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Preface

Introduction

These are the proceedings of the Postgraduate in Cypriot Archaeology (POCA) 2008 conference held at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel (Belgium) from the 27th-29th of November 2008.

All papers have been peer reviewed by senior scholars in order to enhance and guarantee the quality of the papers. The publication format both presents work-in-progress and finished works. We have chosen to organise the papers on a largely chronological basis, since some papers were not included in the final publication. The publication has suffered from a long delay due to a number of practical, editorial and professional reasons. The papers incorporated in this volume represent the research presented in 2008 (and submitted in 2010) and should therefore be read accordingly. The reference lists and affiliations of the contributors have been updated and when relevant the affiliation in 2008 is stated in a footnote. Also referred to in a footnote, and the reference list of the author, is when the researcher has obtained a PhD-title.

In 2008 POCA was held for the first time in Belgium. The conference was organised at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel by the new research team of the Mediterranean Archaeological Research Institute (MARI), which was founded in May 2007 under the direction of Prof. Karin NYS. MARI is a research centre within the department of Art Studies and Archaeology and the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel. The research interest of MARI focuses in particular on Cyprus and the Near East during the Bronze and Iron Ages. By viewing the material cultural of Cyprus and the Levant in relation to the material culture of the entire Mediterranean world, MARI aims at contributing to the elucidation of the socio-economic and cultural history of the Mediterranean world in antiquity. Some of MARI’s research projects, however, have a broader chronological and geographical scope as they centre on the study of the chaîne opératoire of two particular glass categories in northwestern Europe and the Mediterranean during, respectively, Roman and medieval times.

Our University organises Doctoral Schools in order to offer PhD students the opportunity to develop skills supporting their research as well as their teaching abilities, which at a later stage also can prove valuable outside their discipline and the academic environment. Therefore, we felt privileged to organise POCA 2008 to welcome a gathering of graduate students and young scholars active in the field of Cypriot archaeology, anthropology, history, social science or related subjects dealing with the material culture of Cyprus, without any chronological limits. The yearly postgraduate conference of POCA has proved to be beneficial for many postgraduates, hence their participation to several successive conferences. POCA indeed provides an easy accessible platform for presenting preliminary results and exchange ideas with senior scholars. In some cases, international relations are established between researchers of different universities. Equally important is the fact, that since the last years, the organising POCA committees work hard on publishing the proceedings of the conference. This is of major importance, since young researchers are
more and more encouraged to publish before completion of their dissertation. Many universities and funding agencies require international publications as a critical condition. We were very pleased that the then dean of the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy, Prof. Jean Paul VAN BENDEGEM, accepted to open the POCA conference and to have his notes published in this volume.

**Cypriot Material Culture Studies**

The call for papers purposely did not contain a conference theme, in order to invite as many as possible participants and attendants. However, the keynote lecture 'Storage and Political Economy in Late Bronze Age Cyprus', presented by Dr Priscilla KESWANI had multiple objectives. Over the years, Dr Priscilla KESWANI has demonstrated her well-established aptitude and quality to thoroughly analyse material culture, and to relate these observations to some of the larger socio-economic and political questions in the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean. Her lecture, which we are very pleased to incorporate in the proceedings, exactly comprises both components: the study departs from material culture, pithoi, in order to reconstruct the political economy in Late Bronze Age Cyprus.

The conference presented a wide variety of research topics related to Cypriot material culture. Young scholars presented twenty papers and two posters in sessions arranged by topic in order to enhance the discussion between the participants who are frequently confronted with similar methodological questions. All papers were of a very high standard and demonstrated that there is a new generation of young scholars keen to challenge long-held assumptions and to raise new questions. Some papers dealt with archaeometric data and interdisciplinary research which allowed to re-evaluate assemblages. Other papers departed from new-collected archaeological data and presented original contributions. Moreover, some papers clearly sought to understand how Cyprus interacted with its neighbours in different time periods.

The first session set the tone of the POCA 2008 conference by presenting a variety of research topics from different periods: we started with a review on cultural heritage in Cyprus during the period of 1963-1974. Next, we went back until Chalcolitic times to examine the health status from the cemetery at Souskiou-Laona. A re-assessment of Middle Bronze Age evidence illustrated the need to consider this period preliminary to the opening of the Late Cypriot period, while the fourth paper concentrated on regional exchange in southeast Cyprus in that period.

The second session grouped papers that presented long distance relations between Cyprus and other areas within the eastern Mediterranean: two papers dealt with the connectivity with Levantine areas in the Bronze and Iron Age —respectively Anatolia and Syria— whereas, a third paper concentrated on Cypro-Archaic and Cypro-Classical relations between Marion and Athens.

In the third session, figurine traditions were put in retrospect: the technology of picrolite figurines was explained in order to better appreciate a very specific section within the Chalcolithic material culture. Bronze Age anthropomorphic and zoomorphic figurines were
considered to shed light on how the social and political structure, tradition connections, expressions of individual and group identity changed over time. Specifically, the last paper sought to understand how to interpret the “goddesses with upraised arms” which bear strong similarities to the Cretan examples.

The fourth session continued to explore the previous theme by examining Hathoric figures from Amathous and how this “Egyptian deity” was perceived in the Archaic city of Amathous. Statues of Roman emperors, their inscriptions and context were viewed in order to understand the roles that statues played in the imperial cult and imperial representation. Two more papers contributed by considering sculptural and architectural types of material culture: both the early Christian marble tables and Islamic Praskynitaria are significant for their time period.

Pottery was the central theme of the fifth session: four papers dealt with archaeometric data in order to answer larger questions on ceramic production, technology and provenance determination. In addition, a few Cypriot finds from Carthage were presented.

The sixth session grouped inscriptions, linguistic and epigraphical evidence from different periods in order to reconsider some of the long held views on the people and their society.

The last session included the search of the Gymnasium of Nea Paphos, whose existence is corroborated by inscriptions. The last paper also concentrated on architecture, more specifically, on the political motivations of water control through a number of public works and aqueducts.

Finally, two posters were briefly commented and again illustrated the variety of research topics: from Egyptian Scarab-shaped seals to archaeological window glass from Cistercian abbeys.

In addition to the 22 presentations, we were very happy with the participation from two of our Belgian colleagues from the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven and the Universiteit Gent. Prof. Joachim BREITSCHEIDER (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, now Universiteit Gent) presented Cypriot material from the excavations at Tell Tweini in Syria, while Prof. Roald DOCTER (Universiteit Gent) contributed by discussing the Cypriot facies found in Phoenician-Punic Carthage.

