

in method and analysis. Attempts to see Euripides as influenced by specific artworks are too speculative to be compelling. Often Euripides uses imprecise language, or dead metaphors, just as we do when speaking of the ‘mouth of a river’ or ‘eye of a needle’. Not every instance of an ‘artisanal’ term used by others will have the same significance when Euripides uses it. Again, the poet can be subject to many influences, notably Aeschylus, whose brilliant handling of imagery from the plastic arts likely shaped Euripides’ work much more than Stieber allows. It is true that Euripides’ focus on visual arts and manual crafts is a conspicuous feature of his poetry, but this won’t always be evident in the passages selected and analysed in this long and at times over-written book.

PATRICK O’SULLIVAN

University of Canterbury, New Zealand
patrick.osullivan@canterbury.ac.nz

ZUMBRUNNEN (J.) Aristophanic Comedy and the Challenge of Democratic Citizenship.

Rochester NY: University of Rochester Press, 2012. Pp. 165. £40. 9781580464178.

doi:10.1017/S0075426914001566

The political context of Aristophanic comedy has inspired important scholarship: for reasons of space it may suffice to mention D.M. MacDowell, *Aristophanes and Athens* (Oxford 1995), M. Heath, *Political Comedy in Aristophanes* (Göttingen 1987), G.W. Dobrov (ed.), *The City as Comedy* (North Carolina 1997), J.F. McGlew, *Citizens on Stage: Comedy and Political Culture in the Athenian Democracy* (Ann Arbor 2002). The present study innovates by applying the insights of political theory to offer an interdisciplinary interpretation of Aristophanic comedy.

In the introduction (1–20) Zumbrunnen sets the critical framework of his study which aims at investigating whether ancient Athenian democracy as reflected in Aristophanic comedy could be a meaningful resource for democratic theory. To this end Zumbrunnen revisits briefly the liberal (J. Rawls), deliberative (A. Gutmann and D. Thompson) and agonal (C. Mouffe) theories of democracy, pointing out the connections among them. At the same time, the author is reasonably cautious of turning to Athenian democracy, and to the work of a comic poet in particular, in order to draw conclusions about contemporary democracy. Accordingly, he aptly takes into consideration the

institutional differences between ancient and contemporary forms of democracy, the absence of anything comparable to contemporary pluralism in Classical Athens, as well as the Aristotelian notion of disposition (ἔξις) applied to democratic citizenship (4–12). Zumbrunnen then explores S. Wolin’s conception of ‘fugitive democracy’ focusing on the rebellious nature of Athenian democracy and J. Ober’s approach of democratic institutions as designed to foster citizens’ collective action. The author’s main argument permeating his survey is that the polarity of these two impulses may define democratic citizenship as a tension-filled practice posing a challenge to the ‘ordinary’ citizen (as opposed to the elite), which shapes the citizen’s disposition towards democratic participation.

In his interpretation of the *Lysistrata* and *Peace* in the first chapter (21–40) Zumbrunnen adopts Jacques Rancière’s understanding of art as an ‘emancipatory voyage’ (*The Ignorant Schoolmaster: Five Lessons in Intellectual Emancipation*, Palo Alto 1991), by introducing the stimulating idea of ‘comic voyaging’, in which the spectators are invited to engage and explore matters of their own civic identity. The conflicting impulses of democracy are represented in both plays through rebellious characters, on the one hand, and the necessity for collective action, on the other.

The second chapter (41–59) similarly tackles issues of identity by delving into the relation of ordinary citizens to cultural elites, as treated in the *Clouds*, *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Frogs*. I suggest that it may have been worth exploring the implications of the portrayal of women at the Thesmophoria as a metaphorical political entity comparable to the Athenian assembly (see *Thesmophoriazusae* 84, 335, 353, 1145) and, in turn, to the ordinary citizen. This female *dēmos* asserts its democratic identity by disparaging those Athenians wishing to make alliances with Persia in 411 BC and overthrow the democratic constitution (*Thesmophoriazusae* 335–39, 356–67).

In the third chapter (60–80) Zumbrunnen associates the anger of the ordinary citizen in the *Wasps* and *Birds* with the tension arising from the two democratic impulses. In his exploration of the relationship between rule and democracy, Zumbrunnen plausibly shares P. Markell’s understanding of *archē* as openness to the possibility of new beginnings reflected in the *Birds* (P. Markell, ‘The rule of the people: Arendt, archē

and democracy', *American Political Science Review* 100.1 (2006) 1–14). Likewise, the dynamics of democratic politics are explored in the next chapter (81–98) dealing with the rebellious impulse of democracy and the ordinary citizen's battle against the elite by verbal dexterity and political manoeuvre in the *Acharnians* and *Knights*.

