or graduate class" (see above), he has been overly modest there, I think. Anyone reading Thucydides' books VI and VII can, perhaps even should, benefit from the deep knowledge of and understanding for the text Pelling displays. That Pelling's two *Commentaries* under scrutiny do not succeed in answering all questions Thucydides' text poses is, in my view, only a minor inconvenience. Moreover, if even readers of Thucydides' work in antiquity were faced with (near) insurmountable problems regarding the author's Greek, as Dionysius of Halicarnassus makes clear, how can we complain not to understand all of it? As it is, some back up (or support) for Pelling may be present in the shape of, notably, the *CoT* (in fact, often more so than by the *HCT*) to help understand Thucydides' Greek, but essentially Pelling's efforts largely suffice. Equally important, perhaps, these two volumes by Pelling are very easily manageable (at least easier than the copious volumes of the *HCT* and the *CoT*), well produced and hardly contain printing errors. All in all, I think, the Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics series has two more jewels in its crown.

Jan P. Stronk
Independent researcher in Ancient History
jpstronk@planet.nlS.

Douglas Olson, *Aristophanes' Clouds: a commentary*, Michigan Classical Commentaries, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2021, $75.00 (Hardcover), $29.95 (Paper), 274 pp., ISBN 978-0-472-07477-8 (Hardcover), 978-0-472-05477-0 (Paper).

This new commentary on Aristophanes' *Clouds* by a leading expert on Greek Comedy is a welcome addition to the scholarship on this play, a fundamental text for a variety of well-known reasons. In accordance with the aims of the newly launched "Michigan Classical Commentaries" series (https://www.press.umich.edu/browse/series/UM163), the commentary is intended for upper-level undergraduate and introductory graduate courses, but advanced readers will also find much that is useful in it.

In a brief introduction, Olson (henceforth O.) addresses some of the most significant and problematic aspects of the play, which, as O. rightly notes, "remains a puzzle" (1). O. first highlights the oddity of the hero of the *Clouds*, Strepsiades, compared to other Aristophanic heroes (1); he then discusses the thorny question of the double redaction of the play (2-5), that has important consequences both for the text we read and for its staging. A brief section (5-7) tackles the fundamental but often frustrating question of the presentation of Socrates in the *Clouds*, and is followed by two concise treatments of issues relating to staging and meter (7-11). An extremely selective bibliography (10-13) is thematically organized. No works in languages other than English are mentioned: this is perhaps understandable, given

that the commentary is aimed at intermediate, English-speaking, students. However, it may give the wrong impression to those same students that Aristophanes is not studied outside the United Kingdom or the United States. Secundary literature, in general, is very rarely mentioned in the commentary itself.

O. prints his own text of the play (17-59), with no *apparatus criticus* (no manuscript work was conducted by the author, as stated at p. ix); the most significant differences from the text of K. Dover or N. Wilson are discussed in the commentary. The text is not accompanied by a translation either. I have noticed that at l. 439 (29) the word χρήσθων, found in our manuscripts but convincingly expunged by C.G. Cobet (cf. the commentary, p. 122), has been completely eliminated from the text instead of being placed between square or brace brackets, as is usual in critical editions.

The commentary proper is, unsurprisingly, the heart of the book (63-242). It offers *in primis* reliable guidance on grammatical, syntactical, and interpretive matters, generously offering translations of the text discussed. I have found the system of breaking up compound words in their constituent parts especially useful to help students memorizing the words' meanings.

Students will also be well served by the abundant help provided for the identification of verbal forms (but I have noticed two slips: παρατέταται, l. 212, is not a participle, as stated at p. 94, and ἐπιθείην, l. 426, is not passive, as stated at p. 126).

O. knows how to employ Aristophanes' text to illustrate fundamental aspects of grammar and syntax (cf. for example the excellent observations about the opposition between imperfect and aorist at p. 140 *ad* ll. 587-9; or p. 168 *ad* l. 828 on the perfect).

Adequate attention is also given to the communicative peculiarities of dialogues. O. regularly and competently illustrates the pragmatic functions of particles in the context in which they are employed (to quote just a significant example: p. 89 on δέ γε, l. 169). A note on the use of the dative of the first person pronoun μοι as an equivalent (pragmatically speaking) to English "please" (p. 80, l. 107), allows O. to add that the same meaning is also to be assumed in the first line of Homer's *Odyssey*, where ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε Μοῦσα means "please, tell us, Muse", and not "tell me, Muse".

Indeed, I have found the notes in which O. widens the discussion by including material not strictly relevant to the text, like the one just mentioned, particularly enjoyable and stimulating. When discussing the merits of some scholar's conjecture, O. provides information and fascinating details on the scholar in question and on the emendation proposed. The note at p. 95 on R. Bentley's emendation μεταφροντίζετε (for the manuscripts' reading πάνυ φροντίζετε), l. 215, is a little masterpiece; it explains not only how Bentley (about whom essential biographical details are provided) arrived at the conjecture (thanks to a gloss in the *scholia* of manuscript R and a quotation in the *Suda*) but also why the term μεταφροντίζω is absent from the LSJ (Bentley's conjecture has gained general support only in relatively recent

times). In other notes, students will also get to know other famous scholars, like G. Hermann, P. Elmsley, R. Porson, as well as the Byzantine scholar Demetrius Triclinius (cf. 150; 225; 236).

As can be inferred from this, matters relating to textual criticism are quite often discussed in the commentary. My impression is that such discussions become more and more frequent while we approach the end of the play (perhaps because, in the author's view, readers will be by then more trained to tackle such questions?). I have not found all of O.'s textual proposals equally convincing. At p. 71 O. suggests that we should perhaps read the imperfect ἐπῆρε at l. 42 ("kept encouraging"), instead of the aorist ἐπῆρε of the manuscripts, which O., however, retains in the text (the same proposal for another occurrence of the aorist of the same verb, at l. 1457, p. 237). However, parallels in Herodotus (1.90.3; 1.90.4), where the verb is used, like in these passages in Aristophanes, to indicate the "elation that preceeds catastrophe" (H. Avery) confirm that the aorist is perfectly in place there (on Herodotus' use of the verb cf. C.C. Chiasson, "Herodotus' use of tragedy in the Lydian logos", *CA* 22, 2003, 5-35, 28; for the relationship between the Herodotean passage and the plot of the *Clouds*, cf. G. Lentini, "A neglected omen in Aristophanes' *Clouds*", *RFIC* 147, 2019, 277-89, 285 n. 20).

At l. 880 O. reads (with N. Wilson) Naber's συκίνας, "made of fig-wood", instead of the manuscripts' reading σκυτίνας, "made of leather" (cautiously retained also by K. Dover), said of the miniature carts (ἁμαξίδας) built by Pheidippides when he was a baby. The manuscripts' reading has been recently convincingly defended (also against M.L. West's emendation of the passage) by A. Grilli, "Filologia vs. ermeneutica. Paradigmi epistemici a confronto." *Maia* 70, 2018, 445-61, 457-61. O. himself, however, seems to have (or have had) hesitations: in the commentary, p. 174, he writes, in favour of the reading συκίνας, that leather (implied by the adjective σκυτίνας) "seems impossible as a description of material for a miniature cart"; a few lines above, however, he had spoken of Pheidippides as "cutting up leather", words that would imply the very reading σκυτίνας!

O.'s proposal of taking νομίζω at l. 1366 as a dubitative subjunctive ("am I supposed to consider?") and the whole sentence as interrogative (question mark at the end of the following line) is original, but would have required, I believe, more adequate argumentation in the commentary; moreover, O.'s definition of line 1366 as "sarcastic" seems to assume that νομίζω should be taken as an indicative, and not a dubitative subjunctive.

Problems relating to staging are discussed magisterially (some especially valuable notes: p. 72, l. 59 on Strepsiades' slave running into the house; p. 238, *ad* l. 1475 on Pheidippides' exiting: into Strepsiades' house or into the Thinkery?). I have noticed a slip at p. 129, *ad* l. 509: instead of "Strepsiades and Socrates exit the Thinkery" read "Strepsiades and Socrates exit into the Thinkery".

Quite understandably, considering the limits imposed by the series, questions relating to the more general literary and cultural context of the play are given somewhat limited space in the commentary. An aspect that, in my view, would have

deserved at least a brief treatment is the relationship between the *Clouds* and tragedy. As often observed, the plot of the play, and especially its conclusion, seems to reproduce the very common tragic model of 'learning through suffering' (M.S. Silk, *Aristophanes and the Definition of Comedy*, Oxford 2000, 353, speaks of the "well-known world of late archaic and early classical ideology, whose watchwords are *suffering, responsibility, god, justice, punishment, delusion, recognition... too late*"; cf. also Lentini, *A Neglected Omen*, cit.). This element contributes significantly to making the *Clouds* (together with its hero) rather untypical of Aristophanes, as O. himself, as we have seen, observes. Contextualizing adequately the play within its cultural *milieu* would have been, of course, beyond the scope of the book. Still, a theme like the one about the conventional nature of law, for example, developed at ll. 1420-2, would have perhaps required at least a brief reference, in the note at p. 233, to the importance of this idea in the contemporary cultural debate.

The book is closed by three useful appendices and two indices. The first appendix is on the fragments of the first version of the *Clouds*; the second one on other passages relating to Socrates in Ancient Comedy; the third one on the metrical structures of the songs. An index of People, Places, and Objects and one of Greek words make consultation easier.

In conclusion, the author is to be congratulated on this excellent and stimulating edition which, hopefully, will make a fundamental text like Aristophanes' *Clouds* more approachable also by younger students.

Giuseppe Lentini
Sapienza Università di Roma
giuseppe.lentini@uniroma1.it

M. Bandini, L.-A. Dorion, *Xénophon, Hiéron,* Collection des Universités de France, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2021, ccxxxi + 1-156 (1-40 double) pp., 59 €, ISBN 978-2-251-00647-5.

This edition of the *Hieron* is the product of the same collaboration that gave us the *Memorabilia* in 2000-2011, and the structure is identical. There is a long introduction, and the supplementary notes are numerous and in many cases lengthy; the total number of notes for 39 small pages of Greek text is 345. Those that cannot be accommodated as footnotes occupy pages 41-114. A welcome feature is the series of six appendices which list in tabular form concepts occurring in this work that have parallels in other works by Xenophon, and in the case of no. 5, in works by Plato, Isocrates and Aristotle; on p. 188 Dorion justifiably claims to have traced quite a number that had not been noticed hitherto.

The history of the text, which is not particularly remarkable, is outlined on pp. 181-206. There are 31 MSS., of which six are primary witnesses, depending on a minuscule archetype. The secondary tradition is provided by citations in Stobaeus,