FOOD, EXPULSION, AND THE POLIS IN ARISTOPHANES' *BIRDS*

BRIAN V. CREDO, JR.
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
bcredo@sas.upenn.edu

Because humor relies on incongruity, comedy is always looking for situations in which both halves of some opposition coincide. One of the most important oppositions in archaic and classical Greece was between those within the *polis* and those on the outside. If the *polis* felt that one of its insiders should be outside, temporarily or permanently, it had several methods to accomplish this, including generic exile, exile by ἀτιμία, ostracism, φαρμακός ritual, and improper burial. Because these methods of expulsion maintain such an important opposition, one would expect Greek Old Comedy to capitalize upon them more often than its scattered references suggest[1]. Curiously enough, several of these methods display close connections to the familiar comic *topos* of food, which would make such a process all the easier[2]. The present analysis aims to uncover this dynamic at work. First, I will review the evidence for several methods of expulsion and their relation to food. Then, I will argue that expulsion and food are driving forces behind much of the humor throughout Aristophanes' *Birds*, which continually overturns differences between inside and outside, the *polis* and the expelled.

1. Exile, Expulsion, Food

Ancient Greek exile takes many forms, some more elaborate than others. The most common and general words for it—φυγή, φεύγω, and φυγάς—are ambiguous. They can refer to vol-

---

[1] Among Aristophanes' surviving plays, cf. Ar. *Ach.* 517-519; *Eq.* 854-857, 1402-1406; *Pax* 741-742; *Av.* 766-767; *Ran.* 727-733.

[2] Cf. WILKINS 2000a; 2000b; MASTELLARI 2016.

untary flight or forced banishment. Other terms lean toward one pole or the other. Compounds of χωρέω, διδράσκω, ἔρχομαι, and βαίνω imply flight, whereas διώκω, ἐξελαύνω, ἐκβάλλω, ἐκπίπτω, and φυγαδεύω imply banishment[3]. However, the contrast is less stark when one considers that flight is, by definition, a response to some external stimulus. For instance, Homer's Phoenix tells us that his exile was due to his father's anger (*Il.* 9, 447-448): …ὅτε πρῶτον λίπον Ἑλλάδα καλλιγύναικα / **φεύγων** νείκεα πατρὸς Ἀμύντορος Ὀρμενίδαο ("…when I first left Hellas, land of beautiful women, fleeing the feud with my father Amyntor, son of Ormenus"). As the narrative continues, however, we learn that Phoenix was under no compulsion to leave. In fact, his relatives prevented him from doing so until he broke down his bedroom door and hopped a fence[4]. Any tidy categorization of the exile as voluntary or involuntary will not suffice[5]. The same goes for several historical figures who went into exile without being sentenced to it. Unlike Phoenix, however, these exiles were usually avoiding some perceived threat[6].

This ambiguity between flight and banishment is not only a feature of informal exile. It is also a hallmark of the Athenian institution of ἀτιμία. Demosthenes explains that ἀτιμία in his time meant a loss of certain civic rights, whereas previously, an ἄτιμος could be killed with impunity, an arrangement which resulted in a *de facto* exile[7]. Following this notice, the current scholarly consensus is that the meaning of ἀτιμία changed substantially over time, either becoming milder, as Demosthenes suggests, or evolving in its moral, social, and legal connotations[8]. This change was well underway by the fifth century, when our sources usually differentiate ἀτιμία from exile and death[9]. Nevertheless, the threat of being killed with

---

[3] Cf. FORSDYKE 2005, 9-11.

[4] Cf. Hom. *Il.* 9, 464-478.

[5] BOWIE 2007, 25-27 likewise uses this episode to question the distinction between voluntary and involuntary exile, comparing it to the stories of Patroclus in *Il.* 23 and Odysseus' false identity as a Cretan in *Od.* 13.

[6] Cf. FORSDYKE 2005, 179. Thuc. 1, 135-138 describes the flight of Themistocles, who was already ostracized at the time, from Athenians and Spartans who were trying to kill him. Thuc. 3, 98, 5 states that the fifth-century general Demosthenes did not return to Athens out of fear after his defeat in Aetolia. Thuc. 5, 26, 5 records a similar fate for Thucydides himself after his own failure at Amphipolis. Xen. *HG* 1, 7, 1-7 likewise tells how two generals did not return after the Athenian defeat at Arginusae and thus avoided imprisonment. Lycurg. *Leoc.* 117-118 relates the efforts of a certain Hipparchus, son of Charmus, to escape a trial for treason. BERTI 2004, 167-172 summarizes the debates around the identification of this Hipparchus and suggests that his exile would have occurred in the last two decades of the fifth century.

[7] Cf. Demosth. 9, 41-44. Aeschin. 3, 258 and Din. 2, 24 discuss the same case and are more explicit than Demosthenes about banishment. Cf. *IG* V, 2, 357; Plut. *Them.* 6, 3; Aristid. *Or.* 46, 217-218.

[8] SWOBODA 1893, 58-59 was the first to conclude that Ps.-Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 16, 10 wrongly describes archaic laws against tyranny as 'mild' because the only punishment was ἀτιμία. This is merely a misunderstanding on the part of the author, who is thinking of a later form. MAFFI 1981 uses the Homeric epics to explore the difference between legal and moral ideas of ἀτιμία. Recent contributions include VAN 'T WOUT 2011a; 2011b; NOVOTNÝ 2014; LENFANT 2014; DOMINGO 2015; and DMITRIEV 2015. DMITRIEV 2015, 35-36 provides an extensive summary of previous scholarship.

[9] Cf. DMITRIEV 2015, 36, n. 3. *IG* I[3], 40, 4-10, 70-74, dated to 446-445, mentions ἀτιμία alongside exile and death. Ps.-Xen. *Ath. Pol.* 3, 12-13 hypothesizes a class of ἄτιμοι still capable of influencing political affairs at Athens. Lys. 31, 29 clearly refers to present-day ἀτιμία as a light punishment.

impunity unless one fled persisted under other formulations, such as νηποινεὶ τεθνάτω ("Let him die with impunity")[10].

Ostracism was another Athenian expulsive institution with long-lasting effects[11]. Our sources conceive of both ἀτιμία and ostracism as safeguards against tyranny[12]. There is even one ostrakon with a proper name followed by the word ἄτιμος. However, it is likely not using the word to denote exile. Rather, the writer is mocking the candidate, who is pathetically trying to play the victim by claiming to be unjustly deprived of some right[13]. Nevertheless, some other ostraka will be useful for our discussion. Seven from the Kerameikos and one from the Agora name Λιμός ("Hunger") as the person to be expelled[14]. James Sickinger suggests that these votes were lighthearted jibes against the whole process of ostracism[15]. Jokes or not, though, these ostraka evince a conceptual connection between ostracism and food. They show that Hunger fit the bill, however ironically, of an entity to be expelled from the community.

They also connect ostracism to another expulsive practice: φαρμακός ritual, which has its own associations with food. The φαρμακός was a human scapegoat expelled for the benefit of the *polis*, either during a festival or at a time of hardship such as a famine or a plague[16].

---

[10] Cf. *IG* I², 10, 32-34; And. 1, 95-96; Plat. *Leg.* 874c; Demosth. 23, 60.

[11] Philoch. *FGrH* 328 F 30; Diod.Sic. 11, 55, 2; and Plut. *Arist.* 7, 5; *Nic.* 11, 1 variously record the penalty as five and/or ten years.

[12] For ἀτιμία, tyranny, and subversion, cf. Ps.-Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 16, 10; *IG* II³, 320, 7-21. For tyranny and ostracism, cf. Ps.-Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 22, 3-6; Philoch. *FGrH* 328 F 30; Diod.Sic. 11, 87, 1; Plut. *Arist.* 7, 1-2; vd. also Androt. *FGrH* 324 F 6. Cf. Plut. *Nic.* 11 and *Alc.* 13 (both sources for Pl.Com. fr. 203 K.-A., also relevant) for the ostracism of Hyperbolus, which defeated the institution's (alleged) original purpose.

[13] Cf. van 't Wout 2011a, 127-130.

[14] Cf. Brenne 2001, 214-216; 2018, II, 134; Faraone 2004, 222; Sickinger, forthcoming. The ostrakon from the Agora dates to the 480s, and the Kerameikos ostraka date to 471.

[15] Cf. Sickinger, forthcoming.

[16] Cf. Harrison 1922, 95-106; Gebhard 1926; Nilsson 1967, 107-110; Versnel 1977, 37-43; Bremmer 1983; Vernant/Vidal-Naquet 1986, 198-200; Burkert 1972, 58, n. 46; 1977, 139-142; 1979, 64-72; Hughes 1991, 139-165; Bonnechere 1994, 118-124, 252-255, 292-307; McLean 1996, 88-98; Faraone 2004; Compton 2006, 3-18; Sacco 2018. For the φαρμακός ritual as a practice of the *polis* specifically, cf. Hippon. fr. 5 West 1971-1972 (hereafter W); Ar. *Ran.* 732-733; *Scholl. ad* Ar. *Eq.* 1136; Ps.-Lys. 6, 53; Call. *Aet.* fr. 90 Pfeiffer 1949 (hereafter P) c. *Dieg.* 2; Ister *FGrH* 334 F 50; Harp. *s.v.* φαρμακός; Hellad. ap. Phot. *Bibl.* 534a; Hsch. *s.v.* φαρμακός; *Suda s.v.* φαρμακός, Φαρμακός, φαρμακούς; Tz. *H.* 5, 729-732. Cf. Petron. fr. 1 Mueller 1995 (hereafter M), who describes a very similar ritual at the Greek colony of Massilia, in which the victim is led *per totam civitatem*. The principal festival event for φαρμακοί at Athens is the Thargelia. Cf. Deubner 1932, 179-198; Parker 2005, 203-204, 481-483. Harp. *s.v.* φαρμακός and *Suda s.v.* Φαρμακός mention both the φαρμακός and the Thargelia by name. Cf. Strab. 10, 2, 9; *Suda s.v.* περίψημα, who describe similar rituals that took place κατ᾽ ἐνιαυτόν ("once a year"). *Scholl. ad* Ar. *Eq.* 1136c and Tz. *H.* 5, 729-732 describe the φαρμακός as a remedy for a λιμός ("famine") or a λοιμός ("plague"), while Hellad. ap. Phot. *Bibl.* 534a mentions only plague, describing the ritual as τὸ δὲ καθάρσιον τοῦτο λοιμικῶν νόσων ("this cleansing of plague-like illnesses"). Petron. fr. 1 M likewise mentions *pestilentia*. For the close association between λιμός and λοιμός, cf. Hes. *Op.* 242-243; Hdt. 7, 171, 2; Aeschin. 3, 135. Cf. Bremmer 1983, 301, n. 17, with bibliography. Vd. also Vernant/DuBois 1978; Pucci 1990; Foley 1993, who see Oedipus as a φαρμακός whose expulsion after the end of Soph. *OT* cures the Theban λοιμός.

