

J. FAUCOUNAU

**THE CYPRO-MINOAN SCRIPTS: A REAPPRAISAL FIFTY YEARS AFTER
JOHN F. DANIEL'S PAPER**

The existence of a particular type of script in use in Cyprus during the Bronze Age was recognised for the first time in 1889 by the German archaeologist Ohnefalsch-Richter (OHNEFALSCH-RICHTER 1889). But the first to examine the possibility of deciphering the script has been, in 1941, the American scholar John F. Daniel (DANIEL 1941). Half a century after his fundamental paper, in which he truly produced a "corpus" of the then known material and suggested several phonetic values for the Cypro-Minoan signs, it has seemed appropriate, in memory of his pioneer work, to present the important and most recent discoveries concerning the subject.

1 - The decipherment attempts

At the present time, four or five attempts at deciphering the script have been done.

It is unanimously recognized that the first ones, searching for Greek behind the inscriptions, have failed. A more recent attempt made by E. Masson and based on a Hurrian hypothesis (E. MASSON 1974) did not go further than a few "sporadic readings" (as its author has confessed herself) and can be neglected (For a more detailed criticism of this decipherment, see FAUCOUNAU 1977).

There are to-day only two deciphering attempts which are presented by their inventors as systematic and comprehensive : one has been proposed by J. Best & F. Woudhuizen (J. BEST & F. WOULDHUIZEN 1988 & 1989), the second by this present writer.

We consider the J. Best's and F. Woudhuizen's decipherment as unsatisfactory, in spite of the fact that many of the phonetic values they have attributed to the Cypro-Minoan signs are correct. The flawed character of their decipherment seems obvious when one notices the lack of coherence in the grid they have proposed : Starting from the hypothesis that signs with a O-value in Linear B script must have a U-value in Cypro-Minoan (TO becoming TU, LO becoming LU, etc..), they have finally obtained a grid in which the forms of the signs PU, KU, YU, MU for instance *have nothing to do* with the forms of the Lin. B signs PO, KO, YO, MO ... Moreover, the YU-sign is identical with the classical Cypriot KO-sign, the WU-sign with the classical Cypriot WI-sign, etc..., which cannot be accepted, because both scripts are closely related, as shown by J.F. Daniel in his paper.

We have given elsewhere a complete criticism of J. Best & F. Woudhuizen's decipherment (See FAUCOUNAU 1992) and shown why the work of these authors has been rapidly drifted towards a wrong way, in spite of a promising starting hypothesis, i.e. that Cypro-Minoan and Cretan scripts belong to the same "Aegean Group" of scripts.

The decipherment that we have presented in 1977 and 1980 (FAUCOUNAU 1977 & 1980) and completed since then, does not have these flaws. It is more in accordance with the works of many searchers like P. Meriggi, Cl. Saporetti and W. Nahm. It is also in agreement with John F. Daniel's suggestions, as (unlike E. Masson and J. Best) we have found again almost all the phonetic values that the American scholar proposed in 1941 (20 out of 26). A summary in English of our decipherment has been published in 1989 (see FAUCOUNAU 1989), with the grids concerning the three "main Cypro-Minoan

syllabaries", respectively called CM 1 b, CM 2 and CM 3. We give here a reproduction of these syllabaries in Figs. 1, 2 and 3.




































































































	a	e	i	o/um	u
.	 102	 38	 104		
p/b/w	 6	 207	 50	 12	 37
d/t	 4	 7	 23		 47
k/g	 25	 110a	 70	 21	 26
s/ʃ	 82	 44	 27		
y	 69				
l	 87	 24	 9	 5	
m	 53				 39
n	 8	 103b	 206		 100
z	 110b		 88		 41c
r		 18	 75	 97	 96

Fig. 1
The C.M. 1 b Grid
(Schaeffer's Cylinder)

	a	e	i	o/an	u
./h	  102 110	 38	 104	 79	 29
b/p	 6	  11 207	 49	 21	 37
d/t	 4	 62	 23	 13	 47
k/g/h	 25	 107	 70	 21	 30
s	 57	 44	 27	 10	 68
z	 28		 89	 90	 59c
β	 51b	 17	 60	 12	 61
w	 95	 1	 35		
y	 72	 36			
m	 52			 69c	 74
n	 8	 56	 54	 69d	 65
l	 87	 76	 9	 5	 24
r		 33	 75	 97	 96

