Space in Ancient Greek Literature

STUDIES IN ANCIENT GREEK NARRATIVE, VOLUME THREE

Edited by

IRENE J.F. DE JONG

BRILL

Space in Ancient Greek Literature

Mnemosyne

Supplements

Monographs on Greek and
Latin Language and Literature

VOLUME 339

Space in Ancient Greek Literature

Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative

Edited by

Irene J.F. de Jong

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

CONTENTS

PART THREE

CHORAL LYRIC

PART FOUR

DRAMA

PART FIVE

ORATORY

PREFACE

This is the third volume of *Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative* (*SAGN*), a series which, as was set out in the General Introduction to volume 1, aims at investigating 'the forms and functions of the main devices which narratology has defined for us, such as the narrator and his narratees, time, focalization, characterization, description, speech, and plot'. Earlier volumes dealt with 'narrators, narratees, and narratives' and 'time'.

Contributors are given a threefold brief: to see which of the aspects of the device under consideration (set out in the Introduction) are found in his or her author; to describe how this author handles those aspects; and to relate his handling to that of earlier and later authors.

After editing three volumes it has become clear to me that as regards the third aim of the series, tracing the historical development of a device, I have perhaps been too optimistic. For most contributors narratology is something new and their energy is spent largely on mastering it for their own author, leaving them little time to reflect on the diachronical perspective. Readers are at least informed about the existence (and discussion) of a similar device in another author (chapter) through an arrow (→), but I am fully aware that this is only scratching the surface of a much larger topic, worth to be explored some day at a more elaborate scale.

I am happy that like the previous two times I have been able to cover most of the narrative texts of ancient Greek literature, finding enough people willing to join me in this pioneering project of looking at ancient texts from a new perspective. The team was by and large the same as that of volumes 1 and 2, with some welcome reinforcements.

Once again, this volume was prepared for in a workshop, held in Amsterdam on September 4–5, 2009. I wish to thank the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) and the Institute of Culture and History (ICG) of the University of Amsterdam for their financial support.

The preparation of the manuscript for publication was in the—highly efficient and careful—hands of the copy-editor of *Mnemosyne*, Wim Remmelink.

IdJ.

GLOSSARY

analepsis (flashback, *Rückwendung*): the narration of an event which took place earlier than the point in the story where we are. A distinction can be made between *narratorial* and *actorial* analepses, *internal* analepses (falling within the timespan of the **main story)** and *external* analepses (falling outside that timespan), and, in the case of internal analepses, between *repeating* analepses (repeating what has already been told elsewhere) and *completing* analepses (providing new information).

argument function: the function or significance which an embedded narrative has for the characters. Compare **key function**.

characterizing function of space: when space tells us something about a person, his milieu, character, or situation.

close-up: when a narrator describes a setting or object in detail from close quarters.

covert narratees: narratees whose presence in the text is not clearly or explicitly marked.

covert narrator: a narrator who does not explicitly or openly refer to his own activities as narrator and/or gives expression to his emotions concerning what he narrates.

delay: see paralipsis.

description (**ekphrasis**): the detailed description of a place, object, person, or even (typical) event, such as a storm.

distanced space: space which has no immediate relationship with either scenic or extra-scenic space, but lies beyond the areas visible to the audience.

embedded narrative: a narrative which is embedded in the **main story**; it is either told by the **primary narrator** or by a character acting as **secondary narrator**. It usually takes the form of an **analepsis** or **prolepsis**. See also **argument** and **key function**.

embedded or **secondary focalization**: when the **narrator** represents in the **narrator-text** a character's focalization, i.e., his perceptions, thoughts, emotions, or words (indirect speech). Embedded focalization can be *explicit* (when there is a shifter in the form of a verb of seeing, thinking, or a subordinator followed by subjunctive or optative) or *implicit*.

external narratees: narratees who do not play a role in the story told.

external narrator: a narrator who does not play a role in his own story.

extra-scenic space: that which lies immediately offstage, i.e. behind the facade of the *skēnē*-building in the theatre.

fabula: all events which are recounted in the **story**, abstracted from their disposition in the **text** and reconstructed in their chronological order.

fabula-space: a (theoretically) complete depiction of the location(s) of a narrative. See also **story-space**.

focalizer: the person (the narrator or a character) through whose 'eyes' the events and persons of a narrative are 'seen'.

frame narrative: a narrative in which a frame hosts a series of embedded narratives, which together form the bulk of the text.

frames: locations that are not the setting of the story but occur in thoughts, dreams, or memories.

frequency: the number of times an event from the **fabula** is recounted in the **story**. Events may be told once (**singulative narration**), more than once (**repeating narration**), or repeated events may be told only once (**iterative narration**).

internal narratees: narratees who play a role in the story told.

internal narrator: a narrator who plays a role in his own story.

iterative narration: when repeated events are told only once.

key function: the significance which an embedded narrative has for the **narratees**. Compare **argument function**.

main story: the events which are told by the **primary narrator** (minus **external analepses** and **prolepses**).

mirror-description: when a description mirrors or contrasts themes or elements of the narrative in which it is inserted.

narratees: the addressees of the narrator. We may distinguish between **external** and **internal**, **primary** and **secondary** (tertiary, etc.), and **overt** and **covert** narratees. Compare **narrator**.

narrator: the person who recounts the events of the **story** and thus turns them into a **text**. We may distinguish between **external narrators** (who are not a character in the story they tell) and **internal narrators** (who are), **primary narrators** (who recount the **main story**) and **secondary** (tertiary, etc.) **narrators** (who recount **embedded narratives**), **overt narrators** (who refer to themselves and their narrating activity, tell us about themselves, and openly comment upon their story) and **covert narrators**. All narrators are also **focalizers**.

narrator-text: those parts of the text which are presented by the **primary narrator**, i.e., the parts between the speeches. We may further distinguish between simple narrator-text (when the narrator presents his own focalization) and **embedded focalization** (when the narrator presents focalization of a character).

order: the chronological order of the **fabula** may be changed in the **story**, for instance to create **prolepses** and **analepses** or any other anachrony.

overt narratees: narratees whose presence in the text is clearly and explicitly marked.

overt narrator: a narrator who explicitly refers to his activities as narrator and gives expression to his emotions concerning what he tells.

panoramic standpoint: when a narrator positions himself at a considerable distance and can thus oversee a large stretch of space or multitude of events.

paralepsis: a speaker provides *more* information than, strictly speaking, he could, e.g., when the narrator intrudes with his superior knowledge into the embedded focalization of a character or when a character knows more than is logically possible. Contrast **paralipsis**.

paralipsis: a speaker provides *less* information than he could; details or events are left out, to be told at a later, more effective place. This is also known as delay. Contrast **paralepsis**.

personification (or **pathetic fallacy**): the projection of qualities normally associated with human beings upon inanimate objects or nature.

primary narratees: the addressees of the **primary narrator**.

primary narrator: the first narrator we encounter in a story and who usually, unless we are dealing with a **frame narrative**, recounts the **main story**.

prior narration: the narration of events which still have to take place at the moment of narration.

prolepsis (foreshadowing, *Vorauswendung*): the narration of an event which will take place later than the point of the story where we are. We may distinguish between *internal* prolepses (referring to events which fall within the time limits of the **main story**) and *external* prolepses (which refer to events which fall outside those time limits), and between *narratorial* and *actorial* prolepses. See also **seed**.

psychologizing function of space: when space reflects the feelings or mood of a character.

repeating narration: when one event is told more than once.

reported narrators: when a primary narrator introduces characters as narrators, in indirect speech.

rhythm: the relation between **story**-time and **fabula**-time, which is usually measured in the amount of **text**. An event may be told as a *scene* (story-time = fabula-time), *summary* (story-time < fabula-time), *slow-down* (story-time > fabula-time), and *ellipsis*, i.e., not told at all (no story-time matches fabula-time). Finally, there may be a *pause*, when the action is suspended to make room for an extended description (no fabula-time matches story-time).

scenic space: the setting of a play.

scenic standpoint: when a narrator positions himself on the scene and describes its space or events, either moving about (*shifting* standpoint) or from one vantage point (*fixed* standpoint).

secondary narratees: the addressees of a secondary narrator.

secondary narrator: a character in the story of the primary narrator, who recounts a narrative (in direct speech).

seed (hint, advance mention): the insertion of a piece of information, the relevance of which will become clear only later. The later event thus prepared for becomes more natural, logical, or plausible.

simultaneous narration: the narration of events which are taking place at the moment of narration.

singulative narration: when an event is told once.

story: the events as dispositioned and ordered in the **text** (contrast **fabula**). The story consists of the **main story** + **embedded narratives**. In comparison to the fabula, the events in the story may differ in **frequency** (they may be told more than once), **rhythm** (they may be told at great length or quickly), and **order** (the chronological order may be changed).

story-space: the actual space as the text presents it to us. See also **fabula-space**.

subsequent narration: the narration of events which have already taken place at the time of narration.

symbolic function of space: when space becomes semantically charged and acquires an additional significance on top of its purely scene-setting function.

text: the verbal representation of the **story** (and hence **fabula**) by a **narrator**.

thematic function of space: when space itself is the main subject of a narrative.

NARRATOLOGICAL THEORY ON SPACE

I.J.F. de Jong

Introduction

The first volumes of the *Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative* discussed two central and heavily theorised aspects of narrative texts: the narrator and time. This third volume will deal with an aspect that—until very recently—has received far less theoretical attention and is yet of prime importance too: space. Space is here understood in the wide sense of the setting of the action of a story, other localities that are referred to, e.g. in memories or dreams, and objects ('props').[1]

The relative neglect of space in narratological theory, compared to the wealth of models for analysing narrators, perspective, or time, is acknowledged by narratologists themselves,[2] and is plausibly explained by Buchholz and Jahn as due to two reasons: 'One was that Gotthold Ephraim Lessing's characterisation of narrative literature as 'temporal' art (as opposed to 'spatial' arts like painting and sculpture) seemed too evident to be seriously interrogated. The second reason was that space in narratives—especially pre-nineteenth century ones—often seemed to have no other function than to supply a general background setting, something to be taken for granted rather than requiring attention, far less

---

[1] Cf. Bal [1985] 1997: 135: 'The filling in of space is determined by the objects that can be found in that space. Objects have spatial status.'

[2] See H. Meyer [1963] 1975: 210; Hillebrand 1971: 7; Issacharoff 1976: 10 ('la critique, dans son ensemble, a fait preuve d'une certaine myopie a l'égard de la spatialité'); Hoffmann 1978: 1; van Baak 1983: 1; Bal [1985] 1997: 132; Zoran 1984: 310; Lopes 1995: 7; Molino and Lafhail-Molino 2003: 301. One may note that one of the main narratological model-builders, Genette, apart from some remarks on description, does not discuss space. Likewise Forster's famous succinct introduction *Aspects of the Novel* from 1927 has no chapter on space.

essential than the temporal directedness (…) of the plot.'[3] This theoreti-
cal neglect is not justified, however, considering the central place which
space takes in the construction of stories,[4] and is also belied by the prac-
tice of novelists, who, to mention but one thing, often choose places for
their titles: *Iliad*, *Wuthering Heights*, *Northanger Abbey*, *The Mill on the
Floss*, *A Room with a View, Manhattan Transfer, Berlin-Alexanderplatz*,
etc.

Recently, however, narratology has joined in with the 'spatial turn'
that, perhaps under the influence of the globalisation, which accentuated
the significance of locations, has become manifest across disciplines such
as anthropology, sociology, geography, and cultural studies since the
nineties of the twentieth century. In this introductory chapter I have
brought together those theoretical concepts that I consider most useful
for an analysis of space in ancient narrative texts.[5]

The Place of Space

There are huge differences in the attention paid to space: some narra-
tives are full of detailed descriptions or semantically loaded settings, e.g.
Dickens' *Great Expectations*; others, e.g. Musil's *Der Mann ohne Eigen-
schaften*, focus on the plot or characters while their environments are
largely left unspecified. Whether it is provided for in abundance or more
sparingly, narratologists agree that space can never be presented in a nar-
rative text in its totality: the narratees are offered a mere selection of
details. Just as we distinguish between fabula-time and story-time, i.e.
between the (theoretically) complete time of the reconstructed fabula
versus the restricted timespan as it is actually presented in the story,[6]
we may distinguish between fabula-space and story-space: the fabula-
space would be a (theoretically) complete depiction of the location(s) of a

---

[3] Buchholz and Jahn 2005: 551. Cf. Lessing *Laokoon*, ch. 16: 'Handlungen [sind] der
eigentliche Gegenstand der Poesie'.
[4] This is pointed out, e.g., by H. Meyer [1963] 1975: 231; Hillebrand 1971: 6–7;
Issacharoff 1976: 10–12; and Molino and Lafhail-Molino 2003: 301.
[5] When writing this introduction, which also served as a guide for the authors of
the chapters, in 2008, the only comprehensive discussions were Hillebrand 1971: 5–36
(German novels); Hoffmann 1978 (English novels); and van Baak 1983 (Russian novels).
Since then Hallet and Neumann 2009 and Dennerlein 2009 have appeared. For the spatial
turn, see e.g. Warf and Arias 2009 and Weigel 2009.
[6] See *SAGN* 2: 10.

narrative, while the story-space is the actual space as the text presents it to us.[7] Discussions of space mainly concern the story-space. The depiction of story-space always requires active cooperation on the part of the narratees. They are asked to activate in their memory what 'Paris' or 'a dark wood' means, or to imagine a wonder-world like that in Tolkien's *Lord of the Rings*.[8]

Next to the story-space there is the space of the narrator. In the first two volumes of the *Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative* the 'reference to the narrator's own time' motif was introduced: when a primary narrator talks about himself, the circumstances of his act of narration, and his own time. In a similar way we may speak about the 'reference to the narrator's own space' motif. Thus the narrator in Scott Fitzgerald's *The Great Gatsby* reveals at an early point that he comes from and tells his story in the Mid West ('My family have been prominent, well-to-do people in this Middle Western city for three generations'), a location which differs from that of the story itself, which takes place in the East:

> Even when the East excited me most, even when I was most keenly aware of its superiority to the bored, sprawling, swollen towns beyond the Ohio, with their interminable inquisitions which spared only the children and the very old—even then it had always for me a quality of distortion. West Egg [Gatsby's village], especially, still figures in my more fantastic dreams. I see it as a night scene by El Greco: a hundred houses, at once conventional and grotesque, crouching under a sullen, overhanging sky and a lustreless moon … After Gatsby's death the East was haunted for me like that, distorted beyond my eyes' power of correction.
>
> (Scott Fitzgerald, *The Great Gatsby*)

A narrator may also indicate that the space of his story is still to be seen in his own times:

> In that pleasant district of merry England which is watered by the river Don, there extended in ancient times a large forest, covering the greater part of the beautiful hills and valleys which lie between Sheffield and the pleasant town of Doncaster. The remains of this extensive wood are still to be seen at the noble seat of Wentworth, of Wharncliffe Park, and around Rotherdam.   (Scott, *Ivanhoe*)

---

[7] For this distinction, see Chatman 1978: 96 and Bal [1985] 1997: 132–133.

[8] Bachelard 1957: 32; Hillebrand 1971: 7, 14; Issacharoff 1976: 13, 16; Chatman 1978: 104; van Baak 1983: 126; Stanzel [1979] 1984: 116–117; Zoran 1984: 313, 320; Bal [1985] 1997: 215.

In the case of narratives embedded in non-narrative texts (drama or lyric), a comparison of or confrontation between the world of the narrator on the one hand and his narrative and the world of the embedding text on the other may be of particular relevance.

When analysing story-space we may further distinguish, following Ronen, between setting, i.e. the location where the action takes place, which of course may change in the course of a narrative, and 'frames', locations that occur in thoughts, dreams, or memories:[9]

> ils voyageraient, ils iraient en Italie, en Orient! Et il l' apercevait debout sur un monticule, contemplant un paysage, ou bien appuyée à son bras dans un galerie florentine, s' arrêtant devant les tableaux.
>
> (Flaubert, *L'Education sentimentale*)

or

> Take Sally Seton; her relation in the old days with Sally Seton. Had not that, after all, been love? She sat on the floor—that was her first impression of Sally—she sat on the floor with her arms around her knees, smoking a cigarette. Where could it have been? The Mannings'? The Kinloch-Jones's? … There they sat, hour after hour, talking in her bedroom at the top of the house, talking about life, how they were to reform the world.
>
> (Woolf, *Mrs. Dalloway*)

Such frames may bring in distant, inaccessible, hypothetical, or counterfactual locations, which all expand the space of a story in various significant ways.

Drama-theorists in particular distinguish different forms of space,[10] of which the following may be useful for the purposes of this volume.[11] In the first place, there is the *scenic* space, the setting of a play, partly visualised by the facade with central entrance, altar or tomb, props, and further filled in by textual references (the cave on the island of Lemnos in Sophocles *Philoctetes*, the temple of Apollo at Delphi in Aeschylus *Eumenides*, etc.). Next, there is the *extra-scenic* space, that which lies immediately offstage, i.e. behind the facade (the palace interior in Aeschylus *Agamemnon* or the interior of the Cyclops' cave in Euripides *Cyclops*). Such extra-scenic space is frequently evoked in detail

---

[9] Ronen 1986.

[10] For an overview, see McAuley 1999: 17–35.

[11] I base myself on Rehm 2002: 20–25, who in fact has a typology of six spatial categories (theatrical, scenic, extra-scenic, distanced, metatheatrical, reflexive). A comparable typology was developed by Edmunds 1996.

by a messenger, e.g., the bedroom where Jocasta hangs herself and Oedipus stabs out his eyes in Sophocles *Oedipus Tyrannus*. The ancient tragedians could also reveal extra-scenic space by showing it literally on the *ekkyklēma*, as in the case of the mad hero in Euripides *Heracles* who appears bound to a pillar of the home he has destroyed. Finally, there is the *distanced* space, which has no immediate relationship with either scenic or extra-scenic space, but lies beyond the areas visible to the audience. In Sophocles *Oedipus Tyrannus*, for instance, Corinth, Cithaeron, Delphi, and the junction of the three roads are all important distanced locations.[12]

A final introductory question to be asked when analysing space is its distribution: are we dealing with synoptic introductions or with stray indications sprinkled over the text, usually when the action requires them? A classic introduction of space is at the opening of the narrative:

> Except for the Marabar Caves—and they are twenty miles off—the city of Chandrapore presents nothing extraordinary. Edged rather than washed by the river Ganges, it trails for a couple of miles along the bank, scarcely distinguishable from the rubbish it deposits so freely … The streets are mean, the temples ineffective, and though a few fine houses exist they are hidden away in gardens or down alleys whose filth deters all but the invited guest.   (Forster, *A Passage to India*)

But Genette points at the habit of Stendhal to pulverise his 'descriptions, … systematically integrating what he allowed to remain of them to the level of his characters' actions—or daydreams.'[13]

The synoptic introduction of space and objects is also known as description, and this phenomenon merits a separate discussion.

Description

Ancient rhetoric already distinguished *descriptio* or ekphrasis, the detailed description of a place, object, person, or even event,[14] and narratologists tend to set description apart from narration as a separate mode:

---

[12] In view of the intricate relationship between these various forms of space in drama, in this volume of *SAGN* the analysis of dramatic space will not be restricted to the narrative parts but involve the play as a whole.

[13] Genette [1972] 1980: 101.

[14] See Lausberg [1960] 1998: 496. The descriptions of persons will be left out of account in this volume of the *Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative*, and be reserved for a later volume on characterization.

if narration deals with events and actions, description deals with static objects; if narration means the progression of time, description means a pause; if narration is organized according to *logical* predictability (there are earlier and later events, there is a plot with a beginning, a complication, and a resolution), description is organized according to *lexical* predictability (there is a set of terms which in principle could be exhaustively followed, e.g. roof, attic, first floor, basement, etc.).[15] We usually recognise a description when we see one:[16]

> The hills across the valley of the Ebro were long and white. On this side there was no shade and no trees and the station was between two lines of rails in the sun. Close against the side of the station there was the warm shadow of the building and a curtain, made of strings of bamboo beads, hung across the open door into the bar, to keep out the flies.
>
> (Hemingway, *Hills like White Elephants*)

Occasionally a speaker even explicitly labels what he says as a description, paradoxically in the form of a sigh that things actually are impossible to describe (the 'indiscribability' motif):

> (Enobarbus:)   I will tell you.
> The barge she [Cleopatra] sat in, like a burnish'd throne,
> Burn'd on the water: the poop was beaten gold;
> Purple the sails, and so perfumed that
> The winds were love-sick with them; the oars were silver …
>   For her own person,
> *It beggared all description*: she did lie
> In her pavilion, cloth-of-gold of tissue,
> O'erpicturing that Venus where we see
> The fancy outwork nature. On each side …
>
> (Shakespeare, *Antony and Cleopatra*, my italics)

The 'indescriptability' motif may be compared to the '*aporia*' motif, which we often find when narrators embark on their tale and at first seem overwhelmed by the enormity of the task before them.[17]

But even if descriptions are easily discernible, they often display narrative characteristics, which makes the opposition to narration less clear-cut:[18]

---

[15] See e.g. Chatman 1978: 19, 74; Chatman 1990: 9, 31; Hamon [1981] 1993: 64–72; Bal 1981–1982: 100–105; Bal [1985] 1997: 36–43, 108–110; and Wolf 2007: 2–36.
[16] Cf. Bal 1981–1982: 105; Bal [1985] 1997: 36; and Wolf 2007: 6.
[17] See *SAGN* 1: index s.v. narratorial devices.
[18] See Genette 1969: 56–61; Sternberg 1981, esp. 72, 73, 76; Zoran 1984: 326; Bal

> It [the village of Marygreen, where the main character lives] was as old-fashioned as it was small, and it rested in the lap of an undulating upland adjoining the North Wessex downs. Old as it was, however, the well-shaft was probably the only relic of the local history that remained absolutely unchanged. Many of the thatched and dormered dwelling-houses had been pulled down *of late years*, and many trees felled on the green.
>
> (Hardy, *Jude the Obscure*, my italics)

The description of the village at first is static, focusing on its geographical location and outward appearance, but gradually it starts to acquire a narrative dimension, including elements of the village's history. And although a description often involves a pause (which means that no fabula-time matches the story-time),[19] this certainly is not always the case: at the end of a descriptive passage time may turn out to have ticked on or a description may be made part of an action (looking out a window; constructing an object, etc.). This phenomenon of the dynamization or narrativization of descriptions should be connected to the fact that from early times onwards narrators have invented all kinds of devices to naturalise descriptions, i.e. to integrate them as much as possible into their stories. I will return to this in more detail in the next section, on presentation.

Despite the—complicating but at the same time interesting—blurring of the boundaries between description and narration, it is worthwhile to continue to distinguish description, defined here as the synoptic presentation of space or objects, as a separate category, if only in view of the prime importance which ekphrasis takes up in ancient literature. When dealing with such descriptive passages it is relevant to pay attention to their organisation, since descriptions have, as Chatman notes, 'a logic of their own':[20] they may be organised as a refrain (he saw/made X, he saw/made Y, etc.), an enumeration (first, second, third, etc.), according to spatial principles (left, right, in front, behind, etc.), temporal principles (he first saw X, then Y; now, in the past), or other ideologically, culturally. or conventionally determined principles.[21] Finally, of course, there may be no order at all, which is in itself significant:

[1985] 1997: 36; Heffernan 1993: 5–6; Rabau 1995. Note that the ancient concept of ekphrasis, including as it does, the description of events (storms, battles) already allowed for the entrance of narration into description.

[19] See *SAGN* 2: 12.
[20] Chatman 1990: 24.
[21] See Sternberg 1981: 72–88; Lopes 1995: 22–23.

> Now she [Lucy] entered the church depressed and humiliated, not even
> able to remember whether it was built by the Franciscans or the Domini-
> cans. Of course, it must be a wonderful building. But how like a barn! And
> how very cold! Of course, it contained frescoes by Giotto, in the presence
> of whose tactile values she was capable of feeling what was proper. But who
> was to tell her which they were? She walked about disdainfully, unwilling
> to be enthusiastic over monuments of uncertain authorship or date. There
> was no one even to tell her which, of all the sepulchral slabs that paved the
> nave and transepts, was the one that was really beautiful, …
>
>   (Forster, *A Room with a View*)

Although this lies outside the scope of this volume, which deals with the
Greek texts in translation, it is to be noted that the linguistic model of
discourse modes can be expected to sharpen the demarcation between
description and narration.[22]

Presentation and Integration

By and large, space, including descriptions, can be introduced to the
narratees in various ways.[23] The first, very common, method is via the
focalization of the narrator:

> A wide plain, where the broadening Floss hurries on between its green
> banks to the sea, and the loving tide, rushing to meet it, checks its passage
> with an impetuous embrace. On this mighty tide the black ships— … —
> are borne along to the town of St. Ogg's, which shows its aged, fluted red
> roofs and the broad gables of its wharves between the low wooded hill and
> the river brink, tinging the water with a soft purple hue under the transient
> glance of this February sun.   (Eliot, *The Mill on the Floss*)

It is this type of description that is most clearly demarcated qua descrip-
tion and that usually creates a pause.

   But narrators are often loath to interrupt the flow of their narrative
and have looked for ways to integrate descriptions into their stories more
smoothly or naturally. A slightly more integrated method of description
consists in introducing an *anonymous focalizer*, a 'one' or 'man', who
looks at the scene and thereby introduces it to the narratees:

---

[22] See e.g. C.S. Smith 2003 and, for an application to classical texts, Kroon 2007.
[23] See Friedemann [1910] 1969: 178–189; Petsch [1934] 1975: 38–39; Genette [1972]
1980: 99–106; Stanzel [1979] 1984: 117–122; Hamon [1981] 1993: 172–198; Bal [1985]
1997: 37–41; and Lopes 1995: 23–24.

> Yonville-l' Abbaye … est un bourg à huit lieues de Rouen, entre la route d' Abbeville etcelle de Beauvais, au fond d' une vallée qu' arrose la Rieule … Au bout de l' horizon, *lorsqu'on arrive*, *on a devant soi* les chênes de la forêt d' Argueil …   (Flaubert, *Madame Bovary*, my italics)

By far the most widespread method of integrating a description is by making *one of the characters focalize* a setting or object:

> Next morning a fine mist covered the peninsula. The weather promised well, and the outline of the castle mound grew clearer each moment that Margaret watched it. Presently she saw the keep, and the sun painted the rubble gold, and charged the white sky with blue. The shadow of the house gathered itself together and fell over the garden. A cat looked up at her window and mewed. Lastly the river appeared, still holding the mists between its banks and its overhanging alders, and only visible as far as a hill, which cut off its upper reaches.   (Forster, *Howards End*)

Such focalized descriptions are often recognizable in that they are in the past tense (as opposed to the present tense of descriptions focalized by the narrator). There are in fact many variations on this pattern, e.g. a character looking through a window, entering a room, or walking through a city (what Hamon calls 'ambulant description').[24] This method is not only a very elegant way of weaving descriptive or spatial elements into a story but also often acquires an important function *in itself*, in that the way in which a character looks at his or her surroundings may of course tell us something about that character (German narratologists speak of 'erlebte Raum'). I will return to this point in more detail in the section below on the functions of space.

A character may also himself describe a place or object, while addressing another character:[25]

> [the architect Bosinney describes to Soames Forsyte his new house] 'I've tried to plan a house here with some self-respect of its own … This is for your pictures, divided from this court by curtains; draw them back and you'll have a space of fifty-one by twenty-three six. This double-faced stove in the centre, here, looks one way towards the court, one way towards the picture room; this end wall is all window; you've got a south-east light from that, a north light from the court.'   (Galsworthy, *The Man of Property*)

---

[24] Hamon [1981] 1993: 175.
[25] This, as has been pointed out by Hamon [1981] 1993: 186–187, is the typical method of Zola: an inquisitive or knowledgeable person (painter, technician), finding himself with time on his hands (because he is waiting for someone), takes the opportunity to describe some complex object (a locomotive, garden) to someone who does not know about it.

Descriptions by speaking characters are of course paramount in drama.

Finally, the most integrated or narrativised form of space-presentation is when *a character makes an object*. This is the method of the Homeric narrator in the case of the Shield of Achilles (*Iliad* 18), so much admired by Lessing and indeed prescribed by him as the only correct way of integrating descriptions into narrative.[26]

In the specific case of an object of art being described (ekphrasis), no less than four agents may be involved, as Fowler has pointed out:[27] the artist, making the object or having made it in the past; a viewing character; the narratees, who may respond to the object with their imagination or foreknowledge, and the primary narrator-focalizer. Let us take the example of a well-known modern variation on the Shield:

> She looked over his shoulder
> For vines and olive trees,
> Marble well-governed cities
> And ships upon untamed seas,
> But there on the shining metal
> His hands had put instead
> An artificial wilderness
> And a sky like lead
>   […]
> The thin-lipped armouror,
> Hephaestos, hobbled away,
> Thetis of the shining breasts
> Cried out in dismay
> At what the god had wrought
> To please her son, the strong
> Iron-hearted man-slaying Achilles
> Who would not live long.
>
> (Auden, *The Shield of Achilles*)

In this poem we have the artist Hephaestus, who is at work; a character, Thetis, who watches what he is making and does not see what she had expected to see; the narratees, who bring in their knowledge of Homer's Shield of Achilles (and therefore understand what Thetis' expectations are based on) and of contemporary history (and recognise what Hep-

---

[26] *Laokoon*, chs. 16 and 18. A similar preference for description through action rather than perception is expressed by Lukacs [1936] 1978, who at p. 157 explicitly aligns with Lessing.

[27] D. Fowler [1991] 2000: 76–77. In general on ekphrasis, see e.g. Heffernan 1993; (in antiquity) special issues of *Ramus* 31 (2002) and *Classical Philology* 102 (2007) (with rich bibliography); Webb 2009.

haestus is depicting: the modern, totalitarian world); and finally the primary narrator-focalizer, who presents it all. This beautiful poem nicely captures the intriguing ambiguities involved in all ekphrases, the complex division of labour between artist, viewing character, narratees, and narrator: who is it that calls the wilderness depicted 'artificial'?

Presentation and Spatial Standpoint

Another, partly related, aspect of the presentation of space is the *spatial standpoint* of the presenter. We already saw that we must distinguish between the presenter being the narrator, an anonymous focalizer, or a character. But we may further distinguish between the distance which this presentator has towards the space or object described.[28] On the whole we find the following possibilities. Firstly, there is the *panoramic* standpoint, which means that a narrator positions himself at a considerable distance and can thus oversee a large stretch of space:

> The autumn wind blew over England … The streets were crowded. Upon the sloping desks of the offices near St. Paul's, clerks paused with their pens on the ruled page … But in England, in the North it was cold … In Devonshire where the round red hills and the steep valleys hoarded the sea air leaves were still thick on the trees … The smoke hung in veils over the spires and domes of the University cities …   (Woolf, *The Years*)

A narrator may also adopt the position of one of the characters (actorial panoramic standpoint), even embedding their focalization, to take up a suitable position on a tower or hill:

> Having mounted beside her, Alec D'Urberville drove rapidly along by the crest of the hill, chatting compliments to Tess as they went, the cart with her box being left far behind. An immense landscape stretched around them on every side; behind, the green valley of her birth; before, a gray country of which she knew nothing except from her first brief visit to Trantridge.   (Hardy, *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*)

Secondly, there is the *scenic* standpoint, e.g. when a narrator positions himself on the scene and describes it, moving about (*shifting* standpoint) or from one vantage point (*fixed* standpoint). An example of the second possibility is:

---

[28] In the following I draw on the model which was developed by De Jong and Nünlist 2004. One may also compare Hoffmann 1978: 445–486 and Purves 2010. It should be noted that the spatial standpoint of the narrator-focalizer is relevant not only for the presentation of space, but in general for all narration.

> In Marseilles that day there was a villainous prison. In one of its chambers
> … were two men. Besides the two men, a notched and disfigured bench,
> immovable from the wall, with a draught-board rudely hacked upon it
> with a knife, a set of draughts, made of old buttons and soup bones, a set
> of dominoes, two mats, and two or three wine bottles … It received such
> light as it got through the grating of iron bars fashioned like a pretty large
> window, by means of which it could be always inspected from the gloomy
> staircase on which the grating gave. There was a broad strong ledge of stone
> to this grating where the bottom of it was let into the masonry, three or four
> feet above the ground.   (Dickens, *Little Dorrit*)

When adopting a shifting scenic standpoint a narrator will often choose
to accompany one of the characters:

> … Emma had a charitable visit to pay to a poor sick family, who lived a
> little way out of Highbury. Their road to this detached cottage was down
> Vicarage-lane, a lane leading at right-angles from the broad … and, as
> may be inferred, containing the blessed abode of Mr. Elton. A few inferior
> dwellings were first to be seen, and then, about a quarter of a mile down
> the lane rose the Vicarage; an old and not very good house, almost as
> close to the road as could be. It had no advantage of situation; but had
> been very much smartened up by the present proprietor; and, such as it
> was, there could be no possibility of the two friends passing it without
> a slackened pace and observing eyes.—Emma's remark was—'There it is.
> There go you and your riddle-book one of these days.'—Harriet's was—
> 'Oh! What a sweet house!—How very beautiful!'   (Austen, *Emma*)

In this example it is not easy to make out whether the *actorial scenic*
standpoint of the narrator also entails the embedding of focalization: it
would seem to be the ironic narrator who calls the Vicarage 'the blessed
abode of Mr. Elton', but is it the narrator or Emma who qualifies it as
'old and not very good'? Anyway, this focalization contrasts with the
enthusiasm of Harriet, who considers it 'beautiful'. Things are easier to
determine in the case of internal (first-person) narration:

> Before passing the threshold [of Wuthering Heights], I paused to admire
> a quantity of grotesque carving lavished over the front, and especially
> about the principal door, above which, among a wilderness of crumbling
> griffins, and shameless little boys, I detected the date '1500', and the name
> 'Hareton Earnshaw' … One step brought us into the family sitting-room,
> without any introductory lobby, or passage. They call it here 'the house'
> pre-eminently. It includes kitchen, and parlour, generally, but I believe at
> Wuthering Heights the kitchen is forced to retreat altogether into another
> quarter, at least I distinguished a chatter of tongues, and a clatter of
> culinary utensils, deep within; and I observed no signs of roasting, boiling
> or baking, about the huge fire-place; nor any glitter of copper saucepans
> and tin cullenders on the walls.   (Brontë, *Wuthering Heights*)

Finally, we have the *close-up*, in which a setting or object is described in detail while the narrator or a character looks at it from close quarters (as opposite to the panoramic standpoint):

> Now eight candles were stood down the table, and after the first stoop the flames stood upright and drew with them into visibility the long table entire, and in the middle a yellow and purple dish of fruit. What had she done with it, Mrs. Ramsay wondered, for Rose's arrangement of the grapes and pears, of the horny pinked-lined shell, of the bananas, made her think of a trophy fetched from the bottom of the sea, of Neptune's banquet, of the bunch that hangs with vine leaves over the shoulder of Bacchus (in some picture), among the leopard skins and the torches lolloping red and gold …
> (Woolf, *To the Lighthouse*)

The description, focalized by Mrs. Ramsay, zooms in on the long table, the fruit-dish, and then the pieces of fruit and shell which lie on it. One may note in passing how from 'made her think' onwards the setting is replaced by a frame, a picture of Bacchus which the objects on the fruit-dish call to Mrs. Ramsay's mind.

From a discussion of the formal aspects of space, which already contained hints of its significance, I now turn to the important subject of its functions.

Functions

Compared to plot, the most important element of a narrative according to Aristotle and many narratologists after him, and characters, the main interest of a novel according to many modern writers, space has long seemed just a minor ingredient and a mere ancillary to the narrative: a plot and characters have to be situated somewhere and the first and main function of space is to set the scene. When taking the form of a longer description, space would even seem to have merely an *ornamental* function, an idea which goes back to ancient rhetoric, which listed *descriptio* and *evidentia* under the *ornatus* of a speech and considered it to belong especially in digressions. This idea has been reiterated in recent times, e.g., by Genette. Barthes suggests that detailed descriptions may serve to increase the reality effect of a story.[29]

---

[29] See Lausberg [1960] 1998: 360; Genette 1969: 58; and Barthes [1968] 1989. For a fuller historical overview of ideas on description, see Hamon [1981] 1993: 9–36.

Few critics nowadays would like to leave it at that and ascribe space and description a purely ornamental or subservient function. Firstly, space may acquire a *thematic* function, when it is one of the main ingredients in a narrative,[30] for instance in so-called city novels, of which some were already mentioned in the introduction (Dos Passos' *Manhattan Transfer* or Döblin's *Berlin-Alexanderplatz*), or in travel stories (e.g. Lagerlöf's *Nils Holgersson's Wonderful Journey* or Jack Kerouac's *On the Road*).

A second function is involved when a place or object, fully described in the form of a synoptic description, *mirrors* or contrasts themes of the narrative in which it is inserted. Such mirror-descriptions, as they might be called, are a subtype of the larger category of the mise en abyme, when a work within another work in some way resembles the outer work (or part of it).[31] Mirroring is of course a function which is of great importance to both ancient and modern ekphrases.[32] Thus, in Shakespeare's *Rape of Lucrece* the heroine, who has just been raped and is now waiting for her husband to return, kills the time by looking at a painting:

> At last she called to mind where hangs a piece
> of skilful painting, made for Priam's Troy:
> before the which is drawn the power of Greece.
> For *Helen's rape* the city to destroy,
> Threat'ning cloud-kissing Ilion with annoy;
>
> (Shakespeare, *Lucrece* 1366–1370, my italics)

There follows a description of this painting in no fewer than 200 lines, whereby the focalizing Lucrece explicitly looks for points of similarity between the painting and her own situation:

> To this well-painted piece is Lucrece come,
> to find a face where all distress is stell'd.
> Many she sees where cares have carved some,
> but none where all distress and dolour dwell'd,
> till she despairing Hecuba beheld,
> staring on Priam's wounds with her old eyes,
> which bleeding under Pyrrhus' proud foot lies.
>
> (Shakespeare, *Lucrece* 1453–1459)

---

[30] See Bal [1985] 1997: 136–137; Hamon [1981] 1993: 175; and Molino and Lafhail-Molino 2003: 307.

[31] See e.g. Dällenbach [1977] 1989; Bal [1985] 1997: 57–58; and J.J. White 2001.

[32] See esp. Bartsch 1989; and further e.g. D. Fowler [1991] 2001: 82–85; and Elsner 2002, esp. p. 3.

Mirror-descriptions can offer solace, as here, or anticipate the plot, or shed another light on it.

   A third function of space is the *symbolic* one, when it becomes semantically charged and acquires an additional significance on top of its purely scene-setting function.[33] Notions, often oppositionally arranged, such as inside versus outside, city versus country, high versus low, become negatively or positively loaded, or are associated with cultural or ideological values. In the same way certain spatial features (rivers, hearths, stairs, roads, etc.) may represent certain ideas. Some settings have become literary conventions, e.g. the *locus amoenus*. Examples of the symbolic function of space are legion and I pick out just two:

> That second-floor arch in a London house, looking up and down the wall of the staircase, and commanding the main thoroughfare by which the inhabitants are passing … —that stair, up or down which babies are carried, old people are helped, guests are marshalled to the ball, the parson walks to the christening, the doctor to the sick-room, and the undertaker's men to the upper floor—what a memento of Life, Death, and Vanity it is— that arch and stair—if you choose to consider it, and sit on the landing, looking up and down the wall!   (Thackeray, *Vanity Fair*)

Here the narrator himself more or less explicitly indicates that he is talking about the arch and stair in symbolic terms. In the next passage it is the focalizing character who realises the symbolic value of a place:

> He [Jude] saw what a curious and cunning glamour the neighbourhood of the place [the city of Christminster] had exercised over him. To get there and live there, to move among the churches and halls and become imbued with the *genius loci*, had seemed to his dreaming youth, as the spot shaped its charms to him from its halo on the horizon, the obvious and ideal thing to do … He always remembered the appearance of the afternoon on which he awoke from his dream … From the looming roof of the great library, into which he hardly ever had time to enter, his gaze travelled on to the varied spires, halls, gables, streets, chapels, gardens, quadrangles, which composed the *ensemble* of this unrivalled panorama. He saw that his destiny lay not with these …   (Hardy, *Jude the Obscure*)

The main character Jude realises how he had projected his ambitions and aspirations on the impressive city of Christminster.

---

[33] See H. Meyer [1963] 1975; Lotman [1970] 1972: 311–329; Hillebrand 1971: 9; Hoffmann 1978: 267–444, 629–674; van Baak 1983: 54–78; Bal [1985] 1997: 137–138; Lopes 1995: 9–10.

Fourthly, we may distinguish a *characterizing* function, when space tells us something about a person, his milieu, character, or situation:

> … the house-floor is perfectly clean …; as clean as everything else in that wonderful house-place, where the only chance of collecting a few grains of dust would be to climb on the salt-coffer, and put your finger on the high mantelshelf on which the glittering brass candlesticks are enjoying their summer sinecure …   (Eliot, *Adam Bede*)

This is an entirely positive description which tells us much about the sober, hard-working, and industrious mentality of the inhabitants of this farm, among whom the future wife of the hero of the novel.

Space may also tell us something about a character's feelings and then we are dealing with the *psychologizing* function:[34]

> The bird's-eye perspective before her [Tess leaving her parental home a second time] was not so luxuriantly beautiful, perhaps, as that other one which she knew so well; yet it was more cheering. It lacked the intensely blue atmosphere of the rival vale, and its heavy soils and scants; the new air was clearer, more ethereal, buoyant, bracing … Either the change in the quality of the air from heavy to light, or the sense of being amid new scenes where there were no invidious eyes upon her, sent up her spirits wonderfully. Her hopes mingled with the sunshine in an ideal photosphere which surrounded her as she bounded along against the soft south wind.
> (Hardy, *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*)

The symbolic, characterizing, and psychologizing functions are not always easy to distinguish, and the terms are often used indiscriminately by scholars. Moreover, they may come into play at the same time. As a rule of thumb we may consider symbolic functions to be universal or at least collective, characterizing and psychologizing functions to concern individuals; and the characterizing function to concern permanent traits, while the psychologizing one pertains to the mood of a moment.

A particular form of semantic loading of space is *personification* (or *pathetic fallacy*), the projection of qualities normally associated with human beings upon inanimate objects or nature, and animals:[35]

---

[34] See Friedemann [1910] 1969: 185–186; H. Meyer [1963] 1975: 211, 216–219, 222–229 ('erlebte Raum', 'Erlebnisraum'); Genette 1969: 58–59; Hillebrand 1971: 15; Hoffmann 1978: 55–79 ('gestimmte Raum'), 644–683; Sternberg 1981: 81–88; Bal [1985] 1997: 150–152.

[35] Personification is the broader term of the two, including also the attribution of physical life and movement or bodily appearance to elements of nature or the anthropomorphism of abstract ideas ('Peace'). Pathetic fallacy is the attribution of feeling to inanimate nature.

> The wind grew stronger, *whisked under* stones, carried up straws and old leaves, and even little clods, marking its course as it sailed across the fields. The air and the sky darkened and through them the sun shone redly, and there was a raw sting in the air. During a night the wind raced faster over the land, dug *cunningly* among the rootlets of the corn, and the corn *fought* the wind with its weakened leaves until the roots were freed by the *prying* wind and then each stalk settled *wearily* sideways toward the earth and pointed the direction of the wind.
>
> (Steinbeck, *The Grapes of Wrath*, my italics)

In this example it is the narrator who turns to personification. When focalizing characters do so, the device acquires a psychologizing function and the previous example, from *Tess*, is a case in point. Personification is found throughout Greek literature, from as early as Homer. It remains to be decided in each individual case, however, whether we are dealing with a literary device or a mode of thought, i.e. a manifestation of the ease with which the Greeks anthropomorphise nature.[36] With this *caveat* I have already embarked on the final topic of this introduction, the historical dimension of the presentation and functions of space.

A History of Space in Ancient Greek Literature

Having sketched what can after all be only a working model for the analysis of space in narrative texts, the way is now open to turn to the subject of this volume, space in ancient Greek literature. If in the previous two volumes of the series *Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative* there was the challenge to try and apply modern narratological concepts to ancient texts, in the present volume there is an additional issue at stake. Taking stock of modern theory on space and description I have time and again come across the idea that only recently, i.e. mainly with nineteenth-century realist and naturalist novels and with the *Nouveau Roman*, space has become *en vogue* and novelists have started to explore its full range of possibilities.[37] Here theorists seem to have simply overlooked classical literature, with its long history of ekphrasis, the ubiquity of topoi like the *locus amoenus*, or charged spatial oppositions, e.g. inside versus outside, to mention but a few of the more obvious examples. To fill in these blank pages in the history of space in Western European literature will be one of the aims of this volume.

---

[36] See e.g. Copley 1937; Webster 1954; Hurwit 1982: 193–197; Jenkyns 1998: 21–59.
[37] Cf. Genette 1969: 56; Hillebrand 1971: 21; Ricardou 1978; Hamon [1981] 1993: 26.

Several theorists have stressed that space, perhaps even more than time, is a historical category, i.e. that the way in which space is introduced and functions in a narrative text is intimately bound to genres and periods. Here, finally, the name of Bakhtin must fall, who, as the coiner of the concept of chronotope, cannot be absent from an introduction to space, though the practical value of his idea for the kind of narratological analysis undertaken in this volume is, to my mind, small. The term chronotope was introduced by him as follows: 'We will give the name chronotope (lit. 'time space') to the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature … In the literary artistic chronotope, spatial and temporal indicators are fused into one carefully thought-out concrete whole. Time, as it were, thickens, takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible; likewise, space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot, and history.'[38] In practice, what Bakhtin means (and illustrates in his analysis of some ancient Greek novels), is that different genres or periods may display different ways in which space and time are expressed and are connected. While Bakhtin insists on the close connection between time and space, Hillebrand suggests that narratological time is of a more universal nature than space. Space would 'seismographically' register more of an author's personal intention than time. Finally, Molino and Lafhail-Molino claim that the history of space forms a straight line: 'L'évolution littéraire, …, se caractérise par deux traits: la description va vers une précision croissante, de la structure de liste du *locus amoenus* au paysage organisé et aux précisions quantifiées du Nouveau Roman; par ailleurs la description est de plus en plus intégrée au point de vue d'une acteur-spectateur.'[39] To test the validity of all of these suggestions will be one of the other objects of this volume.

However, the main purpose of this volume is to investigate systematically and in detail the manifold forms and functions that space has in the different genres of ancient Greek literature. Some parts of this large topic have already been researched and the results are included,[40] but the chapters assembled here cover more or less the whole of Greek literature. This scale offers the potential of a comparative perspective, which even when it is not realised to the full, will at least have been reconnoitred.

---

[38] Bakhtin 1981: 84.
[39] Molino and Lafhail-Molino 2003: 301–302.
[40] See e.g. (on space in poetry) Vetta and Catenacci 2006; (on space in the novel) Paschalis-Frangoulidis 2002; (on landscape in poetry) Elliger 1975; (on the representation of nature) Cusset 1999; (on space in epic and historiography) Purves 2010.

PART ONE

EPIC AND ELEGIAC POETRY

HOMER

I.J.F. de Jong

The Place of Space

It is a remarkable paradox that despite the unique position which Troy and Ithaca take up as *lieux de mémoire* within European cultural history the role of space in the Homeric epics—at first sight—is modest.[1] We are not given a plan of Priam's or Odysseus' palace, we have no real perception of the distances in the plain between Troy and the Greek camp or between Odysseus' palace and Eumaeus' farmstead, or of the arrangement of harbour, city, and royal palace on Scheria. Whereas many a novelist will start with a description of the setting, providing his narratees with a background against which they can picture the action, the Homeric narrator—as is the case with his plot and his characters—plunges them *in medias res* and presents a large canvas on which occasionally an item is sketched in (the Scaean gate of Troy, the tomb of Ilus in the Trojan plain, Penelope's upper-room), the result being an 'impressionistic framework'.[2] According to Bowra, such neglect of space is a general characteristic of epic poetry, and it may also be relevant to realise, with Rackham, that 'ancient authors rarely tell us what Greece looked like, for they assumed that their readers would know'.[3]

It is, however, misleading to claim, as Andersson does in his otherwise valuable analysis of Homeric scenery, that scenic items are entered 'more or less at random'. The Homeric narrator inserts—or makes his characters insert—settings or props at the exact moment when the action demands them.[4] Thus we hear about Pandarus' bow when he uses it to wound

---

[1] Bassett 1938: 91; Parry 1957: 7; Andersson 1976: 15–16; Elliger 1975: 26.
[2] Andersson 1976: 17; cf. Elliger 1975: 42; Lesky 1947: 154.
[3] Bowra 1952: 132; Rackham 1990: 85.
[4] Bassett 1938: 92; Bowra 1952: 132–149; Elliger 1975: 56–57; S. Richardson 1990: 50–57; Minchin 2001: 101.

Menelaus and break the truce (*Il.* 4.105–111) and about Calypso's cave when Hermes arrives there (*Od.* 5.59–75). The care with which scenery descriptions are placed may be illustrated from Achilles' barrack (*klisiē*), where the action is located in books 9 (185), 16 (221), and 18–19 (*passim*), but which is only described in detail in book 24 (448–456). Then, the description, which brings about a retardation, marks the importance of the moment, the memorable meeting of Priam and Achilles.[5] It is also relevant to what follows: the detail that only Achilles could move the bar holding the gate (24.453–456) will soon figure in the dialogue between Achilles and Priam, when the Greek hero guesses that a god must have helped the Trojan king enter the camp, since 'no mortal man could easily push back the bar across our gates' (566–567).[6]

The reverse technique, by which an object is introduced *long before* it becomes relevant, by way of a seed, is also observable: Achilles' formidable Pelian spear is described twice (*Il.* 16.141–144 = 19.388–391) before he actually wields (22.133–135) and uses it (326–327); the dirty laundry which Nausicaa sets out to wash (*Od.* 6.26, 58–59, 74, 91) in the end will conveniently provide the naked Odysseus with a clean set of clothes (228) but also trigger the suspenseful intervention of Arete, who recognizes the work of her own hands (7.234–235, 323).[7] The secondary narrator Odysseus in particular is wont to introduce props or locations early on in his story[8] (the strong wine of Maron, 9.196–211, or the narrow harbour of the Laestrygonians, 10.87–90), to underscore his own foresight: bringing along the wine allows him to inebriate Polyphemus and rightly judging the potential danger of the narrow harbour makes him moor his ship at its very beginning and thereby prevents it from being destroyed by the Laestrygonians.