The victim was feasted and/or fasted before expulsion, perhaps as a personification of the famine that greedily steals food from the community[17]. The closest connection to ostracism comes from Plutarch. Though he does not use the word φαρμακός, he describes a similar ritual in which a slave was cast in the role of Hunger and driven out of the house with a chant (*Mor.* 693f): ἔξω Βούλιμον, ἔσω δὲ πλοῦτον καὶ ὑγίειαν ("Out with Hunger, in with wealth and health!")[18]. This practice matches nicely with the Λιμός ostraka discussed above[19]. Another similar piece of evidence comes in the form of a Greek inscription of Roman date from Termessos in Asia Minor, which praises a certain Honoratus (*TAM* 3, 103): δίωξε γὰρ εἰς ἅλα λιμόν, σείτου μέτρον ἄπειρον ἀνευρὼν τοῖς κατὰ ἄστυ ("For he chased hunger into the sea, discovering a limitless supply of grain for the whole town")[20].

The final method of expulsion relevant for my reading of *Birds* is improper burial[21]. Sometimes, this entailed throwing victims, dead or alive, into the sea, a practice also attested for scapegoat rituals[22]. Other times, individuals were denied burial within Attica or even exhumed and relocated[23]. Like ἀτιμία and other types of exile, improper burial could often punish betrayal[24]. Horrifyingly enough, this form of expulsion also has a tenuous connection with food. Unburied corpses were imagined as food for dogs and birds[25].

2. Aristophanes' *Birds*

2.1 Ἐς κόρακας

Improper burial is, in fact, the first stop on our gastronomic tour of Cloudcuckooland. At the beginning of the play, Euelpides laments the irony of his situation: now that he and Peisetae-

---

[17] Hippon. frr. 8-10 W describe a φαρμακός who is made to eat certain foods before he meets the opposite fate: λιμῷ γένηται ξηρός ("Let him be dried out with hunger.") For public feasting, cf. *Scholl. ad* Ar. *Eq.* 1136; Call. *Aet.* fr. 90 P c. *Dieg.* 2; Petron. fr. 1 M; *Suda s.v.* φαρμακούς; Tz. *H.* 5, 734.

[18] This description is often included in scholarship on φαρμακός ritual, *e.g.* BREMMER 1983, 301-302; FARAONE 2004, 215; COMPTON 2006, 4-5.

[19] SACCO 2018, 109 differentiates ostracism from scapegoat ritual because of «il fatto…che l'ostracismo non fosse un'espulsione simbolica e che, nelle fonti, la purificazione della *polis* da eventuali "macchie" non appare fondata su alcuna testimonianza.» This does not preclude certain other similarities in how these expulsive institutions were conceptualized.

[20] Cf. BREMMER 1983, 302, n. 18; FARAONE 2004, 222.

[21] Cf. PARKER 1983, 45, n. 47 for texts about improper burial.

[22] Cf. Theopompus *FrGH* 115 F 96, F 227; Diod.Sic. 16, 35, 6. For scapegoats cast into the sea, vd. nn. 63-66 below.

[23] For denial of burial in Attica, cf. Thuc. 1, 138, 6; Xen. *HG* 1, 7, 22; Plat. *Leg.* 855a, 909c; Hyper. 1, 19-20; 4, 18-19; Plut. *Mor.* 834a; *Phoc.* 37, 2. For exhumation and expulsion of corpses, cf. Thuc. 1, 126, 12; Lycurg. *Leoc.* 113; Plut. *Dio* 53, 1; Nic. Dam. FGrH 90 F 60.

[24] For betrayal and improper burial, cf. Thuc. 1, 138, 6; Xen. *HG* 1, 7, 22; Lycurg. *Leoc.* 112-115; Plut. *Mor.* 833a-834b; *X Orat.* 834a-b. For betrayal and exile, cf. Lys. 31, 29; Din. 1, 44; Plut. *X Orat.* 834a-b.

[25] Birds frequently team up with dogs to devour corpses in Homer, *e.g. Il.* 1, 4-5; 2, 391-393; 8, 379-380. Cf. MCCRACKEN 2014 for Plato's use of these Homeric examples. The true *locus classicus*, however, is Soph. *Ant.* 696-698.

rus *want* to go ἐς κόρακας ("to the crows"), they can't find the way[26]. Our sources tell us that crows eat unburied corpses, so telling people to go ἐς κόρακας meant telling them to get lost[27]. As Euelpides will soon find out, the prospect of becoming bird food is very real; Tereus' slave bird will have a threatening beak, and the birds will explicitly threaten to eat him and Peisetaerus[28]. For now, though, the joke turns on the ambiguity of the phrase, which can serve as both a common insult and a literal reference to the land of the birds. Although the insult is often used in passing, there is good reason to believe that Euelpides' joke depends on its expulsive connotations. The lines surrounding Euelpides' joke are deeply concerned with who belongs in the *polis* and who doesn't. A few lines earlier, we have the first of the play's three jibes against the foreign Execestides[29]. Immediately afterward, Euelpides contrasts him and Peisetaerus' voluntary self-expulsion from Athens with the foreign Sacas' attempts to get in[30]. Aristophanes also repeatedly shows awareness of the phrase's expulsive connotations elsewhere, when his characters use it to drive out rapacious characters. Such passages often either take place in houses or pointedly use language suggestive of houses, *e.g.* θύραζε ("out of doors"). This matches nicely with Plutarch's ritual, which drives Hunger out of the house. There are also other instances of the phrase accompanied by the expulsive verb ἀποφθείρω[31]. From its very first articulation, then, our heroes' expedition is expressed in expulsive terms.

2.2 Aristophanes' *Tereus*

This theme continues into the scene with Tereus, the hoopoe. Aristophanes' Tereus is not just a traditional mythic character; he is a self-identified creation of Sophoclean drama[32]. It is this

---

[26] Cf. Ar. *Av.* 27-29. I will hereafter cite *Birds* with line numbers only, unless clarification is required. An *aition* for the phrase ἐς κόρακας is preserved in Aristot. fr. 496 ROSE 1886, which tells a story of how the Boeotians caught and ritually cleansed a group of crows. The verb here is περικαθαίρω, which occurs in two of our texts about scapegoat rituals to describe the cleansing of the community via the scapegoat (Call. fr. 90 P c. *Dieg.* 2 and Hesych. *s.v.* φαρμακοί). After the cleansing, the Boeotians escaped the λοιμός by sending it into the crows with the phrase φεῦγ' ἐς κόρακας ("Flee to the crows!"). Tempting as this *aition* is for my expulsive reading of the phrase, other earlier and more widespread evidence explains the phrase without it.

[27] Cf. DUNBAR 1995, *ad loc.* For crows eating corpses, cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 1472-1474; Ar. *Thesm.* 1026-1028; Demosth. fr. 2, 8 CLAVAUD 1987. Ar. frequently uses it to mean simply, "Get lost": *Eq.* 1314-1315; *Nub.* 646, 871; *Proagon* fr. 477 K.-A.; *Vesp.* 50-51, 458, 835, 852-853, 982; *Pax* 500; *Av.* 889; *Thesm.* 1079, 1226; *Ran.* 185-190, 607; *Plut.* 394, 604, 782. Commentators on *Av.* 27-29 usually interpret it this way as well. Cf. GREEN 1879; SOMMERSTEIN 1987; DUNBAR 1995; all *ad loc.*

[28] Cf. 61, 343-351.

[29] Cf. 11, 764-765, 1526-1527.

[30] Cf. 32-35.

[31] FARAONE 2004, 219 discusses Ar. *Nub.* 121-123, in which Strepsiades frets about his son eating away at his food and quite explicitly threatens to drive him out of the house ἐς κόρακας. Cf. Amipsias fr. 23 K.-A. For other instances of ἐς κόρακας with house language, cf. Ar. *Ach.* 864; *Nub.* 131-133; *Pax* 1221; *Av.* 990; fr. 601 K.-A. For the phrase accompanied by ἀποφθείρω, cf. Ar. *Eq.* 892; *Nub.* 789; Eup. fr. 359 K.-A. Cf. Eur. *HF* 1290 for the expulsive character of this verb.

[32] Cf. 100-101.

distinctly Sophoclean Tereus that Aristophanes will transform from an expelled rapist into a familiar Athenian. Tereus' departure from human society may have been present in other versions of the myth, but it fits especially well into Sophocles' plan for the character, which marginalizes him at every turn (fr. 581, 9-10 Radt): ἀεὶ δὲ μίσει τῶνδ' ἀπαλλαγείς τόπων / δρυμοὺς ἐρήμους καὶ πάγους ἀποικιεῖ ("But out of hatred he will always depart these places and emigrate to desolate copses and crags")[33]. Several words mark these lines out as expulsive. First, there are the verb forms ἀπαλλαγείς and ἀποικιεῖ. The first is an attractive emendation[34]. Ps.-Lysias uses the same verb to banish an ἀλιτήριος (an avenging demon very similar to a φαρμακός) in a highly expulsive passage that we will examine shortly[35]. Likewise, ἀποικιεῖ describes Tereus' emigration from human society to a barren landscape exactly like the one Peisetaerus and Euelpides stumble upon at the play's opening. The words πάγους and δρυμοὺς ἐρήμους match nicely with the rocks that our heroes are afraid of tumbling down[36]. Expulsive language aside, there are plenty of indications that Tereus is a marginalized figure. To start, Sophocles sets his drama in Thrace proper (i.e. north of the Aegean), whereas other sources set it in Phocian Daulis. Gregory Dobrov suggests that the setting change dramatizes Procne's longing for her distant Athenian home and emphasizes Tereus' barbarism, only to have Philomela overcome it through the distinctly Athenian means of a written message[37]. Tereus' marginality becomes even starker after his transformation. If his character's costume featured the typical Thracian ἀκρόκομος hairstyle, as is likely, then its transformation into a hoopoe's crest would have been seamless. The visual link between hair and crest would underscore the transition from exotic foreigner to exotic animal[38]. Indeed, the hoopoe is so beyond the pale that Sophocles appears eager to reconcile his choice with other versions which made Tereus a hawk[39]. Once again, however, Aristophanes humorously subverts our expectations by making this barbaric, Thracian hoopoe not so foreign, not so bestial, after all. Tereus has a slave, eats out of pottery, and prefers pea soup and sardines from nearby Phaleron of all places[40]. Just like Peisetaerus and Euelpides, he has been a human, and he has been reluctant to pay off debt[41]. Instead of cutting out tongues, he teaches

---

[33] RADT 1977 (hereafter R) gives the text as follows: ἀεὶ δὲ μίσει τῶνδ' †ἀπ' ἄλλον† εἰς τόπον / δρυμοὺς ἐρήμους καὶ πάγους ἀποικιεῖ.

