

SHORTER NOTES

EURIPIDES, *CYCLOPS* 393–402

ὀβελούς τ', ἄκρους μὲν ἐγκεκαυμένους πυρί,
 ξεστοὺς δὲ δρεπάνῳ τᾶλλα, παλιούρου κλάδων,
 † Αἰτναῖά τε σφαγεῖα πελέκεων γνάθοις.†
 ὥς δ' ἦν ἔτοιμα πάντα τῷ θεοστυγεῖ
 'Αἶδου μαγείρῳ φῶτε συμμάρψας δύο
 399 ἔσφαζ' ἐταίρων τῶν ἐμῶν, ῥυθμῷ τινι,
 τὸν μὲν λέβητος ἐς κύτος χαλκῆλατον,
 τὸν δ' αὖ, τένοντος ἀρπάσας ἄκρου ποδός,
 παίων πρὸς ὄξυν στόνυχχα πετραίου λίθου,
 ἐγκέφαλον ἐξέρρανε. . .¹

Odysseus describes Polyphemus preparing his meal. One expects an indication of the terrifying size of the σφαγεῖα (cf. 385, 388, 390 f.); and so Αἰτναῖα, lonely though it is in L, should not be abandoned: compare Ar. *Pax*.73 Αἰτναῖον μέγιστον κάνθαρον.² σφαγεῖα must mean bowls for blood. But the blood of the Greeks flows into the cauldron (see below). It seems probable therefore that Αἰτναῖά τε σφαγεῖα is a (probably corrupt) comic periphrasis for the cauldron.³ Hermann read 395 after 399 as Αἰτναῖ' ἄτε σφαγεῖα κτλ.

399 lacks a verb. J. Diggle (*CQ* N.S. 21 (1971) 46 ff.) regards the ellipse as impossible, and suggests the loss, after 399, of a line containing ἔρριψε. But Méridier was right to adduce A. *Sept.*43 ταυροσφαγοῦντες ἐς μελάνδετον σάκος⁴ and Hdt.3.11.2 ἐσφαζον ἐς τὸν κρητήρα. Compare also E. *Phoen.*1010 σφάξας ἐμαντὸν σηκὸν ἐς μελαμβαθῇ, Hdt. 4.62.3, Xen. *Anab.*2.2.9. Diggle misses an important point. The Homeric Polyphemus (*Od.* 9.289–91)

σὺν δὲ δῶμα μάρψας ὥς τε σκύλακας ποτὶ γαίῃ
 κόπτ'· ἐκ δ' ἐγκέφαλος χαμάδις ῥέε, δεῦε δὲ γαῖαν.
 τοὺς δὲ διὰ μελεῖσσι ταμῶν ὀπλίσσατο δόρπον.

Euripides' Polyphemus is more sophisticated. He cooks his meat, and indeed uses two cooking methods (246, 404). Similarly he adds to the Homeric Polyphemus' method of killing his victims a more sophisticated one, the sacrificial method described at 399 (cf. 245, 334–5). The word σφάξω (398; cf. 243) almost always means 'slaughter', usually the cutting of the throat, and frequently in a sacrificial context. It does not mean simply 'kill', and cannot refer to boiling alive.

Diggle thinks that the interpretation represented by Méridier is linguistically possible but intolerably flaccid (op. cit. 47). But perhaps we should read

¹ Murray's text, but with L's ῥυθμῷ τινι in 398; cf. Austin, *CGF* fr. 292, 22 σευτλίον ῥυθμόν τω' εἶχε, Nonnus 13. 156 οἷς τινι ῥυθμῷ κύκλα ποδῶν μεμέλητο, Plut. *De Adul. et Am.* 67 f ἱατροῦ σάρκα τέμνοντος εὐρυθμίαν τινά δεῖ . . . τοῖς ἔργοις ἐπιτρέχειν, parallels which I owe to Professor R. Kassel.

