ΒΙΒΛΙΟΚΡΙΣΙΕΣ

RECENT STUDIES ON SATYR PLAY

LÄMMLE, Rebecca, *Poetik des Satyrspiels*, Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag, 2013, pp. 530.

SHAW, Carl A., *Satyric Play. The Evolution of Greek Comedy and Satyr Drama*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014, pp. 191.

A.

REBECCA LÄMMLE'S BOOK OFFERS a comprehensive survey of satyr drama, both of the surviving fragments and the only extant play, *Cyclops*, while also encompassing ad hoc discussions of specific passages, as well as of key motifs of the genre. It is a long volume, of more than 500 pages, packed with information. The first part of the book (pages 17-50, "Einleitung und Ausblick") is introductory, outlining the aims of research and offering a general presentation of satyr play as a genre, while also concisely tracing its historical trajectory. In pages 23-28, the very title of the book, "Poetik des Satyrspiels", is explicated. Foregrounded as a connecting thread in this general overview of the topics to be discussed are the multifarious links between satyr drama and tragedy, the former eventually being described as "das dionysische und das komische Gedächtnis der Tragödie".[1] Indeed the entire book repeatedly stresses the connection between the two genres — as opposed, in fact, to Carl A. Shaw's book, which instead lays much emphasis on the affinities between satyr play and comedy, as we shall see in section B. However, we should remark that the establishment of multiple points of contact with tragedy, which certainly constitutes a strong underlying idea and even a guiding principle for the project, is combined with an application of the term "poetics" in a rather too broad sense; thus, the book tends to acquire the form of a general study on satyr play, lacking any distinct focus on a clearly

1. Lämmle (henceforth, L.) 28.

defined area of "poetics". The author could, instead, have opted for a more unambiguous delimitation of the ambit of research, most pertinently centred on the "implicit principles" governing satyric composition.[2] Further, while the "interaction" between satyr play and *comedy* is indeed granted some attention (especially in pages 40-50), nevertheless, particularly in the light of the analysis offered by Shaw, one gathers the impression that the affinities between the two genres end up being rather downplayed in Lämmle's book.

The introductory part (pages 17-50) is followed by three major sections each containing a number of chapters. The first is entitled "Voraussetzungen" (pages 51-107) and begins with Chapter 1, which is labelled "*Τραγῳδία παίζουσα*", borrowing of course its title from the famous designation of satyr play in Demetrius' *De elocutione* (169).[3] Here Lämmle seeks to lay the foundations of her view that the "*genus proximum*" to satyr play is tragedy. The chapter deals with matters of performance, especially costumes and masks, as well as with issues of vocabulary and metre. The pages on vocabulary (64-76) offer practical, detailed lists of words characteristic of the satyric genre.[4] Chapters 2 and 3 ("Das Rätsel der Tetralogie" and "Das vierte Element", respectively) attempt to 'decipher' the 'inner logic', as we might term it, of the tetralogy and, more precisely, of the reservation of the fourth place for the satyr play. The author indeed seeks to establish the tetralogy as a system, whereby the fourth piece must fulfil a specific role; as a characteristic case she aptly mentions the Aeschylean *Proteus*,[5] which actually 'responds' to a specific question raised by the *Oresteia*, but left unresolved in the trilogy.[6] In pages 93-98 we find a succinct overview of the various interpretations of the *function* of satyr drama, yet the author refrains from expressly endorsing any one of them.[7] Pages 99-107 involve a consideration of the Aristotelian theory about the origins of tragedy and the *Adelungsprozeß* undergone by the

2. On various definitions of the term "poetics", cf. the *New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, s.v. [eds. A. Preminger and T.V.F. Brogan, Princeton 1993].
3. Contrast Shaw's reading of Demetrius' passage (pp. 13-14).
4. A note on a particular word: the occurrence of *χλανίδιον* in Chaeremon's *Oineus* (fr. 14.9 Snell) may hardly be regarded as an indication of the satyric character of the play; cf. the use of the word in Hdt. 1.195.3 and Eur. *Supp.* 110. See further Stephanopoulos (forthcoming).
5. L. 88-89.
6. Namely, the enquiry on the *nostos* of Menelaos (*Ag.* 617-621). Disappointingly, however, the most recent discussion of *Proteus* by Griffith (2002, 237-254) has not been taken into account.
7. Absent from this overview is any reference to Winkler's influential essay "The Ephebes' Song" (1990). Further, at § 8, reference to Griffith's article "Slaves of Dionysos" (2002) was certainly also due.

genre, as well as of the possible reasons for the introduction of the satyr play into the tragic *agon*. However, we are dealing with a rather cursory discussion[8] — surprisingly enough, given that the establishment of a close connection between satyr play and tragedy, underlying the author's approach to her subject, necessarily involves the *Poetics* as a key point of reference.[9] Furthermore, regardless of the historical validity of the philosopher's positing of the *σατυρικόν* as an essential trait of early tragedy (4.1449a19-21), the very fact of its conception as something (necessarily) 'approximating' classical satyr play calls for in-depth study.[10]

The next part of the book is entitled "Tragödienreflexion" (pages 109-291). It begins with Chapter 4, "'Der eingeschloßene Dritte'" (pages 111-153), which deals with the presence of Dionysos in satyr drama and its importance in terms of the latter's generic identity. In pages 113-125 the author argues against R. Seaford's reading in the *Cyclops* of an "*initiatory pattern*" evoking the origins of satyr play: namely, the enslavement of the *thiasos* by an enemy of Dionysos and the Satyrs' eventual liberation, after the defeat of their captor and his recognition of the god. She thus engages (115 ff.) in a "close reading", as she terms it, of a number of passages from *Cyclops*, through which —contrary to Seaford's view that Cyclops "knows nothing of Dionysos", being disdainful of the *thiasos* and having to be instructed in the manners of the symposium— it is claimed that Polyphemos is actually familiar with Dionysiac ritual and festivity. Regardless of the validity of Seaford's theory —an issue which may by no means be addressed here— it is methodologically questionable to argue, for instance, from lines 203-205 of the play, in which Polyphemos reprimands the Satyrs for their dancing and *βακχιάζειν*, that he is in fact conversant with Dionysiac terminology.[11] Indeed, typical of satyr play is a diffusion of the Dionysiac, in tandem with a

8. Complementing an equally brief consideration of the Aristotelian testimony, from the point of view of the evolution of metrical patterns, in pp. 76-77.
9. See further, comments on Shaw.
10. Absent from the references concerning Aristotle's theory is Schmitt's commentary (2008), despite it having been entered in the bibliography. Further, in p. 99, n. 31, there is a reference to the influential volume edited by Csapo and Miller (2007), yet there is no mention of key views related in it. In p. 101, nn. 38 and 39, Burkert's consequential article (1966) on the origins of tragedy is mentioned, yet without any hint about its distinct contribution to the discussion, the thesis, namely, that tragedy took its name from the sacrifice of a he-goat. Also, more attention could have been allotted to Seaford's theory, not least since it establishes a close link between the Dionysiac origins of tragedy and satyr drama.
11. Cf. e.g. 117: "Woher kennt er … die *τύμπανα*…?"

proliferation of the absurd, the paradoxical, the contradictory.[12]

Further, in pages 128-146, Lämmle considers those plays in which Dionysos (more or less certainly) appears as *dramatis persona*. Most extensive is the discussion of the Aeschylean satyr play *Lykourgos* (pages 129-132),[13] also dealt with further, in pages 280-283, where Lykourgos is regarded as a possible figure of "serial perpetrator" — an inference drawn by tracing a parallel with Nonnos' narration of the story of Lykourgos in the *Dionysiaka*, a narration which is regarded by the author as bearing the influence of the Aeschylean play.