Ariane JACOBS & Peter COSYNS
Foreword

As Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Letters of the Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB, Free University of Brussels), I feel quite honoured to be here among you for the opening session of this conference. I am quite convinced that all of you know on the basis of years of academic practice and experience, that the task of a Dean of a Faculty (not necessarily of Arts and Letters) is not a pleasant one. Sometimes I have the belief that occasions such as this one have been intentionally ‘invented’ to soften the pain and the agony and to allow the poor Dean to continue on his path of sorrow and misery. Being here means that I am given the opportunity to be among other scholars and to feel reintegrated within the scientific community. Of course, that feeling would be a lot stronger if our fields or domains of expertise would overlap. But, alas!, we all know that a perfect match between a Dean’s academic training and the specialty of the members of the conference he is addressing, occurs on an extremely rare basis, very few and far between, as the expression goes. And so it is, I am afraid, in this particular case. By training I am a mathematician and a philosopher (and the latter has become my professional occupation although the subject of my philosophical reflection is the former) and, notwithstanding the existence of mathematical branches in archaeology and some indications of the beginnings of a philosophy of archaeology, it is a hard and challenging task to find direct links and connections. Of course, I could claim that philosophical problems are perennial and that mathematical answers are meant for eternity, so at least in time span, philosophers and archaeologists understand one another, but, nevertheless, we all feel this amounts to no more than a rather weak, if not pretentious defence to establish a connection. However, one failed attempt does not constitute defeat. Fortunately there are many ways to reflect on time and space, so let me try a different approach.

Where are we? Philosophers have spent ages trying to find answers to that tricky question, but my own personal favourite is inspired by the beautiful short movie by Charles and Ray Eames, Powers of Ten. As the title indicates, one travels from the largest structure known to us all, the universe, down to the atomic scale, until all vanishes and we are left with a void. Let me consider eight stages in that journey: (1) the universe, (2) the Milky Way, (3) the Sun, (4) the Earth, (5) Europe, (6) Belgium, (7) Brussels, (8) the place where we are gathered here today. I assume that it is very tempting to see in this progression an increase of detail and of locality. True, it is worth noting that of these eight places four are shared by all of us and only the second half concerns places that seem to be more specific. But, at the same time, one must realize that to a certain extent one is no longer tied to a particular place. Wherever an internet connection is available, sphere (4) is always within reach (although I must add here straight away that the density of the connections shows a huge variance that is clearly determined by socio-economic and political parameters). There is thus a strange loop present here, to use Douglas Hofstadter’s favourite expression —his latest piece of scientific-philosophical musings is entitled I am a Strange Loop— but, wherever I consult the internet, it will always be in a particular location. I will not pursue this philosophically pleasing exploration any further, but instead ponder a few moments on the particularities of topoi (6) and (7).
Let me ask the question one more time: where are we? Perhaps locus (6), Belgium, is a good place to start, but, in all honesty, I have strong hesitations. I have no clear ideas about the perception abroad of this curious country, coming into existence after an opera performance, as common history wants it, counting three communities, each with their own language (Dutch, although some will claim it is Flemish, French and German), counting three regions, that do and do not coincide with the communities, unified by a monarchy (though an idea not shared by everyone), divided by a language barrier (whereof the existence itself is a philosophical conundrum of first order), therefore requiring a staggering six governments (with partial overlaps) and I will not mention the number of ministers apparently necessary to populate them all. The most curious aspect of this staggering complexity is that normally it is supposed to lead to a total and complete immobility but not always so. Occasionally it offers unique opportunities. In particular I am thinking of intellectual environments such as universities and other academic institutions that are subject to so many conflicting rules, coming from equally many different governmental sources, that a certain form of freedom emerges for, let us admit it freely, that we, as intellectuals, are quite well-trained to reason with contradictory and inconsistent data and nevertheless succeed to the most interesting conclusions.

Speaking as a logician and mathematician, it is a well-known and accepted fact that properties of a whole need not necessarily hold for the parts. Although water is wet, a single water molecule definitely is not. However, in the case of the city of Brussels, the capital of Belgium, unfortunately, it does hold. So forgive me if I do not enter into the details of the complexities of this extraordinary place, complexities that are the result of the above mentioned national complexities. Let me just say that it becomes quite understandable why some inhabitants of this country and of this city in particular prefer to leave out place (6) and move straight from (5) to (7) or, in other words, who see Brussels as the capital of Europe. I will not abuse the space accorded to me here in this introduction, but I myself tend to believe that on the one hand the statement “Brussels is the capital of Europe” is strictly speaking false and that on the other hand it is perfectly alright to claim that it is so de facto. The evidence that this place is truly an international melting pot is, as far as I am concerned, overwhelming. It offers thereby unique opportunities to the universities and other places of higher education for establishing international networks, as this conference itself demonstrates by its mere existence.

Now that we have come down to the level of Brussels, this is perhaps the perfect moment in my exposé to say a few things about my university that so far was only briefly mentioned in the first paragraph and, to be honest, only to raise your sympathy for my particular situation (known in argumentation theory as a classic rhetorical device, namely the argument ad misericordiam). The Vrije Universiteit Brussel was officially erected in 1969-1970. Before that date, there was of course the Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB), which in English translates as Free University of Brussels as well. The ULB was founded in 1834, quite soon after the independence of Belgium, supported financially mainly from the Freemasons movement in order to create a place where scientific research would be “free” or, as the beautiful French expression states it, where the “libre examen” would be practised. Inspired by the thoughts of Henri Poincaré, the “libre examen” proposes to let the facts do the
talking, as it were, and not accept whatever idea solely on the basis of an authority, whatever its source. It also implies that in principle no topic, no subject is to be excluded from scientific questioning and analysis. This attitude is most clearly reflected in the university’s motto, namely “Scientia vincere tenebras” (“To conquer darkness through science”). Note that it is not science itself that will drive away the darkness, but rather we ourselves with the help of the sciences. But back to harsh reality. Originally French-speaking, the ULB turned into some kind of bilingual institution but eventually, due to all sorts of political, social and economical developments in Belgium, it would lead to a separation that however never turned into an opposition, although it must be acknowledged that the Belgian present-day situation did not particularly help to reduce tensions. At present thoughts and ideas are circulating to establish a University of Brussels, where VUB and ULB will be partners (again).

The VUB is thus a special university, not only in its specific relation to the ULB, but also among the other universities in the Flemish Community: the University of Ghent, the Catholic University of Louvain, the University of Antwerp and the University of Hasselt. In terms of the subsidies that each of these institutions receives from the Flemish government, based on a complex model that translates into financial parameters the impact of teaching and research, it turns out that all but the VUB receive a sum of money, made up of 55% for the educational part and 45% for the research part. Not so for the VUB however where the sum is composed in exactly the opposite way: 45% for education and 55% for research. So I am tempted to say: welcome at our research university!

So far I have not said much about the specific research done at the VUB in relation to the theme and topic of this conference. I am quite convinced that the choice to organise this meeting here, is no accident, rather the contrary, once one takes into account the following facts and figures:

- In the first half of the seventies my Faculty decided to launch a course on “Archaeology of Ancient Cyprus”. Worldwide there were only a few other places that dedicated some attention to the archaeology of Cyprus. So it is right to say that in this case the VUB has played a pioneering role.

- Since then about 22 master theses and 3 PhD dissertations have been presented and defended that focus on different aspects of the material culture of Cyprus. 2 Master theses and no less than 5 PhDs are in preparation that deal specifically with Cypriot archaeology.

