Histos Supplement 12 (2021) 63–85

4

THE DIFFICULT PASSAGE FROM WAR TO PEACE: LIMINALITY, TRANSITION, AND TENSIONS IN ARISTOPHANES' *PEACE* 8*

Stylianos Chronopoulos

Peace is one of the eleven extant comedies of the Athenian playwright Aristophanes, performed at the City Dionysia 421 BCE, just before the conclusion of the so called 'Peace of Nicias', the treaty between Athens and Sparta concluding the war that had broken out in 431 BCE (Thuc. 5.20.1). The negotiations between Athens and Sparta that began in winter 422/1 (Thuc. 5.17.2) were successful despite difficulties: both the Athenian general Cleon and the Spartan general Brasidas, whose roles in prolonging the war were decisive (Thuc. 5.16.1), had died in summer 422; both sides now had strategic reasons to stop fighting (Thuc. 5.14–16.1); and both were led by generals who favoured a peace treaty (Thuc. 5.16.1–2).[1] *Peace* was thus written and performed while Athens was preparing to make the passage from a state of constant war to a state of peace.[2] The spectators were Athenians, metics, and foreigners, some of whom were officials of their cities who had come also to bring their annual tribute to Athens. The state of transition from war to peace and the prospect of a peace treaty affected the lives of all groups of spectators—albeit in different ways. I will here argue that the *Peace* serves as an interpretation of this transitional historical moment, serving as a sort of popular act of historiography, in which members of the general public are invited to engage in communal reflection on the implications of a pivotal moment in history.

Peace presents several smaller confrontations between supporters of peace and supporters of war in different forms: either narrated by a figure, or projected in the audience, or enacted on stage. It does not, however, contain

* Rachel Bruzzone, Eric Csapo, Ioannis Konstantakos, Donald Sells, and Bernhard Zimmermann have read and commented upon versions of this paper: I am very thankful for their critical remarks and suggestions. Translations from *Peace* are those of Sommerstein (1985) unless otherwise stated.

[1] Thucydides 5.13.2 documents a prevailing pro-peace sentiment in Sparta already before Brasidas' death: see Gomme (1956) 657–8 (*ad* 13.1–2 and 14.1). For the peace negotiations see also Storey (2019) 45–7.

[2] The poets applied to the Archon in order to obtain permission to present a play in the Great Dionysia (*choron aitein*) late in the summer; by this time they must have been able to present at least a rough idea of the play: see Robson (2009) 20.

any major confrontation between the protagonist Trygaeus and an opponent.[3] This fact, combined with its performance only a few days before the signing of the 'Peace of Nicias', has led several scholars to regard it as a play virtually lacking any tension, a simple celebration of the end of the war.[4] Against this interpretation Sicking (1967) argues that *Peace* criticises the peace treaty, since it was far from an ideal, lasting solution. Other interpretations of the play attempt to temper the celebratory tenor by considering its elements of critique.[5]

In this paper I propose a reading of *Peace* that goes beyond the dichotomy of 'celebration vs critique', interpreting the comedy mainly as a play that dramatises a specific historical shift, the transition from a prolonged war to an era of peace. This dramatisation imposes a narrative structure resembling a rite of passage onto the historical process of the transition, while also using this structure to provide reflective responses to the social tensions provoked by the historical transition. These tensions are on the one hand connected with economic loss for some and gains for others, and on the other hand with the problematisation of social values connected with war and peace. To support this reading, I consider the dramatisation of the transition from war to peace in the play, the implied models for understanding the relation of the new period to the past, and the critique expressed by different figures against individuals and social groups.

The paper is divided into five sections.

I first introduce the concepts 'liminal phase', 'social drama', and 'aesthetic drama', and employ them to argue that *Peace* is a staged drama adopting the structure of rites of passage in order to reflect upon the transition from war to peace, as argued in the second section.

In the third section, I examine the play's discourses about the past, visions of the future, and reflections on social and political values that are treated as unstable in the process of transition.

In the fourth section I examine the two models *Peace* proposes for thinking about the relation of the new period of peace to the past: both as a restoration of and return to a familiar past and as a brand-new reality.

Finally, I explore two structures that *Peace* uses to dramatise tensions in the liminal phase: the confrontation between individuals and unified groups on the one hand, and the presentation of groups that initially seem to be

[3] See the remarks in Storey (2019) 28–9.

[4] Sicking (1967) 17–8 presents a good summary of this interpretation. See also Whitman (1964) 104, Newiger (1980) 221–2, Prandi (1985) 74, Harriott (1986) 119, Zimmermann (2006) 78 and Storey (2019) 56–9. The formulation in Whitman (1964) 114 is characteristic: 'The lack of plot and conflict in the *Peace* contributes to its lyrical flavor'.

[5] Blanchard (1982) argues that the intention of *Peace* is, on the one hand, to celebrate the forthcoming peace, and, on the other hand, to criticise specific public persons who support a pro-war political agenda. Cassio (1985) argues that there is a contrast between the utopian agrarian idyll enacted in the comedy and elements of general critique against the political system of the Athenian democracy.

unified but are actually divided into supporters of peace and supporters of war. *Peace* thus provides a means of reflecting on the application of the exclusion–inclusion dichotomy that is crucial for the creation of stable social structures after the liminal period of the passage from war into peace.

1. Experiencing and Representing Passages: Liminality in Social and Aesthetic Dramas

The following examination of *Peace* as dramatisation of specific contemporary historical circumstances presupposes the system Victor Turner and Richard Schechner delineate for the relationship between aesthetic dramas—such as theatre plays—and social dramas, as well as the tripartite model of the rites of passage van Gennep proposes.

Turner employs the metaphor 'social drama' to categorise and name social processes centred around a conflict and structured in four phases leading from the disruptive breach of a crisis, through the formation of clearly opposed parties and the application of crisis-solving social mechanisms to a final phase, consisting either of 'the reintegration of the disturbed social group' or of 'the social recognition of irreparable breach between the contesting parties'.[6] In Turner's system, aesthetic dramas and historical, social dramas are interdependent. Social dramas are concrete historical cases of conflict and similarly concrete manifestations of historical social processes, which the aesthetic dramas selectively absorb, and transform and render social meta-commentary on the life, values, and social structures of a specific society.[7] On the other hand, aesthetic dramas, among which theatre pieces are the most prominent type, provide discursive and performative structures which are used in all phases of social dramas; moreover, aesthetic dramas may be directly connected with a specific social drama as one of the redressive mechanisms which allow groups to reflect on a conflict and devise solutions.[8]

[6] See Turner (1974a) 37 for the definition of social dramas as 'units of aharmonic or disharmonic social process, arising in conflict situations'. For the phases of a social drama, see Turner (1980) 150–1 (from which the citations) and Turner (1986) 34–9, 74–5, 99–100.

[7] For the term 'metasocial commentary' see Turner (1982) 104 citing Geertz: 'a story a group tells itself about itself' and Turner (1990) 8. The citation from Geertz (1973) 448: 'it [sc. the cockfight] provides a metasocial commentary upon the whole matter of assorting human beings into fixed hierarchical ranks and then organising the major part of collective existence around that assortment. Its function, if you want to call it that, is interpretive: it is a Balinese reading of Balinese experience, a story they tell themselves about themselves'. Turner uses the term 'social metacommentaries' instead of Geertz's term 'metasocial commentary', with no differentiation in meaning.

[8] See Turner (1980) 153–4; id. (1986) 38–9; Schechner (1988) 187–8; see also the critical summary of Turner's schemes in Grimes (1985) 80–3. For the reflexive function of the Greek theatre in particular see the remarks in Turner (1982) 103–4.

I apply this general model of relations between social dramas and aesthetic dramas to *Peace***.** There is not enough information, independently from what can be extracted from *Peace* itself, to understand fully the negotiations between the cities and the social processes occurring alongside them in winter 422/1 as a historical and social drama. It is, however, probable that the passage from roughly a decade of constant war to a state of peace provoked significant social and economic changes and corresponding tensions. A close reading of *Peace* shows how comedy can be a tool for a society to reflect on this significant historical transition.

An unusual plot pattern that appears only in *Peace* is the first hint at its role in showcasing the process of historical transition**.** Important acts are anticipated, announced, or even begun. Their completion, however, occurs significantly later, and in some cases after a considerable pause; a significant part of the plot of *Peace* consists of presenting precisely these pauses and the processes that occupy them. This pattern of marked delay is observed in the following significant plot elements:

- As the Chorus enters the stage for the first time (301), the dancers cheer, anticipating the liberation of Eirene and the coming of a new era of peace. Trygaeus, on the contrary, points to the fact that the situation is still precarious.[9] The liberation of Eirene, which marks the completion of the first stage in the peacemaking process and turns the anticipation of the Chorus into reality, finally arrives at verse 520.
- After the liberation of Eirene, Hermes announces a movement of closure for the Chorus, ordering them to leave and go to the countryside (551–5); the execution of this movement begins (555) but remains uncompleted and becomes reality only much later, in the wedding procession after verse 1316 that leads the Chorus, Trygaeus, and Opora to the countryside.[10]
- The sacrifice for the installation of the statue of Eirene is announced and begun at verse 922. It is completed 204 verses later, at 1126.
- Trygaeus' betrothal to Opora takes place at verses 706–7: the event of the marriage is anticipated at 859–64, its preparation completed in the background between verses 842–4 and 868–70, the marriage feast is mentioned in the background in verses 1191–310, but the final consummation of the event comes only with the procession beginning at verse 1316.

This structural pattern of suspense indicates that a major element in the plot of *Peace* is the dramatisation of a lengthy process. Given that peacemaking is in the centre of the plot and that this is directly associated with the ongoing negotiations for a peace treaty between Athens and Sparta, I propose that

[9] For the dance scene of the *parodos* and Trygaeus' reactions to the premature expressions of joy, see Zimmermann (2017) 30–9.

[10] See Revermann (2006) 173–4.

Peace conceives of and dramatises the process of these negotiations. This means that *Peace* projects onto the specific historical reality of the time a particular dramatic structure, offering social meta-commentary by means of this structure.

The structure of *Peace* shares, thus, crucial features with the general tripartite structure of the ceremonies that van Gennep dubs 'rites of passage', a ritual process marking change in the condition of a subject, be it an individual, a group, or a whole society. A series of sequential phases make up such a ritual: first, separation; second, a liminal phase representing transition; and finally, a phase of re-aggregation in which the transformation is consummated and celebrated.[11] The liminal phase is marked by rites that illustrate a destabilisation of accepted structures and social norms, and possibly even an inversion or confusion of value systems. The liminal phase is associated with the 'dangerous, troubling, anxiety-generating aspects of uncertain periods of transition, conflict, and crisis'.[12] It is a period in which, at least theoretically, anything can happen. At the same time this period has an important formative function: structures that are not present in the state from which the subject of the rite departs are generated or anticipated in the liminal phase.[13]

The plot of *Peace* fits this tripartite structure of a rite of passage. The comic hero, Trygaeus, undergoes a double transition, in order to become the subject who secures peace for all Greece (the peacemaking subplot) and the husband of Opora (the marriage subplot). In both of these subplots, the element representing the liminal phase, the phase in which the new structures have not yet been definitely installed, and in which crisis and unstable or non-existent structures are in the process of transforming into a state of stabilised new structures,[14] is particularly long and contains significant confrontations.

Based on the relationship between the historical event of peacemaking in winter 422/1 and the plot of *Peace*, I next argue that *Peace* adopts a structure of a rite of passage with a prolonged liminal phase, in order to project this structure and the ensuing discursive models and social meta-commentaries onto the historical reality of a society in negotiations for a peace treaty after ten years of war. I will show that *Peace*'s plot can be read as a tripartite

[11] See Gennep (2004) 31–3, Turner (1967), id. (1974b) 231–3, Thomassen (2009), and Szakolczai (2009), especially for the liminal phase. This structure is directly comparable with the structure of folk tales narrating how a male hero travels to a liminal place, rescues a female hero, imprisoned there by a monster of some sort, and marries her: Κωνσταντάκος (2019) 190–200 discusses in detail the folk tale structure, on which *Peace*'s plot is based, and compares its elements with elements from tales from Indo-European and Chinese traditions.

[12] Szakolczai (2009) 141–2, 147–9; citation from 142.

[13] Turner (1969) 128–9 and Szakolczai (2009) 142, 147–8, 150–1.

[14] See Grimes (1985) 81–2.

structure similar to the structure of rites of passage with particularly prolonged liminal phases.

2. Parallel Plot Strands, Transitional Processes, and a Prolonged Liminal Phase

In *Peace* the process of securely and finally establishing peace, *after* the liberation of Eirene, is remarkably long and complex. It takes place in two different spaces, first in the sky, in the abandoned palace of Zeus, and then in Athens. Between the moment of the liberation of the goddess (520) and the moment her statue is finally set up (1126), 517 verses elapse, or approximately 38% of the comedy.[15]

At the beginning of the comedy, Trygaeus is separated from Athenian society and his family, flying into the heavens alone (54–5 and 110–49) to visit Zeus and persuade or oblige him to stop the war destroying the cities of Greece (56–81, 103–8). As soon as Trygaeus arrives at the palace of Zeus, he enters a liminal state. He first introduces himself as 'filthiest/utterly vile' (μιαρώτατος), echoing the characterisation Hermes uses for him (182–6) and, although he reveals his real name (190) and thus regains his civic identity, he remains and acts as a human among non-humans in a liminal space between earth and the new abode of the gods, remaining physically within a place that has been abandoned to War. It is in this state that he conceives of his scheme to liberate Eirene by evading Zeus' orders, becomes the leader of the Chorus, and realises his plan.

Even after the liberation of Eirene, Trygaeus remains in a liminal state, entering into a phase of transition. First, he has succeeded as a peacemaker in that he has brought Eirene back, but he has not yet secured a new reality: he must appease the anger of the goddess, return to earth, and establish her cult. Second, he must become the husband of Opora, as soon as Hermes hands her over to him to be his wife. Betrothal is in real life a liminal phase between unmarried life and married life.[16] In the case of Trygaeus, it represents the final phase of the transition between his status as an

[15] Ar. *Pax* 520–1126 = 606 verses, 89 of which belong to the Parabasis; excluding the Parabasis a total of 517 verses remain; the whole comedy is 1358 verses long, that is, the enactment of the process of establishing Eirene after her liberation covers ca. 38% of the comedy. As a measure of comparison: the prologue is 300 verses long and covers *c.* 22% and the first and the second parabasis together are 152 verses long or *c.* 11% of the comedy.

[16] See Gennep (2004) 11 and Dillon (2002) 215 (especially for Athens) for the betrothal as a passage period from adolescence to married life for women. Betrothal is not associated with specific rites of passage for a man, for whom the standard in Athens was to marry in about his thirties (cf. Plat. *Leg.* 721b, 772d, 785b). But betrothal was also a passage for men from a civic and existential point of view, since marriage gave the male citizen the opportunity to legally produce children.

unremarkable, ageing male Athenian at the beginning of the comedy and his being celebrated as the new husband of a deity at its conclusion.[17]

The liminal state in the peacemaker subplot ends with the completion of the sacrifice marking the *hidrysis* of the statue of Eirene (1126). The liminal state connected with the marriage subplot ends with the beginning of the wedding procession (1316). In wedding ceremonies, the phase between engagement and marriage ends with a complex of ritual acts that include a ceremonial feast, the unveiling of the bride (*anakalyptēria*), during which the male protector of the bride brings her to the groom (*ekdosis*), and a wedding procession leading to the new couple's home.[18] Within this complex, the *anakalyptēria* is a critical moment.[19] In *Peace*, the wedding feast happens in the background (1191–315) and there is no indication of a performance of the *anakalyptēria* on stage.[20] The moment marking the completion of the liminal phase in the marriage sub-plot and the definite passage into the celebration phase is the point at which Trygaeus, after having left the stage at verse 1310, reappears at verse 1314 and asks that the bride be brought out in order for the procession to start (1316–8). The two sub-plots are, thus, structurally firmly connected: the celebration phase in the peacemaking-subplot is represented by the marriage feast and the procession; the marriage feast, however, still belongs to the liminal phase in the marriage-subplot.[21]

[17] In the scene with the sickle-maker and the potter, Trygaeus receives several gifts from them to celebrate marriage. It is significant that the sickle-maker comments upon them that the presents are 'out of the sales and the profits [they] have made'. This comment parallels the marriage gifts to the *aparchai,* the firstlings offered or sacrificed to the gods.

[18] For the wedding ceremonies in ancient Greece of the classical period see Oakley and Sinos, (1993) 22–37, and Zoepffel (1985), esp. 383–5 for *engyē* and *ekdosis* in Athens.

[19] For the discussion on the *anakalyptēria,* the sources on it, the exact moment the ritual was performed and its meaning as a passage ritual see Oakley and Sinos (1993), and Mason, (2006) 44–6.

[20] It is possible to assume that just after 1316 a veiled Opora appears on stage accompanied by a male attendant (cf. 1316: *τὴν νύμφην ἔξω τινα δεῦρο κομίζειν*, 'let someone bring the bride out here' [my translation]) and that the unveiling is performed on stage; however, there is no solid grounds for this assumption.

[21] The plot seen from the perspective of Eirene presents a similar tripartite structure: At the beginning of the comedy Eirene is in a state of separation, imprisoned by War. As soon as Trygaeus and the Chorus liberate her, she enters into a liminal state, since she is free but her relation to the Greeks/Athenians, Trygaeus, and the Chorus is vexed and problematic and her cult is not yet installed. After the completion of the sacrifice that installs her statue (*hidrysis*), she enters the new state of an acknowledged and officially worshiped deity. In *Peace* Eirene is a deity and at the same time a symbolic representation of the ideal state of peace, in this case of the state of peace among the Greek cities: Olson (1998) xxxv–xxxvi. From the perspective of Athens and the cities of Greece the passage is the transition from a state of war and acute danger of complete destruction into a state of peace, friendly relations, and prosperity.

3. Recollecting the Past and Envisioning the Future from a Liminal Standpoint

The prolonged liminal phase after the liberation of Eirene is marked by three sets of acts: first, speeches and dialogues about the war and its causes; second, formal or ritual acts that restore a pre-war state and/or create a new reality; and third, interactions between Trygaeus and his slave with supporters of peace and supporters of war. These interactions include episodes that occur during the marriage feast, that is, in the celebration phase of the peace-making subplot but while the liminal phase of the marriage subplot is still incomplete.

The question of who bears responsibility for the war is crucial both to the first part of *Peace* and to this prolonged liminal phase. It is a question directly connected with a negotiation about how to remember the past and, more crucially, how to proceed through the liminal phase into the new state.

At the beginning of the comedy, an answer presupposing the gods' responsibility (56–9, 62–3, 104–8) is confronted with an answer stating that humans alone—specifically Athenians and Spartans—are to blame (210–20).[22] After the liberation of Eirene, both in a rather long speech of Hermes (603–48) and in the subsequent dialogue between Eirene and Trygaeus mediated by Hermes (657–92),[23] an answer focusing on the responsibility of certain politicians or even mainly on the responsibility of Cleon is complemented by or even challenged by an answer focusing on the broad responsibility of the Athenian people.[24] The oscillation between these two answers is a feature of the liminal phase just following the liberation of Eirene: it is a necessary negotiation process in the course of assessing the question of responsibility for the war in a way that ensures a future of peace.

Finally, as the liminal phase nears completion, in the prayer to Eirene, which is a constituent part of the sacrifice for the *hidrysis* of the goddess' statue, a discourse that stabilises new structures appears. Trygaeus and the Chorus employ an explicitly erotic discourse. The goddess is compared to a desirable but potentially unstable and mischievous mistress, while they are presented as her lovers. The discourse, in particular their pleas for her not to abandon them again, explicitly ask her not to behave like an unstable mistress *any more* (986: *τούτων σὺ ποίει μηδὲν ἐθ' ἡμᾶς*). On the one hand, this requisition primarily emphasises how much Trygaeus and the Chorus missed peace during the war;[25] at the same time, however, it implies that the

[22] See Olson (1998) 110 (*ad* 211–2 and 212–19).

[23] For the performance of the dialogue between the statue of Eirene and Trygaeus see Kassel (1983).

[24] For a detailed discussion of the relations between personal interest, fear, and responsibility for the war in Hermes' speech, see Chronopoulos (2017) 235–40.

[25] In verses 987–90 Trygaeus, speaking also on behalf of the Chorus, uses a marked expression to denote the torment they went through during the war while longing for Eirene:

responsibility for the war lies with Eirene herself. Thus, the erotic discourse in the prayer reduces the responsibility for the war to the tautology 'we had war because we did not have peace' and projects it back on the realm of the gods through the personification of peace as the goddess Eirene. It is significant that in the prayer Trygaeus' view of the past is directly combined with a perspective on the future: the comic hero asks Eirene to influence internal and external politics and promote concord, peace, and forbearance among all Greeks (993–9). The end of the liminal phase, to which the sacrifice and the prayer belong, includes and combines an ongoing discussion about how to remember history, interpret the period of war, and shape the future.

The liminal phase in *Peace* is also marked by an inversion of the values that concern both the recollection of the past and the envisioning of the future. The inversion of values in *Peace* involves on the one hand a causal connection between cowardliness and the support of peace and on the other hand the claim that a demagogue can save the city *because* of his low status. In both cases the value inversion is an element of personal jokes targeting Cleonymus and Hyperbolus respectively.

In 670–8 Aristophanes refashions the stock joke targeting Cleonymus' cowardice,[26] presenting Cleonymus as the truest and most loyal friend of Peace. In the liminal world that this comedy represents onstage, a character who contradicts the moral code of the hoplite/citizen is satirised as embodying a kind of virtue: since courage and steadiness in battle are explicitly connected with war, cowardliness must be positive.[27]

In 679–92 Hyperbolus, the person chosen by the Athenian *dēmos* as its new *prostatēs* after Cleon's death, is presented ambiguously: while Trygaeus accepts Eirene's accusation that this person is a *ponēros*, he first stresses the fact that the choice of the people is only a provisory solution in a liminal situation of acute need,[28] and then turns it into its opposite using the

τοῖσιν ἐρασταῖς | ἡμῖν, οἵ σου τρυχόμεθ' ἤδη | τρία καὶ δέκ' ἔτη ('the lovers who have pined for thee these thirteen years'). The verb *τρύχομαι* means 'to be worn out, to be distressed or exhausted', can well be used also in military contexts (cf. Thuc. 1.126: *τρυχόμενοι τῇ προσεδρίᾳ*), and is normally not constructed with the genitive. In this case the genitive can be explained by analogy with the construction of the verb *ἐράω* ('love', 'long for', 'desire'); see Olson (1998) 258–9 (*ad* 988–90): the result is a condensed and marked expression meaning 'be worn out because of our desire/longing for you'; at the same time the expression refers to the distresses of the war. Thus, this peculiar and marked construction contributes to the presentation of Trygaeus and the Chorus as the victims simultaneously of the detriments of the war and the unstable behaviour of Eirene.

