

THE ADVENT OF THE GREEK ALPHABET ON CYPRUS : A COMPETITION OF SCRIPTS

Thomas G. PALAIMA

In this paper I shall focus on methods of approach to understanding the use of writing on the island of Cyprus in the first millennium B.C. Specifically I am interested in defining the precise nature of the interaction, competition or simultaneous co-existence of the Greek alphabetic and the Cypriote Syllabic scripts through time. This topic has many aspects to it, and any observations made here must be considered tentative. In fact, it lies somewhat outside my own area of specialization (Aegean prehistoric scripts and literacy), although work within this field has prompted my recent interest in the epigraphical situation in Cyprus both in the prehistoric and historical periods¹. I hope, however, that some of the questions raised will be pursued in the future by myself and other scholars ; and for this reason I have been teaching a seminar at PASP in spring 1990 on Cypriote epigraphical history².

In order to evaluate Cypriote literacy, one must recognize the patterns of use of several scripts within a general historical and cultural framework and within varied regional, social and/or political environments. I have begun analyzing the entire body of Cypriote inscriptions from the beginning of the Cypriote Geometric period to the Byzantine period using the

¹ See Th.G. PALAIMA, *Cypro-Minoan Scripts : Problems of Historical Context*, in Y. DUHOUX - Th.G. PALAIMA - J. BENNET (eds), *Problems in Decipherment* (BCILL 49), Louvain-la-Neuve 1989, p. 121-187.

² The participants were Tom Block and Bruce LaForse who have concentrated on developments in SW Cyprus ; Leah Himmelhoch, research assistant in PASP, who compiled a rough version of the data base discussed below ; Joanna Smith of Bryn Mawr College, who has been studying the evidence for seals inscribed with Cypriote Syllabic or Greek alphabetic characters ; Nicolle Hirschfeld, who is continuing her work on Cypro-Minoan pot marks ; and two auditors Frederick Schwink and Sara Kimball who have helped enormously in discussing linguistic developments in Cyprus from the Late Bronze Age onward.

Macintosh computer data base Microsoft File. There are now *c.* 1400 entries, some of which contain multiple items, e.g., the Greek alphabetic and Cypriote Syllabic graffiti dedications from the period 225-218 B.C. from the Nymphaeum at Kafizin or the Greek alphabetic inscriptions of the Hellenistic period on amphora handles from Nea Paphos. The inscriptions listed in each entry are classified as follows :

1. *type of script* : Cypriote Syllabic (CS) ; Paphian Cypriote Syllabic (PCS) ; Eteo-Cypriote (EC) ; Greek alphabetic (GA) and Roman alphabetic (RA) ;
2. *provenience (if known)* ;
3. *date (if known)* ;
4. *nature of the text* ;
5. *material*.

The information about these inscriptions has so far come from the following standard sources, eliminating, but noting bibliographically, cross-listings : the annual Cypriote section of the *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (hereafter *SEG*) ; Ino Nicolaou's yearly presentation of Greek alphabetic inscriptions in the *Report of the Department of Antiquities of Cyprus* (hereafter *RDAC*) complete through 1988 ; the réimpression augmentée of Olivier Masson's *Inscriptions chypriotes syllabiques*, Paris 1983 (hereafter *ICS*) ; T.B. Mitford's *Inscriptions of Kourion*, Philadelphia 1971, and his more recent *The Nymphaeum of Kafizin* (*Kadmos* Supplement 2), Berlin 1980.

The data have then been analyzed :

1) *in chronological order* : from the 11th century B.C. through the Hellenistic and Roman periods, and even into the Byzantine. This allows us to view the pattern of use of scripts over time within the major periods of historical and cultural change on Cyprus :

Cypro-Geometric I-III :	1050-750 B.C.
Cypro-Archaic I :	750-600 B.C.
Cypro-Archaic II :	600-475 B.C.
Cypro-Classical I :	475-400 B.C.
Cypro-Classical II :	400-325 B.C.
Hellenistic I :	325-150 B.C.
Hellenistic II :	150-50 B.C.
Roman :	50 B.C.-150 A.D. and following.

For our purposes, the earlier periods are more important. The latest entries are, of course, Greek alphabetic : *RDAC* 1985, p. 331 n° 15, an inscribed bread stamp of greyish limestone of the 6th-7th centuries A.D. ; *SEG* 28 (1978), p. 371-372 n° 1304, an imperial edict of the 6th century A.D. from Kythrea ; and *SEG* 20 (1964), p. 38 n° 125, a limestone building inscription from the monastery of St. Barnaby erected by the archbishop Philoxenos in the 6th century A.D. These date slightly later than some of the inscribed mosaics from Nea Paphos, e.g., *SEG* 23 (1968), p. 212 n° 653. The earliest CS text is the inscribed obelos (T 49.16) from tomb 49 at Palaepaphos-Skales. The next stage of research will correct the data so far compiled and supplement them with other texts from specialized publications of CS inscriptions which appeared after 1983 and from other potential sources of alphabetic material, e.g., studies and catalogues of seals and coins.

The CS obelos (T 49.16) is one of three inscribed obeloi (fig. 1) found deposited together against the wall of the chamber of a tomb dating to the early Cypriote Geometric I period (1050-950 B.C.)³. The other two obeloi (T 49.17 and T 49.18) bear two incised marks separated by a vertical divider. In addition single stones from the dromoi of Tomb 49 and Tomb 67 each have two signs incised on them in the same arrangement. A bronze cup from the surface has a typical 5-sign CM inscription on it. The material from Tombs 49 and 67 gives evidence for a transitional stage of experimentation between the class(es) of Bronze Age writing of Cyprus called Cypro-Minoan⁴ and the Cypriote Syllabary of the historical period which evolved from it. Such experimentation must have involved a change of *system*, at least to the extent of adjusting sign repertoires and modifying the principles by which signs were used⁵. The Palaepaphos-Skales material also supports, without entirely proving, what was conjectured by

³ For the inscriptions, see E. and O. MASSON, *Les objets inscrits de Palaepaphos-Skales*, in V. KARAGEORGHIS, *Palaepaphos-Skales. An Iron Age Cemetery in Cyprus* (Ausgrabungen in Alt-Paphos 3), Constance 1983, p. 411-415. For the find context, see KARAGEORGHIS, *ibid.*, p. 59-61.

⁴ For problems in classifying the Bronze Age data, see Th.G. PALAIMA, *art. cit.* (n. 1), p. 152-162.

