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

1. Exile, Expulsion, Food

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

---

1 Among Aristophanes’ surviving plays, cf. Ar. Ach. 517-519; Eq. 854-857, 1402-1406; Pax 741-742; Av. 766-767; Ran. 727-733.
2 Cf. WILKINS 2000a; 2000b; MASTELLARI 2016.
untary flight or forced banishment. Other terms lean toward one pole or the other. Compounds of χωρέω, διδράσκω, ἔχομαι, and βαίνω imply flight, whereas διώκω, ἔσσελαινω, ἐκβάλλω, ἐκπύττω, and φυγαδεύω imply banishment. However, the contrast is less stark when one considers that flight is, by definition, a response to some external stimulus. For instance, Homer’s Phoenix tells us that his exile was due to his father’s anger (Il. 9, 447-448): ἄτε πρῶτον λιπὼν Ἐλλάδα καλλιγύναικα / φεύγονε νείκα πατρός Ἀμύντορος Ὀμηνίδαο (“…when I first left Hellas, land of beautiful women, fleeing the feud with my father Amyntor, son of Ormenus”). As the narrative continues, however, we learn that Phoenix was under no compulsion to leave. In fact, his relatives prevented him from doing so until he broke down his bedroom door and hopped a fence. Any tidy categorization of the exile as voluntary or involuntary will not suffice. The same goes for several historical figures who went into exile without being sentenced to it. Unlike Phoenix, however, these exiles were usually avoiding some perceived threat.

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

---

3 Cf. FORSDYKE 2005, 9-11.
5 BOWIE 2007, 25-27 likewise uses this episode to question the distinction between voluntary and involuntary exile, comparing it to the stories of Patroclus in Il. 23 and Odysseus’ false identity as a Cretan in Od. 13.
6 Cf. FORSDYKE 2005, 179. Thuc. 1, 135-138 describes the flight of Themistocles, who was already ostracized at the time, from Athenians and Spartans who were trying to kill him. Thuc. 3, 98, 5 states that the fifth-century general Demosthenes did not return to Athens out of fear after his defeat in Aetolia. Thuc. 5, 26, 5 records a similar fate for Thucydides himself after his own failure at Amphipolis. Xen. HG 1, 7, 1-7 likewise tells how two generals did not return after the Athenian defeat at Arginusae and thus avoided imprisonment. Lycurg. Leoc. 117-118 relates the efforts of a certain Hipparchus, son of Charmus, to escape a trial for treason. BERTI 2004, 167-172 summarizes the debates around the identification of this Hipparchus and suggests that his exile would have occurred in the last two decades of the fifth century.
7 Cf. Demosth. 9, 41-44. Aeschin. 3, 258 and Din. 2, 24 discuss the same case and are more explicit than Demosthenes about banishment. Cf. IG V, 2, 357; Plut. Them. 6, 3; Aristid. Or. 46, 217-218.
8 SWOBOUDA 1893, 58-59 was the first to conclude that Ps.-Aristot. Ath. Pol. 16, 10 wrongly describes archaic laws against tyranny as ‘mild’ because the only punishment was ἀτιμία. This is merely a misunderstanding on the part of the author, who is thinking of a later form. MAFFI 1981 uses the Homeric epics to explore the difference between legal and moral ideas of ἀτιμία. Recent contributions include VÁN ‘t WOUT 2011a; 2011b; NOVOTNÝ 2014; LENFANT 2014; DOMINGO 2015; and DMITRIEV 2015. DMITRIEV 2015, 35-36 provides an extensive summary of previous scholarship.
impunity unless one fled persisted under other formulations, such as νησιονεὶ τευνάτω ("Let him die with impunity")¹⁰.

Ostracism was another Athenian expulsive institution with long-lasting effects¹¹. Our sources conceive of both ἀτιμία and ostracism as safeguards against tyranny¹². There is even one ostrakon with a proper name followed by the word ἀτιμως. However, it is likely not using the word to denote exile. Rather, the writer is mocking the candidate, who is pathetically trying to play the victim by claiming to be unjustly deprived of some right¹³. Nevertheless, some other ostraka will be useful for our discussion. Seven from the Kerameikos and one from the Agora name Λύμως ("Hunger") as the person to be expelled¹⁴. James Sickinger suggests that these votes were lighthearted jibes against the whole process of ostracism¹⁵. Jokes or not, though, these ostraka evoke a conceptual connection between ostracism and food. They show that Hunger fits the bill, however ironically, of an entity to be expelled from the community.

They also connect ostracism to another expulsive practice: φαρµακός ritual, which has its own associations with food. The φαρµακός was a human scapegoat expelled for the benefit of the polis, either during a festival or at a time of hardship such as a famine or a plague¹⁶.