[34] Cf. CONINGTON 1852, 10. MILO 2008, *ad loc.* praises it for its appropriateness in context and on paleographical grounds. Vd., however, DE STEFANI 1998 and CASANOVA 2003, 67 for a different solution.

[35] Cf. Ps.-Lys. 6, 53.

[36] Cf. 20-21. MILO 2008, *ad loc.* cites a variety of passages on departure and exile that use one or more words from these Sophoclean lines.

[37] Thuc. 2, 29, 3 makes it clear that the events surrounding Tereus would have taken place in Daulis, perhaps out of a desire to correct Sophocles, and Strab. 9, 3, 13; Paus. 1, 41, 8; 10, 4, 8; and *EM s.v. Δαυλίς* agree. Cf. MAYER 1892, 491; DOBROV 1993, 204-205; MILO 2008, 12; SLATER 2017.

[38] Cf. KISO 1984, 144, n. 74; DOBROV 1993, 196, n. 17, 210-211, 219.

[39] Cf. fr. 581, 5-8 R; Aesch. *Supp.* 62. Cf. DOBROV 1993, 219; FITZPATRICK 2001, 100.

[40] Cf. 75-79.

[41] Cf. 114-119.

barbarians the Greek language[42]. Indeed, all the gruesome aspects of Sophocles' play are papered over. He even still has a relationship with Procne, calling her τὴν ἐμὴν ἀηδόνα ("my nightingale") and σύννομε ("partner")[43]. He praises her singing and even refers to τὸν ἐμὸν καὶ σὸν πολύδακρυν Ἴτυν ("the much-lamented Itys, mine *and* yours")[44].

2.3 Big ideas

It is no coincidence, therefore, that Euelpides' ἐς κόρακας speech ends with a resolution to go to Tereus, whose unexpectedly familiar and amiable nature provides one of the first indications that the journey ἐς κόρακας might just be smooth sailing[45]. Tereus even boasts about the ease of life among the birds. One doesn't have to carry money on one's person, and one can feed on wild sesame seeds, myrtle berries, poppies, and bergamot[46]. But upon hearing about this golden-age natural abundance, Peisetaerus comes up with a strikingly artificial idea which will shape the plot thereafter[47]. When he's done beating around the thicket, he spells it out as follows (179-186):

> **Πε.** οὐχ οὗτος οὖν δήπου 'στὶν ὀρνίθων πόλος;
> **Επ.** πόλος; τίνα τρόπον;
> **Πε.**   ὥσπερ ἂν εἴποι τις τόπος.
>   ὅτι δὲ πολεῖται τοῦτο καὶ διέρχεται
>   ἅπαντα διὰ τούτου, καλεῖται νῦν πόλος.
>   ἢν δ' οἰκίσητε τοῦτο καὶ φάρξηθ' ἅπαξ,
>   ἐκ τοῦ πόλου τούτου κεκλήσεται πόλις.
>   ὥστ' ἄρξετ' ἀνθρώπων μὲν ὥσπερ παρνόπων,
>   τοὺς δ' αὖ θεοὺς ἀπολεῖτε λιμῷ Μηλίῳ.

> **Pe.** So is this not the *polos* of the birds, then?
> **Ep.** The *polos*? How so?
> **Pe.** It's like if you called it the 'place.' Because everything is *pulled* around it and passes through it, it is called the *polos*. But once you incorporate it and wall it off, its name will switch from *polos* to *polis*. Then you'll rule over men like you do over locusts, and you'll destroy the gods with a Melian famine.

If Tereus' civilized demeanor thwarts one expectation, then Peisetaerus' plan to wall off a city within this natural utopia thwarts another[48]. Tereus' description of bird life would seem to

---

[42] Cf. 198-200.

[43] Cf. 203, 209.

[44] Cf. 212.

[45] Cf. 46-48.

[46] Cf. 157-160; Hes. *Op.* 117-118.

[47] Cf. 160-178.

[48] Then again, perhaps Peisetaerus was planning to found a city the whole time. MERRY 1896, 7 sees the basket, myrtle boughs, and pot of 43 as equipment for founding a new city. On his reading, Peisetaerus and Euelpides

satisfy the search for a τόπον ἀπράγμονα ("leisurely place"), but apparently, the lure of the *polis* has a tighter grip on Peisetaerus than we knew[49]. His sales pitch shows what is so attractive about it: the power of boundaries. By walling off the *polis*, the birds will gain power over humans and even gods. It is fitting that this power takes the form of a λιμός, which, as we have seen, is a situation closely related to expulsion. A λιμός Μήλιος ("a *Melian* famine"), in particular, may foreshadow later scenes with expulsive themes, especially involving the gods. In addition to its clear reference to the Athenian siege of Melos in 416, which, if we believe Thucydides, was an affront to traditional religious sensibilities, this phrase may also reference the notoriously impious Diagoras the Melian, who appears later in the play[50]. After all, giving Socrates the epithet ὁ Μήλιος was enough to remind the audience of Diagoras' impiety in *Clouds*[51]. As we will discover soon, there is good reason to associate the play's later 'intruder' scenes, where hunger is a central theme, with expulsion as well, and in the final scenes, the λιμός Μήλιος will put the gods themselves in the same category as these expelled, hungry intruders[52].

2.4 Passages of Pursuit

Before examining these later passages with Diagoras, the intruders, and the gods, we can observe similar themes at work in Peisetaerus' first encounter with the birds. When the birds find out that Tereus has told humans about their settlement, their reaction is less than enthusiastic (327-337):

> **Χο**. ἔα ἔα·
> προδεδόμεθ᾽ ἀνόσιά τ᾽ ἐπάθομεν·
> ὃς γὰρ φίλος ἦν ὁμότροφά θ᾽ ἡμῖν

---

would be colonists using the pot to carry coals from the Athenian πρυτανεῖον. A χύτρα can be used to carry coals, as in Ar. *Lys.* 315 and Xen. *Hell.* 4, 5, 4, but DUNBAR 1995, *ad loc.* sees the objects as general sacrificial implements without any specifically ktistic connotation. As she notes, Peisetaerus and Euelpides speak of *finding* a city here, not founding one (47-48), and they continue to do so until the 'grand idea' forms (120-122).

[49] Cf. 44.

[50] Cf. 1072-1075; Thuc. 5, 103-105.

[51] Cf. Ar. *Nub.* 830b. Cf. ROMER 1994. Another commonality between Peisetaerus' plan, Diagoras, and the siege of Melos may be found in their use of walls. Thuc. 5, 114, 1 reports that the Athenians threw up a wall (a blockade of ships?) around Melos (περιετείχισαν κύκλῳ) to starve the Melians out. Likewise, Diagoras may have written a treatise called Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι (*"Words that Wall Off"*), which described the impenetrable 'wall' between humanity and divinity (Hsch. *s.v.* Διαγόραν; *Suda s.v.* Διαγόρας, Ἀποπυργίζοντας λόγους, Πυργίσκοι καὶ Θησαυροφυλάκια). Some have seen this as a corruption or misattribution (WOODBURY 1965; WINIARCZYK 1980). If it is genuine, it may have been part of the reason Diagoras was proscribed (JACOBY 1959, 24-31; ROMER 1994, 357). WHITMARSH 2016 accepts Romer's argument about the λιμός Μήλιος and sees this passage, along with the end of Eur. *Bellerophon* fr. 286 KANNICHT 2004 (hereafter K)—τὰ θεῖα πυργοῦσ᾽ αἱ κακαί τε συμφοραί... ("x and terrible disasters fortify religion," his tr.)—as engagements with Diagoras' treatise. KATZ 1976, 370-373 was the first to connect this treatise title with Peisetaerus' strategy in *Birds*.

[52] Cf. 859-1057, 1337-1469, 1494-1765.

ἐνέμετο πεδία παρ᾽ ἡμῖν,
παρέβη μὲν θεσμοὶς ἀρχαίους
παρέβη δ᾽ ὅρκους ὀρνιϑων.
εἰς δὲ δόλον ἐκάλεσε,
παρέβαλέ τ᾽ ἐμὲ παρὰ
γένος ἀνόσιον ὅπερ
ὅτ᾽ ἐγένετ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἐμοὶ
πολέμιον ἐτράφη.
ἀλλὰ πρὸς μὲν τοῦτον ἡμῖν ἐστιν ὕστερος λόγος·
τὼ δὲ πρεσβύτα δοκεῖ μοι τώδε δοῦναι τὴν δίκην.

Ch. No! No! We've been betrayed and we suffer unholy things! Someone who was our friend, someone who tended the fields which nourish us, transgressed our ancient laws and violated the oaths of the birds. He lured me into a trap, and he exposed me to an unholy race which was at war with me from the very beginning. But we'll have a word with him later, and I think these two men should have to pay.

This passage draws upon several expulsive themes. Betrayal is a crime punishable by ἀτιμία or forfeiture of the right to burial in Attica[53]. The birds make it clear that this betrayal is especially hurtful coming from someone who farms and eats with them. Παραβάλλω here means something like, 'I throw *x* out as food for *y*,' 'I put *x* in the power of *y*,' or 'I expose *x* to the danger of *y*'[54]. By this logic, Tereus has practically thrown the birds 'to the crows'...or brought an impious contaminant into their midst. Indeed, humanity is described as πολέμιος, an adjective closely related to ἀτιμία[55]. But whether the birds think of themselves *as* expelled or as saddled with two intruders *to* expel is ultimately irrelevant. The point is that an important boundary has been crossed.