⁵ Despite the large number of attested CM signs (114 in the standard numeration of E. Masson) CM prototypes for all the 55-56 signs in the later CS signaries cannot be established even by the most inventive minds. See St. HILLER, *Die kyprominoischen Schriftsysteme*, in *AfO* 20 (1985), p. 75-76.

T.B. Mitford, E. Masson and myself on other grounds⁶, namely that the earliest stages of development of CS from CM perhaps should be localized in southwestern Cyprus. Of course, it also has implications for our central question because it demonstrates convincingly, despite a considerable gap in documentation, that a precursor of the historical Cypriote Syllabic Script was in use much earlier than the canonical date (c. 825-775 B.C.) for the general introduction of the Greek alphabet (from the point of view of Greek epigraphists) as a vehicle for writing Greek⁷. The next relatively securely dated and identified inscriptions in Cypriote Syllabic are vase inscriptions, dedications, sepulchral inscriptions and even seals of the 8th-6th centuries B.C. The earliest of these is a CG III style jug (*ICS*, n° 174) from the region of Polis south of Marion. It has five signs painted *during the process of decoration*⁸ above five parallel and concentric circles that decorate the jug. The fourth sign from the left on the Polis jug resembles the EC version of the sign *so* from Amathous, but such a resemblance in the case of a single sign hardly provides a compelling reason for attributing this otherwise unintelligible inscription to an EC signary of CS at so early a stage in its development.

The finds from Palaepaphos-Skales deserve some attention here (fig.1). On obelos T 49.16, two of the crucial signs for diagnosis, *le* and

⁶ T.B. MITFORD, *The Present State of Cypriot Epigraphy*, in *Akte des IV Kongresses für griech. und latein. Epigraphik*, Vienne 1964, p. 248, and ID., *The Cypro-Minoan Inscriptions of Old Paphos*, in *Kadmos* 10 (1971), p. 87-96. E. MASSON, *La diffusion de l'écriture à Chypre à la fin de l'âge du Bronze*, in V. KARAGEORGHIS (ed.) *Acts of the International Archaeological Symposium «The Mycenaeans in the Eastern Mediterranean»*, Nicosie 1973, p. 91 and n. 13. Th.G. PALAIMA, *Ideograms and Supplementals and Regional Interaction Among Aegean and Cypriote Scripts*, in *Minos* 24 (1989), p. 38, 53-54.

⁷ Most succinctly summarized by A.W. JOHNSTON (ed.), L.H. JEFFERY, *Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*, 2^e éd., Oxford 1990, p. 426-428. For fuller information and analysis, see R. WACHTER, *Zur Vorgeschichte des griechischen Alphabets*, in *Kadmos* 28 (1989), p. 69-76 ; A.W. JOHNSTON, *The Extent and Use of Literacy : The Archaeological Evidence*, in R. HÄGG (ed.), *The Greek Renaissance of the Eighth Century B.C. : Tradition and Innovation* (Skrifter Utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen, 4^e, 30), Stockholm 1983, p. 63-68 ; and B.B. POWELL, *Why Was the Greek Alphabet Invented? The Epigraphical Evidence*, in *Classical Antiquity* 8 (1989), p. 323-325.

⁸ This is an important point because two other earlier vessels, a CG I alabaster vase (*ICS*, n° 254) and a sub-Mycenaean alabastron (*ICS*, n° 349) bear inscriptions which were probably added to the vases long after the period to which they belong. See V. and J. KARAGEORGHIS, *Some Inscribed Iron-Age Vases from Cyprus*, in *AJA* 60 (1956), p. 351-359.

u, fit into the Old Paphian CS tradition, although the first sign, *o*, resembles its counterpart in the EC and Idalion CS signaries. Because of our numerically and chronologically limited data, we do not have a full understanding of the palaeographical histories of the regional CS signaries. We might posit that Paphian developed a simplified version of *o*, while other regional signaries retained an original form derived from sign CM 1 n° 64⁹. The sign for *pe* on the obelos certainly was a free invention in all the later CS signaries.

The spelling conventions do not conform to those of the Mycenaean Linear B script, in which the same name is found on Knossos text B 799.6 in the nominative as *o-pe-ta* (*Opheltas*) with the normal Mycenaean omission of liquids before stops. Employing a sign for *le* in itself is a distinctive feature through which even this early experiment toward CS marks its independence from the influence of the Mycenaean graphic tradition. The Cypriote script in the historical period distinguishes an *l* series from an *r* series. It is thus more consistent than the Mycenaean Linear B (LB) script. For CS represents consonant series according to different points of articulation, whereas LB peculiarly distinguishes voiced from unvoiced stops only in the dental series, while failing to represent the distinction between *l* and *r*¹⁰. This reinforces our impression that the Mycenaean writing system had little to do with the creation of Cypriote Syllabic. There is certainly no ideographic influence, as I have demonstrated recently (see n. 6). And some syllabic values attached to Classical CS signs (e.g., the sign used for *ri* exclusively in the Old and New Paphian signaries, which resembles the Mycenaean LB sign for *re* and CM 1 n° 83) seem to point to their ultimate origin from a writing system designed to represent the needs of Minoan rather than Mycenaean Greek phonology. This observation is further reinforced by the gaps in the *e* and *o* series of the EC and Old Paphian versions of the syllabary, which might derive from the relative weakness of the same series in Minoan Linear A¹¹.

⁹ Cf. the table of signs in St. HILLER, *art. cit.* (n. 5), p. 62-65.

¹⁰ I thank Frederick Schwink for this observation. There is, of course, the possibility that the later CS distinction between a sign for *le* and a sign for *re* had not yet been made at the time the obelos was inscribed. The sign on the obelos might have stood for [re] or [le].

¹¹ For this weakness in Linear A, see most recently Y. DUHOUX, *Le linéaire A : problèmes de déchiffrement*, in Y. DUHOUX - Th.G. PALAIMA - J. BENNET (eds), *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 72.

We can imagine that one of the Aegean Greek settlers who, as V. Karageorghis hypothesizes¹², shifted from the nearby settlement of *Maa-Palaeokastro* to *Palaepaphos-Skales* when Mycenaean III C:1b pottery was in use — a Greek settler whose speech already had developed away from the standard Mycenaean South Greek of the 13th century B.C. toward the characteristic historical Arcado-Cypriote dialect¹³, and who, we must stress, had no need to be familiar with the highly restricted Linear B script which had suddenly vanished 150 years earlier with the destruction of the palaces on the Mycenaean mainland — had his name inscribed on a bronze obelos (T 49.16) in the subsequent CG I phase in an evolved form of Cypro-Minoan. The inscriber represented the genitive of the name *Opheltas* as *o-pe-le-ta-u* using, I believe, principles of syllabification that either were phonologically dictated or were conventional in a still existing form of Cypro-Minoan which was coming to terms, in the 12th and 11th centuries B.C., with the need to write Greek. Until we have more documentation, it will remain an open question just how thoroughly and successfully the CM script had been modified to represent Greek in the 11th century.