- In 1990 the VUB on a suggestion of my Faculty has decided to award Prof. Vassos Karageorghis, the then director of the Department of Antiquities of Cyprus, the title of doctor honoris causa. My University thereby acknowledged the importance of his work as to the pivotal role of Cyprus on the socio-economic and cultural level within the whole of the Mediterranean world during different stages in history.

- Of equal importance, what I should mention as well are the collaborations within the educational field. On the one hand the bilateral Erasmus exchange programs in the area of archaeology and material culture with the University of Cyprus and Sheffield
University should be mentioned. In this connection, I wish to welcome in particular Prof. Demetrios MICHAELIDES (University of Cyprus) and Prof. Patrick QUINN (formerly Sheffield University, now UCL London). On the other hand, I am happy to inform you that in the very near future a new road will be opened for PhD students and researchers, namely to obtain a “simultaneous” PhD diploma from the VUB and another participating university.

As you are all eager to get started with the conference itself, allow me to end my presentation with a philosophical note. The famous 20th century Austrian philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein defined in his famous treatise, the *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, an object as something equipped with all possible connections it could form with other objects. So any object was “surrounded” by a host of potential relations with the rest of the world. The important term here is “potential”. If an object is to be a part of the actual world then at least some of these connections have to be realized. A chair can have many colours, but in this real world it has a particular colour, excluding thereby other possibilities. Although I am going beyond Wittgenstein’s intentions here, it is perhaps a nice thought experiment to see a university as an “object” of some kind, with many possible, potential connections. But in order to be perceived as real, some of these connections need to be realized. I think that this conference today and for the days that follow, will make both my university, the research community of which all of you are part and the world surrounding us, preferably up to an including place (4), a bit more real. I thank you.

*Jean Paul VAN BENDEGEM*
Paul ÅSTRÖM,
The Mentor of Several Generations of Archaeological Students
and an Inspiration for Generations to Come

When the MARI team started planning POCA 2008, we could not think of a scholar more appropriate than Paul ÅSTRÖM to reflect on the colloquium’s contributions and on Cypriot archaeology in general. Hence, I was delighted that he accepted the invitation to deliver the closing lecture. Alas, his sudden illness decided otherwise.

Thus, I felt very moved and honoured when, on the morning after his passing, his wife, Elisabet, told me that, on his last day, he had dictated to her the text which he wanted to be read at the POCA 2008 conference: “Cypriot Archaeology: A Prospering Story” (see this volume, XXII-XXIII).

One characteristic of Paul ÅSTRÖM was his genuine interest in the research of young scholars. My own career in Cypriot archaeology received a tremendous boost from the moment I met Paul ÅSTRÖM on 17th May 1993 at the Cypriote Stone Sculptures conference in Belgium. I was then a master’s student preparing a thesis on the use of masks in Cypriot antiquity. Before the start of the conference, everyone was having coffee in the big front hall at the University of Liège. I was very impressed, as it was as if a major part of my bibliography had come to life; there they stood: Vassos KARAGEORGHIS, Antoine HERMANY, Annie CAUBET, Marguerite YON, Robert MERRILLEES, and ... Paul ÅSTRÖM. They were having very interesting conversations with each other, and they were completely ignoring the few students who were standing timidly in a corner... except for Paul ÅSTRÖM!

He detached himself from the distinguished researchers and came to us, asking us in his kind way where we were from and what we were studying, thereby showing a real interest in our replies. During the pauses, he came again to talk to us, giving useful advice and references, to me and to my friend, who prepared a thesis on the Middle Comedy in the ancient history department. As we desired to participate in an excavation in Cyprus, we conferred with each other about whom we should approach at the end of the conference. I argued that we should first ask Paul ÅSTRÖM, as, if he replied negatively, at least he would do so in a friendly way. However, the reply we received was not at all negative: “Students who attend a full congress are very welcome at my excavation!”. This was the start of my collaborations with Paul ÅSTRÖM at Hala Sultan Tekke.

It is important to stress that Paul ÅSTRÖM’s attitude towards these two Belgian master’s students was not a unique occurrence. Most archaeologists of my generation can tell similar stories. This story is also corroborated by the praising words which Prof. WEINBERG wrote in his evaluation report on Paul ÅSTRÖM’s work as a visiting associate professor at the University of Missouri in 1963-1964:

... The many students who studied with him have given a unanimously favourable report on the courses and have expressed much enthusiasm both for the man and the subjects which taught; nothing speaks better for a professor. The one M.A. thesis which he supervised to completion was given very quick publication in a leading archaeological publication in Switzerland. Even the work of one of the undergraduate students in the course in Cypriote Archaeology was published in a Cypriote journal. This is
indicative of the great attention which Dr Åström gave to his students, and for which they were most grateful...

Prof. Weinberg’s words show that, even as a young professor, Paul Åström attached great importance to encouraging young researchers to publish their work. When Paul Åström started his own publishing house, Paul Åströms Förlag, he offered many young scholars the opportunity to publish their master’s and/or PhD work as an article in the *Journal of Prehistoric Religion*, in SIMA-PB, or even as a genuine volume in the red SIMA series – the nec plus ultra of archaeological publications.

Paul Åström is well known for the excavations he conducted in Cyprus and Greece: the Middle Cypriot sites at Kalopsidha and Ayios Iakovos (1959), the Late Cypriot harbour town west of Hala Sultan Tekke (1971-2005), and the Mycenaean citadel at Midea (1983-1997), the latter of which he led along with Katie Demakopoulou. His name will also remain associated with the discovery of a Mycenaean cuirass in one of the chamber tombs at Dendra (1960-1963), which he explored together with Nicolaos Verdelis. Less well known is that during his time as director of the Swedish Institute in Rome (1967-1969), he excavated the Etruscan settlement at San Giovenale. It is therefore not a surprise that his publication list includes an article on Etruscan material culture:


Moreover, he even tackled a conundrum in Roman studies:


As a Mediterranean archaeologist, Paul Åström was particularly eager to solve yet another conundrum: the chronology of the ancient Mediterranean world. Although this is still a matter of debate, the archaeological community is grateful to Paul Åström for his contributions to this discussion:


Obviously, Paul Åström’s bibliography comprises many publications on different aspects of Greek and Cypriot material culture. For his innovative investigations on finger- and
palm-prints, he teamed up with Swedish police officers Sven A. ERIKSSON and Karl-Erik SJÖQUIST:


He also devoted research to ancient textiles and dress:


His studies on ancient sculpture include work on the Lion Gate at Mycenae, Archaic statues. He even proposed a reconstruction of the Laocoön group which was much lauded by specialists as a highly plausible hypothesis.


