

mid-line, just as there should have been some sort of break at every line-end. At *Ag.* 216 ἐπιθυμείν seems to be wrongly scanned, and there are erroneous syllable divisions at *Ba.* 67 and 118–9, in both cases involving elision of τε. The ionics in the *Bacchae* are chanted in a very catchy 4:4 (the long syllables thus lengthened to correspond with three short ones, as in the synopated iambs at *Ag.* 180ff.), a manoeuvre which G. justified in the booklet with references to Aristoxenos. There is no systematic attempt to observe a pitch accent.

Rather than having all members of the chorus simply chant together all the way through, G. adds variety in various ways, particularly in *Ag.*: (i) she alternates between different chanters: either between male and female subgroups (who handle the strophes and antistrophes in *Ba.* 73ff., with epode sung in unison), or between full chorus and soloists (soloists tend to deal with sections in direct speech, as *Ag.* 125ff., although even there some of the direct speech is given to the chorus; sometimes solo-phrases come out of the blue, as at *Ag.* 60, 177–8); (ii) she has the performers chant in canon, e.g. in *Ag.* 184–205, 218–25, an effect which seems to suit the ionic and anapaestic sequences, but would be difficult to justify historically; (iii) individual words are set off by being repeated, particularly divine names, as Ζεὺς at *Ag.* 2, Παιῖνα at *Ag.* 146; again, though effective to a modern ear, this is subversive to the principles of Greek metre; (iv) there are pronounced variations in tempo (e.g. the marked slowing of tempo at *Ag.* 104ff. and *Ag.* 160ff.); (v) at certain points, the chanters reinforce the metre with a beat, either a drum or clapping (*Ag.* 25ff.) or snapping of the fingers (*Ba.* 93ff.); the beat is generally on the thesis, which in some places gives a lively, syncopated effect, strangely reminiscent of contemporary popular music (it is difficult to imagine that the original performances would have sounded as familiar as that, but who knows?). No attempt is made to use melody or musical instruments, other than the drum.

All in all, it has to be judged a success. One could imagine these recordings finding a place in undergraduate courses on Greek tragedy. My only complaint is that there are only two tracks! It would be interesting to have similar recordings of a few tragic stasima (including ones with more complicated metres than the ones included here), and perhaps a few non-dramatic poems and fragments as well. Dare one look forward to the day, perhaps not so far in the future, when it will be possible to buy the complete recordings of the extant works of Pindar in a CD boxed-set? I hope so.

University of Reading

IAN RUTHERFORD

P. MEINECK (trans. and notes; Introduction by I. C. Storey): *Aristophanes Vol. 1: Clouds, Wasps, Birds*. Pp. xi + 417. Indianapolis and Cambridge: Hackett Publishing, 1998. Paper, £8.95. ISBN: 0-87220-36-1.

Peter Meineck and Ian Storey have joined forces to produce the first volume of a new translation (Meineck), with notes (Meineck), a general introduction (Storey), introductions to each play (Storey), an appendix on the first version of *Clouds* (Storey), and a select bibliography.

S.'s contributions are solid, and conduct the beginner clearly and logically through the various minefields of Aristophanic scholarship, without oversimplification. He gives the range of views, but is not afraid to state his own preferences. He is least at home in dealing with theatre production, where a number of statements need more qualification (e.g. p. xxi 'a circular dancing-space . . .': but that at Thorikos, for example, was rectangular; p. xxii 'vase-paintings of comic scenes do show a raised structure' with n. 31, references to O. Taplin's *Comic Angels* (Oxford, 1993) 'these are . . . fourth century': but there is one *Athenian* vase c. 420 showing a comic scene with raised stage [Pickard-Cambridge *DFA*², Fig. 76]; p. xxiii the *machina* should be given the Greek name, a convention adopted for other items). His outline of Henderson's paper in J. J. Winkler, F. I. Zeitlin (edd.), *Nothing to Do with Dionysos* (Princeton, 1990), 'Old Comedy was a sort of "unofficial opposition" to the democracy of the day' (p. xxxii), contrasts disturbingly with Halliwell's (*Birds and other Plays*, p. lxxiii), 'comedy as embodying the power of the democracy to humble individuals, and remind élite leaders of the sovereignty of the people'. Finally, it is understandable that bibliography has to be selective, but is it useful to refer in footnotes to items which are not accessible in the volume (e.g. p. 265 n. 5, Süvern and Vickers)?

