Abstract

The kingdoms of Cyprus remain a hotly debated issue for the archaeologist and the historian alike due to the fact that the literary sources present a constantly fluctuating number. The political institution of the autonomous city-kingdom was abolished by Ptolemy I Soter in the third century BC, when the island was annexed by the Hellenistic kingdom of Ptolemaic Egypt. Definitive answers to the question, “when were the Cypriote kingdoms founded and what was the geographical extent of their boundaries,” are still unavailable. In view of the discrepancies between the archaeological record and the ancient sources, the decision of at least one European mapmaker, Pierre Moullart-Sanson, to deviate from the Ptolemaic prototype of the four ancient districts of the island and to publish (1718) a map with the ancient Cypriote kingdoms and their boundaries, is astounding. This paper tries to define the specific ancient source(s) upon which the scholar-cartographer may have relied, and the extent to which classical scholarship in Europe, especially during the Enlightenment, influenced the development of the cartography of Cyprus.

THE ENIGMA OF THE KINGDOMS

A foremost riddle that archaeology is expected to elucidate for the history of ancient Cyprus concerns the emergence and development of city-kingdoms during the 1st millennium BC. Considering that literary sources play havoc with the number and the names of these Iron Age polities, it is not surprising that archaeological data—fragmentary and inadequate to this day—often add to the discrepancy. Consequently, no honest scholar can claim precise knowledge of the number, let alone the names and the boundaries, of the Cypriote kingdoms at any one time during their existence.1 Definitive answers, to questions such as, when was a kingdom founded, or what was the geographical
extend of its administrative district, are still unavailable.

In view of this, the unwarranted decision of a Parisian mapmaker to issue in 1718 a map of the Cypriote kingdoms and their boundaries is, to say the least, astounding. This paper attempts to assess the scholarly research that must have been conducted in the name of this unprecedented cartographic project, before the Cypriote kingdoms' map reached the engraving stage. The inception of archaeological research in Cyprus dates roughly from the penultimate decade of the 19th century. Thus, in the early years of the 18th century no material evidence relevant to the kingdoms, such as inscriptions and coinage, was forthcoming. In order to propose a cartographic reconstruction of the ancient kingdoms' geography, the mapmaker and his associates had to rely exclusively on ancient sources. My intention, therefore, is to scan the literary corpus of antiquity in search of those sources that must have served towards the production of this exceptional map, whose theme renders it unique in the history of the cartography of Cyprus.
In the year 1703 Pierre Moullart, grandson of Nicolas Sanson d'Abbeville, added the Sanson to his name. Having sired no male heirs, the sons of Nicolas Sanson bequeathed to their nephew, Pierre Moullart, the family's geographical stock and the duty to preserve the name of the 'father of French cartography'. Neither Nicolas Sanson nor his sons are credited with the production of a map of Cyprus. Hence, the map of the island that Pierre issued in 1718 did not belong to the inherited stock; it was in all respects original. The map carries the names as well as the boundaries (albeit conjectural) of nine kingdoms (Fig. 1). A lengthy text confined within the cartouche (Fig. 2) explains in Latin that in antiquity the island had cities, which functioned as the seats of nine kingdoms.

One can claim with conviction that this was the first map of Cyprus that Pierre had issued but not the last. In 1720, only two years after the first, he published a second map of Cyprus, this time with legends in French instead of Latin (Fig. 3). Curiously, the two maps resuscitate an out-of-date outline of the island ascribed to Paolo Forlani Veronese. Forlani was active in Venice during the dramatic years of the 1560s that led to the Ottoman invasion of Cyprus in 1570. A Latin kingdom from the 12th to
the 15th century, the island was subsequently administered by the Republic of Venice (1489-1570) and fell to the Ottomans in 1571. As a result of the Turco-Venetian conflict, the third quarter of the 16th century became the ‘golden age’ of Cypriote cartography. Issued in 1570, Forlani’s map illustrates the island’s eleven (administrative?) districts, and Moullart-Sanson’s second map of Cyprus follows its prototype in terms of the contents, as well as the shape.

