NOTES ON THE *CYCLOPS* OF EURIPIDES[1]

(i) 37–40   (Σι.)   μῶν κρότος σικιννίδων
                 ὁμοῖος ὑμῖν νῦν τε χὥτε Βακχίωι
                 κῶμοι συνασπίζοντες Ἀλθαίας δόμους
                 προσῇιτ᾽ ἀοιδαῖς βαρβίτων σαυλούμενοι;

THE plural κῶμοι is inapposite, since κῶμος applied to a band of revellers is a collective noun and, however many times the band accompanied Dionysus, it is still the same κῶμος and not a plurality of κῶμοι. Dobree's and Bothe's κώμοις must face the same objection, unless it is understood as 'songs' (as at 492–3 κώμοις παιδεύσωμεν / τὸν ἀπαίδευτον), in which case it becomes a feeble anticipation of ἀοιδαῖς in 40. Florens Christianus' κἀμοί is negligible. Porson suggested κώμωι but left it unclear whether he interpreted Βακχίωι as adjective or noun. Βάκχιος is used adjectivally not more than once or twice in over thirty Euripidean examples (eight in this play), and the satyrs cannot be said to have accompanied a Bacchic κῶμος, for the κῶμος was constituted of the satyrs themselves. And yet Βακχίωι interpreted as a noun would produce an intolerably unstylish collocation of independent datives. Unimpeachable sense and style, and a strong candidate for corruption, would be furnished by κῶμος (Βακχίωι / κῶμος συνασπίζοντες, 'serving alongside Bacchus as his revelling train').

(ii) 49–54   (Χο.)   ψύττ᾽· οὐ τᾶιδ᾽ οὔ;
                 οὐ τᾶιδε νεμῆι κλειτὺν δροσεράν;
                 ὠή, ῥίψω πέτρον τάχα σου
                 —ὔπαγ᾽ ὦ ὔπαγ᾽ ὦ κεράστα—
                 μηλοβότα στασιωρὸν
                 Κύκλωπος ἀγροβάτα.

This is Murray's text (except that in 50 I have written κλειτύν for κλιτύν: see Wackernagel, *Spr. Unt. zu Hom.* 74 f., Barrett on *Hipp.* 227). It puts into the mouth of the satyrs, as they drive the refractory sheep from the hillside towards the Cyclops' cave, this threat: 'Get a move on, horned beast, or I shall throw at you the rock which guards the Cyclops' cave'. And to this the animal, could it have given voice to its feelings, need only have retorted οὐκ ἂν τόν γε δύω καὶ εἴκοσ᾽ ἄμαξαι / ἐσθλαὶ τετράκυκλοι ἀπ᾽ οὔδεος ὀχλίσσειαν. In any case, the Odyssean boulder has no part in this play.

   When Murray's parentheses are removed and a colon is replaced after σου in line 51, the word στασιωρόν, which appears here only, is left to be interpreted by the commentators in the following ways: (i) 'guardian of the fold' = (a) Silenus, or (b) the chorus, or (c) the refractory sheep; or (ii), with LP's accentuation (στασίωρον) retained, 'the fold' itself. This last interpretation, which is espoused by Méridier (Budé edition, 1926) and Ammendola (Florence, 1952), defies analogy and may be dismissed from consideration ('στασίωρος, i.e. στάσεως φύλαξ . . . eadem Analogia qua πυλωρός, κηπωρός, ἀρκυωρός, τεμενωρός', Musgrave). 'Off with you . . . to the fold-keeper (i.e. to himself),' says Paley. It may be allowed that the appellation 'fold-keeper' is not an

