties was writing accounts and expenses for the palace. Most of the classical and Hellenistic Cypriot-Phoenician accounting documents were written on *ostraka*, with ink. Alabaster and gypsum tablets were also used, written in black or red ink as well as clay tablets, which however did not survive in large quantities due to the perishable nature of the material. Chapter number 5 will analyse an example. In classical Cyprus, this evidence suggests the existence of specialised writers or group of writers, experts in writing on particular kinds of tablets and support material.

In the Kition accounts, the scribes seem to have employed a standardised system. This usually includes: a short title at the beginning of the text, which summarises the content; the date which usually corresponds to the 'nomenia', the New Moon of a particular month; and a bullet-point list where each line starts with the preposition L- , 'for/to', followed by the name or the title held by the person employed, or by both the work done and the payment shown through figures and units of measurement. Moreover, the method seems to follow an order which is not based on the amount paid but rather on chronology. Magistrates are always mentioned first and in face B, if we look at the tablet, line 4 was apparently inserted later between line 3 and 5, perhaps indicating that the accounts should follow a precise order. These data are relevant for a better understanding of the scribes' training and education. Although inscriptions do not mention any particular system of scribal education, we may assume that scribes must have been able to draw up precise formularies, according to particular patterns, and that they must have received some special training for being employed in the palace administration. According to Amadasi and Zamora López's analysis of the Idalion *ostraka*, most of the accounts were first inscribed; secondly, when the transaction was completed, they were obliterated and erased with a line; thirdly, at regular intervals, daily or monthly, they were copied on longer documents which were preserved more permanently. The shorter documents were then reused.⁴⁹⁰ A similar methodology was probably

⁴⁸⁹ Bonnet 1991, 165.

⁴⁹⁰ Amadasi 2017, 281.

employed to record the accounts of the palace of Kition; here too, some of the documents may also have been copied monthly, with the intention to preserve them for a long time.

The Kition accounts may also testify to other tasks performed by scribes. In face A, the first line mentions the total of palace expenditure in a specific month. In face B, the reading is disputed because the text is corrupt, in particular the first letters, but editors agree to read DT 'QB, both hapax, where DT should be equivalent of the Hebrew *day*, 'what is conformed to'.⁴⁹¹ 'QB is easily readable and it has been translated as 'remuneration'.⁴⁹² This should indicate that the amount paid for each employee was compliant with the class of workers to which they belonged. If this interpretation is correct, it shows that one of the functions of the palace administration was controlling the salary of the people employed and probably this was one of the scribes' duties, performed at the same time as they recorded the expenses. For example, we may notice that the servants were paid 1 QP' each for the whole month of work on both faces and consequently, the average salary for a servant was 1 QP' per month. Scribes were probably aware of this and checked that the paid outcome effectively matched the standard salaries.

We might also suppose that the 'calculator' mentioned in one inscription from Kition was one of the scribes employed in the palace who was in charge of calculating the payments of the accounts. The inscription is now lost but has been recorded in *CIS*, copied by Pococke.⁴⁹³ According to Amadasi, it may be a funerary stele.⁴⁹⁴ It consists of four lines. The first one shows the name of the deceased, perhaps ŠNT, although the reading is controversial. Line 2 bears the text 'HḤŠB BN'. The root HḤŠB indicates 'to count', 'to make an account'; therefore, the sequence can be translated as 'the calculator' 'son'. Thus, the deceased or his father, or perhaps both of them, should have been 'book-keepers', potentially employed in the palace administration. It is very likely that this title was hereditary since line 4 presents the same sequence of letters 'HḤŠB.

⁴⁹¹ Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 120; Masson, Sznycer 1972, 53.

⁴⁹² Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 120; Masson, Sznycer 1972, 57. It corresponds to the Hebrew 'éqèb', price.

⁴⁹³ Pococke's drawing is however very imprecise (1745, 212).

⁴⁹⁴ Amadasi Karageorghis 1977, B19, l.69 = Yon 2004, n°1049 = *CIS* I, 74; Magnanini 1974, 89-90.

These may concern another member of the family according to the practice of mentioning the title of the ancestor – as shown in several instances above.⁴⁹⁵ If so, we may suppose that scribes specially trained to record calculations existed.

Also, the palace's scribes were probably aware of the local calendar system and they drew up the accounts on the basis of that. The palace administration made payments on the New Moon, *nomenia*, of each month. The term ἩΔΣ, *nomenia*, while present in some Punic texts, is not attested in Phoenician inscriptions outside of Cyprus.⁴⁹⁶ It is mentioned in the Kition accounts and in a Hellenistic inscription from Lapethos.⁴⁹⁷ These lists of expenses were made during the whole month until the new moon that marks the beginning of another month, for which another tablet would have probably been written up. Therefore, we may assume that this system was peculiar to Cyprus and that administration's scribes were skilled in marking calendars. This will be confirmed in chapters number 5 and 6 by the analysis of other documents linked to local administrative centres.⁴⁹⁸

But was this administrative system, with calculators, specialised scribes and their chief, widespread in most, if not in all, the Cypriot city-states? Idalion and Kition show the same recording system in the accounts of the local palaces. Although the Idalion archive is dated to the fourth century BC, when the Kitians had already conquered this city-state, it is quite implausible that in a few years the Kitians completely changed the previous administrative system and established a new one similar to that used in Kition. It is more plausible that the Idalion palace had an administrative system very similar to that of Kition already before the Kitians' domination. Moreover, a recent excavation of the palace of Paphos may confirm this theory. It brought to light an *ostrakon* with accounts written in Cypriot-syllabic Greek, very similar to those of Idalion and Kition.⁴⁹⁹ This may demonstrate that the Paphian palace had an archive similar to the Idalion archive where administrative accounts were stored.⁵⁰⁰

⁴⁹⁵ Amadasi, Karageroghis 1977, 70.

⁴⁹⁶ For onomastic studies related to '*nomenia*' in Cyprus see Masson, Sznycer 1972, 32. *KAI* 43, 4; *KAI* 37, 2; *KAI* 43, 10/12.

⁴⁹⁷ *KAI* 41, 1, 4.

⁴⁹⁸ E.g. see the Bulwer tablet analysed in chapter 5; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Akanthou n°1 = *ICS* 327.

⁴⁹⁹ Iacovou, Karnava 2020, 37-52.

⁵⁰⁰ The following chapters analyse other documents which will help to corroborate this theory – among them the famous 'Bulwer Tablet'. Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Akanthou n°1 = *ICS* 327.

But other city-states may have had a similar administrative system with scribes specialised in recording accounts of the palace. An epitaph from Marion, dated to the sixth century BC, shows the name of Onesagoras, son of Stasagoras called ‘*to-ti-pe-te-ra-lo-i-po-ne*’ in genitive case, the διφθεραλοιφός. This term is a Cypriot-Greek hapax.⁵⁰¹ According to a gloss by Hesychius, it corresponds to the Greek γραμματοδιδάσκαλος, generally translated as ‘teacher’.⁵⁰² However, the term is obscure and scholars have advanced different interpretations. For instance, Bazemore claims that it might indicate ‘leather painter’, ‘leather oiler’ or ‘leather anointer’, thus a sort of ‘recorder’, since the term διφθέρα means ‘leather’.⁵⁰³ But διφθέρα is also used to describe a register or a tablet, leather prepared as writing material or simply ‘writing tablet’, ‘account book’. Diodorus records a fragment of Ctesia which mentions Achaemenid royal documents called βασιλικά διφθέραι, accounts which probably narrated court events. Therefore, the Marion διφθεραλοιφός may have recorded tablets or accounts related to the palace and the court.⁵⁰⁴

Bazemore’s alternative reading of *ti-pe-te-ra-lo-i-po-ne* may corroborate this theory. The scholar argued that this is not a genitive singular but a genitive plural. If so, Onesagoras’ father, Stasagoras, and perhaps Onesagoras himself would be members of a special congregation or a group of experts in writing accounts and expenses according to the local Cypriot system, the *diphtheraloiphoi*, who might have been in charge of teaching the calculation procedures. Bazemore argues that they were members of distinguished social groups, part of the elite of Marion.⁵⁰⁵ Therefore, specialised scribes would appear also in the Cypriot syllabic texts, as in the case of Marion, not only in the Kition sources. We may suppose that the διφθεραλοιφός was employed in the local palace as specialised scribe. This evidence, along with the reports of the archaeological excavations in Paphos, supports the hypothesis that the

⁵⁰¹ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II Marion n° 54 = ICS 143 *o-na-sa-ko-ra-u / to-sa-ta-sa-ko-ra-u / to-ti-pe-te-ra-lo-i-po-ne / e-mi*, I would translate the sequence as ‘I am of Onesagoras, son of Stasagoras, member of the *diphtheraloiphoi*’.

⁵⁰² Bazemore 2002, 397-418; Hsch. δ 1992, ‘διφθεραλοιφός: γραμματοδιδάσκαλος παρὰ Κυπρίοις’, ‘anointer of skins: teacher, among the Cypriots’; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 170 §184. See also comments in ICS, 143: ‘epitaph of a schoolmaster, fifth or fourth century BC’.

⁵⁰³ Bazemore 2002, 402.

⁵⁰⁴ On the use of διφθέρα see Diod. 2.32.4, ‘register’; Almagor 2012, 9-40; Stronk 2010, 15-21; Briant 2002, 889; Llewellyn-Jones, Robson 2010, 61-64. *Dptr* ‘record book’ is also attested in the Bible; for instance, see Esther 2.23, 6.1, 10.2, ‘king’s chronicles’.

⁵⁰⁵ Bazemore 2002, 401-402.

Cypriot city-states shared a similar administrative system with regular scribes, their chief and specialised staff, calculators and accounts writers.

To conclude, the presence of a chief of scribes is well attested in Kition during the classical period along with that of specialised scribes – and perhaps also in other city-states such as Idalion, Paphos and Marion. We have shown that the chief of scribes worked in the palace since he is mentioned in a tablet listing payments for several employees, and not in the temple, as was previously believed. The existence of a chief of scribes requires the presence of a body of several men who worked under his control, and this shows that the administrative structure was hierarchical, based on different levels and well organised. Scribes were mainly engaged in archiving and recording products, and were in charge of writing accounts and expenses for the palace administration following specific rules and procedures as described by the recent analysis of Amadasi and Zamora López.⁵⁰⁶ Since they adopted a standardised system, they must have undergone some form of training, perhaps in particular schools; they were aware of the calendar system, employing it in the accounts' tablets. Drawing up expenses, they checked that the amount paid was compliant with the work done by the employees. We may conclude that scribes performed common administrative tasks for the palace administration. Calculations were probably reserved to specialised scribes.

By contrast, the chief of scribes was sometimes sent away on behalf of the administration. He may have performed tasks such as messenger or diplomatic agent. As far as his skills are concerned, no inscription clearly testifies that the chief of scribes was able to speak more than one language but at least one of them shows that he was probably a member of a mixed family or Phoenician groups which had contacts with Greek culture, as it often happened in Cyprus; in some way, the chief of scribes may have been related to foreign border countries such as Cilicia or Judaea. Having roots in or at least ties with foreign neighbours may have facilitated his diplomatic service. Because of the role he played, the *rab soferim* may have had direct contacts with the members of the court and perhaps with the king.

⁵⁰⁶ Amadasi 2017, 280-285.

3.2 RB ẖZ‘NM and RB SRSRM, other palace officials?

The previous analysis of the Kition epitaphs shows two other significant titles. They are RB ẖZ‘NM, *rab hazannim*, translated as ‘chief of the inspectors’ and RB SRSRM, *rab sarsourim*, ‘chief of the commercial agents’. This is however a speculative translation since both titles are hapax.⁵⁰⁷ More specifically, they are attested in the epitaph of ŠMZBL and PRSY, RB SRSRM, whose stele was erected by their son ’RŠ who also was RB SRSRM so as the ancestors on his father’s side for five generations: this title was clearly hereditary. As shown above, the genealogy of ŠMZBL, mother of ’RŠ, is also mentioned in the text;⁵⁰⁸ it consists of the names of three ancestors, B’LRM, MLKYTN, ‘ZR, followed by the title of RB ẖZ‘NM.

Both these titles testify to the existence of a hierarchical system where chiefs controlled the work of subordinates, as in the case of the scribes and the chief of scribes. But what were the duties of the *hazannim* and the *sarsourim*? Firstly, although the epitaphs do not provide any specific information on the employment location of the RB ẖZ‘NM and the RB SRSRM, we may suppose that they also worked for the local government. The fact that they headed a group of subordinates suggests the existence of a complex hierarchical structure which fits well with the reconstruction of the palace’s administrative system that emerged above. If so, it would be plausible that also the *hazannim* and the *sarsourim* were employed in the palace along with their chiefs. Moreover, some of the names of ’RŠ’s ancestors on his mother side, B’LRM and MLKYTN, are typical of the members of the Kition elite, names usually held by kings and ‘*wanaktes*’.⁵⁰⁹ The name of ’RŠ’s father, PRSY, may also be related to the Kition upper class; it may recall the ancient Persian origins of ’RŠ whose Achaemenid ancestors probably had a privilege status in Kition.⁵¹⁰ Since they

⁵⁰⁷ Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, B45 = Yon 2004, n°1075 = KAI 34 = Magnanini 1973, 112-113, n°88; Teixidor 1974, 332 n°114; Szyner 1985, 79-86.

⁵⁰⁸ ŠMZBL is a hapax among the female names. The second part of the name, ZBL, means ‘prince’ and it may testify to the high rank of this person. Lipinski reads it as ‘the prince’s son/daughter’ (Lipinski 2004, 101; Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 98-99).

⁵⁰⁹ For instances, see Amadasi, Zamora López 2016, 187-193; Amadasi 2017, 282 for the name of MLKYTN in the Idalion *ostraka*.

⁵¹⁰ Cannavò 2012b, 351-352; Yon 1989, 370; Bonnet 1990, 145; similar may have been the case of Satrapas, an official employed in Paphos, better studied in chapter 6 (Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Nea-Paphos n° 1; 2 = ICS 2; 3); Tuplin 1996, 63; Lipinski 2004, 101; Szyner 1985, 79-86.

were part of the Kition elite, 'RŠ and his family members may have held prestigious offices in the palace administration.

But what tasks did they perform? Some scholars read the term 𐎲𐎠𐎡𐎢 as a compound of the participle 𐎲𐎠𐎡, 'to see', and of the dual of 'N, 'eyes' and translate it as 'chief of the inspectors', a term similar to the Assyrian *ḫazannu*.⁵¹¹ These 𐎲𐎠𐎡𐎢 may have inspected and controlled the resources that reached the palace – most of them must have been products of the territory of the city-states. The Assyrian *ḫazannu* played a similar role. One of their duties, for instance, was the regulation of the 'storage and distribution of barley'.⁵¹² Assyrian *ḫazannu* also informed the king about actions of corruption and negligence and they connected the sovereign, with whom they had direct contact, with the local population, particularly those who worked as local representatives. They have been defined by Van Buylaere as 'local *eyes and ears* of the king'.⁵¹³ If the Kitian 𐎲𐎠𐎡𐎢 played a similar role – as suggested by the etymology of the term – they may have been the 'inspectors' or 'investigators' that Clearchus attempted to describe – who have been analysed in detail in the first chapter. But the Cypriot 𐎲𐎠𐎡𐎢, apparently unlike the Assyrian *ḫazannu*, were part of a hierarchical system, coordinated by their chief who was a member of the upper class, perhaps of the royal family, and very likely employed in the central palace. The title of RB 𐎲𐎠𐎡𐎢 may have been appointed by the king with whom the official had direct contact; but contrary to that of RB SRSRM, it does not seem to have been hereditary.

The *sarsourim* were probably commercial agents. The term SRSRM has the same root of the Hebrew noun *sirsūr*, 'broker'.⁵¹⁴ They may have been in charge of managing the palace's commercial activities, dealing with purchases and sales and collaborating with scribes and calculators. They responded to a chief, the RB SRSRM, who probably was a member of the elite too, as his personal name suggests, whose office was hereditary.⁵¹⁵

⁵¹¹ Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 99; *KAI* 34; Krahmalkov 2000, 180; initially this title was linked to the Greek ἐπιμελητής τῶν κρηνῶν, inspector of the sources (Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 99 with bibliography).

⁵¹² Van Buylaere 2010, 230; Jakob 2003, 149-158; Nijenhuis 1991, 46-47.

⁵¹³ Van Buylaere 2010, 229-246

⁵¹⁴ Krahmalkov 2000, 349; Lipinski 2001, 220.

⁵¹⁵ Amadasi (Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 98) related this office to that of a hypothetical *ἀρχιπραγματευτής, chief of courtiers; Cannavò 2012b, 347-357.

All in all, both the officials RB ḤZ'NM and RB SRSRM were members of the upper class and were probably employed in the local palace along with *hazannim* and *sarsourim* as an integral part of the palace administration. Such an administrative system with a *rab soferim*, a *rab hazannim* and a *rab sarsourim* and their subjects may have been the result of a local Cypriot development. This administrative system survived over the years also under the Persian rule.⁵¹⁶ It was probably widespread in all the Cypriot city-states as the presence of specialised scribes and the *ostrakon* found in Paphos demonstrate.

⁵¹⁶ Jigoulov 2015, 128-129.

CHAPTER 4

The role of Carians and their ‘interpreter’ in the Kition administration

4.1 The Cypriot epigraphic attestations of KRSY and MLŠ (H)KRSYM

The office of MLŠ (H)KRSYM is the second most frequent title attested in the Cypriot-Phoenician corpus after the already analysed *rab soferim*. The tasks and duties of the MLŠ (H)KRSYM are controversial. The first word of the sequence, MLŠ, has been unanimously translated as ‘interpreter’ – the significance of which I will discuss later – but the meaning of the second word is disputed.

Three inscriptions from Kition bear the title of MLŠ (H)KRSYM; they are two dedications and an epitaph engraved on stone. A fourth document attests to the presence of a KRSY in Kition – probably the singular form of KRSYM. This is an *ostrakon* that bears a list of accounts and expenses, with an identical layout to that of the accounts of the Kition tablet analysed in the previous chapter.

The first dedication comes from Blastos Hill in Larnaca. It is engraved on two fragments of a marble container and it bears the sequence:

...] YTN ML[Š] (H)KRSYM L[...]

‘...]YTN the interpreter of (H)KRSYM ...’.⁵¹⁷

The epitaph was found in Tourabi Tekkè, very close to the classical early-Hellenistic Greek-Phoenician necropolis of Kition. It consists of two lines:

1. HMŠBT ’Z L’SMN’DNY ŠRDL BN ‘BDMLQRT BN

2. RŠPYTN MLŠ HKRSYM

This is the stele for ’SMN’DNY Shardal (?) son of ‘BDMLQRT son of RŠPYTN interpreter of HKRSYM’.⁵¹⁸

⁵¹⁷ It seems that the determinative article H was inscribed on the stone (HKRSYM). However, it is difficult to read it because of the lacuna. Since it appears in two other attestations, it is likely that it was also employed here too. By contrast, Š is completely missing in lacuna. See Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 23-25, A9 = Yon 2004, n°1009 = *CIS* I, 22; Bonnet 1995, 113; Lipinski 1983, 147; Lipinski 1995, 433-441.

⁵¹⁸ Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 88-90, B40 = Yon 2004, n°1070 = *CIS* I, 44; see Bonnet 1995, 114-115; Lipinski 1983, 129-165. The term HMŠBT, ‘the funerary stele’, with article, seems to be a peculiar form attested only in Kition – normally, it does not include the article. It occurs also in B2.1 (Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 51-53). On the determinative pronoun with

Finally, the last inscription is a dedication made by [RŠP]YTN son of ‘ZRTB‘L, MLŠ HKRSYM, to the god Melqart. It is inscribed on a marble base of a votive statue of uncertain provenance.⁵¹⁹ It consists of 7 lines and mentions the title of MLŠ HKRSYM three times. This title may be attributed either to RŠP]YTN or to his father ‘ZRTB‘L. But as I have argued in the previous chapter about the genealogy of the *rab soferim*, it is most likely that it was the dedicant who held the office of ‘interpreter’. The name of the dedicant, [RŠP]YTN, is partially restored in lacuna. This is a plausible reconstruction since RŠPYTN also appears in line 6 of this inscription. In this last instance, it is followed, once again, by the title of MLŠ HKRSYM. If we suppose that the dedicant and this RŠPYTN were the same person, the text confirms that the dedicant was the individual who played the role of ‘interpreter’.⁵²⁰ Moreover, it is probably not a coincidence that in the epitaph cited above, the MLŠ HKRSYM was called RŠPYTN too. Plausibly, both these texts concern the same individual or at least members of the same family bearing the same personal names. It is also remarkable that the ‘interpreter’ who dedicated the container – the first document mentioned above – had a name which ended in -] YTN, perhaps again RŠPYTN. Going further, we might argue that these three inscriptions concern the same individual, who was MLŠ HKRSYM. Although this is not indisputable, at least it is plausible that this title was held by members of the same family and perhaps was hereditary.

Unlike the other two inscriptions, the last dedication shows two dating formulas. At the beginning – line 1-2 –, the text states that the statue was erected

prosthetic *aleph* ’Z see Krahmalkov 2000, 10; Steele 2013, 196-199. This is one of the Cypriot Phoenician peculiarities and it is rarely attested in other Mediterranean areas (Schmitz 1995, 570-571; Krahmalkov 2001, 76-77). For other occurrences see Amadasi 2016, 6 on the Pyrgi tablets which show the same feature. ŠRDL is usually interpreted as the surname of the deceased but Van den Branden translated it as ‘the official of the door’ (1956, 90-95). This interpretation, however, has been rejected by most scholars (Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 89; Bonnet 1995, 114; Yon 2004, n°1070). Bonnet pointed out that the office of the ‘man on the door’ is already mentioned in the list of the accounts from Kition as ’Š ‘L DL’ (Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, C1 A l. 5 = Yon 2004, n° 1978 l. 5A). This sequence is clearly different from that shown in the epitaph.

⁵¹⁹ Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 178-184, F1 = Yon 2004, n°1125 = CIS I 88. On the provenance of this inscription see Caubet 1984, 221-229. In CIS, this inscription is said from Idalion. De Vogué, however, claimed that it came from Kition. This statement has been accepted by Caquot, Masson (1968, 303).

⁵²⁰ Amadasi (Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 181) already proposed this interpretation. By contrast, Piacentini claimed that ‘ZRTB‘L was the MLŠ HKRSYM (Piacentini 2003, 13-38).

during the month of P'LT in the third year of the reign of Milkyaton, king of Kition and Idalion, son of Baalrom. According to the chronology established by Van den Branden, this corresponds to 387/386 BC.⁵²¹ The second part of the inscription concerns the renewal of the dedication commissioned by the grandsons of RŠPYTN, 'BDPMY and 'BDMLQRT, 'sons of 'DNŠMŠ, son of RŠPYTN interpreter of K[RS]YM'. It is dated to the 6th year of the reign of Milkyaton.

Since scholars agree that these three inscriptions are related to each other, they have tried to date the first two texts on the base of this last dedication, and generally have claimed that they were inscribed during the reign of Milkyaton.⁵²² But as this last inscription shows, in the 6th year of Milkyaton, 384/383 BC, RŠPYTN was already a grandfather. This might suggest that he was at the end of his career and served as MLŠ HKRSYM also before the reign of Milkyaton. Milkyaton's father, B'LRM, is mentioned in the text but was never king since no title is reported.⁵²³ Therefore, RŠPYTN conceivably served also during the last years of the reign of Baalmilik II, the sovereign who preceded Milkyaton, whose father Ozibaal was the first king of both Kition and Idalion.⁵²⁴ Baalmilik II is attested in some inscriptions and coins as king of Kition and Idalion at least until 397BC.⁵²⁵ Thus, RŠPYTN might have been an 'interpreter' already in the first years of the fourth century BC. He served in the decades following the military campaign which allowed Kition to conquer Idalion – which happened after at least one previous unsuccessful siege.⁵²⁶ As we shall see in the following pages, interpreters were often employed in military actions; thus RŠPYTN's office might have been created during the middle of the fifth century BC – when Kition started an aggressive expansionistic policy and conducted military campaigns against neighbouring polities – and perhaps

⁵²¹ Van den Branden 1967, 55-70; Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 184.

⁵²² Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 24; Bonnet 1995, 114.

⁵²³ Van den Branden 1967, 60; Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 180. In the Cypriot documents, dating formulas usually show the name of the king followed by his father's name and the title of king – if he held it (see chapter 1). On this point see Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 180, n. 1). For further examples see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Paphos n°1-2 = ICS 6-7.

⁵²⁴ Yon 2004, n° 45; 46.

⁵²⁵ Markou 2011, 73-77. The coins are part of treasures buried in Idalion and in Vouni between the beginning of the fourth century BC and 380 BC; Schwabacher 1981, 23; 42-43.

⁵²⁶ See chapter 2.

further formalised through the years becoming one of the most prestigious posts.⁵²⁷

In the epitaph of 'SMN'DNY the term ML[Š] (H)KRSYM is located after the name of his grandfather RŠPYTN, but it is again most likely to belong to the dedicant himself. If the office of ML[Š] (H)KRSYM was held by 'SMN'DNY, we might suppose that it was hereditary and that 'SMN'DNY probably served during the government of Pummayaton, king of Kition and Idalion – and also of Tamassos for a brief period – who ruled from 362 to 312 BC. This epitaph was certainly written after 375BC, a sufficient amount of time for two generations – that of 'BDMLQRT son of RŠPYTN and that of 'SMN'DNY – to follow one another.⁵²⁸ However, we cannot exclude that 'SMN'DNY served during the last years of Milkyaton's reign.

4.2 The KRSYM in the Mediterranean and Near East

But who were the KRSYM? What role did they play in Kition? What were the main duties of the MLŠ HKRSYM? Was he an official serving in the government of Kition? The precise meaning of the two words MLŠ and KRSYM must be analysed to better understand the offices they held in Kition.

At first, KRSYM was identified as a plural noun meaning 'thrones'. Its etymology was reconstructed on the base of the Aramaic root KRS' and the whole sequence was read as 'the interpreter of the thrones'. According to this theory, the MLŠ HKRSYM performed his tasks in the court and he was one of the king's closest collaborators.⁵²⁹ This reading was considered the most plausible for a long time, until Lipinski provided an alternative interpretation.⁵³⁰ First, he pointed out that the root KRS' is attested in Aramaic but never in Phoenician, which instead employs the word KS' to indicate 'chair' or 'throne'.⁵³¹ Secondly, he claimed that the ending –YM is usually employed as plural for ethnic names – such as KTYM in the *ostraka* from Arad.⁵³² Therefore,

⁵²⁷ Yon 2004b, 115-126; Kassianidou 2016, 71-88.

⁵²⁸ Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 88.

⁵²⁹ This interpretation was initially followed by Amadasi, Karageorghis (1977, A9, B40, F1) and by Teixidor (1969, 319-358 n°85). By contrast, Van de Branden claimed that the sequence means 'interpreter of the stomach', a sort of *haruspex* (Van den Branden 1956, 91). Vattioni (1968, 71-73) read it as 'interpreter of the vessel', another form of oracle.

⁵³⁰ Lipinski 1983, 146-152.

⁵³¹ This was also noticed by Lidzbarski (1912, 12); Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 24 n. 4.

⁵³² Lipinski 2004, 98; I will further analyse the Arad *ostraka* in the following pages.

he proposed that KRSYM were Cretans.⁵³³ He suggested that in Kition, there were Cretan mercenaries who spoke a Subminoan language – and were not able to speak Greek – as the alleged ‘Eteocretans’ or ‘Cydonians’ did.⁵³⁴ According to Lipinski, they would be mercenaries employed by Milkaton in several campaigns against neighbouring polities.⁵³⁵ Bonnet has partially followed this theory confirming that KRSYM were Cretan mercenaries.⁵³⁶ But we might claim that, although the ‘Eteocretan’ language was preserved until the Hellenistic age in Crete, contacts among populations inevitably increased over the centuries and in the fourth century BC, Greek was widespread on the island. Thus, it is difficult to admit that they needed an interpreter.⁵³⁷

Garfinkel proposed that the KRSYM were ‘Kerosites’, mercenaries from Cyprus attested also in the Arad *ostraka* mentioned there in the singular form QRSY along with the KTYM, inhabitants of Kition according to him – on whom I will focus in the following pages.⁵³⁸ Krahmalkov provided another interpretation; he suggested that the MLŠ HKRSYM was the ‘interpreter of the Corsicans’, the classical *Corsi*, a population of North Sardinia. He claimed that Kition had a close relationship with this island, since Nora in Sardinia was a colony founded by that Cypriot city-kingdom, as the Nora stele shows.⁵³⁹ Finally, Stol advanced the hypothesis that the KRSYM were Carians – and

⁵³³ Lipinski 2004, 97; Fraser, Matthews 1987, n°93, 273; Teixidor 1969, 337; Magnanini 1973, 117.

⁵³⁴ *Od.* 3. 292-293; 19. 175-177; Strab. 10.4.6; Lipinski 2004, 98; Duhoux 1982, *passim*.

⁵³⁵ Lipinski 2004, 98-100; Lipinski 1983, 146-152; Szynger 1985, 82. He claimed they were mercenaries too.

⁵³⁶ Bonnet (1995, 113-124) analysed a tablet from Mari, written under the reign of king Zimri-Lim and dated to the 18th century BC which concerns the expenses of the trip taken by the king to Ugarit, where he resided for one month with part of the court (*ARMT XXIII 556:28-31 = ARM A 1270*). In lines 28-31, Cretans are mentioned as merchants settled in Ugarit; they were paid along with their interpreter. Bonnet proposed that the same happened in Kition in the fourth century BC. But several objections may be advanced. First, the comparison between Cretan community living in Ugarit during the 18th century BC and the alleged Cretans settled in Kition in the fourth century BC may be anachronistic. Secondly, Cretans are mentioned in the Mari text as *kap-ta-ra-i-im*, differently spelled from the KRSYM.

⁵³⁷ Morpurgo-Davies, Olivier 2012, 105-188.

⁵³⁸ Garfinkel 1988, 27-34.

⁵³⁹ Krahmalkov 2000, 243; Krahmalkov 2001, 5. In order to strengthen this interpretation, he proposed a new reading of the ethnic Shardal, ŠRDŁ – mentioned in the second Cypriot document analysed above in line 1 – as ŠRDN and he translated it as ‘Sardinian’. However, as Yon argued, the reading of the Phoenician text is clear and it is unlikely that the stone mason inscribed L instead of N by mistake. (Yon 2004, 207). The Nora stele seems to attest that Nora was a colony of Kition (*CIS I 144, KAI 46*; Gibson 1982, 3.11; Dupont-Sommer 1948, 16-17; Amadasi 1992, 315 see ‘Nora’; Lipinski 2004, 234; Yon 2004, 36-37 n°17). However, other scholars provide a different reading of the text of this stele (Cross 2003, 250 n°1, Schmitz 2012, 15-31).

Amadasi seems to concur with this interpretation.⁵⁴⁰ His suggestion is based on a couple of studies which have been ignored by other scholars principally focused on the history and languages of Cyprus. Both their authors, Ray and Zadok – recently followed by Herda – argued that the Phoenician KRSYM might have been ‘Carians’. However, they spent only few lines on this identification; a closer analysis of the documents that they briefly discussed will support their suggestion about the presence of Carians in Kition.

Ray, who first claimed that KRSYM were Carian mercenaries, based his work on the analysis of two Phoenician documents found in Egypt.⁵⁴¹ This is not surprising since epigraphic documents – most of the Carian inscriptions come from this country – and Greek literary sources, particularly Herodotus but also Diodorus, Aristagoras and Polyaeus, attest to the presence of a substantial Carian community in Egypt.⁵⁴² Their members were mercenaries or allies, called ἐπίκουροι in Greek texts; they were principally settled in Memphis along with other troops of Greek and Phoenician soldiers.⁵⁴³

The first document that Ray has analysed is controversial. It is a Phoenician graffito from Abydos, traditionally dated to the fifth century BC, probably written by a mercenary.⁵⁴⁴ The first edition of this text presents the sequence BNḤDS BN GRHKL HKPS.⁵⁴⁵ The term HKPS has been explained

⁵⁴⁰ Stol 2007, 432. He based his theory on Zadok’s analysis (2005, 80-82), who stressed the point that KRSYM may have been Carians; Amadasi 2007, 199; Amadasi 2015, 343 n. 46.

⁵⁴¹ Ray 1998, 125-136; Ray 1987, 100-103.

⁵⁴² Adiego 2007, 32-128; Masson, Yoyotte 1956.

⁵⁴³ Hdt. 2.140-160; *FGrH* 608 F 9a-b; Polyae. 7.3, Diod. 1.66.1-12. Generally on Carian and Greek mercenaries in Egypt see Lloyd 1983, 279-348; Bettalli 1995, *passim*; Bettalli 2013 *passim*; Kaplan 2002, 229-243; Kaplan 2003, 1-31; Luraghi 2006, 21-47; Sullivan 2011, 31-61; Hale 2013, 176-193; and Van Wees (forthcoming), who argues that the Assyrian Annals provide the first evidence of Carian soldiers in Egypt. Along with Ionians, they were sent by Gyges as auxiliary troops to Psammetichus I in order to support his rebellion against the Assyrian rule in 646-643BC. (Prism A col. ii113-115 ed. Novotny-Jeffers 2018). But perhaps Carians reached Egypt even before, in a one-off expedition – but this time as Assyrian allies – taking part to the famous ‘sack of Thebes’ in 664 BC (Van Wees, forthcoming). After the second expedition, Carians permanently settled in the country and they probably assimilated to local traditions. These mercenaries continued to be employed by the pharaohs, particularly by Amasis and Apries (Hdt. 2.164.8, Kaplan 2003, 11-14). They were still employed by the Persians once they conquered Egypt as the Borsippa archive demonstrates (Waerzeggers 2006, 1-22). Recently on the meaning of ἐπίκουροι see Mahoney 2017, 39-88; Archil. fr. 216 ed. West 1993. On Phoenician mercenaries in Egypt, particularly those involved in the campaign of Psammetichus II to Nubia (591 BC), see Schmitz 2010, 321-337.

⁵⁴⁴ Lidzbarski 1915, III.43.

⁵⁴⁵ *KAI*, 49, 17.

by Lidzbarski, the first editor, as etymologically connected with the Hebrew KYPS ‘wood splinter’.⁵⁴⁶ He proposed to translate the word as ‘carpenter’ and the whole sentence as ‘Benodesh son of GRHKL the carpenter’. But scholars were sceptical about this interpretation.

Garfinkel emended the text. He argued that the texts of the Abydos graffiti are only known from drawings which are often inaccurate.⁵⁴⁷ Thus, it is plausible that also the drawing of the graffito cited above did not show the real letters of the Phoenician inscription. Therefore, he proposed to read it as ‘BNḤDS BN GRHKL HKRS’ where HKRS, according to him, means ‘the Kerosite’.⁵⁴⁸ Ray, however, proposed to read the graffito as ‘Benodesh son of GRHKL the Carian’.⁵⁴⁹ GRHKL is not a Semitic name but, as Ray argued, probably Anatolian. Thus, GRHKL might have been a Carian serving as a mercenary whose son had a Phoenician name, perhaps a member of a mixed family.

In fact, it is not uncommon that Carians belonged to mixed families and this phenomenon was frequent in Egypt too. For example, the oldest Carian inscription from Egypt comes from Sais and it is a bilingual dedication written on the base of a statue of the goddess Neith. The cartouche with the name of Psammetichus I allows to date it to 663-609 BC.⁵⁵⁰ It is remarkable that the name of the dedicant is Egyptian – *P3-dj-Njt* transliterated into Carian *pdnejt*, ‘the one whom Neith has given’ – but the parent’s name is Carian, *qyrs* in genitive, adapted in the Egyptian part as *K3rr*.⁵⁵¹ This inscription shows that a few years after Carians arrived in Egypt, they already adapted to local habits and naming practices so that they called their sons by Egyptian names. Similar examples can be found in the Caro-Memphite bilingual stelae.⁵⁵²

⁵⁴⁶ Lidzbarski 1915, III.93

⁵⁴⁷ For a partial edition of the graffiti see Kornfeld 1978, 93.

⁵⁴⁸ Garfinkel 1988, 31.

⁵⁴⁹ Ray 1998, 134.

⁵⁵⁰ Adiego 2007, 32-33; Masson, Yoyotte 1956, 53.

⁵⁵¹ On the phonetic adaptations of these names see Shürr 1992, 135; Adiego 1993, 161; Vittmann 1996, 1-12; Adiego 2007, 33; 395; 409.

⁵⁵² Adiego 2007, E.Me 4; 5; 6 = Masson, Yoyotte 1956 MY E; F; G (the last one could be a case of reuse); E.Me 9, 10, 15 = MY 1, 2, 7; *CIS I* 112; *SEG XVI.836*; Communities of Carians and Ionians who assimilated to Egyptian customs – particularly religious – are also attested in Saqqara and Naukratis see Villing, Scholtzhauer 2006, 1-10; Porten *et. al.* 1996, 16 n°7; Villing *et al.* 2015, 1-5.

But Carians were members not only of mixed Carian-Egyptian families but also of Greek-Carian families. This was evident in Egypt too. Another famous graffito written in Ionic Greek on the temple of Ramesses II in Abu-Simbel bears the name of the inscribers, two mercenaries who joined Psammetichus II in his campaign to Nubia in 593-591 BC.⁵⁵³ They were a Greek called Archon son of Amoibichos and a Carian individual named Peleqos son of Eudamos. His name, Peleqos, is probably Carian, attested also in a Carian-Memphite door stele but his father's name, Eudamos, is Greek.⁵⁵⁴ They conceivably belonged to a mixed Carian-Greek family. A similar example comes from Piraeus, where a late⁷archaic grave monument, dated to 525-500 BC, was reused to build the Themistoclean wall of Athens, close to the Piraeus gate. The monument bears a bilingual Greek-Carian inscription where the deceased is proudly called Carian – Καρός in the text.⁵⁵⁵

In light of this evidence, it is not implausible that mixed Carian-Phoenician families existed, and GRHKL was probably representative of one of them. Although mercenary troops in Egypt – consisting of Greek, Carian and Phoenician soldiers according to Greek literary sources – were established in

⁵⁵³ The expedition is dated to 593 BC (Hauben 2001, 53 n. 4). Generally, on Abu Simbel graffiti see Bernard, Ali 1959. On the Carian graffiti in Abu Simbel see Adiego 2007, 79-94.

⁵⁵⁴ Adiego 2007, 400, E.Me30; Adiego 1993, 234; Herda 2013, 422-423. Initially, scholars interpreted the graffito as written in the Ionic alphabet. However, the inscribers might have been Doric speakers from Rhodes, according to the analysis of the phonetic spelling (Tozzi 1976, 482-483). According to some scholars, the inscriber may have been a well-educated Greek man, who created a pun for which the name Peleqos would have been πέλεκυς, the axe, used by Archon for inscribing and Οὐδαμός not a Patronymic but the name used by Odysseus in his encounter with the Cyclops. Thus, scholars claim that the graffito would be written by 'axe son of Nobody' (Harrison 1927, 2-3; Hall 1925, 301, Dillon 1997, 128-130). By contrast, Masson pointed out that Peleqos was a Carian name (1994, 137-140) and *ουδαμο* might be a form for ὁ Εὐδάμο; the article replaces E in this genitive form of the personal names Εὐδάμος, a name which is frequently attested in Ionia and Rhodes (*LPN* 1.17;18). See Jeffery 1990, 354-355; Haider 2001, 204; Herda, Sauter 2009, 78; Struffolino 2018, 7-17. To further prove that the graffito concerns two writers, we can compare this text with others written by Cypriot mercenaries or visitors in Egypt during the fifth and fourth centuries BC, signed by two or three different persons. *ICS* 371 = Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Egypt n° 4 is a graffito written by a couple, Kratandros and Themitó, who visited Kheops' pyramid and wrote their names on one of its stones. Another graffito from Abydos bears the name of two writers, probably both mercenaries, both called Zowes but with a different patronymic (*ICS* 405 = Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Egypt n°40). Finally, two graffiti from Karnak show the names of three writers; see Karnak 31b = Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Egypt n°97; Karnak 51 = Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Egypt n°22.

⁵⁵⁵ 1.σῆμα τόδε : Τυρ[2.Καρός τῷ Σκύλ[ακος] 3. *śjas* : *san tur* 4. *vacat* 5. Ἀριστοκλέξ ἐπ[οίεσεν(?)]; Adiego 2007, 164; Masson 1977, 90-91; Herda 2013, 422. For other similar examples see Herda 2013, 424-425; Bresson 2009, 109-120; Unwin 2017, 41; Aubriet 2013, 194-195.

different quarters at Memphis, nothing prevented them from interacting with each other.⁵⁵⁶

All in all, if Garfinkel's emendation is correct, KRSY might be a Phoenician ethnonym employed to indicate a Carian soldier, called GRHKL, who served along with other mercenaries in Abydos in the fifth century BC, very likely a member of a mixed family.

The other document analysed by Ray is a Phoenician *ostrakon* from Elephantine, dated to the Persian period, which bears the text 'HKRSYM' – the same sequence of letters attested in the Phoenician Cypriot inscriptions. Other fragments of jars inscribed with Phoenician letters were found on the island. These jars could contain wine, oil, but also grain to supply the garrison.⁵⁵⁷ These *ostraka* usually bear Phoenician or Aramaic names of receivers followed by their fathers' name and sometimes by a long genealogy in a construct chain.⁵⁵⁸ The jars' receivers were individuals of different communities; their names were Phoenician, Egyptianised-Phoenician, Egyptian, Semitic, Arabic, Aramaic and Iranian.⁵⁵⁹ Plausibly, Levantine merchants sold their products to private individuals writing their names on the jar labels. Most of them were probably employed in the Elephantine garrison. Along with supplying private people, Phoenicians might have also supplied whole communities such as that of the KRSYM with whom they probably traded.⁵⁶⁰

The graffito discussed above – that written by Archon and Peleqos – shows that Carians landed on Elephantine at least at the beginning of the sixth century BC. They sailed along the Nile to Elephantine which was a major

⁵⁵⁶ Hdt. 2.112; 154; Aristagoras *FGrH* 608 F 9ab; Polyæn. 7.3 (= *FGrH* 665 F 200); Unwin 2017, 34-346; Lloyd, Fraschetti 1989, 334; Leclant 1968, 16; Kaplan (2003, 13) states that Carians and Ionians were a cohesive community; this is however difficult to prove.

⁵⁵⁷ Becking (2017b, 186-197) claimed that this material is not enough to suppose that a permanent Phoenician community lived there. Studies conducted by Calabro (2015, 97-113), however, demonstrate that there was a strong linguistic contact between Phoenicians and Egyptians. This happened because of a continuous presence of the Phoenicians in Elephantine. Perhaps a small Phoenician community was living on the island but other Phoenicians reached Elephantine to trade products, particularly wine from Sidon (Becking 2017, 830-839).

⁵⁵⁸ Lidzbarski 1912, 33a; the jars were coated inside and impermeable; they were also the same type of Phoenician jar found in other locations of the Persian Empire.

⁵⁵⁹ Becking (2017, 820-848) tried to list them and to describe the role they played, including Carians and Phoenicians.

⁵⁶⁰ Becking 2017, 831-839.

military outpost.⁵⁶¹ It is not clear however whether they settled permanently there from that period onwards or whether they took part in a one-off expedition. Since no Carian inscriptions have been found in Elephantine, and no archaeological data testify to a Carian presence on the island we lose their tracks until the fifth century BC.⁵⁶² Evidence of Carians in Elephantine comes from an Aramaic papyrus dated to 411 BC which definitely confirms that Carians lived on the island during the years of the Persian rule.⁵⁶³ This document concerns the authorization of a boat repair. A group of Carians, whose names are not specified, used a cedar boat which was leased out hereditarily to the Egyptian Psamisineith and to his partner. Local authorities agreed that the maintenance of the boat was due and supplied Carians with all the materials for its repair, including copper. This last point will be fully discussed later in order to explain which role Carians may have played in Kition. It is not clear whether they were merchants or mercenaries and why they were using the boat, but this papyrus provides clear evidence of their presence on the island during the Persian rule.⁵⁶⁴ In light of this, it seems all the more likely that the HKRSYM of the Phoenician *ostrakon* from Elephantine were indeed Carians.

All in all, according to this analysis, during the fifth century BC, Carians were present in Abydos and in Elephantine and lived in close contact with Phoenicians, perhaps close enough to produce mixed Carian-Phoenician families; they could be mercenaries or merchants. This might confirm that ‘KRSYM’ in the Phoenician texts from Egypt means ‘Carians’, and that the KRSYM attested in the Cypriot-Phoenician inscriptions were Carians too.

⁵⁶¹ Ll. 1-3: ‘βασιλέος ἐλθόντος ἐς Ἐλεφαντίναν Ψαμματίχο 2. ταῦτα ἔγραψαν τοῖ σὺν Ψαμματίχοι τοῖ Θεοκλῶς 3. ἐπλεον ...’, ‘When king Psammetichus reached Elephantine, those that sailed with Psammetichus son of Theokles wrote this...’

⁵⁶² Scholars still debate whether some letters found in the Khnum temple in Elephantine, and dated to the early Roman period, might be considered as Carian quarry markings. Gosline (1992, 43-50) has been the first who proposed that these masons’ marks were Carians; she also pointed out that similar Carian markers were found in Pasargadae (Gosline 1998, 59-82). This is not surprising since Carians were famous for being builders and craftsmen the Achaemenid Empire (Zaccagnini 1983, 262-263; Herda 2013, 452-460). Her theory has been followed by Franklin, who proposed that Carian markers were used in Israel (2001, 107-116; 2008 45-54), and Avishur, Heltzer (2003, 97-90). Adiego, however, has recently proved that among all these signs only two may be recognised certainly as letters of the Carian alphabet. Therefore, this is not ‘a compelling evidence of a connection with Carians’ (Adiego 2007, 26). According to Hitchcock, the origin of these mason marks might be Cypriot (2000, 6-7).

⁵⁶³ TAD A6.2; Porten *et al.* 1996, B11 115-122; Becking 2017, 828-829; Herda 2013, 451; Cowley 1923 89-102, n° 26.

⁵⁶⁴ Becking 2017, 827-829; Fisher-Bovet 2014, 34-36. However, Porten (*et al.* 1996, 115) and Kaplan (2003, 1-31) argued that they were mercenaries.

Moreover, Zadok compared the name KRSYM with the name Karsāja mentioned in the Borsippa archive and the term QRSY in the Arad *ostraka*. He argued that in these last two occurrences, the same noun stem, *krs-*, was used to name the Carians; therefore, since the Phoenician texts employ the same noun stem KRS- in the word KRSYM, they probably used it to designate ‘Carians’ too.⁵⁶⁵

The tablets of the Borsippa archive concern the provision of food rations to a community of Carians who lived in the city. The inhabitants of this community were called Karsāja, Miširāja and Bennesaja. According to Waerzeggers, three times in these documents the same group of people is called both Miširāja, ‘Egyptians’, and Karsāja ‘Carians’, which suggests a mixed Carian-Egyptian community – whereas Bennesaja would indicate a Carian from Anatolia.⁵⁶⁶ The term Karsāja might have been built up on the Egyptian ethnonym *Krs/Grs*, formed on a Semitic noun stem as the Phoenician ethnonym ‘KRSYM’. Waerzeggers argued that they were state pensioners brought to Borsippa by the Persian government after Cambyses’ conquest of Egypt in 525 BC. We may not exclude, however, that they were deported by the Persians from Egypt as specialised soldiers or craftsmen.⁵⁶⁷

In the Arad *ostraka*, the other documents analysed by Zadok, the meaning of the word QRSY, attested only once, is more problematic. These documents were found in the Arad fortress and are dated to the beginning of the sixth century BC, before the fortress was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar II in

⁵⁶⁵ Zadok 2005, 80-83. The debate on what the Carians called themselves is still open. See Simon 2017, 791-809; Carruba 2000, 49-57; Derwa 1964, 76; Strobel 2008, 22; Herda 2009, 49-51; Herda 2013, 446; Franklin 2001, 113. Simon claims that the original name of the Carians was exclusively based on the stem *krs* (794-797). Finally, Popko supposed that both *Krk* and *Krs* were employed indistinctly to designate the Carians (2008, 103-108).

⁵⁶⁶ Waerzeggers 2006, 1-22; Tutubisu and her son Nadirsu are Egyptians according to text n°4 but Carians according to n°6, 10. The scholar argues that they are the same persons – these are not simply cases of homonymy – since their identities are proven by the ‘archival connections between the tablets’; see Zadok 2005, 80-83. Achaemenids deported whole communities if they rebelled or if they were particularly skilled and useful in other locations of the Empire (see Grosso 1958, 350-375); see also Ctes. *Pers.* 13.30 and Diod. 1.46 who claim that Cambyses deported 6000 Egyptians to Susa along with their pharaoh Amyrtaeus; Shahbazi, Kettenhofen, Perry 2012.

⁵⁶⁷ According to Waerzeggers, most of them were women and children, whose husbands were either dead or away on duty as soldiers. (2006, 3). Their maintenance was paid by a special tax imposed to the local inhabitants by the government. Carian mercenaries were maintained through taxes in Egypt too, where a grain fee was imposed to feed the Persians and their ἐπικούροι who lived in the Memphis fort (Hdt. 3.91; Austin 1970, 22; Van Wees (forthcoming). Persians won Egypt in the Pelusium Battle, which is generally dated to 525 BC (see Kahn 2007, 103-112). For a different date (526 BC) see Quack 2011, 228-246.

598/597 BC. They concern mercenaries who resided in the citadel.⁵⁶⁸ QRSY was interpreted as the singular form of KRSYM by Garfinkel and Zadok.⁵⁶⁹

It is worth noting that this QRSY is mentioned in the *ostraka* along with KYTM which are attested in nine documents out of 18. Although Garfinkel and more recently Cannavò are firmly convinced that KYTM were inhabitants of Kition, several other scholars have proved that in later Hebrew and Aramaic texts – as well as in the Qumran scrolls – the term KYTM was generally used to designate ‘Greeks’, the ‘Hellenistic Greek kings’ or the ‘Romans’.⁵⁷⁰ Although this is not the appropriate place to discuss the meaning of KTYM in the Levantine and Biblical texts, the term was probably employed to indicate ‘Greeks’ also before the fourth century BC. Kition, a city affected by the multicultural Cypriot environment and by the authoritative presence of Greeks on the island, may have played a fundamental role in the identification of its inhabitants, the KTYM, as ‘Hellenised’, thus ‘Greeks’ in the eyes of the Levantines.⁵⁷¹ Therefore, the KTYM mercenaries of the Arad fortress may have been Ionians. In that period, the presence of Ionian mercenaries in Judea is attested in several sites such as Meşad Hashavyahu, a citadel located near the Mediterranean Sea between Egypt and the kingdom of Judea.⁵⁷² Moreover,

⁵⁶⁸ Aharoni 1981, 12-34; 128-151; Herzog, Aharoni *et al.* 1984, 1-34; Yon 2004, 56-58; Dobbs *et al.* 2005, 5-37; Cannavò 2007-2011, 185-188.

⁵⁶⁹ According to Garfinkel (1988, 30), in old Hebrew Q and K are often interchanged in loanwords from foreign languages. Since QRSY indicates a member of a foreign population, it is plausible that this phenomenon occurred also in the case of KRSY/QRSY. According to Zadok (2005, 80), the interchange between Q/K depended on the presence of R after the consonant Q.

⁵⁷⁰ Mac. 1.1; 8.5; Dan. 11.30. Joseph. *Ant.* 1.128; Cannavò 2007-2011, 180; Dion 1992, 70-97; Nodet 2011, 260-268; Yon 2004, 16; 43-45; Eshel 2008, 163. Most of the ancient Biblical occurrences of the term come along with the name of the inhabitants of Alashiya and of Rhodes, e.g. in Gen. 10.4 or in Chron. 1.7 where Yawan, Greece, had four sons: Alashiya, Cyprus – whose Semitic name is now confirmed by the Idalion *ostrakon* (4th- 3rd cent, BC) published by Amadasi, Zamora López in 2018 – Tarsus, the Kittim and the inhabitants of Rhodes. Some scholars supposed that KTYM was the Semitic terms to indicate ‘inhabitants of Cyprus’ (see Scolnic, Davis 2015, 1-16 on Dan. 11.30) but this is implausible since they would have been called inhabitants of Alashiya. It is more likely that KTYM was already used to indicate Greeks, very likely Ionians. This does not exclude that Kition, a Phoenician Hellenised city-state in Cyprus, played an important role in the switching of the meaning (see also Cannavò 2007, 181-183).

⁵⁷¹ Cannavò 2007, 182; Lipinski 2004, 226-265; on the Greeks in the Bible see Rollinger 1997, 167-172; Elayi 2017, 95; Nodet 2011, 262; on the presence of mixed families – particularly Greek and Phoenician – in Kition, see Steele 2013, 201-225; Steele 2018, 147-196. This is also demonstrated by loanwords from Greek to Phoenician which show a certain level of integration among different ethnic groups in Kition.

⁵⁷² Naveh 1962, 89-113; Na’aman 1991, 3-71; Fantalkin 2001, who thinks that Greek mercenaries served only for Egypt; for a different view, Niemeier 2001, 12-32.

scholars argue that the quantity of Greek pottery found in this fortress could attest to not only the presence of Greek mercenaries but also of Carian and Lydian mercenaries who used Greek-Ionian pottery or more generally that Lydian and Carian mercenaries were employed in the fortress along with Greeks.⁵⁷³ It is plausible that the employment of Ionian and Carian mercenaries had spread in border areas between Egypt and the kingdom of Judah until reaching the Judean inland.

According to these data, the QRSY employed in the Arad fortress was probably a Carian who resided there along with several Ionians – and very likely he was not alone, though the sources do not attest the presence of other Carians. This shows that the Old Hebrew *QRSYM and the Phoenician term KRSYM were both used to name Carians. Therefore, it is clear that the KRSYM from Kition were Carians too.

4.3 Carians in Cyprus

But what role did Carians play in Cyprus? Were they employed in the Kition government along with their ‘interpreter’? The *ostrakon* found on Bamboula Hill may provide new insights into the role of Carians in Kition.⁵⁷⁴ Its state of conservation is rather poor since the black ink is almost faded; nevertheless, it has been interpreted by Sznycer as a list of accounts and it consists of six lines. As in the accounts and expenses from the palace of Kition, each line starts with the preposition ’L, ‘to’, followed by figures. The first line must be the title of the document and, according to Amadasi, it seems to begin with ‘KR’.⁵⁷⁵ The second line is better conserved. It probably bears the text ‘’L ŠMT [...] 3’, where ŠMT is the feminine numeral adjective ‘eight’. It indicates 8 of a specific item, or individuals, paid 3 of a determinate value missing in lacuna, perhaps QR or QP as in the other accounts from Kition. Line 3 and line 4 are very difficult to read; by contrast, line 5 starts with ’, the sign which traditionally indicates ‘ditto’ in the Phoenician accounts. It seems to end with the word KRSY, ‘Carian’. Nothing precludes ‘KR’ in the title of this document from also

⁵⁷³ Finkelstein 2002, 143-156; Mouritz 2018, 124-125; Tadmor 1966, 102 n. 59; Haider 1996, 75; Fantalkin 2001, 142; Brouwers 2013, 74. The same happened also in Tel Kabir, a Judean site close to Tyre.

⁵⁷⁴ Amadasi 2015, 343 n°KEF 600; Yon 2004, n°1151; Sznycer 2004, 219-220.

⁵⁷⁵ Amadasi 2015, 343.

referring to Carians. Finally, the last line bears again figures, the number 6 written as III III.⁵⁷⁶

Unfortunately, the *ostrakon* cannot be precisely dated. It was found during the excavation conducted in 1980 in a contaminated layer which is difficult to date itself.⁵⁷⁷ It is one of several documents – most of them are *ostraka* written in black or red ink and still unpublished – found during different archaeological campaigns conducted from 1979 to 1999 in Kition Bamboula. According to the archaeological reports, these *ostraka* can be broadly dated from the second half of the eighth century BC to the end of the fourth century BC; therefore, they do not help to establish a precise chronology. The palaeographical analysis, however, shows that the shape of T and Y cannot be dated before the sixth century BC, providing the *terminus post quem* for the text which may be dated to late archaic or classical periods. But what role did Carians play in Bamboula during those years?

The Bamboula hill was the setting of a famous sanctuary dedicated to Astarte and Melqart.⁵⁷⁸ As shown by the archaeological reports, the sanctuary underwent two significant changes over the years. The first happened during the last quarter of the eighth century BC, when a metallurgical and a textile atelier were installed. In that period, the sanctuary underwent a complete reorganisation which involved the intervention of a strong political power during a phase of ‘consolidation’.⁵⁷⁹ The second significant change occurred during the classical age. The old heart of the sanctuary became an extensive esplanade and the place of worship was moved to a new area, delimited by a southern building which hosted banquet halls, and by the *neōria*, the military harbour, built at the end of the fifth century BC.⁵⁸⁰ The war harbour consisted of a series of shipyards – 35-37 metres long x 5.50 metres wide – intended to

⁵⁷⁶ Amadasi 2015, 343. Sznycer, by contrast, read 5 III + II, (2004, 220).

⁵⁷⁷ Amadasi 2015, 335.

⁵⁷⁸ Caubet, Fourrier, Yon 2015, 37-130

⁵⁷⁹ Caubet, Fourrier, Yon 2015, 387; Iacovou 2002, 73-83; on the ateliers see Caubet, Fourrier, Yon 2015, 97-102.

⁵⁸⁰ Caubet, Fourrier, Yon 2015, 382. Although the site of the sanctuary is located 400 metres away from the sea, during the classical period it must have been set on the coast: see Yon 2000, 95-116; Yon 2001, 65-170; Sourisseau, Yon 2010, 57-67. The excavations were conducted through pumps in order to remove the underground water which covered the site, which is unfortunately very damaged. The coast has undergone a significant geomorphological change over the years, also due to the creation of new buildings and to the reclaim of the marshland which covered that area.

contain triremes.⁵⁸¹ It was created to provide an efficient defence force to Kition since it recently became a stronger city-state.⁵⁸² The building of the *neōria* is striking evidence of the steadily increasing political power of the new royal dynasty and of its substantial financial means.⁵⁸³ Shortly, the new harbour became the base of part of the Persian fleet – the Kitians fought alongside the Achaemenids in naval battles.⁵⁸⁴

The presence of this military harbour might be the key point to determine what role Carians played in Kition. As briefly mentioned above, Carians were famous in antiquity for being mercenaries. A famous fragment of Archilochus mentions Carians as mercenaries *par excellence*. The author defines himself as an ‘ἐπίκουρος, a mercenary, like a Carian’.⁵⁸⁵ Occasionally, Carians were also employed as mercenaries in naval battles; therefore, we may assume they were skilful sailors if the circumstances required it.⁵⁸⁶ Several scholars have pointed out their abilities in this field. Herda and Unwin have provided a complete analysis of the ancient epigraphic and literary sources where Carians operated as navy personnel and marines.⁵⁸⁷ We may add that Herodotus claims that ὀλκοί, machines for hauling ships on land, were still visible in Stratopeda when he visited the city along with the ruins of Carian houses made by mudbricks. This detail testifies the presence of boats hauled into the water through ὀλκοί.⁵⁸⁸ Thus, we may assume that in Egypt, Carian mercenaries were used also to sail ships when appropriate, perhaps to reach the

⁵⁸¹ Yon 2000, 111; Sourisseau, Yon 2010, 62-63. Unfortunately, only 6 shipyards have been completely excavated and the poor state of conservation of the site does not allow us to understand how many of them there were in total. The harbour was built in three different phases over the classical period but was still used as civil-trade harbour during the Hellenistic and Roman ages.

⁵⁸² Since the beginning of the fifth century, coins attest the presence of a local kings. See Yon 1992, 243-260; however, Hermay (1996, 223-229) and Iacovou (2008, 645) argue that a Kition dynasty did not exist during the archaic period.

⁵⁸³ Yon 2001, 170.

⁵⁸⁴ Yon 2000, 113; Yon 2001, 170; Sourisseau, Yon 2010, 64. The new harbour also attests to the progress of Persian naval military technique that, from the fourth century onwards, implemented light and fast ships (see Van Wees 2013, 29-34).

⁵⁸⁵ Arch. Fr. 216 West: ‘καὶ δὴ ἐπίκουρος ὥστε Κάρ κελήσομαι’, ‘I shall be called a mercenary like a Carian’. On the discussion about the fragment see Lavelle 2002, 344-351.

⁵⁸⁶ Porten *et al.* 1996, n°B11, 115-122.

⁵⁸⁷ For some literary sources see Alk. fgr. 22 Bergk; Anacr. Fgr. 91 Ber.; Diod.84; 53; Thuc. 1.4; Arist. Birds 292; Hdt. 1.71; Critias frg. 2.; see Herda 2013, 447-452; Unwin 2017, 66-90; Green, Lawall, Polzer 2008, 685-686.

⁵⁸⁸ Hdt. 2.154; Lloyd, Frascchetti 1989, 372; Casson 1996, 636.

battleground through the river. The Ionian soldiers mentioned in the graffito from Abu Simbel adopted the same technique to reach Elephantine.

All in all, this evidence demonstrates that Carians were generally employed as mercenaries and if necessary, they also fought in battles which involved the use of boats. Therefore, with good reason, we may suppose that the KRSY mentioned in the Bamboula *ostrakon* was employed in the Kition *neōria*, as a mercenary. Since the *ostrakon* was found in a contaminated layer, it is not clear whether it originally came from the area of Bamboula where the sanctuary was located.⁵⁸⁹ It is rather conceivable that it was related to the administration of the harbour; its wall is located right next to the sanctuary. The list of accounts might concern the expenses that the Kition administration had to pay for the maintenance of the Carians employed in the *neōria* – particularly if we restore the title of the accounts, the first line of the *ostrakon*, as KR[SYM. These KRSYM were probably serving the local Kition government which paid for their subsistence; this is confirmed by the layout of the document which corresponds in all respects to that of the accounts from the palace of Kition, and is very similar to the documents found in the Idalion archive.

We have some evidence for the employment of Carians in other Cypriot cities even earlier. According to Herodotus, Onesilos, ruler of Salamis in 498 BC, employed a Carian squire, brave and skilled in the art of war, who killed the horse of Artybios, the Persian *stratēgos*.⁵⁹⁰ According to Herodotus, Ionians were sent to Cyprus to fight against the Persians in order to support the Cypriot rebels.⁵⁹¹ The Greek epitaph of Idagygos from Halikarnassos, who is defined as a ‘servant of Ares’ – found in Amathus and dated to 475 BC – may confirm the information provided by the historian and it is possible that Carian mercenaries were sent along with the Ionians to fight against the Persians, though they would presumably have left again after the Persian victory.⁵⁹²

We may conclude that in the fourth century BC, Carians employed in the Kition *neōria* were mercenaries. Thanks to the development of the new military harbour and the increasing necessity of employing soldiers in military

⁵⁸⁹ Amadasi 2015, 335.

⁵⁹⁰ Hdt. 5.111; Lavelle 1984, 249-25; Nenci 1994, 318; Hornblower 2013, 295.

⁵⁹¹ Hdt. 5.109.3.

⁵⁹² Hornblower 2013, 290; Nicolaou 1971, 13; Voskos 1997, n°E3. On the name Ἰδάγγυος see *LPN*.

campaigns, they probably settled permanently in the city-state as employees of the central government along with their MLS.

