

THE *CYCLOPS* OF PHILOXENUS¹

Philoxenus of Cythera's dithyramb, *Cyclops* or *Galatea*, was a poem famous in antiquity as the source for the story of Polyphemus' love for the sea-nymph Galatea. The exact date of composition is uncertain, but the poem must pre-date 388 B.C., when it was parodied by Aristophanes in the parodos of *Plutus* (290–301), and probably, as we shall see below, post-dates 406, the point at which Dionysius I became tyrant of Syracuse (D.S. 13.95–6). The Aristophanic parody of the work may well point to a recent performance in Athens, perhaps the first, and it is hard to identify any more significant reason for mentioning the poem.² Previous accounts of the poem have concentrated on two main points, its supposed satirical purpose, and the possibly dramatic nature of its performance,³ but there has been no attempt to consider these two points in relation to each other, or to assess in detail the value of the source-material. I argue that although there is some evidence to support the satirical reading of the poem, the main value of this tradition is that it reveals Philoxenus' comic treatment of his subject, and that while the Galatea motif has previously been considered the essential element in this comic treatment, it was probably a small part of the plot, perhaps only briefly alluded to. Finally I provide reasons for doubting the prevalent view that the performance included dramatic elements.

I. COMPOSITION

In its earliest version, the ancient tradition which suggests that the *Cyclops* was conceived as a piece of court satire can be found in Athenaeus (1.7a):

συνεμέθυε δὲ τῷ Φιλοξένῳ ἡδέως ὁ Διονύσιος. ἐπεὶ δὲ τὴν ἐρωμένην Γαλάτειαν ἐφωράθη διαφθείρων, εἰς τὰς λατομίας ἐνεβλήθη· ἐν αἷς ποιῶν τὸν Κύκλωπα συνέθηκε τὸν μῦθον εἰς τὸ περὶ αὐτὸν γεγόμενον πάθος, τὸν μὲν Διονύσιον Κύκλωπα ὑποστῆσάμενος, τὴν δ' αὐλητρίδα Γαλάτειαν, εἰς τὸν δ' Ὀδυσσεύα.

(Phaenias fr. 13 Wehrli = PMG 816)

Dionysius enjoyed getting drunk with Philoxenus. But when he was caught seducing his [sc. Dionysius'] mistress Galatea, he was thrown into the quarries; in which he composed his *Cyclops*, and adapted the plot to the fate which had befallen him, representing Dionysius as the Cyclops, the pipe-girl as Galatea, and himself as Odysseus.

Athenaeus is probably quoting from or paraphrasing the fourth-century peripatetic Phaenias of Eresus, who is mentioned at Athen. 1.6e as the source for a story about an exchange between Philoxenus and Dionysius at dinner, which has Philoxenus writing his *Galatea* without any suggestion of satirical intent. Phaenias is known to

¹ This paper has a long history. In its earliest form (1995) it was read and commented on by Professor P. J. Parsons, Dr M. L. West, and Dr E. Hall, to whom many thanks. Parts of it were delivered to the Corpus Christi Classical Seminar in Oxford in Michaelmas, 1997; again, thanks are due to those who attended for their comments and suggestions. A final debt of thanks is owed to Professor C. Collard and *CQ*'s anonymous referee.

² See further C. Kugelmeier, *Reflexe früher und zeitgenössischer Lyrik in der alten attischen Komödie* (Stuttgart & Leipzig, 1996), 255–64.

³ The quasi-dramatic qualities of the *Cyclops* are accepted by D. F. Sutton, *QUCC* n.s. 13 (1983), 37–43, B. Zimmermann, *Dithyrambos: Geschichte einer Gattung* (Göttingen, 1992), 127–8, and M. L. West, *Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford, 1992), 364–6.

have written a work *περὶ τῶν ἐν Σικελίᾳ τυράννων* (fr. 11–13 Wehrli), from which Wehrli assumes this information to be taken. There could also be some material from the *τυράννων ἀναίρεσις ἐκ τιμωρίας* (fr. 14–16 Wehrli), if the point in question is Dionysius' tyrannical behaviour. Alternatively, the story about the pipe-girl and the quarries, which follows directly after the first anecdote without any explicit attribution, may be Athenaeus' own addition from another source, but if this were so, we would normally expect some indication to be given. Contemporary with Athenaeus' report is Aelian's (*V.H.* 12.44), but this too is probably ultimately derived from Phaenias' account.

Other sources also tell us that Philoxenus was for some time court-poet to Dionysius in Sicily,⁴ and several of these authorities know of his imprisonment in the Syracusan quarries, or of some other conflict with Dionysius. Thus Diodorus, for instance, connects Philoxenus' imprisonment with his criticisms of Dionysius' own verse. It is perhaps slightly odd that none of these other sources is aware of the connection between the imprisonment and the composition of the *Cyclops*. Nevertheless, the latter is transmitted consistently in the scholia to *Plutus*, the fullest account being found in the first recension of Tzetzes' commentary (Joh. Tzetz.¹ in *Pl.* 290):⁵

Φιλόξενον τὸν διθυραμβοποιὸν ἢ τραγωιδιοδιδάσκαλον διασύρει, ὅστις ἐν Σικελίᾳ ἦν παρὰ Δωριεῦσιν· λέγεται δὲ ὅτι ποτὲ Γαλατεΐαι τινὲ παλλακίδι Διονυσίου προσέβαλε, καὶ μαθὼν Διονύσιος ἐξώρισεν αὐτὸν εἰς λατομίαν. φεύγων δ' ἐκείθεν εἰς <τὰ> μέρη τῶν Κυθήρων ἦλθε καὶ ἐκεῖ δράμα τὴν Γαλάτειαν ἐποίησεν, ἐν ᾧ εἰσήγαγε τὸν Κύκλωπα ἐρώντα τῆς Γαλατεΐας. τοῦτο δὲ αἰνιττόμενος εἰς Διονύσιον ἀπείκασεν αὐτὸν τῷ Κύκλωπι. ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς <ὁ> Διονύσιος οὐκ ὠξυδόρκει.