Another similar attack occurs a few lines later (343-351):

Χο. ἰὼ ἰώ·
ἔπαγ᾽ ἔπιθ᾽ ἐπίφερε πολέμιον
ὁρμὰν φονίαν, πτέρυγά τε παντᾷ
ἐπίβαλε περί τε κύκλωσαι·
ὡς δεῖ τώδ᾽ οἰμώζειν ἄμφω
καὶ δοῦναι ῥύγχει **φορβάν**.
οὔτε γὰρ ὄρος σκιερὸν
οὔτε νέφος αἰθέριον
οὔτε πολιὸν πέλαγος
ἔστιν ὅ τι δέξεται

---

[53] Cf. Thuc. 1, 138, 6; Xen. *Hell.* 1, 7, 22; Idomeneus *FGrH* 338 F 1; Plut. *Mor.* 833a, 833f-834b; Lyc. 1, 112-115. Cf. Dmitriev 2015, 45.

[54] Cf. *LSJ s.v.*; Dunbar 1995, *ad loc.*

[55] Cf. Demosth. 9, 42; And. 1, 96.

τώδ᾽ **ἀποφυγόντε** με.

> **Ch.** Go! Go! March on, get after 'em, bring 'em the bloody onslaught of war, throw your wings up and surround them. Make them squeal. Make them fodder for our beaks. There is no shadowy mountain, no cloud of heaven, no wave of the sea that will let them **escape** me.

The chorus' use of the participle ἀποφυγόντε to describe Peisetaerus and Euelpides' flight hints at the exilic character of this passage, and a closer examination of its themes, style, and diction can confirm this reading.

One expulsive comparandum is a fragment of Hipponax (fr. 128 W):

> Μοῦσά μοι Εὐρυμεδοντιάδεα τὴν ποντοχάρυβδιν,
> τὴν ἐγγαστριμάχαιραν, ὃς ἐσθίει οὐ κατὰ κόσμον,
> ἔννεφ᾽, ὅπως ψηφῖδι κακὸς κακὸν οἶτον ὄληται
> βουλῇ δημοσίῃ παρὰ θῖν᾽ ἁλὸς ἀτρυγέτοιο.

> Identify for me, o Muse, an offspring of the One-Who-Rules-Widely as the Sea-Charybdis, as the Knife-in-the-Belly, who eats without limit, in order that the wretch may lose his wretched life by stoning after he has been chased down to the shore of the fruit-less sea, according to the wish of the people.[56]

Several features of this passage mark it out as expulsive, including the gluttony of the victim, the reference to stoning and/or legal condemnation, and the location at the seashore[57]. Let us consider each of these in turn.

Hipponax's removal of a glutton from his community is similar to other communities' attempts to remove hunger, *e.g.* the Λιμός ostraka, Plutarch's Βούλιμος ritual, and the inscription from Termessos, discussed above. In each of these cases, the goal is to expel whatever is depriving the community of food. There is also Erysichthon from Callimachus' *Hymn to Demeter*, whom the goddess inflicts with insatiable hunger. Eaten out of house and home, Erysichthon's father prays for his son either to be cured or to be removed and fed by Poseidon, since he can no longer do so himself[58]. Erysichthon ends up at a crossroads, which is a place to 'cast out' ὀξυθύμια, purificatory household refuse[59]. A comic fragment likewise says that someone should be burned at the crossroads among the ὀξυθύμια, recalling Tzetzes' description of the final fate of φαρμακοί when he is citing relevant fragments from Hipponax[60].

---

[56] Eng. trans. by FARAONE 2004, 242, modified.

[57] FARAONE 2004 argues convincingly at length for the expulsive character of this fragment. The following paragraphs represent a cursory summary of the evidence.

[58] Cf. Call. *Dem.* 100-104.

[59] Cf. Call. *Dem.* 114-115. For household refuse, cf. Poll. 2, 231; 5, 163; vd. also Harp.; Phot.; *Suda*; *EM*; all *s.v.* ὀξυθύμια. Cf. JOHNSTON 1991, 220, n. 17.

[60] Cf. Eup. *Dem.* fr. 132 K.-A.; Tz. *H.* 5, 737; Hippon. frr. 5-10 W.

Hipponax's stipulation that his victim be done in ψηφῖδι can be understood in two ways. It is a call either for literal stoning or for some kind of condemnation by vote. Stoning occurs in Callimachus' account of a φαρμακός ritual in Abdera and in an *aition* for the φαρμακός ritual at the Thargelia, which apparently commemorates the stoning of a man with the proper name Pharmakos[61]. Nevertheless, scholars have been willing to entertain an allusion to φαρμακοί regardless of whether they translate ψηφῖδι as "stoning" or "vote"[62].

Finally, the seaside setting of this lynching suggests a purificatory quality. Again, reference can be made to the Termessos inscription, which pursues hunger into the sea, as well as to improper burials at sea. As for scapegoat rituals, Strabo tells us of a purification ritual at Lefkas, comparable to φαρμακός rites, in which a criminal is hurled into the sea, taken up in a boat, and ferried beyond local borders[63]. Also comparable is the Suda's entry on the practice of tossing someone into the sea as a sacrificial offering with the words περίψημα ἡμῶν γενοῦ ("Be our off-scouring")[64]. Tossing sacrificial off-scourings into the sea is attested by Homer, and the idea of casting evil into the sea also crops up in Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex* and Euripides' *Hecuba*[65]. Finally, Aesop is likewise killed by being thrown off a cliff into the sea, charged with the same crime as Pharmakos in the Thargelia *aition*: stealing sacred bowls from Apollo[66].

Such are the reasons for reading this Hipponax fragment as highly expulsive. A close parallel to this fragment elsewhere in Aristophanes will help to bridge the gap between it and our passage from *Birds* (*Eq.* 247-254)[67]:

> παῖε παῖε τὸν πανοῦργον καὶ ταραξιππόστρατον
> καὶ τελώνην καὶ φάραγγα καὶ Χάρυβδιν ἁρπαγῆς,
> καὶ πανοῦργον καὶ πανοῦργον· πολλάκις γὰρ αὔτ᾽ ἐρῶ.
> καὶ γὰρ οὗτος ἦν πανοῦργος πολλάκις τῆς ἡμέρας.
> ἀλλὰ παῖε καὶ **δίωκε** καὶ τάραττε καὶ κύκα
> καὶ βδελύττου, καὶ γὰρ ἡμεῖς, κἀπικείμενος βόα·
> εὐλαβοῦ δὲ μὴ ᾽**κφύγῃ** σε·

---

[61] Cf. Call. *Aet.* fr. 90 P c. *Dieg.* 2; Ister *FGrH* 334 F 50.

[62] MASSON 1949, 302, 311-318 prefers stoning and thus connects the fragment to φαρμακός ritual. ROUX 1964, 126-127 acknowledges a possible reference to φαρμακός ritual but prefers a voting pebble, noting the irony that «ce petit caillou» is able to bring down so great a stomach. GERBER 1970, 301-302 concurs.

[63] Cf. Strab. 10, 2, 9; Ampelius 8, 4. For this ritual discussed in relation to the φαρμακός, cf. BURKERT 1977, 140; BREMMER 1983, 301; FARAONE 2004, 222; COMPTON 2006, 4; KOSMIN 2015, 141.

[64] Cf. *Suda s.v.* περίψημα. Cf. scholarship in previous note, minus KOSMIN 2015, plus NILSSON 1967, 109-110.

[65] Cf. Hom. *Il.* 1, 314; Soph. *OT* 190-195; Eur. *Hec.* 1259-1263. For scholarship on the former play's relation to φαρμακός ritual, vd. n. 16.

[66] Cf. *Vita Aesopi* G 127-128; Ister *FGrH* 334 F 50. These and other passages lead WIECHERS 1961; COMPTON 2006, 19-40; and KURKE 2011, 29-31, 75-76, 85-94 to read Aesop as a φαρμακός figure.

[67] ROSEN 1988, 66-67; FARAONE 2004, 240.

> Strike! Strike the wicked one, the Pest-of-the-Knights, the tax man, the gaping chasm, the Charybdis of theft, wicked, oh so wicked, I'll say it again. For he was wicked many times a day. Strike, pursue, harass, wind him up, loathe him, get on him, and shout, just like we do. Don't let him escape.

The similarities between this passage and the Hipponax fragment are obvious. Both target their victims with ponderous, compound names, and both use Charybdis as a moniker for unbridled rapacity that hurts the community[68]. In addition, the expulsive diction (δίωκε, ᾽κφύγῃ) shows that the aim of this passage is much the same as the fragment: don't let the enemy escape. The passage from *Birds*, with its own expulsive ἀποφυγόντε, shares this motivation as well, but its stylistic features connect it more closely with *Knights* than with Hipponax. Particularly striking are the quick, repetitive imperatives: ἔπαγ᾽ ἔπιθ᾽ ἐπίφερε…ἐπίβαλε in *Birds* vs. παῖε παῖε…ἀλλὰ παῖε καὶ δίωκε καὶ τάραττε καὶ κύκα / καὶ βδελύττου…βόα· / εὐλαβοῦ in *Knights*. It is clear beyond a doubt, then, that the *Birds* passage performs the same function, not just practically but also poetically, as the *Knights* passage. It is also clear that the general expulsive character and particular insults of the *Knights* passage find a precedent in Hipponax. What I would like to suggest, then, is a genealogical relationship between expulsive iambic poetry and comic choral passages featuring the vigorous pursuit of an enemy. The style and diction of these passages are too consistent to be explained merely as results of comedy's predisposition for threatening language and violence[69]. Grouping them together as a 'type' descended from expulsive iambography more easily explains both their function and their similarity to one another.

There is one more small clue to the expulsive character of this passage from *Birds:* the word φορβάν, which has a couple of interesting parallels. First, in Sophocles' *Ajax*, Menelaus threatens Ajax's corpse as follows (1064-1065): ἀλλ᾽ ἀμφὶ χλωρὰν ψάμαθον ἐκβεβλημένος / ὄρνισι φορβὴ παραλίοις γενήσεται ("But he will be cast out on the yellow sand as food for the seashore birds"). Here, we have expulsive language (ἐκβεβλημένος), the expulsive 'to the crows' trope that makes corpses into bird food, and an emphasis on the seashore to match Hipponax's specification. Euripides does something similar two years after *Birds*, when he has Andromeda describe her predicament with the word φορβή and an expulsive verb (fr. 115a K): ἐκθεῖναι κήτει φορβάν ("to set me out as food for the sea monster"). Read in the light of these passages, the birds' self-exhortations cleverly invert the expulsive trope of calling one's enemy a glutton. The birds embrace their traditional role within the expulsive complex and express their wish to devour their enemies themselves. Moving along, the play's focus on food continues through the initial fight with cooking implements and reappears briefly to describe Philocrates-esque bird selling[70].