 = as
81

 = pza
93

 = is
80

 = ?
66

Fig. 2
The C.M. 2 Grid
















































	a	e	i	o	u	ü (or zero)
.	 102	 38	 104		 19	 22
b/p	 6	 207	 51		 37	
d/t	 4		 23		 2	
k/g/h	 25	 110	 70		 26b	 105
s/š	 57		 27		 73b	 58
z			 92		 73a	
w	 95	 1	 35	 98		
y	 71	 36				 40
m	 43		 91		 74	
n	 8		 206	 94	 100	 28
l	 87	 76b	 9	 5	 103	
r	 75	 205		 97	 96	

Fig. 3
The C.M. 3 Grid
(Tablets from Ras Shamra RS 20,25 & RS 17.06)

We would like to quote some conclusions of our paper: "Archaeologists are still reluctant to admit it. But the decipherment of the Cypro-Minoan scripts has now been achieved... With the exception of the «mythological tablet», all the texts of some length *can be read and understood*. The more lengthy, the CM 2 tablets, are letters sent by kings with Mittanian names, *Rila-Zuzu* and *Lazo-senni* (the son of the former?) to "Lukki" kings of Enkomi. Reading and understanding them is no more, but no less difficult than reading and understanding the other Hurrian texts. Let us mention, for the sake of the sceptics, that their Hurrian character cannot be doubted: who can say that tens of sentences like: "*umbu-sarran Kalli-piza-wa hisuhi-dan*" ("And the great king, concerning Kallipiza, is dissatisfied") or "*Elis(i)-man atta-ri Tessobana eror-uman*" ("And by the God El, under your father's reign, the ones of Tessub were helped a lot") are not Hurrian?.. Understanding the longest text in CM 1, the Schaeffer's Cylinder, is more difficult due to the character of the "Semitic-Cypriot Language", which is relatively particular. Nevertheless, one can understand that it is a foundation cylinder concerning a temple(?) erected for his Gods by an otherwise unknown king, "*Sarru-ziti*, son of *Yakub*, from the *Hana* country". *Sarru-ziti* says that he did fight with success the "Hittite", the "Likki" and the "Sini" countries...

And last but not least, most of the small inscriptions *can also be read*, but in less certain way because of the particularisms of the script. Generally, proper names do appear, similar to the P.N. we already knew from the cuneiform tablets. This *onomastica* is often very instructive, concerning the history of Cyprus. It seems for instance that, considering the diverse origins of the P.N. coming from LC III B layers, Cyprus must have been at that time "a land of refuge" for various people..."

We have to add that the criticisms against our decipherment have been up to now superficial: one author has accused us of "multiplying the syllabaries", which is a nonsense because it can be *mathematically proved* that several different, though related, Cypro-Minoan syllabaries have existed. Another has disputed the statistically significant value of our calculations. Obviously, he did not understand that Statistics used in deciphering cannot be exactly the same as Statistics used in building a bridge. The "confidence level" has to be lowered, in case of necessity. Another has blamed us for reinterpreting in 1988 the text of the Schaeffer's Cylinder as a "foundation inscription" instead of a "proclamation" as we originally thought in 1977... etc ... More consistent has been the criticism that, on several occasions, we have found "dialectal" Semitic and Hurrian languages. For instance, we have read the text of the Ras Shamra Tablet RS 17,06 as: "*i-nii-mi še-ni-wo-ti A-bu-ba-lo-ti i-ye pa-ki ta-na-ye...*" what we have considered as "dialectal Hurrian": "*As, to my brother Abu-Ba 'al, what has been done*¹ ...etc..." , an idea that some scholars have rejected. We consider that most of these criticisms have been inspired by preconceived theories. So, the existence of Hurrian dialects has been denied by E. Laroche in his "Glossaire de la langue hourrite", even in the obvious case of the Hurrian texts found at Ugarit. Here is what this author writes concerning these texts: "... Quant à la colonne hourrite du vocabulaire bilingue, elle est bourrée de solécismes, et elle affiche le plus complet mépris du vocalisme, pourtant essentiel à la structure du hourrite. Il ne s'agit pas ici, comme on l'a cru, d'un dialecte, mais bien d'un jargon artificiel fabriqué péniblement par un Sémite auquel le mécanisme de la langue était étranger (... *an artificial jargon ardously fabricated by a Semitic scribe ignoring the structural mechanism of the language*). Denying in ad-

