

ARISTOPHANES' COMIC POETICS:
ΤΡΥΞ, SCATOLOGY, ΣΚΩΜΜΑ

ANTHONY T. EDWARDS

The University of California at San Diego

I

While Aristophanes, particularly in *Frogs*, is one of our earliest witnesses for explicit literary theory and criticism, his plays, as comic texts, present difficulties beyond other sources for ancient views of poetry. Aristophanes' mixture of serious assertions with comic absurdities is exemplified by his coinage τρυγφδία, a comic play upon τραγφδία. The associations of τρύξ with the vine and Dionysiac revelry designate comedy through this compound as a ludicrous and vulgar twin of its noble sister tragedy. Yet, as Taplin has shown, through this comic expression Aristophanes claims for his genre the same prerogative to high themes of civic importance as that conceded to tragedy.¹ The conflicting implications built into the word epitomize the general tension in Aristophanes' plays between comedy as low and vulgar, rustic buffoonery, and comedy as a sophisticated dramatic form utilizing public-spirited themes and offering timely political advice. The result is an apparent irony in Aristophanes' characterization of his genre. Is he being slyly coy in insincerely belittling his comic muse? Or are Aristophanes' protestations of high civic motives and themes made only with tongue in cheek? Certainly Aristophanes' coyness and irony cannot be overlooked as he comments upon comedy within comedy. Upon close examination, however, the humorous paradoxes plaguing Aristophanes' characterization of comedy appear to comprise not so much nonsense as a coherent conception of his comic genre.

II Τρύξ

Τρύξ and Comedy

Another compound formed on τρύξ, one presupposing τρυγφδία, appears in the parodos of *Clouds*. In the course of this scene Socrates utters a line which is both a response to Strepsiades within the dramatic context and at the same time a comment upon the comic genre itself. As the Cloud chorus begins to enter the theater, Socrates asks if Strepsiades hears their "voice along with the divine bellowing thunder" (292). Strepsiades answers that he wants "to fart back (ἀνταποπαρδεῖν) in response to the thunder" (293–94), and continues that whether it is permitted (θέμις) or not, he wants to defecate (χεσεῖω) as well (295). Socrates rebukes Strepsiades:

¹ O. Taplin, "Tragedy and Trugedy," *CQ* ns 23 (1983) 331–33.

οὐ μὴ σκώπει, μηδὲ ποιήσεις ἅπερ οἱ τρυγοδαίμονες οὗτοι·
(296).

Don't mock, and don't do the sort of thing those *trugodaimones* do.

Strepsiades' comment is clearly a piece of buffoonery, a "βωμολόχευμα," which degrades the speaker himself, but whose implications exceed not only his limited intentions but the boundaries of the dramatic, fictive context as well. Within the comic structure of the scene, Strepsiades' crudity undermines the sanctimonious aura of the moment and deflates the self-importance of a comic charlatan. From an immediate historical perspective, moreover, Strepsiades' lines constitute a scatological attack early in the play's action upon the historical Socrates. Strepsiades, who expresses in the scene the outlook of the typical unsophisticated Athenian, ridicules Socrates for his apparent arrogance, eccentricity, and strange beliefs.² At the generic level, finally, the passage slyly presents the scornful indignation of a severe and smug ἀλαζών, "Socrates," at the buffoonish vulgarity and impropriety of comedy itself, perhaps parodically mirroring the estimation of a Socrates, or other victim of comic mockery, of the genre which abuses him. *Clouds* 296 not only responds to Strepsiades in context, but also comments upon comedy itself.

Socrates' response to these vulgarities introduces two important terms connecting Strepsiades' scatology with the comic genre. His vulgarity is labeled a σκῶμμα, mockery or ridicule, and is disdainfully equated with what "those τρυγοδαίμονες"—comic poets—do. I wish to consider in turn each of these elements as it is associated by Aristophanes with comedy: τρύξις—both the new wine and the lees—from which the compound τρυγοδαίμονες is formed; scatology; and the σκῶμμα, the distinctive comic mockery.

Socrates rebukes Strepsiades for his coarse scatology by reference to what "τρυγοδαίμονες" do (...μηδὲ ποιήσεις ἅπερ οἱ τρυγοδαίμονες οὗτοι: 296). The word τρυγοδαίμων is a comic compound for "comic poet." The -δαίμων component of the expression is modeled on κακοδαίμων, and indicates Socrates' disdain for comedy generally, and for Strepsiades' statement in particular. The τρυγ- component is more complex, but also much richer in its implications.

Aristophanes puns frequently on the similarity of this τρυγ- stem to τραγ-, upon which τραγῳδία is formed: e.g., τρυγικός (*Ach.*, 628); τρυγῳδία (*Ach.*, 499, 500); τρυγῳδικός (*Ach.*, 886); τρυγῳδός (*Wasps.*, 650, 1537; fr. 156.9); τρυγῳδοποιουμουσική (fr. 347.1).³ Through this pun on

² Note the effect upon Socrates' reputation attributed by Plato to *Clouds* and other comedies at *Apology* 18B4–20C2. Plato may exaggerate here for reasons of his own, but he can at least be expected to formulate an argument that would appear generally credible as regards the damage done to personal reputations by comic attacks.

³ Unless noted, comic fragments are referred to by the numbers in the edition of R. Kassel and C. Austin, *Poetae Comici Graeci*, vol. 3.2–5 (Berlin 1986–). H. Foley's argument that τρυγῳδία has the specific connotation of "paratragedy" ("Tragedy and Politics in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*," *JHS* 108 [1988], 34–35 with note 14) is convincing for *Ach.* 499 and 500, upon which she focuses, but is not supported by other occurrences of puns on τρυγ-, all of which refer to comedy in general.

trag- comedy is identified, as a sort of anti-tragedy, with τρύξ—both the unstrained new wine and the dregs remaining in the jar after the wine has been poured off. In Pickard-Cambridge's formulation "...trygoidia was probably in origin simply a comic parody of *tragoidia*, giving to comedy a name which was both ludicrous and also suggestive of wine and the wine-god in whose honor the performance took place."⁴ For Aristophanes, τρύξ serves in these compounds as an emblem of comedy itself.

As Pickard-Cambridge suggests, τρύξ is attractive for such a coinage because it is connected with wine while permitting as well a pun on τραγ-. Yet comedy has no more claim upon the patronage of the wine god than does its putative opposite, tragedy. A closer look at the connotations of τρύξ is needed to understand its attraction as an emblem of comedy. Τρύξ has somewhat contradictory associations. It is the must, or new wine, suggesting the abundance and fertility of both the grape harvest and the festivities of the Anthesteria in the month between the two dramatic festivals when the new wine was first tasted.⁵ But it is also the dregs of the wine, a useless residue in comparison to the wine itself. On the one hand, then, τρύξ is the surplus produced by the fertility of the land, and linked to the words τρυγᾶν and τρύγη, "to harvest" and "fruit, crop." On the other hand, the τρύξ is what is left over, residual, and so has an extended meaning of "refuse."⁶ While Taplin is of the opinion that τρυγῳδία is a compound of τρύγη, exploiting only the connotation of fertile abundance, Pickard-Cambridge supposes, correctly I think, that it is formed from τρύξ.⁷ In fact, both denotations of τρύξ contribute to the meaning of "τρυγῳδία".

Τρύξ Negative and Positive

Aristophanes uses τρύξ with the sense of "new wine" in *Peace*, when Trygaeus recalls feasting during peace time upon τῆς τρυγός τε τῆς γλυκείας

⁴ A. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb, Tragedy, and Comedy*² (Oxford 1962) 186. See the discussions of comedy's pose in relation to tragedy by Taplin, (above, note 1) 331–33, and Foley, (above, note 3) 38–43. While a great deal of wine was apparently consumed in the course of both the Lenaea and City Dionysia festivals, neither seems to have been in any direct way a celebration of wine. See A. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*² (Oxford 1968) 29–35; H. W. Parke, *Festivals of the Athenians* (Ithaca 1977) 105–6. The name Lenaea was, however, linked in antiquity with ληνός, "winepress," rather than with λῆναι, "maenads," as it is now explained; see Pickard-Cambridge, *DFE*, 25–29, items 1.b, 4, 19Σ.

⁵ Parke, (above, note 4) 106–20.

⁶ K. Kerényi, "Parva Realia," *Symbolae Osloenses* 36 (1960) 9, suggests that so long as the fermenting wine is unclarified, τρύξ refers to both the liquid and the sediment suspended in it, but after the wine has clarified and been racked off, it is the τρύξ that remains behind as the lees.

⁷ See Taplin, (above, note 1) 333; Pickard-Cambridge, *DTC*, 74–76. Both Chantraine (*Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, vol. 1–4 [1968–77], s.v.) and Frisk (*Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. 1–3 [Heidelberg 1960–72] s.v.) derive all of these comic τρυγ- compounds from τρύξ. While the etymology of both τρύξ and τρύγη remains uncertain, Chantraine and Frisk agree that the two words must be related.