The exact implications of the rest of the inscriptions are harder to determine¹⁴. The two other inscribed obeloi and the stones from the dromoi of Tombs 49 and 67 all conform to what E. Masson (see n.14) has termed the «1+1» CM formula : single signs separated by a vertical divider. Thus they seem to adhere to an indigenous Bronze Age tradition. But obelos T 49.18 seems to have two abstract signs unattested in CM writing *per se*. The repeated signs on obelos T 49.17 suit either later CS *ti* in all signaries or its prototype n° 23 in CM 1, 2 and 3. On stone A from the dromos of Tomb 49, the first sign has a clear parallel in n° 102 of CM 1, 2 and 3 ; the second sign no CM parallel. E. Masson (see n.14) connects the two signs tentatively and implausibly with CS *a* and *e*. Here I think the first sign comes closest to the form of Old Paphian, New Paphian and Eteocypriote *e*, while the second sign might be the prototype for *nu* in the

¹² V. KARAGEORGHIS, *Cyprus from the Stone Age to the Romans*, London 1982, p. 87-88. See also V. KARAGEORGHIS, *New Light on Late Bronze Age Cyprus*, in V. KARAGEORGHIS - J.D. MUHLY (eds), *Cyprus at the Close of the Bronze Age*, Nicosia 1984, p. 19-22.

¹³ E. RISCH, *Le développement du chypriote dans le cadre des dialectes grecs anciens*, in J. KARAGEORGHIS - O. MASSON (eds), *The History of the Greek Language in Cyprus*, Nicosia 1988, p. 71 and n. 15.

¹⁴ I thank Nicolle Hirschfeld for forcing me to rethink the assumptions made by E. and O. MASSON, *art. cit.* (n. 3), p. 413.

Eteocypriote, Idalion and Akanthou regional syllabaries, of which Old Paphian might preserve a slightly modified form. The signs on stone D from the dromos of Tomb 67 resemble respectively signs n° 51 (CM 2 and 3) and n° 23 (CM 1, 2 and 3). In CS the first sign might be associated with *wa* or *ma*; the second sign is *ti* in all signaries. Thus it is very difficult to discern how the signs on these «1+1» inscriptions are functioning: as pure symbols (T 49.18?); as CM signs (T 49.17 and stone D?); as experimental CS (T 49.17 and stone A?). At least we may conclude that at the very outset of Greek writing on Cyprus, there is a regional factor and also a co-existence of traditional and newly developed ways of using script.

After this long and necessary digression, let us return to the two other ways in which the Cypriote epigraphical data of the historical period have been sorted. The second way is:

2) *in alphabetical order by site (and chronological within sites)*. This allows us to look for regional variations in the use of script within Cyprus. The final way is:

3) *in alphabetical order by nature of the inscription*. The sub-categories here include: altars; amphorae; amphora stamps; bowls; coinage; dedications; documents of account; epitaphs and funerary inscriptions; graffiti; honorary decrees; lamps; lead weights; letters; milestones (GA from Keryneia during the reign of Aurelian 270-275 A.D.); mosaics; obscure; seals and rings; sling bullets; vase inscriptions of various types; and others. These sub-categories, taken by and large from the descriptions in the standard publications, have already been further refined. For example, in studying vase inscriptions, I have made distinctions: (1) between inscriptions on whole vases and those on ostraka; (2) among ceramic vase graffiti, ceramic vase dipinti and inscriptions on metallic vessels¹⁵. More important for understanding the applications of the CS script, however, is the further analysis of the purpose of the inscriptions. The main distinction in regard to vases is between (1) inscriptions marking ownership or manufacture; and (2) those commemorating a dedication. Other applications do occur, e.g.: (a) a graffito which serves as a price tag on an imported 5th century Attic «Bell

¹⁵ It is obvious that for special collections of inscribed vases such as the dedications from Kafizin detailed analysis according to vessel shapes, fine vs. coarse wares, and production groups is essential.

krater» (*ICS*, n° 350) ; (b) 2 dipinti on a funerary pithos which describe the wine originally contained in the vessel and exhort the reader to «drink!» (tomb of Cypro-Classical I 475-400 B.C. : *ICS*, n° 207) ; (c) two long lists of names in the nominative case (*ICS*, n° 352a)¹⁶. Such analysis is necessary to discover the range of applications of the CS and GA scripts through time.

Two categories here merit immediate discussion. The use of CS script on Cypriote seals and rings stands in strong contrast to the practice of Late Bronze Age Crete and mainland Greece and even seems to be peculiar in comparison with the use of GA writing on archaic seals elsewhere in the E. Mediterranean. It does, however, continue the tradition of the Late Bronze Age on Cyprus, where CM-inscribed seals are not uncommon¹⁷. These points will be discussed in papers by Joanna Smith (see n. 2) who is studying with great care Cypriote seals and inscribed seals in the prehistoric and historical periods. Pertinent to our interests is her provisional identification of the following numbers of inscribed seals connected with Cyprus : 28 CS¹⁸ ; 1 EC ; 3 GA ; 2 Phoenician. Here I shall confine myself to observations on the representative number of seals already entered into the data base. All are CS and, when datable¹⁹, are quite early : 7th-5th centuries B.C., most from the period before Persian domination of the island²⁰. The names inscribed by and large are typically Greek Cypriote, often first instances, designated here by [1], of a particular proper name : Ζωσικρέφο(ν)τος [1], Ζωφόθεις [1], Πυθοκρέων [1], Πινυτόνικος [1], Ἀριστοφάναξ, Κυπραγόρας, Θεμίστιος, Ἀριστοκλέφης, Τιμοκρέτης, Ὀνάσας, Ἀκεστόδαμος, Ἀκεστος, Ὀνασίλος, Ἀρισταγόρας, and the sobriquet Γαψᾶς [1] meaning «Stupid». There is one Asianic name, Πίλγρης (*ICS*, n° 360), well attested in inscriptions from Halicarnassus ;

¹⁶ Compare the lists of names in the 8th-7th century Greek alphabetic Stillwell sherds from Corinth : B.B. POWELL, *art. cit.* (n. 7), p. 327 n° 20, with suggested interpretations.