1. This letter has been found in a house owned by a man whose name can be *Abu-Ba'al*, a "translation" of *Raşap?-Abu* (See *Ugaritica V*).

vance that Semitic and Hurrian dialects may have been used in Cyprus cannot be considered as a serious objection to our decipherment. More especially as all the criticisms which have been directed against our decipherment cannot conceal the fact *that it works when applied to new or neglected texts ...*

II - Archaeological consequences

The archaeological consequences of the decipherment of the Cypro-Minoan scripts are very numerous, so we will limit our scope in developing and illustrating only a few of them.

2.1 - The decipherment has brought just one confirmation about *the origin* of the Cypro-Minoan scripts, that is that they belong to the "Aegean Group". But the question of knowing *when* and *how* this Creto-Mycenean type of script has reached Cyprus still remains without answer. Nevertheless, some pieces of information can be gathered, which lead to a historical scheme very similar to the one proposed by J. Karageorghis some thirty years ago (See J. KARAGEORGHIS 1958). This historical scheme can be summarized as follows:

During the Early Bronze Age, two "economic powers", Egypt and Mesopotamia, dominated the Oriental Mediterranean area. For their development and for the welfare of their inhabitants, these organised and powerful countries needed diverse materials, such as wood, copper, honey, wool, opium, etc.. So, starting from these countries, commercial roads both maritime and terrestrial were created early. From Egypt, the "Northern Road" went to Byblos and to the Syro-Palestinian coast. From Sumer and Akkad, the road went to *Mari*, and climbing up the Euphrates valley split into two branches, one to *Aleppo* and to the Syro-Palestinian coast where the junction was done with the Egyptian Road, the other going straight to *Kanesh-Kültepe*.

Volens nolens, several different ethnic groups were involved at an early date in these traffics: 1) The Amorite populations of Syria and Palestine 2) The Hurrian and Mittanian (i.e. "Hurro-Aryan") populations from the mountain zone near the sources of Tigris and Euphrates 3) The Hittite populations from the Halys loop.

Under the influence of their Egyptian and Assyrian "teachers", these people did quickly organize themselves in more or less powerful, conquering kingdoms. During the reign of *Hammurabi* of Babylon (1792-1750), the Amorite kingdom of *Iamkhad* with *Aleppo* as its capital, was "the great regulatory element in Northern Syria" (Ch. BAURAIN 1984 p. 32), when at the same time two other great powers, the Mittani and Hittite kingdoms, were developing.

The spreading-out of the Hittite power, which lead consecutively to the destruction c. 1625 BC of the kingdom of *Iamkhad*, appears as *the main event* of the Middle Bronze Age, with very important consequences: 1) The disappearance of the great Amorite kingdom disturbed definitely the old commercial roads. 2) It facilitated the creation of a great political congregation of Hurro-Mittanian people. The Hurrian influence expanded, from the Lake of Van to *Alalakh*, from *Karkemish* to *Mari* and *Nuzi*. 3) It pushed back to the South the Amorite traders, obliged in order to keep their lucrative role as "Middlemen" to search for new markets in the West, i.e. to Cyprus and to the Aegean World.