As the inscriptions analysed above demonstrate, Milkyaton was the king who mostly benefited from the new naval military force. During his reign, Kition reached a peak of wealth and prosperity so that it started to mint gold coins and to compete with the most flourishing contemporary Cypriot city-kingdom, Salamis, ruled by Evagoras.⁵⁹³ Diodorus attests that during the first year of Milkyaton's kingship, conventionally dated to 391 BC, two military confrontations occurred between these two cities and at least Carians took part in the second battle.⁵⁹⁴ In the first one, Amathus, Soli and Kition opposed Evagoras in the war, ἀντέχοντες τῷ πολέμῳ, and dispatched ambassadors to Artaxerses king of Persia. The king sent Hecatomnus of Caria, who had recently become the ruler of an independent satrapy of the Persian Empire – this had made Caria a new centre of Achaemenid power and its fleet an imperial means to exercise control over insurgent regions – to make war upon Evagoras in a second battle, leading a fleet with triremes, troops and soldiers.⁵⁹⁵

The success of the Kitians – helped by the Carians – was probably celebrated through the so-called trophy of Milkyaton. This inscription, found during construction work in the area of the *neōria*, consists of five lines inscribed on the base of a monument, whose main structure is unfortunately

⁵⁹³ Markou 2011, 173.

⁵⁹⁴ Diod. 14.97-98 'ταχὺ δὲ χρημάτων πολλῶν εὐπορήσας καὶ δύναντιν προχειρισάμενος ἐπεχείρησεν ἅπασαν τὴν νῆσον σφετερίσασθαι τῶν δὲ πόλεων ἃς μὲν βία χειρωσάμενος, ἃς δὲ πειθοῖ προσλαβόμενος'. According to Diodorus, once Evagoras gained the throne of Salamis, he collected resources and armies and took over the whole island, by force or by persuasion. Although Diodorus seems to suggest that the whole island was subjected to Evagoras, it is more likely that Evagoras extended his power over other cities which, however, kept their independence.

⁵⁹⁵ Diod. 14.98.2-4; Ephor. *FGrH* II A, n° 76; Reid 1974, 123-143; Lipinski 2004, 95-98. According to Diodorus' version, the Cypriot ambassadors accused Evagoras of having killed Agyris, an ally of the Persians who is named Anaxagoras in a fragment of Ctesias (*FGrH* 30 = Phot. Bibl. 72, 44b 20-42), probably a βασιλεύς of a Cypriot city-state allied with the Achaemenids – who unfortunately is not attested in any coin legend; Stronk 2017, 234; in Ctesias' fragment, however, Evagoras apparently reconciled with Anaxagoras. Diodorus claimed that Artaxerxes accepted the alliance with Kition, Soloi and Amathus because of the strategic position of Cyprus and the great Cypriot naval strength that Artaxerses did not want to lose. Although fictitious, these motivations show that one of the Cypriot striking features – worthy of being mentioned by Diodorus – was the fleet, probably made up by Salaminian and Kitian ships built with the Troodos wood and copper, and, very likely, where Carian mercenaries were employed. Isocrates claimed that Evagoras supplied part of the Persian fleet in the battle of Cnidus; Isocr. 9, 56-58.

lost.⁵⁹⁶ The trophy was erected by Milkyaton and the Kition population for the god Baal-Oz after the victory against the enemies – whose name is not specified but probably Salaminians – and their allies the Paphians during the first year of reign of Milkyaton, king of Kition and Idalion.⁵⁹⁷

Lines 1 and 2 provide information on the commissioners, on the reasons why the monument has been erected and in which year. Line 3 gives details on where the battle took place. The first two words are very damaged; Yon and Sznycer, the first editors – followed by Lorenzo – integrated the text as [‘]LN[M MH]NT ’Š KTY and translated it as ‘the army of men of Kition’. However, the term ‘LNM usually indicates gods. Although Kitian soldiers may have operated under the protection of Baal-Oz, the alternative translation – ‘the army of the gods of the men of Kition’ – is problematic. MH]NT is a plausible integration since autopsy of the inscription confirms the clear presence of]NT. The presence of the letters]LN[, however, is doubtful.⁵⁹⁸ Therefore, I would propose to read part of the sequence as [‘M MH]NT ’Š KTY and to translate it as ‘the members of the army of the people of Kition’. The sequence [‘M MH]NT, ‘*am mahñit*’ ‘members of the army/camp’ is also attested in another Phoenician text and probably it was commonly used.⁵⁹⁹ The following sequence, however, is easily readable as: ‘...L’GD LM MLHMT BMQM [’]Z BYM H...’ ‘(the men of the army) went forth to do battle with them in this place next to the sea’. Therefore, the text states that the battle took place close to the sea.⁶⁰⁰ Since the

⁵⁹⁶ Sznycer 2001, 99-110; Yon, Sznycer 1991, 791-823; The trophy has been mostly studied with a focus on its cross-cultural nature. It bears the term TRPY, a Phoenician hapax and a loan from the Greek term τροπαῖον (Steele 2013, 213).

⁵⁹⁷ Yon, Sznycer 1992, 156-165; Yon 1997, 10-15; Steele 2013, 213. Another of the trophy’s Greek features might consist in omitting the name of famous enemies in the text, considered as ‘superfluous’. The Stoa of the Athenians in Delphi provides another well-known example of the omission of the enemies’ name in a Greek epigraphic text. Paphos gives us another three instances from Cyprus, three Cypriot-syllabic inscriptions where the enemy of king Nicocles is only cited as *po-le-mi-o-se* ‘enemy’ without any reference to his name; see Lorenzo 2015, 309; Lorenzo 2011, 338-344; Walsh 1986, 321; on the Paphian inscriptions, see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Paphos n° 3; 4 = ICS 8; 9.

⁵⁹⁸ Over the years, the weathering exposure may have further corrupted the letters already damaged by scratches.

⁵⁹⁹ Krahmalkov 2001, 135; CIS I 5866 shows the form Š MHNT, about which the first editors probably thought of in reconstructing the text. Unfortunately, the current state of conservation of the first part of the line is so poor that it is difficult to read any other letters. One of them might be N, preceded by another undefined sign.

⁶⁰⁰ B is the preposition ‘in’ and YM, *yam*, the term which indicates ‘sea’ or ‘water’, attested also in the accounts from Kition (Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977 C1 = Yon 2004 n°1078 = CIS I 86). On the discussion of the place see Yon, Sznycer 1992, 160-65; Lorenzo 2015, 305. Trophies usually have a specific topographical placement. In case of a land battle, trophies were located

inscription was found close to Bamboula, it is plausible that the naval battle was fought near the Kition *neōria* and that the monument was originally placed there. This battle may have been one of those two described by Diodorus. According to Lorenzo, it could have been the πόλεμος cited in 14.98.1, the fight which preceded the sending of ambassadors to Artaxerxes.⁶⁰¹ But the outcome of that battle does not seem to be significant. It is more plausible that the trophy was dedicated because of an important naval victory of Kition over the Salaminians and the Paphians. Perhaps, this was the battle fought after the arrival of Hecatomnus' Carian fleet against Evagoras I to which Kitians probably took part as Persian allies.⁶⁰² Carian mercenaries locally employed by the Kitians would not appear in the trophy's inscription since they were part of the local staff maintained by the Kitian administration, as shown by the *ostrakon*, thus considered as part of the Kition disposal.

All in all, the military port of Kition, so equipped, became the theatre of several battles; some of them were due to internal political reasons limited to the island but others involved the intervention of international powers such as Athens and the Persian Empire. They took place during the fifth and fourth centuries BC and involved the presence of Carians who took part in them. They were settled in Cyprus and maintained by the local administration or coming from Asia Minor.

Carians may have performed further tasks in Kition. According to the passage of Diodorus mentioned above, when the Achaemenids needed to construct new triremes and to create a powerful fleet, they turned to the coastal cities of Asia Minor, particularly to those in Ionia and Caria.⁶⁰³ Since Carians appear able to

in the place where the losing army retreated. In case of a naval battle, they were located on a 'sea-shore near the water'. See Stroszeck 2004, 303-332.

⁶⁰¹ Lorenzo 2015, 303-305.

⁶⁰² Diod. 14.98.3. Carians may have taken part in the battle along with the Kitians. Kuhrt lodged objections (2007, 243-247); she thinks that it is impossible to link the battle of the trophy to Diodorus' account because specific enemies are not mentioned and because the trophy is dedicated by the population of Kition, and not by the population of Kition and Idalion. Therefore, she would link the trophy to some local riots. However, this does not implicate that the naval battle against Evagoras involved the intervention of Idalion too; and if it was a local revolt, it would not have been necessary to erect a trophy and to commit a naval battle.

⁶⁰³ Diod. 14.98.3 but see also Hdt. 7.93 and 98 with names of some Carian στρατηγοί such as Pigres son of Isseldomos (Blümel 1992, 22-23, 26-27; Adiego 2007 337; 397; 343-344); Vannicelli, Corcella, Nenci 2017, 403-403.

build triremes, we cannot exclude that in the Kition *neōria*, they were employed not only as mercenaries but also to build triremes if it was required or to repair them.

Traditionally, Carians were serving in other areas of the Persian Empire as boat builders from the archaic period onwards.⁶⁰⁴ Among the analysed documents from the Borsippa archive, one document concerning the ‘Bannasaja’, apparently a Carian from Anatolia, focuses on the payment of a boat due to him by Nabunursu. Details are not provided but it is conceivable that he repaired, built or shipped the boat for Nabunursu through the Euphrates.⁶⁰⁵

Finally, a few papyri attest to the presence of Ionians and Carians employed as sailors by the Persian government in Egypt.⁶⁰⁶ Among them, the Aramaic document analysed above shows that Carians were in charge of shipping a vessel and that they were probably serving for the Persian government in Elephantine. According to Porten, since the satrap gave final consent to supply the Carians with the material they needed, it is very likely that the Persian government paid for it. Those Carians were able to repair the boat using cedar wood and copper⁶⁰⁷. They were concerned about all the steps involved in the reparation since they asked for specific materials intended to be used at different stages among which copper nails and plates.⁶⁰⁸ Thus, it is not implausible that in Kition, Carians also dealt with the maintenance of ships. The metallurgical atelier of the Bamboula sanctuary probably produced copper to cover the hull of the *neōria*’s triremes.⁶⁰⁹ Cyprus certainly did not lack of raw

⁶⁰⁴ For instance, Carians shipped cedar timber – raw material useful to build the new palace of Darius I – along with Greeks from Babylonian to Susa where perhaps they were also employed as carpenters. See Herda 2013, 451; Rollinger 2010, 214; Boardman 2003, 154.

⁶⁰⁵ Waerzeggers 2006, 18-19; See Diodorus who claims that villages were located on the river Tigris in 324 BC, between Susa and Ectabana. (Diod. 19.12.1; Herda 2013, 451).

⁶⁰⁶ Yardeni 1994, 67-78. For instance, the Ahīqar Scroll, dated to 475 BC, the 11th year of the reign of Xerxes (486-464 B.C), attests that Ionian and Phoenician ships handed the royal treasure from Egypt to Persia.

⁶⁰⁷ Stieglitz 2004, 31-35. He noticed that the papyrus shows the term *nhš* which is originally Hebrew and it is usually employed to indicate both bronze and copper.

⁶⁰⁸ Porten 1996, B11, 117-120; the papyrus lists 4 kinds of cedar wood employed in different parts of the boats such as the belly and the deck. They also considered the loss of material in the process of cutting.

⁶⁰⁹ Caubet, Fourrier, Yon 2015, 97-108. Kassianidou 2016, 70-90. Although a few slags were found in this metallurgical workshop, it is possible that it was regularly cleaned after the processing of the raw material as it happened in Enkomi. Therefore, the workshop probably produced more than we could expect.

materials necessary for building or repairing boats, particularly copper and wood. Although Kition was not located close to the Troodos Mountains – with its natural deposits of ophiolite, rich of copper, and extensive forests – it repeatedly tried to get possession of territories and copper mines owned by nearby cities, *in primis* by Idalion, ensuring access to Troodos mines and woods.

Although a deposit of copper in Troulli, an area 12 kilometres away from Kition which consisted of pillow lavas, was constantly exploited by the Kitians, the significant increase in the supply of copper and wood would have ensured greater economic stability and materials for building an important fleet; its efficiency was guaranteed by the employment of Carians as mercenaries, infantry soldiers, navigators, and shipbuilders or ship repairers.⁶¹⁰

4.4 The MLŞ HKRSYM, not only an interpreter

It has been argued that the KRSY mentioned in the Bamboula *ostrakon* was a Carian mercenary who served in the Kition *neōria*, employed by the local administration, as shown by the layout of the list of accounts in the *ostrakon*. This last point allows the conclusion that the administration of the military harbour, as well as that of the military forces employed there, was managed by the central government. But going back to our original documents, we should still establish what role the MLŞ KRSYM, the so called ‘‘interpreter’ of Carians’, played in Kition. May the term MLŞ be translated as ‘interpreter’? Did he serve for the government of the city-state too?

It does seem plausible that an interpreter was required to communicate with Carian mercenaries. Carians spoke a language that no one else knew and wrote in an alphabet unknown to most cultures, therefore they had to learn other languages, in particular Greek, to communicate. Greek literature depicts Carians as foreign speakers. They are described as *barbarophonoi* in the Homeric poems and Strabo dedicated a whole paragraph to debate the precise meaning of the verb *barbarizein*, associating it to *karizein*, ‘to speak as a Carian’.⁶¹¹ Herodotus reports that Psammetichus allocated Carians and Ionians in two camps, the

⁶¹⁰ On the expansionistic aims of Kition during the classical period see Yon 2004b, 115-126.

⁶¹¹ *Il.* 2.867; Strab. 14.2.28; Unwin 2017, 42-51; the Homeric passage is however problematic: it has been argued that the term *barbarophonoi* is a later interpolation, since Thucydides (Thuc. 1.3.3) states that Homer has never used the term *barbaros*; see Kim 2013, 29; Almagor 2005, 42-55; Janse 2002, 351; Bresson 2009, 209-228; Herda 2013, 428-429; Sherratt 2003, 231.

στρατόπεδα, one in front of the other, separated by the river Nile, and provided young Egyptians who were in charge to learn Greek from the mercenaries; the current interpreters descended from those Egyptian boys.⁶¹² Herodotus' anecdote, though fictitious, is probably an aetiological tale which aims to explain the role and origin of Carian-Greek interpreters, which were conceivably widespread when Herodotus was writing. Herodotus granted that both Ionians and Carians knew Greek and that the young Egyptians could learn this language from both of them. Thus, it is plausible that the generation of interpreters contemporary to Herodotus was serving the Egyptians who needed to communicate with Greeks and perhaps also with Carians.⁶¹³

Thus, it is very likely that in Kition, too, one of the principal duties of the *MLS* was to translate from Carian to Phoenician. The Kition instance, in fact, is not an isolated case. Other Carian interpreters are attested in Near-Eastern literature. One occurrence comes from a Babylonian legal document dated to 517/516 BC where the witness is called 'Tattannu the Carian interpreter', 'Tattannu Karsaja *ta/irgumannu*';⁶¹⁴ but since his name is Akkadian, he probably assimilated to the Babylonian culture.⁶¹⁵ A Carian interpreter is mentioned also in a statuette from Memphis, dated to the sixth century BC, which bears a bilingual Carian-Egyptian dedication. The Egyptian text '*H3py dj 'nh Prjm p3wḥm*' is translated as 'Apis gives life to Prjm the dragoman'; by contrast, the Carian text is subdivided in two parts. The section concerning the interpreter shows the text 'Paraeum : armon : kī', Paraeum the interpreter'.⁶¹⁶ Analysing this inscription, Herda and Adiego noticed that the Carian term for 'interpreter' was *armon*. Since the use of an interpreter was rather widespread in Carian communities, they suggested that the Greek word

⁶¹² Hdt. 2.154.

⁶¹³ See Diod. 11.60.4; Thuc. 8.85.2 who provides examples of contacts among Greeks and Carians. According to Unwin, Carians who regularly came into contacts with the 'Greek-speaking world' should have been bilingual (Unwin 2017, 45). Ephorus claims that in the coast of Asia Minor, during the fifth century BC, there were Greek settlements and bilingual communities of Greeks and Carians; Ephorus *FGrH* 70 F 191; Aubriet 2013, 190; Herda 2013, 471.

⁶¹⁴ Zadok 2005, 83.

⁶¹⁵ Herda 2013, 467-468; Zadok 2005, 83, 89.

⁶¹⁶ Adiego 2007, 40 *E.Me* 8; 309; 355; Vittmann 2001, 39-59; Herda 2013, 469.

ἐρμηνεύς, ‘interpreter’, ‘translator’, could be a loan from the Carian word *armon* or that the two terms share a common Aegean-Anatolian origin.⁶¹⁷

In Kition, RŠPYTN may have played a role similar to that of the other Carian interpreters attested in Near-Eastern sources or to the Greek ἐρμηνεύς – who probably do not differ much from each other.⁶¹⁸ But, very likely, his role was not limited to translating. Near-Eastern parallels suggest that as MLŠ HKRSYM, RŠPYTN was in charge of mediating the relationship between the Carian community and the government.

As highlighted above, in Borsippa, young Carians and their mothers were assigned to specific local citizens who directly provided for their maintenance.⁶¹⁹ The food ration did not pass through the stores of a state building but went directly from the hands of the locals to the Carians. The Persian government, however, had previously organised the community in units of ten persons controlled by a Babylonian official, the *rabešerti ša Miširāja*.⁶²⁰ He was in charge of checking that the rations were distributed regularly. One text from the archive shows that there was a hierarchical system within the Carian community. It mentions a Carian who holds the title of *šaknu* or *rabdu*, ‘headman’, according to Waerzeggers.⁶²¹

The area around Nippur provides further examples of organised Carian communities living under the Persian administration; Carians were members of a *hartu*, a land grant assigned to a group of individuals who distinguish themselves by ‘ethnicity’ or ‘profession’.⁶²² The *hartu* was usually subdivided into ‘fiefs’ held by families but administered by a *šaknu*, foreman, who operated on behalf of the central government.⁶²³ According to Zadok, this settlement – called Bannēšu from the traditional Carian Babylonian name – was the biggest in the district after Nippur itself and both the crown prince and the queen owned estates in it. Potts suggests that ‘the villages of the Carians’ in which the

⁶¹⁷ See Adiego 2010, 153; Yakubovich 2012, 131-133; Herda 2013, 469-470; Chantraine *et al.* 1999, 373 for a previous interpretation.

⁶¹⁸ Generally on Greeks communicating with other populations cf. ἐρμηνεύς in Fileni 2006, 96-118; Rochette 1996, 325-347.

⁶¹⁹ Waerzeggers 2006, 6.

⁶²⁰ Waerzeggers 2006, 2.

⁶²¹ Waerzeggers 2006, 4.

⁶²² As said above, the Aramaic papyrus shows that Carians were probably working for the Persian administration since they needed to obtain the permission of the local satrap to repair the boat they used (Porten 1996, B 11) Potts 2018, 1-7; Zadok 1978, 266-232.

⁶²³ Potts 2018, 3.

Macedonian Silver Shields wintered in 317 BC were part of this Carian *hartu*, or more likely, a legacy of this settlement.⁶²⁴

These are two examples of organised Carian communities under the aegis of the Persian Empire. But could a similar scenario occur also in Kition? Did RŠPYTN play other roles according to this system? As demonstrated, in Kition, Carians were probably mercenaries maintained by the local government. It is unlikely that their rations were paid directly by citizens, since they are listed among the expenses that the central administration had to support. It is also impossible to prove that they constituted a community outside of the capital and that they managed their own lands as the Bannēšaja in Nippur. It is more likely that the significant increase of Kitian military campaigns raised the demand of military forces so that the city-state had to hire foreign soldiers – very likely without the intervention of the Persian government – who were allocated directly to the capital.

However, in both examples provided above, an official was in charge of checking the Carian communities on behalf of the Achaemenid central government and the Carians appear as organised in a hierarchical system. This last two points might partially reflect the Kition scenario. We may assume that RŠPYTN was working on behalf of the central government, not Persian in this case but Kitian, also in order to check Carian actions as the *šaknu* did under the administration of the Achaemenid Empire. If we want to go further, it is very likely that the Carian community also had its own hierarchical structure – as generally demonstrated also for mercenaries' communities operating in the classical period.

But RŠPYTN might have undertaken other tasks. As interpreter, he could take part in battles along with Carians. A Phoenician graffito from the temple of Osiris in Abydos attests that a MLS, an interpreter, accompanied mercenaries and soldiers during the campaign. Greek literary sources provide several other instances of interpreters employed in tactical communications.⁶²⁵ For instance, Thucydides states that Tissaphernes used an interpreter to communicate with Carian troops and Cyrus the Younger employed a Carian interpreter called Pigres to communicate with subordinate commanders in their

⁶²⁴ Diod. 19.12.1; Potts 2018, 3-4, 7; Zadok 1981, 39-69; Zadok 2005, 76-106.

⁶²⁵ Garfinkel 1988, 31; *KAI* 49, 17.

own language.⁶²⁶ Undoubtedly, Carians were facilitated in the communications between Greeks and Anatolians since they were daily exposed to different languages and the Persian commanders took advantage of it.⁶²⁷ We may not exclude that RŠPYTN too might have had some Carian ancestors, although he and the members of his family clearly have Phoenicians names. His familiarity with Carian culture and language would have facilitated him in playing his role of ‘interpreter’.

Xenophon’s account of the expedition of the Ten Thousand provides vivid examples of the necessity to employ interpreters in battles and military campaigns as probably was the case of RŠPYTN.⁶²⁸ This was not only because the soldiers came from all over the Persian Empire and spoke different languages but also because they moved through such a vast territory that the communication with the local inhabitants needed interpreters.⁶²⁹ Xenophon himself used an interpreter, ἑρμηνεύς, to negotiate with Seuthes, king of the Thracians. This interpreter reached the king before Xenophon and anticipated the requests of the Greek mercenary.⁶³⁰ A similar role was played by Tiribazus’ interpreter who was sent to anticipate the satrap’s claims.⁶³¹ In these instances, the ἑρμηνεύς played also a political role since he mediated the relationships between the generals and the locals. Near-Eastern sources frequently emphasise this aspect of the interpreter’s work. For instance, in the Bible, MLŠ frequently indicates an ‘intercessor’ or ‘ambassador’.⁶³² Finally, other sources attest to the presence of government interpreters or kings’ interpreters who principally hold other offices such as Darius’ γραμματεὺς, who was sent as an interpreter, a sign that the political-administrative role of these two figures could overlap.⁶³³

⁶²⁶ Thuc. 8.85.1-2. Thucydides states that Tissaphernes’ confidant, Gaulites, was a bilingual Carian. See Kuhrt 2013, 847.

⁶²⁷ Dusinberre 2013, 91; Kuhrt 2013 846-848; Rochette 1996, 333-335; for some instances Xenoph. *Anab.* 1.2.17 and 8.12.

⁶²⁸ Rochette 1996, 333-335.

⁶²⁹ On the use of interpreters in the ‘Ten Thousand’ campaign see Rochette 1996, 333-336;

⁶³⁰ Xenoph. *Anab.* 7.2.19.

⁶³¹ Xenoph. *Anab.* 4.4.5.

⁶³² As Heltzer (2000, 237-242) demonstrated, the only Biblical passage where MLŠ means simply interpreter, translated as *m^etūrg^emān* in Aramaic, is in Gen. 42:33 where Joseph’s brothers did not understand the Egyptians and ‘therefore, there was an interpreter among them’. In other Biblical instances, such as Job. 33.23, the term MLŠ has a political connotation and can be translated as ‘broker’ or ‘ambassador’. In Hebrew, the term *trgmn*, dragoman, was used more frequently to indicate interpreter, a loan from Akkadian. According to Herda, (2013, 467 n.238) and Valerio, Yakubovich (2010, 114), the term dragoman may have a Luwian origin.

⁶³³ Plut. *Them.* 6.3; Quintus Curtius Rufus 5.13.6-7; Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.37; Kuhrt 2007, 847-848.

We should not exclude the possibility that RŠPYTN played a political role in Kition and was perhaps a significant figure in the court. The dedications and epitaph erected by him and his family show that he was a wealthy inhabitant, very likely a member of the elite close to the sovereign – Baalmilk or Milkyaton.

Although RŠPYTN bears a Phoenician name – and his descendants too –, he conceivably belonged to a mixed family as other Carian interpreters mentioned above. He might have been bilingual if not trilingual and this would have facilitated his work. Perhaps his ancestors came to Cyprus during the fifth century BC, when Kition started the aggressive campaigns to take possession of neighbouring territories. Some of the Carians employed in those first fights could have mixed with local inhabitants, become more and more influential, and reached upper-class status. This would not be an isolated case. According to Polyaeus, the Pharaoh Psammetichus I had a personal advisor of Carian origins, called Pigres, who helped him to understand the prophecy of an oracle which predicted that Carians would help the king to defeat Thementes.⁶³⁴ This account suggests a perception that Carians could gain the trust of sovereigns and generals so as to become important advisers and perhaps to affect their decisions.

In sum during the fifth and fourth centuries BC, Kition employed Carians as mercenaries. This city-state tried to conquer the territories of other Cypriot polities through aggressive campaigns in order to increase its wealth and improve its economy. In order to achieve this goal, Kitians built up triremes – which also became an important part of the Persian fleet – and created a military harbour where they employed Carians as mercenaries. This is demonstrated by an *ostrakon*, dated to the fifth century BC and found close to the wall of the *neōria*, which lists expenses that the Kition administration had to pay for the maintenance of a KRSY, a Carian. It is plausible that Carians were also used to repair triremes and as infantry soldiers. They were conceivably organised in a hierarchical structure.

Three other inscriptions, two dedications and an epitaph dated to the beginning of the fourth century BC, attest to the presence of Carians in Kition.

⁶³⁴ Polyaeus 7.3.

They all bear the name of RŠPYTN, followed by the title MLŠ KRŠYM, 'interpreter of Carians'. As interpreter, he translated from Carian into Phoenician and he may have taken part in battles along with Carian mercenaries to facilitate the communications. He was probably paid by the administration of the city-state and he was member of an upper-class mixed family, who perhaps held a prestigious position in the court of Kition.

Administrative officials on the periphery of the Cypriot city-states: the Bulwer tablet

The accounts and expenses of the palace of Kition show that this city-state had a complex administrative structure which controlled collection and process of raw materials and trade of final products on behalf of the government. A similar structure may have existed also in the polities which used Cypriot-Syllabic Greek as principal language of the documents of their administration. This might confirm that all the Cypriot city-states shared a basic common administrative system – as the recent discovery of the document from Paphos mentioned in chapter three may suggest.⁶³⁵

Although the evidence of administrative Cypriot-syllabic documents is very limited, some information comes from a tablet found in the northern part of the island, called Bulwer tablet. Made of well-fired clay, it is quite small (16 cm high x10 cm wide), and it is written in the common Cypriot syllabary.⁶³⁶ Inscribed on two faces, A and B, it was probably incised and punctured in leather-hard condition – when the clay was almost completely dried.⁶³⁷ The following reading and translation of the text are based on Egetmeyer's edition,⁶³⁸ however, some changes have been made according to my own analysis of the tablet; these changes will be discussed in the following pages.

Face A

- | | |
|---|-----------------------|
| (1) a-to-ro-[ke-le-we-o-se we-te-i ⁶³⁹ | (1) Άνδρο[κλέος Φέτει |
| (2) i-tu-ka-[i a-ga-ta-i ⁶⁴⁰ | (2) ἰν τύχα[ι ἀγαθαῖ |
| (3) e-se-lo-ka-ri-se-[⁶⁴¹ | (3) Ἐσλόχαρις[|

⁶³⁵ Iacovou, Karnava 2020, 37-52.

⁶³⁶ Mitford 1961b, 38-39.

⁶³⁷ In leather-hard condition, the clay is 70% dried.

⁶³⁸ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Akanthou n°1 = *ICS* 327; for previous editions see Meister 1910, 148; Mitford 1961b, 40; Masson 1961, 579-580; Neumann 1963, 53-67.

⁶³⁹ In the editions of Masson and Egetmeyer the text is 'a-to-ro-[', 'Andro...' (Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Akanthou n°1 = *ICS* 327).

⁶⁴⁰ Egetmeyer's edition (2010 vol. II, Akanthou n°1) prints *i-tu-ka-[-]*; Masson's edition (*ICS* 327) has *i-tu-ka-[-i]*.

⁶⁴¹ Egetmeyer reads *e-se-lo-ka-ri-se* [, an anthroponym, but the last *-se* is uncertain; Masson's edition has *e-se-lo-ka-ri-?-[-]*. In *ICS* this is printed as ἦς (*e-se*) is an athematic imperfect 3rd

(4) la-pa-to-ne zo-wa-ra-[(4) Λάπατον Ζωφαρχος
(5) mi-ka-la-te-o pi-lo-•-[(5) Μιγαλα-θέω Φιλο[
(6) a-za-ra-wo-ne zo-wo-ke-re-[te-se	(6) Ἀζάραφον Ζωφοκρέ[της
(7) a-po-ro-ti-si-jo e-se-lo-[(7) Ἀφροδίσιω Ἔσλ[
(8) ti-wo-nu-si-o ti-we-i-pi-lo-[(8) Διφωνυσίω Διφείφιλο[ς
(9) ti-wi-o-ne a-ri-si-to-se [(9) Διρίον Ἄριστος[
(10) ko-ro-we-wi-jo a-ri-si-ta-se	(10) Κορρηφίω Ἀριστᾶς
(11) a-ku-we-u-su-ti-ri-jo ti-mi-lo-se	(11) Ἀγυφουσυτριω Τίμιλος
(12) mo-u-ke-se-te-ri-jo-ti-mi-lo-se	(12) Μουκηστηρίω Τίμιλος

Face B

(13) wa-ri-mi-jo-ne a-ra-ko-mi-ne-[(13) φαριμίον Ἀρχομίνη[ς
(14) ta-wa-ki-si-jo a-ri-si-to-wa-[(14) Ταφακισίω Ἀριστορά[να-
(15) xe] i-te-ka-se ka-ti-ne ?-ta-nu[⁶⁴²	(15) -ξ] ἰδὲ κὰς κατὰ ἰν τα[ν
(16) to-ma we-re-se-e e-te po[(16) δῶμα *φέρση (?) ἤδη πο[
(17) i-te la-ko-ne to-a-ma-[(17) ἰδὲ λαχὼν τὸ ἄμα[ρ
(18) po-re-se e-te to-mi-[(18) φορήση ἤδη τὸ μι[
(19) mi-ta-i-se i-te-[(19) μταισε/η (?) ἰδέ[
(20) pe-i-se-i[(20) πείσει

Face A

- (1) In the year of Androcles
- (2) To good Fortune [...
- (3) was an account [...
- (4) of the month Lapatos Zowarchos
- (5) of the month of the Great Goddess Philo[...]
- (6) of the month Azar Zowokretes
- (7) of the month of Aphrodite Ello[...]
- (8) of the month of Dionysus Diweiphilos

person singular of εἰμί, ‘was’, see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 515 §640; Masson 1978, 123-128. For an analysis of all the different interpretations of this line see page 161.

⁶⁴² Egetmeyer and Masson do not provide any translation for the words *ka-ti-ne*. For a

- (9) of the month of Zeus Aristos
- (10) of the month of the young girls Aristas
- (11) of the month of the protector of roads (*probably Apollo*) Timilos
- (12) of the month of the feasts of *Moukes* (?) Timilos⁶⁴³

Face B

- (13) of the month Warimion, the month ‘of the expulsion of the insects from the harvest’s products’ (?) Archomines
- (14) of the month of the feasts of the ‘runner’ (*probably Apollo*) Aristowana-
- (15) –x and per hin [...⁶⁴⁴
- (16) building he may take away already [...
- (17) and having obtained each day [...
- (18) he may bring already [...
- (19) (?) and [...
- (20) he/it will pay [...

Although very lacunose, this text is clearly Greek, not Eteocypriot.⁶⁴⁵ As Masson stated, the syllabic signs are clear and regular but the use of word dividers varies. Lines 3-14 present the same paratactic structure with the name of a month separated from an anthroponym by a dot. This should probably be interpreted as a calendar. Months and anthroponyms feature in both faces A and B; this suggests that the two sides of the tablet are related each to other. They are preceded by a few introductory lines and followed by a text of unclear

⁶⁴³ For analyses of the names of the months see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 259-260 § 284; Trümpy 1997, 253-261; Neumann 1963, 53-67.

⁶⁴⁴ For the analysis of lines 15-20 see the following pages.

⁶⁴⁵ It undoubtedly presents the traditional formula *i-te ka-se*, ἰδὲ κάς, ‘and’, peculiar of the Cypriot Greek dialects and attested in several other inscriptions which usually introduces a main sentence; see Masson 1983, 324-328. For the *i-te ka-se* formula see Hsch. κ 955. Egetmeyer 2010 I, 26-27 §18 and 90-91 §80; e.g. Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Idalion, n°1, ll.5/7 = *ICS* 217 5/7. This sequence is attested also in Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Pyla, n°3, ll.4/7 = *ICS* 306 4/7. Thumb and Scherer (1959, 144 n°1) considered it the equivalent of the ἰ δὴ κάς formula, where ἰ was an iotacism for ἦ ‘if’. However, according to Egetmeyer, the context suggests that this is the conjunction *ide*, which introduces the main sentence, and not the beginning of a conditional/secondary phrase.

content. Who were these persons and why were they mentioned along with months in this document? The tablet raises numerous problems of date, content and place of discovery. All of them must be reconsidered in order to establish where the individuals worked and what their tasks and duties were.

The date of the Bulwer tablet is controversial. Scholars still disagree about when it was precisely composed. According to Meister – the first editor – it could be dated to the archaic period because of the absence of articles which sometimes appear in other later inscriptions.⁶⁴⁶ But this is not a convincing argument. If the tablet was kept in a local administrative archive, it is plausible that scribes annotated briefly the most important information and omitted articles, probably also to save space and material. Masson proposed a more recent date and dated the tablet to the fifth century BC.⁶⁴⁷ By contrast, Mitford and later Hatzopoulos suggested that it was written during the last years of the fourth century BC, as shown in the following pages. More specifically, Hatzopoulos firmly reiterated that the document had been written in Amathus during the reign of Androcles.⁶⁴⁸

This last date however may be excluded by the linguistic and epigraphic features of the text. For instance, in the tablet, the digamma is always conserved and placed in the correct position. This semivowel starts to disappear from Cypriot texts from the end of the fourth century BC onwards, period in which Androcles was ruling in Amathus.⁶⁴⁹ According to Egetmeyer, the use of /w/ F is rare in spelling at the end of the fourth century, and even more in the spoken language.⁶⁵⁰ Thus, the tablet was probably written before the end of the fourth century BC, i.e. during the classical period.

⁶⁴⁶ Meister 1910, 148.

⁶⁴⁷ Masson 1961, 579-582.

⁶⁴⁸ Hatzopoulos 2011b, 329-330.

⁶⁴⁹ This is evident in Amathus. Some legends of coins – dated to the fifth century BC – present the name Wroikos. Afterwards, at the end of the fourth century BC, the legends of coins from Amathus show the same anthroponym but without Ϝ, Roikos. (Steele 2013, 150).

⁶⁵⁰ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 130. In the inscriptions from Kafizin – one of the last examples of surviving Cypriot dialect dated to the third century BC –, etymological /w/ are conserved when positioned at the beginning of the word but completely omitted in internal positions. These texts also show phenomena of hypercorrection: they restore an internal non-etymological /w/. For instance, *a-wi-la*, ‘other’, is frequently attested but it should be written as *a-i-la*. This suggests that the use of the digamma was progressively lost during the years and that Cypriot speakers were not able anymore to place it correctly in the written form. See Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Kafizin n°16 = Mitford 1980 n°159; Steele 2013, 150.

The provenance of the text is also partially controversial. This document was found in Liastrikà, near Akanthou, close to the peninsula of Karpas.⁶⁵¹ According to Masson and Mitford, Massy, colonel and pioneer archaeologist, bought it from a grave robber. He wrote that ‘the document was found among rubbish at the southern base of the northern range’ of a burial site, in a tomb with colonnades.⁶⁵² The accuracy of this provenance is, however, questionable. Since another similar fragment was apparently found in a *temenos* dedicated to Apollo in Lefkonikò – a location close to Akanthou – a few years earlier, Mitford concluded that the Bulwer tablet plausibly belongs to the *temenos* of a temple too. But the reliability of the archaeological investigations conducted in the nineteenth century in Lefkonikò is debatable.⁶⁵³ Thus, we may assume that the Bulwer tablet probably comes from Akanthou, or from the territory that surrounds this village, but it is impossible to identify precisely from which site.

But to which city-kingdom and central administration does the tablet belong? The first line of face A shows three signs *a-to-ro*, likely the beginning of an anthroponym. Hatzopoulos, and earlier Mitford, supposed that this was the name of the king of the city-state which governed the territory where the tablet was found.⁶⁵⁴ According to this scholar, this name might be that of king Androcles, the king of Amathus already mentioned in the first chapter. Hatzopoulos also claims that the information on the origin of the text is totally unscientific and consequently unreliable.

If the tablet were written in Amathus, we have to assume that the syllabic-writing system was employed in that city for writing the Greek dialect too and not only the local Eteocypriot language. Excluding some legends on coins – which show Greek names written by syllabic signs – and an inscription

⁶⁵¹ The location could correspond to the city of Ἀρροδίσιον, mentioned by Strabo (14.682). See *ICS*, 323-324.

⁶⁵² Mitford 1961, 38-55. See *ICS* 327. Massy presented the tablet to Sir H. Bulwer, who was governor of Cyprus from 1888 to 1892. In 1950, the tablet was bought by the British Museum from Rev. C. Hall, who never explained how he came to be in possession of the document. Previously, it had been published by Meister (1910, 148-164) with inaccurate commentary and inappropriate reading of the text. The presence of colonnades recalls the monumental tombs of Nea-Paphos. This leads to the conclusion that the account of the discovery place was fictional, based on the description of the most common and well-known archaeological site of Cyprus.

⁶⁵³ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Lefkonikò n°1, 687-688 with bibliography = *ICS* 309.

⁶⁵⁴ Hatzopoulos 2009, 227-234; Egetmeyer (2010 I, 322 §368) agrees that *a-to-rof* is the beginning of an anthroponym. Neumann (1963, 65) proposed to read it as ἀνδρῶν, ‘of men’. According to him, this genitive could be related to the following list of personal names.

of questionable provenance, all the Amathusian syllabic documents are in Eteocypriot.⁶⁵⁵ Therefore, if the tablet had been Amathusian, it should have been written during a transitional period, when the polities started to lose their independence and the Cypriot local traditions faced the Hellenism with all its cultural implications such as the introduction of the Greek κοινή and the establishment of common politico-administrative offices. However, precisely because the passage of the Cypriot city-states ‘from ten to naught’ took place with a certain continuity – as Hatzopoulos affirmed – there is no reason to suppose a radical change in the writing tradition of Amathus.⁶⁵⁶ Despite the philhellenic character shown by Androcles, it can hardly be assumed that he changed the language of the local administrative system from Eteocypriot to Greek maintaining the syllabic writing system.⁶⁵⁷ Such an innovation would have resulted into the abandonment of the traditional scripts in favour of alphabetic Greek, according to the policy of his government. More precisely, as anticipated earlier, Androcles made two bilingual dedications to the Cypriot Aphrodite.⁶⁵⁸ In these texts, the place of honour is reserved to the ‘Eteocypriot’ language at the expense of the alphabetic Greek, probably in order to comply with a local *usūs*, as Consani stated.⁶⁵⁹ The content, the length and the epigraphic accuracy, however, show the predominance of the Greek. Even in these inscriptions, where the superiority of the Greek culture is striking, the Cypriot syllabary has always been employed for writing the local autochthonous language and never the Greek κοινή or the Cypriot Greek dialect – very little attested in Amathus. Therefore, it is highly unlikely that this tablet was written in Amathus; consequently, the Androcles mentioned in the first line may not be an Amathusian king.

The only other king who bears the name Androcles ruled in Lapethos. He appears on the legend of a coin, found in the treasure of Vouni and dated to

⁶⁵⁵ According to Steele, in Amathus several Greek anthroponyms were introduced from Greek into Eteocypriot (2013, 148-149). The indigenous population might have considered the Greek names as prestigious. Moreover, there is little evidence that Eteocypriots distinguished themselves from the population which spoke other languages (see Iacovou 2006, 27-59).

⁶⁵⁶ Hatzopoulos 2009, 232; Iacovou 2002, 73-87.

⁶⁵⁷ The use of Eteocypriot as administrative language is testified by a clay tablet written in Eteocypriot on face A and B. The content is obscure but its epigraphic structure recalls the administrative accounts of Kition (accounts and expenses), while the format is similar to that of the ‘Bulwer tablet’.

⁶⁵⁸ See chapter 1; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Amathus n° 17; 18 = *ICS* 196d; 196e.

⁶⁵⁹ Consani 1988, 50-53.

415-390 BC.⁶⁶⁰ This coin is one of several which present mixed Greek and Phoenician characteristics. On the *recto*, it shows Athena with an Attic helmet, dressed in a peplum, holding spear and shield; on the *verso*, it presents Heracles, dressed in the lion skin, who holds the bow and the mace. But although the iconography shows specific Greek features, the legend is written in Phoenician, LMLK 'NDR M LPŠ. Scholars translated it as 'of the king Andr- king (M) of Lapethos'; the name was recognised as Androcles since the first edition – in fact, this is the only Cypriot-Greek anthroponym attested which starts in *Andro-*.⁶⁶¹ Since this coin is dated to the classical period, just as the Bulwer tablet, this administrative document could have been written by the chancellery of Lapethos. The Phoenician legend, however, demonstrates that the official language of Androcles' kingdom was not Greek. The same language, Phoenician, was probably used for monumental inscriptions and documents employed in the administration.

The practice of inscribing coins and official monuments in Phoenician seems to be long-standing in Lapethos and there are no epigraphic attestations from this city-state written in other languages, neither Greek nor Eteocypriot, from the archaic period until the Ptolemaic era.⁶⁶² Recently, Markou pointed out that sovereigns with Semitic and Greek names alternated but their coin legends were always in Phoenician – even if the iconography presented specific Greek features, as in the case of the 'Phoenician' kings Baalzakor and Sidqmilk.⁶⁶³ This leads to the conclusion that sovereigns with Greek and Phoenician names ruled in Lapethos but their administrative language was fixed always as Phoenician. Either Greek dynasties alternated with Phoenicians but did not feel the necessity to stress their Greek origins – probably due to a higher level of integration than in the other city-states – or Greek names were also employed by local dynasties of Phoenician origins.⁶⁶⁴ Therefore, these peculiar legends of

⁶⁶⁰ Markou 2011, 56; Masson, Szynger 1972, 100.

⁶⁶¹ Masson, Szynger 1972, 100; Markou 2011, 55-56; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 321-322. The same name is also attested in Amathus, as highlighted above, and in the hypocoristic form *a-to-ro-ko-lo* in Kafizin (225-218; 266b) Lipinski read it simply as Andros (2004, 86).

⁶⁶² Lipinski 2004, 80-87; Steele 2013, 185-191.

⁶⁶³ Lipinski 2004, 86.

⁶⁶⁴ As Steele (2013, 161-166) stated, Greek names could have been considered as prestigious, and therefore, employed also in other Cypriot languages. This is evident in some Eteocypriot inscriptions – which show Greek anthroponyms although their text is written in 'Eteocypriot' and still not deciphered (Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Amathus n°6 = ICS 195). See chapter 1.

Lapethos were not due to a political necessity but probably to cultural contacts, perhaps stronger than in other city-states.⁶⁶⁵

Moreover, a Phoenician inscription, which will be discussed in chapter 6, found in Larnax tes Lapethos, a suburb of Lapethos, further proves the alternation of kings with Greek or Phoenician names since it attests to the presence of a king called Demonikos and a king called Berekshemesh. It is also striking that despite the presence of Greek names, the dating formula and the months cited, KRR and MTN, are Phoenician.⁶⁶⁶

According to these data, Phoenician seems to have been the only language employed in the administration of the territory of Lapethos as well as in its political institutions.⁶⁶⁷ Consequently, the Bulwer tablet – written in Cypriot syllabic Greek and recording mostly Greek months – cannot belong to the chancellery of the government of Androcles of Lapethos, the king mentioned on the coin's legend. This leads to the exclusion of Lapethos as the city-state which governed the territory to which the tablet is pertinent.

In order to understand to which city-kingdom the document was linked, we should take into account its provenance from Akanthou. Although this provenance lacks a scientific basis, it is always opportune to make sense of the available information which should be dismissed only if it can be proved that the informer was unreliable. According to this, the tablet was probably related to one of the two city-states close to the Karpas peninsula, Chytroi or Salamis, both close enough to Akanthou.

The history of Chytroi is still unclear. The city was mentioned in the Sargon Stele and in the Esarhaddon prism as Kitrusi along with its king Pilagura – a sovereign with a Greek name (Pylagoras).⁶⁶⁸ Therefore, it was undoubtedly an independent city-state during the beginning of the archaic period, when the Assyrians subjected the island. But the political status of Chytroi during the classical age is still obscure. There is no evidence of a local kingship from the end of the archaic age onwards. Therefore, the Bulwer tablet cannot be a

⁶⁶⁵The case of Marion is different, where archaeologists found coins with Greek anthroponyms written in Phoenician but also in Cypriot syllabic Greek; Consani 1988, 38-419; Lipinski 2004, 84-86.

⁶⁶⁶ Steele 2013, 191; Lipinski 2004, 85-86.

⁶⁶⁷ It should be however considered that the site of Lapethos is not completely excavated yet.

⁶⁶⁸ Saporetti 1976, 83-88; Iacovou 2006b, 317-320; Masson 1992, 27-29.

document related to an independent administration of Chytroi. No literary sources, coins or inscriptions report the name of a king, even though more than 20 syllabic Greek inscriptions were found at the site.⁶⁶⁹

The last inscription which mentions a king of Chytroi is a fragment of a sarcophagus found in the city, written in Phoenician and dated to the seventh century BC, contemporary to the Assyrian documents.⁶⁷⁰ Lipinski based the reconstruction of this text on the usual formulas and the curse employed at the top of inscribed sarcophagi in the Levantine coast.⁶⁷¹ Although the name of Chytroi is conjectured in lacuna, the inscription bears the word MLK, *melek*. Lipinski supposed that the local Greek dynasty had acquired some Phoenician costumes such as the practice of inhuming the members of the royal family or of a local elite in sarcophagi of Levantine shape.⁶⁷² More plausibly, during the archaic period, Chytroi alternated sovereigns of both Greek and Phoenician origins – as it happened in Lapethos. The choice of employing a particular language, or specific customs, rather than another is due to the political purpose of showing the alleged origins of the ruling dynasty.⁶⁷³ Hence, it is conceivable that at least during the seventh century BC, Chytroi's Greek kings alternate with Phoenician sovereigns and that the sarcophagus belongs to a ruler who wanted to stress his Levantine origins, inscribing it in Phoenician. This leads to the conclusion that in the archaic period, the Chytroi kingship was well established and characterised by the ascension of different dynasties to the throne, perhaps due to political upheavals.

The state of Chytroi during the classical period – the period to which the Bulwer tablet is dated – seems however totally different. Archaeological excavations brought to light a sanctuary at the top of the NW hill dated to the 5th-4th century BC and in all likelihood dedicated to the goddess of Paphos according to the content of local syllabic inscriptions; however, there are no traces of a contemporary palace. The Greek syllabic texts from Chytroi are almost all undated with the exception of three which go back to the fourth

⁶⁶⁹ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Chytroi n° 1-23 = ICS 234-250d.

⁶⁷⁰ RES 922; Masson, Sznycer 1972, 104-108. The inscription was found in Chytroi, in 1908, in the site of 'Skali' along with other Cypriot-syllabic *ostraka*. See also ICS 246-247.

⁶⁷¹ Lipinski 2004, 58; for similar formulas see Leheman 2005, *passim*.

⁶⁷² Lipinski 2004, 58-60.

⁶⁷³ Iacovou 2013b, 133-152.

century BC. A few concern other dedications to Apollo Hylates and to the goddess of Golgoi.⁶⁷⁴ Hence, we may conclude that during the classical age, the city probably was a significant religious hub. Local inscriptions in alphabetic Greek do not appear until the Hellenistic period and attest to the presence of several other cults as well as of a gymnasium.⁶⁷⁵ Later on, Chytroi is cited in a Hellenistic inscription from Delphi, a list of θεωροδόκοι, along with other Cypriot cities; but not all of them were previously capital of the classical city-states.⁶⁷⁶

Since all these sources do not show any evidence for a local kingship, we may assume that Chytroi lost its independence during the classical era and became a secondary city in the territory of another city-state.⁶⁷⁷ Therefore, it is rather unlikely that the Bulwer tablet shows accounts concerning its administration. It is reasonable that this city was one of the first victims of the expansionistic policy of Salamis, which aimed to exploit the natural raw materials from neighbouring territories.⁶⁷⁸ Since Chytroi was too far away from the Troodos mountains, rich in copper, Salamis was probably interested in other local resources, likely water springs.⁶⁷⁹ Archaeological surveys attest to the presence of an aqueduct, used during the Severan age, which covers the Mesaoria plain for 56 km and links the Kephlovryse spring – very close to Chytroi – with Salamis’ city-centre. This spring developed from the Prehistoric period and in all likelihood was exploited from the Neolithic onwards.⁶⁸⁰ Consequently, it could have been one of the principal sources of water for Salamis, even during the Iron Age. Furthermore, Chytroi ‘may have played an important role as gateway to Anatolia, which was particularly rich in silver,

⁶⁷⁴ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Chytroi n°1-23.

⁶⁷⁵ They were dedicated to Artemis, Heracles and Hermes; Nicolaou K. 1976, s. *Chytroi*. For other epitaphs dated to the Hellenistic period see Nicolaou K. 1968, 76-84.

⁶⁷⁶ E.g. it seems that Karpas has never been a capital of a city-state but it is mentioned in the list. Plassart 1921, 1-85; the men cited in the list were the *theōrodoikoi* of the places where the Delphic *theōroi* should have gone to announce festivities.

⁶⁷⁷ Hatzopoulos 2009, 231; Iacovou 2002, 73-87.

⁶⁷⁸ Satraki 2010, 293; Kassianidou 2013, 57; Kassianidou 2016, 71-88.

⁶⁷⁹ See *SEG* XXIII, 675. This inscription could testify that an aqueduct was created for bringing water to Salamis city-centre during Nero’s empire. It is not clear, however, where the spring was (Nicolaou 1963, 12).

⁶⁸⁰ Knapp *et al.* 1994, 394.

according to Kassianidou. Anatolia was rich in those metals which Cyprus did not produce and they would have been essential for the island's economy.⁶⁸¹

Finally, a fragment of Lysias' speech *Against Aeschines* is the only literary source which mentions Chytroi in the classical ages. The family of Nicophemus, Conon's collaborator, and of his son Aristophanes, filed a lawsuit against the confiscation of property that followed their death sentence. The entire affair revolves around the permanent residence of Nicophemus in Salamis and his relationship with Evagoras. The fragment mentions a man, Demaratos from Chytroi, who seems to be involved in the trial.⁶⁸² We may suppose that at that time Chytroi was part of Salamis territory, perhaps where Nicophemus had his properties. If so, the date of the legal action, 387BC, could be considered the *terminus ante quem* for the conquest of Chytroi by Salamis. Therefore, although it is not clear when the conquest of Chytroi took place, it is conceivable that this city and its territory, along with Akanthou, belonged to Salamis when the tablet was written.

After establishing that the tablet was written when Akanthou was part of the territory of Salamis, we may try to better understand who the Androcles mentioned in the first line was. He was probably not a king since Salamis does not have any known sovereign bearing this name – though there are considerable gaps in the list of the Salaminian sovereigns. We may rather suppose that Androcles was an eponymous magistrate.⁶⁸³ He gave the name to the year in which the tablet was written as Philokypros did in the Idalion Bronze tablet.⁶⁸⁴ This is a very plausible option since the text which follows is a calendar. Conceivably, the document started with the name of the year, given by the eponymous magistrate, followed by a list of months and anthroponyms.

Moving on to the function of the document, the tablet presents two holes at the bottom of face A (top of face B). The previous editors believed that they

⁶⁸¹ Kassianidou 2012, 229-259.

⁶⁸² Lys., *Frg.* 2, (Harp. s. Χύτροι) Ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν τοὺς Χύτρος ὁ Δαμάρατος ἐάλω προδιδοῦς. On the link between Conon and Salamis see Diod. 13.6; Nep. 1-3 and chapter 1.

⁶⁸³ Meister 1910, 148.

⁶⁸⁴ Hdt. 5. 104; 4.162. According to Herodotus, Onesilos was brother of Gorgos, son of Chersis, son of Siromos son of Euelthon. Euelthon is probably the same king mentioned in some coins from Salamis dated to 560-525 BC (see Markou 2011, 81-86; Amandry 1992, 19). Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Salamis n° 19 = ICS 332 about Nikodamos and Evanthes, two kings whose reigns were dated between Phaulis and Evagoras I (411-373 BC). Nikodamos ruled after 450 BC, while Evanthes' reign is dated to 430 BC; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Idalion n° 1 = ICS 217.

were probably provided for its suspension by means of a cord. For them, this was the proof that the tablet was not meant for burial and excludes definitely the possibility that it was found in a tomb.⁶⁸⁵ They imagined that it was displayed in a temple, probably associating it to the Idalion Bronze tablet, discussed in chapter 2. But tablets with holes were also typical of archives in the Near East and Egypt. They were used for collecting together documents in a dossier through a cord that was passed through two holes, such as for example small clay tablets found in Dakhleh Oasis near Thebes.⁶⁸⁶ Similar examples come from Lefkonikò and Golgoi: both locations have shown tablets with holes – respectively in clay and in stone – concerning accounts and expenses from a local institution.⁶⁸⁷

If we imagine that the Bulwer tablet was joined to others with strings at the top, when it was turned over, the other side would have appeared in the right way up, ready to be read. If it had been merely suspended from a wall after having been inscribed, only the text on the back (face B) would have been visible since the holes are at the top of face B and at the bottom of face A. As a result, the beginning of the document and the first part of the list with months and anthroponyms would have been obscured, only visible by removing the text from the wall, which seems improbable.

Finally, we may turn to the content. Even before previous editors had analysed the whole text and provided a reading, one word suggested to them that the tablet was related to a temple rather than a palace. In line 16 of face B, several scholars have translated *to-ma*, which corresponds to the Greek δῶμα, as ‘temple’; this is a hapax in the Cypriot syllabic texts. Mitford considered it as the ‘dwelling place’ of the god, and – following the idea to link the tablet to the Lefkonikò excavation – he supposed that the god was Apollo.⁶⁸⁸ He was probably influenced by the meaning of the word in literature: sometimes δῶμα

⁶⁸⁵ According to Mitford, the second text (face A) should be considered the face displayed since the lines are engraved in more uniform lettering and the space between the syllabic signs is regular (Mitford, 1961b, 38).

⁶⁸⁶ The use of clay tablets instead of papyri depends on the long distance from the Oasis to the Nile valley. This means that it was difficult to ensure a constant supply of papyrus and they probably had to fall back to another material. This practice was *en vogue* in 2000 BC as well as in the Greco-Roman period. See Bausi, Brockmann, Friedrich, Kienitz 2018, 79; Worp, Hope 2000, 471-485.

⁶⁸⁷ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Golgoi n°4 = ICS 299 and Lefkonikò n°1 = ICS 309.

⁶⁸⁸ Mitford 1961b, 41.

is used to indicate the ‘house of the god’ but in poetry and only as a metaphor.⁶⁸⁹ Masson too translated δῶμα as ‘temple’, adding that this is common usage in the Arcadian dialect.⁶⁹⁰ But if we analyse the Arcadian inscriptions in *IG*, the word is related to a temple only in one case: a sacred law, found in the *temenos* of Athena Alea at Tegea.⁶⁹¹ The text presents a series of regulations and prohibitions which must be respected, among which is a prohibition against lighting a fire in the sanctuary.

21. [...] :: εἰς ἐπὶ δῶμα πῦρ ἐποίσε, δύο δεκο δαρχμᾶς
 22. ὀφλέν, τὸ μὲν ἕμισυ τᾶι θεοῖ, τὸ δ’ ἕμισυ τοῖς *hier[ο]*-
 23. μνάμονσι :: [...]

‘If someone brings fire to the δῶμα, he must pay 12 drachmas, half to the goddess and half to the *hieromnamos*’.

The term δῶμα is not followed by a genitive τᾶς θεῶ, or an adjective ἱερόν, as one might expect a building in a *temenos* to be.⁶⁹² For this reason, Danielson and Dubois argued it could be a temporary edifice, perhaps built in wood, easily flammable, which would explain the prohibition of lighting fire inside. Dubois concludes that in all likelihood, the δῶμα in question was a transitional building, erected between the destruction of the archaic temple in a fire in 395/4, as Pausanias stated, and the new temple built by Skopas during the middle of the fourth century BC.⁶⁹³ Dubois dated the inscription on the basis of this theory.⁶⁹⁴

⁶⁸⁹ Pind. *Pyth.* 4.53 and Aesch. *Eum.* 242. It is frequently used to indicate the ‘house’ of Hades and Persephone, attested in inscriptions from Epirus (e.g. *SEG* XLI 540A) and literary texts (*Od.* 12.21).

⁶⁹⁰ Masson followed the interpretation of Bechtel 1921, 389.

⁶⁹¹ The plural form is attested in another inscription from Arcadia (*IG* V, 2.498, third century AD); but in that case, it clearly indicates the house of Persephone, the afterlife. The term δῶμα is not attested elsewhere in the inscriptions from Arcadia. For the Tegea inscription see *IG* V 2, 3. The stele was found in 1888, close to the Northern part of the temple. See Dubois 1986 vol. II, 20-34 with further references.

⁶⁹² Dubois 1986, 29.

⁶⁹³ *Paus.* 8.45.4: ἐκεῖνο μὲν δὴ πῦρ ἠφάνισεν ἐπινεμηθὲν ἐξαίφνης, Διοφάντου παρ’ Ἀθηναίους ἄρχοντος, δευτέρῳ δὲ ἔτει τῆς ἕκτης καὶ ἐνενηκοστῆς Ὀλυμπιάδος, ἣν Εὐπόλεμος Ἡλεῖος ἐνίκα στάδιον. ‘The sanctuary was utterly destroyed by a fire which suddenly broke out when Diophantus was archon at Athens, in the second year of the 96th Olympiad, where Eupolemus of Elis won the foot-race’.

⁶⁹⁴ Dubois 1986, 29. He dates the text to 390-380BC, pointing out that the interdiction to light a fire in the sanctuary is most likely inspired by a recent event.

This is relevant for establishing the content of the Bulwer tablet. Not only is the word δῶμα not frequently employed to indicate the temple in the Arcadian dialect, as Masson affirmed; but in the only instance in which it is related to a temple, it is used to indicate a specific transitional building, not a normal temple.

Moreover, in another Cypriot syllabic inscription, the standard Greek word for temple, *naos*, is attested in the accusative as *na-o-ne*, ναόν.⁶⁹⁵ This is also a *hapax* in the corpus but shows that *to-ma* was not simply the Cypriot Greek term for temple.

In the most recent translation of the tablet, Egetmeyer, tentatively renders *to-ma* as ‘maison’, ‘house’.⁶⁹⁶ This too is problematic since the word for ‘house’ or ‘home’ frequently attested in the Cypriot Syllabic Greek is *wo-i-ko-se* or later *o-i-ko-se* – without Ϝ.⁶⁹⁷ In addition, the document format points to institutional archives more than to private accounts, which in Cyprus usually employed reused *ostraka*, so a reference to a private ‘house’ would be unexpected. The house or palace of the king should probably also be excluded, because in the bronze tablet from Idalion, as we have seen, it is called *o-i-ko-se pa-si-le-wo-se*,⁶⁹⁸ the ‘house of the king’, presumably what Isocrates had defined as βασιλειον in his speech *Evagoras*.⁶⁹⁹

In literature, the word δῶμα may designate ‘house’, mostly in poetry, frequently employed in familial contexts, and it may connote the ‘family house’ or less specifically, a common ‘house’; but it is not used in this sense in Attic prose.⁷⁰⁰

This analysis leads to the conclusion that if in the Cypriot Greek dialect the term δῶμα was not employed for describing a temple, private house, or royal palace, Cypriots used it to designate another building, probably an

⁶⁹⁵ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Nea-Paphos n°1 = ICS 1 with further references.

⁶⁹⁶ However, Egetmeyer elsewhere (2010 vol. I, 402 §494) considers ‘temple’ a possible translation.

⁶⁹⁷ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Pyla n° 3 = ICS 306. In the same inscription, analysed in the first chapter, the term *ta-la-mo*, *thalamus*, ‘room’, appears along with a more general *o-i-ko-se*, ‘house’. These two different specific words were adopted on purpose. Such a convention suggests that the terminology was very specific in the Cypriot syllabic texts. Therefore, it is rather implausible to consider *to-ma* a synonym for either *na-o-ne* or *o-i-ko-se*.

⁶⁹⁸ Egetmeyer 2010 II, Idalion n° 1, l.7.

⁶⁹⁹ Isocr. 9.30; Hermary 2013, 83-101. According to Hermary, this is the only written source which mentions a huge building or a palace in Cyprus. He probably did not consider the δῶμα and nor the Idalion bronze tablet.

⁷⁰⁰ Theocr. *Idyl.* 2.52. In a Posidippus fragment, the word δῶμα becomes a metonym for ‘family’. Dubrec 2008, 28.

administrative centre. It should have been a building of fair size, for storing items, collecting tributes – paid by agricultural products, animals, and coins – but also for keeping a local archive. Consequently, δῶμα could have been the Cypriot term used to define the large buildings located in the territory of the city-states, whose presence is testified by archaeological excavations.

For instance, at the beginning of the twentieth century, the Swedish expedition brought to light the ‘palace’ of Vouni, in the North West of Cyprus.⁷⁰¹ Since Vouni never was the capital of a city-state, archaeologists still debate which main functions this building/palace held. Located in a strategic position, it features a series of rectangular chambers, probably used for storing food and products from the local territory. Apparently, it was under the control of the neighbouring city of Marion in the fifth century BC, and no longer part of the territory of Soloi, as we should have expected since it is located closer to this capital.⁷⁰² This excludes the possibility that the building found in Vouni was the residence of a king since the excavations have brought to light buildings in the city centre of Marion, dated to the classical period, and among them the royal palace.⁷⁰³ The territory of Palaipaphos also presents a series of buildings, which are partially excavated. One of these, on the Hadjiabdoulla hill, has been recently identified as an administrative centre, used as an archive but also for storing agricultural products and performing industrial activities.⁷⁰⁴ In Marchello, in the peri-urban area of Palaipaphos, another building has been recently re-interpreted as a Cypro-archaic citadel, rather than as a temple as initially thought.⁷⁰⁵ This building, along with storage rooms, included a votive deposit filled with cultic capitals, miniature models of temples, baetyls and statues of kings, materials which caused some initial confusion amongst archaeologists. However, scholars now agree that institutional buildings linked to the royal power should also have had a religious function, as probably was the case of the edifice in Marchello.⁷⁰⁶ Salamis and Amathus present two very

⁷⁰¹ Gjerstad 1935, 111-290.

⁷⁰² Hermary 2013, 86.

⁷⁰³ Childs, Smith, and Padgett 2012, *passim*; Childs 2012, 90-106; Smith 2018, 167-186.

⁷⁰⁴ The building has rooms used for oil production, millstones, basins and water pipes. Some areas of the building were set up for producing purple with murex (Iacovou 2019, 223-225; Iacovou 2017, 317-329).

⁷⁰⁵ Schäfer 1960, 155-175; Maier 2008, *passim*.

⁷⁰⁶ Iacovou 2019, 221-223; Hermary 2013, 94-96.

similar instances.⁷⁰⁷ This evidence confirms that a building of fair size, other than temples, could exist in the territory of the city states. The Bulwer tablet is therefore likely to relate to such a local administrative building, probably connected to the central administration of Salamis.