In the *Odyssey* in particular props and settings are an integral part of the action: the descriptions of Ithacan scenery (13.345–351), Odysseus'

---

[5] See *SAGN* 2: 12 and cf. (from a cognitive perspective) Minchin 2001: 102.

[6] Cf. the country garden of Laertes, referred to at *Od.* 1.190; 4.737; and 11.187–194, but only described in full at 24.226–234, at the moment it hosts the reunion between Odysseus and his father; the palace of Alcinous, mentioned at *Od.* 6.299–303; 7.22, 46, fully described at 7.81–134, when Odysseus reaches it; Odysseus' bow, first mentioned by Penelope at 19.577, but described at 21.11–41, when she sets out to fetch it.

[7] After its elaborate description at *Il.* 18.478–608 Achilles' shield is only mentioned in passing (22.290–291). After the long description of the scar at *Od.* 19.392–468, brief references suffice (21.219–220, 221; 23.74; 24.331–335). The heavy doors of Odysseus' *megaron*, described at *Od.* 17.267–268, are used at 21.389–391.

[8] De Jong 2001a: 298.

brooch (19.226–231), his marital bed (23.184–201), and Laertes' garden (24.340–344) function as signs of recognition; Circe's detailed description of the entrance to the Underworld serves as a guide-book to Odysseus, who, of course, has never been there before (*Od.* 10.508–515). Odysseus' palace even plays a major role in the action:[9] the suitors feast in the *megaron* (1.144–155 and *passim*), the same place which witnesses the contest with the bow (21.4) and their deaths (book 22); Penelope spends most of her time in her upper room (1.328–329 and *passim*), so as to avoid as much as possible any contact with the suitors; Telemachus retires after his first public performance to his 'sheltered' bedroom (1.425–426); Telemachus and Penelope descend to carefully locked and guarded store-rooms (2.337–347; 21.8–56); 'the beggar'/Odysseus humbly positions himself on the threshold of the *megaron* but also shoots his first arrows from that strategic position (17.339–341; 22.1–4); accomplices of Odysseus close the doors of the *megaron* and courtyard, when the massacre of the suitors is about to begin (21.387–391); and after their reunion Odysseus and Penelope retire to the bedroom built by Odysseus himself (23.295–296). The narrator even uses the palace to create tension, when all of a sudden at the height of the battle between Odysseus and the suitors there appears to be a little side-door in the *megaron*, which, for a brief moment, threatens to offer the suitors a means to get out and fetch help (22.126–128). The references to carpenters fashioning door-posts or chairs (17.340–341; 19.56–58) or wine-jars 'hoping for the return of Odysseus' (2.342–343) 'embody' Odysseus' palace. The hero's nostalgia, which motivates his actions during the ten years of wanderings, is in the first place a longing for persons (1.13; 9.34–36), but his palace (7.225) and Ithaca (1.57–59; 9.27–28) follow closely.

Though lacking the detail spent on Odysseus' palace, it could be argued that the city of Troy also acquires considerable substance in the *Iliad*, this time mainly through the repeated use of epithets:[10] it shares with other cities epithets like 'set on a steep', 'windy', 'with broad streets', 'high-gated' and is individually characterized as 'well-built', 'well-walled', 'with good fortifications', and 'set on the brow of a hill'. Again, there is a connection with the action: Troy is not always endowed with an epithet; when we find one, it is voiced mainly by the Greeks, who talk about

---

[9] See Kullmann 1992: 305–316.
[10] See Trachsel 2007: 12–24, 27–32; for the epithets Bowra 1960; Scully 1990: 69–80; and Visser 1997: 83–94.

their desire to take—or frustration about not taking—this strategically situated, strongly fortified city, and by the narrator in the second half of the *Iliad*, who underscores the pathos of the destruction of this seemingly invincible object being imminent after all.[11]

Up to now my discussion has been concerned with space as setting. But the Homeric epics also make use of a very characteristic form of *frame*: the world of the similes.[12] While the Iliadic battlefield, the Trojan plain, is surprisingly empty and devoid of nature (we do not hear about bushes to hide in or stones to stumble over), nature comes in in the form of similes featuring wild torrents, immovable rocks, rolling waves, and sparkling stars. Thus, the noise of armies clashing together and men being killed is compared to the situation 'when two winter-swollen streams coursing down from the mountains hurl together the mass of their waters where the valleys meet, joining in the gash of a ravine from the great well-heads above, and a shepherd hears their thunder from far in the mountains' (*Il.* 4.452–456).[13] It is passages like these that made Voltaire and Goethe admire Homer as a painter of nature,[14] but it should be realised, with Bouvier,[15] that nature only enters the story when the force or glitter of warriors needs to be illustrated. The eyes of the heroes themselves are fixed on their opponents, not on the sky or hills or trees.

The 'other world' status of similes is often carefully exploited, in that their scenery (and activities) contrasts with that of the story, e.g. when Odysseus desperately clinging to a fig-tree and waiting for Charybdis to disgorge the mast and keel of his ship compares the moment the monster finally does so with the time 'when a man rises from his seat in the market-place and returns home for supper, having settled many disputes from young men seeking justice' (*Od.* 12.439–441). 'There could hardly be a greater contrast between Odysseus' lonely and desperate situation … and the civilized and social activities of the man in the simile, which in normal circumstances would be those of Odysseus. Is this how Odysseus managed to survive his ordeal, thinking of his ordinary life in the past (and, as he hopes, the future)?'[16] Or when Penelope in her

---

[11] Scully 1990: 78.
[12] For the space of similes, see Lesky 1947: 165–175; Elliger 1975: 73–87.
[13] Translations are those of M. Hammond (*Iliad*: Penguin 1987, *Odyssey*: Duckworth 2000), with minor changes.
[14] Cf. Andersson 1976: 28.
[15] Bouvier 1986: 241–246.
[16] De Jong 2001a: ad 12.438–441.

palace on Ithaca is compared to a shipwrecked sailor on a beach, a role normally played by Odysseus (*Od.* 23.233–239), the reversal suggests that in her way she has undergone as many dangers and suffered as much as Odysseus. But the difference between the worlds of simile and story need not always take the form of a contrast. Many similes transport us to the world of animals, which are, however, engaged in the same kind of deadly encounter as the warriors on the battlefield, e.g. when Agamemnon pursuing the Trojans through the plain is compared to a lion pursuing herds of cows across a plain (*Il.* 11.172–177).[17]

Upon closer inspection space turns out to be everywhere in the Homeric epics, mainly in the form of small details carefully inserted whenever the action needs them. The question who presents these scenic details now deserves closer attention.

The Presentation of Space 1:
By Whom and from What Standpoint?

A first and vital presenter of space is of course the Homeric (primary) *narrator-focalizer*, who in doing so may adopt various standpoints. He may opt for a *panoramic* standpoint, as at *Il.* 11.166–171, where he describes how Agamemnon pursues the Trojans across the Trojan plain, past the tomb of Ilus, past the fig-tree, until they reach the Scaean gate and the oak-tree.[18] Usually these landmarks of the Trojan plain are mentioned individually, and their rare combination here in one majestic view both conveys a sense of the speed with which the Trojans run for their lives and adds to the glory of the one who makes them run, the 'lion' Agamemnon.

Conversely, the narrator may also present a *close-up*, as in the case of Andromache's headdress, which is elaborately described at the moment she throws it off, swooning at the sight of Hector being dragged by Achilles across the plain (*Il.* 22.468–472).[19] The mass of descriptive detail

---

[17] See e.g. Giesecke 2007: 49–51, who notes that in general the Homeric outlook on nature is that of a hostile world which needs to be controlled and tamed.

[18] Other examples: *Il.* 2.459–468 (a synoptic view of the Scamandrian plain, with Greek warriors strewn over it like flowers); *Od.* 13.81–92 (the narrator looks at the Phaeacian ship speeding over the sea to bring back Odysseus to Ithaca).

[19] Other examples: *Il.* 4.105–111 (bow of Pandarus); 10.261–270 (helmet of Meriones); 11.632–637 (cup of Nestor); *Od.* 4.125–132 (work-basket of Helen); 21.6–7 (key to Odysseus' storeroom).

creates a retardation, thus marking this emotionally charged moment. The sense of order and domestic harmony evoked by this elaborate headdress, which consists of no less than three different hair-nets and veils, also symbolises the kind of life Andromache will lose now that Hector is dead.

Finally, and most commonly, the narrator may position himself *at the scene* and insert evocative details (e.g. the exhausted Trojans leaning against 'the beautiful battlements' of the Trojan wall, *Il.* 22.3) or give a fuller picture, as when he describes the harbour of Phorcys, following the pace of—quasi positioning himself on—the Phaeacian ship that enters it (*Od.* 13.96–112). Such descriptions by the narrator are typically in the present tense and are often introduced by *esti*, 'there is a place X', a stylistic feature that would become commonplace in later literature ('There lies a vale in Ida … Thither came …': Tennyson *Oenone*).

Instead of focalizing himself, the narrator also may make use of a *character* to introduce a setting, especially in the *Odyssey*.[20] Whereas in the *Iliad* the palaces of Priam, Paris, and the barrack of Achilles are described by the narrator, in the *Odyssey* the palaces of Menelaus, Alcinous, and the cave of Calypso are all focalized by characters, one indication of which is the use of the imperfect tense.[21] A particularly fine example is the long description of Goat-Island (*Od.* 9.116–141) as focalized by Odysseus: both the many negations (hunters do *not* visit the island, *no* flocks or ploughed fields occupy the island, the harbour is such that ships need *no* moorings) and the positive assessments (it has soft water-meadows bordering the shore of the sea, where vines could flourish; it has level land for ploughing, which would yield thick crops; at the head of the harbour there is a spring of bright water) clearly reveal the eye and mentality of its beholder. As a civilised Greek Odysseus is both enthusiastic about the potential of this island and surprised by the fact that no one has as yet exploited it.[22]

At times we even find a highly refined technique of *zooming in* on a place via the focalization of a character. In *Odyssey* book 5 the narrator follows the perception of Odysseus as he slowly approaches Scheria: at 279–281 the mountains of the island, which to Odysseus resembles a shield, become visible; at 358–359 he sighs that the island is still 'far off';

---

[20] Elliger 1975: 147–148, 153.
[21] See de Jong 2001a: ad 5.63–75.
[22] See Elliger 1975: 141–142 and Davies 1987. Other examples: *Od.* 11.568–600 (the interior of the Underworld) and 9.218–223 (the interior of the Cyclops' cave).

at 392, lifted up by a wave, he views it 'nearby'; at 398 he is able to see the woods; at 400–405 and 411–414 he hears the breakers and gets a good look at the steep coast; and at 441–443 he finally spots a place to go ashore, the mouth of a river, bare of rocks and out of the wind.[23]

But even in the *Iliad* we occasionally find focalized space, e.g. when Zeus, taking up a panoramic standpoint on Mt Ida, 'looked far out over the land of the horse-herding Thracians, and the Mysians, fighters at close quarters, and the proud Hippemolgi who live on mares' milk, and the Abii, most civilised of all men' (13.3–6), or a focalized object, when Achilles, in his hands the deadly Pelian spear, 'looks over Hector's fine body, where it would be most exposed. All the rest of his body was covered by his bronze armour … but flesh showed where the collar-bones separate the neck from the shoulders, at the gullet, where a man's life is most quickly destroyed' (22.321–325).

It is not uncommon for the narrator to intrude upon the focalization of his characters and add details which they cannot see from their position or which they simply cannot know. A well-known example is the description of Alcinous' palace (*Od.* 7.81–134), which is clearly focalized by Odysseus, who stands on the threshold and gazes in admiration (7.83, 133–134). Yet, from 95 onwards we are given a description (in the present tense) of the interior of the palace, including the customs, tasks, and qualities of the inhabitants, and from 112 onwards a description of the garden in all seasons.[24]

Characters may not merely focalize a place or object but *describe* it to another character in a speech, never for its own sake but always in order to make a point: when Achilles describes to the Greeks the sceptre that he holds, which will never sprout again after the bronze axe stripped it of its leaves and bark (*Il.* 1.234–239), he underscores the irrevocability of his decision to withdraw from battle; when he describes a 'sword with silver-nailed hilt, a beautiful piece of Thracian work' (*Il.* 23.807–808), he makes clear how valuable a prize he sets out to honour his dead friend Patroclus.[25]

---

[23] De Jong 2001a: ad 5.279–493; and cf. Andersson 1976: 38–39. Another example: 9.166–167 + 181–186 + 216–223 (the Cyclops' cave).

[24] See also the description of Eumaeus' farmstead (*Od.* 14.5–22), which is focalized by Odysseus (5), with the narrator intruding at 7–9 and 17–19.

[25] Other examples: e.g. *Il.* 18.83–85 (Achilles describes his own armour to Thetis); 21.446–447 (Poseidon describes to Apollo the wall that he once built with him); 23.560–

A final form of presentation has been noted and admired since Lessing's *Laokoon* (chapter 16): it consists in the narrator describing an object *while it is being created* (or assembled or put on) by a character: Odysseus, 'like a man well skilled in ship-building', builds his raft, felling trees, trimming and smoothing them, boring through the timbers and fastening them together with treenails and joints, making hull, deck, mast, steering-oar, and sails (*Od.* 5.243–261). This way of describing Odysseus' raft while it is being made has the advantage of building up suspense (the narratees already know that the raft so carefully put together here will be shipwrecked, 5.33–34) and endows it with a characterizing function (it marks Odysseus as a man of culture: cf. 9.391–394, where he is compared to a smith, and 23.184–201, where we hear about him making his own bed and bedroom).[26]

The example *par excellence* of 'description by action' is of course Achilles' new armour, especially his shield, which is created 'before our eyes' by Hephaestus. The situation here is in fact slightly more complicated than in the other instances. We do indeed hear of Hephaestus making 'many ornaments' (eight scenes) on the shield. However, these scenes are presented in such a way that the *description* of Hephaestus' work of art subtly blends with *narration* on the part of the narrator himself. A clear example is the scene of the ambush (18.513–529): men defending their city have decided to go out and ambush their opponents. They are led by Ares and Athena, 'both made of gold' and 'dressed in golden clothing', and 'standing out as gods will, clear above the rest' (*description*). When they reach a river, they take up their position, 'covered in shining bronze' (*description* or *narration*). Then two scouts are posted at some distance, to wait for the herds. 'Soon' they appear, and with them two herdsmen playing on their pipes, 'with no thought for danger' (*narration*). The ambushers see them coming and rush out towards them, and then 'quickly' surround the herds (*narration*). The effect of the mingling of description and narration is that the Homeric narrator and the divine

---

562 (Achilles describes the corselet he is offering as a prize); *Od.* 3.293–296 (Nestor describes part of Crete); 4.72–75 (Telemachus describes the palace of Menelaus); 4.615–619 = 15.113–119 (Menelaus describes the mixing bowl that he offers Telemachus); 19.226–235 (Odysseus describes to Penelope the brooch and chiton of Odysseus).

[26] Other examples: e.g. *Il.* 5.722–731 (Hebe asssembles a divine chariot); 24.266–274 (sons of Priam assemble his chariot); *Il.* 3.330–338 (Paris puts on his armour); 11.16–45 (Agamemnon puts on his armour); *Od.* 23.184–202 (Odysseus narrates how he built his bed).

artisan Hephaestus *together* create this work of art, the one making a shield, the other an ekphrasis.[27]

Of course, the various forms of description may also be combined, as happens in the piecemeal description of the ditch around the Greek camp, a technique also found e.g. in (→) Herodotus. At the time it is made, we hear relatively little: 'they dug a deep ditch, large and wide, and fixed stakes in it' (7.440–441). Its appearance becomes more concrete when focalized by the horses (!) of the Trojans, who stop at its edge: 'they were frightened by the breadth of the ditch, not easy to jump right over or to cross through. For along the whole length there were overhanging edges on both sides, and on top they were fitted with sharp stakes, which the sons of the Achaeans had fixed there long and close set, as a defence against their enemies' (12.50–57). One of the generals, Polydamas, finally describes it to his men in full, military detail: 'It is folly for us to drive our fast horses across the ditch. It is very hard to cross. For there are sharp stakes set on its edge, and the Greeks' wall is close beyond them. There is no room there for horsemen to dismount and fight; it is a narrow space, where I think we will suffer losses' (12.62–66).

Having established where space is introduced and by whom, it is time to take a closer look at the manifestation of space itself: what form does it take, which senses are being appealed to?

The Presentation of Space 2: What Is Described?

This section, again, starts with a paradox: Homer, celebrated for the vividness of his narrative style, i.e. his making the past present and drawing his narratees mentally into the action,[28] is at the same time a narrator who, as was already noted by Lessing (chapter 21), is hardly interested in informing us in detail about the outward appearance of objects and places (and persons).[29] According to what Andersson has aptly called 'the principle of the single property', one feature by way of a *pars pro toto* has to serve for many: mention of the golden floor and golden cups serves to evoke a picture of Zeus' splendid palace on the Olympus (*Il.* 4.1–4). Also, the narrator is keenly interested in the *working*

---

[27] See de Jong 2011 with ample secondary literature of which A.S. Becker 1995 is most important.

[28] See e.g. Ford 1992: 49–56.

[29] Elliger 1975: 52; Andersson 1976: 25; Minchin 2001: 106.

of an object or place: Athena's spear is sharp-edged with pointed bronze, but above all the instrument 'with which she brings low the ranks of men' (*Od.* 1.99–101); Odysseus' palace, has 'stout, double doors, which no man could force his way through' (*Od.* 17.267–268); Ithaca is a 'rough land but a good place for bringing up children' (*Od.* 9.27).[30]

When the narrator appeals to our *visual* senses, he hardly refers to colours:[31] what colour the robe has that Hecuba offers to Athena, the wedding gown that Helen gives to Telemachus, or the tunic that Penelope gave to Odysseus we never get to know; all we hear is that these clothes are 'shining'. Similarly, the long descriptions of the residences of Calypso, Alcinous, Eumaeus, all do without a single colour. When colours are used at all, it is mainly 'black', for blood, waves, the earth, a shield, wine, and water, and 'white', for snow, female skin, a veil, and water. Scenic colour combinations which for us are a cliché, such as a blue sky, a green wood, or a yellow cornfield, are entirely absent from the Homeric epics, which instead focus on glitter and shine.

This striking indifference to colour was at one time explained in terms of (collective) colour-blindness on the part of the early Greeks, an explanation flatly contradicted by the abundance of colour in Greek art, starting with the Minoan/Mycenaean frescoes. A better explanation might be that the epic genre is less interested in realistic colours than in ideological glitter, which better expresses its heroes' martial valour.

Turning from the visual to the *acoustic* we may note that the Homeric epics at times include sounds in their evocation of scenery,[32] e.g. when the Trojans, relentlessly pursued by Achilles, were 'crowded into the deep silvery swirls of the river, and fell into the water with a great crash, and the rushing stream resounded and the banks echoed loud all round. The shouting men swam in many directions, spun about in the eddies' (*Il.* 21.8–11); when Penelope opens the doors of the storeroom containing Odysseus' bow, and they 'bellowed like a bull at pasture in a meadow; so loud was the noise of the fine doors when struck with the key' (*Od.* 21.48–50); or when Odysseus has strung his bow and 'plucked the string to try it. And it sang sweetly to his touch, a note like a swallow's' (*Od.* 21.410–411).

---

[30] Homer is interested in *energeia* (Aristotle's term) rather than *enargeia* (the term of Hellenistic literary criticism), though the latter word is often used in connection with him (already by Plato); see Otto 2010: 71–76.

[31] See Elliger 1975: 96–102; Irwin 1974: 3–30.

[32] See Wille 2001: 19–124.

At times even the *olfactory* sense of the narratees is mentally activated, when odours or scents are mentioned as part of the description of places and objects: altars smell of incense (e.g. *Il.* 23.148) and storerooms or clothing are fragrant (*Il.* 3.382; *Od.* 4.121).

The description of Calypso's island and cave (*Od.* 5.59–75) may well serve to conclude this section, in that here we find an appeal to all the senses: there is the *sight* of the large cave, the many trees, springs, meadows, and birds, the *scent* of cedar logs and citron-wood burning, the *sound* of the nymph's lovely voice singing, and finally the *touch* of the soft meadows that surround her habitat.

The Presentation of Space 3: The Structure of Descriptions

Long descriptions, such as those of Goat-Island (*Od.* 9.116–150), Calypso's cave (*Od.* 5.59–75) or Alcinous' palace (*Od.* 7. 81–134), may be structured in the form of a *list* (*on it* [Goat-Island] wild goats breed … *on it* are soft meadows … *on it* is level land for ploughing … *on it* is a harbour), *spatially* (*round* Calypso's cave there grew trees … *in parallel lines* ran four springs … *at both sides* grew soft meadows),[33] or as a combination (*on both sides* of Alcinous' palace walls of bronze were built … *on either side of* the door were dogs of gold and silver … *inside* there were chairs fixed along the walls … *outside* is a great garden, *there* tall fruit-trees grow … *there* a vineyard was planted … *there* neat vegetable-plots grow …).[34] Different structures have different effects: Odysseus' list-like description of Goat-Island 'organises this empty landscape into a progression of four regions in terms of their utility to man: the wilderness suited to hunting, grazing land, farm land …, and the site for a city with a spring and a good harbour'; the spatial description of Alcinous' palace gives the narratees a virtual tour of the palace, taking them 'across the threshold, into the great hall, past the fifty serving women at their tasks, out into the orchard, the vineyard, and the vegetable garden, and finally to the springs which supply the house and the town'.[35]

---

[33] Another example, on a smaller scale, is the description of the palace of Priam (*Il.* 6.242–250).

[34] Another example of a combination is the description of the harbour of Phorcys (*Od.* 13.96–112).

[35] A.T. Edwards 1993: 28; Minchin 2001: 117–118.

Shorter descriptions of objects or places[36] may also take the form of a list: e.g. Patroclus' spear is 'long-shadowed, huge, heavy, massive, and tipped with bronze' (*Il.* 16.801–802). The description typically is inserted at the moment this spear is actually shattered by Apollo, the retardation marking the moment of Patroclus' demise. Another example is found at the moment Hephaestus turns against the river Scamander, which threatens to drown Achilles, and burns 'the elms, willows, tamarisks, clover, rushes, and galingale that grew in abundance around the lovely stream of the river' (*Il.* 21.350–352). Only now do we get this close-up of the banks of the river, of which we had heard earlier that it was 'rich in flowers' (2.467–468).[37]

But much more often than being a mere list a Homeric description consists of a combination of different elements: (1) a summary description ('beautiful', 'shining'), (2) indications of material, workmanship, size, value, or a special feature, and (3) the history of the object. A typical example is the bow of Pandarus (*Il.* 4.105–111), which is well-polished (*summary description*), made of horn from a leaping goat (*material*) that he himself once had shot (*history*). The horns were sixteen palms long (*size*). These an artisan, polisher of horn, had fitted into a bow, smoothed to a fine polish (*workmanship*), and capped with a golden tip (*material and value*).

The history of the object usually concerns a remote or not-plot related past (as in the case of the bow of Pandarus),[38] but it may also, quite effectively, refer to the more recent past, e.g. when we hear that the clothes from which Hecuba chooses a robe for Athena 'had been brought from Sidon by godlike Alexander himself, as he sailed over the breadth of the sea on that same voyage when he brought Helen to Troy' (*Il.* 6.290–292).[39] Surely the most arresting example of this type is the internal analepsis found when Achilles, about to kill Hector and take his revenge for

---

[36] See Andersson 1976: 35–36; Minchin 2001:100–131; Grethlein 2008.

[37] Other examples: the rivers of the Trojan plain listed at the moment they collectively destroy the wall around the Greek camp (*Il.* 12.20–23); the countries visited by Menelaus on his way home (*Od.* 4.83–85).

[38] See *SAGN* 2: 21–22.

[39] Other examples: e.g. *Il.* 9.188 (the lyre that Achilles took when sacking Thebes); 11.20–23 (the corselet that Agamemnon got from the Cyprian Kinyres when he set out for Troy); 15.705–706 (the ship of Protesilaus, which brought him to Troy but not back home again); 16.222–224 (the chest of Achilles, which Thetis had given him when he set out for Troy); 23.560 (the thorax which Achilles took from Asteropaeus); *Od.* 9.197–207 (Maron's wine, which he gave Odysseus on the occasion of his sack of Ismarus).

Patroclus, scans his opponent's armour, 'which he [Hector] had stripped from mighty Patroclus when he killed him' (*Il.* 22.323). But the object's history may also take the form of an external *pro*lepsis, e.g. when Helen gives Telemachus a robe, which 'should make him remember her and is to be worn by his wife at the time of their marriage' (*Od.* 15.125–128).[40]

This typical element of the 'genetic description', or the 'biography of things' has rightly attracted the attention of scholars. It may be due to the orality of the epics, since narration is cognitively easier than description,[41] but above all it is to be connected with the commemorative function of these texts: material goods are an important sign of status and something to be remembered by, and thus for the narrator to commemorate his heroes means including the often impressive histories of the objects they possess. Thus, it reflects positively on Odysseus to have a bow which once belonged to a mythical archer like Eurytus (*Od.* 21.32). Some objects have travelled not only through time but also through space, as is the case with Meriones' boar-tusk helmet, which, repeatedly changing owner, moved from Eleon to Cythera, to Crete and, finally, to Troy (*Il.* 10.266–271).[42]

Whatever the form of their description, space and objects without exception are inserted in order to fulfil various narrative functions.

Functions

The function of space to *set the scene* for actions to come has already amply passed review. Very often the primary scene-setting function of space or props is accompanied by one or more secondary functions.

Highly important in the Homeric epics is the *symbolic* function of space.[43] The oak-tree standing near the Scaean gate means safety for the Trojans and their allies: the wounded Sarpedon is carried there (*Il.* 5.693) and Achilles notes that when he was still active Hector did not move beyond this point (9.354). The tomb of Ilus in the Trojan plain stands

---

[40] Other examples: *Od.* 4.591–592; 8.430–432; 24.83–84.

[41] Minchin 2001: 116 ('narrative is … easier to call to mind and to perform because of its logical chain of cause and effect').

[42] Archaeology has shown that in historical reality, too, objects, exchanged as guest-gifts, travelled over long distances and accumulated 'biographies' or 'genealogies', sometimes made explicit in the form of inscriptions; see Crielaard 2002: 249–256.

[43] See Elliger 1975: 57–62; Griffin 1980: 1–49; Thornton 1984: 150–163.

for the royal family: it being surrounded by dust and blood when his descendants are chased and massacred by Agamemnon points up the dire straits Troy is in (11.166–169) and Paris leaning against it when shooting an arrow against Diomedes but barely wounding him reveals that he does not really live up to his family's heroic standard (11.369–372).[44] When Andromache throws off the elaborate headdress that she got from golden Aphrodite on the day of her marriage, this signals the loss of her happiness and safety now that her husband Hector has died (*Il.* 22.468–472). Odysseus aptly uses an object associated with guest-friendship, the bow that Iphitus gave him just before he was killed by his host Heracles (*Od.* 21.11–41), to kill the suitors, who, like Heracles, offend against the laws of hospitality.

The symbolism of an object may also be problematised, as happens famously when Agamemnon, about to announce the plan to attack that he has conceived on the basis of a false dream sent by Zeus, is said to lean on a sceptre with an impressive genealogy, reaching back to Zeus (*Il.* 2.100–109). There is clearly irony here, but what seems to be at issue as well is 'the difficulty of getting things right in a crisis for even the greatest of men. Even kings, who can expect backing from Zeus, are going to be victims of Zeus' deception if Zeus has so willed it … The point might be that no one could wield the 'imperishable *skēptron*' like Zeus.'[45]

Other manifestations of space have a symbolic function that transcends the individual text in which they occur and that is, if not universal, at least widespread. We may think here of the association 'left = bad' and 'right = good', which comes to the fore explicitly e.g. at *Il.* 12.200–227, when Polydamas interprets the flight of a bird from the right to the left of the army as a bad omen;[46] the *locus amoenus* (represented by Calypso's habitat and Antinous' garden, which combine trees, water, breeze);[47] and mountains as typical places of danger, where uncivilized persons (the Cyclopes, *Od.* 9.113) or wild animals (e.g. lions: *Il.* 5.554; jackals: 11.474; wolves: 16.158) live or vehement natural forces rage (e.g. *Il.* 4.452–455).

---

[44] Other examples: the Scamander-Xanthus (place of safety); the Scaean gate (the liminal space between the city and the plain); Achilles' new shield (the life which Achilles stands to lose); Odysseus' immovable bed (the solidity of his marriage); the olive, which symbolises culture (Odysseus meets with Athena under an olive tree, blinds the Cyclops with an olive stake, builds his marital bed from an olive tree).

[45] Easterling 1989: 111. For the ironic interpretation, see Griffin 1980: 10.

[46] For more examples, see Cuillandre 1944: 343–346.

[47] Schönbeck 1962: 61–77.

The interesting thing here is that, again, the typical nature of such *loci* is often destabilised when it become clear that for one character it has a different value. Thus Hermes may consider Calypso's habitat a *locus amoenus*, witness his admiration (5.75–76), but Odysseus is less appreciative: sitting on the beach he literally turns his back on it and longs for home. The sea is first and foremost a danger, as Odysseus (*Od.* 5.291–381) and sailors in similes experience (e.g. *Il.* 15.624–628), and, in the absence of ships, a barrier between one's present location and home (*Od.* 4.558–650). However, it is also a means to get to know other people (*Od.* 9.127–129), to accumulate goods (*Od.* 1.183–184), or to escape from war (*Il.* 1.140–154).[48] The city as the centre of legal, political, economic and religious power is generally considered superior to the countryside (fields, grazing lands, and wilderness), but in the second half of the *Odyssey* this hierarchy is turned upside down, when the city becomes vulgar and base, and the countryside noble.[49]

Extended descriptions may *mirror*—parts of—the plot, in a way comparable to embedded narratives.[50] The scenes of the two cities on Achilles' shield, including a teichoscopia, a debate over a peaceful settlement, a fight over dead bodies, and a dispute on whether to accept a price for a slain man (*Il.* 18.490–540), recall the *Iliad* itself.[51] The scene depicted on Odysseus' brooch, 'a hound holding a dappled fawn in its forepaws, gripping it while it struggled … the dog was throttling the fawn in its grip and the fawn was scrabbling with its legs in the effort to escape' (*Od.* 19.228–231), anticipates the story: the dog stands for Odysseus, the fawn for the suitors, and the scene for his revenge on them.

Subtle and at the same effective is Homer's use of space to *characterize* people: when Hector finds Paris 'in his bedroom' sitting amongst the women and fussing over his armour (*Il.* 6.321–324), this is just as revealing of this hero as his 'wearing a leopard skin' when challenging the Greeks on the battlefield (3.17).[52] Likewise, the typical element of the workmanship in descriptions may contain characterizing information:

---

[48] See Lesky 1947: 149–197; Clare 2000.
[49] See A.T. Edwards 1993. For the views on city and nature in Homer, see also Giesecke 2007: 11–51.
[50] For embedded narratives in Homer, see *SAGN* 2: 22–24.
[51] See Andersen 1976, esp. 7 ('The Shield is … a kind of mirror for the *Iliad*').
[52] Cf. Nastes, who went to war wearing gold (*Il.* 2.872–873) but is killed by Achilles; Euphorbus, who has his love-locks plaited in silver and gold (17.52) but is killed by Menelaus; and see Griffin 1980: 1–49.

Hephaestus, of course, has built his house himself (*Il.* 18.371), as has the loyal and industrious Eumaeus (*Od.* 14.7–8), while the barrack of Achilles is built 'for their master' by the Myrmidonians (*Il.* 24.449–450). When Patroclus does *not* take Achilles' heavy Pelian spear, which only the latter can wield (*Il.* 16.140–144), this immediately signals that in the end he will prove no real stand-in for Achilles.

There seems to be only one sure example of the *psychologizing* function of space: the coast bordering on the loud-thundering, endless, or dark sea signals feelings of isolation or despondency, e.g. of Chryses (*Il.* 1.34), Achilles (*Il.* 1.348–350; 23.59–60; 24.12), or Odysseus (*Od.* 5.82–84). What happens much more often in Homer is that emotions are *compared to* natural phenomena in similes, e.g. when the panic of the Greeks is like two winds that come suddenly 'and whip the fish-filled sea, the north wind and the west wind, blowing down from Thrace: the mass of the dark swell rears into crests, and piles the seaweed thick along the shore' (*Il.* 9.1–8).

The phenomenon of *personification*, finally, is found throughout: ships 'revel in a fair wind from Zeus' (*Od.* 5.175–176); a spear 'is eager to sate itself with man's flesh' (*Il.* 21.168); when Poseidon drives with his chariot over the sea, the sea 'divides a path for him in joyfulness' (*Il.* 13.27–29); and the river Scamander has human emotions and speaks in the shape of a man (*Il.* 21.212–382). It seems best to regard these passages as expressions of religious feeling and animistic thinking, rather than as instances of a literary device.[53]

Homeric Space and Reality

Although strictly speaking a discussion of the extratextual existence of the space in a narrative text falls outside the boundaries of a narratological analysis, some words may be said on this subject, since it is such a much discussed one in Homer. The first question is the space of the narrator Homer and his narratees. Most scholars agree that this is Ionia, on the basis of the predominance of Ionian elements in his language. Then there is the question of the world described in his works: is it largely Mycenaean (1600–1200 BC), 'dark age' (1200–900 BC), eighth- or early seventh-century, or an amalgam? This is too large and complex a topic

---

[53] Discussion in Copley 1937: 195–200; Lesky 1947: 185–187; Elliger 1975: 64–69; Hurwitt 1982; and Jenkyns 1998: 21–59.

to even summarise here.[54] What is relevant, however, is that most localities mentioned in the main stories of *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are really existing ones (Ithaca, Pylos, Mycenae, and, most would now agree, Troy), even though quite a few of these cities had lost their grandeur and importance in the time of the narrator and narratees (which, though specified nowhere, is later than the time of the story).[55] The Catalogue of Ships in *Iliad* 2 serves amongst other things to present the narratees with a long list of towns and regions familiar to or even inhabited by them, thus establishing a close relationship between the world of the story and their own world.[56]

The phenomenon of the decor of the story occasionally having vanished by the time of the narrator is on one occasion illustrated very graphically: at *Il.* 12.13–33 the narrator reveals how after the fall of Troy Poseidon and Apollo will run the rivers of Troy against the wall that the Greeks built around their ships. When they are done, the wall will have been carried away into the sea, the deep shore will be covered once more with sand, and all signs of human activity, the ox-hide shields, the helmets, and the race of heroes will have disappeared. This memorable passage conveys more than one message: it may be, as Aristotle suggested, that the narrator wanted to explain why in his time the Greek wall, which probably was no more than a figment of his imagination, was no longer to be seen. It also rehearses the typically Homeric theme of human efforts being dwarfed by the power of the eternal gods. But above all it implies that only poetry can keep alive the memory of the past: who would know about Troy and the Trojan war if not for Homer and his epics?

Although Pylos or Mycenae refer to localities with a historical reality, this does not mean that *all the details* which the narrator mentions are equally historical. As we saw earlier, he inserts details when the action needs them and this already makes a certain degree of invention likely. Moreover, a tendency towards aggrandizement is typical of the epic genre, which sets out to commemorate the glorious past. There are also settings that do *not* correspond to historical places at all: Scheria and Ogygia in the main story, and all the stations of Odysseus' travels as recounted by himself, except for the first, the Ciconians in Thrace. Scholars, starting with the Alexandrian Eratosthenes in the second century

---

[54] For an overview, see e.g. Osborne 2004.
[55] See *SAGN* 1: 13.
[56] See Visser 1997: 16–48.

BC, have disputed the reality of Odysseus' travels, who, in their view, seems to have been blown off the map and into the world of fable.[57] Some have even suggested that it is not so much the Homeric narrator who is fabulising but Odysseus himself, wishing to impress his Phaeacian audience with another of his lying tales. This last position is firmly contradicted by that fact that the primary narrator at several places backs up the story of his hero (Thrinacia, 1.6–9; the Cyclops, 1.7–20; Circe, 8.448) and nowhere calls it a lying tale.[58] Homer seems to authenticate his own poem by making Odysseus label some of the places that he visits *klutos*, 'famous' (10.60, 87, 112). But perhaps more important than the reality of Odysseus' travel story is the way in which it can be read as a specimen of poetic anthropology or ethnographic imagination, an exploration of new worlds and cultural identities.[59]

Conclusion

This chapter has shown that indications of space are sprinkled over the Homeric epics with a sure hand whenever the action needs them, and that they are sometimes carefully introduced at an earlier stage. Usually taking the form of small details, sometimes of synoptic descriptions, space creates settings, prepares for action to come, has a symbolic function, mirrors the plot, characterizes people, and signals moods. The similes open windows to other worlds, where nature is much more present, though hardly as an idyllic decor but more as the stage of violent action between beast and beast, or between man and nature. The close connection between space and action is also brought about by locations being focalized or described in speech by characters.

All in all, the qualification 'latent space' given by Andersson to Homeric space, in contrast to the 'visible space' of Virgil, does not do justice to the ubiquity of scenic details, which always have a function and meaning to the eyes of man, be it the narrator or his characters. The close integration of space and action in Homer also disproves the widespread idea that until the nineteenth century description merely had an ornamental function.

---

[57] For an overview of the different hypotheses and reconstructions, see Wikipedia s.v. 'Geography of the Odyssey'.

[58] See S. Richardson 1996.

[59] See Hartog [1996] 2001 (esp. 24–36); Dougherty 2001.

THE HOMERIC HYMNS

I.J.F. de Jong

Introduction. Space as Theme

There is hardly a genre in Greek literature in which space is more important than that of the Homeric hymns. Hymns—and I concentrate here largely on the four larger ones with their long narrative sections—recount the *timai*, i.e. prerogatives and powers, of the gods they praise, and in such a context cult places and cult objects are naturally of prime importance. Gods also travel a great deal in the hymns. Whereas in the Homeric epics their movements are always closely related to the action of the mortal characters, in the hymns they voyage for their own sake and with their own goals in mind. Then, there is the much-debated question whether the cult places mentioned in the text can tell us something about the place of the performance of the hymns themselves. Finally, hymnic space may have a symbolic function or acquire anthropomorphic traits (personification).

Cult Sites, Favourite Haunts, and Cult Objects

By and large the location of the gods in the hymns is the same as in the Homeric epics. In the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* they live as an extended family on Olympus, where they gather in the palace of Zeus but also have their own palaces (e.g. *Il.* 1.533–536, 606–608). At the same time, they have their individual places of worship throughout the Greek world, which mortals refer to (e.g. Zeus of Dodona, *Il.* 16.233; or Apollo of Delos, *Od.* 6.162) or which the gods visit in the course of the story (e.g. Athena goes to Marathon at *Od.* 7.80; Aphrodite to Paphos at *Od.* 8.362–366).[1]

---

[1] See Kearns 2004: 62–63.

Likewise, the gods of the hymns gather in Zeus' palace on Olympus, which may function alternately as a dining-room (*h.Ap.* 2–13), a 'ballroom', when the god of music Apollo leads the dance (*h.Ap.* 186–206), or a court of justice, when Apollo brings his charge against the cattle-thief Hermes (*h.Herm.* 322–396, cf. esp. 329: 'there [sc. on Olympus] the scales of justice were set in place for them both'). As in Homer, Olympus is conceptualised both as a mountain (e.g. *h.Ap.* 98) and heaven (e.g. *h.Ap.* 325). As a consequence of the 'theogonic' nature of most hymns, Olympus has a special (symbolic) meaning: arriving there, usually straight after being born, means becoming part of the divine family and being acknowledged as a god, and this festive moment is often commemorated. We have Demeter, who returns to Olympus after the quest for her daughter and is given (new) *timai* as compensation for her suffering (*h.Dem.* 460–462, 484–485); Persephone, who joins the gods, presumably for the first time, after Zeus has allowed her to live with her mother for two thirds of the year (*h.Dem.* 463–465, 484–485); and Hermes, who first enters Olympus as an accused (*h.Herm.* 322–328), but who, after his reconciliation with his brother, is officially welcomed by Zeus (505–507).[2] In the case of Apollo there are two passages that have been taken as evocations of his first introduction to Olympus (*h.Ap.* 1–13 and 186–206), but they may equally well represent a recurrent scene.[3]

Gods who, for whatever reason, are angry at their fellow gods may ostentatiously distance themselves from Olympus (Hera at *h.Ap.* 329–348; Demeter at *h.Dem.* 91–94, 302–304, 331–333), a phenomenon not yet found in Homer, where gods separate themselves only to party with the Ethiopians. In the case of Demeter, her angry absence from Olympus is in effect a kind of strike, since she keeps the seed sown by men hidden under the soil and thereby causes a famine that deprives the gods of their sacrifices (*h.Dem.* 305–313). Conversely, a god may find him- or herself on Olympus while elsewhere an important action is going on, as happens to the goddess of birth Eileithyia: she is seated 'atop Olympus under golden clouds' by the designs of Hera (which in epic terms means that

---

[2] Cf. further baby Pan, who is brought to the Olympus by his father Hermes (*Hymn* 19.42–47), and Aphrodite, who is led by the Horae (*Hymn* 6.14–18). We may also compare the arrival of the Muses on Olympus in the hymnic proem of Hesiod's *Theogony* (68–71).

[3] See e.g. Förstel 1979: 223; Miller 1986: 12–13, 67 (both passages describe recurrent scenes); Baltes 1981: 31 (second passage is first introduction); Clay [1989] 2006: 22–29 (first passage conveys both at the same time); N.J. Richardson 2010: 5 (first passage is new introduction), but contrast 82 (the 'god's characteristic activity').

she cannot see what happens around her), while on the island of Delos Leto is in labour surrounded by all other goddesses (*h.Ap*. 91–101).

Apart from their abodes on Olympus, the gods have cult sites throughout Greece, which are often evoked by the hymnic speaker at the opening or end of his hymn, in language which mirrors the prayers of characters in epic: compare, e.g., 'So come, you who presides over the people of fragrant Eleusis, and sea girt Paros, and rocky Antron, mistress Leto … and Persephone' (*h.Dem*. 490–493)[4] to 'Hear me, god of the silver bow, you who protects Chryse and holy Killa and rules over Tenedos, Smintheus' (*Il*. 1.37–39). We also hear about their favourite haunts (Apollo: peaks, upper ridges of mountains, rivers running seawards, headlands, and harbours, *h.Ap*. 22–24 and 143–145; Hermes: mountainous pastures and horse-nurturing plains with cattle that dwells in the fields, *h.Herm*. 491–492), see them visiting cult sites or haunts in the course of the narrative (Aphrodite: Paphos, *h.Aphr*. 58–63) or establishing them (the palm tree on Delos, *h.Ap*. 117; the Telphusian and Delphinian altars, *h.Ap*. 382–387, 490–510; the cult of the Twelve Gods in Olympia, *h.Herm*. 105–137; the cult and cave of the Bee Maidens on Mt Parnassus, *h.Herm*. 552–566).[5]

Two hymns are even devoted *entirely* to aetiological stories of how a god founds one of his sanctuaries: Delos and Delphi in the *Hymn to Apollo* and Eleusis in the *Hymn to Demeter*. As often in early archaic narrative, the presentation of space is dynamic: we hear a great deal about the voyage which leads the god to his new sanctuary (in the first part of the *Hymn to Apollo* we follow Leto in her long search for a birthplace for her son Apollo, which finally brings her to Delos; in the second part, it is Apollo who searches long for the right place to build his oracle; the *Hymn to Demeter* recounts Demeter's search for her daughter, who is kidnapped by Hades, which eventually brings her to Eleusis), a little about the building of the temple (*h.Ap*. 294–299; *h.Dem*. 270–272, 293–302), almost nothing about its outward appearance or rituals, but relatively much about the sacrifices brought by visitors that serve to

---

[4] Cf. *h.Ap*. 30–44, *h.Herm*. 2; *h.Aphr*. 2, 292. I quote the translations of West 2003, with occasional minor changes. The Homeric translations are my own.

[5] For a discussion of the possible actual cult sites corresponding to these references, see N.J. Richardson 2010: ad *h.Aphr*. 68–69 (Paphos); ad *h.Ap*. 493–496 (Delphinian altar), 300 (Telphusian altar); ad *h.Herm*. 128–129 (cult of the twelve Gods in Olympia); ad *h.Herm*. 552–566 (Bee Maidens, who most probably are to be connected with the Corycian nymphs).

sustain the priests (*h.Ap.* 56–60, 526–539). The silence on the rituals is self-evident in the case of the Eleusinian mysteries with their in-built secrecy (cf. *h.Dem.* 478–479: 'the solemn mysteries which one cannot … enquire about or broadcast, for great awe of the gods restrains the voice'). In the case of the Delphic oracle, where scholars have been puzzled by the absence of any reference to the consultation of the Pythia, it may be that the hymn describes a time *before* the establishment of this custom.[6] Only in the case of the Delian festival for Apollo a detailed view is given (*h.Ap.* 146–178), which will be discussed below in the section on the space of the narrator.

In the *Hymn to Hermes*, the hymnic motif of a god establishing a cult site takes a special form. The central theme of this hymn is Hermes thieving and lying his way into Olympus. In other words, we see him practising his *timai*, just as the power of Aphrodite is illustrated by Aphrodite herself falling in love, of Apollo by the god playing on his lyre (*h.Ap.* 201–203) or shooting a deadly arrow (*h.Ap.* 357–358), and of Demeter by the goddess withholding or giving vegetation (*h.Dem.* 305–333, 450–456, 471–473). As the son of a nymph who lives in a cave and had intercourse there with Zeus in secret (*h.Herm.* 3–9), Hermes has to work harder to get his divine credentials accepted than Apollo, son of Leto and Zeus, Demeter, sister of Zeus, or Aphodite, daughter of Zeus. The progression he makes in establishing himself as a god is mirrored by the gradual upgrading of his birthplace.[7] He is born on the wooded mountain Cyllene (228–230), in a 'shady', 'high-roofed', and 'deep-shadowed' cave (6, 23, 229), the typical abode of nymphs (cf. e.g. *Od.* 13.103–112), which has, however, a court-yard (26), like Polyphemus' cave (*Od.* 9.462). Trying out his self-made lyre he sings a hymn about his 'own renowned lineage' and the encomiastic nature of the genre allows him to endow his mother in this song with 'servants, a splendid home, tripods and unending cauldrons' (59–61), i.e. the kind of objects one finds in temples (cf. the tripods and cauldrons in Apollo's temple in Delphi, 179). Hermes' song thus has a hidden agenda, in that it lays 'claim to a divine status he has yet to acquire'.[8] Having performed another of the great deeds that prove his divinity, viz. stealing Apollo's

---

[6] See Chappell 2006. In the hymn it is the Cretan priests who announce Apollo's oracles (*h.Ap.* 393–396), with the present tense suggesting that they are (still) doing so in the narrator's time.

[7] See discussion in Rougier-Blanc 2005: 37–39.

[8] Clay [1989] 2006: 110.

cattle, he returns to the cave, which now turns out to have a *megaron*, doors, and a 'rich inner sanctum' (146–149; cf. *h.Ap.* 523), just as Hermes himself is now called a 'god' (138, 154). To his mother Hermes reveals his ambitions openly: 'It is better to spend every day in pleasant chat among the gods, with wealth and riches and substance, than to sit at home in a gloomy cave' (170–172). When, finally, Apollo comes to the cave in order to look for his stolen cattle, it has expanded into 'a great house', which contains 'closets with nectar, ambrosia, gold, silver, purple and white garments, such things as the blessed gods' holy houses contain' (246–251). Hermes' birth-place has now turned into a temple and he is ready to go to Olympus.[9]

Hymnic gods not only have cult sites but also cult objects. Whereas in (→) Homer objects are commonly described briefly as regards their outward appearance while the main focus falls on their history (how they were made, how their present owners got them, etc.), in the aetiological hymns we typically see a god inventing or acquiring one of his attributes. Thus Apollo presents Hermes with his famous wand (*kērukeion* or *caduceus*) 'very beautiful, made of gold, trefoil' (*h.Herm.* 528–532), and from now on he is called *khrusorrapis*, 'with golden wand' (539, cf. *Od.* 5.87; 10.277, 331). That same hymn contains a very detailed description of Hermes constructing the first lyre from a tortoise (41–51), an instrument that he will later present to Apollo in order to reconcile him (475–496), thus providing that god with his stock attribute, which elsewhere he is seen to have right from his birth (*h.Ap.* 131, 182, 201–202).[10]

Divine Journeys

An important element in all of the four larger Homeric hymns is the divine journey. To analyse them properly, it will be helpful to start with a brief discussion of divine travel in the Homeric epics.[11] Gods travel walking on foot, riding in a chariot, and flying through the air, or they simply reach their destination, without an indication of how exactly they

---

[9] The difference with Apollo's Delos and Delphi and Demeter's Eleusis is, of course, that the cave of Maia in Cyllene has, as far as we know, never become a *real* cult place.

[10] Another cult object is the 'jointed stool' covered by a fleece on which Demeter is made to sit by Iambe (*h.Dem.* 192–205); see N.J. Richardson 1974: ad 192–211.

[11] For discussions of divine travel, see Kullmann 1956: 89–93 and Sowa 1984: 212–235. They focus on the combination of typical elements rather than the methods of transportation.

transport themselves. It has been suggested that 'it is hard to see why one method of transport is chosen over another',[12] but it would seem that there are good narrative reasons after all. Poseidon at *Il.* 13.17–22 displays the typically divine cross between *walking* and *flying*, i.e. stepping from one mountain peak to the other: he comes down from the island Samothrace's peak, takes three strides which make forests and mountains tremble under his feet and with the fourth reaches Aegae, where his underwater palace is (*Il.* 13.17–22). Both ease and speed mark his voyage as divine, while the 'mountain-stepping' no doubt is connected to Greek gods being associated with and worshipped on mountain peaks. In Aegae the god then turns to another form of transport: he mounts his *chariot* to move over the waters to a cave deep in the water between Tenedus and Imbrus near the Trojan coast, while the 'sea-beasts gather from their lairs and gambol at his coming, recognising their lord' (23–30).[13] Art regularly depicts Poseidon riding the waves in a chariot and the second leg of his voyage thus shows him in his natural habitat and exercising his power as a sea-god. The elaborate account of his divine journey amply puts the spotlight on this god and prepares for his intervention into the battle, which will defy Zeus' will.