---

[68] Cf. Faraone 2004, 226 for "Sea-Charybdis" and "Knife-in-the-Belly," which both suggest gluttony.

[69] Cf. Ar. *Ach.* 204-236, 280-283 (with stoning); *Eq.* 453-456; *Vesp.* 422-425, 430-432; *Thesm.* 659-667.

[70] Cf. Ar. *Av.* 327-392, 523-538. Vd. also 577-580, 618-626, 786-789.

2.5 Diagoras, Andocides, Philocrates

After the birds accept Peisetaerus' plan, we proceed to the expulsive heart of the play: the intruder scenes and the second parabasis that comes in their midst. In order not to interrupt my treatment of the intruders, I will start with the second parabasis (1072-1075):

> τῇδε μέντοι θἠμέρᾳ μάλιστ᾽ ἐπαναγορεύεται·
> ἢν ἀποκτείνῃ τις ὑμῶν Διαγόραν τὸν Μήλιον,
> λαμβάνειν τάλαντον, ἤν τε τῶν τυράννων τίς τινα
> τῶν τεθνηκότων ἀποκτείνῃ, τάλαντον λαμβάνειν.

> Indeed, on this very day it is proclaimed: "If anyone kills Diagoras the Melian, he will receive a talent. And if anyone kills one of the dead tyrants, he will receive a talent."

This passage, like the birds' previous onslaughts, calls for death, not expulsion. However, just as the birds used 'expulsive' language to hunt down their enemies, here too does the conceptual overlap between killing and expulsion become apparent. We may recall that ἀτιμία, in making its victim an 'outlaw,' could call for death but result in expulsion. The warrant for Diagoras' death has effectively expelled him, and the decree declares that he may be killed with impunity if found. Furthermore, declarations of ἀτιμία (or the later equivalent under different names) often take the form of conditional statements like this one, and ἀτιμία is closely bound up with tyranny[71]. There is good reason to believe that Aristophanes is aware of the older definition of ἀτιμία and that he has it in mind here. Earlier in the play, the birds present a catalogue of crimes that are perfectly legal in Cloudcuckooland[72]. Among these is opening the gates of the city to the ἄτιμοι (766-767): εἰ δ᾽ ὁ Πεισίου προδοῦναι τοῖς ἀτίμοις τὰς πύλας / βούλεται, πέρδιξ γενέσθω, τοῦ πατρὸς νεοττίον· ("If the son of Peisias wants to betray our gates to the ἄτιμοι, let him become a partridge. Like father, like son"). We have already noted the connection between betrayal and exile[73]. Here, that betrayal is allowing the exiled ἄτιμοι back into the city[74].

Furthermore, Diagoras' expulsion is not merely a comic fiction. Romer takes the beginning of the passage as historical evidence that a proscription of this type was read out against Diagoras on the day *Birds* was performed[75]. If this was the case, then the earlier reference to

---

[71] Cf. *IG* I², 10, 32-34; II³, 320, 7-21; And. 1, 96-98; Ps.-Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 16, 10. Dunbar 1995, *ad loc.* reads this passage as ἀτιμία and sees the proscriptions against the 'dead tyrants' as a jab against lingering, unreasonable fear over tyranny, embodied in the anti-tyrannical curses with which assemblies were still begun.

[72] Cf. 752-766.

[73] Vd. n. 24 above.

[74] Dunbar 1995, *ad loc.* sees in these lines a reference to exiles resulting from the mutilation of the Herms in 415.

[75] Cf. Romer 1994, 355. Sommerstein 1987 and Dunbar 1995, both *ad loc.*, concur. However, Dunbar considers the possibility that this passage could have been interchanged with others to suit whatever announcements of out-

the λιμός Μήλιος, with its expulsive connotations, would recall the announcement against Diagoras the Melian. This historical interpretation has considerable evidence to recommend it. The scholia cite Craterus, a third-century B.C. compiler of decrees, and Melanthius, who, we are told, copied the decree from the original bronze stele directed against αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς <μὴ> ἐκδιδόντας Πελλανεῖς ("him and the Pelleneans who weren't giving him up")[76]. The supposed inscription goes as follows (Craterus *FGrH* 342 F 16b): ἐὰν δέ τις ἀποκτείνῃ Διαγόραν τὸν Μήλιον, λαμβάνειν ἀργυρίου τάλαντον· ἐὰν δέ τις ζῶντα ἀγάγῃ, λαμβάνειν δύο ("If anyone kills Diagoras the Melian, he will receive a talent of silver; but if anyone brings him in alive, two talents"). Diodorus corroborates this reading, telling us that Diagoras was accused of impiety and fled Athens before the decree was issued[77].

Beyond whatever formal expulsive proscription Diagoras may have suffered, we can also point to the fact that Ps.-Lysias conceptually and rhetorically ties Diagoras to another figure whom he calls a φαρμακός: Andocides. Expulsive language is frequent in the speech against Andocides. The beginning is lost, but it appears to have told a moralizing tale about an impious person punished by λιμός; bearing this in mind, the jurors should punish Andocides to avoid the same fate[78]. We are told that ἀπαλλακτέον τοῦ ἀνδρός ("it is necessary to get rid of the man")[79]. Ps.-Lysias is shocked at the kind treatment of Andocides. He cites a law stating that someone who mutilates a mere human φεύξεται τὴν τοῦ ἀδικηθέντος πόλιν ("must flee the city of the one whom he has wronged")[80]. How much guiltier, then, is Andocides, who mutilated the divine Herms! The expulsive climax comes near the end of the speech (Ps.-Lys. 6, 53):

> ποῖον φίλον, ποῖον συγγενῆ, ποῖον δημότην χρὴ τούτῳ χαρισάμενον κρύβδην φανερῶς τοῖς θεοῖς ἀπεχθέσθαι; νῦν οὖν χρὴ νομίζειν τιμωρουμένους καὶ **ἀπαλλαττομένους** Ἀνδοκίδου **τὴν πόλιν καθαίρειν καὶ ἀποδιοπομπεῖσθαι** καὶ φαρμακὸν ἀποπέμπειν καὶ **ἀλιτηρίου ἀπαλλάττεσθαι**, ὡς ἐν τούτων οὗτός ἐστι.

> What kind of friend, what kind of family member, what kind of fellow citizen should have to be hated by the gods in the open for favoring this man in secret? Now, therefore, you need to know that in punishing Andocides and freeing yourselves from him, you are cleansing and expiating the city, sending away a φαρμακός, and freeing yourselves from a demon, since this man is precisely that.

---

lawry were made for the day which *Birds* happened to receive in the allotment. Cf. USSHER 1973 *ad Eccl.* 1158-1159.

[76] Cf. *Scholl. ad loc.* = Craterus *FGrH* 342 F 16b = Melanthius *FGrH* 326 F 3b. Vd. also *Scholl. ad Ran.* 320 = Craterus *FGrH* 342 F 16a.

[77] Cf. Diod.Sic. 13, 6, 7. The diction does not indicate how formal this accusation was. Diagoras is merely described as διαβολῆς τυχὼν ἐπ᾽ ἀσεβείᾳ ("met with the accusation of impiety").

[78] Cf. Ps.-Lys. 6, 1-4.

[79] Cf. Ps.-Lys. 6, 8.

[80] Cf. Ps.-Lys. 6, 15.

In punishing Andocides, the jurors are not merely enacting some abstract concept of justice; rather, they are ridding themselves, almost physically, of an evil (ἀπαλλαττομένους, ἀπαλλάττεσθαι). The words τὴν πόλιν καθαίρειν recall several scapegoat texts, and the combination καθαίρειν καὶ ἀποδιοπομπεῖσθαι appears elsewhere to describe the removal of pollution[81]. Ἀλιτήριοι are likewise associated with pollution and need to be expelled[82]. It is no surprise that Ps.-Lysias mentions them as counterparts to the φαρμακός.

Here again, the main point of Ps.-Lysias' speech is not to get Andocides expelled, but to get him executed[83]. Nevertheless, Ps.-Lysias does draw a distinction between these fates to demonstrate that Andocides is even more worthy of punishment than Diagoras. Both are impious, but there are three main differences. First, Andocides' impiety was in deed, while Diagoras' was in word. Second, Andocides profaned his own city's rites, while Diagoras merely mocked foreign rites. Third, Andocides is here for the punishing, whereas Diagoras is not. If the Athenians let Andocides off while they have him in their custody, their bounty on Diagoras will be exposed as an empty bluff[84]. Although these differences serve primarily to heighten the outrage against Andocides, they still paint Diagoras as roughly the same type of detestable person; if Andocides is even worse, then the outrage against him ought to be catastrophic (Ps.-Lys. 6, 17): ὀργίζεσθαι οὖν χρή, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι ("Therefore, you should be angry, O Athenian men").

The main reason for the birds' reference to the decree against the tyrants and Diagoras is to introduce a new one against their greatest enemy: Philocrates the Sparrowvian. A reward is announced for Philocrates too, but this time, the bounty increases to four talents for a live capture[85]. Diagoras and the tyrants are bad guys everyone recognizes, but Philocrates is even worse because of his crimes against birds. The chorus explains their vendetta as follows (1079-1087):

> ὅτι συνείρων τοὺς **σπίνους** πωλεῖ καθ' ἑπτὰ τοὐβολοῦ,
> εἶτα φυσῶν τὰς **κίχλας** δείκνυσι καὶ λυμαίνεται,
> τοῖς τε **κοψίχοισιν** εἰς τὰς ῥῖνας ἐγχεῖ τὰ πτερά,
> τὰς **περιστεράς** θ' ὁμοίως συλλαβὼν εἴρξας ἔχει,
> κἀπαναγκάζει παλεύειν δεδεμένας ἐν δικτύῳ.
> ταῦτα βουλόμεσθ' ἀνειπεῖν· κεἴ τις ὄρνιθας τρέφει
> εἰργμένους ὑμῶν ἐν αὐλῇ, φράζομεν μεθιέναι.
> ἢν δὲ μὴ πίθησθε, συλληφθέντες ὑπὸ τῶν ὀρνέων
> αὖθις ὑμεῖς αὖ παρ' ἡμῖν δεδεμένοι παλεύετε.