Replaced in this context, the history of Cyprus can be better understood. Relatively isolated until then from the main commercial roads, Cyprus has become an important market for the Semitic traders at the end of the MC III (1725-1625). These traders had carried out their operations in Cappadocia at the time of the Assyrian supremacy, but had been obliged later to withdraw to *Aleppo* and *Mari*, after mainly the reign of the powerful *Shamshi-Adad I* (1814-1782). The *onomastica* of "Cappadocian type"

disclosed by the decipherment of the C.M.1 script leads us to suppose a colonization of Cyprus (or of part of it) by these "settlers-traders" organised in local "*kârum*", at the end of the Middle Cypriot Period. It would be difficult otherwise to understand why the Cypriot proper names found on diverse epigraphical material, clay balls for instance, like *A-li-sa-ru* (E. MASSON 1971a n° 18), *Ha-tum* (ibid. n° 48), *Si-da-a* (E. MASSON 1971b n° 3), etc... are so similar to the Cappadocian names *Zi-da-a*, *Ha-tim*, *A-li...*, etc... We suspect these "Cappadocian" traders to have created, with the help of a part of the native population, the "Copper Road" strewn with LC IA fortresses (see Ch. BAURAIN 1984 p. 61). We also believe in a nationalistic reaction starting from the Western part of the Island, at the end of the period. From the LC IB on, Cyprus will become an important autonomous economic power, who will play a subtle game of balance between the three great countries of that day, the Egyptian, the Hittite and the Mittanian empires.

The Mittanian empire is geographically closer. In spite of the Hittite and Egyptian hostility, it has recovered the best part of the heritage of the great Amorite M.B.A. kingdom. Even though it has no political unity comparable to the Egyptian and Hittite empires, it represents now a powerful economic entity. Hurrian and Hurrianized people constitute an important part of the population in the main trading centres: *Mari*, *Alalakh* and *Ugarit*. Thanks to their presence at Ugarit and in other Syrian ports, the Hurrians-Mittanians can participate in the traffic with Cyprus, Rhodes and further away Crete and the Mycenaean world. In spite of its defeats and its lack of political unity, the Mittanian empire of the Middle Bronze Age represents a reality, difficult to define exactly, but undeniable. It finds its strength from an omnipresent *diaspora*, from *Karkemish* in Hittite land to *Nuzi*, in the heart of the Assyrian country. And also present in Cyprus, indeed.

In the circumstances, one can better understand why one of the oldest Cypro-Minoan documents, the so-called "archaic Enkomi tablet", has been revealed to be written in Hurrian, in an "Aegean" type of script! From the contents of the tablet, one can suppose that the sender was some Hurrian petty king of a Syrian coastal realm, writing to his daughter married to a Cypriot ruler (see FAUCOUNAU 1985).

One can also understand better why a bronze dagger has been found at *Mari*, on which the (Kassite? or Mittanian?) proper name *K/Ĥa-si* is written in Cypro-Minoan characters (see BUCHHOLZ 1959 p. 22).

And it is not forbidden to think that political considerations were not absent when the Cypriots, after gaining their independence, adopted an Aegean script in preference to an Akkadian one, which was the script used by the "Great Powers" of that time to give orders to their vassals...

2.2 - The decipherment has not only clarified the role played, first by the Semitic "Cappadocian" traders in the opening of Cyprus to the "Civilized World" of that time, then by the Mittanians as "middlemen" in transmitting to Cyprus an Aegean script; it has also definitely shown that this transmission has not been unique, but multiple. In the face of the diversity of the syllabaries, we are obliged to suppose that the "intermediaries" have been manifold. *Ugarit* must obviously have been one of them, as the existence of a particular Cypro-Minoan script, the "CM 3", lets suppose. But there must have been others.

2.21 - The case of the *Siyannu* country:

The *Siyannu* country is probably cited in the text of the Schaeffer's Cylinder under the name of *Si-ni*. (For the equivalence of names like: *Muši/Mušuya/Mušu-he/Muši-huna* see J. LEWY 1938). But

there are other signs that this country must have played a role in the history of Cyprus during the second millennium BC:

a) - In modern *Latakia*, which is located in the centre of the ancient *Siyannu* kingdom (ASTOUR 1979 p. 13/28), a cylinder seal bearing a CM 3 inscription has been found (cf BUCHNAN & O. MASSON 1968). The inscription gives the proper name: *Ya-pi-lan-ne* (*Yabbi-Ilâne*). Until now, it is the only Cypro-Minoan inscription found outside Ugarit and Mari (see Fig. 4).