Paul Åström’s text for the POCA 2008 conference reflects his keen interest in applying exact science to archaeology. In his bibliography, the variety of topics which he dealt with in this domain is astonishing:

• **Acoustic Research**


• **Geophysical Prospecting**


• **Palaeobotanical Research**


• **Physical Anthropology**


• **Residue Analysis**


His classical training explains his love of issues in Greek and Latin epigraphy, papyrology and even numismatics:


XVIII

Although the ancient Mediterranean world was Paul ÅSTRÖM’s preferred study domain, he was also very interested in the history and culture of his home country. As a young scholar he made an unassuming contribution to Swedish history:


This article actually reads as a detective story, as it reveals another of Paul ÅSTRÖM’s predilections: the whodunit. This does not come as a surprise, for every archaeologist is actually a detective:


Undoubtedly, his detective skills helped him trace back the steps of past Swedish travellers in Cyprus:


Outside Sweden, it is probably not well known that Paul ÅSTRÖM made a tremendous contribution to the research on Swedish literature with publications on Karin BOYE, Johannes EDFELT, Gunnar EKELÖF, Ellen KEY and Östen SJÖSTRAND. In particular his magnum opus on Gunnar EKELÖF (ÅSTRÖM 1992) was highly praised in the Swedish press.

• Karin BOYE

• Johannes EDFELT

• Gunnar EKELÖF
Finally, he also wrote about two of his favourite non-Swedish authors, Rainer Maria Rilke and Joyce Carol Oates, which probably helped to better grasp their work.

• Rainer Maria Rilke


• Joyce Carol Oates


The above mentioned publications are only a fraction of the more than 700 titles that Paul ÅSTRÖM authored or co-authored.
May his brilliant career, versatile interests and inspiring mentorship remain an inspiration for many generations to come.

Karin NYS
Cypriot Archaeology: A Prospering Story

In the fifties, there were very few Cypriot archaeologists: DIKAIOS, STEWART, KARAGEORGHIS, CATLING and a few others. When I published *Who is Who in Cypriote Archaeology* in 1971, the number of people mentioned was already about 600, who in one way or another were dealing with Cypriot archaeology. Vassos KARAGEORGHIS’s efforts in inviting people from all over the world to carry out excavations in Cyprus had a tremendous effect. At some time nearly twenty foreign missions worked in the island. On many occasions, people asked me to make an update of the *Who is Who in Cypriote Archaeology*. However, by now this would mean a sheer impossible undertaking.

Today, Cypriot archaeology has a leading position in modern archaeological research. It is a pleasure to note that Cypriot archaeology is exercised all over the world from Australia to America. This POCA conference with its so many outstanding papers is a good example.

The old generation of scholars of Cypriot archaeology did not use computers, hence Jim STEWART sat in a German prison camp and composed an awkward classification system of Early Cypriot Bronze Age pottery. When I wrote my thesis in 1957 it was still before the computer. It was David FRANKEL who used the digital possibilities to an extreme extent in his doctoral dissertation *Middle Cypriot White Painted pottery* of 1973. Now we have the digital possibilities to help us enormously.

**New Techniques**

In the time of the SCE, the technical help from the natural sciences was not available. I started to use the help of natural sciences when I worked with the material from Kalopsidha in 1959. Eight different specialists contributed to the final publication with studies on plant remains, residue analysis, fingerprints, human and animal bones, charcoal analysis, pollen, molluscs and geological determinations of stone fragments.

50 years later, the scientific knowledge has significantly enhanced. So it is exciting to observe that new techniques are developed such as direct dating of pottery from its organic residues published in volume 82 of *Antiquity* by BERSTAN et al., and the method of the Belgian archaeological project documented in HST 12 for pottery provenance detection by comparing lead isotope signatures in pottery and sediments.

Nevertheless one should also use one’s own senses: one Roman archaeologist was able to date Roman tiles by just feeling them with her mouth.

Younger generations of archaeologists develop new theories and methodologies with the results of the work of the older generations as a basis. Sometimes young archaeologists

---

express a negative view on the cultural historical approach of the previous generation of archaeologists. Of course their classifications, typologies and chronologies must be refined in the light of new finds. But for the pioneers it was necessary to build up classifications, typologies and chronologies as a basis for future research.

New methods are o.k. but the theoretical approach can go too far. An example of this is to make a new relative chronology of the Cypriot Bronze Age periods. The result is confusing. The present general classification is not perfect, but at the moment there is no better one.

So we must stress: Documentation first – interpretation afterwards.

Paul ÅSTRÖM, 3 October 2008
Latin Commemorative Epigraphs in Venetian Cyprus:
Preliminary Considerations

Mia Gaia TRENTIN1
Università Ca’ Foscari, Venice

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to detect the main characteristics of the Venetian epigraphic production in Cyprus. During the entire Venetian rule, many commemorative epigraphs —public or private— publicized the actions and the image of the Venetian Republic to the local people and also to the merchants and voyagers passing through the island. Thanks to formal and textual analysis, it is possible to retrace the “marketing strategy” used by the Venice Republic to promote a strong, winning image of its reign, using a new kind of script associated with the figure of the lion and following a model already tested in the City of Venice. The palaeographic form of the letters, the texts, the decoration, and the collocation are some of the epigraphic aspects we considered to point out the distinction between French and Venetian inscriptions and the formation of a new political identity through this kind of source.

Introduction

FRANCISCO DE PRIULIS VENETAE CLASSIS
IMPERATORE DIVI MARCI VESSILLUM CYPRI
FELICITER ERECTUM EST
ANNO MCCCCLXXXVIII 28 FEBRUARI

This inscription —now disappeared but quoted by several travellers (IMHAUS & SOLOMIDOU-IERONYMIDOU 2004, fiche 729)2— inaugurates the epigraphic production of the Venetian Republic in Cyprus. The first remarkable element is the date: February 28th 1488. This is the last day of the year on the Venetian calendar (POZZA 2000, 13)3 that started the 1st of March, so the conventional date is February 28th 1489. The chronological datum sculpted in an epigraph does not always correspond with the day of its realization, but it is a registration of an event that the author(s) wanted to be remembered. The date is an element that sometimes, like in our case, can offer much more information than the chronological datum.

1 contact: trentinmia@libero.it
2 Since this is not a philological investigation regarding the texts and their tradition, but an analysis of the epigraphic production of the Serenissima Republic, all the original sources containing information about inscriptions are quoted according to IMHAUS & SOLOMIDOU-IERONYMIDOU (2004).
3 A parte of the Senate dated 16 August 1192 stated the use of the Venetian calendar (more veneto) not only for the document of the cancelleria ducale but also for all the production of the Venetian notai
Commemorative epigraphs, in particular, are produced to maintain the memory of an important event that, sometimes, can be modified in the text to fix its symbolical significance more than its historical value. So, February 28th 1489 is probably not the real date of the event. In fact, official documents of the Republic told us that the *insignia gloriae evangeli protectores nostri sancti Marci* (‘glorious emblems of the evangelist saint Mark, our protector’) were erected on February 21st 1487 (Skoufari 2011: 52). The only event recorded by the acts of the Republic, close to the date of the epigraph, is Caterina Cornaro’s departure from Cyprus on February 26th 1489 (Skoufari 2011: 53).

So, in my opinion, the date engraved on the epigraph is a sort of declaration of the Venetian Republic that wanted to underline the fracture with the protectorate of Caterina Cornaro, showing the presence of the State from the very first moment, as soon as Caterina left the island. And they consciously decided to register it in the epigraph by using their own calendar, to better underline that their administration was already working following their rules. But in the act regarding Caterina’s departure, since it was for domestic use of the chancellery, the date was expressed in conventional way (i.e., February 26th 1489).

Just from this first epigraph is evident that the Venetian epigraphic programme adopted in Cyprus was not fortuitous but the result of a planned and tested, in Venice and abroad, communication policy, as we will try to describe below.

**Epigraphic Production in Venice**

The use of official inscriptions in Venice, as in the rest of the Italian peninsula, started to spread systematically from the 11th century. Since then, as sustained by Petrucci (1986, 3-20), epigraphy gained its role in the urban context, strictly connected with the new politic powers developing in the Italian cities. This new class wanted to affirm its identity by showing its actions and its engagement in the local territory, both political and social-cultural. The graphic form used in the epigraph of this period is the Roman Capital, a kind of script characterized by a solid form, a lengthen module, generally without ornamentation. Due to the cultural and economical relationships with Byzantine territories Greek writing influenced this kind of script in Venice.

The Roman Capital is influenced both in form and singular letters —sometimes borrowed directly from Greek alphabet— like the M with a mi form, the E with the
epsilon form and the A with the upper part developing on the left side (Figure 1) (DE RUBEIS 2008, 40). The mosaic captions of the Saint’s Mark basilica, dated to 11th or 12th century, are a high example of this graphic elaboration (DE RUBEIS 2008, 39-41; PETRUCCI 1991, 121-136). The Roman Capital consolidates this form that spreads in the city contrasting the introduction of the Uncialesque Capital, a kind of script that has been developed from the 12th century.

Figure 1: Example of Venetian Roman Capital with some Greek elements: M with mi form and A with the developed top part (SS. Giovanni e Paolo, façade)

Figure 2: Example of Venetian Uncialesque Capital (SS. Giovanni e Paolo, south aisle)

Figure 3: Example of Venetian Humanistic Capital. Commemorative inscription of the construction of the Rialto Bridge

This kind of script differentiates from the Roman Capital both in letters form and production. The Uncialesque characters arise from the minuscule, inserting uncial
elements and ornamentations that attribute a sinuous aspect. Moreover, this production is characterized by tracing the furrow with different thickness to create a *chiaroscuro* effect. Further, the Uncialesque Capital also is influenced, in Venice by Greek elements (DE RUBEIS 2008, 39-42), especially in the recurring M with *mi* form (Figure 2). This formal elaboration is visible, as well as the previous one, in mosaic captions of the Saint Mark’s basilica dated in the 14th century.

During the end of 15th and the beginning of 16th centuries, Venice is involved by the spreading of the humanistic principles, coming from Padua, interesting the ruling class and the nobility (KING 1986; PASTORE STOCHI 1980, 93-121). The humanistic suggestions influenced the state members, reaching the *Cancelleria Ducale*. It is possible to spot elements showing how from late 15th to early 16th centuries, the Venetian Republic unified and reinforced its image in different fields. In 1476, the Saint Mark’s lion officially becomes a state symbol, although already earlier associated to the city: adopted from the mid-14th century on the doge’s seal (ROSADA 1985, 126-141) and by the *Cancelleria* and other magistratures from the end of 14th century (ROSADA 1985, 142-148) it is also known from 14th century sculptures and paintings. From the graphic point of view, it is possible to notice the use of the Humanistic script in the *Cancelleria* (BARILE 1994). This new kind of script reaches an apex at the beginning of the 16th century with the *Gran Cancelliere* Giovanni Pietro Stella and the doge Leonardo Loredan 4 and, later on, with the *Cancellier Grande* Andrea Franceschi. The lion on one side, and the Humanistic script on the other —both, in documents and epigraphs— will characterize the graphic way of communication of the Venetian Republic, still in use today by the Venetian Municipality as identifying symbols. The humanists’ activities also gave new impetus to the knowledge and the diffusion of the Greek language and literature, already known in the city —thanks to commercial and cultural contacts (FEDALTO 1980, 503-514; PERTUSI 1980, 177-264). Furthermore, in this period, the influence of the Greek writing on Latin was stronger due to the flourishing typographic activity, producing Latin and Greek texts as well (CALABI 1993, 919-925). To resume, the Venetian cultural context is defined by the humanistic circles and by the printers, surrounded by purchasers and consultants requiring Greek books. Furthermore, the city was one of the first destinations for refugees escaping after the fall of Constantinople conquered by the Ottomans. The juncture of all these factors contributed to creating the basis of the presence of a Greek community, officially recognized at the end of the 15th century (CALABI 1993, 919-925).

4 The most significant application is in the production of *Lettere Ducali* written by Giovanni Pietro Stella for the doge Leonardo Loredan in the Venice State Archive, Miscellanea ducale e atti diplomatici, busta 21.
Considering the epigraphic production, Venice reflects the trend of the rest of the peninsula, which was recovering the Classic Epigraphic Capital following the humanistic instance of discovering the classical forms in different fields (King 1986, 23-30). The new epigraphic script is defined Humanistic Capital (Figure 3). A squared module, a polished V furrow with octagonal intersections, with all the curves realized by a circumference section defines this kind of writing. The general aspect is essential and static, but at the same time solemn. In the 16th and 17th centuries, as well as in the Roman period, the Humanistic Capital was employed for official epigraphs due to its strong aspect. In addition, the humanists recovered classic forms, mainly political or cultural titles (Morison 2000, 264-314).

In 16th century Venice, in addition to the official Latin epigraphs, are examples of Greek ones. A rich cultural context is visible in the main façade of the Saint Giuliano’s church, financed by Tommaso Rangone (Zorzi 2012, 107-109; 129-137), a humanist from Ravenna who engaged the best architect of his time, Jacopo Sansovino, to plan the restoration of the building (Lorenzetti 1974, 36-363; Zorzi 2012, 107) (Figure 4). Over the door of the main façade, inspired by humanistic ideals, presents the statue of the donor sitting at his desk, wearing a toga, surrounded by a globe and an armillary sphere. On top, there is the chronological indication expressed in more Veneto (the Venetian calendar), ab urbe condita (counting the years from the foundation of the city) and ab origo mundi (a kind of calculation used in the Byzantine world). The façade is embellished by three epigraphs (Zorzi 2012, 121-122). The one on top is written in an elegant Humanistic Capital and commemorates the figure of Tommaso Rangone (Figure 5) (Zorzi 2012, 111; 115-116). The other two are located at the side doors. The epigraph on the left is in Hebraic (Zorzi 2012, 112; 119-120) while the one on the right is in Greek (Zorzi 2012, 111; 116-119).
(Figure 6). The letters are finely refined, realized with a V furrow of different thicknesses to create a *chiaroscuro* effect, such as in the Latin text, but the grammar of the text is not completely correct. This could be due to the superficial knowledge of the *ordinator*, the one who plans the text. The date is expressed in letters, as in the Byzantine tradition, and it is written between two decorative leaves.