¹⁷ O. MASSON, *Cylindres et cachets chypriotes portant des caractères chyprominoens*, in *BCH* 81 (1957), p. 6-37.

¹⁸ A preliminary catalogue of CS-inscribed seals is furnished by H. CATLING, *The Seal of Pasitimos*, in *Kadmos* 11 (1972), p. 55-78.

¹⁹ *ICS*, n°s 121, 173, 183, 328, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 359, 360, 362, 363, 364, 365, 367a, 367c and 456.

²⁰ H. CATLING, *art. cit.* (n. 18), p. 75-76.

and the name Φαῦος (*ICS*, n° 328) is attested in Crete at Hierapytna²¹. This is remarkable testimony for Cypriote Syllabic literacy in an important personal sphere. Unfortunately all but 5 of the seals are unprovenienced, usually from collections or early museum acquisitions. Of the exceptions, two come securely from the nekropolis of Marion (Ἀριστοφάναξ, *ICS*, n° 121, 6th-4th B.C. ; and *ICS*, n° 367d, a silver ring with 6 unclear signs incised on it) on the western coast and another from the district of Famagousta-*Galinoporni* (Φαῦος, *ICS*, n° 328, mid-6th B.C.) on the southern coast of the Karpass peninsula in the extreme northeast of the island (see map *ICS*, p. 310). *ICS*, n° 183 (with a possibly Eteocypriote name) comes from the secure context of Tomb 73 at Kourion. *ICS*, n° 457 may have come from the district of Athienou. This spread of reasonably certain proveniences at least indicates that the practice of possessing inscribed seals, whatever their function, was not restricted to any single region of the island. In many cases, the names are incised as marks of identity on the edge of an already carved design. On two scarabs, a scarabeoid and a silver ring (*ICS*, n° 358, 367c, 361 and 367), the names themselves are inscribed as the sole decoration on the seal. The great predominance of CS over GA and EC on seals (28:3:1) combined with the Cypriote forms of many of the proper names suggests a special preference for the «national» script of the island by the Greek-speaking population of the archaic period.

Secondly, there are three clay tablets inscribed in CS script. Two come from the region of Famagousta (see map *ICS*, p. 310) : (1) *ICS*, n° 327 from Akanthou-Chytrus a two-sided inscription, fragmentary but with enough traces of Greek proper names and Greek vocabulary to rule out its being Eteocypriote. It deals apparently with cult regulations for a Lampadephoria. It is dated by textual peculiarities to the 6th or 5th centuries B.C., if not earlier. (2) *ICS*, n° 309 a two-sided accounting document from a temenos at Lefkoniko, perhaps of Apollo to whom reference is made in the text by the distinctively Thessalian-Cypriote form of epithet Δαυχναφόριος. No date can be assigned, but it is interesting that these documents cluster in the northeast of the island. The only comparable text comes from Golgoi in the expanded northeastern quadrant of the island : *ICS*, n° 299 a very fragmentary undated limestone tablet inscribed on both sides with lists which include numerals and potentially economic

²¹ For a similar general mix of typically local personal names, see the Cretan armor inscriptions from Afrati (*infra*, n. 28).

vocabulary, e.g., *o-na* = ὠνά. Some long and not easily interpreted phonetic sequences raise the possibility that the text is Eteocypriote, although O. Masson does not find this convincing (*ICS*, p. 298). But a stoichedon inscription on an oblong block (*ICS*, n° 298) from Golgoi defies any interpretation other than Eteocypriote. A fragment of a third inscribed clay tablet preserving three Paphian-style syllabograms was discovered during the 1988 excavation season at Amathous. Despite its minimal text, the fact that the tablet is made of characteristically local clay increases the probability that it was inscribed in the local EC syllabary²². In any event, the oddity of writing on clay tablets is confined to Cypriote syllabic writing, whether Greek or indigenous, and so far is attested only in the northeastern quarter of the island and the Eteocypriote district of Amathus.

The usefulness of these data has been illustrated already by the few examples that I have discussed. What are the possibilities for learning more from these data? The information in this data base has little value for understanding the social, historical and regional implications of Cypriote literacy unless one studies carefully the inscriptions individually and in the context of their total cultural environments. I became interested in questions surrounding the origin and dissemination of the Greek alphabet and in the history and applications of writing on the island of Cyprus from the Geometric period onward because of my work with the Bronze Age writing systems of the Aegean : Cretan hieroglyphic, Minoan Linear A, Mycenaean Linear B, and on Cyprus the Aegean-inspired forms of Cypro-Minoan²³. The social, economic and general historical factors that affected the creation, development, applications and spread of these writing systems *per se* are of paramount importance. The peculiarly restricted nature of Mycenaean literacy (Linear B was used almost exclusively on clay bureaucratic records and in painted formulaic economic texts — somewhat akin to Hellenistic stamped amphora handles — within a specially controlled perfumed oil industry) became clearer when one contrasted it to the wide range of applications of the Greek alphabet, both initially and

²² See item 10 in the communication of Th. PETIT in this volume, p. 481-495. I thank Cl. Baurain for bringing this find to my attention.

²³ The relevant work is published in : Th.G. PALAIMA, *Comments on Mycenaean Literacy*, in J.T. KILLEN - J.L. MELENA - J.-P. OLIVIER (eds), *Studies John Chadwick (Minos 20-22)*, Salamanque 1987, p. 499-510 ; ID., *The Development of the Mycenaean Writing System*, in J.-P. OLIVIER - Th.G. PALAIMA (eds), *Studies Emmett L. Bennett, Jr. (Minos Supplement 10)*, Salamanque 1988, p. 269-342 ; and the articles cited in n. 1 and 6.

throughout the first three centuries of its attested use. Here the total absence of Mycenaean inscribed graffiti (there are a few painted cup inscriptions from Knossos and Mycenae) stood in marked contrast to one of the most common uses of the Greek alphabet in the archaic to early Classical periods whether to mark ownership, to signify the dedication of an object, or even to create a contest prize (e.g., the famous Dipylon oinochoe). The total absence of Mycenaean public inscriptions also differed radically from the use of the archaic Greek epichoric alphabets for funerary, civic, honorary, legal, religious, and propagandistic inscriptions. A cursory survey of the uses of Cypriote Syllabic script demonstrated that the somewhat greater complexity of a syllabic form of writing did not present an insuperable hindrance in and of itself to broader applications of script or more widespread literacy. Thus I became interested in investigating further the history of Cypriote Syllabic.