impossible appellation for the chorus, but since the chorus's claim to that title is far from incontestable the absence of an explanatory pronoun is not to be tolerated; and ὑπάγειν with an accusative of motion to a person is a solecism. If στασιωρόν is referred to the refractory sheep, then a nominative or vocative will be required: Stephanus proposed στασίωρε and Wilamowitz modified the accent; Scaliger proposed στασίωρος and the accent was modified by Hermann. The latest commentator to champion this approach is Mlle J. Duchemin (Paris, 1945): 'L'opinion générale,' she writes, 'est qu' il désigne le bélier, à qui l'Odyssée donnait ce rôle de chef, ou si l'on veut de gardien, du troupeau.' And we have Wilamowitz's assurance that 'passend kann so nur der berühmte Bock heißen' (*Gr. Verskunst*, 224, n. 3; see also his verse-translation of the play, p. 18).[1] But there is not the least ground for supposing that the recalcitrant animal lingering on the hillside is Homer's famous ram: οὔ τι πάρος γε λελειμμένος ἔρχεαι οἰῶν (we retort) / ἀλλὰ πολὺ πρῶτος νέμεαι τέρεν' ἄνθεα ποίης / μακρὰ βιβάς, πρῶτος δὲ ῥοὰς ποταμῶν ἀφικάνεις, / πρῶτος δὲ σταθμόνδε λιλαίεαι ἀπονέεσθαι / ἑσπέριος· νῦν αὖτε (we ask) πανύστατος; And let it be clear that στασιωρός means not 'gardien du troupeau' but 'guardian of the στάσις, the Cyclops' household' (στάσις as in βούστασις, ἱππόστασις, ξενόστασις, and signifying much the same as σταθμός: so σταθμοῦχος in Aesch. fr. 226N [376M], Antiphanes 171K). And we are talking about a sheep, not a sheepdog.

There is only one plausible candidate for the designation στασιωρός: that is, as Musgrave saw, Silenus. It is scarcely more than ten lines ago since Silenus gave us a list of his duties. The position he holds is that of housekeeper and butler to Polyphemus: ἐγὼ δὲ πληροῦν πίστρα καὶ σαίρειν στέγας / μένων τέταγμαι τάσδε, τῶιδε δυσσεβεῖ / Κύκλωπι δείπνων ἀνοσίων διάκονος (29–31).[2] At this moment, he continues, he is making ready to welcome home his master and the flock: καὶ νῦν, τὰ προσταχθέντ', ἀναγκαίως ἔχει / σαίρειν σιδηρᾶι τῆιδέ μ' ἁρπάγηι δόμους, / ὡς τόν τ' ἀπόντα δεσπότην Κύκλωπ' ἐμὸν / καθαροῖσιν ἄντροις μῆλά τ' ἐσδεχώμεθα (32–5). Who could be more fittingly described as 'guardian of the household' and designated as the goal to which the errant sheep should direct its steps?

If the 'guardian of the household' is Silenus the text is defective, for the construction ὕπαγ' ... στασιωρόν, 'off you go to the στασιωρός', is unbelievable. A preposition is needed, and the simplest solution is to add πρός or ποτί at the beginning of line 53:

> ὕπαγ' ὦ ὕπαγ' ὦ κεράστα
> ⟨πρὸς⟩ μηλοβότα στασιωρὸν
> Κύκλωπος ἀγροβάτα.

Cf. 507–9 ὑπάγει μ' ὁ φόρτος (Seymour, Wilamowitz: χόρτος LP)[3] εὔφρων / ἐπὶ κῶμον ἦρος ὥραις / ἐπὶ Κύκλωπας ἀδελφούς. Line 53 becomes a paroemiac, which is more at home in this context than the former pendant hemiepes.

---

[1] Similarly R. Kassel, *Rh. Mus.* xcviii (1955), 280–3.

[2] In line 30 Triclinius' lame guess τῶι τε for τῶιδε does not deserve the respect which editors have accorded it. The deictic ὅδε may be used of a person who, though not on the stage, is present in the speaker's thoughts (cf. Platnauer on *I.T.* 558, H. Lloyd-Jones, *C.R.* n.s. xv [1965], 241–2), and the colloca-

tion τάσδε, τῶιδε is inoffensive.

[3] This conjecture, which I have not seen admitted into any text, is demanded by the imagery of the passage: for the image cf. Antiphanes 3. 2K, W. Schulze, *Kleine Schriften* (Göttingen, 1933), 713. The conjecture is ascribed by Wecklein to Seymour; Wilamowitz in his verse-translation seems to claim it for himself.