It is not surprising that Moullart-Sanson’s Cyprus maps share the same dimensions (345 x 490 mm). They are large but not folding maps of the size one expects to find in atlases. They have, for example, nearly the same dimensions as the 1573 Abraham Ortelius’ map of Cyprus (370 x 495mm) (Fig. 4). This should explain why Andreas and Judith Stylianou expected to find Moullart-Sanson’s Cyprus maps in atlases: “The two maps of Moullart-Sanson appear to be rather rare and we have not been able to trace them in any atlas.” It ought to be noted that a copy of the kingdoms’ map, which was auctioned in Germany in 1998,
was described as "from a composite atlas with additional margins added at sides and bottom." I have received confirmation, however, by no less an authority than Monique Pelletier, that Moullart-Sanson never published an atlas. For what purpose, then, did he issue two large maps of Cyprus? Francis Herbert, Curator of Maps at the Royal Geographical Society in London, suggested that the two maps might have been destined to compliment the publication of a new book. For instance, the pair could have been engraved as illustrations for a monograph on the history of Cyprus since antiquity. This hypothesis becomes more plausible if we recall that at least one such treatise, Johann Paul Reinhard’s Vollständige Geschichte des Königrechts Cypern (Erlangen and Leipzig 1766, 1768), which was published in the second half of the 18th century, contains a pair of folding maps of the island: ‘Cypri Facies Antiqua’ (236 x 327 mm) is dressed with ancient contents and ‘Cypri Facies Hodierna’ (367 x 477 mm) with contemporary contents.
A short note on the milieu of Moullart-Sanson's cartographic career in Paris is essential in understanding the principles of his work. As a result of the foundation of the Royal Academy of Sciences (in 1666) by Louis XIV, the Sun King, the 18th century became a geographically fertile time in France. Cartography was transformed into an intellectual pursuit and scholar-geographers applied careful scrutiny to their sources. The period of the Enlightenment, however, can hardly claim any significant improvements, as far as the map of Cyprus is concerned. Ever since 1573, when Giacomo Franco's cartographic masterpiece was published by Abraham Ortelius, no European cartographer had tried to do better with a Cyprus land-map than to copy this late 16th-century prototype (Fig. 4 as above), which -besides having perfected the island's outline- had updated the toponymic record of Cyprus. The repetitive copying of Ortelius' Cyprus map of 1573, which resulted as a rule in inferior products, continued unabated for almost as long as the island remained a neglected Ottoman province (1571-1879). The next major development in the cartography of Cyprus took place in 1851, when the British Admiralty published the sea-chart that was the result of Captain Thomas Graves' hydrographical survey of 1849.

Engraved in Paris in the first quarter of the 18th century, Moullart-Sanson's curious map of the Cypriote kingdoms had no ambition towards innovative cartography: it was an historical document. The peculiar political institution of the Iron Age kingdoms of Cyprus was abolished between 310-294 BC by Ptolemy I Soter, and the island was annexed to the newly founded Hellenistic kingdom of Ptolemaic Egypt. Almost three centuries later -after the end of the Civil War in 30 BC- Augustus made Cyprus part of the Roman Empire. As a senatorial province (since 22 BC), Cyprus was divided into four administrative districts: Salaminia, Lapithia, Amathusia and Paphia. Every time European cartographers had reason to illustrate the island's ancient geography, their practice was standard: faithful to the description
of Claudius Ptolemy (5, 14.5), the unchallenged authority of ancient geography and renaissance cartography, who lived in Alexandria under the Empire (circa AD 90-168), they indicated these four administrative districts.22 They can be seen clearly on a 16th century small woodcut that accompanies the description of Cyprus in a bilingual edition of Strabo’s Geography, translated into Latin by Gulielmus Xylandrus (Fig. 5).23 Another, 17th century example from Jodocus Hondius Atlas Minor, illustrates ‘ancient’ Cyprus and below six Aegean islands in insets (Fig. 6).24