---

[81] Cf. Hipp. fr. 5 W; Tzetz. *H.* 5, 728-763; *Scholl. ad* Ar. *Eq.* 1136; *Suda s.v.* κάθαρμα, φαρμακός, Φαρμακός; Harp. *s.v.* φαρμακός; Hesych. *s.v.* φαρμακοί. For καθαίρειν καὶ ἀποδιοπομπεῖσθαι, cf. Plat. *Leg.* 877e; *Cra.* 396d-397a. Both describe the purifying of a house from pollution and of people from a topic of discussion.

[82] Cf. Thuc. 1, 126; Antipho. 3, 1-4. Cf. KOSMIN 2015, 140, n. 141 for ostraka which insult their victims as ἀλιτήριοι.

[83] And. 1, 146 tells us the potential sentence.

[84] Cf. Ps.-Lys. 6, 17-18.

[85] Cf. 1077-1078.

...because he strings the finches together and sells them for seven obols, and then he puffs up the thrushes, degrades them, and puts them on display; he pours feathers into the nostrils of blackbirds and he likewise rounds up doves, shuts them in cages, holds them there, and then binds them in a net and makes them act as decoys. We'll tell you this too: if anyone of you is keeping birds locked up in his courtyard, we advise you to let them go. If you don't believe us, then you'll just have to be rounded up by us birds, tied up for our purposes, and act as decoys for other humans.

It is obvious that Philocrates' methods are gruesome, but I would also like to note that they are distinctly culinary. Nan Dunbar notes that σπίνοι ("finches") and κίχλαι ("thrushes") are mentioned as food elsewhere in Aristophanes, that the practice of stringing up small birds in food markets continues today, and that the 'puffing up' of thrushes was probably to make them seem more plump[86]. As for κόψιχοι ("blackbirds"), a late source tells us that they are synonymous with κόσσυφοι, which are not crows, as one might expect from the usual translation, but rather a type of ἀλεκτρυών ("cock") or ("hen")[87]. Hippocrates discusses the nutritional value of both the ἀλεκτρυών and Philocrates' next bird, the περιστερά ("dove")[88]. Because food is so closely tied to expulsion, it is not surprising to see that Philocrates, the fictional character whom the birds fit into the same expulsive box as Diagoras and the tyrants, is someone who not only harms birds, but sells them as food specifically.

2.6 Intruder scenes

Having discussed the choral passage, I will now turn to the many intruder scenes surrounding it[89]. Such scenes were common in Old Comedy, and *Birds* spends the longest on them of any surviving play, though it is questionable whether they were all performed[90]. Such scenes,

---

[86] Cf. Dunbar 1995, *ad loc.* Cf. Ar. *Pax* 1149; *Av.* 523-538. In the latter passage, Peisetaerus notes how birds are caught, felt up for their plumpness, sold, and then eaten.

[87] Cf. Hdn. *De Orthographia s.v.* κόψικος for the κόψικος as an ἀλεκτρυών and Paus. 9, 22, 4 for a general description of the κόσσυφος.

[88] Cf. Hp. *Vict.* 2, 47.

[89] Cf. 859-1057, 1337-1469.

[90] Cf. Ar. *Ach.* 818-835, 910-958; *Pax* 1043-1126; *Pl.* 850-958; Eup. *Dem.* fr. 99, 78-120 K.-A. Ruffell 2013, 252, 275, n. 16 cites these and adds to them the burning down of the Phrontisterion in *Clouds,* the expulsion of Poverty in *Wealth,* and the probable expulsion of the dithyrambic poet Phrynis by Pyronides in Eupolis' *Demes,* which can be inferred from a Paestan bell krater labeling the two characters (Salerno Pc 1812). Pyronides has his arm outstretched toward Phrynis (beating him?), and Phrynis, complete with stereotypically ugly snub nose, apparently falls backward. Revermann 2006, 147-148, 318-319 also discusses the vase and suggests that it represents an intruder scene. Revermann 2006, 336-337 ponders whether time constraints would permit all of the intruder scenes in *Birds* to be performed at the Dionysia. Although he recognizes that some of the humor lies in the excessive number of intruders, he notes that a fuller version of the play could be performed on other occasions. Storey 2011, 105 notes that in Archipp. *Ichth.* fr. 28 K.-A., Melanthius' fate of being handed over to the fish to be

with their frequent beatings and hungry victims, are good parallels for Hipponax's φαρμακός ritual and Plutarch's Hunger ritual[91]. In *Birds,* the beatings are easy enough to point to[92]. Hunger, deprivation, rapacity, and other expulsive tropes, by contrast, crop up in a variety of interesting ways for each of the intruders. The final straw against the priest is his invocation of birds of prey which might greedily carry off the sacrificial meat[93]. Next, we have a poet, who fulfills his stereotype by pathetically begging for material goods, especially a cloak to stop his shivering[94]. The oracle-monger who follows repeats both the poet's requests for clothes and the priest's meat-stealing[95]. Next, we have Meton. Meton is not hungry or deprived *per se*, but his intellectual quackery recalls that of Socrates in *Clouds*, which repeatedly plays upon the idea that such activity robs people of their due[96]. Peisetaerus also compares his own threats to beat Meton to an expulsive institution: Spartan ξενηλασία ("expulsion of foreigners")[97]. The following inspector is just greedy, plain and simple[98]. The decree-monger is beaten off-stage in the end, but before this happens, he tries to issue decrees of exactly the same form as the earlier one against Philocrates[99]. Both start with present general conditions, but interestingly enough, the latter is *anti*-expulsive: ἐὰν δέ τις ἐξελαύνῃ

---

eaten resembles the boxing up and sending off of the sycophant Nicarchus in the second passage of *Acharnians* just cited. I would therefore put this scene in the same category.

[91] Cf. Hippon. frr. 5-10 W; Plut. *Mor.* 693e-694d. For beatings in intruder scenes, Ar. *Ach.* 719-728, 924-926; *Pax* 1119-1124; Eup. *Dem.* fr. 99, 103-104; as well as another scene from the same play preserved on a vase (Vd. n. 90 above.). For hungry intruders, cf. Ar. *Pax* 1043-1126; *Pl.* 872-873 (with the word βουλιμᾷ ("is starving") to describe a sycophant); 890-892.

[92] Cf. 981-991, 1012-1014, 1029-1031, 1040-1046, 1461-1466.

[93] Cf. 889-894. DUNBAR 1995, *ad loc.* cites Ar. *Pax* 1099-1100; Soph. fr. 767 R; and Paus. 5, 14, 1 as parallels. The last of these reports that if a bird of prey steals meat from the altar, it is a bad omen for the one sacrificing. Cf. Soph. *Ant.* 1016-1018, where sacrifices go disgustingly wrong because birds and dogs put out sacrificial fires with pieces of Polynices' rotting corpse. Cf. CHEPEL 2020, 157-186 for the role of sacrifice in comedy's attempt to ritualize itself while preserving a keen awareness of the difference between itself and 'real' ritual.

[94] Cf. 904-930. The base requests for a coat and the emphasis on shivering echo Hippon. frr. 32, 34 W. The trope is common in comedy too. Cf. the helpless Cratinus of Ar. *Eq.* 526-550 and *Suda s.v.* Λύκις, which cites and explains Ar. *Ran.* 12-14 as a joke against three cold comic poets. FARMER 2017, 200, n. 11 also discusses the same phenomenon for Ar. *Gerytades* fr. 156 K.-A. However, the poet in this scene is not entirely iambographic or comic. DUNBAR 1995 *ad* 926-930, 941-945 discusses his verbal echoes of Pi. frr. 105a, 105b SNELL/MAEHLER 1984; indeed, his poetry is introduced as a Πινδάρειον ἔπος ("a Pindaric poem") (939).

[95] Cf. 959-991.

[96] Cf. 992-1020. For instance, Meton's geometry (995-996) and his comparison of the world to a furnace cover (999-1003) have parallels in *Nub.* 202-218, 95-96, respectively. For the greedy ends toward which such doctrine is put, cf. *Nub.* 112-118.

[97] Cf. 1012-1014. Thuc. 1, 144, 2 presents the Megarian Decree as the Athenian equivalent of ξενηλασία. Elsewhere, however, Athenians seek to distance themselves from the practice (Thuc. 2, 39, 1; Plat. *Leg.* 950b). Cf. Plat. *Leg.* 952d-953e for a discussion of the treatment of foreigners, many of whom resemble comic intruders. In particular, Plato condemns βρώμασι καὶ θύμασι τὰς ξενηλασίας ("expulsions of foreigners from meat and sacrifices") (Plat. *Leg.* 953e).

[98] Cf. 1021-1034.

[99] Cf. 1035-1057.

τοὺς ἄρχοντας καὶ μὴ δέχηται / κατὰ τὴν στήλην ("If anyone drives out the resident Athenian officials and does not receive them according to the stele…")[100]. After the second parabasis, the intruder scenes resume with Iris, whose failed attempt to pass through the birds' territory to retrieve sacrifices reminds us of the λιμός Μήλιος and foreshadows the scenes to come[101]. Just like Iris, the other gods will be made into meat-stealing intruders too, all in due time. Next, we meet a would-be parricide, whose potential crime is closely associated with expulsion in both literary and historical sources[102]. After him comes Cinesias, who recapitulates the tropes of deprived poet and intellectual quack[103]. The intruder scenes conclude with a sycophant. Sycophants are frequent victims in intruder scenes, and their main flaws are their hunger and their greed[104].

2.7 An Edible Ending

Having discussed the expulsive features of the intruders, I will now turn to the end of the play. From the depiction of Lamachus as hungry and cold at the end of *Acharnians* to the designation of Cleon as a φαρμακός at the end of *Knights* to the burning down of the Phrontisterion in *Clouds* II, there is no shortage of comic endings that exhibit hunger, expulsive institutions, or more general violence[105]. It should not be surprising, then, that scholars have compared some of these endings to intruder scenes, which, as we have seen, exhibit the same characteristics[106]. I suggest that the ending of *Birds* follows the same pattern, with the gods taking the hungry intruders' place. This endgame commences with the Prometheus scene[107]. Just like any other intruder, Prometheus is beaten quickly, before he can even reveal his identity[108]. Once he is recognized, he confirms the success of Peisetaerus' plan: the λιμός Μήλιος

---

[100] Cf. 1049-1050. MEIGGS 1972, 587-588 suggests that this imaginary anti-expulsive decree from *Birds* parallels a real one from the 440s prohibiting the expulsion of Athenian officials. Cf. DUNBAR 1995, *ad loc.*

[101] Cf. 1202-1261.

