

KYPRIAS, THE *KYPRIA*, AND MULTIFORMITY

JONATHAN BURGESS

THE SHADOWY EXISTENCE OF THE HALIKARNASSIAN POET KYPRIAS, previously known only through obscure or corrupt testimony, was substantiated by the discovery in 1995 of a lengthy inscription at Bodrum.¹ About sixty lines of elegiac verse dating from the Hellenistic period sing the praises of Halikarnassos. A list of literary figures nurtured by the city includes a reference to Kyprias as the composer of “*Iliaka*”:

Ἡρόδοτον τὸν πεζὸν ἐν ἱστορίαισιν Ὅμηρον
ἤροσεν, Ἄνδρονος θρέψε κλυτὴν δύναμιν,
ἔσπειρεν Πανύασσιν ἐπῶν ἀρίστημον ἄνακτα,
Ἰλιακῶν Κυπρίαν τίκτεν αἰδοθέτην. (43–46)

She [Halikarnassos] brought forth Herodotos, the prose Homer in the realm of history; she nourished the renowned power of Andron, she was the mother of Panyassis, the glorious lord of verse, she gave birth to Kyprias, the poet of the tale of Ilium. (tr. H. Lloyd-Jones)

My interest is not in the historicity of Kyprias but rather in his function as a poetic persona of Halikarnassos. Kyprias was probably a mythical figure engendered by Halikarnassian interest in the *Kypria*. Aspects of the inscription indicate that it was a variant of the *Kypria* that found favor in Halikarnassos. Multiformity in the *Kypria* tradition can be understood as resulting from local and pan-Hellenic needs, since this best explains the famous discrepancy between Herodotus and Proclus about the *Kypria*. The inscription suggests that the legendary Kyprias allowed Halikarnassos to comprehend and privilege a pan-Hellenic multiform of the *Kypria* to which it laid claim.

The *Kypria* was most commonly attributed to Stasinos of Cyprus, but Athenaeus apparently reports that Demodamas of Halikarnassos attributed it to a Kyprias of Halikarnassos.² The passage as received is garbled, and numerous emendations have been suggested, but the generally accepted text may be translated “Demodamas of Halikarnassos or Miletus says in his book on Halikarnas-

I am grateful to Minna Skafté Jensen for bringing the Halikarnassian inscription to my attention, and to Jim Marks for discussing its significance for the *Kypria* with me. A version of this paper was presented at the 2002 APA conference in Philadelphia; I thank the audience for its suggestions, especially Richard Martin. Gregory Nagy provided helpful correspondence on a particular point. Comments by anonymous readers of *Phoenix* improved the article. Opinions and errors are my individual responsibility. All translations are my own unless otherwise noted. I thank the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for financial support.

¹ *Editio princeps*: Isager 1998. For commentary, see also Lloyd-Jones 1999a; 1999b; Merkelbach and Stauber 1998: 39–45; Austin 1999. As a *Kypria* testimonium: West 2003: 64–65.

² Ath. 15.682d–e (test. 8 B = test. 12, fr. 4 D; FGH 428 F 1).

so that it [the *Kypria*] is a work of Kyprias of Halikarnassos" (Δημοδάμας δ' ὁ Ἀλικαρνασσεὺς ἢ Μιλήσιος ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἀλικαρνασσοῦ Κυπρία Ἀλικαρνασσεὺς αὐτὰ εἶναι φησι ποιήματα).³ At another point Athenaeus refers to the poet of the *Kypria* as "some Cyprian or Stasinos or whoever he likes to be called" (ὁ τὰ Κύπρια ποιήσας ἔπη, εἴτε Κύπριός τις ἐστὶν ἢ Στασίνος ἢ ὅστις δὴ ποτε χαίρει ὀνομαζόμενος).⁴ It has been suggested that "Kyprios" could be emended to "Kyprias," producing a second apparent reference in Athenaeus to the poet Kyprias.⁵ Further testimony for Kyprias seems to be implied in a statement by Photius. He reports that Proclus considered the title to have a paroxytone accent:

λέγει δὲ καὶ περὶ τινῶν Κυπρίων ποιημάτων, καὶ ὡς οἱ μὲν ταῦτα εἰς Στασίνον ἀναφέρουσι Κύπριον, οἱ δὲ Ἥγησινον τὸν Σαλαμίνιον αὐτοῖς ἐπιγράφουσιν, οἱ δὲ Ὅμηρον γράφαι, δοῦναι δὲ ὑπὲρ τῆς θυγατρὸς Στασίνῳ καὶ διὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ πατρίδα Κύπρια τὸν πόνον ἐπικληθῆναι. ἄλλ' οὐ τίθεται ταύτῃ τῇ αἰτίᾳ· μηδὲ γὰρ Κύπρια προπαροξυτόνως ἐπιγράφεσθαι τὰ ποιήματα. (test. 7 B = p. 33 D [cf. test. 11]).

And he discusses also a certain *Kypria*, including that some attribute it to the Cyprian Stasinos, while others assign Hegesinos of Salamis to it, and others say that Homer wrote it and gave it for the sake of his daughter to Stasinos, and on account of his homeland the work is called the *Kypria*. But he [Proclus] does not follow this explanation, for he says that the poem is not entitled *Kypria* as a proparoxytone.

