

## THE DATE OF EURIPIDES' CYCLOPS

THERE is still considerable disagreement about the date of Euripides' *Cyclops*. The most common view seems to be that it was written in the last ten years of Euripides' career.<sup>1</sup> And yet in the only recent detailed study D. F. Sutton<sup>2</sup> argues that it was produced in 424 BC. And so the *Cyclops* is perhaps the only extant Euripidean play about whose date there is still serious disagreement. This is largely because it is the only one to which the metrical dating criteria formulated by Zieliński and others have never been properly applied. This I now propose to do, as part of a case for about 408 BC as the date of the play.

### I. THE METRICAL CRITERIA

The principle that the frequency and nature of resolution in the iambic trimeter can be an indication of the date of a Euripidean play is generally accepted.<sup>3</sup> Taking the plays of known date, in *Alcestis* (produced in 438 BC) the number of resolved feet<sup>4</sup> expressed as a percentage of the number of spoken trimeters is 6.2, in *Medea* (431 BC) 6.6, *Hippolytus* (428) 4.3, *Hecuba* (c. 424) 12.7, *Troades* (415) 21.2, *Helen* (412) 27.5, *Phoenissae* (411–09) 25.8, *Orestes* (408) 39.4, *Bacchae* (posthumous) 37.6, *Iphigeneia in Aulis* (posthumous) 34.7. In *Cyclops* it is 35.0, which would entitle us to place the play after 412 BC, were it not that the figure may express no more than the greater metrical freedom that satyric drama has over tragedy. After all, *Cyclops* has 17 anapaests (not involving proper names) outside the first foot, and three irredeemable violations of Porson's Law—a degree of licence impossible in tragedy. These two anomalies are quite sufficient to deter us from using the figure of 35% as a criterion of date. And so Sutton's detailed analysis of numerous metrical features, from which he concludes that 'the *τέχνη* of iambic versification in the *Cyclops* materially differs from that of the tragedies', can only be described as overkill. This does not mean, however, that metre should be abandoned altogether as a means of dating the play, as Sutton and, most recently, Ussher would have it. The suggestion was first made by Humphreys<sup>5</sup> that because Odysseus is a serious figure, a *persona tragica*, surrounded by comic ones 'there is conceivably a disparity between his diction and that of other characters of the play. If so, the lines spoken by Odysseus might adhere to the norms of tragedy,<sup>6</sup> and if such a cleavage could be demonstrated, the *Cyclops* might be datable by analysis of his lines alone'. Sutton makes a detailed case against this suggestion.<sup>7</sup> The next section will be devoted to a detailed refutation of Sutton's case for rejecting Humphreys' suggestion. This is the negative first step necessary before we proceed to the positive arguments.

Sutton's evidence falls into the categories of (i) licence unparalleled in tragedy, and (ii) statistical tendencies, concerning word shapes etc., which seem to fall outside the parameters of tragedy.

<sup>1</sup> E.g. R. G. Ussher, who in his recent Commentary (Rome 1978), p. 204, suggested 412 BC, on the curiously slender basis of comparing *Cyc.* 236 with *Ar. Lys.* 368, and *Cyc.* 675–86 with *Ar. Thesm.* 1223 ff. Most influential has been R. Marquart, *Die Datierung des Euripideischen Kyklops* (Leipzig 1912), who made the fatal error of taking all the trimeters of *Cyc.* as comparable for chronological purposes with tragedy (*cf.* below).

<sup>2</sup> *The Date of Euripides' Cyclops* (University Microfilms, Ann Arbor 1974), hereafter 'Sutton'; summarised in his *The Greek Satyr Play*, *Beitr. z. kl. Phil.* xc (Meisenheim am Glan 1980). I am very grateful to the author of these works for his comments on this paper,

although it must be said that he does not agree with its conclusion.

<sup>3</sup> T. Zieliński, *Tragodumenon Libri Tres ii: De Trimetri Euripidei Evolutione* (Cracow 1925), hereafter 'Zieliński'; T. B. L. Webster, *The Tragedies of Euripides* (London 1967) 2–5.

<sup>4</sup> These figures are from E. B. Ceadel, 'Resolved Feet in the Trimeters of Euripides', *CQ* xxxv (1941) 66–89 (hereafter 'Ceadel') and do not include proper names.

<sup>5</sup> *AJP* i (1880) 191 ff.

<sup>6</sup> Here and in the following discussion 'tragedy' should be taken to refer to Euripidean tragedy unless stated otherwise.

<sup>7</sup> Sutton 65–71.

(i) S. claims that there are in Odysseus' trimeters two anapaests illicit in tragedy (260, 288)—far fewer than in the play as a whole, 'but if Euripides were taking care to make these lines adhere to the rules of tragedy, there would be none at all'. However in both cases there are independent reasons for suspecting the text. 260 ἐπεὶ κατελήφθη σοῦ λάθρα πωλῶν τὰ σά: the compound καταλαμβάνω occurs in tragedy only at *Hipp.* 1161, in a rather different sense.<sup>8</sup> There is much to be said for Heath's ἐπεὶ γ' ἐλήφθη: cf. *Hipp.* 955 ἐπεὶ γ' ἐλήφθης in a very similar context. Passive of λαμβάνω with a participle is standard in Euripides: e.g. *IT* 101, *Med.* 381, *Ion* 1113. The corruption would result from the loss of γε. It must however be remembered that the transmitted text could well be right. The other 'illicit anapaest' turns out to be no more than a metrical misinterpretation of a dubious emendation.<sup>9</sup>

It should be added to Sutton's case that 304, ending ἐχρήρωσ' Ἑλλάδα, infringes Porson's law. The question of what exactly constitutes an infringement, and whether all infringements in tragedy should be emended away, cannot be handled here.<sup>10</sup> Several cases involve elision, which may be thought to soften the infringement. Suffice it here to cite merely the infringements strictly comparable to this one, that is those involving elision of a word of two or more syllables. Of these *S. Aj.* 1101 is easily emended, *S. Phil.* 22 and *E. Hcl.* 529 less so.<sup>11</sup>

(ii)<sup>12</sup> (1)<sup>13</sup> Odysseus speaks 233 whole lines and 6 half lines, and so in his 239 lines internal change of speaker occurs once every 39.8 lines. This is less frequent than in the play as a whole (1:26.5), but still more frequent than anything in tragedy (the closest is *Or.*, 1:47.2). However, the discrepancy is small enough to be neutralised by the consideration that in half the cases the responsibility for the internal change can be ascribed to the other ('comic') character. And anyway this tendency, symptomatic of the speed of the action, cannot be used to prise apart the metrical features of Od.'s lines (resolutions, word-shapes, etc.) from those of tragedy.

(2)<sup>14</sup> Dactyls make up 35% of all resolutions uttered by Od. (For the play as a whole the figure is 30%). The closest tragedies are *Alc.* (34%), *Ba.* (38%), *IA* (39%), *Or.* (41%), *Ion* (41%). However, the number of dactyls uttered by Od. is so small (21) that the low percentage seems barely significant. And in terms of absolute frequency (1 dactyl every 11 lines) there is no discrepancy at all with late tragedy.

(3)<sup>15</sup> First foot anapaests make up 23% of all resolutions uttered by Od. (for the whole play the figure is 16%). The closest tragedies are *Alc.* (18%), *Hcl.* (16%), *Supp.* (15%), *El.* (13%), *Or.* (12%). This discrepancy is not inconsiderable. But again the numbers involved are small (Od. utters 14); and the high percentage is to some extent a counterpart of the low figure for dactyls in (2). In terms of absolute frequency the discrepancy with tragedy is not so considerable: Od. utters one every 17 lines (cf. *Or.* 1:21).

