For some years now teachers of Latin and Greek have been trying to defend their subjects against the charge that they are irrelevant to the needs of modern society and education. This has led some to admit, albeit reluctantly, that Classicists must try to communicate with a wider audience. Few are left who feel that the languages are ends in themselves, and most concede that Classical culture or civilisation can be usefully studied by students who know no Latin or Greek, but not many would allow that sometimes a translation can be more informative than the original text. Even fewer would accept the academic merit of an adaptation for popular consumption. I should like to suggest that in at least one case, that of Old Comedy, Aristophanes in particular, the essence of the genre can best be communicated by the performance of a translation which has been adapted to modern taste, in both language and content, and which does not make faithfulness to the original text its objective.

Recently Alan H. Sommerstein discussed the ends and means of translating Aristophanes, and put what might be called the ‘traditional’ or even ‘purist’ viewpoint:  

‘Aristophanes . . . was above all a comedian. Amusement, laughter was his immediate (though not his sole) aim, and the most important aim of a translation for the general reader must be to show how he created it. Second only to this must come faithfulness . . . perhaps we could say that a faithful translation is one that follows the text as closely as possible, subject to two important provisos . . . that the comic qualities of the author must be fully represented . . . that the characters must be made to speak as they naturally would if they were speaking the language in which the translation is written.’  

Thus far there can be little argument, but Sommerstein makes it clear later that ‘comic qualities’ are to be interpreted rather narrowly to exclude any interplay with the audience: 

‘If the ideal aim of a translation is to present what the author would have written had he and his audience been speakers of modern English but otherwise people of their own time and country — and this is the underlying unity behind my twin principles of “comedy first and foremost” and “faithfulness” — then we cannot make the author refer to “thrombosis” (Parker) or “calypso” (Dickinson). Occasionally, perhaps, we lose a little by this exclusion.’
I suggest that we lose more than a little — in a performance we lose our audience! Admittedly translating for the stage does not seem, for Sommerstein, to be a very important part of translating Aristophanes; it comes after consideration of translations ‘designed primarily as an aid to the understanding of the text’, and translations for ‘specialists in other disciplines — most notably literary scholars’, and is treated rather disparagingly:

‘Another group of people with a professional interest in English versions of Greek comedy are those concerned with the theatre. There is even sometimes talk of “versions for the stage” as opposed to “versions for the study”. The opposition is, or should be, a false one. Although Aristophanes, like his tragic contemporaries, wrote primarily for the stage, neither he nor they can have been unaware that their works would be read as well, and there is no evidence that the reading texts differed in any way from the acting texts. And in fact those modern versions (such as Parker’s) which are written with one and a half eyes to the stage are eminently readable as well.’

The implication that ‘versions for the stage’ are the interlopers is, I think, confirmed, by a final comment on Parker’s attempts to explain in his versions references which would otherwise be unintelligible to a general audience:

‘This satisfies the needs of the theatre, but the result is not what most of us would think of as a translation.’

This last point may be strictly correct, but surely he has got his priorities wrong? If the term ‘translation’ can only properly be applied to a faithful version (for the study?), then we do not need translations of Aristophanes at all — we need scripts which convey the meaning of the original, rather than the words, to a non-specialist audience. The needs of students of the text, literary scholars, and the general reader can be catered for in footnotes to the published version of the script.

We are often reminded that Aristophanes and the tragedians wrote for a popular audience, which was surely the spectator not the general reader, and this is why I would deny that Sommerstein’s ‘twin principles’ are compatible. If the comic qualities of the author are to be fully represented, the translation (or whatever it is to be called) must provide a script for performance, and this entails an awareness of the expectation and experience of a modern audience. Obviously we cannot pretend that our audience speaks English or Afrikaans or any other modern language but is otherwise part of the Athens of the 5th century B.C.!!

Faithfulness to the text must yield to the necessity to communicate clearly and immediately with the audience, since such communication is vital in representing the play’s comic qualities, and this means that we must frequently adapt, compensate for a pun or an obscure joke, paraphrase, generalise and even delete. Once all the barriers to a modern audience’s understanding of the play have been removed, one essential ingredient of Old Comedy can be restored — the actors’ rapport with the spectators. I would contend that this special relationship, often noticed, between actor (or author) and audience, is the
essence of the comedy of Aristophanes, and that any translation or production which does not take it fully into account has failed by simply missing the whole point of the exercise.

