SOME EVIDENCE FROM CYPRUS
OF APOLLINE CULT IN THE BRONZE AGE*

The universality of his nature, his aloofness and distance from worshippers have made Apollo the most enigmatic member of the Olympian family of gods. His origins and history are obscure, and are likely to remain so, because the Apollo we meet in classical Greek religion is a composite figure resulting from a combination of elements whose age and provenance are difficult to disentangle. The god’s strong oriental connections have long been recognized, and since Nilsson they have been established on a scientific foundation. In fact it has become fashionable to seek Apollo’s home in the east whence he is believed to have come to Greece and the western Aegean in general about 800 B.C. or even later 1).

This date seems unduly pessimistic, however, and does not agree with the evidence of the history and distribution of Greek cult. Although his name does not appear on the extant Linear B records, important features of Apollo’s Arcadian and Laconian cult associations imply his presence in that part of the world before the end of the Bronze Age 2). Apollo’s festivals, like those of his sister Artemis, were not confined to one ethnic or tribal group such as the Dorians 3), which means that he was worshipped in Greece before the Ionians and Dorians had gone their separate ways and evolved individual dialects. Certain aspects of the classical Apollo had come to the west quite early therefore and these it should be possible to isolate without attempting any kind of unrewarding search for one single origin of so complex a figure.

One promising line of research in this respect consists in the ancient tradition of Apolline cults in Cyprus. Of special interest for our purposes is Apollo’s identification in Idalion with

*) The main arguments of this paper were incorporated in a lecture which was delivered at the XIIIth Congress of the International Association for the History of Religions, in Lancaster, August 1975.
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the Syrian Reshef. A fourth century B.C. bilingual inscription 4) from there – Phoenician-Cypriot syllabic – translates the Phoenician Reshef Mikal into Greek as Apollo Amyklos. Amyklos and Amyklaios are obviously identical in this equation, for the latter occurs on another dedication (third century) to Apollo Amyklaios by a certain Mnaseas and was written in alphabetic Greek 5).

The Phoenician Reshef possessed an equally universal nature as the Greek Apollo 6) and both gods would readily have been identified in the minds of Greek and Phoenician worshippers in Cyprus. The closest points of contact seem to have been their protecting, apotropaic and purificatory powers which were also responsible for their common attributes of bow and arrows 7). More surprising is the juxtaposition in Idalion of the two epithets Mikal and Amyklos, Amyklaios, because the latter were strictly localized titles of Apollo in Laconian Amyklai 8) and in Gortyn, Crete 9).

4) CIS I, 89; Reshef Mikal’s name occurs on five other Phoenician dedications from Idalion, CIS I, 90–94.

5) Mnaseas was a hellenized Phoenician, according to O. Masson, Cultes Indigènes, Cultes Grecs et Cultes Orientaux à Chypre (Éléments Orientaux dans la Religion Grecque Ancienne), Paris 1960, 138; Syria 45 (1968) 308.

6) The most recent study of the god is by D. Conrad, “Der Gott Reschef”, Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 83 (1971) 157–183. Other modern discussions of the topic are referred to in Syria 45 (1968) 307 n.1. See now also W. Burkert, “Reseph-Figuren, Apollon von Amyklai und die “Erfindung” des Opfers auf Cypern”, Grazer Beiträge 4 (1975) 51–79. This last article came to hand after the present essay had been written, but it is gratifying to see that on some fundamental points of Apollo’s early history and cult in Cyprus Prof. Burkert’s conclusions are not dissimilar to mine.

7) The god sends death as well as heals sickness. Reshef’s bow, arrows and lance are shown in 17th century B.C. Syrian iconography – P. Matthiae, Or. An. 2 (1963) 35 ff., Pl. XIV –, and are described in Ugaritic texts, Conrad, Ztschrft. (1971) 172. The etymology of rṣp. (e.g. in the Keret epic) appears to be “pestilence”, Conrad, op. cit. 159. Conrad is, however, more inclined (p. 181 n. 191) to emphasize the common nature of Apollo and Reshef as war and solar gods. However, Apollo’s solar nature most likely belonged to a later stage of the god’s development, cf. M. P. Nilsson, Geschichte der griechischen Religion, Munich 1967, 529. Cf. Wernicke, P.-W. “Apollon” 20f.; Fauth, Kleiner Pauly, “Apollon” 442. Burkert also favours the theory that Reshef with bow and arrows was a kind of “Kriegergott” (Gr. B. (1975) 56), and he cites as an example of this figure the terracotta head from the Laconian Amyklaion (op. cit. 64).

8) Polybius 5, 19, 3.

