

In nearly 800 pages, including a rich bibliography, indexes of passages cited and subjects, and 120 evocatively analysed illustrations, Steiner proposes a sequence of ten chapters, organized chronologically and thematically, from 1, 'Achilles' shield in *Iliad* 18: *choreia* at the forge' (25–75), also about tripods, automats and Hephaestus as a *kōmast* dancer, to 10, 'Choral envisioning' (629–701), about archaic *enargeia* ('vividness'), from a post-classical perspective. Steiner insists here on the analogy between light and movement, 'vicarious transport' (cf. N. Felson-Rubin, 'Vicarious Transport: Fictive Deixis in Pindar's *Pythian Four*', *HSCPh* 99 (1999), 1–31), the energetic and spatial value of *metaphora* (and *schemata*, 'figures'), empathetic participation and divine epiphanies. Under the auspices of Philostratus, these analyses could relate *enargeia* even more to *poikilia* ('variety') and *saphēneia* ('clearness'), to synaesthesia, kinaesthetic empathy and embodied cognitive and emotional aspects of spectatorship and readership, as in contemporary literature and dance studies. Choralities concern all senses: on Hephaestus' craftsmanship and epic creation, Françoise Frontisi-Ducroux claims 'dance is a model of total art, at once visual, figurative, kinetic and musical' (quoted by Steiner, 64; my translation). This assimilation of poetry and metalwork is thoroughly expanded by Steiner, in Chapter 1 and beyond, completed by other comparisons demonstrating that chorality is not a peripheral issue.

The first part of the volume consists of five chapters describing 'paradigms to think and depict *choreia*'. I give only the beginnings of their titles: 2, 'From the demonic to the divine' (76–114) about 'dancing pots' and 'bronze voices'; 3, 'Flying with the birds' (115–81), on halcyons, cranes, doves, etc.; 4, 'The carnival of the animals' (182–258), on dancing animal herds, like horses, cows and deer; 5, 'Water music' (258–339), on nymphs, ships and choral aquatics. The second part contains five chapters, including Chapter 10, on 'chorality as a both real and symbolic construction of communal experience': 6, 'A chorus of columns' (340–404), on Pindar's poems as *agalmata*, 'incipient chorality' (see T. Power, 'Cyberchorus: Pindar's κληιδίετες and the Aura of the Artificial', in L. Athanassaki and E.L. Bowie (eds), *Archaic and Classical Choral Song: Performance, Politics and Dissemination* (Berlin 2011), 67–113) and 'architectural chorus'; 7, 'Choral fabrications' (405–89), on interplays of dance, weaving and cloth-making; 8, 'Choreography' (490–580), on alphabetic writing, dance, *rhuthmos* and *harmonia*; and 9, 'Girls in lines' (581–628), on catalogues.

In the limited space of a review, it is impossible to present important passages which at once provide excellent food for thought, issues to discuss and inspiration for further research. Extremely rich, evocative and bright, this volume is to be integrated into a general trend of scholarship which could be labelled as choral ('plural singularity', 18) and from which Steiner takes her full share. This publication will surely become a stimulating resource and an inspirational source for sensitive problematizations not only of dance, but also of the interactions of literature, culture, the arts and society, in Archaic and Classical Greece and beyond.

MICHEL BRIAND

Université de Poitiers

Email: michel.briand@univ-poitiers.fr

SWALLOW (P.) and HALL (E.) (eds) **Aristophanic Humour: Theory and Practice** (Bloomsbury Classical Studies Monographs). London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2020. Pp. xvi + 280, illus. £90. 9781350101524.
doi:[10.1017/S0075426923000058](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426923000058)

This volume, originating in a conference at King's College London in 2017, explores Aristophanic humour in the context of Classical Athens and in receptions of the comedian.

The contributions draw on a range of theoretical frameworks, from traditional theories of humour (Play, Superiority, Relief) to work that, as several essays show, could inspire scholarship on antiquity. In spite of the theoretical eclecticism, because the 17 essays focus on a single author, the volume is remarkably cohesive, and contributions complement others well. I will trace a few threads that I found compelling.

Peter Swallow's introduction (Chapter 1) situates the volume within a few major scholarly debates (Can humour be analysed? How does humour intersect with laughter? Does seriousness accompany humour?), and he surveys the three traditional theories of humour in a way that will put non-experts on a solid footing. The remaining essays are divided equally between 'Theory' and 'Practice', though readers will find practice in 'Theory' and theory in 'Practice'. Indeed, Nick Lowe's contribution (Chapter 2) evocatively synthesizes the two, reading the prologue of the *Acharnians* not as building to any punchline but as a series of 'comic beats'. This chapter, engaging with recent approaches to humour in and outside of Classics, extends Swallow's traditional framing.

Edith Hall (Chapter 3) explores *paidia* ('play') in comedy, vase painting and Platonic philosophy. She shows how Aristophanic *paidia* differs from its Platonic counterpart. Though the latter has been far more influential in the Western tradition, Hall concludes that engagement with Aristophanes would enrich notions of play. I would then recommend jumping to Chapter 15 as a kind of instantiation of Hall's conclusion. Adam Lecznar's study of the figure of Aristophanes in Nietzsche and Freud is one of my favourite chapters as it unmask comic epistemologies that contend with tragic ones in Western thought. One could also pair Lecznar's chapter with Mario Telò's (Chapter 5), via Georges Bataille, who appears in both. Bataille's articulation of laughter as an encounter with death serves as Telò's starting point, and he offers an adventurous analysis of Aristophanic language alongside discussions of Presocratic philosophy, Stephen Sondheim's *The Frogs* (1974) and Yue Minjun's *Expression in Eyes*. In another compelling piece, research in neuroscience inspires Pavlos Sfyroeras (Chapter 6), who explores laughter's analgesic properties after collective trauma, primarily in this case the Peloponnesian War. Cogent historical contextualization enriches the close readings. Sfyroeras continues Telò's encouragement to understand how the plays theorize their own jokes.

Several essays show the flexibility of incongruity theory to analyse Aristophanic humour. Craig Jendza (Chapter 4) explores several incongruities (human-animal, gender-genre, clothing-costume) and discusses how they differ from those in satyr play and tragedy. In her second contribution, Hall (Chapter 8) argues that comedy bestows some male protagonists with supernatural powers, typically reserved for elites in other genres, as aesthetic projections of the prerogatives of male citizens in democratic Athens. This chapter enriches work thinking about classical literature in the context of science fiction and fantasy. Pierre Destrée (Chapter 9) argues that some of Aristotle's jokes are Aristophanic, and he concludes that Aristotle appreciated Aristophanes more than is sometimes assumed. Athina Papachrysostomou (Chapter 10) applies the concepts of 'surface' and 'deep parody' to public figures in Aristophanic comedy. She suggests that personal satire should be understood within the umbrella of parody, a phenomenon typically discussed in literary terms. Dimitrios Kanellakis (Chapter 11) analyses some statistical data concerning the Aristophanic *paraprosdokian*, an unexpected twist typically at the end of a phrase or a clause, and finds intriguing patterns, which could generate even more robust analysis. Maria Gerolemou (Chapter 12) takes off from Henri Bergson's *Le rire* (1900) to study theatrical movement. The analysis seems to glide between the semantic ranges of the cognates machine and μηχανή®; a fuller explication of these terms would sharpen the analysis. Chapter 14, Swallow's second, interprets scenes with sexual violence, disturbing moments that are played for laughs.

Ralph M. Rosen (Chapter 7) considers ancient satire *vis-à-vis* the phenomenon of the 'troll', that bogey plaguing our democracies from the internet's shadows. By showing

how trolls stoke indignation from those not in on the joke, Rosen shifts the focus from Aristophanes' intentions to his audience's reaction. There is much potential in Natalia Tsoumpra's (Chapter 13) argument for madness's inherent comedic nature, and she makes good use of ancient testimonia on acting and verisimilitude.

Two essays on adaptations of Aristophanes end the volume. Magdalena Zira (Chapter 16) argues that modern Greek producers infuse their adaptations with melancholia, and David Bullen (Chapter 17) reflects on his own adaptation of *Clouds* to protest proposed cuts at Royal Holloway. Both chapters consider the power of Aristophanic drama to respond to crises of our own age.

Readers of the volume will come away with new ideas about the dynamics of humour, what it could mean and how it operates in Aristophanes' plays. If we are to move beyond the standard lament that, as Hall's preface remarks, too little attention has been paid to Aristophanic humour, this volume will play a key role in that progress.

DUSTIN DIXON
Grinnell College
Email: dixondu@grinnell.edu

TELÒ (M.) **Archive Feelings: A Theory of Greek Tragedy**. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2020. Pp. ix + 327. £91.95/\$99.95. 9780814214558.
doi:[10.1017/S0075426923000034](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426923000034)

This ambitious and challenging book sets out to theorize an 'anti-cathartic aesthetics of Greek tragedy' (4). Mario Telò challenges the critical legacy of Aristotelian poetics, as he construes it, by developing an alternative to theories which emphasize the genre's reparative potential. Instead, he asks, 'what if the pleasure of tragedy is produced not by release but by the lack of it' (7), by the very absence of cathartic restoration? The most important components of his theoretical apparatus are Derrida's concept of the archive and Freud's death drive. Derrida frames the archive in terms of its derivation from *archē*, which connotes both a chronological point of origin ('beginning') and a source of normative authority ('rule'). Telò sees 'archive fever', the futile search for an authentic *archē*, as a pervasive feature of tragedy (48–49). Freud's death drive, for Telò, motivates that search: a psychic impulse towards the dissolution of the self which leads tragic subjects to enjoy the painful denial of release.

The book consists of three parts with a total of five chapters. The first part, 'Archival time', explores the temporality of tragic plot. Chapter 1, 'Archiving Oedipus', reads Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus* and Euripides' *Phoenissae*. The *Oedipus at Colonus*, Telò argues, stages the rush to archive Oedipus' body, reflected in the language of haste and urgency that permeates the play. *Phoenissae*, on the other hand, is marked by sluggishness: an 'archive fatigue' that leaves its characters worn out (83–84). This very 'boredom', Telò argues, is alluring: it reflects the death-driven desire to 'collapse into the abyss of non-being' (86–87). Chapter 2, 'The archive and the loop', reads *Medea* and *Heracles*. Both plays, Telò shows, explore what comes after filicide. *Medea*, suspended in her chariot at the end of the play, is precariously balanced between life and death; this suspension challenges the reproductive logic of the future. *Heracles*, after killing his children, contemplates suicide, therefore resisting Theseus' attempt to help him; this longing reflects anti-cathartic desire. Both plays, then, locate aesthetic pleasure in their central characters' reluctance to be 'assimilated into history' (132).