C. W. Marshall – George Kovacs (Hgg.), No Laughing Matter. Studies in Athenian Comedy, London (Bristol Classical Press – Bloomsbury Academic) 2012, XIV, 208 S., ISBN 978-1-78093-015-2 (brosch.) £ 25,–

Reviewed by **Ian A. Ruffell:** Glasgow, E-Mail: ian.ruffell@glasgow.ac.uk

DOI 10.1515/klio-2016-0063

This volume is a „Festschrift“ for the Canadian scholar Ian Storey, who is best known for his work on Old Comedy, and in particular the fragments of Old Comedy, notably „Eupolis. Poet of Old Comedy“ (Oxford 2003) and the Loeb „Fragments of Old Comedy“ (Cambridge, MA u. a. 2011). The contributions that the editors have assembled (mainly from scholars based in Canada or the USA) are accordingly all focused on Athenian Comedy of the fifth and fourth centuries, and there is thus a commendably tight focus for a production of this sort.

The fourteen papers fall into two main categories: discussions of a fragmentary play (or even a single fragment) and treatments of plays by Aristophanes. The papers in the first category are certainly helpful. The collection opens with Jeffrey Henderson looking at the evidence for Kratinos' mythological burlesque, *Nemesis*. He locates this play (along with *Dionysalexandros*) at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War and provides a sure-footed guide to the play's location within the mythological variants of the Helen and Nemesis stories. Henderson accepts that there were topical references, but is understandably reluctant to commit himself on how sustained the political allegory was or how exactly the plot developed. Kratinos' contemporary Krates is the focus of the following article by David Konstan. His discussion of *Thēria* („Beasts“), one of the plays that Athenaeus quotes from in discussing narratives of spontaneous abundance, is particularly interested in how seriously the utopian vision of the play made the case for the abolition of slavery. The animals themselves, according to Konstan, explore this idea in a way that would have been impossible for slave characters to do themselves on the Athenian stage. At the other end of the collection, Elizabeth Scharffenberger provides a commentary on the Middle Comic poet Axionicus' „Euripides Fan“ (*Phileuripides*), with particular interest in the lyric of fr. 4, which she argues continues techniques of Euripides parody demonstrated by Aristophanes in „Frogs“. Finally, Ralph Rosen presents a discussion of Timokles' *Dionysiazousai* fr. 6, which presents an argument for the practical benefit of tragedy, mainly in terms of degrees of comparative suffering. Rosen suggests that this has been taken far too literally as a reflection of fourth-century literary theory, and that it should be seen instead as a parody of a moralising argument for Greek tragedy. Rosen is, I think, clearly right that there is a comic hyperbole here, but I wonder

Brought to you by | University of Glasgow Library
Authenticated
Download Date | 12/5/16 1:47 PM

whether this is as much pointing up the absurdity of tragedy as it is skewering literary-critical pretension.

The papers in the second category are more of a mixed bag. Keith Sidwell and Alan Sommerstein revisit previous work. Sidwell restates his account of the „Acharnians“ as a metacomic parody of Eupolis via various suggestions of Kratinos, originally stated in „Aristophanes’ Acharnians and Eupolis“, CeM 45, 1994, 71–115, and elaborated in „Aristophanes the Democrat. The Politics of Satirical Comedy during the Peloponnesian War“ (Cambridge 2009). I doubt that this reworking will win new converts. Sommerstein offers a small sequence of notes on „Frogs“, which are a supplement to his Aris and Phillips commentary (1996). Hallie Marshall compares Aristophanes and Eupolis in terms of revisions and reperformances, in making the case that the text of „Clouds“ we possess should be approached as a performance text, even if it was never actually performed. There are many sensible points here about the nature of comic revisions and reworkings, but I would have been more comfortable about the discussion of „Clouds“ II in terms of reperformance if the evidence for incomplete revision (mentioned on p. 55) had been addressed directly.

The two other papers on „Frogs“ take a more conventional essay form. Donald Sells follows in the steps of a number of scholars who have investigated the continuities between the chorus of initiates’ ritual-literary utterances and Aristophanes’ comic poetics, and argues that the Aeschylean victory is transcended by the manipulation of Eleusinian ideas to bolster comedy’s political and poetic standing. Arlene Allan traces the echoes in the play of Arginousai and the illegal trial of the generals that followed, instigated by Theramenes. She argues that there is a sustained protest by Aristophanes and that, despite the election of Theramenes shortly after the play was first performed, the play had a slow-burn effect and led to some kind of reprisals upon the instigators, to which Xenophon alludes (hell. 1.7.35). It is possible that „Frogs“ may have contributed to a feeling of remorse, but clearly the Athenian assembly could change its mind without any nudge from the comedians, as the Mytilene Debate clearly indicates (as well as Aristophanes’ own complaints about their fickleness).

„Lysistrata“ and „Ecclesiazousai“ present many similar problems to critics, and the papers on those plays here share certain characteristics. Judith Fletcher examines the latter in terms of due legal and procedural process. For Fletcher, the play is a dystopia, and the abuse of process is part of that nightmare vision. The women’s decree, she argues, is a decree (*psēphisma*), but becomes talked about as if it were a fundamental law (*nomos*), it ought to be subject to a *graphē paranomōn*, since it contradicts established laws, but the courts have been abolished, and it is established by deception. Fletcher draws attention to the legal language throughout the scene with the young man and the „hags“: this is, she argues, the main

Brought to you by | University of Glasgow Library
Authenticated
Download Date | 12/5/16 1:47 PM

source of humour in the scene. There is a lot to like in this paper, but as an account of the play it seemed rather one-eyed, to say the least, something exacerbated by the short length that the authors seem to have been allowed.