[102] Cf. 1337-1371. Vd. n. 16 above for Oedipus as φαρμακός. For the expulsion of a kin-killer either from the family home or the city, cf. *IG* I³ 104; Demosth. 20, 158; 23, 71-73. Cf. other examples in PARKER 1983, 122. For the theme in tragedies other than Soph. *OT* and *OC*, cf. Eur. *El.* 1190-1200; *HF* 1285-1290; *Med.* 846-850; *Or.* 512-515. For a detailed analysis of the parricide scene, especially its connection to the passage containing the play's earlier, explicit reference to ἀτιμία (766-767), cf. ORFANOS 1998.

[103] Cf. 1373-1409.

[104] Cf. 1410-1469. For sycophants in intruder scenes, we have Ar. *Ach.* 818-841, 910-958; *Plut.* 850-958; Eup. *Dem.* fr. 99, 78-120 K.-A. For the same stereotype elsewhere in comedy, cf. Ar. *Banqueters* fr. 228 K.-A.; *Ach.* 557-559, 725-726; *Eq.* 436-437; *Vesp.* 1091-1101; *Pax* 190-191, 651-656; *Av.* 285-286, 1470-1481; *Eccl.* 434-440, 452-454, 559-562; *Pl.* 30-31, 967-973; Eup. *Poleis* fr. 245 K.-A.; Pl.Com. *Women from the Festival* fr. 14 K.-A. Eup. *Prospaltioi* fr. 259, 32-40 K.-A. and *Com.Adesp.* 1090 K.-A. also contain the word but are too incomplete to shed light on its connotation. Cf. Isocr. 21, 5, who defines sycophancy as the use of one's rhetorical ability to get possessions from the rich.

[105] Cf. Ar. *Ach.* 1069-1234; *Eq.* 1402-1405; *Nub.* 1476-1510.

[106] Cf. FARAONE 2004, 214, 239; RUFFELL 2013, 252, 275, n. 16.

[107] Cf. 1494-1552.

[108] Cf. 1503.

has worked perfectly[109]. Indeed, Zeus now has the same fears exhibited earlier by the birds and Peisetaerus. He is afraid of being invaded by a foreign power: the barbarian gods, specifically the gods of Execestides, the archetypal foreigner[110]. Indeed, Prometheus is a fitting source for this news. Peisetaerus refers explicitly to the myth that has shaped this whole discussion of starving the gods: Prometheus' deception of Zeus at Mekone, which allowed mortals to partake of the meat from sacrifices, while the gods received only the κνῖσα ("steam") from the fat and bones[111].

Soon enough, the delegation of gods arrives to bargain with Peisetaerus, who is roasting birds[112]. In addition to the ongoing theme of food consumption, there is another theme related to expulsion at work in this scene: democracy. Poseidon first alerts us to it when he laments the embarrassing dress of the Triballian god, whose inclusion in the delegation is a product of democracy[113]. A more telling remark, however, is Peisetaerus' response to the hungry Heracles, who sees him preparing meat and asks what kind it is (1583-1585): ὄρνιθές τινες / ἐπανιστάμενοι τοῖς δημοτικοῖσιν ὀρνέοις / ἔδοξαν ἀδικεῖν ("Some birds were judged guilty of attempting to rebel against the democratic birds").

An expulsive reading can help us to understand this comment as part of the play's larger irony. The decree against Philocrates' culinary preparation of birds closely resembled real-life ἀτιμία. Part of this similarity consisted in the decree's focus on tyranny, which is paired with dissolution of democracy in our sources for ἀτιμία[114]. Peisetaerus, then, might be eating birds on the pretense of preserving democracy, just as Philocrates was eating them as a tyrant. Furthermore, regardless of whether we ultimately translate δημοτικοῖσιν as 'democratic', the form ἐπανιστάμενοι recalls laws against 'attempting' tyranny[115]. How delicious, then, (pun intended) is the irony between the birds' persecution of Philocrates and Peisetaerus' committing of the very same culinary crime: eating birds[116]! In his supposed zeal to protect the birds, Peisetaerus has become a δημοβόρος βασιλεύς ("people-eating king"), a figure whose greedy consumption is worthy of expulsion just like that of scapegoats, criminals, intruders, and tyrants[117].

However, Peisetaerus is not the only hungry character at the end of the play. There is also Heracles, whose obsession with the roasted birds is criticized by Poseidon (1604-1605): τί ὦ κακόδαιμον; ἠλίθιος καὶ γάστρις εἶ. / ἀποστερεῖς τὸν πατέρα τῆς τυραννίδος; ("What's

---

[109] Cf. 1514-1524.

[110] Cf. 1520-1527.

[111] Cf. 1546; Hes. *Theog.* 533-564. Vd. also Ar. *Av.* 1230-1233, where Iris was explicitly looking for κνῖσα.

[112] Cf. 1565-1693.

[113] Cf. 1570-1571.

[114] Cf. And. 1, 96-98; IG II³, 320, 7-21. Cf. Dmitriev 2015.

[115] Cf. Ps.-Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 16, 10.

[116] Cf. Peisetaerus' own condemnation of humans eating birds at 531-538.

[117] Cf. Hom. *Il.* 1, 231; Hes. *Op.* 39, 263; Alc. fr. 129 W. Cf. Faraone 2004, 238. Dunbar 1996, 68-71 warns against too sinister an interpretation of this brief moment yet still sees "a fine comic irony in Peisetairos now doing himself what he had earlier described as men's heartless treatment of birds."

that, you ass? You're an idiot and a belly too. Are you really going to deprive your father of his rule?"). Poseidon's warnings ultimately fail, and the self-expelled Peisetaerus steals Basileia, the personification of Zeus' power, away from him[118]. The play ends with a triumphant wedding to introduce the new τύραννος of all creation[119]. Before we lose ourselves in the grandeur of the moment, though, we might do well to dwell on one of Poseidon's insults: γάστρις. It carries forth the theme of gluttony that we have examined throughout the play, and it even forms part of the humorous compound that Hipponax ascribed to his scapegoat (fr. 128 W): ἐγγαστριμάχαιρα ("Knife-in-the-Belly"). Indeed, with his ravenous hunger, Heracles is the perfect victim of the λιμός Μήλιος that has turned the tables on the gods, or rather, away from them.

Before the play ends, there is one more passage which corroborates the connection I have traced between food and expulsion and which helps to contextualize Poseidon's insult in relation to it. The chorus tells us about a group of digestive reprobates (1694-1705):

> ἔστι δ᾽ ἐν Φαναῖσι πρὸς τῇ
> Κλεψύδρᾳ πανοῦργον ἐγ-
> γλωττογαστόρων γένος,
> οἳ θερίζουσίν τε καὶ σπείρουσι
> καὶ τρυγῶσι ταῖς γλώτταισι
> συκάζουσί τε·
> βάρβαροι δ᾽ εἰσὶν γένος,
> Γοργίαι τε καὶ Φίλιπποι.
> κἀπὸ τῶν ἐγγλωττογαστόρων
> ἐκείνων τῶν Φιλίππων
> πανταχοῦ τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἡ
> γλῶττα χωρὶς τέμνεται.

> There is a wicked race at the water clock in Phanae. They are called the Bellies-in-Tongues. They harvest and sow and gather the crop and pluck it with their tongues. They are a barbarian race: Gorgiases and Philips. It is to these very horse-loving Bellies-in-Tongues that we may attribute the practice of cutting out the tongue during sacrifice, which is practiced everywhere in Attica.

The passage is a commentary on the predatory rhetorical and intellectual abilities of people like Gorgias, Philip, and their associates, the sycophants who gather around the water clock (**Φαναῖσι…συκ**άζουσί)[120]. The term ἐγγλωτογάστορες ("Bellies-in-Tongues") seems to be a play on a nobler people, the ἐγχειρογάστορες ("Bellies-in-Hands"), who feed themselves with manual labor instead of the wily talent of their tongues[121]. If Poseidon's γάστρις seems

---

[118] Cf. 1565-1693.

[119] Cf. 1706-1743.

[120] Cf. DUNBAR 1995, *ad loc.*; HUBBARD 1997, 31-32.

[121] Cf. DUNBAR 1995, *ad loc.* for attestations of ἐγχειρογάστορες and γαστρόχειρες.

like a generic insult, then the chorus' ἐγγλωτογάστορες provide a closer parallel to Hipponax's ἐγγαστριμάχαιρα. In addition, the insult is directed at sycophants, who, as we have seen, are commonly mocked in intruder scenes because of their hunger and greed[122]. Poseidon insults Heracles, then, exactly as comic heroes insult intruders.

3. Conclusion

From Peisetaerus' initial journey ἐς κόρακας to his final victory over the gods, the connection between food and expulsion provides a framework for a large part of the play's irony. We have already hinted at the prominence of this connection in other comedies as well, *e.g.* the expelled Lamachus' hunger in contrast to Dicaeopolis' well-catered feast at the end of *Acharnians*. In many such examples, as in *Birds*, the connection spans multiple parts of the play, from overall plot lines to choral songs to intruder scenes to endings. I would like to end, then, with the suggestion that food and expulsion *often* serve as two unifying strands among the different pieces of the comic play, which can seem haphazardly thrown together to modern readers. Sara Forsdyke has argued that expulsion was synonymous with political power in the archaic period[123]. It was during this period that Old Comedy's poetic precursors, such as iambography, tragedy, κῶμος song, and choral lyric, were thriving or on the rise. Expulsion and its inextricable relation to food, then, may prove useful for future research seeking to trace the diachronic development of the comic play into a unified poetic and political whole.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BERTI 2004 = M. Berti, *Fra tirannide e democrazia*, Alessandria 2004.

BONNECHERE 1994 = P. Bonnechere, *Le sacrifice humain en Grèce ancienne*, Liège 1994.

BOWIE 2007 = E. Bowie, *Early Expatriates*, in J. Gaertner (ed.), *Writing Exile*, Leiden/Boston 2007, 21-49.

BREMMER 1983 = J. Bremmer, *Scapegoat Rituals in Ancient Greece*, "HSPh" 87 (1983), 299-320.

BRENNE 2001 = S. Brenne, *Ostrakismos und Prominenz in Athen*, Wien 2001.

BRENNE 2018 = S. Brenne, *Die Ostraka vom Kerameikos*, 2 voll., Wiesbaden 2018.

BURKERT 1972 = W. Burkert, *Homo Necans*, Berlin/New York 1972.

BURKERT 1977 = W. Burkert, *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche*, Stuttgart/Berlin 1977.

---

[122] Vd. n. 105 above.

