

SOME NOTES ON EURIPIDES' *CYCLOPS*¹

vv. 73-5:²

ὦ φίλος·
ὦ φίλε Βακχεῖε, ποῖ οἰοπολεῖς;
〈ποῖ〉 ξανθὰν χαίταν σείεις;

L has ὦ φίλος· ὦ φίλε βακχεῖε: ποῖ . . . , P ὦ φίλος ὦ φίλε: βακχεῖε, ποῖ . . . , Paley wanted to delete ὦ φίλος. Subsequent editors did not take up the suggestion. J. Diggle on the other hand has proposed³ that ὦ φίλε was originally a gloss on φίλος ὦ: '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 distributing the two ὦ's in what he thought a fair and impartial manner.' Diggle arrives at φίλος ὦ Βακχεῖε ποῖ οἰοπολεῖς; | 〈ποῖ〉 ξανθὰν χαίταν σείεις; The metre is tidied up, the corruption explained. But φίλος ὦ would be unique in Euripides.⁴ ὦ φίλος is the Euripidean Greek for 'O dear one'.⁵ For 'O dear Hector' he writes ὦ φίλ' Ἑκτορ (*Trö.* 673). If he did want to create here by repetition a sense of πόθος there is no reason why he should not have written what is in L; compare *Trö.* 1081 ὦ φίλος, ὦ πόσι μοι, *Su.* 278 ὦ φίλος, ὦ δοκιμώτατος Ἑλλάδι, and *Andr.* 530 ὦ φίλος, φίλος, ἄνες θάνατόν μοι.

These are small points to set against Diggle's neat creation of an anapaestic rhythm. But there are more serious objections. In L it seems that the original reading was βάκχιε, and that later an ε was inserted under the branch of the χ. It is important to know at which of the three stages of his work on L (*Tr.* 1, *Tr.* 2, and *Tr.* 3) Triclinius made this particular addition to the text. G. Zuntz has observed that 'We know that his first spell of work amounted to doing the *ex-officio*-corrector's job; for this purpose he would naturally have referred to the manuscript from which L had been copied. His final effort, on the other hand, centred on the correction, according to his lights, of the metres in lyric passages, where evidently he relied on his own devices.'⁶ The colour of the addition in L appears on examination to conform to Zuntz's criterion for *Tr.* 3. Another criterion is provided by the fact that it is only the earlier corrections in L that were copied by the scribe of P (*Tr.* 2 and *Tr.* 3 were added after the copying). Now it is clear that in P βάκχιε has been changed to βακχεῖε, for there is a gap between the χ and the ε (filled in, in fact, by an abnormally long branch to the χ), and the space between βακχεῖε and the next word is narrower than is usual in P for words separated by punctuation as these are. What seems to have happened is that the ι and the acute accent were erased, the χ joined to the ε, and ιε added to the end of the word. P was not corrected

¹ I am grateful to Dr. J. Diggle, Professor R. Kassel, Professor P. H. J. Lloyd-Jones, and Mr. T. C. W. Stinton for their valuable comments on this paper, also to Mr. J. Boardman for archaeological, and Father Peter Levi for topographical comment.

² I quote Murray's text throughout.

³ *C.Q.* xxi (1971), 44.

⁴ Though cf. *Or.* 1246 Μυκηνίδες ὦ φίλαι, *El.* 167 Ἀγαμέμνωνος ὦ κόρα, *Hel.* 1451 Φοῖνισσα Σιδωνιάς ὦ ταχεῖα κόπα.

⁵ *Andr.* 510, 530, 1204; *Su.* 278; *Trö.* 267, 1081; *I.T.* 830; *Rhes.* 367; cf. also A. *Dictyulci* 807; and M. L. West in *Glotta* xlv (1967), 143.

⁶ *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (Cambridge, 1965), 194. He adds the important qualification that 'actually there are authoritative readings as well as sheer inventions among every type and stage of Triclinius' alterations'. Even so, a probability can be established.

immediately after its production but 'largely with reference to L'¹ after its arrival in Italy. By this time, of course, L contained Tr. 2 and Tr. 3. βακχεῖε in L, therefore, is certainly a later rather than an earlier change, and so probably one of Triclinius' numerous metrical conjectures—not necessarily wrong, but without authority. It is perhaps the *lectio difficilior*; but it is a form common enough to occur to Triclinius as a means to create something recognizably anapaestic. Forms of βακχεῖος have found their way into the manuscripts against the metre at S. *Ant.* 154, *Trach.* 219, 510, 704.²

This does not prove that Euripides did not write Βακχεῖε. But it is in fact extremely unlikely. Nowhere else does Βακχεῖος mean 'Bacchus', as a noun rather than an adjective. Further, βακχεῖε here would be the only occurrence of that form in the *Cyclops*, whereas the form Βάκχιος occurs eleven times,³ always meaning the god and always (except once—446) guaranteed by the metre. βακχεῖε here can be justified only by the supposition that a word such as δεσπότα has dropped out after it.⁴ Diggle's suggestion is further from what Euripides wrote than is the text of L.

A further indication, albeit a slight one, that the usual, anapaestic diagnosis is wrong is provided by the colon in L after βακχεῖε. Zuntz⁵ has remarked that 'the colon division in L'⁶ offered to Triclinius evidence the authority of which he tended to underrate. . . . Now that it is realized that the verse division in the medieval manuscripts derives from the authoritative Alexandrian edition . . . its neglect by editors and students in general would seem hard to maintain.' And in fact L's colon division for the Parodos as a whole diverges hardly at all from what most modern editors have seen fit to print.

ὦ φίλος, ὦ φίλε Βάκχιε is an Ibycean with final *brevis in longo*, rather than a dactylic trimeter.⁷ ποῖ οἰοπολεῖς; can be converted into an anapaestic monometer by such slight changes as σὺ ποῖ οἰοπολεῖς;⁸ τί ποτ' οἰοπολεῖς; or Paley's ποῖ δ' οἰοπολεῖς;⁹ But this is not the only possible solution; text and colometry remain uncertain.

v. 80:

σὺν τᾷδε τράγου χλαίνα μελέα

This phrase forms part of the satyrs' comparison of past joys in the service of Bacchus with their present wretchedness in the service of Polyphemos. Does it refer to (a) the normal dress of the stage satyr? or (b) merely the satyrs' uniform as shepherds in this play? The problem is more important than it may seem, for the phrase has been seen as one of the three possible indications in literature of the goatishness, or at least of the original goatishness, of fifth-century stage satyrs,¹⁰ who in vase-painting are almost always more like horses

¹ Zuntz, *op. cit.* 146.

² See Pearson ad S. fr. 255.

³ 9, 38, 143, 156, 429, 446, 454, 519, 521, 575, 709. Cf. also *Ba.* 528 βάκχιε.

⁴ Cf. Ar. *Thesm.* 988 f. Βακχεῖε δεσπότα.

⁵ *Op. cit.* 35.

⁶ i.e. L before any correction.

⁷ After such a dactylic colon one would expect the following colon to be dactylic; see A. M. Dale, *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama* (Cambridge, 1968), 35. Ibyceans are not very common in Drama; but another example (not entirely certain; cf. Wilamo-

witz, *Gr. Vers.* 258) of an Ibycean in an Aeolo-choriambic context is E. *I.T.* 1098; (cf. also E. *Alc.* 244 ~ 248).

⁸ For the postponed interrogative cf. *Cyc.* 115, 129, 138, 502, 549, 675; and George Thomson, 'The Postponement of Interrogatives in Attic Drama', *C.Q.* xxxiii (1939), 147-52.

⁹ Cf. Denniston, *Greek Particles*, 173 ff.

