

THE LOOK OF HARRYHAUSEN'S CYCLOPS: HUMAN VS. MONSTER IN THE EYE OF THE BEHOLDER

© Eleanor Regina O'Kell, University of Leeds

The purpose of this paper is to examine the origins, challenges and legacy of the Cyclops of *The 7th Voyage of Sinbad* (1958), one of Ray Harryhausen's most widely recognised and popular creatures. In the half century since its creation one-eyed gigantic characters based on Harryhausen's Cyclops have appeared frequently in films, computer games and comics. In 2010 Harryhausen's Cyclops itself featured in a sell-out graphic novel (*The Wrath of the Titans: Cyclops*) and DVD-only release animated film (*The Wrath of the Titans*) and still appears in 'Top Ten' lists of cinematic monsters.¹ Yet, Harryhausen never called his Cyclops a 'monster', preferring – as he did for all his creations – the term 'creature'.² 'Creature' is a term that not only suggests a potential to go beyond the frightening/monstrous, but also acknowledges the existence of a creator, whose input, control and decision-making are essential to the way the resulting creation is shaped, presented and understood; particularly when the creation pre-existed as a character.

The 7th Voyage of Sinbad (1958) was directed by Ray Harryhausen's frequent collaborator Nathan H. Juran and acknowledged Harryhausen with a main on-screen credit stating, 'Special Visual Effects Created by Ray Harryhausen'; but Harryhausen was also an associate producer and provided the original story – based on existing stories and characters from the *Arabian Nights* – on which Kenneth Kolb based the film's screenplay. Nor did Harryhausen's influence stop there, as is suggested by Harryhausen's description of his usual creative process:

Most of our projects, being mainly a visual pantomime, usually started with the drawings ... We would have many so-called 'sweat-box' sessions with Charles

[Schneer; the producer], the writer and myself, where we would pick the storyline to pieces and try to fill in any missing pieces. The writer then did a treatment or first draft based on many of the drawings and ideas that surfaced in the meetings... the script is finally completed, I then make about 350-400 simple pen-and-ink sketches of each cut in the effects sequences. ... The shooting of them has to be synchronised for the make-up of the shooting and production schedule ... With some directors, I had friction because they thought I was stepping on their toes when I directed the parts of my scenes ... I am the one who has to finally pull all the pieces together.³

It was as a result of this process that *The 7th Voyage of Sinbad* was the top grossing film of summer 1958 and one of the highest grossing films of that year.⁴ Harryhausen's technically innovative, aesthetically ground-breaking and highly distinctive visual style was central to the premise and execution of this highly successful narrative – as recognised by Charles Schneer's new selling tag, specifically aimed at the 6-19 age-group, the technical-sounding term 'Dynamation' (see 1958 release poster, Figure 1), supposedly inspired by 'Dynaflow' on his car dashboard but evocative of the phrase 'dynamic animation', as well as other cinematic selling tags such as 'Shot in Technicolour' or 'Filmed in Cinemascope'. This tag was later changed to 'Dynarama', e.g. 'The Sheer Magic of Dynarama' on the 1974 cinematic re-release poster (Figure 1).⁵ In film terms, then, Harryhausen is an auteur, both in the sense of 'a figure around whom the key enunciative techniques and meanings of a film accrue and find implied cohesion' and 'an agent who foregrounds the relationship between, and the material conditions of, art and commerce as the underpinning imperative of the approach'.⁶ Without Harryhausen's animations, this film, and the others in which he was involved, would, in the assessment of the animation historian Paul Wells, lose virtually everything of narrative and symbolic consequence (Wells 2002: 91).



Figure 1: Posters associated with the original 1958 cinema release (left) and a 1974 cinema re-release (right); © Columbia Pictures.

The story of *The 7th Voyage of Sinbad* was one that Harryhausen wanted to tell and not just because it had the potential for special effects:

The most important thing is that these approaches [stop-motion or traditional cartoon-making] are not seen as things in themselves; you should not want to go to a film just to see the ‘special effects’. They should be part of the story; the whole picture of the film. Many times in the early days we were accused of doing special effects for the sake of special effects, but actually, we chose the types of stories – Greek myths, for example – where you had to use every trick that you could possibly conceive in order to render the mythological concept on the screen. Very few films were made dealing with Greek myths, and when the Italians made those toga and sandals movies they were vehicles for muscle men. Even the ‘Sinbad’ movies made in Hollywood turned out to be romps over the sand dunes in baggy pants, so I wanted to take these subjects and treat them a little more seriously within their own

fantasy context. I wanted to tell the stories of the Arabian Nights as a child might see and imagine them. I wanted to see a 'Cyclops' on screen.⁷

Yet, there is no Cyclops in the *Arabian Nights*, so the 'Cyclops' Harryhausen wanted to see on screen was his reconfiguration of the black-skinned, man-eating giant whom Sinbad blinded with two roasting spits (one in each eye) in tale 120 of Volume 6 of Sir Richard Burton's 1885 translation of *The Book of One Thousand and One Nights*. It is unlikely that this was a response to Burton's note that this giant 'is distinctly Polyphemus', but it is worth noting that Harryhausen's desire to put a Cyclops on screen would otherwise not have been realised because he adhered to Apollonius, who does not include Cyclopes, as a source for *Jason and the Argonauts* (1963: director Don Chaffey) and never got to make projects based either on Homer's *Odyssey* (*The Story of Odysseus*, 1996-98) or Virgil's *Aeneid* (*Force of the Trojans*, 1984), which could have included a Cyclops.⁸

Harryhausen's initial conception of a Cyclops, based on his own response to Homer, can be discerned from the cinema posters, which were developed from his original green-skinned concept art.⁹ In both posters (Figure 1) the Cyclops is visually set apart from the human characters and its blue-toned or green skin forces its identification as an inhuman, monstrous Other, more closely related to the seascape it stands in to throw rocks at a ship or the dragon it battles than to the human beings shown. However, during production, Harryhausen changed his mind and the Cyclops actually appears in the film with brown skin, which reduces the distance between (viewing) audience and creature: brown is a possible human skin colour.¹⁰ The Cyclops makes its first appearance (Figure 2) towering over a pine-tree-topped cliff, which emphasises its gigantic stature and status as a monster, but its snarled anger is a recognisable, human and justifiable response to its cave home being invaded by a group of men who are engaged in stealing its possessions (treasure).¹¹ It is only with the first

full-length shot that the audience – classicists and non-classicists alike – realise that Harryhausen's Cyclops, although humanoid, is not fully human.¹²



Figure 2: Still of Harryhausen's Cyclops' first appearance on screen, from *The 7th Voyage of Sinbad* (1958). © Columbia Pictures, 1958.



Figure 3: Harryhausen's Cyclops model on a lobby card (8x10 inches) displayed in British cinemas to coincide with the 1958 release. © Columbia Pictures, 1958.

Apart from the single eye, horn, pointed ears and two fingers notable from the opening shots, Harryhausen's Cyclops (Figure 3) has furry goat-like hind quarters and cloven hooves. Audiences may have expected a fully humanoid giant, familiar from children's books of 'Myths and Legends' which include Odysseus' wanderings and the voyages of Sinbad the Sailor, as well as from other previous cinematic attempts at depicting Cyclopes.¹³ The most recent of these were *Ulysse* (1954: released in the USA as *Ulysses* in 1955), directed by Mario Camerini, starring Kirk Douglas as Ulysses, and *The Cyclops* (1957: black and white), written and directed by Bert I. Gordon, who had been given the nickname 'Size Matters' for

his fascination with outsize beasts. *Ulysses'* Cyclops appears on the poster against an orange background in a line drawing where a giant bearded human with a skin round his waist stands on a cliff top and heaves a rock at a departing ship and the audience are encouraged to 'Thrill as Ulysses dares the hideous one-eyed Cyclops!'. The single eye in the centre of the forehead was achieved by adding prosthetic 'skin' to the darkly-tanned, solidly-built, Oscar Andriani. While very impressive, the overall effect is not entirely successful (despite the dim lighting), especially in close-up: his nose has a built-up, widened and twisted bridge, his face reflects the light differently from his neck, chest and shoulders and his eye not only appears disproportionately small but is glassy and unblinking.¹⁴ Similarly, *The Cyclops'* cinematic release poster tantalises audiences with 'Nature gone mad! A world of terror – it was a monster yet it was a man! You'll hardly believe what your own eyes see! The strangest monster the world has ever seen...'. However, the reality does not live up to the hype and the poster artwork implicitly recognises this by representing the Cyclops only as a disembodied single, gigantic, green-brown eye that hovers over a miniature landscape (itself dwarfed by a giant iguana) and focuses on a terrified screaming woman, who cowers back into the solid bulk of two startled-but-stalwart men. The film itself depends heavily on rear projection and features Duncan Parkin as a 25ft high, bald, disfigured – hence one-eyed – man who wanders around wreaking havoc.¹⁵ He is robbed of a great deal of menace by being clad in a loincloth that resembles a giant nappy. This clearly indicates that the character of a Cyclops was a cinematic challenge that could not be fully met by a 'man in a suit', a phrase specifically used to designate a human actor dressed up to look like/perform as a monster, shot against a diorama.¹⁶

Harryhausen rose to the challenge by making a conscious decision to modify the giant character in such a way that audiences could not mistake it for a 'man in a suit'.¹⁷ Audience members who, from the framing, realistic movement and facial expressions of the opening

shots, expected Harryhausen's Cyclops to be a 'man in a suit' – a very sophisticated suit with extremely impressive make-up/prosthetics and a highly unusual finger arrangement – would have been amazed to discover that the one-eyed giant could not possibly be a 'man in a suit', for the simple reason that humans have legs and feet that could not possibly have been accommodated within Harryhausen's Cyclops' 'suit'. This is a forceful way of presenting 'Dynamation' or 'the Sheer Magic of Dynarama' as a distinct advance on previous technology and cinema-going experiences. Having made that decision, Harryhausen then, in a typically economical fashion, turned to his own previous creatures for inspiration and settled upon that of the Pan-influenced satyr from his own animated short film *The Satyr* (1946).

