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INTRODUCING SPACE IN LYRIC

‘L’espace ! Voici peu d’années, ce terme n’évoquait rien d’autre qu’un concept géométrique, celui d’un milieu vide.’

Up until the twentieth century, time has been the dominant trope in the teleologically haunted Western humanities. The frameworks for understanding cultural progress privileged temporal stages, such as primitiveness to civilisation and simplicity to complexity. At the end of the twentieth century, however, space began to demand its place next to time. This has been noted especially by philosophers like Michel Foucault, Henri Lefebvre and Edward Soja, who focused on space as a social construct in relation to issues of power and knowledge. In a brief essay, ‘Des espaces autres’, Foucault announced that after the nineteenth century, which was dominated by a historical outlook, ‘l’époque actuelle serait peut-être plutôt l’époque de l’espace’. His prediction was accurate: the end of the twentieth century witnessed a ‘spatial turn’ in humanities, which has lead to a focus on space and its constitutive role in a variety of fields, such as archaeology, anthropology, sociology and ethnography. It has by now been acknowledged that space is a social construct which is fundamental for our understanding of people’s identity, public life, power structures and human-environment interactions.

The shift in attention from time to space is also attested in literary studies. Until recently, space has been neglected in favour of time in literary analysis. The reason for this neglect is probably a consequence of the influential idea of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing in his Laocoon (1766) that literature is essentially a temporal art – as opposed to spatial arts, such as painting or sculpture – a claim

1 Lefebvre 1974, 7.
2 Foucault 1994 (1967), 752.
4 For the ideological role of space see further Heirman-Klooster forthcoming, with further references.
repeated by the narratologist Gérard Genette. From the end of the twentieth century onwards, however, space has become a ‘hot topic’ in literary studies, as demonstrated by the proliferation of books on the essential role of space in a particular genre or period.

The growing awareness of the importance of space in literature has also affected the study of ancient Greek literature. Recently, research has been conducted on the relation between literary space and cartography (papers collected in Bonnafé-Decourt-Helly 2000), on space in the ancient novel (papers in Paschalis-Frangoulidis 2002), on space in relation to myth, ritual and identity (Calame 2006), and on space in connection with issues of visualisation and ‘mapping’ of the plot (Purves 2010; Clay 2011). Moreover, several projects are currently running on space in ancient Greek literature. One of these is the Herodotus Encoded Space-Text-Imaging Archive (HESTIA), led by Christopher Pelling and Elton Barker (2008-2012). It makes use of the latest ICT in combination with close textual study to investigate the geographical concepts through which Herodotus describes the conflict between Greeks and Persians. Another is the third volume of the series Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative edited by Irene de Jong, which is devoted to space (forthcoming); the topic will be discussed by specialists in all genres of Greek literature from Homer to Flavius Josephus. One genre will not be considered, apart from a brief survey of space in the choral lyric poets Pindar and Bacchylides by Bruno Currie, in de Jong’s forthcoming volume: archaic Greek lyric. My thesis sets out to fill this gap.

At the same time, my thesis may shed new light on archaic Greek lyric. Archaic lyric is here understood in its broad sense, a

---

5 Genette 1969, 43.
6 To mention just a few: Berghahn 1998 (modern English novels); Hallaq-Ostle-Wild 2002 (modern Arabic literature); Andrew 2007 (Russian fiction); Störmer-Caysa 2007 (mediaeval literature).
7 See Campbell 1982 (1967), xiv; Nagy 1990, 2 and 18; Gerber 1997, 1; Budelmann 2009, 2-7. Actually, the term ‘lyric’ is a misnomer, for it implies that all poems were accompanied on a lyre and fails to take into account that elegiac lyric was accompanied on an aulos and that iambic lyric was probably not musically
general denominator of all kinds of non-hexametric poetry from the seventh till the fifth century BC, heterogeneous in language, meter, content, function and modes of performance. Traditionally, archaic Greek lyric is further subdivided into iambic and elegiac poetry (poets like Archilochus, Semonides, Solon and Theognis), and *melos* or lyric in its strict sense (poets like Anacreon, Alcaeus, Bacchylides, Pindar, Simonides and Sappho). The latter is further subdivided into monodic or solo lyric and choral lyric. ⁸ Unfortunately, much of archaic lyric poetry has been lost, and what is preserved is often highly fragmentary. Most of it has been indirectly handed down via citations in works of later Greek and Roman authors, while other poems are preserved on papyri, often in a bad state. Only the corpus of Theognis and part of Pindar’s poetry has been passed down through a direct manuscript tradition. So far, studies of archaic Greek lyric aimed at a better understanding of its dialects and metrical systems, of archaic Greek history and society, or concerned literary interpretation.⁹ Currently, the focus lies on the contexts and modes of *performance* of lyric poetry. The acknowledgement that lyric poems were primarily meant to be delivered orally for various audience of listeners and in various modes has caused a ‘performative turn’:¹⁰ scholars now

accompanied. For the Alexandrians, lyric poetry encompassed only melic poetry, as their canon of nine lyrics was a canon of nine *melic* lyric poets.

⁸ Needless to say that this is a simplified classification; for the problems involved in these subdivisions, especially between monodic and choral lyric, I refer to Harvey 1955, Davies 1988, Calame 1998 and Yatromanolakis 2008.


concentrate on the way archaic lyric poetry was performed and how this affects the understanding of the poems, as well as on the places where the poems were performed. However, the role of space within the poems has largely been neglected: this will form the subject of my thesis.

The question is then what I understand by space. Space is a concept which can be approached from many different angles. One is to examine (temporal and) spatial deixis, i.e. the hic (et nunc) of the enunciation of archaic lyric poetry. This kind of research has been conducted in Peponi 1992, a collection of articles in Arethusa 2004 and Cazzato 2011. Another is to focus on the cultural-historical significance of sanctuaries or places such as Salamis or Thebes mentioned in archaic lyric poems. This approach has been undertaken in Veta and Catenacci 2006 as well as, for Bacchylides and Pindar, in Hornblower 2004 and Eckermann 2007. Another way to consider space is to focus on the literary roles of ‘types of space’, such as an island or the underworld. This is the approach I will undertake. I will focus on three dominant and recurrent types of space: city, countryside and sea. These types are much understudied: no in-depth study has been conducted on the city in archaic Greek lyric, while older studies on the countryside (Treu 1955; Parry 1957; Elliger 1975) and the sea (Lesky 1947; Péron 1974, on Pindar) need updating, especially because most of these studies are rooted in a Snellian, geistesgeschichtliche approach to ancient Greek poetry. By investigating these three types of space together, I hope to offer a fairly broad view of the presentation of space in archaic lyric poetry.

In the first chapter a theoretical framework will be developed for a linguistic and literary analysis of these types of space. The linguistic research question concerns the diction of space in comparison to epic poetry (especially epithets). I will focus on differences in lexical, referential and semantic use and differences in effect with respect to the context in which the diction is used. The second and most central research question is a literary one and concerns the roles of space in archaic lyric poems, which I examine from the perspective of various modern literary theories and again
in comparison with epic poetry. I first discuss the role of space as setting, i.e. the scenic backdrop, and frame, i.e. all other places referred to which do not constitute the actual setting of the narrative. I then concentrate on the symbolic role of space, which I subdivide into symbolic associations and symbolic form, i.e. metaphor and personification.

The theoretical framework will be employed in three subsequent chapters on the city (chapter two), the countryside (chapter three) and the sea (chapter four). Each of these chapters consists of a section on the role as setting and frame and the role as symbol, with close attention to the diction in both sections. My investigation will unfold along detailed, micro-analytical readings of archaic lyric poems. This is partly due to the fragmentary state of most archaic lyric poetry, but it is also my hope that these detailed discussions are of interest to students of archaic lyric poems who do not specifically engage in the study of space. Because of my micro-analytical focus, I will limit my study to a representative corpus of 33 poems by a wide range of poets in which the city, countryside or sea is of importance. A list of all the poems discussed can be found in the index of passages. For the sake of clarity, I will quote the relevant parts of the poems at the beginning of each of my analyses.

1. A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF SPACE

1.1. THE DICTION OF SPACE: ITS USE AND EFFECT

My first research question is linguistic and concerns the lyric diction of space. The language of lyric poetry is a mixture of several dialects (such as Aeolic, Attic, Ionic and Doric) with an epic Kunstsprache, which is itself a mixture of Ionic with Aeolic and Achaean elements. While the scarcity of extensive epigraphic material limits our knowledge of the dialects of archaic Greece,  

---

11 A good survey of lyric dialects is offered in Ruijgh 1980; see further supra n9.
the epic Kunstsprache is well known from epic poetry. Because epic poetry forms the point of comparison for my analysis of space in lyric poetry, the lyric diction of space will be examined in comparison to epic poetry, by which I understand the Homeric epics, the Homeric Hymns, Hesiod’s poetry and what has been preserved from the cyclic epics.  

Before explaining how the diction will be investigated, methodological issues concerning the fixation of both lyric and epic poetry, the Homeric epics in particular, must be addressed, for these affect the way in which the comparison is made. There has been much debate whether the Homeric epics were textually fixed around the moment of composition and, if so, whether these versions significantly differed from the later ones by the Peisistratids in sixth-century Athens and, finally, from those of the Hellenistic Alexandrians. The ‘dictation theory’, defended by Richard Janko, Barry Powell and Martin West,14 argues that the Iliad and the Odyssey were textually fixed around their moment of composition, i.e. when the Greek alphabet developed (around the eighth century BC). According to these scholars, the early fixed texts did not undergo any drastic changes in sixth century Athens or later in Hellenistic Alexandria. This theory has been countered by Gregory Nagy’s ‘evolutionary theory’. It claims that there was a long and multiform tradition of oral recomposition in performance, with ‘transcripts’ appearing only from the sixth century and significantly different fixed ‘scripts’ being the work of the later Alexandrinian scholars.15

13 Cf. Lexicon des frühgriechischen Epos.
15 Nagy 1996, 29-112 and 1997; followed e.g. by Burgess 2001, 49-53. Nagy distinguishes between five phases in particular: (1) most fluid period without written texts (early second millennium to the middle of the eight century BC), (2) more formative, Panhellenic reperformance period, still without written texts (mid eighth - mid sixth century BC), (3) first transcripts in Athens thanks to the Peisistratids (mid sixth till latter part of the fourth century BC), (4) period of standardisation of transcripts (latter part of the fourth - middle of the second century BC), (5) more fixed period of scripts in Alexandria (from the second century BC onwards).
A similar debate regarding the fixation of archaic lyric poetry is ongoing. One theory is that all surviving examples were textualised around their moment of composition, i.e. from the seventh till the fifth century BC, and did not undergo important changes; the other holds that they were textualised only in the fifth and fourth centuries BC after continued reperformance and considerably differ from the original compositions. Recently, however, scholars have made clear that orality and literacy should not be too sharply distinguished from each other. They have shown that a long transition from pure orality to widespread literacy lasted from the archaic through the classical age and that the early presence of textual versions of poems did not exclude later, oral reperformances of these poems. In this light, the synthetic suggestion made by André Lardinois regarding the fixation of archaic lyric poems seems likely: while they were probably already textualised during the seventh till the fifth century BC, the versions of the poems we now have display significant changes due to oral reperformances.