9) Law of Gortyn III, 8; SGDI II, 5016, 24 = name of month Amyklaios.
Since Greek speakers settled in Cyprus some three to four centuries before the Phoenicians, it was thought that the name Mikal was the Semitic transcription of Amyklos\(^{10}\) whose cult had been imported from Laconia. One of the dedications\(^ {11}\) actually referred to Reshef Mikal of Idalion suggesting that this combination was peculiar to the place\(^ {12}\). This conclusion proved to be wrong, however, since a fifth century inscription from Kition refers to Mikal on his own\(^ {13}\). Some other compelling evidence establishes Mikal as an independent god of Semitic origin in Beth Shan as early as the fourteenth century B.C.\(^ {14}\). It is hardly surprising then that the position was reversed and Amyklos came to be thought of as a Greek transcription of the Canaanite Mikal\(^ {15}\). In other words, Amyklos, Amyklaios were now said to have arisen from the Semitic god\(^ {16}\) after the arrival in Cyprus of the Phoenician colonists\(^ {17}\) late in the ninth century\(^ {18}\), and consequently possessed no cultic significance of their own. If, however, the syncretism of Reshef Mikal and Apollo Amyklos was confined to Cyprus\(^ {19}\), it is hard to explain why

---

\(^{10}\) References are collected in Masson, *Cultes* 138 and n. 5.

\(^ {11}\) *CIS* I, 90.

\(^ {12}\) Cf. A. Caquot-O. Masson, “Deux Inscriptions Phéniciennes de Chypre”, *Syria* 45 (1968) 308. Compare two other fourth century bilinguals from Tamassos with dedications to Apollo Heleitas and Alasiotas. The epithets are Cypriot toponyms which were translated into the Phoenician equivalents, *Revue des Etudes Sémitiques* 1212, 1213. Masson, *Cultes* 139, cites and rightly rejects the idea that Alasiotas was a place name in the Peloponnese from which the title under discussion was derived.


\(^ {16}\) I.e. Mikal + prothetic α-; Astour, *ibid*.

\(^ {17}\) *Syria* 45 (1968) 310. O. Eissfeldt believes that Mikal arrived in Cyprus from the east during the second millennium B.C., “Philister und Phönizier”, *Der Alte Orient* 54 (1956) 15.


\(^ {19}\) *Syria* 45 (1968) 312.
the cult of Apollo Amyklos should only have travelled to one other site and nowhere else, unless concealed beneath the Laconian Amyklos there lay an older cult which was the same as that in honour of Reshef – Apollo in Cyprus²⁰). This point will come up again presently.

Although Mikal seems real enough on the Beth Shan stele²¹) receiving worship no later than the second half of the second millennium B.C.²²), certain features do cast doubt on his independent personality. These are in the main the Idalion inscriptions in which Mikal was reduced to an epithet of Reshef²³), and to our knowledge Mikal was only ever associated with Reshef. Also suspicious is the use of the definite article between Reshef and Mikal in an unpublished dedication from the same locality²⁴). Reshef the Mikal apparently demonstrates the adjectival quality of the title. Considered from the point of cultic significance it is immaterial, of course, whether Mikal was a toponym, since places generally owed their names to gods and cults and not the other way round. The case against Mikal's being a place name is certainly not as strong as Caquot and Masson believe²⁵) in view of e.g. Apollo's numerous localized epithets – especially in Cyprus –, or those of Reshef or Baal²⁶). Appearances notwithstanding, it is impossible to be sure that Mikal existed merely in the shadow of Reshef²⁷): more probably he achieved personal status in his own right but was subsequently absorbed by the greater god. What is certain, however, is that Reshef and Mikal came together early, i.e. before Phoenician settlement in Cyprus.

²¹) Theories of Mikal's Sumerian origin are generally based on the god's and Reshef's affinity with the chthonic figure of Nergal – W. F. Albright, Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research 90 (1943) 33 f.; Astour, Hellen. 209 f. This derivation is unconvincing mainly because of Reshef's universal nature. Etymologies of Mikal from Sumerian also remain suspect, cf. Syria 45 (1968) 310.
²²) Rowe proposed – Topography of B. Shan, 17 – that Mikal was brought to Beth Shan by mercenaries from the western Mediterranean. See Caquot's and Masson's argument against this in Syria (1968) 309 n. 6.
²³) J. B. Peckham, “Notes on a Fifth-Century Phoenician Inscription from Kition, Cyprus (CIS 86)”, Orientalia 37 (1968) 320, explains this as a syncretism of the Phoenician Mikal of Kition with the Apollo of Idalion which was politically subject to the former city in the fifth century.
²⁴) Now in the British Museum.
²⁵) Syria (1968) 310.
²⁷) See n. 25.
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and during the Bronze Age. Conrad convincingly argues that Reshef and Mikal were also associated outside Cyprus namely at Beth Shan\(^2\)\(^8\). The stele there was dedicated by Egyptians to the local god Mikal who is shown, not unnaturally in the circumstances, in the form, and with the attributes, of the Egyptian Seth, because Seth often represented ‘foreign’ gods including both Mikal and Reshef\(^2\)\(^9\). Now the archaeological remains in the temple area at Beth Shan indicate continuity of cult between Levels IX (14th century) and V (10/9th century), which means quite probably that the same god was worshipped as the Lord of Beth Shan for these four or five centuries, even though he was called Mikal on the Egyptian stele but Reshef on a tenth century seal from the same place\(^3\)\(^0\).