Photius does not report the reasoning of Proclus, and the discussion of authorship of the *Kypria* promised by Proclus at the beginning of his summary of the poem has not survived. It seems from his accentuation, however, that he must have considered the title a genitive singular of the proper name Kyprias, and not a neuter plural.⁶

What should we make of this evidence? Before the discovery of the inscription from Halikarnassos, Kyprias was a rather ghostly figure whose presence in Athenaeus depends on emendation and whose presence in Proclus is only indirectly, and vaguely, indicated by Photius. Taken together those pieces of evidence do seem to suggest that Demodamas put forward Kyprias as a candidate for authorship of the poem, and that somehow Proclus knew of this theory. But

³ Following the emendation of Hecker. For suggested emendations, see especially text and apparatus at *Kypria* fr. 4 D; for discussion, see Welcker 1865–82: 1.284–285, n. 504; Meineke 1867: 331; Wilamowitz 1884: 337; Rzach 1922: 2395; Jacoby at *FGH* F 1; Jouan 1966: 23, n. 6.

⁴ Ath. 8.334b–c (test. 9 B = fr. 7 D). Some have considered "Kyprios" here to be a proper noun, not an adjective. Cf. the Suda reference to ὁ Κύπριος ποιητής (fr. 17 B).

⁵ Severyns 1938.2: 97, note; considered possible by Bernabé (*Kypria* test. 9 B), approved at Lloyd-Jones 1999a: 11; Merkelbach and Stauber 1999: 44; West 2003: 88–90. See also Davies 1988: 38, 44.

⁶ Severyns 1938: 2.96–98. Welcker (1865–82: 1.286–287) demonstrates that Κυπρία, accented as a paroxytone, could be used as a title referring to Aphrodite, as an alternative form of Kypris (cf. Pind. *Ol.* 1.75), though this is unlikely (it is denied at Burkert 1992: 207, n. 10). Coincidentally the Halikarnassian inscription is addressed to Aphrodite, to whom the epithet "Kypris" is applied (2).

in antiquity and in modern times not much credence has been given to either the authorship or even the existence of Kyprias. The name “Kyprias” seems to result from some confusion between the title “*Kypria*” and the adjective “Kyprios.” For example, τὰ Κύπρια ἔπη, “the Cyprian epic,” could easily be understood as τὰ Κυπρία ἔπη, “the epic of Kyprias,” with only a change of an accent.⁷ And references to the Cyprian origin of Stasinus and Hegesias/Hegesinos, putative authors of the poem, might lead to the misunderstanding that “Kyprios” or “Kyprias” was another candidate for authorship. At times it has been suspected that Demodamas himself simply invented Kyprias.⁸ But whatever the origin of Kyprias, in the inscription he is more than a misunderstanding or an idiosyncratic theory of Demodamas. For here it is publicly proclaimed that the whole community of Halikarnassos considered Kyprias a literary figure who brought honor to the city.

This does not prove the existence of Kyprias as a historical person. Information about poets in antiquity tends to be untrustworthy; in particular testimony for Cyclic poets has been suspected.⁹ Yet following Nagy’s lead on the genre of ancient biography of poets,¹⁰ we should put the question of historicity aside and wonder how Kyprias functioned as a legendary figure at Halikarnassos. It is still necessary to conclude that the poet’s name stemmed from the title “*Kypria*” or the adjective “Kyprios.” But Kyprias must have broken free of the realm of texts and scholars to become a figure of Halikarnassian myth, a civic construct who symbolized, explained, and justified the community’s conception of the *Kypria*.

The Halikarnassian inscription that refers to Kyprias probably dates to the late second century B.C.E.¹¹ How much further back in time did the Halikarnassian myth of Kyprias exist? Demodamas knew of Kyprias, and he is dated to around 300 B.C.E. It is possible that he invented the theory of Kyprias as author of the *Kypria*, and this won over his compatriots. But an older tradition is suggested by the reputation of Kyprias indicated by the inscription. I do not think that Kyprias predates the title *Kypria*; rather it seems likely that the title *Kypria* was

⁷Note that variation exists in forms of the title of the *Kypria*. Κυπριακά sometimes replaces Κύπρια; both can stand alone, or be used with such terms as ἔπη, ποιήματα, συγγράμματα, or (*mutatis mutandis*) ἱστορίαι: see Bernabé 1987: 38. An anonymous reader suggests that a testimonium for Naevius that uses the phrase *Cypriae Iliados libro I* (fr. 1 Courtney = 6 B = dub. 1 D), in reference to an apparent translation of the *Kypria* (Courtney 1993: 108), could mean “in Book 1 of the *Iliad* of Kyprias,” not “in Book 1 of the *Cyprian Iliad*,” especially since a second testimonium refers to a work by Naevius simply as the *Iliad* (fr. 2 Courtney = 7 B = dub. 2 D). Cf. the inscription’s reference to the *Iliaka* of Kyprias. I previously suggested that the title *Cypria Ilias* might reflect a wider boundary for the *Kypria* than what we find in Proclus (Burgess 1996: 94, n. 63; 2001: 245, n. 51); the issue is explored further below.