Chapter 5, "Der Chor der Satyrn", comprises a treatment of the key characteristics of the Satyric chorus. A problem —present not only in this part of the book— is that it contains rather lengthy quotations with hardly adequate commentary. For instance, under the heading "Das 'eigentliche' Dasein der Satyrn und Silen" (pages 157-162) we find citations of Soph. *Ichn*. 221-232, Eur. *Cycl*. 63-81 and Pratinas' *Hyporchema* (fr. 3 Snell), yet with very restricted comments (for instance, on page 160 the long footnotes mostly record bibliographical references). As regards specifically the *Hyporchema*, the same text is quoted and discussed in several parts of the book; in this, as in a number of other cases, a unitary treatment would certainly have been preferable. Further themes of this chapter are the relationship between Dionysos and the Satyrs, as well as their connection with the Nymphs, the thyrsus, ivy and wine; more substantial is the discussion (in pages 177-193) of the noise created by the Satyrs through their *χορεία*, as well as of their singing. What is offered here is a study of key vocabulary, such as *κέλαδος*, *πάταγος* and their cognates. The next theme to be examined is the *mode* of satyric dance ("Hüpfen, Springen, Tanzen"; pages 193-201); yet this topic, being central to any discussion of satyr drama and its performance, should have been allotted more space, whereas the distinct contribution of the author could also have been made more clear — in this case in relation to the standard treatments by Seidensticker.[14] An equally important theme is dealt with in § 5.2, "Satyrn in fremden Rollen" (pages 203-215), which opens with the long fragment from Sophocles' *Oineus* (fr. 1130.3-20 Radt).

12. Cf. Pozzoli (2004) 29: "L'assurdo, il paradossale, il senso di straniamento che nasce dalle frequenti contradizzioni, sono i toni prevalenti della drammaturgia satiresca e i poeti vi attingono continuamente perché proprio attraverso questi elementi il *σατυρικόν* assolve la sua funzione".
13. In the bibliography cited on the *Lykourgeia* tetralogy one would also have expected a reference to Di Marco's essay (1993) which concentrates on the *Bassarids*, yet is also of importance for the assessment of the tetralogy as a whole.
14. Seidensticker (2003) and (2010).

While one would certainly agree that this fragment is largely "eine komisch-groteske Übung in Selbstüberschätzung und Dilettantismus",[15] a more in-depth analysis would be particularly welcome, especially if it would have raised the question of a possible parody of contemporary sophists.[16] On the other hand, one might ask whether the enumeration of the multifarious satyric skills (especially at lines 12-16) is equally influenced by the tradition whereby the Satyrs are demonic beings connected with inventions, while also bearing a certain kind of wisdom.[17] The very fact that the undertaking of 'foreign roles' by the Satyrs is a frequent *topos* in satyr play renders questionable its interpretation *solely* as a catalyst for the comic effect.[18] An extended examination (in pages 211-215) of the scene preceding the blinding of Polyphemos in *Cyclops*, in which the Satyrs are initially ready to fulfil a 'foreign' role, but eventually back down, scarcely helps to resolve this issue. As in other places in the book, a prolonged discussion, with ample quotations of Greek text, ends up dimming the focus of analysis.

Chapter 6 is entitled "Sprechen über den Chor", having as its general theme the "metatheatrical"[19] references to the Satyrs' manner of dancing. Yet this chapter, though certainly containing much valuable information, also involves a revisiting of key passages discussed before. This is not to imply that the comments supplied here are not important, but the fragmentation of the material in such a way, whereby the same texts are repeatedly quoted, each time with restricted, very specific commentary, effectively hinders an economical and cohesive development of the whole analysis. Notwithstanding this critical point, as a significant contribution of this chapter ought to be singled out the comments on the fragments of Aeschylus' *Prometheus Pyrkaeus* (especially fr. 204b Radt), comments which centre on the description of satyric *χορεία*.[20]

The next chapter, "Poetik der Serie", deals with the "seriality" (if I am allowed this term) characterizing satyr play. It may actually be regarded as

15. L. 205.
16. See Krumeich et al. (1999) 371; Seidensticker (2012) 238; also, now, O'Sullivan and Collard (2013, 380), who add that "[t]he apparently overt criticism of real-life contemporaries is more typical of Comedy, but occasional in satyric". This point of contact with Old Comedy also pertains to the thematic emphasis adopted by Shaw in his book.
17. On Satyrs and 'marvellous inventions', see Seaford (1976) esp. 215-219 and (1984) 36-37. On the Satyrs' possession of some kind of wisdom – with reference to the fragment of *Oineus*, see Griffith (2002) 202, n. 23.
18. L. 205: "es handelt sich dabei um einen Motor seiner Handlungen und einen Katalysator seiner Komik".
19. Although the author, for uncertain reasons, is reluctant to apply this term.
20. L. 234-240.

one of the most substantial and compelling chapters of the volume — arguably its best. It also directly pertains to the title of the book, namely the "poetics" of the satyric genre, since it refers to what may effectively be construed as distinct "rules" governing the composition of a satyr play. Key themes treated in this chapter are "serial killing" (7.2), as well as, more generally, the presence of evil characters committing serial crimes (7.3); further, the repetitive actions and symmetrical patterns involved in those myths of "serial perpetrators" ("Serientäter"), patterns such as *agon* and *talio* (7.3.2-3). A useful table is found on pages 275-276, comparing various satyric myths of "serial perpetrators" in terms of their structural elements. This very good chapter, which ends in succinct and clear conclusions (7.5) is however burdened in pages 247-254 with lengthy footnotes relating the sources for the myths of the satyr plays considered. Since all this information is lucidly and authoritatively exposed in the standard volume *Das griechische Satyrspiel*,[21] why should it be inserted here, rendering the book less readable? Insertion of relevant references could preferably have been restricted to the cases in which Lämmle disagrees with the aforementioned volume.[22] Similar amassing of information, in fact frequent throughout the book, eventually hinders the foregrounding of the author's original research (no less laudable, for all that).

What follows, from page 293 onwards, is the third and last part of the book, entitled "Einzelstudien". This, in turn, is divided into "Studien I", involving the consideration of select satyr plays and fragments, as well as "Studien II", which offers a discussion of important motifs and themes of satyr drama. A general critical remark on "Studien I" is again the fact that it largely overlaps with *Das griechische Satyrspiel*; there is no need to reiterate here the same remarks as those just made with reference to Chapter 7. To the treatment of each individual play a section entitled "Kommentar" is appended, involving a discussion of clearly selective character, yet with no transparent rationale as to why a specific passage/topic is sorted out for examination (the latter again being, in its turn, focused on particular issues).

