University of Cyprus

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS AND PHILOSOPHY

COLLECTIVE COGNITION, EMOTION AND ACTION IN ARISTOPHANES.

A READING INFORMED BY SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY DISSERTATION

XENIA MAKRI

2019

University of Cyprus

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS AND PHILOSOPHY

COLLECTIVE COGNITION, EMOTION AND ACTION IN ARISTOPHANES.

A READING INFORMED BY SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

XENIA MAKRI

A Dissertation Submitted to the University of Cyprus in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

MAY 2019

VALIDATION PAGE

Doctoral Candidate: Xenia Makri

Doctoral Thesis Title: Collective cognition, emotion and action in Aristophanes.

A reading informed by Social Psychology

The present Doctoral Dissertation was submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the ***Department of Classics and Philosophy*** *and was approved on the 10th of May 2019 by the members of the* ***Examination Committee****.*

Examination Committee:

Research Supervisor:_____

(Name, position and signature)

Committee Member:_____

(Name, position and signature)

Committee Member:

_____

(Name, position and signature)

Committee Member:

_____

(Name, position and signature)

Committee Member:

_____

(Name, position and signature)

DECLARATION OF DOCTORAL CANDIDATE

The present doctoral dissertation was submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy of the University of Cyprus. It is a product of original work of my own, unless otherwise mentioned through references, notes, or any other statements.

Xenia Makri

……..

ABSTRACT [in Greek language]

Αντικείμενο μελέτης της παρούσας διδακτορικής διατριβής αποτελούν οι ψυχολογικές διεργασίες που διέπουν την κοινωνική συμπεριφορά του κωμικού ήρωα και του κωμικού χορού στην αριστοφανική κωμωδία. Για τη διερεύνηση των διεργασιών αυτών, γνωστικών και συναισθηματικών, και την ανάδειξη της σημασίας της υπαγωγής στην ομάδα για την εξέλιξη της πλοκής στην αριστοφανική κωμωδία η Κοινωνική Ψυχολογία παρέχει το θεωρητικό υπόβαθρο και πιο συγκεκριμένα η Θεωρία της Κοινωνικής Ταυτότητας. Μελετώνται πέντε σωζόμενες κωμωδίες: οι *Όρνιθες*, οι *Αχαρνής*, η *Ειρήνη* η *Λυσιστράτη* και οι *Εκκλησιάζουσες*. Στο τελευταίο κεφάλαιο το πραγματεύεται το θέμα της ηγεσίας μελετώνται επίσης συγκεκριμένα αποσπάσματα από τους *Ιππής* και τους *Σφήκες*. Κάθε κεφάλαιο εξετάζει διαφορετικά συστατικά στοιχεία της θεωρίας. Στους *Όρνιθες*, επίκεντρο της ανάλυσης είναι οι διομαδικές σχέσεις και αναδεικνύεται πώς η επιχειρηματολογία που αναπτύσσει ο κωμικός ήρωας ακολουθεί τις αρχές του *Μοντέλου Κοινωνικής Ταυτότητας για τη Συλλογική Δράση*. Επίσης, εξετάζεται πώς η αγόρευση και η μετέπειτα συμπεριφορά του ήρωα ανταποκρίνονται στο σχήμα της ψυχολογίας της ηγεσίας όπως αυτό διαμορφώνεται από τη θεωρία της κοινωνικής ταυτότητας αλλά και πώς το έργο επιβεβαιώνει την ερμηνεία που παρέχει η θεωρία της κοινωνικής ταυτότητας για την εγκαθίδρυση και την αποδοχή της τυραννίας/των ιεραρχικών καθεστώτων. Στους *Αχαρνής* το επίπεδο ανάλυσης είναι το ενδο-ομαδικό. Εξετάζεται η διπλή περιθωριοποίηση του κωμικού ήρωα ως πολίτη και ως αγρότη η οποία οδηγεί στη σύναψη ιδιωτικής ειρήνης με τη Σπάρτη και στην υιοθέτηση αντικοινωνικής συμπεριφοράς από μέρους του. Στην *Ειρήνη* αντικείμενο ανάλυσης αποτελεί η αρνητική κοινωνική ταυτότητα του ήρωα και η επιχειρηματολογία που αναπτύσσει για να πείσει τον θεό Ερμή. Όσον αφορά στη συμπεριφορά του κωμικού ήρωα ως ηγέτη, υποστηρίζεται ότι αυτός δεν αποτελεί παράδειγμα πετυχημένου διομαδικού ηγέτη. Το κεφάλαιο για τη *Λυσιστράτη* πραγματεύεται τις συμφιλιώσεις των δύο ημιχορίων και των Αθηναίων-Σπαρτιατών, οι οποίες ακολουθούν το Αναθεωρημένο Μοντέλο Διομαδικής Επαφής των Hewstone

and Brown. Αναδεικνύεται ο ρόλος της Λυσιστράτης ως διαιτητή αλλά και ως διομαδικής ηγέτιδας. Η ανάλυση των *Εκκλησιαζουσών* υποστηρίζει ότι η παρουσίαση των γυναικών στο έργο βασίζεται στην αναθεωρημένη κοινωνική τους ταυτότητα που βλέπουμε ήδη στη *Λυσιστράτη*. Υποστηρίζεται ότι ο συλλογικός προσανατολισμός των γυναικών γίνεται η βάση του κοινοτιστικού καθεστώτος που εγκαθιδρύουν και αναδεικνύεται η σημασία της ταύτισης με την ομάδα για την ομαλή λειτουργία του νέου καθεστώτος. Το τελευταίο κεφάλαιο εξετάζει πώς η συμπεριφορά των κωμικών ηρώων ως ηγετών επιβεβαιώνει το μοντέλο ηγεσίας της θεωρίας της κοινωνικής ταυτότητας, αποδεικνύοντας ότι αυτό παρουσιάζεται θετικά όταν πρόκειται για πλασματικούς ήρωες και αρνητικά όταν πρόκειται για ήρωες πίσω από τους οποίους κρύβονται ιστορικοί ηγέτες. Μέσα από την ανάδειξη των ψυχολογικών διεργασιών που διέπουν τη συμπεριφορά του κωμικού ήρωα, η διατριβή υποστηρίζει την ύπαρξη ενός κωμικού πρωτο-ρεαλισμού στα έργα του Αριστοφάνη, ο οποίος δεν ακυρώνει την εικόνα του κωμικού ήρωα ως ασταθούς καρικατούρας, αλλά αποδεικνύει ότι αυτή η εικόνα της αστάθειας και της ασυνέπειας συνυπάρχει με ένα πιο ρεαλιστικό μοντέλο συμπεριφοράς. Κατ' επέκταση, επιβεβαιώνει την πολυδιάστατη φύση των ηρώων και του ίδιου του κωμικού είδους.

ABSTRACT [in English]

The present study examines the psychological processes which sustain the social behaviour of the comic hero and the comic chorus in Aristophanic comedy. Social Psychology and Social Identity Theory in particular provide the theoretical background for the exploration of these processes, both cognitive and emotional, as well as for demonstrating the importance of group membership for the action of the plays. Five surviving comedies are studied: *Birds, Acharnians, Peace, Lysistrata* and *Ecclesiazusae.* In the last chapter which focuses on the topic of leadership specific parts of *Knights* and *Wasps* are also analysed. Each chapter explores different components of the theory. In *Birds* the analysis focuses on the intergroup relations and indicates how the comic hero's argumentation follows the propositions of the Social Identity Model of Collective Action. At the same time, it is examined how the hero's harangue and behaviour corroborate the social identity model of leadership as well as how the play in general corroborates social identity theory's propositions for the establishment of and submission to tyranny. In *Acharnians* the analysis focuses on the intragroup relations and it is examined how the hero's double marginalisation as citizen and as rustic prompts him to attain a private peace with Sparta and to adopt anti-social behaviour. In *Peace* the object of analysis is the hero's negative social identity and the argumentation he develops for persuading God Hermes; regarding the hero's behaviour as a leader, it is argued that he cannot be treated as an example of successful intergroup leader. The chapter on *Lysistrat*a focuses on the reconciliations of the two semi-choruses and of Athenians and Spartans, which follow the propositions of the Integrative Intergroup Contact Theory of Hewstone and Brown. Additionally, Lysistrata's role as an arbiter and as an intergroup leader is highlighted. The analysis *of Ecclesiazusae* rests on the assumption that women's presentation in the play builds on their revised social identity in *Lysistrata*; it is argued that their communal social identity becomes the founding principle of the communal regime they establish and the importance of group identification for the smooth operation of the new regime is demonstrated. The last chapter examines whether the behaviour of the comic heroes as leaders follows the tenets of the social identity theory of leadership; it argues that the model is positively assessed when implemented by fictional leaders, but negatively assessed when implemented by heroes who stand for

historical leaders. Through the demonstration of the cognitive processes which guide the behaviour of the comic hero, the study makes case for a comic proto-realism in the plays of Aristophanes; the comic proto-realism does not contradict the caricature-like portrait of the comic hero, however, it proves that stability and discontinuity coexist with a more realistic model of behaviour. Therefore, the findings of the study point to the polyphonic nature of both the comic heroes and the comic genre.

Table of Contents

1 Introduction

1.1 Collective tendencies in Aristophanic comedy

"Hence there is bound to be a tension in comedy between an individualistic and a communal ethos. The comic hero is always essentially on his or her own (save for divine allies, whom we should not forget—though not all successful comic heroes have any); the hero may have assistants or supporters, but never equal partners, and the inspiration and initiative, so far as they are of human origin, normally come from one person alone. And yet the hero is nearly always seeking to make things better not just for him- or herself, but for Athens or Greece or humanity, and when such is the hero's aim it is always successful, and then (if not earlier) it is endorsed and acclaimed by its beneficiaries". [1]

This is a thought-provoking description of Aristophanic comedy; it demonstrates emphatically how classical scholarship's established perceptions of the comic genre undermine its polyphony, versatility and exuberance; although the mainstream literature on Aristophanes continues to pass over in silence the communal tendencies of comic heroes promoting the picture of a high-individualistic genre, their communal tendencies are no less significant than the individualistic. Interestingly, Sommerstein does not merely ascribe these collective tendencies to Trygaeus, Lysistrata, Praxagora and Chremylus, that is, to the heroes who represent "the rebel who stands his ground and tries to reorganize society along new and better lines" according to Dana Sutton;[2] he argues that collective *êthos* is the driving force of nearly all comic heroes' behaviour.[3] One would object that such an argument draws a rather distorting picture of the comic hero and the comic genre, which contrasts sharply with the portrait of the *ponêros* Dicaeopolis,

[1] Sommerstein (2009) 204-205.

[2] Sutton (1980) 17-18. Sutton argues in his book with the eloquent title *Self and Society in Aristophanes* that eight out of the eleven surviving comedies of the poet refer to the rebellion of the comic hero against the contemporary society or/and the divine authority (*Knights, Thesmophoriazusae* and *Frogs* are the three plays omitted). Accordingly, he classifies the heroes of these plays into three types: as we have already mentioned, Trygaeus, Lysistrata, Praxagora and Chremylus represent "the rebel who stands his ground and tries to reorganize society along new and better lines", Dicaeopolis and Pisthetaerus represent "the hero who becomes disgusted with his society, leaves it, and by striking out on his own becomes an "outlaw" in the original sense of the word", whereas Strepsiades and Philocleon stand for "the rascal or criminal who merely exempts himself from society's rules".

[3] Sommerstein (2009) 205 n. 5 clarifies that *Clouds* and *Thesmophoriazusae* do not conform to the schema.

Pisthetaerus and Philocleon.[4] What leaves much space for questioning and misinterpreting Sommerstein's argument (apart from the term *êthos* with its resonant Aristotelian moral connotations) is his failure to associate explicitly the heroes' collective tendencies with their group membership and the collective identity emanating from that group membership; the intention to make things better not just for oneself but for Athens or Greece or humanity stems from the hero's identification with his group -Athens, Greece or humanity- and his actions aim at favouring his group. In fact, the comic heroes' intentions are not 'either individualistic – or communal' but more complex than we think.

Aristophanes' plays dramatize social worlds, utopian or real, in which heroes and choruses are members of groups which stand in power and status relations to one another. As group-members, heroes and choruses are bearers of well-defined collective identities and thus act and interact (between them or with their antagonists) within a framework of identity salience; in such worlds, both utopian and real, the distinction between 'us' and 'them' is pivotal. Albeit usually discussed in political and social terms, group membership and collective identity have strong psychological propensities: they set in motion and are in turn sustained by psychological processes, cognitive and emotional.[5] The aim of this study is to explore the psychological processes which sustain the collective identities of the heroes and choruses in Aristophanes as well as to demonstrate the importance of group membership for the action of the plays; the collective-identity dynamics

[4] *Ponêria* denotes the egotistical, anti-social and villainous qualities of the comic heroes (of Dicaeopolis, the Sausage-Seller, Philocleon, Trygaeus and Pisthetaerus in particular) and it was applied to them by Whitman (1964). Translated as rascality, *ponêria* must not be taken as a moral term, but as "consisting largely in [the hero's] infallible skill in turning everything to his own advantage, often by a mere trick of language" (25). Whitman's book was initially criticized for the ascription of heroic stature to such villain characters, especially since it provided no adequate explanation of what actually differentiates these heroes from the anti-heroes who display the exact same qualities. See Rosen (2014) 223 n.5 for the book's reception. However, *ponêria* gradually became part of the standard characterization of Aristophanic heroes. Rosen ibid., 231 argues that we should concentrate on "the humour that arises from the hero's own presumption, indeed, *insistence* in the work that he really is heroic, regardless of whether anyone outside of the fictional world would find anything heroic, in the traditional sense, in his behaviour. Another way to put this is to say that what is important about comic heroes is not that they are heroic, but that the author says they are."

[5] For the concept of identity in social sciences, see Wetherell (2010) 3-26.

which drive the action of most Aristophanes' plays are explored through the social identity perspective from social psychology.

Social psychology is a subdiscipline of psychology, defined as "the scientific investigation of how the thoughts, feelings and behaviours of individuals are influenced by the actual, imagined or implied presence of others".[6] It is linked to other subdisciplines of psychology such as cognitive psychology as well as to other 'social' disciplines such as sociology and social anthropology. Most of the phenomena-topics studied by these disciplines are the same (including influence, persuasion, obedience, prejudice and discrimination and their reduction, stereotyping, crowd behaviour, social change, leadership, communication, attitudes, etc) and what differs is the focus of each discipline: for example, sociology focuses on the group, whereas social psychology focuses on the individual within a group. The concept of social identity is one of the most eminent concepts of social psychology and the Social Identity Approach (SIA) is perhaps the most influential of the discipline. It encompasses both Social Identity Theory (SIT) and Self-Categorization Theory (SCT), which complement each other and provide an answer to the classical problem of social psychology, the relationship of the individual to the group, explaining how collective phenomena spring out of individual cognitions. Social identity is defined as "that part of the self-concept that derives from group membership. It is associated with group and intergroup behaviours, which have some general characteristics: ethnocentrism, ingroup favouritism, intergroup differentiation; conformity to ingroup norms; ingroup solidarity and cohesion; and perception of self, outgroupers and fellow ingroupers in terms of relevant group stereotypes". [7]

Social psychology constitutes a rather new field of investigation for classics, although some of its main objects of study, cognition and emotion, have long been

[6] Allport (1954) 5.
[7] Hogg and Vaughan (2018) 431.

explored by classicists.[8] The late Garrett Fagan was the first to apply social psychology and social identity theory in particular to the study of classical texts. In his monograph *The Lure of the Arena,* Fagan studied the behaviour of crowds in the Roman games and demonstrated how group membership affected the spectators' behaviour.[9] In December of 2018 a conference with the title "How to do the psychology of the Ancient World" took place in Leiden University as part of the Anchoring Innovation-OIKOS project; the papers presented aimed at uncovering the socio-cognitive processes which were operative in ancient Greece and Rome and thus to reveal the psychology of the ancient world.[10] The cognitive elements of the social identity theory have been also applied to the study of the archaic symposion; Jessica Romney's reading of Alcaeus 129 fragment is informed by the in-group/out-group distinction.[11]

The application of social psychology in this study rests on the assumption that psychological processes cut across historical boundaries at least for one thousand five hundred years (2500) ago and that there is a psychological continuity with the past. Fagan argued that "our shared humanity" justifies the applicability of social psychology for studying ancient minds which come from different historical eras and cultures.[12] He borrows the terms "psychobiology" of Edgerton and "Standard Equipment" of Pinker to describe the universal psychological architecture and compares this shared human psychological functioning to other human universals such as language-acquisition, religion and emotions. At the same time, he acknowledges the influence of environmental factors to mental processes and behaviour such as culture, clarifying, though, that culture is as much a product of human behaviour as a shaper. In his own words "[p]sychological processes do not

[8] For cognition, see, for example, Budelmann and Easterling (2010), all the contributions in Anderson, Cairns and Sprevak (2018) and in Meineck, Short and Devereaux (2019). For emotions, see Konstan (2006), Chaniotis (2012), Chaniotis and Ducrey (2013), Visvardi (2015) and all the contributions in Cairns and Nelis (2017).
[9] Fagan (2011).
[10] For the conference, see https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/8c2401_113ae84bfeca4376b0834b8dca8db3e2.pdf
[11] Romney (2019).
[12] Fagan (2011) 4: "On the broader perspective, our shared humanity with the people of the past means that any insistence that populations divided by culture and history do *not* share basic mental processes requires detailed demonstration, than the more reasonable assumption that they do".

float in some ethereal realm disembodied from culture, nor does culture drop independently from the heavens on to human societies. The two -mind and culture- share an intrinsic bond, each forming and influencing the other. Against this backdrop, it seems unconvincing to argue that all human thought and behavior derive solely from the cultural side of our existence. […] mind and culture should be seen as interlocking cogs in a behavior-generating machine rather than as distinct drives acting independently".[13] In line with this, the present study rests on a second basic assumption, namely that the psychological processes identified by our study reflect the psychology of the Athenians of the fifth century and that the centrality of group membership, collective identity and the in-group/out-group distinction in Aristophanic comedy matches and indicates their centrality in fifth-century Athens.[14]

Such an assumption inevitably places our study in the heart of the controversy regarding comedy's precise interaction with the society and the surrounding political environment. Undoubtedly, the plays are rich sources for the sociology of Athens and the social, political and economic realities of the era,[15] despite the genre's distortive mode of representation. Similarly, the controversial topics in the city's life provide the prime material for the comic poet: whatever is of significance in/for the city, from its political institutions and its rituals to its leaders and prominent individuals, inevitably becomes paramount in the plays. However, the exact nature and scope of comedy's substantial engagement with civic ideology[16] has been for years an abiding matter of controversy for Aristophanic scholarship.[17]

[13] Fagan (2011) 45-46.

[14] The study of emotions by classicists rests on the same assumption. Cf. Cairns and Nelis (2017) 10: "In a very real sense, then, the manifold forms of dramatic enactment and narrative representation of emotion in literature reflect the paradigmatic scenarios of emotion in the wider culture or in particular 'emotional communities' within that culture."

[15] Ehrenberg (1962), Roselli (2014).

[16] For Athenian ideology, see Vernant (1980), Loraux (1993), Cohen (2000), Boegehold and Scafuro (2002) and Lape (2010).

[17] Generally, there have been two schools of thought regarding Aristophanic comedy and its engagement with politics: the one which argued that Aristophanes' plays were meant for entertaining purposes and the other which recognized the poet as a political critic or/and reformer. The main supporters of the first approach which nowadays is considered invalid were Gomme (1938), Dover (1972), Halliwell (1984) and Heath (1987, 1997). Contra: Ste Croix (1972), Henderson (1990, 1993, 1995, 2003a), Sommerstein (1998, 2014), Ober (1998) and Rosenbloom (2002). See also the approach of Vickers (1997) who advocates a political,

This study follows the line adopted by David Konstan in the his book *Greek Comedy and Ideology*; his approach constitutes "a look in which the plays respond to cultural issues, shaping the narratives by which the Athenians defined and understood themselves" and argues that the plays "produced humor by playing off accepted attitudes and recognized social roles, reconstructing or rearranging them in order to bring about absurdities and expose unwarranted pretensions".[18]

Konstan does not define the precise nature of this engagement by arguing that the plays were meant to reinforce the ideology, for example by carnivalizing it, and thus to stabilize the socio-political status-quo, or contrary, that the plays were meant to deconstruct the ideology and thus to problematize or even challenge the status-quo. Accordingly, he does not assign to this "ideological labor" as he calls it a programmatic function. Similarly, the present study lacks these aspirations. What is interesting is that, whereas Konstan's study and the other studies advocating comedy's interaction with civic ideology recognize group membership and collective identity as the pillars of Athenian civic ideology, the psychological processes sustaining them are never acknowledged, discussed or evaluated in them.[19] Therefore, the aim of the psychological analysis attempted in this study is to shed light on an unexplored and much-neglected aspect of comedy's interaction with civic ideology, the dramatization of the psychological aspects sustaining group membership and collective identity; to put it in other words, the aim of this study is to demonstrate the psychological elements which allow to the concept of collective identity stemming from group membership to acquire social and political references and thus to be able to exert an ideological effect.

allegorical reading of the plays and that of Sidwell (2009) who suggests the concept of "ventriloquial paracomedy". In the middle stand Goldhill (1991) whose approach is informed by Bakhtin and the carnival, Carey (1995) and Silk (2000) 301-349. For a thorough discussion of the topic, see Olson (2010), whereas for the applicability of Bakhtin's ideas to comedy, see Edwards (2002).

[18] Konstan (1995) 4 and 6. See also the articles in Dobrov (1997) and McGlew (2002).

[19] McGlew (2002) is a notable exception in the sense that he recognizes the psychological aspects of the concept of collective identity. He has argued for the subversion of the established civic discourse and ideology and made case for Aristophanes' reconstruction of citizenship through shared, collective, desires: "comedy's synecdoche of hero and audience interprets the citizen as agent, whose private desires and political existence is inseparable, and, at the same time, redefines the political world as the space where private interests and desires intersect" (19). Still, his book does not constitute a psychological reading of Aristophanic comedy.

In order to be able to define the aims of our study in more detail, it would be better to start with an overview of the theory itself.

1.2 Theoretical underpinnings: the Social Identity Approach (SIA) in social psychology[20]

The term social identity is nowadays used widely in everyday life and such a popularity has generated generalization; in most cases these usages do not allude to the original meaning of the term or the foundational premises of the theory. An additional problem is that the concept of social identity is also evoked by a number of other theories in the social sciences and thus different specific meanings have been attached to it.[21] In social psychology, Social Identity Theory (SIT) focuses on intergroup relations and its roots go back to the 1970's, in the work of Henri Tajfel. The Second World War and the Holocaust provided the general, historical background for the development of the theory; Tajfel was a Polish Jew and a war prisoner in France. Upon his release, return to Poland and the realization that his family and friends did not survive, Tajfel's life quest became to realise how the Holocaust took place and why people become violent towards others because of their group membership. Having rejected individualistic explanations for the emergence of violence towards others and espousing group-level explanations of hostility, he started working on categorization and became interested in the summer camp studies of Muzafer Sherif carried out in the USA in 1954, today known as Sherif's Robber's Cave study. Twenty-two boys of eleven years old spent three weeks at the camp in order to participate without knowing it in a study aiming at shedding light on how groups develop, engage in intergroup conflict and reconcile.[22] The findings of the study were interpreted by Sherif as following the

[20] The social identity literature is massive and extensive reviews of the basic theories can be found in almost every handbook of social psychology. As a non-specialist, I have learnt in particular from Hogg and Abrams (1988), Turner and Reynolds (2001), Yzerbyt and Demoulin (2010), Stangor (2016) and Hogg and Vaughan (2018). For the core readings, see Hogg and Abrams (2001). Needless to say, the current review is highly selective and raises no expectation to be treated as comprehensive.

[21] For a taxonomy of the concepts, see Brewer (2001) who refers to other attempts of taxonomy as well.

[22] For a detailed description of the study and its findings, see Sherif et al. (1961) and for a critical description of both, Ispas (2013) 4-9.

propositions of realistic conflict theory which argues that a conflict of interests prompts groups into discrimination, fostering a sense of 'us' versus 'them'.

However, the findings in fact showed that in some cases competitive intergroup behaviour and discrimination appears, even without a conflict of interest. In order to identify the minimal conditions which foster hostile intergroup behaviour, Tajfel and his colleagues conducted the 'minimal group studies' by devising the minimal group paradigm: artificial groups were created, with no social interaction between the participants.[23] The findings were corroborated by hundrends of studies conducted all around the world with different kind of participants and showed that under certain circumstances being member of a group is enough for the group members to display competitive and hostile behaviour towards members of other groups, while favouring the members of their own group. The question is why being member of a group leads to discrimination. The concept of social identity was developed particularly for providing an answer to this question and explaining the findings of the minimal studies. The answer is that people think and act differently when they consider themselves as group members and when they consider themselves as individuals: in the first case, people define themselves in terms of their social identity, whereas in the second in terms of their personal identity. Tajfel's classical definition of social identity is as follows: "the part of an individual's self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership" (1978: 63).

Let us make some very important clarifications concerning the concept of social identity: firstly, since social identity stems from our group memberships, this means that people have multiple social identities and that our social identity at a specific time depends on how we perceive ourselves at that time, that is as members of which group we consider ourselves. The same applies for whom we consider as ingroup and outgroup members. Thus, the concept of social identity is dynamic and

[23] See Tajfel and Turner (1979).

depends on the context. The concept of social identity is inextricably associated with two processes, social categorization and social comparison. Social categorization is the process by which people categorise objects, experiences and other people into groups in order to simplify perception and thus their understanding of the world. Categorization produces an accentuation effect: it accentuates the similarities between objects, experiences and people of the same category and their differences from objects, experiences and people of different categories. It follows that the more important categorization is to the individual, the more pronounced the accentuation and that accentuation is generated by categorization only on those dimensions which are associated with the categorization. Categorization produces stereotypic perceptions. However, people do not categorize only other people but themselves as well and this process is called self-categorization; self-categorization is the accentuation of the similarities between the self and the people we perceive belonging to the same category with the self (ingroup members) and of the differences between the self and the people we perceive belonging to a different category from the self (outgroup members). Self-categorization leads to self-stereotyping.

Both social and self-categorization trigger social comparisons; people categorize other people and themselves into groups and evaluate these groups by comparing them. Social comparisons are motivated by positive distinctiveness, the need to be different on dimensions that favour our group and show its superiority. Positive distinctiveness operates at the group level but maps on the individual's motivation for self-enhancement and self-esteem. That means that when we define ourselves in terms of the group, the positive distinctiveness of the group lends us a positive social identity which in turn satisfies our motivations for self-esteem and accomplishing self-enhancement. These individual motivations, however, should not give the impression that SIT constitutes another theory which reduces group behaviour to personal, individualistic motives. On the contrary, Tajfel was interested in the relationship of the individual to society and given that society consists of large-scale groups which stand in status and power relations to each

other, he analysed the conditions under which people act together for achieving a social change, that means, for changing the social structure.

Tajfel's object of study were the low-status groups and the strategies they adopt for improving the negative social identity ascribed to them by subordinate group membership. In the pursuit of a positive social identity, members of low-status groups adopt different strategies depending on their own, subjective beliefs regarding both the society and the relations between the groups within the society. For example, when they think that the boundaries between the groups are permeable, they move from one group to another. This is the social mobility strategy, an individualistic strategy which does not change the status-quo. But when they think that group boundaries are impermeable, they adopt truly group strategies, either social creativity or social competition. Social creativity strategies are adopted when the status-quo is considered stable and thus no cognitive alternatives for a different social structure exist. In these cases, groups can choose other groups to be compared with, of lower status than theirs or equally subordinate with them. Alternatively, they can redefine their traditional negative characteristics by positively re-evaluating them or they can compare themselves with the dominant group on other dimensions, favourable for them. Although social creativity strategies do not change the status-quo, they do ascribe to the members of the subordinate group a positive social identity. The only strategy adopted which can indeed change the status-quo, is social competition-direct, real conflict between the dominant and a subordinate group. For the members of low-status groups to engage in social competition though, the status-quo must be considered insecure, unstable and illegitimate and they must be able to envisage a cognitive alternative. Direct, real competition can take several forms: war, revolution, riot, protest and usually gives rise to social movements.

This is the original theory which focuses on intergroup relations. Generally, amongst its greatest achievements-contributions is that it provides a satisfactory explanation for the occurrence of ingroup bias, even in cases where no conflict of

interest is detectable and it thus complements Realistic Group Conflict Theory. Second, it has made the responses to status inequality, both of members of subordinate and of dominant groups, understandable, interacting with Relative Deprivation Theory.[24] However, despite its achievements, SIT does not explain how people act collectively on the basis of their shared collective identity, in other words, it does not describe the psychological processes underlying the transition from personal to social identity. SCT was particularly developed for treating this limitation. John Turner, Tajfel's student and afterwards colleague and cofounder of the SIT, put the process of self-categorization under the microscope. Let us first see the assumption on which the theory rests. Categories are formed on the basis of the meta-contrast principle: the differences between the members of a category must be less than the differences between this category and other categories within a specific comparative context, but the comparative context is very important in the sense that the same people can belong to one category within a comparative context and to another within another comparative context. The meta-contrast principle also defines the prototypicality of the members of a category: prototypical members are those who are the most representative of the category. Category salience refers to the factors that determine which category provides the basis for categorization each time; it is the result of a category's accessibility (someone's readiness to use one category, affected by his current intentions and prior experiences) and the category's fit (whether this category provides a satisfactory account of the differences and similarities between people and a satisfactory account of the expected content of the similarities and the differences).

To return to the process of self-categorization itself, it operates at three levels: the subordinate (activation of personal identity), the intermediate (activation of social identity) and the superordinate (activation of human identity) and each of them includes the previous. Self-categorization is context-dependent, which means that people can categorize themselves to a specific category at all three levels

[24] For how the theories supplement each other and interact, see our analysis of the *Birds*.

depending on the context each time (e.g. if the category is cleverness, a person can be clever or a group to which belongs can be clever or the human species is clever). Turner was interested in the intermediate level that activates the social identity, which is salient when the intergroup differences increase and the intra-group differences decrease (following again the meta-contrast principle). He argued that when people think and behave in terms of their social identity, they treat themselves as interchangeable with their ingroup members, without paying attention to personal characteristics. He coined the term depersonalization to name this process, a term with no negative connotations. As we have already mentioned, self-categorization leads to self-stereotyping: people see themselves and act accordingly to the ingroup stereotype. In turn, self-stereotyping affects social influence, in simpler words, who is able to exert influence on us. It follows that we are influenced by those members of our group who are more representative of the group than others. These are the most *prototypical* members; prototypicality is not a property of the average members of the group, but of the ideal members who embody the group prototype, the fuzzy set of attributes which describe a group and more importantly distinguish it from relevant outgroups.[25] When the rest of the group's members feel uncertain about the content of their identity (who they are) and their behaviour in a certain situation (how they should behave), they turn to the most prototypical members whose words and behaviour follow and exemplify group norms. Generally, SCT has shed light on the social role of stereotypes and has challenged our perception regarding their cognitive concomitant, the notion of homogeneity: outgroups are not more homogenous than ingroups and group homogeneity in general is affected by strong group identification.

Over the last twenty-years there have been developments and extensions of the original theory, so nowadays the social identity approach has many components

[25] Prototypes and stereotypes are not identical concepts but closely related: prototypes are cognitive representations of groups and stereotypes shared generalisations about members of a social group. From a social identity perspective, prototypes become stereotypes when shared by group members. See Hogg and Vaughan (2018) 52-58.

which provide explanations for a number of phenomena.[26] To begin with the very concept of social identity itself, the distinction between social and personal identity has become more textured and four types of identity are now identified: the person-based social identity, the relational social identity, the group-based social identity (equivalent with the traditional social identity) and the collective identity.[27] This taxonomy has made the relationship between social identities and self-concept more nuanced, but still the concept of social identity needs further expansion and reconceptualization (in order, for example, to take into account that there are different types of groups). Undoubtedly, though, the most important development to the original theory has been made by the social identity theory of leadership which argues that within a context of salient social identity the most prototypical members of a group become the group's leaders.[28] Generally, the social identity theory of leadership has revived the interest of social psychology in leadership and the most recent line of research has turned to intergroup leadership, being the leader of distinct subgroups which wish to retain their subgroup identity or have hostile/competitive relations between them.[29]

Moreover, the model of subjective group dynamics and referent informational theory were developed. The first provides an explanation for the black sheep effect, the tendency of those members of a group who care about intergroup differentiation to treat unlikeable in-group members in more negative ways than unlikeable out-group members. Such a tendency contrasts sharply to in-group favouritism but is explicable on the basis that deviant in-group members constitute a threat for the group: they undermine the subjective validity of the group norms and the in-group members' certainty that their group is better than the out-group. On the contrary, out-group deviants undermine the validity of the out-group while reinforcing the validity of the in-group. As for referent informational theory, it challenges the two

[26] For a description see Hogg, Abrams and Brewer (2017), where all references to specific studies can be found.
[27] Brewer (2001), Brewer and Chen (2007).
[28] Hogg (2001), Hogg and and Knippenberg (2003), Hogg, Van Knippenberg and Rast III (2012b).
[29] Hogg (2015).

established influence processes in social psychology, namely the informational ("an influence to accept information from another as evidence about reality") and the normative ("an influence to conform to the positive expectations of others") because both explain conformity in individualistic terms and neglect group belongingness. [30] It argues for a social influence process underpinned by social identity dynamics which fosters conformity to group norms.

Advances have been also made in the research area of social identity motivations. Besides the motivational role assigned to the quest for positive distinctiveness for the group which is underpinned by self-enhancement, nowadays uncertainty-reduction is also recognized as a strong individual motivation which stirs up group identification. According to uncertainty-identity theory, people cannot feel uncertain about anything that relates to their self and identity and thus identify strongly with a group, especially with high entitativity groups (well-structured groups with clear-cut boundaries).[31] Group identification reduces feelings of uncertainty because it prescribes through self-categorization how people should feel and behave and at the same time makes others' behaviour predictable. Furthermore, there has been the development of intergroup emotions theory.[32] Although the initial SIT recognised the emotional aspect of social identities [cf. the classical definition by Tajfel according to which social identity is *"the part of an individual's self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership"*[33]], emotions were not explored for a long time within social identity research. It is Intergroup Emotions Theory which changed that; its fundamental idea is that group membership leads to appraisal of social objects and situations in terms of their implications of the group and this appraisal elicits emotions which generate actions.

[30] Hogg and Vaughan (2018) 258-259.
[31] See Hogg (2007). Uncertainty-identity theory is represented in detail in the chapter on *Ecclesiazusae.*
[32] See Mackie, Devos and Smith (2000), Mackie, Maitner and Smith (2009).
[33] Tajfel (1978) 63.

At the same time, the Social Identity Approach (SIA) has changed the way collective behaviour is conceptualized by demonstrating that collective action is associated to social identity processes. To be more specific, the social identity model of deindividuation phenomena (SIDE) was developed to contradict deindividuation theory which suggests that anonymity causes antinormative behaviour and explains crowd behaviour on this basis.[34] On the contrary, SIDE argues that anonymity can cause normative behaviour through group identification and thus in such cases crowd behaviour is underpinned by this premise. Additionally, the social identity approach has been extended to the social dilemmas research and literature; shared social identity helps in resolving social dilemmas and fostering cooperation by turning people's self-serving goals to group-serving. In some cases, this transformation of motives is not spontaneous, but it is achieved by an effective leader.[35]

Additionally, there is the social attraction hypothesis which stems from self-categorization theory and provides a new explanation for group cohesion and attraction within groups. It argues that social attraction is not based on individuality but on common group membership. Last but not least, SIT has provided the theoretical framework for the development of theories/models which build on Allport's Contact Hypothesis (the idea that contact between the members of different group improves their relation) and aim at changing negative intergroup attitudes: the decategorisation model suggested by Brewer and Miller, the common ingroup identity model of Gaertner and Dovidio and the Integrative Contact Theory of Hewstone and Brown.[36]

Of course, the SIA has also encountered difficulties and has become object of criticism; in most cases, the findings of test-studies have run contrary to the theory's predictions and different interpretations have been suggested for explaining them,

[34] For SIDE, see Reicher, Spears and Postmes (1995), Postmes and Spears (1998).
[35] See van Vugt and De Cremer (1999), De Cremer and van Vugt (2002).
[36] The three models are discussed in more detail in the chapter on *Lysistrata*.

not always satisfactory.[37] For example, although one would expect that there is a positive correlation between group identification and ingroup bias, given that positive social identity stems from favourable intergroup comparisons, this hypothesis is not supported by the tests. In a similar way, one expects a correlation between ingroup bias (and intergroup differentiation in general) and self-esteem, either in the sense that positive intergroup differentiation boosts self-esteem or in the sense that low self-esteem urges group members to engage in intergroup differentiation in order to restore it. Again, however, none of these two corollaries has been supported by test-studies and despite the interpretations suggested, the motivational role of self-esteem should not be over-emphasised; self-esteem would be better treated not as a direct cause of discrimination but as a by-product of discrimination. In addition, given that SIT is a theory of group differentiation, it is expected that the groups which discover that they are similar to other groups will show intergroup differentiation, however tests of this hypothesis have produced inconsistent findings. Furthermore, it is problematic for SIT that there are cases when group-members do not show ingroup bias (for example, when the out-group is not psychologically salient or when the inter-group context is non-competitive) and even cases when low status groups show out-group bias. Equally problematic for the theory is to predict which strategy will be adopted by the members of low-status groups in order to change their negative identity. Even though the theory offers some predictions, these do not fit well with other identity maintenance strategies which have been suggested after the initial theory. Another problematic finding for the SIT is the positive-negative asymmetry phenomenon, which refers to the decrease of ingroup bias in the minimal group paradigm when negative outcomes replace positive rewards.

As for the directions for future research, these are prescribed by the weaknesses of the approach mentioned above, but they also stem from the changes

[37] The suggested interpretations which deal with the problematic assumptions are not discussed since they are beyond the scope of our analysis. Comprehensive accounts of these can be found in Hinkle and Brown (1990), Brown (2000) and Hornsey (2008).

in our socio-political world. For example, for social psychologists working on social identity it is interesting to examine how social identities are constructed and sustained in the e-world which is dominated by the social media; how the social identity model of social influence operates in the e-world; how immigration and refugee crisis is associated with identity inequality and leads to ethnocentrism on behalf of the hosting countries; how social identity can foster cultural differentiation; how social identity underpin societal extremism and populism.[38]

Before finishing with the overview of the SIA, it is important to see how it engages with politics, given the political orientation of Old Comedy and the sociopolitical content of the established collective identity of the Athenians. Traditionally, social psychology has not been associated with politics; there are other subdisciplines of psychology such as political psychology which show how psychology is relevant to politics. Turner wrote: "It is one reason why social psychology is so marginal politically and has little political clout. A theory that says that we are condemned to play out social roles invented in the past (by whom and how they were invented is never very clear), as if we can never resist and reinvent them now, is a theory of social stability, of endless stagnation. To show how society changes there must be a dynamic and fully 'interactionist' […] social psychology."[39] The social identity approach, however, constitutes such a dynamic and interactionist way of addressing politics. Alexa Ispas' book *Psychology and Politics. A social identity perspective* discusses the stimulating insights that the social identity approach can offer in four basic areas of politics: leadership and more generally social influence, crowd events and the establishment of/submission to authoritarian regimes.[40]

[38] See Hogg, Abrams and Brewer (2017) 7-8.
[39] Turner (2006) 45.
[40] Ispas (2013).

1.3 A social psychological reading of Aristophanic comedy informed by the Social Identity Approach (SIA)

"it is the group through which people are able to change things collectively and politically, and hence ultimately change personalities and individual attitudes"[41]

Our study consists of five chapters, three devoted to specific plays (*Birds, Lysistrata* and *Ecclesiazusae*), one which co-examines two plays (*Acharnians* and *Peace*) and one integrative chapter on the topic of leadership. The chapter on *Lysistrata* includes a brief analysis of the parabasis of *Frogs*, whereas the chapter on leadership discusses specific parts of *Knights* and *Wasps*. *Clouds* is not included in the study because the hero and the chorus do not act and interact as members of social groups who bear a well-defined collective identity. Although women's actions in *Thesmophoriazusae* are motivated by a negative social identity and the assembly scene in the first part of the play (295-654) provides examples of in-group processes, the black sheep effect in particular which is briefly analysed in the chapter of *Acharnians*, these social-identity processes are not associated with the rest of the play which focuses on the Inlaw's failed attempts to escape women and constitute extensive parodies of Euripidean tragedies; *Thesmophoriazusae* is a metatheatrical play and is not examined in this study.[42] Similarly, *Wealth* is not given a chapter either; undoubtedly, Chremylus is a hero with strong prosocial sentiments, sharing his new-attained wealth with his friends. His initial visit to the oracle at Delphi is motivated by a negative social identity (he belongs to the group of poor and honest men, not to the group of rich and rogues), however, social-

[41] Turner (2006) 44.

[42] Cf. Sommerstein (1994) 4: "*Thesmophoriazusae,* however, is not a political play and was never designed to be. It is a drama about drama and about gender, built around a myth that seems to have been firmly established in popular consciousness: that he {Euripides} was a hater and slanderer of women". One could argue that a social psychological analysis of the play informed by social identity theory is not completely impossible, if applied to a metatheatrical reading of the play. Women would stand for comedy itself which bears a negative social identity. Although they adopt collective action for social change (this is to somehow harm Euripides who is responsible for this negative identity), they fail: Euripides' promise to present more positive women on his plays does not constitute a social change-the status-quo remains intact. For the resolution in the play, see Austin and Olson (2004) lxiv-lxviii.

identity processes are not displayed in the play. We can only get a glimpse of them in Chremylus' argumentation for convincing the god Wealth to get into active competition with Zeus (112-217), a pattern which features in *Birds* and to a smaller scale in *Peace*.

Each of the plays examined is treated as a case-study of the social identity approach and given that each comedy has a different topic, our analysis explores different components of the theory in each play. The theoretical prepositions of these components were mentioned briefly in the Introduction, but are discussed in detail in the relevant chapters; in this way, the plays' interaction with the theory is thoroughly displayed. The plays are not examined in a chronological order, but in an order which highlights the continuity of patterns and ideas in Aristophanic comedy. The first chapter is on *Birds*, Aristophanes' play which is best corroborated and in turn best corroborates the theory. Pisthetaerus' behaviour follows the propositions of social identity theory; as an Athenian, the comic hero is a bearer of a negative social identity and in pursuit of a positive social identity, he adopts the social mobility strategy: he leaves his group in order to become member of another group with higher status (to live in another town). However, he ends up building a new city in the air with the birds. Surely, the birds are not a high-status group, but Pisthetaerus realises that they have the potential of becoming such. By stirring them to revolt against human and divine tyranny, he manages to become member and leader of their group. Under his commands, the birds start to display in-group bias, engage in social competition and eventually succeed in changing the social world.

Following the propositions of the integrative Social Identity Model of Collective Action for Social Change (SIMCA), our analysis seeks to demonstrate how Pisthetaerus invokes the social identity of the birds and mostly the cognition and emotions stemming from it (the prejudice, the hostility and the anger) in order to motivate their revolt against human and divine tyranny. In doing so, the birds not only accept him as a member of their group but voluntarily pronounce him their leader and at the end even succumb to the tyrannical regime that he establishes. Therefore, our analysis seeks to provide a (psycho-)logical answer to the following

questions: how does Pisthetaerus manage to become the leader of the birds, why and under which conditions does his regime become tyrannical and why do the birds succumb to this new tyrannical regime.

In the second chapter, *Acharnians* and *Peace* are co-examined; in both plays Aristophanes deals with the topic of peace and both offer valuable insights when compared to the *Birds.* Regarding *Acharnians,* we are set out to demonstrate how Dicaeopolis' marginal status, both as a citizen and as a rustic, urges him to attain a private peace with Sparta. His motives and behaviour are compared to those of Pisthetaerus, given that both represent the *ponêros* comic hero par excellence. Additionally, we examine his behaviour after self-exclusion, seeking to make it comprehensible within a social psychological framework. *Peace,* on the other hand, composed seven years before the *Birds,* also dramatizes human rebellion against the sovereignty of the Gods. Our analysis examines whether the social identity processes identified in the *Birds* were in any way used in *Peace*. Special emphasis is put on the fluctuating identity of the chorus; our aim is to demonstrate that the chorus' fluctuating identity matches Trygaeus' versatile identity and to examine whether Trygaeus' leading roles are explicable in terms of the social identity theory of leadership.

In the third chapter, our analysis of *Lysistrata* does not follow the plot-line of the play, but focuses on the two reconciliations, that of the male and female semi-choruses and that of the Athenians and Spartans. Nonetheless, we seek to demonstrate that reconciliation is in both cases inextricably connected to social identity dynamics which are set in motion from the very beginning of the play by Lysistrata. Lysistrata's motivations are put on the spotlight and are compared with those of the young women and the old women of the chorus. The exploration of the motives is intended to shed light on women's multifaceted social identity and to argue that the play invites the promotion of their communal social identity represented by the old women of the chorus. This identity enables the reconciliation between men and women and at the same time lays the ground for the reconciliation

of Athenians and Spartans through the adoption of a relational identity which makes the 'Other' a collaboration partner. The chapter will finish with an examination of the chorus' plea for reconciliation in the parabasis of *Frogs.*

Our social-psychological reading of *Ecclesiazusae* in the fourth chapter rests on an assumption which pertains our argumentation in general, the idea that in Aristophanes' plays one can discern a development of older ideas and conceptions; the poet returns to, builds on, elaborates on and reworks concepts and ideas that he has used in previous plays. I call this aspect of the poet's dramaturgical technique continuity in order to counterbalance the common characterization of the comic genre as discontinuous.[43] In line with this, we will try to demonstrate that women's presentation in *Ecclesiazusae* builds on their revised social identity in *Lysistrata*. We examine women's motivations for adopting collective action and whether Praxagora is presented as a prototypical leader. In the second part of the play, our analysis aims at demonstrating the importance of group identification for the smooth operation of the new regime by arguing that the latter constitutes a motivational and not a structural remedy for Athens' ills; such an argument makes the ostensible contradiction between the traditionalism/conservatism of women and the innovative character of Praxagora's reforms intelligible.

As becomes obvious, the topic of leadership looms large in our discussions of the plays; Pisthetaerus, Lysistrata, Praxagora and Trygaeus act as leaders of their groups and orchestrate the collective action adopted. Building on our comments in each play, the last chapter intends to check the assumption that these heroes' behaviour can be explained in terms of the social identity theory of leadership and to examine whether the model of social identity theory of leadership is indeed the prevailing model of leadership in the surviving plays of Aristophanes. This assumption is tested on *Knights,* Aristophanes' play which deals directly with the topic of leadership, and to a lesser degree on *Wasps*. Our analysis also aims at

[43] Cf. Silk (2000) 207: "The discontinuity that is such a feature of Aristophanes' style is equally a fundamental quality of his writing -his humor, his poetry, his drama- as a whole".

sketching the development of the model within the poet's oeuvre and attempts to assess its representation (positive or negative), without falling into the trap of engaging in the endless discussion of Aristophanes' political views.

1.4 Implications of a social psychological reading of Aristophanic comedy

The treatment of Aristophanes' plays as case-studies of the social identity approach allows us to sketch the psychological portrait of the comic heroes by demonstrating how group membership guides their thoughts, feelings and behaviour. This implies that their representation in the plays follows the propositions of realist characterization, but such an assumption has been considered problematic after Michael Silk's discussion of characterization in Aristophanes. Silk has argued for the discontinuity of characterization as a standard trait of the poet's plays, introducing the concept of recreativity; recreative mode of representation refers to the capacity of the people to recreate themselves, bearing some but not consistent relationship with reality.[44] The major influence of Silk's argumentation is unambiguous; scholars have not touched upon the topic of characterization in Old Comedy ever since and some have even extended his arguments suggesting that the heroes' cognition and behaviour must be attributed exclusively to the poet.[45]

Nonetheless, Silk himself recognizes that all Aristophanes' heroes belong up to an extent to the realist tradition.[46] Hence, to deprive them completely of cognition

[44] Silk 1990, 2000 235-237. See also Dover (1972) 59-65. Before Silk, the people of Aristophanes were analysed from different points of view: as types (Süss: 1905, 1908), as ritual elements/sacred heroes (Cornford: 1934), as bearers of functions (Sifakis: 1992) and as representative of social classes (Ehrenberg: 1962). For the concept of comic heroism suggested by Whitman (1964), see n. 4.

[45] Cf. Robson (2010) 81-82: "Not only is the idea of discontinuous, 'recreative' characters interesting in itself but it also has important consequences for the way we think and write about the people of Aristophanes. In particular, ascribing thoughts or motivations to his characters becomes something generally best avoided. [...]. And so when talking about the people of Aristophanes, we should generally resist the temptation of trying to 'explain' why a character is acting in a certain way or make claims about what is going through a character's mind at a particular moment. The characters themselves have not made a conscious decision to act in a particular way, nor arguably, are they portrayed as 'capable' (in any meaningful sense) of making any decisions at all: rather it is their creator, Aristophanes, who has decided to have them act in a certain way or make a given statement [...]".

[46] Silk (2000) 221.

and motivation is misleading since such a representation does not correspond to reality. After all, a complete deprivation of thoughts and motivations ends up weakening the argument of discontinuous characterization instead of highlighting it, whereas the adoption of Robson's view can have far-reaching implications, entrapping us into the vicious circle of attributing everything in a play to the poet. Albeit discontinuity and recreativity must be built in all discussions of the genre, the discontinuous and recreative tendencies of the comic heroes should not be overemphasized at the expense of the realistic behaviour which they display at other moments; the propositions of realist characterization can be applied to the heroes of Old Comedy because the latter do have motivations and intentions not despite of, but along their recreative tendencies.[47] Therefore, a secondary aim of this study is to achieve a break in the prevailing portrait of the comic hero as a caricature.

[47] Cf. Ruffel (2014) 167: "Nor does Old Comedy exclude individual motivation and characterization, but in the interplay of repetition and innovation and the joke-based structures, they are only one element among many".

2 *Birds* and Social Identity Theory (SIT)

2.1 Tereus' twofold nature and group belongingness[48]

Perhaps the most striking example of Aristophanes' endless play with the spectators' expectations and anticipations in *Birds* is the alteration of the initial plan of Pisthetaerus and Euelpides;[49] although, the impulse of their journey is to find a calm place to settle down -*πλανώμεθα ζητοῦντε τόπον ἀπράγμονα* (44)-, they end up prompting the birds to erect an avian city in the air -*οἰκίσατε μίαν πόλιν* (172)-. Notably, in both cases the implementation of their plan rests on the agency of Tereus, the Thracian king who is now transformed into a hoopoe and lives happily among the birds. All the references to Tereus' twofold nature found in the prologue are typically comic, revolving around his diet (76-78, 82, 159-160).[50] Yet, Pisthetaerus focuses on the emotional, typically non-comic, aspects of such a nature and this, I suggest, is the most subtle part of Aristophanes' ingenious play in the *Birds;* the feeling of collectiveness, twofold like the nature of Tereus himself, is the driving force of all the interactions in the prologue.

To begin with, for the initial plan the two visitors are in need of Tereus' identity as a bird; however, the comic hero invokes Tereus' human nature, underlining the common fate that it had entailed for them:

ὅτι πρῶτα μὲν ἦσθ' ἄνθρωπος ὥσπερ νώ ποτε,
κἀργύριον ὠφείλησας ὥσπερ νώ ποτε,
κοὐκ ἀποδιδοὺς ἔχαιρες ὥσπερ νώ ποτε·
εἶτ' αὖθις ὀρνίθων μεταλλάξας φύσιν
καὶ γῆν ἐπέπτου καὶ θάλατταν ἐν κύκλῳ,
καὶ πάνθ' ὅσαπερ ἄνθρωπος ὅσα τ' ὄρνις φρονεῖς·
ταῦτ' οὖν ἱκέται νὼ πρὸς σὲ δεῦρ' ἀφίγμεθα,

[48] Throughout the study, the text of Aristophanes is from Wilson (2007) and the translations from Henderson (1998, 2000, 2002), occasionally slightly modified. In both editions, the comic hero's name is ΠΕΙΣΕΤΑΙΡΟΣ (Peisetaerus); however, I use Pisthetaerus.

[49] For Aristophanes' dramatic art in *Birds*, see Gelzer (1996).

[50] For food discourse in comedy, see Wilkins (1997) and (2000). For the metaphorical usage of food discourse by comic poets for discussing, describing and judging literature, see Wright (2012) 129-140.

εἴ τινα πόλιν φράσειας ἡμῖν εὔερον,

ὥσπερ σισύραν ἐγκατακλινῆναι μαλθακήν.

Well, originally you were human, like us,
and once owed money, like us,
and once enjoyed not repaying it, like us;
then trading all that for the guise of birds,
you've flown the circuit of land and sea,
and your mind contains everything a human's does,
and everything a bird's does too. That's why we've come to visit,
hoping you know of a nice cushy
city, soft as a woolen blanket, where we could curl up.
(114-122)

Interestingly, the two men take for granted Tereus' eagerness to help and indeed he sets the knowledge provided by his new identity at the disposal of his previous companions. But soon Pisthetaerus conceives the new grandiose plan, the implementation of which rests even more emphatically on Tereus' avian identity. Accordingly, his human nature is no longer invoked –at least explicitly- and Pisthetaerus merely calls upon Tereus' identity as a bird. In his argumentation he juxtaposes *we* -we, men- to *you* -you, the birds-:

ΠΕΙΣΕΤΑΙΡΟΣ

φεῦ φεῦ·

ἦ μέγ' ἐνορῶ βούλευμ' ἐν ὀρνίθων γένει,

*καὶ δύναμιν ἣ γένοιτ' ἄν, εἰ **πίθοισθέ** μοι.*

ΤΗΡΕΥΣ (ΕΠΟΨ)

*τί σοι **πιθώμεσθ'**;*

ΠΕΙΣΕΤΑΙΡΟΣ

*ὅ τι **πίθησθε**; πρῶτα μὲν*

*μὴ **περιπέτεσθε** πανταχῆ κεχηνότες·*

ὡς τοῦτ' ἄτιμον τοὔργον ἐστίν. αὐτίκα

*ἐκεῖ **παρ' ἡμῖν** τοὺς πετομένους ἢν ἔρῃ,*

"τίς ἐστιν οὗτος;" ὁ Τελέας ἐρεῖ ταδί·

"ἄνθρωπος ὄρνις ἀστάθμητος, πετόμενος,

ἀτέκμαρτος, οὐδὲν οὐδεπότ' ἐν ταὐτῷ μένων."

PEISETAERUS
Aha, aha! Oh what a grand scheme I see in the race of birds,
and power that could be yours, if you take my advice!
TEREUS
What advice would you have us take?
PEISETAERUS
What advice should you take? For a start,
don't fly around in all directions with your beaks agape;
that's discreditable behavior. For example,
back where we come from, if among the flighty crowd you ask,
"Who's that guy?" Teleas will reply,
"The man's a bird, unstable, flighty,
unverifiable, never ever staying in the same spot."
(162-170)

Although Tereus' avian identity is automatically alert -note the usage of first person plural in lines 164: *τί σοι* ***πιθώμεσθ'***, 172: *τί ἂν οὖν* ***ποιοῖμεν***, 173: *ποίαν δ' ἂν* ***οἰκίσαιμεν*** *ὄρνιθες πόλιν-*, he is in fact easily drawn by Pisthetaerus' argumentation (194-196) because of his human nature; for him, it is enough to hear *ὥστ' ἄρξετ' ἀνθρώπων μὲν ὥσπερ παρνόπων,/τοὺς δ' αὖ θεοὺς ἀπολεῖτε λιμῷ Μηλίῳ* (185-186) for embracing the new plan and summoning the birds to hear about it. In the words of Konstan "Pisthetaerus [...] wins the hoopoe to his grandiose scheme with the promise of limitless power, but with the native birds -those who, unlike Tereus, never had been human- he takes a slightly different approach".[51]

Indeed, Pisthetaerus' task with the birds is clearly harder; firstly, he must cope with their hostility:

ΧΟΡΟΣ

ἔα ἔα·

προδεδόμεθ' ἀνόσιά τ' ἐπάθομεν·

[51] Konstan (1997) 11.

ὃς γὰρ φίλος ἦν ὁμότροφά θ' ἡμῖν

ἐνέμετο πεδία παρ' ἡμῖν,

παρέβη μὲν θεσμοὺς ἀρχαίους,

παρέβη δ' ὅρκους ὀρνίθων

εἰς δὲ δόλον ἐκάλεσε,

παρέβαλέ τ' ἐμὲ παρὰ

γένος ἀνόσιον ὅπερ

ἐξότ' ἐγένετ' ἐμοὶ

πολέμιον ἐτράφη.

ΚΟΡΥΦΑΙΟΣ

ἀλλὰ πρὸς μὲν τοῦτον ἡμῖν ἐστιν ὕστερος λόγος·

τὼ δὲ πρεσβύτα δοκεῖ μοι τώδε δοῦναι νῦν δίκην

{διαφορηθῆναί θ' ὑφ' ἡμῶν.

CHORUS
Oo, oo!
We are betrayed, we are impiously defiled!
Yes, our former friend, who browsed with us
in the fields that feed us all,
has broken our ancient ordinances,
has broken our avian oaths.
He's lured me into a trap,
he's cast me out among
an unholy race, that
since its very creation
has been groomed to be my foe.
CHORUS LEADER
Well, him we'll settle accounts with later;
as for these two codgers, I think they should give us satisfaction on the spot now, by being dismembered.
(327-338) [52]

As in the case of the Acharnian chorus in Aristophanes' play of the same title, the birds' hostile attitude springs out of anger and bias and is directed both against

[52] For the parodos, see Gelzer (1996) 206-208.

Pisthetaerus and Euelpides and Tereus. Tereus tramples down the feeling of collectiveness that binds him with the birds, who interpret his decision to accept men as betrayal of collective ordinances and oaths and this inflames their anger (329-332). The visit of the two Athenians awakens birds' bias and stereotypes towards men in general, who have traditionally been their great oppressors, threatening and putting their collective identity in danger (333-335).

Tereus and not the comic hero is the one who manages to bend the chorus' aggression and persuades them to hear the plan. Notably, in his argumentation he invokes his twofold nature and the feeling of collectiveness that it entails in each case, following Pisthetaerus' example. Firstly, he implicitly calls upon his human nature by referring to his wife's Athenian origins:

εἰπέ μοι, τί μέλλετ', ὦ πάντων κάκιστα θηρίων,
ἀπολέσαι παθόντες οὐδὲν ἄνδρε καὶ διασπάσαι
τῆς ἐμῆς γυναικὸς ὄντε ξυγγενεῖ καὶ φυλέτα;

Say, you scurviest of all creatures,
why do you aim to destroy and mutilate two men who've done you no harm,
who are my wife's kinsmen and fellow tribesmen?
(366-368)

The point is that the birds should not attack the two Athenians because they are Prokne's relations and indirectly Tereus' as well; to put it differently, common Athenian origins guarantee the good cause of the visitors.[53] However, the birds are not persuaded and object by arguing that men are birds' perennial enemies and cannot be considered as friends by intention (369-371). Then Tereus manipulates this stereotyped enmity of the birds towards men by arguing:

[53] In the play there is no reference to the tragic elements of Tereus' myth. Instead, Tereus and Prokne, now transformed into hoopoe and nightingale respectively, are a happy couple, even though Prokne still laments over Itys' death (210-212). For Tereus' representation in the play as a contrafact of tragic *Tereus* by Sophocles, see Dobrov (2001) 105-132.

ἀλλ' ἀπ' ἐχθρῶν δὴ τὰ πολλὰ μανθάνουσιν οἱ σοφοί.

ἡ γὰρ εὐλάβεια σῴζει πάντα. παρὰ μὲν οὖν φίλου

οὐ μάθοις ἂν τοῦθ', ὁ δ' ἐχθρὸς εὐθὺς ἐξηνάγκασεν.

αὐτίχ' αἱ πόλεις παρ' ἀνδρῶν γ' ἔμαθον ἐχθρῶν κοὐ φίλων

ἐκπονεῖν θ' ὑψηλὰ τείχη ναῦς τε κεκτῆσθαι μακράς·

τὸ δὲ μάθημα τοῦτο σῴζει παῖδας, οἶκον, χρήματα.

Yet the wise can learn the most from enemies.
Caution does save the day – a lesson you can't learn
from a friend, but the first lesson an enemy imposes.
For instance, it was from enemies, not friends,
that cities learned to build lofty walls and master warships,
and that lesson safeguards children, household, and property.
(375-380)

His sophistic argument appeases the birds' anger (383), who admit that "*ἔστι μὲν λόγων ἀκοῦσαι πρῶτον, ὡς ἡμῖν δοκεῖ./χρήσιμον μάθοι γὰρ ἄν τι κἀπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν σοφός*" (381-382). As a result, the feeling of collectiveness that binds Tereus and the birds is eventually restored:

ΤΗΡΕΥΣ (ΕΠΟΨ)

καὶ δίκαιόν γ' ἐστί, κἀμοὶ δεῖ νέμειν ὑμᾶς χάριν.

ΚΟΡΥΦΑΙΟΣ

ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδ' ἄλλο σοί πω πρᾶγμ' ἐνηντιώμεθα.

TEREUS
It's also the right thing to do, and besides, you should cultivate my good graces.
CHORUS LEADER
Well, we've surely never opposed you in any past dealings.
(384-385)

But at the same time, the bias that sets them apart is not bented; the chorus leader invites Pisthetaerus to expound the plan in the following way:

δολερὸν μὲν ἀεὶ κατὰ πάντα δὴ τρόπον
πέφυκεν ἄνθρωπος· σὺ δ' ὅμως λέγε μοι.

A treacherous thing always in every way
is human nature. But do make your case.
(451-452)

One could think that Tereus' argument is in fact making Pisthetaerus' task even harder. On the contrary, I suggest that it reminds him of the effectiveness of the weapon he has just used in the prologue for persuading Tereus; indeed, Pisthetaerus' powerful weapon is the birds' social identity, the part of their self-concept which derives from group membership and which produces the feeling of collectiveness that they share -and now Tereus also shares with them-. Even though birds' social identity renders Pisthetaerus automatically an enemy, it still has the capacity, under specific conditions, to be reinterpreted and thus to redefine enmity. But before we see this happening in action, we must first define all the aspects of the birds' social identity; for, social identity does not only have an emotional aspect –collectiveness- but entails specific norms, values and ideology.

2.2 From group belongingness to birds' social identity

"In simpler terms, an individual can only represent and speak for a group if there is a group to represent in the first place".[54]

As it has already become obvious, in the social but still utopian world that Aristophanes reenacts in his play, it is the social and not the personal identity of the protagonists that is psychologically salient for their self-conception;[55] indeed, all of them define themselves in terms of their group membership, invoking slightly –if not at all- their personal identity. In line with this, all the interactions that take place in the prologue revolve around membership in birds' group: initially Pisthetaerus

[54] Haslam and Reicher (2012) 22.
[55] For identity salience, see Hogg and Vaughan (2018) 132-134.

and Euelpides seek Tereus' advice because of his membership in the specific group; soon Pisthetaerus conceives a plan that will change the future of the members of the group; the birds are hostile towards Pisthetaerus and Euelpides because they are enemies of their group and accuse Tereus for not acting as a member would do in accepting them; Tereus tries to persuade the birds to hear the beneficial for the group plan.