⁸Jacoby at *FGH* 428 F 1.

⁹Lefkowitz 1981; Davies 1986: 93–100; 1989a: 3–6. On bibliographical tradition about Homer, see now Graziosi 2002.

¹⁰Nagy 1979: 296–308; 1990: 75–76.

¹¹Cf. Isager 1998: 21–23; Lloyd-Jones 1999a: 13. At Merkelbach and Stauber 1998: 45 it is argued that the author is the third-century Halikarnassian author Herakleitos.

corrupted into the personal name Kyprias. In citations of the poem, which begin with Herodotus, *Kypria* denotes the poem and is clearly understood as a neuter plural. Herodotus himself was from Halikarnassos, and so his failure to mention a Kyprias when he cites the *Kypria* is significant. It suggests that no knowledge of Kyprias yet existed (Marks 2002: 4, n. 12). We can consider Herodotus the *terminus post quem* for the Halikarnassian tradition of Kyprias, which then arose sometime between the fifth and third centuries B.C.E.

But if that is the date of the origin of the Kyprias tradition, at what time would Halikarnassians have believed that the legendary author Kyprias lived? In general, the inscription seems to list famous literary figures of Halikarnassos along relatively chronological lines, which would put Kyprias after Herodotus and Panyassis of the fifth century and Andron of the fourth century. That is surprising, for it seems unlikely that a Kyprias of this date could be credibly associated with a *Kypria* epic tradition that must have been regarded as much older. We do not have ancient dating for Stasinos, to whom the *Kypria* is most commonly ascribed, yet there is an anecdote that makes him the son-in-law of Homer, who provided Stasinos with the *Kypria* as a dowry.¹² Whatever the value of this account, it demonstrates that the *Kypria* was considered to be approximately contemporaneous with the Homeric poems. But the inscription's chronology is obviously not strict. It could easily be affected by matters of fame and genre, as well as by metrical considerations (Isager 1998: 15). Herodotus takes pride of place, and mention of him might naturally lead to Andron because he worked in the same genre of history, and then to Panyassis because of his familial relationship to Herodotus, before room is made for Kyprias.

Of particular interest is the inscription's claim that Kyprias wrote "Iliaka" (46). Isager (1998: 9, 17) translates this as "the *Iliaka*," as if a poem's title, whereas the translations of Lloyd-Jones (1999a: 3), West (2003: 65), and Merkelbach (Merkelbach and Stauber 1998: 41) suggest that they view it as an adjective referring to the Trojan content of the poetry of Kyprias. The inscription probably does not intend to present "Iliaka" as a title, since then one would expect an article with the adjective, as is always the case with the title "*Kypria*." And elsewhere the inscription is concerned only with the names of authors and not with the titles of their works. But the issue of whether the inscription's reference to "Iliaka" is a title or a description is not as pressing as it might seem. Early epic titles were descriptive phrases that became conventional. They probably did not originate within living poetic traditions, but rather at a later date when scholars felt the need to use convenient and often flexible tags.¹³ In any event, if at Halikarnassos the ascription to Kyprias depended on a theory that the title commonly used elsewhere was mistaken, then Halikarnassians would not have employed the *Kypria* as the title of the epic by Kyprias. Kyprias as author of a poem called the *Kypria* would

¹² As in the Photius passage quoted above at 235; see *Kypria* test. 2, 3, 7 B = 1, 3, 4, 7 D.

¹³ Finnegan (1992: 107) states that "oral poems do not normally have titles."

be an absurdity. Thus a new title would have to be used for the poem formerly known as the *Kypria*, and the *Iliaka* might very well have served this function. I do not accept the argument of Isager, however, that “*Iliaka*” is a reference to the Cyclic poem *Little Iliad*, which depends on a dubious interpretation of a passage in the *Poetics*.¹⁴ I take “*Iliaka*” to be an alternative term for the *Kypria*, or for some form of the *Kypria*.

“*Iliaka*” as a description of the *Kypria* may bolster my previous argument that the boundaries of the *Kypria* once extended further than they do in the summary by Proclus.¹⁵ “*Iliaka*,” it is true, is a rather generic term and could readily denote any poem about the Trojan war. But “*Iliaka*” may also suggest that the *Kypria* narrated the story of the whole Trojan war, not just the early years. A fragment from the beginning of the *Kypria* refers to Zeus planning to depopulate the earth by means of the “*Iliac war*” (*Kypria* fr. 1 B = 1 D), and this clearly demonstrates that the poem looked forward to the whole of the war.¹⁶ There is also evidence that the *Kypria*, independent of its place in the Epic Cycle, actually narrated the totality that it envisioned.¹⁷ The inscription’s reference to the work of Kyprias as “*Iliaka*” does not prove that the *Kypria* narrated the sack of Troy, but the term would be appropriate for a *Kypria* of this larger dimension.

