

Aristophanes: Fragments. Edited and Translated by JEFFREY HENDERSON. Loeb Classical Library 502. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2008. Pp. ix + 559. Cloth, \$24.00. ISBN 978-0-674-99615-1.

I must declare at the very beginning that I am currently at work on two volumes of the Loeb Classical Library on *The Fragments of Old Comedy (excluding Aristophanes)* and thus have more than a passing interest in the volume under review.

The Loeb Library has over the past few years moved beyond preserved (or mostly preserved) texts and begun to make fragmentary ancient authors available to the grateful reader. We now have West's *Greek Epic Fragments* (nr. 497), and for drama, Sophocles vol. III (Lloyd-Jones, nr. 483) and the excellent first of two volumes of Euripides (Collard & Cropp, nrs. 504, 506), and we await the re-working of Aeschylus by Sommerstein including a wholly new third volume for the fragments (nr. 505). With *Aristophanes V* Jeffrey Henderson (hereafter H.) has given us a thorough and very welcome text and translation of the nearly 1000 fragments of Aristophanes to accompany his equally appreciated four volumes of the eleven extant plays.

But H. gives us much more than the fragments themselves. The first 109 pages present much of the *testimonia* about Aristophanes, including a complete translation of the *Life*, extracts from many of the writers collected in Koster (*Scholia in Aristophanem*, Pars IA) and the references to Aristophanes by later writers of antiquity. Particularly welcome are the extracts from writers on meter (nrs. 96–112) and certain less well-known stories, such as Maximus of Tyre on Socrates (nr. 34), Eunapius (nr. 35), and the intertextual allusion in Achilles Tatius (nr. 73). I did not find the anonymous Koster V, although much of what he has to say is reproduced in Tzetzes' account (nr. 83b). H. includes six papyri (F 590–5) which can with reasonable security be assigned to Aristophanes, suggesting attributions (F 590 to *Anagyris*, and F 592 to *Lemnian Women*).

H. on p. 24 (nr. 20) rightly reads the names of Aristophanes and Cantharus on the list of victors at the Dionysia (IG ii² 2325.58, 60), although on the right-hand page adds "possibly Aristomenes" and "possibly Callistratus." On p. 29 (nrs. 24 and 25) a note might have made it clearer that the two attacks by Cleon are not likely to refer to the same occasion, although H. does quote the scholiast to *Wasps*. On pp. 35–43 (nrs. 30–4) a note would again have warned the unwary reader that the enlistment of Aristophanes in the prosecution of Socrates ignores the gap of 24 years between the original production of *Clouds* and that legal action. In nr. 45 the translation of *Clouds* 554 as "a bad poet's bad trans-

mogrification of my *Knights*" misses the image of clothing in the text, "turned my [or "our"?] *Knights* inside out" (cf. F 58).

How does one present and translate fragments for the Loeb these days? And in particular what does one do with the most fragmentary remains, the bare allusion or one-word citation, such as "bed-mate" (Aristophanes F 893) or "Hysiae" (Euripides F 180)? In Lloyd-Jones' *Sophocles III*, only substantial fragments were included, making this essentially a selected edition. Collard & Cropp include all the fragments, but "brief fragments" appear in the introduction to each play in translation only. H. gives us every fragment with equal attention to each, brief provenance plus Greek text on the left-hand side, English translation on the right. I found the layout disconcerting throughout. Left-hand pages contain swathes of empty space while all introductory material and notes to the individual plays and fragments appear on the right-hand pages. The very first page of the text (p. 110) is particularly wasteful in this respect, and there are frequent and unattractive widowed play-titles (as on pp. 118, 128, 204, 326, etc.). In Collard & Cropp's *Euripides*, on the other hand, the introductory material is presented in italic type equally on left- and right-hand sides, before the familiar Loeb format resumes. This would have made for a more attractive and economical layout of the material here. In a few cases footnotes that begin in one play continue one or two plays later, e.g., n. 125 which begins on p. 355 (*Fry-cooks*) and resumes on p. 362 (*Telmessians*). But perhaps we should not fault the author for a problem elsewhere in the process of production.

Traditional Loeb's have purposely been light on bibliography, which can easily and quickly date the volume. Collard & Cropp is a significant exception as each play is provided with a reasonable, if short, bibliography and reference in the introduction and notes to the literature. At places in *Aristophanes V* certain plays and fragments would have been better served either by discussions in the introductions or notes to individual fragments, alerting the reader to controversies or significant treatments. For example, the other *Thesmophoriazusae* deserved a note about Butrica's radical re-dating of the play to the mid-420s (*Phoenix*, 2001), *Babylonians* could have benefited from a note about the still common (and mistaken) assumption that Aristophanes is defending the cause of the allies against Athenian imperialism (Forrest in *Essays in Honour of C.E. Stevens* [1975] is particularly good here), and even my article (*Phoenix*, 1988) suggesting that Thrasymachus in *Banqueters* F 205.8 is not the sophist, addressed by apostrophe, but the name of the wayward son. Finally, would it have been worth mentioning the suggestion (see Taplin, *Comic Angels*, pp. 65–6) that *Proagon* is the play depicted on the *Choregos*-vase?

On the whole the quality of text, translation and notes is very high and will be of immense value to the browser who needs to consult quickly and conveniently the fragments of Aristophanes. I have a few comments and questions about some individual passages. In F 11 (*Aeolosicon*) was Heracles actually a character in the play? All the scholiast says is that "Aristophanes makes fun of Heracles as a glutton." On p. 129 (introduction to *Anagyrus*) *Clouds* 549–62 does mention more than one attack on Hyperbolus, "now everybody is laying into Hyperbolus." In (i) on p. 130, in addition to a minor typo of *Babyloniois* for *Babylonious*, *toutou* should refer to the hero of Anagyrus, not to the deme. Treat "Anagyrus as an Attic deme" as an interjection, and take *toutou* with the "hero," who then becomes the new subject in the next sentence introduced by *ho de*.

Since the hero Anagyrus took revenge on an old man living nearby, who had cut down the grove of trees—the Anagyrois are a deme in Attica. A man cut down his grove, and he [the hero] made the man's mistress fall madly in love with his son.

Farther down the page in (ii) *bomos* is better translated as "altar" than "tomb." In *Babylonians* H.'s presentation of the fragments demonstrates just how flimsy the cases are for Aristophanes' alleged championing of the allies and for equating the chorus with the cities of the *arche*. F 71 shows that the scholiasts were merely guessing at what "It's the people of Samos, how very lettered!" meant. In F 129 (*Old Age*), I felt that the translation of *teknon* as "kiddo" was not a happy one; I tried this out on both Canadian and English students and neither group was comfortable with it. In F 490 does "in Callippides" refer to Strattis' play of that name? I was glad to see in the introduction to *Seasons* that H. is sceptical about whether the testimony of Cicero (*Laws* 2.37) in fact refers to that comedy. The link is merely that both Cicero and F 578 mention Sabazius, who is also found in at *Wasps* 9–10, *Birds* 873 and *Lysistrata* 388. This is an unsubstantial foundation indeed. More likely Cicero is referring to Aristophanes' lost *Heroes*.

But these are minor quibbles and I would not wish to detract from my appreciation of a fine and meticulous job of giving us the Aristophanic fragments in a very useful volume.

IAN C. STOREY

Trent University