He is mocking Philoxenus the dithyrambic or tragic poet, who lived in Sicily among the Dorians; it is said that once he assaulted Galatea, a mistress of Dionysius, and when Dionysius learned about this, he sent him off to the quarry. Escaping from there, he came to the regions of Cythera, and there composed his play *Galatea*, in which he introduced the Cyclops in love with Galatea. In this he was making a riddling reference to Dionysius, and likened him to the Cyclops, since Dionysius himself had poor eyesight.

Much the same text is found in the scholia to a number of MSS (*Σ Ar. Pl.* 290d: pp. 65–6 Chantry⁶), notably the eleventh-century cod. Venetus Marcianus gr. 474 (V), whose scholia are often fuller and more valuable than those in the older (tenth-century) Ravenna codex (R), and also in cod. Estensis a.U.5.10 (E), dating to the fourteenth century, but containing full and valuable scholia, and in Vaticanus gr. 57 (V⁵⁷). It later appears in the scholia to the Aldine edition, which were drawn from a lost MS used by Musurus. Tzetzes' version is slightly longer, but it is to be presumed that both he and the scholia were drawing on similar sources, since in only very few cases is a direct relationship between Tzetzes and the scholia evident. Tzetzes does not appear to have had access to a particularly reliable MS tradition: in his note on *Pl.* 137 (p. 41 Positano) he complains that he has only two or three recent, and no

⁴ Cf. D.S. 15.6; Machon fr. 9 Gow; Sopater fr. 23 Kaibel; Cicero, *Att.* 4.6.2; Plu. *Tranq.* 12; Paus. 1.2.1; Lucian. *Cal.* 14; *Σ Ar. Pl.* 179; Suda *φ* 397; Joh. Tzetz.¹¹ in *Pl.* 290 pp. 83–4 Positano, etc.

⁵ Ed. L. M. Positano, *Joh. Tzetzae commentarii in Aristophanem* (Groningen & Amsterdam, 1960), 83.

⁶ The scholia vetera have been edited by M. Chantry, *Scholia vetera in Aristophanis Plutum* (Groningen, 1994). The scholia as recorded in *PMG* and Campbell's *Greek Lyric* vol. 5 (Cambridge, MA & London, 1993) are taken from F. Dübner, *Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem* (Paris, 1877), and are now out of date. I have therefore refrained from giving parallel references to *PMG* for these.

ancient, MSS from which to work.⁷ His statements about the plot and performance of the poem must have been a combination of his own conjectures, the records of earlier scholia preserved in his few MSS, and possibly the accounts of earlier writers whose works are no longer extant.

A different story is told by Douris, the tyrant of Samos and pupil of Theophrastus (c. 340–260 B.C.):

Δούρις φησι (FGrH 76 F 58 = Σ Theocr. 6f p. 189.18 Wendel; PMG 817) διὰ τὴν εὐβοσίαν τῶν θρεμμάτων καὶ τοῦ γάλακτος πολυπλήθειαν τὸν Πολύφημον ἰδρύσασθαι ἱερὸν παρὰ τῇ Αἴτνῃ Γαλατείας· Φιλόξενον δὲ τὸν Κυθήριον ἐπιδημήσαντα καὶ μὴ δυνάμενον ἐπινοῆσαι τὴν αἰτίαν ἀναπλάσαι ὥς ὅτι Πολύφημος ἦρα τῆς Γαλατείας.

Douris says that Polyphemus built a shrine to Galatea near Mount Etna on account of the richness of the pastures, and the abundance of milk; but that when Philoxenus of Cythera visited it and could not think of the reason, he invented the story that Polyphemus had been in love with Galatea.

It is to be admitted that Douris' version has a surface plausibility of sorts: we can indeed believe that there were shrines to Galatea in Sicily, and perhaps that one of these was associated in folk-tale with Polyphemus. But the rationalism of Douris' account is typical of his work, and the (incorrect?⁸) etymological connection made between γάλα 'milk' and Γαλατεία seems more likely to be expected from early Hellenistic scholarship than from early fourth-century poetry; it certainly does not seem archaic or classical. We can see the same popular etymology in Lucian (*ver. hist.* 2.3), when he locates a shrine to Galatea on the island of cheese in the middle of a sea of milk. Furthermore, Douris was writing at only a slightly later date than Phaenias, and we might suspect that as a tyrant himself he was concerned to refute, perhaps only tacitly, Phaenias' version of events in order to avoid an unfavourable portrayal of tyranny.⁹ Certainly his account was less widely known or accepted in antiquity itself.