The first drama to be dealt with in "Studien I" is Aeschylus' *Diktyoulkoi*. In the "Kommentar" the author cites the long Simonidean fragment 543 *PMG*, the obvious and important parallel to Danae's *rhesis* in *Diktyoulkoi*, yet the *rhesis* itself (fr. 47a, 773-785 Radt) is not quoted, hindering thus any effective comparison between the two texts. The next play discussed is Aeschylus' *Isthmiastae* or *Theoroi*. As regards the interlocutor of the Satyrs at

21. Krumeich et al. (1999).

22. As is the case, for instance, in p. 248, n. 7 (on *Busiris*) or in pp. 250-251, n. 11 (on *Skiron*).

the beginning of fr. 78a Lämmle opts for Sisyphus, stating also the possibility of Daedalos, Hephaestos or Theseus,[23] omitting however the option of a *νεωκόρος*, a conjecture reached by A. Setti and J. K. Kamerbeek (independently) and followed by, among others, M. Di Marco and, more recently, O. Pozzoli.[24] An examination of specific passages follows, with selective comments. In the case of fr. 78c (37-40, especially the term *διστοίχων*) we find a brief analysis which partly repeats and partly adds to the remarks made at pages 196-197: a characteristic case of repetitiveness within the book. The discussion of Sophocles' *Ichneutae* which follows focuses, in the "Kommentar" section (pages 318-320), on the rich vocabulary for sound encountered in the play.

There follows a brief section on *Inachos* and, finally, a more extensive one on *Cyclops*. The latter focuses on the echoes of the *Odyssey* within the play, of which a characteristic instance is provided by Polyphemos' 'inexplicable' reference to Zeus in lines 320-321, a passage where most scholars have indeed failed to properly appraise the Homeric influence.[25] This analysis is, without doubt, important, yet it does not lead us much further than the conclusion that Euripides is well versed in the Homeric text and that he opportunely exploits the fact that his audience is equally well acquainted with it. The key question, in terms of *poetics*, is rather in which ways does Euripides exploit this knowledge in his dramatic art, in order to transfer in the most advantageous way (in terms of dramatic economy and effect) the epic narrative onto the stage. Worth mentioning here are the three key strategies outlined by N. Chourmouziades, which offer a very good point of departure for further delving into this question: (*a*) omission (characteristically of the events at the end of the play); (*b*) substitution (for example, the Satyrs briefly substitute for the fellow Cyclopes); and (*c*) suppression (when the poet avoids mentioning information that would contradict what the audience perceives onstage; characteristically, Polyphemos' gigantic stature).[26]

Now, "Studien II" deals, as already indicated, with typical motifs and

23. L. 307, n. 8.

24. See Pozzoli (2004) 160-161, with the relevant bibliographical references. It is worth mentioning here that, although Pozzoli's book is cited in Lämmle's bibliography, it does not appear to have been adequately taken profit of.

25. L. 338-339.

26. Chourmouziades (2008) 19-20. I would scarcely be inclined to criticize Lämmle for failing to cite a book in Modern Greek. Yet, on the other hand, she has consulted Chourmouziades' *Σατυρικά* (in its first edition, though: 1974), which is written in the same language, hence one might not unreasonably expect her to be following this author's more recent publications.

themes of satyr play: among other, athletics, alphabet and writing (a particularly original section), *κότταβος* play, metamorphosis, animals. Of eminent importance for satyr play is "invention and discovery" (*εὕρημα*), which may, however, hardly be treated adequately within nine pages (371-380). Among further motifs discussed in "Studien II", a particular remark is in order on the theme of "prophecy" (pages 425-427). Namely, the question arises whether the Satyrs' claim to possess prophetic abilities in Sophocles' *Oineus* (fr. 1130.12-13 Radt), corroborated by the *μάντις χορός* of *Amphiareos* (fr. 113), should be regarded as an indication that there somehow exists a certain connection between Satyrs and prophecy or whether, alternatively, the latter is to be considered as another "fremde Rolle", as implied in Lämmle's previous discussion of the *Oineus* fragment.[27] A final key issue dealt with in this section is the motif of the "riddle", which is considered in pages 428-435. Again, the fact that such a central theme of satyr play is relegated to a rather brief treatment at the end of the volume is methodologically problematic — all the more so, since this theme is intimately connected with the motif of "invention/discovery". As regards specifically the analysis of *Ichneutae* (in pages 431-434), though valuable in itself,[28] it ends up being but one of the many treatments of the play within the volume. One is confronted here with one more instance of the 'fragmentariness', one might say, often characterizing the book as a whole.

The volume concludes with an extensive bibliography, covering pages 447-494, which is, however, somewhat difficult to consult given its splitting (apart from the major category of "Forschungsliteratur") into separate sections as regards the editions, monographs and articles concerning specific plays / categories of fragments. One wonders, for instance, why even "trag. adesp. 655 (*Atlas Satyrikos?*)" should be allotted its own section in the list of references. How easy will it be for the reader to quickly check "West 1976" (his article on *Atlas*) in the bibliography? On the other hand, the exhaustive "Index locorum" is quite accurate and helpful. Indeed, considering the entire book, meticulousness, care for detail and, no doubt, a painstaking copy-editing have helped to produce an impeccable volume.[29]

In truth, we ought to fully bestow upon the author the praise she de-

27. L. 203-205.

28. Especially as regards the interpretation of lines 329-331 in pages 433-434.

29. Equally deserving praise is the scholarly German employed by the author. If I am allowed a comment on language use, however, may I express my reservations as regards the occurrence, at times, of English words, yet for no apparent reason. For instance, is "reentry" in pp. 24, 25 and 28 a word with no equivalent in German or should it be regarded as a kind of 'technical term'? As such may indeed be considered "pattern" on

serves. She has clearly devoted great effort to this work. She has mastered a vast amount of bibliography and has attentively dealt with quite an extensive array of material. The volume contains a large quantity of useful information and helpful discussions on a variety of topics pertaining to satyr play. It is, thus, beyond question that it will be of particular help to students and scholars working on this area of classical scholarship. On the other hand, one feels obliged to note certain shortcomings which inevitably detract, to some extent, from its value. The first relates to the very structure and thematic cohesion of the book, which has developed from a doctoral dissertation, yet it has not fully succeeded in getting rid of the tropes (and concomitant limitations) often attending dissertation-writing. Characteristically, the footnotes, as already observed, are often too long, burdened with quotations and references exceeding the immediate ambit of the argument, which itself sometimes tends to get out of focus.[30] However, my key reservation, voiced from the outset, concerns the very scope of the book, which ends up being a volume which deals with a variety of topics relevant to satyr drama, instead of supplying a focused study on its *poetics*. The chapters arguably most germane to this issue are 1 ("*Τραγῳδία παίζουσα*") and 7 ("Poetik der Serie"), whereas, for instance, the two chapters on the satyric chorus (5 and 6) tend to lose their thematic cohesion, not least due to overlapping discussions. Generally, we find works and fragments being examined again and again, usually each time from a particular, but not always essentially divergent, point of view. In a somehow paradoxical way, a book clearly intended to be rigorously systematic in terms of the disposition of the material (note each chapter's division into many sections and subsections) often ends up losing its thematic coherence, not least due to this over-fragmentation of the analysis. As a result, this manner of arrangement may sometimes obscure Lämmle's original contribution, actually encouraging a more "encyclopedic" consultation of the book, which scarcely does justice to the author's scholarly effort and achievement.