¹⁰ The others are A. fr. 207 Nauck (v. R. Kassel, *Rhein. Mus.* cxvi [1973], 109-12) and S. *Ichn.* 285 Page.

than goats. Were this thesis established it would provide a link between Aristotle's account of tragedy as developing ἐκ <τοῦ> σατυρικοῦ and the etymology of the word τραγωδία as a goat song.¹

Pollux² describes the dress of satyric drama:

ἡ δὲ Σατυρική ἐσθῆς, νεβρίς, αἰγῇ, ἣν καὶ ἱσαλὴ ἐκάλουν, καὶ τραγῇ, καὶ πού καὶ παρδαλῇ ὑφασμένη· καὶ τὸ θήραιον τὸ Διονυσιακόν· καὶ χλανὶς ἀνθηή· καὶ φοινικοῦν ἱμάτιον· καὶ χορταῖος, χιτῶν δασὺς δὴ οἱ Σειληνοὶ φοροῦσι.

There appears to be evidence here to support hypothesis (a); but a more reliable picture of the dress of fifth-century stage satyrs is given by contemporary vase-painting, which shows that in fact they usually wore nothing more than the short skirt, or *περίζωμα*, illustrated, for example, on the Pronomos Vase.³ The discrepancy with Pollux is understandable. One of the changes that the satyr underwent after the fifth century was confusion with the goatlike Pan. Satyr plays were performed, it seems, as late as the Imperial period;⁴ and Hellenistic processional satyrs were sometimes adorned in novel and luxurious styles.⁵

Could the *περίζωμα* be called a *τράγου χλαῖνα*? *χλαῖνα* definitely means a cloak, not a skirt, but the phrase might be a humorous description of a goatskin. The satyric *περίζωμα* was sometimes made of cloth, but sometimes, as on the Pronomos Vase, shaggy and suggestive of a goat. There is then nothing wrong with (a) on this count; the phrase might be a humorous reference to the shaggy *περίζωμα*. But there is an obvious objection to (a): if it is right, are they not curiously metaphysical satyrs to complain so of their own nature? Wilamowitz⁶ called the phrase 'ein von ihm⁷ umgedeutetes Kennzeichen der Bocksnatur'; Schmid⁶ wanted to take *μελέα* closely with what follows it; della Valle⁸ attempted to give the oddity some sense as a kind of pathos. None of these interpretations convinces; nor would the substitution of *μέλεος* for *μελέα*. Clearly (b) is preferable: the satyrs, like Theocritus' rustics,⁹ are wearing goatskins because they are shepherds. The humorous point in *τράγου χλαῖνα* becomes clear: the satyrs are wearing as a *χλαῖνα* (i.e. over their shoulders, not as a *περίζωμα*) the *χλαῖνα* of a goat!

But even this is not entirely clear. We have to imagine the satyrs wearing an upper garment of goatskin and complaining of the wretchedness of it. Normally such a complaint would suggest the kind of snobbery exemplified at Ar. *Nub.* 69–72; in the mouth of creatures usually bare from the waist upwards it requires further explanation. It is true that the satyrs resent being

¹ (a) was propounded by W. Schmid (*Philologus* N.F. ix [1896], 47 ff.), K. Wernicke (*Hermes* xxxii [1897], 307 f.), Wilamowitz (*Griech. Trag. Uebersetzt.* iii [1906], 19), and P. Guggisberg (*Das Satyrspiel* [Zürich, 1947], 21). Recent advocates of (b) have been H. Patzer (*Die Anfänge der griechischen Tragödie* [1962], 61) and A. Lesky (*Greek Tragedy* [1965], 38).

² *Onom.* 4. 118.

³ Beazley *A.R.V.*² p. 1336; Pickard-Cambridge, *Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, fig. 49; Arias-Hirmer, *History of Greek Vase Painting*, pls. 218–19; E. Simon, *Das Antike Theater*, Taf. 7.

⁴ M. Bieber, *History of the Greek and Roman Theatre* (1961), 155, 217, 239 f., Sifakis, *Hellenistic Drama*, 53, 124–6.

⁵ Athenaeus 198 b *φοινικίδας περιβεβλημένοι*, 197 f, 200 c; Dionys. Hal. 7. 72. 10. *τοῖς δ' εἰς Σατύρους περιζώματα καὶ δοραὶ τράγων καὶ ὀρθότριχες ἐπὶ ταῖς κεφαλαῖς φόβαι καὶ ὅσα τοῦτοις ὅμοια*. Cf. also the satyrs in the Villa of the Mysteries at Pompeii (*J.R.S.* iii [1913], plates IX, X, XI).

⁶ Loc. cit.

⁷ i.e. Euripides.

⁸ *Saggio critico* (1933), 23.

⁹ 3. 25; 5. 2, 10, 15; 7. 15 f. and see Gomme and Sandbach ad Men. *Epitrepontes* 229.

These inconsistencies led P. D. Arnott to declare:¹ 'The play's time-scheme is, to say the least, confusing. We leap from one part of the day to another with a freedom unparalleled in Greek Drama.' Another indication of daylight is 85 ff. ὁρῶ πρὸς ἀκταῖς ναὸς Ἑλλάδος σκάφος κτλ.

It is true of most Greek plays that the action represented could not possibly have taken place within the time span of the play itself.² There are also plays—Euripides' *Rhesus*, for example, and his *Iphigeneia in Aulis*—in which part or all of the action takes place by night. Day breaks during Euripides' *Electra*³ and during Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*.⁴ More relevant to our problem are two plays of Aeschylus within which, it has been suggested, the evening of one day passes into the morning of the next.⁵ The passing of a whole night between vv. 776 and 836 of the *Suppliants* seems to me doubtful; the case of the *Choephoroi* is clearer: at 660 ff. Orestes urges haste, ὥς καὶ νυκτὸς ἄρμ' ἐπείγεται | σκοτεινόν, ὦρα δ' ἐμπόρους μεθίεναι | ἄγκυραν ἐν δόμοισι πανδόκοις ξένων,⁶ but at 983–6 he orders the net in which his father was murdered to be spread out before the sun,⁷ and at 1034 ff. he declares his readiness to start for Delphi—not, presumably, by night. I do not know whether the audience would conclude, or were meant to conclude, that 'the night passes in the entertainment of the guests',⁸ or whether they would simply fail to notice or to be worried by the discrepancy. For the *Cyclops* F. Wieseler⁹ imagined the passing of night between the sheep's return and Polyphemus'. It has been suggested that 'lyric passages may have been much the same to the Greeks as the dropping of the curtain to us'.¹⁰ But the Parodos of the *Cyclops* can hardly have this function, for at 82 f. orders are given for the sheep to be gathered into the cave. R. Sri Pathmanathan¹¹ is right to doubt 'the legitimacy of seeking a logical time-sequence in a drama of this type'. On the one hand the return of the satyrs with the sheep is too appropriate and attractive a Parodos to be rejected, and on the other hand the Homeric Cyclopeia does not require that a play on the subject should, like the *Rhesus*, take place entirely by night.¹²

Nevertheless a difficulty remains: even Pathmanathan¹³ regards 212–14 as requiring further explanation: 'Could Euripides have been guilty within three successive lines of such blatant confusion of time? The solution is obvious if we look for it in the proper place. Briefly, this is a simple case of comic *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*—well established as part of the comic writer's stock-in-trade.'

This will not do. But before offering an alternative explanation I will attempt to locate the difficulty more precisely. There is in fact no reason why ἄριστον cannot be taken in the early morning before it is light; nor is there any

¹ In 'The Overworked Playwright', *G. & R.* viii (1961), 169.

² See R. G. Kent in *T.A.P.A.* xxxvii (1906), 39–52.

³ 54 ὦ νύξ μέλαινα; cf. E. *Andromeda* fr. 114 Nauck.

⁴ 279; cf. 588. Also in S. *Ant.*, E. *Ion*, *Phaethon* (v. Diggle ad *Phaethon* 63).

⁵ L. Campbell in *C.R.* iv (1890), 304; also Kent, art. cit. ⁶ Cf. 710–11.

⁷ Where, as at *Cyc.* 542, one imagines the sun shining on to the theatre.

⁸ Kent, art. cit. 41.