Secondly, in the course of comparing Mycenaean literacy to archaic Greek literacy, I noted a strange regional aberration. In contrast to the generally accepted pattern of use of the early alphabet for graffiti, only 7 vase graffiti were known from the island of Crete from the 7th to the 5th centuries B.C. These all came to light subsequent to the first edition of Jeffery's monumental *Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*, Oxford 1961 (= *LSAG*) ; and I discovered them again in the *SEG*. The earliest examples are statements of ownership, one even in meter on an 8th-century plain storage jar from Phaistos²⁴. The latest include dedications on imported pottery. Otherwise Cretan archaic literacy is almost entirely restricted to legal codes and dedicatory inscriptions. The law codes (23+ in number, 6 from pre-550 B.C.) come from 8 sites : Axos, Dreros, Eleutherna, Eltynia, Gortyn, Lyttos, Knossos, Prinias. There are 21 dedicatory texts (16 from 650-600 B.C.). This produces a glaring disparity between the public and personal use of writing.

The subject of potential regional variations in the historical development of the use of the alphabet was subsequently taken up by Stoddart and Whitley²⁵. They used archaic Crete and Attica as test cases,

²⁴ See Th.G. PALAIMA, *art. cit.* (n. 23), p. 510 n. 27 ; and for the Phaistos jar, B.B. POWELL, *art. cit.* (n. 7), p. 329 n° 29 and n. 34.

²⁵ S. STODDART - J. WHITLEY, *The Social Context of Literacy in Archaic Greece and Etruria*, in *Antiquity* 62 (1988), p. 761-772.

and achieved some startling results by analyzing the data into 6 categories which I define and qualify more fully here :

1. law codes, public documents, decrees (including *leges sacrae*, i.e., texts regulating religious practices). One wonders how the CS clay tablets should be categorized and even how *leges sacrae* should be treated given the general tendency for a specialized dialect and script to be restricted eventually to a narrowly defined religious sphere²⁶? Even large-scale religious documents — engraved stelae, etc. — need not have the same public intentions as secular civic decrees. This is especially significant in analyzing the CS material.

2. dedicatory inscriptions on stone or bronze (i.e., inscriptions which had to be commissioned from and executed by a professional mason).

3. dedicatory graffiti, scratched on pottery by wish of the dedicator to designate an object as a votive offering.

4. onomastic graffiti (the simple name or fuller identification of a person written subsequent to the complete decoration and finishing of a vase or other sort of object, e.g., stone blocks, natural rock within sanctuaries, etc., as a mark of ownership or personal display of pride)²⁷.

5. inscribed gravestones (again requiring the services of a professional mason).

6. dipinti executed on pottery before firing by a pot painter involved in pottery production.

These categories allow us to measure the degree of impact of a script within a particular social environment and to grasp the way that writing is being used by a particular historical population. The results for Attica and Crete offer a clear demonstration. They are taken from Stoddart and Whitley, with a few improved figures. I have arranged them to move from more public forms to more personal applications of script.

²⁶ This point is well made in regard to the Kafizin graffiti by Cl. BRIKHE, *Dialecte et koiné à Kafizin*, in *op. cit.* (n. 13), p. 169. The latest inscription preserving possible Eteocretan vocabulary offers a convincing illustration of this phenomenon : Y. DUHOUX, *L'Étéocrèteois*, Amsterdam 1982, p. 89-95 *ARCa.

²⁷ B.B. POWELL, *art. cit.* (n. 7), p. 323-330, analyzes this category somewhat haphazardly into proprietary (ownership) inscriptions (nos 8-9, 28-33) and simple names (nos 13-27). His scheme of classification has the virtue of making clear the specific formulae used in ownership texts.

	Attica 700-480 B.C.	Crete 700-450 B.C.
1 legal texts, etc.	55+ (46 from 550-500)	23+ (6 from pre-550) ²⁸
5 inscribed gravestones	6 (all from 550-480)	5
2 dedicatory inscriptions	349 (115 from 550-500 and 211 from 500-480)	21 (16 from 650-600)
6 dipinti	c. 600+	0
3-4 graffiti	c. 800+ (154 pre-600)	7

These differences in epigraphical data must be connected with differences in the social and political systems prevailing on Crete and the mainland during the archaic period, even if one can cite such distorting factors as the possible use of painted wooden texts in Crete (the use of *poinikastas* for scribe, and *poinikazen* for the process of inscribing²⁹; cf. the Athenian *kyrbeis* and *axones*) and the chance preservation of many Athenian dedications and decrees from the period of the Peisistratids and the first decades of Cleisthenic democracy in the debris of the Persian sack and the hastily built Themistoclean fortification walls. It would certainly be perverse to eliminate as extenuating circumstances the very social and political phenomena (the Peisistratid impulse to public dedication and public display of the laws of the still functioning Athenian constitution; the practice of ostracism) that produced the data. Moreover, the graffiti of the sanctuary of Zeus on Mt. Hymettus point also to an early established

²⁸ One should add to this number: (1) the recently published quadrangular block from Lyttos with boustrophedon inscriptions (dated by letter forms to late 6th/early 5th) on its two long sides: H. and M. VAN EFFENTERRE, *Nouvelles lois archaïques de Lyttos*, in *BCH* 109 (1985), p. 157-188; and (2) a fragment of a law code from Phaistos: in *Annuario* 56 (1978), p. 429-435.

²⁹ L.H. JEFFERY - A. MORPURGO-DAVIES, *ΠΟΙΝΙΚΑΣΤΑΣ and ΠΟΙΝΙΚΑΖΕΝ*: *BM 1969.4-2.1, A New Archaic Inscription from Crete*, in *Kadmos* 9 (1970), p. 118-154, a bronze *mitra* on which was inscribed an agreement appointing Spensithios to *poinikazen* and *mnamoneuwen* for the community. It is dated and provenienced by letter forms to Lyttos-Afrati and c. 500 B.C. Yves Duhoux brought also to my attention the 14 simple «dedicatory» archaic inscriptions on armor thought to come from the sanctuary of Afrati. A.E. RAUBITSCHKE, *The Inscriptions*, in H. HOFFMANN, *Early Cretan Armorers*, Mainz 1972, p. 15-16, identifies among the names: 9 Greek, 3 non-Greek (Eteocretan?), 1 Asianic ethnic (Ο Πρύκς = «the Phrygian»).

custom in Attica of using writing on personal votives. Writing in Crete is much more restricted even in terms of the nature of public inscriptions, primarily for codification of laws.