We might also wonder if the *Kypria* ever varied in content as well as in narrative dimension, since the question of multiformity in the *Kypria* tradition has recently been discussed by Finkelberg.¹⁸ Unfortunately, it is difficult to

¹⁴ Isager 1998: 17. See Lloyd-Jones 1999a: 11 for a refutation, with bibliography. Most translations suggest different authors or are ambiguous. Isager cites Halliwell in Fyfe, Halliwell, and Innes 1995 for “author” but Halliwell (1987) has “authors,” with no comment. Janko (1987: 138) argues that “Aristotle’s wording may imply that he ascribed both epics to the same author.”

¹⁵ Burgess 1996; see also now Burgess 2001: 19–33, 135–148.

¹⁶ Perhaps πολέμου μεγάλην ἔριν Ἰλιακοῖο (fr. 1.5) is the source for the term “*Iliaka*” associated with the work of Kyprias. Note that at Davies 1989b: 93 Ἰλιακός is termed an “oddity,” indicative of the poem’s lateness; adjectives in -ιακός do not otherwise occur until the fifth century. Cf. Severyns 1938: 2.93, where it is explained that “*Kypriaka*” began to be used sometimes for “*Kypria*” when that type of adjective form became common. On the whole, however, I am not as confident as Davies that the Epic Cycle poems can be dated from the linguistic forms in the few surviving fragments.

¹⁷ Previously I have cited testimonia that apparently report the deaths of Astyanax (fr. 33 B = 25 D) and Polyxena (fr. 34 B = 27 D) in the *Kypria*. I add now that the *Kypria*’s reference to the wife of Aeneas (fr. 31 B = 23 D) could also have been featured in a narrative of the fall of Troy. Suggestive as well is a report by a scholiast to Euripides that in the *Kypria* (apparently; the citation is to αἱ Κυπριακαὶ ἱστορίαι) a son of Helen and Menelaus went to Cyprus with a son of Helen and Alexander (ὁ δὲ τὰς Κυπριακὰς ἱστορίας συντάξας Πλεισθένην φησί [not Nikostratos, whom others say was born of Helen], μεθ’ οὗ εἰς Κύπρον ἀφίχθαι καὶ τὸν ἐξ αὐτῆς τεχθέντα Ἀλεξάνδρῳ Ἀγαπῶν; *Kypria* fr. 12 B = 10 D). When this occurred is not stated, and it is usually assumed to be during the voyage of Helen and Paris to Troy (Huxley 1969: 134–135; Davies 1989a: 40; Gantz 1993: 572; see Severyns 1928: 380–381 for the fullest discussion of this puzzling testimonium). It seems to me that the half-brothers are more likely to have been together on Cyprus after the war, not during the trip of Helen and Paris to Troy.

¹⁸ Finkelberg 2000; for a response, see Nagy 2001. These two articles explore the parameters of multiformity, an important concept in Lord 1960. I favor Nagy’s position that multiformity for the

find credible evidence for *Kypria* multiformity. Most of the material cited by Finkelberg cannot be directly placed within the *Kypria* poetic tradition. As a result Finkelberg's multiform *Kypria* is really multiform myth. Her argument portrays variant accounts about the beginning of the war as stemming from different versions of the *Kypria*. The contents of Attic tragedy, Apollodorus, and even Ovid are considered evidence for *Kypria* multiformity. It is true that the *Kypria* was a major source for stories of the early Trojan war, and it is often tempting, if risky, to fill in the details of the Proclus summary by referring to works that were likely influenced by the *Kypria*. Apollodorus in particular offers a summary of the Trojan war that is very similar to the summary of the Epic Cycle by Proclus.¹⁹ But it is another matter altogether to consider details which are incompatible with the Proclus summary evidence for multiformity in the *Kypria* tradition. This assumes that the *Kypria* tradition was the sole source for accounts of the early stages of the war. But such variance simply suggests that there were other sources outside the *Kypria* and that the mythological tradition was flexible. The *Kypria* is not equivalent to myth about the early years of the Trojan war; it is one poetic tradition within the larger framework of the mythological tradition of the Trojan war.

There is one plausible piece of evidence for Finkelberg's argument, however: the famous inconsistency between Herodotus and Proclus on an episode in the *Kypria*.²⁰ Herodotus suspects that Homer could not have composed both the *Kypria* and *Iliad*, as was commonly supposed, for he knows that the *Kypria* narrated a smooth and direct sail back to Troy by Paris and Helen, whereas the *Iliad* seems to know of a different account:

ἐν μὲν γὰρ τοῖσι Κυπρίοισι εἴρηται ὡς τρίταιος ἐκ Σπάρτης Ἀλέξανδρος ἀπύκετο ἐς τὸ Ἴλιον ἄγων Ἑλένην, εὐαεῖ τε πνεύματι χρησάμενος καὶ θαλάσση λείῃ· ἐν δὲ Ἰλιάδι λέγει ὡς ἐπλάζετο ἄγων αὐτήν. (2.117; *Kypria* fr. 14 B = 11 D)

For in the *Kypria* it is said that Alexander arrived with Helen at Troy from Sparta on the third day, having a favorable wind and smooth sea; but in the *Iliad* he says he was driven off course with her.