⁹ *A.G.W.G.* 1881, 1–3.

¹⁰ Kent, art. cit. 43; cf. S. H. Butcher,

Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art (4th edn., 1927), 293.

¹¹ In a reply to Arnott, *G. & R.* x (1963), 128.

¹² In Homer the incident is explicitly spread over more than twenty-four hours: Polyphemus returns with his flocks in the evening (9. 233 ff.) and eats two of the Greeks for his supper, two more for his breakfast the next morning (307 ff.—this may have suggested *Cyc.* 214), and two more for his supper that evening (344). On the same evening he is blinded, and Odysseus and his companions escape on the morning of the next day (437 ff.). ¹³ Art. cit. 128.

reason why Polyphemos should not hunt at night.¹ The difficulty centres on 213: why should Euripides have written the verse if he did not imagine the action as taking place in darkness? And the darkness in which ἄριστον is taken is the darkness of early morning. But if Euripides certainly imagined this episode as enveloped in the darkness of early morning it becomes difficult to maintain the thesis that the action of the play takes place in a kind of temporal vacuum. The contradiction, for example, between this passage and the recent return of the sheep becomes particularly hard to explain. Why the darkness of early morning? Why darkness at all? Why did Euripides write v. 213?

Orion is not so representative of the stars in general that one need not ask why he is mentioned here. And in fact the answer is not far to seek. The satyrs are amusing even when terrified, and when they see Orion they are seeing Polyphemos. Polyphemos is, like Orion, a giant and the son of Poseidon.² Orion is also a hunter and carries a club.³ At *Od.* 11. 572–5 Odysseus sees him in the underworld:

τὸν δὲ μετ' Ὠρίωνα πελώριον εἰσενόησα
θῆρας ὁμοῦ εἰλεῦντα κατ' ἀσφοδελὸν λειμῶνα,
τοὺς αὐτὸς κατέπεφνεν ἐν οἰσπόλοισιν ὄρεσσι,
χερσὶν ἔχων ῥόπαλον παγχάλκεον, αἰὲν ἀαγές.

Compare Arat. *Phaen.* 638–9:

. . . Χίψ ὅτε θηρία πάντα
καρτερὸς Ὠρίων στιβαρῇ ἐπέκοπτε κορύνῃ.

Euripides (*Ion* 1153) calls the constellation ξιφήρης; but it may possibly be Orion who holds a club and some small game on a mid sixth-century kylix in the British Museum;⁴ and he is certainly the figure who, wearing a skin and clutching a club, is being attacked by Apollo and Artemis⁵ on a red-figure amphora of the first half of the fifth century from Agrigento.⁶

Polyphemos has returned from the hunt (130) brandishing a club (210); and he may well be wearing a skin.⁷ For the cowering satyrs he dominates the prospect, no less inescapable than the massive hunter in the sky. On a red-figure psykter of the early fifth century⁸ there is a row of satyrs crawling terrified away from Herakles, who stands with skin and club next to Dionysus, their heads and hands turned back and upwards defensively towards him. E. Buschor⁹ regarded the scene as 'ein Stück attischer Choreographie'. The Cyclops has just threatened the satyrs with his club (210–11), and they may well be performing exaggerated gestures of fear before it.

There is another reason why Orion should occur to Euripides and to the

¹ Xen. *Mem.* 3. 11. 8; *Kyn.* 6. 13; 12. 7; P. *Pyth.* 9. 20–5.

² Hesiod fr. 148 Merkelbach–West.

³ Prof. Kassel has brought to my notice the remark of G. Ammendola ad loc. (*comm.* 1952): 'non a caso è scelta questa, e non altra costellazione; Orione era stato l'appassionato cacciatore . . . il Ciclope è cacciatore anch'esso.'

⁴ Beazley, *A.B.V.* 168. It was in fact normal for a Greek to carry a club when hunting hare. ⁵ Cf. H. *Od.* 5. 121–4.

⁶ Beazley, *A.R.V.*² 261. For some later representations of Orion with club or sword, or both together, see G. Thiele, *Antike Himmelsbilder* (Berlin, 1898), 30, 39, 120; also Roscher, iii. 1023.

⁷ According to J. Diggle that is the point of δασυμάλλω ἐν αἰγίδι κλυομένω at 360 (*C.Q.* xxi [1971], 46).

⁸ Beazley, *A.R.V.*² 188 (probably by the Kleophrades Painter); Buschor, *Satyr Tänze und Frühes Drama*, fig. 58.

⁹ Op. cit. 95.

satyrs at this moment. There is a tradition, of which the first known representative is Hesiod,¹ that Orion came to Chios, became drunk and assaulted Merope the daughter of his host Oinopion, who in revenge blinded the giant. But Orion was eventually cured of his blindness by travelling to the rising of the sun with Kedalion on his shoulders as his guide. Servius preserves an addition to the story:² 'is (sc. Liber) satyros misit qui soporem infunderent Orioni et sic velut vinctum Oenopioni traderent arbitrio eius puniendum. Tum ille Oenopion sopito ei oculos sustulit.' This probably derives from a Satyr Play.³ Silenus in the prologue of the *Cyclops* recalls incidents that have been the themes of previous Satyr Plays.⁴ So too here both audience and satyrs have cause to remember another monstrous hunter striding on to the stage with his club; and at the same time the comparison with Orion may be a subtle suggestion of what will happen to Polyphemus.

The *double entendre* is in fact more than a mere comparison. Orion and Polyphemus resemble each other in appearance; they also resemble Herakles. Orion and Herakles represent the same type, once a 'culture hero' and now a joke. In the poetry of Corinna the hero who fathers fifty sons⁵ and frees the land from wild animals⁶ is called not Herakles but Orion.⁷ Both heroes are rewarded for their services to mankind by being taken into heaven. Orion hunted in the service of Oenopion,⁸ Herakles in the service of Eurystheus; indeed Herakles may well have appeared as a hunter in Euripides' Satyr Play *Eurystheus*, like Orion in the Satyr Play in which he was blinded. There are verbal similarities between the reports of Herakles' callous drunkenness in the prosatyr *Alceste* and Polyphemus' in the *Cyclops*;⁹ it is possible that Orion's satyr-induced drunkenness was equally coarse. And both Herakles and Orion are lecherous.¹⁰

The Homeric Polyphemus is a giant, and his drunkenness is coarse enough,¹¹ but he is neither lecherous nor a hunter with a club. In Euripides he is both.¹² These innovations constitute an assimilation of Polyphemus to the Orion-Herakles type. And clearly there are elements in the Homeric Polyphemus that invite the assimilation. Very different is the other significant change that Euripides made to the Homeric *Cyclops*: in Euripides' Polyphemus there are elements not only of the Homeric cannibal and of the primitive Orion type, but also of the fifth-century Athenian. The consequent synthesis of apparent opposites pervades the play; I will confine myself here to a few poignant examples.

By Euripides' time the primary use of hunting in Attica was no more *Kulturleistung* than it is today. Polyphemus hunts in style, not with his club

¹ Fr. 148 Merkelbach-West, who list later references.

² *Comm. in Verg. Aen.* 10. 763.

³ For the play in question a powerful candidate is Sophocles' *Kedalion*: so Kuenzle in Roscher, iii. 1038, and Schmid, *Gr. L. G.* i. 2. 426; for another suggestion for the theme of the *Kedalion* see Wilamowitz in *N.G.G.* 1895, 237.

⁴ 3 f., 5 ff., 38 ff.; see P. Walz in *Acropole* vi (1931), 154-80.

⁵ 655 *P.M.G.* i. 14 ff.; for Herakles' fifty sons by the daughters of Theopios see, e.g., Apollodorus, *Bibl.* 2. 4. 10; 2. 7. 8

⁶ Schol. Nik. *Ther.* 15 (pp. 40-2 Cru-gnola); cf. Parthenius 20 Martini.

⁷ See also Wilamowitz in *Berliner Klassikertexte*, v. 2. 53.