Ancient Greek satyrs were humanoid but had snub noses and horses' ears, tails, legs and hooves.¹⁸ The god Pan, associated with rural environments and the well-being of flocks, as well as with satyrs, has the hind-quarters of a goat. The advantage of the goat over the horse, both of which are equally suitable to dispel the possibility of the creature being a 'man in a suit' and neither of which avoid the issue of what a Cyclops wears to preserve its modesty, is that audiences are less familiar with goats' genitalia (which are less obvious than horses') and have a well-established image of a goat-legged character without any genitalia as part of their cultural capital: the Devil. This association adds two dimensions to the character of Harryhausen's Cyclops in the audience's perception: i) a demonic edge to its actions (especially man-eating) and ii) an implied moral dimension to its actions – the Devil punishes wrongdoers and Harryhausen's Cyclops reinforces the commandment, 'Thou shalt not steal'. Harryhausen has not commented on these possibilities and it should be noted that any association between the Devil and his Cyclops is undercut because the popular conception of the Devil in a red and black colourway, with facial hair and two 'Devil horns' is a long way from Harryhausen's brown, bald creature with either one horn in the centre of the top of his head or an additional horn close behind it on the back of his head. The introduction

of the Cyclops prior to the revelation of his hind-quarters ensures that the goat-like legs are not established as either the primary reference point for the audience's understanding of the character or as the most striking visual feature of Harryhausen's Cyclops – that is its head, particularly its snarl.

The delayed 'reveal' of the full appearance of Harryhausen's Cyclops mirrors the handling of the Cyclops in Homer *Odyssey* 9, where the (listening) audience first become aware of him when they are appraised of 'the Cyclopes, a violent, lawless people' (Homer, *Odyssey* 9.106-7, trans. Hammond (2000)), who nonetheless might be 'violent, savage, and lawless, or hospitable folk with a god-fearing habit' (Homer, *Odyssey* 9.175-6). They are then told that he was

a monstrous man, who shepherded his flocks away by himself: he had no dealings with other men, but kept apart in his own lawless ways. And he was indeed an amazing monster, nothing like an ordinary man who eats bread, but more like a wooded peak in the high mountains, showing clear by itself away from the others. (Homer, *Odyssey* 9.187-92)¹⁹

This description emphasises both the Cyclops' size and solitary nature. The audience continues on a voyage of gradual discovery as it is revealed that the Cyclops is also immensely strong, he can move 'a massive stone, which not even twenty-two fine four-wheeled wagons could budge from the ground' (Homer, *Odyssey* 9.240-2), and has a 'a great club... of green olive-wood... as large as is the mast of some twenty-oared black ship, a broad freighter that crosses the great open sea' (Homer, *Odyssey* 9.319-27). Then the audience discovers the intention to 'take up the stake and grind it in the Cyclops' eye' (Homer, *Odyssey* 9.332-3), which is acted upon when '[t]hey took up the olive-wood stake with its sharpened point and drove it into his eye' (Homer, *Odyssey* 9.382-3). Yet that this is his only eye is not actually confirmed until his resulting blindness is explicitly stated (Homer,

Odyssey 9.452-3). In Homeric epic the focus is less upon physical appearance than upon the action in which the Cyclops is engaged and this is related with the intention of horrifying the audience:

[h]e snatched up two [of Odysseus' companions] together and smashed them on the ground like puppies: their brains ran out and soaked the earth. Then he tore them limb from limb and made them his supper. And he ate them like a mountain lion, leaving nothing – guts, flesh, bones and marrow (Homer, *Odyssey* 9.289-93) and 'the eyeball burned, and the roots of the eye crackled in the fire' (Homer, *Odyssey* 9.390).²⁰

Later ancient authors who engage with the character of the Cyclops take over Homer's familiar story and giant but give him a name, Polyphemus, which in itself is a step towards humanisation (because human beings have names, whereas monsters do not), and then go on to modify his behaviour and add further physical description.²¹ Virgil, writing, like Homer, in the epic genre, prepares his (listening) audience for Polyphemus' appearance through Achaemenides the Ithacan, who was left behind in the Cyclops' cave by Ulysses (Odysseus) and his comrades in their panicked flight (Virgil, *Aeneid* 3.617). Achaemenides describes the Cyclops as 'so tall he knocks his head on the stars' (Virgil, *Aeneid* 3.619-20, trans. Day Lewis (1986)), but is evasive when it comes to calling him ugly and off-putting ('He is not easy on the eye, not one you could cosily talk to': Virgil, *Aeneid* 3.621), despite being very open about the man-eating that has clearly traumatised him. When the Trojans and Aeneas see the Cyclopes, Virgil plays off the Latin word for long-haired/leafy (*comatus*), to describe:

A terrifying assembly: so on some mountain top

Head-in-air oaks are massed, or cone-bearing cypresses –

Jupiter's own tall wood, or a grove sacred to Diana. (Virgil, *Aeneid* 3.679-81)

And while the audience and the Trojans only see the blinded Polyphemus (who bathes his eye socket in sea-water, following contemporary ancient treatment regimens for eye injury), he is still as capable as he was in Homer of heaving enormous boulders at ships.²²

In conclusion, the epic genre gives its (listening) audience a monstrous, man-eating, immensely strong, hairy Cyclops who towers over the landscape: very much the impression of Harryhausen's Cyclops taken away by (viewing) audiences from *The 7th Voyage of Sinbad*.

Theocritus and Propertius take Polyphemus into the genre of lyric poetry, consequently adopting a different approach; one in which they provide further details of the Cyclops' physical appearance and where the hitherto unpalatable Polyphemus does two things totally at odds with his epic characterisation – falls in love (with the sea-nymph, Galatea) and sings about it.

According to the Hellenistic bucolic poet Theocritus, whose audience would have been very familiar with Homer's *Odyssey*, Polyphemus fell in love when '[h]e was just past boyhood then, with the first bloom about his mouth and temples' (Theocritus, *Idylls* 11.7, trans. Pierre A. MacKay (2009)) but even then he was already well aware of his physical defects.²³

Theocritus' Polyphemus describes his monobrow, stretching from ear to ear, with only one eye below it, and his wide flat nose, but attempts to mitigate his appearance by complimenting Galatea extravagantly and detailing his wealth (Theocritus, *Idylls* 11.30-41).²⁴

In addition, he lays himself on the line:

If I seem too coarse and hairy for you, there is a piece of oak and coals heaped up under the ash. I endure you burning out my soul, so burn out my one eye too, which is dearer to me than anything. (Theocritus, *Idylls* 11.50-53)

This intertextual allusion to Polyphemus' identity as the Cyclops of Homeric epic adds a layer of dramatic irony to the (listening/reading) audience's appreciation of Theocritus' characterisation and helps engage some sympathy for a previously unappealing character.

Such a device, along with the narrative frame, enables Theocritus to

distance himself from the comic figure of Polyphemus in love. Yet at the same time he also draws an explicit parallel between himself as love poet and the emotional, poetic Cyclops, and by doing so Theocritus suggests that the similarity between Polyphemus and himself is one of creation, artificiality, imagination, and emotion.

(Williams 2000: 27)

Love it seems can tame the savage epic beast, but Polyphemus' love is doomed because he and his beloved live in different elements – he on land and she in the sea – and his love is unrequited.