But we should not accept Phaenias' version as a necessary consequence of rejecting Douris'. Webster suggested that the satirical interpretation was actually developed by the poets of middle and new comedy, three of whom are known to have written plays on the Cyclops/Galatea theme: Nicochares (*Galatea*, fr. 3–6 K.-A.), Antiphanes (*Cyclops*, fr. 129–31 K.-A.), and Alexis (*Galatea*, fr. 37–40 K.-A.).¹⁰ Only two fragments of Nicochares' play are of any length: in fr. 4 Galatea may be addressing Polyphemus, and in fr. 3 Polyphemus offers Galatea a spice-box. In Antiphanes there is evidence that preparations are being made for Polyphemus' wedding-feast: he offers to provide meat and cheese (fr. 131), if Galatea will provide fish (fr. 130). There also appears to be some reference to a feast in Alexis' play (fr. 38). Fr. 37 is a speech by a

⁷ See also N. G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* (London, 1983), 193–4.

⁸ E. Risch, *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache* (Berlin & New York, 1974²), 138, tentatively derives Γαλατεία from γάλα, but we would expect Γαλακτ-εία if this were the case (cf. the formations γαλακτο-πότης, γαλακτ-ώδης). The use of γαλα- as a first term is more ancient (cf. the old formation γαλα-θη-νός 'young, tender' < 'taking milk'), but we cannot explain the presence of tau (the suffix is -ειος/-εία). γάλατος is occasionally found as a genitive in the documentary papyri (see P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* [Paris, 1990], s.v. γάλα), but this would not provide evidence for earlier formations on the stem.

⁹ L. J. Sanders, *Dionysius I of Syracuse and Greek Tyranny* (London & New York, 1987), 1–40, discusses in detail the hostile tradition relating to Dionysius, and presents Philoxenus' poem, together with much other material, in the context of the party opposed to Dionysius in Athens in the first half of the fourth century.

¹⁰ T. B. L. Webster, *Studies in Later Greek Comedy* (London, 1970²), 20–1.

slave talking of his master's experiences while studying under the Cyrenaic philosopher Aristippus; Arnott has recently conjectured that the unidentified 'master' was Polyphemus.¹¹ Frr. 39 and 40 are negligible lexicographical notes. It might be noted that there is no evidence in any of this for the presence of Odysseus, who, by contrast, appears to have played a central role in Philoxenus' *Cyclops*, although the fragments are perhaps not extensive enough for a firm judgement to be made. In later versions, both Greek and Latin, Odysseus completely disappears from the narrative. Nor is it clear what role Philoxenus/Odysseus would have had in a satirical play of the sort envisaged by Webster.

Nevertheless, although the historicity of Phaenias' account may be open to doubt, it indicates that Philoxenus' dithyramb was at least susceptible to a satirical reading, even if only in retrospect, and that to this extent at least it must have included a comic element. Independent confirmation of this comes from Arist. *Poet.* 2.1448a9–18 (p. 5 Kassel), where, while discussing artistic mimesis and the poetic portrayal of character, Aristotle divides literature into three main groups, depending on whether they portray men as better than, worse than, or the same as us:

καὶ γὰρ ἐν ὀρχήσει καὶ αὐλήσει καὶ κιθαρίσει ἔστι γενέσθαι ταύτας τὰς ἀνομοιότητας· καὶ [τὸ] περὶ τοὺς λόγους δὲ καὶ τὴν ψιλομετρίαν, ὅον Ὀμηρος μὲν βελτίους, Κλεοφῶν δὲ ὁμοίους, Ἑγέμων δὲ ὁ Θάσιος <ὁ> τὰς παρωιδίας ποιήσας πρῶτος καὶ Νικοχάρης ὁ τὴν Δειλιάδα χείρους· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ τοὺς διθυράμβους καὶ περὶ τοὺς νόμους, ὥσπερ †γάσ† Κύκλωπας Τιμόθεος καὶ Φιλόξενος μιμήσαιο ἄν τις. ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ τῇ διαφορᾷ καὶ ἡ τραγωιδία πρὸς τὴν κωμωιδίαν διέστηκεν· ἡ μὲν γὰρ χείρους, ἡ δὲ βελτίους μιμείσθαι βούλεται τῶν νῦν.

4 †γάσ†: ὥσπερ | γὰς κυκλωπᾶς A (cod. Paris. 1741): *sicut kyklopos* Lat.: ὥσπερ γάρ Vahlen (ed. 1853): γὰς esse fragmentum nominis Οἰνώπας vel Οἰωνᾶς susp. Holland (cf. Athen. 1.19–20 et 638b): Πέρ<σας Τιμόθεος καὶ Ἀρ>γάς, Κύκλωπας κτλ. F. Sussehl, *RhM* 35 (1880), 486ff.¹²

For such differences are possible in dancing, and in music for the pipe and lyre, as well as in the arts which use language alone, or language in metre: for instance, Homer represented superior men, Cleophon men like us, Hegemon of Thasos (the first writer of parodies) and Nicocharas (author of the *Deiliad*) inferior men. The same principle applies in dithyramb and the nome, as one sees . . . and from the possibility of portraying the Cyclops in the manner of Timotheus and Philoxenus. This very distinction also separates tragedy from comedy: the latter tends to represent men worse than present humanity, the former better.¹³

It will be observed that the text is corrupt at what is for us the most crucial point, but the general sense is fairly clear. Homeric epic and tragedy represent men as better than they are, while comedy and parody represent them as worse. However, it is more difficult to establish the position of the citharodic nome and the dithyramb in this scheme. The main problem is the corruption γὰς, which is found in codex A (Parisinus 1741, x/xi s.), the main manuscript on which almost all the Renaissance manuscripts depend. Codex B (Riccardianus 46, xiv s.), which represents a different line of transmission, has two folios missing at the start of the text (1447a8–48a29), and thus is not available for comparison. Of course it is possible that a more complete form of B existed during the Renaissance, and that some of the apographs of A were compared with it. It is clear, for instance, that some of the readings of B entered the group of MSS to which Parisinus 2038 belongs, but in no case is there

¹¹ W. G. Arnott, *Alexis: The Fragments* (Cambridge, 1996), 141.