In 1903, five years after the appearance of his major text of the play, Weck-lein published a slender commentary on the *Cyclops* (Meisterwerke der Griechen und Römer in Kommentierten Ausgaben, VIII [Teubner, Leipzig/Berlin]). No later commentator whom I have consulted is aware of the existence of this book; and until it came into my hands I believed myself to be the πρῶτος εὑρετής of the proposed supplement. Wecklein in 1903 prints ⟨πρός⟩ μηλοβότα στασιωρὸν κτλ. and curtly adds 'πρός ist auch um des Versmaßes willen eingefügt. Stallwächter des Kyklopen ist Silen nach 29'.

(iii) The epode, lines 63–81, after an initial iambic dimeter proceeds with a mixture of choriambic dimeters and enoplians until, after two-thirds of its length, it moves into the unhappy semblance of an anapaestic rhythm as the satyrs address the following cry to Dionysus (73–5):

> ὦ φίλος ὦ φίλε Βακχεῖε, ποῖ οἰοπολεῖς ξανθὰν χαίταν σείεις;.

The problem is to repair the syntax and to restore a rhythm worthy of the name anapaestic. Nauck's οἰοπολῶν is no better and no worse than Triclinius' σείων, for neither furnishes a remedy for the metre. No one will be deluded by the unparalleled anapaestic system created by Wecklein (1898) and Méridier (ὦ φίλος ὦ φίλε Βακχεῖε, ποῖ [ποῦ Wecklein] οἰοπολῶν / ξανθὰν χαίταν σείεις;), or by the overlapping dimeters of Duchemin (ὦ φίλος ὦ φίλε Βακχεῖε, ποῖ οἰο-/ πολῶν ξανθὰν χαίταν σείεις;) or of Wilamowitz (ὦ φίλος ὦ φίλε Βακχεῖε, σὺ δ' οἰ/οπολεῖς, ξανθὰν χαίταν σείεις). With the correption ποῖ οἰοπολεῖς I can find no fault; and all that is achieved by writing ποῦ ⟨ποτ'⟩ οἰοπολῶν (Wecklein in 1903, after Hartung, 'zur Beseitigung des Hiatus') or τί οἰοπολεῖς (Sudhaus *apud* Schroeder, *Eur. Cant.* [1910]) is the total destruction of the metre. Paley, remarking that 'it is to be feared ὦ φίλος can hardly be genuine before ὦ φίλε', would have us expunge the former and read ὦ φίλε Βάκχιε, ποῖ δ' οἰοπολεῖς / ⟨τὰν σὰν⟩ ξανθὰν χαίταν σείων; Similar and better is Conradt's ὦ φίλε Βακχεῖε ποῖ οἰοπολεῖς, / ⟨ποῦ⟩ ξανθὰν χαίταν σείεις; And this is the version which, with ⟨ποῖ⟩ for ⟨ποῦ⟩, stands in Murray's text—except that Murray, instead of deleting ὦ φίλος, has appended it to the preceding sentence, where it stands, isolated and self-condemned, as a dactylic pendant to a series of choriambic dimeters.

It is hard not to sympathize with Paley's doubts over the flaccid pair ὦ φίλος, ὦ φίλε. But that an original ὦ φίλε should have engendered ὦ φίλος ὦ φίλε defies probability. Suppose, however, that there once existed a text embellished by a prosaic but pardonable gloss, thus:

> ὦ φίλε
> φίλος ὦ Βακχεῖε κτλ.

It would be no cause for surprise that a scribe who had never seen the like of Homer's φίλος ὦ Μενέλαε (*Il.* 4. 189) should fuse the two versions by distribut-ing the two ὦ's in what he thought a fair and impartial manner. Our anapaests will therefore run as follows:

> φίλος ὦ Βακχεῖε, ποῖ οἰοπολεῖς;
> ⟨ποῖ⟩ ξανθὰν χαίταν σείεις;

For the combination of nominative and vocative see Kühner–Gerth, i. 48, Schwyzer, ii. 63, West on Hes. *Theog.* 964, and for the position of ὦ see Fraen-kel, *Agamemnon*, ii. 284, n. 2. Any who may doubt the wisdom of invoking the

supralinear gloss may be reminded that in this same line there stands in L above οἰοπολεῖς the gloss μόνος ἀναστρέφῃι, and that metre has at last been restored to line 343 of this play by Jackson's unmasking of the glossator's monstrous λέβητα (*Marg. Scaen.*, 91–2).

