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I have begun the Foreword for all other volumes in the Euripides Series by emphasizing the poet’s remarkable variety of dramatic subjects, ideas and methods. A different kind of variety is afforded by his *Cyclops*, which happens to be not only his one satyr-play which survives complete but also the only such survival from any poet. More on the matter is said in Preface I, in describing the special nature of this volume.

The volume is the nineteenth and last but one in the Series. There remains only *Iphigenia at Aulis*, and I am very pleased that James Morwood has offered to collaborate with me in the work, which is underway.

Oxford, April 2013

Christopher Collard
This volume is a collection, incorporating texts from many authors as well as Euripides, some of them unidentified and without date. Soon after O’Sullivan accepted Collard’s invitation to undertake *Cyclops* for the Euripides Series, we agreed that, since it is the only surviving complete satyr-play, it would be helpful to set beside it the major fragments of all satyric drama, at least in translation, for their mutual illustration; but it was quickly clear to us that only a much fuller treatment would be satisfactory. This volume is apparently the first such collection of satyric texts in English, and certainly the first with introductory and explanatory matter of any extent. We had as incitement and model the comprehensive German volume edited by R. Krumeich, N. Pechstein and B. Seidensticker, *Das griechische Satyrspiel* (1999); it contains the editors’ own substantial contributions, and important illustrations; but it omits *Cyclops*. Our debt to it for the fragmentary plays, texts, translations and notes, and for its valuable studies of the entire genre, is very great.

*Cyclops* is presented in the style established for all complete tragedies in the Series; but the Series General Bibliography is replaced by one particular to this volume.

The fragmentary texts are set out as nearly as possible in the format employed for the two volumes of *Euripides: Selected Fragmentary Plays* (C. Collard, M. J. Cropp, K. H. Lee, J. Gibert, I 1995, II 2004:

Introductory Note surveying the fragmentary remains and advising on our methods of presenting them, and including a bibliography categorized by both topic and ancient author; for each author and play (or single long fragment, attributable or not) a brief bibliography of significant items, under the headings *Texts etc.*, *Discussions* and, where appropriate, *Art*; an introductory description and discussion of the play-fragment(s); Greek text(s) and critical apparatus on the left-hand page, English translation and annotation, as concise as possible, on the right-hand page (these details are expanded in the Advice to Readers).

The volume ends with an Appendix of almost all other known-satyr plays, stating their extent in terms of testimonies and textual fragments, and where possible their likely content; an Index of Motifs and Characters; Addenda; and a General Index.
O’Sullivan took the first and final responsibility for the General Introduction and General Bibliography, and for *Cyclops* in its entirety, and Collard for the Fragments. Each of us read, annotated and contributed to the other’s work. Most of our exchanges were necessarily through e-mail. The volume has been very long in preparation.

We and the publisher record our gratitude to the Curators of the James Logie Collection in the University of Canterbury at Christchurch for permitting the reproduction of the amphora (Cat. No. 42/57) which forms our cover illustration.

April 2013

Christopher Collard (Oxford)

Patrick O’Sullivan (Christchurch, NZ)
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GENERAL INTRODUCTION
TO EURIPIDES’ CYCLOPS
AND
MAJOR FRAGMENTS
OF GREEK SATYRIC DRAMA

1. Satyr Drama: ‘Tragedy at Play’
Of the three major dramatic artforms produced in the Greek world from the late sixth century BC onward – tragedy, comedy and satyr play – this last genre remains the most enigmatic for modern viewers and readers. This is due not least to the fact that we have only one complete satyr play, Euripides’ Cyclops, which retells the famous Homeric story of Odysseus’ blinding of the man-eating, one-eyed monster, Polyphemus. This play survives serendipitously intact as part of an alphabetical group of Euripidean plays in the Laurentian manuscript (L). By contrast, a combined total of thirty-two complete tragedies by Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides (and perhaps two anonymous authors\(^1\)) have come down to us, and eleven comedies of Aristophanes have survived, along with substantial comic fragments from other authors. The relative abundance of tragedy and Old Comedy has understandably given these two genres a higher profile in studies of ancient Greek literature and performance culture, and Greek tragedies and Aristophanic comedies continue to be performed around the world to this day. For most of the last century it was standard for monographs devoted to Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides to neglect satyr plays altogether, or cast a cursory glance at them at best; Cyclops has been blandly dismissed as ‘of little dramatic merit’ and as having ‘no real place in a study of Euripides’ dramatic art’.\(^2\)

But within the Classical period up to one quarter of the output of all tragic

---

1 Issues concerning the authorship of Prometheus Bound and Rhesus, once ascribed to Aeschylus and Euripides respectively, continue to divide scholars and need not concern us here.

2 So G. Grube (1941, repr. 1961), who devotes two perfunctory paragraphs to this play. P. Arnott (1961) dismisses the Cyclops merely as evidence of an ‘overworked playwright’.
playwrights at the City Dionysia – the most important Attic festival held in honour of the god of theatre was comprised of satyr plays. Although poorly preserved, evidence for satyr plays can be found in significant fragments that have been preserved either in papyri or quotes from later authors from antiquity and beyond. It would therefore be a mistake to consider satyr-drama as inconsequential, and opinions dismissive of satyric drama are now deservedly unfashionable. In the nineteenth century some luminaries – notably outside the field of Classical scholarship – recognized the importance of satyr drama. Percy Bysshe Shelley, more famous for re-working ‘Aeschylean’ tragedy in his *Prometheus Unbound*, produced a translation of Euripides’ *Cyclops* in 1819. Moreover, recent decades have witnessed major scholarly interest in this dramatic medium, which has also caught the creative attention of certain writers, and found its place on the stage again in performances, at least of *Cyclops*.

From about the beginning of the fifth to the middle of the fourth century BC at the City Dionysia satyr dramas directly followed three tragedies as a more or less humorous postlude, written by the tragedians themselves.

---

3 Euripides’ *Alcestis* of 438 BC was submitted in place of a satyr play, but still incorporated some of the themes of satyric drama: e.g., an ostensibly happy ending, a disaster averted by the intervention of a wandering hero, (mildly) humorous elements involving gluttony and drunkenness; see A. P. Burnett (1971) 30–1, 44–5; D. Sutton (1971) 55–72, (1980) 180–92, esp. 180–4; Slater (2005) 83–101; L. P. E. Parker (2007) xx–xxiii; see also below §3.2. Comedies and tragedies were performed at the Lenaea from about 440 but there were no satyr plays (*I.G.* ii.2319); see A. W. Pickard-Cambridge (1988) 40–1.

4 Shelley (1819; eds A. and W. G. Galignani); the current scholarly controversies over the authorship of *Prometheus Bound* did not exist in Shelley’s day and he would have considered it a work of Aeschylus.


6 Tony Harrison’s *The Trackers of Oxyrhynchus* (1988), performed in Delphi, is an inventive treatment of Sophocles’ satyr play *Ichneutae (Trackers)* re-cast as the discovery of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt in 1898. Performances of *Cyclops* took place in Cincinnati, Ohio, in 2003, and in Christchurch, New Zealand, in 2008. Both performances coincided with academic conferences, with the Cincinnati performance being part of a scholarly colloquium on Greek satyric drama and its influence. Fuller details of these and performances of other Greco-Roman dramas can be found at APGRD (The Archive of Performances of Greek and Roman Drama) run by the Classics Faculty at Oxford University <http://www.apgrd.ox.ac.uk/>.
We know from inscriptive evidence (IG ii².2320) that by 341/40 BC this system had changed so that a satyr play was produced as prelude to the tragedies which would be part of a separate competition. But the bulk of our material predates this new arrangement, and it has become standard to speak of classical satyr play as the fourth part of a ‘three plus one’ formula. We are told that Pratinas of Phlius was the first to compose satyr dramas – he is credited with 32 overall – and that he competed in Athens in the 70th Olympiad or 499–96 BC against Aeschylus and Choerilus (Suda, s.v. ‘Pratinas’). These plays featured a chorus of part-animal (usually equine⁹), part-man followers of Dionysus known as satyrs, treated heroic myths in a burlesque fashion, and exploited the lechery, cowardice and buffoonery of the chorus of satyrs and their reprobate father Silenus for humorous effect. The antics of these figures are juxtaposed with more grand and heroic figures suited to the tragic stage, such as Odysseus in Cyclops (cf. Silenus’ lampooning of Odysseus, esp. 96–105) or Cyllene in Sophocles’ Trackers, who are therefore made to seem at times pompous or ridiculous. One recent critic presents this kind of drama as a virtual recipe along the following lines: ‘take one myth, add satyrs, observe the result.’¹⁰ The unsubtle insertion, as it were, of satyrs into heroic myths often dealt with by tragedy leads to a comedy of incongruity. Horace implicitly recognized this in speaking of Tragedy as a grand dame being reluctantly compelled to dance among the satyrs (Ars Poetica 231–3):

\[
\text{Effutire levis indigna Tragoedia versus,} \\
\text{Ut festis matrona moveri iussa diebus,} \\
\text{Intererit Satyris paulum pudibunda protervis.}
\]


⁹ Satyrs are sometimes addressed as ‘goat’ (Aesch. Prom. F-K F 207) or are considered ‘like a goat’ (Soph. Trackers 367); but such references could suggest more their buffoonish and lecherous behaviour than their physiognomy. In Prom. F-K they want to kiss fire on seeing it for the first time, and in Trackers the context is lecherous; they are masturbating in front of Cyllene, who also refers to their ‘yellow beards’ as another sign of their goatishness. On a kylix cup of c. 460 BC satyrs appear to imitate the movements of a goat and a bull (LIMC VIII.1 s.v. ‘Silenoi’ 75). For satyrs with goat-like faces and men dressed as satyrs with goat-like masks in fifth-century Greek art, see below n. 131.

¹⁰ F. Lissarrague (1990a) 236.
Tragedy, undeserving of babbling cheap verses,
Like a matron ordered to dance at festival time,
Feeling a little ashamed, will be among the wanton satyrs.

Satyr drama is the original ‘straight-man, funny-man’ brand of humour we
know today.

Satyr play, for all its ostensible ‘low-brow’ elements, was a highly self-
conscious and self-referential genre engaging with specific literary forms
including epic and tragic poetry. On this level, and as a humorous genre, satyr play would seem to share much with Old Comedy; but the case for
this can be overstated, notwithstanding the fact that we know of a number
of comedies that feature a chorus of satyrs. Satyr plays from the Classical
period are distinct from Old Comedy in that they invariably keep to the
realm of heroic myth and do not, as a rule, explicitly lampoon public figures
and contemporary events as Old Comedy frequently did. Python’s satyric
Agen (F1), performed for Alexander in India, satirised his corrupt general
Harpalus, and Lycophron’s Menedemus (F 2–4) parodied the contemporary
philosopher of that name. But these are exceptions from the late fourth
and early third centuries BC, when satyr drama appears to come more
directly under the influence of Old and Middle Comedy. As Isaac Casaubon
established in a tour de force published in the early seventeenth century,
Greek satyr plays of the Classical period are to be distinguished from
comedy and satire, especially Roman satire. Also in diction, metre and
structure, satyr play is significantly closer to tragedy than to comedy, and,

---

11 For recent discussion, see R. Hunter (2009), esp. 56, whose treatment generally focuses
on how Cyclops engages with Homer, especially Odyssey 9.
12 Tanner (1915) saw a number of parallels between Cyclops and Cratinus’ Odysseis. A.
Katsouris (1999) 185 sees no real difference between the satyr chorus and the comic slaves
of Aristophanes and Menander; cf. also N. Zagagi (1999).
13 E.g. Cratinus’ Dionysalexandros; for discussion of this and other comedies with satyr
choruses, see I. Storey (2005) 201–18, who estimates that up to nine such plays were
produced in the fifth and fourth centuries, beginning with the Satyroi of Ephrantides who
first competed between 458 and 454 (IG ii².2325.49). Although Timocles wrote satyr plays
such as Lycurgus and Phorcides, his Icarian Satyrs was almost certainly a comedy; see E.
14 I. Casaubon (1605 repr. 1989); see also C. A. van Rooy (1965) 124–85; for links between
satyr play and Old and Middle Comedy, see KPS (1999) 9–11; C. A. Shaw (2010) and above,
n. 12.
15 A. López-Eire (2003) focuses on linguistic criteria which can be used to distinguish satyr
play and tragedy, but in so doing also implicitly acknowledges that the two genres have much
in common; see also the valuable discussions by Griffith (2005a) 166–72, (2005b), (2010)
despite its earthy concerns and folk-tale elements, is not altogether lacking in moments of pathos and even poignancy, for instance, Danae’s plaintive speech in Aeschylus’ *Net-Fishers* outlining her plight (F **47a 9–21), and the choral ode in *Cyclops* (356–74) denouncing the monster’s cannibalism. As a genre, satyric drama has long been recognized as a hybrid; it was aptly dubbed in antiquity as ‘tragedy at play’ (Demetrius, *On Elocution* 169), a view reiterated by scholars today.\(^6\)

Satyr play in the Classical period – what can be considered its ‘heyday’\(^7\) – was crucial to the overall experience of theatre at the City Dionysia, since the last onstage images and sounds seen and heard by Athenian audiences at the end of a day watching four dramas were invariably the final moments of a satyr drama. Aeschylus was considered the finest exponent of this genre in antiquity (Paus. 2.13.6–7; Diog. Laert. 2.133), which suggests a rather different side to the blimpish figure Aristophanes makes of him in the *Frogs*. It is likely that our view of the great tragedians, and indeed Greek drama generally, would be significantly different had more satyr plays survived. Tony Harrison, whose *Trackers of Oxyrhynchus* engagingly reworks Sophocles’ satyric *Trackers*, goes further: ‘With the loss of these plays we are lacking important clues to the wholeness of the Greek imagination, and its ability to absorb and yet not be defeated by the tragic.’\(^8\)

Harrison’s insight is valuable, certainly as far as satyr plays predating 341 BC are concerned. But satyr drama, or satyric performances, continued well into the Hellenistic and Roman imperial periods long after the ‘three plus one’ formula was abandoned.\(^9\) The functions, appeal and performance contexts of satyr drama would inevitably change over time, and difficulties in understanding the genre from later periods are compounded by the almost complete lack of any remaining material. But satyr drama, whether in performance or surviving as a text to be read or recited, retained something of its popularity. Inscriptional evidence testifies to the longevity of the genre in performances at various locations such as Delos, Samos, Boeotia and

---


16 Cf. also the view of the twelfth-century Byzantine scholar-bishop Eustathius in his *Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey* (2.184.3 Stallbaum), that satyr drama is situated half-way between comedy and tragedy.


18 Harrison (1990) xi; see above n. 6.

An epitaph composed by Dioscorides (Anth. Pal. 707 = TrGF 99 T 2.3–4) says that Sositheus, active in the third century BC and probably a native of Alexandria, led a revival of satyr drama worthy of Pratinas himself, the alleged inventor of the genre. The latest attested writer of satyr plays by name is Lucius Marius Antiochus of Corinth, who won with a production at Thespiae between AD 161 and 169 (IG vii 1773; SEG iii 334); performances involving satyrs seem to have continued until the third century AD. Satyr plays and satyric performances took place outside the Greek world, including even in Rome, notwithstanding an infamous suppression of the Bacchic cult in 186 BC mentioned by Livy (39.8–19). Seaford therefore overstates the case when he says that satyr play remained virtually exclusively Greek ‘no doubt’ because it was inseparable from ‘the thiasos of the satyrs in the religious imagination of the Greeks and in their public and private religious celebrations.’ T. P. Wiseman, rather, has argued that satyric performance of some kind, far from being an ‘un-Roman’ cultural product, was a living artform at the time of Horace, with Sulla and L. Pomponius credited with writing satyric comedies.

Arguably the most important piece of visual evidence for satyr drama and satyric costumes of the Classical period is the Pronomos Vase of the late fifth century BC (Naples, Museo Nazionale 3240 = LIMC III.1 s.v. ‘Dionysos’ 835). On this vase we see a large number of figures on different levels including Dionysus and a female figure (usually taken to be Ariadne), musicians (including the aulos-playing Pronomos), the chorus of a satyr play, and three actors, one of whom represents Heracles who faces an actor playing Silenus. This actor wears a costume covered in tufts of white hair and has a leopard skin draped over his shoulder; he holds a mask depicting the aged satyr as evidently balding, with a heavily furrowed brow and bushy white hair and beard. Of the eleven actors dressed as satyrs, most hold their masks while one, with mask on and hence in propria persona, seems to dance the satyric move known as the sikinis, described by Aristoxenus in the

---

23 Nicolaus of Damascus, a contemporary of Horace, writes that Sulla composed satyric comedies (FGrH 90 F 75 = Athen. 6.261c); for full discussion of this and other relevant evidence, see Wiseman (1988). Nicolaus’ testimony possibly lies behind the story told by Plutarch that a satyr was captured and brought before the dictator (Plut. Sulla 27), just as Silenus was brought before Midas (Arist. F 44; cf. Hdt. 8.138).
24 This vase is now the subject of a monograph; see O. P. Taplin and R. Wyles, eds (2010).
fourth century BC (F 104, 106 Wehrli).\textsuperscript{25} Once \textit{in propria persona}, the satyr cannot keep still, a feature manifest in satyrs onstage; Euripides’ monstrous Polyphemus gives this as the reason why he won’t eat them, as he imagines they would continue to dance in his belly (\textit{Cyc.} 220–1)!

The Pronomos vase continues to pose questions and problems for scholars.\textsuperscript{26} One pertains to the number of these satyrs not including Silenus: eleven. It is known that at one stage the number of chorus members, or choreutae, was raised by Sophocles from twelve to fifteen (\textit{e.g.}, \textit{Life of Sophocles} \textit{T} 1.4 \textit{TrGF}); eleven-man choruses are unattested. It would seem, therefore, that Silenus on the vase is meant to be understood as coryphaeus, or chorus leader of a group of twelve, as opposed to being an independent actor free to go offstage as he does in some satyr plays (\textit{e.g.} Soph. \textit{Trackers} 209; Eur. \textit{Cyc.} 174, cf. 589!). Conversely, Silenus may be a coryphaeus but with the freedom to come and go as actor, as he does in \textit{Trackers} and \textit{Cyclops}.\textsuperscript{27} It is also conceivable that Silenus here is an actor, and that the painter has supplied eleven choreuts simply to give an impression of a satyric chorus, whose number in actual performance is more likely to have been fifteen rather than twelve in the light of Sophocles’ innovation.

The satyrs are played by beardless young men in costumes which tell us much about the appearance of satyrs onstage, at least around the late fifth century. The satyrs each wear a furry loincloth with a short tail and a not exceedingly large erect phallus. Equine features of the satyrs are, however, much more in evidence in earlier Greek art, notably on the François Vase, an Attic black-figure volute krater of \textit{c.} 570 BC (\textit{LIMC} VIII.1 s.v. ‘Silenos’) and the earliest surviving image of satyrs in Greek art. On this vase they are denoted with an inscription \textit{ΣΙΛΕΝΟΙ}, or ‘silen’\textsuperscript{28} Of the many

\textsuperscript{25} On the nature of this dance, see Athenaeus (600c–d), who cites Aristocles, and mentions the \textit{pyrrhichê} as being like a satyric dance because it is danced quickly; for modern discussion, see Voelke (2001) 138–43, 149–57; Seidensticker (2010) 213–29, esp. 217–18; see also below \textit{Cyc.} Comm. 37–40 and on Soph. \textit{Trackers} n. 35, below.

\textsuperscript{26} Griffith (2010) 47.

\textsuperscript{27} Sutton (1980) 140, following Kaimio (1970) 158, makes this suggestion on the assumption that a Greek play could have more than one coryphaeus, including a ‘sub-coryphaeus’ who would lead the chorus in the absence of the coryphaeus.

\textsuperscript{28} From an early stage satyrs, who appear to be Peloponnesian in origin, have counterparts in the form of Attic/Ionic ‘silen’ or ‘sileno’; for discussion, see F. Brommer (1937) 2–5; id. (1940) 222–28; Hedreen (1992) 162–3. In Greek writings from the fifth century onward, there seems to be no palpable distinction between the idea of a ‘silen’ and a ‘satyr’, since the terms are used interchangeably (\textit{e.g.}, Hdt. 7.26, 8.138; Xen. \textit{Anab.} 1.2.13; \textit{Symp.} 4.19; Plato \textit{Symp.} 215b, 216c, 216d, 221d, 222d; Lysias fr. 34).
scenes on this vase, one depicts the Return of Hephaestus, a story told also by Alcaeus (F 349 L-P), and later to become the subject of a fifth-century satyr play by Achaeus (F 17), in which the god is brought back to Olympus under the influence of wine sent by Dionysus to be reconciled with his mother Hera. On the François Vase the satyrs are depicted as part of Dionysus’ retinue, each with a long tail, horses’ legs and a huge erect phallus, much like that belonging to the donkey carrying Hephaestus. But on the Pronomos Vase the satyrs’ bestial characteristics have become more understated since, in addition to their smaller phalluses and shorter tails, the actors do not wear any kind of costume to give the impression of equine legs. That said, the satyrs on the Pronomos Vase with their exposed genitalia and virtual nudity comprise a significant contrast to the three actors on the vase who wear dignified and richly decorated costumes suited to tragedy. This contrast is further evident in the masks the satyrs wear, which depict them as snub-nosed, with bushy beards, enlarged pointed equine ears and heavy, sometimes furrowed, brows all of which give them a grotesque look; indeed, Aeschylus’ satyr play Sacred Delegates (F **78a 13–15) gets comic mileage out of the conventional ugliness of satyrs which would frighten even their mothers. Thus, the ‘straight-man, funny-man’ brand of humour of satyr play narratives is given visual form on the Pronomos Vase in the contrasting costumes and masks worn by the satyr chorus and by the actors.

2. Satyrs: Ambivalent Creatures for an Ambivalent Genre

If satyric drama is best designated as an ambivalent genre, this reflects the fact that satyrs occupy a similarly ambivalent status in the ancient Greek cultural imagination. Both in art – predominantly vase painting of the sixth and fifth centuries BC – and in numerous passages of satyric drama, the hedonism, lechery and drunkenness of these creatures are readily evident. With some justification Edith Halls calls satyrs ‘ithyphallic males behaving badly’, and for François Lissarrague they are ‘the anti-type’ of the ideal

male citizen of Classical Athens.\textsuperscript{31} However, satyr plays and other sources including Herodotus (8.138), Plato (Symp. 216c–217a, etc.), Aristotle (F 44 Rose) and Plutarch (Pericles 5.3) reveal further aspects of these followers of Dionysus. Sometimes these include a certain wisdom, leading to gloomy insights into the nature of human existence; at other times satyrs are even linked to aspects of \textit{aretê}, or ‘excellence’.

2.1 The Satyr as Transgressor

The three habits of laziness, sex and drinking, which characterize so much satyric behaviour or preoccupations onstage, are conspicuous in the first three attestations we have of satyrs in Greek literature and art. The earliest extant literary reference comes from Hesiod, who dismisses them as ‘worthless and useless for work’ (Hes. F 10a.18 MW). Hesiod gives no physical description of the satyrs, nor is there any mention of Dionysus in the fragment, and it seems likely that the satyrs are understood as the sons of Iphthime and her sisters, who consort with the gods, including Hermes; but the god is not explicitly called their father.\textsuperscript{32} This aversion to work remains a staple characteristic of satyrs, who nevertheless are compelled to carry out labours in some satyr plays. At the beginning of Euripides’ \textit{Cyclops} we hear the melodramatic Silenus who complains of the ‘labours’ he has performed for his natural master, Dionysus (1–9), and the tedious chores he must carry out for Polyphemus, his brutal overlord who keeps him and

\textsuperscript{31} E. Hall (1998), (2006); Lissarrague (1990a) 235.

\textsuperscript{32} In Nonnus’ \textit{Dionysiaca} (14.105–17) Iphthime is the mother of the Satyroi as well as the Nymphai and Kouretes. Hermes has connections with satyrs, apart from sharing with them an inclination towards ithyphallicism in the form of herms. As well as appearing in numerous satyr plays (e.g., Soph. Trackers, Inachus; Eur. Sciron, Syleus; the Omphale plays of Ion and Achaeus; Astydamas II Hermes), Hermes appears with satyrs on numerous vases of the late Archaic and Classical period, e.g. the Berlin painter’s splendid amphora (\textit{LIMC} V.1 s.v. ‘Hermes’ 656 bis), and satyrs appear dressed as Hermes or at least wearing his attire (\textit{LIMC} V.1 s.v. ‘Hermes’ 891 Douris). In fifth-century Attic vase painting Hermes is present at Dionysus’ re-birth from the thigh of Zeus (\textit{LIMC} III.1 s.v. ‘Dionysus’ 666); he also brings the infant Dionysus to Silenus (\textit{LIMC} III.1 s.v. ‘Dionysus’ 686), a moment possibly enacted or alluded to in Sophocles’ \textit{Little Dionysus} (F 171–3); see KPS (1999) 253–5 for discussion. The statue, attributed to Praxiteles (Paus. 5.17.3), now in Olympia, of a youthful, athletic Hermes holding a bunch of grapes just out of reach of the infant Dionysus is another famous instance of the intimacy between him and the patron god of satyrs.
his sons enslaved on Sicily (23–35). In literature we first hear of ‘silens’ in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* (262–3), which refers to them indulging in another canonical activity or desire of theirs: having sex with nymphs. The return of Hephaestus on the François Vase in the company of Dionysus and the silens depicts a further preoccupation of these creatures: drinking, evidenced not least by the huge wine sack being carried by a silen whose ithyphallic state makes clear that other satyric thoughts are not far from his mind either.

In black-figure vase painting of much of the sixth century satyrs generally appear to be more bestial in their facial features, hairiness and equine legs. However, with the advent of red-figure vase painting towards the end of the century, the satyrs lose their equine legs, which adopt human form, even though they retain their tails and the more or less grotesque characteristics of large pointed ears, snub noses, heavy eyebrows and often balding pates and heavily furrowed brows. It is possible that the modification of the satyrs’ bestial features may reflect the appearance of satyrs onstage or other kinds of performance even if a link to a specific satyric performance, dramatic or otherwise, cannot be wholly established. Certainly in the first quarter of the fifth century images of actors dressed as satyrs appear, affording a glimpse into these creatures as stage creations, evidenced perhaps most notably by the clear depiction of the actor’s loincloth with attached erect phallus and tail. And the appearance of satyrs in Greek art of the sixth and fifth centuries can tell us much about satyrs in the cultural landscape of Archaic

---

33 Elsewhere the satyrs are happy slaves of Dionysus (*Cyc*. 709), and worship of their god is seen as a presumably pleasant form of labour (*Soph*. *Trackers* 223–4); see also commentary on *Cyclops* (1n.).

34 See above, n. 28.

35 For a full study of silens in black figure vase painting, see G. Hedreen (1992).


37 For such images, see KPS figs. 1b, 2a, 3a–b, 4a–b, 5a–b; on these and other images of onstage satyrs the equine legs are conspicuously absent. For ways of depicting satyr dramas on Greek vases with visual allusions to the satyric costume worn by the actors, see J. R. Green (1991); Hedreen (1992) 105–24, who notes that the presence of an aulos player in some satyric scenes indicates a performance is being portrayed. However, C. Bérard and C. Bron (1989) 143 argue that the presence of the loincloth does not always signify that a theatrical production is being depicted, and that this attire can occur in non-theatrical contexts.
and Classical Greece, even when there is no obvious connection between an image on a vase and a satyric performance. The most conspicuous features of satyric activity on Greek vases of the sixth and fifth century tend to be these elements of play and energy with humour invariably present. Not only do buffoonery, lechery, heavy drinking, and incongruity continue to abound in such images, but for many images of satyrs on fifth-century vases, burlesque treatment of heroic figures and myths is prominent. These vases are thus on a similar footing to satyr drama.

The ithyphallic nature of satyrs in Greek art is a source for much visual and verbal humour. The oversized nature of the satyr’s phallus, however, is not a sign of hyper-masculinity, but, as Eva Keuls correctly notes, a sign of bestiality, and in the case of satyrs, a sign of lack of self-control. A glance at the François Vase shows that the silens are literally more asinine than hyper-virile in their overendowed ithyphallic status, much like the donkey ridden by Hephaestus; this is confirmed by other features which the satyrs share with this animal, such as their equine legs and tails. An image of a different kind confirms the impression that huge genitals do not connote virility and potency. On an Attic red-figured pelike in the Villa Giulia (48238) Heracles is confronted by a figure called ‘Geras’ (‘Old Age’), a diminutive, hunched, bald and decrepit figure whose enlarged testicles and penis hang limply between his legs. Such an image contrasts with the aristocratic ideal announced by the Stronger Argument in Aristophanes’ Clouds (1011–20) where having a ‘small prick’ is announced as a desirable feature in contrast to a ‘huge dick’. It is true that Aristophanes lampoons much

---

38 Mitchell (2009) 234 notes that ‘there is no need to conjure up theatrical explanations to interpret the presence of satyrs in certain scenes.’ Conversely, Hedreen (1992) 106 observes that there may well be images based on satyr play that give no indication that they were based on performance (with no obvious treatment of costumes, etc.), since such information could easily have been communicated verbally by the painter to the customer. E. Simon (1982) 139 suggests that some images on vases depict scenes from satyric drama even when no satyrs are portrayed.


40 Keuls (1993) 68; Stewart (1997) 189–91. K. Dover (1989) 127–9 points out that the oversized genitals of satyrs and other liminal figures depicted on Greek vases are presented as comical or ugly.

41 Mitchell (2009) 118, also notes that Geras’ physique in other respects has much in common with Homer’s description of Thersites (II. 2.216–19), infamously the ‘ugliest man who came to Troy’.
in the Stronger Argument’s character elsewhere, but the kind of physical aesthetic described at *Clouds* 1011–20 is reflected in countless idealized images of youths in Greek statuary and on vases, and occurs in other Attic literature, such as the comedies of Eubulus (F 11.2 K-A). Silenus abuses his sons for their supposed cowardice by calling them among other things ‘phalluses’ (*Soph. Trackers* 151). Over-endowed satyrs, then, are better understood as grotesquely comical when depicted in Greek art rather than embodiments of enviable virility, especially when under the influence of their conspicuously erect phalluses. In such a state, masturbating satyrs are found on black-figure pottery, such as an amphora (Berlin 1761) and an aryballos by Nearchos (New York 26.49). Likewise, satyrs onstage do the same thing, for instance, in response to the indignant Cyllene’s long speech in defence of the infant Hermes (*Soph. Trackers* 366–8); masturbation is also the post-prandial diversion of choice for the monstrous Polyphemus in *Cyclops* (see *Cyc.* 327–8n.).

Satyrs in sixth and fifth-century vase painting are also (in)famous for their attempts on female figures such as nymphs and maenads, evidence of their general lack of *sôphrosynê* (moderation, self-control). On a red-figure cup by the Brygos Painter of c. 490 BC (London BM E65) satyrs molest even the messenger goddess Iris, and move with lecherous intent toward Hera, who is, however, flanked by Hermes and an advancing Heracles. Lechery abounds in satyric drama, and in *Cyclops*, for instance, prurient, misogynistic sentiments are expressed by the chorus, who fantasise about the gang-rape of Helen after the sack of Troy (179–87). Aeschylus’ highly fragmentary *Amymone* (F 13–14) seems to have told of a satyr’s attempted rape of the nymph of the title who is ‘saved’ by Poseidon, only to have sex with the

---

42 For discussion, see Henderson (1991a) 212.
43 = Lissarrague (1990b) figs 2.4, 2.6; fig. 2.5 shows a satyr let down, so to speak, by his huge flaccid penis.
44 Cf. Aesch. *Sacred Delegates* F **78a.29–36 (with n. 10) which could refer to satyrs’ masturbating, resulting in their phalluses’ becoming small and tapering in contrast to their usually excessive size; see W. Slenders (1992).
45 Although satyrs like Marsyas could, however, be seen as embodying wisdom and *sôphrosynê* (Diod. Sic. 3.58–9). For discussion of *sôphrosynê* within aristocratic ethics, see H. North (1966); Dover (1974) 66–9; A. M. Radermaker (2005) passim.
46 Cf. *Cyc.* Comm. 186–7n. Satyric violence of a different kind against women is attested elsewhere in Greek art. On a unique scene on a black-figure lekythos of c. 470–60 BC, which has become the name vase of the Bedlam Painter (Athens NM 1129), some satyrs torture a woman tied to a tree; see Osborne (1998) fig. 116.
god, willingly or otherwise. There are times when the lecherous father of the satyrs, Silenus, indulges in absurd fantasies of rampant sex with nymphs (Eur. Cyc. 169–71; Achaeus, Fates F 28) or brags of his sexual exploits like some aged stud (Soph. Trackers 154–5); in Aeschylus’ Prometheus the Fire Kindler (F 204b 4–5) the satyrs, perhaps led by Silenus as coryphaeus, even imagine that nymphs will be pursuing them! In Aeschylus’ Net-Fishers (F **47a.57–67) Silenus menacingly fantasises about marrying Danae who had been washed up on the shore of Seriphos with the infant Perseus. Both he and his sons imagine that Danae is desperate for sex after having been at sea for so long, just as Euripides’ satyrs see Helen as a nymphomaniac (Cyc. 181).

Hall’s view of satyr drama as a hyper-male genre that implicitly encouraged violence against women begs the question that such satyric behaviour was endorsed by the dramatists and their audience, and that satyrs are masculine in some normative sense. Satyrs are also at times cowards, simpletons and drunkards full of bluff and bluster; indeed, much has been written about satyrs as the comical ‘anti-type’ of the ideal citizen. Evidence for satyrs’ cowardice is found in their petty excuses for not helping Odysseus blind Polyphemus, confirming the hero’s beliefs about them (Eur. Cyc. 635–50); Sophocles’ Inachus seems to present them in a similar light (F **269c col. iii 35–47). In Aeschylus’ Sacred Delegates (F **78c.48–55) they are frightened of what appears to be athletic equipment, or possibly fetters, which they would happily consign to one of their friends. Elsewhere their father abuses them as cowards only to prove a bigger one himself on hearing Hermes’ lyre music for the first time and bolting off in terror (Soph. Trackers 145–209); this drama, it has been argued, consistently undermines the masculinity of the satyrs. In Cyclops Silenus toadies shamelessly to the monster, telling lies that endanger the life of Odysseus and his men (228–40). At times this cowardice is compounded by the satyrs’ own bravado (Soph. Inachus F **269d; Eur. Cyc. 596–8) or specious boasts of their own heroic prowess

---

47 The story is retold by later mythographers, such as [Apollod.] (2.1.4) and Hyginus (Fab. 169a); see also Sutton (1974c) for fuller discussion of the play.
48 Hall (1998) 36 writes of satyr drama as a medium in which ‘male sexual aggression was a phenomenon to be riotously celebrated’.
50 For discussion of these ‘playthings’ (ἀθύρματα) and what they could be, see introductory discussion to Aeschylus’ Sacred Delegates below p. 269.
(Eur. *Cyc.* 5–12) and overblown image of themselves and their fields of competence (Soph. F **1130). At such moments males in the audience are more likely to laugh at the satyrs rather than with them.⁵²

Likewise the satyrs’ drunkenness or over-reaction to wine is attested on sixth and fifth-century vaseware as in satyr drama, where once again Silenus is the culprit (e.g., Eur. *Cyc.* 164–74, 431–4; cf. Soph. *Little Dionysus* F 171–2). Connected to this is the satyrs’ bibulousness – a feature of satyric ogres such as Polyphemus (Eur. *Cyc.* 326–38, 417–26, 503–77, etc.) or Sositheus’ Lityerses (*Daphnis or Lityerses* F 2.6–8); Heracles, a favourite hero of satyric drama, is also a glutton and big drinker (Eur. *Syleus* F 691; *Ion, Omphale* F 29–30; cf. also Eur. *Alc.* 747–72, 780–802, etc.). Indeed, the connection between satyrs and Heracles as bibulous gluttons is nicely encapsulated on an oinochoe of c. 470 BC (BM E 539), which parodies the myth of the hero’s second last labour which involved retrieving the Apples of the Hesperides. Here a satyr, wielding a club and wearing a wine-sack in imitation of Heracles’ lion-skin, approaches a tree encircled by a snake and bearing wine-jugs on its branches. The image also provides us with the comic incongruity of the cowardly satyr masquerading as the most formidable hero of all, rather like Dionysus whose impersonation of the hero reduces Heracles to uncontrolled laughter in Aristophanes’ *Frogs* (38–172). The satyrs’ transgressions – like those of the comically cringeworthy Basil Fawlty or Les Patterson – are reminders of what not to do. For all their lechery, satyrs are generally less threatening to female figures than, for instance, centaurs, whose monstrous violence is well attested in myth and art.⁵³ Satyrs’ attempts on female figures on red-figure pottery end in inevitable failure.⁵⁴ Maenads fend them off easily enough with their *thyrsi*

---


⁵³ The Centauromachy, in which the Lapiths prevented the centaurs from raping the Lapith women, appeared on the west pediment of the temple of Zeus at Olympia, and on the metopes on the western façade of the Parthenon. The François Vase, our earliest known depiction of silens or satyrs in Greek art, is also the earliest known source for the Centauromachy in art and highlights the different natures of these two hybrid creatures: boozy, partying silens as opposed to violent, murderous centaurs. While the battle of Lapiths and centaurs is known as early as Homer (*Iliad* 1.262–68), Pindar (F 166 S-M) is the earliest extant source to mention the attempted rape as the cause of the conflict.

⁵⁴ Gibert (2002) 85. Hall (2006) 146 cites two late examples of ancient beliefs that satyrs assaulted women, from Pausanias (1.23.7) and Philostratus (*Vit. Apoll.* 6.27); the latter refers to an apparition of a satyr said to have appeared in Ethiopia. Keuls (1993) 362 suggests that in scenes on Greek vases where satyrs’ advances are not reciprocated, they are more intent on molesting rather than raping nymphs or maenads.
(ivy-wreathed staves) or fists, and at times the satyrs appear diminutive next to these more dignified female followers of Dionysus, adding to the absurd nature of the satyrs’ desires and the unlikelihood of their fulfilment.\textsuperscript{55} Just as the satyrs perennially avoid disaster however close they get to it, so, too, they never seem to be able to consummate their lust, thus remaining in a comical state of sexual excitation and frustration like the ithyphallic men in Aristophanes’ \textit{Lysistrata}. It seems that the rape of women in satyr play, if it took place at all, was carried out by figures such as Poseidon in Aeschylus’ \textit{Amymone} or Heracles in Euripides’ \textit{Syleus} (F 693; cf. [Apollod.] 2.1.4).\textsuperscript{56}

Satyrs also lust after male figures, including the young Achilles (Soph. \textit{Lovers of Achilles} F 157, etc.), and Heracles (Soph. F 756; cf. Achaeus F 26); in both cases the heroes, much like the maenads, would have no trouble in fending off the satyrs’ ludicrous advances. Satyric homoeroticism appears on Greek pottery. On an Attic jug of c. 430 BC a satyr holding a cockerel – the standard gift from an \textit{erastês} (older, male lover) to his \textit{erômenos} (‘beloved’) – approaches a young robed boy somewhat aggressively.\textsuperscript{57} Satyrs also show little discrimination with whom or what or how they attempt to satisfy their desires, but this does not mean that they are hyper-masculine sexual aggressors. Sometimes they will try to copulate with animals or each other; at other times they are penetrated anally or perform fellatio.\textsuperscript{58} In a grotesque travesty of the Zeus-Ganymede myth the great lecher Silenus finds himself the victim of sexual violence in being dragged offstage to be raped by Polyphemus (\textit{Cyc.} 582–89), and it is possible that the old satyr suffered a similar fate in Aristias’ version of the same story.\textsuperscript{59} In Euripides’ \textit{Cyclops}, Silenus’ rape occurs immediately after the monster, in his drunken stupor, has leered at the chorus of satyrs, imagining them to be the Graces.

\textsuperscript{55} E.g. the neck amphora by Oltos (Paris G 2) and pointed amphora by the Kleophrades Painter (Munich 2344). Sometimes the advances of satyrs appear to be welcomed by nymphs; see Hedreen (1994) pl. 1 (b) column krater by Lydos, c. 560; pl. 1 (c) amphora by the Amasis painter, c. 550; pl. 4 (a) Lip-cup by Oakeshott painter, c. 550. Hedreen interestingly suggests that the more fraught relations between satyrs and nymphs on red-figure pottery may reflect certain plots in fifth-century satyric drama.

\textsuperscript{56} See below on Eur. \textit{Syleus} F 693 n. 11; Sositheus, \textit{Daphnis}.

\textsuperscript{57} \textit{LIMC} VIII.1 s.v. ‘Silenoi’ 87.

\textsuperscript{58} Lissarrague 1990b figs 219, 220; Stewart (1997) 187–91, e.g. fig. 122; for satyrs copulating with animals, see also \textit{LIMC} VIII.1 s.v. ‘Silenoi’ 51 (amphora of mid-sixth century); ib. s.v. ‘Silenoi’ 52 (skyphos of c. 530/520 BC); ib. s.v. ‘Silenoi’ 55 (hydria of c. 540).

\textsuperscript{59} The one surviving fragment of this play (= Aristias F 4) contains a close parallel to Eur. \textit{Cyc.} 556–8; other parallels between the two plays may have existed; see A. Katsouris (1997) 3; KPS (1999) 219–20.
divine embodiments of female beauty, and thus making them potential effeminized victims of his lechery (Cyc. 581). The blurring of satyrs’ sexual identity is further evident when they appear in drag on red-figure pottery. Transvestite satyrs are likely to have appeared also in Ion’s satyr drama Omphale in their usual role as slaves to some potentate, in this case a Lydian queen who gives orders to her ‘girls’ to bring out vessels for a symposium (F 20; cf. F 24, 25). The very meagre fragments of Aeschylus’ Nurses (F 246a-d) possibly featured a chorus of satyrs dressed as female nurses, and the same may be true of Sophocles’ equally sparse Little Dionysus (F 171–2) and Little Heracles (F 223a–227).

The composition of satyr plays could even be allegorized as a sexual encounter involving both ‘active’ and ‘passive’ sexual roles, as conventionally construed within Classical Athenian culture. In Aristophanes’ Thesmophoriazusae the tragedian Agathon, relentlessly pilloried for his effeminacy and sexual passivity, has just been theorizing that a poet should adopt the ways and habits of the kinds of dramas he is producing. Aristophanes parodies this theory by showing that Agathon’s ‘effeminate dramas’ are the result of the tragedian’s own effeminacy (Thesm. 149–52). So, for Euripides’ boorish kinsman, when it comes to producing

---

60 Brommer (1959) plate 118 (= fig. 69), 118a. Lissarrague (1990b) 60–1, notes the depiction of a satyr adopting ‘a typically feminine pose’, draping a fillet over a basket on a red-figure lekythos (= fig. 2.17); Voelke (2001) 66–71 aptly considers satyrs to be ‘between masculine and feminine’.

61 Many have suggested that this drama featured a cross-dressing Heracles, consistent with images from fourth-century art in which Omphale appears in his lion-skin (e.g., LIMC VII.1 45–50 s.v. ‘Omphale’), and with the version told much later by Lucian (59.10); see Loraux (1990) 25; Maitland (2007) 277–8; see also below Ion, Omphale (p. 416).

62 The ancient Hypothesis to Euripides’ Medea confirms that nurses of Dionysus are meant (= Aeschylus F 246a). For more on these three plays, see respectively KPS (1999) 197–202, 250–8, 266–9. If Adespota F 667a ‘A Medea Play’ is satyric, then the satyrs would be in drag, since they would comprise the chorus who are addressed as ‘women’ (F 667a. 113); see Sutton (1987) 9–60, and introductory discussion to Adespota F 667a below p. 491.

63 For discussion of this construction of sexual behaviour as centred on an active (= male penetrator) partner and a passive (= female/penetrated) partner, see Dover (1989) 81–91; D. Halperin (1990), esp. 266–9. See also J. S. Carnes (1998) esp. 109–14 who notes that Plato already deconstructs this antithesis in his Symposium in the speech given by Aristophanes on the mutual desire felt by the two separated lovers (whether male-male, male-female, female-female) to be reunited.

64 In Acharnians (410–13) Aristophanes makes a similar joke about Euripides, mutatis mutandis; cf. Euripides (Suppl. 180–3) and Aristotle (Po. 1455a30–32); cf. also Plato (Ion 535c–e).
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satyr plays one should behave like satyrs; he tells Agathon that next time the playwright wants to compose a satyr drama (literally, ‘do satyrs’: σατύρους... ποιῇς) the kinsman will (Thesm. 157–8): ‘get right behind you with my hard-on (ἐστυκώς) and do [it] with you (συμποιῶ)’. Henderson is right to see doubles entendres in Aristophanes’ use of ποιῇς and συμποιῶ here. Satyr drama is an ambivalent medium sexually, since the production of satyr dramas is comically allegorized as involving both male sexual aggression and sexual passivity on the part of an ‘effeminised male’ – in this case Agathon, who is the butt of the joke in more ways than one. Aristophanes captures neatly the erotic ambivalence of satyrs. Sometimes they can be the object of sexual violence, as is Silenus in Cyclops (582–9) or, as certain vases show, they can appear in drag, or can become effeminized, like Agathon himself. Aristophanes implies that satyrs can fall into both camps as both perpetrators and recipients, even victims, of sexual activity.

Nor are inanimate objects safe from the advances of satyrs. Frequently on vases satyrs will combine drink and sex and will penetrate amphorae, or drink from wine sacks as if performing fellatio, or in their exuberance balance cups on their erect phalluses, as in the famous Douris psykter (BM 678) and elsewhere. Masturbating satyrs are also widely attested in Greek art, as well as appearing in satyr drama (cf. Soph. Trackers 366–8). Onstage and elsewhere, then, satyrs’ sexual activity and desires take on many forms, and their inevitably unfulfilled lusting after female figures is just one of many outlets for their comical hyperactivity, which also at times sees them on the receiving end of violent or incongruous sexual advances. Satyrs are not primarily aggressively heterosexual, nor especially masculine in any straightforward normative sense for an ancient audience. Rather, these followers of Dionysus range in all directions for comic effect, especially as far as sexual activity is concerned.

2.2 More Positive and Paradoxical Features of Satyrs

These lecherous, buffoonish and incongruous qualities imply that satyrs are suitable objects of derision. Aristotle considers the depiction of inferior figures (χείρους) to be a hallmark of comedy, while tragedy depicts people generally better than we are (Po. 1448a16–18; cf. 1449a32–3, etc.). But on

---

65 The translation is by Henderson (1991a) 158, who rightly sees in ποιῇς and συμποιῶ synonyms for βινεῖν (‘fuck’); see also E. Stehle (2002), esp. 382–3.
66 See, for instance, Attic cup, c. 520 BC (Palermo V651); Attic cup by Makron, c. 480 (Boston 01.8024).
67 For discussion, see Dover (1989) 127–8; Lissarrague (1990b) 57, 61 and figs 2.4, 2.6.
the satyric stage and elsewhere there is more to satyrs than simply being comic exemplars of how not to behave. In his iconoclastic *Birth of Tragedy*, published in 1872, Friedrich Nietzsche saw in the satyrs a Dionysian wisdom and considered them embodiments of an idealized form of life free from the constraints, hypocrisies and pettiness of conventional values: ‘For the Greek, the satyr expressed nature in a rude uncultivated state. ... the satyr was man’s true prototype, an expression of his highest and and strongest aspirations. ... The satyr was sublime and divine ... ’. However romantic this may sound to jaded modern sensibilities, Nietzsche was at least right to recognize that there is a more profound aspect to satyrs beyond their role as transgressors – comical or otherwise.

Satyrs enjoy a special intimacy with Dionysus beyond that normally experienced by mere mortals. Writing in the fourth century BC, Theopompus (115 *FGH* 75c.3–4) notes that Silenus at least is ‘less conspicuous than a god in nature, but superior to a man, since he was also immortal’ (θεοῦ μὲν ἀφανέστερος τὴν φύσιν, ἀνθρώπου δὲ κρείττων, ἐπεί καὶ ἀθάνατος ἦν). If Silenus is immortal so, too, by implication are his sons, who may be considered ‘minor divinities’ as a result. With one exception ([Apollod.] 2.1.2), dead satyrs are unattested in Greek myth, art and satyric drama. While some satyr plays are set in or near the Underworld, such as Aeschylus’ *Sisyphus* (F 225–34), or Aristias’ *Fates* (F 3), this does not require the satyrs to have died for them to be depicted there. Many satyr plays set partly or wholly in the Underworld will involve Heracles (*e.g.*, Soph. *Cerberus* F 327a, *On Taenarum* F 198a–e; Eur. *Eurystheus* F 371–80) who would fit the mould well as the wandering hero who would release the satyrs from their gloomy subjugation if they were held captive there. The closest we get to dead satyrs onstage is when Silenus and his sons call down death on each other as the old satyr toadies to Polyphemus, falsely accusing Odysseus and his men of theft, while the chorus defend the new arrivals (Eur. *Cyc*. 228–40, 268–72). Apart from revealing dysfunctional family relations here, the joke...

---

68 F. Nietzsche (1872, tr. F. Golffing, 1956) 52; see also chs 7 and 8.
69 G. F. Else (1939) 139 writes of the ‘embarrassing problem’ involved in the idea of a pre-tragic satyr play; (1965) 9–15; he dismisses Nietzsche’s views on satyrs, citing with approval Hesiod’s denunciation of them (Hes. F 10a.18 MW).
70 More nuanced views of satyrs and their abilities to function on many levels have been gaining ground; Lissarrague (1993) notes the ambivalence of satyrs’ ‘wildness’; see also Voelke (2001) esp. 211–59; Gibert (2002); Griffith (2005a) 172–86; Griffith (2010) 73–9.
71 For discussion, see Gantz (1993) 135–9.
72 See also Appendix: ‘Index of Motifs and Characters’, below.
may also be based on the audience’s understanding that satyrs are, after all, immortal, thus rendering this exchange as one of bluff and bluster, typical of satyrs elsewhere (*e.g.* *Cyc.* 596, Soph. *Inachus* F **269d.21–22*).

In Theopompus’ account Silenus has a didactic role, explaining the physical nature of the earth to Midas, king of Phrygia; and the old satyr’s status as a fount of wisdom occurs again when elsewhere Midas asks him ‘what is best for mortals?’ This famous encounter is alluded to by Herodotus (8.138) and Xenophon (*Anab.* 1.2.13), and told more fully by Aristotle (F 44 Rose) who ascribes to Silenus the following response, as gloomy as it is unexpected of a creature normally associated with hedonistic self-indulgence: ‘… the best thing for all men and women is not to have been born, and, after this, to die as quickly as possible…’. Such a remark equates with many choral utterances in Greek tragedy (*e.g.* Soph. *OT* 1186–96, *OC* 1211–1248), thereby implicitly underlining links between Silenus and his master, the patron god of tragedy. A particularly notable, almost verbatim, parallel comes from the *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi* (*Contest of Homer and Hesiod*). Our version of this fictitious encounter is dated shortly after the time of the emperor Hadrian (*Cert.* 33), but Nietzsche’s hypothesis that it was traceable to the sophist Alcidamas and datable to the late fifth or early fourth century BC, has been confirmed by later papyrus finds dating from the third century BC (P. Lit. Lond. 191) and second century AD (P. Michigan inv. 2754). In this account (*Cert.* 75–9) Hesiod challenges Homer with the same question Midas put to Silenus: ‘… above all else, what is finest for mortals?’ The poet, considered the wisest of all the Greeks (Heraclit. 22 B 56 DK; Hdt. 2.53. etc.), gives the same response as the old satyr: ‘Firstly, the best thing for mortals is not to have been born, but, once born, to pass through the gates of Hades as quickly as possible.’

---

73 Easterling (2009) gives a valuable discussion of passages from tragedy and elsewhere which parallel Silenus’ remark. David Konstan tells me that a Jewish wit is said to have remarked: “best never to have been born; but how many people do you know who have been so lucky?”

74 Our version of the *Certamen* (240) refers to the *Mouseion* (*Literary Miscellany*) of Alcidamas as a source for details of the death of Hesiod. For modern treatment of the date and authorship of the substance of the *Certamen* in the light of papyrological discoveries, see, *e.g.* N. J. Richardson (1981); N. O’Sullivan (1992) 63–6, cf. 79–105; West (1967) and (2003) 296–300. The general story of the alleged contest, and therefore the parallel between Homer’s and Silenus’ wisdom, may even be known as early as Heraclitus who preserves the story of Homer and ‘the riddle of the lice’ (Heraclit. 22 B 56 DK) which also occurs in the *Certamen* (321–38).
Further paradoxical elements ascribed to satyrs can be found in other sources which link them to intelligence and even self-control or σωφροσύνη. Plato’s *Symposium*, which features a number of variably inspired speeches on the nature of desire, culminates in a boozy encomium of Socrates given by Alcibiades, who likens the philosopher to Silenus and Marsyas not only physically, but in his magical abilities to charm and beguile those around him as the satyrs were able to do (*Symp.* 215a–c, 216c–217a, 221d; cf. 222d).\(^7\) Diodorus Siculus (3.58–9) in the first century BC writes of Marsyas as a devotee of the Great Mother, and sees him as embodying understanding (σύνεσις) and self-control (σωφροσύνη).\(^7\) The motif of satyrs as teachers or carers of infants in some satyr dramas (e.g., Aesch. *Net-Fishers*; Soph. *Little Dionysus*; cf. Eur. *Cyc.* 142–3, etc.) may playfully allude to their perceived wisdom as teachers or founts of wisdom elsewhere, as in the Silenus-Midas exchange mentioned by Aristotle (F 44). Silenus similarly plays the role of a fount of wisdom in Vergil’s *Eclogue* 6, in a parallel noted by the fourth-century Vergilian commentator, Servius (Verg. *Buc.* VI 13; 26 = Theopomp. 115 *FGH* 75b). Here Vergil has the old satyr explain the origins of the cosmos and then proceed to sing of a number of well-known heroic myths to a couple of shepherds who have captured him in a cave. But Vergil praises Silenus’ singing, which outdoes even that of Apollo and Orpheus (*Ecl.* 6.29–30). This perceived satyric wisdom occurs in satyr drama where it is given a typically humorous twist. A Sophoclean fragment has the satyr chorus bragging of their own wisdom, skills and knowledge, when apparently presenting themselves as suitors for the daughter of Oeneus (Soph. *Oeneus* F **1130); their fields of expertise range from astronomy, athletics, warfare (!), music and mathematics to ball-twisting and farting. While some have seen parodies of intellectual currents of the day and the speculations of Socrates and Hippias in particular,\(^7\) we may also see the satyrs indulging in self-parody, given their reputation for wisdom in other contexts.

Griffith rightly notes that satyrs onstage rarely if ever make any profound or insightful utterances.\(^7\) Had more satyr drama survived, however, we might well have evidence of wisdom and other sympathetic qualities on the part of\

\(^7\) Alcibiades’ speech has been dubbed a satyr drama; see F. Sheffield (2001).

\(^7\) As Wiseman (1988) 5 points out, Marsyas was important in Italian legend for his prophetic powers (Livy 25.12; Cicero *Div.* 1.89) and as eponymous founder of the Marsi (Silius Italicus 8.502–4, Pliny *HN* 3.108).

\(^7\) E.g. R. Carden (1974) 145–6; see also introductory discussion to Soph. *Oeneus* (= F **1130), below, and n. 8.

General Introduction

these paradoxical creatures. We find, for instance, their surprising, if short-lived, courage in standing up to Polyphemus in *Cyclops* (270–2). Elsewhere in the play the satyrs speak of the anti-Dionysian ogre Polyphemus as an ignoramus; they also consider their intended punishment of him as a form of ‘education’ (173, 492–3). A satyric element even seems to have been considered an essential part of civic excellence or virtue (*aretē*) in the fifth century. Plutarch records a criticism of Pericles from one of the statesman’s contemporaries, Ion of Chios. In criticizing Pericles for his aloofness and austerity, Ion, author of, among other things, satyr plays, demanded that (Plut. *Pericles* 5.4):

"ὡσπερ τραγικήν διδασκαλίαν ... τὴν ἁρετὴν ἔχειν τι πάντως καὶ σατυρικὸν μέρος."

like a tragic tetralogy, ... civic excellence/virtue should also always have some satyr component.

Although Plutarch disagreed with this assessment of Pericles, Ion’s view need not be dismissed as a glib aside. Instead, Ion’s comment taps into widely held Greek views on the importance of combining the serious and playful for their moral value and intellectual soundness. W. K. C. Guthrie has demonstrated the philosophical value Plato placed on the idea of play (Rep. 7.536 b–c, Tim. 59 c–d, Laws 685a, etc.); Agathon in Plato’s *Symposium* acknowledges that his discourse on *erōs* has been given ‘some part of it in playfulness and some in moderate seriousness’ (τὰ μὲν παιδιᾶς τὰ δὲ σπουδῆς μετρίας: Symp. 197e). Herodotus provides a fifth-century parallel to the importance of combining the serious with the playful in his portrait of the canny, successful sixth-century Egyptian pharaoh, Amasis. When some of his friends complained that he was not taking his role seriously enough, Amasis responded that if a man always devoted himself to seriousness (κατεσπουδάσθαι) and never allowed himself a share of play (παιγνίην), he would become mad or suffer a stroke (Hdt. 2.173). The playfulness

---

79 Cf. also *Cyc. 678*, the choral admonition to Polyphemus on the dangers of excessive drinking (!); *Seaford (1984)* 57–9 likens the downfall of Polyphemus to an initiation into Dionysian mysteries presided over by the satyrs.

80 Cf. also Thucydides’ glowing appraisal of Pericles (Thuc. 2.65.5–13).


82 While satyric elements have been identified in Alicibiades’ speech in Plato’s *Symposium* (above n. 75), we may see them elsewhere in the dialogue.

83 Amasis prefaces his reply by noting that archers unstring their bows when not using them to ensure their increased utility, a comment which had become proverbial by Horace’s time.
of onstage satyrs, then, would not always make them figures of contempt for the audience; rather than making them the anti-type of a polis-based notion of excellence, satyric playfulness, at least in Ion’s estimation, is one essential part of it.

Such views provide a salutory alternative to the puritanical dismissal of satyrs by Hesiod, which seems to have exercised an inordinate amount of influence on some modern scholarship. The realization by other scholars, however, that satyrs onstage could be both sympathetic and transgressive in the eyes of the ancient audience offers a better account of these devotees of Dionysus and what ancient sources say about them. Satyrs are a commonly imagined presence within the Attic polis, connected with many other civic rituals in honour of the god. In the Classical period they are, perhaps, fringe-dwellers within the collective Weltanschauung and imagination of the Attic polis, rather than being completely antithetical to polis life and values. Satyrs, then, can be considered ambivalent creatures, operating on levels that put them between being human and animal, human and divine, adult and child, slave and free, naïve and sophisticated. In Cyclops and other dramas satyrs can display a number of these traits, sometimes simultaneously. As Pierre Voelke has noted, a satyr is a ‘figure de l’intermédiaire’.

3. Aspects of Satyric Drama

3.1 Origins and Functions

The origins of satyr drama, like those of tragedy, remain obscure. Ancient sources emphasise that satyr drama was linked to tragedy, even if the exact nature of these links eludes us today. Aristotle’s famous pronouncement that tragedy was late in achieving its grandeur suggests that satyr drama predated tragedy. He writes of tragedy as developing ‘because of the change from a satyric element’ (διὰ τὸ ἐκ σατυρικοῦ μεταβαλέσθαι) and says that tragedy’s metre was firstly tetrameter because ‘its poetry was satyric and more dance-like’ (διὰ τὸ σατυρικὴν καὶ ὀρχηστικωτέραν εἶναι τὴν ποίησιν: Po. 1449a)

(Odes 2.10.19).

84 Above, n. 69.
85 Above, n. 70.
86 As Hedreen (2007) 150–95 shows, a number of vase-paintings from the sixth and fifth century may represent satyrs as ‘practitioners of especially venerable or traditional forms of choral music’ (186).
19–23). But Aristotle nowhere identifies satyr drama as underlying tragedy, only ‘a satyric element’. He may be alluding to the dithyrambs in which choruses of satyrs sang hymns in honour of Dionysus and from which he claims tragedy evolved. In this context it is worth noting that Herodotus (1.23) mentions Arion of Methymna in Lesbos as an important innovator of dithyrambs, since the *Suda* (s.v. ‘Arion’) tells us that this poet flourished in the 38th Olympiad (628–24 BC) and that he ‘first introduced satyrs speaking in metre’. In a work devoted to the world’s first known actor, *On Thespis* (F 38 Wehrli), Chamaeleon, a pupil of Aristotle, mentions early poetic performances on Dionysiac themes called *satyrika*. According to Chamaeleon, who also wrote a book on satyr play (περὶ Σατύρων: F 37a–c Wehrli), over time these *satyrika* were supplanted by other myths and stories that became incorporated into tragedies ‘when they (sc. the poets) no longer remembered Dionysus’ (F 8 Wehrli). Although Chamaeleon seems to be developing his master’s tersely expressed views a little further, the exact nature of these *satyrika* still eludes us.

These sources suggest that satyric performance of some kind predates tragedy. But other ancient sources assert that satyr-play came after tragedy had been established, for instance, Horace (*Ars Poetica* 220–24). Zenobius, author of a collection of proverbs and active at the time of Hadrian, mentions the famous phrase ‘Nothing to do with Dionysus!’ (Οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον) to explain the origin of satyr plays. According to this account, the crowd made this jeer at the poets’ habits of producing tragedies on non-Dionysiac themes, which led to the introduction of satyr plays ‘so that they (sc. the poets) might not seem to be forgetting the god’ (ἵνα μὴ δοκῶσιν ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι τοῦ θεοῦ: Zen. *Prov*. 5.40). However, the waters get muddied here because Zenobius tells us that the poets ‘introduced satyr plays as a prelude’ (προεισάγειν), rather than as a ‘postlude’ to three tragedies throughout the fifth and for the first half of the fourth centuries BC. Possibly, Zenobius is working from a later source that refers to the presentation of satyr plays as a prelude, which we know to have begun by 341/40 BC (*IG ii².2320*). In any case, Zenobius’ account sees the rise of satyr play as resulting from a need to restore a Dionysian element to Greek drama.

The appearance of satyrs in Attic vase painting from about 520 BC in scenes of apparently choral activity or in mythological scenes where one would not normally expect to see them has been cited as reflecting satyrs

---

onstage from around this time. But even vases which depict the blinding of Polyphemus in the company of satyrs, such as the Richmond Vase, need not betray the influence of satyr dramas such as Euripides’ or Aristias’ *Cyclops*. Indeed, this ability of a painter to render the same story independently of a dramatic production is further evident in Pliny’s account of a painting by Timanthes (active c. 400 BC) in which satyrs measure the thumb of the sleeping Cyclops (*HN* 35.74), a moment not depicted or alluded to in Euripides’ version. While Timanthes may have known Euripides’ drama, the painting betrays no direct influence of his version at least. Likewise, certain elements of the Inachus-Io story, dramatized by Sophocles in his satyric *Inachus* (*F* **269a–295a),** appear on vases with satyrs included, *e.g.* Hermes about to slay Argus (*LIMC* V.I s.v. Io 56, 60). Such vases indicate, rather, that the painter was able to treat a well-known theme in a playful or burlesque manner, indicated by the presence of the satyrs, and could still remain independent of any playwrights.

Then again, the putative reorganization of Attic dramatic festivals and the recording of victor-lists may be relevant here. This reorganization is inferred from reconstructed inscriptive lists, produced in the second half of the fourth century BC and known to modern scholarship as the *Fasti* (*IG* ii².2318). One reconstruction has the list beginning in 502/1, a

---

90 Buschor (1943/5) 73, 82; Seaford (1984) 13; Hedreen (1992) 125–8. There are some links between satyrs in performance and padded dancers, or ‘fat men’ and komasts (revellers) which first appear on Corinthian vases by the late seventh century BC; for recent discussion, see T.J. Smith (2007), esp. 49–54; C. Isler-Kerényi (2007), esp. 87–92; Green (2007), esp. 102–5. Corinth seems to have been a centre of choral activity; Arion’s dithyramb was probably performed at Corinth (Hdt. 1.23), and Pratinas, the alleged founder of satyr play, was a native of nearby Phlius; see also Hedreen (1992) 130–6; Csapo and Slater (1994) 90–5. Although E. Csapo and M. Miller (2007) 21 see komasts and satyrs as ‘functionally equivalent’, they deny that komasts are a type of satyr. Hedreen (2007) also sees significant iconographic differences between satyrs and komasts on Attic vases whereby the satyrs move in more orchestrated processions as opposed to the seemingly disordered antics of the komasts.

91 For the scholarly controversies surrounding the genre of this play, see the introductory discussion to Sophocles’ *Inachus*, below.


date that has found favour with many scholars. The following sequence, consistent with Zenobius’ account, is therefore at least conceivable: (i) the traditional Dionysian subject matter of satyrika mentioned by Chamaeleon was superseded by tragedies on non-Dionysian themes – Zenobius (5.40) cites plays entitled Centaurs and Ajax; (ii) satyr plays were introduced either as a prelude to tragedies, or independently of them altogether, to restore Dionysian elements to drama; (iii) in the wake of the putative reorganization of around 502/1 satyr dramas became the fourth installment of the tetralogy; (iv) satyr plays then returned to their status as a prelude or as separate pieces by 341/40 (cf. IG ii.2.2320). Such a scheme, though speculative, may illuminate aspects of satyric drama in the Classical period, namely its Dionysian elements, and its close connection to tragedy. Zenobius’ account (5.40), however vague, bears witness to a need to preserve such elements and illustrates the link between tragedy and satyr play as dramatic genres initially part of a festival devoted to the one god.

Theories about the functions and effects of satyr drama have been mooted from antiquity to the present day. One view claims satyr drama’s role is to provide ‘comic relief’ or relaxation after three intense, emotionally complex tragedies. This is attested as early as Horace (AP 226), and occurs later in the writings of Diomedes (1.491 Keil), a grammarian of the fourth century, and in the Lexicon of Photius produced in the ninth century (s.v. Σατυρικὰ δράματα: Σ 502.13). In more modern times Richard Wagner, to whom Nietzsche dedicated the Birth of Tragedy, took the ‘comic relief’ theory for satyr play further when he invoked the genre to explain the initial function of his comic music-drama Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg (1868) and its relation to his earlier Tannhäuser und der Sängerkrieg auf dem Wartburg (1861). For Wagner, Die Meistersinger would be a satyric pendant to Tannhäuser – both operas feature singing contests – just as he understood that satyr dramas could playfully depict the heroic myths dealt with by tragedies. Whether he realized it or not, Wagner was building on

---

95 Wilson (2000) 13 writes: ‘something approaching consensus sees the record begin in 502/1, though an earlier date is equally possible.’

96 An exact date of 502/1 is not necessary for this hypothesis;


98 See Wagners Gesammelte Schriften, ed. J. Kapp (1914), vol. 1, 113 where Wagner discusses the Die Meistersinger-Tannhäuser nexus; elsewhere he refers to satyr drama as a ‘notwendiges Zugeständnis’ to follow tragedy (vol. 10, 216). As Sutton (1980) 201–2 notes, Wagner appears to have been the first to make this insight on the relation between satyr drama
the insights of Casaubon two and a half centuries earlier. The comic relief and satyr-play-as-parody theories have been reasserted in recent times by Sutton, who goes on to suggest that satyr plays make the world of tragedy look ridiculous, affected and, essentially, much ado about nothing. While of some value, the ‘comic relief’ theory to explain satyric drama is chiefly relevant to those plays produced until 341/340 BC.

Indirectly related to this theory is the comic confrontation between the satyrs and solemn figures more at home in tragedy. This leads to a comedy of incongruity, where high-brow and low-brow characters collide in a fashion that has been compared to the comedy of the Marx brothers. But in Seaford’s view satyr drama was designed to restore what tragedy was deemed to have forsaken: the Dionysiac and ritual elements, whose importance was evident to Zenobius (5.40). Taking his cue from Nietzsche, Seaford locates the appeal of satyr play (at least in the Greek world) in the thiasos of the satyrs, which brings the audience into a pre-urban world of Dionysiac initiation, providing the comfort of communal joy and a release from the burdens and superficialities of civilisation.

This idea comes close to another view that satyr play involves a return to pre-polis, rustic values and privileges nature over culture, proposed by L. Rossi, F. Lasserre and Seidensticker; others, such as Lissarrague and Easterling, have likewise been correct to see that the ‘wildness’ of satyrs can hint at a deeper wisdom of sorts.

Hall considers the sexual politics of satyric drama and sees the satyrs as embodiments of violence and misogyny. Her analysis has value for bringing to light some of the gender implications of satyric drama: as something constructed by exclusively male authors and actors at a certain point in history; the world of the onstage satyrs could be seen as something

101 Rossi (1972/89); Lasserre (1973); Seidensticker (2005). These views would seem to reflect the rural settings of so many satyr plays, which Vitruvius (5.6.9) saw as typical of the genre. See also Lissarrague (1993) 217–18; and Easterling (1997) 37–44, esp. 42–44, who aptly considers satyr play a ‘show for Dionysus’.
of a boys’ club. On her reading, satyr drama as a genre virtually encourages sexual violence against women, and reasserts a collective masculine identity among its audience after the supposedly feminising experiencing of tragedy; as a corollary of this view Hall claims that satyr play is a ‘masculine’ genre which assaults the ‘feminine’ genre of tragedy. But this assumes an antithesis between the two genres that is belied by their connections in metre, diction, language and structure, recognized in antiquity and today.

Again, the satyrs, for all their lechery, are not an unequivocal embodiment of male heterosexual aggression; as has been discussed, they can evince homoerotic desires, be the victims of sexual violence and even appear in effeminized roles. Moreover, such ‘assaults’ on tragedy, as Aristophanes’s *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Frogs* show, are to be found much more readily in the world of Old Comedy and its relentless lampooning of figures such as Agathon and Euripides and their tragedies. It is true that paratragic elements in satyr drama can be found (Eur. *Cyc*. 689, etc.), but the obscenities of Old Comedy make the innuendos and *doubles entendres* of satyr drama look positively tame by comparison. As far as we can tell, satyr drama, for all its lewdness, seems to have abided by Horace’s prescription that it avoid the obscenities of comedy (*AP* 245–7).