---

¹⁰ Cf. IG F, 10, 32-34; And. 1, 95-96; Plat. Leg. 784c; Demosth. 23, 60.
¹¹ Philoch. FGrH 328 F 30; Diod.Sic. 11, 55, 2; and Plut. Arist. 7, 5; Nich. 11, 1 variously record the penalty as five and/or ten years.
¹³ Cf. VAN ’T WOUT 2011a, 127-130.
¹⁴ Cf. BRENNE 2001, 214-216; 2018, II, 134; FARAOINE 2004, 222; SICKINGER, forthcoming. The ostrakon from the Agora dates to the 480s, and the Kerameikos ostraka date to 471.
¹⁵ Cf. SICKINGER, forthcoming.
The victim was feasted and/or fasted before expulsion, perhaps as a personification of the famine that greedily steals food from the community\(^\text{17}\). The closest connection to ostracism comes from Plutarch. Though he does not use the word φαρμακός, he describes a similar ritual in which a slave was cast in the role of Hunger and driven out of the house with a chant (Mor. 693f): Ἐξω Βουλίμων, ἐσω δὲ πλούτον καὶ υγίειαν (“Out with Hunger, in with wealth and health!”)\(^\text{18}\). This practice matches nicely with the Λιμός ostraka discussed above\(^\text{19}\). Another similar piece of evidence comes in the form of a Greek inscription of Roman date from Termessos in Asia Minor, which praises a certain Honoratus (TAM 3, 103): δίωξε γὰρ εἰς ἄλα λιμόν, σείτον μέτρον ἀνειρόν τοῖς κατὰ ἀστυ (“For he chased hunger into the sea, discovering a limitless supply of grain for the whole town")\(^\text{20}\).

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

2. Aristophanes’ Birds

2.1 Εἰς κόρακας

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

---

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

18 This description is often included in scholarship on φαρμακός ritual, e.g. Bremmer 1983, 301-302; Faraone 2004, 215; Compton 2006, 4-5.

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


21 Cf. Parker 1983, 45, n. 47 for texts about improper burial.


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

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

25 Birds frequently team up with dogs to devour corpses in Homer, e.g. Il. 1, 4-5; 2, 391-393; 8, 379-380. Cf. McCracken 2014 for Plato’s use of these Homeric examples. The true locus classicus, however, is Soph. Ant. 696-698.
rus want to go ἐς κόρακας (“to the crows”), they can’t find the way. Our sources tell us that crows eat unburied corpses, so telling people to go ἐς κόρακας meant telling them to get lost. As Eupides will soon find out, the prospect of becoming bird food is very real; Tereus’ slave bird will have a threatening beak, and the birds will explicitly threaten to eat him and Peisetaerus. For now, though, the joke turns on the ambiguity of the phrase, which can serve as both a common insult and a literal reference to the land of the birds. Although the insult is often used in passing, there is good reason to believe that Eupides’ joke depends on its expulsive connotations. The lines surrounding Eupides’ joke are deeply concerned with who belongs in the polis and who doesn’t. A few lines earlier, we have the first of the play’s three jibes against the foreign Execestides. Immediately afterward, Eupides contrasts him and Peisetaerus’ voluntary self-expulsion from Athens with the foreign Sacas’ attempts to get in. Aristophanes also repeatedly shows awareness of the phrase’s expulsive connotations elsewhere, when his characters use it to drive out rapacious characters. Such passages often either take place in houses or pointedly use language suggestive of houses, e.g. θύραζε (“out of doors”). This matches nicely with Plutarch’s ritual, which drives Hunger out of the house. There are also other instances of the phrase accompanied by the expulsive verb ἀποσφείσαντο. From its very first articulation, then, our heroes’ expedition is expressed in expulsive terms.

2.2 Aristophanes’ Tereus

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

---

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


28 Cf. 8, 61, 343-351.

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

30 Cf. 32-35.


32 Cf. 100-101.
distinctly Sophoclean Tereus that Aristophanes will transform from an expelled rapist into a familiar Athenian. Tereus’ departure from human society may have been present in other versions of the myth, but it fits especially well into Sophocles’ plan for the character, which marginalizes him at every turn (fr. 581, 9-10 Radt): ἀεὶ δὲ μίσει τῶνδ’ ἀπαλλαγεῖς τῶσον / δρυµοὺς ἔρήµους καὶ πάγους ἀποικεῖ (“But out of hatred he will always depart these places and emigrate to desolate copses and crags”)33. Several words mark these lines out as expulsive. First, there are the verb forms ἀπαλλαγεῖς and ἀποικεῖ. The first is an attractive emendation34. Ps.-Lysias uses the same verb to banish an ἀλιτήριος (an avenging demon very similar to a φαοµακός) in a highly expulsive passage that we will examine shortly35. Likewise, ἀποικεῖ describes Tereus’ emigration from human society to a barren landscape exactly like the one Peisetaerus and Euphrides stumble upon at the play’s opening. The words πάγους and δρυµοὺς ἔρηµους match nicely with the rocks that our heroes are afraid of tumbling down36. Expulsive language aside, there are plenty of indications that Tereus is a marginalized figure. To start, Sophocles sets his drama in Thrace proper (i.e. north of the Aegean), whereas other sources set it in Phocian Daulis. Gregory Dobrov suggests that the setting change dramatizes Procne’s longing for her distant Athenian home and emphasizes Tereus’ barbarism, only to have Philomela overcome it through the distinctly Athenian means of a written message37. Tereus’ marginality becomes even starker after his transformation. If his character’s costume featured the typical Thracian ἀκρόκοµος hairstyle, as is likely, then its transformation into a hoopoe’s crest would have been seamless. The visual link between hair and crest would underscore the transition from exotic foreigner to exotic animal38. Indeed, the hoopoe is so beyond the pale that Sophocles appears eager to reconcile his choice with other versions which made Tereus a hawk39. Once again, however, Aristophanes humorously subverts our expectations by making this barbaric, Thracian hoopoe not so foreign, not so bestial, after all. Tereus has a slave, eats out of pottery, and prefers pea soup and sardines from nearby Phaleron of all places40. Just like Peisetaerus and Euphrides, he has been a human, and he has been reluctant to pay off debt41. Instead of cutting out tongues, he teaches