The lines which immediately follow (76–81) and which complete the epode are usually printed in this manner:

76   ἐγὼ δ’ ὁ σὸς πρόπολος
      θητεύω Κύκλωπι
78/9   τῶι μονοδέρκται δοῦλος ἀλαίνων
80   σὺν τᾶιδε τράγου χλαίναι μελέαι
      σᾶς χωρὶς φιλίας.

Line 76 is a choriambic dimeter, 78/9 and 80 are anapaestic dimeters, and 81 is a dodrans. But what is 77, θητεύω Κύκλωπι? The length is unexceptionable (Dale's 'hexamakron': *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*², 60 ff.), but the *brevis in longo* is not to be tolerated. Only as curiosities need we record Wilamowitz's two 'possierlichen katalektischen Monometer' θητεύω | Κύκλωπι and Duchemin's iambus+mock-anapaestic dimeter ἐγὼ δ’ ὁ σὸς | πρόπολος θητεύω Κύκλωπι. Headlam, *C.R.* xvi (1902), 250, proposed to delete Κύκλωπι and to juggle with the remaining words until a choriambic rhythm should appear: ἐγὼ δ’ ὁ σὸς πρόπολος | σὺν τᾶιδε δοῦλος ἀλαίνων | τράγου χλαίναι μελέαι | θητεύω τῶι μονοδέρκται κτλ. But metre may be restored by the transposition of a single word, in either of two ways. If θητεύω is transferred from before to after the phrase Κύκλωπι τῶι μονοδέρκται, the lines will run as follows:

76   ἐγὼ δ’ ὁ σὸς πρόπολος
      Κύκλωπι τῶι μονοδέρκται
      θητεύω δοῦλος ἀλαίνων
80   σὺν τᾶιδε τράγου χλαίναι μελέαι
      σᾶς χωρὶς φιλίας.

Line 77 Κύκλωπι τῶι μονοδέρκται becomes an enoplian, and the following θητεύω δοῦλος ἀλαίνων is an enoplian of paroemiac shape which furnishes a straightforward transition to the anapaestic dimeter which follows in line 80. But perhaps it will be sufficient for θητεύω to undertake a shorter migration. As Professor Page suggests, to interchange the order of the words θητεύω Κύκλωπι will yield acceptable metre (Κύκλωπι θητεύω iambic dimeter with spondaic contraction: see Dale, 84–5).

(iv) 356–60 Xo.   Εὐρείας φάρυγγος, ὦ Κύκλωψ,
               ἀναστόμου τὸ χεῖλος· ὡς ἔτοιμά σοι
               ἐφθὰ καὶ ὀπτὰ καὶ ἀνθρακιᾶς ἄπο ⟨   ⟩
                  χναύειν βρύκειν
                  κρεοκοπεῖν μέλη ξένων
                  δασυμάλλωι ἐν αἰγίδι κλινομένωι.

358 ἄπο χναύειν Musgrave: ἀποχναύειν LP: ἄπο ⟨θερμὰ⟩ χναύειν Hermann   360 κλινομένωι Reiske: καινόμενα LP

My business is with the last line of this stanza. Editors are now agreed that LP's καινόμενα is to be rejected; and we may therefore hope that we have seen the last of the pictures painted by Barnes and Musgrave of the primitive Scots and their goatskin cauldrons, and that we shall never again hear such marvels as 'Crunch them and munch them, / limbs of thy guest, / slain in a goatskin's /

thick-hairy vest' (J. Patterson, New York [1900]). Reiske's κλινομένωι is to be accepted; but neither Reiske nor any later editor or translator whom I have consulted has realized what line 360, with this conjecture, means. Here is a sample: 'tibi reclinato, recumbenti in hirsuta pelle caprina' (Reiske), 'sur l'épaisse toison de chèvre où tu t' étends' (Méridier; almost identically Duchemin), 'su villosa pelle di capra sdraiato' (Ammendola), 'while you loll on your shaggy goatskin' (Arrowsmith). This meaning is not to be found in the Greek, although it may be imported by the substitution of ἐπ' for ἐν, a conjecture which is ascribed by Wecklein to Wilamowitz (it appears first in his edition of the *Choephoroe* [1898], 261, then in *Gr. Verskunst* [1921], 274) but which had already been proposed by Haupt in *Philologus* i (1846), 365 [= *Opusc.* i (1875), 187–8].

