not a question. 215 *Ἀττικωνικοί* vocative; but this spoils the parallelism with 212–3 and requires a change in the unanimous reading of the MSS. 223a add *τί φῄς;* (Zacher from metr. Σ^{V}); but do we need two surprised questions here? The similar addition of extra-metrical *ἰή ἰή* in 261 is more convincing however. 257–8 unemended to Kudoimos. 329 *ὀρχήσησθέ τι* (Boissonade + Bekker), to avoid unusual *μή* + fut, indic. as imperative. 365 keep the line; the custom is mentioned by Eur. fr. 39, Hsch. *ε* 5961, etc. 435–57 the Chorus is Trygaeus' interlocutor not Hermes, because the latter is not concerned with human affairs. But not only does Hermes hold the phiale so that we expect him to speak (Sommerstein), but the Chorus have just asked Hermes to tell them what to do (428–9), so a period of silence at this point would be odd, especially as he has a major rôle later in this scene. 458–519 a new order of speakers. 479 *ἔχοντ' <ὑπὸ> τοῦ ξύλου* (Olson). 742–4 keep the paradosis; not all of Sommerstein's objections are met, however. 758 *πρωκτὸν δὲ καμήλου* a reference to homosexual sex; but *ὄρχεις ἀπλύτους* suggests distinct lack of hygiene is more the point? 1135 *ἐκπεπρεμνισμένα* 'having been reduced to rough lumber' rather than 'rooted out'.

The Queen's College, Oxford A. M. BOWIE

THE LOEB ARISTOPHANES COMPLETED

J. J. Henderson (ed.): *Aristophanes. Vol. IV:* Frogs, Assembly-women, Wealth. (Loeb Classical Library, 180.) Pp. 601. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2002. Cased, £14.50. ISBN: 0-674-99596-1.

This volume completes the new Loeb Aristophanes begun in 1998. H. remains true to the policy followed in earlier volumes: brief introductions, bibliographies of annotated editions only, text with minimal (but Latin) apparatus, accurate and sometimes imaginative translation with few stage directions and little annotation, index of personal names only (for this purpose, incidentally, heroes count as persons but gods, even if they appear on stage, do not). The rationale for this policy was stated in the preface to the first volume ('a Loeb edition is not the place for a commentary'), and no one is more entitled to lay down such a principle than the editor of the Loeb Library. Others may continue to feel that the policy has deprived them of numerous valuable insights that H.'s flair and scholarship could have supplied—and to hope that he may see fit to present them subsequently between other covers.

Within H.'s self-imposed limits, there is still much worthy of attention. He points out (p. 8) that *Frogs* could hardly have ignored the existence of Sophocles had he been alive (as Ar. must surely have anticipated that he would be) when the play was produced, and makes an interesting and plausible suggestion as to what might then have been said about him. On *Frogs* 1500 he casually notes that 'Aeschylus . . . will depart carrying a torch': this is new, so far as I can discover, and entirely appropriate to this Eleusinian poet who is returning to earth to bring *σωτηρία* to Athens. Another 'stage-directional' adjustment is made at the end of *Wealth*, where Wealth, sent for at 1196, is not allowed to come out of the house until 1207/8. Presumably, though as usual we are not told, this is to avoid his having to wait in the background while Chremylos deals with the Old Woman; it also produces a neat little surprise, as the

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.21 Published online by Cambridge University Press

door opens and instead of a resplendent Wealth out comes a little woman almost as decrepit as Wealth was when we first saw him.

H.'s text is in general quietly sound. At *Eccl.* 560–1 he ingeniously tries to meet objections to the paradosis (which led me in my edition [Warminster, 1998] to posit a lacuna) by sundering *τοῖς τολμῶσιν* syntactically from *αἰσχρὰ δρᾶν* and taking it in an absolute sense ('from now on *aggressive people* will be in no position to treat the city shamefully in any way, or to testify or trump up charges'); however, testifying (*μαρτυρεῖν*) is not in itself an aggressive act—indeed, it was an act that nobody could perform except at the request of another. In *Eccl.* 952–68 the reader is warned that the text of the 'love-duet' has suffered substantial intrusive glossing and/or paraphrasing; here more than ever one longs for fuller information!

As ever, there are some delightful touches in H.'s translation: 'kinsdom teeth' (*Frogs* 418); 'Heurippides became everyone's golden boy' (*Eccl.* 826); 'au contraire, miss twiggy' (for *νὴ Δί', ὦ φθίνυλλα σύ*) (*Eccl.* 935); at *Wealth* 649–52 an effective treatment of one of the most refractory word-plays, for the translator, in all of Ar. Occasionally a term that would be appropriate in an analogous modern context is used in a way that might mislead, e.g. 'knitting' (*Eccl.* 89), 'sewing' (*Eccl.* 556), 'bunks' (*Wealth* 663), 'jacket' (*Wealth* 882). In *Eccl.* 681 'ballot boxes' will not do (these are *κληρωτήρια*, not *καδίσκοι*); what's wrong with 'lottery machines'—which we still have, though we now use them for rather different purposes?

A few points where one hopes that corrections can be made in a future printing. *Frogs* 15: delete question mark. *Frogs* 282 n.: for 'Sophocles' read 'Euripides'. *Frogs* 1043 n.: Bellerophon was not a stepson of Stheneboia, but a guest of her husband's. *Frogs* 1168: for 'without informing' read 'without the consent of'. *Eccl.* 243 n.: the Spartan 'investment' of Athens did not begin until after Aigospotamoi. *Wealth* intro., p. 417: it is not possible for 'three actors to play all the roles' in *Wealth* unless there is a choral interlude after 1170, and H. ad loc. does not posit one. *Wealth* 173 n.: the 'mercenary force in Corinth' was established in 393, not 390, and by 388 it was no longer commanded by Iphikrates. *Wealth* 550: for 'that Thrasybulus is the same as Dionysius' read 'that Dionysius is the same as Thrasybulus'. *Wealth* 1096: *χοροῦ* is in fact present in K (Ambr. C222 inf.). Something has gone badly wrong with the positioning of the textual notes on *Eccl.* 961–end, one of which is twelve pages out of place.

So now we have at last a complete, usable Loeb Aristophanes; and I am sure it will prove to have lasted better over the next seventy-five years than its predecessor did over the last seventy-five. But one hopes Rogers has not gone out of print for ever!

University of Nottingham ALAN H. SOMMERSTEIN

SATYRIC DRAMA

P. VOELKE: *Un Théâtre de la Marge. Aspects figuratifs et configurationnels du drame satyrique dans l'Athènes classique*. Pp. 471, pls. Bari: Levanti editori, 2001. Paper, €61.97. ISBN: 88-7949-267-5.

Pierre Voelke's study of Greek satyr drama, which originated as his 1999 Lausanne thesis, reflects hard work, enviable learning, and good sense combined with imagination. Clearly and engagingly written, it aims at nothing less than a complete survey of the themes and plots of satyr drama and a new answer to the question of its function within tragic production. In his first chapter, V. sketches five previous

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.21 Published online by Cambridge University Press