

to worry that G. merely reverses the prejudice: any variation must be significant because it is a variation. Nevertheless, this is one of the more rewarding chapters.

Part 3, 'La Poésie et le projet d'Empédocle', first considers Pausanias, the addressee of the material on physics and biology and the 'friends' from Acragas to whom Empedocles discloses himself as a god in fragment B 112. After a strange transition on the word ζῶρος, G. argues that Pausanias is a significant name (παύω + ἄνιη = 'pain-stopper'; in the biographical tradition he is a doctor) and endorses the testimony that the *Purifications* were performed at the Olympic games (Diogenes Laertius 8.63). This means that the *Purifications* are exoteric while the higher truths of the *On Nature* are for Pausanias. A long study of fragment B 115 follows, which G. keeps in the *Purifications*. He finds it notable that the only time the narrator as it were 'cooperates' with Strife is in B 115, where he discloses that it was by 'trusting in mad Strife' (B 115.14) that he sullied his limbs with blood and earned his exile from the blessed. Otherwise, G. has maintained throughout, Love and the Muse are on the same side. Poetic composition is a work of Love, exclusively, and the *On Nature* itself is Empedocles' final atonement for his dalliance with Strife, in preparation of his return to the company of 'the blessed' (p. 699). There is something to this, but it seems rather unfair to Strife. G.'s thesis is the equivalent, in the realm of poetics, of Bollack's 1960's revisionist cosmic cycle, in which Strife plays no positive role and merely separates out the elements, getting them ready for Love to begin her assembly-work, Strife as apprentice to Love's master-craftsman. That is debatable.

The general conclusion answers the opening question. As a religious and moral reformer, Empedocles can achieve more by relying on a traditional background, epic, both to undermine erroneous beliefs about the gods and to get his new message across.

G.'s study is a major contribution to Empedoclean scholarship. The text-critical detail and mastery of its editorial history is impressive, and I have learned, in some cases re-learned, much. Most of its merits are in the details, but as noted above, more still would have been possible on Empedocles' physics and biology. My own biggest disappointment is how little use G. makes of the new Strasbourg papyrus. G. prints only the extant words and leaves even the more plausible supplements blank. In particular, it seems to me that G. underestimates the revolutionary importance of section **d**, which does nothing less than prove the unity of Empedocles' thought, if not necessarily the single-work thesis.

University of Edinburgh

SIMON TRÉPANIÉ
simon.trepanier@ed.ac.uk

ARISTOPHANES AND HIS RIVALS

TELÒ (M.) *Aristophanes and the Cloak of Comedy. Affect, Aesthetics, and the Canon*. Pp. xiv + 237. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2016. Cased, £38.50, US\$55. ISBN: 978-0-226-30969-9. doi:10.1017/S0009840X18000823

In the last two decades or so, there has been an increasing awareness of the competitive environment in which Old Comedy was performed. Various attempts have been made to describe the dynamics of that competition, with models of differing degrees and kinds

of complexity. Such studies have necessarily involved analysis of the comic poets' self-presentation and their use of other genres, not least tragedy. This latest work explicitly builds on such studies, but does not seek to offer (except perhaps by implication) a general model of comic intertextuality. Rather, T.'s interest is in the aftermath of one famous incident, the defeat of Aristophanes' *Clouds* at the hands of Cratinus and his *Pytinê*, a defeat that resonated for some time in subsequent Aristophanic works, explicitly in *Wasps* (422 BCE) and the revised version of *Clouds* itself. The thesis of the book is that, in addition to explicit commentary in the respective *parabases*, both plays re-present and re-play the defeat throughout.

The book consists of five chapters, one of them an extended introduction, and an epilogue. Of the substantive chapters, three are devoted to *Wasps* (Part 1) and one to *Clouds* (Part 2). It has been observed by a number of critics that the plot of *Wasps*, which revolves around attempts to cure an addicted old man, looks suspiciously similar to that of *Pytinê*, albeit that the addiction is not to alcohol but to the law-courts, and some kind of intertextual game is clearly going on. T.'s interpretation of that game is based on the view (in which he is far from alone) that Bdelycleon in some sense represents Aristophanes. Philocleon then becomes a representation of (or code for), not the addicted old Cratinus, but the audience itself, addicted to Cratinean comedy, from which the young man seeks to wean them, ultimately unsuccessfully.