It remains to be established which role the listed men played there, and how the document was linked to the administrative system of the capital. Previous editors supposed that the tablet is an accounting document. This is due to the interpretation of the word *lo-ga-ri-* in line 3 of face A. According to Meister, it indicates ‘account’. He believed that he could see the sign *ja* after *ri*, and consequently reconstructed it as *λογαρια[σμός]*.⁷⁰⁸ But as Masson noted, this word – and the verb *λογαριάζω* are quite late.⁷⁰⁹

Egetmeyer offers a more plausible reading. He followed the interpretation of Mitford and Neumann, who considered this as an anthroponym (one word) *e-se-lo-ka-ri-[se]*, Eslocharis.⁷¹⁰ They compared these signs with the syllabic sequence shown in line 7, where, according to them, *e-se-lo-[* is probably the beginning of the same name. This anthroponym might be one of the several starting with ‘Eslo/Ello’ such as Ellotimos or Ellodamos.⁷¹¹

The tablet, however, can still be considered an account document. This may be proved by the presence of the verb *pe-i-se-i* the future of the verb *τίνω*, ‘he/it will pay’ in line 20 – as discussed in the following pages. Furthermore, the specific layout of the tablet and the organisation of its text – which should have been turned up for reading the content – recalls other two Cypriot-syllabic documents from Lefkonikò and Golgoi, already quoted above, which undoubtedly concern accounts.⁷¹²

⁷⁰⁷ Hermary 2013, 95; Hermary 2015, 29-38; Iacovou 2019, 221-222; Fourrier 2018, 143-144.

⁷⁰⁸ Masson 1983, 317.

⁷⁰⁹ The word may be also read as ‘*λογάριον*’. Also this word, however, is rarely attested in classical texts; see P. Lille 160, 1.11 (282 BC); Kassel, Austin 1984, Ar. *Frg.* 810. An autoptic vision of the tablet does not help to identify the syllabic sign which follows *ri*. *E-se* would be third person singular of an athematic imperfect 3rd person singular of *εἰμί*, attested also in the Arcadian dialect. This is also attested in Abydos (*ICS* 398.4) and in the Arcadian dialect (Dubois 1986, §90). This form comes from an original **e-es-t* where *-Ø < *-t*; see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 515 §640; Masson 1992b, 122, 5; Masson 1978, 123-128.

⁷¹⁰ Mitford 1961b, 40; Neumann 1963, 57; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 172 §185.

⁷¹¹ For a complete list of the names starting in Eslo/Ello- cf. Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 172-173 §185.

⁷¹² This is not the only tablet of accounts which has a preamble. The clay tablet from Lefkonikò starts with a verb, *su-ne-ke-no-to*, *συνεγένοντο*, ‘they came together’, the thematic aorist of

As anticipated above, the very first word of the tablet, *a-to-ro[...]*, is probably the incipit of an anthroponym, Androcles and plausibly, the name of the eponymous magistrate to whose year the tablet is dated.⁷¹³ The sequence of signs in the second line was read as *i-tu-ka* by most of the editors and it has been interpreted as *iv τύχα[ι ἀγαθᾶι]*, the Greek augural formula.⁷¹⁴ On this basis, Mitford and Hatzopoulos consider the document as emanating from a local chancellery. The new interpretation of the word δῶμα provided above reinforces this interpretation.

But as far as the reading of the following lines is concerned, it is appropriate to depart from Hatzopoulos' translation. He interpreted the word *la-pa-to-ne* (line 4, face A) as a genitive for τῶν λαμπαδῶν.⁷¹⁵ Accordingly, the text should be read as Ἐσλόχαρις [ἄρχε] λαμπαδῶν.⁷¹⁶ Although some λαμπάδαρχοι are attested in a few Hellenistic inscriptions from Amathus and Chytroi, the office seems to be specifically Greek and *en vogue* in the Ptolemaic kingdom.⁷¹⁷ It is mentioned in a papyrus from Philadelphia in the Arsinoite *nomos*, dated 147-136 BC, where Hermon the Macedonian wrote to the secretary of the village, the κωμογραμματεὺς Petarpocrates, asking for the abolition of the expensive lampdarchy.⁷¹⁸ Consequently, this service could have been introduced in Cyprus after the establishment of the Ptolemaic domination or with the advent of Hellenism, as was the case for other offices frequently attested in the Cypriot Hellenistic inscriptions (for instance the στρατηγός or the γυμνασάρχος). Indeed, the λαμαπάδαρχοι are mentioned along with a γυμνασάρχος in the inscription from Amathus and in the Egyptian papyrus. This indicates that the offices were potentially set up at the same time.

συγγίγνομαι. According to Egetmeyer (2010 vol. I, 480 §598), the structure of the Lefkonikò tablet could be compared with that of some Mycenaean documents concerning accounts; they usually present the name of a month and a list of anthroponyms (e.g. see PY, An 261).

⁷¹³ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I 367, §445; 416 §525 and Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Amathus n°18 = ICS 196e; Mitford 1980 n°266b.

⁷¹⁴ Mitford 1961b, 39-40; Masson 1983, 325; Hatzopoulos 2009, 229; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Akanthou n°1.

Neumann (1963, 65-66), however, proposed to read the signs as *i-tu-si*. According to him, *i-tu-si* could be the beginning of the word *ἴθυσσις, a substantive derived from the verb ἰθύνω, 'to straighten', – as it is for εὔθυσσις which derives from εὐθύνω. Ἐυθύνω, in fact, is the attic form of ἰθύνω. His hypothesis, however, has been rejected by Egetmeyer (2010 vol. I, 118-121 §118-121) as too speculative since the word *ἴθυσσις is not attested.

⁷¹⁵ Hatzopoulos 2009, 227-234.

⁷¹⁶ Eslocharis would be a hapax in this case.

⁷¹⁷ Mitford 1937, 33; Mitford 1961, 129-131; Michaelidou-Nicolaou 1999, 371-376.

⁷¹⁸ Sel. Pap. II 275 (Hunt, Edgar, 1922).

Since they are both involved in the activities of the gymnasium, they are often mentioned in the same dedications. The λαμπάδαρχος normally was in charge of presiding and organising the λαμπαδηδρομίες, races with torches, halfway between gymnastic competitions and religious practices, which – at least in Athens – were historically managed by the figure of the γυμνασίαρχος.⁷¹⁹ It is plausible that they both presided over the same local feasts, games and gymnasia. However, the archaeological record does not show the presence of a gymnasium in Cyprus before the Hellenistic period.⁷²⁰ All in all, the Cypriot lampadarchy appears as a Hellenistic local office, probably introduced under the Ptolemies, which is unlikely to have been mentioned in a tablet of classical or archaic date.

Even Hatzopoulos later became sceptical about the presence of the λαμπάδαρχος in the Bulwer tablet.⁷²¹ This evidence is enough for setting aside Hatzopoulos' first interpretation and definitely shelve the presence of a λαμπάδαρχος in the Bulwer tablet.

Neumann, followed by Egetmeyer, interprets the syllabic sequence *la-pa-to-ne* as a Cypriot singular genitive of the month Lapatos.⁷²² According to him, this should be the first of eleven months listed in the tablet as in a calendar, all followed by an anthroponym, consistently separated by a dot. He pointed out that this month is also attested in a Mycenaean document from Knossos and in an inscription from Arcadia. The Mycenaean tablet concerns a list of goods and products for the 'Priestess of the Wind' and for the 'Goddess Pipituna'. It presents *ra.pa.to me.no* at the beginning, 'month of Lapatos'.⁷²³ The Arcadian inscription is a bronze plaque regarding the proxeny of Larchippos from Orchomenos, a decree dated to the month of Lapatos, μηνος Λαπάτω – here in

⁷¹⁹ Melfi 2002, 351 n.134; Oehler 1924, 567-569.

⁷²⁰ Cypriot excavations and inscriptions showed the presence of several gymnasia during the Ptolemaic domination (294-58BC). Papantoniou 2012, 221; Legras 1999, 142; Mehl 2000, 715-716.

⁷²¹ Hatzopoulos 2011, 330.

⁷²² Neumann 1963, 53-67; for details on the name of the other months cf. Neumann 1963, 53-67; Neumann 1993, 44-45; Trümpy 1997, 253-261; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, 287, n° 321. For the debate on the two forms of the Cypriot genitive in the second declination see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 390 n°469-470.

⁷²³ *KN FP* 13.

genitive.⁷²⁴ Lapatos has often been considered as a pre-Greek month name. Scholars have supposed that it was employed as a loan word in Mycenaean and, subsequently, preserved in some isolated areas such as Cyprus. Consequently, its etymology remains obscure. By contrast, as Neumann demonstrated, most of the names of the other months are related to deities – as it frequently happens in the Greek calendars – or to common Greek festivities.

It remains to understand what period of the year Lapatos indicated in order to define with which month the calendar begins. Egetmeyer tried to prove that the name Lapatos has Greek origins, in contrast with the previous literature. He linked it to the root *lap-* and to the Greek word *λαῖλαψ*, rain storm, identifying it as an autumn/winter month. But this possible solution cannot find any confirmation.

Significant insights may come, however, from a new interpretation of the sixth line of face A.⁷²⁵ Although the syllabic script is clear, its reading is controversial. The second syllabic sign of the sequence could be read as *za* or *ga* (*a-ga-ra-wo-ne/a-za-ra-wo-ne*). Normally, in Cypriot Greek *ga* is written as *ka*, since the script does not distinguish between voiced and unvoiced consonants – at least in written form. But there are some exceptions where it is represented by the sign that we read in the Bulwer tablet. According to the first editors, this sign should be read as *za*. Since the sign in question was the only one without a precise transliteration and *za* was missing among all the other syllabic signs, they decided to identify it as *za* rather than *ga*. Masson drew the same conclusion considering reliable a gloss by Hesychius where ζάβατος was explained as the Cypriot version of the Greek γάβαθον, a fish plate.⁷²⁶ At the same time, Cypriots also continued to write *ga* as *ka* and it is still not clear why these two systems could coexist and be used at the same time.⁷²⁷

⁷²⁴ Dubois 1986 II, 175-176, Orchomenos n° 11. The inscription is dated to the third century BC.

⁷²⁵ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Akanthou n°1, 576-577.

⁷²⁶ Hsch. ζ2, 43-44; γ3; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 188-190 §202.

⁷²⁷ According to Egetmeyer, the sign in question is attested in the syllabic Greek inscriptions only where in the attic Greek we should expect *ga*. Even in the bronze tablet from Idalion, he reads *u-wa-i-se ga-ne* as ‘ever on the earth’ – considering *ga-ne* as an accusative of respect (Egetmeyer 1993b, 145-155; Weiss 1995, 152; Colvin 2007, 90-91). Previous editors read it as *za-ne*, ‘life’, a substantive derivative from ζάω, and translated the sequence as ‘for all the ‘life’. Between the two interpretations, the content suggests that the reading *za-ne* is more appropriate; for more details see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 190 §202; Egetmeyer 1993, 145-155.

Setting aside this linguistic problem, still unresolved, Masson – following the previous editors – proposed to read the initial sequence of line 6 as *a-za-ra-wo-ne*. Since *za* should correspond to the standard Greek *ga*, he agrees with Mitford to associate the name of this month with the root of ἀγείρω, ‘to collect’.⁷²⁸ By contrast, Egetmeyer read it as *a-ga-ra-wo-ne*. He claims that the sign in question should be always read as *ga* but he also concurs that the meaning of this word may be related to the verb ἀγείρω.⁷²⁹

By contrast, I suggest to read the text properly as *a-za-ra-wo-ne*, as Masson pointed out. But in this case, I propose that *za* should simply be considered the transliteration of a foreign sound rather than a variant of the Cypriot dialect for *ga*. The whole word could be a loan from a Semitic language, considering the frequent linguistic contacts attested in Cyprus, perhaps from a month of a Near-Eastern calendar employed in the Levantine coast and, most important, by the Achaemenids.

The Achaemenids, along with local months written in Ancient Persian, also adopted an official calendar: the Babylonian.⁷³⁰ Just as Aramaic became the official language of the Empire, the Babylonian calendar became the official common system for reckoning years, months and days. This lunisolar system – based on the sight of the new moon – has been incredibly long-lived since it continued to be utilised from 2000 BC in Mesopotamia until the late Roman period.⁷³¹ But thanks to the Persians, it became widespread in the Near-East and in different Mediterranean areas since it was adopted by all the several communities under the umbrella of the Achaemenid administration. For instance, a trilingual inscription from the temple of Leto – at Xanthos in Lycia – features Greek, Lycian and Aramaic texts. The inscription is dated only in the Aramaic part – which is the official document of the Empire – to the month of Siwan, to the first year of the King Artaserxes – 358 BC. Siwan is the name of a month of the Babylonian calendar, also employed by post-exile Hebrews and in that period even in Lycia, thanks to the Achaemenid administrative system.⁷³²

⁷²⁸ Mitford 1961b, 41-43, Neumann 1963, 59-64, Masson 1983, 325-328; Trümpy 1997, 253-261.

⁷²⁹ Egetmeyer 1993c, 19-24; 1993b, 144-155.

⁷³⁰ Stern 2012, 71-123.

⁷³¹ Stern 2012, 71.

⁷³² Dupont-Sommer 1979, 161-177; Fried 2004, 140-154.

Similar is the case of some Aramaic *ostraka* from Elephantine in Egypt. They clearly show that a Babylonian calendar was employed along with the civil Egyptian calendar. Since the *ostraka* concern contracts that should have been understood by the officials of the Achaemenid administration, they employed a double dating system.⁷³³ The Elephantine dates do not coincide precisely with those we should expect in the conversion from the Egyptian dates to the Babylonian ones, but the months have the same name as in all the other locations of the Achaemenid kingdom.⁷³⁴ This allows the conclusion that the Babylonian reckoning method was employed in all the areas of the Empire but, along with this official calendar, a regional system was also used. Some local exceptions in calculating days and months were frequent, due to the extension of the Empire's territory and communication difficulties but the names of the months were consistent. Accordingly, we may assume that also in Cyprus, as part of the Empire, the Babylonian calendar was well known along with other local dating systems.⁷³⁵

Although in the Babylonian calendar no month is called Azar (*a-za-ra-wo-ne*), a similarly named month, Adar, is frequently attested. Originally, the name Adar is Akkadian; it probably comes from the same root of the word *addaru*, cloudy or dark, and it was also part of the Assyrian calendar, where it corresponds to March.⁷³⁶ The version Azar (*a-za-ra-wo-ne*) instead of Adar could depend on a different local Cypriot spelling. On the Levantine coast, and generally outside Mesopotamia, an original Semitic *d* was often spelled as *z*. Similar cases recur in the Aramaic *ostraka* from Elephantine, where the original *d* was rendered as *z* or *d* in the translation of some names from Hebrew.⁷³⁷

⁷³³ Stern 2000, 159-171. This is a peculiar kind of Babylonian calendar. Since in that area of Egypt the local inhabitants did not know when the precise sight of the new moon occurred in Babylonia, they tried to estimate it, often mistaking. It is conceivable that the same happened in other areas of the Empire, since it would have been difficult to communicate a few hours apart when the moon was seen in Babylonia.

⁷³⁴ The Babylonian calendar was also used in Bactria (Shaked 2004, 42-45).

⁷³⁵ This calendar was also adopted in the Neo-Assyrian period as the official state calendar. The beginning of the month was transmitted through the Assyrian Empire by 'reports'. (Stern 2012, 93). Consequently, the name of this month, Adar, could have been known in Cyprus even earlier, perhaps from the Assyrian conquest.

⁷³⁶ Jastrow 1910, 151-155; Stern 2012, 75.

⁷³⁷ Silverman 1969, 691-709.

Finally, the end *wo-ne* could be a genitival suffix, analogically adopted to inflect the month in Cypriot Greek.⁷³⁸

Unfortunately, no literary or epigraphic source presents an entire Cypriot calendar but lists of months are shown in a few tablets concerning accounts and expenses – among which the most complete is the Bulwer Tablet. Since these documents are local and probably created specifically for the internal administration of the city-states, they do not present any official Aramaic calendar. It is however conceivable that the Babylonian/Aramaic months were well known and perhaps also used on the island due to the frequent contacts with the Near East, and most likely with the administrative system of the Empire as well.⁷³⁹ Hence, it is not surprising that one of these has been included in a regional calendar. It is also plausible that every Cypriot city-state adopted its own dating system at the local level, or at least the city-states which used Greek for recording. The comparison between inscriptions from Kition and Idalion and the Bulwer tablet is enough to establish that the Phoenician administration in Kition called months differently from the administration to which the Bulwer tablet belongs.⁷⁴⁰ Two other Cypriot-syllabic documents – contemporary but from different locations, Golgoi and the already cited Lefkonikò– show months which clearly have Greek names, but only one of them, *Aphrodisios*, is also mentioned in the Bulwer tablet.⁷⁴¹ We may conclude that the calendar employed in Akanthou in the classical period was different from those used in Kition, in Golgoi and in Lefkonikò in the same period.⁷⁴² Consequently, Adar could have been a month introduced locally in Cyprus – and perhaps especially in Akanthou

⁷³⁸ This is probably due to the inflection of the foreign word into Greek, made by analogy with the genitive of other months in the list, which end in *-o-ne*. It is not surprising that a non-etymological digamma was inserted between the root and the inflection since it appears frequently in the names of the third declension and in a couple of cases also in the names of the second declension. See Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 411 §515 (on the Cypriot genitive 390-394 §469-472).

⁷³⁹ According to Stieglitz (1998, 211-221) Phoenicians named the months like Hebrews before the exile. Some of them are also mentioned in some Cypriot inscriptions from Kition, Lapethos and Tamassos. However, the Babylonian/Aramaic calendar was employed in Tyre and Sidon during the Roman period. Consequently, even the Phoenician conservative calendar system was replaced at one point by the standard Aramaic version.

⁷⁴⁰ Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, C1 = Yon 2004, n°1078.

⁷⁴¹ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Golgoi n° 40 = ICS 299.

⁷⁴² To define whether the word in question, *ta-u-ka-na-po-ri-o*, indicates a month or a local festivity, however, it is necessary to analyse the content of the tablet more appropriately. (Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Lefkonikò n°1). The other two months which do not appear in the Akanthou tablet are *wa-la-ka-ni-o-se* and *i-ta-no-se*.

– from the Near East. By contrast, two inscriptions from Larnax tes Lapethou and two bilingual dedications from Tamassos show typical Phoenician months in the Phoenician texts, the same which were used in the records from Kition. This leads to the conclusion that the administrations that adopted Greek had their own calendars, which differed locally; but where Phoenician was the official administrative language, a standard Phoenician calendar was applied.

In conclusion, if this interpretation is correct and *a-za-ra-wo-ne* was a local month adopted in Akanthou – which should correspond to the month Adar/Azar, the current March – the month of Lapatos would have been January.⁷⁴³ This indicates that the calendar of eleven months begins with the month of January. Therefore, the tablet could concern accounts related to particular items or products – or perhaps tributes – that should have been collected or paid each month except December.

A confirmation regarding the utilisation of the tablet comes from a deeper analysis of the contents of face B. This is difficult to read because of the bad state of preservation. The first and the second line are still part of the list of months/anthroponyms.⁷⁴⁴ From line 15, the text is clearly legible but the meaning of the words remains ambiguous. The structure of the text is repetitive; it often presents the conjunctions *i-te*, ‘and’, or the adverb *e-te* plus verbs in subjunctive. The traditional Cypriot formula *i-te-ka-se* is followed by the signs *ka-ti-ne*. The sequence *ka-ti-ne* may correspond to the Greek κατά + ἴν, where ἴν is a Levantine unit of measurement employed also in Egypt.⁷⁴⁵ It is plausible that this is a quantity of a specific item collected into the δῶμα – probably missing in lacuna. Since it approximately coincides with 5 litres, the product could have been wine or oil.

Another clear word – which follows *to-ma* – is *we-re-se-e*. According to Egetmeyer, this is an aorist subjunctive, which could be compared with the form

⁷⁴³ As far as the other months in the tablet are concerned, the majority is associated with a specific divinity. Two of them still remain to be completely understood but plausible explanations have been advanced by Egetmeyer (2010, vol. I, 145 §146; 257; §284).

⁷⁴⁴ The last name of the calendar (second line of face B) could be read as *a-ri-si-to-wa-[na]-xe*, where *xe* is the first symbol of line 15.

⁷⁴⁵ *Levit.* 25.

po-re-se in line 18.⁷⁴⁶ He points out that *we-re-se-e* is probably related to ἀπόερσε, ‘he may take or get away’, semantically useful in the context of recording accounts or of institutional incomings and outgoings.⁷⁴⁷ The following part seems to confirm this theory. Line 17 can be translated as ‘and obtaining each day [...]’, *i-te la-ko-ne to-a-ma-[ra* and line 18 starts with *po-re-se e-te* probably a subjunctive form of the verb φορέω, ‘he may bring already’.⁷⁴⁸ Finally, another clear word is the last one, *pe-i-se-i* the future of the verb τίνω, ‘he/it will pay’.⁷⁴⁹

The content clarifies that the tablet concerns payments in goods related to large size building, the δῶμα. Why the first lines report a calendar and why each month is related to a specific person remains elusive, but it is worth hazarding a guess as to what the main duties of these men were. A reasonable conclusion is that they received a daily payment (ιδὲ λαχὼν τὸ ἄμαρ) during each of the months listed in the tablet. It is reasonably safe to assume that the second part of the tablet specified the payment that they have received, or that they are entitled to. This may consist in products of the land collected during the whole year except December, perhaps part of the tributes which were locally paid to the *doma*.⁷⁵⁰ The reason is not clear but it is plausible that in December fees and tributes were imposed and paid differently – as often happened in the Achaemenid administrative system, where apparently some months were dedicated to the collection of specific tributes, particularly at the end of the year.⁷⁵¹ A potential cause could be that the general incomes were mostly

⁷⁴⁶ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 486-487. Masson though about the root for sweeping **wers-*, though it is not attested in Ancient Greek (*ICS* 327).

⁷⁴⁷ Egetmeyer affirms that ἀπόερσε cannot be related to the root **wers-* ‘to sweep away’. In that case, σ would be radical; but in this Cypriot form, σ is clearly the suffix of the aorist. According to him, this verb should be related to the same root of ἔρρω, ‘to go/to come’ **vert-*. (see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 487 §602).

⁷⁴⁸ The following words are still uncertain. Egetmeyer does not provide any translations. Masson proposes *to-mi-ya*; he relates this word to a sacrifice of animals. But the signs could also be read as *to-ki*. In this case, the word should indicate an ‘interest rate’. Both interpretations can match with the context but none is unequivocal since the tablet is damaged and difficult to read.

⁷⁴⁹ Egetmeyer 2010 I, 485 §601. The same form – a future too – is attested in Pyla (400-325BC) in *ICS* 306.8. The Aeolic dialect presents the same labiovelar outcome. These forms all come from the same root **k^wei-*.

⁷⁵⁰ For the donation of the land of the king see the discussion of the Idalion Bronze tablet in chapter 2.

⁷⁵¹ Tuplin 2008, 330. In the documents of the Persepolis archive, the month n°5 is called Turnabaziš, which means ‘dedicated to harvest-share’ or ‘to harvest-tax’ (Tavernier 2007, 452). These taxes were usually paid with agricultural products, animals or slaves.

agricultural products which could not be raised during the winter months, particularly in December.

Another sensible deduction is that the office of the men listed in the tablet lasted for one month. In Cyprus, a similar example is provided by the Kition accounts, where the magistrates of the Nomenia were in charge for a specific lunar month and apparently, considerably paid for their work.⁷⁵² These magistrates probably played a role which was more political than administrative. But the Bulwer tablet's men could have held a proper bureaucratic office. However, the evidence is not enough to exclude one or the other option. Greece – particularly Athens – offers a similar parallel with the *κωλακρέται*, the 'ham collectors'. Mentioned in the *Athenaion Politeia* as Solonian magistrates, they were the only officials who remained in charge for less than one year, generally for a prytany (36 days).⁷⁵³ Even more relevantly, scholars have suggested that originally their term of office was only one month.⁷⁵⁴ Initially, their main duties were to collect the dues owed to kings or to magistrates. Then, they became treasurers who collected the city revenues. Their office was probably established during the archaic period, and in all likelihood regulated during Solon's legislation.⁷⁵⁵ Afterwards, they were deprived of their power and replaced by the *ἀποδέκται*.⁷⁵⁶ Similar officials were attested in Crete and in Sparta.

In the Bulwer tablet, we can guess that the men listed played a similar role. They were employed in this local *δῶμα* by the central administration through a well organised administrative structure divided between a central and peripheral areas. It is plausible that these men held their office for only one month because of the necessity to restrict their control over revenue. This could have been an expedient to limit their power at local level in order to avoid political revolts and insurrections at the expense of the central government of the city-state.

⁷⁵² Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, C1 2.A/2.B = Yon 2004, n°1078.

⁷⁵³ Aristot. *Athen. Pol.* 7.3.

⁷⁵⁴ Van Wees 2013, 39-43.

⁷⁵⁵ Aristot. *Athen. Pol.* 7.3; Rhodes 1981, 139-140.

⁷⁵⁶ Meanwhile, they continued to provide food for the Prytaneum and completely disappeared from inscriptions and literary sources after 411BC. See *IG I² 19 = IG I³ 11* and *IG I² 94 = IG I³ 84*; Henry 1982, 91-118.

Very likely, the revenues were collected monthly – as it also happened in other administrative centres under the umbrella of the Persian Empire – and each official may have been in charge of overseeing the collection in a specific month listed in the tablet.⁷⁵⁷ We may suppose that some tributes were paid in kind; hence, agricultural products and animals directly reached the stores of the palace. These practices coincide with those shown in the Cypriot archaeological reports – where stores were found in large size buildings in the territory of the city-states.⁷⁵⁸ This may further prove that the administrative structure was composite, hierarchical and well organised, not only in the ‘Phoenician administrative’ city-kingdoms but also where the syllabic Greek was chosen as administrative language.

Territories’ resources were one of the reasons, along with an efficient harbour, of the *longue durée* of the Cypriot city-states.⁷⁵⁹ In order to better control these territories, on the one hand Cypriot dynasties used extra-urban sanctuaries which ideologically represented the royal power in peripheral areas;⁷⁶⁰ these sanctuaries, however, do not seem to be directly involved in the exploitation of the land although they were dynamic hubs which promoted communication and exchange among the city-states, particularly those located on the borders.⁷⁶¹ On the other hand, the government may have used secondary peri-urban and extra-urban buildings to store resources – the *domata* –where officials and workers were employed.

Overall, it has been shown that the tablet is an account document which reports expenses of a local δῶμα, probably an administrative institution. The territory near Akanthou was probably administered by this local building which was linked to a central administrative system based in the capital, in all likelihood Salamis. Several officials, appointed by the central government, were

⁷⁵⁷ Jursa 2011, 431-448; Kebler 2015, 11-12. This is not a Cypriot unique feature. The practice of raising products as tributes or paying through *corvée* labour instead of by money was very popular within the Achaemenid Empire (Klinkott 2005, 272-274). A further example comes from the Babylonian clay tablets concerning the fiscal system (tax collection and administration). They show which features were eradicated by the Neo-Babylonian system and what has been introduced by the Achaemenids (Kebler 2015, 2; Joannès 2006, 55).

⁷⁵⁸ Hermary 2013, 85-87.

⁷⁵⁹ Papantoniou, Vionis 2019, 40-65; Iacovou 2013, 15-47.

⁷⁶⁰ Fourrier 2013, 103-122; Iacovou 2013c, 275-291.

⁷⁶¹ Papantoniou, Bourogiannis 2019; Papantoniou *et. al* 2015, 70-75; Averett, Counts *et al.* 2015, 204-220.

employed there. Their office lasted for one month specified in a calendar. We may assume that the principal function of this δῶμα was to raise tributes on behalf of the capital administration – usually consisting of local products. This further proves that the administrative system of the Cypriot city-kingdoms was based on a complex hierarchical structure, with common elements amongst all the city-states.

Religious-civil officials between the centre and periphery in Cypriot Syllabic Greek and Phoenician inscriptions

The analysis of the previous documents has highlighted two key elements characteristic of Cypriot city-states: the overlap between political and religious powers and institutions, whose highest authority was represented by the king, and the presence of magistrates, officials and specialised workers employed in complex political and administrative structures. The analysis of further testimonies will show that these elements may be closely linked. Some Cypriot magistrates employed in the city-centre or in peripheral areas of the polities played both political and religious roles.

6.1 Hunting for wolves: a civic-religious magistracy in the central administration of Paphos

Three Cypriot-syllabic Greek inscriptions mention an official who held the title of ἀρχός. They come from the area of Paphos and they are all related to the religious sphere – in particular, two of them to the cult of Apollo Hylates. A close study of the inscriptions suggests that this ἀρχός was an official employed in the administration of the city.

All three texts are written in a new syllabic system peculiar to Paphos, introduced at the end of the fourth century BC, as part of a package of reforms promoted by Nicocles, the last king of Paphos, who remodelled the government of Paphos and perhaps part of the administration.⁷⁶² He implemented these reforms to resolve practical and political problems faced by his government in order to survive during the period of changes and general instability caused by Alexander's arrival.

In light of this evidence, it is necessary to analyse the political period in which the three inscriptions were written in order to investigate what role this ἀρχός played, whether he effectively was an administrative/religious official,

⁷⁶² In Paphos, the syllabary developed differently from what happened in other Cypriot city-states. It was commonly read from left to right and the shape or the stretch of some signs is distinctive Olivier 2013, 20-21; Egetmeyer 2013, 107-131; Egetmeyer, Karnava, Perna 2012, 23-40; Olivier 2008, 605-620. This local syllabary developed between the eighth and the seventh century BC.

and whether his office was a new one, created in conjunction with Nicocles' reforms, or whether it was traditional and long-standing in Paphos. Finally, it is worth considering if analogous offices were also established in other Cypriot city-kingdoms in order to determine whether or not a similar basic administrative structure existed among the Cypriot city-states, with officials who played comparable civil/religious roles.

Nioccles' programme of reforms substantially reshaped the socio-political organisation of Paphos. It focused on three points: urban reconstruction; reform of the syllabic script; and reform of the cults.

Starting with the first one, it is evident that this king began a process of urban renovation since he transferred the capital of the city-state from Kouklia to Nea-Paphos.⁷⁶³ As several scholars have stated, this change was probably due to the need for having a new functional harbour.⁷⁶⁴ In all likelihood, Ancient Paphos had its own port in front of the sanctuary of Aphrodite and in front of the buildings at the top of the hills of Laona and Habjadoulla – probably the palace and an administrative centre – which are currently under excavation.⁷⁶⁵ The harbour would have been visible from and administered by these centres.⁷⁶⁶ It is plausible that this port was silting up and that the government was forced to create a new capital with a new hub for commercial exchange.⁷⁶⁷ This also happened in other Cypriot cities. For example, the silting up of the port of Enkomi forced the inhabitants to found a new settlement, Salamis, a few kilometres to the North.⁷⁶⁸ Moreover, transferring the harbour undoubtedly involved the diversion of the old Paphian 'copper route'. The final stop would no longer have been Kouklia but the new port. Two dedications to the goddess

⁷⁶³ Iacovou 2013c, 275-291; Młynarczyk, 1990, *passim*.

⁷⁶⁴ Iacovou 2013c, 282.

⁷⁶⁵ Iacovou 2013c, 287; Iacovou 2017, 317-329; <http://ucy.ac.cy/pulp>; Iacovou 2008, 263-290; Maier 2004, 59-74; Maier 2008; Maier, Karageorghis 1984, 285.

⁷⁶⁶ Iacovou 2019, 204-234.

⁷⁶⁷ Iacovou 2008, 625-655.

⁷⁶⁸ Halan Sultan Tekke presented a similar situation. It was abandoned when its port-basin became a salt-lake; see Aström, Bailey, Karageorghis 1976, *passim*; Aström 1998, *passim*; Iacovou 2013c, 286-287; Sherratt 1998, 300-304; Webb 1999, 287. Iacovou identifies the location of *Loures* as possible area for the harbour of Ancient Paphos. She also quotes a passage of Archimandrites Kyprianos, who stated that near the sanctuary in Kouklia there was a lake, big enough to serve as a port. It is not clear, however, from which source he took this information. (Kyprianos 1788, 18).

Hera, found in Ayia Moni, may testify to such a change. This is a remote part of the island and it is plausible that Hera's sanctuary had been located there as a station-point on the new 'copper route' from the Troodos mountains to the new harbour of Nea-Paphos.⁷⁶⁹

As far as the second point is concerned, the inscriptions commissioned by the ἀρχός – as said above – are a striking example of the reform of the script during the reign of Nicocles since they were written in the neo-syllabic system of Paphos. The epigraphic layout of official monumental texts and the choice of one language rather than another often reflect political necessities.⁷⁷⁰ Accordingly, the choice of employing an archaising syllabic writing system, which was closer to the most archaic Cypriot syllabary in shape and appearance, as royal official script had specific political aims. It stressed the continuity between the ancient city and the new capital and, at the same time, the Cypriot origins of Nicocles' dynasty probably in order to legitimise his power.⁷⁷¹ But the Paphian syllabary was also employed in these years to highlight and preserve the role of the sovereign as the priest of the *wanassa* in Paphos.⁷⁷² In fact, most of the inscriptions written in this syllabic system are dedications made by the king in temples, where he was probably recognised for his sacred role – not only because of his political status – as the main religious authority in the city-state.

Along with urban renovation and the reform of the syllabic script, Nicocles' programme also involved the reform of cults. Although the sanctuary of Palaipaphos, dedicated to Aphrodite, remained the principal religious centre of the city-state, Nicocles introduced the new dynastic cult of Apollo Hylates.

⁷⁶⁹ Iacovou 2013c, 287; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Ayia Moni n°1; 2 = *ICS* 90; 91; Masson 1998, 15-19; Consani 1990, 64-66; Mitford 1960, 1-10; Nicolaou 1976b, 18. The two dedications, currently embedded in the façade of a church, concern the settlement of some votive columns in the temple. They probably come from the *temenos* of a sanctuary located under the current monastery, where the church is settled; see the comment of Masson (1983, 146-147). On the practice of donating columns as *ex-voto* in temples see Masson 1980b, 65-80; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Paphos n°166 = Masson, Mitford 1986, n°237.

⁷⁷⁰ Consani 1988, 35-60; see chapter 5.

⁷⁷¹ Some conservative linguistic choices also reflect a political intent of preserving the original language. This mirrored the origins of Nicocles' dynasty, Cypriot Greek. They were used as a stronghold for the autonomy of this city-state. For instance, the syllabic inscriptions of Nea-Paphos tend to preserve the use of digamma in a period when it had started to disappear. (Consani 1990, 63-79).

⁷⁷² Cayla 2018, 65-68; Maier 1989, 376-391; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Paphos n°1, 2, = *ICS* 1, 2. For the first time, the Paphian king appears as priest of the *wanassa* in an inscription from the Necropolis of Agraro, in Kouklia, dated to the beginning of the fourth century BC, where Timocharis was king and priest at the same time (Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Paphos n°8 = *ICS* 16; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Paphos n°9 = *ICS* 17).

He also promoted himself as a descendant of the mythical king Kinyras. This is evident in an alphabetic inscription from Ledra, an epigram dated to the end of the fourth century BC where he is honoured as progeny of Kinyras.⁷⁷³ This too had political implications. The creation of a new political and administrative hub in Kato-Paphos could have involved the separation of the political and religious powers weakening the standing of the sovereign in a period of general instability. In such circumstances, moving the capital would have been a risky choice and perhaps Nicocles tried to compensate by proclaiming himself Kinyras' descendant. Exactly as with the reform of the script, he wanted to stress the autochthony of his kingship in order to preserve a strict connection with the sanctuary of Aphrodite and the ancient capital, pointing out the local origins of his dynasty. These implications had to be made clear to the local inhabitants of Paphos but in particular to the recently Hellenised world. Thus, Nicocles adopted a well-known Greek mythical figure in order to make the message easily intelligible to the wider international Greek audience – not only to the Cypriots. Kinyras, traditionally identified as the king of Cyprus, was the perfect character to legitimise Nicocles' authority in their eyes.

The reforms of Nicocles are essential to an understanding of the role of the ἀρχός. Two of the three inscriptions that mentions this official are dedications engraved on the rock wall of a hypogeum sanctuary dedicated to Apollo Hylates, found in Alona Episkopou, Hellenika, close to the centre of Nea-Paphos.⁷⁷⁴ One of these texts is inscribed on the tympanum of the temple's access door, in front of several steps cut into a *dromos*. The second inscription is on the right wall of the temple's *vestibulum*, close to another internal entrance which leads to a second chamber. Unfortunately, their state of preservation is very poor. The first text consists of four lines, the second of two. Both were dedicated by an *a-ra-ko-se*, ἀρχός. In the first line, both these inscriptions present exactly the same text with the name of the official and the title. Deecke,

⁷⁷³ This text was inscribed on a base of a statue which was dedicated in the sanctuary of the Paphian goddess in Ledra by Archaio. The text is rather corrupt and it has been reconstructed on the base of common formulas and metrical analysis (elegiac couplets); see Cayla 2018, 124; Hansen 1989, n°871; Voskos 2000, 178 E13; Steele 2018, 227.

⁷⁷⁴ Vernet 2016, 301-313; on the cult of Apollo Hylates in Cyprus, see Vernet 2015; the Cypriots probably associated Apollo to the local god Hylates called *o-te-o*, 'the god' (e.g. Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Kourion n°25 = ICS 188 = Mitford 1971, n° 15).

the first editor, read the name at the beginning as *ta-ra-pa-se* and identified it as a Phoenician anthroponym, a local variant for the Punic Adherbal attested in Greek in the form Ἀτάρβας.⁷⁷⁵ The following sequence of signs, *a-ra-ko-se*, is clearly intelligible. He concluded that the dedicant was the same person in both the texts, since the name and the title were identical.

The presence of this ἀρχός allowed scholars, particularly Deecke, to relate these dedications to a few alphabetic inscriptions from Paphos which attest the presence of chiefs of associations connected to the cult of Kinyras.⁷⁷⁶ These scholars were probably influenced by the link between Kinyras and Apollo mentioned in Greek literature.⁷⁷⁷ But the syllabic signs which follow the term *a-ra-ko-se* – although their interpretation is still controversial – cannot be related to the word Kinyras in any way. Cayla has recently re-affirmed that a link existed between the term *a-ra-ko-se* and a cult dedicated to the mythical king of Cyprus.⁷⁷⁸ He bases his theory on the presence of ἀρχοί in some Hellenistic and Roman inscriptions from Paphos. One in particular, a dedication of a statue of a girl, Aristion, to the Paphian Aphrodite made by her parents – Democrates, son of Ptolemy, ‘chief of the Kinyrads’, and his wife Eunike –

⁷⁷⁵ *IosPE* II 438. The name Ἀτάρβας – partially reconstructed in lacuna – is attested only in this inscription from the Black Sea dated to 155 AD.

⁷⁷⁶ Deecke 1883/84, 1-80; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Nea-Paphos n°2; 3 = *ICS* n° 2-3; Cayla 2018, 61-64 with references.

⁷⁷⁷ Pind. *Pyth*, 2.15-17a. In these verses, Kinyras is described as ἱερέα κτίλον of Aphrodite and beloved, by Apollo; Gentili 1995, 43-54; Morpurgo-Davies 1960, 30-40; Carey 1981, 29-30. On the figure of Kinyras of Cyprus, see Franklin (2016, 165-167) who connects the etymology of Kinyras to the term *kinyra*, the divine lyre. He supposes that the Cypriot sovereigns usually took part in rituals where they played the *kinnor* or *kinyra*, as it was distinctive of the sovereigns of the Levantine Coast. See *RS* 24.250; *RS* 24.256; *RS* 19.16. (See also Xella 1976, 11-126). Franklin associates Kinyras with Apollo for his ability in playing this musical instrument. Against this hypothesis see Brown 1965, 197-219; Baurain 1980, 5-12; Baurain 1981, 23-37; Ribichini 1982, 479-500). Franklin based his interpretation also on the analysis of the Cypriot coroplastic. This does show men and women who dance, sing and play musical instruments (Mikrakis 2016, 57-71) This practice, however, was widespread in the whole Mediterranean and not just peculiar to Cyprus; therefore, this is not a conclusive proof. See Bellia, Marconi 2016 and Mikrakis 2016, 57-71.

⁷⁷⁸ See Cayla (2018, 62-64) who agrees with the interpretation of Młynarczyk (1990, 76-85) who supposed that the temple was probably created when Nicocles moved the capital. For him, both Kinyras and Apollo – the protagonists of Nicocles’ reform of the cults – must be associated with the foundation of the new city. See Strab. 14.6.3-5; Paus. 8.5.2, who identified Agapenor as the founder of Ancient Paphos; against them see Apoll. *Bibl.* 3.14.3, who claims that Kinyras founded Paphos. But I think that this version was probably Hellenistic and could have been influenced by the programme of reforms of Nicocles. Cayla supposes that this ἀρχός led the procession mentioned by Strabo (14.6.3) from Paphos to Palaipaphos. He thought that the hypogeum temple was a stationary point of this *pompé* (Cayla 2018, 63). However, there is no evidence of this.

mentions the title of ἀρχὸς τῶν Κινυραδῶν, chief of the Kinyrads.⁷⁷⁹ But the establishment of this title and the institution of the alleged association might be a recent phenomenon. Conceivably, this local worship developed during the Hellenistic period, under the kingship of Ptolemy V Epiphanes – when this inscription was written, according to palaeographic analysis. During his reign, the Paphian cults were deeply reformed with, for example, the introduction of the title of ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς νῆσου, the high priest of the island, paired with the title of στρατηγός and later with that of γυμνασίαρχος.⁷⁸⁰ It is possible that the new cultic association was also part of this programme of reforms. Consequently, its members may have chosen to connect the figure of the ἀρχός to that of Kinyras because both were historically related to Paphos, fusing them in a unique title that had not existed until then.⁷⁸¹

What role did the earlier ἀρχός play if he was not related to the cult of Kinyras? In the first edition of the *ICS*, Masson identified the signs of the first line as *ta-ra-pa-se o-a-ra-ko-se o-[me]-ka-?-?-?-?-se*.⁷⁸² According to him, the two inscriptions should be read as:

1. *ta-ra-pa-se o-a-ra-ko-se // [o]-me-ka-?-?-?-?-se*

⁷⁷⁹ Cayla 2018, n°81 = *SEG* XX 1970, n° 218 = Nicolaou 1971b, n° 19-20. See bibliography in Cayla 2018, 204. The other inscription concerning a Kinyrarchos is dated to 166 AD, but it is unfortunately lost (Cayla 2018, n°166 = *SEG* XL 1990, n° 1365). This was a dedication made by Dionysodoros, probably the priest of Aphrodite, to his father, the Kinyrarchos. If the date were correct, it might demonstrate that a local religious tradition related to Kinyras was long-standing in Paphos. But the date is based on the *editio princeps* (Gardner *et al.* 1888), and is rather debatable. Moreover, the term *kinyrarchos* would be a *hapax*. The last document considered by Cayla is an oath to the Emperor Tiberius, dated to fourteen AD. (Cayla 2018, n° 108, with the oldest bibliography = *SEG* LI 2001, n°1896; Cayla 2001, 69-81; Fujii 2013, 189-190). He supposed that the god Apollo – to whom the oath was sworn – held the title of Κε[ν]υρα[ρ]χ[ος] *sic*. However, the text of this inscription is difficult to read (Cayla 2018, 229-236).

⁷⁸⁰ Scholars usually state that the Cypriot city-states lost their independence after the arrival of Alexander (for instance see Iacovou 2013c, 276; Iacovou 2006b, 330). This is accurate to a limited degree. Although the Cypriot polities had to homologate themselves to the Hellenistic administrative systems, they kept minting their own coins until the reign of Ptolemy V, thanks to a certain level of autonomy – I will further develop this point in the following pages concerning the Hellenistic administrative system of Lapethos. Ptolemy V probably wanted to make sure not to lose Cyprus, since it was one of his few Mediterranean possessions. In order to make this possible, he had further restricted the autonomy of the Cypriot cities, arguably reforming the administrative system and surely the cults.

⁷⁸¹ The link with the Egyptian Pharaoh is emphasised by the second name of the grandfather, Ptolemy (Cayla 2018, 205).

⁷⁸² Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Nea-Paphos n°2; 3 = *ICS* 2; 3.

2. [e-pi-pa]-si-ne to-se-pe-o-se to-|| [te-e-ke-re-se]

3. ka-se ka-te-se-ke-u-wa-se a-|| [po-lo-ni]

4. u-la-ta-i i-tu-ka-i

‘Tarapas, the *archos* (?), who cut the entrance of the cave and prepared it for Apollo Hylates’, and

1. ta-ra-pa-se o-a-ra-ko-se o-me-ka-ke-u-?-se e-pi-pa-si-ne

2. to-se-pe-o-se to-te-e-ke-re-se a-po-lo-ni u-la-ta-i

‘Tarapas, the *archos* (?), cut the entrance to the cave for Apollo Hylates’.

The state of preservation of the first text is very poor and most of its syllabic signs are conjectured on the basis of the second inscription. These dedications concern the cutting of the entrances to the hypogeum, internal and external, called *e-pi-pa-si-ne to-se-pe-o-se*, ἐπίβασιν τῷ σπηῖος, ‘the entrance of the cave’. Τῷ σπηῖος is the genitive of an archaic term – only attested in the Homeric poems – probably a conservative form of the Cypriot dialect.⁷⁸³ In the first inscription, this entrance was cut, *to-[te-e-ke-re-se]*, but also prepared, *ka-te-se-ke-u-wa-se*.⁷⁸⁴ It is remarkable that this verb is absent in the second text. Therefore, it is possible that this second entrance was only cut and not prepared since it was internal and not directly visible to the public. We may assume that the ἀρχός also played an intramural role in the sanctuary, since he made a dedication even in the inner chamber.

Initially, Masson read the signs which follow *a-ra-ko-se* as *o-me-ka-ke-u-?-se*. According to him, μεγα- would be the beginning of an adjective which highlights the prestigious and venerable role played by this official.⁷⁸⁵ But he set this aside interpretation once the third inscription concerning the ἀρχός was found in the village of Tala, in the Paphos district. This dedication was

⁷⁸³ On the formation of *se-pe-o-se* as genitive see Egetmeyer 2010 I, 79-80 §59; Meier-Brügger 1993, 179; *Il.* 4.279; *Od.* 5.57.

⁷⁸⁴ For the pronoun *to-te*, τό(ν)δε see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 433 §550 with examples. This form of the verb κείρω, ‘to cut’, will be discussed in the following pages. For the verb *ka-te-se-ke-u-wa-se*, aorist of κατασκευάζω, see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 473 §589; 491-92 §605.

⁷⁸⁵ Masson 1983, 98.

accidentally discovered in the church of Ayios Georgios, where it was reused as support for the altar.⁷⁸⁶ It too was written in the new Paphian syllabic system and consequently, dated to the end of the fourth century BC. An interlocking tenon is located on the stone under the syllabic scripts, which shows that this marble stump was previously part of an architectural structure. Therefore, it was removed from its original place and re-used to create the monumental inscription. Thus, it was reused twice over the years – making the identification of its place of origin even more problematic. This inscription consists of five lines of which the second and the fourth are disputed.⁷⁸⁷ Masson read the text as:

1. *sa-ta-ra-pa-se o-a-ra*
2. *ko-se o-pi-?-ke-u-sa-se*
3. *e-pi-pa-si-ne ka-te-ke*
4. *ta-i-ta-wo-lo-we-a-i i-*
5. *tu-ka-i*

He noticed that lines 1 and 2 present the same text of the inscriptions found in Alonia Episkopou and he straightforwardly associated this dedication with those of the hypogeum of Apollo. Firstly, Masson and other editors noted that the name of the *archos* is not *ta-ra-pa-se* – as Deecke supposed – but *sa-ta-ra-pa-se*. The right side of the hypogeum inscriptions is considerably damaged and it was not possible to see that a sign was missing at the beginning. *Sa-ta-ra-pa-se* is a hapax in Cypriot anthroponomastics, which recalls the figure of the Achaemenid *σάτραπος*. Similar names were employed in other locations where Greek was spoken. For instance, an inscription from Thasos presents the name *Σατραπ[ί]δου*, another text from Hermonassa – in Taman, Black Sea – shows

⁷⁸⁶ Masson 1988, 63-68. Michaelidis found the inscription in 1988 in the abandoned church of Ayios Geroghios in Stephani, location close to the village of Tala (Paphos district). It is made of Pentelic marble, and it presumably was very expensive since it was imported from Greece. Thus, the stone was probably part of a distinctive monumental building (Callot 1988, 68).

⁷⁸⁷ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Tala n° 1; Masson (1988, 63-68) provides a complete description of the epigraphic and palaeographical analysis. Bazemore announced the existence of a fourth inscription, in this case a digraphic text from Tala, concerning Satrapas (Bazemore 1995, 330-331, cf. Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Tala n° 2), but this was never published.

Σατραβάτης.⁷⁸⁸ Satrapas may have been a significant personality during Nicocles' government, whose name might reflect Persian origins and upper-class status.⁷⁸⁹

The second line is also useful to clarify some syllabic signs of the hypogeum's inscriptions and it might offer suggestions on the role played by Satrapas in these sanctuaries. Masson reads it as *-o-se o-pi-?-ke-u-sa-se*. *-o-se* is clearly the inflected ending of the noun *a-ra-ko-se* whereas it is acknowledged that the second word, *o-pi-?-ke-u-sa-se*, is an aorist participle ending in *-ευσας*.⁷⁹⁰ Scholars agree on this interpretation although the construction with a past participle used as apposition of the subject is not attested elsewhere in Cyprus. It is common, however, in several inscriptions elsewhere in Greece. Masson provided a series of instances of this sentence structure analysing other contemporary Greek epigraphic texts; they all show a title held by a civic-administrative or religious official, such as *ἱερατεύσας*, frequently attested in some texts from Rhodes, or *ἄρξας* from Keos.⁷⁹¹

In the syllabic texts, the use of a Greek construction testifies to a process of Hellenization of the language – that occurred first among the elites in Cyprus.⁷⁹² Satrapas commissioned the texts following the linguistic patterns of the contemporary dedications written in Greek κοινή. The employment of the verb *e-ke-re-se*, ἔκερσε, 'he cut' is another instance of this process. According to Egetmeyer, its morphology is recent, as it was created in analogy with verbs ending in /rs/; the standard Greek form, in fact, should be ἔκειρε (the 'regular' outcome of first Compensatory Lengthening) and not ἔκερσε.⁷⁹³

This, however, occurs simultaneously with Satrapas' intention to show the local origins of the administration to which he belonged in order to legitimise his work and the government for which he served. According to Nicocles' policy, he employed the 'new' archaising syllabic system in all three

⁷⁸⁸ Σατράπης is the Ionic-Attic form (*ID* 1544); the Aeolic version is σαδράπας, attested in Nesos (*JG* XII, 2 645, 18). See Masson 1988, 64; Egetmeyer 2005b, s. σατράπας; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 351 §420; Mitford 1961, 13-34.

⁷⁸⁹ This point has been stressed by Cayla 2018, but also by Papantoniou (2013, 189) who quotes the work of Terrenato (2005, 59-72).

⁷⁹⁰ Masson 1988, 64.

⁷⁹¹ Masson 1988, 65. E.g. in Karpathos (*JG* XII, 1 998) Θέρσ[ιπ]πος Ἀριστ[α]γόρα ἱερατ[ε]ύσας Ἀ[θ]ἄνα [Λι]νδῖαι and in Keos (*JG* XII, 5 552): [Θεοκύ]δες : Ἀρισταίχμου[Αφροδί]τηι ἀνέθηκεν ἄρξας.

⁷⁹² Cayla 2018, 65-68; see chapter 1.

⁷⁹³ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 483-484 §600.

inscriptions along with some archaic terms which mirror the local Cypriot-Greek origins of the government. Some instances might be the use of the word σπηῖος, ‘cave’, in all likelihood, as said above, a Cypriot form and the conservative use of digamma.⁷⁹⁴

In light of this dichotomy, we must analyse the following lines, particularly the aorist participle, always taking into account the political message conveyed by the text. The first signs are easily understandable as *o-pi*. In order to clarify their meaning, Egetmeyer pointed out that the Cypriot dialect has some features in common with the Mycenaean Greek. One of these is the frequent exchange between the prepositions *epi-* and *opi-*, a legacy of an ancient Ablaut.⁷⁹⁵

The sign which follows is the most difficult to decipher. Mitford read it as *wo* and the whole word as *o-pi-wo-ke-u-sa-se*, a local form of the participle ὀμφφοκεύσας.⁷⁹⁶ According to him, Satrapas was the ἀρχός who served as ‘carrier of the divine voice’ since ὀμφι- might be the Cypriot version of ὀμφή, ‘voice’, and *ὀχεύω is a local variant of the verb ὀχέω ‘to carry’. However, as Egetmeyer pointed out, the attic term ὀμφή seems to correspond to the Cypriot ὀμφο- and not to ὀμφι-. An inscription from Abydos testifies this; it bears the name of a Cypriot mercenary, *o-po-ke-le-we-se*, Ὀμφοκλέφης, ‘the one who is famous for his voice’.⁷⁹⁷ Therefore, Mitford’s interpretation is implausible, although it would have been appropriate to the chthonic character of the hypogeum sanctuary.

In his edition, Masson rejected both of Mitford’s interpretations.⁷⁹⁸ He concluded that the third line of the text does not present particular difficulties. Satrapas dedicated an access, *e-pi-pa-si-ne ka-te-te-[ke]*, ἐπίβασιν κατέθηκε, probably the entrance of a temple, as reflected in the other texts. The remainder

⁷⁹⁴ On Homeric words in the Cypriot dialect see Bowra 1934, 54-74.

⁷⁹⁵ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 448 §569; Egetmeyer 2008, 259. He specified that even in the Arcadian dialect we may find traces of this ancient ablaut (cf. note 3) and Dubois 1986, 138. Morpurgo-Davies 1983, 287-310.

⁷⁹⁶ Mitford 1960, 7; Masson 1988, 66-67.

⁷⁹⁷ ICS 416; Egetmeyer 2008, 252; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Egypt n°51, where he affirmed, however, that the interpretation of this anthroponym should be revised.

⁷⁹⁸ As per Viredaz’s *personal comment* (in Paris 1988, *EPHE*); Paleographically, Masson rejected also the first interpretation of Mitford, who originally read the sign as *ti*, according to its similarity with Aegean script (Mitford 1960, 22-23; Masson 1988, 64-65).

of the inscription is easily legible as *ta-i-ta-wo-lo-we-a-i i-tu-ka-i* – possibly the name of a goddess – which I will discuss later.

But what does the participle mean and what was the role played by this ἀρχός in the sanctuaries?⁷⁹⁹ Egetmeyer was the first scholar who tried to better define the duties of Satrapas. He read the peculiar sign as ‘*lu*’, as Viredaz proposed, pointing out that this Paphian sign is attested for the first time in these inscriptions.⁸⁰⁰ Therefore, he read the whole word as *o-pi-lu-ke-u-sa-se* and suggested that this might be the aorist participle of **opilukeuo*, a verb created by a noun, **opilukos* – as in the case of βασιλεύω which derives from βασιλεύς or ἀρχεύω from ἀρχός.⁸⁰¹ The Cypriot **opilukos* might be a local variant of the more common Ἐπίλυκος, which is attested in several Greek texts, most often as an anthroponym.⁸⁰² He translated the participle as ‘who is the chief of wolves’ assuming that this ἀρχός was the chief of a cultic association, whose members were called ἐπίλυκοι.⁸⁰³ He claimed that they were ‘companions of the wolves’; the construction of this word would be very similar to that of the *e.pi.qo.i* mentioned in the Mycenaean texts from Thebes, who correspond to the ἔφιπποι.⁸⁰⁴ According to him, they might be translated as the ‘companions of the horses’ instead of ‘horse riders’ – as scholars have traditionally done – since ἱππεύς, and not ἔφιππος, is commonly used for ‘knight’.⁸⁰⁵

In order to justify the presence of the term ἐπίλυκοι, he compares these syllabic inscriptions with another dedication from Kourion – dated to the reign of Kleopatra and Kaisarion, probably to 37/36 BC – which presents a similar

⁷⁹⁹ Meier-Brügger proposed *o-pi-su-ke-u-sa-se* (1993, 179). According to him, this term would derive from the Mycenaean *o.pi.su.ko*, an official ‘who was in charge of checking the trade of the figues’, attested in a tablet (PY Jn 829.2). But this interpretation has been rejected since the sign *su* is already attested in both the Paphian and the standard syllabary, which appears always as different from that in the Tala inscription.

⁸⁰⁰ According to Egetmeyer, this symbol does not correspond to any other Aegean syllabic signs. The sign ‘*lu*’ is rarely attested in the common syllabic system – only in Vouni, Idalion and Amathus. See Egetmeyer 2008, 253 with some examples such as: *ke-ro-ku-lu-su-to-ne* ‘sealed with wax’ from Vouni (Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Vouni 5 = *ICS* 208 dated to the fourth cent. BC, also proposed by Neumann 1970, 166-169); in the Bronze tablet from Idalion, the subjunctive *lu-se*, ‘may he violate’ (Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Idalion n°1, 1.29 = *ICS* 217).

⁸⁰¹ On the linguistic analysis of term see Egetmeyer 2008, 253-254.

⁸⁰² Egetmeyer 2008, 257-258. See *IG* II 2174; *IG* XII 1.

⁸⁰³ Egetmeyer 2008, 264. He also supposed that this cult had some Indoeuropean roots, where the wolf is often related to young warriors (Egetmeyer 2007, 205-219).

⁸⁰⁴ Egetmeyer 2008, 263; *TH* Fq 214.10

⁸⁰⁵ However, ἱππεύς is a specific Attic form not attested in Mycenaean; the latter could have employed ἔφιπποι.

title.⁸⁰⁶ The document presents itself as a decree in honour of Andronikos, son of Posidonios, who according to Egetmeyer held the office of [παρεπι]λυκάρχης, term he translates as ‘chief of the παρεπίλυκοι’. Egetmeyer recognises παρεπίλυκοι also in lines 24 and 34 of the same inscription, in one case along with the επίλυκοι.

23-24. ...τοῖς ἐπίλυκοις καὶ παρεπιλύκοις

34. ἔδοξε τοῖς ἐπὶ Λυκίης καὶ παρεπιλύκοις

Egetmeyer claimed that since the ἐπίλυκοι were members of a cult association – linked to wolves as the name suggests – the παρεπίλυκοι should have been their subordinates.⁸⁰⁷ He also compared Andronikos’ office of [Παρεπι]λυκάρχης with that played by the *archos* of the syllabic inscriptions. Both these titles show that Satrapas and Andronikos were at the head of hierarchical structures. Moreover, Andronikos was devoted to the cult of Apollo Hylates – as the decree suggests in line 15 – the same deity to which the hypogeum sanctuary was dedicated, perhaps not just a coincidence.

Along with this inscription, he provided another example to prove that they were members of a religious group. He brought into play a marble stele from Knossos dated to the second/first century BC.⁸⁰⁸ The text opens with Οἱ ἐπίλυκοι in the first line, followed by a list of seven anthroponyms (ll.1-6). These ἐπίλυκοι have been commonly identified as members of a worship association, but scholars disagree on the precise role they played.⁸⁰⁹ The

⁸⁰⁶ The date is still debated. Michaelidou-Nicolaou (2007, 368-374, n°3) proposed to date it to 40/39 BC. The text clearly testifies the presence of two βασιλεῖς since Andronikos held the title of ‘ἱερεὺς τῶν Βασιλέων’, ‘priest of the kings’. In fact, in that period Kleopatra VII was ruling with Ptolemy XIII. During those years, however, the island was not part of the Ptolemaic kingdom. In light of this, Thonemann proposed to date the decree to 37/6 BC. According to him, the βασιλεῖς were Kleopatra VII and her son Kaisarion (Thonemann 2008, 94-95).

⁸⁰⁷ As in the case of the ἐπίδικος and the παρεπίδικος.

⁸⁰⁸ Egetmeyer 2008, 256-27; Masson 1985, 189-200; *SEG* XXXV, 989.

⁸⁰⁹ Platon, the scholar who discovered the inscription and published the *editio princeps*, translated them simply as ‘chiefs of Λύκοι’ (1948, 98 n°32; Masson 1985, 190). Nicolaou initially proposed a geographical designation: they could have been inhabitants of a location which held a specific toponym (personal comment in the 8th International Congress of Epigraphy, Masson 1985, 192). Van Effenterre linked them to the substantive *λύκη and identified them as ‘illuminated’ (personal comment, see Masson 1985, 200). Egetmeyer excluded a derivation from the verb λέυσσω, shine, and from its compounds for ablaut reasons. In that case, the syllabic form should have been *o-pi-lo-u-ke-u-sa-se. (Egetmeyer 2007, 261). Finally, Masson affirmed that the meaning of the word is controversial and he preferred not to provide any explanation (1985, 190-191).

remaining part of the inscription deals with the exclusion of outsiders from the sanctuary of Artemis Skopelitis, particularly of Assyrians.

In this instance, as in the inscription from Kourion, we learn that the ἐπίλυκοι existed but we are not able to define precisely what role they played. Were these ἐπίλυκοι specifically members of cultic associations or were they linked to these sanctuaries for other reasons, perhaps civic or political? Could the ἀρχός of the syllabic texts and the ἐπίλυκοι of the alphabetic inscriptions hold similar offices although they are mentioned in documents dated to different historical periods? In order to find an answer, we need to look more closely at the Kourion decree.

New insights into this text come from Thonemann's edition.⁸¹⁰ Thonemann has argued that Andronikos bears the title of [Ἐπι]λυκάρχης and not of [Παρεπι]λυκάρχης since there is not enough space on the right and left side of the stone for six letters. Furthermore, he has pointed out that Andronikos' titles were probably all described as 'civic offices' in line five, π[ο]λειτι[κα]ῖς ἀρχαῖς.⁸¹¹ As a result, the title of Ἐπιλυκάρχης was one of the several civic roles played by Andronikos in Kourion. In line 34, Thonemann proposed to restore ἐπιλύκουσ or ἐπιλύκοις instead of ἐπι Λυκί[ης] as suggested by the first editor.⁸¹² The ionic version Λυκί[ης] would be difficult to explain in a text from Roman Cyprus which we would expect to have been written in κοινή.⁸¹³ According to,

⁸¹⁰ Thonemann 2008, 87-95

⁸¹¹ Thonemann 2008, 89. He partially restores this sequence in lacuna by comparing this text with an inscription from Xanthos which presents several civic offices as 'πλείονας πολιτικὰς ἀρχάς. See TAM II 294; TAM II 905 III E:6-7 from Rhodianopolis.

⁸¹² Michaelidou-Nicolaou 2007, 370-371. Nicolaou published the *editio princeps* of this inscription. She suggested that Andronikos provisioned soldiers who served in Lycia (line 23) called ἐπίλυκοι. She also claimed that the παρεπίλυκοι were a sort of συμπολιτευόμενοι, servicemen often attested in the Greek inscriptions as attached to the κοινά of soldiers. (Michaelidou-Nicolaou 2007, 327-373; Cayla 2018, n°54, Mitford 1961, 31 n°84. See *Test. Sal.* n°74; Gauthier 1985, 198-199). But if the ἐπίλυκοι of the Kourion decree were soldiers serving in Lycia, their name should have been 'epilukioi', according to the name of the region. (Michaelidou-Nicolaou 2007, 372; she notices this too). Secondly, in the dedications of the κοινά, a sequence of words is usually employed to present the soldiers who served abroad – usually with the verb τάσσω – never a singular noun, as it would be for the *epilukioi*: for instance, 'τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἐν τῇ νῆσῳ τασσομένων Λυκίων', often attested in Paphos, but also 'τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἐν τῇ νῆσῳ τασσομένων Ἰώνων' or 'τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἐν τῇ νῆσῳ τασσομένων Κιλίκων' (see Cayla 2018, n°46, 47, 48, 54; 51).

⁸¹³ Thonemann 2008, 91-92. This form is however attested in a bilingual epitaph (Phoenician-alphabetic Greek) from Kition dated to the very beginning of the third century BC but employed only for metric reasons (Yon 2004, 274).

