

PERSONIFICATION IN ARISTOPHANES' COMEDIES*

By

ANNA M. KOMORNICKA

I

Because of its complexity and diversity, as well as its close relationship to metaphor, personification, or προσωποίῳα, causes difficulties and misunderstandings. In the most general terms, personification imparts human personality traits to inanimate objects, animals and abstractions.

The various types of personification include animisation, anthropomorphisation, religious-mythical personification, and deification. It would, however, narrow the definition too far to exclude each and every case when a living being (human or animal), deity, abstraction, or physical phenomenon is represented as inanimate. In some authors, especially some comic poets, that “reification” is as frequent as “animation”. To so define the extent of the trope places it very close to metaphor, but there is agreement that there is a category of allegorical characters stemming straight from metaphor; they are the especially intense and highlighted metaphors¹. Limiting the extent of personification, as linguists often do so, seems to follow from the view that only allegorical characters appearing on stage are personifications; all other figures stemming from animisation or anthropomorphisation, that is those that appear directly in the narrative, are counted wholesale among metaphors.

* Originally published in Polish in “Eos” LII 1962, fasc. 2, pp. 238–257.

¹ H. LAUSBERG, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, München 1960, pp. 441 f.: “Die Allegorie ist für den Gedanken, was die Metapher für das Einzelwort ist: die Allegorie steht also zum gemeinten Ernstgedanken in einem Vergleichsverhältnis. Die Verhältnis der Allegorie zur Metapher ist quantitativ: die Allegorie ist eine in einem ganzen Satz (und darüber hinaus) durchgeführte Metapher”. We believe it incorrect to call those “Versachlichungen” mere metaphors or even “Personal-metapher” when it is not a single word metaphor that is meant, but rather a whole chain of them, complete in itself and defining the situation or subsequent action. Comedy loves the kind of trope in which an inanimate object stands for a living thing, and for a human being in particular.

Each of those varieties of personification can be further subdivided. And so, an inanimate object may be made animate either through being given its own motion, regardless of its surroundings, be they themselves animate or not², or by being given life only in relation to another object, which then itself becomes animate through “receiving” its communications, or by animating that object in relation to animated beings³. In that case “animalisation”, or imparting animal traits to an object, physical phenomenon or abstraction, becomes a special case of animisation too.

Then anthropomorphisation is the poet portraying an inanimate object, abstract concept, physical phenomenon, plant or animal as possessed of some human characteristic: (a) human life, motion, or actions; (b) human appearance, or (c) the faculty of reason or emotions.

In the minds of the ancients it was enough for an inanimate object or abstraction to be assigned one human trait for personification to apply. Thus if we want to analyse the phenomenon in all its aspects, and so adopt the detailed categorization of personification, we must always remember that our theories and methods of analysis do not overlap with their views of the world, the gods and humanity. From that perspective, WEBSTER’s theory of personification is interesting, as its starting point is the mentality of the ancient Greeks, who expressed their world-view precisely through personification and allegory. In WEBSTER’s opinion, the essence of the evolution of Greek thought is the constant conflict of two tendencies, to personify and to schematise⁴.

Anthropomorphism is at its strongest in Greek religious thought, but it is not limited in it to seeing the gods in a human form. Human characteristics are also assigned to such concepts as peace, envy, royal authority, war, wealth or poverty. All the above-mentioned allegorical characters (or personifications) have appeared in tragic, comic, epic and lyric poetry. On stage, they were entities of flesh and blood, with actual actions and not too far removed from the gods hal-
lowed in tradition⁵. In literature, comparing the traits and actions of humans to those of gods is an intensification of a mere simile, leads to deification, and plays a part in allegory and personification⁶.

² H. PONGS, *Das Bild in der Dichtung*, vol. I, Marburg 1927, p. 280.

³ H. KONRAD, *L'étude sur la métaphore*, Paris 1958, pp. 138 ff.

⁴ T.B.L. WEBSTER, *Language and Thought in Early Greece*, Manchester Memoirs XCIV 1952–1953, p. 10 (quoted in IDEM, *Personification as a Mode of Greek Thought*, JWI XVII 1954, p. 10).

⁵ Ch. PICARD, *Le théâtre grec et l'allégorie*, REG LV 1942, pp. 27 f.

⁶ B. SNELL expresses that specificity as follows: “It appears [...] that one object is capable of casting fresh light upon another in the form of a simile, only because we read into the object the very qualities which it in turn illustrates [...] In other words, and this is all-important in any explanation of the simile, man must listen to an echo of himself before he may hear or know himself”. B. SNELL, *The Discovery of the Mind*, transl. by T.G. ROSENMEYER, New York 1960, pp. 200 f.

Deification can give additional allegorical characteristics to known deities, create new relationships between gods and new divine genealogies, or else impart divine form or attributes to abstract concepts⁷, physical phenomena perceptible by the senses, human activity, animals or even inanimate objects. As with all personification, that variety comes in various degrees of intensity⁸, according to its closer or farther kinship with existing myths. We know that art, both sculpture and painting, was to the ancients a frequent source of personification, and especially deification, preserved and consolidated by literary tradition and religious beliefs⁹.

That theoretical introduction was necessary to establish the framework and relative placement of the various categories of personification in Aristophanes, very diverse and indicative of his amazing imagination and skill¹⁰.

II

Since we want to give the fullest possible overview of that trope in Aristophanes, we shall consider personification according to its broadest definition, including both allegorical characters appearing on stage and the indirect personification in dialogues, parabases or songs of the chorus. For our starting points we have chosen inanimate objects, inanimate natural phenomena (of weather, geography etc.), living things (plants and animals), human beings, abstractions, and deities.

⁷ According to a Hellenistic theory of personification, the concept of deities forms in the human mind from various ἐνέργειαι and δυνάμεις. Thus fire was elevated to godhood as Hephaestus, sexual intercourse was called Aphrodite, etc.

⁸ That highest form of personification has been called a "pathetic fallacy", in which the whole environment, nature and inanimate objects participate in man's experience, feeling as he does, hearing and understanding what he says to them, and often exerting otherworldly influence on his fortunes. Cf. F.O. COPLEY, *The Pathetic Fallacy in Early Greek Poetry*, *AJPh* XXVII 1937, pp. 194–209.

⁹ PICARD, *op. cit.* (n. 5), p. 34; WEBSTER, *op. cit.* (n. 4), p. 12; E. POTTIER, *Les représentations allégoriques dans les peintures de vases grecs*, *Monuments Grecs XVII–XVIII 1889–1890*, pl. 9. p. 3.

¹⁰ While thoroughly agreeing with NEWIGER's thesis (H.J. NEWIGER, *Metapher und Allegorie. Studien zu Aristophanes*, München 1957, p. 117 and *passim*) that regarding all abstract characters in comedy as allegories, as was done before, failed to appreciate Aristophanes' rich use of metaphor ("allegorisch-schematische nicht symbolisch-lebensvolle"; cf. S. SREBRNY, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* LXXIX 1958, pp. 1052–1056), we do not believe that all symbolic characters (say, Polemus, Cydoemus, Eirene, Opora or Theoria) should be refused the class "allegory", "wegen der lebhaften Handlung um sie und der aktualisierten Metapher, aus der heraus sie gleichsam geboren werden". We admit that personification and symbolism grow out of metaphor, but we also think calling those five characters metaphors (which is what NEWIGER's argument boils down to; p. 114), too radical. O. WEINREICH, in *Seltsame Liebespaare*, published together with L. SEGER's translation of Aristophanes (Zürich 1953), calls them "Personalmetaphern" (vol. II, p. 494), but without objecting to considering them a kind of allegory or maybe metaphor. Plutus is to NEWIGER a proper allegory.

I. INANIMATE OBJECTS

(1) Animisation

Like a living creature, the coal from Parnes “does not die”, and sheds dust “out of fear” (*Ach.* 348, 350 f.). Triremes have “feet” that run over the sea (*Lys.* 173), and in war, they “devour” vineyards (*Pax* 626 f.). A struck pithos kicks another pithos in anger (*Pax* 613 f.). Women refer to a jug of wine as a sacrificial piglet, and the wine, as its blood (*Lys.* 202 and 205).