Herodotus is thinking of the passage in the *Iliad* (6.289–292) that mentions textiles obtained by Paris in Sidon. But the summary of the *Kypria* by Proclus is compatible with this Homeric passage. In contradiction to what Herodotus says, Proclus states that in the *Kypria* a storm drove Paris to Sidon, which he sacked. Finkelberg explains the apparent variance in the versions of the *Kypria*

Homeric poems was significant yet decreased as the Homeric performance traditions evolved. I would like to credit Finkelberg, however, for making me rethink my position on the *Kypria*.

¹⁹ For example, I myself have argued on the basis of Apollod. *Epit.* 5.4 that in the *Aithiopsis* Achilles was wounded by Paris in the ankle (Burgess 1995: 225). See also below, n. 27, on the possibility of Cyprus incidents in the *Kypria* on the basis of evidence such as Apollodorus. On the use of sources in Apollodorus, see van der Valk 1958; Davies 1986: 104–109.

²⁰ See Bernabé pp. 52–53 for bibliography and a survey of previous solutions.

known to Herodotus and Proclus by reference to the concept of multiformity.²¹ In her view, a multiform *Kypria* tradition would have led to textual versions of the *Kypria* that differed greatly from each other in content. Thus Herodotus could have known a version of the *Kypria* that narrated a swift journey of Paris back to Troy, and Proclus could have known a version in which the journey was delayed by a storm.

The belief in Kyprias at Halikarnassos, now proven by the new inscription, might be thought to strengthen Finkelberg's argument. In fact some time ago Huxley argued on the basis of the ancient testimony about Kyprias of Halikarnassos that Herodotus of Halikarnassos knew a different, Halikarnassian *Kypria* (Huxley 1967). As I pointed out above, however, Herodotus does not refer to Kyprias. He certainly would have if he knew of him. Since Herodotus was arguing against the attribution of the *Kypria* to Homer, he would not fail to cite an alternative author, especially a famous fellow Halikarnassian. And it is unlikely that a Halikarnassian tradition about Kyprias would refer to the epic as the *Kypria*, as Herodotus does. For these reasons Huxley's concept of a Halikarnassian *Kypria* remains problematic. It is possible, however, that Herodotus knew a Halikarnassian multiform of the *Kypria* before the legend of Kyprias became attached to it. To explore this idea further, we need to consider the likely temporal and geographical parameters of Cyclic traditions.

It has been plausibly argued by Nagy that multiformity did exist in long, fluid performance traditions of early epic, including Cyclic epic.²² But a key issue is how long the Cyclic performance traditions would have lasted. Performance at the Panathenaic festival in sixth-century Athens is commonly seen as a decisive stage in the development of the Homeric traditions. Performance of Cyclic epic could once have had a place at the Panathenaia, only to be crowded out eventually by the growing popularity of the Homeric epics.²³ If Panathenaic performance had a stabilizing effect on the Homeric traditions, it would have had a deadening effect on the Cyclic ones. Multiform performance traditions of the Cyclic epics would have lost their fluidity once they ceased to be performed. In the Classical Age, the Cycle poems would usually have been known in fixed, written form, and probably not in many versions. Only multiple texts recorded in the Archaic Age would have provided evidence for variance in the Cyclic traditions, and I consider textual fixation of epic at such a date a rare phenomenon. A relatively early and infrequent fixation of the *Kypria* performance

²¹ Finkelberg 2000: 6. Cf. Allen 1908: 82, where "substantial variants in the Cycle" are hypothesized, including at this passage ("need not . . . have run to more than a line or two"). Consider also the argument at Huxley 1967 for a Halikarnassian version of the *Kypria* (see below, 242–243).

²² See Nagy 1996, and for the Cyclic traditions, Nagy 1990: 70–79; developed further in Burgess 2001.

²³ See Burgess 2001: 14–15; I hope to explore further the role of Cyclic epic at the Panathenaic festival in a forthcoming article.

tradition would explain why most surviving testimony about the *Kypria* does not suggest multiformity.²⁴

There still remains the discrepancy between Herodotus and Proclus, however. And multiformity becomes the obvious solution when local vs. pan-Hellenic aspects of early epic are considered. Nagy has stressed that the Cyclic traditions were relatively more local than the pan-Hellenic Homeric poems, though the distinction need not be rigid or absolute.²⁵ It is usually thought that the *Kypria* was so titled because it originated in Cyprus.²⁶ If so, it probably contained details of local relevance. The trip of Paris and Helen to Troy provided one opportunity for Cyprian elements, as long as their journey included the southeastern Mediterranean in its circuit. For such travel could include adventures apparently known to the *Iliad* and present in the later fixed text of the *Kypria*. Significantly, there are some indications that these adventures included a sojourn at Cyprus.²⁷ It is likely that the *Kypria* tradition would have emphasized Cyprian details occurring during a long return of Paris and Helen when the tradition first developed in Cyprus. Later the fixed text known to Proclus apparently preserved this local nature. But to audiences outside Cyprus, local details would not be of interest, and they may even have been objectionable. The adventurous journey to Troy could be omitted, replaced by a swift trip with no harm done to the poem's essential narrative (Marks 2002: 5). Herodotus may have thought that Paris and Helen arrived quickly at Troy in the *Kypria* because he only knew a pan-Hellenic multiform of the poem.