("the sweet *trux*:" 576) amidst a long list of other delicacies.⁸ Τρύξ occurs in a parallel context in a fragment from *Islands* (402) in which the speaker longs for peace, the countryside, plentiful food, and τρυγός τε φωνήν εἰς λεκάνην ὠθομένης ("the voice of the *trux* being dumped into the pot"), and again in a fragment from *Farmers* (111) where the speaker prays to Peace to return to the fields, where he can eat good food and διελκύσαι / τῆς τρυγός ("have a pull on the *trux* "). In a fragment from Cratinus' *Horae* (269), the speaker similarly recalls his friend at a banquet ἔλκων τῆς τρυγός ("tugging on the *trux* "). Anacreon too refers to drinking τρύγα...μελιηδέα ("*trux* sweet as honey") at what may be a symposium (352 [Page]). In these passages in which τρύξ denotes the new wine, it is characterized as sweet, and linked to peace, the farm, and banquet or symposium.⁹ Τρύξ is used metaphorically with the meaning "new wine" in *Wasps* when Lysistratus mocks Philocleon ξοικας, ὦ πρεσβυτα, νεοπλούτῳ τρυγί ("You, old man, are like newly wealthy *trux*," 1309). Lysistratus uses τρύξ in the sense of "new wine" here to refer not simply to youth, but to the energetic and unrestrained exuberance of a young man just made head of the household.¹⁰ Peace, the countryside, the banquet, and youth, all fundamental values of Aristophanic comedy, are expressed through the image of τρύξ as the new wine, an aspect related to τρύγη/τρυγᾶν.

Polyzelus (fr. 12 Kock), however, opposes τρύξ to the new wine when he describes some people as ἀλλ' οὐ τρυγερούς τὰ φθέγματ' οὐδὲ γλύξιδας: "not thick (like lees) in voice and not sweet (like must)." Here an adjectival form of τρύξ is contrasted as the lees, an unwanted residue, with the new wine from which it must be separated. So, Archilochus calls for wine to be passed among the rowers with the words: ἄγρει δ' οἶνον ἱερυθρὸν ἀπὸ τρυγός ("draw the red wine off from the dregs," fr. 4.8 [West]). The distinction between the wine itself and the τρύξ is unmistakable here.¹¹ This same contrast between τρύξ as lees and τρύξ as wine occurs in a metaphorical sense in a passage from *Wealth* in which Chremylus attempts to persuade a young gigolo not to abandon his decrepit lover:

Χρεμύλος	ὅμως δ' ἐπειδὴ καὶ τὸν οἶνον ἡξίους πίνειν, συνεκποτέ' ἐστί σοι καὶ τὴν τρύγα.
Νεανίας	ἀλλ' ἐστὶ κομιδὴ τρὺξ παλαιὰ καὶ σαπρά.

(1084-6)

⁸ For instances where "τρύξ" can only refer to new wine, see Cicero's κατ' ὀπώρην τρύξ ("ferment in autumn"; *ad Att.* 2.12.3) and Hesychius' τρυγά· οἶνον ἀδιηθητόν ἀπὸ ληνοῦ ("wine unstrained from the pressing").

⁹ Regarding the rustic connotations of drinking must, cf. γλευκοπόταις σατύροισι (*A.P.* 6.44) and Πάν...ἐγχθονίου γλευκοπότης κύλικος (*A.Pl.* 235.5-6).

¹⁰ D. M. MacDowell, *Aristophanes Wasps* (Oxford 1971) ad loc., adequately defends the manuscript reading against Kock's emendation Φρυγί.

¹¹ This same contrast is also evident at Aristotle *Prob.* 926B37 and Hipp. *Nat. Mul.* 97.10. Semonides, fr. 25 (West), also uses τρύξ with the meaning "dregs". Elsewhere, τρύξ designates the lees of other liquids: Hipp. *Liqu.* 4.10; Hdt. 4.23.3. Nicander refers to iron dross as τρύξ (*Al.* 51) and Hippocrates even uses the word to refer to feces: *Epid.* 5.79.

- Chremylus: "Still, since you thought the wine worth
drinking, you've got to drain the *trux* (lees) as well."
Youth: "But this is altogether old and putrid *trux* (new
wine)."

This passage is of interest in the first place since it contrasts wine as youth with τρύξ (lees) as old age. In the youth's response, moreover, Chremylus' use of τρύξ to mean lees is countered by its alternative meaning of must (i.e., youth).¹² This exchange contrasts sharply with the passage from *Wasps* (1309) quoted above, in which τρύξ as "new wine" is a metaphor for brash youth. Here the invitation to swallow the dregs expresses sexual union with the hag, and so the youth exploits the oxymoron "old and putrid must" through a play upon the alternative meaning of τρύξ in order to reject this unattractive proposition. As we see, then, the opposed denotations of τρύξ, both "must" and "lees," are reflected in the extended meanings and connotations of the word. As must, τρύξ is identified with youth, fertility, satiety, and sexual fulfillment. As the dregs, it is linked to notions of residual sediment, refuse, old age.

Ambiguity of Τρύξ

The phrase τρυγωδίαν ποιῶν at *Acharnians* 499 is explained by the scholiast (Σ 499a REΓ) thus: "'Comedy': either because they received τρύξ as a prize—that is, new wine—or because they smeared their faces with τρύξ [i.e., lees] since there were no masks in the old days."¹³ The scholiast refers to two traditions regarding the origin of the word τρυγωδία, based upon the two meanings of the word τρύξ, must and lees. While these two accounts are most likely inventions attempting to historicize a comic parody of τραγωδία, they are of interest for illustrating the uncertainty about the meaning of τρύξ as it is associated with comedy.¹⁴ Thus, in Pickard-Cambridge's view, τρυγωδός "...may mean the 'singer at the vintage' just as well as the 'singer stained with wine lees'..." (*DTC*, 123). This same ambiguity is evident in a passage from *Clouds* in which Strepsiades recalls the happy life of the country:

ἐμοὶ γὰρ ἦν ἄγροικος ἥδιστος βίος,
εὐρωτιῶν, ἀκόρητος, εἰκῇ κείμενος,
βρώων μελίτταις καὶ προβάτοις καὶ στεμφύλοις.

.....
[ἐγὼ] ὄζων τρυγός, τρασιᾶς, ἐρίων, περιουσίας
(43–45, 50).

¹² See MacDowell ad *Wasps* 1309, but noting that by his own argument τρυγά in 1085 clearly does connote "old age" in contrast to the οἶνον of 1084. Chremylus' recommendation of a τρύγοιπος in 1087 secures the meaning of "new wine" (= "youth") for τρύξ in 1086 since a lees strainer is useful only with new, unclarified wine. Since, moreover, old age (= lees) is generically παλαιός and σαπρός (cf. *Wasps* 1343 with MacDowell's note), there is not much punch to these epithets if τρύξ in 1086 is taken as lees (= "old age"), as it must be taken in 1085.

¹³ I refer throughout to *Scholia in Aristophanem*, edidit edendave curavit W. J. W. Koster (Groningen 1960–).

¹⁴ See the discussion of these two traditions at Pickard-Cambridge *DTC*, 74–80, 185–86, and his judgment of their historicity.

"I had the sweetest life, a peasant's—
mouldy, unswept, lying in disarray,
burgeoning with honey bees, flocks, and olive cakes

.....

(but I) smelling of *trux*, fig crates, wool, plenty."

The description mingles the teaming plenty of the country (βρύων...) with a life which is in disarray, moulding, in decay (εὐρωτιῶν). Strepsiades summarizes with the term περιουσία, "plenty," the pungent odors of the fields: wool fleeces, fig racks, and τρύξ. The undercurrent of squalor and disorder in this celebration of country life should not be missed.¹⁵ But what is the meaning of τρύξ in this passage from *Clouds*—must or lees?

Aristophanes offers parallels to this ambivalent evaluation of country life elsewhere. In a fragment from *Farmers* (fr. 111) the speaker dreams with equal desire not only of the leisure and plenty of the country (including τρύξ, new wine: 111.4), but also of the hard and dirty (λουσαμένῳ, 111.3) labor of ploughing, spading, and pruning. In a passage from *Peace*, Trygaeus enumerates the odors of the exhumed goddess:

...ὀπώρας, ὑποδοχῆς, Διονυσίων

.....

κιττοῦ, τρυγοῖπου, προβατίων βληχωμένων,
κόλπου γυναικῶν διατρεχουσῶν εἰς ἀγρόν,
δούλης μεθουούσης, ἀνατετραμμένου χοῶς,
ἄλλων τε πολλῶν κάγαθῶν. (530, 535–38)

"...of harvest, of entertainment, of Dionysia

.....

of ivy, of a lees strainer (*trugoipou*), of bleating sheep,
of the breast of women running into the fields;
of a drunken slave girl, of an overturned pitcher,
and of many other good things."

Trygaeus' catalogue proceeds from the odors of festivities such as harvest, party, and (rural) Dionysia to the more rank-smelling accoutrements of ivy and lees strainer, and then to sheep, and the aromas of sexual stimulation and intoxication.¹⁶ Aristophanes' conception of the odors of the country is richly comprehensive and realistic. The powerful forces of fertility and abundance are intertwined in the life of the countryside with the notion of decay and the pungent odors of livestock and the human body.

This mingling of the country's fertility and abundance with its squalor and putrefaction in Strepsiades' praise of the countryside recapitulates the apparently opposite meanings of τρύξ, and leads back to the meaning of that word in Strepsiades *laus ruris* at *Clouds* 43–50. The R scholia explain τρυγός in line 50

¹⁵ This is emphasized in the scholiast's (Σ NM) comment upon line 44: "The explanation of 'moulding' is 'lying in disarray,' since moisture and perspiration collects upon things lying carelessly in disarray. Peasants live that way, but city people live conscientiously and permit nothing to lie around superfluous, which is why their lifestyle is cleanly."