(4)<sup>16</sup> First foot dactyls may have a break after the first syllable (ὦ πάτερ), or be a complete word form (μητέρα). In *Cyclops* there are 8 of the first type and 10 of the second, a distribution roughly consistent with tragedy. But according to Sutton 'the speeches of Odysseus differ radically from the practice of later Euripidean plays in containing no examples of the first type and five of the second'. However, this seems to be of little significance. *IT* has eleven of the first and eighteen of the second. And of the earlier plays *Hec.* has five of the first and two of the second, whereas *Hipp.* has none of the first and eleven of the second. Furthermore, Sutton seems to have ignored<sup>17</sup> Ζεὺ ξένιε (354), which is of the first type. It should be added that here, as in (7) and (8), in pointing to a discrepancy with later Euripidean plays Sutton is not keeping distinct the question of whether Od.'s lines are technically tragic from the closely related question, which I will deal in the next section, of whether they are comparable with late tragedy.

<sup>8</sup> συμφορὰ . . . κατείληφε . . . πόλεις.

<sup>9</sup> 288 μὴ τλής πρὸς ἄντρα σοὺς ἀφιγμένους φίλους L; . . . σοὶ ἔσαφιγμένους . . . Radermacher, Murray (read by Sutton presumably as with hiatus not crasis); read probably . . . οἴκους σοὺς ἀφιγμένους . . . (Heimsoeth; cf. 252). See my forthcoming commentary.

<sup>10</sup> For Eur. see Platnauer on *IT* 580.

<sup>11</sup> *S. Aj.* 1101 ἡγεῖτ' οἴκοθεν: ἡγετ' Elmsley; *S. Phil.* 22 σήμαιν' εἶτ' ἔχει: μάνθαν' Dawe, *Studies on the Text of Sophocles* iii (Leiden 1978) 122; *E. Hcl.* 529 κατάρχεσθ', εἰ δοκεῖ ('nec κατάρχετ' nec κεί κατάρχεσθαι δοκεῖ [Paley] placet Murray).

<sup>12</sup> The comparative data from tragedy are taken from the work of Zieliński, who included resolutions involving proper names, and Ceadel, who excluded them. Figures for the *Cyc.* will include or exclude them according to whose data on tragedy are being used. The

basis of my calculations differs slightly from Sutton's, in that there are a few places in *Cyc.* in which Murray's text seems to me entirely unacceptable; and I ignore 395 as too corrupt (this is not inconsistent with using Murray-based data for tragedy). But this makes no real difference to my conclusion. Where appropriate figures are rounded off to the nearest integer.

<sup>13</sup> Sutton 65–6, 8.

<sup>14</sup> Sutton 66–7, 18–21, based on Ceadel 72. Sutton gives 33%, presumably excluding Ζεὺ ξένι' (354) as involving a proper name: but on Ceadel's own criterion (69 n.6) it does not.

<sup>15</sup> Sutton 66–7, 23–4, based on Ceadel 72.

<sup>16</sup> Sutton 68, 29–30, based on Zieliński 144–5, 155–6, 167–70, 187–90.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. n. 14 (and anyway the tragic data, from Zieliński, do not exclude proper names).

(5)<sup>18</sup> There are four possible word-forms in first foot anapaests: a word extending into the second foot, a word of precise anapaestic form, a word of tribrachic form made anapaestic by positional lengthening, and a 'broken' form (i.e. including a word-break). The distribution in Od.'s lines is, according to Sutton, 9:7:0:1, which differs from tragedy in having more than 50% of the first type, and in having a predominance of the fourth over the third. But in fact it seems that Sutton has simply miscounted.<sup>19</sup> The true distribution is 5:7:0:2. The predominance of the fourth type over the third is based on numbers too low to be significant, and the general distribution is quite consistent with late tragedy (i.e. *Ion* 12:13:2:1; *Ba.* 8:14:3:3).

(6)<sup>20</sup> Taking the three syllables formed by the latter two of a resolved second foot together with the first of the third foot (e.g. *Πριάμου* in 304 *ἄλις δὲ Πριάμου . . .*), Sutton claims that of the 11 cases in Od.'s lines 3 are 'broken'. This proportion (27%) is higher than in any tragedy (the nearest are *Andromache* 20%, *IA* 19%). But the figures are again too small to be significant. Furthermore, my figures are not 3 out of 11 but 2 out of 10 (20%).

(7)<sup>21</sup> Taking the three syllables formed by the latter two of a resolved third foot together with the first of the fourth foot (e.g. *διεκάν-* in 158 *μῶν τὸν λάρυγγα διεκάναξε . . .*), 7 of the 28 cases are broken, a lower percentage (25%) than in any tragedy written after *Supp.* (*Tro.* 28%; *Ion* 30%; *Hel.* 30%; *Phoen.* 35%). Again the number of cases is too small to be significant. Had there been merely one more case the percentage would have been 29.

(8)<sup>22</sup> Taking the three syllables formed by the latter two of a resolved fourth foot together with the first of the fifth foot (e.g. *δοριπετ-* in 305 *πολλῶν νεκρῶν πιούσα δοριπετῆ φόνον*) Sutton claims that there are in Od.'s lines no broken cases, whereas no tragedy written after *El.* fails to contain them. Again, the figures are small: there are 9 cases, of which in fact 2 (287, 433) are broken<sup>23</sup>—a greater frequency than the 9 in the 77 cases in *Phoen.*

(9)<sup>24</sup> There are two fourth-foot trochees composed of one word, i.e. one every 116 lines. The closest tragedy is *Ba.* (1:184). But clearly the numbers are again too small to be significant.

Is it legitimate to take Od.'s trimeters as comparable with tragedy? Significantly, it is almost certain that, in striking contrast to the play as a whole, there is (with the possible exceptions of 260 and 304) nothing in them that could not occur in tragedy. Sutton's case must rest therefore almost entirely on those figures for word-shapes etc. in which it may appear that Od.'s lines diverge from tragedy. But of the apparent divergences it has appeared that there is only one that may be of real significance: (3) the high percentage of all resolutions constituted by first foot anapaests. The other apparent anomalies recorded by Sutton are based often on figures too small to be significant, and sometimes on simple miscounting. Furthermore, most<sup>25</sup> of these criteria when applied to the more substantial number of trimeters in the whole play (585), revert to within the parameters of tragedy: this tells against the interpretation of the apparent anomalies in Od.'s lines as symptomatic of the greater licence of satyric drama. Nor must one forget the twelve other criteria applied by Sutton,<sup>26</sup> on all of which Od.'s lines fall squarely and unequivocally within the parameters of (late) tragedy. In every test there will necessarily be two tragedies (constituting the upper and the lower extremes) which fall outside the parameters of all the others. And so if Od.'s lines sometimes fall outside those parameters, this does not in itself constitute behaviour untypical of tragedy.

Nevertheless, is the one substantial anomaly, Od.'s first foot anapaests, serious enough to preclude us from comparing his lines to tragedy for chronological purposes? This, like most of the other anomalies, reverts, when applied to the whole play, to within the parameters of

<sup>18</sup> Sutton 68, 32, based on Zieliński 201.