Therefore, the prologue provides us a clear picture of the birds' social identity and its implications for both their (in) group behaviour and their relations with other groups, though the two domains are interdependent.[56] Keeping in mind that "[s]ocial identities not only *describe* attributes but, very importantly, also *prescribe* what one should think and how one should behave as a member",[57] we see that the birds have norms to which they have to conform and which define their behaviour (331-332).[58] Of course, the exact nature of these norms is not described, but we can assume that they prescribe the way the birds must treat their enemies. Also, the birds have low self-esteem, a glimpse of which we get from their dialogue with Tereus and Pisthetaerus just before the *agôn* begins:

ΚΟΡΥΦΑΙΟΣ

ὁρᾷ τι κέρδος ἐνθάδ' ἄξιον μονῆς,
ὅτῳ πέποιθ' ἐμοὶ ξυνὼν
κρατεῖν ἂν ἢ τὸν ἐχθρὸν ἢ
φίλοισιν ὠφελεῖν ἔχειν;

[56] It is useful to recall that "Social identity theory has its origins in the work of Henri Tajfel on social categorisation, intergroup relations, social comparison, and prejudice and stereotyping [...] - often called the *social identity theory of intergroup relations* -and in later theorising by John Turner and his associates on the role of self-categorisation in generating group behaviour associated with collective self-conception [...] - called the *social identity theory of the group,* or self-categorisation theory" (Hogg and Vaughan 2018: 132). For the two theories, see also Introduction.

[57] Ibid., 431.

[58] Norms are defined as the "[a]ttitudinal and behavioural uniformities that define group membership and differentiate between groups" (ibid., 300). See also the definition of Cialdini and Trost (1998) 152: "rules and standards that are understood by members of a group and that guide and/or constrain social behaviour without the force of laws. These norms emerge out of interaction with others; they may or may not be stated explicitly, and any sanctions for deviating from them come from social networks, not the legal system". For the power of norms, see also the chapter on *Ecclesiazusae.*

ΤΗΡΕΥΣ (ΕΠΟΨ)

λέγει μέγαν τιν' ὄλβον, οὔτε λεκτὸν οὔ-

τε πιστόν· ὡς σὰ πάντα καὶ τὸ τῆδε καὶ τὸ κεῖσε καὶ

τὸ δεῦρο προσβιβᾷ λέγων.

ΚΟΡΥΦΑΙΟΣ

πότερα μαινόμενος;

CHORUS LEADER
Does he see a way to cash in on his visit,
convinced that being with me
he'll overpower his enemy
or be able to help his friends?
TEREUS
He promises great prosperity, ineffable
and incredible, for he makes a convincing case
that you can have it all, what's here,
and there, and everywhere.
CHORUS LEADER
Is he insane?
(417-426)

[...] σὺ δ' ὅμως λέγε μοι. τάχα γὰρ

τύχοις ἂν χρηστὸν ἐξειπὼν ὅ τι μοι παροράς,

ἢ δύναμίν τινα μείζω

παραλειπομένην ὑπ' ἐμῆς φρενὸς ἀξυνέτου·

CHORUS
[…] But do make your case, for perhaps
you may divulge a good quality that you see in me
or some greater potential
overlooked by my witless mind.
(452-456)

The low self-esteem of the birds is inextricably connected to their low status, arising also from their perennially conflictual relations with men, driven by bias and stereotypes:

εἰς δὲ δόλον ἐκάλεσε,

παρέβαλέ τ' ἐμὲ παρὰ

γένος ἀνόσιον, ὅπερ

ἐξότ' ἐγένετ' ἐμοὶ

πολέμιον ἐτράφη.

He's lured me into a trap,
he's cast me out among
an unholy race, that
since its very creation
has been groomed to be my foe.
(333-335)

φεισόμεθα γάρ τι τῶνδε μᾶλλον ἡμεῖς ἢ λύκων;

ἢ τίνας τεισαίμεθ' ἄλλους τῶνδ' ἂν ἐχθίους ἔτι;

You mean we should show these men any more mercy than wolves?
What enemies could we take revenge on more hateful than these?
(369-370)

All taken together, the birds constitute a group with a negative social identity. Given that one of the core assumptions of social identity theory is the quest for positive distinctiveness, the birds are accordingly expected to try and overturn the negative picture of their group, either by finding new dimensions of comparison or by engaging in intergroup conflict. This is indeed exactly what Pisthetaerus' plan presupposes (185-186: *ὥστ' ἄρξετ' ἀνθρώπων μὲν ὥσπερ παρνόπων,/τοὺς δ' αὖ θεοὺς ἀπολεῖτε λιμῷ Μηλίῳ*). However, the birds do not opt for positive distinctiveness and under these circumstances Pisthetaerus' plan becomes impossible. Therefore, in order to implement his plan, the comic hero has to undertake the task of cultivating birds' psychological -and clearly human- quest for positive distinctiveness and then urge collective action for achieving it. In this sense, he will complete Tereus' work in civilizing the birds (195-197) who live in the borderline between social structure and pre-social condition. For achiving all these,

he will take advantage of his cultural knowledge of the group, namely their low self-esteem and status and their enmity towards men.

2.3 Persuading the birds to act collectively: A social psychological analysis of Pisthetaerus' speech

Interestingly, Pisthetaerus' argumentation corroborates and is in turn corroborated by the Integrative Social Identity Model of Collective Action (SIMCA), suggested by Martijn van Zomeren, Tom Postmes και Russel Spears.[59] SIMCA came out of meta-analyses of three socio-psychological perspectives of collective action, that of perceived injustice, perceived efficacy and social identity. Each of them has different theoretical background and provides a unique explanation for collective action, sometimes treated as conflicting to the other two. Although not all of them allude to a fully developed, clear-cut theory but rather to a number of developments of the initial concept, it is useful to keep in mind that perceived injustice basically stemmed out of relative deprivation theory (RTD), "a perceived discrepancy between attainments or actualities ('what is') and expectations or entitlements ('what ought to be')."[60] On the other hand, perceived efficacy which assumes that collective action is more likely when based on the shared belief that acting together will indeed lead to goals' achievement, has its distinct origins in the sociological resource mobilization theory –social change is the result of sustained social protest and is achieved through the actions of social movement organizations- but adopts the more subjective reorientation of Klandermans' famous cost-benefit model.[61]

In the words of its introducers: "SIMCA proposes that social identity predicts collective action directly as well as indirectly through the injustice and efficacy variables. Social identity underlies injustice because it provides the basis for the group-based experience of injustice. Hence, it can positively buffer group members

[59] Van Zomeren, Postmes and Spears (2008).
[60] Hogg and Vaughan (2018) 416. For a detailed account of the RTD with references to the primary sources, see ibid., 414-418 and Van Zomeren, Postmes and Spears (2008) 505.
[61] Hogg and Vaughan (2018) 419-420 and Van Zomeren, Postmes and Spears (2008) 506-507. For Klandermans' model see Klandermans (1984) and (1997).

against the negative consequences of low group status and emotionally gear them up for collective action. Moreover, social identity underlies efficacy because a stronger sense of identity empowers relatively powerless individuals. In other words, social identity affects group members' experiences of both group-based injustice and efficacy, which prefigures SIMCA's prediction that social identity functions as a conceptual bridge between the two. Given these considerations, SIMCA proposes that identity, injustice, and efficacy all provide unique explanations for collective action and that social identity bridges the injustice and efficacy explanations of collective action in so far as it predicts perceptions of both. Thus, social identity is not a unique predictor of collective action, but it also functions as the psychological connection between injustice and efficacy."[62]

Let us see Pisthetaerus' speech in detail. In the first part (462-538, the *epirrhêma* of the *agôn*), the grand plan is not exhibited to the birds immediately since Pisthetaerus firstly attempts emotionally to win their trust. As he confesses to Euelpides:

μὰ Δί', ἀλλὰ λέγειν ζητῶ τι πάλαι, μέγα καὶ λαρινὸν ἔπος τι,
ὅ τι τὴν τούτων θραύσει ψυχήν.

No, no, it's just that for quite some time I've been trying to
put something into words, a big juicy utterance that will
shatter these birds to the very soul.
(465-466)

He thus starts by expressing his sorrow over the terrible situation into which the birds have come to and which sharply contrasts with their alleged glorious past:

ΠΕΙΣΕΤΑΙΡΟΣ

[...] οὕτως ὑμῶν ὑπεραλγῶ,
οἵτινες ὄντες πρότερον βασιλῆς -

[62] Van Zomeren, Postmes and Spears (2008) 511.

ΚΟΡΥΦΑΙΟΣ

ἡμεῖς βασιλῆς; τίνος;

ΠΕΙΣΕΤΑΙΡΟΣ

ὑμεῖς

πάντων ὁπόσ' ἔστιν, ἐμοῦ πρῶτον, τουδί, καὶ τοῦ Διὸς αὐτοῦ,

ἀρχαιότεροι πρότεροί τε Κρόνου καὶ Τιτάνων ἐγενέσθε,

καὶ Γῆς.

ΚΟΡΥΦΑΙΟΣ

καὶ Γῆς;

ΠΕΙΣΕΤΑΙΡΟΣ

νὴ τὸν Ἀπόλλω.

ΚΟΡΥΦΑΙΟΣ

τουτὶ μὰ Δί' οὐκ ἐπεπύσμην.

PEISETAERUS
So sorrowful am I on your account, who once were kings-
CHORUS LEADER
Us kings? Of what?
PEISETAERUS
Yes you, kings of all that exists-starting with yours truly and including Zeus himself- and born a long time before Cronus, and the Titans, and even Earth.
CHORUS LEADER
Even Earth?
PEISETAERUS
I swear by Apollo.
PEISETAERUS
I certainly never heard that.
(467-470)

Pisthetaerus' main contentions that the birds are the oldest beings on earth and were once the kings of the universe are supported by a number of arguments, all of which involve comparisons, both chronological -the present state of the group is compared to the past- and social -the group's state is compared to that of other groups-. To begin with, the Lark who is the birds' ancestor was born before Earth and the Gods (471-475) and therefore birds' claim to rule is rightful. Moreover, in the old days birds were kings in Persia, Greece, Egypt and Phoenicia (481-485, 499-501, 504-506),

were set on human kings' -if there were any- scepters (508-510) whereas oaths by birds were customary (520). Even nowadays, birds are perched on Gods' scepters and cult-statues (514-516), enjoying themselves the share of innards offered to the Gods (518-519). Nonetheless, people treat them dreadfully by trapping, killing and eating them (523-538, *pnigos*).

In the words of the theory, Pisthetaerus' description indicates the illegitimacy and instability of the current status quo, thus enhancing birds' identification with their group. Instability refers to the fact that Gods' current kingship over men and birds is not actually perennial as the latter have so far assumed, although Pisthetaerus does not give any information regarding the time and the way the divine sovereignty was established. Nonetheless, it is implied that the birds can similarly change the status quo, like Gods have done before them. Instability encloses the meaning of vulnerability as well; this, of course, does not become immediately evident to a low-status group engaging or planning to engage in collective action like the birds do, but it is a rather gradual realization.[63] The scene with Iris (1170-1261) can be treated as a challenge to the status quo, indicative of its vulnerability, culminating in Prometheus' scene where the response of the Gods to such a challenge is described (1494-1552).[64]

Additionally, birds' identification with their group gets stronger because at the same time Pisthetaerus' arguments prompt them to realize that they are experiencing fraternal or group-based deprivation, meaning that as a group they are enjoying less than they are entitled to -perceived injustice-.[65] According to the more recent assumptions of RTD, the affective components of fraternal deprivation

[63] Haslam and Reicher (2012) 22: "Yet the sense that an existing order is vulnerable does not arise suddenly. As we saw in the BBC Prison study, it evolves out of a series of challenges, initially often quite small in scale, and after seeing the response of the dominant group to them."

[64] For the interpretation of the two scenes, see the following sections.

[65] Cf. Orwell as cited in Hogg and Vaughan (2018) 416: 'Talking once with a miner I asked him when the housing shortage first became acute in his district; he answered, "When we were told about it", meaning that " 'til recently people's standards were so low that they took almost any degree of overcrowding for granted".' See also Konstan (1997) 11: "With them, that is, he must first implant a sense of lack, a nostalgia for an originary plentitude, which, until he tells them otherwise, they have never missed. Inscription within human society takes the form of an initiation into desire, which is predicated on the memory –here self-consciously constructed as a myth- of former sufficiency."

(e.g. group-based feelings like anger) foster collective action more likely than the cognitive components of it -the cold knowledge that you are experiencing inequality-. Remarkably, Pisthetaerus ends his description with men's dreadful treatment of the birds (*pnigos*), arousing in this way their distress and anger; the birds' respond is indicative of their emotional state:

πολὺ δὴ πολὺ δὴ χαλεπωτάτους λόγους
ἤνεγκας, ἄνθρωφ'· ὡς ἐδάκρυσά γ' ἐμῶν πατέρων
κάκην, οἳ τάσδε τὰς τιμὰς προγόνων παραδόν-
των ἐπ' ἐμοῦ κατέλυσαν.
σὺ δέ μοι κατὰ δαίμονα καί <τινα> συντυχίαν
ἀγαθὴν ἥκεις ἐμοὶ σωτήρ.
ἀναθεὶς γὰρ ἐγώ σοι
τὰ νεόττια κἀμαυτὸν οἰκετεύσω.

Very harrowing, yes very, is the tale
you've brought us, human. It made me weep at my fathers'
baseness, who in my own time have wrecked these privileges of mine
that my forebears bequeathed to them.
But now you're here, by the grace of god or some happy
chance, to be my savior.
So shall I live, entrusting to you
my nestlings and myself.
(539-547, the *antôdê*)

Indeed, one does not fail to notice how readily the birds express the intention of acting collectively under Pisthetaerus' command to redress the injustice:

ἀλλ' ὅ τι χρὴ δρᾶν, σὺ δίδασκε παρών· ὡς ζῆν οὐκ ἄξιον ἡμῖν,
εἰ μὴ κομιούμεθα παντὶ τρόπῳ τὴν ἡμετέραν βασιλείαν.

Now it's up to you to instruct us what we should do, because our life won't be worth living unless at all costs we recover our sovereignty.
(548-549, the *antikatakeleusmos*)

Following birds' demand, Pisthetaerus moves to the second part of his speech (550-626, the *antepirrhêma*), expounding his plan. This part is obviously rationalistic in contrast to the emotional former part, albeit sophistic arguments abound in both. For the recovery of the birds' lost kingship, he instructs building a city with fortification walls in the air (550-552). In case Zeus denies returning rulership to the birds, he instructs the declaration of holly war against him and the prohibition of the Gods' travelling through the bird-city (555-557). He also instructs dispatching a herald to men who will inform them on the new status quo and what it entails (561-569). At the end, he advises the birds on the actions to be taken in order for men to be convinced over their power (577-626), expelling in this way the birds' doubts.

Pisthetaerus' detailed analysis proves to the birds that his plan "constitutes a set of rational collective actions to advance their goals and interests, pressurizing those in power to submit to the demands of the disadvantaged" –recourse mobilization theory.[66] Yet, even such an instrumental and objective motive is not enough for fostering collective action and needs to be mediated by more subjective elements; birds must believe that by acting collectively can achieve their goal to regain rulership. Since the implementation of his plan must rest on the birds' shared belief, Pisthetaerus cultivates birds' sense of efficacy by expelling their doubts and in turn by highlighting their collective power on the basis of which they can act and be treated as Gods by men -perceived efficacy-.[67] The end of the speech finds the birds won over to Pisthetaerus' grandiose plan, hailing him as a leader:

ΚΟΡΥΦΑΙΟΣ

ὦ φίλτατ' ἐμοὶ πολὺ πρεσβυτῶν ἐξ ἐχθίστου μεταπίπτων,
οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως ἂν ἐγώ ποθ' ἑκὼν τῆς σῆς γνώμης ἔτ' ἀφείμην.

[66] Van Zomeren, Postmes and Spears (2008) 506, slightly modified.
[67] Cf. Haslam and Reicher (2012) 21-22: "The internal resources of an oppressed, and especially an imprisoned group, will have less to do with material possessions than with the ability to organize and coordinate their actions most effectively [...]. And if one point stands out from all our case studies it is that here the role of *leadership* is critical."

ΧΟΡΟΣ

ἐπαυχήσας δὲ τοῖσι σοῖς λόγοις

ἐπηπείλησα καὶ κατώμοσα,

ἐὰν σὺ παρ' ἐμὲ θέμενος ὁμόφρονας λόγους

δίκαιος ἄδολος ὅσιος ἐπὶ θεοὺς ἴῃς,

ἐμοὶ φρονῶν ξυνῳδά, μὴ πολὺν χρόνον

θεοὺς ἔτι σκῆπτρα τἀμὰ τρίψειν.

ΚΟΡΥΦΑΙΟΣ

ἀλλ' ὅσα μὲν δεῖ ῥώμῃ πράττειν, ἐπὶ ταῦτα τεταξόμεθ' ἡμεῖς·

ὅσα δὲ γνώμῃ δεῖ βουλεύειν, ἐπὶ σοὶ τάδε πάντ' ἀνάκειται.

CHORUS LEADER
Old man, my worst enemy changed into my very best friend,
it's impossible that I could ever choose to discard this idea of yours!
CHORUS
Emboldened by your words,
I give notice and solemnly swear:
if you bring to my cause congenial proposals,
and fairly, squarely, righteously attack the gods,
tuning your thoughts to mine, then not much longer
will the gods be abusing my sceptre!
CHORUS LEADER
So in the tasks that call for brawn, we're ready for duty;
in the plans that call for brains, you're in charge of all that.
(627-637)

2.4 The theory of Identity Leadership

"Leadership is essentially a process of social identity management – and hence effective leadership is always *identity leadership*."[68]

Pisthetaerus' persuasive argumentation makes him more than a simple advisor of the birds; at the end of the *agôn* he is declared leader and such a declaration sharply contrasts with the birds' initial hostile attitude towards him and

[68] Haslam, Reicher and Platow (2011) 197 -slightly modified-.

Euelpides (336-365). Given the orientation of his argumentation towards the enhancement of the birds' social identity for fostering collective action, it is reasonable to suggest that leadership is granted to Pisthetaerus because his self-presentation fits the picture of the leader as drawn by the theory of identity leadership.[69] To elaborate this argument, we turn to the book *The New Psychology of Leadership: Identity, Influence and Power* of Alexander Haslam, Stephen Reicher and Michael Platow.[70] According to the writers, the four core principles of the theory of identity leadership are:

- "to lead us, leaders must represent "us""
- "to engage followers, leaders' actions and visions must promote group interests"
- "leaders are masters, not slaves of identity"
- "leadership and the production of power both center on the hard but rewarding work of identity management" [71]

In anticipation of our analysis, we argue that Pisthetaerus' argumentation corresponds to these four principles, albeit not in the given order. It seems that comedy's deconstructive and subversive tendencies pertain its interaction with modern theories as well; for, Pisthetaerus' case will prove that shared identity and prototypicality is not always a prerequisite for identity leadership.[72] "In doing it for us, crafting a sense of us and making us matter",[73] an out-group member can eventually be seen as one of us and thus become our leader.[74]

[69] The term "identity leadership" is used by Haslam, Reicher and Platow (2011) xiii. In fact, the "theory of identity leadership" must be considered as a more recent development and extension of the social identity theory of leadership as articulated by van Knippenberg and Hogg (2003).
[70] Haslam, Reicher and Platow (2011).
[71] Ibid., 106, 132, 162, 192 respectively.
[72] Cf. van Knippenberg (2011) 1078: "Leadership is a process enacted in the context of a shared group membership, and leadership effectiveness is contingent on followers' perceptions of the leader as a group member".
[73] These expressions are used by Haslam, Reicher and Platow (2011) *passim.*
[74] This can be either metaphorical or literal. In the second case, we are talking about transformation leadership. For the notion of transformational leadership, see n. 85.

2.5 'Being one of us, doing it for us, crafting a sense of us, making us matter' in theory[75]

To begin with, the foregoing analysis has already demonstrated that "[…] *for would-be leaders, nothing can substitute for understanding the social identity of the group they seek to lead*. There are no fixed menus for leadership success, it is always à-la-carte".[76] Both Tereus, the current leader of the birds as well as Pisthetaerus have invoked the social identity of the birds in order to persuade them. But in contrast to Tereus, Pisthetaerus knows that social identity is a dynamic notion, the current content of which should not trap or work as an impediment for its managers. So, even though the interactions with Tereus and the birds themselves provide him a clear cultural knowledge of the latter, he chooses to focus on the past in order to prove "that the present is an age of decline in which group members fail to display the true qualities of the group".[77] The birds' reaction to his main contention that they are the oldest beings and once upon a time the kings of the universe (470: .. *τουτὶ μὰ Δί' οὐκ ἐπεπύσμην)* indicates that he "does not simply work with an understanding of the group that is already self-evident to its members. Instead, he works hard to create and promote a particular version of identity".[78] Of course, identity entrepreneurship is not an easy task,[79] but still Pisthetaerus proves himself

[75] In the following analysis I discuss 'crafting a sense of us' and 'making us matter' together because embedding the values of a group into reality presupposes constructing an identity, or rather a version of it, which reflects those values. Cf. Haslam, Reicher and Platow (2011) 75: "It isn't enough for a leader simply to construct a plausible version of identity. As well as this, the sense of who we are and how we believe the world should be organized in that is associated with a particular sense of social identity needs to be translated into social reality."

[76] Ibid., 133.

[77] Ibid., 161.

[78] Ibid., 146, slightly modified. Cf. ibid., 149: "[...] what marks out great leaders from ordinary ones is the fact that they don't just repeat traditional stories of identity. They innovate. They draw on less well-known strands of group culture. They weave familiar strands into novel patterns. They are careful not to violate what we know of ourselves. Their genius is to make the new out of elements of the old and thereby to present revolution as tradition".

[79] Cf. ibid., 146-147: "[...] identity entrepreneurship actually involves a double labor. On the one hand, considerable work is involved in crafting a definition that is both plausible and appropriate to one's purposes. On the other hand, an equal amount of work is involved in hiding all this labor and making one's accounts of identity seem obvious, effortless, and "natural"".

an artist in achieving it through language.[80] The effects of his masterly executed work are to be seen more emphatically in the parabasis where the birds are portrayed as having already espoused and living up to their real identity:[81]

ἄγε δή, φύσιν ἄνδρες ἀμαυρόβιοι, φύλλων γενεᾷ προσόμοιοι,
ὀλιγοδρανέες, πλάσματα πηλοῦ, σκιοειδέα φῦλ' ἀμενηνά,
ἀπτῆνες ἐφημέριοι, ταλαοὶ βροτοί, ἀνέρες εἰκελόνειροι,
προσέχετε τὸν νοῦν τοῖς ἀθανάτοις ἡμῖν, τοῖς αἰὲν ἐοῦσιν,
τοῖς αἰθερίοις, τοῖσιν ἀγήρῳ, τοῖς ἄφθιτα μηδομένοισιν,
ἵν' ἀκούσαντες πάντα παρ' ἡμῶν ὀρθῶς περὶ τῶν μετεώρων,
φύσιν οἰωνῶν γένεσίν τε θεῶν ποταμῶν τ' Ἐρέβους τε Χάους τε,
εἰδότες ὀρθῶς, Προδίκῳ παρ' ἐμοῦ κλάειν εἴπητε τὸ λοιπόν.
[...]
πρότερον δ' οὐκ ἦν γένος ἀθανάτων, πρὶν Ἔρως ξυνέμειξεν ἅπαντα·
ξυμμειγνυμένων δ' ἑτέρων ἑτέροις γένετ' Οὐρανὸς Ὠκεανός τε
καὶ Γῆ, πάντων τε θεῶν μακάρων γένος ἄφθιτον. ὧδε μέν ἐσμεν
πολὺ πρεσβύτατοι πάντων μακάρων ἡμεῖς. ὡς δ' ἐσμὲν Ἔρωτος
πολλοῖς δῆλον· [...]

Now, then, ye men by nature just faintly alive, like to the race of leaves,
do-littles, artefacts of clay, tribes shadowy and feeble,
wingless ephemerals, suffering mortals, dreamlike people:
pay attention to us, the immortals, the everlasting,
the etherial, the ageless, whose counsels are imperishable;
once you hear from us an accurate account of all celestial phenomena,
and know correctly the nature of birds and the genesis of gods, rivers, Erebus,
and Chaos, thenceforth you'll be able to tell Prodicus from me to go to hell!
[…]
There was no race of immortal gods before Eros commingled everything;
then as this commingled with that, Sky came to be, and Ocean
and Earth, and the whole imperishable race of blessed gods.
Thus we're far older than all the blessed gods, and it's abundantly clear

[80] Ibid., 173: "The effectiveness of leaders, then, is enhanced by their mastery in using one of the basic tools of leadership: language".
[81] Contra Hubbard (1991) 7, who treats birds' cosmogony as indicative of their arrogance. For *Birds'* parabasis in general, see ibid., 157-182.

that we're the off-spring of Eros [...]
(685-704)

One does not fail to notice that the new identity of the birds is inextricably connected to power; the theogony and cosmogony they present in the parabasis leaves no doubts. Accordingly, Pisthetaerus' plan is in line with the norms and values emanating from the social identity he has just crafted for the group; clearly, what matters for the birds is power and status and not material resources and therefore by engaging them in collective action, Pisthetaerus actually promises to consolidate their power and to establish a new social world dominated by them.[82] Indeed, here lies another important aspect of his genius as a leader, namely the promotion of group interest according to the norms and values of the specific group. For, group interest is neither a static notion nor common for all groups, but it is determined by the values and norms of each group. [83]

The issue of power leads us to another point. In the *parabasis* the birds, having completely digested their new identity, declare their willingness to reward mankind, that means, to exhibit their power by offering blessings if being recognized as Gods (708-736). They do not even hesitate to invite men to join their society (753-754). Given the initial bias of the birds towards men who were considered as their perennial enemies, such a striking reversal of their feelings must be credited to Pisthetaerus. In crafting the new identity of the birds, the comic hero has changed the comparative context; the divine birds will now compare themselves to the Olympians who will take men's place as birds' perennial enemies. In a more technical vocabulary, Pisthetaerus redefines the group boundaries so that out-group members can become in-group members.[84]

[82] Haslam, Reicher and Platow (2011) 162: "[...] identities are not so much descriptions of present reality as projects for future reality. They enjoin us to do particular types of things that will bring about particular types of social world".
[83] Ibid., 130-132.
[84] At this point it is critical to recall that "self-categorization theory provides a dynamic model of group processes whereby, far from being set in stone, "who we are" varies as a function of those with whom we are compared" ibid., 85.

Indeed, the transformational[85] power of Pisthetaerus stems out of his prototypicality;[86] for, it should be obvious by now that by making the birds matter, crafting a sense of them and doing it for them, Pisthetaerus becomes one of them. To put it slightly differently, by presenting himself as entrepreneur and embedder of identity as well as in-group champion, Pisthetaerus becomes the in-group prototype for the birds. Even if it sounds paradoxical, he actually gives the birds real wings to fly to the top with his argumentation, *λέγων πτερώσας αὐτούς*, and in turn, he metaphorically wings himself just by talking, *λόγοις ἑαυτὸν πτερώσας*. But since "[d]efining oneself as prototypical is not simply a matter of what one says, it is a matter of what one does, how one looks, and even [...] what one wears",[87] just before the *parabasis* Tereus assures both Pisthetaerus and Euelpides that they will wear wings. The winged Pisthetaerus eventually becomes one of the birds in the literal meaning of the word.

All taken together, in theory Pisthetaerus appears an ideal leader, fitting all the prerequisites of a successful leadership stemming from social identity. This assumption is also confirmed by his actions after the parabasis.

2.6 'Being one of us, doing it for us, crafting a sense of us, making us matter' in action

The events in the second part of *Birds* urge Pisthetaerus to act as a leader; not long after its foundation, Cloudcuckooland accepts a number of visitors, all of

[85] I use the adjective "transformational" without invoking the technical meaning that social psychology has attached to it after the formulation of "transformational leadership theory". According to Hogg and Vaughan (2018) 336 transformational leadership is "[an] approach to leadership that focuses on the way that leaders transform group goals and actions - mainly, through the exercise of charisma. Also a style of leadership based on charisma". The term was initially used by Burns (1978). Although Pisthetaerus does transform the birds' goals and actions, his leadership lacks, as we are soon to discover the moral aspects of transformational leadership.

[86] The notion of leader group prototypicality stems from social categorization theory of Turner (1987). Haslam, Reicher and Platow (2011) 83 define it in the following way: "leaders need to have qualities, attributes, and behaviors that emphasize what makes them the *same* as their followers, while differentiating them from other groups that are salient in a particular context". Generally, leader group prototypicality is not a static notion, varies with context and is inextricably connected with the effectiveness of leaders. For a detailed analysis, see ibid., 83-90, Hogg (2001) and Van Knippenberg (2011).

[87] Haslam, Reicher and Platow (2011) 140.

whom are dispelled by the comic hero (903-1057). Hubbard argues that "[w]e can certainly understand his rejection of the first group that comes to him; the oracle seller, the urban planner Meton, the Athenian inspector, and the sycophantic decree seller are all characters who try to impose external laws and restrictions of one sort or another on the new city, thus annihilating its freedom from restrictions. None of these are really interested in becoming part of Cloudcuckooland. Even the Pindaric poet, who is treated rather sympathetically by Peisthetaerus, comes as an itinerant seeking monetary profit from his ready-made encomiastic poetry; [...] Hence his poetic *nomos* is as constricting and foreign as the legal, architectural and religious *nomoi* of the other parasites."[88] Apparently, in order to defend and protect the collective identity that now shares with the birds,[89] Pisthetaerus must act unfairly to the out-group; in some cases "unfairness is the definition of fairness".[90] In line with this, we see that in the second *parabasis* which is set immediately after this dismissal, the birds do not comment on Pisthetaerus' decision to act without informing nor consulting them on the matter; on the contrary, they continue to denounce human tyranny over them, giving the impression that they embrace his actions (1076-1087).

This leads us to two critical points concerning the nature of Pisthetaerus' regime and the birds' response to it. The introducers of identity leadership clarify that their model does not promote a specific political system, but explains how different types of political system are established. [91] The decisive point is the interpretation of identity, or rather, the extent to which the leader involves the group in the definition

[88] Hubbard (1991) 171.
[89] Notably, Pisthetaerus now speaks in "we", e.g. 931, 940.
[90] Haslam, Reicher and Platow (2011) 116. Cf. ibid., 123: "[...] it is misleading to suggest that a specific form of action –fairness in this instance- is always required for a leader or will always buttress a leader's position. Sometimes leaders must be fair, sometimes leaders must be unfair. But that is only half the story. For, as we have also seen, there is a systematic pattern to the circumstances under which these different behaviors are demanded. [...] leaders must be unfair between groups because they are expected to support their own group. In this context, fairness would fail to advance the group interest, while as a corollary, unfairness promotes this interest. Overall, our point should be obvious by now. The constant here lies not at the level of specific behavior but in the expectation that leaders should promote, and be seen to promote, the group interest in a way that appears appropriate to group members in the situation at hand" and 130: "[...] to be effective, leaders need to support the group interest in ways that are contextually appropriate rather than to display a set repertoire of behaviors".
[91] Ibid., 217-218.

of identity. Therefore, they identify three types of political systems which correspond to three different relations between leaders and groups in the process of identity interpretation, namely the democratic, the hierarchical and the dictatorial. The hierarchical system is described as "one where leaders remain in conversation with members about group identity, but the conversation is limited and asymmetrical. Here leaders can claim to have special expertise in defining group identity. They do not offer their suggestions as a contribution to a debate. Rather, they [...] present their version of identity as the only possible version. *In principle*, they leave open the right of followers to dissent, but *in practice* they seek to make dissent more difficult. The model here is the leader as master".[92] Retrospectively, we see that indeed Pisthetaerus has acted in the way just described above in defining birds' social identity and hence the norms, practices and actions that thereby inform his regime (decisions, governance, task delegation, strategy development) are accordingly hierarchical in nature.

The birds, on the other hand, embrace this hierarchical system. In addition to the second *parabasis* that we have already mentioned, one does not fail to notice how constantly they turn to Pisthetaerus' expertise for their actions -naming the city and sacrificing (809-858)-. The scene with Iris (1170-1261) indicates this more emphatically; although the birds have just finished building impressive walls, Iris manages to enter the city and escapes their efforts to catch her. Her dismissal is achieved by Pisthetaerus and his actions enhance the chorus' confidence over the positive final outcome of their revolt:

ἀποκεκλήκαμεν διογενεῖς θεοὺς
μηκέτι τὴν ἐμὴν διαπερᾶν πόλιν,
μηδέ τιν' ἱερόθυτον ἀνὰ <τι> δάπεδον ἔτι
τῇδε βροτῶν θεοῖσι πέμπειν καπνόν.

We have barred the gods sprung from Zeus,
from any further passage through my city,
and no more shall any mortal on a single killing floor
send savory smoke to the gods by this route.
(1263-1268)

[92] Ibid., 217.

The effectiveness of Pisthetaerus' plan and leadership becomes undeniable when the herald reports the response of men to birds' revolt:

ὦ κλεινοτάτην αἰθέριον οἴκίσας πόλιν,
οὐκ οἶσθ' ὅσην τιμὴν παρ' ἀνθρώποις φέρει
ὅσους τ'ἐραστὰς τῆσδε τῆς χώρας ἔχεις.
[...]
· νυνὶ δ' ὑποστρέψαντες αὖ
ὀρνιθομανοῦσι, πάντα δ' ὑπὸ τῆς ἡδονῆς
ποιοῦσιν ἅπερ ὄρνιθες ἐκμιμούμενοι.
[...]
ἥξουσ' ἐκεῖθεν δεῦρο πλεῖν ἢ μυρίοι
πτερῶν δεόμενοι καὶ τρόπων γαμψωνύχων·
ὥστε πτερῶν σοι τοῖς ἐποίκοις δεῖ ποθέν.

O founder of the most glorious aethereal city,
don't you realize how greedy you're esteemed among mankind,
and how many of them you can count as lovers of this land?
[...]
But now they've about-faced
and gone bird-crazy, and they're having a wonderful time
imitating birds in everything they do.
[...]
More than ten thousand of them will be making the trip up here,
wanting wings and a raptor's way of life.
So somewhere you'll have to find wings for the new arrivals.
(1277-1307)

Similarly, birds' confidence now reaches a climax:

τάχα δὴ πολυάνορα τάνδε πόλιν
καλεῖ τις ἀνθρώπων·
[...]
κατέχουσι δ' ἔρωτες ἐμᾶς πόλεως.

Soon some human will be calling
this city very well-manned.
[…]
Passion for my city grips the world
(1313-1316)

But if so far the birds enjoy what we may call the positive aspects of Pisthetaerus' regime, soon they will realize its negative aspects as well; Pisthetaerus' following actions allude to a rather dictatorial and not a hierarchical system. Two questions naturally arise from this: why does Pisthetaerus become a tyrant and why do the birds succumb to his authoritarian regime or even accept his hierarchical system in the first place? Leaving aside the simplistic answer "Aristophanes' plot wants it this way", we are now able to provide a social psychological answer to these questions.

2.7 *"τάδ' οὐχ ὑπ' ἄλλων, ἀλλὰ τοῖς αὑτῶν πτεροῖς"* (807-808): The Social Identity perspective on tyranny

"In short, shared social identity can be a basis for tyranny, but it can also be a basis for resistance"[93]

The plot of the *Birds* and the foregoing social psychological analysis has shown the validity of the second part of the above quote. Historically, though, social psychology has focused on conformity and the reproduction of social structure, not on resistance.[94] Therefore, the issue of tyranny -why and how people endure others' tyranny or become tyrants themselves- is one of the core issues that have concerned social psychology theorists and practitioners.[95] After years of seeking explanation for tyrannical behaviour in individual traits, social psychologists realized the need for a group-psychology of tyranny. In most cases, the findings of group-oriented

[93] Haslam and Reicher (2012) 7-8.
[94] Ibid., 25: "This involved establishing that resistance is an important phenomenon, a common phenomenon, and one worthy of study. This might seem self-evident, but the starting point for our argument was that social psychology has been so focused on processes of conformity that resistance has been forgotten as a topic of study". See also Introduction.
[95] What follows is just an outline of the history of the issue of tyranny within the domain of social psychology. A more detailed outline with references to the primary sources can be found in Reicher and Haslam (2006b) 1-3.

experiments were negative; being a member of or acting in group promotes extreme antisocial behaviour, including the establishment of tyranny. Given the extremity of some experiments and of their findings, the debate over the social psychological interpretation of tyranny reached an end for some years. But for social psychologists working on social identity such a negative picture was misleading as it was at odds with the basic principles of their approach. The revision of the issue of tyranny within social psychology is mainly the achievement of the BBC prison study (BPS), an experiment conducted by Reicher and Haslam in 2001 in order to counterbalance the main finding of the Stanford Prison Experiment (SPE) of Zimbardo.[96]

Here is a short description of the BPS.[97] 15 men were randomly divided into two groups (prisoners and guards) and their behaviour was examined within an environment which replicated the social world, meaning the inequalities between the social groups. When the prisoners realized that there was no longer any possibility for being promoted to the group of the guards (in social psychological terms, they realized that the boundaries of the groups were impermeable), they started developing a shared identity and worked collectively to challenge the guards, who did not identify with their own group. These challenging actions made the prisoners realize that the relationship between the groups was illegitimate and insecure. This became more acute due to the arrival of a new prisoner, a trade union official, who further questioned the status quo, but most importantly achieved to make arrangements with the guards -as the chosen representative of the prisoners- which decreased the hierarchical status of the former. His case proved how the individual triumphs by working through the group and indicated that leadership within a group is a matter of intergroup relations. After his achievement, the new

[96] Since the details of Zimbardo's study do not detain us here, it is enough to recall that in the SPE young college students were divided into guards and prisoners and were set in an environment that replicated prison. The guards were corrupted by their role and became extremely brutal towards the prisoners, whereas the latter got extremely passive. The basic finding of the study –which had to stop earlier due to its intense results-, was that people can commit atrocities when given powerful roles. For a comprehensive description of the experiment and its findings, see Haney, Banks and Zimbardo (1973).

[97] For a comprehensive description of the BPS and its findings, see Reicher and Haslam (2006a) and online http://www.bbcprisonstudy.org/index.php

prisoner was removed from the study. His fellow prisoners proved unable to implement his democratic vision without him, so they started again challenging the guards and conflict seemed more obvious than ever. Soon the guards' regime collapsed.

Up to this point, the experiment undermined Zimbardo's main contention that people content to the roles assigned to them by others/society and at the same time confirmed the positive perspective of social identity theory for collective action, highlighting the role of the leader. Regarding leadership, it supported three interrelated propositions: "(P1) that social identity makes leadership possible (and that lack of social identity makes leadership impossible); (P2) that effective leadership facilitates the development of a sense of shared social identity (and that ineffective leadership compromises a sense of shared social identity); and (P3) that the longterm success (and failure) of leadership depends upon the creation of structures and processes through which identity-based projects can be realized".[98]

Interestingly, the second part of the study was not planned by the experimenters themselves, but came out naturally; on the experimenters' approval, the participants agreed to establish a self-governing system in which all would be equal. Although at first the new system worked, a group of dissentients (in fact, some of those who had previously contributed to the collapse of the guards' regime) decided to establish a new-guards regime. This internal opposition to the new system -in combination with an irrelevant incident that gave the Communards the impression of an external opposition to their system by the experimenters themselves- made them lose faith in democracy and be no longer willing to fight for it.[99] Due to ethical reasons, the study did not move on, so the establishment of the

[98] Haslam and Reicher (2007a) 129.

[99] Cf. Reicher and Haslam (2006a) 22: "During debriefings, a number of them acknowledged that, although they would not have openly endorsed such a hierarchy, they were less opposed to it than they had been previously and that they felt less repulsed by the idea of a strong social order in which someone else assumed responsibility for making the system work".

new regime did not actually take place; yet the disposition of the participants towards it was more than clear.

In the words of the experimenters themselves "[t]here lessons flow from these points. First, authoritarianism is not a stable, individual difference but an *emergent product* of the dynamics of group life […]. Second, authoritarians are only able to exercise leadership and set about creating an authoritarian world when circumstances move them from a position of extremism to one where they represent the wider group. Third, people are much more likely to embrace extreme social systems when their own groups have failed and when authoritarian leaders seem to be required to bring order to a world in chaos."[100]

2.8 Pisthetaerus' regime becomes authoritarian and the birds succumb to it

With the theory in mind, we now turn to *Birds,* which not only portrays tyranny dynamics in action, but is believed to have provided the model for the erotic tyrant of Plato's Republic IX.[101] *Birds'* plot has striking similarities to the BPS. Like the BPS participants, neither Pisthetaerus nor the birds are disposed towards authoritarianism. The former typically detests tyranny, as most Athenians.[102]

ΤΗΡΕΥΣ (ΕΠΟΨ)
ἀριστοκρατεῖσθαι δῆλος εἶ ζητῶν.
ΠΕΙΣΕΤΑΙΡΟΣ
ἐγώ;
ἥκιστα· καὶ τὸν Σκελλίου βδελύττομαι.

TEREUS
You're obviously looking for an aristocracy.
PEISETAERUS
Who me? Not at all. Even Scellias' son makes me sick.
(125-126)

[100] Haslam and Reicher (2007b) 620.
[101] See Saxonhouse (1978) and Meyer (2014).
[102] Pisthetaerus states that he detests *ἀριστοκρατεῖσθαι,* but the verb here denotes oligarchy; see Dunbar's (1995) comment ad loc. That for the Athenians of fifth century the term tyranny included oligarchy and generally any anti-democratic activity, see Thucydides 6.60.1.

As for the latter, at the beginning of the play they appear to live happily under Tereus' democratic leadership, to whom they have allowed to live freely in their avian society.[103] Thus, both Pisthetrerus' and the birds' behaviour at the end of the play cannot stem from authoritative traits of their personality. However, for those who may potentially object to this assumption by arguing that Pisthetaerus' authoritarian character comes to surface when he gains power or that both he and the birds enact the roles that are given to them, two points must be clarified; first, although the factor of personality cannot be totally dismissed, both SPE and BPS have proved that the establishment of tyrannical systems is definitely a matter beyond individual traits.[104] Second, the emergence of tyranny is a matter inextricably connected to group dynamics: "in contrast to the idea that tyranny is a 'natural' outcome of situations in which normal people are assigned to roles which give them power over others, findings from the BPS [...] suggest a very different analysis. First, they suggest that individuals will only move towards tyranny when they identify with their roles. Second, they suggest that this sense of identification needs to be developed and shared with other ingroup members, and reinforced through group interaction. Third, they suggest that the case for tyranny needs to be promoted by means of active leadership which is grounded in shared identity and which promotes a particular vision of the way in which interests associated with that identity need to be advanced in context".[105]

[103] Tereus was not the king of birds, but rather their democratic leader. See Dunbar's (1995) comment on line 197: "This line clearly implies that Ter. cannot command the birds, but only persuade them, to adopt Peis.' plan; he has personal authority and influence among them (cf. 199-200, 385), but is not, as some commentators have stated, a king among birds as he was among men". This can be also inferred by the birds' reaction when realizing that Tereus had accepted their enemies without asking for their opinion.

[104] According to the conductors of the BPS "the prominence and impact of individuals depended upon their relationship to the group. [...] However, if individuals played a key part in shaping groups, the converse is equally true – the ability of individuals to affect outcomes was dependent upon both the existence of groups and their prototypicality within the group. To put it slightly differently, individual agency was not destroyed by the group, but rather achieved through it. Thus, while personality and other individual difference factors are an important aspect of our study (and we will consider them as part of our analysis below), they cannot substitute for that analysis" (Reicher and Haslam 2006a: 27).

[105] Haslam and Reicher (2012) 7.

Indeed, in the previous section we saw how these three critical factors are enacted in *Birds:* by dispelling the visitors and Iris Pisthetaerus identifies with the role of the leader, the birds reinforce his identification by constantly seeking his guidance as they are unable to oppose the threats by themselves, while Pisthetaerus' leadership, grounded on the shared identity of the group, promotes the common vision. Although all these signify the establishment of a hierarchical system and not the emergence of tyranny, I suggest that the following social interactions further enhance these identifications and lead to the upgrading of the system to tyranny; Pisthetaerus' dismissal of the second group of visitors can be seen as the starting point of this procedure, whereas the four choral stanzas following the second parabasis can be read as indicative, albeit in an implicit manner, of the birds' realization of the change. Scholars have already indicated the connection of the odes to the immediate preceding and following scenes as well as to the main themes of the play, in addition to their main function as instruments of comic abuse.[106]

To elaborate our arguments, we must first note that the dismissal of the second group of visitors blatantly contradicts the birds' proclamation in the *parabasis.* The comic hero sends off the would-be citizens of Cloudcuckooland who can potentially weaken his influence over the birds and threat the social order that he has been trying to establish; he is no longer protecting or defending the social identity of the group.[107] Immediately after the dismissal, the chorus does not restate its confidence as it did before, but enumerates the wonders of the world starting from Cleonymus' tree (1470-1481). Interestingly, Moulton has indicated how the first period of the ode (1470-1472: *πολλὰ δὴ καὶ καινὰ καὶ θαυ-/μάστ' ἐπεπτόμεσθα καὶ/δεινὰ πράγματ'*

[106] See Moulton (1981) 32-33 and Hubbard (1991) 177.

[107] See also Hubbard (1991) 171: "On the other hand the second group of visitors (the young man, Cinesias, and the sycophant) are all people who desire to live in Cloudcuckooland permanently, precisely because of its freedom and lack of conventional *nomoi*. But Peisthetaerus rejects them too, sending the young man off to military service, insulting Cinesias, and beating the sycophant. […] Some critics interpret this anomaly between the programmatic invitation of the parabasis and Peisthetaerus' actual practice as evidence of the hero's recognition that law is a necessary and integral part of any organized society. […] We should be more suspicious of Peisthetaerus' motives […]. He may not be defending the claims of morality here so much as using them to consolidate his own social control over Cloudcuckooland. [...] The parricide, dithyrambist, and sycophant introduce potentially disorderly and subversive influences into his ideal state which, unless channeled into appropriate activities, could threaten his power even more than the foreign parasites whom he had rejected before."

εἴδομεν) recalls Sophocles (*Ant*. 332-333: *πολλὰ τὰ δεινὰ κοὐδὲν ἀν-/θρώπου δεινότερον πέλει*) and in turn echoes the birds' remark at the beginning of the *agôn* (451-452: *δολερὸν μὲν ἀεὶ κατὰ πάντα δὴ τρόπον/πέφυκεν ἄνθρωπος*).[108] He comments: "Athenians who knew the poem from *Antigone* would have recalled that the first antistrophe dealt with man's taming of the animal kingdom, and commenced with the lines: *κουφόνων τε φῦλον ὀρ-/νίθων ἀμφιβαλῶν ἀγρεῖ …* (*Ant.* 342-343) The subjugation of men by the birds is part of Pisthetairos' ostensible aim in establishing Cloudcuckooland. But in fact, the play ends with *one* man's *triumph* over the birds, just as Sophocleans might have expected. This quizzical irony is confirmed by the substitution of *καινά* at *Birds* 1470 for *δεινά* in Sophocles' poem [...]". The idea that this intra and extra textual reference can be taken as a sign of the birds' realization can be reinforced by Pisthetaerus' similarity to Cleonymus; despite their transformation -Pisthetaerus is now a bird and Cleonymus a tree-, both retain their basic characteristics, the former is still *δολερὸς* whereas the latter is a glutton and coward.[109] Pisthetaerus' *δόλος* is exemplified in the second ode (1482-1493), where the analogy between him and Orestes is easily drawn; as the hero Orestes turns into a criminal at night, so Pisthetaerus is the hero of the birds who proves a betrayer at the end of the day/play. His name acquires negative connotations (Pisthetaerus persuades his companions to act against tyranny but establishes a tyranny himself), recalling once more Orestes; the positive and heroic connotations of his name also become negative and antiheroic when he strikes down and robs his companions.

Between the second and the third ode Prometheus' visit takes place. Prometheus describes the Gods' reaction to the birds' effort of establishing a new order, but more importantly, contributes to the successful ending of the revolt by giving valuable advice to Pisthetaerus:

[...]

ἥξουσι πρέσβεις δεῦρο περὶ διαλλαγῶν

[108] Moulton (1981) 34-36.
[109] See Tsakmakis (1997) 44.

παρὰ τοῦ Διὸς καὶ τῶν Τριβαλλῶν τῶν ἄνω·
ὑμεῖς δὲ μὴ σπένδεσθ', ἐὰν μὴ παραδιδῷ
τὸ σκῆπτρον ὁ Ζεὺς τοῖσιν ὄρνοισιν πάλιν,
καὶ τὴν Βασίλειάν σοι γυναῖκ' ἔχειν διδῷ.

[...]
ambassadors will be coming here about a settlement,
from Zeus and the Triballians up-country.
But don't you ratify a treaty unless Zeus returns
his scepter to the birds
and gives you Princess for your bride.
(1532-1536)

His assistance can be viewed as an instance of a third party support for challenging the dominant group,[110] however, the birds do not celebrate over his help and their response further prompts us to treat the ode as springing out of their realization. Prometheus admits that "*ἀεί ποτ' ἀνθρώποις γὰρ εὔνους εἴμ' ἐγώ*" (1545) and indeed his advice is mostly beneficial to Pisthetaerus, who is now acting as a man and not as a bird; he is a *ψυχαγωγός* in "the rather more recent metaphorical meaning in philosophy and rhetoric, "leading" or "charming" souls by persuasion".[111] Following Peisander's example, he summons back the *δολερὴν ψυχήν* which he had deserted in becoming a bird and which now triumphs in the following scene when he persuades the divine embassy. During this arrangement, the birds are left with no doubt concerning the exact nature of his regime since they witness the cooking of their dissident companions:

ΗΡΑΚΛΗΣ
τὰ δὲ κρέα τοῦ ταῦτ᾽ἐστίν;

ΠΕΙΣΕΤΑΙΡΟΣ

ὄρνιθές τινες

[110] Haslam and Reicher (2012) 23: "More generally, however effectively the forces of a subordinate group are marshalled, it still remains true that the dominant group will have the resources to crush any resistance. The success of the subordinate group is therefore at least partly a function of its ability to deter the dominant group from fully deploying its repressive power and this, in turn, relates to the stance adopted by other groups that have a potential interest in proceedings".
[111] Moulton (1981) 40.

ἐπανιστάμενοι τοῖς δημοτικοῖσιν ὀρνέοις

ἔδοξαν ἀδικεῖν.

HERACLES
And what sort of meat is that?
PEISETAERUS
Some birds who've been convicted of attempted rebellion
against the bird democracy.
(1583-1585)

When the comic hero departs for marrying Basileia, the chorus sings of Gorgias (1694-1705), the great rhetorician to whom Pisthetaerus has proved himself identical.

Surprisingly, despite their realization, the birds go on to celebrate Pisthetaerus' wedding and his general success:

μεγάλαι μεγάλαι κατέχουσι τύχαι

γένος ὀρνίθων

διὰ τόνδε τὸν ἄνδρ'. ἀλλ' ὑμεναίοις

καὶ νυμφιδίοισι δέχεσθ' ᾠδαῖς

αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν Βασίλειαν.

Great, great is the luck that embraces
the race of birds
thanks to this man; now with wedding
and bridal songs please welcome
Himself and His Princess!
(1726-1730)

ἀλαλαλαί, ἰὴ παιών,

τήνελλα καλλίνικος, ὦ

δαιμόνων ὑπέρτατε.

Hip hip hooray! Hail Paeon!
Hail your success, you
highest of divinities!
(1763-1765)

Yet, for any psychologist working on social identity, their behaviour would come as no surprise. Having already seen how further social interactions reinforce and promote Pisthetaerus' effective leadership and transform him into a tyrant, the birds' behaviour must be similarly considered as stemming from the exact same social structure.[112] This is a twofold procedure: the social conditions that make him a tyrant, transform the birds into his servile followers who are in need of his grand vision, his own hard work for the implementation of the vision and his capacity to resist any threats to it. After all, Pisthetaerus keeps his promise and makes the birds the dominant group in the social world.

Equally importantly, the birds' submission to Pisthetaerus' regime corroborates the assumption that "[...] where groups fail, [...] people will be more inclined to accept the imposition of a social order by others, even where that violates their values and norms. Therefore, in contrast to those who explain tyranny and other extreme social phenomena in terms of the psychological dysfunctionality of groups, we interpret them in terms of the dysfunctionality of group failure".[113] The birds are prompted to denounce their democratic principles in favour of authoritarianism because democracy has failed; Tereus' leadership simply generated the existing social system in which the birds were a failing and subordinate group.[114] Even if the birds did not embrace Pisthetaerus' regime –and in fact, some of them did not-, it would still be hard for them to overturn it. Pisthetaerus' regime is powerful: he

[112] Cf. Haslam and Reicher (2007a) 143: "[...] far from being a fixed personality or attitudinal variable, acceptance of authoritarian leadership is a product of social structural factors that impinge upon and shape individuals' collective experience. Likewise, we see that far from being a universal given or a psychodynamic primitive, belief in the need for a strong leader (or willingness to tolerate one) arises in response to a specific set of structural conditions and experience".

[113] Reicher and Haslam (2006a) 24.

[114] Cf. ibid., 32: "It is notable that in each case, group members became more willing to accept a system that promised to be viable even if it meant ceding some of the core principles of the group. [...] Thus, rather than people 'naturally' preferring any given form of social order, it appears that, when group members fail to impose an order based on their own existing norms and values, they are willing to adapt those values (or to adopt new ones) in order to create a viable order rather than have no order at all. [...] Traditionally, authoritarianism has been viewed a stable individual difference variable that has the capacity to explain the emergence of hierarchical and tyrannical social structures. However, in contrast to this analysis, the present study illustrates that authoritarianism is a variable outcome of social structure. More specifically, we see that authoritarian solutions – and the personalities that would promote them – appeared more attractive after attempts to make democracy work were seen to have failed".

copes effectively and drastically not merely with external threats –the visitors-, but with internal -the dissident birds- as well.[115]

All taken together, we can now argue with confidence that the birds' behaviour cannot be treated as illogical or as an example of Aristophanic discontinuity; [116] there is a (psycho-) logical explanation of their ostensibly illogical and inconsistent behaviour. Nonetheless, it is ironic that in order to secure their dominance and tyranny over Gods, the birds have to endure tyranny domestically; indeed, "failing groups almost inevitably create a host of problems for their own members and for others".[117]

2.9 *Birds'* social psychological analysis and the play's suggested interpretations

"Thus, classical Athenian dramas meant something to the original audience of citizens that is necessarily quite different from what they have meant to all subsequent audiences and readers—from Hellenistic revivals to the present. Athenian plays can unquestionably be appreciated aesthetically in isolation from their original civic context, but they are explicable historically (and thus useful for a history of Athenian political discourse) only when viewed against the civic context within which and for which they were written. That context, informed as it was by democratic knowledge, has an important bearing on the issue of how comedy worked as a form of political criticism." [118]

Although nowadays few would not read *Birds* as a response, either implicit or explicit, to the Sicilian expedition, the truth is that Aristophanes' play has so far been living up to its title: as birds are difficult to be caught, so is the meaning of this comedy. *Birds* resists a convincing and unanimous interpretation, despite scholars'

[115] Ibid., 21: "The problems this created were exacerbated because the commune's members had never developed procedures for dealing with dissidence, and hence they had no means of responding to threats to their social order".
[116] Silk (2000) 239: "The switches, the transformations, the reversals embodied in Aristophanic characters are -we may surely now agree- something more than incidental odd moments in otherwise tidy or homogeneous wholes. They represent a pervasive and essential fact of Aristophanic drama and, as such, may quite naturally constitute the most important part of a single character's presentation."
[117] Reicher and Haslam (2006a) 33.
[118] Ober (1998) 123.

attempts to capture the original social and political significances of the play by invoking a different version of the comic hero's problematic name each time.[119] The following discussion raises no expectation to be treated as a comprehensive overview of *Birds'* suggested interpretations; nonetheless, lying on the assumption that the play should not be treated as an escapist outopia free of sociopolitical concerns,[120] it advocates that the different and often opposing political readings which have already been suggested are corroborated by the social psychological analysis presented in the previous sections of our study. The readings of Arrowsmith, Henderson, Hubbard and Hall (so far unpublished) will be our case studies in arguing that the immediate political allusions of the *Birds,* whatever these might have been, are mediated by a social psychological perspective.[121]

To begin with, Arrowsmith describes the *erōs,* that blend of *polypragmosynē*, arrogance and greed which pervades all the spheres of Athenians' lives and argues that Athenian imperialism is driven by this erotic, fantasy politics. Pisthetaerus stands for Athenian leaders, the birds for the Athenian demos and "[b]ehind the relations of Pisthetairos and the Birds we are meant to glimpse, not a set of topical allusions to the Sicilian expedition, but the whole process by which the fantastic imperial city of Athens had developed from a traditional Greek polis whose values were grounded in the Attic earth and a sense of *sōphrosynē* learned by harsh experience of a culture of poverty, into the monstrous, tyrant-city of Hellas" (140).[122] For Arrowsmith, all this is *hybris* and the audience is expected to recognize its faults

[119] For a summary of the proposed interpretations, see MacDowell (1995) 211-228.

[120] The most representative of this line of interpretation is Whitman (1964) 167-199.

[121] Arrowsmith (1973), Henderson (1997) and Hubbard (1991) 158-182 and (1997) with emphasis on the outopian element.

[122] Arrowsmith (1973) 140-143: "Behind Pisthetairos, that is, we are meant to see all those Athenian statesmen who, by force of mind [*διάνοια*] and power of speech [*λόγος*], had brought the imperial city to its pitch of perfection. [...] As for the Birds, behind them we can glimpse, first of all, the nostalgic vision of a golden age; an Athens untempted by Eros, content with the harsh horizons of necessity, of innocent and unaggressive *physis*, still at one with the world around it; [...] Then, under the blandishments of political suasion, the Birds become estranged from *apragmosynē* and *hēsychia;* they are tempted by a dream of Eros. [...] And, finally, the Birds stand for the dream-intoxicated flighty Athenian *demos* itself, the anonymous avine democracy, agape with wonder and desire, and prepared to renounce *hēsychia* forever for the unknown frontiers of boundless conquest."

by watching the play and treat it as prophecy for the future;[123] since Athenian imperial policy had already become tyrannical for the demos, Athenians must realize that the fantasy politics of *erôs* is "utterly destructive in its effects and implications- destructive both for those who impose it and those on whom it is imposed-"(155). However, Athenians did not and were soon to experience a tremendous defeat in Sicily and a tremendous defeat in the war about ten years later.

An important, yet much neglected aspect of Arrowsmith's argumentation is that in organizing and directing the voracious imperial policy of the city, leaders like Pericles and Alcibiades had evoked in their persuasive rhetoric Athenians' bond to earth and autochthony.[124] To put it differently, autochthony, one of the fundamental traits of Athenians' collective identity –in this case social identity refers to national identity-,[125] became the fertile soil into which the imperial *erôs* of its citizens was planted and in turn became one of the most powerful weapons of the imperial propaganda. Under this light, Athenian leaders' similarity to Pisthetaerus becomes more striking; as we have already seen, he also evokes/redraws certain traits of the birds' social identity (seniority of birth, natural sovereignty and implicitly autochthony) in order to persuade them for his plan. Arrowsmith even argues laconically that Pericles and Alcibiades treated Athenian attachment to land differently in pursuing their imperial goals.[126] In this way,

[123] Arrowsmith's reading does not rest on its narrow historical and topical context but acquires universal and timeless significance; by maintaining that "Aristophanes' point is not the idiosyncratic *physis* of Athenian imperial man, but the metaphysical *physis* of the human animal-the animal who wants to be god" (154), it highlights the generically human will to power and argues that the play speaks as prophecy for any modern audience. See also ibid., 146.

[124] Ibid., 119-122. Arrowsmith is following the much-disputed conclusion of Fine's study (1951) of land tenure, alienation and mortgage in ancient Athens, namely that land became alienable –literally and thus emotionally- during the Peloponnesian War. For Athenian autochthony, see Fragoulaki (2013) 220-228 and the bibliography cited there.

[125] For the conception of Athens as *ethnos* rather than *polis*, see Cohen (2000).

[126] Arrowsmith (1973)142 n.13. On one hand, Pericles had advocated and created a naval mobile empire which gave Athens new land abroad and thus extended the idea of autochthony; according to Arrowsmith, the cleruchies and colonies made of the uprooted peasants of Attica during the Peloponnesian War must be seen as the means by which Pericles re-established the broken bonds to the earth for the imperial advantage of the city. See also Fragoulaki (2013) 232. On the other hand, Alcibiades' argumentation for the promotion of the Sicilian expedition as cited by Plutarch (Alcib.15,4) is interpreted by Arrowsmith as a reversion to the ante-Periclean Athenian attachment to land and especially to the idea of Athens' land hegemony over Greece.

Arrowsmith's reading demonstrates, albeit implicitly, both the dynamic nature of social identity and the role of the leader as identity entrepreneur, whereas the overall conclusion to be drawn is that the "erotic" rise and fall of imperial Athens is -in the lowest level of explanation- underpinned by the social identity of the Athenians.[127]

In contrast to Arrowsmith, Henderson reads the play in a positive, straightforward way and treats it as a fantasy of success concerning Athenian politics in general and the expedition to Sicily in particular. For him "[i]t is hard to avoid the conclusion that in *Birds*, Aristophanes presented a fantasy of what might have happened had the demos in fact united behind Alcibiades, if it had in fact accepted not merely his plan but his culture as well. What Aristophanes shows us is a fantasy of success and happiness for all, a dream that all Athenians could share but have not yet realized" (141). Such a reading presupposes a strong social psychological background associated with social identity: it raises the issue of leaders' prototypicality and that of a group's stereotyped perception of other groups' members. The birds qua Athenian demos express, but finally overcome their hostility against a member of the elite, whereas Pisthetaerus qua Alcibiades persuades them that he is in fact one of them.[128] In this case social identity refers to class and citizenship (Athenian elite vs Athenian *dêmos*), but due to its association with the imperial policy (Sicilian expedition) is ultimately connected to national

[127] Ibid., 143 also suggests that simultaneously the birds stand for Athens' allies who "surrender their collective strength into the hands of the persuasive tyrant-city and deliver themselves up to the Great Design of Pisthetairos. Allies, then subjects; wingèd and intoxicated by the persuasion of the new politics of Eros, they sentence themselves to serve in the aerial squadrons of the aspiring, celestial Pisthetairos." In fact, Athens had acquired the leadership of the Delian League (the formation of which was a kind of collective action against the Persians) due to another integral trait of their social identity, namely its kinship ties to the Ionians. Later on, this trait was exaggerated by the Athenians for the establishment of tyranny over their allies. Arrowsmith does note the similarity of Pisthetaerus' behaviour towards the birds to Athens' behaviour towards its allies, however, nowhere in his analysis are these equations associated with social identity – Ionianism- as the equation of Pisthetaerus with Athenian leaders and of the birds with the demos is associated with autochthony.