If we are to have Polyphemus reclining on a goatskin rug, then we certainly need ἐπ' and not ἐν. But goatskin rugs are a luxury unknown to the Cyclopean household, where a bed of pine-leaves provides comfort enough (386–7). And the proper place for a goatskin is not the floor but the body: in an inferior goatskin garb the satyrs endure their servitude (80 σὺν τᾶιδε τράγου χλαίναι μελέαι) and in animal skins of presumably superior texture Polyphemus keeps out the Thracian winds (330 δοραῖσι θηρῶν σῶμα περιβαλὼν ἐμόν). 'Take your dinner at ease', say the chorus, 'in a thick fleecy goatskin cloak'. They allude, not without a touch of envy, to some form of furry coat like the fleecy garment worn by Silenus on the well-known Naples volute-crater (Beazley, *A.R.V.*[2], p. 1336 no. 1, Brommer, *Satyrspiele*[2], p. 9 Abb. 1, Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*[2], Pl. xiii, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*[2], Fig. 49, N. E. Collinge, *P.C.P.S.* n.s. v [1958/9], 30). This is the satyric garb which Dionysius of Halicarnassus describes as the μαλλωτὸς χιτών (*A.R.* 7. 72. 10), Aelian as ἀμφίμαλλος χιτών (*V.H.* 3. 40). The preposition ἐν is now put to proper use: so Pind. *Isth.* 6. 37 ἐν ῥινῶι λέοντος, Hdt. 2. 159. 3 ἐν . . . ἐσθῆτι, Soph. *Tr.* 613 ἐν πεπλώματι, Eur. *Ba.* 249 ἐν ποικίλαισι νεβρίσι. For the participle κλινομένωι see 543 κλίθητί νύν μοι πλευρὰ θεὶς ἐπὶ χθονός, Hdt. 1. 211. 2 κλιθέντες ἐδαίνυντο.

Though κλινομένωι is probably what Euripides wrote, it is worth hazarding another suggestion: that LP's ending -μενα may be the product of the easy minuscule confusion between α and ος (see, for example, Porson on *Hec.* 782 [794]). If Euripides wrote κλινόμενος, he offered an anacoluthon no more striking than that which he has just offered at 330–1 (σῶμα περιβαλὼν ἐμὸν / καὶ πῦρ ἀναίθων χιόνος οὐδέν μοι μέλει) or than those which may be found in Kühner–Gerth, ii. 105–7. And if Haupt, Wecklein, and Murray should be right in their speculation that the line missing from the end of the antistrophe, and corresponding with line 360 in the strophe, was none other than line 360 itself, repeated with one slight modification, then that modification will no longer be necessary, for κλινόμενος is just what the antistrophe requires.

(v) 396–402   ('Οδ.)   ὡς δ' ἦν ἕτοιμα πάντα τῶι θεοστυγεῖ
                   Ἅιδου μαγείρωι, φῶτε συμμάρψας δύο
                   ἔσφαζ' ἑταίρων τῶν ἐμῶν †ῥυθμῶι τινί†
                   τὸν μὲν λέβητος ἐς κύτος χαλκήλατον,
       400   τὸν δ' αὖ, τένοντος ἁρπάσας ἄκρου ποδός,
                   παίων πρὸς ὀξὺν στόνυχα πετραίου λίθου,
                   ἐγκέφαλον ἐξέρρανε . . .

The faults of the text quoted are two. First, the phrase ῥυθμῶι τινί is in this context a meaningless locution; and second, line 399 is lacking in construction. Editors will assure us that both faults are illusory: we shall be told that ῥυθμῶι τινί is a sterling phrase and that line 399 either does not lack a construction or, if it does, that to complain of the fact is pedantry. Let us give them a hearing.

The words ῥυθμῶι τινί are interpreted thus: 'ordine quodam et methodo' (Musgrave), 'with a certain deliberate method' (Paley), 'Es lag Art und Schick darin, wie er's tat (Wecklein, 1903), 'non sans méthode' (Méridier), 'con un certo ordine' (Ammendola). Mlle Duchemin, who believes that to boil one's victim alive is a sign of good breeding, but that to dash out his brains is uncivil behaviour, would have the words ῥυθμῶι τινί cohere with line 399 only, and remarks 'Sans doute y a-t-il de la part d'Ulysse une ironie très amère, perceptible dans le τινι . . . "selon les règles, pourrait-on dire" '. It will be sufficient to transcribe Wilamowitz, *Anal. Eur.*, 225: 'ῥυθμός . . . vocabulum Euripidi gratum nulla translatione genuinam amittere potest significationem, ut aut conpluria eisdem quasi numeris perfici aut unius facti tenor certis intervallis carminis instar distingui dicatur. ποίωι τρόπωι τε καὶ τίνι ῥυθμῶι φόνου ita bene iunguntur (El. 772); οὐχ ἕνα ῥυθμὸν κακῶν Supplices habent (98) i.e. lacrimis tonsura capitis sordida veste luctum ostendunt. sed quo pacto simplex factum *quasi per numeros* fiat ignoro'. No one has attempted to refute this objection; and no attempt could succeed.

Consider now how the construction is explained. Here is a literal translation: 'snatching up two of my comrades he began to slay them (with a ῥυθμός), the one into the brazen cauldron, while the other he clasped by the heel . . .'. The words τὸν μὲν κτλ. are said to be governed by ἔσφαζε, which is supplied from the previous line. Méridier, Duchemin, and Ammendola adduce Aesch. *Septem* 43 ταυροσφαγοῦντες ἐς μελάνδετον σάκος and Hdt. 3. 11. 2 ἔσφαζον ἐς τὸν κρητῆρα. And Méridier comments: 'σφάζειν εἰς est une locution connue pour dire: *égorger une victime de manière à faire couler le sang dans un récipient* . . . Le Cyclope égorge un des Grecs au-dessus du chaudron'. That this interpretation is linguistically possible I shall not dispute; I shall contend only that it is effected by a construction of a flaccidity which is all but intolerable.

Wilamowitz proposed to read ῥυθμῶι θ᾽ ἑνί, and his conjecture is printed by Murray. A verb meaning 'he threw', said Wilamowitz, is to be supplied with the words τὸν μὲν κτλ. ('placet in oratione concitata ad τὸν μὲν verbum desiderari'), and the sense of the passage is explained as follows: 'simul correptorum hominum alterum in cortinam conicit Cyclops, alterum trucidat, quo modo non catulos sed lepores semimortuos interimi memini; ingens robur eo cernitur, quod utrumque eodem tenore fit'. The conjecture I believe to be right, the postulated ellipse to be unacceptable. Later, in his verse-translation, Wilamowitz repudiated the conjecture and interpreted the lines after the manner of Méridier: 'kunstgerecht / stach er den einen über dem Kessel ab'. Four years after the appearance of *Analecta Euripidea*, the same conjecture was proposed independently by F. Wieseler in his *Adnotationes Criticae ad Eur. Cycl.* (Göttingen 1879), 8–9. But Wieseler offered a different explanation of the construction: 'verba λέβητος ἐς κύτος χαλκήλατον construenda sunt cum παίων, aeque atque verba πρὸς ὀξὺν στόνυχα πετραίου λίθου.' In other words, 'with a single movement, striking the one against the cauldron, the other, seizing him by the heel, against the rock, he dashed out their brains'. But ἐς κύτος will

not bear this interpretation; and if the second victim was seized by the heel, by what part of the anatomy was the first victim seized? Wieseler repudiated the conjecture two years later, in *Gött. Nachr.* (1881), 194, in favour of a conjecture (ῥυθμῶι τέ νιν) which may take its place among the worse than Cyclopean horrors offered by Jacobs (οὐχ ἑνὶ ῥυθμῶι), Schmidt (ἑνὶ ῥόθωι), Faehse (ῥυθμῶι γ' ἑνί) and Blaydes (*Χο.* τίνι ῥυθμῶι; *Οδ.* τὸν μὲν κτλ.).

Our difficulties arise from the attempt to supply to τὸν μὲν a verb which is not supplied by the context and cannot conveniently be supplied by the imagination. The way out of this impasse is to recognize that Euripides himself must have supplied the verb in a line which has been lost after 399. The following version will show what is needed:

> ῥυθμῶι θ' ἑνὶ
> τὸν μὲν λέβητος ἐς κύτος χαλκήλατον
> ⟨ἔρριψεν, οἰκτρὸν ὕδασι διαπύροις ἕλωρ,⟩
> τὸν δ' αὖ . . .