B.

CARL A. SHAW'S BOOK CONSISTS IN A SERIES of chapters which discuss specific aspects of satyr play, effectively forming a diachronic study suc-

p. 24; less clearly "performance" on p. 25 (juxtaposed with "Darbietung") and elsewhere; scarcely so, "setting" on p. 62 or "stock-figures" on p. 81.

30. For instance, ought the mere mention of *Glaukos Pontios* or *Prometheus Pyrkaeus* in the introduction (p. 27) necessitate a detailed reference to the specific papyri containing the plays' fragments? Another characteristic instance is footnote 45 (page 38), which assumes the form of an encyclopedic article on the Lenaea.

cinctly tracing its evolution as a genre. The author is already known from his scholarly work on this topic, especially his article on 'satyric style' in Middle Comedy,[31] a study included in the book as Chapter 5. We should stress, right from the beginning, that Shaw's book lays particular emphasis —precisely as the subtitle makes clear— on the affinities between satyr play and comedy, tracing their common evolution in time.

The first chapter deals with comedy and the satyric genre in Plato and Aristotle. The discussion of Plato centres on the *Symposium*, especially on passage 223c-d, offering a sensible reading of it, according which Plato is "attributing generic multiplicity to the tragedian, who wrote both tragedies and 'comical' satyr plays".[32] What follows is an examination of the Aristotelian testimony on the origin of the dramatic genres (*Poetics* c. 4).[33] What Shaw imputes to Aristotle, alongside Plato, is "a simple, dyadic conception of poetry that cannot account for the nuances and complexity of the satyr plays"[34] and, more specifically, for the humorous aspect of the satyric genre. Commenting on the Aristotelian statement that tragedy evolved from the *σατυρικόν* and the concomitant *μικροὶ μῦθοι* and *λέξις γελοία* (4.1449a19-21), Shaw indicates an inconsistency between this passage and the one referring to the character of poets and poetry (4.1448b24-27), according to which the division of poets into *σεμνότεροι* and *εὐτελέστεροι* determined their predilection for specific genres at the initial phases of the latter's evolution.[35] Following the author's argument, Aristotle fails to provide an adequate explanation regarding the question of how a *σεμνότερος* could compose a "satyr-drama like" play. In fact, according to Shaw, the existence of satyric performances effectively "contradicts Aristotle's binary model of poetic categorization".[36] Thus, his reference to the *σατυρικόν* is interpreted by the author as a means through which any discussion or analysis of satyr play is bypassed via a clever teleological resolution to the problem, grounded on a historical connection between satyr drama and tragedy. For this reason, Shaw believes that the 'satyric' origins of tragedy are more likely to have been invented.

However, one may wonder whether, after all, the 'counterintuitive' claim that tragedy evolved out of a 'satyric' form characterized by *λέξις γελοία* — despite, or rather *because* of its *prima facie* implausibility— should actually

31. Shaw (2010).
32. Shaw (2014) [henceforth "S."] 14-21: 20.
33. S. 22-25; also 42-43.
34. S. 15.
35. On this dichotomy, see analysis by Schmitt (2008) 286-292.
36. S. 23.

be lent more credibility.[37] Certainly the evidence is scanty, yet this does not entail that research in this direction is utterly impossible. May I merely suggest here two potential lines of enquiry. First, a study of the possible ways in which the formal characteristics of tragedy may have evolved, for instance specific metrical patterns or the *epirrhema*;[38] further, an attentive survey of the evidence concerning dithyramb, including a consideration of the conjectured "satyric dithyramb".[39] The key problem with the interpretation of *σατυρικόν* and *λέξις γελοία* is, of course, the fact that we appear compelled to assume a shift in the course of the evolution of the proto-tragic chorus from the humorous to the solemn, a shift which has been explained by some scholars through the hypothesis of the incorporation of heroic myth into proto-tragic choral song. Alternatively, we may posit, following Seaford and Hedreen, impersonations of Satyrs in ritual, non-comic contexts.[40] Even if an exhaustive discussion of the possible meaning of *σατυρικόν* would have been out of place in Shaw's volume, one would still have expected the author to have dealt, even briefly, with some key scholarly positions, not least since the Aristotelian testimony remains a major point of reference as regards our assessment of the affinities between satyr play and tragedy – and, obversely, with comedy.

The second chapter, entitled "Early *Kômos* Songs: Satyric, Pre-Comic, and Dithyrambic Performance", attempts to trace the common ancestry of satyr drama and comedy to a primary form of *κῶμος*, which is, in its turn, connected with dithyramb. Shaw points to Archilochus' fr. 120 West, arguing that archaic dithyramb must also have included "sexually obscene, improvised, processional song and dance", still not of (exclusively) "serious" quality.[41] The "allusion to drunkenness" in fr. 120 West (*οἴνῳ συγκεραννωθεὶς φρένας*) "also suggests", according to the author, "the possibility for humorous dithyrambic poetry, since it is hard to imagine that being 'thunderstruck

37. Also, as Hedreen (1992, 167) notes, given the fact that, "in Aristotle's mind, there is no serious uncertainty as regards the origins of tragedy", in contrast with the origins of comedy, "to claim that he is advancing an unfounded hypothesis in this context is to accuse him not only of speculation but also of misrepresentation".
38. On these issues, Garvie's analysis (1969, 88-140) remains a helpful point of departure.
39. See Schmitt (2008) 298-301.
40. Taking the lead from Seaford (esp. 1984, 6-7), Hedreen arrives at the conclusion that the evidence (supplied not merely by late literary sources, but also by vase paintings of the classical age) suggests that "silen masquerades were not limited to obscene and humorous performances, but also included serious rites and initiations". He thus warns against "an overly narrow definition of the nature of silens and of satyric performances"; see Hedreen (1992) 170.
41. S. 31

with wine' would be a fitting mental state for leading a solemn dithyramb".[42] Yet inebriation could more plausibly suggest divine inspiration, denoting the bestowal of a Dionysiac impetus (a form of *ἐνθουσιασμός*) upon the poet, rather than point to the state of the celebrants or be deciphered as a secure sign of the 'character' of the performance.[43] Similarly, S. Lavecchia asserts that *συγκεραννοῦν φρένας* alludes not merely to an "evocation" of, but even to an "assimilation" to the god, embodying "a performative recollection of Dionysos' birth".[44] In this light, it scarcely appears self-evident that the dithyrambic performance insinuated by Archilochus must necessarily be (at least one-sidedly) humorous or lowbrow.