Students of Aristophanes' comedies are currently being bombarded with new translations. Halliwell's Oxford World Classics *Birds and other Plays* and Henderson's Loeb of *Clouds, Wasps*

and *Peace*, both of 1998, cover between them the ground trodden by M. However, in this garden, even more than in others, we should be glad to allow a thousand flowers to bloom. Students without Greek are potentially helped, rather than hindered, by being able to consult different versions of the same text. The particular virtue of M. lies in the fact that he is a theatre director who has worked with these texts in an attempt to realize them for modern audiences, without replacing their contemporary references. His aim of producing translations ‘that are understandable, performable, accessible, and entertaining’ has clearly been fulfilled. And (despite some quibbles) his reasonably full notes are generally very helpful.

I cannot help wondering, though, whether such editions would not better serve the university students who are now surely their main audience if they contained fuller commentaries. In all, the notes in this edition amount to sixty-one pages. In Halliwell’s there are only thirty-four pages (for four plays). But add together the notes in Sommerstein’s editions of these three plays (which are keyed to his translations) and you have 279 pages. And he is not a verbose commentator. Since Plutarch, it has been recognized that the understanding of Aristophanes requires a great weight of learning. Nothing has changed.

University College Cork

KEITH SIDWELL

P. TOTARO: *Le seconde parabasi di Aristofane*. (Drama 9.) Pp. xxv + 219. Stuttgart and Weimar: Verlag J. B. Metzler. Paper, DM 50. ISBN: 3-476-45229-8.

This volume has at its core the second parabases of *Knights*, *Clouds*, *Wasps*, *Peace*, and *Birds*, each treated separately with an introductory essay (context, themes), metrical note, text with translation, and a detailed commentary. Texts printed are the most recent Oxford editions or, in the case of *Knights*, Henderson’s Loeb. T.’s particular strengths are in detailing parallel literary motifs, both Greek and Latin (e.g. the *laus vitae rusticae* in *Peace*), treating sympotic themes, and finding sexual innuendo (contrast, for example, the more restrained comments of Dunbar and Olson). Even compared with recent heavyweight commentators, T. is long on detail. However, despite T.’s distinctive voice, the commentaries (*Knights* excepted) do run the risk of redundancy. More serious problems include the absence of an apparatus (which could have reduced or clarified much of the longhand textual criticism in the notes), and a rather leisurely and repetitive style of presentation. T. is a scrupulous and judicious guide to scholarly controversies (with ample citation of predecessors), but at times this even-handedness comes close to fence-sitting. He is reluctant to push himself forward: one tentative and minor emendation (*Birds* 1094, floated elsewhere); the occasional dissension from scholarly consensus. We see most of T. himself in his two appendices on the interpretation of the antepirrheme of *Wasps*, and on *Knights* and the relationship between Aristophanes and Eupolis. These are significant mini-essays (although the latter conspicuously needs a reference to the work of Keith Sidwell).

Despite their valuable remarks, the commentaries are really extended footnotes to the introductory essay on the definition, form, and content of the second parabasis. Here T. is at his best—admirably well-informed, but clear-headed about what can seem an arcane topic. T. brushes aside both the wilder proliferation of formal elements and the over-precise mapping of form to content. For T., the character of the ‘second parabasis’ resides in a combination of metre with one or more of three motifs—*onomasti komoidein*, choral self-praise, and/or appeal to the judges. Particularly valuable is his section on the fragments. Here his flexible criteria and caution over the habit(at)s of comic dicola mean that he is (justifiably) hesitant in assigning fragments to formal contexts. His emphasis on flexibility and distrust of dogma is suggestive, but not pushed to a conclusion. Ultimately, in deciding his corpus, he follows the scholia’s identification of five segments as a *παράβασις*, *τελευταία παράβασις*, or *δευτέρα παράβασις*, and carefully excludes borderline cases such as *Acharnians* 971–99. Despite ‘una patina parabatica’ and close metrical similarities to *Wasps*, T. prefers to accept the scholiastic description of this passage as a *συζυγία κατὰ περικοπήν ἀνομοιοκέρης* (a fudge if ever there was one). T. thus ducks some pressing issues. What is at stake (for him/us/the scholia) in choosing one label over the other, in assigning a specific identity and status to a dramatic segment? How, if at all, did the second parabasis represent a different part of the theatrical experience? T.’s cautious treatment could have provided grounds for either the deconstruction or recuperation of the formal agenda. That would have required more focus and a more consistent argument—more of T. himself and less of the