(2) Anthropomorphisation

The leather whips of the *agoranomoi* are elevated to human rank (*Ach.* 724). Coal and the coal-basket are a loyal friend of the charcoal-burners (ὀμήλικος φιλανθρακῆος, *Ach.* 336), and must not be betrayed (*Ach.* 340). A basket cares about Demus’ well-being (intensified metonymy; *Equit.* 1216). The cup is women’s confidant (*Lys.* 841). Praxagora attributes human traits of appearance and character to a lamp, calling it women’s discreet confidant (*Eccl.* 11–17). Chremes calls a millstone ἡ κιθαρωδός, who wakes him in the night “in morning key” (*Eccl.* 739 ff.). At the dog-trial a cheese grater is a witness (called ταμειῦσα, or a steward), then a ladle, a pestle, a grate, a pan and other kitchen utensils (*Vesp.* 963 ff. and 936 ff.). The vessels in Zeus’ household are called to witness (*Danaides*, fr. 245). Triremes confer on war. Warship-woman hybrids have women’s names, and even patronymics; they swear by a goddess and meet in council like women, although they are made of wood and eaten by worms in their old age (*Equit.* 1300–1315).

(3) Deification

Old men’s staff is called Poseidon (*Ach.* 682), and τὸ πῆος, the hungry Heracles (*Lys.* 928). Ἡ γλώττης στρόφιγξ is a new deity of Euripides (*Ran.* 892; cf. *Nub.*). The image on the Gorgon’s helmet “wakes” to become the real Gorgon as one wishes (*Ach.* 574 and 1118). A statue of Eirene is to represent a living goddess (*Pax* 520 ff.).

II. INANIMATE NATURAL PHENOMENA
(WEATHER, THE ELEMENTS AND THE LIKE)

(1) Anthropomorphisation

The sun draws in its wick and refuses to shine for people as punishment for electing Cleon *strategos* (*Nub.* 584 ff.) That is a complex personification: now the sun is an inanimate object (a lamp, since it has a wick), yet animated (as it draws the wick in), and even endowed with human intentions. The sun and the wick are both concrete (though not to the same degree) and visible to the eye, although the wick, as representative of a lamp, and so of light, may also fall

under the category “abstraction”; abstraction is in fact the common ground of the two areas of simile. In Trygaeus’ interpretation of the heavenly bodies, stars are anthropomorphic; the rich stars return from a feast by night, carrying lamps with fire in them (*Pax* 839 ff.).

(2) Deification

Selene the Moon is a conscious benefactor of humanity; unjustly harmed with the calendar reform becomes indignant, she addresses the people and helps them οὐ λόγους ἀλλ’ ἐμφανῶς, that is, with her light, so they may burn less oil (*Nub.* 608–611, and 615–626). The gods of the new religion are Clouds (*Nub.* 341–350 and passim), Chaos (*Nub.* 424 and 627), Aether (*Ran.* 892 f.), Dinus (*Nub.* 828, 381 and 1471), and Anapnoe (*Nub.* 264, 393, 627 and 667). In a synecdoche, Day bears the epithet μισολάμαχος (*Pax* 304).

III. VEGETATION

(1) Anthropomorphisation

All plants προσγελάσεται (*Pax* 600). The vine catches the fire of war “against its will” (*Pax* 612).

IV. ANIMALS

(1) Anthropomorphisation

The horses of the Marathonomachoi, characterised with a complex simile. They have equine names (such as Σαμφόρας) and genuine hooves, but they row and call to each other like sailors, eat crabs instead of fodder made of Median herbs and dive into the depths of the sea. The knights of the chorus praise the heroism of the horses, but mean themselves and their own courage. The animals are partly made human and certainly compared to the men who did heroic deeds on their backs (or even off them, as when they rowed). Beside the anthropomorphisation of an animal based on a metonymical allegory (a possession standing for the possessor), we have a circular trope here: human characteristics are transferred to an animal, which in turn symbolises its human rider.

Birds in the *Aves* have many human features, although it is the fairy tale kind of anthropomorphism. They have their own tablets with laws (450), settle the earth (1515), and wage war according to the principles of tactics (388–392 and 458 f.). The avian and the human intermingle (*Av.*, passim).

Tereus the hoopoe has a slave who is a bird-man (*Av.* 70–73). In the story told by one of the women a Boeotian eel is a noble and dainty girl whom it would be worthwhile to invite to a ritual to Hecate to keep the children company (*Lys.* 701).

(2) Deification

The avian and the divine intermingle as well (*Av. passim*). Birds give themselves the names of gods (such as Apollo) or their worship sites (*Av.* 716). There are Olympian birds, of both sexes (*Av.* 865 ff.), avian heroes (881), as well as avian theogony and cosmogony (691–707).

V. HUMANS AND HUMAN ACTIVITY

(1) As an inanimate object

Cleon as the Athenian pestle (*Pax* 259–270), whereas Brasidas is the Lacedaemonian pestle (*Pax* 274, 281 ff.). A torch-woman, a feigned transformation introduced for comical and obscene purposes (*Vesp.* 1372–1375). Dicaeopolis, “pretending” to treat the sycophant as pottery: he wants to hit the man to hear the sound he would make when struck, advises packing in straw, hang him head downwards, etc. (*Ach.* 931–945). Philocleon, who wants to take and quasi-takes the form of smoke in order to escape from his house (*Vesp.* 144 ff.)¹¹.

On the borderline between metaphor and indirect personification there are the wishes to be turned into smoke (*Vesp.* 324), or a vote-counting stone (*Vesp.* 332 f.). Then there are the other terms for Cleon which characterise him as inanimate phenomena of nature, but more metaphorical epithets than personifications. Those are: “charybdis of greed”, “maw”, “Cycloborus”, “rapid stream”, or “Boreas”.

(2) As an animal

Labes-Laches (*Vesp.* 836–926); the dog from Cydathenaeum (*Vesp.* 902–930); the chorus of dicast wasps (*Vesp.*, *passim*); Carcinus the crab and the three wren dancers his sons (ὄρχιλοι, τρίορχοι; *Vesp.* 1501 ff.). The pig daughters of the Megarian (a comic travesty and feigned personification resulting from the homonymic χοῖρος; *Ach.* 731 ff.).

Strepsiades calls a creditor Σαμφόρας, a horse’s name, wants to prick him with a goad, and makes as if to stir him into motion, “together with his wheels and his chariot” (*Nub.* 1297–1303). The dicasts act like dogs, and demagogues tame them, whistle for them and sic them on their enemies (*Vesp.* 704 f.). People

¹¹ That metamorphosis, half comical and half allegorical, gives the poet occasion for a play on words, for the jocular questions about which type of wood gives off such pungent smoke, and for looking around for a lid to cover the pot (or the chimney? *Vesp.* 147). Philocleon’s wish to change into smoke has double meaning here: one is to literally slip out, the other, to deceive his captors with a smokescreen of lies. The poet seems to go on to suggest, “or turn into Aeschines”; that Aeschines was an infamous liar, whose nickname was just that, Kapnos.

emulate birds, assume birds' names, demand wings and talons, etc. (a travesty; *Av.* 1305 f. and passim).

Comical feigned metamorphoses, some in the form of a wish: Philocleon into a mouse, Philocleon into a sparrow (*Vesp.* 139–141, 151, and 207 f.); Theorus with a raven's head (in a dream; *Vesp.* 43 ff.); halfway between metaphorical imagery and indirect allegory, Cleon as a monstrous beastlike hybrid (*Vesp.* 1031–1041, and *Pax* 754–758).

(3) As another human person

Demus (the people of Athens; *Equit.*, passim); Paphlagon (Cleon; *Equit.*, passim); slaves wearing the masks of Nicias and Demosthenes (*Equit.* 1–234 and passim). Aristophanes speaks of himself as of a girl who had to expose her child (his comedy), to be adopted by another woman (another comic poet), and nourished and brought up by the audience (*Nub.* 520–532). There are also parodies and “feigned” and “theatrical” personifications (*Thesm.*) and people serving as human character types (*Nub.*)

(4) As a deity (deification)

Pericles' epithet of ὀλύμπιος gives the poet a pretext to attribute to him Zeus' actions: ἐβρόντα, ξυνεκύκα (*Ach.* 530 f.).