Because of the uncertainty of the dates of the fixation of epic and lyric poetry, scholars are no longer inclined to discuss the relationship between both genres as if lyric poetry were dependent on or even subordinated to an earlier fixed set of Homeric texts. Instead, they consider both genres as symbiotic poetic traditions.


18 Lardinois 2006 (see also Budelmann 2009, 8).

19 Martin 1997 and 2001; Dalby 1998; Barker-Christensen 2006, especially 9 and 12-16; Irwin 2005, 22-29; Swift forthcoming. Cf. also Fowler 1987, 20-39, who demonstrates in detail that no direct, verbatim allusions to specific Homeric passages are found in archaic Greek lyric before mid sixth century BC. In this respect, it is also important to point out that certain lyric meters were older than the epic hexameter (see Nagy 1974).

20 The same debate presently runs in epic poetry itself, as the Epic Cycle is no longer considered to be later than the Homeric epics: see especially Burgess 2001.
that draw upon a common stock of diction and themes. For my present purposes this means that I will concentrate on the way archaic lyric poetry differs from epic poetry in the handling of a common reservoir of diction, without assuming the priority of epic poetry over lyric poetry. In particular, I will focus on two sorts of differences: differences in lexical, referential and semantic use and differences in effect.

To begin with the former, scholars have noted that archaic lyric poetry lexically differs from epic poetry in its particular combinations of epithets and nouns. In Archilochus 105.1 and Theognis 10, for instance, the sea noun with which the epithet βαθύς (‘deep’) is combined is πόντος, while in epic poetry it is used with ἅλς. Another type of lexical differences can be added to this: epithets can differ from epic poetry in formation (ιπποτρόφος, ‘horse-rearing’, in Ibycus 282.30, as opposed to ιππόβοτος, ‘grazed by horses’, in epic poetry). Secondly, there can be referential differences, insofar as words that refer to people or objects in epic poetry are used about space in lyric poetry (e.g. ταλαπείριος, ‘much-suffering’, in Ibycus 282.8 about Pergamum, instead of about people as in epic poetry). Finally, there can be semantic differences, i.e. differences in meaning (e.g. ἀνώνυμος in Ibycus 282.15, meaning ‘unnameable’, not ‘nameless’ as in epic poetry).

A second point of attention concerns the effect of the diction. According to a traditional belief, diction shared with epic poetry merely serves to evoke an ‘epic atmosphere’ in archaic lyric poetry. Recently, however, scholars have argued that such diction is deliberately appropriated to achieve various, significant effects. In a martial context, for instance, it can be appropriated to establish a heroic effect when used about soldiers who fight for their polis

---

21 See, for example, Fowler 1987, 39-52; Egoscozabal 2004; Graziosi-Haubold 2009, 96-102; these scholars refute an older theory (defended by Page 1963, 119-164 and Schrerer 1963, 96-97) that lyric diction is conventionally epic without any differences. The differences in the combinations of epithets and nouns have been pointed out especially as regards Bacchylides (Robbins 1997, 287; Maehler 2004, 19; Cairns 2010, 38-41) and the elegiac poetry of Archilochus (cf. Kirkwood 1974, 24-52; Campbell 1976; Létoublon 2008, 53).

22 See most notably Page 1963, 119-163.
(the elegies of Tyrtaeus and Callinus), or, on the contrary, to establish an anti-heroic effect when used about warriors who flee from the battlefield (‘new Archilochus’).23

Because epithets are clear markers of diction shared with epic poetry and because they often concern space, both the use and effect of the diction will be investigated with special attention to them.24 Given the comparison to epic poetry, I cannot avoid the much debated question whether epithets are ornamental or contextually relevant. This debate has especially dominated Homeric scholarship,25 and it has sharpened dramatically since Milman Parry’s argument that the Homeric epithets, excluding a small number of ‘particularised’ ones, have no value other than metrical.26 At present, most scholars agree that epithets are an instrument of versification and that the very frequent ones have no contextual relevance (e.g. θοός, ‘swift’, of ships anchored at beaches).27 However, they also allow for instances where epithets can be argued to be contextually relevant. An example from the Iliad is the epithet πελώριος (‘mighty’) of Ajax in 3.339, used by Helen in response to Priam’s question who the tall and strong Greek hero who surpasses all the others is.

As for the epithets in lyric poetry, at first A.E. Harvey28 assumed that poets made use of epithets merely as an ornament to set up an ‘epic’ tone. This idea became widespread in commentaries on lyric poets and has recently been restated as regards epithets of lyric landscapes in particular.29 However, it would be very unlikely that epithets in archaic Greek lyric bore no

23 For the former see Irwin 2005, especially part one; for the latter see Barker-Christensen 2006 and Swift forthcoming.
25 For a concise state of the art on Homeric epithets I refer to de Jong 1998, 121-126.
26 See Parry 1971 (1928), 119-165. His criteria for deciding whether an epithet is particularised are: metrically equivalent epithets, determinative epithets, epithets separated from their noun, epithets in enjambment.
27 For the ornamental use of the epithet cf. LfgrE, s.v. θοός and Parry 1971 (1928), 158-159.
28 Harvey 1957.
contextual significance, for, as Leif Bergson\textsuperscript{30} has pointed out in his study of epithets in tragic poetry, in non-epic poetry there was no need of fixed formulae to memorise large-scale poems, such as the Homeric epics. The irrelevance of mnemonic devices implies that lyric and tragic poets had much more freedom when handling epithets. The contextual significance of epithets has, in fact, been demonstrated for melic lyric poetry. Charles Segal\textsuperscript{31} has shown that in Bacchylides epithets are important signposts that direct the narratees through the narrative, by underlining significant turns of events, intensifying pathos or marking changes of tone. Alessandra Romè and Anne Broger\textsuperscript{32} have demonstrated that in Alcaeus and Sappho epithets acquire different overtones than in epic poetry, i.e. political and erotic ones, because of the different contexts in which they are used. Focusing on epithets of space, I will investigate whether the contextual relevance of epithets, as suggested for melic lyric poetry by Segal, Romè and Broger, applies to archaic lyric poetry in general.

1.2. THE ROLES OF SPACE

My second, more central research question is literary and regards the roles of space in archaic lyric poetry, for which epic poetry will again serve as a point of comparison. To investigate the roles of space, I will make use of several modern literary theories, amongst which narratology. Narratological theories will be particularly important, for, as Irene de Jong has pointed out, ‘narratology, often called the grammar of narrative, indeed is comparable to our grammars, as it helps us to order and understand certain aspects of the texts we study’. \textsuperscript{33} Although my theoretical framework is primarily intended for archaic Greek lyric, I hope that with the

\textsuperscript{30} Bergson 1956, 28.
\textsuperscript{32} Romè 1965; Broger 1996, especially 304-309.
\textsuperscript{33} De Jong 2007, 14; see also Grethlein-Rengakos 2009, 3.
necessary modifications it may also be of use to students of space in other literatures.\textsuperscript{34}

Because my theoretical framework starts from narratology, some methodological issues concerning the transfer of narratology to archaic Greek \textit{lyric poetry} need to be addressed. Until recently, narratology and lyric poetry criticism were firmly separated from each other: narratologists focused on novels and epic poetry, while lyric critics did not engage in narratological analyses. The latter has been deplored by lyric critics such as Eva Müller-Zettelmann and Margarete Rubik.\textsuperscript{35}

While...narratology at the beginning of the twenty-first century can rely upon a sizeable corpus of internationally recognised and widely applied theoretical frames of reference, ‘modern’ poetry theory forms an enclave far from the influences of mainstream literary theory and still works with axioms derived basically from post-Romantic conceptions of genre and reception... The results are a failure to make use of the results of modern linguistic, literary and cultural theory, an impressionistic and evaluative procedure of analysis, and a terminological pluralism that defies constructive academic debate. It is, therefore, high time to lift the theory of poetry to a level that corresponds to the level of reflection in modern literary studies by means of a transfer of theories from other fields.

Recently, however, in the wake of the ‘transgeneric’ turn in narratology, which has widened the field to other genres which initially fell beyond its scope, Peter Hühn and Jörg Schöner have pioneered narratological analyses of lyric poetry. To methodologically justify this approach, they argue that ‘[n]arration is an anthropologically universal semiotic practice, independent of culture and period, used to structure experience and produce and communicate meaning, and is as such one of the basic operations at

\textsuperscript{34} See also Heirman 2011b for my model of space.

\textsuperscript{35} Müller-Zettelmann-Rubik 2005, 7-8; see also Müller-Zettelmann 2002, 130-134.
work even in lyric poetry’. They contend that the same narrative techniques are at play in prose and lyric poetry, although not necessarily in the same way. For instance, both use mediation, i.e. the presentation of events from a particular perspective. Hühn and Schönert have also put this transfer into practice: with their colleagues from Hamburg, they are publishing an ongoing series of narratological studies of English and German lyric poetry from the sixteenth through the twentieth century.

Narratology has recently also been applied to archaic Greek lyric poetry, independently of the work done by the Hamburg scholars. In 2007 Andrew Morrison published a book on the narrator in archaic lyric and Hellenistic poetry, while Irene de Jong included the choral lyric poets Pindar and Bacchylides in the three series of her *Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative* because their *Epinician Odes* contain long mythological narratives (2004 on the narrator and narratee, 2007 on time, forthcoming on space). The critical response to the SAGN’s analysis of choral lyric poetry only highlights the relevance of extending its approach to the whole of archaic Greek lyric poetry, i.e. also to iambic, elegiac and monodic lyric, particularly in light of the work by Hühn and Schönert. A narratological approach seems justified especially for iambic lyric, because, as Ewen Bowie has argued, this genre includes many brief stories: in Archilochus’ iambic poetry, for instance, there are many political, erotic and military stories as well as animal fables. The importance of narration in iambic lyric might be explained, as André Lardinois has noted, by the fact that the iambic meter lends itself well for the telling of stories, ‘because it allows, like the

---

36 Hühn-Schönert 2005, 1; see also Hühn 2002, 13-14 and 2004, and Hühn-Sommer 2012.
37 Müller-Zettelmann 2002, 137-148, too, points out that mediation is at play both in prose and lyric poetry. She also discusses other points of connection, such as the distinction between story and discourse and the narratorial standpoint.
39 Scodel on SAGN 1 in *BMCR* (2005); Kenaan on SAGN 2 in *AN* 8 (2009).
hexameter, for the free flow of sentences from one line to the next’.  

It is clear that narration can be at play in elegiac and monodic lyric, too, if the recent definition of narration by one of the leading narratologists, Monika Fludernik, is taken into account. Fludernik argues against the reduction of narration to sequentiality, by which a narrative is considered a mere sequence of two or more events. According to her, narration ultimately depends on experienciality: it is enough if there is an anthropomorphic agent, conveying his or her, or someone else’s, past or present experiences, to speak of a narrative. As for archaic Greek lyric, this definition justifies a broadening of the narratological approach from choral and iambic lyric poetry to most elegiac and monodic lyric poetry, where, as Bruno Gentili and Chris Carey have pointed out, the narration of personal experience is common.