There has been a good deal of speculation about the etymology of Mikal\(^3\)\(^1\), much of which is linguistically possible but difficult to prove in view of Mikal’s elusive background. However, the explanation which is both philologically sound and fits the religious context translates Mikal by “Lord, the All-powerful”\(^3\)\(^2\). Some other divine names of the Canaanite pantheon simply mean “Lord” or “King”\(^3\)\(^3\). In Syrian religion Baal signified “Master, Lord”, so did Adon, while melek meant “King”\(^3\)\(^4\). A few of these never rose beyond epithets\(^3\)\(^5\); others, like Mikal, were gods in their own right, though they too tended to be closely associated with a major deity. This was the case for example with Adonis whose history conceals important information about the cultural relationship of Canaan and Cyprus. Mutatis mutandis the association between Reshef and Mikal really re-

\(^{28}\) Ztschrft. (1971) 165.

\(^{29}\) Conrad, op. cit. 165; 167.

\(^{30}\) The gods’ attributes are similar. Mikal carried a sceptre and the symbol of life in his hands. A conical cap on his head has a pair of horns in front from which bands are suspended. On the seal Reshef is shown holding sickle-sword and the symbol of life sign. He is wearing the same type conical cap but with the head of a gazelle in front and double bands at the back.

Conrad, Ztschrft. (1971) 165; 175.

\(^{31}\) Astour, Hellen. 311f.; Caquot-Masson, Syria 45 (1968) 310f. have made up a list of recent proposals.

\(^{32}\) For references see Syria (1968) 310f. and Conrad, op. cit. 166 n. 65; 175f. Cf. Burkert, Gr. B. 4 (1975) 69, “der Mächtige”.

\(^{33}\) The general Semitic word for god – el – means “power”.

\(^{34}\) H. Ringgren, The Religion of Ancient Syria in Historia Religionum, Leiden 1969, I, 198; 200, etc.

\(^{35}\) This seems to be true of melek, which is recorded e.g. as a title of Reshef – Ugaritica V TML 12: V\(^9\) 7.
sembled that of Astarte, Aphrodite with Adonis whose independent name and perhaps personality represented a development in Phoenician religion\(^36\).

Invocatory titles like "King" and "Lord" were used by the Minoans and Mycenaeans whose habit of calling their gods \(\text{Wanax}, \text{Wanassa}\) and \(\text{Potnia}\) is reflected in the Linear B tablets. The custom survived to some extent in Greek literature\(^37\) and in a particular type of cult\(^38\) which from the beginning had revolved about the figure of the \(\text{Wanax}\). Many of the cult's basic aspects the Mycenaeans shared with the Minoans and ultimately with Syrian and Mesopotamian religions. Therefore the use of the titles \((\text{W})\text{anax}, (\text{W})\text{anassa}\) is a sure indication that we are dealing with an ancient cult which had continued from the Bronze Age. Cyprus was no exception to the rule: at Paphos an old tradition recorded that Aphrodite used to be called \(\text{Wanassa}\).\(^39\) We cannot press this kind of evidence too far\(^40\) without knowing more of the nature of Mikal's and Reshef Mikal's cult which will become clearer if we consider the background to the Greek side of the identification.

The evidence concerning the Laconian Amyklai has been examined elsewhere\(^41\). The site was settled uninterruptedly from Early Helladic\(^42\). Although there is, of course, no direct witness that the name of the settlement remained the same from the beginning, Greek tradition is unanimous that Amyklai was an ancient "Achaean" bastion\(^43\). Ancient means Bronze Age in this

\(^38\) B.Hemberg, \textit{Anax, Anassa und Anakes}, Uppsala 1955, \textit{passim}.
\(^39\) This is her title in local syllabic inscriptions, Masson, \textit{Cultes} 135.
\(^40\) There was a Mycenaean temple (Sanctuary I) below that of Aphrodite at Palaepaphos. Associated finds (horns of consecration, two stone capitals and other architectural features), which are the same as those in similar sanctuaries at Kition, Enkomi and Myrtou-Pigadhes, date the temple to the twelfth century B.C., \textit{B.C.H.} 98 (1974) 874f.
\(^41\) "The Dorian Hyacinthia" \textit{Kadmos} 14 (1975) 133–142.
\(^43\) E.g. Paus. 3, 2, 6.
context, for we may be pretty certain that the Cretan Amyklaion near Gortyn was founded as early as that from the Laconian Amyklai 44) even though the name occurs only much later in the written sources 45). This early date is most important for the assessment of the Cypriot connection of divinities and cult whatever the etymology of Amyklai might be 46).

There is not much to be learned from this particular research except that the word need not be Semitic but could be Cypriot 47). Also Amyklai, Amyklaios were non-Greek intrusive words like other mainland toponyms. But the adjectival form does not quite fit Apollo who was generally referred to as ἐν Ἀμύκλαιος, ἐν Ἀμυκλαιῶν rather than Ἀμυκλαῖος, Ἀμυκλαῖος. Amyklaios as cult title, and as month name 48), were comparatively late 49) as opposed to Apollo’s more familiar epithet Hyakinthos, Hyakinthios 80). This does not imply that Amyklai, Amyklaios and Hyakinthos represented two distinct elements in the Laconian festival: both referred to the same cult which was in Apollo’s charge 51). But the significance of the former seems to reside in


46) Amyklai is an Aegean, pre-Greek word, according to J. B. Haley, “The Coming of the Greeks”, A.J.A. 32 (1928) 145; A. Fick, Vor griechische Ortsnamen als Quelle für die Vorgeschichte Griechenlands, Göttingen 1905, 91; 113.