⁸ Parthenius 20; Arat. *Phaen.* 640.

⁹ Cf. *Alc.* 760 with *Cyc.* 425-6.

¹⁰ Orion with Merope, and with Artemis: Kallim. *Hymn. Artem.* 265; Arat. loc. cit.; Hor. *C.* 3. 4. 70 f.; for Herakles see, e.g., E. fr. 693 Nauck: *εἶτα δὴ φίλον ξύλον, | ἔγειρέ μοι σεαυτὸ καὶ γίγνον θρασύ*—from the Satyr Play *Syleus* and almost certainly spoken by Herakles.

¹¹ *Od.* 9. 373 f.

¹² 130, 210 f., 583 ff.

but with hounds (130), and in his demand for a meal after the chase he is at one with prince Hippolytus:¹

χωρεῖτ', ὀπαδοί, καὶ παρελθόντες δόμους
σίτων μέλεσθε· τερπνὸν ἐκ κυναγίας
τράπεζα πλήρης·

The Cyclops indulges in hunting now that he has others to perform the tasks that he had to perform himself in Homer—pasturing and milking the flock² and preparing his meal;³ he even has Silenus sweep from his cave the filth that is in Homer one of the aspects of his barbarity.⁴ But in appearance he is still the primitive hunter. In his hunting therefore are combined both the barbarous and the refined parts of his nature. The same is true of his sexuality: 583 f. ἦδομαι δέ πως | τοῖς παιδικοῖσι μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς θήλεσιν is I think meant to be an amusingly explicit statement of cultured sexual taste; but the object of his appetite, Silenus, is grotesque.⁵ Another characteristic of the primitive type is gluttony. In Homer P. is simply a terrifying eater ὥς τε λέων ὀρεσίτροφος;⁶ this is converted by Euripides into a gluttony of a recognizable type.⁷ And here too there is the same ironic mixture. After asking after his ἄριστον the Cyclops proceeds to ask (216): ἦ καὶ γάλακτός εἰσι κρατῆρες πλέω; The absurdity of the contradiction between milk and κρατῆρες is amplified by his next question, whether the milk is μῆλειον ἢ βόειον ἢ μεμυγμένον (218). Such fastidious barbarism is equalled only by his remark at 248-9:

ἄλις λεόντων ἐστί μοι θοινωμένω
ἐλάφων τε, χρόνιος δ' εἴμ' ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων βορᾶς.

vv. 243-5:

[Κύκλωψ] ὥς σφαγέντες αὐτίκα
πλήσουσι νηδὺν τὴν ἐμὴν ἀπ' ἀνθρακος
θερμὴν ἔδοντος δαῖτα τῷ κρεανόμῳ

For v. 245 Murray prints what is in L. There is in fact in L a gap of unusual length between the ε and the δ of ἔδοντος, and although the ε does not seem to have been written by a different hand, this is a consideration in favour of Heath's διδόντες. Apart from Murray ('proverbium videtur esse') only Simmonds and Timberlake ('with my teeth') retain the text of L. Apart from διδόντες, which I will attempt to defend, replacements of ἔδοντος have been ἐλόντος (Boissonade, Paley, Blaydes), γε δόντος (Wieseler), and διδόντος (Ruhnken); and τῷ κρεανόμῳ has been replaced by τοῦ κρεανόμου (Ruhnken, Wieseler, Méridier), ἄτερ κρεανόμου (Musgrave, Wecklein), ἄτερ κρεανόμων (Dobree, Hermann,⁸ de Falco), τῶν κρεῶν ὁπῶ vel potius χυμῶ (Reiske), τῷ κρεῶν νόμῳ⁹ (Wiesner). No combination of any of these suggestions with each other or with what is in L gives a satisfactory result.

¹ E. *Hipp.* 108 ff.

² Cf. *Cyc.* 27 f. with, e.g., *Od.* 9. 237, *Cyc.* 207 ff. with, e.g., *Od.* 9. 244.

³ Cf. *Cyc.* 214 with, e.g., *Od.* 9. 311, *Cyc.* 241 ff. with *Od.* 9. 251.

⁴ Cf. *Cyc.* 29 ff. with *Od.* 9. 330.

⁵ In Homer P. has no sexuality. But E.'s εὖ τέγγων τε γαστέρ' ὑπτίαν . . . πέπλον κρούω (326-8) (to which Heath rightly compared *Cat.* 32. 10) may have been partially suggested by *Od.* 9. 371 πέσεν ὕππιος.

⁶ *Od.* 9. 292.

⁷ With 215 cf. 356 ff. and Epicharmus fr. 21 Kaibel (of Herakles), *Ar. Ran.* 571, Pherecrates fr. 69 Kock. 2, Telecleides fr. 1 Kock. 12, Heniochos fr. 1 Kock. 3; also *Cyc.* 325 ff.

⁸ Hermann explains: 'sine coquis et diribitoribus, hoc est sine ambagibus se homines assatos devoraturum dicit.'

⁹ i.e. as opposed to what is described in v. 246.

The essential identity of the seemingly distinct practices of sacrificing an animal and killing it for a meal is revealed by the surviving accounts of the two practices and by the terminology common to them. I shall have to confine myself to a few examples. In the *Iliad* the Greeks enjoy a communal meal of sacrificed meat (1. 467 ff.), but even at Achilles' private meal Patroklos gives to the gods *θυγαί* (9. 220). Chremylus in Aristophanes' *Plutus* makes a private sacrifice to Apollo and brings home a *κρεάδιον* (227), and the cock with which Aristion's cook impresses the dinner-guests in Plutarch is *ἄρτι τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ τεθυμένον*.¹ An inscription of the fourth century B.C. provides for the distribution among the *δῆμος* of the meat sacrificed at the Panathenaia.² The chorus of Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* killing a pig for dinner use the word *θύω*.³ When the satyrs sing of Polyphemos' *θύματα* (361 ff.) that is not a metaphor.

Items of Polyphemos' kitchen equipment are *μάχαιραι* (242, 403), *ἄνθραξ* (244, 358, 374, 671), an *ἐσχάρα* (384), and *ὀβελοί* (393). It should cause no surprise that each one of these items occurs at least once in Greek literature in the context of a sacrifice. More interesting is the description of Polyphemos himself as *Ἰδου μάγειρος* (397). On a Hellenistic inscription from Mykonos⁴ among the provisions made for a public sacrifice is payment of the *μάγειρος*;⁵ compare Athenion fr. 1 Kock. 40-1:⁶ *καταρχόμεθ' ἡμεῖς οἱ μάγειροι, θύομεν | σπονδὰς ποιοῦμεν*. A learned cook remarks in Athenaeus (659 d) that *οὐδὲν οὖν ἦν παράδοξον εἰ καὶ θυτικῆς ἦσαν ἔμπειροι οἱ παλαιότεροι μάγειροι· προῖσταντο γούνη καὶ γάμων καὶ θυσίων*—a thesis he proceeds to illustrate at length, notably with passages from Menander⁷ and Semonides.⁸ Clearly the phrase *Ἰδου μάγειρος* suggests more than simply a murderous cook.⁹

More directly suggestive of the sacrifice are the words *σφαγεῖα* (396) and *κρεανόμος* here. *κρεανόμος* has survived elsewhere, so far as I know, only in Lycophron,¹⁰ but would be readily understood by Euripides' audience. After the private sacrifice in the ninth book of the *Iliad* Patroklos sets bread in baskets around the table, *ἀτὰρ κρέα νεῖμεν Ἀχιλλεύς*.¹¹ The importance in public sacrifice of the distribution of the sacrificed meat, *κρεανομία*, is revealed by numerous inscriptions.¹² To take an example already mentioned: an inscription of the fourth century B.C. instructs the *ἱεροποιοί* to distribute among the *δῆμος* the meat of animals sacrificed at the Panathenaia *καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις κρεανομίαις*.¹³ In some communities the function was dignified by a special *ἀρχή*.¹⁴ A notable occurrence of the word *κρεανομία* is in Clement of Alexandria:¹⁵ *αἱ μαινάδες αἱ δύσαγον κρεανομίαν μνούμεναι* on which Gow comments¹⁶ 'the word may come from Dionysiac mystic ritual'. The carver at a private dinner in fifth-century Athens may or may not sometimes have been called *κρεανόμος*.