In its playful treatment of heroic myth and inevitable ‘happy’ (from the point of view the satyrs at least) ending, Seidensticker notes that the satyr drama offers a more optimistic and uncomplicated world-view than that found in tragedy. Rather than cancelling out the intensity of tragedies with their focus on death, suffering and destruction – or narrow avoidance thereof – Seidensticker argues that ‘the light-hearted world of the satyr play appears much brighter against the dark background of tragedy.’ Interestingly, he concludes: ‘The contrasting juxtaposition of tragic and comic results in a mutual intensification.’ On this reading satyr drama is not so much an escape from the tragic – still less is it an assault on it – but rather gives scope to the audience’s ability to engage with two different theatrical genres, or, as Harrison put it, ‘to absorb and yet not be defeated by the tragic.’

The various functions ascribed to satyr play need not be mutually exclusive of each other: provision of earthy humour; parody of tragic elements and

---

105 Above, n. 15.
106 See above, pp. 15–17.
108 Above, n. 18.
heroic myth through a comedy of incongruity; celebration and/or parody of rustic or pre-polis values; assertion of polis values through the buffoonery of the satyrs as anti-types of the polis; restoration of Dionysian elements to theatre; reassertion of male identity and sexual aggression in the audience after three ‘feminizing’ tragedies. Perhaps, however, the one continuing thread through its various incarnations was the association of satyr drama with Dionysus. At least far as satyr play in the Classical era is concerned, Seidensticker well observes: ‘At the moment when the naked, ithyphallic satyrs dance in the orchêstra, if not before, the festival god and his world once again move fully into the centre of the theater. In this sense, the satyr-play can rightfully be considered the high point of the tragic tetralogy performed in honour of the god.’

We would add that the tragic tetralogy during the classical period may be considered emblematic of Dionysus in still another way. If tragedy reflects the destructive side of the god with all the terrifying power, contradictions and complexities which his presence entails, satyr drama could reflect his more joyful and exuberant nature. The experience of the tragic tetralogy in classical Athens, in other words, could entail an ambivalence much like that embodied by the god himself, who in Euripides’ Bacchae (860–1) announces that he is θεὸς δεινότατος, ἀνθρώποισι δ’ ἠπιώτατος ‘to mortals the most terrifying and most benign god’.

3.2 Themes of Satyric Drama
A major aspect of satyr play is the recurrence of stock themes, characters and narratives. Many of these entail folk-tale or romantic elements which involve the following: a happy ending after some danger is averted or, an ogre overthrown; a triumph against the odds in which the (inevitably male) hero has to use his pluck and wits no less than his strength in order to prevail; often a distant or exotic location; fantastic elements such as monsters or unnatural creatures; unheard of inventions; scope for earthy humor and irony, some of it even at the hero’s expense, or resulting from the clash of urbane and unsophisticated characters; perhaps most significantly for satyr play, a relatively straightforward ethical framework in which the supremacy of the

109 See Seidensticker (2005); C. Calame (2010) 69 makes much the same observation; see also Easterling (1997) 37–44.
Olympians (especially Dionysus) is reasserted, the transgressor punished, and Greek values such as hospitality and friendship are upheld. Such features are not unique to satyr play, and could apply to Homer’s *Odyssey*, Old Comedy and other genres such as bucolic poetry and the novel.

Euripides’ *Cyclops* exemplifies these tropes with Odysseus punishing the cannibalistic giant Polyphemus and rescuing the satyrs who gleefully anticipate reunion with their god. Aristias’ *Cyclops* testifies to the suitability of the story for the genre, and is likely to have been followed by the Euripidean version in general outline if not in detail. Other satyr plays featured ogres guilty of similar crimes. Aeschylus’ *Cercyon* (F 102–F *107) told of Theseus’ encounter with the eponymous villain and how the young Athenian hero bested him in a wrestling match. Similarly, Sophocles’ *Amycus* (F 111–12) told of Polydeuces’ victory over the murderous boxer Amycus, king of the Bebryces who lived by the Black Sea; versions of the story told by Theocritus (*Id.* 22.1–134) and Apollonius (2.1–163) make clear Polydeuces’ superior ethics as a Greek in addition to his boxing skills (esp. Theoc. *Id.* 22.131–4). In challenging travellers to physical contests to the death, Cercyon and Amycus will have been guilty of violating the law of *xenia* (hospitality), a precept sacred to Zeus (Homer *Od.* 9.266–71; cf. 9.479). A simple punitive ethic of transgression and punishment is likely to run through these and many satyric dramas, including Aeschylus’ ‘Justice’ play (F 281a, esp. 17–19). In Euripides’ *Sciron* one character, almost certainly Theseus, asserts: ‘I tell you it is a fine thing to punish evil men.’ (F 678); and in his *Syleus* it is said of or by Heracles himself that he is ‘just to the just, but the greatest of all enemies on earth to the wicked.’ (F 692).


112 For links between satyr play as a genre and the *Odyssey*, see Sutton (1974b); Sutton (1980) 191–204 also discusses the influence of satyr play on other ancient and post antique literature; on links between satyr play and Old and Middle Comedy, see Zagagi (1999); Shaw (2010). Griffith (2005b) demonstrates links between the language of Sophocles’ satyr plays and prose romances; elsewhere he discusses satyr drama as a ‘middlebrow’ genre anticipating much in the *Idylls* of Theocritus and novels such as Longus’ *Daphnis and Chloe* (Griffith (2008) 73–81.

113 For discussion of the date of Euripides’ *Cyclops*, see below §4.1. Aristias was the son of Pratinas and active from the 460s onward, making his *Cyclops* almost certainly predate that of Euripides.
Just as tragedy told the story of royal figures, so, too, could satyr play; and many villains on the satyr stage are foreign despots or Greek tyrannical figures, making them easy targets for the democratic Athenian audience. While the demonising of the barbarian Other on the tragic stage has been recognized for some time now,\textsuperscript{114} it would appear that satyr drama could deploy similar motifs. The Egyptian pharaoh and title character in Euripides’ \textit{Busiris} (F 312b–315) conforms to a pattern of satyr villainy in his killing of strangers, and being a despot and foreigner. Busiris defies Zeus in conducting human sacrifice as we learn from [Apollodorus] (\textit{Bibl.} 2.5.11; cf. Hdt. 2.45), just as Polyphemus carries out his cannibalism as a ‘sacrifice’ (Eur. \textit{Cyc.} 334–46, 361–74). The pharaoh’s villainy is thus likely to have been compounded in the eyes of the fifth-century audience, who would have enjoyed his destruction by Heracles.\textsuperscript{115} Aeschylus dramatised the story of the Thracian king Lycurgus in a satyr play (F 124–6); as another non-Greek ogre, and with a hostility to Dionysus, known as early as Homer (\textit{Il.} 6.130), Lycurgus was ripe for a downfall on the satyr, as well as tragic, stage.\textsuperscript{116} Sophocles made hostility to Zeus the defining characteristic of the title character in his \textit{Salomeus} (F 537a–541a), who tried to impersonate the god, only to be brought down by the supreme deity. Another regal satyr ogre appeared in Euripides’ \textit{Eurystheus} (F 372–81), the infamously cowardly monarch who compelled Heracles to carry out his labours. Sositheus’ \textit{Daphnis or Lityerses} (F 1a–3) told the story of the Phrygian king, and bastard son of Midas, Lityerses – another foreign despot – who killed visitors after compelling them to partake in a reaping contest, until he challenged Heracles with predictable results. This play may have closely followed Euripides’ \textit{Reapers}, but it also seems to have much in common with his \textit{Syleus}, in which Heracles triumphed over another ogre to whom he had become enslaved as a farmhand.\textsuperscript{117} Achaeus’ \textit{Aethon} (F5a–11) told of Erysichthon who, as we learn from Callimachus (\textit{Hymn Dem.} VI), defied Demeter in cutting down a tree sacred to her and was punished with insatiable (‘burning’) hunger only

\textsuperscript{114} See, esp. Hall (1989).

\textsuperscript{115} KPS (1999) 663–4 conjecture that Heracles appeared in up to thirty satyr dramas; see also Sutton (1980) 154.

\textsuperscript{116} Polyphrasmon composed a \textit{Lykourgeia} tetralogy in 467 BC (F 1; cf. \textit{TrGF} vol. 1, T 3) which will have told of Lycurgus’ downfall at the hands of Dionysus in tragedy and satyr play.

\textsuperscript{117} For speculative links to Eur. \textit{Reapers}, see, for instance, KPS (1999) 476; Voelke (2001) 23, 43; for arguably more concrete parallels with \textit{Syleus}, see the introductory discussion to Sositheus below.
to die by consuming his own flesh; Achaeus, however, may have dealt with a different aspect of this grim story.\footnote{Athenaeus (10.416b) tells us Aethon (= ‘Burning’) was another name for Erysichthon (= ‘Earth Tearer’). We learn from Ovid (Met. 8.738–884) that to feed his appetite Erysichthon sold his shape-shifting daughter, Mestra, into prostitution, so that she could escape and be re-sold to other buyers in different form. According to Hesiod (F 43a.18–43 M-W), Sisyphus was a customer swindled by this arrangement, but when he complained, lost his case when Athena ruled against him. Achaeus’ play may have told this more humorous side to the story, with the infamous trickster getting his come-uppance; but our fragments hardly indicate it; see Achaeus, \textit{Aethon}, below p. 429.}

What was the role of the satyrs in all this? The status of these satyric ogres as kings or overlords suggests that the satyrs were enslaved by them, just as they were enslaved by Polyphemus in Euripides’ play (\textit{Cyc.} 23–6, 79, 442, etc.); we learn, for instance, from [Apollodorus] (Bibl. 3.5.1) that Lycurgus enslaved satyrs as well as maenads. The theme of the liberation of the satyrs can be safely inferred from those plays featuring satyric ogres. Slavery has another function in satyr drama in linking the hero with the chorus. In Euripides’ \textit{Syleus} and \textit{Eurystheus} Heracles and the satyrs have a common enemy in being slaves to the ogre; likewise, in \textit{Cyclops} the chorus strike up a quick friendship with Odysseus when the hero understands the monstrous situation confronting them all and shares their desire for escape (Eur. \textit{Cyc.} 176, etc.). The fact that the satyr chorus and hero are on the same side in these satyr dramas has important implications for how sympathetic the satyrs will be in the eyes of the audience.\footnote{Griffith (2002) 200 n. 14 lists examples of the satyrs as allies or helpers of the hero.} Cowards and buffoons the chorus of satyrs may often be, as Odysseus readily sees (Eur. \textit{Cyc.} 642), but as friends of the hero and followers of Dionysus there is no doubt about which side of the ethical divide they stand on; at no point does Odysseus plan to abandon the satyrs or even the treacherous Silenus. The satyrs’ reunion with their god and the consequent bliss this brings will thus be a typical ending of these satyr plays, as with \textit{Cyclops}. Interestingly, the satyrs will retain their servile status (Eur. \textit{Cyc.} 709), but it will be under Dionysus, and such servitude will form a marked contrast to what they will have suffered at the hands of the now deposed ogre.\footnote{On the ‘slavish’ nature of satyrs, see Griffith (2002).}

There are times, however, when it seems that even this servitude will prove irksome to them. \textit{Cyclops} begins with Silenus complaining of the ‘labours’ he has endured for the sake of Dionysus (1–10). In Aeschylus’ \textit{Sacred Delegates} (F **78a 23–36, F**78e 37–60) it appears that the satyrs...
are trying to escape from Dionysus who berates them for taking up athletics and abandoning his dance. In Sophocles’ *Trackers* Apollo promises the satyrs freedom and gold if they can find his stolen cattle; freedom from Dionysus may be meant here (63, 75, 77–8, 457). The satyrs refer to Apollo as the god who is our friend (θεὸς ὁ φίλος), calling on him to help with their ‘labours’ (*Trackers* 76–7), while Cyllene even refers to the satyrs’ worship of their god as ‘labours’ (223–4). If Dionysus is meant here, then we find satyr drama playing with one of its own motifs: here the satyrs desire to escape from their own patron god!

Connected to this theme of servitude is the idea of satyrs as labourers. Here again we see a comedy of incongruity whereby the satyrs take up menial tasks either under compulsion or not. *Cyclops* has Silenus cleaning out the monster’s cave and depicts the chorus as none-too-successful herdsmen (41–62); in Sophocles’ *Inachus* they were probably cowherds (cf. F **269c.8**). Elsewhere in satyr plays the chorus are rustic or manual workers such as wood-gatherers (Soph. *Heracles* F 225) or smiths (Soph. *Pandora* or *Hammerers*). In Euripides’ *Syleus*, like Heracles, they will have been slaves on the ogre’s farm; in Euripides’ *Reapers* and Sositheus’ *Daphnis* they are likely to have been farm-labourers threatened by an overlord like Polyphemus (cf. Eur. *Cyc.* 203–19). On other occasions their work for others could be voluntary, in response to a call for help as in Aeschylus’ *Net-Fishers* (F **46a.17–21**), or even profitable, as in the promises of gold from Apollo in Sophocles’ *Trackers* (4, 7–40; cf. 45–54). Both these calls for help are answered by the bumbling satyrs, who are motivated by a mix of goodwill, lechery and venality; Silenus is similarly on the make in *Cyclops* (e.g. 136; cf. 168–74, 179–87).

The satyrs’ role as workers could take some unusual forms, including possibly being servant ‘girls’ in Ion’s *Omphale* (F 20; cf. F 24, 25) set in distant Lydia, but with an exotic queen instead of a brutal ogre as ruler. Euripides’ *Sciron* tells of a brigand for whom the satyrs worked, this time by luring travellers between Athens and Corinth so that the villainous ogre could kill them. However, the satyrs may find their ‘work’ here more genial since, in a move that best illustrates their entrepreneurial skills, they set up

---

121 A plausible supposition is that Dionysus is the interlocutor; see Lloyd-Jones (1956) 545 and Seaford (1984) 34. Lämmle (2007) 354 suggests that Dionysus appears precisely because of the satyrs’ rebellious attitude. For fuller discussion and an outline of the problems in determining the action of this play and the identity of the interlocutor who has been identified as Sisyphus or Theseus, see Aeschylus’ *Sacred Delegates* below p. 268.

122 See introductory discussion to *Soph. Trackers* below.
The satyrs’ lechery is matched by their bibulousness, and wine is a conspicuous feature in many plays. In _Cyclops_ it is essential for the blinding of the monster, but also in allowing for the antics of Silenus, from his first swig (156) until he is dragged into the cave by Polyphemus (582–9). Similarly, the monster drinks constantly (417–662), exhibiting a greed emblematic of satyric ogres and buffoons elsewhere. As Voelke suggests, in Aeschylus’ satyric _Lycurgus_ wine seems to have played a role in the downfall of the Thracian king, who, like Polyphemus, drinks it for the first time, we can be sure, to excess (F 124). In the _Lycurgus_ satyr dramas by Aeschylus and Polyphrasmon wine is likely to have stood for Dionysus himself, so that the god could be seen to be playing a direct role in the downfall of one of his enemies, as is the case with _Cyclops_ (esp. 519–607). Wine is associated with comic gluttony when Heracles defeats Syleus in an eating and drinking contest before dispatching him (Eur. F 69); in Sositheus’ _Lityerses_ (F 6–8) the eponymous ogre gorges and drinks to excess, much like the Euripidean Polyphemus. Wine also features in Ion’s _Omphale_, where Heracles’ famous

---

123 A papyrus fragment summarizing the plot of _Sciron_ tells us that the satyrs brought in ‘revels with prostitutes’ (P. Oxy. 2455; fr. 6 (T iia)).

124 Prostitution may also have been involved in Aeschylus’ _Sacred Delegates_ which was set near Corinth (F **78a n. 10); NB Dionysus(?)’ charge that the chorus have been squandering his money (F **78a.34–5). For _Aethon_, see above, n. 118; for Python’s _Agen_, see below p. 448.

125 Above, n. 39. For further references on sex as a motif in satyr drama, see Seaford (1984) 39 nn. 109–111; also ‘Appendix: Sex, sexuality’ below.

126 Above, n. 55.


128 See _Cyc_. Comm. 519–607n. below.
gluttony is again given full rein (Ion, F 20–22, 26–30); Easterling’s suggestion that the hero’s ‘punishment’ while in Lydia may have been a test of his powers of consumption is certainly plausible.\(^{129}\) Wine is evident in Achaeus’ \textit{Omphale} (F 33), likely to have told much the same story as Ion’s version; and it features again in his \textit{Linus}, whose one fragment suggests a homoerotic and sympotic context (F 26); and Sophocles mentions the sympotic game of kottabos, where wine lees are thrown at a target, in his \textit{Salmineus} (F 537). Achaeus’ \textit{Hephaestus} tells of the god’s return to Olympus under the influence of wine given him by Dionysus in the company of satyrs. A further satyric motif seems evident here, namely the preparation of a boorish guest for a symposium, as occurs in Ion’s \textit{Omphale} (F 21–7) and Euripides’ \textit{Cyclops} (519–75). Dionysus similarly prepares the smith-god for a feast (Achaeus, \textit{Heph.} F 17); Hephaestus is no ogre, but, as an ungainly god, could easily be the source of humour in a sympotic context, as Homer makes him in the \textit{Iliad} (1.597–600). In \textit{Wasps} (esp. 1208–10) Aristophanes uses much the same motif when Bdelycleon inducts his oafish father, Philocleon, into the niceties of sympotic etiquette. In Sophocles’ \textit{Little Dionysus} (F 171–2) the satyrs preside over the invention of wine by the infant god with predictable results. The Delphians are lambasted for gluttony and venality in Achaeus’ \textit{Alcmeon} (F 12, 13). Conversely, in Lycophron’s \textit{Menedemus} (F 2) Silenus complains about the stinginess of the philosopher with his minimal servings of watered-down wine (cf. Ion, \textit{Omphale} F 26; Eur. \textit{Cyc.} 556, 558). Here the humour arises from seeing a bibulous glutton being denied, just as it does when we see lecherous satyrs fail to satisfy their desires.

Satyrical encounters with inventions and more sophisticated aspects of polis culture are another recurrent feature. Lissarrague sees that the humour is predicated on the comically over-dramatized ignorance of the satyrs, whose behaviour is an example of what not to do; their transgressions provide the audience with an inverted anthropology of what it means to be a citizen of the polis.\(^{130}\) Aeschylus (\textit{Prom.} F–K F 207) has the satyrs wanting to kiss fire on seeing it for the first time, prompting Prometheus’ famous warning: ‘Goat, in that case you’ll be mourning for your beard!’ As in some red figure vases, satyrs are also present at what appears to be the creation of Pandora (Soph. \textit{Pandora} or \textit{Hammerers} F 482–6), whose presence will have excited their lechery and amazement; in Hesiod’s account of her creation, Pandora’s role as an artefact come to life is stressed (\textit{WD} 60–3; \textit{Th.} 571–2)


\(^{130}\) Lissarrague (1990a).
and even the gods are gripped by wonder on seeing her (Hes. *Th.* 588). Notable images of Pandora’s creation with satyrs present occur in fifth-century art, but the date of Sophocles’ play is unknown, making direct links between the two depictions hard to establish. Satyric buffoonery with artworks and creations by Hephaestus may have featured in plays where the god would have appeared, such as Achaeus’ *Hephaestus*. In the fuller remains of Aeschylus’ *Sacred Delegates* (F **78a) the satyrs over-react to painted images of themselves which they admire not only for their beauty and life-like qualities, but which they realize are ugly enough to scare their own mother and any passing stranger. Elsewhere in this play the satyrs show fear when presented with ‘novel playthings’ from the anvil and adze (F **78c.49–51). Euripides’ *Eurystheus* (F 372) similarly has a comic over-reaction, possibly by Silenus, to the life-like qualities of an artefact, this time ascribed to the craftsman Daedalus, who was the title character in a play by Sophocles which was possibly satyric (F 158–62).

One of the satyrs’ comic encounters involves their confusion and, in the case of their father, abject terror, on hearing the infant Hermes’ lyre music for the first time (Soph. *Trackers* 131–220). In Sophocles’ *Inachus* (F **269c 27–9) the chorus is startled by the pipe music played by Hermes again (!); in both these instances Sophocles seems to be divesting the satyrs of their role as accomplished musicians widely attested elsewhere. In archaic and

---

131 An Attic volute krater of c. 450 shows satyrs with small goat-like horns protruding from their foreheads, wielding hammers and dancing excitedly as a female figure appears to come up from the ground (= KPS fig. 10 a–b); the aulos player to the left suggests a depiction of a performance of this myth. An Attic calyx krater of c. 460 (BM E 467) shows Athena adorning a very static looking Pandora, while on the level below, men dressed as satyrs — they are wearing shorts and their faun-like masks have larger horns— dance in the presence of an aulos player, again suggesting a satyric performance. An Attic red-figure volute krater of c. 450 BC (Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G275) shows Epimetheus, ‘husband’ of Pandora, holding a hammer and watching as she rises from the ground; and an Attic white-ground plate of c. 450 (BM D 4) shows Hermes and Athena adorning a female figure called Anesidora, usually taken as another name for Pandora. Gantz (1993) 163–4 suggests the hammers are a means of summoning Pandora from the earth or way of releasing her from it.

132 See introductory discussion to Aesch. *Sacred Delegates* below p. 270.

133 Ibid.


135 Although Lloyd-Jones (1996) 117 suggests on the basis of *Inachus* F 288 and F 295 that the satyrs presided as judges in the music contest between Hermes and Argus, which would imply that they are musical authorities of some sort. For satyrs as musicians, see Voelke (2001) 91–129, esp. 97–103, 127–9.
classical vase painting they are frequently depicted as playing the aulos and the lyre or barbitos; the amphora by the Berlin painter has a satyr holding a lyre in the company of Hermes himself! Satyrs also seem to have been associated with august rituals involving lyre playing and dancing.\(^{136}\) In light of the satyrs’ reaction to the lyre music in *Trackers*, however, Sophocles seems to be laughing at them again when they brag of their all-round expertise – which includes musical competence – in his *Oeneus* (F **1130.12).

Another common motif in satyr drama is athletics. At times this will be the means by which a hero may overthrow the villain of the piece, such as the wrestling match in Aeschylus’ *Cercyon* or boxing in Sophocles’ *Amycus*. Some titles imply that the satyrs are the athletes, *e.g.* Pratinas’ *Wrestlers* or Achaeus’ *Games*; an alternative title for Aeschylus’ *Sacred Delegates* is *Isthmian Contestants* who are probably the satyrs. Images of satyr-athletes are known from fifth-century vase painting; the incongruity of the situation is evident in the figures dressed as Hellanodikai (judges or umpires) each holding a giant dildo, instead of a staff, as a symbol of authority.\(^{137}\) Again the humour seems to be based on the idea of satyrs taking on something they are manifestly unsuited to. Their boasts in Sophocles’ *Oeneus* include competence in events such as wrestling, running and boxing; they also boast of their biting and testicle-twisting powers (Soph. *Oeneus* F **1130.8–11*). Athletics can be the object of criticism in satyric drama. The famous diatribe by an unknown speaker against athletes in the first of Euripides’ *Autolycus* plays (F 282) was recognized by Athenaeus (10.413c) as an echo of criticisms made by Xenophanes (21 B F 21.11–24 DK).\(^ {138}\) The Euripidean fragment may be treated as another example of satyr play’s ability to present serious or challenging ideas.

Much of the humour of satyr play is of incongruity and with it goes another regular feature, the setting in some distant, rural or exotic location, which Vitruvius (5.6.9) considered standard for the genre.\(^ {139}\) Aeschylus’ *Net-

---

\(^{136}\) Hedreen (2007) 186; cf. also Pratinas’ *Hyporchema* (F 3) in which the satyrs voice strong opinions on what they see as the intrusive role of the aulos in Dionysian worship, below pp. 242–47.

\(^{137}\) See Brommer (1959) figs 59–60.

\(^{138}\) While some doubt the satyric provenance of the speech – F. d’Angiò (1992); N. Pechstein (1998) 39–40, 114; cf. KPS (1999) 403 – most scholars view *Autolycus* A and B as satyr plays; see below introductory discussion to Euripides *Autolycus* A and B.

\(^{139}\) The implications of foreign settings as the abode of some barbaric ogre, *e.g.* Busiris in Egypt, Amycus by the Black Sea, Lityerses in Phrygia, have been discussed above, pp. 29–31; see also *Cyc. Comm.* 20n. below.
Fishers and Sophocles’ Trackers and Inachus are examples which some see as evidence for satyr play celebrating pre-polis values.\textsuperscript{140} Sometimes these settings are fantastical, allowing for supernatural figures, monsters, shape-shifters or apparitions to become part of the drama. Aeschylus’ Proteus was set probably on an island, featuring the minor sea-god who had prophetic and shape-shifting powers, rather like Silenus in Vergil’s Eclogue 6. The Glaucus Pontius by Aeschylus told the story of a fisherman who became a sea god after eating a herb, and our fragments refer to his emergence from the sea (F 25e–26). Aeschylus’ Circe tells of the Homeric sorceress who could transform men into animals (Od. 10.135–574); shape-shifting seems to have been a means by which Autolycus fooled those he stole from in Euripides’ Autolycus B (cf. Tzetzes, Chiliades 8.435–8, 442–53). In Achaeus’ Aethon Mestra probably would have been depicted or referred to as a shape-shifter; and Peleus speaks of his struggle to subdue the shape-shifting Thetis to make her his wife in Sophocles’ Lovers of Achilles (F 150), which depicts the early life of the great hero and is set in the cave of Chiron the centaur, or the distant island of Scyros, or both. The anonymous ‘Atlas’ play (Adespota F 6a) was set at the western extremity of the world where the Titan holds up the sky and fetches the Apples of the Hesperides for Heracles.\textsuperscript{141}

Sometimes these settings will be more sinister, in or near the Underworld, as in Aeschylus’ Sisyphus (F 225–34),\textsuperscript{142} which tells of the famous trickster who cheated Death and was eventually punished with having to roll a stone up a hill eternally; this play also featured Sisyphus emerging from the Underworld carrying Death on his shoulders (F 227; cf. F 233). This rogue was the title character of another satyr play by Euripides – and probably another such play by Critias(?) (F 19) – and likely featured in Euripides’ satyric Autolycus A and Achaeus’ Aethon.\textsuperscript{143} Other titles suggestive of an underworld setting include Aristias’ Fates, which would have featured

\textsuperscript{140} Above, n. 102.

\textsuperscript{141} On an Apulian bell krater of c. 390–80 BC (= LIMC V.1 s.v. ‘Heracles’ 2687) satyrs steal the weapons of Heracles as he holds up the sky; they may have had this role in the play, but any direct links between this krater and F 655 remain very uncertain, not least because the play’s date is unknown; see introductory discussion to Adespota F 655 below.

\textsuperscript{142} Two titles concerning Sisyphus are accorded Aeschylus: Sisyphus the Runaway (TrGF 3.59 T 93b) and Sisyphus the Stone-Roller (as recorded by a scholiast on Arist. EN 1111a8–9); however, it is possible that one satyric play can be reconstructed; see the introductory discussion on Aeschylus, Sisyphus below.

\textsuperscript{143} Above, n. 118. The genre of Sophocles’ Sisyphus is not certain. Critias(?) (F 19) has been ascribed by some to Euripides as his Sisyphus play of 415 BC; see O’Sullivan (2012b) 167 n. 1.
spirits of the dead, and Sophocles’ *Cerberus* and *On Taenarum*, the mountain through which Heracles descended to fetch the monstrous hound; Euripides’ *Eurystheus*, about the king who set the hero this and other labours, would also have featured the Underworld as a setting or as part of the narrative background. Python’s *Agen* was set near the tomb of the dead prostitute Pythionice in a region described as ‘birdless’ (F 1.2), a word used by Sophocles to describe an entrance to Hades (F 748). *Agen*, like Aeschylus’ *Sisyphus* and *Glaucus Pontius*, seems to have involved a supernatural emergence, here of Pythionice from the Underworld, conjured up by the satyrs in another seemingly incongruous role, as Magi.

That satyrs could be figures of wisdom or learning – incongruously or otherwise – is another conspicuous feature of their collective onstage persona, evident in fifth-century art as well.144 Related to this is their role as caregiver or even teacher of heroic or divine infants; Silenus’ role as caregiver to Dionysus is well known, and he boasts about having discharged it in the satyric *Adespota* F 646a.12.145 This motif, too, is combined with other common elements of satyric drama, such as the depiction of gods and heroes in infancy; in Aeschylus’ *Net-Fishers* Silenus fancies himself as the foster father of the infant Perseus (F **47a.8–6). Aeschylus’ *Nurses* may have dealt with the invention of wine by Dionysus,146 as did Sophocles’ *Little Dionysus*; and in Sophocles’ *Trackers* the ‘infant’ god Hermes has already become a master thief. Sophocles’ *Little Heracles* probably depicted the hero’s strangling of the snakes sent by Hera, known also to Pindar (*Nem.* 1.35–72), in which he already displays the kinds of qualities he will exhibit throughout his life, much like the infant Dionysus and Hermes.

Youthful heroes will inevitably be beautiful, thus giving scope to another satyric motif, homoerotic desire. Achaeus’ *Linus* deals with a later and more disturbing episode in Heracles’ life, his slaying of his music teacher who punished him for poor lyre-playing. Whatever the satyrs’ role here, there is evidence that they lusted after the young hero in a bibulous context (F 26), as they did in unnamed Sophoclean satyr play (F 756). Similar homoeroticism

144 On a red-figure kalpis of c. 460 BC they appear as white-haired old men, evidently as mock-sages with long robes and staves, confronting the Sphinx (*LIMC* VIII.1 s.v. ‘Silenoi’ 160); Simon (1982) saw links here with Aeschylus’ satyr play *Sphinx*, which parodied the Oedipus myth, and was part of his tetralogy on the house of Laius of 467.

145 An Attic white-ground calyx krater by the Phiale Painter of c. 440 BC depicts Hermes entrusting the infant Dionysus to the care of Silenus; see also below Eur. *Cyc. Comm.* 141, 142–3nn.

146 Cf. n. 62 above.
is evident in another play about a young hero and his education, Sophocles’ *Lovers of Achilles* (F 153, 157). Although just what role the satyrs played in this drama is unclear, Sophocles emphasizes the young hero’s extraordinary glance and its effects on the satyrs (F 157). The involvement of satyrs in dramas concerning the education and rearing of infants and youths may not just present them as comically ill-suited to such a nurturing role. It may also allude playfully to another side of satyrs attested outside satyric drama, namely their status as paradoxical founts of knowledge and wisdom, as evident in the gloomy wisdom Aristotle ascribes to Silenus (Arist. F 44), or in the didactic role the old satyr has in other writings by, for instance, Plato (*Symp. 215a–c, 216c–217a, 221d*), Theopompus (115 *FGH 75c.1–2*) or Vergil (*Ecl. 6*). Inverting their role as care-givers or teachers, satyrs may have been pupils as well. An anonymous drama, *Students* (*Mathêtai TrGF 2, Adesp. 5g*), evidently satyric, would seem to offer a good opportunity for the satyrs to be their usual rambunctious selves in a classroom setting, aggravating a (more or less) straight-laced or long-suffering teacher.\(^{147}\)

Far from being mutually exclusive, the various tropes of satyric drama can co-exist within one play and satyrs can operate on many different registers within one drama. Euripides’ *Cyclops* provides the most ample evidence of this, as the sole complete example of its kind. This drama not only engages with other literary, dramatic and mythic traditions, such as Homer and tragedy, it also playfully incorporates a number of concerns that loomed large in the political and philosophical culture of the day, and gives them the kind of treatment appropriate to a genre known for its combination of seriousness and earthy humour.

4. *Euripides’ Cyclops*

4.1 *Theories about the Date of the Play*

The date of *Cyclops* is unknown. Some have used the criterion of thematic and verbal parallels with other plays of known dates and postulated, for instance, a date of the middle to late 420s to bring it in line with Euripides’ *Hecuba*; this play features the blinding of Polymestor for his murder of Hecuba’s son, entrusted to his care, and, like *Cyclops*, can be said to explore aspects of *xenia* and its violations.\(^{148}\) Also citing thematic and verbal parallels, M.

---

\(^{147}\) See Sutton (1974d) 121; cf. the survival and variants of this motif in television series, such as *Welcome Back, Kotter*.

Wright claimed that *Cyclops* must date to 412, the year in which Euripides’ *Helen, Andromeda and Iphigenia among the Taurians* – his ‘escape tragedies’ – were produced. Again, one can detect similar themes between *Cyclops* and these dramas such as escape from an ogre or monster, a distant setting, a happy ending, etc. But such parallels do not, however, constitute dating criteria. There is no reason why satyr plays had to follow the same themes as the preceding tragedies in detail, even if recognized as a genre that ‘played’ with tragedy. With the exception of some dramas by Aeschylus and Polyphrasmon, tragic ‘trilogies’ were not, as a rule, based around one unifying theme. We need not expect any deep-running thematic unity to be continued in the satyr play which followed them. Nor is there any reason why Euripides’ interest in such themes had to be confined to just one time of his career; he may have revisited these themes on different occasions. Parallels between *Cyclops* and other Euripidean plays can be more easily explained by the dramatically similar situations depicted in them. As R. Ussher has shown, verbal parallels can be found with many Euripidean dramas produced at different times; he establishes many parallels between *Cyclops* and other Euripidean plays such as *Ion, Trojan Women* and *Hecuba*, but rightly sees them as having no bearing on the date of the satyr play. L. Paganelli suggested 414–13 as a date for the *Cyclops* on the basis of alleged historical allusions, such as the Sicilian expedition; and J. Duchemin, noting the negative image of Sicily in *Cyclops*, also linked the play to the Sicilian expedition but suggested the play was produced in 412, in the immediate aftermath of the disaster. Even if such allusions could be firmly established, the Sicilian expedition could just as easily function as a *terminus post quem*, and the play could have been performed some years afterward.

---

5 inferred that *Hecuba* borrowed from *Cyclops* which he dated to the early 430s. Sutton (1980) 47–8 employs the same methodology to assert that Sophocles’ *Trackers* was the satyr play accompanying *Ajax*. P. Maxwell-Stuart (1973) 399, asserts a date of 423 for Euripides’ *Cyclops* without any discussion.


150 E.g., Polyphrasmon’s tetralogy, *Lykourgeia*, in 467 (F 1; cf. T 3 Snell); Aeschylus did not always produce connected tetralogies; in 472 BC his satyric *Prometheus the Fire-Kindler* followed his tragedies which included the *Persians* (*TrGF* 3.48 T 55a); see also Gantz (1980).


152 L. Paganelli (1979) 135–9; J. Duchemin (1945) x.
Despite these difficulties, there is some consensus that *Cyclops* seems to come from late in Euripides’ career, around 408 BC. Stylistic and metrical evidence, namely the high incidence of ‘resolution’ in Odysseus’ iambic trimeters comparable with other Euripidean plays whose dates are known, has suggested this to some commentators. While aware that some metrical considerations are more telling than others, Seaford notes, for instance, that the frequency of resolution in Odysseus’ diction in *Cyclops* occurs on average once every 3.8 trimeters, comparable to that in Euripides’ *Helen* of 412 (3.6) and *Phoenissae* of 409 (3.9). Close verbal parallels between *Cyclops* and plays of the late fifth century by Sophocles and Aristophanes have also been cited as dating criteria. Following Milman Parry’s observation, Seaford takes *Cyc.* 222 as an allusion to Aristophanes’ *Thesmophorizae* 1105–6 (dated 411), itself a parody of Euripides’ *Andromeda* (F 125). He also notes the occurrence of the word ἀμφιτρής (‘tunnelled, bored through on both sides’) in *Cyc.* 707 and Sophocles’ *Philoctetes* 19 (dated 409), a word not attested outside these two dramas. He infers that Euripides is alluding to Sophocles here and that *Cyclops* is therefore a late play by and datable to c. 408. While it was once fairly common to assign *Cyclops* to Euripides’ earlier years, most recent views date the *Cyclops* to the last decade of Euripides’ life (between 415–406), for various reasons, some more cogent than others. Yet lack of certainty over the exact date of *Cyclops* is not a major hindrance to our understanding of its key themes and dramaturgy.

4.2 Euripides’ *Cyclops* as a Satyr Play: an Overview

The most important literary precedent to Euripides’ *Cyclops* is Homer’s *Odyssey* book 9, just as the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* was a major foundation for the *Trackers* of Sophocles. Euripides’ engagement with his Homeric model does not, however, simply entail a dramatization of the epic encounter between Odysseus and Polyphemus. Considerable differences between the two versions are evident, too, that are not just simply explained by the two

---

154 M. Parry (1930) 140–1 put *Cyclops* at 409 and suggests that Euripides is answering Aristophanes’ mockery of him with self-mockery.
different genres telling essentially the same story. Other treatments of this story in the satyr play by Aristias (F 4), and the comedies of Epicharmus (F 71–2 PCG) and Cratinus (F 143–57 PCG) are likely to have had some impact on Euripides as well.157

The play begins with a monologue by Silenus, an actor in this drama, as opposed to being a chorus member or coryphaeus (chorus-leader). The old satyr complains to his absent master of the dire situation he and his sons face as slaves of the brutal Cyclops and explains how they got there (1–40). In describing how the satyrs became lost when they were trying to rescue their master who had been kidnapped by pirates, Silenus encapsulates a number of important motifs for this and other satyric dramas (17–26):

But then as we were sailing near Malea an easterly gale descending on the ship threw us onto this rock of Etna [20], where the one-eyed children of the sea-god, the Cyclopes who kill men inhabit their isolated caves. We were caught and are slaves in the house of one of them. They call the master we serve Polyphemus. And instead of Bacchic revels [25] we tend the flocks of a godless Cyclops.

Straightaway we encounter the motif of the enslavement of the satyrs by a monstrous overlord who is ‘man-killing’ and ‘godless’, here identified as Polyphemus. Schooled in Homeric epic, Euripides’ fifth-century audience will have a general idea of what to expect of Euripides’ Cyclops in light of Odyssey 9. But those expecting a close emulation of Homer may have been surprised to learn of the location of Euripides’ drama on Sicily, an innovation possibly attributable to the Sicilian poet Epicharmus (F 70–2 PCG); in Odyssey 9 the home of the Cyclopes is never made clear.158 Yet in Euripides’ Cyclops the Sicilian location is made explicit fourteen times in a play of just of 700 lines (20, 60, 95 (twice), 106, 114 (twice), 130, 298, 366, 395, 599, 660, 703). By the fifth century Sicily had had a long history of sophisticated Hellenism, and as Thucydides (6.2–5) recognized, had been a cultural melting pot for centuries, home to Greek and non-Greek alike.159

157 The story is also treated by Philoxenus (F 816, 819 PMG) and in a dithyramb by Timotheus (F 780–3). The subject was popular in Archaic and Classical Greek Art (LIMC VIII.1 s.v. ‘Polyphemos’ I 16–18, 20; cf. I 40–44, 46, etc.).
158 Thrinakia, the island of the cattle of Helios (Od. 11.107), becomes associated with Sicily in the post-Homeric tradition (e.g., Thuc. 6.2.2; Call. Hymn 3.57).
159 Willi (2008) explores many aspects of Sicily’s cultural importance in the Greek world. Smith (2004) esp. 33–8 discusses what mainland Greeks are likely to have known of the place by the late fifth century.
But Euripides’ drama presents the location as a barbaric dystopia, hostile to Greek religion and law, that is emblematic of the brutal nature of its natural inhabitants, the man-eating Cyclopes.\textsuperscript{60} At the outset, Silenus speaks of their current location as ‘this rock of Etna’ (20) and the homes of the Cyclopes as ‘isolated caves’ (22). This lack of a civilized environment is consistent with the impious cannibalism of Polyphemus (30–1), who is acknowledged bitterly by Silenus as his current ‘master’ (34) in contrast to his natural master, Dionysus, whom he addressed at the outset of his speech.

Next comes the parodos, or the arrival of the chorus in the form of fifteen satyrs returning the monster’s sheep which have been grazing. In their part as none-too-competent shepherds (cf. 49–51), the satyrs play the role of manual labourer as in other satyr dramas set in rural or distant locations, e.g. Aeschylus’ \textit{Net-Fishers}, Sophocles’ \textit{Trackers}, \textit{Inachus}. The parodos (41–81), composed in lyric metres different from the spoken iambics of Silenus’ prologue, extends much in Silenus’ litany of complaints about their barbarous and backward location, notably the complete absence of Dionysus and his rites (63–6). Moreover, the chorus reminds the audience of certain motifs in the satyrs’ condition: their enslaved state, role as forced labourers (64–81), and separation from their god, whose friendship with his entourage is emphasized in the epode or after-song (73–81):

\begin{quote}
O my friend, O my friend (ὦ φίλος ὦ φίλε) Bacchus, 
where are you wandering, separated from your followers, 
are you shaking your golden hair?  \hfill (75) 
I, your very own servant, 
am serf to the Cyclops, 
wandering in exile as a slave to this one-eyed monster, 
and wearing this miserable goat-skin cloak, \hfill (80) 
separated from your friendship (φιλίας).
\end{quote}

Some have doubted the authenticity of lines (73–5) on stylistic and metrical grounds but they have been ably defended on the same grounds.\textsuperscript{61} Either way, ‘friendship’ (\textit{philia}) is important here in underscoring the satyrs’ relationship to their god (81), and gains a certain poignancy as the satyrs allude to the absence of their god and his cult, immediately after their reference to ‘the crags of Etna’ (62). By the end of the parodos, then, we learn of the remoteness and harshness of the land and the man-eating, impious

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{60} See O’Sullivan (2012a).
\textsuperscript{61} For fuller discussion of the issues, see below Cyc. Comm. 73–5n.
\end{footnotesize}
monsters who inhabit it. With good reasons, the satyrs bemoan their plight, and their reluctance for work, however much it may tally with their natural disposition, takes on a more sympathetic aspect.162

When Odysseus and his men arrive, Silenus reiterates the brutality of the despotic monster and his homeland, described as ‘hostile to strangers’ and thus the Homeric law of hospitality (ξενία). In fact, Silenus even evinces some sympathy – destined to be short-lived – for the unwitting new arrivals (89–95):

O unhappy strangers! Whoever are they? They have no idea what our master (δεσπότην) [90] Polyphemus is like, and that the land they have reached is hostile to strangers and that they have come, by an ill fate, right into the man-eating Cyclopean jaw. But quieten down so that we can learn where they’ve come from to be here at Sicilian Etna’s rocky outcrop (Σικελὸν Αἴτναιον πάγον).

The harshness of the environment here stands in contrast to Homer’s description of the Cyclopes’ land and the small island opposite from which Odysseus makes his ill-fated journey (Od. 9.105–41, 181–6). The Homeric Odysseus praises the Cyclopes’ habitat, noting its fertility, its smooth and arable land, rich forests, fresh water springs and easy approach by sea with a natural harbour (Od. 9.131–7, 140–1). Homer’s description is a precursor to the literary locus amoenus (‘lovely place’), a motif found from Plato (Phdr. 230b) to Horace (Odes 3.4.6–8) and later still, and especially a feature of bucolic poetry; yet the landscape Euripides presents in his Cyclops is a stark and bleak contrast to the Homeric model.163

Odysseus appears, speaking dignified iambic trimeters even to the point of affectation at times (96–8), and is destined to play ‘straight man’ to the satyrs ‘funny man’. After Odysseus announces himself as ‘the lord of the Cephallenians’, Silenus brings the hero down to earth, calling him the ‘shrill, relentless babbler’, descended from Sisyphus (0–), the infamous rogue who featured in some satyr dramas. Here the epic hero, praised by Homer for his oratorical powers (Il. 3.204–24, etc.), gets the satyric treatment.164


163 David Konstan refers me to P. Nieto (2000) who discusses the combined backward and idyllic features of Homer’s Cyclopean world.

164 Hostility to Odysseus in later poetry is widely attested, e.g. Pindar, Nemean 7, and Euripides may be alluding to it here; see below Cyc. Comm. 104n. Many have also tried to see the poet of the Iliad as hostile to the Ithacan hero; against this view, however, see Friedrich (2011). S. Montiglio (2011) sees Odysseus presented as a generally negative figure
Another significant difference between the Homeric and Euripidean accounts of Odysseus’ arrival soon emerges. Homer has Odysseus, after he has escaped the Lotus-eaters, purposely set out for the land which has caught his interest, and which he does not yet know is inhabited by the Cyclopes; the hero sets out in one ship, having moored the rest of his fleet on an island nearby (Od. 9.170–6). Moreover, the Homeric Odysseus evinces a recklessness which endangers the life of his men by staying in the monster’s cave, despite the urgings of his men to leave (Od. 9.220–30), an action which scholars see as an act of hybris or arrogance. In Cyclops, by contrast, Odysseus is driven off course by a storm, just as the satyrs were, which underlines the shared precariousness of their situation, and puts hero and satyrs on something of an equal footing, as Silenus realizes immediately (108–10; cf. 17–22).

As Odysseus and the old satyr soon engage in a lengthy line by line exchange known as stichomythia (102–62), again the dismal plight of the satyrs and now Odysseus and his crew becomes clear: the land has no buildings and there are no people dwelling on it (115–118). These Euripidean Cyclopes are particularly backward, since in other traditions they were famous builders (Bacch. 10.77; Eur. Tro. 1088, etc.); but here they fall short of the human achievement of architecture, which was considered by fifth-century sophists such as Protagoras as fundamental to even a basic society (Pl. Prot. a). As was the case with the Cyclopes in Homer’s account (Od. 9.112–15), there are no signs of civilization in terms of communal laws. Euripides’ version goes beyond Homer to point out the backward nature of the Cyclopes’ homeland in making clear that democracy is conspicuously absent from it (119–20), thus underscoring the political as well as physical distance of the dramatic locale from the fifth-century polis of its first production. Agriculture, viticulture – glossed as the domains of Demeter and Dionysus – are absent, too (121–4); the native inhabitants are relentless man-eaters (125–8). Euripides thus develops the motif of liminal and distant setting of satyr plays to underscore the barbarism of Polyphemus and Cyclopes generally and to forge a bond of friendship at least between the chorus of satyrs and Odysseus who all desire

---


66 Here again Euripides goes against the grain, as it were, of the historical Sicily, which was a prime centre of food production in the Mediterranean (Hdt. 7.158.4; Thuc. 6.20.4) and where the cult of Demeter was of great importance; see White (1964); Hinz (1998), esp. 55–167.
to escape from the island as soon as possible. While Vitruvius (5.6.9) is often quoted to show that typical settings of satyr plays tend to be in rustic and far off places, *Cyclops* makes clear that the satyrs are not always going to be at home in such environments.

After Odysseus gives Silenus wine in exchange for food from the monster’s cave, the old satyr indulges in two of his favourite pastimes; excessive drinking and sexual fantasising (168–74). By this time a certain amount of good will has been established between Odysseus and the satyrs, couched in terms of friendship (*philia*), and the hero acknowledges the friendly relations that now exist between them (176). The chorus typically lower the tone with their own prurience and misogyny, thinking the Trojan war essentially about the chance for a ‘gang-bang’ with Helen whom they call a ‘traitor’ and consider a nymphomaniac. After dismissing the entire race of women, the lechery of the satyrs gets the better of them here, and they collectively fantasise about having all the women of the world to themselves, thus comically recasting the bitter misogyny found in tragedy and elsewhere (179–87). In other dramas the satyrs would appear to have lusted after Helen as well, including Sophocles’ satyric *Helen’s Marriage*, and Cratinus’ comedy *Dionysalexandros* in which they appeared as the chorus. Similarly, Aeschylus’ *Net-Fishers* has Silenus and the chorus fantasizing that Danae is desperate for sex after such a long time at sea (F **47a.57–67).

But the real villain of the piece, Polyphemus, soon makes his appearance, barking orders to the terrified satyrs and making clear his hostility to Dionysus (203–5, 210–11):

**CYCLOPS:** Get out of the way! Make way! What’s this? What’s this idleness? Why are you performing a Bacchic revel? There’s no Dionysus here, no castanet of bronze, no rattle of the drums! [205] ... What have you got to say for yourselves? What do you say? One of you will soon start shedding tears [210] courtesy of my club! Look upwards, not down!

The monster’s opening words echo, but in the form of a brutal boast, the lament of the chorus that there is no Bromius and his cult on the island (63–4). Such hostility to Dionysus was a theme of many tragedies, Euripides’

---


168 Above, n. 13.
*Bacchae* being the most famous example.\(^{169}\) Similarly, Sophocles’ satyric *Salmoineus* told the story of that figure’s attempt to displace Zeus, and Homer’s *Odyssey* makes clear Polyphemus’ rejection of Zeus and Olympian values (9.275–9). But the epic, of course, makes no mention of Dionysus in this context, while Euripides gives Polyphemus’ hostility a satyric turn by making the monster, from his first utterance, an enemy of the deity. Inevitably, this anti-Dionysian antipathy makes Polyphemus an enemy not only of the satyrs, but of Odysseus, Zeus and Greek values explicitly (cf. *Cyc.* 320–3, 327–8, 338–42, etc.).

In what follows themes of loyalty, *philia* and family values are both overturned and played out.\(^{170}\) Silenus proceeds to tell his outrageous lie that Odysseus and his men are not only thieves but intend to torture Polyphemus and sell him into slavery; the monster then decides to cook and eat the new arrivals, which Silenus cruelly endorses (232–52). Odysseus’ straightforward account of events is denied by Silenus in an absurd, false and sycophantic oath, which culminates in his willingness to forfeit his sons’ lives if he is forsworn (255–69). Such (ab)use of language puts Silenus on the same level of impiety as Polyphemus.\(^{171}\) But the bonds of *philia* between father and sons become severed, at least temporarily, and those between the satyrs and Odysseus affirmed, when the chorus counter their father’s false oath (268–72):

**CHORUS:** That’s what you deserve. I myself saw you selling his property to the strangers. [270] If I’m telling lies, may my father die. (*To the Cyclops*) Don’t wrong the strangers.

In other satyr dramas dysfunctional familial relations, mostly in the form of Silenus’ abusing his sons, are found (Soph. *Trackers* F 145–68; Lycophron, *Menedemus* F 2), and have recurred in humour for millennia, from Aristophanes’ *Wasps* to *Steptoe and Son*. But here, also of interest is the willingness of the satyrs to stand up to the monster directly and demand that he not harm the strangers. We see courage on the part of the satyrs here, even if later in the play they display their more predictable cowardice in backing out of Odysseus’ plans to blind the giant (635–50). Silenus distorts *philia* by falsely claiming to love his sons so much (269 οὖς μᾶλιστ’ ἐγὼ φιλῶ) and by siding with Polyphemus; yet the *philia* between Odysseus and the chorus is strengthened by the satyrs’ stance against their father and the monster.

---

\(^{169}\) Cf. also Aeschylus’ *Pentheus* F 183; *Bacchae* F 22; Iophon F 2; Xenocles F 1, etc.

\(^{170}\) See Ambrose (2005) for fuller discussion of this aspect of the play.

\(^{171}\) See Fletcher (2005) who argues that both characters pay the price for their false oaths and abuse of language.
In what may be considered the *agôn* or debate of the play (285–346) the cultural gulf that separates man from monster becomes clear. Odysseus speaks in terms of Olympian values, announcing firstly that he and his men are suppliants, as his Homeric counterpart does in referring to Zeus as protector of suppliants (*Od*. 9.270–1); Euripides’ Odysseus invokes again the concept of *philia*, even describing himself and his men as ‘friends’ (φίλους) of the monster (287–8). From here he moves onto specious claims about how the Trojan War, denounced by Polyphemus as wasted on ‘the most vile Helen’ (281–2), had saved Greece from Trojan aggression and had benefited the monster as a supposed inhabitant of a land that is Greek (290–8). Many see Odysseus here using cynical and even comically inept arguments, representative of the supposed faults of the sophistic age, but Euripides may just be playfully undercutting the rhetorical powers of this normally eloquent hero and giving him the satyric treatment again. But the hero’s claims about the importance of the law or custom (*nomos*) of hospitality (*xenia*) put him on firmer ground ethically (299–311) and recall much of his Homeric counterpart’s warning to the beast (*Od*. 9.266–71). Odysseus’ tone is clearly more serious here, recalling motifs from tragedies, as he laments the deaths already caused by the Trojan War (cf. Aesch. *Ag*. 326–9, 430–57; cf. also Aesch. *Seven* 48). In language that recalls Silenus’ description of the Cyclopes’ impious and unholy ways at the outset of the play (30–1) he urges the monster to refrain from impious actions (309–11), just as the prophet Teiresias admonishes the maniacal Pentheus in the *Bacchae* (309). Odysseus finishes with a warning, pointing to the monster’s inevitable fate, and marking a significant change in tone from the pleas which opened the speech.

Polyphemus sees through Odysseus’ admittedly specious, or desperate, claims about the need to save Greece, but states that wealth and sacrificing to his belly, ‘the greatest of gods’, are most important to him (318–19, 334–8). He renounces the authority of Zeus (320–1), and even claims to rival Zeus’ thunderings, not by impiously imitating the god, as did another another satyric ogre, Sophocles’ Salmoneus (F 537–41a; cf. Diod. Sic. 6.7, etc.), but through the habit of masturbation. The monster leads a life of excessive *autarkeia* or self-sufficiency which causes him to reject Olympian values (322–33) and concepts of *philia* which have characterised the interactions

---


173 See *Cyc*. Comm. 327–8n.
among the satyrs, Dionysus and Odysseus. In corruptions of language and ritual the monster allegorises ‘Zeus’ as nothing more than the ability to glut and pleasure oneself (336–7), and cruelly parodies the idea of xenia by saying he will offer it to his guests in the form of a bronze cauldron which will cook them as part of an implied sacrifice (342–6).

Many have seen Polyphemus here as a sophistic figure in his renunciation of laws (338–40) and conventional religion; Thrasymachus in Plato’s Republic (338c–339a, etc.) is cited as a parallel, as is Callicles, who in Plato’s Gorgias similarly attacks conventional ethics and law and argues for a ‘greed is good’ mentality (esp. Gorg. 482c-484d; 491e–492c). But George Grote showed long ago that Callicles is no sophist or even an admirer of them (Gorg. 520a), and Guthrie has demonstrated that Thrasymachus does not endorse a supposed ‘might is right’ philosophy similar to Polyphemus’ world-view. Rather, Polyphemus is better understood as a parody of the tyrannical figure, who as a demonized stereotype in Attic literature embodies the same tropes as Polyphemus in Cyclops – greed, intolerance, sexual and other violence, contempt for law – albeit not in quite the same grotesque manners. This is in fact consistent with Callicles’ views since he advocates his ‘greed is good’ philosophy for those who can attain tyranny, i.e. tyrants (Gorg. 491e–492c). Polyphemus as tyrannical figure has good company in other ogres on the satyr stage: Aeschylus’ Lycurgus, Sophocles’ Amycus, Euripides’ Busiris and Sositheus’ Lityerses. Polyphemus’ status as tyrannical ogre is central to his characterization in Cyclops, and he is often referred to negatively by the chorus

177 Berve (1967) 200 rightly referred to Polyphemus as a ‘burlesk’ tyrant without, however, developing the point. For full discussion, see O’Sullivan (2005) 119–59, esp. 128–59. The following tropes are all associated with tyranny in the following select instances: greed, especially for money (Aesch. Ag. 1619–24, 1628–32; Eur. Pho. 506, 439–40; Arist. Pol. 1311a1–11); brutality (PV 35, 324; Pl. Rep. 9.574e-575a), sexual violence (PV 736–7: Io’s complaint about Zeus; cf. Danae in Net-Fishers; Hdt. 3.80.6; Eur. Suppl. 450–5); lawlessness or contempt for existing law (PV 149–50, 401–5; cf. 10, 222, 224–5, 305, 357, etc.; Hdt. 3.80.4–6; Eur. Suppl. 429–32); desire to enslave others (Arist. Rhet. 1393b5–22, referring to Stesichorus’ warning to the citizens of Acragas of Phalaris’ tyrannical ambitions).
as their ‘master’ (34, 90, 163, etc.) while they are his slaves (24, 78, 79, 442). The monster as slave-owning despot marks a key difference in his identity from his Homeric counterpart while still retaining much of the savagery of his epic incarnation. For the audience watching at the City Dionysia in democratic Athens, Polyphemus’ tyrannical leanings would intensify his villainy.

The play now reaches its darkest moment as Odysseus’ men are driven into the cave and the hero desperately calls on divine aid, invoking firstly Athena, then Zeus as god of hospitality, just as he is invoked in this role in the Homeric account (Od. 9.270–1). In a final tone of defiance Odysseus, unlike his Homeric counterpart, even entertains the possibility of the non-existence or irrelevance of the gods (354–55). It is a theme touched on by a number of Euripidean characters in moments of tragic despair (Heracles 1341; Bellerophon F 282, 286) and may have struck a chord in an age when skepticism about the nature of the divine is attested in the thought of some sophists such as Protagoras (80 B4 DK) and Prodicus (84 B5 DK). The challenge by a mortal to a god at the end of a scene occurs typically in late Euripidean dramas, too (Hel. 1093–1106; IT 1082–8, Pho. 84–7).178

The choral song which follows (356–74) dwells on the impiety and cruelty of the monster’s cannibalism, and the revulsion the satyrs feel at the polluted meal. The tone of the satyrs’ song is one of protest, disgust and despair all of which contrast strongly with malicious glee of Silenus who had earlier encouraged the Cyclops to eat the strangers (250–2, 313–15); the choral song is another instance of the ability of satyr drama to deal with serious emotion. Gluttony as a satyric theme now has moved from being merely crass to something darkly transgressive, and the chorus remind us again that the Cyclops is a native of Etna (366), underscoring the link between the monster and his monstrous habitat. Odysseus’ re-emergence from the cave confirms their worst fears when they ask (377–8):

CHORUS: What is it, Odysseus? That most godless Cyclops hasn’t really feasted on your dear companions, has he?

The chorus see the monster’s crime as unholy and an affront to philia in the reference to the victims as Odysseus’ ‘dear companions’. Odysseus’ long description of the monster’s cannibalism (382–436), is the satyric counterpart to the typical ‘messenger speech’ in tragedy which describes often violent or spectacular off-stage action. The monster’s impiety (396) and gluttony are stressed not least by reference to the vast size of his drinking vessels

(388–91), typical of satyric ogres such as Lityerses who drinks from the same-size jar (Sositheus F 2.7–8). Unlike his Homeric counterpart, who eats his victims raw (Od. 9.289–92), the Euripidean Polyphemus is something of a transgressive gourmand, cutting the dead men’s flesh, boiling it in his bronze cauldron (390–405; cf. 241–9), perhaps influenced by Cratinus’ telling of the story in which the monster cooks his victims (F 150 PCG).\textsuperscript{179}

But Odysseus’ speech also forms a turning point in the play whereby the hero hits upon a way of punishing the Cyclops, escaping the island and re-uniting the satyrs with Dionysus. Interestingly, Homer emphasizes Odysseus’ own thought processes in devising his revenge on the monster; it is a βουλή (‘plan’) that seems best to him (Od. 9.318, cf. 302). In Euripides’ version the hero’s escape plan is ‘an idea sent from some god’ (literally, ‘something divine’: τι θεῖον) that comes to him (Cyc. 411), and from here Dionysus is a more palpable presence in the play in the form of wine. The first step for Odysseus here will be to exploit the monster’s unfamiliarity with wine by getting him drunk, thus making the god, often considered wine personified (Eur. Cyc. 156, 415; Bacch. 275–83, etc.), more central to the story. The ‘wine motif’ comes into play here as it did in other satyr plays such as Ion’s Omphale and Achaeus’ Hephaestus; but it is likely that the satyric Lycurgus, as depicted by Aeschylus (and possibly Polyphrasmon), forms the closest parallel as a slave-owning, anti-Dionysian ogre who tastes, and is defeated by, wine for the first time.\textsuperscript{180} The major satyric themes, then, of the downfall of an ogre, escape from a distant locale and a return to Dionysian joy are all broached here, and this last aspect in particular is couched in terms of a three-way philia between Odysseus, the satyrs and Dionysus (433–8):

ODYSSEUS: But you – since you’re still young – be saved with me and resume your old friendship with Dionysus, who’s not like the Cyclops.

CHORUS: O dearest friend, if only we could see that day when we escape the godless presence of the Cyclops!

From here the revenge motif (timōria) becomes more conspicuous in the drama (441–2). It is not enough merely for Greeks and satyrs to escape; the old ethic of helping friends \textit{and} harming enemies must be invoked (cf. Archilochus fr. 26 W; Theognidea 337–40). As Odysseus gradually reveals his plans to blind the Cyclops, the satyrs’ enthusiasm grows excitedly (465;

\textsuperscript{179} Polyphemus may even resemble the Sicilian tyrant Phalaris, notorious by the time of Pindar (Pyth. 1.95–8) for roasting victims alive in his bronze bull; see O’Sullivan (2005) 132–4.

\textsuperscript{180} See Voelke (2001) 190–1.
Euripides. *Cyclops* and Major Fragments of Greek Satyric Drama
cf. 624–5), comparable perhaps to their over-reaction on seeing fire for the first time which they want to kiss (Aesch. *Prom. Pyrk.* F 207). Odysseus announces that he will rescue his men (whom he again calls ‘friends’), the satyrs, and magnanimously and unhesitatingly includes Silenus, despite the old satyr’s treachery earlier (466–8). As a somewhat comical sign of the philia between chorus and hero, the satyrs, full of bravado as elsewhere (cf. Soph. *Inachus* F 269d.22), declare their willingness to help blind the monster (469–71; cf. 483–5), and claim to be able to lift a hundred wagons if necessary (473–4) – a build-up that points only to their eventual cowardice (635–41). This pivotal scene, which began with an account of the horrors within the monster’s cave, ends on an upbeat note, with an invocation of philia. Odysseus once again asserts, if somewhat pompously, the importance of philia to his own heroic identity and as a motivation for his actions (478–82).

Now, in lyrics (483–518), the satyrs focus gleefully on wreaking revenge on the monster, who is derided for his tone deaf singing and ignorance, and whose punishment will be an education for him: ‘let us educate (παιδεύσωμεν) him ... the ignoramus’ (τὸν ἀπαίδευτον: 489–93; cf. 173). Interestingly, this may play on the idea of satyrs as instructors of sorts: the monster, like his native Sicily, knows nothing of the joys of Dionysus whose worship involves dance, music as well as wine (63–72, 124; cf. 203–5). The intimates of this god will therefore be only too happy to let the ogre become acquainted with their deity if it means the downfall of their enemy. Compared to this beast, whose singing is as inept as his actions are deplorable, these satyrs are figures of elegance and refinement. Dionysian and erotic themes become more explicit in the satyrs’ makarismos, or song of blessing, briefly describing activities of the typical reveller or *komast* in a general context of philia; this reveller embraces a ‘dear male companion’ (φίλον ἄνδρα), while an *hetaira* (girlfriend or courtesan) waits for him on the bed (495–502). A distorted version of this image becomes concrete in the appearance of Polyphemus, the supremely transgressive *komast*, who not only brags of his cannibalism and drunkenness, but is derided by the satyrs as a beautiful groom on his wedding night in the mood for love (511–18). A parody of Sappho has been detected earlier in the play (*Cyc.* 182–6), and here is possibly another in the sardonic ‘compliments’ of the satyrs.

---

181 For discussion of the authenticity of these lines, see below *Cyc.* Comm. 480–2n.
182 Cf. their possible roles in, for instances, Aesch. *Nurses*; Soph. *Little Dionysus, Little Heracles, Python, Agen.*
which may be compared to compliments Sappho pays to the groom in her epithalamians, or wedding songs (cf. Sappho F 111–12, 115–16 L-P). We also get a glimpse of the grotesquely comical Polyphemus as lover, a motif of later poetry, notably of Theocritus (Id. 6 and 11), and Ovid (Met. 13.740–897, esp. 750–68), and which may be reflected in the work of Euripides’ younger contemporary, Philoxenus (F 816, 819 PMG).

In the lengthy stichomythia that follows Odysseus must keep the monster at home for his plan to work (521–69). Part of this involves educating Polyphemus in the niceties of the symposium, like Heracles in Ion’s Omphale (F 21–7) or the title character in Achaeus’ Hephaestus (F 17). Odysseus takes command of the situation early, speaking at times misleadingly (524, 526, 528) and preparing to use the trick of calling himself ‘Nobody’ (549), famous from Homer (cf. 672–5). All the while he plies the monster with drink glossed as ‘the Bacchic one’, a title of Dionysus; wine is presented to the Cyclops as the god himself (519–29, 575). The god who is the friend of the satyrs thus plays a crucial role in aiding Odysseus in his plan. The monster here comes under the influence of his foe in similar fashion to the way in which Pentheus in the Bacchae (811–46) falls under the sway of his Destroyer, Dionysus. Just as the deluded Pentheus imagines two suns in the sky (Bacch. 918), so, too, Polyphemus’ state causes him to make errors of cosmic proportions (578–80). In making Silenus play Ganymede (582–9), the monster puts himself on the same level as Zeus, who famously loved the Trojan prince (Hom. Il. 20.232–5); the monster’s delusion is consistent with his earlier hubristic claims to rival the supreme god (320–1, 328).

The monsters’s rape of Silenus not only recalls the bizarre erotics that began the scene in the satyrs’ parody of the Cyclops as lover (511–18); it is also a fittingly comical, if grotesque, way to bring the distorted philia between Polyphemus and the old satyr to its climax, so to speak.

In addressing the satyrs as ‘sons of Dionysus, noble children’ (590), Odysseus once more alludes, albeit metaphorically, to the implied presence of the god, who is certainly a better role model than their real father, who takes no further part in the play. Indeed, Silenus, as he appears in Sophocles’ Trackers, is by far the most badly behaved of these ithyphallic males, and his onstage persona in Cyclops is in contrast to those other traditions that

---

183 See di Marco (1980) on Cyc. 182–6. For Polyphemus as failed komast, see Rossi (1971), and for parodies of sympotic behaviour in Cyclops, see R. Hamilton (1979)


185 Cf. also the Argive warrior Capaneus in tragedy, who is destroyed by Zeus’ thunderbolt (Aesch. Seven 423–4; Eur. Pho. 1128–33).
ascribed a wisdom to him, preserved by, for instance, Plato (Symp. 215a–c, 216c–217a, etc.) or Aristotle (F 44; cf. Hdt. 8.138) or Vergil (Ecl. 6). Odysseus’ encouragement of the satyrs collectively to act like ‘a real man’ (ἀνήρ: 595) will be as ineffectual as the satyrs’ vain pledges of help (469–75, 596, 632–3). But before this joke on the perennial cowardice of satyrs is played out, we see them once again unite the themes of revenge, escape and reunion with their god, central to this and other satyr dramas. Odysseus prays to Hephaestus and the primordial deity, Sleep, with more heroic self-aggrandisement and another threat to downsize the status of the gods if aid is not forthcoming (599–607; cf. 353–55); then the chorus perform a short astrophic song joyfully anticipating the blinding of the monster, and finishing with another statement of their desire for their god (620–22). This desire is expressed with enough passion and evident noise to make Odysseus think they will wake the monster. This draws an angry rebuke from the hero who sees the chorus now as ‘wild creatures’ (θῆρες: 624–8), as Cyllene called them in Sophocles’ Trackers (221–2). Like his Homeric counterpart, Euripides’ Odysseus similarly can be harsh to sympathetic figures; the Homeric Odysseus threatens the aged Eurycleia with death, after she has recognized him by his scar and, in her astonishment, inadvertently risks revealing his identity before time (Od. 19.467–90).86 As far as Euripides’ satyrs are concerned, the dynamic of friendship between them and Odysseus ebbs and flows, and is about undergo another setback.

When the satyrs come up with – in some cases, literally – lame excuses for not helping blind the monster (635–41), Odysseus, as if invoking Hesiod, calls them ‘worthless men and nothing as allies’ (ἄνδρες πονηροὶ κοὐδὲν οἶδε σύμμαχοι: 642), something which he has long known (649). Here, then, the satyrs’ status as the ‘anti-types’ of the citizen male, in Lissarrague’s expression,87 is all too clear, even if earlier they did stand up to the Cyclops, unlike their toadying father (270–2). Yet even in this situation Odysseus does not despair of them completely, and values their support which he sees as a source of courage for himself and his men, now called ‘close friends’ (653). In a neat paradox Odysseus looks to these creatures as a source of courage in the very moment of their most blatant cowardice.

While the last choral song (656–62) has presented scholars with various

---

86 Compare also his words to Neoptolemus in Soph. Philoctetes (e.g., 50–3, 74–8, 83–4, 108–9, 119–20).

87 Lissarrague (1990a) 235.
problems metrically, its general tenor is a clear exuberant cry for vengeance, a theme which has been steadily building since Odysseus first revealed his plan to them (437–8, 441–2, 464–5, etc.). The satyrs remind us again of the monster’s crimes (658) and call for the blinding with a string of imperatives (656–7, 661) in asyndeton (i.e. without conjunctions) and in dochmiacs, a metre often associated with particularly emotive utterances. The blinded monster’s reappearance and recognition of his own situation can be seen as a farce (663–709), in which the satyrs taunt their long-time tormentor with Odysseus’ trick of Nobody (672–3). The satyrs’ jokes with the name are certainly consistent with the Homeric hero’s own mirth when he sees his trick take effect (Od. 9.413–14). The Homeric hero and Euripidean satyrs, it seems, have a similar sense of humour. This scene may also be considered as playfully invoking tragic norms (‘paratragic’) in being comparable to another Euripidean drama in which a blinded figure gropes around savagely to get back at his tormentors, as Polymestor does in Hecuba (1035–43, 1056–1126).