While many modern scholars have noted that Aristophanes is closest to non-literary, popular entertainment, 'such as circus, the variety stage, music-hall, television and films' 10, no-one to my knowledge has suggested that it might be instructive to return him to the 'masses' by adapting him to the tastes of a modern popular audience. It would not be very difficult to rescue him from the elite audience to which he has been confined by 'faithful' translations.14 Although McLeish clearly does not believe that Aristophanes' plays are 'versions for the study', and his own translations aim 'to erect as few barriers as possible between Aristophanes and the reader or spectator of the 1980's' 15, even he still sees them as the preserve of an elite audience, when he says of the modern spectator, 'He may, for example, have read the play in advance of the performance; he may have later plays of Aristophanes to compare with; he may have ideas about Aristophanes' status in the hierarchy of world theatre; his knowledge of Aristophanes' Greek (my italics) is as a learned, second-hand language, rather than his own.'16

It seems necessary to remind translators of the obvious — a comedian must make people laugh, and they are not doing Aristophanes justice if they ignore the many ways in which he played for laughs from 'the masses', especially when it is obvious that the majority of comic routines used by Aristophanes then would work in the same way now for a popular audience.17 Given the special kind of intimacy which existed then, and can exist now, between comedian and audience surely it is absurd to ask a modern audience to listen in to Aristophanes' dialogue with an alien, absent audience, as they must be forced to do when presented with a 'faithful' translation.18 They will also miss much of the satire.19 Thus there cannot be a 'universal', 'timeless' translation of Aristophanes if the practical consideration of making a live audience laugh is felt to be at all important.

What I am advocating will seem to many to be heresy, and the most I can hope for is that some will admit that it might be a legitimate way to interpret the spirit of Old Comedy.20 The translator for the popular stage, I suggest, must remove all barriers to the audience's understanding of the dialogue and action. To do this he must not only understand the original text and context of the plays, but he must also be an acute observer of the society for which he is translating, its popular idiom and humour. Thus, the first thing to be adapted will be the 'Greekness' of the plays in general, and the particular parochial references to Athens of the 5th century B.C. Wherever possible an equivalent name, place, institution, theme or expression must be found to strike the same chord in a modern audience as that struck by Aristophanes in his original audience.21 This will mean that, not only will there be variations in the script for American, British and South African audiences, but also, to a lesser degree, for audiences in Los Angeles, New York, London, Manchester, Durban, Pretoria and so on. Let us consider a short extract
(The student of Sokrates' academy is explaining some equipment)

Student: And this, you see, is a map of the world. Look, here's Athens.

Strepsiades (inspecting the map): Can't be; if it's Athens, where are the jurymen?

Student: No, I assure you, it is, and all this area is Attica.

Strepsiades: Well, what's happened to my own village, Cicynna?

Student: It's in there somewhere. Anyway, here's the island of Euboea, look, lying stretched out opposite us, all along here.

Strepsiades: Yes, I knew that already. It's been lying like that ever since me and Pericles and the rest of us knocked it out. Where's Sparta?

Student (pointing): Right here.

Strepsiades: Too near, too near! You'd better have another thought or two about that — get it to be a heck of a lot further away from us.

McLeish's version is freer and slicker, but still quite 'faithful'²³:

Student: This is a map of the world. Look: here's Athens.

Strepsiades: Don't be daft! How can it be Athens? Where are the lawcourts and the jurymen?

Student: I tell you it is Athens: Athens and neighbourhood.

Strepsiades: I still don't believe you. Where's my village, Kikynna?

Student: It's in there somewhere. That's Euboea there, that bit lying down along the coast.

Strepsiades: I believe that. They're the biggest liars in the world. But where's Sparta?

Student: Here.

Strepsiades: It's too close! Don't just stand there, do something! Move it further away!

McLeish has found it necessary to change the joke about Euboea, which Sommerstein translates more literally (and more successfully, I feel) and in so doing has dropped Perikles altogether. On the other hand Sommerstein's accuracy in the last two lines is clumsy and McLeish's freedom is preferable. While I applaud McLeish's willingness to identify with his audience by being more colloquial, and eliminating a troublesome political reference, I cannot understand why, once he had started 'removing barriers', he did not take it to its logical conclusion and remove them all. If Perikles can go, then so can Euboea, Kikynna, Sparta and even Athens. What is to replace them depends upon the place of performance. Athens can become 'where we live' or the name of a relevant country, city or town, and the lawcourts could be any topical practice indulged in to comparative excess. Kikynna could be dropped entirely, but reference to some known but insignificant village would raise a laugh ('So, where's Pofadder, then?') Euboea is the real problem — we need some place or
community which has recently suffered at the hands of the audience’s local or national government. Finally Sparta will become the enemy, specific or general. Let me suggest a version for a London audience:

Student: And this here is a map of the whole world. Look, here we are.
Strepsiades: What do you mean? Rubbish, that can’t be us — nobody’s on strike!
Student: Well it is us — the whole country.
Strepsiades (who is, of course, up from the country): Well where’s my farm, then?
Student: It’s in there somewhere. Well, here’s the coast of Normandy, anyway, lying down along here.
Strepsiades: Lying down? I’m not surprised, it’s never recovered since me and Eisenhower flattened it in ’44. Where’s Russia, then?
Student: Here it is, right here.
Strepsiades: (measuring with finger and thumb, and then inspecting the gap) That’s too bloody close for comfort! Next time you draw a map you should think about moving it right over here out of the way.

I would annotate most of these lines to explain the changed references to the reader. Sommerstein has one footnote (on Euboea), whereas McLeish, surprisingly, has none at all.

It would take too long to discuss examples of every type of adaptation, but no great violence need be done to any of the plots.24 There will, however, be a temptation to place a different emphasis from time to time; for example, it is legitimate, I think, to bring out the ‘Women’s Liberation’ element in Lysistrate, Thesmophoriazousai and Ekklesiazousai. I myself would not modernise for the sake of it — Pheidippides’ weakness can still be horses, not motor-bikes. On the other hand I think that poetry, and light opera25 must be avoided (except for parody), since they will tend to alienate a modern popular audience. Not all scholars would agree with McLeish that ‘there is surprisingly little verbal poetry in most of the plays’26, but simple rhyming verse, or elevated prose would serve for the anapaests, perhaps accompanied by popular music for the lyrics.27 These ingredients can, I am sure, be blended together with sufficient subtlety and wit that ‘popularity’ will stop short of ‘vulgarity’.

In addition to the intimacy with the audience provided by a modernised text, there is the intimacy of slapstick, clowning, obscenity and abuse. In this respect a modern producer has every right to use all the techniques of circus and pantomime, even where the text is not very specific, for example at the end of the Ekklesiazousai where three ugly old women tussle for the body of the young man,28 or in the Echo scene of the Thesmophoriazousai29, where the text gives no real indication of how the actors moved.30 One technique which a modern producer could well emphasise is that of encouraging the actors to conspire with the audience against other actors or against the targets of the satire. This is common in pantomime, the circus, children’s plays and among ‘stand-up’ comics.
Such a conspiracy can take place even where the audience is not obviously addressed in the text.\textsuperscript{31} I imagine that most foreigners, and many Greeks, watching festival comic performances in Athens or at Epidavros by modern Greek theatre companies, have been delighted as much by the vitality of the music, costume and action as by the words. I am inclined to think that such performances do indeed recapture the essence of the original.\textsuperscript{32} Finally, let the costumes in a modern performance be as outrageous as they clearly were for ancient comedy, even to the extent of phalli and travesty.\textsuperscript{33} I should like to offer a version of \textit{Ekklesiazousai} ll.130-68 for comparison with Parker's translation, to illustrate how I would take his approach one short step further.\textsuperscript{34}First, Parker's \textit{Congresswomen}: (the women are rehearsing a take-over of government)

Praxagora: \textbf{WHO WISHES TO ADDRESS THE ASSEMBLED CONGRESS?}

Second Woman: I do.

Praxagora: \textbf{WEAR THIS WREATH ON YOUR BROW. MAY FORTUNE ATTEND YOU.}

Second Woman: (Adjusting the wreath) This look all right?

Praxagora: \textbf{YOU MAY PROCEED TO SPEAK.}

Second Woman: Before I've had a drink?

Praxagora: What drink do you mean?

Second Woman: Well isn't this party politics?

Praxagora: Yes . . .

Second Woman: So where's the party?

Praxagora: (snatching back the wreath) Get out of here. A fat lot of help you'd be up there.

Second Woman: You mean they DON'T drink in Congress?

Praxagora: Of all the fatuous questions . . .

Second Woman: They do TOO drink — what's more, they drink it straight. They pass decrees that sound just like D.T.'s.