¹ *Moral.* 696 e.

² *I.G.* 2². 334.

³ 1062; cf., e.g., Alexis fr. 173 Kock. 11, Anaxippus fr. 1 Kock. 23.

⁴ Dittenb. *Syll.* iii (3rd edn., 1920) n. 1024 (pp. 172 ff.).

⁵ l. 14.

⁶ Also Ar. *Pax*. 1017, Pollux *Onom.* 6. 34. The evidence, literary, inscriptional, and etymological, for the origin of the *μάγειρος* in sacrifice has been set out in the exhaustive treatment of the *μάγειρος* in comedy by A. Giannini (*Acme* xiii [1960], 135-216, esp. 135 n. 1), and by H. Dohm (*Zetemata*, Heft xxxii [1964]).

⁷ *Kolax* fr. 1 Koerte.

⁸ Fr. 24 West.

⁹ Cf. Fraenkel ad A. *Ag.* 1235.

¹⁰ *Alex.* 203 (quoted below) 481, 762.

¹¹ 217. Cf. *Il.* 24. 626; *Od.* 15. 140.

¹² F. Puttkammer, *Quo Modo Graeci Carnes Victimarum Distribuerint* (Diss. Königsberg, 1912), *passim*.

¹³ *I.G.* 2². 334. 1. 25.

¹⁴ e.g. the *κρεωδαίτης* at Sparta (Plut. *Moral.* 644 b; Pollux *Onom.* 6. 34). For similarly named officials elsewhere see Puttkammer, *op. cit.* 56 f.

¹⁵ *Protrep.* 1. p. 84. 10 f. Stählin.

¹⁶ Ad *Theocr.* 26. 24.

If he was, that would be a vestige of a way of eating more communal and more explicitly religious.

I have already mentioned some examples of the way in which Euripides combines the simple savagery of the Homeric Polyphemus with the characteristics of a certain comic type, and projects on to this unattractive combination some of the characteristics of the contemporary Athenian. We are faced here with something similar. Polyphemus' meal in Homer contrasts with the sacrificial meal in the ninth book of the *Iliad* (205–21) not only in the simplicity of its preparation but also in the detail that he eats everything:¹

τοὺς δὲ διὰ μελείσσι ταμῶν ὠπλίσσατο δόρπον
ἥσθιε δ' ὥς τε λέων ὀρεσίτροφος, οὐδ' ἀπέλειπεν,
ἔγκατά τε σάρκας τε καὶ ὀστέα μυελόντα.

In Euripides on the other hand the Cyclops' cannibalism is refined, and so made more horrible, not only by his gourmandise² but also by that element of civilization in the meal that made it a *θυσία*. When Polyphemus says (334–5) ἀγὼ οὐτινι θύω πλὴν ἐμοί, θεοῖσι δ' οὐ, καὶ τῇ μεγίστῃ, γαστρὶ τῇδε, δαιμόνων it is not his purpose to shock the Greeks with a metaphor; he means what he says. His *θυσία* is at once civilized, barbarous, and sophisticated.³

How does this bear on the textual problem? The contradiction between the barbarity and the civilization of Polyphemus' *θυσία*, like the contradiction between the sophistication and the barbarity of Polyphemus himself, pervades the play; and occasionally it is encapsulated within a single line (335, 346).⁴ With such lines 245 compares. No suggestion should give us pause which abandons the word *κρεανόμος* or does not refer it to Polyphemus. ἄτερ κρεανόμου would be an explicit statement of the abnormality of the *θυσία*. Although ἄτερ is certainly the appropriate word in such a context,⁵ the emendation is as unlikely as it is unnecessary. Polyphemus himself is both μάγειρος (397) and κρεανόμος. At 359 the satyrs describe his work as κρεοκοπεῖν μέλη ξένων. Why two lines later do they insist μή μοι μή προσδίδου μόνος μόνῳ . . . ? The word προσδίδωμι is frequently used for the distribution of meat by a sacrificing priest.⁶ Polyphemus is μόνος μόνῳ κρεανόμος.⁷ That is part of the perversity mirrored by line 245,⁸ but it is only a part. The advantages of reading διδόντες δαῖτα τῷ κρεανόμῳ are not only palaeographical. The grim irony of ἐν' ἀμφὶ βωμόν στάντες εὐωχῆτέ με (346) is that the Greeks are indeed to feast Polyphemus (cf., e.g., Ar. *Vesp.* 341: μ' εὐωχεῖν ἔτοιμός ἐστι), but with their own flesh. The irony of διδόντες δαῖτα τῷ κρεανόμῳ is similar but contains an extra twist: properly the κρεανόμος gives the company their meat; here

¹ *Od.* 9. 291–3.

² 246–9.

³ The distinction between these three qualities is important. *ὄψοφαγία* and *ἀνθρωποφαγία*, combined though they are in the person of Polyphemus, may appear to be at opposite extremes on the scale of civilization; but they are both perversions of the sacrificial meal. For what Plutarch makes Lamprias say at *Moral.* 644 b is simplistic, no doubt, but may well be fundamentally correct: τότε οὖν αἱ νεμήσεις ἐξέπεσον, ὅτ' ἐπεισῆλθον αἱ πολυτέλειαι τοῖς δειπνοῖς . . . τεκμήριον δὲ τοῦ λόγου τὸ καὶ νῦν ἔτι τὰς θυσίας καὶ τὰ δημόσια δεῖπνα πρὸς μερίδα

γίγνεσθαι διὰ τὴν ἀφέλαιαν καὶ καθαριότητα τῆς διαίτης.

⁴ Or even within a single word: *ξενοδαιτυμόν* (610) suggests the proper status of the *ξένος* as *δαιτυμόν*.

⁵ Cf., e.g., the *χόρευμα τυμπάνων ἄτερ* at E. *H.F.* 892.

⁶ LSJ s.v. *προσδίδωμι* II.

⁷ Similarly P. is dissuaded from ἀδελφοῖς τοῦδε προσδοῦναι ποτοῦ (531).

⁸ Another and more curious perversion of κρεανομία is at Lycophr. *Alex.* 203: (of the snake at the Aulian altar) *συν μητρὶ τέκνων νηπίων κρεανόμος*; cf. also *ibid.* 762.

that relationship is reversed. The scribes cannot be blamed for failing to understand the subtlety.¹

vv. 288–98:²

μὴ τλῆς πρὸς ἄντρα σοι ἐσαφγιμένους φίλους
κτανεῖν βοράν τε δυσσεβῇ θέσθαι γνάθοις·
οἱ τὸν σόν, ὦναξ, πατέρ' ἔχειν νεῶν ἔδρας
ἐρρυσάμεσθα γῆς ἐν Ἑλλάδος μυχοῖς.
ιερᾶς τ' ἄθραυστος Ταινάρου μένει λιμὴν
Μαλέας τ' ἄκροι κευθμῶνες ἢ τε Σουνίου
δίας Ἀθάνας σῶς ὑπάργυρος πέτρα
Γεραίστιοί τε καταφυγαί· τά θ' Ἑλλάδος
†δύσφρον' ὀνειδή Φρυξὶν οὐκ ἐδώκαμεν·†
ὦν καὶ σὺ κοινοί· γῆς γὰρ Ἑλλάδος μυχοῦς
οἱκέις ὑπ' Αἴτνη, τῇ πυριστάκτω πέτρᾳ.

Odysseus is making his defence against Polyphemus' proposal to eat the Greeks. The passage presents several problems.

1. In 290 L has νεῶν. Musgrave, Matthiae, Bothe, and W. Dindorf print νεῶν. Hermann, Nauck, Kirchhoff, Wecklein, de Falco, and Duchemin print Canter's ναῶν.

