handling the distribution of rôles and the cues in his own text, but what happened when, with the beginning of reperformances, the *mise-en-scène* was handled by directors who were no longer the authors?' (p. 200). E.'s answer to this question is that markers internal to the text aided these later directors and also actors in determining changes of speaker. Indeed, in their texts diacritical signs and *sigla nominum* were non-existent because these markers made them unnecessary.

E. focuses on the various markers that indicate the end of a speech in tragic dialogue, especially the end of a rhesis. He divides these markers into two main classes. The first is further divided into implicit (Chapter II) and explicit (Chapter III). Various implicit markers of a speaker's ending his speech serve to launch the interlocutor's reply. They are 'prompters internal to the text' (p. 28). The explicit markers consist of direct requests, imperative or interrogative, to the interlocutor to speak. The markers of the first class as a whole E. calls 'internal didascaliai', using 'didascaliai' in the modern sense of 'stage directions'. The second main class is 'complex'. It includes three kinds of concluding formula: announcements of entrances and exits (Chapter IV); gnomes (Chapter V); farewells and prayers (Chapter VI).

An objection to E.'s main thesis starts with the fact that, from the beginnings of tragedy in Athens down to the middle of the fifth century, there is hardly any evidence that a playwright might have anticipated a reperformance of his work. Why, then, would he have introduced internal didascaliai into his composition? The question becomes more insistent when one considers that the playwright participated in the production and could directly train the performers. E. sees the reason for internal didascaliai in the demands of memorization that were placed on non-professional (until at least the 440s) actors (pp. 5–7). But consider one of E.'s examples (p. 72). At Aesch. *Sept*. 451, Eteocles says to the Messenger: 'Tell me another whose lot puts him at another gate'. It is an 'explicit internal didascalia', inviting the Messenger's reply. The chorus, however, has the next five lines. Then the Messenger replies, taking up the verb of speaking that Eteocles has used. The actor who played the Messenger had to be well enough prepared not to take Eteocles' imperative as a cue.

The conventions of tragic dialogue that E. describes must have evolved separately from any practical concern with *mise-en-scène*. Likewise, other supposed didascaliai in Greek tragedy, those indicating gesture and movement, have been explained as aesthetic and not practical. Oliver Taplin describes them as a verbal redoubling of the action. In his formulation: 'the characters of Greek tragedy say what they are doing, or are described as they act, and so the words accompany and clarify the actions' (*The Stagecraft of Aeschylus: The Dramatic Uses of Exits and Entrances in Greek Tragedy* [Oxford, 1977], p. 28). This redoubling of the action by words was, Taplin holds, not for the director's sake but for the audience's (*PCPhS* 23 [1977], 129–30).

Though one can challenge E.'s main thesis, the phenomena that it led him to analyze are fundamental to the workings of the tragic rhesis, and they are lucidly discussed. E.'s survey of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides is exhaustive, and he comments on each example in his various inventories. His *index locorum* makes his book handy to use for reference, and it will often be used.

Rutgers University LOWELL EDMUNDS

K. Glau: *Rezitation griechischer Chorlyrik. Die Parodoi aus Aischylos' Agamemnon und Euripides' Bakchen als Tonbeispiel auf CD mit Text und Begleitheft.* Pp. 40, CD. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 1998. Paper, Sw. frs. 25. ISBN: 3-82530753-0.

The CD has two tracks, comprising communal chanting of the parodoi of the *Agamemnon* and *Bacchae*, 11 minutes and 13 seconds for the former, 5 minutes and 3 seconds for the latter. The booklet informs us that the recordings were first made as part of birthday celebrations for Prof. Dr Herwig Görgemanns of Heidelberg University. The explanatory booklet includes as libretto the Greek texts from the editions of West and Kopff.

The choruses consist of both male and female voices. The choice of parodoi rather than other texts is perhaps partly determined by the fact that they are dominated by simple and regular metrical patterns that lend themselves well to this sort of presentation. Clarity of recording is excellent, and I noticed no errors in the pronunciation (the 'chi' is a soft German one). The sense of metre is pretty good, though I guess strictly they should have avoided pauses at commas in

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.381 Published online by Cambridge University Press

mid-line, just as there should have been some sort of break at every line-end. At *Ag*. 216 ἐπιθυμεῖν 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 syncopated iambics 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 Ζεύς at *Ag*. 2, Παιᾶνα 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*