First Woman: She's right. They pour libations, too. I know they do: they're always praying, and prayers without wine are perfectly pointless.

Third Woman: And the language. They slander each other like men on benders, and then the police come along and sling out the drunks.

Praxagora: Move along and sit down. You're worse than useless.

Second Woman: I wish to god I'd never grown a beard. This thing absorbs saliva. I'm positively parched.

Praxagora: \textbf{IS ANYONE ELSE DESIROUS OF SPEAKING?}

First Woman: I am.

Praxagora: Then get this wreath on. Don't hold up the agenda. Give us a firmly grounded masculine speech . . . and don't fall over. Use your cane for support.
First Woman: Unaccustomed as I am, I would have preferred to yield the floor to some more experienced speaker. But since I have risen, I cannot refuse to attack a widespread abuse in this city. I refer, of course, to Corruption at the Bar. Does anyone realise how many cases there are in Athens’ taverns filled up with water? Heavens to Betsy, it isn’t . . .

Praxagora: HEAVENS TO BETSY, deadhead? Where did you leave your brain?

First Woman: What’s wrong? I didn’t ask for a drink.

Praxagora: No, but what man swears by HEAVENS TO BETSY? The rest was beautifully stated. Right to the point.

First Woman: Oh (back into the speech) — GODDAM IT ALL, it . . .

Praxagora: (snatching back the wreath) Stop. Enough. Now get this straight: I won’t take another step toward commandeering Congress unless the strictest accuracy is observed in everything we do.

Second Woman: (running back up to Praxagora) Give me the wreath. I want another chance to speak. I know I’ve got it right this time. All practiced and everything. (putting on wreath and striking an attitude) — It is my pleasure to address you, girls . . .

Praxagora: (snatching back the wreath) The same mistake again. These are not girls, they’re MEN.

Second Woman: (pointing to the audience) It’s Epigonos’ fault. I saw him sitting out there and thought I was talking to women.

This same passage in my Women in Revolt reads as follows:35

Praxagora: Who is the first speaker?

Glyke:36 (nervously) Er, I am.

Praxagora: Take the speaker’s stand,31 and good luck!

Glyke: Er, I need a drink!

Praxagora: A drink?

Glyke: (sheepishly) Well, this is a bit like a fancy-dress party33 we must have a drink.

Praxagora: (angry) Go away and sit down — that’s just what you would say when you got there!

Glyke: (petulant) Well, I’m sure they do drink at parliament-meetings!

Praxagora: There you go again.

Glyke: But they do — neat stuff too I daresay. And when you think of some of their decisions, you’ll agree they must have been drunk at the time for all the sense they showed . . . (getting heated) . . . and they’re always calling ‘Order, order!’ That must mean they’re ordering drinks,34 and they swear at each other like drunks, and then the whips35 are called in to whip them out, and then . . .

Praxagora: (patronisingly) Yes, yes, yes you just go and sit down, you’re hopeless.

Glyke: (sulky) Oh, all right, but I wish I’d never worn this thing (the beard),
it's choking me and I'm dying of thirst (sits down).

Praxagora: (official again) Who else wishes to speak?
1st Woman: I do.

Praxagora: (unofficial) Come on, take the stand, let's get started. That's it, lean on your stick and speak up like a man.

1st Woman: (importantly, oratorically) I should have preferred one of the regular speakers to tell you what is best, and allow me to sit in silence, but now I must speak out. It is my personal opinion that the inn-keepers are watering the wine, (becoming agitated) and that . . . that . . . that really gets on my tits . . .

Praxagora: Oh no! 'Tits'! Are you out of your mind?
1st Woman: What's up? I didn't ask you for a drink.

Praxagora: No, but you're a man, remember, and you go talking about your tits! Up to there you were doing very well.

1st Woman: (attempting to resume) Oh, all right then, . . . that really gets me by the balls . . .

Praxagora: No, stop! I'm not setting one foot inside that meeting if we are not word-perfect (tries to usher the woman away).

1st Woman: (resisting) No, let me go; I'll start again. I'm sure I've got it right now — In my opinion, ladies and . . .

Praxagora: They are men, you fool, you are addressing men!

1st Woman: (pointing into the audience) It was him, sitting over there! I caught sight of him and thought I was speaking to ladies . . . (she is finally ushered away).

Notes

31 I have substituted 'speaker's stand' for 'speaker's crown' (a garland worn by speakers in public and by guests at drinking-parties).