¹² The text and most of the apparatus are Kassel's. I have omitted the less relevant parts of Kassel's apparatus, and included (*ex. grat.*) a suggestion by Sussehl.

¹³ Trans. S. Halliwell, *The Poetics of Aristotle* (London, 1987), 32–3.

general evidence for B's version of the passage. Moerbeke's Latin translation (1278), which derives ultimately from the same source as A (Π), has only *sicut kyklopas*. The Arabic translation gives a similar version of the text (in Tkatsch's Latin translation¹⁴): *sicut adsimulat aliquis et imitatur sic Cyclops Timotheus et Philoxenus*.

The apographs of A show a number of variant readings which appear to originate from scholarly corrections. Parisinus 2038, probably written before 1500,¹⁵ has ὡς πέργας καί (*superscriptum*) κύκλωπας. πέργας is clearly nonsensical (πέργη is not a word) and the superscript καί is probably only a scribal attempt to make sense of the syntax. A more developed form of this type of conjecture, ὡς Πέρσας καὶ Κύκλωπας, is seen in codex Robortelli (which he cited in 1548). This was presumably conjectured by a scribe or scholar who knew that *Persae* was a nome by Timotheus (PMG 788–91).¹⁶ ὥσπερ ends a line in A, and it is has often been supposed that a larger lacuna needs to be assumed. Castelvetro saw γᾶς as an element of the name Ἀργᾶς, hence Vahlen's later conjecture ὥσπερ <θεοὺς Ἀρ>γᾶς, Κύκλωπας κτλ., and Susemihl's Πέρ<σας Τιμόθεος καὶ Ἀρ>γᾶς, Κύκλωπας.¹⁷ Holland suggested that γᾶς was part of the name Οἰνώπας or Οἰνώνας, who is mentioned at Athen. 1.20a as an Italian Greek responsible for a citharodic *Cyclops*, in which he portrayed Polyphemos whistling or humming and Odysseus speaking bad Greek.¹⁸ However, there is no evidence from either the Latin or the Arabic versions that any such reference originally stood in the text, and the resulting asyndeton is unusual. More recently Musso has proposed Γα<λατείας ἐρῶντα>ς, but we have no reason to think that this was also Timotheus' subject.¹⁹ Despite Susemihl's assertion that it is difficult to account for γᾶς as an error for γάρ, this is precisely the emendation which seems most satisfactory. γᾶς may be due to assimilation to -πάς in κυκλωπάς, and the fact that both words have the same false accent in A seems to support this view. The acute accentuation in Parisinus 2038 (πέργας) is obviously secondary. γάρ is common in Aristotle as a particle used to introduce examples, which we may translate as 'that is to say'.²⁰ The phrase μιμήσαιτο ἅν τις must then be read either with ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ τοὺς διθυράμβους καὶ περὶ τοὺς νόμους, with a comma after Φιλόξενος, or deleted as a (possibly fragmentary) gloss.²¹

However, this solution makes the meaning only slightly clearer. One alternative is to regard Timotheus and Philoxenus as representative of the nome and the dithyramb respectively. It is certain that Philoxenus' *Cyclops* was dithyrambic (cf. Oeniades PMG 840), but the genre of Timotheus' poem (PMG 780–2) is unknown. A second problem is whether the statement about nomes and dithyrambs is generally related to the whole of the preceding discussion, and thus whether Timotheus and Philoxenus are to represent different types of poetry (comic as opposed to 'serious'), or whether the

¹⁴ J. Tkatsch, *Die arabische Übersetzung der Poetik des Aristoteles und die Grundlage der Kritik des griechischen Textes* (Vienna & Leipzig, 1928–32).

¹⁵ See E. Lobel, *The Greek Manuscripts of Aristotle's Poetics* (London, 1933), 10.

¹⁶ See I. Bywater, *Aristotle's Poetics* (Oxford, 1909), 116–17, and also xxxix–lx on scribal correction in the Renaissance manuscripts of the *Poetics*.

¹⁷ According to Phaenias, Argas was an author of obscene verse, and he was known to Plutarch as a writer of particularly bad nomes (Phaenias fr. 10 Wehrli, Plu. *Dem.* 4; cf. Σ Aeschin. 2. 99).

¹⁸ G. R. Holland, *Leipziger Studien* 7 (1884), 192ff.

¹⁹ O. Musso, *Lo specchio e la sfinge: Saggi sul teatro e lo spettacolo antico e moderno* (Florence, 1998), 73.

²⁰ See J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford, 1954²), 66–8.

²¹ Vahlen, ed.³ 1885.

statement relates only to the remark about Nicochares and Hegemon. We have seen that Philoxenus' *Cyclops* probably included comic elements, but it is uncertain whether we should also conclude this for Timotheus. If Aristotle were establishing another scheme of divisions, similar to that established for Homer, Cleophon, and the comic poets, we might expect the same ordering to be retained, and this may support the view that Timotheus' work was regarded as analogous to epic. Alternatively *ὁμοίως* can be understood to refer only to the last remark, and we might translate: '... Hegemon and Nicochares [portrayed people] as worse (it's the same with dithyrambs and nomes, just as, that is to say, Timotheus and Philoxenus portrayed the Cyclops)'. In support of this view, we might note that if the portrayals by Timotheus and Philoxenus were significantly different from each other, we might expect *μὲν* . . . *δέ* clauses or equivalent.