Reservations may also be expressed as regards Shaw's reference to the *Fasti* inscription (*IG* II² 2318), at the head of which we read that "first there were *κῶμοι* for Dionysos". These *κῶμοι* "were likely dithyrambic performances", according to the author,[45] yet little confidence is actually warranted. Indeed, we may only express certainty of the fact that the *κῶμος* "is a predominantly Dionysian phenomenon, and may sometimes be used with reference to dithyramb".[46] A reference to dithyramb is certainly more plausible in the case of the *κῶμος* mentioned by the law of Euegoros, equally forming part of Shaw's argument.[47] Yet, the author's overall tendency to apply the term

42. S. 30.

43. See Zimmermann (2008) 22-23; also Patzer (1995) 309; Neri (2011) 190-191. Patzer engages in what amounts to a persuasive refutation of Leonhardt's (1991) thesis advocating a chiastic reading of Aristotle's sentence on the origins of the dramatic genres (*Poetics* 4. 1449a10-12). In the light of Patzer's critique, this thesis may hardly be upheld —*pace* Schmitt (2008) 300— as a valid alternative reading; cf. Bierl (2001) 303 n. 7. It is worth noting that Leonhardt's arguments (*op. cit.* esp. 49-60) in favour of a connection between dithyramb and proto-comedy actually have several points in common with Shaw's account (no discussion of his thesis appears however, apart from a reference at p. 23 n. 24).

44. Lavecchia (2013) 60-62: 60.

45. S. 31, referring to Steinhart (2007) 212; it is worth noting that Shaw essentially repeats Steinhart's (*op. cit.* esp. 209-217) argumentation as regards the connection between komasts, dithyramb and comedy.

46. So Kowalzig and Wilson (2013a, 14), commenting on the *κῶμοι* mentioned at the *Fasti*. As Agócs (2012, 200, n. 72) points out (citing also previous scholarship), those *κῶμοι* "may refer to the festival, to the dithyrambs, to other performances by male *choroi* or even to the *pompe*. Nor do ancient texts make a clear distinction between *komos* and *pompe*".

47. In the law of Euegoros (cited by Demosthenes, *Against Meidias* 10), *κῶμος*, mentioned alongside *κωμῳδοί*, is generally considered as referring to men's dithyrambic choruses. However, scholarly opinion is not unanimous, given the divergence of terminology in comparison with the inscriptions recording victories at the Dionysia. Recently, one scholar has even argued against the authenticity of the document: Canevaro (2013) 216-220, esp. 220.

'dithyramb' in a generalized way, effectively equating it with 'Dionysiac song/ *κῶμος*', in fact creates methodological problems and scarcely enables a more accurate grasp of the situation. Namely, while it is certainly valid to assert that "dithyramb presumably served as an influential precursor to comedy", this does by no means necessarily entail that comedy "presumably received its name from its associations with dithyrambic *kômos*-song" (page 32). Indeed, Shaw is inclined to subsume rather too wide a range of choral songs under 'dithyramb'. It is worth noting that this stance runs counter to the —more commendable in my view— line of approach adopted in the recent volume on dithyramb, edited by B. Kowalzig and P. Wilson,[48] in which contibutors display distinct caution against employing this term in an overgeneralized way, without first carefully trying to establish its generic contours.[49]

As regards now the origins of comedy, the author, while ignoring the Aristotelian view, also fails to properly consider the evidence about phallic processions. He instead lays much emphasis on the well-known vases featuring 'komasts' (padded dancers), sometimes together with satyrs.[50] However, caution is again needed here, since, as Hedreen notes, despite the fact that there is evidence suggesting that the padded dancers were associated with Dionysos on Corinthian vases, it does not follow that they were *exclusively* associated with the god.[51] Shaw then proceeds to connect those vase-paintings with the Florence vase depicting a phallic procession, whereby a number of people carry a float featuring a large phallus mounted by a satyr.[52] Notably, on the other side of the vase we see a similar scene, yet now a komast is riding the phallus. Certainly, the analogy makes out of the satyr a super-human analogue of the komast — and this is certainly a valid point, yet the *φαλλοφορία* itself, in a scene which also includes an *ἐξάρχων* leading the group, implies a specifically *phallic* procession and should provide the impetus for further discussion of the question of possible connections between comedy and the *φαλλικά*.[53] In this respect, particularly useful is E. Csapo's study on the rela-

48. Kowalzig and Wilson (2013); the volume is cited by Shaw in the bibliography, but does not appear to enter into the discussion.
49. Ceccarelli notably deals with the question why the term *διθύραμβος* is so rarely attested on stone (2013, esp. 155-162). Instead, we find the term *κύκλιοι χοροί*, which refers, though, to a wider category than dithyramb, as well as the expression *παίδων/ἀνδρῶν χοροί*, denoting the dithyrambic contests at the Dionysia. D'Alessio reaches similar conclusions in his contribution to the volume (see bibliography).
50. S. 33-39.
51. Hedreen (1992) 134. *Contra* S. 34.
52. Florence, National Archaeological Museum, Inv. 3897; Shaw, pp. 38-39.
53. For a succinct discussion, see Iozzo (2009) with further bibliography. Indeed, the (sculpted) Satyr riding the phallus pole on the Florentine vase may essentially be re-

tion between the phallic processions of the Dionysiac *πομπή* and comedy.[54] Csapo, though not assuming a historical link, asserts that Aristotle's testimony must have proceeded from the fact that "a perceptive and intelligent eyewitness readily believed that comic and phallic choruses had something important in common".[55] He further points out, as regards the *πομπή* at the Dionysia, that while some of the choruses, for instance those depicted on the '*komos* ('animal rider') vases', or some satyr choruses, can be perceived as dithyrambic, "[o]ther choruses were, from the very beginning, phallic".[56] One may also invoke here A. Bierl's study, which includes a detailed analysis of the integration of the ritual substratum of phallic songs into Aristophanes' plays: he specifically offers a parallel investigation of the surviving traces of *φαλλικά* —most conspicuously fr. 851 *PMG*— and formal elements of Aristophanic comedy, characteristically the *parabasis*, as well as specific *loci*, particularly *Acharnians* 241-279.[57]

Next, Shaw refers to the well-known group of vases featuring men riding animals, vases belonging to the late archaic period (ca 570 BCE), more emphatically dealing with the famous Berlin vase, as well as the vases depicting dolphin-riders. The so-called 'Berlin Knights'[58] consists in an image of three men wearing helmets, who are riding men disguised as horses, whereas in front of them stands an aulos-player in formal dress. On the obverse, we see a satyr holding an aulos and facing satyrs and nymphs, as if ready to initiate a dance (though there is no evidence of costume). Shaw rightly agrees with Hedreen[59] that this mythical *χορός* can be considered as a model or prototype of the chorus of knights and horses. Further, he follows Csapo and Rusten[60] in positing dithyrambic performances as regards both this and other depictions of animal-riders, asserting, in reference specifically

garded as an expression of the self-evident Dionysiac aspect of phallic processions forming part of Dionysiac cultic activity.

