

ARISTOTLE AND CYPRUS¹

By Simon Hornblower

Summary: (1) I begin with a tribute to Mogens Herman Hansen, most of which seeks to clarify his opinion about when the *polis* came to an end and, more important, when he believed it did not. It will refer mainly but not only to his Introduction to the Copenhagen *Inventory*.² (2) This section offers, against recent criticisms, a defence of the *Inventory*'s treatment of Cyprus in the chapter by F.G. Maier. The section concludes with remarks about the poet Lykophron's important Cypriot material, and argues for its relevance to the modern debate about the nature of the Cypriot *poleis*. (3) This short section introduces the main part of the article. Plato's alleged attempts to make philosophers out of Sicilian rulers have been much discussed, and his pupil Aristotle was Alexander's teacher. But the young Aristotle had less famous educational contacts with a prince of Cyprus. (4) Cyprus as an entity does not feature in Aristotle's *Politics*; there is only a melodramatic allusion to the murder of the Cypriot king Evagoras I (of Salamis). But Aristotle or a member of his school wrote a – now almost totally mostly lost – *Constitution of the Cypriots*. One of the three probable fragments concerns the family of Nikokles king of Paphos. (5) One of Aristotle's earliest works, 353 BCE (?), was the – Isokratean rather than Platonic – *Protreptikos* or *Exhortation* (to philosophy), now fragmentary, but influential in antiquity. It was addressed to 'Themison prince of Cypriots', who is otherwise unknown, as is his home city. This section speculates that Philip II of Macedon knew of and remembered this relationship later, when he invited Aristotle to teach his son Alexander, born in 356. (6) Aristotle's equally early and fragmentary *Eudemos* or *On the Soul* (late 350s?) takes its name from a Cypriot philosopher-friend of Dion, who with other named philosophers had died fighting for Dion at Syracuse in 353 (Plut. *Dio* 22.5; the death is narrated proleptically). A dream-story in Cicero (*Div.* 1.53) provides another link with Philip II's Macedon (cf. §5 above): Eudemos was on his way there in 358.

1 I thank an anonymous referee for bibliographical references to recent publications about Cyprus.

2 I call him 'Mogens' not 'Hansen' throughout; but I refer indifferently to 'the *Inventory*' (of Archaic and Classical *poleis*) and 'IACP'.

1. Preface: Mogens Herman Hansen (1940-2024)

In 2024, the editors of this memorial collection invited potential contributors to write about either Athenian democracy, or the Greek city-state, or “another topic of Greek history or literature that would have been of interest to Mogens.” I have chosen to write about Aristotle, whose *Politics* was the subject of one of the last two of the many books which he gave me over the years (those two in 2013, at Oxford).³ His brain-child the *Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* has even been accused of an excessive and rigidified Aristotelianism.⁴ So my topic falls squarely under the third editorial rubric, but perhaps also under the second, because Archaic and Classical Cyprus was – unlike that other large island Crete – simultaneously and interestingly an island of *poleis* and also of small kingdoms, a simultaneity which was ended by Ptolemy I Soter only towards the end of the fourth century (312-310) when he abolished most of the long-lived pocket kingdoms.⁵ Ptolemy was defeated at sea by Demetrius the Besieger in 306 and control of Cyprus passed to the Antigonids for over a decade. But after that, Cyprus was “a possession of the Ptolemaic dynasty longer than any land except Egypt ... it had geographical position and natural resources of the first importance.”⁶

The outstanding chapter on Cyprus, near the end of the Copenhagen *Inventory*, was by that great authority Franz Georg Maier (1926-2014); sec-

3 Hansen 2013. The affectionate compliments card inside the book (drawing of a worried baby sitting trapped inside a square play-pen consisting of Doric columns: Mogens was always a keen and well-informed student of architecture in all periods) reads: ‘Dear Simon, I know you are very busy but try to find time to read the first of these studies. Yours ever Mogens – see you next Monday’. See further n. 11.

4 Fröhlich 2010: 674, part of a general critique which I address later in this section. I call the *Inventory* Mogens’ brainchild. I do not forget the great contribution of co-editor and large-scale regional author Thomas Heine Nielsen, but in this section I will have most to say about the Introduction, for which Mogens took sole responsibility.

5 It is a complicating factor that for most of the period from the 520s to Alexander, Cyprus was part of the Achaemenid Persian Empire, apart from short periods of revolt and of Athenian contestation. See Watkin 1987; Serghidou 2007; Wiesehöfer 2011.

6 Bagnall 1976: 38.

tion 2 seeks to justify this high praise against what I regard as unjust criticism. In his chapter, Maier more than once looked forward to the early Hellenistic period, for example to the abolition of the local kingdoms by Ptolemy I, just mentioned, or (for example) to the siege of Karpasia by Demetrios the Besieger in 307/6, or the temporarily continuing rule of kings at Keryneia in the Hellenistic narrative of Diodorus book 19.⁷ The present article will have reason (p. 560-61, and again n. 72) to mention Nikokreon of Cypriot Salamis, whose reign ended as late as 311. Here and elsewhere the casual user of the *Inventory* might well feel frustrated that it does not explicitly continue the story into the Hellenistic period. Why does it not? I turn to that question next.

My friendship with Mogens went back more than forty years, but I do not wish to fill this part of my allotted space with personal reminiscences.⁸ Instead I wish to spend the rest of this section (1) on an attempt to answer the question posed earlier, why does the *Inventory* cover only the Classical and Archaic periods and not go further down in time? There is more than one plausible answer. I maintain that the only *illicit* answer is to say or imply that Mogens himself thought that the *polis* came to an end (died the death, or more charitably was merely moribund, or some other such gloomy organic metaphor) in the 330s BCE. That may perhaps have been a scholarly orthodoxy at one time, but very few historians of antiquity have asserted or assumed so pessimistic a view of the life of the *polis* at all recently. Indeed the 26-year-old Arnaldo Momigliano (1908-1987), at the end of his short book about Philip II of Macedon, eloquently and eruditely affirmed the opposite as long ago as 1934.⁹ But it is most often associated with a celebrated dictum of Louis Robert (1904-1985), who like Momigliano knew better than to claim originality for it: “the Greek city did not die at Chaeronea.”¹⁰ That, not the opposite, has long

7 Maier 2004: 1224 col. 1 and 1226 col. 2, on *Inventory* nos. 1014 and 1015.

8 I describe elsewhere (Hornblower 1997: 577-78) how impressed I was at hearing an early salute to him by David Lewis (1928-1994) at a 1984 meeting of ancient historians at Birmingham. Not everyone was so quick to grasp Mogens' importance.

9 Momigliano 1934: 179 and n. 1.

10 Robert 1969: 42 (1989: 561): “La cité grecque n'est pas morte à Chéronée, ni sous Alexandre, ni dans le cours de toute l'époque hellénistique.” In his n. 2 he said he had

been the orthodoxy. It is certainly what I used to tell my undergraduate pupils in my teaching days.

So what was Mogens' own opinion? We should start with his 2006 book *Polis*. The sixth of its chapters is about the end of the city-state culture in Ancient Greece, a phenomenon – represented as a process rather than as an event – dated by the author to late antiquity, beginning with the emperor Diocletian. That is, in the early fourth century CE, not the late fourth century BCE! Mogens rejects expressly and with derision the notion that the city-state was destroyed by the Macedonians

at a single blow, the blow being the Battle of Chaeronea on 7 Metageitnion = 2 August 338, probably at 3 o'clock in the afternoon ...¹¹

As subscribers to the pessimistic view so trenchantly rejected, he cited four respected scholars – of an older generation.¹²

In his sole-authored introduction to the multi-authored *Inventory*, Mogens explained the work's terminal date, making clear in a short closing section on 'The End of the *Polis*' that it was not the terminal date of the *polis*.¹³ But it is an earlier section 'The Chronological Delimitations of the Project' that he explains why the Polis Centre had confined its investigation to the Archaic and Classical Periods:

Philip II's victory over the Greek cities, Alexander's conquest of the Persian Empire and the foundation of approximately 300 new poleis in the Near East inaugurated not the demise of the *polis* but a transformation of it.¹⁴

often expressed these ideas in lectures at the Collège de France, and he promised a two-volume work on the Greek cities in the Hellenistic period. Alas it never appeared; but it was not really his sort of book.

11 Hansen 2006: 48–50 (translated from a 2004 Danish original). This was the other book which Mogens gave me in 2013, the last time I saw him; see n. 3.

12 Hansen 2006: 157 n. 1. They are Carol Thomas (born 1938), Hermann Bengtson (1909–1989), and two friends of mine who both died recently in their 100th year: Peter Green (2024) and George Cawkwell (2019).

13 See *IACP*: 19 col. 2 ('The End of the *Polis*') for a less rhetorical version of 2006: 48. In fact, see n. 11, the two treatments both appeared for the first time together, in 2004.

14 *IACP*: 10–11.

He proceeded to enumerate some of what in his eyes were the main differences. Critics might wish to disagree (indeed some have disagreed sharply, notably Pierre Fröhlich) with his choices or his emphases.¹⁵ (More on this below.) But I hope the main point has been made: in view of this polemical explicitness Mogens Hansen and the *Inventory* should not be misrepresented as believing that anything much happened to the *polis* as an institution that afternoon in August 338.

Let us stay a little longer with Fröhlich's objections to Mogens' argument that the *polis* in the first century BCE (the lateness of that century is an important limiting detail) looked very different from the Classical *polis*. Mogens' examples were all of civic institutions, and Fröhlich sought systematically to flatten the differences in (almost) every case, by pointing to continuities, and to evidence for pre-Hellenistic instances of the relevant phenomena, all with impressive citation of modern scholarship.¹⁶ This is not the place to attempt to adjudicate in that controversy; the scholarly consensus will anyway no doubt shift over time. But some simple long-known and indubitable facts are worth repeating.

In the year 305, so we are told by an impeccable ancient source, Ptolemy I took the title of king, βασιλεύς, and "similarly the other dynasts emulated him in jealous rivalry, ζηλοτυπήσαντες, by calling themselves kings." The author of this sentence (Diodorus, drawing on Hieronymos of Kardia), then names the jealous rivals: Seleukos, Lysimachos, Kassandros.¹⁷ Such a moment in Greek history is unthinkable except after Alexander and his conquests. To be sure, life in the *poleis* went on in many respects unchanged, at least on the surface. A good example is the in-

15 Fröhlich 2010: 654–56. I realise that his review (40 pages, 96 footnotes) ranges very widely, and ends by saying in effect (p. 676) that there are really two books, the *Inventory* (good) and the Introduction (bad); I concentrate on one aspect of the latter.