Nevertheless, despite the problems of the text, we should clearly understand Aristotle to be saying that Philoxenus' poem contained some comic elements in terms of its portrayal of character. So also should we understand Philodemus' remark (*Mus.* 1.23) that if the dithyrambic styles of Pindar and Philoxenus were compared, it would be found that there was no difference in style, but a great difference in the characters represented.

II. PLOT

How much can we in fact know about this poem? In Page's edition we are given ten fragments (*PMG* 815–24); some of these are simply the testimonia we have been discussing above, but others provide more information about the actual narrative. In the first place, we can identify close similarities to the Homeric narrative—thus, for instance, *ΣRVEQ*AldTz Ar. *Pl.* 298b²² informs us that the blinding was included in the poem, presumably at the end: *ταῦτά φησι καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς, ὥς καὶ τῆς τυφλώσεως αὐτοῦ οὐσης ἐν τῷ ποιήματι.*²³ *PMG* 823 is explicitly said in the *Suda* (ε 336) to have been addressed by the Cyclops to Odysseus, and *PMG* 824 comes from a lament or cry by Odysseus after being imprisoned in Polyphemus' cave (*Zenob.* 5.45). These fragments suggest that the plot may have consisted largely of dialogue between Odysseus and Polyphemus, the imprisonment of the former and the blinding of the latter. The Sicilian location must be presumed, but Odysseus' arrival need not have been described. The full details of his subsequent escape may also have been omitted.

It is initially somewhat hard to see where the Galatea motif might have fitted in this outline. Several fragments seem to belong to a romantic lament by Polyphemus: *PMG* 821, perhaps an address to Galatea herself, and *PMG* 822 (*Plu. Quaest. Conviv.* 1.5.1), in which Plutarch refers to Philoxenus' Cyclops singing, presumably to himself, and trying to cure his love *Μούσαις εὐφώνοις* (these words are taken to be from Philoxenus' dithyramb: cf. also *Σ Theocr.* 11.1–3b, *Plu. Amator.* 18). Only one fragment provides a clearer idea about the role played by Galatea in the poem, *PMG* 818, which is part of a letter by Synesius (*Epist.* 121), a Christian writer of the fourth to fifth centuries A.D. Synesius describes Odysseus imprisoned in the Cyclops' cave and attempting to persuade Polyphemus to release him. He tells the Cyclops that he is a

²² *RVEΘ* are the most important MSS for the scholia on *Plutus*; the scholion in the Aldine edition (p. 68 Chantray) clearly derives from one of these or from a similar text.

²³ T. Bergk, *Poetae Lyrici Graeci* (Leipzig, 1853², 1867³, 1882⁴), suggested that from this part of the poem came a proverb recorded in Diogenes (7.82 = *PMG* adesp. 966 *πῦρ ἐπὶ δαλὸν ἔλθόν*), who notes a *Cyclops* as the source (*ἀπὸ τοῦ Κύκλωπος ἢ μεταφορά*). However, the attribution is not certain, and Page did not include the fragment in the corpus. It is not mentioned in the first edition of Bergk (1843).

sorcerer, and offers to acquire by the use of magic Galatea's love for him. The Cyclops refuses his offer. Bergk appears to have been the first to suggest that Synesius' version of the story derived either indirectly or directly from Philoxenus' poem (*nam Synesius si non ipsum carmen usurpavit, at rhetorem aliquem antiquiorem, qui illo usus est, videtur secutus est*), and since then this has been accepted by the majority of editors.²⁴ The argument must rely on the fact that Odysseus is present in this version of the story, while in Middle Comedy Odysseus is probably written out of the narrative, and certainly makes no appearance in Hellenistic or later versions, such as those of Callimachus (*Ep.* 46), Theocritus (*Id.* 6, 11), Propertius (3.2.5), and Ovid (*Met.* 13.750). Of course, even if we admit the presence of Odysseus into Middle Comedy, and assume that one of these plays was Synesius' source, Philoxenus may still have been the ultimate source for the story.²⁵ However, Bergk's suggestion is felicitous, for it relegates the Galatea motif to a less important position than it assumes in later versions, and thus helps to explain how it could have been introduced into a plot which essentially seems to have followed that of the *Odyssey*. We may even wonder whether Galatea herself appeared as a character in the poem. *Plutus* 290–5 (*PMG* 819) suggests a passage in which Polyphemus drove his flocks out for pasturage, singing to a lyre at the same time (cf. *Od.* 9.315, where Polyphemus appears whistling as he drives his flocks along). Such a song may easily have included the two fragments which refer to Galatea, and, contrary to the scholarly consensus, she need not have been addressed to have been a character in the narrative. In this case *Galatea* will have been a later title than *Cyclops*, reflecting the fame of the love-motif rather than the central theme of the poem. The love-motif is not mentioned in Aristophanes' parody, which might again support the view that it was not central to the plot. *PMG* 819 also gives us a clue to the comic portrayal of the Cyclops: the scholia tell us that Polyphemus was portrayed singing to the lyre, and that, in order to represent its sound, Philoxenus used the word *θρεττανελό*. This clearly has humorous overtones, much as *πλαττοθρατ(το)* does in Aristophanes' *Ranae*.

III. PERFORMANCE

For the plot outlined above to have been used must have required a poem of some length, although the amount of detail given is unclear. We know little about the fourth-century dithyramb, since no single example is extant, and the few reports we have are generally brief and uninformative. At Athens performances at the City Dionysia were in the hands of the tribes throughout the fifth and fourth centuries, and in the second half of the latter, the tribes acquired from the archon the right to appoint their own choregoi ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 56.3), but there is little substantial evidence for conditions at festivals elsewhere. We have seen that Philoxenus spent time in Sicily, and the Suda relates that he died in Ephesus. Melanippides of Melos died in Macedon, as did Timotheus of Miletus, but both are also known to have been active in Athens. Telestes of Selinus visited Italy, probably composed poems for performance in Sicily, and won victories in Athens.²⁶ This suggests that Athens was regarded as the centre for dithyrambic poetry (no doubt partly the result of the performance and importance of dithyramb at the City Dionysia), and that much

²⁴ Bergk (n.23). Again, the passage is omitted from the first edition.

²⁵ So Holland (n. 18), 192–6.

²⁶ Melanippides: *Marm. Par.* Ep. 47; Suda, μ 454. Timotheus: Suda, τ 620. Telestes: *Marm. Par.* Ep. 65; Aristox. fr. 117 Wehrli; Plin. *N.H.* 35.36.109.

of what survives was written for an Athenian context, and therefore for non-professional performers. Of course, the quality of dramatic lyric indicates that these performers were nevertheless highly competent, but dramatic choruses only ever have small solo passages, and there is no reason to believe that longer solo passages could have been sustained by dithyrambic choruses. Furthermore, owing to the competitive nature of Athenian performances there must have been some general restriction on the amount of detail possible; Bacchylides' dithyrambs, for instance, vary in length, the longest, Ba. 17, if in fact a dithyramb, having only 132 lines. Both these facts will have contributed to the conventions necessarily observed by the poets, and although conventions can of course be broken, this seems less likely in the case of those established directly as the result of performance conditions. Thus, if a poet was asked to write a dithyramb, he would have known roughly what length it should be (this may, of course, have depended to some extent on the festival at which it was to be performed), and certainly would have known who was going to perform it. More complex elements, such as the introduction of soloists, may have been introduced to the dithyramb in the later fourth century, when performance came into the hands of the *τεχνῖται*,²⁷ but for our period such elements would have been excluded by the non-professional nature of the chorus.

The only reference that we have to an actual performance of the *Cyclops* is uninformative, a fact possibly significant in itself:

περὶ μὲν γὰρ τὴν Μεθώνης πολιορκίον τὸν δεξιὸν ὀφθαλμὸν ἐξεκόπη (sc. ὁ Φίλιππος) . . . τὰ μὲν γὰρ περὶ τῶν αὐλητῶν ὁμολογεῖται καὶ παρὰ Μαρσύαι (FGGrH 135/6 F 17),²⁸ διότι συντελοῦντι μουσικοὺς ἀγῶνας αὐτῶι μικρὸν ἐπάνω τῆς συμφορᾶς κ(ατὰ) δαίμονα συνέβη τὸν Κύκλωπα πάντας αὐλῆσαι, Ἀντιγενεΐδην μὲν τὸν Φιλοξένου, Χρυσόγονον δ(ὲ) τὸν [Στ]ησιχόρου, Τιμόθεον δ(ὲ) τὸν Οἰνιάδου.

(Didym. in [Demosth.] 11.22, col. 12.43ff. = PMG 840)

At the battle of Methone Philip lost his right eye. . . . The story about the pipers is told in the same terms by Marsyas: when Philip was holding musical competitions shortly before his accident it happened by a strange coincidence that all the pipers performed the *Cyclops*, Antigenides that of Philoxenus, Chrysogonus that of Stesichorus, Timotheus that of Oeniades.

[trans. Campbell]

Riginos has recently suggested that 'Cyclops' may have been an epithet applied to Philip during his lifetime, and that this story developed out of the nickname.²⁹ However, we do not need to believe in the historicity of Marsyas' story for this anecdote to be of value. It seems unlikely, even if the story was an invention, that it would have arisen had Philoxenus' dithyramb required anything unusual in terms of performance. Furthermore, if it was capable of being performed on campaign, it can hardly have required a particularly elaborate arrangement of props or a set.

However, as early as Zenobius (5.45 = PMG 824) we find a remark that the poem was in fact a play. This view is taken up by the Aristophanic scholia, in which the

²⁷ The evidence for soloists in the classical dithyramb is generally weak; Ba. 18 is the most widely accepted case of a dithyramb requiring a soloist, but there is no positive evidence for such a theory beyond the form of the poem. There is no definite statement that the dithyramb admitted soloists until [Arist.] *Probl.* 19.15, but the period to which this passage refers is unclear; it is likely to be the later fourth century. It would indeed be odd if such an innovation, had it occurred earlier, had escaped notice.

²⁸ It is unclear whether the Marsyas referred to is Marsyas of Pella (late fourth century B.C.), or the younger Marsyas of Philippi.

²⁹ A. S. Riginos, *JHS* 114 (1994), 105–11. N. G. L. Hammond, by contrast, believes that the details 'are likely to be right'; see *A History of Macedonia* vol. 2 (Oxford, 1979), 257, n. 2.