54. Csapo (2013). The author appears not to have profited from this study, despite the fact that it is cited in the bibliography.
55. Csapo (2013) 41; cf. Pütz (2007) 123-128, concluding that Old Comedy's "development was influenced not only by festive komastic mocking, but also by practices of phallic processions" (128). [Shaw refers to this book (2003), yet to the first edition, not to the second, revised one.]
56. Csapo (2013) 65.
57. Bierl (2001) 300-361. *Ach.* 241-279 characteristically involves the invocation of *Φαλῆς* as *σύγκωμος*, a clear indication of pre-comic, presumably non-dithyrambic, *κῶμοι*, connected with phallic processions; see also comments by Bierl (2001) 353 n. 127.
58. Berlin, Antikensammlung, Staatliche Museen Inv. F 1697; Shaw, p. 41.
59. Hedreen (2007) 163.
60. Csapo (2003) 86-90; Rusten (2006) 52.

to the 'Berlin knights' scene, that although "presumably dithyrambic", "its ridiculous costume and action also qualify it as 'pre-comic' *kômos* song".[61] The final conclusion is that the vase (through both of its sides) "suggestively links dithyrambic, pre-comic, and satyric performance well before the official introduction of comedy and satyr drama in Athens".[62] However, the absence of masks and phallic costumes complicates any assertion about the importance of the vase for tracing proto-comedy.[63] With regard to the vases featuring dolphin-riders, Shaw asserts a connection with the circular dithyramb, which can be considered as having been introduced by Arion. In this regard, Shaw refers to Csapo's analysis,[64] pointing to the latter's "persuasive connection between Arion's myth and the circular dithyramb".[65] However, as regards the possible link with comedy, Shaw does not appear to have taken into account Csapo's caution: "Because of the presence of pipers, these choruses were, somewhat mechanically, labelled 'pre-comic', and the notion that they illustrate some form of 'stage performance' has stuck due to the influence of Webster and his school. There are some arguments in favour of connecting them more closely with dithyramb than comedy".[66]

Shaw's conclusions at pages 42-43, with reference to Aristotle's account —this time in a distinctly more affirmative tone—, still fail to offer a more clear understanding: "We have, then, a complex formula where satyric performance is connected to tragedy because both were dithyrambic, but it is also connected to comedy because both are phallic songs".[67] Again, the problem is that *φαλλικά* need to be treated as a separate category and not as quasi 'proto-satyric' performances, not least because they are not performed by satyrs.[68] On the contrary, no attention at all is allotted to the question

61. S. 40-42: 40.
62. S. 42. Cf. Hedreen (2007, 160-163: 163), who generally refers to a "dithyrambic or comic choros", yet "with no precise parallel in the ancient literature on the history of drama" (186). The same author has argued more recently that this vase-painting may suggest "an undifferentiated form of archaic choral performance, in which serious and comic elements had not yet been separated out into the genres of *tragedy*, comedy, dithyramb, and satyr-play as they were known in the fifth century BC." (italics mine)
63. It is worth mentioning that Rothwell (2007, 37-41: 41) interprets this performance as a spectacle rooted in the culture of the symposium, possibly belonging to the *komos* which follows it.
64. Csapo (2003).
65. S. 40.
66. Csapo (2003) 87.
67. S. 42.
68. Cf. also S. 43: "Aristotle suggests that all four theatrical genres of the classical age were progressively differentiated, the two serious forms from dithyramb, the two humorous

whether dithyramb performed by satyrs might have formed a predecessor of the *tragic* chorus.

In the pages that follow, Shaw deals with Pratinas, effectively taking for granted that the *Hyporchema* belongs to a satyr play; he further suggests that "Pratinas actively differentiates his humorous satyr drama from dithyrambic *kômos*-song, employing tropes typically associated with Old Comedy to criticize contemporary trends in music and dancing at the theatre of Dionysus".[69] Yet, the author does not appear to take into account the reservations expressed against attributing the fragment to satyr play. A key issue concerns the presence of abuse reminding us of Old Comedy, which may, indeed, be counted as a reason to *avoid* regarding the *Hyporchema* as a satyric fragment.[70] Further, Shaw asserts that "[t]he satyr chorus actively attempts to differentiate the *kômos* from the *khoros*, or the dithyramb from drama"[71] — referring to lines 4-9: *ὁ δ' αὐλὸς / ὕστερον χορευέτω· / καὶ γάρ ἐσθ' ὑπηρέτας. / κώμῳ μόνον … ἔμμεναι στρατηλάτας*. Yet the question is whether, given the frequent characterization of dithyramb as *κύκλιος χορός* or merely *χορός*, should *κῶμος* here be taken to denote the 'dithyramb' *as opposed* to *χορός*. One is left again with the impression that a more or less specific, narrow definition is imposed on the term *κῶμος*,[72] whilst, on the other hand, 'dithyramb' is granted rather too general a meaning.

Chapter 3 deals with the connection between Sicilian Comedy and Attic Satyr Play. Particular emphasis is placed on Epicharmus, whose fragments interestingly display a greater similarity to Middle rather than to Old Comedy. Shaw actually advances the view that satyr drama must have been the important missing link between Epicharmus and Middle Comedy. The whole chapter establishes what emerges as "a significant overlap between Epicharmus' Doric comedies and Attic satyr plays in their titles, plots, and characters, as well as in their style of humor".[73] In my opinion, this chapter, along with Chapter 5, are the strongest parts of the book, as well as the most original. As regards Chapter 3, may I only remark that the discussion of

forms from phallic songs". Yet, where does Aristotle suggest that satyr play evolved from *φαλλικά*?

69. S. 45.
70. See Krumeich et al. (1999) 84-85.
71. S. 55.
72. Taking into consideration the multifarious applications of the term in Greek literature, one is led to agree with Agócs (2012, 201) that "*komos* is a flexible concept. It unites a range of connotations in 'family resemblance'. No core sense underpins this range of meanings". Cf. Bierl (2001), 312; Pütz (2007) 121-123. Further, Adrados' perceptive analysis (1975, 37-49, esp. 37-39) still constitutes an important point of reference.
73. S. 76.

the influence of Epicharmus' *Cyclops* on later dramatic literature would also have profited from G. Mastromarco's study on the figure of Polyphemos in comedy.[74]

The next Chapter (4) focuses on the affinities between satyr drama and Old Comedy, concluding with a discussion of Euripides' *Alcestis*. Referring to the testimonies that explain the introduction of satyr play to the Dionysia as a move intending to reintegrate the Dionysiac element into the contest, the author asserts that satyr play, while certainly equal to that role, may not have been entirely fulfilling as humorous drama, providing thus the motivation for the inauguration of the comic *agon* at the Dionysia.[75] In pages 83 to 90, Shaw focuses on phallic humour and obscenity as key elements shared by satyr play and comedy, albeit in a more pronounced way in the latter. As a further common point he mentions the deeper engagement with poetic discourse encountered in both genres (in contrast with tragedy). In this context, the author underlines the occasional appearance of satyric choruses in comedy, most characteristically in Cratinus' *Dionysalexandros*.[76] What follows, in pages 94-100, is the discussion of Euripides' *Alcestis*, in which the author adopts C. W. Marshall's theory, according to which the performance of the satyr-less *Alcestis* should be regarded as a reaction to the enactment of the law of Morychides, forbidding *κωμῳδεῖν*. According to Shaw, Euripides "construes/constructs satyr drama as a 'comedic' *kômos*-song"; hence he "undermines the law, showing that a literal interpretation would result in the elimination of satyr drama from the festival".[77] Yet regardless of the plausibility of Marshall's theory, the question remains whether *Alcestis* shall indeed be regarded as a 'real' tragedy, as Shaw appears to imply.[78] One would expect here at least a brief discussion of the possible presence of satyric motifs in *Alcestis*,[79] as well as of non-tragic or strongly ironic elements in it.[80]