The Roman poet Ovid, in his innovative epic the *Metamorphoses*, which blends epic form with lyric content, adopts both the pastoral setting and love motif.²⁵ He repeats Theocritus' extravagant compliments, expanding them into a nineteen-verse apostrophe to the nymph (Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 13.789-807) that incorporates possibly the longest sequence of comparative ablatives in Latin literature (thirteen). However, instead of having Polyphemus tell his own story Ovid allows Galatea to tell the tale from her perspective and thereby reintegrates the savagery of the epic model, emphasising how it was modified by the lyric genre and what his approach adds:

Behold, that savage creature, whom the very woods shudder to look upon, whom no stranger has ever seen but to his own hurt, who despises great Olympus and its gods, he feels the power of love and burns with mighty desire, forgetful of his flocks and of his caves. And now, Polyphemus, you become careful of your appearance, now anxious to please; now with a rake you comb your shaggy

locks, and now it is your pleasure to cut your rough beard with a reaping-hook, gazing at your rude features in some clear pool and composing their expression. Your love of slaughter falls away, your fierce nature and your quenchless thirst for blood; and ships come and go in safety. (Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 13.769ff, trans. Miller 1916)

The epic model is closely adhered to by Ovid in order for him both to undercut it – ships are never safe from epic Cyclopes – and to reshape it – Ovid's Polyphemus as a jealous lover who threatens his beloved's preferred suitor with castration and then murders him, with an immense boulder torn from a mountain top. Thus,

Ovid keeps the pastoral setting but reinvests the Cyclops, who in Theocritus [*Idyll* 6 and 11] is merely a rustic oaf, with the horrendous attributes of the Homeric monster... This is burlesque of a high poetic order, as good as anything in the *Metamorphoses*, and unique in its kind. (Kenney 1986: 452, n. 13.750-899)²⁶

While Harryhausen has never to my knowledge admitted any familiarity (either first- or second-hand) with Theocritus or Ovid's account of Polyphemus' hairiness, or of the debt owed to Ovid's Polyphemus by Tibullus' Priapus, both these elements of the Cyclops' development by classical authors could be seen as classical literary justification for Harryhausen's economically prudent recycling of his satyr model.²⁷

Having charted the actual and potential classical origins of Harryhausen's Cyclops it is time to address its legacy. Harryhausenesque Cyclopes appear in fandom, films, TV shows and computer games, the first two of which will be analysed here with attention to features which these Cyclopes share with that of Harryhausen, namely: baldness, brown colouration, flattened noses, stance, head positions, heavy musculature, muscle-bound shoulders, arm

position, finger arrangement, nails, skin-texture, veining, pointed ears, horns, goat-like hind-quarters and, especially, snarl.²⁸

Fandom creates a demand for Harryhausen memorabilia and homages. Acquisitive fans want to own Harryhausen's Cyclops to the point where not only are a multitude of die-cast, pre-painted, plastic or posable vinyl models available but the dedicated fan can buy resin kits to make and paint a Cyclops themselves, which they do with a dedication that includes recreating the green colourway of the original film poster as well as the brown colourway of the film itself.²⁹ Yet such copies/homages are not restricted to three-dimensional media: they also appear in CGI form. In 2007 there was a CG Talk challenge to recreate a Harryhausen creature.³⁰ The winner of the 'Best Overall Entry, Best Render, Most Accurate Creature Representation' was a Cyclops by professional CG animator Rick Baker, who documented his progress on a blog and invited comments.³¹ Harryhausen fans responded to his initial concept of 'Harryhausen but more beefy and with a smaller head' with objections based on the competition rules, then responded to his revised starting point by focusing on details such as skin-texture, head and neck shape, mouth width, eye-width, musculature and nail-beds, even providing comparison diagrams. The final colour version (Figure 4) is very much 'Harryhausen's model rendered in CGI format'. It is masterful but for some reason it does not look as 'real' to me as the original, nor does not evoke the same terror. It elicited this comment from thegrub (5th March 2007):

I think you captured the cyclops perfectly, the pose and attitude.

You got my vote.

Would have liked to have seen a little guy on the fire in your diorama, that scared me when I was a kid.

Thanks for reminding me of a great creature I haven't seen in a while.

Now where's that DVD.



Figure 4: Rick Baker's prize-winning CGI version of Harryhausen's Cyclops. © Rick Baker, 2007. Reproduced with Rick Baker's permission.

In response to requests Rick Baker also provided his 'beefed up' version (Figure 5) – in which the debt to Harryhausen is clear and in which the potential of Harryhausen's Cyclops to terrify in CGI form in films today is immediately apparent.³²



Figure 5: Rick Baker's CGI 'beefed up' version of Harryhausen's Cyclops. © Rick Baker, 2007. Reproduced with Rick Baker's permission.

But fans and acknowledged potential from professional CGI animators is not sufficient to claim impact. The success of *The 7th Voyage of Sinbad* was established at the time by box-office receipts and its impact can be seen from the evidence of other producers and distributors leaping on the band wagon to provide similar feature films, including *Jack the Giant Killer* (dir. Nathan H. Juran, 1961), whose producer was sued for copyright infringement by Columbia because of its close resemblance to *The 7th Voyage of Sinbad*.³³ Another example was the 1961 Italian 'sword and sandal' film *Maciste nella terra dei ciclopi* (dir. Antonio Leonviola), which secured release in a dubbed version in the USA as *Monster from the Unknown World* in 1961 and in the UK as *Atlas in the Land of the Cyclops* in 1963. While it returned to the 'man in a suit' aesthetic and its Cyclops features bushy hair, moustache and beard and wears a grey loin cloth, the Cyclops' excessive hair (which reduces facial expression) is styled so that the actor's head position appears close to that of Harryhausen's Cyclops, a resemblance which is emphasised by his very heavily muscled thighs and his lower legs both being covered in a thick pelt of animal-like hair. The film unleashes this man-eating Cyclops in the land of Sadok, on unsuspecting (Sicilian) villagers who are defended by the strongman Maciste (played by Gordon Mitchell). This was exactly the kind of film about which Harryhausen said:

In *The 7th Voyage of Sinbad* I was trying to get away from the 'monster-on-the-loose' cycle that I had been involved with up to then. I destroyed Coney Island, I destroyed San Francisco, and I didn't want to keep doing that, especially as I thought that the original spirit and 'feel' of *King Kong* and *The Lost World* were increasingly lost. (Interview with Paul Wells, Wells 2002: 95).

It is true that 'monster-on-the-loose' tends to dog Harryhausen's Cyclops' steps in most of its guises – especially in computer games – but while that is a starting point in Harryhausen's Cyclops' legacy it is not the end point, especially not in films or, indeed, in music videos.³⁴ Thanks to its closing statement, 'Inspired by the films of Ray Harryhausen', it is beyond doubt that *The Hoosiers'* music video for the single 'Worried about Ray' (2007, directed by Diamond Dogs: Phil Sansom and Olly Williams) owes a debt to Harryhausen. Some have even credited Harryhausen's Cyclops with an appearance, but while it is true that the character is a Cyclops, it is green, has a tail, two horns above its temples, rounded ears and legs unlike those of Harryhausen's Cyclops. Yet its dentition, mouth-width, stance, skin-texture, finger arrangement and nails are those of Harryhausen's Cyclops. Its initial appearance out in the real world as a full-size creature (Figure 6) echoes that of the Cyclops in *The 7th Voyage of Sinbad* (Figure 2) but the subsequent lamppost sequence echoes *20 Million Miles from Earth* (1957) and Harryhausen's two-eyed, long-tailed Ymir, which in the recent digital, Harryhausen-approved, colourised re-release is also green.³⁵ The point of the music video, however, is the death of the creature: shot in the eye with a drumstick by the lead singer, who uses a guitar as a bow. Hence, this video plays off and reproduces a vague cultural memory of two of Harryhausen's most widely-recognised 'monsters' by amalgamating them into a single creature.



Figure 6: The creature, having come alive, makes its first appearance in the outside world (top), before being shot in the eye with a drumstick (bottom), in stills taken from the Hoosiers' official release online music video (http://www.metacafe.com/watch/sy-44035995001/the_hoosiers_worried_about_ray_official_music_video/). © Diamond Dogs, 2007.

Such evidence of enduring popular appeal has contributed to Harryhausen's work, at first 'not properly acknowledged as animated art, and ...made "invisible" by being absorbed into an effects tradition' (Wells 2002: 123), being recognised in 2010 by BAFTA and the British Film Institute with a special award, presented by Peter Jackson. Harryhausen's contribution to film is, it seems, going from strength to strength as what Wells described as 'the third generation of "movie-brat" film-makers' follow Harryhausen through their use and development of CGI.

One of these "movie-brat" film-makers is Peter Jackson himself, who publicly acknowledged the influence of Harryhausen on his development as an animator and director from the age of 14 when he filmed himself fighting with Harryhausen's Cyclops and killing it with a branch he threw like a javelin.³⁶ But Harryhausen's Cyclops is not only responsible for getting him started, it left its mark on *Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Rings* (2001, dir. Peter Jackson) in the form of Weta Workshop's giant cave troll. The Cave Troll has an arrangement of facial features which (despite it actually having two extremely small eyes) strongly resembles a Cyclops due to the prominent (high) positioning of large nostrils that signal the absence-of-a-nose. Its true lineage, however, is revealed by its movement (which deliberately mimics that of Harryhausen's Cyclops), skin-texture, muscle-bound shoulders, head position, dentition, stance and the way in which it holds its arms and hands, hands which recreate the finger arrangement and even the nails of Harryhausen's Cyclops.³⁷

One thing that all these cinematic Cyclopes have in common is that none of them actually say anything. This is unsurprising as language is held to be distinctly human, while cinematic Cyclopes are predominantly meant to be perceived as monsters. The Cyclopes of classical authors, however, had language: from Homer onwards Cyclopes were capable of social and intellectual interaction and could express emotion, even to the extent of being able to compose romantic serenades in a recognisable overblown poetic style. Hence, classical Cyclopes were a deviation from humanity (monstrous humans) rather than differentiated from humanity (inhuman monsters). In contrast to the classical authors, most film-makers deny Cyclopes an intelligible voices and this limits their claim to humanity, relegating them to monstrous status. The cinematic Cyclops, with one exception to date (see below), can only snarl and roar like an animal to communicate anger, fear and pain.