Neither the primary inspiration that led to the production of the kingdoms’ map, nor the specific information of the names of the nine kingdoms could have been attained from Claudius Ptolemy. In Ptolemy’s Geography the word basileio (regnum) does not even exist in relation to Cyprus.25 Strabo (circa 63 BC - AD 25), on the other hand, offers the following hint about the ancient kingdoms: ‘The Cypriotes were first ruled in their several cities by kings, but since the Ptolemaic kings became lords over Egypt, Cyprus too passed to them’ (Strabo 14, 6). It is ironic to think that this vague statement remains the safest
information a cautious scholar would use to this day but it would have been of no help to Moullart-Sanson. The political geography of pre-Roman or pre-Ptolemaic Cyprus had never been mapped before. Moullart-Sanson was not indebted to any of his European predecessors for the map of the Cypriote kingdoms. Being a child of the Enlightenment’s ‘positive geography’, he was led by the principle that “the physical world could be mapped by means of measurement and the rational analysis of all sources, be they literary, mathematical, or cartographic.” In fact, as we will see below, his sources for the map of the ancient Cypriote kingdoms were entirely literary.

**THE WRITTEN SOURCES**

The earliest available textual sources on the Iron Age kingdoms of Cyprus are not Greek. They are Assyrian royal inscriptions, which claim that in 707 BC the kings of Cyprus, who may have been as many as seven, offered their submission to Sargon II.
Thirty-five years later, in 673/2 BC, when Esarhaddon (682-668) was on the throne of the Assyrian empire, the number of the tribute-paying kingdoms of the island had risen to ten. In this instance, the royal prism of Esarhaddon treats us to a complete list of their names and the names of their kings. The ten kingdoms have been identified as Idalion, Chytroi, Salamis, Paphos, Soloi, Kourion, Tamassos, Ledra, Kartihadasti ('the new city', traditionally identified with Kition), and Noure (possibly Amathous).28 Surprisingly, no other source in antiquity ever repeats this number or offers an identical list of names for the kingdoms. Regrettably, two most promising Greek treatises on the kingdoms of Cyprus, namely Aristotle’s On the Constitution of the Cypriotes and Theophrastus’ On Cypriote Kingship, were as lost to Moullart-Sanson as they remain to us.29 Aristotle, besides being the earliest authority known to have devoted an exclusive treatise on the subject of the Cypriote polities, was furthermore active in the 4th century BC, when kingdoms still existed in Cyprus.

In any case, Pierre Moullart-Sanson did not have access to Esarhaddon’s catalogue of ten. Rendered in Akkadian cuneiform, the prism inscription was first deciphered by George Smith and was published in 1871.30 I know of only one scholar, who was intrigued by Moullart-Sanson’s map. I am referring to the late epigraphist Olivier Masson and the article La géographie des royaumes chypriotes chez les modernes, which he co-authored with Antoine Hermary.31 Masson acknowledged the historical value of the map but claimed that the French cartographer’s sources were essentially Strabo and Pliny the Elder. Since we have already commented on Strabo (above), we can now look into Naturalis Historiae. Pliny states that Cyprus was formerly the seat of nine kingdoms (novem regnorum sedem: 5, 35.129). Unfortunately, he does not proceed to name the nine kingdoms, but writes, instead, that the island in his time (AD 1st century) had fifteen towns (oppida in ea XV: 5, 35.130), which he presents by name.32

In short, Claudius Ptolemy discloses nothing about Cypriote kingdoms; Strabo ignores the number of the kingdoms; Pliny
claims there were nine but does not record their names. Equally vague references, which repeat the number nine, can be found in other authors who are Pliny’s contemporaries but the names of nine Cypriote kingdoms are nowhere to be found.\(^{33}\) Although no such source exists in the surviving literary record of antiquity, this sad reality has been handsomely concealed from history textbooks. This, and the fact that it has not yet been unanimously acknowledged that the number of the kingdoms never increased beyond the ten listed by Esarhaddon early in the 7\(^{th}\) century BC (they dropped to nine and later still to seven),\(^{34}\) has led to a series of fictitious reconstructions of the political status of the island in the Cypro-Archaic period.\(^{35}\)

**Diodorus Siculus**

If one goes through each and every one of the extant sources in Greek and Latin that contain information as to kings or kingdoms of ancient Cyprus, one will discover in one’s amazement that only a first-century BC literary source provides the names of as many as seven out of the nine kingdoms: the *Bibliotheke Historike* (hereafter the *Library*) of Diodorus Siculus. Curiously, Diodorus states, but only once where he relates events of the year 351 BC, that there were nine important cities in Cyprus and that each was governed by a king and all kings were subject to the King of Persia (16, 41.4). Nevertheless, he does not name the nine city-kingdoms in this or in any other passage. One needs to persevere through the extant books of the *Library* in order to collect references to kings who ruled over seven different Cypriote kingdoms. These are Kition, Marion, Soloi, Salamis, Amathus, Paphos and Lapithos.