Fig. 4

Cylinder-seal from Latakia



Inscription on jars from Ras Shamra and Enkomi

b) -At Ras Shamra (*Minet-el-Beida*) and at Enkomi, jars of Mycenaean type have been found, bearing an after firing incised inscription to be read *Sa-si* (See O. Masson, *Ugaritica* III p. 234). This name, written *Sa-as-si* or *Sa-si-ya* at Ugarit, is the name of a king of the *Siyannu* kingdom, a predecessor of Abdi-Anati (See ASTOUR 1979 p. 14 and note 15).

c) - Last but not least, the *Siyannu*, a coastal kingdom, had a city bearing the name of *Tarziya*, identical with the Assyrian and Aramaic name of *Tarsus* in Cilicia (See ASTOUR, *ibidem* p. 25). This can be interpreted as a testimony of a relationship between the *Siyannu* and the Western Anatolian coast, the first stage on the journey leading from Syria to Rhodes, Miletos and Crete.

2.22 - *The diversity of the intermediaries* in the transmission of the script is also reflected in *the diversity of the dialects* that one discovers in the Cypro-Minoan inscriptions. The Hurrian dialect of the Ras Shamra tablet RS 17,06, for instance, is quite different from the Hurrian language of the "Lukki Letters" from Enkomi (written in CM 2), more "Mittanian" in style. (This remark would call for more lengthy comments, but it would be inappropriate to express them here).

To sum up the difficult question (that we cannot develop here) of the languages spoken in Cyprus during the Second Millennium B.C., we will say that the main language of the islanders must have been

what we have called the "Semitic-Cypriot" language. There are several attestations of it in the Cypro-Minoan material. But Hurrian was also used, certainly as a "diplomatic language" during the LC III A period, and maybe some Hurrian dialect was likewise spoken in some parts of the Island.

A "Lukki" language must have been introduced during the LC IIIA (and maybe before): In the Cypro-Minoan epigraphical material, it is only attested in the *onomastica* (see here-after). But some of the so-called "Eteo-Cypriot" texts are certainly written in this language (see FAUCOUNAU 1990). And Greek became preponderant after the LC IIIC, whatever the date of its introduction.

2.3 - The "Lukki" people:

One of the most interesting results brought by the decipherment is related to the role played by the "Mycenaeanized populations" from Rhodes and from the Anatolian coast, particularly the "Lukki" people. From the archaeological context surrounding the epigraphical material which has to be attributed to the "Lukki", we must admit that before the LC IIIB, the "Mycenaean" pottery in Cyprus was linked not with Greeks, but with "Mycenaeanized" populations. One of the characteristics of these people was their strong "Mittanian" character. The "Lukki Letters" show that they used Hurrian as a diplomatic language. Their *onomastica* was similar to the *onomastica* at *Mari* and *Nuzi* (and in a lesser degree at *Ugarit*).

If we analyse the detail of the first "Lukki Letter" formed by the DIKAIOS 1952 tablet and the SCHAEFFER 1969 one (See I. NICOLAOU 1980), we can notice in particular two interesting sentences on lines 3 and 8 (recto of the Schaeffer's 1969 tablet):

(3) ar-ett-eβi-ti o-we tap-il-u Elu-is

"You will give all what is prescribed by the God El"

(8) kol-or-i anki sorr!-an-βe Rila-Zuzu ang-ukk-ul-an

"It is thus said! Rila-Zuzu demands that it shall not be modified!"