This limitation is shared by Harryhausen's Cyclops and the CGI Cyclops of *The Cyclops* (2008, dir. Declan O'Brien). In this case, the horn is gone, the musculature is more sinewy, the skin smooth and the finger arrangement more human (three fingers plus thumb, rather than two), but O'Brien's Cyclops unmistakably traces its descent from Harryhausen's Cyclops because of its colouration, veining, baldness, dentition, flattened nose, pointed ears, muscle-bound shoulders, head position, stance and snarl, not to mention its goat-like (albeit hairless) lower limbs. The first third of the film features Harryhausen's Cyclops rendered in CGI in a 'monster-on-the-loose' scenario while the emperor Tiberius forces his bravest general, Marcus (played by Kevin Stapleton), to capture it and bring it to appear in the arena.³⁸ However, the remainder of the film, rather than merely paying homage to the fight between Harryhausen's Cyclops and the fire-breathing dragon in *The 7th Voyage of Sinbad* by featuring any number of fights with interesting animals, sentences Marcus too to the arena, resulting in serious character development on the part of the Cyclops. The Cyclops

and Marcus become unlikely allies and fight together alongside a female warrior in order to save the Roman Empire from the clutches of the corrupt emperor and his evil nephew. In brief, Frances Doel's screenplay takes the 'monster-on-the-loose' scenario and goes beyond it to rehabilitate the Cyclops as a hero, thereby following in a taciturn anti-hero fantasy tradition that arises from the 'strong, silent' type of hero, for example, see the bald central character with the 'surgical shine' job on his eyes of *Pitch Black* (1999, dir. David Twohy), *The Chronicles of Riddick: Dark Fury* (2004, animated by Peter Chung) and *The Chronicles of Riddick* (2004, dir. David Twohy). Despite their uncommunicative nature, apparent self-absorption and murderous pasts, these anti-heroes are normally human in appearance and the alterations made to Harryhausen's Cyclops by O'Brien's CGI animators, especially the way in which shots of the Cyclops are framed to minimise differences in scale between characters at crucial points, gives the impression that the Cyclops (from the waist up, as he is most often seen) is a bald body-builder with sharpened teeth. Thus, the camera work and character development of *The Cyclops* builds on the expressive potential of Harryhausen's Cyclops' facial features to enable O'Brien's Cyclops to cross the boundary between monster and human to being a hero, gaining the sympathy and admiration of the audience along the way.

While the expressive potential and emotional range of Harryhausen's Cyclops has been noted (Hardaway with Calvin 2009; Bergman 2011), what is not noted is that the potential for the Cyclops to be a heroic character exists in embryonic form in *The 7th Voyage of Sinbad*. Harryhausen showed that his Cyclopes are not (all) monstrous by showing a second (two-horned) Cyclops saving – albeit unwittingly – Sinbad and the Princess from a fire-breathing dragon.³⁹ The fight contextualises the Cyclopes within a wider world in which they are prey as well as, or instead of being, predators. That a Cyclops 'saves' the humans at the cost of his own life should gain his race some sympathy from the audience, although some audience

members will perceive his death as some sort of ‘poetic justice’ for the other Cyclops’ man-eating.⁴⁰

The ambiguity of Harryhausen’s Cyclops as threat and saviour is retained in the *SpongeBob SquarePants Movie* (2004), with the uncertain future of its animated ‘man in a suit’ – an old-fashioned diving suit, the helmet of which provides the single round green ‘eye’ that leads to him being called ‘Cyclops’. This Cyclops, who snarls and makes noises but does not speak, rescues SpongeBob and Patrick by inadvertently stepping on the hitman who would otherwise have killed them by stepping on them. Unfortunately, he then captures SpongeBob and Patrick himself and dries them out in order to sell them in his shop. Once an electrical short starts the shop’s sprinkler system and the captured underwater creatures are rehydrated, they blind the Cyclops with the glue which he has used to stick ‘googly eyes’ on to his curios and he is last seen on his back under a number of animated underwater creatures while SpongeBob and Patrick make their escape with the object of their quest, Neptune’s crown.

The Cyclopes’ relationship to Poseidon/Neptune is part of their Homeric identity, but only *Wrath of the Titans* (2012) makes explicit reference to it and does so in order to spring a surprise on the viewing audience when the Cyclopes cease hostilities against Perseus and become his allies. This is a surprise because both the trailer and the pre-release ‘Cyclops featurette’ depicted Cyclopes as one of the range of ‘terrifying creatures’ and ‘demons’ that have been unleashed on the earth. They are ‘foul and fearsome’, ‘one-eyed cannibal giants’, ‘tall as a tree’ (‘30 foot high’) and exclusively shown threatening the heroes.⁴¹ The trailer’s fleeting glimpse of a one-eyed giant snarling in blue lighting references Harryhausen’s Cyclops and its original release posters (Figure 1), but the speed of the Cyclops’ movement

and the appearance of the Cyclopes' human hands and feet in the trailer forcibly demonstrates that these Cyclopes are a departure from it.



Figure 7: Early concept art for the Cyclopes in *Wrath of the Titans* (2012) by Jerad S. Marantz. © Jerad S. Marantz/Aaron Sims. The earlier version on the left was made available online by the artist through the Clash of the Titans Wiki (<http://clash-of-the-titans.wikia.com/wiki/Cyclopes>), the later version on the right was made available online by the Aaron Sims Company (<http://www.aaron-sims.com/past-work/#lightbox-1146>).

Like Harryhausen's Cyclops these Cyclopes underwent changes during pre-production, that something that can clearly be seen from the concept art (Figure 7). The initial disfigured version has the pebbled skin, head angle and muscle-bound shoulders of Harryhausen's Cyclops but a nose closer to that of Peter Jackson's cave troll and human ears.⁴² The undisfigured version has restored Harryhausen's eye-nose-mouth ratio (along with a nose) but has obscured the pebbling of the (now greyish) skin beneath tattoos. The three Cyclopes of the film retain the ratio, muscle-bound shoulders, head angle and tan skin-colour of Harryhausen's Cyclops but have lost any skin pebbling (or tattoos) and have individual facial features, clothing and personalities.

The trailer and featurette are consistent with the film's initial encounter with the Cyclopes, in which they are shown hunting humans for food, including sniffing humans out and capturing

one of Perseus' comrades.⁴³ The culmination of the sequence demonstrates an awareness of the Cyclops' heritage at the same time as departing from it: first a Cyclops is felled by being hit on the head rather than in the eye, then Perseus asks his captured comrade, who is being held upside down by his ankles (presumably prior to having his brains dashed out like a Homeric puppy), 'What are you hanging around for?' to which he replies, 'I thought I'd give him an eyeful!'. In both cases the vulnerability of the Cyclopes' eyes is made obvious but neither are actually blinded. This departure indicates to the audience that new possibilities lie ahead for these creatures. Nothing though prepares the audience for the Cyclopes to have social hierarchy, revealed by the introduction of a Cyclops Elder character, and language (albeit not any human language). In addition, it is the Cyclops Elder who recognises that the magically unfolding trident that Perseus revealed at the conclusion of the fight sequence symbolises a special bond between the hero and Poseidon, which indicates that Perseus should henceforth be treated as an ally, rather than either an enemy or a meal, and as a comrade in arms.⁴⁴

Nevertheless, unlocking the potential of the Cyclops as a creature and a hero rather than a monster is best seen with Mike Wazowski of Pixar's *Monsters Inc.* (2001). The film's premises are that monsters are scary and deliberately frighten children because their city is powered by the energy obtained from children's screams. Mike acts as a personal trainer to help Sulley (James P. Sullivan, his best friend and the top scarer of Monsters Inc.) to scare children more effectively. By the end of the film, however, Mike, Sulley and the rest of the monsters have discovered that children's laughter provides far more energy than their screams and Mike has become the best at training monsters to make children laugh. Hence, the Cyclops becomes a hero to children the world over rather than being, as for their parents, an enduring terrifying memory from a childhood viewing of Harryhausen's Cyclops.



Figure 8: Mike Wazowski. © Pixar, 2001.

Mike Wazowski (Figure 8) not only subverts audience perceptions of Cyclopes as monstrous, he also – uniquely among cinematic Cyclopes – talks eloquently and unstoppably (voiced by Billy Crystal as ‘a mix between Mr. Toad and Sammy Davis, Jr.’).⁴⁵ However, to the casual glance Mike appears to be a green tennis ball with two small horns near his temples, string for limbs and three-toed feet, which raises the question, ‘Does he have anything to do with Harryhausen’s Cyclops?’ A closer look shows that Mike has the dentition (albeit smoothed down), the pebbled skin texture (also smoothed down), the equal mouth and eye width and, most importantly, the stance of Harryhausen’s Cyclops.⁴⁶ His hands have three fingers and a thumb and therefore appear more human, having undergone the same minor modification as O’Brien’s Cyclops, although Mike’s stance and the positioning of his hands means that this arrangement is often virtually indistinguishable from the two-fingers plus thumb hand of Harryhausen’s Cyclops.