Cyprus is not only interesting then as another regional test case, but because it has several parallels with Crete :

1) a mixture of indigenous (Eteocretan and Eteocyprïote) and later arriving Greek populations. In Crete, of course, the Mycenaean Greeks are present and in political control of at least the western 2/3 of the island by the beginning of the LM III period (14th century B.C.). But it remains unanswered how and over what length of time and how uniformly the mixture and assimilation of Mycenaean and Cretan populations were achieved³⁰. On Cyprus the real period of Hellenization can be placed in the Mycenaean III C and sub-Mycenaean periods, or the 12th-11th centuries B.C., although strong contacts between Cyprus and the Mycenaean world can be documented from the mid-14th century onward³¹.

2) a decided Phoenician presence by the 9th century B.C. visible in Crete especially in a recent analysis of archaic Cretan temple architecture³² ; and likewise in Cyprus in the temple architecture of Kition³³. In Cyprus this Phoenician influence is particularly strong at Kition where an 8th century inscription on bronze bowls mentions «the Governor of Qarḥadašt (Kition)» as «servant» of King Hiram II of Tyre (3rd quarter of 8th century B.C.). Earlier epigraphical material is scarce : the Honeyman inscription (unprovenienced, funerary, early 9th) and a fragmentary votive bowl from Kition (end of 9th)³⁴.

³⁰ Y. DUHOUX, *op. cit.* (n. 26), p. 7-24, critically summarizes the evidence for the formation of the historical Eteocretan population.

³¹ The eventual mixing of populations can be monitored in such features as burial habits, e.g., separate burial practices in cemeteries at Lapethos in CG I, but intermixture in CG II with some preference for Eteocyprïote elements. V. KARAGEORGHIS in *CAH*, 2^e éd., vol. III part 1, Cambridge 1982, p. 516-517, 528.

³² J. SHAW, *Phoenicians in Southern Crete*, in *AJA* 93 (1989), esp. p. 180-183. There is also a Phoenician inscribed bronze bowl from a context c. 900 B.C. at Knossos.

³³ V. KARAGEORGHIS, *art. cit.* (n. 31), p. 523-527 ; and ID., *op. cit.* (n. 12), p. 123-127. The archaeological evidence at Kition indicates Phoenician colonization in CG III, c. 850 B.C. : E. GJERSTAD, *The Phoenician Colonization and Expansion in Cyprus*, in *RDAC* 1979, p. 232-233.

³⁴ J. TEIXIDOR, *Early Phoenician Presence in Cyprus*, in N. ROBERTSON (ed.), *The Archaeology of Cyprus*, New York 1975, p. 121-122. After surveying the epigraphical

3) an island with separate independent and competing communities (in Crete separate *poleis* ; in Cyprus 10 territorial monarchies established by the early 7th century B.C.³⁵ : in the 5th century, these were Salamis, Marion, Lapethos, Tamassos, Idalion [annexed by Kition in 470], Paphos, Kourion, Kyreneia, Amathous and Kition) vs. the politically unified Attica of the late archaic period. In Cyprus there are clear territorial patterns affecting the use of script, most notably the clustering of EC at Amathous and the special variant of CS in the region of Paphos.

4) Cyprus and Crete were potential immediate beneficiaries of the newly created Greek alphabet. The epichoric alphabet of Crete shows close similarity to the Phoenician script³⁶. Certainly in the 8th and 7th centuries B.C., Cyprus had strong connections with the Aegean and especially with the great Euboean colonizing and trading powers who had set up a trading colony at Al Mina near the end of the 9th century. Such links can be traced back to the CG I period (1050-950 B.C.), when Cypriote objects are found at Lefkandi, and they continue to intensify in the second half of the 8th century³⁷. If a recently proposed devolutionary scheme for the origin and development of the Greek alphabet is correct³⁸, then the Cypriote connection with the originators and chief colonial disseminators of the alphabet in the 8th century B.C. takes on added significance.

There is, however, one important difference in political history between the two regions (besides the difference in governmental structure — *poleis* vs. kingships — mentioned above). Cyprus was under foreign domination and/or control for much of the period that concerns us : Assyrian domination (709-669 B.C.) ; Egyptian (570/60-545 B.C.) ; Persian (545 B.C. into the fourth century when the efforts of Evagoras I of Salamis in the first quarter of the century and outright unified revolt of nine of the Cypriote kingdoms in 351 B.C. were followed by the conquests of

evidence, Teixidor finds no strong evidence for a Phoenician colonization of Cyprus much earlier than 800 B.C.

³⁵ D.W. RUPP, *The «Royal» Tombs at Salamis*, in *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 1 (1988), p. 122-124, with a survey of alternative theories of archaic Cypriote state formation.

³⁶ L.H. JEFFERY, *op. cit.* (n. 7), p. 40.

³⁷ V. KARAGEORGIS, *art. cit.* (n. 31), p. 522-523, 529-530 ; and ID., *op. cit.* (n. 12), p. 130-131.

³⁸ B.B. POWELL, *The Origin of the Puzzling Supplementals Φ X Ψ*, in *TAPA* 117 (1987), p. 1-20, esp. figs. 1-2.

Alexander which produced some measure of true independence, albeit eventually under Ptolemaic control³⁹). Of course, throughout the 5th century Aegean Greek influence in Cypriote political affairs and on the general culture of the island is marked⁴⁰.

All this said, it is understandable that there really is not much early competition between the GA and CS. The CS was probably well-developed by the date of the creation of the GA. The CS had grown naturally out of the long and peculiarly perverse tradition of Aegean-based linear scripts of the Late Cypriote Bronze Age. It was a stream-lined (55-56 signs), consistent and efficient tool for writing both Greek and Eteocypriote. Most importantly it was *Cypriote* and shared by all the independent communities of the island as a standard waved against foreign domination or cultural interference.

I present here (figs. 2 and 3) some of the evidence for the use of writing in Cyprus deduced from the dated inscriptions in the data base in its current state. I have concentrated on CS down to the 3rd century B.C. and have not represented fully either Phoenician (PH) inscriptions or the great wave of GA texts from the 4th century onward. My main focus in the 4th century is on multiscript texts. There will be future corrections and additions to this evidence, but these should not change appreciably the general patterns here revealed. As one might expect, the earliest evidence for the GA is found in personal spheres probably associated with Greeks of non-Cypriote origin (7th-6th century vase inscriptions from tomb contexts⁴¹ ; and digraphic grave stelae of the 6th century)⁴². Otherwise the

³⁹ V. KARAGEORGHIS, *op. cit.* (n. 12), p. 162-168.