33 Radt 1977 (hereafter R) gives the text as follows: ἀεὶ δὲ μίσει τῶνδ’ τάτπ’ ἄλλοντ’ εἰς τόπον / δρυµοὺς ἔρηµους καὶ πάγους ἀποικεῖ.
35 Cf. Ps.-Lys. 6, 53.
36 Cf. 20-21. Milo 2008, ad loc. cites a variety of passages on departure and exile that use one or more words from these Sophoclean lines.
37 Thuc. 2, 29, 3 makes it clear that the events surrounding Tereus would have taken place in Daulis, perhaps out of a desire to correct Sophocles, and Strab. 9, 3, 13; Paus. 1, 41, 8; 10, 4, 8; and EM s.v. Δαυλίς agree. Cf. Mayer 1892, 491; Dobrov 1993, 204-205; Milo 2008, 12; Slater 2017.
40 Cf. 75-79.
41 Cf. 114-119.
barbarians the Greek language. Indeed, all the gruesome aspects of Sophocles’ play are panned over. He even still has a relationship with Procte, calling her τὴν ἐμὴν ἀμόνα (“my nightingale”) and σύννομε (“partner”). He praises her singing and even refers to τὸν ἐμὸν καί σῶν πολύδακων Ἰντν (“the much-lamented Itys, mine and yours”).

2.3 Big ideas

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

Pe. οὐχ οὖσος οὖν δῆτον ’στιν ὀρνίθων πόλος;
Επ. πόλος; τίνα τρόπον;
Pe. ἠσπερ ἄν εἶποι τις τόπος.
ὅτι δὲ πολεῖται τοῦτο καὶ διέρχεται
ἄπαντα διὰ τοῦτου, καλεῖται νῦν πόλος.
ἡν δ’ οἰκίσητε τούτο καὶ φαρξηθ’ ἀπάξ,
ἐκ τοῦ πόλον τοῦτον κεκλήσθεται πόλις.
ὥστε ἄρξετ’ ἀνθρώποι πλήθους,
τοὺς δ’ αὐθεντεῖς ἀπολείπετε Λιμῷ Μηλίῳ.

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

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

42 Cf. 198-200.
43 Cf. 203, 209.
44 Cf. 212.
45 Cf. 46-48.
47 Cf. 160-178.
48 Then again, perhaps Peisetaerus was planning to found a city the whole time. MERRY 1896, 7 sees the basket, myrtle boughs, and pot of 43 as equipment for founding a new city. On his reading, Peisetaerus and Euelpides
satisfy the search for a τόπον ἀπαγόμενα (“leisurely place”), but apparently, the lure of the polis has a tighter grip on Peisetaerus than we knew⁴⁹. His sales pitch shows what is so attractive about it: the power of boundaries. By walling off the polis, the birds will gain power over humans and even gods. It is fitting that this power takes the form of a λιµός, which, as we have seen, is a situation closely related to expulsion. A λιµός Μήλιος (“a Melian famine”), in particular, may foreshadow later scenes with expulsive themes, especially involving the gods. In addition to its clear reference to the Athenian siege of Melos in 416, which, if we believe Thucydides, was an affront to traditional religious sensibilities, this phrase may also reference the notoriously impious Diagoras the Melian, who appears later in the play⁵⁰. After all, giving Socrates the epithet ὁ Μήλιος was enough to remind the audience of Diagoras’ impiety in Clouds⁵¹. As we will discover soon, there is good reason to associate the play’s later ‘intruder’ scenes, where hunger is a central theme, with expulsion as well, and in the final scenes, the λιµός Μήλιος will put the gods themselves in the same category as these expelled, hungry intruders⁵².