In describing the events of the year 315 BC that led to the ultimate abolition of the kingdoms, Diodorus gives an unexpected reference to a *Lapithios* and a *Kerynitis basileus* in the same passage (19, 59.1). Nevertheless, when in the year 313 BC Ptolemy I began eliminating the Cypriote kings, Diodorus names only Praxippus as ‘king of Lapithia and ruler of Kerynia’
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(19, 79.4). Lapithos and Kerynia are two loci that lie next to each other on the north coast. It is not possible to accept that both of them functioned as the capitals of two different political units at the same time. Moreover, literary as well as numismatic evidence claim that Lapithos, but not Kerynia, was a kingdom to the end of the 4th century BC. If the Periplous of Skylax could be dated with certainty to the 4th century BC, it would provide the earliest written reference to a city (not a kingdom) named Kerynia.

SHORT OF TWO KINGDOMS

Returning now to the kingdoms’ map, we take note of the fact that the names of nine kingdoms have been rendered in Latin in the genitive case: Salamini, Chytri, Laphi, Solorum, Paphi, Curii, Amathi, Cittii, and Mali Regnum. To dare contemplate mapping the territorial extent of nine kingdoms, Moullart-Sanson had to establish first their names. The Library, besides being the earliest extant Greek source that refers to nine kingdoms and names as many as seven, had been edited (twice) and was available in a Latin translation by 1604 - more than a century prior to the map’s production. Assuming that our scholar-cartographer had scanned the Library, he begun by accommodating on the map the same seven kingdoms to which Diodorus refers by name (Kition, Marion, Soloi, Salamis, Amathus, Paphos and Lapithos), but was wise enough not to delineate a separate territory for a kingdom of Kerynia (a locus ‘Cerania’ is found within the territory of the kingdom of Lapithos).

Nevertheless, he was still short of two kingdoms. Neither a kingdom of Kourion nor one of Chytroi are known to Diodorus. What other sources did Moullart-Sanson analyse in order to round up the number with Kourion and Chytroi? Kourion was easy. Herodotus’ Histories contain the earliest Greek reference to a kingdom of Kourion. In describing the revolt of Onesilus of Salamis and other Cypriote kings against Persian rule in
499/8 BC, Herodotus (5, 113.1) refers to the king of Kourion Stesenor who, in the midst of battle, betrayed the cause of the revolt. During the Enlightenment, European scholarship was thoroughly familiar with the work of Herodotus. As an example, I mention that in 1715, only three years before the publication of the kingdoms’ map, Samuel Luchtman had published in Leiden a folio edition of the *Histories (Herodoti Halicarnassei Historiarum Libri IX)* with a Latin translation.

**CHYTROI INSTEAD OF IDALION**

Where did Moullart-Sanson locate a source that claimed Chytroi as the seat of a kingdom? No source, other than Esarhaddon’s royal prism that lists Kitrusi among the ten kingdoms, refers to a kingdom of Chytroi. Neither archaeological excavations, nor epigraphical testimonies have established that Chytroi was a city-kingdom. The remaining decisive factor is coinage. Already before the end of the 6th century BC, one after the other the Cypriote kings were beginning to define and enhance their royal prerogative by striking coins. No coinage has ever been attributed to a kingdom of Chytroi. Assuming that it had the status of a kingdom during the reign of Esarhaddon in the 7th century, Chytroi must have been absorbed before the inception of monetary economy.\(^{39}\) The fact is that Moullart-Sanson had no legitimate grounds for making a kingdom out of Chytroi but he had to have a ninth kingdom.

