

proposal that *Lysistrata* predates *Phoenissae*, particularly as this argument relies on chronology. Given that both Strattis and Aristophanes went on to compose a comic *Phoenissae* in response to Euripides, this would seem another opportunity to explore paradramatic games. J.'s book provides superb groundwork for this, and I hope a next step will be to incorporate more fragments in expanding intergeneric explorations.

Chapter 7 looks at paracomedy beyond the fifth century BCE, opening up possibilities for further exploration, and it raises many possibilities for expansion beyond those proposed by J. into Hellenistic poetry, for example the *Mimiamb*s of Herodas, the work of Theocritus or Apollonius for the way that they receive and respond to comic and tragic drama. The monograph's conclusion briefly situates paracomedy within other theatrical and literary theories, drawing on intertheatricality as well as intertextuality, noting scholarship on early modern drama. I would have welcomed this from the start, particularly given J.'s focus on costume in the latter stages of the monograph. I found convincing J.'s point that by acknowledging paracomedy in our understanding of tragedy we can 'cast Athenian drama as a dynamic world filled with mutual literary influence' (p. 14). I would only wish to amend this to 'literary and *performative*' influence.

J.'s book provides the most detailed and wide-ranging analysis of the relationship between Aristophanes and Euripides, who were contemporary dramatists, colleagues and co-competitors in the performative art of drama. Therefore, the question becomes to what extent are we looking at paracomedy, or rather, as Cratinus put it so ably 2,500 years ago: εὐριπίδαριστοφανίζων? The lack of paracomedy in Sophocles should give pause for thought as to whether this was 'a productive historical phenomena in Greek tragedy' (p. 3) or rather a creative, stylistic choice of certain dramatists. When considering the lack of paracomedy in Sophocles, it is worthwhile to bring in comic fragments alongside Aristophanes. For here the same pattern is observed where Sophocles is rarely named as a comic target and never brought onstage as one, unlike Aeschylus and Euripides, both of whom feature in J.'s book as paracomediants.

I found J.'s work stimulating to think with, providing refreshed perspectives on familiar plays and much room for debate. Given my work on paratragedy, the latter is hardly surprising, and this monograph is a real step forward for exploring intergeneric interactions and the ongoing process of stimulus and response that shaped the development of both comic and tragic drama.

Durham University

SARAH MILES  
sarah.miles@durham.ac.uk

## ASPECTS OF GREEK COMEDY

FRIES (A.), KANELLAKIS (D.) (edd.) *Ancient Greek Comedy. Genre – Texts – Reception. Essays in Honour of Angus M. Bowie. (Trends in Classics Supplementary Volume 101.)* Pp. xvi + 356, colour ills. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2020. Cased, £124, €136.95, US\$157.99. ISBN: 978-3-11-064509-5.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X22002724

The seventeen essays in this Festschrift are of generally high quality and cover a wide range of topics. The only disappointment is that there is just one chapter on post-classical

reception, P. Swallow's excellent discussion of the two major nineteenth-century translators of Aristophanes. Too many of the contributors cite in footnotes an excessive number of modern scholars to support a simple point (M. Silk and Kanellakis are welcome exceptions). Translations are supplied for all Greek texts quoted, even though this collection is unlikely to be read by people other than Hellenists.

I discuss selected chapters. In Part 1, 'Genre', M. Silk's 'Connotations of "Comedy" in Classical Athens' is a lexicological analysis of the terms for comedy, in particular *kōmōdein* and its cognates, which traces the evolution of these terms, with their predominantly negative overtones, from the fifth century to the early third, and explains why Aristophanes prefers *trugōidia* in Dikaiopolis' famous speech in *Acharnians* (501–2). Kanellakis's study on *para prosdokian* in Aristophanes is sound and thorough, but wrongly claims that *Peace* 823 is an example; 'from heaven you looked a pretty rotten lot, | and here you look much worse' (trans. M. Ewans, *Aristophanes, Acharnians, Knights, and Peace* [2011], p. 175) is not a surprise ending but an entirely natural development and was played as such in my production. H.-G. Nesselrath cogently argues against some recent scholarship that the term 'Middle Comedy' is still valuable as a tool for understanding the evolution of Attic comedy.