The second sentence gives us the name of the sender: *Rila-Zuzu*. It seems to be a theophorous name, with two elements. The second, *Zuzu*, has been found in the "Cappadocian tablets" and also at *Mari*. In the texts from *Mari*, a *Zuzu* is king of the country of the *Apum/A-pi-im*, probably in the Khabur area (cf K. VEENHOF, "Aspects of the Old Assyrian Trade", p. 240/241). It is also the name of some inhabitants of the *Nurrugum* (Nu-ru-qi-im KI), a country situated on the Western bank of the Tigris (Birod et al 1979 p. 25). We may suppose that it was the name of a Mittanian God: in Hurrian, *zuzu-maki* ("the gift from Zuzu") is almost always associated to *keldi*: "the good health" and must probably mean: "prosperity, wealth". The name would be, as a consequence, more Indoeuropean than Hurrian. This is confirmed by the initial R- of *Rila-Zuzu* (initial R- does not exist in Hurrian, except in loan-words). One can suppose that *Rila-* is a "Hatti", "native Anatolian" deformation of Indoeuropean *Rida-* (cf. *Tabarnas/Labarnas*), coming from the well-known IE root **reidh-*: "to ride". The steppic, Aryan origin of the PN *Rila-Zuzu* seems therefore quite sure. In his "*Stratigraphie comparée*." CL. Schaeffer has shown the early introduction of an Aryan element in Anatolia. Armenia and the Khabur area have been the "melting-pot" of Hurrians and Aryans, in which they became "Mittanians". *Chagar-Bazar*, in the heart of the Khabur steppe, was a Mittanian Centre as early as the XVth century BC. The rest, i.e. the expansion of the Mittanians, is a well-known story.

The sentence on line 3 shows that *Rila-Zuzu*, in spite of writing in Hurrian, is a worshipper of the Sumero-Akkadian God *El*. It seems therefore probable that his realm was in Northern Syria, an area dominated by the *Mittani* kingdom during the XVth and XIVth centuries. One may think that the tablet

must have been written *after* the destruction of the *Hanigalbat* by king *Shalmaneser I* (1274-1245), but *before* the Aramaean conquest of Syria. The date of the tablet would be c. 1200 BC, when a certain Hurrian revival did happen, facilitated by the destruction of the kingdoms of *Mari* and *Hana* by *Tukulti-Ninurta I* (1245-1207).

This epoch is also the time when the "People of the Sea" began to move towards the South: In 1174, they reached Egypt and were repelled by *Ramses III*. As we will see hereafter, some of them were already settled in Cyprus at the time of the tablet, what lets us think that the receiver of the letter was a "Lukki" king.

This hypothesis rests on the other Cypro-Minoan 2 text, the DIKAIOS 1953 "great tablet", of which the beginning has been recovered. This tablet, also written in Hurrian, is a letter emanating from a king *Lazo-Senni* and sent to "the lord of the Lukki people" (*iβre lukki*) (See FAUCOUNAU 1980 p. 385 and ff). *Lazo-Senni*, who calls himself "the great king" (*umbu-sarran*) complains that "the lord of the Lukki" doesn't give a sufficient help to *Kallipiza*, the "lord of the Byblos mountain" (*pab-irwini kub (o)lorini*). To manifest his dissatisfaction, *Lazo-Senni* begins his letter in an abrupt manner, without any polite formula: "The lord of the Lukki will not receive any gift.." (*iβre lukki mag-ukkan..*).

As both tablets have been found in identical archaeological contexts, we believe that *Lazo-Senni* was the son (or grandson) of *Rila-Zuzu*, because:

a) - the friendly relationship that *Lazo-Senni* says to have existed "at the time of our fathers" (line 7) can be a possible allusion to the one that both kingdoms seem to have enjoyed during the *Rila-Zuzu's* reign.

b) - the name *Lazo-Senni* seems, linguistically, a "Hurro-Aryan" name like *Rila-Zuzu*. If *Senni*: "brother" is purely Hurrian, *Lazo-*, known in some Hurrian texts from Boghaz-Koi under the form *la-az-zi*, can be linked with Greek λαγγάνω, Ion. λάξομαι: "to get from the Gods", whence Hittite *lazziya*: "to be in good health, to be cured".

c) - like *Rila-Zuzu*, *Lazo-Senni* is a worshipper of the god *El* (lines 7 and 17).

If our interpretation is correct (letters sent by North-Syrian kings of Mittanian origin to their "Lukki" vassals at Enkomi), one must admit that "Lukki" kings of probable South-Anatolian origin were settled at Enkomi at that time. The "Lukki" appear, as a consequence, as the "forerunners" of the "People of the Sea", as the least "barbarians" among them, as the ones who had been early in contact with the "Civilized World" of that time, contrary to their close relatives, the Lycians, who, isolated in the mountains of Lycia, will keep very pure their "proto-Indoeuropean" language until the IV century BC (See FAUCOUNAU 1982). About 1200, the "Lukki" emerge, in the Cypriot documents, as strongly "Hurrianized", probably because of their previous connections with the *Kizzuwatna* and the *Karkemish* kingdom created by *Suppiluliuma* (1380-1346) a few centuries before: their kings are worshippers of *Tessub* and they use the Hurrian language in their correspondence.