<sup>19</sup> Where Sutton appears to have miscounted, I have double checked my own figures. Here 445 and 590 (even a word-group is 'broken': Sutton 31) are certainly of the fourth type; Sutton has also mistakenly included proper names (where here Zieliński excludes them).

<sup>20</sup> Sutton, 69, 37, based on Zieliński 152, 161, 181–5, 196–8.

<sup>21</sup> Sutton 69, 41–2, based on Zieliński 152, 161, 181–5, 196–8.

<sup>22</sup> Sutton 70, 46, based on Zieliński 152–3, 161, 173,

193.

<sup>23</sup> Sutton, it seems, makes the mistake of counting (unlike the comparable data of tragedy) only the words which begin with the resolution.

<sup>24</sup> Sutton 70, 47–8.

<sup>25</sup> The exceptions are dactyls as a proportion of all resolutions, and (naturally) internal change of speaker.

<sup>26</sup> Number of resolutions, of multiple resolutions, tribachs as a proportion of all resolutions, third foot resolutions as a proportion of all resolutions, distribution of first foot tribrach word-forms, etc., etc.

tragedy: this tells against it being a symptom of satyric licence, and suggests that a mere 233 lines even of tragedy might produce anomalies which a larger sample would not. In order to test this possibility, I took the first 233 spoken trimeters of *Orestes*, (in my view the closest in time to *Cyclops*) and applied to them the criteria on which, according to Sutton, Od.'s lines diverge from tragedy. No less than three of these criteria produced figures falling outside the parameters of tragedy. (2)<sup>27</sup> Dactyls constitute 34.8% of all resolutions (the figure for Od.'s lines is 35%). (5) The distribution of anapaestic word-forms is 13:8:0:0. (6) Taking the three syllables formed by the latter two of a resolved second foot together with the first of the third foot, we find that of 28 cases only one is broken, at 3.6% a percentage lower than in any tragedy (*El.* is closest with 4% then *Phoen.* with 11%).<sup>28</sup> It does seem that the application of these few arbitrarily selected criteria to an arbitrarily selected passage of tragedy has made the tragic passage appear no less discrepant from tragedy than do Od.'s lines subjected to all the criteria applied by Sutton. I have little doubt that the application of all these other criteria to the *Orestes* passage, and of all criteria to other 233-line sections of tragedy, would produce similar results. To conclude, it seems that Sutton has failed to prise apart Od.'s lines from tragedy.

It is one thing to say that Sutton has failed to prise apart Od.'s lines from tragedy, but quite another to maintain that Od.'s lines can be compared to tragedy as a guide to chronology. The latter point can never be known for certain, because it is always possible firstly that 260 and 304 do represent features alien to tragedy, and secondly that Euripides allowed more and different kinds of resolution at an earlier date (even in Od.'s lines) in satyric drama than in tragedy. However, a strong probability can be established. As will have appeared from the previous section, mere frequency of resolution is not the only metrical guide to chronology. Zieliński formulated ten 'laws' about word-shapes in the trimeter, the progressive infringement of which is described by Dale as 'half-conscious and uncalculated, a willing habituation of the poet's ear to various phenomena, so that they become each year a little commoner'.<sup>29</sup> The reliability of these criteria for chronology (and other similar ones: see below) is demonstrated by the plays of known date, and confirmed by the coherence of the criteria among themselves.

Applied to Od.'s lines, as we shall see, these criteria place the *Cyclops* in the last six years of Euripides' life. Faced with this result, the devil's advocate has to fall back on the argument that Euripides' ear may have been, half consciously, willing to accept certain tendencies in Od.'s lines in the *Cyclops* at an earlier date than it became habituated to them in tragedy, and in this way the wedge can be maintained between Od.'s lines and tragedy. Before proceeding to the criteria themselves, this argument must be dealt with. The fact is that unlike, for example, illicit anapaests or frequent internal change of speaker, the phenomena in question seem unlikely to be affected by any conscious or unconscious change of gear in the poet's mind as he passes from tragedy to satyr play: they are not a matter either of licence or of mood, but are embedded deep within the poet's half-conscious conception of the trimeter. If in composing Od.'s trimeters Euripides had consciously or unconsciously adopted a mood sufficiently distinct from tragedy as to exaggerate half-conscious metrical tendencies, then we would expect *a fortiori* this mood to be manifested also in the *style* of Od.'s utterance generally, notably in his vocabulary.

P. T. Stevens has made a detailed survey of colloquial expressions in Euripides.<sup>30</sup> Of those

<sup>27</sup> Numbered headings refer to (ii) above. The trimeters concerned are 1-309 (lines square-bracketed in Murray's text are excluded).

<sup>28</sup> Figures from Sutton 37, Zieliński 152, 161-2, 181-5, 196-8. First foot anapaests (the only substantial anomaly in Od.'s lines: 23% of all resolutions) form 10% of all resolutions; but there are 12 cases, only two less than are uttered by Od.

<sup>29</sup> Zieliński; A. M. Dale, *Euripides Helen* (Oxford 1967) xxv. Dale prefers Zieliński to the subsequent work of e.g. Ceadel, inasmuch as Z. starts not from

'feet' but from word-shapes in the trimeter: 'the really crucial patterns start in the middle of the "foot" and cross the bar into the following one—naturally, since the words with which the dramatist operates are in overwhelming majority so distributed . . .'

<sup>30</sup> With careful although perhaps insufficient consideration of the evidence and criteria for colloquialisms ('the kind of language that in poetic or prosaic context would stand out however slightly as having a distinctly conversational flavour'): *Hermes Einzels.* xxxviii (1976).

that occur in tragedy 32 occur also in *Cyclops*. And we can add 28 cases which occur in *Cyclops* but not in tragedy. The total number of cases<sup>31</sup> (60) expressed as a percentage of the number of iambic trimeters and trochaic tetrameters<sup>32</sup> (585) is 10.3, whereas Euripidean tragedy ranges from 2.4% (*IT*) to 4.4% (*HF*, *Or.*). The spoken language of the *Cyclops* has therefore significantly more colloquialisms than that of tragedy. But in the 233 lines spoken by Odysseus there are, in striking contrast, only 9 colloquialisms, i.e. 3.9%, which is well within the range of tragedy. Furthermore, of all the 28 cases of colloquialism in *Cyclops* that do not appear in tragedy, only one is uttered by Odysseus: at 701 he tells the blinded Polyphemos *κλαίειν σ' ἄνωγα* (cf. e.g. *Ar. Ach.* 1131). However, this is not a real exception. Odysseus uses the 'untragic expression' only in order to echo Polyphemos' earlier rebuff to himself (338–40 *οἱ δὲ τοὺς νόμους ἔθεντο . . . κλαίειν ἄνωγα*) and adds *καὶ δέδραχ' ὅπερ λέγω*: 'and I (unlike you) have done what I say (whereas Polyphemos has to rely on mere prophecy, 698–700). I have actually made you *κλαίειν*'. In Odysseus' mouth the phrase's very incongruity, amplified by his over-literal interpretation (Polyphemos' eye is bleeding, cf. 174, 490), serves to emphasise the resourceful cruelty of the echo. And so we can say that the language of the *Cyclops* strikingly confirms the view that in composing Od.'s lines Euripides did not, either consciously or unconsciously, adopt a mood sufficiently distinct from tragedy as to exaggerate half-conscious metrical tendencies. Indeed, it appears important to the humorous incongruity inherent in the play precisely that in general Odysseus should *not* descend from the tone of tragedy.<sup>33</sup> Conversely, given the untragic degree of colloquialism in the lines of the other speakers, it is probably unsafe to apply criteria such as Zieliński's to them as well.