Thonemann, those responsible for honouring Andronikos were the ἐπίλυκοι and the παρεπίλυκοι – over whom Andronikos had served as Ἐπιλυκάρχης.⁸¹⁴

Going further, Thonemann noticed that, in lines 23-25, Andronikos paid for the expenses of the ἐπίλυκοι and of the παρεπίλυκοι as well as for the expenditure of the πρυτανεῖον. In line 43, the πρυτανεῖον honoured Andronikos in turn, ἀπὸ [τοῦ πρυτ]ανείου – as the ἐπίλυκοι and the παρεπίλυκοι did in line 34. In light of this evidence, Thonemann claimed that the ἐπίλυκοι were civic magistrates, part of the offices called π[ο]λειτικαῖς ἀρχαῖς as said above, perhaps associated with the πρυτανεῖον.⁸¹⁵ This would explain why they appear along with the παρεπίλυκοι;⁸¹⁶ as Thonemann pointed out, magistrates' assistants have titles starting with παρα-. He provided some examples citing the Athenian παράσιτοι, who held dining rights in the πρυτανεῖον and the παραπρυτάνεις at Teos, who served in the Hellenistic period.⁸¹⁷ Thus, it is conceivable that the παρεπίλυκοι were the 'assistants' of the ἐπίλυκοι.

According to this interpretation, the ἐπίλυκοι were members of a political institution in Kourion, a sort of civic magistrates similar to the πρυτάνεις. In order to support this theory, Thonemann pointed out that a civic building of archaic Athens was called *epilykeion*, the headquarters of the archon polemarch – as Aristotle's *Athenaion Politeia* testifies.⁸¹⁸ Following this theory, Thonemann supposed that in Kourion, the ἐπίλυκοι played political and civic roles similar to those of the members of the *epilykeion* in Athens, which was listed along with the πρυτανεῖον among the principal Athenian civic buildings. He supposed that in Kourion, their chief magistrate, the Ἐπιλυκάρχης, held similar offices to those of the Athenian ἄρχων πολέμαρχος, who concerned

⁸¹⁴ Thonemann 2008, 9.

⁸¹⁵ On the function of the πρυτανεῖον see Miller 1978, *passim*; specifically during the Hellenistic period see Gschnitzer s. Prytanis (1973, 801-808) as suggested by Thonemann; Steskal 2010, 1-8.

⁸¹⁶ Thonemann 2008, 92.

⁸¹⁷ Athen. 6.234d-235e, 237f; Plut., *Sol.* 24.5; *SEG* XXXIV n°157; Ziehen 1949, s. παράσιτοι; *CIG* n°3168.

⁸¹⁸ Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 3.5 ὁ δὲ ἄρχων τὸ πρυτανεῖον, ὁ δὲ πολέμαρχος τὸ Ἐπὶλυκείον (ὃ πρότερον μὲν ἐκαλεῖτο πολεμαρχεῖον, ἐπεὶ δὲ Ἐπίλυκος ἀνφοκοδόμησε καὶ κατεσκευάσεν αὐτὸ πολεμαρχήσας, Ἐπὶλυκείον ἐκλήθη) 'while the Archon had the President's Hall, and the War-lord the Epilyceum (which formerly used to be called the War-lord's House, but because Epilycus on becoming polemarch rebuilt and furnished it, it received the name of Epilyceum', transl. by Rackmann 1952.

himself with a few legal tasks and sacral assignments during the fourth century BC.⁸¹⁹

We may also add that, although Aristotle states that the name of the building *epilykeion* comes from the personal name of an official employed there, Ἐπίλυκος, scholars usually reject this explanation considering it as a secondary interpretation.⁸²⁰ Rhodes claimed that the name of the *epilykeion* is probably connected with the Lyceum, the gymnasium of Athens where the ephebes received their military training, located east of the city, close to the external walls.⁸²¹ Thus, the *epilykeion* could have been a building located in close proximity of the Lyceum where the polemarch performed his military duties.

The potential connection between the Athenian *epilykeion* and the Lyceum allows a further speculation. The Athenian Lyceum was strictly connected to the cult of Apollo Lykeios, in all likelihood worshipped in the building.⁸²² If the *epilykeion* was set close to it, we can suppose that its members were related in some way to the civic and religious activities that took place inside of that gymnasium and perhaps also to the cult of Apollo Lykeios. This might further strengthen the connection between the office of the ἐπίλυκοι and the cult of Apollo Hylates in Kourion, to whom Andronikos the ἐπιλυκάρχης was devoted. The worship of Apollo Lykeios potentially overlapped with that of Apollo Hylates – at least in this Cypriot city-state – since both these cults were related to the growth of youths; Apollo ensured that they reached adulthood in the best possible way.⁸²³ The *kourotrophos* character of the Kourion Hylates is testified by the so-called *temple-boys*, statues and coroplastic *ex-voto* shaped like children or youths found in the sanctuary of Apollo, attested

⁸¹⁹ The polemarch had no longer military authority since 487/6 BC, when the *archontes* were appointed by sortation. See MacDowell 2012, 1168; 1978, 221-224.

⁸²⁰ Also Egetmeyer highlighted this point (2008, 258); Chambers 1990, 152-153.

⁸²¹ Rhodes 1981, 105; Zambrini, Gargiulo, Rhodes 2016, 170; see Hsch. E 4947 s. ἐπί Λύκειον; *Suda* s. ἄρχων; on the location of the Athenian Lyceum see Strab. 9.1.24; Cleid. *FGrH* 323 F 18; Paus. 1.19.3; Travlos 1971, 345-347; on the function of the Lyceum see Lynch 1972, *passim*. Rithie 1989, 250-260;

⁸²² Lucian *Anach.* 7. On the several functions of the *Lyceum* particularly during the Periclean age – ‘religious, military, athletic and political’ – see Jameson 2015, 41-61. *IG* I³ 105, 34; *IG* I² 114 might testify that an assembly gathered in the Lyceum, τὰδ[ε] ἐδόχσεν ἐλ Λυκεῖοι τοι δ[έ]μοι τοι Α]θε[να]ίων ‘it seemed good to the Athenian people in the Lyceum’, translation by Jameson (2015, 54).

⁸²³ Vernet 2015b, 49-50.

from the fifth century BC onwards.⁸²⁴ Other statues with exactly the same iconography were found in the Hellenistic temple of Apollo Lykeios in Mersinaki-Ayia Varvara, northwest of the island.⁸²⁵ This confirms that Hylates of Kourion displayed characteristics usually attributed to Apollo Lykeios in other Cypriot Hellenistic cities and generally in Greek religion. Thus, the devotion of Andronikos to Apollo Hylates was probably not accidental but due to the role he played as ἐπιλοκάρχης. He might have been the chief of the ἐπίλοκοι, who may have been magistrates who held a civic office associated with the gymnasia and the military training of the youths; perhaps they performed some religious duties related to the cult of Apollo, traditionally a *kourotrophos* divinity – Hylates in Kourion and Lykeios in Athens.⁸²⁶

The above analysis supports Egetmeyer's interpretation of the sign as *lu*. Consequently, I suggest that the *a-ra-ko-se o-pi-lu-ke-u-sa-se* mentioned in the syllabic inscriptions held a similar office to that of the ἐπιλοκάρχης in Kourion, who could have been a Hellenistic local variant of the archaic-classical Athenian polemarch; the association with the πρυτανεῖον might corroborate this theory.⁸²⁷ But the duties of the ἀρχός were at some point probably reconsidered and reduced shifting from prestigious military-political roles to civic-religious

⁸²⁴ Hermary 1989b, 69; Beer 1993-1994, *passim*; Caneva, Delli Pizzi 2014, 495-521; Vernet 2015b, 76. According to Vernet, this specific characteristic of the cult of the Hylates in Kourion might be a legacy of Egyptian and Phoenician cults. On the history of the site see Buitron-Olivier 1996 *passim*; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, n° 21-22 = *ICS* 184-185, Mitford 1971, n° 18-19; Bagnall, Drew-Bear 1973, 213-214.

⁸²⁵ Vernet 2015b, 48-51.

⁸²⁶ Perlman 1994, 123-125; *IC* I.viii 5. The connection between the *epilykeion* and the cult of Apollo Lykeios – and perhaps also with the 'lyceum' gymnasium – might be seen also in the inscription from Knossos analysed above. According to Perlman, this *lex sacra* is contemporary with a dedication to Apollo Lykeios from Knossos – dated to the third century BC – where the god is honoured along with his σύνναιοι. Perlman supposed that among them, was perhaps also Artemis Skopelitis, the goddess whose temple the ἐπίλοκοι could access. These two divinities probably shared the same sanctuary, located at Ano Fortesa, where the inscription with the list of the ἐπίλοκοι was found. Therefore, she associated the cult of Apollo Lykeios with the *lex sacra*. It might be added that, in this context, the ἐπίλοκοι could have been seven magistrates who enforced the law which prevented the Assyrians and foreigners from entering into the temple.

⁸²⁷ A recent analysis of the archaeological material of the temple of Apollo in Kourion allows us to question the royal status of this city-state during the fourth century BC; its independence is uncertain and no epigraphic documents give information on the political status of this centre during the classical period. (See Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Kourion n° 1-46). Among several hypotheses advanced by scholars, Vernet's is worth mentioning: the existing political regime of Kourion might have collapsed and another power might have annexed its territory. If so, the best candidate is Paphos and we might hazard that the Kourion ἐπίλοκοι were a legacy of the Paphian magistracy. (Vernet forthcoming).

offices, as in the case of the Athenian polemarch. The *a-ra-ko-se o-pi-lu-ke-u-sa-se* might have been a civic magistrate or civic official, member of the upper class, close to the sovereign, who perhaps was in charge of presiding over specific legal disputes as the Athenian polemarch did. The association with this Athenian magistrate supports the idea that Satrapas also held religious offices, as did the Athenian polemarch and the Ἐπιλυκάρχης in Kourion, who was the priest of the Ptolemaic kings. It is however not clear if he was also concerned with military roles. Satrapas' office probably had to deal with the sanctuaries whose entrances he dedicated to the divinities, where he could have played an internal role, perhaps as a priest. Just as the βασιλεύς became the priest of the *wanassa* in Paphos, a member of the administration could have had similar duties here. The hypogeum sanctuary was probably an oracular site as shown by Vernet and Balandier.⁸²⁸

This leads to the hypothesis that the sanctuary mentioned in the Tala inscription might be one of the underground *temenoi* that became particularly widespread in Cyprus in the late-classical/early Hellenistic period.⁸²⁹ The reading of the hapax *wo-lo-we-a-i* provided by Egetmeyer confirms this theory.⁸³⁰ According to him, this noun might be linked to: the Greek word ὄλυραι – a kind of spelt, generally a cereal; οὐλαί (in attic ὀλαί), which can be translated as wheat, grains or barley flour; finally, οὔλος (also ἴουλος), sheaf of wheat, from which the term Οὐλώ derives, epithet of Demeter, the goddess of the sheaves of wheat and of the wheat crops.⁸³¹ He concluded that the sanctuary mentioned in the inscription was dedicated to Demeter and Kore. Since their cult and mythology can be easily linked to the underworld, the presence of a

⁸²⁸ Vernet 2020, 152; Vernet 2016, 301-313. They confirmed that the hypogeum was an oracular sanctuary as had already been suggested by Młynarczyk (1990, 25-27). The architectural structure of the *temenos* recalls the traditional structure of the oracular temples inspired by chthonic forces, set in earlier tombs. Their survey revealed a small water channel which connected the external wall of the sanctuary, probably close to a spring, with a cavity dug in the middle of the inner chamber. Since the water was fundamental in the divination process, this might further prove that this was an oracular temple. On divination in ancient Cyprus see Kamenou 2016, 156-166; Robert 1978, 338-344; On the cult of Apollo and its oracular hypogeum sanctuaries see Ustinova 2009, 25-44

⁸²⁹ Młynarczyk 1990, 223-232.

⁸³⁰ Egetmeyer 1993c, 35-36

⁸³¹ See Egetmeyer 1993c, 35. The term should derive from **wólwos*, the equivalent of a possible Greek word **ólos*.

hypogeum sanctuary dedicated to these two goddesses is quite plausible.⁸³² A digraph inscription from Kourion testifies that their cult was already widespread on the island during the fourth century BC when Satrapas was serving in the Paphian administration.⁸³³

So far, we have seen that the office of *archos epilukeusas* fits very well in Nicocles' programme of reforms. There is, however, one piece of evidence that might suggest a slightly earlier origin of the office, or at least of the office of the *epilukoi*. Another inscription bearing a verb derived from **opilukeuo* might be decisive to define when this office was established. This text was inscribed on the base of a votive statue, found in Koukila, ancient Paphos, in the temple of Aphrodite, generally dated to the end of the fourth century BC.⁸³⁴ This inscription consists of three fragments and unfortunately, it is difficult to ascertain how many syllabic signs are missed in the lacunas. The first fragment bears the text 'to-i-po-wa-ta-u o', where *to* indicates the statue, *Ipowatau* is probably the genitive of Ippowadas, the dedicant's name, and *o* might be the determinative article or the beginning of a longer word. The second fragment shows the signs '*lu-ke-u-wo*' but the reading of the first symbol is controversial. Masson and Egetmeyer linked these signs to the participle of the Satrapas' inscriptions. Egetmeyer proposed to integrate the whole sequence as *o-[pi]-lu-ke-u-wo-[[n]to-se]*, a genitive participle derived from **opilukeuo*. The third fragment presents the text *ta-se wa-na-*[], universally restored as *ta-se wa-na-[sa-se]*, 'of the *wanassa*'.

Egetmeyer's final translation is: 'this (statue) of Ippowadas, chief of the wolves... of the *wanassa*'.⁸³⁵ The word *a-ra-ko-se* however is not in the text;

⁸³² The ἐπίλυκοι could be connected to an oracular sanctuary also in Crete. In the study of the *lex sacra*, Perlman pointed out that both the texts – that concerning the ἐπίλυκοι and the other on the cult of Apollo Lykeios – were prompted by an ordinance, κατὰ πρόσταγμα and κατὰ ἐπιταγάν in the dedication respectively. According to Perlman and Platon – the first editors of the *lex sacra* – these terms were often related to ordinances which concerned the 'divine will as communicated through oracles'. Although this is difficult to demonstrate in this specific case, it might further prove that the office of the ἐπίλυκοι can be connected with oracles sanctuaries as Satrapas was.

⁸³³ This is a base of a marble statue, dated to the fourth century BC, dedicated by Elloikos, son of Potesios to Demeter and Kore, *ta-ma-ra-ti-ri ka-se ko-ra-i*. Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Kourion n°9 = ICS 182. See Consani 1990, 71; Bagnall, Drew-Bear 1973, 214; for

⁸³⁴ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Paphos n°5 = ICS 10; Mitford 1960, 7.

⁸³⁵ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, 734.

thus, there is nothing to suggest that Ippowadas and Satrapas have held the same office of ἀρχός. If the second fragment effectively presents the same syllabic signs as the aorist participle present in Satrapas' dedications, Ippowadas could have been one of the ἐπίλυκοι, perhaps in turn subordinated to the *a-ra-ko-se o-pi-lu-ke-u-sa-se*. This would confirm that this magistracy was hierarchical. If this is the case, Ippowadas was one of the city magistrates, one of the ἐπίλυκοι, who however decided not to write his dedication following the script imposed by Nicocles' reform. As Egetmeyer pointed out, in this inscription, the script is more cursive than in Tala.⁸³⁶ This might be due to the private character of the text, different from that of an official monumental inscription; but it is unlikely that a public official preferred not to follow the traits of the propaganda of Nicocles, if he served under this king. It is more plausible that Ippowadas dedicated the statue before Nicocles' reforms. According to the palaeographic analysis, this inscription can be dated to the decades which preceded Nicocles' government;⁸³⁷ therefore, its date might be the *terminus ante quem* for the establishment of the magistracy of the ἐπίλυκοι in Paphos. However, we should always take into account that this last analysed text is fragmentary and the precise content is difficult to define; thus, it is appropriate to maintain a certain degree of doubt.

But if the ἐπίλυκοι were established before Nicocles' reforms, were they part of a long-standing institution or were they part of the process of Hellenization of this city-state that had already started from the beginning of the fourth century BC? If the ἐπίλυκοι were a Greek and, more specifically, an Athenian magistracy – according to the hypothesis of Thonemann and Egetmeyer – it is plausible that the Paphian government introduced them in the city-state in order to display Greek identity, conceiving Greece as model of independence from the Achaemenid domination.⁸³⁸ This may have happened already under the kingship of Nicocles' father Timarchos.⁸³⁹ The establishment of the ἐπίλυκοι might also correspond to the establishment of an *epilykeion*, their

⁸³⁶ Egetmeyer 2008, 255.

⁸³⁷ ICS 10.

⁸³⁸ Papantoniou affirmed that, in this period, 'Athens was expanding its political and economic control in the East Mediterranean [...] and the Cypriot βασιλεῖς wanted to 'secure economic development and political stability' by adopting Greek institutions (2013, 171). See Raptou 1999, 263-269; Stylianos 2000, 56-90 and Mehl 2004, 12-13.

⁸³⁹ On the development of Nicocles' dynasty see Iacovou 2019, 221-225.

headquarters, and to the development of other Greek institutions in Paphos, perhaps of a gymnasium called Λυκείον – near which the *epilykeion* might be located. Although the Lyceum became famous as Athenian, it was a civic institution widespread also in other Greek cities such as Epidauros and probably also in Keos. Two inscriptions from Epidauros attest that a dedicant acted as γυμνασίαρχος in the Lyceum (γυμνασιάρχῆσαντα ἐν Λυκείῳ); thus, the local gymnasium was also called Lyceum.⁸⁴⁰ In Keos, another inscription, dated to the third century BC, attests that a γραμματεὺς wrote a *psephisma* on a stele and located it in the Lyceum, ‘καὶ τὸ ψήφισμα ἀνα]γραψάτω ὁ γραμματεὺς εἰς σ[τήλην] καὶ θέτω εἰς Λύκειον’, very likely the local gymnasium.⁸⁴¹

Although no gymnasium has been found in Paphos, the presence of several Hellenistic gymnasia is confirmed by the frequent mention of γυμνασίαρχοι in the epigraphic attestations from the main centres of the island or by the sequence ‘οἱ ἀπὸ γυμνασίου’ in some dedications from Paphos.⁸⁴² Moreover, according to Młynarczyk, it is very likely that a gymnasium was set in Nea-Paphos either near the coast west of Fanari or in Loukkarka, close to the Odeon.⁸⁴³

Although Nicocles implemented several reforms, it is conceivable that a certain degree of continuity existed in the political and administrative systems of the city-state of Paphos despite the change of the capital, and probably also in the institutional buildings. Papantoniou claimed that in Paphos, Soloi and Salamis, ‘the main socio-economic administrative structures – at least in the first years of the transition to the rule of the Diadochi—functioned under a semblance of continuity’.⁸⁴⁴ Therefore, it is plausible that the magistracy of the

⁸⁴⁰ *IG* IV.21 142; Peek 1972, 87, but dated to 143 AD.

⁸⁴¹ In this instance, however, we may not exclude that a temple dedicated to Apollo Lykeios, called Lykeion, existed in Keos and that the *psephisma* was located in this temple. See *SEG* XXIV, n°532. Dunant, Thomopoulos, 1954, 322-328. The presence of a *gymnasiarchos* in Keos is however attested by *IG* XII.5 647. This demonstrates that a local *gymnasium* existed there.

⁸⁴² E.g. Mitford 1971, n°46; Chavane, Yon (1978) 13.44; 48; 62; 65; *SEG* LIII, n°1741.

⁸⁴³ She also supposed that both these gymnasia coexisted. (Młynarczyk 1990, 215).

⁸⁴⁴ Papantoniou 2013, 181. See Hauben 1987, 13-226; Joannès 2006, 101-135; Stolper 2006, 223-260; Markou 2011, 289-291. Nicocles allied himself with Ptolemy, as well as Androcles, Nicocreon of Salamis and Pasikrates of Soloi. Apparently, Marion sided with Perdiccas at first, and subsequently with Antigonos, along with Lapethos, Kition, and the new independent city of Kerynia. Once Ptolemy’s coalition had won, the king landed on Cyprus under the guise of punishing the unfaithful Cypriot kings. The murder of Pummayatou of Kition marks the end of the independence of the Cypriot city-kingdoms, whose rulers were in turn incarcerated and killed. Nikokles apparently committed suicide, as tragically described by Diodorus, Polyenus

ἐπίλοκοι was established in Paphos in the last half of the fourth century BC, potentially with an associated gymnasium, perhaps called Lyceum, when the process of Hellenization had already begun in emulation of the Athenian model.⁸⁴⁵

Epigraphic documents suggest that this process was already advanced during the years of reign of Timarchos, Nicocles' father.⁸⁴⁶ As happened with Evagoras in Salamis, for the first time the coins of king Timarchos, dated between 350 and 325BC, show bilingual legends written in alphabetic and Cypriot syllabic Greek. As a result of those legends, the coins were used even outside of the city-kingdom and beyond the island, promoting the economic independence of this city-state. This might be an example of how Paphos used elements of Greek culture to try to step away from the Persian rule.

This process of Hellenization, however, might be misconstrued as a development in opposition to Nicocles' policy, which aimed to stress the independence of this city-kingdom by promoting the local origins of his dynasty – particularly, as has been said, by the use of the Neo-Paphian syllabary in the monumental inscriptions and proclaiming himself as Kinyras' descendant. However, it is also remarkable that the Greek alphabet became widespread in Paphos exactly during the reign of Nicocles. For instance, the legends on Nicocles' coins are written in alphabetic Greek instead of Cypriot-syllabic. This testifies a precise political intention: the desire to assimilate with Hellenistic culture.⁸⁴⁷ Another example consists in a digraph inscription from the temple of Artemis Agrotera, a dedication made by the king to the goddess where the

and the Marmor Parium (Diod. 20.19-44). In Diodorus' manuscripts, however, Nikokreon may have been confused with Nikocles. On the transition from the βασιλεῖς to a unique στρατηγός τῆς νήσου see Papantoniou 2013b, 33-57.

⁸⁴⁵ Apparently, other Greek monumental buildings were introduced in Paphos. At the end of the fourth century BC; for instance, according to Papantoniou, Nicocles built a theatre. Papantoniou 2013, 171-172; Green 2007, 3-16, Michaelides, Nicolaou 2008, 13-57.

⁸⁴⁶ The use of the Greek alphabet is one of the last steps towards the Hellenization of Cypriot customs. As Papantoniou (2013, 174) pointed out, the burial practices gradually changed and from the fifth century BC onwards, sarcophagi were more and more common at the expense of the monumental tombs with *dromoi*, which almost disappeared in the fourth century BC. The iconography of the sarcophagi was remarkably Greek, with depictions of scenes from the Homeric poems (Karageorghis *et al.* 2000, 204-205, n°331; Flourentzos 2007, *passim*; Petit 2004, 49-96; Petit 2006, 63-100; Petit 2007, 97-114); Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Paphos n°26 = *ICS* 29; Masson 1991, 60-70; Consani 1990, 66-67; Palaima 1991, 449-471; Keen 2016, 87-102.

⁸⁴⁷ By contrast, the coeval king of Soloi minted coins with digraphic legends. Not surprisingly, he was allied with another of the Diadochi.

syllabic signs are confined to the top of the stele.⁸⁴⁸ By contrast, the alphabetic Greek occupies all the middle and bottom parts of the text written in *stoichedon* and in verse (elegiac couplets).⁸⁴⁹ Finally, as anticipated above, the legends of Nicocles' coins are another remarkable instance.

This analysis allows the conclusion that the figure of the *archos opilykeusase* of the syllabic inscriptions perfectly suits with Nicocles' policy. His office was probably established shortly before the change of the capital and therefore, it stresses the continuity between the old and the new government. The epigraphic layout of these inscriptions confirms this hypothesis. By contrast, the magistracy of the ἐπίλυκοι was probably a gesture towards Greek culture. This matches perfectly with the intent of Nicocles – and perhaps of his father too – to show his Greek features when the political situation required it.

All in all, Satrapas, the *a-ra-ko-se o-pi-lu-ke-u-sa-se*, 'the chief who acts as an ἐπίλυκος', i.e. the presiding officer of a college of ἐπίλυκοι, was a civic and religious official. He was probably of Near-Eastern origin, as the name suggests and a member of the upper class. His role may be associated with that of the ἐπιλυκάρχη mentioned in an inscription from Kourion. This consists of a civic office potentially related to that of the Athenian polemarch and to the Lyceum/gymnasium, where the military training of the youths took place. He may have played legal roles in minor disputes and he held a sacral office, probably as a priest, in temples and oracular sanctuaries. This magistracy was probably established in the last half of the fourth century BC in order to imitate a Greek political institution as an assertion for independence from the Achaemenid rule.

⁸⁴⁸ Cayla 2018, n°1 = Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Nea-Paphos n°1 = ICS 1; Cayla 2018, 65. See Hansen 1989, 269 n°870; Mitford 1960, 200-205 = *SEG XVIII*, 586. Consani 1990, 63-79.

⁸⁴⁹ The name of Nicocles does not appear in the inscription but the dedicant is presented as the son of the *basileus* Timarchos. This inscription shows the hapax *e-pi-na-e-a*, which corresponds to the Greek ἐπίναια, which indicates buildings around the temple. This epigraphic layout recalls the previously cited bilingual dedications of the king Androcles in Amathus, where the autochthonous Eteocypriot text is less curated than the Greek one, although it is traditionally located at the top of the monument. It is not coincidence that both Androcles and Nicocles ended up for Hellenizing their manners and allied themselves with Ptolemy in the dispute of the Diadochi, hoping to keep their city-kingdoms independent for longer – although it turned out to be a futile attempt. Consani 1988, 35-60; Steele 2018, 85; Markou 2011, 286-295.

6.2 Civic-religious governors in the peripheral territory of the city-states, the cases of Paphos and Lapethos

Not far from the underground sanctuary of Apollo at Paphos, a tomb inscription suggests the existence of a civic and religious office also in the periphery of this city-kingdom. The text was written in Cypriot-syllabic signs engraved on the rock wall and dated to the last half of the fourth century BC – as is the necropolis itself.⁸⁵⁰ This inscription was considered lost until the tombs of Hellenika were cleaned during the seventies.⁸⁵¹ Since then, scholars have been able to identify the place of origin of the text and provide a new reading. Masson believed that the text reads:

1. *o-i-je-re-u-se a-na-sa-se*

2. *ti-ma-ra-ko-se-to-?-we-na-i-o-ro-si-a*

‘The priest of the *anassa*, Timarchos ...’⁸⁵²

He pointed out that the first sign of the second line is very peculiar but that, due to the context, it can only be *ti* with the upper part curved and badly engraved. Timarchos was Nicocles’ father, king of Palaipaphos, and it is acknowledged that the king of Paphos was the priest of the *wanassa*. Consequently, Masson associated the sequence *o-i-je-re-u-se ta-se-a-na-sa-se* to the name *ti-ma-ra-ko-se*. However, we may object that if this priest had been Timarchos, king of Paphos, the inscription would have undoubtedly included the royal title of βασιλεύς.

Finally, Neumann provided a new reading of the second line.⁸⁵³

2. *?-ma-ra-ko-se-to-nu-mo-na-i-o-ro-si-g*

He translated the full inscription as: ‘...marchos, the priest of the *wanassa*, this is the resting place (house) of Orosias’. He pointed out that this epitaph consists of two nominal phrases. The first concerns the name and the title of who created the tomb and the second sentence specifies that that this was the ‘last’ house of

⁸⁵⁰ Egetmeyer 2010, Nouvelle Paphos n° 4 = ICS 4. Masson described this text in the ICS edition basing his first comment on information coming from a travel book written by Melchior de Vogüé during the nineteenth century – and consequently rather debatable. The drawing of this pioneer is still shown in the second edition of ICS, published in 1983, on which Masson’s comment is based. According to his reading, the text consists of these two lines: 1. *o-i-ye-re-se ta-se a-na-sa-se* 2. *ti-ma-ra-ko-se to · we-na-i-o-si-* ‘The priest of the *anassa* Timarchos, ...’. The last part of the second line was not fully translated and the meaning remained obscure despite the signs being clear in the drawing. When the inscription was re-discovered during the seventies, Masson did not change his previous interpretation.

⁸⁵¹ Masson 1979, 159-171.

⁸⁵² Masson 1979, 160.

⁸⁵³ Neumann 1994,1-4.

Orosias; Egetmeyer followed this interpretation. In order to explain his new reading of the text, Neumann claimed that τόνυ, the first word of this sequence, is an expanded form of the pronoun ὄνυ, also attested in two bilingual inscriptions from Tamassos.⁸⁵⁴ The term μοναί is a *pluralia tantum* form of μονή, an abstract verbal name derived from the same root as μένω, which is attested also in an inscription from Hierapolis, a decree in honour of some φύλακοι.⁸⁵⁵ These words may be related to each other since the discrepancy of gender and number between a noun and its pronominal adjective is frequently attested in Greek, also in literary texts.⁸⁵⁶

This reconstruction of the text is plausible and it clarifies part of the second line. The only word that still presents problems is the alleged *ti-ma-ra-ko-se*. As Masson stated, the peculiar form of the symbol ‘*ti*’ suggests that whoever inscribed the text made a mistake since none of the signs of the Paphian syllabary – or of the standard Cypriot syllabary – has this shape.⁸⁵⁷ But looking at the drawing made by Masson – and at the photo in the last edition – this sign seems to be similar to *ko* or *ro* more than to *ti*.⁸⁵⁸ Although the signs *ro* and *ko* are both attested in this text, it is plausible that the stonemason wanted to inscribe a proper syllabic sign which, for some reason, did not come out regularly. Thus, I would propose to read this sequence as *ko-ma-ra-ko-se* instead of *ti-ma-ra-ko-se*. The term *ko-ma-ra-ko-se*, κώμαρχος might be a personal name but also the name of an office, the ‘chief of the village’.⁸⁵⁹

In this context, we should take a step back to Neumann’s analysis. He claimed that the so called ‘first statement’ – the first of the two nominal sentences – presents the name and the office of the man who created the tomb. But some objections may be lodged against this argument. Although an epitaph which bears two titles at the beginning – ἱερέυς and κώμαρχος – is not common, it is even more implausible that a priest paid for building the tomb of a man to

⁸⁵⁴ Neumann 1994, 3; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 434 §551; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Tamassos n°1; 2 = *ICS* 216.6; 215.b.

⁸⁵⁵ *OGIS* 527.6; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 240 §266. On the name Orosias see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. I, 356 §426.

⁸⁵⁶ Neumann 1994, 3; for some examples, see Schwyzer 1950 II, 602-604. Neumann read the seventh sign of the second line as *nu*. It might also be *no*, but, in that case, this interpretation of the text would not be possible.

⁸⁵⁷ Masson 1979, 160-161.

⁸⁵⁸ Cf. also footnote n° 2 in Neumann 1994, 2.

⁸⁵⁹ Scarpanti 2014, 162 on the Cypriot anthroponyms with *-arch-*.

whom apparently he was not related. The following analysis of the typologies of the Cypriot epitaphs helps to clarify this point.

Cypriot epitaphs can be subdivided into three typologies. The first consists in giving the name of the deceased in the nominative along with the verb εἰμί, 'I am'.⁸⁶⁰ A second type presents the name of the deceased in genitive often followed by the name of the father, and occasionally also by the name of the grandfather or of other members of the family who paid for the burial monument and created the epitaph – often mentioned in a separate sentence.⁸⁶¹ An alternative form of this second typology consists in the name of the tomb in nominative, σᾶμα followed by the name of the deceased in genitive.⁸⁶² We may notice that the degree of relationship is clarified in most of the cases and that very often, the verbs *e-pe-se-ta-se*, ἐπέστασε, or *ka-te-se-ta-se*, κατέστασε, appear in the text.⁸⁶³ The third typology presents the name of the member of the family who paid for the epitaph in the nominative, followed by the dative of the deceased for whom the tomb was created.⁸⁶⁴

The epitaph of Orosias does not fit into any of the typologies. The closest example is the second kind of epitaph. But, as highlighted above, although the inscriptions can bear two separate sentences – as in Orosias' epitaph – either the degree of relationship between the dedicant and the deceased or the verb ἐπίστημι or καθίστημι – or both – are always shown in the text. By contrast, Orosias' inscription does not present any of these features. Therefore, it is not possible to conclude with any certainty that the ἱερεύς of the first line was the person who paid for the building of Orosias' burial monument.

By contrast, Orosias might have held the title of ἱερεύς; we may also suppose that the verb εἰμί has been omitted in the first sentence. The evident grammatical discrepancy between the cases – *O-ro-si-a* is a genitive whereas *i-ye-re-u-se* is a nominative – is not uncommon in the Cypriot epigraphic attestations, particularly in poorly inscribed texts as this. Another epitaph of

⁸⁶⁰ E.g. Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Golgi n°2 = *ICS* 261; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Marion n°4; 34; 64 = *ICS* 97; 126; 152;

⁸⁶¹ E.g. *ICS* 86a; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Dhrymou n° 5 = *ICS* 88; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Marion 1-3;7;9;12-17;26-28; 31-33; 42; 62-63 = *ICS* 94-96; 104-109; 118-120; 123-125; 150-151;

⁸⁶² Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II Marion 51 'to sa-ma e-mi' = *ICS* 140; u.o. 2 = *ICS* 338;

⁸⁶³ E.g. Egetmeyer 2010 II, Anavargos 1; Hadjisavvas 2003, 126; Egetmeyer 2010 II, Marion 65; 67 = *ICS* 153; 154a

⁸⁶⁴ E.g. Egetmeyer 2010 II, Marion n°11; 44 = *ICS* 103; 133;

uncertain origins shows a similar construction. This is a limestone plaque dated to 400-310 BC and inscribed in the common syllabary.⁸⁶⁵

1. *So-ke-re-te-o-se*
2. *to-so-ka-ri-o-se*
3. *to-te-sa-ma-ne*
4. *se-la-mi-ni-o-se*

‘Of Socrete, son of Socharis, this tomb. The Salaminian’

This inscription bears two separate nominal sentences – as the Orosias’ epitaph does. The name of the deceased is in genitive followed by the name of his father and by the subject in nominative τόδε σᾶμαν, ‘this tomb’. This sequence is followed by the affixing Selaminios – second sentence –; this is an ethnic related to the deceased but it is inflected as a nominative instead of being a genitive as *so-ke-re-te-o-se* is. The inscription of the tomb of Hellenika might present the same construction as this epitaph. In that case, ἱερεύς – in the nominative – would be an apposition of the noun Orosias – inflected in the genitive –, one of his prestigious titles. According to this analysis, *ko-ma-ra-ko-se* would not be the name of the man who held the office of ἱερεύς but a second title of Orosias. If this hypothesis is correct, Orosias would be the ἱερεύς of the *anassa* and the κώμαρχος of a village, perhaps close to the necropolis of Hellenika. We may also suppose that his tomb was inscribed – whereas the other graves of the necropolis were not – because he held prestigious offices and he was probably a member of the local elite.

If the reading *ko-ma-ra-ko-se* is correct, it would demonstrate that also in Paphos, the administration of the city-state was subdivided into centre and territory where local κώμαρχοι may have presided over minor villages. If so, there were officials who held civic and religious offices also in the territory of the city-state. This might confirm that in the Paphian government, religious and political roles often overlapped.

⁸⁶⁵ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, uncertain origins n°2 = ICS 338

The potential subdivision of the Paphian political and administrative systems into centre and periphery can be compared to the administrative structure of another city-state, Lapethos. An inscription from this centre testifies to the presence of religious-civil officials in a peripheral context. This is one of the few epigraphic attestations coming from this northern city-kingdom which is still little studied and only partially excavated.⁸⁶⁶ Specifically, this inscription was found in a school in the village of Larnaka tes Lapethou – Narnaka in the Phoenician text – a town close to Lapethos. This is a dedication made by PRM, son of GR‘ŠTRT, dated to the second half of the fourth century BC, therefore, contemporary with the analysed texts from Paphos. The dedicant held both a political and a religious office and he was employed in the government of the village, as the first line of the text shows. The inscription consists of nine lines written on a marble stone – particularly damaged on the right side – written in order to commemorate donations and offers made by PRM to Melqart, Osiris, Astarte and another divinity from Byblos.⁸⁶⁷

According to Lipinski, PRM is not a Semitic anthroponym but it might correspond to the Greek Φόρμος or to the Anatolian Παραμοας.⁸⁶⁸ Since the name of PRM’s father, GR‘ŠTRT, is undoubtedly Phoenician/Semitic, the dedicant probably came from a mixed family, composed of Greeks or Anatolians and Semitic members. As highlighted in the previous chapter, although Lapethos chose Phoenician as its administrative language, its population was mixed perhaps even more than in the other Cypriot city-states. This is demonstrated by the legends on coins and by the dating formulas of this inscription which show that the kings of Lapethos, though members of the same dynasty, had both Greek and Phoenician names.⁸⁶⁹ Thus, it is not surprising that

⁸⁶⁶ Lapethos does not appear in the list of the Cypriot city-states of the Assyrian documents; thus, we may conclude that it became an independent city-kingdom after the Assyrian domination - according to the legends of coins, from the late sixth BC onwards (Destrooper-Georgiades 1984, 140-161; Satraki 2012). On Lapethos during the Late Bronze Age and early Iron Age and on the first nineteenth-century excavations, see Diakou 2018, *passim*; Webb 2018, 35-52; Webb 2019, 1-31. According to Strabo (14.6.3-5) it was founded by Greeks but Pseudo-Scylax states that it was founded by Phoenicians (103).

⁸⁶⁷ Honeyman 1938, 285-298; Magnanini 1973, 125-127; Greenfield 1987, 39-401; Szyner 1988, 59-61; Steele 2013, 190-95.

⁸⁶⁸ Lipinski 2004, 84; Zgusta 1964, 432.

⁸⁶⁹ Markou 2011 88-91; Masson, Szyner 1972, 98; Destrooper-Gerghiades 1984, 145; Lipinski 2004; Zapiti, Michaelidou 2008, 94.

PRM, although he came from a mixed family, played a significant role in the government— as in the case of some officials in Kition.

As we said, PRM bears a title related to his religious duties (MQM 'LM) and another title related to the civil or military role he played in the town. The fact that this second title was not linked to a religious office became evident only when Sznycer provided a new interpretation of it. Honeyman read the text as W ŠW[...] ŠLLPŠ and translated it as 'sacrificer of the offerings of Lapethos'.⁸⁷⁰ For him, W ŠW[...] were two different words: W was the conjunction 'and'; and he reconstructed the second word ŠW[...] as SW['T], on the basis of the term ŠW'T which is attested in the sacrificial tariffs from Carthage and usually translated as 'dismembered parts of a sacrificial animal'.⁸⁷¹ Sznycer, however, proposed a new interpretation of the text. Having inspected the inscription, he proposed to replace the conjunction W, 'and', with the determinative article H, and ' with Y. According to this new reading, HŠWY ['] ŠLLPŠ would mean 'the commander who is in charge of Lapethos'.⁸⁷² This title indicates that PRM was commissioned by the central government of Lapethos to preside over Narnaka. This interpretation allows the conclusion that in this city-state, during the fourth century BC, there were officials who played both political and religious roles as happened in Paphos, and that some of them were in charge to have control of peripheral centres, instructed by the central administration of Lapethos.

As Sznycer pointed out, the political role played by PRM might be either civil or military.⁸⁷³ If the role was military, we might suppose that the village of Narnaka required a military intervention; perhaps the village tried to rebel against the rulers of Lapethos and PRM was sent there to keep this town under control. But no particular military action is mentioned in the text. By contrast, the inscription shows that the role played by PRM was stable and long-standing. He dedicated a votive statue to Melqart during the 15th year of the reign of the king, son of Damonikos, whose name is lost in lacuna, probably Praxippos I, c.

⁸⁷⁰ Sznycer 1988, 59-61; Honeyman 1938, 285-298.

⁸⁷¹ Honeyman 1938, 289; Sznycer 1988, 60-61, Krahmalkov 2000, 416; *KAI* 69.3; *KAI* 69.4; The term has been translated as 'sacrificer' also by Magnanini 1973, 126 *sic* 'sacrificatore dell'offerta per il peccato'.

⁸⁷² ŠWY is the active substantivized participle. The meaning is reconstructed on the base of the root 'to order', attested in ancient Aramaic in the term BŠWY. See Krahmalkov 2000, 415.

⁸⁷³ Sznycer 1988, 61.

350 BC.⁸⁷⁴ During the third year of reign of king Barikshamash, PRM dedicated six silver cups to Melqart and a golden lamp to Osiris, apparently in two different temples.⁸⁷⁵ Finally, he dedicated a bronze statue to Astarte for his father during the 15th year of the reign of an unspecified king, probably Barikshamash, mentioned in the previous lines, a year which should correspond to 335 BC.⁸⁷⁶ This information allows the conclusion that when this text was written, PRM was at the end of his career. According to the dates of the coins which bear the names of these rulers, his career lasted for at least 15 years, from 350 BC until 335 BC.⁸⁷⁷

Therefore, it is more plausible that PRM was a political and administrative official, who presided over Narnaka, the village close to Lapethos, and over the surrounding area. In the text, in fact, the title is followed by the name of the land controlled by PRM, BŠDP'R N[...] which scholars have translated as 'in the region of P'R of Narnaka'. P'R should be a territory of Narnaka which was in turn a small town and very likely the capital of a district. The name of the town, N[RNK], is reconstructed in lacuna on the base of NRNK mentioned in line 2, the location where the temple of Melqart was set.⁸⁷⁸ This indicates that the territory of Lapethos – and most likely also those of the other Cypriot city-states, as shown in chapter 1 and 2 – was subdivided into districts to which towns and villages belonged, supervised by political and administrative dignitaries. We may safely assume that PRM was not the only man who held this title but that other officials played the same role, perhaps supervising other small centres and territories as local governors.

⁸⁷⁴ Steele 2013, 190-191 Ph9 line 2, who followed Honeyman's edition. According to Lipinski, since Praxippos was the last king of this city-state mentioned by Diodorus, Praxippos could be the name of the son of Damonikos, following the principle of the papponymy according to which the grandson was called by his grandfather's name. (Lipinski 2004, 81-87). According to Lipinski, the name of this king would not be Damonikos or Demonikos (Masson, Sznycer 1972, 97-98) but Demowanax; Since in this inscription, the name is written as DMWNKS, it should have been the equivalent of the Greek Δαμῶναξ or Δημῶναξ, a compound with the Greek term -wanax. He also stated that the Greek ending -ος is usually expressed as Š in the Lapethos Phoenician inscriptions. By contrast, Egetmeyer pointed out that DMWNKS should be the same name attested as DMNKS (without W) on a coin from the Vouni treasure. The presence of W in the first version is due to the fact that this anthroponym is a loan from the Cypriot Greek dialect where *o* tends to be retained and often closed in *u*, phonetically rendered as W in Phoenician (Egetmeyer 2010 I, 58-59 §31); see Steele 2013, 221.

⁸⁷⁵ Steele 2013, 190-191 Ph 9 l. 4.

⁸⁷⁶ Steele 2013, 190-191 Ph 9 l. 6.

⁸⁷⁷ For dating the coins of this city-state and the legends of the kings cf. Hill 1904; Robinson 1948, 43-65; Masson, Sznycer 1972, 98-99; Lipinski 2004, 86; Markou 2011, 88-91.

⁸⁷⁸ Steele 2013, 190-191, Ph 9 l. 1.

Kerynia, a city of the territory of Lapethos – which corresponds to the current Kyrenia/Girne – might be an example of a peripheral centre administered by a powerful local governor. According to Diodorus, when Ptolemy I landed on Cyprus, he faced the hostility of king Praxippos of Lapethos and of the *δυνάστης* of Kerynia.⁸⁷⁹ Diodorus differentiated between the role played by this local governor and the king of the city-state to which Kerynia belonged. It is conceivable that Kerynia developed considerably under the aegis of the Lapethos dynasty during the fourth century BC. The economic development of this centre was due to its strategic location; potentially, it was an important harbour which facilitated the trade with nearby Anatolia, from which several raw materials, particularly silver, were imported.⁸⁸⁰ Therefore, it is not surprising that the local governor became almost as powerful as the king of Lapethos, and worthy of being mentioned in the list of the sovereigns who opposed Ptolemy I. This demonstrates that some of the peripheral towns or centres could grow and become more powerful than others.

It is difficult to define whether the title of ḤṢWY [‘]’ŠLLPŠ precisely corresponds to the Greek term *δυνάστης* employed by Diodorus – which is usually translated as ‘ruler’, ‘chief’, or ‘prince’. But it is likely that the Sicilian historian chose the Greek word that seemed more appropriate in this context, perhaps without deep knowledge of the political and administrative systems of the city-state, or the precise Phoenician terminology employed by the local administration. This any rate shows that towns and cities in the territory of Lapethos were ruled and supervised by local governors and that some of them became particularly influential.

But, as said above, PRM, besides being the governor of Narnaka also held a religious office. The first line of the inscription states that he was MQM ’LM. This title describes a precise religious role – not attested before the fourth

⁸⁷⁹ Diod. 19.79.4 ‘Πυγμαλίωνα δὲ εὐρῶν διαπρεβεύομενον πρὸς Ἀντίγονον ἀνεῖλε, Πράξιππος δὲ τὸν τῆς Λαπιθίας βασιλέα καὶ τὸν τῆς Κερυνίας δυνάστην ὑποπεύσας ἀλλοτρίως ἔχειν συνέλαβε...’ ‘Finding that Pummayaton was negotiating with Antiochus, he killed him; he arrested Praxippos the king of Lapethos and the ‘ruler’ of Cyrenia, whom he suspected being ‘ill-disposed’ toward himself’. See Rathmann 2005, 435. This passage by Diodorus concerns events dated to 313 BC. Lapethos and Kerynia were also conquered by Seleucos in 315 BC (Diod. 19.62.6) but they probably became independent again. On Seleucos in Diodorus see Landucci Gattinoni 2005, 155-181.

⁸⁸⁰ Diakou 2018, 253-254; on the trade from the Lapethos region to Anatolia during the Bronze Age see Webb 2018. On the amphora trade during the early Hellenistic period – particularly with Rhodes – see Lawall 2011, 673-682.

century BC – on whose meaning and translation scholars disagree.⁸⁸¹ Zamora López has recently tried to sum up the debate.⁸⁸² Honeyman translated it as ‘establisher of the god’.⁸⁸³ But according to Sznycer, the sequence can be read as ‘who wakes up the divinity’, since MQM is the active participle of an intensive form *QWM ‘stand up’ or ‘rise up’ and ’LM is the plural form of ’L, the noun ‘god’ in the western-Semitic languages.⁸⁸⁴ Lipinski proposed to translate the verb as ‘to resurrect’ or ‘to awake’.⁸⁸⁵ He compared this title with some of its variants attested in several other Phoenician and Punic inscriptions. For example, the Neo-Punic Carthaginian texts frequently show the sequence MQM ’LM MT RH ŠTRNY, ‘awakener of the dead god with the scent of Astronoe’ or MQM ’LM M(LQR)T RH ŠTRNY ‘awakener of the dead god Melqart with the scent of Astronoe’.⁸⁸⁶ Lipinski argued that these are all priestly offices related to the death and resurrection of the divinity during an annual ceremony which commemorated a special event, the passage between the end of winter, when the divinity was asleep, and the coming of spring, when the god must be awakened.⁸⁸⁷

Lipinski suggested that Melqart and Astarte were the divinities involved in this ceremony. In order to prove this, he quoted a passage of Flavius Josephus which describes the role of the MQM ’LM during the ceremony of the ἔγερσις⁸⁸⁸. Josephus’ passages state that Hiram of Tyre ordered the building of

⁸⁸¹ We may notice that this inscription from Lapethos is one of the two Near-Eastern Phoenician texts bearing the title of MQM ’LM. The other dedication comes from Rhodes, and is a bilingual text. (Fraser 1970, 31-36; Maiuri 1916, 267-269). The Lapethos inscription is also one of the oldest, since the office is not attested before the fourth century BC. However, the lack of earlier attestations is probably due to the paucity of the sources. See Zamora López 2018, 77-82.

⁸⁸² Zamora López 2018, 65-85.

⁸⁸³ Honeyman 1938, 285-298; 1940, 5-17

⁸⁸⁴ Sznycer 1988, 60. On the grammatical analysis cf. Müller 1996, 116-122. Zamora López pointed out that ’LM might refer to a singular deity too (2018, 66). He tried to vocalise the words as *mīqm ’ēlīm*.

⁸⁸⁵ Lipinski 1970, 30-58; Lipinski 1995, 494. Lipinski based his theory on the previous work of Clermont-Genneau 1924, 149-167. Bonnet 1992, 294-295; Hoftijzer-Jogeling 1995, s. *mqm ’lm*; Xella 2001, *passim*.

⁸⁸⁶ *CIS I 5*; *KAI 44.2*; *KAI 91.1/3*; Bonnet 1988, 176.

⁸⁸⁷ Lipinski 1970, 56; Greenfield 1987, 397-398; Xella 2001, 42. Apparently, the ceremony took place in February (Amitay 2008, 96). Against this last point see Zamora López 2018, 66; generally against the *Frazerian Category* (dying-and-rising, death-rebirth, or resurrection of the deity) of Ancient Near East gods see Smith 2001, 113-114; Müller 1996, 116-122. By contrast Xella re-evaluated the *dying-and-rising* theory (2001, 73-96).

⁸⁸⁸ *Cont. Ap.* 1.119: ‘ναὸς ἠκοδόμησεν τό τε τοῦ Ἡρακλέους καὶ τῆς Ἀστάρτης, πρῶτόν τε τοῦ Ἡρακλέους ἔγερσιν ἐποιήσατο ἐν τῷ Περιτίῳ μηνί’: ‘He built the temple for Herakles and Astarte and he practised the egeresis in the months of Perit see *Ant. J.* 8.5,4; Nodet 2005, 45; Pegg, Spilsbury, Mason 2005, 40, with a different interpretation: ‘he erected the temple in the

a temple dedicated to Melqart and Astarte where he practised the ἔγερσις, the ‘awakening’.⁸⁸⁹ This ceremony is also mentioned in an inscription found in the temple of Herakles in Philadelphia-Amman;⁸⁹⁰ it was practised in the sanctuary and the person who presided over this rite was called ἐγερσεΐτης τοῦ Ἡρακλέους. Since we know that Melqart is traditionally identified with the Herakles of the Greek pantheon, this text might corroborate the theory that the office of ἐγερσεΐτης corresponded to that of MQL’LM in the Phoenician texts.⁸⁹¹ As Josephus’ passages show, the king held this office and this is not surprising since ‘the institutions of kingship and priesthood’, particularly in Persian-period Phoenicia, ‘were inseparable from one another’.⁸⁹²

According to the Phoenician-Punic epigraphic record, there is no doubt that the role of ἐγερσεΐτης was prestigious and accessible only to members of the elite. Müller stressed that the MQM ’LM usually held also other political offices in the city-state.⁸⁹³ This is clear in most of the Punic inscriptions from Carthage where the MQM ’LM was also a *suffet* and sometimes the chief of the priests, RB KNHM or he bore the title ‘the great’, HRB.⁸⁹⁴ Therefore, it is not surprising that in Narnaka, the MQM ’LM was also the governor of the town and a member of the local elite.

So far, we demonstrated that in Lapethos there were officials who played both civic/political and religious roles and that they presided over peripheral towns and regions – as in the cases of PRM in Narnaka and of the δυνάστης in Kerynia. These centres were probably part of local administrative districts into which the territory of the city-state was subdivided.

In this context, we should also investigate if the offices held by PRM, that of MQM ’LM and that of ἩΨWY [‘] ’ŠLLPŠ, were hereditary or at least

month of...’; Zamora López 2018, 83; see Xella (2017, 97-109) who however argued that these two versions might have been interpolated; Mason, Barclay 2007, vol. 10, 73-74.

⁸⁸⁹ Krahmalkov proposed that the rite was associated with the divinity of Eshmun/Asclepius who was revived by the scent of the goddess Astronoe, perhaps a version of Astarte. (Krahmalkov 2000, 309). He also associated this practice with that of the MQŠ ’LM BMSM ‘awakener of the good in his couch’ attested just in one Punic inscription (*KAI* 77, 1-2).

⁸⁹⁰ Amitay 2008, 98; Bonnet-Tzavellas 1983, 206-207; Lipinski 1970, 31; Abel 1908, 570-578.

⁸⁹¹ Amitay 2008, 97; Lipinski 1995, 238; Lipinski 1970, 31.

⁸⁹² Amitay 2008, 98; Elayi 1986, 249-261; Aubet 2008, 98.

⁸⁹³ Zamora López 2018, 79-80.

⁸⁹⁴ Müller 1996, 116; e.g. *CIS* I 3351, 5/6; 3352,6; 3788,4; 4867,5; 4868, 3; 5903,4. 9; *CIS* I 260, 3; 377, 5; 3788, 4; 4864, 5; 4869, 6; *KAI* 90; *CIS* I 5979; Zamora-Lopez 2018, 69-76.

exclusive to the members of the same family. In order to probe this argument, another Phoenician Hellenistic dedication from Larnaka tes Lapethou must be analysed, which, according to Parmentier, concerns the members of the same family of PRM.⁸⁹⁵ This second text – dated to 274 BC and consisting of 16 lines – is a dedication made by Yatonbaal in order to commemorate his *ex-votos* in the sanctuary of Melqart: a statue;⁸⁹⁶ a votive bronze face of his father; an altar; a bronze tablet and silver weights. According to the text, he also consecrated beasts on the boundaries of the region of Narnaka, BGBL ŠR NRNK.⁸⁹⁷

This inscription states that Yatonbaal held the title of RB 'RŠ, an office usually translated as 'chief of the land' or 'governor of the region'. In this text, the name of the dedicant is followed by a long genealogy which shows four generations of ancestors: 'YTNB'L RB 'RŠ BN GR'ŠTRT RB 'RŠ BN 'BD' [...]SR BN GR'ŠTRT BN ŠLM PR KRML', 'Yatonbaal chief of the land, son of Gerashtart chief of the land, son of Abdo[...]sir, son of Gerashtart, son of Shalem, from Karmel (?)'.⁸⁹⁸

Yatonbaal's father and grandfather held also the title of 'chief of the land'; thus, we may conclude that the office of RB 'RŠ was hereditary. Line 7 states that the bronze face of Yatonbaal's father was dedicated when the father was still alive, 'BHY 'BY YŠT, in 280/278 BC. By contrast, in line 4, the text specifies that the statue was dedicated by Yatonbaal, as memorial of his living reputation, SKR BH[Y]M LŠMY, when he was already RB 'RŠ in 274-272 BC. According to Parmentier, it is implausible that two RBM 'RŠ co-existed in the same district – i.e. that Yatonbaal and his father were both RBM 'RŠ in the same years; thus, Parmentier concluded that Yatonbaal inherited the title from his father between 280 BC and 274/272 BC. Therefore, the official was at the beginning of his career when he commissioned this inscription.

⁸⁹⁵ Parmentier 1987, 403-412.

⁸⁹⁶ For information on the chronology of text in relation to the Ptolemaic dynasty ruling on Cyprus see Teixidor 1967, 171, n°43; Teixidor 1988, 188-190.

⁸⁹⁷ KAI 43 = RES 1311; Berger 1895, 69-88; Honeyman 1940, 57-67; Van Den Branden 1964, 246-261; Steele 2013, 189-190. Steele reported the text edited by Van den Branden and Honeyman. They read ŠR but the best transcription is probably ŠD, 'field', region. R and D are often confused since paleographically are very similar. The same happened in a few lines later for 'RN 'lords' which should be transliterated as 'DN.

⁸⁹⁸ Steele 2013, 189, Ph8 ll.2-3; Honeyman 1940 57-58, ll. 2-3; the reading 'PR KRML' is by Van den Branden (1964, 246-261).

If we suppose that the dedication of PRM and this second inscription concern the same family, we might also argue that only these family members had the prerogative of holding prestigious offices and of being governors of the territory of Narnaka over the years. But how can we prove that Yatonbaal and PRM were relatives? Parmentier analysed all the personal names mentioned in the two documents in order to understand how these dedications separated by 61 or 63 years might be related each other. The name Gerashtart is attested in both texts; in the first inscription, he is the father of PRM. In the second inscription, Gerashtart is the father of Yatonbaal, who in turn held the title of ‘chief of the land’ RB ’RŠ; but it is also the name of the father of Yatonbaal’s great-grandfather who did not hold any office. According to Parmentier, Gerashtart, GR’ŠTRT, the father of PRM mentioned in the first inscription analysed above, and Gerashtart who was the oldest ancestor of Yatonbaal might be the same person. In terms of chronology, there are 61 or 63 years between the engraving of the two inscriptions, a sufficient amount of time for the succession of four generations. Thus, the grandfather of Yatonbaal, called Abdosir, who also did not hold any office, would be the brother of PRM, the dedicant of the first inscription. This allows the conclusion that PRM and Yatonbaal were both members of a reputable upper-class family, whose members ruled in Narnaka holding the office of ḤŠWY [‘] ’ŠLLPŠ ‘the commander who is in charge of Lapethos’, at the end of the fourth century BC, and of RB ’RŠ ‘chief of the land’ in the third century BC. This does not prove that the office of ḤŠWY [‘] ’ŠLLPŠ was hereditary, but at least it shows that the government of the village was controlled by a powerful family.

It is plausible that these two offices, that of ḤŠWY [‘] ’ŠLLPŠ and that of RB ’RŠ, were similar and related each other. The title of ‘chief of the land’, RB ’RŠ, is not attested elsewhere in the Ptolemaic kingdom, in Cyprus, or in Egypt, but it is conceivable that the Ptolemaic rulers had introduced this office in Lapethos.⁸⁹⁹ According to Parmentier, the sequence RB ’RŠ might be a sort

⁸⁹⁹ Several scholars have advanced different interpretations on the role played by Yatonbaal. Honeyman thought about a member of the local administration and translated his office as ‘district officer’ (1940, 57-67); Volkmann associated it with the Ptolemaic *toparches* or *kōmarches*, in both cases a royal official (1956, 448-455). Van den Branden argued that this was a honorific title which did not concern the administration of the territory of Narnaka, and that both Yatonbaal and his father held it at the same time (1964, 245-261). Also Bagnall (1976, 72) excluded that this was an administrative office since there was no space enough for three

of Phoenician translation of the στρατηγός τῆς νῆσου attested in the other Cypriot cities or a kind of minor στρατηγός – as attested in Nea-Paphos.⁹⁰⁰ It is evident that Lapethos continued to use the Phoenician language in its administrative documents and monumental inscriptions despite the diffusion of the κοινή. Parmentier therefore thought that instead of introducing the common terminology of the Ptolemaic kingdom, Lapethos had its own nomenclature for the officials who played the same roles as the Ptolemaic employees attested in the alphabetic Greek inscriptions of the other Cypriot cities.⁹⁰¹

However, it is implausible that the office of RB 'RŠ corresponded to that of a general στρατηγός or to that of the στρατηγός τῆς νῆσου since this title, *per se*, states that Yatonbaal was in charge of a specific 'RS, 'region', 'land' or 'area' – definitely not an island. Moreover, the inscription attests that Yatonbaal had authority within the borders of the district of Narnaka; he had consecrated animals to Melqart within these borders.⁹⁰² This practice probably aimed to ensure that his authority was under the protection of the god not only in the village but also in the surrounding territory where he exercised his power. Border practices involved the personal intervention of the principal authorities of the city.⁹⁰³ In Narnaka, the person who consecrated animals on the boundaries of the territory must have been a local authority. In the Athenian *dēmoi*, for example, the demarch who within the deme presided over court cases and was in charge of sacrifices along with the *hieropoioi*.⁹⁰⁴

This allows the conclusion that the ḤŠWY ['] 'ŠLLPŠ and the RB 'RŠ had very similar duties and played almost the same role in the government of

generations of RB 'RŠ from 294BC until 274BC, when the island underwent a 'definitive' re-organization of the royal bureaucracy. However, in light of the discovery of the documents of the Idalion archive (third century BC) it is not possible anymore to affirm that a definitive administrative re-organisation was applied already in that period. Finally, Teixidor claimed that the RB 'RŠ was a kind of 'magistrate of a territory outside of the city walls' (1988, 188-190).

⁹⁰⁰ Parmentier 1987, 411. E.g. Cayla 2018, n°45.

⁹⁰¹ Diod. 20.47.3; *Salamis* 13.97; Bagnall 1976, 40.

⁹⁰² Steele 2013, 189, Ph8 l.10; Honeyman 1940, 57-58, l.10.

⁹⁰³ For instance, in Sparta before a military action, the king sacrificed animals on the borders of the territory of the πόλις– 'ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρια τῆς χώρας: ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἐκεῖ αὖ θύεται' cf. Xen. *Lac.* 13.2-3; Jameson 2014, 99; Lipka 2002, 212-213; on the sacredness of borders in the ancient world cf. the oath of the Ephebes in Athens l. 19. *SEG XVI.140*. Siewert 1977, 102-111; Ober 2005, 196 2012.

⁹⁰⁴ See Mikalson 2016, 60-61; *IG I³ 244* τὸν δέ[μαρχον] [καὶ τὸς : ἡ[ε]ροποιοί- ος : τοῖ Λεοῖ δρᾶν τ]- [έ]λεον : λέχ[σιν ...] [ὀ]βολὸν 'the de[march] and the *hi[er]opoioi* are to sacrifice' (5) an adult animal, assigned by lot, to Leos'. See Osborne 2007, 195-199; *IG II¹*, 1358, 23 = *SEG XXI.541*; Jameson 1965, 154-172; *SEG XLIII.26*; *SEG XLI.75*

Lapethos. At the beginning of Ptolemaic domination, the contemporary local government of Lapethos probably agreed with the new rulers on the establishment of a new office, the RB 'R Š, the chief of the land, created by analogy with the local ḤŠWY [‘] 'ŠLLPŠ. Thus, the RB 'RŠ might not be the Phoenician correspondent of the στρατηγὸς τῆς νῆσου in Lapethos, as Parmentier suggested, but a new local variant of the previous office ḤŠWY [‘] 'ŠLLPŠ whose main duty was to supervise the territory of Narnaka. It is not surprising, in fact, that the Ptolemaic government preferred not to overly intervene in the local administrative system of the Cypriot cities when the situation did not require it. We may also suppose that Lapethos accepted Ptolemaic domination in exchange for the autonomy of their institutions and government, which continued to use Phoenician as administrative language.⁹⁰⁵

According to this analysis, plausibly the title of ḤŠWY [‘] 'ŠLLPŠ held by a local dignitary during the fifth and fourth centuries BC turned into the RB 'RŠ, chief of the land, during the Hellenistic period. Although we may not prove that ḤŠWY [‘] 'ŠLLPŠ was a hereditary office, it was held by members of the same family and passed down through generations. The family representatives who bore the title were part of the local upper class which continued to hold privileges even during the early years of the Ptolemaic domination.

Moreover, in Lapethos, the religious offices instituted during Ptolemaic rule also seem to be exclusive to the members of the same family. In line 5, the text of Yantonbaal's dedication states that Yantonbaal raised the statue in the sanctuary of Melqart when the priest – more precisely, 'priest of the Lord of the Kings Ptolemy', WKHN L'RN MLKM PTLMYŠ – was Abdashtart, son of Gerashtart chief of the land, in the year that corresponds to the 33rd year for the inhabitants of Lapethos.⁹⁰⁶

We may argue that Abdashtart was the brother of the dedicant Yatonbaal since they were both sons of a Gerashtart who held the title of chief of the land.

⁹⁰⁵ Diodorus claims that Ptolemy I incarcerated the king of Lapethos and the δυνάστης of Kerynia because he was suspicious. It is possible, however, that the city accepted Ptolemy I as new king in return of the autonomy of their political-administrative system. (Diod. 19.79.4-6; Chevanne, Yon 1978, 154).

⁹⁰⁶ Steele 2013, 189. This office lasted for one year. The change in duration of the priesthood from a longer tenure – probably for life – to an annual period in office is often attested during the Hellenistic period, when sometimes the priest became the eponym of the year; see *SEG XVIII.87*; *IG II² 2865*; Parker 1996, 127.