Does the context require temples or ships? The general sense favours temples, which would be considered more important than harbours to Poseidon; and the preservation of temples is the more natural boast for the Greeks, their destruction a greater reproach (295 f.). But that is not conclusive. All the places that Odysseus goes on to mention have both harbours and shrines to Poseidon. That is of course not coincidental. And clearly the mariner is less likely than the farmer or the archaeologist to distinguish between the harbour and its temple: Odysseus, for example, seems to have both in mind: *ιερᾶς* (292) and v. 318 (in Polyphemus' reply) *ἄκρας δ' ἐναλίας ἄς καθίδρυται πατήρ* suggest temples; *λιμὴν* (292) and *καταφυγαί* (295) suggest harbours. I will argue that *κευθμῶνες* (293) refers to a cave, and that *μυχοῖς* (291) probably refers to caves or inlets.

Examination of the Greek gives a more positive result. *ἔδρα* may refer to the harbouring of ships,³ but it is much more common referring to the habitation of a deity. Further, *πατέρ' ἔχειν νεῶν ἔδρας* differs from e.g. *πατέρ' ἔχειν λιμένας* in its weak but pointless suggestion of some relationship between Poseidon and the ships.⁴

ναῶν ἔδρας is a less oddly periphrastic alternative, meaning 'temples for him to dwell in'. Between the two senses of *ἔδρα* illustrated by A. *Ag.* 596 *ἐν θεῶν ἔδραις* on the one hand and by E. *Hel.* 797 *ὀρᾶς τάφου τοῦδ' ἀθλίου ἔδρας ἐμάς* on the other there is a spectrum of meaning on which E. *Andr.* 303 *τυράννων ἔσχεσ' ἂν δόμων ἔδρας* seems to be closer to the former, *Cyc.* 290 closer to the latter sense.

An argument for νεῶν remains. The Attic form νεώς, temple, occurs in

¹ An intermediate stage in the corruption may have been, as Duchemin suggests, *δι-δόντος* (to be taken with *ἀνθρακος*).

² Murray's text but with Kassel's *ιερᾶς* in 292.

³ S. *Ajax* 460 *ναυλόχους* . . . *ἔδρας*.

⁴ It is true that Poseidon numbers among

his titles *σωτήρ νηῶν* (h. *Hom.* 22. 5), *δεσπότης ναῶν* (P. *Pyth.* 4. 207) and *ναυμέδων* (Lycophr. *Alex.* 157). But Odysseus wishes to claim that the Greeks have benefited the god, not the ships under his protection. And cf. *καθίδρυται* (318) with *ἔδραι* here.

tragedy only at A. *Pers.* 810. Hence Canter's *ναῶν*. But the objection may be made that the corruption assumed by Canter is unparalleled in the manuscripts of tragedy.¹ The objection would be misplaced. Only here does the context allow and indeed suggest the change to what the scribe would regard as the more orthodox genitive plural of *ναῦς*.

2. *γῆς ἐν Ἑλλάδος μυχοῖς* (291). It is ridiculous that Odysseus is obliged by the situation to find some service that his countrymen have done the Cyclops, for no such service could possibly exist. The point of contact that he does find is represented by the repetition of the phrase *γῆς Ἑλλάδος μυχοί* (cf. 297). The phrase is a curious one and may be deliberately ambiguous, a cheap and desperate rhetorical trick. Certainly it is difficult to choose between two accounts of its meaning.

(a) *μυχοί γῆς* and *μυχοί χθονός* in Euripides are recesses in the earth, particularly Hades.² *I.A.* 660 *ἐν Αὔλιδος μυχοῖς* and *I.A.* 1600 *Αὔλιδος κοίλους μυχοῖς* refer to a harbour, *Andr.* 1265 f. *παλαιᾶς χοιράδος κοῖλον μυχὸν Σηπιάδος* to a cave. Most interesting is E. *Pirithous* 15 f. (von Arnim) *τοιόνδ' ἰχνεύων πρᾶγος Εὐρώπης κύκλω | Ἀσίας τε πάσης ἐς μυχοὺς ἐλήλυθα*. The speaker is Herakles, the *πρᾶγος* the capture of Cerberus. Page³ translates *μυχοὺς* 'the farthest ends', a sense for which I can find no parallel; it is better to imagine Herakles seeking the entrance to the underworld in various *caves*. The true entrance, Taenarum, is the first in Odysseus' list. I will show that both there and at Malea there are reasons for associating the worship of Poseidon with a cave. The same is not true, so far as we know, of Sunium and Geraistus. This inconsistency is hardly explained away as another symptom of Odysseus' *ἀπορία*. It may be thought that by *μυχοί* he means both caves and recesses in the land, i.e. inlets, of which there is no shortage at Geraistus and Sunium. Certainly when Odysseus repeats the phrase at 297 it seems most likely that he refers to Polyphemus' cave.⁴ But of course the phrase may be designed to mean one thing at 297 and another here.

(b) With Page's translation of *μυχοὺς* in the *Pirithous* more sense can be made of Odysseus' list. Poseidon was worshipped in more than four harbour towns. What these four have in common is their position: three at extremities of the Greek mainland, one at an extremity of Euboea. Odysseus then calls Aitna a 'farthest point' of Greece.⁵ This seems to me less likely than (a). On the other hand, as I have suggested, both may be right.

Whichever of these possibilities is preferred, it is clear that Odysseus *πολύτροπος* has anachronistically located Aitna in an area inhabited by Greeks; the anachronism is sustained by suggestions of the Persian Wars (especially in 295 f.). The Trojans, after all, did not threaten Greece, still less Sicily. When Euphemus the Athenian is reported by Thucydides as telling the men of Kamarina in the winter of 415/14 B.C.:⁶ *καὶ οὐ καλλιεπούμεθα ὥς ἢ τὸν βάρβαρον μόνονι καθελόντες εἰκότως ἀρχομεν ἢ ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ τῇ τῶνδε μάλλον ἢ τῶν ξυμπάντων τε καὶ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ αὐτῶν κινδυνεύσαντες* it is easy to believe that this was

¹ *Pers.* 810 is guaranteed by the metre. Confusion between the forms of *ναῦς*, on the other hand, is common: e.g. *E. El.* 1348: *ναῶν* L *νεῶν* Triclinius, Murray).

² *Su.* 545, 926, 1206; *H.F.* 37; *Tro.* 952; fr. 865 Nauck.

³ Loeb Library, *Select Papyri*, iii. 125.

⁴ Cf. 480, where *ἀντρον μυχῶν* means much the same as *ἀντρον*, as at *Hel.* 424.

⁵ Poseidon is associated with *πρῶνες* in *S. fr.* 371 Pearson, quoted below.

⁶ 6. 83. 2.

not the only occasion on which the Athenians impressed on Sicilians their achievements in the Persian Wars.¹

3. Line 292. The ancient town of Taenarum possessed a harbour and a temple of Poseidon. Strabo² writes of the town as τὸ ἱερὸν ἔχουσα τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος ἐν ἄλσει ἰδρυμένον· πλησίον δ' ἐστὶν ἄντρον. More interesting is Pausanias' report:³ ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ ἄκρᾳ ναὸς εἰκασμένος σπηλαίῳ καὶ πρὸ αὐτοῦ Ποσειδῶνος ἄγαλμα. No convincing emendation has been suggested for εἰκασμένος. Taenarum was visited by R. M. Woodward in 1907.⁴ He found a natural cave 'in the west side of the small shallow ravine which runs into the harbour'. 'In the ravine itself, and immediately west of the entrance to the cave, are distinct traces of an oblong building of good Greek masonry . . . If, as is not improbable, there was an opening in the west wall of the temple leading directly into the cave, this might have given Pausanias the impression that the temple resembled a cave.' Whatever the truth of the last remark it is extremely likely that the worship of Poseidon was associated with the cave.⁵

4. Μαλέας τ' ἄκροι κευθμῶνες (293). The literal sense of ἄκρος qualifying an object always serves to specify some (extreme) part of that object. Hence an ἄκρος κευθμῶν is not a 'high' or 'outermost' κευθμῶν but some part of a κευθμῶν. The word κευθμῶν may refer to a vault,⁶ to a hiding-place or hole,⁷ and in particular to a cave or a fold in a mountain.⁸ None of these meanings would give much sense to the phrase ἄκροι κευθμῶνες in this context. The other members of Odysseus' list,⁹ and the derivation of the word, suggest that it may here uniquely refer to a sheltered inlet of the sea.¹⁰ But ἄκρος qualifying 'inlet' would have to specify an inmost rather than an outermost extreme; and for that the only parallel would be the translation in LSJ of E. *Hipp.* 255 πρὸς ἄκρον μυελὸν ψυχῆς as ' . . . inmost . . . ', a translation attacked by W. S. Barrett in his commentary. It is true that from the sea the inmost point of a harbour represents an extreme, but that fact is hardly enough to justify ἄκροι.¹¹

Odysseus' phrase γῆς ἐν Ἑλλάδος μυχοῖς and the association of Poseidon with a cave at Taenarum suggest that these κευθμῶνες too are a cave or caves sacred to Poseidon. At A. *Eum.* 805 the future homes of the Eumenides are called ἔδρας τε καὶ κευθμῶνας ἐνδίκου χθονός. On this point the evidence provided by Pausanias is almost conclusive:¹² Πλέοντι δὲ ἐκ Βοιῶν τὴν ὑπὸ τὴν ἄκραν τῆς Μαλέας λίμνην (Boblaye; λίμνη codd. There is no lake in the area) ἔστιν ὀνομαζόμενον Νύμφαιον καὶ Ποσειδῶνος ἄγαλμα ὀρθὸν καὶ σπηλαίον θαλάσσης

¹ Compare also 297 ὦν καὶ σὺ κοινοῖ with Nikias' words to the allies before Syracuse (Thuc. 7. 63. 4): ὥστε κοινωνοὶ μόνοι ἐλευθέρως ἡμῖν τῆς ἀρχῆς ὄντες. For another aspect of Odysseus the fifth-century Athenian see line 160.

² 8. 5. 1 (p. 363): cf. Pomponius Mela 2. 3. 51 'in ipso Taenaro Neptuni templum et specus'. ³ 3. 25. 4.

⁴ B.S.A. xiii (1907-8), 249 ff.

⁵ Woodward's observations on the site of the temple have been confirmed by Waterhouse and Hope Simpson in B.S.A. lvi (1961), 123-4.

⁶ e.g. Hes. *Theog.* 158 γαίης ἐν κευθμῶνι. Cf. E. *Hec.* 1.

⁷ H. *Od.* 13. 367; at *Od.* 10. 283 it means pigsty.

⁸ P. *Pyth.* 9. 34; Orac. ap. Hdt. 7. 141. v. 5; E. *Hel.* 24.

⁹ λίμνη (292) and καταφυγαί (295); also, there was a harbour at Sunium.

¹⁰ Cf. S. fr. 371 Pearson: Πόσειδον, ὃς Αἰγαίου ἡμέδεις | πρῶνας ἢ γλαυκᾶς μέδεις εὐ-|ανέμου λίμνας ἐφ' ὕψη-|λαῖς στομάτων σπιλάδεσσιν, for which Pearson offers as a translation 'who holdest sway on lofty crags over the entrance to the blue waters of the sheltered cove'.

¹¹ Still less is Duchemin's citation of *Hipp.* 255 as an example of ἄκρος meaning 'pro-fond'. ¹² 3. 23. 2.

ἐγγύτατα, ἐν δὲ αὐτῷ γλυκέος ὕδατος πηγῇ. καὶ ἄνθρωποι περιουκοῦσι πολλοί. The spring in the cave has been found at Hagia Marina, four miles west of the cape itself. Like the other members of Odysseus' list *Νύμφαιον*—Hagia Marina combined a harbour with the worship of Poseidon, and as it is the only harbour in the area it would be rash to locate the *κευθμῶνες* anywhere else.¹ The spring in the cave, and the statue, suggest that the cave was, as at Taenarum, sacred to Poseidon.²

We have found the *κευθμῶνες*. But what of *ἄκροι*? If *ἄκροι κευθμῶνες* could mean 'high-up caves', it would not refer to Pausanias' cave, which is *θαλάσσης ἐγγύτατα*. But it cannot mean that. By *τὴν ἄκραν τῆς Μαλέας* Pausanias meant the cape of Malea. The most obvious characteristic of Malea is that it is a cape, and we must read *Μαλέας τ' ἄκρας κευθμῶνες*.³

5. Lines 295 f. L has *τά θ' Ἑλλάδος | δύσφρον' ὀνειδῇ Φρυξὶν οὐκ ἐδώκαμεν*. This presents three difficulties: (a) it does not scan,⁴ (b) *δύσφρων* is a curious epithet to apply to *ὀνειδῇ* in this context; (c) the sentence as a whole does not make sense.

Heimsoeth's *δύστηλτ'* and Wecklein's *δύσφημ'* are designed to remedy both (a) and (b). As a remedy for (b) *δύσφορά γ'*, which first appeared in Parisinus 2887, has been adopted by Hermann, Paley, Nauck, and Méridier. As a remedy for (c) Musgrave's unlikely suggestion that *δίδωμι* here means 'forgive' was adopted by, among others, Hermann.⁵ Others have replaced *οὐκ ἐδώκαμεν* by *ἀντεδώκαμεν* (Musgrave), *οὐκ ἀνήκαμεν* (Kayser), *ἐκτετίκαμεν* (R. Schenk), *οἴκτρ' ἐθήκαμεν* (Herwerden), *οὐ λελοίπαμεν* (Wiesner), *τὰ δ' . . . δύσφροσιν . . . ἐξεπράξαμεν* (Kirchoff), *οὐ μεθήκαμεν* (Wecklein), *οὐ προῦδώκαμεν* (Shackle).⁶ Méridier's punctuation (*—δύσφορά γ' ὀνειδῇ—*) makes some sense of the *γε*, and is also an attempted remedy for (c).

None of these proposals is very likely. Several of them overestimate the flexibility of the usage of the word *ὀνειδος*. If such a phrase as *ὀνειδῇ ἐκτετίκαμεν* is possible in Greek, it could only refer to actual, verbal rebukes. But clearly *ὀνειδῇ* does not mean that here. When *ὀνειδος* in Euripides means 'disgrace' or 'matter for disgrace' it is almost always used predicatively (e.g. *Alc.* 721 *σοὶ τοῦτ' ὀνειδος*; *Andr.* 410 *ἐμοὶ δ' ὀνειδος μὴ θανεῖν ὑπὲρ τέκνου*). The excep-

¹ As far as I know no archaeological traces of the worship of Poseidon have survived here or anywhere else in Malea.

² For the association of Poseidon with springs see, e.g., Paus. 2. 2. 8; 8. 7. 2, 8. 2, 10. 4; cf. 1. 26. 5; also *R.E.* s.n. Poseidon 504, 511 and Roscher's *Lexik. Mythol.* s.n. Poseidon 2818 f., 2832 ff.

³ Cf. P. *Pyth.* 4. 174 *ἀπ' ἄκρας Ταυάρου* also S. *Trach.* 788 *Εὐβοίας τ' ἄκραι* (ἄκρα Diog. Laert. 10. 37 (cod. F); ἄκραι codd. Soph. et Diog. cet. codd.); E. *El.* 442 *Εὐβοῖδας ἄκρας* (Orelli; ἀκτὰς L; cf. *versum praecedentem*; see Denniston ad loc.). At 318 f. Polyphemus replies *ἄκρας δ' ἐναλίας ἄς καθίδρυνται πατὴρ | χαίρειν κελεύω τί τάδε προῦστήσω λόγῳ*;

⁴ For the extremely rare opening choriamb v. V. Schmidt, *Sprachliche Unter-*

suchungen zu Herondas (Berlin, 1968), 69 ff.

