



Review

Reviewed Work(s): Near Eastern and Aegean Texts from the Third to the First Millennia B.C. by A. Bernard Knapp

Review by: Thomas G. Palaima

Source: *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. 101, No. 3 (Jul., 1997), p. 629

Published by: Archaeological Institute of America

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/507145>

Accessed: 21-06-2020 22:48 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Archaeological Institute of America is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Journal of Archaeology*

is a useful “further-reading” section at the end. Overall, the book is very nicely produced, with clear figures and tables. If you want to learn or teach archaeological statistics with a heavy emphasis on non-confirmatory EDA and the importance of sampling rather than a more “classical” approach, then this book is highly recommended.

GARY LOCK

INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD
36 BEAUMONT STREET
OXFORD OX1 2PG
UNITED KINGDOM
GARY.LOCK@ARCHAEOLOGY.OXFORD.AC.UK

NEAR EASTERN AND AEGEAN TEXTS FROM THE THIRD TO THE FIRST MILLENNIA B.C., edited by *A. Bernard Knapp*. (Sources for the History of Cyprus 2.) Pp. ix + 92. Greece and Cyprus Research Center, Altamont, N.Y. 1996. \$30. ISBN 0-9651704-2-X.

This remarkable volume presents, in English, translations or brief synthetic discussions of all primary contemporary documents that contain references to terms that have been interpreted—not without considerable controversy—as referring to the island of Cyprus during the Bronze and Early Iron Ages or as connected to the debate over its identification. It is thus the first comprehensive and generally accessible sourcebook on what has been known for over a century as the *Alashiya* question. In a 13-page introduction, Knapp surveys the key evidence and arguments for and against the equation *Alashiya* = Cyprus, while making a strong case for the identification.

One hundred twenty-two “texts” are then presented in contributions by Gary Beckman, John Bennet, Anne D. Kilmer and Ruggero Stefanini, Piotr Michalowski, William L. Moran, Boyo G. Ockinga, Jack M. Sasson, Neal Walls, and Donald J. Wiseman. The texts appear in rough chronological order, as grouped by language, script, and culture (all dates centuries B.C.E.; number of texts noted in brackets): Eblaite (23rd [1]); Akkadian from Mari and Babylonia (19th–18th [8]), Alalakh (18th–15th [4]), Amarna (14th [9]), Ugarit (13th–12th [7]), Hattusha (14th–13th [2]), and Babylon (mid-18th [1]); Hittite from Hattusha (15th–13th [14]); Ugaritic from Ugarit (14th–13th [18]); Hurrian from Ugarit and Hattusha (14th [2]); Egyptian hieroglyphic from Egypt (15th–11th [24]; 19th–18th [1]; 3rd [1]); Linear B from Knossos, Pylos, and Thebes (14th–13th [25]); biblical Hebrew [2]; and Phoenician (7th [1]; 4th [1]). Besides different forms of the term *Alashiya*, the Linear B, Eblaite, and Hurrian material contains discussions of *ku-pi-ri-jo* (“of Kypros,” whether as an adjective or an anthroponym) and terms speculatively connected with it—and with “copper”—in Semitic *lkaparum* and Hurrian *lkapalil*. The Egyptian hieroglyphic texts are subdivided into those that refer respectively to *ʾa-si-ja* (*ʾisy*) = *Asiya* and to *ʾu-la-sā* = *Alashiya*. Each text is accompanied by its date, its primary publication, and references to further detailed discussion (catalogue on pp. 79–83). The volume concludes

with an extensive bibliography of relevant scholarship from 1849 through 1996, a general chart of Cypriot chronology, a less than complete map of sites, and a useful index. This volume is preliminary to the editor’s *Alashiya: Onomastica, historica, archaeologica* (Jonsered, forthcoming).

Some small points: Given the Egyptian *Asiya*-vs.-*Alashiya* evidence, and the apparent Greek translation of *Asiya* as *Kuprou* in the decree of Canopus (239/8 B.C.), one certainly should have included texts with the Mycenaean ethnic adjectival forms *a-si-wi-ja* and *a-si-wi-jo* that contrast both with *ku-pi-ri-jo* and with *a-ra-si-jo* in the Linear B texts. Knapp (p. 1) doubts the equation of Mycenaean *a-ra-si-jo* with *Alashiya* because the Mycenaeans also use *ku-pi-ri-jo*. But on page 13, he himself puts forward the parallel of Deutschland/Allemagne/Germany/Tedesco, and Masson’s suggestion that *Alashiya* and *Kupros* may have referred to different parts of the island of Cyprus. Given the polyglot and multi-ethnic situation that prevailed in Crete and the Greek mainland—and Cyprus!—in the second millennium, the Linear B texts could contain more than one term, introduced at different times and in different places and circumstances, referring to the island of Cyprus or sublocales within it, one of which (*ku-pi-ri-jo*) eventually predominates. In fact the ethnic *Ἀλασιωτᾶς* is known on Cyprus itself well into the historical period (cf. text §122).

THOMAS G. PALAIMA

PROGRAM IN AEGEAN SCRIPTS AND PREHISTORY
DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78712-1181
PASPTGP@UTXVMS.CC.UTEXAS.EDU

FOUILLES RÉCENTES À KHIROKITIA (CHYPRE) 1988–1991, edited by *Alain LeBrun*. Pp. 422, pls. 47, figs. 65, plans 44, maps 2, tables 34. Éditions recherche sur les civilisations, Paris 1994. ISBN 2-86538-247-8.

This is the third major volume by Alain LeBrun and his colleagues on the Aceramic Neolithic settlement of Khirokitia. So important is this site that the Aceramic Neolithic in Cyprus often is called the Khirokitia Culture. Khirokitia, originally excavated by Porphyrios Dikaios, has been the ongoing focus of the LeBrun team since 1977, making it the best-documented site of the Khirokitia Culture in Cyprus. Like the previous volumes, this well-packaged monograph contains a wealth of new information based on excavations from 1988 to 1991, concentrating on the eastern sector of the settlement.

The first two chapters discuss stratigraphy and radiocarbon chronology. Chapters 3–9, written by LeBrun and dealing with architecture and the use of space, are the most innovative in this volume, and although some may disagree with LeBrun’s interpretations, his careful analyses deserve careful consideration. Chapters 8 and 9, concerned with domestic space usage and the spatial organization of the village, are particularly interesting.

Chapters 10–12 treat various aspects of the human remains: they are described in chapter 10, while chapter 11