¹⁶ The parallels to 536–37 cited by J. van Leeuwen, *Aristophanis Pax* (Leiden 1906) underline this element of sexual revelry.

as νέου οἴνου ("new wine"), but the V scholia add to this notice ἢ τῆς ὑποστάθμης ("or else 'the dregs'"). Whether must or dregs is more suitable to this vision of country life is uncertain, since the rotten waste of decomposition is mingled there with the vital productivity of nature. Τρύξ is integrated through these associations into comedy's general vision of the countryside as a locus of satiety, fertility, ease, intoxication, the festival, and laughter. The simple contradiction of opposed meanings, dregs/new wine, is inscribed within a conception of the country comprehending the notions both of refuse and harvest. Indeed, within this rich juxtaposition of decomposition and generation, the paradox of τρύξ as simultaneously the name of a valued necessity of life and of a residual waste product seems less insistent. It is the cycle implied here and its associated values that Aristophanes attaches, through the compound τρυγοδαίμονες and related puns, to comedy itself at the moment of Socrates' objection to Strepsiades' scatological humor. As an image τρύξ encodes the opposing estimations of comedy as fertile, festive, and liberating, versus comedy as the low-brow twin of tragedy, a dealer in impropriety and scandalous ridicule.

III Comic Scatology

Comedy and Scatology

Socrates' response to Strepsiades' crude language that he not do "the sort of thing those *trugodaimones* do" (μηδὲ ποιήσεις ἄπερ οἱ τρυγοδαίμονες οὗτοι: *Clouds* 296) receives the following comment in the Triclinian scholia (296c): "Because other comic poets in their comedies were constantly bringing on men defecating and performing other shameful acts." Triclinius' comment, preserving an older judgment (cf. *Σ Vet.* 296b–d), calls attention to the utter conventionality of such scenes, and so to their popularity as comic fare, while Socrates' interdiction betrays a simultaneous disapproval of such scatology. The notice goes on to mention Aristophanes' contemporaries Eupolis and Cratinus in particular, though Aristophanes himself hardly avoided this comic device.¹⁷ Exemplary is the opening of *Peace* (1–42), in which the ambiguity of this substance is also apparent. The two slaves preparing and delivering the dung cakes regard it as repulsive waste—in desperation one calls upon the ἄνδρες κοπρολόγοι (9), the dung collectors, to make a pick-up. Yet they offer it as food to the beetle, the comic Pegasus who enables Trygaeus to save Greece.¹⁸ The contradictory character of feces in comedy, popular yet disapproved of, is perhaps emblemized in general by the basket of the dung collector in which dung is carried away as an unwanted waste, but in which it is at the same time collected as a valuable resource. This double evaluation of excrement manifests itself both in the day to day life of the ancient Greeks as well as in the role of scatological humor in comedy.

¹⁷ See J. Taillardat, *Les Images d'Aristophane: Études de langue et de style*² (Paris 1965) 71. See also Ussher's note (R. G. Ussher, *Aristophanes Ecclesiazusae* [Oxford 1973]) ad 311–13. For a general discussion of the essential role played by obscene and scatological language in Aristophanes' comedy, see J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse* (Yale 1975) 24–35, 54, 142–43.

¹⁸ See Trygaeus' elaboration of this theme at 137–39.

The intrinsic comic potential of feces is illustrated through a bit of esoteric information given Strepsiades by the phrontisterion's door keeper. The night before, as Socrates gaped up into the heavens searching out the orbit of the moon, a lizard defecated into his open mouth (169–73). Strepsiades reacts to the story with glee (174). Within the scene, the anecdote is unmotivated, and so gratuitous. It serves to degrade and ridicule Socrates and his philosophical researches through its remarkable vulgarity alone, and thus exemplifies the comic force of feces outside any more sophisticated or comprehensive context of humor or criticism. Strepsiades' simple-minded pleasure in the story, moreover, reflects the reaction of spontaneous hilarity such jokes might arouse in a comic audience towards a figure like Socrates.¹⁹ So in a vivid passage from Eubulus' *Cercopes* praising the Thebans for having toilets in their houses we are told that "there is no greater good than this for a mortal when he is full since a man who needs to shit, walking bow-legged, sweating (?) all over, and biting his lip, is altogether laughable to see." (παγγέλοιός ἐστ' ἰδεῖν: fr. 52. 3–6). Laughter erupts spontaneously in response to the transgression of a fundamental standard of comportment, the prescribed mode for treating defecation and excrement. Feces are intrinsically funny on the comic stage as these passages attest.

A direct link between comedy and scatological language is clearly indicated by the degree to which Aristophanes' protagonists monopolize its use. In the plays in which scatology is most important it is Dicaeopolis, Sausageseller, Trygaeus, Dionysus, Blepyrus, and Carion and Chremylus who control this language.²⁰ This equation of scatology with the comic genre emerges explicitly in Socrates' objection at *Clouds* 296 to Strepsiades' rustic humor that he not do as "those τρυγοδαίμονες" do. This same identification is repeated in Aristophanes' most elaborate scatological routine (*Eccl.* 313–71). Blepyrus' opening soliloquy and conversation with his neighbor are motivated and repeatedly interrupted by the theme of his need to defecate and his frustrating constipation. As dawn breaks and the city's streets come to life, Blepyrus beseeches the goddess Eleithyia that she not abandon him to his condition "so that I don't end up a comic shit pot" (σκωραμὶς κωμωδική, 371). As Taillardat explains, if Blepyrus remains in the street in his present posture he will arouse the laughter of passers-by as surely as the perennial chamber pot amuses a comic audience.²¹ Blepyrus speaks of the σκωραμὶς as a virtual emblem for comedy as a whole. Aristophanes self-consciously comments upon

¹⁹ Cf. the passing jibes at Cinesias (*Frogs* 366 and *Ecc.* 329–30), the chorus' mocking attack on Antimachus at *Ach.* 1164–72, or Carion's description of Asclepius as a σκατοφάγος ("shit-eater") at *Wealth* 706.

²⁰ See in this regard Henderson's discussion, (above, note 17) 56–107, upon which I rely. The association of comedy and scatology is also evidenced by the exploitation of feces as a material of ridicule and comic refutation. See, e.g., *Kn.* 997–98, 1057, *Peace* 1235–37, *Wasps* 625–26, *Birds* 1116–17, *Frogs* 1074–76, 1089–98, *Eccl.* 588–96, 638–40, and *Wealth* 313.

²¹ Taillardat, (above, note 17) 71 n. 1. Taillardat goes on to list a few relevant Aristophanic scenes. Aeschylus reinforces this identification of comedy with κόπρος in his reference to a chamber pot as a βέλος / γελωτοποιόν (a "hilarious missile": fr. 180); so also Sophocles fr. 565. (I cite from *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, B. Snell, R. Kannicht, S. Radt, edd. vol. 1–4 [Göttingen 1971–].)

his genre in this passage by designating the chamber pot, and the sort of humor it implies, as something innately comic through the epithet *κωμωδική*.

The link between scatology and comedy is also asserted in the opening lines of *Frogs*. After Xanthias, laden with baggage, offers to tell one of the conventional jokes (τι τῶν εἰωθότων) guaranteed to raise a laugh with the audience (1–2), Dionysus introduces a series of scatological gags only to forbid each in turn (πιέζομαι, 3; θλίβομαι, 5; χεζητιᾶς, 8).²² Finally Xanthias objects in frustration:

τί δῆτ' ἔδει με ταῦτα τὰ σκεύη φέρειν,
εἴπερ πόησω μηδὲν ὥνπερ Φρύνιχος
εἴωθε ποιεῖν καὶ Λύκις κάμειψίας
σκεύη φέρουσ' ἐκάστοτ' ἐν κωμωδίᾳ; (12–15)

"What do I need to carry all this baggage for
if I'm not going to do any of what Phrynichus,
Lycus, and Ameipsius always do
each time they carry baggage in a comedy?"

Xanthias identifies as intrinsically comic precisely the sort of scatological jokes mentioned by Dionysus, and backs his assertion up with reference to the customary practice of rival comedians. Indeed, the logic of his objection betrays that the purpose of the baggage is, in fact, to provide a pretext for these scatological jokes. Xanthias accuses Dionysus of effectively denying him access to the common vocabulary of comedy, which is a scatological vocabulary.

