

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΚΥΠΡΙΑΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ

ΠΡΑΚΤΙΚΑ ΤΟΥ

Δ' ΔΙΕΘΝΟΥΣ ΚΥΠΡΟΛΟΓΙΚΟΥ ΣΥΝΕΔΡΙΟΥ

Λευκωσία 29 Απριλίου - 3 Μαΐου 2008

ΑΡΧΑΙΟ ΤΜΗΜΑ

ΕΚΔΟΤΙΚΗ ΕΠΙΜΕΛΕΙΑ:

Δρ Άνδρέας Δημητρίου

Egypt in Cyprus.

A Pharaonic perspective in Herodotus 2.182.2?

Antigoni Zournatzi

— ΑΝΑΤΥΠΟ —



Χορηγός: Ίδρυμα Άναστάσιος Γ. Λεβέντης

ΛΕΥΚΩΣΙΑ

2011

Egypt in Cyprus. A Pharaonic perspective in Herodotus 2.182.2?***

At the very end of the second Book of the *Histories*, Herodotus closes a lengthy narrative section concerning the activities of the sixth-century Pharaoh Amasis (ca. 570-526 BC), with the statement that “he [i.e., Amasis] was the first man to seize Cyprus and compel the island to pay tribute” (Hdt. 2.182.2: *εἶλε δὲ [Ἀμασις] Κύπρον πρῶτος ἀνθρώπων καὶ κατεστρέψατο ἐς φόρου ἀπαγωγὴν*).¹ Amasis was the penultimate ruler of the Twenty-Sixth Dynasty, which was displaced by the Persians under Cambyses (530-522 BC); his subjugation of Cyprus thus sets the more or less immediate background to the Persian annexation of the island. Taken at face value, Herodotus’ remark would indicate that Amasis’ conquest was the opening chapter in the history of the island’s domination by foreign powers.

It has long been known that Near Eastern texts tell a different story.² Subject to Cyprus’ identification with Alashiya, foreign territorial and fiscal claims on the island can be traced as early as the closing centuries of the Bronze Age. One of the most telling statements in this regard occurs in a thirteenth-century inscription of the Hittite ruler Suppiluliuma II which makes reference to another Hittite king, probably his father Tudhaliya IV (1265-1235 BC), “who smote his enemies from Alashiya, enslaved their country and made it tributary on the spot”.³ Furthermore, from eighth-century

* Senior Researcher Research Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity National Hellenic Research Foundation (Athens).

** For helpful comments and criticisms during the preparation of the present article, warm thanks are due to David Stronach, Anna Michailidou and Mark Levi.

1. Hdt. 2.182.2; cf. Diod. 1.68.6.

2. Cf. esp. A.B. Lloyd’s (*Herodotus, Book II. Commentary 99-182* [ÉPRO 43], Leiden 1988, 240-241) earlier commentary in this regard; cf. *Erodoto, Le storie*, vol. II, *L’Egitto* (ed. A.B. Lloyd, trans. A. Fraschetti), Fondazione Lorenzo Valla 1996, 399 comment on 182, 12-13.

3. H.G. Güterbock, “The Hittite conquest of Cyprus reconsidered”, *JNES* 26 (1967) 73-81; a translation of the relevant text may also be consulted in A.B. Knapp, ed., *Sources for the history of Cyprus*, vol. II, *Near Eastern texts from the third to the first millennia BC*, Greece and Cyprus Research Center 1996, 32-33 Text 38. For the broader historical setting and an overview of the textual evidence bearing on Hittite dealings in general with Alashiya/Cyprus, see, respectively,

Assyrian inscriptions one can infer a period of political control and/or economic exploitation of the island by the Phoenicians,⁴ whose overseas expansion (beginning in the eleventh century BC) placed the island within the orbit of Phoenician activity and left a lasting imprint upon the Cypriot cultural and political landscape of the first millennium. Perhaps more importantly, Cyprus' submission to Assyria is unambiguously proclaimed in a number of Assyrian texts dating from the reigns of Sargon II, Sennacherib, and Esarhaddon in the late eighth and seventh centuries.⁵ The most famous among these texts, an inscription of Sargon II (727-705 BC), carved on a stele which was discovered on the island of Cyprus a century and a half ago, states:

“...[Seven king]s of the land of Ia', a district [of Iad]nana (Cyprus), which [is situated] at seven days' journey [in the midst of] the sea of the setting sun and whose dwellings are distant—[since] far-off days [they had not paid?] the tax (šibtu) of Assyria, for none of the kings, my fathers [who preceded] me [had even heard] the name of their land—they heard from the midst of the sea of [the deeds that I had performed] in Chaldea and the Hatti-land, and their hearts beat fast; their [tribute]: gold, silver, [vessels of] ebony, boxwood, the treasure of their land, [into] Babylon to my presence, [they brought and] they kissed my feet...”⁶

J.D. Muhly, “The land of Alashiya: references to Alashiya in the texts of the second millennium B.C. and the history of Cyprus in the Late Bronze Age”, in: *Πρακτικά του Πρώτου Διεθνούς Κυπριολογικού Συνεδρίου (Λευκωσία, 14-19 Απριλίου 1969)*, vol. I, Nicosia 1972, 218, and H. Georgiou, “Relations between Cyprus and the Near East in the Middle and Late Bronze Age”, *Levant* 11 (1979) 87-92 (both works cited by Lloyd, *Herodotus* [footnote 2], 241).