Even if the *Kypria* tradition was Cyprian in nature, and survived as such in its textual fixation down to Proclus, it might also have circulated more widely at one time in pan-Hellenic form. Pan-Hellenic manifestations could have

²⁴ I do not consider variance in the title (e.g., "*Kypriaka*"), or a reference to the "poets of the *Kypria*," in the scholia to the *Iliad* (15.57; *Kypria* fr. 27 B = 21 D) evidence for multiple or variant poems entitled the *Kypria* (cf. Murray 1911: 357; Wilamowitz 1884: 346; Rzsch 1922: 2379, 2394–95; Severyns 1938: 2.94); nothing more than confusion over title and authorship need to be signified.

²⁵ See especially Nagy 1979: 7–11; 1990: 60–61, 70–78. For further exploration of this issue, see Burgess 2001: 162–166; Marks 2002: 20–22.

²⁶ Cf. Huxley 1969: 134–135; Lloyd-Jones 1972; Burkert 1993: 103–104; Nagy 1990a: 77. The evidence for content of Cyprian relevance, discussed below, is suggestive but limited and uncertain. Janko (1982: 176) does not think from the linguistic evidence of fragments that the poem originated at Cyprus, though he is willing to allow that it was performed there. Marks (2002: 19–22) locates the poem's origins in Cyprus or the southeastern Aegean, stressing Near Eastern themes within the *Kypria*.

²⁷ At Apollod. *Epit.* 3.3–4 and Dictys 1.5 the journey to Troy includes a stay at Cyprus, for which the *Kypria* may be the source, though that is not certain. At Apollod. *Epit.* 3.8 Menelaus and Talthybius seek help before the war from Kinyras, king of Cyprus, who avoids commitment (cf. *Il.* 11.19–23); it has been suspected that this episode was in the *Kypria* (Wagner 1891: 181–182; Frazer 1921: 2.199, n. 3; Kullmann 1960: 264, n. 2; West 1997: 629, n. 134). The testimonium about a son of Helen and Paris and a son of Helen and Menelaus travelling to Cyprus (see above, n. 17), whenever this occurred, suggests that the poem provided a heroic genealogy for Cyprus. Cf. *Od.* 4.83, where Cyprus is one of many stops of the *nostos* of Menelaus.

travelled widely for some time without replacing the local Cyprian version of the tradition which came to be attested by Proclus. Pan-Hellenic multiforms would not have emerged as the textual representative for the *Kypria* because the *Kypria* performance tradition did not succeed on the pan-Hellenic stage, as the Homeric traditions did. Herodotus, though, could have known a pan-Hellenic version resulting from a performance tradition of the *Kypria* outside Cyprus. It may well have been at Athens that Herodotus came across a textual pan-Hellenic multiform. Alternatively, he may have learned of a pan-Hellenic multiform at Halikarnassos, since Halikarnassos presumably could have been one of the stops in the circulation of the *Kypria*'s pan-Hellenic performance tradition. If the latter, it is even possible that the *Kypria* that Herodotus cites is the poetry of Kyprias which the Halikarnassian inscription praises. This would not be Huxley's idiosyncratically Halikarnassian *Kypria*, but rather a pan-Hellenic multiform of the *Kypria* that became established in Halikarnassos.

In this context, the Halikarnassian inscription's description of Kyprias as an αἰδοθετής deserves closer scrutiny. Lloyd-Jones (1999a: 3) translates this as "poet," but the term may be more suggestive, perhaps reflecting some of the issues examined above. Kyprias is described as one who sets, or arranges, song—could it be that more than creativity is implied? Halikarnassian legend may not have claimed that Kyprias composed the *Kypria* but rather was involved with some aspect of its transmission. Perhaps he was credited with gathering or recording *Kypria* verses, or perhaps he was thought to have been the first to bring the *Kypria* tradition to Halikarnassos.²⁸

Comparable is Onomakritos, a performer of oracular verse under the Pisistratids who was caught inserting his own verses into the poetry of Musaeus. Herodotus terms him a διαθέτης of oracular verse ("arranger"; Herodotus 7.6); in a later account by Tzetzes (Cramer 1.6) he was a member of a committee responsible for a recension of Homeric verse.²⁹ Also relevant are the various stories of Athenian leaders effecting the acquisition, recension, and performance of the Homeric poems, or of Kynaithos being the first rhapsode to recite Homeric poetry at

²⁸ Cf. the translation at Merkelbach and Stauber (1998: 41) of Ἰλιακῶν ... αἰδοθετήν: "den Setzer der Gesänge um Ilion." Later in the inscription Timokrates, of whom nothing is known, is described by the same term (54). The only other surviving example is in the epigram of Archimedes (*Anth. Graeca* 7.50.2), translated in Paton 1916 as "poet." It may be significant that in this epigram the person addressed as αἰδοθετής is warned not to compete with Euripides by writing a *Medea*. Note also that θέτης can mean "adoptive father of a child" (see LSJ s.v. θέτης; cf. θετικός, -ή, -όν; θετός, -ή, -όν). On the other hand the epithet ὑμνοθέτης applied to Dionysios later in the inscription (49) apparently has no special significance in its known usages (Theocrit. *Ep.* 11.4; *Anth. Graeca* 4.1.2, 7.428.16, 12.257), and Lloyd-Jones (1999a: 11) argues that both are generic terms for "poet," chosen for metrical purposes. Cf. also ἐπέων ... θέσιν at Pind. *Ol.* 3.8, which does suggest creative composition.