[128] Cf. Henderson (1997) 139 "Like Alcibiades, who faced initial hostility from a demos ever wary of elite tyranny, Peisetairos must face initial hostility from the birds, the traditional victims of human tyranny who, in the play, bear a distinct resemblance to the demos. And like Alcibiades, who in 455 challenged Nicias, architect of the peace of 421 and current leader of a quiet Athens, Peisetairos challenges the quietist Tereus. On their side, the Athenians, who had not added to their empire during the war and who had been quiescent since 421, are reminded, like the birds, of their former imperial glory and recalled to activism. In the end, the Athenians accepted Alcibiades' plan and his leadership, just as the birds accept Peisetairos and his plan."

identity. Thucydides' account backs up and clarifies the social psychological assumptions of Henderson's reading: in his speech-answer to Nicias in favour of the Sicilian expedition, Alcibiades presents himself as a benefactor of the city and challenges Nikias' prototypicality by highlighting his *adraneia* (Thucydides 6. 16-18).

Given that historically *Birds* and reality had parted company, Henderson's reading ends up contradicting Ober's arguments on mass and elite in classical Athens.[129] Hubbard's interpretation points to the same direction, despite the different immediate context he ascribes to the play; for him, *Birds* is not about the Sicilian expedition, but must be read as an allusion to the mutilation of the *Hermai* and the profanation of the Mysteries in 415. His analysis demonstrates the sophistic background of the play and raises the same social psychological issues that Henderson's reading does. However, in this case we are dealing with a negative straightforward reading of the play: "[...] we see this play primarily as an expression of popular outrage against those social elites held responsible for the sacrileges, showing the consequences of their theoretical paradigm for an ideal city put into action."[130] Thus, the comic hero represents the elite leaders of the political clubs, those loyal disciples of the sophists who attacked the traditional religion and intended the subversion of the political order. Alcibiades is once more easily borne in mind when watching Pisthetaerus convincing the birds to enact his impious plan and establishing a tyranny over them at the end.

Recently, Edith Hall has proposed a new reading of the play as a satire on Athenian opportunists in Thrace. [131] In her own words, "the play emerges as a satire

[129] Ober (1989). Henderson ibid., 139: "Alcibiades had promised a dream of power that could be realized only if the Athenians were willing to put aside their factionalism to create a new unity of mass and elite, of young and old, of poor and rich. Peisetairos does the same, pleading for a new unity of man and bird as the recipe of power. Moreover, Alcibiades had argued that this unity would depend on the demos' willingness to accept leadership by those, like himself, who were naturally fit to lead." One does not fail to notice how Henderson's essay title ("Mass versus Elite and the Comic Heroism of Peisetairos") alludes to Ober's book title.

[130] Hubbard (1997) 27.

[131] Hall's interpretation was presented in an open lecture at the University of Cyprus (November 2015). It has also been delivered in different forms at the University of Oxford (October 2014), at the University of California (February 2016) and at the National Hellenic Research Foundation in Athens (October 2016). The presentation in Athens is available online at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=66cQGCW9Urw. As far as I

less on Athenian politics than on the murky doings of individual opportunistic Athenians on the make in the Thracian hinterland of their empire."[132] Her lecture demonstrated the Thracian background and topography of the play, so far unnoticed by Aristophanic scholarship,[133] the strong paratragic relationship of the play with Sophocles' *Tereus*,[134] and the thematic allusions to Thrace (slavery, colonization, hybridity, tyranny).[135] It also discussed whether the play satirises a specific individual (Peisistratus and/or Peisander) and suggested that Cloudcuckooland stood for a real place, namely the *emporion* of Pistyros, arguing that Pisthetaerus' name alludes to this *emporion.* Hall's reading fits perfectly with our social psychological analysis of the play which sheds light to the stereotypes that foreground social identities. Elaborating her arguments, we can argue that the depiction of the birds builds on the Athenian stereotypes for the Thracians: for example, although the birds' initial hostile attitude towards the two Athenians and their readiness to attack them is usual for comic choruses, it can also be seen as an allusion to the warlike and brutal nature of the Thracians. Actually, in *Birds* we see a simultaneous exploitation and subversion of stereotypes; one does not fail to notice how the transformation of the hero into a tyrant in the second half of the play simultaneously confirms the self-stereotyped Athenian idea of Athens as tyrant of its colonies and allies and subverts the Athenian stereotyped idea concerning Thracian unreliability; birds are proven reliable followers of Pisthetaerus, whereas Pisthetaerus is proven an unreliable leader.[136] This takes us to the strongest affinity between Hall's reading and our analysis: the tyranny issue. Our demonstration of

know, it has not yet been published. I would like to thank her for kindly allowing me to have the text of her presentation. All references are to this text, which I cite as Hall (2015).

[132] Hall (2015) 8.

[133] With the exception of Tsakmakis (1997) 40-42, who argues that one of the few clear references of the poet to the historical events of the time is to the expedition to Thrace and not to Sicily.

[134] See also Dobrov (2001) 105-130.

[135] Within this frame, one can add that Tereus' double nature may actually allude to a *proxenos* or a Thracian king to whom Athenians had granted Athenian citizenship at some point in order to facilitate the establishment of an alliance between the two. Even the building of fortification walls may corroborate the Thracian colouring of the play, if one accepts Sears' assumption (2013: 239-240) that the military strategy of erecting fortification walls was initiated by Miltiades the Elder in the Thracian Chersonese and was henceforth gradually exploited in Athens and by Athenians as a basic colonial activity.

[136] For the Athenian stereotypes of barbarians, see Hall (1989) 107-110, 112-123, 126, 128, 137-138.

how a leadership based on common social identity can foster tyranny is in line with Hall's assertion that the play "mocks the gullibility of the barbarian natives and its target is unscrupulous Athenians who wanted to become tyrants and believed that they could fulfil this nefarious ambition in Thrace".[137]

[137] Hall (2015) 22.

3 Talking about peace with a look towards *Birds: Acharnians* and *Peace*

3.1 *Acharnians:* social identity, exclusion and inclusion

"Aristophanes' comedies, by questioning the boundaries that came into play during the calcification of the meaning of citizenship for the Athenians, highlight the problematic nature of our facile linguistic constructions about who acts when we say the Athenians -or any political groups- "act." Such language always includes some and excludes others, and every polity must address the criteria that constitute membership in the political actor."[138]

The heroes of *Birds* and *Acharnians*, Pisthetaerus and Dicaeopolis, are each other's alter ego; Whitman, referring to the former, argues that he is "simply the man of heroic *poneria* par excellence; more probably, he becomes that in much the same way Dicaeopolis did. Like Dicaeopolis, he presents the individual fugitive from an increasingly impossible society, and he also reaches the point where he is suddenly inundated by a vision of supremacy, which he immediately implements with all his resources".[139] For Sutton, Pisthetaerus and Dicaeopolis stand for a specific type of comic hero, the one "who becomes disgusted with his society, leaves it, and by striking out on his own becomes an "outlaw" in the original sense of the word".[140] The heroes' affinities stem from their common deviant status and it is their self-exclusion that sets in motion the action of the two plays. Pisthetaerus as an Athenian is a bearer of a negative social identity who adopts the social mobility strategy: he leaves his group in order to become member of another group which will lend him higher status and thus a positive social identity. The psychological processes sustaining the adoption of the social mobility strategy are not dramatized in the play; instead, the first part of *Birds* dramatizes the process of Pisthetaerus' inclusion and the second part the exclusion of all the prospective members of

[138] Saxonhouse (2014) 91.
[139] Whitman (1964) 170.
[140] Sutton (1980) 17.

Cloudcuckooland by the comic hero. The play in general underlines how inextricably associated are the acts of inclusion and exclusion with social identity dynamics, albeit social identity operates at different levels in the play- sometimes as national identity and sometimes as citizen identity. Given the strong affinities between Pisthetaerus and Dicaeopolis, one is prompted to put the behaviour and motivations of the latter under scrutiny; is he also a bearer of a negative identity and are thus his actions motivated by the quest of a positive social identity?

3.1.1 A self-exclusion prompted by social marginalization

Our assumption is that under a social psychological perspective the *Acharnians* dramatize the consequences of the war for intragroup relations and the subgroup structure within the group and thus the hero's behaviour must be interpreted within this context. Indeed, Angus Bowie has argued that it is distortive to label and treat the *Acharnians* as merely a peace-play when it deals with many other important subjects such as the relationship between state and individual, between city and deme, and between city and country, acknowledging, though, that all these relations are affected by the war.[141] Wars in general constitute both a valence threat for the conflicting parts, putting in danger their status and prestige, as well as an entitativity threat, putting in danger what the group stands for and its cohesiveness. In both cases, the threat constitutes a collective self-concept threat for the members of each group.

For social psychologists, how groups respond to self-concept threats is an intriguing and interesting topic of research and they have thus explored the impact of these threats mostly on intergroup relations. However, Michael Hogg and Matthew Hornsey have explored the consequences of these threats for intragroup relations as well, given that groups are almost never homogenous but contain subcategories.[142] They have identified the adoption of different identity

[141] Bowie (1993) 18.
[142] Hogg and Hornsey (2006).

management strategies on behalf of group members in the face of self-concept threat, depending on the type of the threat, the motives aroused by the threat and the type of response the context allows. The two commonest strategies are group consolidation when members identify strongly with the group, and group disintegration when members disidentify with the group and identify with the subgroup, in some cases even causing schisms. Another strategy is the marginalization of specific individuals who are a-prototypical; this strategy has the same effects with group consolidation and does not cause group disintegration.

The *Acharnians* engages in a rather paradoxical way with these findings; as we are about to discover, the war as a self-concept threat does not prompt all Athenians to identify strongly with their group; only a specific subgroup, that of the rustics, identifies strongly with his civic identity and supports the continuation of the war as a response to the intergroup threat. Dicaeopolis is also member of this subgroup, but despite being a high-identifier in both his civic and rustic identity, he does not wish the continuation of the war. Dicaeopolis' and the Acharnians' behaviour demonstrates how social identity incites motivational needs which on one hand prompt intergroup reconciliation and at the same time work as barriers to conflict resolution. Dicaeopolis' soliloquy at the very beginning of the play is indicative of how differently he and his fellow citizens respond to the war:

ὅσα δὴ δέδηγμαι τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ καρδίαν,
ἥσθην δὲ βαιά, πάνυ γε βαιά, τέτταρα·
ἃ δ'ὠδυνήθην, ψαμμακοσιογάργαρα.
φέρ' ἴδω, τί δ' ἥσθην ἄξιον χαιρηδόνος;
ἐγῷδ' ἐφ' ᾧ γε τὸ κέαρ εὐφράνθην ἰδών·
τοῖς πέντε ταλάντοις οἷς Κλέων ἐξήμεσεν.
ταῦθ' ὡς ἐγανώθην, καὶ φιλῶ τοὺς ἱππέας
διὰ τοῦτο τοὔργον· ἄξιον γὰρ Ἑλλάδι.
ἀλλ' ὠδυνήθην ἕτερον αὖ τραγῳδικόν,
ὅτε δὴ 'κεχήνη προσδοκῶν τὸν Αἰσχύλον,

ὁ δ' ἀνεῖπεν· "εἴσαγ', ὦ Θέογνι, τὸν χορόν".
πῶς τοῦτ' ἔσεισέ μου δοκεῖς τὴν καρδίαν;
ἀλλ' ἕτερον ἥσθην, ἡνίκ' ἐπὶ μόσχῳ ποτὲ
Δεξίθεος εἰσῆλθ' ᾄσόμενος Βοιώτιον.
τῆτες δ' ἀπέθανον καὶ διεστράφην ἰδών,
ὅτε δὴ παρέκυψε Χαῖρις ἐπὶ τὸν ὄρθιον.
ἀλλ' οὐδεπώποτ' ἐξ ὅτου 'γὼ ῥύπτομαι
οὕτως ἐδήχθην ὑπὸ κονίας τὰς ὀφρῦς
ὡς νῦν, ὁπότ' οὔσης κυρίας ἐκκλησίας
ἑωθινῆς ἔρημος ἡ πνὺξ αὑτηί,
οἱ δ' ἐν ἀγορᾷ λαλοῦσι κἄνω καὶ κάτω
τὸ σχοινίον φεύγουσι το μεμιλτωμένον.
οὐδ' οἱ πρυτάνεις ἥκουσιν, ἀλλ' ἀωρίαν
ῥέγκουσιν, εἶτα δ' ὠστιοῦνται πῶς δοκεῖς
ἥκοντες ἀλλήλοισι περὶ πρώτου ξύλου,
ἁθρόοι καταρρέοντες· εἰρήνη δ' ὅπως
ἔσται προτιμῶσ' οὐδέν· ὦ πόλις, πόλις.
ἐγὼ δ' ἀεὶ πρώτιστος εἰς ἐκκλησίαν
νοστῶν κάθημαι·

How often I've been bitten to my very heart!
My delights? Scant, quite scant-just four!
My pains? Heaps by the umpteen million loads!
Let's see, what delight have I had worthy of delectation?
I know-it's something my heart rejoiced to see:
those five talents Cleon had to disgorge.
That made me sparkle! I love the Knights
for that deed, "a worthy thing for Greece"!
But then I had another pain, quite tragic:
when I was waiting open-mouthed for Aeschylus,
the announcer cried, "Theognis, bring your chorus on!"
How do you think that made my heart quake?
But I had another delight, when "Once Upon A Calf"
Dexitheus came on to sing Boeotian-style.

But just this year I died on the rack
when I saw Chaeris creeping on to play the Orthian tune.
But never since my first bath have my brows been as soap stung
as they are now, when the Assembly's scheduled for a regular
dawn meeting and here's an empty Pnyx:
everybody's gossiping in the market as up and down
they dodge the ruddled rope.
The Presidents aren't even here. No, they'll come late,
and when they do you can't imagine how they'll shove
each other for the front row,
streaming down en masse. But they don't care at all,
about making peace. O city, city!
I am always the very first to come to Assembly
and take my seat.
(1-29)

Fisher has pointedly observed that in the first 16 lines of the soliloquy Dicaeopolis speaks mostly as spectator of the dramatic festivals, recalling recent theatrical and musical events that he and the audience had attended.[143] He argues that his civic experiences resemble his experiences as a theatre-goer; they have given him more pains than pleasures. Whereas he remains a conscientious Athenian citizen who attends the Assembly-meetings and is concerned with the terrible situation and how peace will be achieved, his fellow-citizens arrive late for the Assembly-meetings and so do the self-centered presidents who do not care about making peace but how they will get the best seats. Dicaeopolis is presented as a marginalized individual and his marginalization is observable both verbally (use of verbs in the first singular) and in performative terms (seating alone in the empty *Pnyx*).[144]

The picture of loneliness and isolation is reinforced in the following scene which demonstrates vividly the corruption of the Athenian officials who do not opt for peace, make profit from the war and believe the lies and false promises of the allies. Dicaeopolis is the only one who protests when Amphitheus, the immortal commissioned by the Gods to make peace with Sparta but cannot afford the

[143] Fisher (1993) 33. Whether the incident with Cleon is a theatrical or a political event, see Carawan (1990) and Olson (2002) ad loc.
[144] Xanthou (2010) 299-300.

expenses of the trip, is removed violently (45-60). Athenian officials are more interested in the report of the ambassadors from Persia. Again, Dicaeopolis is the only one to unmask the ambassadors' lies and demonstrates by interrogating Pseudo-Artabas, the King's Eye who is brought with them, that the Persian king does not intend to send any gold to the Athenians as the ambassadors have claimed (65-114). Dicaeopolis also exposes that the eunuchs accompanying the Pseudo-Artabas are in fact Athenian effeminates (115-122), but despite all these, the Council invites Pseudo-Artabas to the Prytaneum (123-125). Afterwards, Theorus arrives from Thrace and more specifically from the court of the king of Odrysai Sitalkes. He argues that Sitalkes is a loyal ally of Athens and intends to send military aid, but the military aid proves to be a troop of Odomantian mercenaries who must be paid two drachmas per day for their services -an extraordinary amount, the double of the usual pay- and who steal Dicaeopolis' lunch instead of attacking Boeotia (134-165). The comic hero complaints about the pay of the mercenaries and manages to temporarily stop the Assembly meeting, without achieving to raise the topic of peace (167-173).

Dicaeopolis does not fit this picture; with the exception of Amphitheus, the "god on both sides" who is commissioned by the Gods to make peace with Sparta, he is the only one who wishes the end of the war. Albeit dramatically he has no supporters, the spectators are expected to identify with him, seeing themselves as conscientious citizens who are also able to discern the lies heard in the Assembly. Many of them would even share his quest for peace, but in contrast to him, would not give voice to their inner desires.[145] It is a great irony that the group has

[145] Cf. Olson (2002) xxxviii-xxxix: "All the same, by the mid-420s the average Athenian man in the street must occasionally have asked himself what he and his family had got out of the war so far. If he had rowed in the fleet or fought as a hoplite, he had been paid for his time, but not a great deal and certainly not enough to make the petty annoyances of military service —to say nothing of the risk to his life— worth while. He had certainly seen friends and neighbours killed and wounded, and may have been wounded himself; his farm, if he had one, had most likely been damaged; prices were higher than they had been before the war and the range of goods available for purchase more limited; the countryside was dangerous even when the enemy was not there in force; and if he had ever thought he exercised control over his own existence or destiny, he definitely exercised much less such control now. Whatever pleasures might be associated with the war—military commands, ambassadorial appointments with all their perks, and the like—had certainly not come to him and seemed unlikely ever to do so. Doubtless he hated the Spartans and everything they stood for and had done, and had little confidence in their willingness to keep whatever agreements they might make (cf.

marginalized individuals like the comic hero who do not support the continuation of the war but are conscientious citizens and thus prototypical of the citizen identity.[146] According to the group socialization model, when a member of a group is marginalized into a deviant role, a resocialization process takes place: "the group tries to restore the individual's contributions to the attainment of group goals, and the individual tries to restore the group's contributions to the satisfaction of personal needs."[147] In the play, however, the group does not attempt to restore the individual's contributions to the attainment of group goals, whereas Dicaeopolis, who wishes to restore the group's contributions to the satisfaction of personal needs through discussion in the Assembly, has no success. He is thus urged to psychologically leave the group and between the Pseudo-Artabas' exit and Theorus' entry, he commissions Amphitheus to make a private treaty with Sparta (125-133): a self-exclusion process has already begun.

Dicaeopolis' soliloquy demonstrates that social identity simultaneously operates at the subgroup level as well:

[…] κᾆτ', ἐπειδὰν ὦ μόνος,
στένω, κέχηνα, σκορδινῶμαι, πέρδομαι,
ἀπορῶ, γράφω, παρατίλλομαι, λογίζομαι,
ἀποβλέπων εἰς τὸν ἀγρόν εἰρήνης ἐρῶν,
στυγῶν μὲν ἄστυ τὸν δ' ἐμὸν δῆμον ποθῶν,
ὃς οὐδεπώποτ' εἶπεν· "ἄνθρακας πρίω",
οὐκ"ὄξος", οὐκ "ἔλαιον", οὐδ' ᾔδει "πρίω",
ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἔφερε πάντα χὠ πρίων ἀπῆν.
νῦν οὖν ἀτεχνῶς ἥκω παρεσκευασμένος

Ach. 307-8 n.). But if he could have whatever he wanted and the public good were not a concern, he—like most of his friends, relatives, and neighbours— would choose peace with the enemy over war. And in his heart of hearts he may have felt no real love for great men like Perikles and Kleon, even if he had repeatedly voted along with them to continue the war and reject all Spartan overtures on the ground that this remained the wise and proper thing to do."

[146] For the different definitions of the Athenian identity offered in the play through the presentation of institutions, of different Athenian citizens and of non-Athenian citizens, see Whitehorne (2005).

[147] Levine and Moreland (1985) 151.

βοᾶν, ὑποκροῦειν, λοιδορεῖν τοὺς ῥήτορας,

ἐάν τις ἄλλο πλὴν περὶ εἰρήνης λέγῃ.

[...] Then, in my solitude,
I sigh, I yawn, I stretch myself, I fart,
I fiddle, scribble, pluck my beard, do sums,
while I gaze off to the countryside and pine for peace,
loathing the city and yearning for my own deme,
that never cried "buy coal",
"buy vinegar", "buy oil"; it didn't know the word "buy";
no, it produced everything itself, and the Buy Man was out of sight.
So now I'm here, all set to
shout, interrupt, revile the speakers,
if anyone speaks of anything except peace."
(29-39)

The comic hero says that he misses his deme and longs for the life he enjoyed there and that he hates the agora (32-36). Compton-Engle has demonstrated how emphatically Dicaeopolis' soliloquy points to his rural identity: apart from his dislike of the Agora, there are his old-fashioned theatre tastes (he likes Aeschylus), his concern with peace and his hatred of Cleon.[148] And since this is a comedy, the rustic identity comes to the fore in the form of robust behaviour: he sighs, he yawns, he stretches himself, he farts, he fiddles, scribbles, plucks his beard and does sum (30-31). But even in his subgroup identity, Dicaeopolis is -dramatically speaking- marginalised. The other rustics we see in the play is the chorus of the Acharnians. On one hand they share a lot with the comic hero: they are also old, farmers, Athenians of the countryside who were forced to abandon their houses and live in the city because of the war, haters of Cleon and deeply concerned with the terrible situation inflicted by the war. On the other hand, there are significant differences between them: Dicaeopolis does not come from the deme of Acharnae but of the deme of Cholleidae (406), he does not support the continuation of the war and thus hates Lamachus. What is interesting is that Dicaeopolis' deme-identity (social identity operating at an even lower level) is not given special emphasis in the play

[148] Compton-Engle (1997) 38-63.

-we hear about it when Dicaeopolis visits Euripides- and the differences between him and the Acharnians do not point to a distinction between different demes.[149] Dicaeopolis' quest for peace like the chorus' quest for war must not be associated with their respective deme-identity, (albeit the Acharnians' deme-identity is exploited dramatically by the poet throughout the play), but with their strong identification with their common rustic identity.

The idea that Dicaeopolis and the Acharnians must be treated as members of the same subgroup, as rustics, is corroborated by the idea that both provide the only examples of conscientious political behaviour and are depicted as prototypical of the Athenian citizen identity. McGlew has aptly argued that "whereas Dicaeopolis renders the *political id* (emphasis mine) of the Athenian citizen, in particular, his uncomplicated and unmoderated desire for peace, the chorus at the start of *Acharnians* seems to capture his *political ego* (emphasis mine), the accumulated events and experiences that, with his desires, help make up the citizen identity."[150] By emphasizing the common rustic identity of the hero and the chorus, the play points to the centrality of the distinction between city and country or between city and deme, making at the same time the hero's marginalization at the level of his rustic identity bolder. The chorus not only constitutes a numerical majority but an ideological majority, leading us to believe that most of the rustics wished the continuation of the war like the Acharnians, albeit in real life this was a highly debatable issue (Thucydides 2.21.3) and Acharnae were in many ways an unusual and even marginalized deme.[151]

That the chorus stands for an ideological majority is also supported by the fact that, although the poet exploits dramatically their bellicose nature, this nature is not

[149] Cf. McGlew (2002) 68 n.27: "Yet, I am reluctant to think that Aristophanes was really thinking about a political conflict between regions of Attica or between established factions (rather than between an opportunistic few and the many)."
[150] Ibid., 68.
[151] Cf. Bowie (1993) 41: "Distinguished by size, ideology and perhaps economy, and removed from the city in their oak-forests, it would have been natural for them to have been conceived by members of other demes as in some ways exceptional and even marginal".

rendered their central motive for the continuation of the war; the Acharnians wish justifiably the war to be continued because their land has been laid by the Spartans:

ΑΜΦΙΘΕΟΣ

ἐγὼ μὲν δεῦρό σοι σπονδὰς φέρων
ἔσπευδον· οἱ δ' ὤσφροντο πρεσβῦταί τινες
Ἀχαρνικοί, στιπτοὶ γέροντες, πρίνινοι,
ἀτέρμονες, Μαραθωνομάχαι, σφενδάμνινοι.
ἔπειτ' ἀνέκραγον πάντες· "ὦ μιαρώτατε,
σπονδὰς φέρεις, τῶν ἀμπέλων τετμημένων;"
κἀς τοὺς τρίβωνας ξυνελέγοντο τῶν λίθων·
ἐγὼ δ' ἔφευγον· οἱ δ' ἐδίωκον κἀβόων.

AMPHITHEUS
I was hurrying back here with some treaties for you
when some elders of Acharnae
got wind of them, sturdy geezers, tough as hardwood,
stubborn Marathon fighters, men of maple.
Then they all started yelling, "Traitor! Are you
bringing treaties when our vines are slashed?
And they began to fill their cloacks with stones.
I ran away; they kept chasing me and shouting.
(178-185)

ΧΟΡΟΣ

ὅστις, ὦ Ζεῦ πάτερ
καὶ θεοί, τοῖσιν ἐχθροῖσιν ἐσπείσατο,
οἷσι παρ' ἐμοῦ πόλεμος ἐχθοδοπὸς αὔξεται
τῶν ἐμῶν χωρίων·
κοὐκ ἀνήσω πρὶν ἂν σχοῖνος αὐτοῖσιν ἀντεμπαγῶ
<καὶ σκόλοψ> ὀξύς, ὀδυνηρός, ἐπίκωπος, ἵνα
μήποτε πατῶσιν ἔτι τὰς ἐμὰς ἀμπέλους.

CHORUS
that man, Father Zeus

and ye Gods, who's made a truce
with our foes, though on my side malevolent war
waxes strong against them on account of my lands.
Nor will I ease off, till like a reed I impale them in revenge,
like a stake sharp and painful, up to the hilt,
so that never again, will they trample my vines.
(223-233)

They chase Amphitheus who brings the treaty and when they find Dicaeopolis celebrating the Rural Dionysia, they are ready to attack him, casting him a traitor:

οὗτος αὐτός ἐστιν, οὗτος·

βάλλε, βάλλε, βάλλε, βάλλε,

παῖε, παῖε τὸν μιαρόν.

οὐ βαλεῖς; οὐ βαλεῖς;

[...]

τοῦτ᾽ ἐρωτᾷς; ἀναίσχυντος εἶ καὶ βδελυρός,

ὦ προδότα τῆς πατρίδος, ὅστις ἡμῶν μόνος

σπεισάμενος εἶτα δύνασαι πρὸς ἔμ᾽ ἀποβλέπειν.

That's the man! That one there!
Pelt him, pelt him, pelt him, pelt him!
Hit him! Hit the pariah!
Won't you pelt him? Won't you pelt him?
[...]
You ask that? You're shameless and disgusting,
you traitor to your country, the only one among us
to make peace, and then you've the nerve to look me in the eye!
(280-292)

Despite the fact that they have become a kind of scapegoat in order for the group valence and entitativity threat to be faced, the Acharnians identify strongly with their city-state and support the continuation of the war. One is led to believe that it is their strong identification that does not allow the group to disintegrate, despite the other citizens' indifference to the war and their low identification. The Acharnians do not separate their group identity (Athenians) from their subgroup identity (rustics) and although the war decreases their subgroup distinctiveness,

they consider it both as a means of revenging the sacrifice of their rustic identity and a means of confronting the threat at the group level. In contrast, Dicaeopolis' point of view, corroborated by the scenes in the Assembly, is that the continuation of the war is not protecting the valence and entitativity of the city-state, but allows a leadership-clique to grow richer and the urban dwellers, the subgroup holding the central position in the group identity, to indulge passively into trading in the Agora without realizing the lies heard in the Assembly. The loss of his subgroup distinctiveness and its economic consequences render Dicaeopolis a bearer of low a self-esteem and in turn a bearer of a negative social identity who experiences self-conceptual uncertainty.[152] By not being able to be a farmer, the comic hero "has lost his normative compass and sense of grounding in a social group that validates his beliefs, attitudes, and actions."[153]

The chorus' anger and hostility bring in mind birds' reaction towards Tereus who also appeared to betray the common identity. In social psychology, such reactions provide example of the Subjective Group Dynamics model (SGD) and especially the black sheep effect. The SGD model examines how group entitativity is sustained and how group members respond to threats to entitativity.[154] According to the Encyclopedia of Group Processes and Intergroup Relations "[e]ntitativity can refer either to the actual *properties* of the group (in which case it is comparable to group cohesion) or to the *perception* of the group as a viable entity rather than a mere collection of people. [...] Entitativity can be seen as the glue that holds (or is

[152] Olson (1991) has argued for the economic and socio-political character of Dicaeopolis' motivations: "Dicaeopolis resents both his unhappy new status as an urban cash-consumer of staple goods, and the fact that he is excluded from all the pleasures the war-time city still has to offer, while others continue to enjoy themselves. [...]. As he makes clear in his opening monologue, this disaffection is rooted first of all in his altered economic position since the war began. Forced out of his deme and within the city walls by the hostilities, he has become a cash-consumer of charcoal, vinegar and olive oil, goods his old country home supplied without money and in abundance [...]. Secondly, while Dicaeopolis, trapped inside the city walls [...], grows steadily poorer, others are growing rich." (200)

[153] Hogg and Wagoner (2017) 212, slightly altered. It must be noted that not all people feel uncertain to the same degree or respond to uncertainty in the same way-this is treated as personality variance- and that uncertainty must matter to someone in order to motivate his behaviour. See Hogg (2007) 79.

[154] It must be clarified that we speak of group members who have a salient group membership, that means group-membership constitutes the psychological basis for their behaviour, their self-conception and the way they process information.

perceived as holding) a group together, the "groupness" or unity of a group."[155] The SGD argues that group members' behaviour is governed by the motivation to sustain and maximise both descriptive intergroup distinctiveness and prescriptive intragroup differentiation in order to sustain the group's entitativity. In simple words, groups members are motivated to differentiate between groups (they adopt a prescriptive focus which directs their attention to the characteristics of a person which assign him to their own group instead to another) and between people within their own group (they adopt a prescriptive focus which directs their attention to characteristics which have value for them but are not associated with a specific group). The adoption of a prescriptive focus makes people on one hand treat favourably the ingroup members whose behaviour follows the standards and validates the superiority of the group and on the other hand makes them treat negatively the ingroup members whose behaviour does not follow the standards and invalidates the superiority of the group.[156]

As it become obvious, the SGD model is inextricably associated with deviance; deviant are those members of a group that deviate from its norms, either by not complying with them or by acting and speaking in ways that oppose to them, and in doing so they constitute a threat for the group's entitativity. A special case for SGD is the black sheep effect which describes how group members respond to deviant ingroup members within an intergroup context (context involving comparison, competition or conflict with another group). The black sheep effect is the tendency of the members of a group to treat unlikeable or deviant in-group members in more negative ways than unlikeable or deviant out-group members. Such a tendency contrasts sharply to in-group favouritism but is explicable on the basis that deviant in-group members constitute a threat for the group: they undermine the subjective validity of the group norms and the in-group members' certainty that their group is better than the out-group. On the contrary, out-group

[155] Levine and Hogg (2010) 238.
[156] For a full description of the SGD model, see Marques et al. (2001).

deviants undermine the validity of the out-group while reinforcing the validity of the in-group.[157]

To return to comedy, Dicaeopolis is for the chorus of Acharnians a deviant, the black sheep; they deny a listening to him, even claiming that they hate him more than Cleon (297-302).[158] The comic hero must force the chorus to allow him to defend his actions and does so by taking advantage of their deme identity. This is the only occasion in the play where the different deme identity of the hero and the chorus is emphasized:

ΔΙΚΑΙΟΠΟΛΙΣ

δήξομἄρ᾽ ὑμᾶς ἐγώ.

ἀνταποκτενῶ γὰρ ὑμῶν τῶν φίλων τοὺς φιλτάτους·

ὡς ἔχω γ᾽ ὑμῶν ὁμήρους, οὓς ἀποσφάξω λαβών.

ΚΟΡΥΦΑΙΟΣ

εἰπέ μοι, τί τοῦτ᾽ ἀπειλεῖ τοὔπος, ἄνδρες δημόται,

τοῖς Ἀχαρνικοῖσιν ἡμῖν; μῶν ἔχει του παιδίον

τῶν παρόντων ἔνδον εἴρξας; ἢ ’πὶ τῷ θρασύνεται;

ΔΙΚΑΙΟΠΟΛΙΣ

βάλλετ᾽, εἰ βούλεσθ᾽· ἐγὼ γὰρ τουτονὶ διαφθερῶ.

εἴσομαι δ᾽ ὑμῶν τάχ᾽ ὅστις ἀνθράκων τι κήδεται.

ΚΟΡΥΦΑΙΟΣ

[157] For the black sheep effect, see Marques and Páez (1994).

[158] Perhaps the best example of the black sheep effect in Aristophanes comes from *Thesmoporiazusae,* in the scenes of women's reaction to the Inlaw's speech in defense of Euripides. His long speech constitutes of four parts: a prologue which acknowledges that Euripides is guilty and women are right to be hostile against him (466-475); a narrative describing personal experiences which prove that women are in fact worse than Euripides' description (476-490); a list of female misbehaviours not mentioned by Euripides and an example that the speaker witnessed (491-516); and a final summary of the key point of the prologue (517-519). For women, this is a speech by a fellow group member and their reaction is fierce, like the chorus' reaction towards Tereus and Dicaeopolis in *Birds* and *Acharnians* respectively. Mica, who is a person with a strong social identity (her speech in lines 383-432 on how Euripides slanders women is indicative of her strong identification) reacts in the same way (533-539) and she is about to fight with the Inlaw (540-570), but the fight is annulled the last moment by the appearance of Cleisthenes (571-573). Cleisthenes is an out-group member and women should have treated him accordingly. But Cleisthenes is in fact a deviant out group member whose behaviour opposes the norms of his own group and invalidates its superiority while validating the superiority of the ingroup (574-581). Therefore, women's attitude towards Cleisthenes contrasts sharply to their attitude towards the Inlaw qua woman (601-602).

ὡς ἀπωλόμεσθ᾽· ὁ λάρκος δημότης ὅδ᾽ ἔστ᾽ ἐμὸς.

ἀλλὰ μὴ δράσῃς ὃ μέλλεις, μηδαμῶς, ὦ μηδαμῶς.

ΔΙΚΑΙΟΠΟΛΙΣ

ὡς ἀποκτενῶ. κέκραχθ᾽· ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐκ ἀκούσομαι.

ΧΟΡΟΣ

ἀπολεῖς ἄρ᾽ ὁμήλικα τόνδε φιλανθρακέα;

ΔΙΚΑΙΟΠΟΛΙΣ

οὐδ᾽ ἐμοῦ λέγοντος ὑμεῖς ἀρτίως ἠκούσατε.

ΧΟΡΟΣ

ἀλλὰ νυνὶ λέγ᾽, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, τόν τε Λακε-

δαιμόνιον αὐτόθεν ὅτῳ τρόπῳ σοὐστὶ φίλος·

ὡς τόδε τὸ λαρκίδιον οὐ προδώσω ποτέ.

ΔΙΚΑΙΟΠΟΛΙΣ

τοὺς λίθους νύν μοι χαμᾶζε πρῶτον ἐξεράσατε.

ΧΟΡΟΣ

οὑτοί σοι χαμαί, καὶ σὺ κατάθου πάλιν τὸ ξίφος.

DICAEOPOLIS

Then I'll bite you!
I'll kill in return your nearest and dearest;
for I've got hostages of yours; I'm going to fetch them and cut their throats!

CHORUS LEADER

Tell me, fellow demesmen, what does he mean by this
threat against us Acharnians? He hasn't got somebody's
child, one of ours, locked up in there, has he? Then why is he so cocky?

DICAEOPOLIS

Pelt me, if you like! And I'll murder this!
I'll soon see which among you has a care for kith and kindling!

CHORUS LEADER

Now we're done for! That coal basket is from my deme!
Don't do what you're set on doing! Don't, oh don't!

DICAEOPOLIS

Kill I will. Shout away; I don't intend to listen.

CHORUS

Then you'll kill this, my coeval, my coal-eague?

DICAEOPOLIS

You were deaf to my pleas a moment ago.
CHORUS
Very well, say your piece,
tell us here and now
in what way
the Spartan's your friend.
For this dear little basket
I'll never desert.
DICAEOPOLIS
Please begin by disgorging your stones on the ground.
CHORUS
There you are, they're on the ground. Now you lay down your sword.
(325-343)

The chorus constitutes at all the levels of its social identity (group-civic, subgroup-rustic, deme-Acharnians) a very cohesive group;[159] we have already seen how fiercely they attack Dicaeopolis for being a deviant member of the group-civic and subgroup-rustic identity. When he threatens to kill a basket of Acharnian charcoal that he keeps as hostage, they immediately allow him to speak, dropping their stones.

Having forced and not persuaded the chorus to give him the chance to defend his action, Dicaeopolis is about to make a speech with his head on the block. But before doing so, he makes a confession:

καίτοι δέδοικα πολλά· τούς τε γὰρ τρόπους
τοὺς τῶν ἀγροίκων οἶδα χαίροντας σφόδρα,
ἐάν τις αὐτοὺς εὐλογῇ καὶ τὴν πόλιν
ἀνὴρ ἀλαζὼν καὶ δίκαια κἄδικα·
κἀνταῦθα λανθάνουσ' ἀπεμπολώμενοι·

[159] The term cohesiveness is slippery and social psychologists do not agree on its exact nature or method of measurement. Following Hogg and Vaughan (2018) 293 we define cohesiveness as "[t]he property of a group that affectively binds people, as group members, to one another and to the group as a whole, giving the group a sense of solidarity and oneness." This definition is based on the suggestion of Hogg (1993) not to treat cohesiveness as the aggregation of interpersonal attraction and to draw a distinction between personal and social attraction. The former refers to the interpersonal liking stemming from close relationships and idiosyncratic preferences, whereas the latter refers to liking stemming from common group membership and it is based on prototypicality (how prototypical of the group is the person). Social attraction, like ethnocentrism, stereotyping and intergroup differentiation is produced by self-categorization. Group cohesiveness is inextricably associated with loyalty and the sacrifice of the personal gain for the group. See Hogg and Vaughan (2018) 295-296 with bibliography.

τῶν τ' αὖ γερόντων οἶδα τὰς ψυχὰς ὅτι
οὐδὲν βλέπουσιν ἄλλο πλὴν ψήφῳ δακεῖν.
αὐτός τ' ἐμαυτὸν ὑπὸ Κλέωνος ἄπαθον
ἐπίσταμαι διὰ τὴν πέρυσι κωμῳδίαν.
εἰσελκύσας γάρ μ' εἰς τὸ βουλευτήριον
διέβαλλε καὶ ψευδῆ κατεγλώττιζέ μου
κἀκυκλοβόρει κἄπλυνεν, ὥστ' ὀλίγου πάνυ
ἀπωλόμην μολυνοπραγμονούμενος.
νῦν οὖν με πρῶτον πρὶν λέγειν ἐάσατε
ἐνσκευάσασθαί μ' οἷον ἀθλιώτατον.

And yet I'm very apprehensive: I know the way
country people act, deeply delighted,
when some fraudulent personage eulogizes them and the city,
whether truly or falsely;
that's how they can be bought and sold all unawares.
And I know the hearts of the oldsters too,
looking forward to only to biting with their ballots.
And in my own case I know what Cleon
did to me because of last year's comedy.
He hauled me before the Council,
and slandered me, and tongue-lashed me with lies,
and roared like the Cycloborus, and soaked me in abuse,
so that I nearly died in a mephitic miasma of misadventure.
So now, before I make my speech, please let
me array myself in guise most piteous.
(370-384)

Dicaeopolis confesses how much afraid of the differences between him and the Acharnians he is; these are the differences which have led to his marginalisation. The other rustics are easily flattered and hate being told the painful truth, whereas he, like the poet, is devoted to telling only the truth.[160] For this reason, he needs a

[160] For the hero's identification with the poet and its implications for the play in general, see the discussion of Goldhill (1991) 188-196, Hubbard (1991) 41-53, 58-59, Riu (1999) 27-28, Olson (2002) xlvi-lii, Sommerstein (2004) and Sidwell (2009) 106-155. See also Slater (2002) 56-57 who suggests that Aristophanes himself played the role of Dicaeopolis.

pity-arousing costume. The need to cause pity brings in mind Pisthetaerus' confession to Euelpides before delivering his speech to the birds: *μὰ Δί' ἀλλὰ λέγειν ζητῶ τι πάλαι μέγα καὶ λαρινὸν ἔπος τι,/ὅ τι τὴν τούτων θραύσει ψυχήν* (*Birds* 465-466). Definitely, the situation is very different in the two plays: apart from pity, Pisthetaerus wishes to arouse the anger of the chorus by demonstrating the deprivation that they have been suffering, whereas Dicaeopolis wishes to ensure the chorus' empathy and perspective taking; the former is in need of the birds for the implementation and success of his plan, whereas the success of the second's plan will not benefit the chorus in any way; the former seeks to enhance the birds' identification with their group in order to motivate their revolt against human and divine tyranny, whereas the latter is about to demonstrate the betrayal of the civic identity of the Athenians by their leaders in order to persuade the chorus for the correctness of his decision. It is ironic that whereas for Pisthetaerus who is an outgroup member the birds' social identity constitutes a weapon in their confrontation, for Dicaeopolis who is an ingroup member the common rustic identity becomes an impediment.

After visiting Euripides, the comic hero chooses Telephus' costume (393-479) which enables him to arouse the pity and also highlights the striking similarities between their situation -they are both delivering a speech in front of a hostile audience with the head on the block and defending the enemies.[161] The speech that eventually Dicaeopolis delivers in the persona of Telephus does not explain explicitly his decision to make peace with Sparta as one may have expected, but focuses on the insufficient causes of the war and constitutes an attack on its morality. Chris Carey has demonstrated that the Telephus' persona and the borrowing of props is intended to amuse the spectators, pointing to the fantastic nature of the account.[162] Nonetheless, arguing for the lack of serious intent in the play and treating it as an escapist outopia does not deprive it completely of any

[161] For the effects achieved by the usage of Euripides' play in the *Acharnians* and by the usage of tragedy in the form of paratragedy in comedy in general, see Foley (1988).
[162] Carey (1993) 256. Contra MacDowell (1983) passim.

political colouring; Carey rightly argues that the play and comedy in general portrays the negative aspect of the Athenians' relationship with their politicians, acknowledging, though, that this relationship had other aspects as well.[163] Part of this negative relationship is how the politicians have betrayed the collective social identity of the people by beginning this war and this is what Dicaeopolis' speech sets out to prove. He describes Pericles' personal motives for the Megarian decree and argues that by putting his personal interest above the collective, Pericles betrayed the collective identity of the Athenians (515-534).[164] Similarly, Dicaeopolis claims that Lamachus advocates the continuation of the war for personal gain (595-619). Although the comic hero is no different from the politicians who are playing a role and their speeches are performances meant to convince the demos,[165] his arguments, convincing in context as they are, persuade initially half of the chorus and later, after ridiculing Lamachus, the other half as well (626-627).

It is interesting that in Dicaeopolis' description of the causes of the war, special attention to the Megarian degree is drawn (515-534). The degree constituted an act of exclusion and one is tempted to see an allusion to his own state: an act of exclusion had caused the war and now marginalization causes Dicaeopolis' actions

[163] Carey (193) 262.

[164] In *Peace*, Hermes' account of the causes of the war is different, but still historically inaccurate; both Trygaeus and the chorus admit that they have never heard of these connections before (615-618). Special emphasis is drawn to the Megarian degree like in Dicaeopolis' account, but Pericles' personal motive for the degree is his fear not to get implicated in Phidias' defalcation, given Athenians' fond of vindictive juries (605-609). Trygaeus then describes how the Spartan leaders were bribed by the Athenian allies to provoke the war, although the Athenian raids made as a response to this provocation had caused the Spartan farmers great pain (619-627). Then he describes what happened on the other side, in Athens, after the outbreak of the war. The rural population who had moved within the city's walls after Spartans' invasion in 431 was deceived by the self-centred politicians who wished the war to be continued (632-638). A specific politician, Cleon, threatened the richest among the allies, sometimes succeeding their conviction, sometimes annulling it by being bribed and thus growing rich. (639-648). Despite the differences, the general idea of the two accounts is the same: politicians of both sides betray their collective identity by acting in self-centred ways and thrive by manipulating the social identity of the people in their harangues. For a detailed analysis of Hermes' speech, see Cassio (1985) 79-95 and the comments of Olson (1998) and Sommerstein (1980) ad loc. MacDowell's detailed analysis (1995: 186-192) aims at demonstrating the validity of the account.

[165] Cf. Foley (1988) 46: "The discerning audience sees how Dikaiopolis uses tragic rhetoric to distract the chorus from his treachery and then goes on in later scenes to win their positive admiration for it. The outrageous extremes to which Dikaiopolis exploits his peace repeat more shockingly-in part because his success is so seductive-the abuses perpetrated in the Athenian assembly, where politicians in wartime 'buy and sell' (374) their audience with deceptive rhetoric, material success, and disguise. For the discerning audience, the comic injustice of the hero thus reinforces the justice of comedy-above all, Aristophanes' exposure throughout the play of the dangerous effects of high style (political and tragic) rhetoric on a gullible and volatile populace."

and leads to his self-exclusion. Therefore, it would be more accurate to separate the hero's motivation for wishing peace from his motivation for attaining a personal peace with Sparta: his negative social identity and self-conceptual uncertainty motivate Dicaeopolis' quest for peace, but it is his marginalisation in both his civic and rustic identity that leads to the private peace. In corroboration to this idea is that the comic hero begins his speech by emphasizing this marginalization:

μή μοι φθονήσητ', ἄνδρες οἱ θεώμενοι,
εἰ πτωχὸς ὢν ἔπειτ' ἐν Ἀθηναίοις λέγειν
μέλλω περὶ τῆς πόλεως, τρυγῳδίαν ποιῶν.
τὸ γὰρ δίκαιον οἶδε καὶ τρυγῳδία.
ἐγὼ δὲ λέξω δεινὰ μέν, δίκαια δέ,
οὐ γάρ με νῦν γε διαβαλεῖ Κλέων ὅτι
ξένων παρόντων τὴν πόλιν κακῶς λέγω.
αὐτοὶ γάρ ἐσμεν οὐπὶ Ληναίῳ τ' ἀγών,
κοὔπω ξένοι πάρεισιν· οὔτε γὰρ φόροι
ἥκουσιν οὔτ' ἐκ τῶν πόλεων οἱ ξύμμαχοι·
ἀλλ' ἐσμὲν αὐτοὶ νῦν γε περιεπτισμένοι·
{τοὺς γὰρ μετοίκους ἄχυρα τῶν ἀστῶν λέγω.}
ἐγὼ δὲ μισῶ μὲν Λακεδαιμονίους σφόδρα,
καὐτοῖς ὁ Ποσειδῶν, οὐπὶ Ταινάρῳ θεός,
σείσας ἅπασιν ἐμβάλοι τὰς οἰκίας·
κἀμοὶ γάρ ἐστιν ἀμπέλια κεκομμένα.
ἀτὰρ, φίλοι γὰρ οἱ παρόντες ἐν λόγῳ,
τί ταῦτα τοὺς Λάκωνας αἰτιώμεθα;
ἡμῶν γὰρ ἄνδρες, κοὐχὶ τὴν πόλιν λέγω,
μέμνησθε τοῦθ', ὅτι οὐχὶ τὴν πόλιν λέγω·
ἀλλ' ἀνδράρια μοχθηρά, παρακεκομμένα,
ἄτιμα καὶ πάρασημα καὶ παράξενα,
ἐσυκοφάντει Μεγαρέων τα χλανίσκια·

[...]

Don't be aggrieved with me, gentlemen spectators,
if, though a beggar, I am ready to address the Athenians
about the city while making comedy.
For even comedy knows about what's right;
and what I say will be shocking, but right.
this time Cleon will not accuse me
of defaming the city in the presence of foreigners;
for we are by ourselves; it's the Lenean competition,
and no foreigners are here yet; neither tribute
nor troops have arrived from the allied cities.
This time we are by ourselves, clean-hulled-
{for I count the resident foreigners as the bran of our populace.}
Myself, I hate the Spartans vehemently;
and may Poseidon, the god at Tainarum,
send them an earthquake and shake all their houses down on them;
for I too have had vines cut down.
And yet I ask -for only friends are present for this speech-
why do we blame the Spartans for this?
For it was men of ours -I do not say the city,
remember that, I do not say the city-
but some trouble-making excuses for men misminted,
worthless, brummagem, and foreign-made
who began denouncing the Megarians' little cloaks.
[...]
(497-519) [166]

The driving force of the speech is the equation of the hero, the poet and even the comic genre with Telephus which casts all of them as marginalized individuals with low political and social status. Telephus is ostensibly a beggar and a barbarian and is thus denied the right to speak; Dicaeopolis is marginalized both in his civic and rustic identity-he cannot even raise the topic of peace in the Assembly despite being a conscientious citizen and then the other rustics do not give him the chance to defend himself despite the fact that he is also a victim of the war (509-512); Aristophanes was cast as a public villain by Cleon who attempted to silence and

[166] For a reading of the speech which shows the influence of rhetoric, see Major (2013) 51-60.

marginalize him for telling the truth;[167] the comic genre is treated as of lower status compared to the tragic and its authority to tell what is right on public affairs is questioned. The topic of exclusion and marginalization pervades the parabasis as well, not only in reference to the poet, but also to the chorus: speaking as Athenian old men, the choreutai complain about how young men mistreat them in law-courts (685 f.), recalling their own remarks in the parodos on how their age makes them impotent and marginalizes them (209-218). [168] And of course, the exclusion theme is depicted vividly in the scenes following the parabasis when Dicaeopolis establishes the borders of his agora and excludes the Athenians from it, trading only with the enemies: Boetians, Megarians and all Peloponnesians.

3.1.2 After (self-) exclusion: adopting reintegrating or anti-social behaviour?

"Exile, exclusion of the citizen from the circle of the political actor, from the life of the city, is meant to be a hardship, a punishment. Dicaeopolis nevertheless craves the life of an exile, to be freed from all the choices the city makes. He longs for what others consider a punishment, but this is, after all, a comedy."[169]

As we have already seen, the first part of the play dramatizes Dicaeopolis' marginalization: both group and subgroup cast one of their most prototypical members as deviant, without giving him the opportunity to become a full member again through a resocialization process; social marginalisation forces the hero into an act of self-exclusion, to attain a private peace. Social psychology of exclusion and inclusion argues that in most cases ostracized members either adopt an ingratiating behaviour which enables their reinduction in the group or engage in anti-social behaviour which further distances them from the group.[170] What about Dicaeopolis'

[167] For Aristophanes' conflict with Cleon, see Olson (2002) xxix-xxxi with bibliography and for the identification of the hero with the poet, see n.160.
[168] For the parabasis and its connection to the play in general, see Hubbard (1991) 41-53, 58-59 and Bowie (1982).
[169] Saxonhouse (2014) 93.
[170] Williams and Govan (2005).

behaviour? With the exception of MacDowell, the comic hero's selfishness and anti-social behaviour is underlined by most scholars.[171] In turn, such behaviour clearly cannot be considered as intending to achieve the hero's ingratiation. Indeed, immediately after attaining his private peace, Dicaeopolis chooses to mark his psychological exit with the celebration of Rural Dionysia (241-279). It is very common for groups to mark role-transitions by ceremonies-rites which are symbolic, serve apprenticeship-causes and achieve loyalty-elicitation.[172] This ceremony, however, is organised by Dicaeopolis himself; he turns the Rural Dionysia, a festival which conventionally sustained the deme-ideology, into his personal exit ceremony which is meant to indicate that in his new rustic identity the comic hero is no longer the same man.[173] These personal rites of passage become indicative of his new selfish rustic behaviour; Dicaeopolis not only celebrates the Rural Dionysia alone, but does not share his peace with his ex-fellow rustics, not even with the poor Decretes (1018-1036).

This behaviour has striking similarities with the civic identity that had marginalised the comic hero in the first place, prompting Compton-Engle to argue that at the second part of the play Dicaeopolis becomes an urban persona: he trades in his own agora (albeit through a barter system) and serves his personal gain.[174] As such, his behaviour paradoxically seems to raise his inclusionary status instead of permanently distancing him from the group-the city: the priest of Dionysus invites him to the Choes-feast (1085-1094) and the chorus -who after the parabasis speaks mostly as a chorus of Athenians or as a comic chorus- declares him a triumphant victor (1226 f). Are we thus expected to infer that Dicaeopolis' behaviour in being simultaneously antisocial and ingratiating turns social psychological theories to their head?

[171] MacDowell (1983) 147 f,. Contra Dover (1972) 88, Bowie (1982) 38-40, Foley (1988) passim and Fisher (1993) 39-41. Carey (1993) 247 finds the hero's selfishness dramatically justified and argues that his behaviour should not be judged by the canons of real life. For a similar argument, see Olson (2002) xliv-xlv.
[172] Levine and Moreland (1985) 149, Hogg and Vaughan (2018) 299.
[173] Bowie (1993) 35-36.
[174] Compton-Engle (1997) 38-63.

Both Fisher and Bowie have argued that the peculiarities of the specific dramatized ritual context, the second day of the Anthesteria festival, the Choes, are meant to reflect the ambiguities of Dicaeopolis' behaviour by drawing affinities between the comic hero and the mythical Orestes.[175] But whereas for Bowie the ambiguities are not resolved and the play does not provide clear-cut answers, for Fisher the end of the play manifests Dicaeopolis' complete alienation from both his rustic and citizen identity. Building on Fisher's argumentation and through a comparison with the *Birds*, the following analysis argues that Dicaeopolis' anti-social behaviour in accordance with the propositions of the theory distances him psychologically from the city, the chorus and the audience and that the triumphant ending of the play must be evaluated within the dramatized ritual context of the Choes and must be treated as serving metatheatrical purposes.

Fisher argues that "our sense of Dicaeopolis' isolation is continued as we think of him at the Choes, eating and drinking at his table (and, maybe, still not sharing his hares and trushes, though this is not clear). We could perhaps go a bit further, and see Dicaeopolis as a marginal figure, a quasi foreigner, an isolated individual at the festival, as he has seemed separate and marginal throughout his private peace, market, and patronage. He appears, that is, as problematic an outsider as was Orestes in the *aition* of the ritual, someone with whom the city had relations of ambiguous *xenia*, not of integrated fellow citizenry."[176] Given that the Rural Dionysia had become Dicaeopolis' personal rites of passage, the Anthesteria festival can be treated as the ritualised rites of his limited resocialization, a civic ritual occasion during which Dicaeopolis can be accepted for a limited time back to the city. The Choes-setting enables the poet to present a triumphant Dicaeopolis enjoying his victory and causing the public envy, without questions regarding the political/social implications of his behaviour and the official polis' stance towards him (accepting him back and thus giving the impression that it praises his selfish conduct) being raised. At the same time, by treating the Anthesteria as a ceremony

[175] Bowie (1993) 35-38, Fisher (1993) 41-44.
[176] Fisher (1993) 43.

of limited resocialization and not as an exit ceremony which is normally expected to be humiliating or involving a kind of suffering for the leaving member, we are reminded that, in dramatic terms, Dicaeopolis' triumph is justified. Indeed, is Lamachus, the supporter of war, who suffers pain at the end of the play and not the comic hero. To put it in other words, by being placed in the Choes-context, Dicaeopolis' triumph becomes socially acceptable, even for limited time and on a specific occasion.

Additionally, Dicaeopolis' triumph at the Choes-setting acquires metatheatrical connotations and foreshadows the play's victory at the festival. The comic stage and the dramatic competition constitute the second civic ritual in which Dicaeopolis' behaviour can be accepted and treated as triumphant. Our assumption is that the chorus' celebration of his victory must be placed and interpreted within this context. Surely, the chorus is impressed by the hero's good fortune and the results of his private treaty (836-859, 971-976), feeling envy (1008-1011). Dicaeopolis' good fortune even prompts them to denounce the war and embrace reconciliation in an ode foreshadowing the personification of reconciliation by the poet as late as in *Lysistrata*:

ΚΟΡΥΦΑΙΟΣ

αὐτόματα πάντ' ἀγαθὰ τῷδέ γε πορίζεται.
οὐδέποτ' ἐγὼ Πόλεμον οἴκαδ' ὑποδέξομαι,
οὐδ' παρ' ἐμοί ποτε τὸν Ἁρμόδιον ᾄσεται
ξυγκατακλινείς, ὅτι παροινικὸς ἀνὴρ ἔφυ,
[...]

ΧΟΡΟΣ

ὦ Κύπριδι τῇ καλῇ καὶ Χάρισι ταῖς φίλαις ξύντροφε Διαλλαγή,

ΚΟΡΥΦΑΙΟΣ

ὡς καλὸν ἔχουσα τὸ πρόσωπον ἄρ' ἐλάνθανες.
πῶς ἂν ἐμὲ καὶ σέ τις Ἔρως ξυναγάγοι λαβών,
ὥσπερ ὁ γεγραμμένος, ἔχων στέφανον ἀνθέμων;
[...]

CHORUS LEADER
To this man all bounties are supplied spontaneously.
I will never welcome the War into my house,
nor will he ever recline at my side and sing the Harmodius' song,
for he is an unruly fellow when he drinks.
[...]
CHORUS
O Reconciliation, companion of Cypris the fair and the beloved Graces,
CHORUS LEADER
I didn't realize what a lovely face you have.
How I wish that some Eros, like the one in the painting
who wears a garland of rosettes, could bring you and me together!
[…]
(977-999)

At the same time, the chorus describes the comic hero as someone who thinks big thoughts (988), underlines his determination not to share his peace with anybody (1037-1039) and confess how the smell of the cooking tortures them (1037-1046).[177] The dismissal of Lamachus from the *Choes* feast reminds them of a similar deprivation/exclusion from a celebratory feast they had suffered in the past by Antimachus:[178]

Ἀντίμαχον τὸν Ψακάδος †τὸν ξυγγραφῆ† τὸν μελέων ποιητήν,

ὡς μὲν ἁπλῷ λόγῳ κακῶς ἐξολέσειεν ὁ Ζεύς·

ὅς γ' ἐμὲ τὸν τλήμονα Λήναια χορηγῶν ἀπέλυσ' ἄδειπνον.

ὃν ἔτ' ἐπίδοιμι τευθίδος

δεόμενον, ἡ δ' ὠπτημένη

σίζουσα, πάραλος ἐπὶ τραπέζῃ κειμένη

ὀκέλλοι· κᾆτα μέλ-

λοντος λαβεῖν αὐτοῦ κύων

ἁρπάσασα φεύγοι.

Antimachus son of Drizzler, the drafter of bills, the composer of bad songs:

[177] For a different interpretation of these lines, see MacDowell (1983) 158. See also McGlew (2002) 77-78 who argues that the chorus' comments are descriptive and not evaluative.
[178] For the interpretive issues raised by the ode which are inextricably associated with the chorus' point of view in these lines (Acharnians or comic chorus in general), see Olson (2002) ad loc.

to put it bluntly, may Zeus terribly eradicate him!
He's the one who, as producer at the Lenaea, unkindly
dismissed me without dinner.
May I yet see him hungry for squid,
and may it lie grilled and sizzling by the shore
and make port safely at his table;
and then, when he's about
to grab it, may a dog snap it up
and run away with it!
(1150-1161)

The ode sets the chorus closer to Lamachus since both are excluded from celebratory feasts.[179] At the end of the same ode the chorus also associates Dicaeopolis with the mugger nicknamed Orestes (1162-1168). The mugger Orestes was also mentioned by the chorus of birds (*Birds* 1490-1493) and in our analysis of that play we have treated this reference as indicative of the birds' realisation that Pisthetaerus had become a tyrant. Similarly, one is prompted to treat this reference as a disapproval of Dicaeopolis' behaviour by the chorus.

Apart from the reference to Orestes, there are more affinities between the end of *Acharnians* and *Birds*. As we have already seen, although the birds realise that Pisthetaerus has become a tyrant, they celebrate his wedding with Basileia. In their song they hail the comic hero as *καλλίνικος*: "Hip hip hooray! Hail Paeon!/Hail your success, you/highest of divinities" (1763-1765). The same expression is used by the chorus of Acharnians (1228, 1232). Whereas the military triumphant cry *τήνελλα καλλίνικος* fits the birds-soldiers who obey their tyrannical master, it sounds quite paradoxical when coming out of the mouth of the Acharnians for celebrating the victory of a man who has both distanced himself from the chorus and has renounced the war. In line with this, one does not fail to notice that in the case of the birds, the celebration is spontaneous, with no sign of diffidence: the messenger and the chorus leader (1718-1720, 1726-1730, 1745-1748, 1755-1758)

[179] Similarly, Bowie (1993) 35, Wilson (2007) 276. Contra Multon (1981) 18-24 who argues that Antimachus' misfortunes resemble those of Lamachus and that the ode in general emphasizes the connections between politics and drama which are constantly exploited in the play- "the bellicose general comes to a fate that is appropriate for the obnoxious choregos" (24).

exhort them to celebrate the wedding and Pisthetaerus' victory over Zeus and they dutifully do so (1720-1725, 1731-1743, 1749-1754), with enthusiasm and joy. Their choral song as a whole constitutes at the same time a wedding song, a hymn and a paean. Even if Pisthetaerus is a tyrant, his regime has made the birds the dominant social group in the world and thus his victory over Zeus has a social aspect; the birds' epinician performance keeps the victor within the society, even though this is a tyrannical society.[180] The chorus' celebration of Dicaeopolis' victory is not spontaneous: the comic hero himself orders the chorus to hail him as champion (1227) and to follow him, singing a victory hymn (1231). The chorus responds in a rather diffident way "Hail then -since you bid me, old sir- the Champion" (1228) and escort him singing "Yes, we'll follow, in your honor,/singing "Hail the Champion" for you and your wineskin" (1232-1234).[181]

For Wilson, the chorus' expression "hardly conceals the fact that there is an enormous gulf between them as celebrants and the subject of their song. This is of course in order, for the victor has by his achievements put himself beyond the circle of ordinary mortals. But the choral performance that follows a victory should also serve to integrate the victor back in his community, not isolate him forever in the transcendent and dangerous moment of his glory. Moreover, this chorus is made up of fellow demesmen who continue to suffer from the very predicament over which Dicaeopolis has triumphed. And the *τήνελλα καλλίνικος* ought surely arise rather more spontaneously than this. The charm of victory's beauty depends on such spontaneity-or at least on its appearance" (277). One is thus inclined to assert that the chorus celebrates Dicaeopolis' victory in the wine-contest and not his personal triumph and this allows the exodus song to retain its metatheatrical connotations; Dicaeopolis is a triumphant comic hero and his victory in the wine-contest anticipates the victory in the festival, but such a hero has only place in the

[180] Cf. Calame (2004) 181: "The final choral ode maintains the same indeterminacy in this respect as that which predominates in this concluding choral part as a whole as to the exact status of Peisetairos: having no content himself with the thunderbolt, in place of Zeus' scepter, Peisetairos embodies the paradoxical social identity of a citizen of democratic Athens who has become the tyrannical ruler of the utopian city of birds."
[181] Wilson (2007) 277-278.

theatre and not in the city.[182] We must not forget that it was the priest of Dionysus who had invited him in the contest. Under such a perspective, Wilson's suggestion that "Dicaepolis left the stage by entering the skene, his own house and side of celebrations with the *Basileus*, leaving the chorus, excluded, to depart in silence" (2007: 277-278) becomes more attractive and corroborates the social-psychological theories on exclusion. Both the chorus and the audience are set apart from the hero; the comic theatre and rituals like the *Choes* are the only occasions in which Dicaeopolis can be accepted back to the city as triumphant. But even in these cases, he remains a marginalised triumphant figure.