[123] Cf. FORSDYKE 2005, 8.

BURKERT 1979 = W. Burkert, *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual*, Berkeley/Los Angeles 1979.

CASANOVA 2003 = A. Casanova, *Osservazioni sui frammenti del* Tereo, in G. Avezzù (ed.), *Il dramma sofocleo.* Atti del Seminario Internazionale (Verona, 24-26 gennaio 2002), Stuttgart 2003, 59-68.

CHEPEL 2020 = E. Chepel, *Laughter for the Gods*, Liège 2020.

CLAVAUD 1987 = R. Clavaud, *Démosthène*, Paris 1987.

CONINGTON 1852 = J. Conington, *Epistola critica de quibusdam Aeschyli, Sophoclis, Euripidis fragmentum*, New York 1852.

COMPTON 2006 = T. Compton, *Victim of the Muses*, Washington 2006.

DE STEFANI 1998 = C. De Stefani, *Una nota a Sofocle fr. 581 Radt*, "Maia" 50 (1998), 427-431.

DEUBNER 1932 = L. Deubner, *Attische Feste*, Berlin 1932.

DMITRIEV 2015 = S. Dmitriev, *Athenian* Atimia *and Legislation Against Tyranny and Subversion*, "CQ" 65.1 (2015), 35-50.

DOBROV 1993 = G. Dobrov, *The Tragic and the Comic Tereus*, "AJPh" 114.2 (1993), 189-234.

DOMINGO 2015 = E. Domingo, *Algunas observaciones sobre la «atimía»*, "CFC(G)" 25 (2015), 85-113.

DUNBAR 1995 = N. Dunbar, *Aristophanes. Birds*, Oxford 1995.

DUNBAR 1996 = N. Dunbar, Sophia *in Aristophanes'* Birds, "SCI" 15 (1996), 61-71.

FARAONE 2004 = C. Faraone, *Hipponax Fragment 128W*, "Cl Ant" 23.2 (2004), 209-245.

FARMER 2017 = M. Farmer, *Tragedy on the Comic Stage*, New York 2017.

FITZPATRICK 2001 = D. Fitzpatrick, *Sophocles'* Tereus, "CQ" 51.1 (2001), 90-101.

FOLEY 1993 = H. Foley, *Oedipus as* Pharmakos, in R. Rosen, J. Farrell (edd.), *Nomodeiktes: Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald*, Ann Arbor 1993, 525-538.

FORSDYKE 2005 = S. Forsdyke, *Exile, Ostracism, and Democracy*, Princeton/Oxford 2005.

GEBHARD 1926 = V. Gebhard, *Die Pharmakoi in Ionien und die Sybakchoi in Athen*, München 1926.

GERBER 1970 = D. Gerber, *Euterpe*, Amsterdam 1970.

GREEN 1894 = W. C. Green, *The* Birds *of Aristophanes*, Cambridge 1894.

HARRISON 1922 = J. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the study of Greek Religion*, Cambridge 1922.

HUBBARD 1991 = T. Hubbard, *The Mask of Comedy*, Ithaca/London 1991.

HUGHES 1991 = D. Hughes, *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece*, London/New York 1991.

JACOBY 1959 = F. Jacoby, *Diagoras* ὁ ἄθεος, Berlin 1959.

JOHNSTON 1991 = S. I. Johnston, *Crossroads*, "ZPE" 88 (1991), 217-224.

KANNICHT 2004 = R. Kannicht, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, vol. V, Göttingen 2004.

KASSEL/AUSTIN 1983- = R. Kassel, C. Austin, *Poetae Comici Graeci*, 8 voll., Berlin/New York 1983-.

KATZ 1976 = B. Katz, *The* Birds *of Aristophanes and Politics*, "Athenaeum" 54 (1976), 353-381.

KISO 1984 = A. Kiso, *The Lost Sophocles*, New York 1984.

KOSMIN 2015 = P. Kosmin, *A Phenomenology of Democracy*, "Cl Ant" 34.1 (2015), 121-162.

KURKE 2011 = L. Kurke, *Aesopic Conversations*, Princeton 2011.

LENFANT 2014 = D. Lenfant, *Le Pseudo-Xénophon et les délits entraînant l'atimie dans l'Athènes de son temps*, "REG" 127.2 (2014), 255-270.

MAFFI 1981 = A. Maffi, Ἀτιμάζειν *e* φεύγειν *nei poemi omerici*, in P. Dimakis (ed.), *Symposion 1979*. Actes du IVᵉ Colloque international de droit grec et hellénistique (Αἴγινα, 3-7 Septembre 1979), Αθήνα 1981, 249-260.

MASSON 1949 = O. Masson, *Sur un papyrus contenant des fragments d'Hipponax* (P. Oxy. *XVIII. 2176)*, "REG" 62.291/293 (1949), 300-319.

MASTELLARI 2016 = V. Mastellari, *Middle Comedy*, "AAntHung" 56 (2016), 421-433.

MAYER 1892 = M. Mayer, *Mythistorica*, "Hermes" 27 (1892), 481-515.

MCCRACKEN 2014 = J. McCracken, *Dogs and Birds in Plato*, "Ph&Lit" 38.2 (2014), 446-461.

MCLEAN 1996 = B. McLean, *The Cursed Christ*, Sheffield 1996.

MEIGGS 1972 = R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire*, Oxford 1972.

MERRY 1896 = W. W. Merry, *Aristophanes: The* Birds, Oxford 1896.

MILO 2008 = D. Milo, *Il* Tereo *di Sofocle*, Napoli 2008.

MUELLER 1995 = K. Mueller, *Petronii Arbitri* Satyricon *Reliquiae*, Stuttgart/Leipzig 1995.

NILSSON 1967 = M. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, München 1967.

NOVOTNÝ 2014 = M. Novotný, *Andocides on* ἀτιμία *and the term* πρόσταξις, "Eirene" 50.1-2 (2014), 61-88.

ORFANOS 1998 = C. Orfanos, *L'épisode du Parricide dans les* Oiseaux *d'Aristophane (vers 1337-71)*, "Pallas" 48 (1998), 119-134.

PARKER 1983 = R. Parker, *Miasma*, Oxford 1983.

PARKER 2005 = R. Parker, *Polytheism and Society at Athens*, Oxford 2005.

PFEIFFER 1949 = R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus*, Oxford 1949.

PUCCI 1990 = P. Pucci, *The Tragic* Pharmakos *of the* Oedipus Rex, "Helios" 17.1 (1990), 41-49.

RADT 1977 = S. Radt, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, vol. IV, Göttingen 1977.

REVERMANN 2006 = M. Revermann, *Comic Business*, Oxford 2006.

ROMER 1994 = F. E. Romer, *Atheism, Impiety and the* Limos Mêlios *in Aristophanes'* Birds, "AJPh" 115.3 (1994), 351-365.

ROMER 1997 = F. E. Romer, *Good Intentions and the* ὁδὸς ἡ ἐς κόρακας, in G. Dobrov (ed.), *The City as Comedy*, Chapel Hill/London 1997, 51-74.

ROSE 1886 = V. Rose, *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta*, Leipzig 1886.

ROSEN 1988 = R. Rosen, *Old Comedy and the Iambographic Tradition*, Atlanta 1988.

ROUX 1964 = G. Roux, *Hipponax Redivivus*, "REA" 66.1-2 (1964), 121-131.

RUFFELL 2013 = I. Ruffell, *Humiliation?: Voyeurism, Violence, and Humor in Old Comedy*, "Helios" 40.1-2 (2013), 247-277.

SACCO 2018 = L. Sacco, *Il* pharmakos *nelle fonti antiche e nella Storia delle religioni*, "Mythos" 12 (2018), 103-115.

SLATER 2017 = N. Slater, *What Language Did the Shuttle Speak?*, in Luca Austa (ed.), *Frammenti sulla scena I*, Alessandria 2017, 59-75.

SNELL/MAEHLER 1984 = B. Snell, H. Maehler, *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*, Leipzig 1984.

SOMMERSTEIN 1987 = A. Sommerstein, *Aristophanes,* Birds, Warminster 1987.

SOMMERSTEIN 2014 = A. Sommerstein, *The authenticity of the Demophantus decree*, "CQ" 64.1 (2014), 49-57.

STOREY 2011 = I. Storey, *Fragments of Old Comedy*, Cambridge, Massachusetts/London 2011.

SWOBODA 1893 = H. Swoboda, *Arthmios von Zeleia*, "Archaeologisch-epigraphische Mittheilungen" 16 (1893), 49-68.

USSHER 1973 = R. G. Ussher, *Aristophanes. Ecclesiazusae*, Oxford 1973.

VAN 'T WOUT 2011a = P. E. van 't Wout, *Neglected Evidence for the Nature of Atimia*, "ZPE" 176 (2011), 126-134.

VAN 'T WOUT 2011b = P. E. van 't Wout, *From Oath-swearing to Entrenchment Clause,* in A. Lardinois, J. Blok, M. van der Poel (edd.), *Sacred Words*, Leiden/Boston 2011, 143-160.

VERNANT/DUBOIS 1978 = J.-P. Vernant, P. duBois, *Ambiguity and Reversal*, "New Literary History" 9.3 (1978), 475-501.

VERNANT/VIDAL-NAQUET 1986 = J.-P. Vernant, P. Vidal-Naquet, *Mythe et tragédie en Grèce ancienne*, vol. II, Paris 1986.

VERSNEL 1977 = H. Versnel, *Polycrates and His Ring*, "SMSR" 1 (1977), 17-46.

WEST 1971-1972 = M. L. West, *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati*, 2 voll., Oxford 1971-1972.

WHITMARSH 2016 = T. Whitmarsh, *Diagoras, Bellerophon, and the Siege of Olympus*, "JHS" 136 (2016), 182-186.

WIECHERS 1961 = A. Wiechers, *Aesop in Delphi*, Meisenheim 1961.

WILKINS 2000a = J. Wilkins, *The Boastful Chef*, Oxford 2000.

WILKINS 2000b = J. Wilkins, *Edible Choruses*, in D. Harvey, J. Wilkins (edd.), *The Rivals of Aristophanes: Studies in Athenian Old Comedy*, London 2000, 341-354.

WINIARCZYK 1980 = M. Winiarczyk, *Diagoras von Melos*, "Eos" 68 (1980), 51-75.

WOODBURY 1965 = L. Woodbury, *The date and atheism of Diagoras of Melos*, "Phoenix" 19 (1965), 178-211.