This may be confirmed by the title appointed at the end of the genealogy of Yatonbaal, PRKRML. Van den Branden suggested to read it as PR KRML and to translate it as ‘fruit of the mountain Karmel’;⁹⁰⁷ it might indicate the place of origin of Yatonbaal’s family. The same ‘ethnic’ is repeated after the name of Gerashtart, father of Abdashtart and chief of the land;⁹⁰⁸ this confirms that Yatonbaal and Abdashtart were members of the same family and in all likelihood brothers. This leads to the conclusion that if these two inscriptions concerned the same family – probably mixed between local inhabitants of Greek or Anatolian origins and Canaanite from KRML – PRM would be the brother of Abdosir, the great great-uncle of both Yatonbaal and Abdashtart.

It may also be concluded that PRM’s descendants continued to hold the most prestigious offices in the village, at least in the early Hellenistic period. Conceivably, PRM’s powerful family in Narnaka – and more generally, the elites of Lapethos – tried to maintain their authority even after that the last king of this city-state, Praxippos, was dethroned, and apparently imprisoned, by Ptolemy I Soter.⁹⁰⁹ Although a new government, ‘more republican’, developed in this city-state, the members of the elite to which PRM’s family belonged continued to be employed in the city’s administration.⁹¹⁰ The introduction of a new local calendar – which starts from the beginning of the reign of Ptolemy I, in 307/6 BC, since the text attests that the eleventh year of reign of Ptolemy II, 274 BC, corresponded to the 33rd year for the people of Lapethos – was not enough change to reshape the political structure of the city-state.

All in all, Cypriot officials who played both religious and civil roles are attested in Cyprus in the late classical period in Paphos and in Lapethos. The study of their offices has allowed us to better understand that the administration of these Cypriot city-states was subdivided between centre and periphery, with a complex system of officials and subordinates. These officials may have been employed in the central government, as in the case of Satrapas, the *archos opilukeuōn* who probably performed similar tasks to that of the polemarch in

⁹⁰⁷ Van den Branden 1964, 245-161.

⁹⁰⁸ The text (ll. 5-6) reads: ‘... ‘BD‘ŠTRT BN GR‘ŠTRT RB ’RŠ PR KRML...’, ‘Abdashtart son Gerashtart, chief of the land, from Karmel’, according to Van den Branden’s edition (1964, 246).

⁹⁰⁹ Diod. 19.79.4-6.

⁹¹⁰ The same probably happened in Amathus (see Consani 1988, 56-57) where a local, more ‘republican’, government succeeded Androcles’ kingship.

Athens, who operated in the Athenian *epilykeion* and dealt with specific court trials during the fourth century BC. He was in charge of his subordinates, the *ἐπίλυκοι*, whose political and administrative duties were related to the military training of the youths; their religious roles appear to be especially connected with the cult of Apollo.

Other officials were employed in the periphery of the city-states. The territory of the city-kingdoms was divided into districts, called ŠDM in the Phoenician texts, ruled by local governors instructed by the central administration. In Paphos, *κόμαρχοι* may have been in charge of ruling over peripheral villages; in the territory of Hellenika, one of them, Orosias, was also the priest of the *wanassa*. In Lapethos, the governor of these districts – which always had a secondary small town as capital – was the ‘ḤṢWY [‘] ’ŠLLPŠ BŠD’ ‘the commander who is in charge of Lapethos in the region of ...’ probably translated as *δυνάστης* in the Greek sources. He held also the prestigious priestly office of MQM ’LM, awakener of the gods. These offices were not hereditary but held by members of the same upper-class family close to the sovereign.

Although the Cypriot city-states Hellenised more and more during the fourth century BC – for instance, in Paphos, the office of the *ἐπίλυκοι* was established probably on the model of an Athenian magistracy – their administration still showed features that mirrored a local structure of government, with officials presiding over peripheral areas. This system was long-lasting, and its legacies appear even in the early years of the Ptolemaic domination. This makes the political and administrative systems of the classical city-states hybrid and uniquely Cypriot.

CONCLUSION

The *Kypriōn Politeia* regained

ii.1 The consistency of the Cypriot administrative system

The analysis of the case studies presented in this dissertation provides a clearer view of the political-administrative system of the Cypriot city-states during the classical period. But are these data enough to reconstruct the famous *Kypriōn politeia* – mentioned in the *Introduction* – which raised the interest of Greek authors? Although gaps still have to be filled – in this regard the latest archaeological excavations are very promising – new key elements emerged. The analysis has shown that the Cypriot city-states shared a similar basic political, administrative and economic system. This may be the reason why Greek sources refer to a general Cypriot *politeia*, a unique form of government broadly applied to all the polities. On a macro-level, the administrative systems were common to all the city-kingdoms, while the political structure showed more significant differences.

According to the data obtained from the case studies' analysis, the common administrative structure regulated collection and processing of raw materials and agricultural products coming from the territories of the city-states. As archaeological reports suggest, Cypriot polities based their economy on the exploitation and trade of these resources – among them principally copper but also wood, purple, olive oil, wine.⁹¹¹ This means that their survival depended on the efficient management of peripheral zones as well as of the central palaces where these resources were processed, and on the presence of an efficient port for trade, as shown in the previous chapter.⁹¹² Thus, we may assume that since their first development, the city-kingdoms had a complex administrative structure which controlled centre and periphery. This may be proved by the presence of administrative buildings with storage rooms not only in the capital but also in peri-urban and extra-urban areas – such as the Vouni palace, the Amathus silo and the Salamis rampart.⁹¹³

⁹¹¹ Kassianidou 2016, 71-88; Kassianidou 2013, 48-82; Iacovou 2013c, 275-291; Iacovou 2013, 15-47; Iacovou 2019, 204-234.

⁹¹² Iacovou 2013c, 275-291.

⁹¹³ See chapter 5; Fourrier 2018, 143-144; Hermary 2013, 83-101; Iacovou 2019, 210.

The capitals of the city-states were the centres of this administrative system and the headquarters of the main institutions: the ‘house of the king’, the palace where the king lived called *o-i-ko-se pa-si-le-wo-se* in the Idalion tablet and BT in Phoenician documents; the temple of the poliad divinity; and administrative buildings with rooms for storage and processing of materials.⁹¹⁴ Products from territories owned by the sovereign filled the king’s personal treasury. The king could also donate part of his territories to members of the upper class, to skilled workers in recognition of specific performance – as in the case of the physician Onesilos mentioned in the Idalion tablet – or to influential political figures such as Conon and Nicophemus who received donations from Evagoras I in Salamis.⁹¹⁵ The new land owners may have *pa-no-ni-o-ne*, full and hereditary property rights over the plot of lands exempt from any tax.

Taxes in kind were probably levied on lands and houses owned by private citizens.⁹¹⁶ After a monetary economy was introduced in the sixth century BC, some taxes were paid in silver coins.⁹¹⁷ Such taxes may have filled the city treasury, which was separate from the royal treasury and probably held in one of the main administrative buildings in the city-centre.

The designated use of the plots of land, their sizes, the owners and the owners of the bordering lands were recorded in a cadastre, as the Idalion tablet’s specific nomenclature suggests. The text presents the term *(t)o-i-ro-ni* (nominative **o-i-ro-ne*), ‘cadastral district’; this allows the assumption that the territory of this city-state was subdivided into districts.⁹¹⁸ For instance, the plot of land given to Onasilos was located in the district of Alampria. Cadastral documents were probably held in the same administrative buildings where there were archives and storage rooms. They were used to calculate the amount of taxes that citizens had to pay on their properties in accordance with size and use.

A similar territorial subdivision emerged also from a couple of Phoenician inscriptions from Lapethos. One of them, dated to the late classical

⁹¹⁴ Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Idalion n°1 1.2 = ICS 217 1. 2; Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, C1 1; Amadasi 2017, 275-284; Hadjicosti 2017, 257-274; Iacovou 2019, 210-213; Hermary 2013, 83-101.

⁹¹⁵ See chapter 2; Lys.19.

⁹¹⁶ See chapter 2.

⁹¹⁷ For instances see Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Idalion n°1 1.7; Egetmeyer 2010 vol. II, Pyla n°3 = ICS 306 = Yon 2004, n° 2510; the first Cypriot silver coins come from a deposit in the Persepolis foundation dated to the 6th century BC (Markou 2012, 88-91).

⁹¹⁸ See chapter 2.

period, attests to the presence of a governor of a specific district. His name was PRM, a member of the elite, who held the office of ḤṢWY [‘] ṢLLPŠ, the governor who ruled on behalf of Lapethos in the district of Narnaka.⁹¹⁹ The roles played by other officials in Kourion and Paphos may suggest that such territorial subdivision was common amongst the polities – as possibly was also the taxation system related to it. For instance, the Kourian *da-mo-te-ro-i* may have been in charge of ruling and administering the *dāmoi* into which the territory of this city-state was subdivided.⁹²⁰ The presence of a *kōmarchos* in Paphos – although more dubious – may suggest that each Paphos village had its own governor; in this case, Paphos’ territory may have been subdivided into *kōmai* rather than in *dāmoi*.⁹²¹

In Lapethos, a ‘chief of the land’, RB ṚS, is still attested in the third century BC, after the Cypriot kings had been overthrown.⁹²² This may suggest that such territorial subdivision was due to the practical necessity of administering the peripheries and their resources rather than to ensure the city-states’ political stability – to which, however, the local districts may have contributed since they also represented the central institutions in extra-urban areas. The necessity of administering Cypriot territories continued during the Ptolemaic domination and some of the previous administrative institutions – such as local land/territory’s officials in Lapethos and the presence of archives whose documents recorded accounts and expenses of the central administration as attested in Idalion – were still employed in the third century BC.⁹²³ The continuity of these institutions during the Hellenistic period, employed for practical reasons, may suggest that that they already existed before the classical period. Such an efficient system was one of the strengths that guaranteed the *longue durée* of the city-states.

The process of collecting, recording, and trading raw materials and products coming from peripheral districts was probably subdivided in two steps. Before reaching the city centre, these items were initially stored in local

⁹¹⁹ See chapter 6.

⁹²⁰ See chapter 1.

⁹²¹ See chapter 6.

⁹²² See chapter 6.

⁹²³ Amadasi, Zamora López 2016, 187-193.

buildings which held local archives – as shown by the content of the Bulwer tablet and, as anticipated above, by the presence of storage buildings in peri-urban and extra-urban areas.⁹²⁴ Some officials were in charge of checking this collection and redistribution; they were appointed for one month. Plausibly, all the incomings and outgoings to and from these buildings were recorded on tablets or *ostraka*. We may also suppose that not all these products were sent to the central headquarters but a few were locally employed for the maintenance of the building and of the bureaucratic apparatus attached to it.

Once raw materials and agricultural products reached the administrative centres in the capital, they were processed, stored, and eventually traded. Commercial agents, called SRSRM in the Phoenician record, may have been responsible for this last stage.⁹²⁵ Once again, scribes carefully recorded all the items involved in this process on receipts – mostly tablets and *ostraka* – which were stored in archives held in the administrative buildings. In order to record accounts and expenses, they applied a standard system which is attested in both Phoenician and Cypriot-syllabic Greek documents from different city-states, in particular Kition, Idalion and Paphos.⁹²⁶ Among these scribes, there were ‘calculators’ – one of them is mentioned in a Kition Phoenician document as HḤŠB – and also men in charge of keeping records of trials and of events concerning the city-kingdom such as the *διφθεράλοιφος* mentioned in an epitaph from Marion.⁹²⁷

The bureaucratic machinery of this administrative system was complex and hierarchical. Phoenician testimonies show that scribes and commercial agents who worked in the central palace were led by a ‘chief of scribes’, RB SPRM, and a ‘chief of commercial agents’, RB SRSRM.⁹²⁸ These offices were hereditary and held by members of the upper class. The chief of scribes, for instance, was not a mere secretary, but he probably also played a diplomatic role and might be sent off on missions on behalf of the central palace.

Among palatial employees, Kition accounts show the presence of gate keepers, officials, bakers, singers and barbers, whose salary was paid by the

⁹²⁴ See chapter 5.

⁹²⁵ See chapter 3.

⁹²⁶ See chapter 3.

⁹²⁷ See chapter 3.

⁹²⁸ See chapter 3.

central administration.⁹²⁹ Also, some Idalion *ostraka* attest to the presence of ‘king’s men’ involved in the functioning of the palace.⁹³⁰ In light of this, we may argue that a substantial amount of the funds of the king and of the city was spent on the maintenance of this bureaucratic apparatus, of administrative buildings which held archives, stores and workshops, of the king’s palace, and of specialised workers and other staff.

Conceivably, the central government also paid for the maintenance of the secret police employed by the rulers and the elites to monitor public opinion. Its members were called *Gerginoi* and *Promalanges*, ‘investigators’ according to Clearchus’ account and they were widespread in all the city-states.⁹³¹ Their roles may have been the same or similar to that of the ḪZ‘NM, ‘investigators’, mentioned in a Kition epitaph, who were led by a chief, the RB ḪZ‘NM.⁹³²

Finally, it is not surprising that the central government looked after the defence of the city-state. Kition, for instance, built a military harbour – Salamis probably did the same – where it employed Carian mercenaries, HKRSYM; they were used also in military campaigns against neighbouring polities.⁹³³ These mercenaries were permanently employed in the city-state and their maintenance was paid by the central administration along with those of all the other employees mentioned above.⁹³⁴ They had an interpreter, MLṢ HKRSYM, who conceivably also played a diplomatic role.

As anticipated earlier, this complex administrative system was crucial to the *longue durée* of the Cypriot city-states since it allowed the control and management of the resources of the island and consequently, the economic stability of the city-kingdoms.⁹³⁵ Since it was strictly connected to the management of the territories on which the survival of all the city-states relied, it probably developed along similar lines in all the centres, regardless of the language employed by the local government. Administrative *ostraka* from Kition, Idalion and Paphos which show the same layout and accounting system

⁹²⁹ Yon 2004, n°1078 = Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, C1.

⁹³⁰ See chapter 3.

⁹³¹ See chapter 1.

⁹³² See chapter 3.

⁹³³ See chapter 4.

⁹³⁴ Amadasi 2015, 343 n° KEF 600 = Yon 2004, n°1151; for the Salamis harbour see Balandier 2019, 289-312.

⁹³⁵ Iacovou 2019, 204-234; Iacovou 2013, 15-47; Iacovou 2013c, 275-291.

although written in different languages prove this.⁹³⁶ When the city-states became part of the Neo-Assyrian Empire, this administrative system must have been already well-established. Cypriot sovereigns spontaneously submitted to the Assyrians probably because being members of the Assyrian trade network was particularly convenient for the development of the Cypriot economy on an international scale.⁹³⁷ Facing international trade and exchanges without a well-established and organised internal administrative system would have been too disadvantageous for the city-states. By contrast, a good management of their internal economy allowed them to better face the impact with the international market. In turn, this contributed to the consolidation of their borders and hegemony on the peripheral territories by stimulating a trade mostly based on the exploitation of territorial resources.⁹³⁸

But was this administrative system, which already existed in the archaic period, an innovation of the Early Iron Age or rather a legacy from a system already used during the Late Bronze Age? The Iron Age Cypriot polities started to develop in the 12th century BC but the process was not simultaneous for all the cities.⁹³⁹ For example, at this early stage Kition and Paphos, previously simply coastal *emporía*, took over new territories and their agricultural and metal resources acquiring a significant economic and geopolitical strength.⁹⁴⁰ This allowed them to invest in the construction of new monumental buildings such as megalithic *temenoi*, which became the physical manifestation of the acquisition of new power.⁹⁴¹ This evolution may have triggered the development of more complex forms of administration, and this was very likely the basis of the administrative system that emerges from the classical sources. But this new system may not have been totally designed from scratch.

Scholars have stressed the importance of cultural bridges between Bronze Age and Iron Age Cyprus. For instance, some of the few Cypriot polities

⁹³⁶ See chapter 3.

⁹³⁷ Cannavò 2015f; Cannavò 2018b, 240-264.

⁹³⁸ Cannavò 2015f; This resulted into the proliferation of extra-urban sanctuaries and into the development of a 'warrior base material culture'; Fourrier 2013, 103-122; Petit 1991-1992, 5-17.

⁹³⁹ Iacovou 2014c, 663-665.

⁹⁴⁰ Iacovou 2014b, 798-800.

⁹⁴¹ Iacovou 2020, 247-265.

which survived to the Late Bronze crisis – Enkomi/Salamis, Kition and Paphos – developed into the most important archaic and classical city-states. During the beginning of the Iron Age, they continued to process resources of the Cypriot territory and to export the final products, in particular copper. This economic aspect is one of the most significant elements of continuity between the Bronze Age and Iron Age Cyprus.⁹⁴²

Once Greeks immigrated to the island as skilled workers, who contributed to the development of new economic enterprises, they mixed with the local population and employed the local syllabic writing system to write in their own language. This is another striking element of continuity between late Bronze Age and Iron age.⁹⁴³ Along with this scribal practice, it is also plausible that the surviving polities developed an administrative recording system similar to that employed by the major centres of Late Bronze Cyprus. In Enkomi, for example, an archive, or perhaps several archives, of clay tablets was found, which, although written in Cypro-Minoan and not deciphered yet, may be related to the production of copper and to the workshops where it was processed. These workshops were in close proximity to the administrative buildings where the archive was held.⁹⁴⁴ Perhaps these documents also recorded all the phases of collecting, processing, and trading copper, in a manner similar to the Iron Age *ostraka* and tablets. Therefore, we cannot exclude *a priori* that an administrative system linked to the resources of the Cypriot territory and already employed in the late Bronze Age was at the basis of the complex administration of the classical polities, although so far the evidence is not enough to determine it.

Since this system was strictly connected to the economy of the island, it was, on the one hand, unique and peculiar to Cyprus. On the other hand, the presence of a centralised bureaucratic apparatus has many parallels in Near-Eastern palatial systems. Similar employees and members of the court are attested in documents from Ugarit, a city with which Enkomi had close contacts during the Bronze Age – Franklin suggested many parallels, although some are

⁹⁴² Iacovou 2014c, 663-667; Iacovou 2014b, 798-800; Snodgrass 1994, 167-173.

⁹⁴³ Iacovou 2014b, 798; Iacovou 2008, 625-657; Egetmeyer 2013, 107-131.

⁹⁴⁴ Ferrara 2012, *passim*; Steele 2013b, 9-97.

rather adventurous. These employees – among them the ‘kings’ men’ – received donations from the sovereign in exchange for their work.⁹⁴⁵ Of a similar kind may have been Iron Age Levantine administrative systems for which, however, little information is available – the following pages will shed some lights on this.⁹⁴⁶

We may conclude that, in Cyprus, although some continuity between the administrative system employed during the Late Bronze Age and that of the Iron Age is plausible, it is difficult to demonstrate through the available data. But we may state with certainty that the Iron Age administrative system was a consistent and lasting one; its tracks are still evident in third century BC documents, several decades after the end of the independence of the city-states.

ii.2 The development of the classical Cypriot political system between Achaemenid and Greek influences

The Cypriot political system, in contrast to the administrative one, seems to have undergone more change. Some elements however seem constant: for instance, in classical Cypriot-syllabic texts, the presence of kings and an elite called *wanaktes* whose social status was far above common citizens.⁹⁴⁷

The overlapping of political and religious powers contributed to the long life of Cypriot kingship. Cypriot kings were the highest political authority in the city-states but also the highest priests. This contributed to entrenching their power more strongly. Sanctuaries represented the religious authority of the king and extra-urban cults connected, at least ideologically, centres and peripheries of the city-states. Inevitably, such overlapping also affected the administrative system. Kitian accounts and the *ostraka* found in the Idalion palace show that the central administration paid for the maintenance of temples and local cults as well as for religious festivities such as the *marzeah*.⁹⁴⁸ For example, Kitian accounts show that the government paid for architects who worked in the temple of Astarte and for artisans who worked in the temple of MKL.⁹⁴⁹ We may argue

⁹⁴⁵ Knapp 2008, 318-323; Voskos, Knapp 2008, 665-667; Franklin 2016, 113-115; for example, see *RS* 15.82.

⁹⁴⁶ Elayi 1987, *passim* and 89; Quinn 2018, 201-204.

⁹⁴⁷ See chapter 1.

⁹⁴⁸ See chapter 1.

⁹⁴⁹ Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, C1 ll. A4; ll. B5 = Yon 2004, n° 1078 ll. A4; ll. B5.

that some of the taxes collected in the administrative buildings were probably employed for the maintenance of local cults too.

The overlapping of political and religious roles was not exclusively the prerogative of Cypriot sovereigns. Inscriptions from Lapethos and Paphos show that administrative officials and magistrates held important religious offices. In Lapethos, PRM, governor of Narnaka was also MLQ 'LM, 'the awakener of the dead god', a religious office not attested before the fourth century BC.⁹⁵⁰ In Paphos, the *kōmarchos* Orosias was also the priest of the *wanassa*.⁹⁵¹ Finally, in Paphos and later in Kourion – whose independence in the late classical period is still under discussion – an *archos tōn epilukōn* is attested in inscriptions dated to the end of the fourth century BC. He was a member of the upper class whose magistracy was probably similar to that of the Athenian *polemarchos*. This *archos* was in charge of the *epilukoi*, whose political administrative duties were related to the military training of the youths; their religious role was connected with the cult of Apollo and with oracular sanctuaries. We may conclude that political and religious roles could overlap at several levels in the Cypriot city-states.⁹⁵²

Also, the analysis of these magistracies shows that some offices were peculiar to certain city-states and not widespread on the island, and, remarkably, that some developed during the fourth century BC. The case of the *archos tōn epilukōn* in Paphos – a magistracy introduced during or slightly before Nicocles' reforms – and of his subordinates provides an example. The development of these new offices may prove that the city-states' political system changed more significantly and that this depended on the international political scene with which Cypriot sovereigns had to deal. The introduction of this *archos*, for instance, was probably an attempt to imitate a Greek political institution as an assertion of independence from Achaemenid rule. But were there other, more significant, political changes in the classical period? Might the presence of 'republican' institutions, as shown in the first chapter, and the appearance of the *polis* in the epigraphic record, be a product of recent changes?

⁹⁵⁰ See chapter 6.

⁹⁵¹ See chapter 6.

⁹⁵² See chapter 6.

An answer may be found in the Idalion bronze tablet. Its text states that both the king and the *polis* had decisional power and that both agreed to allocate part of the king's land to the physician Onasilos. This has allowed the supposition that perhaps, when the Bronze tablet was written, the Idalians were represented by an assembly which took decisions on behalf of the population.⁹⁵³ But was it a council or an assembly of representatives of a wider elite, presided by one or more officials, perhaps by the eponymous magistrate mentioned at the beginning of the text? When did it develop? Was it unique to Idalion or did it also occur in other Cypriot city-states? Although documents do not provide any specific information in these regards, other Cypriot magistracies might suggest the existence of assemblies or similar bodies also in other city-kingdoms.

In Kition, an epitaph dated to the fourth century BC attests to the presence of a *suffet*.⁹⁵⁴ The deceased is a woman called 'THD, daughter of 'BD'ŠMN the *suffet*, wife of GRMLQRT, son of BNHDŠ son of GRMLQRT son of 'SMN'ZR.⁹⁵⁵ According to Amadasi's onomastic analysis, GRMLQRT may be the name of a representative of the Kition upper class along with 'BD'ŠMN, the only *suffet* attested on the island until now.⁹⁵⁶ It is rather an unusual text since only other two Phoenician inscriptions mention this office, one from Tyre (which shows that the office could be hereditary) and the other from Piraeus, both dated to the third century BC.⁹⁵⁷ By contrast, several Punic and Neo-Punic inscriptions show a substantial presence of *suffetim* from the end of the fourth century BC onwards.⁹⁵⁸

Literary texts show that the position of *suffet* was a common magistracy in Canaanite polities where the *suffet* held a judicial office, but might also

⁹⁵³ Kröner 2017, 217-243.

⁹⁵⁴ Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 76-78 B31= Yon 2004, n° 1061. The epitaph is a marble stele, reused as lintel in the central arc of the nartex of St. Antony's church in Kellia, a village close to Larnaca (Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 76). It consists of five lines and it is currently held in the Larnaca museum.

⁹⁵⁵ The original text was: '1.[L'TH]D BT 'BD'Š 2.[MN H]SPT 'ŠT GR 3.[ML]QRT BN BNHD 4.[Š B]N GRMLQRT B 5.[N ']'ŠMN'ZR, 'To 'THD daughter of 'BD'ŠMN the *suffet*, wife of GRMLQRT, son of BNHDŠ son of GRMLQRT son of 'SMN'ZR'. 'THD is a hapax in the feminine Phoenician anthroponomastic; its reading is however uncertain. See Amadasi Karageorghis 1977, 78;

⁹⁵⁶ Amadasi, Karageorghis 1977, 76; Steele 2013, 215; Steele 2018, 192.

⁹⁵⁷ CIS 118 = KAI 58 = Magnanini 1974, 137 n° 4; Manfredi 2003, 341-342; Lipinski 2004, 170. The inscription from Tyre mentions four generations of *suffetim* – from which we may assume that the office was hereditary. See Magnanini 1974, 25 n°2; the inscription concerns the dedication of a cistern.

⁹⁵⁸ Manfredi 2003, 383-385.

become a leader and ruler of his community.⁹⁵⁹ A passage of Flavius Josephus' *Contra Apionem* shows the presence of five *dikastai*, interpreted as *suffetim*, who succeeded the king Baal in Tyre after the siege of Nabuchodonosor II, 585-583 BC.⁹⁶⁰ The first three held the office for only a number of months, and the final two held the position jointly for six years. Their appointment was a consequence of the Babylonian military intervention which interrupted the line of succession of the local sovereigns.⁹⁶¹ Thus, if necessary, the *suffetim* could replace the *melek*.

But the Kition *suffet* probably held a slightly different role during the fourth century BC. According to Rozenberg and Manfredi, the *suffetim*'s roles evolved from a generic office of judges which generally belonged to kings and rulers of whom they could eventually be substitutes – as shown by the passage of Josephus above – to specific public magistrates.⁹⁶² This is evident in the East Mediterranean as well as in the Punic world, where the *suffetim* became the annual eponymous magistrates as several inscriptions demonstrate.⁹⁶³ In a bilingual Greek-Phoenician document from Thurbunica dated to the second-first century BC, the term *suffet* has been translated into Greek with the noun *archōn*.⁹⁶⁴ This proves that the two titles could overlap, perhaps because they were both annual offices.⁹⁶⁵ This may suggest a link between the *suffet* and the eponymous magistrates of Idalion and Akanthou who held an office similar to the Greek eponymous archon and were all appointed for one year. The *suffet* may also have played a juridical role similar to those of the eponymous archon in Athens, who presided over criminal and civil trials.⁹⁶⁶ The Carthaginian

⁹⁵⁹ Rozenberg 1975, 77-86.

⁹⁶⁰ Joseph. *Ap.* 1.21.154; on the Greek translation of the term *suffetim* see Manfredi 2003, 381; Sznycer 1978, 569-570; the siege of Nabuchodonosor ended with the capitulation of Tyre (Mason, Barclay 2006, 89) when Ethobaal, king of Tyre was dethroned (Katzenstein 1973, 325-330). According to Labow (2005, 155 n°177) the siege happened between 598-583 BC; see also Herm 1975, 153.

⁹⁶¹ The presence of these *suffetim* allows some scholars to affirm that in this period, Tyre was a 'republic' headed by elective magistrates (Stockwell 2010, 128).

⁹⁶² Manfredi 2003, 341; Rozenberg 1975, 76-86; see also Krahmalkov 2000, 477.

⁹⁶³ For an instance, see *IPT* 31 from Leptis Magna; Wilson 2012, 274; *KAI* 77.1/4; *KAI* 159.5/6.

⁹⁶⁴ Manfredi 2003, 381 with bibliography; see also *DCPP* s. *suffet*.

⁹⁶⁵ As Manfredi pointed out, several scholars tried to define whether the *suffet* corresponded to a precise Greek or Latin office but without reaching a precise conclusion. (Manfredi 2003, 381). Sznycer claimed that the *suffet* was such a Semitic office that Greeks and Romans used the most convenient word to translate it according to the circumstance. Sznycer 1978, 569-571; Elayi 1987, 37; Bondi 1990, 259; Manfredi 2003, 342.

⁹⁶⁶ Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 56.6.

suffetim held office for one year; there were two of them and they jointly held the highest office in the city-state presiding over the elders' council, as highlighted by Aristotle's *Politics*.⁹⁶⁷ They were members of rich families, part of the local elites, among whom they were elected.⁹⁶⁸ Considering all these data, we may suppose that also the Kition *suffet* was a member of the upper class, appointed for one year, who may have presided over trials, elders' councils and perhaps over an assembly.

According to Manfredi, the evolution of the roles of HŠPTM goes along with that of 'M, 'the people', in Phoenician and Punic inscriptions, when 'M started acting as assembly or at least as a deliberative body and not simply 'people'.⁹⁶⁹ Such an evolution is not surprising since the presence of assemblies and councils is long-standing in the Near East. It is worth to mention again the passage of the Assyrian Annals which concerns the agreement between Esarhaddon and Baal of Tyre: the elders, probably gathered in a council, and the king were both parties to the agreement.⁹⁷⁰ Probably kings never deliberated alone. In Neo-Babylonian cities, a popular assembly, constituted by common citizens, gathered when the council of elders was not able to make a decision; this assembly was a parallel deliberative institution.⁹⁷¹ Manfredi argues that in the Levantine city-states the popular assembly, 'M, may have played a similar role.⁹⁷²

In some parts of the Mediterranean, *suffetim* were part of the popular assembly 'M. A clear instance comes from the West Punic world in the form of an inscription from Cagliari dated to the third century BC. According to

⁹⁶⁷ Aristot. *Pol.* 2.11, 1272 b-1273a; Diod. 25.16; Radice, Gargiulo, Sounders 2014, 177 and 411-413; Weil 1960, 116-121. Aristotle calls the Carthaginian *suffetim* βασιλεῖς; see also Lockwood 2019, 1-35.

⁹⁶⁸ Diod. 25.16, Liv. 30.7.5.

⁹⁶⁹ Manfredi 2003, 379; Fantar 1993, 229-293; Manfredi 2003, 386-390 with a table with the occurrences of 'M.

⁹⁷⁰ Elayi 1987, 40. The reading of *mil (?) ki* as a council is however controversial.

⁹⁷¹ Moreover, the Wen-Amón papyrus shows that in the Phoenician city-states, assemblies existed since 1100 BC, if we accept Wilson's reading, though we do not know whether these assemblies had an effective deliberative power (Wilson 1945, 295 who translated the word *md-dwt* as assembly, comparing this hapax with the Hebrew 'moed', assembly); Sass 2002, 247-255; Zaccagnini 2003, 132; Albright 1951, 223-231. On the Phoenician assemblies in the Hellenistic period see Teixidor 1980, 454-464; Manfredi 2003, 355; on the presence of Jewish assemblies under the Achaemenid rule see the following pages and Dion 1991, 281-287; it is also worth to mention the Babylonian assembly attested in the Borsippa texts, called *puhur ummāni* in A 924, 1-5 (Moorey 1975, 70).

⁹⁷² Manfredi 2003, 354-355.

Manfredi, those *suffetim* were elected by the ‘M to which they belonged.’⁹⁷³ But when did the term ‘M start to designate not just ‘the people’ but an assembly of the people which perhaps may elect its representatives?’⁹⁷⁴ A fifth-century inscription from Byblos may help to better understand when the transition took place.⁹⁷⁵ It is a dedication written by the *melek* Yehawmilik, whose reign is usually dated about 450 BC, to the Lady of Byblos. The text describes the temple and the objects dedicated to the divinity by the king. Lines 10-11 bear a sentence governed by the verb TTN, ‘he gave’, followed by the sequence ḤN L’N ’LNM WL’N ‘M ’RṢ Z ḤN M ’RṢ. The last part of this sequence ḤN M ’RṢ has been initially considered a diplography, a mere repetition of the scribe, since the same text appears a few words earlier.⁹⁷⁶ However, Elayi convincingly proposed to translate the first part of it, ḤN L’N ’LNM WL’N ‘M ’RṢ Z, as ‘in favour of the sight of the gods and of the people (population) of this land’ and the second part, ḤN M ’RṢ, as ‘in favour of the assembly of the people of this territory (the civic territory)’. According to her reading, this inscription seems to differentiate the ‘M ‘people’ from the ‘M ‘assembly of people’; if so, this document would be the *terminus ante quem* for the appearance of ‘M as assembly of people in the Phoenician texts and would stress the transition from one use of ‘M to the other.

According to both Elayi and Manfredi, the Phoenician city-states started to open up to more ‘republican’ institutions beyond the king mostly in the classical period.⁹⁷⁷ To further prove this, Elayi also mentions a change in the

⁹⁷³ Manfredi 2003, 342; Manfredi 1997, 3-14; Garbini 1997, 112-113 and n° 288; Fantar *et al.* 1969, Antas II; The inscription was found in the temple of Antas in Sardinia. It bears the text ‘HŠPT’ Š B ‘M K [RL]’, ‘the *suffet* who is in the ‘assembly’ of Karalis’.

⁹⁷⁴ The Phoenician inscription of Karatepe, dated to eighth century BC, already shows ‘M, but in that case it still indicates simply the population, ‘W‘M Z ‘YŠB’, ‘and the population who live there’; see Manfredi 2003, 354; Garbini 1981, 156-160. On the use of Phoenician language in Cilicia, see Yakubovich 2015, 35-55.

⁹⁷⁵ CIS I, 1 = KAI 10 = Magnanini 1973, 27-28, who however expunges the second ḤN M ’RṢ.

⁹⁷⁶ KAI 10; Elayi 1987, 42-43; for previous interpretations see Puech 1981, 158-162. On the iconography of the stele, now held in the Louvre, see Jigoulov 2015, 44-49; Gibson 1982, 96. On the influences of the Achaemenid administrative system on the structure of some Levantine governments of some city-states see Jigoulov 2015, 48-49; Dandamayev 1995, 29-31.

⁹⁷⁷ Elayi also analyses a decree where the Sidonians were considered a political entity (KAI 14; Elayi 1987, 42; Jigoulov 2015, 51-53), particularly advanced in term of ‘republican’ institutions (Elayi 2008, 97-122) and an inscription which mentions the chief of 100 men, RB M’T (Magnanini 1973, 26 n°4): these 100 men would be representatives of a council. (Elayi 1987, 51; Elayi 1990, 63-77). This interpretation has been accepted by Bondi (1995, 190-302) and may be corroborated by Diodorus’ account (16.45.1) which states that Tennes, king of Sidon, ‘marched out of the city going to a σύνοδος of Phoenicians and he took with him the most distinguished of the citizens, to the number of one hundred, in the role of advisers’. The 100

legend of the Byblos coins, which gained a more ‘republican’ aspect over the years. Some of them bear only ‘MG, interpreted as the population of Byblos, or ‘G, GL, simply Byblos, and they do not feature the term *melek* any longer as earlier coins did.⁹⁷⁸

The transition of ‘M from people to ‘M acting as deliberative body may have happened in Cyprus too. The term ‘M appears in the famous trophy of Milkyaton, already mentioned in chapter 4, dated to the beginning of the fourth century BC. Its text states that the whole population of Kition, WKL ‘M KTY, erected the monument along with the king. We may assume that the ‘M agrees to erect the trophy, perhaps after a consultation in an assembly. This would be another case in which the population of a Cypriot city-state took an active part in decisions which concerned the polity. The Idalion Bronze tablet provides the other striking example, as mentioned earlier. A convincing parallelism exists between the formula *pa-si-le-u-se-ka-se-a-po-to-li-se e-ta-li-e-we-se*, ‘the king and the city of the Idalians’ of the Bronze tablet and the formula of the Milkyaton’s trophy MLK KTY W’DYL ...WKL ‘M KTY, ‘the king of Kition and Idalion and the whole population of Kition’. In this instance, the term ‘M, ‘population’, ‘people’, is preceded by the adjective KL, ‘whole’. This might suggest that a distinction existed between a council of upper-class members and a popular assembly defined as KL ‘M. The formula ‘WKL ‘M KTY’ occurs several times in the inscription as the formula *pa-si-le-u-se-ka-se-a-po-to-li-se e-ta-li-e-we-se* does in the Bronze tablet. In the trophy, WKL ‘M KTY is mentioned in line 1, where the population of Kition agree to erect the trophy along with the king; in line 3, where the king affirms that the divinity protects him along with the population of Kition; and finally in line 4, where the text repeats that both the king and the whole population of Kition agree to erect the monument.⁹⁷⁹ Plausibly, the king did not just share his success with the

men mentioned in this passage, who gathered as counsellors, may have been the members of the same institution quoted in the inscription (Elayi 1987, 80-81). By contrast, Manfredi (2003, 354) Grelot (1972, 267-271), Petit (1990, 116) point out that M’T, 100, is usually employed in military contest to indicate a group of 100.

⁹⁷⁸ These coins are dated to the second half of the fourth century BC –about 332BC –and they were struck under the reign of ‘Aynel, cited as Ἐυνελος in the Greek sources, the last Giblete king; Elayi 1987, 44-47; Jigoulov 2015, 80. Idalion may show a similar system since in some of its coins, the name of the king does not appear but only the name of the city (Masson 1996, 37-40; Georgiadou 2010, 163).

⁹⁷⁹ Yon, Sznycer 1992, 156-165; Yon, Sznycer 1991, 791-923; Lorenzo 2015, 300-328; Lipinski 2004, 94-96.

inhabitants of Kition but the Kitians were actively involved in the decision to erect the trophy. This shows a striking parallelism between the political systems of Kition and that of Idalion when the city-state was still independent.⁹⁸⁰ Two Cypriot city-states, Idalion and Kition, thus shared a similar political system although they adopted different languages in their administration.

But why were more ‘republican’ institutions introduced during the classical period in the Levantine area and Cyprus? Elayi suggested that this phenomenon was due to the influence of the Greek *poleis*. She also claimed that, during the classical period, the Phoenician sovereigns were in an ‘uncomfortable’ position because they needed to deal with their traditional palatial economy and royal authority and, at the same time, with a limitation of their political power in the eyes of the local citizens.⁹⁸¹

It is indisputable that from the fifth century BC there was a cultural openness towards the Greek world in Levant and Cyprus – and as we shall see in the following pages, in the whole Achaemenid Empire.⁹⁸² Perhaps this process was facilitated in Cyprus by familiarity with the Greek language in all the city-kingdoms – as we demonstrated, the population was mixed – and by the elites’ claim of presumed or real Greek status.

Some scholars have argued that the presence of the *polis* in the epigraphic record was related to the second ‘Hellenization’ of the island, which increased after the Ionian revolt.⁹⁸³ According to Sznycer and Yon, for instance, the ‘republican’ tone of the text of Milkyaton’s trophy was due to the Greek character of the whole inscription – as shown in the previous chapter, the practice of erecting a trophy is itself a Greek habit.⁹⁸⁴ As said above, the

⁹⁸⁰ Yon and Sznycer assumed that this formula was a local version of the Greek expression ‘*δημος τῶν Κιτιέων*’, since the term *δημος* followed by the name of the city or of the inhabitants in genitive is frequently attested in Greek epigraphic texts. However, this formula never appears in Classical Cyprus, where the presence of *demos* as ‘people’ has been challenged – see chapter 1 (it appears however in the Athenian decree *IG II² 337*). Therefore, the parallel with the *polis* of Idalion seems more appropriate and convincing.

⁹⁸¹ Elayi 1997, 76.

⁹⁸² This has led Elayi to claim that a sort of ‘Hellenization’ of the Levantine city-states’ bodies – which increased from the fourth century BC and heavily after the Alexander’s arrival – occurred as well as in other western locations of the Empire (Elayi 1997, 63-77, particularly 72); see also Manfredi 2003, 349; Collombier 1991, 27; Petit 1990, 92-93. Bonnet, by contrast, rejects the definition of Levantine city-states as Greek *poleis* (Bonnet, Baurain 1992, 151).

⁹⁸³ Iacovou 2014, 111; Papantoniou 2011, 36-43; Michaelidis, Papantoniou 2018, 267-290.

⁹⁸⁴ Yon, Sznycer 1992, 156-165; Yon, Sznycer 1991, 791-923.

introduction of the magistracy of the *archon tōn epilúkōn* also was a product of this Hellenization process.

However, an equally valid reason why more ‘republican’ institutions developed during the classical period may exist. Manfredi – and Elayi in later works too – claims that the principal cause of the development of more ‘republican’ bodies in the Phoenician city-states was the reform of the Achaemenid administration.⁹⁸⁵ At the beginning of the fifth century BC, the administrative system of Achaemenid peripheral territories was completely restructured in order to reorganise the collection of taxes. According to Manfredi, this Achaemenid reform would have reinforced the power of local areas under the umbrella of the Empire and of their inhabitants through whom the Persians controlled the *phoros* collection. She also claimed that, at a later time, a new consolidation phase of the developed ‘republican’ institutions was established thanks to Alexander’s arrival and the consequent deeper Hellenization of institutions.⁹⁸⁶

Undeniably, the Achaemenid administration caused a significant change in the political and administrative framework of both the centre and the periphery of the Empire, as Near-Eastern and Greek literary sources testify. Greek authors mention Darius as the greatest Achaemenid reformer. Herodotus states that he was the first Great King who imposed a fixed tribute; he defined him negatively as a *kapēlos*, shopkeeper.⁹⁸⁷ According to Herodotus, Darius, in order to better collect taxes, subdivided the Empire into 20 satrapies.⁹⁸⁸ Polyaeus states that Darius introduced the taxation and asked for a huge amount of money from his subjects but, in order to limit his unpopularity, returned half of it to the population.⁹⁸⁹ Finally, Plutarch claims that Darius asked the subjects to pay only for half of the amount of taxes established earlier in order to gain popularity.⁹⁹⁰ Although Greek sources are historically not entirely

⁹⁸⁵ Manfredi 2003, 350; Elayi 1987, 37; Elayi 1997, 63-77; on the relationship between the Persians and their subjects see Kuhrt 2001, 165-174.

⁹⁸⁶ Elayi 1997, 63-77, Manfredi 2003, 350-353; changes due to Darius’ administrative reforms are also evident in first-hand evidence from Babylonia – and not only in Greek sources – where a new terminology for new taxes was introduced (see Kebler 2015, Stolper 2006)

⁹⁸⁷ Hdt. 3.89; Kleber 2015; Briant 2002, 70.

⁹⁸⁸ Hdt. 3.80-95. On the taxation under the Achaemenid Empire see Kleber 2015; Asheri, Medaglia Frascchetti 1990, 307-309.

⁹⁸⁹ Polyaeus. 7.11.3.

⁹⁹⁰ Plut. *Mor.* 172f.

reliable and partially inconsistent, it is clear that they testify to an important change.

According to recent studies by Kleber, the documents found in the Persepolis archive also reflect such a change.⁹⁹¹ Because of Darius' reform, all the private lands and urban properties, including those of the centre of the Empire, became part of a tax scheme. This triggered the rebellion of the local Babylonian elite, harassed by taxes, in 484 BC.⁹⁹² The suppression of the revolt was accompanied by the introduction of a purely imperial administration, as the tablets show, at the expense of the previous central municipalities governed by the elite. We might assume that, in order to quell similar riots in peripheral areas and to balance local power, Achaemenids may have looked favourably at the development of more 'republican' institutions, at the expense of local sovereigns.

This is even more plausible if we look, once again, at Herodotus' account. A famous controversial passage of his work states that the Persian general Mardonius dismissed the tyrants in Ionia and introduced there 'democracy' after the Ionian revolt, in 492 BC, 'τοὺς γὰρ τυράννους τῶν Ἰόνων καταπαύσας πάντας ὁ Μαρδόνιος δημοκρατίας κατίστα ἐς τὰς πόλιας', 'Mardonius deposed all the Ionian tyrants and set up democracies in the cities'. However, Herodotus does not specify in what the new 'democracies', δημοκρατίας, consist of.⁹⁹³

Since this statement is preceded by Herodotus' personal comment on the figure of Otanes – he claims that this event may be considered the proof that Otanes, member of the Persian court, declared that δημοκρατία would have been better for the Persian Empire –, most scholars consider the passage unreliable,⁹⁹⁴ but some consider it plausible.⁹⁹⁵ For instance, Scott suggests that Mardonius

⁹⁹¹ Kleber 2015.

⁹⁹² Waerzeggers 2004, 150-173.

⁹⁹³ Hdt. 6.43.3; see Nikolaidou-Arabatzi 2018, 237-28; Robinson 2011, 142-143; Scott 2005, 196-197; Nenci 1998, 210; Aristagoras of Miletus established the *isonomia* in order to gain popular favour before the Ionian revolt (Hdt. 5.37-38). The Achaemenids quelled the revolt and initially, they re-established the tyranny. Secondly, they seem to have dismissed it, according to Herodotus' account.

⁹⁹⁴ Hdt. 3.80.

⁹⁹⁵ Robinson 2011, 142. Among the first group of scholars, it is worth mentioning Briant (2002, 496-497), who however stated that the Persians did not have any ideological preference on the form of government of their subjects and therefore, they would not have opposed it; see also Rhodes 2000, 124-125; Austin 1990, 289-306. Among the scholars who considered Herodotus'

realised that the tyrants no longer had the support of the local population and so decided to dismiss them in favour of ‘democracies’.⁹⁹⁶

The analysis of some inscriptions from Teos – and from Abdera, its colony – may prove the reliability of the statement.⁹⁹⁷ Information comes from two famous imprecations that officials had to read aloud at three annual festivals.⁹⁹⁸ Elected monarchs, *aisumnētai*, are mentioned there negatively; by contrast, the current and future government is considered community-oriented and more stable. This allows the editors to suppose that the Teians were protecting a democracy in opposition to a previous tyranny.⁹⁹⁹ In light of this evidence, Herodotus’ statement does not seem such a long way from reality.

Although the tyrants of Asia Minor and the Cypriot and Phoenician kings are very different in historical and political terms, the development of more ‘republican’ institutions may have been particularly encouraged by the Achaemenid authority in all the city-states under the umbrella of the Empire.¹⁰⁰⁰ At the same time, the local population may have requested a greater representation precisely in light of the new taxes, the *phoros*, which the city-states had to pay to the Great King. This might have triggered the development of some representative bodies not only in Asia Minor, where the Achaemenids considered it appropriate to set up more ‘republican’ governments, but also in regions such as the Levant and Cyprus where royalty was a long-established institution.¹⁰⁰¹

The development of ‘republican’ bodies could also counterbalance the power of local kings, satraps or governments, thus ensuring a better stability throughout the territory. This was advantageous for the Achaemenids in order

statement as reliable see Graham 1992, 42-47; Luraghi 1998, 35-46; Scott 2005, 542-545; Robinson 2011, 141-180.

⁹⁹⁶ Scott 2005, 544-545.

⁹⁹⁷ In Thrace, Abdera was founded by Teians who escaped from Persians in 545 BC. However, Abderites decided to refound their mother city (see Pind. fr. 52b Sn.-M, 28-38; *SEG* XXXI.984; Robinson 2011, 140). Therefore, the political institutions are very similar so that some scholars speak of ‘*sympoliteia*’ between these two cities (Graham 1992, 42-47; Herrmann 1981, 1-30)

⁹⁹⁸ *SEG* XXXI.985; *ML* 30.

⁹⁹⁹ Robinson 2011, 140; Herrmann 1981, 24. Under the control of the Hekatomnid dynasty, which ruled on behalf of the Achaemenid Empire, inscriptions show the presence of βουλή καὶ δῆμος, the assembly and the people along with the sovereigns who acted as satraps. Likely, the Achaemenids looked favourably at this political system. (Gauthier 1990, 417-443; Robinson 2011, 159-162; e.g. Hornblower, 1982, 31-38; 112-114; *Syll.*³ 169 = Blümel 1985 1.1; *SEG* XXXVI.983 = Blümel 1985, 52.

¹⁰⁰⁰ Luraghi 1998, 35-44.

¹⁰⁰¹ Luraghi 1998, 37-38,

to counter separatist riots with which the Empire constantly had to deal.¹⁰⁰² Presumably because of this, the development of these ‘republican’ institutions – or their maintenance in case they were already well established in the areas before the Persian rule – was endorsed in both centre and periphery of the Empire.

As anticipated above, in the Babylonian city-states, free citizens *mār banî* – or in some specific cases, high rank officials *qīpu* – took part in local assemblies (*puhru*) which had juridical power over properties, criminal trials and private disputes.¹⁰⁰³ Along with assemblies of free citizens, the Achaemenid government allowed assemblies or councils of foreigners who settled in a sufficient number to create a community.¹⁰⁰⁴ In Babylon, documents attest to the presence of an assembly of Egyptian elders and of a council of Jewish elders who decided about internal issues of civil law.¹⁰⁰⁵ In the periphery of the Empire, ‘republican’ institutions developed not only in Asia Minor and Phoenicia but also in Judah; this became a theocratic state and was ruled by the assembly of the elders of the city (*ziqne 'ir*), by the judges (*suffetim*) and by the assembly of the citizens.¹⁰⁰⁶ Finally, as Dandamayev suggested, in Persia too important decisions were probably discussed in assemblies or councils.¹⁰⁰⁷ Herodotus testifies that when Cyrus II decided to rebel against Astyages king of Medes, he gathered in an assembly with the Persians to inform them of his decision.¹⁰⁰⁸

All in all, although the Achaemenid Empire consisted of a complex juridical system subdivided into central structure, satrapies and local governments, there was a common denominator: the presence of councils or assemblies throughout the territory. They contributed to the stability of the Empire and balanced the power of local governments. Therefore, the establishment of more ‘republican’ institutions in Cyprus may have followed a common pattern under the umbrella of the Empire.

¹⁰⁰² On some revolts in the Achaemenid Empire see Waters 2016, 93-102; Lee 2016, 103-121; Dusinberre 2016, 122-137.

¹⁰⁰³ Holtz 2014, 9; 170 and *passim*; Dandamayev 1981, 45-49.

¹⁰⁰⁴ Dandamayev 2012, 631-632.

¹⁰⁰⁵ Strassmaier 1890, n°85; Eph'al 1983, 106-112.

¹⁰⁰⁶ Weinberg 1992, 24-25; 63-65; 123; Pirenne 1954, 205-210.

¹⁰⁰⁷ Dandamayev 2012, 632.

¹⁰⁰⁸ Hdt. 1.125.

Furthermore, introduction of more ‘republican’ institutions was not entirely unfavourable to local kings and governors. From the fifth century BC, in the Levantine city-states, and probably in Cyprus too, the power of the sovereigns partially decreased in favour of the upper class.¹⁰⁰⁹ In Cyprus, striking evidence comes from the origins of the most famous kings on the island, Evagoras and Milkyaton, whose fathers were never kings, as inscriptions and literary sources testify. They were members of the upper class who competed for power.¹⁰¹⁰ Their non-hereditary powerbase might have prompted them not only to look for the support of members of the elite but of the population too – the establishment of new more ‘republican’ institution may have also helped the sovereign to win the favour of the people. The presence of a secret police confirms that Cypriot *basileis* were particularly concerned about the public opinion and we may assume that the police was ready to intervene in order to stamp out any sign of subversion. At the same time, the oath that Nicocles’ upper-class subject was forced to swear proves that the support of the elite members was equally important for the kings in difficult times.¹⁰¹¹

Both literary sources and epigraphic attestations provide information in regard of this political scenario. Isocrates states that palace conspiracies among members of the elites were an everyday occurrence – we might mention the Phoenician refugee who gained the throne at the expenses of a local Salaminian dynasty. In turn, this refugee, once he gained the power, was dethroned by one of the *δυνάσται* who ‘governed’ with him.¹⁰¹² Although Isocrates’ account is not totally reliable, it is plausible that influential courtiers existed, perhaps among those who appear in the description of the Kition court or in the *ostraka* of the Idalion archive such as the king’s men.¹⁰¹³

¹⁰⁰⁹ Stockwell 2010, 123-131; Elayi 1987, 70. Elayi 1997, 63-77; Manfredi 2003, 350; Jigoulov 2015, 120-131. The main difference between the Levantine and the Cypriot political system consists in the physical presence of Persian officials in the Phoenician city-states, particularly in Sidon, but not in Cyprus; see Wiesehöfer 2015, 103, Ruzicka 2012, 165-166; Elayi 2013, 288-289.

¹⁰¹⁰ Diod.16.42, 46; Arr. *An.* 2.20.6; Pinto 2009, 213-218; Jigoulov 2015, 84.

¹⁰¹¹ See chapter I.

¹⁰¹² Isocr. 9.26; Giuffrida 1996, 594; Vallozza 2005, 185-192; on the exile see Theop. *FGrHist.* 103 F 11 = Phot. *Bibl.* 176 a14; Diod. 14.98.

¹⁰¹³ Amadasi, Zamora López 2016, 187-193.

According to the information coming from this speech, the refugee's new 'dynasty' ruled for two generations, probably from 450 BC onwards, and Evagoras was born during the second of them (411 BC).¹⁰¹⁴ It is not by chance that the date of the arrival of the refugee almost coincides with the date of the Idalion bronze tablet, the oldest Cypriot document where the *polis* appears and becomes agreement contractor along with the king in decisions concerning the city-state. In those years, political clashes amongst upper-class factions, which mined the stability of the kingship, may have been already common.

Literary sources also provide other instances of the instability of the Cypriot kingship.¹⁰¹⁵ Diodorus, for example, tells the story of Evagoras II, probably the son of Nicocles, son of Evagoras I, or perhaps his brother, who, along with the Athenian Phocion, was sent in 351 BC by Artaxerxes in charge of Carian military soldiers and triremes to quell a revolt. The kings of the Cypriot city-states at this time rebelled from Persian domination in the wake of a revolt in Phoenicia.¹⁰¹⁶ Evagoras II is described as a former king of Cyprus, 'τὸν ἐν τοῖς ἐπάνω χρόνοις βασιλευκότα κατὰ τὴν νῆσον, 'who previously was a king on the island'. This statement allows the conclusion that Evagoras II was dethroned perhaps by a coup d'état and replaced by Pnytagoras, his successor and nephew; this last king may have risen to power thanks to the support of both the population and the upper class.¹⁰¹⁷

All this leads to the conclusion that although the introduction of more 'republican' institutions in Cyprus from the fifth century BC onwards was probably encouraged by the Achaemenid policy – and the population itself may have requested a bigger representation in light of the new taxes recently introduced – these new institutions were also well accepted by local sovereigns in order to increase the power-sharing among competitive elitarian groups, to limit the riots and to make their kingship more stable.

¹⁰¹⁴ Giuffrida 1996, 593.

¹⁰¹⁵ See Aristotle (*Pol.* 5, 1311b) on the ruin of the monarchies: 'sometimes it also happens for personal revenge. This is the case of the eunuchs who killed Evagoras I, because his son has seduced the eunuchs' wife'.

¹⁰¹⁶ Diod. 16.42. Stronk 2017, 260; Maier 1994, 239-230; Elayi 1990, 141; Wiesehöfer 2015, 93-111; Ruzicka 2012, 164-176; Lipinski 2004, 42; on Pnytagoras, see Körner 2019, 335.

¹⁰¹⁷ Körner 2019, 335.

This Cypriot political system, which developed during the classical period with magistracies and more ‘republican’ bodies beyond the kings, was described in the *Kypriōn politeia* probably along with the roles played by officials employed in the bureaucratic-administrative machinery. But a few years after the international interest in Cypriot kingship increased, Cypriot kings were in a more uncomfortable position than ever. In order to hold fast their authority, they needed the support of the elite whose power seemed to be constantly increasing and the support of the population too.

This scenario was the result of years of political instability. During the classical period, Cypriot kings were constantly divided between the necessity to appear Greek in order to make their city-kingdoms international powers and the urgency to keep their local authority and cultural roots strong to preserve their independence.

When the city-states became part of the Achaemenid Empire, they decided to submit voluntarily to Cambyses and to pay tribute to the Persians.¹⁰¹⁸ Plausibly, the reason was the shifting of power in the east of Mediterranean – thanks to Cambyses’ conquests, Persia became the first naval power in the area.¹⁰¹⁹ For the Cypriots, trading by sea was essential;¹⁰²⁰ thus, becoming part of the Achaemenid commercial network, and not being hindered by it, was the most convenient option. However, the city-states tried to maintain a degree of independence from the Empire.¹⁰²¹

At the beginning of the classical period, Cyprus – some of the Cypriot polities such as Marion and Salamis more than others – started to increase contacts and trade with Greece and Athens.¹⁰²² This resulted into a strong economic development towards West which helped them to take a step back from the Achaemenid Empire.¹⁰²³ This also triggered a process of Hellenization. Although Greek culture impacted at different levels on the Achaemenid empire – for instance the Achaemenid government employed Greeks as specialised

¹⁰¹⁸ Hdt. 3.19.3; according to Xenophon (*Cyr.* 1.1.4) however Cyprus became part of the Empire already under Cyrus the great. But this statement has been rejected by most scholars (Watkin 1987, 154-163; Tuplin 1996, 16; Briant 2002, 48)

¹⁰¹⁹ Dillery 2005, 387-406.

¹⁰²⁰ Iacovou 2013c, 275-291.

¹⁰²¹ Körner 2016, 33. Körner defines this a ‘suzerainty’ relationship.

¹⁰²² Gunter 2014, 248-253; Childs 2012, 91-106; Mavrogiannis 2011, 133-168; Hermary 2000c, 277-281.

¹⁰²³ Raptou 2015; Raptou 1999, *passim*.

workers such as engineers, architects, physicians, mercenaries – in Cyprus, the process of assimilation of Greek customs was probably quicker than on other areas also thanks to the Cypriot Greek language still preserved and spoken on the island, as anticipated above.¹⁰²⁴

When most of the Cypriot sovereigns joined the Ionian revolt (499 BC) on the Greek side, they declared their intention of gaining independence.¹⁰²⁵ In these years, on the eve of the Persian wars, being Greek started to mean being opposite to Persia.¹⁰²⁶ Over a period of almost two centuries, during the fifth and fourth centuries BC, the Cypriots were at the forefront of several confrontations between Persia and Greece. Some of the Cypriot polities actively contributed to the Achaemenid fleets providing triremes and fighting against Greece.¹⁰²⁷ At the same time, when their sovereigns were looking for independence from the Achaemenid Empire, they found Athens as a possible ally. Emblematic is the case of Evagoras I, who stressed the Greek origins of his dynasty and consolidated the ties with Athens and Greece in order to obtain support against the Great King and to conquer more territories.¹⁰²⁸

Finally, Alexander's advent contributed to the consolidation of the Hellenization of Cypriot customs – although most cultural changes happened under the Ptolemaic domination – and the role of Cypriot 'republican' institutions according to a 'Hellenized' model.¹⁰²⁹ As result, at the end of the fourth century BC, the term *polis* started to appear more frequently in official decrees as Paphian inscriptions demonstrate.¹⁰³⁰ In terms of international policy, even in these years, by showing Greek features, the city-states could easily become part of international exchange networks recently implemented because of Alexander's conquests.¹⁰³¹

But as argued above, Cypriot kings also had to deal with internal political issues. In order to keep the favour of the local population, which was

¹⁰²⁴ Steele 2018, 49-54; for the Hellenization of the Achaemenid customs see Balcer 1983, 260-264.

¹⁰²⁵ According to Gjerstad this depended on the discontent caused by Darius' reform; Gjerstad 1948, 475; Karageorghis 1982, 69-70; Kröner 2016, 34-36; Zournatzi 2005, 46-48. Generally on the Ionian Revolt, see Murray 1988, 461-490; Wallinga 1984, 401-437.

¹⁰²⁶ Rhodes 2007, 1-17; Balcer 1989, 127-143.

¹⁰²⁷ For some examples see Hdt. 6.6, 7.90; 7.98; Diod. 14.39.

¹⁰²⁸ Mavrogiannis 2011, 133-148; Kröner 2016, 36-40; Xen. *Hell.* 5.1.10; Ruzicka 2012, 78-81.

¹⁰²⁹ Michaelidis, Papantoniou 2018, 267-280; Bagnall 1976, 57-73; Mehl 2000, 698-712.

¹⁰³⁰ Cayla 2018, n° 2; 3.

¹⁰³¹ Michaelidis, Papantoniou 2018, 267-290.

mixed – as material culture and epigraphic attestations testify – they had to stress their autochthonous roots, for instance claiming to be descendant of the mythological king Kinyras – as in the case of Nicocles in Paphos or Androcles in Amathus.¹⁰³² This gave them the right to rule over the city-states especially in the eyes of the Cypriot inhabitants whose support was becoming more and more essential. Subject to political tensions on multiple fronts, finally, Cypriot dynasties did not survive the Diadochi's power struggles. The end of the Cypriot city-states however did not coincide with the end of their administrative system whose traces are still visible in documents of the third century BC.

¹⁰³² See chapter 5 and 6.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations

AASOR = *The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, Boston (1922-)

ABSA = *Annual of British School at Athens*, Cambridge (1894-)

AD = *Aramaic Documents of the fifth century B.C.*, (Eds.) Driver R.G., Mittwoch, E., Oxford, (1965)

AION = *Annali dell'Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale"*, Naples (1929-)

AJA = *American Journal of Archaeology*, Boston (1897-)

AJP = *American Journal of Philology*, Baltimore (1880-)

Anecdota Graeca = *Anecdota Graeca*, (Ed.) Bekker, I., Berlin (1814-1821).