A scribe who writes a clause beginning τὸν μὲν knows that he will soon find a clause beginning τὸν δέ or the like, and it is not surprising if once in a while his eager anticipation of that clause causes his eye to light upon it a moment too soon.

(vi) 552–5   *Κυ.*   οὗτος, τί δρᾶις; τὸν οἶνον ἐκπίνεις λάθραι;
                Σι.   οὔκ, ἀλλ' ἔμ' οὗτος ἔκυσεν, ὅτι καλὸν βλέπω.
                Κυ.   κλαύσηι, φιλῶν τὸν οἶνον οὐ φιλοῦντά σε.
                Σι.   ναὶ μὰ Δί', ἐπεί μού φησ' ἐρᾶν ὄντος καλοῦ.

                      555 φησ' Florens Christianus: φῆις LP

Cyclops: 'You there, what are you up to? Drinking the wine on the sly?'
Silenus: 'No it gave me a kiss because I am good-looking'.
Cyclops: 'You will pay for it—playing the lover to wine which doesn't love you'.
Silenus: 'Yes, by Jove, since it says it loves me because I am good-looking'.

Yes *what*, by Jove? 'Yes, I shall pay for it'? Certainly not. Read οὐ for ναί: 'No, by Jove, I shall not, since it says it loves me'. Editors show no awareness that the transmitted text gives nonsense—except perhaps Murray and Wecklein, of whom the former mentions and the latter prints (in both editions) Wieseler's hispid ἐπεί ⟨οὔ⟩ μου φῆις ⟨σφ'⟩ ἐρᾶν. There is a similar mistake only three lines later, but here the remedy has been anticipated, though there is no mention of it in the modern editions. At 558 the Cyclops cries ἀπολεῖς· δὸς οὕτως ('You will ruin the wine; give it to me neat'). To which Silenus replies ναὶ μὰ Δί' οὐ πρὶν ἄν γέ σε / στέφανον ἴδω λαβόντα γεύσωμαί τ' ἔτι ('Yes, by Jove, not before I see you take a garland and I have another taste'). Here Wecklein (in both editions) diffidently suggested οὐ for ναί, which is the simplest remedy. Blaydes proposed οὐ μὰ Δία πρίν (*Adv. Crit. in Eur.* [1901]), and the same conjecture is ascribed to Kaibel by Wilamowitz in his verse-translation. Another possibility would be νὴ Δί' οὐ πρίν.

How easily ναί and οὐ may become interchanged is demonstrated by line 560. Here we have the metrically defective *Κυ.* ὠινοχόος ἄδικος. *Σι.* μὰ Δί', ἀλλ' ὤινος γλυκύς.[1] In L there is an erasure before μὰ, the reason for which is plain

---

[1] I have written ὠινοχόος for LP's ὢ οἰνοχόος and have retained LP's ὤινος. For the crasis cf. ὠιζυρός, Ar. *Nub.* 655, *Vesp.* 1504, 1514, *Lys.* 948, Theoc. 10. 1. Editors usually print Canter's οἰνοχόος (ὤιν-) and οἶνος (ὤινος), but a vocative is more effective, as Murray saw (he prints ὢ οἰνοχόος and ὢ οἶνος).

to see: '*μα* a Byzantinis productum esse constat' (Wilamowitz, *Anal. Eur.* 12).
L probably had originally, as Hermann restored, οὐ μὰ Δί'. The Aldine editor
restored a nonsensical ναί.

(vii) 673–5 Κυ. Οὖτίς με τυφλοῖ βλέφαρον.   Χο. οὐκ ἄρ' εἶ τυφλός.
          Κυ. ὡς δὴ σύ—   Χο. καὶ πῶς σ' οὖτις ἂν θείη τυφλόν;
          Κυ. σκώπτεις. ὁ δ' Οὖτις ποῦ 'στιν;   Χο. οὐδαμοῦ, Κύκλωψ.