4. See, in particular, N. Na'aman, “Sargon II and the rebellion of the Cypriote kings against Shilṭa of Tyre”, *Orientalia* 67 (1998) 239-247; cf. idem, “The conquest of Yadnana according to the inscriptions of Sargon II”, in: T. Abush et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the XLVe rencontre assyriologique internationale*, vol. 1, *Historiography in the cuneiform world*, Bethesda, Md., 2001, 359-360.

5. For recent presentations and discussions of the cuneiform evidence about Cyprus' submission to Assyria, see A.T. Reyes, *Archaic Cyprus. A study of the textual and archaeological evidence*, Oxford 1994, 50-60; C. Tuplin, *Achaemenid studies* (Historia Einzelschriften 99), Stuttgart 1996, esp. 49-60; A. Mehl, “The relations between Egypt and Cyprus from Neo-Assyrian to Achaemenid rule (7th-6th cent. B.C.)”, in: *Egypt and Cyprus in Antiquity* (eds. D. Michaelides, V. Kassianidou and R.S. Merrillees), Oxbow Books 2009, 60-66 (all with earlier bibliography).

6. This translation is owed to Stephanie Dalley (in Reyes, *Archaic Cyprus* [footnote 5], 51). For a recent translation (in French) of the entire text of the Cyprus stele, which is now in Berlin (Vorderasiatisches Museum VA 968), see F. Malbran-Labat, “Inscription assyrienne (no. 4001)”, in: M. Yon, *Kition dans les textes: testimonia littéraires et épigraphiques et corpus des inscriptions* (Kition-Bamboula V), Paris 2004, 345-354.

Modern attempts to explain the apparent incongruity between Herodotus and Near Eastern testimony in this instance have led to contrasting interpretations of the implications of Herodotus' word.⁷ In the opinion of Alan B. Lloyd, while it "is not surprising that [Herodotus] knows nothing of the Hittite conquest... his total ignorance of Assyrian activities on the island casts a baleful light on the deficiencies of [Greek] historical tradition".⁸ Others, reluctant to accept Herodotus' total failing in this instance, have suggested that what Herodotus must have really meant is that Amasis was merely the first *Egyptian* conqueror of Cyprus;⁹ or that his comment ought to allude to intrinsic differences between the respective circumstances of Assyrian and Egyptian suzerainty. According to George F. Hill, although Herodotus 2.182.2 "may seem to a certain degree inconsistent with what we know of Cyprus under the Assyrian Empire, indicates at least that the Egyptian domination was more firmly established than the Assyrian".¹⁰ Other commentators have conjectured, more specifically, that Amasis would have been the first man ever to impose *regular* tribute upon the Cypriots and contrast putative Egyptian direct control or fiscal claims over the island with a supposedly more relaxed type of distant Assyrian control that aimed merely at a more or less loose form of economic exploitation of Cypriot resources.¹¹

7. For an earlier review of such interpretations, see G.A. Papantoniou, "Some conclusions from Herodotus' information about Cyprus", in: *Πρακτικά τοῦ Πρώτου Διεθνoῦς Κυπρολογικοῦ Συνεδρίου (Λευκωσία, 14-19 Ἀπριλίου 1969)*, vol. I, Nicosia 1972, 221-223.

8. Lloyd, *Herodotus* (footnote 2), 240-241; cf. W.W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, vol. I, Oxford 1912, 255 *ad loc.*

9. See, e.g., How and Wells, *A Commentary* (footnote 8), 255 *ad loc.*, and Ph.-E. Legrand, *Hérodote. Histoires, livre II* (Collection Budé), Paris 1963, 194 n. 7 *ad* 182 (cf. Lloyd, *Herodotus* [footnote 2], 241). Though generally held to be unlikely, the possibility, arising from Diod. 1.68.1, that Egyptian claims (however more tenuous?) over Cyprus might have been pressed even earlier, under Amasis' predecessor, Apries (589-570 BC), is still difficult to dismiss entirely. For the relevant evidence, see, conveniently, Reyes, *Archaic Cyprus* (footnote 5), 73-74 (who doubts, however, that there was ever an "Egyptian domination" of the island [p. 78]; but see below); Tuplin, *Achaemenid* (footnote 5), 34-35; Mehl, "The relations" (footnote 5), suggesting (on p. 64) that the "earliest possible time, [when] Egyptian rule over Cyprus...can have begun" could even be during the reign of Necho II (610-595 BC).