ANSMN = *American Numismatic Society Museum Notes*, New York (1945-1988)

AOAW = *Anzeiger der oesterreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Wien, (1864-)

ARM = *Archives Royales de Mari. Lettres I-III. Textes cunéiformes*, (Eds.) Dossin, G., Charles-F. J., Kupper, J.R., Paris (1946)

ARMT = *Archives royales de Mari : [transcriptions et traductions]*, (Eds.) Dossin, G., Parrot, A., Paris (1950)

ASAtene = *Annuario della Scuola archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni italiane in Oriente*, Athens (1914-)

ASNS = *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*, Pisa (1873-)

BASOR = *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, Chicago (1919-)

BCH = *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, Athens (1877-)

BICS = *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, Oxford (1959-)

BNJ = *Brill New Jacoby, online edition*, (Ed.) Worthington, I., Leiden (2007-)

BPhW = *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, Berlin (1881-1994)

BSFN = *Bulletin de la Société française de Numismatique*, Paris (1945-)

BSL = *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris*, Paris (1869-)

CCEC = *Cahiers du Centre d'Études Chypriotes*, Paris (1984-)

Chrest. Wilck. = *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde, v. I: Historischer Teil, 1-2, t. 2: Chrestomathie*, (Ed.) Wilcken, U., Meißel L., Leipzig (1912)

CIG = *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, (Ed.) Boeckh, A., Berlin (1825-1860)

CIS = *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, (Eds.) Renan, E. *et al.*, Paris (1881-1968)

CQ = *The Classical Quarterly*, Cambridge (1907-)

CR = *Classical Review*, Cambridge (1887-)

CRAIBL = *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, Paris (1857-)

DCPP = *Dictionnaire de la Civilisation Phénicienne et Punique*, (Ed.) Lipinski, E., Turnhout (1992)

DK = *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, (Eds.) Diels, H., Kranz, W., Berlin (1903/1906), (Ed.) Reale, G. *I Presocratici: prima traduzione integrale con testi, Testimonianze e frammenti*, Milano (2006)

DNP = *Der Neue Pauly*, Leiden (2002-2011)

DNWSI = *Dictionary of the North West Semitic Inscriptions*, (Eds.) Jongeling, K., Hoftijzer, J., *et al.*, Leiden (2003)

EH = *Le sanctuaire punique d'El - Hofra à Constantine, I – II*, (Eds.) Berthier, A., Charlier, R., Paris (1955)

FGrH = *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker I-III*, (Ed.) Jacoby, F., Berlin (1923)

FHS&G = *Theophrastus of Eresus. Sources for his life, writings, thought and influence, I, II*, (Eds.) Fortenbaugh, W.W., *et al.*, Leiden (1992)

FuB = *Forschungen und Berichte, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin* (1959-)

Gott. Misz = *Göttinger Miszellen*, Göttingen (1972-)

HS = *Historische Sprachforschung*, Göttingen (1988-)

IC = *Inscriptiones Creticae: opera et consilio Friderici Halbherr collectae*, (Eds.) Guarducci, M., Halbherr, F., Roma (1935-1950)

ICS = *Les inscriptions chypriotes syllabiques. Recueil critique et comment*, (Ed.) Masson, O., Paris (1983)

IEJ = *Israel Exploration Journal*, Haifa (1950)

IF = *Indogermanische Forschungen*, Berlin & New York (1892-)

IG = *Inscriptiones Graecae*, Berlin (1860-)

IGCH = *An Inventory of Greek Coin Hoards*, (Eds.) Thompson, M., Mørkholm, O., Kraay, C.M., New York (1973)

IoSPE = *Inscriptiones antiquae orae septentrionalis Pontis Euxini Graecae et Latinae*, (Ed.) Latyshev, V., Saint-Petersbourg (1885-1901)

IPT = *Iscrizioni puniche della Tripolitania*, (Eds.) Levi della Vida, G., Amadasi M.G., Roma, (1987)

I.Thrac.Aeg = *The Inscriptions from Aegean Thracia, Ἐπιγραφὲς τῆς Θράκης τοῦ Αἰγαίου μεταξύ τῶν ποταμῶν Νέστου καὶ Ἐβρου (Νομοὶ Ξάνθης, Ροδόπης καὶ Ἐβρου*, (Eds.) Loukopoulou, L.D., Parissaki, M.G., Psoma, S., Zournatzi, A., Athens, (2005)

JAC = *Journal of Ancient Civilizations*, Changchun (1986-)

JAOS = *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, New Haven (1843-)

JDAI = *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*, Berlin (1917-)

JEH = *Journal of Egyptian History*, Leiden (2008-)

JESHO = *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, Leiden (1957-)

JFA = *Journal of Field Archaeology*, Abingdon-on-Thames (1974-)

JHS = *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Cambridge (1880-)

JMA = *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology*, Sheffield (1988-)

JNES = *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Chicago (1884-)

JSOT = *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, Oxford (1976-)

JSS = *Journal of Semitic Studies*, Oxford (1965-)

JWP = *Journal World Preistory*, New York (1987-)

KAI = *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*, (Eds.) Donner, H., Röllig, W., Wiesbaden (1960-1964)

KZ = *Kuhns Zeitschrift = Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, Göttingen, (1852-1988)

KS = *Kyprikai Spoudai*, Nicosia (1937-)

LPN = *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names, Volume V.B: Coastal Asia Minor: Caria to Cilicia*, (Eds.) Balzat, J.-S., Catling, R.W.V., Chiricat, E., Marchand, F., Corsten, T., Oxford (2013)

MEC = *Mari Eponym Chronicle*, (Ed.) Birot, M., *Les chroniques 'assyriennes' de Mari, M.A.R.I. 4*, 219-242, (1985)

MSS = *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, Dettelbach (1952-)

NC = *The Numismatic Chronicle*, London (1838-)

OCD = *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, (Eds.) Hornblower, S., Spawforth, A., Oxford (2005)

OD = *Oxford Dictionary*, Oxford (1989²)

OGIS = *Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae, voll. 2*, (Ed.) Dittenberger W., Leipzig, (1903-1905)

OJA = *Oxford Journal of Archaeology*, Oxford (1982-)

OLP = *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica*, Leuven (1970-2000)

OLZ = *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, Münster (1898-)

P. Eleph. = *Elephantine-Papyri, Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Königlichen Museen in Berlin: Griechische Urkunden, Sonderheft. Elephantine-Papyri*, (Ed.) Rubensohn, O., Berlin (1907)

P. Lille = *Papyrus grecs (Institut Papyrologique de l'Université de Lille)*, (Eds.) Jouguet, P., Collart, P., Lesquier, J., Xoual, M., Paris (1907, 1908, 1923, 1928-1929).

P.Lond = *Greek papyri in the British Museum* (Eds.) Kenyon, F.G., Bell, H.I., et al., London, (1893-1919)

P.Oxy = *The Oxyrhynchus papyri* (Eds.) Grenfell, B.P., Hunt, A.S., Oxford, (1898)

P.Petr. = *The Flinders Petrie papyri* (Ed.) Mahaffy, J.P., Cambridge (2013)

PRU, III = *Le palais royal d'Ugarit, III*, (Ed.) Nougayrol, J., Paris, (1955)

RA = *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale*, Paris (1884-2016)

RAr = *Revue archéologique*, Paris (1844-)

RDAC = *Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus*, Nicosia (1963-2012)

RE = *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Göttingen (1894-1978)

REArm = *Revue des Études Arméniennes*, Paris (1920-)

REL = *The Revised Eponym List = Ups and Downs at Kanesh: Chronology, History and Society in the Old Assyrian Period*, (Eds.) Barjamovic, G., Hertel, T., Larsen, T., Leiden (2012).

RES = *Répertoire d'épigraphie sémitique*, (Eds.) Clermont-Ganneau, S.C., et al., Paris (1900-1968)

RHA = *Revue historique des armées*, Paris (1945-2014)

RS = *The cuneiform texts of Ras Shamra-Ugarit*, (Ed.) Schaeffer, C.F.A., Oxford (1936).

- RSF* = *Rivista di Studi Fenici*, Roma (1973-)
- RPh* = *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes*, Paris (1845-)
- SB-PAW* = *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Classe*, Berlin (1882-1918)
- SCO* = *Studi Classici e Orientali*, Pisa (1951-)
- SEC* = *Semitica et Classica*, Turnhout (2007-)
- SEG* = *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, (Eds.) Chanotis, A., Corsten, T., Papazarkadas, N., Stavrianopoulou, E., Tybout, R.A., Amsterdam (1923-)
- Sel. Pap.* = *Select Papyri*, (Eds.) Hunt, A.S., Edgar C.C., Harvard (1934)
- SMEA* = *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici*, Roma (1966-)
- Syll*³ = *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 3rd edition, (Ed.) Dittenberger, W., Leipzig (1915-1924)
- TAD* = *The Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt*, (Eds.) Porten, B., Yardeni, A., 4 volumes, Jerusalem (1986-1999)
- UF* = *Ugarit Forschungen*, Münster (1969-)
- YBC* = *Siglum of cuneiform tablets in the Yale Babylonian Collection*, Yale (1911)
- ZPE* = *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Bonn (1967-)

Commentaries and Editions consulted

- Anacreon, (Ed.) Gentili, B., (1958), *Anacreon, edidit Bruno Gentili*, (Romae).
- Aristophanes, (Eds.) Kassel, R., Austin, C., (1984), *Fragments, Poetae Comici Graeci, Volume III.2*, (Harvard).
- Aristotle, (Ed.) Gigon, O., (1987), *Fragments, Librorum deperditorum fragmenta, collegit et annotationibus instruxit Olof Gigon*, (Berlin).
- Aristotle, (Ed.) Rackham, H., (1952), *Athenian Constitution*, (Harvard).
- Aristotle (Eds.) Radice, R., Gargiulo, T., Saunders, T.J., (2014), *Politica*, (Milano).
- Aristotle, (Ed.) Rose, V., (1967), *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta / collegit Valentinus Rose*, (Stuttgart).
- Aristotele, (Eds.) Zambrini, A., Gargiulo, T., Rhodes, P.J., *Costituzione degli Ateniesi (Athenaion Politeia)*, (Milano).
- Harpocration, (Ed.) Dindorf, W. (1853), *Harpocrationis Lexicon in decem oratores Atticos*, (Oxford).

- Herodotus, (Eds.) Asheri, D., Fraschetti, A., Medaglia, S.M., (1990), *Le Storie III, La Persia*, (Milano).
- Herodotus, (Ed.) Hornblower, S. (2013), *A Commentary on Herodotus 5*, (Cambridge).
- Herodotus, (Ed.) Hude, H. (1906), *Herodoti Historiae*, (Oxford).
- Herodotus, (Ed.) Lloyd, A.B., Fraschetti, A., (1989), *Le storie di Erodoto. Testo greco a fronte:2*, (Milano).
- Herodotus, (Ed.) Nenci, G. (1994), *Erodoto: la rivolta della Ionia. V Libro delle Storie*, (Milan).
- Herodotus, (Ed.) Nenci, G. (1996), *Le Storie. Libro VI: La battaglia di Maratona*, (Milano).
- Herodotus, (Ed.) Rosén, H.B. (1997), *Herodoti Historiae. Vol. II: Libros V - IX Continens*, (Stuttgart).
- Herodotus, (Ed.) Vannicelli, P., Corcella A. (2017), *Erodoto - Le storie. Libro VII: Serse e Leonida*, (Milano).
- Homer, (Eds.) Heubeck, A., West, S., Hainsworth, J.B. (1981), *The Odyssey, A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey, vol. I: Introduction and Books i-viii*, (Oxford).
- Josephus Flavius, (Eds.) Mason, S.N., Pegg, C.T., Spilsbury, P., (2005), *Translation and Commentary: Vol. 5: Judean Antiquities 8-1*, (Leiden).
- Josephus Flavius, (Eds.) Mason, S.N., Barclay, J., (2006), *Against Apion*, (Leiden).
- Josephus Flavius, (Ed.) Labow, D. (2005), *Contra Apionem, Buch I. Einleitung, Text, Text-kritischer Apparat, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, (Stuttgart).
- Lysias, (Ed.) Medda, E., Lisia, *Orazioni XVI-XXXIV, Frammenti. Introduzione, traduzione e note*, Milano.
- Pindaro, (Ed.) Gentili, B. (1995), *Le Pitiche*, Milano.
- Stephanus Von Byzanz, (Ed.) Billerbeck, M., Neumann-Hartmann, A., (2016), *Pi - Ypsilon: Recensuerunt Germanice Verterunt, Adnotationibus Indicibusque Instruxerunt Margarethe Billerbeck Et Arlette Neumann-Hartmann*, (Berlin).
- Tyrtaeus, Solon, Mimnermus, Theognis, (Ed.) Gerber D.E. (1999), *Greek Elegiac Poetry: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries B.C., Volume 1*, (Harvard).

Secondary literature

Abel, F.M. (1908), 'Inscriptions de Transjordanie et de Haute Galilée', *Revue Biblique* 5: 567-578.

Adiego, I.J. (2007), *The Carian Language*, (Leiden).

Adiego, I.J. (2010), 'Recent Developments in the Decipherment of Carian' in *Hellenistic Karia, Proceedings of the First International Conference on Hellenistic Karian*, (Eds.), Van Bremen, R., Carbon, J. M., (Oxford): 147-176.

Adrados, F.R. (1972), 'El Bronce de Idalion a la luz de la serie E de Pilos', *Kadmos* 11: 79-86.

Aharoni, Y. (1981), 'Arad Inscriptions', (Jerusalem).

Alavoine, V. (2000), 'Le marzh est-il un banquet funéraire? Étude des sources épigraphiques et biblique', *Le Muséon* 113: 1-23.

Albenda, P. (1986), *Le palais de Sargon d'Assyrie*, (Paris).

Albright, W.F. (1951), 'The Eastern Mediterranean about 1060 B.C', in *Studies Presented to D. M. Robinson, I*, (Ed.) Mylonas, G.E., (Saint-Louis): 223-231

Alden, M. (2005), 'Lion in Paradise: Lion Similes in the Iliad and the Lion Cubs of IL. 18.318-22', *CQ* 55.2: 335-342.

Alexiou, E. (2010), '*Der Evagoras des Isokrates. Ein Kommentar. Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 101*', (Berlin & New York).

Alexiou, E. (2015), 'The Rhetoric of Isocrates' Evagoras: History, Ethics and Politics', in *Isocrates Entre jeu rhetorique et enjeux politiques*, (Eds.), Bouchet, Ch., Giovanelli-Jouanna, P., (Lyon): 47-61.

Alin, P. (1978), 'Idalion Pottery from the Excavations of the Swedish Cyprus Expedition', *Opuscula Atheniensi* 12: 91-109.

Allen, D.F., Burnet, J., Pomeroy Parker, C., Chase Greene, W. (1938), *Scholia Platonica, contulerunt atque investigaverunt Fredericus De Forest Allen, Ioannes Burnet, Carolus Pomeroy Parker. Omnia recognita praefatione indicibusque instructa edidit Guilielmus Chase Greene*, (Haverford).

Almagor, E. (2005), 'Who is a Barbarian? The Barbarians in the Ethnological and Cultural Taxonomies of Strabo', in *Strabo's Cultural Geography. The Marking of a Kolossourgia*, (Eds.) Dueck, D., Lindsay, H., Potheary, S., (Cambridge): 42-55.

Almagor, E. (2012), 'Ctesias and the importance of his Writings Revisited', *Electrum* 19: 9-40.

Amadasi, M.G. (1974), 'A proposito di KLKY in un'iscrizione fenicia di Cipro', *RSF* 2: 167-170.

- Amadasi, M.G. (1992), 'Nora' in *Dizionario della civiltà fenicia*, (Roma).
- Amadasi, M.G. (2004), 'Mise à jour bibliographique des inscriptions publiées dans *Kition III* (1977)', in *Kition dans les textes, Kition Bamboula V*, (Ed.) Yon, M., (Paris): 205-215.
- Amadasi, M.G. (2007), 'Notes d'onomastique phénicienne à Kition', in *Hommage à Annie Caubet. Actes du colloque international 'Chypre et la côte du Levant aux II^e et I^{er} millénaires'*, (Ed.) Hermay, A. (= *CCEC* 37): 197-209.
- Amadasi, M. G. (2015), 'Le matériel inscrit, Les inscriptions phéniciennes', in *Kition-Bamboula VI, Le sanctuaire sous la colline*, (Ed.) Yon, M., (Lyon): 335-345.
- Amadasi, M.G. (2016), 'Sull'ambientazione della lamina fenicia di Pyrgi' in *Le lamina di Pyrgi. Nuovi studi sulle iscrizioni in etrusco e in fenicio nel cinquantenario della scoperta*, (Eds.) Bellelli, V., Xella, P., (Roma): 5-19.
- Amadasi, M.G. (2017), 'The Idalion Archive. 2 The Phoenician inscriptions', in *ΑΡΧΑΙΑ ΚΥΠΡΟΣ Πρόσφατες εξελίξεις στην αρχαιολογία της ανατολικής Μεσογείου*, (Eds.) Παπαδημητρίου, Ν., Τόλη, Μ., (Athens): 274-284.
- Amadasi, M.G., Karageorghis, V. (1977), *Fouilles de Kition. III, Inscriptions phéniciennes*, (Nicosia).
- Amadasi, M.G., Zamora López, J.A. (2016), 'L'archivio fenicio di Idalion: stato delle ricerche', *SEC* 9: 187-193.
- Amadasi, M.G., Zamora López, J.A. (2018), 'The Phoenician name of Cyprus. New Evidence from Early Hellenistic Times', *JSS* 63: 77-97.
- Amadasi, M.G., Zamora López J.A. (2018b), 'The Phoenician marzeah. New Evidence from Cyprus in the 4th Century BC', *Studia Eblaitica* 4: 187-214.
- Amandry, M. (1984), 'Le monnayage d'Amathonte', in *Amathonte I, Testimonia I, Auteurs anciens, Monnayage, Voyageurs, Fouilles, Origines, Géographie*, (Eds.) Aupert, P., Hellmann, M.C., (Paris): 57-76.
- Amandry, M. (1986), 'A propos du trésor de Chypre, 1934/35 (*IGCH* 1277)', *CCEC* 6: 37-38.
- Amandry, M. (1992), 'Acquisitions recentes de monnaies chypriotes au Cabinet des Medailles', *CCEC* 17: 19-22.
- Amandry, M. (1997), 'Le monnayage d'Amathonte revisité', *CCEC* 27: 35-44.
- Amitay, O. (2008), 'Why Did Alexander the Great Besiege Tyre?' *Athenaeum* 96: 91-102.
- Aravantino, V. (2010), 'Mycenaean Thebes: old questions, new answers', in *Espace civil, espace religieux en Égée durant la période mycénienne. Approches épigraphique, linguistique et archéologique. Actes des journées*

d'archéologie et de philologie mycénienne, Lyon, 1er février et 1er mars 2007, (Eds.) Bohem, I., Müller Celka, S. (Lyon): 51-72

Åström, P. (1998), *Hala Sultan Tekke 10. The Wells*, SIMA 45:10, (Göteborg).

Åström, P., Bailey, D.M., Karageorghis, V. (1976), *Hala Sultan Tekke 1. Excavations 1897-1971*, (Göteborg).

Aubet, M.E. (2001), *The Phoenicians and the West: Politics, Colonies and Trade*, (Cambridge).

Aubet, M. E. (2008), *The Phoenicians and the West 2ed: Politics, Colonies and Trade*, (Cambridge).

Aubet, M.E. (2009), *Tiro y las colonias fenicias de Occidente*, (Barcelona).

Aubriet, D. (2013), 'Mylasa et l'identité carienne', in *Fourth Century Karia*, (Ed.) Henry, O., (Paris): 189-208.

Aubriet, D. (2013b), 'À propos de l'épithaphe et de la mémoire à Mylasa, petite cité dans le monde grec' in *Le Mort dans la Ville, Pratiques, contextes et impacts des inhumations intra-muros en Anatolie, du début de l'Age du Bronze à l'époque romaine*, (Ed.) Hery, O., (Istanbul): 143-155.

Aupert, P. (1996), *Guide d'Amathonte*, (Paris).

Aupert, P. (2003), 'Le dépôt archaïque du rempart nord d'Amathonte II. Les premières inscriptions grecques alphabétiques d'Amathonte. (Inscriptions d'Amathonte VI), *BCH* 127-1: 107-121.

Aupert, P., Florentzos, P. (2008), 'Un exceptionnel document à base cadastrale de l'Amathonte hellénistique'. (Inscriptions d'Amathonte VII), *BCH* 132-1: 311-346.

Austin, M. (1970), 'Greece and Egypt in the archaic age', *Revue des études anciennes*: 16-22.

Austin, M., (1990), 'Greek Tyrants and the Persians, 546-479BC', *CQ* 40, 289-306.

Averett, E.W. (2015), 'Masks and Ritual Performance on the Island of Cyprus', *AJA* 119.1: 3-45.

Averett, E.W., Counts, D., Gordon, J.M., Kardulias, P.N. (2015), 'Shedding light on the Cypriot rural landscape: Investigations of the Athienou Archaeological Project in the Malloura Valley Cyprus, 2011–2013', *JFA* 40: 204-220.

Avishur, Y., Heltzer, M. (2003), 'Carrians as skilled masons in Israel and mercenaries in Judah in the early I millennium B.C.E.', *Kadmos* 42: 87-90.

- Avram, A. (2009), 'Le traité et sa publication : serments, tables de bronze et copies affichées sur des stèles', *Cahiers du Centre Gustave Glotz*, Vol. 20: 211-232.
- Bachvarova, M.R. (2016), *From Hittite to Homer: The Anatolian Background of Ancient Greek Epic*, (Cambridge).
- Bagnall, R.S. (1976), *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt*, (Leiden).
- Bagnall, R.S., Drew-Bear T. (1973), 'Notes on the History of Kourion', *Chronique d'Égypte*: 179-195.
- Balandier, C. (2019), 'Salamine de Chypre au tournant du Ve au IVe siècle, 'rade de la paix' phénicienne, arsenal achéménide ou royaume grec en terre orientale: le règne d'Évagoras Ier reconsidéré', in *Salamis of Cyprus: History and Archaeology from The Earliest Times to The Late Antiquity*, (Eds.) Mavrojannis, T., Ioannou, C., Rogge, S., (Münster): 289-312.
- Balcer, J. (1977), 'The Athenian episkopos and the Achaemenid King's Eye' *American Journal of Philology* 98: 252-263.
- Balcer, J. (1983), 'The Greeks and the Persians: The Processes of Acculturation', *Historia* 32, 257-267.
- Balcer, J. (1989), 'The Persian Wars against Greece: A Reassessment', *Historia* 38: 127-143.
- Bannier W. (1917), 'Zu griechischen Inschriften I', *BPhW* 37: 1446-1448.
- Barnes, J. (1953-1954), 'Cimon and the first Athenian Expedition to Cyprus', *Historia* 2: 163-176.
- Barnett, R., Lorenzini, A. (1975), *Assyrian sculpture in the British Museum*, (London).
- Bartol, K. (2019), 'Structuring the Genre: The Fifth- and Fourth-Century Authors on Elegy and Elegiac Poets', in *The Reception of Greek Lyric Poetry in the Ancient World: Transmission, Canonization and Paratext*, (Eds.) Currie, B., Rutherford, I., (Leiden): 129-147.
- Baslez, M-F. (2019), 'Les communautés juives de la Diaspora dans le droit commun des associations du monde gréco-romain' in *Private Associations and Jewish Communities in the Hellenistic and Roman Cities*, (Ed.) Eckhardt, B., (Leiden): 97-114.
- Baurain, C. (1980), 'Kinyras. Une Étymologie obscure', *Onomata* 5:7-12.
- Baurain, C. (1981), 'KINURAS et KERAMOS', *L'Antiquité Classique* 50: 23-37.

- Baurain, C. (2011), 'La contribution des Teucrides aux cultes royaux de l'époque hellénistique', in *More Than Men, Less Than Gods: Studies on Royal Cult and Imperial Worship, Studia Hellenistica 51*, (Eds.) Iossif, P.P. Chankowski, A.S., Lorber, C.C. *et al.* (Louvain): 121-155.
- Baurain, C. (2014), 'Réflexions sur la 'Tombe 77' de Salamine de Chypre', in *The Age of the Successors and the Creation of the Hellenistic Kingdoms (323-276 BC)*, *Studia Hellenistica 53*, (Eds.) Hauben, H., Meeus, A., (Louvain): 137-166.
- Bausi, A. Brockmann, C., Friedrich, M., Kienitz, S. (2018), *Manuscripts and Archives*, (Berlin).
- Bazemore, G.B. (1995), 'Unpublished inscription from tala: new evidence for the paphian city kingdom and the Cults of Cyprus', *AJA* 99: 330-331.
- Bazemore, G.B. (2002), 'Gender, Sex and the Cypriot Syllabic. Inscriptions: Females in the Written Record of Ancient Cyprus', in *Engendering Aphrodite: Women and Society in Ancient Cyprus*, (Eds.) Bolger, D., Serwint, N., (Chicago): 397-418
- Beattie, A.J. (1958), 'A Cyprian Exhortation to Sobriety', *Rheinisches Museum* 101: 138-146.
- Beattie, A. J. (1959), 'A Cyprian Contract Concerning the Use of Land', *CQ* 53: 169-172.
- Bechtel, F. (1921), *Die griechischen Dialekte*, (Berlin).
- Becking, B. (2017), 'The Other Groups That Were... Some Remarks on Different Minor Ethnicities in Persian Period Elephantine', *Journal for Semitics* 26/2: 820-848.
- Becking, B. (2017b), 'Mercenaries or Merchants? On the Role of Phoenicians at Elephantine in the Achaemenid Period', *Die Welt des Orients*: 186-197.
- Beekes, R.S.P. (1971), 'Cyprian alawo', *Mnemosyne* 24: 350-352.
- Beer, C. (1993-1994), *Temple-boys. A Study of Cypriote Votive Sculpture, Part 2. Functional Analysis, (SIMA CXIII)*, (Stockholm).
- Bellia, A., Marconi C., (2016), *Musicians in Ancient Coroplastic Art: Iconography, Ritual Contexts, and Functions*, («TELESTES. Studi e Ricerche di Archeologia musicale nel Mediterraneo», II), (Pisa-Roma).
- Bennet, J. (2017), 'Palaces and Their Regions: Geographical Analysis of Territorial Exploitation in Late Bronze Age Crete and Greece', in *Palatial Economy in the Ancient Near East and in the Aegean: First Steps Towards a Comprehensive Study and Analysis. ESF Exploratory Workshop Held in Sèvres (France), 16-19 Sept. 2010, Pasiphae 11*, (Eds.) Carlier, P., Joannès, Fr., Rougemont, Fr., Zurbach, J. (Pisa-Roma): 151-174.

- Bennett, C. (1980), *The Cults of Ancient Greek Cypriotes*, (Philadelphia).
- Bennett, E. L., Olivier J.P. (1973), *The Pylos tablets transcribed*, (Roma).
- Bernard, A., Ali, A., (1959), *Abou-Simbel : inscriptions grecques cariennes et sémitiques des statues de la façade*, (Kairo).
- Berndt Ersöz, S. (2020), 'The Upright Tiara of the Persian King', in *Achaemenid Anatolia: Persian presence and impact in the Western Satrapies 546-330 BC: Proceedings of an international symposium at the Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul, 7-8 September 2017 - Uppsala studies in ancient Mediterranean and Near-Eastern civilizations; Vol. 37., Department of Archaeology and Ancient History*, (Ed.) Dahlén, P., (Upsala): 65-79.
- Berger, P. (1895), 'Mémoire sur une inscription phénicienne de Narnaka dans l'île de Chypre', *RA* 3: 69-88.
- Bettalli, M. (1995), *I mercenari nel mondo greco, I. Dalle origini alla fine del V sec. a.C.*, (Pisa).
- Bettalli, M. (2013), *Mercenari. Il mestiere delle armi nel mondo greco antico. Età arcaica e classica*, (Rome).
- Beyer, D. (1990), 'Le palais de Sargon II, roi d'Assyrie', *Le monde de la Bible*: 19-21.
- Bianco, M. (2015), 'Considérations sur les anthroponymes phéniciens transcrits en grec dans les inscriptions bilingues gréco-phéniciennes', *SEC* 8: 53-62.
- Bianco, M., Bonnet, C. (2016), 'Sur les traces d'Athéna chez les Phéniciens', *Pallas* 100: 155-179.
- Bikai, P.M. (1987), *The Phoenician Pottery of Cyprus*, (Nicosia).
- Biraschi, A.M. (1982), 'Aspetti e problemi della più antica storia di Temesa nella tradizione letteraria', in *Temesa e il suo territorio, Atti del Convegno Perugia-Trevi 1981*, (Ed.) Maddoli, G., (Taranto): 29-39.
- Blažek, V. (2017), 'Apollo the archer' in *Ancient Greek Linguistics, New Approaches, Insights, Perspectives*, (Eds.) Logozzo, F., Pocetti, P., (Berlin): 643-662.
- Blümel, W. (1985), *Die Inschriften von Iasos, vol. 1-2*, (Bonn).
- Blümel, W. (1992), *Die inschriften von Knidos. Teil I*, (Bonn).
- Bondi, F., (1990) 'I Fenici in Erodoto', in *Hérodote et les peuples non grecs*, (Vandoeuvres-Genève): 213-286.
- Breitenberg, B. (2007), *Aphrodite and Eros: The Development of Erotic Mythology in Early Greek Poetry and Cult*, (New York-London).

- Bresson, A. (2009), 'Karien und die dorische Kolonisation', in *Die Karer und die Anderen, Internationales Kolloquium an der Freien Universität Berlin, 13 bis 15 Oktober 2005*, (Ed.) Rumscheid, F., (Bonn): 109-120.
- Briant, P. (2002), *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire* (Ann Arbor).
- Brinkman, J. (1964-), *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, (Chicago).
- Brouwers, J. (2013), *Henchmen of Ares: Warriors and Warfare in Early Greece*, (Rotterdam).
- Brown, J. P. (1965), 'Kothar, Kinyras, and Kythereia', *JSS* 10: 197-219.
- Boardman, J. (2003), *Die Perser und der Westen. Eine archäologischen Untersuchung zur Entwicklung der persischen Kunst*, (Mainz).
- Boiy, T. (2004), *Late Achaemenid and Hellenistic Babylon*, (Leuven).
- Bondi S. F. (1995), 'Les institutions, l'organisation politique et administrative', in *La Civilisation Phénicienne et Punique. Manuel de recherche*, (Ed.) Krings, V., (Leiden-New York-Köln): 290-302.
- Bonetto, J. (2019), 'Nora', in *Il tempo dei fenici. Incontri in Sardegna dall'VIII al III sec. a.C.*, (Eds.) Del Vais, C., Guirguis, M., Stiglitz, A., (Nuoro): 64-69.
- Bonnet, C. (1988), *Melqart: Cultes et mythes de l'Héraclès tyrien en Méditerranée*, (Leuven)
- Bonnet, C. (1990), 'Les étrangers dans le corpus épigraphique phénicien de Chypre', *RDAC*: 141-153.
- Bonnet, C. (1991), 'Les Scribes Phénico-Puniques', in *Phoinikeia Grammata, lire et écrire en Méditerranée, actes du colloque de Liège, 15-18 novembre 1989*, (Eds.) Baurain, C., Bonnet C., Krings V., (Liegi): 147-171.
- Bonnet, C. (1992), 'Miqim elim', in *Dictionnaire de la civilisation phénicienne et punique*, (Ed.) Lipinski, E., (Bruxelles): 294-295.
- Bonnet, C. (1995), 'L'interprète des Crétois (phén. *mls [h]krsym*). De Mari à Chypre en passant par Ougarit', *SMEA* 36.1: 113-123.
- Bonnet-Tzavellas, C. (1983), 'Le dieu Melqart en Phénicie et dans le bassin méditerranéen: un culte national et officiel' in *Redt Tyrus / Sauvons Tyr - Histoire phénicienne / Fenicische geschiedenis*, (Eds.) Gubel, E., Lipinski, E., Servais-Soyez, B., (Leuven): 195-207.

- Bonnet, C., Baurain, C., (1992): *Les Phéniciens. Marins des trois continents*, 1992.
- Boskos, A.I. (1999), *Η Αρχαία Κυπριακή Γραμματεία, I*, (Nicosia).
- Boskos, A.I. (2000), ‘Κριτικά καὶ Ἑρμηνευτικά στο Κυπριακὸ Ἐπίγραμμα’, *Proceedings of the Third international congress of Cypriot studies 16-20 April 1996*, (Eds.) Ioannides, G.K., Hadjistilli, S.A., (Nicosia): 171-181.
- Bowra, C.M. (1934), ‘Homeric Words in Cyprus’, *JHS* 54-1: 54-74.
- Bowie, A.M. (2003): ‘Fate May Harm Me, I Have Dined Today: Near- Eastern. Royal Banquets and Greek Symposia in Herodotus’, *Pallas* 61, 99-109.
- Bowie, E. (2018), ‘Herodotus-narrator, scientist, historian’ in *Herodotus on health and disease*, (Ed.) Demont, P. (Berlin): 175-196.
- Bresson, A. (2007), ‘Les Cariens ou la mauvaise conscience du barbare’ in *Tra Oriente e Occidente. Indigeni, Greci e Romani in Asia Minore*, (Eds.) Bresson, A., Urso, G., (Pisa): 209-228.
- Brinkman, J.A. *et al.* (1956), *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, (Chicago).
- Brinkman, J.A. (2006), ‘Babylonian Royal Land Grants, Memorials of Financial Interest, and Invocation of the Divine’, *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 49.1:1-47.
- Buchholz, H-G., Matthäus, H. (2003) (2004), ‘Zyprische Bronzeschalen der geometrischen und archaischen Periode. Eine Studie zu Typologie, Chronologie, Epigraphik und kultureller Außenwirkung zyprischen Metallhandwerks des frühen ersten Jahrtausends v. Chr’, *CCEC* 33: 99-148.
- Budin, S. (2004), ‘A Reconsideration of the Aphrodite-Ashtart Syncretism’, *Numen* 51: 95-145.
- Budin, S. (2008), *The Myth of Sacred Prostitution in Antiquity*, (Cambridge).
- Buitron-Oliver, D. (1996), *The sanctuary of Apollo Hylates at Kourion: Excavations in the Archaic Precinct (SIMA CIX)*, (Jonsered).
- Caciagli, S. (2016), ‘CHAPTER 20 Sappho Fragment 17: Wishing Charaxos a Safe Trip?’ in *The Newest Sappho: P. Sapph. Obbink and P. GC inv. 105, Frs. 1-4: Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song, vol. 2*, (Eds.) Bierl, A., Lardinois, A., (Leiden): 424-448.
- Cadogan, G., Iacovou, M., Kopaka, K., Whitley, J. (2012), *Parallel Lives: Ancient Island Societies in Crete And Cyprus*, (Athens).

- Calabro, D. (2015), 'Egyptianizing Features in Phoenician and Punic Inscriptions from Egypt', in *Semitic Languages in Contact*, (Ed.) Butts, A., (Leiden-Boston): 97-113.
- Callot, O. (1988), 'L'inscription syllabique en paphien récent du village de Tala Paphos', *RDAC*: 63-68.
- Callot, O. (2002), 'Une «dame à la fenêtre» à Kition', *CCEC* 32: 185-190.
- Caneva, S.G., Delli Pizzi, A. (2014), 'Classical and Hellenistic statuettes of the so called Temple Boys: A religious and social reappraisal' in *La presenza dei bambini nelle religioni del Mediterraneo antico. La vita e la morte, i rituali e i culti tra archeologia, antropologia e storia delle religioni*, (Ed.) Terranova C., (Ariccia): 495-521.
- Cannavò, A. (2007-2011), 'The Role of Cyprus in the Neo-Assyrian Economic System: Analysis of the Textual Evidence', *RSF* 35: 179-190.
- Cannavò, A. (2008), 'The Cypriot Kingdoms in The Archaic Age a Multicultural Experience' in *The Eastern Mediterranean, XVII International Congress of Classical Archaeology: Meetings Between cultures in The Eastern Mediterranean, Bollettino di Archeologia online. Volume Speciale*, (Rome): 37-46.
- Cannavò, A. (2008b), 'La dominazione egiziana a Cipro e i rapporti fra Cipro e l'Egitto nel VI sec. a.C.', *SCO* 49: 137-158.
- Cannavò, A. (2009), 'Il problema dell'agora a Cipro: fisionomia dei centri ciprioti fra polis e qārt', in *Agora, foro e istituzioni politiche in Sicilia e nel Mediterraneo antico*, (Ed.) Ampolo, C., (Pisa): 347-357.
- Cannavò, A. (2010), 'Between Iadnana and Kittim: Eastern Views of Archaic Cyprus', in *POCA 2007 Postgraduate Cypriot Archaeology Conference*, (Eds.) Christodoulou S., Satraki A., (Cambridge): 169-196.
- Cannavò, A. (2012), 'Chypre dans les études historiques du XIXe et XXe siècles: découverte de l'antique, construction du passé', *CCEC* 42: 423-457.
- Cannavò, A. (2012b), 'Il problema dell'agora a Cipro: fisionomia dei centri ciprioti fra polis e qārt', in *Agora greca e agorai di Sicilia*, (Ed.) Ampolo, C. (Pisa): 347-357.
- Cannavò, A. (2015), 'Les Teucrides de Chypre au miroir d'Isocrate', in *Isocrate, entre jeu rhétorique et enjeux politiques*, (Eds.), Bouchet, C., Giovannelli-Jouanna, P., (Lyon): 235-247.
- Cannavò, A. (2015b), 'The Phoenicians and Kition: continuities and breaks', in *Trasformazioni e crisi nel Mediterraneo. "Identità" e interculturalità nel Levante e nell'Occidente fenicio tra XII e VIII sec. a.C.*, *RSF Suppl.*, (Eds.) Garbati, G., Pedrazzi T., (Rome): 139-151.

- Cannavò, A. (2015c), 'Towards a History of the Histories of Cyprus', in *Cypriot Cultural Details: Proceedings of the 10th Post Graduate Cypriot Archaeology Conference*, (Eds.) Hadjikyriakos, I., Trentin, M.G., (Oxford): 161-177.
- Cannavò, A. (2015d), 'Inscribed burial markers of Cyprus: a critical review', in *POCA 2012, Postgraduate Cypriot Archaeology Conference*, (Eds.) Matthäus, H., Morstadt, B., Vonhoff, C., (Cambridge): 360-387.
- Cannavò, A. (2015f), 'Cyprus and the Near East in the Neo-Assyrian Period' in the website *Kyprios Character. History, Archaeology & Numismatics of Ancient Cyprus*.
- Cannavò, A. (2018), 'Kittim', in *Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Phoenician Culture: Historical Characters*, (Eds.), Ercolani, A., Xella, P., Livadiotti, U., Melchiorri, V., (Louvain): 143.
- Cannavò, A. (2018b), 'In the Middle of the Sea of the Setting Sun. The Neo-Assyrian Empire and Cyprus: economic and political perspectives', in *Imperial Peripheries in the Neo-Assyrian Period*, (Eds.) Tyson, C.W., Herrmann V.R., (Louisville): 240-264.
- Cannavò, A. (2018c), 'Eteocypriots', in *Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Phoenician Culture, 1: Historical Characters*, (Eds.) Ercolani, A., Xella, P., Livadiotti, U., Melchiorri, V., (Louvain): 78-79.
- Cannavò, A., Fourrier, S., Rabot, A. (2018), *Kition-Bamboula VII: Fouilles dans les nécropoles de Kition (2012-2014)*, (Lion).
- Capdetrey, L. (2007), *Le pouvoir séleucide. Territoire, administration, finances d'un royaume hellénistique (312-129 avant J.-C.)*, (Rennes).
- Caquot, A., Masson, O. (1968), 'Deux inscriptions phéniciennes de Chypre', *Syria* 45: 295-321.
- Carey, C. (1981), *Commentary on five odes of Pindar: Pythian 2, Pythian 9, Nemean 1, Nemean 7, Isthmian 8*, (Salem).
- Carlier, P. (1984), *La Royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre*, (Strasbourg).
- Carlier, P. (1991), 'A propos de artisans wa-na-ka-te-ro', in *Atti e Memorie del Secondo Congresso Internazionale di Micenologia*, (Eds.) De Miro, E., Godart, L., Sacconi, A., (Roma): 569-570.
- Carpenter, M. (1983), 'Ki-ti-me-na and ke-ke-me-na at Pylos', *Minos* 18: 81-88.
- Carter, J.B. (1997), 'Thiasos and Marzeah. Ancestor Cult in the Age of Homer', in *New Light on a Dark Age: Exploring the Culture of Geometric Greece*, (Ed.) Langdon, S., (New York): 72-112.
- Carruba, O. (2000), 'Der Name der Karer', *Athenaeum* 88: 49-57.
- Casson, L. (1996), *Ships and Seamanship in the ancient World*, (Princeton).

- Caubet, A. (1984), 'Aux origines de la collection chypriote du Louvre: le fonds Guillaume- Rey (1860 à 1865)', *RDAC*: 221-229.
- Caubet, A., Fourrier, S., Yon, M. (2015), *Kition-Bamboula VI: Le sanctuaire sous la colline*, (Lyon).
- Cawkwell, G. (2005), *The Greek Wars*, (Oxford).
- Cayla, J.B. (2018), *Les inscriptions de Paphos. La cité chypriote sous la domination lagide et à l'époque impériale*, (Lyon).
- Cesnola, L.P. (1877), *Cyprus, its cities, tombs and temples*, (London).
- Chadwick, J. (1972), 'Deux notes sur le digamma', in *Mélanges de linguistique et de philologie grecques offerts à Pierre Chantraine*, (Ed.) A. Ernout, A., (Paris): 27-34.
- Chambers, M. H. (1990), *Aristoteles Staat der Athener*, (Berlin).
- Chantraine, P. (1968-1980), *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, (Paris).
- Chantraine, P. (1972), 'L'épigraphie chypriote syllabique', *Journal des Savants*: 213- 226.
- Chantraine, P., Blanc, A., De Lamberterie, C., Perpillou, J.L. (1999), *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque : histoire des mots*, (Paris).
- Charalambous, A., Webb, J.M. (2020), 'Metal procurement, artefact manufacture and the use of imported tin bronze in Middle Bronze Age Cyprus', *Journal of Archaeological Science* 113: 1-12.
- Charpin, D., Ziegler, N. (2003), *Mari et le Proche-Orient à l'époque amorrite : essai d'histoire politique*, *Florilegium Marianum V*, (Paris).
- Chavane, M.J., Yon, M. (1978), *Testimonia Salamina 1, première, deuxième et troisième parties*, (Paris).
- Childs, W. (2012), 'Marion: A City-Kingdom of Ancient Cyprus', in *City of Gold. The Archaeology of Polis tis Chrysochous*, (Eds.) Childs, W., Smith, J.S., Padgett, J.M., (Princeton): 91-106.
- Childs, W., Smith, J.S., Padgett, J.M., *City of Gold. The Archaeology of Polis tis Chrysochous*, (Princeton).
- Clermont-Ganneau C. (1924), 'L'egersis d'Héraclès et le Réveil des dieux' *Syria*: 149-167.
- Cline, E.H. (2014), *1177 B.C.: The Year Civilization Collapsed*, (Princeton).
- Collombier, A.-M. (1991), 'Organisation du territoire et pouvoirs locaux dans l'île de Chypre à l'époque perse', in *Transeuphratène* 4: 21-43.

- Collombier, A.-M. (1995), *Recherches sur l'histoire de Chypre à l'époque des royaumes autonomes*, thèse de l'Université de Paris X–Nanterre.
- Colvin, S. (2007), *A Historical Greek Reader: Mycenaean to the Koiné*, (Oxford).
- Consani, C. (1988), 'Bilinguismo, diglossia e digrafia nella Grecia Antica. Considerazioni sulle iscrizioni bilingui di Cipro' in *Bilinguismo e biculturalismo nel mondo antico. Atti del colloquio interdisciplinare tenuto a Pisa il 28 e 29 settembre 1987*, (Eds.) Campanile, E., Cardona, G.R., Lazzeroni, R., (Pisa): 35-60.
- Consani, C. (1990), 'Bilinguismo, diglossia e digrafia nella Grecia antica III.: Le iscrizioni digrafe cipriote', *Studi in memoria di Ernesto Giammarco*, (Ed.) Bolelli, T., (Pisa): 63-79.
- Cooke, G. A. (1903), *A Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions*, (Oxford).
- Corsaro, M. (1983), 'Le forme di dipendenza nella *chora* del re e in quella cittadina dell'Asia Minore ellenistica', in *Modes de contacts et processus de transformation dans les sociétés anciennes : actes du colloque de Cortone, 24-30 mai 1981*, (Rome): 523-548.
- Corsaro, M., (1985), 'Tassazione regia e tassazione cittadina dagli achemenidi ai re ellenistici: alcune osservazioni', *Revue des Études Anciennes* 87: 73-95.
- Counts, D. (2001), 'Myth into Art: Foreign Impulses and Local Responses in Archaic Cypriot Sanctuaries', in *The Cambridge Prehistory of the Bronze and Iron Age Mediterranean*, (Eds.) Knapp, B.A., Van Dommelen, P., (Cambridge): 285-298.
- Counts, D. (2008), 'Master of the Lion: Representation and Hybridity in Cypriote Sanctuaries', *AJA* 112.1: 3-27.
- Counts, D. (2010), 'Divine Symbols and Royal Aspirations: The Master of Animals in Iron Age Cypriote Religion' in *The Master of Animals in Old World Iconography*, (Eds.) Counts, D.B., Arnold, B., (Budapest): 135-150.
- Cowgill, W. (1964), 'The supposed Cypriote *duwánoi* and *dokoi*', *Language* 40: 343-365.
- Cowley, A.E., *Aramaic papyri of the fifth century B.C.*, (Oxford).
- Cramer, J.A. (1835), *Anecdota Graeca e codd. Manuscriptis Bibliothecarum Oxoniensium*, (Oxford).
- Crick, N. (2015), *Rhetoric and Power: The Drama of Classical Greece*, (Columbia).
- Cross, F. M. (1972), 'An Interpretation of the Nora Stone', *BASOR*: 13-1

- Dandamayev, M.A. (1981), 'The Neo-Babylonian Citizens', *Klio* 63: 45-49.
- Dandamayev, M.A. (1995), 'Babylonian Popular Assemblies in the First Millennium BC', *The Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies Bulletin* 30: 23-31.
- Dandamayev, M.A. (2012), '“CITIZENSHIP” in the Achaemenid Period', *Encyclopædia Iranica*, V/6: 631-632.
- David, M. L., Stroud, R.S. (1979), 'Athens Honors King Euagoras of Salamis', *Hesperia* 48: 180-193.
- Davis, W.M. (1980), 'The Cypriotes at Naukratis', *Gott Misz* 41: 7-19.
- Davis, O., (1928-1930), 'The Copper Mines of Cyprus', *ABSA* 30: 74-85
- Dareddy, G. (1900), 'Stèle de l'an III d'Amasis', *Rec. Trav.* 22: 1-9.
- Deecke, W. (1883-84), 'Die griechisch-kyprischen Inschriften in epichorischer Schrift. Text und Umschreibung, mit einer Schrifttafel', in *Sammlung der Griechischen Dialectinschriften*, (Ed.) Collitz, H., (Göttingen), 1-80.
- Del Freo, M. (2017), 'Quelques réflexions sur les possessions foncières et les obligations à Pylos', in *Palatial Economy in the Ancient Near East and in the Aegean: First Steps Towards a Comprehensive Study and Analysis. ESF Exploratory Workshop Held in Sèvres (France), 16-19 Sept. 2010, Pasiphae* 11, (Eds.) Carlier, P., Joannès, Fr., Rougemont, Fr., Zurbach, J. (Pisa-Roma): 105-120.
- Déléage, A. (1934), *Les cadastres antiques jusqu'à Dioclétien*, (Le Caire).
- De Martin, S. (2020), 'Theognis the author, traditional wisdom, and some side effects of authority,' in *Defining Authorship, Debating Authenticity: Problems of Authority from Classical Antiquity to the Renaissance*, (Eds.) Berardi, R., Filosa, M., Massimo, D., (Berlin-Boston): 111-138.
- Demont, P., (2018), 'Herodotus on health and disease' in *Herodotus, narrator, scientist, historian*, (Ed.) Bowie, E., (Berlin): 175-196.
- De Olmo Lete G., Sanmartin J. (2015), *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition, 1-2*, (Leiden).
- Deroy, L. (1956), 'Sur la langue d'une inscription éteochoyprite', *Minos* 4: 90–103.
- Derwa, L. (1964), 'A propos de la date de la guerre de Troie', *RHA* 22/74: 67-86.
- De Sensi Sestito, G. (2015), 'Temesa: tradizioni e documentazioni a confronto, in "Verso Temesa": atti del Convegno Campora San Giovanni -Amantea 31 ottobre 2015, (Ed.) Ruffo, M.F., (San Giovanni in Fiore): 9-34.

- Destrooper-Georgiades, A. (1984), 'Le trésor de Larnaca (IGCH 1272) réexaminé', *RDAC*: 140-161.
- Destrooper-Georgiades, A. (1985), 'Archéologie, numismatique, et la mission suédoise à Chypre', *Archaeologia Cypria* 1: 97-109.
- Destrooper-Georgiades, A. (1995), 'La numismatique de l'Orient', in *La civilisation phénicienne et punique. Manuel de recherche*, (Ed). Krings, V., (Leiden-New York-Köln): 148-165.
- Destrooper-Georgiades, A. (1996), 'Les tortues d'Égine à Chypre', *ΧΑΡΑΚΤΗΡ, Αφιέρωµα στη Μάντω Οικονοµίδου, Δημοσιεύματα του Αρχαιολογικού Δελτίου* 57: 103-113.
- Destrooper-Georgiades, A. (2002), 'Les royaumes de Kition et d'Idalion aux V^e et IV^e siècles à la lumière des témoignages numismatiques', *CCEC* 32, (*Colloque en honneur de M. Yon, Lyon, 20-22 juin 2002*): 351-368.
- Destrooper-Georgiades, A. (2002b), 'Cypriot Coins in the Hungarian National Museum', *Numismatic Report, Cyprus Numismatic Society XXXI-XXXII* 2000-2001: 7-16.
- Destrooper-Georgiades, A. (2004), 'La participation des Chypriotes aux jeux panhelléniques à l'époque classique; répercussions sur le monnayage de l'île?', *Bulletin du cercle d'études numismatiques* 41.2: 37-42.
- Dever, W.G. (1995), 'Preliminary Excavation Reports: Sardis, Idalion, and Tell el-Handaqq North', *AASOR* 53: 1-113+115-154.
- De Vogué, M. (1862), 'Nouvelles Archéologique et correspondance', *RAr* 5: 345-347.
- Di Fidio, P., 'A reassessment of taxation on sacred lands in the Linear B corpus, in *Palatial Economy in the Ancient Near East and in the Aegean: First Steps Towards a Comprehensive Study and Analysis. ESF Exploratory Workshop Held in Sèvres (France), 16-19 Sept. 2010, Pasiphae* 11, (Eds.) Carlier, P., Joannès, Fr., Rougemont, Fr., Zurbach, J. (Pisa-Roma): 121-140.
- Diakou, S. (2018), *The Upper Geometric cemetery at Lapithos: University of Pennsylvania Museum Excavations, 1931-1932*, (Uppsala).
- Dillery, J. (2005), 'Cambyses and the Egyptian Chaosbeschreibung Tradition', *CQ* 55.2: 387-406.
- Dillon, M.P.J. (1997), 'A Homeric Pun from Abu Simbel', *ZPE* 118: 128-130.
- Dion, P.E. (1991), 'The Civic-and-Temple Community of Persian Period Judaea: Neglected Insights from Eastern Europe', *JNES* 50: 281-87
- Dion, P.E. (1992), 'Les KTYM de Tel Arad: Grecs ou Phéniciens?', *Revue Biblique* 99: 70-79.

- Dobbs-Allsopp, F.W., Roberts, J.J.M., Seow, C.L., Whitaker, R.E. (2005), *Hebrew Inscriptions: Texts from the Biblical Period of the Monarchy with Concordance*, (Yale).
- Dubois, L. (1986), *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien, I-III*, (Louvain-la-Neuve).
- Dubrec, Y. (2008), 'Une note sur Posidippe, epigr. 82, 6 A-B', *ZPE* 64, 28.
- Duhoux, Y. (1976), *Aspects du vocabulaire économique mycénien : cadastre, artisanat, fiscalité*, (Amsterdam).
- Duhoux, Y. (1982), *L'Étéocrétois. Les textes – la langue*, (Amsterdam).
- Duhoux, Y. (2009), 'Eteocypriot and Cypro-Minoan 1-3', *Kadmos* 48: 39-75.
- Duhoux, Y., Morpurgo-Davies, A. (2008), 'Mycenaean Economy' in *A Companion to Linear B: Mycenaean Greek Texts and Their World, Bibliothèque des Cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique de Louvain 120*, (Eds.) Duhoux, Y., Morpurgo, D., (Louvain): 157-200.
- Dunant, C., Thomopoulos, J. (1954), 'Inscriptions de Céos', *BCH* 78: 336-338
- Dunkel, G.E. (2007), 'Chips from an Aptologist's Workshop I', in *Studies in Historical and Indo-European Linguistics, Presented to Jay H. Jasanoff by Students, Colleagues, and Friends*, (Eds.), Nussbaum, A.J., (New York): 53-61.
- Dunkel, G.E. (1981), 'Mycenaean ke-ke-me-na, ki-ti-me-na', *Minos* 17: 18-29.
- Dupont-Sommer, A. (1948), 'Nouvelle lecture d'une inscription phénicienne archaïque de Nora en Sardaigne (*CIS I*, 144)', *CRAIBL* 92: 12-22.
- Dupont-Sommer, A. (1970), 'Histoire ancienne de l'Orient', *École pratique des hautes études. 4^e section, Sciences historiques et philologiques. Annuaire 1969-1970*: 131-160.
- Dupont-Sommer, A., (1979), 'L'inscription araméenne', in *Fouilles de Xanthos VI : la stèle trilingue du Letôon*, (Eds.) Metzger, H., Demargne, P., (Istanbul): 129-178.
- Dusinberre, E.R.M. (2016), 'Resistance, Revolt and Revolution in Achaemenid Persia: Response' in *Revolt and Resistance in the Ancient Classical World and the Near East*, (Eds.) Collins, J.J., Manning J.G., (Leiden): 122-137.
- Dvorjetski, E. (2016), 'From Ugarit to Madaba: Philological and Historical Functions of the marzēah', *JSS* 61: 17-39.
- Edel, E. (1978), 'Amasis und Nebukadrezar II', *Gott. Misz* 29: 13-20.
- Egetmeyer, M. (1992), *Worterbuch zu den Inschriften im kyprischen Syllabar*, (Berlin).
- Egetmeyer, M. (1993), 'Zurkyprischen Bronze von Idalion', *Glotta* 71: 39-59.

Egetmeyer, M. (1993b), 'Kyprisch za: Einlautliches oder ein graphisches Problem?', *Kadmos* 32: 145-155.

Egetmeyer, M. (1993c), 'Zur kyprischen Onomastik', *Kadmos* 32: 19-38.

Egetmeyer, M. (1998), 'L'homme propose, dieu dispose'. Remarque lexicale à propos d'une inscription chypriote syllabique (ICS² 264)', *CCEC* 27: 93-95.

Egetmeyer, M. (2002), 'Nachtrag zu kyprisch za' in *Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 80 Geburtstag*, (Eds.), Fritz, M., Zeilfelder, S. (Graz): 95-99.

Egetmeyer, M. (2002b), 'VII. Inscribed Stones' in *Ancient Art from Cyprus in the Collection of George and Nefeli Giabra Pierides*, (Ed.) Karageorghis, V., (Athens): 260-264.

Egetmeyer, M. (2004), 'Apports philologiques sur l'administration du royaume d'Idalion', *CCEC* 34, *Frontières et territoires au centre de Chypre : la région d'Idalion de l'Antiquité au XIXe siècle (colloque Aix-en-Provence 2003)*: 101-114.

Egetmeyer, M. (2005), 'Satrapas', in *Die indischen und iranischen Lehnwörter im Griechischen*, (Ed.) Brust, M., (Innsbruck): 597-612.

Egetmeyer, M. (2006), 'Cipriota e-xe / o-ru-xe', in *Studi linguistici in onore di Roberto Gusmani*, (Eds.) Bombi, R., et al., (Alessandria): 707-712.

Egetmeyer, M. (2007), 'Lumière sur les loups d'Apollon', *Les sanctuaires syro-anatoliens de la préhistoire au début de l'ère chrétienne*, *Res Antiquae* 4: 205-219, (Bruxelles).

Egetmeyer, M. (2008), 'Epilukos / opilukos: un titolo greco di origine indoeuropea', in *Colloquium Romanum Atti del XII Colloquio Internazionale di Micenologia 'Pasiphae' II Roma, 20-25 febbraio 2006 sotto l'alto patronato del Presidente della Repubblica*, (Eds.) Sacconi, A., Del Frio, M., Godart, L., Negri, M., (Pisa-Roma): 251-268.

Egetmeyer, M. (2008b), 'Langues et écritures chypriotes : nouvelles perspectives', *CRAIBL* 152-3: 997-1020.

Egetmeyer, M. (2010), *Le dialecte grec ancien de Chypre : Tome I: Grammaire. Tome II: Répertoire des inscriptions en syllabaire chypro-grec*, (Berlin).

Egetmeyer, M. (2010b), 'The Recent Debate on Eteocypriote People and Language', *Pasiphae* 3: 69-90.

Egetmeyer, M. (2012), "'Sprechen Sie Golgisch?'" Anmerkungen zu einer übersehenen Sprache' in *Etudes mycéniennes 2010. Actes du XIII colloque international sur les texte égéens*, (Ed.) Carlier, P., (Pisa-Rome): 427-434.

Egetmeyer, M. (2013), 'From the Cypro-Minoan to the Cypro-Greek syllabaries: linguistic remarks on the script reform' in *Syllabic Writing of Ancient Cyprus*, (Ed.) Steel, P., (Cambridge): 107-132.

- Egetmeyer, M. (2017), 'Script and language on Cyprus during the Geometric Period: an overview on the occasion of two new inscriptions', in *Understanding Relations Between Scripts*, (Ed.) Steele, P., (Oxford): 180-201.
- Egetmeyer, M., Karnava, A., Perna, M. (2012), 'Rapport 2006-2010 sur les écritures chypriotes syllabiques', in *Études mycéniennes 2010. Actes du XIIIe colloque international sur les textes égéens, Sèvres, Paris, Nanterre, 20-23 septembre 2010*, (Ed.) Carlier, P., (Pisa-Rome): 23-40.
- Egetmeyer, M., Karnava, A., Landenius Enegren, H., Perna M. (2017), 'IG XV 1, Inscriptiones Cypri Syllabicae: the completion of Fasciculus I, Inscriptiones Amathuntis, Curii et Marii', in *Aegean Scripts. Proceedings of the 14th International Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies, Copenhagen, 2-5 September 2015*, (Eds.) Nosch M.L., Landenius Enegren, H.,(Rome): 45-54.
- Elayi, J. (1986), Le roi et la religion dans les cités phéniciennes à l'époque perse, in *Studia Phoenicia IV, Religio Phoenicia*, (Eds.) Bonnet C., Lipinski, E., Marchetti, P., (Brussels): 249-261.
- Elayi, J. (1987), *Recherches sur les cités phéniciennes à l'époque perse*, (Naples).
- Elayi, J. (1990), 'Tripoli (Liban) à l'époque perse', *Transeuphratène* 2: 59-71.
- Elayi, J. (1997), 'Pouvoirs locaux et organisation du territoire des cités phéniciennes sous l'Empire perse achéménide', *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma, Serie II, Historia Antigua* 10: 63-77
- Elayi, J. (2008), 'Byblos et Sidon, deux modèles de cités phéniciennes à l'époque perse', *Transeuphratène* 35, 89-113.
- Elayi, J. (2013), *The History of Phoenicia*, (Atlanta).
- Elayi, J. (2017), *Sargon II, King of Assyria*, (Atlanta).
- Eph'al, I. (1983), 'On the Political and Social Organization of the Jews in Babylonian Exile,' *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Supplement V*: 106-112.
- Eshel, H. (2008), 'The Kittim in the War Scroll and in the Pesharim' in *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 27-31 January, 1999*, (Eds.) Goodblatt, D., Pinnick, A., Schwartz, D.R., (Leiden): 29-44
- Faist, B. (2010), 'Kinship and Institutional Development in the Middle Assyrian Period', in *Continuity of Empire (?) Assyria, Media, Persia*, (Eds.) Lanfranchi, G., Roaf, M., Rollinger, R., (Padova):15-24.

- Fantalkin, A. (2001), 'Mezad Hashavyahu. Its Material Culture and Historical Background', *Tel Aviv* 28: 3-165.
- Fantar, M.H. *et. al* (1969), *Ricerche puniche ad Antas*, (Roma).
- Fantar M.H. (1993), *Carthage, Approche d'une civilisation*, (Tunis).
- Faraone, C.A., (2005), 'Curses and blessings in ancient Greek oaths', *Journal of ancient Near Eastern religions* 5: 138-156.
- Farber, G. (2007), 'Pecus non olet? Visiting the Royal Stockyards of Draham during the First Month of Amarsu'ena 2' in *Studies Presented to Robert D. Biggs, June 4, 2004: From the Workshop of the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary, vol. 2. AS 27*, (Eds.) Roth, M.T. *et al.* (Chicago): 35-64.
- Ferrara, S. (2012), *Cypro-Minoan Inscription, I-II*, (Oxford).
- Ferrara, S. (2013), 'Writing in Cypro-Minoan: one script, too many?' in *Syllabic writing on Cyprus and its context*, (Ed.), Steele, P., (Cambridge): 49-76.
- Ferrara, S., Bell, C. (2016), 'Tracing copper in the Cypro-Minoan script', *Antiquity* 90 (352): 1009-1021.
- Fevrier, J.G. (1958-1959), 'Remarques sur le Grand Tarif dit de Marseille', *Cahiers de Byrsa* 8: 35-43.
- Fileni, M. G. (2006), 'La comunicazione linguistica fra Greci e barbari nella Grecia antica', *Quaderni urbinati di cultura classica* 83/2: 97-118.
- Finkelstein, I. (2002), 'The Philistines in the Bible: A Late-Monarchic Perspective', *JSOT* 131/67: 2- 27
- Fisher-Bover, G. (2014), *Army and Society in Ptolemaic Egypt (Armies of the Ancient World)*, (Cambridge).
- Flourentzos, P. (2007), *The Sarcophagus of Palaipafos. Lefkosia*, (Nicosia).
- Fränkel, E. (1950), 'Griechisches und Italisches', *IF* 60: 142-144.
- Franklin, J.C. (2016), *Kinyras: The Divine Lyre*, (Harvard).
- Franklin, N. (2001), 'Masons' Marks from The Ninth Century Bce. Northern Kingdom of Israel Evidence of The Nascent Carian Alphabet?', *Kadmos* 40-2: 97-106.
- Franklin, N. (2008), 'Trademarks of the Omride builders?', in *Bene Israel: studies in the archaeology of Israel and the Levant during the Bronze and Iron Ages in honour of Israel Finkelstein*, (Eds.) Fantalkin, A., Yasur-Landau., A., (Leiden): 45-54.

Fraser, P.M., Matthews, E. (1987), *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names, I: The Aegean Islands, Cyprus, Cyrenaica*, (Oxford).

Fraser, P.M. (1970), 'Greek-Phoenician Bilingual Inscriptions from Rhodes', *ABSA* 65: 31-6.

Fried, L.S. (2004), *The Priest and the Great King: Temple-Palace Relations in the Persian Empire*, Winona Lake.

Friedrich, J. (1932), *Kleinasiatische Sprachdenkmäler*, (Berlin).

Forster, E.S. (1941), 'Dogs in Ancient Warfare', *Greece & Rome* 10: 114-117.

Fourrier, S. (2001), 'Naucratis, Chypre et la Grèce de l'Est; le commerce des sculptures chypro-ioniennes' in *Naukratis, Die Beziehungen zu Ostgriechenland, Ägypten und Zypern in archaischer Zeit*, (Eds.), Hockmann, U., Kreikenbom, D., (Mainz): 39-54.

Fourrier, S. (2002), 'Les territoires des royaumes chypriotes archaïques : une esquisse de géographie historique', *CCEC* 32 (*Hommage à Marguerite Yon*): 135-146.

Fourrier, S. (2007), *La coroplastie chypriote archaïque. Identités culturelles et politiques à l'époque des royaumes*, (Lyon).

Fourrier, S. (2008), 'Légendes de fondation et hellénisation de Chypre. Parcours historiographique', *CCEC* 38:103-118.

Fourrier, S. (2013), 'Constructing the Peripheries: Extra-Urban Sanctuaries and Peer-Polity Interaction in Iron Age Cyprus', *BASOR* 370: 103-122.

Fourrier, S. (2016), 'The Iron Age city of Kition: the state of research 85 years after the Swedish Cyprus Expedition's excavations, in *Ancient Cyprus Today, Museum Collections and New Research*, (Eds.) Bourogiannis, G., Mühlénbock, C., (Uppsala):129-139.

Fourrier, S. (2018), 'Salamine de l'époque géométrique à la fin de l'époque classique : les espaces urbains', in *Les royaumes de Chypre à l'épreuve de l'histoire : Transitions et ruptures de la fin de l'Âge du Bronze au début de l'époque hellénistique*, *BCH Supplément* 60, (Eds.) Cannavò, A., Thély, L., (Athènes): 129-145.

Fourrier, S. (2019), 'Cyprus' in *The Oxford Handbook of the Phoenician and Punic Mediterranean*, (Eds.) Doak, B.R., Lopez-Ruiz, C. (Oxford).

Fourrier, S., Hermay, A. (2006), *Amathonte VI. Le sanctuaire d'Aphrodite, des origines au début de l'époque impériale*, (Paris).

Fujii, T. (2013), *Imperial Cult and Imperial Representation in Roman Cyprus*, (Stuttgart).