Some have seen the punishment of the beast as an act of gratuitous cruelty, but there is nothing to suggest we should pity Polyphemus. While the Platonic Socrates may have been arguing that it is worse to commit wrong than to suffer it (Pl. Gorg. 469c, 475a–d, etc.), and tragedy may have been exploring the extent to which a punishment may exceed a crime (e.g., Aesch. Oresteia; Eur. Bacch. 1348; cf. PV passim), no such qualms are evident in this play. In fact, the raging monster is even assimilated to the most terrifying threat to Olympian order, Typhon, who is imprisoned under Etna (Pindar, Pyth. 1.13–28; PV 363–72). More than once the chorus call for Polyphemus to be blinded, using cognates of the verb τύφω (to burn, consume in smoke), and remind us again that he is as violent as the volcano he inhabits in referring to him as ‘the shepherd of Etna’ (6–60), a reprise of their earlier description of him as the ‘Cyclops of Etna’ (66).90

---

189 E.g. Arrowsmith (1956) 6 refers to the ‘barbaric cruelty’ of Odysseus’ revenge, and refers to Polyphemus as a ‘likeable buffoon who loathes war, understands generosity and tipsily “rapes” (sic) Silenus’ (8); Ussher (1978) 191 writes: ‘... Odysseus proceeds to what can only be (as he himself well knows) a senseless outrage.’ Neither in Euripides’ account nor in Homer’s does Odysseus express any remorse for his actions; in both instances he sees himself as an agent of justice (Od. 9.477–9; Eur. Cyc. 421–2, 693); cf. also Friedrich (1991); Segal (1992); C. Brown (1996).
190 The chorus’ words remind us of the brutal environment in which the play is set. Cf. also Ovid’s conflation of the monster and his fiery, volcanic habitat (Met. 13.867–9; cf. 877).
Odysseus, moreover, reminds the Cyclops – and the audience – of the crimes committed by the monster which merited the punishment (693–5):

You were bound to pay the penalty for your unholy feast. For a worthless thing it would have been for me to destroy Troy by fire, if I had not avenged the slaughter of my companions! [695]

Here Odysseus reiterates the impiety of the monster’s crimes and the importance of *philia* as a motivating factor: indeed, avenging the murder of his companions even trumps his great triumph at Troy. The language here recalls 421–2, when Odysseus in the cave realizes that the drunken Polyphemus would ‘soon pay his due’ (δίκην δόσει τάχα) and the play has since then been leading up to this moment. This simple ethic of punishing wrongdoers occurs in other satyr dramas (cf. Aesch. ‘Dike Drama’ F 281a), and is evidently endorsed by Theseus, Athens’ home-grown Heracles (Eur. *Sciron* F 678); it is emblematic of Heracles himself (Eur. *Syleus* F 692). In this case the punishment of the monster amounts almost literally to an ‘eye for an eye’, and this is enacted by Odysseus; and his final taunt ‘go to hell’ (κλαίειν σ’ ἄνωγα: 701) recalls the monster’s dismissal of Odysseus’ pleas (κλαίειν ἄνωγα: 340).

Polyphemus’ continued threats and prophecy about Odysseus’ wanderings hardly mar the generally upbeat, if rather abrupt, ending of the play (703–7), spoken by the chorus (708–9):

Well anyway, we’re going to be fellow sailors with Odysseus here and from now on we’ll be the slaves of the Bacchic god!

Homer’s account ends the Odysseus-Polyphemus episode on a relatively sombre note, with Odysseus and his men shedding tears for their comrades slain by the monster, notwithstanding Odysseus’ triumph and their escape (*Od.* 9.566–7). But this brief Euripidean couplet, in iambic trimeters as opposed to the anapaests which often conclude tragedies, has no hint of melancholy about it. It does, however, allude concisely to many important themes in the drama: friendship, slavery, the different master the satyrs have served, release from the monster and reunification with their god. The satyrs’ self-professed status as Odysseus’ fellow sailors is another nod to the *philia* they share with these Greeks. Paradoxically, the idea of slavery that had defined the satyrs’ condition at the outset of the play (23–6, 78–81; cf. 442, etc.) emerges at the very moment of the satyrs’ freedom. But now this ‘slavery’ is a byword for the friendship they enjoy with their god (73–5, 81, 435–6, 620–2, etc.), and stands in contrast to what they had endured under a despot living on the fringes of the Greek world.
Just as the final couplet refers with great economy to a number of important issues in the play, so the *Cyclops* as a whole, at just over 700 lines, can be said to encapsulate much of literary and dramatic significance. In the play we not only find the tropes one would expect of a satyr play retelling a famous Homeric narrative, we also see Euripides incorporating a number of contemporarily significant elements in his work. Arguably the main theme of *Cyclops* is liberation from an ogre defeated by Greek hero who frees the satyrs and paves the way for reunion with Dionysus. Yet *Cyclops* also deals with issues such as hospitality and friendship (and transgressions thereof), impiety and its consequences. There is also a culture clash in which Greek values prevail over a creature who lives by greed and brute strength in a brutal, backward environment, and who would remind the audience of a debauched tyrant, especially offensive to Attic democratic sensibilities. Many such themes are common to other satyr plays, and in *Cyclops* they are approached with a mixture of seriousness and at times brutally bawdy humour. The satyrs make clear that Odysseus’ heroic posturing at times cries out to be lampooned; but the play is not without its moments of pathos, and at all times the satyrs remain friends with Odysseus, just as they never despair of being reunited with Dionysus. It is significant that the chorus sympathise with the suffering of Odysseus and his men before the hero emerges as their saviour. In their comically transgressive but also sympathetic qualities the satyrs of Euripides’ *Cyclops* are fitting embodiments of a medium that deftly combines the serious and playful.

---

191 A truism of scholarship on ancient Greek drama is that all satyr plays were about this length; but this is based on the sole example of the genre to survive intact. The usual guess is that Sophocles’ *Trackers* is of similar length to *Cyclops* on the basis of how far the action has proceeded in the extant papyri compared to the narrative progression of the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*. Aeschylus’ *Net-Fishers* could easily have gone well over 1,000 lines; the papyrus breaks off at line 832 (=F **47a.68), not long after Danae has arrived with her infant son on Seriphos. Aeschylus’ *Sisyphus the Runaway* and *Stone-Roller* may be separate titles for just one play, which could have run to a similar length (see below pp. 293–4). The possibility that some satyr plays could be of similar lengths to tragedy should therefore not be ruled out.
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KYKΛΩΨ

CYCLOPS
NOTE ON THE GREEK TEXT
AND CRITICAL APPARATUS

Text

The survival of *Cyclops* as the only complete satyr play by any poet is a secondary consequence of a remarkable accident. The principal medieval manuscript tradition of Euripides carries ten complete plays, including the almost certainly inauthentic *Rhesus*. A further nine plays, preserved in just one manuscript and its derivatives, descend from a very ancient edition which was arranged by titles alphabetically; it gives us most of those running from *epsilon* to *kappa*, the eight tragedies *Helen, Electra, Heraclidae (Children of Heracles), Heracles, Hiketides (Suppliant Women), Ion, Iphigenia at Aulis, Iphigenia in Tauris* – and the satyric *Cyclops*.

The one ms. of authority is L (see below, under Apparatus), written about 1320. Its master-mind was the accomplished late Byzantine scholar of Greek drama, Demetrius Triclinius. He revised the initial transcript against its now lost exemplar, and twice later made further corrections and conjectures, attempting for the first time since antiquity a metrical analysis and description of the lyrics.

The most important copy of L is P (below), long thought to derive from the same exemplar, since its text is so close and is known to have been written within a few years of L, and very probably in the same place. The great majority of manuscript experts, however, now accept the demonstration by G. Zuntz in 1965 that P was copied from L after Triclinius’ first but before its subsequent interventions. P therefore has value only for preserving a few original readings of L where Triclinius later obscured or erased them; and for affording a few ‘better’ independent readings, whether by deliberate change or simple accident; and a few conjectures by subsequent revisers; in *Cyclops* these are very few indeed: see the Apparatus to lines 69, 181, 510, 514, 604.

A few other copies of L (not of P) survive, made around 1500 in Italy. The most important two are in Paris (below); they contain corrections or independent conjectures of value, about a dozen or so in *Cyclops*, at e.g. 52, 93, 172.

There are also partial texts of the play. Just one papyrus has been found, of the 4th Century AD (below); it has three small, very damaged fragments from twenty-five lines, which show a few differences from L. Lines, part-line or words from the play are found as quotations in other ancient writers: see the Apparatus at 104, 136, 333, 394, 410, 534, 654.

The first printed edition containing *Cyclops* was the famous Aldine *Euripides* of 1503 (below). The currently standard critical edition of Euripides is by J. Diggle (OCT, Vol. 1, 1984), on whose text and apparatus we have based our own in this volume. The most important individual editions equipped with introductory matter and full commentary are by R. Ussher (1978), R. Seaford (1984) and W. Biehl (1986).
Note on the Greek Text and Critical Apparatus

Apparatus

The apparatus printed below the text omits many minor details, generally straightforward corrections of orthographic error in the manuscript tradition, and other small and long-accepted editorial corrections. Not all manuscript readings or editors’ interventions and conjectures recorded are discussed in the commentary, especially when they are undisputed elements of the ‘received text’; they are included simply for information. For a full and up-to-date apparatus see Diggle’s edition.

Abbreviations


L = Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana 32.2 (1300–20 AD).

Tr1, Tr2, Tr3 = Demetrius Triclinius, corrector of ms L; 1 = his corrections against L’s exemplar; 2, 3 = his two subsequent revisions of L, chiefly his own conjectures.

P = Rome, Vatican Library Palatinus graecus 287 (1320–25 AD), containing Cyclops 1–243 and 352–end (244–351 filled a folio now missing). A copy of L made after its corrections by Tr1 but before its revisions by Tr2, Tr3.

P2 = corrections and conjectures by two later hands in P, of uncertain date.
apogr. Par. = Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale grec 2817 or 2887 (both about 1500 AD): copies of L made after its revisions by Triclinius, with occasional corrections and (apparently) conjectures.

Aldine = Editio Aldina (the ‘Aldine Edition’, published by Aldus Manutius, Venice 1503). The editor(s?) made a small number of minor corrections and conjectures.

* each asterisk indicates a letter erased in a manuscript, and usually then overwritten, the original being now illegible.

< ... > = letter(s) or word(s) added, or lacunae identified, by scribes or editors.

[ ... ] = letter(s), word(s), line(s) deleted by editors.

add(ed), beg(inning(s)), conj(ectured), del(eted), om(itted), punct(uated).

A colon separates details of individual readings or conjectures (letter, word, phrase or clause) in the numbered Greek line(s); a semi-colon separates such information from that relating to another place in the same line(s).
ΚΥΚΛΩΨ

ΣΙΛΗΝΟΣ Ὄ Βρόμιε, διὰ σὲ μυρίους ἔχω πόνους νῦν χ᾿ ὂτ’ ἐν ἰβη τοῦμον εὐσθένει δέμας: πρῶτον μὲν ἦνικ’ ἐμμανῆς Ἡρας ὑπο Νύμφας ὀρείας ἐκλιπὼν ἵχου τροφοῦς ἐπειτὰ γ’ ἀμφὶ γηγενὴ μάχην δορὸς ἐνδέξιος σῷ ποδὶ παρασπιστῆς βεβὼς Ἕγκέλαδον ἐτέαν ἃς μέσην θενὸν δορὶ ἔκτεινα – φέρ’ ἵδω, τούτ’ ἵδων ἄναρ λέγω; οὐ μὰ Δί’, ἐπεὶ καὶ σκῦλ’ ἐδείξα Βακχίῳ καὶ νῦν ἐκείνων μείζων’ ἐζαντλῶ πόνον. ἐπεὶ γὰρ Ἡρα σοι γένος Τυρσηνικὸν ληστῶν ἐπώρσεν, ὡς οὐδεθείς μακράν, πυθόμενος σὺν τέκνοισι ναυστολῶ σέθεν κατὰ ζήτησιν. ἐν πρόμυῃ δ’ ἄκρα αὐτὸς λαβὼν ἤθυνον ἀμφῆρες δόρυ, παῖδες δ’ ἐπ’ ἔρετμοις ἢμενοι γλαυκὴν ἅλα ῥοθίοισι λευκαίνοντες ἐζήτουν σ’, ἄναξ. ἦδη δὲ Μαλέας πληςίον πεπλευκότας ἀνεβάλεν ἡμᾶς τήνδ’ ἐς Αἴτναν πέτραν, ἢν οἱ μονῆς ποντίου παῖδες θεοῦ Κύκλωπες οἰκοῦσ’ ἀντὶ ἔρημ’ ἀνδροκτόνων. Τούτων ἔνος ληφθέντες ἐσμέν ἐν δόμοις δούλου ἐκαλοῦσι δ’ αὐτὸν ὅ λατρεύομεν Πολύφημον· ἀντὶ δ’ εὐίων βακχευμάτων ποίμνας Κύκλωπος ἀνοσίου ποιμαῖνομεν.
Characters of the Play

SILENUS, father of the satyrs
CHORUS, the satyrs captured by Polyphemus
ODYSSEUS
POLYPHEMUS, the Cyclops

Scene: Outside the cave of Polyphemus. Silenus holds a rake and appeals to the absent Dionysus.

SILENUS: O Bromius, because of you I have had countless labours, now and when my body was in the strength of its prime. First, when you were driven mad by Hera, you left and abandoned your nurses the mountain nymphs; then, in the battle against the Earthborn Giants [5], positioned on your right side as shield-bearer, and smiting Enceladus right in the middle of his wicker shield, I killed him ... hang on – let me see, am I just saying what I saw in a dream? No, by Zeus! For I even displayed the spoils to Bacchus.

But now I am enduring to the full a labour greater than those. [10] For when Hera roused the tribe of Tuscan pirates against you, so that you should be sold a long way off, <I myself> on learning this, set sail with my children, with the aim of finding you. Right on the stern, I myself took and steered the oared ship [15], and my boys sitting at the oars making the grey sea white <with> all their splashy rowing went in search of you, Lord. But then as we were sailing near Malea an easterly gale descending on the ship threw us onto this rock of Etna [20], where the one-eyed children of the sea-god, the Cyclopes who kill men, inhabit their isolated caves. We were caught and are slaves in the house of one of them. They call the master we serve Polyphemus. And instead of Bacchic revels [25] we tend the flocks of a godless Cyclops.
παίδες μὲν οὖν μοι κλειτύων ἐν ἐσχάτοις
νέμουσι μῆλα νέα νέοι πεφυκότες,
ἐγὼ δὲ πληροῦν πίστρα καὶ σαίρειν στέγας
μένον τέταγμαί τάςδε, τάδε δυσσεβείı
Κύκλωπι δείπνων ἀνοσίων διάκονος.
καὶ νῦν, τὰ προσταχθέντ', ἀναγκαῖος ἐξει
σαίρειν σιδηρὰ τῆδε μ’ ἀρπάγη δόμους,
ὡς τὸν τ’ ἀπόντα δεσπότην Κύκλωπ’ ἐμὸν
καθαροῖς ἀντροῖς μῆλα τ’ ἐσδεχόμεθα.
(30)
ἡδη δὲ παίδας προσνέμοντας εἰσορῶ
ποίμνας, τί ταῦτα; μὸν κρότος σικινίδων
ὁμοῖος ὑμῖν νῦν τε χῶτε Βακχίω
κάμος συνασπίζοντες Ἀλθαίας δόμους
προσήτ’ ἀοιδαῖς βαρβίτων σαυλούμυνοι;
(35)
ΧΟΡΟΣ

παῖ γενναίων μὲν πατέρων
γενναίων δ’ ἐκ τοκάδων,
πά δὴ μοι νίσις σκοπέλους;
οὐ τάδ’ ὑπήνεμος αὐ-
ρα καὶ ποιηρὰ βοτάνα,
(40)
διναύεν θ’ ὕδωρ ποταμὸν
ἐν πίστραις κεῖται πέλας ἄν-
τρων, οὔ σοι βλαχαὶ τεκέων;
ψύττ’ οὐ τάδ’, οὔ;
οὐ τάδε νεμὴ κλειτὺν δροσερὰν;
ὡς, ῥήσῃ πέτρον τάχα σου’
ὑπαγ’ ὑπαγ’ ὑπαγ’ ὑπαγ’ <πρὸς>
πληβότα στασιωρόν
Κύκλωπος ἀγροβάτα.
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My sons, then, on the remotest hill slopes tend the young flocks of sheep, being young themselves, while I, remaining here, am ordered to fill the drinking troughs and sweep out the dwelling as the menial servant of this impious Cyclops and his unholy meals. And now, my orders – I have to sweep out the house with this iron rake, so that I may welcome my absent master, the Cyclops, and his sheep in a clean cave.

*A chorus of satyrs begins to enter through a side-entrance, driving sheep before them.*

But now I see my boys driving the flocks here. What’s this? Are you really thumping away with dance-steps like those when you went to the house of Althaea, as a band of revellers and companions-at-arms of Bacchus, swaggering to the songs of lyres?

*Strophe*

CHORUS: *(addressing a ram)*

O son sprung from noble sires
and noble mothers,
tell me, by what path are you wandering towards the rocks?
Is there not a soft breeze and lush grass here
and swirling water from rivers
set aside in drinking troughs near the caves
where your bleating young are?

*Mesode*

Get on! Here! Here, won’t you!
Graze on the dewy hill-side here, won’t you?
Hey, I’ll soon throw a stone at you!
Get a move on! Get a move on, you ram,
<to> the guardian of the fold that belongs to the Cyclops,
the shepherd who roams the wild.
σπαργῶντας μαστοὺς χύλασον· ἀντιστροφή
dέξαι θηλὰς πορίσασ’ (56)
οὖς λείπεις ἄρνων θαλάμοις.
pοθοῦσι σ’ ἀμερόκοι-
tοι βλαχαὶ σμικρῶν τεκέων.
eἰς αὐλὰν πότ’ ἀμφιβαίνεις† (60)
pοιηροὺς λιποῦσα νομοὺς
Αἰτναίων εἴσω σκοπελῶν;
οὐ τάδε Βρόμιος, οὐ τάδε χοροί
Βάκχαι τε θυρσοφόροι,
oὐ τυμπάνων ἀλαλαγμοί,
oὐκ οὖνοι χλωραὶ σταγόνες
κρήναις παρ’ ὑδροχύτοις· (65)
oὐδ’ ἐν Νύσσῃ μετὰ Νυμ-
φάν ἵακχον ἴακχον ὧ-
dὰν μέλπω πρὸς τὰν Ἀφροδ−
tαν, ἃν θηρεύων πετόμαν
Βάκχαις σὺν λευκόποσιν.
ὦ φίλος ὦ φίλε Βακχεῖε,
pοῦ οἰοπολῶν
ξανθὰν χαίταν σείεις; (75)
ἐγὼ δ’ ό σὸς πρόπολος
Κύκλωπι θητεύω
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Antistrophe
Loosen your full udders. [55]
Receive those of the lambs whom you left in the chambers and give them your teats.
Your bleating little children, who have slept all day, are longing for you.
When †are you encircling† to your fold, [60]
leaving the pastures where you graze within Etna’s rocks?

Epode
There is no Bromius here, no choruses either, [65]
no thyrsus-wielding Bacchants,
no rapturous cries from drums,
no bright drops of wine [70]
beside the rushing waters of springs.
Nor can I sing with the Nymphs on Nysa the song “iacchos! iacchos!”
to Aphrodite, whom I pursued, flying along with the white-footed Bacchants.
O my friend, O my friend Bacchus, [75]
where are you, wandering, separated from your followers, are you shaking your golden hair?
I, your very own servant, am serf to the Cyclops,
τῷ μονοδέρκτα δοῦλος ἄλαινοιν
σὺν τάδε τράγου χλαίνη μελέα
σὰς χωρίς φυλίας. (80)

Σιλ. σιγήσατ’, ὦ τέκν’, ἄντρα δ’ ἐς πετρηρεφὴ
pοίμνας ἄθροίσαι προσπόλους κελεύσατε.

Χο. χωρείτ’ ἀτὰρ δὴ τίνα, πάτερ, σπουδὴν ἥξεις;

Σιλ. ὅρῳ πρὸς ἄκταίς ναὸς Ἑλλάδος σκάφος
κόπης τ’ ἄνακτας σὺν στρατηλάτῃ τινί
στείχοντας ἐς τὸδ’ ἄντρον’ ἁμφὶ δ’ αὐχέσιν
τεῦχη φέρονται κενά, βορᾶς κεχρημένοι,
κρωσσοὺς θ’ ύδρηλούς. ὦ ταλαίτωροι ξένοι·
tίνες ποτ’ εἰσίν; οὐκ ἵσασι δεσπότην
Πολύφημον οἰος ἄνδρα δεξένυν τε γῆν
τὴν ἔμβεβεσαι καὶ Κυκλωπίαν γνάθον
τὴν ἀνδροβρῶτα δυστυχῶς ἀφιγμένοι.
ἀλλ’ ἧσυχοι γίγνεσθ’, ἵν’ ἐκπυθώμεθα
πόθεν πάρεισι Σικελὸν Αἰτναῖον πάγον. (90)

ΟΔΥΣΣΕΥΣ ξένοι, φράσαιτ’ ἂν νάμα ποτάμιον πόθεν
dίψης ἄκος λάβοιμεν εἴ τέ τις θέλει
βορὰν ἠδήσαι ναυτίλοις κεχρημένοις;
<ἐξα’>
tί χρῆμα· Βρομίου πόλιν ἔοιγμεν ἐσβαλεῖν·
Σατύρων πρὸς ἄντροις τόνδ’ ὥμιλον εἴσοροῦ· (100)
χαίρειν προσεῖπα πρῶτα τὸν γεραίτατον.

Σιλ. χαίρ’, ὦ ξέν’, ὅστις δ’ εἰ φράσαν πάτρον τε σήν.

Οδ. Ἐθανάτου Ἐουσασέους, γῆς Κεφαλλήνων ἄναξ.

Σιλ. οἴδ’ ἀνδρά, κρόταλον ὅμιχα, Σισύφου γένος.

Οδ. ἐκείνος αὐτός εἰμι· λοιδόρει δὲ μή. (105)
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wandering in exile as a slave to this one-eyed monster, and wearing this miserable goat-skin cloak, separated from your friendship.

SIL: Be silent, my children, and order your attendants to herd the flocks into the rocky caves.

CHO: (to the attendants) Go on! But what’s making you anxious, father?

SIL: I see a ship – a Greek ship – and mighty oarsmen coming to this cave with someone who I suppose is their leader. Around their necks they carry empty containers – they must be wanting food – and pitchers for water. O unhappy strangers! Whoever are they? They have no idea what our master Polyphemus is like, and that the land they have reached is hostile to strangers and that they have come, by an ill fate, right into the man-eating Cyclopean jaw. But quieten down so that we can learn where they’ve come from to be here at Sicilian Etna’s rocky outcrop.

Odysseus and his men enter from the side.

ODYSSEUS: Strangers, would you tell us where we could find flowing river water to quench our thirst and if there is someone willing to sell food to sailors in need? <Hey>, what’s this? We seem to have invaded the city of Bromius. I see a gathering of satyrs here in front of the cave. I greet firstly the eldest.

SIL: Greetings, stranger, tell me who you are and what your country.

OD: Odysseus of Ithaca, king of the land of the Cephallenians.

SIL: I know the man, a shrill, relentless babbler, of the race of Sisyphus.

OD: I am that very man. No need to rub it in.
Σιλ. πόθεν Σικελίαν τήνδε ναυστολῶν πάρει;
Οδ. ἐξ Ἰλίου γε κάτο Τροϊκῶν πόνοιν.
Σιλ. πώς; πορθμὸν οὐκ Ἰδήσθα πατράς χθονός;
Οδ. ἀνέμων θύελλαι δεῦρο μ’ ἧρπασαι βία.
Σιλ. παπαῖ’ τὸν αὐτὸν δαίμον’ ἐξαντλεῖς εμοὶ.
Οδ. ἦ καὶ σὺ δεῦρο πρὸς βίαν ἀπεστάλης;
Σιλ. ληστὰς διώκων οἳ Βρόμιον ἀνήρπασαν.
Οδ. τίς δ’ ἦδε χώρα καὶ τίνες ναίουσι νιν;
Σιλ. Αἰτναῖος ὤχθος Σικελίας ὑπέρτατος.
Οδ. τείχη δὲ ποῦ ’στι καὶ πόλεως πυργώματα;
(110)
Σιλ. οὐκ ἔστ’ εἰς’ ἐρήμοι πρόνες ἄνθρωπων, ξένε.
Οδ. τίνες δ’ ἔχουσι γαῖαν; ἦ θηρῶν γένος;
Σιλ. Κύκλωπες, ἄντρ’ ἔχοντες, οὐ στέγας δόμων.
Οδ. τίνος κλώντες; ἦ δεδήμευται κράτος;
Σιλ. μονάδες: ἀκούει δ’ οὐδὲν οὐδεὶς οὐδενός.
Οδ. στειροῦσι δ’ – ἦ τό ξώσι; – Δήμητρος στάχνων;
(115)
Σιλ. γάλακτι καὶ τυροῖσι καὶ μήλων βορᾶ.
Οδ. Βρομίου δὲ πόμ’ ἔχουσιν, ἀμπέλου ρόας;
Σιλ. ἥκιστα· τοιγὰρ ἄχορον οἰκοῦσι χθόνα.
Οδ. τί φῄς; βορᾷ χαίρουσι ἀνθρωποκτόνῳ;
Σιλ. οὐδεὶς μολὼν δεῦρ’ ὅστις οὐ κατεσφάγη.
Οδ. αὐτὸς δὲ Κύκλωψ ποῦ ’στιν; ἦ δόμων ἐσω;
Σιλ. φρούδος, πρὸς Αἴτνῃ θῆρας ἰχνεύων κυσίν.
Οδ. οἴσθ’ οὐν δ’ ἰράσον, ὡς ἅπατρόμεν χθόνος;
Σιλ. οὐκ οἶδ’, Ὀδυσσεῦ; πάν δὲ σοὶ δράσας ἀν.
Οδ. δόσησον ἦμιν σίτων, οὐ σπανίζομεν.
Σιλ. οὐκ ἔστιν, ὥσπερ εἶπον, ἄλλο πλὴν κρέας.
Οδ. ἀλλ’ ἦδε λιμοῦ καὶ τόδε σχετήριον.
(135)
Σιλ. καὶ τυρὸς ὀπίας ἔστι καὶ βοὸς γάλα.
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Euripides: Cyclops

SIL: Where have you sailed from to be here in Sicily?

OD: From Ilion and the hardships at Troy.

SIL: How did you get here? Didn’t you know the way back to your fatherland?

OD: Stormy winds brought me here headlong by force.

SIL: Oh no! You are indeed suffering the same fate as befell me.

OD: So were you also driven here by force?

SIL: Yes, as I was chasing pirates who had abducted Bromius.

OD: What land is this and who inhabits it?

SIL: The mound of Etna, the highest in Sicily.

OD: But where are the city-walls and the fortifications?

SIL: There are none. The headlands are bereft of men, stranger.

OD: Who occupies the land? A race of beasts?

SIL: Cyclopes, who live in caves, not houses.

OD: Whose subjects are they? Or is power shared among the people?

SIL: They’re loners; nobody is subject at all to anyone else.

OD: Do they sow Demeter’s crop? Or what do they live on?

SIL: On milk, cheese, and the meat of sheep.

OD: Do they have the drink of Bromius, the streams of the grape-vine?

SIL: Absolutely not. For that reason they inhabit a land where there is no dancing.

OD: Are they kind to strangers and do they honour divine laws regarding strangers?

SIL: They say that strangers have the sweetest flesh.

OD: What are you saying? Do they delight in killing and eating men?

SIL: Nobody who has come here has not been eaten.

OD: But where is the Cyclops himself? Inside his dwelling?

SIL: He’s gone away towards Etna, tracking down wild beasts with his dogs.

OD: Do you know, then, what you are to do, so we may get off this land?

SIL: I don’t know, Odysseus. But we’d do anything to help you.

OD: Just sell us some bread, which we need.

SIL: There isn’t any, as I said, except for some meat.

OD: Well, that’s also a nice way of putting a stop to hunger.

SIL: And there’s cheese curdled with fig juice, and cow’s milk, too.
Οδ. ἐκφέρετε· φῶς γὰρ ἐμπολήμασιν πρέπει.
Σιλ. σὺ δ’ ἀντιδώσεις, εἰπέ μοι, χρυσὸν πόσον;
Οδ. οὐ χρυσὸν ἀλλὰ πῶμα Διονύσου φέρω.
Σιλ. ὃ φιλτατ’ εἰπών, οὐ σπανίζομεν πάλαι.
Οδ. καὶ μὴν Μάρων μοι πῶμ’ ἔδωκε, παῖς θεοῦ.
Σιλ. δν ἐξέθρεψα ταῖσδ’ ἐγώ ποτ’ ἁγκάλαις;
Οδ. ὁ Βάκχιον παῖς, ὡς σαφέστερον μάθης.
Σιλ. ἐν σέλμασιν νεώς ἐστιν ἢ φέρεις σὺ νιν;
Οδ. ὃδ’ ἁσκὸς δς κεύθει νιν, ὡς ὁρᾶς, γέρον.
Σιλ. οὔτος μὲν οὐδ’ ἂν τὴν γνάθον πλήσειε μου.
Οδ. ἐκφέρετε· φῶς γὰρ ἐμπολήμασιν πρέπει.
Σιλ. καὶ μὴν Μάρων μοι πῶμ’ ἔδωκε, παῖς θεοῦ.
Οδ. ὁ Βάκχιον παῖς, ὡς σαφέστερον μάθης.
Σιλ. ἐν σέλμασιν νεώς ἐστιν ἢ φέρεις σὺ νιν;
Οδ. ὃδ’ ἁσκὸς δς κεύθει νιν, ὡς ὁρᾶς, γέρον.
Σιλ. οὔτος μὲν οὐδ’ ἂν τὴν γνάθον πλήσειε μου.
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OD: Bring them out. Market goods deserve to see daylight.
SIL: And you, you’ll give me in return, tell me, how much gold?
OD: I carry not gold but the drink of Dionysus.
SIL: Ah, yours are the dearest words! That’s what we’ve needed for so long.

OD: And in fact Maron, the god’s own son, gave me this drink.
SIL: The one I myself once reared in these arms of mine?
OD: Yes, the son of Bacchus, so you may understand more clearly.
SIL: Is it in the hold of your ship or are you carrying it with you?
OD: (producing the wine-skin) Here is the wine-skin that contains it, as you see, old man.

SIL: But this wouldn’t even give me a mouthful.

 UINavigationController< A lacuna of two lines here >

OD: Yes; <> twice as much drink as flows from the wine-skin.
SIL: Well, you really are speaking of a beautiful and pleasant spring – just what I like.
OD: Do you want me to give you a taste of the wine unmixed, first?
SIL: That’s fair. For a taste calls for a sale.
OD: And look, I’ve even brought along a drinking cup with the wine-skin.
SIL: Come on, pour it out and let it gurgle in so I can remember what it means to drink.
OD: There, done!   SIL: O wow! What a beautiful scent it has!
OD: What? You saw that?   SIL: No, by Zeus! But I’m smelling it!
OD: Now taste, so that you don’t just praise it in words alone.
SIL: O wow!! Bacchus is calling me over to dance!
Yes! Yes! Yes!
OD: Did it really gurgle down your throat beautifully?
SIL: So that it reached the tips of my toes.
OD: And what’s more, we’ll give you some money, too.
SIL: Just loosen the wine-skin. Let the gold be.
OD: Now bring out cheeses and a young lamb.
SIL: I’ll do this, and not worry much about masters. I could go mad after drinking – yes, one cup – swapping all the Cyclopes’ flocks in
ῥίψας τ’ ἐς ἅλμην Λευκάδος πέτρας ἄπο
ἀπαξ μεθυσθεὶς καταβαλών τε τὰς ὀφρύς.
ὡς δς γε πίνων μὴ γέγηθε μαίνεται’
ιν’ ἔστι touti τ’ ὄρθθὶν ἐξανιστάναι
μαστοῦ τε ὀραγμὸς καὶ παρεσκευασμένων
ψαῦσαι χερόις λειμῶνος ὀρχηστῆς θ’ ἁμα
κακῶν τε λήστης. εἴτ’ ἐγὼ <οὐ> κυνήσομαι
τοινδὲ πῶμα, τὴν Κύκλωπος ἀμαθίαν
κλαίειν κελεύων καὶ τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν μέσον;

<Xo.> ἄκου’, Ὀδυσσεῦ· διαλαλήσωμέν τι σοι.
Οδ. καὶ μὴν φίλοι γε προσφέρεσθε πρὸς φίλον.
Χο. ἐλάβετε Τροίαν τὴν Ἑλένην τε χειρίαν;
Οδ. καὶ πάντα γ’ οἴκουν Πριαμιδῶν ἔπερσαμεν.
Χο. οὔκουν, ἐπειδή τὴν νεάνιν εἰλετε,
ἀπαντες αὐτὴν διεκροτήσατ’ ἐν μέρει,
ἐπεὶ γε πολλοὶς ἢδεται γαμομενή,
τὴν προδότιν, ἢ τοὺς θυλάκους τοὺς ποικίλους
περὶ τοῖν σκελοῖν ἱδούσα καὶ τὸν χρύσεον
κλῳὸν φοροῦντα περὶ μέσον τὸν αὐχένα
ἐξεπτοήθη, Μενέλεουν ἀνθρώποιον
λήπτων λαποῦσα; μηδαμοῦ γένος ποτὲ
φύναι γυναικῶν ὤφελ’, εἰ μὴ ’μοι μόνῳ.

<Σιλ.> ιδοὺ’ τάδ’ ύμῖν ποιμνίων βοσκήματα,
ἀναζ’ Ὀδυσσεῦ, μηκάδων ἀρνῶν τροφαί,
πηκτὸν γάλακτος τ’ οὐ σπάνια τυρεύματα.
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exchange for it, throwing myself from the Leucadian rocks into the salt
sea, drunk and relaxing my furrowed brows, just once. Since the one
who drinks without enjoying it is mad. (grabbing his phallus) With
drink it’s possible to make this stand to attention. You can grab hold of
breasts and lay your hands on bush all ready [170], and there’s dancing
to boot and a forgetting of woes. So shall I <not> kiss such a drink and
tell that moron of a Cyclops – and his eye in the middle of his head – to
go to hell?

Silenus goes into the cave.

<CHO>: Listen, Odysseus. We’d like to talk something over with you. [175]
OD: Well, of course, since you come to me as friends to a friend.
CHO: Did you take Troy and Helen captive?
OD: Yes, and we sacked every house belonging to the sons of Priam.
CHO: So, when you had captured the young woman, did you all bang her,
taking it in turns, [180] since she enjoys having sex with lots of
partners anyway, the traitor. When she saw him sporting all that fancy
trouser-equipment round his legs, and his gold necklace all around his
neck, she was swept away, leaving behind [185] that excellent little
fella, Menelaus. I wish that the race of women had never been created
anywhere at all … except for me alone!

Silenus enters from the cave.

SIL: Look, here are the sucklings from the flocks for you, lord Odysseus,
the nurslings of the bleating sheep, and abundant cheeses curdled with
milk. [190] (turning to Odysseus and his men) Off with the lot of you!
φέρεσθε· χωρεῖθ' ὡς τάχιστ' ἀντρων ἀπο,
βότρυος ἐμοὶ πῶμ' ἀντιδόντες εὐίου.
οἴμοι· Κύκλωψ ὄδ' ἔρχεται· τί δράσομεν;
Od.
ἀπολολάμεν τάρτ', ὥ γέρον· ποί χρή φυγεῖν;
Σιλ.
ἐσω πέτρας τήσδ', ὅπερ ἂν λάθοιτε γε. (195)
Od.
δεινὸν τὸδ' εἶπας, ἄρκυνον μολεῖν ἔσω.
Σιλ.
οὐ δεινόν· εἰσὶ καταφυγαὶ πολλαὶ πέτρας.
Od.
οὐ δῆτ': ἐπεὶ τὰν μεγάλα γ' ἡ Τροία στένοι,
εἰ φευξόμεσθ' ἔν' ἄνδρα, μυρίον ὄ' ὠχλον
Φρυγῶν ὑπέστην πολλάκις σῦν ἀσπίδι.
(200)
ἀλλ', εἰ θανεῖν δεί, καθθανοῦμεθ' εὐγενῶς
ἡ ζώντες αἰνὸν τὸν πάρος συσσώσμεν.
Οδ. δεινὸν τόδ' εἶπας, ἀρκύων μολεῖν ἔσω.
Σιλ.
οὐ δεινόν· εἰσὶ καταφυγαὶ πολλαὶ πέτρας.
Od.
οὐ δῆτ': ἐπεὶ τὰν μεγάλα γ' ἡ Τροία στένοι,
εἰ φευξόμεσθ' ἔν' ἄνδρα, μυρίον ὄ' ὠχλον
Φρυγῶν ὑπέστην πολλάκις σῦν ἀσπίδι.
(200)
ἀλλ', εἰ θανεῖν δεί, καθθανοῦμεθ' εὐγενῶς
ἡ ζώντες αἰνὸν τὸν πάρος συσσώσμεν.
Οδ. δεινὸν τόδ' εἶπας, ἀρκύων μολεῖν ἔσω.
Σιλ.
οὐ δεινόν· εἰσὶ καταφυγαὶ πολλαὶ πέτρας.
Od.
οὐ δῆτ': ἐπεὶ τὰν μεγάλα γ' ἡ Τροία στένοι,
εἰ φευξόμεσθ' ἔν' ἄνδρα, μυρίον ὄ' ὠχλον
Φρυγῶν ὑπέστην πολλάκις σῦν ἀσπίδι.
(200)
ἀλλ', εἰ θανεῖν δεί, καθθανοῦμεθ' εὐγενῶς
ἡ ζώντες αἰνὸν τὸν πάρος συσσώσμεν.
Οδ. δεινὸν τόδ' εἶπας, ἀρκύων μολεῖν ἔσω.
Σιλ.
οὐ δεινόν· εἰσὶ καταφυγαὶ πολλαὶ πέτρας.
Od.
οὐ δῆτ': ἐπεὶ τὰν μεγάλα γ' ἡ Τροία στένοι,
Move away from the cave as quickly as you can and give me a drink of Bacchus’ wine in return. Oh no! The Cyclops is coming this way! What are we going to do?

OD: Then we’re done for, old man. Where can we to escape to?
SIL: Inside the cave here, where you might well escape him. [195]
OD: This is dangerous, what you say, to go into a trap.
SIL: No, it’s not dangerous. There are many places to hide in the cave.
OD: No, not in there! Since Troy, I tell you, would groan very loudly if we are going to flee one man, when many times with my shield at the ready [200] I stood against a throng of Trojans beyond counting. But if I must die, I shall die nobly, or I shall live and preserve my good repute of old.

Enter the Cyclops by a side entrance.

CYCLOPS: Get out of the way! Make way! What’s this? What’s this idleness? Why are you performing a Bacchic revel? There’s no Dionysus here, no castanet of bronze, no rattle of the drums! [205] Tell me: how are my newborn lambs in the cave? Are they at the teat and are they running to their mothers’ under-bellies? Has milk been drawn to fill the rush-made baskets for cheese? What have you got to say for yourselves? What do you say? One of you will soon start shedding tears [210] courtesy of my club! Look upwards, not down!

CHO: See? My head is bent upwards towards Zeus himself, and I can see the stars and Orion.

CY: Is my meal well prepared?

CHO: It’s here. Only may your gullet be well ready. [215]
Κυ. ἦ καὶ γάλακτός εἰσὶ κρατῆρες πλέω;
Χο. ὥστ' ἐκπιεῖν γέ σ', ἢν θέλης, ὅλον πίθον.
Κυ. μῆλειον ἢ βόειον ἢ μεμειγμένον;
Χο. ὃν ἂν θέλης σὺ; μὴ ἐμε καταπίῃς μόνον.
Κυ. ἥκιστ'· ἐπεὶ μ' ἂν ἐν μέση τῇ γαστέρι
πηδώντες ἀπολέσαι τ' ἂν ὑπὸ τῶν σχημάτων.

(220)

κυ. ἦς τ' ὅχλον τόνδ' ὥρῳ πρὸς αὐλίοις;
λησταί τίνες κατέσχον ἢ κλώπες χθόνα;

(225)

ὁρῶ γέ τοι τούσδ' ἄρνας ἐξ ἄντρων ἐμῶν
στρεπταίς λύγοις σῶμα συμπεπλεγμένους
τεύχη τε τυρόν συμμιγή γέροντά τε
πληγαις μέτωπον φαλακρόν ἐξοδηκότα.

Σιλ. ὢμοι, πυρέσσω συγκεκομμένος τάλας.
Κυ. ὑπὸ τοῦ; τίς ἐς σὸν κρᾶτ' ἐπύκτευσεν, γέρον;
Σιλ. ὑπὸ τῶνδε, Κύκλωψ, ὅτι τὰ σ' οὐκ εἴων φέρειν.

(230)

Κυ. οὐκ ἦσαν ὄντα θεοῦ μὲ καὶ θεῶν ἀπό;
Σιλ. ἐλεγον ἐγὼ τάδ’· οἱ δ’ ἑφόρουν τὰ χρήματα,
καὶ τὸν γε τυρὸν οὐκ ἐώντος ἔσθιον
toύς τ’ ἄρνας ἐξεροθύντο οἰδήσαντες δὲ σὲ
κλωφ’ τριπήχει, κατὰ τὸν ὀρθαλμὸν μέσον
τὰ σπλάγχν’ ἔφασκον ἐξαμήσεσθαι βίᾳ,

(235)

μάστιγι τι’ ἐν τῷ νότον ἀπολέσθαι σέθεν,
κάπετα συνδήσαντες ἐς θάδωλια
tῆς ναὸς ἐμβαλόντες ἀποδώσειν τινὶ
πέτρους μοχλεύειν, ἡ 'ς μυλόνα καταβαλεῖν.

(240)

Κυ. ἄληθες; οὔκουν κοπίδας ὡς τάχιστ’ ἰὼν
θῆξεις μαχαίρας καὶ μέγαν φάκελον ἐξολὼν
ἐπιθεῖς ἀνάψεις; ὡς σφαγέντες αὐτίκα
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And are the bowls full of milk?

So full that, if you want, you can drink a whole storage jar.

Is it sheep’s or cow’s milk or mixed?

Whatever you like. Only please don’t gulp me down.

Of course not. Since you would kill me [220] with all your dancing, leaping around in my belly. Hey! What’s this mob I see in front of my house? Are they robbers or thieves who have put into shore here? Anyway, I see my lambs here from my cave with their bodies all bound up together with twigs [225], and I see my baskets of cheeses jumbled everywhere, and the old man with his bald head and face all swollen up from a beating.

Ah me! Wretched me! The pains of my beating are burning me up!

Who did this? Who has been pounding your head, old man?

These men did it, Cyclops, because I wouldn’t allow them to carry off your things.

Didn’t they know that I am a god and am sprung from gods?

I told them this myself. But they continued to carry off your property and began to eat your cheese, although (I) wouldn’t allow it, and to bring your sheep outside. And they boasted that they would bind you with a collar three cubits wide and in full view of that big eye of yours rip out your guts with brute force [235]; then they’d flay your back good and proper with a whip, then tie you all up and throw you onto the benches of their ship and sell you off to someone to heave rocks, or throw you into a mill-house.

Really? (to a follower) Now then, you go and sharpen my cleaver, my knives and pile up a great bundle of fire-wood and set it alight – and
πλήσουσι νηδὺν τὴν ἐμὴν ἀπ’ ἀνθρακος
θερμὴν διδόντες δαίτα τῷ κρεανόμῳ,
τά δ’ ἐκ λέβητος ἔφη καὶ τετηκότα.
ὥς ἐκπλεώς γε δαίτας εἰμ’ ὀρεσκόου’
ἀλλ’ ἐδότων ἐστὶ μοι θοινομένω
ἐλάφων τε, χρόνιος δ’ εἰμ’ ἀπ’ ἀνθρώπων βορᾶς.

Χο. τὰ καινὰ γ’ ἐκ τῶν ἰθάδων, ὦ δέσποτα,
ηδίον’ ἔστιν. οὐ γὰρ οὐν νεωστί γε
ἄλλοι πρὸς ἄντρα σοφαρκόντο ἔνοι.

Οδ. Κύκλωψ, ἄκουσον ἐν μέρει καὶ τῶν ἔννοι.
ἡμεῖς βορᾶς ἤχεισιν ἐμπολὴν λαβείν
σῶν ἄσσον ἄντρων ἰλθομεν νεως ἀπο.
τοὺς δ’ ἁρνας ήμῖν οὕτως ἄντ’ οἴνου σκύφου
ἀπημπόλα τε καθίσου πείν λαβών
ἐκὼν ἔκοισι, κούδεν ἥν τούτων βία.
ἀλλ’ οὕτως γυίζες οὕδεν δὲν φησιν λέγει,
ἐπεὶ κατελήψηθα σοὶ λάθρα πωλῶν τὰ σά.

Σιλ. ἐγὼ; κακῶς γ’ ἀρ’ ἔξολοι’. ὸδ. εἰ ψευδομαι.

Σιλ. μα τὸν Ποσειδώ τὸν τεκόντα σ’, ὦ Κύκλωψ,
μα τὸν μέγαν Τρίτωνα καὶ τὸν Νηρέα,
μα τὴν Καλυψό τὰς τε Νηρεως κόρας,
μα θαὶερὰ κύματ’ ἰχθύων τε πᾶν γένος,
ἀπώμοσ’, ὦ κάλλιστον, ὦ Κυκλώπιον,
ὁ δεσποτίσκε, μὴ τὰ σ’ ἐξοδάν ἐγὼ
ἐξαισία χρήματ’, ἥ κακῶς οὕτως κακοὶ
οἱ παῖδες ἀπόλοιθ’, οὓς μάλιστ’ ἐγὼ φιλῶ.
Χο. αὐτὰς ἐξ’ ἐγὼ γε τοὺς ἐξείνας τὰ χρήματα
περνάντα σ’ εἰδόν’ εἰ δ’ ἐγὼ ψευδή λέγω,
ἀπόλοιθ’ ὁ πατήρ μου τοὺς ξένους δὲ μὴ ἀδίκει.
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get a move on, will you? Since, once they’re slaughtered, they’ll soon fill my belly, giving me the dispenser of meat a hot feast from the coals, and the rest will be boiled and cooked from the cauldron. Since I’m fed up with meat from the mountains: I have had enough of feasting on lions and deer, and I’ve been too long deprived of eating a man’s flesh.

SIL: After one’s usual diet, O master, new food really is more pleasant. And recently other strangers haven’t been arriving at your cave.

OD: Cyclops, listen also to us strangers in turn. We came from our ship near your cave wanting to make a purchase of food. And this man sold these sheep to us, in return for a cup of wine, and after getting his drink, traded them to us, a voluntary seller to voluntary customers. There was no violence in any of this. But he speaks no truth in anything he says, since he was caught selling your things while your back was turned.

SIL: Me? In that case – may you die a miserable death!

OD: If I’m lying.

SIL: By Poseidon, your own father, O Cyclops, by great Triton and Nereus, by Calypso and the daughters of Nereus, by the holy waves and the entire race of fishes, I swear, O my most handsome little Cyclops, O my darling little master, that I really was not going to sell your things to these strangers. Otherwise may these miserable boys of mine, whom I love so dearly, die a miserable death.

CHO: That’s what you deserve. I myself saw you selling his property to the strangers. If I’m telling lies, may my father die. (to the Cyclops) Don’t wrong the strangers.
Κυ. ἤ τίς κακίστης οἱ μετῆλθον άρπαγάς
'Ελένης Σκαμάνδρου γείτον’ Ἰλίου πόλιν;
Οδ. οὗτοι, πόνον τον δεινὸν ἐξηντληκότες.
Οδ. θεοῦ τὸ πράγμα· μηδέν’ αἰτιῶ βροτῶν.
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CY: (to the chorus) You’re lying. As far as I’m concerned, I trust this man more than I would Rhadamanthys and I say he is more just, too. (to Odysseus and his men) But I want to ask you something. Where have you sailed from, strangers? [275] What country are you from? Which city reared you?

OD: We are Ithacans by birth, and we have come to your land from Troy, having sacked that city, since we were driven off our course by storms at sea, Cyclops.

CY: So are you the ones who went to avenge on the city of Troy, by the banks of Scamander, [280] the abduction of the most vile Helen?

OD: Yes, we are the ones who endured to the full that mighty labour.

CY: A shameful campaign, in that you sailed to the land of the Phrygians for the sake of one woman.

OD: It was the deed of a god. I don’t blame any mortal for it. [285] But we, O noble son of the god of the deep, beg you as suppliants and are speaking freely: do not bring yourself to kill friends who have arrived at your cave, and make an unholy meal for your jaws. O lord, we protected your father and the sites of his temples [290] for him to occupy within the folds of Greece. The harbour of sacred Taenarus remains intact, so too the caverns of cape Malea, the rock of Sunium, that belongs to the goddess Athena, is safe with all its silver beneath, and safe are the sheltered places of Geraestus. We did not surrender Greece’s cause [295] to Phrygians, †a senseless disgrace†. You also share in these things. For the land in whose folds you live – under Etna the rock that streams with fire – is Greek.

But, if you turn your back on these arguments, there is a law among mortals, that you should receive those who have been languishing at sea as suppliants, [300] give them hospitality and provide them with
ζένια τε δοῦναι καὶ πέπλους ἐπαρκέσαι,
οῦκ ἀμφὶ βουπόροις πηχθέντας μέλη
ὀβελοῖσι νηδὺν καὶ γνάθον πλῆσαι σέθεν.
ὡς δὲ Πριάμου γαῖ' ἐχήρωσ' Ἑλλάδα
πολλῶν νεκρῶν πιοῦσα δοριπετὴ φόνον
άλόγους τ᾿ ἀνάνδρους γραῦς τ᾿ ἀπαιδας ὀδηγεῖς
πολλοὺς τε πατέρας. εὰ δὲ τοὺς λελειμμένους
ποὺ συμπιρώσας δαίτ᾿ ἀναλώσεις πικράν,
ποὶ τρέγεται τίς; ἀλλ᾿ ἐμοὶ πιθοῦ, Κύκλωψ
πάρες τὸ μάργον σῆς γνάθου, τὸ δ᾿ εὐσεβές
κέρδη ποινηρὰ ζημιὰν ἡμείσιαν. (305)

Σιλ.

παραίνεσαι σοι βούλομαι τὸν γὰρ κρεῶν
μηδὲν λίπτῃς τοῦτ᾿ ἢν δὲ τὴν γλώσσαν δάκης,
κομψὸς γενήσῃ καὶ λαλίστατος, Κύκλωψ. (310)

Κυ.

ο πλοῦτος, ἀνθρωπίσκε, τοῖς σοφοῖς θεός,
τὰ δ᾿ ἀλλὰ κόμποι καὶ λόγων εὐμορφίαι.
ἀκρας δ᾿ ἐναλίας αῖς καθιδρυται πατηρ
χαίρειν κελεύω τί τάδε προυστήσω λόγῳ;
Ζηνὸς δ᾿ ἐγὼ κεραυνὸν οὐ φρίσσω, ξένη,
οὗδ᾿ οἰδ᾿ ὅτι Ζεύς ἔστ᾿ ἐμοὶ κρείσσων θεός.
οὐ μοι μέλει τὸ λοιπὸν ὡς δ᾿ οὐ μοι μέλει
ἄκουσον· ὅταν ἄνωθεν ὄμβρον ἐκχέῃ,
ἐν τῇδε πέτρᾳ ἔχω σκηνώματα, καὶ μόσχον
δαινύμενος, εὔ τέγγων τε γαστέριν,
ἐπεκπιὼν γάλακτος ἀμφορέα, πέπλον
κρούω, Διὸς βρονταῖσιν εἰς ἔριν κτυπῶν. (315)
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clothes, not that they should have their limbs pierced on beef-skewers and fill a belly and appetite like yours. The land of Priam has made Greece bereft enough as it is, having drunk many corpses’ blood that was shed by the spear, [305] and has destroyed wives left without their husbands and made old women and grey-haired fathers childless. If you are going to put those that are left together into the fire and consume them in a cruel feast, where can one turn? But listen to me, Cyclops. Let go of this mad appetite, and choose what is holy [310] instead of what is unholy. Because wicked gains return punishment for many men.

SIL: I want to give you some advice. Don’t leave behind a single morsel of this man’s flesh. For if you bite off his tongue, you will become oh-so-smart and the best chatterer around, Cyclops. [315]

CY: Little man, wealth is god for the wise; the rest is all pompous and fine-seeming words. As for the sea-side capes where my father is set up in temples, I bid them ‘good riddance’. Why did you put them in the forefront of your speech? But I don’t tremble before the thunderbolt of Zeus, stranger, [320] nor am I convinced that Zeus is a mightier god than I am. Zeus isn’t going to worry me for the future. As to why he doesn’t worry me, hear this: whenever he sends the rain down from above, I have a water-proof shelter in this rock, and, dining on a roasted calf or some beast, [325] I lie on my back and give my belly a good soaking by drinking dry a storage jar of milk, and I bang my clothes, making enough noise to rival Zeus with his thunderings.
ὅταν δὲ βορέας χιόνα Θρῄκιος χέῃ,
καὶ πῦρ ἄναίθων, χιόνος οὐδέν μοι μέλει.
ἡ γῆ δ’ ἀνάγκη, καὶν θέλη κἀν μὴ θέλη,
τίκτουσα ποίαν τάμα πιαίνει βοτά.
ἀγώ οὖνιν θῶ νυκτὶ πλῆν ἐμοὶ, θεοίσθη δ’ οὖ,
καὶ τῇ μεγίστῃ, γαστρὶ τῇδε, δαίμονων.
οὐ τοῦμπιεῖν γε καὶ φαγεῖν τοὺφ’ ἡμέραν,
Ζεὺς οὗτος ἄνθρωποις ἁλίκτουσα τἀμὰ πιαίνει βοτά.
ἁγὼ οὔτινι θύω πλὴν ἐμοί, θεοῖσθι δ’ οὐ,
καὶ τῇ μεγίστῃ, γαστρὶ τῇδε, δαίμονων.

Ὁδ. αἰτὶ, πόνους μὲν Τροϊκοὺς ὑπεξέδυν
θαλασσίους τε, νῦν δ’ ἐς ἀνδρὸς ἀνοσίου
ὠμὴν κατέσχον ἀλίμην τε καρδίαν.
ὦ Παλλάς, ὦ δέσποινα Διογένεις θεά,
νῦν νῦν ἄρηξον· κρείσσονας γὰρ Ἰλίου
πόνους ἀφῆγµαί κἀπὶ κινδύνου βάθρα.
Whenever a northern wind from Thrace pours down the snow, I cover my body with the skins of wild beasts, [330] and get a fire blazing, and the snow is no worry for me at all. And the earth perforce, willy-nilly, brings forth grass and fattens my livestock. I don’t sacrifice them to anyone except myself – not to the gods at all – but also to my stomach here, the greatest of divinities. [335] Since to drink and eat all you want every day and not cause yourself any grief – this is Zeus for folk who are sensible. Those who have established laws and complicated human life, can go to hell. <While> as for me, I won’t stop short of gratifying [340] my desire by eating you. But as for hospitality, you’ll have the following, so I’ll remain blameless: fire and this ancestral bronze (cauldron), which, while it boils, will hold your chopped flesh nicely. But go inside, so that, standing around the altar of the god [345] within the cave, you may provide me with a feast.

**OD:** Ah! Ah! I have escaped ordeals at Troy and on the sea, but now have come to shore at a godless man’s savage heart – no harbour at all. O Pallas, o mighty goddess born of Zeus, [350] come to help us now, now! For I have come to an ordeal greater than any I faced at Troy and am on the hard edge of danger. And you, Zeus, whose home is amongst the bright seat of the stars, protector of strangers, look upon these
σὺ τ’, ὦ φαεννάς ἀστέρον οἰκῶν ἔδρας
Zeû ξένι’, ὥρα τάδ’: εἰ γὰρ αὐτὰ μὴ βλέπεις,
ἄλλως νομίζῃ, Ζεῦ, τὸ μηδὲν ὃν θεός. (355)

Χο. εὐρείας φάρυγος, ὦ Κύκλωψ,
ἄναστόμου τὸ χεῖλος· ὡς ἔτοιμά σοι
ἐφθὰ καὶ ὀπτὰ καὶ ἀνθρακίας ἀπὸ <θερμά>
χαῦειν βρύκειν
κρεοκοπεῖν μέλη ξένων
dασυμάλλω ἐν αἰγίδι κλινομένω. (360)

μὴ 'μοὶ μὴ προσδίδου·
μόνος μόνῳ γέμιζε πορθμίδος σκάφος.
χαιρέτῳ μὲν αὐλίς ἀδε,
χαιρέτῳ δὲ θυμάτων
ἀποβώμιος †ἀν ἔχει θυσίαν†
Κύκλωψ Λιτναῖος ξενικῶν
κρεῶν κεχαρμένος βορᾶ.

†νηλῆς ὃ τλάμον ὡς τεσπσιών δωμάτων†
ἐφεστίους ἱκτῆρας ἐκθύει δόμων,
κόπτων βρύκων (372)
θέρμ’ ἀπ’, ἀνθρακών κρέα
<
>.
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things! For if you do not see them, then in vain are you worshipped, Zeus, when you are nothing as a god. [355]

The Cyclops drives Odysseus and his men into the cave. Silenus follows.

Strophe

CHO: O Cyclops, open up the mouth of your wide gullet, since the limbs of your guests are ready for you, all boiled and roasted and <hot> from the coals to munch, gnaw, tear in pieces, as you lie back in your thick-fleeced goat-skin. [360]

Mesode

Don’t, I tell you, don’t offer me any. Alone, for yourself alone, fill up the hull of your ship. Let me be rid of this dwelling! Let me be rid of this godless †sacrifice† of victims, †which† the Cyclops of Etna †conducts†, as he rejoices in the meat from his guests for food.

Antistrophe

†O cruel one! Piteless is the one who in his home† sacrifices suppliants come to the hearth in his home and who feasts on them roasted and with polluted teeth, tearing, gnawing at their flesh hot from the coals.

<Some editors see a lacuna here>
Οδ. ὦ Ζεῦ, τί λέξω, δείν’ ἵον ἄντρων ἔσω
κοῦ πιστά, μύθοις εἰκότ’ οὐδ’ ἔργοις βροτῶν;
Χο. τί δ’ ἔστ’, Ὅδυσσεῦ; μών τεθοίναι σέθεν
φίλους ἐταίρους ἀνοσιώτατος Κύκλωψ;
Οδ. διςσώς γ’ ἀθρήσας κάπιβαστάςας χεροί
οἱ σαρκίς εἶχον εὐτράφεστατον πάχος.
Χο. πῶς, ὦ ταλαίπωρ’, ἢτε πάσχοντες τάδε;
Οδ. ἐπει πετραίαν τήνδ’ ἐσήλθομεν στέγην,
ἀνέκαυσε μὲν πῦρ πρῶτον, ὑψηλῆς δρυὸς κορμοὺς πλατείας ἐσχάρας βαλὼν ἔπι,
τρισσών ἀμαξῶν ὡς ἀγώγιμον βάρος,
καὶ χάλκεοι λέβητ’ ἐπέξεσεν πυρί.
Επειτα φύλλων ἐλατίνων χαμαιπέτῃ
ἐστρωσεν εὐνὴν πυρὸς φλογί.
κρατῆρα δ’ ἐξέπλησεν ὡς δεκάμφορον,
μᾶξας ἀμέλξας, λευκὸν ἐσχέας γάλα,
σκύφος τε κισσοῦ παρέθετ’ εἰς κύτος τριῶν
πῆξεν, βάθος δὲ τεσσάρων ἐφαίνετο,
ὡς δ’ ἦν ἕτοιμα πάντα τῷ θεοστυγεῖ
Ἅιδου μαγείρῳ, φῶτε συμμάρψας δύο ἑνὶ τὸν μὲν λέβητος ἐς κύτος χαλκῆλατον
377 τεθοίναι Reiske: γε θοινάται L
380 εὐτραφεστατόν Scaliger: ἐντραφεστατόν L: εὐτραφεστατόν P
382 στέγην Musgrave: χθόνα L
392 after 385 Paley, after 395 Hartung
387 ἐστρωσεν Pierson: ἐστησεν L
394 τάλλα Scaliger: γ’ άλλα L: κλάδων Scaliger: κλάδω (i.e. κλάδῳ) L and (-ω) Athenaeus 14.650a
394–5 lacuna Boissonade, 395–6 Fix
395 del. Diggle
397 Ἅιδου Stephanus: δίδου L
397, 399, 395 σφαγεῖον Αἰτναίον γε, πελέκεως γνάθοις, 398 ... ρυθμῷ τινι, 400 Seaford
398 θ’ ἐνι Wilamowitz: τινι L
399 κύτος Aldine: σκύτος L
Odysseus enters from the cave.

OD: O Zeus, what am I to say, when I’ve witnessed such terrible things inside the cave – things that are incredible, like stories but not like deeds of mortals?

CHO: What is it, Odysseus? That most godless Cyclops hasn’t really feasted on your dear companions, has he?

OD: Yes, he spotted two and weighed them in his hands as they had the fattest, most well-nourished flesh. [380]

CHO: O wretched man, how could you all go on enduring these things?

OD: When we entered this rocky dwelling, firstly he lit up the fire, throwing onto the wide hearth the trunks of a huge oak tree heavy enough for about three wagon loads, [385] then he put a bronze cauldron to boil on the fire. [392] Then he laid out on the ground a bed of pine tree leaves near the fire’s blaze. After milking the cows, he filled a bowl about as big as ten storage jars, pouring white milk into it, and he set next to it a cup of ivy wood about three cubits wide and which looked to be four cubits deep, as well as spits made of branches of thorny wood whose ends had been burnt in fire, [398] but the rest smoothed with a sickle †and sacrificial bowls of Etna for the jaws of his axes†. [395] When everything was ready for that butcher from hell, so hateful to the gods, snatching up two men among my companions he cut their throats, and in one movement one of them into the bronze hollow of the cauldron. As for the other, he seized him
<
τὸν δ’ αὖ, τένοντος ἁρπάσας ἄκρου ποδός,
pαιών πρὸς ὄξιν στόνυχα πετραῖον λίθου
ἔγκεφαλον ἐξέρρανε· καὶ ἔκαθαρτάσας
λάβρου μαχαίρα σάρκας ἐξώπτα πυρί,
tά δ’ ἐς λέβητ’ ἐφήκεν ἐψεσθαι μέλη.
ἐγὼ δ’ ὁ τλήμων δάκρυ’ ἀπ’ ὀφθαλμῶν χέων
ἐχριμπτόμην Κύκλωπι καθαρπάσαν·
ἄλλοι δ’ ὃπως ὄρνιθες ἐν μυχοῖς πέτρας
πτήξαντες εἵχον, ἁίμα δ’ οὐκ ἐνήν χροί.
ἐπει δ’ ἐταίρων τῶν ἐμῶν πλησθεὶς βορᾶς
ἀνέπεσε, φάρυγος αἰθέρ’ ἐξανεὶς βαρῶν,
ἐσήλθε μοι τι θείον· ἐμπλήσας σκύφος
καθαρπάσας δ’ ὑπαίτιον τοῦ θεοῦ Κύκλωψ,
πετραῖον τὸν ἐμέν δ’ οἰον Ἑλλάς ἀμπέλον ἄπο
θείον κομίζει γάμον, Διυνύσου γάμος.
ὁ δ’ ἐξολευός δὲν τῆς ἀνασχύντου βορᾶς
ἐξεῖς ἐς τ’ ἐς τάδ’ ἐκπλεως χεῖρα· Φίλτατε ξένων,
καλὴν κύλικα δαιτὶ πρὸς καλῇ δίδως.
ἡσθέντα δ’ αὐτὸν ὡς ἐπῃσθόμην ἐγώ,
ὦ παῖ αὐτὸν ὣς ἐπισθομήν ἐγώ,
ὑλὴν ἐδωκά κύλικα, γιγνώσκων ὁτὶ
τρώσει νὸν οἶνος καὶ δίκην δῶσει τάχα.
>
399–400 lacuna (containing e.g. ἔρριψε) Diggle
401 στόνυχα Scaliger: γ’ ὄνυχα L
402 διαρπάσας or διαρταμῶν Paley
404 τά δ’ Heath: τάδ’ L
406 καθαρπάνου W. Dindorf: καὶ διηκόνου L
407 ἄλλοι Kirchhoff: ἄλλοι L
410 αἰθέρ’ L and Athenaeus 1.23e: ἀέρ’ Scaliger; ἐξανεὶς Porson: ἐξανεὶς L: ἐξανεὶς Athenaeus
412 αὐτοῦ τοῦδε L. Dindorf: αὐτοῦ τόδε (i.e. τόδε) L
413 ὦ παῖ Aldine
416 ἐπιστώμην Dobree
417 <τ’> Barnes
419 καλὴ (i.e. καλῆ) Tr2: καλὸν L: καλῆ also L (or Tr1)
422 οἶνος following Herwerden Murray: οἶνος L
by his ankle, [400] dashed him against the sharp edge of a rocky stone and spattered his brains out. And †seizing down† their flesh with a savage blade he roasted them over the fire and threw their limbs into the cauldron to boil. In my misery, pouring forth tears from my eyes, I myself stood nearby [405] and was servant to the Cyclops. But the others like birds kept cowering in the recesses of the cave, and the blood was gone from their faces.

Then after glutting himself on the flesh of my companions, as he slumped back and let a deep belch from his gullet, [410] an idea sent from some god came to me. I filled a cup with Maron’s wine here and offered it to him to drink saying this: “O son of the ocean god, Cyclops, see what sort of divine drink this is that Greece provides from the vine, the joy of Dionysus.” [415] And he, full up with that most shameful meal, received it <and> drained it, knocking it back in one draught, and praised it, raising his hand: “Dearest of guests, you’ve given me a splendid drink to follow a splendid meal.” When I realised that he was pleased by this [420] I gave him another cup, knowing that the wine would be his ruin, and that he would soon pay his due. Sure enough, he started singing, while I kept pouring out one
καὶ ὅ ἐπὶ πρὸς ὀδῶς εἴρπτʼ ἐγὼ δʼ ἐπεγχέον ἄλλης ἐπʼ ἄλλης σπλάγχν’ ἐθέρμανον ποτῶ.

δὲι δὲ παρὰ κλαίουσι συνναύταις ἐμοῖς ἄμουσ’, ἐπηχεῖ δ’ ἄντρον. ἐξελθὼν δ’ ἐγὼ σιγὴ σὲ σῶσαι καὶ, ἐὰν βούλῃ, θέλω.

ἀλλʼ εἶπατʼ εἴτε χρήζετ’ εἴτʼ οὐ χρήζετε φεῦγειν ἄμεικτον ἄνδρα καὶ τὰ Βακχίου ναιεῖν μέλαθρα Ναῖδων νυμφῶν μέτα.

ο ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐνδὸν σὸς πατὴρ τάδ’ ἤνεσεν· ἀλλʼ ἄσθενῆς γὰρ κάποι ἀνδρὸς ἐκφυγόντες ποτῶ.

ἄμουσ’, ἐπηχεῖ δ’ ἄντρον. ἐξελθὼν δ’ ἐγὼ σιγῇ σὲ σῶσαι καὶ, ἐὰν βούλῃ, θέλω.

ἀλλʼ εἶπατʼ εἴτε χρήζετ’ εἴτʼ οὐ χρήζετε φεῦγειν ἄμεικτον ἄνδρα καὶ τὰ Βακχίου ναιεῖν μέλαθρα Ναῖδων νυμφῶν μέτα.

ἀλλʼ ἀσθενῆς γὰρ κάποι ἀνδρὸς ἐκφυγόντες ποτῶ.

425 συνναύταις Aldine: σὺν ναύταις L, cf. 705
426 ἐπηχεῖ Barnes: ἐπῆχε L
430 Ναῖδων Casaubon: δαναίδων L
436 ἀνάλαβ’ o hiatus Par.: ἀναλαβοῦ L
439–40 τὸν ψύχον χρησφοροῦν (or -ομαι) | σφραγίζεσθαι τὸν ψύχον | Diggle: (τὸν ψύχον σφραγίζεσθαι τὸν ψύχον)
440 οὐ L; ἕκαστο χηρεύοντα καταφυγήν Hermann
444 o hiatus Par.: kathapheusis
448 kathapheusis L
449 ἡ προθυμία Musgrave: ἡ ’πιθυμία L
cup after another and warmed his innards with the drink. So he sings
his cacophony next to my fellow sailors who are weeping, [425] while
his cave resounds with it. Now I’ve come out quietly, because I want
to save you and me, if you’re willing. So tell me if you do or don’t
want to escape this monstrous man and live in the halls of Bacchus
with the Naiad nymphs. [430] For your father inside has approved of
it; but he’s weak because he’s been taking full advantage of the drink,
captured in the cup as if in bird lime and is struggling with his wings. But
you – since you’re still young – be saved with me and resume your old
friendship [435] with Dionysus, who’s not like the Cyclops.

CHO: O dearest friend, if only we could see that day when we escape the
godless presence of the Cyclops! For a long time now †my own siphon
has been widowed and I’ve been unable to eat!†

OD: Well, hear the revenge I have for that utterly ruthless beast and the
escape from your slavery.

CHO: Tell me! Because I would not more gladly hear the sound of the Asian
kithara than that the Cyclops had been destroyed.

OD: He wants to go to his brother Cyclopes to a revel, since he is so pleased
by this Bacchic drink.

CHO: I understand. You’re raging to grab him when he’s by himself in the
woods to cut his throat or to push him down a cliff.