In addition, Mike Wazowski exhibits an awareness of his one-eyed condition that hints at an awareness of his intertextual/extratextual past and context and acknowledges his potential to be blinded. First, when defending himself from a child (whose touch monsters believe to be toxic) with spray disinfectant, he takes off his improvised sieve eye-protector, catches a sneeze full in the face and, by reflex use of the disinfectant, (temporarily) blinds himself.⁴⁷ At this point Mike is unwilling to accept that the child is anything other than a toxic liability and is

particularly resistant to the fact that Sulley gives her a name ('Boo', based on one of the noises she makes because she is not yet old enough to talk properly), since naming creates emotional bonds. Second, Mike snaps his own eyelid into his eye when attempting to make Boo laugh. It could be argued that these 'blinding' incidents are intertextual references to Homer (or even to Theocritus, given that the comic eye-lid snap is designed to get the energy necessary to transport Boo, for whom Mike too has come to care deeply, home safe) rather than to Harryhausen, but the context and Mike's awareness of his lineage elsewhere in *Monsters Inc.* makes the link with Harryhausen more likely.

Further evidence of Harryhausen's legacy is the character Celia, Mike's girlfriend, who is also a Cyclops, but who otherwise shares many recognisable features with Harryhausen's Medusa, especially her sinuous movement and the individually animated snakes which comprise her hair.⁴⁸ The first thing to note here is that Mike the Cyclops is capable of forming a relationship and is progressing successfully through the stages of courtship. Early on in the film the audience sees him complimenting and sweet-talking Celia, the Monsters Inc. receptionist, into a birthday dinner only he can provide:

Celia: "So, uh, are we going anywhere special tonight?"

Mike: "I...I just got us into a little place called, um, Harryhausen's."

Celia: "Harryhausen's? But it's impossible to get a reservation there."

Mike: "Not for Googley Bear!"⁴⁹

In other words Mike has an "in", which is a tacit acknowledgement that he is a direct descendant of one of Harryhausen's creatures, that lets him effortlessly get a table at Harryhausen's, a sushi restaurant in a white box-like building decorated with a giant pair of chopsticks holding a single eyeball between them. This renders the building itself a Cyclops that has its eye on everything that is going on around it and connects the restaurant and Harryhausen with the eyeball used as the letter 'o' in the film's title. Inside, Harryhausen's is

charming, intimate and ideal for Mike and Celia's dinner date, which is going well, until it is interrupted by Sulley with a child hidden in his gym bag. In the ensuing chaos Mike chooses Sulley over Celia and she is injured. Understandably, she is not impressed and for most of the rest of the film the two are at loggerheads, although by the end of the film matters are definitely improving. For that reason, it would be unwise to attempt to attribute familiarity with the ancient story of Polyphemus and Galatea to the story-writers or screenplay-writers of *Monsters Inc.*⁵⁰ It seems more likely that Mike and Celia's relationship is an attempt to develop and outdo previous well-known portrayals of a familiar character, Harryhausen's Cyclops. In *Monsters Inc.* the film-makers are following in the footsteps of ancient authors by endeavouring to show new aspects of a particular character and exploit these aspects in ways commensurate with the genre of their vehicle. *Monsters Inc.* may be animation and it may technically be sci-fi (the cinematic category which includes 'fantasy'), but it is also comedy, set-off by some elements of near horror, and a story of discovery, including self-discovery, that is actually about the nature of friendship and the growth of friendship between individuals.⁵¹ All of these are very human stories and Mike Wazowski – a monster who is not monstrous and learns in both his personal and professional life not to be a monster at all – is, despite being designated the supporting actor rather than the lead, crucial to their development.

Such complexity is a product of an animated film that is aimed, like *The 7th Voyage of Sinbad*, not just at an audience of children but at an audience of sophisticated cinema-going adults (the children's parents) whose cultural capital includes Harryhausen and his Cyclops. Its combination of genres defies straightforward classification, in much the same way as Ovid's *Metamorphoses*:

The *Metamorphoses* conforms to the conventional pattern of classical epic insofar as it is long poem in hexameters of high literary pretensions. That is as far

as conformity extends. ...The *Metamorphoses*, if it is anything, is high comedy. ...[T]he *Metamorphoses* is *ex hypothesi* and of set purpose episodic. More fundamentally still, it is of its nature anti-generic. At i.452 the theme of love makes the first of its many appearances [in] an implicit assertion of the poet's freedom ... to handle each theme in the style which it seemed to him to demand: elegiac, pastoral, tragic – or indeed, as in the battles of Books V and XII, epic itself. The *perpetuum Carmen* [of orthodox epic] turns out to be, among other things, an anthology of genres. (Kenney, 1986: xvii-xviii)⁵²

These observations on Ovidian epic parallel the redefinition of cinematic 'genre' which is developing from the simplistic definition of 'a discrete "category" or "type" of film which is defined by its visual, technical, thematic or subject-oriented consistencies' – which results in *The 7th Voyage of Sinbad* variously classified as 'mixed-media' (animation and live action, like *Mary Poppins*, *Pete's Dragon* or *Who Framed Roger Rabbit*), 'fantasy' (itself a sub-category of 'sci-fi') or 'adventure' – towards more complex descriptions such as:

a system which is subject to change and modification in relation to shifting historical and socio-cultural forces and practices. Each 'genre', therefore, also has its own history and development, often demonstrating the movement from 'innovation' to consolidation as a 'classical' model; progression through 'formal' intervention; and re-definition through self-reflexive or intertextual revision[or] a framework which simultaneously invites complicity with traditional models, but encourages re-definition through pastiche, exaggeration, intertextual play, reconfigured signifiers and so on[or] a model of *bricolage* in which varying cultural resources are mobilised to 'authenticate' or 'challenge' generic expectations or outcomes.⁵³

Animation as a genre as simplistically defined ('uses drawings or models to tell a story') is engaged in an extended process of change, modification and redefinition that is being accelerated by the growing sophistication of CGI techniques. These are increasingly capable of blurring the line between animation and live action to a point where the two are barely distinguishable. This, combined with the presentation of increasingly sophisticated and self-conscious intertextual referencing in animated films, means that animation is more of a framework through which any kind of content can be expressed, including content not entirely (or completely un-) suitable for children; to whom animation in simplistic terms has until recently been thought to belong.

The absence of any live-action human characters in *Monsters Inc.* reconfigures the monsters into humans. It puts the burden of emotional story-telling onto the animated characters in a way that was absent in the films in which Harryhausen was involved.⁵⁴ However, without Harryhausen's insistence that his animated characters were 'never monsters, always creatures' and without his input into film history, such development and genre-blending would not have been possible. It may sound like flattery to suggest that Harryhausen can not just claim to be an auteur but could stake a claim to being a cinematic Homer, but it just so happens that I think it could be true. After all, to quote Kenney (1986: xxii) on Ovid: 'Genius is, among other things, the ability to transform common artistic property into something original and individual.' And, one might add, unmistakable – and Harryhausen's Cyclops is certainly that.

Filmography

Dr. Cyclops, 1940, directed by Ernest B. Schoedsack

The Satyr, 1946, directed by Ray Harryhausen

Ulisse, 1954, directed by Mario Camerini (released as *Ulysses* (USA: 1955)

The Cyclops, 1957, directed by Bert I. Gordon

20 Million Miles to Earth, 1957, directed by Nathan H. Juran

The 7th Voyage of Sinbad, 1958, directed by Nathan H. Juran

Jack the Giant Killer, 1961, directed by Nathan H. Juran

Maciste nella terra dei ciclopi, 1961, directed by Antonio Leonviola (released as

Monster from the Unknown World (USA: 1961) and *Atlas in the Land of the Cyclops* (UK: 1963))

Star Wars: The Return of the Jedi, 1983, directed by Richard Marquand

Hercules, 1997, directed by Ron Clements and John Musker, animated by Walt Disney Feature Animation

Pitch Black, 1999, directed by David Twohy

O Brother, Where Art Thou?, 2000, directed by Joel [and Ethan] Coen

Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Rings, 2001, directed by Peter Jackson

Monsters Inc., 2001, directed by Pete Docter, David Silverman and Lee Unkrich, animated by Pixar

The Chronicles of Riddick: Dark Fury, 2004, animated by Peter Chung

The Chronicles of Riddick, 2004, directed by David Twohy

The Spongebob SquarePants Movie, 2004, directed by Stephen Hillenburg (animation) and Mark Osborne (live-action sequences)

Worried about Ray, 2007, directed by Diamond Dogs (Phil Sansom and Olly Williams),

<http://www.metacafe.com/watch/sy->

[44035995001/the_hoosiers_worried_about_ray_official_music_video/](http://www.metacafe.com/watch/sy-44035995001/the_hoosiers_worried_about_ray_official_music_video/)