![Figure 5: Commemorative epigraph in Humanistic Capital, dedicated to Tommaso Rangone, San Giuliano façade, Venice, mid 16th century](image)

![Figure 6: Commemorative epigraph in Greek dedicated to Tommaso Rangone, San Giuliano Façade, Venice, mid 16th century](image)

Even if this example cannot be included in the official production of the Venetian government, it is interesting to quote this example to underline the presence of Greek epigraphs in Venice armillary sphere —surely attributed to a local production mainly for the technical realization, clearly comparable with the characteristics of the Latin epigraph. This epigraph testifies the presence of workshops able to create such products. On the other hand, the fact that such epigraphs —the Greek and the Hebraic— are exposed in a public place lets us know that these kind of characters were recognizable, at least by part of the society, even if they could not read or understand the content (ZORZI 2012, 127).
Inscriptions in Cyprus

A. Situation before Venetian Rule

The Serenissima Republic took power in Cyprus thanks to a focused “marriage politic”, which provide for the marriage of Caterina Cornaro, a Venetian noblewoman, to Jacque II Lusignan, the last descendent of the French dynasty (ARBEL 1993). When the king died, Caterina succeeded her husband. Initially, she reigned alone, surrounded by her Venetian family, who finally suggests that she leaves political control of the island directly to the Venetian Republic (SKOUFARI 2011, 47-40). Before her reign, the Lusignan dynasty had the power for less than three centuries, a period characterized by a great number of epigraphs, mainly in the funerary sphere, as the work Lacrimae Cypriae (IMHAUS & SOLOMIDOU-IERONYMIDOU 2004) testifies. These epigraphs are realized in Uncialesque Capital of French influence, locally revised. Among the funerary epigraphs, there are some official epigraphs commemorating urban works that were financed by members of the Lusignan dynasty. As seen before, this numerical difference between funeral and official texts is due to the difficult affirmation of the writing in the public context, which will start to develop from the 14th century. Before this period, in fact, it was difficult for the epigraphs to gain an independent space on the monuments. A well-known example is the commemorative epigraph of the restoration of the Saint Nicholas’ church in Famagusta, dated 1311 (IMHAUS & SOLOMIDOU-IERONYMIDOU 2004, Fiche 711) (Figure 7). It is a ten lines of text in Uncialesque Capital of French influence, engraved on two sides of the buttress stones of the south aisle. The text is situated at a high level, and the letters are in quite a small space. These two aspects do not allow for easy reading of the text. In addition, this text is engraved on a building stone rather than on a specific stone slab, representing the ongoing process of epigraphic affirmation and awareness.

Approaching the 15th century, we notice a decrease in the number of official epigraphs, while the funerary epitaphs remain constant. Concerning the Lusignan period, there is a strong increase in this kind of production that originated in local workshops (IMHAUS & SOLOMIDOU-IERONYMIDOU 2004, 65-80). Since that period, funerary production slowly decreased but represented the most significant epigraph production even in the following centuries, maintaining the French and Venetian models and sometimes melting the two traditions.

---

5 Local workshops are attested for the extraction and preparation of the stone slabs, locally engraved.
6 The numerical proportion is summarised in IMHAUS & SOLOMIDOU-IERONYMIDOU 2004, 665-673.
On the other side, Greek inscriptions are rather uncommon counting only funerary examples. However, among the small number of Greek epigraphs, it is possible to identify some exemplars of high-level production, connected to wealthy people, usually clergy. The reduced number of Greek inscriptions is due to the fact that the epigraphic device was principally connected with the ruling class or with the elite, then composed of the Franks and the Greek clergy. Furthermore, Greek donors preferred to paint instead of having their names and dedications carved as the painted epigraphs well testify in churches.

B. Production during the Venetian Rule

A turning point concerning the official epigraph production on the island can be connotated in the epitaph of the last Lusignan: Jacques II, Caterina Cornaro’s husband. The epigraph disappeared, but well know thanks to Enlart’s transcription (IMHAUS & SOLOMIDOU-IERONYMIDOU 2004, Fiche 734). The handed-down text refers to the date of 1473. Even if we do not dispose of an epigraph’s reproduction, the lexical standard —quoting the classical tradition (CYPRI REGI, PIUS, PRUDENS, CLEMENS, MAGNANIMUS PRINCEPS…) — positions the text in a humanist context. Moreover, if we consider the epigraphic form used by the humanist in Venice at that time (as exposed in the first part of this paper), we can suppose this was the first example of an epigraph realized in Humanistic Capital. This hypothesis can be supported by the strict contacts between Jacques II, the City of Venice, and its humanistic circles (ARBEL 1988; 1993).

Further, also the epigraph regarding the elevation of Saint Mark’s standard has now disappeared, but was handed down by Mariti, who placed it inside Saint Nicholas’ Church in Famagusta —not in its original location but laying down near the two altars. Mas Latrie also refers at the end of the 19th century to the presence of the
epigraph located in an unknown church of Famagusta (IMHAUS & SOLOMIDOU-IERONYMIDOU 2004, Fiche 729). For this manufacture, as well as for the previous one, it is possible to suggest its realization in Humanistic Capital. Its form, in fact, was already attested in Venice and the lexical standard, once again, is rich of classical elements (VENETAE CLASSIS IMPERATOR…), typical of the humanistic ambient.

Before considering the still-existing epigraphs, it is useful to make some observations about the events regarding their conservation through the centuries. The materials we presently know have been catalogued in the work Lacrimae Cypriae (IMHAUS & SOLOMIDOU-IERONYMIDOU 2004), but they represent only a minimal part of the original number. This can be sustained by comparing the Venetian epigraph production of Cyprus with other areas such as Corfu or Crete (GEROLA 1907-1908; RUSCONI 1952) where a greater number of epigraphs survived because the Venetian control lasted longer than in Cyprus. Moreover, the testimonies of travellers who visited the island during the last centuries have recorded texts of epigraphs since disappeared. The loss of a part of the Venetian epigraphs of Cyprus is, as usual, primarily due to building activities that often reuse these objects in hard stone or marble for their quality. A major part of the survived epigraphs, in fact, are conserved in Famagusta, the city that, for historical reasons, less suffered of destructive urban interventions through the centuries, maintaining most of the monuments in their original form inside the city walls. A second reason was the indifference concerning the previous epigraphic production of the new conquerors, the Ottomans, that played a relevant role. As observed by RIZZI (1998, 546-547), it is not possible to attribute to the Ottoman Empire a conscious will of destroying Venetian carved and sculpted testimonies, often symbolized by the lion and, in a subtle way, by the Epigraphic Capital. RIZZI, who studied the use of the lion in the Venetian territories, notes that when the Ottomans conquered the Venetian colonies in the Levant, they just eliminated the strongest Venetian public symbol: the columns surmounted by the lions, usually placed in the main square of the most important cities. In Cyprus, these columns were visible in Famagusta, Nicosia, and Larnaca. Nowadays only in Nicosia it is still possible to see the Venetian column without the lion in Konak Square. Venetian epigraphs thus rather suffered from accidental loss than from a systematic destruction.