Scatology Negative and Positive

If feces are intrinsically comic and scatology is identified as integral to the language of comedy, still the evaluation of feces and scatology by Aristophanes is complex. In a brief fragment (43 Kock) Strattis sums up elegantly the negative evaluation of excrement: οὐδ' ἐν κοπρίᾳ θησαυρὸν ἐκβεβλημένον—"treasure isn't tossed in a dung pit." The opposition here between the value and desirability of a treasure and the repulsiveness of excrement is absolute. Anything of value ought on account of that very quality to be kept free of dung. So, Trygaeus degrades and banishes the armorer by defecating in his breastplate (*Peace* 1226–37), and Strepsiades challenges his son to eat dung if he will copy roosters in every way (*Clouds* 1430–31). Excrement is characterized as worthless and defiling, a material that must be segregated from the interior of the house and contact with the body. Indeed, the available evidence indicates that it was illegal to defecate in public places in Athens, and that a service was organized to collect septic refuse and remove it from the city. As Henderson

²² The tedium Dionysus exhibits toward these jokes of course testifies to their ubiquity. That Dionysus, god of drama, forbids this sort of humor in his pose as a high-brow critic even as he tells them, and continues to dominate the use of scatological jokes throughout the play (Henderson, [above, note 17] 91–93) indicates the ambiguous character of this sort of humor for Aristophanes. Regarding Aristophanes' occasional disavowals of scatological humor, see note 17 above.

suggests, the humor of defecatory jokes and routines relies upon the fact that feces and defecation are always out of place in any social context whatever.²³

Strattis' formulation seems, however, to be contradicted by an odd collocation in the description from *Acharnians* of the Persian king. After four years the Athenian ambassadors arrive at his court to find that he has left with his army for the outhouse, *κάχεζεν ὀκτὼ μῆνας ἐπὶ χρυσῶν ὄρων* ("...and he crapped for eight months on the golden mountains," 82). In this play upon the resemblance of excrement to "mountains of gold," leisure and wealth are somehow appropriately associated with the monarch's defecation. Aristophanes seems to have tapped a subterranean link between the apparent opposites, feces and wealth.²⁴ The connection between these two notions is supported historically by the process obverse to that of collecting and removing κόπρος from inhabited areas—namely, the agricultural use of dung as fertilizer. The earliest mention of this practice occurs in the *Odyssey* when the dog Argus is described lying ἐν πολλῇ κόπρῳ ("in a pile of dung") of mules and cattle to be carried away by slaves τέμενος μέγα κοπήσοντες ("to manure the huge estate," 17.296–99). Of relevance to a consideration of Aristophanes' scatological humor is Theophrastus' ranking of the various types of manure: "The most pungent (δριμυτάτη) is that of humans, according to Chartodras this is the very best (ἀρίστην); second is that of hogs..." (*HP* 2.7.4).²⁵ Human excrement, which takes the central place in Aristophanes' scatology, is not excluded from this economy. Indeed, it seems probable that the κοπρολόγοι at Athens and elsewhere sold what they collected in the city to farmers in the countryside.²⁶

²³ Henderson, (above, note 17) 187. Regarding the management of public sanitation, see: E. J. Owens, "Koprologoi at Athens," *CQ* ns. 23 (1983) 44–50; and C. Vatin, "Jardins et services de voirie," *BCH* 100 (1976) 555–64.

²⁴ The play is upon the color χρύσεος; see W. J. M. Starkie, *The Acharnians of Aristophanes* (London 1909) ad loc.; and the discussion of Henderson, (above, note 17) 189–90, who notes this passage. See also *Peace* 724 where Hermes states that Zeus will feed the dung beetle on the "ambrosia of Ganymede," expressing again the waste/treasure paradox in terms of the fecal economy. This paradoxical economy is beautifully illustrated in the confrontation of the agriculturalist Persians with the pastoralist Ethiopian king at Herodotus, 3.22.4. On the link between these opposed terms, see the illuminating essay of Martin Pops, "The Metamorphoses of Shit," *Home Remedies* (Amherst 1984) 88–116, esp. 106–8. Freud has also noted this paradoxical equation: S. Freud, "Character and Anal Eroticism," *Collected Papers* vol. II⁴ J. Riviere ed. (London 1949) 49–50. Regarding the equation of feces with money or a gift of value bestowed by the child, see "On the Transformation of Instincts with Special Reference to Anal Eroticism," *ibid.*, 168, and *The Complete Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, J. Strachey trans., (NY 1966) 564–65.

²⁵ A fourth century BC inscription from Amorgos requires a lessor to put 150 measures of dung into the soil of a plot per year (*SIG*³ 963, 20–26); cf. *Pap. Fay.* 118.17–20, 119.33–34; and *Brit. Mus. Pap.* 317.6–9. The necessity of manuring fields is also mentioned at Xen. *Oec.* 17.10, 18.2, 20.3–4, 10; Plat. *Prot.* 334A7–B3; Theophr. *CP* 3.9.1–3, *HP* 2.7.1, 7.5.1, 8.6.3, 8.7.7; Hesych. sv κόπρος. The status of dung as the basic form of fertilizer is evidenced by the use of κόπρος as a generic term for "fertilizer" even when other substances are referred to: Xen. *Oec.* 16.12; Theophr. *HP* 8.9.1.

²⁶ For the activities of the κοπρολόγοι, see Owens, (above, note 23) 48; and Vatin, (above, note 23) 556–61.

Aristophanes himself alludes to manuring in two lines from *Lysistrata* (1173–74) exploiting a sexual double entendre. An Athenian exclaims “Undressed and naked, I want to do some plowing (γεωργεῖν).” to which the Spartan responds “And I straightaway some dung-shoveling (κοπραγωγεῖν), by the two gods.” The Athenian’s “plowing” refers to vaginal intercourse as does the Spartan’s “dung-shoveling” to anal intercourse in an exchange in which peace and a return to agricultural labor merge with sexual fulfillment. Both metaphors for sexual activity presuppose the agricultural use of dung to replenish the fertility of the soil.²⁷

The positive associations of excrement in the countryside are summed up in the speech of a ruined farmer begging Dicaeopolis for a share of his treaty as he recalls the prosperity he had before he lost his yoke of oxen: ὥπερ μ’ ἐτρεφέτην / ἐν πᾶσι βολίτοις (“who were keeping me all in cow dung,” 1025–26). The phrase ἐν πᾶσι βολίτοις, like the similar ἐν πᾶσι λαγῶσι (“all in roast hares,” *Wasps* 709), is a variant upon ἐν πᾶσι ἀγαθοῖς (“in all good things”), and thus exploits manure as a rustic image for all the peace and prosperity of country life.²⁸ This positive evaluation of dung as expressive of the abundance of country life must rest in particular upon its use to restore the earth’s productivity. So the scholiast explains the use of βολίτοις at *Acharnians* 1026 “[He said this] because it is by means of dung (διὰ τῆς κόπρου) that farmers cause their seeds to flourish and produce the greatest amount of crops, from which they themselves are nourished.”

Ambiguity of Scatology

As a general image of country life, to pass one’s time ἐν πᾶσι βολίτοις bespeaks satiety and fulfillment. Dung as an emblem for country life expresses a strange mixture of vital growth with squalor and decomposition—the rotten fertility also expressed through the image of τρύξ. Κόπρος is endowed with contradictory evaluations. It is regarded, on the one hand, as absolute waste, useless and always out of place, but, on the other, as the source of renewed fertility and so an image of easy abundance.²⁹ These contrasting evaluations are

²⁷ See J. Henderson, *Aristophanes' Lysistrata* (Oxford 1987) ad loc. Cf. *Kn.* 295.

²⁸ See W. J. M. Starkie, *The Clouds of Aristophanes* (Amsterdam 1966) and J. van Leeuwen *Aristophanis Nubes* (Leiden 1898) ad loc. The general association of dung with country life is exhibited at, e.g., *Peace* 24–28; *Wealth* 304–5, 313–14. Cratinus fr. 43: οὐκ ἀλλὰ βόλῖτα χλωρὰ καὶ οἰσπώτην πατεῖν—“hopping (or inhabiting?) green cow chips and sheep turds”—also probably refers to country life, perhaps to Paris’ youth spent as a shepherd.

²⁹ Pops, (above, note 24) 106–8 comments upon “...that equation of startling and apparent contradiction, shit is money. All agricultural communities subscribe to the Chinese proverb ‘waste is treasure,’ in which the least valued is the most valued: in this equation, shit is death which gives life, the last which shall be first. Shit carries a very powerful double charge, positive and negative, and that is why it is the body’s most magical substance.” For a more prosaic formulation, see Vatin, (above, note 23) 555. See also the illuminating discussion of scatological presented by M. Bakhtin, *Rabelais and his World*, H. Iswolsky trans. (Bloomington 1984) 145–52, 162–64, 173–76 434–35, and *passim*. Bakhtin stresses the ambivalence of scatological imagery as simultaneously life and death, destruction and rebirth. J-C. Carrière, *Le Carnaval et la politique. Une*

organized within the cycle of the fecal economy. In the comic realization of this paradoxical valuation this material is viewed positively as an emblem of country life, invoking images of fertility, ease, satiety, plenty, the festival, and laughter. These are all elements of the comic utopia's new world, challenges to the oppressive and authoritarian order of reality which that utopia overturns. Corresponding, however, to its associations with refuse and filth, dung serves in comedy as the material of ridicule and degrading mockery which is both low-brow and an impropriety. The link between scatology and comedy via the emblem of the σκωραμὶς κωμωδική invests the genre with an ambiguous value recapitulating the doubleness of τρύξ as an image. The genre espouses high civic and political goals, but achieves them through the vulgar medium of scatology. Yet it is precisely because scatology is a vulgarity and impropriety that it is able to serve Aristophanes' critical discourse as a means of exposing and uncrowning the arrogant ἀλαζόνες whom Aristophanes attacks. The scandalous vulgarity of scatological humor is paradoxically a cornerstone for comedy's critical voice, one which is ethically fertile and productive for Athens.

IV

The Σκῶμμα

The Σκῶμμα and Comedy

Socrates' response to Strepsiades' scatological comments opens with an injunction against the σκῶμμα: οὐ μὴ σκώψει. The σκῶμμα—"mockery, ridicule"—is the stock in trade of the comic poet. The equation of the σκῶμμα with comedy is all but explicit in Socrates' injunction (*Clouds* 296) "don't make a σκῶμμα, and don't do the sort of thing those comic poets (*trugodaimones*) do." This connection is repeated in the parabasis of *Knights* when the sad fate of Magnes is recounted: he gave the audience his all until old age and then

ἐξεβλήθη πρεσβύτης ὢν, ὅτι τοῦ σκώπτειν ἀπελείφθη· (525)

"He was driven from the stage in his old age because he flagged at making *skômmata*."