²⁹ See Nagy 1990: 170, 172–174; 1996: 72–73, 104–105. Cf. Eupolis fr. 326 Kassel-Austin, where the phrase διάθεσιν ᾠδῆς is used in the context of whether traditional or new arrangement of music is to be used.

Syracuse in the late sixth century.³⁰ Relevant also is the story of Stasinos receiving the *Kypria* as a dowry when he married the daughter of Homer (see above, 235). Here it seems competing authorial ascriptions are welded together into one narrative. The motivation behind the tale is not immediately obvious and has been explained in different ways. Probably its significance varied according to how and where it was told.³¹ It does suggest that incompatible information about a poem could be addressed and potentially resolved through biographical myth of poets.

That is not to say that the Halikarnassians celebrated Kyprias as someone who had stolen or tampered with the *Kypria* tradition. Yet the description of Kyprias as an αἰδοθέτης, coupled with the vagueness of the reference to his work as “*Iliaka*,” suggests an awareness of different and potentially competitive conceptions of the *Kypria*. Kyprias may have been celebrated as one who was responsible for bringing a pan-Hellenic, and therefore more acceptable, version of the *Kypria* to Halikarnassos. Though favoring this pan-Hellenic version, Halikarnassians would have been sensitive to questions about its antiquity and authenticity. The name “Kyprias,” denoting a person of Cyprian origin, would function to bolster the authority of the version current in Halikarnassos. The Halikarnassian legend would therefore be compensatory and defensive: the *Kypria* multiform in Halikarnassos may have been different from the Cyprian version, but its acquisition and establishment in Halikarnassos were credited to a Cyprian, which secured for it some degree of validity. In a sense Kyprias did become more than a scribal error or a scholar’s clever theory. He became a mythological means for Halikarnassos to explain its interest in a poetic tradition apparently originating elsewhere. The legend of Kyprias may have simultaneously recognized the Cyprian roots of the *Kypria* tradition yet purported to claim a Halikarnassian role at some later stage of it. Analogous is the manner in which the inscription provides a Halikarnassian setting for, or involvement in, myths usually not considered local. Several mythological references seem to establish connections with neighboring areas in Asia Minor, and the account of the infancy of Zeus lays claim to a pan-Hellenic story.³² A Halikarnassian legend of Kyprias would have provided similarly local context for a poetic tradition known to have originated outside Halikarnassos.

To summarize, the new inscription does not prove that Kyprias composed the work usually known as the *Kypria*, nor does it even prove the existence of a historical Kyprias. It does confirm that there was a belief at Halikarnassos in this Kyprias, who previously was known of only through ancient testimony that was

³⁰ Bibliography for the “Pisistratean recension” is very large; see esp. Davison 1955; Jensen 1980; Nagy 1996: 69–71, 77–80, 110–113. Kynaithos: schol. Pind. *Nem.* 2.1 (Hippostratus *FGH* 568 F 5).

³¹ Cf. Merkelbach 1969: 138–141; Lloyd-Jones 1972; Graziosi 2002: 186–189. For the larger significance of tales about Cyclic poets, see further Nagy 1990: 73–79.

³² See Isager 1998: 12–14, 21–22. Several other cities claimed to be the place of the birth and infancy of Zeus (Paus. 4.33.1).

indirect and difficult to interpret. As such the inscription is a fascinating indication of the use of the *Kypria* outside Cyprus. The phraseology employed would seem to refer to a different form of the *Kypria*, and multiformity for the poem might also be indicated by the discrepancy between Herodotus and Proclus regarding the travel of Paris to Troy. An analysis contrasting local and pan-Hellenic versions of the poem provides the systemic background upon which the Halikarnassian inscription and the Herodotus/Proclus discrepancy become more intelligible. The Halikarnassian pride in Kyprias, as evidenced by the inscription, suggests that his legend provided the means by which Halikarnassos could explain and justify its use of a pan-Hellenic multiform of the *Kypria*.

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
97 ST GEORGE STREET
TORONTO, ONTARIO
M5S 1A1