As for the fragments of fifth-century satyric drama, they do nothing to alter the picture presented by *Cyclops*. There are colloquialisms and metrical licences unknown in tragedy, but none of them are known to be, and some of them are known not to be, uttered by a *persona tragica*. The fragments are on the whole not extensive enough to make the counting of resolutions worth while. But it should perhaps be noticed that the satyric fragments of Aeschylus and Sophocles exhibit a frequency of resolution in the trimeter only slightly greater than that of their tragedies, and that the longest satyric fragment of Euripides, *fr.* 282 (from the *Autolycus*), contains no irregularities and only 3 resolutions in 28 lines.<sup>34</sup>

We may now proceed to apply to Od.'s trimeters all those criteria (many of them Zieliński's) which have been shown to be chronologically significant when applied to tragedy, as well as others for which some chronological significance has been claimed. For this purpose it will be useful to use Zieliński's classification of the plays into four groups, modified by the elimination of the *Rhesus* and the transference of *Electra* from group 3 to the end of group 2:<sup>35</sup> (1) before 427 BC (*Alc.*, *Med.*, *Hipp.*, *Held.*); (2) 427–c.417 (*Andromache*, *Hec.*, *Supp.*, *El.*); (3) c.416–409 (*HF*, *Tro.*, *Ion*, *IT*, *Hel.*, *Phoen.*); (4) 408–6 (*Or.*, *IA*, *Ba.*).

A.<sup>36</sup> The number of trimeters per resolution ranges in group (1) from 23.5–15.3, in (2) from 8.8–5.9, in (3) from 4.7–3.6, in (4) from 2.9–2.5. In Od.'s trimeters it is 3.8. The closest tragedies are *Hel.* (412 BC) with 3.6 and *Phoen.* (411–09) with 3.9. In the other trimeters of *Cyclops* (excluding the formal *agon*) it is 2.1.

B.<sup>37</sup> Before group (3) there is only one stretch of more than three lines each containing one or more resolution (in *El.*). *Tro.* has 3, *IT* 3, *Ion* 4, *Hel.* 4, *Phoen.* 6, *Or.* 13, *Ba.* 5, *IA* 10. In Od.'s 233 trimeters there is one (433–6).

C.<sup>38</sup> Lines containing two or more resolved feet occur in (1) every 413 lines (ranging play by play

<sup>31</sup> Stevens' total (p. 65) is 48, presumably because he excludes what he refers to as 'non-tragic features of vocabulary, apart from colloquialisms in the present sense'. But this makes no difference to our argument.

<sup>32</sup> There are in fact no trochaic tetrameters in *Cyc.*

<sup>33</sup> See e.g. 103–5, 175–86, 310–15.

<sup>34</sup> Aesch. has 4 resolutions in 41 complete trimeters, Soph. 16 in 134 (of which *Ichn.* has 11 in 93). Sutton is

forced to suppose that E.'s satyr-plays may have developed metrically in a manner similar, but not exactly parallel, to tragedy.

<sup>35</sup> G. Zuntz, *The Political Plays of Euripides* (Manchester 1955) 66–71; Dale (n. 29) xxiv–xxv.

<sup>36</sup> Zieliński 140–1.

<sup>37</sup> Ceadel 82.

<sup>38</sup> Zieliński 142, 154, 164, 186.

from 888 to 267), in (2) every 196 (from 457 to 120), in (3) every 54 (70–45), in (4) every 22 (34–19). For Od.'s lines the figure is 46.

All three of these developments express the increasing frequency of resolutions. Whereas the following thirteen are independent of this increase.

D.<sup>39</sup> In (1) there is only one first foot dactyl (0.5% of all resolutions). In (2) there are 21 (4.1% of all resolutions). In (3) there are 139 (9%). In (4) 132 (12.3%). In Od.'s lines 4 (6.6%).

E.<sup>40</sup> In (1) all 20 first foot tribrachs are constituted by a single word. In (2) there are 7 exceptions in 30 cases (23%). In (3) 45 exceptions in 120 cases (38%). In (4) 26 exceptions in 61 cases (43%). In Od.'s lines there are 3 exceptions in 6 cases (50%).

F.<sup>41</sup> When the fourth element is resolved there is always a caesura after the fifth, with in (1) 1 exception in 24 cases (4%), (2) 7 exceptions in 88 cases (8%), (3) 29 exceptions in 257 cases (11.3%), (4) 41 exceptions in 240 cases (17.1%). In Od.'s lines there is one exception (425) in 10 cases (10%).

G. The anapaestic word occupying the fourth and fifth elements (e.g. *ὤς κείνος ἀφανής* . . .) becomes more frequent. According to Dale<sup>42</sup> there are in *Med.* 3 (4.4% of all resolutions), in *IT* 17 (7%), in *Hel.* (excluding the name Helen) 24 (6.7%), in *Or.* 30 (6.7%), in *Ba.* 26 (7.8%). In Od.'s lines there are 4 (5.5%).

H.<sup>43</sup> The paeonic word occupying the third, fourth, and fifth elements (e.g. *ἐς γῆν ἐναλίαν* . . .) does not occur in any play before 415 BC. From then on we have *Tro.* 2, *HF* 3, *IT* 0, *Ion* 4, *Hel.* 5, *Phoen.* 7, *Or.* 16, *Ba.* 19, *IA* 14. In Od.'s lines there is one (590).

I.<sup>44</sup> The proceleusmatic word occupying the third, fourth and fifth elements (e.g. *Ἄτρῆως ἐλέγετο* . . .) also occurs in only the last two groups (2 in *IT*, 1 in *Hel.*, 9 in *Ba.*, 5 in *IA*). There is no case in Od.'s lines.

J.<sup>45</sup> Third foot resolutions as a percentage of all resolutions range in (1) from 61 to 58, in (2) from 66 to 52, in (3) from 58 to 46, in (4) from 44 to 39. In Od.'s lines they are 44%. The closest tragedy is *Or.* (408 BC) with 44%.

K.<sup>46</sup> A resolved eighth element is followed by a short ninth, with in (1) 2 exceptions (both proper names) in 34 cases (6%), in (2) 25 exceptions (18 of them proper names) in 72 cases (35%), in (3) 91 exceptions (24 of them proper names) in 220 cases (41%), in (4) 80 exceptions (17 of them proper names) in 165 cases (48%). In Od.'s lines there is one exception (394, not a proper name) in 7 cases (14%).

L.<sup>47</sup> In (1) there is no certain case of resolution of the fifth foot; in (2) there is one (0.2% of all resolutions), in (3) there are 21 (1.4%), in (4) 10 (0.9%). There is one (348) in Od.'s lines (1.4%).

M.<sup>48</sup> Zieliński looked at syllables short by 'weak position' in the necessarily short elements (third, seventh and eleventh), and found that the proportion of such syllables in the third element tended to decrease, that the proportion in the seventh element tended to remain stable, and that (necessarily) the proportion in the eleventh element tended to increase. The percentages for the third and eleventh elements are in (1) 41 and 37, in (2) 32 and 46, in (3) 32 and 47, in (4) 25 and 52. In Od.'s lines they are 34 and 50.

N.<sup>49</sup> Both syllables of a resolved element are naturally short (i.e. not by 'weak position'), with in (1) 6 exceptions (2.7% of all resolutions), in (2) 29 exceptions (5.4%), in (3) 111 (7%), in (4) 56 (5.2%). In Od.'s lines there are 2 exceptions (2.7%).