[26] For Cleonymus as a target whom Aristophanes attacks repeatedly, see Storey (1989) and Robson (2009) 166. For an analysis of this specific joke against Cleonymus see Chronopoulos (2017) 271–3.

[27] For a similar re-interpretation of cowardliness, see the discussion about the end of the comedy, see below, pp. 80–1.

[28] See 685–6; the Athenian Dēmos is presented as being suddenly left almost naked after Cleon's death (*ἀπορῶν ἐπιτρόπου καὶ γυμνὸς ὤν*). The image of the *gymnos* Dēmos, that is of

polysemy of the term *ponēros*, which may refer at the same time to Hyperbolus' political agenda and style, his poor background and his origins, or/and his handicraft profession as lamp-maker.[29] Trygaeus isolates the reference to the profession and creates a joke based, on the one hand, on the satirical *topos* of projecting the professional activity of a demagogue onto his political activity,[30] and, on the other hand, on the blending of the literal fact that Hyperbolus produces lamps with the metaphorical expressions 'groping in the dark at the political issues' (*ψηλαφᾶν ἐν σκότῳ τὰ πράγματα*) and 'discussing/deciding by light' (*ἅπαντα πρὸς λύχνον βουλεύσομεν*). In this case, the 'light' is nothing more that 'lamp-light', but it seems to be better than nothing in this critical and difficult moment for the Athenian people. The joke establishes a logic that destabilises the moral/political code implied in Eirene's negative reaction towards Hyperbolus and inverts its values, creating a direct link between a *ponēros prostatēs* controlling the democratic deliberation processes and *euboulia*, the ability to take just and correct decisions (*eubouloteroi genēsometha*).

Both jokes have an obviously satirical purpose in subverting values in the ways discussed below. At the same time, however, these jokes *are* the only answers Trygaeus gives to Eirene's questions. In the liminal phase enacted in *Peace*, jokes illustrating an inversion of norms and values are serious discourse.

Just after the liberation of Eirene, Trygaeus stands at a liminal point between war and peace, a precarious position reflecting the situation of the historical audience. Remembrance and interpretation of the past, as well as envisioning of the future, from this liminal point are marked by oscillation about responsibility for the war and by the destabilisation of values and norms concerning both the code of the hoplite/citizen and the code of political behaviour that comedy in general promotes.

a Dēmos left only with a *chiton*, alludes to the fact that the now lost Cleon as a tanner provided Dēmos with the necessary garments: see Neil (1901) 126 (*ad* 881–3) and Olson (1998) 209–10 (*ad* 685–7).

[29] For *ponēros* and *mochthēros* as Hyperbolus' distinctive marks, see Rosenbloom (2002) 301 n. 73 and 309; for the polysemy of *ponēros*, the interconnection between the political and the moral meaning, and the usages of the term in the political–ideological confrontations in Athens at the end of the fifth century, see Neil (1901) 206–8 and Rosenbloom (2002) 284–312. For the alleged poor background or alien origin of Hyperbolus and his lack of education see Rosenbloom (2002) 290 and 308 n. 102. For Hyperbolus' biographical data see *APF*, no. 13910 (p. 517) and Brenne (2001) 215.

[30] See Rosenbloom (2002) 307; to the passages referred to there may be added Ar. *Eccl.* 252–3 (performed between 393 and 390 BCE).

4. From War into Peace: Restoring the Past or Creating a Brand-New Reality?

After the liberation of Eirene, Hermes and Trygaeus perform three acts: the handing over of Theoria to the Council of the Five Hundred; the betrothal and marriage of Opora and Trygaeus; and the *hidrysis* of the statue of Eirene. These acts are formal and ritual processes, the completion of which marks either the restoration of a pre-war situation and/or the establishment of a new reality in the era of peace. *Peace* represents these processes as such, dramatising the historical passage from war to peace.

Hermes hands over Opora to Trygaeus to be his wife in a dramatisation of the formal act of betrothal (*engyē*, 706–12);[31] he then entrusts Theoria to him,[32] and orders him to return her to the Athenian Council of the Five Hundred (713–7; cf. 892–3). As soon as Trygaeus returns to earth, he orders his slave to take Opora into the house and to start the preparations for the marriage (840–4), stating his intention to hand Theoria over to the Boule (846). Soon afterward, the slave announces that the marriage preparations are complete (868–70) and Trygaeus leads Theoria to the special section of the auditorium designed for the members of the Council (871–908).[33]

These two acts are similar in that both can be seen as acts of restoration. Nevertheless, there is a significant distinction, since the restoration of Theoria establishes a continuity between a certain period of the past and the present, while Trygaeus' betrothal represents a kind of rejuvenation. The two acts thus imply two different models for viewing the passage from war to peace and assessing how the new reality is related to the past.

Hermes and Trygaeus explicitly present the handing over of Theoria to the Council as an act of returning to the pre-war situation.[34] Hermes gives orders to Trygaeus (713–4): 'take Showtime here, and bring her as quickly as possible to the Council, whom she used to belong to'. Later, when Trygaeus executes Hermes' instructions, he and his slave engage in a comic dialogue with sexual innuendos, which point in the same direction (891–3).

The restoration is presented both in a formal and in a joking register as an act that isolates and brackets out a certain traumatic and destructive period of the past and secures the continuity of the normal.

On the other hand, the betrothal and the marriage of Trygaeus and Opora restores Trygaeus to a previous stage of his youth, while creating a

[31] See Olson (1998) 212 (*ad* 706–8); for *engyē* in Attic legislation on marriage and the debate about its exact function see Harrison (1968) 3–9 and Oakley and Sinos (1993) 9–11.

[32] For the different meanings of *Theoria* see the discussion in Cassio (1985) 124 and Landrum (2013) 31–2 and n. 19. Sommerstein (1985) translates 'Theoria' aptly as 'Showtime'.

[33] See Olson (1998) 239 (*ad* 881–2) and 242–3 (*ad* 905–6)).

[34] See Cassio (1985) 124–5 who stresses the aspect that the act of handing over Theoria to the Boule is an act of restoration that in the real world corresponds to the restoration of the possibility to travel freely, in order to visit a festival.

new reality: the old man (860–3) and father (111) becomes a groom once more and appears to be young again.[35] The presentation of this transition (856–62) is significant. The Chorus addresses Trygaeus and praises him; he responds by pointing to his rejuvenated state.

The restoration in this case does not mean return to normality and continuity between past and present but the creation of a brand-new reality with no reference to the past: the children of Trygaeus appear on stage only in the prologue (110–72) and are not mentioned again later. The motif of rejuvenation, which comedy uses in several contexts,[36] implies in this case a different model to reflect on the transition from war to peace: the end of war is presented as a definite turning point and the establishment of peace as the initiation of a new era representing a complete break with the past.

The model of the new era also underlies the most important ritual act that Trygaeus conducts, the sacrifice with which he sets up the statue of Eirene. In fifth-century Athens, the goddess Eirene was not officially worshipped as an autonomous deity.[37] In the comic world of *Peace*, the transition from war to peace is performed through an innovation, the establishment of the new cult. This cult opens up a new era which makes real what is impossible in the real world, namely everlasting peace.

The *hidrysis*-sacrifice is a complex ritual that marks the end of the liminal phase in the peacemaking subplot.[38] The completion of the sacrifice is the presupposition for the initiation of Eirene's cult. Only a selection of the ritual acts that constitute the regular sacrificial process in real life are performed onstage: the choice of the sacrificial animal (922–38); the preparation of the altar and the bringing of the animal to the altar (938–60);[39] the cleansing ritual and the prayer to the goddess (960–1015);[40] the preparation of the fire (1023–38); the burning of the thigh-bones, the rump, and the tail (1039 and

[35] For an interpretation of the speaking name 'Trygaeus' revealing the fact that the comic hero is old and young at the same time see Sells (2018) 119–26 with further bibliography; see also Kanavou (2011) 98–9.

[36] For the dramatic element of rejuvenation in Aristophanic comedies, see Byl (1977) 72–3, and Hubbard (1989) 94–105. See also the emphasis Segal (2001) 64–7 places on the rejuvenation element in *Peace*.

[37] An autonomous official cult of Eirene was established in Athens in 375/4: see Olson (1998) 113 (*ad* 221) and 264 (*ad* 1019–20). Athanassaki (2018), based on Euripides' *Cresphontes*, Aristophanes' *Acharnians*, *Farmers*, and *Peace*, discusses in detail the possibility that in the last years of the 420s, a real movement existed towards establishing an official cult of Eirene in Athens.

[38] For the ritual act of *hidrysis* of a statue see Pirenne-Delforge (2015) 126–30.

[39] For the ritual act of sprinkling the sacrificial animal with water see Naiden (2013) 65–6.

[40] The animal is not killed onstage. Instead of performing the act onstage, Trygaeus and his slave deliver a dialogue about the nature of goddess Eirene ('surely Peace takes no delight in slaughter, "nor is her altar bloodied"' (1018–19)); the slave is asked to kill the animal off-stage, cut out the thigh-bones, and bring them back on stage (1020–1): see 1017–22 and the remarks in Olson (1998) 264–5.

1053–4—that is, the shares of the goddess, which Trygaeus will also use to do the divining);[41] the wine offering to the goddess (1060, 1104–10); and the roasting of the entrails and the other parts of the animal (1040, 1110–20).[42]

The performance of the sacrifice is an extended process: Trygaeus announces his intention to sacrifice in verse 922 and the ritual act ends at verse 1126, that is, it covers 204 verses or roughly 15% of the comedy. The length of the sacrifice process is due, among other factors, to the fact that Trygaeus and the Chorus discuss which offerings/animal should be used for the sacrifice (924–36, 13 verses). The debate over the type of the sacrifice and the sacrificial animal clearly indicates the novelty of the decision to set up the statue and establish the cult of Eirene. Different gods and different circumstances demand different types of sacrifice, and the practitioners know from traditional experience which type they should choose each time.[43] No such experience is available for the *hidrysis*-sacrifice Trygaeus intends to conduct, as the goddess Eirene is being installed for the first time. Accordingly, the transition from war to peace is presented and experienced as a passage into a novel condition.[44]

Peace thus presents two different models for understanding the relationship between the troubled past and the upcoming period of peace: the new period is simultaneously a restoration of the more distant past and an entirely new period as an unprecedented condition with new safeguards against disaster. The plot of the comedy and especially its end merges these two models, as the rejuvenated countryman Trygaeus, a human who is married to a deity and has been restored to his youth and stripped of any connection to his personal past, returns to the country and his fields, in many ways resembling the condition of his state in its entirety.

[41] See Naiden (2013) 111–4).

[42] See Bremmer (2006) for a concise presentation of the procedure of a typical sacrifice ritual with animal sacrifice and Ziehen (1939) 598–623 for a more detailed presentation. The sacrificial feast, that is, the event consisting of the celebration phase of the sacrifice ritual, is not presented on stage. The marriage feast that happens in the background in verses 1192–315 and the offering of food from this feast to the Chorus and by extension to the audience (1193–6 and 1305–15; see Olson (1998) 311 (*ad* 1305–11/12)) can be regarded as the replacement of the sacrificial feast.

[43] See the remarks in Ullucci (2011) 63.

[44] See Ambler (2014), who reads *Peace* as a critique of established religion and focuses on the fact that Trygaeus breaks with the existing religious tradition and installs a new Pantheon. This reading is possible—and actually opens up an interesting and innovative insight into the play—because the installation of Peace is indeed presented as a highly innovative act.

5. Individuals against Groups—Unified and Divided Groups: Two Models to Represent Tensions

In *Peace* the transition from war to peace is an event that involves a whole community. This community is represented both by the audience and by groups of Athenian citizens represented onstage. These groups and the audience do not simply express untempered joy for the new life in peace but become involved in confrontations, with which the comedy dramatises and reflects upon social tensions of this period of transition. *Peace* uses two different structures for the dramatisation of conflicts. The first is based on the confrontation between a group and an individual who tries unsuccessfully to find a place in it. The second structure consists of creating divisions between groups which are initially presented as unified, supposedly united in a pro peace stance. The division is based on the fact that specific subgroups or persons belonging to these groups actually stand on the side of war. In the following, I discuss in some detail the examples from both conflict-structures.

5.1 Individuals against Groups: The Case of Hierocles

A significant part of the sacrifice scene whose end marks the conclusion of the liminal phase in the peacemaking subplot is the confrontation between Trygaeus and his slave on the one hand, and the oracle collector Hierocles, on the other.

Hierocles enters the stage as soon as Trygaeus and his slave start roasting the sacrificial meat, and three important ritual acts that mark the conclusion of the sacrificial process are completed despite his disturbing presence: the separation of the parts of the sacrificed animal that belong to the god; the wine-offering (*spondē*);[45] and the collective participation in the consumption of the entrails (1115–16). He is identified as an oracle collector (*chrēsmologos*),[46] that is, a religious expert who possesses a collection of diverse oracles, from which he selects, recites, and interprets in various circumstances, including processes of political deliberation.[47] Thucydides (2.8, 21; 8.1) testifies that in Athens, oracle collectors had—at least until the disaster of the expedition in Sicily—a significant role in political deliberation regarding the war.

[45] See *Pax* 1056–61 and 1109–10, Ziehen (1939) 613–4, and Olson (1998) 270 (*ad* 1056) and 280–1 (*ad* 1110).

[46] For translating the tern *chrēsmologos* as 'oracle collector' instead of 'oracle monger' see Parker (2005) 111.

[47] For the distinction between a *mantis* and a *chrēsmologos* see Smith (1989) 141–3 and Flower (2008) 60–5. For oracle collectors in general in Greece in the archaic and classical periods cf. also Bowden (2007) 34–7; for the presentation of oracle collectors in Aristophanic comedies, see Smith (1989) 141–7 and Barrenechea (2018) 53–4. See also Shapiro (1990), who discusses in detail the activity and the political connections of the oracle-collector Onomakritos of the 6th century (Hdt. 7.6). For Hierocles see also Eupolis, fr. 231 (*Poleis*).

The comic character 'Hierocles' in *Peace* refers most probably to the historical Hierocles (*PAA* 7473), the person who was instructed in the decree *IG* I^3 40.64–6 to lead the sacrifice that sealed the treaty between Athens and Chalkis after the suppression of the revolt of Euboean cities in 446/5.[48] The features of the historical Hierocles indicate that he had gained money and fame because of the war and that he had some power and influence in the city. This assumption is crucial for the interpretation of his presence in *Peace*.