2.4 - The other "Mycenaeanized" populations:

The "Lukki" were certainly not the only ones to settle in Cyprus c. 1200 BC. One can find in the Cypro-Minoan documents, faint traces of other Indoeuropean people, less "Hurrianized" than the "Lukki".

But the bulk of these people (including the Greeks) did probably arrive after the LC III B, during a period of great disorders. So, they are paradoxically better known from the later (Eteo-Cypriot and Greek) inscriptions written in "Classical Syllabic Script" than from the Cypro-Minoan ones. (See FAUCOUNAU 1990).

As a consequence, the only document we will quote is a clay ball found at Hala Sultan Tekke in 1971-1973 by the Swedish Expedition (see Fig. 5). The name can be read, with a certain difficulty, as:

O-lo-le

apparently a "native Anatolian" deformation of Greek Ὀλωδης (Our previous study in FUCUS 1988 must be corrected on this point).



Clay-ball from Hala Sultan Tekke (SIMA XLV:5)

Clay-ball from Enkomi (Alasia I n° 41)

Clay-ball from Enkomi (Alasia I n° 46)

Bronze spit from Kouklia

Fig. 5
Inscriptions with the C.M. -sign n° 64

I have said "with a certain difficulty" because the first sign n° 64  (not to be confused with the CM 2 sign n° 65 ) is a very rare sign. But its value "O" can be established with an acceptable certainty by comparison with the "Classical Cypriot" inscription *O-pe-le-ta-u* of the Kouklia Bronze spit (V. KARAGEORGHIS 1981).

The analysis of the name as "Lukko-Greek" (and not 100% "Lukki"!) seems to be confirmed by the second name mentioned on the clay ball from Enkomi (*Alasia* n° 41):

U-po-to-li-ya

which looks as belonging to the same linguistic stock.

As a conclusion, it can be said that the pioneer's work of J.F. Daniel has today been almost achieved. Most of the Cypro-Minoan inscriptions can be read and understood. What is needed now is a "corpus" of the epigraphical documents, established as carefully as this great American scholar did, fifty years ago.

J. Faucounau
13 avenue des Dauphins 13
1410- Waterloo- Belgium

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

Την ύπαρξη κάποιου παράξενου είδους γραφής στην αρχαία Κύπρο εντόπισε για πρώτη φορά ο Γερμανός αρχαιολόγος Ohnefalsch-Richter το 1889. Αυτός όμως που πρώτος τη μελέτησε επιστημονικά και εισηγήθηκε φωνητικές αξίες για τα Κυπρο-μινωικά σύμβολα ήταν ο Αμερικανός John F. Daniel το 1941. Έκτοτε έγιναν αρκετές προσπάθειες αποκρυπτογράφησης της και τώρα αυτό έγινε κατορθωτό αν και οι αρχαιολόγοι είναι απρόθυμοι να το δεχθούν. Οι γλώσσες των Κυπρο-μινωικών επιγραφών, οι οποίες ανήκουν στην ομάδα του Αιγαίου, πρέπει να ήσαν Σημιτικές και Χουρριτικές διάλεκτοι. Στην Κύπρο της 2ης π.Χ. χιλιετίας ομιλούνταν η «Σημιτο-Κυπριακή» γλώσσα, καθώς και η Χουρριτική (η γλώσσα της διπλωματίας στην Υστερο-κυπριακή (=ΥΚ) IIIA περίοδο) μαζί με κάποια διάλεκτό της. Η γλώσσα των Λυκίων (Lukki) εισήχθη επίσης την ΥΚ IIIA περίοδο ή λίγο νωρίτερα, ενώ η ελληνική επικράτησε μετά την ΥΚ IIIB.