jburgess@chass.utoronto.ca

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- B = *Poetae epici Graeci. Testimonia et fragmenta*. Pars 1. Ed. A. Bernabé. Leipzig, 1987. Corrected edition 1996.
- Cramer = *Anecdota Graeca Oxoniensia*. Ed. J. A. Cramer. 4 vols. 1835–57.
- D = *Epicorum Graecorum fragmenta*. Ed. M. Davies. Göttingen, 1988.
- FGH = *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Ed. F. Jacoby. Leiden, 1923–.
- Kassel-Austin = *Poetae comici Graeci*. Eds. R. Kassel and C. Austin. Berlin, 1983–.
- RE = *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Eds. G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, K. Mittelhaus, and K. Ziegler. Stuttgart, 1893–.
- Allen, T. W. 1908. "The Epic Cycle," *CQ* 2: 64–74, 81–88.
- 1924. *Homer: The Origins and the Transmission*. Oxford.
- Austin, A. 1999. "Notes on the 'Pride of Halicarnassus'," *ZPE* 126: 92.
- Bernabé, A. ed. 1987. *Poetae epici Graeci. Testimonia et fragmenta* 1. Leipzig. [Corrected edition 1996].
- Burgess, J. S. 1995. "Achilles' Heel: The Death of Achilles in Ancient Myth," *Cl. Ant.* 14: 217–243.
- 1996. "The Non-Homeric *Cypria*," *TAPA* 126: 77–99.
- 2001. *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle*. Baltimore.
- Burkert, W. 1992. *The Orientalizing Revolution*. Tr. M. E. Pinder and W. Burkert. Cambridge, MA.
- Courtney, E. ed. 1993. *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Oxford.
- Davies, M. 1986. "Prolegomena and Paralegomena to a New Edition (with Commentary) of the Fragments of Early Greek Epic," *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen 1 phil.-hist. Kl.* 2: 91–111.
- ed. 1988. *Epicorum Graecorum fragmenta*. Göttingen.
- 1989a. *The Epic Cycle*. Bristol.
- 1989b. "The Date of the Epic Cycle," *Glotta* 67: 89–100.

- Davison, J. A. 1955. "Pisistratus and Homer," *TAPA* 86: 1–21.
- Finkelberg, M. 2000. "The *Cypria*, the *Iliad*, and the Problem of Multiformity in Oral and Written Tradition," *CP* 95: 1–11.
- Finnegan, R. 1992. *Oral Poetry*. Expanded edition. Bloomington.
- Frazer, J. G. ed. 1921. *Apollodorus: The Library*. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA.
- Fyfe, W. H., S. Halliwell, and D. C. Innes. 1995. *Aristotle, Longinus, Demetrius. Poetics. On the Sublime. On Style*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA.
- Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth*. Baltimore.
- Graziosi, B. 2002. *Inventing Homer*. Cambridge.
- Halliwell, S. 1987. *The Poetics of Aristotle*. London.
- Huxley, G. 1967. "A Problem in the *Kypria*," *GRBS* 8: 25–27.
- 1969. *Greek Epic Poetry*. London.
- Isager, S. 1998. "The Pride of Halikarnassos. *Editio princeps* of an Inscription from Salmakis," *ZPE* 123: 1–23.
- Janko, R. 1982. *Homer, Hesiod, and the Hymns*. Cambridge.
- ed. 1987. *Aristotle. Poetics*. Indianapolis.
- Jensen, M. S. 1980. *The Homeric Question and the Oral-Formulaic Theory*. Copenhagen.
- Jouan, F. 1966. *Euripide et les légendes des chants cypriens*. Paris.
- Kullmann, W. 1960. *Die Quellen der Ilias. Hermes Einzelschriften* 14. Wiesbaden.
- Lefkowitz, M. R. 1981. *The Lives of the Greek Poets*. London.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 1972. "Stasinos and the *Cypria*," *Stasinos* 4: 115–122.
- 1999a. "The Pride of Halicarnassus," *ZPE* 124: 1–14.
- 1999b. "The Pride of Halicarnassus: Corrigenda and Addenda," *ZPE* 127: 63–65.
- Lord, A. B. 1960. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, MA.
- Marks, J. 2002. "The Junction between the *Kypria* and the *Iliad*," *Phoenix* 56: 1–24.
- Meineke, A. 1867. *Analecta critica ad Athenaei Deipnosophistas*. Leipzig.
- Merkelbach, R. 1969. *Untersuchung zur Odyssee*². Munich.
- and J. Stauber. 1998. *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten* 1. Stuttgart.
- Murray, G. 1911. *The Rise of the Greek Epic*². Oxford.
- Nagy, G. 1979. *The Best of the Achaeans*. Baltimore.
- 1990. *Pindar's Homer*. Baltimore.
- 1996. *Poetry as Performance*. Cambridge.
- 2001. "Homeric Poetry and Problems of Multiformity: The 'Panathenaic Bottle-neck'," *CP* 96: 109–119.
- Paton, W. R. 1916. *The Greek Anthology*. 5 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA.
- Rzach, A. 1922. "Kyklos," in *RE* 11.2, cols. 2347–2435.
- Severyns, A. 1928. *Le cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque*. Paris.
- 1938. *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus*. 2 vols. Paris.
- van der Valk, M. 1958. "On Apollodori *Bibliotheca*," *REG* 71: 100–168.
- Wagner, R. ed. 1891. *Epitoma Vaticana ex Apollodori Bibliotheca*. Repr. Hildesheim 1971.
- Welcker, F. G. 1865–82. *Der epische Cyclus, oder die homerischen Dichter*². 2 vols. Repr. Hildesheim 1981.
- West, M. L. 1997. *The East Face of Helicon*. Oxford.
- 2003. *Greek Epic Fragments*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von. 1884. *Homerische Untersuchungen*. Berlin.