The Hierocles episode shares basic features with scenes in other comedies in which characters who do not otherwise appear in the play come onstage and either attack the comic hero or try to profit from the reality he has established. The hero usually reacts by denying them what they ask for and/or chasing them off.[49] These episodes are designed to illustrate the consequences of the new reality the hero has created, and they thus occur only after this new reality has been definitely imposed.[50] In contrast with these examples, the Hierocles episode does not come after the final establishment of the statue and the cult of Eirene but while it is unfinished. In other words, Hierocles appears while the liminal phase is not yet concluded and represents the last challenge in the process of passage from war to peace. The way the episode is introduced (1048–50) indicates that the sacrifice is at a crucial point: Trygaeus focuses on the fact that it is not yet completed, regards Hierocles as a potential opponent, and fears that he will endanger the process of establishing peace. By contrast, the slave focuses on the fact that the sacrifice is almost finished and regards Hierocles as a person who simply wants to get some personal profit. While the slave's point of view is more compatible with a typical episode *after* the establishment of the new reality in the comic world, Trygaeus' comment implies rather a confrontation episode *before* the definite establishment of this new reality. It is significant in this context that one of Hierocles' arguments against the peace treaty is that the gods oppose it (1073–9); he thus recalls one of the first obstacles Trygaeus had to overcome in order to liberate Eirene, namely Zeus' prohibition of such an act (371–82).

The final ritual acts, bringing to an end the long liminal phase of the peacemaking subplot, coincide with the confrontation with, and the

[48] Mattingly (2002) argues for an alternative dating of the decree *IG* I^3 40 at 424/3 in connection with the military intervention of Athens in Euboea reported by Philochorus. For the roles Hierocles possibly undertook during this sacrifice see Olson (1998) 269; cf. also Meiggs–Lewis (1988) 173. For the available biographical data about Hierocles see Olson (1998) 268–9 and Flower (2008) 62.

[49] For a discussion of the Hierocles episode in comparison to similar episodes from other comedies see Cassio (1985) 129–35.

[50] See the presentation of these episodes as structural part of the Aristophanic comedy in Robson (2009) 10–11, in the section entitled 'Consequences of the Agôn'. For a detailed discussion concerning the relation between these episodes and the main plot of the comedy see Zimmermann (1987).

expulsion of, Hierocles.[51] Hierocles simultaneously represents an individual who profits from war and seeks to hinder peace to maintain his profits; an individual who seeks to exploit collective processes to gain some personal advantage; and a rather powerful individual who stands for the entrenched social structures established during the ten-year war period (cf. Thuc. 3.82.8). In his figure, *Peace* binds together advocacy for the war and the uninhibited pursuit of personal profit and discredits both, while also criticising social and hierarchical structures that foster the war. During the first stages of the sacrificial process, Trygaeus and his slave have created a unified space including the stage, the orchestra and the spectators:[52] this sacrificial community, led by the comic hero, remains unified, confronts Hierocles, and rejects him, thus securing the proper conclusion of the sacrifice, the end of the liminal phase in the peacemaking-subplot, and the emergence of new structures in the Athenian society.

5.2 Divided Groups

A confrontation between an individual such as Hierocles and a group such as the sacrificial community presided over by the comic hero represents a case in which the tension is provoked by the individual alone and can be solved rather simply by excluding this individual from the community. *Peace*, in its liminal phase, also dramatises other, more complicated cases of tensions, presenting groups that at first glance give the impression of being unified and of having a pro-peace stance when the opposite is actually true: these groups are shown to be deeply divided. *Peace* uses this structural pattern to dramatise tensions in three crucial moments of the prolonged liminal phase: tensions involving the Chorus before the liberation of Eirene; tensions projected onto the audience just after the liberation; and those involving the community of the guests just before the definite completion of the liminal phase during the marriage feast.

The Chorus of the comedy is introduced as a group comprising virtually all Greeks and all professional classes (296–8): all dancers are initially enthusiastic to help liberate Eirene (302–8). But as soon as they start performing the task, it becomes obvious that not everybody is equally interested in it. The unified group is presented then as divided into different ethnic groups: Boeotians, Argives, Megarians, and Athenians, who do not really help; while of the Spartans, only those being held as prisoners of war in Athens are really interested, since they have urgent personal reasons (475–508). Besides the division into ethnic groups, the Chorus is also divided in

[51] See Cassio (1985) 137, who remarks also that the expulsion of Hierocles signifies in more general terms Trygaeus' definite victory against the enemies of peace.

[52] Cf. 925–6, where Trygaeus discusses with the Chorus the offerings/animal that should be sacrificed. In 960–72 the spectators and the Chorus are included in the ritual acts: see Cassio (1985) 126.

segments according to professions (cf. 296–7); of these, only the group of farmers shows genuine interest in the endeavour and manages in the end to liberate Eirene (508–11). During the following actions and for the rest of the play the Chorus is in fact a Chorus of farmers (cf., for example, 560–600 and 1127–71).

The transformation of the Chorus from a group comprising all Greeks into a group that consists only of farmers[53] deconstructs a discourse that presents everyone as a peace supporter and thus as a member of the community celebrating a recently achieved peace treaty as one. *Peace* starts with a Chorus that includes the entire community and successively tears this group apart, gradually identifying the real supporters of peace. Thus, through the discourses of an idealised agrarian landscape and life (especially in 560–600 and 1127–71), the comedy celebrates the new era of peace not as an obvious choice but as the result of the process of sifting apart true and false supporters of peace and excluding the latter.[54]

The joy that prevails after the liberation of Eirene is illustrated with two rather opposing images. In the first, Hermes and Trygaeus comment upon the imagined reactions of the various cities they can see from their perch in the sky. The cities form an undivided collective, they talk to one another and laugh together happily. Trygaeus agrees with Hermes' remark while pointing to the fact that they all still bear clear signs of the fights that have just ended (538–42):

> *Hermes*: Come now, look and see how all the states have been reconciled, how they're talking to one another and laughing in gladness—
>
> *Trygaeus*: And that though they've got incredible black eyes, *the whole lot of them*, and have cupping vessels applied to them.[55]

Just after this image of a previously divided but now unified group follows a second one that focuses on the spectators and uses the opposite pattern to

[53] For the staging problem that the fluctuation of the Chorus' identity poses, see the discussion in Zimmermann (1985) I.262–5: Zimmermann favours the idea that no extra dancers were present and no specific dancers were identified as Megarians, Boeotians, or Spartans. The transformation of the identity of the Chorus is performed through the text and through mimetic gestures. Cassio (1985) 74–6 proposes a different solution: at 508, where Trygaeus addresses exclusively the farmers, the vast majority of the dancers leaves some dancers behind and becomes 'the Chorus of the farmers'. The few dancers who remain are re-united with the Chorus after 520. See also Olson (1998) 181 (*ad* 508).

[54] For the tension between the presentation of unified collectivities and their disruption see also the remarks in Nelson (2016) 227–30, focusing on the question of how 'Panhellenic' peace can be.

[55] Since representatives from several allied cities were attending the performance of the play, it is probable to assume that the image Hermes draws also has a reference to assumed reactions of representatives of some of these cities among the spectators.

illustrate joy. The spectators are not presented as a unified collective but as disrupted group. Craftsmen of different specialisations are opposed to each other. On the one hand, weapon and arms producers and sellers, and, on the other hand, producers and sellers of farming tools have exactly the opposite reactions. The tool producers indeed treat the weapon producers as humiliated opponents (543–50). In an economy with a considerable degree of horizontal specialisation, as the Athenian economy at the end of the fifth century seems to have been,[56] the passage from war to peace causes loss for some and gains for others, a process the comedy presents as a zero-sum game. We may assume that this representation is related to or reflects a discourse in real life about the need to re-organise production and find a new balance in production and commerce.

