Pisistratid attempts to unite countryside and city, but V. is careful to highlight the differences, which have everything to do with Dionysus.

Chapter 3, on satyrs as mediating figures, sets the stage for the following six, on satyrs in connection with music, dance, drink, sex, athletics, and inventions and marvels. These chapters patiently and intelligently document what all have recognized as the major themes of satyr play. Their chief argumentative purpose is twofold: to establish that the complex Dionysiac essence of satyrs blurs all kinds of boundaries, so that they can hardly be seen (as Lasserre and Lissarague would have it) as simple anti-types of the citizen; and secondly to show that in the plays, satyrs do not just invert and negate, but quite often also experiment with and lay claim to the values of civilized society. Nor is this just a matter of setting them up for amusing failure and humiliation: dramatic satyrs' naivety and earnest aspirations (to understand, to act civilized) are for V. crucial aspects of a function he calls 'mediating'. After writing in his final sections about satyr play's creation of emotional distance, laughter, and social cohesion, he concludes that the genre helped its audience to a reaffirmation of norms not only by stirring laughter at their inversion, but by allowing the spectators, through the eyes of the satyrs, to rediscover, re-appropriate, even (here his sympathy to Seaford is on display) be re-initiated into the essentials of their cultural identity.

Chapters 10 and 11 consider two types of satyr play principals, monstrous villains and heroes. V.'s demonstration that both types, simple enough in themselves, share traits with the chorus of satyrs tends again to make the satyrs more complex, their mediating rôle more important. As a principal who sometimes resembles not only the satyrs but the villains, Heracles is an interesting special case. V. argues that satyric Heracles, unlike his tragic counterpart, remains essentially uncomplicated because the regular course of the plots calls for him finally to snap to attention and crush the ogres and villains. He does not, like the satyrs, remain suspended in whatever marginal condition (servitude, ambivalent sexuality, appetite) temporarily afflicts him.

In a book so full of detailed arguments, some inevitably invite disagreement. I found V. unconvincing in Sections 5.3–5.6 on *sikinnis* and *pyrrhike*, 9.1 on the significance of the discovery of fire in Aesch. F 204b** (*Prometheus Pyrkaeus*), and 10.1 connecting satyr play villains' inhospitality with Dionysiac myth and cult. Among memorable successes I would include what he says about the associations of satyric music, the simultaneously uncouth and civilized nature of satyric drinking, and Aesch. F 78a (*Isthmiastai*), in which satyrs confront well-wrought images of themselves. On the larger question of function, it is not to be expected that debate will cease. V. brings satyrs, satyr play plots, and audience response together under the banner 'integration of the marginal'. His argument that such a process can never be complete is meant to explain why satyrs were not only good to represent at the end of each tragic production, but had to be represented there, at the heart of Athenian civic life, year after year.

University of Colorado at Boulder JOHN GIBERT

MENANDER'S *SAMIA* FOR STUDENTS

N. Pice, R. Castellano (edd.): *Menandro:* La Samia. *Introduzione, traduzione e commento*. Pp. 224. Bari: Edipuglia, 2001. Hardback, €23.24. ISBN: 88-7228-314-0.

This new edition of Menander's *Samia*, according to its introduction, was 'born in

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press

school and destined for schools'. It is handsomely bound and printed, with a generally acceptable Greek text, a fairly accurate Italian translation, and a commentary designed to help students at a fairly elementary level. Unfortunately, however, it contains too many flaws of too many kinds for any warm recommendation. For instance, the organization of the presented material is inconvenient; the translation is chopped up into passages of 5–20 lines, which are then embedded in the commentary. At times, too, there has been a failure of communication between the editors, resulting in a translation that sometimes differs from the printed Greek (e.g. 43 *οἶμαι* text, *οἴμοι* translated; 125; 132; 115–17 given to Nikeratos in the text, to Demeas in the translation).

The introduction gives an account of Menander's background, the Athens of his time, the theatre, and the ethos and structure of New Comedy. There are sensible comments on the social discord between town and country and the importance of the family in Menander's idealized Athenian society, but they are not helped by blunders in the very opening paragraph (neither Philip II nor Alexander was still alive in 322). The discussion on the dating of Samia was probably written before *ZPE* 121 (1998), 35–6 (arguing for *c*. 314) appeared, but several of the other discussions display no awareness of important recent studies, such as A. C. Scafuro's *The Forensic Stage* (Cambridge, 1997) on the legal background, or J. H. Oakley and R.H. Sinos's *The Wedding in Ancient Athens* (Madison and London, 1993). A brief bibliography is appended, here naturally concentrating on Italian scholarship, but it still has some surprising omissions—the editions of F. Sbordone (Naples, 1971), D. M. Bain (Warminster, 1983), and M. Lamagna (Naples, 1998), for example; the editors are unaware of G. Vogt-Spira, *Dramaturgie des Zufalls* (Munich, 1992) on the influence of philosophy on Menander, and of L. Berczelly, *BICS* 35 (1988), 119–27, on the later dating of the Mytilene mosaics. Foreign scholars' names are too often misspelled—E. Keuls at least twice.

The Greek text is based on the second edition of Sandbach's Oxford text (1990), with ideas grafted on from the editions of Austin, Jacques, and Paduano; it has one new idea (504 [*φέρων γε τὴν*, relegated to the commentary and then misprinted!), and does not always opt for the generally accepted supplement, reading, or conjecture. There is no apparatus, and square brackets are too often omitted. Iotas are inconsistently printed subscript or adscript. At 148 and 150 there is faulty alignment, and 205 is omitted. Neither of the two doubtful fragments (fr. 437 Kock, *P.Berlin* 8450) is printed.

The Italian translation seems reasonably accurate, but omits 206. At 285 *ἄθλιε*, 325 *λάβ' αὐτόν*, and 552 *δικαίως–Ἡράκλεις* are not translated; at 315 *φ[ησιν]* is not *dicono*; 583, 680–81 (*ἐξεύρηκά γε / τόδε κακόν*) and 690 (*παῖ*) are mistranslated.

The commentary offers useful help on elementary points of grammar and syntax that trouble students, but makes some blunders (e.g. 549 *κεκράξεται* is not perfect passive), and at times it omits to explain a construction that students find difficult (e.g. 428 *οὐ μὴ δύῃ*). It never mentions, let alone discusses, alternative textual readings or suggestions. Greek words in the commentary have been carelessly proof-read, and a few entries are misplaced. Comments on other matters are of varied quality, with some serious omissions (e.g. 98 *Πόντος*: see *ZPE* 121 [1998], 43–4), and some excellent insights (e.g. 327: Demeas behaving like a young man in love). A few details: 5 *ποεῖν*, see now *ZPE* 134 (2002), 43–51; 10, the ephebe law was introduced by Epicrates, not Epicurus; 39, *πάννυχις* does not mean rape; 98–101, *ZPE* 121 (1998), 42–3; 251, *θεραπαινίδιον* is not a hapax: cf. Men. *Dysk*. 460, while LSJ cites also Parthenius, Lucian, and Plutarch; 340–2, *ZPE* 122 (1998), 14–15; 547, on *ὦ τᾶν* see

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press

now E. Dickey, *Greek Forms of Address* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 158–60; 570–80, see *Pallas* 54 (2000), 86–7.

An appendix includes a farrago of short essays, etc.: on the Menander finds (but only up to the early 1970s, and so omitting *Karchedonios*, *Leukadia*, and the new Oxyrhynchus and Michigan fragments of *Epitrepontes*), metre, and modern stagings of *Samia* (but without mention of, for example, the radio broadcasts of Turner's English translation in 1971 and of Hurst's French in 1975), together with (i) some other scholars' critiques of the play (D. Lanza, D. Del Corno, P. A. Cavallero), (ii) a repeat of the Italian translation, and (iii) a translation of the epitome of Plutarch's *Comparison of Aristophanes and Menander*. There is also a small collection of illustrations of comic masks, the Mytilene mosaic, and a modern production of the play.

University of Leeds W. GEOFFREY ARNOTT

ARCHESTRATOS' GOOD FOOD GUIDE

S. D. Olson, A. Sens: *Archestratos of Gela. Greek Culture and Cuisine in the Fourth Century B.C.E.* Pp. lxxiii + 261. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. Cased, £48. ISBN: 0-19-924008-6.

Both editors and publishers are to be congratulated on bringing out a substantial commentary on an author who does not belong to the canon of great writers from the fourth century B.C. Archestratos has received some attention over the past decade, but nothing on the present scale or sophistication. The authors are well placed to edit the *Hedupatheia*, having edited the rather different parodic poem of the same period, the *Attikon Deipnon* of Matro of Pitane (Atlanta, 1999), and (Olson only) the *Acharnians* and *Peace* of Aristophanes. Argumentation on everything from date (taking issue with Dalby) to manuscript affiliations in the tradition of Athenaeus (agreement with Arnott's latest view in *Athenaeus and his World*, ed. D. Braund and J. Wilkins [Exeter, 2000], pp. 48–50) is sharp and persuasive. This is true both of the substantial introduction of some seventy pages and of the commentary on each fragment (the fragments are introduced individually with their context in Athenaeus included, with Greek text, translation, and notes). Other topics dealt with at length in the introduction are structure and contents; literary background and genre; audience and reception; food; dialect, language, and style; metre; and scholarly editions. Every reader comes with his or her own preoccupations, not all of which are likely to be shared by the authors. One of my current interests, in the *Hedupatheia* as a form of travel literature, is not covered extensively, but even this demand is met with sensible comment on p. xxx. The work of Archestratos deserves treatment on this scale partly because it is the product of a Greek world (including Sicily and southern Italy) in transition. Its author appears to come from the city of Gela, which was destroyed by the Carthaginians. Whatever his personal circumstances, the poem is a hymn to mobility. Dozens of cities are mentioned, but the journey is for the pleasure of eating good food rather than enforced displacement. Archestratos also anticipates later scholarly concerns—this is why he is such a valuable author for Athenaeus. From Athenaeus' extensive engagement with the poem we discover that it was of interest to

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press