more productive: Nick Lowe's seminal 'Aristophanic spacecraft' (in L. Kozak and J. Rich (eds.), *Playing around Aristophanes* (Oxford 2004), 48–64) is briefly mentioned but very little used. There is an interesting suggestion about the temporally separated Rural Dionysia, Lenaea and Anthesteria in *Acharnians*: 'the fictional festivals celebrated on stage can be interpreted as being incorporated into … the Lenaia. Different festivals are united into one chronotope of the Dionysiac celebration' (127). But, as Elena Chepel shows, comedy plays fast and loose with time, and blurring together the different festivals thus misses the point that Dicaeopolis moves from an isolationist celebrant of a normally communal festival to reintegration into the city: the temporal dislocation comments on the problematic nature of Dicaeopolis' behaviour. Indeed, Chepel could usefully have said more about how her ideas relate to general interpretations of the plays. In the chapter on sacrifice, for example, the idea that in comedy the men sacrificing have the gods under their control rather than vice versa, so that 'the reversed sacrificial hierarchy allows comic poets … to alleviate the fear that the gods will not accept the offering' (173), is interesting, but one would have liked more evidence that such a fear was a major feature of sacrificial practice (and were comic audiences worried about this?).

All in all, I am not sure that we have a completely new answer to the 'Dionysus problem', but there is plenty to ponder here. What we have ultimately is a very good doctoral thesis that could have benefitted from more revision. Ideally, Chepel would have reversed the dominance of detailed analysis over theory and recast the whole by picking out the main novelties, expounding them with carefully chosen examples and exploring the wider implications of them for Greek comedy, society and religion. But in a crazy world where publication is all, what young scholar can afford the time for such radical restructuring?

A.M. Bowie
The Queen's College, Oxford
Email: angus.bowie@queens.ox.ac.uk

JENDZA (C.) **Paracomedy: Appropriations of Comedy in Greek Tragedy**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020. Pp. xi + 341. £58. 9780190090937.
doi:10.1017/S0075426922000350

Several studies of note have recently explored 'paratragedy' (comedy humorously exploiting tragedy), but Craig Jendza reverses the relationship, seeking instances from tragedy where the dramatist (usually Euripides) interacts with an earlier comic scene. This he calls 'paracomedy'. Many would object that a comic moment is foreign to the accepted seriousness (*spoudaios*) of tragedy and that tragedy calling attention to another drama breaks the theatrical 'fourth wall'. Jendza would argue that the 'lightheartedness of comedy' in a tragedy, such as Pentheus' dressing scene, intensifies the coming horror, just as Dicaeopolis masquerading as the tragic Telephos 'makes the audience laugh' (39). He takes Cratinus' marvellous coinage, 'a Euripidaristophanizer' (*fr.* 342), to mean first that both dramatists could be viewed as doing similar things, but also that they are engaging in a conscious professional rivalry (32–35). Jendza traces one such interaction from Euripides' *Telephus* (438) through *Acharnians*, *Helen*, *Andromeda* and *Thesmophoriazusae* (a crucial text), to *Orestes* and *Bacchae*. For Jendza, 'the heyday of paracomedy' is the decade 415–405 (37). In the first chapter he lays down three criteria for 'paracomedy': (i) 'distinctive correspondences' between tragic and comic elements, (ii) priority of the comic elements, and (iii) authorial motivation and effect upon the spectators (17). In his conclusion he makes the good point that more than intertextuality is involved, that 'intertheatricality' might be a better term (165).

The core of the book lies in chapters 3 through 5, discussions of two tragedies already suspected of comic sympathies, *Helen* and *Orestes*. Chapter 3 regards Menelaus, a hero in 'wretched rags', as relating to Euripides' earlier *Telephus* but through 'the lens of *Acharnians*' (100). But would most spectators know the *Telephus* from the tragic original or from the parody in comedy? In the next chapter, Jendza takes up Marshall's suggestion that *Helen* is a pair of dramas, a tragic 'Helen' (1–385) and a comic 'Menelaus' (386–527). But where C.W. Marshall (*The Structure and Performance of Euripides'* Helen (Cambridge 2014), 55–95) saw the 'Menelaus' as a humorous engagement with *Proteus*, the *Oresteia*'s lost satyr drama, Jendza sees Euripides as taking on Aristophanes' comic criticisms and 'reestablishing the superiority of the tragic genre' (166). Incidentally, Victor Castellani ('Notes on the Structure of Euripides' *Alcestis*', *AJP* 100 (1979), 487–96) had argued that in *Alcestis*, another 'suspect' play, we have a 'tragic' prologue at the beginning and then a 'comic' one when the slave enters at 747. Finally (chapter 5), he argues persuasively that the *Orestes* contains paracomical allusions to all four parodies in *Thesmophoriazusae*, and that 'the play demonstrates a high level of cleverness and a subtle hand in their execution' (213).

Some of Jendza's examples of paracomedy I find less convincing. First, he argues (42–52) that the *Eumenides* displays several instances of comic influence, including the 'episodic prologue', which he finds in no other tragedy (but what about the opening of Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris*?). I think the fast-paced prologue has more to do with Aeschylus' acceleration of the dramatic tempo in the second half of the trilogy. Second (206–12) he concludes from the description in the hypothesis to *Orestes* of the play's 'rather comic conclusion' that Orestes' threat to incinerate the palace comes from the closing scene of the revised *Clouds*. But since the 423 staged version of *Clouds* had a different ending and since this later *Clouds* was probably never performed, any direct influence seems unlikely. Could 'rather comic' (*kōmikōteran*) just mean a 'happy ending' (*cf.* Arist. *Poet*. 1453a35–39)? He argues (230–42) for Euripides' lost *Antiope frs* 185–87 as a paracomedy of *Thesmophoriazusae* 148–67. But this assumes a late date for *Antiope*, based on Σ *Frogs* 52, which places the play 'a little while before' *Frogs*. The metrical evidence, however, suggests rather a date in the late 420s and the scholiast has likely confused *Antiope* with *Antigone*, certainly a late play. A list of Euripides' plays in the Roman inscription *IG* XIV 1154 lists 'Antigone' twice (column I 6, 12) and omits 'Antiope'. Finally, since so little remains of late fifth-century drama, there is a real danger of a *post hoc propter hoc* conclusion. Jendza sees (67–75) the frenzied dancing of Heracles as inspired by the inebriated performance of Philokleon at the end of *Wasps* and the noisy chorus that might disturb the sleeping Orestes as owing much to the boisterous chorus in *Peace* who Trygaeus fears may disturb War (309–10). But enthusiastic dancers and noisy choruses may just be a recurring feature of Athenian drama.

Jendza writes with intelligence and ingenuity, and with a lively enthusiasm that comes through on every page. His analysis of words is far-reaching: witness his running discussion of the significant terms *palaios* ('old-fashioned') and *kainos* ('new-fangled') and the play on *xyrophorein* ('razor-bearing')/*xiphophorein* ('sword-bearing') in *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Orestes* (175–84). And his command of the scholarship is impressive. He has succeeded in establishing 'paracomedy' as a subject worthy of further interest and study. One may raise an eyebrow (or two) at some of his suggestions, but his study will be the starting point for future discussions in the field.

Ian C. Storey
Trent University
Email: istorey@trentu.ca

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426922000350 Published online by Cambridge University Press