   Hermes, armed with his winged sandals, *flies* over the sea to the distant island of Calypso (*Od.* 5.49–55). Hera's voyage at *Il.* 14.225–230 and 281–293 displays the divine cross between flying and mountain-stepping, but in its second leg follows a so-called *hodological* route, which is typical of human travellers and which consists in moving from one landmark to another:[14] from Mt Athos she crosses the sea to the island Lemnos; thence she moves northeastwards to the island Imbrus, then southwards down the coast of the Troad to Lekton, its southwest tip, and from there walks up to Zeus, who is sitting on Mt Ida. The combination of the miraculous divine (way of travelling) and the anthropomorphic (route) is typical for the conception of the gods in Greek literature.[15]

---

[12] Kearns 2004: 63.

[13] For other instances of gods using a chariot, see *Il.* 5.364–369, 720–777; 8.41–50, 382–396, 438–439; *Od.* 5.380–381.

[14] The principle is best known from the *periplous*-format of the seafarer's geography. See Gehrke 2007. The term 'hodological' is introduced (though not coined) by Janni 1984: 79–90, esp. 82. In a way, Odysseus' adventurous voyage of *Od.* 9–12 has a hodological structure, witness the formulaic 'from there we sailed on' and the indication of the number of days travelled, though the stations are, of course, no known landmarks but rather unknown and dangerous new territories.

[15] See Kearns 2004 (esp. 63).

Finally, there is the procedure whereby a god is simply said to *reach* his or her destination, as when Athena moves from the peaks of Olympus to Ithaca in two lines (*Od.* 1.102–103).[16] This brevity may be due to narrative economy, the narrator wanting to rush on with his story, but often it suggests that gods move at a supernatural speed. The narrator may make the numinous speed of divine travel explicit by inserting a comparison: Athena comes shooting down 'like a star' (*Il.* 4.74–79) and Hera moves as quickly 'as the thoughts dart in the mind of a man who has travelled over many lands, and in his subtle imagination he calls up many memories, thinking to himself, "Let me be there or there"' (*Il.* 15.79–83).[17]

Let us now, armed with this overview of epic divine travel turn to the movements of the gods in the hymns. Aphrodite *walks* across the Ida towards Anchises' farmstead, which allows the narrator to give us a taste of her power, since wild animals leave their lairs and start coupling (*h.Aphr.* 69–74). The musical god Apollo may lead a dancing procession (*h.Ap.* 501–502, 514–519; *h.Herm.* 505–506).[18] In their restless moving about in the *Hymn to Hermes* both Hermes and Apollo never turn to flying or the use of a chariot but walk and run. The reason is not difficult to think of. The whole point of the story consists in Hermes stealing Apollo's cattle and then cleverly disguising his tracks by using specially invented shoes and driving the animals backwards (69–104) and Apollo as a kind of sleuth looking for trails and interviewing a witness along the road (186–234).

Hades uses a *chariot* when carrying off Persephone (cf. *h.Dem.* 18, 19), probably because, like Poseidon and his chariot, this is his typical attribute in visual art.[19] When Hermes later brings back Persephone from the Underworld to her mother in Eleusis, he borrows Hades' chariot

---

[16] Cf. *Od.* 6.2–20; 13.160; 15.1–4. Such brief formulations are found regularly when a god returns to Olympus after an intervention on earth, e.g. *Il.* 1.221–222; *Od.* 7.78–80.

[17] When a travelling god is compared to a bird (e.g. *Od.* 1.319–320; 3.371–372; 5.51–54), there is the much debated problem whether this is a mere comparison or whether it implies a metamorphosis; for discussion and literature, see de Jong 2001a: ad 1.319–324. For explicit indications of the gods' speed, see 13.18, 24, 30; 5.770–772.

[18] In the case of Demeter's frantic search for her kidnapped daughter Demeter her way of moving is not entirely clear: she is running with burning torches in her hand (cf. 47–48, 61), but also speeds 'like a bird over land and water' (43), which suggests flying.

[19] N.J. Richardson 1974: ad 19 suggests that the chariot typically belongs to epic rape scenes, but not all of them involve a chariot.

(375–389).[20] In both cases we hear of the chariot moving not only over land and sea but also over mountains, which suggests a cross between riding and flying.[21] When 'the Phrygian girl'/Aphrodite in her lying tale tells how she was snatched away from the dance by Hermes and brought to Mt Ida, she explicitly says that she was *flying* with Hermes through the air (cf. 'I felt that my feet were not touching the grain-growing earth', *h.Aphr.* 125); this time Hermes has no chariot but, simply relying on his winged sandals, flies while holding his 'fare' in his arms, as he seems to do with Helen in E. *Helen* (cf. 1671 'on your journey through the sky'). This may be a mirroring of the fact that in actual truth Aphrodite herself flew from Paphos to Ida (66–67).

In the last two cases the hymnic narrator attempts something new in comparison to the Homeric epics, viz. to convey the sensation of flying: 'neither sea nor flowing rivers nor glassy gleans nor mountain peaks stayed the immortal steeds' impetus, but they passed over them cleaving the deep air' (*h.Dem.* 380–383).[22] A rudimentary form of this device is found in Hermes' description of his (air-)voyage to the remote island of Calypso ('Who would choose to go all the way across that endless tract of salt water? There is no city of mortals anywhere near, where they make sacrifices and offer gods choice hecatombs', *Od.* 5.100–103), while a more advanced example will be found in (→) Apollonius Rhodius' description of Eros' flight from Olympus to Aia ('In his passage through the vast sky, the fertile earth, the cities of men, and the sacred streams of rivers opened up beneath him', *Arg.* 3.160–167).

Apollo at *h.Herm.* 227–230 simply arrives at his destination, since there is no narrative need to elaborate on his travelling.[23] And brevity of narration suggests divine speed, when Iris, sent to fetch Eileithyia, 'quickly crossed the intervening space' between Delos and Olympus (*h.Ap.* 108).[24] As in (→) Homer, but less frequently, comparisons may

---

[20] For another chariot-voyage, see *h.Dem.* 88–89, which perhaps involves flying (N.J. Richardson 1974: ad 89).

[21] See N.J. Richardson 1974: ad 380–383. The flying may be due to the horses being winged (see previous note).

[22] Cf. *h.Dem.* 33–34 and *h.Aphr.* 122–125.

[23] Having described the journeys of Hermes and Apollo from Mt Cyllene to Pieria, where Apollo's cattle is grazing, and then back via Onchestus to the river Alpheus/Pylos, where Hermes leaves the cattle he has stolen at a farmstead/in a cave (and making a third time Apollo reconstruct Hermes' journey, in front of Zeus: 336–360), the narrator at 397–398 recounts their joint return to the place of crime only briefly.

[24] Cf *h.Dem.* 317–318, 340–342.

underscore the numinous nature of divine travelling, as when Apollo
returns from his temple at Delphi to the ship with Cretan sailors who
are to become his priests 'quick as a thought' (*h.Ap.* 448).[25]

It is fitting to conclude this section with a discussion of the *Hymn to
Apollo*, in which divine travel is something of a leitmotif. In the attribu-
tive sections we hear that Apollo has '*many* temples and wooded groves',
and that '*all* the peaks, upper ridges of mountains, headlands, rivers run-
ning towards the sea, and harbours' find favour with him (22–24, 144–
145). This already suggests a god who 'roams the islands and the world
of men' (142) a great deal, in order to visit all his cult sites. The narrative
parts then recount three journeys, which mention many of these sites: the
journey of his mother Leto around the Aegean looking for a place to give
birth to Apollo, which at the same time is an evocation of Apollo's Aegean
dominion (30–50); his own journey through northern Greece in search
for a place to found his oracle (216–293), which may reflect 'the reli-
gious association of various northern Greek communities with Delphi';[26]
and his sea journey round the Peloponnese to Delphi/Crisa together with
the Cretan sailors (409–439), which mirrors other mythological voyages
rather than that it evokes a string of cult sites or a cultic unity.

All three journeys take the form of a catalogue, but they are differently
organized.[27] The first catalogue is a list of Aegean cult places of Apollo
that is presented from a panoramic narratorial standpoint:[28]

> All whom Crete has within it, and Athens,
> the island of Aegina, Euboea famed for ships,
> Aegae, Eiresiae, and maritime Peparethus,
> Thracian Athos and the summits of Pelion,
> Samothrace and Ida's shaded mountains …
> All that way Leto travelled when pregnant with the Far-shooter.

The catalogue is static (it contains only one verb: 'has within it') and
only at the very end does it turn out to convey also the journey of
Leto, who 'fly-steps' from peak to peak and from island to island. There
are no indications of time, but presumably Leto is wandering for nine

---

[25] Cf. *h.Ap.* 186–187, 440–443; *h.Dem.* 43–44, and N.J. Richardson 2010: ad *h.Ap.*
186–188.

[26] N.J. Richardson 2010: ad *h.Ap.* 216–286.

[27] See Baltes 1981; and discussion in N.J. Richardson 2010: ad locc. He also has helpful
maps.

[28] Cf. Miller 1986: 33: a 'stately survey of Apollo's dominion, conducted from some
distant vantage-point high over the Aegean'.

months, rather than voyaging at divine speed. The double function of
the catalogue is highly effective: the same places who first fear to receive
Apollo will later all become part of his dominion. His later magnificence
contrasts with the straitened circumstances of his first appearance in the
world.

The second catalogue, Apollo's itinerary in search of the right location
of his oracle, is dynamic and presented from an actorial standpoint, the
narrator as it were following in the footsteps of Apollo:

> To Pieria first you came down from Olympus;
> you passed by sandy Lectus …
> Soon you reached Iolcus, …
> From there you crossed the Euripus, …
> From there you went on, far-shooting Apollo,
> and reached Onchestus …

This journey is, once more, a mix of the mortal (the god's route is
hodological) and the divine (both the quick succession of names and
the repeated 'quickly' at 218, 222, 281 refer to the typically divine speed,
which only slows down near the end, when Apollo reaches his goal).

Apollo's third journey, on board the Cretan ship, naturally takes the
form of a *periplous*, the narrator adopting an actorial standpoint that at
times even includes embedded focalization:

> Journeying on, the ship reached Arene and lovely Argyphea,
> Thyron where the Alpheus is forded and well-cultivated Aipy …
> As it headed for Pheia, exulting in the divine tailwind,
> from under the clouds there appeared to them Ithaca's steep mountain,
> Doulichion and Same and wooded Zacynthus.
> But when it had rounded the whole of the Peloponnese …

Taken together, the three catalogues show the extent of Apollo's power
and thereby confirm the panhellenic aspirations of his Delphic ora-
cle: 'here I am minded to make my beautiful temple as an oracle for
humankind, who will ever come in crowds bringing me perfect heca-
tombs, both those who live in the fertile Peloponnese and those who live
in Europe (the northern mainland) and the sea girt islands' (247–251).
In fact, according to Clay, the Homeric hymns themselves would have
a decided panhellenic orientation and be composed for presentation in
the Greek world at large.[29] This brings up the question of the space of the
hymnic narrator.

---

[29] Clay [1989] 2006: 10, 52.

Space of the Hymnic Narrator

Hymnic narrators resemble the epic narrator in that they do not mention their name or provide biographical details. Unlike him, however, they occasionally refer to their own space, in the introductory or closing parts of the hymns. Thus we hear about 'this contest' (6.19–20), 'this city' (13.3), 'this house' (24.4), and 'these (rituals)' (*h.Dem.* 480), all with the proximal deictic pronoun *hode*. The extratextual referent of 'this' is not specified, because it is clear for the hymnic narratees, who find themselves at the same place as the narrator.

There is one hymn which contains an exceptionally long reference to the narrator's space, which turns out to be the same as the setting of its (first) narrative: the island of Delos in the *Hymn to Apollo*. The first view of 'rocky, sea-girt Delos' (26–27) is given by Leto, and it is not a very attractive one: as she points out to Delos herself, it is 'not rich in cattle or sheep', does 'not bring forth a harvest or grow abundant fruit trees', in short it has 'no richness under its soil'. But if Delos will receive her son Apollo, he will build a temple and 'all men will bring you hecatombs as they congregate here' (51–60). Delos is willing, but fears that Apollo may be so disappointed with her as to kick her over into the sea, so that octopuses and seals will make a home in her (70–78). Leto then swears that Apollo will honour her above all others (87–88).

Then the narrator plays a spectacular trick. Instead of narrating how the god builds his temple and establishes his cult (as he does e.g. at *h.Dem.* 293–302, 473–477), he follows in the footsteps of Apollo visiting Delos *while his cult is already in full swing* (*h.Ap.* 146–150):

> But it is in Delos, Phoebus, that your heart most delights,
> where the Ionians with trailing robes assemble
> with their children and wives on your avenue,
> and when they have seated the gathering
> they think of you and entertain you with
> boxing, dancing, and singing.

It is the god himself who focalizes the festival of the Ionians. Then the narrator introduces an anonymous witness, who takes over the focalization (151–155):

> A man might think they were the unaging immortals
> if he came along then when the Ionians are all together:
> he would take in the beauty of the whole scene and be delighted
> at the spectacle of the men and the fair-girt women,
> the swift ships and the people's piles of belongings.

It would seem that the narrator, wishing to make the point that the assembled Ionians resemble the gods, could not use the focalization of Apollo (who presumably would never call mortals immortal), and yet wanted a more authoritative focalizer than himself. For this reason, he introduces a 'hypothetical observer from outside the pan-Ionian community … whose testimony carries conviction because it is independent of ethnic or cultic allegiances'.[30]

Through the combined focalizations of Apollo and the anonymous witness the narrator confirms the truth of Leto's earlier promise that Delos as the seat of Apollo's cult would attract many visitors. But he does not stop here. He takes over from the anonymous witness and himself focalizes the highpoint of the festival, the amazing chorus of the Maidens of Delos (156–164). The proximal deictic pronoun *tode* (156) suggests that the narrator is actually in the presence of the Maidens. Indeed, another deictic marker, *enthade* at 168, confirms that the narrator finds himself on Delos, since the *enthade* at 170, in a speech addressed to the Maidens of Delos, makes clear that 'here' means 'on Delos'.[31] The narrated world has merged, metaleptically, with the world of the narrator.[32] The narrator even addresses the Maidens, discussing their and his own poetic performances, and from this conversation we get an even broader picture of the world of this hymnic narrator: he was born on Chios, now performs on Delos, and professionally 'roams the well-ordered cities of men'.

Such stray deictic references to the space of the narrator are of course relevant to the vexed question of the performance of the hymns. Most scholars assume that they were performed at cult places at the occasion of festivals. Some even assume that the hymn paid honour to the god of the festival concerned: the *Hymn to Demeter* may have been performed at Eleusis in conjunction with the Eleusinian Games or the *Ballētus* festival in honour of Demophon, the *Hymn to Apollo* has been connected with the Delian festival, the *Hymn to Hermes* with Olympia and with the athletic festival of *Hermaea*, which took place at various places in

---

[30] Miller 1986: 58.

[31] Cf. also earlier *enthade* at 80, in a speech by Delos (and *tēide*, in a speech by Leto). Note that the second, Pythian, part of the *Hymn to Apollo* also contains numerous instances of *enthade*, which all occur, however, in speeches (247, 249, 258, 287, 289, 366, 381).

[32] See de Jong 2009.

Greece.[33] Other scholars, however, are less sure of a specific relationship
between hymned god and festival.[34] Clay even cuts through the rela-
tionship between festival and hymn altogether and argues for them to
have been sung at symposia.[35] To decide in this matter lies outside the
competence of a narratological analysis of space. It may well be that origi-
nally composed for local festivals, the hymns soon were reperformed all
through Greece, in much the same way as the (→) Pindaric and Bac-
chylidean odes. The deixis *ad oculos* that the instances of *hode* expressed
at the original performance could easily become deixis *ad phantasma* at
later reperformances.

The Functions of Hymnic Space

As the preceding analyses have made clear, space hardly ever is mere set-
ting in the hymns. It is nearly always associated in one way or another,
often aetiologically, with cults of the hymned god. Indeed, hymnic narra-
tors are not very interested in setting the stage at all: thus the underworld
to which Persephone is abducted, the palace of Celeus at Eleusis, which
receives Demeter, or the 'high-roofed steading' near the river Alpheus,
where Apollo's stolen cattle is hidden, are barely described. Conversely,
sometimes places are described which have no obvious relation to the
action at all but are of religious importance, the most notable exam-
ple being Onchestus, a sacred grove of Poseidon already known from
Il. 2.506, which Apollo passes during his quest for a place for his oracle
(*h.Ap.* 230–238) and when searching for his stolen cattle (*h.Herm.* 186–
187, cf. Hermes passing the same place at 86–87).[36]
  The aetiological spirit of the hymnic narrator also makes him include,
once, a so-called 'antiquarian flashback', a device which embryonically
appears at *Il.* 20.216–218 ('Dardanus founded Dardania, when sacred

---

[33] See N.J. Richardson 1974: 12; N.J. Richardson 2010: 15, 24–25; Johnston 2002
(connection with *Hermaea*).
  [34] See e.g. Parker 1991 ('We should surely wonder, at the least, whether the Hymns,
works designed to entertain and needing no pious devotion to render them palatable,
were necessarily any more occasional or context-bound than was epic itself', 2) and Gar-
cia 2002 ('the hymnist was charged with achieving the god's presence through narrative',
9).
  [35] Clay [1989] 2006: 7.
  [36] For Onchestus, see Clay [1989] 2006: 115 and N.J. Richardson 2010: ad *h.Ap.* 231–
238 and ad *h.Herm.* 88.

Ilios had not yet been built as a city of mortals but they still lived on the slopes of the Ida'), and which was to have a great future in Apollonius of Rhodes and (→) Callimachus: 'Apollo arrived at the site of Thebes, which was cloaked in vegetation, for *no* mortal *yet* dwelt in holy Thebes and there were *not yet* any paths or roads crossing the wheat-bearing Theban plain, but it was occupied by wild growth' (*h.Ap.* 225–228).[37]

If space is largely religiously coloured and motivated, the hymns also witness the birth of an important erotic topos (and symbolic use of space): the meadow of love. Young girls are typically abducted while picking flowers in a meadow, with the flowers symbolically suggesting their youth and beauty, which are soon to be deflowered (cf. e.g. E. *Ion* 887–896; *Hel.* 244–249; Moschus *Europa* 32–36, 63–69).[38] In the *Hymn to Demeter* first the hymnic narrator recounts how Persephone was abducted by Hades while picking 'beautiful' flowers in a 'soft meadow', then Persephone herself reports the event to her mother, and with hindsight now associates the flowers with eros (425, and cf. 417). It seems that the symbolic setting was more important than the geographical one, which the hymnic narrator places in Nysa, for reasons which so far have escaped commentators but which may have been a mere mythological reflex.[39]

But perhaps most characteristic for the hymns are the many instances of personification: the projection of human traits into inanimate objects or nature, and animals. This phenomenon is already known from (→) Homer, where the sea 'divides a path for Poseidon in joyfulness' (*Il.* 13.27–29), and Hesiod, where the house of Zeus 'takes delight in' the lily-like voice of the Muses (*Th.* 40), but the hymns are particularly packed with it: countries 'are afraid' of Apollo (*h.Ap.* 46–48), the earth 'smiles at' the birth of Apollo (*h.Ap.* 118), the sky, earth and sea 'smile at' the beautiful narcissus, created to lure Persephone (*h.Dem.* 13–14), and olive trees 'do not hear' Persephone's cries (*h.Dem.* 23).[40]

---

[37] The term derives from Hopkinson 1984: ad 24. For a comparable way of looking at a place from different temporal perspectives, see *h.Dem.* 450–456 (the Rarian plain which used to be life-giving, at present is barren, but soon will produce wheat again).

[38] A useful discussion in Bremer 1975: 268–274.

[39] See N.J. Richardson 1974: ad 17.

[40] Related are instances where nature responds physically to the numinous power or presence of gods: cf. Aphrodite being fawned upon by normally ferocious beasts (*h.Aphr.* 69–74); the miraculous gushing of wine and growing of a vine on the ship that transports Dionysus as a captive (*Hymn* 7.34–42), mountains trembling, and the earth and sea

The most radical case is the island of Delos in the *Hymn to Apollo*, the depiction of which constantly switches between the physical and the anthropomorphic:[41] Leto 'sets foot' on Delos, and then addresses her, but talks about her very much in terms of an island, which is to become 'the seat' of Apollo but at present 'does not bring forth a harvest or grow abundant fruit'. Delos answers, both referring to herself as 'island' and speaking about her 'head'. Delos then 'rejoices' in the birth of Apollo but at the same time 'becomes laden with golden growth'. The ambiguity inherent in this picture has been anticipated in (→) Homer, where the river Scamander in *Iliad* 21 is likewise both river (213, 218) and man (212–213): 'all this is very strange and very hard to visualise, and it is a reminder of the gulf between Greek and modern ways of talking and thinking about the visible phenomena of nature'.[42] The personification of the island Delos will be further radicalised and by then—most probably—turned into literary play by (→) Callimachus in his *Hymn to Delos*.

Conclusion

The Homeric hymns have recently been situated, as regards their language, between Homer and lyric.[43] It would seem that in their treatment of space, too, they are aligned both to epic, e.g. in the central role of Olympus or the treatment of the journeys of gods, and to lyric, e.g. as regards the incipient evocation of the space of the narrator via proximal deictic markers. But their overriding interest lies with the (often aetiologically charged) cult sites and cult objects of the gods they hymn, which are crammed in whenever possible, even when the story does not need them.

---

shuddering when Artemis goes out to hunt and shoot her grievous arrows (*Hymn* 27.6–9), and Olympus, the earth, sea, and sun reacting to the birth of Athena out of Zeus' head (*Hymn* 28.9–14). The same phenomenon is found in (→) Homer, when the earth 'put forth fresh-springing grass, and dewy clover, and saffron, and hyacinth thick and soft' underneath Zeus and Hera making love on Mt Ida (*Il.* 14.347–349); Hesiod, when grass grows under Aphrodite's feet as she steps ashore newly born (*Th.* 194); and Euripides, e.g. *IT* 1243–1244 and *Ion* 1078–1080.

[41] See Parker 1991: 4; Fröhder 1994: 84–87; M. Clarke 1997: 67–69.
[42] M. Clarke 1997: 68.
[43] N.J. Richardson 2010: 8.

APOLLONIUS OF RHODES

J.J.H. Klooster

Regarding space in the *Argonautica*, Delage stated in 1930: 'l' épopée d' Apollonios est surtout géographique'. Few have repeated the statement with similar emphasis, but the geographical component of the *Argonautica* undeniably catches the eye:[1] throughout, the Argo's route is charted with great precision, often in the style of a scientific work of geography.[2] In fact, one of the epic's feats is the combination and harmonisation of the various routes of the Argo found in previous mythographers and contemporary scientific sources.[3] It seems that especially the extensive Libyan episode in book 4 should be considered both a tribute to poetical tradition (Pindar, *Pythian* 4) and a way of mythically justifying Greek presence in Northern Africa; an ideological issue of interest for the Ptolemies.[4] There are a number of extensive synoptic descriptions in the epic, describing natural phenomena, landscapes, buildings and objects. It is noteworthy however, that a relatively large number of these is focalized by the narrator and, more strikingly, seems to have no direct bearing on the actual action of the narrative. This explains some of the epic's unusual feel.

Besides such apparently unmotivated descriptions, there is another noteworthy aspect of Apollonius' treatment of space that deserves attention: the thematic importance of man's interaction with his surroundings. The Argo's passage causes numerous changes in the landscape (often described in aetiological digressions, things that are 'still there to

---

[1] D. Meyer 2001: 233; Clare 2002: 67. Harder 1994:19 disagrees.

[2] Important studies are Elliger 1975; Fusillo 1985; Williams 1991; Harder 1994: 17–35; D. Meyer 2001: 217–235; Danek 2009: 275–292. Manakidou 1992 focuses on ekphrasis. On the development of ancient geography, see van Paassen 1957; Jacob 1991; Lanzilotta 1988. I have not seen Thalmann 2011.

[3] Cf. Delage 1930: *passim*. Ptolemaic interest may account for the geographical focus; cf. D. Meyer 2001: 219, 222, 234.

[4] See e.g. Clauss 2000: 11–32; Stephens 2000: 195–215; Stephens 2003: 171–238; Mori 2008: 9.

be seen'). Also, Orpheus and Medea exercise magical power over nature and Heracles uses his superhuman physical strength to the same end. Finally, there appears to be a kind of mutual influence between material aspects of the landscape and the psychology of the heroes: often, the landscape subtly mirrors their state of mind ('paysage moralisé', 'Erlebte Raum').

Distribution of Space

In book 1.559, the Argo departs. Before this event, the space of the narrative has been summarily indicated in the proem with references to the Black Sea and the Cyanean Rocks (or Symplegades) (1.2–3), the characteristic landmarks of the Argo's journey in early myth; in the geographical backgrounds of the individual Argonauts in the Catalogue (1.18–223); in the brief indications of the setting of Iolcus and the launching place Pagasae (1.234–367); and in the description of the outfitting and launching of the ship Argo (1.368–401), a kind of narrativized setting of the place where much of the action will take place.[5]

After this, in the first two books the distribution of spells of travelling and going ashore follows a fairly regular pattern: travelling is generally narrated in swift passages enumerating landmarks passed and seen by the Argonauts; disembarkations are introduced by descriptions of varying length, depending on the narrative importance of the setting. Thus Lemnos is merely called 'rocky Lemnos, the Sintian island' (1.608) before the narrator details what happened there the year before the Argo arrived (the slaughter of its male inhabitants), while the geographical layout of Cyzicus is described in some detail (1.936–1052) because of its role in the mistaken killing of the Doliones. An important exception to this is the passage 2.899–1029, where extensive descriptions of an ethnographical and geographical nature are included of places and peoples merely passed by (discussed below).

With the exception of its prologue on Mt Olympus (3.6–167), book 3 is set in Colchis, and due to the splitting of the storylines (Medea, Argonauts, Aeetes) is situated in different locations simultaneously; especially the palace of Aeetes is described quite extensively (3.215–248). Book 4 comprises the tortuous and eventful journey back. As so many

---

5 Cf. Fusillo 1985: 289.

extraordinary places are visited or passed (the Celtic Lakes, the island of the Sirens, Trinacria, the Syrtis, the Libyan deserts), this book contains most of the epic's extended descriptions. The end of the journey (4.1765–1766, 1776–1777), on the other hand, is very briefly and laconically summarized. As this overview shows, the distribution of spatial descriptions is somewhat uneven, sometimes occurring at places where there is no narrative action; and with a strong concentration in book 4.

Fabula-Space versus Story-Space

Modern editions of the *Argonautica* usually contain a map of the Argo's route, which demonstrates that this route can be easily followed when reading the poem: although partly based on Odysseus' wanderings (especially in book 4), the description of the Argonauts' progress is embedded in realistic geography as known in the third century BC, especially on the outward journey (books 1–2).[6] The fabula-space, theoretically comprising all the locations on the roundtrip Iolcus-Colchis and back, is generally presented in a manner that is typical of *periplous*-accounts: the narrator mentions the major landmarks (e.g. mountains) along the coast seen by the Argonauts, which enable them (and the narratees) to ascertain their position.[7] Danek (2009: 282) comments on the strict linearity of the outward voyage:

> In books 1 and 2 … Apollonius represents space as a single line which allows no departures or alternatives. We get the impression that the narrator's view is strictly limited to a camera's eye installed on the top of the mast of the Argo.

This is broadly true, and is confirmed by the fact that more than once the Argo's journey is likened to a 'path' (e.g. 1.545–546, 573–579). The landscape is often focalized by the Argonauts rather than the narrator, as in the following account of a speedy passage along a stretch of coast:

> … from there [Aphetae] they sped onward past Meliboea, *seeing* its coast and stormy beach. At daybreak they immediately *saw* Homole situated by the sea and skirted it. Soon thereafter they were to pass by the streams of the river Amyrus. From there they *beheld* Eurymenae and the sea-washed

---

[6] Cf. Delage 1930: 278; D. Meyer 2001: 218–220; Clare 2002: 66–67.

[7] Cf. Güngerich 1950 on this practice in *periplous*-literature. Cf. e.g. 1.922–935, 1164–1166, 1360–1362. Note that Phineus' prophecy too focuses on similar landmarks (esp. 2.347–372).

ravines of Ossa and Olympus. But running all night with the blowing wind, they passed the cliffs of Pallene beyond the headland of Canastra. At dawn, as they fared on, the Thracian mountain of Athos *rose before them*, which with its highest peak casts a shadow over Lemnos even as far as Myrine, although the island lies as far away as a well-equipped merchant ship could travel from dawn to midday.[8]   (1.592–605)

Interrupting the focalizations of his characters, the narrator, like a historiographer with an interest in natural marvels, suddenly relates the information about the amazingly long shadow cast by Mt Athos (in omnitemporal present tense; focalizations by the Argonauts are in past tense). There is no direct relevance of this interruption for the narrative, although theoretically the shadow could have been observed by the Argonauts too, especially since they passed Mt Athos at dawn. The same does not apply to the details provided *in extenso* by the narrator regarding the Thermodon Delta (2.970–984, described as if seen on a map and from above), the Amazons (2.985–1000, whom the Argonauts do *not* encounter) and the Acherusian Headland (2.729–745, described in such detail as would be impossible for a passing seafarer to take in). Both the *periplous*-format and the naratorial digressions are strongly reminiscent of (→) Herodotus and geographical literature and this confirms that Apollonius' narrative technique is at some points more like that of a historian than that of an epic poet.[9]

Although this is not always easy to prove, the scholia suggest that the amount of detail provided in such geographical descriptions depended on the exactness of the sources at Apollonius' disposal. It has been suggested that the descriptions of Cyzicus, the region of Heraclea Pontica, and Corcyra owe their precision to the fact that Apollonius drew his information from chronicles of local historians.[10] The passages on the Eridanus (Po), the Tritonian Lake and the land of the Bebrycians on the other hand, are much vaguer. That the eastern region of the Pontos is described mainly in terms of *ethnography* rather than geography (the customs of the Amazons, Chalybes, Tibareni and Mossynoeci) is usually also attributed to the nature of the information at Apollonius' disposal,[11] although, more generally speaking, the interest in ethnography is also

---

[8] All translations are taken from Race 2008. See on this passage Harder 1994: 17.
[9] See *SAGN* 1: 62.
[10] See in particular Baschmakoff 1948.
[11] Cf. Delage 1930: 291, 292, 281; D. Meyer 2001: 220.

a characteristic fitting in with the Herodotean slant of the narrator.[12] In any case, it is attractive to assume that the mode of description may to some extent reveal the nature of the sources Apollonius used to plot the Argo's voyage.

Another feature corroborating this is the actual layout of the route. The first leg of the journey, from Iolcus to Colchis (books 1–3), is fairly straightforward. Apollonius follows traditions which presented the natural course towards Colchis, via the Bosporus and through the Euxine Sea, following the southern shore. This was a well-known trade route. The Argo's return, on the other hand, is odd. Various traditional routes through this region were known, passing either through a river network in Northwestern Europe (Timaeus, Timagetus), or through the Adriatic and the Ligurian sea surrounding Italy (Homer, Timaeus), or via Northern Africa (Hesiod, Pindar, Herodotus and Antimachus). Alternatively, the Argo could have returned the same way it came (Callimachus).

However, instead of limiting himself to one of these traditional routes, Apollonius combines them or alludes to them, with the unlikely result of taking the Argo from the Euxine Pontos (Black Sea) northwest through the river Ister (Danube) into the Adriatic Sea, thence back into the Eridanus (Po), through interconnecting rivers into the Ligurian sea, and finally, via Libya back to Greece. This 'petit tour de force', as Delage calls it, results in an intriguing combination of the latest scientific and scholarly insights with all that poetic and mythical geography had to offer. It is probably useless to ask what Apollonius actually believed to be true; the point is rather that he included what he knew had been told, following the Argo's progress 'on an imaginary map on which earlier poets and historians have left their marks: signposts that cannot be ignored by a Hellenistic writer'.[13] In the process, special attention was awarded to politically important space and tradition, as in the Libyan episode.

A peculiar mixture of myth and pseudo-empiric observations is also visible in the description of the Acherusian Headland:

> [The Acherusian Headland] *rises* in steep cliffs facing the Bithynian Sea. At its base, rocks washed smooth by the sea *are* rooted in place and around them the waves roll with a mighty roar, but above, the spreading plane trees *grow* on the highest peak. Down from it towards the interior *slopes* a hollow valley, where the cave of Hades lies, covered over with woods

---

[12] The presentation of these peoples by Phineus in 2.372–397 is in fact noticeably similar to the ethnographical descriptions in Herodotus.

[13] D. Meyer 2001: 227.

and rocks, from which an ice-cold vapour, blowing up continuously from its chill depths, ever *forms* a glistening frost which *melts* in the midday sun. … Here too is the mouth of the Acheron river which *gushes* through the headland and *issues* into the eastern sea, for a hollow ravine *carries* it down from above. In later generations, Nisaean Megarians named it the Soönautes river, when they were on their way to settle in the land of the Mariandynians, for it saved them along with their ships when they encountered a violent storm.   (2.729–745)

This description is wholly focalized by the narrator and provides a kind of panoramic overview in the omnitemporal present tense. Sometimes the narrator's viewpoint shifts, while he zooms in on remarkable details (reminiscent of paradoxography), suggesting the empiric, realistic character of the information (the cold vapour forming frost that melts at midday). It has been suggested that this style aimed at enhancing the realism of the narrative and enabling the narratees to relate to the ancient, mythical events told in it (cf. Barthes' *effet de réel*).[14]

Another way of relating mythical events to the present of the narratees is the attention the narrator pays to many traces (some of them still visible) left in the Argo's wake. These aetiological digressions are, of course, focalized by the narrator and therefore related in an omnitemporal present tense. In form and purpose aetiologies are a kind of conflation of the 'reference to the narrator's own time'[15] and the 'reference to the narrator's own space' motifs. The focus on aetiology is also typical of Callimachus (hence *Aetia*), and is generally believed to result from the scholarly preoccupations of the Alexandrians, stimulated by the wish of the Ptolemies to relate the present to Greek mythical tradition. The traces left by the Argo form a theoretically visible link between the primeval, heroic world and that of the well-read (or travelled) third-century narratees, with the effect that the heroic past becomes tangible as well as relevant, and the truth of the Argonautica journey is 'proven'.

The reader of the *Argonautica* may in fact get a nagging suspicion that the expedition of the Argonauts is thus at some level a Greek civilizing exercise which changes the face of the earth permanently, mostly for the better.[16] Young, pious and polite heroes work in concord

---

[14] Zanker 1987: 71–72. Conversely, Beye 1982: 103 argues that such passages make the mythical facts related in the epic narrative seem 'naive' in comparison.

[15] See index of *SAGN* 1 and 2.

[16] See Clauss 2000: 11–32; although he also notes the general pessimistic atmosphere of the epic which seems to imply, at the same time, that the world may have become 'more human but less humane'.

to dispatch brutes in untanned hides (Amycus), to silence, slay or chase monsters (the Sirens, Gegeneis, harpies), to populate (is)lands (their fertile encounter with the Lemnian women; the clod of Libyan earth), to open up seaways that were unnavigable or unknown before (the Symplegades, the fanciful return via Danube, Rhone and Swiss lakes), to oppose a cruel tyrant king (Aeetes) and abduct his willing daughter (Medea).

More negative enduring changes in the landscape result, e.g., from the accidental killing of the Doliones, in the form of a spring formed by the nymphs' tears cried over Cleite, the murdered king's wife (1.1065–1069). Significantly ambivalent is the way in which Heracles' killing of the monstrous snake of the Hesperides and the creation of a fountain is related by these nymphs to the Argonauts as a cruel and destructive deed, although it saves the Argonauts (4.1432–1449).

Most of the changes in the landscape take the form of human constructions (altars, shrines, graves and cities), but there are also some changes in nature itself, and of course changes in place-names, although these do not qualify as 'space', even if they signify Greek influence on space.[17] An example is the description of the beach of Elba (Aethalia), where the Argonauts scrape off their sweat with local pebbles (4.656–658):

> … and these, skin-like in colour, are strewn along the beach. And there too are the throwing stones and wondrous equipment of theirs, where the place is named the harbour of Argo, after them.

We see how a physical characteristic of the location in need of explanation, and in fact locally or traditionally explained in this way (the skin-colour pebbles and, apparently, boulders or rocks in the form of discuses and other sports equipment), is related to a name, 'Argo's harbour', which together with this narrative 'proves' the aetiology. This makes an un-Greek, often unclaimed, landscape by a physical token 'Greek': *the Argo was here*. Collecting and combining historical, ethnographical and literary sources that refer to events related to the Argo's journey, Apollonius turns this event into a pivotal point in Greek history.[18]

---

[17] Human constructions: 1.1058–1062: grave of Cyzicus; 1.1345: city founded by Polyphemus; 2.841–844: grave of Idmon; 2.851–857: grave of Typhis; 4.1620–1622: temples for Triton and Poseidon. Changes in nature: 1.1145–1149: spring created by Rhea; 2.604–606: Symplegades become fixed; 4.1444: spring created by Heracles; 4.1755: clod of earth becomes Thera.

[18] Cf. *SAGN* 2: 80.

Ideologically by far the most important aetiology would appear to be the creation of the island Thera, strategically placed as the last one before Argo returns home.[19] Thera was the place from which Greeks would eventually migrate to Cyrene, a city-state under Ptolemaic influence at the time of the *Argonautica*'s composition. The Argonaut Euphemus receives a clod of Libyan earth as a guest gift from the marine divinity Triton as the Argo leaves Libya after making sacrifices to Apollo (4.1552–1563). Later (4.1731–1764), after an epiphany of Apollo, Euphemus dreams he both nurses and ravishes the clod in the form of a woman; but in his dream the woman explains that if he throws her into the sea, she will turn into an island, Calliste, that will feed his descendants. From there, as the narratees would have known, the Dorian Greeks would migrate to Cyrene (cf. Pindar *P.* 4). Thus a divine mandate could be seen to justify the Greek presence in Northern Africa.

Conversely, some landmarks and peoples encountered were already present before the Argonauts' arrival and are therefore identified not only through description, but also by an account of their past, explaining their present appearance or name. In fact, the Argonauts frequently follow in the footsteps of other heroes, and thus become part of a network of monuments and legends (cf. 2.658: the temple of Dipsacus; 2.911–914: the tomb of Sthenelus; 2.385–387, 1169–1173: a temple built by the Amazons; 4.114–120: a temple built by Phrixus). Their most recent predecessor is of course Heracles, after his disappearance in 1.1198.[20]

The fact that in the composition of the epic the route of the Argo is actually determined by various (sometimes contradictory) ancient traditions found by Apollonius in his research, whereas in the narrative it is the single journey of the Argonauts which influences the history and physical aspect of places they pass on their way, creates an interesting paradox. A particularly revealing example of this may be found in 4.552–556, where the narrator, before embarking on the most Odyssean stretch of the Argo's journey, around Italy's west coast, asks the Muses how it is possible that traces of the Argo are to be seen 'beyond the Adriatic sea and Italy'. This is certainly not where the Argonauts were heading at this point of the narrative; they must have had to make a very strange and unexpected detour to arrive there. This gives the impression that though traces and lore in this region were traditionally part of the

---

[19] Cf. Stephens 2000: 203–204.
[20] Williams 1991: 89.

Argonautic material,[21] the narrator wonders (or wishes to make his narratees wonder) how he is going to fit them into his version of the *story*. How can the narrator still make the Argo sail along the west coast of Italy, having already taken it where it is now? The detour is subsequently explained as resulting from the anger of Zeus after Apsyrtus' killing, which causes a storm that blows the Argonauts off course. On a metapoetic level, explicitly marked by this invocation of the Muses, the passage draws attention to the stitching together of different poetic traditions.

Considering this, I suggest interpreting the description of the bard Orpheus (which opens the Catalogue of Argonauts in book 1) on a metapoetic level as a trope for the compositional technique of Apollonius:[22]

> And [Orpheus], *they say*, charmed the hard boulders on the mountains and the course of rivers with the sound of his songs. And the wild oak trees, *signs still to this day of his singing, flourish* on the Thracian shore of Zone where they *stand* in dense, orderly rows, (*hexeiēs stikhoōsin*) the ones he led forth from Pieria, charmed by his lyre.   (1.26–31)

The phrasing *hexeiēs stikhoōsin* here seems to allude to hexameter verse, and it may be recalled that the Greek technical, rhetorical term for poetic material was *hulē*, which seems, in turn, to be hinted at by the oak-trees, which are arranged in orderly rows by Orpheus' songs. Also, these trees are led down by lyric music from the homeland of the Muses, Pieria. Orpheus may therefore function as a symbol for the poet Apollonius and his ordering of traditional stories into a unified narrative about the Argonauts, 'proof' of which is then provided by the (still visible) traces left in the Argo's wake. Similarly, Orpheus leaves his marks on the landscape by his songs, and his description also addresses the important theme of altering/ordering the landscape with lasting results: the trees he charmed with his song remain *to this day* (note once more the omnitemporal present tense) as testimony to his singing.[23]

---

[21] For fabula (the aggregate of events reported in a narrative in their full form and chronological order) and material (the extratextual historical sources or tradional tales from which a narrator forms his fabula), see *SAGN* 1: 9.

[22] Klooster 2011: 76–77.

[23] For Orpheus as an ordering force, cf. Clare 2002: 231–260. Orpheus' ordering influence on his surroundings is visible at 1.569–574; 2.161–163; twice Orpheus' song is indirectly linked to the creation or finding of a spring: 1.1145–1149; 4.1423–1430. The cosmogony (1.503–511) describes the 'ordering' of the universe.

Besides Heracles, who changes landscapes by brute force (1.1188–1205; 4.1441–1449), the other main character whose powers change nature is Medea. Her chthonic magic, contrary to the charming powers of Orpheus, creates chaos: 'she can suddenly halt the flow of roaring rivers and arrest the stars and the paths of the sacred moon' (3.532–533).[24] When her witchcraft comes into play, in book 3 (the episode in Colchis) and the first part of book 4 (the chaotic flight of the Argonauts' and their sacrilegious murder of Apsyrtus), Orpheus' ordering influence is remarkably absent from the narrative. If this singer who provides order and harmony is at some level indeed to be equated with the Apollonian narrator, it becomes attractive to relate this absence to what Morrison (2007a: 271–312) has called the 'crisis of confidence' which the narrator undergoes in the later books of the *Argonautica*.

Space of the Narrator versus Story-Space
(Orientation versus Disorientation)

Though the ostensible aim of the Argo's quest is to capture the Golden Fleece (1.4), Jason's main object, from the moment of departure onwards, is always a safe return home.[25] He departs 'at the command of King Pelias' (1.3), who wishes to get rid of him, since it has been prophesied that Jason will kill him. For that reason Pelias 'arranges the ordeal of a very arduous voyage, so that either on sea or else among foreign people [Jason] would *lose any chance of returning home*' (1.15–17; cf. the fate of Odysseus' companions: *Od.* 1.9). The *length* of the journey is in fact emphasised from the very beginning: 'their journeys on the vast sea' (1.21). Particularly telling is the announcement in the catalogue of heroes of Mopsus' death in Libya, 'as far from the Colchians as the distance that is seen between the setting and the rising of the sun' (1.79–85). Mopsus dies not only far from home, but also far from Colchis, which emphasises the vast extent of the Argo's journey. More and more, in particular on the journey homeward (book 4), the space travelled by the Argonauts is thematically presented as a vast, hostile and undesirable element which does not excite their interest.

---

[24] At 4.54–66 the Moon, as a personified goddess, remarks on the irony that Medea, who once bewitched her, is now herself bewitched by Eros.

[25] Cf. Fusillo and Paduano 1986: 7–8. In particular: 1.415–416; 2.411; 3.992–996; 4.202–205.

Indeed, Apollonius himself presumably did not travel far and wide, even if his narrating persona offers the narratees detailed information about locations the Argonauts pass, and the route they struggle to find.[26] A similar contrast between a (sometimes prophetic) authority aware of the details of the route, even though he has not travelled it, and the disorientation of the actual travellers thematically recurs within the narrative. Phineus, the blind prophet, accurately foretells the Argonauts how to travel from Thynia onwards to Colchis (2.317–407).[27] On the other hand, Argus, the son of Phrixus, provides information about the return route by reproducing geographic knowledge found on an ancient engraved map (4.279–293).[28]

The one time the Argonauts themselves are able to enjoy a panoramic view of the route ahead is after their second ascent of Mt Dindymum (1.1112–1116): 'Before their eyes appeared the Macrian heights and the entire coast of Thrace opposite, as if they held them in their hands (…)'.[29] In fact, their spatial standpoint here is reminiscent of that of the gods, as exemplified by Eros' descent from Olympus to Earth (3.164–166): 'And beneath him at times appeared life-sustaining earth and cities of men and divine streams of rivers, and then at other times mountain peaks, while all around was the sea (…)'. Though this technique is not new in itself (→ Homer), the fact that the narrator, as it were, flies along with Eros is innovative (shifting standpoint).[30] Interestingly, this divine perspective (here Athena descending to earth) is likened in a complex simile to that of a traveller who sees all routes homeward unfolding before his mind's eye:

> And as when a man roams far from his homeland—as we suffering humans often must wander—and no land is distant but all routes are visible, and he thinks of his own home and pictures at once the way by sea and by land, and in his swift thoughts seeks now one place, now another with his eyes—so quickly did Zeus' daughter spring down and plant her feet on the inhospitable Thynian shore.   (2.541–548)

---

[26] Delage 1930: 293: 'un voyage en chambre plutôt qu'un journal de bord'.
[27] Phineus uses a narrative style strikingly similar to that of the narrator. Fränkel 1968: 179 characterized the prophecy as a 'geographischer Lehrfilm' and a 'gesprochene Landkarte'.
[28] Other guides (often demi-gods): Cyzicus (1.982–984), Argus (2.1197–1215), the Argo itself (4.580–591), Thetis (4.851–865), the Libyan Heroines (4.1305–1379), Hesperides (4.1406–1448), Triton (4.1551–1585).
[29] See on this passage Williams 1991: 85–89 and Clare 2002: 66–73.
[30] See Danek 2009: 287.

Besides addressing the theme of the wanderer's desire for home, this simile beautifully captures the gap between human and divine powers: what humans may only imagine, gods (and omniscient narrators) can actually do.

The Characterizing and Psychologizing Functions of Space

In the *Argonautica* there is a distinction between the spatial representation of normal, run-of-the-mill locations and that of marvellous places. Generally speaking, indications of 'normal' surroundings are brief and not very colourful. Towns and cities are just mentioned, as are palaces (with the exception of that of Aeetes). The narratees are presumably expected to fill in the details from their own experience:

> They observed a projecting stretch of land which from the gulf looked very broad and at sunrise they rowed ashore. Here were located the ox stables and sheepfold of Amycus, haughty king of the Bebrycians …[31]
>
> (1.1360–2.1–2)

Besides creating such unspecific descriptions that leave practically everything to the narratees' imagination, Apollonius sometimes uses similes to suggest, by means of contrast or association, elements of locations. For instance, Medea and the lamenting maidens ready to die in the Libyan desert are compared to swans on the grassy banks of the river Pactolus: the lush, watery landscape in the simile by contrast suggests the aridity of their actual surroundings (4.1296–1305).[32]

When we do find extensive descriptions, these concern unusual localities or objects, foremost Cyzicus, the Symplegades, the Thermodon Delta, the Acherusian Headland (discussed above), the palace of Aeetes, and the shallows of the Syrtis. Here it should be noted that the descriptions often are longer than the function of the setting in the story warrants. Among the objects, it is in particular the mantle of Jason and the ball of Eros that command the attention. Interestingly, these descriptions all follow entirely different formats, both in their achievement of impressions of visual (or even acoustic) directness and in their presentation (focalized by narrator or characters, dynamic integration into the narrative or pause, panoramic, scenic, or close-up standpoint).

---

[31] Cf. Harder 1994: 16–17. Other examples, e.g.: 1.608, 782–790, 965; 2.759–760; 3.210–212; 4.1068.

[32] Cf. 1.545–456, 573–579.

The Argonauts' greatest adventure on their way to Colchis is doubtless their passage through the Symplegades. Its description is dynamically integrated into the narrative according to the focalization by the Argonauts in the various phases of their approach and struggle to enter and pass the straits (shifting standpoint). The acoustic element plays a remarkable role; in fact, as Phineus had predicted, the terrifying sound of the rocks is the first sign of their proximity:[33]

> … they proceeded very fearfully, for already the *thudding of the crashing rocks struck their ears*, and the sea-washed headlands *resounded*.
>
> (2.552–554)

Following Phineus' advice, the Argonauts send a pigeon to precede them through the Symplegades, and this is when the frightening spectacle of the Symplegades is first described fully:

> The two rocks came back together again with a crash. A mass of seething spray shot up like a cloud and the sea roared terrifyingly, and the vast sky rumbled all around. The hollow caverns at the base of the jagged rocks boomed as the sea surged within, while the white foam of the crashing wave spurted high above the cliff.   (2.564–570)

The impression one takes away from this description (the passage continues for another 35 lines) is that of action, noise and visual directness. Adjectives and adverbs suggest the psychological effect on the Argonauts (fearful, terrifying). There is no narratorial focalization or use of the present tense, both because in this way the focalization by the Argonauts underlines the fearful aspect of the Symplegades and because they were no longer visible as moving rocks in the narrator's own time.

Narratorial comment (panoramic overview in omnitemporal present tense) is mixed with focalization by the heroes (scenic standpoint with past tenses) in one of the most appreciated descriptions of the *Argonautica*, the Syrtis-episode. The situation here could not be more different: whereas the dynamic Symplegades at least offered the Argonauts the opportunity to actively overcome their danger, the eerily silent, lifeless Syrtis-landscape leaves them utterly helpless. This passage follows the format of the description by negation (→ Homer):

> … they came far into the Syrtis, where there is no getting back out again for ships, once they are forced to enter that gulf. For everywhere are shallows, everywhere thickets of seaweeds from the depths, and over them silently washes the foam of the water. Sand stretches along the horizon, an no land

---

[33] Similar emphasis on acoustic phenomena at e.g. 4.129–138.

animal or bird travels there. Here it was that a flood tide—for frequently indeed does this tide recede from the mainland and then, rushing back again, violently disgorge itself on the beach—suddenly drove them to the innermost part of the shore, and very little of their keel was left in the water. They leapt off the ship and sorrow gripped them when they looked at the sky and the expanse of vast land stretching just like the sky into the distance without a break. No watering place, no trail, no herdsmen's steading did they see in the distance, but everything was wrapped in dead calm …   (4.1235–1250)

In the chaotic movement of the Symplegades, elements (sea, air, rocks) were hard to distinguish from each other, but the Syrtis' scary stillness also blurs the elements: sea, land and sky are all vast, undifferentiated expanses. The emptiness causes complete disorientation, a feeling that there is 'nowhere to go'.[34] What nature there is, is in fact inverted: there is too much water, and it is too shallow; plants grow there rather than on land, there is no animal life.

This episode is the only time the Argonauts themselves remark upon the landscape, and they too compare it to their passage through the Symplegades. First an anonymous Argonaut, evoking and preferring the ordeal of this previous adventure, comments on the desolation of the present landscape (4.1251–1268). Then the narrator's observations about the impossibility for ships to escape from the Syrtis are echoed almost literally and enlarged upon by Ancaeus, the helmsman (4.1261–1276). Finally, to emphasize once more the utter unnaturalness of a landscape where nothing is as it should be, the heroes are likened to lifeless ghosts in a plague- or war-stricken city where frightful omens invert the natural order (4.1280–1289). The fact that neither narrator nor characters see a way out underlines the miraculous nature of the eventual escape, the carrying of their vessel through the desert for twelve days in a row, in its turn an inversion of the normal way of travelling.

The desolation of the landscape beautifully mirrors the despair that takes hold of the Argonauts in this episode. Such mutual reflection of psychology and nature in the manner almost of pathetic fallacy recurs several times in the epic.[35] An example occurs when the Argonauts

---

[34] Complementing this landlocked disorientation is the episode at sea near Crete, where distinctions between air and sea are similarly blurred in complete darkness (4.1694–1701). On the Syrtis-episode, see Williams 1991: 163–184; Harder 1994: 18; Clare 2002:150–159.

[35] Cf. the description of Medea's sleepless despair (3.744–765). Here it is rather the quiet landscape that contrasts with the turmoil in Medea's breast.

enter the Eridanus after their treacherous murder of Apsyrtus. They pass through an incredibly gloomy and disturbing landscape of pine trees (the transfigured Heliades) which are weeping amber tears along the marshy banks of sulphurous smoking waters, mourning their brother Phaethon's fall from his father's sun chariot (4.596–620). Since we have been told that Apsyrtus' alternative name was *Phaethon* (3.245), the suggested relation between the landscape and the heroes' anguished guilt becomes even stronger. Note also the poignant contrast between the sisterly tears of the Heliades, and Medea's unrepentant murder of her brother Apsyrtus/Phaethon.

> No desire for food or drink came over the heroes, nor did their minds turn to joyous thoughts. But instead, during the day they were sickened to exhaustion, oppressed by the nauseous stench, which, unbearable, the tributaries of the Eridanus exhaled from smoldering Phaethon, while at night they heard the piercing lament of the loudly wailing Heliades, and as they wept, their tears were borne along the waters like drops of oil.
>
> (4.619–626)

We see here once again that the landscape is invoked through focalization by the heroes; their physical and psychological reactions to it indirectly depict its distinctive aspects (a nauseous stench, wailing sounds).

By a variety of techniques then, all the above passages involve the narratees in the heroes' plight, either through focalization by the heroes themselves (Symplegades, Eridanus), or through mixing objective facts stated by the narrator with the heroes' despair (Syrtis), or by creating landscapes that reflect the heroes' psychology (Syrtis, Eridanus). In these respects these passages differ completely from the description of the Thermodon Delta (2.970–984):

> No river is like that one, nor does any send forth from itself over the land so many separate streams. If anyone were to count each one, he would be four short of one hundred. But only one true source exists, and this flows down to the plain from high mountains, which, they say, are called the Amazonian mountains. From there it spreads straight into higher ground, and that is why its courses are meandering: one constantly winds this way, another that way, wherever each most readily finds low-lying land—one far away, another close by. Many of the branches have no names where they are drained off, but the river, joined by a few streams, empties in full view into the Inhospitable Sea, beneath the curved headland.

Clearly, this description does not represent the way the Argonauts could have seen the delta; it seems to be focalized from above, suggesting a panoramic view, or even a depiction on a map studied by the narrator

(note once more the omnitemporal present).[36] Moreover, the passage develops into an 'if not'-situation, stating that the Argonauts would certainly have encountered and become involved in a fight with the nearby Amazons (who are described in a relatively lengthy ethnographical digression), had not a favourable wind begun to blow (2.985–1000). It is typical for the narrative style of the *Argonautica* that the passage not only creates a pause in the narrative, but does so by recounting facts that seem entirely irrelevant to it. It could, however, be suggested that the description of the network of streams is meant to foreshadow the importance of rivers for the Argonauts' return home. This would fit the interpretation usually given to the digression on the Amazons. These *female warriors* are considered to foreshadow the paradox that the Golden Fleece is finally obtained through Medea's love rather than by the valour of the heroes.[37]

Besides the description of the Amazons, there are more signs that, once the Symplegades are passed, the Argo enters a kind of topsy-turvy land where customs are unpleasantly un-Greek. Ethnographical asides on the habits of the Tibareni, Mossynoeci and Chalybes constantly emphasize the contrast with 'normal' practice (always in the historiographer's omnitemporal present). Similarly, the narrator's focalized description of one of the first items in view in Colchis, the plain of Circe, is bizarre and unpleasant: 'many tamarisks and willows grow in rows, on whose topmost branches hang dead bodies bound with cords' (3.200–203).[38] This inversion of 'normal' Greek practice should perhaps be linked to the fact that the Colchians are in fact portrayed as descendants of the Egyptians (cf. 4.259–293), who were traditionally (i.e. since Herodotus at least) generally seen as 'most opposite to the Greeks in every respect' (Hdt. 2.35.1).

The palace of Aeetes is one of the main locations of the narrative of book 3. Until this point the action has been mainly outdoors, or on board of the Argo, or on couches of leaves under the starry sky, with the important exception of the Lemnian episode, where the Argonauts enter the Lemnian women's city and, of course, their beds. Book 3, however,

---

[36] Cf. Fränkel 1968: 258–259, who draws a diagram of the delta. The one mention of maps in the *Argonautica* occurs at 4.272–281; these maps portray river networks, too.

[37] The theme of women, love and war is foreshadowed in the descriptions of Atalanta, Aphrodite reflected in Ares' shield on Jason's mantle, the encounter with the Lemnian women.

[38] The entering of the Symplegades has been read as a symbolic *rite de passage*, or *katabasis*. Cf. 2.728–745, 1248–1250, 1271–1275.

is mainly taken up with the intimate emotions of Medea. On a symbolic level this is echoed by the fact that she is often depicted indoors, in her room in the palace.[39] The fact that many scenes take place behind closed doors in the women's quarters also enhances the atmosphere of secret treachery and duplicity characterizing the Colchian episode, which is on a narrative level underscored by the fact that here the story becomes separated into multiple, simultaneous storylines.[40]

When Jason finally enters Aeetes' palace, it is described in great detail (3.215–248), deriving much from the description of (→) Homeric dwellings, in particular Calypso's cave and Alcinous' palace in the *Odyssey*.[41] The Homeric allusions hint at the contrasts and similarities between its most important inhabitants: cruel Aeetes is the very opposite of righteous Alcinous, while Medea is similar to Nausicaa (a young girl longing for a stranger's attention) and Calypso (loved and eventually left by the hero). The description once more mixes focalization by the characters with what appear to be remarks by the narrator, although these are not in the typical omnitemporal present of his ethnographical and geographical digressions, presumably because this is so clearly a place of myth. The order of the description reflects the order in which the Argonauts enter the palace (vestibule, courtyard, threshold, garden, etc). But the narratee wonders how the visitors could have known about Hephaestus' artefacts, or the magical springs, or Apsyrtus' mother. Theoretically, Argus, the son of Phrixus, a Colchian who guides Jason and his men, might have furnished this information,[42] but this seems to be gainsaid by the narratorial comment 'it is said'. Most likely, we are dealing with an 'Alexandrian footnote' of a learned narrator: there was a source mentioning these facts. In this sense, the passage is different from its Homeric model, where the narrator is simply omniscient and no reference is made to possible sources.

A noteworthy feature of the description of the palace is the way in which it furnishes a line-up of the Colchian characters that will play important roles in the sequel:

---

[39] See Manakidou 1992: 169–173 on how the palace symbolizes Medea's maidenhood. Note the recurrence of doors, bolts and thresholds (3.645–649, 822; 4.26–42).

[40] Cf. Danek 2009: 283–287.

[41] Cf. e.g. Williams 1991: 151–162. Homeric elements: Calypso's garden and cave (*Od.* 5.55–75) also have a vine and four fountains. Alcinous' palace (*Od.* 7.81–132) sports similar architectural elements as Aeetes' palace; it is also ornamented with two bronze dogs made by Hephaestus.

[42] Cf. Danek 2009: 283–284.

> And here a central door was forged, and next to it were many well-built double doors and rooms in both directions, while an ornate colonnade ran all along both sides. At angles on either side stood taller buildings. In the loftiest one lived King Aeetes with his wife, while in the other lived Aeetes' son Apsyrtus [excursus on Apsyrtus' mother: 3.242–246]. But in the rooms lived the servants and Aeetes' two daughters, Chalciope and Medea.   (3.215–248)

Similarly pointing forward are the miraculous artefacts produced by Hephaestus for Aeetes, which include the magical bronze bulls and the plough which Jason will have to wield to prove his valour and obtain the Golden Fleece (3.230–234). In this way, major themes of the subsequent narrative are economically incorporated into the setting where events take place.

Such layering of meaning is also found in the two most famous descriptions of objects in the *Argonautica*: the mantle of Jason and the ball of Zeus promised to Eros. Both of these ekphrases have received a considerable amount of critical attention. I will here limit myself to the mantle of Jason, a gift from Athena, which he puts on when he is preparing to meet the Lemnian queen Hypsipyle (1.721–768).[43] The scholiast already noted that this passage was an allusion to the Shield of Achilles (→ Homer),[44] and pointed out the symbolic importance of the fact that Jason's weapon of choice is a beautiful cloak rather than a shield. It characterizes him as *apolemos*, a 'love hero' (Lawall 1966), whose *aristeia* depends on, or even consists of, the seduction of women. The mantle is not described while being made but the narrator states that it *was made* by Athena in the past. The description takes the form of a list: 'next in order was *fashioned*' (*etetukto*, vel sim.), 'and on it were / was' (*esan / eēn*). The passage thus forms a pause of 47 lines during which the story remains stationary: it opens with Jason preparing to fasten the clasp and ends with his doing so.

The wonderful colour and ornaments of the mantle plainly reveal its divine origin: 'You could cast your eyes more easily on the rising sun than gaze at that cloak's red colour …'.[45] But this phrase also hints at the

---

[43] On the significance of the ball (symbolizing the Universe), see in particular Manakidou 1992: 143–156; Pendergraft 1991: 95–102; Clauss 2000: 11–32.

[44] Although the pseudo-Hesiodic *Aspis* also plays a role in the ekphrasis.

[45] Its red colour and its shining brightness are leitmotifs in the epic, constantly connected to (Jason's) erotic desirability. Significantly, these also occur in the description of the Golden Fleece at 4.167–177, later used as wedding bed for Jason and Medea (4.1141–1152).

difficulties of actually seeing and understanding what is depicted on it, a point to which we will return below. Differing from the Homeric shield-description once more, the images are for the most part episodes from myth, not general images of human life. Moreover, they are described in a way that remains mostly within the boundaries of what might actually be depicted, in other words, they are static images rather than dynamic scenes, although the lifelikeness of the final vignette is stressed:

> And on it was Phrixus the Minyan, as if actually listening to the ram, which seemed to be speaking. When looking at them, you would fall silent and be deceived in your heart, expecting to hear some wise pronouncement from them; and so you would gaze for a long time in that expectation.

Inviting the participation of the narratees, this final passage hints at the problems of interpreting the pictorial program on the cloak as a whole: it would seem to evoke the narratees' amazement, their wish to hear 'some wise pronouncement' on its (prophetic) meaning. In effect, the cloak's description has invited a considerable amount of critical attention. Although it is immediately clear that the stories or images depicted are in some way important to major themes of the narrative, the point of discussion is how this relation should be construed. Whereas some wish to read all the images as corresponding strictly to single events in the narrative, or functioning as lessons for Jason, it seems more attractive to read them in an associative, at times clearly paradigmatic, at other times more obliquely symbolic way: they do not all relate in the exact same way to elements of the narrative and often predicate on various themes and events simultaneously.[46] Bulloch (2006: 44–68) suggests moreover that there is a deeper correspondence with the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, which obliquely reflects on the sinister turn which Jason's relation with Medea will take.

In the associative interpretation, the Cyclopes' fashioning of their thunderbolts (1.730–734) refers to the important theme of Zeus' justice and might, by which the Argonauts must but do not always abide.[47] The vignette of Amphion and Zetus constructing the walls of Thebes by the power of music and physical strength alternately (1.735–741) exalts the ordering, constructive power of song (as embodied principally in Orpheus) over muscular strength (e.g. Heracles, Idas), or, on a broader

---

[46] See bibliography in Fusillo 1985 and Manakidou 1992.
[47] Their most important transgression of Zeus' laws is the murder of Apsyrtus. The Cyclopes-vignette, moreover, takes up the end of Orpheus' song in 1.508–511.

level, of civilization over brutality (Polydeuces and Amycus; Jason and Aeetes). In an almost metonymical way, Aphrodite mirroring herself in the shield of Ares (1.742–746) alludes to the dual theme of love and war in the Argonautic quest, which finds its climax in Medea's love for Jason. Erotic desire may function as a 'weapon', but the image also points to the danger that such desire may breed 'war' and ultimate destruction.[48] The final image of Phrixus and the speaking ram (1.763–667) furnishes a close link between ekphrasis and narrative, by depicting the antecedent to the whole venture of the Argonauts and, simultaneously, its goal, the Golden Fleece. Moreover, since the pronouncement of the ram was presumably an oracle, the picture may also be said to reflect self-referentially on the prophetic function of the iconographical programme of the cloak as a whole.

Thus, although the description in fact forms a pause in the narrative, it is also one of the most important passages in the whole epic in terms of thematic explication and the foreshadowing of events. Moreover, the cloak is not just a cloak but the first in a series of cloaks that form a meaningful thread throughout the epic, linked by the themes of love, war, and deceit. In 2.30–32, Polydeuces, preparing to fight the brute Amycus, is said to be wearing a cloak given him by one of the Lemnian women. Addressing the opposition between brute force and elegant civilization, this episode in turn prefigures the contrast between Jason (whom we remember cloaked in his beautiful mantle, a gift from Athena) and Aeetes (dressed in bronze armour fashioned by Hephaestus: 3.1225–1234). Preparing a sacrifice to Hecate previous to his test of valour against the Earthborn giants, Jason wears another Lemnian mantle given to him by Hypsipyle 'as a memento of their fervent lovemaking' (3.1203–1206); as was the case with Hypsipyle, it is Jason's erotic appeal that has seduced Medea into giving him the magic drugs he is about to offer to Hecate; like Hypsipyle, Medea will eventually be left by Jason. Finally, Medea's brother Apsyrtus is lured into Jason's trap by the gift of the mantle on which Dionysus and Ariadne once made love (4.423–434), and which was another gift from Hypsipyle.[49] Here not only the Lemnian connection is brought into play, but the story of Theseus deserting Ariadne is evoked as well.

---

[48] Cf. the invocation to Eros in 4.445. Note that Aphrodite is 'a poetic description of a reflected image in a woven picture' (Zanker 1987: 69).

[49] Cf. *SAGN* 2: 70–72.

Besides furnishing an oblique comment on many major themes of the epic by way of its ornaments, the mantle of Jason is the first in a meaningful series and a privileged symbol of love and treachery throughout the epic. The fact that this mantle is made of a woven fabric, full of 'intricate designs (*daidala polla*), skilfully fashioned', meta-poetically predicates on the finely wrought strand the mantles themselves form in the texture of the narrative.

Conclusion

The treatment of space in the *Argonautica* is a multifaceted subject. Whereas Apollonius has paid considerable attention to the harmonisation of geographical and literary traditions surrounding the Argo's voyage, the amount of attention he pays to the description of settings which are important to the narrative varies greatly. He describes in detail locations that seem to have no specific relevance, whereas locations where significant action does take place are merely sketched in by means of a few lines. These frequent digressions, focalized by the narrator, point to the interesting paradox that, although Apollonius presumably has not travelled the route of the Argo, he is aware of its remarkable details, which do not seem to interest his disoriented, home-sick heroes at all. This contrast recurs in the opposition between authorities aware of the route ahead, and the ignorance of the Argonauts themselves.

A key theme is changes in the natural surroundings of the Argonauts, in particular as a result of actions by the heroes themselves. They frequently interfere with the landscape they encounter, transforming it. These transformations are recounted by the narrator as aetiological stories. Since the traces left by the Argonauts are still visible, they form a link between the mythical past of the narrative and the present of the narratees and narrator, as well as 'proving' the correctness of the narrative. The strong emphasis on the Libyan episode clearly holds ideological implications for the presence of the Greeks in Northern Africa.

On a more psychological level, the landscape also appears to influence the Argonauts and, in particular, their state of mind. This is specifically the case in the Syrtis-episode and the passage through Eridanus. I have suggested that both themes, altering and ordering the landscape, and ordering sources to re-create the Argo's route, are metaphorically addressed in the description of Orpheus, who changes and orders nature with his songs.

While some learned digressions *prima facie* interrupt the narrative flow, it is almost always possible, on a deeper, thematic level, to explain them as relevant. This is the case with the enigmatic excursus on the Thermodon-delta and the Amazons, the asides in the description of Aeetes' palace and, most significantly, in the series of mantles, beginning with the mantle of Jason, which are described at various thematically central moments in the narrative.

On the whole, by mixing awareness of literary predecessors with quasi-scientific geographic interests and incorporating multilayered descriptions into his narrative, Apollonius has created a richly variegated, complex space for his characters to move in (and his narratees to read about).

CALLIMACHUS

M.A. Harder

In the earlier volumes of *SAGN*, we have seen that Callimachus' treatment of the various aspects of storytelling is always careful and innovative, suggesting a great interest in the possibilities of narrative techniques and often related to a programmatic 'message'. The same holds true for his treatment of space. Here a particularly striking element is that both the narrator's and the story-space are of a decidedly bookish character. The descriptions of space can be related to the scholarly and literary tradition by means of various references and allusions. Many locations are in fact defined by what Callimachus must have read about them in books and in their turn evoke these books for the narratees. Besides, the presentation of space often has metapoetic overtones, as we can see that Callimachus is using it to structure his works and to underline its various messages.

In this chapter I will illustrate Callimachus' use of space by means of some significant examples. These will by no means exhaust the subject, but should give the readers a general idea of Callimachus' innovative and creative way of handling these issues. I will focus on the use of intertextuality in descriptions of space, on space as a structuring device in the collection of hymns, on the ways in which the presentation of space may help to convey a poem's programmatic message, and on Callimachus' experiments with space and objects as actors and speakers.

Space and Intertextuality

In many cases the space descriptions of Callimachus acquire a distinctly bookish character by means of allusions to earlier texts, aetiological traditions or scholarly discussions, as for instance in *Hymn* 4, where Callimachus shows the historical and literary dimensions of space, as Apollo predicts future events in Thebes, on Cos, in Delphi and in Egypt at various stages of myth and history (87–98 and 162–195), or in *Aetia* fr. 75.53–77, where the island Ceos is presented by means of a summary

of the history of Ceos by the author Xenomedes. A simple small-scale example of this technique is *Hymn* 4.156, where Corcyra, in a list of islands which refuse to receive the pregnant Leto, is briefly referred to as 'the most hospitable of all'. This epithet relates the island to the well-known island of the Phaeacians from the *Odyssey* and thus shows the narratees that Callimachus identified the island of the Phaeacians with Corcyra.[1]

At the same time Callimachus seems to make an effort to connect this bookish space with the present: the space of the third century BC is presented as filled and shaped by the traditions of the past and Callimachus' descriptions help the narratees to remember that past. The question how many of the rituals and monuments referred to were really still there in Callimachus' time, however, is hard to answer. In some cases in the *Aetia* there are good reasons to suspect that the rituals referred to as being performed 'even now' were already obsolete in the third century BC, so that even the present space acquires a bookish dimension.[2] In other cases such as the mention of 'our present king' in *Hymn* 1 or the description of the procession in *Hymn* 6.120–133 the references to the present must have evoked the real world of contemporary Alexandria or other contemporary towns. The result is an intricate mixture, which invites the narratees to think carefully about the status of a given space at all times.

Story-Space in Hymn 1

A good example of this treatment of space is the use of story-space in *Hymn* 1, which is full of references to literary, antiquarian and scholarly discourses. To begin with, the place where Zeus is born is an object of doubt, evoking scholarly discussion (was he born on Crete or in Arcadia?) and argument (the Cretan claims cannot be right), and then turns out to be a mountain in Arcadia covered with wood, now a sacred and secluded space (10–14). In this way Callimachus at once embeds the story-space in a historical and learned framework with relevance for the present. The same mixture of scholarly and aetiological interests is also evident in the next passage, where Rhea is searching for water

---

[1] On the scholarly dispute about the name of the island of the Phaeacians in antiquity, see Harder 2012: ad fr. 12.3–4.

[2] So e.g. in fr. 43, where it is not certain that the anonymous ritual of the founder of Zancle was still carried out in Callimachus' time (see Harder 2012: ad fr. 43.58–83).

to wash her baby and Callimachus adds a description of the formerly dry landscape of Arcadia, where the now well-known rivers (of which he gives a brief catalogue) did not yet exist when Zeus was born, and tells about the emergence of the river Neda in which Zeus was bathed (11–41). The nymph Neda, after whom the river is called, then carries Zeus to Crete, where he is hidden from Cronus in the Dictaean cave and brought up, and again the description is furnished with several *aitia* (42–54). When Zeus has grown up the space expands and he is said to rule in heaven. This is his final destination and the kind of 'space' he deserves because of his superior qualities, as Callimachus makes clear by referring to different traditions on this subject: he states that old poets cannot have been right when they said that Zeus was made king of heaven by casting lots and that it must have been his superior qualities that made him king (60–67). In heaven Zeus is to be lord of the kings on earth (a notion supported with a quotation from Hes. *Th.* 96) and among them is 'our' king, who in his turn rules widely on earth (55–90). Thus we see that in the first part of the hymn the narratees are referred back to the historical and scholarly dimensions of the story-space and that the story-space is related to the present by the numerous *aitia*, while in the second part the reference to the present king, who shares in the power of Zeus, adds a new and contemporary dimension to the bookish world of the past. The narratees seem to be made aware of the fact that the ancient story-space, with all the traditions associated with it, is in fact the space of their own world too.

The Space of the Narrator in Hymn 5

In *Hymn* 5 we see a similar technique in the description of the narrator's space. The setting here is Argos, where women are invited to attend the ceremony of the ritual bath of Athena and the goddess' statue is about to be carried in a procession from her temple to the river Inachus, where it will be bathed. In this passage several aspects of the Argive space are evoked and by means of allusions Callimachus embeds the description in the Greek literary tradition, so that the space acquires a definitely bookish character and Argos stands for more than just the contemporary Argos of the third century BC:

(1) We hear that the shield of Diomedes will also be carried in the procession. This is a practice the Argives learned from Athena's priest Eumedes, who once was threatened by the people and fled to the

mountains with the Palladion, brought to Argos by Diomedes after the Trojan war (35–42). The details of this story are not entirely clear,[3] but the connections with the literary and scholarly traditions are undeniable. As Bulloch argues, the story of Eumedes may be connected with the episode of the return of the Heraclids to Argos and Eumedes may have tried to give the Palladion back to their leader Temenus. Stories about this generation of Heraclids were dealt with in several plays by Euripides and must have played a part in the claims of the Greek descent of the Macedonians.[4] Thus they would also be of importance for the connections between the Ptolemies and Argos as seat of the Heraclids.[5]

(2) We hear that, because the river Inachus will be Athena's bath today, the people of Argos should have their water brought from the springs Physadeia or Amymone (45–51).[6] These names recall the story of Danaus and his daughters, who fled from Egypt to Argos and provided the once dry area with springs. Again we see references which turn the landscape into an area filled with stories from the past, which connect it closely with Ptolemaic claims about connections between Egypt and Argos.

So, as in *Hymn* 1 the bookish character of the description seems to be of more than just antiquarian interest, as it helps to enhance the status of Argos, the place from which, through Heracles and his descendants, the Ptolemies ultimately claimed to come, and to connect it with Egypt by means of the mention of the Danaids.

Reception of the Homeric Hymns

Many elements from the Homeric hymns recur or are carefully varied in the hymns of Callimachus and this applies also to the treatment of space. The way in which Callimachus deals with the movements and travelling of the gods and the personifications of space will be discussed below. In this section I will discuss a few other aspects of Callimachus' reception of the treatment of space in the Homeric hymns.

An interesting point, which has already received ample scholarly attention, is Callimachus' elaboration of the narrator's space in his so-called mimetic hymns.[7] One can say that in (→) the Homeric hymns

---

[3] See the discussion in Bulloch 1985: ad 35–42.
[4] See on these plays Harder 1991.
[5] See also Bulloch 1985: 12–13.
[6] For details, see Bulloch 1985: ad loc.; Harder 2012: ad *Aetia* fr. 65–66.
[7] See Harder 1992 (with further references).

the brief glimpses of the narrator's space at the beginning and the end of the hymns suggest a hint of mimesis. Callimachus seems to have elaborated on this in creating the setting for his mimetic hymns, possibly also inspired by the more extended passage about the narrator's position in *h.Ap.* 165–181. In *Hymns* 1, 3 and 4 the hints of mimesis are slight, but nevertheless more varied than in the Homeric hymns: in *Hymn* 1.1–2 there is a small hint of mimesis when the narrator refers to a symposium as the proper occasion for singing about Zeus; in *Hymn* 3.1 and 4.1–10 the singer refers to his own task of singing for Artemis and Apollo and the need not to forget them. In *Hymns* 2, 5 and 6 we have elaborate descriptions of a ritual setting in which the narrator appears as a master or mistress of ceremonies and organizes the ritual event, including the songs and stories which make up the body of the hymn. At close reading these religious settings turn out to be more than just a variation of form, but can be shown to be tuned to the poem's message.

A closer look at the *Hymn to Apollo* in relation to *Hymns* 2 and 4 shows how by his reception of aspects of space in the Homeric hymn Callimachus provides his narratees with instruments to connect his two hymns.[8] A few examples may serve to illustrate Callimachus' technique in this respect:

(1) In *h.Ap.* 18 and 117 the palm tree near which Leto bore Apollo is mentioned, in 18 together with the river Inopus. This tree recurs in *Hymn* 4.210 in the same scene after Callimachus has told in 206 how Leto sat down at Inopus' stream; in *Hymn* 2.4 a Delian palm tree occurs as well, nodding suddenly at the epiphany of Apollo. Thus a link seems to be established between Callimachus' hymns as well as between each of these hymns and the Homeric hymn: by means of the references to the palm tree birth and epiphany become closely related.

(2) *h.Ap.* 30–46 describes Leto's journey along the islands and the coast of the Aegean Sea. In Callimachus' fourth hymn this motif is extended: before she is finally received on Asteria/Delos Leto travels first on mainland Greece, in the Peloponnese and Boeotia, ending at Thebes (70–99), then through Achaea and Thessaly, ending at the river Peneius (100–152), and then across the islands, ending at Cos (153–195). The last episode is closest to Leto's travels in the Homeric hymn, but the first and second episode recall Apollo's travels on the Greek mainland in

---

[8] The picture may be further completed when one takes into account all allusions to *h.Ap.*, not just those relating to space.

search of a place to build his temple in *h.Ap*.214–286. In the (→) *Hymn to Apollo* we find a reference to Thebes in an antiquarian flashback in 225–228,[9] where we read that at that time the area was not yet inhabited, but just covered by wood, and a dialogue with the river-goddess Telphusa in 244–276, who tells Apollo to build his temple not on her banks but at Crisa.[10] Read against this pretext Callimachus' hymn appears as a careful variation of the treatment of space in the Homeric hymn.

(3) Connections between *Hymn* 2 and the *Hymn to Apollo* seem quite certain, if one compares *h.Ap*. 19 and 207 with *Hymn* 2.31 about Apollo being a popular subject of song. From the point of view of space and objects the links are smaller, but one can point to the references to Apollo's building of the foundations for his temple in *h.Ap*. 254 and 294 and the repeated use of the same noun *themeilia* in *Hymn* 2.57, 58 and 64, where the infant Apollo is building an altar (in this passage the notion of Apollo's early achievements recalls *h.Ap*. 127–132).

Space as a Structuring Device in the Collection of Hymns

Although, of course, we cannot be entirely certain, there now seems to be a certain consensus that the hymns of Callimachus were arranged and probably conceived as a collection by Callimachus himself.[11] This allows us to explore the hymns on these terms and in fact many parallels and connections within the collection have been observed and have strengthened the notion that the collection may be regarded as a 'poetry book'. The presentation of space as one of the structuring devices in the collection of hymns is therefore also worth investigating.

Generally speaking one can say that *Hymns* 1, 2, 5 and 6 show a pattern of briefly referring to a limited number of spaces and then zooming in on one specific location, which then acquires a central role as the main story-space.[12] In *Hymns* 3 and 4, however, the treatment of story-space is more caleidoscopic, although there too Artemis and Apollo eventually

---

[9] Here the repeated 'not yet' in 226 and 227 is recalled in *Hymn* 4.88–91, where we find three times 'not yet' at the beginning of the lines in the unborn Apollo's address of Thebes.

[10] This dialogue, as well as that between Leto and Delos in 49–90, may have inspired the speeches of Delos in *Hymn* 4.203–204 and 266–273.

[11] See e.g. Depew 2004: 117; Bulloch 2010: 168–169.

[12] This pattern also seems present in Callimachus' treatment of Zancle in the *Aetia* (fr. 43).

reach their final destination on, respectively, Olympus and Delos. A closer look at some of the hymns reveals further connections across the collection. As to narrator's space we see connections between the three mimetic hymns, *Hymn* 2, 5 and 6, where the narrator presents himself as acting in a specific space and telling his story within the framework of a ritual event.

When we compare the story-space in *Hymns* 1, 2, 3 and 4, we can observe interesting parallels and variations. All four hymns recall the way in which in (→) the Homeric hymns the gods are travelling a great deal and much attention is given to the locations of their cult and their position on Olympus, but while adhering to a pattern of 'three (groups of) locations plus one final destination' Callimachus carefully varies the theme of movement in each hymn.

In the story-space in *Hymn* 2 the description of Apollo first evokes his golden attributes and rich possessions in Delphi and then moves to an unnamed town, which benefits from his healing powers (32–41). In 47–54 we get a picture of the herds of Admetus on the Amphryssus, looked after by Apollo. From there we move to Delos, where Apollo as a child built the famous altar of horns (56–64), and finally to Cyrene (65–96). The passage about Cyrene is almost as long as the preceding descriptions of space taken together and describes the institution of the cult for Apollo Carneius and the settlement of the Dorians in the area. In a way comparable to *Hymn* 1, where after the various locations of his youth Zeus finally settles in heaven, we see a pattern of three (groups of) locations dealt with relatively briefly and then a central one dealt with at greater length and described in line 90 as 'seen' by Apollo himself. Read together these hymns suggest that the importance of Apollo in Cyrene and for the Battiads may be compared to that of Zeus in the world at large and for the Ptolemies. As opposed to *Hymn* 1, where the *aitia* appear in the first three locations, the aetiological element is here the most prominent in the passage about Cyrene. The presentation of space with its parallels and contrasts thus seems to invite the narratees to consider these hymns as a pair.

Hymn 3, for Artemis, seems to vary the pattern of *Hymns* 1 and 2. It begins again in a fairly confined space, as the young goddess is sitting on her father's lap, asking for her attributes, and is still too small to reach her father's beard (1–40). Even so, the passage already suggests the extension of the space eventually covered by the goddess when Zeus promises her many towns with sanctuaries on islands and on the mainland (33–39). Immediately after this the goddess is on her way through

the world to collect her hunting attributes: to Crete and Oceanus (to collect nymphs), to the Cyclopes (to collect her bow and arrows), to Arcadia (for hunting dogs) (40–97). The next part of the hymn relates her activities in various places: hunting on the banks of Anaurus, driving her chariot on Mt Haemus in Thrace, cutting a torch on Mysian Olympus, and finally arriving with her hunting spoils at the home of the gods (98–169). Thus her career reaches its climax after the mention of two groups of three earlier locations, showing a pattern which recalls *Hymns* 1 and 2. Then the focus changes to locations where Artemis is honoured and Callimachus lists Egyptian Inopus, Pitane, Limnae, Halae, Doliche, Perge, Taygetus, and the harbours of the Euripus (170–188). Then, after a list of nymphs, there is another series of locations, partly mentioned explicitly, partly indicated by means of the names of people who had some kind of connection with Artemis: Miletus, Samos, Argolis, Arcadia, Ephesus, Attica, Thessalia, Aetolia, Aulis, Naxos, Chios (225–267). By means of these extensive lists Callimachus is evoking many mythological stories and the story-space again reflects the scholarly and literary tradition. Compared to *Hymn* 1, where the world was presented very much as a unity governed by Zeus, and *Hymn* 2, where the focus was largely on Cyrene, each with its neat pattern of 'three plus one', here after the pattern of 'two times three plus one' we get a different picture. The attention of the audience is led from Olympus to the human world, which is presented as consisting of many small individual places, each of them with its own relation with the goddess. This suggests a busy world full of variety as a background for stories and traditions in which the versatile goddess played an important part.

It is worth comparing *Hymn* 4 to *Hymn* 3 too. Just as *Hymns* 1 and 2 can be regarded as pairs 'space-wise', so can *Hymns* 3 and 4, where the fact that Artemis and Apollo are both children of Leto and Zeus *a priori* points to some kind of connection. In *Hymn* 3 Artemis starts from her father's lap and is then moving into and around the world: in *Hymn* 4 both elements seem to be carried one step further and thereby seem to become part of a more experimental and fanciful world, as Apollo is found not on his father's lap, but within his mother's womb— an unprecedented kind of story-space—and the world, represented by a large number of locations as in *Hymn* 3, is moving around and away from the god. As in the three earlier hymns in the collection here too we have the pattern of 'three plus one': three groups of spaces are fleeing for the pregnant Leto before she is finally accepted on Asteria/Delos.

The Programmatic Use of Space

In Callimachus' poems we may often observe a connection between the treatment of narrator's or story-space and possible programmatic messages. That is: the presentation of space seems to draw attention to certain important issues and to offer the narratees clues to the function and message of the poems.

In his hymns Callimachus presents the narrator's space in different ways. At the beginning of *Hymns* 3 and 4 the narrator refers to himself and his intention to sing about Artemis and Delos respectively, but there is no mention of the actual space in which the narrator is supposed to perform. In *Hymn* 1.1 the question 'what better subject than Zeus is there for singing at libations' may suggest that the singing takes place at a specific symposium where libations were part of the proceedings. Thus it may evoke a spatial setting for the hymn. However, the hint is slight and one could also take the words as referring to *any* kind of libations, not just to those at a specific symposium at which the narrator is going to sing this hymn to Zeus. In the other three hymns the situation is radically different. Here the narrator presents himself as a kind of master or mistress of ceremonies at a religious event and the space in which these events take place is evoked at the beginning of the poems. The treatment of the narrator's space in *Hymn* 2 may serve as an example of how Callimachus can use this kind of mimetic setting for programmatic purposes. In the *Aetia* the narrator's space is of particular importance in books 1 and 2, where the narrative is presented as a dream of Callimachus in which the Muses told him the *aitia* on Mt Helicon.

As we have seen in the discussion of the story-space in *Hymn* 1 above, there is a movement there from small and confined beginnings to the notion of the rule on heaven and earth, so that the treatment of space parallels the career of Zeus. Other hymns as well as the *Aetia* show similar uses of story-space being tuned to the events in a possibly programmatic way. *Hymns* 5 and 6 and some passages from the *Aetia* may serve as examples.

The Programmatic Use of the Space of the Narrator

Hymn 2 begins with a lively description of its setting (1–8):

> How the sapling of Apollo's laurel tree just shook,
> how the whole temple shook; be off, be off whoever is sinful.

> Truly, Apollo must be kicking at the doors with his beautiful foot.
> Don't you see it? Suddenly the Delian palm tree has nodded
> pleasantly, and the swan sings beautifully in the sky.
> Now, bars of the doors, push yourself out of the way,
> and you too, bolts; for the god is no longer far away;
> and, young men, get ready for singing and dancing.

Here the narrator presents himself, without further introduction, as someone who is present at an epiphany of Apollo at Delos. It is not clear, though, whether we must think of a specific ritual event at the historical Delos or assume that Delos is chosen just as a typical background for Apollo, as a place charged with religious and literary associations.

In any case the description of the space is selective and limited to elements which play a central part in this religious event. Space and objects also play an active part in the action, because everything is moving in anticipation of the god's epiphany. The shaking of the laurel tree and the temple and the rattling of the doors ('kicked' by the god) indicate the movements of the god who is about to appear. The well-known Delian palm tree and the swan, a bird closely associated with Apollo[13] and here said to appear in the sky (5), seem to be nodding and singing in confirmation. Then the narrator urges the doors to open themselves and the chorus of young men to prepare themselves for song and dance. Thus the description of space and objects and the activities implied in it seem to underline the impact and importance of Apollo's epiphany and to inspire the narratees, who may place themselves in the position of the audience (technically one of the various groups of narratees addressed by the narrator in the mimetic setting of the hymn),[14] with awe and admiration. The notion of the presence of a chorus and an audience peopling the narrator's space and participating in his song for Apollo is then continued by references to the chorus' singing and dancing and the audience's listening in lines 12–16, 17, 25, 28–31. With the words 'we hear *hie hie paieon*' in 97, after the eulogy of Apollo in 32–96, there seems to be a return to the ritual setting.

Then, in 105–113, there seems to be a different kind of narrator's space. The scene moves rather abruptly and without further explanation to a kind of space which is not well-defined or described with any kind of detail (and need not be the same as the temple at the poem's beginning).

---

[13] For details, see Williams 1978: ad loc.

[14] On the complex situation concerning the narratees in this hymn, where apart from the audience at Delos several others ddressees may be detected, see *SAGN* 1: 73.

Here Apollo and Envy have a discussion about poetic quality and Apollo kicks Envy away. The narrator, who seems to have undergone a change from the master of ceremonies at the hymn's beginning to a more abstract omnipresent narrator watching and hearing (semi-)divine beings, then concludes in 113: 'Farewell, lord; let Criticism go where Envy goes'. This final reference to space is even more undefined than the setting of the dialogue. It suggests a kind of outer space, which may recall the distant places where the sinful were sent in line 2, rejected from the presence of Apollo just like Envy and Criticism (and in their wake the poets defended by them?) here. Thus the notion of space seems to play an important part not only in providing a vivid picture of the ritual for Apollo, but also on a metapoetic level in drawing attention to the boundaries between the worlds of those devoted to Apollo, presumably including the right kind of poets, and of the faithless sinners, presumably including the wrong kind of poets.

In the *Aetia* we have some explicit references to narrator's space in *Aetia* 1–2. First of all there is the setting of the dialogue with the Muses on Mt Helicon which provided the framework for these books, as is explained by the Florentine scholia (fr. 2d).[15] This setting at a location where once the Muses met Hesiod and instructed him to be a poet (cf. fr. 2) means that the narrator's space is a setting of considerable programmatic importance. It suggests that one of Callimachus' reasons for choosing the narrator's space of this part of the *Aetia* was that it could act as a means to point to Hesiod as an important model and to share in the way in which he was made into a poet by a decisive act of the Muses, the so-called *Dichterweihe*. Thus the description of space seems to be programmatically inspired, as it embeds Callimachus in the literary tradition and relates him to a famous predecessor. It should also be noted that at the same time the space is of a slightly unreal and decidedly bookish character, as the dialogue with the Muses takes place in a dream and the location of the dream is based on the literary example of Hesiod.

Other passages from the *Aetia* where the narrator's space consists of a symposium setting show a similar picture.[16] In fr. 43.12–17 the narrator

---

[15] Fragments of the *Aetia* are referred to by their numbers in Harder 2012.

[16] It is not clear how these symposium-fragments must be related to the framework of the dialogue with the Muses; they could e.g. be reminiscences of 'the young Callimachus' about which he told the Muses or by which he interrupted the dialogue. In any case these fragments evoke the traditional setting for the presentation of poetry, as we find it

tells how the luxuries of a symposium, such as oil and wreaths, food and drink, all have vanished and only the stories he has heard there have remained with him. In fr. 178, which may be from *Aetia* 2, although we cannot be certain,[17] the narrator's space at a symposium organized by the Athenian Pollis is described at some length (fr. 178.1–21):

> and neither the day of the opening of the jars nor the time
>   when Orestes' pitchers bring a happy day for slaves escaped him;
> and celebrating the yearly festival of the daughter of Icarius,
>   your day, Erigone, object of pity for the Attic women,
> he invited congenial friends to a meal, and among them
>   a stranger, who, having just arrived, stayed in Egypt,
> where he came on some private business; by birth he was
>   an Ician and I shared a couch with him,
> not by prior arrangement, but the word of Homer, that the god
>   always brings like to like, is not untrue.
> For he too abhorred drinking neat wine with his mouth wide open
>   in large Thracian draughts, but enjoyed a small cup.
> To him I spoke as follows when the bowl went round
>   for the third time, after I had learned his name and family:
> "This word is very true indeed, that wine needs not only
>   a share of water, but also of conversation.
> Let us throw this into the difficult drink as an antidote
>   —because it is not served round in ladles
> and you will not ask for it, looking at the unbending eyebrows
>   of the cup-bearers, at a time when a free man fawns upon a slave—,
> Theogenes"

As in the case of the dialogue with the Muses, here too the description of the space is of programmatic interest. By focusing on the setting in the house of Pollis Callimachus evokes contemporary Alexandria, which, apart from attracting a Cyrenean poet like himself, gave a new home to immigrants from Athens, such as Pollis, and attracted visitors from elsewhere in the Greek world, such as Theogenes of Icus. Thus the lively, cosmopolitan city of the third century BC provides the background space. At the same time the dining hall where 'Callimachus' hears the story of Peleus at Icus from Theogenes is space with a strong literary dimension, as the notion of a symposium suggests other symposia as the setting for

---

from the archaic period onwards and for which Callimachus in fr. 178 with his references to a symposium at the home of the Athenian Pollis in Alexandria seems to provide contemporary evidence. See further Harder 2012: ad fr. 43.12–17 and ad 178.

    [17] See Harder 2012: ad loc.

the telling of stories or for learned discussions, such as the episode in the *Odyssey*, where Odysseus tells the Phaeacians about his adventures, or Plato's *Symposium*, where a discussion about love is preferred to excessive drinking. Thus Callimachus places his dialogue with Theogenes also within a bookish kind of space created by the literary tradition. The people and objects which fill the space add to this impression. By means of several allusions to the *Odyssey* Callimachus conveys the notion that Theogenes, whose mouthpiece he will be, is a skilled storyteller, not unlike Odysseus.[18] Concerning the objects the description focuses on items which underline the programmatic message: the couch which is emphatically shared by Theogenes and 'Callimachus' (8–10) and the cups of wine which are passed round, which—unlike Polyphemus—they use modestly (11–21).

The Programmatic Use of Story-Space

Hymns 5 and 6 are rather similar in structure because of their mimetic character as a brief religious scene in which the narrator is a kind of mistress (or master) of ceremonies. As to the story-space in *Hymn* 5, the narrator first describes how Athena and the nymph Chariclo, whom she dearly loved in Thebes, never were apart when she travelled to Thespiae or Haliartus or Coroneia (57–64). After thus hinting at three locations where the goddess might appear the narrator focuses on one spot (as in *Hymns* 1, 2, 3 and 4), settling for the fountain of Hippocrene on Mt Helicon, where Athena and Chariclo are bathing (70–74):

> Once on a time they undid the pins from their robes
> by the fair-flowing fountain of the horse on Helicon
>   and were bathing; midday quiet took the hill.
> Both of them were bathing, and the hour was midday,
>   and deep was the quiet that held the hill.[19]

In this passage there is great emphasis on the midday quiet at the lonely spot, just below the summit of Mt Helicon, and the bathing of the naked goddess and her companion. The repetition is very effective in creating the tense and somewhat frightening atmosphere of this time of the day, which for Greeks and Romans was the moment when one could meet

---

[18] For details, see Harder 2002: 212–217 and 2012: ad loc.
[19] Translation by Bulloch 1985.

gods and ran grave risks if one disturbed them:[20] the space is therefore
not 'just' a geographical location, but is charged with a very specific
atmosphere which turns it into a threatening and ominous place at the
time of the story. Then Tiresias, the son of Chariclo, unwittingly comes
to the fountain with his dogs to drink and is blinded, but, as Athena
predicts, will also become a well-known and important prophet (75–
133). As in the *Aetia* the fact that the space is Mt Helicon must also
have been of significance. Apparently the place where poets received
information from the Muses was also a fit place for a seer like Tiresias
to receive his gift and the divine elements of both gifts may be brought
to the attention of the narratees and be thought to enhance each other.

In *Hymn* 6 we see a similar pattern. At first the story-space is the space
of three (groups of) stories which will *not* be told: the movement across
the whole world of Demeter searching for Persephone, ending at the
spring Callichorus (10–16), the towns to which she gave laws (18), and
Eleusis (indicated, but not mentioned at this point), where she taught
Tlepolemus about agriculture (19–21). Thus, as in *Hymn* 5 we first get a
picture of a great deal of possible story-space, before the narrator settles
on Dotium, an ancient centre for the cult of Demeter in Thessaly,[21] where
according to Callimachus the Pelasgians had created a sacred grove for
the goddess (24–30):

> The Pelasgians still inhabited holy Dotium, not yet the Cnidian land;
> there (?) they had built a fair grove
> thick with trees—an arrow could hardly have passed through.
> Within were pines, large elms, and pear-trees
> and fair sweet-apples; and the amber-coloured water boiled up
> from ditches. Demeter was madly fond of the place
> as of Eleusis, as fond of Triopas as she was of Enna.[22]

Again as in *Hymn* 5 the story thus begins with a description of the
story-space, an extended and striking *locus amoenus*, and here too the
description is of great importance for what follows, since because of
its particular beauty the place is dearly loved by Demeter. In 31–67
Erysichthon, the son of king Triopas, starts cutting down the grove and
eventually the angry Demeter punishes him with an unsatiable hunger.
The scene then changes to the royal palace, where Erysichthon drives

---

[20] See Bulloch 1985: ad *Hymn* 5.72.
[21] See Hopkinson 1984: ad 24.
[22] Translation by Hopkinson 1984.

his parents to despair by eating everything in sight, and the story-space is emphatically limited to the palace, underlining the isolated situation of the suffering family. In 72–81, where Erysichthon's mother rejects all invitations for her son, one gets an impression of all the places where he can no longer go to: on the one hand the places he is invited to as part of the bourgeois social 'network' of the family (games for Athena at Iton, a wedding, a banquet, another wedding), on the other hand the places which suggest the ordinary pursuits of a young man, mentioned in his mother's lies to the people who invite him (Crannon on business, Pindus for hunting, somewhere abroad, games with discus-throwing, a drive with his chariot, Mt Othrys for the counting of cattle). All these places are out of bounds for Erysichthon because of his eating disorder and 87 summarizes, 'meanwhile, closeted in the house, he banqueted all day long …'. The house then figures again in the prayer of Triopas to Poseidon (96–110), where the old man tells how his stables are empty because all the animals have been eaten. The conclusion in 111–112 again draws attention to the house: 'as long as resources lay in the house of Triopas, only his private chambers were aware of the evil …'. Then the scene changes once again in 113–115 and the claustrophobic atmosphere of the palace is finally left behind: 'but when his teeth had dried up that deep wealth, then the king's son sat at the crossroads begging for crusts and scraps thrown away from the feast'. As in *Hymn* 5 the description of the story-space here too is well tuned to the story, but here we move on a more mundane level from the sacred grove to the palace, where the treatment of the space underlines the despair and isolation of the whole family, and finally to the crossroads, where the story ends with the king's son Erysichthon as a pathetic beggar.

A special aspect of the story-space, as with Mt Helicon in *Hymn* 5, may also be its metapoetic aspects, as it has been argued that Demeter and her sacred grove, described at length as a *locus amoenus* at the beginning of the story, may stand for the subtle, innovative poetry of Callimachus, whereas Erysichthon may represent the 'wrong' kind of poets, who thoughtlessly attack this kind of poetry.[23]

In the *Aetia* too story-space is an important and functional element in the telling of stories and although the amount of fragments does not allow generalisations, one can still make some interesting observations.

---

[23] See J. Murray 2004: 212–216.

Thus in fr. 43 Callimachus tells about the founder's ritual at Zancle, where the founders quarreled as to who should be the town's eponymous hero and the story-space described is the town (in fr. 43.68–71 there is a brief description of the building of the city-walls). However, in the earlier part of fr. 43 the narrator, 'Callimachus', talking with the Muses, first gives a catalogue of other Sicilian cities which are *not* selected as story-space, but were obviously described in books written by others (28–55), before, eventually, the story of Zancle is told. The overall pattern of this fragment thus recalls the hymns, where, as shown above, the narrator often mentions some places briefly, before zooming in on one specific location: Callimachus seems to transport this hymnic pattern to his elegiac *Aetia*.