2.4 Passages of Pursuit

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

Χο. ἵα ἔα·
προδεδόµεθ’ ἀνόσια τ’ ἐπάθοµεν·
ός γὰρ φίλος ἦν ομότορα θ’ ἡµῖν

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

⁴⁹ Cf. 44.

⁵⁰ Cf. 1072-1075; Thuc. 5, 103-105.

⁵¹ Cf. Ar. Nub. 830b. Cf. Romer 1994. Another commonality between Peisetaerus’ plan, Diagoras, and the siege of Melos may be found in their use of walls. Thuc. 5, 114, 1 reports that the Athenians threw up a wall (a blockade of ships?) around Melos (περιετείχισαν κύκλῳ) to starve the Melians out. Likewise, Diagoras may have written a treatise called Αποσαραµένους λόγου (“Words that Wall Off”), which described the impenetrable ‘wall’ between humanity and divinity (Hsch. s.v. Διαγόρας; Suda s.v. Διαγόρας, Ἀποσαραµένους λόγους, Πυραυλεῖου καὶ Θησαυροφυλακάων). Some have seen this as a corruption or misattribution (Woodbury 1965; Winiarczyk 1980). If it is genuine, it may have been part of the reason Diagoras was proscribed (JACOB 1959, 24-31; Romer 1994, 357). Whittamash 2016 accepts Romer’s argument about the λιµός Μήλιος and sees this passage, along with the end of Eur. Bellerophon fr. 286 Kannicht 2004 (hereafter K)—τὰ θεία πυραυλεῖα’ αἱ κακαὶ τε εὐµφοροία… (“x and terrible disasters fortify religion,” his tr.)—as engagements with Diagoras’ treatise. Katz 1976, 370-373 was the first to connect this treatise title with Peisetaerus’ strategy in Birds.

⁵² Cf. 859-1057, 1337-1469, 1494-1765.
ενέμετο πεδία παρ’ ἡμῖν,
παρέβη μὲν θεσμοῖς· ἀλλοίως
παρέβη δ’ ὀρκοὺς ὀρνισσιών.
εἰς δὲ δόλον ἐκάλεσε,
παρέβαλε τ’ ἐμὲ παρὰ
γένος ἀνόσιον ὅπερ
ὅτ’ ἐγένετ’ ἐπ’ ἐμοὶ
πολέμιον ἐτράφη.

Ἀλλὰ πρὸς μὲν τοῦτον ἡμῖν ἔστιν ὑστερος λόγος·
τὸ δὲ πρεσβύτα δοκεῖ μοι τώδε δοῦναι τὴν δίκην.

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

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

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

Χο. ἰὼ ἰὼ·
ἔπαγ’ ἐπὶ θ’ ἐπώρεσε πολέμιον
ὄρμαν φανίαν, πτέρυγα τε παντά
ἐπίβαλε περί τε κύκλωσαν·
ὡς δὲ τῶδ’ ὁμώδειν ἄμφω
καὶ δοῦναι ὤγχεί φορβάν.
οὔτε γάρ ὅρος σκιερὸν
οὔτε νέφος αἰθέριον
οὔτε πολιόν πέλαγος
ἔστιν ὁ τι δέξεται

53 Cf. Thuc. 1, 138, 6; Xen. Hell. 1, 7, 22; Idomeneus FGrH 338 F 1; Plut. Mor. 833a, 833f-834b; Lyc. 1, 112-115. Cf. Dmitriev 2015, 45.
54 Cf. LSJ s.v.; Dunbar 1995, ad loc.
55 Cf. Demosth. 9, 42; And. 1, 96.
Go! Go! March on, get after ‘em, bring ‘em the bloody onslaught of war, throw your wings up and surround them. Make them squeal. Make them fodder for our beaks. There is no shadowy mountain, no cloud of heaven, no wave of the sea that will let them escape me.

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

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

Μοῦσά μοι Ἐυφιμεδοντιάδεα τὴν ποντοχάρυβδιν,
τὴν ἐγκατασταμάχαιαν, ὃς ἐσθίει οὐ κατὰ κόσμον,
ἐννεφ’, ὅπως ψηφρίδι κακός κακὸν οἴτον ὀλήται
βολή δημοσίη παρὰ θίν’ ἀλὸς ἀτρυγέτοιο.

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

Several features of this passage mark it out as expulsive, including the gluttony of the victim, the reference to stoning and/or legal condemnation, and the location at the seashore57. Let us consider each of these in turn.

Hipponax’s removal of a glutton from his community is similar to other communities’ attempts to remove hunger, e.g. the Λιμός ostraka, Plutarch’s Βούλιμος ritual, and the inscription from Termessos, discussed above. In each of these cases, the goal is to expel whatever is depriving the community of food. There is also Erysichthon from Callimachus’ Hymn to Demeter, whom the goddess inflicts with insatiable hunger. Eaten out of house and home, Erysichthon’s father prays for his son either to be cured or to be removed and fed by Poseidon, since he can no longer do so himself58. Erysichthon ends up at a crossroads, which is a place to ‘cast out’ ὀξυθύμια, purificatory household refuse59. A comic fragment likewise says that someone should be burned at the crossroads among the ὀξυθύμια, recalling Tzetzes’ description of the final fate of φαρμακοί when he is citing relevant fragments from Hipponax60.