3.2 *Peace*: looking backwards and forward under a social-identity perspective

Peace is usually compared to the *Acharnians* since is the second surviving play of the poet which deals with the topic of peace.[183] At the same time, the play is comparable with the *Birds*, which was produced seven years later: in both plays the collective action taken, envisaged by the comic hero and implemented with the chorus' assistance, is partly directed against the divine authority of the Gods. Through comparisons with these two plays, our analysis of *Peace* aims at shedding light to the social identity processes which sustain the action of the play. Special emphasis is drawn to the strikingly fluctuating identity of the chorus which has monopolised scholarship's attention.[184] This chapter argues that the chorus' fluctuating identity matches Trygaeus' versatile identity: sometimes his behaviour is guided by panhellenic sentiments, sometimes he acts as a farmer and sometimes as an Athenian farmer in particular; as social psychologists would say, Trygaeus' social identity operates at different levels in the play. Still, at each of these levels Trygaeus is cast as the most prototypical of the identity in operation and is awarded

[182] Wilson (2007) 278 raises the possibility that such a disjunction points to the protagonist's personal victory-personalized prize in the festival which is distinct from that of the chorus and of the play. Wilson rejects the assumption of Sommerstein (1980, ad loc) that the text of the play does not save all the victory song because it was not composed by Aristophanes.

[183] For a comparison of Aristophanes' peace plays, see Newiger (1980).

[184] For the fluctuating identity of the chorus in *Peace*, see Sifakis (1971) 29-32 with references to older bibliography, Dover (1972) 137-139, Sommerstein (1985) xviii-xix and Hubbard (1991) 241-242.

the role of the leader. Nonetheless, the operation of social identity at different levels weakens the panhellenic argument of the play and hence Trygaeus' characterization as "the most Panhellenic of all Aristophanes' heroes".[185] At the same time, Trygaeus' prototypicality of the identity of Athenian farmer described in the scenes after the parabasis assigns an elevated status to him and an authoritative colouring to his behaviour, allowing us to discern the seeds out of which Pisthetaerus has emerged.

The interpretive riddle posed by the fluctuating identity of the chorus in *Peace* is believed to have become more nuanced after Sifakis' substantial treatment of the issue; his much-cited and influential conclusion is as follows: "In none of the comedies does the chorus have a consistent and unalterable dramatic character. The boundaries of its character are flexible and, from scene to scene, from moment to moment, can be enlarged, or become narrower, and so its point of view may change. What appears to be a special problem in *Peace* is due to the fact that the fluctuations of the character of the chorus start much earlier than the parabasis, during the most intensive involvement of the chorus in the action. This is unusual but still keeping with the rules with the chorus' function" (1971: 32). In my opinion, this conclusion does not provide a satisfactory or an adequate explanation for the chorus' identity; Sifakis conflates the term identity (dramatic identity, role) with the term perspective (point of view). Quite differently, instead of treating this fluctuation as conventional, McGlew has argued that it is distinctive and thus significant for understanding the meaning of the play; it urges the audience to reflect on the nature of political identity and peace.[186] Driven by the same assumption, we draw attention to Trygaeus' similarly fluctuating identity, which seems to have escaped scholarly attention.[187]

The play begins with a description of Trygaeus' behaviour by his slave:

[185] Hall (2006) 326.
[186] McGlew (2001) 75.
[187] Hall (2006) describes the different roles of Trygaeus within its role in the play and her analysis is similar to that of Fisher (1993) for Dicaeopolis in the *Acharnians*.

ὁ δεσπότης μου μαίνεται καινὸν τρόπον,

οὐχ ὅνπερ ὑμεῖς, ἀλλ' ἕτερον καινὸν πάνυ.

δι' ἡμέρας γὰρ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν βλέπων

ὠδὶ κεχηνὼς λοιδορεῖται τῷ Διὶ

καί φησιν, "ὦ Ζεῦ, τί ποτε βουλεύει ποιεῖν;

κατάθου τὸ κόρημα· μὴ 'κκόρει τὴν Ἑλλάδα."

My master's mad in a novel way;
not the way you all are, but another, quite novel way.
All day long he gazes at the sky,
with his mouth open like this, railing at Zeus.
"Zeus," he says, "what on earth do you plan to do?
Lay down your broom; don't sweep Greece away!"
(54-59)

And immediately Trygaeus himself appears arguing:

ὦ Ζεῦ, τί δρασείεις ποθ' ἡμῶν τὸν λεών;

λήσεις σεαυτὸν τὰς πόλεις ἐκκοκκίσας.

Zeus! What on earth are you trying to do to our people?
Before you know it you'll have pitted and pulped our cities!
(62-63)

The slave describes Trygaeus' behaviour as *mania*, reminding us of Philocleon's *nosos* in *Wasps* (*Wasps* 71), while Trygaeus himself appears on stage angry with Zeus and in despair. This behaviour is associated with the hero's panhellenic sentiments. Throughout the play, he repeats that he seeks peace for all the Greeks (93, 105-108, 406-413, 865-866, 987-998) and when he rides his beetle for flying to heaven, he addresses the audience which includes the allies -the play is performed at the City Dionysia-, asking them to pray for him who is performing these labours on their behalf (150-151). The hero is a bearer of a negative identity and this affects his personal life as we can judge from what he says to his daughters: "You may guess, girls, but if truth be told, you annoy me/whenever you ask me for bread and call me

dear daddy/when in our house there's nary a droplet of silver at all./ But if I return with success, you'll very soon be enjoying/a great big bun, topped off with a nice knuckle sandwich" (119-123). Like Dicaeopolis, he also experiences self-conceptual uncertainty and the identity-threats posited by the war strengthen his identification with his group. What is interesting, though, is that in these accounts of Trygaeus' motivations nothing is heard of Athenians or Spartans, only of Gods and Greeks; the Gods are held responsible for the civil war which threatens Greeks' superordinate integrity and valence. Thus, the strong identification with his group prompts Trygaeus to face the Gods; flying to the sky to meet Zeus and to protest is an act of social competition, although it does not entail any direct conflict with the Gods.

Trygaeus, however, is unable to find Zeus; as Hermes explains, the Gods have moved out because they were angry with the Greeks and now Greeks' luck is left at War's hands (175-226).[188] In this play the idea-pattern of *Birds* to challenge the divine authority is not fully developed, although it will reappear later, significantly less significant, when Hermes announces that Zeus has ordained death to anyone trying to liberate Peace. War is desperate to find pestles from Athens and Sparta to put in his mortar and when he departs for finding new (227-288), Trygaeus realises that this is his only chance to act and stop the war: the pestles have died, the Gods are not implicated in the war (at least, this is what he knows so far) and War himself is preoccupied with finding new pestles. In technical vocabulary, Trygaeus adopts collective action when he realises that the status-quo is insecure and he is efficient in achieving his goal. Full of joy, he calls the chorus to assist him:

νῦν, τοῦτ' ἐκεῖν'· ἥκει τὸ Δάτιδος μέλος,
ὃ δεφόμενός ποτ' ἦδε τῆς μεσημβρίας,
"ὡς ἥδομαι καὶ χαίρομαι κεὐφραίνομαι."

[188] For what War stands for, cf. Olson (1998) xxxix-xl: "The current reign of War and the disappearance of Peace are thus not so much the marks of a new and more brutal divine policy toward Greece as a symbol of the consequences of the purely human pig-headedness by means of which the Greeks have guaranteed their own destruction" (xl). In the *Acharnians* War is presented as an unwelcomed drunken companion (978-987).

νῦν ἐστιν ἡμῖν, ὦνδρες Ἕλληνες, καλὸν

ἀπαλλαγεῖσι πραγμάτων τε καὶ μαχῶν

ἐξελκύσαι τὴν πᾶσιν Εἰρήνην φίλην,

πρὶν ἕτερον αὖ δοίδυκα κωλῦσαί τινα.

ἀλλ', ὦ γεωργοὶ, κἄμποροι καὶ τέκτονες

καὶ δημιουργοὶ καὶ μέτοικοι καὶ ξένοι

καὶ νησιῶται, δεῦρ' ἴτ', ὦ πάντες λεώ,

ὡς τάχιστ' ἄμας λαβόντες καὶ μοχλοὺς καὶ σχοινία·

νῦν γὰρ ἡμῖν αὖ σπάσαι πάρεστιν ἀγαθοῦ δαίμονος.

That's that, now! Here comes the song of Datis,
which once upon a time he used to sing while masturbating of an afternoon:
"How happy, how pleasured, how bubbly I feel!"
Now is a good time, men of Greece,
to rid ourselves of troubles and battles
by excavating Peace, the friend of us all,
before some other pestle foils us again.
You farmers and merchants and carpenters
and craftsmen and immigrants and foreigners
and islanders, come here, all you people,
as quick as you can; bring shovels and crowbars and ropes;
now is our chance to hoist one for the Good Spirit.
(289-300)

The chorus comes immediately -even though Trygaeus is in heaven and had needed a giant beetle for getting there-, sharing his joy:

δεῦρο πᾶς χώρει προθύμως εὐθὺ τῆς σωτηρίας.

ὦ Πανέλληνες, βοηθήσωμεν, εἴπερ πώποτε,

τάξεων ἀπαλλαγέντες καὶ κακῶν φοινικίδων·

ἡμέρα γὰρ ἐξέλαμψεν ἥδε μισολάμαχος.

πρὸς τάδ' ἡμῖν, εἴ τι χρὴ δρᾶν, φράζε κἀρχιτεκτόνει·

Everyone come this way in high spirits, straight for salvation.
All you Greeks, let's lend a hand, now if ever before,
and rid ourselves of musters and fine red uniforms;

for this is the shining dawn of a Lamachus-loathing day!
So tell us what needs doing here, and be our foreman;
(301-305)

ἀλλ' ὅ τι μάλιστα χαρι-
ούμεθα ποιοῦντες, ἄγε,
φράζε· σὲ γὰρ αὐτοκράτορ'
εἵλετ' ἀγαθή τις ἡμῖν τύχη.

But whatever we can do
to please you, come,
tell us; for a stroke of good luck,
has chosen you as our commander.
(357-360)

They call themselves Panhellenes (302) and Trygaeus in a similar manner had called them Greeks of all the social classes and occupations (296-298). Unsurprisingly, immediately they declare Trygaeus as their leader with enthusiasm; in line with the propositions of social identity theory of leadership, Trygaeus is 'one of them' and 'is doing it for them'. The emotional state of both can be explained in terms of Intergroup Emotions Theory.[189] The core proposition of the IET is that social categorization (group membership) is associated with intergroup appraisal: when people identify with a social group, they appraise situations, events and social objects (the outgroup members included) in terms of the implications the latter have for the group. This means that there are cases in which the group suffers a negative impact but the self is unharmed, cases in which the group is benefitted but the self is not and cases in which the fellow ingroup members are attacked/restrained by outgroup members but the self is not; nonetheless, all these cases are psychologically important for the self and the appraisals conducted, either positive

[189] For IET, see Mackie et al. (2000), Mackie and Smith (2002), Mackie et al (2009).

or negative, accurate or inaccurate, lead to the experience of relevant intergroup emotions.[190]

The collective act, rescuing Peace, is about to begin when Hermes reappears, announcing that Zeus has ordained death penalty for liberating her (371-372). This is the only conflict we see in the play, certainly not as powerful as Dicaeopolis' conflict with the Acharnians or Pisthetaerus' conflict with the birds. Trygaeus must convince Hermes not to betray the whole plan to Zeus and does so in the same way that Dicaeopolis and Pisthetaerus convince their opponents: by building on and taking advantage of Hermes' social identity.[191] When they first met, Trygaeus had offered him meat in order to appease his initial hostility (192), but now more than bribery is needed. The chorus tries flattery, but it does not work and Trygaeus says:

ΤΡΥΓΑΙΟΣ

καί σοι φράσω τι πρᾶγμα δεινὸν καὶ μέγα,

ὃ τοῖς θεοῖς ἅπασιν ἐπιβουλεύεται.

ΕΡΜΗΣ

ἴθι δή, κάτειπ'· ἴσως γὰρ ἂν πείσαις ἐμέ.

ΤΡΥΓΑΙΟΣ

ἡ γὰρ Σελήνη χὠ πανοῦργος Ἥλιος

ὑμῖν ἐπιβουλεύοντε πολὺν ἤδη χρόνον

τοῖς βαρβάροισι προδίδοτον τὴν Ἑλλάδα.

ΕΡΜΗΣ

ἵνα δὴ τί τοῦτο δρᾶτον;

[190] IET treats emotions as social phenomena in contrast to a bulk of research which considers emotions as individual phenomena and rests on the social identity approach (both SIT and SCT), integrated with appraisal theories in general (not a specific one). Broadly speaking, appraisal theories derive from the theorizing on individual emotions and their general assumption is that differentiated appraisal of situations, events and social objects impels the subjective experience of emotions. The experience of intergroup emotions should not be treated as identical with intergroup empathy; intergroup empathy occurs when identifying with the emotions of members of other groups, whereas intergroup emotions occur when identifying with the members of the ingroup. In turn, intergroup emotions induce the impulse or the tendency to act (behavioural tendency); feeling angry, for example, prompts the group members to act against the source of their anger. The best example of IET in Aristophanes is provided in *Wasps.* See the chapter on leadership in this study.

[191] The same pattern is used in *Wealth* (112-217) by Chremylus for convincing the God Wealth to oppose Zeus.

ΤΡΥΓΑΙΟΣ

ὁτιὴ νὴ Δία

ἡμεῖς μὲν ὑμῖν θύομεν, τούτοισι δὲ

οἱ βάρβαροι θύουσι διὰ τοῦτ᾽ εἰκότως

βούλοιντ᾽ ἂν ἡμᾶς πάντας ἐξολωλέναι,

ἵνα τὰς τελετὰς λάβοιεν αὐτοὶ τῶν θεῶν.

ΕΡΜΗΣ

ταῦτ᾽ ἄρα πάλαι τῶν ἡμερῶν παρεκλέπτετην

καὶ τοῦ κύκλου παρέτρωγον ὑφ᾽ ἁμαρτωλίας.

ΤΡΥΓΑΙΟΣ

ναὶ μὰ Δία. πρὸς ταῦτ᾽, ὦ φίλ᾽ Ἑρμῆ, ξύλλαβε

ἡμῖν προθύμως τήνδε τε ξυνέλκυσον.

καὶ σοὶ τὰ μεγάλ᾽ ἡμεῖς Παναθήναι᾽ ἄξομεν

πάσας τε τὰς ἄλλας τελετὰς τὰς τῶν θεῶν,

μυστήρι᾽ Ἑρμῆ, Διπολίει᾽, Ἀδώνια·

ἅλλαι τέ σοι πόλεις πεπαυμέναι κακῶν

ἀλεξικάκῳ θύσουσιν Ἑρμῇ πανταχοῦ.

χἄτερ᾽ ἔτι πόλλ᾽ ἕξεις ἀγαθά. πρῶτον δέ σοι

δῶρον δίδωμι τήνδ᾽, ἵνα σπένδειν ἔχῃς.

ΕΡΜΗΣ

οἴμ,᾽ ὡς ἐλεήμων εἶμ᾽ ἀεὶ τῶν χρυσίδων.

TRYGAEUS

And I am going to tell you something terribly important,
something that's being plotted against all the gods.

HERMES

By all means, speak up; perhaps you'll convince me.

TRYGAEUS

Well, the moon and that nefarious Sun
have been plotting against you for some time now
and mean to betray Greece to the barbarians.

HERMES

What do they hope to accomplish by that?

TRYGAEUS

Simple: we sacrifice to you and the barbarians
sacrifice to them; so naturally
they'd want us all annihilated,
so they could take over the rites of the gods themselves.
HERMES
So that's why they've long been clipping days
and taking bites out of the year: pure chicanery.
TRYGAEUS
Absolutely. And so, my dear Hermes, lend us
an eager hand, and help us pull her out,
and in your honor we'll celebrate the Great Panathenaea
and all the other rites of the gods-
the Mysteries, the Dipoleia, the Adonia, all for Hermes;
and when the other cities are rid of their troubles,
they'll sacrifice to you everywhere as Hermes Averter of Trouble.
And you'll get other benefits too; to begin with,
I'm giving you this as a gift, to use for libations.
HERMES
Uh oh, I've always had such a soft spot for gold plate!
(403-425)

The beginning of Trygaeus' argumentation is similar to Pisthetaerus': *μὰ Δί' ἀλλὰ λέγειν ζητῶ τι πάλαι μέγα καὶ λαρινὸν ἔπος τι, /ὅ τι τὴν τούτων θραύσει ψυχήν* (*Birds* 465-466). As a God, Hermes is afraid of being overthrown and opts for more festivals on his honour and more sacrifices.[192] This is what Trygaeus promises him and the God is finally won over and even agrees to help: together with Trygaeus they perform the libation and supervise the rescue (431-458).

In the pulling scene, however, we see that the superordinate panhellenic identity is not salient for all the chorus' members, most of whom act in their group identity (Boeotians, Argives, Megarians, Athenians) or even personal identity (Lamachus) by pulling at the opposite direction and thus hindering the whole operation (464-507). Hermes dismisses them and finally only the farmers manage to pull Peace out of the cave (508-516). Paradoxically, one does not fail to notice that Peace's rescue is presented in military terms and McGlew has argued that Trygaeus

[192] Sommerstein (1985) ad loc: "Trygaeus rightly assumes that Hermes will have no compunction about betraying his fellow-gods for gain."

acts as an autocratic architect and commander.[193] But more importantly, Trygaeus panhellenic sentiments fade. While he complaints about the Boeotians (464-466), similar complaints are raised against him by the chorus leader:

ΚΟΡΥΦΑΙΟΣ

ἄγε νυν ξυνανέλκετε καὶ σφώ.

ΤΡΥΓΑΙΟΣ

οὔκουν ἕλκω κἀξαρτῶμαι

κἀπεμπίπτω καὶ σπουδάζω;

ΚΟΡΥΦΑΙΟΣ

πῶς οὖν οὐ χωρεῖ τοὔργον;

CHORUS LEADER
Come on you two, help us pull!
TRYGAEUS
Aren't I pulling then, and hanging on,
and falling to, and doing my best?
CHORUS LEADER
Then why is our work going nowhere?
(469-472)

It must also be noted that Trygaeus does not reinforce the superordinate panhellenic identity of the chorus (as we will see Lysistrata doing in the negotiations between Athenians and Spartans by referring to old mutual benefactions and their common participation in festivals) or encourages the chorus to continue. Only when the farmers are left, he encourages them by saying "He says the job's moving along! Now everyone put your heart into it" (510). Liberating Peace is the farmers' accomplishment and is beneficiary only for them, not for men of other occupations like the crest maker, the hoe maker and the spear maker (545-549). Indeed, the chorus' praise of the goddess Peace alludes exclusively to their rustic identity:

χαῖρε, χαῖρ', ὡς ἦλθες ἀσμένοις ἡμῖν, φιλτάτη·

[193] McGlew (2001) passim interprets the chorus' inability to perform the common task as indicative of the two basic features of social chaos: the failure of collective identity and the rejection of leadership.

σῷ γὰρ ἐδάμην πόθῳ,

δαιμόνια βουλόμενος

εἰς ἀγρὸν ἀνερπύσαι.

< >

ἦσθα γὰρ μέγιστον ἡμῖν κέρδος, ὦ ποθουμένη,

πᾶσιν ὁπόσοι γεωρ-

γὸν βίον ἐτρίβομεν·

καὶ γὰρ μόνη ὠφέλεις.

πολλὰ γὰρ ἐπάσχομεν

πρίν ποτ' ἐπὶ σοῦ γλυκέα

κἀδάπανα καὶ φίλα.

τοῖς ἀγροίκοισιν γὰρ ἦσθα χῖδρα καὶ σωτηρία.

ὥστε σὲ τά τ' ἀμπέλια

καὶ τὰ νέα συκίδια

τἄλλα θ' ὁπόσ' ἐστὶ φυτὰ

προσγελάσεται λαβόντ' ἄσμενα.

Welcome, welcome! We're so happy, most beloved, that you've come home to us.
I'm overcome with longing for you
in my amazing desire
to head back to the country.
< >
For you were the greatest boon, desired one,
for all of us who led
life on the land,
for you alone would help us.
Yes, our benefits were many
in your day long ago -sweet
freely given, and precious-
for you were the country folk's chowder and shelter.
And so the vines
and the young fig trees
and all the other plants together
will receive you with joyful smiles.
(582-600)

Again, Trygaeus is the most prototypical of the rustic identity and naturally acts as the leader:

ἀκούετε λεώ· τοὺς γεωργοὺς ἀπιέναι.
τὰ γεωργικὰ σκεύη λαβόντας εἰς ἀγρὸν
ὡς τάχιστ' ἄνευ δορατίου καὶ ξίφους κἀκοντίου·
ὡς ἅπαντ' ἤδη 'στὶ μεστὰ τἀνθάδ' εἰρήνης σαπρᾶς.
ἀλλὰ πᾶς χώρει πρὸς ἔργον εἰς ἀγρὸν παιωνίσας.

Attention people: the farmers may take their farm tools
and go home to the country
as soon as they like, without spear, sword, and javelin,
since our whole world now brims with late-vintage peace.
Now everyone raise the paeon, and be off to your work in the fields!
(551-555)

νῦν μὲν οὖν ὦνδρες, προσευξώμεσθα πρῶτον τῇ θεῷ,
ἥπερ ἡμῶν τοὺς λόφους ἀφεῖλε καὶ τὰς Γοργόνας·
εἶθ' ὅπως λιταργιούμεν οἴκαδ' εἰς τὰ χωρία,
ἐμπολήσαντές τι χρηστὸν εἰς ἀγρὸν ταρίχιον.

Now then, gentlemen, let's address our first prayers to the goddess
who has rid us of crests and Gorgon blazons;
then let's dash off home to our lands,
after we've bought a bit of good salt fish for the farm.
(560-563)

The idea that peace is not beneficiary for all will become more obvious in the second part of the play (1197-1264). Meanwhile, Trygaeus is given Cornucopia as his wife and Holiday for giving her to the Council (706-719). When she is delivered to the Council, Trygaeus and his slave perform a sacrifice to the goddess Peace. It is notable that now the comic hero is acting in his social identity as an Athenian farmer, not just any farmer: he states emphatically that he had saved his fellow-demesmen and the agricultural population by putting a stop to Hyperbolus (918-921) and he is in turn praised by the chorus for saving their holy city (1036). The

chorus now consists of Athenian farmers who sing about the blessings of the country-life and peace (second parabasis, 1127-1190).[194] In fact, allusions to the Athenian identity can be identified much earlier in the play: when the chorus sings happily after Trygaeus' call, their remarks point to an Athenian identity despite their panhellenic character (349-357). Even Trygaeus' name which alludes to his identity as an Athenian farmer is heard for the first time in the play when he meets Hermes (190-191). In line with this, the peace attained is exclusively in Trygaeus' and Athenian farmers' interest; following Dicaeopolis and Pisthetaerus' example, Trygaeus excludes Hierocles, the oracle collector calling him an *alazôn* (1045-1126), and the dealers-craftsmen of armour (1210-1264). Only the sickle maker and the potter (1197-1206) are welcomed to his wedding with Cornucopia.

Peace finishes with the celebration of the hero's wedding: Trygaeus marries Cornucopia like Pisthetaerus marries Basileia. One can discern a line of development compared to the *Acharnians*; from the two girls who accompany Dicaeopolis at the end of the play to the institution of marriage in the other two plays, which can be taken as indicative of the polis' approval of Trygaeus' and Pisthetaerus' acts. But at the same time, the weddings ensure the personal power of the comic heroes, allowing us to discern a parallel line of development, more politicized: first, there is Dicaeopolis, an individual Athenian who has acted in Saxonhouse's words "as if he were a tyrant like the Persian king but without the masses subject to his choices and decisions, as if (contrary not only to Aristotle) the boundaries around an individual and his family could be sufficient to create a polis. Individuals who are not tyrants do not make their own treaties with other cities. Individuals are not the actors in relations between cities."[195] Then comes Trygaeus who acts in his collective identity, although this identity is sometimes more inclusive than other times. He is surely "not the mouthpiece of a far-sighted minority lamenting the continuation of an apparently unending war, but a man who

[194] For an analysis, see Moulton (1981) 95-101.
[195] Saxonhouse (2014) 93.

performs on a level of comic fantasy a task to which the Athenian people had already addressed itself on the mundane level of negotiation".[196] He shares the benefits of the peace with the fellow farmers, but his behaviour assigns to the second part of the play a latent authoritative, if dramatically justified, tone; Trygaeus holds an eminent position among the Athenian farmers and he is the one who marries Cornucopia. His boastfully comments in exchanges with the chorus are indicative:

ΧΟΡΟΣ

εὐδαιμονικῶς γ' ὁ πρε-

σβύτης, ὅσα γ' ὦδ' ἰδεῖν,

τὰ νῦν τάδε πράττει.

ΤΡΥΓΑΙΟΣ

τί δήτ', ἐπειδὰν νυμφίον μ' ὁρᾶτε λαμπρὸν ὄντα;

ΧΟΡΟΣ

ζηλωτὸς ἔσει, γέρων,

αὖθις νέος ὢν πάλιν,

μύρῳ κατάλειπτος.

ΤΡΥΓΑΙΟΣ

οἶμαι. τί δῆθ', ὅταν ξυνὼν τῶν τιτθίων ἔχωμαι;

ΚΟΡΥΦΑΙΟΣ

εὐδαιμονέστερος φανεῖ τῶν Καρκίνου στροβίλων.

ΤΡΥΓΑΙΟΣ

οὔκουν δικαίως; ὅστις εἷς ὄχημα κανθάρου 'πιβὰς

ἔσωσα τοὺς Ἕλληνας, ὥστ' ἐν τοῖς ἀγροῖσιν αὐτοὺς

ἅπαντας ὄντας ἀσφαλῶς κινεῖν τε καὶ καθεύδειν.

CHORUS

Lucky indeed,
to judge from what I see,
is the old man's situation now.

TRYGAEUS

[196] Dover (1972) 137.

Just wait till you see me as a splendid bridegroom!
CHORUS
You'll be enviable, a codger
become a young man once again,
anointed with scent.
TRYGAEUS
I imagine so. Just wait till we're together and I've got those tits in my hands!
CHORUS LEADER
You'll seem luckier than Carcinus' whirligigs!
TRYGAEUS
And rightly, no? For I alone rode on beetle-back
and saved the Greeks, who now can all live safely,
in the countryside, screwing and snoozing.
(856-867)

ΧΟΡΟΣ
ἦ χρηστὸς ἀνὴρ πολί-
ταις ἐστὶν ἅπασιν ὅσ-
τις γ' ἐστὶ τοιοῦτος.
ΤΡΥΓΑΙΟΣ
ὅταν τρυγᾶτ', εἴσεσθε πολλῷ μᾶλλον οἷός εἰμι.
ΧΟΡΟΣ
καὶ νῦν σύ γε δῆλος εἶ·
σωτὴρ γὰρ ἅπασιν ἀν-
θρώποις γεγενήσαι.
ΤΡΥΓΑΙΟΣ
φήσεις <γ'>, ἐπειδὰν ἐκπίῃς οἴνου νέου λεπαστήν.
ΚΟΡΥΦΑΙΟΣ
καὶ πλήν γε τῶν θεῶν ἀεί σ' ἡγησόμεσθα πρῶτον.

CHORUS
Yes, a man
like this one is good
for all the citizenry.
TRYGAEUS
When you gather in your vintage, you'll realize much better what a man I am.
CHORUS
Even now we plainly see,
for you've become a savior
for all mankind.
TRYGAEUS
That's why you'll say when you drink off a cup of new wine!
CHORUS LEADER
Yes, and that, next to the gods, we'll always consider you the best.

(909-917)

The chorus praises Trygaeus and recognises his higher status; its comments allude to the chorus' comments in the *Acharnians* (836-859, 971-76, 1008-11), but mostly reminds us of the chorus of birds who happily celebrates Pisthetaerus wedding to Basileia, despite the fact that Pisthetaerus' regime had replaced divine tyranny over them. Albeit the festive tone of second part of *Peace* does not allow explicit associations, Trygaeus could have provided the model for Pisthetaerus. Not in the sense that the heroes' authoritative behaviour stemmed from their personality, but in the sense that in both cases contextual factors and the heroes' prototypicality enabled such behaviour. From a social psychological perspective, Trygaeus represents the danger of how prototypical leaders, by acquiring more status and by being treated as charismatic, at the end become differentiated from the members of the group. "The one of us" is no longer one of us and this lays the ground for Pisthetaerus, the saviour of the birds who at the end becomes their tyrant. [197]

In conclusion, leaving *Birds* out of the equation and focusing on *Acharnians* and *Peace,* it is impossible not to note how differently peace is presented in them. In the *Acharnians,* peace is presented in economical terms and is achieved and enjoyed by an individual, whereas in *Peace* it is presented in sensory, especially sexual terms and is achieved by an individual acting on his collective, sometimes narrower sometimes larger, identity. Similarities do exist; in both plays peace is personified and the rural element predominates, although Jones has argued that the picture of the agriculturist's reality drawn by these two plays does not correspond to reality and it is a rather selective, simplified and idealized version of the hardships of the farmers' lives.[198] At the same time, neither play emphasizes that true peace is more

[197] Cf. Hogg (2001) 196: "For example, social attraction and prototypical attribution processes may transform a prototypical leader into a high status role occupant who has a charismatic leadership personality. A structural differentiation is created within the group that severs the emphatic bond between leader(s) and followers and instantiates a form of intergroup relations. This transforms influence into power and provides a social structural framework that makes very real the opportunity to abuse power."
[198] Jones (2004) 276.

than a treaty and as such it has strong psychological aspects, cognitive and emotional prerequisites for its achievement. These will be explored in *Lysistrata,* a play which is not actually about peace, but reconciliation. When reconciliation is achieved in *Lysistrata,* it is still defined in sexual terms, but the emphasis throughout the play is on the psychological element and on the panhellenic sentiment already seen from *Peace*. Although the panhellenic sentiment of the first part of *Peace* gradually fades, bids are still found in the second part: the bridegroom Trygaeus speaks as an Athenian farmer with an eye for all Greece (1318-1328).

What is more interesting is the continuity in the poet's conception of peace: when Trygaeus makes a libation to the Goddess Peace, the anticipated peace foreshadows the psychological conciliatory elements of peace in *Lysistrata* and evokes the rustic terms in which peace as presented in the first part of the *Acharnians:*

λῦσον δὲ μάχας καὶ κορκορυγάς,
ἵνα Λυσιμάχην σε καλῶμεν·
παῦσον δ' ἡμῶν τὰς ὑπονοίας
τὰς περικόμψους,
αἷς στωμυλλόμεθ' εἰς ἀλλήλους·
μεῖξον δ' ἡμᾶς τοὺς Ἕλληνας
πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς
φιλίας χυλῷ, καὶ συγγνώμη
τινὶ πρᾳοτέρᾳ κέρασον τὸν νοῦν·
καὶ τὴν ἀγορὰν ἡμῖν ἀγαθῶν
ἐμπλησθῆναι, 'κ Μεγάρων σκορόδων,
σικύων πρώων, μήλων, ῥοιῶν,
δούλοισι χλανισκιδίων μικρῶν·
κἀκ Βοιωτῶν γε φέροντας ἰδεῖν
χῆνας, νήττας, φάττας, τροχίλους·
καὶ Κωπάδων ἐλθεῖν σπυρίδας,

καὶ περὶ ταύτας ἡμᾶς ἁθρόους

ὀψωνοῦντας

[...]

Release us from battles and tumults,
so we may call you Lysimache.
Rid us of those suspicions,
oh so savvy,
that make claptrap of our parleys;
and blend us Greeks,
starting afresh,
with the juice of friendship, and imbue
our thinking with a more obliging fellowship.
Have our market fill up
with bounties: from Megara garlic,
early cucumbers, apples, pomegranates,
little wool jackets for our slaves;
and from Boeotia men seen bearing
geese, ducks, pigeons, wrens,
and Copaic eels coming by the basketful;
and amid this may all of us together
go shopping,
[…]
(991-1007)

4 *Lysistrata*: the multifaceted social identity of women and the social identity perspective on reconciliation

"Most notably, social identity theory is not a theory of prejudice. It certainly is not a theory of murderous bigotry. It is, at root, a theory of group freedom. It tells of the way that oppressed groups can find ways to challenge groups that have the power to ascribe identities and stereotypes. The most original parts of the theory describe how groups can re-create stereotypes that are applied to them: they can find new dimensions of comparison, alter the valuation of existing traits, collectively oppose powerful out-groups, etc." [199]

4.1 Nothing to do with feminism

4.1.1 The multifaceted social identity of women

Our discussion begins with one of the two commonest interpretations of the play, the feminist;[200] although it reflects modern views on the play which contradict the historical context of its original performance, the feminist interpretation still offers valuable insights on which our own reading rests. "Is Aristophanes the enlightened, progressive thinker who anticipates emancipation and the women's rights movement by more than two millennia? Surely not. One crucial thing to realise is that putting a woman into a position of political authority, control and power in a comedy is an important part of the humour. It is funny, straightforwardly ridiculous, because it blatantly (and fantastically) defies the reality of the world of the audience."[201] Indeed, nowadays no classicist would disagree with Revermann regarding the interpretation of *Lysistrata*; this is not a feminist play, although at the beginning of the 20th century it had been interpreted and staged as such. Of course, gender relations do lie at the heart of the plot and are masterly manipulated by Aristophanes. One feels tempted to examine whether *Lysistrata*'s resistance to feminism has a social psychological foothold as well.

[199] Billig (2002) 179.
[200] For *Lysistrata*'s reception as a feminist play, see Mitchell (2016) and Robson (2016). For how the modern feminist readings/productions contradict the historical performance of 411, see Revermann (2010), especially 72-75.
[201] Revermann (2010) 72-73.

Within the context of social identity theory, a feminist reading of the play would urge us to treat women as the low-status group who experiences a negative social identity by comparing itself to men and thus in pursuit of a positive identity adopts collective action for social change. The play, however, does not fit well with such an interpretation; the women seek just a temporary overturn of the status-quo with no intention of pursuing a positive social identity in doing so. The truth is that social identity theory itself has not fitted well with gender relations and feminism in general; although 'gender' divides people in two contrasting social categories which stand in power and status relations to one another,[202] it is only potentially included in the main fields of investigation for social identity theorists. This is not to say that there have not been attempts to explain women's behaviour in terms of social identity theory; for example, Williams and Giles were the first who applied the basic tenets of the theory to gender relations.[203] However, their model became object of criticism mainly for its assumptions over women's consciousness and group identifications, that is, for treating womanhood as a fixed and unified social category and thus for drawing a monolithic social identity for them.[204] Interestingly, Aristophanes' play advocates the same arguments raised against explaining women's behaviour in terms of social identity theory. In the social world of the play like in the real world, womanhood has many faces: the young women, the older women of the chorus and Lysistrata herself represent different aspects of this multifaceted identity.[205] A detailed picture of each aspect can be drawn after examining women's motives for adopting collective action; their general motive is to put an end to the ongoing war, but for each of the three this motive is inextricably associated with specific traits of their social identity. What is interesting is that these

[202] See, for example, Hogg and Abrams (1988) 13: "'Social categories' refers to the division of people on the basis of nationality (British-French), race (Arab/Jew), class (worker/capitalist), occupation (doctor/welder), sex (man/woman), religion (Muslim/Hindu), and so forth […]."

[203] Williams and Giles (1978). Their model was suggested in response to the rise of the Women's Liberation Movement.

[204] See, for example, Breakwell (1979), Condor (1986) and most of the chapters in Skevington and Baker (1989).

[205] Cf. Henderson (1987a) 105: "First, scholars often discuss women as if they were a monolithic group, while poets and dramatists portrayed them according to a social and domestic hierarchy in which age was an important factor."

aspects are presented in stereotypical terms and are in perfect contradistinction with the three different types of men presented in the play, the young men, the old men of the chorus and the Proboulos, and thus the confrontations between men and women also shed light on women's multifaceted identity.

Let us begin with the young women. For gearing them up, Lysistrata manipulates a basic trait of their social identity, their love for sex:[206]

ΛΥΣΙΣΤΡΑΤΗ

τοὺς πατέρας οὐ ποθεῖτε τοὺς τῶν παιδίων

ἐπὶ στρατιᾶς ἀπόντας; εὖ γὰρ οἶδ' ὅτι

πάσαισιν ὑμῖν ἐστιν ἀποδημῶν ἀνήρ.

ΚΑΛΟΝΙΚΗ

ὁ γοῦν ἐμὸς ἀνὴρ πέντε μῆνας, ὦ τάλαν,

ἄπεστιν ἐπὶ Θρᾴκης φυλάττων Εὐκράτη.

ΜΥΡΡΙΝΗ

ὁ δ' ἐμὸς γε τελέους ἑπτὰ μῆνας ἐν Πύλῳ.

ΛΑΜΠΙΤΩ

ὁ δ' ἐμός γα, καἴ κ' ἐκ τᾶς ταγᾶς ἔλση ποκά,

πορπακισάμενος φροῦδος ἀμπτάμενος ἔβα.

ΚΑΛΟΝΙΚΗ

ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μοιχοῦ καταλέλειπται φεψάλυξ.

ἐξ οὗ γὰρ ἡμᾶς προὔδοσαν Μιλήσιοι,

οὐκ εἶδον οὐδ' ὄλισβον ὀκτωδάκτυλον,

ὃς ἦν ἂν ἡμῖν σκυτίνη 'πικουρία.

ΛΥΣΙΣΤΡΑΤΗ

ἐθέλοιτ' ἂν οὖν, εἰ μηχανὴν εὕροιμ' ἐγώ,

μετ' ἐμοῦ καταλῦσαι τὸν πόλεμον;

ΚΑΛΟΝΙΚΗ

[206] This picture of women's licentiousness is so vivid that some scholars were prompted to identify striking similarities between them and Athenian *hetairai*. See Stroup (2004) and Faraone (2006) 210-211. Contra McGlure (2015). For other female stereotypes which are seen in action in the prologue of the play such as laziness, craftiness, lasciviousness, love for dresses and posturing, see Taaffe (1993) 54-56.

νὴ τὼ θεώ·

ἐγὼ μὲν ἄν, κἂν εἴ με χρείη τοὔγκυκλον

τουτὶ καταθεῖσαν ἐκπιεῖν αὐθημερόν.

ΜΥΡΡΙΝΗ

ἐγὼ δε γ' ἄν κἂν ὥσπερεὶ ψῆτταν δοκῶ

δοῦναι ἂν ἐμαυτῆς παρατεμούσα θἤμισυ.

ΛΑΜΠΙΤΩ

ἐγὼν δὲ καί κα ποττὸ Ταΰγετόν γ' ἄνω

ἔλσοιμ' ὅπα μέλλοιμί γ' εἰράναν ἰδῆν.

LYSISTRATA
Don't you all pine for your children's father
when they're off at war? I'm sure that
every one of you has a husband away from home.
CALONICE
My husband's been away five months, my dear,
at the Thracian front; he's guarding Eucrates.
MYRRHINE
And mine's been at Pylos seven whole months.
LAMPITO
And mine, whenever he does come home from the regiment,
is soon strapping on his shield and flying off again.
CALONICE
Even lovers have vanished without a trace.
Ever since the Milesians revolted from us,
I haven't seen a six-inch dildo
which might have been a consolation, however small.
LYSISTRATA
Well, if I could devise a plan to end the war,
would you be ready to join me?
CALONICE
By the Two Goddesses,
I would, even if I had to pawn this dress and,
on the very same day, drink up the proceeds!
MYRRHINE
As for me, I'd even cut myself in two like a flounder
And donate half to the cause!
LAMPITO
And I would climb to the summit of Taygetus,

if I could catch sight of peace from there.
(99-118)

However, it is the same love for sex that prompts women to reject the plan from the very start:

ΛΥΣΙΣΤΡΑΤΗ

ἀφεκτέα τοίνυν ἐστὶν ἡμῖν τοῦ πέους.

τί μοι μεταστρέφεσθε; ποῖ βαδίζετε;

αὖται, τί μοιμυᾶτε κἀνανεύετε;

τί χρὼς τέτραπται; τί δάκρυον κατείβεται;

ποιήσετ᾽ ἢ οὐ ποιήσετ᾽; ἢ τί μέλλετε;

ΚΑΛΟΝΙΚΗ

οὐκ ἂν ποιήσαιμ᾽, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ πόλεμος ἑρπέτω.

ΜΥΡΡΙΝΗ

μὰ Δί᾽ οὐδ᾽ ἔγὼ γάρ, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ πόλεμος ἑρπέτω.

ΛΥΣΙΣΤΡΑΤΗ

ταυτὶ σὺ λέγεις, ὦ ψῆττα; καὶ μὴν ἄρτι γε

ἔφησθα σαυτῆς κἂν παρατεμειν θἄμισυ.

ΚΑΛΟΝΙΚΗ

ἄλλ᾽ ἄλλ ὅ τι βούλει. κἄν με χρῇ, διὰ τοῦ πυρὸς

ἐθέλω βαδίζειν τοῦτο μᾶλλον τοῦ πέους·

οὐδὲν γὰρ οἷον, ὦ φίλη Λυσιστράτη.

LYSISTRATA
All right. We're going to have to give up-the prick.
Why are you turning away from me? Where are you going?
Why are you all pursuing your lips and shaking your heads?
What means your altered color and tearful droppings?
Will you do it or not? What are you waiting for?
CALONICE
Count me out; let the war drag on.
MYRRHINE
Me too, by Zeus; let the war drag on.
LYSISTRATA

This from you, Ms. Flounder? Weren't you saying
just a moment ago that you'd cut yourself in half?
CALONICE
Anything else you want, anything at all! I'm ever ready to
walk through fire; rather that than the prick.
There's nothing like it, my dear Lysistrata.
(124-135)

At the end, women are persuaded only when Lysistrata reassures them that men will soon give in (165-166).

However, the effect of the sex-strike on men does not become evident so soon and this affects women who attempt to desert (706-780). The crisis in the citadel sketches a clearer picture of their identity, their unreliability and treacherousness in particular, and this picture is enhanced by the erotic encounter of Myrrhine with her husband Cinesias (829). Cinesias appears on stage desperate, longing for his wife; both his first name and deme name (Paionidae) allow puns with *βινεῖν*, like Myrrhine's name alludes to the metaphorical use of myrtle as female genitalia.[207] The sex-strike has made him and the other men, Athenian and Spartan alike (1076-1099), to lose control over their body which was considered an important aspect of men's self-identity in classical Athens.[208] The loss of self-control will eventually result in the withdrawal of their body from the service of the state for a destructive cause; men will no longer be warriors. Thus, in Cinesias' erotic encounter with Myrrhine we see a reversal: it is the male body who needs to be subject to control by a female mind.[209] The beginning and the end of their encounter is indicative of the reversed situation:

ΚΙΝΗΣΙΑΣ

ὡς οὐδεμίαν ἔχω γε τῷ βίῳ χάριν,

[207] Cf. Henderson (1987b) 174. For the possibility that Myrrhine stands for the priestess of *Athêna Nikê*, see Henderson (1987b) xl-xli.
[208] For men's self-control and/as service to the city see Winkler (1990) 45-70, Hunter (1994) 96-153 and Fox (1998). For women's social control, see Cohen (1991) 133-170.
[209] Cf. Taaffe (1993) 52: "The husbands' appearance displays a dramatically exaggerated masculinity just as these men are stepping into the fictional and symbolic roles of women, as creatures physically representative of home-bound fertility, needful of and overtly preoccupied with sex, willing to relinquish control of public policy, and eager to return to the confines of home and marriage."

ἐξ οὗπερ αὕτη 'ξῆλθεν ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας·

ἀλλ' ἄχθομαι μὲν εἰσιών, ἔρημα δὲ

εἶναι δοκεῖ μοι πάντα, τοῖς δὲ σιτίοις

χάριν οὐδεμίαν οἶδ' ἐσθίων. ἐστυκα γάρ.

ΜΥΡΡΙΝΗ

φιλῶ φιλῶ 'γὼ τοῦτον· ἀλλ'οὐ βούλεται

ὑπ' ἐμοῦ φιλεῖσθαι. σὺ δε με τούτῳ μὴ κάλει.

ΚΙΝΗΣΙΑΣ

ὦ γλυκύτατον Μυρρινίδιον, τί ταῦτα δρᾷς;

κατάβηθι δεῦρο.

ΜΥΡΡΙΝΗ

μὰ Δί', ἐγὼ μὲν αὐτόσ' οὔ.

ΚΙΝΗΣΙΑΣ

ἐμοῦ καλοῦντος οὐ καταβήσει Μυρρίνη;

ΜΥΡΡΙΝΗ

οὐ γὰρ δεόμενος οὐδὲν ἐκκαλεῖς ἐμέ.

ΚΙΝΗΣΙΑΣ

ἐγὼ οὐ δεόμενος; ἐπιτετριμμένος μὲν οὖν.

ΜΥΡΡΙΝΗ

ἄπειμι.

[...]

ΚΙΝΗΣΙΑΣ

ἀλλ' ᾠζυρά, κατάκεισο καὶ μή μοι φέρε

μηδέν.

ΜΥΡΡΙΝΗ

ποιήσω ταῦτα νὴ τὴν Ἄρτεμιν.

ὑπολύομαι γοῦν. ἀλλ' ὅπως, ὦ φίλτατε,

σπονδὰς ποιεῖσθαι ψηφιεῖ.

ΚΙΝΗΣΙΑΣ

βουλεύσομαι.

ἀπολώλεκέν με κἀπιτέτριφεν ἡ γυνὴ

τά τ' ἄλλα πάντα κἀποδείρασ' οἴχεται.

οἴμοι τί πάθω; τίνα βινήσω,

τῆς καλλίστης πασῶν ψευσθείς;

πῶς ταυτηνὶ παιδοτροφήσω;

ποῦ Κυναλώπηξ;

μίσθωσόν μοι τὴν τίτθην.

CINESIAS
I've had no joy or pleasure in my life
since the day she left my home.
I go into the house and feel agony; everything
looks empty to me; I get no pleasure
from the food I eat. Because I'm horny!
Myrrhine appears on the ramparts.
MYRRHINE
I love that man, I love him! But he doesn't want
my love. Please do not make me go out to him.
CINESIAS
Myrrhinikins, dearest, why are you doing this?
Come down here!
MYRRHINE
I'm positively not going down there!
CINESIAS
You won't come down when I ask you, Myrrhine?
MYRRHINE
You're asking me, but you don't really want me.
CINESIAS
Me not want you? Why, I'm in agony without you!
MYRRHINE
Goodbye.
[...]
CINESIAS
Now lie down, you witch, and don't bring me
anything more.
MYRRHINE
That's what I'll do, so help me Artemis;
I'm just getting my shoes off. But remember, darling,
you are going to vote for peace.
Myrrhine dashes into the Acropolis.

CINESIAS
I'll give it serious consideration. (finding Myrrhine gone)
The woman's destroyed me, annihilated me!
Not only that she's pumped me up and dropped me flat!
Ah, what shall I do? Who shall I screw,
cheated of the loveliest of them all!
How will I raise and rear this orphaned cock?
Is Fox Dog out there anywhere?
Lease me a nursemaid!
(865-958)

Whereas the poet exploits the negative, obviously funny, social stereotypes for the young wives, at the same time he undermines them by juxtaposing the positive, obviously less funny, and less popular stereotypes of the older women. In line with this, the young women carry out the 'lighter' part of the double plot, the sex-strike, and the older women of the chorus the 'serious' part, the occupation of the Acropolis.[210] When defending the occupation to the semi-chorus of old-men, the old women argue that their actions and advice offered are motivated by the need to repay the city for what it had offered them so long:

ΧΟΡΟΣ ΓΥΝΑΙΚΩΝ
ἡμεῖς γάρ, ὦ πάντες ἀστοί, λόγων
κατάρχομεν τῇ πόλει χρησίμων·
εἰκότως, ἐπεὶ χλιδῶσαν ἀγλαῶς ἔθρεψέ με·
ἑπτὰ μὲν ἔτη γεγῶσ' εὐθὺς ἠρρηφόρουν·
εἶτ' ἀλετρὶς ἦ δεκέτις οὖσα τἀρχηγέτι,
καὶ χέουσα τὸν κροκωτὸν ἄρκτος ἦ Βραυρωνίοις·
κἀκανηφόρουν ποτ' οὖσα παῖς καλὴ ᾽χουσ'
ἰσχάδων ὁρμαθόν.

WOMEN'S CHORUS
Citizens of Athens, we begin
by offering the city valuable advice,
and fittingly, for she raised me in splendid luxury.

[210] I do not imply, however, that we should draw a stark distinction between the 'lighter' and the 'more serious' part of the women's plan. See the discussion following.

As soon as I turned seven I was an Arrhephoros;
then was I was ten I was a Grinder for the Foundress;
and shedding my saffron robe I was a Bear at the Brauronia;
and once, when I was a fair girl, I carried the Basket,
wearing a necklace of dried figs.
(638-647)

Old women refer to their main roles in the city as ritual performers; they participate to the city's cults since their girlhood serving as arrhephoroi, as grinders of sacred cakes, as bears at Brauron and as kanêphoroi.[211] Their important religious tasks allow them to claim Athenian citizenship and grant them equal status with men. Equally important contribution to the city is the birth of their sons:

ἆρα προὐφείλω τι χρηστὸν τῇ πόλει παραινέσαι;
εἰ δ' ἐγὼ γυνὴ πέφυκα, τούτο μὴ φθονεῖτέ μοι,
ἢν ἀμείνω γ' εἰσενέγκω τῶν παρόντων πραγμάτων.
τοὐράνου γάρ μοι μέτεστι· καὶ γὰρ ἄνδρας εἰσφέρω.

Thus I owe to the polis to offer some good advice.
And even if I was born a woman, don't behold it against me
if I manage to suggest something better than what we've got now.
I have a stake in our community: my contribution is men.
(648-651)

Henderson argues that the old-women provide an example of "the maternal ideal", that is, the idealized perception of motherhood and must be seen as protectresses of the threatened tradition.[212] Generally, in the play the older women are exempt from all the stereotyped negative and satirical features of their age, except from bellicosity.[213]

But even their bellicose nature seems a natural response to the attack of the old-men, who also act in accordance with their stereotyped identity. They are

[211] For old women's symbolic return to a premarital state through these rituals, see Loraux (1993) 162-166 and Bierl (2012) 267-269.
[212] Henderson (1987a) 108-117. For the portrayal of older women as protectresses and continuators of tradition see also Shaw (1975) and the response of Foley (1982). For the heroic aspect of their representation, see Faraone (1997).
[213] A full account of the satirical features of older women in Old Comedy in general can be found in Henderson (1987a).

Marathon-fighters and haters of the Persians (285, 318f), angry and bellicose (662ff), loyal supporters of the current leaders and of the continuation of the war like the Acharnians. They see everywhere conspiracies for establishing tyranny (616-635), they complain about their age which makes them impotent (286ff) and are fond of jury services (380). The best symbol for their identity is the fire which they carry,[214] whereas the water becomes the symbol of women's social identity.[215] The initial confrontation of the two semi-choruses constitutes the first battle in the war of sexes in the play, at the end of which the old women disarm the old men and are thus able to argue for their contributions to the city:

Χο^{γε}. τί δ', ὦ θεοῖς ἐχθρά, σὺ δεῦρο ὕδωρ ἔχουσ' ἀφίκου;

Χο^{γυ}. τί δ' αὖ σὺ πῦρ, ὦ τύμβ', ἔχων; ὡς σαυτὸν ἐμπυρεύσων;

Χο^{γε}. ἐγὼ μὲν ἵνα νήσας πυρὰν τὰς σὰς φίλας ὑφάψω.

Χο^{γυ}. ἐγὼ δε γ', ἵνα τὴν σὴν πυρὰν τούτῳ κατασβέσαιμι.

Χο^{γε}. τοὐμὸν σὺ πῦρ κατασβέσεις;

Χο^{γυ}. τοὔργον τάχ' αὐτὸ δείξει.

Χο^{γε}. οὐκ οἶδά σ'εἰ τῆδε ὡς ἔχω τῇ λαμπάδι σταθεύσω.

Χο^{γυ}. εἰ ῥύμμα τυγχάνεις ἔχων, λουτρόν γέ σοι παρέξω.

Χο^{γε}. ἐμοὶ σὺ λουτρόν, ὦ σαπρά;

Χο^{γυ}. καὶ ταῦτα νυφικόν γε.

Χο^{γε}. ἤκουσας αὐτῆς τοῦ θράσους;

Χο^{γυ}. ἐλευθέρα γάρ εἰμι.

Χο^{γε}. σχήσω σ'ἐγὼ τῆς νῦν βοῆς.

Χο^{γυ}. ἀλλ' οὐκέτι ἠλιάζει.

Χο^{γε}. ἔμπρησον αὐτῆς τὰς κόμας.

Χο^{γυ}. σὸν ἔργον ὦχελῶε.

Χο^{γε}. οἴμοι τάλας.

[214] For the fire-bearing chorus, see Martin (1987).

[215] For a sexual-ritual reading of the scene in reference to fire and water, see Bierl (2012) 265-267.

Χο^{γν}. *μῶν θερμὸν ἦν;*

Χο^{γε}. *ποῖ θερμόν; οὐ παύσει; τί δρᾷς;*

Χο^{γν}. *ἄρδω σ' ὅπως ἂν βλαστάνῃς.*

Χο^{γε}. *ἀλλ' αὖός εἰμ' ἤδη τρέμων.*

Χο^{γν}. *οὐκοῦν, ἐπειδὴ πῦρ ἔχεις, σὺ χλιανεῖς σεαυτόν.*

MEN'S LEADER:
Why are you here with water, you witch?
WOMEN'S LEADER:
And why are you here with fire, you tomb? To burn yourself up?
MEN'S LEADER:
Me, I' me here to build a pyre and burn up your friends.
WOMEN'S LEADER:
And I've come to put it out with this.
MEN'S LEADER:
You put out my fire?
WOMEN'S LEADER:
That's what you soon will see.
MEN'S LEADER:
I think I might barbecue you on the spot with this torch of mine.
WOMEN'S LEADER:
Got any soap with you? I'll give you a bath.
MEN'S LEADER:
You give me a bath, you rotten crone?
WOMEN'S LEADER:
A bath fit for a bridegroom!
MEN'S LEADER:
Listen to her insolence!
WOMEN'S LEADER:
I'll have you know I'm a free woman!
MEN'S LEADER:
I'll put a stop to your bellowing.
WOMEN'S LEADER:
You're not on a jury now, you know.
MEN'S LEADER:
Torch her hair!
WOMEN'S LEADER:
(doushing them) *Achelous, you're on!*
MEN'S LEADER:
Wooh! Damn!

WOMEN'S LEADER:
I hope it wasn't too hot?
MEN'S LEADER:
Hot? Stop it! What do you think you're doing?
WOMEN'S LEADER:
I'm watering you, so you'll bloom again.
MEN'S LEADER:
But I'm already dried out from shivering!
WOMEN'S LEADER:
You've got the fire there; why not sit by it and get warm?
(371-386)

The third female type that we see in the play is Lysistrata. Hall has aptly demonstrated that she is modelled on a number of female mythological and historical figures who share extraordinary features and perform extraordinary activities: she resembles Alcmene in being a sex-strike initiator, the Amazons and the Lemnian women –especially their queen Hypsipyle- in taking over the state, the wise Melanippe in defending women and even the Karian queen Artemisia in being a brave fighter. But most of all, there are strong parallels between her and Lysimache, the priestess of Athena Polias.[216] Generally, Lysistrata stands for all those women, whom classical scholarship has tended to characterize 'masculine', treating them as intruders into the world of men.[217] Her presentation is in contradistinction with Proboulos' depiction which is stereotypical and recalls the depiction of antiheroes like Lamachus and Cleon by the poet: he represents the leaders who promote the continuation of the war, albeit we never hear that he does so for serving his personal gain. In the *agôn* the Proboulos questions the women's right to have an opinion on politics and to take actions with political implications (501) and this gives Lysistrata the opportunity to explain women's plan and its underlying motives:

ἡμεῖς τὸν μὲν πρότερόν σιγῇ χρόνον ἐξηνειχόμεθ' <ὑμῶν>

[216] Hall (2010) 29-36. For Lysistrata's identification with Lysimache, the priestess of *Athêna Polias*, see the discussion of Revermann (2006) 236-243. Faraone (2006) argues that Lysistrata also has an alternate role as a courtesan and madam in the play.
[217] For the pattern of 'intrusive female', see Shaw (1975).

ὑπὸ σωφροσύνης τῆς ἡμετέρας τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἅττ' ἐποιεῖτε·
οὐ γὰρ γρύζειν εἰᾶθ' ἡμᾶς. καίτοὐκ ἠρέσκετέ γ' ἡμᾶς.
ἀλλ' ἠσθανόμεσθα καλῶς ὑμῶν, καὶ πολλάκις ἔνδον ἄν οὖσαι
ἠκούσαμεν ἄν τι κακῶς ὑμᾶς βουλευσαμένους μέγα πρᾶγμα·
εἶτ' ἀλγοῦσαι τἄνδοθεν ὑμᾶς ἐπανηρόμεθ' ἄν γελάσασαι,
"τί βεβούλευται περὶ τῶν σπονδῶν ἐν τῇ στήλῃ παραγράψαι
ἐν τῷ δήμῳ τήμερον ὑμῖν;" "τί δὲ σοὶ ταῦτ;" ἦ δ' ὅς ἄν ἀνήρ.
"οὐ σιγήσει;" κἀγὼ 'σίγων.

[…]

πῶς ὀρθῶς, ὦ κακόδαιμον,
εἰ μηδὲ κακῶς βουλευομένοις ἐξῆν ὑμῖν ὑποθέσθαι;
ὅτε δὴ δ' ὑμῶν ἐν ταῖσιν ὁδοῖς φανερῶς ἠκούομεν ἤδη·
"οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνὴρ ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ." – "μὰ Δί', οὐ δῆτ' <ἔσθ'>" ἕτερός τις, -
μετὰ ταῦθ' ἡμῖν εὐθὺς ἔδοξεν σῶσαι τὴν Ἑλλάδα κοινῇ
ταῖσι γυναιξὶν συλλεχθείσαις. ποῖ γὰρ καὶ χρῆν ἀναμεῖναι;
ἢν οὖν ἡμῶν χρηστὰ λεγουσῶν ἐθελήσητ' ἀντακροᾶσθαι
κἀντισιωπᾶν ὥσπερ χἠμεῖς, ἐπανορθώσαιμεν ἂν ὑμᾶς.

Before now, and for quite some time, we maintained our decorum
and suffered < in silence > whatever you men did,
because you wouldn't let us make a sound. But you weren't exactly
all we could ask for.
No, we knew only too well what you were up to, and many a time we'd
hear in our homes about a bad decision you'd made on some great issue
of state.
Then, masking the pain in our hearts, we'd put on a smile and ask you,
"How did the Assembly go today? Any decision about a rider
To the peace treaty?" And my husband would say, "What's that to you?
Shut up!" And I'd shut up.

[…]

How could he be right, you sorry fool,
when we were forbidden to offer advice even when your policy was wrong?
But then, when we began to hear you in the streets openly crying,
"There isn't a man left in the land," and someone else saying, "God knows,

there isn't, not a one,"
after that we women decided to lose no more time, and band together
to save Greece. What was the point of waiting any longer?
So, if you're ready to listen in your turn as we give you good advice,
and to shut up as we had to, we can put you back on the right track.
(507-528)

Lysistrata's argumentation stresses the domestic sphere and this is intelligible given the general domestic orientation of her plan.[218] She argues that women had waited for long in vain for any success, even though they did not agree with men's actions. In some cases they asked their husbands politely over the Assembly decisions but were rebuked and forced to remain silent; in case they became more critical, they were threatened with beating by their husbands. Women lost patience and decided to act collectively to save Greece when they've heard men saying that "there isn't a single man left in the country." Her arguments, similar but not identical to that of the older women, reveal a growing anxiety and uncertainty over the prevailing situation and have nothing to do with the sex-governed motivations for peace heard before. In fact, Lysistrata's initiative to save Greece is motivated by the need to reduce the feelings of anxiety and uncertainty and thus her behaviour can be explicable in terms of uncertainty-identity theory. The theory argues that the need to reduce self-uncertainty constitutes in fact a stronger motive for social identity processes than maintaining a positive social identity.[219]

Lysistrata's victory over Proboulos is absolute; not only he is not able to raise a counter-argument, but he is also humiliated: he is first dressed up as a woman, wearing a veil and holding a basket with wool (531-535) and later as a corpse (599-607). In all three confrontations, women are victorious: old women and Lysistrata are in fact proven superior than men, whereas the young women manage to replace war in exercising power on men's body. The Acropolis setting reconciles all these

[218] Lysistrata's arguments allude to Andromache's argumentation in the *Iliad* 6 and this allows to see Lysistrata as married, who appeals to her husband (like Andromache to Hector). However, I believe that her arguments stem from the general domestic orientation of her plan and the fact that she is speaking in the name of all women, albeit she is certainly not prototypical. Therefore, I do not believe that she must be treated as a housewife nor her speech as unsuited to her status.
[219] For a comprehensive description of the theory, see the chapter on *Ecclesiazusae*.

aspects of womanhood; indeed, most scholars have noticed that women form a joint front against the male semi-chorus in the Acropolis for the biggest part of the play.[220] Letting aside the main staging/performative reasons for such a choice, the merging also serves the revision of women's social identity and the promotion of a more positive picture of them through the association to the older women; the latter's positive traits neutralize and win over the negative traits of the young women, while exempting Lysistrata from a destructive intrusion into the political sphere so commonly attempted by her tragic counterparts (and undermining her implicit alternate role as a madam who runs a brothel if we accept Faraone's argument). Womanhood equally stands for the solidarity, the cooperative spirit and the affection which characterize mainly the sphere of the older women, or the *oikos* as Foley would put it, and at the same time the ritual service in cults grants to this promoted aspect of womanhood status and authority.

It is important to note that Lysistrata cannot be seen as a prototypical leader in the play: on one hand, the differences between her and young wives are striking,[221] on the other no clear signs of her age or marital status are given and this distances her from the older women. Her distance from the chorus becomes bolder if we take into account her rather agentic traits which do not allude to affection or warmth and of course her higher status, provided that we accept her identification with the priestess of Athena Polias and even with the goddess Athena herself. Additionally, one can even argue that Lysistrata potentially confirms men's stereotypical fear of women with masculine behaviour and thus she cannot be treated as prototypical of all women; this would undermine the basic argument of

[220] For the Acropolis setting, see Vaio (1973), Henderson (1980) 186, Loraux (1993) and Revermann (2006) 246-253, especially 250-251: "The most important and interesting use of scenic space, however, lies elsewhere. It is the domestication and, above all, sexualization of public space, and the ways in which the two are intertwined. Whereas the religious and political overtones of the Acropolis setting draw on characteristics specific to this particular space (a metonymic use of the Acropolis, so to speak), domestication and sexualization work metaphorically, transferring connotations to the Acropolis which are humorously incongruous and inappropriate: the Acropolis as household, and the beleaguered Acropolis as a metaphor of the sex battle and the battle of the sexes. In these functions, as household and as female body, the Acropolis setting becomes the conceptual centre of the play, not just as regards dramatic technique and deployment of theatrical resources but, most of all, humour".