49) Amyklaios may have been scratched on a roof tile – I.G. V, 1, 863 – otherwise the title is used of the cult statue in Amyklai on Laconian coins of Antigonos Doson (3rd. cent. B.C.) and on imperial coins of Commodus and Gallienus. The references have been collected in P.-W. “Sparta” (Ziehen) 1458.

50) Cf. P.-W. “Apollo” (Jessen) 43; “Sparta” (Ziehen) 1456.

51) Cf. Nonnus, Dion. 11, 365; 12, 160, where Hyakinthos and Amyklaios are identified.
its particular form of cult building or locality, such as for example its open position on a hill\(^{52}\) prior to the transference of the Amyklaion to Crete, \textit{i.e.} before the end of the Bronze Age. Amyklai doubtless referred to a central aspect of the Laconian cult which was also connected with Hyakinthos and with Apollo who absorbed the former figure in his own worship. The Reshef Mikal—Apollo Amyklos notices of Idalion similarly reflected actual cult which should not have materially differed from that in Amyklai.

The archaeological evidence is explicit: Achaeans came to Cyprus in large numbers from the end of the thirteenth century B.C. in Late Cypriot III\(^{53}\). Greek tradition tells the same story of settlement in Cyprus following the Trojan War, particularly from Arcadia and Laconia\(^{54}\). Accounts like Agapenor's founding of Paphos, or that of Lapethos by Laconian Praxandros, arose from historical events\(^{55}\) and largely agree with the archaeological evidence\(^{56}\). Thus firm ties bound Cyprus to the Peloponnesse, so that religious ideas, deities and cult were passing both ways across the Aegean before the Bronze Age had been rung out\(^{57}\). Pausanias records the curious popular memory of Laodike, daughter of Arcadian Agapenor, dedicating a temple to Aphrodite Paphia in her old home in Tegea\(^{58}\). Should one not then consider the very real possibility that the name Amyklai came

---

52) See below n. 77 for the possible connection of Hyakinthos with peak cult. Cypriot cult shared with that of the Mycenaeans the use of open air sanctuaries. See the archaeological reports of \textit{e.g.} Kition cited below and R.V. Nicholls, “Greek votive statuettes and religious continuity, c. 1200 –700 B.C.”, in \textit{Auckland Classical Essays}, presented to E.M. Blaiklock (B.F. Harris ed.), Auckland 1970, 8; 9.


54) See Steph. Byzant. \textit{Δακεδαἷμων ἦστι καὶ ἔτερα Δακεδαἷμων Κύπρου μεσόγειος. Eust. II. 2, 581, ἦστι δὲ καὶ Κυπρία Δακεδαἷμων.}

55) Paus. 8, 5, 2; Lycochr. 479ff.; Strabo 14, 683, 682; Lycochr. 586ff. and schol. The evidence has been collected by E. Gjerstad, “The Colonization of Cyprus in Greek Legend”, \textit{Opuscula Archaeologica} 3 (1944) 107–123; Kiechle, \textit{Lakonien} 68–75.

56) Compare Gjerstad, \textit{op. cit.} 112; 119. Kiechle has to make room for the Dorian invasion of Greece and accordingly postpones the migration to Cyprus until after the Mycenaean Age, p. 72.

57) This point has been debated by some modern scholars, \textit{e.g.} K. J. Beloch, \textit{Griechische Geschichte}, Strassburg 1913, I, 2, 106; Gjerstad, \textit{Op. Arch.} (1944) 110ff., who also cites Enmann.

58) Paus. 8, 53, 7.
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from Cyprus or even further east⁵⁹)? But questions about the “how” and “when” of this transmission are still beyond us.

The earliest remains of cult at Amyklai belong to L.H. III B/C. They consist of typical Mycenaean “Psi” figurines and wheel-made animals⁶⁰). Miniature votive double axes complete the picture of a Minoan-Mycenaean type cult which survived the end of the Bronze Age⁶¹) and continued in its essentials in the historical Amyklaian festival. The old Aegean figure of Hyakinthos was central to this cult whose apotropaic content and ritual attracted the attention of the more important god. Apollo’s own apotropaic nature and early date of involvement with the Hyakinthia are evident from his ancient image at Amyklai for which Bathycles centuries later built the massive marble throne⁶³). The semi-iconic statue was in the form of a bronze pillar, but with arms, which carried spear and bow, feet and head plus helmet. The curious form appears on Spartan coins which, though late, doubtless preserved a tradition that began in prehistoric times⁶⁴). We are reminded of Apollo Pythaios, whose identical armed and pillar-shaped image stood on the hill Thronax in Laconia. The cult, too, was the same for both figures, because the Spartans felt free to use the gold which Croesus had sent for Pythaios to adorn the Amyklaian Apollo⁶⁵).

Stone columns or pillars were extremely common symbols of Apollo throughout Greece from Acarnania, Laconia, Megara to Attica and in the east⁶⁶) in his capacity as purifying god, protector and defender against evil (Alexikakos, Apotropaioi)⁶⁷).

