Alexiou, Holst-Warhaft, Loraux, and Seaford regarding the banning of lamentation and its appearance in tragedy.[1] T. does not see tragedy as simply appropriating lament, but as filtering it. This is a view with which I am much in sympathy (I have recently argued that male authors of tragedy tend to distort and exaggerate female-composed laments).[2] T.'s exciting new readings provide an excellent basis for scholars to further exploit this interesting research area.

T. also makes her case for a more Euripidean view of the tragic. She sees Euripides as a 'poet outsider' (p. 106) critical of Athenian society and of tragedy, and the most metatheatrical of the tragic poets. In her reading of the *Bacchae*, T. sees Pentheus' cross-dressing as signalling the shortcomings of this dramatic convention (p. 102). Similarly in *Helen* T. argues that Euripides plays with the difficulties of the tragic form. She suggests that his Helen takes a public and masculine rôle—the rôle of an Athenian chorus director who manipulates and directs the plot to allow herself and Menelaus to escape (p. 153). While T.'s arguments for a more metatheatrical Euripides are persuasive, I am less inclined to see Euripides as more critical of Athens than the other playwrights. In particular, the parallelism that can be found in T.'s readings of Sophocles' *OC* and of Euripides' *HF* tends away from this view. Nevertheless, the case for a reading of tragedy which is not so dependent on Aristotle's theories in the *Poetics* is well made.

This leads to T.'s discussion of Sophocles' *OT*, a necessary play for this book to examine in its attempt to move away from Aristotelean ideas of tragedy. However, in my opinion the reading of this play is not as compelling as the others. T. is still able to make a gendered reading of the play—in particular, her arguments for Oedipus as a 'hysteric' (p. 63), and hence a feminized character, are worthy of note. (This reading is also applied to Hercules on p. 143.) However, sentences such as 'Having, in a sense, given birth to himself, turning into his own mother, [Oedipus] also embodies those very qualities he so yearns to be rid of: falseness, femininity, artificiality' (p. 57) seem unnecessarily convoluted. Indeed, readers may find that the language and terminology employed throughout this book obscures some of T.'s truly interesting and compelling arguments.

*Roehampton University* FIONA McHARDY
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni232

## THE DEATH OF THERSITES

G. MORELLI: *Teatro attico e pittura vascolare. Una tragedia di Cheremone nella ceramica italiota.* (Spudasmata 84.) Pp. 179, pls, figs. Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2001. Paper, €32.80. ISBN: 3-487-11494-1.

Amongst the sparse testimonia for fourth-century tragedy none is more tantalizing than the Apulian crater (Boston 03.804) which Carl Robert identified with Chaeremon's *Achilles Thersitoktonos*. Since the surviving text of this play comprises

[1]M. Alexiou, *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition* (Cambridge, 1974); G. Holst-Warhaft, *Dangerous Voices* (Routledge, 1992); N. Loraux, *The Invention of Athens* (Harvard, 1986); R. Seaford, *Reciprocity and Ritual* (Oxford, 1994).

[2]F. McHardy, 'Women's Influence on Revenge in Ancient Greece', in *Women's Influence on Classical Civilization* (Routledge, 2004), pp. 92–114.

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni233 Published online by Cambridge University Press

two one-line fragments, the elaborate vase-painting, produced within a few decades of the play's first production, provides a tempting target for dramatic reconstruction. The play was based on an episode from the *Aethiopis* in which (the Proclan summary says) Achilles killed the Amazon Penthesilea, the Achaeans returned her body to the Trojans for burial, Thersites accused Achilles of succumbing to *erôs* for Penthesilea, Achilles retaliated by killing him, and dissension ensued amongst the Achaeans until Odysseus took Achilles to Lesbos for purification. Morelli devotes the first half of his monograph to setting out and discussing the sources for this episode down to Byzantine times, and the evidence for Chaeremon's play. Apart from the Proclan summary, M. looks to the lengthy narrative of Quintus of Smyrna (1.568ff.) for guidance on the early epic tradition, inferring from Quintus against the Proclan summary that the *Aethiopis* placed Thersites' death before the return of Penthesilea's body to the Trojans for burial, and included a prominent rôle for Diomedes. Both points seem questionable, especially as the kinship between Diomedes and Thersites may well be a fifth-century artifact.

The vase, with all figures named, shows Achilles sitting with Phoenix in an *aediculum* (his tent), Diomedes approaching aggressively but restrained by Menelaus and followed by a young Aetolian, and Agamemnon hurrying from the other side, followed by another young warrior (Phorbas). The lower register has Thersites' decapitated body lying amongst some scattered vessels (taken by Robert to suggest a disrupted sacrifice), Automedon kneeling as if to guard the corpse, and a servant hurrying away. Above, two divine pairs converse amongst themselves—Pan with Poinâ (Retribution), Hermes with Athena. In Robert's interpretation, the chief figures belong to Chaeremon's play, but the Aetolian, Phorbas, the Slave, and perhaps Phoenix are circumstantial additions by the painter, 'Automedon' represents a guard unnamed in the play, and only Hermes or Athena will have had a dramatic rôle as *deus* (Poinâ having an allusive relevance to the retribution incurred by Achilles). M. by contrast seeks a specific dramatic rôle, or at least relevance, for all the figures, arguing that a vase-painting with a clearly dramatic subject and all its figures named must have been so designed. This position will will have its sympathizers, but it depends essentially on the much-debated presumption that the painters of such vases, and their customers, were devoted to accuracy in the representation of the play.