The comic disposition with which the ordinary citizen perceives social and economic justice is cogently presented in the fifth chapter (99–122). Zumbrennen favours N. Fraser's status-centred recognition aiming at overcoming subordination in the *Ecclesiazusae* (*Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the Post-Socialist Condition*, London 1997). The comic recognition in the *Wealth* asserts the shared status of ordinary citizens leading to transformative changes through redistribution.

Zumbrennen concludes (123–35) by arguing that despite the institutional differences between ancient and contemporary democracy the two democratic impulses in Aristophanes may also apply (only basically, of course) in contemporary democratic politics. Ultimately, the spectator-citizen is invited to reflect upon the challenge of democratic citizenship, which shapes the comic disposition of Aristophanic heroes and resonates in both theatre and political life.

The edition is finely produced, except for certain misspellings of Greek names and words (28 read 'geōrgikon'; 28, 46, 48–49, 84, 87–91, 95, 97–98, 131 read 'Dicaeopolis'). This is a well-conceived and well-constructed interdisciplinary contribution to the field of 'Aristophanic politics'.

IOANNA KARAMANOU

University of the Peloponnese
karam@uop.gr

MARSHALL (C.W.) and KOVACS (G.) *Eds No Laughing Matter: Studies in Athenian Comedy*. London: Bristol Classical Press, 2012. Pp. xiii + 208. €29. 9781780930152.

doi:10.1017/S0075426914001578

This carefully-edited volume (Marshall and Kovacs' second joint venture after *Classics and Comics*, Oxford 2011) consists of 14 engaging and often provocative contributions in honour of Ian Storey's retirement.

As normally in *Festschriften*, the chapters – chronologically arranged by author and play – gravitate toward Storey's own scholarly output.

The title and overall theme derive from a *leitmotiv* of Storey's lectures: that 'comedy is no laughing matter', but a serious reflection of society. Two chapters (J. Henderson, D. Konstan), treating Old Comedy fragments, celebrate Storey's relevant Loeb edition (2011). In the same vein, two more contributions (E. Scharffenberger, R.M. Rosen) illuminate shards of Middle Comedy. E. Csapo's piece on comic invective acknowledges Storey's important work on the subject, whereas two further articles (K. Sidwell, H.R. Marshall), although focusing more on Aristophanes than on Eupolis (surprisingly, there is no autonomous Eupolis chapter in the volume), pay homage to Storey's *opus vitae* (*Eupolis: Poet of Old Comedy*, Oxford 2003). All these, plus six more chapters on Aristophanes – on *Lysistrata* (S.D. Olson), *Frogs* (D. Sells, A. Allan, A. Sommerstein), *Ecclesiazusae* (J. Fletcher) and *Wealth* (R. Tordoff) – display a kind of sober out-of-the-box thinking that the honoree must appreciate. Menander is practically absent from the volume, presumably because he had never been one of Storey's favourite research topics (C.W. Marshall's concluding chapter on the Daphne mosaic is more about the *Nachleben* of Cratinus than about Menander himself).

Henderson's and Konstan's contributions, in their judicious distillation of fragmentary data, are exemplars of the genre. Henderson argues cogently that, like *Dionysalexandros*, Cratinus' *Nemesis* is a mythological play alluding to Pericles as a seducer and adulterer. Konstan, on his part, suggests that, contrary to common opinion, rather than simply evoking a bygone Golden Age, Crates' *Thēria* is a utopia that envisages a future world without slavery.

Csapo's chapter, which is best read in tandem with his article on Dionysiac *pompē* in E. Bakola, L. Prauscello and M. Telò (eds), *Greek Comedy and the Discourse on Genres* (Cambridge 2013), shows conclusively that the ritual practices evoked by the terms τὰ ἐξ ἀμάξης and πομπεία should be associated with no other festival than the Great Dionysia.

Sidwell's chapter engages with Storey the most directly. Storey (correctly, I think) criticized as excessively complex Sidwell's argument that Aristophanes' poetic rivalries (for instance, with Eupolis) mask real political differences and that his characters are disguised caricatures of one (or more) opponents every time (now fully developed in *Aristophanes the Democrat*, Cambridge 2009).