---

⁵⁹) For a different view see Gjerstad, op. cit. 112.
⁶⁰) B.S.A. 55 (1960) 75 and n. 44.
⁶¹) See the discussion in Kadmos (1975).
⁶²) Celebrated in the month of Hekatombaion, IG V, I, 188, 1. 8; cf. I. Chirassi, Elementi di Culture Precerealiti nei Miti e Riti Greci, Rome 1968, 171 and n. 28.
⁶³) Fifth century B.C., Paus. 3, 1, 3; 19, 3. The throne concealed Hyacinthus’ tomb in its base.
His best known epithet in this function was Agyieus 68); but he could also be called Prostaterios 69), Thyraios 70), Propylaioi 71) etc., as his pillars were placed in front of private houses or even public buildings, like theatres and sanctuaries 72), or even public roads 73). The shape of the column was typically baetylic, i.e. pointed or cone-shaped 74), and appears on coins from Oricus, Apollonia and Ambracia 75).

In short the evidence for this aspect of Apollo is strong and suggests that the god’s apotropaic qualities, together with the primitive image, belonged to his earliest nature which became submerged later in a confusing multitude of functions. Quite probably, as Nilsson suggests 76), the community and city-god Apollo Patroos evolved from the function of the protector of individual homes and byways. However, for our purposes two points are very important: firstly the history of the divine pillar in Minoan-Mycenaean cult in general, and secondly the particular association of this “baetylic” Apollo with the east. Both points are related really, because they refer to common basic cult practices and beliefs of the Bronze Age which the Aegean peoples shared with much of the east at the time. Mycenaean stone and pillar cult and its beginnings have been fully discussed 77): it seems clear that the aniconic preceded the iconic statue and was thought to represent the god and his power. Therefore Apollo’s semi-iconic imagery and connection with stone worship are an indication of the antiquity of his cult not only in the east 78), but also in the Greek world 79), which seems to support our conten-

68) Harpocr. q.v. ’Ayvûh; Loxias, Photius, Biblioth. 535.
69) See the inscriptions in n. 64.
70) Macrobius 1, 9, 6, where he cites Nigidius.
71) Aristoph. Wasps 875.
72) E.g. the Athenian Thesmophorion, Aristoph., ibid. and Thesmoph.

489.
76) Gesch. I, 557.
79) Clem. Alex., Strom. 1, 418P, cites the poet Eumelus as his authority that Apollo was worshipped in Delphi in pillar-shape. The god’s baetylic omphalos is probably better evidence for his long residence in Delphi, cf.
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It seems that the figure of Apollo the protector originated in the east, possibly in Anatolia: perhaps he had already guarded the ancient city of Troy, for the baetyls, which were found flanking the gates of Troy VI, might well have been symbolic of Agyieus. But the strongest memory of Agyieus' eastern origins survived in the double function of his stone as divine image and sacrificial altar. This dual purpose was Semitic and particularly at home in Phoenician belief according to which the stone baitylos served at once as the God's house and His altar on which He received His sacrifice. Such incidentally played an important rôle in Phoenician Creation Myths, so that their cultic use also travelled to Greece by the secondary route.

It was, one imagines, the apotropaic and protective qualities inherent in Apollo's stones and pillars which brought him together with Reshef Mikal in Cyprus. Mikal's precise value in this equation remains unknown, but independently, or as part of Reshef, he must have exercised the same functions in this syncretism as his other partners. Thus it becomes possible to interpret two items of direct evidence in the light of this cultic background: Mikal's pillar is actually mentioned in the Kition inscription, and there is no reason to suppose that its signi-

---

Nilsson, *Gesch.*, I, 204. In Megara Apollo Karinos was represented by a small pyramid-shaped stone near the Nymphades Gates, Paus. I, 44, 2; Apollo Lithesios was shown standing beside a stone in Malea, Steph. Byzant. q.v. *Abyios.* The same applies, of course, to other Greek deities with similar associations, like Dionysus Perikionios in Thebes (schol. Eur., *Phoen.* 651; Clem. Alex., *Strom.* I 24, 418P; Zeus Meilichios and Artemis (Patroa) in Sicyon (pyramid and pillar, Paus. 2, 9, 6); and Hera (Clem. Alex., *ibid.*).

80) There is an obvious connection between this type of cult on Ayia Kyriaki and peak cult which also survived from the Minoan-Mycenaean Age. In classical times Apollo with the epithet of Hyakinthos received offerings on peak cult sites in Crete (Tylissos) and on the mainland, *B.C.H.* 91 (1967) 133 and n. 1.


84) Dietrich, *Origins* 55

85) CIS I, 86, 1, 14. This is the translation of the Semitic 'ṣṭṭ (prothetic
Significance greatly differed from that of Apollo’s baetyl. Secondly we are in possession of some interesting information from the archaeological remains of the Phoenician temple in Kition which may have housed the dedication. According to the excavator’s report, the entrance to this temple was flanked by two stone columns, and it does not seem too far fetched to ascribe to these the same kind of powers that were felt to reside in the pillars of Agyieus.