OD: No such thing. My purpose is to do this through cunning.
Χο. πώς δαί; σοφόν τοί σ’ ὄντ’ ἀκούομεν πάλαι.  (450)
Οδ. κώμου μὲν αὐτόν τοῦ δ’ ἀπαλλάξαι, λέγων ὡς οὔ Κύκλωψ πῆμα χρῆ δούναι τόδε, 
μόνον δ’ ἔχοντα βίοτον ἡδέως ἄγειν. οὗτον δ’ ὑπνώσησθε βακχίου νικώμενος, 
ἄκρεμόν ἐλαίας ἔστιν ἐν δόμοις τις, 
ὁτ’ ἐξαποξύνας ὡς οὐ Κύκλωπι πῶμα χρὴ δοῦναι τόδε, 
μόνον δ’ ἔχοντα βίοτον ἡδέως ἄγειν. 
οὕτω κυκλώσω δαλὸν ἐν φαεσφόροι 
Κύκλωπος ὄψει καὶ συναυανῶ κόρας.  (455)
Χο. ἰοῦ ιοῦ· 
γέγηθα μαινόμεσθα τοῖς εὑρήμασιν.  (460)
Οδ. κἄπειτα καὶ σὲ καὶ φίλους γέροντά τε 
νεδει μελαίνης κοῖλον ἐμβήσας σκάφος 
διπλαῖσι κωπηλατεῖ, οὕτω κυκλώσω δαλὸν ἐν φαεσφόροι 
Κύκλωπος ὄψει καὶ συναυανῶ κόρας.  (465)
Χο. ἰοῦ ιοῦ· 
γέγηθα μαινόμεσθα τοῖς εὑρήμασιν.  (470)
Οδ. κἄπειτα καὶ σὲ καὶ φίλους γέροντά τε 
νεδει μελαίνης κοῖλον ἐμβήσας σκάφος 
διπλαῖσι κωπηλατεῖ, οὕτω κυκλώσω δαλὸν ἐν φαεσφόροι 
Κύκλωπος ὄψει καὶ συναυανῶ κόρας.  (475)

454 ὑπνώσῃ Hermann: ὑπνώσῃ (i.e. ὑπνώσῃ) L: ὑπνωθῇ Dobree
455–71 and 484–96 very damaged line-ends, and 479–81 line-beginnings, P. Oxy. 4545
456 ἐξαποξύνας Tr1: ἀποξύνας L [P. Oxy. defective]
458–9 βαλὸ | ... ὄμμα τ’ Pierson: βαλὸν (β’αλον P. Oxy.) | ... ὄμματ’ L [P. Oxy.]
461 end τ]ροχηλατεῖ (i.e. -εῖ) P. Oxy.
468 ἀποστελῶ Tr’1: ἀποστέλλω L [P. Oxy.]
469 ὡσπερεὶ Reiske: ὡσπερ ἐκ L [P. Oxy.]
471 φόνου L [P. Oxy.]: πόνου Nauck
472 οὗ Reiske: ὅν L
473 ἀραίμην Matthiae: ἀροίμην L
475 ἐκθύψωμεν Hertlein: ἐκθύψωμεν L
CHO: How, exactly? For a long time we’ve been hearing how clever you are!

OD: I intend to keep him from this revel by saying that he shouldn’t give this drink to the other Cyclopes, but that he should keep it on his own and live in pleasure. When he falls asleep, conquered by the Bacchic god, there is a beam of olive in his cave, whose point I’ll sharpen well with this sword and place in the fire. Then, when I see it burning, I’ll lift it up and thrust it hot into the middle of the Cyclops’ eye and boil out his sight with the flame. And just as a man fitting the structure of a ship drives the borer through back and forth with a couple of leather thongs, so I shall twist the fire brand around in the light of the Cyclops’ eye and scorch out his pupil.

CHO: Wow! Wow! I’m happy, we’re crazy about what you’ve come up with.

OD: And then I shall put you and (your) friends and the old man into the spacious hold of my black ship with its double bank of oars and send us away from this land.

CHO: Is there then some way I too could take hold of the brand that will blind the Cyclops’ eye, as if it were a libation to a god? I want to take part in this bloodshed.

OD: Yes – you’ll have to. For the brand, which you must help take hold of, is massive.

CHO: I could carry the weight of a hundred wagons if we are going to smoke out – like a nest of wasps – the eye of the damned Cyclops!
Οδ.

σιγάτε νυν’ δόλον γὰρ ἔξεπιστασαί
χῶταν κελεύω, τοῖσιν ἄρχιτέκτοσιν
πειθεθ’. ἐγὼ γὰρ ἄνδρας ἀπολιπὼν φίλους
τοὺς ἐνδόν ὄντας οὐ μόνος σωθήσομαι.
καίτοι φύγοιμ’ ἂν κάκβεβηκ’ ἄντροι μυχὰν’
ἀλλ’ οὐ δίκαιον ἀπολιπόντ’ ἐμοὺς φίλους
ζῆν οἶσπερ ἥλθον δεύρο σωθῆναι μόνον.

Χο.

ἄγε τίς πρῶτος, τίς δ’ ἐπὶ πρῶτῳ
ταχθεὶς δαλοῦ κάρειν ὁχμάσαι
Κύκλωπος ἔσω βλεφάρων ἄσας
λαμπρᾶν ὑψιν διαικναίσει;

[ὁδὴ ἐνδοθεν]

σίγα σίγα. καὶ δὴ μεθύων
ἄχαριν κέλαδον μουσιζόμενος
σκαῖος ἀπωδός καὶ κλαυσόμενος
χωρέι πετρίον ἔξω μελάθρων.

480–2 del. Conradt, following an anonymous scholar: P. Oxy. has the initial letters of 480–1, and almost certainly had (those of) 482–3 also, since remnants of 484–96 follow in a further fragment

481 ἐμοὺς apogr. Par.: ἐμοῦ L: [P. Oxy.]

483–6, 488–94, 495–502, 511–18 assigned to semi-choruses by Tr2, cf. the distribution of 635–41

484 δαλοῦ Stephanus: δαλῶ (i.e. δαλῶ) L [P. Oxy.]; ὁχμάσαι Musgrave: ὁχμάσας L [P. Oxy.]

487 ὠδή ἐνδοθεν L: οὐδὴ ε[ P. Oxy.: deleted by most editors

489 κατακλαυσόμενος Hermann: τάχα κλαυσόμενος Fix [P. Oxy.]

491 χωρέι (i.e. χορεῖ) πετρ[ (=etr[ insecurely read) P. Oxy.: χωρεῖ γε L

492 νιν L (read uncertainly in P. Oxy.): νιν Diggle


495 μάκαρ (i.e. μάκαρ) P. Oxy., conj. Hermann: μακάριος L
OD: Now be quiet, all of you; for you know my ruse. When I give the order, obey its architects. I shall not save myself alone and abandon the men who are my friends inside. However, I could flee and I have emerged from the recesses of the cave. [480] But it would not be right for me to abandon my friends with whom I came here and be the only one saved.

CHO: Come on then, who is to be positioned first and who next to first to hold fast and control the beam of the firebrand, thrusting it into the Cyclops’ eye and boring out his bright sight? [485]

(singing from within)
Silence! Silence! For now the Cyclops comes out from his rocky halls drunk, trying to croon in charmless singing, clumsy, tone-deaf and about to pay for it with tears. [490] Come now, let us educate him with our revels the ignoramus; he’s certain to be blinded anyway.

Strophe A
Blessed is he who shouts the cry in honour of Dionysus, [495] with the beloved streams of the grape-vine’s cluster, ready for a revel with sails spread
φίλον ἄνδρ’ ὑπαγκαλίζων, ἐπὶ δεμνίοις τε ἡξανθὸν†
χλιδανᾶς ἔχων ἑταίρας
μυρόχριστος λιπαρὸν βό-στρυχον, αὐδὰ δέ: Θύραν τίς οἴξει μοι;

Κυ.  
παπαπαῖ· πλέως μὲν οἶνου, γάνυμαι <δὲ> δαιτὸς ἡβα
σκάφος ὀλκάς δὲς γεμισθείς
ποτὶ σέλμα γαστρὸς ἀκρας.

Χο.  
καλὸν ὄμμασιν δέδορκώς, καλὸς ἐκπερῤῆς μελάθρων.

501 λιπαρὸν Scaliger: λιπαρὸς L
502 τις Aldine
503 παπαπαῖ Hermann: πα πα πα L
504 <δὲ> Tr2; ἡβα following Lobeck (-η ) Diggle: ἡβης L
507 φόρτος Seymour: χόρτος L
510 ξεϊνε φέρ’ Tr2: φέρε ξέν’ P (L illegible)
512 καλὸς Scaliger: καλὸν L; ἐκπερῤῆς Heath: ἐκπέρα Scaliger
513 τις Aldine
514 λίχνα Paley; ἀμμένει Tr1 or Tr2, and P: ἀμμέν** L
514–15 λίχνα σ’ ἡμμέν’ ἀμμένει (ἡμμέν’ ἀμμένει L. Dindorf) καὶ | ῥοδόχρως τέρεινα νύμφα Seaford
515 χὼς (thus L)] κοῦ Paley
517 χροῖα Barnes: χρόα L
embracing a dear male companion,  
and on a couch  
having †blonde† of a voluptuous girlfriend,  
his glistening locks anointed with myrrh,  
<and> he calls out: “Who will open the door for me?”

The Cyclops enters.

Strophe B

CY: O wow! I’m filled up with wine,  
<but> I’m rejoicing with the feast’s youthful zest.  
Like a cargo ship my hull’s loaded  
up to the deck at the top of my belly.  
This cheerful cargo leads me out  
to the revel in springtime  
to my brother Cyclopes.  
Come on, come on, stranger, put that wineskin in my hands.

Strophe C

CHO: Giving a beautiful glance from his eyes,  
he steps forth from the halls in beauty  
<…> “Who loves me?”  
Wedding torches †burning wait for your  
flesh and like† a tender nymph  
inside dewy caves.  
But wreaths of no one colour  
will soon be with you around your brow.
Οδ. Κύκλωψ, ἄκουσον· ὡς ἔγω τοῦ Βακχίου
tοῦτοι τρίβων εἴμ’, ὧν πιεῖν ἐδωκά σοι. (520)
Κυ. ὁ Βάκχιος δὲ τίς; θεὸς νομίζεται;
Οδ. μέγιστος ἀνθρώποισιν ἐς τέρψιν βιόν.
Κυ. ἐρυγγάνῳ γοῦν αὐτόν ἥδεως ἔγω.
Οδ. τοιόσοδο δαίμονον οὐδένα βλάπτει βροτῶν.
Κυ. θεὸς δ’ ἐν ἁσκῷ πῶς γέγηθ’ οὐκούς ἔχων;
Οδ. ὅπου τίθη τις, ἐνθάδ’ ἐστιν εὐπετῆς.
Κυ. οὐ τοὺς θεοὺς χρῆ σώμι’ ἔχειν ἐν δέρμασιν.
Οδ. τί δ’, εἰ σε τέρπει γ’, ἢ τὸ δέρμα σοι πικρόν;
Κυ. μισὸ τὸν ἁσκόν· τὸ δ’ ἐπιτὸν φιλῶ τόδε.
Οδ. μένων νυν αὐτοῦ πίνει κευθύμει, Κύκλωψ.
Οδ. οὐ χρῆ μ’ ἀδελφοίς τούδε προσδόναι ποτοῦ;
Οδ. ἐρυγγάνῳ γάρ αὐτός τιμιώτερος φανή.
Οδ. διδούς δὲ τοῖς φίλοισι χρησιμώτερος.
Οδ. πυγμάς δ’ κώμος λοίδορόν τ’ ἔριν φιλεῖ.
Κυ. μεθύω μέν, ἔμπας δ’ οὔτις ἂν ψάυσειέ μου. (535)
Οδ. ὁ τάν, πεποκότ’ ἐν δόμοις χρῆ μένειν.
Κυ. ἠλίθιος ὅστις μὴ πιὼν κωμόν φιλεῖ.
Οδ. δς δ’ ἂν μεθυσθείς γ’ ἐν δόμοις μείνῃ σοφός.
Κυ. τί δρῶμεν, ὦ Σιλήνε; σοὶ μένειν δοκεῖ;
Σιλ. δοκεῖ· τί γάρ δεῖ συμποτῶν ἄλλων, Κύκλωψ; (540)
Οδ. καὶ μὴν λαχνώδες γ’ οὖδας ἀνθηρᾶς χλόης.
Σιλ. καὶ πρὸς γε θάλπος ἡλίου πίνειν καλόν.
κλίθητί νῦν μοι πλευρὰ θεὶς ἐπὶ χθονός.
Κυ. ἰδοὺ.
Σιλ. τί δῆται τὸν κρατήρ’ ὅπισθ’ ἐμοῦ τίθης; (545)
Οδ. ὅς δ’ ἂν μεθυσθείς γ’ ἐν δόμοις μείνῃ σοφός.
Κυ. τί δρῶμεν, ὦ Σιλήνε; σοὶ μένειν δοκεῖ;
Σιλ. δοκεῖ· τί γάρ δεῖ συμποτῶν ἄλλων, Κύκλωψ;
Euripides: Cyclops

OD: Cyclops, hear me, as I’m an old hand with this Bacchus, whom I gave you to drink.

CY: So who is this Bacchus? Is he acknowledged as a god?

OD: The greatest for men’s enjoyment of life.

CY: Anyway, I belch him out with pleasure.

OD: Such is his divinity. He harms no mortal.

CY: But how can a god be happy to have a wineskin as his dwelling?

OD: Wherever anyone puts him, there he goes easily.

CY: It is not fitting for the gods to cover their bodies in wineskins.

OD: Why, if he delights you? Or do you find the skin unpleasant?

CY: I hate the wineskin, but I love this drink here.

OD: Then stay where you are, drink and be merry, Cyclops.

CY: But shouldn’t I give some of the drink to my brothers?

OD: No, because by keeping it yourself you’ll appear all the more honoured.

CY: But giving it to my friends will make me more useful to them.

OD: A revel usually brings on conflict, insults and fighting.

CY: I may be drunk, but all the same nobody could lay a finger on me.

OD: Listen, fella, a man who’s drunk too much should stay at home.

CY: A man’s a fool who doesn’t drink and love a revel.

OD: No, but one who gets drunk and stays at home is wise.

CY: What should we do, Silenus? Do you think it’s a good idea to stay?

SIL: I do; for what need is there of other banqueters, Cyclops?

OD: And, look, the ground and its flowery grasses are luxuriant.

SIL: And it’s a fine thing to drink under the warmth of the sun. Now please set yourself down on the ground and lie on your side.

The Cyclops lies down.

CY: There, done! (to Silenus) Then why are you putting the wine bowl behind me?

SIL: So that no-one here may take it.
κλέπτων υδιν θ state ν ευκλεόντος αὐτόν ἔξεως μέσον.

σὺ δ’, ὦ ξέν’, εἰπὲ τόῦνομ’ ὃτι σε χρή καλείν.

Οδ. Οὐτίν’ χάριν δὲ τίνα λαβών σ’ ἐπανέσω;

Κυ. πάντων σ’ ἐταίρον ὅστερον θουνάσομαι. (550)

Οδ. καλὸν γε τὸ γέρας τῷ ἐξένῳ δίδως, Κύκλωψ.

Κυ. οὐτὸς, τῇ δράσει; τὸν οἶνον ἐκπίνεις λάθρα;

Σιλ. οὐκ, ἀλλ’ ἐμ’ οὕτως ἔκκυσεν ὃτι καλὸν βλέπω.

Κυ. κλαύσῃ, φιλῶν τὸν οἶνον οὐ φιλοῦντα σέ.

Σιλ. οὐ μὰ Δί’, ἔπει μοῦ φησ’ ἐράν ὄντος καλῶ.

Κυ. ἐγχει, πλέων δὲ τὸν σκύφων δίδου μόνον.

Σιλ. πῶς οὖν κέκραται; φέρε διασκεψώμεθα.

Κυ. ἀπολείς; δὸς οὕτως. Σιλ. οὐ μὰ Δί, οὐ πρίν ἄν γε σε

καλὸν βλέπω.

Σιλ. καλόν γε τὸ γέρας τῷ ξένῳ δίδως, Κύκλωψ.

Κυ. οὗτος, τί δρᾷς; τὸν οἶνον ἐκπίνεις λάθρᾳ;

Σιλ. οὔκ, ἀλλ’ ἔκκυσεν ὅτι καλὸν βλέπω.

Κυ. κλαύσῃ, φιλῶν τὸν οἶνον οὐ φιλοῦντα σέ.

Σιλ. οὐ μὰ Δί’, ἔπει μοῦ φησ’ ἐράν ὄντος καλῶ. (555)

Κυ. ἐγχει, πλέων δὲ τὸν σκύφων δίδου μόνον.

Σιλ. πῶς οὖν κέκραται; φέρε διασκεψώμεθα.

Κυ. ἀπολείς; δὸς οὕτως. Σιλ. οὐ μὰ Δί, οὐ πρίν ἄν γε σε

στέφανον ἔδω λαβόντα γεώσσωμαι τ’ ἔτι.

Κυ. οἰνοχόος ἄδικος. Σιλ. <οὐ> μὰ Δί’, ἀλλ’ οἶνος γλυκύς.

(560)

ἀπομακτέον δὲ σοῦστιν ὡς λήψῃ πιεῖν.

Κυ. ἰδοὺ, καθαρὸν τὸ χείλος αἱ τρίχες τε μου.

Σιλ. θέων νῦν τὸν ἄγκων’ εὐρύθμως κατ’ ἐκπε, ὡσπερ μ’ ὅρας πίνοντα χῶσπερ οὐκ ἐμέ.

Κυ. ἀ ν’ ἢ ἢ, τὶ δράσεις; Σιλ. ἡδέως ἡμύστισα. (565)

Κυ. λάβ’, ὦ ξέν’, αὐτός οἰνοχόος τε μοι γενοῦ.

Οδ. γιγνόσκεται γοῦν ἀμπελός τῇ μη ηρώ.

Κυ. φέρ’ ἐγχειν νῦν. ὅδ’ ἐγχέω, σίγα μόνον.

Κυ. χαλεπῶν τὸῦ’ ἔπας, ὅτις ἂν πινὴ πολὺν.

Οδ. ἰδοὺ, λαβὼν ἐκπίθη καὶ μηδὲν λίπης;

(570)

συνεκθανεῖν δὲ σπώντα χρῆ τῷ πώματι.

550 ὑστατον Hermann
551 Σιλ. Lenting
553 Σιλ. L (self-correction, or Tr1): Οδ. L
554 σὲ Diggle: σὲ L
555 οὐ Diggle: υαὶ L; φησ’ Chrestien: φῆς L
558 οὐ μὰ Δί’ Wecklein: ναὶ μὰ Δί’ L
560 οἰνοχόος (ὡφυχόος) W. Canter: ὡ οἰνοχόος L; <οὐ> Hermann: L erased: val Aldine;

οἰνος (ὡφυς) W. Canter: ὡνος (i.e. ὡφυς) L
561 ἀπομακτέον Cobet: ἀπομακτέον L; σοῦστιν ὃς Wilamowitz: σοι ὃς L; σοι γ’ ὄπως Tr1
564 οὐκέτι Nauck
566 λάβ’ ὦ ... τέ μου Dobree: λαβὼν ... γε μου L
571 σπῶντα Casaubon: σιγόντα L
Euripides: Cyclops

CY: You’re wanting to steal some and drink it, more like. Put it down in the middle here. And you, stranger, tell me what name I should call you.

OD: Nobody. And what favour shall I get and be grateful to you for?

CY: I shall feast on you last after I’ve eaten all your companions. [550]

OD: Well, Cyclops, that’s a fine present to give to your guest.

_Silenus drinks some wine, hoping to escape the Cyclops’ notice._

CY: Hey, you! What are you doing? Are you drinking the wine on the sly?

SIL: No, but this wine here kissed me because I look beautiful.

CY: You’ll be sorry you love the wine that doesn’t love you.

SIL: No, by Zeus, since it says it’s crazy for me because I’m beautiful. [555]

CY: Pour the wine in and fill the cup, then just give it to me.

SIL: I wonder how the mixture is. Come now, let me see…

CY: You’ll be my ruin! Give it as it is! SIL: No, by Zeus! Not until I see you wearing a crown and I’ve had a further taste.

CY: The wine-pourer does me wrong! SIL: <No>, by Zeus! But the wine is sweet! [560] You have to wipe (your mouth), however, so you can have it to drink.

CY: See, my lips and moustache and beard are clean.

SIL: Now support yourself elegantly on one elbow and drink it down, just as you see me drinking – or not, as the case may be (<he drinks a large dose>).

CY: You there! What are you up to? SIL: Sweetly down in one gulp!

[565]

CY: O stranger, take the wine and you be the wine-pourer for me.

OD: Well, certainly my hands have some knowledge of the vine.

CY: Come on, pour it in. OD: I’m pouring it. Just keep quiet.

CY: That’s a difficult thing you’ve said – for a man who’s been drinking a lot.

OD: There. Now take it and drink it all down and don’t leave any. [570] Because when a man’s knocking it back he should only be all spent when the drink is.
Κυ.  παπαί, σοφόν γε τὸ ξύλον τῆς ἀμπέλου.
Οδ.  κἂν μὲν σπάσῃς γε δαιτί πρὸς πολλῇ πολύν,
    τέγξας ἄδιψον νηδύν, εἰς ὕπνον βαλεῖ,
    ἦν δ’ ἐλλίπης τι, ξηρανεὶς ο’ ὁ Βάκχιος. (575)
Κυ.  οὐδ οὐδ’·
    ὡς εξένευσα μόης· ἀκρατος ἢ χάρις.
    ὃ δ’ οὐρανός μοι συμμεμειγμένος δοκεῖ
    τῇ γῇ φέρεσθαι, τοῦ Διός τε τὸν θρόνον
    λεύσσω τὸ πᾶν τε δαμόνων ἀγνὸν σέβας.
    οὐκ ἂν φιλήσαμ’; αἱ Χάριτες πειρόσι με.
    ἂς Γανυμήδη τόνδ’ ἔχων ἀναπαύσομαι
    κάλλιον ἢ τὰς Χάριτας, ἥδομαι δέ πως
    τοῖς παιδικοίσι μᾶλλον ὅτι τοὺς θήλεσιν. (580)
Σιλ.  ἐγὼ γὰρ ὃ Διός εἴμι Γανυμήδης, Κύκλως;
Κυ.  ναὶ μὰ Δί’, ὃν ἁρπάζω γ’ ἐγὼ ’κ τῆς Δαρδάνου.
Σιλ.  ἀπόλωλα, παῖδες· σχέτλια πείσομαι κακά.
Κυ.  μέμφη τὸν ἐρασθήν κάντρυφας πεπωκότι;
Σιλ.  οἶμοι’ πικρότατον οἶχον ὄψομαι τάχα.
Οδ.  ἄγε δή, Διονύσου παῖδες, εὐγενῆ τέκνα,
    ἐξόνον μὲν ἀνήρ’ τῷ δ’ ὑπνῷ παρεμένος
    τάχ’ ἐξ ἀναιδοῦ φάρυγος ὄψομαι κρέα.
    δαλὸς δ’ ἔσωθεν αὐλίων ἀνθέθη τι καπνὸν
    παρευτρέπισται, κοὐδὲν ἄλλο πλὴν πυροῦν
    Κύκλωπος ὄψιν· ἀλλ’ ὅπως ἁρπάζω τοῖς
    παιδικοῖσι μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς θήλεσιν. (595)
Χο.  πέτρας τὸ λῆμα κἀδάμαντος ἐξόμεμεν.
    χώρει δ’ ὡς οἶκους πρὶν τι τὸν πατέρα παθεῖν
    ἀπάλαμνον· ὥς καὶ τάνθάδ’ ἐστίν εὔτρεπῃ.
Euripides: Cyclops

CY: Oh yes! How clever the wood of the grapevine is.
OD: And if you drain a lot on top of a big meal, drenching your belly so it’s no longer thirsty, the wine will send you to sleep, but if you leave some, Bacchus will make you parched. [575]
CY: Wow! Wow! *(Takes a long drink)* I only just managed to swim out of that one! This is unmitigated delight! I think I see heaven borne along mingled with the earth. I’m gazing upon the throne of Zeus and the whole august majesty of the gods. [580] *(looking at the satyrs)* The Graces are tempting me. Wouldn’t I like to kiss (them)? Enough! I shall get off more splendidly with Ganymede here than with the Graces. And I get a certain greater pleasure from boys than from females anyway.
CY: Yes, by Zeus, the one I myself am now seizing from the land of Dardanus.
SIL: I’ve had it now, boys! I’m going to suffer something terrible!
CY: Do you find fault with your lover and are you fastidious about one who’s drunk?
SIL: O woe is me! I’ll soon see that the wine is very bitter now.

*Polyphemus takes Silenus into the cave.*

OD: Come on now, sons of Dionysus, noble children! [590] The man has gone inside. Soon, relaxed in his sleep, he’ll vomit the flesh from his shameless gullet. The brand is ready inside the cave, †it pushes out† smoke, and there’s nothing left to do but burn out the Cyclops’ eye. So be sure you act like a real man! [595]
CHO: We shall have a heart of rock and adamant! Now hurry into the house before our father suffers something diabolical, since here things are ready for you.
"Ἡφαιστ', ἄναξ Αἴτναε, γείτονος κακοῦ
λαμπρὸν πυρώσας ὄμμ' ἀπαλλάχθηθ' ἀπαξ, (600)
σύ τ', ὦ μελαινής Νυκτὸς ἐκπαίδευμ', "Ὑπνε,
ἄκρατος θηρὶ τῷ θεοστυγεῖ,
καὶ μὴ 'π'ι καλλίστοισι Τροϊκοῖς πόνοις
αὐτόν τε ναύτας τ' ἀπολέσῃ' Ὀδυσσέα
ὑπ' ἀνδρὸς ὦ θεῶν οὐδὲν ἕ τ' ὑβροτῶν μέλει.
ὅ τιν τύχην μὲν δαίμον' ἤγείσθαι χρεών,
τὰ δαμόνων δὲ τῆς τύχης ἐλάσσονα.
(605)

Χο. λήψεται τὸν τράχηλον
ἐντόνως ὁ καρκίνος
τοῦ ξενοδαιτύμονος' πυρὶ γὰρ τάχα
φωσφόρους ὅλει κόρας.
ἐσπετον ἐρνος. ἀλλ' ἵτω δαίμον' χρεών
κρύπτεται ὁ καρκίνος
τοῦ ξενοδαιτύμονος· πυρὶ γὰρ τάχα
φωσφόρους ὅλει κόρας.
(610)
(615)
Χο. κάγῳ τὸν φιλοκισσοφόρον Βρόμιον
ποθεινὸν εἰσιδεῖν θέλω,
Κύκλωψ, ὥς τις πικκός,
καθιστά τὸν τράχηλον
ἐντόνως ὁ καρκίνος
τοῦ ξενοδαιτύμονος· πυρὶ γὰρ τάχα
φωσφόρους ὅλει κόρας.
ἐσπετον ἐρνος. ἀλλ' ἵτω δαίμον' χρεών
κρύπτεται ὁ καρκίνος
τοῦ ξενοδαιτύμονος· πυρὶ γὰρ τάχα
φωσφόρους ὅλει κόρας.
(620)
(625)
Χο. σιγάτε πρὸς θεῶν, θῆρες, ἡσυχάζετε,
συνθέντες ἄρσα στόματος· οὐδὲ πνεῖν ἐῶ.
οὐ σκαρδαμύσσειν οὐδὲ χρέμπτεσθαί τοια,
ὡς μὴ 'ξεγερθῇ τὸ κακόν, ἔστ' ἄν θηραμᾶς
ὅπις Κύκλωπος ἐξαμιλληθῇ πυρί.
(630)
Οδ. σιγάτε πρὸς θεῶν, θῆρες, ἡσυχάζετε,
συνθέντες ἄρσα στόματος· οὐδὲ πνεῖν ἐῶ.
οὐ σκαρδαμύσσειν οὐδὲ χρέμπτεσθαί τοια,
ὡς μὴ 'ξεγερθῇ τὸ κακόν, ἔστ' ἄν θηραμᾶς
ὅπις Κύκλωπος ἐξαμιλληθῇ πυρί.
(630)
Χο. σιγάτας πρὸς υἱὸς θεῶν, κυκλώπ, ἀτέρχιτο,
συνθέντες ἄρσα στόματος· οὐδὲ πνεῖν ἐῶ.
οὐ σκαρδαμύσσειν οὐδὲ χρέμπτεσθαί τοια,
ὡς μὴ 'ξεγερθῇ τὸ κακόν, ἔστ' ἄν θηραμᾶς
ὅπις Κύκλωπος ἐξαμιλληθῇ πυρί.
(630)

604 ναύτας Tr2: ναῦς P (and probably L: now illegible)
610 ξενοδαιτύμονος Hermann: ξένον δαίτυμόνος L
617 μαίνομένου 'ξελέτω Hermann: μαίνομενο κρύπτεσθαι L
626 χρέμπτεσθαί Tr2: χρίμπτεσθαί L
Euripides: Cyclops

OD: Hephaestus, lord of Etna, burn out your evil neighbour’s bright eye and be rid of him once and for all. [600] And you, O Sleep, nursling of Black Night, come with unmitigated power to this beast, so hateful to the gods. And after his most noble labours at Troy do not destroy Odysseus himself and his men at the hands of a man who cares nothing for either gods or mortals. [605] Otherwise we will have to consider chance a divinity and the gods less than chance.

Odysseus goes into the cave.

CHO: The tongs will tightly throttle the neck of the guest-eater. For soon through the fire he will lose the pupil that brings him light. Already the firebrand is a burning coal and is hidden in the ashes, the mighty shoot of the oak tree. But let Maron come, let him do his work, let him take out the eye of the raging Cyclops, so his drinking may be his undoing. And I want to look on Bromius, whom I long for, who loves to wear ivy, and to leave the Cyclops’ desolate land. Shall I come that far?

Odysseus enters from the cave.

OD: For the gods’ sake, be quiet, you wild creatures, and keep still! Shut your mouths tight! I forbid anyone even to breathe [625] or blink or clear his throat in case the monster wakes up before the sight of the Cyclops’ eye has been forced out by the fire.

CHO: We are silent and gulping our breath down through our mouths.

OD: Come on now, go inside and make sure you grab the brand firmly in your hands. [630] It is smouldering red-hot nicely.
Χο. οὖκομεν σὺ τάξιες οὐστίνας πρώτους χρεὸν
cαυτὸν μοχλὸν λαβόντας ἐκκαίειν τὸ φῶς
Κύκλωπος, ὡς ἂν τῆς τύχης κοινώμεθα;

Ημιχ. ἥμεις μὲν ἔσμεν μακροτέρῳ πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν
ἐστῶτες ὥθειν ἐξ τὸν ὄρθοβαλμὸν τὸ πῦρ.

Ημιχ. ἡμεῖς δὲ χωλοὶ γ'/ ἀρτίως γεγενήμεθα.

Ημιχ. ταῦταν πεπόνθατ' ἄρ' ἕμοι' τοὺς γὰρ πόδας
ἐστῶτες ἐσπάσθημεν οὐκ οἶδ' ἐξ ὅτου.

Ὁδ. ἐστῶτες ἐσπάσθητε; Ἡμιχ. καὶ τὰ γ'/ ὅμματα
μέστ' ἐστίν ἡμῖν κόνεος ἢ τέφρας ποθέν.

Οδ. ἄνδρες πονηροὶ κοιūδὲν οἶδε σύμμαχοι.

Χο. ὅτι ὁ νῶτον τὴν ράχιν τ' οἰκτίρομεν
καὶ τοὺς ὀδόντας ἐκβαλεῖν οὐ βούλομαι
tυπτόμενος, αὕτη γίγνεται πονηρία;

Ὀδ. πάλαι μὲν ἤδη σ' ὄντα τοιούτον φύσει,
νῦν δ' οἶδ' ἄμεινον. τοῖς δ' οἶκειοις φίλοις
χρῆσαί μ' ἀνάγκη. χειρὶ δ' εἰ μηδὲν σθένεις,

Χο. ὅτι τὸ νῶτον τὴν ράχιν τ' οἰκτίρομεν
καὶ τοὺς ὀδόντας ἐκβαλεῖν οὐ βούλομαι
tυπτόμενος, αὕτη γίγνεται πονηρία;

Ὀδ. πάλαι μὲν ἤδη σ' ὄντα τοιούτον φύσει,
νῦν δ' οἶδ' ἄμεινον. τοῖς δ' οἶκειοις φίλοις
χρῆσαί μ' ἀνάγκη. χειρὶ δ' εἰ μηδὲν σθένεις,

Χο. ὅτι τὸ νῶτον τὴν ράχιν τ' οἰκτίρομεν
καὶ τοὺς ὀδόντας ἐκβαλεῖν οὐ βούλομαι
tυπτόμενος, αὕτη γίγνεται πονηρία;

Ὀδ. πάλαι μὲν ἤδη σ' ὄντα τοιούτον φύσει,
νῦν δ' οἶδ' ἄμεινον. τοῖς δ' οἶκειοις φίλοις
χρῆσαί μ' ἀνάγκη. χειρὶ δ' εἰ μηδὲν σθένεις,

Χο. ὅτι τὸ νῶτον τὴν ράχιν τ' οἰκτίρομεν
καὶ τοὺς ὀδόντας ἐκβαλεῖν οὐ βούλομαι
tυπτόμενος, αὕτη γίγνεται πονηρία;

Ὀδ. πάλαι μὲν ἤδη σ' ὄντα τοιούτον φύσει,
νῦν δ' οἶδ' ἄμεινον. τοῖς δ' οἶκειοις φίλοις
χρῆσαί μ' ἀνάγκη. χειρὶ δ' εἰ μηδὲν σθένεις,

Χο. ὅτι τὸ νῶτον τὴν ράχιν τ' οἰκτίρομεν
καὶ τοὺς ὀδόντας ἐκβαλεῖν οὐ βούλομαι
tυπτόμενος, αὕτη γίγνεται πονηρία;

Ὀδ. πάλαι μὲν ἤδη σ' ὄντα τοιούτον φύσει,
νῦν δ' οἶδ' ἄμεινον. τοῖς δ' οἶκειοις φίλοις
χρῆσαί μ' ἀνάγκη. χειρὶ δ' εἰ μηδὲν σθένεις,
Euripides: Cyclops

CHO: So won’t you station those who are to be at the front end to take hold of the burnt pole and scorch out the Cyclops’ eye, so that we can share in this success?

Chorus members speak severally, either in small groups or individually.

CHO. MEMBER(S) A:
   We’re standing too far from the door to push the fire into his eye.

CHO. MEMBER(S) B:
   Just now our legs have gone lame.

CHO. MEMBER(S) C:
   Then the same thing as you’ve suffered has happened to us. We’ve sprained our feet, just standing here … I don’t know how.

OD: You’ve sprained your foot when you were standing still?

CHO. MEMBER(S): Yes, and our eyes have become full of dust and ash from somewhere.

OD: These are worthless men and nothing as allies!

CHO: Just because I pity my back and my spine and don’t want to get beaten up and lose my teeth, is this cowardice? Anyway, I know an incantation of Orpheus that’s absolutely splendid, so that the brand will all by itself march up to his head and set the one-eyed son of the earth on fire.

OD: For a long time I knew you were like this by nature, but now I know it better. I’m going to have to use my close friends for this. But, if there’s no strength in your arm, then at least urge us on anyway, so we may get some courage for our friends through your urgings.

Odysseus goes into the cave.

CHO: We’ll do this. We’ll get a mercenary to run the risk for us. But may the Cyclops be consumed in smoke through our encouragement!

O! O! Push it in most nobly,
Hurry, burn out the eye
Of the beast who dines on his guests!
τύφετ’ ὦ, καίετ’ ὦ
tὸν Ἀἴτνας μηλονόμον.
(660)
tόρνευ’ Ἕλκε, μὴ σ’ ἐξοδυνηθείς
dράσῃ τι μάταιον.

Κυ. οὕμοι, κατηνθρακώμεθ’ ὀφθαλμοῦ σέλας.
Χο. καλός γ’ ὁ παιάν· μέλπε μοι τόνδ’ αὖ, Κύκλωψ.
Κυ. οὕμοι μάλ’, ὡς ὑβρίσμεθ’, ὡς ὅλωλαμεν.
(665)
ἀλλ’ οὕτι μὴ φύγητε τῆσδ’ ἔξω πέτρας
χαίροντες, οὐδὲν ὄντες· ἐν πύλαισι γὰρ
σταθεῖς φάραγγος τῆσδ’ ἐναρμόσω χέρας.
Χο. τί χρῆμ’ ἄντειξ’ ὁ Κύκλωψ; Κυ. ἀπωλόμην.
Χο. αἰσχρός γε φαίνῃ. Κυ. κατ’ ἐκμάθη γ’ ἄθλιος.
(670)
Χο. μεθύων κατέπεσες ἐς μέσους τοὺς ἄνθρακας;
Κυ. Οὕτις μ’ ἀπώλεσ’. Χο. οὐκ ἄρ’ οὔδεῖς <σ’> ἥδικει.
Κυ. Οὕτις με τυφλοὶ βλέφαρον. Χο. οὐκ ἄρ’ εἰ τυφλός.
Κυ. πῶς φῆς σύ; Χο. καὶ πῶς σ’ οὔτις ἄν θείη τυφλόν;
Κυ. σκώπτεις, ὁ δ’ Οὐτίς ποῦ ’στιν; Χο. οὐδαμοῦ, Κύκλωψ.
(675)
Κυ. ὁ ξένος ἵν’ ὀρθῶς ἐκμάθῃς μ’ ἀπώλεσεν,
ὁ μιαρός, ὃς μοι δοὺς τὸ πῶμα κατέκλυσεν.
<Xo.> δεινὸς γὰρ οἶνος καὶ παλαίεσθαι βαρός.
<Kυ.> πρὸς θεῶν, πεφεύγας ἤ μένουσ’ ἔσω δόμον;
Χο. οὕτως σιωπῆ τὴν πέτραν ἐπῆλυγα
(680)
λαβόντες ἐςτῆκασι. Κυ. ποτέρας τῆς χέρος;
Χο. ἐν δεξίᾳ σου. Κυ. ποῦ; Χο. πρὸς αὐτή τῇ πέτρᾳ.
ἔχεις; Κυ. κακόν γε πρὸς κακῷ τὸ κρανίον
παισάς κατέαγα. Χο. καί σε διαφεύγουσί γε.

659 τύφετ’ ὦ, καίετ’ ὦ Musgrave: τυφέτω καίετω L
660 Ἀἴτνας Victorius: Ἕλκε L 661 μή ’ἐξοδυνη- | θεὶς apogr. Par.
664 αὖ Markland: ὦ L
668 τῆδ’ Nauck: τάσδ’ L: ταῖσδ’ Kirchhoff
672 ἀπώλεσ’ Matthiae: ἀπώλεσεν L; <σ’> Battier
674 πῶς φῆς σύ Stinton: ὡς δὴ σύ L: ψεῦδη σύ Diggle; σ’ οὗτις W. Canter: σῦ· τίς σ’ L; W.
Dindorf deleted this verse
677 κατέκλυσεν W. Canter: κατέκαυσε L
678 <Χο.> Reiske; οἶνος (ὄνος) Camper: οἶνος L
679 <Κυ.> Reiske
O consume him in smoke! O burn the shepherd of Etna!
Keep on twisting, keep on heaving it round, in case in his agony he does something outrageous to you.

*Polyphemus shouts from within.*

**CY:** Ah! Ah! The light of my eye has been burned to charcoal!
**CHO:** A beautiful song of triumph! Sing it for me again, Cyclops.

*Polyphemus comes to the mouth of the cave.*

**CY:** Ah! Ah! Look how I’ve been assaulted! How I’ve been destroyed! But you will never escape from this cave without paying, you nonentities! Because I’m going to stand in the cleft’s opening here and block it up with my hands.
**CHO:** Why are you shouting, Cyclops? **CY:** I am destroyed.
**CHO:** Well, yes, you do look ugly. **CY:** And I’m in a pitiful state on top of all this.
**CHO:** Did you stumble right into the middle of the coals while you were drunk?
**CY:** Nobody has destroyed me. **CHO:** So no one has wronged you.
**CY:** Nobody has blinded my eye. **CHO:** So you are not blind.
**CY:** How do you mean? **CHO:** And how could nobody make you blind?
**CY:** You’re laughing at me. But Nobody, where is he? **CHO:** Nowhere, Cyclops.
**CY:** The stranger destroyed me – so you may understand correctly – that bastard, who gave me the drink and drowned me in it.

<**CHO**>: Yes, for wine is powerful and hard to wrestle with.
<**CY**>: By the gods, have they fled or are they staying in the cave?
**CHO:** They’re standing here in silence occupying an overhanging rock. **CY:** On which side of me?
**CHO:** On your right. **CY:** Where? **CHO:** Just near the rock itself. Have you got them?

*The Cyclops hits his head on the rock.*

**CY:** I’ve got worse on worse! Now that I’ve bashed my skull and I’m broken! **CHO:** Yes – and now they’re getting away from you.
Κυ. οὐ τῇδὲ πη, τῇδ’ ἐῖπας; Χο. οὐ’ ταῦτη λέγω.
(685)
Κυ. πῆ γὰρ; Χο. περιάγου κείσε, πρὸς τάριστερά.
Κυ. οἴμοι γελωμι’ κερτομεῖτ μ’ ἐν κακοῖς.
Χο. ἀλλ’ οὐκετ’, ἀλλὰ πρόσθεν ὀὔτες ἐστὶ σοῦ.
Κυ. ὁ παγκάκιστε, ποῦ ποτ’ εἶ; Οδ. τῆλοι σέθεν
φυλακαίσι φρουρῷ σῶ’ Ὀδυσσέας τόδε.
(690)
Κυ. πῶς ἐῖπας; ὄνομα μεταβαλῶν καινὸν λέγεις.
Οδ. ὅπερ μ’ ὁ φύσας ὄνομας’ Ὀδυσσέα.
(695)
Κυ. αἰαι’ παλαιὸς χρησμὸς ἐκπεραίνεται
τυφλὴν γὰρ ὄψιν ἐκ σέθεν σχῆσιν μ’ ἧφη
Τροίας ἀφορμηθέντος. ἀλλὰ καὶ σέ τοι
δίκας ὑφέξειν ἀντὶ τόνδ’ ἔθεσπισε
πολῖν θαλάσσῃ χρόνον ἐναιωροῦμενον.
(700)
Οδ. κλαίειν σ’ ἄνωγα· καὶ δέδραχ’ ὅπερ λέγω.
ἐγὼ δ’ ἔπ’ ἀκτάς εἶμι, καὶ νεῶς σκάφος
ήσε τ’ πόντον Σικελὸν ἐς τ’ ἐμὴν πάτραν.
(705)
Κυ. οὐ δῆτ’, ἐπεῖ σε τῆσδ’ ἀπορρήξας πέτρας
πολῖν θαλάσσῃ χρόνον ἐναιωροῦμενον.
Χο. ήμεῖς δὲ συναύτας γε τοῦδ’ Ὄδυσσέως
ἀνεῖ, τὸ λοιπὸν Βακχίω δουλεύομεν.
CY: Didn’t you say, here somewhere, here?  CHO: No. I said, right here.  
[685]
CY: Where, exactly?  CHO: Turn around that way, to your left.
CY: Ah! I am being laughed at! You’re taunting me in my misery.
CHO: But not any more. Anyway, here he is in front of you.
CY: O utterly vile man, wherever are you?  OD: Far away from you, I’m keeping the body of Odysseus here in safety.  
[690]
CY: What’s that you said? You’re changing your name and using a new one.
OD: The very one my father called me: Odysseus. You were bound to pay the penalty for your unholy feast. For a worthless thing it would have been for me to destroy Troy by fire, if I had not avenged the slaughter of my companions!  
[695]
CY: Ah! Ah! An ancient prophecy is being brought to pass. For it said that I would have my sight made blind by you as you were sailing from Troy. But don’t forget it also foretold that you also would pay the penalty for these actions, drifting over the sea for a great length of time.  
[700]
OD: Go to hell! I have done what I said. But now I am going to go to the shore and launch my ship over the Sicilian sea and to my homeland.

*Exit Odysseus with his men by a side entrance.*

CY: No way! Because I’m going to break off a piece of this rock, throw it at you and crush you, your sailors and all! [705] I’m going to climb up the hill, even though I’m blind, making my way on foot through this tunneled (cave) with its entrance on the other side.

CHO: Well anyway, we’re going to be fellow sailors with Odysseus here and from now on we’ll be the slaves of the Bacchic god!

*Exit the chorus following Odysseus and his men.*

FINIS
The Scene: all the action takes place in front of the cave of Polyphemus in Sicily, under Mount Etna. The door of the skênê building functions as the mouth of the cave, and the skênê itself was probably painted to represent rocks and grass.

1–40: Prologue: Silenus
Silenus enters from the skênê door and explains the background to the ensuing drama. This technique was already observed by the comic poet Aristophanes as a typical feature of Euripidean tragedies (Frogs 946–7), but is not unique to Euripides: cf. Aesch. Ag. 1–39. Although occasionally spoken in monologues by mortals principally involved in the action (e.g. IT and El.), such Euripidean speeches were often delivered by deities, as in Alcestis, Hippolytus, Ion and Bacchae; but in the former three the deities are only minor players, at least in terms of stage presence. In both the Cyclops and Euripides’ Bacchae we have instances of introductory monologues delivered by immortals who are also chief players in the action to follow (for Silenus as immortal, see Theopompus 115 FGH 75c). Silenus complains to his patron god of his current plight as a slave to the brutal and godless Cyclops, Polyphemus (22, 26, 30–1, 34), deprived of Bacchic revelry (25), and of how he came into such a predicament (11–22). With such a preamble Euripides endows this satyr play with the common themes of the satyrs’ subjugation by an ogre and isolation from Dionysus; see Gen. Intro., pp. 28–38. Their eventual rescue by a wandering hero will be a natural inference for the ancient audience in the light of the Odysseus-Polyphemus episode, familiar from Homer’s Odyssey and treated by fifth-century dramatists such as Epicharmus (F 71–2 PCG), Cratinus (F 143–57 PCG), Aristias (TrGF 9 F 4), Philoxenus (F 816, 819 PMG) and in a dithyramb of Timotheus (F 780–3). It also featured widely in Archaic and Classical Greek art (LIMC VIII.1 s.v. ‘Polyphemus’ I 16, 17, 18, 20; cf. I 40–44, 46, etc.).

1 Bromius: ‘the roarer’ a title applied frequently to Dionysus in the play (also: 63, 99, 112, 123, 620), also found in Pindar (F 75.10), Aeschylus (Eum. 24) and elsewhere in Euripides (e.g. Bacc. 66). In the Homeric hymns, the god is ἐρίβρομος (H. Hom. 7.56, 26.1); he also roars when transformed into a lion (H. Hom. 7.45). His worship involves thunderous noise in Homeric Hymn 26.10, Ar. Thesm. 997–8; cf. also Ar. Clouds 313 and Eur. Bacc. 156, 546. These aspects of his persona are commensurate with the boisterous, exuberant nature of his worship. The significance of calling Dionysus ‘Bromius’ here and elsewhere (e.g. 63) gains irony and even poignancy since we are told a number of times that the cultic activity that his worship involved – including dance, percussive music and wine drinking – is starkly absent from Polyphemus’ island (e.g., 25–6, 63–81, 123–4, 203–5).
because of you … countless labours: the satyrs are the servants, even the willing slaves, of Dionysus (Cyc. 23–6n. 709); Cyllene in Sophocles’ Trackers refers to them as performing labours for the god as part of their worship (223–4). But here Silenus complains about his role as the god’s servant. If the interlocutor at Aeschylus’ Sacred Delegates (F **78a 23–36; 78c) is Dionysus, as plausibly suggested by Lloyd-Jones (1956) 545 and Seaford (1984) 34, at times the satyrs wished to escape even Dionysus; for full discussion of the satyrs as slaves of the god, see Griffith (2002) and (2005), esp. 176–85. In the Cyclops their relationship with the god is mostly characterized by φιλία (‘friendship’: 81, 176, 378, etc.) – in contrast to the brutal despotism they are subjected to under Polyphemus throughout the play. Despite Silenus’ protestations to his patron god, the satyrs’ separation from Dionysus is painful to them (63–75), and leads to an almost erotic desire to be reunited with him (620–3).

2 when my body was in … its prime: a comically incongruous notion for the typically decrepit and debauched satyr, made all the more so by his appearance as a menial serf (28). On the basis of vase paintings, Seaford (2n.) suggests that Silenus may have ‘aged’ in the course of the fifth century. But Silenus, as the satyrs’ father, will always be at least one generation older than the chorus (cf. 434). He reminisces similarly in Sophocles’ Trackers (154–5); cf. also Aesch. Net-Fishers (F **47a, 821–2, esp. 830–2). The expression seems to recall, in mock-heroic fashion, the kind of utterances made by Nestor in the Iliad (e.g. 7.157; 11.670; 23.269).

3–4 driven mad by Hera: the story of Dionysus’ madness is preserved by [Apollod.] (Bibl. 3.5.1) and Nonnus (32.38–152), and involved his coming into conflicts with Lycurgus, king of the Edonians, and Pentheus, king of Thebes. Euripides famously deals with the latter in his Bacchae of 406 BC or a little before, but earlier tragedians had dealt with the god’s conflict with both kings. Aeschylus produced a Semele or Hydrophoroi (F 221–4 Radt), Pentheus (F 183) and Bacchae (F 22), and Lycurgus (F 124–6 Radt) was the title of an Aeschylean satyr-play that accompanied his tragedies Edonians, Bassarids and Neaniskoi. Interestingly, [Apollod.](Bibl. 3.5.1) writes that Lycurgus enslaved Dionysus’ maenads and satyrs. It seems very likely, then, that Aeschylus’ Lycurgus involved the enslavement at least of these male followers of the god, thus anticipating the Cyclops. Iophon produced a Pentheus or Bacchae (TrGF <22> T 1a, F 2 Snell) and Xenocles I a Bacchae of 415 (TrGF <33> F 1 Snell). The story of each of these opponents of Dionysus is popular also in Archaic and Classical vase painting: LIMC VI.1, 309–19; VI.1, s.v. ‘Lykourgos’ I 12–14, 17, 19, 20, 26, 27; LIMC VII.1 s.v. ‘Pentheus’ 24, 39, 40, 41, 43–5, etc. Polyphrasmon’s Lykourgeia tetralogy appeared in 467 BC (TrGF F 1; cf. T 3 Snell). We need not see here an allusion to any one of these plays specifically, but the brevity of the reference to Dionysus’ madness sent by Hera implies that the tale and its consequences are well known.

3 mountain nymphs: the mountain in question is probably Nysa, where nymphs
tended the infant Dionysus (H. Hom. 26.3–6; cf. also ib. 1–9 for Nysa as the god’s birthplace). Mt. Nysa is mentioned by Homer (Il. 6.130–7) as the place where Lycurgus attacked the young god and his nurses; cf. also Aesch. Prometheus the Fire Kindler n. 3 and adesp. 646a nn. 7, 12.

**battle**: literally, ‘battle of the spear’, a common tautology in tragedy (Aesch. Ag. 438; Eur. F. 360.24, etc.), but also occurring in satyr drama where the satyrs similarly boast of their military prowess (Soph. Oeneus F **1130. 9–10). Silenus’ overblown sense of his own heroics, hinted at in line 2, finds fuller expression here (5–8). Such implausible geriatric reminiscing features also in Soph. Trackers (154–60) where it is immediately followed by his running off in terror on hearing Hermes’ lyre-music, which to him is unidentifiable noise (205–10). Dionysus famously took part in the battle against the Earth-born Giants (Gigantomachy), depicted not only on vases (LIMC IV.1 s.v. ‘Gigantes’ 193, 327, 365, 369, 375, etc.; also LIMC III.1 s.v. ‘Dionysos’ 613, 615, 618, etc.), but on the north frieze of the Siphnian treasury at Delphi. The role of Silenus and the satyrs in this conflict is less well established in the literary tradition; but they appear in this context on some early Classical vases; see (LIMC IV.1 s.v. ‘Gigantes’ 316). It has been suggested that their role in the Gigantomachy on vases from the late sixth and early fifth centuries may have been influenced by a satyr play; see Hedreen (1992) 70, 110; Vian (1952) 83–90.

6–7 on your right side as shield-bearer … I killed him (i.e. Enceladus): Silenus fantasises about being a hoplite warrior, and Dionysus’ ‘right-hand man’. In hoplite formation the general practice was for the shield to be carried on the left arm of the man, who, standing to the right of his comrade, would thus protect him with his shield (Thuc. 5.71). Satyr-epic-heroeic warriors, including hoplites and peltasts, are depicted in black and red-figure vases (LIMC VIII.1 s.v. ‘Silenoi’ 130, 132, 154, 189, etc.); an Attic pelike of c. 500–490 depicts Dionysus donning a hoplite corselet while a satyr attends him, holding a helmet and thyrsus-cum-spear (LIMC III.1 s.v. ‘Dionysus’ 609). Silenus’ boast about killing the giant Enceladus contradicts the usual version in art and literature whereby Athena slays him (Eur. Ion 209; [Apollod.] Bibl. 1.6.2; LIMC IV.1 s.v. ‘Gigantes’ 342, etc.).

8 hang on – let me see (φέρε ἳδω): for this as a colloquial expression, see Stevens (1976) 42; colloquialisms are common in the Cyclops (see 131, 174, 259, 340nn., etc.), as might be expected of satyr-drama generally. The implausibility of the claim at 6–7 occurs even to Silenus, making his boast, temporarily at least, seem too outlandish even for him. The comic incongruity of the old satyr as elite warrior would not be lost on those among the audience who comprised Athens’ hoplite army. For differing views as to the make up of the audience at Athenian dramatic festivals, see Goldhill (1997); cf. Henderson (1991b). **in a dream**: adverbial accusative in the Greek (cf. IT 518, etc.), not accusative governed by ἰδὸν (‘I saw’: literally, ‘on seeing’).

For... even: translates ἐπεὶ καλ, on which, see Denniston (1954) 296–7. **displayed**
the spoils to Bacchus (literally, ‘the Bacchic one’): dedicating the spoils of war to a god was a common practice for victors (e.g. Hdt. 8.121; Thuc. 2.84.4). Actors were known to dedicate masks to their patron god Dionysus after victory in the dramatic contests (Ar. F 130 PCG; see also Green (1994) fig. 3.17; cf. figs 3.18, 3.19). But Silenus’ words are perhaps too brief here to be considered a ‘metatheatrical’ reference on the part of Euripides. Kaimio, et al. (2001) offers full discussion of such references in Greek satyr plays.

I am enduring to the full: Davies (1999) sees here the culmination of a comic and somewhat hyperbolic priamel – a poetic or rhetorical technique in which a series of alternative objects, ideas or topics is given before the real subject appears as the climax – from Silenus, and the verb adds a rather melodramatic touch. The verb ἐξαντλέω seems to be a favourite of Euripides (e.g., Medea 79; Suppl. 838; cf. Cyc. 110); at 282 Odysseus uses it in a more heroic context for the ordeals at Troy.

11–12 Dionysus’ (mis)adventures at sea are recounted famously in the seventh Homeric Hymn when he is kidnapped by pirates, who, with the exception of the helmsman, fail to recognize his godhead, like Pentheus and Lycurgus. This incident is recounted by Ovid (Met. 3.605–92), Nonnus (45.105–69) and [Apollod.] (Bibl. 3.5.3). The image by Exekias of the reclining Dionysus in a vine-laden boat surrounded by dolphins alludes to the same myth (LIMC III.1 s.v. ‘Dionysos’ 788). Seaford posits a connection here with the Attic ritual of the Anthesteria in which an image of Dionysus was carried through the streets on a ship laden with vines, but the monologue here explains how the satyrs ended up in Sicily.

13 <I myself>: translates the emphatic <ἐγὼ> a conjecture by the corrector of L, Triclinius.

on learning this: Silenus presents himself as springing into action as soon as he hears of his master’s predicament; consistent with this idea is Diggle’s supplement <εὐθύς> (‘immediately’) in place of <ἐγὼ>, although Triclinius’ conjecture can stand.

set sail with my children: the satyrs later see themselves as fellow sailors of Odysseus (709), and sometimes appear as rowers in vase-painting (e.g. ARV 2nd edn., 134.3). The suggestion by Waltz (1931) 289–91 that this search for Dionysus was the subject of a satyr-play remains possible (cf. also Duchemin on 11–12).

14–17 The mock heroics underlying Silenus’ image of his control of the ship continue here with resonances of epic and tragedy. took: translates the aorist participle λαβὼν, whose object seems to be the ship; some find the combination of ‘took’ with locative ‘on the stern’ awkward and Diggle (1969) 31 emended it to βεβώς (cf. 6 where βεβώς is Kassel’s conjecture) to give the sense ‘stationed on the stern’. Odysseus also describes himself as helmsman (Od. 9.177–80, etc.), indicating his role as captain. Euripides’ words for describing how Silenus steered the ... ship – ηὔθυνον ... δόρυ – echo Aeschylus’ ἱθυνεὶν δόρυ (Pers. 411); cf. Eur. Helen (1660). For δόρυ denoting ‘ship’, LSJ s.v. I; at Odyssey 9.384 δόρυ denotes
a ship’s timber. **oared**: translates ἀμφῆρες, lit. ‘rowed on both sides’; at Thuc. 4.67.3 a cognate adjective, ἀμφηρικόν, describes a very small boat propelled by side-oars rather than over the stern (cf. below 468n.). The description of the satyrs’ **splashy rowing** (ῥοθίοσι, literally ‘dashing wave’ or ‘uproar’) conveys the chaotic energy we would expect of them as oarsmen, making them comic counterparts to contemporary **thêtês** (hired rowers from the citizen body), while also recalling the rowing of Odysseus’ men (**Od.** 12.472).

18–19 **Malea**: a headland in Laconia. Another parallel with the **Odyssey** can be found here; Odysseus likewise ends up in the land of Cyclopes when rounding Malea, but is driven off course by a northerly (**Od.** 9.80–1), instead of an easterly (ἀπηλιώτης ἄνεμος), as stated by Silenus here.

20 **onto this rock of Etna**: Homer makes no mention of Sicily as the Cyclopes’ home, but Euripides repeatedly identifies it: **Cyc.** 62, 95, etc. (references to Etna); 95, 106, etc. (references to Sicily). This setting may have been invented by Epicharmus (F 70–2 **PCG**). Satyr plays were typically set in distant (from Greece) settings, often inhabited by ogres (e.g., Aesch. **Lycurgus** F 124–6; Soph. **Amycus** F 111–12; Eur. **Busiris** F 312b–315; and Sosith. **Daphnis or Lityerses** F 1a-3); Euripides’ **Cyclops** fits this mould. While Sicily was clearly recognized as a powerful and sophisticated part of the Greek world, here the description of the Cyclopes’ homeland is an indication of their barbarism as ogres living on the fringes of the civilized world, as understood by the Atheno-centric audience and other mainland Greeks; for the implications of the locale for Polyphemus’ characterization and for the idea of Sicily in the play more fully, see O’Sullivan (2012a) 169–89.

21–2 **the one-eyed children of the sea-god, the Cyclopes who kill men**: Poseidon is father of the Cyclopes also in Homer (**Od.** 9.412, 529) and, typically, of other menacing giants in Greek mythology, such as Antaeus (Pindar, **I.** 4.52ff) and Orion (cf. below 213n.). Two other ogres of Euripidean satyr-plays, Sciron and Busiris, are also sons of Poseidon (P. **Oxy.** 2455, F 6; [Apollod.] **Bibl.** 2.5.11). For discussion of these and other man-killing ogres in satyr-plays (e.g. Sositheus’ **Daphnis or Lityerses**, F 2), see above Gen. Intro. pp. 28–31. **their isolated caves**: this extends the implications of the ‘rock of Etna’ where the Cyclopes live; on the wild and distant (from Athens) locales which frequently serve as the setting for satyr-plays, see previous note.

23–6 **We were caught**: ληφθέντες ἐσμὲν is periphrasis, involving a part of εἰμί and, here, an aorist participle (in this case the aorist passive participle of λαμβάνω); cf. 381, 635 below **slaves ... godless Cyclops**: these lines sum up the satyrs’ situation and outline the character of the ogre of the piece. δοῦλοι (‘slaves’) in l. 24 is conceivably emphatic through enjambment. The status of the satyrs as slaves recurs in this drama (79, 442; cf. 709) and is common to satyr plays; see 1n. and on Eur. **Sciron** below, and **Index of Motifs** below. The description of Polyphemus and his murderous actions as ‘godless’ (ἀνοσίος) occurs throughout the play (26, 316–
21, 336–8, 348, 378, 438, 693); elsewhere he and his cannibalism are ‘impious’ (δυσσεβής: 30, 289). Homer similarly stresses the cruel and pitiless nature of the monster and his actions (Od. 9.272, 287, 295, 351, 368). Aeschylus emphasizes the horror and pity involved in Thyestes’ unwitting cannibalism, referring to his meal in nautical terms as a ‘pitiable freight’ (Ag. 1221), and the chorus register their horror in recalling it (Ag. 1242–4). The same kind of nautical imagery will describe Polyphemus’ anthropophagy (‘eating of humans’) later in the play (361–2, 505–7); The predicament of the satyrs is twofold (25–6): their slavery to such a monster is compounded by the absence of Bacchic revelry, their natural activity (cf. 38–40, 63–81); interestingly, the absence of wine is first mentioned, not by Silenus, but by the chorus (67) in the parodos (41–81).

27–8 Silenus sets himself apart from his sons, the chorus, in doing more domestic work as opposed to their pastoral labours. Silenus is the first actor to appear, as opposed to the coryphaeus, as is confirmed when he goes into the skênê building to fetch provisions for Odysseus (174), or is carried offstage by Polyphemus (589ff.). **My sons ... tend the young flocks** (μῆλα νέα), **being young** (νέοι) **themselves:** Silenus’ age also distinguishes him from the chorus, a contrast achieved by the polyptoton here of νέα νέοι. Nor is this the only contrast to emerge between father and sons (see below 268–9n., 270–2n.), and Polyphemus views him differently from the others (273–4), eventually taking a shine to the aged satyr in grotesquely comic terms (582–9).

29–30 **sweep out the dwelling:** στέγη in Greek, especially in tragedy (Aesch. Ag. 3, 518; Soph. OT 637, etc.), normally denotes the building represented by the skênê; pace Ussher 1978, Sophocles’ use of it to denote a cave does not seem to be exceptional (Phil. 286, 298, 1262); cf. Euripides’ Antiope (F 223.44). The audience may be meant to recall one of the labours of that great satyric hero, Heracles, which involved cleaning out the stables of Augeas, depicted on one of the metopes of the temple of Zeus at Olympia (c. 470–60 BC).

30–1 **this impious Cyclops and his unholy meals:** the implications of the man-killing (ἀνδροκτόνοι) Cyclopes (22) begin to emerge more clearly here, at least as far as Polyphemus is concerned, who has already been called ‘godless’ (26); see above 23–6n.

32 **my orders:** τὰ προσταχθέντα, an aorist neuter plural passive participle in the accusative case in apposition to the clause σαίρειν ... δόμους (‘to sweep out ... the house’); cf. 296n.

33 **with this iron rake:** ἁρπάγη usually means ‘hook’, but is better understood here as ‘rake’. As a theatrical prop it is a clear signifier to the audience of Silenus’ menial status. In Sositheus’ Lityerses (TrGF 1a), where travellers were forced to compete in a reaping contest, the satyrs, or at least Silenus, probably held sickles, again as an indication of their servile status (on Lityerses, see more fully below, pp. 456–61). There may be something paratragic in Silenus’ lament, since to sweep
out the house is understood as a typically servile duty in tragedy (Eur. Hec. 363, Phaeth. 56); cf. Eur.’s Ion, however, where the title character speaks proudly of his duties of sweeping the portico of Apollo’s temple (102–43, 151–3, 181–3).

34–5 master … in a clean cave: Polyphemus has no slaves or attendants in the Odyssey, but in the Cyclops is a δεσπότης (‘master’) here and elsewhere (e.g. 34, 90, 163, 250; cf. 267). Given the references already to his murderous and godless disposition, δεσπότης is far from neutral here and carries overtones of brutality and harsh rule associated with tyranny, as it does in Herodotus (3.89) and Plato (Laws 859a; cf. Statesman 276e); for the idea of Polyphemus as a tyrannical figure in the play, see O’Sullivan (2005), and above Gen. Intro. pp. 46–50. Polyphemus thus stands in contrast to the satyrs’ natural master, Dionysus, addressed shortly before as ‘Lord’ (ἄναξ: Cyc. 17). Polyphemus’ demand that his cave — now denoted by the more usual ἄντρον — be kept clean for himself and his sheep (!) again sets him apart from his Homeric model and his filthy cave (Od. 9.329–30).

37–40 Silenus introduces the chorus as they make their way with the flocks along the eisodos (side-entrance) to the orchestra; some attendants appear, too (83; cf. 41–81 n.), either from the cave or with the chorus. The satyrs are typically boisterous, but Silenus’ tone is one of surprise, given their current slavery and godless master, and the fact that they themselves lament their plight later in the parodos (63–81).

thumping … dance steps: κρότος σικινίδων. Aristoxenus tells us (F 104, 106, Wehrli) that the sikinis was the dance of satyr-drama; for discussion of ancient etymologies and speculations on its origins, see Seaford on Cyc. 37. The depiction of the actor in satyr-costume on the Pronomos vase in Naples seems to give a clear indication of its movements: head to the right, right hand on hip, left arm outstretched, weight on (ball of) right foot, left knee lifted high with toe pointing downward; for illustration and recent discussion, see Voelke (2001) pl. 3 and ib. 138–43; Seidensticker (2010); see also Soph. Trackers 35n. below.

39 band of revellers: Diggle (1971) 42 emends to κώμος as a collective noun (‘band of revellers’) from L’s plural κώμοι (‘bands’), his point being that satyrs only ever form one unified ‘band’. The corruption probably arose from the adjacent plural συνασπίζοντες ‘companions-at-arms’, which echoes Silenus’ description of himself at Cyc. 5 as a ‘shield-bearer’; see 6–7n. Althaea: Dionysus had an amorous encounter with Althaea, wife of king Oeneus (= ‘wine-man’), who was the first to receive the gift of wine from the god ([Apollod.] Bibl. 1.8.1; Hyginus Fab. 129). Although no satyr play on this theme is known with certainty, such an episode would have lent itself well to satyric drama with its emphasis on wine and lechery. Sophocles’ Oeneus, of which F **1130 is the sole certain remnant, may have alluded to or dealt with it. For discussion, see KPS 368–74.

swaggering: as Seaford notes, σαυλούμενοι connotes lasciviousness. The satyrs’ movements evidently recall the kind of erotic κώμοι (revels) they have participated in elsewhere with Dionysus; in Cratinus’ Dionysalexandros (F 39–51 PCG) they
accompanied the god in his attempts to seduce Helen; cf. also Cyc. 534 and Pratinas 4 F 3.7–9 (with nn.) for fights during a kômos, fuelled by erotic desire and/or wine. **songs of lyres**: although not the primary Dionysiac instrument, the lyre does appear in Dionysiac scenes: *e.g.* the Pronomos vase, and other satyric scenes, notably the amphora attributed to the Berlin Painter (*LIMC* VIII.1 s.v. ‘Silenoi’ 28c, 92, 93, 103, 104, 125, etc.); see also KPS: plates 15a, 15b, 28a. The double aulos (‘pipe’) is more usual with satyrs and revels, as early as the François Vase, the first extant depiction of satyrs (or ‘silenoi’); see also *LIMC* VIII.1 s.v. ‘Silenoi’ 46a, 103, 104, 105a, 105b; KPS: plates 4, 6a, 7a, 10, 16; cf. R. Osborne (1998) fig. 80. For the instrument itself, see on Pratinas below, our introductory note and its n. 4.

**41–81**: **Parodos**: A chorus of fifteen satyrs enters with attendants (83) and possibly a token sheep or two (see Seaford 41–81n.). No further explicit reference is made to these attendants, and their identity is unknown. They cannot be other Cyclopes (cf. Cyc. 120); nor can they be satyrs who comprise the chorus. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that they are humans, even though Silenus tells Odysseus that all humans who arrive on the island get eaten (126–8); see also below 241–3n. They may have appeared solely as silent figures for dramatic convenience, and they are still onstage at 137 and 162. Here it seems likely that these helpers tended the sheep while the satyrs danced during the parodos. Evidently these attendants are lower in the pecking order than the satyrs, and Polyphemus would thus be a δεσπότης even without the satyrs as his slaves.

The satyrs sing what has been called by Seaford (1984) *ad loc.* the first extant bucolic song in European literature, but this genre is possibly known as early as Homer; cf. the herdmens on Achilles’ shield playing their pipes (*Il*. 18.525–6) before being ambushed. ‘Lityerses’, the ogre of a satyr play by Sositheus (*TrGF* 99 F 2–3), was also the name of a harvest song; and it is possible there may have been a similar song in Euripides’ satyric *Theristae* or *Reapers*, which may well have told the same story (for discussion, see below, p. 446). In any event, pastoral is well-suited to many general themes of satyric drama, given the usually rural settings of satyr plays; but the song ends on a melancholy note. The satyrs’ song begins with an address to the ram of the herd and orders to the ewes to suckle their young with references to the pastoral setting; the tone of this address vacillates from a playful grandiloquence (41–8) to frustration (49–52) to an almost sentimental wish to see the young lambs suckled (55–62). But their song overall finishes on a plaintive note in the epode (63–81), consistent with Silenus’ prologue, as the satyrs lament their current plight as captives of a monster in a remote location isolated from their natural master. The epode thus emphasizes a number of themes important in the play: the absence of the kind of activity the satyrs associate with their worship of Dionysus, the friendship they usually enjoy with their god (now lost), and their current status as exiles at the foot of Etna and as slaves to an ogre. These motifs recur at significant points in the drama as wrongs which are eventually ‘righted’ by the play’s end.