Συμπερασματικά, μπορεί να λεχθεί ότι οι περισσότερες Κυπρο-μινωικές επιγραφές μπορούν σήμερα να διαβαστούν και να γίνουν κατανοητές και το μόνο που χρειάζεται είναι ένα κόρυψος όλων των υπορχουσών επιγραφών.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ASTOUR M.
1979: "The kingdom of Siyannu-Usnatu", *Ugarit Forsch.* II, 1979, p. 13-28.
- BAURAIN Ch.
1984: "Chypre et la Méditerranée Orientale au Bronze Récent", Paris 1984.
- BEST J. & WOULDHUIZEN F.
1988: "Ancient Scripts from Crete and Cyprus", Leiden-New York, 1988.
1989: "Lost Languages from the Mediterranean", Leiden-New-York, 1989.
- BIROT M., KUPPER J.R. & ROUAULT O.
1979: "Noms propres de Mari", *Archives Royales de Mari XVI*, Paris, 1979.
- BUCHANAN B. & MASSON O.
1968: "A Cypriote Cylinder at Yale..", *B.C.H.* 92, 1968, p. 410-415.
- BUCHHOLZ H.G.
1954: "Zur Herkunft der Kyprischen Silbenschrift", *Minos* 1954.
1959: *Praehistorische Zeitschrift* 37, 1959, p. 22 .
- DANIEL J.F.
1941: "Prolegomena to the Cypro-Minoan Script", *A.J.A.* 1941, p. 249-282.
- FAUCOUNAU J.
1977: "Etudes Chypro-Minoennes" I-III, *Syria* 1977, pp. 209-249.
1980: "Etudes Chypro-Minoennes" IV & V, *Syria* 1980, pp. 375-410.
1982: "Le Lycien et la thèse "proto-indoeuropéenne de P. Kretschmer". *B.S.L.* 77, 1982, p. 157-175.
1985: "Le développement de l' écriture à Chypre..", *Actes du Deuxième Congrès Intern. d'Etudes Chypristes. Nicosia*, 1982.
1989: "The Decipherment of the Cypro-Minoan Scripts", *Journal of Business & Society, Cyprus College*, Fall 1989, p. 162-171.
1990: "L'interprétation des textes étochypristes..." (forthcoming).
1991: "A Late Cypriot I Cylinder-seal.." (forthcoming).
1992: "The Decipherment of Ancient Scripts" (forthcoming).
- GARELLI P.
1969: "Le Proche-Orient Asiatique", Paris 1969.
- KARAGEORGHIS J.
1958: "Quelques observations sur l' origine du syllabaire chypro-minoen", *Rev. Arch.* 1958, p. 1-19.
- KARAGEORGHIS V.
1981: "Studies in Cypriote Archaeology", edit. Institute of California 1981, p. 89-95.
- LAROCHE E.
1976 & 1977: "Glossaire de la langue hourrite", *Rev. Hittite & Asianique*, 1976 & 1977.

LEWY J.

1938: "Influences hurrites sur Israel", *Rev. Et. Sémi.* 1938, p. 49-75.

MASSON O.

1957: "Cylindres et cachets chypriotes", *B.C.H.* 81, 1957, p. 6-37.

MASSON E.

1971 a: "Boules d'argile inscrites trouvées à Enkomi" *Alasia I*, Paris, p. 479-504.

1971 b: "Étude de vingt-six boules d'argile inscrites", *S.I.M.A.* XXXI: 1, 1971.

1974: "Cypromimoica", *S.I.M.A.* XXXI: 2, 1974 .

MICHAELIDOU-NICOLAOU I.

1980: "Regroupement de deux fragments de tablettes d'Enkomi". *S.M.E.A.*, fasc. XXI, p. 7-16.

NAHM W.

1981: "Studien zur Kypro-Minoischen Schrift", *Kadmos* 1981, p. 53-63.

O'CALLAGHAN R.T.

1948: "Aram Naharaim", Roma 1948.

OHNEFALSCH-RICHTER

1889: *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, 1889.

SCHAEFFER Cl.

1948: "Stratigraphie Comparée..", Oxford 1948.

1978: "Les problèmes d'épigraphie chypriote", *Journal des Savants* 1978, p. 87-104 .