33 She refers to the other implications of wearing a garland (see n.31), rather than her man's clothes.

34 Glyke's argument in Greek is, 'they are always pouring libations of wine (with prayers and oaths); do you think they'd do so much praying if it weren't for the wine?' Pouring a libation of wine would normally be the preliminary to drinking some.

35 'The whips' are the state policemen of Athens, Scythian archers. Although there is no equivalent ambiguity in Greek, the term in English serves to illustrate Glyke's confusion about procedure.

37 She actually insists that 'no water tanks be allowed in wine-shops'. The Greeks did usually water their wine, but here and elsewhere women are alleged to prefer it neat. In her enthusiasm she swears an oath by 'the two goddesses' (Demeter and Persephone), a typical woman's oath. A few lines later she tries to correct this by swearing a man's oath, 'by Apollo'. I have substituted a similarly revealing slip of the tongue, and correction.
Again Aristophanes is specific; the woman says she saw ‘Epigonos over there’, who, although he is unknown is probably being mocked for effeminacy.

It will be noticed that, in my version, all that is left of ancient Athens is the names of the characters, and perhaps these too should be adapted. In Parker’s version I cannot see the logic of allowing prayers, libations and wreaths to intrude into Congress, and of mixing metaphors between Corruption at the Bar and Athens’ taverns (the pun does not exist in the Greek anyway). Far from rewriting the Greek I have translated it more literally than Parker in places, where there seemed no reason why a modern speaker should not say exactly what the Greek says. I may be open to criticism for my free interpretation of jokes and idiom, but my policy there is to keep the laugh, even if it means losing the text, and not vice-versa.

In conclusion, it is a pity that, because so much Classical drama is timeless and universal, it should be felt that such profundity should only be accessible to an elite audience, which either understands the original language, or at least is so familiar with the aspirations of the ancient author and his audience that it will understand all the allusions to their society. In the case of Aristophanes we have every excuse to popularise our author, and it is an opportunity which we cannot afford to ignore.

NOTES

* This paper was read at the biennial Conference of the Classical Association of S.A. at Pretoria in January 1983. Part of the work on it was done during my sabbatical leave in 1982, for which I received a generous Senior Research Bursary from the Human Sciences Research Council.

6. Sommerstein’s translations are aimed at the ‘general reader’ (op. cit. 143), but who is required to be something of a specialist — he will recognise Cleonyme as the feminine of Cleonymus (op. cit. 152). It is this ‘literariness’ which makes the Penguin translations of Aristophanes (D. Barrett (1964), A.H. Sommerstein (1973), Barrett and Sommerstein (1978)) ‘versions for the study’ despite the attempt to provide something ‘both readable and actable’. They certainly do not lend themselves easily to the vulgar slapstick which I am sure accompanied the original performances, and communication with a non-specialist audience would be virtually impossible.
7. This would seem to be the correct balance. It acknowledges that the translator owes an explanation to the specialist where the words of his version do not immediately recall the words of the original, since to a large extent scholars have turned Aristophanes into literary comedy, but it reminds us that in essence Aristophanes is non-literary comedy, and that his eyes were probably looking in the same direction as Parker’s; see now on non-literary comedy Kenneth McLeish, The Theatre of Aristophanes, London 1980, 17 ff.
8. Most recently by P. Walcot, Greek Drama in its Theatrical and Social Context, Cardiff 1976, 1–10; O. Taplin, Greek Tragedy in Action, London 1978, 1–2; McLeish op. cit. 34 ff.
10. Taplin (op. cit. 177) refers to the ‘naive historicist’ approach to ancient culture, which claims that we should catch some sort of mental time-machine and become members of the original
audience. There may be some justification for asking the student-reader to do this but Sommerstein seems to require it of the audience at the end of *The Lysistrata*, when he would have the cast of the play underline an implied reference to Athens in the Spartan's song; he would have them kneel to the sanctuary of Athene Nike, which, although out of sight, stood 'as all the audience knew' on the right of the stage representation of the Propylaea, *op. cit.* 150.

11. Sommerstein admits the need to adapt in certain circumstances, even extensively on occasions, but warns: 'It is only purely verbal jokes that should, where necessary, be adapted. Facts by contrast are sacred — and for this purpose “fact” means “anything alleged by Aristophanes to be a fact”.' This again, I think, only works in the study, because Aristophanes alleges many facts about his audience which are patently untrue for any modern audience. For example at *Frogs* 297, Dionysos appeals to his own priest in the front row, 'Oh priest, save me so that we can share a drink together'; but for Sommerstein his presence is (doubly!) 'sacred'. I am tempted to translate the line, 'Is there a priest in the house? Help me and I promise I'll come to church next Sunday!'