Cyclops, 2008, directed by Declan O'Brien

The 7 Adventures of Sinbad, 2010, directed by Ben Hayflick and Adam Silver

Wrath of the Titans, 2010, directed by Joe Whiteaker

Percy Jackson: Sea of Monsters, 2013, directed by Thor Freudenthal

Sinbad: the fifth voyage, 2013, directed by Shahin Sean Solimon

Bibliography

Applebaum, S. 2006. Ray Harryhausen: "When I was 13 I saw King Kong. I couldn't believe it." *Stephen Applebaum: Culture Web*, December 2006

http://stephenapplebaum.blogspot.co.uk/2006/12/ray-harryhausen-when-i-was-13-i-saw_28.html

Ashlin, S. 2003-12. Jack the Giant Killer (1961/1962) **½. *1000 Misspent Hours and Counting* <http://www.1000misspenthours.com/reviews/reviewsh-m/jackthegiantkiller.htm>

Ball, R. J. 1983. *Tibullus the Elegist*. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Baker, R. 2007. *Work-in-progress Blog*. 11th February – 14th March 2007

<http://www.zbrushcentral.com/showthread.php?41905-Harryhausen-Cyclops-Wip>

Bergman, M. 2011. *The Ray Harryhausen Creature List*. <http://www.harryhausen.com>

CG Society 2007. Winner notification. 23rd February 2007,

<http://forums.cgsociety.org/showthread.php?t=466712>

Eagle One Media 2009. *Titans* return and Clash in All New *Wrath of the Titans* DVD. 15th

December 2009, http://www.bluewaterprod.com/news/wrath_of_the_titans_dvd.php

Frangoulidis, S. 1992. Epic Inversion in Apuleius' Tale of Tlepolemus/Haemus. *Mnemosyne* 45: 63-65.

- Frazier, T. Super Movie Monday – Jack the Giant Killer. *Hero Go Home*, 22nd August 2011, <http://www.herogohome.com/2011/08/22/super-movie-monday-jack-the-giant-killer/>
- Hankin, M. 2008. From the Land Beyond Beyond. In M. Hankin, *Ray Harryhausen: Master of the Magicks*, vol. 2: *The American Films*: 231-294. Los Angeles: Archive Editions.
- Hardaway, C. with S. Calvin 2009. Is Ray Harryhausen's Cyclops the Greatest Monster in Movie History? *Monster Kid Online Magazine* #7: October 2009, <http://gammillustrations.bizland.com/monsterkid7/cyclops.htm>
- Harrod, H. 2010. Ray Harryhausen interview. *The Telegraph*: 18th April 2010, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/film/film-life/7593495/Ray-Harryhausen-interview-Stop-motion-animation-Clash-of-the-Titans-Jason-and-the-Argonauts.html>
- Harryhausen, R. 2009. *The official Ray Harryhausen website*. <http://www.rayharryhausen.com/index.php>
- Harryhausen, R. and T. Dalton 2006. *The Art of Ray Harryhausen*. London: Aurum Press.
- Harryhausen, R. and T. Dalton. 2009. *An Animated Life: Adventures in Fantasy*. London: Aurum Press.
- Harryhausen, R. and T. Dalton 2011. *Ray Harryhausen's Fantasy Scrapbook: models, artwork and memories from 65 years of filmmaking*. London: Aurum Press.
- Homer 2000. *The Odyssey* translated by M. Hammond, with an introduction by Jasper Griffin. London: Duckworth.
- Hopkinson, N. 2000. *Ovid: Metamorphoses Book XIII*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jackson, J. 2010. *A Tribute to Ray Harryhausen on the Occasion of his Ninetieth Birthday*. <https://www.bfi.org.uk/live/video/389>
- Kenney, E. J. 1986. Introduction and notes to A. D. Melville (trans.), *Ovid: Metamorphoses*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Otis, B. 1966. *Ovid as an Epic Poet*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Ovid 1916. *Metamorphoses*, translated by F. J. Miller. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.
- Papaioannou, S. 2005. *Epic Succession and Dissension: Ovid Metamorphoses 13.623-14.582, and the Reinvention of the Aeneid*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Pixar 2001. *Monsters Inc* (official website), <http://www.pixar.com/featurefilms/inc/> (quoted) now replaced by http://www.pixar.com/features_films/MONSTERS%2C-INC
- Propertius 1976. *Elegies*, translated by H. E. Butler. Cambridge, MA. and London: Harvard University Press.
- Ruth, S. 2011. Cinema's 15 Greatest Giant Monsters. *D'ment'D Cinema*: 29th August 2011, <http://web.archive.org/web/20120301215250/http://www.dmentdcinema.com/2011/08/cinemas-15-greatest-giant-monsters.html>
- Saturday Fright Special 2009. *Cyclops* (2008) d. Declan Obrien. *Saturday Fright Special's Fangtastic Features*: 20th February 2009, <http://saturdayfrightspecial.blogspot.com/2009/02/cyclops-2008-d-declan-obrien.html>
- thegrub 2007. <http://www.zbrushcentral.com/showthread.php?41905-Harryhausen-Cyclops-Wip/page8>, 5th March 2007
- Theocritus 1912. *Idylls in Greek Bucolic Poets*, translated by J. M. Edmonds. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.
- Ultraman Collector 2009. Best Ray Harryhausen Cyclops. *Toy Karma: Collecting Japanese Toys, Painting Cool Art and Making Original Toys*: 28th August 2009, <http://toykarma.blogspot.com/2009/08/best-ray-harryhausen-cyclops.html> (website no longer exists)
- Virgil 1986. *The Aeneid*, translated by C. Day Lewis, with an introduction and notes by Jasper Griffin. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Webber, R. P. 2004. *The Dinosaur Films of Ray Harryhausen: features, early 16mm experiments and unrealized projects*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.

Wells, P. 2002. *Animation: Genre and Authorship*. London and New York: Wallflower.

Williams, M. F. 2000. Propertius 2.26b, Theocritus' *Idyll* 11, and Epic Poetry. *Scholια* 9: 20-42.

Wootton, A. 1996. Animation and Dynamation: Ray Harryhausen interviewed. In J. Boorman and W. Donohue (eds.), *Film-makers on filming, Projections* 5: 53-6. London and Boston: Faber & Faber.

¹ *Wrath of the Titans* (2010) on DVD was marketed as a story developed under the guidance of Ray Harryhausen and presented as a unique motion comic film, fans of the beloved original motion picture can immerse themselves again in the further adventures of hero Perseus and his winged horse Pegasus in anticipation of the upcoming theatrical big budget remake of *Clash of the Titans* on March 26, 2010. (Eagle One Media: 2009)

Harryhausen's *Cyclops* is number eight: Ruth (2011).

² The term 'creature' is preserved by listings such as Bergman (2011).

³ Harryhausen in Wootton (1996: 54).

⁴ Harrod (2010).

⁵ Original cinematic release poster (1958). A fuller range of cinematic posters covering the initial release and subsequent re-releases in a variety of countries, through which the enduring place of the *Cyclops* as a key feature of the film is clear, can be found through the Movie Poster Database (<http://www.movieposterdb.com/movie/0051337/The-7th-Voyage-of-Sinbad.html>) and Listal (<http://www.listal.com/movie/7th-voyage-sinbad/posters>).

⁶ Definitions in Wells (2002: 82, in relation to Walt Disney, and 90, in relation to Ray Harryhausen). For a full discussion of the role of the auteur in the context of animation, see Wells (2002: 72-113). While Harryhausen, as Keen, this volume, points out, does not consider himself as the sole 'author' of the films in which he was involved (Harryhausen and Dalton 2009: 265), auteur theory does not ignore the collective effort of film production but does identify a distinctive of artistic and creative vision which is apparent in those films in which Harryhausen participated and due to which his relationship with the directors of the films' live action occasionally suffered:

[Interviewer] 'I imagine if you're playing against a creature you can't see, but which you know is going to be fantastical, you have to be quite expert in judging how far to push your acting?'

[Harryhausen] "That's why I make these drawings. They're published in the scripts so that the actors know what they're looking at when all they'll have to look at is a pole or a stuntman. That's why I direct all the scenes myself that I'm involved in. Sometimes the director of the main part of the film resents that. One director tried to get me fired; he thought I had too much say." (Applebaum (2006)).

⁷ Quotation from an interview between Ray Harryhausen and Paul Wells in Wells (2002: 97).

⁸ Harryhausen was consultant on story development and character design for a film version of Homer's *Odyssey* for Carrington & Cosgrove Hall Productions: see Harryhausen (2009). A script for *Force of Trojans* was developed by Harryhausen, Scheer and Beverley Cross; Harryhausen even created its storyboards, and although the project was shelved (due to Hollywood's perception of audience interests, box-office receipts and the expense of Harryhausen's creative process) some visual artefacts survive: see Harryhausen and Dalton (2011). Harryhausen's desire to screen a *Cyclops* goes back to *20 Million Miles to Earth* (1957), which began as a story he co-wrote with Charlotte Knight called *The Cyclops* (Harryhausen 2009).

⁹ Harryhausen states that the *Cyclopes* were based on those of Homer (Harryhausen and Dalton 2006: 99).

¹⁰ The reasons for Harryhausen's change of mind are not known, but were not linked to the fidelity of colour film. Harryhausen made his colour-film debut with *The 7th Voyage of Sinbad* because he was convinced that the medium was then sufficiently advanced to seamlessly integrate animated and live-action sequences.