Cyclops is several times described as a δράμα, and Philoxenus as a dramatist, or more particularly a tragedian (particularly odd given the evidence for comic elements in the work), and the use of an actor and some sort of costume are mentioned or implied (*Σ Ar. Pl.* 290c [p. 65 Chantry]):

α. (RVEMatrV⁵⁷Ald): Φιλόξενον τὸν διθυραμβοποιόν – ἢ τραγωιδοδιδάσκαλον – διασύρει . . . ἐκεῖ (i.e. in the *Cyclops*) γὰρ εἰσάγε τὸν Κύκλωπα κιθαρίζοντα καὶ ἐρεθίζοντα τὴν Γαλάτειαν.

β. (VMEBarbAld): διασύρει τὸν Φιλόξενον τὸν τραγικόν, ὃς εἰσῆγαγε κιθαρίζοντα τὸν Πολύφημον.

γ. (V): Φιλόξενος διθυραμβοποιὸς πεποίηκε “Γαλάτειαν” δράμα, ἐν ᾧ πεποίηκε τὸν Κύκλωπα ἐρῶντα αὐτῆς καὶ κιθάραν κρούοντα καὶ ἐν τῷ κρούειν ἀπομιμούμενον “θρεττανελό, θρεττανελό”.

a. He is mocking Philoxenus, the dithyrambic or tragic poet . . . because there he introduces the *Cyclops* playing the cithara and provoking Galatea.

b. He is mocking the tragedian Philoxenus, who introduced Polyphemus playing the cithara.

c. The dithyrambic poet Philoxenus made the play ‘Galatea’, in which he portrayed the *Cyclops* in love with Galatea and playing the cithara, and in striking it representing the sound by ‘threttanelo, threttanelo’.

These testimonies have obviously been collated from various sources; only V contains all three notes. Tzetzes¹ also referred to Philoxenus as a dithyrambic or tragic poet, and in his note on *Pl.* 298 (πήραν ἔχοντα) to an actor carrying a bag: ὅτι παρὰ Φιλοξένῳ τῷ διθυραμβοποιῷ πήραν ἔχων εἰσῆλθεν ὁ ὑποκρινόμενος Κύκλωψ καὶ λάχανα ἐπιφερόμενος (p. 85 Positano). This information is also given by some of the scholia on *Pl.* 298a (REΘBarbAld): καὶ γὰρ παρὰ τῷ Φιλοξένῳ “πήραν ἔχων” εἰσῆλθεν. Slightly more information is offered by V and M: τοιοῦτον γὰρ τὸν Κύκλωπα εἰσάγει “πήραν ἔχοντα” καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ “λάχανα ἄγρια” (p. 68 Chantry). Again, although the use of the verb εἰσάγω does not necessarily imply a dramatic piece, when taken with the other evidence this must be its intended meaning here.³⁰

As we have seen, however, there is no suggestion in Didymus that the poem was anything other than a regular dithyramb, at least in terms of performance, and it should also be noted that if Philoxenus needed to represent the sound of the lyre by the word θρεττανελό, it is unlikely that an actor actually carried and played one. Consequently, it must be wondered what sources the scholia had for their belief that the *Cyclops* was (quasi-) dramatic. There is considerable evidence for the introduction of a mimetic element in the dithyrambic (and citharodic) poetry of the late fifth and early fourth centuries, but it is questionable whether this could extend to the use of a soloist. What evidence there is relates either to instrumental or vocal mimesis (e.g. Timoth. *PMG* 785, 792, *Pl. Rp.* 3.397ab), or to physical mimesis on the part of the aulete. There are fewer references to the latter, but we may cite the type of aulete mentioned by Aristotle for Timotheus’ *Scylla* (*Poet.* 26.1461b30 = *PMG* 793): . . . πολλὴν κίνησιν κινοῦνται, οἷον φαῦλοι αὐλῆται κυλιόμενοι ἂν δίσκον δέμι μιμείσθαι καὶ ἔλκοντες τὸν κορυφαῖον ἂν Σκύλλαν αὐλῶσιν. This statement, together with references to a lament by Odysseus (e.g. *Arist. Poet.* 15.1454a28), has been taken to mean that the chorus-leader played the part of Odysseus and sang solo,

³⁰ In a late scholion in cod. Reg. (Parisinus gr. 2821: c. 1370) there is another direct reference to an actor: οὕτω γὰρ πεποίηκε τὸν τοῦ Κύκλωπος ὑποκριτὴν εἰς τὴν σκηνὴν εἰσαγόμενον (p. 87 Chantry, ed. *Scholia recentiora*, 1996). The scholia in Reg. are derived from the works of Thomas Magister and the first Triclinian edition, and in cases such as this have little independent value.

and that the aulete played the role of Scylla.³¹ However, there is no reason to suppose that the aulete's activity was a fixed element in the performance of the *Scylla*, or that the reference to a 'lament of Odysseus' need indicate anything beyond the fact that such a lament was included in the narrative. It is perhaps significant that Aristotle ascribes the practice to bad auletes. We might also note Pausanias' comments (9.12.5–6) about the famous fifth-century Theban aulete Pronomus: λέγεται δὲ ὡς καὶ τοῦ προσώπου τῷ σχήματι καὶ τῇ τοῦ παντὸς κινήσει σώματος περισσῶς δὴ τι ἕτερπε τὰ θέατρα. That there is a connection between this way of performing and the late fifth-century trend towards musical mimesis is probably to be accepted, but it is not clear that we should extend the practice to the chorus. We might more readily suspect that the activity in which the aulete indulged was generally impromptu, and inspired by the music itself: there is no evidence that it was regarded as essential to the performance, and was almost certainly not included in the MSS as 'instructions for auletes' or anything like that.