[221] See Taaffe (1993) 52, 61-62.

the play. Generally, Lysistrata is better seen as a charismatic-transformational leader who is motivating, inspiring, shows commitment to the group, works for collective goals which transcend self-interest and has a vision for the group.[222]

4.1.2 The social identity of women revisited: from gender to reconciliation

"This is a man's world, this is a man's world / But it wouldn't be nothing, nothing without a woman or a girl."

James Brown, 1966

Aristophanes' play provides empirical backing for the revised concept of women's social identity developed by Williams and further elaborated by Skevington. Williams, six years after the theoretical statement of the 'social identity of women' model with Giles, tried to transplant the findings of the so called 'individualistic' social psychology, namely that women value relationships more than men, into the field of intergroup relations, the main field of inquiry of the so called 'social' social psychology. For the integration of the two, she drew upon social identity theory again: she argued that men's intergroup behaviour is consistent with the theory since they define their identity by the processes of differentiation, comparison and competition. On the contrary, women display affiliation and attachment to others and as a group are given meaning through sustaining relationships with other groups and performing activities of service and care. In addition, at the in-group level women can acquire a positive identity due to a communal (common) identity that they share with other in-group members, and not by employing other strategies such as social competition. Using Bakan's terminology, Williams labelled men's style of identification *agentic* social identity and women's *communal* social identity.[223] Communality and agency are until today

[222] For transformational and charismatic leadership, see Burns (1978) and Bass (1985).
[223] See Williams (1984).

considered amongst the basic gender stereotypes and are not only inextricably connected to status, but are in fact status-confirming.[224]

Skevington empirically tested William's developed thesis by comparing women (majority) and men (minority) nurses and noticed that both sexes expressed both styles of identification, however the female orientation of nursing as an occupation determined the predominance of communality over agency.[225] In her own words "{t}he data therefore indicate a more complex pattern than the one originally theorized by Williams, as both sexes expressed identifications which are agentic *and* communal, and the sex-role of the occupation they choose seems to influence whether agency or communality predominates within the group. As a consequence of these findings, groups where women are in a *majority* (as distinct from all-women groups) will be referred to as women-orientated groups (similarly male-orientated groups are those in which there is a majority of men) because the majority appear to have an important influence in determining which style of social identity predominates in the group. In the case of women-orientated group this would be a communal social identity."[226]

Within this framework, it should not be treated as a coincidence that in *Lysistrata* reconciliation between the sexes begins from women and it is achieved after their sweeping victory in all the fields of action: the victory of the female semi-chorus over the male semi-chorus, of Lysistrata over Proboulos and of Myrrhine

[224] Cf. Williams (1984) 315: "From this position, it can be argued that the association between masculinity and agency is one of the fundamental ways in which the power and status of men in society is perpetuated. It is an agentic style of identity construction which is most appropriate for the 'superior' partner in this intergroup relationship. There exist many socially approved ways in which men are both expected to and able to define themselves as different from and better than women. Communality represents a less attractive option because, when women are deemed inferior, there are problems in deriving value and self-esteem from interdependence with them. By the same token the association between communality and femininity can be seen as perpetuating women's 'inferiority'." Breakwell (1990) has argued that Williams' distinction is by itself gender biased and promotes sexism. Although such a criticism can be applied to *Lysistrata*, it is nonetheless consistent with the play's historical and social background: Aristophanes is a man who writes mainly for men in a sexist society and shows no intention of crediting the distinction between agency and communality with any status-overturning expectations.

[225] See Skevington and Dawkes (1988).

[226] Skevington (1989) 49-50. It must be noted that Skevington's elaborated account gives a prominent place to positive emotions since a communal social identity creates an affectively positive intergroup context. There have been studies which suggest that it is status that determines the communal or agentic behaviour of the group; therefore, they argue that low status groups generally behave in more emotional ways, whereas high status groups in more assertive. See Conway et al. (1996).

over Cinesias. Metaphorically speaking, women's victories result in the establishment of a 'feminine world', what Skevington would call "women-orientated" world and in such a world men are also expected to embrace a communal social identity which prescribes sustaining relationships with other groups.[227] This is indeed the kind of world that Aristophanic reconciliation presupposes. Put in another way, the establishment of a "women-orientated world" over a "male-orientated world" has the same effect with removing ideological conflict-supporting beliefs which work as socio-psychological barriers to reconciliation. And as we are about to see, at the same time the other aspect of women's revised social identity, the status-granting ritual service, enables reconciliation between men and women through the embracement of the superordinate identity of ritual performer. Similarly, the reconciliation of Athenians and Spartans will be achieved through the embracement of a superordinate identity.

4.2 Not peace, but reconciliation

4.2.1 Reconciliation in social psychology

Throughout our analysis so far we have used the term reconciliation, although Classical scholarship labels *Lysistrata* a peace play and the second commonest modern interpretation of the play is the pacifist.[228] This is not a random choice but it is consistent with Aristophanes' reluctance to discuss the negotiations and mutual concessions to be made between Athens and Sparta in realistic terms. Still, the play does not simply display the festive atmosphere to be established after the end of the war in clearly comic terms, that is, by portraying the prevalence of sex (the naked Reconciliation), food (the banquet) and song (the songs of Spartans and Athenians); it also defines the cognitive and emotional prerequisites on which the establishment

[227] Cf. Henderson (1987a) 113: "Unlike the male sphere, the women's world was private and cooperative, with little stimulus to change or motivation for conflict. Indeed, conflict in the women's sphere was at all costs to be avoided."

[228] For *Lysistrata*'s reception as a peace and even a pacifist play, see Hardwick (2010). For how the modern pacifist readings/productions contradict the historical performance of 411, see Revermann (2010) 75-76.

of such a festive atmosphere rests and in this way alleviates peace from its realist political apparatus.[229]

Reconciliation is a relatively new term in the social sciences in general and in social psychology in particular and there seems to be no agreement on its exact content, not even in the single domain of social psychology. By arguing that in our analysis the term denotes peacemaking exempted from any political assumption we set ourselves at the centre of the recently evolving "psychological" approach on the study of conflict. Therefore, we adopt Nadler, Malloy and Fisher's definition of reconciliation as cited in the introduction of their volume *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Reconciliation*: "a *process* that leads to a *stable end* to conflict and is predicated on *changes in the nature of adversarial relations* between the adversaries and *each of the parties' conflict-related needs, emotions, and cognitions*".[230] Nadler distinguishes between two different types of conflict-related emotions which prevent the achievement of reconciliation and need to be removed, the feeling of distrust and the negative feeling emanating from threats to worthy identity. The process of removing the former feeling is called "instrumental reconciliation" and the process of removing the latter "socioemotional" reconciliation.[231]

The importance of cooperation between conflicting groups as advocated by the process of instrumental reconciliation has long ago been acknowledged in social psychology. Allport's Contact Hypothesis, the classic hypothesis for prejudice

[229] Cf. Newiger (1980): "This comedy, as opposed to the earlier peace plays, thus acquires a deeper human dimension. It seems to me that, to the extent to which its Utopian conception distances it from the political reality of a conceivable peace, the play acquires a more human reality. That must be the reason why of all Aristophanes' plays this one moves us the most today, even (and especially) if we free ourselves from the false notion that the play is pacifistic." 233 essays in interpretation

[230] Nadler, Maloy and Fisher (2008) 19.

[231] In Nadler and Shnabel's own words: "[s]ince trust between the adversaries is said to result from repeated acts of cooperation to achieve common *instrumental* goals (e.g., cleaner environment, better health), we have labeled this route to ending intergroup conflict as *instrumental reconciliation.* Because we focus on the restoration of a sense of worthy identity by overcoming the *emotional* barriers of victimhood and guilt through an *interaction* that involves an admission of past wrongdoings and subsequent forgiveness we have labeled this route to ending conflict as *Socioemotional Reconciliation*" (2008: 41). See also Nadler (2002). The distinction between instrumental and socioemotional reconciliation is similar to Kelman's distinction between conflict resolution and reconciliation. In fact, Kelman (22) proposes a distinction between *three* processes of peacemaking, namely conflict settlement, conflict resolution and reconciliation. In short, he argues "[...] that it may be useful to conceive of conflict settlement as operating primarily at the level of interests, conflict resolution at the level of relationships, and reconciliation at the level of identity."

reduction and the improvement of intergroup relations, argues that contact between groups reduces bias when attempted under four conditions: the members of the different groups have equal status, common goals, interact within a cooperative context and their interaction is supported by institutional authorities.[232] Along the years, a fifth condition was added to these, namely that the contact between members of different groups must be on a regular basis, must have duration and must be substantial in order to provide opportunities for personal acquaintance and development of close relationships between the members of the groups.[233] The Contact Hypothesis has received substantial empirical support and has been extremely stimulating;[234] however, the original theory as well as the subsequent research remained silent about the social psychological processes which underlie the changes achieved in attitudes and behaviour through contact. Similarly unclear were how these changes will be generalized in order to refer to the whole out-group, beyond the specific contact situation and the members of the outgroup who are present. Therefore, in the 80's three theoretical models were suggested for addressing these considerations and the three of them draw upon the social identity theory; together they constitute the revised Contact Hypothesis.

Brewer and Miller suggested the decategorization or personalization model.[235] According to it, contact must be attempted in such a way as to influence the cognitive representations of group membership by eliding intergroup boundaries and thus urging group members, both of the ingroup and outgroup, to perceive each other as individuals. In this case, bias is reduced because categorization weakens, category stereotypes are undermined, and the positive effects of personalization can be generalized by being applied to members who are not present during the contact.[236] In quite a different way, Samuel Gaertner and John Dovidio have suggested that contact must be attempted in such ways so to influence

[232] See Allport (1954).
[233] Pettigrew (1998).
[234] For a meta-analysis, see Pettigrew and Tropp (2004).
[235] Brewer and Miller (1984).
[236] For a brief summary and critical assessment of the model, see Brown and Hewstone (2005) 261-264.

the cognitive representation of group membership by urging the members of a group to redefine group boundaries and to develop a common ingroup identity.[237] This process is called recategorization and it can take two forms: either the formation of one superordinate group and thus the development of a common identity for its members or the formation of two subgroups in the group and the development of a dual identity for its members.[238] In both cases, bias and hostile attitude against outgroup members become more positive, always in accordance with the premises of SIT (in group favouritism and bias), and reconciliation is achieved. The Common Ingroup Identity model has been supported by several experimental studies.[239] It should be noted that, despite their differences, recategorization and decategorization are not mutually exclusive processes and can work simultaneously and complementary to each other.

Yet, a critique raised against both recategorization and decategorization model is that they leave the generalization issue unsolved. Instead, Hewstone and Brown have suggested another model which argues that, paradoxically categorization (this means maintaining separate group identities) reduces bias , in settings where Allport' conditions for contact are valid.[240] Initially the model was called Mutual Intergroup Differentiation Model because one of his two central ideas holds that when contact is attempted, the superiorities and inferiorities of both groups must be mutually acknowledged by their members. In its subsequent modifications, though, this idea was no longer emphasized;[241] instead, the other central idea of the model became dominant, namely that contact must be intergroup: individuals interact as group members or as representatives of their groups. Thus, the model was labelled Intergroup Contact Theory. When first suggested in 1986 the model was not tested, but in the following twenty years it has been extensively tested.

[237] Gaertner et al. (1989).
[238] The second proposition was suggested after acknowledging the difficulties of relinquishing group identity in favour of a superordinate identity. See Gaertner et al. (1993).
[239] For a review, see Dovidio and Gaertner (2000).
[240] Hewstone and Brown (1986).
[241] The model was subsequently modified in 1996 (Hewstone: 1996) and in 1997 (Vivian, Hewstone and Brown: 1997).

After reviewing the evidence-empirical research instigated by the model, its founders proposed a refined version of it in 2005 which has tackled with its initial shortcomings.

Let us briefly discuss the outcome of the studies/tests -experimental, laboratory, correlational- which have led to its refinement.[242] On one hand, these studies/tests focused on the moderation level of contact, that means they examined the conditions under which contact reduces prejudice and for whom this happens. They have shown that contact diminishes prejudice when group salience is high and when the contact person is seen as typical of the outgroup. On the other hand, most of the studies/tests focused on the mediational level of contact, that means they examined the processes which lead to the contact effects. These studies have shown that intergroup contact is also mediated by affective mediators, not solely cognitive (e.g. knowledge, stereotype change), and that the former are in fact more important and offer more secure predictions of the intergroup behaviour than the latter. The affective mediators are of two classes, the positive predictors of prejudice which are reduced by optimal contact and the negative predictors of prejudice which are increased by optimal contact. One positive predictor of prejudice reduced by contact is intergroup anxiety, the negative feeling which is caused by uncertainty and is experienced by members of a group when they are expecting to meet or indeed meet (especially for the first time) with members of other groups. Intergroup anxiety is also reduced in cases of indirect or extended contact, in cases when group members observe the contact/friendship that other ingroup members have with out-group members. Other positive mediators of prejudice which are reduced through contact is threats, both realistic and symbolic, and the negative emotions towards the outgroup such as fear, anger and disgust. On the other hand, positive intergroup affect such as empathy and perspective-taking (witnessing someone else's emotional state, imagining how he feels and views the world and adopting his perspective), positive emotions towards the out-group and self-disclosure

[242] For a detailed description of the studies, see Brown and Hewstone (2005) 267-317.

(presenting important aspects of one self to other persons) constitute negative predictors of prejudice. In line with Allport's 'acquaintanceship potential', these affective mediators shed light on the importance of cross-group friendship for the promotion of the contact effects: direct cross-group friendship and mostly indirect reduces intergroup anxiety and facilitates self-disclosure. Last but not least, there were studies in which moderation and mediation effects were tested simultaneously; it became obvious that group salience during contact moderates the most important mediational effects. Additionally, these studies have shown the importance of both interpersonal and intergroup contact, an idea which was supported theoretically in the original model; contact situations which are high on both dimensions lead to optimal results.

The revised model also recognizes its associations with the other models; the acknowledgment of the importance of cross-group friendship brings it closer to the model of Miller and Brewer, which argues that contact must be attempted through interpersonal interactions. Its similarity with the recategorization model is more than apparent after the revision of the latter and the proposal of the 'dual identity' approach. At the same time, the refined model itself constitutes also an integrative attempt. Of course, the integration of the three models was first attempted by Pettigrew, who argued for three phases in the contact-situation: during the first phase, group categories are no longer salient-they are minimized (following the propositions of the decategorisation model of Miller and Brewer); during the second phase subgroup categories become salient (following the propositions of Hewstone and Brown's model) and during the third phase a common ingroup identity develops (following the propositions of Gaertner and Dovidio's model).[243] This sequence/temporal arrangement indeed constitutes an ingenious integrative suggestion, however, it has not been much empirically tested, probably because it is too carefully structured to be achieved in real-life. In addition, given that studies

[243] Pettigrew (1998).

have shown the importance of having simultaneous interpersonal and intergroup interactions, the two first phases of the temporal sequence would merge into one.

To sum up, the central hypothesis of the Hewstone–Brown model remains the same: "Maintaining some group salience in settings that otherwise satisfy Allport's criteria for favorable contact leads to positive and generalized change in people's orientations toward out-groups."[244] The three major changes in the model can be summarized as follows: the realisation that contact should be attempted on both intergroup and interpersonal dimensions and not exclusively on intergroup; the acknowledgement that affective mediators, usually moderated by category salience, are very important and the reconciliation-integration of the model with the other two against which was initially conceived. This is the Integrative Theory of Intergroup Contact.

4.2.2 The reconciliations in *Lysistrata* as empirical tests of the Integrative Theory of Intergroup Contact

"'Subjective' elements of conflict often persist long after its 'objective' elements disappear. They can become independent of the initiating, more 'objective,' causes of the conflict and contribute to an escalation and continuation of violence even after the initial causes have become irrelevant [...]. Thus, the formal resolution of a conflict is often merely the first step toward peaceful co-existence. To promote peace and reconciliation, a psychological process is required to change people's often deeply entrenched beliefs and feelings about the out-group, their in-group, and the relationship between the two [...]."[245]

The reconciliation of the two semi-choruses, of men and women, alludes to the concept of instrumental reconciliation, providing empirical support to the Integrative Theory of Intergroup Contact in particular. Following the propositions of the model, we see that reconciliation is achieved when the two groups come in

[244] Brown and Hewstone (2005) 317.
[245] Cairns et al. (2005) 461.

contact, which in the play is in fact literal (physical). The conditions under which contact takes place are those prescribed by the model; firstly, men and women interact within a framework of identity salience. This means that they are both aware of their respective group membership, of the group differences, of the perceived typicality and the perceived homogeneity of each group. For example, the leader of the male semi-chorus addresses women in the following way:

Χο^{γε}. οὐδέν ἐστι θηρίον γυναικὸς ἀμαχώτερον,
οὐδὲ πῦρ, οὐδ' ὦδ' ἀναιδὴς οὐδεμία πάρδαλις.
Χο^{γυ}. ταῦτα μέντοι <σὺ> ξυνιεὶς εἶτα πολεμεῖς ἐμοί,
ἐξόν, ὦ πόνηρέ, σοι βέβαιον ἔμ' ἔχειν φίλην;
Χο^{γε}. ὡς ἐγὼ μισῶν γυναῖκας οὐδέποτε παύσομαι.

MEN'S LEADER
No beast, nor even fire, is harder to battle than a woman,
and no leopard is so ferocious.
WOMEN'S LEADER
So you understand that, and yet you're still fighting me,
when it's possible, you rascal, to have our lasting friendship?
MEN'S LEADER
Because I'll never stop hating women!
(1014-1018)

It is interesting that their contact is not attempted exclusively at the intergroup level but at the inter-personal as well; the women's leader approaches men's leader and then each member of the female semi-chorus approaches a member of the male semi-chorus. Nevertheless, reconciliation is women's initiative and this is in consistence with their communal social identity, just like men had initiated hostilities in the first place also in consistence with their agentic social identity:

Χο^{γυ}. ἀλλ' ὅταν βούλῃ σύ. νῦν δ' οὖν οὔ σε περιόψομαι
γυμνὸν ὄνθ' οὕτως. ὅρα γὰρ ὡς καταγέλαστος εἶ.
ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐξωμίδ' ἐνδύσω σε προσιοῦσ' ἐγώ.
Χο^{γε}. τοῦτο μὲν μὰ τὸν Δί' οὐ πονηρὸν ἐποιήσατε·

ἀλλ᾽ ὑπ᾽ ὀργῆς γὰρ πονηρᾶς καὶ τότ᾽ ἀπέδυν ἐγώ.

Χο^{γν}. πρῶτα μὲν φαίνει γ᾽ ἀνήρ, εἶτ᾽ οὐ καταγέλστος εἶ.

κεἴ με μὴ ᾽λύπεις, ἐγώ σου κἄν τόδε τὸ θηρίον

τοὐπὶ τὠφθαλμῷ λαβοῦσ᾽ ἐξεῖλον ἄν, ὅ νῦν ἔνι.

Χο^{γε}. τοῦτ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἦν με τοῦπιτρῖβον. Δακτύλιος οὑτοσί.

ἐκσκάλευσον αὐτό, κἆτα δεῖξον ἀφελοῦσά μοι·

ὡς τὸν ὀφθαλμόν γέ μου νὴ τὸν Δία πάλαι δάκνει.

Χο^{γν}. ἀλλὰ δράσω ταῦτα· καίτοι δύσκολος ἔφυς ἀνήρ.

ἦ μέγ᾽, ὦ Ζεῦ, χρῆμ᾽ ἰδεῖν τῆς ἐμπίδος ἔνεστί σοι.

οὐχ ὁρᾷς; οὐκ ἐμπίς ἐστιν ἥδε Τρικορυσία;

Χο^{γε}. νὴ Δί᾽ ὤνησάς γέ μ᾽, ὡς πάλαι γέ μ᾽ ἐμφρεωρύχει,

ὥστ᾽, ἐπειδὴ ᾽ξηρέθη, ῥεῖ μου το δάκρυον πολύ.

Χο^{γν}. ἀλλ᾽ ἀποψήσω σ᾽ ἐγώ, καίτοι πάνυ πονηρὸς εἶ,

αἰ φιλήσω.

Χο^{γε}. μὴ φιλήσῃς.

Χο^{γν}. ἤν τε βούλῃ γ᾽ ἤν τε μῃ.

WOMEN'S LEADER
Well, choose your own time. But meanwhile I'm not going to let you go undressed like that. Just look how ridiculous you are. I'm coming over and putting your shirt back on.
MEN'S LEADER
That's certainly no mean thing you've done; in fact, it was mean of me to take it off in anger before.
WOMEN'S LEADER
Now you look like a man again, and not so ridiculous. And if you weren't so nasty to me I'd have grabbed that bug in your eye and taken it out; it's still in there now.
MEN'S LEADER
So that's what's been torturing me! Here's a scraper; please dig it out of my eye, then show it to me when you've pulled it out, because it's really been biting my eye for quite some time.
WOMEN'S LEADER
All right, I will, though you're a born grouch. My god, what a humongous gnat you've got in there! See this? Isn't it positively Tricorysian?
MEN'S LEADER
You've certainly helped me out, because that thing's been digging wells in me for a long time, and now that it's out, my eyes are streaming copious tears.

WOMEN'S LEADER
Then I'll wipe them away-though you're quite a rascal-
and kiss you.
MEN'S LEADER
Don't kiss me!
WOMEN'S LEADER
I'll kiss you whether you like it or not!
(1019-1036)

Women perform actions of service, care and affection: they replace men's clothing which had been removed before because of anger, remove the bug from their eyes, wipe their tears and kiss them. Here is men's reaction:

ἀλλὰ μὴ ὥρασ' ἴκοισθ'· ὡς ἐστὲ θωπικαὶ φύσει,
κἄστ' ἐκεῖνο τοὔπος ὀρθῶς κοὐ κακῶς εἰρημένον,
"οὔτε σὺν πανωλέθροισιν οὔτ' ἄνευ πανωλέθρων".
ἀλλὰ νυνὶ σπένδομαί σοι, καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν οὐκέτι
οὔτε δράσω φλαῦρον οὐδὲν οὔθ' ὑφ' ὑμῶν πείσομαι.
ἀλλὰ κοινῇ συσταλέντες τοῦ μέλους ἀρξώμεθα.

MEN'S LEADER
The worst of luck to you! You're natural sweet-talkers
and that ancient adage is right on the mark and no mistake:
"Can't live with the pests or without the pests either."
But now I'll make peace with you, and nevermore
mistreat you or suffer mistreatment from you.
Now let's come together,and begin our song.
(1037-1042)

Their interaction reduces the negative feelings towards each other, men's anger in particular. Old men are won over admitting that it is not possible to live without women, reconcile with them and promise not to hurt them anymore. Indeed, at this point we get a glimpse of the serious aspects of the establishment of a woman-orientated world resulting from women's victories in all the domains of the play; since women are now the dominant subgroup, it is their communal social identity which predominates in the group. Along their clearly comic feminization,[246] men's

[246] For the comic but clearly positive feminization of men in the play cf. Foley (1982) 11: "In the *Lysistrata* temporary feminization, as in many Greek festivals, is a positive component of the male cure. The women dress the Proboulos as a woman when he fails to understand their position (531-38); the men become mad

suggestion to form a joint Athenian chorus (1042) denotes the expression of a communal social identity on their behalf.

But what about Allport's conditions for optimal contact? Let us see how they are also satisfied. The revised, status-granting social identity of women allows them to interact with men in equal status terms and their interaction is supported by institutional authorities, namely Lysistrata who had just outweighed Proboulos. One may object that men and women do not interact within a cooperative context with common goals or on a regular basis. But there is in fact a cooperative context which prescribes substantial interaction (in broad sense) with common goals on a regular basis: the participation in the religious festivals of the polis. Indeed, the semi-chorus of older women has highlighted before their ritual service to the city in lines 638-647 and we have argued that their role as ritual performers constitutes an integral aspect of their revised social identity; now we see how their ritual role strengthens the attempted reconciliation by sustaining the embracement of the superordinate identity of ritual performer by both men and women.[247] The song and dance they are about to perform jointly not only anticipates peace but also constitutes a ritual action that they undertake together and stems from this superordinate identity.

After the reconciliation of the two semi-choruses, reconciliation between Athenians and Spartans is attempted. Lysistrata holds the role of the arbiter and after summoning Reconciliation,[248] begins her speech by presenting the qualifications for arbitrating:

ἐγὼ γυνὴ μέν εἰμι, νοῦς δ' ἔνεστί μοι.
αὐτὴ δ' ἐμαυτῆς οὐ κακῶς γνώμης ἔχω,

for the orgies of Aphrodite in a manner usually associated with sex-mad comic women (832, 898); Cinesias is forced to play the nurse to his abandoned phallus (956-58) as well as to his child, who is unwashed and neglected in a household going to ruin in the absence of his wife. At the close of the play an Athenian prescribes a dose of drink, another comic female vice, for future harmony in inter-Greek relations (1228-30)."

[247] Cf. Foley (1982) 4-5, 11-12.

[248] For Reconciliation's presentation, see Henderson (1987b) 195-196. For a comparison of how peace is brought about in *Acharnians, Peace* and *Lysistrata,* see Newiger (1980) 231-233. For Reconciliation as a prostitute, see Stroup (2004) 63-68, Faraone (2006) 219 and McGlure (2015) 78-79.

τοὺς δ' ἐκ πατρός τε καὶ γεραιτέρων λόγους
πολλοὺς ἀκούσασ' οὐ μεμούσωμαι κακῶς.

It's true I'm a woman, but still I've got a mind:
I'm pretty intelligent in my own right,
and because I've listened many a time to the conversations
of my father and other elders, I'm pretty well educated too.
(1124-1127)

Lysistrata as a woman has a significant advantage for acting as an arbiter: she cannot be seen as representing only one of the groups, despite being an Athenian.[249] In fact, none of the delegates (Athenian or Spartan) treats her as an Athenian nor she herself acts in this identity. On the contrary, everyone stresses her sex: the koryphaios invites her to arbitrate by saying *χαῖρ' , ὦ πασῶν ἀνδρειοτάτη· δεῖ δὴ νυνί σε γενέσθαι/δεινὴν <μαλακήν,> ἀγαθὴν φαύλην, σεμνὴν ἀγανήν, πολύπειρον (*1108*),* whereas the Athenian delegate summons her twice by calling her name (1086, 1103). [250] The fact that he is using her name implies that Lysistrata is not an ordinary woman and also highlights the authority granted to her after the victory over Proboulos and after the general success of her plan.

After stating her credentials, Lysistrata unfolds her argumentation:

λαβοῦσα δ'ὑμᾶς λοιδορῆσαι βούλομαι
κοινῇ δικαίως, οἳ μιᾶς γε χέρνιβος
βωμοὺς περιρραίνοντες ὥσπερ ξυγγενεῖς
Ὀλυμπίασιν, ἐν Πύλαις, Πυθοῖ -πόσους
εἴποιμ' ἂν ἄλλους, εἴ με μηκύνειν δέοι-;
ἐχθρῶν παρόντων βαρβάρῳ στρατεύματι
Ἕλληνας ἄνδρας καὶ πόλεις ἀπόλλυτε.

Now that you're my captive audience I'm ready to give you the

[249] For the difficulties of arbitration during the Peloponnesean war, see Tritle (2007) 175-176.
[250] With the exception of the Spartan delegate who calls her Lysistratus (1105), which can be taken as a joke. See Henderson (1987b) ad loc. For a different assessment of Praxagora's presentation in these lines, see Taaffe (1993) 69.

tongue-lashing you deserve-both of you. You two sprinkle altars
from the same cup like kinsmen, at Olympia, at Thermopylae, at Pytho- how
many other places could I mention if I had to extend the list-
yet when enemies are available with their barbarian armies,
it's Greek men and Greek cites you're determined to destroy.
(1128-1134)

By reproaching both parties alike for forgetting their cultural and racial unity, Lysistrata stresses the common superordinate identity that Athenians and Spartans share along with their respective subgroup identities. This superordinate panhellenic identity is sustained by common cultural tasks like sacrifices to the Gods (1129-1130) and participation to athletic and music festivals (1131-1132) and by common fate –the wars against the barbarians (1133-1134). In fact, Lysistrata argues that the co-operative interdependence of the two parties is even broader given their mutual past benefactions:

εἶτ', ὦ Λάκωνες, πρὸς γὰρ ὑμᾶς τρέψομαι,
οὐκ ἴσθ' ὅτ' ἐλθὼν δεῦρο Περικλείδας ποτὲ
ὁ Λάκων Ἀθηναίων ἱκέτης καθέζετο
ἐπὶ τοῖσι βωμοῖς ὠχρὸς ἐν φοινικίδι
στρατιὰν προσαιτῶν; ἡ δὲ Μεσσήνη τότε
ὑμῖν ἐπέκειτο χὠ θεὸς σείων ἅμα.
ἐλθὼν δὲ σὺν ὁπλίταισι τετρακισχιλίοις
Κίμων ὅλην ἔσωσε τὴν Λακεδαίμονα.
ταυτὶ παθόντες τῶν Ἀθηναίων ὕπο
δηοῦτε χώραν, ἧς ὑπ᾽ εὖ πεπόνθατε;

Next Spartans, I'm going to turn to you.
Don't you remember when Pericleidas
the Spartan came here once and sat at the altars
as a suppliant of the Athenians, pale in his scarlet uniform,
begging for troops? That time when Messenia was up in arms
against you and the god was shacking you with an earthquake?
And Cimon went with four thousand infantrymen
and rescued all Sparta?
After being treated that way by the Athenians, you' re now out to

ravage the country that's treated you well?
(1137-1146)

ὑμᾶς δ᾽ἀφήσειν τοὺς Ἀθηναίους <μ'> οἴει;
οὐκ ἴσθ' ὅθ' ὑμᾶς οἱ Λάκωνες αὖθις αὖ
κατωνάκας φοροῦντας ἐλθόντες δορὶ
πολλοὺς μὲν ἄνδρας Θετταλῶν ἀπώλεσαν,
πολλοὺς δ' ἑταίρους Ἱππίου καὶ ξυμμάχους,
ξυνεκβαλόντες τῇ τόθ' ἡμέρᾳ μόνοι
κἠλευθέρωσαν, κἀντὶ τῆς κατωνάκης
τὸν δῆμον ὑμῶν χλαῖναν ἠμπέσχον πάλιν;

Do you think I'm going to let you Athenians off?
Don't you remember how the Spartans in turn,
when you were dressed in slaves' rags, came with their spears
and wiped out many Thessalian fighters,
many friends and allies of Hippias?
That day when they were the only ones helping you to drive him out?
And how they liberated you, and replaced your slaves' rags
with a warm cloak, as suits a free people?
(1149-1156)

These are real historical events: responding to Spartans' plea for help, the Athenians sent a force under Kimon's command to help them deal with the helots' revolt in 462, whereas in 510 the Spartans had helped Athenians to overthrow Hippias' tyranny.[251] In both cases, Lysistrata gives an exaggerated version of the events and omits the sequel, but this is what her argument requires: past benefactions show how the nature of the relations between the adversaries can change and how the conflict-related emotions and cognition can be removed. Her goal is achieved and immediately afterwards negotiations begin, although both Athenians and Spartans are in fact responding to Reconciliation's charms and not to Lysistrata's arguments: the Spartan ambassador's response is *οὔπα γυναῖκ' ὄπωπα χαίωτέραν* (1157) and the Athenian ambassador adds *ἐγὼ δὲ κύσθον γ'*

[251] For a detailed account of the historical events, see Henderson (1987b) and Sommerstein (1990) ad loc. with references to primary historical sources.

οὐδέπω καλλίονα (1158). Such responses alleviate the seriousness of the scene and at the same time ensure that no objection to the arguments is raised.[252] Still, Nonetheless, the two parties now move on to what Kelman calls conflict settlement: "a process yielding an agreement that meets the interests of both parties to the extent that their respective power positions enable them to prevail".[253] Conflict settlement is, of course, conducted in a typical Aristophanic way, that is, within a farcical and sexual context: "a woman's body is imagined as the geographical substrate, parceled out by men into warring areas and states".[254]

4.3 More than an arbiter: Lysistrata as an intergroup leader

One does not fail to notice that in the reconciliation of Athenians and Spartans Lysistrata's arguments render her, even temporarily, not just as a mere arbiter but as an intergroup leader. Intergroup leadership is a new area of research within the context of social identity theory of leadership; in fact, it works complementarily to the original theory because of its focus on the intergroup and not the intragroup level. The theory provides an answer to two interrelated questions: "how can a leader effectively lead a group that comprises two or more distinct and self-contained identity-defining subgroups whose relations to one another are characterized by conflict and hostile stereotypes? And relatedly, what role can leadership play, more broadly, in reducing intergroup conflict and hostility?"[255] The driving force of intergroup leadership is the concept of intergroup relational identity; to quote once more its founder, Michael Hogg, intergroup relational

[252] Cf. also Henderson (1987b) 196: "We should not imagine that by introducing Reconciliation Ar. was indicating to the spectators that they need not take to heart the arguments made by Lys. in her speech (1128-56): *τὸ γὰρ δίκαιον οἶδε καὶ τρυγωδία* (*Ach*. 500). In fact, Reconciliation is a suitable embodiment of these arguments, which appeal to nostalgia for peaceful times in terms with which no spectator could quarrel."

[253] Kelman (2008) 22. For Kelman's distinction between conflict settlement, conflict resolution and reconciliation as three different processes of peacemaking, see n. 231. One does not fail to notice that in *Thesmophoriazusae* the conflict between women and Euripides is terminated with a conflict settlement (1160-1171) and not a conflict resolution, not to mention a reconciliation. In turn, this points to its deceptive character. Cf. Austin and Olson (2004) lxv-lxvi.

[254] Konstan (1993) 244. For Reconciliation as a sacrificial body, see Fletcher (1999).

[255] Hogg (2015) 188.

identity is "a self-definition in terms of one's group membership that incorporates the group's relationship with an outgroup as part of the ingroup's identity."[256]

The concept of intergroup relational identity is not identical to the concept of (superordinate) collective identity and this urges us to rethink our assessment of Lysistrata's arguments: given her emphasis on the collaborative relationship of Athenians and Spartans, the panhellenic identity must not be treated as a superordinate collective identity but rather as an intergroup relational identity which refers to an extended self and which entails the collaboration partner. Indeed, one of the most important advantages of the intergroup relational identity is that it alleviates for the intergroup leader the problem of prototypicality; there is no group prototype or to put it correctly, the relational relationship is the prototype. Inextricably related to this idea is boundary spanning, one effective strategy adopted by leaders for the construction of a relational intergroup identity, besides identity-rhetoric.[257] Boundary spanning refers to the idea that a leader's behaviour must exemplify the intergroup relational identity by having links and interactions with outgroup members: for example, Lysistrata has a friendly relationship with Lampito (78-81) and thus embodies the cooperative interaction between Athenians and Spartans. Whereas Lysistrata's non prototypicality of women's group allows her to get the role of the arbiter and intergroup leader, her prototypicality of the relation intergroup identity on which reconciliation is built, renders her a successful intergroup leader; this is her major difference from Trygaeus.

[256] Hogg (2015) 189.

[257] For a comprehensive description of these strategies, see Hogg (2015) 193-196. Other strategies which can be adopted but are not evident in the play is transference of the intergroup relational identity. Hogg (2015: 198) describes it as follows: **"**An intergroup relational identity may be transferred from one intergroup relationship to another when the cognitive representation of a well-established intergroup collaboration is projected onto the new intergroup relationship it is felt to resemble, much like role expectations and role identity may transfer [...]. Intergroup leadership may stimulate the process of transference of intergroup relational identity, which would be particularly valuable where there are multiple subgroups nested within a superordinate group. If leadership is able to establish transference from an intergroup relational identity based on a well-established collaboration to a new collaboration partner, such leadership would have an advantage in establishing and effectively leading new intergroup collaborations within the overarching group."

It is also important to underline that Lysistrata's role as an intergroup leader is anticipated by her political suggestion in the debate with Proboulos: using a wool-working metaphor, she recommended to incorporate into Athens the immigrants, the friendly foreigners, the public debtors and the citizens of the colonial cities by granting them Athenian citizenship:[258]

[...]

εἶτα ξαίνειν εἰς καλαθίσκον κοινὴν εὔνοιαν, ἅπαντας
καταμειγνύντας· τούς τε μετοίκους κεἴ τις ξένος ἦ φίλος ὑμῖν,
κεἴ τις ὀφείλῃ τῷ δημοσίῳ, καὶ τούτους ἐγκαταμεῖξαι·
καὶ νὴ Δία τάς γε πόλεις, ὁπόσαι τῆς γῆς τῆσδ' εἰσὶν ἄποικοι,
διαγιγνώσκειν ὅτι ταῦθ' ὑμῖν ὥσπερ τὰ κατάγματα κεῖται
χωρὶς ἕκαστον· κᾆτ' ἀπὸ τούτων πάντων τὸ κάταγμα λαβόντας
δεῦρο ξυνάγειν καὶ συναθροίζειν εἰς ἕν, κἄπειτα ποιῆσαι
τολύπην μεγάλην, κᾆτ' ἐκ ταύτης τῷ δήμῳ χλαῖναν ὑφῆναι.

Next, card the wool into a sewing basket of unity and goodwill, mixing
in everyone. The resident aliens and any other foreigner
who's your friend,
and anyone who owes money to the people's treasury
mix them in there too.
And oh yes, the cities that are colonies of this land:
imagine them as flocks of your fleece, each one lying
apart from the others. So take all these flocks
and bring them together here, joining them all and making one big
bobbin. And from this weave a fine new cloak for the people.
(579-586)

4.4 Reconciliation in sensual terms

After the end of negotiations, Aristophanes draws the picture of the reconciled future in sensual terms by displaying the banquet, the songs and the reunification

[258] For the wool-working metaphor, see Henderson (1987b) 141. Henderson notes that the metaphor has a strong ritual aspect since wool-working was associated with the cult of Athena and the Panathenaia in particular. Thus, it can be associated with women's revised social identity with its prominent ritual aspect. For a poetic analysis of the metaphor, see Moulton (1981) 48-58.

of the couples. In the songs of the Spartan and Athenian delegates the cognitive and emotional prerequisites on which the establishment of reconciliation and such a festive atmosphere rests is highlighted, corroborating in this way Lysistrata's arguments. In detail, the Spartan delegate points to the panhellenic identity of the Athenians and Spartans which is sustained by their wars against the Persians:

ὅρμαόν τῷ κυρσανίῳ,
Μναμόνα, τὰν τεὰν
Μῶάν, ἅτις οἶδεν ἁμὲ τώς τ' Ἀσαναί-
ως, ὅκα τοὶ μὲν ἐπ' Ἀρταμιτίῳ
πρώκροFον σιείκελοι
ποττὰ κᾶλα,
τὼς Μήδως τ' ἐνίκων·
ἁμὲ δ' αὖ Λεωνίδας
ἄγεν ᾗπερ τὼς κάπρως
σάγοντας, οἰῶ, τὸν ὀδόντα· πολὺς δ'
ἀμφὶ τὰς γέννας ἀφρὸς ἤνσεεν,
πολὺς δ' ἁμᾶ καττῶν σκελῶν ἵετο.
ἦν γὰρ τὤνδρες οὐκ ἐλάσσως
τᾶς ψάμμας τοὶ Πέρσαι.
ἀγρότερα σηροκτόνε, μόλε
δεῦρο, παρσένε σιά,
ποττὰς σπονδάς,
ὡς συνέχῃς πολὺν ἁμὲ χρόνον. νῦν δ'
αὖ φιλία τ' ἀὲς εὔπορος εἴη
ταῖσι συνθήκαισι, καὶ τᾶν αἱμυλᾶν ἀ-
λωπέκων παυάίμεθα.
ὦ δεῦρ' ἴθι, δεῦρο,
ὦ κυναγὲ παρσένε.

Memory, speed to this lad

your own Muse, who knows
about us and the Athenians,
about the day at Artemisium
when they spread sail like gods
against the armada
and defeated the Medes;
while we were led by Leonidas,
like wild boars we were, yes,
gnashing our tusks, our jaws running
streams of foam, ad our legs too.
The enemy outnumbered
the sands on the shore, those Persians.
Goddess of the Wilds, Beast Killer,
come this way, maiden goddess,
to join in the treaty,
and keep us together for a long time.
Now let friendship in abundance
attend our agreement always, and let us
ever abandon foxy stratagems.
O come this way, this way,
o Virgin Huntress!
(1247-1272)

The Athenian delegate invites Gods to join the couples in their dance, reminding us of the success of the sex strike and simultaneously pointing to the panhellenic identity sustained by participation to the common festivals:

[…] ἀνὴρ δὲ παρὰ γυναῖκα καὶ γυνὴ
στήτω παρ' ἄνδρα, κᾆτ' ἐπ' ἀγαθαῖς ξυμφοραῖς
ὀρχησάμενοι θεοῖσιν εὐλαβλώμεθα
τὸ λοιπὸν αὖθις μὴ 'ξαμαρτάνειν ἔτι.

πρόσαγε χορόν, ἔπαγε <δε> Χάριτας,
ἐπὶ δὲ κάλεσον Ἄρτεμιν,
ἐπὶ δὲ δίδυμον ἡγέχορον Ἰήιον
εὔφρον', ἐπὶ δὲ Νύσιον,
ὃς μετὰ μαινάσι ὄμματα δαίεται,
Δία τε πυρὶ φλεγόμενον, ἐπὶ δὲ

πὸτνιαν ἄλοχον ὀλβίαν·

εἶτα δὲ δαίμονας, οἷς ἐπιμάρτυσι

χρησόμεθ' οὐκ ἐπιλήσμοσιν

Ἡσυχίας πέρι τῆς ἀγανόφρονος,

ἣν ἐποίησε θεὰ Κύπρις.

[...] Let's have husband stand by wife and wife
by husband, and then to celebrate our great good fortune
let's have a dance for the gods.
And let's be sure never again to make the same mistakes!

Bring on the dance, include the Graces,
and invite Artemis,
and her twin brother, the leader of the dance the Healer,
and the benign Nysian whose eyes flash
bacchic among his maenads,
and Zeus alight with flame
and the thriving Lady his consort;
and invite the divine powers
we would have as witnesses to remember
always this humane Peace,
which the goddess Cypris has fashioned.
(1279-1294)

The actual song (1296-1315) which accompanies the couple-dance is clearly Spartan: the Spartan muse is invoked (1296-1297) and only Spartan deities are mentioned (1298-1301).[259] Willi has made the ingenious suggestion to treat this song as evoking the attracting Other as opposed to the abhorrent Other evoked by the spoken Laconian dialect:[260] "Hence, at the *end* of the play, when Athens and Sparta are saved, the Spartan dialect is only sung, without a hint of parody, as language of

[259] For the unusual features of the final part of the play, see Henderson (1987b) 213-214 and Revermann (2006) 254-260. The actual exit-song, a hymn to *Athêna Chalkioikos*, is not preserved.

[260] Willi (2002) 140: "Thus in the Athenian cultural consciousness the Laconian dialect had both negative and positive connotations. It was not only the language of the enemy but also a language of songs and poetry. This dichotomy may have lived on for centuries in aesthetic evaluation, not unlike the negative attitude towards American speech in England. Pausanias at least was still surprised by the fact that 'the Spartan dialect did not spoil the charm of Alcman's songs, although it is usually so far away from sounding pleasant' (Paus. 3.15.2). Whereas Laconian as a spoken dialect evoked the abhorrent Other, Laconian as a sung dialect, as the Doric of choral lyrics, evoked the attractive Other—that Other which everyone desired to integrate, as the Athenian ambassador's request illustrates, and as Athens had professed by 'de-Othering' it and introducing it, in a somewhat tamed shape, into her own literary genre, the choruses of tragedy." For a different evaluation of the song, see Henderson (1987b) 219 who discusses earlier evaluations of the song.

the Muses. While the plot of *Lysistrata* invites rational reflection about the integration of the enemy as a friend, Aristophanes' use of the enemy's dialect is a linguistic trick to support this integration on an emotional level. In 411 BC Aristophanes has recognized that a true peace, not one that pursues mainly economic goals like that of *Acharnians,* is possible only if the emotional boundaries are removed—and it is through the dramatic use of language that he conveys this new concept of peace to the people of Athens."[261] The cognitive and emotional aspects of reconciliation demonstrated by our analysis are corroborated by a linguistic approach as well.

4.5 Stepping stones to reconciliation in post-oligarchic Athens: forgiveness and trust in the parabasis of *Frogs*[262]

Reconciliation is not the main theme of *Frogs* as it is in *Lysistrata,* nonetheless, it figures in the suggestion to restore the political rights to the disenfranchised citizens of 411. This suggestion is made at a pivotal part of the play, the *epirrhêma* of the *parabasis*, perhaps the most cited part of all Aristophanic comedy due to Dicaearchus' report that the play had won a second, honorary performance exactly because of the advice offered:[263]

τὸν ἱερὸν χορὸν δίκαιόν ἐστι χρηστὰ τῇ πόλει
ξυμπαραινεῖν καὶ διδάσκειν. πρῶτον οὖν ἡμῖν δοκεῖ
ἐξισῶσαι τοὺς πολίτας κἀφελεῖν τὰ δείματα,
κεἴ τις ἥμαρτε σφαλείς τι Φρύνιχου παλαίσμασιν,
ἐγγενέσθαι φημὶ χρῆναι τοῖς ὀλισθοῦσιν τότε
αἰτίαν ἐκθεῖσι λῦσαι τὰς πρότερον ἁμαρτίας.
εἶτ' ἄτιμόν φημι χρῆναι μηδέν' εἶν' ἐν τῇ πόλει·
καὶ γὰρ αἰσχρόν ἐστι τοὺς μὲν ναυμαχήσαντας μίαν

[261] Willi (2004) 141.
[262] The title of the chapter, slightly adapted, is the title of a chapter by Hewstone et al. (2008).
[263] See Dover (1993) 73-75.

καὶ Πλαταιᾶς εὐθὺς εἶναι κἀντὶ δούλων δεσπότας·
κοὐδὲ ταῦτ' ἔγωγ' ἔχοιμ' ἂν μὴ οὐ καλῶς φάσκειν ἔχειν ,
ἀλλ' ἐπαινῶ· μόνα γὰρ αὐτὰ νοῦν ἔχοντ' ἐδράσατε.
πρὸς δὲ τούτοις εἰκὸς ὑμᾶς, ***οἳ μεθ' ὑμῶν πολλὰ δὴ***
χοἱ πατέρες ἐναυμάχησαν καὶ προσήκουσιν γένει,
τὴν μίαν ταύτην παρεῖναι ξυμφορὰν αἰτουμένοις.
ἀλλὰ ***τῆς ὀργῆς ἀνέντες****, ὦ σοφώτατοι φύσει,*
πάντας ἀνθρώπους ἑκόντες ξυγγενεῖς κτησώμεθα
κἀπιτίμους καὶ πολίτας, ὅστις ἂν ξυνναυμαχῇ.
εἰ δὲ ταῦτ' ὀγκωσόμεθα κἀποσεμνυνούμεθα,
τὴν πόλιν καὶ ταῦτ' ἔχοντες κυμάτων ἐν ἀγκάλαις,
ὑστέρῳ χρόνῳ ποτ' αὖθις εὖ φρονεῖν οὐ δόξομεν.

It is right and proper for the sacred chorus to help give
good advice and instruction to the city. First then, we think that
all the citizens should be made equal, and their fears removed*,*
and if anyone was tripped up by the Phrynichus' holds,
I say that those who slipped up at that time should ***be permitted to***
dispose of their liability and put right their earlier mistakes*.*
Next I say that no one in the city should be disenfranchised,
for it's a disgrace that veterans of a single sea battle should
forthwith become Plataeans, turning from slaves into masters;
not that I have any criticism to voice about that-
indeed I applaud it as being your only intelligent action-
but in addition to that is fitting, ***in the case of people who have fought many***
a sea battle at your side, as have their fathers, and who are your blood relations,
that you pardon this one misadventure when they ask you to*.*
Now relax your anger, *you people most naturally sage,*
and let's readily accept as kinsmen and as citizens
in good standing everyone who fights on our ships.
If we puff ourselves up about this and are too proud to do it,
especially now that we have a city ***"embraced by high seas,"***
there will come a time when we'll seem to have acted thoughtlessly.
(686-705)

The chorus' advice does not corroborate the Integrative Theory of Intergroup Contact like the two reconciliations in *Lysistrata*, but still highlights the importance of other stepping stones for the achievement of reconciliation, that of forgiveness

and trust.[264] The chorus recommends that the city should restore citizen rights to the citizens who had supported the oligarchic revolution of 411 and thus to engage in an act of reconciliation and resocialization. Since anger constitutes an important psychological barrier for the achievement of reconciliation, it prompts the audience to relinquish it. It even facilitates the relinquish of anger by arguing that in fact the supporters of the oligarchic coup were the victims of Phrynichus who tripped them up. The audience is also prompted to accept their apology and forgive them, especially since they share a common identity and have participated in many naval battles. These references are also expected to reestablish trust between Athenian citizens.[265] At the end, the chorus argues for the endorsement of a collective citizen identity defined by common service to the navy and explains how the seriousness of the situation dictates the achievement of reconciliation.

[264] For the importance of forgiveness and trust in reconciliation processes, see Dovidio et al. (2008) and Hewstone et al. (2008).

[265] Lysistrata also refers to trust (1185-1187): "There you may exchange pledges of mutual trust,/ and then each of you may reclaim his own wife and go home."

5 *Ecclesiazusae*: rethinking prototypicality, norms, conformity, ideology and culture in times of crisis

5.1 Interpreting the play

"If the Ecclesiazusae was designed to satirize philosophers or philosophies, it does a poor job of identifying its targets; it is too rooted in the general concerns of the 390's to be innocently mythic; to read the play as purely "festive" is to overlook its satiric impetus; the satire of any one contemporary politician or policy, however, is at best tangential; it is neither a denunciation of communism nor a particularly ringing defense of it -in fact it is not really "about" communism at all. It is not about any of these things, although these approaches all in one way or another constitute valid readings of the play or identify genuine problems. The more useful inquiry, however, is to ask what larger satiric aim these afore-mentioned motives serve, and I suggest that the satiric target of the Ecclesiazusae is the selfish behavior of the Athenian dêmos."[266]

Rothwell describes vividly the problem of interpreting *Ecclesiazusae,* the play which had been treated by classical scholars as a puzzle, for some an interesting one, for others a quite dull. The truth is that Rothwell's insightful suggestion that the satiric target of the play is the selfish behaviour of the Athenian *dêmos* has masterly put the pieces together, finishing the puzzle. But in doing so, it has raised more questions and has created a new puzzle, this time a more challenging one: given that Aristophanic comedy constantly demonstrates the clash of private and collective interests and exposes selfishness,[267] what is the difference between the conception of *Ecclesiazusae* and the other plays of the poet? To argue that something has changed, either in the era and/or for the poet, implies the adoption of a historical perspective and brings to the fore all the negative consequences of such a perspective. Since the line between historical and historicizing readings is thin, it is safer to approach the play from other perspectives, which allude to its historical aspects without falling into the trap of historicism. Social Psychology offers such a perspective and allows us to assert that *Ecclesiazusae* advocates a reconsideration of

[266] Rothwell (1990) 10.
[267] McGlew (2002).

the Athenian social identity, culture and ideology: the following chapter analyses the social psychological mechanisms sustaining this reconsideration and in turn sheds light to the social and political reality lying underneath it.

5.2 Men acting as women: Athenian citizen-identity in crisis

Ecclesiazusae begins with a female conspiracy in action, however, the motivations of the conspiracy are not stated explicitly:[268] when discussing with the other women the details of their scheme, Praxagora argues -without providing any further explanations- that women need to take over the government, otherwise the city will remain oarless and becalmed (107-8), echoing the ship of the state metaphor.[269] This is comfortable dramatically since we are told twice that women have geared up at the Skira festival (18, 21). It is not until the rehearsal speech that we get a description of the prevailing situation which has motivated women's actions:

[...] ἄχθομαι δὲ καὶ φέρω
τὰ τῆς πόλεως ἅπαντα βαρέως πράγματα.
ὁρῶ γὰρ αὐτὴν προστάταισι χρωμένην
ἀεὶ πονηροῖς· κἄν τις ἡμέραν μίαν
χρηστὸς γένηται, δέκα πονηρὸς γίγνεται.
ἐπέτρεψας ἑτέρῳ· πλείον' ἔτι δράσει κακά.
χαλεπὸν μὲν οὖν ἄνδρας δυσαρέστους νουθετεῖν,
οἳ τοὺς φιλεῖν μὲν βουλομένους δεδοίκατε,
τοὺς δ' οὐκ ἐθέλοντας ἀντιβολεῖθ' ἑκάστοτε.
ἐκκλησίαισιν ἦν ὅτ' οὐκ ἐχρώμεθα
οὐδὲν τὸ παράπαν· ἀλλὰ τον Ἀγύρριον
πονηρὸν ἡγούμεσθα. νῦν δὲ χρωμένων
ὁ μὲν λαβὼν ἀργύριον ὑπερεπήνεσεν,
ὁ δ' οὐ λαβὼν εἶναι θανάτου φήσ' ἀξίους
τοὺς μισθοφορεῖν ζητοῦντας ἐν τἠκκλησίᾳ

[268] Sommerstein (1998) 11-12.
[269] This is Rothwell's observation (1990: 48-49).

[…], and I am annoyed and depressed
at all the city's affairs.
For I see that she constantly employs scoundrels
as her leaders. Even if one of them turns
virtuous for one day, he'll turn out wicked for ten.
You look to another one? He'll make even worse trouble.
I realize how hard it is to talk sense to men as cantankerous as you,
who fear those who want to befriend you
and consistently court those who do not.
There was a time when we convened
no assemblies at all, but at least we knew Agyrrhius
for a scoundrel. Nowadays we do convene them,
and the people who draw pay praise him to the skies,
while those who draw none say that the people who attend
for the pay deserve the death penalty.
(174-188)

τὸ συμμαχικὸν αὖ τοῦθ', ὅτ' ἐσκοπούμεθα,

εἰ μὴ γένοιτ', ἀπολεῖν ἔφασκον τὴν πόλιν·

ὅτε δὴ δ' ἐγένετ', ἤχθοντο, τῶν δὲ ῥητόρων

ὁ τοῦτ' ἀναπείσας εὐθὺς ἀποδρὰς ᾤχετο.

ναῦς δεῖ καθέλκειν· τῷ πένητι μὲν δοκεῖ,

τοῖς πλουσίοις δὲ καὶ γεωργοῖς οὐ δοκεῖ.

Κορίνθιοις ἄχεσθε, κἀκεῖνοί γε σοί·

νῦν εἰσὶ χρηστοί – "καὶ σὺ νῦν χρηστὸς γενοῦ".

Ἀργεῖος ἀμαθής· ἀλλ' Ἱερώνυμος σοφός.

σωτηρία παρέκυψεν · ἀλλ' ὀργίζεται

Θρασύβουλος αὐτὸς οὐχὶ παρακαλούμενος

And about this alliance: when we were examining this issue,
the people insisted that the city would perish if we did not ratify it.
But when it finally was ratified, the people were unhappy, and its
staunchest supporter had to leave town in a hurry.
We need to launch a fleet: the poor man votes yes,
the wealthy and the farmers vote no.
You get angry with the Corinthians, and they with you;
Now they're nice people, "so you be nice too."

The Argives are morons, but Hieronymus is sage.
And occasionally we get a glimpse of salvation, but Thrasybulus
gets angry that you're not inviting him to take charge.
(193-203)

Praxagora starts her speech by expressing how annoyed and depressed at all the city's affairs she is (175). Namely, the city's affairs are the election of bad leaders (176-188) and the implementation of vacillating and thus destructive policies (193-203). Behind them lies the individualistic disposition of the Athenians:

[...]

ὑμεῖς γάρ ἐστ', ὦ δῆμε, τούτων αἴτιοι.

τὰ δημόσια γὰρ μισθοφοροῦντες χρήματα

ἰδίᾳ σκοπεῖσθ' ἕκαστος ὅ τι τις κερδανεῖ,

τὸ δὲ κοινὸν ὥσπερ Αἴσιμος κυλίνδεται.

And you, the sovereign people, are responsible for this mess.
For while drawing your civic pay from public funds,
each of you angles for a personal profit.
Meanwhile the public interest flounders like Aesimus.
(205-208)

The individualistic disposition of the Athenians becomes more acute when compared to the old good days of Myronides, recalled by the women of the chorus while heading to the assembly:[270]

ὅρα δ' ὅπως ὠθήσομεν τούσδε τοὺς ἐξ ἄστεως

ἥκοντας, ὅσοι πρὸ τοῦ

μέν, ἡνίκ' ἔδει λαβεῖν

ἐλθόντ᾽ ὀβολὸν μόνον,

καθῆντο λαλοῦντες

ἐν τοῖς στεφανώμασιν,

νυνὶ δ᾽ ἐνοχλοῦσ' ἄγαν.

[270] One must not fail to notice that the chorus' song, although structurally corresponds to *parodos*, it accompanies the chorus' temporary exit from and not entrance to the stage.

ἀλλ᾽ οὐχί, Μυρωνίδης

ὅτ᾽ ἦρχεν ὁ γεννάδας,

οὐδεὶς ἄν ἐτόλμα

τὰ τῆς πὸλεως διοι-

κεῖν ἀργύριον φέρων·

ἀλλ᾽ ἦκ᾽ἂν ἕκαστος

ἐν ἀσκιδίῳ φέρων

πιεῖν ἅμα τ᾽ἄρτον αὖ-

ον καὶ δύο κρομμύω

καὶ τρεῖς ἄν ἐλάας.

νυνὶ δὲ τριώβολον

ζητοῦσι λαβεῖν, ὅταν

πράττωσί τι κοινόν, ὥσ-

περ πηλοφοροῦντες.

Let's be sure to jostle the assemblymen from town,
who before now
never used to attend,
when their pay was only one obol,
but would sit gossiping
in the garland shops.
Now they fight hard for seats.
Never in the good old days,
with noble Myronides in charge,
would anyone have dared
to husband the city's affairs
for a handful of money.
No, everyone would come
bringing his own little bag lunch,
something to drink, some bread,
a couple of onions,
ad three olives.
Now what they want
is three obols
for doing a public service,
like common laborers.
(301-310)

It is interesting that men's selfishness and individualistic disposition is equated with feminization. In general, in Aristophanic comedy the effeminate character of political leaders, especially of Cleon, is constantly gibed at.[271] Following this tradition, Praxagora argues that although Agyrrhius used to be a woman, now is a major political figure (102-104). But in the play feminization is not ascribed only to political leaders and Epigonus who is always found among women (165-168), but to all men; Chremes is the only notable exception. The best example of the newly defined feminized behaviour is provided by Blepyrus, Praxagora's husband. Dressed on his wife's underdress and shoes (313-319), Blepyrus is preoccupied with his constipation (354-368) praying to Hileithya to relieve him (369-371) and laments over losing the payment for the assembly attendance (389-393). His individualistic disposition becomes bolder considering that he behaves in such a way on a day the agenda of the assembly referred to the salvation of Athens (396).[272]

Blepyrus' individualism dressed in female apparatus contrasts sharply to the traditional Athenian citizen identity, canonically dressed in male apparatus.[273] We are thus inclined to argue that *Ecclesiazusae* presents men experiencing an identity-crisis and draws the picture of Athens in the middle of political and social crisis.[274] That men do not seem to realize the urgentness of the situation is part of the problem. On the contrary, women not only realize the problem but are motivated to act collectively for treating it. Like Lysistrata, the motive of their actions is not self-enhancement or the quest for positive social identity, but the growing anxiety and uncertainty over the prevailing situation;[275] like in *Lysistrata,* the salvation of

[271] See, for example, *Acharnians* 664, *Knights* 379-381, 877-878, *Peace* 48, 758.
[272] See Sommerstein (1998) 176 ad loc.
[273] Cf. Ober (1998) 132: "The men, located at their homes and concerned entirely with private affairs, thus contrast sharply with the women, whom we met in the previous scene on their way to Assembly and who are deeply concerned with the public weal. This "private world of men versus public world of women" dichotomy inverts the Athenians' ordinary assumption that the private realm is the appropriate domain of women, while the public realm is for men only".
[274] See David (1984).
[275] This becomes clearer if one compares women's complaints in *Thesmophoriazusae* (e.g. 384-432) which indeed allude to a negative social identity.

the city becomes the driving force for the action of the play.[276] Praxagora's argumentation, which remind us of Lysistrata's complaints to the Proboulos (507-528), corroborates the basic propositions of uncertainty-identity theory. In the words of its founder, Michael Hogg, "[t]he core tenets of uncertainty-identity theory are (a) that feelings of uncertainty, particularly about or relating to who one is and how one should behave, motivate behaviours oriented towards reducing uncertainty, and (b) that the social identity process of categorizing oneself and others as group members very effectively reduces self-uncertainty – because social categorization provides a consensually validated social identity that describes and prescribes who one is and how one should behave."[277] In simpler words, uncertainty-identity theory argues for the motivational role of self-uncertainty for group identification and membership.[278]

Experiments have shown that uncertainty as a motivation for group identification is in fact stronger than and prevails over self-enhancement, the other main motivation associated with social identity processes, the dynamics of which were explored in our analysis of the *Birds*.[279] According to uncertainty-identity theory, uncertainty challenges people's certainty regarding their self-sense, cognition, feelings and behaviour and it is caused by contextual factors such as adolescence, political and economic crisis, etc. When people are already members of a group, uncertainty can take several forms: for example, the members who are treated by their fellow members as marginal and non-prototypical can feel uncertain or the group as a whole can feel uncertain because of a specific subgroup or leader who acts in ways that contradict the normative traits of the group,

[276] For the salvation theme in *Lysistrata*, see Faraone (1997). The salvation is the driving force of action also in *Peace* (93, 866) and it figures in *Frogs* (1501). The salvation theme is very common in the orators of the day and appears also in Peisander's speech in Thucydides 8.53.3. See generally Lévy (1976).
[277] Hogg (2015) 589.
[278] For an account of the motivations satisfied by group membership, see Hogg, Hohman and Rivera (2008).
[279] Self-enhancement stems from social identity theory as originally conceived, the so called *social identity theory of intergroup relations*. Uncertainty-identity theory stems from social categorization theory, the so called *social identity theory of the group*, which emphasizes the cognitive aspects of group membership and of the related phenomena, giving prominence to the process of depersonalization and the idea of prototypicality.

changing its prototype and thus identity. In any case, the "key factor is feeling that one has lost one's normative compass and sense of grounding in a social group that validates one's beliefs, attitudes, and actions."[280] Nonetheless, not all people feel uncertain to the same degree or respond to uncertainty in the same way-this is treated as personality variance- and definitely uncertainty must matter to someone in order to motivate his behaviour. [281]

In the light of uncertainty-identity theory, the plot of *Ecclesiazusae* can be summarized as follows: the political and social crisis which had occurred after the end of the Peloponnesian War led to the feminization of Athenian citizens. Women who share the Athenian identity take this as an identity-threat; they feel that the defining properties of the superordinate group have changed due to the actions of men and experience uncertainty. Uncertainty motivates them to identify with their subgroup and hence decide to act collectively in order to achieve a social change, this time without adopting any coercive means as they do in *Lysistrata*.[282] Since women have geared up at the Skira festival, these social identity processes are not shown in the play and can be inferred from Praxagora's rehearsal speech. However, we get a glimpse of social identity dynamics, when women express some doubts on how their behaviour in the assembly will convince men:

καὶ πῶς γυναικῶν θηλύφρων ξυνουσία
δημηγορήσει;

But how can a congregation of women, with women's minds,
expect to address the people?
(110)

[280] Hogg and Wagoner (2017) 212.

