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The Ionian at Aristophanes *Peace* 46

**Ralph M. Rosen**

In the opening scene of the *Peace*, the servant of Trygaeus introduces an Ionian to explain to an Athenian why a dung beetle is on stage (43–48):

οὐκοῦν ἂν ἦδη τῶν θεατῶν τις λέγω
νεανίας δοκησίστοφος, “τόδε πράγμα τ’;
ὁ κάνθαρος δὲ πρὸς τ’,” κἀ’ ἀντί 
ἀνήρ
Ἰωνικός τις φήσι παρακαθήμενος;
“δοκέω μὲν, ἐς Κλέωνα τοῦτ’ αἰνίσσεται,
ὅς κείνος ἀναίδεως τὴν σπατιλὴν ἐσθιεῖ.”

Scholars have often wondered why an Ionian in particular should be brought on for this purpose. Of the various solutions offered, none has appeared to be adequate. Platnauer, in his edition of the play, concludes in *aporia*: “The *Peace* was produced at the City Dionysia, on which occasion foreigners were admitted into the theatre; otherwise there seems to be no particular reason for making this interlocutor an Ionian.”¹ As Platnauer no doubt realized, the mere fact that foreigners were admitted to the City Dionysia hardly explains why an Ionian is specified at this point.

Sharpley, in his edition, offers what at first glance seems a plausible explanation: “sitting cheek by jowl ... with the Athenian exquisite is an oracular philosopher from over the sea.”² Although he elaborates no further, he evidently felt that the passage played on the contrast between an Athenian *δοκησίστοφος* (one who thinks he is *σοφός*) and an Ionian *φιλόσοφος*. Cassio shares this view and explains that in the passage “è adombrato un collegamento popolare tra intellettualità (o pretese d’intellettualità) e presenza di Ioni ad Atene.”³ On this interpretation, the servant implies that it takes an Ionian—*i.e.* a philosopher ‘by nature’—to appreciate the symbolism of the dung beetle. 44–47, then, would function as a parody of philosophical explanation, since (1) the Ionian’s rationalization degenerates into a scatological

---

joke, and (2) the explanation is incorrect, for the dung beetle, as Aristophanes makes clear later on, is not on stage primarily to ridicule Cleon (127ff, on which see infra). Yet this approach seems only partially to explain the passage. It may be that the Ionian is meant to represent a typical intellectual, but the details of his remarks at 46f seem intended to reveal a more specific characterization than this.

Van Leeuwen’s comment that the Ionian represents a “provincialis aliqui homo,” though surely mistaken, nevertheless points to a better understanding of the passage. Van Leeuwen apparently felt that the Ionian’s scatological joke (σπατίλην ἐσθιε) could only come from a crude and ill-bred individual. Although this contradicts the stereotypes of Ionians at the time, the premise that the obscenity is meant to seem appropriate to the Ionian’s character is sound. If we then ask what the connection is between scatological obscenity and Ionia, the answer is clear: the Ionian iambos. Because the prologue as a whole is designed to exploit the comic potential of the dung beetle’s scatophagous habits, it seems likely that an Ionian is introduced at 46 precisely because of his presumed familiarity with this kind of humor. If Aristophanes associated (and expected his audience to associate) Ionia with the sexual and scatological aischrologia of the iambos, then the scatological joke in the mouth of an Ionian at 46 becomes eminently appropriate.

4 The popular conception of Ionians at Athens was that they were emasculated by their luxurious lifestyle. The references in comedy are almost unanimous on this; cf. for example Callias fr.5 K., Ar. Pax 929–36. While I can find no passage in extant fifth-century literature referring explicitly to Ionians as philosophers, Cassio (supra n.3) rightly points out that Ionian intellectualism was seen in Athens to be a consequence of their proverbial ‘softness’. See especially Ar. Eq. 1375–80, where a sophistic discussion is imagined taking place in a perfume shop.

5 J. van Leeuwen, Aristophanis Pax (Leiden 1906) 16 ad 46.

6 The fact that the servant quotes the Ionian in dialect suggests that he is concerned with verisimilitude of character. H. van Herwerden, Aristophanous Eirene II (Leiden 1897) 8 ad 45ff, compares the Ionian’s function to that of the Megarians and Boeotians in Acharnians who also speak in dialect, but concludes that in each instance the joke is simply that “plebeeculae Atticae iocularis videbatur hominum paullo aliter quam ipsi loquentium.”

7 By iambos I mean the entire literary genre, not merely poems composed in iambics. True iamboi could be composed (e.g.) in trochaic tetrameters or epodic meters as well. Cf. M. L. West, Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus (Berlin/New York 1974) 22f.

8 Cf. Eccl. 883, where the old woman, in a hymnic parody, invokes the Muses for her “Ionian song” (μελῳδρον ... τῶν ἱονικῶν), which, as is clear from the ensuing amoebean song (900–23), implies aischrologia; cf. R. G. Ussher, Aristophanes Ecclesiazusae (Oxford 1973) 196. On aischrologia in the iambographers see West (supra n.7) 25 and J. Henderson, The Maculate Muse (New Haven 1975) 17–29. Although the iambos was not a thriving literary genre in the fifth century, the greatest iambographers of the past, Archilochus and Hipponax, were certainly widely known. The references to Hipponax in Aristophanes (Lys. 360f, Ran. 660f) imply a familiarity with that author, and
The fact that the Ionian’s obscene explanation of the dung beetle amounts to an attack on Cleon, moreover, strengthens his connection with the iambos, since, as is well known, iambographic *aischrologia* often served invective purposes. Archilochus shows this, for example, in several of the fragments directed against the daughters of Lycambes (fr.30–47 W., especially 42 and 43); and Hipponax, whose invective seems to have relied on the obscene even more than Archilochus’, exhibits this penchant in such passages as 70.7–8 and 114a W. (69, 133 Degani):

τὸν θεοῦσιν ἐχθρὸν τοῦτον, ὡς κατευθοῦσης
τῆς μητρὸς ἐσκύλευε τὸν βρύσσον.

†έξ †όλλοι τις αὐτοῦ τὴν τράμων †ύποργάσατι.

Although the joke at *Peace* 46 exists solely for its attack on Cleon (*eis Ἐλέωνα ἀινύσμετα*), part of its humor lies in the fact that, as noted above, the dung beetle does not function as a cipher for a scatophagous Cleon in the context of the play as a whole. As Trygaeus states (129f.), he chose the beetle because of its ability to fly to the gods, a notion he found ἐν τοῖς Ἀισέωποι λόγοις. Therefore, as it is not Aristophanes’ main purpose to ridicule Cleon through an allegorical dung beetle (as the Ionian supposes), the suggestion that an Ionian would nevertheless interpret the beetle along these lines parodies the willingness of an Ionian to see invective in anything.⁹

That the Ionian is meant to be seen as drawing on his knowledge of his native literary traditions is further exemplified by the fact that he is made to interpret the dung beetle as one would interpret an Ionian animal fable. That is, when he says the the beetle “is a riddle for/alludes to” (*αἰνύσμετα*) Cleon’s alleged scatophagy,¹⁰ it seems that Aristophanes had in mind the derivation of the verb from the noun *αἰνος*, ‘animal fable’.¹¹ Thus *αἰνύσμετα* expresses the senti-

---

⁹ the various fifth-century allusions to Archilochus (*e.g.* Pind. *Pyth.* 2.52ff; Plato [reflecting a fifth-century context] *Ion* 531α–32α, *Resp.* 365c; for others see A. von Blumenthal, *Die Schätzung des Archilochos im Altertume* [Stuttgart 1922] 1–8) indicate that he was considered a poet of major stature, despite occasional misgivings about the acerbity of his *iamboi* (*e.g.* Critias 888.44 D.-K.). For the Archiloechean quotations in Aristophanes see A. Hauvette, *Archiloque* (Paris 1905) 95. We should note also that Cratinus composed a play called the *Archilochoi* (ca 449 B.C.) which seems to have pitted the iambographers against the epic poets (fr.1–16 K.-A.).

¹⁰ It does also afford Aristophanes a fleeting attack on Cleon; but we must remember that Cleon had died the year before, and an extended diatribe against him (as in *Eq.* or *Vesp.*) would now have little point (as Trygaeus points out at 648–57).

¹¹ For jokes involving scatophagy in Aristophanes see Henderson (*supra* n.8) 192f.

¹¹ On the semantics of *αἰνος* see G. Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans* (Baltimore 1979) 237–40. Although the verb *αἰνοσματε* occurs in a variety of contexts, its predominant
ment that the dung beetle is an *aínos* for Cleon. This becomes evident later in the prologue when Aristophanes explicitly acknowledges that he arrived at the idea of a dung beetle from Aesop (127–30):

**Slave**

τις δ’ ἡ ‘πινοια σοφοτιν ὠστε κάνθαρον
ζεύξαντ’ ἐλαύνειν ἐς θεοὺς, ὃ πάππαι;

**Tr.**

ἐν τούσιν Αἰσώπου λόγοις ἐξηρέθη
μόνοις πετημῶν ἐς θεοὺς ἀφιγμένοις.

As Trygaeus explains (on Aristophanes’ behalf) at 133f, he had in mind specifically the fable of the Eagle and the Dung Beetle, and he refers to the part of the story where the beetle drops a ball of dung into Zeus’ lap in an effort to dislodge the eagle’s eggs that are lying there:12 ἧλθεν κατ’ ἐχθραν αἰετοῦ πάλαι ποτέ, ὃ ἐκκελύνδων κάντις-

τμωρφέσων. Since, as this passage makes clear, the animal fable was represented in the fifth century most coherently by the distinctly Ionian Aesopic tradition,13 it is especially appropriate at *Peace* 46 for an Ionian to see a fable allegory in the dung beetle.

That the *ainos* could be incorporated into the *iambos* as a vehicle for invective (just as the Ionian of *Peace* views the dung beetle—an *ainos* “against Cleon”) is shown by the fragments of the iambographer Archilochus. Thus fr.174 W. begins:14

*aínos* τις ἀνθρώπων ὃδε,

ὡς ἄρ’ ἀλώπηκα καίετος ἐννοινήν

ἐμείειαν,

meaning of ‘saying one thing by means of another’ seems to be derived from an original association with the Ionian *ains*. Often the verb takes on an almost technical meaning involving the riddling of oracles (cf. Hdt. 5.56; Ar. *Eq.* 196, *Av.* 970; Pl. *Ap.* 21B3). It is curious that all but the last of these passages involve animals in some way, perhaps preserving the original connection between *aivíσσομαι* and *ainos* as animal fable. On the interconnection of *aivóς/aínyma/aínisoma* see Nagy 240.

12 See Ben E. Perry, *Aesopica 1* (Urbana 1952) 322 no. 3: ὁ κάνθαρος ... κόπρων σφαίραν ποιήσας ἀνέπτη καὶ γενόμενος κατὰ τοῦ ἄος κόπους ἐνταῦθα καθήκεν. ὃ ὅ ἶς Ἀπόστισέσασθαι τὴν κόπρον βουλόμενος, ὃς διανέστη, ἔλαβεν τὰ ὡδά ἀπορρίψας. Dung beetles also appear in no. 84 (“The Two Dung Beetles”) and no. 112 (“The Ant and the Dung Beetle”).


and if editors are right to place it among the Lycambs poems (172–81 W.), this fragment helps to fulfill the poet’s promise of 172 W.: πάτερ Λυκάμβα ... νῦν δὲ δὴ πολὺς ἀστῶσι φαίνεαι γέλως. Elsewhere (185 W.) Archilochus employed in a similar fashion the fable of the fox and the monkey:

εἴρεώ τιν' ύμῖν αὖνον, ὦ Κηρυκήδη,
ἀχνυμεῖνη σκυτάλη,
πίθηκος ἦι θηρίων ἀποκριθείς
μοῦνος ἄν' ἑσχατῆν,
τῷ δ' ἄρ' ἀλώπηξ κερδαλῇ συνήντετο,
πυκνὸν ἔχουσα νόσν.

The numerous testimonia concerning this fragment collected by West indicate that this particular treatment of the fable was well known in antiquity. In one of Plato’s few references to Archilochus, Adeimantus alludes to the fable (Resp. 363c, τὴν δὲ ... Ἀρχιλόχου ἀλώπεκα ... κερδαλέαν καὶ πουκάλην), and it is likely that Pindar has it in the back of his mind at Pyth. 2.77ff. This shows, therefore, that in the

15 As F. Lasserre points out (Les épodes d’Archilque [Paris 1950] 131), the phrase εἴρεω + vocative implies that the fable is addressed to someone and that its lesson will be directed at that person. (His reconstruction of the details of the epode, however, is highly speculative.)

16 Pind. Pyth. 2.76–78:

ἀμαχον κακόν ἀμφισέρους διαβολών ύποφάτεις,
όργαις ἀτενέως ἀλωπέκων ἤκελοι,
κέρδει δὲ τι μάλα τούτῳ κερδαλέον τελέθει;

That these lines allude to the Archilochian fable is suggested by the fact that the iambographer is given programmatic status earlier in the ode: see A. Miller, “Pindar, Archilochus and Hieron,” TAPA 111 (1981) 140; Nagy (supra n.11) 250. At lines 52–56, that is, Pindar explicitly repudiated Archilochian psogoi and kakagoria as being antithetical to his own poetry of praise:

ἐμὲ δὲ χρείων
φεύγειν δάκος ἀδύνων κακαγοράν.
εἶτε γὰρ ἐκὸς ἔως τὰ πόλλʼ ἐν ᾧμαχαία
ψυχερὸν Ἀρχιλόχου βαρυλόγους ἐχθεῖσιν
πιανόμενον.

In 76 the “insinuations of slander” (διαβολῶν ύποφάτεις) seem to recall the earlier expressions βαρυλόγους ἐχθεῖσιν and δάκος κακαγοράν, and ἀμαχον may even be a pun on ἤμαχαία of the earlier passage (54). In 76–78, then, it seems probable that Pindar is thinking of the fable of the fox and the monkey (where Archilochus may have identified with the fox—see Lasserre [supra n.15] 126–35). When Pindar continues with κέρδει δὲ τι μάλα κερδαλέον τελέθει, the true sarcasm of the play on κέρδος can only emerge if the audience has in mind the Archilochian ἀλώπηξ κερδαλῆ. For τούτῳ ἀμάλα τούτῳ κερδαλέον must refer to something, perhaps it is the epithet of Archilochus’ fox (κερδαλῆ) which we are to understand from the allusion in the previous line. It is even possible that the monkey of 73 calls to Pindar’s mind the Archilochian fable, although F. Mezger is right to say that the fox and the monkey are thematically unrelated here (Pindars Siegeslieder [Leipzig 1880] 59f).
fifth century the ainos had become closely associated with the most prominent iambographer, and it helps to explain more fully why an Ionian is introduced in the Peace passage: someone from Ionia who would be sensitive to both the iamb and the ainos (and their apparent interaction) would quickly assume that the dung beetle on the stage, because of its scatophagous habits, must be intended as an allegorical attack on someone.

Two passages in Aristophanes’ Wasps in fact indicate a fifth-century awareness of the use of the fable for invective. Having been advised by his son that quoting Aesop is a mark of social refinement (1259), Philocleon tries his hand at it with the baking woman. In a humorous misinterpretation of Bdelycleon’s original advice—to tell something amusing from Aesop (Αἰσωπικὸν γέλουν)—Philocleon begins to tell a story about Aesop. Nevertheless, he makes his story reflect the fact that Aesop was a fabulist, and it becomes a kind of fable in itself (1401–05):

AtUW7T0V a1T0 BEi1TVOV f3aBi(,ovfJ' euQteー。セ@ fJpaUEta Kat. I-'EfJVU'T1ョセ@ VAaK'TEI. KVWV,
",,,,.
Ka1TEt'T ekeエvoセ@ EI.7TEV· W KVOV KVOV,
Ei VT, ill.' aV'Tt ゲェセ@ k。kWェセ@ ケaNwGtGtGtQセ@ 1T0fJev 7TvP0V<; 7Tpiaw, UwcPPOVELV av 1-'01,
bokeGゥセNB@
It is clear that the story here is meant to refer to Philocleon and the baking woman, where Philocleon is Aesop and the baking woman is the barking dog. The baking woman realizes too that this ‘Aesopic’ story is directed against her, as her reply demonstrates: καὶ κατα-γελᾶς μου;

At 1446, Philocleon, still determined to take Bdelycleon’s advice, begins another story about Aesop:

PH. Αίσωπον οἱ Δελφοί ποτ’—
BD. ὀλίγον μοι μέλει.
PH. —φάλην ἐπητιῶντο κλέψαι τοῦ θεοῦ.
ὁ δ’ ἔλεξεν αὐτοῖς ὡς ὁ καὐθαρός ποτε—

The story, preserved in the biographical tradition, was that Aesop was unjustly accused by the Delphians of stealing a sacred bowl and condemned to death; before his death, he told an ainos to the Delphians as a way of illustrating their folly. Some versions say that he told the fable of the Eagle and the Dung Beetle. Philocleon here makes Aesop use this fable as a pointed attack on the Delphians,

17 See A. Wiechers, Aesop in Delphi (Meisenheim am Glan 1961).
18 E.g. Vitae G/W 134–39: Perry (supra n.12) 76f, 106f.
which reveals his awareness that the fable is an appropriate vehicle for such a purpose.  His use of the dung beetle, moreover, implies that the fifth-century Athenian would naturally associate this creature with Aesop, and it thus affirms further the Aesopic background of the dung beetle in the Peace.

If we can show next that Aristophanes himself was aware that the scatological humor of the entire Peace prologue was akin to, if not derived from, the conventions of the Ionian iambos, then our explanation of the Ionian's function at 46 becomes even more probable. To this end we may turn to a peculiar fragment of Hipponax:

\[\begin{align*}
\eta \tau \varepsilon \varsigma \kappa \nu \rho \alpha \theta \delta \mu \varepsilon \tau \omega \varepsilon \kappa e n  & \\quad \varepsilon \mu \mu \tau \pi \nu \tau \sigma \sigma \sigma w \kappa \iota f \varepsilon \eta \kappa e n \\kappa a \varphi \iota \varphi \iota \varepsilon \omega w \kappa \\delta \varepsilon \lambda \theta \omega n \kappa a \tau \iota \iota \delta \mu \mu \eta n \pi \lambda \epsilon \tau \nu \lambda e s \quad \eta \pi \nu \tau \kappa \kappa \kappa \kappa \eta \nu \tau \kappa \\
\wedge \zeta e n \ \delta e \ \lambda \alpha \iota \nu \eta \iota \kappa \varphi \iota \rho \alpha \omega i \kappa \iota \iota \mu \iota \kappa e n \varphi e s \quad \tau \nu \iota \iota \nu \iota \iota \iota e s \quad \kappa a \te \beta \alpha \iota \nu \iota e s \ldots
\end{align*}\]

Henderson has remarked that the detail of “fifty dung beetles . . . swarming in a squadron over the latrines . . . distinctly foreshadows the prologue to Peace.” In particular, Trygaeus' paratragic speech at 149ff does seem to be a deliberate development of the comic ramifications of the Hipponactean scene. In Hipponax, the swarm of beetles apparently attacks the speaker, attracted to the smell of the \( \beta \omicron \lambda \omicron \nu \kappa a \tau \iota \delta \mu \mu \eta n \). At 151ff Trygaeus, riding on the back of one of these creatures, imagines a similar situation and pleads with the men at Athens:

\[\begin{align*}
\mu \eta \ \beta \delta \varepsilon \iota \tau e \ \mu \eta \nu \ \chi \varepsilon \zeta e \theta \ \eta \mu \varepsilon \mu \nu \ \tau r \omega \iota \nu \n \omega s \ \varepsilon i \ \mu e \tau e \nu \nu \sigma \sigma o s \ \omicron \tau o \sigma \ \omicron \iota \nu \ \omicron \delta \sigma \varphi \nu \iota \eta \sigma e t e \tau a i, \\
\kappa a t o k \kappa \alpha \iota \ \omicron \nu \iota \nu \iota \iota \iota s \mu e \ \beta \nu \iota k o \iota \iota \iota \sigma e t a i.
\end{align*}\]