Σκώπτειν is used here generically for writing comedy—"...because the jokes quit coming." Similarly, in a line in which Trygaeus breaks the dramatic illusion of his flight to Olympus and directly addresses the operator of the crane, he marks this transition by crying out κούκέτι σκώπτων λέγω ("...and this

Introduction à la comédie grecque (Paris 1979), 135–39, discusses this ambiguity of comic obscenity in terms influenced by Bakhtin, characterizing it as positive as a stimulus to fertility, but negative as a moral provocation. K. Reckford, *Aristophanes Old-and-New Comedy* (Chapel Hill and London 1987) 461–67 details the link between ritual αἰσχρολογία and fertility in connection with comedy in its festival setting.

isn't joking [i.e., comic dialogue] now.,” *Peace* 173).³⁰ The σκῶμμα is again equated with comic mockery at *Wealth* 557 where Penia accuses Chremylus in the course of the agon σκώπτειν πειρᾷ καὶ κωμῳδεῖν... (“You try to mock and to play the comic...”). Penia pairs σκώπτειν and κωμῳδεῖν as equally adequate descriptions of the same statement. Indeed, the fundamental meaning of κωμῳδεῖν, “to ridicule,” is difficult to distinguish from that of σκώπτειν.³¹

Σκῶμμα Negative and Positive

Aristophanes offers programmatic discussions of the comic σκῶμμα in several passages. In the parabasis of *Peace* (736–61), for example, the speaker contrasts the tired and threadbare themes from which Aristophanes weaned his competitors with the high and audacious political themes characteristic of the poet's own plays. Aristophanes, we are assured, halted his rivals from mocking (σκώπτοντας, 740) rags and making war on insects, he banished bread-making and begging Heracleses from the stage, and he got rid of slaves mocking (σκώψας, 745) fellow slaves in tragic diction. Such low-brow fare and vulgar buffoonery (βωμολοχεύματ' ἀγεννῇ, 748) were done away with when Aristophanes “created for us a great art (τέχνην μεγάλην, 749), and girded it with towering fortifications of big words and ideas and mockery not of the vulgar sort (σκώμμασιν οὐκ ἀγοραίοις, 750); nor did he attack private little men and women in his comedies, but with the rage of Heracles he set upon the most powerful men, facing off against the horrid stench of hides and muck-hearted threats...” (749–53). The speaker goes on to describe how he, like a Heracles, courageously battled a monstrous Cleon on behalf of his audience.³² Likewise in the parabasis of *Clouds* (537–62) the speaker contrasts the πονηρὰ σκῶμματα (542)—slapstick and stale jokes—of his rivals with his own new and urbane witticisms, such as the attacks upon Cleon and Hyperbolus, which he then dropped before they became trite. Aristophanes opposes in these

³⁰ Trygaeus' abandonment of the dramatic context is not extraordinary. See F. Meucke, “Playing with the Play. Theatrical Self-Consciousness in Aristophanes,” *Antichthon* 11 (1977) 59–60.

³¹ See *LSJ* s.v., and, e.g., *Frogs* 368, *Peace* 751–52, *Wasps* 1025–26, and *Wealth* 557. At *Peace* 734–52 the σκῶμμα is closely associated with comedy and comic poet, as at *Wasps* 1287–89. Demetrius refers to “pleasantries” that are less refined as κωμικώτεροι, σκώμμασιν εἰκνύει (“more comic, similar to skōmmata”; *de El.* §128), and Aristotle commonly uses the verb σκώπτειν for the joking of comic poets (*EN* 1152A22; *Rhet.* 1405B30; *de Sens.* 443B30). Cf. Hermogenes' κωμικῶς λέγειν ἅμα καὶ σκώπτειν (περὶ μεθόδου δεινότητος, §34, p. 440 [Walz]). The association of the σκῶμμα with comedy is briefly discussed by R. Janko, *Aristotle on Comedy. Towards a Reconstruction of Poetics II* (London 1984) 210–11. See also in this line Lucian, *bis Ac.* §33. As a humorous genre, the σκῶμμα is also tied to the values, shared with comedy, of the festival and fertility through its association with such rites as the Haloa and Stenia. See L. Deubner, *Attische Feste* (Hildesheim 1966) 53, 57–58, 61, and note also *H. Dem.* 200–204 and the comments of N. J. Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford 1974) ad loc.

³² This emphasis upon the political nature of Aristophanes' own comic mockery is repeated in a parallel passage from the parabasis of *Wasps* (1030–37), including the assertion that the playwright battles courageously on behalf of his public.

passages his own σκώμματα οὐκ ἀγοραῖα to the buffoonish mockery typical of other comedians. While their comedies are condemned for their conventional and time-worn scenarios, characters, and gags, his own dramas excel through their new language, distinctive mockery, and especially through their courageous political themes, as exemplified by his attacks upon Cleon. Aristophanes directs his comic attack at the high and mighty. In espousing a τέχνη μεγάλη and σκώμματα οὐκ ἀγοραῖα and rejecting πονηρὰ σκώμματα, moreover, Aristophanes leaves the issue of αἰσχρολογία, vulgar and obscene language, beside the point. Aristophanes claims to abandon slapstick and old jokes in favor of imaginatively elaborate scenarios and language, political themes, and attacks on powerful citizens. He does not rule out formulating all of this in vulgar and obscene terms.³³

The political character of Aristophanes' mockery is underlined in the second parabasis of *Wasps* where Aristophanes recalls how the Athenians looked on in laughter as Cleon flayed him, hoping only that he would toss out some little jibe (σκωμμάτιον, 1289) while in Cleon's grip. Under the circumstances the by-standers await the same sort of low political mockery with which Aristophanes attempted to overthrow Cleon in *Banqueters* and *Knights*. Again, in the parabasis of *Acharnians* (630–64) the themes of public service, Aristophanes' conflict with Cleon, and political mockery are interwoven. Recalling how Aristophanes was indicted for mocking the city (ὡς κωμῳδεῖ τὴν πόλιν, 631), the speaker claims that the poet has improved the city and made the Spartans envious of the services he has rendered since he "dared to say what is just (τὰ δίκαια, 645) among the Athenians," and because he "will mock justly" (κωμῳδήσει τὰ δίκαια, 655).³⁴ The passage concludes, now in first person, that Cleon can contrive what he likes since "the right will be with me along with justice (τὸ δίκαιον, 661) as my ally." Aristophanes identifies his bitter, mocking attacks upon Cleon as the essence of his comedy, and gives them a broadly political interpretation as the vehicle of justice and a valuable benefit to his city.

Aristophanes offers an indirect representation of the comic σκῶμμα in its political context in the parodos of *Clouds*. Strepsiades asks why, if the goddesses are indeed clouds, they look like women (340–41), and Socrates explains that "They become whatever they wish. So, if they see some long-haired savage like one of these shaggy ones, the son of Xenophantus for example, in mockery (σκώπτουσαι) of his obsession they liken themselves to centaurs." (348–50).³⁵

³³ Regarding the role of vulgar humor in Aristophanes' τέχνη μεγάλη, note, e.g., the enabling role of Trygaeus' dung beetle, the intertwining of sexual and political themes in *Lysistrata*, *Ecclesiazusae*, and *Wealth*, or the scatological attacks mounted on Cleon in *Knights* and elsewhere.

³⁴ Similarly: *Frogs* 686–87. See the discussions of this passage by Taplin, (above, note 1) 331–33, and Foley, (above, note 3) 38–43.

³⁵ The Σ ad 349b–c, identify the son of Xenophantus as an ardent pederast. See K. J. Dover, *Aristophanes Clouds* (Oxford 1968) ad 350. The σκῶμμα as a type of joke is associated with the technique of comparison, εἰκῶν. See *Clouds* 1266–68; *Wasps* 542–43, 787–95, 1308–21; *Eccl.* 1002–5; *Wealth* 880–86; Antiphanes, fr. 195.10–12 (Kock). Note also Demetrius, *de El.* §172: περὶ δὲ σκωμμάτων μὲν, οἷον εἰκασία τίς ἐστίν..., and Hesych. εἰκάζειν· σκώπτειν, τὸ λέγειν ὁμοίος εἰ τῷδε. See the discussions of the equation of εἰκῶν and σκῶμμα

In response to the embezzling of a Simon, "they straightway became wolves, revealing his nature (φύσιν)." (352). The pederasty of Xenophantus' son is held up to public ridicule in the likeness of a centaur, an icon of uncontrolled lust, and the rapacity of Simon is laid bare in the image of a wolf. The Clouds' σκώμματα aim at ethical criticism and pointedly hold disgraceful behavior up to public scrutiny through humiliating ridicule, much as Aristophanes claims to do through his comedies to his city's benefit.³⁶

This group of passages dealing with the comic σκῶμμα is organized by the contrast between mockery that is hackneyed and passé and mockery that is topical and audaciously political, between πονηρὰ σκώμματα (*Clouds* 542) and σκώμματα οὐκ ἀγοραῖα (*Peace* 750). While the terms of this distinction tend towards the aesthetic in their concern with good taste and sophistication, they nonetheless privilege Aristophanes' own brand of vitriolic political mockery. It is not surprising if in programmatic statements, in which Aristophanes discusses the comic genre and his achievements as a comic poet, he does not entirely separate the political aspect of his art from questions of technique and innovation. Indeed, that Aristophanes would have perceived the aesthetic and the political as autonomous categories seems questionable. Aristophanes attributes to his σκώμματα an ethical content and a censorial purpose within the broad political context of Athenian life. By holding Cleon up to public ridicule in the guise of a Paphlagonian slave or representing him as a composite beast attacked by an Aristophanes-Heracles, Aristophanes in effect enacts the "mockery" of his own Cloud chorus as they broadcast through their shape-shifting the true nature of various misfits and swindlers. Comic ridicule debunks the imposter, debases pretentious self-importance, and generally brings the high and mighty low through festive vulgarity. Aristophanes endorses as the cornerstone of his comic art the σκῶμμα that criticizes someone or something through its mockery. This mockery aims to convey its insights on matters of public concern, and it does so with an obvious relish for the discomfort it brings to its victims.