There is, however, a depressingly wide chronological gap between the Achaean and Phoenician periods of colonization and the inscriptive evidence. This and other grave problems will have to be squarely faced. The question of continuity, as in Greece, can to some extent be answered by the archaeological evidence. It is as well to remember, however, that no identifiable temple of Mikal has yet been uncovered. In Kition, for example, which has been the site of the most sensational discoveries in recent years one important Phoenician temple has come to light which belonged to Astarte, the Phoenician Aphrodite. Now the accounts (CIS 86) which mention Mikal’s name actually concerned Astarte’s temple, although Mikal is said to have his own temple. Should we therefore assume the same temple to have housed the two? Perhaps, perhaps not; but the monumental remains of Kition do in fact suggest that twin deities (male and female?) where revered in the temple area. There certainly existed a close relationship between the Amyklaian Apollo and Aphrodite in Laconia.

Possibly the puzzling epithets of Tetracheir and Tetraotos, which also belonged to Apollo in Amyklai, on the usually reliable authority of Sosibius, arose from such cultic background of twin figures. These points are

\[ \text{aleph} \] which has been proposed by Peckham, Donner-Röllig and M. Da-hood, cited in Syria 46 (1969) No. 96, p. 338f.


87) Remains of others are mentioned in B. C. H. 97 (1973) 652.

88) The armed Aphrodite is called Amyklaia by Nonnus, Dion. 43, 6. There were two statues of Aphrodite in Amyklai by Gitiades and Polyclitus, the second of which carried the epithet παγδ ’Αμυκλαίο (Paus. 3, 18, 8; 4, 14, 2). Furtwängler believed that the famous statue on Bathycles’ throne represented Aphrodite Enhoplios, Roscher, Myth. Lex. I, 408. Cf. also the curious column-shaped image (like a meta) of the Paphian Aphrodite, Tac., Hist. 2, 3.

89) In Zenobius 1, 34; cf. Hesych. q.v. Κοψίδας; Farnell, Cults IV, 127.
plausible, particularly in view of the history of Aphrodite and Apollo cult in Cyprus, but can not be proved, alas 90).

Such reservations aside, the archaeological picture of some of the major Cypriot settlements does bring out two significant aspects: firstly there is much evidence of cult continuity beyond the end of the Bronze Age, and secondly Cyprus, perhaps like nowhere else in the ancient world, practised a religious syncretism which was composed of so-called Eteocypriot elements, no doubt containing some Anatolian ideas which settlers had brought with them in the Early Bronze Age, as well as Mycenaean Greek and Phoenician elements, not to mention others of minor importance. The same kind of continuity and religious mixture which, as Schachermeyr rightly saw, resulted for example in the famous statue of the Horned God at Enkomi 91), is also evident in the remains of the Kition site which had been settled from the beginning of the Bronze Age or earlier 92). The large temple, which the Phoenicians built for Astarte at the end of the ninth century B.C. 93) not only stood in what had been the sacred area from at least the Late Bronze Age, but in one way or another linked up with the preceding Eteocypriot and Mycenaean precincts and sanctuaries.

There were four earlier temples each one concerned with the same type of cult. The two oldest were Temple II and the much smaller Temple III which had been built alongside one another by the local inhabitants in L. Cypr. II 94). At the end of the thirteenth century B.C. (L. Cypr. III) the Mycenaean settlers in Kition erected the east wall of their own Temple I 95) on top of what had been one of the walls of Temple II which also re-

90) This also applies to Apollo’s arms and helmet at Amyklai, despite the obvious parallels from Syrian iconography of Reshef (bow), and armed Astarte.

91) Anzeiger für die Altertumswissenschaft 25 (1972) 156. Although scholars’ opinions differ concerning the identity of the figure, most agree that the statuette was the result of a mixture of styles, e.g. P. Dikaios, “The Bronze Statue of a Horned God from Enkomi”, Archäologischer Anzeiger (1962) 29 f.; C. F. A. Schaeffer, Archiv für Orientforschung 21 (1965) 68.

92) Karageorghis, Cyprus 144.


95) B.C.H. 95 (1971) 381.
mained in use but was modified at the same time\(^{96}\)). The smaller of the twin temples Temple III, disappeared at the time of the construction of Temple I but its site became part of a sacred temenos and saw cult in conjunction with Temples I and II, since a stone altar and horns of consecration were found in the area\(^{97}\). This entire temple complex functioned until the destruction of the site, probably by earthquake\(^{98}\), in the eleventh century\(^{99}\). Subsequently there was an architectural gap until the Phoenician arrival in the ninth century, but not a cultic one: worship plus burnt offering went on throughout the troubled times in the temenos, on and about some four successive altars, perhaps until the end of the Phoenician temple\(^{100}\). The latter was in fact a reconstruction of the Achaean Temple I (cf. a similar reuse of Temple IV by the Phoenicians)\(^{101}\) which continued the same worship of the same deities, albeit under different names, probably until Ptolemy in 312 B.C. ordered the destruction of Phoenician sanctuaries in Kition\(^{102}\).

