

Charis p 10/555 X0

REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS

MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS  
AND WORKS

REPORT OF THE  
DEPARTMENT OF ANTIQUITIES  
CYPRUS, 1987



PUBLISHED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ANTIQUITIES, CYPRUS  
AND

PRINTED BY ZAVALLIS PRESS LTD., NICOSIA

1987

03 JUL. 1995



# Indentification d'échantillons de bois de cercueils

par Arlette PLU  
Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris

Echantillons de bois de cercueils provenant de écropole de Larnaca/Kition à Chypre, quartier *ghios Giorghios*, Tombe 4, sarcophages *b* et *c*, vés en octobre 1985 (1: sur couvercle de *b*; 2: coffre *c*).

Les deux échantillons de bois de cercueils exacts sont tous les deux en bois de conifères.

Bois légèrement carbonisé, en assez bon état de conservation. (Pl. LI: 3).

*Examen microscopique:* Bois à canaux sécréteurs, à parois minces, situés surtout dans le final, au voisinage de la limite d'accroissement. Aux horizontaux contenus dans certains rayons. Les ligneux hétérogènes: trachéides transversales breuses, en files marginales, à parois minces et dentées; 2 à 4 ponctuations pinoïdes à picéoides file moyenne par champ de croisement. Grandes ponctuations aréolées, unisériées, parfois bisériées, à parois radiales des trachéides du bois initial. Tous ces caractères permettent de reconnaître le bois de Pin, et plus spécialement de Pin Pignon: *Pinus pinea* E., famille des Pinacées.

Le Pin Pignon, appelé aussi Pin Pinier, Pin sol, est présent sur tout le pourtour de la Méditerranée, de la Péninsule Ibérique jusqu'à la Syrie. Il est utilisé pour ses pignes, et aussi comme arbre d'ornement. Le Pin Pignon produit un bois jaune-rougeâtre à grain grossier, employé surtout comme bois de chauffage.

2) Bois brun-clair doré, très abîmé par insectes et champignons. (Pl. LI: 4).

*Examen microscopique:* Bois sans canaux sécréteurs. Parfois des canaux traumatiques (non observés sur l'échantillon, étant donné son mauvais état de conservation). Rayons ligneux soit unisériés soit bisériés, assez hauts (environ 50 cellules), hétérogènes: quelques trachéides transversales à parois minces et lisses, sur une file, en marge des plus hauts rayons; 2 à 6 ponctuations taxodioides par champ de croisement. Grandes ponctuations aréolées, unisériées, parfois bisériées sur les parois radiales des trachéides du bois initial. A fort grossissement on peut observer des ponctuations aréolées avec *torus lobé* (torus à bord crénelé), ce qui est caractéristique du genre *Cedrus*.

Le genre *Cedrus* (famille des Pinacées) ne comprend que quatre espèces dont trois se retrouvent dans les montagnes des régions méditerranéennes. En Afrique du nord on rencontre le Cèdre de l'Atlas: *Cedrus atlantica* Manetti. En Asie Mineure, dans le Taurus, dans les montagnes de Syrie et du nord du Liban se trouve le Cèdre du Liban: *Cedrus libani* Barrel. Le Cèdre de Chypre: *Cedrus brevifolia* Henry se distingue du Cèdre du Liban par des dimensions plus réduites de toutes ses parties et une croissance plus lente. Ce serait une espèce spéciale à cette île.

De couleur jaune-roux, le bois de Cèdre est un excellent bois d'œuvre qui, dans l'Antiquité, a été très largement utilisé. L'identification de cet échantillon sera: *Cedrus* sp. cf. *Cedrus brevifolia* Henry.