This is then the moment to wonder why the kingdom of Idalion is absent from the map of Moullart-Sanson. Idalion, just like Kourion were kingdoms in the 7th century BC, as far as the Assyrians were concerned. Unlike Chytroi, Idalion and Kourion, survived into the 5th century BC for their kings to issue distinctive coinage with syllabic Greek legends.\(^{40}\) Nevertheless, Kourion and Idalion are the two Cypriote kingdoms missing from Diodorus account. Literary sources are silent as to their fate. We know from inscriptions that the Phoenician kings of Kition annexed the kingdom of Idalion early in the 5th century.
after the failed insurrection of the Cypriotes in 499/8 BC. We do not know when, how or by whom was the kingdom of Kourion abolished, but it was certainly not by Ptolemy I. Kourion had been absorbed before the end of the 4th century, when Ptolemy I eliminated the last of the kings and the institution of the city-kingdoms.41

Idalion, an inland kingdom with no access to the sea, did not make it on the map of Moullart-Sanson, because neither Herodotus nor Diodorus, or any other surviving ancient source for that matter, identify Idalion as the seat of a kingdom. Thus, Chytroi, an inland city, became the ninth kingdom on the map. Moullart-Sanson could have chosen it because of its pre-eminence in the written sources: Chytroi is explicitly mentioned by Claudius Ptolemy as one of the three inland cities of Cyprus.42 As such, it is regularly featured on European maps based on Ptolemy's Geography. Chytroi is also on the list of Pliny's fifteen towns of Cyprus. The decisive clue is given by the cartographer himself: in the cartouche of his map, he acknowledges that he applied a version of the Roman road-system from Peutinger's tables. Chytroi are, indeed, quite clearly marked as Citari on the Peutingeriana.43

MALI REGNUM: WHY EAST?

We still have to explain the provenance of the name, and the location on the map, of Mali Regnum. Malos is not a geographical locus of Cyprus; it belongs in Cilicia. The mystery was solved by the erudite Masson.44 In Book XII of the Library Diodorus describes events of the year 454 BC and refers to two of the city-kingdoms: one is Kition, the other is Marion, but in this particular instance the Greek codex of the Library renders Marion as Malon (in the accusative), probably confusing the name with that of the Cilician Malos.45 This error, which was recognized and corrected into Marion in editions of the Library that postdate the production of Moullart-Sanson's map, proves that the cartographer (and his associates) had consulted an early
Moullart-Sanson had unwittingly copied an error but this was hardly his main problem with Marion. None of the ancient sources would give him a clue as to where this kingdom was located. The Cypriote kingdoms were known by the name of their capital city. The geographical location of the other cities was not in doubt because even after the abolition of kingship Salamis, Kition, Kourion, Lapithos, Amathus, Soloi, Paphos and Chytroi continued to function as urban centres during the Hellenistic and Roman era. Thus, their co-ordinates were calculated by Claudius Ptolemy in his description of the island. This, however, is not the case with Marion. Our knowledge as to where it stood remains imperfect to this day. It was only in the late 19th century that Marion was suspected of lying west under the village of Polis in the bay of Chrysochou. Still, as recently as 1997, the director of Princeton University’s excavations in the area wrote that “the identification of this site with Marion is based on a modern consensus of scholarly opinion, not on concrete fact.”

Diodorus records that the kingdom of Marion was raised to the ground by order of Ptolemy I Soter (circa 312 BC) and its population transferred to Paphos (19, 79.4). One assumes that if its population was transferred to Paphos, Marion could not have been situated on the opposite end of the island, where Moullart-Sanson chose to locate it. Some other reasoning must have compelled him to do so, and this was the association of Marion with Arsinoe. Writing five hundred years after Diodorus, Stephanus Byzantius (AD 5th century) had access to information, which allowed him to disclose that Arsinoe was a Cypriote city previously named Marion. Apparently, Ptolemy II Philadelphos (285-246 BC) founded a new city on the ruins of Marion, which he named Arsinoe after his sister (and wife) Arsinoe II, who was deified before her death in 270 BC. The name Arsinoe, however, was given to an unknown number of places in Cyprus (no fewer than three) and the ancient geographers fail to identify one of them with Marion. In his description of Cyprus, Ptolemy (5, 14.4) refers to one Arsinoe to the west, beyond Soloi. Pliny (5,
35.130) enumerates an Arsinoe amongst the contemporary cities of the island and refers separately to Marion as a city that had existed in the past. He is unaware of its geographical location and the connection between Marion and Arsinoe eludes him. Strabo, however, mentions three Arsinoe: the first is a port city on the east coast near Salamis; the second is on the south coast below the sanctuary of Aphrodite at Palaepaphos; the third matches Ptolemy's Arsinoe on the west coast. Yet, he associates none of the three with an earlier city and kingdom named Marion.

The relation between the various Arsinoe of Cyprus—commemorated on inscriptions or mentioned by ancient authors— and the Arsinoe that occur on the pre-modern maps of Cyprus will not be resolved in this paper; it will require a long-term research. Suffice it to say that Moullart-Sanson accommodated on his kingdoms' map no fewer than four loci by the name of Arsinoe—though no place could have born this name until well after the abolition of the kingdoms and the inception of Ptolemaic rule. One is to the west within the borders of the Paphian kingdom and is defined as plain Arsinoe (in accord with Ptolemy and with Strabo's third Arsinoe). The second, below Antiqua Paphos (between Zephyria and Hierocephsis) is Arsinoe Statio (in accord with Strabo's second Arsinoe). The third, Marium postea Arsinoe, is a locus on the south coast within the limits of the kingdom of Amathus. The fourth is Arsinoe Urbs et Portus on the east coast between Salamis and Leucolla (in accord with Strabo's first Arsinoe), on the site where Medieval Ammochostos was destined to grow, and it is the only one designated within the borders of Mali Regnum.

The identification of Marion with one of these Arsinoe must have lingered inconclusively in the mind of Moullart-Sanson. Eventually, he opted to associate the kingdom of Marion with Arsinoe-Famagusta to the east. Having made up his mind on this, he then had to furnish Mali Regnum with a territory worthy of a kingdom. To do so, he ran—in the most unconvincing manner—an awkward boundary line from just to the south of Salamis and all the way up to the north coast. The
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The kingdom of Marion was thus endowed with access to the sea on three fronts - on the north, east and south coast - and with most of the fertile plain of Mesaoria. Salamini regnum was left with nothing but the peninsula of Carpasia.

Cartographic Scholarship

Pierre Moullart-Sanson, géographe du roi, died childless in 1730, a decade after he had printed his second Cyprus map. Wishing, in his turn, to preserve the cartographic heritage of the Sanson family, he designated in his will three friends to succeed to the Sanson stock: they were a priest, a lawyer and a professor of mathematics. Of the three it was Gilles, the mathematician, who was to carry on with the map business and who, along with his son Didier, founded the most famous 18th century family of French Mapmakers: the Robert de Vaugondy. Like the Sansons before Pierre, the Vaugondy did not produce a map of Cyprus, though we may assume that they inherited the copperplates of the two Cyprus maps.

As far as French cartography is concerned, Pierre Moullart-Sanson is completely overshadowed by his grandfather and his spiritual heirs, the Vaugondy. In the field of the cartography of Cyprus, however, he had a well-concealed reason that led him to produce an original cartographic illustration of the island’s political status in the Classical period. Having survived for the better part of the 1st millennium BC, the system of the autonomous city-kingdoms of Iron Age Cyprus was terminated by Ptolemy I Soter shortly after the close of the 4th century (by 294 BC). Any map, which attempts to antedate by four to five hundred years Strabo’s and Ptolemy’s geography of Roman Cyprus, is not a mere faithful transfer onto the medium of the copper plate of an existing model that anyone in the map trade could have copied. The ancient kingdoms’ map, which bears the signature of Pierre Moullart-Sanson, is the end result of original scholarly research amidst a collection of antique data and of scholastic scrutiny of the information provided by often conflicting or diverging
literary sources. It is more than likely that in this endeavour Moullart-Sanson was not by himself. Nevertheless, the project in the name of which he issued the two Cyprus maps, remains a mystery. Apparently, it was never realised, and the two maps went unnoticed. I do not think they were ever officially traded, which would explain why they are so rare.