To judge from the remains, which have been discovered in the sacred area, the cult was cosmopolitan with all the elements mentioned above\(^{103}\) and presenting a panorama of religious

---

\(^{96}\) *B.C.H.* 95 (1971) 384ff. Temple IV was discovered in 1973, east of the sanctuaries complex, with its south wall against the city wall. Like Temples I–III, Temple IV was built in the thirteenth century B.C. and continued in use until c. 1000 B.C. It was rebuilt as a Phoenician sanctuary during the ninth century, *B.C.H.* 98 (1974) 866ff.; *A.J.A.* 79 (1975) 129.

\(^{97}\) *B.C.H.* 95 (1971) 386. In the following report, 96 (1972) 1059ff., the excavators divide the sacred area into Temenos A (subsequently abandoned), north of Temple I, and Temenos B, east of it. Another temenos and altar came to light in the course of the 1973 campaign. Both temenos (like Temenos A) and altar (with evidence of burnt offerings) date from L. Cypr. III (*i.e.* they were in use during Levels I–III) and were taken over by the Phoenicians for their own sacrificial rites, *B.C.H.* 98 (1974) 867.

\(^{98}\) Karageorghis, *Cyprus* 148; *B.C.H.* 96 (1972) 1063.

\(^{99}\) *B.C.H.* 95 (1971) 386; 96 (1972) 1064.

\(^{100}\) *B.C.H.* 95 (1971) 388.

\(^{101}\) *B.C.H.* 96 (1972) 1064. Cf. n. 93 above.


\(^{103}\) Some of the monumental remains illustrate this mixture: e.g. portions of Minoan-type columns from Temple I (cf. similar finds from Enkomi and Myrtou-Pigadhes), *B.C.H.* 95 (1971) 386; Mycenaean clay statuettes, *ibid.*, including a "Psi" figurine which may have come from Temple III or a nearby tomb, *B.C.H.* 97 (1973) 651. Examples of Cypro-Minoan script should perhaps also be classed in this category, *B.C.H.* 95 (1971) 384; 97 (1973) 653. Oriental influence, prior to Phoenician settlement in Cyprus, is evident from e.g. a miniature bronze liver, and the wing of an ivory sphinx from the debris beneath Temple I, *B.C.H.* 95 (1971) 384.
beliefs which were adapted to Cypriot conditions but whose common Aegean heritage never disappeared. The two most noticeable examples of this fact are the part played in cult by the bull and the close association of the vital copper foundries and workshops with the deities guarding the welfare of the settlement. The horns of consecration in the temenos beside Temple I\(^{104}\) could have been made by the Mycenaean settlers; but the cult associated with them had been at home in Cyprus from the beginning of the Bronze Age and earlier times, as witness inter alia the famous clay model of an open air sanctuary with bulls from Vounous\(^{105}\) and the recently found miniature sanctuaries with bucrania from Kochati near Idalion\(^{106}\). The cult may originally have come to the island from Anatolia\(^{107}\), but it was shared throughout the Bronze Age with other Aegean cultures\(^{108}\), so that horns of consecration, bucrania or bull-masks are evidence of old inherited features of island culture, whatever new ideas foreign settlers brought with them. This applies to the horns in the temenos beside, and contemporary with, Temple I at Kition, as much as to the bucrania and masks belonging to the Phoenician temple\(^{109}\). The bull in cult and its association with a goddess of nature had, of course, been familiar to Mycenaeans and Phoenicians before they came to Cyprus.

Another practice that appeared to be peculiarly Cypriot, but in fact constituted a local variation of common ideas, is the association of copper foundries with the community sanctuaries and gods. The Kition “Industrial Quarter” for example, west of Temple III, was directly related to the temples and sacred temenos throughout L. Cypr. III\(^{110}\) and continued with the

---

Such models of the liver were used for divinatory purposes in the Near East and especially in Ugarit, cf. op. cit. n. 84 for references. Another feature with distinctly oriental flavour is the sacred garden in Temple I, B. C. H. 97 (1973) 648, figs. 78, 79 and n. 49.

\(^{104}\) B. C. H. 95 (1971) 386; 97 (1973) 653 & fig. 86 (Temenos B); cf. the examples from Myrtou-Pigadhes and from Aphrodite's temple at Paphos, ibid.

\(^{105}\) Karageorghis, Cyprus 110 and Pl. 49.

\(^{106}\) B. C. H. 95 (1971) 344, fig. 16–19.


\(^{108}\) Cf. Dietrich, Origins 104f.; 114ff.


Phoenician temple. The latter was also used for copper working in the course of its fourth and last period from the mid-fifth to the late fourth century B.C.\(^{111}\). However, the gods revered in these workshops and sanctuaries were still the same protectors of the community and of its source of revenue as those we are familiar with from other centres in the Aegean world of the Bronze Age. In Cyprus the community’s most precious possession was its copper, so that it seems reasonable to connect the famous bronze statuette from Enkomi of a bearded and armed figure standing on a copper ingot with the Cypriot version of the protecting deity\(^{112}\).

Karageorghis believes that the deities receiving worship in the “twin” Temples I and II in Kition were the patron god and goddess of the copper industry\(^{113}\). This explanation is plausible, even though only one goddess figure on an ingot has so far come to light\(^{114}\). But these divinities ought to be seen in a wider religious arena, in the sense that they must have played a part in the cult which continued into historical times and which incorporated the various elements we have discussed. For example, in Kition it should be possible to identify such community gods with the Phoenician Astarte whose temple after all became an integral part of the earlier temples and temenos and functioned concurrently with them. Somewhere in the same cultic background we should also be able to find the figure of Mikal, as well as that of the related Reshef and Apollo Amyklaios whose names were inscribed in the Idalion bilinguals. In other words, can one fit together the archaeological with the inscriptive evidence? To do this convincingly would require written source material from the critical last period of the Bronze Age and the ensuing Dark Age. But our close look at what evidence there is allows some useful conclusions.

Reshef Mikal and Astarte were, of course, intruders in Cyprus; but they probably arrived before Phoenician colonies

\(^{111}\) B.C.H. 94 (1970) 252. Many ivory carvers found in the temple point to another kind of industry, 97 (1973) 652. Compare also the copper workshops in Tamassos which were associated with the cult of Astarte, and similar arrangements in Enkomi, 97 (1973) 665; Syria 50 (1973) 111.


\(^{113}\) B.C.H. 96 (1972) 1059.

\(^{114}\) In a private collection which is to be published by H.W. Catling, according to Karageorghis, B.C.H. 95 (1971) 388 and n. 89.
actually established themselves on the island in the ninth century. In any case these two took over local cults and deities with the same functions as their own and deriving from a common Aegean background. There are some indications that, following old Aegean practice\textsuperscript{115}, the gods of Cyprus were addressed as “Queen” and “Lord” by their worshippers\textsuperscript{116}. Mikal, too, meant “Lord” in Phoenician like Adon, while Astarte is referred to as “the holy Queen” in her temple accounts from Kition\textsuperscript{117}.

As far as it is still possible to read Mikal’s character and functions, he was an apotropaic figure, although his identity was subordinate to the great god Reshef. In Kition Mikal appears to have been closely associated with Astarte, and he may have been invoked as the protector of the community’s copper industry. This same function of protector and guardian against evil caused Apollo Amyklaios to be recognized as the equivalent of Reshef. Mikal in Idalion. The epithet Amyklaios is poorly attested in Greece and the logical conclusion seems to be that the name was borrowed from the Semitic Mikal. If so, then we would be in possession of further evidence in favour of the early establishment in Cyprus of Mikal’s cult, for the simple reason that the Laconian Amyklai was known prior to the end of the Bronze Age. In any case Amyklaios described the same function of Apollo as his older title Hyakinthios, which does mean unfortunately that we can learn nothing about the cult from the history of the name Amyklaios. As Sir John Myres suggested some time ago\textsuperscript{118}, the Greek and Semitic gods concealed Eteocypriot figures; true, but, though the names differed, their functions were the same.

What can be learned about the age of Apollo’s cult from the Cypriot evidence? The god was known on the island at the same time as, and quite possibly earlier than, in Laconia where it is likely that he had established himself before the end of the Bronze Age. It would not be sensible, however, to pursue the question whether Apollo came to Greece first and only from Cyprus; we ought not to shut the door on Apollo’s many other cult associations and their background. But we are concerned with

\textsuperscript{115} Dietrich, \textit{Origins} 185ff.
\textsuperscript{116} \textit{Wanassa} is established but not \textit{Wanax}.
\textsuperscript{117} \textit{mlkt qdst} in line 7 of \textit{CIS} I, 86, \textit{Syria} 46 (1969) 338 with further modern literature.
the apotropaic god and protector of the community, both functions which formed part of Apollo’s earliest nature and which he acquired in the east. Thus we are led to the historically probable conclusion that on their arrival the Mycenaeans already found Apollo well entrenched in Cyprus as Alasiotas for example or Heleitas, or under another of his local titles 119).

Cyprus provided an important cultural entrepôt between east and west and evidently transmitted some aspects of the universal figure that is known as Apollo. The history of the island’s cult does suggest that Apollo could well have reached the Greek world during the Late Bronze Age. This date should, however, be regarded as a terminus ante quem: other earlier routes to the west were certainly also open to him, especially over Minoan Crete, if we are to trust in the traditional accounts which survived in the Greek historians. There is furthermore the connection of Apollo Hyakinthios with Cretan peak cult which may have come about quite early. These avenues will have to be explored more closely, and particularly the relationship between the Alexikakos and the oracular Apollo.

Grahamstown

B. C. Dietrich

119) Compare Burkert’s very similar conclusion, Gr. B. 4 (1975) 70. He believes, however (p. 74), that a Minoan-Mycenaean Paiawon figure coalesced with the Syrian Reshef Mikal in Cyprus during the twelfth century B.C., and that from this cult, once it had been introduced to Greece, evolved the Dorian god Apollon – Apollon in the Geometric period. This close link of Apollo with the Dorians (presumably an alien element in the Mycenaean world) – whatever the etymological merit of Apollo from Apellai – produces its own problems (cf. above p. 1), as Burkert realised, “Appellai und Apollon”, Rheinisches Museum 118 (1975) 17.