Next, the author deals with vase-paintings featuring satyrs named *Κῶμος*, arguing that "[s]ince any song sung by a satyr named Komos will inherently be a *kômos*-song, the artist may be exploring the connections between satyrs

74. Also, more precisely, the discussion of fr. 72 K-A (cited by Shaw at p. 63) could be combined with a reference to fr. 70 K-A, which pertains to the same theme (wine-drinking); see Mastromarco (1998) 36-37.
75. S. 81.
76. S. 90-94.
77. S. 99.
78. Thus, effectively subscribing to one of the possible readings of the play – recently affirmed by Parker (2007) ix-xxiv, esp. xxi and Seeck (2008) 35.
79. To Sutton (1980, 180-190), add Chourmouziades (1986) 22-26, 79-110.
80. Special mention is due to Roisman's essay (2005), drawing interesting parallels between *Alcestis* and *Cyclops*.

and *kômôidia*".[81] Once more, the author opts to invest *κῶμος* with a rather limited sense, in order to argue for a practically exclusive connection with *κωμῳδία*. However, what one is warranted to assert, with some confidence, as regards these vases, is that *Κῶμος* always appears in the context of a Dionysiac *θίασος* and indeed seems to personify the joyous Dionysiac celebration. The bell krater from Compiègne, featuring *Τραγῳδία* and the small satyr *Κῶμος*,[82] might well be alluding to satyr play, yet the fact that, on other vases for instance, satyrs named *Κῶμος* are frequently depicted playing the lyre, means that the existence of a dramatic context is far from always being self-evident. Finally, concerning those vase-paintings, one would expect A. Smith's attentive study to have been taken into account.[83]

Chapter 5, "Middle Comedy and the 'Satyric Style'" has already been mentioned as one of the most original and well-argued parts of the book. The general thesis is that key *topoi* of Middle Comedy, such as mythological burlesque, domestic and erotic themes, riddles and depoliticized humour, suggest a generic relationship with satyr play, whereby comedy has inherited a number of its stock themes. In Chapter 6, "Post-Classical Satyr Play and Old Comedy", the author argues that, whereas early fourth-century comedy adopted satyric themes, shortly thereafter it was post-classical satyr play that incorporated elements this time of Old Comedy, such as paratragedy, "parabasis-like metatheatrics", urban settings and even *ὀνομαστὶ κωμῳδεῖν*. A prime example is Python's *Agen*, of which Shaw offers a valuable analysis, involving the tracing of interesting parallels with Herodas' *Mimiamb* 1.[84] As regards the discussion of Chaeremon's *Centaur*,[85] may I express my reservations concerning the plausibility of its ascription to satyr drama, not least due to the moralistic character of fr. 14b Snell.[86] Moreover, to deny the validity of the Aristotelian designation of *Centaur* as *μικτὴ ῥαψῳδία* for the reason that the philosopher "for the most part avoided discussing satyr drama"[87] hardly appears as a valid argument. The chapter continues with the examination of further post-classical satyric fragments, especially of Lycophron and Sositheus, as well as with a discussion of Greek and Roman productions of the imperial age. Conclusions follow, succinctly recapitulating "the inter-

81. S. 100-105: 100.
82. Musée Vivenel 1025; Shaw, p. 102.
83. Smith (2007).
84. S. 128-129.
85. S. 130-133.
86. See further Stephanopoulos (forthcoming).
87. S. 130.

connected game of comic and satyr play", which has indeed been the central thesis of the whole book.[88]

As a general remark, I would assert that we are dealing with a useful and certainly valuable book, embodying a project which is unquestionably a desideratum: namely a diachronic and systematic study of the affinities between satyr drama and comedy, affinities that often tend to be downplayed in favour of an emphasis on the satyric genre's relationship with tragedy. This shift of focus is indeed salutary and deserves recognition. On the other hand, the multifarious points of contact between satyr play and comedy need not necessarily overshadow the distinct points of connection with tragedy, both those harking back to the origins, as well as those emerging in the course of those genres' mature development. Hence the reservations I have expressed, particularly on the first two chapters. In my view, the book would much profit from a more attentive study of the evidence, especially as regards the early history of the dramatic genres, as well as a more thorough engagement with the relevant bibliography. While it is understandable that the volume was intended to be concise, in certain cases lack of proper engagement with important scholarly contributions risks creating a distorted image or oversimplifying complicated issues. As regards the production of the book, a more thorough copy-editing would have certainly added to its overall quality.[89]

Finally, one may confidently assert that both volumes betray a significant renewal of interest in satyr play. We are, of course, dealing with two different books. Most significantly one is intended to offer a succinct outline of the trajectory of the genre, whereas the other opts for rather detailed, expansive analyses. More importantly, Shaw's book focuses on the connection between satyr play and comedy in its manifold historical transformations,

88. S. 150-153: 153.

89. "Leonhardt (1991)" in p. 23 (correctly), yet "Leonardt, J. 1991" in the bibliography; instead of "aphoriskos" read "amphoriskos" in pp. 34 and 36; p. 47: instead of "*De Saltibus*" (Lucian's work), read "*De Saltatione*"; "Mathiesen" (correctly) in p. 47, n. 49, yet "Mathieson" in the bibliography; read *ἴχρια* instead of *ἰχρία* in p. 65; "Dictyes" (p. 60), yet "Diktyes" (pp. 66, 67); instead of *κιθαραῳδικῶν*, read "*κιθαρῳδικῶν*" in p. 84; "KPS (1999)" most often, e.g. in p. 82, n. 9, but "KPS" in p. 130, n. 27 and "Krumeich (1999)" in p. 74, n. 53 (same volume); "Crusius (1902)" in p. 130 is absent from the bibliography; "Rossi, L.E. 1972", in p. 172, is not (partly) "reprinted" in "B. Seidensticker, 1989", but translated into German.
Also, the typesetting of prose citations in a manner resembling quotations of poetic works (with line divisions) should preferably have been avoided: compare, e.g., the Aristotelian passages (pp. 22, 24) with the Archilochean quotation (p. 30).

while Lämmle's analysis is effectively guided by a view which approaches satyr play primarily as part of the tragic tetralogy. Both volumes possess their distinct value and will certainly support, but also stimulate further research on satyr play. Through their elucidations, but also through their failure, at times, to sufficiently pursue a particular line of enquiry, they highlight multifarious desiderata for further in-depth study on this engaging philological topic.

REFERENCES

Adrados, F.R. (1975), *Festival, Comedy and Tragedy. The Greek Origins of Theatre*, Leiden.

Agócs, P. (2012), "Performance and Genre. Reading Pindar's *κῶμοι*", in id., C. Carey and R. Rawles (eds.), *Reading the Victory Ode*, Cambridge, 191-223.