² Cf. E. Fraenkel, *Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes*, pp. 53–7.

³ This means that the σφαγεῖα cannot be 'made with axes' (as some commentators have imagined), and that Αἰτναῖος here cannot mean simply 'Aitnaian' as it does elsewhere in the play (20, 95, 114, 336).

⁴ Cf. Ar. *Lys.* 188–9.

τὸν μὲν λέβητος ἐς κύτος χαλκήλατον,
 <σφαγεῖον Αἰτναῖον γε, πελέκεων γνάθοις
 ἔσφαξ' ἑταίρων τῶν ἐμῶν, ῥυθμῶ τινι,>
 τὸν δ' αὖ κτλ.

in which ῥυθμῶ τινι is allowed to contrast with the ἀρρυθμία described in τὸν δ' αὖ κτλ. This also creates a more orderly syntax: ἔσφαξε can be taken anyway only with τὸν μὲν κτλ. For the postponed genitive compare e.g. *El.* 1357–9, *Hel.* 1126–8. For the exegetical γε with a noun in apposition see Denniston, *Greek Particles*, pp. 138 f. Polyphemus' cauldron makes a huge and terrifying σφαγεῖον. The corruption was probably due to the scribe's eye passing from τὸν μὲν to τὸν δέ.⁵ He then realized his error and wrote the missing lines in the margin.

Axes were sometimes employed in the sacrifice,⁶ though not, so far as I know, for cutting the throat; but (despite 241–2) this is no normal sacrifice. Both axe and cauldron have replaced more civilized instruments.

Brasenose College, Oxford

RICHARD SEAFORD

⁵ As Diggle observes (*op.cit.*, p. 48).

⁶ e.g. *Il.* 17. 520, *Od.* 3.442.

A NOTE ON ARISTOTLE, *POLITICS* 1.1

1252^a 18–23 reads in Ross's text and lineation:

ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις τὸ σύν-
 θετον μέχρι τῶν ἀσυνθέτων ἀνάγκη διαφεῖν (ταῦτα γὰρ ἐλά-
 χιστα μόρια τοῦ παντός), οὕτω καὶ πόλιν ἐξ ὧν σύγκειται 20
 σκοποῦντες ὁψόμεθα καὶ περὶ τούτων μᾶλλον, τί τε δια-
 φέρουσιν ἀλλήλων καὶ εἴ τι τεχνικὸν ἐνδέχεται λαβεῖν περὶ
 ἕκαστον τῶν ῥηθέντων.

Newman *ad. loc.* regarded it as 'on the whole . . . most probable that both τούτων and ἕκαστον τῶν ῥηθέντων refer to δεσποτικός, οικονομικός, πολιτικός, and βασιλικός', on whose generic differences Aristotle insists so strongly earlier in the chapter; Susemihl and Hicks *ad. loc.* merely asserted Newman's tentative view dogmatically, and it now seems to have become almost canonical. I think it needs to be challenged.

The crucial word is καὶ in ^a21 (commonly and perhaps justifiably omitted in translation): 'we shall see better about these *as well*, in what respect they differ from each other'. 'As well as what?', we naturally ask. Clearly the answer is the ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις . . . ἐλάχιστα μόρια τοῦ παντός, whose inspection is to be the model (ὥσπερ . . . οὕτω καί) for the examination of the constituent elements of the state (πόλιν ἐξ ὧν σύγκειται σκοποῦντες): οὕτω καὶ πόλιν marks out the state as the particular σύνθετον that is to be analysed in accordance with the general method, and καὶ τούτων correspondingly marks out the parts of this σύνθετον as seen better as a result of the analysis. Just as ταῦτα in ^a19 refers to ἀσυνθέτων, the parts of any σύνθετον, so does τούτων refer to ἐξ ὧν, the elements of which the σύνθετον that is the state is made up. Aristotle's argument and method is thus neat enough, being presented (intendedly or not) in the following form: