door opens and instead of a resplendent Wealth out comes a little woman almost as decrepit as Wealth was when we first saw him.

H.'s text is in general quietly sound. At *Eccl.* 560–1 he ingeniously tries to meet objections to the paradosis (which led me in my edition [Warminster, 1998] to posit a lacuna) by sundering *τοῖς τολμῶσιν* syntactically from *αἰσχρὰ δρᾶν* and taking it in an absolute sense ('from now on *aggressive people* will be in no position to treat the city shamefully in any way, or to testify or trump up charges'); however, testifying (*μαρτυρεῖν*) is not in itself an aggressive act—indeed, it was an act that nobody could perform except at the request of another. In *Eccl.* 952–68 the reader is warned that the text of the 'love-duet' has suffered substantial intrusive glossing and/or paraphrasing; here more than ever one longs for fuller information!

As ever, there are some delightful touches in H.'s translation: 'kinsdom teeth' (*Frogs* 418); 'Heurippides became everyone's golden boy' (*Eccl.* 826); 'au contraire, miss twiggy' (for *νὴ Δί', ὦ φθίνυλλα σύ*) (*Eccl.* 935); at *Wealth* 649–52 an effective treatment of one of the most refractory word-plays, for the translator, in all of Ar. Occasionally a term that would be appropriate in an analogous modern context is used in a way that might mislead, e.g. 'knitting' (*Eccl.* 89), 'sewing' (*Eccl.* 556), 'bunks' (*Wealth* 663), 'jacket' (*Wealth* 882). In *Eccl.* 681 'ballot boxes' will not do (these are *κληρωτήρια*, not *καδίσκοι*); what's wrong with 'lottery machines'—which we still have, though we now use them for rather different purposes?

A few points where one hopes that corrections can be made in a future printing. *Frogs* 15: delete question mark. *Frogs* 282 n.: for 'Sophocles' read 'Euripides'. *Frogs* 1043 n.: Bellerophon was not a stepson of Stheneboia, but a guest of her husband's. *Frogs* 1168: for 'without informing' read 'without the consent of'. *Eccl.* 243 n.: the Spartan 'investment' of Athens did not begin until after Aigospotamoi. *Wealth* intro., p. 417: it is not possible for 'three actors to play all the roles' in *Wealth* unless there is a choral interlude after 1170, and H. ad loc. does not posit one. *Wealth* 173 n.: the 'mercenary force in Corinth' was established in 393, not 390, and by 388 it was no longer commanded by Iphikrates. *Wealth* 550: for 'that Thrasybulus is the same as Dionysius' read 'that Dionysius is the same as Thrasybulus'. *Wealth* 1096: *χοροῦ* is in fact present in K (Ambr. C222 inf.). Something has gone badly wrong with the positioning of the textual notes on *Eccl.* 961–end, one of which is twelve pages out of place.

So now we have at last a complete, usable Loeb Aristophanes; and I am sure it will prove to have lasted better over the next seventy-five years than its predecessor did over the last seventy-five. But one hopes Rogers has not gone out of print for ever!

University of Nottingham ALAN H. SOMMERSTEIN

SATYRIC DRAMA

P. VOELKE: *Un Théâtre de la Marge. Aspects figuratifs et configurationnels du drame satyrique dans l'Athènes classique*. Pp. 471, pls. Bari: Levanti editori, 2001. Paper, €61.97. ISBN: 88-7949-267-5.

Pierre Voelke's study of Greek satyr drama, which originated as his 1999 Lausanne thesis, reflects hard work, enviable learning, and good sense combined with imagination. Clearly and engagingly written, it aims at nothing less than a complete survey of the themes and plots of satyr drama and a new answer to the question of its function within tragic production. In his first chapter, V. sketches five previous

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.22 Published online by Cambridge University Press

answers to this question: (1) satyr play provided for relaxation after the emotional demands of tragedy; (2) it preserved the Dionysiac element that tragedy had largely lost; (3) the pairing of its rural with tragedy's urban orientation helped opposing elements of Attica's population transcend their social and political differences; (4) the satyrs, as anti-types of the Athenian male citizen, led the audience to a reaffirmation of its values; and (5) satyr play reaffirmed a collective male consciousness after the experience of 'feminine' emotions aroused by tragedy. Modern scholars often combine these explanations. Nearly all see some truth in the first two, but few think they explain everything. Richard Seaford's attempt to derive certain features of the genre from Dionysiac mysteries is treated by V., who is sympathetic to it, as an extension of the second answer. The third, given by Luigi Enrico Rossi, has had little influence on anglophone scholars. By contrast, the fourth, proposed by François Lasserre and developed by François Lissarague, was described by Edith Hall in 1998 as 'currently canonical'. The fifth answer was given by Hall herself, who sees it as a supplement to Lissarague's 'anthropological' approach. After a full discussion in his final chapter, V.'s answer emerges as a combination of (1), (2), a bit of (3), and a significantly modified (4). If this sounds complicated, that's because it is. If Hall is right about the status of Lissarague's view, one might say more simply that V.'s achievement in this arena is a gentle but sustained and largely successful polemic against it; however, he has barely come to grips with Hall's own provocative thesis. Satyr studies have thus reached an exciting juncture, a good time for those with a serious interest in them to re-examine their views. Incidentally, readers of German will find that the task has been made much easier by two other recent books: R. Krumeich, N. Pechstein, and B. Seidensticker (edd.), *Das griechische Satyrspiel* (Darmstadt, 1999); and N. Pechstein, *Euripides Satyrographos: Ein Kommentar zu den Euripideischen Satyrspielfragmenten* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1998). My review of these at *CJ* 98 (2002–2003), 79–88 includes a closer look at Hall's article, 'Ithyphallic Males Behaving Badly; or Satyr Drama as Gendered Tragic Ending', which appeared in M. Wyke (ed.), *Parchments of Gender: Deciphering the Body in Antiquity* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 13–37.

V.'s subtitle proclaims a theoretical basis that can be described as eclectic semiotic narratology. It is eclectic because one key term, *figure*, is taken from A. J. Greimas, while a second, *configuration*, comes from P. Ricoeur, even though Greimas used it as a term of art in an incompatible sense. V. casually extends the model still further so as to license discussion of what a traditional classicist would be content to call the backgrounds and social function of satyric drama. While V.'s distinction between *figure* and *configuration* does not, I think, prove very important, the indispensable notion of 'mediation' acquires its meaning in the course of interpretation rather than in a moment of theory-driven definition. If V. is theoretically aware, he is also practical and anything but doctrinaire.

Chapter 2 is devoted to the settings of satyr play. Clearly, most can be described as marginal: mountains, coasts, islands, caves, and non-Greek lands. Following a familiar path, V. associates such spaces with Dionysus. More ambitiously, he argues that non-marginal satyr play settings have a Dionysiac colouring too, because traces of a banquet or symposium can be found in most of them. Having thus assembled evidence for a claim that satyr play brings marginal, Dionysiac space into the heart of the city, V. links it in his final chapter with rituals concerning Dionysus Eleuthereus, patron god of the City Dionysia, and political arrangements concerning Eleutherae, situated on the boundary between Attica and Boeotia. This subtle argument, which V. published as an article in 1992, owes something to Rossi's view of satyr drama in relation to

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.22 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/53.1.22 Published online by Cambridge University Press