Bierl, A. (2001), *Der Chor in der alten Komödie. Ritual und Performativität*, Munich - Leipzig.

Burkert, W. (1966), "Greek Tragedy and Sacrificial Ritual", *GRBS* 7, 87-121.

Canevaro, M. (2013), *The Documents in the Attic Orators. Laws and Decrees in the Public Speeches of the Demosthenic Corpus*, Oxford.

Ceccarelli, P. (2013), "Circular Choruses and the Dithyramb in the Classical and Hellenistic Period. A Problem of Definition", in Kowalzig and Wilson (2013) 153-170.

Chourmouziades, N.Ch. (1984), *Σατυρικά*, 2nd ed., Athens.

Chourmouziades, N.Ch. (1986), *Εὐριπίδης σατυρικός*, Athens.

Chourmouziades, N.Ch. (2008), *Εὐριπίδου Κύκλωψ*, Athens.

Csapo, E. (2003), "The Dolphins of Dionysus", in id. and Miller (2003) 69-98.

Csapo, E. (2013), "Comedy and the *Pompe*. Dionysian Genre-Crossing", in E. Bakola, L. Prauscello and M. Telò (eds.), *Greek Comedy and the Discourse of Genres*, Cambridge, 40-80.

Csapo, E. and M.C. Miller (eds.) (2003), *Poetry, Theory, Praxis. The Social Life of Myth, Word and Image in Ancient Greece. Essays in Honour of William J. Slater*, Oxford.

Csapo, E. and M.C. Miller (eds.) (2007), *The Origins of Theater in Ancient Greece and Beyond. From Ritual to Drama*, Cambridge.

D'Alessio, G. (2013) "'The Name of the Dithyramb'. Diachronic and Diatopic Variations", in Kowalzig and Wilson (2013) 113-132.

Di Marco, M. (1993), "Dioniso ed Orfeo nelle *Bassaridi* di Eschilo", in A. Masa-

racchia (ed.), *Orfeo e l'orfismo. Atti del seminario nazionale (Roma-Perugia 1985-1991)*, Roma, 101-153.
Garvie, A.F. (1969), *Aeschylus' Supplices. Play and Trilogy*, Cambridge.
Griffith, M. (2002), "Slaves of Dionysos. Satyrs, Audience, and the Ends of the *Oresteia*", *ClAnt* 21, 195-258.
Hedreen, G. (1992), *Silens in Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painting. Myth and Performance*, Ann Arbor.
Hedreen, G. (2007), "Myths and Rituals in Athenian Vase Paintings of Silens", in Csapo and Miller (2007) 150-195.
Hedreen, G. (2013), "The Semantics of Processional Dithyramb. Pindar's *Second Dithyramb* and Archaic Athenian Vase-Painting", in Kowalzig and Wilson (2013) 171-197.
Iozzo, M. (2009), "Phallic Rituals", in N.Chr. Stampolidis and Y. Tassoulas, *Eros. From Hesiod's* Theogony *to Late Antiquity*, Athens, 260-262.
Kowalzig, B. and P. Wilson (eds.) (2013), *Dithyramb in Context*, Oxford.
Kowalzig, B. and P. Wilson (2013a), "Introduction: The World of Dithyramb", in eid. (2013) 1-27.
Krumeich, R., N. Pechstein and B. Seidensticker (eds.) (1999), *Das griechische Satyrspiel*, Darmstadt.
Lavecchia, S. (2013), "Becoming Like Dionysos. Dithyramb and Dionysian Initiation", in Kowalzig and Wilson (2013) 59-75.
Leonhardt, J. (1991), *Phalloslied und Dithyrambos. Aristoteles über den Ursprung des griechischen Dramas*, Heidelberg.
Mastromarco, G. (1998), "La degradazione del mostro. La maschera del Ciclope nella commedia e nel dramma satiresco del quinto secolo a.C.", in A. M. Belardinelli, O. Imperio, G. Mastromarco, M. Pellegrino and P. Totaro (eds.), *Tessere. Frammenti della commedia greca: studi e commenti*, Bari, 9-42.
Neri, C. (2011), *Lirici Greci. Età arcaica e classica*, Rome.
O'Sullivan, P. and C. Collard (2013), *Euripides: Cyclops and Major Fragments of Satyric Drama*, Oxford.
Parker, L.P.E. (2007), *Euripides: Alcestis*, Oxford.
Patzer, H. (1995), Review of Leonhardt (1991), *Gnomon* 67, 289-310.
Pütz, B. (2007), *The Symposium and Komos in Aristophanes*, 2nd ed., Oxford.
Roisman, H.M. (2005), "The *Cyclops* and the *Alcestis*. Tragic and the Absurd", in G.W.M. Harrison (ed.), *Satyr Drama. Tragedy at Play*, Swansea, 67-82.
Rothwell, K.S. (2007) *Nature, Culture, and the Origins of Greek Comedy. A Study of Animal Choruses*, Cambridge.
Rusten, J. (2006), "Who 'Invented' Comedy? The Ancient Candidates for the Origins of Comedy and the Visual Evidence", *AJP* 126, 37-66.
Schmitt, A. (2008), *Aristoteles: Poetik*, Berlin.
Seaford, R.A.S. (1976), "On the Origins of Satyric Drama", *Maia* 28, 209-221.
Seaford, R.A.S. (1984), *Euripides: Cyclops*, Oxford.
Seeck, G.A. (2008), *Euripides: Alkestis*, Berlin - New York.

Seidensticker, B. (2003), "The Chorus of Greek Satyr Play", in Csapo and Miller (2003) 100-121.
Seidensticker, B. (2010), "Dance in Satyr Play", in O. Taplin and R. Wyles (eds.), *The Pronomos Vase in its Context*, Oxford, 213-229.
Seidensticker, B. (2012), "The Satyr Plays of Sophocles", in A. Markantonatos (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Sophocles*, Leiden - Boston, 211-241.
Shaw, C.A. (2010), "Middle Comedy and the 'Satyric' Style", *AJP* 131, 1-22.
Smith, A.C. (2007), "Komos Growing Up Among Satyrs and Children", in A. Cohen and J.B. Rutter (eds.), *Constructions of Childhood in Ancient Greece and Italy* (*Hesperia* Supplements, vol. 41), Princeton, 153-171.
Steinhart, M. (2007), "From Ritual to Narrative", in Csapo and Miller (2007) 196-220.
Stephanopoulos, Th.K. (forthcoming), in V. Liapis and Th.K. Stephanopoulos, "Greek Tragedy in the Fourth Century", in V. Liapis and A.K. Petrides (eds.), *Greek Tragedy after the Fifth Century*, Cambridge.
Winkler, J.J. (1990), "The Ephebes' Song: *Tragôdia* and *Polis*", in J.J. Winkler and F.I. Zeitlin (eds.), *Nothing to Do with Dionysos?*, Princeton, 20-62 (= *Representations* 11 [1985] 26-62).
Zimmermann. B. (2008), *Dithyrambos. Geschichte einer Gattung*, 2nd ed., Berlin.

University of Patras

AGIS MARINIS
a.p.marinis@gmail.com