What is the meaning of the Cyclops' ὡς δὴ σύ in 674? 'utinam et tu sis talis',
Barnes; 'quem ad modum tu ipse nunc caecus es si scilicet non vides me caecum
esse', Hoepfner (= 'Blind as you', Arrowsmith); 'sic [ὣς] tu sis caecus',
Hermann; ' "as *you* say" (but not as is really the case)', Paley ('supply λέγεις');
'dicturus erat ἀπόλοιο aut simile quid', Blaydes (*Adv. Crit. in Eur.* 497); 'als
wenn du nicht blind wärest. Denn nur ein Blinder kann nicht sehen, daß ich
mein Auge verloren habe', Wecklein; 'Oui, . . . à t' entendre', Méridier;
'C'est toi qui le dis!', Duchemin.

If a verb is mentally to be supplied after σύ, as these translations assume,
then the Athenian listener who was able, before his thoughts were interrupted
by the following question of the chorus, to puzzle out the identity of the
missing verb, must have enjoyed the nimble brain of an Oedipus or the
divinatory powers of the Sibyl. Nor does Denniston, *G.P.*² 229, fare any more
successfully when he includes this passage among his examples of ὡς δή 'with
finite verb: *quasi vero*' and declares the sentence to be 'broken by interruption'
after σύ. Let me quote again (see *P.C.P.S.* N.S. xv [1969], 57) a remark which
Housman directed against similar subterfuges: 'Aposiopesis is a comforting
word; but the sphere of the figure so named is limited by conditions which here
preclude it. In cases of aposiopesis it is requisite that we should be able to
form a notion how the speaker was about to complete the sentence which he
breaks off' (*C.R.* i [1887], 241). How, in this context, Polyphemus might have
completed a sentence beginning with the momentously uninformative 'As if
indeed you . . .', I cannot imagine.

Dindorf thought the whole line interpolated (similarly Herwerden, *Mnemo-
syne* xxxi [1903], 283). But an interpolator who could write καὶ πῶς σ' οὖτις ἂν
θείη τυφλόν; which if not very original is at least faultless, might have been
expected to precede it with something better than a meaningless splutter.
Schenkl conjectured ὄλοιο and Kirchhoff ὀλεῖς σύ or ὀλεῖ σύ. But there is as
little need to resort to conjecture as there is to supply a verb. The verb is
supplied by Euripides—σκώπτεις in the next line. The interruption of a speaker's
words by the interposition of an otiose question designed to pave the way for
the second part of the interrupted speech is familiar enough (see for example
Jebb on Soph. *O.C.* 645). But the interposed words need not be confined to
a conventional formula of interrogation: sometimes they have no connection
in syntax, and little connection in sense, with the words they interrupt. So *Alc.*
892–3 Χο. τλᾶθ'· οὐ σὺ πρῶτος ὤλεσας . . . Αδ. ἰώ μοί μοι. / Χο. γυναῖκα, *H.F.*
1050–2 Χο. οἴμοι. / φόνος ὅσος ὅδ' . . . Αμ. ἆ ἆ, / διά μ' ὀλεῖτε. Χο. κεχυμένος
ἐπαντέλλει, *Ion* 558–9 'Ιων. καὶ τί βουλόμεσθά γ' ἄλλο . . . Ξο. νῦν ὁρᾶις ἃ χρή σ'
ὁρᾶν. / 'Ιων. ἢ Διὸς παιδὸς γενέσθαι παῖς; *Tro.* 1310–11 Εκ. ἀγόμεθα φερόμεθ'
. . . Χο. ἄλγος ἄλγος βοᾶις. / Εκ. δούλειον ὑπὸ μέλαθρον, Soph. *Aj.* 981–2 Χο. ὡς
ὧδ' ἐχόντων . . . Τευ. ὦ τάλας ἐγὼ τάλας. / Χο. πάρα στενάζειν. In a passage of
brisk mockery and repartee the interruption is easy and natural. The chorus's

interposed jest provides a good introduction to the Cyclops' despairing σκώ-πτεις, just as in the passage from the *Ajax* Teucer's ὦ τάλας ἐγὼ τάλας prepares the way for the chorus's πάρα στενάζειν. For ὡς δή as a preface to an indignant statement or exclamation see Denniston, p. 212.

Queens' College, Cambridge   JAMES DIGGLE