In Part 2, 'Texts and Contexts', there is much to enjoy. F. Morosi's chapter on the father–son relationship in *Clouds* and *Wasps* brings stimulating new interpretations of *Wasps* 651–2 and 1351–9 (pp. 118–20), and also finely reinterprets Philocleon's rejection of Bdelycleon's offer to support him: 'if he wants to be supported by his son, he has to cede his authority to him – and this he cannot accept. This is why his salary as a juror is vital for Philocleon. Scholars have often branded Philocleon's refusal to be richly supported by his son as nonsense – a clear proof of Philocleon's madness. However, it is exactly that refusal that makes Philocleon's character rational; since his desire is for authority, not for riches, being supported is precisely what he must *not* accept. Far from being an act of caring, Bdelycleon's behaviour towards his father is an act of physical and psychological repression' (p. 115). The contrast with Strepsiades, who is always attempting to avoid supporting his son, then becomes evident.

H. Kopp, in 'Comic *Euboulia*: Deliberation, Free Speech, and the Language of Oligarchy in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*', provides a thorough analysis of the overtones of *euboulia* in Athenian political discourse; he then refutes the view, held by S.D. Olson, M. Santucci and others, that the heroine is advancing a proto-oligarchic agenda, preparing the ground for the coup that took place five months after the play's performance in January 411 BCE. I agree with Kopp, and indeed it is notable and prescient (though he does not mention it) that Aristophanes has *Lysistrata* name Peisander unfavourably at line 490.

This is followed by another chapter on *Lysistrata*, in which A. Markantonatos gives a thoughtful analysis of the reference to the Adonia and the choral *amoibaion* at the centre of the play, which, since the Old Men and Old Women are thoroughly hostile to each other at this point, replaces a *parabasis*. Then comes A. D'Angour's analysis of the music of the Frogs' chorus in *Frogs*. He notes that it is accompanied by the *aulos*, which he controversially describes as 'the most conspicuous avant-garde instrument of the late fifth-century New Music' (p. 189); surely, the *aulos* accompanied tragic and comic lyrics from the very beginning of the festivals. But his new analysis of the metre and melodic contour is sound; his starting point is that 'the irruption of the frogs' refrain is undoubtedly a challenge [to Dionysus] to row to a rhythm that is faster than the one originally set [by Charon]' (p. 191). However, I cannot accept his conjecture that for this scene the *auletes* stood in the boat between Dionysus and Charon (p. 192), and Dionysus seizes the instrument from the player as he takes over '*brekekekex*' from the frogs in lines 251–2 (pp. 194–5). There are practical considerations: would there be room for him in

Charon's presumably small boat? And could he play (standing up) while stagehands move the boat across the playing space? But also, D'Angour had previously noted that the *auletes* is on the side of the frogs, since Dionysus does not sing until after he has declared victory – and he even suggests that the player might have donned a frog-costume for this scene. The *auletes* should therefore be somewhere where he can interact closely with the frog chorus.

N. Tsoumpra tackles the identity of Dionysus in *Frogs* – ‘the gradual construction of Dionysus’ masculine gender identity and his transformation from an effeminate and passive male figure to a masculine and virile one’ (p. 200). She notes his increasing interest in heterosexual sex during the second chorus (lines 415–16) and in the scene where a female servant of Persephone tempts Xanthias–Heracles with the promise of dancing girls. Then, when it comes to the *agōn*, Aeschylus is all martial, Homeric manliness while Euripides identifies strongly with the domestic, female sphere (p. 210). After analysing the *agōn* in this way, she then, with striking originality, compares the Dionysus of *Frogs* not with Dionysus in Euripides’ recent, posthumous *Bacchae* but with Pentheus. She argues: ‘Dionysus’ identification with the male element in himself leads to the choice of the manly Aeschylus over the effeminate Euripides, and to the salvation of Athens (1418–21)’ (p. 214). By contrast, ‘Pentheus’ failure to make the initiatory crossing to full maturity leads to the demise both of the royal house and the city’ (pp. 214–15). This is a cogent and illuminating chapter.

Other essays include E. Hall’s ‘In Praise of Cario, the Nonpareil Comic Slave of Aristophanes’ *Wealth*’, and in Part 3, ‘Reception’, O. Taplin on the comic vases of northern Apulia, N. Sidoti on paratragic burlesques and the reperformance of tragedies in the fourth century, and Swallow (as already mentioned) on Thomas Mitchell and John Hookham Frere, the two nineteenth-century translators of Aristophanes into English.