In Cyprus, as well as in other contexts, the epigraphic dispersion should be attributed primarily to the natural historical progress and not, at least in our case, to a conscious project of destruction.
C. Venetian Workshops

For what concerns the epigraphic form and content, one of the most relevant examples among the remaining artifacts is that of Zaccaria Loredan, General Captain of the island between 1491 and 1520 (IMHAUS & SOLOMIDOU-IERONYMIDOU 2004, Fiche 712-657). The epigraph is situated inside the Famagusta fortress and is fragmented at the lower part (Figure 8). The remaining part is a marble slab, decorated by a simple frame, containing a seven-line text. The epigraph is realized with a clear Humanistic Capital, characterized by a strong influence of classical models, both for the text realization and for the mise-en-page, defined by *scriptio continua*. The first line, this epigraph presents the author’s name and his political charge, followed by the main events of his career, as in the Venetian case quoted above.

![Figure 8: Part of the commemorative epigraph in Humanistic Capital dedicated to Zaccaria Loredan, late 15th - early 16th century, Famagusta fortress](image-url)

The formal and textual characteristics place this epigraph in the humanistic trend, already mentioned for the Venice context. Moreover, the refinement attributes this exemplar to a high level of production. Further analysis is required to estimate whether local or Venetian artisans made the epigraph, even if I am in favour of the latter suggestion. Venetian artisans, in fact, could arrive in Cyprus following the Venetian representatives, as already suggested by RIZZI for the manufacture of the sea door lion of Famagusta (RIZZI 1993-1994, 314). Moreover, the realization, cured and equilibrated, suggests the production was the work of an artisan with good knowledge of the Humanistic Capital and its realization, while most of the Cypriot examples we considered are clearly produced by artisans trying to reproduce a model they do not know. Further archival researches and material

---

7 It is a way to distribute the text with no space between the words.
surveys could provide also relevant information regarding the possibility that artifacts arrived already finished from Venice as an alternative to the artisans’ mobility.

Figure 9: Commemorative epigraph in Humanistic Capital dedicated to Nicolò Foscarì (Foscarini), Famagusta city walls, end of 15th century

Other epigraphs are mainly situated in Famagusta, distributed along the city walls, next to the doors. Most of them present the lion related with the name and the chronological indicators of the General Captain who realized or restored the structure. RIZZI observed that eight of the 13 lions still present in Cyprus are crowned—an element present in Cyprus as well as on a pair of Cretan lions of the same period— whereas in Venice, the crown does not reappear until the 18th century (RIZZI 1993-1994, 311-312). In some cases, it is also possible to see a fortress on a hill behind the lion, an image representing the Famagusta fortress, in RIZZI’s opinion (Figure 9). RIZZI attributes only one example among the 13 survived to Venetian artisans because of its formal characteristics (RIZZI 1993-
1994, 321-322). This lion is the one surmounting the main Famagusta gate: the Sea Door. All the Venetian lions symbolize the figure of Saint Mark, holding a book containing the motto PAX TIBI MARCE EVANGELISTA MEUS, usually realized during this period in a late Roman Capital (Figure 10). This fact can be ascribed to the Humanists, who recovered the formal aspect of the 10th-11th century books containing the script, which originated at the Roman Capital. To represent a book, in painting or in sculpture, they used the typical book script for titles: the Roman Capital. During the following centuries, this kind of script will assume the form of the Humanistic Capital, but some elements of the first one will persist, showing the never-ending link to the original script.

When the Humanistic Capital is used for St. Mark’s motto the module is squared, with small lettering typical of Roman script. Finally, the “R” will present its descendent line, curved to the external side and not to the internal one, as used in the Humanistic Capital.

Among the lions along the Famagusta city walls, three are related with commemorative inscriptions mentioning Nicolò Foscari, Captain of the island in 1491, here defined CYPRI PRAEFECTO, clearly of classical influence (IMHAUS & SOLOMIDOU-IERONYMIDOU 2004, fiches 716-717, 659). The text is engraved on different marble blocks, inserted below the lion. The complex is decorated with a simple frame. The commemorative text is realized in a Humanistic Capital, formally different from the one of Zaccaria Loredan’s epigraph. In this exemplar, the single words are separated and placed on two lines. A clear furrow of constant thickness traces the letters. Moreover, the extremely geometric form of the letters partially hides a non-homogeneous module visible, for example, in “N” and “A” with non-equidistant lines (Figure 11). In addition, the ornamentation at times appears to be uncertainly traced, with a different definition as compared to Zaccaria Loredan’s epigraph. It is also possible to notice a right line defining the descendent part of the “R.” The above-mentioned elements suggest a non-Venetian realization of the epigraph that is, in contrast, visible in the Zaccaria Loredan’s exemplar. It may be possible to single out a local workshop, trained and equipped with models to reproduce it. These models, at least between the end of the 15th and the beginning of 16th centuries, were two: first, the Roman Capital to engrave the motto on the lion’s book and, second, the Humanistic Capital to trace the commemorative inscriptions, isolated or situated under the lions.
A probable presence of Venetian workshops is detectable in the commemorative inscription dedicated to Nicolò Priuli, General Captain of the island in 1496 (IMHAUS & SOLOMIDOU-JERONYMIDOU 2004, Fiche 720; 660) (Figure 12). The epigraph is placed in the monumental complex of the Sea Door, the most monumental line because it was the most official and symbolic access to the city. In the middle part of the arcade is placed the only exemplar of a lion made by Venetian artisans. The epigraph can be as well attributed to a Venetian workshop due to its technical and formal elements. From its formal point of view, the epigraph presents a modelling frame, an equilibrated mise-en-page that develops in four lines of text, the last line separated from the others for more ample space. From observing the technical elements, it is possible to see the technique used to define the furrow of a non-uniform thickness, filled with dark metal —employed the same way in Leonardo Loredan’s epigraph in Venice.

In addition to these elements, the frame and the decorative motif situated on the lower part are clearly of Venetian taste and realization, even of a middle-level production. Other elements to support the presence of Venetian workshops, or, on the other hand the artisans’ mobility, can be gained by studying the morphology of the letters. The module is uniform, the words are separated with equilibrated spaces emphasized by the presence of a small triangle, visible also in Leonardo Loredan’s and Zaccaria Loredan’s epigraphs. Moreover, an important indication is the form of the “R,” reproducing the model of the Humanistic Capital absent in other epigraphs of local origin, mentioned above. The attribution of this product to a Venetian workshop or, more probably, to Venetian artisans, is supported further by its location, the Sea Door, realized by Venetian artisans. The choice to create a monumental entrance on the seafront should have been a strong symbolic message to the ships approaching the most important port of that period, showing the richness, the power, and the culture of the Serenissima.