The criteria by which Aristophanes distinguishes πονηρὰ σκώμματα from his own σκώμματα οὐκ ἀγοραῖα are, however, contested from other quarters by voices who confront his critical σκῶμμα directly in political and ethical terms. Even as, for example, Socrates equates Strepsiades' scatological σκῶμμα with comedy (τρυγοδαίμονες), he flatly condemns it as well. Strepsiades' scatology, mocking and deflating the sacred mood of the epiphany of Socrates' deities as well as ridiculing the historical Socrates, elicits an unqualified denunciation of comic mockery as an impediment to meaningful speech. Socrates' attitude is recapitulated in *Wealth* (557) when in the course of their debate Penia

by G. Monaco, *Paragoni Burleschi degli Antichi*, Biblioteca di Cultura Moderna 66 (Palermo, 1966) 14–17, 19, 29–64, and of L. Radermacher, *Aristophanes Frösche* (Wien 1921) 275. The association of the εἰκὼν with the σκῶμμα and its ethical intent is emphasized at Plato, *Meno* 80A–C, and at *Symp.* 215A.

³⁶ The resemblance of the Clouds' mockery to comedy is discussed by K. Reckford, "Aristophanes' Ever-Flowing Clouds," *Emory University Quarterly* 22 (1967) 223, and by A. Köhnken, "Der Wolken Chor des Aristophanes," *Hermes* 108 (1980) 157–60.

objects that Chremylus' critical and mocking play upon the meaning of μακαρίτης as both "wealthy" and "dead" is out of place in serious debate:

σκόπτειν πειρᾷ καὶ κωμωδεῖν τοῦ σπουδάζειν ἀμελήσας.

"You try to mock and to play the comic with no regard for seriousness."

Penia opposes the comic σκῶμμα to seriousness (τὸ σπουδάζειν), and, like Socrates, objects to it as an impediment to serious and productive communication.³⁷

The hostility of ἀλαζόνες like Socrates and Penia to the σκώμματα of their mocking interlocutors is supported by the view that an outspoken σκῶμμα is a form of ὕβρις. In *Wasps* Xanthias stresses that Philocleon's stinging and buffoonish mockery of Lysistratus and Thouphrastus is a form of ὕβρις, violent outrage, associated with his drunkenness and subsequent physical violence (1300, 1322–25 and ff.). Philocleon is characterized as "most violent" (ὕβριςτότατος, 1303) of all the drinkers, and Xanthias summarizes "thus he outraged (περιτύβριζεν, 1319) each in turn, mocking them buffoonishly (σκώπτων ἀγροίκως, 1320)..." Xanthias' characterization is based on the judgment that Philocleon's insulting comments were simply out of place (λόγους λέγων / ἀμαθέστατ' οὐδὲν εἰκότας τῷ πράγματι, 1320–21), infecting the lofty and refined with the low and vulgar. Similarly, in *Wealth* (886) the sycophant responds to the mockery of Carion and "Just Man": "But is this not great *hubris*? You mock me (σκόπτετον)." Here again mockery is regarded by its unwilling victim as ὕβρις.³⁸ In two fragments from Eupolis parasites condemn the use of a σκῶμμα ἀσελγές, an "unrestrained *skōmma*" (fr. 172. 12–15, fr. 261) as both tasteless buffoonery and inappropriate to their status at the table. So one of Alexis' characters generalizes (fr. 156 Kock) that "mockery (σκῶψις) causes more pain (λυπεῖ) than it does pleasure (τέρπει) by far. For it is the beginning of harsh words, and once you speak, you'll hear something right back. It only remains then to start making insults (λοιδορεῖσθαι)..." This escalating exchange of σκώμματα which leads so

³⁷ The contrast posed by Penia is echoed in an elegiac fragment in which γελᾶν, παίζειν, φλυαρεῖν, and σκόπτειν are encouraged for the moment, while σπουδή is reserved for later: *Elegiaca Adespota* 27, 4–7 (West). See the similar terms used of the activities of Amasis at Hdt. 2.173.1–174.1, and Antiphanes fr. 144 (Kock). W. Burkert, *Greek Religion*, J. Raffan trans. (Oxford 1985) 104–5, notes the consistent association of αἰσχρολογία with buffoonery in Greek ritual, and the contrast between such "aeschrological" rituals and the more serious, august sort. See also W. Burkert, "Götterspiel und Götterburleske in altorientalischen und griechischen Mythen," *Eranos Jahrbuch* 51 (1982) 335–37.

³⁸ This same judgment is implicit in the forceful objections to being mocked at *Clouds* 1267, *Eccl.* 1005, and 1074. See also *Wealth* 973. Mockery as a form of ὕβρις is discussed by D. M. MacDowell, "Hybris in Athens," *Greece and Rome* 23 (1976) 20–21. N. R. E. Fisher, "Hybris and Dishonour: I," *Greece and Rome* 23 (1976) 184 discusses ὕβρις in its verbal forms, and at 181 quotes Aristotle's formulation that "wit (εὐτραπεία) is educated ὕβρις" (*Rhet.* 1389B11–12). See also the discussion of the associations of σκόπτειν and its synonym χλευάζειν with abuse and insult by R. M. Rosen, *Old Comedy and the Iambographic Tradition* (Atlanta, GA 1988) 54.

quickly to λοιδορία corresponds well to the scene from *Wasps* between Philocleon and his fellow drinkers noted above. The σκῶμμα is characterized as buffoonery, gratuitous insult, and a vulgar affront to refinement and seriousness.³⁹

Aristotle's discussion of propriety in joking in the *Nicomachean Ethics* (1128A1–B9) further contextualizes the negative judgment of the σκῶμμα made by Socrates and Penia. That is, his testimony is valuable here not as a philosophical evaluation of a literary genre, but because it reflects in a more general way a sober judgment of certain types of mockery which also finds expression in Aristophanes' plays. While Aristotle does not discuss the comic σκῶμμα per se in this passage, he juxtaposes, in a manner recalling the prejudice of Socrates and Penia, the αἰσχρολογία of Old Comedy, the σκῶμμα as an abusive and unrestrained type of joke, and the willingness of the βωμολόχος to get a laugh at any cost. Aristotle distinguishes good mockery and joking from bad in the first place on the basis of what pains (λυπεῖν) its object versus what pleases (τέρπειν, 28A25–29). Restraint in joking is necessary since the σκῶμμα is a type of abuse (λοιδορήμα), and just as abuse is curbed by law, so mockery (σκώπτειν) ought to be restrained (28A30–31).⁴⁰ Aristotle's judgment that the σκῶμμα is a form of abuse is corroborated by Theophrastus' definition of the σκῶμμα as a "concealed reproach (ὀνειδισμός) of a fault (ἁμαρτία)." ⁴¹Demetrius (*de El.* §172), perhaps under peripatetic influence, allows that σκώμματα of a pleasant sort are permissible, but warns that otherwise they are to be avoided just as abuse (λοιδορίας).⁴² Similarly, the anonymous work on comedy known as the "*Tractatus Coislinianus*" generalizes that "a mocker (σκώπτων) seeks to criticize faults of soul and body."⁴³

³⁹ Regarding the low-brow character of the σκῶμμα, see Monaco, (above, note 35) 50–52. Monaco, 32, suggests that Thoupfrastus' reaction to Philocleon's σκώμματα (διεμύλλαινεν ὡς δὴ δεξιός; *Wasps*, 1315) indicates a cultivated disdain for such insipid humor.

⁴⁰ Cf. Hesychius' σκῶμ(μ)ατα· λοιδορήματα γέλωτος χάριν. Aristotle's analysis resembles the terms of his rough contemporary, the comic poet Alexis, as set forth in fr. 156 (Kock), quoted above: λύπη versus τέρψις, making versus taking a σκῶμμα, and the σκῶμμα as abuse (λοιδορεῖσθαι). Note also the equation of the σκῶμμα with λοιδορήμα by Hesychius s.v. Στηνία and by Photius s.v. τὰ ἐκ τῶν ἁμαξίων (discussed by Deubner, [above, note 31] 53, 103).

⁴¹ *Ap. Plut. Mor.* 631E. This fragment is discussed in detail by Janko, (above, note 31) 210–11.

⁴² Earlier (§128) Demetrius distinguishes between the dignified pleasantries of the poets and those which are common and comic, like the σκῶμμα, and then provides examples of the latter sort, which ought to be avoided since they do not differ from σκώμματα.

⁴³ Koster XV.33 (*Prolegomena de Comoedia. Scholia in Aristophanem*, vol. I.1A): ὁ σκώπτων ἐλέγχειν θέλει ἁμαρτήματα τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τοῦ σώματος. The passage is discussed by Janko, (above, note 31) 208–11. Similarly, Platonius (Koster I.1A, I and II), in his discussions of the differences among the types of comedy and among the comic poets, uses σκῶμμα/σκώπτειν consistently to refer to comic writing. It is precisely the attacks on public men, jurors, and wrong-doers that Platonius equates with the σκώμματα of Aristophanes, Cratinus, and Eupolis.