10. G.F. Hill, *A History of Cyprus*, vol. I, London 1940, 109.

11. See, e.g., Papantoniou, "Some conclusions" (footnote 7), 221 and n. 4, arguing from Herodotus' (3.89.3 and 3.97.2) testimony on the offering of gifts and tribute in the Persian empire that "gifts... sent annually, or from time to time, to the king of Assyria, or booty taken by Apries, cannot be regarded as a payment of tribute". See also in the same sense P. Stylianou, "Τα ἀρχαία

All along, hard evidence for the conjectured differences between the circumstances of Cyprus' domination by the Assyrians and Egyptians, respectively, has been difficult to obtain. Despite modern pronouncements, Cyprus' fiscal relations with both the Assyrians and the Egyptians remain poorly attested. Judging, for instance, by customary Greek usage, the term *φόρος* used by Herodotus to designate Amasis' economic demands on the Cypriots could indicate a regular "tribute" or "tax". We are, however, left entirely in the dark concerning the actual form, amount, and regularity of the *φόρος* that was due from the Cypriots to Egyptian authorities. At the same time, while the list of precious materials and luxury goods presented to Sargon by the Cypriot kings might appear to justify assumptions that the island's contributions to Assyria were in the form of precious gifts, the Assyrian documents allow no certainty that the Cypriot contributions to the Assyrian coffer were necessarily perceived by the Assyrians as voluntary complementary offerings.¹² Nor is it possible to obtain any accurate estimate of the economic benefits that the Assyrians, who were in control at the time of the cities and markets that strung along the southeastern Mediterranean coast, could have had from Cypriot trade (especially in copper) with the continent.¹³ On the other hand, common reason for Assyria's and Egypt's evident interest in the island could be provided

βασιλεία", in: *Ιστορία της Κύπρου* (ed. Th. Papadopoulos), vol. B part B, Nicosia 2000, 484-485 and 494; in the same sense, M. Iacovon, "The early Iron Age urban forms of Cyprus", in: *Mediterranea Urbanization. 800-600 B.C.* (eds. R. Osborne and B. Cunliffe), (Proceedings of the British Academy 126), Oxford 2005. Compare, among others, the formulation of V. Karageorghis ("Cyprus", in: *The Cambridge ancient history*, vol. III.3, *The expansion of the Greek world, eighth to sixth centuries B.C.* [eds. J. Boardman and N.G.L. Hammond], Cambridge 1982, 59) that "Assyrian domination was lenient and was confined to political matters and to the payment of tribute of the Cypriot kings, who were left to exercise their own rule over their kingdoms and develop their own cultural life."; and Malbran-Labat's ("Inscription" [footnote 6], 352 and 353) contentions that "[l]a présence de la stèle en terre chypriote témoigne-t-elle peut-être, non d'une conquête territoriale, mais d'une mainmise économique", and that Sargon's reference to the Cypriots' offerings of gifts were important as expressions of an Assyrian economic and diplomatic success.

12. Reyes (*Archaic Cyprus* [footnote 5], 54 with references) stresses the ambiguity of the terms *katru/kadru* ("gift, present, offering, or bribe") and *madattu* ("that which is given") which are used in Sargon's inscriptions to describe the Cypriots' "offerings" to Assyrian rulers. It is still possible to detect, however, an instance of Assyrian vengeance exacted for "gifts withheld" by the Cypriots (see Tuplin, *Achaemenid* [footnote 5], 25 with n. 42 on p. 24 and n. 49 on p. 26; cf. Na'aman, "The conquest" [footnote 4], 359 and 362).

13. Cf., e.g., Malbran-Labat, "Inscription" (footnote 6), 353-354. An Assyrian interest in Cypriot copper is suggested by S. Dalley's translation of the text of Sargon's Cyprus stele, see Reyes, *Archaic Cyprus* (footnote 5), 54 and n. 27.

by Cyprus' renown, since the time of the Amarna letters, as a source of timber and a center for shipbuilding.¹⁴ A famed relief from Sargon's palace at Khorsabad appears to depict a fleet of ships transporting long beams by sea.¹⁵ Such beams were presumably destined for palatial building projects in the Assyrian heartland and, given this circumstance, it is hard not to suppose that the island's contributions to Assyria (as presumably to Egypt) included not only finished luxury "gifts" of wood, as one might surmise from Sargon's Cyprus inscription, but also choice timber from tracts of forest that were still far from denuded (see Strabo 14.6.5). Cypriot materials for shipbuilding (Amm.Marc. 14.8.14) and the Cypriots' skills as shipwrights would have certainly been as appealing to the Assyrians¹⁶ as to first-millennium Egyptians, whose aspiration to create a powerful navy since the reign of Necho II is recorded in Herodotus (2.159.1-2).

The historical and archaeological record is, if anything, still less helpful when it comes to trying to define the actual extent of Assyria's and Egypt's political and administrative control of the island. Einar Gjerstad thought he could "recognize" a further reference to the Egyptians' firm control of Cyprus, which is putatively implied by the 2.182.2 passage, in Herodotus 7.90, wherein the Cypriots are said to have traced the origins of their various *ethne* to, among other places, Ethiopia. Herodotus' mere reference to Ethiopia as the place of origin of a part of the Cypriot population is always difficult to perceive, however, as a telling allusion to Ethiopians who were settled on the island "in the civil and military service of an Egyptian control administration" following the island's reported conquest by the Egyptians, as Gjerstad suggested.¹⁷ The

14. Cf. J.D. Muhly, "The role of Cyprus in the economy of the eastern Mediterranean during the second millennium B.C.," in: *Acts of the International Archaeological Symposium "Cyprus Between the Orient and the Occident"*, Nicosia, 8-14 September 1985 (ed. V. Karageorghis), Nicosia 1986, 49-50.

15. See E. Strommenger, *5000 years of the art of Mesopotamia* (trans. C. Haglund), New York 1964, pl. 299; cf. Reyes, *Archaic Cyprus* (footnote 5), 58.

16. See Reyes, *Archaic Cyprus* (footnote 5), 58 with references.

17. See E. Gjerstad, *The Swedish Cyprus Expedition*, vol. IV.2, *The Cypro-Geometric, Cypro-Achaic and Cypro-Classical periods*, Stockholm 1948, 467, who assumes, however, that under Amasis the Cypriot kings would have been forced to "the same kind of dependency as that imposed by the Assyrians". This same scholar's (*ibid.*, 467-468) further suggestion, namely, that the rigor of Egyptian rule could be further gauged from "a great and determining [Egyptian] influence on Cypriote culture", has also proven difficult to maintain. See, among others, Stylianou, *Ta arxaiá basíleia* (footnote 11), 493-494, and G. Markoe, "Egyptianizing male votive statuary from Cyprus: a reexamination", *Levant* 22 (1990) 111-122 with references to earlier discussions.

establishment of Assyrian officials on the island from the time of the Cypriots' submission to Sargon through the reign of Esarhaddon, when Cyprus is last mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions, also remains a moot point.¹⁸ Nonetheless, as Tuplin notes, an Assyrian "claim of provincialization" of Cyprus might be implied by the concluding statement ("and [as Assyrians (?)] I counted them") that is found in one of the Sargonid texts mentioning the seven Cypriot kings.¹⁹ In addition, Assyrian texts seem to provide evidence for an at least indirect promulgation of Assyrian authority on the island through the Tyrians, and presumably through Tyre's colony in Cyprus, Kition.²⁰ While the details are still not as specific as one might have liked them to be, such references make it difficult to dismiss the possibility that the island's submission to Assyria had at least as much impact on the Cypriot city kingdoms (whose existence was evidently not disrupted) as "conquest" by the Egyptians—especially since our sources remain silent about the political implications (and duration) of the latter conquest.

In short, attempts to detect significant differences between the circumstances of the Cypriots' vassalage to the Assyrians and Egyptians, respectively, have not

18. The less than full certainty as to the actual presence and whereabouts of Assyrian representatives on the island can be seen to account, for instance, for the variant perceptions, on the one hand, that "Cyprus was a tributary of Assyria whose representative ought to reside at Kition, as suggested by the find there of Sargon's Cyprus stele and the absence of a king of Kition from the detailed list of Esarhaddon's Cypriot vassals" (cf. E. Lipinski, "Le Ba'ana' d'Idalion", *Syria* 63 [1986] 379; see also *ibid.*, esp. 382, for a possible piece of indirect evidence for an Assyrian presence at Idalion) and, on the other hand, that "Assyrian representative(s) either stayed at Kition...or visited the place from time to time" (Na'aman, "The conquest" [footnote 4], 362). For more nuanced approaches to the implications of the Assyrian evidence and further bibliography, see Reyes, *Archaic Cyprus* (footnote 5), 49-60, Tuplin, *Achaemenid* (footnote 5), esp. 24-30, and Mehl, "The relations" (footnote 5), 60-62. Based on archaeological considerations, J. Boardman (*Cyprus between East and West* [16th Annual Lecture on the History and Archaeology of Cyprus, Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation], Nicosia 2001, 16-22) suggested a relocation of Cypriots to Al Mina by the Assyrians. If correctly inferred, such a practice would tend to support the notion of a more direct Assyrian involvement in Cypriot affairs (cf. V. Karageorghis, *Κύπρος, το σταυροδρόμι της Ανατολικής Μεσογείου, 1600-500 π.Χ.* [trans. M. Nikolakaki and E. Papatoma], Athens 2002 (trans. of the Milan 2002 edition), 154 and 155).

19. See Tuplin, *Achaemenid* (footnote 5), 25 with n. 46. The reference is to D.D. Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, vol. II, *Historical records of Assyria (from Sargon to the end)*, Chicago 1927, §44.

20. Na'aman, "The conquest" (footnote 4).

been entirely successful to date. The Assyrian evidence in particular continues to imply the need, also exposed by the commentary of Lloyd, for more rigorous questioning of the historical accuracy of Herodotus' word. And a further step in this direction was taken some fifteen years ago by Andres Reyes based on a marked convergence of the Herodotean portrait of Amasis with that of the Lydian king Croesus.

Reyes points out that Croesus is depicted in Herodotus as a ruler who was inclined, like Amasis, to make generous dedications to Greek temples.²¹ Croesus' conquest of the Ionians is also described in the *Histories* in much the same terms as Amasis' conquest of Cyprus.²² Such commonalities²³—which would tend to undermine in any case our confidence in Herodotus' intention to offer an individualized depiction of Amasis—could indicate, as Reyes notes, that “Herodotus' perception of Amasis, an Egyptian monarch, may well have been coloured by his own understanding of the ways in which other tyrants, notably Kroisos, behaved”.²⁴ Accordingly, the phrase *κατεστρέψατο ἐς φόρου ἀπαγωγὴν* (used in the cases of both Croesus and Amasis) could be understood, he suggests, “as a literary motif, rather than as a factual statement”, and Herodotus 2.182.2 as “a deliberate parallel between Amasis and “Croesus” which “need not reflect the actual relation between Cyprus and Egypt”. Hence, Reyes' contentions that: “[i]t may well be...that political relations between Amasis and Cyprus were less hostile than is normally assumed from Herodotus 2.182.2” and that “...historically, there need not have been any such phenomenon” as an “Egyptian domination” of Cyprus.²⁵

Reyes' suggestion that the portrait of Amasis is fashioned in accordance with that of Croesus—both portraits deriving from a stereotypical Greek perception of Oriental monarchs—would seem an appealing solution to the vexing historiographic problem

21. See Reyes, *Archaic Cyprus* (footnote 5), 77, with reference to Hdt. 1.47-56.

22. Idem, *Archaic Cyprus* (footnote 5), 77, drawing a comparison between Hdt. 2.182.2: *εἶλε δὲ [Ἀμασις] Κύπρον πρῶτος ἀνθρώπων καὶ κατεστρέψατο ἐς φόρου ἀπαγωγὴν*, and Hdt. 1.6.2 (cf. 1.27.1): *οὗτος ὁ Κροῖσος βαρβάρων πρῶτος τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν τοὺς μὲν κατεστρέψατο Ἑλλήνων ἐς φόρου ἀπαγωγὴν...* (emphasis mine).

23. For a further parallelism between Amasis and Croesus (their “testing of oracular truth”), see L. Kurke, *Coins, bodies, games and gold. The politics of meaning in archaic Greece*, Princeton 1999, 95 and n. 65.

24. Reyes, *Archaic Cyprus* (footnote 5), 77.

25. *Ibid.*, 78.

posed by the 2.182.2 passage. It is, after all, well known that the boundaries between Herodotus' commitment to historical accuracy and the license he may have exercised as a storyteller in processing historical information and embellishing his narrative are often difficult to define. However, as Tuplin noted, Reyes' discussion would appear to be "unduly neglectful of the issue of tribute in Herodotus' formulation".²⁶ Perhaps more importantly, the point is that the question of Herodotus' accuracy hinges equally, if not primarily, upon the nature of his sources—an aspect of the 2.182.2 passage that earlier commentaries have not adequately addressed. It is with this aspect that the remainder of this presentation is concerned. Herodotus' reference to Amasis as the first conqueror of Cyprus and his simultaneous ignorance of Cyprus' prior submission to Assyria can both be explained, in fact, by his probably patchy information about Assyrian and Cypriot history.

In the case of the Assyrians, Herodotus promises in Book 1.184 to give an account of the "many kings of Babylon" in his Assyrian *logoi*. This promise to give an account of Assyrian history (which also appears in 1.106.2, and which apparently remained unfulfilled²⁷) could give rise to an impression that the historian had at his disposal extensive information about the history of the Assyrians. The contents, however, of his narrative make it difficult to presume that he had an all-encompassing view of Assyrian history or even of the progress of Assyrian expansion. Although he evidently knew about the Assyrian rule of "Upper Asia" (1.95.2), the record of Assyria's phenomenal political ascendancy in the Near East is alluded to in his work by a limited number of brief passages which occur in his ethnographic *logoi*, and in particular in his accounts about the Medes and the Egyptians.²⁸ The information recorded in each instance is also related to these peoples' affairs. By the time Herodotus was writing, the Assyrians had long disappeared from the Near Eastern political scene. His information about them consisted, it seems, of separate episodes which had already crystallized in the

26. Tuplin, *Achaemenid* (footnote 5), 37.

27. For the various arguments advanced on this point, see, among other discussions, R. Drews, *The Greek accounts of Eastern history*, Washington, D.C., 1973, 92-95.

28. Assyrian expansionist activities are referred to in Hdt. 1.95.2-106 (Median *logos*), and 2.141.2-5 and 147.2 (Egyptian *logos*). Other passing references to Assyrian history and activities occur in the context of Herodotus' Persian (1.131.3), Babylonian (1.178-200 *passim*), and Egyptian (2.150.2-3) accounts.

historical traditions of their various subjects and adversaries – and it was in this form that it was transmitted to Herodotus.²⁹

Focusing narrowly on events of ethnic significance for the Medes and the Egyptians, Assyrian imperialist activities remembered in these peoples' local traditions would be unlikely to preserve information about the Assyrian empire's dealings with Cyprus. Memories of Cyprus' submission to Assyria would be preeminently expected to materialize in a Cypriot history, but there is no Cypriot *logos* in Herodotus' work. Despite Cyprus' close connections with the Greek world, the *Histories* reflect no more than a marginal interest in Cypriot affairs and there are rarely references to the use of Cypriot sources. The relevant information, which is as a rule of unaccounted origin,³⁰ is, again, consistently scattered—just like the passages related to the Assyrians—in different sections of Herodotus' narrative related to the affairs of other states and peoples.