Thus, narration seems to be at play in the whole of archaic Greek lyric in two forms: sequential, in which an internal narrator or, in the case of mythological narratives, an external narrator recounts past or present events (especially in iambic and choral lyric poetry), and experiential, about past or present experiences (especially in elegiac and monodic lyric poetry). However, there are also (parts of) archaic lyric poems which deal with omnitemporal state of affairs, such as Semonides 1 about the vain hopes of man, and thereby fall outside the scope of these two categories. Consequently, these cannot be considered narratives. However, I will not be so rigid as to exclude these non-narrative (parts of) poems from my corpus, but in such cases I will use the term ‘speaker’ instead of ‘narrator’.

Now that the transfer of narratology to archaic lyric poetry has been argued for, time has come to build up my theoretical framework for the analysis of the roles of space. Generally

---

44 Cf. also the historical and mythological stories in long elegiac, of which, unfortunately, most are lost: see recently Lulli 2011.  
45 In this respect, I deviate from Hutchinson 2001, x and Morrison 2007, 16 and 32, who adopt the term narrator for all archaic lyric poetry.
speaking, I distinguish between two roles: one as setting and frame and one as symbol. These roles, however, are not mutually exclusive, as the setting can acquire symbolic overtones. In this respect, the distinction is based on a difference in gradation according to the dominant role.

**1.2.1. Space as Setting and Frame**

According to many narratologists, the basic role of space is that of setting, i.e. providing a scenic backdrop against which the narrated events take place. The setting can be very concrete and detailed, to the extent that it turns into a description. It can also remain implicit and vague, so that it requires a serious effort for the narratees’ imagination to concretise it. Whether detailed or not, indications of the setting are distributed either throughout the narrative (at moments when the action requires an explanation of the locale) or concentrated at the beginning (as a kind of synoptic description).

Because epic poetry serves as a point of comparison, it is relevant to point out that the dominant role of space in the Homeric epics is that of setting. As Theodore Andersson, Christos Tsagalis and Irene de Jong have demonstrated, in Homer space is often reduced to set the scene of the narrative and mentioned only when relevant to the plot: more interesting than space *an sich* is what happens in space. Although there is more attention to space

---


47 On the attention paid to space see Chatman 1978, 106; Zoran 1984, 313 and 320; Bal 1997 (1985), 135-136; van Baak 1983, 36 and 126. The relation between space and imagination has now become the focus of attention in cognitive narratology: see Ryan 2003, Herman 2002, 263-300 and especially Dennerlein 2009. Although these raise some interesting theoretical challenges, their hermeneutical value for the analysis of literary texts has yet to be demonstrated.

48 For the distribution of space see Zoran 1984, 321-322.

49 Andersson 1976, 15-52 (*Iliad* and *Odyssey*); Tsagalis 2010, 87-97 (*Iliad*); de Jong forthcoming b (*Iliad* and *Odyssey*).
in the *Odyssey*, because of the theme of Odysseus’ wanderings, and in the Homeric similes in the *Iliad*, space is essentially subordinated to the plot of the narrative. As regards the Homeric similes about the sea, for instance, their main role is to illustrate an event, i.e. the noise of the attack or withdrawal of a fighting mass (*Il. 2.207-210 and 394-397; 15.381-384*), or emotions, i.e. the confusion or distress felt by a mass or hero (*Il. 9.1-8; 14.16-22; 15.624-629*), of the narrative. 50

The spaces referred to in the narrative are, however, not restricted to the setting. The narratologist Ruth Ronen has demonstrated that the narrative also encompasses several ‘frames’, places which do not constitute the actual locale. 51 These frames are classified by their distance from the setting: the setting is surrounded by or juxtaposed with ‘secondary’ background frames and frames that are more ‘distant’ from the setting. To take the *Iliad* as an example, the setting is the Trojan plain, while the sea is the secondary frame and Greece a distant frame. Frames and setting can be interchanged in the course of the narrative, as the space which is the setting at the beginning of the narrative can later become a secondary or distant frame and vice versa. As for the Homeric epics, this applies especially to the *Odyssey*: when Odysseus finds himself on Scheria, Ithaca is a distant frame; when returned home, Ithaca is the setting and the stops on his long voyage have become distant frames. Another important aspect of the relation between setting and frames, according to Ronen, is that the former constitutes the ‘actual’ space of the narrative, whereas the latter, especially the distant frames, are sometimes counterfactual or hypothetical, insofar as ‘they contain an impossible, imagined or believed situation which cannot be or is not actualized’. 52 A case in point is the moment Odysseus arrives in Ithaca (see *Od*. 13.187-258). For the narrator and the narratees it is clear that Odysseus has returned home, or, in other words, that

50 Cf. Fränkel 1999 (1921), 301-305; Coffey 1957, 124 and 130; Scott 1974, 62-66. See further 4.3.

51 Ronen 1986, especially 423-429 (followed in Ryan 2012).

52 Ronen 1986, 429.
Ithaca is the actual setting. However, Odysseus, the character inside the story, is not aware of his homecoming at first, but believes that he has arrived in an unknown country: he still considers Ithaca a distant frame, a place he hopes to reach eventually. This example shows that the narrator can handle setting and frames to build up an effect of dramatic irony.\textsuperscript{53}

In my analyses of setting and frame I will focus on the way they are affected by the temporal structure of the narrative. For this purpose I will make use of the popular, threefold division of time in duration, order and frequency by the ‘founding father’ of narratology, Gérard Genette.\textsuperscript{54} Duration concerns the narrative rhythm or speed, i.e. the relation between narrated time and narrating time, as an event of the story can be passed over in silence in the narrative (ellipsis), presented rapidly and in broad strokes (summary), or in great detail (scene), sometimes to the extent that the narrated time comes to a complete standstill (pause). Order regards the question whether the events are narrated in a chronological sequence. Frequency, finally, deals with the number of times an event is recounted in the narrative: one event can be narrated once (singulative) or more than once (repeating), and several events can be recounted only once (iterative). Order and frequency are handled in a particular way in epic and archaic lyric poetry (especially Pindar) in what are known as ‘lyric narratives’.\textsuperscript{55}

The order of lyric narratives is anachronical, as they begin \textit{in ultimas res}, move back in time to the earliest point – typically with the particle γὰρ or a relative pronoun – then move forwards in time again (usually in greater detail) until the point of departure is

\textsuperscript{53} See de Jong 2001, \textit{ad loc.} for a discussion of this passage as an instance of a ‘delayed-recognition’ story-pattern, with the use of dramatic irony.

\textsuperscript{54} See Genette 1983, Ch. 4-6; cf. also Bal 1997 (1985), 80-113 and de Jong 2007. Cp. also Bakhtin’s chronotope theory for the relation between time and space, which was originally designed as an analytical instrument to trace generic divisions throughout the history of the Western novel from ancient Greece to Rabelais: Bakhtin 1981 (1938); further e.g. Keunen 2007 and Bemong a.o. 2010.

\textsuperscript{55} For ‘lyric narrative’ (also called ‘epic regression’) in epic poetry and Pindar see Krischer 1917, 136-140; Schadewaldt 1966 (1938), 84; Slater 1983, 118-126; de Jong 2001, xiv.
reached. The order influences the frequency of the events recounted, as the event mentioned in the beginning is repeated in the end. In archaic Greek lyric the repeated event is often used as a thematic parallel between the mythological narrative and the situation of the narrator. The question then is how the anachronical order and the repetition of certain events affect the setting and frames of the narratives.

1.2.2. Space as Symbol

The role of space is not restricted to that of setting and frame: space can also have a *symbolic* role. Making use of phenomenological theories and metaphor theories, I distinguish between two types of symbolism of space: symbolic associations and symbolic form, i.e. metaphor and personification.

Symbolic Associations

A first type of the symbolic role of space is when space, as Herman Meyer and Gerhard Hoffmann have shown,56 is semantically charged to the extent that it has symbolic associations. As an example, the city of Babylon has associations with perverse sexuality from the Old Testament (the ‘Whore of Babylon’), while the countryside has religious and mystical associations in Romantic poetry. Sometimes the symbolic associations become so dominant that we are dealing with imaginary instead of real spaces, i.e. with spaces that are the product of the imagination of the narrator (or speaker) or a character and exist only in his or her mind but not in the actual world. Although space primarily has a role as setting and frame in the Homeric epics, it acquires symbolic associations in some cases. For instance, spatial marks on the Trojan battlefield, such as the oak tree near the Scaean gate, are associated with security for the Trojans in the *Iliad*, while the rugged mountains

---

56 Meyer 1975 (1963); Hoffmann 1978.
and caves on the island of the Cyclopes are associated with a lack of civilisation in the *Odyssey* (9.106-115).\(^5^7\)

The symbolic associations of different types of space are sometimes opposed to each other in ways that vary cross-culturally, as Jurij Lotman and Joost van Baak have demonstrated.\(^5^8\) A well-known example is the opposition between city and countryside. In Hellenistic poetry and, above all, in Roman bucolic poetry, the complex, urban life is often opposed to the simple and honest life in the countryside.\(^5^9\) As for archaic Greek lyric, a fragment by Alcaeus (130b) contains a dramatic monologue in which an exiled narrator complains that he has been driven out of the city (lines 8-9) and spends a ‘rustic life’ (\(ζ scanners μοίραν  ἔχων ἀγροϊωτίκαν\), 2) as a wolf-like figure (\(λυκαιμίας\), 10), longing for the *agora* and the *boulē* (lines 3-5). The savage and lonely life in the countryside seems to be set against the socio-political, ‘civilised’ life. However, the opposition might not be as strict as it seems. At the end of the fragment, the narrator recounts a kind of beauty conquest of women in a precinct, close to which he apparently finds himself. Does this mean that the opposition between city and countryside is maintained, as the narrator only briefly forgets the hardship of his life at the countryside, or even reinforced, as he catches a glimpse of the civilised life in bitter contrast to his own rustic life? Or does it weaken the opposition, as it indicates that life in the countryside is not so hard after all? Even if the former were more likely, it would be too tentative to conclude on the basis of one fragment that the opposition between city and countryside applies to archaic Greek lyric poetry.\(^6^0\) More generally speaking, a risk in studying

\(^{5^7}\) For the symbolic associations of the spatial marks on the Trojan plain I refer to Elliger 1975, 57-62; Thorton 1984, 150-163; Trachsel 2007, 66-98; Clay 2011, 103-105. For the island of Polyphemus cf. de Jong 2001, *ad loc*.

\(^{5^8}\) Lotman 1990, 123-142 and van Baak 1983, 54-78.

\(^{5^9}\) Cf. Elliger 1975, 363 (on Theocritus) and 438 (on Horace); van Baak 1983, 45 (in general); Reinhardt 1988 (on Theocritus).

\(^{6^0}\) Steiner 1986, 92-94 observes an opposition between the countryside as wild and hostile and the city as a source of blessings in Pindar’s *Epinician Odes*. However, the only example she is able to offer is *Pythian* 9, where Cyrene and Telesicrates
types of space as a set of binary oppositions is that no gradations or intermediate dimensions are taken into account, so that the complexity of space is overlooked or left unexplored.\textsuperscript{61} Therefore, it seems more fruitful to investigate the symbolic associations of types of space \textit{an sich}, which, for my purposes, are the city, countryside and sea. Of course, it is often difficult to exactly decide whether we are dealing with symbolic associations, for they range from manifestly marked to more implicit. This means that the observation of symbolic associations is ultimately a matter of interpretation that cannot be proven with certainty. However, it is still possible to substantiate the observation on the basis of close attention to the diction and the context in the particular poem.