Similar factors seem to be evident in the contribution by Douglas Olson on „Lysistrata", which is trenchant but lacks nuance. The key argument here is that the play reflects the politics of 412 rather than 411 (even allowing for the evidence for last-minute changes, which Olson notes). His method is to argue first that comic poets had to reflect the views of its audience, and second that the political content can be found once all the humour and other distractions have been subtracted (gender, for example, is „a comic red herring", 74). Thus he argues *inter alia* that the seizing of the Acropolis and Lysistrata's famous wool-working allegory about cleaning up the body politic reflect a broad desire for a benevolent coup and a purge of the citizenry. Nonetheless, this had no influence on the audience of 411, and does not mean that Aristophanes was a crypto-oligarch or approved of the oligarchic coup. I have doubts myself that this fits the narrative of events that Thucydides gives us, but I have even more reservations that this is a productive mode of analysis of either comedy or politics, not least in this most politically anxious and divided of periods.

Much more nuance is on display in the last of the papers on Aristophanes, by Robert Tordoff. It also has the best title, „Carion Down the Piraeus: The Tragic Messenger Speech in Aristophanes' *Wealth*", although regrettably the influence of Messrs Hawtrey, James and Williams goes no deeper. This paper is ostensibly an analysis of the speeches by Carion at „Wealth" 627–770, arguing that it is a thorough-going parody of a tragic messenger-speech, albeit of a somewhat unreliable kind. In fact, the paper offers a much broader examination of the role of Carion within the play. It shows how the expanded role of the slave was engineered, but also how Carion's activities at the Asclepieion mark him as the kind of person who will not profit from the new regime, and how the slave gets his come-uppance and returns to his master's household in the final reckoning.

Beyond the papers that fall into these two broad categories, Eric Csapo continues his examination of the early history of the Dionysia by reconsidering references to „parade abuse" (πομπεία) or abuse „from the wagons" (τὰ ἐξ ἁμάξης), which he argues should be attached to the City Dionysia rather than the Lenaia or Anthestieria that later sources specify; and one of the editors, Marshall, presents a reception-based paper, and argues for a visual allusion to Kratinos' *Pytinē* („Wine-flask") in a third century CE mosaic from Daphne, near Syrian Antioch, which features Menander and the courtesan Glykera, with Comedy as a third figure. Marshall makes the case that Kratinos was not unknown in the Greek East at around this time, although the representation does not, to my mind, compel the reading of a love triangle.

Brought to you by | University of Glasgow Library
Authenticated
Download Date | 12/5/16 1:47 PM

As with so many collections of this type, the result is something of a curate's egg, with some contributions more substantial or effective than others. There is good close reading of fragments or passages, and some interesting broader pieces, but the scale of the work militates against more significant contributions. In sum, this is not a volume that will change the way that we view ancient Greek comedy, but it is a coherent and useful one that serious scholars will need to know.

Danielle L. Kellogg, Marathon Fighters and Men of Maple. Ancient Acharnai, Oxford – New York (Oxford University Press) 2013, XIV, 348 S., 9 Abb., 1 Kte., ISBN 978-0-19-964579-4 (geb.) £ 75, –

Reviewed by **Robin Osborne,** Cambridge, E-Mail: ro225@cam.ac.uk

DOI 10.1515/klio-2016-0064

It is now almost thirty years since a flurry of work on both sides of the Atlantic brought the countryside and communities of Attica into the scholarly limelight (I think of J. Ober's „Fortress Attica. Defense of the Athenian land frontier. 404–382 B.C." [Mnemosyne 84], Leiden 1985, D. Whitehead's „The Demes of Attica. 508/7 – ca. 250 B.C. A Political and Social Study", Princeton 1986, and N. F. Jones's „Public Organization in Ancient Greece. A documentary Study" [Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society 176], Philadelphia 1987 as well as my „Demos. The Discovery of Classical Attika" [Cambridge Classical Studies], Cambridge u. a. 1985; and note also R. Garland's „The Piraeus. From the 5th to the 1st century B.C.", Ithaca – New York 1987). Since then a lot of work has taken place – historical, epigraphic and archaeological. It makes sense therefore to revisit classical Attica, and, despite Moses Finley's famous opposition to city histories, inevitably cited here, it is no crazy idea to do so by looking in close detail at the most populous of all Athenian demes, Acharnai.

The last generation of work on the Athenian demes revealed demes as important nodes of Athenian civic life, basic to Athenian citizen identity, but individually various. Deme life was revealed as complementary to the civic life of the *polis*, parallel rather than hierarchically subordinate, with individuals generally choosing to get involved either with their demes or with central *polis* matters rather than training themselves locally for central activities. At the religious level demes were shown to be both locking in to the central festival calendar, whether by active involvement in central festivals or by arranging their own parallel celebrations. As to what demes looked like on the ground, there was more dispute. Wesley Thompson's arguments against demes being bounded territorial units gained some support, particularly once Antony Andrewes had shown how easy it was to

Brought to you by | University of Glasgow Library
Authenticated
Download Date | 12/5/16 1:47 PM