Insights, for instance, into Cypriot traditions and customs turn up as asides to the Aegean Greek and foreign customs and practices discussed in greater length in Herodotus' work.³¹ References to the Salaminian ruler Evelthon (4.162.2-5) are occasioned by his discussion of the affairs of Cyrene; details concerning the attire, numbers, and military performance of the Cypriot contingent in Xerxes' armada (e.g., 7.90, 8.11.2) and to the ethnic origins of the Cypriots (7.90) are incidental to the

29. In the case of the Medes, such information may well have been transmitted through Persian sources, as is implied by Hdt. 1.95.1. Achaemenid affinities have even led in the past to the characterization of Herodotus' account of Median history as an artifact, in part, of Achaemenid propaganda (P.R. Helm, "Herodotus' *Medikos logos* and Median history", *Iran* 19 [1981] 87-88). A transmission of the Assyrian episodes included in the Egyptian *logos* through the Egyptian tradition is indicated by their perceptible Egyptian bias. See, e.g., the suppression of the uncomplimentary fact for the Egyptians that there had been a period of Assyrian occupation of Egypt in Herodotus' (2.141.2-5 and 147.2) account of Sennacherib's invasion of Egypt (noted by A.R. Burn in A. de Selincourt's translation of Herodotus' *Histories*, New York 1977, 188n.); and cf. page below.

30. Herodotus' express references to (Cypriot) sources in 1.105.3 and 7.90 are quite exceptional.

31. For instance, his reference to the origins of the Cypriot sanctuary of Aphrodite Ourania at 1.105.3 is an aside to his account of the destruction of the temple of the same goddess at Ascalon by the Scythians, itself ultimately a part of the Median *logos*; at 199.5, the existence of the custom of sacred prostitution in Cyprus is an aside to the description of the similar custom performed in the Babylonian temple of Aphrodite/Mylitta in the Babylonian *logos*; at 2.79.1, his reference to the celebration of "Linus" with song in Cyprus is a part of the Egyptian *logos*.

descriptions of the Persian expeditionary force and the naval battle at Salamis – which were, again, directly relevant to the history of the Greeks of the Aegean. Reference to Cyprus' submission to Persia occurs as a passing remark to Cambyses' Egyptian expedition (3.19.3). Equally, the unusually detailed account of the Cypriot Revolt in Book 5 (104-105.1 and 108-116.1) undoubtedly owes its existence in Herodotus to its causal connection with Aegean Greek, and in particular Ionian, struggles against Persia.

The incidental character of Herodotus' references to the Assyrians and the Cypriots – that is, only in connection with other peoples' affairs – directs our attention to his preoccupation with Egyptian history throughout Book 2, where his description of Amasis as the first conqueror of Cyprus appears. In 2.147.1 and 154.4 Herodotus tells us that for his narrative of the history of Egypt from the reign of Psammetichus on (i.e., for the latter part of Book 2 which includes his account about Amasis) he uses other sources in addition to the Egyptian ones.³² According to Alan Lloyd, these other sources would have been mostly oral Greek sources.³³ As he showed in detail, the selection of the materials also reveals a hellenocentric focus, which is especially prominent in chapters 2.178-182, encompassing the sum of the information offered in the second Book of the *Histories* about Amasis' foreign relations.³⁴

In particular, the narrative concerning Amasis describes the Egyptian ruler's decision to grant the Greeks the privilege of founding an emporium at Naucratis and his interest in the regulation of the Greeks' commercial presence and activity in Egypt (2.178-179); his generous donations and dedications to Greek temples at Delphi, Cyrene, Lindos and Samos (2.180, 181.4-5, 182); the league he concluded with the Cyrenaeans (2.181.1) and his friendship with the tyrant, Polycrates, of Samos (2.182.2) – all items that clearly document a selective preoccupation with those aspects of Amasis' policies that were of immediate interest to the Greeks. Excluded are this ruler's analogous acts of economic diplomacy and strategic piety addressed to other

32. Hdt. 2.147.1: ... ὅσα δὲ οἱ τε ἄλλοι ἄνθρωποι καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι λέγουσι ὁμολογέοντες τοῖσι ἄλλοισι κατὰ ταύτην τὴν χώραν γενέσθαι, ταῦτ' ἤδη φράσω...; cf. 154.4: τούτων [i.e., from the Ionians and Carians] δὲ οἰκισθέντων ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ οἱ Ἕλληνες οὕτω ἐπιμισγόμενοι τούτοις τὰ περὶ Αὔγυπτον γινόμενα ἀπὸ Ψαμπίχου βασιλέως ἀρξάμενοι πάντα καὶ τὰ ὕστερον ἐπιστάμεθα ἀπρεκέως.