16 Fröhlich did not, I should make clear, accuse Mogens of saying the *polis* died in 338.

17 Diod. 20.53.4. Baurain 2019 argues that the inspiration for this was the Cypriot (Teucriid i.e. Salaminian) kingship. That is what might be called Cyprocentrism. Ptolemy I was a Macedonian who had grown up in a country ruled by kings, βασιλεῖς, since Archaic times. Ptolemy was himself reacting to Antigonos' assumption in 306 of the royal title after his son Demetrios' victory gave him Cyprus (Diod. 20.53.2). But the Antigonids claimed kinship with the old Argead Macedonian line (Plb. 5.10.10).

scribed religious decree about the synoikism of the two-*polis* Aegean island of Mykonos: it is epigraphically datable to about 200 BCE, but there is nothing in its contents to indicate that we are in a world of autocrats. And epigraphically-based analysis has taught us that the canny *polis* authorities in Seleucid western Asia Minor learned how to negotiate adroitly with the kings to whom they were subject.¹⁸ But in reality the world had changed. Already at the end of the violently curtailed reign of Philip II of Macedon, the Athenians honour a friend at his court, in what reads like a thoroughly Hellenistic document: the friend has helped Athenian envoys and made efforts to secure favorable treatment for Athens.¹⁹ That this antedates the Hellenistic age – on any start-date – by a few years does not prevent us from calling it precociously Hellenistic in tone. But the most important and salient factual novelty is, as Fröhlich himself remarks earlier, the subject of the late Getzel Cohen’s three volumes on the Hellenistic settlements from Europe to Bactria and India (1995-2013, straddling the publication date of the *Inventory*): new city foundations in the East and elsewhere.²⁰ And who can read the text of Antigonos Monophthalmos’ polite but firm letter of about 303 BCE to Teos (*RC* nos. 3/4) about the synoikism with Lebedos, two very ancient cities of Ionia, without acknowledging that we are in a new phase of the history of the *polis*? Louis Robert himself regarded *euergetism* (civic benefactions by wealthy individuals) as the crucial innovation of the Hellenistic age.²¹

18 The cult calendar: *Syll.*³ 1024 (*LSCG* no. 96), duly cited at *IACP* no. 506 (Gary Reger; see also Reger 2001). The *Inventory* often draws on such Hellenistic evidence, especially epigraphic. How could it be otherwise? Seleucid W. Asia Minor: Ma 1999.

19 Tod, *GHI* no. 181, sadly dropped from Rhodes – Osborne, *GHI*.

20 Cohen 1995, 2006 and 2013; cf. Fröhlich 2010: 653, citing the two volumes of Cohen available at that date. See also the important annotated appendix of eponymous Hellenistic city-foundations and ethnics in Fraser 2009: 325-76 (posthumous).

21 Robert 1969: 42, cf. n. 10. The topic has been taken further since then: Fröhlich 2010: 675 n. 93; 656-57 n. 37. If Mogens had used the actual modern word ‘euergetism’ at *IACP*: 10-11 (you will not find εὐργετισμός in *LSJ*), Fröhlich’s task of attempted dismantlement would have been harder. But I daresay Mogens had euergetism in mind when he wrote there of the post-Classical springing up of “a number of private or semi-private economic and social institutions alongside the public institutions of the *polis*” (an item absent from Fröhlich’s p. 654 report of Mogens). Was Mogens’ offence perhaps no more than failure to cite the obvious recent works? See n. 22.

The evidence I have just cited is (to repeat) not new; nor are all the scholars whom I cite in this article and this section particularly recent. The sweeping vehemence of Fröhlich's unexplained contempt for some reputable but older scholarly works sometimes surprises me.²²

At the end of his important section on chronological delimitations, Mogens briefly mentioned another and purely common-sense reason why the *Inventory* stops when it does: finance and practicalities. He conceded that the ideal solution would have been to conduct two investigations, one dealing with the earlier period, the other with the Hellenistic and Roman. But he insisted that in the real world the Centre did not have the resources or the time for this. It is fair to say that if some of the *Inventory*'s reviewers and critics had had their purist way, the rest of us workers in the field would still, a year after Mogens' death, be waiting for the hypothetical vastly expanded *Inventory*.²³ (I for one am more than happy and grateful to have been able to use *IACP* constantly for the past two decades.)²⁴ And where would the money have come from?

Finally, let me insist that 'the Hellenistic age' began at different times in different places. Crude periodisation is easy to pick holes in. But authors of text-books in student series are often constrained by editorial policy, itself determined by understandable practical considerations on

22 At 656 n. 37 (deploring Mogens' antiquated citations) he calls A.H.M. Jones' *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian* (Jones 1940) a "synthèse complètement dépassée." Really? Completely? Only twenty years before Fröhlich's review, Oswyn Murray and Simon Price entitled their own up-to-date collection *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander* in explicit homage to Jones 1940; their 'Preface' speaks of "the impact that Jones' work had in pioneering a new field of history" (Murray & Price 1990: vii).

23 Fröhlich 2010: 654 acknowledged this, in the course of a sustained criticism at 648–56 of the project's end-date; see n. 15. Hansen's response to Fröhlich (Hansen 2015) did not address this aspect as a whole, but was confined to the matter of dependent or autonomous *poleis*. Fröhlich's was a lengthy, detailed and serious review discussion. Some of the other reviews of *IACP* were short, superficial, and not worth bothering with. Exceptions were Naerebout 2005 and Parker 2006, neither of whom was troubled by the project's end-date. The latter was enthusiastically positive, and concluded "the work is a superb achievement at many different levels."

24 Here is a personal reminiscence. I could not wait to buy my copy of *IACP* as soon as it appeared in the shops. Mogens visited London very soon after and was horrified: he had planned to give me a copy. Later that day, having gone to an ATM, he stuffed a wad of banknotes into my jacket pocket: the price of the book.

the part of publishers. Realities on the ground were different. Take for example Sparta. It was only in the third century BCE that the ancient and partly mythical dual kingship, hedged around with constitutional safeguards and limitations, gave way to a Hellenistic monarchy of a contemporary sort. We can if we like date the shift in question to king Areus I's depiction of himself on locally minted portrait coins which imitated the grand issues of Alexander and Demetrios the Besieger. This followed and exploited his unexpected defeat of the greatest general of the age, Pyrrhos, in what for a Spartan was a highly unusual partnership with Macedon (272, early in the long Macedonian reign of Antigonos Gonatas). In a city which had always hitherto got its coins from abroad, these symbolic issues represented a startling set of innovations which sent the Greek world a clear message: Sparta is now ruled by a regular Hellenistic monarch.²⁵ Or we could move down half a century to 227, when Kleomenes III made his full brother Eukleidas co-ruler, a constitutional impossibility in the centuries of the venerable two-family dyarchy of Agiads and Eurypontids. In his usual pithy way, Karl Julius Beloch called this action of Kleomenes "a constitutional comedy which deceived nobody into thinking he was anything but absolute ruler of the state."²⁶

But to return to the main focus of the present article, which will be Cyprus.²⁷ There is an entirely legitimate sense in which Cyprus did not enter the Hellenistic age until the forcible changes made by Ptolemy I to the old system of government; see above.

Or take the matter of cultural patronage, especially of philosophers. Philosophers are found at the courts of most of the great Hellenistic kingdoms, even that of Lysimachos, although it is only at Gonatas' Macedon (the Stoic Persaios) and Kleomenes III's Sparta (Sphairos, another Stoic) that they conceivably made much active difference to anything. Diogenes Laertius tells a story illustrating the risky outspokenness of the philosopher Menedemus of Eretria. It is located at the court of Nikokreon of Cypriot Salamis, sub-ruler of one of a number of petty kingdoms initially

25 See e.g. David 1981: 133-34. These interesting coins are ignored in the standard works on Hellenistic royal portraiture, Davis & Kraay 1973; Smith 1988.

26 Plut. *Cleom.* 11.5; Beloch 1925: 703.

27 See Barr. map 72.

tolerated by Ptolemy I, as they had been by Alexander.²⁸ Nikokreon's rule began in 331 and ended in about 311. Classical? Or Hellenistic? The analogy with the court of Gonatas suggests the latter: Menedemos spent time there too. But Philip II had already employed Aristotle, who had instructed a Cypriot prince of the Classical period called Themison. It is to this man, and to other fourth-century BCE Cypriot Aristotelians, to whom I will turn in sections 3-6.

2. Cyprus in the Inventory

But first I need to stay longer with the coexistence on pre-Hellenistic Cyprus of *poleis* and kingdoms.²⁹ I also need to justify my praise in section 1 of Maier's Cyprus chapter, about which hard words have been written in the two decades since it was published. But first, terminology. Historians have struggled to find a satisfactory term to describe the coexistence or simultaneity just mentioned: 'city-kingdoms' was rejected by Maier himself as seeming "somewhat incongruous." Choice of terms is partly determined by the degree to which the modern author wishes to stress the status of the Cypriot communities as city-states or *poleis*.³⁰ The search for modern consensus is therefore pointless.

28 Diog. Laert. 2.129-30; see Knoepfler 1991: 179 n. 22; also Bagnall 1976: 39-40.

29 On the Cypriot kings, a much discussed topic, see Maier 2004: 1224: "The basic structure common to all kingdoms – whether they were ruled by Greek or Phoenician dynasties – seems to have been a hereditary autocratic monarchy." Perhaps "autocratic" is too strong, at least at some places and times; see Pestarino 2022 at e.g. 55-57 and 200. But Mehl 2016 is agnostic about any development towards more inclusive regimes. Körner 2017: 379 has "traditionale Herrschaft." On the origins of the kingship, Petit 2019 plausibly prefers to see Phoenician influence, not Cypriot 'autochthonism'.

30 Maier 2004: 1223 col. 2; Iacovou 2014: 98 agrees with Maier to that extent, at least. The term 'city-kingdoms' is retained by Pestarino 2022: 35 as the title of her valuable monograph and in the sub-title of her discussion (35-44) of "δῆμος and πόλις in the Cypriot city-kingdoms" (she nowhere mentions the *Inventory*; cf. n. 32). But she also (p. 6) writes of 'city-states'. On Pestarino 2022 see now Hussein 2025. Petit 2019: 14-15 gives a punishingly long list of modern terms, but the main focus of his fine book is earlier than the period covered by the present article. See also Körner 2017 (cf. n. 29).