Structurally, the parodos is comprised of the following: a strophe (41–8); mesode,
or a short astrophic ‘midsong’ (49–54); antistrophe identical to the metrical structure of the strophe (55–62); and epode, or aftersong (63–81). Metre is mostly aeolochoriambic dimeters (e.g., 41–8=55–62 in correspondence) and anapaestic dimeters (50–1, 79–80) and anapaestic monometers (49, 74); for fuller analysis, see Dale (1968) 59, 130–77 (for aeolic choriambics generally), 215–16; for specific analysis of this ode and outline of the metrical scheme, see Dale (1981) 66–8; Ussher and Seaford.

41–42 son ... noble sires and noble mothers: The address referring to the ‘noble’ parentage of the ram constitutes a rather grandiloquent periphrasis, even if the satyrs mean it seriously; but cf. the Homeric Polyphemus’ anthropomorphizing address to the ram of the flock after being blinded as κρέα πέπον, ‘dear ram’, which he thinks is lagging behind the rest of the sheep in sorrow for his master’s blinded eye (Od. 9.443–60). sprung from: the Greek preposition ἐκ governing both nouns, but standing with the second, is a frequent trope (e.g., Hcl. 755–6, IT 886–7). [In 41 παί is Dindorf’s emendation of the unmetrical πᾶ δή μοι of the ms, evidently caused by πᾷ δή μοι of 43, as Duchemin suggests.]

43 tell me: translates the ethic dative μοι, very common (e.g., Cyc. 206, 543); see Smyth §1486.

44–6 a soft breeze ... rivers: the satyrs at first attempt to entice the ram, using pastoral imagery associated with the motif of the locus amoenus (‘lovely place’), a literary topos found in other genres: e.g., Plato’s Phaedrus (230b), and bucolic poetry of the Hellenistic era and beyond; cf. also Horace Odes 3.4.6–8. But Euripides uses similar imagery elsewhere, albeit briefly (e.g., Med. 839–40). [Musgrave’s emendation of αὔρα ‘breeze’ to αὐλὰ ‘hall’, is accepted by Duchemin to mean, in effect, ‘a hall sheltered from the wind’. But this is not necessary, since ὑπήνεμος αὔρα, in meaning literally a ‘breeze sheltered from the wind’, amounts to a soft breeze; for further discussion, see Ussher and Seaford.]

47 drinking troughs: πίστρωμας is feminine in form, as usual; the neuter πίστρα in 29 is required by metre (and conjectured here by Boissonade: πίστροις).

48 where: translates οὗ, Casaubon’s emendation; some editors (e.g., Ussher, Paganelli) retain Triclinius’ question οὔ, parallel with 44, which would give ‘... Do you not have your bleating young (here too)?’

49–51 Get on!: translates the blunt, onomatopoeic command ψύττα which the chorus almost spits out at the sheep; cf. the similarly inarticulate cries of the satyrs to each other (or their dogs) in Soph. Trackers F 314.176. The tone of the satyrs is now more imperious, then becomes pleading again: Graze on ... here, won’t you!: For interrogative οὐ and future indicative in a brusque command expecting obedience, cf. And. 1067; see Smyth §1918. The satyrs’ threat of stone-throwing (51) reflects their own frustration at failing to control the sheep, one of the menial tasks they must perform for which they are evidently ill-suited. at you: a variety of the partitive genitive, with ῥίπτω as at Bacc. 1096–7; see Smyth §1349.
52 ram: translates κεράστα, literally ‘horned creature’, which again seems to be a slightly grandiose way of referring to the sheep here (cf. 41–2n.).

53–4 <to> the guardian of the fold: (στασιωρὸν) Musgrave plausibly suggests that this refers to Silenus, since the old satyr is attendant of the fold (29–35); this interpretation requires Wecklein’s supplement πρὸς, which would make the line a metrically acceptable paroemiac. [Wilamowitz suggested that the noun refers to the ram, and emended it to make it vocative (στασιωρὲ), a view endorsed by Kovacs (1994) 145–6.]

53–4 the shepherd who roams the wild: Polyphemus is a hunter, even if not always successful (cf. 212–13, etc.). [Both μηλοβότα (‘shepherd’) and ἀγροβάτα (‘who roams the wild’) are Doric genitives in -α, typical of lyric; μηλοβότα may have led to the ms corruption to ἀγροβότα, which means ‘a creature who feeds in the wild’. Triclinius emended to ἀγροβάτα (cf. also 658, below).]

55–62 This antistrophe is addressed to the ewes.

56–7 give ... your teats: [translates θηλὰς πορίσας’, Broadhead’s emendation for the unmetrical and difficult θηλαῖσι σπορὰς of the ms ‘receive (δέξαι) the young ones with your teats’; for this, admittedly doubtful, sense of σπορά, see LSJ s.v. II b. whom: Diggle emended L’s ἃς to οὓς thereby restoring the masculine ‘common’ gender to the lambs, in line with 224, etc. in the chambers: (= θαλάμοι) another rather grandiose expression used by the satyrs, now for the cave’s interior.]

60 †are you encircling† (= ἀμφιβαίνεις): L’s verb is unmetrical and inappropriate in sense; Triclinius’ emendation to ἀμφιβαλεῖς (‘go round to’) has generally not found favour because ἀμφιβάλλω (literally ‘throw’ or ‘put around’) does not elsewhere appear intransitively to denote motion, which is required to make sense of 61–2.

62 Etna’s rocks: see 20n.

63 no Bromius: the epode (63–81) articulates more fully the satyrs’ painful isolation from Dionysus and his rites, mentioned already by Silenus (25–6), who had addressed the god by the same title at the very beginning of the play (i.e. 1n.).

64–5 thyrsus-wielding Bacchants (thyrsi are ivy-wreathed staves typically carried by the devotees of Dionysus): these figures are frequently depicted in the company of the god and satyrs on Attic red-figure vase-painting, notably on the hydria by the Kleophrades painter (LIMC VIII.1 s.v. ‘Mainades’ 36); cf. also Eur. Bacc. 556–7, where the thyrsus appears again. rapturous cries from drums (= τυμπάνων ἀλαλαγμοί): these instruments resemble tambourines and in later fifth-century vase-painting are usually carried by Maenads. In the Bacchae (120–134), the chorus tell how this instrument was introduced into the cult of Dionysus by the Corybantes who received it from Rhea, mother of Zeus; at Bacc. 59 Dionysus calls drums his own invention and Rhea’s. The verb ἀλαλάζω can refer to the cries of the bacchants themselves (Bacc. 1133) and the ‘cries’ of the drums suggest they are almost animated, fittingly enough for Dionysiac instruments, as if possessed by the god. The habit of endowing objects with an apparent life of their own is as old as Homer, who can speak of weapons as ‘pitiless’, ‘shameless’ or ‘raging’
66–7 bright drops of wine: the Dionysian liquid *par excellence* is similarly spoken of as almost animated in being called χλωράι, suggesting brightness and freshness but also associated with physical and emotional life; thus it is applied to tears (Eur. Med. 906, etc.) and blood (Hec. 127; Soph. Trach. 1055); see Seaford’s note ad loc. for more references, which suggest that χλωρός here means ‘invigorating’. See Dodds’ introduction to his commentary on the *Bacchae* for full discussion of still other kinds of liquids associated with Dionysus, apart from wine, such as blood, semen and sap in a young tree (1960: ix–xi); other liquids include milk, honey and water (cf. Bacc. 704–11). The invigorating brightness of the wine here also recalls its description in Homer as ‘bright, gleaming’ (αἴθοψ: Il. 4.259, etc.). The satyrs’ enthusiasm for wine is, of course, also depicted widely in Greek art: e.g. the cup interior, c. 510 BC attributed to the Epeleios painter; Douris’ psykter, c. 490 BC (= BM E768), the oinochoe depicting the satyric parody of Heracles and the Apples of Hesperides, c. 470 BC (= BM E539), etc. rushing waters of springs: evocation of the god’s boisterous, rural celebration through wine suits the life of satyrs generally, and here involves a brief description of a *locus amoenus* (see 44–6 n.). But here the satyrs are really lamenting the absence of such activity on Polyphemus’ island, adding poignancy to their plight.

68 Nymphs on Nysa: see 4n. Nymphs, rather than maenads, are typically the companions of satyrs: cf. Soph. Trackers 223–8 and n. 39; and for full discussion, see Hedreen (1994). However, at Cyc. 72 the satyrs see themselves as the pursuers of bacchants, which the audience would likely understand as involving unsuccessful erotic attempts, as depicted on fifth-century vases, e.g. the Kleophrades painter’s famous hydria of c. 480 BC; see 64–5n. Hedreen (1994) 58–65 shows that by the time of red-figure vase-painting, nymphs invariably fend off lecherous satyrs, in contrast to scenes of mutually amorous activity more readily found on black-figure vases, and suggests this may be due to satyr plays depicting maenads rebuffing their male counterparts. The choral reminiscences about such failed amorous encounters thus add a comic element to their longings here.

69–70 “iacchos! iacchos!”: a song in honour of Dionysus (Hdt. 8.65), or another name for the god himself as Iacchos (Soph. F 959, Ar. Frogs 398); so taken by Kassel and Seaford who make iacchos the object of μέλπω and emend ᾠδὰν to become instrumental φοιν to become instrumental φοιν (Kassel) or φοιν (Seaford) ‘with a song’ or ‘with songs’ respectively. Aphrodite, whom I pursued: it is perhaps surprising to find that the satyrs associate the song here with Aphrodite, but Dionysus is hardly excluded. Lecherous behaviour is typical of satyrs, especially under the influence of wine (e.g.,

(e.g. *Il*. 4.521, 5.661, 11.572–4, 13.501, etc); for discussion, see Kokolakis (1981). Similarly, Euripides can speak of parts of the body as if they have an energy or emotion of their own, e.g., *Hec.* 1128 when Polymestor wishes to lay his ‘raging hand’ on Hecuba; for animation of concrete objects elsewhere in Euripides, cf. *Hipp.* 807; *Hel.* 1352.

66–7 bright drops of wine: the Dionysian liquid *par excellence* is similarly spoken of as almost animated in being called χλωράι, suggesting brightness and freshness but also associated with physical and emotional life; thus it is applied to tears (Eur. Med. 906, etc.) and blood (Hec. 127; Soph. Trach. 1055); see Seaford’s note ad loc. for more references, which suggest that χλωρός here means ‘invigorating’. See Dodds’ introduction to his commentary on the *Bacchae* for full discussion of still other kinds of liquids associated with Dionysus, apart from wine, such as blood, semen and sap in a young tree (1960: ix–xi); other liquids include milk, honey and water (cf. Bacc. 704–11). The invigorating brightness of the wine here also recalls its description in Homer as ‘bright, gleaming’ (αἴθοψ: *Il*. 4.259, etc.). The satyrs’ enthusiasm for wine is, of course, also depicted widely in Greek art: e.g. the cup interior, c. 510 BC attributed to the Epeleios painter; Douris’ psykter, c. 490 BC (= BM E768), the oinochoe depicting the satyric parody of Heracles and the Apples of Hesperides, c. 470 BC (= BM E539), etc. rushing waters of springs: evocation of the god’s boisterous, rural celebration through wine suits the life of satyrs generally, and here involves a brief description of a *locus amoenus* (see 44–6 n.). But here the satyrs are really lamenting the absence of such activity on Polyphemus’ island, adding poignancy to their plight.

68 Nymphs on Nysa: see 4n. Nymphs, rather than maenads, are typically the companions of satyrs: cf. Soph. Trackers 223–8 and n. 39; and for full discussion, see Hedreen (1994). However, at Cyc. 72 the satyrs see themselves as the pursuers of bacchants, which the audience would likely understand as involving unsuccessful erotic attempts, as depicted on fifth-century vases, e.g. the Kleophrades painter’s famous hydria of c. 480 BC; see 64–5n. Hedreen (1994) 58–65 shows that by the time of red-figure vase-painting, nymphs invariably fend off lecherous satyrs, in contrast to scenes of mutually amorous activity more readily found on black-figure vases, and suggests this may be due to satyr plays depicting maenads rebuffing their male counterparts. The choral reminiscences about such failed amorous encounters thus add a comic element to their longings here.

69–70 “iacchos! iacchos!”: a song in honour of Dionysus (Hdt. 8.65), or another name for the god himself as Iacchos (Soph. F 959, Ar. Frogs 398); so taken by Kassel and Seaford who make iacchos the object of μέλπω and emend ᾠδὰν to become instrumental φοιν to become instrumental φοιν (Kassel) or φοιν (Seaford) ‘with a song’ or ‘with songs’ respectively. Aphrodite, whom I pursued: it is perhaps surprising to find that the satyrs associate the song here with Aphrodite, but Dionysus is hardly excluded. Lecherous behaviour is typical of satyrs, especially under the influence of wine (e.g.,

(e.g. *Il*. 4.521, 5.661, 11.572–4, 13.501, etc); for discussion, see Kokolakis (1981). Similarly, Euripides can speak of parts of the body as if they have an energy or emotion of their own, e.g., *Hec.* 1128 when Polymestor wishes to lay his ‘raging hand’ on Hecuba; for animation of concrete objects elsewhere in Euripides, cf. *Hipp.* 807; *Hel.* 1352.
so the realms of the two deities combine easily. The reference to the
goddess here is better understood as a personification of sexual activity, just as
Dionysus is wine personified (e.g., 415, 519–29), and Hephaestus fire personified
(599–600); the satyrs are telling us they have had endured a forced abstinence
from heterosexual activity (cf. 439–40). Sexual arousal induced, or increased, or
diminished by alcohol is a perennial human experience and often a comic motif of
western literature. After the murder of Duncan, the porter in Macbeth (Act II, Scene
III) provides some light relief, satyric in spirit, in his earthy musings on the effects
of alcohol ‘which provoke the desire, but take away the performance’.

72 white-footed Bacchants: female skin is usually white in black-figure vase
painting, and Greek poetry from Homer onwards, where ‘whiteness’ generally
connotes femininity and beauty (e.g. II. 1.55, 195, 208, etc. for Hera); it also suggests
status and decorum in that girls of a certain class did not need to work outdoors and
were covered up. Here ‘white-footed-ness’ is consistent with the Bacchants’ being
barefoot, as they are typically depicted in vase-painting; for discussion, see Irwin
(1974, 111–29, esp. 123–6). Orestes is λευκόπους (Anacr. 9.4–5), possibly because,
as Irwin suggests (1974) 126, in his frenzy he goes about barefoot like a Bacchant.

73–5 O my friend ... golden hair?: the important concept of friendship between
Dionysus and his followers is broached here, and recurs to underscore their
relationship with their god as well as with Odysseus and his men (81, 176, 378, 435–
6, 437, 466, 478, 650–3; cf. 496–8), in contrast to the fear and loathing the satyrs
feel for Polyphemus. [Some see problems in these lines and Diggle daggers them
all. The textual problems, as well as those of metre, which has not been confidently
identified, concern firstly, the coupling in ὦ φίλος ὦ φίλε of different forms, the
nominative used as a vocative preceding the true vocative. The nominative can
nevertheless function as a vocative, and ὦ φίλος occurs seven times in Euripides
(Andr. 510, 530, 1204; Supp. 278; Tro. 267, 1081; IT 830), as Kovacs (1994b)
146, notes, who nevertheless emends to ὦ φίλος ὦναξ (‘O my friend, my lord’).
For the nominative as vocative elsewhere in satyric drama, cf. Aesch. Prom. Fire-
Kindler F 207 (on which, see n. 9); Ussher also aptly compares II. 4.189 (φίλος ὦ Ἐνέλας);
so L’s reading may be right. Secondly, the form Βακχεῖε is rare, but it is
paralleled in Aristophanes (Thesm. 987); L may again be right. Thirdly, there are two
uncoordinated finite verbs in 74–5: οἰοπολεῖς (‘are you wandering’) and σείεις (‘are
you shaking?’). Nauck’s conjecture οἰοπολῶν (‘wandering’) restores grammatical
sense easily enough; also Wecklein’s ποῦ, giving ‘where (are you now)?’ for L’s
incorrect ποῖ (‘where to?’), fits in well with 81. The translation reflects both these
emendations.] are you shaking your golden hair?: Elsewhere Dionysus shakes
his hair (Bacc. 240) as do his male followers (ib. 185); head-shaking is typical of
many maenads in red-figure vases (LMC VIII.1 s.v. ‘Mainades’ 13, 30, 29, 144,
etc.). The mention of Dionysus’ hair as blonde or golden need not make him seem
effeminate, even though the god is elsewhere described as effeminate (Eur. Bacc.
353, 455). ξανθός regularly describes Menelaus in Homer (Od. 4.76, 168, etc.), and is used for Achilles (Il. 1.197, 23.141) and Odysseus (Od. 13.399, 431).

76–81 Diggle (1971) 44–5 discusses the metre of the passage; line 77 has proved most problematic for editors. L has θητεύω Κύκλωπι (printed by, for instance, Murray, Paganelli and Paduano); but Diggle says brevis in longo (the final short iota in Κύκλωπι) ‘is not to be tolerated’ and prints Fritzsche’s emendation Κύκλωπι θητεύω which gives an ‘acceptable’ iambic dimeter with spondaic contraction and is adopted by other editors (e.g., Ussher, Napolitano); see also Seaford for further discussion.

76–9 your ... servant ... serf to the Cyclops ... slave: under Dionysus the satyrs’ servitude is characterized by friendship throughout the play (see above 73–5n.), just as Euripides’ Ion can speak proudly of his servile duties of sweeping the portico of Apollo’s temple (Ion 102–43, 151–3, 181–3); at Cyc. 709 the satyrs look forward to being slaves of the Bacchic god again. But under Polyphemus the satyrs endure a brutal despotism, which they complain about twice here. Sophocles’ Trackers implies the servile state of the satyrs, who seem to be promised freedom by Apollo (62–3; cf. 75–8, 223–8), but whether this means freedom from Dionysus or a temporary master is not clear (see introductory discussion to Soph. Trackers below).

80 miserable goat-skin cloak: while satyrs occasionally seem to be goatish (Aesch. Prom. Fire-Kindler F 207; Soph. Trackers 367), they are much more equine in the Archaic and Classical periods in appearance. It is unlikely that that there is a reference here to the perizôma – the hairy shorts with phallus and tail attached, and an essential part of the costume of actors in satyr-plays, depicted on the Pronomos vase (cf. below 99–101n.); see also Hedreen (1992) 107–12. Rather, the chorus seems to be alluding to their abnormal and ungainly attire as a visual manifestation of their unnatural role as slaves to Polyphemus. As Seaford points out, there is a comic contrast here to the leopard-skins and fawn-skins they wear as part of their service of Dionysus (cf. Aesch. Net-Fishers F **46.790; Soph. Trackers 224–5 where Dionysus is their usual master); also, the Silenus-actor on the Pronomos vase wears a leopard skin over his costume. The satyric complaint is almost self-parodic in that these normally rustic, unsophisticated figures complain rather preciously of being made to wear rustic clothing.

81 your friendship: see 73–5n.

82–95 Silenus abruptly brings the parodos to an end and looks in the direction of the new arrivals, which heralds a new development in the drama. Descriptions of characters arriving along the eisodos, or the side entrance to the acting area and orchestra, are common enough in tragedy. This lengthy account of the arrival of Odysseus and his men not only adds to the anticipation of their presence, but, more practically for the theatre, allows them – and they are described as carrying buckets and containers (87–8) – time enough to get to the acting area. In Homer,
Odysseus brings twelve men with him (Od. 9.195); but in Cyclops their number is unspecified.

83 attendants: see above 41–81n.

85 a ship – a Greek ship: literally ‘a hull of a ship of Greece’. This pleonasm is common enough (e.g. Aesch. Pers. 419; Eur. IT 742, 1345; cf. also Cyc. 118, 702).

86 mighty oarsmen: literally ‘lords of the oar’. Silenus adds a grandiloquent touch to the information he gives in an almost paratragic manner, reminiscent of Aeschylus’ heroising description of every Athenian oarsman at Salamis: κώπης … ἀναζάς (‘lord of his oar’: Aesch. Pers. 378; cf. 383); in his Telephus (F 705 Kannicht) Euripides uses the comparable verbal expression κώπης ἀνάσσων. It is interesting to compare Silenus’ words here to his otherwise mostly disdainful attitude to Odysseus and his men for the rest of the play.

87–8 In the Odyssey, Homer emphasizes Odysseus’ own curiosity to the point of recklessness as the motivation for his arrival at Polyphemus’ island and cave (Od. 9.172–6, 228–30). Euripides makes him a more reluctant traveller driven by necessity in the search for food and water (cf. also 96–8, 109).

89–93 These lines increase the sense of foreboding, further indicating that Polyphemus is every bit the transgressive monster of Odyssey 9, and thus a suitable ogre for a satyr play. O unhappy strangers! (ὦ ταλαίπωροι ξένοι): similar expressions of pity are found at Eur. Medea 990, 1057, IT 479; satyric drama could at times, even momentarily, broach the same emotions as tragedy. Silenus’ sympathy for strangers is genuine (he also considers them unlucky: 92) but it is also relatively short-lived, in contrast to his more generous-spirited sons, e.g. at 381.

90–1 our master Polyphemus: here the monster’s despotic nature (NB δεσπότης: 90) underscores his villainy. the land … is hostile to strangers: the location matches the character of its natural inhabitants, the Cyclopes (see 20n.). As in Homer, violations of hospitality characterize the behaviour of Polyphemus (Od. 9.259–80); Odysseus emphasizes that it is Zeus and the other gods who have avenged the monster’s crimes against strangers (Od. 9.478–9). [For Jacob’s emendation of L’s στέγην (‘dwelling’) to τε γῆν (‘and … the land’), accepted by Diggle, see Duchemin and Seaford; cf., however, Ussher, Biehl, Paduano who retain the ms reading. The essential point about the inhospitality of the Cyclops and his environs remains.]

92–3 the man-eating Cyclopean jaw: elsewhere in Euripides the adjective κυκλωπίος denotes gigantic, prehistoric architecture of what modern scholarship calls the Bronze Age, understood by the ancients to have been built by Cyclopes (e.g. Bacchylides 10.77; Eur. HF 15, 998; Tro. 1088; El. 1158; [Apollod.] Bibl. 2.2.1). Here the adjective is used literally to pun on both the size and the monstrous owner of such jaws. [Williams, cited in Diggle’s OCT apparatus, suggests that 90–3 are a question to give: ‘Do they have no idea that … Cyclops?’ ἀνδροβρῶτα (= ‘man-eating’) is a correction by ms P of L’s ἀνδροβότα.]

95 Sicilian Etna’s rocky outcrop: see 20n. [As Seaford notes, πάρεμι (‘be
Odysseus and his men probably, though not necessarily, enter from the opposite side to that used by the chorus. **Strangers:** this is, of course, a conventional word of greeting, but Odysseus’ first word is somewhat ironic given that Silenus has told us that the land is hostile to strangers (91) and its inhabitants are man-killing monsters (22). **would you tell us:** Odysseus’ language is polite with the optative and ἄν (on which, see Smyth §1830) and formal to the point of affectation in his use of periphrases, *e.g.* νῦμα ποτάμιον: **flowing river water** (literally = ‘a current of a river’). Despite Silenus’ attempt to bring him down to earth (*e.g.* see below 104, 105, 314–5nn.), Odysseus mostly maintains a more dignified – if at times pompous – and heroic persona than is generally accorded him by many commentators; see Gen. Intro. p. 48.

**99–101  <Hey>, what’s this?: <ἔα·> is a supplement by Wecklein. As Ussher (who does not include Wecklein’s supplement) notes, Odysseus’ surprise as he gets a closer look at the satyrs is paralleled elsewhere by Euripidean characters (*Andr.* 896); see also Stevens (1976) 33. Also comparable is Eur. *Andromeda* F 125: Perseus’ surprise on seeing Andromeda; and cf. Polyphemus (at *Cyc.* 222). **city of Bromius:** there is some irony in this remark, given that Silenus and the satyrs have told us that there is no Bromius or Dionysus present for them to worship in their current plight (25–6, 63). But to the sophisticated Odysseus, the sight of any satyr will naturally lead him to associations of Dionysiac worship, and it seems that the hero has seen enough satyrs to populate a small community. **I greet…** (literally, χαίρειν προσεῖπα is: ‘I addressed to greet’) the aorist here is ‘tragic’, so-called ‘instantaneous’ or ‘performative’; see Lloyd (1999). Fix emended to προσεῖπον, but editors print the aorist here in alpha, the first or weak aorist on stem εἰπ- (see Smyth p. 695). Again Odysseus is formal and polite, as befits his circumstances as a traveller in need of help. **the eldest:** that Silenus is conspicuously the older probably indicates that the actor playing him wore a mask with white hair attached as held by the actor on the Pronomos Vase (on the upper level speaking to the Heracles-actor); for an illustration, see Pickard-Cambridge (1962) fig. 85; see also above 2n.

**102–62** This lengthy exchange is in stichomythia whereby each character speaks one line of dialogue in turn; also included are two lines of *antilabê* (a change of speakers within a line, *e.g.*, 153–4). The highly stylized question and answer format (*esp.* 102–31) occurs in all forms of Greek drama, but there are many colloquialisms in the following exchange (*e.g.* 149, 150, 152, 153, 154, 156), giving it a conversational tone; for general treatment of this form of dialogue, see, most recently Collard (2007) 16–30. Euripides uses it here to outline again the bleakness of the satyrs’ situation: the remoteness and harshness of the environment; the man-eating monsters who inhabit the land (125–8); the lack of any of the accoutrements a Greek would expect of a civilised community: no buildings, communal laws,
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agriculture or viticulture (115–24); see more fully O’Sullivan (2012a). Odysseus and Silenus strike a deal: the old satyr will give the visitors food in return for wine which allows him to reveal his true colours and indulge in fantasies about a return to his old habits of drink and lechery (163–74). With some satyric lampooning of Odysseus’ heroic posturing (104–5; cf. also 177–8), the exchange essentially establishes the goodwill between the hero and the satyrs (albeit short-lived in the case of Silenus), who all share a desire to escape as quickly as possible.

102 stranger: on the possible irony and foreboding of this word, see above 96–8n. tell me who you are... As Ussher notes, in immediately demanding to know the visitors’ identity and origin, Silenus violates the heroic ethic of hospitality in Homer, just as the Homeric Polyphemus does (Od. 9.252). Contrast the Phaeacians in the Odyssey; Odysseus arrives at Alcinous’ palace at Od. 7.132–5, and does not identify himself until Od. 9.19–20. However, Silenus is not on his home territory and it is conceivable that he may see in Odysseus’ arrival a chance to escape.

103 Cephallenians: a name used by Homer for Odysseus’ followers (Il. 2.631–2, Od. 20.210; cf. Od. 24.378). Sophocles’ not altogether flattering portrait of the hero in Philoctetes of 409 BC likewise refers to him as Κεφαλληνῶν ἄναξ (‘lord of the Cephallenians’: Phil. 264).

104 a shrill, relentless babbler: cf. Rhes. 499 where Odysseus is similarly called κρότημα (cf. Soph. F 913); see Collard (2005) 370. While Odysseus is praised for his powers of speaking in Homer (e.g. Il. 3.304–24), already by the Odyssey he is at times a long-winded liar, as even his patron goddess, Athena, tells him (Od. 13.291–301). Frequently unfavourable treatments in post-Homeric poetry are attested in Pindar (Nem. 7.20–6), and Euripides’ Hecuba (218–437), and Palamedes (F 578–90 Kannicht), Philoctetes F 789c.§8, Troades (esp. 279–92), and Sophocles’ Philoctetes; hostility may have set in already by the time of the Cypria of probably the seventh century BC (F 20 Davies), which tells of his murder of the innocent Palamedes. For full discussion of his various depictions, see Stanford (1954), esp. 91–117; more recently, S. Montiglio (2011) passim. of the race of Sisyphus: γένος functions as an accusative of respect to mean ‘(son) of Sisyphus by race’ (cf. Bacc. 460, Pho. 125), or as a noun in apposition with ἄνδρα (‘man’) thus giving ‘son of Sisyphus’ (cf. Her. 888). Sisyphus was the notorious trickster, punished in the Underworld by having to roll a stone up a hill only to fail in every attempt (Homer Od. 9.593–600), who later became a symbol for Albert Camus’ existential belief in the futility of human existence, Le Mythe de Sisyphe (1942). As something of a comic, incorrigible anti-hero, given to theft and trickery, he was a popular subject for satyr plays by, e.g., Aeschylus (F 225–34; on which, see below), Euripides (Autolycus F 282–3; and F 673–4), possibly Sophocles (F 545: see p. 506) and (?)Critias (F 19; see below). Silenus’ phrase here may be taken metaphorically, given that Odysseus’ usual father was Laertes (Od. 9.19, 505), but in some accounts – at least according to his enemies – he was the bastard son of Sisyphus (Aesch. F
286; Soph. Ajax 189–90, Phil. 417, etc.). [The scholiast to Soph. Ajax 190 quotes the line with γόνον (lit. ‘son’), but as Seaford notes, there is no reason to change γένος, notwithstanding the parallel of Eur. Ia 1362.]

105 **that very man:** ἐκεῖνος αὐτός, cf. Ar. Wealth 82–3 where Chremylus uses the same expression somewhat incredulously of the dilapidated Plutus who replies dejectedly αὐτότατος (‘my very self’), similar in tone to Odysseus’ admission here. **No need to rub it in:** literally, ‘don’t abuse (me).’ Silenus has just taken some gloss off Odysseus’ grandiose persona (cf. 314–5), in an exchange that juxtaposes the heroic and comic. In Od. 9.20 the hero brags that his κλέος (‘heroic renown’, ‘glory’) reaches heaven; but Silenus turns such fame into a notoriety for deceit that has reached Sicily, thus puncturing his heroic pretensions somewhat. [αὐτός, which gives better sense, is L. Dindorf’s emendation for L’s οὗτος, which would give ‘this is that man’.]

106 For πάρειμι, see 95n.

107 **hardships at Troy:** these hardships (πόνοι), which Odysseus mentions again (e.g. 282, 347, 351, 603), comprise a genuinely heroic counterpart to the ‘hardships’ which Silenus melodramatically complained about in the first line of the play.

110 **Oh no!** (παπαῖ): Silenus expresses a mixture of surprise and sympathy – the two need not be mutually exclusive – more in tune with his earlier response on seeing the strangers (cf. above 89–93n.), and a departure from his rather lame attempt at humour at 108. Now he identifies with the plight of the arrivals and even uses the same word – ἐξαντλεῖς (you are indeed suffering) – that he applied to his own sufferings; see above 10n.

112 Silenus alludes again to what brought him to Sicily in somewhat heroising terms, but Odysseus lets it pass. The audience has heard it before, and is spared what would no doubt be an embellished account of these events from the aged satyr.

114 **The mound of Etna:** Etna itself functions in synecdoche for Sicily (cf. 20n., etc.), but here ‘mound’ (ὄχθος) seems ironic in referring to the huge volcano; but ὄχθος occurs again at 706, and there as elsewhere can mean any hill, even the Athenian Acropolis (Eur. Ion 12).

115 Odysseus’ apparently innocent question, following up his query at 113, taps into a major strand of Greek thought about human progress, since the invention of housing was amongst the first indications of even an emergent human society. Prometheus taught house-building to mortals who had previously lived in caves (PV 450–3, 469–71); in Soph. Ant. 359–60 house-building is one of many great human technical achievements. In Protagoras’ myth of the origins of communities it indicates some level of human progress, albeit incomplete, even before the rise of politicized consciousness (Plato, Prot. 322a).

116 **There are none** (reading Schenk’s ἔστι – the singular form required for the neuter plural subjects – for L’s ἐστι): there is another possible irony here in that the
Cyclopes, famous for building monumental architecture (cf. above 92–3n.), live on an island without any buildings at all. stranger (ξένε): Silenus addresses Odysseus this way, even after learning the hero’s name (103–5), implying that, as a stranger, Odysseus is likely to have a rough time whilst on the island; cf. above 91, 96–8 nn.

117 a race of beasts? (θηρῶν γένος): in his incredulity Odysseus inadvertently stumbles upon the right answer to his question about the native inhabitants of Sicily.

118 not houses: translates the periphrastic pleonasm οὐ στέγας δόμων (see 85n.). Silenus here implies that the inhabitants, as cave dwellers, do not comprise a civilized community (cf. 115 n.), as is confirmed also at 120. This recalls their habits mentioned already in Homer (Od. 9.112–15): ‘They have neither assemblies for council, nor appointed laws, but they dwell on the peaks of lofty mountains in hollow caves, and each one is lawgiver to his children and his wives, and they take no account of each other.’

119 Whose subjects ...: literally, ‘hearing/obeying whom?’ (τίνος κλύοντες); for this use of κλύω (which functions as a synonym of ἀκούω in the next line), cf. Eur. Bellerophon F 286.11. power shared among the people: it seems odd to refer by implication to a δῆμος (‘people’ or ‘citizen body’) here, given that Odysseus has just been told that the inhabitants are cave-dwellers with no communal laws. The point may be to underline, by a rather slow process of question and answer, the vast difference between the lifestyle of these beasts and the culture of the Attic δῆμος, the play’s first audience, for whom democracy and the related ideal of ἰσονομία (‘equality before the law’) were brandished as important political concepts (Hdt. 3.80.6; 83.1; 142.3; 5.37.2 [where it is opposed to tyranny]; Thuc. 2.37.1; Eur. Suppl. 429–62).

120 loners; nobody ... anyone else: the excessively self-contained lifestyle of each of the Cyclopes and consequent lack of communal activity is emphasized here in the threefold polyptoton (repetition of the same word in different cases) of οὐδείς. For the relevance of excessive autarkeia (self-sufficiency) to the Cyclops overall, see Konstan (1990). It is only under the influence of the wine which Odysseus gives him, that Polyphemus begins to think of his fellow Cyclopes; see 533n. [μονάδες is a now widely accepted emendation by Schmidt (1975), which develops 118, in place of of L’s νόμαδες (‘nomads’), which seems at odds with 121–2; but cf. Ussher, who retains the ms reading.]

121–2 In addition to lacking architecture of any type, the Cyclopes practice no agriculture (on which, see next note), even though here, as in Homer, they keep sheep and make cheese. Polyphemus tells us that the earth produces grass to fatten his livestock (332–3). The natives, in other words, have nothing to do with Demeter; here is another example of the reductive and distorted portrait Euripides gives of Sicily, which famously functioned as the bread basket of the ancient Mediterranean (Hdt. 7.158.4; Thuc. 6.20.4, etc.); for the importance of the cult of Demeter on Sicily, see White (1964) and Hinz (1998), esp. 55–167.
123–4 streams of the grape-vine: an appositional phrase with Βρομίου ... πῶμα. [Reiske’s emendation ροας is for L’s ungrammatical ροας, a scribal error likely influenced by the datives in 122.] no dancing: dancing was about as important to the satyrs as drinking, and for them, there can hardly be one without the other. The absence of agriculture and wine signals an important difference not only culturally between the Cyclopes and mortals, but also in the relationship of each race to the gods. In the Bacchae (275–83) Teiresias posits Demeter’s crop (cf. Cyc. 121) and the wine of Dionysus as the greatest goods for mortals. Both agriculture and wine were gifts bestowed on mortals by the Olympians – the former to Triptolemus ([Apollod.] Bibl. 1.5.2; cf. H. Hom. Dem. 2.470–9; Soph. F 539), the latter to king Oeneus, the ‘wine-man’ ([Apollod.] Bibl. 1.8.1; Hyginus Fab. 129; cf. above 39n.). Agriculture and wine are spoken of as gods – as Demeter and Dionysus, respectively – in fifth-century drama (Bacc. 275–83, 285; Cyc. 156, 415, 454) and philosophy (Prodicus 84 B5 DK); see Guthrie (1962–81) vol. 3, 226–49 for an overview of concepts of the divine in the age of the Sophists. The Cyclopes know nothing of such blessings, a fact which seems to underlie Polyphemus’ disdain for the Olympians (see esp. 316, 318–19, 320–1, 327–8, 336–8nn.). Polyphemus’ ignorance of wine puts him on the same uncivilized level as the centaurs who went berserk at the wedding of Pirithous when they got their first whiff of it ([Apollod.] Ep. 1.21–2). This led to the famous battle between Lapiths and Centaurs, depicted on such monuments as the west pediment of the temple of Zeus at Olympia and the metopes of the Parthenon, often seen as a battle between the forces of civilization and barbarism: e.g. Pollitt (1972) 81–3; Stewart (1997) 191–5; Osborne (1998) 172–3.

125–6 strangers: while the Cyclopes eat other kinds of food (122, 248–9), this exchange emphasizes their hostility to ξένοι, which Silenus has already mentioned (89–93, esp. 91). Again, Odysseus’ unknowing question calls for an emphatic ‘no’, this time mentioning the man-eating habits of the monsters.

127 the ... flesh: βορά: although used twice in the fairly neutral sense ‘food’ or ‘meat’ for Odysseus and his men (88, 97), βορά frequently denotes the monster’s vile appetite here and elsewhere (249, 254, 289, 367, 409, 416); twice this βορά is explicitly condemned; it is ‘unholy’ (289) and ‘most shameful’ (416).

128 Nobody ... has not been eaten: (οὐδὲς) this clearly refers only to human travellers (as opposed to the monster’s attendants; see above 41–81n.). The satyrs are, after all, immortal (Theopompus 115 FGH 75c, etc.), and not to Polyphemus’ liking anyway (220–1). Does this line anticipate Odysseus’ trick, made famous by Homer (Od. 9.364–7), of calling himself ‘Nobody’? Although in Homer and later in the play (549) Odysseus calls himself Οὔτις, punning and word-play between the two negatives οὐ and μή (the first objective, the second subjective) is detectable already in Homer’s account (Od. 9.405–6, 408, 410, 414, 422). Homer plays upon two ‘nobodies’: ‘Nobody’ οὔτις and ‘nobody’ μη τις and the etymologically distinct μῆτις ‘ruse’ (414, 422). Those familiar with the tale may have seen in Silenus’ remark
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an ironic, even unintended, prophecy here. The pun in Homer was recognized long ago by Stanford (1939) 104–5 and 1964 on Od. 9.408.

130 Hunting with dogs carries with it aristocratic and heroic overtones at least in Homeric epic (Il. 9.533–49; Od. 19.428–66), but also occurs in satyric drama; see below on Soph. Trackers F 314 n. 35. Homer makes no mention of Polyphemus as hunter and dog-owner, but here this detail seems to give him a certain sophistication over his Homeric counterpart, even though in the play he remains bestial on other levels (cf. esp. 442, 602, 658). On the relative sophistication of Polyphemus, see, for instance, Seaford (1984) 51–9; cf. Marshall (2005).

131 Do you know ... what you are to do: Literally: ‘Do you know what do…’. This translates the imperative δρᾶσον (‘do’), Canter’s emendation of L’s δróbāsēς (‘you shall do’); the question-mark is introduced because of the answer in 132 ‘I don’t know. But …’. L’s reading, which also requires a question mark, is retained by some (Duchemin, Ussher, Paganelli, Biehl). But as Seaford notes, parallels to the emended text can be found elsewhere in Euripides (e.g. Hec. 225, Ion 1029, IA 725). Simmonds and Timberlake (1927) 131n. explain the emended construction as a change from indirect to direct speech; but it can also be understood as a colloquialism; see Stevens (1976) 36. For discussion of οἶσθ’ ... ὃ δρᾶσον, see Diggle (1994) 500–1.

132 we’d do: δρῴημεν is an Ionic form; cf. Hel. 1010; Alc. 272; Smyth §460.

134–5 Meat is a staple of Homeric heroes (Il. 9.205–21; 24.621–7, etc.). In the diet of the Athenians of Euripides’ day meat was not nearly as common as fish and cereals; for discussion, see Davidson (1998) 3–20. nice ... hunger: in the Greek these two words (ἡδὺ, λιμοῦ) are juxtaposed to give the effect of an oxymoron as a result of hyperbaton, with predicative λιμοῦ advanced for emphasis.

136 cow’s milk: The Greeks were not great drinkers of milk, and when Homer refers to milk, it is usually sheep’s milk (Il. 4.434, etc.), rather than cow’s milk as here; Homeric heroes usually drink wine (Il. 1.471–2, 9.706, 24.641–2, etc.). In the Odyssey Polyphemus has no cattle, only goats and sheep. That milk is Polyphemus’ staple drink is the natural corollary of his ignorance of wine, and a further indication of his barbarism (see above 123–4n.). As Seaford notes, milk-drinking mostly had connotations of barbarism in Greek thought (e.g. Il. 13.5–6, Hes. F 150.15, Hdt. 1.216; Galen 6.765). [Athenaeus (14.658c) cites this line with Διὸς γάλα (‘milk of Zeus’, but the case for emending ms. L is generally not accepted. Διὸς γάλα might refer to the goat’s milk that Zeus was fed as an infant by the nymph Amalthea (or goat of the same name) or the nymph Melissa on Mt. Ida in Crete (cf. [Apollod.] Bibl. 1.1.7.).]

137 Bring ... out: ἐκφέρετε: as a plural imperative, this order can be only to the unidentified attendants of 83, because a chorus cannot enter the skênê. For similar ‘anonymous’ commands cf. e.g. Hec. 981, Cretans F 472e, 45–6; see Taplin (1977) 79–80 for Aeschylus. Silenus will act on it, too (163); this confirms his role as an independent actor, rather than being coryphaeus.
138 how much?: the word-order here – the postponement of πόσον (‘how much’) – emphasizes Silenus’ venality (cf. 150, 160), which is evident in other satyr-plays and thus a trope of his characterisation, e.g. Soph. Trackers 51, 56, 78, 162, 208; cf. 456; in Eur. Sciron (F 675) the old satyr appears to act as pimp for some prostitutes.

140 the dearest words: cf. Eur. Ion 1488; Soph. Phil. 1290. The antecedent of οὗ is πῶμα (drink) of the previous line. what we’ve needed: a direct echo of οὗ σπανίζομεν which Odysseus used when asking for bread (133). Euripides incorporates a neat complement here: wine is to Silenus and the satyrs as bread is to civilized humans. Both are unknown to the Cyclopes.

141 Maron: a priest of Apollo and son of Euanthes in the Odyssey, who gave Odysseus wine (Od. 9.197–8); elsewhere he is also the grandson of Dionysus (Hes. F 238). This is the earliest extant description of him as the son of the wine-god; Satyrus gives him the same parentage as here (FGrH F 1.27). At Cratinus F 135 Maron is a metonymy for wine, like his father (cf. Cratinus F 146); and possibly also at Cyc. 412.

142–3 The one I … reared: the wording evokes Silenus’ well-known role as the carer of Dionysus in satyr-drama (Soph. Little Dionysus F 171; cf. Aesch. Net-Fishers F **47a.770; Adespota F 646a.4–12) and art (e.g. Boardman 1989: fig. 126); cf. also statues of Silenus holding the infant god (e.g. LIMC VIII.1 s.v. ‘Silenoi’ 215, which is a replica in the Louvre, of a famous Vatican statue). But Odysseus’ reply and reference to the son of Bacchus make it clear that Silenus has also reared Maron. Euripides is thus alluding to an episode otherwise unknown to us, but which may have been the subject of another satyr-play, as long ago suggested by Waltz (1931).

145 Here is the wine-skin … it: the use of νιν (here = ‘it’) is rare for a neuter (πῶμα), but cf. Eur. Bacc. 289–90. [Radermacher’s emendation ἁσκὸς (= ὁ ἀσκός ‘the wine-skin’) gives more force to the demonstrative ὅδε ‘here’ (literally ‘this’) than L’s ἀσκὸς.]

146 Silenus’ greed for wine – compounded here by his enforced abstinence during his time as Polyphemus’ slave – matches the satyrs’ more general exuberance for their favourite drink (cf. Sophocles’ satyr Little Dionysus F 172).

147 The translation follows the text of Diggle who posits a lacuna here, following Nauck and Kirchhoff, while Duchemin’s text daggers the first four Greek words. The problem is that ναί (yes) and δὶς τόσον πῶμα (twice as much drink) can only depend on a preceding but missing clause. However, Ussher and Seaford suggest that reading νά (from νάω ‘flow’), mooted by a number of scholars, apparently independently – Blumenthal, Grégoire, Levi, Cerri – removes the difficulty. The sense would thus be: ‘there runs twice as much drink as flows from the wine-skin’. Odysseus might be saying that two parts of water are added for every part of wine (suggested by Cerri), or that the wine-skin will replenish itself twofold for every
amount that Silenus drinks from it (suggested by Simmonds and Timberlake, who still nevertheless print ναί ‘Yes’). This latter interpretation seems a plausible way of reading Odysseus’ words, who is, after all, trying to strike a favourable deal for himself and his men, and it may be considered part of his ‘sales pitch’; as we have learnt, the wine is of divine origin (141–3). But this reading would have more cogency if 147 began with an adversative in response to 146. These readings, then, must remain speculative; what does seem beyond dispute is that the reading of L here is too elliptical and abrupt after 146.

148 beautiful: the wine is spoken of in almost visual terms as καλός more than once in this scene; see 153n., 158n., below.

149 Literally: ‘Do you want that I should give you a taste …?’ This combines two questions ‘do you want?’ and a deliberative aorist subjunctive ‘am I to give you a taste?’ This paratactic idiom is colloquial; see Stevens (1976) 60. unmixed: standard Greek practice was to mix wine either with honey or water (Ar. Knights 1187, etc.); more fully, see Davidson (1998) 20–69. Stronger drink here will affect Silenus all the more and give more scope for his comic and transgressive behaviour later in the play. In Lycophron’s Menedemus (F 2.6–7) an enraged Silenus complains of his host’s stinginess in serving watered down wine in small cups; cf. also Ion Omphale F 27 with n. and Achaeus, Aethon F 9, below. For word play and metaphorical uses of ἄκρατος, see below 576–7n. and 602n.

150 sale: cf. above 138n.

151 And look: translates the expression καὶ μὴν, which suggests that Odysseus produces the cup with a flourish, as if to entice the aged satyr further and increase his chances of getting a good return for the gift of wine. brought along: translates ἐφέλκω (more literally) ‘take in tow’ (LSJ s.v. I); the cup is tied to the wine-skin (or Odysseus’ belt) like a small boat towed by a ship.

152 Come on: φέρε followed by an imperative is colloquial; see Stevens (1976) 42; cf. above 8n. pour it out and let it gurgle in: translates Valckenaer’s emendation ἐγκάναξον, accepted by Diggle, of L’s ἐκπάταξον (‘hit’ or ‘knock’), retained by Duchemin and Ussher. The compound in ἐκ- more or less restricts the sense to ‘out (of the skin)’, and this seems acceptable only as a colloquialism. A good parallel for Valckenaer’s emendation is Ar. Knights 105–6; but the ms reading can still be understood in the sense of ‘hit’ whereby the wine hits the cup when poured out; and as lectio difficilior L’s reading still has some plausibility. so I can remember what it means to drink: literally: ‘so that I may remember, having drunk’. Here, the aorist participle πιών is coincident, but it could also be taken as a past ‘by having drunk’; for discussion of such participles, see Barrett (1964) on Hipp. 289–92.

153–4 There, done! (ἰδού): a colloquial compliance (cf. 545); see Stevens (1976) 35–6. What a beautiful scent ...: ὡς is exclamatory (cf. also 577, 665); Smyth §2682. In the Odyssey, Maron’s wine is described as having a ‘sweet aroma’ (Od. 9.210). But Silenus uses καλὴ, a word more usually associated with fine appearances
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(e.g. Aesch. Sacred Delegates F **78a 18; cf. ib. 12; LSJ refer it to ‘outward form’: s.v. καλός I). Seaford cites two instances of smell being spoken of in visual terms (Ar. Birds 1715–16; Alexis F 222.3–4). That a smell should be visible is paradoxical synaesthesia and is hardly sufficient reason to emend the text, as do Kovacs (χροιὰν: ‘colour’) and Willink (φυὴν: ‘form’ or ‘body’), for L’s ὀσμὴν. The word seems to prompt Silenus’ use of καλός (‘splendid’) at Cyc. 153 and Odysseus’ question about ‘seeing’ the aroma, with εἶδες (you saw) emphatically placed first as if to underline his incredulity. The joke may work on another level: an incongruous, almost hyperbolic use of language by Silenus to express his excitement and anticipation; cf. his joy expressed at 159. What? translates γὰρ which can be used in abrupt questions to convey surprised recognition; see Denniston (1954) 78–9.

155 so that you don’t …. ὅς ἄν + subjunctive in a purpose clause is rare in Attic prose, but occurs again at 634 (cf. Smyth §2201.a and b). in words alone: the λόγος-ἔργον (‘word-deed’) distinction and interaction was famous in Sophistic thought (Gorgias 82 B3 DK, esp. 83–6; cf. [Aristotle] On Melissus, Xenophanes and Gorgias 979a11–80b 21), in Antisthenes (on which see O’Sullivan and Wong 2012) and in Thucydides’ methodology as historian (1.20.3–22, etc; see Parry (1981)). It occurs in other Euripidean dramas (e.g., Alc. 339; El. 893) and implicitly elsewhere in Cyclops (375–6 with n.) and other satyric drama (e.g. Soph. Trackers 152). It need not carry overtones of intellectual debate and speculation here at 155; Odysseus, rather, wants Silenus’ appreciation of the wine to translate itself into action so that the old satyr gives generous amounts of food in return.

156–7 For satyrs, drink and dancing are inseparable; cf. 124n.

158 Did it really: Odysseus seems to be toying with Silenus; his question is here is ironic, as μῶν can sometimes expect a negative answer; cf. Latin num. But as Barrett (1964) on Hipp. 794 notes, Odysseus fully expects Silenus to react as he does to the wine and approves of it; the use of μῶν here suggests mock surprise. beautifully: the play on καλός (cf. 148, 153) is kept up.

160–1 money: strictly speaking, an ‘anachronism’ – but one hardly likely to bother the audience – in that (a) the heroic age did not have any currency and (b) the mythical Sicily of the play has no people, and therefore no commerce, on it; cf. also Sciron F 675 for other anachronistic references to money in satyric drama. Odysseus’ offer of money is probably a mere pretence (cf. 139), but perhaps was designed to ingratiate himself further with the old satyr. Just loosen the wine-skin: the wine-skin has already been opened; now Silenus wants the wine to flow more freely from it. Silenus, a normally venal figure (cf. above 138n.), in rejecting Odysseus’ offer of money, thus appears in his true colours as obsessed with the pleasures of drink, especially since he has begun drinking (155–9).

162 bring out: see above 137n.

163 masters: Ussher suggests that the plural δεσποτῶν can signify a single master, as at Eur. Hec. 557, and may refer to Polyphemus; conversely, as Silenus goes
on to mention all the Cyclopes (165), it appears that these – including, of course, Polyphemus – are the masters he has in mind. The absence of an article, however, with δεσποτῶν may suggest that Silenus is thinking of masters generally.

164–6 I could go mad: ἄν ... μαίνοιμην Silenus in his mania for drinking is hardly likely to be satisfied with ‘one cup’ of wine. The influence of Dionysus seems to be present on more than one level here, as cognates of μαίνομαι typically express the frenzy of Bacchic worship, evident in the etymology of the word maenad (Eur. Bacc. 32, 354, etc.); at Bacc. 130 the satyrs are themselves μαινόμενοι (but cf. 168n.). In his first appearance in Greek literature Dionysus is already μαινόμενος (Il. 6.132). Silenus’ desire for drunkenness can be seen as a desire to be reunited with his god (cf. 124n.). throwing myself (ῥίπτας): this intransitive use of ῥίπτω is paralleled at Alc. 897. Leucadian rocks: part of a promontory, off the west coast of Greece just north of Ithaca, and a place of execution for criminals who were thrown into the sea (Strabo 10.2.9). [While μαίνομαι can occasionally take infinitives in the sense ‘rage madly to do something’ (e.g., Il. 16.75) it is far more often associated with participles; thus, Diggle prints Kirchhoff’s emendations of ἐκπιών (‘after drinking’) for L’s ἐκπιεῖν, and at 166 ῥίψας (‘throwing’) for L’s ῥίψαι, which, like the aorist participle ἀντιδούς (‘swapping’), is coincident with ἄν ... μαίνοιμην (cf. above 152n.). But some editors, e.g., Duchemin, Paganelli and Paduano, retain the infinitives.]

167 relaxing my furrowed brows: a unique usage of καταβάλλω here; Silenus’ brow is furrowed because of his sufferings. Wine, as he tells us, leads to a forgetting of woes (172), an idea found elsewhere in Greek thought; for instance, in the Cypria (F 18 Davies) and Eur. Bacc. (280–3) wine is called the best antidote for sorrow. just once: in his comic enthusiasm, Silenus, normally a coward like his sons (Soph. Trackers 205–9; cf. Cyc. 635–45), claims he would be happy to die a criminal’s death if he could sate his desire for drink just once’, ἅπαξ. For parallels to the idea of attaining satisfaction by doing something ‘just once’, see Soph. El. 1483; Ar. Wasps 92; Solon F 33.6 (all cited by Seaford).

168 Since: translates ὧς, which here is ‘elliptical’ beginning a sentence, ‘since, because, for ...’; for this colloquial use, see Stevens (1976) 48. is mad: μαίνεται. Here the word refers to those who are ‘mad’ in not enjoying wine as a gift of Dionysus (cf. 164n.). A destructive madness is a common affliction of those who refuse to acknowledge Dionysus properly, such as the Proetids (Hes. F 131–3M-W), the Minyads (Ovid. Met. 4.1 ff; Aelian VH 3.42) and Lycurgus (Soph. Ant. 955–65, esp. 959, 962); for Lycurgus, see also above 3–4n. The ‘madness’ of Dionysus’ most famous opponent in tragedy, Pentheus in Euripides’ Bacchae, is reiterated in the play; at Bacc. 325–6 Tiresias says to him, μαίνη (‘you’re mad’), because he ‘fights the god’; cf. 301, 359; note also Bacc. 399–400, 887 and 999 where cognates of the verb μαίνομαι are used of divine opponents generally; and Cadmus’ judgement at 1295. 169–71 These lines combine three cardinal satyric activities: drink, dance and sex,
the last of which is uppermost, so to speak, in Silenus’ fantasy here. For discussion of the sexual activity of satyrs, see Lissarague (1990b); Keuls (1993) 357–72; above Gen. Intro. pp. 9–17, and Index of Motifs. **it’s possible:** for ἔστι with infinitive (here, ἐξανιστάναι ‘to make to stand to attention’) cf. ψαῦσαι (‘grab hold’) at 171; Hipp. 705 (see also Smyth §1985). **this:** τοῦτο is a more emphatic demonstrative than τούτο, and the deictic with final iota is not tragic; it occurs also in Soph. Trackers 114. Silenus grabs, or at least points to, his phallus, a conspicuous part of the satyr actor’s costume (cf. Pronomos vase; KPS pls. 4, 5a–b, 28a–b; see also Lissarague 1990b figs. 2.4, 2.6, 2.23, 2.28 for satyrs grabbing their own penises; *LIMC* VIII.1 s.v. ‘Silenoi’ 117, 119). **breasts:** satyrs groping female figures are widely depicted on vases (KPS pl. 29b, *LIMC* VIII.1 s.v. ‘Mainades’ 62, 64; ‘Silenoi’ 104, etc.), and they may have done so (or tried) in any number of satyr plays, e.g. *Net-Fishers*; Achaeus, *Fates* F 28; Soph. *Helen’s Marriage* or *Pandora*. **all ready:** translates παρεσκευασμένου, which Diggle considers corrupt; some emendations have been posited (see Duchemin; Seaford). Kovacs in his Loeb edition (1994a) prints Blaydes’ conjecture παρεσκευασμένον, explaining elsewhere (1994b) 149 that he accepts it as neuter with ἔστιν understood; this would give (literally): ‘it is ready...’. Ussher and Seaford more plausibly take the genitive participle with λειμῶνος (here=’bush’; cf. κήπος ‘garden’: Archilochus F 196a West) and tentatively suggest that it could refer to depilation (cf. Ar. *Thesm.* 591; Lys. 89). But, as λειμῶν connotes moisture as well as fertility (LSJ s.v. I), then the participle may refer to lubrication, natural or otherwise, in preparation for sex (cf. the **double entendre** at Cyc. 516: the nymph’s ‘cave’ is moist: δροσερῶν ... ἄντρων). Such apparent readiness on the part of the female will seem unlikely here, but this is Silenus’ fantasy after all; cf. other satyr fantasies of female sexual appetite (below 181–2n; *Net-Fishers* F**46c.59–61). And while it is true that red-figure scenes often show maenads resisting satyrs (e.g. the amphora by the Kleophrades painter of c. 490: *LIMC* VIII.1 s.v. ‘Mainades’ 36; the amphora by Oltos, c. 520: *LIMC* VIII.1 s.v. ‘Mainades’ 62), Hedreen (1994) has shown that black figure depictions more frequently show nymphs willingly accepting the advances of satyrs.

**172 shall I **<not>** kiss:** another example of Silenus’ hyperbolic, almost erotic joy at being reunited with his beloved drink, paralleled elsewhere in the play (at 553 and 555 the wine ‘kisses’ Silenus; cf. 439–40) and in Greek art: e.g. Osborne (1998) 17–18; for depictions of satyrs’ sexual play with drinking vessels, see the famous psykter by Douris (=BM E768); Kilmer (1993) figs R126, R 148. Plutarch (*Mor.* 2.86e) tells us that in Aeschylus’ *Prometheus Fire Kindler* the satyrs want to kiss fire on seeing it for the first time but are warned they will mourn for their beards if they do (Aesch. F 207 with n. below). [The negative supplement <οὐ> by Matthiae, while requiring interrogative punctuation to follow it, is generally accepted (cf., however, Duchemin). κονήσομαι should be retained over Tyrwhitt’s <οὐ>κ ὠνήσομαι (‘won’t I buy?’), which also requires an interrogative to follow it.]
173 moron of a Cyclops (literally, ‘the Cyclops’ ignorance’) such periphrasis recalls Homer’s referring to the might of Hector (Il. 9.351), or Pindar referring to Heracles (F 29.4), but, appropriately for this drama, such grandiloquent expression is given a satyric spin and used to denote the stupidity of an ogre. Similar periphrases are also found at 580 (‘the august majesty of the gods) and in Soph. Trackers 258. Polyphemus is ignorant of the pleasures of wine, and by corollary, the Dionysiac thiasos; elsewhere the chorus call him an ‘ignoramus’ (493) and the monster’s boorishness and ignorance of sympotic etiquette are emphasized later in the play (519–75). Pentheus in the Bacchae similarly suffers from ἀμαθία (480, 490).

174 go to hell: translates the colloquialism κλαίειν κελεύων (literally: ‘ordering him to cry’); as Stevens (1976) 15 notes, κλαίειν has the sense of ‘smart for something’. The expression occurs in Aristophanic comedy (e.g. Ach. 1131, Knights 433), but not extant tragedy; cf. also below 340–1nn. and 701n. where κλαίειν appears with a similar verb of command (ἀνώγα). At 319 Polyphemus uses the milder expression χαίρειν κελεύω ‘good riddance’. eye in the middle of his head: the position of μέσον is predicative, and does not refer to a middle eye. Silenus emphasizes the physical grotesqueness of the monster to show his disdain; his comment also anticipates – unwittingly from his perspective, but for the knowing audience at least – the blinding to come (cf. 458–9), as does the reference to ‘crying’ (κλαίειν).

175 talk something over: this reflects the prefix in the compound in the verb διαλαλήσωμεν, which is not necessarily pejorative in Euripides, while λαλεῖν can be so elsewhere in denoting ‘chatter’; see below 313–15n. Tyrwhitt attributes this line to the chorus, while L leaves it unattributed. The satyrs want more than just a quick chat; their prurient reasons become clear at 179.

176 Well, of course ... friends to a friend: the theme of friendship (φιλία) is struck immediately between Odysseus and the satyrs, emphasised further by the particle μὴν (‘well, of course’), which here, as Denniston (1954) 353–4 notes, expresses a favourable reaction to the words of the previous speaker; cf. above 73–5n.

177 take Helen captive (χειρίαν): for the predicative adjective so used, see And. 628; Smyth §1043.

179–80 you had captured (εἴλετε): there may be word-play following the appearance of ‘Helen’ in 177, alluding perhaps to Aeschylus’ play on her name at Ag. 689–90 (where she herself ‘captures’, i.e. destroy); cf. also Eur. Hec. 442–3; Tro. 1213–14. the young woman: Helen is known to the satyrs in other dramas that deal with her marriage to Paris ten years earlier. In Sophocles’ Helen’s Marriage (F 181–4), the satyrs openly lusted after her, and she may have been onstage with them in Cratinus’ comic Dionysalexandros. all bang her: compounds of κροτέω for sexual activity appear in Old Comedy; see Henderson (1991a) 171 n. 88 for refs. The satyrs’ question implies that the Greeks went to war for the sole chance of having sex with her. This is not just a comic projection of the satyrs’ own fantasies; it also deflates, in typical satyric fashion, the more ‘heroic’ and pompous reasons
mooted for the Trojan war elsewhere in Greek tragedy, e.g. Eur.’s *Troades* (860–79), and later in *Cyc.* by Odysseus himself (285–312 below).

**181–2** The satyrs consider Helen some sort of nymphomaniac. Apart from Menelaus and Paris, another of her ‘husbands’ was Deiphobus (*Little Iliad*, arg. 2; Eur. *Tro.* 959). Theseus abducted her as a child (Diod. Sic. 4.63.2; [Apollod.] *Ep.* 1.23–4), and in some accounts Achilles was her ‘fifth husband’ (Servius ad *Aen.* 1.34; Tzetzes, *On Lycophron* 143, 174; cf. also *Cypria* arg. 11). The traitor: the satyrs take a predictably simplistic view of Helen’s guilt, seemingly consistent with what Helen says about herself in the *Iliad* (3.180), and with views found in Alcaeus (F N 1, B10 L-P) and the chorus of Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon* (esp. 403–8, 681–93); cf. Sappho (F 16 L-P) for a treatment different in tone. Elsewhere in Euripidean tragedies she is labelled ‘traitor’ (*And.* 630, *El.* 1028, *Hel.* 834, 931, 1148), but as early as Homer the question of Helen’s guilt is an open one, with Priam blaming the gods for the war (*Il.* 3.162–5), as indeed does Odysseus in response to Polyphemus’ attack on her (*Cyc.* 280–5). Euripides’ lecherous chorus here have no interest in the issues raised by other treatments of Helen’s story, such as Gorgias’ *Encomium of Helen* (82 B 11 DK) which ostensibly portrays her as victim of one of four forces: the gods, erotic desire, Paris’ violence, or his supposed rhetorical powers. Likewise the satyr chorus here would hardly countenance Helen’s own defence speech which Euripides gives her in the *Troades* (914–65) and some of its claims: e.g. that the gods are to blame for the war, and that Hecuba, in ignoring baleful prophecies about Paris, is to be blamed for Troy’s fall, and that Helen’s own beauty saved Greece from a Trojan invasion.

**182–4** The substance of these lines equates closely with those of Hecuba in the *Troades* who claims that Helen’s arrogance and greed for Oriental splendour as much as lust led her to elope with Paris (987–97, 1020–22); di Marco (1980, 39–45) argues for a parody of Sappho F 22 (L-P). But Euripides incorporates some clever doubles entendres here to make the causes for Helen’s elopement one and the same. Fancy trouser-equipment (θυλάκους τοὺς ποικίλους): Paris’ attire is assimilated to the clothing of fifth-century Persians (Hdt. 5.49.3; Ar. *Wasps* 1087), but, as the cognate θυλάκη means scrotum (LSJ s.v. I; cf. Ar. *Frogs* 1203), a punning reference to sexual organs is inescapable here; see Henderson (1991a) 27. His neck: in comedy αὐχήν can also mean penis (Ar. *Lys.* 681); see also Henderson (1991a) 114; cf. Sophocles’ satyric F 756 where a lecherous satyr wants to throw his arms around Heracles’ αὐχήν (possibly from his *Oeneus*; for discussion, see n. 2 on *Oeneus* p. 381 KPS 373–4). It is tempting to see another double entendre in the reference to Paris’ αὐχήν here, notwithstanding the gold necklace around it, which identifies him as an exotic, richly attired barbarian.

**185** She was swept away: by this passive ἐξεπτοήθη the satyrs do not intend to absolve Helen of responsibility any more than does Alcaeus’ [ἐ]πτ[όω]σε (‘she fluttered’; F N 1.3 L-P, if correctly supplemented). In the *Troades* Hecuba claims
that Helen’s mind ‘was made’ Cypris, *i.e.* Aphrodite, at the sight of Paris (*Tro.* 988: ἐποιήθη), but, of course, still demands her death. Gorgias (*Hel.* 19) invokes much the same idea, when conversely claiming that Helen fell victim to the erotic nature of Paris’ presence and is therefore to be exonerated.

185–6 **that excellent little fella, Menelaus:** di Marco (1980) 39–45 sees further parody of Sappho F 16.6–9 (L-P), especially her reference to Menelaus as ἄριστος where the tone is far more poignant than here. In the *Iliad* Menelaus is not small; at least he is broader than Odysseus when the two are standing, while the latter is more lordly when they are seated (*Il.* 3.180–1). That the satyrs have a fondness for this hero, expressed in a condescending diminutive (ἀνθρώπιον), seems apt (cf. Polyphemus’ contemptuous ἄνθρωπίσκε to Odysseus at 316); diminutives are naturally rare in tragedy (but see Stevens (1976) 5 n. 12); see n. 12 on Critias (?) *Sisyphus* (?) F 19.39. Menelaus has comical elements about him as early as Homer, notably in his duel with Paris in *Iliad* 3 which he wins ‘on points’, but which ends only in his being cuckolded again (esp. *Il.* 3.426–48). While a competent fighter in the *Iliad*, he is in no position even to think about fighting Hector (*Il.* 7.109–19); and elsewhere in the *Iliad* he is compared to a mosquito (17.570–2). In the *Odyssey* he is upstaged by his wife (15.166–81), and in the *Troades*, for all his stated intentions, he is still in thrall to his wife, as Hecuba knows only too well, even as he makes lame attempts at humour about Helen’s weight (1050–1). The failure of Menelaus’ resolve to kill Helen on seeing her exposed breasts is known from Old Comedy (Ar. *Lys.* 155–6), and depicited in fifth-century art (*LIMC* IV.1 s.v. ‘Helene’ 260, 262, 264–6, 269–72, 274, 275, 277). In some traditions he is even considered a coward (implied at Aesch. *Ag.* 115; see Fraenkel’s note ad loc.), and Apollo refers to him as a ‘weak spear-fighter’ (*Il.* 17.588), a description recalled in Plato’s *Symposium* (174c); such qualities might further endear him to the chorus, whose own cowardice emerges readily enough in *Cyc.* (635–50).

186–7 This misogynistic topos is traceable to Hesiod in the accounts of Pandora’s creation (*Th.* 571–90; *W&D* 60–90) and Semonides (F 7 *passim*, esp. 72, 96–7). Similar sentiments are expressed by a number of figures in tragedy: *e.g.*, Eteocles in Aeschylus’ *Seven* (187–90, 256), Jason in Euripides’ *Medea* (573–5) and Hippolytus (*Hipp.* 616–50), this last instance a particularly transgressive form of misogyny that is not only disturbing to one of Hippolytus’ attendants (*Hipp.* 88–120), but earns the fatal wrath of Aphrodite. Such trenchant misogyny is comically recast by the hedonistic satyrs, who like to have their cake and eat it, too. The idea that Euripides was a misogynist is a running gag already in Aristophanic comedy (*e.g.* *Thesm.* *passim*), and has been the focus of much modern scholarship; for an overview, see, for instance, March (1990) 32–75.

188 **flocks** (ποιμνίων): translates Scaliger’s emendation of L’s ‘shepherds’ (ποιμένων) accepted by *e.g.* Duchemin, Ussher, Biehl, Paduano, which suggests ‘creatures reared by shepherds’ defined in 189 as ‘lambs’.
lord Odysseus: Silenus’ tone becomes more sycophantic now (cf. above 104), in the prospect of making a decent exchange.

Although serious danger looms – Ussher sees urgency in the present imperatives (φέρεσθε, χωρεῖτε) – Silenus is still keen to make sure he gets his wine.

The ms attributes line 193 to Odysseus; Dindorf’s attribution of it to Silenus is widely accepted. Hermann divided it between the chorus and Odysseus. Paganelli (1981) gives τί δράσομεν; (‘what are we going to do?’) to Odysseus, and divided 194 between Silenus and the chorus; Duchemin divided it between Silenus and Odysseus. But L’s attribution need not be dismissed tout court, even though the evident alarm at 193 might seem uncharacteristic of Odysseus (cf. 198–202). He certainly expresses fear at 194 (the latter half at least is undeniably his words), and it is not uncommon for characters in tragedy and elsewhere to express alarm at shocking news, only to regain some element of composure or focus shortly afterwards; cf. the reaction of Eteocles to the news of Polynices’ presence at the gate at which he himself is to fight (Aesch. Seven 653–7).

The advice to run into the cave, is, as Odysseus realizes, fraught with danger, but is necessary for the dramatic action to be consistent with the Homeric model. It need not be seen as malicious on the part of Silenus, despite his apparent glee at the prospect of Polyphemus’ cannibalistic meal (250–1, 313–15).

Some sermonizing from Odysseus here, as he rehearses the heroic code of standing one’s grounds against the enemy, which he enunciates and enacts himself when under pressure from hordes of Trojans (Il. 11.401–10); cf. Il. 17.90–112 when Menelaus allows discretion to be the better part of valour in similar circumstances (and which may be the source for the idea that he was a coward; cf. Aesch. Ag. 115, and above 185–6n.). if I must die ... nobly (εὐγενῶς): his concern to face death, if necessary, recalls Hector’s resolve to fight Achilles and at least die ‘not ingloriously’ (μὴ ... ἀκλειῶς: Il. 22.304); on the theme and variants of καλῶς θανεῖν (‘to die nobly’) elsewhere in Euripides, see Hec. 329; Hel. 298; Or. 1152; Erechtheus F 361.

preserve my good repute of old: there is some irony here, since for Silenus, at least, Odysseus’ renown conjures up a man of suspect ancestry and a relentless babbler (104), not the brave hero Odysseus announces himself to be. [Schenk emends L’s εὖ σώσομεν to συσσώσομεν (lit. ‘save together with my life’) to give better sense.]