⁵ Hermann's alternative solution, a lacuna after 295, was printed by Paley. Conradt placed the lacuna before *τά θ' Ἑλλάδος*. But Murray's observation on this point 'et videtur sane aliquid de fulmine Iovis dictum fuisse: cf. v. 320 seq.' underestimates Polyphemus' sophistication (and v. Kassel, *Rhein. Mus.* xcvi [1955], 286). It is anyway dangerous to resort to a lacuna when what does survive is clearly in itself nonsense. Scaliger placed 296 before 285; Kock placed it after 282 (with a lacuna after 295 and Musgrave's *ἀντεδώκαμεν*). Similarly Mancini, who deletes 292–5!

⁶ C.Q. ix (1915), 245; he imagines an intermediate stage *ΔΥΣΦΡΟΝΕΙΑΗΦΡΥΞ ΙΝΟΥΔΩΚΑΜΕΝ* caused by 'double parablepsia', and reads *δύσφρον' <ἐς> ὀνειδῇ . . .*

tions¹ are mild enough to bear out the point that the word never entirely loses its subjective content.

The predicative *ὄνειδος* is frequently appositional (e.g. E. *Hrclld.* 72 πόλει τ' ὄνειδος; E. *Andr.* 1241 Δελφοῖς ὄνειδος). Imagine that Euripides wrote τὰ θ' Ἑλλάδος, | δύσφορον ὄνειδος Φρυξίν, ἐξεσώσαμεν—inviting from an ignorant scribe² the change τὰ θ' Ἑλλάδος | δύσφορα ὀνειδὴ Φρυξίν ἐξεσώσαμεν. ἐξεσώσαμεν now becomes a puzzle, to which οὐκ ἐδώκαμεν 'we did not give the Phrygians cause to insult the Greeks' is a not wholly contemptible solution. An emendation along these lines gives, unlike some others, an appropriate antecedent for ὦν in 297. Also, οὐκ ἐδώκαμεν is suspiciously difficult to arrange in any reconstruction, particularly if ὄνειδος (or ὀνειδὴ) is to be retained. I offer this suggestion *exempli gratia*, without certainty, but as meeting conditions which have to be met. Shackle's οὐ <προῦ>δώκαμεν, for example, would be no worse than ἐξεσώσαμεν.³

It might be claimed that these conditions are satisfied more economically by Méridier's punctuation. But Méridier's text suffers from two drawbacks. Firstly, in Euripides at least, the appositional *ὄνειδος* requires the specification of the party to whom the *ὄνειδος* attaches (and almost always in the dative case; hence the attraction of *ὄνειδος Φρυξίν* here). Secondly, this vagueness is magnified beyond toleration by the unparalleled reference of the appositional *ὀνειδὴ* to a hypothetical negation of the main clause.

Odysseus' argument in 290–8 requires the premiss that the Trojans were intent on conquering Greece. The phrase δύσφορον ὄνειδος Φρυξίν is the nearest that he comes to stating that (false) premiss.

vv. 342–4:

ξενία τε λήψῃ τοιάδ', ὥς ἄμεμπτος ὦ,
πῦρ καὶ πατρῶν τόνδε λέβητά γ', ὃς ζέσας
σὴν σάρκα διαφόρητον ἀμφέξει καλῶς.

In 344 L's *δυσφόρητον* is retained by Barnes ('pinguem'), Reiske ('delicatulam'!), De Falco ('indigesta'), and Duchemin (as De Falco). Scaliger's *διαφόρητον* ('torn in pieces') is printed by Hermann, Kirchhoff, and Murray. A. Palmer⁴ suggested *δυσρόφητον*. All these words are *hapax legomena*.⁵

The lines are Polyphemus' reply to Odysseus' observation on the correct method of treating suppliants (301 ff.):

ξενία τε δοῦναι καὶ πέπλοις ἐπαρκέσαι,
οὐκ ἀμφὶ βουπόροισι πηχθέντας μέλη
ὀβελοῖσι νηδὺν καὶ γνάθον πλήσαι σέθεν.

Duchemin in her commentary was right to detect in ἀμφέξει an allusion to 301. But she failed to draw the textual conclusion. We are faced with another of Polyphemus' grim yet subtle ironies,⁶ and again the copyist has failed to understand it.⁷ *διαφόρητον* creates the desired contrast with ἀμφέξει καλῶς. Better

¹ *Hrclld.* 301 τέκνοις ὄνειδος οὐνεχ' ἡδονῆς λιπεῖν, *Andr.* 621 f. ἐκφέρουσι γὰρ μητρῶν ὀνειδῇ, *Ion* 593 τοῦτ' ἔχων τοῦνειδος.

² τὰ θ' Ἑλλάδος is indeed a curious phrase. But cf. Musgrave's certain restoration of E. *El.* 1077 εἰ μὲν τὰ Τρώων εὐτυχοῖ.

³ Cf. Hdt. 9. 7: οὐδαμὰ προδώσομεν τὴν

Ἑλλάδα.

⁴ *Hermathena* xiii (1887), 231.

⁵ Except that Hesychius has *δυσφόρητον* δυσβάστακτον.

⁶ Cf. my remarks above on what P. says two lines later (346).

⁷ Cf. my remarks above on 245.

still is the simpler change *δυσφόρητος*, which was corrupted into the case of *σάρκα*. Polyphemus offers Odysseus a fine inherited garment of bronze,¹ but Odysseus will not enjoy wearing it. The *hapax legomenon* is less surprising where the notion is almost unique.² For the function of *δυσ-* compare *δύσσυμφος*, *δυσφόρμιγξ* and *δύσγαμος*, which may all be Euripidean inventions. *φορέω*, like *ἀμπέχω*, often refers to the wearing of a garment or of armour. But *δυσφόρητος* might also mean *ἀφόρητος*, an ambiguity perhaps not wholly dispelled by *ἀμφέξει καλῶς*.

The other corruption in these lines is also due to the copyist's inability to understand Polyphemus' irony. J. Jackson³ removed the 'split anapaest'⁴ and the suspect *γε* in 342 by reading *πῦρ καὶ πατρῶν τόνδε χαλκόν, ὃς ζέσας*, and regarding *λέβητα* as originally a superlinear gloss. He pointed out that the cauldron is, of course, of bronze (392), and compared *Od.* 8. 426: *χαλκὸν ἵηνατε, θέρμετε δ' ὕδωρ*.⁵ *δυσφόρητος* restores the full force of Polyphemus' irony, and so adds point to *πατρῶν τόνδε χαλκόν*, which could refer to a cauldron or to armour. Both armour and cauldron are acceptable *ξένια*, but not when combined in a single object.

Brasenose College, Oxford

RICHARD SEAFORD

¹ Cf. *Ar. Thesm.* 165: *αὐτός τε καλὸς ἦν καὶ καλῶς ἡμπέσχετο*.

² Cf. *Il.* 3. 57 f.: *ἦ τέ κεν ἦδη | λαῖνον ἔσσο χιτῶνα κακῶν ἔνεχ' ὅσσα ἔοργας*. Also *P. Nem.* 11. 16; *A. Ag.* 872; *A.R.* 1. 691, 1326.

³ *Marginalia Scaenica*, 91 f.

⁴ The 'split anapaest' occurs occasionally in comedy, and in the *Cyclops* at 235 and

334; but in both those places there is, as here, an independent reason for suspecting the text.

⁵ To which add the beginning of *Od.* 13, where Alcinous suggests additional gifts for Odysseus (v. 13): *ἀλλ' ἄγε οἱ δώμεν τρίποδα μέγαν ἠδὲ λέβητα*. Cf. v. 19: *νῆαδ' ἐπεσσεύοντο, φέρον δ' εὐήνορα χαλκόν*.