Chapter 2 sets up these connections. Bdelycleon's *semnotês* ('haughtiness') is linked to metapoetics, in relation both to Aristophanes' self-construction elsewhere (notably in the parabasis of *Peace*) and to Aristophanes' construction of Aeschylus (although T. resists a strong association between Aristophanes and Aeschylus because he wants to reserve Aeschylean associations for Cratinus, following E. Bakola). His famous metatheatrical *aporia*, claiming that curing Philocleon is beyond comic poets (*trygoidoi*) is emphasised. As for the nature of the relationship being envisaged, the master signifier is given by the scene following the *parabasis*, where Bdelycleon dresses up Philocleon in preparation for the symposium. He persuades Philocleon to take off his poor, low-status *tribôn* and put on the thick and classy *khlaina*. T. connects the former with Cratinean comedy, the latter with Aristophanic. He builds on the metapoetics of this scene and the connotations of these textiles by drawing links with the language of the *parabasis* in particular.

The following two chapters add further imagistic grist to the mill. Chapter 3 focuses on engagement with tragedy, again starting from existing scholarship. Critics, beginning with D. Harvey, have long noted that Philocleon's sickness (*nosos*) and madness (*mania*) have affinities with those of Euripidean female characters such as Phaedra in *Hippolytus*. For T., these tragic connotations (both Euripidean and also some Aeschylean elements) are a way to characterise Cratinean comedy. Chapter 4 looks at other generic interactions, principally fable, which is one of the types of sympotic entertainment in which Philocleon is trained, only for him to deploy it abusively at the symposium itself and in the aftermath with complaints about his behaviour. Philocleon's failure to master the *sôphrosynê* of the fabular tradition is one of the key ways that Cratinean comedy is differentiated from Aristophanic. The conclusion of the play, which has often puzzled critics, is read by T. not as a triumph of comedy over tragedy but an aporetic (or despairing) assimilation of Cratinean comedy (taken as an exemplar of *phortikos* comedy, deprecated in the prologue) and tragedy. Without conceding to Cratinus, Aristophanes is dramatising and presenting again the failure of *Clouds* as a kind of sickness against which his nice warm cloak was intended to insulate the audience, only for it to be spurned.

Aristophanes returns to the theme in the *Clouds* as we have it (which T. dates to 419–417). In common with some recent scholars (such as M. Revermann), he is inclined to view the revision as intended for performance. The *parabasis* deals explicitly with the travails of

the first version, from which T. picks out the image of Electra and draws out the relationship between father and daughter through intertextuality with the *Oresteia*. The *parabasis* also deals explicitly with Eupolis (among others), and so this play is read as a similar meta-comic game, albeit that Eupolis is added to the mix as someone continuing the Cratinean mode. The character alignments do not work so well here, and so T. makes connections more on the verbal than on the character level. Indeed, the Socratised Pheidippides is associated with Cratinean-Eupolidean comedy and, if anything, the old man now seems to be closer to the Aristophanic model than the Cratinus-influenced audience. The burning down of the Thinkery is a rejection of such comedy.

This is an extremely subtle book that requires very close attention. It proceeds by pursuing verbal echoes across plays and between plays, and it evokes some recent theoretical trends, not least affect (mainly as a source of imagery), and interesting comparanda are brought in, especially in the epilogue. Some may be sceptical about the whole project of comic intertextuality, but this reviewer is not one of them. We certainly need close readings and theoretically-informed works of this kind. There are, however, some problems in the particular readings offered.

The first is that the subtlety of the individual readings is not always matched by some of the other interpretative moves that are rather more crude, particularly the tendency to associate characters as one-dimensional code for literary players (as K. Sidwell has done). The association of Bdelycleon with Aristophanes is one that I, for one, would resist, partly because of how he is described in the play (his *semnotês* is not a straightforward good), partly because of what he does in the play (he cheats) and partly because of his other intertextual associations. Although we do not have the original *Clouds*, there is nothing in the *testimonia* to suggest that Pheidippides was substantially different in the original version, and that particular horsey and disrespectful son must be as much an intertext for Bdelycleon as Bdelycleon is for the revised *Clouds* (if not more so). Not to read *Wasps* in the light of *Clouds* itself, as well as *Pytinê*, seems somewhat perverse. There is also a certain amount of sliding around along with these big associations. The poor cloak of Cratinean comedy, for example, is at various points both unable to cover its wearer adequately and smothering or choking. The reading of *Clouds*, as well as being less extensive than that of *Wasps*, was also much harder to follow, particularly with the half-change of emphasis towards Eupolis. As an example of the difficulties here, the burning down of the Thinkery (with a torch) is an example of the crude comedy that Aristophanes claims to deprecate. For T., torches are, indeed, a mark of tragic-Cratinean comedy, but by some special pleading Strepsiades' apparent embrace of it *against* the Cratinean-Eupolidean Socrates becomes a distancing from it, which I did not understand.