VI. ABSTRACTION

(1) As an inanimate object

In the symbolic scene where Greek cities are crushed in Polemus' mortar, Sicily is represented by cheese (*Pax* 250 f.); Attica, by honey (*Pax* 252 ff.). Poetry, literature and verses are spoken of as market goods (such as cheese), weighed, measured and compared to the products of wood processing (*Ran.* 1369 and passim; *Thesm.* 52 f.). Peace is a liquid and comes in bottles (*Ach.* 187 f., 191, 1033 ff., and 1053–1066).

(2) As inanimate nature

A sea storm stands for unrest and war, whereas governing the state is navigating the seas.

(3) As vegetation

In Polemus' mortar, Megara is onion, and Laconia is leeks (or chives? *Pax* 242–245).

(4) As an animal

The Athenian polis is a starved and terrorised dog, feeding on scraps of calumny (*Pax* 641 ff.).

(5) As a human being (and human actions)

Diallage-Armistice (*Ach.* 989 ff. and *Lys.* 1114 ff.). Opora-Harvest and Theoria-Spectacle (*Pax* 523, 530, 706 ff., 842–944, and 885). Spondae-Truce (*Equit.* 1389 ff.); Georgia (*Pax* II, fr. 294); Dikaios Logos (Just Cause/Superior Argument) and Adikos Logos (Unjust Cause/Inferior Argument) (*Nub.* 899 ff.). Aristophanes' comedy as a baby exposed by its mother (that is, the author; *Nub.* 520–532). Aristophanes poetry, compared to the character of Electra, who searches for a discerning audience and immediately recognizes a lock of Orestes' hair (*Nub.* 534–540)¹².

War is a rowdy drunk, and the damages of war are the result of that rake brawling in the house, fields and vineyards (*Ach.* 978–987). Cities converse, and laugh as they hear of the coming of peace, even though their faces hurt and their bodies are sick (*Pax* 539–542).

Add to this the mild face of sweet Ἡουχία (*Av.* 1322 f.); Τρυφῆς πρόσωπον (*Eccl.* 973); Mnamon, called a young singer by a Laconian (*Lys.* 1248); Penia-Poverty (*Plut.* 415 ff.); and the weight loss treatment that Euripides imposes on poetry as if it were a person (*Ran.* 939–943).

(6) As a deity

Eirene-Peace (*Pax*, passim) is a statue of a goddess on stage, but worshipped like an actual goddess; Basileia is a divine girl (*Av.* 1536); Polemus-War and Cydoemus-Battle Tumult serve the gods; in the sausage seller's apostrophe, Shamelessness, Falsehood, Stupidity, Deceit, Arrogance and Agora are demons (*Equit.* 634 f.). Macco personifies stupidity (*Equit.* 62 and 396); πόθος and ὦραι are deities in Trygaeus' prayer (*Pax* 455)¹³. Old Age and Health reside with the gods on Olympus (*Av.* 603 and 606); there are also Chronos (*Ran.* 100), Peitho (*Ran.* 1396), and Ζύνειος (*Ran.* 893).

III

We would like to discuss in somewhat more detail those personifications that appear on stage “in person”, as it were. They are:

1. The personified choruses of Clouds and Wasps.

¹² The weight of that simile is on its proper object, that is, on comedy writing characterised by the poet. However, its characteristics are literal rather than metaphorical, with only a few anthropomorphic features: σώφρων ἐστὶ φύσει (537), πιστεύουσα (544), οὐδὲν ἤλθε (538), οὐδ' ἔσκωψε (540), οὐδ' εἰσηζε δᾶδας ἔχουσα, οὐδ' ἰοῦ ἰοῦ βοᾶ, ἀλλ' αὐτῆ καὶ τοῖς ἔπεισιν πιστεύουσα ἔληλυθεν (543 f.). Cf. H.J. NEWIGER, *Elektra in Aristophanes' Wolken*, Hermes LXXXIX 1961, pp. 422–430.

¹³ In the lost comedy *Horai* there was a chorus of personified seasons. It is not certain whether they were goddesses or women; rather goddesses according to Strabo X 3, 18 and Cicero, *De leg.* II 15; in that play Aristophanes mocked newfangled deities adopted by the Athenians from other cults (cf. J.M. EDMONDS, *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*, vol. I, Leiden 1957, pp. 724 ff.).

2. Allegorical characters:
 - a. Non-speaking: Diallage, Spondae, Eirene (the statue), Opora, Theoria, Basileia.
 - b. Speaking: Polemus, Cydoemus, Dikaios Logos, Adikos Logos, Penia, Plutus, Georgia.
 - c. Kitchen utensils.
 - d. Wearing an animal mask: Labes, the dog from Cydathenaeum, Carcinus, and the Carcinites.
 - e. “feigned” non-speaking: the torch-woman; and speaking: parodies and “theatricals”, Euripides and Mnesilochus playing tragic characters.
 - f. Demus, Paphlagon and the slaves wearing the masks of Nicias and Demosthenes.
 - g. Human character types (Socrates).
 - h. Protagonists bearing *nomina significantia*: Dicaeopolis, Agoracritus, Strepsiades, Pheidippides, Philocleon, Bdelycleon, Trygaeus, Euelpides, Peisthetaerus, Lysistrata, and Praxagora.
3. Animal travesty: the Megarian’s daughters dressed up as pigs; humans dressed up as birds; Tereus and his slave.

Ad 1. Clouds are the “meteorological” deities and the chorus of the play. The poet calls them παρθένοι ὀμβροφόροι¹⁴, πολυτίμητοι Νεφέλαι [...] δέσποιναι [...] σμῆνος θεῶν [...] μεγάλαι ἀνδράσιν ἄγροῖς, i.e. to sophists, soothsayers, dandies etc.¹⁵ Their purpose in the comedy is twofold. First, Aristophanes uses them to mock religious ceremony¹⁶, newfangled philosophy of nature¹⁷ (which he depicts with humour and caricature), and theogony (since they are sung in the play as daughters of Oceanus), which supposedly oust traditional beliefs and mythological depictions of recognized deities. Second, they are tasked with teaching dialectic tricks, evasive speech, throwing words to the wind, empty slogans, and finally the ability to dispute over nothing¹⁸. That latter function the poet entrusts

¹⁴ Cf. C.L. STEVENS, *Rabelais and Aristophanes*, SPh LV 1958, pp. 24–30; conversely G. HIGHET, *The Classical Tradition*, Oxford 1951, p. 188. STEVENS tries to prove that Rabelais knew and consciously drew on Aristophanes. He does know the words *ombrophores* and *phronistère*, and some of his technique and ideas are from *Plutus*.

¹⁵ *Nub.* 331–354; cf. U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Der Chor der Wolken des Aristophanes*, Berlin 1921, pp. 738–741.

¹⁶ G. MÉAUTIS, *La scène de l’initiation dans les Nuées d’Aristophane*, RHR CXVIII 1938, pp. 92–97, where the author emphasises parallels between Strepsiades’ initiation and the dialogue between Pentheus and the priest in Euripides’ *Bacchae*.

¹⁷ A. WEIHER, *Philosophen und Philosophenspott in der attischen Komödie*, München 1913, passim.

¹⁸ *Nub.* 317–321; P. IVENS, *De sophistiek en de grieksche Literaturogeschiedenis*, Philologische Studiën VII 1935–1936 and VIII 1936–1937; C. CORBATO, *Sofisti e politica ad Atene durante la*

also to Socrates, as well as two other abstract agonistic characters (the Logoi), each time using different artistic means.

To move on to the *Wasps*, its chorus is among Aristophanes' more original personifications. The symbolic travesty rests on metaphors used in the *parodos*, serving to strengthen that type of personification, followed by similes in the *epirrhema* and *antepirrhema*, reinforced by more similes. They are the old heliasts, Attic peasants and tradesmen, leaning on a staff. From the moment they enter (*Vesp.* 230) to the moment they intend to personally free their imprisoned colleague (405), nothing indicates the transformation to come. Then they drop their cloaks, reveal the "sting" hidden underneath, put on the wasp masks and refer to themselves as wasps (430). That part of the *parodos* still voices human problems, such as old age and poverty, but those around them adapt to the chorus' metaphorical travesty. Bdelycleon pretends to take their pseudo-hoax literally, and commands the slaves to shoo the swarm of wasps away from the house (456), and to smoke them out (457). The centre of gravity of the action shifts in the direction of the agon between the father and son, and the chorus is again made just of peasants weary with toil and poverty. Only once does the poet return to the wasp travesty, resting it on a simile this time (1071–1090), where the chorus addresses the audience, explains its wasp-like appearance and the purpose of the sting, but does so without identifying with the insects, instead clarifying its costume, calling now on wasps' characteristics, now on human ones: *στάς ἀνὴρ παρ' ἄνδρα* (1083); *ξὺν δορὶ ξὺν ἄσπίδι* (1081); and the summary of the dicasts' demands (1120):

...τὸ λοιπὸν τῶν πολιτῶν ἔμβραχῦ
ὄστις ἂν μὴ ᾿χη τὸ κέντρον, μὴ φέρειν τριώβολον¹⁹.