In M.'s play-reconstruction all but four of the vase's figures have speaking parts. Pan and Poinâ do not, but evoke the play's dramatic focus on the problem of Achilles' offence. Phoenix is prominent as a sympathetic foil for Achilles, and in the prologue explains the dispute over the treatment of Penthesilea (who on M.'s account, amazingly, breathes on while the Achaeans conduct their extensive discussions). The Aetolian is taken to represent a chorus of Aetolians; they arrive at Achilles' tent followed by Diomedes and Thersites, who quarrel with Achilles until Thersites delivers his insult. Next Phorbas reports that Thersites has proceeded to disfigure the dying Penthesilea's body and Diomedes has thrown her into the Scamander. Achilles leaves his tent swearing revenge, and the Servant reports that he has killed Thersites at a sacrifice and dragged his body to the Myrmidons' camp to prevent its burial. Achilles then returns pursued by Diomedes and Menelaus, Phorbas runs to fetch Agamemnon, and recriminations continue until Athena intervenes to impose a reconciliation, ordering Achilles to surrender Thersites' body for burial and go with Hermes to Lesbos for purification.

Even granting M.'s basic premises, this reconstruction includes some surprises. A play set in the Myrmidon camp will hardly have had a chorus of Aetolians. Thersites disfiguring the dying Penthesilea is first featured in Lycophron's *Alexandra*, and

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni233 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Diomedes casts her into the Scamander only in the much later fictions of 'Dictys' and 'Sisyphus of Cos', where this has nothing to do with Thersites. If Achilles killed Thersites at a sacrifice (or assembly?), this surely did not occur before the Amazon's expiry. Achilles may perhaps have obstructed Thersites' burial because the Achaeans obstructed Penthesilea's, but the dragging of his body to Achilles' camp cannot safely be inferred from the vase, where the lower register may well represent a remote scene.

M. offers a useful compilation of material and a provocative discussion, but to my mind he does not leave us much the wiser about the shape and detail of Chaeremon's play.

*University of Calgary* MARTIN CROPP

doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni233

## ON STAGE IN PISA

F. NENCI: *Il gioco della scena tragica. Esperienze umane e teatrali degli studenti del laboratorio 'La tragedia greca dal testo alla scena' (anni 1997–2003), Liceo Classico G.Galilei, Pisa*. Pp. 271, b/w and colour ills. Pisa: Edizioni Ets, 2003. Paper. ISBN: 88-467-0931-4.

The long titles say it all; and this handsomely produced book should interest anyone moved by Greek Tragedy, but particularly producers and actors. It is a well-illustrated anthology of performance-texts, from the 'laboratorio' conceived and directed since 1997 by Prof. Francesca Nenci, Head of Greek and Latin in the Liceo. She enjoys the support of the Classics Department of the University of Pisa, and, not least for publication of the book, of the Provincial Adminstration in Pisa and of the city's Lions Club. That is striking enough; what makes the book special are the many prefatory and accompanying essays by N. herself and many of her temporary assistant producers, stage- and music directors, choreographers and not least actors—for all of them have been her pupils in the Liceo; and they too have made most of the translations, always in consultation with N. These simple facts and the flourishing of the 'laboratorio' attest her astonishing energy; the Direttore of the Liceo writes how she conducts its work alongside her teaching both there and in the University; the written contributions of her pupils enthuse over her inspiration (see especially Giordana Guerriero on pp. 17–19, 194–5).

While N. herself writes here for the general public, it is on the basis of very competent scholarship: see her *Eschilo. Coefore* (Bologna, 1999, jointly with L. Arata, which I noticed in *CR* 51 [2001], 156) and *Seneca. Tieste* (Milano, 2002). To the former of these two N. contributed a long 'Nota sulla traduzione e sulla regia delle Coefore de Eschilo', the first fruit of the 'laboratorio', performed in both Pisa and Siracusa in 1997; it is the first play presented in *Il gioco*.

Here are brief comments on the productions from 1997–2003 recorded in the volume (after its receipt I learned that in 2004 the production was of *Alcestis*). *Choephori* (1997): text generally shortened, set out with stage directions and cues for musical accompaniments; for example, the 'Divum Iocastae' from Stravinsky's *Oedipus Rex* accompanies death cries for Aegisthus (line 869 of the Greek text) and Clytemnestra (931); in all seven plays the music is startling in its extent and catholic in source. A remarkable omission in this first play is Orestes' exchange with Pylades (899–902), but the performance-text maintains momentum. A vivid stage moment

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni233 Published online by Cambridge University Press