Aristotle draws the distinction between polite and impolite joking in the second place on the basis of what is suitable for a free man (ἐλευθερίῳ) to say or to hear said of himself (28A16–19). The correct disposition stands, not surprisingly, midway between a peasant's suspicion of all joking and a buffoon's (βωμολόχοι) willingness to raise a laugh no matter what the cost (28A4–17).⁴⁴ To illustrate his point, Aristotle notes that contemporary comedy relies upon innuendo (ὑπόνοια) for its humor whereas the older comedy exploits obscenity (αἰσχρολογία, 28A19–24).⁴⁵ This opposition continues in the contrast between the buffoon (βωμολόχος) and the witty (εὐτράπελος) or free (ἐλευθέριος) man. The buffoon goes overboard in striving for a laugh, and is therefore less concerned with good form and not grieving (λυπεῖν) the object of his mockery (σκωπτόμενον, 28A4–7). Whereas the free man serves as a law to himself for curbing his mockery, the buffoon cannot resist a joke (ἥττων ἐστὶ τοῦ γελοίου), and sparing neither himself nor anyone else, says for the sake of a laugh what others would not wish either to say or to hear (28A31–28B1). Aristotle endorses mockery which is pleasant for both its maker and its object in liberal company, and rejects that which brings pain and embarrassment, is abusive, buffoonishly strives for a laugh, and resembles the αἰσχρολογία of the old style comedy. Aristotle's analysis emphasizes both the violence of the σκῶμμα in its potential for ὕβρις, as well as its capacity to undermine refinement and urbanity through its coarse vulgarity. In his objection to obscenity, to inappropriate and abusive mockery, and to valuing a laugh above all else we recognize the perspective of Socrates and Penia upon the comic σκῶμμα. This correspondence guarantees the coherence of the views of these two comic personae with the broader system of Greek ethical presuppositions. Aristotle condemns precisely the σκῶμμα which bears a critical barb for its victim and exploits vulgar, low-brow humor, the same σκῶμμα extolled by Aristophanes as central to his τέχνη μεγάλη.

This condemnation of the critical σκῶμμα as a form of ὕβρις and buffoonery for its reliance upon abusive vulgarity and for bringing its victim painful humiliation contradicts Aristophanes' lofty conception of his τέχνη μεγάλη and σκώμματα οὐκ ἄγοράια. The ethical ground from which this view of the σκῶμμα as ὕβρις springs is the sentiment of αἰδώς. This designates the impulse to avoid public humiliation, affronts to one's honor and self-esteem, resulting either from an objective failure to satisfy accepted public standards or from criticism that one has fallen short of such expectations.⁴⁶ The same

⁴⁴ See also *Rhet.* 81A33–35; *EE* 34A14–24, and *MM* 93A12–19.

⁴⁵ Plato, *Rep.* 395E, associates κωμωδεῖν with αἰσχρολογεῖν.

⁴⁶ Fisher, (above, note 38) 177–93 stresses throughout his argument that ὕβρις is an affront to its victim's sense of honor and shame. The link between the σκῶμμα and αἰδώς is strengthened by the association of the σκῶμμα with public places. Alexis (fr. 156 Kock) locates σκῶψις in ἡ μακρὰ συνουσία. Philocleon imagines old men σκωπτόμενοι δ' ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς (*Wasps* 542), and Dicæopolis' personal market will free him of "mockery" ἐν τᾷγορᾷ (*Ach.* 854–55). The same fragment of Alexis notes the symposium as a setting for σκώμματα, also the site of Philocleon's σκώμματα (*Wasps* 1299–1325), which is mentioned as well at Eupolis 172, Antiphanes 144 (Kock), and Nicolaus 1.26–32 (Kock); cf. Hdt. 2.173.1–174.1 and Plut. *Lyc.* 12.4–5. Παίσαντα καὶ σκῶψαντα at *Frogs* 389–93 refer to the preeminently public context of the comic performance itself.

quality, however, which makes this σκῶμμα an impropriety and a piece of ὕβρις simultaneously enables it to serve Aristophanes' high-minded purposes. The relation between αἰδώς and the σκῶμμα is illustrated by a passage from *Clouds* in which the Stronger Argument appeals to Pheidippides to choose the old education:

κάπιστήσῃ μισεῖν ἀγορὰν καὶ βαλανείων ἀπέχεσθαι,
καὶ τοῖς αἰσχροῖς αἰσχύνεσθαι κὰν σκώπῃ τίς σε φλέγεσθαι
(991–92)

“and you will learn to hate the marketplace and to avoid the baths,
and to be ashamed at shameful things, and to blaze up if someone
mocks you.”⁴⁷

The σωφροσύνη which the Stronger Argument will impart to Pheidippides recommends feeling shame when appropriate and a reaction of embarrassed anger when “mocked.” In the Stronger Argument’s view the σκῶμμα is not to be taken lightly, but is rather the stimulus for a strong emotional reaction, as indicated by the vivid expression φλέγεσθαι. The line’s context in a long list of αἰσχρά which Pheidippides will learn to avoid (991–99) implies that the imagined σκῶμμα is of the ethical variety, a reproach to the young man’s character or actions, and that shame and anger are the appropriate response to such mockery for a noble youth.

Plutarch in his *De audiendo* discusses the σκῶμμα in terms of such direct relevance to *Clouds* 991–92 that I quote it at length:⁴⁸

“To bear cheerfully and without offence (ἀλύπως) an inoffensive jibe (σκῶμμα...ἀνύβριστον), made wittily (μετ’ εὐτραπείας) and in fun, is neither vulgar nor uncultured, but altogether noble (ἐλευθέριον) and Spartan. To listen, however, to admonitions and rebukes meant to reform one’s character (ἐπανόρθωσιν ἡθους) and using reproachful words stinging like a poison, [to listen to these] without feeling humbled, overcome with perspiration and dizziness, on fire in one’s soul with shame (αἰσχύνῃ φλεγόμενον), but rather remaining unmoved, grinning and dissembling, [to do] this reveals remarkable servility in a youth and insensitivity to what is shameful (τὸ αἰδεῖσθαι)...”

(*Moralia* 46D)

While one ought to endure with good humor a σκῶμμα ἀνύβριστον, to listen to someone aiming to correct one’s character through biting reproach without a reaction of humiliation, vertigo, a spirit inflamed with αἰσχύνῃ, this is characteristic of a mean disposition and an insensitivity to τὸ αἰδεῖσθαι. Plutarch echoes the Stronger Argument’s recommendation of a forceful reaction

⁴⁷ “Blaze up” here refers to the physical effects of flushing as well as to the strong emotional reaction indicated by φλέγεσθαι: shame and then anger. See Dover and Sommerstein, who translates “flare up,” ad loc.

⁴⁸ Cited by Starkie, van Leeuwen ad loc. The consistency of Plutarch’s vocabulary with other discussions of the σκῶμμα (λυπ—, ὕβρις, αἰδ—, ἐλευθέριος, εὐτραπεία) argues that the view he expresses here is based in traditional Greek attitudes towards mockery.

to mockery that is ethically critical and challenges its object's sense of αἰδώς. The link between the σκῶμμα and ὕβρις, implicit in this passage in the approval of the σκῶμμα ἀνύβριστον, ensures that the Stronger Argument's φλέγεσθαι refers not to the blush accompanying an embarrassed admission of a wrong, but to the anger at an affront to one's honor. For the αἰδώς that forestalls anti-social behavior is not at stake here. Rather, this is the imperative to avoid humiliating criticism since only that is a matter of ὕβρις. We are reminded here of Aristotle's assertion that the σκῶμμα is fundamentally a λοιδορήμα, an "abusive reproach." So Philocleon complains that Lysistratus the σκωπτόλης has treated him αἰσχιστα (*Wasps* 787–88)—in a manner that is shameful (i.e., for Philocleon)—in a comment upon one of Lysistratus' mocking jibes.⁴⁹

The natural reaction to a critical σκῶμμα appears to be anger, indignation, and the desire to defend one's reputation—to deny any reason to experience αἰδώς. The victim of a σκῶμμα, then, perceives that he is being subjected to ὕβρις because the σκῶμμα is an affront to an individual's αἰδώς. In view of the association of the σκῶμμα with comedy itself and the similar meanings of σκώπτειν and κωμῶδειν, this same relationship between the σκῶμμα and ὕβρις is suggested by a passage from *Acharnians* (630–31) in which the chorus relates the allegations made against Aristophanes by Cleon in reaction to *Babylonians*:

διαβαλλόμενος δ' ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἐν Ἀθηναίοις
ταχυβούλοις,
ὡς κωμῶδεῖ τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν δῆμον καθυβρίζει.

"accused by his enemies before the quick-judging Athenians
that he mocked our city in comedy and committed *hubris* against
the citizenry."

To make the city an object of comedy and to commit ὕβρις against the people are presented as equal grounds for an indictment, and in fact probably express two actions which are better related hypotactically than paratactically—"he outraged the citizenry by ridiculing our city."⁵⁰ Aristophanes' political σκώμματα οὐκ ἀγοραῖα, intended, as we see, to provoke a reaction of αἰδώς at public humiliation and serving as the core of Aristophanes' comic τέχνη μεγάλη, are viewed from this ethical context as impertinent and gratuitous ὕβρις.