---

57 FARAONE 2004 argues convincingly at length for the expulsive character of this fragment. The following paragraphs represent a cursory summary of the evidence.
58 Cf. Call. Dem. 100-104.
60 Cf. Eup. Dem. fr. 132 K.-A.; Tz. H. 5, 737; Hippon. frr. 5-10 W.
Hipponax's stipulation that his victim be done in ψηφίδα can be understood in two ways. It is a call either for literal stoning or for some kind of condemnation by vote. Stoning occurs in Callimachus' account of a φαρµακός ritual in Abdera and in an aition for the φαρµακός ritual at the Thargelia, which apparently commemorates the stoning of a man with the proper name Pharmakos⁶¹. Nevertheless, scholars have been willing to entertain an allusion to φαρµακοί regardless of whether they translate ψηφίδα as “stoning” or “vote”⁶².

Finally, the seaside setting of this lynching suggests a purificatory quality. Again, reference can be made to the Termessos inscription, which pursues hunger into the sea, as well as to improper burials at sea. As for scapegoat rituals, Strabo tells us of a purification ritual at Lefkas, comparable to φαρµακός rites, in which a criminal is hurled into the sea, taken up in a boat, and ferried beyond local borders⁶³. Also comparable is the Suda’s entry on the practice of tossing someone into the sea as a sacrificial offering with the words περίψηµα ἡµῶν γενοῦ (“Be our off-scouring”)⁶⁴. Tossing sacrificial off-scourings into the sea is attested by Homer, and the idea of casting evil into the sea also crops up in Sophocles' Oedipus Rex and Euripides' Hecuba⁶⁵. Finally, Aesop is likewise killed by being thrown off a cliff into the sea, charged with the same crime as Pharmakos in the Thargelia aition: stealing sacred bowls from Apollo⁶⁶.

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

παίε παίε τὸν πανούργον καὶ ταραξιππόστρατον καὶ τελώνην καὶ φαρµακαν καὶ Χάριµβιν ἀρταγής,
καὶ πανούργον καὶ πανούργον· πολλάκις γὰρ αὐτ᾽ ἔρω.
καὶ γὰρ οὕτος ἢν πανούργος πολλάκις τῆς ἡµέρας.
αὖλα παίε καὶ δίωκε καὶ τάραττε καὶ κύκα
καὶ βδελύττου, καὶ γὰρ ἡµέας, κάπικείµενος βόσα
eνλαβοῦ δὲ μὴ ἱερόγη σε.

⁶² Masson 1949, 302, 311-318 prefers stoning and thus connects the fragment to φαρµακός ritual. Roux 1964, 126-127 acknowledges a possible reference to φαρµακός ritual but prefers a voting pebble, noting the irony that «ce petit caillou» is able to bring down so great a stomach. Gerber 1970, 301-302 concurs.
⁶⁵ Cf. Hom. Il. 1, 314; Soph. OT 190-195; Eur. Hec. 1259-1263. For scholarship on the former play’s relation to φαρµακός ritual, vd. n. 16.
⁶⁶ Cf. Vita Aesopi G 127-128; Ister FGrH 334 F 50. These and other passages lead Wieggers 1961; Compton 2006, 19-40; and Kurke 2011, 29-31, 75-76, 85-94 to read Aesop as a φαρµακός figure.
Strike! Strike the wicked one, the Pest-of-the-Knights, the tax man, the gaping chasm, the Charybdis of theft, wicked, oh so wicked, I’ll say it again. For he was wicked many times a day. Strike, pursue, harass, wind him up, loathe him, get on him, and shout, just like we do. Don’t let him escape.

The similarities between this passage and the Hipponax fragment are obvious. Both target their victims with ponderous, compound names, and both use Charybdis as a moniker for unbridled rapacity that hurts the community. In addition, the expulsive diction (δίωκε, ἱερύγη) shows that the aim of this passage is much the same as the fragment: don’t let the enemy escape. The passage from Birds, with its own expulsive ἀποφηγόντε, shares this motivation as well, but its stylistic features connect it more closely with Knights than with Hipponax. Particularly striking are the quick, repetitive imperatives: ἐπαγ’ ἐπιθ’ ἐπιφατε...ἐπιβαλε in Birds vs. παίε παίε...ἀλλὰ παίε καὶ δίωκε καὶ τάραττε καὶ κώκα / καὶ βδέλυτ-του...βόα: / εὐλαβοῦ in Knights. It is clear beyond a doubt, then, that the Birds passage performs the same function, not just practically but also poetically, as the Knights passage. It is also clear that the general expulsive character and particular insults of the Knights passage find a precedent in Hipponax. What I would like to suggest, then, is a genealogical relationship between expulsive iambic poetry and comic choral passages featuring the vigorous pursuit of an enemy. The style and diction of these passages are too consistent to be explained merely as results of comedy’s predisposition for threatening language and violence.

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

---

68 Cf. FARONE 2004, 226 for “Sea-Charybdis” and “Knife-in-the-Belly,” which both suggest gluttony.
69 Cf. Ar. Ach. 204-236, 280-283 (with stoning); Eq. 453-456; Vesp. 422-425, 430-432; Thesm. 659-667.
2.5 Diagoras, Andocides, Philocrates

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

τίδε μέντοι θημέρα μάλιστ' ἐπαναγορεύεται·
ην ἀποκτείνη τις ύμων Διαγόραν τὸν Μήλιον,
λαμβάνειν τάλαντον, ἣν τε τῶν τυράννων τίς τινα
tων τεθνηκότων ἀποκτείνη, τάλαντον λαμβάνειν.

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

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

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

71 Cf. IG F, 10, 32-34; IP, 320, 7-21; And. 1, 96-98; Ps.-Aristot. Ath. Pol. 16, 10. DUNBAR 1995, ad loc. reads this passage as ἀτιμία and sees the proscriptions against the ‘dead tyrants’ as a jab against lingering, unreasonable fear over tyranny, embodied in the anti-tyrannical curses with which assemblies were still begun.
72 Cf. 752-766.
73 Vd. n. 24 above.
74 DUNBAR 1995, ad loc. sees in these lines a reference to exiles resulting from the mutilation of the Herms in 415.
75 Cf. ROMER 1994, 355. SOMMERSTEIN 1987 and DUNBAR 1995, both ad loc., concur. However, Dunbar considers the possibility that this passage could have been interchanged with others to suit whatever announcements of out-
the λιμός Μήλιος, with its expulsive connotations, would recall the announcement against Diagoras the Melian. This historical interpretation has considerable evidence to recommend it. The scholia cite Craterus, a third-century B.C. compiler of decrees, and Melanthius, who, we are told, copied the decree from the original bronze stele directed against αὐτόν καὶ τοῦς ἕκαστον Πελλανεῖς (“him and the Pelleneans who weren’t giving him up”)76. The supposed inscription goes as follows (Craterus FGrH 342 F 16b): ἵνα δὲ τις ἀποκτείνῃ Διαγόραν τὸν Μήλιον, ἀλαμβάνειν ἀργυρίου τάλαντυν ἕαν δὲ τις ζῶντα ἀγάγη, ἀλαμβάνειν δύο (“If anyone kills Diagoras the Melian, he will receive a talent of silver; but if anyone brings him in alive, two talents”). Diodorus corroborates this reading, telling us that Diagoras was accused of impiety and fled Athens before the decree was issued77.

Beyond whatever formal expulsive proscription Diagoras may have suffered, we can also point to the fact that Ps.-Lysias conceptually and rhetorically ties Diagoras to another figure whom he calls a φαρµακός: Andocides. Expulsive language is frequent in the speech against Andocides. The beginning is lost, but it appears to have told a moralizing tale about an impious person punished by λιμός; bearing this in mind, the jurors should punish Andocides to avoid the same fate78. We are told that ἀπαλακτέον τοῦ ἀνδρὸς (“it is necessary to get rid of the man”)79. Ps.-Lysias is shocked at the kind treatment of Andocides. He cites a law stating that someone who mutilates a mere human φεύξεται τῆς τοῦ ἀδυναθέντος πόλιν (“must flee the city of the one whom he has wronged”)80. How much guiltier, then, is Andocides, who mutilated the divine Herms! The expulsive climax comes near the end of the speech (Ps.-Lys. 6, 53):

ποίον φίλον, ποίον συγγενή, ποίον δημόσιαν χρή τούτων χαρισάμενον κρύβην φανερώς τοῖς θεοῖς ἀπεχθάσθαι; νῦν οὖν χρῆ νομίζειν τιμωρούμενος καὶ ἀπαλακτομένως Ἀνδοκίδου τῆς πόλιν καθαίρειν καὶ ἀποδικοσπεισθαι καὶ φαρµακὸν ἀποπείμετιν καὶ ἀληθήν ἀπαλακτεσθαι, ὡς ἐν τούτῳ ὑπότος ἐστί.