In some cases the symbolic associations of space are connected to the mood or emotions of the characters or the narrator (or speaker) located in that space. In these cases, we are dealing with the ‘psychologising function’ of space,\textsuperscript{62} i.e. of mirroring someone’s feelings or contrasting with them. This function has been argued to be typical of the countryside in ancient Greek poetry, expanding on the belief that man and countryside were still closely connected to each other in ancient Greece.\textsuperscript{63} In tragic and Hellenistic poetry desolated landscapes sometimes mirror the protagonists’ loneliness and despair (cf. the island of Lemnos in Sophocles’ \textit{Philoctetes} 686-706 and 1452-1467, and the Syris-landscape in \textit{Argonautica} 4.1235-1250).\textsuperscript{64} For archaic Greek lyric many scholars have even argued that the primary function of the countryside is psychologising, as it often serves as an outer

\textsuperscript{61} Cf. O’Ttoole 1980, 135-136 and 140; Rehm 2002, 1 and 270. For a complication of the opposition between city and countryside in antiquity I refer to Rosen-Sluiter 2006.


\textsuperscript{63} Cf. Parry 1957 and Segal 1963.

reflection of inner moods, especially in poets like Alcaeus, Sappho and Ibycus.65

Symbolic associations of space can also be standardised as literary motifs. When they are not restricted to one specific poem but are at play in a wider literary tradition, they should be examined against the background of that tradition. An example from ancient Greek poetry is the motif of the ‘meadow of love’, which is associated with virginal innocence and abduction. The flowery meadow is the place where a young and innocent girl finds herself, sometimes picking flowers, before being abducted by a man; the most famous example is the abduction of Persephone by Hades, as told in the *Hymn to Demeter*.66

Symbolic Form: Metaphor and Personification

A second type of the symbolic role of space is the symbolic form, i.e. space as metaphor or personification. While in the first type the symbolic role has been proven to stem from an association with something else, here it stems from the representation of something else.67 As studies of metaphor in Pindar and Archilochus have demonstrated, the use of metaphors is characteristic of archaic Greek lyric, especially in comparison with epic poetry, where similes prevail over metaphors.68 In order to make clear how I will analyse the use of metaphors of space in archaic Greek lyric, it is important to address the radical changes in the way metaphors have been studied from the last century onwards.69

---

66 For the ‘meadow of love’ motif in Greek poetry see Motte 1973, 38-48 and 208-213; Bremer 1975; Cairns 1997, 60-66; Calame 1999 (1992), 165-174. See further 3.3.3.
67 That metaphor is a form of symbol has been argued *in extenso* by Ricoeur 1976, 45-70.
68 For metaphors in archaic Greek lyric see Steiner 1986 (on Pindar) and Crowther 2003 (on Archilochus). For the domination of similes over metaphors in epic poetry see Stanford 1972 (1936), 118-143.
Up until the early-mid twentieth century metaphor theorists followed ancient theories of metaphor (Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian) by analysing metaphor as an abbreviated simile, a substitution of one word or expression in terms for another (the classical, Aristotelian example being Achilles equated with a lion). The idea of metaphor as a substitution soon came under attack. An example from archaic Greek lyric that illustrates the problems involved in this idea is a piece from Archilochus’ Cologne Epode (fragment 196a), in which a man persuades a girl to sexually engage with him. In lines 21-24 he makes use of spatial metaphors to seduce the girl:

\begin{verbatim}
θηλιγκοῦ δ’ ἐνεφθε καὶ πυλέων ύποφ[ μή] τι μέγαψε, φίλη·
σχήσω γάρ ἐς ποη[φόρους κ]ήπους....
\end{verbatim}

‘But, my dear, do not begrudge me (to go?) under the coping and the gates; for I shall steer towards grassy gardens....’

Although most scholars agree that the spatial references are metaphors for the pudenda muliebria, it is unclear which female genitals each reference precisely points to. For instance, some think that the gardens stand for the mons Veneris, while others suggest pubic hair. The impossibility of precisely determining the referents derives from the fact that metaphors are no mere substitutions.

Being aware of the inadequacy of the substitution theory, I.A. Richards and Max Black proposed the interactionism theory in the mid-twentieth century. This theory, which has been influential

---

70 Ancient views on metaphor are discussed in Stanford 1972 (1937), 3-77 and Innes 2003, 7-27.
72 See further my discussion of the fragment in 3.3.2 and 3.3.3.
in classical scholarship,\textsuperscript{73} holds that the metaphorical referent (the ‘vehicle’) and the non-metaphorical referent (the ‘tenor’) interact with each other against a commonly shared background of similarities and differences.\textsuperscript{74} Its assumption, however, that metaphor is a verbal phenomenon inherent to literary language has been questioned during the past few decades: metaphor is now considered a cognitive phenomenon generally characteristic of human thought.

The \textit{cognitive} metaphor theory developed by Georke Lakoff, Mark Johnson and Mark Turner\textsuperscript{75} deconstructed the interactionist scheme of tenor-vehicle-ground and defined metaphor as a process of mapping of concepts from one domain (the ‘source domain’) to another (the ‘target domain’), as exemplified by metaphors like life as a journey and debate as war. Cognitive metaphor theory not only brought along a new perspective on metaphors in literature,\textsuperscript{76} but also provoked a high interest in the workings of metaphor outside literary texts (for example in advertisements). To understand the function of metaphors of space in archaic lyric poems, I will adopt the findings of cognitive metaphors theorists. These theorists speak of varying functions of metaphors, from a means to inform or explain something, i.e. as cognitive elucidation, to a means to persuade or indirectly express emotions.\textsuperscript{77} Which of