Every one of the few known copies of the kingdoms’ map is missing two lines from the legend enclosed within the cartouche. These two lines were haphazardly eliminated from the copper plate. Could we hope to find a copy of the map that had been through Moullart-Sanson’s printing press before he had reason to eliminate those two lines from the legend? And if we do, is it going to shed light on the unrealised but certainly ambitious project in which this remarkable scholar-cartographer was involved.

**A DISTURBING REALISATION**

On another level –irrespective of Moullart-Sanson's conjectural Cyprus project– the exercise of having to search for the source material of the kingdoms’ map discloses some very disturbing and well-concealed truths. The Cypriote kingdoms, and their very antique and conservative institution, were abolished by Ptolemy I following his confrontation with another of the Successors, Antigonus and his son Demetrios Poliorcetes. By the time when the intelligentsia of the Hellenistic world became interested in the newly acquired island colony of Ptolemaic Egypt, reliable sources regarding the original, the Archaic Cypriote kingdoms (7th-6th centuries BC), had become unavailable to the Greek authors of antiquity. In the 1st century BC, at about the time the island was to become a province of the Roman Empire, knowledge as to a period, when Cyprus was divided into ten kingdoms was forever lost. Furthermore, though the memory of an era, when there were nine kingdoms was vaguely retained, nobody seemed to have had a record of all their nine names or those of the nine royal families.
Diodorus had limited and fragmentary knowledge even as to the Cypriote kingdoms that existed during the conflict of the Successors in the late 4th century. It is shocking to contemplate that no surviving Greek source can tell us explicitly how many (their number) and which kingdoms (their names) were in existence, when Alexander the Great sought the alliance of the Cypriote kings during the siege of Tyre in 332 BC.

Zealous scholars during the Renaissance and subsequently during the period of the Enlightenment—for example, Thomaso Porcacchi in the late 16th century and Johannes van Meurs in the 17th century—began to make their own assumptions as to which Cypriote cities had once been seats of kingdoms. Before Moullart-Sanson sat down to engrave the kingdoms’ map in the second decade of the 18th century, he and his scholar associates exercised considerable scrutiny over the sources in order to select nine cities that had functioned as capitals of the Cypriote kingdoms. In the end, they too, gave in to assumptions since no extant source had preserved the nine names of the Cypriote kingdoms. We will never know to what extent Aristotle's lost treatise could have remedied such a vast historical gap.
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1. Recently discussed in IACOVOU 2002.
2. Consult GORING.
3. PEDLEY, 21.
4. STYLIANOU 1980, 98.
5. I take this opportunity to introduce a previously unrecorded copy of the rare map of the Cypriote kingdoms. The map belonged to the late Homer Habibis and is now in the collection of Mrs Sylvia Ioannou. For permission to illustrate it in this article, I am indebted to Mrs Ioannou and to her curator Artemis Skoutari.
6. STYLIANOU 1980, 99-100 [129].
7. Figures 3 and 5-6 were kindly provided by the curators of the Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation map collection in Nicosia.
8. STYLIANOU 1980, 34 [39].
10. STYLIANOU 1980, 100 [130].
11. STYLIANOU 1980, 60 [66].
14. I wish to acknowledge that in my research on Pierre Moullart-Sanson and his Cyprus maps I sought the assistance of Mme Monique Pelletier, Conservateur en chef, Département des Cartes et Plans, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, who kindly responded to my inquiries (date of correspondence 14.6.1999).
15. I am grateful to Mr. Francis Herbert for his most helpful suggestions (date of correspondence 2.6.1999).
17. Pedley, 7.
21. Stylianou 1992, 490 (an eminent ancient historian, Peter Stylianou should not be confused with the late Andreas and Judith Stylianou, authors of the seminal work on The History of the Cartography of Cyprus. Nicosia 1980).
23. Stylianou 1980, 68 [74].
27. Gjerstad, 449; Yon and Malbran-Labat.
28. Borger, 60; Baurain; Masson; Reyes, 58.
29. Hadjiioannou 1975, 344 [90], 346 [91].
30. Consult Masson and Hermany, 23 (note 3).
31. Masson and Hermany.
32. Hadjiioannou 1980a, 344 [292].
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