When the beetle begins to veer towards earth, Trygaeus says (157ff):

\[\begin{align*}
\pi \nu \ \pi a r a k l \iota \nu e i s \ \tau o \iota s \ \mu \nu k \iota \nu \iota \iota \varsigma \ \pi \nu \varsigma \ \tau a s \ \lambda \varsigma \iota \varsigma \iota \varsigma \iota \iota. \end{align*}\]

We may compare line 10 of the Hipponax fragment, \( \delta \zeta e n \ \tau a s \ \lambda \alpha \nu \iota \varsigma \).

It is true, as noted above, that Aristophanes claims to have derived the dung beetle from Aesop (127ff), and he certainly makes no mention of Hipponax in the prologue. Yet his use of the fable owes

19 For the Aesopic \( \alpha i n o s \) as a vehicle for blame, see Nagy (supra n.11) 281–83.
21 Henderson (supra n.8) 23.
much more, it seems, to the kind of scatological humor found in the Hipponax fragment (and other iambographic fragments) than to the original Aesopic version. It seems clear, therefore, that Aristophanes was conscious of the Ionian literary provenance of the scatological jokes concerned with the dung beetle, and consequently it is easy to understand why at 46 an Ionian is chosen to engage in this sort of humor.

Finally, the expression σπατίλην ἔσθει put into the mouth of the Ionian (47) also suggests that he is meant to be seen as drawing on his acquaintance with the iambos. For rather than a common word for excrement (such as σκῶρ, βόλβατος, or κόπρος), he chooses σπατίλη ('diarrhea'), a rare Ionic word which, apart from its comic usage here, appears only as a medical term. Since it is readily apparent from the fragments that the iambographers were fond of this kind of technical or exotic vocabulary for comic purposes, the use of the word σπατίλη at 47 would be appropriate for an Ionian trying to parade his familiarity with iambographic diction.
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22 For other scatological references in the iambographers cf. Henderson (supra n.8) 22. In the Peace prologue note the details of 99–101 (κοπρώνες, λαίφας, πρωκτοῖς ἐπικλείειμ) and 162–65, which are more in the spirit of the Hipponax fragment than of Aesop.

23 I have treated the influence of the iambographers on Old Comedy in my Old Comedy and the Iambographic Tradition (Diss. Harvard 1983).

24 See Henderson (supra n.8) 192–94.

25 As in the Hippocratic Περὶ διαίτης ὁδόων 28. For other instances see Herwerden (supra n.6) 9. Used of Cleon the term is a particularly clever choice, since, as Henderson points out (supra n.8: 192), it is a play on the leather (σπάτος) associated with his tanning profession and τιλᾶν ('to excrete'). This does not, of course, alter the fact that it would have a distinctly Ionian ring to the Athenian audience.

26 In Hipponax 151b W. (202 De.), for example, the word κοχύλη ('buttocks'), although common in the comic poets and occurring in Herodas (7.48), seems originally to have been a medical term. Similarly, the word τράμις ('perineum') attributed to Archilochus (283 W.) and Hipponax (114a W., 133 De.) by the Hippocratic commentator Erotian, would seem to derive from specialized vocabularies. The only non-lexicographic occurrence of τράμις is in Ar. Thesm. 246, where it seems to mean simply πρωκτός; see E. Fraenkel, Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes (Rome 1962) 117. Hapax words such as γρόμφας ('old sow') at Hipponax 103.11 W. (106 De.) may not be strictly technical, but surely reflect a love of the recherché. In his edition, Degani lists 87 hapax legomena in the fragments (see p. xxviii). On technical vocabulary in Aristophanes see K. J. Dover, "Der Stil des Aristophanes," in Aristophanes und die Alte Komödie (Wege der Forschung [Darmstadt 1975]) 134f.

27 I wish to thank Professor David Konstan for his helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper.