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three actors plus speaking child extras (though this does not prove that it was so performed, and the fundamental discussion of MacDowell, CQ 44 (1994) 326–35, should anyway have been referred to). On the vexed question of the staging of Peace's rescue, O. concludes that she is hauled out on the ekkolykma (clarifying some important details of the process for the first time); from Trygaios' movements before and after the parabasis, he tentatively deduces that the hero's house and Zeus's palace were represented by the same door (not the central one) in the skene façade (in his commentary O. more than once acutely establishes at which side a character enters from the time that elapses between his being seen and his making contact with other persons, e.g. 262, 1207–9). Like Platnauer, O. prints and discusses the fragments customarily ascribed to Peace II; he rightly considers it virtually certain that such a play once existed, suspects that it was produced after 413, and thinks it more likely to have been a reworking of Peace I than a wholly new play (though he is wrong to cite Eur. Hipp. as a parallel, and makes no attempt to answer Platnauer's point that 'our play was essentially a pièce d'occasion, suitable for March 421 and for no other time').

O.'s analysis of the later textual tradition (including a brilliant reconstruction of the form and fate of its hyparchetype, b), previously published in CQ 48 (1998) 62–74, is now extended to include the surviving earlier mss. RV, but not very satisfactorily: we are told that 'R and V agree repeatedly against the other witnesses' (liii), but are then referred to a catalogue which shows only, and unhelpfully, that RV are often right together where b is wrong. In fact they also often agree in error (e.g. 16, 41, 76, 120, 161, 218, 219); interestingly, the distribution of these shared errors is patchy (more than half of them occur in the last quarter of the play). Thus O.'s siglum n for RV is justified—but the evidence to justify it has to be gleaned from his apparatus.

Textual innovations include: 186–7 transposed (B. Milles per litt.), restoring the conventional sequence nampatronymic-ethnic; 223a (τι π θείς;) and 261a (ι' ι' γ') restored to text from scholia (for the former, Clouds 235 furnishes a parallel); 872 δναυσατε ττο τιλ βουληι (unnecessary); 953 τουδ' (partitive, 'some of this beast'; excellent). Surprisingly, having given good reason for attaching much more importance to p (PCH) than previous editors have done, O. neither marks in his text nor mentions in his commentary the lacuna of 7–9 lines which p indicates at 440/1; to judge by p, a note has here fallen out of the commentary, and one hopes it will be restored in a reprint. In the concluding lines before 1188–1215, Eccl. 1144–8). The mysterious ταυτη ι of 1193 is identified as Trygaios' old εξουςις, on the assumption that he is already dressed for the wedding (but he is still a farmer, and will need working clothes; whatever the object is, it must be something for which in peacetime a country-dweller would have no use). At 1318 ff., there is surely no 'perhaps' about Trygaios having an erect phallus.

After this performance, O.'s forthcoming Acharnians, in the same series, will be awaited with the greatest eagerness.

ALAN H. SOMMERSTEIN
Centre for Ancient Drama and its Reception, University of Nottingham


Old Comedy often has caught the eye of interpreters who wish to see a ritual pattern in its plot lines, most famously in F.M. Cornford's The Origins of Attic Comedy (London 1914). Lada-Richard's new book differs from Cornford's by focusing on only one play and on specific Dionysiac cults and institutions (mysteries, wine, theatre), as well as coming-of-age rituals. While this approach looks more promising, the result is equally disappointing; in fact, there is more to be said for Cornford's (untenable) thesis that Dionysus in Frogs represents a dying and rising god than for L.-R.'s claim that he is an initiate going through 'a ritual initiation sequence grafted upon a comic dramatic plot' (119).

L.-R. in the Introduction presents her main thesis as well as her methodology. She argues that in interpreting the play one should take the fullest possible cultural context into account, especially in the case of a stage figure like Dionysus, who already had a 'divine personality' outside the play (2). In ch.1, she observes that Dionysus and Heracles have more in common than their confrontation in the Prologue suggests. Ch.2, the largest in the book, lays out her main thesis, namely that Dionysus, starting as a wild and ambiguous god in the Prologue and ending as a civilizing presence at the end of the play, undergoes an initiation, reminiscent both of that of a young adult (51–78) and of an ithyphallic and in the Bacchic or Eleusinian Mysteries (78–120).

Chs.3–9 are intended to fill out this picture. Ch.3 studies the allusions to wine in the play and sees a progression from Dionysus' self-description as 'Dionysus,
atic claim of the book is that a more gentle, civic Dionysus can be distilled from the wild and dangerous deceiver (237 ff.), also belong to Dionysus' darker side of Aeschylus' 'Dionysiac' qualities, such as his power to believe that the Agon is pictured as a symposium). Some (and to Euripides: 285), and perhaps the most problem-able as well. For example, it is surprising that some-

This short summary does not do justice to the book, whose value lies more in the detailed discussions of Dionysiac rituals than in its main thesis. L.-R. demon-

This collection of articles on Josephus' final composi-


of, the CA, and they paint a useful picture of scholarly directions, present and future; unusually for a volume of essays, it also comes armed with excellent indexes. There is appended a concordance to the Latin portion of the text, but although in their introductory chapter Levison and Wagner claim that this concordance forms ‘the anchor’ of the volume, to which is tethered the collection of articles, the truth is that the concordance stands quite on its own: the articles have nothing to do with it, and its presence does not substantially enhance the work. It could just as well have been published on its own. L. and W.’s introduction is a model of its kind (1–48): they present a summary of the contents of the CA, an analysis of the articles in the volume, and finally a briefly annotated bibliography of work on the CA. Their dis-
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