[281] In *Ecclesiazusae* uncertainty is not felt only by women but men as well, at least some of them: the Assembly meeting was for the salvation of the city (396-397) which means that some men shared women's perception concerning the desperate state of Athens. Chremes also reports that the Assembly had decided to entrust the city to women because this was the only thing never tried before (456-457), implying that there had been other attempts by men to save the city.

[282] Women take power by different means in *Lysistrata* (occupation) and *Ecclesiazusae* (assembly voting) and this probably has to do with the different era and political situation in each case, the war in *Lysistrata* and the restored democracy in *Ecclesiazusae*.

οὐκ οἶδα· δεινὸν δ' ἐστὶν ἡ μὴ 'μπειρία.

I'm not so sure: inexperience is a dangerous thing.
(115)

δεῦρ' ὦ γλυκυτάτη Πραξαγόρα, σκέψαι, τάλαν,

ὡς καὶ καταγέλαστον τὸ πρᾶγμα φαίνεται

Come here, darling Praxagora. Look, my dear
how ridiculous this is.
(125)

In technical words, women are still questioning their efficacy for the implementation of the plan. According to the Social Identity Model of Collective Action (SIMCA), perceived efficacy is not simply a unique and direct predictor of collective action but is also mediated by social identity.[283] Praxagora's speech in demonstration manages to build women's confidence for completing the *coup d'état* by cultivating their sense of efficacy. At the same time, her firm answers to women's upcoming questions on how to handle possible difficulties (248-249: *ἀτὰρ ἢν Κέφαλός σοι λοιδορῆται προσφθαρείς, /πῶς ἀντερεῖς πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐν τῇκκλησίᾳ* 254: *τί δ' ἢν Νεοκλείδης ὁ γλάμων σε λοιδορῇ;* 256: *τί δ' ἢν ὑποκρούωσίν σε;* 258-259: *ἐκεῖνο μόνον ἄσκεπτον, ἢν σ' οἱ τοξόται/ἔλκωσιν, ὅ τι δράσεις πότ'*) give, albeit in a comic manner, the impression of sustained actions and fill women with confidence over the success of their plan. Praxagora even teaches them how to vote, expelling their last and most important doubt (262-264: *ταυτὶ μὲν ἡμῖν ἐντεθύμηται καλῶς·/ἐκεῖνο δ' οὐ πεφροντίκαμεν, ὅτῳ τρόπῳ/τὰς χεῖρας αἴρειν μνημονεύσομεν τότε./εἰθισμέναι γάρ ἐσμεν αἴρειν τὼ σκέλει*). As a result, after Praxagora's speech women leave for the Assembly as one chorus; we are shown in performative terms how their social identity is reinforced.[284]

One must not fail to notice that men's feminized social identity urges them to accept women's sovereignty. When Chremes reports the events of the Assembly to

[283] For a detailed analysis of SIMCA, see the chapter on *Birds*. All relevant references are cited there.
[284] This is Rothwell's observation (1991: 46).

Praxagora's husband Blepyrus, he is won over and accepts it precisely because of his selfishness and individualistic disposition:

ΒΛΕΠΥΡΟΣ

ἅπαντα ἄρ' αὐταῖς ἐστι προστεταγμένα

ἃ τοῖσν ἀστοῖς ἔμελεν;

ΧΡΕΜΗΣ

οὕτω ταῦτ' ἔχει.

ΒΛΕΠΥΡΟΣ

οὐδ' εἰς δικαστήριον ἄρ' εἶμ', ἀλλ' ἡ γυνή;

ΧΡΕΜΗΣ

οὐδ' ἔτι σὺ θρέψεις οὕς ἔχεις, ἀλλ' ἡ γυνή.

ΒΛΕΠΥΡΟΣ

οὐδὲ στένειν τὸν ὄρθρον ἔτι πρᾶγμ' ἄρά μοι;

ΧΡΕΜΗΣ

μὰ Δί', ἀλλὰ ταῖς γυναιξὶ ταῦτ' ἤδη μέλει·

σὺ δ' ἀστενακτὶ περδόμενος οἴκοι μενεῖς.

[...]

ΒΛΕΠΥΡΟΣ

λόγος γέ τοί τις ἔστι τῶν γεραιτέρων,

ὅσ' ἂν ἀνόητ' ἢ μῶρα βουλευσώμεθα,

ἅπαντ' ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον ἡμῖν ξυμφέρειν

BLEPYRUS
And they've been put in charge of everything
that used to be the business of the citizens?
CHREMES
That's the way it is.
BLEPYRUS
So I want be going to court anymore, my wife will?
CHREMES
And you won't be caring for your dependent anymore, your wife will.
BLEPYRUS
And I'll have no more need to groan myself awake at dawn?

CHREMES
God no, all that's the women's concern now;
you can stop groaning and stay at home farting all day.
[…]
BLEPYRUS
Well, there is an ancestral saying,
that however brainless or foolish our policies,
all our affairs will turn out for the best.
(458-475)

All men's duties are now assigned to women: men do not have to go the court or maintain their household and their only concerns will be farting, eating and having sex.

5.3 Women dressed as men but acting as women: rethinking the action of the prologue with *Lysistrata* in mind

Our reading of the first part of the play lies on the assumption that women's presentation builds on their presentation in *Lysistrata.* In that play Aristophanes revisits women's negative collective identity by promoting their true, multifaceted identity: hence, although their negative traits are exploited, they are outweighed by their positive traits. This multifaceted identity which allows Aristophanes to invite both the audience's laughter and reflection is ascribed to the women of *Ecclesiazusae* as well. On one hand, Praxagora -what an irony- enumerates some of women's negative traits/standard comic stereotypes such as deceptive persuasiveness, trickery, unreliability and naivety in the rehearsal speech in front of women (224-238), while other traits are seen in action: for example, one can easily recollect how Praxagora herself confronts her husband, masterfully repelling his accusations with lies (520-553). On the other hand, these negative traits/stereotypes are undermined by positive female traits.[285] These, however, are not brought to light by associating women to old women; differences in age, status and social roles are eliminated and in *Ecclesiazusae* all women adopt an agentic mode of behaviour and pursue

[285] For a similar juxtaposition of positive and negative female traits, see the parabasis of *Thesmophoriazusae* (785-829).

collective action for social change. Thus, all women enact the role of protectresses of the threatened tradition. According to Jeffrey Henderson, this role is in fact part of a bigger picture: "drama, especially comedy, typically casts such "others" in the role of critics of the executive demos and its leaders, as instruments of salvation or the restoration of social harmony when the leaders of the official city have disrupted things".[286] What is interesting, though, is to understand why women are chosen by the poet over other "others" or minorities, given that all minorities constitute a safe vehicle for the poet to express opinions resented or easily dismissed if credited to men and can therefore be used for calling the values and principles of the Athenian culture into question, urging Athenians to critically assess and revalue their culture.[287] Leaving aside possibilities which cannot be checked, namely that Aristophanes' choice may be prompted by reality (e.g. actual complaints voiced by women for the continuation of the war and the behaviour of the Athenians after the war, or contemporary discussions over political reforms which made case for women's participation in politics(!), it seems to me that a specific trait of women had made them the most suitable 'other' for conveying the message of the play, namely communality.

As we have seen in *Lysistrata*, female communality prescribes affiliation and attachment to others and is attested by activities of service and care at the individual level as well as by sustaining relationships with other groups at the intergroup level. Thus, it is inextricably connected to women's roles as household managers and mothers, which in turn enable and accommodate their political enrollment.[288] These roles, along with women's conservatism, constitute Praxagora's strong arguments for assigning power to women:

[286] Henderson (1991) 145-146.

[287] Henderson (1987a) 129. Albeit minority and otherness are not the same concepts, in our analysis are treated as synonymous. For the concept/phenomenon of otherness and the different approaches to it, see Hazell (2009).

[288] In *Lysistrata* women's interest in and authority over politics stems from their role as ritual performers. Praxagora does refer to Thesmophoria in her speech (223a), but does so as an example of women's conservatism without any emphasis on their role as ritual performers. For women's conservatism which also grants them political authority (215-228), see section 5.6

ταῖς γὰρ γυναιξί φημὶ χρῆναι τὴν πόλιν
ἡμᾶς παραδοῦναι. καὶ γὰρ ἐν ταῖς οἰκίαις
ταύταις ἐπιτρόποις καὶ ταμίαισι χρώμεθα.

I propose that we turn over governance
of the city to women; after all, we employ them
as stewards and treasurers in our own households.
(210-212)

ὡς τοὺς στρατιώτας πρῶτον οὖσαι μητέρες
σώζειν ἐπιθυμήσουσιν· εἶτα σιτία
τίς τῆς τεκούσης θᾶττον ἐπιπέμψειεν ἄν;

first, as mothers they'll want to
protect our soldiers; and second, who will be
quicker to send extra rations than the one who bore you?
(233-236)

Female communality becomes even more striking because individualistic disposition is not assigned to women in the play, despite the fact that it generally constitutes a standard comic female stereotype which denotes women's proneness to satisfy personal needs and thus encompasses lust, gluttony, bibulousness and love for posturing.[289] I would suggest that in the play the notion of female communality is widened, encompassing affiliation and attachment, lack of selfishness/individualistic disposition and deep concern for the public sphere, the commons. This threefold notion of communality provides the basis for the institution of a communal regime as a remedy for Athens' current social ills.

Taking everything into consideration, it becomes obvious that there is no gender-reversal in the play, or if there is, is one-sided gender reversal, displayed only on behalf of men;[290] like in *Thesmophoriazusae* where all men are dressed up as

[289] For the female comic stereotypes, see Taaffe (1993) passim.
[290] Contra Said (1996) 293.

women, in *Ecclesiazusae* all men behave like women.[291] Aristophanes is not making case for women's masculinity since this would undermine the general argument of his play given how suspiciously Greek society treated gender reversal or acquisition of traits and/or behaviour of the opposite sex: feminized men were ridiculed, masculine women were treated as abnormal and were excluded. Albeit in *Ecclesiazusae* women try to acquire, not with great success we must admit, the distinctive physical traits of men such as tanned complexion, hairy body, beard (60-72) and borrow their outfit (73-75), their behaviour is genuinely feminine and they return immediately to their female outfit once their goal is achieved.[292] Within this framework, I suggest that *Ecclesiazusae* moves one step further from *Lysistrata*: due to their revised social identity, women in *Lysistrata* are no longer depicted as a marginal but as an integral part of the society, whose behaviour must become prototypical for both Athenians and Spartans if reconciliation is to be achieved. In *Ecclesiazusae*, women not only share the genuine Athenian citizen identity but become more prototypical of it than men, whose behaviour now contradicts the normative traits of that identity. Women's scheme is motivated by the need to reestablish the normative traits of the Athenian citizen identity and in order to achieve this they become themselves a normative compass for the Athenians. It can again be taken as a subtle and ironic statement on behalf of the poet that women's positive social identity hides underneath male outfit and is brought to light in times of crisis.

Let us now move from the assumptions to the implications of our reading of the first part of the play. Firstly, explaining women's behaviour in terms of uncertainty identity theory implies that we treat them as a high- entitative group; the theory argues that not all groups can reduce self-uncertainty, but the most entitative. "Entitativity is that property of a group, resting on clear boundaries,

[291] In both plays there is one notable exception, the Skythes in *Thesmophoriazusae* and Chremes in *Ecclesiazusae*. For transvestism in *Thesmophoriazusae*, see Saïd (1987), Zeitlin (1981/1996) 375-416 and Taaffe (1993).

[292] For how the cloaks which women steal from their husbands link the cross-dressing and economic aspects of the play, see Compton-Engle (2005).

internal homogeneity, social interaction, clear internal structure, common goals, and common fate, which makes a group ''groupy'' [...] Groups can vary quite widely in entitativity from a loose aggregate to a highly distinctive and cohesive unit [...]. Generally, entitativity is more a matter of perceived interdependence and mutual social influence than mere similarity or homogeneity [...]".[293] Therefore, the key proposition of the theory is that highly entitative groups with clear prototypes are the most effective at reducing uncertainty: people will either identify strongly with such a group or will increase the entitativity of the group they are already identified with. Uncertainty-identity theory goes even beyond entitativity in associating uncertainty with societal extremism, identification with totalistic groups and zealotry.[294] Can women be considered a highly-entitative group with clear prototype which can reduce uncertainty when identified with? Or, given how uncertainty-identity theory underpins extremism and totalism, can women or the regime established by them be considered extreme and totalist?

Undoubtably, the original conception of Aristophanes' play builds on "the male view of all women as a secret tribe in league against the system" to use Henderson's words.[295] Female solidarity, examples of which are given in the prologue of both *Lysistrata* and *Thesmophoriazusae,* had reinforced such a perception and rendered women a highly entitative group in men's mind despite women's differences in status and social roles. But given how Aristophanes likes to undermine the exact same social stereotypes that he exploits, in *Ecclesiazusae* women's entitativity is not sustained by such a negative picture ("a secret tribe in

[293] Hogg (2007) 88.

[294] Ibid., 92: "Uncertainty-identity theory describes a psychological mechanism that converts uncertainty into totalism. The process may be initiated by extreme and enduring uncertainty-for example, widespread societal uncertainty caused by economic collapse, cultural disintegration, civil war, terrorism, and large-scale natural disasters, or more personal uncertainty caused by unemployment, bereavement, divorce, relocation, adolescence, and so forth. Under these circumstances, extreme groups may do a better job than merely high-entitativity groups at reducing or fending off uncertainty. People seek out extreme groups to identify with, or they make existing groups more extreme. Furthermore, people will identify strongly with such groups. They will have a strong sense of belonging and a strong feeling of attachment to the group, and their sense of self will be comprehensively defined by the group-they could be described as zealots, fanatics, or true believers." For the studies that provide support to uncertainty-identity theory's predictions about identification with totalistic groups see ibid., 94-97.

[295] Henderson (1987a) 113.

league against the system") but by women's shared revised social identity: as we have already argued, differences in age, status and social roles are eliminated and women constitute a 'homogenous' group with a multifaceted social identity of which Praxagora is the most prototypical member.[296] Yet, being highly entitative does not automatically render a group extremist or totalist. No matter how tempting is to apply to women's regime such characterizations which have been applied to modern communist regimes, this is unbearable. However, there have been scholars who have identified similarities between Praxagora's scheme and oligarchic coups.[297] Although Alan Sheppard has convincingly demonstrated the democratic credentials of Praxagora's plan and women's actions,[298] we cannot deny that there is indeed a flirt with oligarchic practises, for example in the way women manage to obtain power, and this is not at all coincidental. Aristophanes is playing with audience's expectations: having witnessed how crisis and uncertainty had led to the rule of Thirty in 404, the play suggests identification with a group which has the same aim with the rule of the Thirty –to save democracy- and ostensibly the same oligarchic colouring- like all the minorities who challenge the status-quo, but ends up advocating egalitarianism more than any other form of constitution.

Secondly, we have repeatedly referred to women's minority position in the play and this allows us to examine the minority influence processes portrayed. Although almost all Aristophanic heroes represent minority positions, we do not get to see minority influence strategies in action in the plays. *Ecclesiazusae* is an exception, albeit a quite paradoxical one: minority influence appears in the apparatus of majority influence, providing a further, subtle example of Aristophanes' game with apparatus in the play. It seems that Athenian society was not yet ready to see the public triumph of minorities: minority position is advocated by women disguised as men.[299] The fact that men are easily persuaded by the

[296] For Praxagora's prototypicality, see the following section.
[297] Scholtz (2007) 71-111, Fletcher (2012) 127-140.
[298] Sheppard (2016).
[299] Interestingly, only in the plays where women are in the place of the "other" and/or constitute a minority, that position triumphs and a true social change is achieved; though in earlier plays like the *Acharnians* the

majority even when majority is advocating a minority position makes irony bolder. According to the social psychology of social influence "[c]onsistency is the most important behavioural style for effective minority influence, as it speaks directly to the existence of an alternative norm and identity rather than merely an alternative opinion".[300] Praxagora in her rehearsal speech argues, though in comic terms and by exploiting some of the female comic stereotypes,[301] for women's traditional or conservative attitude which is a pattern of consistency and contrasts sharply to men's quest for innovation:[302]

Apart from consistency, it is equally important for the minority to achieve to be treated as an ingroup and not a threatening outgroup critic in order to make the majority more receptive towards its position. [303] In *Ecclesiazusae* there is no need for that: women's critique of men's behaviour is accepted because it ostensibly stems from their own mouth. Blepyrus' reaction to Chremes' report is indicative of men's positive attitude towards such ingroup critique:

ΒΛΕΠΥΡΟΣ

καὶ τί εἶπε;

ΧΡΕΜΗΣ

πρῶτον μέν σ' ἔφη

εἶναι πανοῦργον.

ΒΛΕΠΥΡΟΣ

comic hero does represent a political or/and social minority who manages to persuade the chorus, he enjoys the success of his plan alone, without achieving a social change. One can object that this also true for Trygaeus in *Peace,* but actually he does not represent a minority position despite being member of a social minority. Even in *Lysistrata,* where a social change –although temporary- is achieved, we do not see minority influence strategies in action; women manage to establish their women-orientated world by coercive means.

[300] Hogg and Vaughan (2018) 262.

[301] One must not fail to observe though that Praxagora's speech is not entirely comic in tone; at the beginning she enumerates positive examples of women's conservatism/traditionalism as attested by their domestic (215-217, 221) and religious duties (223a).

[302] Sommerstein (1998) 158 refers to women's conservatism, whereas Rothwell (1990) 54 to women's traditionalism. If women's regime is indeed innovative or conservative/traditionalist, see sections 5.5 and 5.6.

[303] Cf. Hogg and Wagoner (2017) 216: "Active minorities are effectively criticizing the majority's position and practices. In doing so, they need to be very careful to be viewed as ingroup not outgroup critics. Research on the intergroup sensitively effect shows that outgroup critics are strongly rejected and that thus have little influence; whereas ingroup critics are viewed less negatively and can be viewed as working constructively in the group's best interest [...]-thus they are better positioned to be influential."

καὶ σέ;

ΧΡΕΜΗΣ

μή πω τοῦτ᾽ ἔρη.

κἄπειτα κλέπτην.

ΒΛΕΠΥΡΟΣ

ἐμὲ μόνον;

ΧΡΕΜΗΣ

καὶ νὴ Δία

καὶ συκοφάντην.

ΒΛΕΠΥΡΟΣ

ἐμὲ μόνον;

ΧΡΕΜΗΣ

καὶ νὴ Δία

τωνδὶ τὸ πλῆθος.

ΒΛΕΠΥΡΟΣ

τίς δὲ τοῦτ᾽ ἄλλως λέγει;

ΧΡΕΜΗΣ

γυναῖκα δ᾽ εἶναι πρᾶγμ᾽ ἔφη νουβυστικὸν

καὶ χρηματοποιόν. κοὔτε τἀπόρρητ᾽ ἔφη

ἐκ Θεσμοφόροιν ἑκάστοτ᾽ αὐτὰς ἐκφέρειν,

σὲ δὲ κἀμὲ βουλεύοντε τοῦτο δρᾶν ἀεί.

ΒΛΕΠΥΡΟΣ

καὶ νὴ τὸν Ἑρμῆν τοῦτό γ᾽ οὐκ ἐψεύσατο.

ΧΡΕΜΗΣ

ἔπειτα συμβάλλειν πρὸς ἀλλήλας ἔφη

ἱμάτια, χρυσί,᾽ ἀργύριον, ἐκπώματα,

μόνας μόναις, οὐ μαρτύρων ἐναντίον,

καὶ ταῦτ᾽ ἀποφέρειν πάντα κοὐκ ἀποστερεῖν,

ἡμῶν δὲ τοὺς πολλοὺς ἔφασκε τοῦτο δρᾶν.

ΒΛΕΠΥΡΟΣ

νὴ τὸν Ποσειδῶ, μαρτύρων γ' ἐναντίον.

BLEPYRUS
And what did he say?
CHREMES
First, he called you a criminal.
BLEPYRUS
And what did he call you?
CHREMES
I'll get to that.
Then he called you a crook.
BLEPYRUS
Only me?
CHREMES
That's right,
and an informer too.
BLEPYRUS
Only me?
CHREMES
That's right, you and most of this crowd here as well!
BLEPYRUS
Well, who'd deny that?
CHREMES
He went on to say that a woman is a creature bursting with brains,
and moneymaker, and that women never divulge
the secrets of the Thesmophoria, by contrast
with you and me, who leak what we say in Council all the time.
BLEPYRUS
By Hermes, that last point's no lie.
CHREMES
Then he said that women lend each other
dresses, jewelry, money, drinking cups,
privately and without witnesses,
and always return everything and don't cheat,
as most of us men, he claimed, do.
BLEPYRUS
By Poseidon, we cheat even when there are witnesses.
(436-451)

At the end, these strategies lead to the adoption of the minority position by the majority (men) and to the establishment of a women-orientated world, a world

where the women have become prototypical of the superordinate group. Before analyzing the new regime, let us consider Paxagora's election as leader.

5.4 "Think crisis-think female" in Aristophanes: leadership under uncertainty[304]

Long before all their doubts are expelled, women elect Praxagora as their leader upon the implementation of her plan:

οὐκ ἐτὸς ἄρ', ὦ μελ', ἦσθα δεινὴ καὶ σοφή·
καί σε στρατηγὸν αἱ γυναῖκες αὐτόθεν
αἱρούμεθ', ἢν ταῦθ' ἁπινοεῖς κατεργάσῃ.

That's no wonder, madam, that you were so impressive and sage.
Furthermore, your fellow women hereby elect you
general if you succeed with this plan of yours.
(245-247)

Although at first glance Praxagora's election seems the result of her uniqueness, I suggest that it actually stems from her prototypicality, in her being not an exceptional or a charismatic member of the women's group but in being the most representative of their collective identity. Slater argues that "[i]t is tempting to praise Praxagora's speech by denigrating the other women's attempts up to this point. The analogy of Lysistrata may mislead us. Lysistrata in her play is a unique figure, the only woman capable of organizing and maintaining the sex strike. Aristophanes deliberately tells us very little about her, in part to set her off: we have no idea, for example, if she has a husband and thereby participates in the strike herself. Praxagora is by no means unique. She is simply different in degree, not kind, from the women who have spoken before her. All the women are slowly mastering their acting skills, learning to wear their masculine garb properly, move, and speak

[304] "Think crisis-think female" is a contemporary stereotype denoting that in times of crisis and uncertainty women are more desirable leaders than men. See Ryan et al. (2011). Generally, though, leadership is associated with men and this is the "think manager-think male" stereotype. See Shein (1973). There are different explanations for women's election as leaders in times of crisis and uncertainty with the most well-searched being that feminine traits and roles make women more desirable (Gartzia et al. 2012). At the same time, researchers have demonstrated that women are preferred because crisis and uncertainty strengthen the need for any leader and thus people are more supportive of non-prototypical leaders; additionally, crisis and uncertainty change leader-prototypicality perceptions and thus women are rendered more group prototypical than men (Rast et al. 2012, 2013, 2015).

not only in a masculine voice but also from a masculine mental architecture".[305] In fact, Praxagora's prototypicality is easily sketched and one does not fail to notice how harmoniously she comprises features which in *Lysistrata* are divided between the old women, the young women and Lysistrata herself. To begin with, Praxagora acts in an agentic mode and attempts a successful intrusion into the world of men unlike her tragic counterparts, following the example of Lysistrata. She is also persuasive and has excellent rhetorical skills like her. However, she is not completely exempted from common female vices such as lust (8-11, 14-15, 525-526). In addition, she is treacherous and manipulative, deceiving her husband Blepyrus easily. At the same time, she resembles the old women in *Lysistrata* in being a protectress of the tradition and of her confederates. All in all, she provides the best example for the multifaceted identity of women which Aristophanes probably had started building in *Lysistrata.*[306]

Given that the social world of the play is one of crisis and ambiguity, our assessment of Praxagora as a prototypical leader corroborates the propositions of the social identity theory of leadership when integrated with uncertainty-identity theory. The integration of the two theories aims at explaining leader preferences in times of uncertainty and crisis. Evidence from organizational surveys has shown that feelings of uncertainty strengthen support for prototypical leaders;[307] this is indeed the case of women in *Ecclesiazusae.* However, other studies have illustrated how uncertainty can equally weaken, alter or even negate the leader prototypicality advantage.[308] In macro-analysis, Aristophanes' plot supports these findings as well, urging the audience to realize the necessity of rethinking and eventually altering

[305] Slater (2002) 212. For a different perspective of the women's intelligence and skills, see Sommerstein (1998) 26.

[306] Of course, there is always the possibility that Aristophanes started building women's multifaceted identity in other play(s) which have not survivied as well as that this multifaceted identity may come from comedy's interaction with tragedy where women are not depicted as a monolithic category.

[307] Pierro et al. (2007), Cicero et al. (2007, 2010).

[308] Rast et al. (2012), Rast et al. (2015). The contradictory findings and discrepancies are due to the different conception and operationalization of uncertainty in the afore-mentioned studies. While Pierro et al. focused on uncertainty-related constructs which motivate uncertainty reduction like the need for closure, job stress and role ambiguity, Rast et al. examined the impact of self-uncertainty itself and not of its correlates. In Aristophanes' play this distinction is not sustained.

the leader-prototypicality advantage: women become more group-prototypical compared to men and thus are more appropriate to rule the city.[309]

It is important to note, though, that women rule the city by establishing the communal regime and in the second part of the play we do not actually see Praxagora in the role of the leader. This can be associated, as we will see below, with Sheppard's assumption that the comic heroine is cast as a founding figure and lawgiver in the manner of Solon, which in turn provides a convincing account for her absence from the second part of the play: Praxagora, the female Solon, leaves the stage like the historical Solon had left Athens after the establishment of his laws.[310]

5.5 From female communality to a communal regime[311]

5.5.1 The communal regime in operation: the triumph or "the tragedy of the commons"?[312]

ΒΛΕΠΥΡΟΣ

τὴν δὲ δίαιταν τίνα ποιήσεις;

ΠΡΑΞΑΓΟΡΑ

κοινὴν πᾶσιν. τὸ γὰρ ἄστυ

μίαν οἴκησίν φημι ποιήσειν συρρήξασ' εἰς ἓν ἅπαντα,

[309] Cf. McGlew (2002) 195: "Neither Lysistrata nor Praxagora is characterized by the simple desires that drive Aristophanes' early male heroes. Just as Lysistrata seems immune to the sexual urges that motivate her fellow revolutionaries, Praxagora's play is not in any obvious sense a response to particular desires and annoyances that characterize her life. In this sense, the characters of Lysistrata and Praxagora represent a radical departure from Aristophanes' early heroes. The latter are typically busy shaping new worlds to satisfy their personal pleasure, exploiting the audience's sense of identity with the hero to convince them that they have a place in comedy's fantastic new world".

[310] For our argument for 'the rule of law', see section 5.5.2.

[311] I use the expression 'communal regime' to describe Praxagora's new society because of its communal elements (sex enjoyment is communal, private property is surrendered to a common stock), without suggesting that it should be treated as the ancient equivalent of communism, despite any similarities between them.

[312] I use the expression "tragedy of the commons" to denote the failure of Praxagora's regime. The expression is used in social sciences to describe the commons dilemma, a type of social dilemma in which everybody benefits if everybody cooperates and everybody gets harmed if everybody competes. It was the title of an article exploring this type of dilemma by the ecologist and philosopher Garrett Hardin in 1968, however the expression belongs to the British economist William Forster Lloyd who used it in an essay in 1833 to discuss the possible results of over-using a common resource such as the common pasture which English villages used to share.

ὥστε βαδίζειν εἰς ἀλλήλων.

BLEPYRUS
And what standard of living will you establish?
PRAXAGORA
The same for all. I mean to convert the city
into one household by breaking down all partitions to make one dwelling,
so that everyone can walk into everyone else's space.
(673-675)

In *Ecclesiazusae* Aristophanes is not simply taking the idea that *polis* management should be like *oikos* management to its logical end by assigning women the management of the city's affairs,[313] but also takes communality to its logical end by presenting women establishing a communal regime. The communal measures refer to lifestyle and property as well as to sexual relations: on one hand, all possessions will be surrendered to a common stock (597-600), clothes will provided by women (653-654), land will be cultivated by slaves (651) and food will be served in the former government buildings now turned into communal dining halls (676). On the other hand, women will become common property (614-615) and the beauty and youth advantage in sex relations will be counterbalanced by the priority advantage (615-634). Equally important is that Praxagora's communal regime leaves no place for self-interest as she explains to Blepyrus:

ΓΕΙΤΩΝ
πῶς οὖν ὅστις μὴ κέκτηται γῆν ἡμῶν, ἀργύριον δὲ
καὶ Δαρεικούς, ἀφανῆ πλοῦτον;
ΠΡΑΞΑΓΟΡΑ
τοῦτ' εἰς τὸ μέσον καταθήσει.
ΒΛΕΠΥΡΟΣ
κεἰ μὴ καταθεὶς ψευδορκήσει, κἀκτήσατο γὰρ διὰ τοῦτο.

[313] Aristophanes presents constantly the household and state as similar institutions, not only in women's plays, *Lysistrata* and *Ecclesiazusae*, but also in *Knights* and in the first part of *Wasps.* For a broader conception of how city and house politics merge in Aristophanes' plays, see Hutchinson (2011) and Lape and Moreno (2014).

ΠΡΑΞΑΓΟΡΑ

ἀλλ' οὐδέν τοι χρήσιμον ἔσται πάντως αὐτῷ.

ΒΛΕΠΥΡΟΣ

κατὰ δὴ τί;

ΠΡΑΞΑΓΟΡΑ

οὐδεὶς οὐδὲν πενίᾳ δράσει· πάντα γὰρ ἕξουσιν ἅπαντες,

ἄρτους, τεμάχη, μάζας, χλαίνας, οἶνον, στεφάνους, ἐρεβίνθους.

ὥστε τί κέρδος μὴ καταθεῖναι; σὺ γὰρ ἐξευρὼν ἀπόδειξον.

ΒΛΕΠΥΡΟΣ

οὔκουν καὶ νῦν οὗτοι μᾶλλον κλέπτουσ', οἷς ταῦτα πάρεστιν;

ΓΕΙΤΩΝ

πρότερόν γ', ὦταῖρ', ὅτε τοῖσι νόμοις διεχρώμεθα τοῖς προτέροισιν·

νῦν δ', ἔσται γὰρ βίος ἐκ κοινοῦ, τί τὸ κέρδος μὴ καταθεῖναι;

NEIGHBOR
And what about the man who owns no land but has invisible wealth,
like silver coin and gold darics?
PRAXAGORA
He'll contribute it to the common fund.
BLEPYRUS
And if he doesn't, he'll perjure himself; after all that's how he got it in the first place.
PRAXAGORA
But see, it won't be of any use to him anyway.
BLEPYRUS
What do you mean?
PRAXAGORA
No one will be doing anything as a result of poverty, because everyone will have all the necessities:
bread, salt fish, barley cakes, cloaks, wine, garlands, chickpeas.
So where's his profit in not contributing? If you can find it, do tell me.
PRAXAGORA
But even now, aren't the people who have all this the bigger thieves?
NEIGHBOR
That was before, my friend, when we lived under the previous system.
But now that everyone will be living from a common fund, where's his profit in not contributing?
(601-610)

All these in theory, but what happens in action? Following the typical story-pattern of Aristophanic comedies, in the second part of the play, the one following the parabasis, we expect to see the implementation of these measures and the comic heroine enjoying her success after expelling any threats. However, *Ecclesiazusae* does not feature a parabasis and its second part consists of two scenes which describe social dilemmas and strike the audience with the absence of Praxagora-her last words are in line 724 and the play finishes in line 1184.[314] The first scene depicts the lifestyle and property measures in operation: a law-abiding citizen, the Neighbour, is about to hand in his property to the state when a free-rider, the Selfish Man, prevents him by declaring his decision not to surrender his own property and his intention to attend the communal dinner despite that (730-876).[315] The second scene depicts the sexual measures at work: three Old Women prevent a young woman and a young man called Epigenes to copulate and thus to evade the law by claiming their sexual rights to the latter. At the end, Epigenes is forced to perform his duty with the second and the third Old Woman.[316] The two scenes do not provide clear-cut answers, at least for modern audiences: for example, we do not know whether the Selfish Man's plan succeeds at the end or whether the Old Women's depiction and Epigenes' claims are expected to make us sympathize with the latter. Things get even more perplexed because the choral songs which separate these scenes are not preserved in the manuscripts.[317] Thus, they have lent themselves easily in support of contradictory interpretations and have divided scholars between a pessimistic reading with ironic overtones and a positive one.[318]

[314] According to the classical definition of Dawes (1980) 170 "[s]ocial dilemmas are characterized by two properties: (a) the social payoff to each individual for defecting behavior is higher than the payoff for cooperative behavior, regardless of what the other society members do, yet (b) all individuals in the society receive a lower payoff if all defect than if all cooperate."

[315] The free-rider effect is defined by Hogg and Vaughan (2018) 426 as "Gaining the benefits of group membership by avoiding costly obligations of membership and by allowing other members to incur those costs."

[316] Olson (1987) have suggested that Epigenes and the Selfish Man is the same person.

[317] See the discussion of Rothwell (1992) and Sommerstein (1998) 24-25.

[318] The main pessimistic and ironic readings of the play are those of Foley (1982), Saïd (1996) and Hubbard (1997). Contra Sommerstein (1998), Slater (2002) 207-234, Ruffel (2006) and Henderson (2009) 154-156. Rothwell (1990) is in the middle.

Although all Aristophanes' comedies resist simplistic readings and *Ecclesiazusae* could not have been an exception, one can argue with confidence that its waters are the muddiest of all plays, even muddier than those of the *Birds*. Our analysis does not intend to make the waters clearer by solving the interpretive riddle of the play, but rather aims at rephrasing it: we suggest that the second part of *Ecclesiazusae* is expected to urge the audience realize what the institution of the communal regime actually stands for besides or, better to say, underneath its radical structural apparatus. Our assumption is that the poet is at pains to associate the communal regime to female communality because the communal regime is in its essence a motivational solution for Athens' social ills, the triumph of the pro-social orientation of women's sex over men's growing pro-self orientation.[319] Social psychology provides support for such an assumption; whereas research has shown that structural solutions can be very effective for resolving social dilemmas, social psychologists have also acknowledged the difficulties of imposing them and have tested the impact of other solutions. "If structural solutions are so difficult, what other options do we have? One factor that seems particularly effective in resolving social dilemmas is group identification [...]. Where people identify very strongly with a group that accesses a shared resource, those people act in ways that benefit the group as a whole rather than themselves as separate from the group […]".[320] Within this framework, the interpretive riddle posed to the play's audiences, ancient and modern, is not whether the communal regime operates well, but whether the Athenians realise the need to espouse the "communal" social identity in order for a structural solution stemming from and grounded on this identification to operate well.

In turn, the assumption that Aristophanes' play advocates the importance of group identification implies that the operation of the communal regime does not prescribe obedience or coercive compliance to its laws, but relies on conformity to

[319] For the development of social value orientations (pro-self and pro-social) and the social motives underlying them (individualism, competition and cooperation) see van Lange et al. (1997).
[320] Hogg and Vaughan (2018) 427, with references to all the relevant experiments.

group/social norms. Social norms are "rules and standards that are understood by members of a group and that guide and/or constrain social behaviour without the force of laws. These norms emerge out of interaction with others; they may or may not be stated explicitly, and any sanctions for deviating from them come from social networks, not the legal system."[321] If this is indeed the case, then *Ecclesiazusae* automatically has more to say about norms, values, ideology and culture and less to say about politics and laws.[322] How are we then expected to interpret the constant references to *νόμοι* and *ψηφίσματα* which are found in the scenes of the second part of the play and seem to suggest that the communal regime rests on and in turn promotes 'the rule of law'? And relatedly, why does a motivational solution such as group identification need a structural apparatus in the first place? The answer to both questions seems to lie in the engagement with the contemporary sociopolitical context; the play satirizes the heavy constitutional reforms of the fourth century which promoted the rule of the law and also the Athenians' fond of innovation.

5.5.2 Playing with apparatus again: the rule of the communal law

"democratic citizenship does not lay itself fully bare in legal definitions and formal actions"[323]

The expression 'rule of law' has a long run in philosophy dating back to ancient Greek political thought and wide applications in contemporary political science, legal theory and economics, despite its different conceptualization and far from univocal meaning in both contemporary and ancient literature. Generally, nowadays "[t]he Rule of Law comprises a number of principles of a formal and procedural character, addressing the way in which a community is governed. The formal principles concern the generality, clarity, publicity, stability, and prospectivity of the norms that govern a society. The procedural principles concern

[321] Cialdini and Trost (1998) 152.
[322] Cf. Fletcher's similar, though clearly ironic, argument: "[i]t is appropriate that the new state is devoted to food, sex and clothing; law and politics are incompatible with women's rule (2012: 131).
[323] McGlew (2002) 6.

the processes by which these norms are administered, and the institutions—like courts and an independent judiciary that their administration requires".[324] To put it in Tamanaha's laconic terms, 'the rule of law is an accepted measure worldwide of government legitimacy'.[325] In ancient political thought, the 'rule of law' was conceptualized very differently by Aristotle and Plato; in *Politics* Aristotle advocates the 'rule of the law' as a legal framework which prescribed the limitation of the power held by the deliberative popular bodies and the promotion of the magisterial authority for maintaining the sovereignty of law. Plato in the *Laws* "emphasizes the creation of the 'fiction' of sacred, immutable, personified Laws which rule over citizens who are their slaves or servants" and "focuses upon the grounding of the rule of law in processes of education and socialization which create the conditions necessary for the maintenance of this fiction".[326] Both Aristotle and Plato were sceptical of radical democracy and thus their conceptualizations contrast to the Athenian democratic ideology which argued that the laws should protect people from the state and ensure that the latter does not intrude into people's private lives.[327]

The different conceptions of the term in both contemporary and ancient thought partly enforce the ongoing debate in classical scholarship regarding the endorsement of 'the rule of law' in the fifth century.[328] In contrast, the fourth century is treated unanimously by classical scholarship as the era of 'the rule of law'; already from the end of the fifth century the Athenians had privileged the sovereignty of the law and had weakened the sovereignty of the assembly/people through

[324] The definition comes from the online Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rule-of-law/#LawSociNorm. For a detailed account of the history of the expression, its formal-procedural-substantive requirements, its applications and the controversies pertaining them, see ibid.

[325] Tamanaha (2004) 3.

[326] Cohen (1995) 35-36.

[327] For a detailed discussion of the conceptualizations of the 'rule of the law' by Aristotle, Plato and Athenian ideology, see Cohen (1995) 34-57 with references to the primary sources. For Aristotle, see also Miller (2007) and Bertelli (2018) and for Plato, see Bobonich (2010).

[328] For example, scholars like Osborne (1985), Ober (1989), Todd (1993), Cohen (1995), Christ (1998) and Lanni (2006, 2016) believe that the Athenian legal system of the fifth century did not conform to the "rule of law" but it privileged personal standing. Contra Ostwald (1986), Sealy (1987), Rubinstein (2000, 2007), Rhodes (2004) Harris (2006, 2013) and Canevaro (2013, 2015).

constitutional reforms. According to the new definition of the law established within the framework of the codification of 403/2 and cited by the orator Andocides "[LAWS] *A law which has not been inscribed shall not be employed by officials on any matter whatever. No decree of the Council or Assembly shall prevail over a law. It shall not be permitted to pass a law applying to an individual unless the same law applies to all Athenians, unless it is resolved by six thousand voting by secret ballot*".[329] Hansen has aptly demonstrated that Andocides' citation of the new definition of the law, although condensed, reveals three significant reforms: first the prohibition of the unwritten law and thus the non-usage of the term *νόμος,* at least officially, in the meaning of custom any longer, second the introduction of the distinction between *νόμοι* as permanent laws and *ψηφίσματα* as assembly decrees of limited duration or immediate concern and third the prevalence of laws-*νόμοι* over decrees-*ψηφίσματα*-.[330]

Under the light of these clarifications, we return to *Ecclesiazusae.* Although the play was produced in the fourth century, the poet blurs the distinction between the terms *νόμοι* and *ψηφίσματα* by using both for the reforms made by Praxagora (*νόμοι*: 759, 762, 944, 1022, 1041, 1049, 1056, 1077 *ψηφίσματα:* 649, 813, 1013).[331] Many interpretations have been suggested for identifying Aristophanes' purpose and implied message –if there is any- for this blurring. Ober, for example, has argued that, despite the formal distinction, there must have been confusion in people's mind over the actual differences between the two terms, allowing Aristophanes to mix them for comic effect.[332] Additionally, he argues that the appeal to *νόμος* is meant to legitimize Praxagora's reforms: since women pack the Assembly their reforms are actually *ψηφίσματα*, but the poet elevates their status by treating them

[329] Andocides *On the Mysteries* [87] in Gagarin and MacDowell (1998) 124.
[330] See Hansen (1991) 170-174. For a more detailed discussion of the distinction between *νόμοι* and *ψηφίσματα,* see also Hansen (1978) and Rhodes (1980) 305-306.
[331] There are other references to *νόμοι* and *ψηφίσματα* in the play; in line 609 *νόμοι* refers to the old laws, in line 741 we have *ὄρθριον νόμον*, in lines 987 and 988 the term refers to backgammon rules, whereas in lines 1089-1090 we have *τὸ Καννωνοῦ ψήφισμα.* A similar blurring of the terms is found in *Birds* (1035-1045), but that play was produced in 414 when the distinction was not applied.
[332] Ober (1998) 145.

as *νόμοι*.[333] However, in *Ecclesiazusae* there are passages which can be taken as implying the validity of the distinction (762-764 and 812-816) and personally neither do I see any comic effect achieved by using both terms interchangeably. Nonetheless, I agree that such a blurring is typically Aristophanic in nature.[334] If comic effect is declined as an explanation, then irony is the only explanation left for the merging of the two terms. But as always with irony in Aristophanes, it is not easy to identify its target or its way of working and in any attempt to define it the audience must be taken into account: his behaviour, his expectations and his social knowledge. In this case, the easy answer is to argue that irony is meant towards Praxagora's reforms as Said and others who propose negative readings of the play assume; the difficult answer is to discern irony behind the satire of the contemporary politics and ideology along with Ruffel.

Building on his rationale, our assumption is that the blurring of the terms and generally the depiction of how the communal regime operates in the second part of the play is meant to demonstrate that, despite the introduction of structural reforms which promote the 'rule of law' and are intended to protect democracy by operating as a remedy for Athens' social ills, Athens is in great need of a different kind of remedy. The on-going individualistic behaviour of the citizens highlights that this must be a motivational solution or a structural solution with strong motivational aspects, within the context of which coercive compliance to the law will be replaced by conformity to social norms. Women's communal regime is such a solution; it is the institutionalization of female communality and it is sustained by laws which are grounded on social norms which promote pro-social behaviour. The figure of Praxagora is crucial in this procedure; Alan Sheppard has argued that, given how the constitutional reforms of the fourth century were associated with appeals to tradition, exploited the rhetoric of *πάτριος πολιτεία* and invoked the picture of

[333] Ober (1998) 146. Contra Fletcher (2012) who treats the blurring as a means of implicitly questioning the legality and validity of women's reforms.
[334] Cf. also the parody of *probouleumata* in the assembly-scene in *Thesmophoriazusae* (372-379).

Solon as the founding father of democracy, the comic heroine must be seen as a lawgiver and a founding father.[335]

Praxagora qua female Solon establishes the communal regime which is sustained by and in turn promotes the rule of a different kind of law. At a very crucial point of the plot, in her argumentation for assigning government to women, Praxagora uses the term *νόμος* (216) in the meaning of custom. This is the first occurrence of the term in the play and its usage in the second old meaning -but probably still in use in everyday life- cannot be random, especially in an era dominated by discussions over other possible or/and ideal systems of government and after the introduction of constitutional reforms aiming at stabilizing the democracy: it clarifies that the communal regime is sustained by and in turn promotes the rule of tradition.[336] In this sense, it is of little importance whether Praxagora's reforms are described as *νόμοι* or *ψηφίσματα;* this is a distinction applying to the structural apparatus of the remedy and it must not overshadow its motivational nature; Praxagora's reforms are grounded on women's customs and it is due to the identification with women's group and the adherence to the communal norms prescribed by this identification that the communal regime is expected to outweigh the individualism of the Athenians. Still, the predominance of the term *νόμος* over *ψηφίσματα* is in line with the historical and sociopolitical background of the play which promotes the sovereignty of the law and the superiority of laws

[335] Sheppard (2016) 477-484. For Solon as a founding father of democracy, see Hansen (1991) 298-300, Thomas (1994), Mossé (2004). For the rhetoric of *πάτριος πολιτεία,* see Finley (1975) 34-59 and for how this rhetoric was exploited by both oligarchs and democrats, see Shear (2011) and Canevaro (forthcoming).

[336] In this way, women's communal regime works for Aristophanes in the way that the courts of the fifth century worked according to Lanni (2016). Lanni argued for the Athenians' contextualized and individualized notion of justice in the fifth century, thus making case for a rather different 'rule of law' endorsed by the Athenian legal system. After bringing to light the limitations of both informal social control and law enforcement, she describes the "expressive" or "symbolic" function of the law and explains how the court system enforced conformity to norms and how argumentation developed in the court shaped and reinforced the norms. Cohen (2005) 11-12 is right to argue that the Athenians "saw themselves as committed to and generally upholding the rule of law on which, in their opinion, their democracy depended. The crucial point here, however, is that unlike Lanni they did not conceptualize "legal" and "social ends" as standing in opposition to one another. It is their understanding of the way in which the interests of the demos and the rule of law intersect that produces what Lanni rightly calls a "highly individualized and contextualized notion of justice." Modern legal sociology provides the theoretical background of her analysis, especially the literature on social norms. Generally, nowadays the interaction of social norms and law is a promising field of research in both economics and law theory.

over decrees; but this ostensible alignment with reality makes Aristophanes' ironic glance towards the ineffectiveness of constitutional reforms bolder.

Let us see how the two scenes corroborate our assumption. In the first scene the Selfish Man constantly attempts to prevent the Neighbour from handing over his property to the state, either by making fun of his dutifulness and suggesting the adoption of a strategic move -wait and see- (760-770, 787-793) or by underlining the impermanence of the assembly decisions (797-798, 812-829), probably alluding to the clarity of the distinction between *νόμοι* and *ψηφίσματα*. The Neighbour defends his decision by expressing his confidence over his fellow citizens' intentions, promises, commitments and actions (773: *λέγουσι γοῦν ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς* 774: *καί φασιν οἴσειν ἀράμενοι* 799: *οἴσουσιν, ὦ τᾶν* 800: *ἀμέλει, κομιοῦσιν* 805-6: *ἔγωγε· καὶ γὰρ τοὺς ἐμαυτοῦ γείτονας/ὁρῶ φέροντας*). His persistence to turn in his possessions and his confidence over the behaviour of his fellow citizens urge the Selfish Man to admit the power of group norms, although interpreting them in his own fashion:

ΑΝΗΡ

οἴσειν δοκεῖς τιν,' ὅστις αὐτῶν νοῦν ἔχει;

οὐ γὰρ πάτριον τοῦτ' ἐστίν.

ΓΕΙΤΩΝ

ἀλλὰ λαμβάνειν

ἡμᾶς μόνον δεῖ;

ΑΝΗΡ

νὴ Δία·

SELFISH MAN

Do you really think that anyone with a brain is going to turn it in?

That's not in our national character.

NEIGHBOR

You mean we should only take?

SELFISH MAN

Absolutely.

(778-779)

The Neighbour's behaviour provides an example of referent informational influence. Referent informational influence is one of the three processes of social influence that social psychologists have suggested for explaining conformity.[337] It stems from social identity theory and argues that people conform not only when they want to gain social approval or be confident about social reality, but also when they see themselves in group terms. In this case, they assimilate their behaviour to group terms and conform to group norms. A basic difference between referent informational influence and the other two types of conformity processes is that people conform to norms and not to other people, whose behaviour is only treated as a source of ingroup normative information. Furthermore, surveillance is not necessary for conformity because the norm on which the law is grounded is internalised. This may explain Praxagora's absence from the second part of the play: since communality is internalised, there is no need for a leader to supervise or force conformity to the communal laws.[338] Moreover, it is in line with Praxagora's argument as cited by Chremes that women lend each other household and personal goods without witnesses or contracts (446-450).

Additionally, the Neighbour's behaviour allows us to suggest that 'the rule of law' is not simply grounded on social norms but works as a social norm itself. One does not fail to notice that it is the Neighbour who refers first to the law, declaring that his intention to hand in his property is in accordance to it (758-759), whereas his answer to the Selfish Man's comment that he is stupid for doing so shows genuine bewilderment: "*τί δ' ; οὐχὶ πειθαρχεῖν με τοῖς νόμοισι δεῖ;*" (762).

[337] The other two processes of conformity are informational and normative influence. According to Hogg and Vaughan (2018) 257 and 258 respectively "[i]nformational influence is an influence to accept information from another as evidence about reality" and "[n]ormative influence is an influence to conform to the positive expectations of others, to gain social approval or to avoid social disapproval". For the primary bibliography and experiments, see ibid..

[338] Ruffel (2006) 102-103 argues that Praxagora's absence from the second part of the play and generally the diminished role of the protagonists of the late plays invite the audience to "move away from the confrontation of the mass audience to individual reflection, choice and reactions by the anonymous characters. The interest in the individual response, in the audience as in the fictional world, is arguably enacted in the structure of *Ecclesiazusae*. The interest in and acknowledgement of the individual Athenian's decisions, responsibilities and response is what marks out the late plays from the earlier. Combined with the provocative content, this new focus on the individual everyman and everywoman is inviting the question, "Well, what would you do?".

However, he never refers to punishment, arguing for example that there is going to be a kind of punishment for him for not obeying the law. Given the constant references to law in the play, one would expect constant references to punishment as well, but the only punishment Praxagora ever refers to is the deprivation of food in cases of crimes of violence (665-666). Additionally, the Neighbour only supposes, after the Selfish Man's pressing and annoying questions, that there will be beating in cases of non-compliance with the law (801), which is though never seen in action. In the same way, all his assumptions on how women will stop the Selfish Man from attending the communal dinner without handing in his property are based on the practices adopted by the previous regime (862-866). The point is that Praxagora's regime does not actually prescribe the imposition of any sanction for non-compliance to the law. Or, when it does so, this is not emphasized. Similarly, the three Old Women do not use the imposement of punishment as an argument to convince Epigenes to have sex with them.[339] Following the propositions of modern legal sociology, Lanni would interpret the lack of punishment as an indication of the expressive function of the law: passing a *law* affects behaviour even if the law is hardly or not at all enforced. Following the propositions of social psychology, I call this 'the social norm of the rule of law' or 'the rule of the law as a social norm': obeying the law works as a social norm to which people conform without being enforced by the law itself. [340]

Within this interpretive framework, a straightforward reading of the second scene, the one which has puzzled scholars advocating a positive interpretation of the play the most,[341] is no longer problematic: the scene indeed advocates the 'rule of law' and presents the Old Women, surely in comic terms, in the role of over-zealots whose behaviour covers the gap created by the absence of lawsuits in the

[339] One could object that the absence of any reference to punishment in the play can be explicable in terms of Aristophanic characters' discontinuity and Aristophanes' general disobedience to common-sense, however, such an argument is against the central argument of this study.

[340] Scholars who have suggested positive readings of the play have interpreted the scene accordingly: for example, Sommerstein (1998) 213 argues that, although the Selfish Man has the last word in the scene, his failure must have been reported by the following choral song which is not saved. See also the arguments of Henderson (1996/2010) 154, Slater (2002) 221-223 and Ruffel (2006) 93-98.

[341] Ironic interpretations of the play focus on this scene: see, for example, Saïd's analysis (1996) 309-313.

new regime (657).[342] However, the previous scene allows us to suggest that it does so on the assumption that the law is grounded on the power of the social norms. The fact that we see the first Old Woman quoting from the text of a *ψήφισμα* (1012-20) in order to convince Epigenes to have sex with her must be taken as indicative of the poet's ironic attitude; for someone who fails to truly identify with women's group like Epigenes, the new regime is treated as a series of coercive laws which must be laid down in written and obeyed. In fact, the audience is invited to deconstruct the ostensibly inevitable analogy between Old Women's monstrous appearance and coercive compliance to the law (1056-1057): behind or, better to say, underneath the monstrous appearance hide the old women who protect both the threatened tradition and the newly established status-quo, underneath the coercive compliance to the law hides the conformity to group norms, underneath the radical hides the traditional. What the audience has to do is simply look beyond and underneath the striking standard comic stereotypes regarding old women's lust and unsuccessful attempts to look younger by wearing clothes unsuited to their age and by using excessive make-up.[343]

[342] Henderson (1996/2010) 154-156 has defended the scene by explaining that for several reasons the spectators were likely to sympathize with the Old Women and not Epigenes and has argued that the final scene indicates that Praxagora's reforms were indeed successful. To defend his generally positive reading of the play, Sommerstein (1998) 21-22 has treated the scene as serving male spectators' expectations over the final outlook of a *gynaikokratia.* Slater's defense is perhaps the most categorical: "No one has questioned whether sexual communism works efficiently in the play; the complaint is that it works far too well. We should not allow the young man's emotional rhetoric to distract us from the fact that Praxagora's state functions in this regard precisely as it was intended. This young man hopes to cheat the new law by having the young girl before he performs his duty to the old. Nor is he being "raped" by the old women. Their claim to him is contingent on his desire for the young girl; under the terms of the law, if he were to abandon his pursuit of the young girl, the old women would have no further claim upon him -but this possibility is never raised. The fact that this young scofflaw fails in his attempt to reap the benefits of the new state (not only the banquet but free sexual access to young citizen women, which he never would have had in the real Athens) without paying the price is further evidence that the unnamed neighbor will not succeed in his similar attempt, either." (2002: 229). See also Ruffel (2006) 82-84, who follows Olson's suggestion (1988) and treats the love-duet scene as a parody of a *paraclausithyron*, without recognising any romanticism in it. On the contrary, he recommends seeing over the monstrous appearance of Old Women by pointing to their role in policing sexuality which alludes to the same role they held in the previous regime and invites the audience to treat the scene as deriving from the already established male-analogues.

[343] See Henderson (1987a) 117-118.

5.6 The solace of radicalism: ideology and culture through Aristophanes' ironic glance[344]

As our analysis has demonstrated, Aristophanes' game with apparatus is more far-reaching than a mere costume exchange associated with gender roles and it pervades the whole plot, not just the prologue of *Ecclesiazusae*. Such a game is inevitably overloaded with ironic overtones, however, irony is not directed at Praxagora's regime. Following the example of the *Birds*, Aristophanes is not being ironic towards his protagonists or their actions, but chooses to shed light on the ironies of the era, this time the socio-political ironies, prompting the audience to reflect over other systems of government, the operation of the law within them and his own behaviour. Kenneth De Luka is probably right to argue that *Ecclesiazusae* is a reflection on the perfect democratic law, [345] although his understanding of what Aristophanes defines as perfect law diametrically opposes to the definition advocated in this study: the perfect law is the one which stems from social norms and functions itself as a social norm. Under this perspective, the communal regime must not be treated as a political and economical system, but as a societal structure and world-view; *Ecclesiazusae* in fact advocates collectivism. Collectivism denotes "the societal structure and world-view in which people prioritise group loyalty, commitment and conformity, and belonging and fitting in to groups, over standing out as an isolated individual".[346]

[344] The expression "the solace of radicalism" is the title of an article by Michael Hogg (2010) arguing that uncertainty strengthens identification with radical groups. Its usage here is ironic.

[345] De Luka (2005).

[346] Hogg and Vaughan (2018) 654. According to the cultural dimensions theory, individualism-collectivism is one of the five value orientations on the basis of which countries can be compared. The theory stemmed from Hofstede's (1980) research project on how culture influences values in the workplace and led to the development of cross-cultural psychology. A similar project was conducted by Schwartz (1992), Schwartz and Bardi (1997) and the first dimension of his theory, the openness to change-conservatism, bears similarities to Hofstede's individualism-collectivism dimension. Collectivism is inextricably connected to group processes and intergroup relations and has attracted the interest of social psychologists; on the contrary, communism is a social-economical system and thus its study is beyond the scopes of social psychology. Popular misconception treats communism in general as a collectivist system, but this is not true for all communist theories and regimes. For example, Marxist communism is collectivist in orientation but its ideals are highly individualistic. Needless to say that the distinction does not apply to Aristophanes for whom is absolutely logical to assign to the communal regime both collectivist orientation and ideals. For a broader definition of collectivism out of the field social psychology, cf. the Routledge Dictionary of Politics (Robertson 2004: 87):

Therefore, the solution advocated by Aristophanes is in fact traditional, despite its innovative structural apparatus. Not because the structural elements of the new regime continue to reinforce the traditional roles of men and women (men are still warriors, women clothes suppliers and the slaves are offloaded with men's activities),[347] but because the motivational aspects underlying the suggested solution are truly collectivist and thus traditional. Within this framework, Praxagora's appeals to women's conservatism become more intelligible and gradually the ostensible contradiction between the traditionalism/conservatism of women and the innovative character of the reforms fades:

ὡς δ' εἰσὶν ἡμῶν τοὺς τρόπους βελτίονες
ἐγὼ διδάξω. πρῶτα μὲν γὰρ τἄρια
βάπτουσι θερμῷ κατὰ τὸν ἀρχαῖον νόμον
ἁπαξάπασαι, κοὐχὶ μεταπειρωμένας
ἴδοις ἂν αὐτάς. ἡ δ' Ἀθηναίων πόλις,
εἰ πού τι χρηστῶς εἶχεν, οὐκ ἐσῴζετ' ἔτι,
εἰ μή τι καινόν <γ'> ἄλλο περιηργάζετο.
καθήμεναι φρύγουσιν ὥσπερ καὶ πρὸ τοῦ·
ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς φέρουσιν ὥσπερ καὶ πρὸ τοῦ·
τὰ Θεσμοφόρι' ἄγουσιν ὥσπερ καὶ πρὸ τοῦ·
πέττουσι τοὺς πλακοῦντας ὥσπερ καὶ πρὸ τοῦ·
τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐπιτρίβουσιν ὥσπερ καὶ πρὸ τοῦ·
μοιχοὺς ἔχουσιν ἔνδον ὥσπερ καὶ πρὸ τοῦ·
αὑταῖς παροψωνοῦσιν ὥσπερ καὶ πρὸ τοῦ·
οἶνον φιλοῦσ' εὔζωρον ὥσπερ καὶ πρὸ τοῦ·

"Collectivism can be, and often has been, given a complicated theoretical meaning or meanings, but its normal use today is rather simple. Theoretically, and the main work comes from the tradition of anarchism, a collective is any group of co-operating individuals who may produce or own goods together, but which does not exercise coercive force on its members, and thus is not a state or political system. Such voluntary associations are not, however, just groups of individuals who retain their own shares and are tied by no bonds other than individual self-interest, for collectivism is used as a theoretical counter to rational individualism, as well as against statism or state socialism."

[347] Sommerstein (1998) 12-13.

βινούμεναι χαίρουσιν ὥσπερ καὶ πρὸ τοῦ·
ταύταισιν οὖν, ὦνδρες, παραδόντες τὴν πόλιν
μὴ περιλαλῶμεν, μηδὲ πυνθανώμεθα
τί ποτ᾽ ἄρα δρᾶν μέλλουσιν, ἀλλ᾽ ἁπλῷ τρόπῳ
ἐῶμεν ἄρχειν,

And their character is superior to ours,
as I will demonstrate. First, they dye their wool
in hot water according to their ancient custom,
each and every one of them; you'll never see them
try anything new. But the Athenian state
wouldn't hold on to that custom if it worked just fine;
no, they'd be fiddling around with some innovation.
Meanwhile the women settle down to their cooking, as they always have.
They carry burdens on their heads, as they always have.
They celebrate the Thesmophoria, as they always have.
They bake cookies, as they always have.
They drive their husbands nuts, as they always have.
They hide their lovers in the house, as they always have.
The buy themselves extra treats, as they always have.
They like their wine neat, as they always have.
They like a fucking, as they always have.
And so, gentlemen, let us hand over governance of the city to women,
and let's not beat around the bush or ask what they
plan to accomplish. Let's simply
let them govern.
(215-232)

Following the pattern of fourth century democratic ideology, Praxagora's reforms are associated with appeals to tradition and her arguments build on the rhetoric of *πάτριος πολιτεία*, casting her as a lawgiver and founding father in the manner of Solon. But what Praxagora's plan promotes and rests on, the rule of traditional social norms, conveys a diffidence on the constitutional reforms and undermines the democratic ideology by turning the rhetoric sustaining it to its head. The same is done by the orators of the fourth century: according to Rosalind Thomas, their invocation of Solon's authority shows an implicit diffidence to the constitutional

reforms and a nostalgia for a simple legal system, and thus contrasts sharply with democratic ideology. [348]

Aristophanes' game with apparatus reveals the ironies of the era of *Ecclesiazusae*, blurring all the established distinctions and polarities: femininity underneath masculinity, collectivism underneath a communal regime, motivational underneath structural, ideological underneath institutional, traditional underneath innovative.[349] Inevitably, Aristophanes cannot but be ironic towards his audience for failing to see underneath the apparatus and finding solace in times of crises in the first part of the polarities, when it should deconstruct such polarities. The following exchange between the chorus and Praxagora with its strong metatheatrical connotations provides an excellent example of the audience's behaviour which prompts the poet's ironic stance:

ΧΟΡΟΣ

νῦν δὴ δεῖ σε πυκνὴν φρένα

καὶ φιλόσοφον ἐγείρειν

φροντίδ' ἐπισταμένην

ταῖσι φίλαισιν ἀμύνειν.

[348] Thomas (1994). The affinities between the orators and *Ecclesazusae* can go further: Thomas (1994: 124, 132-133) argues that the image of the lawgiver invoked by the orators is archaic and reminds of Sparta's tradition and conception of the law. Similarly, the reforms of Praxagora have a strong Spartan colouring (David 1984: 25-27, Sheppard 2016: 476-477), which prompts David to raise the possibility that the communal regime may have been inspired by a fourth-century propaganda for a collectivist solution to Athens' social ills which had its origins in a fifth-century aristocratic-philolaconism.

[349] Ecclesiazusae has the same function that Markantonatos and Zimmermann (2012) v-vi assign to the drama of the fifth century: "Regardless of their theoretical stance, the vast majority of scholars of Greek history agree that the social and political crisis of the late fifth century aggravated the weaknesses of Athenian society and stifled its strengths, undermining well-established norms and polarizing personal or national relations. Under those fast-changing circumstances, the security achieved over time through social and political arrangements was dismantled by the wide differences between diverse segments of the Athenian community such as old and young, citizens and non-citizens, slave and free, democratic and oligarchic coalitions. In the absence of strong leadership the Athenians had to reconcile their personal aims with social order by finding a way out of the acute conflict between private interests and the public good. Against this background of major civil unrest and big disenchantment with democratic values and constitutional safeguards, which further exacerbated already-existing social and political frictions, Greek drama, we suggest, strongly deplored the large divergences among the interests of the members of the Athenian polis, and more importantly, condemned with full force those who attempted to guide the community with the intention of pursuing their own exclusive interests."