O.<sup>50</sup> Except for in the first foot, resolutions make the beginning of a word, with in (1) 2 exceptions (0.9% of all resolutions), in (2) 6 (1.1%), in (3) 32 (2%), in (4) 74 (6.9%). In Od.'s lines there are 2 exceptions (2.7%).

P.<sup>51</sup> Resolutions are in words of three or more syllables, with in (1) 13 exceptions (5.9% of all resolutions), in (2) 84 (15.5%), in (3) 360 (22.6%), in (4) 311 (28.8%). In Od.'s lines there are 12 (19.7%). The closest tragedies are *El.*, *Tro.*, *Hel.*, *Ion*, *Phoen.*, each with between 21% and 22%.

<sup>39</sup> Ceadel 71–2.

<sup>40</sup> Zieliński 145, 155, 169, 187.

<sup>41</sup> Zieliński 147, 159, 175, 193.

<sup>42</sup> *Op. cit.* (n. 29) xxvi.

<sup>43</sup> Dale (n. 29) xxvi–xxvii.

<sup>44</sup> Dale (n. 29) xxvii–xxviii.

<sup>45</sup> Zieliński 144, 155, 166, 187.

<sup>46</sup> Zieliński 146, 157, 170–3, 192.

<sup>47</sup> Zieliński 146, 157, 174, 191.

<sup>48</sup> Zieliński 207–8. He did not count cases where a vowel in one word is followed by two syllables in the next.

<sup>49</sup> Zieliński 151, 160, 179, 195.

<sup>50</sup> Zieliński 148, 159, 176, 194.

<sup>51</sup> Zieliński 152, 161, 181, 196.

The remaining eight tests are listed only because they have been advanced as chronologically significant, although in each case there is good reason for supposing that this is not so.

Q.<sup>52</sup> The number of anapaests (proper names excluded, and so all in the first foot) as a percentage of all resolutions is in (1) 10.4, in (2) 11.4, in (3) 9.6, in (4) 9.9, in Od.'s lines 23 (see above). Clearly there is no significant trend.

R. The distribution of anapaestic word forms in the first foot—see (ii) (5) above—is in (1) 3:15:2:1, in (2) 17:34:5:1, in (3) 47:75:14:4, (4) 37:48:14:7, in Od.'s lines 5:7:0:2. Clearly there is no significant development in the proportions.

S.<sup>53</sup> The second foot tribrach as a percentage of all resolutions shows an increase: (1) 10.9; (2) 14.3; (3) 13.6; (4) 19.6. Od.'s lines have 16.3. But an indication of the limited value of this test for chronology is the fact that the percentage in *Phoen.* (12, 411–09 BC) is the same as in *Alc.* (438 BC) and less than in *Held.* (16, group (2)).

T.<sup>54</sup> After a resolved fourth element (second foot tribrach) the fifth is long, with in (1) 8 exceptions in 24 cases (33%), in (2) 26 exceptions in 88 cases (30%), in (3) 85 exceptions in 257 cases (33%), in (4) 60 exceptions in 240 cases (25%). In Od.'s lines there are 4 exceptions in 10 cases (40%). Clearly there is no significant trend.

U.<sup>55</sup> Third foot dactyls are in (1) 43% of all resolutions, in (2) 45%, in (3) 37%, in (4) 28%, in Od.'s lines 31%. But an indication of the limited value of this test for chronology is the fact that the percentage in *Alc.* (32, 438 BC) is less than in *Phoen.* (37, 411–09 BC).

V.<sup>56</sup> Resolved third feet always contain a caesura, with in (3) 2 exceptions in 834 cases, in (4) 5 exceptions in 443 cases. In Od.'s lines there are in the 19 cases no exceptions. Clearly there are not enough cases in (1) and (2), or enough exceptions in (3) and (4), to make the absence of exceptions in (1) and (2) significant.

W.<sup>57</sup> Lines with 3 resolutions: *Or.* has 7, and *El.*, *IT*, *Ion*, *Phoen.*, *IA* one each. Od.'s lines have none. But even if the relatively late appearance of this feature has any significance independent of the increasing frequency of resolutions described in (A) above, its absence (as in e.g. *Ba.*) is of no chronological significance.

Tests A to P fall roughly into three categories:

(a) A, B, and C express the increasing frequency of resolution.

(b) J, M, and P express developments which, like A, B, and C, are based on a substantial number of cases (though P on considerably less than the others), but which are independent of the increasing frequency of resolution expressed by A, B, and C.

(c) All the other tests are based on a small number of cases, especially in Od.'s lines. And so if they are to be taken seriously, the development between chronological groups must be striking enough to overcome the handicap inherent in the smallness of the numbers. F, G, I, and N fail this test.<sup>58</sup>

(a) puts the *Cyclops* at the end of group (3), about 412–09 BC. As for (b), M can do no more than suggest a date roughly in (2) and (3), P roughly in late (2) and (3); but J definitely indicates about the beginning of (4).

With (c) we have to be more careful. There are four tests (E, H, K, L) in which a feature occurs in Od.'s lines, but not at all in group (1). Each of these features had more opportunity to occur in group (1) than in Od.'s lines. And so even though there are in all only 6 cases in Od.'s lines, the discrepancy is significant, in that it seems that in group (1) the feature was simply not yet part of Euripides' repertory (*cf.* the remarks of Dale, above n. 29). And so if taken cumulatively, these tests constitute what seems to me an excellent case for placing the play after group (1), i.e. after 427 BC. The case is strengthened still further by D and perhaps O, in which there is a considerable discrepancy in percentages between group (1) and Od.'s lines.

<sup>52</sup> Sutton 24, based on Ceadel 72.

<sup>53</sup> Ceadel 72.

<sup>54</sup> Zieliński 147, 159, 175, 193.

<sup>55</sup> Ceadel 72.

<sup>56</sup> Zieliński 148, 159, 175–6, 193.

<sup>57</sup> Zieliński 142, 154, 165, 187.

<sup>58</sup> Dale overemphasised the importance of G, perhaps because she expressed its frequency as a percentage not of resolutions but of trimeters. There is no case of I in Od.'s lines, but neither is there in e.g. *Phoen.* As for F and N, the number of cases, at least in Od.'s lines, is too small; and in N the development is not a definite one.

In one test (H) a feature occurs in Od.'s lines but not at all in either of the first *two* groups. The same argument then applies for a *terminus post quem* as with E, H, K, and L in the previous paragraph. But because we have here an isolated example, it is weaker, even though the opportunity for the occurrence of the feature was in group (2) considerable, much greater even than in group (1). It is doubtful that E, L, or O can be used to strengthen the argument.

Taken together, all these criteria constitute a strong case for placing the *Cyclops* at about the end of group (3), say c. 412–08 BC. This is consistent with all the valid tests, and positively indicated by several. The most telling perhaps is J: it is based on a very large number of cases; it is however more subtle than A, B, and C; and it gives a more precise result than M and P. Other telling criteria are A, H, and P.

## II. THE NON-METRICAL CRITERIA

Chronological criteria based on the supposed development of such features as colloquialisms, neologisms, and dramatic technique in tragedy are mostly of dubious value even for tragedy, and clearly unsuitable for a satyr play; and even Od.'s lines are either inappropriate (dramatic technique) or an insufficient sample (neologisms, colloquialisms).

Nor can anything be inferred from paintings of satyrs with Polyphemos, which are of uncertain date, may have been inspired by another satyric *Cyclops*, and even if inspired by Euripides' may have been painted years after the first production.<sup>59</sup> And although the play is certainly influenced in a general way by contemporary events, it is equally certain that there is no reference in it specific enough to allow a precise dating. Attempts to date the play by these criteria are quite rightly rejected by Sutton.

The only remaining criterion is provided by similarities with specific passages of other plays of known date. This criterion too has been violently abused.<sup>60</sup> The most serious recent attempt of this kind is by Sutton,<sup>61</sup> who argues on the basis of similarities with *Hecuba* that *Cyclops* was produced in the same trilogy (probably 424 BC). The similarities he adduces are as follows. The name of the villain of *Hec.*, Polymestor, is an invented character with a name modelled on the villain Polyphemos. In both plays this villain, having violated a position of trust, is blinded by his victims. In both plays the structure of the blinding is as follows:<sup>62</sup> there is a preparatory exploitation of the villain's special weakness, the entry of the villain and his punisher into the *skene*, choral invective against the villain, his cries from within, his emergence groping blindly for his punisher, who eludes and reviles him as he threatens pelting, and finally his accurate prediction of sufferings for his punisher. And there are similarities in diction: cf. *Hec.* 1034–40 with *Cyc.* 663–7 (esp. ὦμοι . . . ὀμμάτων τάλας/ὀφθαλμοῦ σέλας and ὦμοι μάλ' . . . ἀλλ' οὔτι μὴ φύγητε in both passages). Furthermore, 'in both plays an appeal for mercy, based on νόμος, similarly defined, is rejected with a cold and brutal lecture on expedience'.<sup>63</sup> And so, it is concluded, the *Cyclops* parodies the *Hecuba*, just as Sophocles' satyric *Ichneutae* parodies his *Ajax* and perhaps Euripides' satyric *Sisyphus* his *Alexander*.

The central weakness of Sutton's case is encapsulated in his attempt to pre-empt the criticism that the similarities in diction should be dismissed as no more than examples of Euripides' tendency to repeat phrases:<sup>64</sup> 'But within the context of strikingly similar scenes', he writes,

<sup>59</sup> Paintings: the Richmond Vase (415–10 BC?): A. D. Trendall, *The Red-Figured Vases of Lucania, Campania and Sicily* (Oxford 1967) i 27. Timanthes: Pliny *NH* xxxv 74. Other satyric *Cyclops*: e.g. Aristias'.

<sup>60</sup> E.g. van Leeuwen in *Mnemos.* xvi (1888) 429 ff. (*Wasps*); cf. E. Roos, *Die Tragische Orchestik im Zerrbild der Altattischen Comödie* (Lund 1951) 190–9.

<sup>61</sup> Sutton, *GSP* (n. 2) 114–20: this develops the work of H. Grégoire in *AC* ii (1933) 131, E. Delebecque,

*Euripide et la Guerre du Péloponnèse* (Paris 1951) 161–77, and G. Kaibel in *Hermes* xxx (1895) 82–5.

<sup>62</sup> *Hec.* 1035–1295; *Cyc.* 655–709.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. *Cyc.* 299–303, 338–40, with *Hec.* 291, 299–331. νόμος as a desirable standard of action occurs also at *Hec.* 800; cf. 866, 976.

<sup>64</sup> Sutton, *GSP* (n. 2) 115; on repetitions in drama see e.g. Milman Parry, *HSCP* xli (1930) 97–114 (repr. in *The Making of Homeric Verse* [Oxford 1964] 285–98).

'these parallels acquire undeniable significance.' In fact however the similarity of context is an argument in precisely the opposite direction. As Sutton is well aware, both Agamemnon in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* and Klytimestra in Sophocles' *Electra* cry from within, on being struck, ὤμοι πέπληγμαι . . ., and then, on being struck again, ὤμοι μάλ' αἰθις . . . Polymestor (ὤμοι τυφλοῦμαι φέγγος ὀμμάτων τάλας . . . ὤμοι μάλ' αἰθις . . .) and Polyphemos (ὤμοι κατηνθρακώμεθ' ὀφθαλμοῦ σέλας . . . ὤμοι μάλ' . . .) also cry out from within when being unexpectedly struck. But they, having been merely blinded, differ from Agamemnon and Klytimestra by virtue of the fact that they emerge alive and blindly groping for their punisher, who eludes and reviles them: there is nothing surprising in all this. The similarity of the cry in all four cases does not mean that the four plays were written even within a generation of each other. It seems rather that the dramatist, when treating a situation identical or similar to one in a previous play either by himself or by another, is not always concerned to devise structure or diction that is entirely original, but will draw, consciously or unconsciously, and even after a lapse of years, on a stock of metrical phrases that is not the private property of one individual. Modern preconceptions of creative originality seem to have blinded certain scholars to this element in dramatic composition even after they must presumably have become aware of its much greater presence in Homeric epic. Almost all the attempts to date the *Cyclops* by comparison with other plays are flawed by this blindness. For example, Sutton maintains that anybody who supposes that *Hecuba* and *Cyclops* were not written together is under the obligation of providing an alternative explanation of the resemblances between them.

When in *Cyclops* (424–7) Polyphemos gets drunk, this is described in terms similar to the drunkenness of Herakles in *Alcestis* (756–63) of 438 BC: the same contrast is brought out between singing and simultaneous lamentation, and there are similarities of diction (ἄμουσα as the first word in the line, and θερμαίνειν).<sup>65</sup> In three of Euripides' plays (*Cyc.*, *IT* of c. 412 BC, *Hel.* of 412 BC) Greeks arrive by sea in a foreign land, where they are in danger of being killed, but, together with other Greeks whom they find held captive there by the killer, they deceive him and make their escape. And along with these and other similarities of plot there are similarities of diction.<sup>66</sup> Sutton acknowledges the similarities between these three plays, but dismisses them as symptomatic not of date but of genre. In this he is perfectly correct. But what he fails to see is that the same kind of dismissal can be employed on his own use of *Hecuba*. Elements of the blinding of Polymestor and of Polyphemos may have been conceived under the influence of a type. It is perhaps possible that in his treatment of the blinding of Polyphemos Euripides was influenced, consciously or unconsciously, by the *Hecuba* written (in my view) about sixteen years earlier. But this seems in fact unlikely. More likely, but no less fatal to Sutton's argument, is that elements at least of the type originated in a dramatisation of the *Cyclops* story *previous* to *Hecuba*. We know of three such plays: Epicharmus' comic *Cyclops*, Aristias' satyric *Cyclops*, and Cratinus' comic *Odysseus*; and there may well have been others. Only one line survives from Aristias' play, but enough from Epicharmus' and Cratinus' to display verbal similarities with Euripides' version.<sup>67</sup> It is not unlikely that Euripides in representing the blinding of Polymestor, and of Polyphemos, was influenced, probably unconsciously, by previous dramatic representations of the blinding of Polyphemos. But the mere possibility of this is enough to dissolve the logic used by Sutton to tie *Hecuba* and *Cyclops* together in the same tetralogy.

Some minor elements of Sutton's argument remain to be dealt with. Both *Hecuba* and *Odysseus* appeal unsuccessfully to νόμος: but they both do so because they are both face to face

<sup>65</sup> Cf. also E. fr. 907N, *Alc.* 542. On detailed similarities between *Cyc.* and *Ba.* see Seaford, CQ xxxi (1981) 252–75.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. *Cyc.* 89–90 with *IT* 479, *Cyc.* 91 with *IT* 94, *Cyc.* 249 with *IT* 258, *Cyc.* 300 with *IT* 276, *Cyc.* 353–5 with *IT* 1082–8 (and *Hel.* 1093–1106), *Cyc.* 594 with *IT* 725; *Cyc.* 198–9 with *Hel.* 808, 845, 948–9, *Cyc.* 299 with *Hel.* 832. More similarities of plot: Sutton 104–9.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. Cratin. fr. 143 . . . Φρύξας, ἐψήσας, κάπ' ἀνθρακιάς ὀπτήσας with *Cyc.* 358 ἐφθὰ καὶ ὀπτὰ καὶ ἀνθρακιάς ἀπο . . ., both of the cooked Greeks; Cratin. fr. 135 with *Cyc.* 412; Epich. fr. 83 (Kaibel) with *Cyc.* 568; other examples of verbal similarities with an earlier dramatist's treatment of the same or similar theme: E. *Ba.* and A. *Lycurg.* (Dodds, Euripides *Bacchae* xxviii–xxxii); S. *El.* and A. *Cho.*: G. Thomson on *Cho.* 691–9.

with someone who proposes a brutal murder (Odysseus, Polyphemos). The appeal to νόμος is nothing extraordinary in Euripides,<sup>68</sup> and in these circumstances entirely to be expected.<sup>69</sup> There is no reason to suppose parody. Secondly, there is no tangible evidence whatsoever to suppose that any satyr play verbally parodied a previous play in the same tetralogy. In four of the five known tetralogies of Aeschylus the satyr play derives from the same area of myth as the tragedies, and there *may* have been parody. There is no reason to believe that Sophocles' *Ichneutae* parodied, or was produced together with, his *Ajax*.<sup>70</sup> As for Euripides, it is no more than a guess to say that his *Sisypheus* parodied the *Alexander*.<sup>71</sup> Finally, in the Polymestor episode it appears that Euripides is following a local myth,<sup>72</sup> and is unlikely to have invented Polymestor's name. Even if he did, it would be worse than pointless, in a tragedy, to model it on Polyphemos'.<sup>73</sup>

There are however some parallels with other plays, most of them ignored by Sutton, which *can* be used to date the *Cyclops*. In Euripides' *Andromeda* (412 BC) Perseus' first words on seeing Andromeda are (*fr.* 125 ἔα τίν' ὄχθον τόνδ' ὀρώ περίρρυτον κτλ.). This was parodied by Aristophanes the next year in *Thesmophoriazousae* (1105f.): ἔα τίν' ὄχθον τόνδ' ὀρώ καὶ παρθένον κτλ.; In *Cyclops* the first words of Polyphemos on seeing the Greeks are (222) ἔα τίν' ὄχλον τόνδ' ὀρώ πρὸς αὐλίοις κτλ.; Milman Parry suggested that here Euripides is 'answering Aristophanes' mockery by mocking himself'.<sup>74</sup> This is I think correct. The similarity between the lines in *Andromeda* and *Cyclops* is of a different kind from that described above. There is not enough similarity of situation to demand the same stock phrase, but there is enough to make the self-parody recognisable. And the similarity of phrase seems too elaborate to be unconscious, partly because it is achieved largely by coincidence of *sound* (ὄχθον and ὄχλον). The point is clinched by the parody in Aristophanes. Here then is a deliberate echo. If so, it seems unlikely that Euripides would introduce a ridiculous echo of a satyr play into the tragic *Andromeda*. It must be the other way around.

Polyphemos continues (223–5)

λησταί τινες κατέσχον ἢ κλώπες χθόνα;  
ὀρώ γέ τοι τούσδ' ἄρνας ἐξ ἄντρων ἐμῶν  
στρεπταῖς λύγοισι σῶμα συμπεπλεγμένους.

In 225 συμπεπλεγμένους means not just tied up (as συνδέω in 238) or tied together (as συνέεργον ἐϋστρεφέεσσι λύγοισι at *Od.* ix 247), but woven or *entwined* together, like wrestlers (*Hdt.* iii 78), lovers (*Pl. Symp.* 191a), words (*Pl. Sophist* 262d), or a garland (*Plut. Eum.* 6). Conceivably it could mean here that the sheep are entwined together like wrestlers. But then the singular σῶμα is odd.<sup>75</sup> We should perhaps read Blaydes' previously ignored σώματ' ἐμπεπλεγμένους. The sheep are enmeshed in the withies like Hippolytus in the reins (*Hipp.* 1236 ἡνίαισιν ἐμπλακεῖς) or Jokasta in the noose (*S. OT* 1264 πλεκταῖσιν αἰώραισιν

<sup>68</sup> Cf. e.g. *Supp.* 378, 526, 571, *Or.* 523, *fr.* 337.2; L. Paganelli, *Echi Storico-Politici nel 'Ciclope' Euripideo* (Padua 1979) 53.

<sup>69</sup> Sutton points out that it does not occur in *IT* or *Helen*. But that is because there is no such confrontation as is required by the plots of the *Hec.* and *Cyc.* Did it occur in those satyr-plays in which there probably was such a direct confrontation? Sutton anticipates the question (*GSP* [n. 2] 119): 'there is no reason, for example, to think that Euripides developed the idea of civilised versus barbaric behaviour as explicitly in such similar satyr-plays as *Sciron* and *Syleus*, or that he expressed this contrast in terms of *nomos*.' But there is of course equally no reason to suppose that he did not.

<sup>70</sup> Sutton, *GSP* (n. 2) 47–8, and *Arethusa* iv (1970) 60, 67. In fact there are only similarities of the kind already discussed.

<sup>71</sup> G. Murray in *Mélanges Glotz* (Paris 1932) ii 646; J. Ferguson, *TAPA* c (1969) 110; R. Scodel, *The Trojan Trilogy of Euripides* (Göttingen 1980). No less of a guess is it to say that it parodied *Od.*'s cunning in *Palamedes* and *Troades*.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. *V. Aen.* iii 41–68; *Serv.* in *V. Aen.* iii 15; *Plin. NH* iv 18.41; Méridier, *Budé Hecuba* p. 173.

<sup>73</sup> For other explanations of the name see s.v. 'Polymestor' in Roscher, *Lex. Myth.*

<sup>74</sup> *HSCP* xli (1930) 140–1 (= *Making of Homeric Verse* [n. 64] 319).

<sup>75</sup> Kühner–Gerth (i 15) give only one parallel for the singular σῶμα with a plural: *HF* 703 πέπλοις κοσμεῖσθε σῶμα, where the plurality is unimportant. At *IT* 1155 σῶμα λάμπονται πυρί read σώμαθ' ἄππονται (Heimsoeth).

ἐμπεπλεγμένην). At *Thesm.* 1032 (ἐν πυκνοῖς δεσμοῖσιν ἐμπεπλεγμένην) Aristophanes is again parodying Euripides' description of Andromeda. And if Blaydes' emendation of *Cyc.* 225 is right, Euripides at *Cyc.* 225 maintains the answering self-parody of Perseus' entry by going on to compare implicitly the lambs to Andromeda. This extra detail may serve to confirm Parry's view. And in fact the self-parody may begin a little earlier, at Polyphemos' very first words on entry (203: before he sees the Greeks), ἀνεχε πάρεχε, which are also the first words uttered by Cassandra on her entry (308) in *Troades* (415 BC). It seems that the phrase was used in everyday life (Ar. *Vesp.* 1326). Still, its occurrence here (for the same reasons as 222) looks like self-parody, compounded perhaps by Polyphemos wielding his club in a manner reminiscent of Cassandra wielding her torch.<sup>76</sup>

The non-metrical evidence thus points to a date shortly after *Andromeda* (412 BC) and *Thesm.* (411 BC). This coheres splendidly with the metrical evidence. It may be possible to be yet more specific. The year 408 BC was suggested to A. M. Dale by a single consideration: at the very end of the play Polyphemos says that in order to pelt the departing Greeks he will go up to the cliff δι' ἀμφιτρῆτος τῆσδε (707). She takes this 'strangely elliptical phrase' to be a reference to the cave of Philoctetes (*S. Phil.* 19 δι' ἀμφιτρῆτος αὐλίου, cf. 16–18, 159, 952) lovingly presented to the audience of the previous year's tragedies.<sup>77</sup> *Philoctetes* was produced in 409 BC. The adjective ἀμφιτρῆς, 'pierced through' (here meaning with another entrance at the back) occurs nowhere else: and so the omission of the noun<sup>78</sup> is surprising, particularly as there has been no previous suggestion of this feature of the cave.<sup>79</sup> All this suggests a parodic allusion to Sophocles' tragedy. And it should be added that the word used for 'cave' in the parodied phrase (αὐλίον) occurs with this sense outside the *Philoctetes* only to refer to Polyphemos' cave again in the *Cyclops* (345).

To conclude, it is very probable that the *Cyclops* was written after the production of *Thesmophoriazusae* in 411 BC, in the last five years of Euripides' life, most likely in 409 BC to be produced along with *Orestes* in 408 BC.

### III. IMPLICATIONS OF THE DATE

It has been argued recently by L. Paganelli<sup>80</sup> that the *Cyclops* displays various attitudes and preoccupations which are characteristic of Euripidean tragedies written after 416 BC and which can be related to contemporary historical developments. For example, he points out that the (unhomeric) Sicilian setting is referred to no less than fifteen times in the course of a very short play. He sees in Polyphemos certain characteristics associated with Sicily (his 'almost Gorgianic rhetoric', ὀψοφαγία, despotism, and Hellenism mixed with barbarism<sup>81</sup>), and in the terms of Odysseus' appeal to Polyphemos (290–8), 'We saved Greece from the Trojans', he sees one of the elements of Athenian propaganda: 'we saved Greece from the Persians'.<sup>82</sup> It seems to me that neither these features nor any of the others adduced by Paganelli can be used to date the play.

<sup>76</sup> Seaford, *CQ* xxv (1975) 198.

<sup>77</sup> *WS* lxix (1956) 106 (= *Collected Papers* 129): 'It may be objected that the nightmare of the closed cave is thereby spoilt; not more, however, than by the earlier necessity of letting Odysseus out on the stage (426–7) to give his narrative speech and lay the plot with the satyrs.' At the end of the play Polyphemos has to be got off the stage somehow. Cf. also Dale in *Maia* xv (1963) 313 (= *Collected Papers* 183); Sutton, *GSP* (n. 2) 120 f.

<sup>78</sup> There is nothing wrong with the text: V. Schmidt in *Maia* xxvii (1975) 202; O. Zwierlein in *Gnomon* xxxix (1967) 453–4.

<sup>79</sup> Except perhaps in 60, where the satyrs are persuading the sheep to enter the cave. L has εἰς αὐλὸν

πότ' ἀμφιβαίνεις, but responson requires a short penultimate. Almost all emendations ignore the fact that ἀμφι- with verbs of motion suggests *encompassment*. Read perhaps ἀμφίθυρον (for the ellipse of the verb of motion—which may have caused the corruption—in a shepherd's orders to his flock cf. Theoc. viii 45–50, *et al.*); if so, this would be a parodic allusion to *S. Phil.* 159 οἶκον μὲν ὄρας τόνδ' ἀμφίθυρον πετρίνης κοίτης.

<sup>80</sup> *Op. cit.* (n. 68).

<sup>81</sup> Paganelli (n. 68) 121–2; *Cyc.* 316 ff., 214 ff., 241 ff.; Seaford (n. 76) 200–2; *Συρακοσία τράπεζα* Pl. *Rep.* 404d, etc.; despotism: Thuc. vi 38.3.

<sup>82</sup> Thuc. vi 82–3; cf. vi 76.4, vii 63.4 (cf. *Cyc.* 297); Hdt. vii 157.2, 159, 161.3; Diod. Sic. xiii 25.2.

Nevertheless, now that we have arrived at the date by a safer route, they should be seen through the eyes of an Athenian audience watching the play, as we believe,<sup>83</sup> in the period immediately after the Sicilian disaster. And to this purpose one further observation remains to be made.

After the final defeat the Athenian prisoners were imprisoned for at least eight months<sup>84</sup> in the dreadful conditions described by Thucydides (vii 87). According to Plutarch (*Nic.* 29) some were sold into slavery, and of these some were saved by Sicilian admiration for their knowledge of Euripides. He adds the picturesque detail that many Athenians who eventually reached home told Euripides gratefully of how they had in this way been freed. Whatever the truth of this, the years immediately after 413 BC must have been for the Athenians tinged with horror and anger at the sufferings of those of their fellow citizens and relatives who had been trapped<sup>85</sup> in the quarry with the growing pile of bodies. In autumn 409 BC, the Athenians imprisoned some captured Syracusans in the Peiraeus stone quarries,<sup>86</sup> no doubt as fitting retaliation. This is the atmosphere in which we must think of the sophisticated<sup>87</sup> Sicilian<sup>88</sup> savage slaughtering the Greeks trapped in his cave, of the reaction not only of Odysseus' men (407–8)

ὅπως ὄρνιθες ἐν μυχοῖς πέτρας  
πτήξαντες εἶχον, αἶμα δ' οὐχ ἐνῆν χροῖ,

but also of the satyrs (363–8)

χαιρέτω μὲν αὖλις ἄδε,  
χαιρέτω δὲ θυμάτων  
ἀποβώμιος ἂν ἴξει θυσίαν†  
Κύκλωψ Αἰτναῖος ξενικῶν  
κρεῶν κεχαρμένος βορᾶ,

and of the final joyful triumph over the ogre followed by the return to Greece.

RICHARD SEAFORD

*The University of Exeter*

<sup>83</sup> Though not Paganelli, who chooses 414–13 BC, on the slender grounds that the Greek triumph over the Sicilian Polyphemos expresses an optimism impossible after that time.

<sup>84</sup> Thuc. says merely that the diet of corn and water lasted ἐπὶ ὀκτώ μηνῶν.

<sup>85</sup> Gomme-Andrewes-Dover *HCT* cite Cicero's description of the quarries three and a half centuries later: 'nihil tam clausum ad exitum, nihil tam saeptum

undique, nihil tam tutum ad custodiam nec fieri nec cogitari potest' (*Verr.* ii 5.68).

<sup>86</sup> Xen. *Hell.* i 2.14; they soon escaped by digging through the rock.

<sup>87</sup> Seaford (n. 76) 200–2.

<sup>88</sup> He is described, more specifically, as living under Aetna (20, 298, etc.). For much of the Sicilian expedition the Athenians were based under Aetna, which can in clear weather be seen from Syracuse.