Get out of the way! Make way! ἀνεχὲ πάρεχε, which seems formulaic, occurs at Ar. Wasps 1326 (cf. Birds 1720) and Eur. Tro. 308 where it introduces a wedding procession with torches; see Duchemin, Ussher, and Seaford for detailed discussion. L attributes this line to Silenus, Duchemin to the chorus; Paganelli divides it between the chorus and Polyphemus, and Biehl between Silenus and the monster. Attribution of 203 to Polyphemus (Tyrwhitt) is most likely; the bullying imperatives are well-suited both to his despotic nature, forcefully expressed here
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(and at 210) in the three tribrachs which express the monsters’ impatience and anger, which are alluded to already by the satyrs and Silenus and become fully manifest as the play progresses (cf. 211).

204–5 Bacchic revel: the satyrs are not performing this at all; it is simply an inference which the ignorant Polyphemus makes as a result of seeing their ‘idleness’. Polyphemus’ remarks on the absence of Dionysus and his cult brutally confirm what Silenus and the satyrs have already complained about (25–6, 63–81, esp. 63–5). Straightaway he emerges as another anti-Dionysian ogre to appear on the satyr stage, such as the Aeschylean Lycurgus (see above 3–4n.). Drums are instruments associated with the cult of Dionysus (see above 64–5n.; Eur. Bacc. 59, 156) and are depicted being played by maenads (Boardman 1989: figs 177, 229); drums were used in the worship of Cybele and Dionysus (Hdt. 4.76, Eur. HF 892), as were castanets (Eur. Hel. 1308; H. Hom. 14.3; Pindar, F 70b9–10; Hdt. 2.60).

206 Tell me: translates the ethic dative μοι (cf. 43n.).

207 L has γε, which is unparalleled in a question (Seaford); Dindorf emended to τε to make it co-ordinate with καί (here aspirated and elided before ὑπό). However, Duchemin, Ussher, Paganelli, Biehl all retain the ms reading.

208–9 Has milk … cheese? A slightly elliptical expression in the Greek; literally: ‘has filling with cheeses been milked in ...?’ The question is whether enough has been milked to produce sufficient cheese to fill the baskets after curdling.

210–11 shedding tears: cf. 490, 554 for other threats to make others cry (and 174n.). my club: Ussher sees a reference to stocks here, but it seems far more natural to see ξύλον as a club, the monster’s weapon in Homer with which he is blinded (cf. Od. 9.319); s.v. ξύλον LSJ II.2. The club is the monster’s weapon in many images on Greek pottery from the sixth century on; e.g. LIMC VIII.1 s.v. Polyphemus I 40–3, 46. In Eur. Syleus F 693 ‘club’ is probably metaphoric for Heracles’ penis (see n. 11 on p. 413), but the monster here need not be threatening the satyrs with rape, despite the fate of Silenus later (581–9). In any event, the use of violence by this monstrous despot (above 34–5n.) to control the satyrs reflects a motif concerning how tyrants rule (Plato, Statesman 276e); see also above 24n., and 442. Look upwards, not down! The satyrs are evidently cowering in fear; as it is likely that Polyphemus’ costume noticeably increases the height of the actor wearing it, the order is for them to look him in his grotesquely single eye.

213 Orion: probably a reference to the giant himself rather than the constellation, despite the mention of stars. Here we may see a comic over-reaction of the satyrs to the fearsome prospect of their towering master, a hunter, like Orion, albeit one who has returned home empty-handed. The Orion reference is apt for the Euripidean Polyphemus for other reasons, too. Both are club-wielding giants and sons of Poseidon (Od. 11.572–5); both are violent and lecherous, since Orion’s assaults on Merope and Artemis (Hesiod, F 148a) find their eventual parallel in Polyphemus’ grotesque rape of Silenus (581–9). Both meet with the same punishment. Hesiod (F 148a) and
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Servius (*Aen.* 10.763) mention Orion’s blinding by Merope’s father, Oinopion, a son of Dionysus. Seaford plausibly suggests that this episode may have been dealt with in Sophocles’ satyric *Cedalion* (F 328–33). For discussion of *Cedalion*, see, more recently, KPS 344–8, esp. 344 n. 3 for other sources for this episode.

214 **meal:** ἄριστον is usually the morning meal, but can be a movable feast, as Ussher notes, citing Ar. *Birds* 788; also LSJ note that it could mean ‘lunch’ (Thuc. 4.90, Hdt., 3.26, etc.). Problems about the passage of time in the play disappear once we realize the satyrs need not be talking literally about seeing stars.

215 **gullet:** φάρυγξ: here a masculine, though more often feminine, e.g. 356; its gender not determinable at 410, 592. This becomes the focus for Polyphemus’ cannibalism later in the play (356, 410, 592; cf. 608); the potentially comic glutton here emerges as something more sinister and malignant.

217 **a whole storage jar:** pithoi were large storage jars, many times the capacity of ordinary amphorae; the gluttony of the Cyclops is commensurate with his size; cf. also 327, 388. Lityerses, the ogre of Sositheus’ satyr-play, *Daphnis or Lityerses*, has a similar penchant for bibulous excess in drinking down a pithos the size of ten amphorae (Sositheus, F 2.7–9; see n. 4).

218 **sheep’s or cow’s:** the Greek adjectives could refer to the neuter γάλα (216) or πίθος in the accusative. The relative ὃν (219), L’s reading kept by Diggle, would suggest the latter is more likely.

220–1 **dancing, leaping around:** even though the satyrs have complained of the absence of dancing and other Dionysiac activities since their captivity (25–6, 63–81), Polyphemus seems to realise that dancing and constant movement are an essential part of their nature and makes a cruel joke from it. [L has no object expressed for ἀπολέσαιτε, resulting in Seidler’s emendation of L’s γ(ε) to μ(ε), commonly accepted].

222 **The tone of ἔα (Hey!) here is one of resentment as well as surprise, while Odysseus’ ἔα (99) is simply the latter; for both ‘surprise’ and ‘unwelcome surprise’, see Stevens (1976) 33 n. 81. Polyphemus is immediately hostile to the strangers in referring to them contemptuously as a ‘mob’: ὃγχλος (cf. *Hec*. 607, *Her*. 527, etc; Plato, *Gorg*. 455a;).

223–5 **Odysseus and his men have little chance in the wake of Polyphemus’ reaction to their presence, more volatile than the comparatively restrained, but no less menacing, tone of his Homeric counterpart, who even tries to trick Odysseus into revealing the whereabouts of his ship (*Od*. 9.279–81). **Anyway** (γέ τοι): the expression is a livelier form of the more common γοῦν ‘at any rate’, and both particles combined can have an exclamatory force; see Denniston (1954) 550 (4), 551 (iii). Polyphemus goes on to leap from one wrong conclusion to another without directly addressing the strangers until 275. **bodies:** σῶμα (literally, in singular form ‘body’) here is an accusative of respect.

226–7 **the old man … beating:** another wrong inference made by the Cyclops,
this time exploited by Silenus to escape the monster’s wrath (228–34). It is typical
of the roguish satyr to side with whoever he thinks is in control. The objection
of Ussher on 224–30 that Silenus has not been drinking long enough to have a
ruddy complexion misses the point. Silenus is no ordinary imbiber, and we may
fully expect the effects of his sudden reacquaintance with his beloved drink to be
comically exaggerated. The actor may have put on another reddish mask on going
into the skênê-building at 174, and he has certainly been onstage since 188. **bald:**
φαλακρόν can also be a noun and mean tip of the penis or ‘knob’ (Net-Fishers F
**47a.24, and see note 12 below; Soph. Trackers 368, etc.); but here its proximity
to μέτωπον (‘forehead’) shows it is adjectival and means ‘bald’; Silenus is bald
in almost all depictions of him in vase-painting. **head:** translates Tyrwhitt’s
emendation of L’s πρόσωπον (‘face’) to μέτωπον (‘forehead’), given Polyphemus’
reference to Silenus’ κάρα (‘head’) at 229.

231 I am a god ... sprung from gods: With this remark, Polyphemus shows
that he is not an atheist, as many have asserted; see O’Sullivan (2005) 119–22.
In acknowledging the existence of the gods, but holding conventional religion in
contempt – including his father’s temples (318–9) – the Cyclops is arguably an even
more transgressive figure; see also below 582–3n.

232 they continued to carry off: the imperfect ἐφόρουν implies that Odysseus
and his men wilfully ignored Silenus’ protests; cf. also ἐξεφοροῦντο in 234.

233 although (I) wouldn’t allow it (οὐκ ἐῶντος): μου is easily supplied from
232 ἐγώ, with ellipse of the ‘subject’ in the genitive absolute construction (Smyth
§2072).

234 This verse has a ‘3rd foot anapaest’ so far unique in satyric drama; Musgrave
emends to ἐξεφροῦντο, but this gives it wrong sense (‘let the sheep go out’): they
are tied up (225).

235 collar three cubits wide: collars were applied to dogs (Ar. Wasps 897) and
criminals (Xen. Hell. 3.3.11). Silenus’ fiction tries to convey to Polyphemus that the
strangers view him as bestial as well as criminal; the huge size of the collar seems
to allude to his physical height, although the extent to which this was represented
visually (i.e., in the actor’s costume) remains unclear; cf. above 210–11n. **in full
view of that big eye of yours:** [for κατά ‘in the sight of’, Canter’s emendation for
L’s impossible κᾆτα (‘and next’), cf. Eur. El. 910. μέσον is again predicative (cf.
above 174n.); more literally the expression is ‘the eye in the middle (of your head).’]

237 flay: Ruhnken’s emendation to ἀπολέψειν for L’s ἀποθλίψειν, which means
‘to squeeze’. The former seems more likely here unless the reference here is to
blood oozing from a whipped back, like juice from a grape; for this sense Seaford
cites Nicander F 86.

240 to heave rocks: putting Polyphemus to work in a quarry seems to be a grim
joke on the abilities of Cyclopes as builders of monumental architecture; cf. above
92–3n. **mill-house:** Ruhnken’s emendation to ἢ ’ζ μυλῶνα for L’s ἢ πυλῶνα. The
latter sense would seem to mean ‘to knock down a gateway’; but the idea of being thrown into the mill after a beating is at least better attested in Greek thought (Lysias 1.18, Menander A 245, Hero 3). Silenus’ lie becomes more fanciful at every turn, including the implausibility that a disembowelled person (236) could be expected to perform hard labour.

241–3 Now then, you go ... will you?: for οὔκουν plus future indicative, see Denniston (1954) 435 and Smyth §2953.d; cf. also 632 below. To whom does Polyphemus address this gruff order? Ussher assumes Silenus. But the old satyr blithely remains onstage, and it is hardly likely that he would ignore a command from his brutal overlord, who does not repeat the command to him, despite his continuing presence. Also, the tone is out of keeping with Polyphemus’ generally benign attitude to Silenus (229, 273–4, 539), even if this eventually manifests itself grotesquely later (581–9). The order may be addressed to one of the attendants mentioned at 83, as in the translation by Kovacs (1994a), who may have entered with the satyrs during the parodos (41–81n.).

243 Since (ὡς): see above 168n.

244–5 Unlike his Homeric counterpart, the satyric Polyphemus carves his victims up and cooks them, becoming a monstrous chef as in other versions of the tale (Cratinus F 143 PCG; Antiphanes F 132, 133 PCG); in the Odyssey he eats them raw (Od. 9.291–3). Here, this important difference endows the Euripidean monster with certain elements of sophistication amid all his savagery; for discussion of the form of sacrifice to himself that Polyphemus’ meal takes (cf. 334–5), see Seaford 1984 and his introduction (pp. 51–9). fill my belly: Polyphemus is not only a typically gluttonous satyr ogre, but resembles the gluttonous athlete pilloried in another Euripidean satyr play, who is described as ‘slave to his jaws and a minion to his belly’ (Autolycus A 282.5; see below p. 389). me, the dispenser of meat: κρεανόμος (‘one who distributes the flesh of victims’: LSJ, citing this passage). Simmonds and Timberlake translate it without explanation as ‘my teeth’, while Ussher sees it as ‘with my knife’, citing the sacrificial context; but the sacrifice is perverted. As Seaford notes, later passages in the play make it more likely that the reference is to Polyphemus, since the chorus refer to his activity of ‘meat chopping’ and ‘dispensing’ (359, 361). This gives rise to a new irony: instead of offering his guests food, this transgressive host eats his visitors, who thereby ‘give’ (διδόντες) their host a feast. [giving (διδόντες) is Heath’s emendation for L’s, ἔδοντος, a genitive participle in agreement with μου, implicit in the personal possesive ἐμὴν (cf. Eur. Supp. 921; Smyth §977). This genitive participle gives awkward sequence, meaning ... ‘belly, as I eat my feast from the hot coals, to me as the dispenser of meat.’]

246 cauldron: later described as bronze (343, 392, 399), another sign of the monster’s sophistication, albeit put to barbarous uses. For possible links to Phalaris, another Sicilian despot, infamous for his cruelty in roasting victims in a bronze bull (Pindar Pyth. 1.95–8), see O’Sullivan (2005) 132–4.
Since: translates ὡς, which is explanatory asyndeton; it could also be ‘elliptical’ here; see above 168n.

Since lions: the presence of lions in the Sicilian landscape again suggests the wild, uncivilised nature of the play’s setting (see above 20n.). That Polyphemus eats these animals emphasises his savagery and brute strength. It is one thing to kill a lion as heroes like Heracles do; it is quite another to eat one. For the idea that one attains the characteristics of what one eats (‘you are what you eat’), see below 313–15n.

too long deprived … man’s flesh: χρόνιος is idiomatically an adjective agreeing with Polyphemus, but here is translated as an adverb; cf. And. 84 (see also Smyth §1042). Here is an ominous confirmation, straight from the monster himself, of what Silenus and the satyrs have already mentioned of the Cyclopes generally (31, 92–3, 126,128); also, a grim counterpart to the satyrs’ forced abstention from their natural drink, wine (140, 439–40).

after: for this meaning of ἐκ (i.e. ‘following in change from’), see Smyth §1688. O master: Silenus continues to toady to the Cyclops, but there is some irony in calling him δέσποτης, albeit lost on the ogre (cf. 266–7) due to the negative connotations of δέσποτης in the play (see above 34–5n.); cf. also Silenus’ disdain for ‘masters’ at 163. When at first curry ing favour with the civilized Odysseus, Silenus calls him ἂναξ (189), a title also reserved for Dionysus (17).

in turn: Odysseus’ request to be heard ἐν μέρει might lead the audience to expect some sort of ἀγών (formal debate), so much a marked feature of many Euripidean plays (e.g. Troades 914–1032); before the ἀγών in Hecuba (1132–237) Agamemnon announces he will hear each speaker ἐν μέρει (1130); for this aspect of Euripides’ dramas, see Lloyd (1992). But this satyric ἀγών, which has no adjudicator, is postponed (285–346).

The asyndeton here, as Ussher notes, is continuative and explanatory of why Polyphemus should listen (see Smyth §2165a, 2167b).

Odysseus gives an accurate account of events, unlike the smooth talking chatterer he has been called earlier in the play; see above 104n. (cf. below 313–15n.). voluntary seller … no violence: Odysseus invokes the ἑκὼν ... βίᾳ ('voluntarily’ – ‘by force’) antithesis used elsewhere by Euripides (Tro. 373, IA 360); cf. the virtually identical ἑκὼν ... ἄκων ('voluntarily’ – ‘involuntarily”) antithesis; Hipp. 319; IT 512; Or. 613, etc.

But he speaks … back was turned: these statements are true, but, the latter is potentially problematic for Odysseus’ case, as he bought the goods on the sly, knowing them to belong to Polyphemus (cf. 165). no truth: translates the
colloquialism ὑγιὲς οὐδὲν (literally, ‘nothing sound’); cf. Plato Rep. 10.603b 1–2; see also Stevens (1976) 26. **since he was caught**: translates ἐπεὶ κατελήφθη. The anapaest in the second foot is alien to tragedy; for similar departure from tragic metre, see 265n. The same translation comes from Heath’s γ’ ἔληφθη, which removes the anapaest; it also uses the simple verb (λαμβάνω), as is usual with a participle in the sense ‘caught (taking)’, and is therefore preferable here to the compound (καταλαμβάνω).

**261 In that case**: translates Kirchhoff’s emendation to γ’ ἄρ(α) of L’s γάρ which does not strengthen a wish on its own; cf. also the virtually identical expression κακῶς ὄλοιο ‘may you die a miserable death’ (without γάρ) at Aesch. Sacred Delegates F **78c col. I 2. If I’m lying: rather than simply repeating this curse back at Silenus, as the satyrs do at 272, Odysseus’ rejoinder – completing the line – neatly undercuts Silenus’ words by ostensibly agreeing with them with one obvious proviso. Cf. Chremylus’ skeptical responses to the Old Woman’s complaints in Ar. Wealth (1018–21); similarly, in the Contest of Homer and Hesiod Homer’s improvisations undercut Hesiod’s attempts to force him to complete a couplet that begins in a nonsensical way (Contest 9). This technique of agonistic exchange is one form of ‘capping’ which occurs when a participant in dialogue on a set theme responds to an opponent by cleverly modifying that thought or theme until one opponent is outmatched; for full discussion, see Collins (2004) passim who plausibly sees it operating in the Cyclops in 521–40, 669–75 and in the passage from the Wealth (see ib. 44–50), but neglects what appears to be a very blatant form of capping in Cyclops here.

**262–5** The list of sea deities invoked by Silenus (although Calypso is not especially associated with the sea) begins, appropriately enough, with Polyphemus’ own father, but continues in descending order of importance to end up with the most banal of sea creatures, in a comic anticlimax. As Seaford suggests, such an ending seems to parody oaths that finish with an invocation to ‘all the gods’ (e.g. Eur. Med. 746–7).

**265** There is a second foot anapaest here (as at 334), on which see Denniston on Eur. El. 1141.

**266–7** O my most handsome little Cyclops, O my darling little master (Κυκλώπιον ... δεσποτίσκε): an apostrophe as absurd as it is insincere, with diminutives – a linguistic form typical of satyrical drama (e.g., Cyc. 185, 316) – addressed to a gigantic, one-eyed ogre; cf. the old satyr’s contempt for the monster expressed earlier (173–4). In Achaeus’ Linus F 26 the satyrs address Heracles in similar terms, but with a homoerotic intent absent from Silenus’ remarks here.

**268–9** may these miserable boys of mine: the joke seems to work on a number of levels. Satyrs are immortal (Theopompus 115 FGH 75c, etc.), so this wish is destined to remain unfulfilled, but this is hardly likely to be an issue for Silenus. The fact that he at least ostensibly puts his sons’ lives on the line with this false
oath and calls them κακοί (‘miserable’) undercuts any claims he makes to feeling affection for them as he does here. For the contempt the satyric father feels for his sons, cf. Soph. *Trackers* 145–68 (esp. 145–53); Lycophron, *Menedemus*, F 2; cf. also next note.

270–2 **you**: the view of Denniston (1954) 144 that αὐτὸς ἔχ(ε) literally means ‘keep (the curse of 268–9) for yourself’ is correct and suits the context well. It speaks volumes about Silenus’ behaviour here that the satyrs are moved to defend Odysseus, even risking incurring the anger of their overlord. In Soph. *Trackers* (329–43, 371–403) they also stand up to Cyllene, a less threatening figure than Polyphemus, but fairly overbearing all the same. **If I’m telling lies**: recalls Odysseus at 261, and suggests the emerging friendship between him and the chorus of satyrs. **may my father die**: echoing their father, the satyrs give as good as they get. **Don’t wrong the strangers** (or ‘guests’): the preceding sentence referring to Silenus in the third person as ‘my father’ makes it more likely that the monster is addressed, as shown by his response in 273.

273–4 **Rhadamanthys** was a judge of the dead famous for his justice (Pindar, *Ol*. 2.75, *Pyth*. 2.73; Plato, *Laws* 624b). That Polyphemus offers such praise of the old satyr says more about the monster than it does about Silenus, by indicating the ogre’s propensity to misconstrue things. Silenus’ attitude to Polyphemus ranges from open hostility and contempt (see 23–35nn., 173–4nn.), to a deceptive obsequiousness (see 266–7n.), to attempts to steal the wine from him (552–3, 557–8, 565).

275–6 As is to be expected, Polyphemus’ questioning here violates the heroic code of hospitality (cf. 102n.) as it does in the *Odyssey* (9.252–5).

277–9 The ellipse of the first person plural of εἰμί (‘I am’) in 277 is rare, but appears elsewhere in Euripides (*El*. 37), while that of the singular, in a similar formula of identification, occurs already at 103; see Smyth §945. Again, this is a straightforward version of events by Odysseus, consistent with what he told Silenus. Cf. the lie he tells Polyphemus in the *Odyssey* (9.281–6), albeit in response to a loaded question from the monster.

280–1 **went to avenge on the city of Troy**: μετέρχομαι takes the double accusative here (LSJ s.v. IV 2); here it constructs like other verbs of vengeance such as ἐτιμωρησάμην at 695. **the abduction**: translates ἁρπαγὰς, a term often used in tragedy to refer to Helen’s abduction (e.g. Aesch. *Ag*. 534). **the most vile Helen**: Polyphemus’ verdict coincides with that of the satyrs (esp. 182), even though he has implied that she was a victim of rape in using ἁρπαγὰς (cf. Gorgias’ verdict, esp. *Hel*. 6). That Helen, as one woman, is responsible for an entire war and its consequent destruction is repeated by the monster (283–4) and is a topos (Aesch. *Ag*. 62, 448, 800, 1455–7; Eur. *Tro*. 368–9, 781, 873–9; but cf. Gorgias *Hel*. 4; and above 181–2n.). Polyphemus’ unmitigated misogyny (cf. the satyrs at 187) informs his antipathy to the war, rather than any sense of moral outrage at the sack of Troy (explored so in many tragedies) or the loss of life generally that resulted from the war.
282 endured to the full (ἐξηντληκότες): cf. 10n.
283 A shameful campaign in that you ... (στράτευμά γ’, οἵτινες ...): the relative plural by sense rather than strict congruence is common enough with ὅστις ‘marking the character of a person, in that you ...’; see Diggle on Phaethon 160–2; Smyth §2510.
285–346 Whether or not these speeches by Odysseus (285–312) and Polyphemus (316–46) comprise a formal agôn or debate, this exchange between hero and monster presents two world-views in sharp contrast to each other. On this level at least it differs from the more typical of Euripidean agônes where attempts are made at justifying past actions in the face of a lengthy accusation or denunciation (e.g., Hec. 1132–237; El. 1011–99; Tro. 914–1032). As might be expected of the hero famed for his eloquence, Odysseus’ speech works on a number of levels, beginning with appeals to friendship and the rights of suppliants (288), before moving onto more specious claims about the Trojan War and how it benefited Polyphemus as a ‘Greek’ (290–8). Much of Odysseus’ argument concerns the law (νόμος) of hospitality and respecting suppliants which civilized people would be expected to uphold (299–311); his veiled threat (312) suggests he realizes such claims will fall on deaf ears, nor is he mistaken.

The monster’s detailed response attacks specific points raised by Odysseus (e.g. 316–19), but is based on an impious rejection of the authority of Zeus (320–1), and of laws such as that of hospitality (ξενία) which are traceable to the god (338–40); as long as the monster can enjoy physical comfort and gratification, nothing else and nobody else matters (322–33, 340–1). The urgings of greed, indeed gluttony, underpin the monster’s world-view so much that he even makes them the basis of his own theology of sorts (334–8). Such a response may well have struck the original audience as surprisingly articulate, but Polyphemus’ speech condemns him further in showing that he acts out of conscious malice; his words will come back to haunt him (see, for instance, 340, 701nn.). Many commentators have rightly seen parallels between Polyphemus’ Weltanschauung here and that of the Platonic Callicles, who similarly argues for a ‘greed is good’ ideology (Pl. Gorg. 482c–4d; 491e–2c). This connection need not make the Cyclops a sophistic figure, which has too often been claimed; rather, his stated devotion to greed, lawlessness, violence and debauchery (cf. 326–7) align him more closely with popular notions of tyrants as demonized figures within Athenian culture; for full discussion, see O’Sullivan (2005) passim. Odysseus’ speech may be considered to uphold law (νόμος) on various levels (some more plausible than others); Polyphemus, conversely can be seen to uphold nature (φύσις), but only in so far as it serves his basest, most impious desires. An articulate monster is still a monster, and a fitting ogre for satyric drama.

285 the deed of a god: the ascription of blame to the gods for the Trojan War is as old as Homer (Il. 1.5; 3.164–5); cf. above 181–2n.). According to the Cypria (F 1) the war was a proto-Malthusian plan by Zeus to relieve Earth of excess human population.
286–7 O noble son of the god of the deep: Odysseus tries to appeal to what he might consider Polyphemus’ better nature and attempts to get him on side with reference to his parentage and calling him ‘noble’ (γενναῖε: 286) and ‘lord’, ἄναξ: 290). Given Poseidon’s typical offspring, however, this may be a self-defeating ploy by Odysseus; cf. above 21–2n. Cf. Arist. Rhet. 1377b 21–8a 30 for discussion of the rhetorical techniques of cultivating good will in one’s listeners and presenting oneself favourably to them. suppliant: by identifying himself and his men as such, Odysseus puts a special obligation on Polyphemus to respect them, as one of Zeus’ epithets was ‘Protector of suppliants’ (Aesch. Suppl. 347; Soph. Phil. 484; Eur. Hec. 345; Pher. F 114, etc.); a rejection of suppliant rights is therefore tantamount to an attack on Olympian and civilised values, consistent with Polyphemus’ stated views elsewhere (320–1, 338–40, etc.). freely: the implication is that Odysseus and his men deserve respect also as free men, and even as potential friends; cf. Eur. Alc. 1008 and see next note.

288–9 friends: Odysseus has good reason to invoke the concept of φιλία here, which already characterizes the relationship between Dionysus and the satyr chorus, as well as Odysseus, his men and the satyrs (again with the exception of Silenus; cf. above 73–4n., 176n.). Polyphemus’ callous rejection of Odysseus’ case thus involves a rejection of φιλία. unholy meal for your jaws: this recalls Silenus’ descriptions of Polyphemus’ cannibalism (30–1; cf. 92–3).

290–91 we protected…: a specious claim as no part of Greece was under any threat from Troy; cf. also the implausibility of 295–6. temples: Canter’s emendation to ναῶν of L’s νεῶν (‘of ships’); ‘the sites of ships’ would mean, in effect, harbours. Although Odysseus goes on to mention the harbour of Taenarus (292), his point is that these places have been preserved as centres of worship of Poseidon. to occupy: translates ἔχειν, a prolative infinitive nearing one of purpose (Smyth §2008).

292–5 sacred Taenarus: an old harbour town at the southern end of the Peloponnese, which had a temple to Poseidon (Strabo 8.5.1) and held a festival in honour of the god, called the Taenaria (Hesychius; IG 5.1.211.1). [L’s ἱερᾶς (‘priest’) is a manifest impossibility and a mere scribal error; an adjective is both needed idiomatically for Ταινάρου, and Kassel’s emendation ἱερᾶς is an apt one (cf. e.g. Med. 825–6: ἱερᾶς / χώρας).] caverns of cape Malea: Malea was the easternmost of the promontories at the southern end of the Peloponnese; according to Pausanias (3.23.2), in the harbour beneath it was a statue of Poseidon, and a nearby cave seems to have been sacred to the god (Paus. 2.2.8; 8.7.2; 8.8.2; 8.10.4). [L’s άκροι was emended to άκρας by Seaford, who takes it as referring not to the position of the cave or harbour inland, but to the cape itself, citing Paus. 3.23.2]. rock of Sunium: on the southern headland of Attica, the ruins of its temple of Poseidon are famously visible today, but one to Athena existed there in antiquity also (Paus. 1.1.1); reference to Athena does not add much to Odysseus’ case, but Euripides
would inevitably include it for the sake of his audience. *silver*: nearby are remains of the important mines at Laurium. *Geraestus*: a promontory in the south-east of the island of Euboea; like Sunium, this region was also sacred to Poseidon (Ar. *Knights* 559).

296 **surrender**: for this sense of δίδωμι, cf. *Od.* 24.65; Pindar, *Pyth.* 5.60; Pl. *Rep.* 574c. †a senseless disgrace†: translates δύσφορον ὀνείδη, which does not scan. Triclinius emended to δύσφορον γ ὀνείδη (printed by Duchemin and Ussher), but forms of δύσφορος have been put into the text to read δύσφορα γ ὀνείδη as in the Parisian apograph (printed by some editors), which literally translates as: ‘intolerable disgraces’; Seaford (1975) conjectured δύσφορον ὄνειδος, (‘an intolerable disgrace’), but reconstructed the Greek line to give the English sense ‘We saved the Greek’s cause, an intolerable disgrace for the Phrygians’. Diggle made the same conjecture, but with the two words as a parenthesis.

297–8 **You ... share**: translates Seidler’s emendation to indicative κοινοῖ from the imperative κοινοῦ of L. Odysseus’ rhetoric becomes more specious, perhaps goaded by a sense of desperation, given his interlocutor. Troy was no threat to Sicily, and no mythic tradition mentions Trojan plans to invade Greece (cf. the speciousness of Helen’s arguments at Eur. *Tro.* 925–37!). *the land ... under Etna ... is Greek*: although much of Sicily had long been considered part of the Greek world by the fifth century BC, the location is consistently presented in the play as a harsh, barbaric dystopia (20, 95, 622, etc.); for discussion, see Gen. Intro. pp. 42–4 and O’Sullivan (2012a *passim*). Odysseus’ appeals to this Sicilian ogre are thus ironically undercut and may have resonated with the contemporary audience on various levels in the light of more recent historical events, e.g. the refusal of the Syracusan tyrants to help against the Persians (Hdt. 7.159; 7.161.3 – perhaps understandable in the face of the threat of Carthage). And, if the play has a late date (see Gen. Intro. pp. 39–41), the ruthless destruction of the Athenian forces in Syracuse, told with such pathos by Thucydides (7.75–87), would therefore be likely to undermine the idea of Sicily as a place of civilized Hellenic values as far as an Athenian audience was concerned.

299 **But ... there is a law**: Odysseus hopes that Polyphemus will act under the obligations imposed by law (νόμος, Musgrave’s emendation for L’s νόμοις, ‘by mortal laws’, which deprives the sentence of syntax), if he cannot be persuaded by Odysseus’ arguments (λόγοι). Here Odysseus touches on the important contrast in Greek thought between persuasion and compulsion, but it would not suit his purposes here to start threatening the monster too openly. For other links between law and compulsion or oppression and contemporary debate on the issue, see Antiphon 87 F 44B DK A col. 2.26–30; Hippias in Pl. *Prot.* 337d–8b; cf. also the divergent views of the Anonymus Iamblichi 89 F 6.1 DK and Callicles in Pl. *Gorg.* 483–92.

300–3 **Much the same law of hospitality (ξενία) is invoked by the Homeric Odysseus (Od. 9.266–71). **suppliant (ἱκέτας): in claiming this status (see above
286–7n.), Odysseus intends to increase the onus on Polyphemus of behaving in a civilized fashion, as the rights of suppliants were generally considered inviolate, and here overlap with those of ξένοι (‘guests’, ‘strangers’) as Odysseus and his crew are called (89, 252, etc.); for other equations of the rights of suppliants and strangers, see e.g. Aesch. Suppl. 191–6.

304–7 having drunk many corpses’ blood ... fathers childless: Odysseus combines epic and tragic motifs of the carnage and suffering caused by war. For the focus on the loss of Greek lives at Troy and the consequent sorrow of parents and loved ones, see Aesch. Ag. 326–9, 430–57 (where it threatens to boil over into communal anger); Eur. Hec. 322–5, etc. For the earth drinking the blood of the slain, see Aesch. Seven 48, 734–8. Odysseus tries to present the Greeks as victims here, but such loss and waste is equally applicable to the Trojans (Il. 7.421–32, etc.); Priam’s loss of so many of his children moves Achilles to ‘pity his grey head and beard’ (Il. 24.516; cf. 24.477–507). However, Polyphemus is unlikely to be moved by such considerations in the light of his earlier comment (283–4).

309–10 Odysseus’ tone changes to being admonitory, so that his appeals are mixed with implied threats, a rhetorical technique recognized in the fifth century (cf. Gorgias 82 B 27 DK) and traceable to Homer, when the bard, Phemios, pleads for his life (Od. 22.344–53). But listen to me, Cyclops: ἀλλ’ ἐμοὶ πιθοῦ, Κύκλωψ. Ussher pointed to the similarity between Odysseus’ words here and those of Teiresias to Pentheus: ἀλλ’ ἐμοὶ, Πενθεῦ, πιθοῦ: (‘but listen to me, Pentheus’: Bacc. 309); the expression ἀλλ’ ἐμοὶ πιθοῦ occurs only four times in the extant Euripidean corpus. In both Bacchae and Cyclops not only is there a plea for correct religious observance (cf. Bacc. 309–13) but in each case a despotic or tyrannical figure is addressed; for Pentheus as tyrant, see Bacc. 43, 775–7; for Polyphemus as despot cf. above 34–5n.

311–12 return (ἠμείψατο): the aorist is gnomic (i.e., one that makes a generally applicable or proverbial statement), which is appropriate for this sentiment, found elsewhere in Greek literature (Hes. WD 352; Soph. Ant. 311ff., esp. 326).

313–15 Silenus’ gleefully malicious injunction here is counterpart to the choral interjections that occur in tragedies between the main speeches in a dramatic ἀγών (often these are neutral and conciliatory, e.g. ALC. 673–4, Or. 542–3; but cf. Tro. 966–8 for a passionate and partisan choral comment). Silenus has already spoken of Odysseus’ garrulity (above 104n.), and his suggestion seems to reflect a belief held in some traditional cultures that one adopts the characteristics of what or whom one eats; see Frazer (1914–1917) vol. V ii, ch. 12. oh-so-smart (κομψὸς) can connote excessive ingenuity and subtlety (Eur. Suppl. 426); this latter sense is used of Odysseus by Diomedes (Rhesus 625). the best chatterer: λαλίστατος and its cognate λαλεῖν are almost always derogatory in fifth-century drama, denoting idle and incessant chatter (Eur. Suppl. 462), and contrasted with proper speaking (λέγειν) by Eupolis (F 91 PCG); Aristophanes presents Socrates and Euripides as chatterers
Silenes abuses his sons by calling them λαλίστατοι (Soph. ** F 1130.16 (and see n. 8); cf. above 175n. where the satyrs would like διαλαλεῖν to Odysseus about Helen.

316 Little man (ἀνθρωπίσκε): contemptuous in tone (cf. 185n. on ἀνθρώπινον and 266–7) and a play on Odysseus’ size compared to the giant, likely brought out visually onstage (cf. above 210–11n.). wealth is god for the wise: there may be a parody of sophistic explanations of the divine espoused by, for instance, Prodicus (84 B 5 DK); but allegorising theologies are found as early as the sixth century BC, in Theagenes’ readings of Homeric epic (8 F 2 DK), as well as other Euripidean tragedies (Bacc. 285, etc.). Polyphemus’ obsession with wealth would have tyrannical overtones for the contemporary audience, as tyrants and greed (especially for money) frequently go together in ancient thought (e.g., Aesch. Ag. 1633–9; Eur. Suppl. 450–1.

317 pompous and fine-seeming words: Polyphemus again seems to be on Callicles’ wavelength, who dismisses conventional νόμος or law (Pl. Gorg. 492d); cf. Odysseus’ invocation of laws at 299. Elsewhere in Euripidean tragedy characters dismiss ideas as mere show (e.g. Antiope F 16.2; Andr. 937, Pho. 470); at Hec. 131 the chorus, albeit for different reasons from those of Polyphemus, denounce Odysseus as a smooth-tongued liar. [L’s εὐμορφία (emended to εὐμορφία by Nauck) may stand, as its plural form parallels κόμποι (‘boasts’); the argument for singular εὐμορφία is perhaps the attachment of the genitive λόγων, but plural abstracts govern λόγων at e.g. Bacc. 266–7 ἄφορμαι, Hec. 250 εὑρήματα: such plurals usually mean ‘instances of ...’.]

318–19 father is set up in temples ... ‘good riddance’: for the idiom χαίρειν κελεύω (literally, ‘I bid fair well’), see Stevens (1976) 26. Polyphemus’ dismissal of the worship of his father might seem odd in the light of 231, but the point is for him to be presented here as contemptuous of conventional religious and ethical precepts.

320–1 But I don’t tremble ... Zeus: the monster’s impiety becomes even more transgressive, putting him on the same level as the Argive warrior Capaneus – another giant – who openly defies Zeus’ thunderbolt (Aesch. Seven 423–4; Eur. Pho. 1128–33), only to invite his own destruction (Eur. Pho. 1180–6: for an able defence of these lines, see Mastronarde (1994) 451–82); cf. also Soph. Ant. 131–7; Eur. Suppl. 496–90). In the probably satyric ‘Atlas’ play the Titan voices similar contempt for the power of Zeus (see below Adespota F 655 col. i Fr. A 15–18, and see n. 6). stranger (ξένε): Polyphemus’ mentioning of this word underlines his rejection of ξενία, recalling the words of foreboding uttered earlier by Silenus (esp. 91).

322–3 Zeus ... for the future: the concentration on Zeus’ weather in 323–31 and
the equation of the monster’s belly with Zeus (334–8) point to Zeus as the subject of μέλει. Zeus is also the unstated subject of ἐκχέη (cf. 320, 321; cf. also Il. 16.385 where Zeus χέει ὅδωρ). Here τὸ λοιπὸν functions adverbially to mean ‘for’ or ‘in the future’, as it does at 709 and elsewhere in Euripides. In any event, it is clear for those who remember their Homer that the ‘future’ for Polyphemus will involve punishment, ultimately traceable to Zeus (cf. Od. 9.479), thus adding irony to the monster’s remarks here.

324–5 The translation follows L’s ἔχω ‘I have’ at 324, but also reflects Boissonade’s emendation καὶ ‘and’ for L’s ἦ ‘or’. These readings are favoured by Seaford and noted by Diggle, who nevertheless prints 324 with Reiske’s ἔχων ‘having’, and L’s ἦ at 325. beast: translates δάκος, from the verb δάκνω (‘bite’); it can signify a monster (e.g., Aesch. Seven 558 where it signifies the image of the Sphinx on the shield of Parthenopaeus) or simply a wild animal (Eur. Hipp. 646). Euripides may wish to remind us that the Cyclops did eat lions (cf. 248).

326–7 give ... a good soaking: translates Reiske’s widely accepted emendation εὖ τέγγων τε of L’s ἐν στέγοντι (‘in a/the covering’), which gives only partial sense, as a noun would be expected. εὖ τέγγων seems to fit well with the gluttonous and uncivilized behaviour Polyphemus boasts about here; cf. also below 574n. Consistent with this are the monster’s boasts about his capacity as a drinker at 327 and at 336–7; these are borne out later in the play (503–89). a storage jar of milk: amphorae were used in sympotic contexts for wine and water; here is a joke on the barbaric incongruity of using one for milk (cf. above 136n.). For gluttony as a satyric theme, see also Gen. Intro. pp. 33–4, and Cyc. 217, 338nn.

327–8 I bang my clothes: the general scholarly view sees here a reference to masturbation rather than farting, despite the reference to Zeus’ thunderings: e.g., Ussher (citing Catullus 32.10: nam pransus iaceo et satur supinus / pertundo tunicamque palliumque: ‘For having dined, I’m lying back and I’m full, and I’m bursting through my tunic and bedclothes.’); Seaford (citing Catullus and Martial 11.16.5); Biehl (1986) 141; Henderson (1991a) 245; Slenders (2005) 46. Kovacs (1994b) 153–4 rejects any sexual innuendo here, but his reading depends on his own emendations including changing πέπλον to πλέων so that Polyphemus says ‘.... when I have drunk dry a full storage jar of milk, I beat on it, making a din to rival Zeus’ thunder.’ Musgrave’s emendation πέδον ‘ground’ for πέπλον would mean Polyphemus is bragging about ‘beating the ground’ as if dancing loudly; but this is as coy as it is implausible, and the monster has already announced that there is no Dionysiac activity on the island, a key component of which is dancing (204–5). Moreover, for κρούω to denote sexual activity, see LSJ s.v. 8; also Henderson (1991a) 27, 171 for parallels in Old Comedy which support this reading (e.g. Eupolis, F 184 PCG, Aristophanes, Knights 1379, Eccl. 989, etc.). Although reference to the ‘milk’ that gives his belly a good soaking at 326 occurs before πέπλον κρούω, the drenching of the belly by this white liquid may still be a double entendre (given its
proximity to the idea of masturbation), and could refer to ejaculation, as Henderson (1991a) 245, suggests; if the idea is ‘drench his belly inside’, one would expect σπλάγχνη (‘innards’), which appears in this context at 424. Masturbation was often associated with slaves and satyrs (e.g. Soph. Trackers 366–8 and n. 64; cf. Aesch. Sacred Delegates F ** 78a.29–36 and see n. 10); see also Lissarague (1990b) 57, 61, figs. 2.4, 2.5, 2.6; Stewart (1997) 187–91. While his earlier claims to rival Zeus had made him comparable to the warrior-giant Capaneus (above 320–1n; cf. below 337n.), Polyphemus here reveals another aspect of his own self-sufficiency and impiety that descend to further sordidness. to rival Zeus ... thunderings: another satyric ogre, Salmoneus (Soph. F 537a–41a), attempted to do this, but in a rather different manner, by attaching bronze cauldrons to his chariot, only to suffer the inevitable punishment (Diod. Sic. 6.7; [Apollod.] 1.89; cf. Verg. Aen. 6.590–1; see also Appendix below, p. 506).

330–1 The participles περιβαλὼν (lit. ‘throwing around’) and ἀναίθων (lit. ‘lighting up’) are left without a first person singular verb to allow for the change in construction; they are thus ‘hanging nominatives’ (cf. Eur. Hec. 971; Hel. 290; IT 947; Smyth §3008e). This makes the impersonal μέλει (lit. ‘it will be a concern for’) the principal verb in the sentence. The verb περιβάλλω (lit. ‘I throw round’) stands here in the Greek idiom with the thing thrown round in the dative and the thing ‘covered’ in the accusative, e.g. Or. 372. [Triclinius corrected L’s περιλαβών ‘seizing round, grasping’, an old transcriptional error in uncial letters.] no worry for me at all (μέλει): 322–31 exemplifies ring-composition very evidently, with the order of 322 οὔ μοι μέλει ... 323 ἐκχέῃ reversed in 329 χέῃ ... 331 οὐδέν μοι μέλει. 332–3 perforce, will-nilly (literally, ‘through necessity’): the idea of necessity (ἀνάγκη here) had become a personified concept in Presocratic philosophy of Parmenides (28 B 8.30 DK) and Empedocles (31 B 116 DK), but neither of these shows any indication of rejecting Olympian religion. In the Troades (886) Hecuba sees Zeus and Necessity as one and the same; but in Aristophanes’ parody of Socrates’ cosmology (Clouds 367, 377) Necessity does replace the supreme Olympian. Polyphemus admits the existence of Zeus and the other gods, but sees no reason to pay them honour. Here, Polyphemus emphasises necessity not for any philosophical reasons, but because it contributes to his own consumption and hoarding; ἀνάγκη not personified occurs elsewhere as the inevitable course of fate (e.g. Hec. 1295, cf. El.1301). The monster therefore sees himself, not as a beneficiary of the gods, but of something which compels the earth to provide for his livestock (cf. above 123–4n.).

334 For the second foot anapaest, see 265n. 334–5 Ussher wrongly takes these lines as evidence of Polyphemus’ supposed atheism. Polyphemus is simply announcing that he does not sacrifice to gods whose existence he does not deny, but only to his belly; the impiety is compounded by his elevation of his belly to the role of supreme god. In his Phoenissae (506), Euripides
has Eteocles deify tyranny in virtually identical terms as ‘the greatest of gods’.

336–8 **Since**: translates the elliptical ὡς (on which, see 168n.). **for folk who are sensible** (ἂνθρώποις τοῖσι σώφροσιν): Polyphemus posits, in effect, a redefinition of the cardinal Greek virtue of σωφροσύνη (lit., ‘sound mindedness’, ‘moderation’, ‘self-control’), since he makes gluttony and self-indulgence prescribed behaviour. This is the opposite of what σωφροσύνη normally connoted in Greek usage (LSJ s.v. 2). For discussion of the concept in Euripides, see North (1966) esp. 68–84 and 76: ‘the most common meaning is control of passion, appetite, or emotion’; see also Dover (1974) 66–9 and Rademaker (2005) passim. Polyphemus’ rampant hedonism is echoed in the views of Callicles (Plato, *Gorg.* 491e–2c), but the latter still shows contempt for σωφροσύνη in any form at all and does not attempt to redefine it as does the monster here. **Zeus**: some of the more abstract or elevated notions of Zeus as an all-knowing and somehow inscrutable figure found in philosophy and tragedy (e.g., Heraclitus 22 B 32 DK; Aesch. *Ag.* 160–6; Soph. *Tr.* 1278; Eur. *F* 877; *Tro.* 884–8.) are reduced by Polyphemus here to the most basic and rapacious levels of self-gratification. **every day**: for other less obviously impious doctrines of ‘living for the day’, see Eur. *Her.* 503–5 (with Bond’s n.). [L’s genitive τοῦ πιεῖν (336), emended to nominative τοὐμπιεῖν by Reiske, is widely accepted; the article in τοὐμπιεῖν is shared with φαγεῖν (but καὶ φαγεῖν is emended to κἀμφαγεῖν by Reiske) and λυπεῖν, and the article in τοὐφ’ ἡμέραν is part of a fixed expression, e.g. Eur. *Phrixus* F 835.1.]

338–9 **laws**: Polyphemus’ hedonism brings him on a collision course with νόμοι (laws), which he spurns for the sake of sating his desire to eat his hapless visitors (340–1). This contempt for νόμοι is consistent with Callicles’ views (Pl. *Gorg.* 483b); see 317n., and above Gen. Intro., p. 49. **complicated**: in other contexts ποικίλλω can mean ‘embroider’ (Eur. *Hec.* 470), but the sense here is pejorative, as at Eur. *Suppl.* 187.

340–1 **go to hell**: κλαίειν ἄνωγα: a colloquialism, literally meaning ‘I order <you> to cry’ (ἄνωγα is a perfect with a present sense); it is a more emphatic version of κλαίειν κελεύων (174n; cf. below 701n.). <While>: translates the adversative δέ, which Barnes’ posited after τὴν, and which is accepted by Ussher and printed by Diggle. But the text can stand without it, the resultant asyndeton adding emphasis to the monster’s brutal statement. For the idea of asyndeton as the most effective in producing literary power or force (δεινότης) in ancient literary criticism, see Demetrius, *Eloc.* 269–71 (cf. 358–9 and 465nn.). **desire**: for ψυχή connoting appetite or desire, cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 841; Pl. *Rep.* 579b; Xen. *Cyr.* 8.7.4.

342 **hospitality** (ξένια, literally: ‘hospitalable things’): this responds to Odysseus’ reference to ξένιά (301). Polyphemus again overturns traditional meanings and concepts (cf. 336–8 n.); his ‘hospitality’ will involve eating his guests, and in doing so he sardonically imagines himself a perfect host. A further irony is that instead of receiving a hot meal, as a ξένος would expect, Odysseus and his men will provide
one themselves to their host. The Homeric Polyphemus sardonically announces his
own notion of hospitality, not when stating his intention to eat Odysseus’ men,
but when saying he will eat the hero last, in return for his gift of the wine (Od.
9.369–70); cf. his parting guest-gift, ξείνια, of throwing a rock at Odysseus’ ship
(Od. 9.517).

343 this ancestral bronze (cauldron): translates πατρῷον τόνδε χαλκόν with
Jackson’s emendation χαλκόν of L’s λέβητα γ’ (dismissed as an intrusive and
unmetrical gloss); as Seaford observes, Homeric Greek can be similarly elliptical
in connoting ‘cauldron’ simply with ‘bronze’ (Od. 8.426). Bronze cauldrons were
gifts from host to guests in the heroic world – Odysseus receives one from Alcinous
(Od. 13.13–19); the normally benign function of such an object is again overturned
here to become the instrument of Polyphemus’ cannibalism. Why ‘ancestral’? It
seems unlikely that we should think of Poseidon here; perhaps it adds to the idea of
Polyphemus as a debauched gourmand using his equivalent of the ‘family silver’.
There is no need to assume that the cauldron was onstage, despite the demonstrative
tόνδε here. Demonstratives and deictic pronouns can be used for figures and
objects not onstage, yet vividly present in the mind of the speaker; e.g. the Argive
attackers with their shield-blazons in Aeschylus’ Seven (e.g., 395, 404, 492, 544,
595). while it boils: translates the aorist participle of ζέω (literally, ‘make hot’;
here used intransitively to mean, in effect, ‘become hot’), and is a coincident aorist
participle with a verb in the future tense; see Barrett (1964) Hipp. 289–92n. The
compound ἐπιζέω can be transitive as at 392 below (also IT 987).

344 chopped: translates διαφόρητον (literally: ‘taken apart, broken’); for
eamples, see LSJ I.4. This is Scaliger’s emendation, accepted by Diggle, Ussher
(tentatively) and Paganelli, of L’s δυσφόρητον (‘hard to bear’, described by
Duchemin as ‘malaisé à comprendre’, who prints it anyway, as does Biehl). L’s
reading, in referring to ‘flesh’, is deemed nonsensical by Seaford who emends to
dυσφόρητος to make the adjective agree with the bronze cauldron, which will thus
be ‘hard to wear’; Odysseus will ‘wear’ the cauldron (i.e. be put in it), but will not
enjoy it. Kovacs (1994b) 155 along similar lines accepts Barnes’ δυσφάρωτον (‘ill-
clad’), which he takes as a sardonic reference to the law invoked by Odysseus that
suppliants should receive clothing from their hosts (300). nicely: for καλῶς as a
colloquialism, see Stevens (1976) 55; the adverb here has some irony in referring to
instruments of the monster’s heinous crimes; see also below 631n.

345–6 standing around the altar: the usual phrase for victims at an altar
awaiting their sacrifice (cf. Aesch. Ag. 1036–8; Eur. El. 787–92, etc.). The ‘altar’ is
an effective metaphor for the cauldron; just as a god receives gifts prepared at an
altar, so too Polyphemus’ belly, which he calls ‘the greatest of gods’ (335), receives
gifts prepared in a cooking utensil. [‘altar’ is Stephanus’ emendation to βωμὸν of
L’s κῶμον (revel)]. of the god: Blaydes’ emendation to the genitive with βωμὸν.
L’s dative τῷ … θεῷ (to mean ‘in honour of the god’) is accepted by many: e.g.
Duchemin, Ussher, Paganelli, Biehl, to be construed with εὐωχῆτέ με (‘so that you can provide me with ...’). In any event, Polyphemus’ cannibalism – the monster is referred to as a ‘man’ (see next n.) – will be yet more repugnant as a savage parody of a sacrifice to a god (cf. above 231, 334–5nn.). within the cave: the violence obviously has to take place offstage, and Euripides has to distinguish the interior ‘altar’ from the actual altar that stood in full view of the audience in the orchestra. provide me with a feast: cf. above 342n.

347–9 Odysseus’ earlier heroic posturing (198–202) has dissipated, and the Greeks evidently go meekly into the cave. godless man’s: much the same expression, ‘a most godless host’, is used of the murderous Polymestor in Hecuba (790) – one of many parallels between these two figures (see below 378, 681–8nn., 696–9n.) – and by the chorus in the Bacchae of Pentheus (613). Odysseus, like the satyrs (above 23–6, 30–1nn.), sees Polyphemus’ crimes in religious terms; cf. also 289, 310–11, 605. Polyphemus, as a ‘man’, accordingly should behave like one, observing divine law and refraining from his intended feast (cf. also 429, 591, 602 with nn.). no harbour at all: translates ἀλίμενον, which develops the nautical sense of κατέσχον (cf. 223) and develops metaphorically the earlier reference to ordeals ... on the sea (πόνος ... θαλασσίως 347–8). [savage heart: reading Reiske’s emendation ὑμήν to agree with καρδίαν for L’s γνώμην (which is accepted by many editors: e.g. Murray, Duchemin, Ussher, Paganelli, Biehl, Paduano) which would mean ‘the mind and heart’; this would constitute a variant on the Homeric model, e.g. Il. 6.447 when Hector knows ‘in his mind and in his heart’ (κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν) that Troy will fall.)

350–2 Odysseus appeals to the goddess who supported him throughout the Odyssey. born of Zeus: this would remind the audience of the birth of their patron goddess from the head of Zeus, depicted famously on the east pediment of the Parthenon (cf. Eur. Ion 454–5). Odysseus’ urgency is evident in the repetition of νῦν, as it was in his initial outburst αἰαῖ. This need not diminish his heroism; rather, it points to the savagery of the ogre he must face. now, now!: there is no parallel for doubled νῦν in extant Greek poetry; here the expression is very emphatic in Odysseus’of moment of desperation; but cf. double negative μὴ below (Cyc. 361); also Trackers 246 and n. 44. hard edge: translates βάθρα, which can mean the base or foundation of an altar (Eur. Tro. 16–17). βάθρα is an unparalleled metaphor for ‘danger’ and Musgrave conjectured βάθη (‘depths’), so that Odysseus would be saying ‘(I have come to) the depths (of danger)’; cf. ‘of troubles’ (Aesch. Pers. 465; Eur. Hel. 303). But βάθρα is defensible in that Odysseus seems like a sacrificial animal brought to the base of an altar and is therefore close to, i.e. on the brink of, danger and death. This imagery is at least consistent with the language of sacrifice which Polyphemus has used for the imminent slaughter (345–6, cf. 334–5). At Eur. El. 608 ἐκ βάθρων means ‘from the foundations (upwards)’, referring to destruction.
Zeus ... bright seat of the stars: the supreme god is appealed to in similar terms (Eur. Pho. 1006). Odysseus ostensibly invokes Zeus in august terms as god of hospitality (cf. Od. 9.270–1) and in cosmic terms as a dweller among the stars; cf. Prometheus’ appeal to cosmic agents to witness his own sufferings at the hands of Zeus (PV 1091–3). [φαεννῶν is Kassel’s emendation for L’s φαεννῶν: an example of enallage, with change from prime to secondary application of the adjective as at Pho. 84–5; El. 728.] if you do not see ... : underlying Odysseus’ words is a more defiant tone – a manifestation of Odysseus’ desperation, evident a few lines earlier (347, 351) – demanding of Zeus that he show himself worthy of such respect. Dale (1969) 183–4, sees the challenging tone of this prayer from a mortal to a god at the close of a scene as typical of Euripides’ last plays (e.g., Hel. 1093–106; IT 1082–8; Pho. 84–7). Odysseus voices a similar challenge just before the decisive action of the play (606–7n.). in vain are you worshipped, Zeus, when you are nothing as a god: this translates Triclinius’ Ζεῦ for L’s apparent Ζεὺς. Another possible rendering of this reading would be ‘in vain are you worshipped as a god, Zeus, when you are (as) nothing.’ L’s nominative would make Zeus the predicate of νομίζῃ and take θεός in apposition with τὸ μηδὲν, the predicate of ὀν to give: ‘in vain are you worshipped as Zeus, when you are nothing as a god.’ For other expressions of ‘being nothing’, cf. Eur. Tro. 613; El. 370; Cyc. 642, 667.

These lines evince a tone of foreboding, not endorsement of the cannibalism about to take place, and are in stark contrast to Silenus’ malicious injunctions to Polyphemus (250–2, 313–15), which differ from his own complaints about the monster’s cannibalism (22, 31). wide gullet: emphasizes the gluttony of the monster (as at 215), and physical grotesqueness of the cannibalism; his gullet is mentioned again in Odysseus’ account of the bloody meal (410). <hot>: Hermann’s supplement, made likely by 244–5 (‘a hot feast from the coals’, above)
Commentary

and 374 (‘flesh hot from the coals’); the description of the cooked flesh here also recalls Cratinus’ description of the same episode (F 150 PCG).

358–9 to munch, gnaw, tear in pieces: the three infinitives expressed in asyndeton χναύειν βρύκειν / κρέοκοπεῖν make the monster’s actions more forceful and vivid to the audience’s imagination. For the significance of asyndeton, see 340–1n; cf. 465n.

360 as you lie back: Polyphemus seems to adopt a quasi-symposiast pose as he does later in the play under instruction from Silenus (542–4, 563–4), as well as in the famous ‘Richmond Vase’ depicting his blinding (=LIMC VIII.1 s.v. Polyphemus I 24). [The translation reflects Reiske’s emendation to κλινομένῳ of L’s καινόμενα (‘killed’, i.e. ‘dead’ limbs: probably the result of reading an alpha instead of a lambda).] in your thick-fleeced goat-skin: often translated as ‘on your, etc.’, but this would require ἐπὶ instead of ἐν. As Diggle (1971) 45–6 notes, ἐν refers to figures clothed in certain attire as occurs later at Cyc. 527 (cf. also Pindar, Isthm. 6.37; Hdt. 2.159.3; Soph. Tr. 613; Eur. Bacc. 249; and Diggle (1981) for further examples). That Polyphemus is to be imagined wearing his goat-skin is consistent with his bragging about throwing animal skins around himself to keep warm (330); also in the Richmond Vase he is partially clad in an animal skin.

361–2 In the mesode here (361–7) and antistrophe (370–4) the satyrs become more explicit in their denunciation of Polyphemus’ actions, in keeping with their complaints in the parados (esp. 76–81) and their own exhortations to Polyphemus not to harm the strangers (272). Don’t ... don’t: note the double negative (μὴ ... μὴ...) for agitation and emphasis, brought out further with ἐμοὶ, and cf. Odysseus’ desperate plea (351n.). Alone, for yourself alone: these creatures of the communal thiasos realize the meal violates all notions of φιλία (friendship) which they cultivate with their god as well as Odysseus and his men (above 73–5n; 176n.). The monster has spurned this notion (288–9; cf. 340–1); the meal is thus another indicator of his self-sufficiency, manifesting itself here in isolation. This wish here also recalls their earlier complaint (74–5, 81) that their real master, Dionysus, has been forced to be on his own since the satyrs have become enslaved to their unnatural master, the Cyclops. fill ... ship: introduces nautical imagery for the monster’s inhuman gluttony; Polyphemus speaks of himself in similar nautical terms when emerging from the cave, drunk (505–6; cf. also 497). [fill up: Wecklein’s emendation γέμιζε of L’s κόμιζε ‘convey’.]

363–4 Let me be rid (χαρέτω): the satyrs’ stated refusal of food voices their sympathy for Odysseus and his men and underscores the transgressive nature of Polyphemus’ butchery, emphasized further in their desire to be rid of the monster’s dwelling altogether, which is expressed in the anaphora (repetition) of χαρέτω.

364–5 †sacrifice ... which ... conducts†: the phrase ἤν ἐξεῖ θυσίαν is problematic because ἐξεῖ is unmetrical here as an incomplete half-anapaest and has been variously emended: e.g., παρέχει (‘provide’) Wilamowitz; ἀνάγει (‘conduct’) Jackson; also
θυσία seems to have been attracted to the case of its relative, thus remaining, in effect, the nominative subject (cf. Eur. *Her.* 1163–4; Soph. *El.* 160; Aesch. *Seven* 553); Hartung posited θυσία. In either case θυσία would thus be the subject of χαιρέτω at 364 and be qualified by ἀποβώμιος to mean a sacrifice ‘away from the altar’, i.e. something that ‘is, or ought to be, apart from altar(s) to the gods’, i.e. ‘godless’ (LSJ s.v.) or ‘impious’ due to the nature of its victims (θυμάτων). Ussher keeps the transmitted text and takes ἀποβώμιος to qualify Κύκλωψ – who would thus become the subject of χαιρέτω – and retains θυσία as an accusative of respect to be taken with θυμάτων, and so renders: ‘impious in the manner of his sacrificial offerings’. Despite the textual difficulties, the chorus clearly maintain the imagery of corrupted sacrifice broached already in Polyphemus’ sardonic language and cruel threats (334–5, 345–6) and in Odysseus’ desperate plea to Athena and Zeus (352).

366–7 Cyclops of Etna: for the significance of Polyphemus’ Sicilian or ‘Etnaean’ nature in the play, see above 20n. the meat from his guests: ξενικῶν/κρεῶν: another mention of the breach of ξενία (‘hospitality’) by the monster.

368–71 Pitiless (νηλής): the word used of the Homeric Polyphemus by Odysseus (*Od.* 9.287). Line 370 is unsound in metre. According to Murray, δωμάτων (here translated as ‘in his home’) should be deleted, while in 371 Kirchhoff wanted to substitute ξένους (‘guests’) for δόμων (‘of his home’). sacrifices (ἐκθύει): this word highlights the impious nature of Polyphemus’ crimes and puts him on the same level as another man-eating ogre from a Euripidean satyr play, Busiris, who conducted human sacrifice (Eur. *Busiris* F 312b–315). suppliants: the satyrs’ word pointedly corresponds with Odysseus’ description of himself and his men at 287 and 300.

373–2 The lines are transposed in order to restore metrical correspondence with 358, and with it the identical placing of the words βρύκειν in 358 and βρύκων in 372. with polluted teeth: as another symbol of Polyphemus’ impiety, his teeth are ‘polluted’ in eating suppliants and guests, as indeed his teeth presumably were before now (cf. 125–8, 249); this kind of graphic detail also recalls the reference to the monster’s gullet (356). tearing, gnawing: the asyndeton of these participles recalls that of the three infinitives in the strophe, evoking Polyphemus’ gluttony (358–9 with n.).

374 Many editors after Hermann have posited a lacuna after this line; a whole verse is wanted to complete responson with the strophe. Hermann deleted L’s ἀνθρῶπων before θέρμα to restore the metre (catalectic trochaic dimeter), the scribal error almost certainly caused by confusion with ἀνθράκων.

375–6 In Homer Odysseus has no opportunity (or narrative need) to leave Polyphemus’ cave at any time before his actual escape because of the huge rock the monster places over the cave’s entrance (*Od.* 241–2). Here a shocked Odysseus reappears and recounts in the manner of a messenger in tragedy events too violent and tumultuous to be depicted before the audience. O Zeus, what am I to say...?:
λέξω here is a deliberative aorist subjunctive; Odysseus’ expression is paratragic and identical to Talthybius’ words to Hecuba as he contemplates with dismay the mutability of human fortunes (Eur. Hec. 488). Odysseus, known so widely as a powerful and effective talker here and especially in tragedy (104, 313–15nn.), is now at a loss for words to describe the horrors he has witnessed; what he does describe emulates the Homeric narrative (cf. 393–4n.). like stories ... not like deeds: in a further irony, he can only liken these events to μῶθι, and in so doing he employs a variant on the well-known λόγος-ἔργον (‘word-deed’) antithesis and interaction; see 155n. The forebodings of the chorus in 356–74 will be shown to be well-founded.

377–8 The chorus understand instantly; μῶν (‘really’) need not be understood as ‘nicely ironic’, pace Ussher, who sees it in the light of 356–60, but misconstrues the tone of that passage. Here the particle has a tone of resignation or apprehension about it; see Barrett (1964) on Hipp. 794; the ‘nicely ironic’ tone is more evident at 158 (see with n.). most godless Cyclops: the monster is on much the same level as Euripides’ Polymestor and Pentheus (see above 347–9n.) your dear companions: the expression φίλους ἑταίρους echoes Odysseus’ words in Homer (Od. 9.63); the chorus see Polyphemus’ crime as a violation of φιλία and religious sensibilities.

380 [most well-nourished: εὐτραφέστατον, Scaliger’s widely accepted emendation of L’s ἐντρεφέστατον, a superlative form of an otherwise unattested adjective ἐντρεφής, that would mean literally ‘most nourished in a place’.] could you all go on enduring: ἦτε πάσχοντες is periphrasis, involving a part of εἰμί and participle, for ἐπάσχετε, and seems to suggest prolonged suffering or endurance; for the combination, cf. above 23 and 635 below; Aesch. Ag. 1178; see also Smyth §1961.

382 dwelling: this translates Musgrave’s emendation στέγην for L’s inappropriate χθόνα as a violation of φιλία and religious sensibilities. firstly he lit up the fire: the entire preparations for the meal are carried out, not by any attendants (cf. 83n.), but by Polyphemus himself (383–94), as if to underline his enthusiasm for the impious feast.

385 heavy enough for about three wagon loads: ὡς literally, here: ‘approximating to’; for this meaning, cf. 388; see also Smyth §2995. The rock that blocks the cave entrance in the Odyssey is too heavy for twenty-two wagons (Od. 9.214–2).

392 Paley, followed by Duchemin and Diggle, was the first to place this line here, which would seem to give a more straightforward sequence of events: the monster lights the fire and puts the cauldron on it. [Some scholars have suspected the order of
392 and 393 because they end in the same word, πυρί, but lines ending in identical or nearly identical forms (i.e. homoeoteleuton) are not rare in Euripides and their occurrence is not in itself a compelling reason for transposition. Like Hartung, Ussher transposes 392 after 395. But scholarly consensus has not been achieved; Simmonds and Timberlake, Paganelli and Biehl print the order of the ms.]

387 he laid out: ἔστρωσεν (aorist of στορέννυμι), Pierson’s emendation of L’s ἔστησεν (‘he set up’).

388–9 a bowl about as big as ten storage jars: Polyphemus’ appetite for drink puts him on the same level as another satyric ogre, Lityerses in Sositheus’ Daphnis (see F 2.7–8 and n. 4) who drinks from a pithos of the same dimensions, which is the only other occurrence of δεκάμφορον in extant Greek; cf. above 217n. We also see another aspect of Polyphemus’ barbarism in that he uses a bowl, normally reserved for mixing wine at symposia, for milk drinking, on which see 136n.

390–1 a cup ... which looked ... deep: the cup (reading σκύφος as neuter, as at Eur. F 146.2) is the object of παρέθετο (‘set next to’) and βάθος (‘depth’) can be plausibly taken as subject of ἐφαίνετο (‘looked’), to give literally ‘and (its) depth looked (to be) of four (cubits)’; this makes better sense of τεσσάρων (‘four’). The size of Polyphemus’ ivy drinking cup, like that of the κρατήρ (‘bowl’), underlines his own size and strength as well as gluttony (see previous note). At the same time, the description of the cup seems to recall in a primitive and parodic vein Homer’s famous description of Nestor’s elaborate golden cup in the Iliad (11.631–6), already well-known enough to become the subject of allegorising readings; for instance, Stesimbrotus (FGrH 107 F 23) in the late fifth century BC saw in Nestor’s ability to handle the great cup an allegory of the old man’s ability to hold his liquor. The monster is happy enough to drink from the much smaller cup in the company of Odysseus and Silenus (519–89), just as in the Odyssey he drinks from the cup the hero hands him, likewise made from ivy: κισσύβιον (Od. 9.346).

393–4 spits ... of branches: Odysseus’ speech is quasi-Homeric in its attention to detail, and we may notice even here another contrast with a Homeric model. Achilles, in full accordance with heroic etiquette, prepares food for himself and Priam by roasting lamb on spits – ὀβελοῖσιν – (Il. 24.621–6). Here, the Cyclops prepares his own meal with ὀβελοί, but these are primitive wooden types like those used by the infant Hermes in his rustic dwelling (H. Hom. 4.121); Theophrastus (HP 1.3.2) also mentions that thorny wood is used for spits. [L’s and Athenaeus’ κλάδῳ was emended to κλάδων by Scaliger who also corrected the scribal slip γ’ ἀλλὰ.]

395 †sacrificial bowls of Etna ... axes†: Boissonade posited a lacuna before 395, while Fix posited one after 395. Diggle in his OCT apparatus prefers to delete this line, presumably because no prior mention has been made of σφαγεῖα (bowls to catch the blood of sacrificial victims) or axes. But, although considered by some to be corrupt, this line still conveys some interesting possibilities. The ‘bowls’ (i.e. cauldron) may be compared to the crater of Etna not just in terms of size, as
Duchemin and Ussher suggest (cf. also ‘the Etna beetle’ in Aesch. *Sisyphus* F 233 and n. 8; Soph. *Trackers* F 314.307), but also in the dangers each posed for human life; at Pindar, *Pyth.* 1.13–28 and in *Prometheus Bound* (363–72) the volcano’s activity is attributed to the monstrous Typhon, struggling beneath its weight. The harsh and brutal connotations of the adjective Αἰτναῖος in the play (20, 62, 95, etc.) have been recently discussed (O’Sullivan 2012a; cf. above 366n.), and it is possible here that the bowls, in being ‘Etnaean’ and put to a brutal use, may have become endowed with brutal characteristics themselves, just as the knife the monster uses is described as λάβρος ‘savage’ or ‘violent’ (403–4n.). Seaford suggested that the line be transposed after 399 then followed by 398 to give the following sequence of events: the giant throws one man into the cauldron, the ‘sacrificial bowl’, then grabs another by the ankle, etc. Seaford also suggests σφαγεῖον Αἰτναῖον γε ‘the Etnean sacrificial bowl’ in apposition with the cauldron.

396 hateful to the gods: θεοστυγεῖ (also at 602) can be both active and/or passive, i.e. hating and/or being hated by the gods; for the latter sense, cf. Lycurgus, another enemy of Dionysus, who was punished by Zeus and ‘became hateful’ (ἀπῆχθε) to all the gods (*Il.* 6.140). The active sense is also apt here, in the light of the monster’s stated contempt for the Olympians, especially Zeus (316–21).

397 butcher from hell: Stephanus’ emendation of L’s δίδου to Αἴδου is generally accepted, the corruption easily explained by reading the uncial alpha as a delta. For the metaphorical sense of Αἴδου meaning ‘hellish’ cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 1115, 1235; Eur. *IT* 286–7; *HF* 1119; *Hec.* 1077. On the attributive genitive, see Smyth §1297–8.

398 and in one movement: translates ῥυθμῷ θ’ ἑνὶ, Wilamowitz’s emendation of L’s ῥυθμῷ τινί. The emendation θ’ ἑνὶ makes sense if we understand that the Cyclops is holding a man in each hand: one he throws into the cauldron; he then dashes the other’s brains out on a rock. The use of the indefinite here lacks force (‘in a movement’), while θ’ ἑνὶ, in the position of emphasis at the end of the line, would nicely balance δύο in the same position immediately above. This would create a sequence of numbers for effect: (397) two; (398) one; (399) the one; (400) the other. Ussher plausibly cites Aesch. *Pers.* 462, 975 for similar expressions of ‘one movement’ or ‘one rushing motion’; cf. also Eur. *Supp.* 94.

399 Diggle (1971) 48 posited a lacuna after this line to explain the absence of a verb governing τὸν μὲν in 399 and suggested that it contained ἔρριψε (‘he threw’), but this is not reported in the apparatus to his OCT text.

400–2 This action recalls *Od.* 9.289–92, but the Homeric monster kills his victims by dashing them onto the ground, then devours them raw ‘like a lion’ after cutting them up. Duchemin suggests the account here may be influenced by Sophocles’ description of Heracles’ killing of Lichas (*Trach.* 779–82) by grabbing him by the foot and throwing him down a cliff; cf. also *Il.* 1.591 for the partitive genitive (Hephaestus thrown from heaven); Sositheus *Daphnis* F 3.1 and note 9; Smyth §1346. *†seizing down†*: the sense of καθαρπάσας seems less satisfactory
here than a verb of tearing or cutting apart as suggested by Paley (διαρπάσας or διαρταμῶν).

403–4 savage blade: the monster’s equipment reflects its owner’s character, and is spoken of in almost animated terms (LSJ λάβρος s.v. I, II.2), as are the weapons of war in Homeric epic which can be ‘pitable’, ‘shameless’ or ‘raging’ (e.g. Il. 4.521, 5.661, 11.572–4, 13.501, etc.); see above 64–5n. Evidently an experienced cannibal (cf. 241–9), Polyphemus displays the culinary precision here of a meticulous butcher who distinguishes between various cuts of meat and cooks them accordingly; cf. the culinary detail of Polyphemus’ cooking described by Cratinus (F 150 PCG). to boil: a prolative infinitive after a verb of motion as at 412; cf. above 257n., 290–1 n.

405–6 The significance of Odysseus’ actions here is left unexplained, and is usually passed over by commentators. In the Homeric account he simply watches in horror and weeps with the rest of his men, gripped by helplessness (Od. 9.294–5). In my misery, pouring forth tears ...: there is nothing unheroic in such tears; the hero’s first appearance in the Odyssey (5.81–4) has him weeping with longing to return home (cf. also Od. 8.522, etc.). In Euripides’ version Odysseus’ distress is palpable, but he retains his composure, and he distinguishes his response from the extreme, debilitating fear felt by his men (see next note.). stood nearby: this could be explained by Odysseus’ wish to observe the Cyclops closely while hatching a plan to escape. ... was servant to the Cyclops: cf. Silenus’ complaint at 31 of being forced to be the monster’s servant (διάκονος). But in what way was Odysseus Polyphemus’ servant? The plan to ply the beast with wine does not occur to him until 411–12. [Note Dindorf’s emendation to κἀδιακόνουν (with augment before preverb) for L’s καὶ διηκόνουν (with augment following preverb) which is post-Classical; the alpha in διακονέω is long, and ancient.]

407–8 Euripides reworks Od. 9.236, which describes the fear shown by Odysseus’ men, already in Polyphemus’ cave, when they see the monster for the first time. but the others ... kept cowering: ἔχω in periphrastic expressions is found only with the aorist or perfect participle and expresses ‘permanency’ (Med. 33; Hec. 1013; see Smyth §1963) not just prolonged activity like εἰμί and the present participle at 381. like birds: cf. Her. 974; And. 1140.

410 deep belch: a virtual oxymoron as αἰθήρ typically denotes the upper air, the air of heaven as something bright and pure (e.g., the realm of Zeus: Ar. Frogs 100; cf. ib. 892), but it can mean any air or vapour as at 629; and βαρύς here denotes something from the depths that is disgusting or noisome. The presence of αἰθέρα in Athenaeus’ citation (1.23e) of this line protects it from Scaliger’s conjecture of ἀέρα (‘vapour, gas’). gullet (φάρυγξ): again, the focus of Polyphemus’ monstrous gluttony (cf. 215, 356nn.).

411–12 idea sent from some god (literally, ‘something divine’): Odysseus attributes his plan of action here to some god, while in the Odyssey his own θυμός (‘heart’ or ‘mind’) is emphasized as deciding his course of action. Firstly, it holds
him back from killing the beast, as this would prevent their own escape (Od. 9.302); then he resolves to blind Polyphemus after getting him drunk, as this seems the best plan κατὰ θυμὸν (‘according to my mind’: Od. 9.318). **Maron’s wine here:** see 141n. Odysseus has the wineskin onstage, a significant prop, as it will be crucial in the scene where Polyphemus is made more drunk in full view of the audience, as a prelude to the blinding offstage. **to drink:** prolated infinitive as at 290–1, 404, 561; cf. 257.

413 **O son of the ocean god:** recalls Odysseus’ earlier imprecation to Polyphemus (286) when pleading for himself and his men to be spared. Odysseus would expect the monster to consider this address a compliment, despite Polyphemus’ dismissal of his father’s temples (318–19); yet Odysseus, in the light of his recent experiences, can use such a title again here to imply savagery on the monster’s part, so typical of Poseidon’s sons (cf. 21–2n.). [Diggle, citing Eur. IT 1230 and Ion 1619 as parallels (where Apollo is addressed as ‘O son of Zeus and Leto’: ὦ Διὸς Λητοῦς τ’ Ἄπολλον), reads τοῦ for the Aldine’s παῖ, on the basis that ὦ and the genitive of a bare or articular name is the idiom of invocation, rather than the explicit παῖ. But L’s text is defensible.]

414 **Greece:** as Odysseus tries to entice Polyphemus with wine hitherto unknown to the monster (cf. 123–4), he implies that Greece is alien to Sicily, in contrast to his earlier somewhat specious claim that the land of Sicily was ‘Greek’ (297–8), which had fallen on deaf ears.

415 **the joy of Dionysus:** while γάνος means something bright or gleaming, appropriate for wine elsewhere (cf. Cyc. 67; Homer Il. 1.462, Od. 2.47, etc.), here it seems to connote something joyful as well (cf. Aesch. Ag. 579, 1392). Διονύσου could be a subjective genitive (*i.e.* wine is a gift from Dionysus), or ‘Dionysus’ could be simply a byword for wine itself; if the latter, god and wine are considered as one (cf. Prodicus 84 B 5; Eur. Bacc. 275–83; see above 123–4n., 141n.). At 519–29 the god is spoken of in the latter sense but called the ‘Bacchic one’ or ‘Bacchus’ as opposed to being explicitly called ‘Dionysus’ as here and at 139.

416–17 Polyphemus’ man-eating habit is gluttonous – he is ‘full up’ with his meal; as Seaford notes, ἔκπλεως is a stronger word than ἔμπλεως (conjectured by Dobree), meaning just ‘full’. This finds its natural corollary in his first cup of wine, which he drinks in one gulp. His consequently swift drunkenness in fact facilitates the monster’s downfall, and is keenly exploited by Odysseus (420–4). **<and>:** Barnes’ conjecture τ’ restores the metre. **drained it … knocking it back:** σπάω and ἕλκω (the latter a coincident aorist participle; cf. 152n.) function as synonyms here to emphasize the monster’s gluttony, evident also in ἐμυωστιν (‘in one draught’), an internal accusative of similar meaning to the verb ἑλκύσας.

418 **raising his hand:** Seaford interprets this gesture to mean admiration, while Ussher says it indicates a request for another drink; the two meanings are not mutually exclusive. **‘Dearest of guests…’:** this is the first time Polyphemus
shows any inclination towards φιλία or ξενία in regard to his guests. But such a feeling is a distorted form of φιλία and ξενία, as it arises only as a result of his incipient inebriation and his expectation that his greed will be catered to; he still fully intends to eat his guests.

421 knowing that: ὅτι is a prepositive at verse-end, more common in Sophocles (Aj. 678, 792; El. 332, 426, 998, 1106, 1367, etc.) than Euripides (e.g. Med. 560).

422 would be his ruin: τρώσει (future of τιτρώσκω) literally ‘wound, harm’ seems to have a figurative meaning here. Polyphemus will be in a weakened state as result of his gluttonous drinking; the wine plays a decisive role in overcoming the monster. pay his due (δίκην δώσει): literally ‘give justice’; Odysseus voices one of the key themes of satyric drama as he does again at 693: the meting out of punitive justice to an ogre; cf. Aesch. ‘Dike Drama’ F**281a; Eur. Sciron F 678; Syleus F 692, etc.

423–4 sure enough: as Denniston (1954) 249 notes, this usage of καὶ δὴ ‘seems to combine the ideas of connexion and immediacy’. started singing: singing, as a natural consequence of drinking, is found in the Odyssey (14.464) and, more generally, in the genre of the σκολίον (‘drinking song’). See next note.

425–6 warmed his innards: cf. Ar. Frogs 844. cacophony (ἄμουσα): just as Polyphemus’ sense of φιλία is grossly distorted, so, too, is his singing. He has already been denounced for his ignorance and boorishness (173) and will later be referred to as an ignoramus in need of education (492–3). Ussher and Seaford rightly see parallels with Heracles’ singing in Eur.’s Alcestis (758–63); like Polyphemus, the hero is ‘warmed’ with wine (cf. Eur. Alc. 758). Cf. also Eur. Syleus (T iiiia); Ion, Omphale F 22, below; and the gluttonous Lityerses’ reaping song (Sositheus, Daphnis n. 1, below. In Alc. 760–1, Heracles howls a cacophony, but here, Polyphemus’ deplorable singing adds insult to injury; for the monster’s transgressions are far worse than Heracles’ behaviour, which is not intended to upset the house of Admetus. my fellow sailors who are weeping: there seems to be a grim joke here in Euripides’ expression; Polyphemus’ singing, like his murderous actions, is another reason for the tears of the hapless sailors who are stuck in the cave, which resounds with the monster’s cacophony.

427–8 The reference to the chorus is in both singular (σὲ, βούλῃ) and plural (εἴπατε, χρῄζετε); here the singular probably refers to the coryphaeus, the plural certainly to the chorus overall; but such a basis for the distinct uses of singular and plural is not always clear. The shift from singular to plural occurs unproblematically elsewhere (465, 476; cf. also 441–2), and the chorus can refer to their own actions in the plural (437–8, 444) or singular (447).

429 monstrous: translates ἄμεικτον. When applied to a person as here, literally it can mean ‘incapable of mixing with others’. Polyphemus, like other monsters, such as centaurs (Soph. Tr. 1095), is therefore anti-social and savage (LSJ ἄμικτος, s.v. III) – another brief allusion to his inability to cultivate social relations or φιλία.
A direct corollary of this is the fact that he is, in the words of the chorus at 438, ‘godless’ (ἀνόσιος). However, ἄμεικτος also conveys the idea that one cannot ‘mix it (i.e. fight) with’ Polyphemus, just as Homeric and other warriors ‘mix it’ (μείγνυμι), i.e., ‘fight in battle (Il. 15.510; Alcaeus F 330 L-P; Pind. Pyth. 4.212–13; cf. Soph. OC 1047, etc.); the two senses of ‘monstrous’ and ‘unable to be fought’ can easily co-exist. man (ἄνδρα): although frequently called a ‘beast’ (442, etc.), Polyphemus is also called ‘man’ (also at 348, 591, 605; cf. 199) indicating that he is essentially an anthropomorphic monster (as opposed to Scylla, Hydra, etc.) and that his anthropophagy is essentially a form of cannibalism.

430 Naiad nymphs: this translates Casaubon’s emendation of L’s δαναίδων (most easily explained as a mistake due to dittography in ΑΔΑΝΑ) to Ναΐδων. Even though [Apollod.] (Bibl. 2.1.4) and Hyginus (Fab. 169a) mention a satyr’s attempt on the Danaid Amymone, also the title of an Aeschylean satyr play (F 12–14 Radt; see also Appendix, below), the satyrs have no general connection with the Danaids; for satyrs and Naiads, cf. Pratinas F 3.4, below.

433–4 This rather elliptically expressed idea is that Silenus in his drunkenness flails his arms about in the same way as a bird caught by its feet in lime flaps its wings about – either uncontrollably or without achieving anything; but ‘bird’ does not appear in the simile, its presence being left to inference from ‘lime’ and ‘wings’. struggling with his wings: metrical phrasing and the logic of the simile make πτέρυγας an accusative of respect with ἀλύει which is only transitive in Oppian of the second century AD (Halieutica 4.195, 4.337); the subject of the verb is Silenus who is ‘trapped’ or ‘caught’ (λελημμένος) in his wine cup, and has already been described as ‘weak’ (ἀσθενὴς at 432). For liming in a simile for mental hopelessness, cf. Lucian, Voyage to the Underworld 14.

435–6 your old friendship: as Odysseus knows, the relationship between Dionysus and the satyrs is famously characterised by φιλία (thus he describes it as ‘old’); cf. above 73–5n.

437 O dearest friend: φίλτατε is admittedly very common (Eur. El. 229, 345, etc.), but, given the numerous mentions of the φιλία between the satyrs and Odysseus earlier (see above 73–5n.), and the reiteration of the φιλία between Dionysus and the satyrs in the preceding line, it points again to the friendship between satyrs and hero.

438 godless presence of the Cyclops (ἀνόσιον κάρα): this periphrastic idiom (κάρα plus adjective and genitive of name) is usually honorific (Or. 475; cf. Tro. 661, etc.), but the reverse applies here, as at Tro. 1024; cf. also Dido’s refers to Aeneas as: ‘infandum caput’, ‘an unspeakable person/creature’ (Vergil, Aen. 4.613).

439–40 †my own siphon ... to eat!† These lines are metrically at fault in three places (see below); in 440 the two finite verbs χηρεύομεν and ἔχομεν are uncoordinated, and καταφαγεῖν (‘to eat up’) is nonsensical. Apt sense can however be in part discerned. σίφων (lit. ‘tube, ‘pipe’: LSJ I.a and b) makes a metaphor for
‘penis’, as almost certainly at Juvenal 6.310. It can stand here as accusative of respect with active χηρεύομεν (Seaford observes that the Middle would be idiomatic, as at A1c. 1089); thus, sexual abstinence has ‘widowed’ the satyrs’ penis(es); for such frustration see the longings of 68–70, 169–70, 495–502. Seaford, emending the second half of 439, adds to the plausibility of this meaning by noting the satyrs’ habits of confusing the pleasures of wine and sex as depicted on vases (to which we can add Osborne (1998) figs. 5, 89 [the latter =Lissarague 1990b: fig. 2.8, the psykter by Douris]); see also Kilmer (1993) figs. R126, R148; Voelke (2001) fig. 21. For the names of types of pottery as metonymy for male genitalia, see Ar. Frogs (1208, 1213, 1219, 1226, 1233, 1238, 1241), where Euripidean heroes, in losing their ληκύθιον (‘little oil flask’), lose their manhood in all senses; see Snell (1979), and, for a different view, Bain (1985) who argues that no double entendre is meant; cf. Dover (1993) ad loc., who inclines towards Bain’s view.

An objection to the interpretation above is that the normal meaning of 439 διὰ μακροῦ is ‘after a long time’ (IT 480; Pho. 1069) rather than ‘for a long time’ (Hec. 320 and IA 1399 are ambiguous). The latter has however been acceptable to some editors who in 440 adopt καταφυγεῖν ‘to escape’ (Paris apograph, for καταφαγεῖν) or καταφυγήν ‘escape, refuge’ (Hermann, but as part of further changes to the text); both the verb and the noun are made to depend upon ἔχομεν or some form of ἔχω ‘(we) are not able to, (we do not have an) escape’. This idea would expand upon 437–8; Hermann indeed conjectured ‘... our σίφων which has no refuge, no place to go’, a transparent double entendre, on which Seaford comments ‘an entirely satisfactory refuge would be provided by a nymph (68, 430)’. For detailed discussion of the difficulties here see Seaford especially; subsequently Biehl and Kovacs (1994b) 155–6.

[The metrical faults are: (1) in 439 the first syllable of σίφωνα is long where a short in the fourth foot is required; in 440 (2) the fourth foot in L consists of only two short syllables and (3) the fifth of a dactyl impossible in both tragedy and satyr. Cures for (1) have been sort in rearrangement of the words (e.g. Hermann, Diggle) and for (2) and (3) by conjecture (Hermann, cf. Seaford and Kovacs, much more adventurously: neither is cited in our apparatus).]

441–2 revenge: this brings on the next significant piece of action in the play: the punishment of the Cyclops, mentioned here again; see also 422n. Inflicting punishment on one’s enemies was seen as a standard of behaviour going back to the Archaic age: Archilochus, F 126 W; Theognidea, 337–40; for discussion, see Dover (1974) 180–4. Goins (1991) cogently rebuts the views of those who find Odysseus’ act gratuitous or presented in a negative light by the poet.

443–4 Asian kithara: Webster (1967) 18 sees a compliment here to the Milesian poet Timotheus; F 370 of Eur.’s Erechtheus of 422 BC refers to ‘Asian music’. More to the point, however, is that Asia is the place from where Dionysus brought his cult and his music (Bacc. 64, 1168); the Phrygian aulos is part of the musical
celebration of Dionysus when the ‘raging satyrs’ receive the tympanum from Rhea (Bacc. 128–30); cf. also lotus-pipe (Bacc. 160, etc.). **the Cyclops ... destroyed:** the satyrs, like Odysseus, are keen, not just to escape, but to wreak vengeance on Polyphemus (see previous note).

445–6 Ussher finds Polyphemus’ desire to join in a revel (κῶμος) with his brothers ‘a pleasing trait’, but it seems likely that the monster’s behaviour in such a context would be as transgressive as his cruel parody of the idea of hospitality or ξενία (342–4) and his own appalling singing (425–6; cf. Odysseus’ warning to him on the potential violence of revels: 534). Nevertheless, Polyphemus’ inclinations here form an interesting contrast to the generally solipsistic lifestyles of the Cyclopes (120; cf. Od. 9.112–15).

449 **purpose ... through cunning:** δόλιος ἡ προθυμία (lit., ‘cunning intention’): this, as opposed to βία (strength), will be Odysseus’ chief weapon against the monster, as it was in the Odyssey (9.282, 406, 408, 422). [Musgrave’s emendation of L’s ἐπιθυμία (‘desire’) cognates of which occur only twice elsewhere in extant Euripides, once in a sexual context (Andr. 1281; cf. Alc. 867). Conceivably, however, ἐπιθυμία may stand, so that Odysseus refers to his ‘desire’ to punish Polyphemus via deceit; such ‘desire’ may pick up the excited tone of satyrs who say to the hero ‘you’re raging’ (μενοινᾶς) to punish the monster.]

450 **exactly** translates δάι: this colloquial particle (common in Aristophanes and absent from formal prose) functions as a semi-connective in a question motivated by what has preceded it (cf. Hel. 546); see Denniston (1954) 262–3. The satyrs want to know in detail how their monstrous oppressor will be overthrown. **For a long time ... clever:** Odysseus’ reputation precedes him here in a way slightly more favourable than at 104. πάλαι could be taken with σοφός to mean that Odysseus has had a reputation for cleverness ‘since the beginning’ (i.e. all his life); cf. also 649 where the satyrs live up to their old reputation.

451 Duchemin suggests that the infinitive ἀπαλλάξαι depends on an assumed μενοινῶ, following the chorus’ μενοινᾶς ‘you’re raging…’ (448). But ἀπαλλάξαι is more easily explained as following on from προθυμία, so that the noun functions like a verb in taking the infinitive (i.e. προθυμία ἀπαλλάξαι = προθυμέω ἀπαλλάξαι) ‘my desire/intent/purpose is to take him away…’; cf. Tro. 689. For the emendation προθυμία, see 449n.

454 **conquered by the Bacchic god:** νικώμενος is followed by a genitive of comparison (Βακχίου) and functions in the same way as ἡσσώμενος (‘inferior’; cf. Smyth §2004; cf. also Eur. Autol. A F 282.5 where an athlete as is described as ‘a minion to his belly’: νηδύος ... ἡσσήμενος); the use of νικώμενος possibly continues the figurative language used for the effects of wine on the monster which will ‘wound’ or ‘harm’ him (see 421–2n.). As at 446, Odysseus’ periphrastic way of referring here to wine in personified form as ‘Bacchus’ (literally, ‘the Bacchic one’) implies that Dionysus is present on more than one level (cf. 123–4), and has a direct
hand in the defeat of the monster, as would be fitting, given Polyphemus’ hostility to the god and his worshippers (esp. 203–11, and passim).

455  beam of olive: in the Odyssey (9.319–28) Odysseus blinds Polyphemus with the monster’s club, which would have made a nice irony here: the instrument of the ogre’s violence and oppression (211) is turned against him. The olive beam Odysseus uses here requires many to lift it (472), and his need of the satyrs’ help in carrying this branch is exploited for comic potential later (635–41). In some depictions a beam, as opposed to Polyphemus’ club, is also the instrument of his blinding (LIMC VIII.1 s.v. ‘Polyphemos’ I 18, 20, 31); on the Richmond Vase (LIMC VIII.1 s.v. ‘Polyphemos’ I 24) Odysseus and his men appear to be wielding a tree trunk over the sleeping giant.

456  sharpen well: translates ἐξαποξύνας which appears in Triclinius’ text for ἀποξύνας in L; the compound with ἐκ, favoured by Euripides (see Zuntz (1965) 54), expresses thoroughness or completion.

457–9  At 454–7 the sentence proceeds more by vivid idiom and sense than by the expected syntax of a future indicative in the main clause after ὅταν + subjunctive; but here in 457–9 this normality does occur. [Pierson emended to βαλῶ ... ὄμμα τ’ for L’s βαλὼν and ὄμματ’ (on the plural, see 462–3n.); but the asyndeton of L between the participles is perhaps defensible given that Odysseus is vividly outlining his revenge on the monster, which he extends in a simile, and is alluding to the decisive action of the play.]

460–1  And just ... leather thongs: the simile recalls the famous Homeric passage (Od. 9.383–6). Such an obvious reference here almost seems to break the dramatic illusion whereby the Odysseus of drama alludes to the Odysseus of epic. Likewise in Antisthenes’ account of the Judgement for the Arms of Achilles (B XIX 12.14 Radermacher) Odysseus finishes his speech by saying how a future poet will depict the heroes, alluding again in heavy-handed fashion to specific Homeric passages and epithets which denigrate Ajax (e.g. Il. 7.219–23; 11.558–65), and present himself in a favourable light in describing him as πολύτλας (‘much-enduring’: Il. 8.97, Od. 5.171, etc.), πολύμητις (‘of much cunning’: Il. 1.311, etc.) and πολυμήχανος (‘of many resources’: Il. 2.173; Od. 1.205, etc.).

462–3  I shall twist ... Cyclops’: the word-play and assonance between κυκλώσω and Κύκλωπος (cf. also 459) cannot be reproduced in English. in the light of ... eye: literally ‘the eye that brings him light’; the monster’s eye will be subjected to light in the form of scorching fire. Odysseus thus relishes the prospect of revenge on the monster with a pun and grimly ironic language. pupil: κόρας is plural, but must be translated in the singular for the Cyclops; at 617 and 673 the singular βλέφαρον (‘eye’) is used. On this issue even Homer nods, too, referring to the monster’s ‘eyebrows’ (Od. 9.389).

465  I’m happy, we’re crazy about ...: the satyrs’ joy is predictably instantaneous and a little overstated (see also 624–5n.), expressed in asyndeton (cf. 341, 358–
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9nn.), and change of person from singular to plural (cf. above 427–8nn.). **what you’ve come up with:** literally, ‘the discoveries, inventions’ (τοῖς εὑρήμασιν). This is a typical reaction of the satyrs when confronting a εὐρήμα (as here) for the first time, and a motif of satyric drama: *e.g.* Aesch. Prom. Fire-Kindler F 207 where the satyrs want to kiss fire on seeing it for the first time; Soph. Trackers and the satyric reaction on first hearing lyre music (131–209); see Gen. Intro. pp. 34–6, and Index of Motifs, below.

466 **you:** σὲ (‘you’), the singular here, refers to the coryphaeus. (your) **friends:** φίλους has no possessive adjective here, but its position between ‘you’ and ‘old man’ suggests that the satyrs are meant (cf. 176; cf. also 73–5nn.), notwithstanding the fact that Odysseus also calls his men φίλοι (‘friends’: 478, 481) who are in the cave along with Silenus.

467 **black ship:** more Homeric resonance; ships are regularly black in Homeric epic (*e.g.*, *Il.* 1.141, 2.568, 24.780; *Od.* 2.430, 3.61, 21.39, etc.). The transitive aorist participle ἐμβήσας here takes two accusatives: the object embarked upon (Odysseus’ ship) and the satyrs put onto it (see previous note); cf. Eur. Hcld. 845.

468 **double bank of oars:** this seems to give the best sense of διπλαῖσι κώπαις (cf. Lysias 1.9 where a two-storeyed house is called διπλόον οἰκίδιον) and would suggest that the ship to be imagined is a bireme with two levels of oars on each side; cf. also above 14–17n. on ‘oared’.

469–70 **as if it were a libation to a god:** this translates Reiske’s emendation ὡσπερεὶ for L’s ὥσπερ ἐκ (‘as from, after’); it is unfortunate that P.Oxy. 4545 (see 471n.) is defective here and cannot help with ὡσπερεἰ. Consensus on the precise meaning has not been achieved. Much of the obscurity arises from the terse combination of metaphorical (the libation) with concrete (the brand) elements; see the discussions by Duchemin, Ussher and Seaford (who suspects corruption). Reading with the ms ὥσπερ ἐκ to give: ‘as if it were after a libation to the god’), the Cyclops may be envisaged as a sacrificial victim, over whom (or into whom) a libation has been poured with the wine given him by Odysseus. Conversely, the reference could be to the ritual of dipping a torch into holy water (χέρνης), which is then sprinkled over altar, onlookers and victim (*Ar. Peace* 959; *Eur. Heracles* 928–9). On this reading, Polyphemus’ eye functions as the water into which the brand is plunged; cf. the words of the Homeric Odysseus who compares the act of blinding to a bronze-worker plunging hot metal into cold water (*Od.* 9.391–3). In any event, the sacrificial imagery is noteworthy: just as Polyphemus had earlier described his imminent slaughter of Odysseus’ men as a sacrifice (334–5, 345–6), now the revenge will take this form. Sacrificial imagery is used to great effect to describe murder in some tragedies (*Aesch. Ag.*., esp. 1433; *Eur. Medea* 1054); see above 345–6nn.

469–70 contain a rare example of ἔστιν ὅπως + optative with ἄν, thus disproving the
471 bloodshed (φόνου): Diggle prints πόνου (labour), Nauck’s emendation of L’s φόνου (‘slaughter’, ‘bloodshed’); but the ms is quite defensible. L’s reading is accepted by the first editor of P. Oxy. 4545 which contains the remains of Cyc. 455–71, 479–81, 484–96 (see app. crit.). But only the last two letters of 471 remain in the papyrus (lambda and omega), and even these are printed with sub-linear dots, so in its current state the papyrus does not confirm or contradict L’s reading. In any event, φόνου has been widely accepted (by, for instance, Murray, Simmonds and Timberlake, Duchemin, Ussher, Paganelli, Biehl, Kovacs, Paduano) and is defensible on other grounds. φόνος need not always refer to actual killing, but can mean bloodshed or bloodletting (LSJ s.v. I.4). Even if φόνος does mean ‘slaughter’ here, its desire might be expected of the satyrs, whose enthusiasm for Polyphemus’ punishment seems to know no bounds (cf. 464–5); Seaford notes the expression κοινωνεῖν φόνου (‘take part in slaughter’) elsewhere in Euripides (Andr. 915; El. 1048; Or. 1591). At IT72 φόνος refers to blood spilt at an altar; a close verbal parallel is found in Porphyry (On Abstinence 2.29) in a similarly sacrificial context.

472 Yes – you’ll have to: as Denniston (1954) 454 notes, γοῦν here signifies an affirmative response, indicating that Odysseus expects the satyrs to help him, which sets up the humour of their inevitable cowardice later (635–48). Odysseus’ men are evidently still cowering in the recesses of the cave, weeping in fear (425–6; cf. 407–8), hence his reliance on the satyrs here and later (cf. 590–5); but he has ‘to use his close friends’, 650–1. brand ... massive: see above 455n.

473–4 a hundred wagons: possibly a colloquial comparison; cf. the oak tree heavy enough for three wagonloads thrown by Polyphemus onto his hearth (385); the continued enthusiasm of the satyrs – creatures not known for their physical strength or courage – leads to them to exaggerate here; cf. their bluff and bluster later in Cyc. (596–8, 632–4) and elsewhere in satyric drama (Soph. Inachus F **269d.22). Audience recollection of such comments will add humour to the chorus’ cowardly avoidance of action later in the play (635–41).

475 we are going to smoke out: ἐκθύψομεν, the future of ἐκτύφω, is Hertlein’s emendation of L’s ἐκθρύψομεν (‘we shall break up’; see also 659n.). like a nest of wasps: cf. the similar image in, for instance, Aristophanes (Wasps 457; Lys. 476; Wealth. 301). damned Cyclops: literally ‘Cyclops who will be destroyed terribly’; τοῦ κακῶς ὀλουμένου is a colloquial expression of abuse found elsewhere in Euripides (Hcld. 874) and comedy (cf. Ar. Ach. 865, Ec. 1076); for discussion, see Stevens (1976), 15.

476 be quiet, all of you: the plural imperative here (σιγᾶτε) is directed at the chorus as a whole; the singular ἐξεπίστασαι (‘you know’) is directed at the coryphaeus. (cf. 440–1, 435, 466).

477 its architects: while the metaphor is grandiose, it is worth noting that Odysseus
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refers to himself as a skilled craftsman only a few lines earlier (cf. above 460–1n.); more generally in Homeric epic Odysseus’ skill as a craftsman is emphasized, e.g., as shipwright (Od. 4.241–61), and even bed-maker (Od. 23.183–204), as well as when he is blinding the monster (Od. 9.383–93). The regular metaphor for someone who contrives a scheme is simple τεκτών, (‘builder, carpenter, creator, deviser’), e.g. Aesch. Ag.153, 594; Eur. Med. 409. Interestingly, the τεκτών in either metaphorical or literal uses is frequently described as σοφός (‘clever, skilled’), which also suits Odysseus here and more generally (e.g. Pind. Pyth. 3.113; Bacch. Dith. 6.6; Eur. Med. 409 [cf. Alc. 348]; Critias 43 F 19.34 [on which see below n. 10]; Ar. Birds 1154–5; Pl. Prot. 312c).

478–9 men who are my friends: Odysseus’ actions are motivated by concerns of friendship (φιλία) here, and his heroism seems to be reasserting itself along Homeric lines compared to his despondency (347–55) after his altercation with the monster. At Od. 9.421 Odysseus’ concern for his ἑταῖροι (‘companions’) is a strong motivating factor in his revenge on Polyphemus.

480–2 Seaford and Kovacs (1994a) follow Conradt and Diggle here in deleting these lines, while most editors accept them. The case for deletion rests on what some consider an oddness and ineptitude of style (e.g., coordination of optative and ἂν with perfect indicative in 480); some commentators suspect the repetition of words from 478 in 481, and Seaford refers to what he sees as the ‘lameness’ of the sentiments. Such awkwardness may be consistent with Odysseus’ somewhat stilted language (96–8n.) and heroic sermonizing earlier in the play (198–202). The beginnings of lines 480–1 appear in P. Oxy. 4545 (see 471n.), from which 482–3 are missing. Günther (2001) 18, who considers the lines ‘most probably an interpolation’, acknowledges that the papyrus shows that they were present in antiquity; it is possible to go further and say that Euripidean authorship of the lines is not ruled out either.

483–518 Choral song: Initially, the chorus focuses on the punishment of the monster in a metaphorical komastic (revel) setting (483–94), an idea which Polyphemus unwittingly develops in his desire to join a literal revel (κῶμος: 508). The strophe at 495–502 takes the form of a μακαρισμός, a song of blessing or thanksgiving, such as in the first strophe of the parodos of the Bacchae (72–87, esp. 72–4; cf. 902–12), which maintains an august tone throughout. Here the satyrs combine references to ritual Dionysiac utterances (εὐιάζει: 495) – cf. Bacc. 68, 1034 – with the more physical pleasures of sex and drunkenness; cf. Silenus’ fantasy (168–74). But this need not be considered a parody of Dionysiac rites; such a combination of the mystic and hedonistic reflects the satyrs’ own liminal status as devotees of the god with earthy and divine aspirations. Polyphemus staggers onstage (503–10), exuberant and bragging of his drunken state with thoughts of attending his first ever revel with his brother Cyclopes; typically of satyric gluttons (cf. Heracles in Eur. Syleus F 691; Ion Omphale F 21, 26, 29), the monster demands yet more wine.
At 511–18 the satyrs derisively serenade Polyphemus with a wedding song, presenting him, in effect, as a groom on his wedding night. A bizarre erotic tone emerges here, only to culminate in the intended rape of Silenus (582–9; see below 597–8n.). Euripides gives us here possibly the first treatment of the monster as would-be lover, if, as is likely, it pre-dates Philoxenus (c. 435–380 BC), poet of the earliest known version of the Polyphemus-Galatea story (F 816, 819 PMG), in which the monster is the unsuccessful and somewhat ludicrous suitor of the beautiful nymph, a theme which became famous in later poetry, e.g. of Theocritus (Id. 6, 11); see also Bion, (F 16); Moschus (Ep. Bion. 2); and Ovid (Met. 13.738–897; cf. Vergil Ecl. 9.39ff).

The metres are initially anapaestic dimeter with final line catalectic (483–94); but catalexis also occurs in 486 before the parepigraphê (stage direction) as well as in 494 at the end of the system. Anapaests are suitable here for the martial sentiments expressed in which the satyrs imagine the imminent blinding of the monster (cf. Eur. Hcld. 288–96 and [Eur.] Rhes. 379–87 which have martial language appropriately cast in anapaestic rhythm, imitative of marching). The satyrs’ anapaests are followed by anacreontics, suitable for the erotic tone, in the three strophes (495–502, 503–10, 511–18), the second of which is ‘sung’ by the drunken Polyphemus. The sequence of three identical strophes is very rare in drama, and even more striking is that the central strophe is the one sung by the monster; one might expect the pair comprised of the first and third strophes to surround a lyric passage of a different character, probably free lyric; but the metre of Polyphemus’ song is the same probably because it maintained the symposiast/erotic tone. Triclinius attributed 483–6 and 488–94 as well as the first and third strophes to semi-choruses; cf. the distribution of dialogue in 635–41.

483–4 The satyrs’ excitement expresses itself in a repetition of πρῶτος (‘first’). **to hold fast and control:** Musgrave’s emendation ὀχμάσαι gives better logic to the scene: being positioned to hold, lifting, then driving ([opthæ: 485] the ‘beam’ into the monster’s eye (for the infinitive with ταχθεὶς cf. 29–30). L’s participle ὀχμάσας (‘on holding fast’) is the middle of three, in asyndeton – harsh perhaps, but appropriate to the action described (cf. 340–1n.). beam translates κώπην which most commonly means ‘oar’ or ‘handle’ and may thus continue the nautical imagery used elsewhere in the blinding (460–3).

485 eye: translates βλεφάρων, strictly speaking, a plural; see 462–3n.

487 singing from within: stage directions are rare in mss but can occasionally be found in tragedy (e.g., Aesch. Eum. 117), comedy (Ar. Thesm. 129) and elsewhere in satyr drama (Aesch. Net-Fishers F **47a.29 and 39). Taplin (1977) 121–32 argues that such directions are not the words of the playwright but later additions to performance texts.

488–90 Polyphemus’ charmless, drunken singing (ἐχθριν κέλαδον) has already been mentioned by Odysseus (see above 425–6n.), and now the satyrs derisively
emphasize this as another of the monster’s barbaric traits through the asyndeton of σκαῖος ἀπῳδὸς (the former adjective: ‘gauche’ or ‘ill-omened’ (LSJ II.2); the latter: ‘tone-deaf’). and about to pay for it: κλαυσόμενος (lit. ‘about to weep’; see above 174n.): emendations were made by Hermann (κατακλαυσόμενος) and Fix (τάχα κλαυσόμενος: ‘soon about to weep’) to create climactic syntax with the three participles in asyndeton (cf. 483–5n.), but the last one in a different tense; Hermann’s is perhaps preferable because τάχα seems otiose with the future participle (even though it stands with future indicatives at 518, 592).

492–3 As followers of Dionysus, the satyrs are accomplished revellers, musicians and singers; they are frequently depicted in this capacity on vaseware (above 40n.), and make boasts along these lines elsewhere in satyric drama (e.g. Soph. Oeneus (?) F ** 1130.12 [song] and 1130.15 [dance]). They thus know a bad singer when they hear one. Come now let us educate (φέρε ... παιδεύσωμεν): φέρε and subjunctive is colloquial; cf. above 8n. Diggle conjectured νυν for νιν, emphasizing the urgency of the satyrs’ tone with φέρε. revels (κῶμοι): just as the punishment of the monster is glossed as a metaphorical education, it seems that ‘revels’ here has a similarly metaphorical usage, since later in the play it simply denotes the revel which Polyphemus hopes to have with his brothers and from which Odysseus keeps him (508, 534, 537), and at 497 κῶμος involves the earthy pleasures as conjured up in the satyrs’ imagination. But the satyrs’ metaphorical κῶμοι alluded to at 492 are apt, since they will provide a context for the downfall of Polyphemus, the self-proclaimed enemy of Dionysus and his worship. the ignoramus: significantly, Silenus has mocked Polyphemus’ ἀμαθία before (173), when, as here, a komastic setting is being imagined. Given the centrality of μουσική to Greek education (Plato Rep. 398c–9d; Laws 812b–3a; Aristotle Pol. 1337b 23–b32; 1339a 14–41b 18), it is natural that the Cyclops’ barbarous actions – most recent of which is his current cacophony – are seen to bring on a punishment glossed metaphorically as an education of sorts. The monster’s ‘education’ by Odysseus (519–75), who inducts him into aspects of symptic etiquette, is also comparable to that which the young sophisticate Bdelycleon imparts to his boorish father Philocleon in Aristophanes’ Wasps (1122–64).

494 anyway: for this meaning of πάντως, cf. Hdt 5.111; Eur. El. 227 (with Denniston’s note ad loc.); Or. 1163; Ar. Thesm. 984. For the explanatory asyndeton, cf. 683 and Smyth §2167.B.

495 Blessed is he...: likewise at Bacc. 902–12 the μακαρισμός recurs at a similar point in the action: it is followed by Pentheus’ falling under the spell of Dionysus; here it is followed by Polyphemus’ feeling the effects of wine, the first stage of Odysseus’ plan to blind him (esp. 420–2).

496–7 with beloved streams: for πηγή describing Dionysus’ constantly flowing wine, cf. Moschion 97 F 6.24–5; also Cyc. 123 (ῥοάς). φίλαισι πηγαῖς (496) is dative of instrument possibly going with the participle ἐκπετασθεὶς, but it could
go with εὐιάζει (‘shouts the cry in honour of Dionysus’); either way, the fact that these ‘streams’ are φιλαί (‘dear, friendly, beloved’) here expresses the precious closeness between Dionysus and his worshippers during such ‘revels’; on the φιλία (‘friendship’) between Dionysus and the satyrs cf. 73–5n; Gen. Intro, e.g. p. 32. with sails spread: ἐκπετασθεὶς, aorist passive participle of ἐκπετάννυμι (literally, ‘spread out’), describes a person already ‘spread out’, who has laid himself on his back: the best parallel for which is Pind. Isthm. 3/4.65 ἀλωπήξ αἰετοῦ ἀτ ἀναπιτναμένα (the archaic form of πετάννυμι) ῥόμβον ἵσχε, (‘like a fox on its back thwarting an eagle’s swoop’). In the satyrs’ choral song the person is simply reclining like a symposiast; he’s already stationary, and so already ‘embracing a male companion’ (499).

498 embracing a dear male companion (φιλον ἄνδρ’ ὑπαγαλίζων): the participle can have erotic implications (cf. Soph. Tr. 540 for the cognate noun), and elsewhere satyrs reveal homosexual desires (Soph. Lovers of Achilles F 153, 157; F 756; Achaeus, Linus F 26, etc.) as well as heterosexual, which are also in evidence here at 500 (cf. also above 168–74, 169–71; cf. 186–7). For komastic satyrs arm in arm in Greek art, see, for instance, Carpenter, pl. 19B, and for satyric homosexual activity in art, see Lissarrague (1990b) 64–5 and fig. 2.28. Does the homosexual allusion point to Polyphemus’ eventual rape of Silenus? Cf. 583–4n.

499–501 The text has been emended a number of times to account for (1) the metrical anomaly: τε is long before ξανθὸν, whereas responsion requires a short, and a stichic anacreontic would not permit 3 longs; (2) ξανθὸν (‘blonde’) and λιπαρὸν (‘glistening’) qualify the same noun βόστρυχον (‘lock of hair’); (3) there is no clear object of ἔχων (‘having’). No consensus on how to construe the text has been achieved, but for a good overview, see Seaford. Although L’s text is corrupt, there emerges a plausible picture of a more or less drunken komast, anointed with myrrh, and with glistening locks, embracing both his male friend, in the company of a girlfriend (ἑταίρα), and ready to partake in further pleasures of the κῶμος (reading Scaliger’s λιπαρὸν as the accusative semi-objective with the verbal adjective μυρόχριστος [on which, see Smyth §1598] in place of, L’s λιπαρὸς).

502 Who will open the door for me? a clear double entendre, also found readily in Old Comedy (Ar. Lys. 309; Thesm. 424; Eccl. 989, etc.); see Henderson (1991a) esp. 27, 137, 138, 171. If the scene to be imagined is one of the satyr/komast reclining with both a male and female lover, the question becomes more telling. This meaning is not precluded by a likely allusion to the παρακλαυσίθυρον, the song by the lover outside his beloved’s door (e.g., Ar. Eccl. 962). For fistfights outside girls’ doors, cf. Pratinas 4 F 3.7–9, below; cf. also 534n.

503–4 I’m filled ... rejoicing: Polyphemus expresses his joy with γάνυμαι, which recalls Odysseus’ description of the wine he proffered the monster as Διονύσου γάνος (‘joy of Dionysus’; see above 415n.), the first part of his plan to subdue him; although the Cyclops feels at ease now, his undoing has already begun. The erotics
of the choral song become steadily more emphatic now that Polyphemus appears. The monster’s use of γάνυμαι may be a play on words to anticipate his amorous intentions later when Silenus plays the unwilling role of Ganymede to his Zeus (577–89). <but>: a conjecture by Triclinius likely made to restore metre. with the feast’s youthful zest: Seaford compares Pindar, Pyth. 4.295; Polyphemus’ bonhomie is made offensive by his gloating over his cannibalistic feast (δαίτος), and is exacerbated by the wine (cf. above, 416–17n.).

505–6 Like a cargo ship … belly: the translation takes σκάφος as accusative of respect with γεμισθεὶς (literally, ‘loaded up in respect of my hull’). The image is a vivid one, depicting him as a cargo ship of wine, unsteady on his feet in his drunkenness as a ship would be in rough seas. The monster’s delight is all the more jarring to audience and satyrs, as he uses much the same nautical imagery for himself as the chorus used of him when they sang of their revulsion at his meal (361–7, esp. 362). The monster, extending the ‘satyric glutton motif’ to include cannibalism (cf. above 326–7n., and Gen, Intro., pp. 33–4), delights in what repelled the satyrs.

507 cheerful (εὔφρων), resembles the εὐφροσύνη of the wine-bowl at Xenophanes’ symposium (21 B 1.4 DK); but the piety and high-mindedness of the poet-philosopher’s prescriptive drinking party (esp. 21 B 1.13–14) could hardly be further from the monster’s murderous self-indulgence here, so that the adjective εὔφρων conveys some irony. Polyphemus’ increasing sense of joy and abandon will give his downfall more dramatic impact, and more pleasure for the satyrs and mortals onstage at least. cargo: translates φόρτος, which continues the nautical imagery, is Seymour’s emendation of L’s χόρτος: ‘fodder, produce’. Polyphemus imagines himself led or towed along like a ship by the wine which, in bestowing good cheer, is itself described in quasi-animated terms.

508–9 to the revel in springtime: the time of year of the City Dionysia, the occasion of the play’s first performance, but the expression here need not be taken as an allusion to the festival. my brother Cyclopes: it is a measure of the effect that the wine is having on him that Polyphemus, the great embodiment of extreme autarkeia, now feels the communal urgings of the thiasos (cf. also above 120n; 445–6n.).

510 Come on, come on (φέρε ... φέρε): a further indication of the monster’s greed evident in this colloquialism; cf. 8 n., 152, 492, 568. stranger: Triclinius emended L’s now illegible reading to the Ionic ξεῖνε which occurs only here in the play (P has the Attic ξένε), possibly for the sake of metrical variation. put … in my hands: for this meaning of ἔνδος, cf. IT 167.

511–12 beautiful glance from his eyes … in beauty: heavily sarcastic for the one-eyed monster – NB the plural reference to his eyes (462–3n.) ὄμμασιν – whose fearsome prospect turned the satyrs’ faces away in fear (211); cf. also the comic obsequiousness of Silenus, which plays on a similarly incongruous notion (266–7; cf. 34–5, 174). For the καλόν/καλός repetition, cf. Ar. Ach. 253; Peace 1329–30,
the latter in the context of a wedding song or ‘hymeneal’. There is possibly here in 
_Cyc_, as earlier (see 182–4, 186–7nn.), a parody of Sappho who also compliments 
the groom (F 111, 112, 115, 116 L-P); see Page (1955) 119–26 for Sappho’s 
epithalamians (‘wedding poetry’). The joke continues in that the monster has a 
lover’s glance comparable to that of Helen herself who in Aeschylus’ _Agamemnon_ 
emits a ‘melting glance from her eyes’ (μαλθακὸν ὀμμάτων βέλος); cf. also Eur. 
_Tro._ 891–2. Noteworthy too, by way of contrast, are the ‘spears’ that the beautiful 
young Achilles emits from his eyes, filling the satyrs with lust for him (Soph. _Lovers_ 
F 157, n. 11, below). The language of 511 works on another level in comically 
inverting the motif of the terrifying glare of warriors in epic (II. 3.342, 23.815, etc.) 
or tragedy (Aesch. _Seven_ 498; cf. _Sacred Delegates_ 21), or monstrous images (e.g. 
_Il._ 11.37; [Hes.] _Shield_ 160).

513 No supplement for the lacuna in the ms (revealed by incomplete responsion 
with 497) has received general acceptance. “Who loves me?” The satyrs seem 
more likely to be attributing these words to Polyphemus, as they have just been 
speaking about him, rather than presenting it as one of their own utterances, as a 
complaint that nobody loves them. Heath and Scaliger conjecture ἐκπερᾷς (‘you 
are coming out’) and ἐκπέρα (‘come out’) respectively so that φιλεῖ τίς ἡμᾶς are 
simply the satyrs’ own words and do not mock Polyphemus; but this would amount 
to the bizarre consequence of the satyrs’ calling the monster beautiful and inviting 
him to ‘love’ them! While the lacunose state of the text urges caution, the idea of 
Polyphemus as an absurd lover is worth entertaining; it begins to appear in the poetry 
of Eur.’s younger contemporary Philoxenus and becomes a favourite theme for later 
writers (see above 483–518n.). We may also translate: ‘Somebody loves me’, with 
unaccentuated τις (Aldine edition) as Ussher does, who attributes the word to the 
satyrs and sees them alluding to Polyphemus’ imminent amorous activity. Others 
(e.g. Diggle (1972) 345), retaining the interrogative form, suggest that the satyrs 
would be alluding to Polyphemus’ own lecherous intentions towards them, citing 
585–9. But Polyphemus’ usual post-prandial diversion seems to have sufficed for 
him so far (327–8n.); moreover, this seems to lessen the impact of his intention 
towards Silenus, the grotesque humour of which is reinforced by its unexpectedness 
– at least from the satyrs’ point of view – despite the allusion to homosexual activity 
in the satyr’s komastic fantasy (see 498n.). Polyphemus has shown no such erotic 
interest in the satyrs, nor do the satyrs anticipate this possibility until their father 
is actually dragged into the cave (507–8). In keeping with their general disdain 
and loathing of the monster the satyrs seem here (511–13) to be mocking him in 
the most absurdly sardonic and incongruous terms they can think of: as a beautiful 
lover. But it is a joke that seems to backfire; Polyphemus’ rape of Silenus takes 
place in a bizarrely erotic context that steadily builds up from here (see also 541n., 
553–5n.).

514–15 The metre and sense of the obelised text are too corrupt for any restoration
or explanation to command wide acceptance; the translation represents the text in L. For discussion, e.g., Duchemin; Diggle (1972) 345–7 who despairs of making sense of the lines; Ussher accepts Paley’s emendation κοῦ for L’s χὡς to give: ‘hostile (δαία) torches await your flesh and no soft nymph in dewy caves’. Seaford in his admittedly ‘highly conjectural’ restoration wishes to make the image less explicit, and would delete L’s χὡς and δαία to give: ‘Lighted torches await you, and (καί), a rose-coloured (ῥοδόχρως) tender nymph.’ In any event, the nuptial imagery continues here with the mention of torches (λύχνα) and νύμφα (‘bride’ or ‘nymph’: LSJ s.v. I & II). The torch procession for the bride is referred to elsewhere in Euripidean drama (Tro. 308–50, etc.), and was one of the most conspicuous features of the marriage rite: see Garland (1990) 217–25; Oakley and Sinis (1993) passim. As the satyrs know Odysseus’ plan to blind Polyphemus with a burning branch (451–65; 483–6), this short hymeneal emerges as a thinly veiled prophecy of the monster’s imminent punishment with its reference to the torches which are δαία meaning both ‘burning’ and ‘hostile’.

516–18 inside dewy caves: superficially this image has elements of a brief locus amoenus (cf. 44–6, 66–7nn.), but as nymphs are frequent sexual partners of satyrs (68n.), a double entendre is the more obvious point here; see 169–71n. and Henderson (1991a) 27. Silenus boasts of his youthful virility when in his prime through his manhood he left many memorials fashioned in nymphs’ dwellings (Soph. Trackers 154–5). wreaths: these were worn by the groom (Plut. Mor. 771d), but also by symposiasts (Ar. Ach. 1091, Eccl. 133; cf. also Osborne (1998) figs. 72, 77, 92, etc.) of which Polyphemus wishes to become one … of no one colour: the implication is that such wreaths were of just one colour; but cf. Ar. Birds (159–61), and see Seaford for further refs. The satyrs seem to be dwelling graphically on the gore that will result from Polyphemus’ wound; Ussher suggests the multi-coloured reference is to the flame of the fire; it could be to the flowers in the image (cf. 541), or all three.

519–607 In many ways this scene is the turning point of the play as Odysseus exerts control over the Cyclops. The early part of the scene is dominated by the exchange in stichomythia between hero and drunken monster (521–39). Again there is the much-stylized question and answer format, but, rather than being a frank exchange of information as earlier between Odysseus and Silenus (102–62), Odysseus’ answers here must serve his purpose in keeping Polyphemus at home without arousing suspicion. The hero’s answers are at times vague, misleading and designed to change the topic (524, 526, 528); and elsewhere he parries the monster’s stated intentions to attend a revel with his fellow Cyclopes (530–8). Collins (2004) 44–6 sees much stichomythic ‘capping’ in the exchange whereby Odysseus even elicits from the monster an unwitting prediction of his own fate (535). Interestingly, it is Silenus who, for reasons most likely dictated by his desire to have more wine for himself, makes the decisive point that keeps Polyphemus at home (540). From
here the comic antics come more into play with Silenus and Odysseus ‘educating’ the ogre into the niceties of sympotic etiquette, a likely satyric motif (cf. Ion 19 Omphale F 27; Achaeus, Hep. F 17); all the while the old satyr helps himself to the wine at every opportunity and inadvertently adds to the bizarre erotics of the scene that culminates in the threatened rape (541–65, 576–89). By this time, however, the monster’s fate is sealed, as Odysseus confidently predicts when trying (vainly as it turns out) to recruit the satyrs into his plan to blind the beast (590–607).

519  **this Bacchus** *(i.e. wine):* literally, ‘the Bacchic one’, a periphrastic expression underscoring the link between Dionysus and his emblematic drink; for the conflation of Dionysus with wine, see 123–4 with n., 156, 415 with n., 575 with n; cf. also Moschion 97 F 6.24–5. As Sutton (1980) 128, observes, the Cyclops, like Pentheus in the *Bacchae*, gradually comes under the influence of his foe before his downfall; Dionysus entrances Pentheus (*Bacc.* 811–46) while Odysseus continues to ply the Cyclops with drink (*Cyc.* 519–75).

520  **an old hand**: translates τρίβων, a colloquialism; see Stevens (1976) 50.

521  This line is sometimes read as one question, with unaccentuated τις (Ussher, Paganelli), or has its second half (θεὸς νομίζεται) given to Odysseus (Wieseler, Duchemin) thus running on into 522; but such antilabê is extremely unlikely at the beginning of stichomythia. **this Bacchus:** the monster knows nothing at least of Dionysus’ emblem, the vine (cf. 123–4 with n.); this may be surprising given that Polyphemus has bragged about the absence of Dionysus and accused the satyrs of engaging in a Bacchic revel (see 204n.). But the apparent inconsistency may be explained by the fact that the monster has made no connection between wine – which he here calls ‘the Bacchic one’ – and the god he knows as ‘Dionysus’ (as he calls him at 204), despite Odysseus’ description of wine as ‘the joy of Dionysus’ (415). Certainly the monster’s ignorance of the debilitating powers of wine is essential for the ensuing plot; from here his ‘education’, as the satyrs have called it (492–3 wth n.), begins in earnest.

522  Odysseus’ words are the corollary of the *Cypria* (F 18 Davies) and Eur. *Bacchae* (280–3) where wine is called the best antidote for sorrow; see above 167n.

524  **He harms no mortal:** anybody familiar with the story of Pentheus before Eur.’s *Bacchae* and of Lycurgus would know how destructive Dionysus can be (and cf. *Bacc.* 861–2: the god’s admission of his own ambivalence); see 3–4n. for references to earlier treatments onstage of these opponents of the god. As part of his plan, Odysseus also uses the power of the wine to harm and overcome the monster (422, 454).

527  **not fitting for the gods:** Polyphemus, for all his contempt for the Olympians, still expects some dignity on their part at least in their appearance; although the wearing of skins is an indicator of servile status (cf. 80n.), the chorus describe their brutal ‘master’ (cf. 34–5n.) as doing this (360). In Ar. *Frogs* Aeschylus denounces
the shabby attire of Euripides’ tragic characters who he thinks should be dressed more in accord with their aristocratic status (1061–4). For other gnomic comments on how the gods should behave, cf. Eur. Bacc. 1348, also applied to Dionysus, and cf. the critiques of conventional theology by Xenophanes (21 B 11, 12 DK) who posits a more abstract notion of the divine (21 B 23–26 DK). in wineskins: for this meaning of ἐν, cf. above 360n.

528–9 Odysseus cuts short Polyphemus’ elementary theological musings with a return to the pleasures of drink, thus playing to Polyphemus’ likely capacity for it. I love this drink here: a more blunt statement than the almost erotic ecstasy Silenus exhibits, when reunited with the wine (172–3).

531 See 533n.

532 No, because: for this use of γάρ, cf. Alc. 147; see also Denniston (1954) 73. you’ll appear all the more honoured: this appeal to τιμή (honour) would be more compelling to a Homeric hero (cf. Achilles, II. 1.243–4, 355–6, etc.) or regal figure than a solitary Cyclops (cf. 120); but Odysseus has already addressed Polyphemus in terms befitting royalty (290). φαίνομαι without the participle of εἰμί recurs at 670 and elsewhere in Euripides: Hipp. 332 with the same adjective as here (τιμιότερος: ‘more honoured’); for φαίνομαι without the participle, see Smyth §2119.

533 my friends: as in his reference to his ‘brothers’ at 531, Polyphemus now feels communal urgings induced by the wine and wishes to join a revel (537; cf. also 445–6n.; 508–9). These sudden impulses fly in the face of the monster’s disparagement of the idea of friendship (cf. 288n.), and in the solipsistic lifestyle of the Cyclopes generally (120n.).

534 See above 502n. Apart from Pratinas 4 F 3.7–9 and Eubulus F 94, a mythic example of violence after drinking is the attempted rape of the Lapith women by the Centaurs and the famous battle with the Lapith men that followed (123–4n.); this paradigmatic myth is recast in satyrical terms in Polyphemus’ drunken rape of Silenus (576–89). [Athenaeus (1.36d) offers a different version of this line: πληγὰς ὁ κῶμος λοίδορόν θ’ ὕβριν φέρει (‘the revel brings on blows, and abusive violence’), but none of these variants is considered superior to L’s text.]

535 nobody: (οὔτις) pace Seaford, it does not seem too subtle to see here, as do Duchemin and Stanford (1954) 105, a reference to Odysseus’ trick, famous from Homer onward, of using the name Nobody (cf. also Cyc. 550, 672–5). By now the monster, in his drunkenness, is beginning to fall into the trap set for him by the hero, and heavy-handed Homeric references have already occurred earlier in the play (e.g. 460–3). Here the joke may work on a paratragic level in that Polyphemus, like some tragic characters (e.g. Oedipus, Soph. OT 139–40, 249–52, 258–68), unwittingly voices an anticipation of his own fate.

536 Listen, fella: translates o τᾶν, a colloquialism, which also occurs at Soph. Trackers 104; Odysseus refrains from addressing Polyphemus as a φίλος even
ironically. But as Stevens (1976) 42 notes, ὦ τᾶν can convey impatience and condescension, both of which are well suited to Odysseus’ tone here as he has been trying for some to persuade the boorish monster to stay at home.

538 No, but...: for this nuance of δὲ... γε, see Denniston (1954) 153. Polyphemus’ desires to join in a κῶμος – natural enough for a Greek male under the influence of Dionysus – must be quelled for Odysseus’ plan to work. But the monster is a travesty of a komast anyway; cf. 445–6n.

539 What should we do...? τί δρῶμεν, a common enough expression in moments of tragic crises, especially in Euripides (e.g., Hipp. 782, El. 967, IT 96, Ion 756; cf. Soph. Phil. 963); its appearance here suggests paratragic mock seriousness (cf. also its appearance in Soph. Trackers 104). Polyphemus’ trust in Silenus is as comically ill-founded as it was earlier (273–4), when it came in the wake of the old satyr’s outrageous lie (232–40). Silenus has not spoken since 313–15 and Polyphemus’ address to him is a way for Silenus to be reintroduced into the action, so that the comic antics of his drinking can come into play, as well as his role as the victim of Polyphemus’ lechery (after which he speaks no more in the play). From here until 575 the stichomythia involves an occasional third voice, a rarity.

540 Silenus’ answer encourages the monster to stay and thus is consistent with Odysseus’ plan to which he has agreed (431). But, independently of this, he may want the Cyclops to stay where he is simply so he can get more of the wine himself, as he does later (552–3, 560–1, 565).

541 L’s attribution of this line to the Cyclops is accepted by most editors, but Mancini (1899) argued that it should be spoken by Odysseus; so also Diggle. To a large extent the issue of attribution depends on the nuances of καὶ μὴν ... γε (541). Although Ussher and Seaford take both expressions as implying assent (citing Denniston (1954) 157–9, 352), they draw different conclusions: Ussher follows the attribution in the ms to the Cyclops, while Seaford attributes it to Odysseus; if, as is plausible, Odysseus is the speaker, the particles suggest that his tone is one of further encouragement, rather than assent, as the plan to keep Polyphemus at home is Odysseus’ (536, 538). the ground and its flowery grasses are luxuriant: this expression is perhaps briefly redolent of the locus amoenus motif (cf. 44–6, 66–7, 516–18nn.), and certainly has erotic overtones reminiscent of epic and other dramatic poetry: cf. Zeus’ making the ground soft with grasses and hyacinths immediately before having sex with Hera in the Διὸς ἀπάτη (Seduction of Zeus) episode in the Iliad (14.346–9); the water, grass and flowers and nymphs mentioned to which Aphrodite came from the Judgement of Paris (IA 1294–9; 1300); Chaeremon 71 Oeneus F 14; Io is bidden to await Zeus’ advances in the flowery meadows where she is then turned into a heifer (Aesch. Supp. 538–42, etc.). Polyphemus has already been derided by the chorus as a grotesquely absurd lover (511–18), and this parodic symposium climax, so to speak, with a bizarre erotic encounter of its own (576–89).

543 please ... lie on your side: μοι is an ethic dative (cf. 43n.); the pose is that
of the symposiast. Much of the humour of this scene depends on Silenus’ moving around behind Polyphemus so he can drink on the sly (545–7). Polyphemus’ posture here recalls the Richmond Vase scene of his blinding with satyrs on the right (LIMC VIII.1 I 24). Commentators have rightly drawn attention to the parallel in Ar. Wasps (esp. 1208–10) when son teaches father the niceties of symposium etiquette; but parallels to such instruction of a boorish or awkward figure in sympotic ritual can be found also in satyr drama (e.g. Ion, Omphale F 21–7; Achaeus, Hephaestus F 17).

544 There, done! (ἰδοὺ): omitted by L; but added by Triclinius; for this colloquialism, see 153n.

545 Then why (τί δῆτα): the particle with the interrogative expresses surprise here, even indignation; see Denniston (1954) 272; Smyth §2851.

546–7 here may take it: reading παρών καταλάβη (lit., ‘being present, may take it’) with L. Reiske emended to παριών (‘going past’), but παροίν creates a rare ‘2nd foot anapaest’ (Seaford p. 45 n. 137), and, while P has καταβάλῃ ‘spills it’, L may just be right. Here the antilabê runs over to the next line (as at 558–9, 640–1, etc.); at 683 antilabê of just one word occurs. The attempts by Silenus to swindle Polyphemus out of the wine, and the monster’s blunt recognition of this, followed by his gruff orders and impatience (cf. also 558, 560), undermine any suggestion, pace Ussher (on 226, 539–43), that there is anything ‘touching’ about the monster’s attitude to the old satyr (cf. 273–4, 539nn.).

548–50 This allusion to the trick of Nobody (cf. 535n.), Odysseus’ request for a ‘gift’ in return for the wine and the cruel nature of that ‘gift’, all follow in a very succinct manner the Homeric model (Od. 9.355–70), although here Polyphemus does not sardonically invoke ξενία (hospitality) as he had done earlier (342–3n.). last ... all your companions: literally, ὕστερον is an adjective referring to Odysseus (σὲ) meaning ‘later’, and ἑταίρων ὕστερον can be taken as a genitive of comparison (cf. Ar. Eccl. 859; Smyth §1431); but the meaning is that Polyphemus will save Odysseus till last (as in Homer: see 342n.); Hermann altered to ὕστατον, presumably with this in mind.

551 Many editors accept L’s attribution of line 551 to Odysseus, rather than Silenus (Lenting, Diggle). Coming from Silenus, it would be consistent with his earlier barbed comments (313–15); but it is difficult to see how even Silenus would encourage an action that would ruin his chance to get off the island, unless he is being ironic. In the ms attribution it is a sarcastic understatement from Odysseus, as well as drawing attention to the act as a violation of ξενία (hospitality); he is the ξένος a number of times (102, 548, 566, 676, etc.)

552 Hey, you!: the abrupt and colloquial οὕτως (see Stevens 1976, 37–8) from Polyphemus to Silenus may support the possibility that the old satyr spoke at 551. From 552–66 he toys with Polyphemus, and such antics would be effectively introduced with an interjection from him at 551, as it would turn the focus back from Odysseus to the old satyr.
553–4  this wine here kissed me: Silenus even describes the wine as having amorous feelings towards himself, as if the drink is somehow personified; cf. the satyric habit of making drinking vessels sexual objects (172–4n.; cf. 439–40n.).  wine ... doesn’t love you: Polyphemus continues the personification, as he goes on to do in his description of it as σοφός (572; cf. also 520–6).  beautiful: Silenus imagines himself (here and at 555) to be one of the καλός (‘beautiful’) boys so commonly depicted on symptotic vases and cups. The self-deluding vanity of a creature as ungainly as Silenus has been evoked earlier in the play (2n.), and recurs here as a motif of satyric humour: cf. Aesch.  Net-Fishers (F **47a, 821–2); Soph.  Trackers (154–5). In Aeschylus’  Sacred Delegates a satyr describes his portrait as καλλίγραπτον (‘beautifully painted’: Aesch. F **78a12) and as depicting his καλὴς μορφῆς (‘beautiful shape’: F **78a 19); for discussion, see O’Sullivan (2000) esp. 360–3, and below on Aesch.  Sacred Delegates. The comic incongruity of καλός applied to the old satyr recalls the satyr chorus’ sarcastic description of the monster in the same terms (511–12 with n.; cf. 583 the adverbial κάλλιον).

555  No: Diggle (1971) 48–9 emended L’s ναὶ (‘yes’); this reading thus has Silenus responding to Polyphemus’ words: ‘You’ll be sorry’ (κλαύσῃ: literally, ‘you will weep’; see above 174n.). But L’s text may be defensible as a response to Polyphemus’ view that the wine doesn’t love the old satyr, to give: ‘Yes, by Zeus (the wine does love me!)’.

556–7  Silenus has no real interest in whether or not the wine is mixed (cf. above 149); here his delaying tactics allow for more visual play as the satyr helps himself to more drink, while the monster’s impatience grows, exacerbated by his own greed in his demand that the drinking cup be full; cf. above 336–8n.

558  You’ll be my ruin!: the translation assumes με (‘me’) after ἀπολεῖς, as in comedy’s idiom (e.g. Ar.  Clouds 93); see Stevens (1976) 11. But it is possible that τὸν οἶνον could be understood as the object, so that Polyphemus thinks the wine will be ruined, if mixed; so Ussher, who cites Polyphemus’ words to Odysseus in Aristias’  Cyclops 4: ἀπώλεσας τὸν οἶνον ἐπιχέας ὕδωρ (‘you will destroy the wine, pouring water into it’). But Silenus is simply using delaying tactics to drink more of the wine himself (559), and Polyphemus is already aware of the old satyr’s tricks (546–7). In supplying ‘me’, the joke seems to work better in reflecting Polyphemus’ increasingly hyperbolic desire for the wine; cf. also 576–83 for his exuberant, indeed hubristic, description of the wine’s effects on him.  as it is (οὕτως): rather than ‘without more ado’ is colloquial (cf.  Alc. 860), Stevens (1976) 56; so that ἀπολεῖς and οὕτως in tandem give a peremptory tone.  No: Wecklein’s emendation for L’s ναὶ (‘yes’) seems more plausible in this instance; it is difficult to see why the satyr would agree with the Cyclops on this point.

559  For wreaths worn at symposia, see 516–18n.

560  <No>: Hermann supplemented οὐ, but the Aldine text reads ναὶ (‘yes’), which could add to the joke in that Silenus now brazenly admits to the tricks he is playing on Polyphemus (cf. 546), all for the sake of the wine.
561 You have to wipe (your mouth): translates ἀπομακτέον, Cobet’s emendation, the gerundive form of ἀπομάσσω. ‘your mouth’ is idiomatically not in the Greek, but here the sense of ‘mouth’ is required by 562 ‘my lips’. Cf. ἀπομαγδαλία, a crust the Greeks used to wipe their mouths or hands after a meal and then threw to the dogs (LSJ s.v. I): this is from the same root as ἀπομακτέον ‘rub’, whence μᾶζα ‘moulded’ bread or cake (cf. Ar. Peace 1, 3, 4, 565, 853). But L’s ἀπομυκτέον (from ἀπομύσσω ‘remove the mucus’) is accepted by some editors (Murray, Ussher, Paganelli, Biehl, Paduano); the idea of Polyphemus’ mucus-ridden face would work well as another of his repulsive features to be imagined by the audience. It is also consistent with his own unsavoury habits he gloats about earlier (326–8); and other monstrous figures are also imagined as having mucus running down their faces, such as Achlys (an incarnation of Death and Darkness) on Heracles’ shield ([Hes.] Shield 267). so you can have it to drink: apart from here and one other instance (Bacc. 784) ὡς + future indicative of purpose is not attested in Euripides, and is generally much rarer than ὅπως (read here by Tricilinius); see Smyth §2203. [Wilamowitz’s emendation σοὐστὶν (= σοι ἐστὶν) ὡς is metrical, although the copula is often omitted with both –τέος personal and -τέον impersonal; see Smyth §2151–2.]

562 beard: translates τρίχες, which usually means hair, but the reference here is to hair around the mouth.

563 See 543n. for other satyric and Aristophanic parallels to Silenus’ instructions on proper symptic behaviour.

564 just as you see me drinking – or not ... be: ἐμέ will be emphatic after enclitic με (cf. And. 752–4, cited by Seafood). [Nauck read οὐκέτι (‘no longer’) for L’s οὐκ ἐμέ, which would give the sense that Silenus is urging Polyphemus to behave elegantly when he sees him drinking or ‘no longer drinking’.] Diggle (1969) 33–4 interestingly suggests that Silenus dips his head into the ‘bowl’ so that he disappears from sight. But, while the language used for the drinking vessel in the play varies, mostly it is understood as a cup, rather than a bowl: ποτήρ (151), κύλιξ (164, 421, 433), σκύφος (411, 556); cf., however, κρατήρ (545); the only other instances of κρατήρ refer to Polyphemus’ milk bowls including one as large as ten amphorae (216, 387). Alternatively, then, Silenus may lift the cup to his face with the same effect as would happen to a drinker from an ‘eye cup’ (κύλιξ). These vessels frequently depict Dionysian scenes on the interior, with two large eyes painted on the exterior which sometimes have a satyr’s face between the eyes: see e.g. Osborne (1998) figs. 68–9. To an onlooker, the symposiast’s face would be obscured behind the upturned cup as he drinks from it, his eyes replaced by those on the cup, and his ears by the handles; no painted eyes are mentioned on the cup here, but the effect of temporary ‘invisibility’, alluded to by Silenus, would be the same.