We are fully in agreement with WEBER'S²⁰ convincing argument as to the role of the wasp-chorus in the play, especially where he claims that the "sting", symbolic here of the judiciary, is at the core of the metaphor.

Ad 2a. Non-speaking allegorical characters. Those include Diallage (*Ach.* 989 ff.), the object of the chorus' erotic desires and intentions expressed as a metaphor borrowed from the cultivation of vine and olives. In *Lys.* 1114 Diallage is also an alluring girl, a prize to the lonely men, showered by those around her

guerra del Peloponneso, Trieste 1958; NEWIGER, *Metapher...* (n. 10), p. 74; S. WILCOX, *The Scope of Early Rhetorical Instruction*, HSCPh LIII 1942, pp. 121–155; N. PETRUZZELLIS, *Aristofane e la sofistica*, Dioniso XX 1957, pp. 38–62; C.T. MURPHY, *Aristophanes and the Art of Rhetoric*, HSCPh XLIX 1938, pp. 69–113.

¹⁹ Cf. 1113–1121; for economic and sociological commentary, see A. KOMORNICKA, *Ludzie pracy w komediach Arystofanesa*, in: *Arystofanes*, Wrocław 1957, pp. 102 f.

²⁰ H. WEBER, *Aristophanische Studien*, Leipzig 1908, pp. 145–164; ἔγκεντρὶς (*Vesp.* 427 and 1037); κέντρον (*Vesp.* 225, 406, 420, 423, 1115 and 1121); cf. VAN LEEUWEN (ad *Vesp.* 224), who compares Aristophanes' metaphorical sting with Homer's (*Il.* XVI 259 ff.); NEWIGER, *Metapher...* (n. 10), p. 77, on *Vesp.* 223 ff.

with double innuendos. In *Equit.* 1389 ff., Spondae is a beautiful hetaera offered by the sausage seller to his rejuvenated master Demus.

In *Pax* 521 ff., Eirene is necessarily a *persona muta*, since she appears on stage as a statue, accompanied by the living girls Opora and Theoria; still, the poet's mischievous imagination depicts her as the most "alive" of the three non-speaking allegorical characters, as others attribute various feelings to her, pretend to talk to her, listen for her supposed whispering or rely to the audience her words, orders or complaints.

Opora and Theoria come on stage bearing the attributes of harvest and of festival games. They personify joy, happiness and pleasure – all those goods that peace brings. Formerly they served as hetaerae to the Olympians; now one shall fall to the saviour Trygaeus, and the other to the Council. Scholars have been right to emphasise the connection between the wine-growing peasant Trygaeus and the earth, its fruit and plentiful harvest, shown by Aristophanes on stage as his marriage to the fruit-bearing Opora, the symbol of earth's fertility²¹. Of the three allegorical characters in *Pax*, only Eirene is called a goddess, sacrificed to and prayed to.

All those *personae mutae* portray the benefits of peace in the form of sensuous beauty, female charm and all that it conceals²².

Basileia (*Av.* 1713 ff.) is particularly difficult to interpret. We shall return to that intriguing allegorical character elsewhere; for now let it suffice to say that she embodies the royal authority of Zeus and appears on stage as a divine maiden. Her divine nature makes her different from other non-speaking characters and exempt from any obscenity or eroticism, even though she is to marry a mortal.

Ad 2b. Speaking allegorical characters: Polemus-War and Cydoemus-Battle Tumult, a cook and his assistant, both servants to the gods. Those are introduced to demonstrate the threat posed by Cleon's actions and benefits from his death, and in general to illustrate the terror and consequences of war in a poetic guise different to that of the *Acharnians*. Polemus keeps Eirene-Peace captive and plots the destruction of Hellas. The role of Cydoemus is similar to that of Eirene's companions; he is just inseparable from war²³.

²¹ NEWIGER, *Metapher...* (n. 10), pp. 110 f.

²² As WILAMOWITZ correctly notes (*Lysistrata*, Berlin 1927, p. 59), "die Sehnsucht nach dem Frieden wird in die geile Begehrlichkeit nach den Reizen dieses Frauenzimmers verwandelt". K. LEVER (*Poetic Metaphor and Dramatic Allegory in Aristophanes*, Classical Weekly XLVI 1953, p. 221), writes, "They motivate action through attraction not through participation".

²³ Hom. *Il.* V 593 and 333; on Achilles' shield, Eris is shown with Cydoemus, the companion of Enyo. In Hesiod's *Sc.* 156 there are Eros, Cydoemus and the fury Kera. L. DEUBNER, *Personifikationen abstrakter Begriffe*, in: W.H. ROSCHER (ed.), *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, vol. III 2, Leipzig 1909, col. 2095.

The Just Cause (Dikaios Logos) and the Unjust Cause (Adikos Logos) are personifications of ethical import, “rhetorical-allegorical” characters, as DEUBNER²⁴ calls them. Unlike other personifications, for which it matters what they look like, whether they are beautiful, young, old or neglected (Penia, Plutus), and how they are dressed, those two are completely “impersonal”; the author says nothing of their external appearance, nothing to help us visualise them. We suspect that he does that on purpose in an attempt to deprive them of any external individuality and emphasise the unimportance of their looks, which play no part in the plot. It is hard to resist the thought that in a modern staging they would be best represented by two loudspeakers set on the opposite edges of the stage.

The purpose of the two Logoi is to present two world-views, and two paedagogical and dialectical systems²⁵.

Penia and Plutus from Aristophanes’ last preserved comedy require a more detailed interpretation²⁶. Let us try to characterise those two allegorical characters more closely, indicate differences between them and throw light on how the poet treated them.

Penia-Poverty resembles a neglected old woman; those around her mistake her for an alewife, πανδοκεύτρια (426), καπηλίσ (435) or a street vendor, λεκιθόπωλις (427). Blesidemus compares her appearance and gaze, μανικόν τι καὶ τραγικόν (424), to those of the Erinyes of tragedy; all she lacks is a torch. Her yellow complexion and wild cries cause fear and revulsion in Chremylus and his companion. When they learn who it is they see, they pommel her with the worst possible epithets, ζῶρον ἐξωλέστερον (443), μιαρωτάτη (451), and

²⁴ DEUBNER, *op. cit.* (n. 23), col. 2107. It is possible to trace the literary roots of those two antinomian concepts to Hesiod (*Th.* 228), whereas in their moral and paedagogical aspect they could be a reference to the myth of Heracles at the crossroads, with its Ἄρετή versus Εὐδαιμονία / Κακία. The *Suda* s.v. *Prodikos*; Xen. *Mem.* II 1, 21 ff.; Epicharmus’ titles Λόγος καὶ Λογίνα and Γᾶ καὶ Θάλασσα could indicate an agon of the Earth and the Sea (a guess supported by the testimony of the Byzantine Δικαιόλογος γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης). Cf. T. SINKO, *Literatura grecka*, vol. I 2, Kraków 1932, p. 398; J. WIKARJAK, *De abstractionibus personatis apud Graecae comoediae poetas*, in: *Munera philologica Ludovico Ćwikliński oblata*, Posnaniae 1936, pp. 2 f. The concepts (καταβάλλοντες λόγοι, ἀντιλογίαί) were developed further by the sophists, and in tragic poets there was Sophocles’ lost satyr play *Krisis* (fr. 334 N²), where Aphrodite stands for Ἥδονή, and Athena represents Φρόνησις-Νοῦς-Ἄρετή. Eur. *Hipp.* 928 ff. φωνὴ δίκαια, τ’ ἄδικα; *Phoen.* 471 ὁ ἄδικος λόγος; *Iphig. Aul.* 1013. Cf. B. BILIŃSKI, *Walka postępu i reakcji na scenie Eurypidesa*, Meander VII 1945, pp. 330 f.; and NEWIGER, *Metapher...* (n. 10), pp. 138 ff.