κοινῇ γὰρ ἐπ' εὐτυχίαισιν

ἔρχεται γλώττης ἐπίνοια πολίτην

δῆμον ἐπαγλαϊοῦσα

μυρίαισιν ὠφελίαισι βίου·

δηλοῦν <δ>' ὅ τί περ δύναται καιρός.

δεῖται ϯγάρ τί γεϯ σοφοῦ τινος ἐξ-

εὑρήματος ἡ πόλις ἡμῶν.

ἀλλὰ πέραινε μόνον

μήτε δεδραμένα μήτ'

εἰρημένα πω πρότερον·

μισοῦσι γὰρ ἦν τὰ παλαιὰ

πολλάκις θεῶνται.

ΚΟΡΥΦΑΙΑ

ἀλλ' οὐ μέλλειν, ἀλλ' ἅπτεσθαι καὶ δὴ χρὴ τῆς διανοίας,

ὡς τὸ ταχύνειν χαρίτων μετέχει πλεῖστον παρὰ τοῖσι θεαταῖς.

ΠΡΑΞΑΓΟΡΑ

καὶ μὴν ὅτι μὲν χρηστὰ διδάξω πιστεύω· τοὺς δὲ θεατάς,

εἰ καινοτομεῖν ἐθελήσουσιν καὶ μὴ τοῖς ἠθάσι λίαν

τοῖς τ' ἀρχαίοις ἐνδιατρίβειν, τοῦτ ἔσθ' ὃ μάλιστα δέδοικα.

CHORUS

Now you must summon up a shrewd intelligence
and a philosophic mind
that knows how to fight for your comrades.
For it's to the posterity of all alike
that from your lips comes a bright idea
to gladden the lives of the city's people
with countless benefits;
now's the time to reveal its potential.
Yes, our city needs
some kind of sage scheme;
describe it in full, making sure only
that none of it's ever been
said or done before:
they hate to watch the same old stuff

over and over again!
CHORUS LEADER
No more delay! Here and now you must put your idea in play:
what spectators most appreciate is speed.
PRAXAGORA
Well, I'm sure my proposals are worthwhile, but I'm awfully
worried about the spectators are they ready to quarry a new vein
and not stick with what's hoary and conventional?
(571-585)

Similarly, the chorus' plea to the judges at the end of the play adds one more distinction/polarity which must be deconstructed, the serious-comic distinction; this polarity urges the chorus-leader to invite separately the intellectual judges who understand the deeper meaning of the play and the ones who stay in its surface, enjoying the comic elements:

σμικρὸν δ' ὑποθέσθαι τοῖς κριταῖσι βούλομαι·

τοῖς σοφοῖς μὲν τῶν σοφῶν μεμνημένοις κρίνειν ἐμέ,
τοῖς γελῶσι δ' ἡδέως διὰ τὸ γελᾶν κρίνειν ἐμ
σχεδὸν ἅπαντας οὖν κελεύω δηλαδὴ κρίνειν ἐμέ,

But first I have a small suggestion for the judges:

if you're intelligent, remember the intelligent parts and vote for me;
if you've got sense of humor, remember the jokes and vote for me.
Yes, it's virtually all of you that I'm asking to vote for me.
(1154-1157)

5.7 Solon, Praxagora and "Aristophanes": metapoetic hints in *Ecclesiazusae*?

This chapter finishes with a tempting suggestion which needs further research. Once more Sheppard's reading has provided the stimulus, especially his treatment of Praxagora as a reformer-lawgiver whose "words pick up upon the interest in founder figures, such as Solon and Lycurgus, as well as upon the invocation of

tradition as a means to legitimate one's own reforms."[350] Elaborating his thesis, we have argued that the role of the lawgiver provides a satisfactory account for Praxagora's absence from the second part of the play and we have treated her as a new prototype of leader, taking into account that the communal regime is depicted as an alternative rule-of-law-system: the leader qua lawgiver who establishes the rule of the law and then withdraws from the political life.[351] Given that Emmanuela Bakola has argued ingeniously for the construction of a Solonian persona by Aristophanes in his five earliest extant comedies, it is thus tempting to examine whether Praxagora's depiction as a female Solon may have metapoetic connotations and whether behind the comic heroine hides the persona of Aristophanes; [352] this would be the most striking game with apparatus in the play on behalf of the poet.

Bakola has demonstrated that "Aristophanes' persona as the determined reformer who is faced with a corrupt city that needs cleaning up, who undertakes his reforming actions alone, who protects the city and its people with his *nouthesia*, who asserts his vision repeatedly and whom his fellow Athenians misunderstand and fail to appreciate, is arguably a very precise refashioning of the Solonian persona as it emerges in the surviving corpus."[353] At the same time, Bakola has also demonstrated the associations of the Aristophanic persona with the Euripidean persona and poetry ("Aristophanes" describes himself as *dexios, kainos, sophos*) and has thus argued for an "inherent contradiction in Aristophanes' self-presentation".[354] However, this contradiction is deconstructed in a metaliterary and

[350] Sheppard (2016) 473-474. For Solon in comedy, see Martin (2015), especially 77-79 for Solon's invocation as an authority by Aristophanic heroes (*Clouds* 1185-1190 and *Birds* 1656-1666).

[351] Thus, I disagree with Sheppard's conclusion that the second part of *Ecclesiazusae* demonstrates the need for a strong leader: "The democracy needs further reform but the final two scenes of the play demonstrate, through the figures of the Selfish Man, Epigenes and the Old Women, that reform itself is not enough. Athens needs leadership, particularly someone who can operate within the speech and politics of the assembly, since, without continual leadership and guidance, the Athenians will lurk back into self-interest, showing little regard for the law. Yet, since men have revealed themselves to be universally governed by self-interest, this leader needs to be a woman" (2016: 474). Regarding Praxagora's leadership, if Aristophanes wished to highlight its importance by these two scenes as Sheppard argues, it seems to me that his point would be more explicit by portraying Praxagora in action, tactfully handling such problems. In this way, there would be no doubts over the success of her plan and her personal triumph would be unquestionable like Pisthetaerus' triumph in the *Birds,* although also variously interpreted.

[352] Bakola (2008) 4-6. For the Solonian persona, see Stehle (2006).

[353] Bakola (2008) 5.

[354] Ibid., 8-10

self-reflective reading of the *Frogs*: the result of the poetic contest and the selection of Aeschylus by Dionysus points to the revision and redefinition of Aristophanes' persona, in other words, the repudiation of the 'clever' and 'novel' Eurpidean poetics and the adherence to the old kind of *nouthesia,* now enriched with Aeschylean-Bacchic elements.[355]

Whether this is a permanent or a final redefinition for the poet, it is not known. If, however, our assumption is correct, then *Ecclesiazusae* confirms that Aristophanes adopted the same persona fifteen years after the *Frogs*: behind Praxagora stands the fictionalized Aristophanes who quests for reform and *nouthesia* in the fashion of Solon, expressing implicitly his diffidence to the constitutional reforms established at the time. Although *Ecclesiazusae* does not feature structural elements which allude to the poet's earlier comedic style like *Frogs* does, quite the opposite one would say, our analysis has demonstrated that the tension between old and new, traditional and innovative pervades the play, which despite its radical apparatus advocates traditional values and collectivism. It is ironic that Praxagora cannot escape innovation, no matter how hard she tries: the social and political climate of the fourth century obliges her to present her traditional values under an innovative apparatus. The same is true for "Aristophanes": despite undressing the Euripidean apparatus of novelty and showing the traditional values of his poetry, he cannot repudiate the characterization *εὐριπιδαριστοφανίζων*.[356]

[355] Bakola (2010) 68-70.

[356] I use the term for denoting the traits of Aristophanes' art, without arguing that in Cratinus' fragment 342 it is addressed to 'Aristophanes'. For the interpretation of Cratinus' fragment and the meaning of the term, see Sidwell (1995) 62-63, Luppe (2000) 19, O' Sullivan (2006) 163-169, Olson (2007) 110-111, Bakola (2010) 24-29 and Wright (2012) 7-9.

6 Aristophanic Comedy and the Social Identity Theory of Leadership

As we have already seen, leadership is an important aspect of the plot in *Birds, Peace, Lysistrata* and *Ecclesiazusae* and thus the four plays are indicative of the interest displayed by Aristophanes in general in the concept and implementation of leadership. For, Aristophanes' interest in leadership is not only evident in the abundant, invective in tone, explicit references to people who were considered as the leaders of the Athenian *dêmos;*[357] many of the poet's plays feature a comic hero acting as a leader of a group. The present chapter examines the behaviour of these comic heroes, without however claiming to be an exhausting treatment of the topic of leadership in Aristophanic comedy.[358] Building on our comments for Pisthetaerus, Trygaeus, Lysistrata and Praxagora, the aim of our analysis is threefold: firstly, to demonstrate that there is a prevailing model for the comic heroes as leaders in the surviving plays of Aristophanes, namely the model of social identity theory of leadership and to sketch its development within the poet's oeuvre; secondly to evaluate its representation, whether it is positively or negatively assessed, without falling into the trap of associating this representation with the political views of Aristophanes himself; and thirdly to examine how the model reconciles with a basic trait of the *alternative democracy* portrayed in many plays, that is, the rejection of low-status leaders and the support of well-born and well-educated leaders.[359]

6.1 Setting the theoretical frame under the commands of Pisthetaerus, Trygaeus, Lysistrata and Praxagora

The social identity theory of leadership was originally published by Michael Hogg in 2001, but its full-blown articulation appeared two years later by Hogg and van Knippenberg.[360] Its main components have been tested and applied

[357] Sommerstein (1996) has collected and discussed these satirical references to politicians.
[358] For the comic heroes as leaders from a ritual perspective, see the thesis of Tsoumpra (2014).
[359] See Sommerstein (2009) 204-222.
[360] Hogg (2001), Hogg and van Knippenberg (2003).

systematically, conceptually developed and extended since the first formal publication of the theory.[361] Nowadays, the theory constitutes one of the most prominent and well-established social psychological theories of leadership and it has generally rejuvenated the interest of social psychology in the concept of leadership. Its roots are traced in the social categorization theory and in the social identity analysis of influence. Self-categorization theory refers to the cognitive dimension of social identity and it is inextricably associated to the notion of prototypicality and the process of depersonalization. In simple words, it argues that people categorize themselves (as they categorize other people) into a group and assimilate all the aspects of their attitudes, feelings and behaviours to the prototype of the group. Prototype is the set of attributes which define and prescribe the attitudes, feelings and behaviours which characterize a group and distinguish it from others. As a result, people are depersonalized; they are not viewed as unique individuals but as matches of the ingroup prototype.[362] The other root of the theory, the social identity analysis of influence, also centers on the notion of prototypicality and argues that, given that prototypicality governs perception and evaluation of group members and that group members differ on how prototypical they are, more prototypical group members are more influential within the group.[363]

Building on these two premises, the social identity theory of leadership emerged as the answer to the question whether prototypical members of a group are more likely to become leaders and be influential when established as such. It predicates that when members of a group identify strongly with it and thus group membership is an integral aspect of their identity, they will support, trust and consider more effective leaders who are group prototypical. In describing the associated social cognitive and social interactive processes, the founders of the

[361] For an extensive overview of the new conceptual developments and extensions of the social identity theory of leadership, see Hogg and van Knippenberg (2003) 268-291.

[362] For a more comprehensive description of self-categorization theory, see Introduction. All relevant references are cited there.

[363] For the social identity analysis of social influence, see Abrams and Hogg (1990), Turner (1991) and Hogg and van Knippenberg (2003) 7-10.

theory explain that leaders' prototypicality "(a) makes them (appear to be) the focus rather than the target of conformity processes across the group, (b) renders them consensually positively evaluated and liked (i.e., popular) in group terms, thus imbuing them with status within the group, (c) makes them appear to be ''one of us'' and thus trustworthy, which paradoxically extends them latitude to be normatively innovative, and (d) encourages followers to dispositionally attribute their influence, status, and innovativeness and thus construct a charismatic personality for them that further facilitates leadership."[364]

Let us now see how the four plays of Aristophanes sustain the assertion that the social identity theory of leadership can provide an alternative cognitive compass for comprehending the behaviour of the comic heroes as leaders. Our social psychological reading of the *Birds* has corroborated the identity–leadership model, an integrative and rather metatheoretical account of the original social identity theory of leadership, developed by Reicher, Haslam and Platow in the book *The New Psychology of Leadership*.[365] The four basic propositions of their theory are that 1) to lead us, leaders must represent us, 2) to engage followers, leaders' actions and visions must promote group interests, 3) leaders are masters not slaves of identity and 4) leadership and the production of power both center on the hard but rewarding work of identity management.[366] Pisthetaerus' argumentation and actions follow these principles, albeit not in the given order: since he is "doing it for the birds", "crafting a sense of them" and "making them matter", he is eventually cast as "one of them".[367] At the end of the play, the true nature of Pisthetaerus' regime is revealed: he has become a tyrant and the birds his servile followers. Both Pisthetaerus' tyrannical behaviour and the birds' submission to it corroborate the social identity perspective to tyranny; according to it, individuals become tyrants when they identify with the role of the tyrant, when the people on whom tyranny

[364] Hogg, van Knippenberg and Rast III (2012a) 292.
[365] Reicher, Haslam and Platow (2011).
[366] Ibid., 106, 132, 162, 192 respectively.
[367] Ibid., passim.

is imposed share this identification, when social interaction also reinforces the identification, and when tyranny is based on an active leadership grounded on the shared identity of the tyrant and his followers.

Trygaeus carries the burden of liberating goddess Peace and acts on his own initiative, but his action has a social orientation; he repeatedly stresses that he seeks peace for all the Greeks. When he calls the chorus by his side, immediately they declare him as their leader with enthusiasm and joy. As we have argued, the fluctuating identity of the chorus (Panhellenes, farmers, Athenian farmers) matches Trygaeus' versatile identity and since the comic hero is depicted as the most prototypical of these different social identities, he is thus assigned the role of the leader in each case. Indeed, Trygaeus' leading roles corroborate the propositions of the social identity theory of leadership. However, given how the panhellenic attempt to rescue Peace fails and only the farmers achieve to liberate her, Trygaeus must be seen as a failed intergroup leader; the play does not engage with the theory of intergroup leadership and this has implications for the panhellenic character of the peace achieved and of the play in general. Additionally, the authoritative behaviour of the comic hero at the last part of the play allows us to see Trygaeus as impersonating the danger of how prototypical leaders, by acquiring more status and by being treated as charismatic, at the end become differentiated from the members of the group.

In *Lysistrata*, the heroine of the same name is the leader of women. Although she is definitely "one of them", "doing it for them", "crafting a sense of them" and "making them matter", she is not a prototypical member of women's group. It is the older women of the chorus who are the most prototypical: their positive representation outweighs the stereotypical negative picture of the younger women and allows Lysistrata to perform a successful intrusion to the world of men. In this way, through the association to older women, all women in the play become emblematic of a communal social identity which prescribes solidarity, affection and attachment to other groups. In the first half of the play, Lysistrata is better seen as a

charismatic-transformational leader who is motivating, inspiring, shows commitment to the group, works for collective goals which transcend self-interest and has a vision for the group. Nonetheless, in the second part of the play, her behaviour casts her more than a simple arbiter; Lysistrata acts as an intergroup leader who manages to build an intergroup relational identity for both Spartans and Athenians and thus to achieve their reconciliation. Intergroup relational identity is the key term of the theory of intergroup leadership introduced by Hogg and refers to the "self-definition in terms of one's group membership that incorporates the group's relationship with another group as part of the group's identity".[368] The theory of intergroup leadership is grounded on social identity dynamics and works complementarily to the original social identity theory of leadership by providing an intergroup understanding of leadership.[369]

As for Praxagora, her election as leader by the other women in the first part of *Ecclesiazusae* is indeed the result of her prototypicality, the result of her being the most representative of women's collective identity. The play describes a social world in the middle of crisis and ambiguity and women choose a prototypical leader who is more apt to reduce uncertainty. Thus, their behaviour is in line with one of the core propositions of the social identity theory of leadership when integrated with uncertainty-identity theory. However, the play in macroanalysis corroborates a contradictory proposition as well, namely that crisis can alter who and what is considered prototypical of the group: it is women who are now prototypical of the Athenian identity, not men, and that is why they become the leaders of the city.

6.2 Paphlagon and the Sausage-seller in the *Knights*

Pisthetaerus, Trygaeus, Lysistrata and Praxagora are not the only comic heroes in the role of the leader in the surviving plays of Aristophanes; Paphlagon and the

[368] Hogg, van Knippenberg and Rast III (2012b) 233.
[369] For a more comprehensive overview of the theory, see the chapter on *Lysistrata.*

Sausage-seller in the *Knights* are their forerunners. Indeed, when one thinks about leadership in Aristophanic comedy, *Knights* is the first play that comes to his mind. The play is a political allegory presenting Athenian Democracy as the house of Demos Pyknites and the Athenian leaders as his servants and constitutes a fierce satirical attack on Cleon, the leading politician of Athens of that time, who stands behind the newly-bought servant Paphlagon (2).[370] The play through the figure of Paphlagon satirizes Cleon's leadership style, especially his denunciations of others, his deceptive rhetoric, his coercive tactics and even his shouting voice which makes all the previous traits bolder.[371] Since Aristophanes is not so consistent in sustaining the details of the household allegory, at the end of the play the Sausage-seller wins over Paphlagon and becomes not only the leading slave of the household of Demos, but the leader of Athens as well (164-167, 169-170, 171, 172-174). Therefore, the play is revealing of the attitude of Aristophanic comedy towards leadership in general and Cleon in particular.

Let us take things from the beginning. After stealing and reading Paphlagon's oracle, the two other servants of Demos, Demosthenes and Nicias, learn that Paphlagon will be ousted by an even worse man.[372] Immediately afterwards, they accidentally meet a sausage-seller and explain to him that he will be the saviour of the city and themselves. However, the Sausage-seller initially doubts whether he can become their saviour and the leader of the city and the servant Demosthenes tries to reassure him by listing the qualities needed:

ΑΛΛΑΝΤΟΠΩΛΗΣ

[370] Aristophanes' attack on Cleon is sustained through four plays: the *Babylonians* (in 426, regarding the imperial policy), the *Acharnians* (in 425, regarding the war), the *Knights* (in 424, regarding the leadership-style) and the *Wasps* (in 422, regarding his manipulation of the demos through the court system). For Aristophanes' relations to Cleon, see Olson (2002) xxix-xxx, xl-lii, Sommerstein (2004) and very recently Hall (2018); for a literary explanation, see Rosen (1988) 59-82, (2007) 78-89. For Aristophanes' self-praise for attacking Cleon, see *Clouds* 545–562, *Wasps* 1029–1037*, Peace* 748–761.

[371] For the similarities between Cleon's representation in the *Knights* and in Thucydides, see Rusten (2006) 552-553 and Henderson (2017) 613-615. Especially for Cleon's denunciations of others in both Aristophanes and Thucydides, see Foster (2017). See also *Knights'* analysis by McGlew (2002) 86-111.

[372] I follow Sommerstein (1980) 46-47, (1981) 3, who names the two slaves who open the play Demosthenes and Nicias. On their identity, see also MacDowell (1995) 87-88 and Henderson (2003b).

εἰπέ μοι, καὶ πῶς ἐγὼ

ἀλλαντοπώλης ὢν ἀνὴρ γενήσομαι;

ΔΗΜΟΣΘΕΝΗΣ

δι' αὐτὸ γάρ τοι τοῦτο καὶ γίγνει μέγας,

ὁτιὴ πονηρὸς κἀξ ἀγορᾶς εἶ καὶ θρασύς.

ΑΛΛΑΝΤΟΠΩΛΗΣ

οὐκ ἀξιῶ 'γὼ 'μαυτὸν ἰσχύειν μέγα.

ΔΗΜΟΣΘΕΝΗΣ

οἴμοι, τί ποτ' ἔσθ' ὅτι σαυτὸν οὐ φὴς ἄξιον;

ξυνειδέναι τί μοι δοκεῖς σαυτῷ καλόν.

μῶν ἐκ καλῶν εἶ κἀγαθῶν;

ΑΛΛΑΝΤΟΠΩΛΗΣ

μὰ τοὺς θεούς,

εἰ μὴ 'κ πονηρῶν γ'.

ΔΗΜΟΣΘΕΝΗΣ

ὦ μακάριε τῆς τύχης,

ὅσον πέπονθας ἀγαθὸν εἰς τὰ πράγματα.

ΑΛΛΑΝΤΟΠΩΛΗΣ

ἀλλ' ὦγάθ' , οὐδὲ μουσικὴν ἐπίσταμαι

πλὴν γραμμάτων, καὶ ταῦτα μέντοι κακὰ κακῶς.

ΔΗΜΟΣΘΕΝΗΣ

τουτί σε μόνον ἔβλαψεν, ὅτι καὶ κακὰ κακῶς.

ἡ δημαγωγία γὰρ οὐ πρὸς μουσικοῦ

ἔτ' ἐστὶν ἀνδρὸς οὐδὲ χρηστοῦ τοὺς τρόπους,

ἀλλ᾽εἰς ἀμαθῆ καὶ βδελυρόν.† ἀλλὰ μὴ παρῇς

ἅ σοι διδόασ᾽ ἐν τοῖς λόγιοισιν οἱ θεοί.

[...]

ΑΛΛΑΝΤΟΠΩΛΗΣ

τὰ μὲν λόγι' αἰκάλλει με· θαυμάζω δ' ὅπως

τὸν δῆμον οἷος τ' ἐπιτροπεύειν εἴμ᾽ ἐγώ.

ΔΗΜΟΣΘΕΝΗΣ

φαυλότατον ἔργον· ταὔθ' ἅπερ ποιεῖς ποίει·

τάραττε καὶ χόρδευ' ὁμοῦ τὰ πράγματα

ἅπαντα, καὶ τὸν δῆμον ἀεὶ προσποιοῦ

ὑπογλυκαίνων ῥηματίοις μαγειρικοῖς.

τὰ δ' ἄλλα σοι πρόσεστι δημαγωγικά,

φωνὴ μιαρά, γέγονας κακῶς, ἀγόραιος εἶ·

ἔχεις ἅπαντα πρὸς πολιτείαν ἃ δεῖ·

χρησμοί τε συμβαίνουσι καὶ τὸ Πυθικόν.

ἀλλὰ στεφανοῦ καὶ σπένδε τῷ Κοαλέμῳ,

χὤπως ἀμυνεῖ τὸν ἄνδρα.

SAUSAGE-SELLER
Tell me, just how does,
a sausage-seller like me become a big shot?
DEMOSTHENES
That's precisely why you are going to be great,
because you're loudmouthed, low class and down market.
SAUSAGE-SELLER
Even I don't think I deserve great power.
DEMOSTHENES
Uh oh, what makes you say you don't deserve it?
You sound as though you've got something good on your conscience.
Don't tell me you come from a distinguished family!
SAUSAGE-SELLER
Heavens no, they're nothing if not low class.
DEMOSTHENES
Congratulations, what blessed luck!
Right there you've got a fine start in politics.
SAUSAGE-SELLER
Look, mister, I'm uneducated
except for reading and writing, and I'm damn poor even at those.
DEMOSTHENES
The only thing that hurts you there is that you're only damn poor.
No, political leadership's no longer a job for a man
of education and good character,
but for the ignorant and disgusting.
Please don't throw away
what the gods are offering you in their prophecies!

[...]
SAUSAGE-SELLER
The prophecies are flattering, but it's an amazing idea,
me being fit to supervise the people.
DEMOSTHENES
Nothing's easier. Just keep doing what you're doing:
Make a hash of all their affairs and turn it
into baloney, and always keep the people on your side
by sweetening them with gourmet bon mots.
You've got everything else a demagogue needs:
a repulsive voice, low birth, marketplace morals-
you've got all the ingredients for a political career.
Plus, the oracles and Delphic Apollo agree.
So put on this garland, pour a libation to the God Dimwit,
and see that you settle our enemy's hash.
(178-222)

According to Demosthenes, a political leader must be *πονηρός*, come from the Agora and be bad (181). The adjective *πονηρός* points to the lack of genuine elite status and in turn to the social class represented by the new elite; it is closely associated with the adjective *ἀγοραῖος* (181, 218) which denotes someone who makes his living by selling things in the market;[373] it contrasts to the adjectives *καλὸς κἀγαθός* and that is why Demosthenes argues that a political leader must not come from a noble-aristocratic family (185-186), but must be of low birth (218). In addition, a political leader must be ignorant and uncultured (188-189) and generally he must have all the traits of the demagogues (the word is used here without any negative connotations): the ability to create agitation and confusion (214-215), rhetorical skills (215-216) and a loud voice (218).[374] By implication, the qualities described by Demosthenes are those of Paphlagon/Cleon.

In his comprehensive study of Athens' new politicians, W. Robert Connor has aptly demonstrated that we should not treat at face value what the comic poet claims about new politicians' wealth, genealogy and education or, to be more

[373] For the usage of the adjectives *πονηρός* and *ἀγοραῖος* in Aristophanes, see Rosenbloom (2002) 300-312.
[374] For Cleon's ability to create agitation and confusion-*τάραττε καὶ χόρδευ' ὁμοῦ τὰ πράγματα/ ἅπαντα* (214-215), see Edmunds (1987).

precise, their lack of education: Cleon, for example, came from a prosperous and genuine Athenian family, albeit not an aristocratic one, and possibly was educated.[375] Why then does Comedy present such a false picture of him? According to Connor, Comedy "adopts a kind of dogged literal-mindedness in transforming real life into fantasy. It pretends to accept everything Cleon says, and then to discover to everyone's surprise that the words are ambiguous or absurd. If Cleon emphasizes that he claims neither a distinguished genealogy nor great family connections, then Comedy brings on an outlandish Paphlagon, a man quite without Attic descent."[376] This is indeed a typical Aristophanic practice; as we have argued throughout this study, in a similar way the poet exploits the social stereotypes in order to undermine them.[377]

In addition, Connor argues that Cleon had repudiated his friends and in general the old style of politics which rested on the dynamics of *philia* in order to forge an alliance between himself and the *dêmos*. Interpreting his argument from a social identity perspective, the assertion is that Cleon grounded his leadership on one of the core propositions of the social identity theory of leadership, the prototypicality-advantage. Demosthenes' account points to the same idea and indeed at the end the Sausage-seller outweighs Paphlagon mostly because of his low antecedents which render him truly one of the common people (1232-1248). In corroboration of his argument, Connor refers to an anecdote by Plutarch and the depiction of Cleon by Thucydides (3.37.3-4) and Aristophanes in the *Knights*.[378] From the *Knights* in particular, he does not cite Demosthenes' list of qualities, but the following verses:

ΠΑΦΛΑΓΩΝ

ὁτιὴ φιλῶ σ', ὦ Δῆμ', ἐραστής τ' εἰμὶ σός.

[375] For Cleon's wealth, family background and education, see Connor (1971) 151-152, 158-168.
[376] Ibid., 174.
[377] Cf. our analysis of *Lysistrata*.
[378] Connor (1971) 91-98. For Thucydides' representation of Cleon, see Woodhead (1960) and Westlake (1968) 60-85.

PAPHLAGON
Because I adore you, Mr. Demos, and because I'm your lover!
(732)

ΑΛΛΑΝΤΟΠΩΛΗΣ

πρῶτον μέν, ὁπότ' εἴποι τις ἐν τὴκκλησίᾳ·
"ὦ Δῆμ᾽, ἐραστής εἰμι σὸς φιλῶ τέ σε
καὶ κήδομαί σου καὶ προβουλεύω μόνος,"
τούτοις ὁπότε χρήσαιτό τις προοιμίοις,
ἀνωρτάλιζες κἀκεροντίας.

SAUSAGE SELLER
First of all, whenever somebody said in the Assembly,
"Demos, I'm your lover and I cherish you,
and I alone care for you and think for you,"
whenever anybody started a speech with that stuff,
you'd flap your wings and toss your horns.
(1340-1344)

The verses draw a vivid picture of Paphlagon's alleged fidelity towards Demos which makes him his lover and Connor argues that the rhetorical practices of the historical Cleon must be identified in these words.[379] Even if one cannot treat along with Connor "this manner of speech as fully consistent with that of a man who turned his back on a group of influential *philoi* and built his power on mass support" (Connor 1971: 98) and chooses to focus on the lover-metaphor,[380] undoubtedly the verses sketch Paphlagon/Cleon as an ingroup champion, a leader

[379] Connor (1971) 97, esp. n. 14. For the lover-metaphor, see Henderson (1991) 66-70, Wohl (2002) 73-92 and Scholtz (2004) 265-267. For Scholtz, the lover-metaphor does not allude to the actual rhetorical practices of Cleon, but must be treated as "comically absurdist reification inspired by the "demophilia topos," a well attested blame-motif attacking court and assembly speakers for attempting to seduce the demos with specious claims of affection" (264). He argues that Aristophanes sexualizes the topos, presenting it as pederastic courtship, and connects it with *kolakeia*. For the erotic metaphor by Pericles in Thucydides, see Monoson (1994), Orwin (1994) 29, Wohl (2002) 30-73, McGlew (2002) 38-42 and Scholtz (2007) ch.2. For *erôs* in political oratory and prose of the fifth century and for Thucydides' concept of political *erôs*, see Ludwig (2002) 144-169.

[380] I refrain from elaborating the love-metaphor because it implies that the *erastês* is superior, whereas Connor's emphasis on *philos* implies equality and it thus corroborates the application of the social identity theory of leadership model. Similarly, the household allegory which makes the *dêmos* the master and the politicians his slaves does not fit well with the model and its emphasis on the leader being "one of us". See, however, the following note on how the two can be reconciled.

who is doing it for the people. In turn, this makes the implications of the household allegory on which the play rests bolder: the relationship between Athenian Democracy and its leaders should be like the relationship of master/servant ought to be, that is, characterised by devotion and fidelity on behalf of the servant/political leader.[381] Demosthenes' description of Paphlagon's behaviour points to this idea, albeit Paphlagon's behaviour is clearly considered as hypocritical, as mere *kolakeia*:

οὗτος καταγνοὺς τοῦ γέροντος τοὺς τρόπους,
ὁ βυρσοπαφλαγών, ὑποπεσὼν τὸν δεσπότην
ἤκαλλ' , ἐθώπευ' , ἐκολάκευ' , ἐξηπάτα
κοσκυλματίοις ἄκροισι, τοιαυτὶ λέγων·
"ὦ Δῆμε, λοῦσαι πρῶτον ἐκδικάσας μίαν,
ἐνθοῦ, ῥόφησον, ἔντραγ', ἔχε τριώβολον.
βούλει παραθῶ σοι δόρπον;'" εἶτ᾽ ἀναρπάσας
ὅ τι ἄν τις ἡμῶν σκευάσῃ, τῷ δεσπότῃ
Παφλαγών κεχάρισται τοῦτο.

He sized up the old man's character,
this rawhide Paphlagon did, so he crouched before the master

[381] Amongst the organizational leadership theories, there is the Servant leadership model introduced by Greenleaf in 1970. However, his definition of the servant leader was rather vague and not empirically validated: "The Servant-Leader is servant first [...]. It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead [...]. The best test, and difficult to administer is this: Do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, and more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on the least privileged in society? Will they benefit, or at least not further be harmed?" (1977: 7). As a result, different models have been developed for describing the core characteristics of servant leadership. For a summary, see van Dierendonck (2011) 1231-1232. To eliminate conceptual plurality, van Dierendonck (2011: 1232-1234) has mapped and combined the characteristics of the different models and distilled the following six characteristics of servant leader: empowering and developing people, humility, authenticity, interpersonal acceptance, providing direction and stewardship. Research has showed that servant leadership can be applied successfully to sports coaching, increasing the coaches' effectiveness and the athletes' motivation (Hammermeister et al.: 2008, Rieke et al.: 2008). At the same time, the promising potential of applying the social identity theory of leadership to sports coaching has also been explored (Cassidy et al.: 2014). Building on these two premises, Tony Cassidy (2015) 207 has very recently argued for the integration of the two theories within the sports coaching context: "Prototypical members espouse the shared core values and attitudes that in turn reflect the ethical and moral stance of the group and the reality of the social world that they inhabit. Hence, a prototypical leader will be perceived as authentic. Additionally as the prototypical member will be perceived to pursue the aims and aspiration of the group they will be seen as serving the group. This helps explain why a servant leader will be accepted and successful."

and started flattering and fawning and toadying and swindling him
with odd tidbits of waste leather, saying things like,
"Mr. Demos, do have your bath as soon as you've tried only one case."-
"Here's something to nibble, wolf down, savor: a 3-obol piece."-
"Shall I serve you a snack?" And then Paphlagon swipes
whatever any of the rest of us has prepared
and presents it to the master.
(46-54)

Whereas there is no doubt that the model of social identity theory of leadership provides the cognitive and behavioural compass for understanding the action of Aristophanes' play, the depiction and assessment of the model by the poet is rather ambivalent. Whereas it is clearly repudiated in reference to Paphlagon and at the end of the play Demos feels ashamed for being easily deceived by politicians of this kind (1355), the model is positively assessed in reference to the Sausage-seller. What is then the difference between the Sausage-seller and Paphlagon/Cleon, given that in theory the former is worse than the latter- he was won in all the stages of their competition, including the imprudence contest?[382] Their basic difference is that the Sausage-seller is truly "one of the people" and he is "doing for the people". The following scene is revealing:

ΑΛΛΑΝΤΟΠΩΛΗΣ

ἐγὼ φράσω σοι. τὴν ἐμὴν κίστην ἰὼν
ξύλλαβε σιωπῇ καὶ βασάνισον ἅττ' ἔνι,
καὶ τὴν Παφλαγόνος· κἀμέλει κρινεῖς καλῶς.

ΔΗΜΟΣ

[382] Regarding the competition between the Sausage-seller and Paphlagon, one notices that Aristophanes is not always consistent with the idea that the worst person is actually the best. MacDowell (1995) 99 lists some of the inconsistencies and gives his explanation for them: "For example, the Sausage-seller accuses Paphlagon, the leather-seller, of selling poor-quality leather to country people wickedly (316-18); yet, in a contest of imprudence and theft, that ought to be a point in favour of Paphlagon, not against him. At the end of this part of the contest each accuses the other of trickery or wickedness (450), two of the very qualities in which each was supposed to be showing his own superiority (331-2); and the Sausage-seller actually defeats Paphlagon not by showing himself to be better in those ways but by hitting him (451-6). It seems, then, that presenting a comic inversion of conventional public morality was not Aristophanes' primary concern in this scene. That was just a joke which he was willing to abandon whenever it got in the way of a more important purpose. The more important purpose is to vilify Kleon."

φέρ' ἴδω, τί οὖν ἔνεστιν;

ΑΛΛΑΝΤΟΠΩΛΗΣ

οὐχ ὁρᾷς κενήν,

ὦ παππίδιον; ἅπαντα γάρ σοι παρεφόρουν.

ΔΗΜΟΣ

αὕτη μὲν ἡ κίστη τὰ τοῦ δήμου φρονεῖ.

ΑΛΛΑΝΤΟΠΩΛΗΣ

βάδιζέ νυν καὶ δεῦρο πρὸς τὴν Παφλαγόνος.

ὁρᾷς <τάδ';>

ΔΗΜΟΣ

οἴμοι, τῶν ἀγαθῶν ὅσων πλέα.

ὅσον τὸ χρῆμα τοῦ πλακοῦντος ἀπέθετο·

ἐμοὶ δ' ἔδωκεν ἀποτεμὼν τυννουτονί.

ΑΛΛΑΝΤΟΠΩΛΗΣ

τοιαῦτα μέντοι καὶ πρότερόν σ' ἠργάζετο·

σοὶ μὲν προσεδίδου μικρὸν ὧν ἐλάμβανεν,

αὐτὸς δ' ἑαυτῷ παρετίθει τὰ μείζονα.

ΔΗΜΟΣ

ὦ μιαρέ, κλέπτων δή με ταῦτ' ἐξηπάτας;

ἐγὼ δέ τυ ἐστεφάνιξα κἠδωρησάμαν.

ΠΑΦΛΑΓΩΝ

ἐγὼ δ' ἔκλεπτον ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ γε τῇ πόλει.

SAUSAGE SELLER
I'll tell you. Don't say a word,
just go pick up my basket and examine what's in it;
and Paphlagon's too. Don't worry, you'll make a good decision.
DEMOS
Let's see now, what's in it?
SAUSAGE SELLER
Daddy, don't you see it's empty?
I brought everything to your table.
DEMOS

Say, this is a basket with Demos' interests at heart!
SAUSAGE SELLER
Now come over here to Paphlagon's.
See this?
DEMOS
My goodness, it's crammed; look at all the goodies!
Have a look at the cheesecake he's put aside for himself!
And he cut me off a slice no bigger than this!
SAUSAGE SELLER
That's what he did to you all along,
tossing you a pretty piece of his profits
and putting away the lion's share for himself.
DEMOS
You scum, is that how you robbed me blind,
and me that crowned and endowed you?
PAPHLAGON
But I stole for the good of the city!
(1211-1226)

In contrast to Paphlagon's basket which contains some goods he has retained for himself (1218-1220), the Sausage-seller's basket is empty because he has offered everything to Demos (1214-1215). Additionally, his revealed name, Agoracritus, interpreted as "disputant of the market" (1257-1258), testifies that he is indeed "one of the people", a genuine child of the market. Against him there is not a single allegation for foreign birth and this makes the connotations of Paphlagon's name more explicit: the alleged barbarian descent deprives him of the identity of Athenian citizen.[383] And of course, the strongest evidence for the Sausage-seller's true prototypicality and devotion is the rejuvenation of the Demos; although we do not get a clear picture of the measure he takes, his leadership rejuvenates master Demos (1321, 1331);[384] indeed, according to the social identity theory of leadership, leadership grounded on social identity is always transformational.[385]

[383] Claims about Cleon's alleged barbarian descent are not found exclusively in Aristophanic comedy but also in Eupolis (FF 308 and 456) and Plato the comic poet (FF 166 and 170). See the discussion of Sommerstein (2000).
[384] Edmunds (1987) 43 argues that Demos' rejuvenation is metaphorical; he is not transformed, but transported to old Athens and remains old in age. Contra Olson (1990). For Demos' rejuvenation as the second plot-line of the play, see also Brock (1986).
[385] For the relationship between the social identity theory of leadership and charismatic/transformational leadership, see Hogg and van Knippenberg (2003) 30-31.

The political and cognitive-behavioural background of the *Knights* is also valid for *Wasps*,[386] despite the fact that the play does not feature a comic hero acting as a leader: the play builds on the satirical presentation of Cleon's leadership style. However, Cleon's espouse of the prototypicality-advantage of the social identity theory of leadership model and his self-presentation as being one of the people is clearly repudiated. When the chorus is eventually persuaded by Bdelykleon of Cleon's true face (725-735) and Philokleon's career as a juror ends (999-1002), Bdelykleon prepares his father for a new luxury life-style and instructs him how to cap skolia in symposia (1222-1265).[387] The guests at the imaginary symposium include Cleon himself and people who were considered his friends and supporters:

αὐλητρὶς ἐνεφύσησεν· οἱ δὲ συμπόται
εἰσὶν Θέωρος, Αἰσχίνης, Φᾶνος, Κλέων,
ξένος τις ἕτερος πρὸς κεφαλῆς, Ἀκέστορος.

The girl piper has started to play. Your drinking companions
are Theorus, Aeschines, Phanus, Cleon,
and a second foreigner next to Acestor.
When in the company of men like these,
be sure you take up the songs in fine fashion.
(1219-1221)

The point is that, albeit not an aristocrat, Cleon could still attend symposia and have habits that ordinary people could not and thus his self-portrait as a prototypical leader grounded on the low origins that he shares with ordinary people collapses. Also, one can discern an implicit reference to his alleged foreign descent in the phrase *ξένος τις ἕτερος* (1221), implying that he is the first *ξένος* in this group.

Nonetheless, the idea of Cleon's prototypicality is not totally dismissed in *Wasps*; he never appears in the play,[388] but he is prototypical of the chorus of old

[386] For the political ideology of the play, see Edmunds (1987) 51-57, Konstan 1995 (15-28) who argues that the play advocates an aristocratic lifestyle and political ideology and contra Olson (1996), Olson and Biles (2016) xliv-lxii who argue that it advocates a democratic ideology, albeit a conservative one.
[387] For the interpretation of the final scenes of the play, see Vaio (1971) and for Philokleon's nosos, see Sidwell (1990).
[388] For the portrait of Cleon in *Wasps*, see Storey (1995).

jurors who stand for the Athenian *dêmos.* His prototypicality is now real and it is grounded on the violent nature that he shares with the chorus: Cleon provides the prototype for their behaviour in general and especially for their anger. Such an assertion is corroborated by Cleon's representation in Thucydides.[389] Scholars have long acknowledged how Aristophanes and Thucydides corroborate each other in drawing the politician's portrait: in both Cleon is the demagogue par excellence.[390] Our aim is to show how *Wasps* brings to the fore a much-neglected affinity between the representation of Cleon in *History* and Aristophanic comedy, namely his endorsement of the politics of emotion, of anger in particular, which enhances the politician's characterization as *βιαιότατος* (3.36.6) and renders him an ingroup prototype.[391]

David Mirhady has observed how anger pervades *Wasps*; he has counted twenty (20) occurrences of expressions indicative of anger like *orgê, thumos, menos* and *cholê* in the play.[392] Most of these occurrences are used in the scenes depicting the chorus' hostility towards Bdelykleon, an outgroup member and not an ingroup member as in the *Acharnians*. Ostensibly Bdelycleon has done nothing to hurt the old jurors of the chorus; he just tries to keep his father in the house for not acting as a juror. But Philocleon and the jurors share the same identity (266-269) and in fact

[389] I refer to the persona of Cleon which Aristophanes has been building already from *Babylonians* and not the real Cleon. The Aristophanic Cleon shares many features with the Thucydidean Cleon and recently Tsakmakis (2018) has argued that the Thucydidean Cleon builds on the Aristophanic.

[390] For the argument that both representations of Cleon arise from prejudice and personal animosity, see Lafargue (2013) 19-25, (2015) 132-135, 157.

[391] For a rather different approach to Cleon's representation in *Wasps* which also highlights the affinities of this representation to Thucydides' portrait of him and especially his politics of emotion, see Biles (2016) esp. 125-128. Biles summarises his argument as follows: "*Wasps* takes up the portrait of Cleon as an anti-intellectualizing force in politics and poetry that is treated on a more limited basis in *Knights*, and develops it in an ambitious new direction, through a sophisticated plot that fuses its satire of the demagogue's manipulation of the law courts with an examination of audience tastes and critical judgment. Cleon's status as a figure who bridges political and theatrical spheres is key to this interpretation, and valuable evidence for his ability to do so is provided by Thucydides' evaluation of his political sway over the demos. Cleon embodies an attitude of emotion-driven conservatism that clashes with Aristophanes' comedy of ideas, and *Wasps*' solution for the political corruption serves equally well as a solution for the poet's professional crisis" (118).

[392] Mirhady (2009) 28. He argues that many of these "angry" words suit the chorus' identity as jurors and examines whether the play provides evidence for the role which anger played in the courts and whether this role was democratic. For anger as an emotion in ancient Greece, see Konstan (2006).

Philokleon seems to be one of the most prototypical of them (276-280). Therefore, when they discover that Bdelykleon is responsible for Philokleon's confinement in the house, they reveal their waspish character and express their anger:

εἰπέ μοι, τί μέλλομεν κινεῖν ἐκείνην τὴν χολήν,
ἥνπερ ἡνίκ᾽ ἄν τις ἡμῶν ὀργίσῃ τὴν σφηκιάν;
νῦν ἐκεῖνο νῦν ἐκεῖνο
τοὐξύθυμον, ᾧ κολαζό-
μεσθα, κέντρον ἐντατέον ὀξέως.
ἀλλὰ θαἰμάτια λαβόντες ὡς τάχιστα, παιδία,
θεῖτε καὶ βοᾶτε, καὶ Κλέωνι ταῦτ᾽ ἀγγέλετε,
καὶ κελεύετ᾽αὐτὸν ἥκειν
ὡς ἐπ᾽ ἄνδρα μισόπολιν
ὄντα κἀπολούμενον, ὅτι
τόνδε λόγον εἰσφέρει,
μὴ δικάζειν δίκας.

Tell me, why are you waiting to launch the wrath
we feel when anyone vexes our nest?
Out now, out now
with that sharp-tempered stinger that we use
to punish, and brace it sharply.
Now grab your cloaks as quick as you can, lads,
and run and shout, report this to Cleon,
and tell him to come
and confront a man who hates his country
and who'll be destroyed for
proposing the idea
that lawsuits be abolished!
(403-414)

Their anger towards Bdelycleon provides an example of Intergroup Emotions Theory (IET). As we have already seen, the key postulate of the theory is that group membership attains emotional significance and leads to the appraisal of events and social objects in terms of their implications for the group (and not for the individual

group member). This appraisal in turn leads to the experience of relevant emotions and to relevant behavioural tendencies (taking action).[393] Although Bdelykleon has not forbidden the chorus members to act as jurors, they interpret his efforts to keep his father, a member of their own group, confined to the house under the custody of slaves, as happening to themselves. Hence, in line with the propositions of the IET, their anger prompts them to attack Bdelykleon:

καὶ σέ γ' αὐτοῖς ἐξολοῦμεν. ἀλλὰ πᾶς ἐπίστρεφε
δεῦρο κἀξείρας τὸ κέντρον εἶτ᾽ ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἵεσο,
ξυσταλείς, εὔτακτος, ὀργῆς καὶ μένους ἐμπλήμενος,
ὡς ἄν εὖ εἰδῇ τὸ λοιπὸν σμῆνος οἷον ὤργισεν.

And we'll destroy you as well with them! Now every man wheel
this way, draw stingers and charge him,
with ranks closed, in good order, full of rage and spirit,
so he'll never forget what a swarm he's angered.
(422-425)

When the slaves repel them, they accuse Bdelycleon of tyranny and conspiracy, echoing probably historical Cleon's rhetoric of conspiracy:[394]

ἆρα δῆτ᾽ οὐκ αὐτὰ δῆλα
τοῖς πένησιν, ἡ τυραννὶς ὡς λάθρᾳ γ᾽ ἐ-
λάμβαν' ὑπιοῦσά με,
εἰ σύ γ', ὦ πονωπόνηρε καὶ Κομηταμυνία,
τῶν νόμων ἡμᾶς ἀπείργεις ὧν ἔθηκεν ἡ πόλις,
οὔτε τιν'᾽ ἔχων πρόφασιν,
οὔτε λόγον εὐτράπελον,
αὐτὸς ἄρχων μόνος;

Don't the poor folk see it plainly,

[393] For a detailed description of the theory, see the chapter on *Peace.*
[394] See Biles and Olson (2015) ad loc. and on line 345 with bibliography for the rhetoric of conspiracy and tyranny. Similar accusations are heard by Paphlagon in the *Knights:* 257, 452, 476, 628, 862.

how tyranny has sneaked up on me
from behind and tried to jump me,
now that you, you troublesome troublemaker, you long-haired Amynias,
debar us from our country's established legal rights,
without making any excuse
or dextrous argument,
but autocratically?
(463-470)

The jurors/wasps behaviour recalls Cleon's characterization by Thucydides as *βιαιότατος* before his speech in the Mytilenean debate; Cleon is angry with the Athenians for changing their minds and reconsidering the punishment of the Mytileneans. In his speech, he promotes a policy based on emotion, particularly anger:

"Do not, then, be traitors to your own cause, but
recalling as nearly as possible how you felt when
they made you suffer and how you would then have
given anything to crush them, now pay them back.
Do not become tender-hearted at the sight of their
present distress, nor unmindful of the danger that so
lately hung over you, but chastise them as they
deserve, and give to your other allies plain warning
that whoever revolts shall be punished with death.
For if they realise this, the less will you have to neg-
lect your enemies and fight against your own allies."
(Thucydides 3.40.7–8)[395]

Cleon's true prototypicality in *Wasps* is also matched with his presentation as an in-group champion-doing it for the jurors: the chorus calls Cleon their patron (242), Philokleon argues that *αὐτὸς δὲ Κλέων ὁ κεκραξιδάμας μόνον ἡμᾶς οὐ περιτρώγει,/ ἀλλὰ φυλάττει διὰ χειρὸς ἔχων καὶ τὰς μυίας ἀπαμύνει* (596-597) and both praise him for the raise of the jurors' pay to three obols per day established some years ago (53, 255, 799, 905). At the same time, Cleon is presented as an

[395] Translation is from Smith (1921). For different analyses of the speech, see Andrewes (1962), Kagan (1975), MacLeod (1978), Andrews (2000) and Visvardi (2015) 73-83. The analysis of Tsakmakis and Kostopoulos (2011) is informed by politeness theory and highlights the importance of social identity, albeit not from a social-psychological perspective, but from pragmatics.

embedder of identity-making the jurors matter, if we can judge from Philocleon's description of the benefits, power and pleasure, he enjoys as a juror:

καὶ μὴν εὐθύς γ' ἀπὸ βαλβίδψν περὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀποδείξω
τῆς ἡμετέρας ὡς οὐδεμιᾶς ἥττων ἐστὶν βασιλείας.
τί γὰρ εὔδαιμον καὶ μακαριστὸν μᾶλλο νῦν ἐστι δικαστοῦ,
ἢ τρυφερώτατον ἢ δεινότερον ζῷον, καὶ ταῦτα γέροντος;
ὃν πρῶτα μὲν ἕρποντ' ἐξ εὐνῆς τηρούσ' ἐπὶ τοῖσι δορυφάκτοις
ἄνδρες μεγάλοι καὶ τετραπήχεις· κἄπειτ' εὐθὺς προσιόντι
ἐμβάλλει τις τὴν χεῖρ' ἁπαλὴν τῶν δημοσίων κεκλοφυῖαν.
ἱκετεύουσιν θ' ὑποκύπτοντες τὴν φωνὴν οἰκοτροχοοῦντες·
" οἴκτιρόν μ', ὦ πάτερ, αἰτοῦμαί σ', εἰ καὐτὸς πώποθ' ὑφείλου
ἀρχὴν ἄρξας ἢ 'πὶ στρατιᾶς τοις ξυσσίτοις ἀγοράζων."
ὃς ἔμ' οὐδ' ἄν ζῶντ' ἤδειν, εἰ μὴ διὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀπόφευξιν.

I will indeed, and right out of the gate I'll demonstrate
that our sovereignty is as strong as any king's.
What living thing is there today more fortunate and felicitated than a juror,
more coddled or commanding, oldster though he is?
To begin with, I crawl out of bed to find big men,
six-footers, watching for me at the court railings. As soon as I approach,
one of them gives me a soft hand, fresh from stealing public money.
They beg and grovel, pitifully pouring out their pleas:
"Pity me, father, I beg you! Maybe one time you too pocketed something
when holding office or procuring field rations for your messmates."
He wouldn't even have known I exist if I hadn't gone easy on him last time.
(548-558)

ὃ δὲ γ'ἥδιστον τούτων ἐστὶν πάντων, οὗ 'γὼ 'πελελήσμην,
ὅταν οἰκαδ' ἴω τὸν μισθὸν ἔχων, κἄπειθ' ἥκονθ' ἅμα πάντες
ἀσπάζωνται διὰ τἀργύριον,
[...]
ἆρ'οὐ μεγάλην ἀρχὴν ἀρχω καὶ τοῦ Διὸς οὐδὲν ἐλάττω,
ὅστις ἀκουω ταὔθ' ἅπερ ὁ Ζεύς;
ἢν γοῦν ἡμεῖς θορυβήσωμεν,
πᾶς τίς φησιν τῶν παρόντων·
"οἶν βροντᾷ τὸ δικαστήριον,

ὦ Ζεῦ βασιλεῦ."

κἂν ἀστράψω, ποππύζουσιν

κἀγκεχόδασίν μ' οἱ πλουτούντες

καὶ πάνυ σεμνοί.

καὶ σὺ δέδοικάς με μάλιστ' αὐτός·

νὴ τὴν Δήμητρα, δέδοικας. ἐγὼ δ'

ἀπολοίμην εἰ σὲ δέδοικα.

But the nicest part of all, which slipped my mind,
is when I come home with my pay. That's when everyone
gives me a warm welcome at the door because of the money.
[...]
So don't I wield great authority, as great as Zeus'?
I'm even spoken of in the same way as Zeus.
For instance, if we're in an uproar,
every passerby says,
"Zeus Almighty,
the jury's really thundering!"
And if I look lightning, the fat cats and
the VIPs say a prayer and shit in their pants.
And you're very much afraid of me yourself. Oh yes, by Demeter,
you're afraid. But I'll be damned if I'm afraid of you!
(605-630)

6.3 In conclusion: Rethinking leadership in Aristophanes

After this brief examination, we can argue with confidence that the prevailing model of leadership in Aristophanic comedy can be described as that of social identity theory. A second preliminary conclusion would be that when the plays dramatize implementations of the model by historical leaders (Cleon) or fictional leaders who stand allegorically for historical ones (Paphlagon), the model of social identity leadership is cast in negative light; on the contrary, completely fictional leaders like Trygaeus, Lysistrata and Praxagora are viewed positively -in the sense that that their schemes have a good cause-, or at least in thought- provoking ways.[396] This is also true of the Sausage-seller, although if one prefers to think of him as

[396] Despite the possibility of being modelled on the priestess of Athena Polias Lysimache, Lysistrata as a political leader is fictional.

modeled on the historical Cleon, then he is the notable exception which proves the rule. Of course, there is always the possibility of irony mixed with flattery towards the audience on behalf of the poet: Demos is rejuvenated, but as Paphlagon argues, he is not saved from leaders of this kind: "some other man will take you as his own,/no greater thief, but luckier perhaps" (1251-1252).

Pisthetaerus' case, however, messes things up: his original plan has a good cause, but leads to the enslavement of the birds; he is not explicitly sketched negatively and this difficulty to assess his representation has partially enabled so many contradictory interpretations of the play; albeit a fictional leader, he is most probably modelled on a historical one, either Alcibiades or one of the *Thrakophoitai*, the Athenian wannabe tyrants, if we follow Hall. Given that our social psychological analysis of the play has demonstrated how the social identity theory of leadership can lead to the establishment of tyranny and can foster toleration of tyranny, it would thus be more accurate to argue that Aristophanes' plays do not castigate the model of social identity leadership per se, but shed light on the populist motivations underlying its implementation by the historical Athenian leaders.[397] Additionally, based on the example of the Sausage-seller, we can argue that the plays seem to promote the idea that in real life (that is fifth-century Athens) this model of leadership was impossible- no common man could become leader of the *dêmos* and those who claimed to be common people, they were not; the claims of the demagogues (term without negative connotations in the fifth century) were demagogic (in the modern meaning of the word) and Aristophanes turns these

[397] For the social psychology of populism, see Aslanidis (2017). Sommerstein (2009) 204-222 has argued that *Birds, Lysistrata* and *Ecclesiazusae* represent an alternative to democracy, an absolute monarchy. Regarding the two female plays, he justifies this assumption by invoking the means by which women acquire power and the fact that they act without the consent of the community (the men). Although I do not think that in these plays Aristophanes wanted to emphasize the nature of the political system like he has done in *Birds* and I doubt whether Praxagora's regime is indeed tyrannical, nonetheless, it is worth clarifying that the model of the social identity theory of leaderhip does not prescribe the establishment of a specific political system (democratic, hierarchical, dictatorial-what Sommerstein calls monarchy). As Haslam, Reicher and Platow explain, the model of the identity leadership has an explanatory function: it explains how the relation of leader and followers in the interpretation of identity defines the form of the political system (2011: 217-218).

arguments to the demagogues' head. As the Sausage-seller fights and beats Paphlagon with his own weapons, so does Aristophanes with Cleon.

Under this perspective, the depiction of the model reconciles with the *alternative democracy* portrayed in many plays and especially the rejection of the low-status leaders and the support of the well-born and well-educated leaders. Indeed, the strongest repudiation of the social identity model of leadership as implemented by historical leaders is provided in the parabasis of *Frogs,* despite the fact that the play does not feature a comic hero acting as a leader. After suggesting the restoration of political rights to the disfranchised citizens in the *epirrhêma,*[398] in the *antepirrhêma* the chorus explains the reasons lying behind the city's problems:

πολλάκις γ' ἡμῖν ἔδοξεν ἡ πόλις πεπονθέναι
ταὐτὸν εἴς τε τῶν πολιτῶν τοὺς καλούς τε κἀγαθοὺς
εἴς τε τἀρχαῖον νόμισμα καὶ τὸ καινὸν χρυσίον.
οὔτε γὰρ τούτοισιν οὖσιν οὐ κεκιβδηλευμένοις,
ἀλλὰ καλλίστοις ἁπάντων, ὡς δοκεῖ, νομισμάτων
καὶ μόνοις ὀρθῶς κοπεῖσι καὶ κεκωδωνισμένοις
ἐν τε τοῖς Ἕλλήσι καὶ τοῖς βαρβάροισι πανταχοῦ
χρώμεθ' οὐδέν, ἀλλὰ τούτοις τοῖς πονηροῖς χαλκίοις,
χθές τε καὶ πρώην κοπεῖσι, τῷ κακίστῳ κόμματι.
τῶν πολιτῶν θ' οὓς μὲν ἴσμεν εὐγενεῖς καὶ σώφρονας
ἄνδρας ὄντας καὶ δικαίους καὶ καλούς τε κἀγαθοὺς
καὶ τραφέντας ἐν παλαίστραις καὶ χοροῖς καὶ μουσικῇ,
προυσελοῦμεν, τοῖς δὲ χαλκοῖς καὶ ξένοις καὶ πυρρίαις
καὶ πονηροῖς κἀκ πονηρῶν εἰς ἅπαντα χρώμεθα
ὑστάτοις ἀγιγμένοισιν, οἷσιν ἡ πόλις πρὸ τοῦ
οὐδὲ φαρμακοῖσιν εἰκῇ ῥᾳδίως ἐχρήσατ' ἄν.
ἀλλὰ καὶ νῦν, ὦνόητοι, μεταβαλόντες τοὺς τρόπους

[398] See our analysis of the *epirrhêma* in the chapter on *Lysistrata*.

χρῆσθε τοῖς χρηστοῖσιν αὖθις· καὶ κατορθώσασι γὰρ
εὔλογον, κἄν τι σφαλῆτ', ἐξ ἀξίου γοῦν τοῦ ξύλου,
ἤν τι καὶ πάσχητε, πάσχειν τοῖς σοφοῖς δοκήσετε.

It's often struck us that the city deals
with its fine upstanding citizens
just as with the old coinage and the new gold.
Though both of these are unalloyed,
indeed considered the finest of all coins,
the only ones minted true and tested
everywhere among Greeks and barbarians alike,
we make no use of them; instead we use these crummy coppers,
struck just yesterday or the day before with a stamp of the lowest quality.
Just so with our citizens: the ones we acknowledge to be well-born, well-behaved,
just, fine, and outstanding men,
men brought up in wrestling schools, choruses, and the arts,
we treat them shabbily, while we choose the coppers, the aliens, the red-heads,
bad people with bad ancestors for all purposes,
the latest arrivals, whom formerly the city
wouldn't readily have used even as scapegoats.
But even at this late hour, you fools, do change your ways
and once again choose the good people. You'll be congratulated for it
if you're successful, and if you take a fall, at least the intelligent will say that
if something does happen to you, you're hanging from a worthy tree.
(718-737)

According to the chorus, the Athenians had experienced the same situation with their leaders as with their coinage: as they had used the bronze coins instead of the gold and silver, they had chosen foreigners without any elite status or noble descent for leaders instead of noble, educated and well-behaved citizens. Behind the *πονηρούς, χαλκίους, ξένους* and *πυρρίας* one can easily recognize politicians like Cleon and Cleophon, whereas behind the *εὐγενεῖς σώφρονας ἄνδρας ὄντας καὶ δικαίους καὶ καλούς τε κἀγαθοὺς καὶ τραφέντας ἐν παλαίστραις καὶ χοροῖς καὶ μουσικῇ* the members of the elite, most of whom were involved in the oligarchic coups.[399] The description of the bronze leaders by the chorus reminds us of Demosthenes' description of the leaders' traits in the *Knights*; the cognitive and

[399] See the analysis of Hubbard (1991) 205-210.

behavioural background is the same in the two plays. Both castigate the driving force of the social identity theory of leadership, the notion of prototypicality, and repudiate the leadership of Cleon and Cleophon. The affinity of the two plays provides the answer to the objection that the plea for restoring the political rights to the disfranchised supporters of the Four Hundred and for recognizing the superiority of the elite in the parabasis of *Frogs* must be attributed to the specific historical circumstances.

7 Conclusion

Social psychology's focus on the individual renders it a suitable tool for examining the prominence of Aristophanic heroes within the comic plays and how group membership affects their behaviour. To return to Sommerstein's description which has stimulated our discussion, the people of Aristophanes envisage a comic plan and act essentially alone for putting it into action, with supporters but not equal partners; however, the conception of the comic plan stems from a collective identity which the hero shares or intends to share (like Pisthetaerus) with the chorus. The primary aim of this study has been to shed light on the psychological processes, cognitive and emotional, which sustain the behaviour of the comic hero and the chorus when acting in their collective identity.

Our social psychological reading of the *Birds* has shown how the manipulation of the birds' social identity by the comic hero liberates them from the tyranny of humans and Gods. Albeit an outgroup member, Pisthetaerus manages to become an ingroup member and most importantly the leader of the birds, contrary to the social identity theory's proposition regarding the importance of prototypicality: our reading has demonstrated that when an out-group member has a vision for the group and works hard for changing the social reality in favour of the group, eventually he can become not merely a member but the leader of the group. Additionally, our analysis has shown how social identity sustains the establishment of tyranny and it has explained why Pisthetaerus becomes a tyrant and why the birds succumb to his tyrannical regime. In the last part of the chapter, we discuss the suggested political readings of the play, arguing that all of them are mediated by a social identity perspective.

Pisthetaerus' past behaviour, before meeting the birds, is also explicable in terms of social-identity theory: his negative social identity had urged him to adopt the strategy of social mobility. Sommerstein notes that "he does not even pretend to try and persuade the Athenians that their institutions are not serving their best

interests: he sees they are not serving his, and he leaves."[400] In contrast, Dicaeopolis tries desperately to convince his group to act in ways that will alter his negative identity, but fails to do so. In our analysis we have argued how his double marginalization, as a citizen and rustic, forces him to attain a private peace with Sparta. Dicaeopolis does not leave the group (Athens), but chooses a psychological self-exclusion which motivates his subsequent behaviour. We have interpreted this behaviour as clearly anti-social and we have thus argued that his absolute triumph is in fact acceptable within the dramatized ritual context, the Choes day of the Anthesteria festival, and the theatre.

In our analysis of *Peace* in the same chapter we have shown how Trygaeus' negative social identity motivates his behaviour; flying to the sky to meet Zeus and to protest is an act of social competition, although it does not entail any direct conflict with the Gods. The comic hero does not need to persuade the chorus to help him liberate Peace, but needs to convince Hermes not to betray his plan to the Gods. Foreshadowing Pisthetaerus' manipulation of the birds' social identity, Trygaeus convinces Hermes by the same means. Additionally, we have demonstrated that Trygaeus has an equally fluctuating identity with the chorus and that he is the most prototypical of his different identities in all cases; thus, he is assigned the role of the leader. However, given how the panhellenic attempt to rescue Peace fails and only the farmers achieve to liberate her, Trygaeus must be seen as a failed intergroup leader and this has implications for the panhellenic character of the peace achieved and of the play in general. Additionally, the authoritative behaviour of the comic hero at the last part of the play has allowed us to suggest that he can be treated as the positive model out of which Pisthetaerus emerged.