¹¹ The actions to which the *Cyclops* responds are an important part of its characterisation in ancient literary sources too: e.g. in Homer's epic *Odysseus* and his men await the *Cyclops*' return in order to engage in the rituals of guest friendship and receive gifts but the *Cyclops* ignores these conventions, instead eating the men; in Euripides' satyr play *Odysseus* and his men are prepared to trade for supplies but the leader of the satyrs

(beings with horses' ears, legs, tails and hooves) falsely accuses them of theft, which accusation the Cyclops – trusting established friends over strangers – believes, responding by imprisoning and eating the men. In Homer the Cyclops' response is unjustifiable, characterising him as 'bad', but in Euripides his response, although extreme is explicable in human terms and justifiable were the charge true.

¹² The fight on the beach and the blinding of the Cyclops may be watched as YouTube clips at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a77pycC78Q0> and <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wnRf9MX2ros>. Stills from the sequences involving the Cyclops have been reproduced and discussed in Hankin (2008: 231-294).

¹³ The desire to tell the story of a clever human outwitting a giant on screen in live action sequences can be traced to *Dr. Cyclops* (1940), directed by Ernest B. Schoedsack, which features a bespectacled (two-eyed) scientist who shrinks human beings to the size of mice and is blinded by them as part of their successful escape. I am grateful to the anonymous reviewer for bringing this film to my attention as a re-telling of Homer.

¹⁴ Prosthetic skin and glass eyes had been used previously and recently in cinematic history to create an on-screen 'monster' with lop-sided eyes in the form of Quasimodo in *The Hunchback of Notre Dame*, as played by Charles Laughton in 1936 (directed by William Dieterle) and Anthony Quinn in 1956 (directed by Jean Delannoy). I am grateful to Penny Goodman for bringing the 1936 film to my attention as a possible influence on early cinematic Cyclopes.

¹⁵ The disfigurement involves the appearance of the flesh on the right side of his face having been melted and partially burned away: the right eye socket is covered over seamlessly by this melted flesh. A similar solution to the problem of rendering a tall, heavily-built actor one-eyed is to have the character wear an eye-patch, e.g. the Royal Shakespeare Company's *The Odyssey* (1992) and the Coen brothers' *O Brother, Where Art Thou?* (2000).

¹⁶ Ancient visual artists also found depicting a Cyclops a challenge, even though differences of scale make it easy to portray giants in relation to humans in painting and sculpture. In archaic Greek vase painting technical limitations meant that characters were depicted in profile, with the result that Cyclopes appear two-eyed when they are not, e.g. the proto-Attic 'Eleusis amphora', c.650BC (Museum of Eleusis: 2630). The development of red-figure and the increased technical expertise of classical Greek vase painters leads to full-face depictions, e.g. a Cyclops, with a third eye in the middle of his forehead above two smaller eyes, on a Lucanian red-figure calyx crater by The Cyclops Painter (name vase), c.410-400 BC (British Museum: London 1947.7-14.18). This is usually taken to be a theatrical scene (although it cannot, as frequently maintained, be Euripides' *Cyclops* because Euripides wisely keeps his Cyclops off-stage in his cave throughout) with a depiction of the Cyclops actor's actual mask, which further demonstrates the practical difficulties and limitations of a 'man in a suit' approach – how is he to see? Sculptors could resolve the difficulties of portraying Cyclopes by sculpting a giant Cyclops in relation to twice life-size human characters and positioning the Cyclops looking up at the ceiling – so that human viewers could not see its face (e.g. the C1st AD free-standing sculpture of Odysseus blinding Polyphemus in the dining grotto of Tiberius' villa at Sperlonga) or using the theatrical setting of their depiction to justify showing the Cyclops as a satyr-like character with a third eye, commensurate with 'man in a suit' portrayals of Cyclopes in the theatre (e.g. Figure 9).



Figure 9: Polyphemus and Galatea, C2nd AD relief sculpture from the ancient theatre at Nemi, now in the Museo Massimo, Rome. © Ann Raia, 1999. Courtesy of VRoma (www.vroma.org).

¹⁷ I am grateful to Tony Dalton for drawing this aspect of Harryhausen's decision-making vis-à-vis the Cyclops to my attention at the *Animating Antiquity* conference.

¹⁸ The appearance of satyrs in Greek satyr plays can be seen as part of the 'man in a suit' tradition. Human portrayal of satyrs in real life influenced Greek vase painters, who increasingly depicted satyrs with human legs and feet and sometimes even showed their horses' tails firmly anchored to furry trunks. For a depiction of theatrical satyrs in relation to the description of the blinding of the Cyclops, see the Lucanian red-figure calyx crater by The Cyclops Painter (name vase) of c.410-400 BC (British Museum: London 1947.7-14.18), cf. n.16.

¹⁹ On the significance of being likened to a mountain, both in Homer and Virgil, and the development of this motif in Apuleius, see Frangoulidis (1992).

²⁰ Homeric epic generally does not provide detailed physical descriptions of characters; this reticence may indicate that the audience were already familiar with the physical characteristics of Cyclopes from other stories or from artistic depictions.

²¹ Polyphemus' name has metaliterary significance and evokes epic, etymologising as 'he who is much renowned/notorious' (Greek), and 'he whose story has become the subject of literary *fama* many times over' (Latin) according to Papaioannou (2005: 95). For modification of the behaviour of others in relation to that of the Cyclops and its effects on audience's evaluation of the Cyclops' behaviour, see n.11.

²² Rock-hurling is a means of textual integration with earlier/epic versions of the Cyclops story, see Papaioannou (2005: 96-8).

²³ Theocritus, *Idylls* 6 has a shepherd sing of Galatea's unrequited love for the oblivious Polyphemus, depicting the Cyclops as no more or less than a fellow pipe-playing shepherd. Nevertheless, the Cyclops' epic characterisation is acknowledged as, with a nod to the maxim 'Love is blind', the song concludes '(f)or oft the foul, good Polypheme, is fair i' the eyes of love' (Theocritus, *Idylls* 6.19).

²⁴ Like that of a satyr, the image which informs Roman sculptors' portrayals of Polyphemus and Galatea, especially in theatrical settings, cf. n.16.

²⁵ A brief but well-informed discussion of all the various Polyphemus narratives prior to Ovid is Hopkinson (2000: 35-8).

²⁶ Kenney goes on to describe Ovid's Polyphemus as an anticipation of King Kong (1986: 453 on 13.786-7), but this says more about Kenney's frame of reference and cultural capital as a modern interpreter of classics than it does of the inspiration for cinematic King Kongs.

²⁷ Tibullus's Priapus is compared by Ball (1983: 73) to Ovid's Polyphemus because Tibullus (1.4.9-72) has Priapus lecture on love to a lover and beloved, concluding with the threat of punishment, and Ovid (*Metamorphoses* 13.859-869) has Polyphemus conclude his tender love song to Galatea by threatening to dismember her suitor Acis.

²⁸ This influence can be seen in: the brown colouration, heavy musculature, lumbering movement and hairy legs of the 'man in a suit' Cyclops of the TV series *Lost in Space* (1965-68); the baldness, musculature, shoulders, pointed ears, flattened nose, dentition, flattened nose, finger arrangement and single crown-of-head horn of the potbellied, blue animated Cyclops of Disney's TV series *Hercules* (1998), which superseded the Cyclops of Disney's film *Hercules* (1997), which featured the brown colouration, baldness, flattened nose, head position and stance. In the computer game *God of War* a variety of Cyclopes appear as opponents but they are all influenced in terms of their head position, baldness, muscle-bound shoulders, skin-texture, arm position, flattened nose and stance. In Popcap's *Bookworm Adventures*, three Cyclopes appear as opponents, including Polyphemus as an end-of-level 'boss'. All feature the brown colouration, head position, baldness, muscle-bound shoulders, arm position, stance and lumbering movement of Harryhausen's Cyclops, but by professing to follow Odysseus' route, presenting the Cyclopes as Sicilian herders and citing information on them – including their singing voices – from 'Homer's *Book o'Beasties*' and the 'Cyclops Poetry Competition', PopCap emphasise their Cyclopes' classical origins.

²⁹ One of the most popular resin kits (meeting with Harryhausen's approval, a fact for which I am again grateful to Tony Dalton at the *Animating Antiquity* conference) is sculpted by Mike Maddi with a box that boasts 'Cyclops resin kit in Dynamation quality!': for images and one fan's assertion that this is the best kit available, see Ultraman Collector (2009).

³⁰ The competition rules read:

Sculpt one or more representations of Ray Harryhausen's creatures in 1 month (See the provided list).

The idea of this "mini-challenge" is to simulate an impossible dateline for a project. The artists will have at their discretion how detailed the models they will be working on, and the amount of models, and if the models will be shaded/rigged. But the model will have to be Ray's interpretation.

For example an entry might call for a Medusa, but the artist will have to sculpt a Ray's screen interpretation from the classic film *Clash of the Titans*.

³¹ For the winner notification, see CG Society (2007). For Rick Baker's work-in-progress blog, see Baker (2007).