T. is refreshingly non-absolutist about his interpretations, and indeed, if one goes all or even some of the way with him, this sort of implicit or ironic passive-aggressive whinge at the audience (as I take it) might be compatible with any number of readings. Whether the audience took this on board (consciously or unconsciously) is of course impossible to say, but T. argues that those who were influenced by it were ancient scholars who duly privileged Aristophanes as the leading writer of Old Comedy, even within the canon of three: Cratinus, Eupolis and Aristophanes. It is not impossible – there is clearly much of ancient scholarship that takes Aristophanes' commentary at face value, and much of ancient biography follows the method of taking characters from plays as representing the author. But this is my final anxiety: surviving ancient scholarship rarely displays the kind of subtlety employed in this book, or needed it to privilege Aristophanes (even if aspects of that are, for me, overstated). It was not, I think, any cloak that ensured Aristophanes' canonicity or led Aelian to suppose that *Clouds* was victorious. Whether this particular mix of subtlety

and allegory best represents the processes of the fifth-century audience may well be the more interesting question.

University of Glasgow

IAN RUFFELL
ian.ruffell@glasgow.ac.uk

ORACLES AND NARRATIVES

KINDT (J.) *Revisiting Delphi. Religion and Storytelling in Ancient Greece*. Pp. xvi + 215, ill. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016. Cased, £64.99. ISBN: 978-1-107-15157-4.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X18000574

This volume is a brisk, thought-provoking monograph that gives the reader a fresh look at the accounts of Delphic oracles as told in a wide range of authors and genres, from history (Herodotus) to tragedy (Euripides) to philosophy (Plato). With so many scholars having inquired after the realia pertaining to the oracle (e.g. How did the Pythia enter her altered state? How many of the oracular replies we possess were nothing more than later fabrications?), K. proposes the need to study the Delphic oracle from a different angle. Leaving aside other questions for the time being, K. examines these oracle stories as narratives that are told in certain ways and whose common tropes can help us understand something about ancient Greek attitudes, not just towards the oracle, but towards that most central concern of religion, communication between gods and mortals.

K.'s monograph is organised into five main chapters, along with an introduction, a conclusion and a substantive appendix. Each of the five chapters deals with the use of oracles by a different author; after discussing the three Classical authors listed above, she expands the inquiry to later authors, Pausanias and Athenaeus. While the most substantive conclusions come from her three chapters on the Classical trio, the latter two chapters help to frame the entire thesis by introducing a discussion of the role of statues in divine communication and its interplay with the lessons to be drawn from narratives about oracles. Finally, both the conclusion and the appendix (itself comprising another, related reflection) serve as a meditation on the lessons learned during the process of examining the narrative structures of the oracle stories chosen.

The first substantive chapter considers the use of oracles in Herodotus' *Histories*. While K. arranges the authors under discussion in chronological order, starting with Herodotus is nonetheless sensible due to the predominance of oracle stories in his work, from the famous account of Croesus' consultation of the Delphic oracle prior to his invasion of the Persian Empire in Book 1 all the way to the various oracles dating to the Persian invasion of Greece as recorded in the last three books of the *Histories*. K. analyses these accounts in order to determine the ways in which Herodotus uses the oracular pronouncements to further his own narrative, noting that the introduction of an oracle as a second 'omniscient voice' (in addition to the narrator) often allows Herodotus to stake out positions that might not seem sufficiently supported were he simply to state them himself. In this sense, Herodotus uses the pronouncements of the Delphic oracle as a vehicle to adumbrate his own world view. Yet while this might be simply of passing interest in the case of individual oracles, K. notes that there are patterns that recur over the majority of the oracle nar-