As for Maier's *Inventory* chapter, I continue to regard it as the clearest and sanest treatment of a topic and complex region whose difficulty Maier rightly and honestly stressed in his opening section 'The Island': he called the evidence "scanty", "confused", "difficult to reconstruct." But the chapter, or rather the opening section only (see below), has attracted some intemperate language, and selectivity of quotation and referencing.³¹ The sentences which have been most sharply criticised run as follows: "after the abolition of the kingdoms between 313 and 306, the cities began to develop institutions modeled on the traditional Greek *polis*." And "it is indeed extremely doubtful whether *poleis* in the traditional Greek sense existed in Archaic and Classical Cyprus." Distinguished scholars have inflated these remarks to mean that Maier "rejects the existence of *poleis* on the island before the Ptolemaic era", or have written – in a slightly less extreme formulation – of "the doubts cast on the existence of *poleis* in Cyprus by F.G. Maier."³² If the first formulation were literally correct, there would have been no need for a chapter on Cyprus in the *Inventory* at all! And yet we have one, and most of it consists of detailed treatment of no fewer than ten *poleis*, nos. 1012 to 1021, 'Amathous' to 'Soloï'.

This brings me to selectivity of referencing. The recent objections to Maier's *Inventory* chapter tend to be to his opening two pages of introduction, taking no account of what follows: the numbered mini-essays on the ten *poleis*.³³ But the strength and glory of the *Inventory* as a whole lies largely (in my opinion) in such localized mini-essays, which bring out the individuality of often small communities, whose cults and foundation

31 It is a pity that Maier himself, who died in 2014 (p. 554), was not able to reply in print to criticisms published in that very year (but expressed in an earlier colloquium).

32 Iacovou 2014: 103 and Hatzopoulos 2014: 221 respectively; the precursor was Demand 1996, in a publication of the Copenhagen Polis Centre itself. (I ignore Iacovou's accusations of 'Athenocentrism' against the *Inventory* generally). As we have seen (n. 30), Pestarino 2022 never mentions the *Inventory* as an entirety, or Maier's chapter in particular. But since at 6 n. 24 she directs the reader to the whole of Iacovou 2014 in the relevant context, it seems reasonable to suppose she endorses her opinion.

33 This is true of Iacovou 2014 and Hatzopoulos 2014. As we have just seen, Pestarino cites the *Inventory* not at all, either for Hansen's general 'Introduction', or for Maier's chapter, or for his ten *poleis*. She does however (p. 6 nn. 22 and 25) twice cite Hansen 2006 (his *Polis* book) in apparent acceptance of his "definition of *polis* as city-state."

myths and so on may differ even from physically close neighbours. Particularity is all. The poet-painter William Blake (1757-1827) wrote “to Generalize is to be an Idiot; to Particularise is the Alone Distinction of Merit.”³⁴ The evidence adduced by Maier’s critics (and presumably designed to show that there were *poleis* on Cyprus after all, despite his alleged denial of this) regularly consists of items succinctly cited by him in the mini-essays. To take just one example, an Amathousian inscription for Ariston son of Aristonax mentions the word *polis*. It is duly cited by Maier. There are several other such examples.³⁵

Maier’s position was in reality a good deal more subtle than has been supposed. Was he so wrong to see the Cypriot *poleis* as *sui generis*?³⁶ In one obvious respect they were: territory. He noted, with authoritative recent endorsement, that all the Cypriot *poleis* had territories of over 500 km², so that that they belonged in the largest category of the *Inventory*.³⁷ As for Maier’s opinion that things changed qualitatively for the Cypriot *polis* at around the transition period between Classical and Hellenistic periods (they “began to develop institutions modeled on the traditional Greek *polis*”), that has caused offence. But it is not much different from the thoughtful conclusions of a more recent expert.³⁸

That is as far as is appropriate to go in the scope of an article. But I wish finally to draw attention to a literary part of the tradition, a part which may affect our view of the Cypriot *poleis*. I refer to the long and difficult, but very important Cypriot section of Lykophron’s 1474-line

34 In his ‘Annotations’ to the works of Sir Joshua Reynolds. It goes without saying that I do not regard any scholar cited in these footnotes as an idiot!

35 Maier 2004: 1225 col. 2 (no. 1012; he cites it as “SEG 16.789 (C41/C3e).” Cf. also the much-discussed evidence from Idalion at both Maier 2004: 1224 col. 1 (from ‘The Island’) and 1225-26 (no. 1013); and Maier 2004: 1228: col. 2 for Paphos (no. 1019).

36 At least in the Classical period. See n. 29, citing Petit for the origins.

37 Maier 2004: 1224 col. 1, approved by the always excellent Thierry Petit, now leader of the team excavating the site of Amathous; see Petit 2019: 47 n. 487.

38 Who however does not, to repeat, use Maier 2004. See Pestarino 2022: 40 and n. 24: “the last Cypriot sovereigns ... Hellenised their customs according to an international process sped up by Alexander’s arrival”, and esp. 44: “the role of the *polis* conceivably increased when the Cypriot city-kings disappeared” (cf. also 174 with n. 87).

iambic poem the *Alexandra*.³⁹ It treats five Greek oikists, founders, in turn and at varying lengths, though without specifying the cities founded: Teukros (Salamis), Agapenor the Arkadian (Paphos), Akamas the Athenian (Soloï), Kepheus from Achaia (Boura, Olenos and close neighbour Dyme; the Cypriot place he supposedly founded is mysterious), and Praxandros the Spartan (Lapethos).⁴⁰

The date of the *Alexandra* (early third or early second century BCE?) has been disputed since antiquity, but there is no doubt that it is Hellenistic, and that it shows an awareness of the Roman conquerors which has always attracted the attention, and divided the opinions, of historians. It is (with internal digressions) one of the longest treatments of a single region in a poem rich in local material which, so I would argue, may well go back to *polis* histories of the Classical period; just as Isocrates' *Evagoras* surely draws, however tendentiously and philhellenically, on local Salaminian traditions. Most historians of Cyprus have taken little notice of Lykophron, but a 1979 article by P.M. Fraser on 'Lycophron on Cyprus' ought to have changed that. Its importance for students of the poem was that it provided strong arguments for the later (early second century) date of composition. For that reason it has since its publication been regularly cited by editors and commentators on Lykophron in many modern languages, whether or not they agree with the dating argument, which has to do with Lykophron's very probable awareness of Eratosthenes (c. 285–194), whose poem *Hermes* is now known to have dealt with the foundation of Paphos.⁴¹ But on the whole, when modern historians of Cyprus

39 Lines 447 – 591, with Hornblower 2015: 217–56.

40 On Praxandros see, with onomastic and epigraphic arguments (esp. on the one-word inscription Masson 1983: no. 49, Paphos), Hornblower 2010. Körner 2017: 99 cites Lykophron, but calls the fifth Cypriot oikist 'Praxippos' (correctly 'Praxandros' in the chart at p. 119). For Cannavo 2021 see n. 42.

41 Christodoulou 2014: 199 n. 44 (in a study of Teukros' *nostos*) calls Fraser 1979 an "étude malheureusement peu citée." This is true only of some post-1979 publications narrowly about Cyprus, not those on Lykophron (including Fraser himself in *OCD*!). At 2014: 194 n. 17, Christodoulou cites *Alex.* (494–98) for brothers Demophon and Akamas, but not for Teukros, the focus of his study. (Lykophron ignores Demophon.) Körner 2017: 118–20 used Lykophron in his chart of oikists (see n. 40) and routinely cited Fraser 1979. See also Voskos 2013: 16, Finglass 2023: 95–96, and Mitthof 2023:

do refer to the island's foundation-legends, they understandably tend to cite such straightforward prose authors as Strabo or Pausanias, not the much earlier and more difficult Lykophron, because in his usual poetically allusive way he avoids specifying which Cypriot cities the five oikists founded.⁴² But that intentional lack of specificity does not reduce the cardinal importance of the temporal primacy enjoyed by Lykophron's account of all these oikist-traditions (whatever date we prefer for his poem); the exception is the well-established association of Teukros with Cyprus.⁴³ Line 586 on Kepheus the Achaian remains an unsolved puzzle, but it must hide something which would be worth investigating.⁴⁴

It may be wondered, what bearing these oikist-stories have on the nature and culture of the Classical Cypriot *poleis*. I have suggested elsewhere that they may ultimately derive from *polis* histories of the Classical period; perhaps Androkles, king and historian at the end of the fourth century – and therefore in some ways interestingly comparable to Ptolemy I Soter – gathered some of them up. And Philostephanos of Cyrene's *On Cyprus* was another learned source for Lykophron.⁴⁵ But some sources surely started out as orally transmitted traditions. (This approach entails rejecting the recently canvassed view that *polis* histories were a development of the Hellenistic or perhaps late Classical periods, rather than of the fifth century or even earlier.)⁴⁶ If my suggestion was on the right lines, the self-consciousness and pride in founders which was evidently

201-2. – Eratosthenes on Paphos: POxy 3000, cf. Fraser 1979: 338 and Geus 2002: 114 n. 85.

42 Examples: Maier 2004: 1227 col. 2 on Lapethos (no. 1017) for “Lakonians under Praxandros: Strabo 14.6.3” (contrast Cannavo 2021: 148 n. 85, citing Lycoph. *Alex.* 586, but noting that the allusion to Lapethos is not explicit). Pestarino 2022: 11 and 159 n. 19, cites only Paus. 8.5.2 for Agapenor.

43 Herodotus (7.90) noted the Arkado-Cypriot link but not Agapenor. Dialect considerations are relevant, see Hornblower 2015: 228.

44 Philostephanus (fr. 19 Badino) had him come to Cyprus with Praxandros.

45 For Androkles see n. 72; see esp. the ‘old scholiast’ on Lycoph. *Alex.* 447, where the name Androkles should not be emended. Philostephanos: fr. 5 Badino.

46 Against what seems to be Rosalind Thomas' stance on the late beginning of *polis* histories (Thomas 2019: 8-9; 100 “... a new subject” in chapter title; 143; 150), see Hornblower 2024: 71 n. 40, noting the Cypriot case. But her exact opinion is elusive.

felt in some Classical Cypriot *poleis* would be well worth factoring in to discussions of the island's complex communities of the pre-Ptolemaic period.