In the love-story of Acontius and Cydippe in *Aetia* 3 the story-space is closely related to the two lovers, who each have their own geographic as well as gendered space and have to find a place to meet. Thus in fr. 67.5–6 at the beginning of the story we read 'for, lord, he came from Iulis, she from Naxos, Cynthian, to your sacrifice of oxen at Delos'. Subsequently both protagonists are described in their own space as girl and boy. We read about Cydippe surpassing all the other girls when she goes to the spring of Silenus on Naxos or dances in the chorus for the sleeping Ariadne (fr. 67.11–14). Then some fragments deal with Acontius as a young man who impresses other men when he goes to school or to the baths (fr. 68) or at the symposium (fr. 69). So here the symbolic use of space, in the sense of gendered story-space, forms an important aspect of the introduction of characters. These introductions were followed by a scene on Delos, where Acontius fell in love and tricked Cydippe into swearing that she would marry him. Here we have no remains of Callimachus' text, but the sequel suggests that the spatial references underlined the movements of the lovers towards and away from each other. In fr. 72 Acontius, who has returned to Ceos, withdraws to the countryside and complains about his situation, inscribing Cydippe's name on trees (fr. 73 and 74). Here the use of story-space and objects as a kind of 'sympathizing' setting for Acontius' mood is a good example of the psychologizing function of nature. After this the scene changes to Naxos, where Cydippe falls ill three times when her father tries to marry her off to somebody else. Here the story's setting is the girl's home, where the preparations for the wedding are made, so again a gendered kind of space, drawing attention to the girl's dependent position (fr. 75.1–43). There are some excursions to other locations as well: after the three attempts to get Cydippe married her father goes away to consult Apollo's oracle and Apollo mentions three

places where Artemis was *not* (in a way which recalls the pattern of a hymnic presentation of space) and emphasizes that she was at home on Delos when Cydippe swore to marry Acontius. When her father comes home, the girl reveals the truth and Acontius comes from Ceos to Naxos to celebrate the wedding. After a brief evocation of the wedding-night, the story ends with another reference to Ceos, where the Acontiads, the offspring of the marriage, are said to rule in Iulis 'even now' (fr. 75.44–52). The island's history and the foundation of its four main towns is then described in the summary of the Cean history of Xenomedes of Ceos, where the narrator claims to have found the love-story of Acontius (fr. 75.53–77).

On the whole the presentation of the story-space seems to be well integrated into the love-story: it underlines the differences in gender between the boy and the girl and their movements to and from and eventually with each other in the course of the story as well as the crucial presence in the same 'space' of Artemis at the time of Cydippe's oath. At the end, however, Callimachus draws attention to a certain tension concerning the story's space: he emphasizes the bookish character of it all by telling that he found the story in the work of Xenomedes and then summarizing this work, whereas on the other hand he seems to draw the attention of his narratees to the Alexandrian library where he probably found the work of Xenomedes and to the island Ceos, which in his own time was a Ptolemaic fleet-base and must therefore have been of some topical interest as well. Bookish and contemporary Ceos and Ptolemaic Alexandria are thus combined into an intricate new mixture.[24]

---

[24] Elsewhere in the *Aetia* we find interesting treatment of story-space too. For instance, in the *Victory of Berenice* at the beginning of book 3 one may detect a parallel between countryside, suffering from the destructions wrought by the Nemean lion (fr. 54b), and the cottage of the old farmer Molorcus, wrecked by mice (fr. 54c): both are described at some length and a mirror effect may have been intended. In the *Iambs* the use of the story-space in *Iamb* 1 as setting for the travels of the golden cup of Bathycles from one of the seven sages to the next is interesting as the journey provides a contrast with the confined space of Alexandria with its quarreling scholars and suggests that the world is larger and that a more respectful view of one's colleagues is possible (and recommended). In *Iamb* 4 the idea of two superior poets excluding a third one, standing nearby but considered inferior, is illustrated by the story of the olive and the laurel, each proclaiming its superiority and at the end excluding and reproaching a nearby bramble-bush. Thus the notion that sharing space does not imply equality and that coming too close can be considered offensive is present at two levels. In the *Hecale* Hecale's hut, where Theseus on his way to kill the Marathonian bull finds shelter, must have been significant as story-space, as it probably had a symbolic function in illustrating both Hecale's coming down in the world and the unusual emphasis on this episode in the story of Theseus.

Space and Objects as Actors and Speakers

A particularly innovative aspect of Callimachus' treatment of space is the way in which locations and objects may acquire a new role as actors and start moving and speaking. Sometimes an object tells its story and narrator-space and story-space overlap. In the *Aetia* we can see Callimachus experimenting with the possibilities the new literacy and the increasingly important medium of 'books' offer in this respect, particularly by extending the generic conventions of inscriptions in unprecedented ways. Elsewhere, as at the beginning of *Hymn* 2 and in the story of Delos in *Hymn* 4, objects and locations are moving and speaking and, instead of being the passive object of description or just a setting for others to act in, play a certain part in the action. Callimachus here radicalized the potential of personification, as found in (→) Homer and (→) the Homeric hymns. In these cases too, the treatment of space and objects often has programmatic and topical overtones.

Some of the hymns contain brief and slightly ambiguous instances of personification, such as the beginning of *Hymn* 2, where the religious setting is full of movement, a situation which is still within the realm of more or less credible manifestations of a god's power, or *Hymn* 6.37–39, where the 'song' of a tree when hit by an axe may also be regarded as the noise of its falling down.[25]

In *Hymn* 4, however, Callimachus is much more experimental. This hymn contains the story of Leto, who tries to find a place where she can give birth to Apollo and finally succeeds on Asteria/Delos. The story begins with a description of the floating island Asteria (later to become Delos) (11–54), where particularly 16–22 and 41–50 suggest the movement in space, as the other islands are led by Asteria in a dance and Asteria itself floats from the Saronian Gulf via the Euripus to Cape Sunium or Chios or Samos.[26] In 55 Callimachus tells how Hera has placed guards to survey the mainland and the islands in order that no place will allow Leto to give birth in it (55–69). The result is that the world starts moving as all the regions flee when Leto is arriving (70–78):

---

[25] But elsewhere in Callimachus trees are found discussing their qualities; see previous note.

[26] For a discussion of the backgrounds of the idea that geographical locations are not fixed but can move around and the way Callimachus explores these notions in his hymn, see Nishimura-Jensen 2000 (especially 289–294).

> Arcadia fled, Parthenium, the holy mountain
> of Auge, fled, and after them the old man Peneius fled,
> the whole part of the Peloponnese near the Isthmus fled,
> except Aegialus and Argos (etc.)

The scene then changes to Leto's womb, from where the unborn Apollo addresses and threatens Thebes, predicting the fate of Niobe's children (86–98). Leto moves on and again towns refuse to take her in and rivers and mountains flee (99–105). Desperately Leto asks the nymphs of the river Peneius, as well as the river itself and Mt Pelion, to wait and receive her (106–120). The river is doubtful at first, but then pulls himself together and stops his stream so that Leto can give birth (122–132). Even when Ares threatens to throw the top of Mt Pangaeum into the river and the whole of Thessaly starts to shake, Peneius stands firm, but then Leto tells him to save himself and moves on (133–152). She goes to the sea, where the islands, supervised by Iris, also flee, and she tries to reach Cos (153–161), but then Apollo intervenes again and tells his mother that there is nothing wrong with Cos, but that it is destined to be the birthplace of another god, i.e. Ptolemaeus II Philadelphus, born at Cos in 308 BC, with whom one day Apollo will fight against the Gauls in Delphi and in Egypt (162–189). Apollo then tells Leto to go to a small floating island (190–196) and Asteria, who is just passing, invites Leto to step on her; Leto does so and gives birth to Apollo (197–214). The story ends with Hera accepting the situation and Zeus taking away her anger (215–259) and the hymn is concluded with a passage in which Asteria, now called Delos, is praised at length (260–326).

   As in *Hymn* 3 we have a large world full of possible locations for the god, but apart from that the treatment of space is much more experimental here. First of all we have space as an actor, which seems to be an important innovation by Callimachus, possibly inspired by brief references in *h.Ap.* 47–48 (Leto travels to many places) 'but they all trembled very much and were frightened and none of them dared to receive Phoebus' and 118 (about Delos at the birth of Apollo) 'and the earth beneath her smiled'[27] and by the dialogues between Leto and Delos in 49–90 and between Apollo and the river-goddess Telphusa in 244–276. The space

---

[27] For the well-attested notion of nature smiling, see Allen, Halliday, and Sikes 1936: ad loc. As Jacqueline Klooster suggests to me the notion of the world on the move may also owe something to the way in which in archaic poetry the river Scamander, for instance, was following Achilles through the Trojan plain in the *Iliad*.

which is the setting for the story is at the same time taking part in it, moving, talking and experiencing emotions such as fear and pity. The passages in which the personification is prominent are distributed carefully: (1) the introductory passage in 11–54 presents the situation of Asteria/Delos, in which the island appears as a distinct person and the other islands are personified as well; (2) there are three passages about the fleeing landscapes, each of them concluded by speech: 70–99, concluded by Apollo's speech to Thebes; 100–152, concluded by the dialogue between Leto and Peneius; 153–195, concluded by Apollo's refusal to be born on Cos and advice to go to Asteria; (3) in 196–274 a fourth brief reference to fleeing islands is followed by Leto's arrival on Asteria and Apollo's birth and the scene includes two brief speeches by the island (203–204 and 266–273). The personification is also enlivened by details such as the rivers Dirce and Strophia holding the hand of their father Ismenus in their flight (76–77) or the way in which Peneius shows his mixed feelings as well as his courage and Asteria shows her defiance of Hera and her self-confidence as Apollo's birthplace.

Speaking Objects in the Aetia

In the *Aetia* we have some instances of the narrator's space overlapping with story-space, when the narrator tells about himself in fr. 64, 97 and 110. In all three instances the space is of a somewhat elusive nature that can exist only in books and one gets the impression that Callimachus, in a time of increasing literacy, is experimenting with the new possibilities offered by this medium, starting from the conventions of inscriptions in which a dead person or an object might speak about itself to the people who look at it.[28]

In fr. 64 the dead poet Simonides is complaining that Phoenix, the leader of Acragas, has built his tombstone into the city-wall and destroyed its inscription (which he then quotes in indirect discourse). He then addresses the Dioscuri and probably asked them for help in the lost part of the poem. The voice suggests space and objects, that is Acragas and the tombstone built outside the town and bearing an inscription, which was demolished and then used to build a new city-wall. Even so, it is hard to locate the voice of the dead Simonides within this space,

---

[28] See e.g. Svenbro 1988: 33–52.

as he cannot even speak by means of the demolished inscription on his tombstone. In a 'book', however, this kind of 'un-realistic' treatment of space is no problem and may, in fact, provide a challenge for an innovative poet.

In a similar way the notion of an afterlife of objects in some undefined space seems to have inspired Callimachus. Thus we find the ancient wall of the Pelasgians in fr. 97 looking back on its former existence and the lock of Berenice, which has become the constellation Coma Berenices, speaking about itself and its emotions 'from the sky' in fr. 110.

In fr. 110 the treatment of space is not only complex because of the overlap of narrator-space and story-space, but also highly relevant for the poem's message as 'space' is an important element in the lock's career. In Catullus' translation,[29] Berenice's lock, whose standpoint we are invited to share, travels through space a great deal. Lines 1–9 present the lock among the stars of heaven, where it was spotted by the astronomer Conon, so that the narratee is made aware of the important new location of the lock right at the beginning. Then we are told how the lock reached this particular status. We move back to the time when Berenice promised to sacrifice the lock for the safe return of Ptolemaeus III Euergetes from the Syrian war and it was still on the queen's head, witnessing her sadness at the separation from her husband (9–36). The moment of separation of the lock from Berenice's head is then described at some length (37–50) and we read how Zephyrus carries the lock away from the temple where it was sacrificed and drops it into the sea, from where Aphrodite takes it up to the gods and gives it a place among the stars (51–68). Then the lock's old location on Berenice's head is briefly referred to again, when the lock complains once more about the separation (69–78). Finally the scene moves to heaven again, where the lock becomes the object of a cult, so that a connection between the two spaces, on earth and in heaven, is finally established (79–92).[30] The last lines of the poem (93–94) again seem to draw the narratees' attention to the world of the stars (perhaps indicating their envy of the lock).[31] In Callimachus'

---

[29] Catullus 66, which is a fairly close translation of Callimachus' poem, may well be used to supplement the notions of the use of space that can be derived from fr. 110.

[30] There is some discussion concerning 79–88 about the sacrifices of newly wedded wives to the lock, which are in Catullus' version but not in the Callimachus papyrus of this part of the poem. The sacrifice demanded from Berenice, in 89–92, is found in both versions. For further discussion, see Harder 2012: ad loc.

[31] See Harder 2012: ad loc.

version lines 94a–b (which are omitted by Catullus) suggest that his poem at some stage ended with a farewell to a queen, probably Berenice,[32] so that there once again the scene moved back to earth. Summarizing, the treatment of space and the ways in which the narratees are invited to follow the movements of the lock in the *Lock of Berenice* effectively underline the notions of apotheosis and its translation into ritual which are central to the poem. It also establishes a close connection between the three locations at which the lock spent its time: Berenice's head, the temple of her dynastic mother Arsinoe Zephyritis, where it was probably sacrificed, and heaven. Thus it helps to embed the young Berenice in the Ptolemaic dynasty and to foreshadow the queen's own apotheosis by which she was to tread in the footsteps of Arsinoe.[33]

Conclusion: Callimachus' Bookish Space

In conclusion we may say that Callimachus' treatment of space is very experimental and innovative, though always in a kind of dialogue with the literary tradition before him. He fully explores the possibilities of space-descriptions or references to space and objects to relate his poems to the Greek literary tradition, to structure his works, to provide them with programmatic overtones and to experiment with new ways of treating space and objects as actors in the new medium of written literature. The result is a largely bookish kind of space, but by references to contemporary space this kind of space is also connected with issues relevant for third century Alexandria and the position of the Alexandrian court poet.

---

[32] See Harder 2012: ad loc.

[33] We find similar experiments elsewhere in Callimachus too; cf. e.g. *Ep*. 34, where a stick dedicated to Heracles answers questions posed to it by the dead hero; *Iambs* 7 and 9, where statues are speaking. Further complexities of the presentation of an object may be found in fr. 114, where someone is asking a statue of Apollo at Delos questions about itself, particularly why it is carrying its bow in its left hand and the Charites in its right hand. Here the convention of the statue speaking through its inscription is carried even beyond the notion of a monologue by the addition of the voice of a curious spectator.

CHAPTER FIVE

THEOCRITUS

J.J.H. Klooster

Introduction

Since bucolic poetry is all about herdsmen in the countryside, Theocritus might be expected to be the Greek landscape poet *par excellence*. Indeed:

> … bei keinem anderen griechischen Dichter laden so verführerisch weiche Grasteppiche zum Verweilen ein, plätschern so viele Bäche im Schatten sich wiegender Bäume, hallt die Gegend wider vom Gesang der Vögel, oder is erfüllt vom Summen der Bienen, vom Zirpen der Zikaden, gibt es so viele Bäume, Sträucher, Blumen, Gräser und Farne wie bei Theokrit.[1]

Still, it would be a mistake to call Theocritus 'a poet of nature' in the Romantic sense of the phrase: natural beauty is hardly ever admired for its own sake in his poems. In the bucolic *Idylls* (1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7) it mostly features as a backdrop for the herdsman's song. Moreover, even if there are numerous passages concerning landscape, they hardly ever take the form of clear descriptions. Elements of the setting are sketched in but their relation to each other remains uncertain. This lack of contingent detail is reminiscent of the vague way Theocritus indicates time.[2] On the few occasions landscapes are strongly stylized or idealized (cf. *Id.* 1, 5, 7) they have a specific function. Either these descriptions occur in character-text, and serve to characterize the speaker, or, as in some mythological *Idylls* (11, 13, 22),[3] the pastoral setting thematically collides with grander heroic/epic elements of the story.

---

[1] Elliger 1975: 318. The number of flowers, plants, shrubs, and trees Theocritus mentions is in fact so large (87 different species, twice as many as the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* together) that it has been asked whether he was a botanist (Lindsell 1936–1937: 78–93); see further Lembach 1970. Other important studies focusing on Theocritus' landscapes are Rosenmeyer 1969: 179–205 and Segal 1975: 115–139. Krevans 1983: 201–220 discusses the significance of geographical names in *Idyll* 7.

[2] *SAGN* 2: 97–98.

[3] I here omit the discussion of the (spurious) *Idylls* 21 and 25 as well as epigrams 1–5.

A truly idealized pastoral landscape enters poetry only after Theocritus.[4] This may be related to the fact that the opposition city-country (in which the city is compared negatively to the innocence and freedom of the countryside) is not strongly present in the *Idylls*. It is true that *Idyll* 3 features an urban custom (the *paraclausithyron*) transposed to a rustic setting (a cave) for comic effect, and in *Idyll* 7 Simichidas and Lycidas have sometimes been said to represent respectively (or both) city and countryside (see below). But the emphatic contrast between these two environments only comes to the fore in the spurious (later) *Idyll* 20, where a herdsman complains that he is rejected by an arrogant city girl on account of his rusticity.[5] All in all, the opposition is at its most meaningful if we are willing to suppose that the narratee of the *Idylls* is a city-dweller.[6] But, as noted above, a more explicit contrast is created between epic heroism and pastoral themes/landscapes (11, 13, 22).

Nevertheless, rusticity of setting and character, and prominence of nature are elements that set Theocritus' achievements apart from previous Greek literature. Though herdsmen and their surroundings as well as *loci amoeni* occur in earlier poets (→ Homer), Theocritus is the first to make them his trademark. He thus creates his own literary domain, which is unified and characterized precisely by his descriptions of landscapes and objects:

> The descriptive elements in Theocritus' pastoral landscapes are not purely ornamental but are related to one another … as constituent parts of a total design, like letters in an alphabet which we can eventually learn to read.[7]

Embedding of Settings

As stated, the bucolic *Idylls* function on the premise that the narratee is not a countryman but a city-dweller, presumably even a member of the urban elite. On the one hand this presupposes a narrator who is himself at home in both of these milieus, and on the other hand it creates an—often delicately ironic—psychological distance between the naive characters in the poems and the (by implication) sophisticated narratees. Yet,

---

[4] The one exception is the wish for peace on Sicily expressed in the *Encomium for Hiero* (*Id.* 16.88–97).

[5] See Reinhardt 1988.

[6] See Gutzwiller 1991.

[7] Segal 1975: 210. See also Krevans 1983: 201–220.

at the same time this distance is paradoxically diminished by the fact that the herdsmen function as 'analogies' of the narratees.[8] In their, often comic, naiveté, the characters serve to reflect the narratees' own concerns: unanswered love, the search for spiritual peace, etcetera. This creation of analogies is effected through the embedding of songs (usually variants of a bucolic *agon* or *amoebaeon*). Of course such embedding also affects the representation of space; in particular the differentiation of the *space of the narrator* from the *story-space*. Analysis of *Idyll* 6 illustrates how this works.[9]

(A1)   (1–5): In an unspecified setting the external narrator tells his nar-ratee about two herdsmen, Damoetas and Daphnis, who propose to sing: the story-space is briefly indicated: they '*gathered the herd together to the same place*' (1–2, indicating their harmonious friendship) and '*sat down at a spring*' (3). The *narrator's own space*, though not specified, is presumably different from that of the story.

(B1)   Song of Daphnis (6–19) posing as a *praeceptor amoris* advising Polyphemus on his affair with the nymph Galatea. He sketches a landscape: Polyphemus and his dog are *at the edge of the sea* (11–14), while Galatea throws apples at his herds. This is clearly meant as a mythical imaginary setting: the island of the Cyclops, in other words, not the location where Daphnis himself is physically present.

(A2)   (20): The external narrator interrupts for change of speakers.

(B2)   Song of Damoetas (21–40), who enacts the role of Polyphemus and takes over landscape elements sketched by Daphnis, adding *caves* (28), and elaborating on the *mirroring qualities of the sea* (35–38).

(A3)   (41–46): The external narrator concludes: after their song, the herdsmen exchange kisses and play the *syrinx* and the *aulos*, while their heifers dance *in the tender grass* (45). There is no return to the space of the external narrator.

We see how embedding here generates various levels of *imaginary spaces*, differentiated from the space of the external narrator. In *Idyll* 1, embed-ding of space further serves to emphasise the contrast between 'mythical' and 'realistic' space. In this mimetic poem, the space of Thyrsis and the

---

[8] See Gutzwiller 1991.
[9] Translations are based on Gow 1952.

Goatherd is presented in their opening dialogue (1.1–23, see below).
Though clearly stylized, it seems on the whole realistic, even if it contains
references to Pan and the Nymphs. These are not referred to as actually
present, and thus may exist only in the herdsmen's religious imagination.
However, in Thyrsis' embedded song about the fate of the mythic *bouko-
los* (cowherd) Daphnis, nature gets distinctly unrealistic traits. Animals
(cows, but also jackals, wolves and even the outlandish lion) come to
mourn Daphnis (pathetic fallacy), and gods are in direct contact with
the human protagonist. Daphnis seemingly enjoys a privileged, mystical
relation with nature,[10] which his death upsets, hence his wish that a series
of *adynata* may mark this event:

> Now violets bear, brambles, and thorns, you must bear violets, and let
> fair narcissus bloom on the juniper. Let all be changed, and let the pine
> bear pears, since Daphnis dies. Let the stag pursue hounds and from the
> mountains let owls cry to nightingales.   (1.132–136)

In the already distinctly mythical world of the song about Daphnis, this
inset is even more fantastic; like the recurrent refrain, it clearly marks the
embedded song as poetic art, stylized and set apart from the real world.

   The element of pathetic fallacy recurs in the references to Daphnis
in *Idyll* 7, where similar, if even more complicated, embedding of songs
and real and imaginary spaces occurs. The internal narrator Simichidas,
at some temporal remove (7.1: 'there was a time when'), recalls his walk
from the city to a harvest festival *in the country* (*Thalysia*) organized by
friends on Cos (as appears from various topographical names). On the
way, he meets the mysterious goatherd-poet Lycidas, and they exchange
songs, which abound with geographical indications.

   Lycidas announces his song (7.52–89) as 'fashioned *on the mountain*'
(51), while herding his flocks. Its opening evokes a miraculously calm
winter sea over which his beloved Ageanax may safely sail to *Lesbian
Mytilene*, if he 'saves Lycidas from desire'. He then describes in concrete
detail the comforts of a rustic party at which he will be present once
Ageanax has departed. Lying on a leafy couch, Lycidas will drink *Pteleatic*
wine (a reference to a Coan deme?) while shepherds pipe, one from
Acharnae (Attic Acharnae?) and one from *Lycope* (unclear) (7.71–72).
And Tityrus will sing of the fate of Daphnis (cf. *Id.* 1), whom '*the oaks on
the banks of the river Himeras*' mourned (7.74–75, suggesting Sicily, and

---

[10] Cf. Segal 1974.

perhaps Stesichorus of Himera, who allegedly wrote about Daphnis) as he was wasting away like snow on '*high Haemus, or Athos or Rhodope or furthest Caucasus*' (7.76–77, evoking a vast, inhospitable world to symbolize the extent of Daphnis' suffering). Tityrus will also sing of legendary, otherwise unknown Comatas, a goatherd imprisoned *in a cedar chest* by a king and miraculously fed on honeycombs by bees (7.78–82). The song ends with an apostrophe of Comatas (embedded in the song within the song), and the wish that he were alive today, so that Lycidas might

> herd your beautiful goats *upon the mountains* and listen to your voice, while you, divine Comatas, would lie down and make sweet music *under the oaks or pines.*   (7.88–89)

Through embedding and allusion to numerous geographical locations that may refer to poetic traditions, Lycidas' song moves steadily into the realm of the imaginary, or, we might say, to the heartland of bucolic poetry (note the return of '*on the mountains*', 51 ~ 88)[11] as well as towards ever greater spiritual peace. The opening description of the *deep, calmed sea* points to a concrete space, but on a figurative level foreshadows the calm Lycidas wishes to attain; Mytilene might allude to Sappho and the Lesbian lyric tradition. Through his apostrophe of Comatas, a miraculous example of the redemptive powers of music, Lycidas finally enters a virtual *locus amoenus*, completely freed from his burning desires. As realistic settings give way to realms of poetry and inner peace, concrete topographical references disappear: Lycidas bases himself mainly on legendary forebears.[12]

Simichidas claims his song is a bucolic poem too, similarly composed by him while he 'tended his herds *in the mountains*', but it is very different in tone and allusions, although it also evokes a range of imaginary locations.[13] Simichidas describes his friend Aratus' unanswered love for a boy, Philinus. Pan, connected with *Thessalian Homole* (7.104–105, an obscure allusion to a cult place, reminiscent of Callimachus' *Aetia*?) is

---

[11] On the significance of the marginal spaces 'mountain' and 'sea', see Segal 1975: 223–226. It must be noted that shepherds in the other *Idylls* are not located explicitly 'on the mountains', but rather near a spring, in the shade (although this does not preclude mountainous settings).

[12] Cf. Krevans 1983: 201–220.

[13] See in particular Giangrande 1968: 491–533 on Simichidas' quasi-bucolicism.

asked to make the boy gratify Aratus' desires. If he accomplishes this 'then never may the *Arcadian* boys flog you whenever they find scanty meat' (7.107), referring to a—once more obscure—rustic custom, again adding a pastoral (if learned) flavour to the song. If Pan denies his favour, Simichidas wishes considerable discomfort on him:

> May you sleep in nettles and in midwinter find yourself *on the mountains of the Edonians turned towards the river Hebrus, near the pole.* And in summer may you herd your flocks *among the furthest Ethiopians beneath the rock of the Blemyes from where even the Nile is no more seen.* But you, leave *the sweet stream of Hyetis and Byblis, and Oecus, that steep seat of golden haired Dione,* Erotes, rosy as apples, and wound with your bow the lovely Philinus …   (7.110–118)

The learned description of Pan's unpleasant experiences in the extreme north and south symbolically reflects Aratus' erotic distress and answers Lycidas' catalogue of mountains (7.76–77): the Edonians and Hebrus are located on *Mt Rhodope.* Erotes are called to the scene from Byblis, Hyetis and Oecus. The first two names refer to springs in the neighbour-hood of Milete, and hence to Byblis, who was metamorphosed into a spring after her love affair with her brother Caunus; Oecus is a city near Milete, founded by Byblis' father.[14] Despite the prayer to *pastoral* Pan, it appears from the following lines that the affair of Aratus and Philinus is really set *in the city*, since there is talk of Philinus' doorsteps (7.122: *epi prothuroisin*), on which the speaker no longer wishes to stand all night long with Aratus. This refers to the typically urban practice of the *para-clausithyron* known from e.g. the epigrams of Asclepiades (*AP* 5.167, *AP* 5.189), in which young men after their revels went to the house of the beloved to serenade him/her in front of the closed doors.

Obscure references to pastoral cults, enigmatic allusions to Milesian myths, and an urban *paraclausithyron*: all things considered, Simichidas presents a 'potpourri' (Hunter) of Hellenistic poetical fads, whereas Lycidas' song seems to point back to the past, beyond the archaic lyric singers to an alleged legendary pastoral tradition.

The poem ends with a description of a lush *locus amoenus* by Simichi-das, the primary narrator, after he and Lycidas have taken leave of each other (7.132–155). The direct and sensual description of the rustic ban-quet, on a leafy couch, with cool splashing water, abundant, sweet-

---

[14] Both Nicaenetus and Apollonius are attested to have written *ktisis*-poems related to this myth, so the allusion may be to their poetry.

scented fruit, a 'bucolic orchestra' of woodland animals and fragrant wine (all five senses are appealed to), is interrupted by references to Castalian Nymphs (Delphi), Heracles at the cave of the Centaurs and Polyphemus dancing by the river Anapus (these last two of course figure prominently in Theocritus poetry, cf. *Id.* 6, 11, 13, 25). It seems that this last *locus amoenus* signifies, on a structural level, the fusion of Simichidas and Lycidas' poetics: both elements from earlier and contemporary poetry, and a direct 'pastoral' inspiration are mixed at the source of the *Thalysia* (cf. *diekranasate*, 7.154); they provide a rich poetic drink or harvest. Krevans relates this to her argument that the many geographical names in the poem constitute allusions to previous authors and genres of poetry; together they form the basis for Theocritus new bucolic poetry.[15]

Songscapes

In purely mimetic poems (1, 2, 4, 5, 14, 15), setting and props, including changes of scene, are all incorporated in the words of the characters. These mimetic poems were presumably not meant for performance in the way of classical mime or drama. So for the mental envisaging of the scene, narratees are completely dependent on information provided by the poet through his characters. Interestingly, this does not always result in clear, visual descriptions. Take for instance the celebrated opening of *Idyll* 1:

> THYRSUS: A sweet whispering *the pine*, Goatherd, *there, by the springs is singing*, and sweetly too do you pipe …
>
> GOATHERD: Sweeter, shepherd, does your song stream down than *the echoing water there from that high rock* …
>
> TH.: Will you, by the Nymphs, will you, goatherd, sit here, *opposite the hillock and the tamarisks and pipe*? …
>
> G.: It is not allowed, shepherd, in the noontime, we are not allowed to pipe: we fear Pan … Let us sit *here under the elm, opposite Priapus and the water nymphs, where the shepherd's seat is and the oaks.*   (*Id.* 1.1–23)

We have a pine, sources, rocks, a hill, tamarisks, an elm, apparently a shrine of Priapus and the water nymphs, a shepherd's seat and oaks;

---

[15] Krevans 1983: 201–220. Spanoudakis 2001 points out that the geography of *Idyll* 7 probably owes a great deal to the (mostly lost) elegiac *Demeter* of the Coan poet Philitas (mentioned at 7.40). It may be remembered that Ptolemy Philadelphus was born on Cos.

everything indicated with deictic pronouns (*ha pitus tēna*, 1; *teide*, 12; *touto geōlofon*, 13), to create a sense of nearness and tangibility. But what are the relations between these features? Are the waters in the first line and in the reply of the Goatherd the same? 'Derlei Fragen sollte man jedoch lieber nicht stellen.'[16] The truth is that a translation of the passage does not do justice to the *musicality* of the Greek original, arguably one of its main aims. The first line, an onomatopoeic series of *ā*, *i* and *ū*-sounds (*hadu ti to psithurisma kai ha pitus aipole tēna*, 1), evokes the fluty sound of the panpipe (*hadu de kai tu surisdes*, 2–3), the bucolic instrument *par excellence*. Moreover, the remarkable syntactical structure of the lines creates the impression, through parataxis, internal rhyme and anaphora, that nature and music are somehow a continuum. The pine *sings* a sweet whispering which is compared (in acoustically similar and onomatopoeic words) to the sweet piping of the Goatherd; the song of Thyrsis in turn *streams down* more sweetly than the *echoing* (not *cold*, *clear* or any of the more normal epithets) water. Rather than a clear-cut visual impression, the lines evoke a melodious, if indistinct, *locus amoenus* in which music and nature blend into what Segal has termed a 'songscape'.

Characterizing Functions of Space

Since the (ironic) distance between Theocritean characters and their narrator and his narratees emerged as important, it follows that references to spatial settings or objects by these characters should perhaps be evaluated differently from those furnished (and usually focalized) by an external narrator. This works in many different ways. In *Idyll* 5, for instance, there is an abundance of lovely landscape-descriptions (31–34, 45–49, 50–59, 124–131). Surprisingly, these figure in the context of an otherwise aggressive shouting match between two herdsmen. Their real purpose (already apparent in the strong emphasis on deictic adverbs in 22 *teide*; 45, 46 *toutei*, *hōde*; 50 *teide*) is to outshine the antagonist's words, and emphasise the superior qualities of the speaker's own *locus amoenus*. Whereas in *Idylls* 1 and 6 herdsmen decide to sing *in the same place*, no such concord is reached in this poem; the loveliness of the description contrasts sharply with the unpleasantness of the repartee.

---

[16] Elliger 1975: 326 on this passage.

Like a tragic heroine, Simaetha (*Id.* 2) marvels at the discord between her feelings and the cosmos, exclaiming: 'Mark, still is the sea, still are the breezes; yet not still the torment in my breast!' (2.38–39; cf. 163–166, the quasi-hymnic farewell to the moon). This cosmic appeal comically exceeds the boundaries of her otherwise narrow universe which is defined by gossipy neighbours (154), her own bedroom (86, 139) and her lover's favourite haunt, 'Timagetus' gymnasium' (8, 51, 80, 97). Invoking 'Lady Moon' as witness to her confessions, naive Simaetha, left by her lover (*Id.* 2), thus attempts to place her little urban drama in a grand cosmic scheme.

Simaetha sees things out of proportion; the lovelorn Cyclops (*Id.* 11) is blind in a different way. Seated at the edge of sea and land, looking out over the waves like a parody of Achilles (*Il.* 1.350) or Odysseus (*Od.* 5.101), heroes from the epic domain to which he traditionally belonged, Polyphemus, now the unlikely denizen of a bucolic world, sings. He knows why Galatea flees from him: because of his monstrous looks. Yet, as he claims, he has enough to make up for this handicap: cattle, cheese and 'eleven fawns all with collars and four bear cubs' (11.30–41). He cannot understand why Galatea prefers the sea to his island with its many attractions:

> Leave the grey-green sea to break on the shore; you will spend the night more pleasantly here with me in the cave; there are laurels, and slender cypresses, there is black ivy and a vine with its sweet fruit, there is cold water, which wooded Etna pours to me as an ambrosial drink from her white snow. Who would rather have the sea and the waves than those?[17]
>
> (11.43–49)

The setting the Cyclops pictures here in his clumsy catalogue, which once more lacks clear spatial relations, is perfectly acceptable in itself—that is, if we leave out its ugly inhabitant. Polyphemus' own incongruous presence in his *locus amoenus* is one problem; another is that Galatea is a sea-creature and, although this element may seem strange and unattractive to a Cyclops, it is her habitat. Polyphemus is unable to identify with Galatea's perspective: she does not belong on land nor does she eat cheese. And no more does a Cyclops belong in the sea, but still he sighs: 'Alas, that my

---

[17] *Od.* 9 describes the Cyclops' island; features which Theocritus takes over are the cave, shadowed by laurels (9.189), the vines, and in general the exceeding fertility of the (uncultivated) soil (9.109). The laurels praised here ironically play a role in the Cyclops' blinding.

mother bore me not with gills, so I might have dived down to you and kissed your hand' (11.54–55) and announces his intention to learn to swim anyhow. What makes these grotesque wishes poignant is the fact that traditionally Polyphemus' mother was indeed a sea-nymph, Thoosa, while his father was Poseidon: he is constitutionally drawn to the element to which he does not belong.

Obviously, poor one-eyed Polyphemus does not see clearly: he is unable to view his surroundings or the sea, or himself as Galatea would.[18] But it can be more complicated to judge the tone of spatial references, even in a context of naive characters. Let me illustrate this by a discussion of *Idyll* 15. In this poem, Theocritus furnishes information about the setting while creating an image of the bustling city of Alexandria seen through the eyes of two housewives. That Alexandria is the setting becomes clear at 22, where Gorgo proposes to go see the Adonis festival at the palace of 'rich king Ptolemy' (cf. 46–50, 106–111). The scene in this poem changes twice: 15.1–43: at Praxinoa's; 44–73: on the way to the palace; 74–149: inside the palace (shifting scenic standpoint). This works as follows:

> GORGO: Is Praxinoa *inside*?
>
> PRAXINOA: Gorgo darling, how long it's been! She is *inside*. A miracle that you should have come even now. Eunoa, quick, *fetch her a chair and put a cushion on it.*
>
> GO.: That's fine.
>
> PR.: Sit down.
>
> GO.: Dear me, I only nearly made it here, Praxinoa, *such masses of people, so many chariots. Leather boots wherever you look, and everywhere men in uniforms. And the road was endless. You live further and further away.*
>
> (15.1–7)

Later on, the crowdedness of the city of Alexandria is stressed by Praxi-noa's exasperated exclamations about rearing horses and madding crowds:

> PR.: Dear Gorgo, what will become of us, look, the cavalry of the king! Dear man, please don't step on me! The chestnut reared! Look how wild he is! Foolhardy Eunoa, won't you get out of his way?! He'll kill his rider. It's good I left the little one at home!   (15.51–55)

---

[18] A similar connection between lack of judgment (seeing and seeming) is the theme of *Idyll* 6, also featuring the Cyclops in love. In *Idyll* 11, the Cyclops' blindness also extends to his future fate, cf. *SAGN* 2: 103.

By now Gorgo and Praxinoa have emerged as typical bourgeois house-wives, who see the world as coloured by their own down-to-earth worries about clothing, annoying husbands, busy crowds and exasperating ser-vants. So how are we to interpret their reactions to, and hence our own appreciation of, the following hymn, embedded in the poem as 'the song of the Argive woman at the Adonis-festival of the Ptolemies'?

> For your sake [Aphrodite] …, does Berenica's daughter Arsinoe, lovely as Helen, pamper Adonis with all that is beautiful. By him in their season are all that fruit-trees bear, and delicate gardens in silver baskets guarded, and golden flasks of Syrian perfume. And all the cakes that women fashion on the kneading-tray, mingling every hue with white wheat-flower, are there and those they make of sweet honey and smooth oil. All creatures of the earth and air are there besides. And green bowers have been built, laden with the tender dill, and boyish Erotes flit overhead like young nightingales that flit upon the tree from spray to spray, making trial of their fledgling wings. O ebony, O gold, O eagles of white ivory that bear Zeus the son of Cronus a boy to pour his wine. And crimson coverlets above, soft as sleep. Miletus will say, and he who pastures on Samos with his flocks: 'Ours are the coverlets for the fair Adonis' couch'. In Adonis' rosy arms the Cyprian lies, and he in hers. Of eighteen years or nineteen is the groom; the golden down is still upon his lip; his kisses are not rough. And now farewell to Cypris as she clasps her lover …   (15.109–131)

The language of this hymn not only differs greatly from the colloquial style of the rest of *Idyll* 15, but also from Theocritus' descriptive style in general.[19] The singer begins with an enumeration of the offerings sur-rounding Adonis. There is notable stress on their richness and abun-dance, to the detriment of precision: *every kind* of fruit, *all* the cakes that women fashion, *every* hue, *all* creatures of the earth and the air. The unusually large number of adjectives (beautiful, silver, delicate, golden, sweet, smooth, green, crimson, soft, rosy, etc.) is uncharacteristic of The-ocritus.[20] The singer's impressionistic apostrophe 'O ebony, O gold, O eagles of white ivory' presumably refers to a wooden inlaid couch on which Adonis reclines, featuring the rape of Ganymede.

The people producing the gifts are given prominence. This provides a dynamization of the descriptions and both stresses the inclusive nature of the festival (cf. *all women* bake for Adonis) and underlines the extent of Ptolemy's domain (including Miletus and Samos). Other narrative

---

[19] The emphasis on inclusiveness, completeness and abundance returns in *Idyll* 17 for Ptolemy Philadelphus, suggesting that the hymn in 15 employs (or parodies) the style of royal encomium.

[20] See in particular Elliger 1975: 318–363 *passim*.

elements are present in the implied movement of the eagles and the Erotes, and the description of Adonis' kisses.

The secondary narratees are impressed by these stylistic pyrotechnics, as Gorgo's comments show:

> Go.: Praxinoa, that woman is just the cleverest! Happy to know so much, thrice happy to have such a sweet voice. Still, time we went home. Diocleidas hasn't had his lunch, and the man's all vinegar; don't you go near him when he's hungry.

The comic lapse into bathos clashes with the exalted pathos of the hymn, but, apart from this, how are we to judge Gorgo's reaction to the singer? Just how erudite is she? How should the remarkable stylistic characteristics pointed out above be evaluated? Are they meant to achieve a serious aesthetic goal or is the hymn, as Zanker puts it 'an example of how badly people wrote public poetry'? Precisely the asking of such questions may be the aim of this passage:

> Theocritus distances himself from commitment to interpretation by putting the evaluative statements into the mouth of designedly naive *dramatis personae* like Gorgo and Praxinoa, 'which turns back on the reader the requirement of evaluative response'.[21]

The poem's encomiastic intention (it is, after all, a scene at the royal palace) makes the problem especially intriguing. It is hard to imagine that the Ptolemies would allow their festivals to be ridiculed by poets; most likely, therefore, the hymn is crafted as a clearly recognizable pastiche (this would be in tune with the thematic emphasis on 'lifelikeness' in the rest of the poem, cf. 15.80–86), an evaluation of which was left to the discretion of the narratees. What is at any rate provided is a comic view of what royal splendour looks like if seen through the eyes of the populace.

Concluding, spatial references by characters in the mimetic *Idylls* serve to *characterize* them, or provide clues as to their *psychological state*. Since these poems mostly lack narratorial comment, narratees are invited to participate actively and see if they may extrapolate an 'objective' evaluation of what is being described, or interpret its structural significance.[22]

---

[21] Zanker 2004: 83 quoting Goldhill 1994: 197–223. See further on this *Idyll* e.g. Manakidou 1992: 83–90.

[22] Similar issues arise in connection with the *locus amoenus* in *Idyll* 7 (see above), since here we have the (naive?) internal narrator Simichidas.

Ekphrasis

In general, ekphrasis, of course, often leaves the interpretation of its relation to the themes of the surrounding narrative implicit; we may think of Achilles' shield (→ Homer) or Jason's cloak (→ Apollonius of Rhodes). These descriptions are provided by external narrators; in the mimetic *Idyll* 1, however, which contains Theocritus' most famous ekphrasis (the *kissubion*, or goatherd's cup, 1.27–60),[23] description is furnished by one of the characters (the Goatherd). Yet, it fulfils the same function as the ekphrases referred to above: it maintains many implicit thematic relationships with elements both of the poem *per se* and the bucolic *Idylls* as a collection. In the last instance this ekphrasis focuses the narratees' attention on the creative activity of the author: he creates a character who describes an artefact which symbolizes the poetic creation he is himself a part of (the bucolic corpus). The cup is offered by the Goatherd to Thyrsis in return for his song of the 'Sufferings of Daphnis'; the ekphrasis thus actually balances the song in the way one song balances another in bucolic contests (cf. 5, 6, 7, [8, 9]).

All major ekphrases in Greek literature are usually read as significant variations on the Homeric and pseudo-Hesiodic *Shields*. In the *Argonautica* the fact that a cloak is chosen characterizes its wearer Jason as unwarlike; here the *kissubion*, a wooden (and thus not very valuable) cup, indicates the humility and rusticity of bucolic poetry. Still, it is a refined work of art in its own right: an *aipolikon thaēma* ('goatherd's marvel'), 'a wonder (*teras*) that will strike your heart' (1.56). It is 'newly fashioned' (*neoteukhes*), 'still smells of the knife' (1.28) and has remained 'untouched' (*akhranton*) until now (1.60), suggesting the novelty of the type of poetry it symbolizes; its 'sweetness' (27, 149) advocates a poetic aim (cf. the recurrent *hadu* in the opening of *Idyll* 1). Like the song of Thyrsis, the finely wrought cup elevates popular art to a high level. On it are depicted three scenes from everyday life, not strictly bucolic in theme, which could be read as 'the three ages of man' located in three different types of spatial locations (city, countryside, sea-shore), as well as three types of 'labour'. It has been suggested that the cup represents scenes from the life that Daphnis has spurned. This could be

---

[23] See Gallavotti 1966: 421–436; F. Cairns 1984: 96–99, 101–107; Manakidou 1992: 51–82; Hunter 1999: ad 27–56; Zanker 2004: 12–15; Payne 2007: 28–40.

Theocritus' reinterpretation of Achilles' shield and this hero's choices in life: if Daphnis is a bucolic Achilles, Theocritus is a bucolic Homer.[24]

The pictorial themes (love, old age, childhood, as well as 'simple folk' and the physical results of hard labour) are frequent in Hellenistic art. Despite many attempts at reconstruction, the exact collocation of the scenes is (deliberately?) left unclear. The cup's rim is encircled by flowering ivy winding its tendrils (1.29–31).

> And within (*entosthen*)[25] is wrought (*tetuktai*) a woman, such a thing as the gods might fashion (*theōn daidalma*)[26] wearing a cloak and headdress. And beside her two men with long beautiful hair contend from either side in alternate speech. Yet these things touch not her heart, but now she looks on one and smiles, and now to the other she shifts her thoughts, while they, long hollow-eyed from love, labour to no purpose (*mokhthizonti*).
>
> (1.32–38)

The dynamization of the description turns static images into little narratives: the men *are contending*, the woman apparently *looks to both sides alternately*. A psychological interpretation is provided by the goatherd: the men are in love; the woman does not care for them. Thus a narrative is created, whose details remain obscure, though its outcome for the men is revealed: they labour in vain. Theirs is clearly not an individual story, rather a vignette of 'love's labour lost', a frequent theme of Theocritus' poetry (1, 2, 3, 6, 10, 11, 13). Similar traits characterize the next description, of an old fisherman casting his net:[27]

> By these (*tois de meta*) is carved (*tetuktai*) an old fisherman, and a rugged rock on which the old man eagerly gathers up a great net for a cast, looking like a man who labours greatly (*kamnonti*). You would say that he was fishing with all the strength of his limbs, so do the sinews stand out all about his neck, grey-haired though he is; yet his strength is as a youth's.
>
> (1.39–44)

The stress here is on physical labour and the strength it requires. The narratees' reaction to this is incorporated by the comparison (*eoikōs*)

---

[24] F. Cairns 1984: 107–109; the fact that the *Idylls* are written in hexameters and were therefore regarded as a subspecies of epic supports this suggestion.

[25] It is ambiguous whether this means 'inside the cup' or 'inside the frame of ivy'.

[26] Such formulas are typical of ekphrasis (cf. 15.79), but this one also alludes to Pandora, the woman fashioned by the gods to cause men grief and pain (Hesiod, *Works and Days* 66).

[27] Although fishermen do not belong to the authentic Theocritean *Idylls* (21 is spurious, perhaps even inspired by this description), a fisherman also occurs in the Hesiodic *Aspis* 213–215; the Homeric shield features other labourers.

and the phrase 'you would say'. Although the depiction is again more or less dynamic (the net is about to be cast), there is no real narrative: it is a 'snapshot' of a man *working*, and as such a rather rare occurrence in the bucolic world (except *Idyll* 10, where work is significantly contrasted with lovesickness). The description of the man's hair as 'grey' should probably be attributed to the interpretation of the Goatherd, who describes the man as 'old'. Physical labour here contrasts with the futile love-labour of the earlier picture. The third description addresses yet another kind of 'labour':

> And a little way from the sea-worn old man, there is a vineyard with a fair load of reddening clusters, guarded by a little boy who sits upon its dry stone wall. About him hang two foxes, and one goes to and fro among the vine rows plundering the ripe grapes while the other brings all her wit to bear upon his bag and vows she will not let the boy be [until she has raided his breakfast bread].[28] But the boy is weaving a pretty cricket cage of bond rush and asphodel and has more joy in his weaving than care for bag or for vines. (1.45–54)

The absence of a verb referring to the process of fashioning of the image makes this scene the most lifelike. It once more contains elements of narration: one fox ravages the vines; the other preys on the boy's lunch, its intentions are even described. But the boy remains blissfully unaware of his troubles, which, like the young men's love-cares and the old man's intense labour, remain forever suspended. The foxes flank the little boy in the same way as the two men flank the young woman and as the two three-figure scenes apparently flank the one-figure scene of the old fisherman (ABA). The labour in this last image is 'artistic' and playful; the boy is plaiting a cricket-cage for his own pleasure. The image obviously denotes poetical activity: crickets (more frequently cicadas), weaving, and the child at play (Call. *Aet.* fr. 1) occur as metaphors for poetry in Hellenistic authors. Thus the boy's undisturbed pleasure forms an image of the *hasukhia* sought (and sometimes found) by Theocritean herdsmen in poetry (1, 7, 11). By this *mise en abyme*, the cup contains a metaphorical depiction of the activity through which it has come into being.

---

[28] On the textual problems, see Gow 1952 and Hunter 1999: ad loc.

Space in the Mythological Idylls

So far we have been concerned with spatial references in the voices of characters in mostly mimetic *Idylls* and have been able to conclude that the element distinguishing such references is their psychologically revealing nature with regard to the personage speaking. We will now have a look at descriptions by external narrators. This situation occurs most prominently in two 'mythological' *Idylls*, 13 and 22. Both feature episodes from the Argonautic quest that also occur in the epic of Apollonius (resp. *Arg.* 1.1221–1232; 2.1–97).

 Idyll 13 recounts how Heracles lost his beloved Hylas in Mysia, when the boy went to fetch water at a spring. Heracles, the archetypical Greek hero, is here, like Polyphemus in *Idyll* 11, transposed to a bucolic world. This causes remarkable clashes between style and subject matter. For instance, to express Heracles' dedication to Hylas, the narrator states:

> He never parted from him, neither at noon's onset, nor when dawn with her white steeds sped upwards to the Halls of Zeus, nor when the chickens looked twittering to their roosting-place as on the smoke-stained perch their mother shook her wings.   (13.10–12)

After the grand tragic-epic formula 'the white steeds of dawn', the final lines incongruously evoke the image of Heracles and Hylas snuggling cosily together like a hen and chick. Similarly, the time of sailing for the Argonauts is the onset of summer, when 'the far uplands pasture the young lambs', surely not the association we are to imagine the heroes themselves as having. Although similes and time-indications taken from the animal-world or even country-life are rife in epic (think of the many Iliadic similes concerning wild animals, or of farmers and shepherds at their tasks), the flavour here is distinctly different. It is as if the heroic world is being focalized by a bucolic narrator, who 'mit sichtlichem Behagen' lingers over such descriptions (cf. the leafy couches in 7.67–68, 132–134). The same flavour clings to the rustic description when the Argo lands and the Argonauts prepare their camp for the night:[29]

> One resting place they laid for all, for there was a meadow with mighty store of litter for their couches, where they cut sharp sedges and tall galingale.   (13.33–35)

---

[29] Tränkle 1963: 504. On the clash between bucolicism/eroticism and heroism in this poem, see Mastronarde 1968: 273–290; Gutzwiller 1981: 19–29.

