homosexual love in tragedy and says that "In a lost play by Aeschylus, Achilles recalled embracing his dead boy-friend Patroclus, but elsewhere desire is heterosexual." In the note, W. tells us that this lost play was the *Myrmidons*. He should also have mentioned Euripides' *Chrysippus* which probably dealt with the rape of Chrysippus by Laius, and Sophocles' *Niobe* in which one of the sons of Niobe, when being shot by Apollo, called upon his lover for help. Sometimes there are references to the figures in the text (e.g., on pp. 89, 100 and 126) but usually the figures and plates are left unmentioned which, in my opinion, is a bit annoying. It is much more informative to read a book in which all the figures and plates are somehow mentioned or referred in the text. All the references made to the text are correct, except the reference on page 131 (made to p. 00 which, I assume, must be p. 51). On page 122, W. claims that "Greek tragedies are set in a single place, with only two clear exceptions". In the note, the *Eumenides* of Aeschylus and the *Ajax* of Sophocles are mentioned. W. could also have mentioned Aeschylus' *Aetnaeae* which possibly had four or five changes of scene (1st scene is Aetna, 2nd Xuthia, 3rd Aetna again, then Leontini, then Syracuse and Temenite, a suburb of Syracuse), and (Critias'/Euripides'?) *Peirithous* (which probably had scenes both in the upper world and in Hades), even though, I must admit, the information we have about the scenes of the *Aetnaeae* and the *Peirithous* is far from clear. (In addition to these plays, Sophocles' satyr play *The lovers of Achilles* might have contained at least one change of scene.)

GTP is an introduction, as is clear from its name, and as such, it is suggested reading for all students of Greek drama. Furthermore, I suggest that students should also read, together with *GTP*, a book which describes briefly the action of all the extant plays (for instance, A. H. Sommerstein, *Greek Drama and Dramatists*, London – New York 2002, or J. M. Walton, *Living Greek Theatre*, New York – Westport – London 1987). Naturally, it goes without saying that students of Greek drama should also read the plays themselves. David Wiles' first sentence in the Introduction is a question. He asks "Does the new century need a new introduction to Greek theatre?" After having read this book, my answer is a yes. W. has managed to pack a lot of useful information and many inspiring ideas into this book which is not too long. I can sincerely recommend *GTP* to all translators and directors who are working with a production of any ancient drama, as well as to every classicist who is interested in (re)performances of ancient dramas. After all, the ancient Greek dramas were originally written to be performed.

Vesa Vahtikari

The Cambridge companion to Roman satire. Edited by KIRK FREUDENBURG. Cambridge companions to literature. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2005. ISBN 0-521-00627-9. XVI, 352 pp. GBP 18.99.

In his important introduction to satire in 1994, Dustin Griffin suggested that the new studies of satire should have an intense historicist understanding of its sociopolitical contexts and functions. In a thematic issue of *Arethusa* devoted to satire in 1998, Susan Morton Braund and Barbara K. Gold claimed that the growing interest in Mikhail Bakhtin's work and gender theory has brought corporeal issues into focus. As still

unaddressed questions in respect to satire, they mentioned bodily terms: the fetishization of the body, the processes of bodily destruction and dismemberment, taboo breaking, the body politic, female bodies and animal imagery. A reader is thus tempted to ask how does the present volume, *The Cambridge companion to Roman satire*, approach and define the role of satire in the scholarly climate that has recently been strongly affected by gender issues and cultural studies.

The purpose of the series (Cambridge companions to literature) is to provide comprehensive and stimulating introductions to different literary genres and authors. Thus, this book does not aim to offer the last word in satire criticism although it does give some new insights. In viewing recent satiric theory, the editor, Kirk Freudenburg, claims in his introduction that the old formalistic approach, which was developed in the 1950s at Yale and which mainly dealt with the role of the satirist and the literary form, may have been dominating the field long enough. Freudenburg notes that scholarship has once again become more sensitive in reading satires in their historical, political and cultural contexts. Scholars are thus concerned more with the reception and effects of satire in the society than with its literary form. One can only hope that a close reading is still valued because it is important in recognizing the nuances of the text instead of just quickly consuming them in order to let the findings serve, for instance, larger cultural issues.

This volume includes 17 substantial articles written by an international team of well-established scholars. The internationality is delightful for still, far too rarely, do researchers coming from different linguistic areas meet in satire studies. The book is divided into three parts. The first part is the most traditional. It is chronologically arranged, presenting first the development of the genre in Rome with relation to its Greek precedents (Frances Muecke). The articles that follow examine the core practitioners of verse satire, namely Horace (Emily Gowers), Persius (Andrea Cucchiarelli) and Juvenal (Victoria Rimell). The discussion then moves on to the main representatives of Menippean satire in Rome. There is a study of Seneca's learned allusions (Ellen O'Gorman), a brief but clear account of two late Menippean authors, Julian and Boethius (Joel Relihan) and a chapter on the difficulty of defining the genre of Petronius's *Satyricon* (Victoria Rimell). Except for a few scattered remarks, references to Apuleius are missing.

The articles outline the basic stylistic features and themes found in the texts. In the first part, the intended reader is someone who has previous knowledge of Roman satire and its authors but who is not deeply familiar with the scholarly work in the field. Persius, for example, is discussed in a conventional manner as a Stoic and with reference to his condensed and obscure style, whereas Juvenal is introduced as the satirist of superlatives and hyperbole. The articles are well written, but for a researcher already familiar with these issues, such characterizations do not offer much new, although "introduction" could also mean bringing something new into a discussion. For an advanced reader, among the most rewarding passages in the first part may therefore be its few thematic studies. In her article on epic allusion in Roman satire, Catherine Connors provides a detailed and entertaining analysis of the role of allusions which are not mere literary decorations but include and serve different (political) ends. Roland Mayer's article, which examines the relationship between satire and philosophy, is also

thematically interesting. The interconnection between satire and philosophy is not an unexplored issue, but important in that it extends the discussion over the generic boundaries.