The antagonism between tool producers and sellers who gain, and weapon producers and sellers who lose is not only projected onto the public of the theatre. It is also enacted on stage in two episodes after the completion of the *hidrysis* sacrifice, during the final phase of the liminal period in the marriage sub-plot (1197–208 and 1208–69). These episodes belong typologically to those illustrating the consequences of the new reality the comic hero has imposed. In the first episode, a sickle-maker and a potter bring Trygaeus sickles, pots, some other farming tools, and gifts for his marriage. They are grateful to him because of the gains they are making since peace has been restored (1198–201, 1205). Conversely, in the second episode, a dealer of arms, a producer of helmets, and a producer of spears, all in desperate economic straits because of the sudden fall in demand for their products, try to persuade Trygaeus to buy some of their wares. Trygaeus does not immediately refuse but ridicules the weapon sellers/producers: he sarcastically offers extremely low prices, describing how he will use some helmet crests or a cuirass for very low purposes, but when his humiliating offers are nevertheless accepted, he refuses to make the purchase after all (1214–23 and 1224–39). Alternatively, he proposes transforming the weapons into tools that bring no gain (1240–9, 1256–9), practically impossible solutions (1250–4), or else mass sale at ridiculous prices (1260–3). Theoretically everyone can participate in the new reality, provided that they accept the new conditions: those who lose from the new situation have to go through their own process of passage and change. But it is obvious that this process neither is easy nor has a guaranteed end. In *Peace*, the weapon sellers and producers are treated as enemies and are definitely excluded, even though they demonstrate some will, at least, adapt to the new situation.

The third case to which the division of groups applies involves the invitees at the wedding feast. They are initially presented as a collective without any further qualification (1191–2 and 1265–7).[57] Some verses later, children of

[56] See Harris–Lewis (2016) 1–3, 24–5 and n. 123.

[57] In verses 1191–2 Trygaeus is surprised by the large number of the guests who have come to the wedding feast: 'Whew! What a crowd's come to dinner for the wedding!' Olson

these invitees come out to practice the songs they intend to sing at the feast, as Trygaeus wants to hear their songs. The first child sings only epic verses about war and battles, and it emerges that he is the son of the general Lamachus (1270–90), who has been addressed shortly beforehand as an obstacle in the attempt to liberate Eirene (473–4).[58] Trygaeus chases Lamachus' son away (1294) and asks explicitly for the child of Cleonymus to come forward and sing. Trygaeus uses the characterisation of Cleonymus as loyal peace lover because of his cowardliness, an identity already established earlier in the comedy. Because of this characterisation, Trygaeus is sure that his child will never sing a song for the war (1295–7). The cowardliness of Cleonymus is here presented as a guarantee that both father and son will be for peace and against war. Both Lamachus and Cleonymus are ridiculed: the difference is that Lamachus' son is expelled from the feast, while Cleonymus' son remains a welcome guest.[59] The exclusion–inclusion dichotomy is thus also applied to the celebratory community: from the initially unified collective of the invitees, at least one supporter of war must be expelled before the marriage procession, the representation of the proper celebratory re-aggregation phase in *Peace,* begins.

Conclusion

Peace is directly tied to a contemporary historical reality, and contains significant 'historiographic' elements that offer interpretations of the past and its relationship with the present and future. In this article I have attempted to examine some of the features of this association, that is, I have posed the general question of how the comedy *Peace* responds to the negotiations for a peace treaty between Athens and Sparta in summer and winter 422/1 and to the transition from a prolonged period of war to a period

(1998) 295–6 (*ad* 1192) remarks that 'since no persons have been seen on stage entering the house, the remark is most easily taken as a reference to the audience'.

[58] There is no indication that Lamachus was supporting the continuation of war at 421 apart from the way he is portrayed in *Peace*. Obviously, it is possible to interpret this comic portrait as corresponding directly to the historical reality; cf. Olson (1998) 133 (ad 302–4). Nevertheless, the speaking name of the general Lamachus, a compound from the epitatic prefix λα- and the noun μάχη ('battle'), and an intended intertextual reference to his salient role as supporter and representative of pro-war politics in a previous Aristophanic comedy, the *Acharnians*, may also have some importance for choosing him as a comic figure in *Peace*; see the discussion in Ercolani (2002) 241 and Chronopoulos (2017) 252–62. For a detailed discussion of this passage, see Zogg (2014) 58–70 and 144–63.

[59] See the remarks in Zogg (2014) 160–3. See also Gödde (2011) 304–5, who argues that Trygaeus associates the installation of Peace directly with the usage of a language that will not allude to or be reminiscent of war. He goes so far in this respect that he inverts the conventional language, which actually prohibited the naming of acts that one should never commit, like 'throw away your shield' (*rhipsaspis, apoballein ta hopla*), and not only uses these words but also rewards the associated behaviours.

of peace. *Peace* connects fantastic plot elements, such as the flight of a human being to the palace of Zeus or the marriage of a human being to a deity, and representations of rites, such as the sacrifice complex and the betrothal–marriage complex, to create a plot structure similar to the tripartite division of rites of passage. This plot structure has a significantly prolonged liminal phase, in which the process of the passage from a state of war into a state of peace is performed onstage. *Peace* projects this plot onto the historical process of negotiations and transition from war into peace. A general feature of liminal phases is ambivalence regarding value codes and structures: they are periods in which, on the one hand, firm, broadly accepted structures and norms are destabilised or even disappear, and, on the other, new or altered norms and structures start to form. *Peace* represent discourses that destabilise crucial civic and political values, seeming at least partly to suggest that this value system irresponsibly foments war, and creates a plot that enacts onstage the formation process of new structures in social and economic life and the ensuing tensions. *Peace* proposes two different models of thought about the relation of this new period to the past: it both conceives and presents the new present as a restoration of the past, the continuation of a normality that was interrupted by the war; and it also presents it as a novel, unprecedented reality. The plot of the comedy is designed to merge these two models. The transformation that *Peace* represents on stage is a difficult one, since it involves crucial tensions. *Peace* applies two different structural patterns to perform these tensions: powerful individuals are set up in opposition to and excluded from groups, and groups that are initially presented as unified are subsequently shown to be divided between supporters of peace and supporters of war. The latter are excluded or humiliated, while the group continues to exist in a new or a differentiated form. *Peace* thus applies an exclusion–inclusion dichotomy in order to destroy previously existing structures but also in order to begin with the formation of the structures to be established in the upcoming new period.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ambler, W. (2014) 'On the Anabasis of Trygaeus: An Introduction to Aristophanes' "Peace"', in J. J. Mhire and B.-P. Frost, edd., *The Political Theory of Aristophanes: Explorations in Poetic Wisdom* (Albany, N.Y.) 137–59.

Athanassaki, L. (2018) 'The Cult of Peace on the Athenian Stage during the Peloponnesian War: From Euripides's *Cresphontes* to Aristophanes's *Peace* and Beyond', *ICS* 43: 1–24.

Barrenechea, F. (2018) *Comedy and Religion in Classical Athens: Narratives of Religious Experiences in Aristophanes'* Wealth (Cambridge).

Bowden, H. (2007) *Classical Athens and the Delphic Oracle: Divination and Democracy* (Cambridge).

Bremmer, J. N. (2006) 'Opfer III. Griechenland', *DNP* 8: 1240–6.

Brenne, S. (2001) *Ostrakismos und Prominenz in Athen: Attische Bürger des 5. Jhs. v. Chr. auf den Ostraka* (Vienna).

Byl, S. (1977) 'Le Vieillard dans les comédies d'Aristophane', *AC* 46: 52–73.

Cassio, A. C. (1985) *Commedia e partecipazione: la 'Pace' di Aristofane* (Naples).

Chronopoulos, S. (2017) *Spott Im Drama: dramatische Funktionen der persönlichen Verspottung in Aristophanes' 'Wespen' und 'Frieden'* (Heidelberg).

Dillon, M. (2002) *Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion* (London and New York).