565 Literally: τί δράσεις ‘what are you going to do?’; cf. the use of the present δράς (552). Polyphemus here sees Silenus about to drink the wine; the satyr answers him after he has done so. one gulp: Silenus’ capacity for drink matches that of the monster (417, 558).
for me: Μοι here is dative of advantage. Odysseus’ role as οἶνοχόος (‘wine
pourer’) gives him more control over Polyphemus’ drinking. Silenus’ drinking,
when wine pourer, while providing some humour, could stand in the way of such
plans in leaving insufficient wine to send Polyphemus off to a drunken sleep.
Odysseus agrees to be wine pourer with cool understatement. Well, certainly:
for this nuance of γοῦν, see Denniston (1954) 452. some knowledge of the vine:
on the link between wine and civilization, cf. above 123–4.
for a man: it is impossible to know whether the omitted antecedent for ὅστις was
τοῦτῳ (‘this man’: Ussher, Biehl) or τόδε, ‘this thing, instance <of a man> who’s ...
(Eur. El. 816; Hel. 942; Smyth §2510). a lot (πολύν): sc. οἶνον (‘wine’); also at 573.
drink it all down: ἔκπιθι: the emphatic prefix ἐκ signifies completion, as
elsewhere (456n.).
Because: for δέ functioning like γάρ, cf. Alc. 61; Med. 717; Hipp. 94; see
also Denniston (1954) 169 with further refs. when a man’s knocking it back:
Casaubon’s σπῶντα for L’s σιγῶντα (‘keeping silent’) which is unmetrical; the
emendation fits in well with Odysseus’ instructions to the monster to drink all the
wine. only be all spent when the drink is: literally ‘die together with the drink’;
the language here is striking; συνεκθνῄσκω – a hapax legomenon in Classical Greek
– posits an identity of wine and drinker: another way of saying ‘keep drinking till
all the wine is gone.’ Similar play on the identity of drinker and drinking vessel
is evident in how one appears to others when drinking from an ‘eye-cup’ (564n.);
drinker and cup merge as one as the wine (or Dionysus) is transferred from one
vessel to another.
how clever the wood of the grapevine: no interpretation of ξύλον (‘wood’) so
far offered seems completely convincing, given the lack of comparable uses
of the word to cast any light on its appearance here. Some notable interpretations
include: ‘the living wood of the vine’; a periphrasis, i.e. just ‘the vine’ (Ussher,
Biehl); possibly the ‘club’, i.e. ‘the strength of the wine to kill you’ (Seaford), or the
wooden frame of the punitive ‘collar’ (cf. Ussher, citing Ar. Clouds 592), with a less
drastic metaphor, i.e. to incapacitate merely. Either of the latter two is plausible only
if we could be sure that Athenians used ξύλον in this allusive way. But it is difficult
to see why Polyphemus would speak about the wine in such terms, since, for him
at this stage, it is a purely a source of pleasure. Even as a statement of unintended
irony, the language here is extraordinarily oblique; cf. the more straightforward
allusive irony of 535 (with n.). On the other hand, literal ‘wood’ (= the vine) is
paralleled by Anaxagoras 59 A 45.18 DK, where ξύλον is a constituent of a living
δένδρον (‘tree’) together with its bark and fruit (cf. LSJ x. III), cf. literal Ἀργοῦς
ξύλον (‘timbers of the Argo’: Aesch. Argo F 20; and LSJ II 1). In any event, again
the grapevine is spoken of as somehow animated (cf. 507, 553–5), but not as the
liquid embodiment of Dionysus as in 156, 415, 454, 519–27. Polyphemus evidently
thinks of the wine as something to cater purely to his own greed (cf. 503–10, 523,
Commentary

529, etc.); it would thus be easily incorporated into his idea of the good life earlier in which gluttony is the highest goal (esp. 336–8). But the wine is σοφός on another ironic level: more than just satiating the monster’s gluttony, it is an effective agent in his undoing orchestrated by Odysseus, a man also famous for being σοφός (450).

574 so it’s no longer thirsty: ἄδιψον is a predicative-proleptic adjective which qualifies the object (here νηδύν: ‘belly’) of the verb (in this case the aorist participle ‘drenching’ τέγξας); see Smyth §1040b. Odysseus’ encouragement of Polyphemus to ‘drench his belly’ ostensibly recalls the monster’s boasts of doing this himself with his milk-drinking (326). But Odysseus seems to be referring to Polyphemus’ stomach while it digests his huge, not to say hideous, meal (δαιτὶ ... πολλῇ: 573); cf. the modern colloquialism of drinking ‘on a full (or empty) stomach’. Alcaeus refers to wine as drenching the lungs (F 347), presumably the result of anatomical ignorance, but it may refer to the experience of choking or gagging when one eats or drinks too quickly, which Polyphemus himself seems to allude to (577, 677).

575 Bacchus will make you parched: another conflation of the god and his drink (see above 519n.). Odysseus seems to be saying that only drinking more than one’s fill is proper tribute to Dionysus, although this is likely to be lost on the monster, who would still think that the ‘Bacchic one’ refers solely to wine and not Dionysus. Whether this really tells us something about Dionysus as a god who induces thirst is uncertain; but Apollo, as both healer and bringer of disease (Iliad 1), and Demeter, as goddess of and withholder of grain (and bringer of hunger at least to Erysichthon: cf. Achaeus’ satyr F 6–10, below; Callimachus, Hymn 6), provide possible parallels (cf. 123–4n.). In any case, Odysseus is simply using any form of persuasion to get Polyphemus as drunk as possible, and the hero is not always candid with the truth (see 524n.).

576–7 I only just managed to swim ...: Polyphemus’ ‘near death’ experience of almost drowning extends the reference to ‘dying with the wine’ (571) in almost literal terms; frequently the wine in drinking cups was likened to the sea with painted ships on the inside of the lip of the cup which would appear to float on the surface of the wine; cf. also the Homeric epithet of the sea as οἶνοψ (literally ‘wine-faced’, suggesting ‘wine-coloured’, or possibly ‘wine-dark’: Il. 23.316; Od. 2.421, 5.132), and the Cyclops has already compared himself to a ship (504–7; cf. 362). This is the monster’s last swig of the wine and his enjoyment is now more emphatic here (ἰοὺ ἰού) than before (cf. παπαῖ at 572). Assuming Odysseus’ instructions have been followed (570–1, 573–4), the wine has now been finished, leading to Polyphemus’ desire for sex. This is unmitigated delight!: this refers not only to the intensity of Polyphemus’ pleasure here, but may suggest that the wine is unmixed (‘unmitigated’) or ἄκρατος (cf. 149 when Silenus tastes it neat); for the
same metaphorical language elsewhere for ‘pure’ ‘pleasure’ or ‘desire’, cf. Plato, *Laws* 793a; Soph. F 941. The monster does not seem to care either way (557–8), and unmixed wine would certainly aid Odysseus’ plan to get the monster drunk as quickly as possible. Cf. 602 when Odysseus prays for Sleep, one of the effects of the wine, to come to the monster ἄκρατος or ‘(with) unmitigated (power)’.

**578–80** Polyphemus’ hallucination is comparable to that of another enemy of Dionysus who falls under the god’s power, Pentheus (*Bacc*. 918–22). heaven ... mingled with the earth: Seaford takes this to reflect beliefs about the cosmic, life-producing union of sky and earth (e.g., Aesch. F 44; cf. Hes. *Th.* 126–58), but it seems more likely to indicate just how unhinged Polyphemus’ mind has become, just like Pentheus’ mind when he sees two suns in the sky (*Bacc*. 918) – an image of madness recalled in Vergil’s description of the madness of Dido (*Verg.* *Aen.* 4.469–73). Earth combining with heaven is an impossibility elsewhere in satyric drama, e.g. Eur. *Syleus* F 687. the throne of Zeus and the whole august majesty of the gods: the Cyclops has little trouble imagining or recognising the gods in his delirious state. The open contempt he showed for Zeus and a fortiori the Olympians (318–21) might seem tempered here, but his attitude is not one of a convert to Olympian religion; it simply spurs him on to further impious thoughts and actions.

**581** Wouldn’t I like to kiss (them)? the monster now seems to leer at the satyrs whom he imagines to be the Graces, (or possibly even the Olympians themselves with Silenus as Zeus). [The question mark inserted by Wilamowitz gives better sense than a simple statement; for the idiom οὐκ ἄν + optative as an interrogative wish, cf. Smyth §1824, cf. 2662. A number of editors read a semi-colon or full stop after φιλήσαιμι (e.g., Paley, Murray, Duchemin, Ussher), but a connective such as γάρ would be needed to complete the sense if οὐκ ἂν φιλήσαιμι is read as a statement. If such punctuation nevertheless stands, Polyphemus is announcing that he does not wish to kiss the Olympians, adding a further comic strand to his impiety. If so, he would not be the only transgressor to harbour lecherous thoughts about the gods.] Graces: contemplation – albeit in a delusional state – of an attempt on divine figures like the Graces would put Polyphemus on a similar level to Ixion, father of Centaurs, who made an infamous attempt on Hera, and met with an equally notorious punishment, thereby becoming a paradigm of transgressive lust (apart from Aeschylus’ probably satyric *Ixion* (F 90, 91), see also Pindar, *Pyth.* 2.21–48; Eur. *Pho.* 1185; *Ixion* T ii–iii; cf. *Pirithous* (Eur. or Critias?) F 5.7–15; cf. also Ixion in art; *LIMC*.V.1 s.v. 1, 3, 9, 11–15, 17). On a kylix cup by the Brygos painter, c. 490 BC (= KPS fig. 29a-b), satyrs make a similar attempt on Iris, winged messenger of the gods, in the presence of Dionysus; on the reverse they even lecherously approach Hera (a parody of the Ixion myth?), who moves off, flanked by Hermes and Heracles.

**582–3** Enough!: ὡλὰς with half-stop – Wecklein’s punctuation – is a colloquialism,
e.g. Eur. Hel.1581, Philoctetes F 791; see also Collard (2005) 367. Ganymede: his fame as the object of Zeus’ desire is attested in early epic (Il. 20.232–5; cf. H. Hymn 5.202–4, etc.) and his abduction widely depicted in art, including an akroterion (roof-top sculpture) from Olympia, c. 470 BC (LIMC IV.1 ‘Ganymede’ s.v. 56), and on various pots, which appropriately enough featured in symposiac contexts (LIMC IV.1, 12, etc.). Polyphemus’ delusion here recalls his earlier hubristic claims in not fearing Zeus and rivalling him (320–1, 328). Now, in another context, he even imagines himself the supreme god in one of the Olympian’s most famous encounters; for another satyric ogre’s delusions of rivalling Zeus, see Soph. Salomeus F 537–41a, and see above 327–8n. I shall get off: translates ἀναπάυσομαι which has sexual connotations elsewhere (Hdt.1.181.1; Machon 286; Athen. 603a; Plut. Alex. 2); see 583–4n. more splendidly: this translates Spengel’s emendation to κάλλιον ἢ] of L’s κάλλιστα νὴ, which, accepted by many editors (Murray, Duchemin, Ussher, Biehl), would give: ‘By the Graces, … in the finest style.’ But Polyphemus is dismissing heterosexuality for which the Graces may stand, so it hardly seems likely he would swear by them even in his drunken state. In any event, the monster’s intent is clear enough.

583–4 boys: Polyphemus decides to indulge in a homosexual act on this occasion, but he is not devoid of heterosexual impulses; cf. his ‘temptation’ by the Graces (581). As Seaford notes, homosexual activity had aristocratic connotations (cf. Ar. Knights 735–40; Plato Symp. 181b); see Dover (1989) 142, 149–151. In Xenophon’s Hiero (31–3) desire for παιδικά is seen as a natural impulse (ἐμφυέσθαι) in the tyrant. Polyphemus’ longing for παιδικά puts him on a par also with certain barbarians (Athen. 603a); cf. 172–4, 492–3nn. for other allusions to his barbaric or uncivilised nature; elsewhere the same desire is displayed by satyrs themselves (Soph. Lovers of Achilles F 153).

585 What? for this meaning of γάρ, see 154n. Despite the fact that Odysseus is the οἶνοχόος (‘wine-pourer’) here (566), there is no suggestion he would ever be the object of Polyphemus’ lust; he is never anything other than a potential meal for the monster (550). An erotic context has slowly been building up since 511–18, derisively at first, but inadvertently fuelled by Silenus’ own words (at, e.g., 553–5) which now come back to haunt him.

586 I myself am now seizing: reflects the particle γέ as qualifying ἁρπάζω. from the land of: translates ἐκ τῆς, reflecting Hermann’s emendation of L’s τοῦ, which, as the article qualifying Δαρδάνου, means that Polyphemus is stealing Ganymede from Dardanus; conceivably, this may stand. However, Ganymede was the son of Tros, Dardanus being his great-grandfather (Il. 5.265–7, 20.215–35). Also, ἐκ is not usually used with persons, and elsewhere in Euripidean drama ἐκ τῆς can have the same meaning ‘from the land’, since omission of the feminine noun γῆ is a very common locution (Held. 140, Ion 1297).

588 lover: ἐραστὴν: Polyphemus now grotesquely embodies the ideas of 511–
18 – however comically meant by the satyrs – and takes the role of the older or active lover. Silenus, as a result, is forced to play the role of the implicit ἐρώμενος ('beloved' or object of the lover’s desire), an idea that has, with equal comic incongruity, been building up for some time (cf. 553–5, etc.); cf. the reference to the ‘boys’ in whom the monster takes pleasure. Fastidious about one who’s drunk: Scaliger’s correction πεπωκότι of L’s πεπωκότα (the accusative -οτα is a grammatical impossibility because an accusative with (ἐν)τρυφάω could be only an internal one); the indirect object of ἐντρυφᾷς is a dative of a person here, which is rarely attested with this verb until later Greek (e.g. Plut. Them. 18.5).

589 O woe … wine: there may be an untranslatable pun in οἴμοι … οἶνον. I’ll … see: ὄψομαι here may be surprising and could stand as a synoynym for μαθήσομαι (‘I’ll learn’) or γνώσομαι (‘I’ll find out’), but for ‘seeing’ as (later) full realization, see e.g. Eur. Supp. 731, 782–5; Bacc. 814–15 (with πικρός, as in Cyc. here); cf. also Supp. 945; Held. 415; Med. 1388. Wine … very bitter: for πικρός denoting objects seeming bitter in their after-effects, cf. Eur. Med. 399; Hec. 772, etc; this contrasts Silenus’ earlier description of the wine as γλυκύς ‘sweet’ (560).

590 sons of Dionysus: Odysseus refers to the god by a different name now, rather than calling him ‘the Bacchic one’ when speaking to Polyphemus, perhaps to bring out an aspect of the god other than as wine personified. Here the hero is speaking somewhat loosely, but his purpose is to flatter the satyrs; their actual father Silenus (16, 269, etc.) is hardly an appropriate role model to be invoked (especially in the current circumstances!), compared to their patron god who was at least pre-eminent in the Gigantomachy (6–7n.). Noble children: this address takes the form of flattery, as the locution is mock-heroic or mock-solemn, as παῖδες and τέκνα often are, e.g. (Aesch. Pers. 402, Eur. Cretans F 471); cf. Homeric warriors described Greeks as ‘offshoots of Ares’ (Il. 2.663, 745, 3.147, etc.). But this appeal to the satyrs proves to be a groundless hope on Odysseus’ part; he seems to have expected their cowardice all along (642, 649).

591 The man: see 347–9n., 429n., 605n. In his sleep (literally, ‘in the sleep’): the Greek article τῷ is surprising, as over-determined; perhaps ‘the sleep which will follow his drunkenness’ (455) is meant.

592 he’ll vomit: in another close parallel to the Homeric account, Odysseus likewise mentions Polyphemus’ vomiting (cf. Od. 9.372–4). From his shameless gullet (ἐξ ἀναιδοῦς φάρυγος): as elsewhere, this part of the monster’s body is the focus of Polyphemus’ heinous gluttony (215, 356, 410), and is now qualified by a suitable adjective.

593 it pushes out+: the indicative ὁθεῖτε, which may have been corrupted by proximity of ϐοήσει in the previous line, is considered problematic because of the asyndeton with παρευτρέπεται (‘is ready’). A participial phrase (e.g. καπνὸν <πνέων> ‘emitting smoke’) is arguably to be expected here; see Diggle (1969) 34–6, who conjectured καπνὸν <πνέων> or <πνέων> καπνὸν with ὁθεῖ deleted. However,
some editors retain L’s reading: *e.g.*, Paley (who suspects corruption), Duchemin, Paganelli and Biehl (who retains it as a parenthesis); the asyndeton is not entirely out of keeping with Odysseus’ speech which aims to rouse the satyrs to action.

594–5 Here are two colloquialisms: (i) there’s nothing left to do; (ii) be sure: in Odysseus’ injunction, using ὅπως and the future indicative ἔσῃ (also 630; see also Collard (2005) 372) to the chorus on how to act collectively. These two colloquialisms together suggest excitement on the part of the normally cool Odysseus, and are dramatically apt as the play approaches the decisive action. a real man (ἀνήρ, literally ‘a man’): the singular here possibly suggests that Odysseus is addressing the satyrs individually; on the use of the singulars and plurals for the chorus, see above 427–8n., 465n. ἀνήρ here has exactly the martial or heroic overtones which the satyrs typically fall short of, as Odysseus realises (642), and so its appearance here is comically incongruous, as satyrs can never be ‘men’ in the sense required here (cf. 590n.). The different nuances of the words are evident in Xerxes’ despair at having many ἄνθρωποι but few ἄνδρες at the battle of Salamis (Hdt. 7.210–11); cf. also *Alic*. 957; *Phrixus* F 829, etc.

596 a heart (λῆμα): cf. the Theban defender Polyphontes who, in preparing for the oncoming battle, is ἀδίθων λῆμα (‘fiery in his heart’: Aesch. *Seven* 448; cf. also *IT* 609; *Held* 702); in their over-enthusiastic response (above 465n.) the satyrs put themselves on the same level with such figures, only to be deflated by their inevitable cowardice later (635–48). rock and adamant: here meant favourably (as at *Od*. 17.463) as a sign of the satyrs’ courage; but ‘rock’ can be coupled with ‘adamant’ in a negative sense (Pind. F 33d*.8).

597–8 before our father suffers something: it remains unclear whether or not Silenus suffers this fate; he speaks no more in the play and there is no explicit indication whether in fact he goes into the cave with Polyphemus at 589, only a hint at 586. But the imminent threat of rape is probably sufficient for the grim humour, which would be more effective if the old satyr is in the cave, with the audience unsure of what, if anything, is going on. Ancient sources tell us that Solon enshrined the inviolability of a male citizen’s body in law, proscribing male prostitution and enslavement (Demosthenes, 22.23–5; Aeschines, 1.17–19); for discussion, see Dover (1989) 33–4. Thus, Polyphemus’ actions here would be not just a violation of the individual, but also an affront to Attic law; the satyr context, however, gives the scene an earthy, somewhat grotesque humour – at least for audiences used to Old Comedy (Ar. *Knights* 365, *Clouds* 529, etc.). Cf. the sexual humiliation of the victim on a famous oinochoe celebrating Cimon’s victory over the Persians at Eurymedon (c. 466 BC) on which a Greek called ‘Eurymedon’ is about to sodomise a Persian who looks at the viewer in a gesture of helplessness with the word κύβαδε (‘bending forward’) written next to him; see Kilmer (1993) R1155. diabolical (ἀπάλαμνον): the rare enjambed word (this is its only attestation in all Greek drama and it is Canter’s emendation for L’s ἀπαλλαγμὸν) means literally ‘without hands’, but here
could mean something like ‘against which hands are useless’, *i.e.*, ‘something for which there is no remedy’ (see below 662n.); cf. also Pind. *Ol*. 1.59, 2.63.

**599–600** **Hephaestus:** while he had his forge on Etna (*Prometheus Bound* 366–7), there is no tradition of enmity between him and Polyphemus or any of the Cyclopes; in Callimachus (*Hymn* 3.46–8) and Vergil (*Aeneid* 8.416–23) the one-eyed giants work at his anvils. Here the reference seems to be to the god in his role as fire personified; Odysseus calls on the god to burn (πυρώσας) the monster’s eye. As early as Homer Hephaestus embodies the power of elemental fire (*Il*. 2.426), especially in his battle against the river Scamander (*Il*. 21.342–82; cf. Ar. *Wealth* 660–1). His name in the fifth century also functioned as metonymy for fire itself (Theagenes 8 F 2 DK; Pindar *Pyth*. 1.25–6; Prodicus 84 B 5 DK), as did the names Demeter and Dionysus for grain and wine (123–4n.).

**601** **Sleep, nursling of Black Night:** this follows Hesiod (*Th.* 211–12); Homer, makes Sleep the twin brother of Death (*Il*. 16.672, 682) and the two are famously depicted as winged hoplites picking up Sarpedon’s body on the column krater by Euphronius (*LIMC* VII.1 Sarpedon 4). Night, as a child of Chaos, is one of the primordial cosmic deities, and a figure to inspire fear (Hes. *Th.* 744–5, 758); like her father Chaos, she generates malignant incarnations associated with darkness; in Aeschylus Night is the ‘black mother’ of the Furies (*Eum*. 745, cf. 416; see also West, *Theogony* pp. 35–6). Elsewhere in Euripides Night is not only black (*El*. 54) or μελάμπεπλος (‘black-robed’: *Ion* 1150), she is mother of horrors such as Λύσσα (‘Madness’) that causes Heracles to kill his own family (*HF* 822); thus Sleep here, as child of Night, will be malignant for the monster in making him vulnerable to being blinded and plunged into a world of darkness.

**602** **unmitigated power:** ἄκρατος here may deliberately recall Polyphemus’ description of the χάρις (‘delight’) he experienced earlier in his drinking (577) of which Sleep is a natural consequence. Thus, the monster’s excesses will bring on a punishment from agents, one of whom is described in the same terms as ‘unmitigated’ (see 577n.); both the wine and resultant sleep are necessary to the blinding, and the punishment will fit the crime, in keeping with satyric justice (see 421–2n., 693n.). **beast:** elsewhere Odysseus and the chorus speak of Polyphemus in such bestial terms (442, 658); but he is also referred to as a man (348, 429, 591 with n., 605). **hateful to the gods:** see 396n.

**603** Odysseus invokes his heroic past again (cf. 198–200, 347–52, and later 694–5), this time as a rhetorical ploy for his prayer. **most noble labours:** the πόνοι at Troy to which he referred earlier (107) are now recalled but this time as a reflection of his heroism. His reliance on his heroic credentials does not preclude his dependence on and acknowledgement of divine help.

**604** This portentous line is mock-epic in diction and its artificial word order – with second noun ναῦτας (‘sailors’) interposed between attribute αὐτόν (‘himself’) and first noun Ὅδυσσεα (‘Odysseus’) – which cannot be rendered into clear English;
605 man ... mortals: Odysseus’ reference to Polyphemus, as a ‘man’, marks a contrast to his calling him a beast three lines earlier, but his point is that Polyphemus, as a man (which he has been called elsewhere, see 347–9n.), deserves punishment for his disdain of men and gods, like other transgressors (cf. 348, 429); for Odysseus’ reference to the satyrs as θῆρες (‘wild creatures’), see 624n.

606–7 Arguably a more telling example of the challenge from a mortal to a god than at 353–5 (see note). chance (τύχη) has a neutral meaning as agent or cause beyond human control (e.g., Archil. F 16 W; Pind. OI. 14.15; Aesch. Seven 426); it can also be a personification or divinity (e.g., H. Hom. 2.420; Soph. OT’977; Trackers 79; Eur. Hec. 786). In the late fourth century BC a cult of Tyche was established at Antioch, and Pausanias (6.2.6–7) tells us of a cult statue made in her honour by Eutychides, a pupil of Lysippus, for the Syrians on the river Orontes (c. 300 BC). The idea of τύχη dominating human affairs occurs in Talthybius’ speech as he contemplates the fate of Hecuba (Hec. 488–91); and scholars have long recognized its treatment by Thucydides as a non-divine factor in determining some events in his history; see Cornford (1907) 97–108; Hunter (1973) 73–9; Edmunds (1975) passim.

608–23 In an upbeat interlude, the chorus expresses delight at the prospect of Polyphemus’ imminent punishment, invoking ‘Maron’ as wine personified, which turns their thoughts to reunion with their natural master, Dionysus. The metre for this short, astrophic song comprises trochaic dimeters with catalexis and syncopation, dactylic cola, and iambic dimeters; but the colometry is uncertain, hence the irregular line numbering; Dale (1968) 46, and Ussher, for instance, take πρασσέτω (‘Let him do its work’: 616) with the next colon, while Seaford, following Diggle, argues that it fits better with the preceding trochaic rhythm. For fuller discussion and outline of the scheme, see Dale (1969) 42–6 and (1983) 223; Ussher; Seaford.

608–9 tongs ... throttle the neck: we need not take this image literally, at least as far as the tongs (καρκίνος) are concerned; Biehl saw the reference to the tongs as alluding to Odysseus’ invocation of Hephaestus the smith-god at 599–600, but the god’s name seems to be metonymy for fire. As Ussher observes, the satyrs hope that Polyphemus will ‘get it in the neck’ and the expression may thus be a folk saying; καρκίνος does not occur in tragedy but appears in Soph. Trackers (305), where it means ‘crab’, i.e. a creature that has tongs or pincers. LSJ (καρκίνος s.v. I) give two examples of proverbial usages of the word from Aristophanes (Peace1083) and Herodas (4.44); cf. also CPG II.73.17. But the image need not be seen as a dead metaphor, since the monster’s throat or gullet (φαρύγξ) has repeatedly been the symbol of his greed and cannibalism (215, 356, 410, 592) and now is a suitable focus for the punishment Odysseus will mete out to him.

610 of the guest-eater (ξενοδαιτυμόνος, Hermann’s emendation of L’s unmetrical ξένων δαιτυμόνος): the monster’s violation of hospitality is recalled here (and again at 658). The chorus’ anticipation of what Polyphemus is to suffer resembles
the chorus’ anticipation of Pentheus’ punishment in the Bacchae (977–1022); immediately after Pentheus’ departure, the chorus invokes the hounds of Lyssa to attack the impious king, and go on to rehearse his destruction, twice calling on ‘sword-wielding’ justice to pierce him in the throat: λαιμῶν διαμπὰξ (Bacc. 992–6=1011–15). Likewise, the satyrs look forward to the blinding of Polyphemus, who throughout the play has shown himself to be equally godless and lawless (Cyc. 26, 30–1, 348, 378, 438; cf. Bacc. 995–6, 1015–6). Pentheus is ‘lawless’ (ἀνομος: Bacc. 996, 1016), just as Polyphemus renounces law and Olympian religion (203–5, 316–21, 338–40). For similar anticipations by a dramatic chorus of what will inevitably happen, cf. Eur. Med. 978–1001, Hipp. 765–75, although in each of these instances the chorus’ tone is one of foreboding and dread rather than vengeful exuberance.

611 the pupil that brings him light: the satyrs’ language recalls the grim irony of Odysseus at 462–3.

615 is hidden: the present κρύπτεται functions like a perfect, as at Eur. Her. 263 (see also Smyth §1886–7). mighty shoot / of the oak tree: Odysseus has mentioned an olive beam as the weapon of Polyphemus’ blinding (455), but the satyrs, who are hardly likely to be sticklers for detail, may simply be thinking of the beam’s enormity; earlier it was called μεγας (472; see 455n.). On the Richmond Vase (LIMC VIII.1 s.v. Polyphemus I 24) Odysseus and his men appear to be wielding a tree trunk over the sleeping giant.

616 let Maron come, let him do his work: cf. the chorus’ words in the (Bacc. 992–3=1011–12), gleefully anticipating the demise of Pentheus: ἴτω δίκα φανερός, ἴτω / ξιφηφόρος: ‘let justice come manifest, let sword-wielding (justice) come!’ Maron, like his father, Dionysus, is identified with wine itself (cf. 123–4, 415, 519–29nn.).

617–18 the raging Cyclops: in what way is this sleeping monster μαινομένος? Madness can denote the state of mind of worshippers of Dionysus (164n.), but Polyphemus is no proper follower of Dionysus, even though in his own grotesque way he partakes in a sort of revel of drunkenness and sex. But since ‘madness’ can refer to those who have spurned the god’s proper worship, the participle aligns Polyphemus with figures such as Lycurgus and Pentheus (see 3–4, 168n.), and probably also refers to his own violent habits (203–11, 582–9, etc.). [Hermann’s μαινομένου is a correction for ms. L, which gives μαινομένος, thus making the rage Maron’s; and L is unmetrical here).]

619 so his drinking may be his undoing: literally, ‘so he may drink badly’; the adverb κακῶς, apart from alluding to the ill consequences that Polyphemus’ drinking will have for him, could also have normative implications: the monster has drunk to excess and, as a travesty of a symposiast, committed acts offensive to religious and civic norms (cf. Theognidea 509 where the consumption of much wine is called a κακόν, ‘evil’). However, there need not be any normative sense to the adverb at Cyc. 619, since Odysseus and the satyrs wanted him to drink, and the
satyrs are great drinkers themselves; in Homeric epic and elsewhere in Euripides κακῶς need have no moral connotations (e.g., Il. 5.164; Eur. Hcld. 450).

620–1 whom I long for: ποθεινόν: as at Eur. Hel. 623, Or. 1045, ποθεινός need not have specifically erotic connotations, and no myth tells of erotic activity between the satyrs and their god (see 498n. for homosexual tendencies of satyrs). But the satyrs’ desire to be reunited with Dionysus is passionately expressed, and there is a strong statement of the φιλία between the satyrs and their god, now addressed by his cult title Bromius (1n.) as Silenus had addressed him. who loves to wear ivy: φιλοκισσοφόρος is a hapax legomenon, but the image is not so far from Pratinas F 3.16 where Dionysus is addressed as ‘lord with ivy in his hair’ (κισσόχαιτ’ ἄναξ). The ivy wreath is a standard form of head-dress for Dionysus in art, especially when satyrs and maenads are engaged in a thiasos around him (cf. Bacc. 177, 205, 702, etc.); the imminent prospect of release now puts thought of cultic activity in the minds of the satyrs.

622 desolate land: ἐρημία is literally ‘emptiness’ or ‘loneliness’. The Cyclops’ land is ‘empty’ of the cult of Dionysus and all its pleasures (25–6, 63–81, 203–11, etc.); the satyrs’ isolation from their natural lord has made them lonely as a result. Here is a further reiteration of the play’s setting on the fringes of the civilized world, as conceived in Athenocentric minds, (see 20n).

623 Shall I come that far? literally, ‘to such an extent’: ἐς τοσόνδε without a following noun in the genitive occurs elsewhere in Euripides, e.g. Pho. 1449 (contrast Soph. El. 961). The only genitive one can supply from context is ἐρημίας which makes no sense here as the satyrs are anticipating joyful reunion with their god. The elliptical use of ἐς τοσόνδε and the satyrs’ longing suggest that the chorus is saying something along the lines of: ‘shall I ever reach such (an extent of) bliss?’

624 be quiet ... keep still: again, the satyrs’ exuberance gets the better of them (465n.). wild creatures: in contrast to his words of encouragement earlier (590n.) Odysseus’ tone here is one of rebuke which underlines his role as a figure of ostensibly heroic or tragic status compared to these followers of Dionysus, whom he has elsewhere called ‘friends’ (φιλοί: 176, etc.). Cyllene, another dignified figure comically juxtaposed to satyrs onstage, likewise addresses them as θῆρες (Soph. Trackers 221–2; cf. 252); and their father, in a fine piece of hypocrisy, abuses them as κάκιστα θηρῶν (ib. 147) and κάκιστα θηρίων (ib. 153).

625–6 Shut your mouths tight! (literally, ‘putting together the joints of your mouth’): ἄρθρα στόματος is a paratragic periphrasis reminiscent of Sophocles, e.g. Oedipus’ eyes are described as ἄρθρα τῶν ἀυτοῦ κύκλων (OT 1270, literally: ‘the sockets of his own eyes’); Philoctetes refers to his own ankle as ποδὸς ἄρθρον (Phil. 1201–2 ‘the joint of his foot’). Odysseus’ words here seem more emphatically stylized when followed by the more colloquial σκαρδαμύσσειν (‘blink’) and χρέμπτεσθαι (‘clear throat’: Triclinius’ correction of L’s χρίμπτεσθαι: ‘to draw near’). Odysseus’ anger here is consistent with his Homeric counterpart who responds in a similarly
stern manner to those who, even unintentionally, might ruin his plans to wreak
vengeance on his enemies, e.g., his threats to the aged Eurycleia after she recognizes
him by his scar (Od. 19.467–90); cf. also his words to Neoptolemus in Soph. Phil.

the monster: translates τὸ κακόν, used colloquially (cf. Ar. Birds 931 of an
obnoxious person). But the word order leaves τὸ κακόν ambiguous, so that it could
mean either ‘the trouble, disaster’ (abstractions can ‘sleep’ Eur. Suppl. 1147; cf. Eur.
El. 41), or ‘the monster’ who should not be woken up; the ‘Cyclops’ only becomes
explicit after the ‘before’ clause begins.

628 has been forced: a sense of contest or struggle (ἅμιλλα is emphasized here in
ἐξαμιλληθῇ, a fairly popular word with Euripides, occurring six times in his extant
corpus, with cognates occurring another 37 times. Willink (1986) on Eur. Orestes
38 seems to have considered the present tense of verb there to be middle (but
active in force), rather than passive, and interprets ‘has done battle with the fire’;
but Euripides makes the passive sense of the uncompound verb clear enough
elsewhere (e.g., Eur. F 812.2). ὄψις more likely depends on ὄμματος to give ‘sight
of the Cyclops’ eye’ (cf. IT 1167), as in the translation; but ὄμματος could also
follow from the preposition ἐκ in ἐξαμιλληθῇ, to give: ‘... the sight has been forced
from the Cyclops’ eye by the fire.’

629 We are silent ... mouths: a rather grandiloquent response from the satyrs;
cf. their pseudo-heroic claim (596). Here the satyrs, who neither eat nor drink in
the play, gulp down αἰθέρα, in contrast to the gluttonous Polyphemus who belches
αἰθέρα after his hideous meal (see 410n.).

630 make sure you grab: for ὅπως and future indicative, see 594–5n.

631 nicely: καλῶς, an echo of Polyphemus when describing the instruments of his
cannibalism (see above 344n.); here, with equally colloquial tone, it is applied to the
instrument of Odysseus’ revenge.

632–4 So won’t you ...?: For οὔκουν plus future indicative, see above 241–3n.
From here (until 641) the satyrs engage in predictable stalling tactics, in contrast
to their zeal for the task earlier (469–71, 483–6). The joke, of course, is predicated
on their perennial cowardice (cf. Soph. Inachus F **269c col. iii 32–47; Trackers
F 314.145–75), but Euripides is also playing with the dramatic convention that the
chorus be continuously onstage from their first appearance (rare exceptions include,
e.g., Aesch. Eum. 234; Soph. Ajax 814). Aeschylus pushes the same convention to
its limits when the chorus overhears the murder of Agamemnon and debates what
to do next, including rushing in to intervene (Ag. 1343–71).

634 So that: For ὅς ἄν + subjunctive in a purpose clause, see above 155n.
success: translates τύχη, which often has the neutral meaning of ‘chance’ or ‘fortune’
as an agent beyond human control (see 606–7n.); here the sense is more the idea
of τύχη as a favourable outcome; cf. Theognis 130; Hdt. 7.10; Eur. Hel. 1409; Ar.
Birds 1315, etc.
The exact attribution of these lines remains uncertain. Many editors (Duchemin, Biehl, Paganelli, Diggle, Kovacs) assign the lines to two semi-choruses. Diggle in his OCT apparatus argues for two such choral groups, giving 635–6, 638–9 and 640–1 to one (on the basis of the repetition of ἑστῶτες in 636 and 639, and καὶ ... γε at 640 as following on from 638–9) and 637 to the other. Sophocles’ *Trackers* 176–202 has a similar problem of attribution in excited satyric lyric; 100–114 (ibid.) are clearly voiced by at least two chorus-members, and possibly more. In *Cyc.* 635–41 Ussher posits three individual speakers, Murray four, although the plurals would indicate that groups rather than individuals are speaking. Conceivably, several speakers would add to the comedy of the scene, so that the excuses seem to emerge randomly from a group of satyrs desperate to avoid any dangerous activity. Lines 638–9 need not necessarily be spoken by the same semi-chorus as 635–6; a new excuse is proffered for their inactivity.

Matthiae emends to μακροτέρω as comparative adverb of place (Smyth §345a), while other editors posited different forms required for the meaning ‘too far’ (lit. ‘further’): μακροτέραν (Cobet), μακροτέρον (Musgrave); L’s μακροτέροι does not seem likely as μακρός is used of persons only when denoting height.

Then (= ‘in that case’): for this meaning of ἀρα, see Denniston (1954) 45, s.v. (2). *we’ve sprained our feet*: the aorist passive of σπάω here literally means ‘we have been dislocated’ or ‘wrenched’; for the accusative τοὺς ... πόδας, see Smyth §1748b (and cf. 663).

and *our eyes*: Barnes conjectured ἡμῖν for L’s ἡμῶν to give the right idiom: dative of (dis)advantage. The position of the pronoun ἡμῖν, the third word in its line, is not emphatic, as Duchemin claims; contrast ἡμεῖς as emphatic first word in 635 and 637.

*men*: for the contrast with ‘real men’, ἄνδρες, which Odysseus hopes the satyrs will be, see 594–5n. By now, however, the satyrs have demonstrated their inability to fulfill what is expected of a male. The reading of L is correct here; ἄνδρες (‘the men’: Matthiae) destroys the sense, since the satyrs are not ‘men’ (ἀνδρες) in the normative sense of ἀνήρ at 595; here they are πονηροί (‘worthless men’).

*nothing as allies*: cf. 667n. Odysseus’ verdict on the satyrs seemingly states the obvious, as he acknowledges (649); cf., however, the satyrs’ willingness to stand up to the Cyclops (270–2). Odysseus’ view here echoes that of Hesiod (F 10a.18 M–W), the earliest extant literary reference to satyrs, who calls them οὐτιδανοί and ἀμηχανοέργοι (‘worthless and useless for work’).

*Just because*: ὁτιή, more colloquial than ὅτι, is not attested in tragedy, but is common in comedy (Hermippus F 63.11; Eupolis F 305.2; Ar. *Ach.* 1062, etc.); its appearance in Aeschylus’ ‘Justice-play’ (F 281a.9) suggests that that play is satyric.

lose my teeth: ἐκβαλεῖν literally means to ‘throw out’ (at *Cyc.* 20 it means
‘throw off course’), but here the sense is ‘shed’ or ‘lose’; cf. Solon F 27.1–2 (W).

645 this: αὕτη is attracted to the feminine as complement from the neuter subject, which is the clause from ὁτιή onwards.

646 incantation: literally an ‘epode’ (‘song over’ a person or thing; such were considered to have medicinal properties and psychosomatic effects (Od. 19.457–8; Gorg. Hel. 10, 14; Eur. Hipp. 478). Orpheus: the satyrs want to take the efficacy of epodes further and charm an inanimate object, just as Orpheus and Amphion were said to do in attracting trees and rocks as well as animals through music (Eur. IA 1212–13; Bacc. 562–4; Antiope F 223.91–4). absolutely: translates the colloquialism πάνυ (cf. Aesch. Net-Fishers F **47a.825; Soph. Trackers 105, etc; see Collard (2005) 366).

647 so that: ὥστ(ε), Blaydes’s emendation (of L’s ὡς), gives the regular syntax for Euripides in an infinitival consecutive clause (with πάνυ replacing the usual οὕτως); see Diggle (1981) 8, as at Alc. 358, El. 667.

648 son of the earth: while Polyphemus’ father is emphasized as Poseidon in the play (21, 262, 286) and in the Homeric account (above 21–2n.), Hesiod makes the Cyclopes the offspring of Earth and Ouranos (Th. 139). In the choral reference to him as παῖδα γῆς Polyphemus becomes assimilated to the hubristic Earth-born giants who attempted to overthrow the gods, alluded to earlier in the play (5–9). The concept of being a ‘son of the earth’ thus connotes chthonic monstrosity; cf. other ogres and monsters such as Antaeus (ps. Apollod. 2.5.11), Typhon (Hes. Th. 821–2), the monstrous Argos (Aesch. Supp. 305), and others. Comparable, too, is the Euripidean Pentheus – a stated enemy of Dionysus, like Polyphemus (203–11, etc.) – whose earth-born nature is made explicit by the Bacchic chorus who call him the γόνον γηγενῆ of Echion (Bacc. 995–6, 1015–6; cf. 540–1); this kind of lineage would compound his villainy in the chorus’ eyes (see also 608–10n for other links between Pentheus and Polyphemus). The satyrs’ jibe at Polyphemus seems to be sardonic mockery of his portentous ancestry. Poseidon, too, is also associated with the earth in his capacity as the ‘Earth-Shaker’ or ‘Earth-Encircler’ (e.g., Il. 7.45, 13.43, 15.173, 15.174; cf. Pindar Pyth. 4.33, etc.), so Polyphemus’ status as a ‘son of the earth’ does not preclude this connection either.

649 For a long time (πάλαι): Odysseus’ tone here is one of resignation, as the satyrs live up to their reputation (see 642n.). Cf. also 450: Odysseus similarly lives up to his reputation (for cleverness), which the satyrs have also known (πάλαι) and which excites them.

650 Odysseus’ reluctance to use his men for the task may be explained by their traumatized state in the cave (407–8); in any case Euripides gets comic mileage out of the satyrs’ mock-heroics (595–8, 629–48). close friends: (οἰκείοις φίλοις): Odysseus reintroduces the theme of φιλία as a motivating factor for his actions (similarly at Od. 9.421–2) and for the support of the chorus. The fact that they are
οἰκεῖοι underscores that they are fellow Ithacans, making the claims of φιλία here arguably stronger; cf. And. 986.

652–3 **But ... then at least:** ὅλλαʹ οὖν ... γε introduces a more moderate suggestion, ‘after concessive conditional clauses’ (Denniston 1954, 444.6). **some courage:** the command for such encouragement is more than a token gesture. Homer often stresses the emotional impact of speeches which rouse warriors to battle (Il. 4.414, 5.470, 792, etc.); cf. Od. 9.376–7, for Odysseus’ words of encouragement to his companions. Gorgias (Hel. 14) emphasises the power of words to generate courage and banish fear or complacency as required. **for our friends:** this command reiterates the φιλία mentioned at 650, and φίλων is enjambed, suggesting emphasis; in urging their friends the chorus now have something dramatically plausible to do while Odysseus goes back inside the skênê building.

654 **mercenary ... for us:** literally ‘will run the risk in the Carian’. Carians were known as mercenaries (Archilochus F 216 W; cf. Cratinus F 18 PCG) and their name became synonymous with vicarious involvement in danger, as Aelius Aristides explains (Panath. 163 Dindorf). Euripides perhaps alludes to a proverbial expression found later at e.g. Plato Laches 187b; Euthyd. 285c. In other words, the satyrs here will get someone else to confront the danger for them, just like anyone does who hires Carian mercenaries. For the preposition ἐν so used (apart from the Cratinus and Plato references), cf. Thuc. 2.35.1.

655 **But may ... be consumed in smoke** (τυφέσθω): see 659–60n.

656–62 Duchemin follows the suggestion, made by Rossignol in 1854, that this short song follows the format of a nautical shanty, ultimately traceable to the κέλευσμα or call of the boatswain to the rowers to keep time. But there is nothing nautical about the song here, even though the satyrs later announce themselves as the συνναῦται (fellow sailors) of Odysseus (708). The song can be understood in the more basic sense of a κέλευ(σ)μα (‘order, command’) which not only appears in tragedy (Aesch. Eum. 235; Soph. Ant. 1219), but also in Odysseus’ immediately preceding speech here (Cyc. 653, 655, cf. 652) and elsewhere in satyric drama (Soph. Trackers 231). The graphic nature of the imperatives (656–7, 659–60) plays out in words what is happening in the cave, so that the blinding is presented to the mind’s eye of the audience through words, and quite possibly through some mimed action of the chorus itself (as was done in the production staged by staff and students from the University of Canterbury, NZ, in 2008).

Metrical problems in this last and shortest choral song are outlined by Dale (1981) 69, who says the colometry is doubtful overall; Seaford suspects the word-overlap between the choriambic dimeter at 656 and the dochmiacs of 657. Diggle’s apparatus on 656–8 suggests a colometry of one iamb followed by two choriambic cola. Since ἐξοδυνηθεῖς in 661 forms a very rare brief colon (e.g. Aesch. Seven 152), Dale and Seaford suggest it could be divided as ἐξοδυνηθεῖς to make line 661 a dochmius and choriamb followed by a phe CRE in 662, thus echoing the metre.
of 657–8; but Dale considers this a ‘very dubious colon’. Kovacs (1994b) 157, prefers in 661 the (arguably improved) reading of the Paris apograph, μὴ ἡ γουνηθνθθίς which omits εἵ <‘to you’>.

656–7 The triple imperative in asyndeton, like the double in 661, conveys the intensity of the chorus’ emotion here emphasized in the two doctmiacs (cf. the four asyndetic imperatives at Hec. 62–3, if the text is authentic and not corrupt); cf. also Pratinas F 3.10–12. For imperatives from a chorus seeking punishment cf. Bacc. 977–1023; Or. 1302–10, esp. 1302–3.

658 the beast who dines on his guests: a reiteration of Polyphemus’ crimes and his savage nature (esp. 302–3, 3411–4, 396–404). A Laconian skyphos of c. 550 BC (LIMC VIII.1 s.v. Polyphemus I 18) depicting the blinding of the Cyclops synoptically – with events happening over time compressed into one image – shows the monster holding severed limbs, as a visual reminder of his barbarity [for the Doric genitive in –α, see above 53–4n.].

659–60 consume him in smoke: cf. 475, 655; there may be an implicit conflation here with Polyphemus and Typhon, another infamous opponent of the Olympians, especially in the wake of two choral injunctions for Polyphemus to be destroyed, using τύφω. This cosmic monster, like Polyphemus in the play, has strong associations with Etna, ever since Zeus hurled it onto him after blasting him with a thunderbolt (Pindar, Pyth. 1.13–28; PV 363–72; [Apollod.] Bibl. 1.6.3); and Polyphemus’ punishment is consistently spoken of in terms of burning or scorching, rather than, as in such (456–63, 475, 599–600, 610–12, 627–8, 648, 655, 657, 659). the shepherd of Etna: see above 20n. and 366–7n. for the implications of the locale of the play. [L’s ἔτνας is phonetic corruption].

661 keep on twisting, keep on heaving it ....: (τόρνευ’ ἕλκε) as present imperatives imply sustained action. The language recalls Odysseus’ own simile of a carpenter drilling through a ship’s plank by spinning a borer with thongs (460–2) to describe how he will blind Polyphemus, itself an echo of Od. 9.383–6. The satyrs’ choice of word does not have the pun contained in Odysseus’ κυκλώσω (462).

662 something outrageous (τι μάταιον): μάταιος is used commonly of people who are wildly inappropriate or immoral, e.g. Theoclymenus (Hel. 918), Helen and Clytaemestra (El. 1064), rather than their actions (cf. Med. 450). Here the sense may denote ‘irreverent, profane’, (LSJ II); at Aesch. Eum. 337 it is used of the matricide, τι could refer to the instant physical destruction of Odysseus being roasted and eaten if he fails to kill Polyphemus; if so, then the expression recalls the idea of the appalling and sacrilegious nature of the monster’s meals alluded to elsewhere (364–5, 416, etc., and later at 693). At the same time, the sense of μάταιον also recalls ἀπάλαμνον, which described the imminent fate of Silenus who was about to suffer something ‘diabolical’ or ‘something for which there is no remedy’ at the hands of the monster (see above 597–8n.); in the case of Odysseus, this does not, of course, mean rape, but rather the likelihood of death.
Polyphemus is blinded and eventually comes onstage where he is taunted by the satyrs in another exchange involving stichomythia and antilabê, or individual lines shared by two or more speakers (669–89; esp. 672–5, 681–6). The famous Homeric joke of ‘Nobody’ finally comes into play, this time as a result of the satyrs’ deliberately misunderstanding the enraged monster’s words (671–5). As Collins (2004) 47–8 suggests, it is a scene of paratragic anagnorisis in which the Cyclops’ recognition of his own situation is reduced to farce by the satyrs, which may parody the tragic blinding and eventual appearance of the enraged Polymestor in Hecuba (1035–43, 1056–126). There is nothing to suggest that we should pity the Cyclops, whose crimes are outlined again by Odysseus when he finally identifies himself (690, 692) and refers to the monster’s ‘unholy feast’ and ‘murder of my companions’ (693–5). Similarly, the hero’s ‘go to hell’ (701) grimly recalls the monster at his most arrogant and menacing (340); the satyric ogre has been dealt satyric justice (see 421–2, 693nn; Gen. Intro. pp. 29–30, 51–2). Despite further threats from the defeated monster, echoing the actions of his Homeric counterpart, the play ends on a rollicking, if abrupt, note with the satyrs’ upbeat rejoinder (708–9) that they will be Odysseus’ fellow sailors and the self-professed slaves of their longed-for friend, Dionysus.

Polyphemus’ initial outburst may have come from within the skênê-building, like Agamemnon’s famous cries (Aesch. Ag. 1343, 1345), or Polymestor in Eur.’s Hecuba (1035, 1037), in which case there is some satyric parody of tragedy, or at least paratragic action, here. the light of my eye: for this accusative, see Smyth §1748b (and cf. 638–39n.); cf. also Hec. 1035 (Polymestor again). burned to charcoal (κατηνθρακώμεθα): cf. the description of Typhon as ἠνθρακωμένος (‘incinerated’) by the thunderbolt of Zeus (Prometheus Bound 372).

665 you will never escape: οὔτι μή with aorist subjunctive (φύγητε) expresses strong denial for the future (Smyth §2755a); the expression is used by Polymestor to convey the same threat to his tormentor (Hec. 1039).
The idiom is common (Smyth §2062.a), but it is not certain that it is truly colloquial, for it is very frequent in tragedy: e.g., Eur. Or. (above); Med. 396, 398; Soph. OT 363; see Collard (2005) 366–7. **nonesities** (οὐδὲν ὄντες): cf. And. 700. After his blinding the Homeric Cyclops similarly called Odysseus ὀλίγος τε καὶ οὐτιδανὸς καὶ ἄκικυς (‘small and worthless and feeble’), unlike the man he expected would blind him (Od. 9.515); see also 642n., for Hesiod’s similar verdict on satyrs.

667–8 in the ... opening: literally, ‘gates’ (πύλαισι); the monster speaks of his cave as if it is a building of some stature; Silenus refers to it in architectural terms as a building (στέγας) and ‘house’ (δόμους); see above 29, 33, 635–6nn. **cleft’s ... here:** this reflects Nauck’s emendation τῆσδε qualifying φάραγγος (literally ‘of this cleft’), for L’s τάσδε, qualifying χέρας (‘these arms’): while retained by some editors, L perhaps needlessly emphasizes the act of stretching rather than the precise location, which is important: the entrance-cleft, not mentioned before, rather than the whole cave (666). **block it up** (ἐναρμόσω): literally, ‘I will fit into’; cf. Eur. Hipp. 1189 (putting feet into footstalls); Lucian 79.11.4 9 (inserting a peg).

669 Why ... ? τί χρῆμα; here means just τί; contrast 99 where it is an independent question, meaning ‘What is it?’ The feigned innocence of the satyrs is underscored in the colloquialism they use here; see Stevens (1976) 22. In 669–75 the chorus takes the role played by the other Cyclopes in Homer’s account, who ask Polyphemus in all sincerity what his trouble is (Od. 9.403–6), in contrast to the satyrs’ gleeful mockery here.

670 Well, yes: here γε is assentient and even exclamatory (Denniston (1954) 126–7); for φαίνομαι without the participle ὄν, see above 532n. ugly: as Ussher notes, this use of αἰσχρός does not occur in tragic contexts; cf. Ar. Eccl. 705. Polyphemus’ complaints are not evidence of compassion on the part of the poet, as Ussher claims; the monster’s punishment would tally well with the audience’s expectations of what usually happens to ogres in satyric dramas (Gen. Intro. pp. 29–30); see 421–2n. The satyrs’ taunting of Polyphemus (Cyc. 669–88) contrasts with the sympathy, albeit brief, which the chorus in the Hecuba shows even for Polymestor, after which they hasten to remind him of his own crimes (Hec. 1085–6).

672–5 The trick of ‘Nobody’ is finally played out, its humour emphasized in four lines of **antilabê** (cf. 663–709n.), in which the satyrs deliberately misunderstand the monster’s enraged words, as Euripides engages in word-play on Οὖτις (thrice), οὐδὲς and οὐδαμοῦ.

673 has blinded my eye: τυφλοῖ is a vividly emphatic present tense (cf. Smyth §1887), just as the Homeric Cyclops (Od. 9.408) answers that Nobody ‘is killing’ (κτείνει) him. Here τυφλοῖ takes two objects ‘me’ and ‘eye’, one denoting the whole person, the other the part specifically affected; cf. Or. 545, Tro. 635; see Smyth §985.

674 How do you mean?: translates the conjecture πῶς φῂς σύ; by T. Stinton (1990, 290–1), which conveys some humour in allowing the satyrs another joke at
Polyphemus’ expense who still takes at face value what the chorus is saying to him. Polyphemus’ words here in the ms ὡς δὴ σύ; make little sense (cf. Eur. Andromache 235 where they introduce a complete clause); Diggle (1971) suggests they should be taken as an interrupted expression with σκώπτεις (‘you’re mocking’), but the καὶ πῶς in the satyrs’ immediate rejoinder suggests that what precedes it – Polyphemus’ utterance – must be complete; for καὶ πῶς denoting surprise (here feigned by the satyrs) or contempt, see Denniston (1954) 309–10. Stinton’s conjecture has merit in being consistent with the satyrs’ mocking tone, but no emendation commands assent, and elsewhere Diggle (1981) 38 n. 1 suggested ψεύδῃ σύ (‘you’re lying’); W. Dindorf deleted this verse.

677 bastard: μιαρός is another of many colloquialisms in this scene (cf. Soph. Trackers 197; Eur. Sisyphus F 673.2; and see Collard 2005, 369), which cumulatively give an overall effect of agitation and energy. drowned (κατέκλυσεν): Canter’s emendation of L’s unmetrical κατέκαυσε (‘burned’); L’s reading was a purely scribal slip, alpha for lambda in uncial. The image recalls Polyphemus’ own exuberance in downing his last swig of the wine, which he ‘only just managed to swim out of’ (577); for κατέκλυζω in a simile, cf. Or. 343 (wealth), and in metaphor, [Aesch.] Sept. 1078.

678–9 These two lines are unattributed in L, and therefore by implication (or omission) continued for Polyphemus, but 678 is very awkward in his mouth and 679 is then too abrupt; nevertheless Biehl accepts L. But the lines were plausibly given to the chorus and Polyphemus respectively by Reiske. wine is powerful ... with: the satyrs are not normally the sort of creatures to heed the dangers of excessive drinking, and their comic encounters with wine were a motif in other satyr dramas (e.g. Soph. Little Dionysus; cf. also Oeneus F 1130; Ion, Omphale F 20–30; Achaeus, Hephaestus F 17; cf. the complaints of Silenus in Lykophr. Menedemus F 2–4!); see also 123–4, 169–71nn. Coming from them, this self-satisfied, even sanctimonious, utterance has much comic irony; but it may also be considered one of the ‘lessons’ they teach the monster (cf. 492–3n.).

679–80 In another departure from Homer (cf. Od. 9.425–60) and one easily explained by its greater theatrical convenience, Euripides has Odysseus’ men (and presumably Silenus) get past Polyphemus at the cave entrance rather than by clinging under his sheep. But the playwright finds further comic potential in this innovation. As Polyphemus attempts to chase Odysseus’ men, the satyrs, having taunted him verbally, now let their revenge take the form of some farcical violence – inflicted vicariously, of course – again predicated on the monster’s dim-witted insistence on taking what they say at face value.

681–2 occupying: translates λαβόντες (cf. Eur. Supp. 652; IT 962). Polyphemus’ lunging and frantic questions about the whereabouts of his tormentors (also at 685–6) parallel the desperation of the blinded Polymestor in the Hecuba (1056–82, esp. 1065). The double change of speakers in one iambic trimeter is rare in extant drama
682–3–4  **Have you got them?** (ἔχεις;): the continuation of the part-line 682 in just one word in the next verse is remarkable, but (a) it is syntactically separate and (b) it accommodates the theatrical time needed for the head-banging. Polyphemus’ collision with the rock could be easily arranged by means of a stage property, or could have been mimed by the actor, again, exactly like the stumbling Polymestor (Hec. 1050, 1056–60, 1079–81); cf. also the half-heard steps of his persecutors (Hec. 1069).  **I’ve got worse on worse:** Polyphemus’ remark is paratragic (similar wording at Eur. *Hipp.* 874).  **skull:** τὸ κρανίον is accusative object of παίσας (*Now that I’ve bashed*; cf. Eur. *El.* 688) and κατέαγα (perfect of κατάγνυμι: ‘break’, ‘shatter’, etc.) is used in a passive sense to mean literally ‘I’m broken’, just as ὀλόλοια (strong perfect of ὀλλοῦμι) is frequently passive in sense (e.g. 665); conceivably, κρανίον could be accusative of respect (Ussher and Seaford point to *Ar.* Wealth 545), but this would leave παίσας unexplained.  **Yes:** γε emphasizes καὶ: ‘Yes, and ...’; see Denniston (1954) 157 (1) and 158 for the unusual separation of the particles here. Polyphemus has got a bump instead of the men — and they are now escaping him (cf. 666); the satyrs’ γε is also assentient and conveys their enjoyment of the scene as spectators.

685  **Didn’t you say, here somewhere, here?** this translates Blaydes’ conjecture οὐ τῇδέ πῇ, τῇδ’ εἶπας; which Diggle in his OCT and Seaford follow. Text and punctuation of 685 vary: Biehl and Ussher, for instance, keep L’s οὐ τῇδ’ ἐπεὶ τῇδ’ εἶπας (*‘Not here, since you said, Here’*).

686  **Turn around that way:** The chorus need not be grouped altogether in this scene, but has probably spread out over the orchestra with individuals calling out instructions at random to confuse Polyphemus further. [This is Nauck’s emendation περιάγου κεῖσε for L’s senseless and unmetrical περίαγουσί σε. The middle form of the imperative has the literal sense of ‘lead yourself around’.]

687  **I am being laughed at:** the laughter of one’s enemies was a serious concern for heroic figures and was to be avoided virtually at all costs (e.g. Soph. *Ajax* 79, 379–82; Eur. *Medea* 797, 1049–51, 1354–7, 1362; see Knox 1977). Here such laughter contributes in no small way to Polyphemus’ torment. Cf. also Polymestor’s question to Hecuba about whether she is enjoying the outrage she has inflicted on him (Hec. 1257).

688  **not any more:** Seaford aptly compares *Hel.* 1230–1 for a similar rejoinder to κερτομεῖτέ με (*‘you’re taunting me’*), and notes that in both cases the charge of taunting is negated by the response, which introduces a new element in the exchange; in *Cyc.* this brings Odysseus into the action.

689  **O utterly vile man** (ὦ παγκάκιστε): common tragic abuse (Soph. *Ant.* 742; *Tr.* 1124; Eur. *Med.* 465; *Suppl.* 513, etc.), and is a more intense form of ὦ κάκιστε,
also common in tragedy (Soph. OC 866; Eur. Tro. 943, etc.); neither term appears in extant comedy. Polyphemus’ language is paratragic rather than colloquial here (cf. above 677n.). However the comparable expression ὦ πανοῦργε is found in comedy (Ar. Ach. 311), and in tragedy (Eur. Hec. 1257; Hcld 947).

689–90 I’m keeping the body ... in safety: there is a mild tautology in φυλακαῖσι φρουρῶ, perhaps as a form of emphasis; Biehl notes the same expression at Rhes. 764–5, of warfare (cf. also IA 1028; Ion 22). As in Homer’s account, Odysseus does not begin his taunts until confident that he is beyond reach of the monster (Od. 9.475–9, 502–5, 523–5). [Canter’s emendation σῶμα (‘body’) of L’s nonsensical δῶμα (‘home’) is paralleled elsewhere in Euripides (Her. 435; Hel. 691; cf. Cyc. 527 where Pierson conjectured δῶμα); cf. also the periphrasis of δέμας (‘body’) + genitive of person (Eur. El. 1341; Hec. 724, etc.).]

692 me: Nauck’s emendation με gives more regular and idiomatic word order (Diggle cites Eur. El. 264; Ion 324, 671 as parallels); L has γε which follows 691 with assent (the monster’s observation that Odysseus is using a new name). called me: the imperfect of ὀνομάζω is idiomatic; in Eur. Suppl. 1218 ὀνόμαζε likewise expresses how Tydeus called his son Diomedes (cf. IT 1452; Hcld 86).

693 Odysseus does not explicitly say here that Zeus and the rest of the gods punished Polyphemus, as in the Homeric account (Od. 9.479). But his reference to the monster’s ‘ unholy meal’, his consistent invocation of divine powers (350, 354–5, 599–602), and his attribution of his entire plan to τι θεῖον (‘an idea sent from some god’ 411) show that divine agency has played a big role in exacting justice from Polyphemus, in addition to the hero’s own qualities demonstrated at Troy (cf. 603–5n.). In the Odyssey (9.302) the hero refers instead to ἕτερος θυμὸς (‘a second thought’) as the inspiration behind his decision to blind the monster. You were bound: ἔμελλες is similarly used in satisfied verdicts of those made to pay for their transgressions (Eur. Med. 1354; HF 1079). to pay the penalty for your unholy feast: the alliteration and hyperbaton of δώσειν δ’ ἀνοσίου δαιτὸς δίκας emphasizes the point (as at Med. 1298; Bacc. 489), which fits in well with the theme of swift, punitive justice evident elsewhere in satyric drama; see above 421–2n.

694–5 a worthless thing: this translates L’s κακῶς, which makes clear sense as it is (Cobet conjectured ἄλλως ‘in vain’). Dobree emended to καλῶς (‘a fine thing’), accepted by Diggle, which has to be invested with irony to fit the context, and, even though this sense is not unparalleled (e.g., Eur. Med. 504, 588), most editors accept the ms reading. Either way, in Odysseus’ own words his revenge here trumps even his own glorious labours at Troy (603–5; cf. 347–52). my companions: Odysseus again alludes to the idea of φιλία – in the form of avenging his ἑταῖροι – as a motivating factor.

696–9 Polyphemus in the Odyssey describes the oracle at greater length (9.507–14) and makes a separate prayer to Poseidon to punish Odysseus (9.528–35); here the monster tells how the same oracle predicted Odysseus’ further sufferings, rather than pray to his father for them. While Polyphemus has no prophetic powers of his
own, his bitter recollection of the oracle is comparable to the vindictive prophecies by the blind and enraged Polymestor, similarly directed at his tormentor (Hec. 1259–73). In Euripides’ Heraclidae (1026–44) Eurystheus is another defeated figure predicting at the end of the drama future events in the wake of his downfall. 697 by you (ἐκ σέθεν): (also e.g. And. 1275) an example of the ablatival suffix substituting for the genitive case-ending (cf. 689 τηλοῦ σέθεν).

698 But don’t forget (ἅλλὰ καὶ ... τοι): the untranslatable particle τοι has ‘threatening’ overtones (Denniston (1954) 540) which we have tried to render in ‘don’t forget’.

700 drifting (ἐναιωρούμενον): literally, ‘suspended’, suggesting that Odysseus will have little if any control over the directions his journey takes; Euripides uses the same verb of Polydorus’ ghost (Hec. 32), which is literally in the air, ‘hovering’.

701–2 Go to hell! (κλαίειν σ’ ἄνωγα): see 174n., 340n. This colloquialism echoes Polyphemus’ contemptuous dismissal – κλαίειν ἄνογα – of Odysseus’ earlier arguments (338–40) and reinforces the sense of a transgressor getting his come-uppance. what I said: Paley conjectured λέγεις (‘you say’) for L’s λέγω on the basis that ἐγὼ δέ (But now I) implies a different subject from the previous line; on this reading Odysseus would be referring to Polyphemus’ words at 697–8. But the hero could easily be referring to his own words at 695 and L’s reading may stand. λέγω here can mean ‘I said’; the Greek present is idiomatic (Smyth §1885.a calls it the ‘progressive perfect’); cf. also the chorus’ words at Hec. 1047–8 δέδρακας οἷάπερ λέγεις; ‘have you done what you said?’; i.e. blinded Polymestor.

702–3 my ship (νεῶς σκάφος): for this pleonasm, see 85n. over the Sicilian sea: see above 20n. and to my homeland: this will, of course, be a long time coming for Odysseus, but there is no need to attach much dramatic irony to this remark. Notwithstanding Polyphemus’ prophecies of hard times ahead and his threats of further violence, Odysseus’ triumph dominates the mood of this last scene. By contrast, the recounting of the tale in the Odyssey ends with some foreboding (9.553–5) and on a sombre note, with Odysseus and his men mourning the loss of their companions (9.566–7) [Schumacher conjectured εἰς for L’s ἔς τ’ (cf. Eur. El. 1347). Zuntz (1963) 66, notes that the ‘Sicilian sea’ denoted the body of water between southern Italy, including Sicily and Greece, including Crete (Thuc. 4.24.5; Xen. Oec. 20.27). The idea behind Schumacher’s conjecture, then, seems to be that Odysseus will sail on the Sicilian sea to get home, as opposed to sailing it primarily to escape Polyphemus in the first stage of his journey home, which L’s reading seems to suggest. However, L may stand and is accepted by Diggle.]

704–5 you (σε): an example of Wackernagel’s Law, the advanced enclitic here separated by a complete sense-unit from its point of control. a piece of this rock: πέτρας is a partitive genitive following a verb that affects the object only partially (Smyth §1341); Kirchhoff read the accusative here, in which case πέτραν = ‘a whole rock’ (cf. Antiope F 223.93). your sailors and all: for αὐτός and dative in
the common idiom to convey the idea of accompaniment, cf. e.g. Med. 165; Smyth §1525 notes that the expression is common when the destruction of a person or thing is referred to. This action is clearly impossible to stage before the audience, so Euripides has Polyphemus announce his intention to hurl rocks at Odysseus and his men, to be consistent with the Homeric narrative (Od. 9.481–6, 537–42).

707 **making my way on foot:** similar expressions combining pleonastic ποδί with βαίνω (or compounds) are found in Euripides (e.g., Hec. 1263; El. 489–90), but also in Sophocles (Ajax 1281), the lyric poetry of Stesichorus PMG 185.5) and Homeric epic (Il. 5.745); see also Schmidt (1975) 292–3; Diggle (1981) 36–7. [Kirchhoff nevertheless wanted to supply a noun, with πέτρας itself replacing ποδί (L’s reading); Diggle preferred to suggest a lacuna after this line.]

707–8 **this tunneled (cave) with its entrance on the other side:** ἀμφιτρής literally means ‘bored through on both sides’ (ἀμφί + τετραίνω’), and qualifies (πέτρας) ‘rock’ inferred from 704; but this is too far away; the adjective has been substantivised here (examples in Smyth §1028). The monster’s cave has another entrance which will give him access to a place from where he can hurl rocks at Odysseus and his men. The only other occurrence in extant Greek of ἀμφιτρής describes the cave of Philoctetes (Soph. Phil. 19), and has been taken by some as a dating criterion for the Cyclops; see above Gen. Intro., pp. 39–41. Because the word ἀμφιτρής appears both in Soph. Phil. and here in Cyc., with their caves, its occurrence has been conjectured as having stood in the (much) earlier Philoctetes of Euripides, where, as in Sophocles’ play, the existence of a rear-entrance is (even more) important: this is F 5 Mueller, mentioned by Kannicht in TrGF 5.830.

708–9 **This choral couplet in iambic trimeters brings the play to a very abrupt end.** We do not know whether other satyr dramas ended this way, as no other satyr play endings have survived. While anapaests usually conclude tragedies, the ending of Sophocles’ OT (if genuine) and Euripides’ Ion are in trochaic tetrameters; Barrett (1964) on Hipp. 1463–66 questions whether all the Euripidean tailpieces are genuine. In any case, the mood at the end of Cyclops is buoyant, and some important motifs in are alluded to here, namely friendship, slavery and the different natures of two masters the satyrs have experienced (see 23–6, 34–5, 73–5, 76–9, 435–6nn.). **Well anyway ... fellow sailors:** δέ ... γε are often used in ‘retorts and lively rejoinders’ (Denniston (1954) 153); the satyrs thus give a riposte to Polyphemus’ reference to Odysseus’ fellow sailors (705). The satyrs’ role as members of Odysseus’ crew reasserts the φιλία between them and the hero and may recall 466–8. The present participle ὄντες (‘being’: 709) is probably ‘dynamic’ (cf. Smyth 2065) and its position at the beginning of the line implies emphasis and intensity, as does the identically placed pronoun ἡμεῖς (‘we’: 708); this is appropriate for the satyrs as they relish their newly won freedom.

709 **we’ll be the slaves of the Bacchic god:** the satyrs’ eagerness to resume this role indicates the joys of such ‘servitude’ (63–78, 620–3, etc.). The play ends on
a note of mild ring composition and paradox, whereby slavery, emphasized in the satyrs’ description of their plight at the outset (23–6, 78–81, cf. 442, etc.), resurfaces at the very moment of their escape. But this ‘slavery’ means a return to the joys of life under their natural master, Dionysus (cf. 429–30), and liberation from the brutal despotism of the Cyclops.