⁴⁰ See the various large-scale Greek naval expeditions against Persian forces in the region of Cyprus : 478 B.C. (THUC. I 94), pre-466 B.C. (THUC. I 100), c. 460 B.C. (THUC. I 104, 2), 450 B.C. (THUC. I 112) and a possibly intended campaign in 440 B.C. (PLUT., *Pericles* 26) discussed in A. FRENCH, *The Athenian Half-Century 478-431 B.C.*, University of Sydney 1976, p. 23-26, 37-38, 49, 51, 59-60, 64-65, 74. See also the Athenian casualty-list dated to 460-459 and referring to members of the Erechtheid tribe who died while on campaigns in Cyprus and elsewhere : R. MEIGGS - D. LEWIS, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, Oxford 1969, p. 73-76 n° 33.

⁴¹ See particularly the 7th-6th century Attic amphora fragments from tomb 10 at Salamis with names inscribed in Attic alphabetic characters : V. KARAGEORGHIS - O. MASSON, *Quelques vases inscrits de Salamine à Chypre*, in *Kadmos* 4 (1965), p. 150-153.

⁴² The digraphic stelae come from Marion (ICS, n° 164) and Athienou (ICS, n° 260). ICS, n° 260 is inscribed on the plinth of a funerary stele, decorated in relief above with

GA begins to take hold publicly in connection with the important political changes on the island in the 4th century as an indication that the Cypriote communities had freed themselves from Persian domination and were becoming full participants in the Hellenistic Greek world established by Alexander and his successors. I shall discuss the evidence from dedicatory inscriptions and coinage below. The relatively large number of CS graffiti of Cypriote mercenaries from Abydos and Karnak in Egypt in the first quarter of the 4th century attests to the vitality of the CS script and its permeation through Cypriote society at the start of this transitional period. This transformation is eventually completed in the period of Ptolemaic control, when the GA and the *koiné* dialect assumed prestige status. The number and peculiarities of the CS Kafizin graffiti in comparison to their more numerous GA counterparts and the relegation of CS to less prestigious utilitarian wares indicate the degree to which active use of the CS script and local Cypriote dialect had begun to wane by the 4th quarter of the 3rd century⁴³.

There are three points I wish to stress here in regard to CS literacy and the transition from the CS to the GA. First, the complete absence of CS public legal texts in all periods and in all communities offers a startling contrast to the frequent use of the GA for such documents in archaic Crete

antithetical lions and on the base with a winged sun. The text has the simple formula : Personal Name nom. + *e-mi* attested on grave stelae at Marion (e.g. *ICS*, n^{os} 104-106, 126, 133). The GA text seems Rhodian and is cleverly written left to right to stand in perfect antithesis to the right to left CS text. The respective texts are symmetrically disposed beneath the wings of the sun. See *ICS*, pls. XLIV, 2 and XLV, 1. *ICS*, n^o 164 records in Knidian epichoric script on the main surface of the stele and in CS on its left side simply the word «sister» gen., possibly in reference to a young infant who died before being named. We might propose that *ICS*, n^o 164 was executed for a Knidian settler in Cyprus, while *ICS*, n^o 260 was erected for an important figure with Rhodian connections who wished the tomb to be intelligible to non-Cypriote Greek visitors. At Amathous an early gravestone of a Halikarnassian (c. 475 B.C.) is inscribed completely in East Ionic GA characters : L.H. JEFFERY (eds), *op. cit.* (n. 7), p. 353, pl. 69, n^o 41.

⁴³ Purely GA *koiné* inscriptions (243) outnumber purely CS dialectal texts (34) by more than 7 : 1. In addition there are 32 digraphic inscriptions. For a general assessment of the interaction between CS-dialectal and GA-*koiné* at this period emphasizing the degree to which the CS script and Cypriote dialect had lost their vitality, see Cl. BRIXHE, *art. cit.* (n. 26). This material should be studied now by pottery groups and, if possible, individual palaeographical hands to assess the degree of competence of individuals in using both the native Cypriote script and dialect.

and Attica. Only the famous Idalion bronze (*ICS*, n° 217) can be placed in this category, but its purpose as a settlement of a contractual obligation distinguishes it from the many legal codes and bouleutic measures written in the epichoric Greek alphabets. Either the machinery of government in the Cypriote territorial kingdoms must not have called for the public display of laws and enactments, or such information was recorded on less permanent material such as wood, bronze or even clay. We have already mentioned the meager evidence for rather lengthy CS clay inscriptions. Wooden boards (*sanides*) were certainly used regularly for civic notices at the statues of the eponymous heroes in the Athenian agora⁴⁴. Cypriote glosses and vocabulary in the texts of an epitaph from Marion (*ICS*, n° 143) and the Idalion bronze point to a tradition of painted inscriptions in Cyprus⁴⁵.

Second, the use of scripts on coinage illustrates clearly how the GA eventually superseded the CS. The coinage of kings Stasiwoikos I and Timocharis from the 2nd half of the 5th century at Marion is inscribed in CS (*ICS*, n°s 169 and 170). On *ICS*, n° 169 the name of Stasiwoikos is written on the recto in one form of the genitive and on the verso in the peculiarly Cypriote *-o-ne* form. By the time of the last king of Marion, deposed by Ptolemy in 312 B.C., we find digraphic legends with several interesting features. The king's name and title are written in CS, but in forms which suppress the distinctively Cypriote internal digamma used on the earlier coinage : *pa-si-le-o-se* (*ICS*, n° 171d) and *sa-ta-si-o-i-ko* = Stasioikos II (*ICS*, n° 171e), and often falsely restored during this very period as a hypercorrection in words where it has no etymological or analogical basis⁴⁶. The king's name and title are thus thoroughly pan-Hellenized. Consistent with this process of pan-Hellenization is the fact that on coins of the same period the full or abbreviated designation of the community of Marion is given in GA : MAP, MA, MAPIEYΣ, MAPI (*ICS*, n° 171a, c, e, f). I interpret this as a conscious decision to provide the information necessary for the wider circulation of the coins (identification

⁴⁴ H.R. THOMPSON - R.E. WYCHERLEY, *The Agora of Athens* (The Athenian Agora 14), Princeton 1972, p. 38-41, with discussion of ancient testimonia.

⁴⁵ *ICS*, p. 168 and 243. J. KARAGEORGHIS, *art. cit.* (n. 8), p. 354-359, discusses the lexical evidence, but also points out in regard to the CG 3 Marion dipinti that the linear forms of CS signs can best be explained by assuming that writing by incision into hard surfaces was prevalent.