- Gaber, P., (2008), 'The History of History: Excavations at Idalion and the Changing History of a City-Kingdom', *Near Eastern Archaeology* 71(1): 52-63.
- Gaber, P., (2018), 'Urbanization on Cyprus: The View from Idalion', *Global Journal of Archaeology & Anthropology* 6.1, 1-16.
- Gaber, P., Dever, W.G. (1995), 'Idalion, Cyprus: Conquest and Continuity', *Preliminary Excavation Reports: Sardis, Idalion, and Tell el-Handaquq North*, AASOR: 85-113.
- Garbini, G. (1975), 'Sul nome fenicio della porpora', *RSF* 3: 15-16.
- Garbini, G. (1977) 'Sulla datazione dell'iscrizione di Ahiram', *AION* 627: 81-89.
- Garbini, G. (1978), 'La scrittura Fenicia a Cipro e in Anatolia', *ASNS III*: 887-906.
- Garbini, G. (1981), 'L'iscrizione fenicia di Karatepe', *AION* 41: 156-160.
- Garbini, G. (1997), 'Nuove epigrafi fenicie da Antas', *RSF* 25: 59-67.
- Gardner, E.A., Hogarth, D.G., James, M.R., Smith, R.E (1888), 'Excavations in Cyprus, 1887-88. Paphos, Leontari, Amargetti', *JHS* 9: 147-271.
- Garfinkel, Y. (1988), 'MLŠ HKRSYM in Phoenician Inscriptions from Cyprus, the QRSY in Arad, HKRSYM in Egypt, and BNY QYRS in the Bible', *JNES* 47.1: 27-34.
- Gauthier, P. (1985), *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs (IV^e-I^{er} siècle avant J.-C) : contribution à l'histoire des institutions*. (Paris).
- Gauthier, P. (1990), 'L'inscription d'Iasos relative à l'*ekklesiastikon*', *BCH* 114.1: 417-443.
- Gallavotti, C. (1977), 'Iscrizione di Stasanore a Cipro', *Kadmos* 16: 160-163.
- Gennadiou, A. (2019), 'Geography and Demography of Salamis: Quantifying a Kingdom of the Cypro-Classical Period' in *Salamis of Cyprus, History and Archaeology from the Earliest Times to Late Antiquity*, (Eds.) Rogge, S., Ioannou, C., Mavrojannis, T., (Münster - New York): 354-378.
- Georgiadou, A. (2010), 'La Tablette d'Idalion réexaminée', *CCEC* 40: 141-203.
- Georgiadou, A. (2015), 'The Tablet of Idalion, ICS 217', in the website *Kyprios Character. History, Archaeology & Numismatics of Ancient Cyprus*.
- Georgiou, A. (2015), 'Cyprus during the 'Crisis Years' revisited' in *The Mediterranean Mirror: Cultural Contacts in the Mediterranean Sea between 1200 and 750 B.C.*, (Eds.) Babbi, A., Bubenheimer-Erhart, F., Marín-Aguilera, B., Mühl, S., (Mainz): 129-145.

- Georgiou, G. (2009), 'Three stone sarcophagi from a Cypro-Classical tomb at Kition', *CCEC* 39: 113-139
- Gibson, J.C.L. (1982), *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions: Volume 3: Phoenician Inscriptions, Including Inscriptions in the Mixed Dialect of Arslan Tash*, (Oxford).
- Giuffrida, M. (1996), 'Le fonti sull'ascesa di Evagora al trono', *ASNS IV*: 589-627.
- Given, M. (1998), 'Inventing the Eteocypriots: Imperialist Archaeology and the Manipulation of Ethnic Identity', *JMA* 11: 3-29.
- Gjerstad, E. (1935), *The Swedish Cyprus Expedition*, (Stockholm).
- Gjerstad, E. (1948), *The Swedish Cyprus Expedition: The Cypro-Geometric, Cypro-Achaic and Cypro-Classical periods*, (Stockholm).
- Gjerstad, E. (1979), 'The Phoenician Colonization and Expansion in Cyprus', *RDAC*: 230-254.
- Gomme, A.W. (1945), *An Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, (Oxford).
- Goren, Y., Bunimovitz, S., Finkelstein, I., Na'Aman, N., (2003), 'The Location of Alashiya: New Evidence from Petrographic Investigation of Alashiyan Tablets from El-Amarna and Ugarit', *AJA* 107: 233-255.
- Gorman, B., Robinson, W., Graham, A.J., (1963), *Oikistes. Studies in Constitutions, Colonies, and Military Power in the Ancient World*, (Leiden).
- Gosline, S.L. (1992), 'Carian quarry markings on Elephantine Island', *Kadmos* 31.1: 43-50.
- Gosline S.L. (1998), 'Quarry, Setting and Team Marks: the Carian Connection', *JAC* 13: 107-113.
- Graham, A. J (1992), 'Abdera and Teos', *JHS* 112, 42-73.
- Gray, D.H.F. (1954), 'Metal-Working in Homer', *JHS* 74: 1-15.
- Grayson A.K., (1991), *Assyrian rulers of the early first millennium BC (vol. 1, 1114-859BC), Royal inscriptions of Mesopotamia. Assyrian periods, vol. 2)*, (Toronto- Buffalo-London).
- Green, J.R. (2007), 'Paphos and the World of the Theatre' in *Proceedings of the International Archaeological Conference: From Evagoras I to the Ptolemies. The Transition from the Classical to the Hellenistic Period in Cyprus, Nicosia, 29-30 November 2002*, (Ed.) Flourentzos, P., (Nicosia): 3-16.
- Green, P. (2010), *Diodorus Siculus, The Persian Wars to the Fall of Athens: Books 11-14.34 (480-401 BCE)*, (Austin).

- Greene, E.S., Lawall, M.L., Polzer M.E. (2008), 'Inconspicuous Consumption: The Sixth-Century B.C.E. Shipwreck at Pabuç Burnu, Turkey', *AJA* 112.4: 685-711.
- Greenfield, J.C. (1974), 'The Marzeah as a Social Institution', *Acta Scientiarum Hungaricae Antiqua Academiae* 22: 450-455.
- Greenfield, J.C. (1987), 'Larnax tēs Lapithou III Revisited' in *Studia Phoenicia V: Phoenicia and the East Mediterranean in the First Millennium b.c. Proceedings of the Conference held in Leuven from the 14th to the 16th of November 1985. Studia Phoenicia V*, (Ed.) Lipinski. E., (Leuven): 391-401.
- Greenwood, E. (2006), *Thucydides and the Shaping of History*, (London).
- Grelot, P. (1972), 'Documents araméens d'Egypte. Introduction, traduction, présentation', (Paris).
- Griffith, A. (1987), 'Democedes of Croton. A Greek Doctor at the Court of Darius', in *Achaemenid History II. The Greek Sources*, (Eds.) Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H., Kuhrt, A., (Leiden): 37-51.
- Grosso, R. (1958), 'I deportati in Persia', *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 86: 350-375.
- Gschnitzer, F. (1973), 'Prytanis', *RE Suppl. XIII*: 801-808.
- Guarducci, M. (1967), *Epigrafia greca I: Caratteri e storia della disciplina. La scrittura greca dalle origini all'età imperiale*, (Roma).
- Guion, S.G. (1996), 'Greek Syllable Structure. Evidence from Cyprian', *Diachronica* 13: 63-82.
- Gunter, A., 2014, 'Beyond 'orientalizing': Encounters Among Cultures in the Eastern Mediterranean', in *Assyria to Iberia at the Dawn of the Classical Age*, (Eds.) Aruz, J., Craft, S.B., Rakic, Y., (New York): 248-253.
- Hadjicosti, M. (1995), 'Excavations at Idalion', *CCEC* 24: 25-28.
- Hadjicosti, M. (1997), 'The Kingdom of Idalion in the Light of New Evidence', *BASOR* 308: 49-63.
- Hadjicosti, M. (1999), 'Idalion before the Phoenicians: The Archaeological Evidence and its Topographical Distribution', in *Cyprus. The Historicity of the Geometric Horizon*, (Eds.) Iacovou, M., Michaelides, D., (Nicosia): 34-54.
- Hadjicosti, M. (2017), 'Το Αρχείο του Ιδαλίου - 1. Ιστορικό και αρχαιολογικό πλαίσιο' in *ΑΡΧΑΙΑ ΚΥΠΡΟΣ Πρόσφατες εξελίξεις στην αρχαιολογία της ανατολικής Μεσογείου*, (Eds.) Παπαδημητρίου, Ν., Τόλη, Μ., (Athens): 257-274.
- Hadjisavvas, S. (2012), *The Phoenician Period Necropolis of Kition, Volume I*, (Nicosia).

- Hadjisavvas, S. (2014), *The Phoenician Period Necropolis of Kition, Volume II*, (Nicosia).
- Hadjisavvas, S. (2017), *Alassa. Excavations at the Late Bronze Age Sites of Pano Mantiliaris and Paliotaverna 1984-2000*, (Nicosia).
- Hadjisavvas S., Dupont-Sommer A., Lozachmeur H. (1979), ‘Cinq stèles funéraires découvertes sur le site d’Ayios Georghios, à Larnaca-Kition’, *RDAC*: 101-116.
- Haider, P.W. (1996), ‘Griechen im Vorderen Orient und in Ägypten bis ca. 590 v. Chr.’ in *Wege zur Genese griechischer Identität: Die Bedeutung der früharchaischen Zeit*, (Ed.) Ulf, C., (Berlin): 59-115.
- Haider, P.W. (2001), ‘Epigraphische Quellen zur Integration von Griechen in die ägyptische Gesellschaft der Saïtenzeit’, in *Naukratis. Die Beziehungen zu Ostgriechenland, Ägypten und Zypern in archaischer Zeit. Akten der Table Ronde in Mainz, 25-27. November 1999*, (Eds.) Hockmann, U., Kreikenbom, D., (Möhnesee): 197-215.
- Hale, J.R. (2013), ‘Not Patriots, Not Farmers, Not Amateurs. Greek Soldiers of Fortune and the Origins of Hoplite Warfare’ in *Men of Bronze, Hoplite Warfare in Ancient Greece*, (Eds.) Kagan, D., Viggiano, G., (Princeton): 176-193.
- Hall, H.R. (1925) ‘The restoration of Egypt’, in *The Cambridge ancient history iii: the Assyrian empire*, (Eds.) Bury, J.B., et al. (Cambridge): 301.
- Hamp, E.P. (1953), ‘Cypriote ὕφας ζῶν’, *Classical Philology* 48: 240-243.
- Hanan, E. (2009), ‘The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State’, *JTS* 60: 634-636.
- Hansen, P.A. (1989), *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca: saeculi IV a. Chr. n., tome II, 146-150 (Tituli sepulcrales), 266-271 (Tituli dedicatorii)*, (Berlin-New York).
- Harrison, A.R.V. (1968), *The law of Athens*, (Oxford).
- Harrison, E. (1926), ‘Cambridge Philological Society’, *CR* 40/4, 140.
- Hatzopoulos, M.B. (1994), *Cultes et rites de passage en Macedoine*, (Athens-Paris).
- Hatzopoulos M.B. (2009), ‘Chypre, de la multiplicité des royaumes à l'unité de la province lagide’, *CCEC* 39, 227-34.
- Hatzopoulos, M.B. (2011), ‘“Factoïdes” et la date du Bronze d’Idalion’, in *Πρακτικὰ τοῦ Δ' Διεθνοῦς Κυπριολογικοῦ Συνεδρίου. Λευκωσία 29 Ἀπριλίου – 3 Μαΐου 2008, I.2, Ancient Section*, (Ed.) Demetriou, A., (Nicosia).

Hatzopoulos, M.B. (2011b), 'Retour sur Androclès d'Amathonte (rectificatif à CCEC 39, 2009, p. 226-234)' *CCEC* 41: 329-330.

Hatzopoulos, M.B. (2014), 'Hatzopoulos, Cypriot Kingships in Context', *CCEC* 44: 217-233.

Hatzopoulos, M.B., Georgiadou, A. (2013), 'Donations de Macédonie et de Chypre' in *Epigraphy, Numismatics, Prosopography and History of Ancient Cyprus, paper in Honour of Ino Nicolau*, (Ed.) Michaelides, D., (Uppsala): 203-210.

Hatzopoulos, M.B., Gonaropoulou, L., Kalogridou, I., Paschalidis, P. (1998), *Inscriptiones Macedoniae inferioris: inter Bermium montem at Axiu flumen repertae: fasciculus primus Inscriptiones Beroeae*, (Athens).

Hauben, H. (1987), 'Cyprus and the Ptolemaic Navy', *RDAC*: 213-226.

Hauben, H. (2001), 'Das Expeditionsheer Psametiks II' in *Punica – Libyca – Ptolemaica. FS W. Huß, Studia Phoenicia 16*, (Eds.) Geus, K., Zimmerman K., (Leuven): 53-77.

Healey, J.P. (1974), 'The Kition Tariffs and the Phoenician Cursive Series', *BASOR* 216: 53-60.

Henry A. 1982, 'Polis/ Acropolis, Paymasters and the Ten Talent Fund' *Chiron* 12: 91-118.

Herda, A. (2009), 'Karkiša–Karien und die sogenannte Ionische Migration' in *Die Karer und die Anderen, Internationales Kolloquium an der Freien Universität Berlin 13. bis 15. Oktober 2005*, (Ed.) Rumscheid, F., (Bonn): 27-108.

Herda, A. (2013), 'Greek (and our) views on the Karians', in *Luwian Identities Culture, Language and Religion between Anatolia and the Aegean*, (Eds.) Mouton, A., Rutherford, I., Yakubovich, I., (Boston): 421-508.

Herda, A., Sauter, E. (2009), 'Karerinnen und Karer in Milet: Zu einem spätklassischen Schlüsselchen mit karischem Grafijito aus Milet', *Archäologischer Anzeiger*: 51-112.

Helly, B. (2004), 'Gloses thessaliennes et Realia', in *Dialetti, dialettismi, generiletterari e funzioni sociali. Atti del V Colloquio Internazionale di Linguistica Greca (Milano 2002)*, (Ed.) Rocca, G., (Alessandria): 265-301.

Hellmann, C., Hermary, A. (1980), 'Inscriptions d'Amathonte III', *BCH* 104: 259-272.

Heltzer, M. (1987), 'The *ger* in the Phoenician society. Phoenicia and the East Mediterranean in the first millenium BC', in *Studia Phoenicia V, Phoenicia and the East Mediterranean in the first millenium B.C., Proceedings of the*

Conference held in Leuven from the 14th to the 16th of November 1985, (Ed.) Lipinski, E., (Leuven): 309-314.

Heltzer, M. (2000), 'The Biblical Words for "to Translate" and "Translate" and their Origin', *UF* 32: 237-242.

Hendrix, E. (1999), 'A Cypriot Silver Bowl Reconsidered 2. The Technique and Physical History of the Bowl', *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 34: 21-31

Hergoz, Z., Aharoni, M., Rainey, A.F., Moshkovitz, S. (1984), 'The Israelite Fortress at Arad', *BASOR* 253: 1-34.

Herm, G. (1975), *The Phoenicians*, (New York).

Hermay, A. (1981), *Amathonte II: Testimonia 2. Les sculpture découvertes avant 1975*, (Paris).

Hermay, A. (1985), 'Un nouveau chapiteau hathorique trouvé à Amathonte', *BCH* 109: 657-708.

Hermay, A. (1989), 'Rapports sur les travaux de la mission de l'École française à Amathonte en 1988', *BCH* 113: 855-910.

Hermay, A. (1989b), *Catalogue des antiquités de Chypre. Sculptures*, (Paris).

Hermay, A. (1989c), 'Tèimoignage des documents figurés sur la société chypriote d'époque classique', in *Early Society in Cyprus*, (Ed.) Peltenburg, E., (Edinburg), 180-196.

Hermay, A. (1996), 'Le statut de Kition avant le v^e s. av. J.-C.' in *Alle Soglie della classicità. Il Mediterraneo tra tradizione e innovazione*, (Ed.) Acquaro, E., (Pisa-Roma): 223-229.

Hermay, A. (1999), 'Amathus before the 8th century BC', in *The Historicity of the Geometric Horizon: Proceedings of an Archaeological Workshop, University of Cyprus, Nicosia, 11th October 1998*, (Eds.) Iacovou, M., Michaelidis, D., (Nicosia): 55-59.

Hermay, A. (2000), 'Déesse plutôt que reine? À propos d'une coupe en argent de la Collection Cesnola', *CCEC* 30: 67-78.

Hermay, A. (2000b), 'Des Chypriotes loin de leur île (époque hellénistique)', *CCEC* 29: 45-57.

Hermay, A., (2000c), 'La céramique attique du IV^e s. à Chypre', in *La céramique attique du IV^e siècle en Méditerranée orientale*, (Ed.), Sabbatini, B., (Naples): 277-281.

Hermay, A. (2001), 'Naucratis et la sculpture égyptisante à Chypre', in *Naucratis, Die Beziehungen zu Ostgriechenland, Ägypten und Zypern in archaischer Zeit*, (Eds.) Hockmann, U., Kreikenbom, D., (Möhnesee): 27-38.

- Hermay, A. (2005), 'Amathus Capital of Kingdom and City-State', in *A History of Limassol in Cyprus from Antiquity to the Ottoman*, (Eds.) Nicolaou-Konnari, A., Schabel, C., (Boston): 1-48.
- Hermay, A. (2005b), 'Les derniers temps du royaume d'Idalion et son annexion par Kition. Le témoignage des sculptures', *CCEC* 35: 99-126.
- Hermay, A. (2013), 'Building Power: Palaces and the Built Environment in Cyprus in the Archaic and Classical Periods', *BASOR* 370: 83-101.
- Hermay, A. (2014), 'Les textes antiques ont-ils créé le mythe d'une prostitution sacrée à Chypre ?', *CCEC* 44: 239-260.
- Hermay, A. (2015), 'La "Terrasse Ouest" d'Amathonte (Chypre): bilan et hypothèses', in *De l'île d'Aphrodite au paradis perdu: itinéraire d'un gentilhomme lyonnais. En hommage à Yves Calvet*, (Eds.) Geyer, B. Matoian, V., Al-Maqdissi, M., (Leuven-Paris-Bristol): 29-38.
- Hermay, A., Masson, O. (1990) 'Deux vases inscrits du Sanctuaire d'Aphrodite à Amathonte (1865–1987)', *BCH* 114: 187-214.
- Hermay, A., Mertens, J. R (2014), *The Cesnola Collection of Cypriot Art. Stone Sculpture*, (New Haven-London).
- Hermay, A., Yon, M., Caubet, A. (2010), 'Nouvelle lecture d'un mot à la première ligne de l'inscription phénicienne de Larnaca-tis-Lapithou conservée au musée de Nicosie', *RDAC*: 59-61.
- Herrmann, P. (1981), 'Teos und Abdera im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.' *Chiron* II: 1-30.
- Herrmann, P., Malay, H. (2007), *New Documents from Lydia*, (Vienne).
- Herzog, Z., Aharoni, M., Rainey A.F., Moshkovitz, S. (1984), 'The Israelite Fortress at Arad', *BASOR* 254: 1-34.
- Heubeck, A. (1976), 'Kupriaka', *ZPE* 23: 255-261.
- Hill, G.F. (1940), *A History of Cyprus, vol. I*, (Cambridge).
- Hirsch, S.W. (1985), *The Friendship of the Barbarians: Xenophon and the Persians*, (Tufts).

- Hitchcock, L.A. (2000), ‘‘One Cannot Export a Palace on Board a Ship’’: Studying Aegean Elements in Cypriot Late Bronze Age Architecture,’ *Backdirt. Newsletter of the Cotsen Institute of archaeology at UCLA*: 6-7.
- Hobden, F. (2013), *The Symposion in Ancient Greek Society and Thought*, (Cambridge).
- Hodot, R. (1990), *Le dialecte éolien d’Asie. La langue des inscriptions. VIIe s. a.C. - IVe s. p.C.*, (Paris).
- Hofstetter, J. (1978), *Die Griechen in Persien. Prosopographie der Griechen im persischen Reich vor Alexander*, (Berlin).
- Hoftijzer, J. , Jongeling, K. (1995), *Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions*, (Leiden).
- Holwerda D. (1991), *Scholia vetera et recentiora in Aristophanis Aves*, (Groningen)
- Holtz, S. E. (2014), *Neo-Babylonian Trial Records*, (Atlanta).
- Honeyman, A.M. (1938), ‘Larnax tēs Lapethou: A Third Phoenician Inscription’, *Le Muséon* 51: 285–298.
- Honeyman, A.M. (1939), ‘The Phoenician Inscriptions of the Cyprus Museum’, *Iraq*: 104-108.
- Honeyman, A.M. (1940), ‘Observations on a Phoenician Inscription of Ptolemaic Date’, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 26: 57-67.
- Hornblower, S. (1982), *Mausolus*, (Oxford-New York).
- Hornblower, S. (1991), *A Commentary on Thucydides, I*, (Oxford).
- Humbert, J. (1960), *Syntaxe grecque*, (Paris).
- Hurschmann, R. (2001), ‘Schloss’, *DNP* 11: 186-190.
- Huyse, Ph. (1990), ‘Die persische Medizin auf der Grundlage von Herodots Historien’, *Ancient Society* 21: 141-148.
- Iacovou, M. (2002), ‘From ten to naught. Formation, consolidation and abolition of Cyprus’ Iron Age polities’, *CCEC 32, (Hommage à Marguerite Yon)*: 73-87.
- Iacovou, M. (2006), ‘‘Greeks’, ‘Phoenicians’ and ‘Eteocypriots’. Ethnic Identities in the Cypriote Kingdoms’, in *Sweet Land...: Cyprus through the Ages*, (Eds.) Chrysostomides, J., Dendrinou, C., (Camberley): 27-59.
- Iacovou, M. (2006b), ‘From the Mycenaean QA-SI-RE-U to the Cypriote PA-SI-LE-WO-SE: The basileus in the kingdoms of Cyprus’ in *Ancient Greece*

from the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer', (Ed.) Deger-Jalkotzy, I., (Edinburgh): 315-335.

Iacovou, M. (2007), 'Advocating Cyprocentricism: An Indigenous Model for the Emergence of State Formation on Cyprus' in "Up to the Gates of Ekron" (*1 Samuel 17:52*), *Essays on the Archaeology and History of the Eastern Mediterranean in Honor of Seymour Gitin*, (Eds.) Crawford, S.W., Ben-Tor, A., Dessel, J.P., Dever, W.G., Mazar, A., Aviram, J., (Jerusalem): 461-475.

Iacovou, M. (2008), 'Cultural and Political Configurations in Iron Age Cyprus: The Sequel to a Protohistoric Episode', *AJA* 112: 625-657.

Iacovou, M. (2012), 'From Regional Gateway to Cypriot Kingdom: Copper deposits and copper routes in the chora of Paphos', in *Eastern Mediterranean Metallurgy and Metalwork in the Second Millennium BC., A Conference in Honour of James D. Muhly*, (Eds.) Kassianidou, V., Papasavvas, G. (Oxford), 58-69.

Iacovou, M. (2012b), 'External and internal migrations during the 12th century BC. Setting the stage for an economically successful Early Iron Age in Cyprus', in *Cyprus and the Aegean in the Early Iron Age. The Legacy of Nicolas Coldstream*. (Ed.) Iacovou, M. (Nicosia), 207-227.

Iacovou, M. (2013), 'Historically Elusive and Internally Fragile Island Polities: The Intricacies of Cyprus's Political Geography in the Iron Age', *BASOR* 370: 15-47.

Iacovou, M. (2013b), 'The Cypriot Syllabary as a Royal Signature: The Political Context of the Syllabic Script in the Iron Age' in *Syllabic Writing on Cyprus and Its Context*', (Ed.) Steele, P., (Cambridge): 133-152.

Iacovou, M. (2013c), 'Paphos before Palaepaphos. New approaches to the history of the Paphian kingdom', in *Epigraphy, Numismatics, Prosopography and History of Ancient Cyprus. Papers in Honour of Ino Nicolaou*, (Ed.) Michaelides, D., (Uppsala): 275-291.

Iacovou, M. (2014), 'Beyond the Athenocentric Misconceptions: The Cypriote Polities in their Economic Context', *CCEC* 44: 96-117.

Iacovou, M. (2014b), 'Cyprus during the Iron Age through the Persian Period', in *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of the Levant (ca. 8000 – 332 BCE)*, (Eds.) Steiner, M.L., Killebrew, A.E., (Oxford): 795-824.

Iacovou, M. (2014c), 'Cyprus during the Iron Age I period (Late Cypriote IIC - IIIA)', in *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of the Levant (ca. 8000 – 332 BCE)*, (Eds.) Steiner M.L., Killebrew, A.E., (Oxford): 660-674.

Iacovou, M. (2014d), 'Working with the shadows: in search of the myriad forms of social complexity' in *Athyrmata: Critical Essays on the Archaeology of the Eastern Mediterranean in Honour of E. Susan Sherratt*, (Eds.) Wilkinson, T., Galanakis, I., Bennet J., (Oxford): 117-126.

- Iacovou, M. (2017): ‘Ο τύμβος της Λαόνας στην Παλαίπαφο Από την αναγνώριση στη μέθοδο διερεύνησης, in *TEPΨΙΣ Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology in honour of Nota Kourou*, (Eds.) Vlachou, V., Gadolou, A., (Bruxelles): 317-329.
- Iacovou, M. (2019), ‘Palaepaphos: Unlocking the Landscape Context of the Sanctuary of the Cypriot Goddess’, *Open Archaeology* 5: 204-234.
- Iacovou, M. (2020), ‘Greeks on the island of Cyprus. 'At home' on the frontiers’, in *A Companion to Greeks across the Ancient World*, (Ed.) De Angelis, F., (Chichester): 247-271.
- Iacovou, M., Karnava, A. (2020), ‘An administrative *ostrakon* from Kouklia-Hadjiabdoullah’, *CCEC* 49: 37-52.
- Intzesiloglou, B. G., (2006), ‘The inscription of the Kynegoi of Heracles from the ancient theatre of Demetrias’, in *Inscriptions and history of Tessaly proceedings of the International Symposium in Honour of Professor Christian Habicht*, (Ed.) Pikoulas, G., (Volos): 67-77.
- Jaffe, S.N. (2017), *Thucydides on the Outbreak of War. Character and Contest*, (Oxford).
- Jameson, M. (1965), ‘Notes on the Sacrificial Calendar from Erchia’, *BCH* 89: 154-172.
- Jameson, M. (2014), *Cults and Rites in Ancient Greece Essays on Religion and Society*, (Cambridge).
- Janes, S. (2013), ‘Death and Burial in the Age of the Cypriot City Kingdoms: Social Complexity Based on the Mortuary Evidence’, *BASOR* 370: 145–68.
- Janse, M. (2002), ‘Aspects of Bilingualism in the History of the Greeks’, in *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text*, (Eds.) Adams, J.N., Janse, M., Swain, S., (Oxford): 332-390.
- Jakob, S. (2003), *Mittelassyrische Verwaltung und Sozialstruktur. Untersuchungen*, (Leiden).
- Jastrow M. (1910), ‘Months and Days in Babylonian-Assyrian Astrology’, *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature*, 151-155.
- Jeffery, L.H., Morpurgo-Davies A. (1970), ‘Ποινικαστά and Τροινικάζεν: BM 1969. 4–2. 1, a new archaic inscription from Crete’, *Kadmos* 9: 118-156.
- Jeffery, L.H. (1990), *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*, (Oxford).
- Jigoulov, V. (2015), *The social History of Achaemenid Phoenicia*, (London).
- Jiménez Delgado, J.M. (2005), ‘Consideraciones en torno a PY Eb 297/PY Ep 704.5-6’, *Kadmos* 44: 43-50.

Joannès, F. (1990), 'Pouvoirs locaux et organisations du territoire en Babylonie achéménide', *Transeuphratène* 3: 173-189.

Joannès, F. (2006), 'La Babylonie méridionale: Continuité, déclin ou rupture?' in *La transition entre l'Empire Achéménide et les royaumes hellénistiques (vers 350-300 av. J.-C.)*, (Eds.) Briant, P., Joannès, F., De Boccard, P., (Paris): 101-135.

Jursa, M. (2011), 'Taxation and Service Obligations in Babylonia from Nebuchadnezzar to Darius and the Evidence for Darius' Tax Reform', in *Herodotus and the Persian Empire*, (Eds.) Rollinger, R., Truschnegg, B., Bichler, R., (Wiesbaden): 431-448.

Kraay, C.M. (1976), *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins*, London.

Kagan, J.H. (1999), 'The Archaic and Early Classical Coinage of Kourion', *CCEC* 29: 33-44.

Kahn, D. (2007), 'Note on the time-factor in Cambyses' deeds in Egypt as told by Herodotus', *Transeuphratène* 34: 103-112.

Kamenou, M. (2016), 'Oracles and divination in Cyprus' in *Approaching Cyprus: Proceedings of the Post-Graduate Conference of Cypriot Archaeology (POCA) held at the University of East Anglia, Norwich, 1st-3rd November 2013*, (Eds.) Maguire, R., Chick, J., (Newcastle upon Tyne-Cambridge): 156-166.

Kaminski, G. (1991), 'Thesaurus. Untersuchungen zum antiken Opferstock', *JDAI* 106: 63-181.

Kaplan, P. (2002), 'The Social Status of The Mercenary in Archaic Greece', in *Oikistes, Studies in Constitutions, Colonies, and Military Power in the Ancient World. Offered in Honor of A. J. Graham*, (Eds.) Gorman, V.B., Robinson, E.W., (Leiden): 227-243.

Kaplan, P. (2003), 'Cross-cultural contacts among mercenary communities in Saite and Persian Egypt', *Mediterranean Historical Review* 18-1: 1-31.

Karageorghis, J. (1998), 'Les noms de la Grande Déesse dans les inscriptions syllabiques chypriotes', *CCEC* 27: 109-119.

Karageorghis, J. (2005), *Kypris. The Aphrodite of Cyprus: Ancient sources and archaeological evidence*, (Nicosia).

Karageorghis, V. (1967), *Salamis III: Excavations in the Necropolis of Salamis I*, (Nicosia).

Karageorghis, V. (1970), *Salamis IV: Excavations in the Necropolis of Salamis, II*. (Nicosia).

Karageorghis, V. (1970b), 'Chronique des fouilles et découvertes archéologiques à Chypre en 1969', *BHC* 94: 191-300.

- Karageorghis, V. (1971), 'Chronique des fouilles et découvertes archéologiques à Chypre en 1970' *BHC* 95: 335-442.
- Karageorghis, V. (1972), 'Chronique des fouilles et découvertes archéologiques à Chypre en 1971', *BHC* 96: 1055-1008.
- Karageorghis, V. (1973), 'Chronique des fouilles et découvertes archéologiques à Chypre en 1972', *BHC* 97: 601-689.
- Karageorghis, V. (1974), *Salamis V: Excavations in the Necropolis of Salamis III*, (Nicosia).
- Karageorghis, V. (1982) 'Cyprus' in *The Expansion of the Greek World, Eighth to Sixth Centuries B.C. CAH Second Edition volume III part 3*, (Eds.) Boardman, J., Hammond, N.G.L., (Cambridge): 57-70.
- Karageorghis, V. (1983), *Palaepaphos-Skales: An Iron Age Cemetery in Cyprus*, (Constance).
- Karageorghis, V. (1990), *Les anciens Chypriotes: entre Orient et Occident*, (Paris).
- Karageorghis, V. (1990b), 'A propos de Kitiens portant la tiare', *Semitica* 39: 1-5.
- Karageorghis, V. (1993), 'Erotica from Salamis', *RSF* 21, *Supplemento*: 7-13.
- Karageorghis, V. (1995), *The Coroplastic Art of Ancient Cyprus IV. The Cypro-Archaic Period: Small Male Figurines*, (Nicosie).
- Karageorghis, V. (1999), 'A Cypriot Silver Bowl Reconsidered 1. The Iconography of the Decoration Author(s)', *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 34: 13-20.
- Karageorghis, V. (2004), 'Herodotus and Cyprus', in *The World of Herodotus. Proceedings of an International Conference September 18-21*, (Eds.) Karageorghis, V., Taiphakos, I., (Nicosie): 1-7.
- Karageorghis, V. (2005), *Ancient Cypriote art in Russian museums: the State Historical Museum, Moscow; the Pushkin State Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow; the State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg*, (Nicosia).
- Karageorghis, V. (2007), 'Eating and Drinking in Cyprus, 13th-6th centuries BC', in *Keimelion, Elitenbildung und elitärer Konsum von der mykenischen Palastzeit bis zur Homerischen Epoche / The Formation of Elites and Elitist Lifestyles from Mycenaean Palatial Times to the Homeric Period*, (Eds.), Alam-Stern, E., Nightingale, G., (Vienna): 257-262.
- Karageorghis, V., Demas, M. (1985), *Excavations at Kition V, Kition Kathari, Plans and Sections*, (Nicosia).

- Karageorghis, V., Mertens, J.R., Marice E. R. (2000), 'Ancient art from Cyprus' in *The Cesnola Collection, Metropolitan Museum of Art*, (New York).
- Karageorghis, V. Mitford, T. (1964), 'A Royal Inscription from Curium', *BCH* 88: 67-76.
- Karnava, A. (2018), 'The Syllabic Inscriptions of Amathus: Past and Present', in *Les royaumes de Chypre à l'épreuve de l'histoire : Transitions et ruptures de la fin de l'âge du Bronze au début de l'époque hellénistique*, *BCH Supplément* 60, (Eds.) Cannavò, A., Thély, L., (Athènes): 201-212.
- Karlsson, M. (2013), *Early Neo-Assyrian State Ideology, Relations of Power in the Inscriptions and Iconography of Ashurnasirpal II (883–859) and Shalmaneser III (858–824)*, (Uppsala).
- Kassianidou, V. (2004), '«And at Tamassos there are important mines of copper... » (Strabo, Geography, 14.6.5)', *CCEC* 34, 33-46.
- Kassianidou, V. (2012), 'The origin and use of metals in Iron Age Cyprus', in *Cyprus and the Aegean in the Early Iron Age. The legacy of Nicolas Coldstream Cultural Foundation of the Bank of Cyprus*, (Ed.) Iacovou. M., (Nicosia): 229-259.
- Kassianidou, V. (2013), 'The Exploitation of the Landscape: Metal Resources and the Copper Trade during the Age of the Cypriot City-Kingdoms', *BASOR* 370: 49-82.
- Kassianidou, V. (2016), 'Copper metallurgy in Iron Age Kition', in *Actes du Colloque de Marseille, 16-17 Octobre 2015 en hommage à Antoine Hermary 'Chypre et les grandes îles de Méditerranée. Un nouvel espace d'échanges, de la fin du IIe millénaire av. J.-C. à l'époque hellénistique'*, *CCEC* 46: 71-88.
- Kassianidou, V. (2017), 'The production and trade of Cypriot copper during the Bronze Age: New data (in Greek)' in Ancient Cyprus Recent Developments' in *the Archaeology of the Eastern Mediterranean*, (Eds.) Papadimitriou, N., Toli, M. (Athens): 111-134.
- Katz, J.T. (2008), 'The origin of the Greek pluperfect', *Die Sprache* 46, 1-37.
- Katzenstein, J. (1973), *A History of Tyre*, (Jerusalem).
- Kebler, K. (2015), 'Taxation in the Achaemenid Empire', in the website *Oxford Handbooks Online*.
- Keen, P., 'Political Power and the Decline of Epichoric Languages and Writing Systems in Hellenistic Cyprus', *Ancient History Bulletin*: 87-102.
- Killen, J.T. (1968), 'The Knossos o-pi Tablets', *Atti e memorie del I° congresso internazionale di micenologia II*, (Roma): 640-641.

- Killen, J.T. (2008), 'Mycenaean economy', in *A Companion to Linear B: Mycenaean Greek Texts and Their World. Vol. 1*, (Eds.) Duhoux Y., Morpurgo-Davies, A., (Louvain): 159-200.
- Kim, H.J. (2013), 'The Invention of the "Barbarian" in Late Sixth-Century BC Ionia', (Eds.) Almagor, E. Skinner, J., (London-New York): 25-48.
- Klinkott, H. (2005), *Der Satrap. Ein Achaimenidischer Amtsträger und seine Handlungsspielräume*, (Frankfurt am Main).
- Kloekhorst, A. (2008), *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*, (Leiden).
- Knapp, A.B., Held, S.O., Manning, S.W. (1994), 'The Prehistory of Cyprus: Problems and Prospects', *JWP* 8-4: 377-453
- Knapp, A.B. (2008), *Prehistoric and Protohistoric Cyprus: Identity, Insularity, and Connectivity*, (Oxford).
- Knapp, A.B. (2013), *The Archaeology of Cyprus: From Earliest Prehistory through the Bronze Age*, (New York).
- Komfeld, W. (1978), *Neues über die phönikischen und aramäischen Graffiti in den Tempel von Abydos*, (Wien).
- Körner, C. (2016), 'The Cypriot Kings under Assyrian and Persian Rule (Eighth to Fourth Century BC): Centre and Periphery in a Relationship of Suzerainty' *Electrum* 23: 25-49.
- Körner, C. (2017), *Die zyprischen Königtümer im Schatten der Großreiche des Vorderen Orients. Studien zu den zyprischen Monarchien vom 8. bis zum 4. Jh. v. Chr.*, (Leuven-Paris-Bristol).
- Körner, C. (2019), 'The Kings of Salamis in the Shadow of the Near Eastern Empires: A Relationship of "Suzerainty"', in *Salamis of Cyprus. History and Archaeology from the Earliest Times to Late Antiquity. Schriften des Instituts für Interdisziplinäre Zypern-Studien: Vol. 13*, (Eds.) Rogge, S., Ioannou, C., Mavrojannis, T., (Münster): 327-339.
- Körner, C. (2019b), 'Silbenschrift und Alphabetschriften im archaischen und klassischen Zypern – Ausdruck verschiedener Identitäten?' in *Sprachen – Schriftkulturen – Identitäten der Antike. Beiträge des XV. Internationalen Kongresses für Griechische und Lateinische Epigraphik. Wien, 28. August bis 1. September 2017*, (Eds.) Amann, P., Corsten, T., Mitthof, F., Taeuber, H., (Wien): 59-76.
- Körner, C. (2020), 'Die Zyprischen Könige Des 4. Jhs. V. Chr. Kleinkönige Mit Einem Neuen Königlichen Selbstbewusstsein?' in *Kings and Greek Art in the 4th Century BC Tagung an der Universität Zürich 18-20. Januar 2018*, (Ed.) Grawehr, M., Leybold, C., Mohr, M., Thiermann, E., (Rahden): 153-162.

- Kornfeld, W. (1978), 'Neues fiber die phönikischen and aramäischen Graffiti in den Tempeln von Abydos', *AOAW* 115: 193-204.
- Kraay, C.M. (1976), *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins*, (London).
- Krahmalkov, C.R. (2000), *Phoenician-Punic dictionary*, (Leuven).
- Krahmalhov, C.R. (2001), *A Phoenician-Punic Grammar*, (Leuven).
- Kuhrt, A. (1995), *The Ancient Near East: c.3000-330 BC*, (London).
- Kuhrt, A. (2001), 'The Persian Kings and their subjects: A unique relationship?', *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 96.2, 165-172.
- Kuhrt, A. (2007), *The Persian Empire: A Corpus of Sources from the Achaemenid Period*, (London).
- Kurke, L., (1992), 'The politics of abrosyne in Archaic Greece', *Classical Antiquity* 11: 91-120.
- Kyprianos, A. (1788): *Ἀρχιμανδρίτου Κυπριανοῦ Ἱστορία Χρονολογικὴ τῆς Νήσου Κύπρου*, Th. Papadopoulos (ed), reprinted in *Κυπριολογικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη* 1: 1971, (Nicosia).
- Landucci Gattinoni, F. (2005), 'La tradizione su Seleuco in Diodoro XVIII-XX', in *Diodoro e l'altra Grecia: Macedonia, Occidente, Ellenismo nella Biblioteca storica: atti del convegno, Milano, 15-16 gennaio 2004.*, (Eds.) Bearzot, C., Landucci Gattinoni, F., (Milan): 155-181.
- Lanfranchi, G.B., Rollinger, R. (2010), 'Kingship and institutional development in the middle assyrian period' in *Concepts of Kingship in Antiquity. Proceedings of the European Science Foundation Exploratory Workshop held in Padova, November 28th - December 1st, 2007*, (Eds.) Lafranchi, G.B., Rollinger, R., (Padova): 15-24.
- Larsen, M.T. (2015), *Ancient Kanesh: A Merchant Colony in Bronze Age Anatolia*, (Cambridge).
- Lavelle, B.M. (1984), 'Herodotos on the Argives of Kourion', *Hermes* 112 (2): 249-252.
- Lavelle, B.M. (2002), 'The Apollodoran Date for Archilochus', *Classical Philology* 97 (4): 344- 351.
- Lawall, M.L. (2011), 'Early Hellenistic Amphoras from Two Closed Contexts: Kerynia Shipwreck and Ephesos Well LB', in *Ζ' Επιστημονική Συνάντηση για την Ελληνιστική Κεραμική Αίγιο, 4-9 Απριλίου 2005*, (Eds.) Drougou, S., et al. (Athens): 673-682
- Leahy, A., (1988), 'The Earliest Dated Monument of Amasis and the End of the Reign of Apries', *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 74, 183-199.

Leclant, J. (1968), 'Éléments pour une étude de la divination dans l'Égypte pharaonique', in *La divination, études recueillies par A. Caquot Leibovici, M.*, (Eds.) Caquot, A., Leibovici, M., (Paris): 1-23.

Leclant, J. (1980), 'Le nom de Chypre dans les textes hiéroglyphiques' in *Salamine de Chypre, histoire et archéologie : état des recherches, Lyon, 13-17 mars 1978*, (Ed.) Yon M., (Paris): 131-135.

Lee, J.W.I. (2016), Cyrus the Younger and Artaxerxes II, 401 BC: An Achaemenid Civil War Reconsidered, *Revolt and Resistance in the Ancient Classical World and the Near East* (Eds.) Collins, J.J., Manning J.G., (Leiden): 103-121.

Legras, B. 1999, *Néotês. Recherches sur les jeunes Grecs dans l'Égypte ptolémaïque et romaine*, Paris.

Lehmann R.G. (2005), *Die Inschrift(en) des Ahirom-Sarkophags und die Schachtinschrift des Grabes V in Jbeil (Byblos)*, (Mainz).

Lejeune, M. (1972), *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*, (Paris-Klincksiedk).

Lejeune, M. (1972b), 'Le damos dans la société mycénienne', *Mémoires de philologie mycénienne* 3: 137-54, (Rome).

Lejeune, M. (1994), 'Le "don" d'Idalion', *CCEC* 21: 3-5.

Lejeune, S. (2010), 'Some Thoughts about the Civic Community in Archaic and Classical Cyprus', in *POCA 2007, Postgraduate Cypriot Archaeology Conference*, (Eds.) Christodoulou, S., Satraki, A. (Cambridge): 219-230.

Leukart, A. (1975), 'Syllabaire et dialecte chypriotes classiques', in *Chypre des origines au Moyen Âge, Département des sciences de l'Antiquité*, (Ed.) Van Berchem, D., (Geneve): 100-108.

Lewis D.M., Stroud, R.S. (1979), 'Athens Honors King Euagoras of Salamis', *Hesperia* 48, 180-193.

Lidzbarski, M. (1912), *Phönizische und aramäische Krugaufschriften aus Elephantine*, (Berlin).

Lidzbarski, M. (1915), 'Die phönikischen und aramäischen Inschriften in den Tempeln von Abydos in Eägypten', *Ephemeris*: 93-116.

Lincoln, B. (2003), 'À la Recherche du Paradis Perdu', *History of Religions* 443: 139-154.

Lipiński, E. (1970), 'La fête de l'ensevelissement et de la résurrection de Melqart', in *Actes de la XVIIe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale (Bruxelles, 30 juin-4 juillet 1969)*, (Ed.) Finet, A., (Ham-sur-Heure): 30-58.

- Lipinski, E. (1983), 'Notes d'épigraphie phénicienne et punique. 7 : L'interprète des Crétois', *OLP* 14: 129-165.
- Lipiński, E. (1983b), 'La Carthage de Chypre', in *Studia Phoenicia I-II, Redt Tyrus/Sauvons Tyr II: Histoire phénicienne*, (Eds.) Gubel, E., Lipinski, E., Servez Soyez, B., (Leuven): 209-234.
- Lipinski, E. (1987), 'Resheph Amyklos' in, *Studia Phoenicia 5, Phoenicia and the East Mediterranean in the first millenium B.C., Proceedings of the Conference held in Leuven from the 14th to the 16th of November 1985*, (Ed.) Lipinski E., (Leuven): 87- 99.
- Lipinski, E. (1991), 'The Cypriot vassals of Esarhaddon' in *Ah, Assyria... Studies in Assyrian History and Ancient Near Eastern Historiography Presented to Hayim Tadmor, Scripta Hierosolymitana 33*, (Eds.) Cogan, M., Eph'al, I., (Jerusalem): 58-64.
- Lipinski, E. (1995), 'The Inscribed Marble Vessels from Kition', in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots*, (Eds.) Zevit, Z., Gitin, S., Sokoloff, M., (Winona Lake): 433-442.
- Lipinski, E. (2001), *Semitic language: outlines of a comparative grammar 2nd edn*, (Leuven)
- Lipinski, E. (2004), *Itineraria Phoenicia, Studia Phoenicia 14*, (Leuven).
- Lipka, M. (2002), *Xenophon's Spartan Constitution: Introduction, Text, Commentary*, (Berlin-New York).
- Liverani, M. (1971), 'La royauté syrienne de l'Age du Bronze Récent', in *Le palais et la royauté*, (Ed.) Garelli, P., (Paris): 329-356.
- Lloyd, A.B. (1983), 'The Late Period, 664-323 BC', in *Ancient Egypt: A Social History*, (Eds.) Trigger, B., Kemp, B., O'Connor, D., Lloyd, A., (Cambridge): 279-348.
- Lloyd Llewellyn, J. Robson, J. (2010), *'Ctesias' 'History of Persia': Tales of the Orient*, (London-New York).
- Lockwood, T. (2015), *Aristotle's Politics, A Critical Guide*, (Cambridge).
- Lorenzo, K. (2011), *Ancient Greek and Roman Naval Victory Monuments*, PhD Thesis, (Madison).
- Lorenzo, K. (2015), 'East defeats West: Naval warfare and cross-cultural adaptation on Classical Cyprus, in *POCA (Postgraduate Cypriot Archaeology) 2012* symposium, November 2012, (Eds.) Matthäus, C.V.H., Morstadt B., (Cambridge): 300-308.
- Lupack, S. (2011), 'A View from Outside the Palace: The Sanctuary and the Damos in Mycenaean Economy and Society', *AJA*, 115/2: 207-217.

- Luraghi, N. (1998), 'Il Gran Re e i tiranni. Per una valutazione storica della tirannide in Asia Minore durante il regno dei primi Achemenidi', *Klio* 80: 22-46.
- Luraghi, N. (2006), 'Traders, Pirates, Warriors: The Proto-History of Greek Mercenary Soldiers in the Eastern Mediterranean', *Phoenix* 60.1/2: 21-47.
- Lynch, J. P. (1972), *Aristotle's School: A Study of a Greek Educational Institution*, (Berkeley- Los Angeles-London).
- Lykke, A. (2017), 'Ritualizing the Use of Coins in Ancient Greek Sanctuaries', *JAH* 5:205-227.
- Ma, J. (2016), 'Elites, Elitism, and Community in the Archaic Polis', in *Annales Histoire Sciences Sociales* 71.3: 631-658.
- MacDowell, D.M. (1978), *The law in classical Athens*, (London-Hudson).
- MacDowell, D.M. (2012), 'Polemarchos' in *OCD*.
- Magnanini, P. (1973), *Le iscrizioni fenice dell'Oriente*, (Roma).
- Maier, F.G. (1968), *Cyprus from earliest time to the present day*, (London)
- Maier, F.G. (1985), 'Factoids in ancient history: the case of fifth-century Cyprus', *JHS* 105: 32-39.
- Maier, F.G. (1989), 'Priest Kings in Cyprus', in *Early Society in Cyprus*, (Ed.) Peltenburg, E., (Edinburgh): 376-391.
- Maier, F.G. (1994), 'Cyprus and Phoenicia' in *CAH Volume VI*, (Eds.) Lewis, D.M., Boardman, J., Hornblower, S., Ostwald, M., (Cambridge): 297- 337.
- Maier, F.G. (2004), *Guide to Palaipaphos (Kouklia)*, (Nicosia).
- Maier, F.G. (2008), *Alt-Paphos 6. Nordost-Tor und persische Belagerungsrampe in Alt-Paphos*, (Mainz – Rhein).
- Maier, F.G. Karageorghis, V. (1984), *Paphos, History and Archaeology*, (Nicosia).
- Maiuri, A. (1916), 'Un'iscrizione Greco-Fenicia a Rodi', *ASAtene* 2: 267-269.
- Mahoney, K. (2017), 'Mycenaean E-pi-ko-wo and Alphabetic Greek 'Επίκουρος Revisited', *Kadmos* 56: 39-88.
- Malbran-Labat, F. (1995), 'La stèle de Sargon II à Chypre. Le texte de l'inscription', in *Le palais de Sargon II roi d'Assyrie. Actes du colloque organisé au musée du Louvre les 21 et 22 janvier 1994*, (Ed.) Caubet A., (Paris): 169-179.
- Manfredi, L. (1987): 'Monete e valori ponderali fenici a Kition', *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 61: 81-87.

- Manfredi, L. (1992), 'Le saline e il sale nel mondo punico' *RSF* 20: 3-14.
- Manfredi, L. (1997), 'I suffeti e l'assemblea del popolo in Sardegna', *RSF* 25: 3-14.
- Manfredi, L. (2003), *La politica amministrativa di Cartagine in Africa*, Roma.
- Markoe, G. (1985), *Phoenician Bronze and Silver Bowls from Cyprus and the Mediterranean*, (Berkeley)
- Markoe, G. (1990), 'Egyptianizing male votive statuary from Cyprus: a reexamination', *Levant* 22: 111-122.
- Markoe, G. (2005), *The Phoenicians*, (London).
- Markou, E. (2011), *L'or des rois de Chypre. Numismatique et histoire à l'époque classique*, (Athens).
- Markou, E. (2012), 'Coinage and economic politics', in *Ancient Cyprus, cultues in dialogue*, (Eds.) Pilides, D., Papadimitriou, N., (Nicosia): 88-91.
- Markou, E. (2015), *The coinages of the kings of Cyprus from the Archaic to the Early Hellenistic period*, (Nicosia).
- Markou, E. (2018), 'Quelques réflexions sur le monnayage d'Amathonte de l'époque classique' in *Les royaumes de Chypre à l'épreuve de l'histoire: transitions et ruptures de la fin de l'âge du Bronze au début de l'époque hellénistique*, *BCH Supplément 60*, (Eds.) Cannavò, A., Thély, L., (Athènes): 221-235.
- Masson, E. (1979). 'Le chypro-minoen I: comparaisons possibles avec les syllabaires du Ier millénaire et l'éteo-chypriote', *Colloquium Mycenaeum: Actes du sixième Colloque international sur les textes mycéniens et égéens tenu à Chaumont sur Neuchâtel du 7 au 13 septembre 1975*, (Eds.) Risch, E., Mühlestei, H., (Chaumont): 397-409.
- Masson, E., Masson O. (1983), 'Les objets inscrits de Palaepaphos-Skales' in *Palaepaphos-Skales: A Iron Age Cemetery in Cyprus*, (Ed.) Karageorghis, V., (Constance): 411-15.
- Masson, O. (1957), 'Les inscriptions éteo-chypriotes. II.-IV.', *Syria* 34: 61-80.
- Masson, O. (1960), 'Cultes indigènes, cultes grecs et cultes orientaux à Chypre' in *Eléments orientaux dans la religion grecque ancienne. Colloque de Strasbourg, 22-24 mai 1958*, (Paris): 129-142.
- Masson, O. (1961), 'À propos d'un ouvrage récent sur les inscriptions chypristes syllabiques', *BCH* 85: 569-582.
- Masson, O. (1968), 'Notes d'onomastique chypriste, IV^e série : le nom Κιλικῶς à Chypre et dans le monde grec', *KS* 32: 9-15.

- Masson, O. (1974), 'Notes d'onomastique chypriote, V-VIII (V. Remarques complémentaires sur les noms en Πυρο-, VI. Aristoklès dit 'Κουκούμης', VII. Le nom Κιλκῆς en Cilicie?, VIII. Un nouveau nom phénicien : KLKY)', *RDAC*: 157-162.
- Masson, O. (1977), 'Notes d'épigraphie carienne III-IV', *Kadmos* 16: 87-94.
- Masson, O. (1977b), 'Vase chypriote inscrit pour un Fabricant d'arcs' *RDAC*: 154-156.
- Masson, O. (1978), 'La forme verbale ης 'erat' dans les dialectes grecs', in *Etrennes de septantain : travaux de linguistique et de grammaire comparée offerts à Michel Lejeune*, (Paris): 123-128.
- Masson, O. (1979), 'Une inscription syllabique de la Nouvelle-Paphos retrouvée (ICS 4)' in *Studies Presented in Memory of Porphyrios Dikaios*, (Nicosie): 159-161.
- Masson, O. (1980), 'Le dialecte chypriote de Salamine', *Salamine de Chypre. Histoire et Archéologie. État des Recherches (colloque Lyon 1978)*, (Ed.) Yon, M., (Paris): 177-191.
- Masson, O. (1980b), 'Une nouvelle inscription de Paphos concernant le roi Nikoklès', *Kadmos* 19, 1980, 65-80.
- Masson, O. (1981), 'Les graffites chypriotes alphabétiques et syllabiques', in *La chapelle d'Achôris à Karnak*, (Eds.) Traunecker, C., et al. (Paris): 251-284.
- Masson, O. (1984), 'Kypriaka, XV-XVII. (XV. Les rois de Paphos avant et après le siège de 498; XVI. Notes sur le « trésor de Curium; XVII. Quelques inscriptions difficiles de Kouklia-Paphos et un trait de la phonétique paphienne)', *BCH* 108: 71-89.
- Masson, O. (1987), 'Inscriptions syllabiques', in *Salamine de Chypre XIII, Testimonia Salamina 2*, (Eds.) Pouilloux, J., De Boccard, A., (Paris): 11-14.
- Masson, O. (1988), 'L'inscription syllabique en paphien récent du village de Tala (Paphos)', *RDAC*: 63-68.
- Masson, O. (1989), 'Les inscriptions chypriotes syllabiques de Golgoi, fouilles 1969- 1972', *Kadmos* 28, 156-167.
- Masson, O. (1990), 'Chypriotes et Phéniciens à Golgoi de Chypre', *Semitica* 39: 43-45.
- Masson, O. (1991), 'Notes de numismatique chypriote. IX-X', *Revue Numismatique* 33: 60-70.
- Masson, O. (1992), 'Encore les royaumes chypriotes dans la liste d'Esarhaddon', *CCEC* 18: 27-30.

- Masson O. (1992b), 'Les fouilles américaines à Idalion (1971-1980) et leurs résultats Épigraphique', *Kadmos* 31: 113-123.
- Masson, O. (1994), 'La grande inscription grecque d'Abou-Simbel et le nom probablement Carien Peleqos', *SMEA* 34: 137-140
- Masson, O. (1996), 'Le nom d'Idalion sur des monnaies de la ville', *CCEC* 25: 37-39.
- Masson, O. (1998), 'À propos des inscriptions syllabiques de Dhrymou (Paphos) et du site antique correspondant (avec « Appendice : Les inscriptions d'Ayia Moni, ICS 90 et 91 »)', *CCEC* 27: 15-19.
- Masson, O. Hermary A. (1982), 'Inscriptions d'Amathonte, IV', *BCH* 106: 235-242.
- Masson, O., Mitford, T. (1986), 'Les Inscriptions syllabiques de Kouklia - Paphos', (Konstanz).
- Masson, O., Sznycer, M. (1972), *Recherches sur les Phéniciens à Chypre*, (Paris).
- Masson, O., Yoyotte, J. (1956), *Objets pharaoniques à inscription carienne*, (Le Caire).
- Matthäus, H. (2007), 'The Royal Tombs of Tamassos. Burial Gifts, Funeral Architecture and Ideology', *CCEC* 37: 211-230.
- Matthiae, P. (1996), *L'arte degli Assiri. Cultura e forma del rilievo storico*, (Roma-Bari).
- Mattingly, H.B. (1989), 'The Jordan hoard (IGCH 1482) and Kimon's last campaign', in *Proceedings of the 10th International Congress of Numismatics, September 1986*, (Ed.) Carradice, I., (Wetteren): 59-64.
- Mavrogiannis, T., (2011), 'Το πολιτικό πρόγραμμα του Ευαγόρα Α' το εμπόριον και τα τείχη της Αθήνας', in *Πρακτικά του Δ' Διεθνούς Κυπριολογικού Συνεδρίου Λευκωσία 29 Απρ. – 3 Μαΐου 2008, том. Α' Ι Αρχαίο Τμήμα*, (Ed.) Demetriou, A., (Nicosia): 133-168.
- McLaughlin, J. (2001), *The marzēah in the Prophetic Literature, References and Allusions, Light of Extra-Biblical Evidence*, (Leiden).
- Medda, E. (2009), 'Il Leoncino Fra Le Braccia (Aesch. Ag. 723)', *Philologus* 153: 195-205.
- Mehl, A. (1996), 'Zyperns Städte im Hellenismus: Verfassung, Verwaltung und führende Gesellschaft, in *Hellas und der griechische Osten. Studien zur Geschichte und Numismatik der griechischen Welt*, (Ed.) Franke, P.R., (Saarbrücken): 127-152.

Mehl, A. 2000, 'Hellenistike Kypros' in *Historia tes Kyprou*, vol. 2, (Ed.) Papadopoullos, T., (Nicosia): 619-761.

Mehl, A. (2004), 'Cypriot City-Kingdoms: No Problem in the Neo-Assyrian, Late Egyptian and Persian Empires, But Why to Be Abolished under Macedonian Rule?' *Epetirida, Kentro Epistimonikon Erevnon Kyprou* 30: 9-20.

Mehl, A. (2016), 'The Cypriot Kings: Despots or Democrats or...? Remarks on Cypriot Kingship Especially in the Time of Persian Suzerainty', *Electrum* 23: 51-64.

Meiggs, R. (1972), *The Athenian Empire*, (Oxford).

Meier-Brügger, M. (1993), 'Zu kyprisch e-tu-wa-no-i-nu und e-to-ko-i-nu', *Glotta* 70: 129-130.

Meier-Brügger, M. (1993b), 'Autour de grec σπέος', *RPh* 65: 179-184.

Meissner, T. (2006), *S-stem Nouns and Adjectives in Greek and Proto-Indo-European. A Diachronic Study in Word Formation*, (Oxford).

Melfi M. 2002, 'Il complesso del Pythion-Asklepieion a Paros', *ASAtene* 80, III 2: 327-360.

Mesiter, R.K. (1910), 'Kyprische Sakralinschrift', *SB-PAW*: 148-164.

Meyer, E. (1901-1902), *Geschichte des Altertums*, 4-5, (Stuttgart et Berlin).

Méndez Dosuna, J. (1993), 'El cambio de *e* en *i* ante vocal en los dialectos griegos: ¿una cuestión zanjada?', in *Dialectologica Graeca (colloque de dialectologie grecque 2, Miraflores de la Sierra, Madrid 1991)*, (Eds.) Crespo, E., Ali, I. (Madrid): 237-259.

Metzger, H., Demargne, P., (1979), *Fouilles de Xanthos VI : la stèle trilingue du Letôon*, (Istanbul).

Michaelides, D. (2009), 'Medicine in Ancient Cyprus', in *Greek Research in Australia: Proceedings of the Eighth Biennial International Conference of Greek Studies*, (Eds.) Rossetto, M., Tsianikas, M., Couvalis, G., Palaktoglou, M., (Adelaide): 93-106.

Michaelides, D., Nicolaou, D. (2008), 'Archaia Kypros', in *En chordais kai organois. Diaskedasi kai psichagogia sten Kypro apo tin archaiotita mechri tin Anexartisia*, (Eds.) Vryonidou-Yiango, M., Laiki, M., (Nicosia): 13-57.

Michaelides, D., Papantoniou, (2018), 'The Advent of Hellenistic Cyprus' in *Les Royaumes de Chypre à l'épreuve de l'histoire: Transitions et ruptures de la fin de l'âge du Bronze du début de l'époque hellénistique. BCH-Suppl.*, (Eds.) Cannavo, A., Thély, L., (Athens): 267-290.

Michaelidou-Nicolaou I. 1999, 'A Cypriot evidence for the associate reign of Cleopatra VII and Ptolemy XV Caesarion', in *Atti XI di Congresso*

Internazionale di Epigrafia Greca e Latina, Roma, 18-24 settembre 1997: 371-376, (Roma).

Michaelidou-Nicoloau, I., (2007), 'The Inscriptions', in *Kourion: Excavations in the Episcopal Precinct*, (Ed.) Megaw, A.H.S., (Washington): 368-374.

Mikalson, J.D. (2016), *New aspects of religion in ancient Athens: honors, authorities, esthetics, and society*, (Leiden).

Mikrakis, M. (2016), Musical Performance and Society in Protohistoric Cyprus: Coroplastic and other Visual Evidence in *Musicians in Ancient Coroplastic Art: Iconography, Ritual Contexts, and Functions*, («*TELESTES. Studi e Ricerche di Archeologia musicale nel Mediterraneo*», II), (Eds.) Bellia, A., Marconi C., (Pisa-Roma): 57-71.

Millard, A.R. (1994), *The Eponyms of the Assyrian Empire 910-612 B.C.*, (Helsinki).

Miller, S.G. (1978), *The Prytaneion: its Function and architectural form*, (Berkeley-London)

Miller, S.G. (1988), 'The Theorodokoi of the Nemean Games', *Hesperia* 57: 147-163.

Miralles-Macià, L. (2007), *Marzeah y thiasos. Una institució convivial en el Oriente Proximo Antiguo y el Mediterráneo*, (Madrid).

Mitford, T. (1937), 'Contributions to the Epigraphy of Cyprus', *JHS* 57: 28-37.

Mitford, T. (1960), 'Paphian Inscriptions Hoffmann nos. 98 and 99', *BICS* 7: 1-10.

Mitford, T. (1961), 'Unpublished Syllabic Inscriptions of the Cyprus Museum', *Minos* 7: 15-48.

Mitford, T. (1961b), 'Studies in the Signaries of South-Western Cyprus' (= *University of London, Bulletin Supplement n° 10*), *Institute of Classical Studies*: 1-55.

Mitford, T. (1961c), 'The Hellenistic Inscriptions of Old Paphos', *ABSA* 56: 1-41

Mitford, T. (1963), 'Akestor, King of Paphos', *BICS* 10: 27-30.

Mitford, T. (1971), *The Inscriptions of Kourion*, (Philadelphia).

Mitford, T., Nicolaou, I.K. (1974), *The Greek and Latin inscriptions from Salamis, Vol. 6*, (Nicosia).

Mitford., T. (1980), *The Nymphaeum of Kafizin. The Inscribed Pottery*, (Berlin - New York).