In our analysis of *Lysistrata* we have seen how the comic heroine manipulates women's social identity for gearing them up for collective action. Lysistrata's argumentation in the debate with the Proboulos renders the need to reduce the feelings of anxiety and uncertainty caused by the war as her basic motivations.

[400] Sommerstein (2009) 213.

Interestingly, these motivations differ significantly from those invoked by herself for convincing women to engage in collective action and are not quite the same with the motivations of the old women of the chorus for engaging in collective action. This polyphony corroborates our assumption that the play sheds light to women's multifaceted social identity which is presented in perfect contradistinction to the three types of men we see in the play. In the war of sexes (old women's semi-chorus vs old men's semi-chorus, Lysistrata vs Proboulos and Myrrhine vs Cinesias), women are in all cases victorious. However, it is their communal social identity, best represented by the old women of the chorus, which outshines the other two. Women's communal social identity symbolizes the cognitive and affective presuppositions for the achievement of reconciliation; to put it in simpler words, Aristophanes' suggested model of reconciliation presupposes a "feminine" way of thinking, feeling and acting without raising any feminist expectations. The reconciliation of the male and female semi-choruses foreshadows the reconciliation of Athenians and Spartans: women, like the Spartans, constitute for Athenians the Other with whom it is time to reconcile, after replacing a negative perception of him with a positive one. Our analysis has demonstrated how both reconciliations follow the propositions of the Integrative Intergroup Contact Theory of Hewstone and Brown; in line with the propositions of this theory, Lysistrata invokes the cognition and emotions sustaining the shared, collective Panhellenic identity of the Athenians and Spartans for achieving their reconciliation. At the same time, Lysistrata can be treated, even temporarily, not simply as an arbiter, but as an intergroup leader who takes on the difficult to task to reconcile subgroups that retain their distinct identities and have conflictual relations between them. The fact that in the first part of the play she is not cast as a prototypical leader, enables her alternative role as an intergroup leader in the second part of the play.

Our analysis *of Ecclesiazusae* rests on the assumption that women's presentation in the play builds on their revised social identity in *Lysistrata*; their communal social identity which prescribes displaying affiliation and attachment to others, sustaining relationships with other groups and performing activities of

service and care becomes the founding principle of the communal regime they establish. Apart from this, Lysistrata's motivation for gearing up women, namely the need to reduce uncertainty caused by men's actions, is now assigned to all women and thus their behaviour and the action of the first part of the play becomes explicable on the terms of uncertainty-identity theory. Praxagora, in contrast to Lysistrata, is presented as a prototypical leader for women, although in macro-analysis the play demonstrates how uncertainty can equally weaken, alter or even negate the leader prototypicality advantage; women become the leaders of the Athenian *dêmos.* Our analysis of the second part of the play has demonstrated the importance of group identification for the smooth operation of the new regime and has argued that in fact the communal regime constitutes a motivational and not a structural remedy for Athens' ills. The structural apparatus must be taken as indicative of the poet's satirical stance towards and diffidence in the constitutional reforms of the fourth century which promoted the rule of the law. In contrast, the second part of the play seems to promote an alternative rule of the law which rests on traditional social norms. Under this perspective, the regime established (political system) stands for collectivism (world-view); this makes the ostensible contradiction between the traditionalism/conservatism of women and the innovative character of Praxagora's reforms intelligible and it has important implications on how ancient and modern audiences interpret the scenes of the second part of the play.

In the last chapter we have demonstrated that the behaviour of the comic heroes as leaders follows the propositions of the social identity theory of leadership; the model is positively assessed when implemented by fictional leaders, but negatively assessed when implemented by heroes who stand for historical leaders. In any case, the flexible concept of social identity (which resembles the versatile and recreative tendencies of the chorus) is a powerful weapon in their hands and its exploitation seems to reinforce the *ponêria* which characterizes heroes like Pisthetaerus and Trygaeus, making clear that, although group membership

prescribes collective intentions and actions, it does not assign them moral connotations.

This takes us to the secondary aim of this study which has been to achieve a break in the caricature-like portrait of the comic hero by displaying how his behaviour corroborates and is corroborated by the propositions of social identity theory. As we hope to have shown, our analysis allows us to argue for a comic proto-realism which is not only observed in the plays of the middle and last production period of Aristophanes' career, but as early as in *Acharnians.* Nonetheless, it is true that the comic proto-realism is more explicit in the plays of the middle and last period because it is accompanied by a simultaneous downgrade of the recreative tendencies in these plays, both in part of the heroes and the chorus. It is tempting to argue for a gradual development in Aristophanes' writing towards choral decline, limited recreative tendencies and thus realistic characterization of both chorus and heroes, although this realism is by no means comparable to the realistic-ethical characterization of the tragic heroes, not to mention the realistic-rounded characterization of modern-drama heroes.[401]

In defending the applicability of social psychology as a tool for the behaviour of the spectators in the Roman games on the basis of our shared humanity, Fagan argues: "[d]espite obvious sociohistorical divergences, fictional characters in, say, the epics of Homer or the plays of Euripides, as well as historical personages portrayed in the pages of a Thucydides or a Tacitus, behave in ways we recognize and relate to. They act out of motives, display emotions, and do things we find familiar, or even expect. They can be greedy, ambitious, selfish or altruistic; they

[401] The argument for comic proto-realism is reinforced by the similarities in the behaviour of comic heroes and the chorus as leaders and followers with the behaviour of the politicians and the *dêmos* respectively in the process of decision making as described by Thucydides. Mass/crowd psychology has been applied for describing the volatile and short-sighted reactions of the *dêmos* in the *History* (Hunter: 1986, 1988), which is taken to promote a sharp dichotomy between reason and passion, *gnômê* and *orgê.* The social identity perspective, arguing that the behaviour of the crowd members is guided by their shared social identity, could be an extremely useful tool for investigating the behaviour of the *dêmos* as crowd in Thucydides and how the leaders control it or manipulate its emotions. Following the propositions of the theory, the crowd must be treated as rational and his emotional reactions as stemming from its social identity. In Fagan's study (2011), crowd behaviour is interpreted through the social identity perspective. For the social identity perspective on crowd behaviour in general, see Reicher (1999, 2001).

can be courageous or cowardly, loyal or false; they seek redress when wronged or rationalize when wronging others; they feel grief in the face of death; they delight in their success – they are in short recognizable human beings. This is the basis for the celebrated timelessness of great literary works, the reason they are hailed for their deep humanity, psychological insight, and elucidation of the human condition".[402] It is no surprise that Aristophanes and his heroes are excluded from this group of plays and poets/historians. And possibly they will never be included, although they are members of this group; marginal and surely not prototypical, but still members. Extravagant assertion someone may object; well, comedy is an extravagant genre.

[402] Fagan (2011) 46-47.

8 References

Editions of the texts cited:

Austin, C. and S. D. Olson (2004) *Aristophanes Thesmophoriazusae*. Oxford

Biles, Z. P. and S. D. Olson (2015) *Aristophanes: "Wasps"*. Oxford

Dover, K. J. (1993) *Frogs.* Oxford

Dunbar, N. V. (1995) *Aristophanes: Birds.* Oxford

Henderson, J. (1998-2008) *Aristophanes.* Loeb Classical Library, 5 vols. Cambridge MA

Kassel, R. and C. Austin (1983–) *Poetae Comici Graeci*, vols. i, ii, iii 2, iv, v, vi 2, vii, viii. Berlin and New York

Olson, S. D. (1998) *Aristophanes: Peace*. Oxford

(2002) *Aristophanes: Acharnians*. Oxford

Smith, C. F. (1921) *Thucydides*, vol. 3. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA

(1930) *Thucydides*, vol. 2. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA

(1999) *Thucydides*, vol. 1. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA

(2006) *Thucydides*, vol. 4. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA

Sommerstein, A. H. (1980-2002) *The Comedies of Aristophanes:* vol. 1: *Acharnians* (1980); vol. 2: *Knights* (1981); vol. 4: *Wasps* (1983); vol. 5: *Peace* (1985), 2nd ed. (2005); vol. 6: *Birds* (1987); vol. 7: *Lysistrata* (1990); vol. 8: *Thesmophoriazusae* (1994); vol. 9: *Frogs* (1996); vol. 10: *Ecclesiazusae* (1998); vol. 11: *Wealth* (2001). Warminster

Wilson, N. G. (2007) *Aristophanis Fabulae.* Oxford Classical Texts, 2 vols. Oxford

Works cited:

Abrams, D. and M. A. Hogg (1990) 'Social identification, self-categorisation, and social influence', *European Review of Social Psychology* 1: 195-228. DOI: 10.1080/14792779108401862

Allport, G. W. (1954) *The nature of prejudice*. Reading MA

Anderson, M., D. Cairns and M. Sprevak, eds. (2018) *Distributed Cognition in Classical Antiquity.* Edinburgh

Andrewes, A. (1962) 'The Mytilene Debate: Thucydides 3.36-49', *Phoenix* 16: 64-85

Andrews, J. A. (1994) 'Cleon's Ethopoetics', *Classical Quarterly* n.s. 50: 45-62

Arrowsmith, W. (1973) 'Aristophanes' *Birds:* The Phantasy Politics of Eros', *Arion* n.s. 1: 119-167

Aslanidis, P. (2017) 'Populism and Social Movements' in C. R. Kaltwasser, P. Taggart, P. Ochoa Espejo, and P. Ostiguy, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Populism.* Oxford, 305-325

Bakola, E. (2008) 'The drunk, the reformer and the teacher: agonistic poetics and the construction of persona in the comic poets of the fifth century', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 54: 1–29

(2010) *Cratinus and the Art of Comedy*. Oxford

Bass, B. M. (1985) *Leadership and Performance beyond expectations.* New York

BBC prison study http://www.bbcprisonstudy.org/index.php

Bierl. A. F. H (2012) 'Women on the Acropolis and Mental Mapping: Comic Body-Politics in a City in Crisis, or Ritual and Metaphor in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*' in Markantonatos and Zimmermann (2012) 255-290

Biles, Z. P. (2016) 'Thucydides' Cleon and the Poetics of Politics in Aristophanes' *Wasps*', *Classical Philology* 111: 117-138

Billing, M. (2000) 'Henri Tajfel's 'Cognitive aspects of prejudice' and the psychology of bigotry', *British Journal of Social Psychology* 41: 171–188

Bertelli, L. (2018) 'Justice and law in Aristotle' in Harris and Canevaro (forthcoming)

Bobonich, C. (2010) *Plato's Laws. A critical guide.* Cambridge

Boegehold, A. L. and A. Scafuro, eds. (2002) *Athenian Identity and Civic Ideology*, Baltimore, MD and London

Bowie, A. M. (1982) 'The parabasis in Aristophanes: prolegomena, *Acharnians*', *Classical Quarterly* 32: 27–40

(1993) *Aristophanes: Myth, Ritual and Comedy*. Cambridge

Bowie, E. L. (1988) 'Who is Dicaeopolis?', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 108: 183–185

Breakwell, G. M. (1979) 'Women: Group and Identity?', *Women's Studies International Quarterly* 2: 9-17

Brewer, M. B. (2001) 'The many faces of social identity: Implications for political psychology', *Political Psychology* 22, 115–125. doi:10.1037/0033295x.114.1.133

Brewer, M. B. and Y.- R. Chen (2007) 'Where (who) are collectives in collectivism? Toward conceptual clarification of individualism and collectivism', *Psychological Review* 114: 133–151

Brewer, M. B. and N. Miller (1984) 'Beyond the contact hypothesis: Theoretical perspectives on desegregation' in N. Miller and M. B. Brewer, eds. (1984) *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation.* Orlando, FL, 281–302

Brock, R. W. (1986) 'The Double Plot in Aristophanes' *Knights*', *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 27: 15-27

Brown, R. (2000) 'Social identity theory: past achievements, current problems and future challenges', *European Journal of Social Psychology* 30: 745-778. DOI: 10.1002/1099-0992(200011/12)30:63.0.CO;2-O

Brown, R. J. and M. Hewstone (2005) 'An integrative theory of intergroup contact', *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* 37: 255–343. doi:10.1016/ s0065–2601(05)37005–5

Budelmann, F. and P. Easterling (2010) 'Reading Minds in Greek Tragedy', *Greece and Rome* (Second Series) 57.2: 289-303

Burns, J. M. (1978) *Leadership.* New York

Cairns, D. and D. P. Nelis, eds. (2017) *Emotions in the Classical World: Methods, Approaches, and Directions*. Stuttgart

Cairns, E., T. Tam, M. Hewstone and U. Niens (2005) 'Intergroup forgiveness and intergroup conflict: Northern Ireland, a case study' in E. L. Worthington Jr., ed. (2005) *Handbook of forgiveness*. London, 461-477

Cagan, D. (1975) 'The Speeches in Thucydides and the Mytilene Debate', *Yale Classical Studies* 24: 71-94

Calame, C. (2004) 'Choral Forms in Aristophanic Comedy: Musical Mimesis and Dramatic Performance in Classical Athens', in P. Murray and P. Wilson, eds. (2004)

Music and the Muses: The Culture of 'Mousikē' in the Classical Athenian City. Oxford, 157-184

Canevaro, M. (2013) *The documents in the Attic orators: laws and decrees in the public speeches of the Demosthenic corpus*. Oxford

(2015) 'Making and changing laws in ancient Athens' in Canevaro and Harris (forthcoming)

Canevaro, M. and E. M. Harris, eds. (forthcoming) *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Law*. Oxford (pre-published on Oxford Handbooks Online)

Carawan, E. M. (1990) 'The five talents Cleon coughed up (Schol. Ar. *Ach.* 6)', *Classical Quarterly* 40: 137–147

Carey, C. (1993) 'The Purpose of Aristophanes' *Acharnians*', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 136: 245–263

Cassidy, T. (2015) 'Organisational leadership approaches in sports coaching' in I. O'boyle, D. Murray and P. Cummins, eds. (2015) *Leadership in Sport.* London and New York, 195-210

Cassidy, T., P. Cummins, G. Breslin, M. Stringer (2014) 'Perceptions of Coach Social Identity and Team Confidence, Motivation and Self-Esteem', *Psychology* 5: 1175-1184. DOI: 10.4236/psych.2014.510130

Cassio, A. C. (1985) *Commedia e partecipazione. La Pace di Aristofane.* Napoli

Cialdini, R. B. and M. R. Trost (1998) 'Social influence: Social norms, conformity, and compliance' in Gilbert, Fiske and Lindzey (1998) 151-192

Chaniotis, A., ed. (2012) *Unveiling Emotions: Sources and Methods for the Study of Emotions in the Greek World*. Stuttgart

Chaniotis, A. and P. Ducrey, eds. *Unveiling Emotions II. Emotions in Greece and Rome: Texts, Images, Material Culture.* Stuttgart

Christ, M. (1998) *The Litigious Athenian*. Baltimore, MD

Cicero, L., A. Pierro and D. van Knippenberg (2007) 'Leader group prototypicality and job satisfaction: The moderating role of job stress and team identification', *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice* 11.3: 165-175. DOI: 10.1037/1089-2699.11.3.165

(2010) 'Leadership and Uncertainty: How Role Ambiguity Affects the Relationship between Leader Group Prototypicality and Leadership Effectiveness', *British Journal Management* 21.2: 411-442. doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2009.00648.x

Cohen, B., ed. (2000) *Not the Classical Ideal: Athens and the Construction of the Other in Greek Art*. Leiden, Boston and Cologne

Cohen, D. (1991) *Law, sexuality and society: the enforcement of morals in classical Athens.* Cambridge

(1995) *Law, Violence and Community in Classical Athens. Key Themes in Ancient History Series.* Cambridge

Compton-Engle, G. L. (1997) 'Sudden Glory: Acharnians and the Fist Comic Hero', Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University

(2005) 'Stolen Cloaks in Aristophanes' "Ecclesiazusae"', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 135.1: 163-176

Condor, S. (1986) 'From Sex Categories to Gender Boundaries: Reconsidering Sex as a "Stimulus Variable" in Social Psychological Research', *BPS Social Psychology Section Newsletter*. Spring

Connor, W. R. (1971) *The New Politicians of Fifth-Century Athens*. Princeton, NJ

Conway, M., M. T. Pizzamiglio and L. Mount (1996) 'Status, communality and agency: Implications for the stereotypes of gender and other groups', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 71: 25–38. doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.71.1.25

Cornford, F. (1914: 1934) *The Origin of Attic Comedy*. London (2nd edn Cambridge 1934)

De Cremer, D. and M. Van Vugt (2002) 'Intra and intergroup dynamics of leadership in social dilemmas: a relational model of cooperation', *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 38.2: 126-136

David, E. (1984) *Aristophanes and Athenian Society of the Early Fourth Century B.C.*. Mnemosyne Supplement 81. Leiden

Davidson, J. (1997) *Courtesans and Fishcakes: the Consuming Passions of Classical Athens*. London and New York

Dawes, R. M. (1980) 'Social Dilemmas', *Annual Review of Psychology* 31: 169-193

De Luka, K. (2005) *Aristophanes' Male and Female Revolutions. A reading of Aristophanes' Knights and Assemblywomen*. Lanham MD

Dobrov, G. (2001) *Figures of Play: Greek Drama and Metafictional Poetics*. Oxford

ed. (1995) *Beyond Aristophanes: Transition and Diversity in Greek Comedy*. Atlanta, GA

ed. (1997) *The City as Comedy: Society and Representation in Athenian Drama*. Chapel Hill, NC

Dover, K. J. (1972) *Aristophanic Comedy*. Berkeley, CA

Dovidio, J. F. and S. L. Gaertner (2000) 'Aversive racism and selection decisions: 1989 and 1999', *Psychological Science* 11.4: 315-319. doi.org/10.1111/1467-9280.00262

Dovidio, J. F., S. L. Gaertner, M.-S. John, S. Halabi, T. Saguy, A. R. Pearson and B. M. Riek (2008) 'Majority and Minority Perspectives in Intergroup Relations: The Role of Contact, Group Representations, Threat, and Trust in Intergroup Conflict and Reconciliation' in Nadler, Malloy and Fisher (2008) 227-253. DOI:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195300314.003.0011

Edmunds, L. (1987) *Cleon, "Knights" and Aristophanes Politics.* Lanham, Md

Edwards, A. T. (2002) 'Historicizing the popular grotesque: Bakhtin's *Rabelais and His World* and Attic Old Comedy' in R. B. Branham, ed. (2002) *Bakhtin and the Classics*. Evanston, IL, 27–55

Ehrenberg, V. (1962) *The People of Aristophanes: A Sociology of Old Attic Comedy*, 3rd edn. New York

Fagan, G. (2011) *The Lure of the Arena: Social Psychology and the Crowd at the Roman Games.* Cambridge

Faraone, C. A. (1997) 'Salvation and female heroics in the parodos of Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 117: 38-59

(2006) 'Priestess and Courtesan: The Ambivalence of Female Leadership in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*' in C. A. Faraone and L. K. McClure, eds. (2006) *Prostitutes and Courtesans in the Ancient World*. Madison, 207−223

Fine, J. V. A (1951) *Horoi: Studies in Mortgage, Real Security, and Land Tenure in Ancient Athens*. Athens

Finley, M. I. (1975) *The Use and Abuse of History*. London

Fisher, N. (1993) 'Multiple personalities and Dionysiac festivals: Dikaiopolis in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*'. *Greece and Rome* 40: 31–47

Fiske, T., D. T. Gilbert, and G. Lindzey, eds. *Handbook of social psychology*, 5th edn, vol. 2. New York

Fletcher, J. (1999) 'Sacrificial Bodies and the Body of the Text in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*', *Ramus: Critical Studies in Greek and Roman Literature* 28: 108-125

(2012) 'The women's decree: law and its other in *Ecclesiazusae'* in C. W. Marshall and G. Kovacks, eds. (2012) *No Laughing Matter: Studies in Athenian Comedy*. Bristol, 127-140

Foley, H., ed. (1981) *Reflections of Women in Antiquity*. New York and London

(1982) 'The 'female intruder' reconsidered: women in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* and *Ecclesiazusae*', *Classical Philology* 77: 1–21

(1988) 'Tragedy and politics in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 108: 33–47

Foster, E. (2017) 'Aristophanes' Cleon and Post-Peloponnesean War Athenians: Denunciations in Thucydides', *Histos* Supplement 6: 129-152

Fox, M. (1998) 'The constrained man' in L. Foxhall and J. Salmon, eds. (1998) *Thinking men: masculinity and its self-representation in the classical tradition.* London, 6-22

Fragoulaki, M. (2013) *Kinship in Thucydides: Intercommunal Ties and Historical Narrative*. Oxford

Gaertner, S., J. Mann, A. Murrell and J. Dovidio (1989) 'Reducing intergroup bias: The benefits of recategorization', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 57: 239–249. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.57.2.239

Gaertner, S. L., J. Dovidio, P. A. Anastasio, B. A. Bachman and M. C. Rust (1993) 'The common ingroup identity model: Recategorization and the reduction of intergroup bias', *European Review of Social Psychology* 4: 1–26. DOI: 10.1080/14792779343000004

Gartzia, L., M. Ryan, N. Balluerka and A, Aritzeta (2012) 'Think crisis–think female: Further evidence', *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 21.4: 603-628. doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2011.591572

Gelzer, T. (1996) 'Some Aspects of Aristophanes' Dramatic Art in the *Birds*' in Segal (1996) 194-215

Gilbert, D. T., S. T. Fiske and G. Lindzey, eds. *The handbook of social psychology*, 4th edn. New York

Goldhill, S. (1991) *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature*. Cambridge

Gomme, A. W. (1938) 'Aristophanes and politics', *Classical Review* 52: 97–109

Greenleaf, R.K. (1977) *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*. New York

Hall, E. (1987) *Inventing the Barbarian*. Oxford

(2006) *The Theatrical Cast of Athens: Interactions between Ancient Greek Drama and Society*. Oxford

(2010) 'The many faces of Lysistrata' in Stuttard (2010) 29-36

(2015) 'Aristophanes' *Birds* as Satire on Athenian Opportunists in Thrace' (unpublished), 1-36. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=66cQGCW9Urw

(2018) 'The boys from Cydathenaeum: Aristophanes versus Cleon again' in D. Allen, P. Christiansen and P. Millet, eds. (2018) *How to do Things with History: New Approaches to Ancient Greece*. Oxford, 339-363

Halliwell, S. (1984) 'Aristophanic satire', *Yearbook of English Studies* 14: 6–20

Hammermeister, J. J., D. Burton, T. Pickering, N. Baldwin, M. Chase and K. Westre (2008) 'Servant Leadership in Sport: A Concept Whose Time has Arrived', *International Journal of Servant Leadership* 4: 185-221

Haney, C., C. Banks and P. Zimbardo (1973) 'A study of prisoners and guards in a simulated prison', *Naval Research Reviews,* Office of Naval Research, Washinghton, September: 1-17

Hansen, M. (1978) '*Nomos* and *Psephisma* in fourth-century Athens', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 19: 315–330

(1991) *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes*. Oxford

Hardwick, L. (2010) '*Lysistratas* on the Modern Stage' in Stuttard (2010) 80-89

Harris, E. (2006) *Democracy and the Rule of Law in Classical Athens*. Cambridge

(2013) *The Rule of Law in Action*. Oxford.

Harvey, D. and J. Wilkins, eds. (2000) *The Rivals of Aristophanes: Studies in Athenian Old Comedy*. London

Haslam, S. A. and S. D. Reicher (2007a) 'Identity entrepreneurship and the consequences of identity failure: The dynamics of leadership in the BBC Prison Study', *Social Psychology Quarterly* 70: 125-147

(2007b) 'Beyond the banality of evil: Three dynamics of an interactionist social psychology of tyranny', *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 33: 615-622. doi.org/10.1177/0146167206298570

(2012) 'When prisoners take over the prison: A social psychology of resistance', *Personality and Social Psychology Review 16:* 154-179. doi.org/10.1177/1088868311419864

Haslam, S. A., S. D. Reicher and M. J. Platow (2011) *The New Psychology of Leadership: Identity, Influence, and Power.* Hove and New York

Hazel, C. (2009) *Alterity. The Experience of the Other.* Bloomington

Heath, M. (1987) *Political Comedy in Aristophanes*. Gôttingen (= *Hypomnemata* 87)

(1997) 'Aristophanes and the discourse of politics' in Dobrov (1997) 230–249

Henderson, J. (1980b) '*Lysistrata*: the play and its themes' in Henderson (1980a) 153–218

(1987a) 'Older women in Attic Comedy' in *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 117: 105–129

(1987b) *Aristophanes' Lysistrata*. Oxford

(1990) 'The *demos* and the comic competition' in J. J. Winkler and F. Zeitlin, eds. (1990) *Nothing to do with Dionysus? Athenian Drama in its Social Context.* Princeton, JC, 271–313

(1991) *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy,* 2nd edn. New York and Oxford

(1993) 'Comic hero versus political elite' in Sommerstein et al. (1993) 307–319

(1995) 'Beyond Aristophanes' in G.W. Dobrov, ed. (1995) *Beyond Aristophanes: Transition and Diversity in Greek Comedy*. Oxford, 175-183

(1996/2010) *Three Plays by Aristophanes: Staging Women*. London

(1997) 'Mass versus Elite and the Comic Heroism of Peisetairos' in Dobrov (1997) 135-148

(2003a) 'Demos, Demagogue, Tyrant in Attic Old Comedy' in K.A. Morgan, ed. (2003) *Popular Tyranny.* Austin, 155-179

(2003b) 'When an Identity Was Expected: The Slaves in Aristophanes' *Knights'* in G. F. Bakewell and J. P. Sickinger, eds. *Gestures: Essays in Ancient History, Literature, and Philosophy Presented to Alan L. Boegehold.* Oxford, 63-73

(2017) 'Thucydides and Attic Comedy' in R. Balot, S. Forsdyke and E. Foster, eds. (2017) *The Oxford Handbook of Thucydides.* New York and Oxford, 605-620

Henderson, J., ed. (1980a) *Aristophanes: Essays in Interpretation*. New York (= *Yale Classical Studies* 26)

Hewstone, M. (1996) 'Contact and categorization: Social psychological interventions to change intergroup relations' in N. Macrae, C. Stangor and M. Hewstone, eds. (1996) *Stereotypes and stereotyping.* New York, 323–368

Hewstone, M. and R. Brown (1986) 'Contact is not enough: An intergroup perspective on the 'Contact Hypothesis'' in M. Hewstone and R. Brown, eds. (1986) *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters.* Oxford, 1–44

Hinkle, S. and R. Brown (1990) 'Intergroup comparisons and social identity: some links and lacunae' in D. Abrams and M. A. Hogg, eds. (1990) *Social Identity Theory: Constructive and critical advances.* London, 48-70

Hewstone, M., J. B. Kenworthy, E. Cairns, N. Tausch, J. Hughes, T. Tam, A. Voci, U. von Hecker and C. Pinder (2008) 'Stepping Stones to Reconciliation in Northern Island: Intergroup Contact, Forgiveness, and Trust' in Nadler, Malloy and Fisher (2008) 199-226. DOI:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195300314.003.0010

Hofstede, G. (1980) *Culture's Consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA

Hogg, M. A. (1993) 'Group cohesiveness: A critical review and some new directions. *European Review of Social Psychology* 4: 85-111. DOI: 10.1080/14792779343000031

(2001) 'A social identity theory of leadership', *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 5: 184-200. doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr0503_1

(2007) 'Uncertainty-identity theory', *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* 39: 69-126. doi:10.1016/s0065–2601(06)39002–8

(2010) 'Influence and Leadership' in Fiske, Gilbert, and Lindzey (2010) 1166-1207

(2015) 'Constructive leadership across groups: How leaders can combat prejudice and conflict between subgroups', *Advances in Group Processes* 32: 177–207. doi:10.1108/s0882614520150000032007

Hogg, M. A. and D. Abrams (1988) *Social Identifications: A Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations and Group Processes.* London

eds. (2001) *Intergroup relations: Essential readings.* Philadelphia

Hogg, M. A., D. Abrams, and M. B. Brewer (2017) 'Social identity: The role of self in group processes and intergroup relations', in *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations* 20.5: 570-581. doi.org/10.1177%2F1046496404263424

Hogg, M. A., Z. P. Hohman and J. E. Rivera (2008) 'Why do people join groups? Three motivational accounts from social psychology', *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 2.3: 1269-1280. DOI: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2008.00099.x

Hogg, M. A. and D. van Knippenberg (2003) 'Social identity and leadership processes in groups', *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* 35: 1–52

Hogg, M. A., D. van Knippenberg and D. E. Rast III (2012a) 'The social identity theory of leadership: Theoretical origins, research findings, and conceptual developments', *European Review of Social Psychology* 23: 258–304. doi:10.1080/10463283.2012.741134

(2012b) 'Intergroup leadership in organizations: Leading across group and intergroup boundaries', *Academy of Management Review* 37: 232–255. doi:10.5465/amr.2010.0221

Hogg, M. A. and G. M. Vaughan (2018) *Social Psychology* (8th Edition). Harlow

Hogg, M. A. and M. J. Hornsey (2006) 'Self-concept threat and multiple categorization within groups' in R. J. Crisp and M. Hewstone, eds. (2006) *Multiple social categorization: Processes, models, and applications.* New York, 112-135

Hogg, M. A. and J. A. Wagoner (2017) 'Normative exclusion and attraction to extreme groups: Resolving identity-uncertainty' in K. D. Williams and S. A. Nida, eds. (2017) *Ostracism, social exclusion, and rejection*. New York, 207–223

Hornsey, M. J. (2008) 'Social Identify Theory and Self-Categorization Theory: A Historical Review', *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 2: 204-222. doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00066.x

Hunter, V. (1986) 'Thucydides, Gorgias, and Mass Psychology', in *Hermes* 114: 412-429

(1988) 'Thucydides and the Sociology of the Crowd', in *Classical Journal* 84: 17–30

(1994) *Policing Athens: social control in Athenian lawsuits 420-320 BC.* Princeton

Hubbard, T. K. (1991) *The Mask of Comedy: Aristophanes and the Intertextual Parabasis*. Ithaca, NY

(1997) 'Utopianism and the Sophistic City in Aristophanes' in Dobrov (1997) 23-50

Hutchinson, G. O. (2011) 'House Politics and City Politics in Aristophanes', *Classical Quarterly* 61.1: 48–70

Ispas, A. (2013) *Psychology and Politics. A Social Identity Perspective.* London and New York

Jones, N. F. (2004) *Rural Athens under the Democracy*. Philadelphia

Kelman, H. C. (2008) 'Reconciliation From a Social Psychological Perspective' in Nadler, Malloy and Fisher (2008) 15-32

Klandermans, B. (1984) "Mobilization and participation: Social-psychological expansions of resource mobilization theory", *American Sociological Review* 49: 583-600. doi.org/10.2307/2095417

(1997) *The social psychology of protest.* Oxford

Konstan, D. (1995) *Greek Comedy and Ideology*. New York

(1993) 'Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*: women and the body politic' in Sommerstein et al. (1993) 431-444

(1997) "The Greek Polis and Its Negations: Versions of Utopia in Aristophanes' *Birds*" in Dobrov (1997) 3-22

(2006) *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks*: *Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature.* Toronto

Lafargue Ph. (2013) *Cléon. Le guerrier d' Athéna*. Bordeaux

(2015) *La Bataile de Pylos: 425 av. J. -C. Athènes contre Sparte.* Paris

Lanni, A. (2006) *Law and Justice in the Courts of Classical Athens*. Cambridge

(2016) *Law and Order in Ancient Athens*. Cambridge

Lape, S. (2010) *Race and Citizen Identity in the Classical Athenian Democracy*. Cambridge

Lape. S and A. Moreno (2014) 'Comedy and the social historian' in Revermann (2014) 336-369

Leiden conference on Classics and Social Psychology
https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/8c2401_113ae84bfeca4376b0834b8dca8db3e2.pdf

Levine, J. M. and M. A. Hogg, eds. (2010) *Encyclopedia of group processes and intergroup relations.* Thousand Oaks, CA

Levine, J. M. and R. L. Moreland (1985) 'Innovation and socialisation in small groups' in S. Moscovici, G. Mugny and E. Van Avermaet, eds. (1985) *Perspectives on minority influence*. Cambridge, 143–169

Lévy, E. (1976) *Athènes devant la défait de 404. Histoire d' une crise idéologique.* Paris

Loraux, N. (1993) 'The comic acropolis: Aristophanes, Lysistrata' in N. Loraux (1993) *Children of Athens: Athenian Ideas about Citizenship and the Division Between the Sexes*. Princeton, NJ, 143–183

Ludwig, P. D. *Eros and Polis. Desire and Community in Greek Political Theory.* Cambridge

Luppe, W. (2000) 'The Rivalry between Aristophanes and Kratinos' in D. Harvey and J. Wilkins, eds. (2000) *The Rivals of Aristophanes: Studies in Athenian Old Comedy.* London, 15-20

MacDowell, D. M. (1983) 'The Nature of Aristophanes' *Akharnians*', *Greece and Rome* 30.2: 143-162.

(1995) *Aristophanes and Athens: An Introduction to the Plays*. Oxford

(1998) 'Andocides' in M. Gagarin and D. M. Mac Dowell, eds. (1998) *Antiphon and Andocides.* Austin, 94-170

Mackie, D. M., T. Devos and E. R. Smith (2000) 'Intergroup emotions: Explaining offensive action tendencies in an intergroup context', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 79: 602–616. doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.4.602

Mackie, D. M., A. T. Maitner and E. R. Smith (2009) 'Intergroup emotions theory' in T. D. Nelson, ed. *Handbook of prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination*. New York, 285–308

Mackie, D. M. and E. R. Smith, eds. (2002) *From prejudice to intergroup emotions: Differentiated reactions to social groups.* Philadelphia

MacLeod, C. (1978) 'Reason and Necessity: Thucydides iii -9-14, 37-48', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 98: 64-78

Major W. E. (2013) *The Court of Comedy: Aristophanes, Rhetoric, and Democracy in Fifth-Century Athens*. Columbus OH

Markantonatos, A and B.Zimmermann (2012) 'Preface' in Markantonatos and Zimmermann (2012) v-xi

eds. (2012) *Crisis on Stage: Tragedy in Comedy in Late Fifth-Century Athens* (Trends in Classics Supplementary Volume 13). Berlin and Boston

Marques, J. M., D. Abrams, D. Páez and M . A. Hogg (2001) 'Social categorization, social identification, and rejection of deviant group members' in M. A. Hogg and R. S. Tindale, eds. *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Group processes*. Oxford, 400–424

Marques, J. M. and D. Páez (1994) 'The "black sheep effect": Social categorization, rejection of ingroup deviates, and perception of group variability', *European Review of Social Psychology* 5: 37–68. doi:10.1080/14792779543000011

Martin, R. P. (1987) 'Fire on the Mountain: Lysistrata and the Lemnian Women', *Classical Antiquity* 6: 77-105

(2015) 'Solon in comedy' in M. Noussia and G. Nagy, eds. (2015) *Solon in the Making: The Early Reception in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries.* Berlin, 66-85

McClure, L. K. (2015) 'Courtesans Reconsidered: Women in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*', *EuGeStA* 5: 54-84

McGlew, J. (2001) 'Identity and Ideology: The Farmer Chorus of Aristophanes' *Peace*', *Syllecta Classica* 12: 74-97

(2002) *Citizens on Stage: Comedy and Political Culture in the Athenian Democracy*. Ann Arbor, MI

Meineck, P., W. M. Short and J. Devereaux, eds. (2019) *The Routledge Handbook of Classics and Cognitive Theory.* London and New York

Meyer, M. (2014) 'Peisetairos of Aristophanes' *Birds* and the Erotic Tyrant of *Republic* IX' in Mihre and Fraust (2014) 275-302

Mihre, J. J. and B.-P. Fraust, eds. (2014) *The Political Theory of Aristophanes. Essays in Poetic Wisdom*. Albany

Miller, F. D. (2007) 'Aristotle's philosophy of law' in F. D. Miller, C-A. Biondi, eds. *A history of the philosophy of law from the ancient Greeks to the Scholastics,* vol. 6, Dordrecht, 79–110

Mirhady, D. (2009) 'Is the Wasps' Anger Democratic?" in J. R. C. Cousland and J. R. Hume, eds. *The Play of Texts and Fragments. Essays in Honour of Martin Cropp*. Leiden, 71-87

Mitchell, A. G. (2016) 'Classical Reception in Posters of *Lysistrata*: The Visual Debate Between Traditional and Feminist Imagery' in Walsh (2016) 331-368

Monoson, S. (1994) 'Citizen as *Erastes*: Erotic Imagery and the Idea of Reciprocity in the Periclean Funeral Oration', *Political Theory* 22: 253–276

Mossé, C. (2004) 'How a Political Myth Takes Shape: Solon, 'Founding Father' of the Athenian Democracy' in P. J. Rhodes, ed. (2004) *Athenian Democracy.* Edinburgh, 242-259

Moulton, C. (1981) *Aristophanic Poetry. Gôttingen*

Nadler, A., T. E. Malloy and J. D. Fisher, eds. (2008) *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Reconciliation.* Oxford

Nadler, A. and N. Shnabel (2008) 'Instrumental and Socioemotional Paths to Intergroup Reconciliation and the Needs-Based Model of Socioemotional Reconciliation' in Nadler, Malloy and Fisher (2008) 37-56

Nadler, A. (2002) 'Post resolution processes: Instrumental and socio-emotional routes to reconciliation' in G. Salomon and B. Nevo, eds. *Peace education: The concept, principles, and practices around the world*. Mahwah, NJ

Newiger, H.-J. (1980) 'War and Peace in the Comedy of Aristophanes' in Henderson (1980a) 219-237

Ober, J. (1989) *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens: Rhetoric, Ideology, and the Power of the People*. Princeton, NJ

(1998) *Political Dissent in Democratic Athens: Intellectual Critics of Popular Rule.* Princeton, NJ

Olson, S. D. (1987) 'The identity of the δεσπότης at Aristophanes' *Ecclesiazusae* 1128ff.', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 28: 161-166

(1988) 'The 'Love Duet' in Aristophanes' *Ecclesiazusae*', *Classical Quarterly* n.s. 38: 328–330

(1990) 'The New Demos of Aristophanes' *Knights*', *Eranos* 88: 60-63

(1991) 'Dicaeopolis' political motivations in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 111: 200–203

(1996) 'Politics and Poetry in Aristophanes' *Wasps'*, *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 126: 129-150

(2007) *Broken Laughter: Selected Fragments of Greek Comedy*. Oxford

(2010) 'Comedy, politics, and society' in Dobrov (2010) 35–69

Orwin, C. (1994) *The Humanity of Thucydides*. Princeton

Osborne, R. G. (1985) 'Law in action in classical Athens', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 105: 40–58

Osborne, R. G. and S. Hornblower, eds. (1994) *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis*. Oxford

Ostwald, M. (1986) *From Popular Sovereignty to the Sovereignty of Law*. Berkeley and Los Angeles

O' Sullivan, N. (2006) 'Aristophanes' First Critic: Cratinus fr. 342 KA' in J. Davidson, F. Muecke and P. Wilson, eds. (2006) *Greek Drama III: Essays in Honour of Kevin Lee*. London, 163-169

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998) 'Intergroup contact theory', *Annual Review of Psychology* 49: 65–85. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.psych.49.1.65

Pettigrew, T. F. and L. Tropp (2006) 'A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 90.5: 751–783. doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751

Pierro, A., L. Cicero, M. Bonaiuto, D. van Knippenberg and A. W Kruglanski (2007) 'Leader Group Prototypicality and Resistance to Organizational Change: The Moderating Role of Need for Closure and Team Identification', *Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology* 14.1: 27-40

Postmes, T. and R. Spears (1998) 'Deindividuation and anti-normative behavior: A meta-analysis', *Psychological Bulletin* 123: 238-259. doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.123.3.238

Rast, D. A. III, A. M. Gaffney and M. A. Hogg (2012) 'Leadership under Uncertainty: When Leaders who are Non-Prototypical Group Members can Gain Support', *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 48.3: 646–653. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2011.12.013

(2013) 'The tyranny of normative distance: A social identity account of the exercise of power by remote leaders' in n M. C. Bligh and R. E. Riggio, eds. *Leadership: Research and practice. Exploring distance in leader-follower relationships: When near is far and far is near.* New York, 215-240

Rast, D. A. III, M. A. Hogg and J. J. Tomory (2015) 'Prototypical Leaders Do Not Always Get Our Support: Impact of Self-Uncertainty and Need for Cognition', *Self and Identity* 14.2: 135-146. doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2014.964755

Reicher, S. D. (1999) '"The Crowd" century: Reconciliating practical success with theoretical failure', *British Journal of Social Psychology* 35: 535-553. DOI: 10.1111/j.2044-8309.1996.tb01113.x

(2001) 'The Psychology of Crowd Dynamics' in M. A. Hogg and R. S. Tindale, eds. (2001) *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Group Processes*. Malden, MA, 182-208

Reicher, S. D. and S. A. Haslam (2006a) 'Rethinking the psychology of tyranny: The BBC Prison Study', *British Journal of Social Psychology* 45: 1-40. DOI:10.1348/014466605X48998

(2006b) 'Tyranny revisited: Groups, psychological well-being and the health of societies', *The Psychologist* 19: 46-50

Reicher, S. D., R. Spears and T. Postmes (1995) 'A social identity model of deindividuation phenomena', *European Review of Social Psychology* 6: 161–198. doi:10.1080/14792779443000049

Revermann, M. (2006) *Comic Business: Theatricality, Dramatic Technique, and Performance Contexts of Aristophanic Comedy*. Oxford

(2010) 'On Misunderstanding *Lysistrata*, Productively' in Stuttard (2010) 70-79

ed. (2014) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Comedy*. Cambridge

Rhodes, P. J. (1980) 'Athenian Democracy after 403 B.C.', Classical Journal 75: 305-323

(2004) 'Keeping to the point' in E. M. Harris and L. Rubenstein, eds. (2004) T*he law and the courts in ancient Greece.* London, 137–158

Rieke, M., J. Hammermeister and M. Chase (2008) 'Servant Leadership in Sport: A New Paradigm for Effective Coach Behavior', *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching, 3,* 227-239. doi.org/10.1260/174795408785100635

Riu, X. 1999. *Dionysism and Tragedy.* New York.

Robertson, D. (2004) *The Routledge Dictionary of Politics,* 3rd edn. London and New York

Robson, J. (2009) *Aristophanes: An Introduction*. London

(2016) 'Aristophanes, Gender and Sexuality' in Walsh (2016) 44-66

Romney, S. (2019) 'Group identity and archaic lyric: we-group and out-group in Alcaeus 129' in Meineck, Short and Devereaux (2019) 191-201

Roselli, D. K. (2014) 'Social class' in Revermann (2014) 241-258

Rosen, R. M. (1988) *Old Comedy and the Iambographic Tradition*. Atlanta, GA

(2007) *Making Mockery: The Poetics of Ancient Satire.* Oxford

(2014) 'The Greek 'comic hero'' in Revermann (2014) 222-240

Rosenbloom, D. (2002) 'From *ponêros* to *pharmakos*: theater, social drama, and revolution in Athens, 428–404 B.C.E.', *Classical Antiquity* 21: 283–346

Rothwell, K. (1990) *Politics and Persuasion in Aristophanes' Ecclesiazusae*. Mnemosyne Supplement 111. Leiden

Rubinstein, L. (2000) *Litigation and Cooperation. Supporting Speakers in the Courts of Classical Athens*. Stuttgart

(2007) 'Arguments from precedent in Attic oratory' in E. Carawan, ed. (2007) *Oxford readings in the Attic orators.* Oxford, 359–371

Ruffell, I. (2006) 'A little ironic don't you think? Utopian criticism and the problem of Aristophanes' last plays' in L. Kozak and J. Rich, eds. (2006) *Playing Around Aristophanes: Essays in Celebration of the Completion of the Edition of the Comedies of Aristophanes by Alan Sommerstein*. Oxford, 65–104

(2014) 'Character types' in Revermann (2014) 147-167

Rule of Law retrieved from https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rule-of-law/#LawSociNorm

Rusten, J. (2006) 'Thucydides and Comedy' in A. Rengakos and A. Tsakmakis, eds. (2006) *Brill's Companion to Thucydides.* Leiden, 547-558

Ryan, M. K., S. A. Haslam, Hersby M. D. and R. Bongiorno (2011) 'Think crisis-think female: Using the glass cliff to reconsider the think manager-think male stereotype', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 96: 470-484. DOI: 10.1037/a0022133

Saïd, S. (1996) '*The Assemblywomen*: Women, Economy, and Politics' in Segal (2006) 282-313

(1987) 'Travestis et travestissements dans les comédies d'Aristophane', *Cahiers du Groupe Interdisciplinaire du Théâtre Antique (GITA)* 3: 217–48

Saxonhouse, A. W. (1978) 'Comedy in Callipolis: animal imagery in the *Republic*', *The American Political Science Review* 72: 888–901

(2014) 'Boundaries: The Comic Poet Confronts the "Who" of Political Action" in Mihre and Fraust (2014) 89-108

Schwartz, S. H. (1992) 'Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical Advances and empirical tess in 20 cultures', *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* 25: 1-65. doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60281-6

Schwartz, S. H. and Bardi, A (1997) 'Influences of adaptation to communist rule on value priorities in Eastern Europe', *Political Psychology* 18: 385-410. DOI: 10.1111/0162-895X.00062

Scholtz, A. (2004) 'Friends, Lovers, Flatterers; Demophilic Courtship in Aristophanes' *Knights'*, *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Assoociation* 134: 263-293

(2007) *Concordia Discors: Eros and Dialogue in Classical Athenian Literature*. Washington D.C.

Sears, M, (2013) Athens, *Thrace and the Shaping of Athenian Leadership.* Cambridge

Segal, E., ed. (1996) *Oxford Readings in Aristophanes*. Oxford

Shaw, C. A. (1975) 'The female intruder: Women in Fifth-Century Drama', *Classical Philology* 70: 255-266

Sealey, R. (1987) *The Athenian republic: Democracy or the rule of law?* Philadelphia-London

Shear, J. (2011) *Responding to Oligarchy in Classical Athens.* Cambridge

Shein, V. E. (1973) 'The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 57: 95-100. doi.org/10.1037/h0037128

Sheppard, A. (2016) 'Aristophanes' *Ecclesiazusae* and the Remaking of the *Πάτριος Πολιτεία*', *Classical Quarterly* 66.2: 463-483

Sherif, M., O. J. Harvey, B. J. White, W. R. Hood, and C. Sherif (1961) I*ntergroup Conflict and Cooperation: The Robber's Cave Experiment.* Norman, OK

Sidwell, K. (1990) 'Was Philocleon cured? The *nosos* theme in Aristophanes' *Wasps*', *Classica et Mediaevalia* 41: 9–31

(1995) 'Poetic Rivalry and the Caricature of Comic Poets: Cratinus' *Pytine* and Aristophanes' *Wasps*' in A. Griffiths, ed. (1995) *Stage Directions: Essays in Ancient Drama in Honour of E. W. Handley.* London, 56-80

(2009) *Aristophanes the Democrat: The Politics of Satirical Comedy during the Peloponnesian War*. Cambridge

Sifakis, G. M. (1971) *Parabasis and Animal Choruses*. London

(1992) 'The structure of Aristophanic comedy', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 112: 123–142

Silk, M. S. (1990) 'The people of Aristophanes' in C. B. R. Pelling, ed. (1990) *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*. Oxford, 150–173

(2000) *Aristophanes and the Definition of Comedy.* Oxford

Skevington, S. (1989) 'A Place for Emotion in Social Identity Theory' in Skevington and Baker (1989) 40-58

Skevington, S. M. and D. A. Dawkes (1988) 'Minorities at Work: Men in a Woman's World' in D. A. Canter, J.C. Jesuino, L. Soczka, G. M. Stephenson, eds. (1988) *Environmental Social Psychology.* London, 272-280

Skevington, S. M. and D. Baker, eds. (1989) *The Social Identity of Women.* London

Slater, N.W. (2002) *Spectator Politics: Metatheatre and Performance in Aristophanes*. Philadelphia, PA

Sommerstein, A. H. (1980) 'Notes in Aristophanes' Knights', *Classical Quartely* n.s. 27: 46-56

(1984) 'Aristophanes and the demon Poverty', *Classical Quarterly* 34: 314–333. Reprinted with minor revisions in Segal (1996) 252–281

(1992) 'Old comedians on Old Comedy', *Drama* 1: 14–33

(1993) 'Kleophon and the restaging of Frogs' in Sommerstein et al. (1993) 461–76

(1996) 'How to avoid being a *komodoumenos*', *Classical Quarterly* 46: 327–356

(1998) 'The Theatre Audience and the *Demos'* in J. A. López Férez, ed. *La comedia Griega y su injluencia en la literatura Espanola* (Estudios de filologia Griega, Vol. 3). Madrid, 43-62

(2000) 'Platon, Eupolis and the "demagogue-comedy"' in D. Harvey and J. Wilkins, eds. (2000) *The Rivals of Aristophanes: Studies in thenian Old Comedy.* London, 437–451

(2004) 'Harassing the satirist: the alleged attempts to prosecute Aristophanes' in I. Sluiter and R. Rosen, eds. (2004) *Free Speech in Classical Antiquity.* Leiden 145–174

(2005) 'An alternative democracy and an alternative to democracy in Aristophanic comedy' in Sommerstein (2009) 204–222

(2009) *Talking about Laughter and Other Studies in Greek Comedy*. Oxford

(2014) 'The politics of Greek comedy' in Revermann (2014) 291-305

Sommerstein, A. H., S. Halliwell, J. Henderson and B. Zimmermann, eds. (1993) *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis: Papers from the Greek Drama Conference, Nottingham, 18–20 July 1990*. Bari

Stangor, C. (2016) *Social groups in action and interaction*, 2nd edn. New York

Ste Croix, G. E. M. de (1972) *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War*. Ithaca, NY

Stehle, E. (2006) 'Solon's self-reflexive political persona and its audience' in J. Blok and A. Lardinois, eds. (2006) *Solon of Athens: new historical and philological approaches*. Leiden, 79–113

Storey, I. C. (1995) 'Wasps 1284-91 and the Portrait of Cleon in *Wasps'*, *Scholia* 4: 3-23

Stuttard, D., ed. (2010) *Looking at Lysistrata. Eight essays and a new version of Aristophanes' provocative comedy.* London

Stroup, S. C. (2004) 'Designing Women: Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* and the 'Hetairization' of the Greek Wife', *Arethusa* 37: 37−73

Süss, W. (1905) *De Personarum Antiquae Comoediae Usu et Origine*. Bonn

(1908) 'Zur Komposition der altattischen Komödie', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 63: 12–38

Sutton, D. (1980) *Self and Society in Aristophanes.* Washington, DC

Taaffe, L. K. (1993) *Aristophanes and Women*. London and New York

Tajfel, H., ed. (1978) *Differentiation between Social Groups: Studies in the Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations.* Cambridge, MA

Tajfel, H. and J. C. Turner (1979) 'An integrative theory of integroup conflict' in W. G. Austin and S. Worchel, eds. *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations.* Monterey, CA

Tamanaha, B. (2004) *On the rule of law: history, politics, theory.* Cambridge

Thomas, R. (1994) 'Law and Lawgiver in the Athenian Democracy' in R. Osborne and S. Hornblower, eds. (1994) *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis*. Oxford, 119-133

Todd, S. C. (1993) *The shape of Athenian law.* Oxford

Tritle, L. A. (2007) '"Laughing for Joy": War and Peace Among the Greeks' in K. A. Raaflaub, ed. (2007) *War and Peace in the Ancient World.* London, 172-190

Tsakmakis, A. (1997) 'Κατασκευάζοντας το θεατή των *Ορνίθων*' in A. Tsakmakis and M. Khristopoulos, eds. (1997) *Όρνιθες. Όψεις και αναγνώσεις μιας αριστοφανικής κωμωδίας.* Athens, 33-52

(2018) 'Laughing at Cleon – defending Pericles. Athenian demagogues, Thucydides' audience, and Comedy' in N. Villacéque, ed. (2018) *À l'Assemblée comme au théâtre. Pratiques délibératives des Anciens, perceptions et résonances modernes*, Actes de colloque. Rennes, 75-90

Tsakmakis, A. and Y. Kostopoulos (2011) 'Cleon's Imposition on his Audience' in G. Rechenauer and V. Pothou, eds. (2013) *Thucydides-A Violent Teacher?* Göttingen, 171-184

Tsoumpra, N. (2014) 'Comic leadership and power dynamics in Aristophanes', Ph.D. thesis, Oxford University

Turner, J. C. (1987) 'The analysis of the social influence' in J. C. Turner, M. A. Hogg, P. J. Oakes, S. D. Reicher, and M. S. Wetherell, eds. *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory.* Oxford, 68-88

(1991) *Social Influence*. Buckingham

(2006) 'Tyranny, freedom, and social structure: Escaping our theoretical prisons', *British Journal of Social Psychology* 25: 237-252. 25: 237-252. doi.org/10.1348/014466605X79840

Turner, J. C. and K. J. Reynolds (2001) 'The Social Identity Perspective in Intergroup Relations: Theories, Themes, and Controversies' in R. Brown and S. Gaertner, eds. (2001) *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Intergroup Processes*. Oxford, 133-152

Vaio, J. (1971) 'Aristophanes' *Wasps*: the relevance of the final scenes', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 12: 335–351

(1973) 'The manipulation of theme and action in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 14: 369–380

van Dierendonck, D. (2011) 'Servant Leadership: A Review and Synthesis', *Journal of Management* 37.4: 1228-1261. doi.org/10.1177/0149206310380462

van Knippenberg, D. (2011) 'Embodying who we are: Leader group prototypicality and leadership effectiveness', *The Leadership Quarterly* 22: 1078-1091. doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.09.004

van Knippenberg, D. and M. A. Hogg, eds. (2003) *Leadership and power: Identity processes in groups and organizations.* London

van Lange, P. A. M., E. M. N. De Bruin, W. Otten and J. A. Joireman (1997) 'Development of prosocial, individualistic, and competitive orientations: Theory and preliminary evidence', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 73.4: 733-746

van Zomeren, M., T. Postmes and R. Spears (2008) 'Toward an intergrative social identity model of collective action: A quantitative research synthesis of three socio-psychological perspectives', *Psychological Bulletin* 134: 504-535. doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.134.4.504

Vernant, J.-P. (1980) *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece*. Trans. J. Lloyd. New York

Vickers, M. (1997) *Pericles on Stage: Political Comedy in Aristophanes' Early Plays.* Austin

Visvardi, E. (2015) *Emotion in Action. Thucydides and the Tragic Chorus*. Leiden and Boston

Vivian, J., M. Hewstone and R. J. Brown (1997) 'Intergroup contact: Theoretical and empirical developments' in R. Ben-Ari and Y. Rich, eds. (1997) *Understanding and enhancing education for diverse students: An international perspective*. Ramat-Gan, 13-146

van Vught, M. and D. De Cremer (1999) 'Leadership in Social Dilemmas: The Effects of Group Identification on Collective Actions to Provide Public Goods', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 76.4: 587-599

Walsh, P., ed. (2016) *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Aristophanes.* Leiden and Boston

Westlake, H. D. (1968) *Individuals in Thucydides*. Cambridge

Wetherell, M. (2010) 'The field of Identity Studies' in M. Wetherell and C. Talpade Mohanty, eds. (2010) *The Sage Handbook of Identities*. London, 3-26

Whiterhorne, J. (2005) 'O City of Kranaos! Athenian Identity in Aristophanes' "Acharnians"', *Greece and Rome* 52.1: 34-44

Whitman, C. H. (1964) *Aristophanes and the Comic Hero*. Cambridge, MA

Wilkins, J. M. (1997) 'Comic Cuisine: Food and Eating in the Comic Polis' in Dobrov (1997) 250-269

(2000)*The Boastful Chef: The Discourse of Food in Greek Comedy*. Oxford

Willi, A. 'Languages on stage: Aristophanic language, cultural history, and Athenian identity' in A. Willi, ed. (2002) *The Language of Greek Comedy*. Oxford, 111-149

Williams, J. A. (1984) 'Gender and Intergroup Behaviour: Towards an Integration', *British Journal of Social Psychology* 23: 311-316

Williams, J. A. and H. Giles (1978) 'The Changing Status of Women in Society: An intergroup perspective' in Tajfel (1978) 431-446

Williams K. D. and C. L. Govan (2005) 'Reacting to Ostracism: Retaliation or Reconciliation?' in D. Abrams, M. A. Hogg and J. M. Marques, eds. (2005) *The Social Psychology of Inclusion and Exclusion.* New York and Hove, 47-62

Wilson, P. (2000) *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia: The Chorus, the City, and the Stage*. Cambridge

(2007) '*Nikê*'s cosmetics: dramatic victory, the end of comedy, and beyond' in C. Kraus, S. Goldhill, H. P. Foley and J. Elsner, eds. (2007) *Visualizing the Tragic: Drama, Myth, and Ritual in Greek Art and Literature. Essays in Honour of Froma Zeitlin*. Oxford, 257–287

Winkler, J. J. (1990) *The Constraints of Desire. The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece.* New York and London

Wohl, V. (2002) *Love Among the Ruins: The Erotics of Democracy in Classical Athens*. Princeton, NJ

Woodhead, A. G. (1960) 'Thucydides' Portrait of Cleon', *Mnemosyne* 13: 289-317

Wright, M. (2012) *The Comedian as Critic: Greek Old Comedy and Poetics.* London

Xanthou, M. G. (2010) 'Contextualizing Dikaiopolis' persona: Urban Life, Rural Space, and Rural Perceptions of Urbanity in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*', *Hellenika* 60.2: 296-314

Yzerbyt, V. and S. Demoulin (2010) 'Intergroup relations' in Fiske, Gilbert, and Lindzey (2010) 1024-1083

Zeitlin, F. I. (1981) 'Travesties of gender and genre in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae'* in Foley (1981) 169–217. Revised in F. Zeitlin (1996) *Playing the Other: Gender and Society in Classical Greek Literature*. Chicago, IL, 375–416

9 Index of Aristophanic passages

Birds:

(172) 26, 28

(173) 28

(185-186) 28, 35

(194-196) 28

(195-197) 35, 55

(199-200) 55

(327-338) 28-29, 33, 35

(336-365) 42

(366-368) 30

(369-371) 30, 35

(375-380) 30-31

(381-382) 31

(383) 31

(384-385) 31, 55

(417-426) 34

(451-452) 32, 57

(452-456) 34

(462-538) 37-38

(465-466) 37-38, 85, 104

(467-470) 28

(470) 44

(471-475) 38

(481-485) 38

(499-501) 38

(504-506) 38

(508-510) 39

(514-516) 39

(518-519) 39

(520) 39

(523-538) 39

(539-547) 40

(548-549) 40

(550-626) 41

(627-637) 41-42

(685-704) 45-46

(708-736) 46

(753-754) 46

(809-858) 49

(903-1057) 48

(1035-1045) 183

(1076-1087) 48

(1170-1261) 39, 49

(1263-1268) 49

(1277-1307) 50

(1313-1316) 50-51

(1470-1481) 56, 57

(1490-1493) 94

(1494-1552) 39

(1532-1536) 58

(1545) 58

(1583-1585) 58-59

(1656-1666) 196

(1718-1720) 95

(1720-1725) 95

Clouds:

Ecclesiazusae:

(215-232) 191-192

(216) 185

(223a) 166

(224-238) 165

(233-236) 167

(245-247) 174

(248-249) 163

(254) 163

(256) 163

(258-259) 163

(262-264) 163

(301-310) 158-159

(313-319) 160

(354-368) 160

(369-371) 160

(389-393) 160

(396) 160

(396-397) 162

(436-451) 171-173

(446-450) 187

(456-457) 162

(458-475) 164-165

(520-553) 165

(525-526) 175

(571-585) 193-195

(597-600) 177

(601-610) 177-178

(987-988) 183

(1012-1020) 189

(1013) 183

(1022) 183

(1041) 183

(1049) 183

(1056-1057) 183, 189

(1077) 183

(1089-1090) 183

(1154-1157) 195

(1184) 179

Frogs:

(686-705) 152-153

(718-737) 221-222

(1501) 161

Knights:

(2) 203

(45-46) 209-210

(164-167) 203

(169-170) 203

(171) 203

(172-174) 203

(178-222) 204-206

(257) 216

(316-318) 212

(331-332) 210

(379-381) 160

(450) 210

(451-456) 210

(452) 216

(476) 216

(628) 216

(732) 207-208

(862) 216

(877-878) 160

(1211-1226) 210-212

(1232-1248) 207

(1251-1252) 220

(1257-1258) 212

(1321) 212

(1331) 212

(1340-1344) 208

Lysistrata:

(99-118) 116-118

(124-135) 118-119

(165-166) 119

(285) 124

(286) 124

(318) 124

(371-386) 124-126

(380) 124

(501) 127

(507-528) 127-128, 161

(531-535) 128

(579-586) 148

(599-607) 128

(616-635) 124

(638-647) 122-123

(648-651) 123

(662) 124

(706-780) 119

(829) 119

(865-958) 120-122

(1108) 143

(1014-1018) 139

(1019-1036) 139-141

(1037-1042) 141

(1076-1099) 119

(1086) 143

(1103) 143

(1124-1127) 142-143

(1128-1134) 143-144

(1128-1156) 146

(1129-1130) 144

(1131-1132) 144

(1133-1134) 144

(1137-1146) 144-145

(1149-1156) 145

(1157) 145

(1158) 145-146

(1247-1272) 149-150

(1279-1294) 150-151

(1296-1315) 151

Peace:

(48) 160

(54-59) 98

(62-63) 98

(93) 98, 161

(105-108) 98

(119-123) 99

(150-151) 98

(175-226) 99

(190-191) 108

(192) 102

(227-288) 99

(289-300) 99-100

(296-298) 101

(301-305) 101

(302) 101

(349-357) 108

(357-360) 101

(371-372) 102

(403-425) 102-104

(406-413) 98

(431-458) 104

(464-507) 104

(469-472) 105

(508-516) 104

(510) 105

(545-549) 105

(551-555) 107

(560-563) 107

(582-600) 105-106

(748-761) 203

(758) 160

(856-867) 110

(865-866) 98, 161

(706-719) 107

(909-917) 111

(918-921) 107

(987-998) 98

(991-1007) 113

(1036) 107

(1045-1126) 108

(1127-1190) 108

(1197-1206) 108

(1197-1264) 107

(1210-1264) 108

(1318-1328) 112

Thesmophoriazusae:

(372-379) 184

(384-432) 160

Wasps:

(53) 217

(71) 98

(255) 217

(266-269) 214

(276-280) 215

(403-414) 215

(422-425) 216

(463-470) 216-217

(548-558) 218

(596-597) 217

(605-630) 218-219

(725-735) 213

(799) 217

(905) 217

(999-1002) 213

(1219-1221) 213

(1222-1265) 213

(1029-1037) 203

Wealth:

(112-217) 102