

---

## Τεκμήρια

---

Τόμ. 2 (1996)

---

### Cypriot Kingship: Perspectives in the Classical Period

A. ZOURNATZI

doi: [10.12681/tekmeria.113](https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.113)

---

#### Βιβλιογραφική αναφορά:

ZOURNATZI, A. (1996). Cypriot Kingship: Perspectives in the Classical Period. *Τεκμήρια*, 2, 154–181.  
<https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.113>

CYPRIOI KINGSHIP: PERSPECTIVES IN THE CLASSICAL PERIOD

To Myriam and Jim

Writing in the first century before our era, Diodoros of Sicily reports that there existed on the island of Cyprus in the middle of the fourth century nine πόλεις ἀξιόλογοι (large cities), each ruled by a king who was a vassal of the Persian ruler.<sup>1</sup> From the written record - classical references, as well as Assyrian and Cypriot inscriptions, and the legends of Cypriot coinage<sup>2</sup> - we learn the names

---

*Acknowledgments.* The present paper was written during my stay at the Cyprus American Archaeological Research Institute (Nicosia) as a National Endowment for the Humanities Postdoctoral Fellow of the American Schools of Oriental Research in 1993-4. It was initially presented in a lecture in the Department of Classics of the University of Southern California (Los Angeles) in February 1994.

Dr. Patricia Maynor Bikai has been a precious advisor on "things Phoenician" over the past ten years. For advice and helpful comments in the preparation of this study thanks are further due to Ms. Kathleen McCaffrey and Professors Vassos Karageorghis, Marie-Christine Hellmann, Louisa D. Loukopoulou, James Ross and David Stronach, Drs. Hélène Cassimatis, Alison K. South and Louise Steele. I also wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to Professor David W. Rupp, both in terms of his published comments and his generous distribution of papers connected with studies in progress. To him I owe, in addition, map 2. The present reproduction of that map and map 1 were prepared by M. Y. Montmessin of the Maison de l'Orient Méditerranéen (Lyon). All other illustrations are reproduced with permission of the Cyprus Department of Antiquities (Pls: 1,4,7), the Bildarchiv Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin (Pl. 2), the British Museum (Pl. 3), the French Mission of Kition-Bamboula (Pl. 5), and the Trustees of the National Museums and Galleries on Merseyside, Liverpool (Pl. 6).

1. Diod. XVI 42.4, the reference is set to 351/0 B.C., at the time of the joint revolt of the Cypriots and Tenes of Sidon against the regime of Artaxerxes III (358-338 B.C.).

2. For the relevant Assyrian texts, see C. Saporetti, "Cipro nei testi neoassiri," *Studi Ciprioti e Rapporti di Scavo*, fasc. 2, Rome 1976, 83-88, and A.T. Reyes, *Archaic Cyprus. A Study of the Textual and Archaeological Evidence*, Oxford 1994, 49-60, with bibliography. O. Masson, *Inscriptions chypriotes syllabiques. Recueil critique et commenté*, 2nd ed. Paris 1983 (hereafter *ICS*<sup>3</sup>), is the basic reference for Cypro-syllabic inscriptions. The main collections and discussions of the Phoenician inscriptions from Cyprus are the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum* I, Paris 1881 (hereafter *CIS* I); A. Honeyman, "The Phoenician inscriptions of the Cyprus Museum", *Iraq* 6, 1939, 103-10; O. Masson and M. Szyner, *Recherches sur les Phéniciens à Chypre*, Geneva and Paris 1972 (hereafter *Recherches*); M.G. Guzzo Amadasi

of a total of thirteen major cities which existed in Cyprus in the archaic and classical periods (Map 1: Amathous, Khytroi, Idalion, Kyrenia, Kition, Kourion, Lapithos, Ledroi, Marion, Paphos (Palaipaphos), Salamis, Soloi, Tamassos).<sup>3</sup> Our sources also supply names of local kings, although complete dynastic sequences are not possible to reconstruct in any case, and occasionally the dynastic record of a city will be represented by merely one or two names.<sup>4</sup>

The division of Cyprus into several separate political units was well adapted to the geography of the island which is divided by the Kyrenia range to the north and the Troodos mountains in the central and western part of the island into a number of natural units. The obstacles which the hilly terrain would have placed in the way of communications and transportation among these natural units before the construction of the modern road system are even

---

and V. Karageorghis, *Fouilles de Kition III. Inscriptions Phéniciennes*, Nicosia 1977 (hereafter *Kition III*). A new publication of the literary and epigraphic testimonia on Kition (including the Phoenician inscriptions) is to appear in *Testimonia. Kition-Bamboula V*, currently in preparation.

G.F. Hill, *A Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum 24: Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Cyprus*, London 1904 (hereafter *BMC, Cyprus*), and E. Babelon, *Traité des monnaies grecques et romaines II:1*, Paris 1907, 569ff., and *II:2*, Paris 1910, 691ff., offer the best conspectus of Cypriot coinage but need to be complemented by subsequent numismatic bibliography, on which see conveniently A. Destrooper-Georgiades, "Numismatique Chypriote," *Transeuphratène* 10, 1995, 213-24. An up-to-date, comprehensive treatment of the coinages of the Cypriot city-kingdoms is currently under preparation by *idem*, *Manuel de numismatique chypriote archaïque et classique* (Sites et Monuments, École française d'Athènes).

3. Not all of those cities are known to have enjoyed an independent political existence at all times during the archaic and classical periods. A systematic survey of the literary, epigraphic and numismatic evidence for the status of those cities at different periods can be found in H.J. Watkin, *The development of cities in Cyprus from the Archaic to the Roman period*. Ph.D thesis, Columbia University 1988, 1-45. On the history of the Cypriot city-kingdoms in general, see also G. Hill, *A History of Cyprus I*, Cambridge 1940 (hereafter *HC I*); E. Gjerstad, *The Swedish Cyprus Expedition IV.2: The Cypro-Geometric, Cypro-Achaic and Cypro-Classical Periods*, Stockholm 1948 (hereafter *SCE IV.2*); Λ. Ἀντωνιάδης, *Μελέτες γιὰ τὴν Κύπρον καὶ τὶς σχέσεις τῆς μετὸν Ἑλληνικὸ κόσμον τὴν περίοδο τῶν ἀρχαίων βασιλείων (Γενικὴ Ἱστορία - Θεομοὶ - Οἰκονομία καὶ Κοινωνία)*, Nicosia 1980; P.J. Stylianou, *The Age of the Kingdoms. A Political History of Cyprus in the Archaic and Classical Periods* (Μελέται καὶ Ὑπομνήματα II), Nicosia 1989.

4. See for convenience L. Antoniadès, "L'institution de la royauté en Chypre antique," *Κυπριακαὶ Σπουδαὶ ΜΕ'*, 1981, 49-52.

visible in the western part of the south coast of Cyprus: in the cases of the adjacent districts of Paphos, Kourion, and Amathous communications with their neighbours would have been far easier by sea than by land. The division into kingdoms (that is to say into several separate political entities) would also appear to be appropriate to the size of the island (c. 9.250 km<sup>2</sup>). Each one of these kingdoms, said by Diodorus to have consisted of a major city and subordinate villages,<sup>5</sup> would have surpassed the size of the average Greek polis.<sup>6</sup>

The number of the kingdoms, until their abolishment by the Ptolemies around the end of the fourth century B.C.<sup>7</sup> was not constant. Thus while Diodorus records nine separate territorial rules in the fourth century, in the Neo Assyrian records, which are the earliest documents attesting to the existence of kingdoms on Cyprus, the number of these kingdoms is variously recorded as seven in the late eighth century, and ten in the seventh century.<sup>8</sup> In the classical period that number seems to have been directly dependent on the power, ambitions and dispositions of the various kings, the most striking contrast being provided by the late fifth and early fourth century ruler of Salamis, Evagoras, who aspired to place under his control the entire island, and the fourth century king Pasikypros of Tamassos who, as Athenaios reports, sold his kingdom to king Pumiathon of Kition for fifty talents.<sup>9</sup>

Information about the prerogatives, practices and powers of the Cypriot rulers is by and large confined to the fifth and fourth centuries before our era, when the institution was already developed. Evidence about the earlier

5. Diod. XVI 42.4: ὑπῆρχε τεταγμένα μικρά πολιίσματα τὰ προσκυροῦντα ταῖς ἐννέα πόλεσιν.

6. Cf. A. Snodgrass, "Cyprus and Early Greek History" (Fourth Annual Lecture on History and Archaeology of the Cultural Foundation of the Bank of Cyprus), Nicosia 1988, 14.

7. *HC* I (n. 3) 156-172; Watkin (n. 3) 112-130.

8. *Infra*, p. 160f.

9. Douris of Samos (ζ' Μακεδονικῶν) *FrGrHist* 76 q' F 4 (= *Athen. Deipnos.* IV 167 c-d): Ἀλέξανδρος μετὰ τὴν Τύρου πολιορκίαν Πνυταγόραν ἀποστέλλων ἄλλας τε δωρεὰς ἔδωκε καὶ χωρίον ὃ ἠτήσατο. Πρώτερον δὲ τοῦτο Πασίκυπρος [ὁ] βασιλεύων ἀπέδοτο δι' ἄσωτίαν πεντήκοντα ταλάντων Πυγμαλίῳνι (sic Pumiathon) τῷ Κιτιεῖ, ἅμα τὸ χωρίον καὶ τὴν αὐτοῦ βασιλείαν· καὶ λαβὼν τὰ χρήματα κατεγήρασεν ἐν Ἀμαθοῦντι. For the identification of the domain of Pasikypros's rule with Tamassos, see Watkin (n. 3) 41 and 152 n. 35.

periods is scanty and vague, resting mainly upon the testimony of Greek legend and the more or less ambiguous indications provided by the archaeological record of the island. It is instructive to look briefly into the suggestions that have been made up-to-date concerning the origins of the institution before we turn to the evidence for kingship on Cyprus during the classical period.

Greek legend traced the foundation of a number of the states which existed in the archaic and classical periods and of these states' ruling dynasties to Achaean heroes of the Trojan war.<sup>10</sup> Although the veracity of Greek foundation legends can often be placed to question, in this case the legends of a migration of Mycenaean to Cyprus around the end of the Bronze Age seemed to be supported by the Cypriot Greek dialect spoken on the island during the first millennium, because Cypriot Greek has affinities with the Arcadian dialect spoken in the Peloponnese in Mycenaean times,<sup>11</sup> and it was written in a syllabic script which antedates the introduction of the alphabet. The hypothesis of the antiquity of the use of the Greek language on Cyprus was further supported by the discovery on the island, in an archaeological context assigned to the 11th century B.C., of a bronze obelos inscribed with symbols of the ancient Paphian script which have been interpreted to record the Greek name Ὀφέλλας in the genitive (*O-pe-le-ta-u*) (Pl. 1).<sup>12</sup>

Until the early 1980's, the archaeological record of the final phase of the Cypriot Bronze Age (Late Cypriote III: ca. 1200 - ca. 1050 B.C.) and of the ensuing early Iron Age (Cypro-Geometric IA-IB: ca. 1050 - ca. 950 B.C.) was also generally held to confirm the Mycenaean origins of Cypriot states suggested by Greek legends and by the archaic character of the Cypriot Greek

---

10. Copious collection of testimonia in K. Χατζηϊωάννου, *Ἡ ἀρχαία Κύπρος εἰς τὰς Ἑλληνικὰς Πηγὰς Α'* Nicosia 1971, 46-67; discussion of the various legends in E. Gjerstad, "The Colonization of Cyprus in Greek Legend," *OpArch* III, 1944, 107-23.

11. M. Sakellariou, "Achéens et Arcadiens," in J. Karageorghis and O. Masson, eds., *The History of the Greek Language in Cyprus*, Nicosia 1988, 9-17; M.E. Voyatzis, "Arcadia and Cyprus: Aspects of their Interrelationship between the Twelfth and Eighth Centuries B.C.," *RDAC* 1985, 155-63. On the links between Arcadia and Cyprus in the Greek tradition, see Paus. VIII 5.2 and VII 53.7.

12. Palaipaphos-Skales Tomb 49 no. 16. E. Masson and O. Masson, "Les objets inscrits de Palaepaphos-Skales," in V. Karageorghis, *Palaepaphos-Skales. An Iron Age Cemetery in Cyprus (Ausgrabungen in Alt-paphos auf Cypern Band 3)*, Konstanz 1983, 41 ff.

dialect. The wider historical framework of the Eastern Mediterranean world in the end of the Bronze Age links a widespread unrest to the twelfth-century collapses of the Hittite and Mycenaean Bronze Age monarchies.<sup>13</sup> These disturbances in other regions would appear to coincide roughly with a series of destructions or abandonment of sites (e.g., Kalavassos-Ayios Dhimitrios, Maroni-Vournes, Pyla-Kokkinokremos) and the emergence of fortified settlements on Cyprus (e.g., Pyla Kokkinokremos, Maa-Paleokastro), as well as with the appearance on the island of novel architectural features with Aegean connections and of pottery types which display close similarities to Mycenaean wares.<sup>14</sup> Thus a hypothesis formed of a large scale migration in the beginning of the twelfth century of displaced Mycenaean immigrants which further postulates that these newcomers transplanted on Cyprus “their political system: a network of warlike monarchies, each usually centered on a fortified citadel, with the king called by the title of *wanax*, and performing a leading religious role as well as his political one”.<sup>15</sup> As a corollary to this hypothesis, the Cypriot kingdoms of the Archaic and Classical periods would also have been modelled on a Mycenaean prototype.<sup>16</sup>

However, while Greek was presumably spoken on Cyprus as far back as the eleventh century, and was the dominant language on the island in the first millennium, recent investigations no longer unequivocally support the hypothesis that the Greek language was introduced to Cyprus along with an imported Mycenaean political order.<sup>17</sup> At present there is a growing tendency

---

13. See in general (with reservations) N.K. Sandars, *The Sea Peoples. Warriors of the Ancient Mediterranean*, London 1978, and the various contributions in W.A. Ward and M.S. Joukowsky, eds., *The Crisis Years: The Twelfth Century B.C. From Beyond the Danube to the Tigris*, Dubuque 1992 (hereafter *The Crisis Years*).

14. V. Karageorghis, “The Crisis years: Cyprus,” in *The Crisis Years* (n. 13) 79-86, is an apt summary of the relevant, and much debated over, archaeological evidence.

15. This definition is given by A. Snodgrass (n. 6) 12. For an overview of the different formulations of the hypothesis in earlier publications, see D.W. Rupp, “The Seven Kings of the Land of Ia’, a District of Ia-ad-na-na: Achaeans Bluebloods, Cypriot Parvenus or Both?” in *Festschrift for Brunilde S. Ridgway*, K.J. Hartswick and M. Sturgeon, eds., University of Wisconsin Press, Madison (forthcoming).

16. This view is normally more or less moderated by the admission of the incorporation of non-Greek elements in this “Mycenaean” institution, e.g., Antoniadis (n. 4) 33-35.

17. And the evidence, namely, Linear B records, which would most explicitly make the case for the exercise of a Mycenaean-type state organization on Cyprus, is lacking in the

to think in terms of a “Greek penetration” rather than a massive migration (a “colonization”)<sup>18</sup> and to acknowledge that the instances of destruction and rebuilding of sites formerly connected to the arrival of Mycenaeans are not all possible to link to a single cause or even to ascribe to a single period.<sup>19</sup>

The thesis of the Mycenaean origins of the first-millennium political organization on the island has thus lost some of its earlier appeal, and one is allowed to consider a number of alternative possibilities.

One of these, proposed by James Muhly,<sup>20</sup> places the emphasis upon local Cypriot phenomena. According to Muhly, a centralized state (Alasia) had existed on the island since the sixteenth century. In the course of the thirteenth century this state would have controlled a network of centers throughout the island which focused on the exploitation of the local copper resources. With the decline of this centralized state towards the mid 12th century, these regional centers of copper production (Enkomi, Athienou, Pyla-Kokkinkremos, Kition, Hala Sultan Tekke, Maroni-Vournes, Kalavassos-Ayios Dhimitrios, Kourion-Bamboula, Alassa-Pano Mandilaris, Maa-Palaeokastro, Apliki Karamallos, and Myrtou Pighadhes) “were quick to take the opportunity to claim autonomy and entered a path of development which led to the formation of the Iron Age kingdoms, one of the earliest being the kingdom of Paphos and one of the latest ones that of Salamis (1050/1000 B.C.).”<sup>21</sup>

---

archaeological record of the island.

18. Cl. Baurain, “Passé légendaire, archéologie et réalité historique: l’hellénisation de Chypre,” *Annales. Economies Sociétés Civilisations* 44:2, 1989, 471. Cf. V. Karageorghis, *The End of the Late Bronze Age in Cyprus*, Nicosia 1990, and *idem* (n. 14) 82; B. Kling, *Mycenaean III C: 1b and Related Pottery in Cyprus*, Göteborg 1989 (=SIMA 87), 175-6; and J. Vanschoonwinkel, “La présence grecque à Chypre au xte siècle av. J.-C.,” in V. Karageorghis, ed., *Cyprus in the 11th century B.C.* (hereafter *Cyprus in the 11th Century B.C.*), Nicosia 1994, 109-131.

19. E.g., Karageorghis (n. 14) esp. 79 and 83f. For an earlier plea to refrain from assigning distinct breaks in the archaeological record of 13th to 11th century Cyprus with the arrival of distinct peoples (in this case, the Achaeans) without “independently established supporting evidence,” see F.G. Maier, “Kinyras and Agapenor,” in V. Karageorghis, ed., *Acts of the International Archaeological Symposium “Cyprus between the Orient and the Occident” (Nicosia, 8-14 September 1985)*, Nicosia 1986, 311-318.

20. J. Muhly, “The Organization of the copper industry in Late Bronze Age Cyprus,” in E. Peltenburg, ed., *Early Society in Cyprus* (hereafter *Early Society*), Edinburgh 1989, 298-314.

21. Muhly, *op.cit.*, 303.

Muhly's formulation must, of course, be viewed as hypothetical as no adequate documentation is available for the existence of any such kingdoms prior to the eighth century.<sup>22</sup>

Our lack of hard evidence concerning the political organization of Cyprus from the twelfth/eleventh through the ninth century is also illustrated by the hypotheses that the political organisation of the island during those centuries may have relapsed "into some looser form of tribalism"<sup>23</sup> or to "some form of a complex chiefdom system."<sup>24</sup> If either of the latter forms of organization reflects the state of affairs on Cyprus in the three or four centuries following the end of the Bronze Age, then continuity between the Bronze Age and the political institutions of the eighth century and later is also difficult to establish.

As it is, the most recent reconstruction of the origins of the Cypriot kingdoms of the Archaic and Classical periods also notes the significant uncertainties that center around the hypotheses just summarized and places the emphasis upon the historical events which surrounded the earliest unambiguous attestations of the Cypriot kingdoms in the late eighth century.<sup>25</sup> Beginning in the eighth century, Cyprus begins to be mentioned in the records of Neo-Assyrian rulers. The earliest such attestations occur in the records of Sargon II (721-705), who boasts to have brought into submission "seven kings of the land of Ia', a district of Iadnana at seven-days' journey in the sea of the setting sun." Sargonid references to the seven kings of Ia occur in eight texts,<sup>26</sup> the most famous one of which is inscribed on a stele, which was discovered in the ruins of ancient Kition towards the middle of the last century and is now displayed in Berlin (Pl.2).<sup>27</sup>

---

22. For the continuous occupation of a number of those sites since the 11th century B.C., however, see M. Iakovou, "The Topography of Eleventh Century B.C. Cyprus," in *Cyprus in the 11th Century B.C.* (n. 18) 149-165.

23. E.g., Snodgrass (n. 6) 18, who rejects, however, this possibility.

24. Rupp (n. 15), following Ch. S. Spencer, "On the Mode of State Formation: Neoevolutionism Reconsidered." *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 9, 1990, 1-3.

25. Rupp (n. 15).

26. Saporreti (n. 2).

27. Vorderasiatisches Museum VA 968; J. Börker-Klähn, *Alt Vorderasiatische Bildstelen und Vergleichbare Felsreliefs*, Mainz 1982, 202-3. A new study of this important document

That Iadnana is to be identified with Cyprus is suggested by the more detailed list recording the names and respective seats of rule of ten kings of Iadnana in the “Display inscription” of Esarhaddon (680-669 B.C.) which commemorates that monarch’s rebuilding of the royal palace at Nineveh and dates to 673/2 B.C.<sup>28</sup> In Esarhaddon’s list one can identify, without pressing the interpretation at least six of the place names mentioned with the names of Cypriot cities attested in Greek texts and Cypriot inscriptions. The correspondences are marked on the tentative sketch - owed to David Rupp - of the location and boundaries of the reconstructed kingdoms shown on Map 2<sup>29</sup>: *Edil* has been identified with Idalion, *Kitrusi* with Chytroi, *Pappa* with Paphos, *Kuri* with Kourion, *Tamesi* with Tamassos, and *Lidir* with Ledra. Less certain are the identifications of *Silli* and *Sillua* with Salamis and Soli, and much disputed those of *Nûria* and *Qartihadast* with Amathous and Kition, respectively.<sup>30</sup>

Rupp observes that beginning in the reign of Ashurnasirpal II (883-859 B.C.)

---

and of its political implications for Cyprus has been prepared by F. Malbran-Labat, “La stèle chypriote de Sargon (VA 968),” *Testimonia, Kition-Bamboula V* (forthcoming), summarily announced in *idem*, “La stèle de Sargon II à Chypre: Le texte de l’inscription,” in A. Caubet, ed., *Khorsabad, le palais de Sargon II, roi d’Assyrie. Musée du Louvre, Paris, 19-20 Janvier 1994* (Conférences et colloques du Louvre), Paris 1995, 169-179.

The earlier thesis, supported among others by H.J. Katzenstein, *The History of Tyre*, Jerusalem 1973, 241, that the stèle was found at Idalion, is no longer considered to be valid. See E. Gjerstad, “The Phoenician Colonization and Expansion in Cyprus,” *RDAC* 1979, 237 n.5. and M. Yon, “La stèle de Sargon II à Chypre: La découverte de la stèle à Larnaca (Chypre),” in *Khorsabad, le palais de Sargon II, roi d’Assyrie*, (Conférences et colloques du Louvre), Paris 1995, 161-168.

28. R. Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons. Königs von Assyrien*, Graz 1956, 59-61; J.B. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, 3rd edn., Princeton, NJ, 1969, 290-291.

29. Transliterations of the names of the kingdoms after Borger (n. 28) 60. On the identification with place names attested in Cypriot inscriptions and classical texts, see (among others) Saporetti (n. 2) 86-87. For an overview of modern pronouncements on the location and geographical boundaries of the Cypriot kingdoms, see O. Masson and A. Hermay, “La géographie des royaumes chypriotes chez les modernes,” *Centre d’études chypriotes, Cahier* 17, 1992, 23-28 and pls. I-IV.

30. For Nûria as equivalent to “[Kin]nuria/e”, a presumably ancient designation of Amathous, see C. Baurain, “Un autre nom pour Amathonte de Chypre,” *BCH* 105, 1981, 361-72. For an overview of the long debate on the location of Qartihadast, see esp. M. Yon, “Le Royaume de Kition: Epoque archaïque,” *Studia Phoenicia* 5, 1987, 366-7, who argues in favor of the identification of that city with Kition.

the Assyrian army began to conduct “with almost annual regularity ruthless razzias” beyond the east to the Mediterranean coast, and that similar activities in the area are documented in the reign of his son Shalmaneser (859-824). Furthermore, following a brief interval of Assyrian military weakness, during which Assyrian claims on the Levant were no longer pressed, pressure on the area was renewed by Tiglathpileser III (747-727 B.C.) and his successors. Rupp finds it surprising that “in this context of (Assyrian) military conquest and economic exploitation of the Levant (the coast of which is in places less than a day’s sail from Cyprus)” there would not be a single trace of official Assyrian recognition of Cyprus’ existence and no formal economic interaction with the island prior to the mid-eighth century.” He concludes, therefore, that prior to that time, Cyprus must have lacked “a visual network of formal states and their concomitant urban centers.” In his view the prototypes for the eighth-century states of Cyprus should be sought in contemporary models of political organization in the Levant, and in particular in the practices of the Phoenicians, whose mother cities strung along the coast of the Levant.

The Phoenicians, who were probably already consolidated into states as early as the eleventh century,<sup>31</sup> had also by the ninth century established a physical presence on the island (at least in the area of Kition)<sup>32</sup> both with a view to the exploitation of Cyprus’ highly marketable reserves of copper and timber (including cedar!),<sup>33</sup> and the use of the island as a way station and a

---

31. R.R. Stieglitz, “The Geopolitics of the Phoenician Littoral in the early Iron Age,” *BASOR* 279, 1990, 9-12.

32. V. Karageorghis, *Kition: Mycenaean and Phoenician discoveries in Cyprus*, London 1976. The final report on the excavations of the Phoenician levels at Kition, V. Karageorghis et al., *Excavations at Kition VI*, is currently under preparation. The literary and archaeological evidence on the Phoenician presence on Cyprus from the ninth century B.C. onwards is discussed by A. Dupont-Sommer, “Les Phéniciens à Chypre,” *RDAC* 1974, 75-94; E. Gjerstad, “The Phoenician Colonization and Expansion in Cyprus,” *RDAC* 1979, 230-54; M. Szyner, “Salamine de Chypre et les Phéniciens,” in M. Yon et al., *Salamine de Chypre: Histoire et Archéologie*, Paris 1980, 123-29. A stimulating discussion of possible literary references and allusions to a still earlier Phoenician presence on Cyprus is offered by P. Maynor Bikai, “Cyprus and Phoenicia: Literary Evidence for the Early Iron Age,” in G.C. Ioannides, ed., *Studies in Honour of Vassos Karageorghis*, Nicosia 1992, 241-248.

33. For cedar on Cyprus, see J.E. Garfitt, “The Cyprus Cedar,” *Quarterly Journal of Forestry* 60.III, 1966, 185-189.

staging post for commercial enterprises further west. Rupp has convincingly put together evidence demonstrating that this early period of Levantine political and economic activity in Cyprus went hand in hand with a diversification of the material culture of the island (which becomes especially noticeable in 850-750 B.C.) and with increasing indications in the archaeological record for the emergence of a social hierarchy, such as “rich burial assemblages” which may “be seen as conscious attempts to articulate new status distinctions and to legitimize recently acquired power.” Further indications for a social stratification from the mid-eighth century onwards are, according to the same scholar, the increasing concentration of monumental buildings, literacy, and the recovery of luxury items within or in the immediate proximity of cities which continued as centers of administration of the Cypriot states.<sup>34</sup>

For Rupp, it would be during this period, spanning the eighth and the seventh centuries that monarchs who came to power also adopted the model of a Levantine political system and its concomitant ideology and iconography.

Of the views proposed so far for the origins of the Cypriot kingdoms, Rupp’s argument that Cypriot kingship followed a Levantine model would best seem to account for the increase in the archaeological record of evidence attesting to the formation of a hierarchal state in Cyprus starting in the eighth century, and for the timing of the earliest literary references to Cyprus. However, as Rupp himself admits,<sup>35</sup> before the reign of Sargon, Assyrian claims on the Levant were more or less tenuous. The absence of references to Cypriot kingdoms in the records of Sargon’s predecessors need not indicate, therefore, a political void on Cyprus prior to the mid-eighth century. One

---

34. The archaeological evidence is discussed in a series of articles: D.W. Rupp, “‘Vive le roi’: The emergence of the state in Iron Age Cyprus,” in D.W. Rupp, ed., *Western Cyprus: Connections. An Archaeological Symposium held at Brock University, St. Catharines, Ontario, Canada, March 21-22, 1986*, Göteborg 1987 (=SIMA 77), 147-168; *idem*, “The ‘Royal Tombs’ at Salamis (Cyprus): Ideological messages of Power and Authority,” *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 1, 1989, 111-139; *idem*, “‘Puttin’ on the Ritz: manifestations of high status in Iron Age Cyprus,” in *Early Society* (n. 20) 336-62.

35. Rupp (n. 15).

should also note that evidence for the existence of social hierarchy in some areas at least of the island prior to the mid-eighth century is available, for instance, in the wealthy burials of Palaepaphos-Skales and Episkopi-Kaloriziki.<sup>36</sup>

The point remains that none of the models that have been advanced until now can securely account for the origins of Cypriot kingship. And the relationship of the practices of earlier and classical period kings cannot be traced since we lack the evidence on the particulars of Cypriot rule in the earlier periods. In the case of Neo-Assyrian records, for instance, Cypriot rulers are each designated as *sharru*, the Akkadian term for “king” also used for Assyrian monarchs. Assyrian references to the eighth- and seventh-century kings of Cyprus offer no information, however, about the status of those rulers in their respective communities.

While one cannot obtain any specific information about the origins and early stages of the institution of Cypriot kingship for the end of the second and the early part of the first millennium, the foregoing review ought to still make clear that, due to the island’s exposure to many different cultures and influences, the realities of Cypriot kingship must have been very nuanced and complex.<sup>37</sup> This is at least implied by the varied linguistic landscape of the

---

36. The archaeological evidence for the existence of a social hierarchy in Cyprus in the course of the 11th and 10th centuries is discussed by Snodgrass (n. 6) 10 and J.N. Coldstream, “Status symbols in Cyprus in the Eleventh century B.C.,” in *Early Society* (n. 20) 225-35. However, the mace-heads, which have been discovered in Cypriot contexts of the late 10th, mid-ninth and mid-8th centuries, and which were thought earlier to represent tangible evidence for the existence of monarchical rule on Cyprus during that period, can no longer be unquestionably accepted as such: N. Kourou, “Sceptres and maces in Cyprus before, during and immediately after the 11th century,” in *Cyprus in the 11th Century B.C.* (n. 18) 203-27; Rupp (n. 15).

37. Cf. F.G. Maier, “History from the earth: The kingdom of Paphos,” *IIIe Colloque International de l’Association pour la Syrie-Palestine à l’époque perse: “La Transeuphratène à l’époque perse: Contacts et échanges culturels,” Paris 21-23 Avril 1994*, (Summaries) 74, who believes, however, in the continuous existence of the Cypriot kingdoms during the Late Bronze and Iron Ages: “In Cyprus the local kingdoms had been a dominant form of political organization since the Late Bronze Age, although it is difficult to assess to what extent the traditions of Mycenaean monarchy and Canaanite kingship were instrumental in shaping the peculiar system of Cypriot monarchy. Its institutions survived throughout the archaic and classical periods, setting the island apart from the Greek world where (except for its northern fringes and Cyrene) kingship had disappeared long before.”

island in which a dialect of Greek was used side by side with Phoenician and with a still undeciphered, presumably native, language which we call Eteocypriot. The latter language survived tenaciously, at least in the kingdom of Amathous, into the third century before our era.<sup>38</sup> Furthermore, alongside the possible adoption by the Cypriots of a Levantine model of a monarchical state, as Rupp suggested, the island's Greek heritage also continued to manifest itself in the institutions of the island through the use of such terms as *basileus* and *wanax*, which have a venerable Mycenaean Greek past, and in various (Greek) rulers' claims to be descended from heroes of the Trojan war. The terms *basileus* and *wanax* are both found (lines 1 and 2, respectively) in the Cypro-syllabic portion of a bilingual dedication to Apollo at Idalion dating from the 4th regnal year of Melekiathon, a fourth-century king of Kition (Pl. 3).<sup>39</sup>

The point also needs to be made that definitions of Cypriot royalty current in the second millennium or in Neo-Assyrian times need not have remained unchanged in the subsequent centuries. Whether or not Mycenaean presence in the late second millennium was responsible for the transmission of Mycenaean Greek ruling habits to Cyprus or contacts with the Levant were responsible in the first place for the emergence of an eastern type of monarchy on Cyprus, the island continued to be exposed to the political customs of states and Empires that sprang in the East. Circumstances which could favor the enrichment and modification of Cypriot kingship subsequent to the eighth and seventh centuries would include, in addition to Assyrian rule, periods of domination of the island by the Egyptians<sup>40</sup> and by the Achaemenid Persians,

---

38. For the "indigenous" origins of the Amathousians the main references are: *FrGrHist* 115(Theopompos) F 103; Stephanos of Byzantium, *Ethnika*, s.v. "Amathous"; Pseudo-Skylax of Caryanda, *Periplus* in *Geographi Graeci Minores* 1, 77-78, 103. See also the discussion of C. Baurain, "Réflexions sur les origines de la ville d'après les sources littéraires," in P. Aupert and M.-Chr. Hellmann, *Amathonte I. Testimonia I* (Etudes Chypriotes IV), 1984 109-117. A list of the "Eteocypriot" texts found on Cyprus has been put together by Reyes (n. 2) 22.

39. BM West. Asiat. Dept. Inv. 125-320. *ICS*<sup>2</sup> no. 220: line 1: pa-si-le-wo-se, *pa-si-le-u*; line 2: *wa-na-xe*.

40. Hdt. II 182.2: ("Αμασις) εἶλε δὲ Κύπρον πρῶτος ἀνθρώπων καὶ κατεστρέψατο ἐς φόρου ἀπαγωγὴν, is the only known explicit statement of Egyptian political control over Cyprus. An overview of the political and cultural relations between Cyprus and Egypt in the first half of the first millennium may be found in Reyes (n. 2) 69-84.

whose control of Cyprus from the second half of the sixth century to the time of Alexander is amply documented in the Greek sources.<sup>41</sup>

Turning then to the classical period one may first observe that Persian domination did not affect the position of Cypriot kings. Herodotus<sup>42</sup> reports that Cyprus was incorporated, together with the Levantine coast, in the fifth satrapy (geographical district for administrative and fiscal purposes) of the Achaemenid Empire. Tribute, either in the form of fixed payments or in the form of contributions of supplies or men and ships to the Persian armies and navies,<sup>43</sup> and loyalty appear to have constituted the only obligations to the Achaemenid dynasts by the Cypriot rulers, who were otherwise left to their own devices. That the Persian monarchs recognized the royal status of Cypriot kings is perhaps most clearly indicated by the prerogative of those kings to mint autonomous coinage while they were vassals of the Persian Empire.<sup>44</sup>

Complete dynastic sequences are not available, and often names of kings recorded on inscriptions and coinage is all that is known about the practice of kingship in a number of the kingdoms. For those areas, however, for which evidence exists, it is clear that only one monarch ruled at a time (unlike the Spartan institution of dual monarchy, for instance) and that kingship was as a rule hereditary. This for instance is equally true of the Greek-speaking cities of Paphos and Salamis as it is of the city of Kition, which was ruled in this period by a Phoenician dynasty.

---

41. The date of Cyprus' incorporation in the Persian empire is discussed by H.J. Watkin, "The Cypriote surrender to Persia," *JHS* 107, 1984, 154-63. J. Wiesehöfer, "Zypern unter persischer Herrschaft, in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg and A. Kuhrt, eds., *Achaemenid History* IV. *Centre and Periphery*, Leiden 1990, 239-52, Th. Petit, "Présence et influence perses à Chypre," in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg and A. Kuhrt, eds., *Achaemenid History* VI. *Old Cultures in a New Empire*, Leiden 1991, 161-78, and A.-M. Collombier, "Organisation du territoire et pouvoirs locaux dans l'île de Chypre à l'époque perse," *Transeuphratène* 4, 1991, 30-38, are useful summaries of the relevant literary and archaeological evidence.

42. Hdt. III 91.

43. See in general, C. Tuplin, "The Administration of the Achaemenid Empire," in I. Carradice, ed., *Coinage and Administration in the Athenian and Persian Empires (The Ninth Oxford Symposium on Coinage and Monetary History)*, *BAR International Series* 343, Oxford 1987, 137-158 and the recent extensive discussion of P. Briant, *Histoire de l'empire Perse. De Cyrus à Alexandre*, Paris 1996, 399-433 with bibliographical notes on 956-962.

44. Legends with royal names are standard on Cypriot coinage, see *BMC, Cyprus* (n. 2) *passim*.

Thus, in a Cypriot Syllabic inscription of the late sixth or early fifth century from the Persian siege mound at Palaipaphos, an otherwise unknown individual by the name of Onasicharis calls himself “king of Paphos” and states his descent from a “Stasis king of Paphos” giving also the patronymic of his father (Pl. 4).<sup>45</sup> Similar documents are available from Phoenician Kition. For instance, Baalmelek II, who reigned in the second half of the fifth century,<sup>46</sup> also traces in his inscriptions his lineage through his predecessors: “Ba’almelek, king of Citium and Idalium, son of king ‘Oziba’al, king of Citium and Idalium, son of king Ba’almelek, king of Citium...”.<sup>47</sup> Likewise, Pumiathon, the last known Phoenician king of the same city, always records in his inscriptions<sup>48</sup> his descent from his illustrious predecessor Melekiathon, whom we will be discussing in a moment. Although these genealogical lists do not go beyond the third generation, the care with which various rulers recorded their royal ancestors reveals the importance of heredity as a requirement of legitimate rule on Cyprus.

Not all Cypriot kings inherited their rule, however. Kingship, as the object of strife among sons of a deceased ruler or as the target of local civic disaffection and revolt, has often been an extremely vulnerable institution. Cypriot kingship appears to have been no exception in this respect. A direct connection with the previous rulers appears to have been lacking, for instance, in the case of Melekiathon of Kition, since his father, Baalram, does not bear a royal title in Melekiathon’s inscriptions.<sup>49</sup> Insights into the strategies of legitimation employed by that ruler can possibly be derived from

---

45. Kouklia Museum KA 2141+KA 2098: *ICS*<sup>2</sup> (n. 2) 15, superseded by O. Masson et T.B. Mitford, *Les Inscriptions Syllabiques de Kouklia-Paphos (Ausgrabungen in Alt-Paphos auf Cypem, Band 4)*, Konstanz 1986, 21–25 no. 2 and pl. 4.

46. For the conventionally accepted dates of rule of the fifth- and fourth-century dynasts of Kition, see *BMC, Cyprus*, xxx–xlii.

47. A.M. Honeyman, “The Phoenician Inscriptions of the Cyprus Museum,” *Iraq* 6, 1939, 104–106, nos. 3 and 7, also considered by M. Yon, “Sur l’administration de Kition à l’époque classique,” in *Early Society* (n. 20) 365–66 and n. 5.

48. *CIS* I (n. 2) nos. 10 and 11 = *Kition* III (n. 2) A 2 and A 1; so also Yon, *op.cit.*, 366 and n. 6.

49. *ICS*<sup>2</sup> (n. 2) no. 220 (also *supra* n. 39) = *CIS* I (n. 2) no. 89. Baalram bears, in the syllabic portion of the text, the title *Ḳánax*, which is equivalent to *’dn*, “prince”, in the Phoenician version of the text. The terms *Ḳ áναχτας/ánaxsas* are used of the children of Evagoras in Isoc. *Evag.* 72

an inscription recently discovered in Larnaca and dated to the first year of his reign (Pl. 5).<sup>50</sup> The inscription records a victory of Melekiathon king of Kition and Idalion, son of Baalram, and all the people of Kition over their enemies, who are not identified, and over their enemies' auxiliaries, the Paphians. The emphasis on the collaboration of the king with all the people of Kition, which is previously unparalleled in the Phoenician texts from the island, has been referred by M. Szynger, who studied the inscription, to the untraditional circumstances of Melekiathon's rise to power.<sup>51</sup> As was noted earlier, Melekiathon was not in the direct line of succession to the throne of Kition. The victory commemorated in the inscription, and dating significantly from the first year of Melekiathon's reign, may have set, as Szynger suggested, the stage for his accession, and the popular support, which is repeatedly invoked by Melekiathon in lines 1,3, and 5 of the inscription, may betray that in this instance, military superiority and popular support superseded royal descent as a prerequisite for kingship.<sup>52</sup>

Divine support, in this case the support of Ba'al 'Oz ("Lord of Strength") invoked as a bestower of victory, was an essential prerequisite for legitimate rule in the Near East, where royalty was conceived as a mark of favor bestowed by the gods, and where monarchy as an institution was intimately connected with divinity.<sup>53</sup> On Cyprus such theocratic associations were not confined to the perceptions of kingship at Kition, the demonstrably Eastern, Phoenician center of the island, but can also be found in Greek centers, notably Paphos and Salamis.

The sacral character of Paphian kings emerges clearly from inscriptions of fourth-century kings of that city in which the functions of king

50. Larnaca Museum, MLA 1513: M. Yon and M. Szynger, "Une inscription phénicienne royale de Kition (Chypre)," *CRAI* 1991, 791-823 (the essentials of this article were also published in M. Yon and M. Szynger, "A Phoenician victory trophy at Kition," *RDAC* 1992, 157-165).

51. M. Szynger, *op.cit.*, 820-21.

52. For another notorious instance of a Cypriot ruler, namely Evagoras of Salamis, whose connections with the legitimate dynasty of his city are quite shadowy, see A. Zournatzi, "Evagoras I, Athens and Persia: ca. 412 - ca. 387/6 B.C.," Ph.D thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1991, 9-29.

53. See H. Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods*, Chicago 1978.

and high priest are combined in one person.<sup>54</sup> These fourth-century rulers appear furthermore to be perpetuating a much earlier tradition documented in the fifth century by Pindar and traced to the mythical king Kinyras who is said to be the founder of the famous shrine of the goddess Aphrodite of Paphos.<sup>55</sup>

Although there is no evidence for the performance of priestly functions by the rulers of Salamis, an intimate association of kingship with divinity in this city is suggested by certain literary references to Evagoras. These references are to be found in the *Evagoras*, an encomium composed in honor of the Salaminian ruler by the fourth-century Athenian orator Isocrates. In this speech, the lineage of Evagoras is directly traced to Zeus through the mythical personalities of Teukros, Telamon, and Aiakos.<sup>56</sup> A divine, and more frequently an heroic, pedigree was often claimed in antiquity and it abounds in Greek encomia, the literary genre to which the *Evagoras* belongs. However, as M. Yon<sup>57</sup> notes in her analysis of the divine connections that are ascribed to Evagoras in this speech, the art of the orator lies in choosing such mythological facts as would correspond to realities readily perceptible to the audience. It may thus be significant that Zeus is the only divinity mentioned in Isocrates' account of Evagoras' rule and personality and that this divinity is mentioned repeatedly and only in connection with the person and the functions of the king: twice to record that Zeus is the ancestor of Evagoras and a third time in a parallelism of Zeus, the king of gods, with Evagoras, the king of the Salaminians.<sup>58</sup> Furthermore, to acknowledge the assistance of Evagoras in their struggle with the Spartans in the 390's, the Athenians are also known to have placed an honorary statue of that ruler near the image of Zeus Soter.<sup>59</sup> These two associations of Evagoras with Zeus may not be fortuitous if one assumes the existence in Salamis of a cult of Zeus which was

54. E.g., *JCS*<sup>2</sup> (n. 2) nos. 4, 6, 7, 16, 17; also in F.G. Maier, "Priest Kings in Cyprus," in *Early Society* (n. 20) 387 n. 3.

55. Pind. *Pyth.* II 15-16. Complete list of ancient references in Maier, *op.cit.*, 377, 380 and ns. 4-8.

56. Isoc. *Evag.* 13-18.

57. M. Yon, "Zeus de Salamine," in Raymond Bloch, ed., *Recherches sur les religions de l'antiquité classique*, Geneva and Paris 1980, 96-97.

58. Yon, *op.cit.*, 96.

59. Isoc. *Evag.* 57 and Paus. I.3.2. In the latter text the epithet of Zeus is Ἐλευθέριος.

associated with the local rulers.<sup>60</sup> This suggestion may not be as far-fetched as one may think considering the lack of native Salaminian evidence for this period since the prominence of the cult of Zeus in this city is amply attested in Roman Imperial times.<sup>61</sup>

The prominent association of Greek Cypriot rulers of the classical period with deities who bear Greek names, such as Aphrodite and Zeus, may be misleading in the sense that it urges us to assume that the religious foundations and character of Cypriot kingship were still rooted in Greek tradition. Such an approach would overlook, however, the religious syncretism that is likely to have taken place on the island prior to and during the classical period.<sup>62</sup>

The fourth century inscriptions of the priest-kings of the goddess of Paphos do not name the goddess, referring to her by the title *wanassa*,<sup>63</sup> meaning “Queen/Lady”, which would seem to establish the Mycenaean credentials of this goddess.<sup>64</sup> However, when the goddess of Paphos is first named on local inscriptions a century later she is designated alternately

60. Among the testimony cited by Yon (n. 57) 97-98 in support of this suggestion, the fourth-century pottery fragments, inscribed, respectively, ΣΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ ([Διός] Σωτήρος) and ΣΩΤ (Σωτ[ήρος]), from the “Daimonostation” in Salamis (a likely location for the temple of Zeus in the classical period) are of particular interest.

61. Yon (n. 57) 92-95.

62. *HC I* (n. 3) 89-90: “(kingship in Cyprus)... as we see it in the fifth and fourth centuries, it is a pure despotism, except perhaps at Idalium. At Paphos especially, but also probably elsewhere, it was combined with, nay, rooted in, the high-priesthood. In the Homeric kingship there was nothing despotic, nothing in the professional sense sacerdotal. It may be that Achaean importations, such as the Teucrid dynasty, were grafted on to the original stock, which must have existed in Cyprus as in Anatolia and Syria-Palestine.”

For a discussion of the iconographic evidence on the continually evolving perceptions of the Salaminian cult of Zeus under Graeco-Roman influence from the eleventh century B.C. to Roman imperial times, see M. Yon, “‘Du taureau à l’aigle.’ Documents figurés,” in *Mythologie Gréco-Romaine, Mythologies Périphériques. Etudes d’iconographie*, Lilly Kahil et Christian Augé, eds., Paris 1981, 89-93.

63. *ICS*<sup>2</sup> (n. 2) nos. 4, 6, 7, 10, 16, 17, 90, 91.

64. For religious aspects of the *wanax* in the Mycenaean vocabulary, see L.R. Palmer, “Mycenaean Religion: Methodological choices”, *Res mycenaeeae. Akten des VII. Internationalen Mykenologischen Colloquiums in Nürnberg vom 6.-10. April 1981*, Göttingen 1983, 338-365, esp. 352-360.

Aphrodite Paphia<sup>65</sup> and Ashtarte Paphia,<sup>66</sup> Ashtarte being the Phoenician goddess of fertility. At the same time, the generic title *wanassa* would have allowed her to be readily associated with the primordial—and nameless—Great Goddess of Cyprus whose manifestations are ubiquitous in the cults of the island at least since the chalcolithic period (ca. 3000-2300).<sup>67</sup>

Just as the Paphian *wanassa* had the potential to be simultaneously interpreted as a native, a Greek and a Near Eastern goddess, the religious insignia, and iconography in general, of her custodians, the Paphian priest-kings, might possibly also reflect such multiple associations.

In a wide ranging analysis, F. Maier has proposed the identification of a late archaic limestone head, slightly larger than life size, found in the debris of the Persian siege mound at Palaipaphos, as a representation of a Paphian priest king (Pl. 6).<sup>68</sup> And indeed the synthesis of elements attested in the iconography of this sculpture, so far unique in Cypriot statuary, is imbued with venerated Near Eastern symbols of power and religious authority, but no single source of inspiration can account for its combination of symbols. The double crown is without a doubt a slight modification of the standard Egyptian royal headdress “depicted in countless statues and reliefs from the Middle Kingdom onward.” Also Egyptian is the uraeus, the cobra of lower Egypt and an emblem of the Egyptian royal crown. Departing from these Egyptian models, however, the headdress is decorated with a scale pattern. Also alien to the iconography of the Egyptian royal crown is the

---

65. *Recherches* (n. 2) 81. Dated by T.B. Mitford, “The Hellenistic Inscriptions of Old Paphos,” *BSA* 56, 1961, 10ff., to the third century B.C. together with other alphabetic examples.

66. *STRT PP*: The Cyprus Museum, “Ins. Ph.” 8. Dated to the third century B.C. at the latest in *Recherches* (n. 2) 81-86.

67. J. Karageorghis, *La Grande Déesse de Chypre et son culte à travers l’iconographie, de l’époque néolithique au VI<sup>ème</sup> s. a.C.* (Collection de la Maison de l’Orient Méditerranéen ancien No 5, Série archéologique: 4), Lyon 1977: representations found as early as the Chalcolithic (3000-2300 B.C.) or even the Neolithic period; pp. 119ff. for the Cypro-Geometric and Cypro-Archaic periods.

68. Merseyside County Museum, Liverpool, KA 730: Maier (n. 54) 61 no. 7 and fig. 1. V. Wilson, “The Kouklia Sanctuary,” Appendix to F.G. Maier, “Excavations at Kouklia (Palaepaphos) 1973,” *RDAC* 1974, 140, proposes, however, that that head be “compared with statues assigned to an early stage of the Archaic Cypro-Greek style.”

representation of the winged disc. The use of this symbol, however, as an emblem of power and authority was widespread in the Near East and Egypt and is also consistent with the iconography on the local coinage struck by the Paphian kings. Finally, the closest prototypes for the carefully executed beard of the statue seem to derive from earlier Assyrian and contemporary Achaemenian representations of royalty and nobility.

To return to the Paphian “priest-king”, this piece represents a unique instance in which a representation of royalty can be identified with some degree of plausibility in Cypriot statuary. Its value as evidence for Cypriot royal practices in general may, therefore, be limited. It is still significant, however, that a Greek-speaking king in Cyprus could employ insignia imbued with eastern elements of authority and act in the capacity of a high priest, practices which would have seemed alien to Greeks further west, but which would have nonetheless been in line with contemporary perceptions and representations of Eastern royalty.

The exceptional economic and social status which go hand in hand with autocratic rule are normally reflected in royal residences. Greek authors occasionally mention the extravagance and luxurious habits of Cypriot rulers but give no descriptions of palaces.<sup>69</sup> It may still be possible to reconstruct the physical setting of Cypriot royalty from the testimony of archaeology.

There are in all five archaic and classical period sites where archaeological explorations have recovered structures that have been identified as palaces: Amathous,<sup>70</sup> Idalion,<sup>71</sup> Palaipaphos,<sup>72</sup>

---

69. References in Antoniadès (n. 2) and F.G. Maier, “Palaces of Cypriot Kings,” in V. Tatton-Brown, ed., *Cyprus and the East Mediterranean in the Iron Age*, London 1989, 16-27.

70. F. Alabe and Th. Petit, “Rapport sur les travaux de l’École française à Amathonte de Chypre en 1989: 2. ‘Le palais’,” *BCH* 114, 1990, 996-1023; Th. Petit, “Amathonte de Chypre: bilan de deux campagnes de fouilles (1988 et 1989) au ‘palais’ d’ époque archaïque et classique,” *Transeuphratène* 4, 1991, 9-20.

71. Originally identified by E. Gjerstad, in E. Gjerstad et al., *The Swedish Cyprus Expedition II: Finds and Results of the Excavations in Cyprus 1927-1931*, Stockholm 1935 (hereafter *SCE II*), 462. For subsequent excavations, see L. Stager, A. Walker, P. Gaber and A. Graham, “Palace,” in L. Stager and A. Walker eds., *American Expedition to Idalion, Cyprus 1973-1980*, Chicago 1989, 5-13; P. Gaber, “The University of New Hampshire Expedition to Idalion, Cyprus. Preliminary Report,” *RDAC* 1992, 170-171.

72. J. Schäfer, “Ein Perserbau in Alt-Paphos?” *OpuscArch* III, 1960, 155-175; F.G. Maier

Soloi<sup>73</sup> and Vouni.<sup>74</sup> In the absence of epigraphic confirmation, none of these identifications can be considered certain.<sup>75</sup> Yet, even if there can be no certainty, there are a number of telling indications.<sup>76</sup>

With the exception of Vouni, a site which it has not been possible so far to identify with any of the cities mentioned in the ancient record,<sup>77</sup> all of these edifices are located in ruling cities of the kingdoms of the archaic and classical periods. Furthermore, when the period of occupation of these buildings can be determined, habitation does not appear to be continued beyond the end of the fourth century,<sup>78</sup> that is beyond the time of the abolition of the Cypriot kingdoms.

In spatial terms, the singularity of these buildings is reflected in the choice of location, normally a hilltop, which may be fortified, as were seemingly the acropoleis of Amathous and Idalion, and which normally commands wide vistas of the natural surroundings (as at Amathous, Idalion, Soli and Vouni).<sup>79</sup>

and V. Karageorghis, *Paphos. History and Archaeology*, Nicosia 1984, 207 ff.; F.G. Maier and M.-L. von Wartburg in V. Karageorghis, ed., *Archaeology in Cyprus 1960-1985*, Nicosia 1985, 106f.; Maier (n. 68) 17.

73. Identified in the course of a "trial trench", A. Westholm, in E. Gjerstad et al., *The Swedish Cyprus Expedition III: Finds and Results of the Excavations in Cyprus 1927-1931*, Stockholm 1937 (hereafter *SCE III*), 413. Some information about the subsequent, unpublished, Canadian excavations can be gleaned in V. Karageorghis, "Chronique des fouilles à Chypre en 1973," *BCH* XCVIII, 1974, 885-887 and fig. 82, and J. de Gagniers and T. Tam Tinh, *Soloi. Dix campagnes de fouilles (1964-1974)* I, Sainte Foy 1985, xxii.

74. E. Gjerstad, *SCE III* (n. 73) 205-229, and *idem*, *SCE IV.2* (n. 3) 23-29.

75. See also Maier (n. 69) 19 n. 10, who refers to "the critical remarks" of J.-C. Margueron, "L'apparition du palais au Proche-Orient", in E. Lévy, ed., *Le système palatial en Orient, en Grèce et à Rome. Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg, 19-22 Juin 1985*, Leyden 1987, 13-15, "on the tendency to identify every monumental and complex building with a royal palace."

76. For approaches similar to the one adopted here, see Maier (n. 69) and Th. Petit (n. 69) p. 11. The proposed function of those buildings is also followed by J. Mlynarczyk, "Palaces of Strategoi and the Ptolemies in Nea Paphos: Topographical Remarks," in W. Hoepfner and G. Brands, eds., *Basileia: Die paläste der Hellenistischen Könige (Internationales Symposium in Berlin vom 16.12.1992 bis 20.12.1992)*, Mainz 1996, 197-200.

77. E. Gjerstad, "Four Kings," *OpArch* IV, 1946, 21-24, and *idem*, *SCE IV.2* (n. 3) 453-477, proposed that the Vouni "palace" was constructed after 498 B.C. by a persofile king of Marion in order to survey the city of Soloi. This suggestion is challenged in F.G. Maier, "Factoids in ancient history: the case of fifth-century Cyprus," *JHS* CV, 1985, 36-37.

78. Certainly in the cases of the edifices of Amathous, Palaipaphos and Vouni.

79. The "palace" of Palaipaphos rests against the inner face of the wall of the city.

The fine ashlar masonry of their surviving walls betrays access to an elite of stone masons (the degree of sophistication in the construction techniques employed is perhaps best demonstrated at Palaepaphos where, according to the excavators, the level of the foundation courses throughout the building never varies by more than 2 cm.<sup>80</sup>). When a comparison of these structures with domestic architecture is possible as, for instance, at Idalion,<sup>81</sup> where a section of the lower city has also been excavated, architectural contrast further underlines the economic and social divide which must have separated common people from the members of the highest echelon of the local social hierarchy.

Evidence for the economic and administrative role of these buildings has been increasing. The finds from the “palace” at Amathous include evidence for the storage and redistribution of goods<sup>82</sup> as well as for the housing of documents as indicated by finds of a fragment of a clay tablet<sup>83</sup> and clay sealings.<sup>84</sup> At Idalion the earlier meagre corpus of inscribed ostraka found by the first American expedition<sup>85</sup> has now been considerably expanded with the discovery in the vicinity of the building complex identified as a palace of a number of ostraka and limestone plaques—most of them inscribed in Phoenician. According to Maurice Sznycer and Olivier Masson who have been entrusted with the publication of these documents—they record transactions of an economic nature.<sup>86</sup>

---

80. Maier (n. 69) 17.

81. “Building 1”, L.E. Stager, A. Walker, G. Ernest Wright, eds., *American Expedition to Idalion, Cyprus. First Preliminary Report: Seasons of 1971 and 1972*, Cambridge, Mass., 1974, 44 and fig. 36.

82. Petit (n. 70) 19, fig. 2 and pls. 1-3.

83. Petit (n. 70) 16 and pl. xi,2, and *idem*, “Syllabaire et alphabet au “palais” d’Amathonte de Chypre vers 300 av. J.-C.” in Cl. Baurain, C. Bonnet, V. Krings, eds., *Phoenicia Grammata. Lire et écrire en Méditerranée (Actes du Colloque de Liège, 15-18 novembre 1989)* (*Studia Phoenicia* XIII), Namur 1991, 484-485 and fig. 11.

84. Petit (n. 83) 485-486 and fig. 12.

85. F.M. Cross, “Inscriptions,” in L.E. Stager et al. (n. 81) 77-81.

86. Summarily announced by O. Masson and M. Sznycer in Nicosia in April 1994. See also M. Hadjicosti, “the city-kingdom of Idalion,” (summary of paper presented in the 97th Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America), *AJA* 100, 1996, 345, who identifies the building in which the discovery was made as “the Phoenician administrative center used by officials at Idalion” in the 4th century B.C.

At Vouni affluence is also indicated by the abundance and quality of the finds, such as imported objects of fine metalwork—as the silver bowls and gold and silver bracelets with animal finials of a type favored by the Persians, the latter indicating that Cypriot rulers may have been emulating Persian standards of luxury.<sup>87</sup>

We are reminded that the extant remains constitute only a meagre reflection of the impressive furnishings and original appearance of these buildings by the exceptional architectural elements which are found occasionally in their ruins. Such elements include Hathoric capitals of ultimately Egyptian inspiration but executed in what appears to be a native style.<sup>88</sup>

The religious functions of Cypriot kings and their privileged social and economic status, as indicated by their hereditary rule and by the monumentality of the buildings identified as royal palaces, all point to affinities with eastern autocracies. In common with eastern monarchs, Cypriot kings can be seen to have exercised considerable control over military and diplomatic operations. Herodotus relates that the Cypriot kings themselves commanded the armies of their respective cities in the Cypriot Revolt of the 490's<sup>89</sup> as well as the contingents which their cities contributed to the second Persian expedition against Greece in 480.<sup>90</sup> Furthermore, Evagoras of Salamis appears to have been in sole charge of both diplomatic relations with Athens, Persia and the king Acoris of Egypt and military operations against the Persian monarch Artaxerxes II in the 390's and the 380's.<sup>91</sup>

---

87. E. Gjerstad, *SCE* III (n. 74) pls. XC, XCI, XCII. For the four gold and silver bracelets of Achaemenid type, see P. Amandry, "Orfèvrerie achéménide," *Antike Kunst* 1, 1958. 20 and pls. 11, 21, 22, 12.26-29, who assigns to them a date "from the second half or last quarter of the 5th century to the early years of the fourth."

88. For "hathoric" capitals associated with "palaces", see: Alabe and Petit (n. 70) 1003-5 and fig. 24, and Petit (n. 70) 15 and n. 33 (Amathous); Gjerstad, *SCE* III (n. 73) pl. LVII (Vouni).

89. Hdt. V 104, 108-15.

90. Hdt. VII 90, 98; VIII 11.

91. E.g., the Athenian decrees *IG*<sup>2</sup> 113 and *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 20, granting Evagoras citizenship and honors for his support of the Athenian cause; Evagoras' dealings with Artaxerxes II, Ktesias, *Pers.* 94 (= *FrGrHist* 688 F 30); with Acoris, Diod. XV 2-10.

However, very little evidence actually exists as to how Cypriot rulers interacted with the common people. Works composed by Aristotle and Theophrastos on the government of the Cypriots<sup>92</sup> no longer survive, and we have no records of Cypriot laws to reconstruct the relationship between the king and the community. Only two inscriptions have survived which might be interpreted as royal decrees.<sup>93</sup>

The inscription on a famous bronze tablet found at Idalion may indicate that Cypriot kings did not hold absolute power over their subjects.<sup>94</sup> This tablet refers to grants of land, to the equivalent in value of one *talent* of silver and of four *pelekeis* and two *Idalian didrachms*, respectively, by the king Stasikypros and the city of Idalion to a certain doctor, named Onasilos, who, with his brothers, had provided free medical services to the community during an attack on the city by the Medes and the people of Kition. In this inscription which must belong to the fifth century,<sup>95</sup> and which is dated, quite

92. Arist. *Πολιτεία Κυπρίων*, Theophr. *Βασιλεία Κυπρίων*, Harpocration and *Suidas*, s.v. “ἄνακτες, ἄνασσαί”.

93. The non-epigraphic evidence on the powers of the cypriot kings over the inhabitants and the resources of their domain is also limited, see in particular Strabo XIV 684,65 and Theophr. V 8.1: Strabo comments on the authority of Eratosthenes that “in ancient times the plains of Cyprus were thickly overgrown with forests and that, because the kings could not prevail over the growth of the timber, they permitted anyone who wished, or was able, to cut out the timber and to keep the land thus cleared as his own property and exempt from taxes.” The reference in Strabo should probably not be taken to imply that all land belonged to the king. Interpreted in the light of the reference in Theophrastus : ἐν Κύπρῳ γοῦν οὐκ ἔτεμνον οἱ βασιλεῖς, ἅμα μὲν τηροῦντες καὶ ταμειυόμενοι, ἅμα δὲ καὶ διὰ τὸ δυσκόμιστον εἶναι, it can also be seen to allude to the sacred role of the king-one which was deeply rooted in Near Eastern state ideology-in protecting and promoting the resources of his kingdom (without of course denying the economic advantages that such a role would have conferred upon ruling individuals).

94. *ICS*<sup>2</sup> (n. 2) no. 217.

95. The date of the obviously unsuccessful siege on Idalion mentioned in the inscription cannot be determined but must in any case fall within the fifth century. The reference to the Medes would set the upper chronological limit of this event to after 500 B.C., because, as far as we know, relations between the Cypriot kingdoms and Persia were peaceful until the 490's, when at the instigation of the king of Salamis, Onesilos, the Cypriots rebelled from Persia and joined the Ionian revolt. The lower limit is set by the annexation of Idalion to the kingdom of Kition sometime around the middle or in the second half of the fifth century during the reign of Azbaal, see M. Marvin in L.E. Stager et al. (n. 81) XXV, who follows the reconstruction of the political history of Kition in this period by J.B. Peckham, *The Development of the Late Phoenician Scripts*, Cambridge, Mass., 1968, 17-21.

exceptionally, by eponym (not by regnal year!),<sup>96</sup> the king is never mentioned alone but is always accompanied by “κάς ἁ πτόλις Ἰδαλιῆφες” or “κάς ἁ πτόλις”, meaning “the city of the Idalians” or simply “the city”. Both the king and the people take an oath to honor the land grant to Onasilos his brother and their sons and to refrain from taxing it in the future.

In his long analysis of the tablet, Konstantinos Spyridakis<sup>97</sup> has suggested that this document, where the king and city “appear to be speaking with separate voices,”<sup>98</sup> indicates that some measure of democracy existed in Idalion, modelled on, or influenced by, the Athenian constitution, which granted the Athenian citizens the right to decide affairs of state, including the collection of revenues and the allocation of resources.

In the lack of evidence as to who constituted the *polis* at Idalion and as to who the eponym and his status were, it is difficult to evaluate the strength of the suggested links of the Athenian and Idalian modes of governance. Nevertheless, this inscription, which conveys a concept of state as represented by both the king and the people, raises the possibility that fifth century Idalion was not a pure autocracy but had some form of mixed governance.

A second inscription (Pl. 7), discovered on the Acropolis of Kourion and dated to the late sixth or early fifth century B.C., states, as reconstructed by Terence B. Mitford, that a Cypriot king has reserved a plot of land for the “δαμοτέρων”:

[-κ]ρότης ὁ Στα[σι-]  
 -ἴνις ὁ Κωρίω βασιλε[ύς]  
 [ζᾱ(ν)] ? δαμοτέρων τά(ν)δε ἐθεμί[σατυ].<sup>99</sup>

96. See the discussion of Watkin (n. 3) 146 n. 43.

97. K. Spyridakis, “Συμβολή εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ ἀρχαίου Ἰδαλίου (5 αἰ. π.Χ.),” *Κυπριακαὶ Σπουδαὶ Α*, 1937, 70ff.

98. From T.B. Mitford, *The Inscriptions of Kourion*, Philadelphia 1971, 381.

99. Episkopi Museum, RR 32: Mitford (n. 98) no. 218, 377-382.

Mitford considers “δαμοτέρων” or “δαμότερον”<sup>100</sup> as a rare and poetic term equivalent to δημοτικός, a collective term referring to the city or representatives of the city, comparing its suffix with the Mycenaean occurrence “Φανάκτηρον τέμενος,” which designates the royal domain.<sup>101</sup> By analogy, Mitford argues that “δαμοτέρων,” or “δαμότερον” ought to refer to persons or things of the demos, although, in the context of this inscription, under the authority of the king. If the reading “δαμοτέρων,” or “δαμότερον” is correct, and if developments in the study of Mycenaean still support Mitford’s Mycenaean analogy (and as far as I know they do) the suggestion is attractive, and would provide us with a second indication of the existence of a civic body on Cyprus. In the lack of more precise information, however, as to who constituted this body and what its functions were, it would seem unwarranted to assume in this instance, as in the preceding example from Idalion, that increased contacts of Cyprus with Greece, and Greek democratic practices in the course of the classical period may have served to temper the absolute character of Cypriot rule. We now know, furthermore, from the inscription of Melekiathon recently discovered in Larnaca that official statements of joint action or responsibility of king and people in state affairs were not confined to the Greek-speaking centers of the island but also formed a part of Cypro-Phoenician political expressions.

---

**100.** The reading of the crucial term, “δαμοτέρων” or “δαμότερον”, is somewhat open to ambiguity since the character interpreted as *ro* (line 3 fourth symbol from right on Pl. 7) deviates from the standard writing of the syllable in the Paphian script in which the inscription is written. *ro* is normally represented by an X and an horizontal bar above it, and as Mitford, *op.cit.*, 379 remarks, “without the short stroke descending at right angles from the middle of the horizontal.” An inscription on a plain white ware jug of the sixth century B.C., Mitford’s no. 13, provides another instance where this excrescence occurs.