²⁵ E. WOLF, *Griechisches Rechtsdenken*, vol. III 2, Frankfurt am Main 1954, pp. 198 ff.

²⁶ WIKARJAK, *op. cit.* (n. 24), p. 7 is right to say “has veras personas non esse, sed potius certas notiones humana specie ornatas”. Both are discussed in NEWIGER, *Metapher...* (n. 10), pp. 155–178, so we had to give up on our own materials and conclusions reached before his work was published, although we take them into account above in as much as necessary for the argument as a whole; in a large part, they overlapped with NEWIGER’s interpretation.

ἡπίτριπτος (619)²⁷. Unlike Plutus, a mythological character encountered frequently in literature, Penia is the work of our poet and not a deity, even though she refers to herself as δέσποινα and claims an almost divine influence over people and their lives²⁸.

As has been stated above, Plutus is a deity known to us from literature earlier than Aristophanes²⁹. Our poet gave him special attributes, such as old age³⁰, filthiness³¹, blindness³² and cowardice³³, but we encounter already some of them in earlier literary sources³⁴.

²⁷ While Penia's arguments are in a way parallel to those of the Logoi in the *Clouds* (being paedagogical-philosophical there, and social-paedagogical-philosophical in *Plutus*), we cannot quite agree with NEWIGER, *Metapher...* (n. 10), p. 161, that the respective personifications are similar. We think the two Logoi are "impersonal" advocates of different world-views, a certain normative view of the world and humanity, whereas Penia has her personal external and internal characteristics.

²⁸ Poverty is mentioned in Hesiod (*Erga* 717 f.) as a personification and a concept; cf. Alcaeus 142 D, where Poverty is a sister of Ἀμηχανία. In Aristophanes, Chremylus accuses her of being a sister to Beggary, Πτωχεία (*Plut.* 549); cf. Theogn. 173 ff., 351 ff., 383 ff., and 649 f. Herodotus (VIII 111) says that "as for the Andrians, they are poor in the extreme, and two deities, θεοὶ δύο ἄχρηστοί, Poverty and Helplessness, like to keep them company". In Plato (*Conv.* 203 C) we read of the genealogy of Eros and his parents Poros and Penia; cf. Democritus, fr. 24 and 284, and Gorgias, fr. 11 a. In the mouth of Demaratus addressing Xerxes Herodotus puts the following words about Poverty as a "co-dweller of Hellas": "Know that poverty is always a faithful companion of Hellas, but Virtue is its acquisition, gained through reason and strict laws; for by practising Virtue, Hellas defends itself from poverty and tyranny" (cf. T. SINKO, *Bieda, wspólmieszkanca Hellady*, Meander I 1946, pp. 128 ff.). See also VOIGT, *Penia*, *RE* XIX 1 (1937), coll. 495 ff.; and O. HÖFER, *Penia*, in: ROSCHER, *op. cit.* (n. 23), vol. III, col. 1921.

²⁹ For Πλοῦτος and Πλούτων, see J. ZWICKER, *Plutos*, *RE* XXI 1 (1951), col. 1028. More about Plutus: EISELE, *Plutos*, in: ROSCHER, *op. cit.* (n. 23), vol. III, coll. 2572 ff.; Hesiod, *Th.* 969–974 (where he is the son of Iasion and Demeter) and *Erga* 121 ff. (δαίμονες πλουτοδόται); Theogn. 523 ff.; the pseudo-Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* 485–489 (where the goddesses send Plutus, who grants riches, to those they love); in titles, Ἐλπὶς ἢ Πλοῦτος (in Epicharmus), and Πλοῦτοι (in Cratinus). Cf. Th. KOCK, *FCA*, pp. 686 f., fr. 35–39 on that play's relationship to Aristophanes; F. STÖSSL, *Personifikationen*, *RE* XIX 1 (1937), col. 1050; WIKARJAK, *op. cit.* (n. 24), pp. 7 f.; R. GOOSSENS, *Plutos, Le papyrus Cumont*, *REA* XXXVII 1935, p. 430; and D.J. HEMELRIJK, *Πενία ἐν Πλοῦτος*, Utrecht 1925, where the author lists the occurrences of πένης, πλούσιος and related words from all of Greek literature from Homer to Aristotle (Plutus in Aristophanes: pp. 24–27; in other comic poets: pp. 32–35; missing the interesting text from *Eccl.* 197 f.).

³⁰ Aristophanes' novelty, since in Greek art Plutus is depicted as a naked babe; only on a Nolan hydria from Vulci (Brit. Mus. Corp. Vas. Fasc. 6, pl. 64 b and c; L.R. FARNELL, *The Cults of the Greek States*, vol. III, Oxford 1907, pl. XXXII a) is he a grey-haired old man.

³¹ Scholia ad vv. 84 f.; because he consorts with "filthy" rich people, see below.

³² Hipponax, fr. 29 D; Timocreon, fr. 5 D; Antiphanes, fr. 259 and 81; he blinds those he grants himself to: *FCA* II, p. 121; schol. Theocr. 10, 19 a, p. 230, 5; Eurip. fr. 770, A. NAUCK, *FTG*, p. 606; A. ALBERT, M. ESSER, *Das Antlitz der Blindheit in der Antike*, Leiden 1961, pp. 7, 29, 85, 117, 151 ff., and 179 f.; NEWIGER, *Metapher...* (n. 10), p. 168.

³³ The rich ever fear for their property: Eurip. *Phoen.* 597.

³⁴ C.F.H. BRUCHMAN, *Epitheta deorum quae apud poetas Graecos leguntur*, Lipsiae 1893; ZWICKER, *op. cit.* (n. 29), coll. 1044–1046 (Plutus' epithets).

The myth made up by Aristophanes to explain his god's blindness is interesting³⁵: it is Zeus' revenge. As a μείρακιον, Plutus only visited the good, wise and honest people, and of course Zeus is jealous of all the χρηστοί (87–92)³⁶. That φθόνος of the Olympians is often emphasised in Aristophanes' work, and, as VAN DAELE correctly observes, divine power and happiness are generally in conflict with human happiness and success, not to mention the many references to gods' unethical actions, their greed, cowardice etc. What we have here, then, is another paradox in the work of a poet who fulminated against philosophy and notions undermining faith in the gods! The scene where the god of wealth is cured of his blindness, and Aristophanes mocks the methods of "treatment" in the Asclepieum of Epidaurus, has invited many comments and interpretations³⁷.

Both poverty and wealth are treated by the poet, either as (1) an object (meaning either a person who is poor or rich, or simply money); (2) a concept; (3) a condition (suffering poverty or enjoying wealth); or (4) an allegorical character (either appearing on stage, or spoken of as a living person: the character Penia, the character Plutus, the god of wealth). At the same time, when Plutus visits people, it is to give them material wealth, that is money, or so to speak, to give them himself³⁸. Sometimes the two meanings intertwine in the comic way so beloved by the poet³⁹. For instance, Plutus says of himself (237–244):

If I (the person) got inside a miser's house, straightaway he would bury me (the money) deep underground; if some honest fellow among his friends came to ask him for the smallest coin, he would deny ever having seen me (the person? the money?). Then if I (the person) went to a fool's house, he would sacrifice me (the money) in dicing and wenching, and very soon I (the person) should be completely stripped and pitched out of doors.

So Penia: "If Plutus (the person) recovered his eyesight and divided himself (the money) equally among all..." (510). This constant exchange of person and thing extends to the metaphorical description of Plutus' exterior. For example Plutus appears dirty, because he has just left the house of an infamous "filthy"

³⁵ Cf. Ch. ROSENTHAL, *Aristophanis Aves quatenus secundum populi opiniones conformatae sint III*, *Eos* XXX 1927, pp. 63–67.

³⁶ H. VAN DAELE, *Aristophane*, vol. V, Paris 1930, ad v. 87, pp. 93 f.

³⁷ R. HERZOG, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros*, Leipzig 1931 (Philologus Supplement XXII, fasc. 3), p. 88; ROSENTHAL, *op. cit.* (n. 35), pp. 67 f.: "De aqua marina vel fontana, quae adempta caeco lumina reddat"; pp. 68 f.: "Serpens in fabula"; H.W. MILLER, *Aristophanes and Medical Language*, TAPhA LXXXVI 1945, p. 76.

³⁸ PICARD, *op. cit.* (n. 5), pp. 43 f., has examples to illustrate his thesis that Greek theatre never gave rise to permanent allegories that could acquire "tangibles et humaines" characteristics, and so the allegories it did create never grew in creative power or had any descendants.

³⁹ K. HOLZINGER, *Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar zu Aristophanes' Plutos*, Wien 1940, s.v. Plutos, p. 82 (ad v. 226); NEWIGER, *Metapher...* (n. 10), pp. 158 ff.

miser Patrocles⁴⁰. An abstract characteristic, miserliness, gains the metaphorical epithet “dirty”, which is then attributed, now as something literal and concrete, both to the living character Plutus, and to actual money, which could well be “dirty” if it is ill-gained⁴¹. It is that “exchange” of person and thing which causes our difficulty in capitalisation in some of the lines featuring Penia and Plutus⁴². The line between the various aspects of the trope (proper allegory, or a popular personification of a philosophical concept, or a specific symptom of cult) is blurred⁴³.

There is one more speaking allegorical character: Georgia in the play *Pax* 2, of which we have a fragment (294). Her function there is probably similar to that of Opora and Theoria, although hers is a higher-level personification. In the fragment she praises Eirene, rather as her subordinate than an equal.

Ad 2c. In the *Wasps*, kitchen utensils act as witnesses in the dog-trial regarding the “Sicilisation” of cheese. They are played by extras without masks, each holding his token object in his hand, as well as employing gestures, head movements (966) and maybe facial expressions. The crucial witness is a cheese grater, referred to as τραπεῦσα or a steward. Questioned by Bdelycleon, she confirms that she did grate cheese for the soldiers (965 f.). Lined up next are: a ladle, a pestle, a grate, a pan and other utensils that are to testify to Labes’ innocence⁴⁴.

Ad 2d. Characters appearing in an animal mask are: Labes the dog referring in a comic way to *strategos* Laches and his famous trial for theft on Sicily in 425 BC. He is also a silent character, wearing a mask, acting a dog with hand gestures and mimics, e.g. baring his teeth (901) and his silence is probably, according to the poet’s intention, pointing to his innocence, sense of harm and helplessness, especially in contrast to his sharp-tongued adversary. Labes-Laches remains silent just as Thucydides in his trial (946 ff.), defended by Bdelycleon.

The dog from Cydathenaeum that has a loud bark and can lick pots clean (905) is Cleon. Aristophanes does not twist his name or coin a neologism or *nomen significans* to indicate whom he has in mind. All he needs to evoke an association with the demagogue in his audience is to mention his place of origin.

⁴⁰ VAN DAELE, *op. cit.* (n. 36), ad v. 84 quotes scholia about Patrocles’ proverbial greed and miserliness, but adds that the man was also literally slovenly and dirty. He could be Socrates’ *frater uterinus* mentioned in Pl. *Euthyd.* 297 C; Aristophanes charges Socrates with the same crime of not washing and of neglecting himself (*Nub.* 836; *Av.* 1282). Cf. SREBRNY, *op. cit.* (n. 10), p. 1056, who clarifies that ἀύχμιών has a broader meaning of “wretched, neglected”.

⁴¹ NEWIGER, *op. cit.* (n. 10), p. 169, interprets this slightly differently.

⁴² F. DORNSEIFF, *Pindars Stil*, Berlin 1921, pp. 52 ff.; about Plutus, p. 56.

⁴³ O. WEINREICH, *Stiftung und Kultsatzungen eines Privatheiligtums in Philadelphia in Lydien*, Heidelberg 1919, no. 4.16.13. The agon of Penia and Plutus, and its moral and sociological problems, will be discussed separately.

⁴⁴ Cf. Aristoph. *Danaides*, fr. 245.

Carcinus the crab and his crab children the Carcinites carrying the emblems of tragic poetry, that is a tragic mask and a papyrus scroll, stand for newfangled tragic authors, dancers and followers of Carcinus. Aristophanes mocks them mercilessly, sneering at their grotesque ballet figures.

Ad 2e. This category comprises “feigned” allegorical characters. We call them feigned when actually they are persons on stage, mute or speaking, not allegories, but somebody around them or they themselves pretend that they are something else, have somebody else’s personality or acts someone else. It is a comic trope *par excellence*, since comedy positively loves all sorts of mystification, amusing dress-ups, imitations and double acting⁴⁵.

Of non-speaking characters of this type there is the nude hetaera in the *Wasps* whom Bdelycleon picks up at a feast and takes home to then try to make his son believe that she is a statue or perhaps a torch, demonstrating various parts of her body as if she really were an inanimate object.

Among the speaking feigned personifications there are the “theatricals” and parodies of tragedy acted out by Euripides and Mnesilochus in the *Thesmophoriazusae*. The two men “become” characters of myth and literature: Andromeda (*Thesm.* 1015–1055), Palamedes (770–784), Helen (855 ff.), and Menelaus (871 ff.), supposedly to escape the Athenian women planning to kill them. The comic force of thus “aping” the great heroes of myth requires no comment, especially in the context and mood of comedy, which brings out special contrast between the actor (old fat Mnesilochus) and his role (virginal Andromeda or beautiful Helen).

Ad 2f. Demus, Paphlagon and the slaves in the *Knights* are a category in themselves, their twofold nature reflected in the metaphorical structure of the play. The two planes of that comedy are the Household in the foreground and the Pnyx, and with it the Polis, in the background. The two planes co-exist and shift around each other throughout the play.

In his foreground country house, Demus is a selfish, narrow-minded householder; at the same time in the background he is the Athenian people, δῆμος Ἀθηναίων, with all its weaknesses and vices⁴⁶.

⁴⁵ The trope is not the same as the phenomenon often observed in tragedy or epos, where a character is mistaken for somebody else in earnest (as when Electra does not immediately recognise her brother), or himself does not know who he is (Oedipus), or pretends on purpose to be somebody else to lull the vigilance of others (Odysseus towards the suitors).

⁴⁶ NEWIGER, *op. cit.* (n. 10), pp. 11 ff. characterises this character extensively; H. KLEINKNECHT, *Die Epiphanie des Demos in Aristophanes’ Rittern*, *Hermes* LXXIV 1939, pp. 58–65; P. FAULMÜLLER, *Der attische Demos zur Zeit des peloponnesischen Krieges im Lichte zeitgenössischer Quellen*, München 1938; O. WASER, *Demos, die Personifikation des Volkes*, *Revue suisse de Numismatique* VII 1897, pp. 313 ff.; A. KOMORNICKA, *Das alltägliche Leben und die Natur, zwei wichtige Inspirationsquellen des Aristophanischen Dichtkunst*, *Eirene* I 1960, pp. 133 f.

Paphlagon supervises the slaves in Demus' household and at the same time personifies Cleon, one specific man, whom the poet in his hatred equips not only with Cleon's personal traits, but also with all the characteristics of dishonest demagogues and propagandists. The exaggeration is in either case typical of satire in comedy⁴⁷.

The slaves in the *Knights* are nothing more than the masks of the *strategoí* Nicias and Demosthenes. Were it not for the masks and a few allusions to historical events, they could be taken for plain slaves in Demus' house, limited to the "real" plane of the Household⁴⁸. They do not even have "significant" names.

Ad 2g. Human character types. The best example for this category of personification is Socrates in the *Clouds*. From the point of view of poetic art he is somewhere between Paphlagon-Cleon on the one hand, and Aeschylus in the *Frogs* or Euripides (*Ach.*, *Ran.* and *Thesm.*) on the other. The latter two just stand for themselves, although to an extent they are also patterns of literary trends and of a different, philosophically minded poetry.

Socrates in Aristophanes, however, stands for the type of a sophist and slovenly ascetic, a man indistinguishable in his appearance from a wiseacre tramp⁴⁹ discoursing in the streets and squares. The poet used his name, because Socrates was the most recognisable person in Athens. Aristophanes' Socrates, contrasted with Plato's and Xenophon's testimonies, was for many centuries a *crux interpretum* and a source of misunderstandings and scholarly conflicts⁵⁰.

20th century scholarship may have reached the best interpretation of that exceptional phenomenon. Rejecting the traditional charges of falsifying Socrates' character in the *Clouds*⁵¹, it tends to accept, *toutes proportions gardées*, the

⁴⁷ W. STEFFEN, *Rola karykatyry w komediach Arystofanesa*, in: *Arystofanes*, Wrocław 1957, pp. 120 ff.; T.A. DOREY, *Aristophanes and Cleon*, G&R III 1956, pp. 132 ff.

⁴⁸ In our opinion I. TRENCSENYI-WALDAPFEL, in his interesting paper on the *Knights* (AAnthHung V 1957, pp. 97–127), sees a too strong connection between the technique of their personification and the way it is applied to Demus or Paphlagon. Rather, we think the slaves are realistic and have all the characteristics of actual slaves, but without the mark of individuality stamped on Demus and Paphlagon.

⁴⁹ W. HOLOEHR, *De metaphoris Aristophaneis*, Berlin 1922, ch. IV; D. GRENE, *The Comic Technique of Aristophanes*, Hermathena XXV 1937, pp. 95–98; E. WÜST, *Neue Aristophanes-Studien*, Erlangen 1914, pp. 4 ff.; A. BONNARD, *Deux images de l'homme dans la littérature grecque*, Bibliothèque Universelle et Revue de Genève CXLVIII 1929, pp. 389–404, on the philosophy of the end of the 5th century BC, when the type of the learned sophist arose.

⁵⁰ GRENE, *op. cit.* (n. 49), p. 95, points out the element of contrast in Aristophanes' Socrates; O. SEEL, *Aristophanes oder Versuch über Komödie*, Stuttgart 1960, pp. 98–106.

⁵¹ W. SÜSS, *De personarum antiquae comoediae usu atque origine*, Bonn 1905, p. 8; A. BELLESORT, *Athènes et son théâtre*, Paris 1954, p. 328; differently GRENE, *op. cit.* (n. 49), pp. 106 f., who in his investigation into grotesque satire opposes SÜSS and refuses to see in the character of Socrates a mere "alazon doctus"; K. WENIG, *Le romantisme d'Aristophane*, Listy Filologické L 1923, pp. 177–190 and 289–294; that author believes that Aristophanes' attacks on the dialectics practised by sophists and Euripides, as well as on Socrates' intellectualism, are explained by his

testimony of the play, while also trying to penetrate the poet's intentions⁵². Now Aristophanic comedy does not strive to present that greatest of philosophers as he really was, but rather as he was seen by the common Athenian in the street, whether we call him Demus, Dicaeopolis or Strepsiades⁵³. Many of Socrates' characteristics – his external features, habits, subject matter and methods of discussion – are in Aristophanes caricatured, but in accordance with historical facts. It is true that he seems to credit Socrates with the theory that air is all-powerful, actually taught by Diogenes of Apollonia⁵⁴, but as Adam KROKIEWICZ is right to observe in his astute interpretation of Aristophanes' Socrates⁵⁵, we know that he read and discussed with his disciples various learned works, so he could have just as well investigated with them the doctrines of Diogenes or Anaximenes of Miletus. The mirror of comedy does not just distort, it may also bring forth some features while completely obscuring others, and its purpose is not to reflect bare reality⁵⁶. Comedy can be, and is, a source of information about the people, life and opinions of an era, but the information it provides is not always factual; it may be gossip, the mood accompanying an event, or anecdotes circulating in the city, valuable even if untrue; one must only keep in sight its principles of comicality and caricature⁵⁷.

sentimentality, romanticism, and dreams that the past of the Marathonomachoi will return. Similarly F. LORENTZ, *De Aristophanis spe atque imagine reipublicae Atheniensium restituendae*, Berlin 1865 (but they are not convincing).

⁵² Cf. W. SCHMID, *Das Sokratesbild der Wolken*, Philologus XCVII 1948, pp. 209–228, who demonstrates that Aristophanes was quite well versed in the subtleties of Socratic philosophy.

⁵³ B. BILIŃSKI, *Walka idei w komediach Arystofanesa*, in: *Arystofanes*, Wrocław 1957, p. 70, makes this interesting comment: "Irony and satire target not only sophisticated methods and beliefs. The ideal of mouldy past is mocked too in its hieratic gravity, and who knows whether it is not Aristophanes himself but the simple man Strepsiades and other commoners like him who failed to understand the new trends and only wanted to see in them either corruption or some practical profit for their daily lives".

⁵⁴ SÜSS, *op. cit.* (n. 51), p. 8.

⁵⁵ A. KROKIEWICZ, *Sokrates*, Warszawa 1958, pp. 31 ff.

⁵⁶ GRENE, *op. cit.* (n. 49), p. 97. B. FARRINGTON, *Greek Science*, Harmondsworth 1961, p. 89 opposes the view that "Socrates brought down philosophy from heaven to earth". In his opinion it was the other way round, "Socrates [...] discouraged research into nature, substituted for the ideal of positive science a theory of Ideas closely linked with a belief in the Soul as an immortal being", resulting in "theological astronomy and teleological physics"; he also "abandoned the scientific view of nature and man [...] and substituted for it a development of the religious view [...] He made no contribution to science". That opinion is controversial, but if we were to accept it, then indeed Aristophanes' Socrates found in a basket suspended above the ground and debating over some meteorological (that is, in some cosmic aspect, "otherworldly") phenomena would have the import proposed by BILIŃSKI.

⁵⁷ G. MURRAY, *Aristophanes*, Oxford 1933, p. 98, is right to note that the representation of Socrates' character and teaching, which were taken for a joke in 423 BC, in 399 became accusatory because of the shift in the general mood and political situation; A. KOMORNICKA, *Komedia Arystofanesa*

Ad 2h. Protagonists (usually bearing *nomina significantia*) receive diverse treatment at Aristophanes' hands. A protagonist's name may mean:

a. their character or some special characteristic: Strepsiades is a schemer⁵⁸; Dicaeopolis embodies the abstraction of a just city into a righteous citizen, who acts according to the author's values, that is makes peace and enjoys its pleasures; Paphlagon, a slave of the worst sort (a reference to *παφλάζειν*, "to skim", "to ladle up scum"; Philocleon and Bdelycleon, whose names express only their attitudes to Cleon and the demagogues, being declarations of their political sympathies; Euelpides is the one filled with good hopes; Peisthetaerus, a trustworthy companion.

b. their origin: Agoracritus is the chosen one of the agora, or basically street garbage; the dog from Cydathenaeum points to Cleon through its use of the place name.

c. some typical activity of theirs, either work (e.g. Trygaeus, "vine-harvestman"), entertainment (Pheidippides, the one who wastes his possessions on horses)⁵⁹, or their special function in the play (Lysistrata, "disbander of armies", and Praxagora, the "energetic activist in public affairs" who introduced the women's rule in the country).

One can mention Labes again here; besides being an analogy to Laches, his name means "grabber".

Ad. 3. Animal travesty is present in the pretended transformation of the Megarian's daughters into pigs (*Ach.* 738–935), whose father puts snout masks on their faces and porcine tails on their behinds as the audience looks on. The masquerade is not supposed to fool anybody, either the audience, or Dicaeopolis; its purpose is to introduce comic obscenity⁶⁰. Some scenes in the *Birds*, where men dress up as birds and themselves mock the disguise (*Av.* 804–808), could be included in the same category.

It would also be fitting to mention the "mythical" metamorphosis, naturally specifically treated by Aristophanes, of the bird-man, or Tereus the hoopoe, and

jako źródło wiadomości o kulturze materialnej Grecji V i IV w. p.n.e. Wartość i wiarygodność przekazu źródłowego komedii, Warszawa 1958, pp. 8 ff.

⁵⁸ B. MARZULLO, *Strepsiade*, Maia VI 1953, pp. 99–124; F. VANDERVELDEN, *Le paysan chez Aristophane*, Liège 1942, *passim*.

⁵⁹ MARZULLO, *op. cit.* (n. 58), pp. 99–124; Ch.W. PEPPLER, *Comic Terminations in Aristophanes and the Comic Fragments*, Baltimore 1902, pp. 48 ff.: "Pheidippides' that combination of economy and luxury, of plebeian and patrician name (*Nub.* 67)"; WÜST, *op. cit.* (n. 49), pp. 4 f. and 10 ff.; on the allusions to Alcibiades, see J.W. SÜVERN, *Über Aristophanes' Wolken*, Berlin 1826.

⁶⁰ The complexity of this little scene deserves to be emphasised. It provokes at once laughter and pity, caused by the impression of the utter poverty of a man who sells his daughters for a bunch of garlic (let us remember how the audience, which was largely made up by peasants, would react in that specific political situation!). Contrary to the popular claim that ancient literature knew nothing of lyrical comicality in Chaplin's style, nothing of laughter seasoned with a tear, we think that this scene, as well as a few others in the same poet, comes at least very close.

his slave, once human, but now a bird too⁶¹. Euelpides says that since Tereus was once a man, he knows the nature and ways of men well and that πάνθ' ὅσα περ ἄνθρωπος ὅσα τ' ὄρνις φρονεῖ (*Av.* 119). That special transformation is not an original idea of Aristophanes, but a re-working of the myth of the wretched fate of Tereus, Procne and Philomela, turned into birds by the gods. Therefore, Tereus keeps the customs, likes and tastes from his old incarnation: he has a slave, enjoys sardines from Phalerum and pea-soup, uses a spoon and a pan, and has already taught the “barbarian” birds τὴν φωνήν, or human speech, Greek of course. In short, he is something intermediate between a man and a bird.

IV

All that remains now is to summarise our argument regarding the technique, types and functions of personification in Aristophanes' plays, and to attempt to outline that trope's development in the several comedies.

Aristophanes applied personification very often, both indirectly, to enliven his choral song and dialogue, and directly, introducing actual allegorical characters. He gives the figure much wider scope than either tragedy or epic poetry used to; in those genres even plain animisation is rare, and the only other kind of personification is allegorical representation of trite abstractions. Aristophanes grants life, human characteristics and human actions to inanimate objects, inanimate natural phenomena, plants and animals, and conversely, he can turn an animal, physical phenomenon, human being or god into a dead thing.

The secret of his genius lies in the fact that while his world is upside down at times, mocking logic and the laws of nature that govern us all, it not only keeps its balance (a circus artist's and juggler's balance though it is), but also draws the readers and spectators into its incredible reality. His powers of suggestion are so irresistible that we wonder at nothing, take him at his word, and believe in phenomena far removed from the norms of our lives, just as we do not wonder at even the wildest dreams until we wake. We think that it is this atmosphere of dreams and their laws (their lawlessness, one is tempted to say) that is the key to understanding the fantastic world of Aristophanes and the poetic principles behind his work. At times he achieves his “metamorphoses” with masks (a dog's muzzle or a beaked bird's head), then at other times he just hands his actors wasps' stings, throws wings over their backs, or puts pigs' snouts on their noses. At still other times, his tongue playfully in his cheek, it is only his imagination, and that of the audience with it, that “pretends” to change, that quasi-changes,

⁶¹ T. ZIELIŃSKI, *Die Märchenkomödie in Athen*, in: IDEM, *Iresione*, vol. I, Leopoli 1931 (Eus Supplementa II), pp. 25 ff.; NEWIGER, *op. cit.* (n. 10), p. 84: “Tereus-Motiv”.

the stout Mnesilochus into the seductive form of Helen of Troy or the maiden Ariadne⁶².

Aristophanes' personifications are rooted in the notion held by the ancients that the whole world is in a sense "personal", that one should look for the concrete image in everything around one, seeing divine or human personality and activity everywhere⁶³. His abstract concepts are Clouds billowing with wind and rain; divine and venerable maidens; a statue of the woman-goddess Eirene; the divine Basileia companion of Zeus; girls either magnificently dressed or even grander in their nudity – Spondae, Diallage, Opora and Theoria; the two aspects of war, Polemus and Cydoemus; wealth and the god of wealth in one, the worn out blind man Plutus; and finally Penia-Poverty, an old woman in tatters.

But then sometimes the actual personification is not present on stage, and the concept remains abstract; even so, the poet manages to surround it with such events and atmosphere that, while invisible, it becomes an object to be weighed, measured, and probed for scent and quality. So it is with poetry in the *Frogs*.

His personifications are neither continuous nor consistent; he likes to carry them over into the sphere of the real, as though forgetting their allegorical "embodiment" and meaning (as in the *Wasps*), only to refer to their allegorical form moments later. Some of his personifications have two different roles to play on two different planes, themselves and something else. Some stand for an actual person (Paphlagon for Cleon), and others for a collective (Demus for δῆμος Ἀθηναίων).

Aristophanes can impart a faint allegorical flavour to even the most realistically treated characters of his plays by employing *nomina significantia*, which take them into the realm of the fantastic or the grotesque. If he takes up as his subject a man whom every child in Athens knows, he can transform him into a comic type bordering on truth, appearances and gossip alike, putting in his mouth as well his own words as others, used by wiseacres who just look similar to him, and so show Socrates as something halfway between a caricature of a sophist and a real philosopher.

He either borrows his personifications from mythology (rarely, but Plutus is an example), or replaces traditional characters of myth with his own allegorical deities (Polemus instead of Ares), or takes over traditional concepts and allegories from lyric poetry, tragedy and earlier comedy if he sees dramatic potential in them⁶⁴, or else he simply fashions them out of his unpredictable and profuse imagination.

⁶² Not to mention characters borrowed from animal fables, such as frogs or the chorus of birds, as they have no allegorical substrate.

⁶³ Cic. *Nat. deor.* II 61: "tum autem res ipsa, in qua vis inest maior aliqua, sic appellatur, ut ea ipsa vis nominetur deus [...] Quorum omnium rerum quia vis erat tanta ut sine deo regi non posset, ipsa res deorum nomen obtinuit".

⁶⁴ LEVER, *op. cit.* (n. 22), pp. 221 f.

Most of Aristophanes' personifications have something comical in them, but their comicality is, so to speak, extra – it is not the point of the personification. In either case, it comes in many shades, from incisive invective and satire (Paphlagon), through harmlessly mocking the people one loves in spite of everything (Demus), through carefree laughter in cases of animal travesty and laughter seasoned with a tear (the Megarian's daughters or the Wasps) through the above-mentioned lyrical laughter to laughter spiced up with fear (scene of crushing the Greek cities), where the allegory resembles reality all too painfully⁶⁵.

Many personifications, such as the *personae mutae* embodying peace and its fruits, are in fact not comical at all, but rather lyrical despite much obscenity; the Logoi, Plutus and Penia do have incidental comical moments, but on the whole they are philosophical and moral characters. Therefore we must conclude that the comicality of Aristophanes' plays lies much more in his jokes, puns, *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*, burlesque, caricature, metaphors, similes, allusions and fantastic elements than in his personifications.

The evolution of Aristophanes' personification, as of all of his technique, depends on the theme and plot of a given play, but also on historical transformations and political and socio-economic situation. The vicious satire and impetuous criticism of his early plays give way to milder hues as censorship of political and personal allusions gets tighter. With its exalted and joyous mood and its type of personifications, the play about Peace is closely tied to returning hopes for a better future and an end to military action. Escaping from tragic reality into a cloud-lined fantasy realm imprints itself on the personifications of the *Birds*, the fantastic comedy *par excellence*. The *Thesmophoriazusae* and the *Frogs* are another escape, this time into the realm of literature and literary criticism, where "theatrical" and "feigned" personifications, parody and pastiche reign supreme. The *Clouds*, a play centred on philosophical, dialectical and pedagogical themes, likewise determines the style of its personifications. In the *Lysistrata* and the *Ecclesiazusae* types and protagonists recede into the background rather than forming the core of the play as they do in the *Acharnians* and the *Knights*, and emphasis is mainly on the plot and motifs which make for the thesis (women want to put an end to the war; women take over as rulers of the country). Both the action and allegorical characters that take part in it become more and more dramatic. The *Plutus*, the least "funny" of all the preserved comedies, rests on two personifications and is a dramatic narrative of socio-economic conflict whose first louder notes could already be heard in the *Ecclesiazusae*. Its two major *dramatis personae*, Penia and Plutus, with their style and the overall mood of the play seem to enter another stage to compete on; they are already close to the characters of our poet's greatest rival Euripides.

⁶⁵ On the dramatic quality of that last scene cf. J. TAILLARDAT, *À propos des images d'Aristophane*, L'Information Littéraire XIII 1961, fasc. 2, p. 73.