33. A.B. Lloyd, "Herodotus' account of Pharaonic history", *Historia* 37 (1988) 24 and 31.

34. See esp. *ibid.*, 28 (identifying a hellenocentric focus in the "points of emphasis, choice of subject matter, attitudes, and the thought-structures into which the material is cast") and 41-53.

peoples, for which some archaeological indications are available, for instance, from the Levant.³⁵ Mention of the Pharaoh's conquest of the largely Greek-speaking island of Cyprus at the end of the same narrative section must have also been motivated, as suggested by earlier scholars, by Herodotus' interest in Amasis' dealings with the Greeks.³⁶

Yet these materials which were largely transmitted by Greek sources and focus on events of intrinsic interest to the Greeks, can be traced to corresponding Egyptian traditions, like Herodotus' other references to the acts of Egyptian kings. Herodotus' Egyptian history – in essence a compilation of successive Egyptian rulers' memorable *erga* – closely corresponds, as shown by Lloyd, to “the scope of Egyptian historiography which is largely filled with royal accounts of royal deeds”, expressing traditional Egyptian concepts of kingship³⁷ (and largely meant to promote the legitimacy of Pharaohs and inspire admiration for the personal accomplishments of individual kings). Herodotus' materials on Amasis were no exception in this regard.

Amasis' establishment and organization of the Greek emporium of Naucratis – like the hydraulic projects (the construction of a dam, a canal, and a lake to the north and west of Memphis) by means of which the first ruler of Egypt, Min, regulated the course and flow of the Nile (2.99)³⁸ – can be taken to allude to the canonical role of the Pharaoh as the head of state of his kingdom,³⁹ including the Greeks and other foreigners settled in his domain.⁴⁰

35. See Reyes, *Archaic Cyprus* (footnote 5), 78 and n. 42 (with earlier bibliography), for a bronze jug with cartouches of Amasis found in Sidon. An Egyptian stone mortar inscribed with the royal names and epithets of Amasis found in Cyprus might imply analogous gestures of piety by that ruler toward temples in Cyprus. However, according to Alison South (“An Egyptian stone mortar with inscription of Amasis from Cyprus”, *RDAC* [1987] 78), “[i]t is far more likely that... [the mortar] arrived in Cyprus as part of the antiquities trade”.

36. Lloyd, “Herodotus' account” (footnote 33), 49; cf. idem, *Herodotus* (footnote 2), 175, attributing the especially prominent hellenocentric focus of the episodes of Amasis' *vitae* related in Herodotus to Amasis' important impact on the Greek world.

37. A.B. Lloyd, “The Late Period”, in: B.G. Trigger, B.J. Kemp, D. O'Connor and A.B. Lloyd, *Ancient Egypt: a social history*, Cambridge 1983, 288-343 *passim*; cf. idem, “Herodotus' account” (footnote 33), 41 with n. 54, and 42.

38. Cf. Lloyd, “Herodotus' account” (footnote 33), 41.

39. Cf. *ibid.*, 41.

40. The Egyptian rulers' ultimate prerogative in regulating the affairs of Naucratis is indicated, among other things, by an inscription detailing the Naucratices' fiscal obligations which was

Equally, Amasis' dedications to Greek sanctuaries could be perceived as an extension of the Pharaoh's traditional religious duties (which regularly comprised prodigious building activities and dedications to Egyptian temples), combined in the case of the Greek sanctuaries with the requirements of foreign diplomacy.⁴¹

Military achievements had an equally important place in Egyptian historiography. They expressed the traditional role of Egyptian royalty in defending and enlarging their domain.⁴² In this regard, references to Amasis' conquest of Cyprus would also be in character with an Egyptian tradition about Amasis' activities. But was such a tradition responsible for elevating Amasis to the status of the first conqueror of Cyprus?

Unrivaled accomplishments were a no less important preoccupation of the Egyptian tradition, in whose surviving formulations objectivity often played second fiddle to national pride and propaganda. Lloyd notes that nationalist propaganda is conveyed in the Herodotean representation of Sesostris, "the ideal Egyptian ruler...as an Egyptian king whose conquests surpass those of the Persian rulers of Egypt".⁴³ According to the same scholar, the workings of Egyptian national pride can possibly also be detected in "the omission of Assyrian support for Necho I from Herodotus' description of how the former monarch was restored to Egypt".⁴⁴

That Amasis was the first conqueror of Cyprus could also derive from an Egyptian account of Amasis' *vitae* with a nationalist slant, disregarding an earlier Assyrian conquest. An emphasis on the conquest of Cyprus in the Egyptian tradition, and presumably in Amasis' own official proclamations, would be entirely justified by the prestige that foreign powers traditionally assigned to their control of the island.⁴⁵ The

erected by the fourth-century Pharaoh, Nectanebo I, in the temple of Neith and discovered in its ruins (M. Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian literature: a book of readings*, vol. 3, *The Late Period*, Berkeley 1980, 86-89). See also, however, Lloyd, *Herodotus* (footnote 2), 221, on the "restrictive character" of Amasis' measures on Naukratis.