³² There is a feeling that, if Harryhausen were growing into the craft of animation today and pushing the boundaries of CGI technology – in the same way that he pushed the boundaries of stop-motion animation and animation/live action interplay as he grew into his craft in the 1950s – then this is the creature he might create.

³³ For the background to and parallels between the two films, particularly Harryhausen's Cyclops and its poor imitation (the Cormoran), see Ashlin (2003-2012) and Frazier (2011).

³⁴ In the world of computer games Cyclopes are usually stupid, angry and destructive. For example in Disney's *Hercules* computer games Cyclopes routinely smash up towns full of Greek-temple-like architecture while citizens flee screaming down the streets. Fortunately the Cyclopes only occasionally grab fleeing citizens in their giant hands and never eat them, but the threat is there and it is very unsettling to observe it in an animated world created for children aged 6-10.

³⁵ I was told at the *Animating Antiquity* conference that there was a green two-horned Cyclops model, which I have found reproduced by the Japanese company Futura and cited as Harryhausen's Cyclops, but I have not been able to link this to an actual Harryhausen film, only *The 7th Voyage of Sinbad* poster.

³⁶ For Peter Jackson's tribute to Harryhausen's Cyclops on the occasion of Ray Harryhausen's ninetieth birthday, see Jackson (2010: 2:20-3:20).

³⁷ Peter Jackson has been explicit about these similarities and their deliberate reference to Harryhausen's Cyclops (see, e.g. Harryhausen 2009). Some audience members will have looked at Jackson's cave troll and been reminded of the Rancor from *Star Wars: The Return of the Jedi* (1983) with its two sets of nostrils located between its rather small eyes above a gaping, fanged mouth. Despite being based on an initial concept described by its creators as a cross between a bear and a potato and starting out as a 'man-in-a-suit', the Rancor developed into a rod-puppet that reproduced the skin-texture, head position, muscle-bound shoulders, snarl and stance of Harryhausen's Cyclops while varying its finger size/number and exaggerating its nails, shoulder and spine lumps and dentition. This resemblance has never been publically acknowledged and is based purely on my observation, so it is, of course, possible that the resemblance was unconscious rather than conscious on the part of the Rancor's creators/animators. But if it was unconscious the fact that a resemblance can be observed indicates the importance of Harryhausen's Cyclops as a benchmark for the creation of terrifying cinematic monsters, particularly man-eaters.

³⁸ Saturday Fright Special (2009) notes the missed opportunity for even more fighting, but while their review does not note Harryhausen's Cyclops, it emphasises the involvement of producer Richard Corman and the influence of several other films of the early 1960s, attributing this to O'Brien and Doel's 'profound respect' for the period and the 'B' film genre.

³⁹ Watch the fight at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o_6Fr1SmYhA.

⁴⁰ There is no evidence, e.g. the presence of human skulls, to support the supposition that Harryhausen's Cyclopes are habitual eaters of man-flesh. The cages in which the sailors are kept could equally well be cages for animals and the same can be said for the cooking arrangements shown.

⁴¹ The official Cyclops featurette can be watched at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vvmBCOSwy9M>.

⁴² The Cyclops of *The 7 Adventures of Sinbad* (2010) also has this kind of nose/nostrils and this kind of hair growth, but except for having a three-finger plus thumb arrangement of digits and human legs and feet is otherwise an exaggerated rendering of Harryhausen's Cyclops, which with respect to the muscles has led to reviewers' jocular comments about this Cyclops being on steroids. For a discussion of Jackson's cave troll and the Rancor, the dentition of which is shared by the initial concept art for *Wrath of the Titans* (2012), see n.36. Even where Cyclopes depart radically at first glance from Harryhausen's Cyclops, e.g. the bull-horned, fanged, Cyclops from *Sinbad: the Fifth Voyage* (2013) poster and trailer (http://www.imdb.com/video/withoutabox/vi3098781465?ref_=tt_pv_vi_1), certain features, such as the eye-nose-mouth ratio, muscle-bound shoulders and angle of the head, seem to have become an inescapable staple of the character's portrayal. For the relationship of *Sinbad: the Fifth Voyage* to the Harryhausen *Sinbad* films, see Keen (this volume).

⁴³ The encounter with the Cyclopes can be watched at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wGeL2mLeQ7I>.

⁴⁴ It is too soon to tell what *Percy Jackson: Sea of Monsters* (2013) will do with its Cyclopes. A possible teaser trailer suggests that a tan-skinned, humanoid, Cyclops shepherd will corner someone inside his cave, but how Tyson, Percy's half-brother and a Cyclops, will appear is unclear.

⁴⁵ Pixar (2001).

⁴⁶ I am grateful to Lynn Fotheringham for the suggestion (at the *Animating Antiquity* conference) that Sulley also conforms in part to Harryhausen's Cyclops, i.e. in terms of stance, flattened nose, eye(s) and mouth width, dentition, muscle-bound shoulders and two horns on his temples (with reference to the green Harryhausen Cyclops type, n.34), but especially in terms of hairiness with regard not just to his lower limbs, but to his whole body. Seeing Mike and Sulley as Harryhausen's Cyclops split in two, as Lynn Fotheringham suggested, is tempting, not only as the converse of the process being undergone in *The Hoosiers* music video but also because it is a familiar narratological strategy for retelling/varying stories and especially because doing this has the advantage of presenting two discrete CGI challenges to two separate teams of animators that would otherwise have had to have both been addressed for the same character: i) rendering expression with a one-eyed character, ii) animating hair. That the latter has always been a challenge is supported by Harryhausen's own admiration for *King Kong's* animation of the gorilla's hair in the draught from the aeroplanes and Harryhausen's contribution, through taxidermist George Lofgren, to the removal of problematic hair 'ripple' that had resulted from models being posed, as seen in *King Kong* (1933, dir. Merian C. Cooper and Ernest B. Schoedsack), for *Mighty Joe Young* (1949, dir. Ernest B. Schoedsack) by using rubberising techniques, see Webber (2004: 41) and Hankin (2008: 29). Similarly, Pixar were delighted to have figured out several complicated algorithms for rendering hair that have contributed to the success of their Renderman software and have since been widely used (<http://renderman.pixar.com/view/hair-and-fur>), including for Peter Jackson's remake of *King Kong* (2005). The difficulty of animating naturalistic hair is recognised by Rapunzel's hair being a fitting subject for Disney's 50th animated feature film, *Tangled* (2010).

⁴⁷ This sequence can be watched at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tkdj6oli5oU> (2:15–2:35). The sequence comes about after Boo has touched 'Little Mike', Mike's brown, furry, one-eyed Cyclops 'teddy bear', which can be seen as another reference to Harryhausen's Cyclops (or to the 'child's toy' version of it which is *Jack the Giant Killer's* Cormoran, see n.32).

⁴⁸ Cf. the head of Medusa being found in the fridge in the Hoosier's music video.

⁴⁹ Watch Mike in action with Celia <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M9Xu19GnRB0>.

⁵⁰ Story: Pete Docter, Jill Culton, Jeff Pidgeon and Ralph Eggleston. Screenplay: Andrew Stanton, Daniel Gerson and Robert L. Baird with additional screenplay material by Robert [L.] Baird, Rhett Reese and Jonathan Roberts.

⁵¹ Between Mike and Sulley (monster and monster) and between Mike/Sulley and Boo (monster and human).

⁵² Kenney (1986: xiv-xv) describes how Ovid's poem 'subscribes to two incompatible poetics', those of traditional (Homeric) epic and of Callimachean (learned and allusive Hellenistic) poetry. Kenney also emphasises Ovid's achievement as 'transmut[ing] what ought to be a profoundly depressing vision of existence into a cosmic comedy of manners. Under the wild fantasy and the vast exaggerations, the black humour and the occasional cruelty, Ovid's is a serious way of looking at the world, or at least a way that can be taken seriously.' (1986: xix) and identifies his aim as 'to carry the reader effortlessly from episode to episode, his appetite constantly titillated by variety of subject-matter, tone, tempo, linguistic wit, and literary treatment' (1986: xxi) by 'combining, varying, and embellishing the available materials... wittily, obliquely, allusively, piquantly, and above all unexpectedly.' (1986: xxii). Whether Ovid's *Metamorphoses* is a continuous poem (*perpetuum Carmen*; a phrase which also designates Homeric epic), linked episodes, or has a bewildering variety of structures, continues to be debated, but the issues at stake remain those identified by Otis (1966).

⁵³ Wells (2002: 44). For a full discussion of defining genre in relation to a number of established categories and in the context of animation, see Wells (2002: 41-71).

⁵⁴ This is not to say that Harryhausen's creatures did not convey emotions – indeed Harryhausen even attended acting classes at Los Angeles City College in order to better realise emotion through the gait and movements of his creatures – just that the burden of emotional story-telling is still on the human characters. 'His creations are absolutely alive; in each frame his creatures move, twitch, breathe, **act** [original emphasis] with a personality and pathos that can only be ascribed to a direct connection to Ray', Bergman (2011). Pixar (2001) details the fact that 'the characters introduced new challenges in conveying body language and facial expression'. Pixar addressed this by assigning animation leads for each main character. These key animators acted as specialists whom the other animators would turn to for advice as to movements, personality and expression.'