**101.** From M. Ventris and J. Chadwick, “Evidence for Greek dialect in the Mycenaean archives”, *JHS* 73, 1953, 99. The term is attested on a “cadastral” tablet from Pylos: PY Er 01: 1: *wa-na-ka-te-ro te-me-no to-so-jo*, and 3: *ra-wa-ke-si-jo te-me-no* GRAN 10. In that instance, a certain quantity of grains is associated with the *temenos* of the *wanax* and the *temenos* of the *lawagetas*. According to F. Gschnitzer, “Vocabulaire et institutions: la continuité historique du deuxième au premier millénaire” in E. Risch and H. Mühlestein, eds., *Colloquium Mycenaeanum (Actes du sixième Colloque International sur les textes Mycéniens et Egéens tenu à Chaumont sur Neuchâtel du 7 au 13 Septembre 1975)*. Neuchâtel and Geneva 1979, 122, the term appears to be from the beginning as much “characteristic of the fiscal regime as of the social and political order.”

The evidence on Cypriot kingship, reduced for the purposes of this presentation to a few representative examples, does not allow one to trace the origins or chart the formative stages of the institution. Neither does it allow us to expose all aspects of the role of kings in Cypriot society. However, from the amalgam of cultural elements in the royal iconography and practices of Cypriot kings, which can be traced to no single strand of tradition, it would still emerge that kingship on Cyprus cannot be reduced to a Mycenaean substratum with Phoenician elements, nor to a Near Eastern institution with Greek accents. Instead, Cypriot kingship may be perceived as an institution which, although not well understood, may nonetheless have blended many heritages, each of which had the potential of contributing to its own character—a character which, like that of Cypriot culture of all eras, would have been at once cosmopolitan and uniquely Cypriot.

*Maison de l'Orient Méditerranéen*  
*Université Lyon 2*

*Antigoni Zournatzi*

## ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

### Η ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ ΣΤΗΝ ΚΥΠΡΟ ΩΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ ΚΛΑΣΣΙΚΗ ΕΠΟΧΗ: ΜΑΡΤΥΡΙΕΣ ΚΑΙ ΑΠΟΨΕΙΣ


Οί υπάρχουσες μαρτυρίες γύρω από τον θεσμό της αρχαίας κυπριακής βασιλείας επικεντρώνονται στα προνόμια, τις πράξεις, και τις αρμοδιότητες των βασιλέων των κλασικών χρόνων (5ου και 4ου αι. π.Χ.). Ο αποσπασματικός χαρακτήρας των πηγών δεν επιτρέπει να σχηματίσουμε πλήρη εικόνα του θεσμού κατά την εποχή αυτή. Άραιές και άσαφείς παραμένουν επίσης οί πληροφορίες για την προέλευση και τὰ στάδια διαμόρφωσής του.

Ὡς τις αρχές τῆς δεκαετίας τοῦ 1980, ἡ προέλευση τῶν κυπριακῶν βασιλείων τῆς ἀρχαϊκῆς καὶ κλασικῆς ἐποχῆς συνδεόταν κυρίως μὲ τὴν ἀφιξη Μυκηναίων μεταναστῶν στο νησί τὸν 12ο αἰ. π.Χ. Ἡ ὑπόθεση αὐτὴ ἑναρμονίζεται μὲ τὴν μυθολογικὴ παράδοση, ἡ ὁποία βεβαιώνει τὴν κτίση ἑνὸς ἀριθμοῦ ἐκ τῶν ἡγεμονικῶν πόλεων τῆς Κύπρου καὶ τὴν καταγωγὴ τῶν δυναστῶν τους ἀπὸ τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς ἥρωες τοῦ Τρωϊκοῦ πολέμου. Ὡστόσο, ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ μύθου δὲν ἀποτελεῖ ἀκλόνητο ἐπιχείρημα ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐγκαθίδρυσης Μυκηναϊκοῦ τύπου κρατιδίων στὴν Κύπρο. Πέρα δὲ ἀπὸ ἔμμεσες ἐνδείξεις ποὺ ἀφοροῦν τὴν Μυκηναϊκὴ παρουσία στο νησί (ὅπως εἶναι ἡ ἐμφάνιση Μυκηναϊκῶν στοιχείων στὸν πολιτισμὸ τοῦ νησιοῦ ἀπὸ τὰ τέλη τῆς ἐποχῆς τοῦ Χαλκοῦ καὶ ἡ διάδοση τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσας στὴν Κύπρο πιθανὸν ἀπὸ τὸν 11ο ἢ 10 αἰ. π.Χ.), δὲν ἔχουμε στὴ διάθεσή μας τὴν παραμικρὴ συγκεκριμένη πληροφορία γιὰ τὴν πολιτικὴ δομὴ τῆς Κύπρου ἀπὸ τὰ τέλη τῆς 2ης χιλιετίας ὡς τὰ τέλη τοῦ 8ου αἰ. π.Χ., ὅταν 7 Κυπριακὲς πόλεις καὶ οἱ ἀντίστοιχοι βασιλεῖς τους ἀναφέρονται γιὰ πρώτη φορὰ στὶς ἐπιγραφές τοῦ Ἀσσυρίου δυνάστη Σαργῶν Β'.


Ὑπὸ αὐτὲς τὶς συνθῆκες, οὔτε ἡ Μυκηναϊκὴ καταγωγὴ τῆς Κυπριακῆς βασιλείας, οὔτε κἂν ἡ ἐπιβίωση στὴν 1η χιλιετία οἰασδήποτε πολιτικῆς δομῆς ἐπικρατοῦσε στο νησί προηγουμένως μποροῦν νὰ θεωρηθοῦν ὡς δεδομένες. Σύμφωνα μάλιστα μὲ μία πρόσφατη ἐκδοχὴ, ἡ ἴδρυση τῶν Κυπριακῶν βασιλείων τῶν ἱστορικῶν χρόνων μπορεῖ νὰ ἀποτελῆ φαινόμενο τῆς ἀρχαϊκῆς ἐποχῆς, καὶ νὰ ἀκολουθῆ Φοινικικὰ, ἢ γενικότερα ἀνατολικὰ, πρότυπα.

Ἐνῶ δὲν εἶναι δυνατόν νὰ διαπιστώσουμε τὶς συνθῆκες κάτω ἀπὸ τὶς


ὁποῖες διαμορφώθηκε ἡ Κυπριακὴ βασιλεία, ἡ συνεχῆς ἔκθεση τοῦ νησιοῦ σὲ πολλοὺς διαφορετικοὺς πολιτισμοὺς καὶ ἐπιδράσεις καὶ ἡ πολυεθνικὴ σύσταση τοῦ κυπριακοῦ πληθυσμοῦ τοῦλάχιστον ὑπονοοῦν τὴν πολυπλοκότητα καὶ πολυμορφία τοῦ θεσμοῦ καθ' ὅλην τὴν διάρκεια τῆς ὑπαρξῆς του. Πολύπλοκη καὶ πολύμορφη εἶναι πράγματι καὶ ἡ εἰκόνα τῆς Κυπριακῆς βασιλείας ποὺ σχηματίζουν οἱ ὑπάρχουσες μαρτυρίες γιὰ τὴν κλασσικὴ ἐποχὴ. Χαρακτηριστικὴ εἶναι, παραδείγματος χάριν, ἡ συνύπαρξη στὸ πολιτικὸ λεξιλόγιο τῆς ἐποχῆς ὄρων μὲ ἀναμφισβήτητο Μυκηναϊκὸ παρελθόν, ὅπως “βασιλεύς” καὶ “ἀνάξ”, καὶ τῶν φοινικικῶν τους ὁμολόγων “mlk” καὶ “’dn”, ἐνῶ τὸ ἀμάλαγμα στοιχείων ποὺ πιστοποιοῦμε στὴν εἰκονογραφία, στίς ἐξουσίες, καὶ στίς πράξεις τῶν βασιλέων τῆς ἐποχῆς δὲν εἶναι δυνατὸν νὰ ἀναχθῆ σὲ μίαν συγκεκριμένη παράδοση.



A. Zourmatzi, "Cypriot Kingship". Map 1.




Map 2. Cyprus in the Archaic Period: The urban centers and theoretical boundaries of the ten kingdoms listed on the prism - inscription of Esarhaddon in 673/2 B.C. (By D. W. Rupp).



A. Zournatzi, "Cypriot Kingship"

Pl. 1: Bronze spit from Palaipachos inscribed in Cypro-syllabic with the genitive of the name "Opheltes". From an archaeological context ascribed to the eleventh century B.C. (Courtesy Cyprus Department of Antiquities).




A. Zournatzi, "Cypriot Kingship"

Pl. 3: Bilingual inscription of Milkyathon from Idalion. Early fourth century B.C. (Photograph British Museum).



*A. Zournatzi, "Cypriot Kingship"*


*Pl. 2: The stele of Sargon II from Cyprus. Late eighth century B.C.  
(Photograph Bildarchiv Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin).*



A. Zournatzi, "Cypriot Kingship"


Pl. 4: Cypro-syllabic inscription of Onasicharis, king of Paphos. Late sixth or early fifth century B.C.

(Courtesy Cyprus Department of Antiquities).




A. Zourmatzi, "Cypriot Kingship"

Pl. 5: Inscribed base of naval victory trophy of Milkyathon. 392 B.C.  
 (Courtesy French Mission of Kition-Bamboula).



A. Zourmatzi, "Cypriot Kingship"

Pl. 7: Cypro-syllabic inscription of a king of Kourion, [--κ]ρετης son of Στα[σι--].  
 Early fifth century B.C.  
 (Courtesy Cyprus Department of Antiquities).



A. Zournatzi, "Cypriot Kingship"

Pl. 6: Late archaic limestone head of "Paphian priest king" from Palaipaphos  
(Courtesy Trustees of the National Museums and Galleries on Merseyside,  
Liverpool).