The incident to which Aristophanes refers in this passage from *Acharnians* is, of course, Cleon's judicial retaliation for the same comic assaults which Aristophanes presents as exemplary of his political σκώμματα. Cleon's

⁴⁹ Conversely, someone who is able to laugh along when he is reprovved and even praise his critic is compared by Plutarch to a parasite (παράσιτος) and criticized for ἀναισχυντία (*Moralia* 46C). Cf. the complementary observations of the parasites at Nicolaus fr. 1, 31–32 (Kock) and Antiphanes fr. 80 (Kock).

⁵⁰ The uses of κωμῶδεω at *Wasps* 1026 and *Frogs* 368 demonstrate that the objects of this activity characteristically respond with the same anger as is elicited from the butt of a σκῶμμα. See notes 2 and 31 above. Whether it was Aristophanes himself or his producer, Callistratus, whom Cleon denounced is not of immediate consequence.

reaction to these comic onslaughts through legal attacks, however, testifies to his perception of them as ὕβρις, insolent and gratuitous outrage. Aristophanes indirectly represents this response to his comic mockery in a line from *Knights*. Paphlagon-Cleon reacts to Sausageseller's scatological assault on his use of flattery, accusations of treason, and oracles (893–901) with the exclamation οἰοίσι μ', ὦ πανούργε, βωμολοχεύμασιν τaráττεις ("With what buffooneries you harass me, scoundrel," 902). The demagogue of *Knights* condemns Aristophanes' σκῶμματα οὐκ ἀγοραῖα as mere buffoonery, their opposite, in a line perhaps offering a comic reflection of Cleon's actual response to Aristophanes' earlier attacks. Paphlagon responds with angry indignation and condemns as gratuitous clowning the mockery which in the larger context of the comic performance serves to deflate Cleon's public image and criticize his political practice.⁵¹ His reaction conforms to Socrates' and Penia's denunciation of the comic σκῶμμα as well as to the Stronger Argument's precept καὶ τοῖς αἰσχροῖς αἰσχύνεσθαι, κὰν σκώπτῃ τίς σε φλέγεσθαι. The broader frame provided by Aristotle, Plutarch, and other comic poets for the views of the σκῶμμα articulated by Socrates, Penia, and the Stronger Argument confirms that Cleon's negative evaluation of Aristophanes' comic σκῶμμα is not simply the recrimination of an irate κομφοδούμενος, but the expression of a customary and accepted equation of this sort of critical σκῶμμα with ὕβρις and βωμολοχία. Cleon's response to Aristophanes' mockery and ridicule betrays a sense of αἰδώς of which Plutarch or the Stronger Argument would approve. In sum, from this perspective Aristophanes' critical σκῶμμα would appear to be to legitimate discussion what the dregs are to wine, or κόπρος to a city street—a cheap laugh, appealing to an unrefined sense of the risible and undermining meaningful discourse.

Ambiguity of the Σκῶμμα

If Aristophanes' distinction between πονηρὰ σκῶμματα and his own σκῶμματα οὐκ ἀγοραῖα were mapped onto Aristotle's analysis, certainly the harmless farces, which Aristophanes discredits, of Heracles cheated of his dinner or a slave's mock-tragic sympathy would more closely resemble acceptable mockery, while the barbed political attacks, which Aristophanes proudly offers as his contribution to civic life, would fall into the category of the condemned σκῶμμα ἀσελγές. Any σκῶμμα making an ethical criticism through an appeal to αἰδώς will appear as hybristic violence to its victim, whether a son of Xenophantus, Cleon, or the city of Athens. This perception would not, moreover, appear unjustified to unprejudiced onlookers. The ethical σκῶμμα is always an impertinence and a disruption, a gratuitous attempt through vulgar and debasing images to squeeze a joke out of a situation at any cost. Socrates' prohibition οὐ μὴ σκώπει or Penia's accusation σκώπτειν πειρᾷ καὶ κομφοδεῖν τοῦ σπουδάζειν ἀμελήσας react to this unrestrained and critical ridicule which Aristophanes embraces as the essence of his comedy. Aristophanes' comic σκῶμμα is fundamentally ambiguous as both the vehicle of serious ethical and political criticism and as an irreverent and violent

⁵¹ For a similar dramatization of a victim's reaction to comic mockery, see p. 158 above.

disruption of seriousness and social decorum. Comic mockery's vulgarity and scatology, its debasing comparisons, lack of regard for the self-esteem or good name of its victims, its exploitation of unrestrained laughter to make its point, all appear to belie comedy's claim to function as a political and ethical advisor to the city, to expose unjust behavior and flawed characters, and to support the shared values of the community.

These conflicting aspects of the σκῶμμα must nevertheless be seen as inseparable in that the element which undermines direct communication, ridicules with vulgar images, and corrupts seriousness with its humor, at the same time supports the critical, ethical dimension of the σκῶμμα and of comedy. The same gross vulgarity that appears in every instance excessive is the mechanism of infecting the high with the low, seriousness with laughter, authority with debilitating impotence. Were it deprived of its scandalous impropriety, the comic σκῶμμα could not maintain its peculiar critical stance. The σκῶμμα's appeal to αἰδώς through mockery enables its ethical-political function, but opens it as well to reception as ὕβρις. In effect Aristophanes covers the mighty and proud in comic excrement. Of course, the σκῶμμα alone cannot comprehend Aristophanes' entire panoply of comic devices and effects. Nonetheless, the same oxymoronic mixture of high and low which it embodies as an image and mechanism of comedy must underlie Aristophanes' own comic poetics since a primary vehicle of his high-minded comedy, his τέχνη μεγάλη, is this scurrilous and offensive σκῶμμα.

In its ambivalence, moreover, between disruption and insight, seriousness and laughter, impropriety and precept, the σκῶμμα reproduces the contradictory character exhibited by τρύξ and κόπρος, both emblems of the comic. For the comic σκῶμμα produces a humor that from one perspective is an affront and an excess, but from another is the medium of comedy's ethically and politically critical messages. While τρυγῳδία too knows τὸ δίκαιον, it expresses it through a strategy radically different from that employed by its more refined and noble sister, tragedy.

V

It has recently been argued that the plays of Aristophanes lack any underlying seriousness or political significance. According to this view there exists a fundamental incompatibility of comic humor and serious content, of generic form and historical reference, of the discourse of the festival and that of the assembly. Aristophanes is characterized as a comedian first and only, whose preoccupation with entertaining his audience permitted only mock seriousness. Aristophanes' protestations of high intentions and achievements are thus viewed as wholly ironic.⁵² But the irony of Aristophanes' humble and playful

⁵² A. W. Gomme's "Aristophanes and Politics," *CR* 52 (1938) 97–109 presents the founding arguments for this approach to Aristophanes. Among this group, see: A. M. Bowie, "The Parabasis in Aristophanes: Prolegomena, *Acharnians*," *CQ* 32 (1982) 27–40; S. Halliwell, "Aristophanic Satire," *Yearbook of English Studies*, 14 (1984) 6–20; M. Heath, *Political Comedy in Aristophanes*, *Hypomnemata* 87 (Göttingen 1987); and R. M. Rosen (above, note 38). Contra, see: G. E. M. de Ste. Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (Ithaca, NY

characterization of comedy, as τρυγφδία for example, lies, rather, in the fact that through such low images Aristophanes simultaneously vouches for the genre's seriousness and importance. Aristophanes' conception of comedy incorporates and surpasses such simplistic oppositions.

Within the logic of comedy opposites are bound in an intimate if tense unity. While the present study in no way exhausts the topic of Aristophanes' representation of his genre, the images for comedy which we have examined are expressive of an economy of human life linking decay and growth: τρύξ as both the lees and the new wine, and dung as both waste and fertility. Κόπρος, moreover, as realized in comic scatology incorporates both the values of the comic utopia as well as those of comic abuse. The σκῶμμα as the mechanism of comedy's critical mockery presupposes the same complex of values as these images, but integrates them even more tightly since it is precisely through the low and vulgar that comic mockery mounts its high-minded ethical and political criticism. Anchored in such images, comedy's humble pedigree and indecent manners are asserted as a claim to noble intentions and a constructive role in the city. Comedy's objectionable excess of buffoonish and offensive humor secures for the city both a healthy laugh and salutary advice. The view that there is an irreconcilable conflict between laughter and seriousness or between literary art and politics entirely misunderstands Aristophanes' conception of the comic genre. For it is precisely through the images and strategies of the vulgar, low-brow, and ludicrous that comedy's serious and critical messages are expressed and from which they cannot be separated.

1972) 355–74; H. Erbse, "Über das politische Ziel der Aristophanischen Komödie," *Studi in Onore di Aristide Colonna* (Perugia 1982) 99–116; W. Kraus, *Aristophanes' politische Komödien: Die Acharner/Die Ritter*, Öster. Ak. der Wissensch. Phil.-Hist. Klasse. Sitzungsberichte, 453. Band (Wien 1985); L. Edmunds, "Cleon, Knights, and Aristophanes' Politics" (Lanham, MD 1987); J. Henderson, "The Demos and the Comic Competition," *Nothing To Do with Dionysus? The Social Meanings of Greek Drama*, John J. Winkler and Froma Zeitlin, edd. (Princeton 1990) 271–313.

I gratefully acknowledge the debt this paper owes to the Center for Hellenic Studies and its director, Zeph Stewart. My argument has benefitted from the acute comments of TAPA's referees, and from the criticisms of Bracht Branham, Leslie L. Collins, Page duBois, William Fitzgerald, Edward N. Lee, and Sheldon Nodelman.