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

lawry were made for the day which Birds happened to receive in the allotment. Cf. Ussher 1973 ad Eccl. 1158-1159.
76 Cf. Scholl. ad loc. = Craterus FGrH 342 F 16b = Melanthius FGrH 326 F 3b. Vd. also Scholl. ad Ran. 320 = Craterus FGrH 342 F 16a.
77 Cf. Diod.Sic. 13, 6, 7. The diction does not indicate how formal this accusation was. Diagoras is merely described as διαβολής τυχόν ἐπ᾿ ἀσεβεία (“met with the accusation of impiety”).
78 Cf. Ps.-Lys. 6, 1-4.
79 Cf. Ps.-Lys. 6, 8.
80 Cf. Ps.-Lys. 6, 15.
In punishing Andocides, the jurors are not merely enacting some abstract concept of justice; rather, they are ridding themselves, almost physically, of an evil (ἀπαλλαττομένους, ἀπαλλάττεσθαι). The words τὴν πόλιν καθαίρειν recall several scapegoat texts, and the combination καθαίρειν καὶ ἀποδιοισμείσθαι appears elsewhere to describe the removal of pollution. The main reason for the punishment against Andocides is even more worthy of punishment than Diagoras. Both are impious, but there are three main differences. First, Andocides’ impiety was in deed, while Diagoras’ was in word. Second, Andocides profaned his own city’s rites, while Diagoras merely mocked foreign rites. Third, Andocides is here for the punishing, whereas Diagoras is not. If the Athenians let Andocides off while they have him in their custody, their bounty on Diagoras will be exposed as an empty bluff. Although these differences serve primarily to heighten the outrage against Andocides, they still paint Diagoras as roughly the same type of detestable person; if Andocides is even worse, then the outrage against him ought to be catastrophic (Ps.-Lys. 6. 17): οργίζεσθαι οὖν χρή, ὁ ἄνδρας Ἀθηναίοι (“Therefore, you should be angry, O Athenian men”).

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

δὴ συνείρξαν τοὺς σπίνους πωλεῖ καθ’ ἑπτὰ τοὺρβολού, εἶτα φυσών τὰς κίχλας δείκνυσι καὶ λυμαίνεται, τοῖς τε κοιψίχοισιν εἰς τὰς θνικὰς ἔγχει τὰ πτερά, τὰς περιστεράς θ’ ὁμοίως συλλαβῶν εἰρξας ἔχει, καταναγκάζει παλεύειν δεδεμένας ἐν δυστύῳ. ταῦτα βουλόμεσθ’ ἀνειπεῖν· κεῖ τις ὀρνίθας τρέψει εἰργμένους ὡς ἐν αὐλῇ, φράζομεν μεθείνα. ἥν δὲ μὴ πιθήσθη, συνηπερθέντες ὑπὸ τῶν ὀρνίθων ἀθόρυ βωμὲς αὐτ’ ἡμῖν δεδεμένοι παλεῦετε.

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

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

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

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

85 Cf. 1077-1078.
...because he strings the finches together and sells them for seven obols, and then he puffs up the thrushes, degrades them, and puts them on display; he pours feathers into the nostrils of blackbirds and he likewise rounds up doves, shuts them in cages, holds them there, and then binds them in a net and makes them act as decoys. We’ll tell you this too: if anyone of you is keeping birds locked up in his courtyard, we advise you to let them go. If you don’t believe us, then you’ll just have to be rounded up by us birds, tied up for our purposes, and act as decoys for other humans.

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

2.6 Intruder scenes

Having discussed the choral passage, I will now turn to the many intruder scenes surrounding it. Such scenes were common in Old Comedy, and Birds spends the longest on them of any surviving play, though it is questionable whether they were all performed. Such scenes,
with their frequent beatings and hungry victims, are good parallels for Hipponax’s φασμακός ritual and Plutarch’s Hunger ritual\(^91\). In Birds, the beatings are easy enough to point to\(^92\). Hunger, deprivation, rapacity, and other expulsive tropes, by contrast, crop up in a variety of interesting ways for each of the intruders. The final straw against the priest is his invocation of birds of prey which might greedily carry off the sacrificial meat\(^93\). Next, we have a poet, who fulfills his stereotype by pathetically begging for material goods, especially a cloak to stop his shivering\(^94\). The oracle-monger who follows repeats both the poet’s requests for clothes and the priest’s meat-stealing\(^95\). Next, we have Meton. Meton is not hungry or deprived per se, but his intellectual quackery recalls that of Socrates in Clouds, which repeatedly plays upon the idea that such activity robs people of their due\(^96\). Peisetaerus also compares his own threats to beat Meton to an expulsive institution: Spartan ξενηλασία (“expulsion of foreigners”)\(^97\). The following inspector is just greedy, plain and simple\(^98\). The decree-monger is beaten off-stage in the end, but before this happens, he tries to issue decrees of exactly the same form as the earlier one against Philocrates\(^99\). Both start with present general conditions, but interestingly enough, the latter is anti-expulsive: ἐὰν δέ τις ἢξελατύνῃ

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

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

\(^92\) Cf. 981-991, 1012-1014, 1029-1031, 1040-1046, 1461-1466.