Furthermore, the evidence for costume in the later dithyramb is slight. We know that dithyrambic choruses could sometimes be dressed in relatively elaborate clothing: Demosthenes dressed the chorus for which he was choregos at the Great Dionysia in 358 in golden crowns and sacred garments (Dem. 21.14–18), while Antiphanes (fr. 201 K.-A.) speaks of a dithyrambic chorus wearing golden robes. We also know that the aulete could be equally elaborately dressed: the *Suda* (α 2657 = *PMG* 825) tells us that Philoxenus' aulete Antigenides wore Milesian shoes, although we are not sure why this should have been noteworthy, and also that he wore a yellow cloak in *Κωμαστής* (conjectured by Berglein³² to have been a dithyramb by Philoxenus). But that this was intended as dramatic costume is unlikely, and it is certainly not the case that any of the dithyrambic choreutai wore masks, which would more firmly indicate the inclusion of a dramatic element.³³ Nor can we accept the arguments of Zimmermann that because the Cyclops role in *Plutus* is sung by Carion, to whom the chorus then responds, the Cyclops must have been sung by a soloist in Philoxenus' dithyramb.³⁴ Such an argument ignores the fact that Aristophanes could freely use the conventions of comedy without reflecting those of the original genre: no one would think from the parody of Agathon at *Thesm.* 101–29 that a soloist sang the part of the chorus in his tragedies. Nor would we think merely from the parody at *Av.* 1372–1401 that Cinesias sang his dithyrambs himself, or that he made use of soloists.³⁵

The authorities of the scholia presumably post-date Athenaeus, who, if there had been an ancient controversy about the genre of the *Cyclops*, would no doubt have mentioned the fact. Philoxenus' works were being performed in Arcadia at least into the second century B.C. (cf. Polyb. 4.20.8–9), but we find few references to them after that date outside the treatises on music and poetry. This should not necessarily indicate that texts were no longer available, and it seems highly likely that Athenaeus and Plutarch had read the work, but they may not, of course, have seen it performed. It is in the second-century A.D. that we first find a reference to the poem as a play (Zenobius), and this classification may simply be an error, but if the poem contained a certain amount of dialogue (as we can suggest on the basis of *PMG* 818, 819, 821?,

³¹ T. Gomperz, *Jahrb. f. klass. Philol.* 133 (1886), 771–5.

³² L. A. Berglein, *De Philoxeno Cytherio dithyramborum poeta* (Göttingen, 1843), 35–6.

³³ See A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, rev. J. Gould and D. M. Lewis, (Oxford, 1968²), 177.

³⁴ Zimmermann (n. 3), 127–8.

³⁵ Argued unconvincingly by G. Comotti, *QUCC* n.s. 31 (1989), 107–17.

823, 824), then scholars less well educated than Athenaeus and Plutarch, unfamiliar with an actual performance, and perhaps with only a cursory familiarity if any with the text, may have mistaken the work for quasi-dramatic, and their comments about costume could then simply have been extrapolated from the narrative. Their views might also be influenced by the misinterpretation of the use of words such as *εἰσάγω* and *εἰσφέρω* in earlier sources.

University College Dublin

J. H. HORDERN

ADDENDUM

The confusion of the later ancient authorities over the productions of the classical period does not generally seem very extensive, and errors of the sort associated with Philoxenus' *Cyclops* are few and far between. I would like briefly to compare the Suda notice on Telestes: *Τελέστης· κωμικός. τούτου δράματά ἐστιν Ἀργὼ καὶ Ἀσκληπιός, ὥς φησιν Ἀθήναιος ἐν τῷ ἰδ' τῶν Δειπνοσοφιστῶν* (Suda, τ 265: 4.518 Adler). There is no mention of the notice in Pauly–Wissowa or Pickard–Cambridge,³⁶ and it is not referred to in most of the standard collections of the fragments. Campbell, in the recent Loeb edition of the lyric fragments (p. 123), has only a brief comment: 'An error; both plays were probably dithyrambs'. The statement that Telestes was a comic poet is unparalleled, and here is likely to result from the confusion of two people with the same name. We know of two inscriptional references to a comic poet called Telestes from the third century B.C. The first comes from a choregic inscription from Delos, dated to 286 B.C. (*BCH* 7 (1883), 105): *οἷδε ἐπεδείξαντο τῷ θεῷ ἐπὶ Ἀριστοκρίτου ἄρχοντος* [there follows a list of τραγωιδίαι], *κωμικοὶ Τελέστης Ἀθηναῖος . . .* [there follow lists of other performers; *αὐληταί, κιθαρωιδοί*, etc.]. The second dates to 266, and appears on a list of *κωμικοὶ* for the Soteria at Delphi: *κωμικοὶ Τελέστης Θεοκλείδου Ἀθηναῖος*.³⁷ It is reasonable to assume that these two inscriptions refer to the same person. The coincidence of names, and the fact that this second Telestes is demonstrably a comic poet, leads us to suspect that the compiler of the Suda notice has merely confused the Athenian Telestes with the dithyrambic poet Telestes of Selinus, the references to whose works are taken from Athen. 14.616f–617a (*PMG* 805–6). A similar confusion may also occur in the Suda notice on Timotheus of Miletus, who is described as having lived at the time of Philip of Macedon, which might be the result of some confusion with the aulete Timotheus of Thebes (Suda, τ 620).

³⁶ P. Maas, *RE* 9.391–92; A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy* (Oxford, 1962²), 52–3.

³⁷ C. Wescher and P. Foucart, *Inscriptions recueillies à Delphes* (Paris, 1863), no. 5.58, 11.