This emphasis on bucolic settings becomes especially obvious when we compare the extreme brevity with which the synopsis of the Argo's voyage is given (13.22–24; landmarks singled out are the Symplegades and the Phasis). The landscape in which Hylas finally disappears could be described as the 'dark side' of this bucolic world: the space of the Nymphs, 'dread goddesses for the country folk' (13.44):

> Soon in a low-lying place he saw a spring, around which grew thick rushes, and dark celandine, green maidenhair and luxuriant wild celery, and creeping dog's tooth. And in the water Nymphs were arraying the dance …   (13.39–43)

The spring is focalized first by Hylas, then the narrator breaks in by mentioning the Nymphs, obviously unseen by Hylas. Usually the refreshing shaded coolness of springs is emphasised (cf. 5.33; 7.7–9, 136–137), but here 'the learned botanical catalogue is highly evocative of the pool's mysterious dangers' and its lush vegetation, which practically smothers the spring itself, is suggestive of feminine eroticism. The place represents forces against which Heracles' physical strength achieves nothing. In this sense the power of the Nymphs is similar to the internal force of erotic desire that propels the hero on in his frantic search for Hylas, through thorny bushes, over hills and thickets, 'all Jason's quest forgotten' (13.64–67). Heracles completely loses his way in this (bucolic) world full of nymphs and insinuating vegetation, as his getting lost in the thorns suggests, in what seems like an exteriorization of his anguish. When he finally reaches his heroic destination Phasis, it is on foot, long after his comrades, who scold him as *liponautēs* (ship-deserter, 13.73–75); Hylas, however, is 'numbered among the immortals'. The narrator's descriptive stress on bucolic elements—which may have seemed incongruous at first—with hindsight reveals a consistent symbolism.

In *Idyll* 22, the pastoral elements also serve to create contrasts. In this poem, the Dioscuri are hymned in two separate narratives. The first of these two recounts how Polydeuces defeats Amycus, the brutal king of the Mariandyni, in a boxing match (22.27–134). Once more, the Argonauts disembark (*ekbantes*, 22.32, cf. 13.32) to prepare for themselves a bed made from the local flora. This time Castor and Polydeuces stray from the group:

> But together Castor of the swift steeds and swarthy Polydeuces wandered apart from their comrades and viewed the varied wild woodland on the hill. Beneath a smooth rock they found a perennial spring brimming with clearest water, the pebbles in its depths showing like crystal or like

silver. Hard by, tall pines were growing, poplars and planes and tufted cypresses, and fragrant flowers farmed gladly by the shaggy bees—all flowers that teem in the meadows as spring is on the wane.   (22.36–43)

The spring (not present in Apollonius 2.1–97) is focalized by the Dioscuri, who, we may guess, were looking for drinking water; hence the emphasis on the water's clearness. This spot is a true *locus amoenus*, shadowed by all kinds of trees, fragrant with flowers from the nearby meadow, and buzzing with bees. But its loveliness only serves to create a contrast (cf. *Id.* 11, Polyphemus contrasted with his *locus amoenus*). In this case, the contrast is with the man seated next to the spring, Amycus, described almost as if he were an object (a statue):[30]

> There a monstrous figure was seated in the sun. Terrible to look at was he; his ears were crushed by the blows of hard fists; his mighty chest and broad back *rounded with iron flesh, as if it were some colossus of forged metal*, and beneath his shoulder-points the muscles in his brawny arms stood out like *rounded boulders which some winter torrent has rolled and polished in its mighty eddies*. A lion-skin fastened by the paws swung on his back and neck.   (22.44–52)

The description establishes a motionless image and thus creates a pause; this strongly contrasts with the stichomythic dialogue between Amycus and Polydeuces that follows directly afterwards (22.54–74), and the visually precise account of the subsequent boxing match (22.80–130). The poem appears to experiment with the juxtaposition of widely different narrative styles and effects.[31] The lovely setting (comically?) clashes with its monstrous inhabitant; its peacefulness and the pause in the narrative are in contrast with the dynamic action of the bloody fight that it accommodates.

Conclusion

Theocritus' use of space shares some characteristics with his treatment of time: both may convey an impression of indistinctness, but on the other hand, both are also used for very precise structural aims, in particular the psychological characterization of speakers.

   The embedding of songs in other songs (and thus of spaces within spaces) is a typically Theocritean device. It is used for the creation of

---

[30] There have even been attempts at identification with the bronze Terme-boxer, cf. the discussion in Zanker 2004: 34–35.
[31] Cf. *SAGN* 2: 108–109.

'pastoral analogies', that is, imaginary, mythical or at least distanced worlds where events and characters are located that to some extent predicate on the realities of other levels of the poem, or of its narratees. In *Idyll* 1, the embedded song about Daphnis clearly defines itself by its mythical elements as different from, more unreal than, the world evoked in the dialogue of Thyrsis and the Goatherd. But even this dialogue, through its artificial fusion between song and landscape, had already declared itself *a work of art*. True *pathetic fallacy* only has its place in the embedded mythical world of the likes of Daphnis and Comatas. At the same time, we might say that the harmony of music and nature in the opening of *Idyll* 1 is a translation of this concept, signifying that man can reach the same mystical harmony with nature as Daphnis and Comatas *through poetry and music*.

In the mimetic poems, settings are created in the words of the speakers. This raises some interesting issues. Firstly, there is the question of whether a strictly 'visual' representation of space is aimed at. This is clearly the case in some *Idylls* (2, 3, 15), but not always: in 1 and 7 musicality appears to take precedence over sight. Secondly, since Theocritus' characters are frequently naive, the narratee is left with a relatively large interpretational role. How are their references to space to be evaluated? What characterizing or psychologizing elements may be gathered from them? Often these passages form keys to the interpretation of the character's state of mind and thus to the themes of the poem, as in the case of Simaetha's disproportionate invocations of the elements, or Polyphemus' misguided evocations of his *locus amoenus*. The evaluation of spatial references may also become a theme in itself, as in *Idyll* 15, where it remains tantalizingly unclear how we are to judge the Adonis-hymn Gorgo so enthusiastically praises. In the ekphrasis of the *kissubion*, finally, the poem's narratee is implicitly invited to find reflections of themes essential of Theocritus' poetics, and to place the description in the tradition of epic ekphrases.

A similar bucolic *Auseinandersetzung* with epic seems to be taking place in the mythical narratives in 13 and 22. In both poems, the narrator consciously sets up a contrast (especially through the settings) between the bucolic world, the habitat of his own particular poetic invention, and heroic epic, the genre to which his poetry is related through its metre.

PART TWO

HISTORIOGRAPHY

HERODOTUS

T. Rood

Half-way through the *Histories* Herodotus tells of a journey that has far-reaching repercussions for the rest of the work—a trip to the Greek mainland made by Aristagoras, tyrant of Miletus, in the hope of gaining support for the Ionians' planned revolt from Persian rule. Aristagoras went first to Sparta, where he tried to persuade Cleomenes, one of the Spartan kings, to invade Asia by showing him 'a bronze chart on which was engraved a map of the whole earth' (5.49.1) and by describing the various peoples through whom the Spartans would have to pass on their way to Susa. At their next meeting, Cleomenes first asked Aristagoras 'how many days' journey it was from the Ionian coast to the king's palace' (5.50.1); then, informed that 'the journey inland would take three months' (5.50.2), he indignantly told Aristagoras to leave before he had the chance to outline the route in detail. Aristagoras journeyed to Athens next, but the narrator cuts off to fill in the account of the route that Aristagoras was unable to offer Cleomenes (5.52–53, the Royal Road from Sardis to Susa). When he returns to Aristagoras, Herodotus explains how he persuaded the Athenians to send twenty ships—'the beginning of misfortune for Greeks and barbarians alike' (5.97.2).[1]

Herodotus' account of Aristagoras' journey to Sparta and Athens is not just a turning-point in the narrative of the *Histories* as a whole, but also rich in material for a narratological analysis of space. In this chapter, analysis of this story will pull together some aspects of Herodotus' treatment of space (my discussion will necessarily be highly selective given the strong thematic importance of space in Herodotus' work).[2] Among

---

[1] Translations are (at times adapted) from Waterfield 1998a. I use 'Herodotus' as shorthand for 'the Herodotean narrator'.

[2] There is already a large bibliography related to this topic: note e.g. van Paassen 1957, esp. 117–166; Bichler 2000; Bichler 2007; T. Harrison 2007; more detailed studies of Herodotus' presentation of particular regions include Hartog 1988 on Scythia, Rollinger 1993 on Babylon, and Haziza 2009 on Egypt.

the issues that this episode raises are the importance of focalization and the difference between verbal and other ways of representing space. Above all, Herodotus' account of this episode lays bare one of the mechanisms that drives the treatment of space throughout the narrative—the link between geographical knowledge and military power. We start, though, by exploring some of the different levels at which the narrative's treatment of space operates.

Spatial Levels: From the Local to the Cosmic

What is the setting for Aristagoras' speech to Cleomenes? Herodotus reveals nothing—except that it is in Sparta: the two men simply came 'to words' (*es logous*, 5.49.1, 2). Again, when the day for Cleomenes' reply arrives, Herodotus reports only that the two men came together 'to the agreed place' (*es to sugkeimenon*, 5.50.1). As in many other conversational scenes (e.g. 3.80–82, the debate on the constitutions), Herodotus focuses on the words said rather than on the physical setting for those words. As the account of Aristagoras' stay in Sparta continues, however, Herodotus does become more specific in his handling of space. He first mentions that Cleomenes, after bidding Aristagoras leave Sparta, returned 'to his house' (*es ta oikia*, 5.51.1)—allowing us to infer that the earlier conversation had not been held there. He then reveals that Aristagoras went 'to Cleomenes' house' with a suppliant's branch—and it is in this private setting that two significant developments occur: firstly, Aristagoras attempts to bribe Cleomenes; secondly, Cleomenes' young daughter intervenes to stop him accepting the bribe. Herodotus still makes no attempt to describe Cleomenes' house: the relative precision about the setting is all that is required to contrast with the earlier meeting and to justify the intervention by the young girl. Other Herodotean scenes that one assumes took place indoors (e.g. 5.41.2, the Spartan ephors observing the wife of the Spartan king Anaxandridas giving birth)[3] are not even given that degree of detail.

More attention is paid to internal space in oriental contexts. In his account of the uprising of the seven Persian conspirators against the false Smerdis and his brother, Herodotus brings out the steps by which the conspirators are able to penetrate the usurpers' inner sanctum: first

---

[3] Cf. Garland 1990: 61 on childbirth in ancient Greece.

they are described on the road; then they reach the palace gates (where they get past the overly respectful guards); then they come into the courtyard (where they meet the suspicious eunuchs); finally they reach the main hall, and during the fighting one of the Magi 'took refuge in a bedroom that led into the main hall' (3.77–78—the description at 3.78.3, *ēn gar dē thalamos esekhōn es ton andreōna*, uses an imperfect tense, perhaps suggesting that it is focalized by the Magus).[4] This elaborate sequence brings out the rulers' seclusion—a practice shared by some other oriental rulers in Herodotus, but particularly important for the false Smerdis (cf. 3.68.2). Even here, however, it is the sequence of spaces that counts: there is no description of the rooms themselves. Herodotus is similarly spare in recounting scenes set in rulers' bedrooms: Otanes' daughter, for instance, is merely described as going *par' auton* [viz. the false Smerdis] when she goes to sleep with him (3.69.6), while a bed is the only prop mentioned in the scene where Atossa pleads with Darius to adopt a more aggressive foreign policy (3.134.1). A telling exception is the first bedroom scene in the *Histories*, where slightly greater precision is required to bring out the moral topography of the punishment of Candaules for wanting to show off his wife naked (Candaules' wife places Gyges by 'the same door', 1.12.1, that is, in the same spot as Candaules had placed him when he wanted to display her, to fulfil her planned revenge: 'The place from where he showed me to you naked will be the place from which to launch the attack against him', 1.11.5).[5]

To return to Aristagoras: the sparseness of Herodotus' account of the setting for his conversations with Cleomenes is matched more broadly by the sparseness of his account of the city in which the conversations occur. When Aristagoras first arrives in Sparta, Herodotus does offer a resumé of Spartan history (5.39–48, picking up 1.65–68), but neither here nor elsewhere does he offer an account of the city itself. This lack of detail is in fact typical of Herodotus' accounts of cities throughout the *Histories*. The only two detailed city-descriptions that he offers are, revealingly, for two cities in the Persian empire, Ecbatana and Babylon (1.98, 178–187), and even here city-description has a symbolic aspect, serving in part as a

---

[4] For this use of the imperfect, cf. 1.126.1; 2.113.2; 6.102; 7.175, 8.33; also e.g. Ps.-Hanno 2, 4, 9, 12, 13; and cf. (→) Homer and (→) Thucydides.

[5] Note also e.g. the phrase 'the king's house', which is used several times in Herodotus and also has Persian parallels (e.g. Meiggs and Lewis [1969] 1988, no. 12 ll. 16–17; cf. Brock 2004: 173; Tuplin 2007: 792 n. lists Herodotean examples); or the description of eastern treasure-chambers (1.30; 2.121.a).

reflection on political systems: the excessively enclosed space of Ecbatana is constructed by the unapproachable tyrant Deioces, and a comparison between the sizes of the largest wall around Ecbatana and the wall around Athens (1.98.5) perhaps hints at the growing tyranny of the Athenian empire.[6]

Accounts of physical monuments (particularly dedications in sanctuaries) are the most significant exception to Herodotus' general reluctance to offer detailed accounts of cities.[7] Buildings and other man-made structures are included amidst the great and marvellous *erga* that Herodotus set to describe, for instance the three 'great works' at Samos (3.60)—'a tunnel which was dug right through the bottom of a hill 150 fathoms high …' (measurements are given for its length, height, and width, as well as for another channel dug along its length to carry water to the town); 'a mole in the sea, over two stades long, enclosing the harbour in water which is as much as twenty fathoms deep'; and 'the largest temple of all the temples we know' (its architect but no measurements are given). The narrator alleges that these monuments (which are described after the account of the history of Samos under Polycrates) are great enough to justify the length of the preceding treatment of the island's history— though this explanation may in fact be a pretext for the further spatial description. Such monuments do not generally form part of coherent descriptions of their physical settings: as we shall see, Herodotus prefers to build up a picture of sanctuaries piecemeal by describing successive dedications at a site.[8]

Herodotus' tendency to offer little specificity about space is also found in his treatment of journeys made by individuals. Aristagoras arrives at Sparta and then at Athens, with no detail given about his route. So too with other journeys: many characters made the journey between Sardis and Susa (e.g. Darius and Histiaeus at 5.25.1; a message at 5.32; a tattooed slave at 5.35.2), but in none of these cases is there any detail about the route followed. Similarly visitors from Greece or elsewhere in Europe arrive at Sardis with no attention paid to how they got there (e.g. 5.11–12, 24.2, 73, 96.2; 6.125)—though when travellers from Asia move across to Europe Herodotus is more likely to mention their crossing of

---

[6] Cities: A.M. Bowie 2006: 122–129. Athens: Munson 2001: 90.

[7] Cf. Erbse 1992: 146–156.

[8] Note that further detail on the temple on Samos is offered at 4.88. Irwin 2009 offers a more politicised reading of Herodotus' Samos in relation to contemporary Athens.

the Hellespont (e.g. 5.11.1 [cf. the analeptic 12.1], 14.2, 23.1), a symbolic space that receives fuller elaboration in key military contexts (7.44–56 for Xerxes' crossing; 9.114–121).[9] By the same narrative logic, spatial movements by single characters are treated with less detail than (actual or prospective) military movements by whole armies: Aristagoras' account of the peoples of Asia and the narrator's detailed account of the Royal Road are offered when the possibility of the Spartans following that route is raised.

While Herodotus pays little attention to the distribution of space within the sites he mentions, he does show some concern with their localization or with other geographical details. He typically offers such information paratactically through a new sentence, often in the form of the 'there is a place X' motif[10] or again through a defining genitive, an appositional phrase (linked by a definite article or participle), or a relative clause.[11] Precision about location can also be combined with more incidental information: during the Ionian attack on Sardis, for instance, the Lydians and Persians on the acropolis poured out 'towards the river Pactolus, which brings gold-dust down from Mt Tmolus; it flows through the middle of the square and then discharges into the river Hermus on its way, and this into the sea' (5.101.2); here a concern for marvels (cf. 1.93.1) is combined with Herodotus' regular practice of providing information on the flow of rivers and in particular on where they enter the sea.[12]

Herodotus at times uses this type of geographical information for localized narrative effects. By locating Sigeum 'in Troas' and 'by the Sca-mander' (4.38.2; 5.65.3), for instance, he prepares for a later dispute over the town: when the Mytilenaeans demand return of Sigeum after Peisi-stratus has seized it, the Athenians 'argued that Aeolians had no more right to the land of Ilium than themselves or any other Greeks who had helped Menelaus avenge the abduction of Helen' (5.94.2). The geograph-ical markers for Sigeum act as seeds. In the account of Cambyses' route

---

[9] Cf. also 3.56.2, 138.4 for strong markings of the Asia/Europe boundary in military contexts, and also the strong polarizing in the Persian account of the origin of hostilities at 1.4.4. For ways in which this geographical polarity is qualified, see Rood 2010a.

[10] E.g. the Ionians decide to assemble 'at Lade; Lade is a small island off the city of Mile-tus', 6.7; cf. e.g. 1.26.2, 76.1, 84.3; 2.169.4; 6.22.2, 47.2, 61.3; 7.59.1 and Kerschensteiner 1964; for a similar geographical example in an almost contemporary mythographer, cf. Pherecydes fr. 82a Fowler.

[11] Genitive: e.g. 1.46.2, 69.4. Participle: e.g. 1.82.2. Relative clause: e.g. 1.6.1; 3.91.1.

[12] Powell 1938 lists 41 instances of *ekdidōmi* in this sense in Herodotus.

to Egypt, by contrast, Herodotus exploits for immediate effect the symbolic force of myth: by noting that 'the land onwards from Lake Serbonis (where the story goes that Typhos was buried) is Egyptian' (3.5.3), he invites us to see Typhos as a mythical antecedent to the hybristic Cambyses.[13]

When Herodotus does employ large-scale descriptions of space, these descriptions tend to be in connection with the theme of imperialism (and particularly with Persian expansion). He generally describes foreign lands when they are attacked by an aggressor. At times, as in the Aristagoras scene, the account is given in the form of a single description of a proposed or actual route (e.g. 1.104, the route between Scythia and Media; 3.5, Cambyses' route to Egypt; 5.17.2, the short route from Lake Prasias to Macedonia). Herodotus' fullest descriptions of space occur when he offers a unified account of a country (geography, ethnography, and past history) as it comes under attack. These elements are found in varying degrees in his accounts of Cappadocia (1.72), Ionia (1.142–148), Caria, Caunus, and Lycia (1.171–173), and Babylonia (1.178–187, 192–200). Particularly notable are the accounts of Egypt in book 2 and of Scythia and Libya in book 4, where Herodotus goes beyond a linear concern with route to offer a more panoramic vision of the overall shape of a country or of its different regions (see below).

As well as being tied to the expansion of Persian power, Herodotus' descriptions of countries combine to create a larger sense of cosmic space, with the patterns of balance and diversity between different countries (and particularly between Scythia in the north and Egypt in the south) offering a spatial corollary to the patterns of historical explanation at work in the narrative as a whole.[14] That is to say, Herodotus' analysis of the pattern of historical change as programmatically stated at the outset of the work (1.5.4: big cities become small, small cities become big) offers a unifying concept through which local variations may be understood, and this underlying conceptual unity across time is matched by Herodotus' construction of space at a global level, where local diversities can be integrated into an overarching structure predicated on both variety and balance. This overarching structure is also articulated

---

[13] This form is already used in the Homeric Catalogue of Ships, particularly for the Trojans' allies (*Il.* 2.594, 850, 852, 857). On Typhos, cf. Dillery 2005: 392.

[14] Cf. Gould 1989: 86–109; Munson 2001: 131–132. For Egypt/Libya and Scythia, see e.g. Redfield 1985; Hartog 1988: 14–19; Thomas 2000: 53–54, 56, 75–79. Cf. also 1.142.1–2 on the climate of Ionia as a mean between northern cold and southern heat.

through Herodotus' disquisitions on the margins of the inhabited world (esp. 3.106–116) and on the divisions of continents (2.16; 4.37–45) and seas (1.202.4; 2.23; 4.36.2).

The Geographical Style

Whatever the level of Herodotus' engagement with space, he often has recourse to a range of techniques for describing space that are found in Hecataeus of Miletus, who wrote a geographical *Periegesis* towards the end of the sixth century or the start of the fifth, and in other geographical writers.[15] Hecataeus' work was an account of the places and peoples found along the shores of the Mediterranean and Black Sea (as well as some inland areas and islands). The text itself survives only in fragments (*FGrH* 1), few of which offer much beyond names. Where Hecataeus' actual words are preserved, the style is typically simple, paratactic, and repetitive: 'the Cherronesians border the Apsinthians to the south' (F 163: *Apsinthioisi pros mesēmbrian homoureousi Kherronēsioi*); 'to this point the land of Becheirice; next to them the Chi … up to them the Chi … the Dizeres border the Chi to the east' (F 207: *es men touto hē Bekheirikē, ekhontai d' autōn Khoi … mekhri men toutōn Khoi … Khoisi d' homoureoisi pros hēlion aniskhonta Dizēres*); 'near the city Alazia is the river Odrysses, which flows out of Lake Dascylitis from the west through the plain of Mygdonia and empties into the Rhyndacus' (F 217, tr. Jones).

A particularly suggestive cluster of the sort of geographical expressions found in Hecataeus' work occurs in the scene where Aristagoras visits Sparta. Among the typical expressions used in the primary narrator's account of the route of the Royal Road are the second-person form *diexela(i)s* (5.52.2, 'you will pass through');[16] the dative generalizing participles *diabanti*, *poreuomenō(i)*, *diexelasanti*, *esballonti*, and *anabainonti* (5.52.2–6, 'for a person crossing' or 'marching' or 'passing through' or 'entering' or 'going up'—a variant of the 'anonymous witness' device);[17] and the repetitive mapping of space in terms of stages and parasangs

---

[15] For Herodotus in his literary context, see R.L. Fowler 1996; on the early development of ancient geography, see van Paassen 1957; Jacob 1991; and Lanzillotta 1988.

[16] See *SAGN* 1: 158 for second-person addresses as a feature of geographical writing.

[17] See *SAGN* 1: 110 (and index). For geographical parallels, cf. e.g. *esionti* (1.51.1; 2.169.4), *parameibomenois* (1.104.1), *mesounti* (1.181.4), *periionti* (2.138.2); *espleonti* (3.90.2); *diabanti* (4.18.1, 4.19, 4.21); *huperbanti* (4.25.1); the device is also found in Hecataeus (*huperbanti*: F 169) and (→) Pausanias.

('stretching through Lydia and Phrygia are 20 stages, 94½ parasangs …
up to the Cilician borders 28 stages, 104 parasangs …').[18] The use of
these expressions itself creates a sense of spatial distance: in keeping with
the general Greek tendency to be concerned mostly with the geography
of difference,[19] these expressions are most commonly used in contexts
remote from the narratee's presumed range of knowledge (in Herodotus'
account of Xerxes' invasion of Greece, for instance, they largely drop out
after the Persian army has passed through Thermopylae). The repetition
of stages and parasangs also maps out the successive regions the Spar-
tans would have to pass through, creating a sense of separate units that
are themselves part of a larger whole (in modern terms, a sense of both
experienced place and more abstract space).[20]

   Characteristically geographical expressions are used even more lav-
ishly by Aristagoras in his meeting with Cleomenes, and again their effect
is to create a strong sense of spatial distance. When he starts by saying
that the peoples in Asia 'live next to each, as I shall explain' (5.49.5),
the middle verb he uses, *ekhomai*, in the sense of 'be next to', is typi-
cal of geographical writing: it is found, for instance, in Hecataeus (F 207,
quoted above) and in Herodotus' account of the short route from Lake
Prasias to Macedonia ('first, next to (*ekhetai*) the lake, there is a mine
… and after the mine after crossing the mountain called Dysorum one
is in Macedonia', 5.17.2).[21] And as he proceeds to use the verb a further
four times he falls into a repetitive style (albeit with some variety) simi-
lar to Herodotus' mapping of space through stages and parasangs: 'these
Phrygians to the east are next to (*ekhontai*) the Lydians … The Cappado-
cians are next to (*ekhontai*) the Phrygians … The Cilicians border on
(*prosouroi*) them, stretching down to this sea … These Armenians are
next to (*ekhontai*) these Cilicians … and the Matieneans to the Armeni-
ans … This land Cissia is next to (*ekhetai*) them …' (5.49.5–7). Aristago-
ras also follows the geographical tradition by showing an interesting
in naming ('the Cappadocians, whom we call Syrians')[22] and by mov-

---

   [18] For such repetition, cf. Rood 2010a: 55, with n. 17.
   [19] Hartog 1988, esp. 212–225; Cole 2010: 206–212.
   [20] For measurements in terms of the time taken to travel a route, cf. 1.72.3, 104.1;
2.34.1 (with the expression *euzōnō(i)*, 'for a man travelling light'); 3.26.1 (seven days'
journey across sand).
   [21] For *ekhomai*, cf. Powell 1938, s.v. *ekhō*, C.I (46 uses in Herodotus).
   [22] For Herodotus' varied interest in naming, cf. 7.201 (differences between people:
most Greeks call 'Thermopylae', *epikhōrioi* and *perioikoi* call 'Pylae'); 1.1 (difference over
time: 'in what is now called Hellas'); 3.26.1 (meaning in foreign languages: Oasis is 'the
Isles of the Blessed' in Greek). Cf. the Homeric interest in divine and mortal names.

ing from the coast to neighbouring islands. The peoples themselves are described with another mode of expression characteristic of geographical writers—superlatives:[23] *poluargurōtatoi*, *poluprobatōtatoi*, *polukarpotatoi*—they are 'most rich in silver/flocks/crops' (5.49.5); through Aristagoras Herodotus offers a pastiche of this superlative mode of expression, turning it into a crude version of ethnography tailored towards his goal of enticing Cleomenes into Asia.

When Aristagoras and the narrator describe the distance between Sardis and Susa, they also follow the practice of other Greek geographers by adopting a Mediterranean-centred perspective: the route is mapped from the Aegean coast to the interior. This perspective is not in itself surprising when a possible Spartan invasion of Asia is being discussed, but it is also the perspective that shapes Herodotus' narrative throughout the *Histories*. While Herodotus' proem balances the great deeds done by both Greeks and barbarians, his first *logos* establishes the dominant spatial perspective: the Phoenicians 'came to this sea from what is called the Red Sea' (1.1.1). The deictic *tēnde* ('this') is a mark of Herodotus' Mediterranean focus, and particularly striking since the story is attributed to Persians (who lived closer to the Red Sea than to the Mediterranean). 'This' sea is also implicitly opposed to other seas that are 'southern' (the Indian Ocean), 'northern' (the Black Sea), or 'outside the Pillars of Heracles'.[24] Herodotus adopts this same spatial perspective as he locates places or peoples as 'on the right/left to one sailing into the Hellespont' (3.90.2; 6.33.1: *espleonti*—viz. from the Mediterranean) or through phrases such as 'above' (where we would say 'north');[25] or as he describes the journey through Egypt 'for one travelling up' the Nile (2.97.2, 155.1: *anapleonti*).[26] This perspective is also implicit in broader Greek naming-practice: the

---

[23] For the ethnographic superlative, cf. 2.77.1; 3.8.1, 20.1; 4.93, 183.4, 187.3; van Paassen 1957: 161–162; Bloomer 1993; also e.g. Ctesias *FGrH* 688 F 45 §§ 16, 21, 23, 43, 45, 47, 48; Diodorus Siculus 3.28.3, 35.7.

[24] For the 'outside' sea, see 1.202.4; for 'northern', 4.37 (though more often of the Mediterranean in relation to Africa: 2.11.3, 32.4, 158.4, 159.1; 4.42.2); 'southern' (sometimes also explicitly 'Erythraean'), 2.11.3, 158.4; 3.17.1; 4.37, 42.3 (though at 4.13.2 the same phrase focalized by Aristeas signifies the Black Sea); for 'this sea', cf. also 4.39.2, 41; note also 'Greek sea' at 5.54.2; 7.28.2.

[25] E.g. 5.5 *tōn katuperthe Krēstōnaiōn oikeontōn* (where Waterfield translates 'the tribes to the *north* of Crestonia'); Powell lists 30 (adverbial and prepositional) uses of *katuperthe* in the sense 'inland'; cf. the use of *enerthe* ('below') in the sense 'seawards of' (six occurrences, all in the account of Egypt). Note that Herodotus does also use the north wind for orientation (e.g. 5.9.1), as well the rising, midday, and sinking sun and the Arctus constellation.

[26] Cf. also *anō ionti* at 2.7.1, 8.1, 29.2.

stretch of sea between the Aegean and the Black Sea (the Pontos), for instance, was known as the Propontis—'the Fore-sea'—even when it was described from a Pontic perspective ('the Bosporus stretches to the Propontis; and the Propontis … opens into the Hellespont', 4.85.3–4).

The dominance of the Greek perspective is also suggested by Herodotus' use of analogies between the familiar and the less familiar. As we have seen, the size of the wall-circuit at Ecbatana is compared with Athens (1.98.5). So too the shape of the Crimea is compared with that of Cape Sunium or southern Italy (4.99.4–5); the Araxes has islands within it said to be the size of Lesbos (1.202.1); the distance from the Egyptian coast to Heliopolis is said to be the same as that 'from the Altar of the Twelve Gods in Athens to the temple of Olympian Zeus in Pisa' (2.7.1); one portion of the Nile is as crooked as the Meander (2.29.3); and a sacred lake in Egypt is the same size as a lake on Delos (2.170.2).[27] More indirectly, by claiming that a bronze vessel in Scythia is six times the size of a bowl dedicated by Pausanias at the mouth of the Black Sea, and then proceeding to describe the Scythian vessel 'for the sake of anyone who has not seen Pausanias' bowl' (4.81.3–4), Herodotus presents the entrance to the Black Sea as a liminal area by contrast with the still more marginal lands of Scythia.

The centrality of the Aegean region is established in other ways too. In terms of climate, Ionia is defined as a medium between extremes: 'these Ionians … have founded their cities in the finest spot of all the people we know of: neither the lands to the north and south [lit. 'up and down'] are like Ionia, for some of them suffer from the cold and rain, while others are oppressively hot and dry' (1.142.1–2). Later in the work the spatial implications of this finely balanced climate are reasserted in a discussion of the margins of the world: 'the extremities of the inhabited world were allotted the finest features, just as Greece was allotted much the most finely mixed seasons' (3.106.1); picking up his earlier account of the long-lived Ethiopians, said to be 'the tallest and most beautiful of all people' (3.20.1), Herodotus now describes Arabia with its strange spices (3.107–111) and India with its gold-gathering ants (3.102), the furthest inhabitable land to the east (beyond lies sandy desert, 3.98.2). He offers a picture of the world as balanced, with the fineness of the Greek climate at the centre

---

[27] Cf. Hartog 1988: 225–230. Note also e.g. how the outer wall at Babylon is compared with a breastplate (1.181.1); and that Herodotus can also introduce comparisons between two non-Greek items (e.g. Babylonian and Egyptian irrigation, 1.193.2).

matching the marvels at the world's extremes.[28] The centrality of Greece is also asserted by the increasing uncertainty of geographical knowledge as one moves away from the Greek centre: Herodotus describes northern lands where locals say that a proliferation of feathers, or bees, prevents further travel (4.7; 5.10; cf. also 3.115–116).[29] These uncertain edges are also part of Herodotus' moral geography: Cambyses is first said to plan an expedition against 'the long-lived Ethiopians, who live in Libya, on the coast of the southern sea' (3.17.1), but when he starts on the expedition itself Herodotus stresses that he had 'not considered the fact that he was intending to make an expedition to the ends of the earth' (*es ta eskhata gēs*, 3.25.1); the vaguer phrasing (together with the seed planted by the presentation through negation in the second passage) underlines Cambyses' folly.

Maps and Texts

Another medium in which the Aegean was marked as central was the Greek map—like the one that Aristagoras displays at Sparta. Herodotus does not describe the map itself; he uses it, rather, to suggest a number of differences between verbal and visual presentations of space. For one thing, Aristagoras is not described as displaying the map at Athens—doubtless because of the difficulty of showing it to a whole assembly rather than just one interlocutor.[30] More tellingly, Herodotus uses the map to bring out the vagueness of Aristagoras' presentation of space. Cleomenes is unable to extrapolate from the abstract space of the map a sense of how long it would take to march along the route. Aristagoras' misguidedly honest reply in turn becomes the excuse for a virtuoso display by the narrator, as he maps the route along the Royal Road in terms of stages (*stathmoi*) and parasangs, including even measurements in half-parasangs (5.52–53). After stating that Aristagoras' estimate was right, Herodotus even corrects himself and notes that one has also to take account of the trip from Ephesus to Sardis, thereby adding an extra three

---

[28] For Herodotus' account of margins, see Fehling 1989: 97–104; Fehling 1994; Nesselrath 1995; also Rood 2006a: 297–298 for Herodotus' relativizing of the opposition between centre and margins.

[29] Cf. Fehling 1989: 101, who sees Herodotus' three zones (known, fabulous, unknown) as part of his rhetoric of credibility.

[30] Pelling 2007: 184.

days to the three-month journey (5.54). The passage is a bravura exercise in narratorial control that also implicitly relates such measuring to issues of domination: we think of Darius measuring the Pontus (4.85–86) or of Xerxes measuring his army by having successive groups occupy a space that can fit 10,000 men (7.60).[31]

Herodotus also prompts reflections on the differences between texts and images through Aristagoras' claim to the totality of his map's spatial representation: it shows 'the whole earth'—'every stretch of sea and all the rivers'. This claim seems to clash with the necessarily restricted presentation of space in the narrative itself. Herodotus as narrator cannot offer the same totality of representation as the map: in discussing the rivers of Scythia, for instance, he writes that 'there are almost as many rivers flowing through it as there are canals in Egypt' and that 'I will name (*onomaneō*) the notable rivers (*onomastoi*), those which can be sailed up from the sea' (4.47.2—he lists eight). Aristagoras' total representation of space seems in turn to be linked with his appeal to a total imperialism: 'When you could easily make yourselves the rulers of *all Asia*, how could you choose another option?' (5.49.8). The language of ruling 'all Asia' does recur at other points in the *Histories*,[32] but it seems especially compelling when 'all Asia' can be grasped in a single view by the character within the text. Yet the vision of 'all Asia' offered by the map is necessarily selective, like Herodotus' own narrative: maps cannot show everything. And the narrator significantly juxtaposes this vision with another form of totality—the 'total necessity' imposed by some of the barriers in the path of the invader of Asia: 'Phrygia ends at the river Halys, where there are gates which it is a total necessity (*pasa anagkē*) to pass through to cross the river; there is also a substantial guard-post at the Halys. … Matiene has four navigable rivers flowing through it, which there is a total necessity (*pasa anagkē*) to cross by ferry' (5.52.2–4). Herodotus' own presentation of the route strikes a very different note from Aristagoras' manipulative exploitation of the map.

The different perspectives of Aristagoras and the narrator are further highlighted by the way they use similar geographical styles to contrasting ends. While Aristagoras focuses on the riches to be won in Asia, Herodotus is much more precise about the length of the journey and

---

[31] Cf. Konstan 1987 for Persians' concern for size; Christ 1994 for royal measuring and enquiry.
[32] Cf. T. Harrison 2007: 50; note also e.g. 1.130.3.

about the obstacles in the way.[33] The narrator's alternative account of space seems designed to counter the character's over-optimistic view: he fills in the details that Aristagoras was prevented from giving to Cleomenes, but not perhaps in the way that Aristagoras himself would have done. The difference between the two accounts is best seen in their descriptions of Susa. Aristagoras reports that 'Susa itself lies on the banks of this river here in Cissia, which is called the Choaspes. Susa is where the Great King usually lives, and where the treasuries are, with all this wealth. All you have to do is capture Susa, and your wealth would undoubtedly challenge that of Zeus!' (5.49.6). The narrator, by contrast, alludes to a stretch of road that 'goes up to the Choaspes (another river which is deep enough to be navigable), where the city Susa has been built (*polis pepolistai*)' (5.52.6). Whereas Herodotus calls Susa a *polis*, Aristagoras defines it purely in terms of the wealth stored there—the final source of temptation in the long trek away from the Mediterranean.

Herodotus' account also disturbs the contrast between map and text. Though it exposes the whole of Asia to a single view, the cartographic representation of space offered by Aristagoras' map itself needs interpretation. Furthermore, the map serves as a supplement to, not a replacement for, a hodological perspective:[34] Aristagoras points to the relevant spaces on his map as he describes in words the peoples encountered on the route to Susa. The problem with his map lies not in the nature of cartography per se, but in the crude way in which he tries to exploit the map for a political purpose that the narrator finds suspicious.

Aristagoras' use of a map may also serve as a comment on the way in which space is integrated in Herodotus' analysis of patterns of imperial expansion. Herodotus' more robust account of Asia may offer a sceptical riposte to the panhellenic fantasies expressed in Aristagoras' fanciful description.[35] Yet the narrator's accounts elsewhere in the *Histories* are marked by a tension over their relation to characters' imperial drives.[36] On the one hand, they offer a form of resistance to the onward march of the narrative, a temporary halt to the progress of Persian expansion; and the Scythian geography in particular highlights the impossibility

---

[33] Cf. Flower 2000: 70–73; Rood 2006a: 295–296.

[34] Cf. Purves 2010: 132–138, 144–150, on the opposition of the cartographic and hodological in relation to Aristagoras (my emphasis is slightly different); also e.g. Bichler 2007: 74–76; Pelling 2007.

[35] Cf. Flower 2000: 70–73; Rood 2006a: 295–296.

[36] Cf. Payen 1995; Rood 2006a: 294.

of the Persians' gaining control of a land that seems particularly suited for nomads.[37] At the same time they bring out the magnitude of the Persians' conquests, justifying Herodotus' initial claim that his enquiries deal with great and marvellous deeds; indeed, the account of Egypt sets the Persians' conquest in the context of earlier expeditions (notably Egyptian invasions of Asia) while also self-consciously alluding to the way earlier rulers have imposed themselves on the landscape as a form of self-commemoration.[38]

That Herodotus is not hostile to the cartographic mode in itself is shown by the way his own narrative is frequently structured not by the hodological idea of the route but by the interrelation between different spatial units. A good illustration of this tendency is supplied by his description of Babylon (1.178–187). Herodotus describes first the size and shape of the city: 'it is situated on a huge plain, and the length of each of its sides (it forms a square) is 120 stades', giving a circumference of 480 stades (1.178.2).[39] His account then moves progressively from the outside in, not via a pedestrian route but through a series of smaller enveloping spaces. He describes first 'a wide, deep moat, full of water, surrounding the whole city', and then 'a defensive wall'. After interrupting the purely spatial description (in the (→) Homeric manner) to describe how the moat and wall were built, with a neat balance in the use of earth dug from the moat for the wall (1.179; cf. 1.185.4), he then notes that the city is divided into two districts by the Euphrates and further protected by an inner wall. His account then moves progressively towards the centre: 'In the middle of one of the two districts of the city stands the royal palace, surrounded by a tall, strong wall, and in the centre of the other there is a bronze-gated sanctuary … In the middle of the sanctuary has been built a solid tower, a stade long and the same in width, which supports another tower, which in turn supports another, and so on … In the last tower there is a huge temple' (1.181.2–5). This panoramic description invites the narratee to construct a mental image of how the city would appear seen from above. A similar move away from a purely hodological view of space is found in Herodotus' account of Egypt and Scythia. His

[37] Hartog 1988: 34–60; Purves 2006.

[38] For Sesostris' expeditions into Asia (generally seen as Egyptian invention to counterbalance the Persian conquest), see 2.102–103, 106; for Darius' failed attempt to set up a statue, cf. 2.110.2–3; note also 2.158.1 (canal).

[39] For other circumference measurements, cf. 1.93.5, 163.4, 185.4; 2.15.3, 41.5, 149.1; 7.109.2.

account of these lands is rich in internal differentiation between different sorts of cultural zone.[40] He also includes details about their dimensions and shapes: Scythia is square (4.99–101), while the width of Egypt varies along the Nile (2.5–9).

Piecemeal Description

The opposition between cartographic and hodological space is further complicated by the technique of the piecemeal description of geographical information. This technique is employed in the course of an account of campaigns, for instance in the early stages of Darius' invasion of Scythia,[41] and more fully in Xerxes' invasion of Greece; the information takes the form both of geographical detail about places along the route and of discussion of possible routes.[42] In itself this technique might be thought to reflect a hodological perspective. And yet the very disjointedness that results in Herodotus' account of Scythia contributes to his broader mapping of space. His account is marked by an opposition between Scythia and Egypt (and/or Libya) that is predicated on the idea of a balance between polar opposites. This contrast is taken further by the opposition between the looser structure of the Scythian *logos* and the more formal structure for Egypt. Herodotus makes a number of (not totally compatible) attempts to describe Scythia, basing his descriptions partly on the model of a coastal *periplous*, with rivers used as a way of anchoring the different Scythian peoples living by the coast and inland (4.17–36, 47–58), partly on more abstract cartographic modes (4.99–101);[43] he offers no historical overview of the land apart from the different accounts of Scythian origins. The account of Egypt, by contrast, is more regular, with successive sections on the geographical structure of the land, the customs of the people, and the accomplishments of a long list of kings.

---

[40] Cf. Shaw 1982–1983 on Scythia.

[41] See 4.85–86 (Pontus), 90, 92, 93 (rivers in Thrace), 99–101 (shape of Scythia), 123.2–3.

[42] Detail: 7.26.3 (Celaenae), 30.1 (salt marsh, Colossae), 30.2 (boundary marker), 33–34 (Abydus), 42.1–2, 43, 58.2–3, 59.1–2, 112, 113, 115; 8.31, 32.2, 33 (temple of Apollo at Abae). Route: e.g. 7.31 (split), 198–200 (approaches to Thermopylae).

[43] Cf. Dewald 1998: 647 for the *periplous* model (also 660 for a parallel with 4.168–178, the arrangement of the Libyan ethnography along the coast from east to west); Hartog 1988: 344–349 on the tension between concrete and geometric space.

It is not that the account of Egypt is lacking in piecemeal description. By embedding descriptions of physical monuments in the historical narrative of the Egyptian kings who built them, Herodotus offers an ordered but gradually unfolding picture of the topography of a site. The result can be traced in relation to the sanctuary of Hephaestus (Ptah) at Memphis.[44] Herodotus first describes it as 'huge and remarkable' (2.99.4: *mega te kai axiapēgētotaton*) when it was constructed by Min, the first king of Egypt. Then a 'northern gateway' in the sanctuary is constructed by Moeris, last of the 330 kings after Min, who wanted to display 'a monument' (2.101.2: *mnēmosuna*). A later king, Sesostris, used conquered peoples to haul large blocks of stone for the sanctuary (2.108.2) and left as 'monuments' (*mnēmosuna*) 'in front of the Hephaestaeum' 'two stone statues thirty cubits in height of himself and his wife, and statues of his four sons too, each twenty cubits in height' (2.110.1); similarly Rhampsinitus 'left as monument (*mnēmosuna*) the western gateway of the Hephaestaeum, and erected two statues facing this gateway, each of which is twenty-five cubits in height' (2.121.1), while Asychis 'built the eastern gateway for Hephaestus, which is the most magnificent and by far the largest' (2.136.1; Herodotus adds that 'all the gateways have figures carved on them and countless other marvels of construction, but this one easily outdoes the others'). Another addition was made by Sethos: 'A stone statue of this king still stands in the sanctuary of Hephaestus with a field-mouse in his hand' (2.141.6). Later, Psammetichus 'built the southern gateway for Hephaestus' (2.153), while among Amasis' dedications is 'the 75-foot figure which is lying on its back in front of the Hephaestaeum in Memphis' (2.176.1). Throughout book 2, then, Herodotus makes a sustained attempt to locate successive buildings at Memphis in relation to the Hephaestaeum, perhaps to support his claim that he personally travelled there.[45] The piecemeal description then continues in the narrative of Cambyses' campaign, when Herodotus describes the cult statue of Hephaestus that Cambyses mocks (3.37.2).

---

[44] So too for the pyramids (2.124–125, 127, 134.1, 136.3–4) and labyrinth (2.148). Exceptional are the accounts of the 'remarkable' (2.137.5) sanctuary of Bubastis (2.138) and of Lake Moeris (2.149–150, anticipated at 2.101.2), which are added by association. Contrast how for Scythia (a few) physical monuments are described within the ethnographic section: 4.3.2 (trench), 71 (royal tombs), 81 (bronze vessel); note also monuments resulting from Darius' expedition (4.87, *stēlai* set up by Darius at Bosporus, though later carried off by the Byzantines; 91, *stēlē* at river; 92, mound of stones at another river; 124.1, forts left unfinished).

[45] For priests as informants, see 2.2.5, 2.3.1.

The technique of piecemeal description is also applied to Greek sanctuaries. The location of many dedications at Delphi is described throughout the work, though no single building plays the same structuring role as the Memphis Hephaestaeum.[46] A less prominent example is Herodotus' presentation of the sanctuary of Abae. This sanctuary is first localized through a genitive of definition ('belonging to the Phocians') in the list of oracles that Croesus tests (*Abas tōn Phōkeōn*, 1.46.2). Knowledge of its Phocian location is then presupposed at 8.27.4–5, where Herodotus describes the Phocians making dedications there and at Delphi. The greatest detail about the shrine, however, is delayed until it is burnt down by the Persians ('Abae, where there was a rich sanctuary of Apollo, well stocked with treasuries and many votive offerings', 8.33); the basic fact of the sanctuary's Phocian location is then repeated at its final appearance (8.134.1, similar in form to 1.46.2).

Space and Focalization

The progressive revelation of spatial information can also be tied to issues of focalization. Following Darius' failed invasion of Scythia, Herodotus reports that as a reward for loyalty Histiaeus asked for 'Myrcinus in the land of the Edonians, wanting to found a city in it' (5.11.2). But when the Persian governor Megabazus found out that Histiaeus was fortifying the site, he rebuked Darius for allowing a Greek 'to found a settlement in Thrace, where there is a limitless supply of timber for shipbuilding, where there are plenty of spars for oars, and where there are silver mines too' (5.23.2). The additional detail about Myrcinus is given when there is a threat that Histiaeus may set himself up as leader over Greeks and Thracians (cf. 5.3.1 for the danger of the Thracians getting a leader). De Jong (2001b: 114–115) has offered a similar reading of the piecemeal distribution of spatial information in the account of Xerxes' invasion of Greece: 'Herodotus chose to present the geographical

---

[46] Locations for Delphic offerings include: the Corinthian treasury (1.14.2, 50.3, 51.3; 4.162.3); the Clazomenian treasury (1.51.2); the temple of Athena Pronaia (1.92.1); 'the tripod in front of the temple' (8.27.5); 'the bronze three-headed serpent very close to the altar' (9.82.1); 'behind the altar which the Chians dedicated and in front of the actual altar' (2.135.4); in the same place as other offerings (1.14.3; 8.122.1); or unspecified (1.31.5). For other sanctuaries, cf. e.g. 5.59–61 (temple of Apollo in Thebes). Cf. Crane 1996: 163–208; also Purves 2010: 150–158 for a discussion of Delphi as an intersection that binds the narrative.

information about Greece in close connection with Xerxes' march through that country' so as to show 'the process by which this Persian king gradually gets to know Greece'. This is a good suggestion in itself—though as the expedition advances into central Greece Herodotus prefers not to repeat geographical information presumed to be familiar to the narratee. At the same time, throughout the Plataea narrative in book 9 the piecemeal description technique, with spatial descriptions interwoven with characters' considerations of strategy, is used for the reasoning of both Persians and Greeks as the two armies shift camp more than once before finally engaging.[47] Besides this, a unified account of Greece would also run counter to the dominant thread of the narrative—Herodotus' analysis of the constant Greek temptation towards fragmentation and internal disunity. One of the spatial questions Herodotus is concerned to pose is precisely the meaning of 'Greece'.[48]

Focalization is important for understanding other aspects of Herodotus' treatment of space. We have already noted in the account of Aristagoras' visit to Sparta that character and narrator offer very different accounts of Asia. Aspects of focalization play a key role in other scenes too: characters often present highly dubious claims about geographical facts such as distance and size. At 5.13.2, for instance, the Paeonian brothers trying to tempt Darius tell him that Paeonia is not far away (*ou prosō*); Herodotus' account as a whole suggests that terms such as 'near' and 'far' are inherently open to interpretation (see e.g. 5.80, an oracle on nearness that the Thebans interpret as relating to kinship, not physical distance).[49] Factual claims on size are also open to question: at 5.106.6 Histiaeus wrongly calls Sardinia 'the largest island';[50] Aristagoras tempts a Persian governor by saying that Naxos was 'not a large island', but was 'exceptionally beautiful and fertile, lay close to the Ionian coast, and

---

[47] See 9.13.3 (Mardonius moves from Attica, which is not suitable for cavalry, to Boeotia, which is), 19.3–20 (the Greeks do not come down to the plain—because of the Persian cavalry, as is more strongly suggested at 9.25), 25.2 (the Greeks move camp to a site with better water access), 39.1 (details on the Cithaeron pass where Mardonius sends his cavalry), 43.2 (Herodotus explains about the river Thermodon), 51.1–3 (the Greeks move to an island near Plataea).

[48] Note the broad geographical definition of 'Hellas' at 1.92.1; 2.182.1. The exception that proves the rule is Sparta, commonly interpreted as an 'internal other', where Herodotus does offer a quasi-ethnographic account; but this account in any case focuses on the institution of the dual kingship rather than the geography of Sparta itself.

[49] For physical distance, cf. 6.108.3 on Plataea.