Ercolani, A. (2002) 'Sprechende Namen und politische Funktion am Beispiel der Acharner', in id., ed., *Spoudaiogeloion: Form und Funktion der Verspottung in der aristophanischen Komödie* (Stuttgart) 225–54.

Flower, M. A. (2008) *The Seer in Ancient Greece* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).

Geertz, C. (1973) 'Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight', in id., *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays* (New York) 412–53.

Gennep, A. van (2004) *The Rites of Passage* (London and New York).

Gödde, S. (2011) *Euphêmia: die gute Rede in Kult und Literatur der griechischen Antike* (Heidelberg).

Gomme, A. W. (1956) *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, vol. II: Books II–III* (Oxford).

Grimes, R. L. (1985) 'Victor Turner's Social Drama and T. S. Eliot's Ritual Drama', *Anthropologica* 27: 79–99.

Harriott, R. M. (1986) *Aristophanes: Poet and Dramatist* (London and New York).

Harris, E. M. and D. M. Lewis (2016) 'Introduction: Markets in Classical and Hellenistic Athens', in E. M. Harris, et al., edd. *The Ancient Greek Economy: Markets, Households and City-States* (Cambridge) 1–37.

Harrison, A. R. W. (1968) *The Law of Athens 1: Family and Property* (Oxford).

Hubbard, T. K. (1989) 'Old Men in the Youthful Play of Aristophanes', in H. Falkner and S. B. Luce, edd., *Old Age in Greek and Latin Literature* (New York) 90–113.

Kanavou, N. (2011) *Aristophanes' Comedy of Names: a Study of Speaking Names in Aristophanes* (Berlin and New York).

Kassel, R. (1983) 'Dialoge mit Statuen', *ZPE* 51: 1–12.
Κωνσταντάκος, I. M. (2019) 'Παραμύθι, *πολιτική και σάτιρα στην αττική κωμωδία*', in Έ. Παπαδόδημα, ed., Αρχαίο δράμα και λαϊκή ηθική (Athens) 177–206.
Landrum, L. (2013) 'Performing *Theoria*: Architectural Acts in Aristophanes' *Peace*', in M. Feuerstein and G. Read, edd., *Architecture as a Performing Art* (Farnham) 27–43.
Mason, C. (2006) 'The Nuptial Ceremony of Ancient Greece and the Articulation of Male Control through ritual', *Classics Honors Projects* Paper 5 (http://digitalcommon s.macalester.edu/cl assics_honor s/5).
Mattingly, H. B. (2002) 'The Athenian Decree for Chalcis (*IG* 13.40)', *CQ* 52: 377–9.
Meiggs, R. and D. M. Lewis, edd. (1988) *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.*, revised ed. (Oxford).
Naiden, F. S. (2013) *Smoke Signals for the Gods: Ancient Greek Sacrifice from the Archaic through Roman Periods* (New York and Oxford).
Neil, R. A., ed. (1901) *The Knights of Aristophanes* (Cambridge).
Nelson, S. A. (2016) *Aristophanes and his Tragic Muse: Comedy, Tragedy and the Polis in 5th Century Athens* (Leiden).
Newiger, H.-J. (1980) 'War and Peace in the Comedy of Aristophanes', *YCS* 26: 219–37.
Oakley, J. H. and R. H. Sinos (1993) *The Wedding in Ancient Athens* (Madison).
Olson, S. D., ed. (1998) *Aristophanes: Peace* (Oxford).
Parker, R. (2005) *Polytheism and Society at Athens* (Oxford).
Pirenne-Delforge, V. (2015) 'Greek Priests and 'Cult Statues': In How Far [*sic*] are they Unnecessary?', in J. Mylonopoulos, ed., *Divine Images and Human Imaginations in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Leiden) 121–41.
Prandi, L. (1985) 'Il dibattito sulla pace durante la guerra del Peloponneso', *Contributi dell'Istituto di Storia antica dell'Università del Sacro Cuore* 11: 69–85.
Revermann, M. (2006) *Comic Business: Theatricality, Dramatic Technique, and Performance Contexts of Aristophanic Comedy* (Oxford).
Robson, J. (2009) *Aristophanes: an Introduction* (London and New York).
Rosenbloom, D. S. (2002) 'From "Poneros" to "Pharmakos": Theater, Social Drama, and Revolution in Athens, 428–404 BCE', *ClAnt* 21: 283–346.
Schechner, R. (1988) *Performance Theory*, revised ed. (New York and London).
Segal, E. (2001) *The Death of Comedy* (Cambridge, Mass. and London).
Sells, D. (2018) *Parody, Politics and the Populace in Greek Old Comedy* (London).
Shapiro, H. A. (1990) 'Oracle-Mongers in Peisistratid Athens', *Kernos* 3: 335–45.
Sicking, C. M. J. (1967) 'Aristophanes laetus?', in R. E. H. Westendorp, ed., *ΚΩΜΩΙΔΟΤΡΑΓΗΜΑΤΑ: Studia Aristophanea W. J. W. Koster in honorem* (Amsterdam) 115–24.
Smith, N. D. (1989) 'Diviners and Divination in Aristophanic Comedy', *ClAnt* 8: 140–58.

Sommerstein, A. H., ed. (1985) *Aristophanes: Peace* (Warminster).
Storey, I. C. (1989) 'The "Blameless Shield" of Kleonymos', *RhM* 132: 247–61.
—— (2019) *Aristophanes: Peace* (London and New York).
Szakolczai, A. (2009) 'Liminality and Experience: Structuring Transitory Situations and Transformative Events', *International Political Anthropology* 2: 141–72.
Thomassen, B. (2009) 'The Uses and Meanings of Liminality', *International Political Anthropology* 2: 5–28.
Turner, V. (1967) 'Betwixt and Between: The Liminal Period in "Rites de Passage"', in id., *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual* (Ithaca) 93–111.
—— (1969) *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure* (Chicago).
—— (1974a) *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society* (Ithaca).
—— (1974b) 'Passages, Margins and Poverty: Religious Symbols of Communitas', in Turner (1974a) 231–71.
—— (1980) 'Social Dramas and Stories about Them', *Critical Inquiry* 7: 141–68.
—— (1982) *From Ritual to Theater: the Human Seriousness of Play* (New York).
—— (1986) *The Anthropology of Performance* (New York).
—— (1990) 'Are There Universals of Performance in Myth, Ritual and Drama?', in R. Schechner and W. Appel, edd., *By Means of Performance: Intercultural Studies of Theatre and Ritual* (Cambridge) 8–18.
Ullucci, D. (2011) 'Contesting the Meaning of Animal Sacrifice', in J. Wright Knust and Z. Várhelyi, edd., *Ancient Mediterranean Sacrifice* (New York and Oxford) 57–74.
Whitman, C. H. (1964) *Aristophanes and the Comic Hero* (Cambridge, Mass.).
Zimmermann, B. (1985) *Untersuchungen zur Form und dramatische Technik der aristophanischen Komödien I: Parodos und Amoibaion* (Meisenheim am Glan).
—— (1987) 'L'organizzazione interna delle commedie di Aristofane', *Dioniso* 57: 49–64.
—— (2006) *Die griechische Komödie* (Frankfurt am Main).
—— (2017) 'Tanz im griechischen Drama', in G. Figal and B. Zimmermann, edd., *International Yearbook for Hermeneutics 16: Hermeneutics and the Performing Arts* (Tübingen) 30–46.
Zoepffel, R. (1985) 'Geschlechtsreife und Legitimation zur Zeugung im alten Griechenland', in E. W. Müller, ed. *Geschlechtsreife und Legitimation zur Zeugung* (Freiburg) 319–401.
Zogg, F. (2014) *Lust am Lesen: literarische Anspielungen im 'Frieden' des Aristophanes* (Munich).