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{73} See e.g. Leidl 2003 and the papers collected in Harrison-Paschalis-Frangoulidis 2005 (on the ancient novel); for archaic lyric poetry see Steiner 1986, 1-10, Nünilist 1998, 1-2, Crowther 2003, 84-91.
\item \textsuperscript{74} Richards 1965 (1936), especially 93-98; Black 1954-1955 (he chose for the less influential terms ‘principal subject’, ‘subsidiary subject’ and ‘system of associated commonplaces’).
\item \textsuperscript{75} Lakoff-Johnson 2003 (1980); Lakoff-Turner 1989; for ancient Greek literature Sluiter 2005 and 2011. It is interesting to note that in contrast to Aristotle, Cicero did not limit the use of metaphors to literature, for in \textit{De Oratore} 3.155 he says that even peasants use metaphors.
\item \textsuperscript{76} Cf., for instance, the special issues on the cognitive value of metaphors in \textit{Poetics Today} 13, 4 (1992), 14, 1 (1993) and 22, 3 (1999).
\item \textsuperscript{77} For metaphor as cognitive elucidation see Lakoff-Turner 1989, 63-65. For the persuasive function of metaphor see Lakoff-Turner 1989, 63-65 and above all Charteris-Black 2005. For metaphor as an indirect expression of emotions see
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
these functions are at play in a particular poem will be decided on the basis of the poem as a whole.78

A fourth approach to metaphors is the narratological one by Benjamin Biebuyck, Gunther Martens and Monika Fludernik.79 These scholars argue that metaphors have an important, thematic function within the plot of a narrative and require hermeneutic participation by the reader. In Charles Dickens’ *Little Dorritt*, for instance, prison metaphors constitute a key theme of the plot, suggesting that life itself should be considered a prison. This approach is, however, less useful for my purposes, since small-scale lyric poetry often includes only one metaphor, which does not form part of a larger plot.

In addition to metaphors, I will also be looking at instances of *personification* of space, i.e. when inanimate subjects are endowed with human traits.80 What often helps clarify whether we are dealing with personification is a comparison of the diction to other early Greek poetry:81 if nouns, adjectives or verbs used about space in a lyric poem refer to human beings elsewhere in early Greek poetry, we can conclude that we are dealing with personification of space. Personification of space is relatively scarcely attested in epic poetry, although instances of nature physically responding to the numinous power or presence of gods are not uncommon.82 In my

---

78 This avoids the critique by Biebuyck-Martens 2011 that cognitive metaphor theory is not useful to study literary metaphors, because it isolates the metaphor from the rest of the text. For the application of cognitive metaphor theory to metaphors in lyric poetry in relation to the poem as a whole see Steen 1999 and 2009, Crisp 2003 and Müller 2009.


81 I use ‘early Greek poetry’ for epic and archaic lyric poetry throughout my thesis.

82 Especially in the *Homeric Hymns*: *h. Ven.* 5.69-74, *h. 27.6-9* and *h. 28.9-14*; see also *Il.* 13.27-29; 14.347-349; *Th.* 194. The *Hymn to Delos* is a notable exception with its extended personification of the island of Delos (see further de Jong forthcoming c).
analyses I will investigate the functions of personification in relation to the poem as a whole: is it used only as a means of dramatisation, as scholars have pointed out, or are other functions involved? In what follows, I distinguish between several subtypes of personification, which can, of course, overlap.

Firstly, there is what John Ruskin has called the *pathetic fallacy*, when space is endowed with feelings normally ascribed to human beings. This subtype is best known from Romantic poetry. In a poem by William Cowper, for instance, it is said that ‘The fruitful field / Laughs with abundance’ (*The Task*, Book 6). According to Ruskin, the pathetic fallacy occurs only in Romantic poetry, but not in Greek or Latin literature. This has been partially refuted by Frank Copley, Jeffrey Hurwitt and Richard Jenkyns, who have pointed out instances of the pathetic fallacy in Greek and Latin literature, including archaic Greek lyric. One of the aims of this thesis is to investigate whether there is pathetic fallacy of space in archaic Greek lyric.

A second subtype of personification is *activisation*, by which space is endowed with physical or mental life, e.g. rage or calmness. In Statius’ *Silvae* (4.3.61), for example, the shores and woods are said to be moving in rage (*Fervent litora mobilesque silvae*).

Thirdly, there is *anthropomorphisation*, the bodily appearance of space as man or woman. This is a popular type of personification in late antique, Roman poetry (especially Ausonius, Claudian, Prudentius and Rutilius Namatianus), where the city of Rome is presented as a woman whose attributes reveal the status and power of the Empire. In a poem by Rutilius Namatianus (1.115-120), for example, Rome is anthropomorphised as a woman wearing a laurel headdress and a golden diadem.

---

84 Although these subtypes of personification are largely based on Webster 1954, 10, I made some modifications: I replaced Webster’s ‘animisation’ by ‘pathetic fallacy’, which is more standard, and I added a fourth category, namely ‘prosopopoia’.
85 See Ruskin 1907 (1856), 205-245.
87 For the anthropomorphisation of Rome in late antiquity see Roberts 2001.
A final subtype of personification is *prosopopoioia*, the attribution of speech to space. A famous example from Latin literature is Cicero’s *In Catilinam* (1.18), in which the Roman *patria* accuses Catiline of having committed crimes against her and asks him to leave Rome out of fear of him. An example from modern lyric poetry is the *Song of the Cities* by Rudyard Kipling, in which several cities utter exclamations. Sydney, for instance, exclaims: ‘Greeting! My birth-stain have I turned to good; Forcing strong wills perverse to steadfastness; The first flush of the tropics in my blood. And at my feet Success!’

Now that my theoretical framework of space has been set out, it can be put employed in the next three chapters about the city, the countryside and the sea.