3. Introduction to the rest of the article

Plato's alleged attempts to make philosophers out of Sicilian rulers are well known, however flimsy the actual evidence.⁴⁷ Even more famous is Aristotle's better attested education of the future Alexander the Great.⁴⁸ Less familiar are Aristotle's earlier and sometimes educational contacts with Cyprus, or rather with men from different Cypriot cities, because Cyprus was not a unified political entity in the mid fourth century BCE. One of these was an actual Cypriot prince, city uncertain. And we shall see in section 6 that Aristotle had a non-royal but remarkably interesting Cypriot friend, a wandering philosopher called Eudemos to whom Aristotle dedicated a work.⁴⁹

4. The Constitution of the Cypriots

That members of Aristotle's school were interested in Cyprus is certain, although it is very unlikely that his successor Theophrastus wrote a treatise *On the Kingship of the Cypriots* – as the Suda has often been taken to say, in its entry on the tiara. Diogenes' Laertius' enormous list of his works includes no such treatise; it shows only that, like many a Hellenistic philosopher with political interests, Theophrastus wrote a general

47 'Alleged' because after Burnyeat & Frede 2015 it is impossible to regard Plato's *Seventh Letter* as usable historical evidence for any visit to Sicily. They scorn the usual compromise view that the *Letter* was the work of a close and well-informed disciple.

48 But see Brunt 1993: 294–99 for a minimal view of what that education consisted of; see also Pelling 2025: 158–59 on Plut. *Alex.* 7–8.

49 Evdokimov 2020, an interesting study which goes well beyond the Aristotelian Cypriot *Politeia* of its title, collects and discusses the evidence for Aristotle's connections with Cyprus, but I disagree with some of his assumptions and conclusions.

work *On Kingship* (5.42).⁵⁰ He did however recognise the importance of Cyprus as a source of ship-building timber.⁵¹

Cyprus as a political and social entity does not feature at all in the *Politics* of Aristotle himself, which has by contrast much to say about another very large but no less politically fragmented island to the west: Crete.⁵² But just one individual Cypriot is mentioned, for his melodramatic end, murdered by a eunuch: Evagoras I of Cyprus (actually Salamis). The story, variously told, is found elsewhere, notably in a fragment of Theopompus of Chios.⁵³ It would be special pleading to infer, from this solitary mention of a Cypriot king, that Aristotle was here voicing a particular personal interest in Cyprus: the context (book 5 ch. 10 on monarchy) is full of often lurid anecdotes about the fates of rulers and tyrants, from the Greek, Persian and even Assyrian worlds.

Despite this virtual silence Aristotle, or one of his students, did include a *Κυπρίων πολιτεία*, a *Constitution of the Cypriots*, in the collection of

50 τ 547 Adler: Θεόφραστος δ' ἐν τῷ περὶ βασιλείας Κυπρίων τὴν κίταριν ὡς διάφορον. (Hatzopoulos 2014: 218 n. 4 wrongly cites “Souda, s.v. ἄνακτες, ἄνασσαι” for this). The last four words mean that *kitaris* differs from tiara. We should – with Whitehead 2008, knowledge of which I owe to Pestarino 2022: 1 n. 3 – punctuate with a comma after *περὶ βασιλείας*, so that “of the Cypriotes” applies to the *kitaris*, not the treatise. Noting that the fuller treatise title is not otherwise attested, Whitehead suggested “the translation could be something like ‘Theophrastos in the work *On Kingship* [says] the *kitaris* is Cyprian, on the grounds that it is something different.” Hatzopoulos 2014: 217–18 accepted the existence of the Cypriot treatise, even calling its loss as “irreplaceable”, like that of the Aristotelian *Constitution of the Cypriots*.

51 Theophr. *Hist. pl.* 5.8.1; Fraser 1994: 172 and 184; cf. Pestarino 2022: 71 and n. 117.

52 Fr. 519 Rose is about the ‘Pyrrhic dance’, and consists of four items from various authors, all assigned by Rose to the *Constitution of the Cretans*. Wrongly: see below.

53 Arist. *Pol.* 1311b5, cf. Theopompos (*FGrHist* 115) fr. 103 with Shrimpton 1991: 181 and Flower 1994: 198. See also Diod. 15.47.8, the source of which is not clear. Evdokimov 2020: 412 follows those who assign it to Ephoros, Stylianou 1998: 376 prefers the ‘chronographer’ whom Diodorus used for dynastic and other dates (this one is paired with an item of Roman history). That is attractive, although it would be Diodorus’ only Cypriot dynastic date, and Schwartz 1959: 39–44 did not include it in his authoritative chart of chronographic passages.

158 such ‘constitutions’.⁵⁴ (But that noun is too narrow a translation of the Greek word *politeia*.)⁵⁵ Because the consensus about this particular *Constitution* has changed radically in the past century, it will be necessary to say something about the modern textual history of this part of the Aristotelian corpus.

In the older collection (1886) of the complete fragments of Aristotle, Valentin Rose (1839-1916) allowed the Κυπρίων πολιτεία only two fragments, one about the unusual dentition of Timarchos king of Paphos, the other about the Cyprian royal titles *anaktes* and *anassai*.⁵⁶ We will return to these later. Just a century later, in 1987, the Swiss scholar and historian of philosophy Olof Gigon (1912-1998) re-edited all the fragments as a supplementary volume 3 to Immanuel Bekker’s old but still unsurpassed edition of all Aristotle’s works.⁵⁷ In the process of editorial revision he got rid of the entire contents of Rose’s *Constitution of the Cretans*

54 The frs. of the *Constitutions* are nos. 381-603 Rose, 473-621 Gigot. Barnes 1984: 2453-58, too early for Gigon, translated only 34 of Rose’s historical fragments. When citing Aristotle’s fragments, historical and other, I adopt where available the translations of Barnes and his collaborator Gavin Lawrence (Barnes 1984: 2384-2462), with trivial changes.

55 πολιτεία has a wider extension than ‘constitution’, and can sometimes mean ‘way of life’. Certainly the fragments of the Aristotelian *Constitutions* include much mythical and some chatty anecdotal material about places whose ‘constitutions’ cannot have offered much for the political scientist. An example is Delos: fr. 489 Rose, 497 Gigon, recounts anecdotes about Pythagoras; and cf. p. 571 for Timarchos’ dentition, if that really is from the *Constitution of the Cypriotes*.

56 NB “complete collection”: Ross 1955 was a selection, and in particular included none of the historical fragments.

57 Gigon 1987, an impressive achievement – on its own terms; but not without problems. He was far more generous than Rose in the length of his ancient quotations. (Heroically, he included, as fr. 474, double-columned pp. 581-615, the entire *Constitution of the Athenians*, most of which was discovered on papyrus just five years after Rose’s edition appeared.) But as an apparent policy-decision he rarely cited modern publications: his long introduction to Cyprus at p. 662 manages to cite only ancient literary evidence, and at least one introduction contains factual errors (several on Halikarnassos at p. 621). Nor did he explain the rationale and consequences of decisions like those we are now concerned with. His approach was largely textual.

(while conceding that there must have been such a *Constitution*).⁵⁸ He did so in two ways. First, by simply ignoring one of Rose's two supposedly Cretan fragments altogether (the admittedly tenuous fr. 518, a scholiast on Theocritus who claimed that "Aristotle says that Herakles was taught by Rhadamanthys", the Cretan brother of Minos). Second, by reassigning the other, a composite fragment (519 Rose, four separate elements) to the *Constitution of the Cypriots*.⁵⁹ He did this on good textual grounds, as we shall see. The result is that in his edition, Aristotle's information about the famous 'pyrrhic' dance (a war-dance in armour), locally called the *prylis*, became information about Cyprus. That was exciting news for modern historians of Cyprus, although the truth had been seen long before (1938), in a short but outstanding article by the pioneering female Homeric scholar and archaeologist Hilda L. Lorimer (1873-1954): see n. 64. The evidence must be set out, with some simplification.

Before we go further, here is a warning. With one exception (Harpocration on *anaktes* and *anassai*) none of the fragments of the now expanded *Constitution of the Cypriots*, even those which explicitly ascribe their contents to Aristotle (not all of them do), say that they come from that *Constitution*. For example, the item about the royal teeth could have come from some lost scientific or medical work.⁶⁰ It has even been half-heartedly suggested that a scholion on the *Odyssey* might have come from the Cypriot *Constitution*: it cites a Cypriot law which allowed you to pull out a pig's teeth if the creature damaged your crops.⁶¹ Cypriot teeth again, recalling Timarchos?

58 Because the Hellenistic scholar Herakleides Lembos (*OCD*⁴ 'Heraclides (3)') included it in his excerpts from Aristotle's *Constitutions*: Gigon 1987: 565 no. 3. Curiously, Herakleides made no mention of a Cypriot *Constitution*. There are seven other such omissions. Gigon (1987: 564) explains these by reference to the "wholly or partly non-Greek" character of the places, but this does not work well for e.g. Ithaka or Kolophon.

59 Cretan fr. 519 Rose therefore became Cypriot fr. 534 Gigon, separated into five numbered components 1-5. (As usual, Rose did not number his four components: four not five because his second one amalgamated what became Gigon's nos. 4 and 5).

60 So rightly Evdokimov 2020: 410.

61 Gigon 1987: 662 for the suggestion. The scholion is on *Od.* 18.29: the beggar Iris angrily calls the disguised Odysseus a swine and continues the metaphor by boasting

To return to the pyrrhic dance: the first piece of evidence comes from a scholiast (ancient commentator) on Pindar, who says, citing Aristotle, that it is called the *prylis* “among the Cypriots”, *παρὰ Κυπρίοις*.⁶² But Rose here, without textual authority, printed his own emendation “among the Cretans”, *παρὰ Κρησί*, while conscientiously giving *παρὰ Κυπρίοις* as a variant in his critical apparatus. So far so good, but Rose in effect did the same for a Homeric scholiast (on *Iliad* 23), who cited Aristotle as saying that the ‘Achaians’ (i.e. the Greeks, in Homeric parlance) brought the *pryleis* to Cyprus, *εἰς Κύπρον*.⁶³ Rose here printed *εἰς Κρήτην*, “to Crete”, but this time he printed no variant in the apparatus. This was however not as irresponsible as it might seem, because Rose was innocently using Bekker’s edition of the Homeric scholia, now replaced by Erbse 1969–1988. The ‘emendation’ was in fact made by Bekker.⁶⁴ It is therefore easy to see why Rose felt entitled to emend the Pindar scholion: he was bringing it into line with what in all honesty he believed was the evidence of the Homeric scholion. There was in his mind, we can assume, a further textual consideration. Another Homeric scholiast (on *Iliad* 12) gives this brief note on the word *prylees* (plural of *prylis*): ‘thus the Gortynians’ (of Crete); no mention of Aristotle. But both Rose and Gigon accept that it is from the Cypriot *Constitution*.⁶⁵

So the textual position is virtually certain. There is a more general reason why a Cretan origin for the pyrrhic dance should have seemed attractive to Rose. It was believed in antiquity that it originated at the birth of Zeus at the Idaian cave on Crete, when the *kouretes* (female deities of some sort) danced the ‘pyrrhic’ (or *prylis*), so as to drown the cries

that he could knock his teeth out “as you do with a sow caught eating the crop” (tr. Martin Hammond). See Steiner 2010: 161, n. on the *Od.* passage, citing Callim. *Hymn to Artemis* 156 and, more pertinently, *Ael. NA* 5.45 (the law Salaminian).

62 Fr. 534 no. 1 Gigon, a much longer extract than the first item in Rose’s fr. 319. The relevant Pindar scholion is on *Pythian Two* line 127 (line 69 in modern editions).

63 Fr. 519 Rose, third item, citing a scholiast on *Iliad* 23.130; fr. 534 no. 2 Gigon.

64 The true state of affairs was established by Lorimer 1938: 130–31; cf. Ceccarelli 1998: 53 n. 131, acknowledging Lorimer. As usual (n. 57), Gigon neither explained what had happened, nor did he cite Lorimer (and nor does Evdokimov, who credits the re-allocation to Gigon).

65 *Πρυλλέες: οὕτω Γορτύνιοι*, fr. 519 Rose, second item, in a bracket after an entry in Hesychius equating the *prylis* with the pyrrhic dance; fr. 534 nos. 4 and 5 Gigon.

of the newborn baby.⁶⁶ This Cretan tradition fitted well with the hazy idea that the pyrrhic dance was Dorian, Spartan, and martial, but in fact it was also a feature of festivals at Ionian Athens.⁶⁷ But what of Cyprus? Compelling archaeological evidence for anything very like the pyrrhic dance needs to be identified.⁶⁸ As for myth, Cypriots are absent from the Homeric *Catalogue of Ships* in book 2 of the *Iliad*, and the implications of the story of Kinyras and Agamemnon (on which see below p. 577) are the opposite of martial. So we must look to archaeology, or to other new evidence, to understand this ‘pyrrhic’ cluster of Cypriot fragments.

Of the two other fragments of the *Constitution of the Cypriots*, the second reports that Timarchos, the father (so Pollux) or son (so Pliny the Elder) of Nikokles had two rows of teeth.⁶⁹ Neither Pollux nor Pliny says explicitly that Timarchos was king or prince of Paphos, but see below for the epigraphic evidence.⁷⁰ Nikokles was certainly ruler of Paphos in south-west Cyprus.⁷¹ He was one of four Cypriot kings who allied themselves to Ptolemy, the future Ptolemy I Soter, in 321.⁷² Timarchos was the

66 Strabo 10.4.16 (= Ephoros (*FGrHist* 70) fr. 149) and 10.3.19 (= Hes. fr. 123 M/W); Callim. *Hymn to Zeus* 52, calling the dance the πρύλις. Lorimer 1938: 131–32; Jeanmaire 1939: 426–55; Ceccarelli 1998: 110.

67 Parker 2005: 242 n. 101 (the Tauropolia?); 257 and 268 (the Panathenaic festivals).

68 It is only a speculation by Evdokimov (2020: 410) that some warriors on the sarcophagus he cites are “probably going to dance next to the king’s grave monument.”

69 Fr. 527 Rose, 534 no. 1 Gigon.

70 Terminology is difficult. The Greek words ἄναξ and βασιλεύς have a long, pre-Greek, history. For βασιλεύς see n. 83. As for ἄναξ, Mycenaean *Wanax*, it has been argued that it might mean no more than a ‘non-royal member of a socio-political elite’. See Pestarino 23–26, with copious bibliography. But see n. 78.

71 Diodorus (20.21.1) calls him βασιλεὺς τῶν Παφίων. (Polyaenus’ use of the passage is vague, calling him “king of the Cypriots”: 8.48).

72 The others were Nikokreon of Salamis, Pasikrates of Soloi, and Androkles of Amathous: Arrian (*FGrHist* 156) fr. 10 §6 (cf. Diod. 20.21.1 for Nikokles); Berve 1926: 2.279 no. 567; Hill 1940: 156; and esp. Masson (n. 73). For Androkles, king and historian, see Hornblower 2015: 219–21, citing recent epigraphic evidence (Greek and syllabic). He is mentioned by a scholiast on Lykophron’s Cyprus section, cf. n. 45.

name of the father of Nikokles, and Pliny was simply in error.⁷³ The father too was king of Paphos, and is very probably Aristotle's Timarchos.⁷⁴ Two near-identical syllabic inscriptions from Palaipaphos ('old Paphos', the site of the temple of Paphian Aphrodite), read as follows:

Nikokles. King [βασιλεύς] of Paphos, priest of Vanassa [φάνασσα, the Lady i.e. Aphrodite], son of Timarchos, king of Paphos [in the genitive, so Timarchos is described as king] erected (this stele) to the goddess.⁷⁵

By happy chance, the Timarchos fragment of Aristotle (above) explains the noun ἄνασσα, as used on Cyprus. It is in fact, as we have seen, the only one of the fragments of the Κυπρίων πολιτεία which says specifically that it comes from that work: Pollux's version of the fragment merely cites a vaguely designated "work of Aristotle" as source, and the more careless Pliny the Elder does not even do that much. But Valerius Harpocration says:

Anaktes and *anassai*: sons and brothers of the king [*basileus*] are called *anaktes*; their sisters and wives are called *anassai*: Aristotle in the *Constitution of the Cyprians*.⁷⁶

73 I follow Masson 1983: 103, who improved on earlier reconstructions. He was right that the Nikokles inscriptions confirm the evidence of the Pollux half of Aristotle fr. 527 (Rose) that Nikokles' father was Timarchos. He dated Timarchos to about 350-325 and Nikokles to 325-309.

74 Masson (n. 73); Hill 1940: 164 n. 2; cf. Berve 1926: 2.373 no. 748.

75 Masson 1983 nos. 6 and 7, Egetmayer 2010 Paphos nos. 1 and 2. The first was long known, the second was published as Mitford 1939 (commentary still worth consulting).

76 Fr. 526 Rose, 532 Gigon, both cited from Bekker's ed. of Harpocration (Bekker 1833: 18, 4-6), whose lexicon was explaining Isokrates 9 *Evagoras* 72. But Dindorf 1853: 1.32 with n. 9 preferred a different ms., which he called D. (Paris 2552). This began more fully: 'Ἰσοκράτης Εὐαγόρα. ἔοικε δ' ὁ ῥήτωρ ἔθους τινὸς ἐν Κύπρῳ μνημονεύειν. 'Ἰσοκράτης in the *Evagoras*. The orator seems to be mentioning a custom in Cyprus' etc. Keaney 1991: 23 A no. 118 prints this, but on Keaney see Slater 1994.

The word *anassa*, the feminine form of *anax*, is far from obscure: it is Homeric.⁷⁷ Harpocration's lexicon of the Attic orators was merely concerned to explain a passage of Isokrates about the designation of human royal families on Cyprus.⁷⁸ But was the Aristotelian context equally restricted? Did Aristotle's discussion go further and take in the cult name of Paphian Aphrodite, as used by Nikokles son of king Timarchos?⁷⁹

The epigraphic evidence is plain enough, and very valuable. By contrast the evidence of Pollux is confusing and confused.⁸⁰ But someone in Aristotle's school evidently knew personal details about the Paphian royal family.

5. Themison of Cyprus and Aristotle's *Protreptikos*

Fascinating though that is (at least, I think so), there is some far more solid evidence for Aristotle's personal and surely pedagogic link to a Cypriot prince. One of his earliest works, perhaps around 353 BCE, was called the *Protreptikos* or *Exhortation* (to philosophy).⁸¹ It was addressed to

77 E.g. Od. 3.380, ἀλλά, ἄνασσ' ἱλήθῃ, "so, Goddess, be gracious to us." The scansion of this prayer to Athena requires the initial digamma φάνασσα, as in the inscription.

78 Whatever may be true of the elasticity of the titles *anax* and *basileus* generally, and on Cyprus in particular (see nn. 70 and 83), the fragment from Harpocration clearly implies royalty for both terms.

79 For 'Wanassa' (or Vanassa) as Aphrodite on Cyprus (Golgoi and Paphos) see Parker 2017: 5.

80 Thus Pollux says that it was to this Nikokles that "the Athenian sophist" i.e. Isokrates wrote advice, but that is a mistake for one of the 'Cyprian orations' to be mentioned shortly, i.e. Isokrates (2) *To Nikokles* or perhaps (9) *Evagoras*.

81 Frs. 50-61 Rose; 54 and 55 nos. 1-6 Gigon; also Ross 1955: 26-56. From Pistelli 1888 (see n. 86), Barnes (1984: 2403-17) added yet more Iamblichus material, translating and re-ordering it all. For the date of the *Protreptikos* ("c. 353") see Brunt 1993: 291; cf. his n. 27: Themison "otherwise unknown." The biographical tradition (see Diog. Laert. 5.1-10; Gigon 1987: 28-31 for the *Vita Marciana*) does not know of an actual visit by Aristotle to Cyprus, but instruction can be done by correspondence: Stobaeus' words are ἔγραψε πρὸς.

‘Themison (the) prince of Cypriots’, τὸν Κυπρίων βασιλέα.⁸² The noun *basileus* does not necessarily imply a monarch or autocrat, and can be used in the plural, as by Hesiod when he famously called them collectively “bribe-swallowing.”⁸³ But when combined with the genitive plural ‘of the Cyprians’, the description surely indicates at least a member of the royal house.⁸⁴

Much of the treatise is lost, but its title and addressee recall the ‘Cyprian orations’ of Isocrates, (9) *Evagoras*, (2) *To Nikokles* and (3) *Nikokles or Cypriots*.⁸⁵ We shall see, however, that so far as the ancient quotations allow us to judge, the message and content were Platonic rather than Isokratean. Aristotle’s treatise (it was probably not a dialogue) was enormously popular in antiquity: it was the model for Cicero’s – also mostly lost! – dialogue the *Hortensius*, and Iamblichus quoted many passages from it.⁸⁶ But it is a shame that only one surviving passage, from Stobaeus, actually names Themison. This precious fact comes down to us by a winding path. According to Stobaeus (n. 82):

Zeno [the first Stoic] said that Crates [of Thebes, Cynic philosopher] while sitting in a cobbler’s workshop, read Aristotle’s *Protreptikos* which he wrote to Themison prince of Cypriots, saying that no-one had more goods than he for devoting himself to philosophy, for he had great wealth, so that he could spend money on this, and a good reputation as well.