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

\(^94\) Cf. 904-930. The base requests for a coat and the emphasis on shivering echo Hippon. frrs. 32, 34 W. The trope is common in comedy too. Cf. the helpless Cratinus of Ar. Eq. 526-550 and Suda s.v. Λόκις, which cites and explains Ar. Ran. 12-14 as a joke against three cold comic poets. Farmer 2017, 200, n. 11 also discusses the same phenomenon for Ar. Gerytades fr. 156 K.-A. However, the poet in this scene is not entirely iambographic or comic. Dunbar 1995 ad 926-930, 941-945 discusses his verbal echoes of Pi. frrs. 105a, 105b Snell/Maehler 1984; indeed, his poetry is introduced as a Πινδάριον ἐπος (“a Pindaric poem”) (939).

\(^95\) Cf. 959-991.

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

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

\(^98\) Cf. 1021-1034.

\(^99\) Cf. 1035-1057.
to the hungry intruders' place. After the second parabasis, the intruder scenes resume with Iris, whose failed attempt to pass through the birds' territory to retrieve sacrifices reminds us of the λιµός Μήλιος and foreshadows the scenes to come. Just like Iris, the other gods will be made into meat-stealing intruders too, all in due time. Next, we meet a would-be parricide, whose potential crime is closely associated with expulsion in both literary and historical sources. After him comes Cinesias, who recapitulates the tropes of deprived poet and intellectual quack. The intruder scenes conclude with a sycophant. Sycophants are frequent victims in intruder scenes, and their main flaws are their hunger and their greed.

2.7 An Edible Ending

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

---

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

101 Cf. 1202-1261.

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

103 Cf. 1373-1409.


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

106 Cf. FARAOE 2004, 214, 239; RUFFELL 2013, 252, 275, n. 16.

107 Cf. 1494-1552.

108 Cf. 1503.
has worked perfectly\textsuperscript{109}. Indeed, Zeus now has the same fears exhibited earlier by the birds and Peisetaerus. He is afraid of being invaded by a foreign power: the barbarian gods, specifically the gods of Exectedes, the archetypal foreigner\textsuperscript{110}. Indeed, Prometheus is a fitting source for this news. Peisetaerus refers explicitly to the myth that has shaped this whole discussion of starving the gods: Prometheus’ deception of Zeus at Mekone, which allowed mortals to partake of the meat from sacrifices, while the gods received only the κνίσα (“steam”) from the fat and bones\textsuperscript{111}.

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

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

However, Peisetaerus is not the only hungry character at the end of the play. There is also Heracles, whose obsession with the roasted birds is criticized by Poseidon (1604-1605): τί ὁ κακόδαιµον; ἡλίθιος καὶ γάστρις εἰ. / ἀποστείρω τὸν πατέρα τῆς τυραννίδος; (“What’s

---

\textsuperscript{109} Cf. 1514-1524.

\textsuperscript{110} Cf. 1520-1527.

\textsuperscript{111} Cf. 1546; Hes. Theog. 533-564. Vd. also Ar. Av. 1230-1233, where Iris was explicitly looking for κνίσα.

\textsuperscript{112} Cf. 1565-1693.

\textsuperscript{113} Cf. 1570-1571.

\textsuperscript{114} Cf. And. 1, 96-98; IG IP, 320, 7-21. Cf. DMITRIEV 2015.

\textsuperscript{115} Cf. Ps.-Aristot. Ath. Pol. 16, 10.

\textsuperscript{116} Cf. Peisetaerus’ own condemnation of humans eating birds at 531-538.

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

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

ēστι δ’ έν Φαναίοι πρός τή
Κλεψύδρα πανούργον ἐγ-
γλωττογαστόρων γένος,
οἱ θερίζουσιν τε καὶ σπείρουσι
καὶ τρυγάον ταῖς γλώτταις
συκάζουσι τε—
βάρβαροι δ’ εἰόν γένος,
Γοργίας τε καὶ Φιλίππου.
κατ’ ὁ τῶν ἐγγλωττογαστόρων
ἐκείνων τῶν Φιλίππων
πανταχοῦ τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἢ
γλώττα χωρίς τέμνεται.

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

The passage is a commentary on the predatory rhetorical and intellectual abilities of people like Gorgias, Philip, and their associates, the sycophants who gather around the water clock (Φαναίοι...οὐκάζουσι)120. The term ἐγγχειρογάστορες (“Bellies-in-Hands”) seems to be a play on a nobler people, the ἐγχειρογάστορες (“Bellies-in-Hands”), who feed themselves with manual labor instead of the wily talent of their tongues121. If Poseidon’s γάστρις seems

---

118 Cf. 1565-1693.
119 Cf. 1706-1743.
121 Cf. DUNBAR 1995, ad loc. for attestations of ἐγχειρογάστορες and γαστρόχεισες.
like a generic insult, then the chorus’ ἐγγλωτογάστορες provide a closer parallel to Hipponax’s ἐγγαστριµάχαιρα. In addition, the insult is directed at sycophants, who, as we have seen, are commonly mocked in intruder scenes because of their hunger and greed. Poseidon insults Heracles, then, exactly as comic heroes insult intruders.

3. Conclusion

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