The second part of the book is devoted to satire as social discourse. Satire has sometimes been considered as a special mixture of play, aggression, judgment and laughter (by George A. Test). Two of these elements are studied here. Thomas Habinek deals with play element in satire and goes deeper into the other ludic practices of Roman society. Fritz Graf examines satire's ritualistic roots by relying on an anthropological perspective and drawing attention to old Roman curses, public shaming and other forms of aggressive discourse and social customs. The fashionable bodily issue is addressed by Alessandro Barchiesi and Andrea Cucchiarelli, who explore how Lucilius and Horace used their ailing bodies as a motif in their satires, and how the idea of the satirist as a physician was created by Lucilius and then adopted by later writers. Erik Gunderson continues on the bodily terms and, in an enthusiastic way, discusses vile, perverted bodies as a prerequisite for the satirist's nostalgia for the lost integrity of the good man and for special satirical pleasures.

The third part considers the genre's influence on English literature. Colin Burrow first reminds us of satire's Roman-ness, its vital connection to Roman society, and then examines Roman satire's resurgence in Elizabethan England. Dan Hooley traces the reception of Roman satire in authors such as John Wilmot (the Earl of Rochester) and John Dryden. Charles Martindale continues in the same vein, drawing attention to Alexander Pope and his contemporaries. Finally, Duncan Kennedy asks whether Roman satire still has heirs in modern times. He notes that, although verse satire is still written, references to Roman satirists are rare, and the twentieth-century engagement with this genre is largely in the form of translations. Kennedy also presents a short account of Bakhtin's carnival theory but without problematizing it. The book concludes with a chapter by John Henderson, presenting a view of the two key words of the book, Roman and satire.

The Cambridge companion to Roman satire is a reliable guide and comprehensive introduction to the subject. One minor weakness in the volume lies in its sparse use of quotations from the primary sources which would have made the discussions more lively and illustrative. In depth analyses of individual texts are also lacking, probably due to the restricted number of pages reserved for every article. In general, I believe that readers find thematic discussions more rewarding than those focusing on individual authors. In relation to this, I would have been interested in reading more about the Roman satirists' ambivalent attitudes to Greek culture, a topos which pops up here and there in the book. This is also related to the issue of the supposed Roman-ness of the genre. Since Quintilian, verse satire has been regarded as an entirely Roman genre but, at the same time, the Roman satirists owed much to their Greek predecessors. The satirists' relationship to Greek learning is briefly touched upon by Freudenburg in his introduction and by Muecke as regards the Greek models of the genre. Freudenburg notes that the Roman satirists were hostile to both literary and cultural Greek influences but this criticism was not the point of their writing but had a different purpose. It helped the satirists to articulate their poetic processes, to establish satire as an essentially Roman genre and to define themselves as true Roman voices in contrast to the Greeks. By

criticizing the Greeks (and epic poets), the Roman satirist thus created a "free-speaking, rugged, and utterly Roman self" (p. 5). John Henderson returns to the issue of the Roman-ness in his retrospective on the volume, but it would have been very useful had satire's supposed *Romanitas* and the satirists' relationship with Greek culture been thoroughly discussed in a separate article.

The up-to-date bibliography at the end includes the most important recent studies on Roman satire. The suggestions for further reading attached to every article are extremely useful for readers. A Nordic reader might note the absence of Lennart Pagrot's Swedish book *Verssatirens teori* (1961), which is still one of the best historical surveys in the field. All in all, this volume is primarily of interest to graduate or postgraduate students beginning their studies on Roman satire, but it also appeals to scholars interested in updating their views of recent developments in research on Roman satire.

Sari Kivistö

The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought. Edited by CHRISTOPHER ROWE and MALCOLM SCHOFIELD. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2000. ISBN 0-521-48136-8. XX, 745 pp. GBP 75.

The volume under review here, authored by an international team of distinguished scholars under the able editorship of Christopher Rowe and Malcolm Schofield (who also both contribute substantially to the book), is nothing less than the very first general and comprehensive treatment of its subject in the English language. Its expressed purpose is to provide a fresh, critical account of Greek and Roman political thought, broadly conceived. Observing that it is quite possible to think and reflect politically without doing so in a systematic or philosophical manner – and that such thinking may be expressed in literature of any sort – Rowe, in his introduction (pp. 1 f.), stresses that the subject matter of the the volume is *political thought*, rather than *political theory*. This means that the book, adopting a largely author-based approach, is not concerned exclusively with the authors of the great political works of antiquity. Writers such as Plato, Aristotle and Cicero receive their due share of attention, but the volume begins with none else than Homer and ends with fourth-century Christian and pagan writers reflecting on divine and human order. In between, a host of writers more or less commonly associated with political thinking are dealt with, ranging from Hesiod, Tyrtaeus and the early natural philosopers to the historians, philosophers and jurists of the Roman Empire. The overview cuts short in the middle of the fourth century AD; only a short epilogue takes the story a little further, down to Augustine. The rationale for the choice of this terminal point, which of course is an altogether arbitrary one, is that another volume published by the Cambridge University Press, *The Cambridge History of Mediaeval Political Thought, c. 350 – c. 1450* (edited by James H. Burns, 1991), begins its story at this very point.

The broad and inclusive conception of *political thought* is reflected not only in the range of authors discussed, but also in the heterogeneous authorship of the volume itself. The scholars assembled by the editors include historians of law, politics, culture