Before we consider the content of the *Protreptikos*, we must ask, who was this Prince Themison, what was his city, and was he ruler? He is not attested by any other ancient literary source, and he has not attracted

82 See fr. 50 Rose, 54 Gigon; SVF 1: 62–63 fr. 273 (both from Stobaeus, *Anthology* 4.32.21). Nock 1933: 175; Jaeger 1948: 54–57; Ross 1949: 8; Chroust 1966a; Schütrumpf 1980: 287–98; Scholz 1998: 138 n. 39.

83 Hes. *Op.* 38–39 βασιλῆας/δωροφάγους.

84 Pestarino 2022: 1 n. 4 writes of “Themiston [*sic*], king of the Cyprians”, her only reference to him. ‘Themiston’ is a slip; there is no textual authority for that spelling.

85 See Forster 1912 for all three. For the *Evagoras*, see Alexiou 2010 and Petit 2022.

86 Pistelli 1888, ostensibly an edition of Iamblichus’ *Protreptikos*, largely consists of the fragments of Aristotle’s work as quoted by Iamblichus.

much attention from modern historians of Cyprus.⁸⁷ The main, and no longer very modern, exception is the numismatist Sir George Hill in the first volume of his elderly but still useful *History of Cyprus* (1940).⁸⁸ He considered, without firmly endorsing, the suggestion that Themison's city was Keryneia, the rather feeble grounds for which were that "we know the names of the kings of all Cypriote states except Kerynia at this time."⁸⁹ Maier, in his chapter on 'Cyprus and Phoenicia' in the new *Cambridge Ancient History*, presumably followed Hill's identification: he speculated that Aristotle's Themison might have been the unnamed ruler of Keryneia who, according to Diodorus (from Hieronymos), arranged a short-lived anti-Ptolemaic alliance with Antigonos Monophthalmos in 315. But in the *Inventory* Maier seems to have abandoned this suggestion: rightly.⁹⁰

Theophoric personal names beginning Themis- or Themist- are formed from Themis the goddess of Right (Θέμις, Homeric genitive Θέμιστος). They, and Themison in particular, are common everywhere in the Greek world, and a few Themisons are from Cyprus.⁹¹ So onomastic

87 For Maier see section 2. That other distinguished authority Vassos Karageorghis (1929–2021) cited only Eudemos (section 5 below), not Themison, to exemplify interest in philosophy on Cyprus in Aristotle's time: Karageorghis 1982: 164. There must have been some philosophical tradition on the island: in the early Hellenistic period the founder of Stoicism Zeno (born c. 335, moved to Athens 313) and his renegade pupil Persaios were both originally from Kition (not, however, treated by the *Inventory* as a *polis*: IACP: p. 1224 col. 2). The Aristotelian Klearchos of Cypriot Soloi, more famously attested for inscribing Delphic precepts at Ai Khanoum in Afghanistan (Robert 1973, Mayhew et al. 2022 frs. 102–4), supposedly criticized Cypriot flatterers: Ath. 255c–257c = fr. 17 Mayhew et al. 2022.

88 Hill 1940: 158 n. 4.

89 For Keryn(e)ia, roughly in the middle of the north coast of the island, east of Lapethos, see Barr. map 72 C2 and IACP no. 1015. For the relationship between Lapethos (no. 1017) and Kerynia see Cannavo 2021:141–42: separate but associated?

90 Diod. 19.57.4 and 59.1; Maier 1994: 334 (in parenthesis and with a question mark, using CAH's Latin spelling 'Ceryneia'). He gave no reason for the identification, and did not subsequently mention Themison in his IACP entry on Kerynia (n. 89). Cf. Petit 2022: 143 n. 90: a "conjecture très douteuse" which "doit sans doute être abandonnée."

91 The most famous Themist- is the Athenian Themistocles.

evidence does not help much.⁹² The most we can say, until fresh epigraphic or numismatic evidence turns up, is that the otherwise unknown Themison of the *Protreptikos* might be a junior member of one of the royal families of Cyprus, perhaps one who died before fully reaching adulthood, but was old enough to have won a good reputation.

Aristotle's appeal to Themison was described by Arthur Darby Nock as "a passionate plea for the supreme value of this life of contemplation", where "this life" refers to the picture in Plato's *Theaetetus* of the philosopher "absorbed in the eternal verities."⁹³ This was different from the educational programme of Isokrates, and Aristotle's *Protreptikos* has been seen as a deliberate reply to Isokrates.⁹⁴ An amplification of an important fragment long known from Stobaeus came to light in 1904, on a papyrus from Oxyrhynchos in Egypt.⁹⁵ Here are some sentences from it which give the flavour:

We ought to believe that happiness consists not in the acquisition of much property but rather in the manner of the disposition of the soul ... It is not the horse that has a golden curb-chain and costly harness, but whose nature is bad, that we think worth anything; rather we praise the one that has a good disposition ... The saying 'no knife for a child' means 'do not give bad men power'.

From the sole fragment of Aristotle which actually names Themison, and which we have already quoted in full, we see that he urged Themison to use his great wealth, and his good reputation, for the study of philosophy. Another possible quotation from Iamblichus runs as follows:

92 For a while I thought that something could be done by invoking certainly or possibly Themis-derived names from Paphos, of which there are several, Greek and syllabic, but not enough to build a convincing case on. To the Cypriot Themisons in *LGNP* vol. 1 (1987) add now *SEG* 42.1312 = *IG* XV. 2.1 (2020) line 2 (Kition or possibly Golgoi): dedication of mask to Dionysus by Themison son of Pasiphilos, c. 250 BCE.

93 Nock, as in n. 82.

94 Wilamowitz 1893: 1.327; Von der Mühl 1941; Chroust 1966a; Scholz 1998: 138 n. 39; Evdokimov 2020: 415. See also Brunt 1993: 286 and (with some reservations about the view that Isokrates 15 *Antidosis* was a reply to the *Protreptikos*) n. 14.

95 Fr. 57 Rose (Stobaeus 3.3.25); *POxy* 666. Too late for Rose, and not in Gigon.

to everyone this much is quite plain, that no-one would choose to be in possession of the greatest possible wealth and power but deprived of understanding and mad.⁹⁶

The treatise's preoccupation with its addressee's wealth is notable, as far as the evidence allows us to say; and it goes beyond a conventional contrast between worldly goods on the one hand and intellectual or spiritual on the other. Cyprus' copper mines were always a source of prosperity, beginning with the mythical king Kinyras of Paphos' gift of a gleaming (enamel, gold, and tin) cuirass to Agamemnon (and Cyprus' general reputation for wealth may help to explain the curious tradition of Kinyras' staggering but non-Homeric and unfulfilled promise to supply fifty ships for the Greek navy against Troy).⁹⁷

Cypriot mineral prosperity continued down to and including the Hellenistic period, as Lykophron, very probably drawing on the polymath Eratosthenes, knew well.⁹⁸ The palaces of Classical Cyprus were conspicuously grand and costly, however much Greek comic poets may have exaggerated the luxurious life-styles of their royal owners.⁹⁹ It is frustrating that we do not know Themison's home city for sure.

That uncertainty matters less than the fact of Aristotle's instruction of a prince. Philip II of Macedon may have known of and remembered this pedagogic relationship later, when he invited Aristotle to teach his son Alexander, born in 356. Aristotle's father Nikomachos had been doctor to Philip's father Amyntas (for the biographical tradition see n. 80) so Aristotle will already have been known at Pella.

96 Fr. 55 Rose (Barnes 1984: 241-45). Not included by Gigon.

97 *Iliad* 11.19-28 (cuirass); Apollod. *Epit.* 3.9 (ships, with West 213: 103, withdrawing his earlier view that this went back to the epic *Cypria*). But in the event he sent only one ship; the other 49 were made of clay. The late Martin West (1937-2015) offered a daring interpretation of the latter item in terms of "some ancient ritual custom or sport in which clay model ships were floated on the sea": West 2015: 26-28. This publication was delivered as a contribution to a conference on 'Hellenism in Cyprus from Stasinus to Demonax' at Leukosia/Nikosia in September 2005, where I was lucky enough to hear it.

98 See Lycoph. *Alex.* line 484 and Eratosthenes, geographical fr. 3B 91 Berger and fr. 130 Roller (= Strabo 14.6.5), with Hornblower 2015: 229-30.

99 Maier 1994: 300-1.

6. Eudemos of Cyprus and other fighting philosophers in Sicily

Aristotle's equally early and equally fragmentary *Eudemos* or *On the Soul* (late 350s?) took its title from a Cypriot friend of Aristotle.¹⁰⁰ He is not to be confused with Eudemos of Rhodes, the eponym of the *Eudemian Ethics*.¹⁰¹ The much-travelled Cypriot Eudemos' biography is much better known to us than Themison's, mainly thanks to Cicero's account in Book One of *On Divination*.¹⁰² Cicero's main narrative (we will consider his introductory sentence shortly) runs as follows:

... Aristotle's friend, *familiarum suum*, Eudemos of Cyprus, while on a journey to Macedonia, came to Pherai, a Thessalian town of considerable note at that time, but held in cruel subjection by the tyrant Alexander. Now in that town, he [Aristotle] says, Eudemos fell so ill that the doctors feared for his life. He dreamed that a handsome young man told him that he would soon recover, that in a few days the tyrant Alexander would die, and that five years later, Eudemos himself would return home, *domum esse rediturum*. And indeed, Aristotle writes, the first two predictions were fulfilled forthwith: Eudemos recovered and

100 The *Eudemos*: frs. 37–48 Rose, 56–66 Gigon (tr. at Barnes 1984: 2399–403, including, at 2400, an additional, unnumbered, and very interesting fragment preserved in an Arabic source; not in Gigon). See Chroust 1966b and Evdokimov 2020: 414 for discussions of Eudemos and the treatise. Its chronological relation to the *Protreptikos* is unclear: the latter may have been earlier. Brunt 1993: 287 n. 19 wrote “Aristotle's *Eudemos* must have been composed in or soon after 354 when he was only 30.” That is a little too early, given that Eudemos' death was itself – as we shall see – in either 354 or early 353. We have already seen (n. 81) that Brunt put the *Protreptikos* c. 353.

101 As he is by Ostwald & Lynch 1994: 617–18. Other mistakes in that one paragraph are (i) Dion's expedition to attempt the overthrow of Dionysius II is dated “c. 354” (date of Dion's death) not 357, see Berve 1956: 65 [805]; (ii) the sub-title of Aristotle's *Eudemos* is given as *On Grief* (no, it was *On the Soul*); (iii) Eudemos is said, fancifully and on no evidence, to be an exile who had left Cyprus to escape tyranny there. If he was an exile from Cyprus, how could he have expected to return there, as Cicero says? It is a pity that we do not know Eudemos' Cypriot home city.

102 Fr. 37 Rose, 56 Gigon = Cic. *Div.* 1.53. The speaker is presented as Marcus Cicero's brother Quintus.

the tyrant was killed by his wife's brothers. But towards the end of the fifth year, when the dream had led him to believe he would return from Sicily to Cyprus, he died in battle at Syracuse. And so the dream was interpreted as meaning that when Eudemos' soul had left his body it had returned to his home, *domum reuertisse*.

Plutarch in his *Life of Dion* fills this out valuably in his narrative of the departure from Adriatic Zakynthos of Dion's expedition of 357. Plutarch here looks forward to the later death in action of Eudemos, as follows:

Many citizens [of Syracuse] joined Dion, and among philosophers Eudemos the Cypriot, to whom after his death Aristotle wrote his dialogue on the soul; and Timonides of Leukas, and Miltas, the Thessalian, a seer who had studied at the Academy...¹⁰³

How and when did Eudemos die? Alexander of Pherai was assassinated in 358, which means Eudemos' allotted five years (or nearly) were up in 353 or late 354.¹⁰⁴ The best guess is that he was killed in a battle at that time between the 'friends' of the recently (354) murdered Dion against the army of Kallippos, another Platonist, but one who had suddenly changed allegiance away from Dion's cause.¹⁰⁵ Timonides, another Platonic philosopher and a historian also, is thought to have been Plutarch's

103 Plut. *Dio* 22.5 Ziegler (Teubner ed.), where Eudemos' death is a characteristically Plutarchan prolepsis or narrative anticipation. Rose & Ross (1955: 16) print this as the second part of their frs. 37 and *Eudemos* fr. 1 respectively; Barnes 1984: 2400 ignores it. Gigon 1987: 288 prints *Dio* 22.4-7 as a separate fr. 57 (but confusingly cites it as '22.3-4 ed. Ziegler'; 22.3-4 is B. Perrin's Loeb numbering of the paragraphs). See Porter 1952: 75. – Zakynthos: Plut. *Dio* 22.8. – On the intriguing figure of the seer Miltas, see Flower 2008: 110, 118, 178, and (briefly mentioning the Academy) 194-95. – Brunt 1993: 328 n. 87 wrote "none of those named [by Plutarch [i.e. Eudemos, Timonides, and Miltas; also Kallippos, cf. Plut. *Dio* 17.2] qualifies as a philosopher." That is hyper-sceptical: it entails either discounting Plutarch, or else applying an impossibly high standard for qualification as a 'philosopher'.

104 Date of death of Alexander of Pherai: Beloch 1922: 84.

105 On Kallippos, see Berve 1956: 115 [855]. The battle is scantily recorded, but must be the defeat recorded by Diodorus at 16.36.5, ἡττηθέντες, referring to the friends,

source for this part of the *Life*.¹⁰⁶ So many fighting philosophers! One hopes they remembered the lessons of Plato's military dialogue, the *Laches*, although Miltas might have had mixed feelings about its famous advice (199a) that the general should be master not servant of the seer.

Cicero's account of Eudemos' dream contains features familiar from dream epiphanies throughout classical antiquity, notably the medical worry, and the visitation by a handsome young man.¹⁰⁷ That last detail would seem to imply that the message was divinely inspired. On the usual view the *Eudemos* takes this story as the cue for a disquisition on the immortality of the soul, recalling the *Phaedo* of Plato, but with differences. The philosophical arguments will concern us less than the man's career and his dream. That Eudemos himself was a philosopher like his friend Aristotle is certain from Plutarch; and it is goes only slightly beyond Plutarch's evidence to say that the dialogue was written out of grief for a beloved friend.¹⁰⁸

William Harris thinks that Cicero did not have the Eudemos story directly from Aristotle, but "rather from a Stoic who used the story to suggest what no other source comes close to suggesting, that the great philosopher shared the commonest Stoic view about dream-divination (which was favourable)."¹⁰⁹ Harris concludes "it is easy to see what the Aristotle of the *Parva naturalia* would have said about the Eudemos story: it proves nothing, because the sick sometimes recover and tyrants are quite often assassinated." And the third "fulfilment" was "merely a play on words." Harris' initial suggestion about the anonymous Stoic source may be too sceptical. Aristotle's ideas may well have moved on since his youth; and in any case the topic of the dialogue was not divination but the soul. Cicero seems not to have known quite what to make of the story. He begins:

φίλοι, of the late Dion; they now moved north from Syracuse to Leontini: Berve 1956: 124 [864]. For the identification of this battle as the scene of Eudemos' death see Hill 1940: 213.

106 Porter 1952: xx-xxi; Timonides is *FGrHist* 561, and T[estimonium] 1 is Plut. *Dio* 22.5, as in n. 103 above.

107 See e.g. Hdt. 5.56.1 (Hipparchos); Livy 21.22.6 (Hannibal).

108 Jaeger 1948: 39 wrote that "In this dialogue Aristotle immortalized the memory of his beloved friend and sought comfort for his sorrow."

109 Harris 2009: 162-64.

What, is the singular, the almost divine, intellect of Aristotle in error, or does he wish others to fall into error, when he writes that his friend Eudemos ... (etc. as before)

All the above assumes that Cicero found the story of the dream in the *Eudemos*. It is true that Cicero does not say this in so many words. But the inference is made very likely by the combination of Cicero's evidence with that of Plutarch, and by Cicero's closing allusion to the journey 'home' of the soul (*anima* must translate ψυχή). From the literary point of view, Eudemos' mini-biography would make for a good opening to the dialogue, like that of Plato's *Theaetetus*. That may be a further reason not to press too hard the implications of the dream.

Eudemos' death in battle at Syracuse, fighting in the company of other friends of Plato's friend Dion, takes him and us back into the world of Plato and 'his' *Seventh Letter* (n. 47). But why, five years earlier, was Eudemos on his way to Macedonia? An intriguing destination. We have no idea and can only guess, but if he arrived there at all, it is tempting to wonder if he spoke to king Philip. A royal audience might even have been the purpose of the visit. If so, the visit might somehow intersect thematically with Aristotle's own later career, and Philip's invitation to Aristotle in 342 to tutor the young prince Alexander, born in 356, not long after Eudemos' journey. Did Philip subsequently remember having met Eudemos, and had he meanwhile been told about Aristotle's *Eudemos*? Or even perhaps read it for himself? If he bothered to read the *Protreptikos*, he took no notice of its philosophical content, to judge from his aggressive actions in Greece.¹¹⁰

With this last speculation I leave this often speculative inquiry into Aristotle's connections with an always important and interestingly complicated island. I would like to believe that Mogens, whose "rigidified Aristotelianism" has been judged so harshly (n. 4), might have unbent sufficiently to take some of it seriously.

110 Brunt 1993: 294-95: the *Eudemos* and *Protreptikos* would have "marked him [Aristotle] out as a man of distinction", but (cf. Brunt) Philip in the 340s violated the teachings of the latter treatise, at least.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexiou, E. (ed.) 2010. *Der 'Euagoras' des Isokrates. Ein Kommentar*. Berlin.
- Badino, R.C. 2010. *Filostefano di Cirene. Testimonianze e frammenti*. Milan.
- Bagnall, R.S. 1976. *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt*. Leiden.
- Barnes, J. (ed.) 1984. *The Complete Works of Aristotle. The Revised Oxford Translation*. 2 vols. Princeton.
- Baurain, L. 2011. 'La contribution des Teucrides aux cultes royaux de l'époque hellénistique' in P. Iossif et al. (eds.) *More than Men, Less than Gods. Studies on Royal Cult and Imperial Worship*. Leuven, 21-55.
- Bekker, I. (ed.) 1833. *Harpocraton et Moeris*. Berlin.
- Beloch, K.J. 1922. *Griechische Geschichte*. 2nd ed. Vol. 3.2. Berlin & Leipzig.
- Beloch, K.J. 1925. *Griechische Geschichte*. 2nd ed. Vol. 4.1. Berlin & Leipzig.
- Berger, H. 1880. *Die geographischen Fragmente des Eratosthenes neu gesammelt, geordnet und besprochen*. Leipzig (reprinted Amsterdam 1964).
- Berve, H. 1926. *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*. 2 vols. Munich.
- Berve, H. 1956. *Dion*. Wiesbaden [= *Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz, Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse* 1956 no. 10, 743-881. Both paginations will be given].
- Brunt, P.A. 1993. *Studies in Greek History and Thought*. Oxford.
- Burnyeat, M. & M. Frede (ed. D. Scott) 2015. *The Pseudo-Platonic Seventh Letter*. Oxford.
- Cannavo, A. 2021. 'Retour à Lapethos, Une mise au point historique et épigraphique' in N. Chiarenza et al. (eds.) *LRBT. Dall'archeologia all'epigrafia/De l'archéologie à l'épigraphie. Studi in onore di Maria Giulia Amadasi Guzzo/Études en hommage à Maria Giulia Amadasi Guzzo*. Turnhout, 139-58.
- Carvounis, K. et al. (eds.) 2023. *Cyprus in Texts from Graeco-Roman Antiquity*. Mnemosyne Supplements vol. 467. Leiden.
- Ceccarelli, P. 1998. *La pirrica nell'antichità greco romana. Studi sulla danza armata*. Pisa & Rome.
- Christodoulou, P. 2014. 'Les mythes fondateurs des royaumes chypriotes. Le nostos de Teukros' *Cahiers du centre d'études chypriotes* 44, 191-215.

- Chroust, A.-H. 1966a. 'What Prompted Aristotle to Address the *Protrepticus* to Themison?' *Hermes* 94, 202-7.
- Chroust, A.-H. 1966b. 'Eudemus or *On the Soul*. A Lost Dialogue of Aristotle on the Immortality of the Soul' *Mnemosyne* 19, 17-30.
- Cohen, G. 1995. *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor*. Berkeley.
- Cohen, G. 2006. *The Hellenistic Settlements in Syria, the Red Sea Basin, and North Africa*. Berkeley.
- Cohen, G. 2013. *The Hellenistic Settlements in the East from Armenia and Mesopotamia to Bactria and India*. Berkeley.
- Davis, N. & C.M. Kraay 1973. *The Hellenistic Kingdoms. Portrait Coins and History*. London.
- Demand, N. 1996. 'Poleis on Cyprus and Oriental Despotism' in M.H. Hansen & K. Raaflaub (eds.) *More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*. Stuttgart, 7-15.
- Dindorf, W. (ed.) 1853. *Harpocratonis lexicon in decem oratores Atticos*. 2 vols. Oxford.
- Egetmeyer, M. 2010. *Le dialecte grec ancien de Chypre. Tome 1: Grammaire. Tome II: Répertoire des inscriptions en syllabaire chypro-grec*. Berlin.
- Erbse, H. 1969-1988. *Scholia graeca in Homeri Iliadem*. Berlin.
- Evdokimov, P. 2020. 'The Cypriot Politeia of Aristotle and Royal Power in Cyprus' in M. Christidis et al. (eds.) *Classical Cyprus. Proceedings of the Conference, University of Graz 21-23 September 2017*, Κυπριακά – Forschungen zum Antiken Zypern, *Studies on Ancient Cyprus*. Vol. 5. Vienna, 409-24.
- Finglass, P. J. 2023. 'Stesichorus, Cyprus, and the Heroes of Attica' in Carvounis et al. 2023, 91-103.
- Flower, M. 1994. *Theopompus of Chios. History and Rhetoric in the Fourth Century BC*. Oxford.
- Flower, M. 2008. *The Seer in Ancient Greece*. Berkeley.
- Forster, E.S. (ed.) 1912. *Isocrates. Cyprian Orations*. Oxford.
- Fraser, P.M. 1979. 'Lycophron on Cyprus' *Report of the Department of Antiquities of Cyprus* 1979, 318-43.
- Fraser, P.M. 1994. 'The World of Theophrastus' in S. Hornblower (ed.) *Greek Historiography*. Oxford, 166-91.
- Fraser, P.M. 2009. *Greek Ethnic Terminology*. Oxford.

- Fröhlich, P. 2010. 'L'inventaire du monde des cités grecques: une somme, une méthode et une conception de l'histoire' *Revue Historique* 655, 637-77.
- Geus, K. 2002. *Eratosthenes von Kyrene. Studien zur hellenistischen Kultur- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte*. Munich.
- Gigon, O. (ed.) 1987. *Aristotelis opera vol. 3. Librorum deperditorum fragmenta*. Berlin.
- Hansen, M.H. 2006. *Polis. An Introduction to the Ancient Greek City-State*. Oxford.
- Hansen, M. H. 2013. *Reflections on Aristotle's Politics*. Copenhagen.
- Hansen, M.H. 2015. 'The Dependent Polis: Further Considerations, in Response to Pierre Fröhlich' *GRBS* 55, 863-88.
- Harris, W.V. 2009. *Dreams and Experience in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge MA.
- Hatzopoulos, M. 2014. 'Cypriote Kingships in Context' *Cahiers du centre d'études chypriotes* 44, 217-33.
- Hill, G.F. 1940. *A History of Cyprus*. Vol. 1. Cambridge.
- Hornblower, S. 1997. 'David Malcolm Lewis' *PBA* 94, 557-96.
- Hornblower, S. 2010. 'Lykophron's *Alexandra* and the Cypriot Name Praxandros' in R.W.V. Catling & F. Marchand (eds.) *Onomatologos. Studies in Greek Personal Names presented to Elaine Matthews*. Oxford, 84-90.
- Hornblower, S. (ed.) 2015. *Lykophron. Alexandra. Greek Text, Translation, Commentary, and Introduction*. Oxford.
- Hornblower, S. 2024. 'Anachronism, Prophecy, and Local History in the Mists of Time' in F. Montanari et al. (eds.) *In the Mists of Time. Negotiating the Past in Ancient Literature. Studies in Honour of Antonios Rengakos*. Berlin, 63-78.
- Hussein, E. 2025. 'Ancient Cyprus: New Directions in Historical, Literary and Archaeological Scholarship' *CR* 75 (online, accessed 1 Oct. 2025).
- Iacovou, M. 2014. 'Beyond the Athenocentric Misconceptions: the Cypriote Politics in their Economic Context' *Cahiers du centre d'études chypriotes* 44, 95-117.
- Jaeger, W. (tr. R. Robinson) 1948. *Aristotle. Fundamentals of the History of his Development*. Oxford.
- Jeanmaire, H. 1939. *Couroi et Courètes. Essai sur l'éducation spartiate et sur les rites d'adolescence dans l'antiquité hellénique*. Lille.

- Jones, A.H.M. 1940. *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian*. Oxford.
- Karageorghis, V. 1982. *Cyprus. From the Stone Age to the Romans*. London.
- Keaney, J.J. (ed.) 1991. *Valerius Harpocraton. Lexeis of the Ten Orators*. Amsterdam.
- Knoepfler, D. 1991. *La vie de Ménédème d'Érétrie de Diogène Laërce. Contribution à l'histoire du texte des Vies des philosophes*. Basel.
- Körner, C. 2017. *Die zyprischen Königtümer im Schatten der Großreiche des Vorderen Orients. Studien zu den zyprischen Monarchien vom 8. bis zum 4. Jh. v. Chr.* Leuven.
- Lorimer, H.L. 1938. 'ΠΡΥΛΙΣ and ΠΡΥΛΕΕΣ' CQ 32, 129-32.
- Ma, J. 1999. *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*. Oxford.
- Maier, F.G. 1994. 'Cyprus and Phoenicia' CAH 6², 297-336.
- Masson, O. 1983. *Les inscriptions Chypriotes syllabiques. Recueil critique et commenté*. Paris.
- Mayhew, R. et al. (eds.) 2022. *Clearchus of Soli. The Sources, Text, and Translation*. Abingdon.
- Mitford, T.B. 1939. 'Nikokles, King of Paphos' in W.M. Calder & J. Keil (eds.) *Anatolian Studies Presented to William Hepburn Buckler*. Manchester, 197-99.
- Mehl, A. 2016. 'The Cypriot Kings. Despots or Democrats or...? Remarks on Cypriot Kingship especially in the Time of Persian Suzerainty' *Electrum* 23, 51-64.
- Mitthof, F. 2023. 'Imagined Sacral Landscape? Cult Sites of Apollo Hylates in the Ancient Literary Sources' in Carvounis et al. 2023, 200-10.
- Momigliano, A. 1934. *Filippo il Macedone. Saggi sulla storia greca del IV secolo A.C.* Florence.
- Murray, O. & S. Price (eds.) 1990. *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander*. Oxford.
- Naerebout, F. 2005. Review of IACP BMCR 2005.02.29.
- Nock, A.D. 1933. *Conversion. The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo*. Oxford.
- Ostwald, M. & J. Lynch 1994. 'The Growth of Schools and the Advance of Knowledge' CAH 6², 592-633.
- Parker, R. 2006. Review of IACP CR 56, 380-84.
- Parker, R. 2017. *Greek Gods Abroad. Names, Natures and Transformations*. Oakland.

- Pelling, C. 2025. *Plutarch. Alexander*. Oxford.
- Pestarino, B. 2022. *Kypriōn Politeia, the Political and Administrative Systems of the Classical Cypriot City-Kingdoms*. Leiden.
- Petit, T. 2019. *La naissance des cités-royaumes Cypriotes*. Oxford.
- Petit, T. 2022. 'Isocrate, la théorie de la médiation de Chypre à l'époque des royaumes' *Ktema* 47, 135-54.
- Pistelli, H. (ed.) 1888. *Iamblichus. Protrepticus*. Leipzig.
- Porter, W.H. (ed.) 1952. *Plutarch. Life of Dion*. Dublin.
- Reger, G. 2001. 'The Mykonian Synoikismos' *REA* 103, 157-81.
- Robert, L. 1969. 'Théophraste de Mytilène à Constantinople' *CRAI* 1969, 42-64 (= Robert 1989: 561-83).
- Robert, L. 1973. 'Les inscriptions', in P. Bernard (ed.) *Fouilles d'Ai Khanoum* 1: 207-37.
- Robert, L. 1989. *Opera minora selecta*. Vol. 5. Amsterdam.
- Roller, D. 2010. *Eratosthenes; Geography. Fragments Collected and Translated with Commentary and Additional Material*. Princeton.
- Rose, V. 1886. *Aristotelis fragmenta*. Stuttgart.
- Ross, W.D. 1955. *Aristotelis fragmenta selecta*. Oxford.
- Scholz, P. 1998. *Der Philosoph und die Politik. Die Ausbildung der philosophischen Lebensform und die Entwicklung des Verhältnisses von Philosophie und Politik im 4. und 3. Jh. v. Chr.* Stuttgart.
- Schwartz, E. 1959. *Griechische Geschichtsschreiber*. Leipzig.
- Shrimpton, G. 1987. *Theopompus the Historian*. Montreal.
- Schütrumpf, E. 1980. *Die Analyse der Polis durch Aristoteles*. Amsterdam.
- Serghidou, A. 2007. 'Cyprus and Onesilus. An Interlude of Freedom (5.108-61)' in E. Irwin & E. Greenwood (eds.) *Reading Herodotus. A Study of the Logoi in Book 5 of Herodotus' Histories*. Cambridge, 269-88.
- Slater, W. 1994. Review of Keaney 1991, *BMCR* 1994.06.07.
- Smith, R.R.R. 1988. *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*. Oxford.
- Steiner, D. (ed.) 2010. *Homer Odyssey Books XVII and XVIII*. Cambridge.
- Stylianou, P.J. 1998. *A Historical Commentary on Diodorus Siculus Book 15*. Oxford.
- Thomas, R. 2019. *Polis Histories, Collective Memories and the Greek World*. Cambridge.
- Von der Mühl, P. 1941. 'Isokrates und der Protreptikos des Aristoteles' *Philologus* 94, 259-65 [= 1975: 321-27].

- Von der Mühl, P. (ed. B. Wyss) 1975. *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*. Basel.
- Voskos, A. 2023. 'Ancient Cyprus: From Myth to History and Literature' in Carvounis et al. 2023, 13-46.
- Watkin, H.J. 1987. 'The Cypriote Surrender to Persia' *JHS* 107, 154-63.
- West, M.L. 2013. *The Epic Cycle. A Commentary on the Lost Troy Epics*. Oxford
- West, M.L. 2015. 'Early Poetry in Cyprus' in G.A. Xenis (ed.) *Literature, Scholarship, Philosophy, and History. Classical Studies in Memory of Ioannis Taifacos*. Stuttgart, 25-36.
- Whitehead, D. 2008. *Suda On Line* website s.v. 'kitaris', accessed 22.8.2025.
- Wiesehöfer, J. 2011. 'Herodot und Zypern' in R.B. Rollinger et al. (eds.) *Herodot und das persische Weltreich*. Wiesbaden, 717-34.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von 1893. *Aristoteles und Athen*. 2 vols. Berlin.