[50] Though as Asheri 2007: ad loc. notes, this error was made by others in antiquity.

was rich in property and slaves'; and that from Naxos and neighbouring islands he could attack Euboea, 'which is a large, prosperous island, at least as big as Cyprus and easy to take' (5.31.1–3). Here, as in his speech at Sparta, Aristagoras' presentation of space is tied to potential military expeditions. So too when Mardonius tries to persuade Xerxes to invade Greece, he adds to his 'argument for retaliation' the additional argument 'that Europe was a particularly beautiful place, where every kind of cultivated tree grew and the soil was excellent' (7.5.3).[51]

The influence of focalization on Herodotus' modes of spatial description is also seen in his use of a wide range of different stylistic and narrative registers. Aristagoras' totalizing language of 'the whole of Asia' also appears in Astyages' dream that a vine grew from his daugher's genitals and 'overshadowed the whole of Asia' (1.108.1); the key opposition between Europe and Asia is evoked when Cyrus dreams of 'Hystaspes' eldest son with wings growing out of his shoulder-blades; with one wing he cast a shadow over Asia, with the other he overshadowed Europe' (1.209.1). The important opposition between mainland and islands can be expressed through an oracle ('If Zeus had wanted an island, he would have made an island', 1.174.5) or through a pointed saying (the wise adviser Bias makes Croesus abandon his plan to sail against islanders by suggesting that 'the islanders are jointly buying ten thousand horses' for an attack on Sardis—which is exactly what Croesus would want; so too, he concludes, the islanders would like to catch the Lydians at sea, 1.27). Elsewhere, the strategic advantages of Byzantium over Chalcedon are conveyed through a saying that the Persian Megabazus 'left as an immortal memory': 'the Chalcedonians must have been blind for all that time, because otherwise they wouldn't have chosen to settle in a worse place when a more attractive one was available' (4.144.2). The diversity of Herodotus' spatial modes is further shown by the contrasting ways in which simple explanations can be offered: the fact that 'Attica is well south of Lemnos' explains why the Pelasgians are willing to offer Lemnos to the Athenians if they sail from their own territory to the island by a north wind in a single day (6.139.4—an offer fulfilled after Miltiades' conquests in the Chersonese); again, the fact that 'Syria is on Egypt's borders (*homoureei*)' is mentioned in a piece of Homeric exegesis in which Herodotus argues that mention of Paris' putting in to Sidon shows that Homer knew of Paris' journey to Troy via Egypt (2.116.6). In these two

---

[51] For narratorial comments on beauty, cf. 5.42.3; 6.24.2.

passages we see Herodotus underscoring fairly elementary geographical information for the sake of local narrative effects. A similar diversity, finally, can be seen in Herodotus' comment that his view of the extent of Egypt is confirmed by an oracle that was consulted by citizens of an area in the part of Egypt bordering on Libya who did not like following Egyptian religious observances: the oracle avowed that 'any land watered by the Nile in flood was Egypt' (2.18.3).

Conclusion

We have seen, then, that narratological analysis can help to tease out both the localized variety of Herodotus' treatment of space and the ambivalent relationship of Herodotus' long spatial descriptions to the pattern of imperialism scrutinized in the narrative as a whole. Space has been profitably analysed in relation both to time (when are spatial details presented?) and focalization (how are they presented?); at the same time, we have seen the importance of reading Herodotus against the tradition of geographical writing in prose. It remains to be seen whether the same is true on a lesser level with the generally smaller spatial range of Herodotus' historiographical successors Thucydides and Xenophon.

THUCYDIDES

T. Rood

At the start of his sixth book, Thucydides reports that the Athenians were planning to conquer Sicily, and then at once undermines their ambitions by stressing that 'most Athenians were ignorant of the extent of the island and the size of its population, both Greek and barbarian' (6.1.1). He follows this bold statement with an account of the island: 'To circumnavigate Sicily would take a merchant ship nearly eight days … Here follows an account of the original settlement of Sicily …' (6.1.2–2.1).[1] Thucydides' technique of offering an account of Sicily as the Athenians succumb to their ambition to conquer the island seems to recall (→) Herodotus' technique of describing foreign lands as they fall prey to Persian imperial designs.[2] Yet the account he offers (6.2–5, known as the *Sikelika*) differs from the Herodotean paradigm in important respects. Thucydides does bring out the size of the island by noting how long it takes to sail around it and also by a closing stress on its greatness (6.5.1). In between, he offers not a spatially oriented description of the island's inhabitants but a temporally oriented account of the stages of its colonization. And this account serves as a prelude to failure, not (as often in Herodotus) as a magnification of imperialist conquest.[3]

   The *Sikelika* is often seen as exceptional within Thucydides' work as a whole: it was one of two sections that Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Pomp.* 3) cited as an illustration of how variety can prove refreshing within a narrative. Yet its superficially distinctive status seems to be lessened by its temporal rather than spatial orientation. It is often suggested that spatial description plays a relatively small role in Thucydides'

---

[1] Translations are (at times adapted) from M. Hammond 2009. I generally use 'Thucydides' as shorthand for 'the Thucydidean narrator'.
[2] Particularly close is Hdt. 1.201, where mention of Cyrus' (unfulfilled) desire to conquer the Massagetae is followed by a description of this tribe.
[3] Though Herodotus' account of Scythia (4.17–36, 46–82, 99–101) and of the royal road (5.52) are exceptions.

narrative, certainly by comparison with Herodotus.[4] A contrast is also often drawn between the two historians' treatment of physical land-marks. While Herodotus devotes lavish attention to the monuments of Egypt and Mesopotamia, Thucydides glances only in passing at the great buildings of Athens (1.10.2; 2.13.3–5). He is also sometimes thought to subscribe to a Periclean vision of space—an image of Athens as a self-sufficient utopian 'island' whose greatness transcends conventional spa-tial barriers.[5] One scholar has even concluded that 'the aim of Herodotus was to put the Persian Wars in their setting; the aim of Thucydides was to take the Peloponnesian War out of its setting'.[6]

Another section where Thucydides seems to give priority to time rather than space is the *Archaeology*, his opening sketch of Greece (1.2–19). The *Archaeology* is often seen as parallel to the *Sikelika*: just as the account of Sicily magnifies the island's greatness, so too the *Archaeology* helps to substantiate Thucydides' claim that the Peloponnesian War was 'the greatest disturbance to affect the Greek and a good part of the non-Greek world, one might even say the majority of mankind' (1.1.2). Despite that strongly spatial claim, the *Archaeology* itself takes the form of a linear account of the development of Greece; as in the *Sikelika*, there is a strong focus on population movements.

If we read both sections against the rest of his work, a much richer vision of Thucydides' treatment of space may emerge. Particularly impor-tant is the question of when spatial information is offered. The detailed account of Sicily could have been placed much earlier, when Thucy-dides describes how the Athenians intervene in the island during the earlier stages of the war. Equally, Thucydides does later (albeit indirectly) offer the sort of overt geographical sketch that he eschews at the start of book 6. His catalogue of the Syracusans' allies before the final battle in the harbour at Syracuse passes from east to west through the Greek cities on the (south) coast 'turned towards Libya', and then mentions Himera as the only Greek city on the (north) coast 'turned towards the Tyrrhenian sea' (7.58.1–2).

In this chapter I will start by outlining in more detail the techniques Thucydides uses to impart spatial information. After examining how previous scholars have explained these techniques in terms of Thucy-

---

[4] E.g. Funke and Haake 2006: 382.

[5] Cf. Crane 1996; contrast Taylor 2010 for a more anti-Periclean reading of Thucy-dides' view of 'the idea of Athens'.

[6] J.A.K. Thomson 1935: 43.

dides' use of earlier geographical writers and of the narratee's assumed knowledge, I will suggest that they can more powerfully be related to Thucydides' explanatory goals and his spatial definition of the war.

The Distribution of Spatial Information

Within his account of Sicilian colonization Thucydides offers geographical information only for the movements and locations of the non-Greek peoples: the Sicanians are still in the western parts of the island (6.2.2); the Sicels pushed the Sicanians to the southern and western parts and still inhabit the central and northern areas themselves (6.2.5). Except for one site (6.3.4) that was only briefly occupied, he offers no indication of where the various Greek cities whose foundation dates he mentions are located—as if basic knowledge of their location can be taken for granted. A similar element of presupposition operates at a more local level in the Sicilian narrative: as Dover notes, Thucydides 'writes at times as if both he and his readers were familiar with places and objects in the neighbourhood of Syracuse; this is notably true of his reference to the Olympieion, Daskon, the Anapos, and the Helorine Road in vi.64–66, Temenites in vi.75.1, and Euryelos, Labdalon, and the fig-tree … in vi.97–98'. And yet, as Dover also notes, Thucydides could also make 'the opposite assumption', notably in his 'elementary description' of Epipolae (6.96.1–2).[7] Here Thucydides reports the Syracusans' perception that if the Athenians failed to gain control of Epipolae—'a steep area lying directly above the city'—they would find it hard to wall off Syracuse; and then explains that 'the rest of the area has steep edges and slopes right down to the city, and all of it is visible from inside the city: the Syracusans call it Epipolae ("the Heights") because it forms a plateau above the surrounding terrain'.

To understand Thucydides' technique better, it will be helpful to review briefly the way he offers geographical information about places in his narrative as a whole. As we shall see, such information can be introduced directly by characters in speeches, and is often focalized by characters: in the case of Epipolae, its strategic importance is first perceived by the Syracusans ('a steep area …') and then confirmed by the narrator

---

[7] Gomme, Andrewes, and Dover 1945–1981: IV 467; though, as Hornblower 1991–2008: III 523 notes there is also an element of delay: Epipolae had been mentioned without any details at 6.75.1.

(the explanation 'for the rest of the area …' uses indicative forms); the subsequent account of how the Athenians seize the site implies that they too are aware of its importance. In this section, however, our focus will be on the narrator's explicit provision of information.

As in the Sicilian narrative, many places are mentioned without further spatial orientation. Thucydides' narrative generally remains intelligible, however, even when spatial details cannot be precisely placed cartographically. To cite one controversial example: in the Potidaea narrative, Thucydides writes that the Athenians left Macedonia and 'came to Beroea. From there they went on to Strepsa, and … proceeded by land to Potidaea. In short marches they reached Gigonus on the third day' (1.61.4–5). To understand this section, direct knowledge of the locations of the relatively unfamiliar Beroea, Strepsa, and Gigonus is not required: the narrative relies on the presupposition that they lie between the more familiar Macedonia and Potidaea. The controversy in this passage derives from the fact that mention of Strepsa derives from a clever nineteenth-century emendation (*epi Strepsan*): the manuscript reading *epistrepsantes* ('turning round') spoils the topographic coherence.[8]

Thucydides' spatial information tends to be quite short, often no more than one or two adjectives relating to a place's shape, appearance, or strategic value.[9] Some battlefields are delineated through the troops positioned on them rather than through any particular properties of their own.[10] Where hoplites are involved, features that upset the progress of the soldiers across the plain or introduce an element of surprise merit mention (at Delium, for instance, water courses prevent the extremes on each side from engaging, 4.96.2, and then Pagondas sends the Boeotian cavalry around a hill unseen, taking the Athenians by surprise,

---

[8] Cf. Hornblower 1991–2008: ad loc.

[9] Epithets applied to places include: *alimenos* ('harbourless'); *apedos* ('flat'); *aphanēs* ('out of sight'); *dasus* ('thick'); *dusprosodos* ('inaccessible'); *helōdēs* ('marshy'); *epithalassios* ('seaside'); *epikairos* ('suitable'); *epitēdeios* ('suitable'); *erēmos* ('deserted'); *erumnos* ('strong'); *isthmōdēs* ('isthmus-shaped'); *karteros* ('strong'); *koilos* ('hollow'); *lokhmōdēs* ('bushy'); *mēnoeidēs* ('crescent-shaped'); *petrōdēs* ('rocky'); *prosantēs* ('steep'); *stenos* ('narrow'); *hupsēlos* ('high'); *khalepos* ('difficult'); *kheimerinos* ('stormy').

[10] E.g. at 6.67 (first big battle at Syracuse), dispositions on the right, centre, and left are described, together with the depths of the line; the account of the ensuing battle (6.69–70) is spatially bare (except that Syracusan cavalry prevent the Athenians from pursuing far in victory and the Syracusans gather at the Helorine Road after their retreat). The euphemism *euōnumos* is used for 'left' only of human units.

96.5); particularly striking is the close attention given to spaces where hoplites are battling light-armed troops in difficult terrain (e.g. 3.97–98; 4.34). When action takes place within cities, there is a progression from the spatial indeterminacy typical of speech-scenes[11] to the greater detail in descriptions of foreign invasions and (above all) scenes of slaughter in civil war.[12] Even in the more detailed descriptions, the spaces that appear tend to be atomised (or at most defined in relation to one other site)[13] rather than integrated in a coherent civic topography.

When Thucydides does provide explicit orientation about places, his most common technique is to introduce them by their name and then to give some detail about their location within a larger geographical region. The narrative proper starts with a famous example: 'Epidamnus is a city on the right as one sails into the Ionian Gulf' (1.24.1). More often, spatial information is integrated in the narrative in relation to characters' actions: a particular place may be located as it initiates action (e.g. 4.123.1: 'Mende defected from them, a city on Pallene and an Eretrian colony')[14] or is traversed or attacked (e.g. 3.51.1: 'the Athenians sent an expedition against Minoa, the island which lies in front of Megara'). Thucydides uses a range of techniques to locate places within a wider region: a genitive (e.g. 3.93.1: *Kēnaion tēs Euboias*, 'Cenaeum belonging to Euboea'); an adjective (e.g. 3.31.1: *Kumēn tēn Aiolida*, 'Aeolian Cyme') or prepositional phrase introduced by the definite article (e.g. 3.92.1: 'Heraclea the colony in Trachis'); a participle clause (e.g. 4.57.1: 'the upper city, about ten stades from (*apekhousan*) the sea'); a relative clause

---

[11] The main exception is found in the quasi-ethnographic frame to the *Epitaphios* (2.34.5: 'the public cemetery, situated in the most beautiful suburb of the city'); note also the localization of assemblies (with no speeches recorded) during the coup at Athens in 411 (8.67.2: 'at Colonus [it is a sanctuary of Poseidon outside the city, about ten stades away]'; then back to the site 'known as the Pnyx, the traditional place for assemblies' at 8.97.1).

[12] For the first category, see e.g. the fighting at Plataea (2.1–6; 3.20–24), Torone (esp. 4.110.2, 111.2, 113.2), and Mycalessus (7.29–30); for the second, the scenes at Corcyra (esp. 4.48); cf. also the Herodotean richness of sacred space in the Pausanias excursus (1.133–134; cf. Crane 1996: 187–189).

[13] E.g. 6.75.1 ('a wall which … extended along the whole of the region which faces Epipolae') or 2.15.3 ('an area below it turned broadly to the south'), or to define broader areas, 2.55.1 (the Peloponnesians ravage 'the part of the territory facing the Peloponnese, then the area turned towards Euboea and Andros').

[14] Or 'away-household', as C.P. Jones 1999: 12 glosses the Greek word *apoikia* to bring out its spatial element.

(e.g. 2.80.1: 'the river Anapus, which is eighty stades from Stratus'); or an appositional noun phrase (e.g. 1.30.1: 'Leucimme, a promontory of Corcyra').[15]

Spatial information is also sometimes introduced in the form of the 'there is a place X' motif, as in (→) Homer or (→) Herodotus. In the opening Corcyra narrative, for instance, a Corinthian fleet gathers wrecks 'to Sybota ...; Sybota is an uninhabited harbour in Thesprotia' (1.50.3). These independent units are occasionally expanded into longer geographical descriptions. A good example is found slightly earlier in the Corcyra narrative, when the Corinthian fleet reaches 'the mainland opposite Corcyra, anchoring at Cheimerium in Thesprotia' (1.46.4):

> There is a harbour, and a city lies above it, some way from the sea, in the Elaean district of Thesprotia, Ephyre. Near Ephyre the Acherusian lake discharges into the sea; the river Acheron from which it takes its name flows through Thesprotia and feeds this lake. The river Thyamis also flows here, forming the border between Thesprotia and Cestrine; between these rivers the promontory of Cheimerium juts out.

The present tense is generally used both in these independent passages and in geographical relative clauses: it marks the information as true independently of the immediate narrative context. Occasionally, however, the temporal perspective of the characters is maintained by use of the imperfect: there is a notable proliferation of such forms in the narrative of the Athenians' retreat from Syracuse, one of the most vivid sections of the work.[16]

These relatively small-scale descriptions nonetheless provide a broader spatial orientation. In particular, they define the Greek mainland and the Aegean as central. Thus the location of Epidamnus (1.24.1: 'on the right as one sails into the Ionian Gulf') is focalized by a voyager sailing away from the Mediterranean basin (it is not 'a city on the left as one sails out of the Ionian gulf').[17] The same directionality informs

---

[15] Sieveking 1964 offers a lengthy analysis of these techniques, with detailed lists and much excellent narratological comment.

[16] Imperfects: 7.78.5 bis (including *ekaleito* for a place-name), 79.1, 84.4; see also 3.97.2; 4.43.3; 6.62.3; of distances: 2.13.7; 4.66.3, 67.1; at 4.31.2 the fort described is temporary.

[17] Thucydides' definition of places as 'on the right' or 'on the left' is always in relation to moving groups (or, in this case, a generalized voyager, an instance of the 'anonymous witness' device), with the exception of 2.100.4—but even there 'Macedonia to the left of Pella and Cyrrhus' is 'from the viewpoint of an invader proceeding southwards' (Rhodes 1998: 267), i.e. towards the Mediterranean.

Thucydides' definition of a Thracian region 'as one has crossed (*huper-banti*) Mt Haemus' (2.96.1); his description (itself matched in Athenian administrative documents) of the Chalcidice peninsula and the Greek cities along the coast further east as 'Thraceward';[18] and his account of how the plague originated in Ethiopia 'above' (*huper*) Egypt (2.48.1). It is also used when it runs counter to characters' own perceptions: Thucydides writes of Cyrus invading the area 'within the river Halys towards the sea' (1.16), though for the Persians this invasion involves moving across the Halys; or again of 'the narrow pass into Arrhabaeus' territory' (4.127.2) when Brasidas is withdrawing from that territory. This perspective is embedded not just in static spatial descriptions, but also in accounts of movements: thus the plague went 'down' to Egypt (2.48.1), crossed to the Piraeus, and moved to the 'upper city' (2.48.2).[19]

As for the sort of large-scale regional description that Thucydides provides (at least in part) for Sicily, the other such passage that Dionysius of Halicarnassus specified is the account of Sitalces' kingdom in Thrace (2.96–98.1). Thucydides himself connects these two sections by the way he ends them: 'so great (*tosēnde*) was the island on which the Athenians had become eager to make war' (6.1.1); 'so great (*tosautēs*) then was the territory over which Sitalces was king' (2.98.1). The two accounts differ, however, in both motivation and form: while the account of Sicily is a closely defined unit that highlights the Athenians' ignorance of the land they are attacking, the account of Sitalces' kingdom opens more loosely and is placed in a context where Sitalces himself is the aggressor. Thucydides first offers geographical description indirectly as he recounts how Sitalces gathers his army:

> Beginning with the Odrysians Sitalces first made a levy of all the Thracians he ruled between Mounts Haemus and Rhodope and extending to the sea in the direction of the Black Sea and the Hellespont, then of the Getae as one has crossed Mt Haemus and the other regions inside the Danube towards the Black Sea … He also called into service many of the mountain Thracians … He made a levy also of the Agrianians and the Laeaens and all the other Paeonian tribes within his rule at its furthest reach.
>
> (2.96.1–3)

---

[18] Thirty-six instances altogether: the phrase has connotations of 'on the way towards that region of splendid resources'; it is used in Athenian tribute inscriptions—as is *apo Thraikēs*, also used by Thucydides for envoys from the Chalcidice (5.38.1, 4) and for the Brasidean troops (5.34.1, 35.6, 67.1). Is *epi Thraikēs* in a Corinthian speech (1.68.4) an imposition of Athenian spatial categories?

[19] Many further examples can be gleaned from Bétant 1843–1847 s.vv. *anō*, *anōthen*, *entos*, *katō*.

The spatial information imparted in the account of Sitalces' levy pre-
pares for a more detailed sketch in which the extent of Sitalces' rule is
defined first in terms of tribes, then in terms of travelling distances by
foot and sea along the coast from Abdera to the mouth of the Danube,
and by foot inland from Byzantium to the Strymon (2.96.3–97.2).[20]

Thucydides also offers a detailed geographical sketch of one of the
objects of Sitalces' expedition, Macedonia. After describing Sitacles'
route to Macedonia, he notes that his army gathered at Drobescus and
prepared to invade 'lower Macedonia, which Perdiccas ruled' (2.99.1)—
for 'there is also an upper Macedonia, comprising among other peoples
the Lyncestians and the Elimiotians' (2.99.2), by contrast with 'what
is now coastal Macedonia' (2.99.3). Following the Herodotean tech-
nique of describing lands as they are attacked, Thucydides then describes
'lower Macedonia'. He recounts how Perdiccas' ancestors (originally from
Argos) won the land

> by forcibly evicting the Pierians from Pieria (they later settled in Phagres
> and other places across the Strymon below Mt Pangaeum—the coastal
> area below Pangaeum is still called the Pierian Gulf), and likewise the
> Bottiaeans (now neighbours of the Chalcidians) from Bottia. They also
> acquired a narrow strip of Paeonia running down along the river Axius to
> Pella and the sea … and took control of the land on the other side of the
> Axius as far as the Strymon, which is called Mygdonia … The whole of
> this area is now called Macedonia …   (2.99.3–6)

Just as Sitalces' sequence of levies introduces a panoramic account of
his kingdom, so here the sequence of population expulsions introduces
a panoramic account of Macedonia. Thucydides' technique recalls the
Archaeology and the *Sikelika*, which similarly delineate space through a
description of population movements.[21]

Thucydides often fleshes out his bare spatial description of places and
regions with further information that bolsters his spatial mapping. This
information can seem incidental. It can relate, for instance, to a famous

---

[20] Note that Thucydides is concerned exclusively with the outer limits of Sitalces'
kingdom: unlike (→) Herodotus and Polybius, he does not attempt to define the shape
of regions or cities by recourse to analogies, except for the comment on Zancle as 'like a
reaping-hook' (6.4.5), introduced to explain its name (and cf. 4.102.3 on rivers flowing
round Amphipolis, again explaining the name; note also some comments on the shape
of land where this has strategic significance—e.g. 'crescent-shaped' at 7.34.2).

[21] The same verb, *anistanai*, is used for Sitalces' levy in the present (2.96.1, 3) and for
expulsions in the past in the accounts of Macedonia (2.99.3, 5), the *Archaeology* (1.8.2,
12.3, 4), and the *Sikelika* (6.2.2, 4.2 bis, 4).

feature (e.g. 'Actium in the territory of Anactorium, where the temple of Apollo is', 1.29.3; cf. 3.94.2; 7.26.2 for other temples of Apollo; 'Laureium, where the Athenians' silver mines are', 2.55.1), or even a feature created as a result of the action being described (trophies at 4.67.5; 5.10.6). More commonly, it concerns a place's historical or mythological associations, in particular its colonial status; the fact that this type of information tends to be found when Thucydides introduces places in remote locations forms part of his construction of space.[22]

A similar type of spatial structuring is provided by ethnographic detail about peoples at the margins of the Greek world. Discussing the resources of Sitalces' kingdom, for instance, Thucydides offers an exposition of the Thracian habit of receiving gifts, explicitly constructed as the opposite of Persian royal gift-giving (2.97.4); he also adopts a Herodotean temporal fluidity in this section as he looks ahead to the value of Thrace's tribute in the time of Sitalces' successor (2.97.3; cf. the prolepsis on Macedonia at 2.100.2). Greater narratological complexity is found in a passage where Thucydides reports how the Messenians persuade Demosthenes to invade Aetolia. The Aetolians are first described as 'a large and warlike tribe' living 'in unfortified villages widely separate from one another' (3.94.4). This description appears in the Messenians' indirect speech, but it echoes the narratorial analysis in the *Archaeology* of settlement patterns in early Greece (1.5.1)—where Aetolia is also listed among the remote regions of the Northwest where old customs that were once universal still survive (1.5.3). The narrator then offers the information that one Aetolian tribe is 'said to eat raw flesh' (3.94.5)—a typical marker of savagery. Here the spatial definition suggested by the inclusion of ethnographical material is reinforced by the cognitive uncertainty ('said to …').[23]

Thucydides does not adopt the same stylistic register for all the fringes of the Greek world. Athenian raids in Caria, Lycia, and the Black Sea (2.69.2; 3.19.2; 4.75.2) are treated briefly, without strong spatial definition. Above all, Thucydides is sparing in recounting interactions with Persia. He highlights from the start the potential importance of Persia, but only via allusions to embassies sent to or from the king (2.7.1, 67.1; 4.50.1). In keeping with the common Greek practice of describing the

---

[22] Cf. *SAGN* 2: 140–141.
[23] Cf. Rood 2006b: 244 for the use of *legetai* and *legontai* in passages dealing with distant places and times.

routes of journeys in terms of people rather than places, his account of the embassies focuses on the person of the king rather than on the specific location of the king at any given moment.[24]

We have seen, then, that Thucydides' narrator introduces spatial information in a wide variety of direct and indirect ways. It is time now to try to understand why this information takes the forms it does.

The (Traditional) Geographical Style

Like (→) Herodotus, Thucydides adopts the modes of description commonly found in geographical writers such as Hecataeus. This fact has led some scholars to assume that he directly used earlier writers: use of Hecataeus has been seen, for instance, in his adoption of the 'point of view of a coasting voyager' in his account of Epidamnus as 'a city on the right as one sails into the Ionian Gulf' (1.24.1).[25] But the problem with this suggestion is that Hecataeus described the coastal route around the Mediterranean the other way round (clockwise, not anticlockwise),[26] and also that he moves along the coast from place to place, often using the phrase *meta de* ('and after') or the middle form *ekhomai* ('next is/are …') to introduce successive places or peoples. Thucydides uses a phrase appropriate for describing a place in isolation, without regard for neighbouring places.

Scholars have also argued that it was when Thucydides did not have personal knowledge of the terrain he was describing that he borrowed information from earlier geographical writers. With regard to 1.46.4 (quoted above), for instance, Pearson found it easy to believe that 'Thucydides looked up some Periegesis (perhaps even Hecataeus') to find something about Cheimerium, about which he knew nothing, and copied

---

[24] For 'to the king', cf. also 1.137.1 (as well as e.g. Ar. *Ach*. 65; Rhodes and Osborne 2003: no. 21 l. 3); Thucydides does not mention Susa or Ecbatana (evoked at Ar. *Ach*. 64, 613) by name. The same pattern is found even in book 8, when the Persian satraps Tissaphernes and Pharnabazus become prominent in the narrative: though Thucydides does mention the satrapal capitals Sardis and Dascylium once each in excursuses on the past (1.115.4, 129.1), he never locates these contemporary figures there. For descriptions in terms of peoples in Greek context, cf. e.g. 2.23.3 (*dia Boiōtōn*—the same phrase in Meiggs and Lewis [1969] 1988: no. 51 l. 6, an inscriptional narrative); 3.95.1; 5.4.6; 6.62.7.

[25] N.G.L. Hammond 1967: 448, following Pearson 1939: 51, and also citing Strabo 7.5.8, 8 as evidence for a shared source.

[26] As Sieveking 1964: 121 notes.

down the description word for word'.[27] His assumption seems to be that the more apparently irrelevant and traditional the description, the greater the likelihood that Thucydides copied from a source. In most cases, however, the fact that we have to rely on scattered citations from, say, Stephanus of Byzantium for our knowledge of Hecataeus and other early geographers means that we cannot say how closely Thucydides followed them.

Use of earlier historical writers has also sometimes been assumed. The influence of Antiochus of Syracuse (who wrote a history of Sicily down to 424 BC) has been detected in Thucydides' description of 'the islands called the Islands of Aiolos' (3.88.1):[28]

> These islands are cultivated by the Liparaeans, who are colonists from Cnidus. They live in one small island in the group, and it is called Lipara; they travel from there to farm the other islands, Didyme, Strongyle, and Hiera. The people there think that Hephaestus has his forge on Hiera, as it can be seen emitting copious fire at night and smoke by day. These islands lie opposite the territory of the Sicels and Messenians.   (3.88.2–3)

This passage has many elements in common with the description of these islands in Pausanias (10.11.3–4)—where Antiochus is mentioned. The attribution to Antiochus seems particularly tempting because Thucydides' account of Sicilian colonization is also commonly thought (partly owing to some stylistic peculiarities) to derive from Antiochus.[29] But the problem with assuming too close a use of Antiochus at 3.88 is that Pausanias specifically cites Antiochus only for details that are not in Thucydides (the name of the colonizer, the expulsion of the original inhabitants). Pausanias himself may have used Thucydides and cited Antiochus precisely for those details he did not find in the more famous author.[30]

The main problem in basing arguments about sources on stylistic criteria is that such arguments present Thucydides passively adopting the language of his supposed sources. It is more plausible to assume that Thucydides consciously adopted different mannerisms in his longer geographical sections.[31] When he describes a mountain as 'large and uninhabited, next to (ekhomenon) Rhodope' (2.96.4), the form he uses (the

---

[27] Pearson 1939: 52.

[28] Compernolle 1960: 473–479.

[29] See esp. Gomme, Andrewes, and Dover 1945–1981: IV 198–210.

[30] Cf. Jacoby 1923–1958: IIIb 490–491 (commentary on *FGrH* 555 F 1), suggesting that Thucydides could equally have used Hecataeus; Bosworth 1992: 47 n. 5.

[31] Cf. Hornblower 1991–2008: I 372, III 280.

middle of *ekhō* in the spatial sense of 'next to') is rare in his work but common in (→) Herodotus and geographical writers.[32] The geographical style is further recalled by the use of the generalizing dative participle introducing an 'anonymous witness' (2.96.1: 'as one has crossed (*huperbanti*) the Haemus').[33] And (→) Herodotus in particular is brought to mind by Thucydides' measurement of space by the time taken by 'a man travelling light' (*anēr euzōnos*, 2.97.1, 2). These Herodotean mannerisms are themselves part of Thucydides' structuring of space, casting Thrace as a remote region.

Thucydides' treatment of Sitalces' kingdom suggests that source-based approaches must also ask why he adopted the traditional geographical style *when* he did. One answer was provided by Gomme: he argued that the 'careful description' of Cheimerium (cited above) suggested 'autopsy or information from a special source' and that 'it is more likely that irrelevant information is a result of his own research'.[34] Another approach is to think in terms not so much of Thucydides' own knowledge, but rather of his conception of his narratee. An analysis of the regional distribution of Thucydides' geographical notes has identified 'two main areas where Thucydides thinks his audience may need assistance in following the narrative'—'western Greece, from Zakynthos to Epidauros [read 'Epidamnos'?] and in as far as the mouth of the Corinthian gulf' and 'the Chalkidike and Thracian coast'.[35] But while this approach in terms of the narratee is valuable, it is still the case that Thucydides' provision of spatial information is too inconsistent to be entirely explained through the model of the narratee. And this approach also fails to take account of a number of narratological complexities. A simple model of the narratee cannot explain why Thucydides repeats information that has already

---

[32] The middle is found at 5.67.2; 8.90.5; and in a temporal sense at 6.3.2 (where Antiochan influence has been suspected). Another distinctive feature of the longer geographical passages is orientation by cardinal points: restricted to the *Sikelika* are *mesēmbrinos* ('southern', 6.2.5), *hespera* ('evening') in the sense of 'the west' (6.2.2) and the cognate adjective *hesperios* ('western', 6.2.5); the north wind is used only twice purely for orientation apart from the *Sikelika* (6.2.5) and the Thrace/Macedonia section (2.96.4, 101.3); the south wind is used only once (3.6) apart from in that section (2.101.2) and the geographical excursus on early Athens (2.15.3); the sinking and setting sun are found in a catalogue (2.9.4) and again in the Thrace section (2.96.4).

[33] The same participle is found at Hdt. 4.25.1; exactly the same phrase is found in Hecataeus (*FGrH* 1 F 169).

[34] Gomme, Andrewes, and Dover 1945–1981: I 179.

[35] Ridley 1981: 41 (also 44: 'areas with which the continental Greek … would be least familiar').

been given, such as the location of Thyreatis on the borders of Argos and Laconia.[36] Like (→) Homer, Thucydides also sometimes includes spatial information not when a place is first mentioned, but at a later point: Crommyon, for instance, appears twice (4.42.4, 44.4) before its location ('in Corinthian territory') and its distance from the city of Corinth are given (4.45.1)—information which provides a formal frame to a new area of Athenian action.[37] Above all, Thucydides' descriptions of space are not just offered in response to lack of knowledge: they are related too to his explanatory aims.

Space and Explanation

Explanation of why characters act is often implicitly encoded in what appear to be purely spatial descriptions. When Thucydides begins the war narrative proper by recounting how 300 Thebans 'entered Plataea, a city in Boeotia allied to Athens' (2.2.1), it is unlikely that he imagined readers unfamiliar with its location: the very name of the city evokes a great Greek victory over the Persians, and in due course there are allusions to that past in speeches (notably by the Plataeans pleading for their life), and a further hint in the mention of 'the hero-shrine of Androcrates' near Plataea (3.24.1), which is familiar from Herodotus' account of the battle of Plataea (9.25.3). Rather, the location of this famous city is offered because it explains why the Thebans (set on control over the whole of Boeotia) attacked it. Similarly when Thucydides describes how a Cretan from Gortyn persuaded the Athenians to sail against Cydonia as a favour to the people of Polichna, 'neighbours (*homorois*) of the Cydonians', his phrasing is again explanatory: he appeals to the traditional notion of rivalry between neighbours.[38] Again, when the Athenians are said to attack the Melians, 'islanders (*nēsiotas*) who refused to take Athenian orders or join their alliance' (3.91.2), the epithet evokes the idea of Athenian naval supremacy over islands. This imperialistic definition of islands is in turn picked up in the Melian dialogue (5.97, 99), and then twisted in the account of the Athenians' ignorance of 'the size of

---

[36] 2.27.2; 4.56.2, with Rood 1998a: 53. Cf. also Anactorium as 'at the mouth of the Ambracian Gulf' at 1.55.1 and 4.49.1, with Sieveking 1964: 168.

[37] Cf. Sieveking 1964: 140: 'keine "Orientation", sondern Bezeichnung einer neuen Schädigung korinthischen Gebietes'.

[38] For similar uses of *homoros*, cf. Sieveking 1964: 148–149.

the island' of Sicily (6.1.1): 'large as it is, it is separated from being mainland by about twenty stades of sea' (6.1.2). Sicily is an island that is almost not an island, and the term 'island' soon drops from the account of the Athenians' doomed expedition.[39]

Implicit spatial encoding can also be found in geographical descriptions even when their explanatory function is overt. A notable instance is found in Thucydides' account of Athens' first expedition to Sicily. When the Syracusans plan to gain control of Rhegium, Thucydides first reveals their thinking in embedded focalization: 'There is very little distance between the promontory of Rhegium in Italy and Messana in Sicily, and the Athenians would not now be able to lie off Rhegium and command the strait'. He then offers a fuller account of this stretch of sea:

> This strait is the sea between Rhegium and Messana, where Sicily comes closest to the mainland: it is what is called Charybdis, through which Odysseus is said to have sailed. Its dangerous reputation is understandable given that narrow gap and the currents caused by the influx of water from two great seas, the Tyrrhenian and the Sicilian.   (4.24.5)

The account of the dangerous currents is evidently part of the Syracusans' strategic thinking: it explains why the Athenians would not be able to command the strait. Mention of those currents is also offered in explanation of how Charybdis came to be localized there. But this apparent explanation still leaves open the question of why this mythological register was needed at all.

A richer understanding of Thucydides' depiction of the Strait of Messina emerges if we look beyond the immediate context. The allusion to Charybdis can be integrated into a broader Odyssean geography of the west: starting with Corcyra (associated with the Homeric Scheria, 1.25.4; 3.70.2), this Odyssean mapping continues with 'the islands of Aeolus' (3.88.1); with the mention of the tradition that the Cyclopes and the Laestrygonians were the most ancient inhabitants of the island (6.2.1); and with the reference to 'Trinacria' as Sicily's earliest name (6.2.2, evoking the Odyssean 'Thrinacria'). These allusions create a sense of Sicily's spatial remoteness that is in turn variously reinforced by speakers (6.11.1, 13.1, 68.3, 86.3) and by the narrator's claim that the young 'longed for foreign travel and the sights abroad' (6.24.3). While the notion that it

---

[39] Cf. Constantakopoulou 2007: 14, 83–85, 92–99 (she also relates the use of island-terminology to the *nēsiotikon* district in the Athenian tribute lists); Rood 1998a, index s.v. 'islands'.

is dangerous to yearn for what is distant was traditional,[40] Thucydides' language picks up his earlier evocation of a mythical Sicily. He implies that it was the fascination exerted by stories that were localized in Sicily that made the Athenians desire to travel there themselves.[41] This mythical note vanishes in turn when the Athenians arrive in Sicily and find that the island's cities are all too like Athens (7.55.2).

This type of implicit spatial explanation of characters' actions is matched by passages where characters' spatial perceptions are made explicit through embedded focalization. Thus Thucydides explains that the Spartans founded Heraclea because it would be 'good' (*kalōs*) for the war, as it was 'only a short crossing' to Euboea and 'it would lie usefully on the route to Thrace' (3.92.4); he then gives slightly more detail about the crossing when the Athenians think it 'a specific threat to Euboea, as it is a short crossing from there to Cape Cenaeum in Euboea' (3.93.1). The Athenians' narrower focus on the threat to Euboea is a seed, looking ahead to Thucydides' analysis of the significance of Euboea when the island revolts (8.96.2); it illustrates at the same time their blindness to the possibility of a Peloponnesian march to the Thrace. Similar strategic comments help to explain why the Athenians agree to a defensive alliance with Corcyra (it 'lay nicely on the coastal route to Italy and Sicily', 1.44.3—picking up the Corcyraeans' own argument at 1.36.2 and also linking verbally with the Spartans' perception of the advantage of Heraclea); and also why they fortify Minoa (3.51.2: it is closer than Boudorum or Salamis for their watch on Megara).[42] Characters' understanding of space is also revealed in their deliberations about routes (e.g. 1.26.2, 107.3–4; 7.1.1): while the straight line of the itinerary is often seen as the most important mode in Greek conceptions of space, Thucydides also shows characters embedding perceptions of linear routes within a broader regional sense of space.

The importance of Thucydides' explanatory goals is brought out particularly strongly by the technique of piecemeal description, known from (→) Homer and (→) Herodotus (often with a subtle interaction between statements focalized by the narrator and by characters). There is space here only to focus on two important examples—Decelea and Pylos.

---

[40] See Young 1968: 106–120 (with 120 n. 18 on Thucydides); Rood 1998a: 177 n. 68.

[41] Cf. Rood 1998b, where full bibliography can be found.

[42] Cf. also 4.1.2 (Syracusans seeing Messana as 'a gateway to Sicily'—and aware that the Athenians knew its potential; the phrase is then echoed by Alcibiades at 6.48); 4.53.2 (value of Cythera for attacks on Laconia), 75.1, 108.1; 5.53; 7.50.2; 8.55.1, 60.1, 90.4; also e.g. 1.68.4 from speeches and 1.7 and 6.2.6 from reconstructions of the past.

The important site of Decelea is first mentioned (as 'in Attica', 6.91.6) in Alcibiades' speech encouraging the Spartans to fortify the site. When the Spartans follow up on his advice, Thucydides describes more precisely its position in relation to Athens and Boeotia: 'Decelea is about 120 stades from the city of Athens, and roughly the same distance or a little more from Boeotia. The fort was built with a view to the devastation of the plain and the best tracts of land, and could be clearly seen from the city of Athens' (7.19.2: *epiphanes mekhri tēs … poleōs*); the description here echoes the earlier account of Epipolae (cf. *mekhri tēs poleōs … epiphanes* of Epipolae at 6.96.2).[43] Finally at 7.27–28 Thucydides offers a detailed account of the damage done to the Athenians by the occupation of Decelea, noting how they were forced to convey supplies by sea around Sunium rather than by land from Oropus, and noting too a shift in the symbolic role of Athens: it 'came to resemble a military outpost rather than a city' (7.28.1). Earlier, the emphasis given to Epipolae prepared for an important but temporary shift in the fortunes of the war; here, Thucydides brings out that the Spartans' hold on Decelea was enduring.

The technique of piecemeal description is used with greater complexity in the Pylos narrative. The advantages of the site are first highlighted in a speech by Demosthenes (4.3.2–3). Next, Thucydides reports that the Athenian soldiers fortified the 'most vulnerable points'—'for most of the site had sufficiently strong defences to have no need of a wall' (4.4.3); he later specifies that these were 'the part facing the mainland' (4.5.2). The adjacent island of Sphacteria then receives a long description when the Spartans send men across to it (4.8.6). Faced by a Spartan attack, the 'deserted' nature of the site, earlier seen by Demothenes as one of its advantages (4.3.2), now becomes counter-productive (there is nowhere for Demosthenes to procure weapons for his sailors 'in the deserted place', 4.9.1); later still, the roughness of the terrain on Sphacteria (4.33.2) turns out to the Athenians' advantage, as the Spartan hoplites trapped on the island are unable to offer pursuit. A similar shift of spatial value occurs with Thucydides' focus on the Athenians' camp on Pylos: as their stay becomes longer than expected, he brings out that there was only one spring (4.26.2) and that they were inconvenienced by the lack of space (4.26.3: *stenokhōria*). But this same shortage of space (*stenokhōria* is repeated at 4.30.2) proves advantageous when troops put in 'at the

---

43 Cf. Hornblower 1991–2008: ad loc.

extremities of the island' to eat food and unwittingly cause a fire that deprives the Spartan hoplites of their tree cover.[44]

Superimposed on Thucydides' gradual disclosure of different aspects of the sites of Pylos and Sphacteria are a number of intra- and intertextual spatial associations. Demosthenes had initially been put off attacking the Spartans trapped on the island by recollection of the disaster he had suffered in Aetolia, where his men had become trapped in unfamiliar wooded areas (4.30.1, looking back to the spatially detailed narrative at 3.97–98). When the Athenians do attack and then find a path around, Thucydides introduces a spatial comparison with Thermopylae (4.36.3) that helps explain the Greek surprise at the Spartans' subsequent surrender (4.40.1). Spatial similarities explain characters' planning for the future and their interpretations of the past.

The spatial significance of Pylos and Sphacteria is itself developed further within Thucydides' work. For the Spartans, the reversal is underlined by Thucydides' repeated return to the fate of 'the men on the island' (with no need to explain which island is meant):[45] paradoxically the very lack of naming underscores how strongly events on Sphacteria have been inscribed in the Spartans' collective memory. For the Athenians, the spatial memory of Pylos changes as they begin to suffer in the confined spaces of Syracuse: the key term *stenokhōria* is now applied to the harbour (7.36.4 bis, 49.2, 70.6) and Epipolae (7.44.2). Finally, cut off after the loss of their ships, the Athenians are in the position of the men on the island after the loss of their ships (7.71.7).

The example of Pylos shows with particular clarity how variations in spatial detail relate to Thucydides' explanatory goals. The wealth of spatial detail and the symbolic power of the spatial terms are both related to the importance of the Pylos campaign as a great turning point in the war.

Total Space

In addition to offering local spatial details that help explain the course of the war, Thucydides also offers an insight into the transformations wrought in perceptions of space by the phenomenon of Athenian

---

[44] Rood 1998a: 28.

[45] Cf. Constantakopoulou 2007: 14. Contrast 'from Pylos' in an Athenian inscription on a shield probably taken from the men on the island (*IG* I³ 522).

expansionism. It is above all in speeches that Athens' threat to tradi-
tional spatial conceptions is conveyed: 'In relations between neighbour-
ing states mutually assured defence is always the condition of indepen-
dence. With the Athenians, then, in particular, whose ambition is to
enslave not just their neighbours but distant peoples too … we have to
realize that … defeat for us will mean a single and undisputed border
for the whole land' (4.92.4). The speaker here, the Boeotian Pagondas,
is trying to goad the Boeotians into battle even though it is not clear
that the Athenians are still in Boeotia. Even so, his account of the Athe-
nians' redefinition of space does fit in with the type of transformation
suggested earlier in the work in Athenian speeches—above all, in the
Funeral Oration, where Pericles projected a positive vision of the Athe-
nians as recipients of goods 'from all over the world' (2.38.2: *ek pasēs gēs*)
and as themselves forcing 'every sea and every land' (*pasan … thalassan
kai gēn*) to be open to their daring (2.41.4, cf. 63.2).[46]

Thucydides himself subscribes to the view that the Peloponnesian War
is the climax to a process of spatial transformation within the Greek
world. As we have seen, he defined the war's greatness partly in terms
of its quasi-universal spatial extent (1.1.2); later in the *Archaeology* he
drew the same contrast Pagondas makes with earlier wars marked by
fighting against neighbours (1.15.2).[47] The qualitative difference of space
shown in the spread of the Peloponnesian War to regions such as Thrace
receives further support from the distinctive style Thucydides adopts
in treating outlying areas. If his depiction of locations such as Thrace
and Epidamnus operates as a sort of stylistic reflection of spatial dis-
tance, then his occasional Herodoteanisms are especially appropriate in
challenging Herodotus' own claim of the greatness of Xerxes' invasion
of Greece. The geographical expansion of the war is further shown by
Athens' expedition to Sicily, which is marked as an island with settlers
from both west (Iberians, 6.2.2) and east (Trojans, 6.2.3). The Pelopon-
nesian War also brings together other distant cities that were settled
during the great post-Trojan War diaspora (2.68.3; 4.120.1, cf. 1.12.1–2;
2.102.5–6 alludes to another foundation from the same era). The Greek
world is united as never before by the disunity of the Peloponnesian War.

---

[46] Note also 2.43.3: 'famous men have the whole earth (*pasa gē*) as their tomb'.
[47] I discuss Thucydides' presentation of spatial changes over time in a forthcoming
paper.

The cost of Athens' geographical reach is best shown by an intruder from the margins—the plague. The plague's move down from Ethiopia to the coast mirrors the way in which within the human body (subjected by Thucydides to a detailed generalizing description) 'the affliction moved down to the chest' (2.49.3: *katebainen*, cf. *katebē* at 2.48.1). It proves particularly pernicious with people living 'in huts which at that time of the year were stifling' while 'the dead and the dying were piled on top of each other' (2.52.1). The dense physicality of that spatial narrative returns at the climax of the Sicilian narrative with Thucydides' account of the massacre of Athenians at the river Assinarus: the troops fight for the chance to drink bloodied water, and corpses are piled on corpses (7.84.5–85.1). The survivors are then placed in the stone-quarries at Syracuse, 'a deep and narrow space' where they are exposed to 'direct sun and suffocating heat, with no shelter', where they have to do everything 'in the same place because of the confined space' (*stenokhōria* once more), and where corpses are once more piled on top of corpses (7.87.1–2). The pathetic detail of Thucydides' description of the suffering in Sicily reveals how much is lost in the totalizing perspective of Pericles' rhetoric of space.[48]

---

[48] For the echoes of the plague narrative at 7.84–85 and 7.87, cf. Connor 1984: 204 n. 51; Hornblower 1991–2008: III 743; note also that *pnigos* at 2.52.2 and *pnigēros* at 7.87.1 are the only two occurrences of this root ('stifling') in Thucydides.

CHAPTER EIGHT

XENOPHON

T. Rood

Stranded in Mesopotamia, 'at least 10,000 stades from Greece' (*An.* 3.1.2), the character Xenophon addresses the despondent Greek mercenaries to try to reassure them that their position is not as bad as it seems. Among other arguments, he dismisses the geographical obstacles blocking the way home: 'Suppose … you think that the rivers will prove problematic and that in crossing them you were led into a trap. If so, you should consider whether in fact this was not an act of sheer stupidity on the part of the barbarians, in the sense that all rivers—even those which are impossible to cross far from their sources—become crossable, without even wetting one's knees, as one gets close to their sources' (*An.* 3.2.22).[1] Xenophon here answers the fear of uncrossable rivers that had been raised by the Spartan general Clearchus (*An.* 2.4.6: 'the Euphrates cannot be crossed in the face of hostile resistance') in support of continuing negotiations with the Persians, and later repeated by the Persian satrap Tissaphernes (*An.* 2.5.18: 'You wouldn't even be able to get across some of these rivers at all, without us to ferry you across'). He attempts to conquer geographical fear by the force of argument—and in due course on their retreat the narrator does note that the Greeks pass near the sources of the Tigris and Euphrates (*An.* 4.4.3; 4.5.2).

Xenophon-narrator's detailed account in the *Anabasis* of the experiences of an army of Greek mercenaries marching to and from Mesopotamia contrasts with his presentation in the *Hellenica* of a more confined Greek world. While the *Anabasis* follows the movements of a single body of troops across vast spaces, the *Hellenica* seems in many respects closer to the Thucydidean model—a collection of campaign narratives with

---

[1] Translations from the *Anabasis* are (at times adapted) from Waterfield 2005; those from the *Hellenica* are (at times adapted) from Marincola's translation in Strassler 2009. I generally use Xenophon as shorthand for 'Xenophon-narrator', except in the section on the *Anabasis*, where I maintain the key distinction between 'Xenophon-narrator' and 'Xenophon-character'.

widely varying degrees of spatial precision. Yet at one point in the *Hellenica* a surprisingly strong echo of the spatial world of the *Anabasis* is heard. The echo appears in a speech made by a Corinthian, Timolaus, during the Corinthian War. Addressing the anti-Spartan coalition, Timolaus argues that 'the Spartans are like rivers': 'For rivers at their sources are not large, but easy to cross; yet as they go farther, other rivers empty into them, and make their current flow more powerfully. So it is with the Spartans …' (*Hell.* 4.2.11–12). In the short term, this argument has little practical effect: the Spartans are on the road already. Read against Xenophon's speech in the *Anabasis*, Timolaus' argument suggests that attacking the Spartans at home would need the virtuosity shown by the Ten Thousand in their retreat. But in the long term it is indeed the vulnerability of Sparta that marks the *Hellenica*'s biggest departure from the spatial configuration of the Greek world portrayed by Herodotus and Thucydides. Before the narrative path of the *Hellenica* leads to Sparta, however, there is the Thucydidean business of the final years of the Peloponnesian War to finish off.