12. Most obvious in the parabasis, 'the comic poet was in a privileged position when he used the parabasis as a medium for offering advice and admonition to the audience' K.J. Dover, *Aristophanic Comedy*, London 1971, 52, but common elsewhere, 'By contrast with tragedy the chorus or the characters ... may at any moment ... make explicit reference to the ... audience' *op. cit.* 55–6. Cf. also G.M. Sifakis, *Parabasis and Animal Choruses*, London 1971, 12, 'This direct communication between performers and audience is a basic rule of the game and a most important source of laughter ...', and McLeish *op. cit.* 87, 'The actors' awareness of their own performance, and their alliance with the audience in watching and enjoying that performance, leads to a special kind of intimacy between players and spectators. The performers constantly comment on this intimacy and make full satirical use of it.'


14. Cf. Walcot, *op. cit.* 2, 'Theatre attendance today is essentially a middle-class habit ... But popular audiences may still be found today ... A sharp distinction may be drawn between an audience present in a theatre and the audience accustomed to watching a film or television, and such a distinction will be related to social class as much as to sheer numbers.'


18. Let me emphasise that I am making a special case for Old comedy; tragedy wholly ignores its audience — see Taplin *op. cit.* 187 n.5.

19. Sommerstein observes, quite rightly, that satire and comedy have to be translated separately for British and American reader (*op. cit.* 140–1) — note 'reader' again; the problem is worse with a live audience which cannot re-read an obscure remark, and it goes deeper than just dialects and verbal humour.

20. It will of course be objected that, 'it is not Aristophanes'. This may be true, but nor is anything else translated and performed for a modern audience — we can never recreate the original setting. My compromise would be to provide full notes to a script for the reader, but the performance must stand on its own for the spectator.

21. This is, admittedly, not an easy task, nor will translators ever be able to capture every nuance and retain every joke, but their versions will at least amuse their audience.


24. Only *The Wasps* and *The Frogs* pose real, but not insurmountable, difficulty for the translator looking for a topically equivalent theme.

25. Gilbert and Sullivan, much favoured, and cleverly used by Barrett and Sommerstein are, I fear, a little out of date now, and hardly 'popular'.


27. 'Popular' music can be modern without necessarily reflecting the latest teenage trends.

28. *op. cit.* 1–11 — see McLeish's suggestion that they should be pantomime dames, *The Theatre of A.* 155.

29. *op. cit.* 1065-97

30. The absence of stage-directions might lead some to argue for a fairly static performance. However, if we remember the circus, and that many scenes may well have been versions of standard comic routines, we might conclude that much was probably left by the author to the virtuosity and improvisation of the actors — see McLeish *op. cit.* 17–21. They would, naturally,
rehearse their routines but, as today, they would not necessarily write them down.

31. The ancient actor, even masked, could have brought the audience into the action by the direction of his remarks, or by a gesture.

32. It is true that they usually employ a 'faithful' modern Greek translation, but there are fewer barriers between Aristophanes and a modern Athenian audience. It is noteworthy that any references to the contemporary political situation are greeted with great enthusiasm, not because they are unexpected, but because they are 'popular'.

33. McLeish suggests that comedy may well have 'guyed' the convention of travesty acting on occasions. It is difficult to decide how far, if at all, the more obviously feminine roles were a parody of travesty, and it is probably safer to have these played by women, in order not to distract a modern audience, which will not be used to the convention of 'serious travesty' — see McLeish op.cit. 153–6.

34. My version is from Women in Revolt (unpublished). Parker's is from The Congresswomen in The Complete Greek Comedies — see note 5 above; I have not kept exactly to his lay-out, which reflects the line-divisions of the original Greek. Clearly his version is for an American audience, whereas mine is for a British one. Patrie Dickinson's versions, Aristophanes' Plays, O.U.P. 1970, are colloquially translated for a British audience, but stick strictly to an Athenian setting, and are, therefore, less adventurous than Parker's translations, and, I think, less funny.

35. I print here selected footnotes which explain the translation.

36. The allocation of speakers is discussed in an earlier footnote, and Glyke has been characterised as a buxom 'dumb blonde'.
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