41. Cf. Lloyd, "The Late Period" (footnote 37), 293-294 and 330.

42. Cf. *ibid.*, 295.

43. Lloyd, "Herodotus' account" (footnote 33), 40, with reference to Hdt. 2.110.1 and 103.1.

44. *Ibid.*, 40, with reference to Hdt. 2.152.1.

45. For the important place of Cyprus as a prestigious holding and a marker of extraordinary ancient Near Eastern imperialist expansion, see, e.g., Stylianou, "Τα αρχαία βασίλεια" (footnote 11), 484, and Na'aman, "The conquest" (footnote 4), 357-358, concerning Assyrian attitudes; and A. Zournatzi, "The Apadana coin hoards, Darius I, and the West", *AJN* 15 (2003) 1-28, with reference especially to the economic and ideological importance that the Persians ascribed to their own hold of Cyprus.

hellenocentric focus of Herodotus' sources and the Greek historian's systematic and deliberate emphasis on "first doers",⁴⁶ combined with his apparent ignorance of Cyprus' earlier submission to Assyrian kings, may have merely lent a hand in the historical transmission of Amasis' conquest of the island as a hitherto unrivaled deed.

46. Cf. Drews' (*The Greek accounts* [footnote 27], 61) comment that "[f]or Herodotus much of the significance of the conquest lay in the fact that Amasis succeeded in doing what no mortal had ever done before".

Antigoni ZOURNATZI

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

Η Αίγυπτος στην Κύπρο. Μια Φαραωνική ερμηνεία στον Ηρόδοτο (κεφ. 2.182.2)

Κλείνοντας την αφήγησή του γύρω από τις δραστηριότητες του Φαραώ Άμασι (περ. 570-526 π.Χ.) στο δεύτερο βιβλίο των *Ιστοριών*, ο Ηρόδοτος (2.182.2) αναφέρει ότι ο Άμασις ήταν ο πρώτος άνθρωπος που κατέλαβε την Κύπρο και την κατέστησε φόρου υποτελή. Είναι ωστόσο γνωστό ότι επιγραφικά κείμενα από την Ανατολή αναφέρονται σε αρχαιότερες κατακτήσεις της μεγαλονήσου από ξένους κατακτητές και σε παροχές εισφορών ή δώρων υποτελείας από τους Κυπρίους σε ασιάτες μονάρχες, ιδίως σε Ασσύριους βασιλείς του ύστερου όγδοου και του έβδομου αι. π.Χ.

Αυτή η αντίφαση ανάμεσα στον Ηρόδοτο και τις ανατολικές μαρτυρίες έχει προκαλέσει ποικίλες ερμηνείες. Σύμφωνα με μία από αυτές, η μαρτυρία του Ηροδότου προδίδει τη γενικότερη άγνοια των ελληνικών πηγών γύρω από την ανατολική ιστορία. Άλλοι μελετητές υπέθεσαν ότι το χωρίο του Ηροδότου πρέπει να αφορά μόνο στον πρώτο *Αιγύπτιο* κατακτητή του νησιού. Για άλλους η αποσιώπηση συγκεκριμένα της ασσυριακής κυριαρχίας στην Κύπρο από τον Έλληνα ιστορικό θα μπορούσε να υποδηλώνει ότι ο χαρακτήρας της ασσυριακής ηγεμονίας ήταν πιο πρόσκαιρος ή/και λιγότερο επιβαρυντικός οικονομικά σε σύγκριση με τις συνθήκες της αιγυπτιακής κατάκτησης. Έχει επίσης προταθεί ότι η αναφορά στον Άμασι ως «πρώτο κατακτητή» της Κύπρου ενδέχεται να είναι εντελώς ανυπόστατη ιστορικά: συγκεκριμένα, να αποτελεί ένα «μοτίβο» το οποίο δανείστηκε ο Ηρόδοτος για καθαρά λογοτεχνικούς σκοπούς από μία στερεότυπη αρχαία ελληνική αντίληψη των ανατολικών μοναρχών.

Η παρούσα μελέτη επικεντρώνεται στο ερώτημα των πηγών του Ηροδότου σε αυτή την περίπτωση. Υποστηρίζει την άποψη ότι η απουσία αναφοράς στην ασσυριακή κυριαρχία στην Κύπρο στο 2.182.2 οφείλεται σε άγνοια του ιστορικού για το γεγονός και αντικατοπτρίζει ειδικότερα τις περιορισμένες γνώσεις του γύρω από την ιστορία των ασσυριακών κατακτήσεων και γύρω από την ιστορία της ίδιας της Κύπρου. Παράλληλα, προτείνεται ότι η παρουσίαση του Άμασι ως «πρώτου κατακτητή» της Κύπρου πιθανότατα προέρχεται, όπως και οι υπόλοιπες αναφορές στις δραστηριότητες του Φαραώ στο δεύτερο βιβλίο των *Ιστοριών*, από την αιγυπτιακή παράδοση· μία παράδοση, η οποία δεν αποκλείεται να απηχεί φαραωνική έπαρση, αποσιωπώντας το ασσυριακό προηγούμενο.