I take issue with parts of two chapters. In ‘Imagining Space: Spatial Perception and the Gaze in Aristophanes’ *Birds*’ A. Migliara admits the possibility that the scene-building facade might have been painted, but still cites C.W. Dearden to the effect that it was an anonymous background ‘capable of being transformed by the audience’s imagination to whatever scene the poet suggests’ (p. 135). In a too much ignored 1989 article, ‘Agatharchos, Aeschylus and the Construction of a Skene’ (*Maia*, N.S. 1.1, 35–8), G. Ley established that panels on the facade were painted to represent scenic location from the time of the *Oresteia* onwards; and Migliara proceeds to note that in the first half of *Birds* ‘many clues locate the setting in a wild countryside with trees and rocks’ (ibid.). If this setting was represented by panels, then the change to Cloudcuckooland at or before the first *parabasis* could equally have been represented by hanging new panels, this time depicting a blue sky and clouds. (Changes of scene involving change of panels very probably took place in *Libation Bearers*, *Ajax* and *Eumenides* between the exit and re-entry of the chorus and, in the first two examples, at the midpoint of the drama as in *Birds*.) This assumption would solve many of the problems about *opsis* with which Migliara grapples in the remainder of her chapter.

Fries, in ‘Evidence from Aristophanes for the Language and Style of Euripides’, translates Cratinus’ famous evocation of the new style of drama with the coinage *euripidaristophanizōn* as meaning ‘an Aristophanic imitator of Euripides’ (p. 240). This is tendentious; the ‘quibbler of words and maker of maxims’ who is accused of *euripidaristophanizein* is surely being held simply to be an imitator of shared characteristics of the style of *both* poets (a ‘Euripidaristophanizer’); and he could potentially be either a tragic or a comic playwright, this being a short fragment whose context is unknown. The scholion cited in the accompanying footnote does not adequately support Fries’ interpretation.

I do not want to end on a negative note; overall this is a very good collection, and the editors are to be congratulated on eliciting such fine essays from seventeen very different contributors.

*University of Newcastle, Australia*

MICHAEL EWANS  
[michael.ewans@newcastle.edu.au](mailto:michael.ewans@newcastle.edu.au)

## METATHEATRE IN ANCIENT DRAMA

PAILLARD (E.), MILANEZI (S.) (edd.) *Theatre and Metatheatre. Definitions, Problems, Limits*. (MythosEikonPoiesis 11.) Pp. x + 308, colour ill. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2021. Cased, £100, €109.95, US\$126.99. ISBN: 978-3-11-063741-0.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X22002335

The term ‘metatheatre’ has become widely, if not completely, accepted as a theoretical model. It denotes a self-reflexive tendency in which the text of a drama clarifies its status as a dramatic production through references to costumes, props and other dramatic devices, recognition of the audience’s presence, the *mise en abyme*, and any means that break the dramatic illusion. Since this concept was coined for modern theatre by Lionel Abel in 1963, a number of contemporary scholars have explored it in ancient theatre, the most notable being C. Segal (*Dionysiac Poetics and Euripides’ Bacchae* [1982], *Euripides and the Poetics of Sorrow. Art, Gender and Commemoration in Alcestis, Hippolytus and Hecuba* [1993]), M. Ringer (*Electra and the Empty Urn. Metatheater and Role Playing in Sophocles* [1998]) and N.W. Slater (*Plautus in Performance: the Theatre of the Mind* [1985], *Spectator Politics: Metatheatre and Performance in Aristophanes* [2002]).

The volume under review deals with aspects of metatheatricality in Greek and Roman, but in fact mainly in Greek, drama. It contains eleven contributions, the quality of which varies from the first-rate that clearly add to our knowledge to the unconvincing. Despite the claim that ‘It is high time to rethink what we include under the terms “ancient Greek theatre”, “paratheatre” and “metatheatre”’ (p. 7), I did not find any rethinking of what we mean by the terms, but rather noteworthy discussions of certain passages pertaining to the concepts. Given the diversity of the volume’s content, I will concentrate on the chapters that I found particularly valuable.

The introduction by the two editors contains a useful overview of the terms *thea*, *theatron* and *drama* in classical and Hellenistic Greek (pp. 2–7). Chapters by O. Taplin and A. Giannotti contribute to this discussion and provide a helpful overview of the gradations of performance and the pre-performance ceremonies, when the playwright/director of a tragedy could tell the potential audience the theme of the forthcoming play and the changes made as part of this new version of an ancient myth. Under the term ‘diffused performance’ Taplin subsumes creative intimations, rehearsals, festival rituals, pre-play ceremonies, discussions, re-performances and various receptions across genres and times. By ‘core performance’ he understands an event set in the time and place of theatre and thus distinct from the everyday world. Giannotti analyses the pre-play ceremonies and their sources and concludes that spectators may have played an important