---

8 RIZZI suggests a comparison between the Famagusta sea door and the main door of the Venetian arsenal. PAPACOSTAS supported this suggestion with more specific architectural comparisons during the workshop on the collective project Medieval Famagusta, 25-26 October 2008, Nicosia.
Figure 12: Main façade of the Venetian ‘Arsenale’
Nearby Famagusta, there is another interesting example to consider. It is a fragmentary epigraph commemorating a General Captain of the island, a member of the Contarin family (IMHAUS & SOLOMIDOU-IERONYMIDOU 2004, Fiche 723; 660). The text can be completed as follows:

[---] CONTARENO /  
[REGNI] CYPRI /  
[PRAEFE]CTUS

The first name is missing, and it is difficult to designate the exact person since the inscription could refer to Lorenzo Contarin, General Captain in 1501, but equally to Bartolo Contarin, who had the same position in 1518. The text presents a poor knowledge of the Latin language. Usually, these kinds of texts provide the name and the political position of the subject expressed in temporal significance; here, just the name is in this form, while the charge is in a nominative case. If we consider, then, the technical characteristics, we notice that the uniform furrow was made to be filled with metal, which is currently lost. The writing shows the artisan’s essay to reproduce the Humanistic Capital, usually employed in these texts, but without a satisfying result. The module is not squared, the letters are not equally separated, including an “NT” ligature characteristic of the Roman Capital and not of the Humanistic one. The final proof is the form of the “R,” here traced with the descendent line curved on the external side, as typical of the Roman Capital. This kind of writing clearly demonstrates the inability of the artisan to realize a Humanistic Capital.

Figure 13: Venetian column at Konak Square, Nicosia, mid 16th century

Two examples differing from those already considered are located in Nicosia. The first inscription is located on the hexagonal base of the Venetian column in Konak Square (IMHAUS & SOLOMIDOU-IERONYMIDOU 2004, Fiche 702; 653) (Figure 13).
As mentioned before, this column—like at least two other on the island—was surmounted by a lion, as the Venetian Republic used to do in the main cities under their rule. It was erected between 1547 and 1549. When the Ottomans conquered the island, they took away the lion and left the column still standing. Around the base, it is possible to read a sort of warning, as the Republic used to do in its territories (Gerola 1932, 301-389). The text, much like a motto, says:

“FIDES INCORRUPTA NON PULCHRITUDO NON HUJUS UBERTAS SPECETUR INCOLAR”.

The text is realized in Humanistic Capital, defined by a squared module but presenting elements characteristic of the Roman Capital, such as ligatures and small lettering. As mentioned before, these elements started to appear in the Humanistic Capital due to resistance opposed to this kind of script by the Roman Capital. Even in this case, thanks to a careful observation, it is possible to notice the non-uniform module, not even in the small letters. The module and letters morphology appear to be uncertain. The “V” furrow is uniform and does not create the chiaroscuro effect. These elements, once again, are suggestive of a local workshop copying models directly supplied by the centre, Venice.

The second inscription is a complex example currently visible at the Kyrenia Gate (Imhaus & Solomidou-Jeronymidou 2004, Fiche 702bis, 653) (Figure 14). It is composed of two different fragments of an epigraph. The upper part is a four-line text fragment. The Humanistic Capital used is defined by the “V” furrow, quite uniform, created to be filled with metal as demonstrated by the small holes still visible along the furrow. The script is rich in ligatures and included letters and, as in the previous example, some elements such as the uniform furrow, the non-constant module, and the uncertain definition of some letters (principally the “X” in line 3), indicating the presence of a local workshop. This kind of local production could reproduce prototypes such as the lower part of the inscription. This fragmentary part is equally realized in a Humanistic Capital with more or less the same characteristics: included letters and ligatures. Here, however, the “V” furrow has a different thickness to create the chiaroscuro effect; the module is uniform, and the definition of the letters look clear. In the last line, it is possible to see some sort of floral motifs separating the numerals of the chronological date, as present in the Greek inscription of Tommaso Rangone in Venice (Figure 6). Further researches on photographic and archival documents will be probably able to define when was made the renovation of the gate and the reconstruction of the two manufactures-epigraph now visible on the gate. A photo by Haigaz Mangoian, around 1930,

---

9 Such examples are present in Crete.
shows a very different Kerynia Gate, without the “Venetian” epigraph (BONATO ET AL. 2011, 83).

Some other examples are for instance those related to the Podocatharo family, containing the Humanistic Capital, the lion, and Venice. They are of Cypriot origin but strictly connected with Venice, principally for economic reasons (ARBEL 1989a, 187-189; 1989b, 135-138). In the commemorative stone located in Agia Marina in Thersephanou are visible the arms of the family containing a lion. In the lower frame, there is an inscription imitating the form of the Humanistic Capital with modest results. It is a local product (IMHAUS & SOLOMIDOU-IERONYMIDOU 2004, Fiche 708; 656). The last example is located in Nicosia, in the well-known house of Hadjigeorgakis Kornesios, another coat of arms of the Podocatharo family. The main representation is a Venetian crowned lion, more similar to a cat, holding its book with the motto in Romanic Capital (Figure 15).

Figure 14: The inscription at the Kyrenia Gate, Nicosia, mid 16th century (?)
Figure 15: Coats of arms of the Podocatharos family (Hadjigeorgakis Kornesios Museum, Nicosia)
Conclusions

From the present analysis, it is possible to trace the epigraphic strategy adopted by the Serenissima Republic in Cyprus. The aim was primarily to promote their power and control on the island and, secondly, to underline their public interventions through realization of urban works, such as the Famagusta city walls and the Konak Square in Nicosia. The government of Venice conducted this operation using the same model already tested in Venice: the figure of the lion and the Humanistic Capital, often associated together. Moreover, the choice to distribute the epigraphs along the city walls was not occasional. That location ensured great visibility and a symbolic value: To enter the city, you had to pass under the lions and the epigraphs. This consideration explains, once more, the elegant complexity of the Venetian workmanship on the Famagusta Sea Door, the most important entrance. This work was useful to individual local workshops that were producing epigraphs from Venetian models. More specific and wide investigations will enrich this preliminary report with materials regarding local productions as well as technical aspects, in order to better define the presence of local and Venetian workshops rather than artisans’ mobility.

In Nicosia, as well the two surviving inscriptions, confirm the pre-eminence of the symbolic value of their form as identifying element of the Republic. The text on the base of the column in Konak Square is an example of that, with the Humanistic Capital, associated with the lion, holding the entire monument from the base. Another significant example is the epigraph on the Kerynia Gate. The reconstructed text has no determined meaning, but its form symbolizes the Venetian State through the epigraphic script, even if not associated with the lion.

The Venetian government succeeded its aim: to represent and symbolise their authority by introducing a distinct element. With the Humanistic Capital the Republic differentiated itself from the previous rulers, who were associated with the Uncialesque script. Moreover, Venice initially decided not to produce bilingual epigraphs in Cyprus in contrast to Venice and Crete. This choice was probably due to the moderate spread of Latin knowledge in the local population; the majority, in fact, was able to speak the language while nearly everybody was able to recognize, if not read, the Latin letters because of the long-lasting commercial exchanges with Venice (ARBEL 1986; 1989).10

---

10 At least in Nicosia and Famagusta the integration was also provide thanks to the urban assemblies accepting local members.
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