## NICOCLES AND PTOLEMY - REMARKS ON THE EARLY HISTORY OF NEA PAPHOS\*

According to Strabo and Pausanias the foundation of Nea Paphos, the capital of Cyprus in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, took place just after the Trojan War.<sup>1</sup> Until not so long ago this had been the prevailing view.<sup>2</sup> However, more recent investigations have brought to light ample material pointing to the end of the 4th cent. B.C. as a possible date for the official foundation of the town.<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, the excavations at Palaepaphos have demonstrated beyond a doubt that the old capital of the Paphian kingdom has a remote history.<sup>4</sup> As for Nea Paphos scholars usually agree, following in this T.B. Mitford,<sup>5</sup> that the foundation of the town may be linked with the reign of king Nicocles, the last local ruler of the Paphian kingdom, who wanted a new town to serve as his economic and political capital, while Palaepaphos retained its religious importance associated with the famous temple of Aphrodite.<sup>6</sup> Quoted as supporting this hypothesis were Nicocles' efforts to assert an independent policy of his own and his building activities in various parts of his kingdom.<sup>7</sup> Additional proof was seen in the fact that when Ptolemy Soter's army destroyed the neighbouring city of Marion in 313/312 B.C. its population was transferred to Paphos.<sup>8</sup> This had been interpreted as a reward granted to Nicocles for his faithful services to the Egyptian ruler.<sup>9</sup> I must admit to having shared this view for quite some time. However, a reappraisal of archaeological remains in and near Nea Paphos, a reevaluation of historical data pertaining to the last quarter of the 4th cent. B.C. combined with the results of more recent studies<sup>10</sup> make me see the role of the last Paphian king as founder and builder of an entirely new town — Nea Paphos — in a somewhat different light.

The survey of the archaeological remains pertaining to the earliest history of the town<sup>11</sup> may be summarized as follows. Although within the area encompassed by the Nea Paphos town walls no direct architectural proof of an early settlement has been found as yet, some scattered finds of pottery sherds, terracottas and coins have been reported. They have been tentatively assigned to the Classical and even Archaic period.<sup>12</sup> Recently, the Polish Mission uncovered flint blades in the lowest layer beneath the Villa of Theseus, near bedrock. In the immediate vicinity of Nea Paphos there have been found remains which — barring an even earlier neolithic settlement<sup>13</sup> — date from the Geometric, Archaic and Classical periods. These remains are: — a large cemetery of the late 11th-early 3rd cent.

B.C., situated only two and a half kilometres north of Nea Paphos; it must have belonged to an im-

\* The abbreviated text of this paper entitled "The beginnings of Nea Paphos" was read during the XII International Congress of Classical Archaeology in Athens in 1983. It will be published in the Acts of the Congress in an even more abbreviated form. Since the date of this publication is still unknown, I have decided to publish a more complete version in the *RDAC*. In the meantime other studies concerning our subject directly or indirectly have been published. I wish to mention here particularly: F. G. Maier, V. Karageorghis, *Paphos. History and Archaeology* (1984), esp. 222ff.; W. A. Daszewski et al., *RDAC* 1984, esp. 301-4 and *ibid.*, Mlynarczyk 309-11; J. Mlynarczyk, "Remarks on the Classical settlement on the site of Nea Paphos", *Archaeologia Cyprica* 1 (1985), 69-78; *id.*, Remarks on the town plan of Hellenistic Nea Paphos, in *Proceedings of the 2nd Congress of Cypriot Studies* (Πρακτικά του Δευτέρου...), (1985), 317-25; W. A. Daszewski, "Researches at Nea Paphos 1965-1984" in *Archaeology in Cyprus 1960-1985* (1985), esp. 277-81; F. G. Maier, *AltPaphos auf Cypern* (6 Trierer Winckelmanns Pr.) 1985, (also for a complete bibliography).

1. Strabo 14, 6, 3; Paus. 8, 5, 2.
2. Cf. for instance I. K. Peristianis, *Kypriaka Chronika* 5 (1927), 29.
3. J. H. Iliffe, T. B. Mitford, *Liverpool Libraries, Museums and Arts Committee Bull.* 2 (1952), 32ff.; J. Bérard *RA* 43 (1954), 3ff.; J. Deshayes, *La nécropole de Ktima* (1963), 11; Mitford, *OpAth* 3 (1960), 204; K. Nicolaou, "The topography of Nea Paphos", *Mélanges K. Michalowski* (1966), 561ff.; K. Michalowski, *Poland* 4/140 (1960), 44; W. A. Daszewski, *RDAC* 1968, 33ff.; Z. Kapera, *Etudes et Travaux* 2 (1968), 130ff.
4. F. G. Maier in *Chypre des origines* (1975), 38-43; V. Karageorghis, *Ancient Cyprus* (1981), 63f., 66ff., 105f., 112; Maier, *AltPaphos o.c.*; V. Karageorghis, *Palaepaphos-Skales. An Iron Age Cemetery in Cyprus, (Ausgrabungen in Alt Paphos, ed. F. G. Maier, Bd. 3)* (1983).
5. Mitford, *OpAth* 3, (1960), 198, 204f.
6. O. Masson, *Les inscriptions chypriotes syllabique* (repr. 1983), 94; Nicolaou, *Topography, o.c.*, 564.
7. Inscriptions referring to the building activities of the king, see Mitford, *OpAth* 3 (1960), 200-3.
8. Diod. 19, 79, 4; G. Hill, *The History of Cyprus* (1949), 164.
9. Mitford, *OpAth* 3 (1960), 204; Nicolaou, *Topography, o.c.*, 564; Kapera, *o.c.*, 140.
10. In particular: H. Gesche, *Chiron* 4 (1974), 103ff.; O. Morkholm, *Chiron* 8 (1978), 135ff.
11. In his study on the topography of Nea Paphos K. Nicolaou does not discuss this matter sufficiently limiting himself to the description of Hellenistic and Roman remains. A detailed study was prepared in 1980 as a doctoral thesis at Warsaw University (as yet unpublished) by a member of the Polish Mission to Kato Paphos, Miss Jolanta Mlynarczyk. Her study will be published in the forthcoming volume of Nea Paphos (= III. Polish Excavations) "Nea Paphos in the Hellenistic period".
12. Cf. Bérard, *RA* 43 (1954), 6; Mitford, *OpAth* 3 (1960), 204; *BCH* 89 (1965), 297; *BCH* 102 (1978), 928. Unpublished terracotta figurines representing horse-riders and birds, described as of the Archaic and Classical periods, were supposedly found in the area of Kato Paphos. They are now in the Paphos Archaeological Museum (inv. nos 207, 210, 212, 213); cf. also Mlynarczyk, *o.c.*, 95 n. 6. I have been kindly informed by Dr I. Nicolaou that coins of king Timarchos (350-325 B.C.), Nicocles' father, were found at Nea Paphos during excavations in the area of the House of Dionysos. It is obvious that these early coins could have been in use for quite some time, hence their discovery alone does not prove the existence of an early settlement; if combined with other discoveries, however, their finding acquires additional importance.
13. P. Dikaïos, *RDAC* 1936, part 1, 79.

settlement situated on the site of the town of Ktima-Paphos.<sup>14</sup> of tombs located about 1 km east of Nea in the *Ellinika* and *Alonia tou Episkopou* although never investigated properly, some can be assigned through comparative most probably to the Classical period. One among these tombs is the sanctuary of Hylates, which is dated by an inscription later part of the 4th cent. B.C. and which is mentioned in one of these early tombs.<sup>15</sup> Tombs which can be identified inside the underground complex of catacombs known as Koloni and Aghios Lambrianos, situated in the northern part of Nea Paphos. The earliest of these catacombs can be assigned probably to the 5th and the 4th cent. B.C.<sup>16</sup> A series of rock-cut tombs which can probably be identified in the western part of Nea in the area of the House of Dionysos and the E-W street as well as just west of the Kolones castle.<sup>17</sup> Assuming that the tombs were situated outside the inhabited zone, their positioning would indicate the broad limits of the early settlement, most probably of the 4th cent. B.C., preceding the official foundation of Paphos. This settlement must have been located within the south-eastern part of the island, around a natural bay with two streams flowing into it.<sup>18</sup> On the west it was bordered by the peninsula, which was originally more prominent for the northern end of the bay, now largely silted up, had once cut deeply into the sea. On the north the settlement extended to the catacombs and on the east it was bounded by a stream once flowing into the sea at the present harbour.<sup>20</sup> On both sides of the settlement there had existed two cult centres, probably predating the official foundation of Paphos. They had one feature in common: one was dedicated to Apollo Hylates, the other to Agrotera, both patron gods of wildlife, and forests. This fact may suggest that the sanctuaries had been initially located outside the inhabited area.<sup>21</sup> The early settlement delimited by the tombs was located in a village, developing near a comfortable protected natural anchorage, which offered fresh water to their crews. One may assume that this natural harbour was used by the inhabitants of an early town which had developed on the site of modern Paphos. Here one can discern a similarity to early settlement in the region. Towns were usually located inland on promontories dominating the agricultural plain. At the same time

they were usually provided with an anchorage or a harbour in the nearest possible vicinity.<sup>22</sup> Such is the situation of Palaepaphos and such was also the situation of the early settlement which had existed on the site of the modern Yeroskipou village. Of these three places, the area of Nea Paphos had the most favourable conditions.

When in the later part of the 4th cent. B.C. the general situation in the Eastern Mediterranean changed dramatically due to Alexander's conquests and the ensuing conflicts over his legacy among his generals, Cyprus found itself in the middle of the struggles. Sea connections began to play a role greater than ever. The region of Paphos found itself directly involved, since it was geographically predisposed to give support to ships navigating from Egyptian Alexandria to Rhodes and the Aegean and from Rhodes eastward along the southern coast of Cyprus. The only place where a large and convenient harbour town could have been developed easily was the emplacement of our early settlement — the later Nea Paphos. Thus, as a result of economic pressures, the population of the upper town must have in all probability gradually descended towards the sea.<sup>23</sup> It was the administrative frame that king Nicocles wanted to establish in order to speed up and facilitate this phenomenon.

A more precise date can perhaps be given for this happening. Alexander died in 323 B.C. Immediately after his death the role of the central government was still preponderant, but soon it was to be challenged by the provincial satraps. One of the first to oppose central authority was Ptolemy of Egypt. In 321 B.C., endangered by a forthcoming attack by Perdikkas, he concluded an alliance with four Cypriot kings — Nicocreon of Salamis, Nicocles of Paphos, Pasikrates of Soli and Androkles of Amathus.<sup>24</sup> The direct outcome of this alliance in Cyprus is not known, but it must have rather strengthened the position of the allied kings when their friend Ptolemy rose in power after the assassination of Perdikkas and the subjugation of the Cyrene region.<sup>25</sup> At this time Ptolemy, had he even contemplated such a move, did not yet lay open claim to Cyprus. The island remained fairly independent. Some kind of political vacuum and further weakening of the central government, particularly after Antipater's death in 319 B.C.,<sup>26</sup> had the result of reviving the independent aspirations of local rulers, a fact best illustrated by the autonomous coinage of Pumiathon of Kition and Nicocles of Paphos.<sup>27</sup> In the case of the Paphian king it was at first, as G. Hill puts it, a rather "furtive kind of assertion of independence",<sup>28</sup> since on the usual Alexander tetradrachms issued probably around 320 B.C.<sup>29</sup> he concealed his name in microscopic characters in the lion's mane. Later, however, he became bolder and sometime around 317/316 B.C.<sup>30</sup> issued a series of fine coins showing a turreted head of Aphrodite and, on the reverse, a figure of Apollo

seated on the omphalos and the inscription "Nicocleous Paphion".<sup>31</sup> I think that it was probably at this time, between 321/320 and 316/315 B.C. that Nicocles may have decided to enlarge the early settlement and make a new town out of it.<sup>32</sup> The grid of the original streets<sup>33</sup> shows an orthogonal type of plan composed of regular insulae cut by a network of perpendicular streets.<sup>34</sup> It shows one particular

14. The so-called Iskender necropolis and perhaps also the Vasiliko tombs which resemble the "Tombs of the Kings" at Kato Paphos, cf. Bérard, *o.c.*; Deshayes, *o.c.*, 237ff. and esp. 242; Nicolaou, *Topography*, *o.c.*, 561 and 601.
15. Mitford, *OpAth* 3 (1960), 204; Masson, *ICS*, 96-99; Nicolaou, *Topography*, *o.c.*, 583f.; Kapera, *o.c.*, 137; J. Młynarczyk, *RDAC* 1980, 247-51. For the tombs see L. de Mas Latrie, *L'île de Chypre* (1879), 24f.; M. de Vogue, *Mél. d'Arch. Or.* 4 (1868), 98; D. G. Hogarth, M. R. James, *JHS* 9, 264; D. G. Hogarth, *Devia Cypria* (1888), 69f.; I. K. Peristianis, *Genike Historia tes Nesou Kyprou* (1910), 414; *id.*, *Kypriaka Chronika* 5 (1927), 29f.; E. Oberhammer, *RE* sv. Paphos, col. 945f.; Młynarczyk, thesis, *o.c.*, 116ff.
16. It is to be noted that Mitford, who dated the inscription from the Sanctuary of Apollo, suggested that this sanctuary is either contemporary with the foundation of Nea Paphos or precedes its foundation and could be linked with some settlement or village situated in the area later occupied by the town. Since the sanctuary was arranged in a disused tomb, it is obvious that at least the necropolis to which this tomb had belonged was contemporary with the early settlement.
17. Nicolaou, *Topography*, *o.c.*, 591; for a new and convincing interpretation, see Młynarczyk's thesis *o.c.*, 120ff. where she analyzes the catacombs, distinguishes the earliest parts and compares them to the tombs of the early necropolis near Ktima (cf. Deshayes, *o.c.*, Tombe I, pl. 4 and Tombe 9, pl. 9) and to the tombs at Kouklia and Marion (cf. Hogarth, James, *JHS* 9, *o.c.*).
18. Nicolaou, *Topography*, *o.c.*, 596; *id.*, *RDAC* 1967, 103. These rockcut chambers were interpreted by the excavators as quarries or underground household chambers, or sanctuaries, which indeed may be true as far as their secondary function is concerned, that is after they ceased being used as tombs. An idea of the date of these chambers can be formed if one remembers that an early Hellenistic pebble mosaic was found at a level above them. This mosaic pavement had apparently belonged to a house datable to the phase of the earliest building activity in the town. For the mosaic, see V. Karageorghis, *BCH* 102 (1978), 930; also D. Salzmann, *Untersuchungen zu den Antiken Kieselmosaiken* (1982), 126, no. S 3 (late 4th-early 3rd cent. B.C.). For Saranda Kolones, I owe this information to A.H.S. Megaw. It will be published by him in the forthcoming "Chronique" of V. Karageorghis in *BCH*.
19. The possibility of the existence of an early settlement on the site of Nea Paphos was suggested by Mitford, *OpAth* 3 (1960), 204; *id.*, *BICS* 7 (1961), 9, n. 14; also Młynarczyk, thesis, *o.c.*, 123f.
20. W. A. Daszewski, "Port główny i przystanie pomocnicze w Nea Paphos w świetle obserwacji podwodnych (The main harbour and auxiliary harbours in Nea Paphos in the light of underwater observations)", *Meander* 6 (1981), 327-36.
21. Generally speaking, the settlement corresponds roughly to the southern part of the modern village of Kato Paphos. However, the morphology of this area has changed since antiquity. Of the two original streams none exists at present, while the bay, which once reached the foot of the mound with the Byzantine castle, is now silted up, shallow and very much smaller. The stream situated to the east dried out and disappeared beneath constructions long ago. The one in the centre of the village was still partly visible some twenty years ago terminating in marshes near the harbour. Historical sources reveal that in the early 10th cent. A.D. the water supply must have still been quite abundant since the Arabs on their return voyage from the siege of Thessalonika stopped over and bathed at Paphos (Joannes Com., *De excidio Thessalonicensi* c. 77, ed. Bonn 596).
22. For Apollo Hylates, see above n. 15. For Artemis Agrotera, Mitford, *OpAth* 3 (1960), 200-5; Masson, *ICS*, 95f.; Nicolaou, *Topography*, *o.c.*, 586; Młynarczyk, thesis, *o.c.*, 238. Both sanctuaries date to the later part of the 4th cent. B.C., but are most probably a continuation of an earlier cult there. One may guess that in antiquity the areas where both the sanctuaries had been located looked rather like the present-day Lara peninsula or Cap Akamas with their forests, bushes, rocks and wild game.
23. Strabo 14.6. Palaepaphos had not a harbour but a hyphormos, cf. recently F. G. Maier, V. Karageorghis, *Paphos. History and Archaeology* (1984), *passim*.

24. The cemetery near the town of Ktima is assigned to the period from the end of the 11th to the early 3rd cent. B.C. The most flourishing period in the town's development seems to have been that of the 8-6th cent. B.C., then a certain hiatus in Classical times and a substantial decrease in population are to be noted. cf. Deshayes, *o.c.*, 242.
25. Arrian (= Jacoby, *FGH* 156 F 10).
26. Diod. 18, 36, 5; for Cyrene *id.* 18, 21, 9.
27. Diod. 18, 48, 4. The Cypriot kings must have been fairly free to pursue their own policies. We learn that Eumenes, Ptolemy's enemy, could recruit mercenaries on the island in 318 B.C. (Diod. 18, 61, 4).
28. Naturally, these were not unique, though perhaps the most characteristic among such issues. Other kings, including Nicocreon of Salamis, Eunostos of Soli, Stasioecus of Marion or Praxippus of Lapethos also issued their own coins, cf. *BMC Cyprus*, pls 40, 41, 53, 54, 60, 62, 112-114, 117; Morkholm, *o.c.*, 145.
29. Hill, *o.c.*, 164 and pl. 5: 4.
30. The early dating of these coins as suggested by E. T. Newell, supported by new arguments given recently by O. Morkholm (*Chiron*, 8 *o.c.*) is more convincing than the late dating suggested by H. Gesche (*Chiron* 4 *o.c.*) if reconsidered in a wider spectrum of politics during the last two decades of the 4th cent. B.C. For Newell, see Reattribution of certain tetradrachms of Alexander the Great, 1912 (extr. from *AJN* 45 (1911); 46, (1912); *id.* in *NC* (1915), 294-322; *id.*, The dated Alexander coinage of Sidon and Acco, *Yale Oriental Series, Researches* II (1916); *id.*, "Nicocles, king of Paphos", *NC* (1919), 64-5; "Alexander hoards II", Demanhur 1905, *NNM* 19 (1923); also J. F. M. May, "The Alexander Coinage of Nicocles of Paphos", *NC* (1952), 1-18. More recently Morkholm, *o.c.* as opposed to H. Gesche, *o.c.*, who dates these coins to ca. 313/312-310/309 B.C.
31. The arguments for such a dating given by Morkholm (*Chiron*, *o.c.*, 146), as opposed to a later dating around 310 B.C., are very convincing.
32. *BMC Cyprus*, pl. 22: 10; Masson, *OpAth* 8 (1968), 116-8; Gesche, *Chiron* 4, *o.c.*, 111, n. 29.
33. The turreted crown of Aphrodite may commemorate the fortification of the new city, but such a representation would not have been, as Hill, *o.c.* 164f. points out, anything "new on Cyprus; for we see on the coins of Euagoras II and his successors a goddess, who can hardly be any but Aphrodite, wearing a battlement crown". Aphrodite on Nicocles' coins is a reference to the city of Palaepaphos, the fortifications of which underwent serious repairs during Nicocles' reign as suggested by an inscription on an altar from Palaepaphos (Mitford, *OpAth* 3 (1960), 198, n. 5, 203, no. 2, also see Gesche, *Chiron* 4 *o.c.*, 111-2). Archaeological investigations of the main gate at Palaepaphos indicate a strengthening of the walls in the second half of the 4th cent. B.C. (see F. G. Maier, *RDAC* 1973, 190; *id.*, in *Proceedings of the First Congress of Cypriot Studies* (1972), 97). K. Nicolaou (*Topography*, *o.c.* 572) is of the opinion that the above inscription refers to the fortifications of Nea Paphos.
34. The elaboration of the grid mentioned here was finalized by Miss J. Młynarczyk on the basis of our discoveries made in the Maloutena area while excavating a Late Roman Palace (Villa of Theseus). Also taken into consideration were the discoveries made by K. Nikolaou in the area of the House of Dionysos as well as all the visible remains in other parts of the town and aerial photographs. The Hellenistic grid had not changed much since its establishment early in the Hellenistic times.
35. For the first suggestion of an orthogonal town-plan of Nea Paphos, cf. W. A. Daszewski, "Dawna stolica Cypru..." in *Meander* 33 (1978), 171-87. The size of the insulae — after the latest correction — was probably about 30 × 80 m. Average street width was 3-6 m.; the largest streets were 12-20 m. wide.

re which cannot be explained upon morphological functional grounds alone. The plan was composed of two distinct parts oriented differently (NE-SW-SE and N-S/E-W).<sup>35</sup> The NE part strangely coincides with the hypothetical emplacement of the settlement and may represent the earliest part of the town established by Nicocles. The SW sector may have been added soon afterwards when the town received its final shape. These are merely suppositions, but if one considers the whole area contained within the town walls and embracing both parts, one finds that the town must have had over 100 ha,<sup>36</sup> while the harbour had an additional 22 ha more.<sup>37</sup> Nea Paphos thus appears to be without parallel in the ancient world, still three times larger than Priene, twice as large as Olynthus and larger than the fortified area of Miletus. Its main streets were 12 and even 20m. wide, just like the streets of important cities such as Athens or Alexandria.<sup>38</sup> The question therefore arises whether Nicocles really needed such a great town or whether the whole project was but an extension of his drive to independence, wealth and power, or whether there were still other reasons for the town and the harbour in particular had been planned so big.<sup>39</sup>

Competing with Antigonus for influence on Cyprus, Ptolemy formed in 315 B.C. a new coalition with the most powerful kings of the island.<sup>40</sup> Only Nicocreon is mentioned by name, but one may guess that the kings of Paphos, Soli and Amathus were associated. Ptolemy's army on Cyprus operated under the command of Menelaus, his brother, and Demetrius.<sup>41</sup> Most of the island was subjugated. Cerynia and Lapethos were taken, Kition besieged, the city of Marion temporarily won over to Ptolemy's side. This soon changed however. In 313 B.C. Ptolemy himself with a large army had to cross over to Egypt to fight against those other Cypriot kings who refused to obey him. Ptolemy's army was defeated, the command of Menelaus, his brother, and Demetrius.<sup>42</sup> Most of the island was subjugated. Cerynia and Lapethos were taken, Kition besieged, the city of Marion temporarily won over to Ptolemy's side. This soon changed however. In 313 B.C. Ptolemy himself with a large army had to cross over to Egypt to fight against those other Cypriot kings who refused to obey him. Ptolemy's army was defeated, the command of Menelaus, his brother, and Demetrius.<sup>43</sup> H. Hauben in her article on Nicocles and Nicocreon, in attempting to find reasons for Nicocles' "sudden" reversal of allegiance from Ptolemy to Antigonus, concludes that it was this last disappointment that brought him to the path of treason and eventually led to his

suicidal death in 310/309 B.C.<sup>44</sup>

It seems to me that the true reason for his death, and for the fact that Nicocreon and not Nicocles was so richly rewarded, had been germinating in the global policy of Ptolemy for quite some time. The Cyprus campaign of 315-313 B.C. was not an isolated episode, but part of a larger war effort by Ptolemy, Lysimachus, Cassander and Seleucos to crush Antigonus in Asia.<sup>45</sup> Antigonus himself, just like Ptolemy, attempted to secure the collaboration of various Cypriot kings. At the same time he hastened to organize his naval force.<sup>46</sup> He therefore established three shipyards in Phoenicia: in Tripoli, Byblos and

For comparison of insulae sizes in *Dura Europos*, Miletus, Magnesia ad-Macander, Antioch, Priene, Olynthus see R. Martin, *L'Urbanisme dans la Grèce antique* (1974), 123.

35. A different orientation of various parts of the town is to be found in other places as well, but can be explained by reasons of topography and function, i.e. Piraeus (cf. Martin, *op. cit.*, 107 ff. and fig. 7) or Cnidus (both the island and mainland parts) (*ibid.*, pl. 31; also *AJA* 72 (1968), fig. 23, pl. 59). In Paphos there was no need to adapt the plan to the topography.

The two parts do not seem to have clearly defined differing functions. In the south-western area we were able to identify small private dwellings and workshops, while epigraphic evidence suggested also the existence of religious buildings. This sort of buildings was to be found in other parts of the town as well. Both parts of the town adjoin the harbour. Thus, a greater concentration of public buildings could have been found in both parts, especially in the sector adjoining the port and along the common border of both the districts. This may be suggested by the size of the insulae in this area, which is greater than elsewhere (observation made by Młynarczyk, thesis, *op. cit.*). However, the slightly different orientation of the western part of the town (a deviation from the E-W axis) might have been caused by a desire to protect the inhabitants from strong westerly winds predominating in this region. It would thus have been a practical implementation of one of the principles of ancient town-planning (Vitruvius 1, 6).

36. Nicolaou, *Topography*, *op. cit.* 567, gives 95 ha, but he apparently includes the silted up part of the harbour. The city walls, which were obviously traced at one time in the earliest phase of the town's existence, embraced the entire town. They conform to the topography of the peninsula and result from the needs of defence. This does not, however, imply that the whole area *intra muros* was inhabited or that it was covered by the street system. Examples of other Hellenistic centres demonstrate that such a situation was not infrequent.

37. This includes the silted up area, well visible on aerial photographs, on the east and north of the present harbour.

38. R. Martin, *op. cit.*, 116f.

39. I was able to check and measure the harbour myself (including underwater observations).

What remains of the breakwaters is sometimes preserved only just under water surface. The eastern branch is some 480m. long (the top is under water); Nicolaou, *Topography*, *op. cit.*, 578 gives 350m. The western branch is composed of two parts. The one stretching E-W is ca. 235m. long, the branch stretching south of it — ca. 50m. long. Nicolaou does not differentiate the two parts and gives ca. 170 as its preserved length. The width of the breakwater is 5-10m., in places probably as much as 15m. (for details see above n. 19).

40. Diod. 19, 59, 1.

41. *Id.*, 19, 62, 4; also *id.*, 19, 62, 56.

42. Diod. 19, 78, 4-5.

43. See above n. 9; also Gesche, *Chiron* 4 *op. cit.*, 111 and n. 29; *id.*, 112 n. 33.

44. Gesche, *op. cit.*, 111-2.

45. See also remarks of D. Van Berchem in *Chypre des origines au Moyen Age* (1975), 54.

46. Diod. 19, 58, 1-5, writes about Antigonus that "it so happened that his enemies then ruled the sea with many ships, but that he had, altogether, not even a few" (Loeb ed. transl. by Russell M. Geer).

Sydon. The fourth one was in Cilicia, the fifth in Rhodes. Since Antigonus had a firm grip on the Phoenician coast, had forces in Cilicia and controlled the supply of timber, it thus became vital for Ptolemy to have his own naval base — other than Alexandria — in the region and a steady supply of materials for ship construction. The nearest, safest and by far the best spot was Paphos, since it not only had a relatively large natural harbour, but was rich in timber for shipbuilding also. By 315 B.C. Ptolemy had fully understood that it was primarily in his interest to develop Nea Paphos and to do so in accordance with his own needs. Assuming that Nicocles had enlarged the earlier Classical settlement into his new town sometime between 321 and 316 B.C., he most probably had neither the time to build such a huge harbour nor the need for one. Nor could he, even had he had the resources, completed the extensive works on the fortifications.

If the original plan of the town was designed according to Nicocles' wishes, it must have been under Ptolemy's instigation that it became final and was fully put into life. The process was continued under the latter's successors. This is probably then the real reason why Ptolemy Soter transferred the inhabitants of Marion to Paphos. They were to speed up the building of a town-base for his Mediterranean fleet and create a foothold for him on Cyprus. It also seems very likely that Nicocles' aspirations to independence generated Ptolemy's hidden mistrust a long time before the latter actually forced the Paphian king to commit suicide. Planning to dominate Cyprus, he could neither tolerate for long nor ignore local rulers with independent ideas. This attitude was born out dramatically by the fate of other Cypriot

kings. The magnitude of harbour works and fortifications at Nea Paphos and the final town-plan suggest a possibility that both may have resulted from Ptolemy's aggrandizement of Nicocles' initial foundation. That Ptolemy considered Nea Paphos his main operational naval base and foothold on Cyprus is best confirmed by the happenings of 306 B.C., when a new conflict with Antigonus and Demetrius broke out. Ptolemy came first to Paphos to assemble his fleet there before sailing to Kition and Salamis.<sup>47</sup> Later, it was Nea Paphos where Ptolemy Philadelphos built his largest ships and which Callicrates, admiral of the Ptolemaic navy, visited.<sup>48</sup> Therefore, it seems that the beginnings of Nea Paphos should be linked with Nicocles as much as with Ptolemy Soter and his son and successor Ptolemy Philadelphos, who finally implemented his father's ideas to the end. There is also a theoretical possibility that Demetrius, for reasons similar to Ptolemy's, contributed to the development of the town harbour and fortifications during the period when Cyprus and Nea Paphos were in his hands.

W. A. DASZEWSKI

47. Diod. 20, 49, 1. I think that in 313 B.C. Ptolemy also landed at Paphos since it was for ships coming from Alexandria the nearest and the largest port on Cyprus.

48. The ships — a triconteres and an eikoseres — were built by Pyrgoteles, to whom Ptolemy Philadelphos erected a statue in the temple of Aphrodite at Palaepaphos (O.G.I.S. 39; Hill, *op. cit.*, 173f.; Mitford, *BSA* 56 (1961), 9 n. 17; Nicolaou, *Topography*, *op. cit.*, 564). We also have an inscription upon an amphora concerning one Pritios, a shipbuilder at Nea Paphos (see *JHS* 72 (1952), 115; Mitford, *BSA* 56 (1961), 9 n. 17; Nicolaou, *Topography*, *op. cit.*, 564). For Callicrates, see H. Hauben, "Callicrates of Samos, a contribution to the study of the Ptolemaic admiralty", *Studia Hellenistica* 18 (1979); also Mitford, *The Inscriptions of Kourion* (1971), 117-8, no. 58; also *id.*, *BSA* 56 (1961), 9f.