⁴⁶ A. MORPURGO DAVIES, *Problems in Cyprian Phonology and Writing*, in J. KARAGEORGHIS - O. MASSON (eds), *op. cit.* (n. 13), p. 101-108.

of the issuing community) in a widely intelligible form (GA) while employing the native CS script for the local propagandistic purposes of the ruler. The same practice occurs on coins of king Timarchos of Paphos from 350-325 B.C. (*ICS*, n° 29a and b) again marking a change from earlier Paphian coinage of the 5th and first half of the 4th century which is in CS and does not indicate the name of the community. The transition is completed in the period of Timarchos's son Nikokles, who issues a stater which employs exclusively GA characters : on the obverse to abbreviate «king of Paphos» ΠΙΒΑ ; and on the reverse to identify Nikokles ΝΙΚΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ / ΠΑΦΙΟΝ⁴⁷. The coinage of Amathous also shows a gradual transition. Coins from c. 450 and 390 B.C. (*ICS*, n°s 197 and 198) are inscribed in EC, in the second case even though the king of Amathous bears a Greek name. On coinage from 385-350 B.C. (*ICS*, n°s 199-203) CS is used. Exceptional are coins of Amathous which were minted by the champion of the anti-Persian movement, Evagoras I of Salamis, when he was in control of Amathous sometime during the Cyprian War of 391-386 B.C. In keeping with Evagoras's pro-Hellenic program, these coins designate his name by means of the GA letter E in the exergue⁴⁸.

Finally, in the dedicatory texts of the 4th century we can also observe how the GA came into ascendancy. There are at least nine dedicatory texts of this period purely in CS. As early as 385 B.C., however, a bilingual triscript (*ICS*, n° 220) dedication by the Phoenician prince Baalrom in the temple of Apollo at Idalion conveys its message in order of priority : PH-CS-GA. Two slightly later religious dedications from Tamassos (*ICS*, n° 216 from 375 B.C. and *ICS*, n° 215 from 362 B.C.) use only PH-CS. A bilingual biscript dedication (*ICS*, n° 196) by the *polis* of Amathous, dated by its republican tone to sometime after 313 B.C., employs EC and GA, but still gives the native EC script pride of place. However at Soloi, a biscript dedication (*ICS*, n° 212) by king Stasikrates dated post-331 B.C. makes CS subordinate to GA. At the end of the 4th century then in the public sphere the CS writing system was forced to give way to the historical factors that brought the independent communities of Cyprus into what was becoming the greater Hellenistic Greek world created by the

⁴⁷ G.F. HILL, *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Cyprus*, London 1904, p. lxxix-lxxx, pl. XXII 10 and 11.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. xxvii, pl. I 6 and 7. See also V. KARAGEORGHIS, *op. cit.* (n. 12), p. 164.

campaigns and policies of Alexander the Great. In the competition of scripts, CS now survived only through a kind of local guerilla warfare of which the Kafizin dedications offer our latest attested example.

Thomas G. PALAIMA

Program in Aegean Scripts and Prehistory (PASP)

Department of Classics WAG 123

University of Texas at Austin

USA - AUSTIN, TX 78712-1181

















































stone A from dromos of Tomb 49 (9 cm. high):						
						
Old and New Paphian-EC <i>e</i>		Idalion-Akanthou-EC <i>nu</i>		CM 1, 2, 3 no. 102		
stone D from dromos of Tomb 67:						
						
style of Idalion-EC <i>wa</i>	EC <i>ma</i>	CS <i>ti</i>	CM 2, 3 no. 51	CM 1, 2, 3 no. 23		
obelos T 49.17 (10 mm. high):						
						
			CS <i>ti</i>	CM 1, 2, 3 no. 23		
obelos T 49.18 (9 mm. high):						
				pure symbols?		
obelos T 49.16:						
					(6-8 mm. high)	
Old Paphian						
		re	le			
New Paphian						
		re	le			
Idalion						
Akanthou						
Eteocypriote						
						
CM 1 no. 64	—	CM 2 no. 33	CM 1, 2 no. 24	CM 1, 2, 3 no. 4	CM 1, 2 no. 21	

Fig. 1. Inscribed Material from Palaepaphos-Skales Tombs 49 and 67 with Comparanda from Cypriote Syllabic Regional Signaries and Standard Cypro-Minoan Sign Systems.

		8th	7th	7th/6th	6th	6th/5th	6th/4th	5th	5th/4th	4th	4th/3rd	3rd
VASES ownership	ceramic vase graffiti			④		①	⑫	① statement of price		○ □		
	dipinti		②					① description of contents		○ ICS 208		
	metal vases/ jewelry		②/	/①	②	/②		②/	/○			
VASES dedications	ceramic vase graffiti				①			②		○	○	③④ Kafizin ③② 243
	dipinti									○		
	metal vases/ jewelry					①/		③/				
VASES unknown purpose	ceramic vase graffiti			③+					⑨			
	dipinti	①				①				①		
	metal vases								②			
Ostraka	ceramic vases		①	□	①				○			
Wall graffiti										④⑥ ③⑥ ① ④ P Nubian		
Scarabs/Seals			②		②	①	①	③	①			

○ = CS ◇ = EC P = Paphian CS
□ = GA M = multiple examples

Tabl. 1. Tentative trends in the uses of CS from datable texts
(all figures approximate).

	7th/6th	6th	6th/5th	6th/4th	5th	5th/4th	4th	4th/3rd	3rd
"public" religious text	①		① ICS 327 clay tablet from Akanthou			① ICS 8 oath of Paphians			
"public" legal text					① Idalion Bronze ICS 217				
epitaph: stelai		④ ② Golgoi Marion	③	⑤①	③ ①	②⑧+ □	⑦ ICS 16 = Timochares, King of Paphos (pre-350) ② Soloi, Kourion		② Paphos and Amathous [post-Androkles in 313 B.C. GA in Amathous]
stone	⑦	⑦							
dedicatory	④	◇ ⑬		①	④	⑦	⑤ ICS 196 EC/GA ⑥ ICS 212 GA/CS ⑦ PH ICS 220 PH/CS/GA ⑧ PH ICS 215 PH/CS ⑨ PH ICS 216 PH/CS ⑨	②	
coinage		④			⑭ ICS 170 Marion (purely CS) ◇ Amathous	①	② ICS 29 ③ ICS 171 Marion ① ◇ ? ◇ Amathous ICS 198 □ Amathous under Evagoras I ⑥ Amathous		

○ = CS ◇ = EC
□ = GA PH = Phoenician

Tabl. 2. Tentative patterns of public and large-scale uses of CS from datable texts
(all figures approximate).