- Młynarczyk, J. (1990), *Nea Paphos in the Hellenistic Period (Nea Paphos III)*, (Varsovie).
- Moore, J.D. (2013), *Scribal Culture in the Ancient Near East*, (Oxford).
- Moore, F., Cross, J. (2003), *Leaves from an Epigrapher's Notebook: Collected Papers in Hebrew and West Semitic Palaeography and Epigraphy*, (Leiden).
- Moorey, P.R.S. (1975), *Biblical Lands*, (Oxford).
- Morpurgo-Davies, A., (1960), 'Κτύλος (Pind. Pyth. II 17)'. *Rivista di Cultura Classica e Medioevale* 2: 30-40.
- Morpurgo-Davies, A. (1983), 'Mycenaean and Greek Prepositions: *o-pi, e-pi* etc'. in *Res Mycenaee. Akten des VII. Int. Mykenologischen Colloquiums*, (Eds.) Heubeck, A., Neuman, G., (Göttingen): 287-310.
- Morpurgo-Davies, A. (1988), 'Problems in Cyprian Phonology and Writing', in *The History of the Greek Language in Cyprus*, (Eds.) Karageorghis, J., Masson, O., (Nicosia): 99-130.
- Morpurgo-Davies, A. (2012), 'Phonetic Laws, Language Diffusion, and Drift: The Loss of Sibilants in Greek Dialects of the First Millennium BC', in *Laws and Rules in Indo-European*, (Eds.) P. Probert, A. Willi, (Oxford), 102-121.
- Morpurgo-Davies, A., Olivier, J-P. (2012), 'Syllabic scripts and languages in the second and first millennia BC' in *Parallel lives: ancient island societies in Crete and Cyprus*, (Eds.) Cadogan, G., Iacovou, M., Kopaka K., Whitley, J., (Athens): 105-118.
- Mosca, P.G, Russel, J. (1987), 'A Phoenician inscription from Cebel Ires Daği in rough Cilicia', *Epigraphica Anatolica* 9: 1-28.
- Mouritz, D.M. (2018), *Ast greek pottery and Graeco-Anatolian mercenaries in the Southern Levant in Iron Age (Ca, 600 BCE)*, (Melbourne).
- Müller, H.P. (1996), 'Der phönizisch-punische *mqm 'lm* im Licht einer althebräischen Isoglosse', *Orientalia* 65: 116-122.
- Münnich, M.M. (2013), *The God Resheph in the Ancient Near East' Hardback Orientalische Religionen in der Antike*, (Tuebingen).
- Murray, O. (1988), 'The Ionian Revolt', in *The Cambridge Ancient History (The Cambridge Ancient History)*, (Eds.) Boardman, J., Hammond, N., Lewis, D., Ostwald, M., (Cambridge): 461-490.
- Myers, P. (2019) 'The Greek Alphabet and The Canaanite Sibilants', *JSS* 4/1: 10-93.

- Mylonas, D. G. (1998), *Archaische Kalksteinplastik Zyperns: Untersuchungen zur Ikonographie, Typologie und formgeschichtlichen Entwicklung der kyprischen Rundplastik der archaischen Zeit. Ph.D. dissertation*, (Mannheim).
- Na'aman, N. (1991), 'The Kingdom of Judah Under Josiah', *Journal of the Institute of Archaeology of Tel Aviv University*: 3-71.
- Na'aman, N. (2015), 'Four Notes on The Ancient Near Eastern Marzeah', , *Open-Mindedness in the Bible and Beyond. A Volume of Studies in Honour of Bob Becking*, (Eds.) Korpel, M.C.A, Grabbe, L.L., (London- New Delhi- New York- Sidney): 215-222.
- Nahm, W. (2013), 'The Case of the Lower Middle Chronology', *Altorientalische Forschungen* 40: 50-372.
- Naveh, J. (1962), 'The Excavations at Mead ashavyahu Preliminary Report', *IEJ* 12: 89-113.
- Neumann, G. (1963), 'Zur Deutung der kyprischen Bulver- Tafel', *Kadmos* 2: 53-67.
- Neumann, G. (1974), 'Zu den Hexametern der kyprischen Inschrift, ICS 264' *Kadmos* 13: 146-155.
- Neumann, G. (1987), 'Griechisch κυβερνάω', *KZ* 100: 64-69.
- Neumann, G. (1992), 'Zu κυβερνάω', *HS* 105: 188.
- Neumann, G. (1993), 'Beiträge zum Kyprischen XIV', *Kadmos* 32: 39-49.
- Neumann G. (1994), 'Beiträge zum Kyprischen XV', *Kadmos* 33: 1-9.
- Neumann, G. (1996), 'Beiträge zum Kyprischen XVI', *Kadmos* 35: 39- 48.
- Neumann, G. (1999), 'A Cypriot Silver Bowl Reconsidered 3. The Inscription', in *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 34: 33-35,
- Neumann, G. (2004), 'Beiträge zum Kyprischen XXI', *Kadmos* 42: 109-130.
- Nicolaou, I. (1963), 'Inscriptions Cypriae Alphabeticae II', *RDAC*: 41-51.
- Nicolaou, I. (1965), 'Γεωμετρικοί Τάφοι Κυθραίας', *Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus*: 30-73.
- Nicolaou, I. (1968), 'Tombe Familiale de l'époque Hellénistique à Chytroi, Chypr', *BCH* 92: 76-84.
- Nicolaou, I. (1971), *Cypriot inscribed Stones*, (Nicosia).
- Nicolaou, I. (1971b), 'Inscriptiones Cypriae Alphabeticae X 1970', *RDAC*: 65-79.

- Nicolaou, I. (1991), 'Inscriptiones Cypriae Alphabeticae XXX 1990', *RDAC*: 195-202.
- Nicolaou, K. (1973b), 'Archaeological News from Cyprus, 1972', *AJA* 77: 425.
- Nicolaou, K. (1976), 'Chytroi' in *The Princeton encyclopaedia of classical sites*, (Eds.) Stillwell, R., *et al.*, (Princeton).
- Nicolaou, K. (1976b), *The Historical Topography of Kition (SIMA 43)*, (Göteborg).
- Nikolaidou-Arabatzi, S., (2018), 'ἱστορέειν and θωμάζειν: scientific terms and signs of unity in Herodotus' in *Histories in Herodotus - narrator, scientist, historian*, (Ed.) Bowie, E., (Berlin): 223-242.
- Niemeier, W.D. (2001), 'Archaic Greeks in the Orient. Textual and Archaeological Evidence', *BASOR* 32: 12-32.
- Nijboer, A.J. (2013), 'Banquet, Marzeah, Symposion and Symposium during the Iron Age: disparity and mimicry', in *Regionalism and Globalism in Antiquity; Exploring their Limits*, (Ed.) De Angelis, F., (Leuven-Paris): 95-125.
- Nijenhuis, W. (1991), 'City frontiers and their disappearance', *Assemblage* 16: 43-53.
- Nodet, E. (2005), *La Crise Maccabèenne. Historiographie Juive et Traditions Bibliques*, (Paris).
- Nodet, E. (2011), 'Les "Kittim", Les Romains et Daniel', *Revue Biblique* 118-2: 260-268.
- Noe, S.P. (1954), 'Countermarked and Overstruck Greek Coins at The American Numismatic Society', *ANSMN* 6: 85-93.
- Novotny, J., Jeffers, J. (2018), *The Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period, Volume 5/1*, (Ann Arbor).
- Ober, J. (2005), *Athenian Legacies: Essays in the Politics of Going on Together*, (Princeton).
- Oehler, J. (1924), 'Lampadarchia' in *RE* XII: 567-569.
- Ohnefalsch-Richter, M. 1888, 'Topographical Studies in Cyprus. District II, - Idalion. Ancient Idalion and Neighbourhood', *The Owl, Science, Literature and Art* 6: 4-47; 7; 54-56; 8; 59-64.
- Olivier, J.P. (2008), 'Les syllabaires chypriotes des deuxième et premier millénaires avant notre ère. État des questions', in *Colloquium Romanum, Atti Del XII Colloquio Internazionale di Micenologia II, Pasiphae II del 20-25 febbraio 2006 sotto l'alto patronato del Presidente della Repubblica, vol.*

II, (Ed). Sacconi, A., Del freo, M., Godart, L., Negri, M., (Pisa-Roma): 605-620.

Olivier, J.P. (2013), 'The development of Cypriot syllabaries, from Enkomi to Kafizin', in *Syllabic Writing on Cyprus and its Context*, (Ed.) Steel, P., (Cambridge): 7-26.

Olivier, J.P., Pilides, D. (2008), 'A Black Glazed Cup from the Hill of Agios Georgios, Belonging to a 'Wanax'', *RDAC*: 337-352.

Orlin, L., *Assyrian Colonies in Cappadocia*, (Mouton).

Osborne, M. J. (1972), 'Attic Citizenship Decrees: A Note', *ABSA* 67: 129-158.

Osborne, M. J. (2006), 'The eponymous archons of Athens from 300/299 to 286/5', *Ancient Society* 36: 69-80.

Osborne, R. (2007), 'Did democracy transform Athenian space?' in *Building Communities: house, settlement and society in the Aegean and beyond. Proceedings of a conference held at Cardiff University, 17–21 April 2001*, (Eds.) Fisher, N., Westgate, R., Whitley, J., (London): 195-199.

Palaima, T. (1991), 'The Advent of the Greek Alphabet on Cyprus: A Competition of Scripts', in *Phoinikeia Grammata, Phoinikeia Grammata, lire et écrire en Méditerranée, actes du colloque de Liège, 15-18 novembre 1989*, (Eds.) Baurain, C., Bonnet C., Krings V., (Liegi): 449-471.

Palaima, T. (1995), 'The nature of the Mycenaean Wanax: non-indo-european origins and priestly functions', in *The role of the ruler in the Prehistoric Aegean, Proceedings of a Panel Discussion presented at the Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America, New Orleans, Louisiana 28 December 1992*, (Ed.) Rehak, P., *Aegeum* 11: 119-139.

Papantoniou, G. (2011), '“Hellenising” the ‘Cypriot Goddess’: ‘Reading’ the Amathousian Terracotta Figurines', in *From Pella to Gandhara. Hybridisation and Identity in the Art and Architecture of the Hellenistic East. BAR-IS 2221*, (Eds.) Kouremenos, A., Chandrasekaran, S., Rossi, R., (Oxford): 35-48.

Papantoniou, G. (2012), *Religion and Social Transformations in Cyprus. From the Cypriot Basileis to the Hellenistic Strategos*, (Leiden).

Papantoniou, G. (2013), 'Cypriot Autonomous Polities at the Crossroads of Empire: The Imprint of a Transformed Islandscape in the Classical and Hellenistic Periods', *BASOR* 370: 169-205.

Papantoniou, G. (2013b), 'Cyprus from Basileis to Strategos: A Sacred-Landscapes Approach', *AJA* 117: 33-57.

Papantoniou, G. (2016), 'Cypriot ritual and cult from the Bronze to the Iron Age: a longue-durée approach', *Journal of Greek Archaeology* 1: 73-108.

Papantoniou, G., Bourogiannis, G. (2018), 'Sanctuaries as Central Places: Revisiting the Agia Irini Sanctuary in Iron Age Cyprus', *Land 7.139 (Open Access Journal)*.

Papantoniou, G., Kyriakou, N., Sarris, A., Iacovou, M. (2015), 'Sacred Topography in Iron Age Cyprus: The Case of Vavla-Kapsalaes' in *Archaeological Research in the Digital Age*, (Eds.), Papadopoulos, C., et al. (Rethymnon): 70-75.

Papantoniou, G., Vionis, A. (2019), 'The River as an Economic Asset: Settlement and Society in the Xeros valley in Cyprus' in *Central Places and Un-Central Landscapes. Political Economies and Natural Resources in the Longue Durée*, (Eds.) Papantoniou, G., Vionis, A., (Basel): 40-65.

Parker, S.T. (1976), 'The Objectives and Strategy of Cimon's Expedition to Cyprus', *AJP* 97: 30-38.

Parker, R. (1996), *Athenian Religion. A History*, (Oxford).

Parmentier, A. (1987), 'Phoenicians in the administration of Ptolemaic Cyprus', in *Studia Phoenicia V, Phoenicia and the East Mediterranean in the first millenium B.C., Proceedings of the Conference held in Leuven from the 14th to the 16th of November 1985*, (Ed.) Lipinski E., (Leuven): 403-412.

Paulus, S. (2017), 'The Babylonian Kudurru Inscriptions and their Legal and Sociohistorical Implications' in *Karduniaš. Babylonia under the Kassites 1: The Proceedings of the Symposium held in Munich, 30 June to 2 July 2011. Untersuchungen zur Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie, 11. Boston, MA*, (Eds.) Bartelmus, A., Sternitske, K., (Berlin-Munich-Boston): 229-244.

Peckham, B. (1968), 'Notes on a Fifth Century Phoenician Inscription from Kition', *Orientalia* 37: 304-324.

Peckham, B. (1972), 'The Nora Inscription' *Orientalia* 41.4: 457-468.

Peckham, J.B. (1968), *The Development of the Late Phoenician Script*, (Cambridge).

Pedersen, H. (1930), 'Zu den nicht-griechischen Inschriften von Amathus', *OLZ* 33: 963-969.

Pedersen, H. (1938), 'Les noms grecs de l'inscription bilingue d'Amathonte', *Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves* 2: 161-165.

Peege, C., Della Casa, P., Fasnacht, W. (2018), *Agia Varvara-Almyras: An Iron Age Copper Smelting Site in Cyprus*, (Oxford).

Peek, W. (1972), *Neue Inschriften aus Epidauros, Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse, Band 63, Heft 5*, (Berlin).

- Peltenburg, E. (1996), 'From Isolation to State Formation in Cyprus, c.3500-1500 bc.', in *The Development of the Cypriot Economy from the Prehistoric Period to the Present Day*, (Eds.) Karageorghis, V., Michaelidis, D., (Nicosia): 17-43.
- Périkhanian, A. (1971), 'Les Inscriptions araméennes du roi Attaches', *REArm* 8: 169-74.
- Perlman, P. (1994), 'Inscriptions from Crete I', *ZPE* 100: 123–125.
- Perlman, P. (2000), *City and Sanctuary in Ancient Greece: The Theorodokia in the Peloponnese*, (Göttingen).
- Perna, M. (2018), 'La grande inscription d'Amathonte (ICS 194+195) une nouvelle étude épigraphique. Rapport préliminaire' in *Les royaumes de Chypre à l'épreuve de l'histoire: transitions et ruptures de la fin de l'âge du Bronze au début de l'époque hellénistique*, *BCH Supplément 60*, (Eds.) Cannavò, A., Thély, L., (Athènes): 213-220.
- Perpillou, J.L. (1987), 'Les formes cypriotes', *RPh* 61: 202-203.
- Peters, M. (1980), *Untersuchungen zur Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Griechischen*, (Vienne).
- Peters, M. (2002), 'Indogermanische Chronik 35. Dritter und letzter Teil', *Die Sprache* 39: 94-12.
- Petit, D. (1999), **Sue- en grec ancien : la famille du pronom réfléchi. Linguistique grecque et comparaison indo-européenne*, (Paris).
- Petit, T. (1990), *Satrapes et satrapies dans l'empire achéménide. De Cyrus le Grand à Xerxès Ier*, (Paris-Liège).
- Petit, T. (1991), 'Syllabaire et alphabet au "palais" d'Amathonte de Chypre vers 300 avant notre ère', in *Phoinikeia Grammata, lire et écrire en Méditerranée, actes du colloque de Liège, 15-18 novembre 1989*, (Eds.) Baurain, C., Bonnet C., Krings V., (Liegi): 481-495.
- Petit, T. (1991b), 'Présence et influence perses à Chypre', in *Achaemenid History VI, Asia Minor and Egypt: Old Cultures in a New Empire. Proceedings of the Groningen 1988 Achaemenid History Workshop*, (Eds.) Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H., Kuhrt, A., (Leiden): 161-178.
- Petit, T. (1995), 'Objets égyptisants et idéologie royale à Amathonte', *Transeuphratène* 9: 131-147.
- Petit, T. (1995b), 'Amathous (autochtones eisin). De l'identité amathousienne à l'époque des royaumes (VIIIe-IVe siècles av. J.-C.)', in *Kyprios character, quelle identité chypriote? Actes de la table ronde organisée par Histoire au Présent*, (Ed.) Jansen P., *Sources Travaux historiques*: 51- 64.

- Petit, T. (1996), 'Religion et royauté à Amathonte de Chypre' *Transeuphratène* 12: 97-120.
- Petit, T. (1997-1998), 'La langue éteocypriotte ou l'«amathousien». Essai d'interprétation grammaticale', *Archiv für Orientforschung* 44-45: 244-271.
- Petit, T. (1999), 'Eteocypriot Myth and Amathusian Reality', *JMA* 12: 108-120.
- Petit, T. (2001), 'The First Palace of Amathus and the Cypriot Poleogenesis', in *The Royal Palace Institution in the First Millennium bc: Regional Development and Cultural Interchange between East and West. Monographs of the Danish Institute at Athens 4*, (Ed.) Nielsen, I., (Athènes-Åarhus): 53-75.
- Petit, T. (2004), 'Images de la royauté amathousienne: le sarcophage d'Amathonte' in *Iconographie impériale, iconographie royale, iconographie des élites dans le monde gréco-romain. Travaux du Centre de recherche en histoire 1.*, (Eds.), Perrin, Y., Petit, T., (Saint-Etienne): 49-96.
- Petit, T. (2006), 'Malika: L'identité composite du Dieu-Roi d'Amathonte sur le sarcophage de New York', in *Identités croisées en un milieu méditerranéen: Le cas de Chypre (Antiquité-Moyen Âge. Publications des Universités de Rouen et du Havre 391*, (Eds.) Fourrier, S., Grivaud, G., (Rouen-Le Havre): 63-100.
- Petit, T. (2007), 'The Hellenization of Amathus in the 4th Century B.C.', in *Proceedings of the International Archaeological Conference: From Evagoras I to the Ptolemies. The Transition from the Classical to the Hellenistic Period in Cyprus, Nicosia, 29–30 November 2002*, (Ed.) Flourentzos, P., (Nicosia): 93-114.
- Petit, T. (2013), 'L'origine des cités-royaumes cyprïotes et des royaumes d'Israël et de Juda. Simultanéité et similitudes', *Théologiques* 2: 23-49.
- Petit, T. (2015), 'La ville et le royaume d'Amathonte n'ont pas été fondés au XIe siècle', in *Géosciences, archéologie et histoire en Crète de l'âge du Bronze récent à l'époque archaïque*, (Eds.) Lefevre-Novaro, D., (Padoue): 353-375.
- Petit, T. (2019), *La naissance des cités-royaumes cyprïotes*, (Oxford).
- Petit, T., Péchoux, P.Y., Aupert, P. (1991), 'La campagne de prospection, Rapport sur les travaux de l'Ecole française à Amathonte de Chypre en 1990', *BCH* 115: 775-787.
- Petrakis, V.P. (2016), 'Writing the wanax: Spelling peculiarities of Linear B wa-na-ka and their possible implications', *Minos* 39: 61-158.
- Pfoh, E. (2016), *Syria-Palestine in the Late Bronze Age. An Anthropology of Politics and Power*, (Abingdon).
- Piacentini, D. (2003), 'Il verbo «tradurre» ed il termine «traduttore» nel Vicino Oriente. Tre esempi: sumerico, eblaita, fenicio', in *Mutuare, interpretare, tradurre: storie di culture a confronto. Atti del 2° Incontro «Orientalisti» (Roma, 11-13 dicembre 2002)*, (Ed.) Regalzi, G., (Roma): 13-38.

- Picard, O. (1978), 'La tortue de terre sur les monnaies d'Egine', *BSFN* 33: 330-333.
- Pilides, D.P., Destrooper-Georgiades, A. (2008), 'A Hoard of Silver Coins from the Plot on the Corner of Nikokreontos and Hadjopoullou Streets', *RDAC*: 307-334.
- Pinault, G.J. (2000), 'Védique dāmunas-, latin dominus et l'origine du suffixe de Hoffmann', *BSL* 95.1: 61-118.
- Pinto, P. M. (2009), 'Kellis III Gr. 95 And Evagoras I', *ZPE* 168: 213-218.
- Pirenne, J. (1954), 'Les institutions du peuple hébreu', *Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité* 1: 205-210.
- Pirngruber, R. (2017), *The Economy of Late Achaemenid and Seleucid Babylonia*, (Cambridge).
- Plassart, A. (1921), 'Inscriptions de Delphes, la liste des Théorodoques', *BCH* 45: 1-85.
- Platon, N., (1948), 'Πόλεις τῆς Β Ἀκτῆς Κρήτης', *Kr. Cr.*: 329-345.
- Pococke, Richard. (1745), *A Description of the East, and Some other Countries*. (London).
- Poggio, A. (2012), 'Immagini venatorie e monumenti dinastici: l'impero persiano tra centro e periferia' in *Arte e Potere, Forme artistiche, istituzioni, paradigmi interpretativi, atti del convegno di Studio in Pisa, Scuola Normale Superiore, 25-27 Novembre 2010*, (Eds.) Castiglione, M., Poggio, A., (Milano): 227-241.
- Poldrugo, F. (2001), 'La persistenza della figura del "Wanax" miceneo a Cipro in età storica', *SCO* 47.1: 21-51.
- Popko, M. (2008), *Völker und Sprachen Altanatoliens*, (Wiesbaden).
- Porten, B., Farber, J.J., Martin, C.J.F., Vittmann, G. (1996), *The Elephantine Papyri in English (Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui)*, Leiden.
- Potts, D.T. (2018), 'The Carian Villages', *Cuneiform Digital Library Bulletin* 2: 1-7.
- Pouilloux, J., (1975): 'Athènes et Salamine de Chypre', *RDAC*: 111-121.
- Pouilloux, J., Roesch, P., Marcillet J. (1987), *Salamine de Chypre XIII. Testimonia Salamina 2*, (Paris).

- Puech, E. (1981), 'Remarques sur quelques inscriptions phéniciennes de Byblos', *RSF* 9: 153-168.
- Puech, E. (1990), 'Notes sur des inscriptions phéniciennes de Kition et Kato-Paphos', *Semitica* 39: 99-109.
- Puhvel, J. (1954), 'Greek etymologies', *Language* 30: 454-456.
- Quack, J. (2011), 'Zum Datum der persischen Eroberung Ägyptens unter Kambyses', *JEH* 4: 228-246.
- Quattordio Moreschini, A., (1988), 'Una costruzione di origine anatolica nel bronzo di Idalion', *Studi di storia e di filologia anatolica dedicati a Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli*: (Ed.) Imparati, F., (Firenze): 221-226.
- Quinn, J. (2018), *In search of the Phoenicians*, (Princeton).
- Qviller, B. (1981), 'The dynamics of the Homeric society', *Symbolae Osloenses* 56.1: 109-155.
- Ravasco, A. (2006), 'Il Marzeah nell'esegesi e nella filologia', *Materia Giudaica* 11: 391-403.
- Radner, K. (2010), 'The stele of Sargon II of Assyria at Kition: a focus for an emerging Cypriot identity?' in *Interkulturalität in der Alten Welt: Vorderasien, Hellas, Ägypten und die vielfältigen Ebenen des Kontakts*, (Eds.) Rollinger, R., Gufler, B., Lang, M., Madreiter, I., (Wiesbaden): 429-449.
- Ray, D.J. (1987), 'The Egyptian approach to Carian', *Kadmos* 26.1: 98-103.
- Ray, D.J. (1995), 'Soldiers to Pharaohs: The Carians of Southwest Anatolia', in *Civilisations of the Ancient Near East, I*, (Ed.) Sasson, J.M., (New York): 1185-1194.
- Ray, D.J. (1998), 'Aegypto-Carica', *Kadmos* 37: 125-136.
- Raptou, E. (1999), *Athènes et Chypre à l'époque perse (vie-ive s. av. J.-C): histoire et données archéologiques*, (Paris).
- Raptou, E., (2015), 'The relations between Athens and Cyprus during the classical period' in the website *Kyprios Character. History, Archaeology & Numismatics of Ancient Cyprus*.
- Rathmann, M. (2005), *Perdikkas zwischen 323 und 320: Nachlassverwalter des Alexanderreiches oder Autokrat?*, (Wien).
- Recke, M. (2018), "'Like herrings in a barrel' - Max Ohnefalsch-Richters Ausgrabungen in Tamassos-Phrangissa 1885', in *'I don't know what am I myself, it is so very difficult to explain.'* *Max Ohnefalsch-Richter (1850-1917) und die Archäologie Zyperns*, (Eds.) Horacek, S.G., Schmid, S.G., (Berlin): 213-238.

- Reid, C.I. (1974), 'Ephoros Fragment 76 and Diodorus on the Cypriote War', *Phoenix* 28: 123 - 143.
- Reyes, A.T. (1994), *Archaic Cyprus. A Study of the Textual and Archaeological Evidence*, (Oxford).
- Rhodes, P.J. (1981), *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, (Oxford).
- Rhodes, P.J. (2000), 'Oligarchs in Athens', in *Alternatives to Athens*, (Eds.) Brock, R., Hodkinson, S., (Oxford): 119-136.
- Rhodes, P.J. (2017), 'The Impact of the Persian Wars on Classical Greece 1' in *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars: Antiquity to the Third Millennium* (Eds.) Bridges, E., Hall, E., Rhodes, P.J., (Oxford), 1-17.
- Ribichini, S. (1982), 'Kinyras di Cipro', *Religioni e Civiltà* 3:479-500.
- Ribichini, S. (2004), 'Al servizio di Astarte. Ierodulia e Prostituzione sacra nei culti fenici e punici' in *El mundo punico, Religion antropologia y cultura material*, (Eds.) Gonzales, A.B., Matilla, G., Egea, A., (Murcia): 55-68.
- Risch, E. (1974), *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*, (Berlin-New York).
- Ritchie, C.E. (1989), 'The Lyceum, the garden of Theophrastus and the garden of the Muses. A Topographical revaluation', *Philia Epê eis Geôrgion E. Mylonan* III: 250-260.
- Robert, L. (1978), 'Sur un Apollon oraculaire à Chypre', *CRAIBL* 122.2: 338-344.
- Robert, L., Robert, J. (1976), 'Une inscription grecque de Téos en Ionie. L'union de Téos et de Kyrbissos', *Journal de Savants*: 206-209.
- Robinson, E.S.G. (1948), 'Greek Coins Acquired by The British Museum 1938-1948', *NC*: 43-65.
- Robinson, E.W. (2011), *Democracy beyond Athens: popular government in the Greek classical age*, (Cambridge).
- Rochette B. (1996), 'Πιστοι ἐρμηνεῖς. La traduction orale en Grèce', *Revue des Études Grecques* 109: 325-347.
- Rogge, S., Ioannou, C., Mavrojannis, T. (2019), *Salamis of Cyprus, History and Archaeology from the Earliest Times to Late Antiquity. Conference in Nicosia, 21-23 May 2015*: (Münster-New York).
- Rollinger, R. (1997), 'Zur Bezeichnung von "Griechen" in Keilschrifttexten', *Revue d'Assyriologie* 91: 167-172.

- Rollinger, R. (2010), 'The Eastern Mediterranean and Beyond: The Relations Between the Worlds of the 'Greek' and 'Non-Greek' Civilizations', in *A Companion to the Classical Greek World*, (Ed.) Kinzl, K.H., (Oxford): 197-226.
- Rosen, H.B. (1982), 'Questions d'interprétation de textes juridiques grecs de la plus ancienne époque' in *Symposion 1977, Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte*, (Eds.) Modrzejewski, J., Liebs, D., (Cologne): 9-32.
- Roussel, P. (1930), 'Les KYNHΓOI à l'époque hellénistique et romaine', *Revue des Études Grecques* 43: 361-371.
- Rowe, M.I. (2002), 'The King's men of Ugarit and Society in Late Bronze Age Syria', *JESHO* 45: 1-19.
- Rozenberg, M.S. (1975), 'The ŠÖFeTİM in the Bible', *Eretz-Israel* 12: 77-86
- Rupp, D.W. (1987), 'Vive le roi: The emergence of the state in Iron Age Cyprus', in *Western Cyprus: Connections. Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology*, (Ed.) Rupp W.D., (Göteborg): 147-68.
- Ruzicka, S. (2012), *Trouble in the West: Egypt and the Persian Empire, 525-332 BC*, (Oxford).
- Samama, E. (2003), *Les médecins dans le monde grec : sources épigraphiques sur la naissance d'un corps médical*, (Genève).
- Saporetti, C. (1976), 'Cipro nei testi neoassiri' in *Studi Ciprioti e rapporti di scavo* 2: 83-88.
- Salem, I., Salem L.A. (2000), *The Near East: The Cradle of Western Civilization*, (New York).
- Salvesen, A. (1998), 'Keter', in *Semantics of Ancient Hebrew*, (Ed.) Muraoka, T., (Louvain): 67-73.
- Salvesen, A. (1999), '“Keter”, Something to do with a camel?', *JSS* 44: 35-46.
- Salvini, B.A., (2008), *Babylone*, (Paris).
- Samuel, E.A. (1972), *Greek and Roman Chronology: Calendars and Years in Classical Antiquity*, (München).
- Sass, B. (2002), 'Wenamun and his Levant – 1075 B.C. or 925 B.C.?', *Egypt and the Levant* 12: 247-255.
- Satraki, A. (2010), 'The Archaeology of the Cypriot Basileis: Manifestation of Royal Authority In Iron Age Cyprus', in *POCA 2007 Postgraduate Cypriot Archaeology Conference*, (Eds.) Christodoulou S., Satraki A., (Cambridge): 197-217.

Satraki, A. (2012), *Κύπριοι Βασιλείς απο τον Κόσµασο μέχρι το Νικοκρέοντα. Η πολιτειακή οργάνωση της αρχαίας Κύπρου από την Ύστερη Εποχή του Χαλκού μέχρι το τέλος της Κυπροκλασικής περιόδου με βάση τα αρχαιολογικά δεδομένα*, (Athens).

Satraki, A. (2013), 'The Iconography of Basileis in Archaic and Classical Cyprus: Manifestations of Royal Power in the Visual Record', *BASOR* 370:123-144.

Satraki, A. (2018), 'Ptolin Edalion: Transitions and breaks in the life of an inland Cypriot city state' in *Les royaumes de Chypre à l'épreuve de l'histoire. Transitions et ruptures de la fin de l'âge du Bronze au début de l'époque hellénistique*, *BCH Supplément 60*, (Eds.) Cannavò, A., Thély, L., (Athens): 147-165.

Scafa, E. (1993), 'La bilingue di Amatunte (ICS n.196) ed i rapporti tra eteociprioti e greci' in *Lingua e culture in contatto nel mondo antico e altomedievale. Atti dell'VIII Convegno Internazionale di Linguisti di Milano 10-12 Settembre 1992*, *ICS 196*, (Ed.) Finazzi, R.B., (Brescia): 517-28.

Scafa, E. (1996), 'Sul nome eteocipriote di Amatunte', *RDAC*: 159-163.

Schäfer, J. (1960), 'Ein Perserbau in Alt-Paphos? ', *Opuscula Atheniensia* 3: 155-175.

Scarpanti, E. (2006), 'Onomastica greca e identità cipriota. Alcuni risultati preliminari di uno studio sull'uso degli antroponimi nell'antica Cipro', in *Quaderni della Sezione di Glottologia e Linguistica – Università degli Studi "G. d'Annunzio" di Chieti, 17-18 (2005-2006)*, (Ed.) Mucciantè, L., (Alessandria): 155-192.

Scarpanti, E. (2014), *L'identità linguistica nell'antica Cipro e il caso del sistema antroponomastico locale*, (Mantova).

Schmitt, R. (1995), 'Eine ketzerische Bemerkung zur Idalion-Bronze: 'und' statt 'oder'', *Kadmos* 34: 1-4.

Schmitz, P.C. (1995), 'The Phoenician Text from the Etruscan Sanctuary at Pyrgi', *JAOS* 115-4: 559-575.

Schmitz, P.C. (2009), 'The spr š lh "Tablet Scribe" at Phoenician Kition (CIS I 86 A 14)', *JAOS* 129-3: 499-501.

Schmitz, P.C. (2010), 'The Phoenician Contingent in the Campaign of Psammetichus II Against Kush', *JEH* 3/2: 321-337.

Schmitz, P.C. (2012), *The Phoenician Diaspora: Epigraphic and Historical Studies*, (Winona Lake).

Schmitz, P.C. (2013), 'The Ritual Accounts from Kition (CIS I 86 = KAI 5 37) in Historical Context', *Hebraica Masoretica*: 189-229.

- Schürr, D. (1992), 'Zur Bestimmung der Lautwerte des karischen Alphabets', *Kadmos* 31: 127-156.
- Schwabacher, W. (1981), 'The coins of the Vouni treasure reconsidered', *Numismatic Report, Cyprus Numismatic Society XII*: 11-51.
- Schwyzler, E. (1923), *Dialectorum Graecarum exempla epigraphica potiora*, (Hildesheim - Zurich - New York).
- Schwyzler, E. (1939), *Griechische Grammatik. I Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre Wortbildung, Flexion*, (München).
- Schwyzler, E. (1950), *Griechische Grammatik, II. Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*, (München).
- Scolnic, B., Davis, T. (2015), 'How Kittim became Rome and the Importance of Cyprus in the Sixth Syrian War', *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 127: 1-16.
- Scott, L. (2005), *Historical Commentary on Herodotus Book 6*. (Leiden)
- Sealey, R. (1987), *The Athenian Republic*, (London).
- Seiler H. (1958), 'Zu System und Entwicklungsgeschichte der griechischen Nominaldeklinaton', *Glotta* 37, 41-67.
- Shahbazi, A.S., Kettenhofen, E., Perry, J.R. (2012), 'Deportations', *Encyclopædia Iranica*, VII/3: 297-312.
- Shaked, S. (2004), *Le satrape de Bactriane et son gouverneur: Documents araméens du IV^e s. avant notre ère provenant de Bactriane*, Paris.
- Sheedy, K. (1999), 'The Idalion Stater found in a tomb at Marion in 1886', *NC* 159: 281-284.
- Sherk, R.K. (1990), 'The eponymous officials of greek cities I', *ZPE* 83: 249–288.
- Sherk, R.K. (1993), 'The eponymous officials of greek cities V', *ZPE* 96: 267–295.
- Sherratt, S. (1998), 'Sea Peoples and the economic structure of the late second millennium in the Eastern Mediterranean', in *Mediterranean Peoples in Transition. Thirteenth to Early Tenth Centuries B.C.E. Studies in Honor of Professor Trude Dothan*, (Eds.) Gitin, S., Mazar, A., Stern, E., (Jerusalem): 292-313.
- Sherratt, S. (2003), 'Visible writing: questions of script and identity in Early Iron Age Greece and Cyprus', *OJA* 22-23: 225-242.

- Siewert, P. (1977), 'The ephebic oath in fifth-century Athens', *JHS* 97: 102-111.
- Silverman, M.H. (1969), 'Aramean. Name-Types in the Elephantine Documents' *JAOS* 89: 691-709.
- Simon, Z., (2015), 'Against the Identification of Karkiša with Carians', in *Nostoi Indigenous culture, Migration and Integration in the Aegean islands and Western Anatolia during the late Bronze and early Iron ages*, (Eds.) Stampolidis, N.C., Maner, C., Kopanias, K., (Istanbul): 791-809.
- Sittig, E. (1914), 'Amathountos diglossos epigraphi', *Efimeris Archaologiki*: 1-2.
- Sittig, E. (1924), 'Zur neu gefundenen kyprischen Sprache', *KZ* 52: 194-202.
- Slanski, K.E. (2003), *The Babylonian entitlement narûs (kudurrus). A study of their form and function*, (Boston).
- Smith, M.S. (2001), *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts*, (Oxford).
- Smith J.S. (2018), 'The Changing Urban Landscape of Marion' in *Les royaumes de Chypre à l'épreuve de l'histoire : transitions et ruptures de la fin de l'âge du Bronze au début de l'époque hellénistique BCH suppl. 60*, (Eds.) Cannavò, A., Thély, L., (Athens): 167-186.
- Snodgrass, A.M. (1994), 'Gains, losses and survivals: what we infer for the 11th century BC.', in *Cyprus in the 11th Century B.C.: Proceedings of the International Symposium Organized by the Archaeological Research Unit of the University of Cyprus and the Anastasios G. Leventis Foundation, Nicosia, 30–31 October 1993*, (Ed.) Karageorghis, V., (Nicosia): 167-73.
- Sokolowski, F. (1980), 'On the Decree of Teos Concerning the Appointment of the Phrourakos for Kyrbissos', *ZPE* 38: 103-106.
- Sommerstein, A.H. (2014), 'The language of oaths 5.1, How oaths are expressed' in *Oaths and Swearing in Ancient Greece*, (Eds.) Sommerstein, A.H., Torrance, I.C., (Berlin): 76-85.
- Sourisseau, J.C., Yon, M. (2010), 'Les neoria et le port militaire de Kition-Bamboula (Larnaca, Chypre)' in *Ricoveri per navi militari nei porti del Mediterraneo antico e medievale. (Atti Workshop Ravello 2005)*, (Eds.) Blackman, D., Lentini, M.C., (Aix-Marseille): 57-67.
- South, A. (2002), 'Late Bronze Age settlement patterns in southern Cyprus: The first kingdoms?', *CCEC* 32: 59-72.
- Southern, M.R.V. (1999), *Sub-grammatical Survival. Indo-European s-mobile and its Regeneration in Germanic (= JIES, suppl. 34)*, (Washington).

- Spyridakis, K. (1937), ‘Συμβολή εις τήν Ἱστορίαν τῆς Πολιτείας τοῦ Ἀρχαίου Ἰδαλίου’, *Κυπριακαί Σπουδαί Α Α*: 61-78.
- Stager, L.A., Walker, A.M. (1989), *The American Expedition to Idalion, Cyprus 1973–1980*, (Chicago).
- Stavrou, P. (2014), ‘Golgi's inscription image details (E6 in Voskos, 1997)’, in the website *STARC Repo, The Cyprus Institute*.
- Steele, P. (2013), *A Linguistic History of Ancient Cyprus, The Non-Greek Languages, and their Relations with Greek, c.1600-300 BC*, (Cambridge).
- Steele, P. (2013b), *Syllabic Writing on Cyprus and its Context*, (Cambridge).
- Steele, P. (2018), *Writing and Society in Ancient Cyprus*, (Cambridge).
- Steskal, M. (2010), *Das Prytaneion in Ephesos*, (Vienna).
- Stern, S. (2000), ‘The Babylonian Calendar at Elephantine’, *ZPE* 130: 159-171.
- Stern, S. (2012), *Calendars in Antiquity*, (Oxford).
- Stieglitz, R.R. (1998), ‘The Phoenician-Punic Menology’, in *Boundaries of the Ancient Near Eastern World: A Tribute to Cyrus H. Gordon*, (Eds.) Lubetski, M., Gottlieb, C., Keller, S., (Sheffield): 211-221,
- Stieglitz, R.R. (2004), ‘Copper Sheathing and Painting with Orpiment at Elephantine Island’, *BASOR* 336: 31-35.
- Stockton, D.L. (1990), *The Classical Athenian Democracy*, (Oxford).
- Stockwell, S. (2010), ‘Before Athens: Early Popular Government in Phoenician and Greek City States’ in *The Secret History of Democracy*, (Eds.) Isakhan B., Stockwell S., (London): 35-48.
- Stol, M. (2007), ‘Review of Kition Bamboula V. Kition dans les textes, Paris, 2004’, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 64: 431-433.
- Stolper, M.W. (1995), ‘The Babylonian Enterprise of Belesys’, in *Dans les pas des Dix-Mille*, (Ed.) Briant, P., *PALLAS* 43: 217-238.
- Stolper, M.W. (2006), ‘Iranica in Post-Achaemenid Babylonian Texts’ in *La transition entre l'Empire achéménide et les royaumes hellénistiques (vers 350–300 av. J.-C.)*, (Eds.) Briant, P., Joannè, F., De Boccard, P., (Paris): 223-260.
- Stolper, M.W. (2007), ‘Kasr texts: excavated – but not in Berlin’, in *AS 27 Studies Presented to Robert D. Biggs, June 4, 2004 From the Workshop of the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary, Volume 2*, (Eds.) Roth, M., Farber, W., Stolper, M.W., Von Bechtolsheim, P., (Chicago): 243-284.

Strassmaier, J.N. (1890), *Inscripfen von Cambyses, König von Babylon*, (Leipzig).

Stratford, E. (2015), 'Successor Eponyms, Debt Notes, Intercalation, and the Old Assyrian Calendar during Kültepe Level II: A Critical Reappraisal', *JNES* 74: 301-324.

Strobel, K. (2008), 'Neues zur Geographie und Geschichte des alten Anatolien. Eine Einführung mit einem Beitrag zur hethitischen Geographie des westlichen Anatolien', in *New Perspectives on the Historical Geography and Topography of Anatolia in the II and I Millennium BC*, (Ed.) Strobel, K., (Firenze): 9-61.

Stronk, J. (2010), *Ctesias of Cnidus, Persica I*, (Düsseldorf).

Stronk, J. (2017), *Semiramis' legacy: the history of Persia according to Diodorus of Sicily*, (Edinburgh).

Stroszeck, J. (2004), 'Greek trophy monuments' in *Myth and Symbol II, Symbolic phenomena in ancient Greek culture. Papers from the 2nd and 3rd international symposium on symbolism at The Norwegian Institute at Athens, September 19-22- 2002*, (Ed.) Des Bouvrie, S., (Bergen): 303-332.

Struffolino, S. (2018), 'Iscrizione dei mercenari greci ad Abu Simbel', *Axon* 2.1: 7-18.

Stüber, K. (2000), 'Zu Bedeutung und Etymologie von altindisch *sáras-*, iranisch **harah-* und griechisch *ἔλος*', *HS* 113: 132-142.

Stylianou, P.G. (1989/1992²), *The Age of the Kingdoms: A Political History of Cyprus in the Archaic and Classical Periods*, (Nicosie).

Stylianou, J.P. (2000), 'Ta Archaia Vasileia', in *Istoria tes Kyprou, V.2, P.2: Archaia Kypros*, (Ed.) Papadopoulos, T., (Nicosia): 465-618.

Sullivan, B.M. (2011), 'Paying Archaic Greek Mercenaries: Views From Egypt and the Near East', *The Classical Journal* 107/1: 31-61.

Szzynger M., (1978), 'Carthage et la civilisation punique', in *Rome et la conquête du monde méditerranéen (264-224 av. J.-C), Genèse d'un empire*, (Ed.) Nicolet, C., (Paris): 545-599.

Szzynger, M. (1985), 'Les noms de métier et de fonction chez les Phéniciens de Kition d'après les témoignages épigraphiques', in *Chypre : la vie quotidienne de l'antiquité à nos jours. Actes du Colloque, Musée de l'Homme*, (Ed.) De Sique, Y., (Paris): 79-86.

Szzynger, M. (1987), *Les Stèles puniques de Constantine, musée du Louvre, département des Antiquités orientales*, (Paris).

Szzyner, M. (1988), 'Nouvelle lecture d'un mot à la première ligne de l'inscription phénicienne de Larnaca-tis-Lapithou conservée au musée de Nicosie', *RDAC*: 59-61.

Szzyner, M. (2001), 'À Propos du «Trophée» dans l'Inscription Phénicienne de Milkyatôn, le Roi de Kition et d'Idalion' in *Studia Phoenicia XVI, Punica – Libyca – Ptolemaica: Festschrift für Werner Huss zum 65. Geburtstag dargebracht von Schülern, Freunden und Kollegen*, (Eds.) Geus, K., Zimmermann, K., (Leuven): 99-110.

Szzyner, M. (2004), 'Inscriptions Phéniciennes Inédites', in *Kition dans les textes, Kition Bamboula V*, (Ed.) Yon, M., (Paris): 217-228.

Tadmor, H. (1966), 'Philistia under Assyrian Rule', *Bibl.Arch* 29/3: 86-102.

Tadmor, H. (1994), *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III, King of Assyria. Critical Edition with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, (Jerusalem).

Tatton-Brown, V. (2002), 'The Kingdom of Idalion: Lang's excavations in the British Museum', *CCEC* 32 (*Hommage à Marguerite Yon*): 243-256.

Tavernier, J. (2007), *Iranica in the Achaemenid Period (ca.550 -330 B.C.): Lexicon of Old Persian Loanwords, Attested in non-Iranian texts*, (Leuven).

Teixidor, J. (1967), 'Bulletin d'épigraphie sémitique', *Syria* 44-3-4: 171.

Teixidor, J. (1969), 'Bulletin d'épigraphie sémitique', *Syria* 46-3-4: 319-358.

Teixidor, J. (1972), 'Bulletin d'épigraphie sémitique', *Syria* 49-3-4: 413-449.

Teixidor, J. (1974), 'Bulletin d'épigraphie sémitique', *Syria* 51-3-4: 299-340.

Teixidor, J. (1980), 'L'assemblée législative en Phénicie d'après les inscriptions' *Syria*, 57-2-4: 453-464

Teixidor, J. (1988), 'Ptolemaic Chronology in the Phoenician Inscriptions from Cyprus', *ZPE*: 71-190.

Teixidor, X. (1975), 'Early Phoenician Presence in Cyprus: Analysis of Epigraphical Material' in *The Archaeology of Cyprus: Recent Developments*, (Ed.) Robertson, N., (New Jersey):121-8

Teixidor, X. (1976), *The Phoenician Inscriptions of the Cesnola Collection*, *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 11, (New York).

Teixidor, X. (1986), *Bulletin d'épigraphie sémitique 1961-1980*, (Paris).

Terranova, C. (2016), *La presenza dei bambini nelle religioni del Mediterraneo antico*, (Roma).

Terrenato, N. (2005), 'The Deceptive Archetype: Roman Colonialism in Italy and Postcolonial Thought' in *Ancient Colonizations: Analogy, Similarity and Difference*, (Eds.) Hurst, H., Owen, S. (London): 59-72.

- Thonemann, P. (2008), 'A Ptolemaic Decree from Kourion', *ZPE* 165: 87-95.
- Thumb, A., Scherer A. (1959), 'Der kyprische Dialekt' in *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*, (Ed.) Thumb, A., (Heidelberg): 141-174.
- Tompkins, D. (2013), 'The Language of Pericles', in *Thucydides between History and Literature*, (Eds.) Tsakmakis, A., Tamiolaki, M., (Berlin): 447-464.
- Tozzi, P. (1976), 'Sulla iscrizione del mercenario greco Anaxanor ad Abu-Simbel', *Athenaeum* 64.3-4: 482-483.
- Travlos, J. (1971), *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens Hardcover*, (New York).
- Tsagrakis, A. (2016), 'The wa-na-ka - (F)άνακς - ἄναξ', *Pasiphae* 10: 201-216.
- Trigger, B.G., Kemp; B.J., O'Connor, D. (1983), *Ancient Egypt: A Social History*, (Cambridge).
- Trümper, C. (1997), *Untersuchungen zu den altgriechischen Monatsnamen und Monatsfolgen*, (Heidelberg).
- Trundle, M. (2017), 'Hiring Mercenaries in the Classical Greek World. Causes and Outcomes? La contratación de mercenarios en la Grecia Clásica, Causas y consecuencias?' *Millars* 80: 35-62:
- Tuplin, C. (1987), 'The Administration of the Achaemenid Empire' in *Coinage and Administration in the Athenian and Persian Empires*, *British Archaeological Reports 343*, (Ed.) Carradice, I., (Oxford): 109-166.
- Tuplin, C. (1996), *Achaemenid Studies*, (Stuttgart).
- Tuplin, C. (2007), 'Treacherous hearts and upright tiaras: on the head-gear of Persian Kings', in *Political and Cultural Interactions in the Achaemenid Empire*, (Ed.) Tuplin, C.J., (Swansea): 67-97.
- Tuplin, C. (2008), 'Taxation and Death. Certainties in the Fortification Archive?', in *L'Archive des Fortifications de Persépolis : état des questions et perspectives de recherches*, (Eds.) Briant, P., Henkelman, W. (Paris): 275-301.
- Tuplin, C. (2011), 'Managing the World: Herodotus on Persian imperial administration', *Herodotus and the Persian Empire*, (Ed.) Rollinger *et al.*, (Wiesbaden): 39-64.
- Tuplin, C. (2018), 'Xenophon, Isocrates and the Achaemenid Empire: History, Pedagogy and the Persian Solution to Greek Problems', *Trends in Classics* 10.1: 13 - 55.
- Tsagalidis, C.C. (2008), *Inscribing Sorrow Fourth-Century Attic Funerary Epigrams*, (Berlin).
- Tzagrakis, A. (2016), 'The wa-na-ka' *Pasiphae* 10: 201-216.

- Uchitel, A. (2005), 'Land-Tenure in Mycenaean Greece and the Hittite Empire: Linear B Land-Surveys from Pylos and Middle Hittite Land-Donations', *JESHO* 48: 476-486.
- Ulbrich, A. (2011), 'Unpublished sculptures from ancient Idalion: The earliest provenanced, find, assemblage in the Ashmolean Cypriot collection', *CCEC* 41: 183-210.
- Unwin, N.C. (2017), *Caria and Crete in Antiquity: Cultural Interaction Between Anatolia and the Aegean*, (Cambridge).
- Ustinova, Y. (2009), *Caves and the Ancient Greek Mind: Descending Underground in the Search for the Ultimate Truth*. (Oxford).
- Valerio, M., Yakubovich, I., (2010), 'Semitic Word for 'Iron' as Anatolian Loanword', in *Исследования по лингвистике и семиотике: сборник статей к юбилею Вяч. Вс. Иванова*, (Ed.) Nikolaeva, T.M., (Moscow): 108-116.
- Valerio, M., Ferrara, S. (2020), 'Rebus and acrophony in invented writing. Writing Systems Research' in *Syllabic Writing on Cyprus and its Constests*, (Ed.) Steele, P., (Cambridge): 1-6.
- Vallozza, M. (2005), 'L'esule fenicio: realtà e artificio letterario (Isocrate, Evagora 19-21)', in *Greci, Fenici, Romani: interazioni culturali nel Mediterraneo antico. Atti delle giornate di studio di Viterbo, 28-29 maggio 2004*, (Eds.) Bondi, S.F., Vallozza, M., (Viterbo): 185-192.
- Van Buylaere, G. (2010), 'The role of the hazannu in the Neo-Assyrian Empire' in *Proceedings of the 53e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale – Vol. 2: City administration in the ancient Near East (Babel und Bibel 5)*, (Eds.) Kogan, L. et al.: (Penn State University): 229-246.
- Van Den Branden, A. (1956), 'Notes pheniciennes', *Bulletin du Musee de Beyrouth* 13: 87-95.
- Van Den Branden, A. (1964), 'L'inscription phénicienne de Larnax Lapethou ii', *Oriens Antiquus* 3: 245–61.
- Van Den Branden, A. (1966), 'Elenco delle spese del tempio di Kition', *Bibbia e Oriente* 8: 245-252.
- Van Den Branden, A. (1967), 'L'inscription phénicienne d'Idalion *CIS*, 1, 88', *Studi sull'Oriente e la Bibbia*: 55-70.
- Van Wees, Hans (2013), *Ships and Silver, Taxes and Tribute A Fiscal History of Archaic Athens*, (London).
- Van Wess, Hans (forthcoming), 'The first Greek mercenaries in Egypt: myths and realities'.
- Vanstiphout H.L.J., 1992, 'The banquet scene in the Mesopotamian debate poems', in *Banquets d'Orient*, (Ed.) Gyselen, R., (Bures-sur-Yve): 9-22.

- Vattioni, F. (1968), 'Note fenicie', *AION* 18: 71-73.
- Vernet, Y. (2015), 'The Cypriote Apollo. Characteristics of the Apolline Cult in Cyprus', in the website *Kyprios Character. History, Archaeology & Numismatics of Ancient Cyprus*.
- Vernet, Y. (2015b), *L'Apollon de Chypre: naissance, évolution et caractéristiques du culte apollinien à chypre de ses origines à la fin de l'époque hellénistique, thèse doctorale*, (Avignon).
- Vernet, Y. (2016), 'Le culte d'Apollon à Nea Paphos et ses environs de la fondation de la ville à la domination romaine', in *Nea Paphos. Fondation et développement urbanistique d'une ville chypriote de l'antiquité à nos jours. Études archéologiques, historiques et patrimoniales. Actes du Colloque international, en collaboration avec le Département des Antiquités de Chypre, Université d'Avignon et des Pays de Vaucluse, 30 octobre – 1er novembre 2012*, (Ed.) Balandier, C., (Bordeaux): 301-313.
- Vernet, Y. (2020), 'The evolution of the religious topography of Paphos under the reign of Nikokles' in *Ex Oriente Lux. Studies in Honour of Jolanta Młynarczyk*, (Eds.) Jakubiak, K., Łajtar, A. (Warsaw): 147-156.
- Vernet, Y. (forthcoming), 'Le statut de Kourion à l'époque chypro-classique' in *Acts of the International Conference "Classical Cyprus", University of Graz, 21st-23rd September 2017*.
- Villing, A., Bergeron, M., et al. (2013-2015), *Naukratis: Greeks in Egypt*, (London).
- Villing, A., Schlotzhauer, U. (2006), *Naukratis and the Eastern Mediterranean: Past, Present and Future*, (London).
- Vittmann, G. (1996), 'Zum Gebrauch des k3-Zeichens im Demotischen', in *Studi Egittologia e di Antichità Puniche*, (Eds.) Acquaro, E., Pernigotti, S., (Pisa): 1-12.
- Vittmann, G. (2011), 'Ägypten zur Zeit der Perserherrschaft', in *Herodot und das persische Weltreich: Akten des 3. Internationalen Kolloquiums zum Thema "Vorderasien im Spannungsfeld klassischer und altorientalischer Überlieferungen" Innsbruck, 24.-28.I, Classica et Orientalia 3*, (Ed.) Rollinger, R., Truschneegg, B., Bichler, R., (Leipzig): 373-429.
- Volkman, H. (1956), 'Der Herrscherkult der Ptolemäer in phönikischen Inschriften und sein Beitrag zur Hellenisierung von Kypros', *Historia* 5: 448-455.
- Voskos, A. (1997), *Αρχαία Κυπριακή Γραμματεία Επίγραμμα, I, II* (Nicosia).
- Voskos, A. (2000), 'Κριτικά καὶ Ἑρμηνευτικά στο Κυπριακὸ Ἐπίγραμμα', in *Proceedings of the Third International Conference of Cypriote Studies*,

- (Nicosia, 16-20 April, 1996), (Eds.) Ioannides, G.K., Hadjistyllis, S.A., (Nicosia): 171-181.
- Voskos, I., Knapp B. (2008), 'Cyprus at the End of the Late Bronze Age: Crisis and Colonization or Continuity and Hybridization?' *AJA* 112.4: 659-684.
- Waerzeggers, C. (2004), 'The Babylonian Revolts Against Xerxes and the 'End of Archives'', *Archiv für Orientforschung* 50, 150-173.
- Waerzeggers, C. (2006), 'The Carians of Borsippa', *Iraq* 68: 1-22.
- Walcher, K. (2009), *Die Architektur und Bauornamentik der archaischen Königsgräber von Tamassos auf Zypern*, (Rahden).
- Wallinga, H.T. (1984), 'The Ionian Revolt', *Mnemosyne* 37: 401-437.
- Walser, G. (1966), *Die Völkerschaften auf den Reliefs von Persepolis*, (Berlin).
- Walsh, J. (1986), 'The Date of the Athenian Stoa at Delphi', *AJA* 90.3: 319-336.
- Waters, M. (2016), 'Xerxes and the Oathbreakers: Empire and Rebellion on the Northwestern Front' in *Revolt and Resistance in the Ancient Classical World and the Near East*, (Eds.) Collins, J.J., Manning J.G., (Leiden): 91-102.
- Watkin, J.H. (1987), 'The Cypriote Surrender to Persia', *JHS* 107: 154-163.
- Webb, J.M. (1999), *Ritual Architecture, Iconography and Practice in the Late Cypriot Bronze Age*, (Jonsered).
- Webb, J.M. (2018), 'Lapithos Tomb 201. A singular Middle Bronze Age burial assemblage' in *Structures of Inequality on Bronze Age Cyprus. Studies in Honour of Alison K. Smith (Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology PB 187)*, (Eds.) Hulin, L., Crewe, L., Webb, J., (Uppsala): 35-52.
- Webb, J.M. (2019), 'Shifting Centres: Site Location and Resource Procurement on the North Coast of Cyprus over the Longue Duré e of the Prehistoric Bronze Age', *Land* 7(2):1-31.
- Weber, M. (2017), 'Two (?) Lion Reliefs from Iron Age Moab: Further Evidence for an Architectural and Intellectual Koiné in the Levant?', *BASOR* 377: 85-106.
- Wehrli, F. (1948), *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar, Heft III: Klearchos*, (Basel).
- Weil, R. (1960), *Aristote et l'histoire. Essai sur la 'Politique'*, (Paris).
- Weinberg, J. (1992), *The Citizen-Temple Community*, (London).

- Weiss, M. (1995), 'Life Everlasting: Latin *iūgis* 'everflowing', Greek ὑγιής 'healthy', Gothic *ajukdūbs* 'eternity' and Avestan *yauuaējī-* 'living forever', *MSS* 55: 133-155.
- West, M.L. (1993), *Greek lyric poetry: the poems and fragments of the Greek iambic, elegiac, and melic poets (excluding Pindar and Bacchylides) down to 450 BC*, (Oxford).
- West, M.L. (1997), *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*, (Oxford).
- Westbrook, R. (2000), 'Babylonian Diplomacy in the Amarna Letters', *JAOS* 120.3: 377-382.
- Whitehead, D. (2008), 'Kidaris' in the website *Suda On Line*.
- Wiesehöfer, J. (2015), '4 Fourth Century Revolts against Persia: The Test Case of Sidon (348–345 bce)', in *Brill's Companion to Insurgency and Terrorism in the Ancient Mediterranean*, (Eds.), Howe, T., Brice, L.L. (Leiden): 93-112.
- Wilhelm, A. (1980), *Griechische Epigramme*, (Bonn).
- Willi, A. (2008), 'Demeter, Gê, and the Indo-European Word(s) for 'Earth'', *HS* 120: 169-194.
- Willing, A., Schlotzhauer, U. (2006), *Naukratis: Greek Diversity in Egypt - Studies on East Greek Pottery and Exchange in the Eastern Mediterranean*, (London).
- Wilson, A.I. (2012), *Neo-Punic and Latin inscriptions in Roman North Africa: function and display*, (Cambridge).
- Wilson, A.J. (1945), 'The Assembly of a Phoenician City', *JNES* 4: 245.
- Wilson, N.G. (2015), *Herodotea Studies on the Text of Herodotus*, (Oxford).
- Woodward, A.M. (1911-1912), 'Inscriptions from Beroea in Macedonia', *ABSA* 18:132-165.
- Worp, P., Hope C., (2000), 'A Greek Account on a Clay Tablet from the Dakhleh Oasis, with an appendix by C. Hope, The Discovery of the Clay Tablet' in *Papyri in honorem Johannis Bingen octogenarii (P. Bingen)*, (Ed.) Melaerts, H., (Leuven): 471-486.
- Xella, P. (1976), 'Il Dio siriano Kothar', in *Magia: Studi di storia delle religioni in memoria di Raffaella Garosi*, (Ed.) Xella, P., (Rome): 111-126.
- Xella, P. (1995), 'Ugarit et les Phéniciens : identité culturelle et rapports historiques', in *Ugarit. Ein ostmediterranes Kulturzentrum im Alten Orient:*

- Ergebnisse und Perspektiven der Forschung*, (Eds.) Dietrich, M., Loretz, O., (Münster): 239-266.
- Xella, P. (2001), *Quando un dio muore. Morti e assenze divine nelle antiche tradizioni mediterranee*, (Verona).
- Xella, P. (2017), Self-Depiction and Legitimation: Aspects of Phoenician Royal Ideology in *Herrschaftslegitimation in vorderorientalischen Reichen der Eisenzeit*, (Eds.) Levin, C., Müller, R., (Heidelberg): 97-109.
- Xydopoulos, I. (2016), 'The theorodokoi inscription from Nemea (SEG 36, 331) and the date of IG IV, 583', *Tekmeria* 13: 395-418.
- Xypolia, I. (2017), *British Imperialism and Turkish Nationalism in Cyprus, 1923-1939: Divide, Define and Rule*, (New York).
- Yakubovich, I. (2012), 'The Carian Language, by Ignacio J. Adiego', *JNES* 71/1: 131-133.
- Yakubovich, I. (2015), 'Phoenician and Luwian in Early Iron Age Cilicia', *Anatolia Studies* 65: 35-53.
- Yardeni, A. (1994), 'Maritime Trade and Royal Accountancy in an Erased Customs Account from 475 B. C. E. on the Aḥiqar Scroll from Elephantine', *BASOR* 293: 67-78.
- Yon, M. (1987), 'Le royaume de Kition. Epoque archaique' in *Phoenicia and the East Mediterranean in the First Millennium b.c.. Proceedings of the Conference held in Leuven from the 14th to the 16th of November 1985. Studia Phoenicia V*, (Ed.) Lipinski, E. (Leuven): 357-374.
- Yon, M. (1989), 'Sur l'administration de Kition à l'époque classique', in *Early Society in Cyprus*, (Ed.) Peltenburg, E.J., (Edinburgh): 363-375.
- Yon, M. (1992), 'Le royaume de Kition', *Numismatique et histoire économique phéniciennes et puniques*, *Studia Phoenicia IX*, (Eds.) Hackens, T., Moucharte, G., (Louvain): 243-260
- Yon, M. (1995), 'La stèle de Sargon II à Chypre : la découverte de la stèle à Larnaca' in *Khorsabad, le palais de Sargon II, roi d'Assyrie*, *Actes du colloque organisé au musée du Louvre par le Services culturel les 21 et 22 janvier 1994*, 8ed., Caubet, A., (Paris): 159-168.
- Yon, M. (1997), 'Kition in the Tenth to Fourth Centuries BC', *BASOR* 308: 9-17.
- Yon, M. (2000), 'Les hangars du port chypro-phénicien de Kition. Campagnes 1996-1998' (Mission française de Kition-Bamboula), *Syria* 77: 95-116.
- Yon, M. (2001), 'Ancient Military Port at Kition', *Archaeologia Cypria* 4: 165-70.

- Yon, M. (2004), *Kition dans les texts, Kition-Bamboula V*, (Paris).
- Yon, M. (2004b), 'Les ambitions des rois de Kition', *CCEC* 34: 115-126.
- Yon, M. (2006), 'Sociétés cosmopolites à Chypre du IX^e au III^e siècle avant J.-C.' in *Identités croisées en un milieu méditerranéen. Le cas de Chypre (antiquité – moyen âge)*, (Eds.) Fourrier, S., Grivaud, G., (Rouen-Le Havre): 37- 61.
- Yon, M. (2007), 'La culture chypro-phénicienne: art phénicien, art chypriote' in *La Méditerranée des Phéniciens: de Tyr à Carthage*, (Eds.) Fontan E., Le Meaux, H., (Paris): 118-125.
- Yon, M., Sznycer, M. (1991), 'Une Inscription Royale de Kition (Chypre)', *CRAIBL*: 791- 823.
- Yon, M., Sznycer, M. (1992), 'A Phoenician Trophy at Kition', *RDAC*: 156-165.
- Young, P. H. (2005), 'The Cypriot Aphrodite Cult: Paphos, Rantidi, and Saint Barnabas,' *JNES* 64.1: 23-44.
- Young, J.H., Young, S.H., (1955), *Terracotta Figurines from Kourion in Cyprus*, (Philadelphia).
- Zaccagnini, C. (1983), 'Patterns of Mobility among Ancient near Eastern Craftsmen', *JNES* 42: 245-264
- Zaccagnini, C. (2003), *Mercanti e politica nel mondo antico*, Roma.
- Zadok, R. (2005), 'On Anatolians, Greeks and Egyptians in 'Chaldean' and Achaemenid Babylonia', *Journal of the Institute of Archaeology Tel Aviv* 32: 76-106.
- Zahlhaas, G., Neumann, G., (1994), 'Zwei neue karische Inschriften aus München', *Kadmos* 33: 160-163 .
- Zamora López, J.A. (2015), 'Bronze and Metallurgy in Phoenician Sources', in *Phoenician Bronzes in Mediterranean (Bibliotheca Archaeologica Hispana 45)*, Chapter: *Bronze and Metallurgy in Phoenician Source: Real Academia de la Historia*, (Ed.) Jiménez Avila, J., (Madrid): 29-45.
- Zamora López, J.A. (2018), 'The *miqim elim*. Epigraphic evidence for a specialist in the Phoenician-Punic cult', *RSF* 45: 65-86.
- Zapiti, E., Michaelidou, L. (2008), *Coins of Cyprus From the Collections of the Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation*, Nicosia.
- Zgusta, L. (1964), *Kleinasiatische Personennamen*, (Prag).
- Ziehen, L. (1949), 'παράσιτοι', *RE* 18.2: 1377-1381.

Zournatzi, A. (1996), 'Cypriot kingship: perspectives in the classical period', *THKMEPIA* 2: 154-181.

Zournatzi, A. (2005), *Persian Rule in Cyprus. Sources, Problems, Perspectives*, (Athens).