Hellenica

As with Thucydides, the dominant Greek focus of the *Hellenica* emerges clearly from Xenophon's treatment of events outside the Greek mainland. There are a number of isolated reports of events in Sicily and Persia, but these are generally thought to be interpolations (1.1.37, 5.21; 2.2.24, 3.5 on Sicily; 2.1.8–9 on Cyrus).[2] At other times, events in Sicily and Persia are mentioned in a way that nonetheless keeps the central focus on Greece. In relation to Sicily, news is reported through messages (1.1.27) and military help is reported as it arrives (6.2.33; 7.1.20, 28; contrast 7.4.12). With Persia, the same technique is used for the arrival of financial help (7.1.27) and for the journeys of envoys (Spartan envoys who have gone up to the king are mentioned on their return, when they stop Athenian envoys on their way up, 1.4.2). Where the main narrative does follow envoys up to the king, there is not much spatial detail: envoys are sent 'to the king of the Persians', they 'go upcountry', and arrive 'there' (7.1.33–34); as in Thucydides, Susa itself is not mentioned by

---

[2] These are not marked as interpolated in the OCT, but see Cawkwell in Warner 1979: 61 n. References in this section are to *Hellenica* unless otherwise indicated.

name.[3] It is when the envoys return that more spatial details are reported: an Athenian is executed for 'failing to share quarters' with his colleague; Arcadian envoys reports that 'the golden plane tree about which so much had been made was not even big enough to give shade to a grasshopper' (7.1.38). Persian affairs are also subordinated by the use of a summary form: the geographically diverse events covered in the *Anabasis* are treated in one sentence, with a total ellipsis of the period after the arrival at the sea (3.1.2); Cyrus' earlier journey upcountry is treated with similar brevity (2.1.14). It is true that Xenophon offers more spatial detail in his account of Cyrus' dealings with Lysander and Callicratidas, but nothing approaching the scene in the *Oeconomicus* where Lysander meets Cyrus in a *paradeisos* (4.21).

Exceptional in its treatment of Asiatic space is the account of Agesilaus' expedition. Strongly framed by allusions to Agamemnon and Xerxes,[4] this section ends with a Herodotean focus on continents (4.2.6: Agesilaus delayed awarding prizes until 'after they had crossed from Asia into Europe') and on the Hellespont as a crossing-point (4.2.8: the only place specified for this part of his march). And while some parts of the account of his movements (e.g. 4.1.1 on the initial plundering of Phrygia)[5] and negotiations[6] are spatially vague, there is a pronounced escalation of detail in the run-up to Agesilaus' personal meeting with Pharnabazus. First, Agesilaus sets out for Dascyleium:

> … where Pharnabazus' royal residence was, and there were many large villages in the area round it which supplied provisions in abundance, and wild animals as well, exceptionally fine ones, some of them in enclosed parks, others in open spaces. A river full of all sorts of fish flowed near the place, and there were unlimited numbers of birds for those able to catch them.   (4.1.15–16)

---

[3] See also 4.7.12 (envoys to Tiribazus); 4.7.16 (Tiribazus to the king); 5.1.25 (Antalcidas returns from the king to the coast); 5.1.30 (Tiribazus summons the Greeks); the margins in Strassler 2009 indicate the location of these scenes as 'Sardis' (though it is not mentioned in the text at this point), '?Susa ?Persepolis', '?', '?Sardis'.

[4] See *SAGN* 2: 155–156.

[5] Similar vagueness appears in contexts both Greek (3.2.2; 4.3.21–22, 4.15) and Asiatic (1.2.4 [Lydia], 17; 2.1.16 ['the king's land']).

[6] E.g. the translation in Strassler 2009 suggests that Agesilaus in discussions with the Paphlagonians had 'Spithridates removed from the room' (4.1.5), and that his interlocutors 'went out' (4.1.12) and again 'entered' (4.1.13)—though the Greek terms (*metastēsamenos, anastantes, prosiontōn*) need not imply an interior space at all.

As a description of landscape, this passage is comparable with Xeno-phon's account of the estate he bought for Artemis at Scillus (*An.* 5.4.6–13); the similarity has even given rise to the misleading notion that Xenophon casts himself as the 'satrap of Scillus'.[7]

A further piece of Persian colouring appears when Agesilaus makes a sudden attack on Pharnabazus' camp. Xenophon evokes traditional images of the luxury of Persian tents as he describes the booty: 'many drinking camps and other possessions of the sort that Pharnabazus could be expected to have were taken' (4.1.24). The civilized Pharnabazus is reduced to living 'just like a nomad, … always on the move' (4.1.25).

Xenophon's attention to Persian detail reaches an unexpected climax in his account of the meeting between Agesilaus and Pharnabazus. The Spartan king is 'stretched out on a grassy part of the land (*en poai tini*)' when Pharnabazus arrives, 'wearing clothing that was worth a great deal of gold'. The moral geography implied in the description of Agesilaus is clarified by what follows: 'as his servants placed embroidered carpets beneath him, on which the Persians, with their soft style of living, are accustomed to sit, Pharnabazus noticed the spare and simple outfit of Agesilaus', and lay down on the grass too (4.1.30). These orientalizing elements prepare for an unexpected reversal of sympathy when Pharn-abazus lectures Agesilaus on his failure to meet his reciprocal obligations. He recalls the help he offered the Spartans in the final years of the Pelo-ponnesian War, and contrasts that with his present position: 'When I look at what my father left to me, those things in which I used to take pleasure—the fine dwellings, and parks full of trees and wild animals—I find that some have been cut down while others have been burnt to the ground' (4.1.33). Here the delights of the *paradeisos*, implicit in the narrator's earlier description, are overtly conveyed so as to bring out Pharnabazus' outrage.

In dealing with Greece, Xenophon tends to adopt a different style. Consider a typical passage from the early sections of the *Hellenica*: 'The Athenians at Sestus, learning that Mindarus intended to sail against them with sixty ships, slipped away by night to Cardia. Alcibiades, too, went there from Clazomenae with five triremes and a skiff. Learning that the

---

[7] Georges 1994: 207, cf. L'Allier 1998; against the view of the estate at Scillus as modelled on a Persian *paradeisos*, see Tuplin 2004: 268–269. Within the *Hellenica*, lesser aesthetic flourishes occur at 3.2.27 ('the beautiful suburbs and gymnasia' at Elis) and 6.2.6 (land at Corcyra 'well cultivated and most beautifully planted', with 'magnificent houses and wine cellars')—both scenes of destruction.

Peloponnesian ships had set sail from Abydus to Cyzicus, Alcibiades himself went on foot to Sestus and ordered the ships to sail around' (1.1.11). The restless movement of this section is typical of Xenophon's account of the Ionian War: bare place-names appear frequently as characters constantly respond to news of other characters' movements.[8]

Xenophon's general reluctance to offer geographical explanation also emerges in his account of some fighting on Aegina in the run-up to the King's Peace. An Athenian general set an ambush 'in a hollow a little beyond the Heracleium'; then Athenian hoplites 'ascended to a spot sixteen stades beyond the Heracleium, where the so-called Tripyrgia stands' (5.1.10). A recent editor comments that the sites of the Heracleium and the Tripyrgia are both unknown and that it is unclear what sort of topological marker the Tripyrgia is.[9] We can only guess whether Xenophon expected his narratees to know any better. The assumption of narratee knowledge is still a reasonable explanation for some of Xenophon's silences—especially if awareness of earlier historians was also assumed. The fact that Cythera's strategic significance had been prominently treated by both Herodotus and Thucydides may help to explain Xenophon's failure to explain why Pharnabazus uses the island as a base (4.8.7–8).[10]

Xenophon's technique when he does offer geographical information is similar to (→) Thucydides'. Spatial definition tends to be brief: the important battlefield of Leuctra is 'in Thespian territory' (6.4.4); at 3.2.30, three in a run of names of Peloponnesian cities are defined (two as 'Triphylian', one as 'the city between Heraea and Macistus'); at 4.8.17, Ephesus receives no explanation while three other cities (Priene, Leucophrys, and Achilleium) being used as a base are localized 'in the plain of the Maeander'. One of those cities, Leucrophrys, had earlier been mentioned with the incidental detail that 'there was a very sacred sanctuary of Artemis and a lake' (3.2.19; cf. 4.8.37 on the 'plain around Cremaste, where their gold mines are'). Elsewhere, when Xenophon describes a conflict at Olympia, he explains that the Arcadians deploy 'along the Cladeus river, which flows by the Altis and empties into the Apheius'

---

[8] Hornblower 1991–2008: III 524 dubs similar instances of unexplained toponyms in Thucydides 'Xenophontic'.

[9] Strassler 2009: 174 n. ('it is presumably a hill of some sort').

[10] Though implied knowledge of information supplied by Herodotus and Thucydides is not a sufficient general explanation of Xenophon's choices; an overt explanation could in any case have more strongly brought the use of Cythera at different times into relation with each other (especially as in Herodotus its advantages are given as advice to Xerxes).

(7.4.29), underlining the intrusion of military force into sacred space. A more political perspective is offered by the description of Acanthus and Apollonia as 'the two largest cities in the vicinity of Olynthus' (5.2.11) at a time when envoys from those cities are warning of the threat posed by Olynthus' expansion.

Particularly interesting is the blend of narrator and character information about Aegospotami, the final battle of the Peloponnesian War. Aegospotami is located 'opposite Lampsacus' (2.1.21), matching the description of the Arginusae islands, scene of a major earlier battle, as 'opposite Mytilene' (1.6.27). After indicating the width of the Hellespont at that spot ('about fifteen stades'), Xenophon then offers further information via Alcibiades' focalization, who sees the shortcomings of the Athenians' position (2.1.25: 'he saw that the Athenians … were not near a city, and so they had to go for their supplies to Sestus, which was fifteen stades distant from the ships; while on the other side the enemy was in the harbour of the city of Lampsacus'). Here, it is in fact Alcibiades' focalization that proves to be more important for explaining the ensuing disaster (2.1.27–28: the Athenians are scattered fetching food when they are attacked). Xenophon's handling of spatial information supports Thucydides' stress on the harm done to Athens by Alcibiades' exile (6.15).

Alcibiades' advice is not the only instance where overt spatial information is offered through the strategic considerations of characters. Jason of Pherae, for instance, is said to destroy the walls of Heraclea 'not because he was afraid that once this passageway was opened up anyone could come against his realm but rather, because he thought that by destroying Heraclea, which sits on a narrow piece of ground, he could not be prevented by anyone else from marching back into Greece whenever he wished to do so' (6.4.27). In this passage, Jason's confidence is emphasized by the presentation through negation, which implicitly contrasts his perspective with Thucydides' account of how the Spartans and Athenians (both of whom lived south of Thermopylae) perceived the importance of Heraclea (3.92). Xenophon marks the beginning of a northwards reorientation of the Greeks' conceptual geography.[11]

---

[11] For other examples of characters' strategic perceptions of space, see 1.1.35 (Agis' assessment of the relative importance of controlling Attica and the Hellespont—'the source from which grain was coming to them by sea'); 4.4.13 (walling of Epieicea as protection for allies); 4.8.7 (lack of harbours); 5.4.36 (significance of Cithaeron for attacking Thebes—part of Xenophon's broader interest in routes between Boeotia and the Peloponnese, cf. the later campaign where the heights have already been seized by Athens and Thebes and the Spartans return home (5.4.59); also e.g. 5.4.48–49; 6.4.3, 25, 5.51).

Even when Xenophon does not provide overt geographical explanation, he can still offer a rich accumulation of spatial detail. There is a large number of bare spatial markers in Xenophon's account of the overthrow of the Thirty at Athens. He mentions troop contingents moving 'along the wagon road that leads from Athens to Piraeus', going to 'the Hill of Munichia' and 'the Hippodameian agora', and filling 'the road that leads to the temple of Mounichian Artemis and the shrine of Bendis' (2.4.10–11); Spartan troops appear 'in the so-called Halipedon' and 'the Quiet Harbour', and take part in a pursuit to the 'theatre' (2.4.30–32). Further spatial detail comes in allusions to burials, presumably evoking associated monuments (a seer buried 'at the ford of the Cephisus river', 2.4.19, and Spartans buried 'in the Ceramicus, in front of the city gates', 2.4.33). There are also some fine details in Xenophon's coverage of Theramenes' arrest in the council chamber: Critias brings his young thugs (who have been listening to the preceding speeches with 'daggers under their armpits', 2.3.23) openly into the view of the council at the 'railing' (2.3.50); Theramenes seeks refuge at the 'hearth' (2.3.52) but is dragged away 'through the agora' (2.3.52)—and left only to make his final defiant throw of the dregs of his hemlock cup (2.3.56). While Xenophon may have had a readership aware of Athenian topography in mind, this wealth of detail is offered for its graphic quality, reflecting the strong part played by the crimes and overthrow of the Thirty in the Athenians' collective memory.

The presence of spatial markers is particularly striking in Xenophon's account of events in Sparta. Both Herodotus and Thucydides had paid occasional attention to internal Spartan space,[12] but the detail Xenophon offers displays his special knowledge of Sparta. Sharp detail is offered first in the account of the Cinaedon conspiracy, where an informer tells how Cinaedon led him 'to the border of the agora', asked him to count the number of Spartiates and non-Spartiates (adding that 'on every estate of the Spartiates there was but one man who was their enemy— the master—and many allies', 3.3.5), and showed him a warehouse with 'many daggers, swords, and iron-spits' (3.3.7). Cinaedon was duly bound in collars and 'led round the city, struck with whips and goads as they went' (3.3.11).

Still more pronounced is Xenophon's spatial presentation when Sparta is threatened for the first time by attack from without. He reports how,

---

[12] E.g. Th. 1.133–134 (Pausanias' arrest and supplication).

the year after the battle of Leuctra, the Thebans advance via Caryae, the Arcadians via 'Oion in Sciritan territory' (6.5.25). After pillaging Sellasia and encamping 'in the plain in the sacred precinct of Apollo', 'they did not attempt to cross via the bridge into the city, because they could see the hoplites in the temple of Athena Alea ready to engage them' (6.5.27). Instead they kept the Eurotas river 'on their right' (6.5.27) until they were 'opposite to Amyclae', where they crossed and positioned their cavalry 'in the racecourse in the precinct of Poseidon the Earthholder' (6.5.30). The Spartans meanwhile hid troops 'in the temple of the sons of Tyndareus' (6.5.31). Unable to press against the city, the invading army took 'the road that leads to Helos and Gytheium' and besieged 'Gytheium, where the Spartans had their dockyards' (6.5.32). Xenophon underlines the novelty of this military topography of Sparta by his unusual focus on the response of the Spartan women, who 'had never before even laid eyes on an enemy' (6.5.28).

Xenophon's main departure from his predecessors in the handling of military space is his overt didacticism. He praises, for instance, the Athenian general Iphicrates (6.2.32, 39) for a campaign in which he went out himself 'to examine the ground and select the best spot from which his men would be able to see any approaching ships' (6.1.33); later he criticises Iphicrates for a spatial blunder that allows the Thebans an easy exit from the Peloponnese (6.5.51). He also openly praises Epaminondas for making camp within the city walls of Tegea—a position with advantages in terms of security, secrecy, and supplies (7.5.8). This type of didacticism is not uncommon in Xenophon's writing; it is in turn taken much further by (→) Polybius.

A similar didacticism about space appears in some of the speeches in the *Hellenica*. Thus Xenophon presents Corcyraean envoys at Athens outlining the advantages of their island's position in a passage of indirect speech: 'Corcyra was well placed in respect to the Corinthian Gulf and the cities on its shores, and it was well placed also to inflict damage on Laconia; best of all was its position in respect to Epirus, which lay opposite it, and for the coastal voyage from Sicily to the Peloponnese' (6.2.9).[13] This passage interestingly expands on the claim made by Corcyraean envoys in Thucydides that Corcyra was useful for the coastal route to Sicily (1.36.3)—a claim that looks ahead to the great Athenian expedition

---

[13] Cf. 5.2.25; 6.1.9, 11 for arguments in speeches.

described later in Thucydides' work. The speech Xenophon gives to the Corcryraean envoys, by contrast, does not seem tied to the overarching structure of the *Hellenica*.[14] Indeed, the lack of close thematic coherence is itself part of Xenophon's point: he depicts a world that has moved beyond the all-encompassing bipolar structure portrayed by Thucydides. This shift is also reflected in the changing scope of Athenian ambitions: while Thucydides' Athenians had been tempted by Corcyra's position for the route towards Sicily (1.44.3), it is only a negative advantage (stopping Dionysius from sending help) that is highlighted in Xenophon.

A further hint of how the spatial configuration of the Greek world has moved beyond the Thucydidean model emerges in a speech where Procles of Phlius uses spatial arguments in favour of the dual hegemony of Athens and Sparta. Procles argues that Athens' geographical position makes it suitable for naval command, since 'the majority of the cities that have need of the sea dwell around your city', and Athens also has harbours (7.1.3); the Spartans, by contrast, 'dwell inland, and so as long as they control the land, they can live well, even if they are kept from the sea' (7.1.8). Coming as they do after Sparta's defeat at Leuctra and the rise of Thebes, Procles' arguments may be read as out-of-date, evoking the sort of fantasy to which Spartan envoys in Thucydides had at one point appealed (4.20.4).[15] By the time Procles speaks, Sparta's enemies have confirmed the wisdom of Timolaus' comparison of Spartans and rivers. They have cut the Spartans off at their source.

Anabasis

Here is how Xenophon-narrator portrays the Greeks' position before the speech in which he tried to reassure them about their chances of getting back home:

> The Greeks were in great difficulty (*en pollēi aporiai*) … they were at the gates of the king; they were surrounded on all sides by countless hostile tribes and cities; there was no longer anyone who would sell them provisions; they were at least 10,000 stades from Greece; there was no guide to show them the way; there were uncrossable rivers blocking their route home …[16] (3.1.2)

---

[14] On Xenophon's narrative of events in Corcyra, see Tuplin 1993: 160–161.
[15] Cf. Tuplin 1993: 114.
[16] References in this section are to *Anabasis* unless otherwise indicated.

This emotional passage offers an overview of the scale of the spatial world of the *Anabasis*. It follows some earlier hints during the march upcountry. The language of *aporia* first appears during the mutiny at Tarsus, when the difficulty of breaking away from Cyrus is discussed (1.3.13). The narrator later offers a general assessment of the Persian empire that became 'obvious to anyone who thought it': 'although its size and the enormity of its population gave the king's empire strength, the length of the journeys involved and the fact that its forces were scattered made it weak and vulnerable to a sudden offensive' (1.5.9). A more positive view of the empire's size as a source of strength is given by Cyrus when he reassures the Greek officers that he will be able to give them the rewards he has promised: 'my father's empire extends south to a region where men cannot live because of the heat and north to a region where they cannot live because of the cold' (1.7.6–7). We shall see further hints emerging as the Greeks ponder different options during the retreat.

What is common to all the wider perspectives of Persian space is that they are focalized by characters. Narratorial summaries of the distance the Greeks have travelled and the lands they have crossed are offered at 2.2.6; 5.5.4; and 7.8.25–26, but these are interpolations, themselves perhaps inspired by the technique the narrator employs to create a broader sense of Persian space—a careful delineation of each stage of the Greeks' long march.

The successive movements of the troops through the Persian empire are conveyed by the swift and formulaic style the narrator adopts. For the army's march upcountry, the same phrase is repeated again and again: 'Cyrus progresses X stages, Y parasangs'; the only exception is for Cyrus' descent down to the Cilician plain (1.2.21–23). In this formula, 'stages' (*stathmoi*) indicate time (the number of days marched) while 'parasangs' indicate distance. The constant repetition of the same phrase seems to mirror the army's steady advance; the Persian measure of distance also adds a touch of authenticity to a journey through the Persian empire. For the march to the sea, the stages/parasangs formula is again used, but with much less regularity. The formula is disrupted in particular in the uneasy early stages of the retreat, when the narrator focuses on the Greeks' distance from the Persians (e.g. 2.4.10) rather than on the length of their marches; and again when the army is crossing difficult terrain such as the Carduchian mountains (4.1–2). He also changes the verb used for marching: it is no longer Cyrus who 'progresses' (*exelaunei*); it is troops who marched (*eporeuthēsan*). Xenophon-narrator's technique changes again when he recounts the Greeks' march along the Black Sea

coast. The regular parasangs formula drops out of the account, and the only measurements of distance covered that the narrator gives (now in stades) are when units march into the interior for supplies or plunder and get into difficulties.[17]

The *Anabasis* is also formulaic in its spatial descriptions of rivers and cities. The narrator names the rivers the army crosses, but generally the only detail he gives is their width. He also names the cities they stop at, but his descriptions tend to be short and repetitive: Peltae is 'an inhabited city', as are the next four stops; after this, Iconium is merely 'the last city in Phrygia', while the next three stops, Dana, Tarsus, and Issus, are 'great and prosperous'. Towns are localized at most in relation to natural features (rivers and the sea) or to larger man-made units (regions and their borders).[18] Only rarely is this bare description fleshed out (see especially 1.2.7–9 on Celaenae, perhaps written to improve on Hdt. 7.26.3; 1.2.22 on the Cilician plain). A shift occurs beyond the Euphrates. Up to that point, when the army arrives at a city by a river, the narrator mentions the city before the river. Between the Euphrates and Trapezus on the Black Sea coast, he mentions their arrival at the river first and the city second; the army also often arrives at unnamed villages. Also, up to the Euphrates the name of rivers is at times explicitly glossed (e.g. 1.2.23: 'a river called the Cydnus'; 1.4.4), while from there to the Black Sea the name of cities is glossed in this way (e.g. 4.7.19: 'a city … which was called Gymnias'). Another distinctive feature of the account of the region beyond the Euphrates is the presence of descriptions of large man-made constructions (a ditch, 1.7.14–15, the Median Wall, 2.4.12, deserted cities, 3.4.7–9, 10–11) with parasang measurements. Throughout the march up and the retreat, imperfect tenses are far more common than present tenses for geographical descriptions (e.g. for cities, palaces, bridges, the width of rivers, though present tenses are at times used for rivers). As with the parasang formula, a further shift in technique occurs after the Greeks' arrival at Trapezus. The Greek cities along the Black Sea coast are introduced in a style familiar from Greek geographical writers and occasionally found in Thucydides.[19] This type of geographical

---

[17] This paragraph summarises Rood 2010b; cf. also *SAGN* 2: 149.

[18] Rivers: 1.4.11, 5.4. The sea: 1.4.1, 6. Regions: 1.2.23. Borders: 1.2.11, 19, 4.3.

[19] E.g. Heraclea is 'a Greek city, a Megarian colony, in the territory of the Mariandynians' (6.2.1); Calpe Harbour is described as 'in the part of Thrace which is in Asia … on the right as one sails into the Euxine Sea' (6.4.1, cf. Thucydides' introduction of Epidamnus at 1.24.1)—itself the prelude to an exceptionally detailed description which seems to be promoting the possibility of founding a new colony on the site.

introduction is no longer used when the Greeks are in European Thrace; shorter localizations are offered when they cross back to Asia to join up with the Spartans.[20]

The account of landscape in the *Anabasis* is most detailed in sections where the stages/parasangs formula is not used. A tactical view of space dominates in descriptions of terrain, which draw on an established code of military suitability (plains for cavalry and hoplites, hills for hoplites and light-armed troops, mountains for light-armed troops or refuge).[21] There are also spatially detailed accounts of some of the strongholds assaulted by the Greeks. Of particular narratological interest are sections where detailed spatial information is first given not directly by Xenophon-narrator, but as seen by the character Xenophon (e.g. 3.4.31; 4.6.11). This distribution of information underlines Xenophon-character's distinctive spatial understanding: typically, he sees more than the other generals, and it is this capacity to see more that leads the Greeks to safety.

The detailed narrative of the march itself contrasts with the vagueness of the narrator's preliminary sketch of the background. No details are offered about Cyrus' first journey upcountry with 300 Greek hoplites or about the early scenes involving Darius and his two sons (1.1.1–3); similarly Tissaphernes goes simply 'to the king' (1.2.4: *hōs basilea*) to warn him (cf. also 1.4.5). The march is narratologically privileged in other ways too. Descriptions of cities begin with the first stop on the march, not with Sardis, where Xenophon-character joined Cyrus. And while the spatial range of the narrative is widened by anachronies dealing with Xenophon-character himself (set in Athens and Delphi before the march, 3.1.4–7, and in Scillus in the Peloponnese after it, 5.3.6–13, and also covering his journey from Ephesus to Sardis, 6.1.23),[22] these deviations underscore the dominance of the primary spatial focus on the march.

During the march, a narrow spatial focus is maintained in a number of ways. Arrivals, departures, and other types of encounter tend to

---

[20] I treat the material of the following paragraph in much more detail in a forthcoming article. For spatial definition through allusion to myth, cf. *SAGN* 2: 159.

[21] See e.g. 3.4.2; 6.5.19; 7.3.44 for cavalry and plain; 3.4.24 for hoplites' pleasure at hills (by contrast with the plain, where they are pressed by cavalry) and 4.3.1 for hoplites' view of the plain (by contrast with mountains, where they are pressed by light-armed troops); 3.4.28; 6.5.19;7.3.44 for peltasts and mountains.

[22] See *SAGN* 2: 160–161.

be reported as they happen, with little background detail.[23] This technique is put to particularly good effect when the narrator deals with the Greeks' contacts with the Persian army. As Cyrus advances further into Mesopotamia, he becomes overconfident because his brother has not yet opposed him. But then turmoil is produced by news that the king is approaching with a large army (1.8.1). The approach of the army is then conveyed through visual means: the narrator reports how the troops see a dust cloud and then the gleam of bronze (1.8.8). This technique climaxes in Cyrus' shout: 'I see the man' (1.8.26).[24] After Cyrus' death, the narrator writes of envoys arriving 'from the king' (*para basileōs*, 2.1.7, 3.17, cf. 2.1.17)—using a phrase that could as readily be applied to envoys sent from Susa to Sparta. The point here is that the king is close, but the Greeks are not quite sure how close. They are left to infer the king's proximity from scouts' sight of pack animals and from smoke seen in villages (2.2.15), or again from the fact that messengers return soon after their departure (2.3.6)—and this time the Greeks are not even sure whether the messengers have come from the king himself. The pattern of marking Persian arrivals continues in the early stages of the retreat when first Mithradates and then Tissaphernes appear with increasing numbers of troops (3.3.1, 6, 4.2, 13, 5.2). Across the mountains of Kurdistan, the sudden sight of fires hints once again at the presence of a Persian army nearby (4.4.9–10). And in Bithynia a sudden attack by Pharnabazus' cavalry is reported before any explanation is offered of Pharnabazus' motives for helping the Bithynians (6.4.24). Much of the atmosphere generated by the narrator's handling of space derives from the way his narrow focus on the movements of the Greek troops makes the narratee share in their uncertainties about where they are in relation to the much larger Persian army.

The rest of my discussion of the *Anabasis* will focus on how the Greeks' route is narrated. Various techniques are used to describe the direction of the march upcountry: the troops march 'through' regions (Lydia, Phrygia, Lycia, Cilicia, Syria, Arabia, Babylonia) or else with a river on their right or left (1.5.1, 5). What the narrator fails to do is to offer

---

[23] For arrivals after Sardis, see 1.2.6, 9, 4.2 (contrast the earlier split focus on how the various Greek generals gathered troops). Cf. also 1.2.12, 20 for the arrival and departure of the Cilician queen Epyaxa; news of what happened to the troops sent with her is delayed until the main army arrives at Tarsus (1.2.25–26).

[24] Cf. Purves 2010: 187–188.

explicit guidance through cardinal points (in relation to winds, stars, or the sun).[25] A modern scholar can, with the help of maps, note that Cyrus' 'meandering march through Phrygia must have puzzled both his hoplites and his enemies'.[26] That meandering can partly be explained by natural obstacles and by the fact that Cyrus was still collecting further troops. But was he also trying to mislead his opponents? The narrator gives no explanation; he does not even give any impression of puzzlement.

Why does the narrator offer so little guidance about direction? Like his failure to define parasangs, his technique raises the question of how much knowledge he presupposes. Readers of Herodotus would have been familiar with the royal road from Sardis to Susa (5.52–53). Ctesias, it seems, had provided an even fuller outline of the royal road system (*FGrE* 688 F 33). We might expect the narrator to engage with these earlier authors, particularly in view of Herodotus' use of stages and parasangs. But he does not relate Cyrus' route to the royal road or show any consciousness that Cyrus was following an unusual (and an unusually fast, but more difficult) route.[27] The lack of detailed information about direction does, however, have a pronounced effect of its own. Like the excess of detail about stages and parasangs, it gives an impression of security. Because Cyrus is in control, the Greeks do not have to grapple with uncertainties; the one time when they do worry about their position—the mutiny scene at Tarsus—underlines their helplessness.

The narrator's technique shifts in important respects during his account of the march to the sea. He now reveals that they marched the first stage of their retreat 'with the sun on the right' (2.2.13)—that is, to the north.[28] He also explains that they are marching northwards when they choose to head through the Carduchian mountains:

---

[25] Contrast Ps.-Hanno's (possibly fictional) account of a coastal voyage down the west coast of Africa: 'we sailed along to the south for two days, and from there to the east for the course of a day. … from there we sailed to the south for twelve days' (8, 11, text in Müller 1855–1861).

[26] Yalichev 1997: 128–129.

[27] Cf. Tuplin 1999: 341–342, 355; and note that Xenophon does at 1.2.20 note that a contingent was sent ahead to Cilicia by a swifter road. Contrast Lendle 1995: 5, who calls the Herodotean passage a 'prototype' ('Vorbild').

[28] Grote 1846–1856: IX 126, comparing Hdt. 4.42.4, took this to mean to the east, i.e. with the sun on the right as it moved through the sky. The fact that this type of phrase is normally applied to rivers perhaps points up the Greeks' difficulty in adjusting to their surroundings early in the retreat.

> The prisoners said that Babylon and Media lay to the south, past the land through which they had already come; that to the east lay the route to Susa and Ecbatana, where the king is said to have his summer residence; that to the west, if one crossed the river, lay the way to Lydia and Ionia; and that the way north, through the mountains, would take them to the Carduchians.   (3.5.15)

The order south-east-west-north prepares for some ethnographic detail on the Carduchians, 'a belligerent, mountain-dwelling people who had never submitted to the king' (3.5.16). Details of what lay beyond them are then revealed as the generals decide to head north: 'the prisoners had told them that on the other side of the mountains they would come to Armenia, a large and prosperous land (*pollēs kai eudaimonos*) … From there they could easily go wherever they wanted' (3.5.17). The full report on their choice of route at this key point offers a broader vision of their place within the Persian empire as well as a good sense of the difficulties of marching through an unknown land (3.5.15). Later, as they cross Armenia, Xenophon-narrator confirms their direction by mentioning that they were marching into a north wind (4.5.3)—though the main point of this detail is to stress the hardship of the march.

Apart from these broad indications that the Greeks are marching north, the narrator does not use cardinal points to indicate the direction of their retreat. He describes the army as marching to the right or left of rivers, through lands and peoples, or through plains and snow, and arriving at cities, villages, or rivers. There is no suggestion that they departed from a straight course during their march to the sea. The maps constructed by modern scholars, by contrast, allow for many loops owing both to the mountainous terrain and to the fact that the account seems to have too many parasangs to fit in (it has been suggested that they strayed eastwards along the river Phasis (Araxes) under the impression that it would bend back westwards to Colchis and the Black Sea—when in fact it flows into the Caspian).[29]

Rather than focus on the direction of the Greeks' march, the spatial techniques in this section of the march convey a sense of how they grapple with difficulties. At the start of the retreat, he highlights their lack of geographical knowledge: Clearchus reports that 'I have now discovered

---

[29] At issue is the meaning of the preposition *para* at 4.6.4: did they march 'to' or 'along' the Phasis? Xenophon elsewhere has them march not along rivers, but 'having' them 'on their left' or 'right'; but they do sail 'along' the land and march 'along' the sea (6.2.1; 7.8.7—*para* in both cases). For the Phasis, see J.O. Thomson 1948: 84.

that between us and the king there lies the Tigris' (2.2.3), though it is
not clear how he made this discovery; later, he confesses his ignorance
about the route ahead ('there may be other rivers we need to cross …',
2.4.6). Xenophon-narrator also brings out, as we have seen, how much
they learn on the march (3.5.15, cited above; cf. also how they ask a
village headman what land they are in—'and he said "Armenia"', 4.5.34).
At times, too, he shows how they rely on local guides for parts of the
route (4.1.23–24, 17–18, 5.1, 6.1–2, 7.19; contrast 'without a guide' at
3.1.2, 4.2.24).

There is also a spatial point to the narrator's definition of lands by
their inhabitants. Earlier, the Greeks had marched through Lycaonia,
Syria, and Babylonia (1.2.19, 4.6, 7.1); now they march 'to the Taochians',
'through the Chalybians', and 'through the Scythenians' (4.7.1, 15, 18).
While this personal form is not uncommon in accounts of expeditions,
definition of lands by inhabitants recalls the technique of Hecataeus (e.g.
FGrH 1 FF 100, 108, 137, 203, 207, 292, 299) and other geographers
when treating regions without strongly centralized political structures.
Unlike Hecataeus, however, the *Anabasis* does not explicitly locate these
peoples relative to each other. What mattered was not their relative
location, but that the Greeks marched through them. Throughout the
retreat, that innocuous preposition 'through' suggests difficulty as much
as direction.

Xenophon's technique when he narrates the march along the Black
Sea coast is in some respects simpler. There is no doubt about the
troops' direction as they move towards Greece. There are, as mentioned
earlier, some detours inland, but Xenophon focuses solely on the natural
obstacles that have to be overcome to get back to the sea. There is,
however, a notable innovation in Xenophon's technique when he reports
the problems that lie ahead on the land route. These difficulties are
conveyed by the words of an envoy from Sinope, Hecatonymus:

> you will come to a series of rivers. First there is the Thermodon, three
> plethra wide, which in my opinion is difficult enough to cross anyway, let
> alone when you have sizeable enemy forces before and behind you. The
> second river is the Iris, which is also three plethra wide, and the third
> is the Halys, which is at least two stades wide. You would need boats to
> cross the Halys … The Parthenius is just as uncrossable, and that's the one
> you'd come to next, if you succeeded in crossing the Halys. So I think the
> overland route is not difficult so much as downright impossible for you.
> But if you go by ship, you can sail from here to Sinope and from Sinope to
> Heraclea …   (5.6.9–10)

Hecatonymus has a function like the Odyssean Circe (*Od*. 12.37–141), presenting the travellers with a warning about what lies ahead. They take his advice and sail.

The soundness of Hecatonymus' advice seems to be suggested by the narrator's account of how the Greeks look on 'the mouths of the rivers—first, the Thermodon, then in order the Iris, the Halys, and the Parthenius' as they sail past (6.2.1). But in fact three of these rivers are to the east of Sinope, and so should have been mentioned when the narrator told of the Greeks' voyage from Cotyora to the port of Sinope (6.1.14–15). This mistake has been attributed to an interpolator satisfying the expectation raised by Hecatonymus' speech that the rivers would be mentioned in the coming narrative.[30] It is equally possible, however, that Xenophon made the mistake himself: it has been taken as a sign either that he did not keep a journal ('for if he had, where could he have more leisure to write than on board …?')[31] or that he arranged his notes much later.[32]

The presentation of the army's steady progress towards Greece is disrupted when the possibility of settling on the Black Sea coast is raised. This possibility is first mentioned by the character Xenophon. His rhetoric is then falsely presented to local Greek merchants: 'if you want, you can pick any place you like on the inhabited coastline around the Euxine and seize it … You have the ships to enable you to make sudden raids wherever you want' (5.6.20). Later, Xenophon-narrator mentions that the other generals approach Xenophon-character and say that they want to sail to Phasis and seize land there (5.6.36). This happens, according to the narrator, after the people of Heraclea fail to pay a bribe they had promised if the Greeks left the Black Sea—a bribe offered in the first place because they had heard of Xenophon-character's own plans for a settlement. The narrator is reticent about Xenophon's response to the generals' proposal. All he says is that Xenophon-character insisted that someone else put the proposal before the soldiers—and that he was then openly accused by a general who had not taken part in the earlier discussion of wanting to deceive the soldiers by leading them 'back to Phasis' (5.7.1).[33] So he has to defend himself against the charge that he

---

[30] Lendle 1995: ad loc.
[31] Forster 1740–1742: lxxiii; so too Cawkwell in Warner 1972: 270 n.
[32] Rennell 1816: 18, 258.
[33] It is suggested that Xenophon-character's opponents played on a confusion between the river Phasis, which the troops had passed, and the region Phasis, which they had not.

could have meant to deceive them—which he does with a geography lesson: 'you know perfectly well that it's the north wind that takes you out of the Euxine Sea towards Greece, whereas it is the south wind that takes you to Phasis' (5.7.7). Once more Xenophon-character asserts his authority through his use of geographical argument.

The spatial chaos that is averted by Xenophon-character's rhetoric reappears after the Greeks' arrival at the Bosporus:

> Then Pharnabazus … sent word to Anaxibius, the Spartan naval commander, who happened to be in Byzantium, and asked him to ferry the army out of Asia … Meanwhile, Seuthes the Thracian sent Medosades with a request that Xenophon should do his best to see that the army made the crossing …   (7.1.2, 5)

The shift of narrative momentum away from the Greeks highlights their loss of spatial control. The rest of the account is marked by uncertainty about where it is best for them to go and by a much more confusing pattern of movements. The spatial complexity is matched by the narrative complexity of speeches that review (with varying levels of details) the Greeks' movements since their return to Europe. Clear narrative direction is restored only when the army crosses back to Asia to join the Spartans. But this final movement frustrates at the same time various earlier intimations that the narrative is directed teleologically towards homecoming (e.g. 3.1.3; 6.4.8; also the Odyssean allusion at 5.1.2).

The diversity of techniques used for the various stages of the march should not disguise the overall unity provided by the focus on the movements of the Greek army. The distinctiveness of the spatial techniques employed in the *Anabasis* comes from the use across the whole course of the work of techniques adopted on a local scale in earlier writers. The unified focus of the *Anabasis* contrasts in particular with the *Hellenica*, where the narratee struggles to detect a clear teleological drive in the varying levels of spatial detail. And yet the confusion that Xenophon-narrator saw within the Greek world at the end of the *Hellenica* is itself prefigured in the closing sequence of the *Anabasis*. The clarity of geographical insight that was possible ten thousand stades from Greece proves hard for Xenophon to recapture when the Greeks actually get there.

CHAPTER NINE

POLYBIUS

T. Rood

Polybius, like Thucydides, begins his work by using extension in space as a criterion for the greatness of his subject.[1] But while Thucydides emphasizes the spatial extent of a single war, Polybius' focus is on how the Romans subjected 'nearly the whole inhabited world' in fewer than fifty-three years (1.1.5). This claim receives further support both in the proem, where Polybius notes the lesser scope of earlier empires (1.2: Persian, Spartan, Macedonian), and later in the work, where he repeatedly highlights the spatial extent of Roman undertakings: he comments on the 'vast scope' (*megaleion*) of operations in the Second Punic War (8.1.1) and claims that the final battle at Zama holds in suspense the inhabitants not just of Italy and Africa but also of Spain, Sicily, and Sardinia (15.3.4), with 'all those parts of the world which now hold a place in history' as the prize of victory (15.9.4–5).[2]

Analysis of Polybius' treatment of the extensive areas covered by his work is made easier by the fact that he offers many narratorial comments on space, notably on the spatial divisions embedded within his annalistic framework.[3] Nonetheless, the fragmentary state of much of the work still raises many problems. We cannot be sure, for instance, whether some areas covered in later sections of the narrative received separate geographical treatments. There are, admittedly, several geographical excerpts preserved from the later books, but sometimes these

---

[1] For earlier discussions of Polybius' treatment of space, see Walbank 1948; Walbank 1957–1979 (on relevant passages); Walbank 1972: 115–128; van Paassen 1957: 290–313; Pédech 1964: 515–597; Texier 1976; K.J. Clarke 1999: 77–128; Janni 2003; Prontera 2003; Maier fc.

[2] Cf. also remarks by Hannibal (15.6.4–6) and Scipio (15.10.2). A similar type of spatial magnification occurs at e.g. 10.40.7 (Scipio's conquests); 18.28.12, a comparison between fighting with phalanxes (like the Macedonians, conquerors of Greece and Asia) and legions (like the Romans, conquerors of Africa and the West); 18.46.1, gathering at the Isthmia from almost all the *oikoumenē*.

[3] *SAGN* 2: 173–174.

fragments lack any indication of context; and even when the context can be inferred, the relevance of particular spatial details may still be unclear. Further problems are posed by the principles underlying the Byzantine collections of excerpts that have preserved much of what survives after book 5. Some of the material that appears in the excerpts (gnomic comments, descriptions of Roman dealings with foreign embassies) seems to have little spatial potential. It is also likely that there were explicit discussions of geography in the later books that have not been preserved.[4] Plenty of pronouncements on the handling of space do survive, however, and it will be helpful to start by reviewing these sections before turning to see how space is handled in the rest of the narrative.

Programmatic Statements

Polybius makes a number of general reflections on the importance of geography for the historian. He claims that the historian must be able to survey 'cities, places, rivers, harbours, and in general all the peculiar features of land and sea and the distances of one place from another' (12.25e); he elsewhere corrects earlier accounts by stressing his autopsy of the Alps and New Carthage (3.48.12; 10.11.4). He also distinguishes between different types of geographical information: he dismisses details about the foundation of cities and migrations since they offer no chance of novelty (9.1.4, 2.1–2),[5] and stresses instead that 'the most essential thing in chorography' is to 'describe the actual situation of places and give the actual distances' (34.1.5).

But which places to describe and which distances to give? A key statement of Polybius' principles occurs when he is about to describe Hannibal's crossing of the Pyrenees: he explains that geographical information is included for the sake of the narratees' understanding of unfamiliar places (3.36.1–3). This basic principle is stated elsewhere to justify accounts of the sites of Lilybaeum, Byzantium, and Sparta (1.41.6; 4.38.11–12; 5.21.4–5). On the other hand, Polybius explains that he does

---

[4] Sacks 1981: 13 (arguing from choices made by gnomological excerptors in the books which do survive).

[5] Polybius still includes some Greek foundation stories (4.54.6; 16.12.2; cf. 21.24.11 [appeal to kinship in a speech]; 8.33.8–9 [explaining a river name]; 12.5 [traditions about Locri]) while also noting some Roman colonies.

not give a full description of Sardinia because there are existing accounts of the island that agree with each other (1.79.6–7), or again that he summarizes the situation of Sestus and Abydus 'as everyone who has the least claim to intelligence has acquired some knowledge of them owing to the singularity of their position' (16.29.3).

Polybius justifies the inclusion of geographical information even more strongly by stressing its explanatory value irrespective of the narratees' level of knowledge. In treating relations between Rome and the Gauls in his introductory books, he writes that 'a sketch of the peculiarities' of Cisalpine Gaul 'will help better to comprehend the more important of the events' (2.14.3). The same principle applies to spatial detail on a more local scale: as he explains in justifying an account of Sparta and its surrounds, 'in the majority of land and sea battles in a war defeat is due to difference of position' (5.21.6). For Polybius, spatial information may also have explanatory force owing to the influence of geography on character: he alleges that the Carthaginians were 'bestialized' by the hardships they endured in crossing the Alps (3.60.6), and later offers a generalization on environmental determinism in discussing the harshness of the Arcadian character (4.21.1–2).[6]

Polybius was alert to the danger that excessive geographical information could interrupt the narrative. After Hannibal's arrival in Italy, he pauses to explain why he had not included in his account of the march the usual geographical digressions 'about the mouth of the Mediterranean at the Pillars of Heracles, or about the Outer Sea and its peculiarities, … matters concerning which authors dispute with each other at great length'. His explanation is that he 'did not wish to be constantly interrupting the narrative and distracting readers from the actual subject'; he adds that he 'decided not to make scattered and casual allusions to such matters', but to assign 'the proper place and time to their special treatment' (3.57.4–5). This passage seems to be alluding to the separate book (34) that Polybius (following the model of Ephorus) devoted to geography.[7] In this book Polybius promoted his own status as an explorer in the West by a disquisition on Odysseus' travels and a sceptical review of

---

[6] Cf. K.J. Clarke 1999: 87–91.

[7] Cf. Strabo 8.1.1; another possible allusion by Polybius himself is 3.37.11 (promising to treat Spanish tribes). Note that the placement of many fragments in book 34 is uncertain: there is a danger of separating 'geographical' from 'historical' sections by allocating unplaced geographical fragments to book 34 (for a possible reconstruction, see Walbank 1957–1979: III 563–569).

Pytheas' account of Britain;[8] he also ranged more broadly to include a discussion of equatorial zones.[9]

Polybius also discusses the treatment of space by earlier historians. He stresses the danger that *topographia* may be subjected to gratuitous rhetorical elaboration (29.12.4), and marks out certain sites where that danger must be resisted (e.g. the palace of Ecbatana, 10.27.8, and the Alps, where earlier historians 'get into the same difficulties as tragic dramatists, all of whom, to bring their dramas to a close, require a *deus ex machina*', 3.48.8; cf. also 4.42.7). This element of polemic occurs in many of Polybius' other geographical remarks. He criticises Timaeus for being wrong on the mouths of the Rhone (34.10.5) and Eratosthenes and Dicaearchus for mistaken distances (34.5–7—from Strabo, who criticises Polybius in turn). The treatment of space is also discussed in book 12, which is devoted to criticism of earlier historians.[10] Polybius here stresses the importance of the historian's personal experience of terrain by making an extensive analysis of the battle-narratives of Callisthenes, suggesting that his account of army movements fails to take account of a river he has mentioned and that the numbers assigned to the armies do not fit the topography (12.17–21).[11] Elsewhere he reproaches Zeno of Rhodes for topographical errors (16.16.1–17.7), even claiming that he wrote to a grateful Zeno to point them out (16.20.5–6).[12] At the same time, he tries to pre-empt criticism of his own work by asking forgiveness for geographical errors over names in view of its immense scope (29.12.11).

Polybius' discussions of the treatment of geography have a number of further functions. By correcting supposed geographical errors, he promotes an image of his own diligence without the need to introduce the sort of analeptic material required when he corrects historians' accounts of earlier periods (though he does that too, as we have seen with Callisthenes). Methodological discussions of space also fit Polybius' carefully constructed sense of control over the ordering of the narrative: when he writes that the narrative of events may be *anupotakta* (literally 'unsub-

[8] Cf. Walbank 1972: 126; for Polybius and Odysseus, also Zecchini 1991: 118–123; Hartog [1996] 2001: 163–171; Marincola 2007: 16–20, 23–25.

[9] Polybius is also credited with an entirely separate work on this topic (Walbank 1957–1979: I 6).

[10] Especially Timaeus: see 12.3.1–6 (African fertility), 3.7–4.4 (Corsican animals), 4.5–8 (Arethusa); and more generally 28a.3–5 for criticism of second-hand ethnography.

[11] Cf. Prandi 2005: 79–81. Note also 12.25f.5 and 16.18–19 for criticism of Ephorus' account of Mantinea and one of Zeno's battle-narratives.

[12] Cf. Lenfant 2005: 195–197.

jected') without knowledge of locations, he uses a word cognate with the verb *hupotassein*, part of his vocabulary of military and political control. Geographical passages may also have localized narrative functions. The two important discussions in book 3 (36–38, 57–59) have generally been seen as late additions, but they do relate closely to their contexts: the first passage (on Polybius' treatment of names) emphasizes Hannibal's crossing of the Pyrenees, while the second (on Polybius' failure to offer conventional ethnographical descriptions of the areas Hannibal marches through) emphasizes Hannibal's arrival in northern Italy. By promising at this point a later account of the extremes of the earth, Polybius also stresses the Romans' failure to keep the war confined to Spain. That section (book 34) in turn extends the spatial range of the work well beyond the sphere of Roman control.

We have seen, then, that Polybius carefully explains many aspects of his treatment of space. It is time now to see how those methodological statements relate to his narrative practice.

Geographical Descriptions

In explaining his different principles for including geographical information in familiar and unfamiliar places, Polybius claims that 'the mention of names is of no small assistance in recalling them to our memory' in narratives of events in 'known countries' (3.36.3). This claim is justified by his frequently scrupulous provision of place-names. A good example is a passage describing the route of Prusias in the vicinity of Pergamum: 'directing his army to the Nicephorium … he marched his army back to Elaea … he withdrew to Thyateira, attacking and despoiling on his retreat the temple of Artemis at Hiera Come. Similarly he not only despoiled, but burnt to the ground the sanctuary of Apollo Cynneius near Temnus' (32.15). Polybius does not here offer any indication of where any of these places are: it is assumed that narratees will reconstruct Prusias' route from the names alone.[13] Such is the magnitude of Polybius' work, moreover, that bare names can also come to carry an intratextual resonance: he has earlier narrated similarly sacrilegious operations by Philip V in the same area (16.1).[14]

---

[13] For a bare list of names as creating plausibility, cf. schol. bT *Il.* 14.226–227 (with Nünlist 2009: 61–62).

[14] Though even there the places did not receive further topographical precision.

Does it follow that Polybius refrained from offering mere accounts of names 'in the case of unknown lands'? In the narrative of Hannibal's march, no names are offered apart from his starting point (New Carthage), rivers (Ebro, Rhone) and mountains (Pyrenees, Alps) that he crosses, and a region known as the 'Island' by the confluence of the Rhone and Isère (3.49.5); the calculation of the distances Hannibal covered adds the name of another city, Emporium (3.39.5). It is by no means clear, however, that Polybius' programmatic statement on naming offers a guide to his practice throughout the work: a few toponyms appear, for instance, in surviving sections of Polybius' account of Antiochus III's campaigns in the far east, though generally his movements are not narrated with great detail. Other presumably unfamiliar places are introduced imprecisely, but then a name is offered in a relative clause or through the additional of a participle such as *kaloumenos*, *prosagoreuomenos*, or *eponomazomenos* ('called', 'named').[15] The point at 3.36, then, is not so much to express a general principle as to justify the lack of detail in the account of a famous march through a difficult mountainous area.

It is in any case hard to form a clear image of the amount of knowledge expected of narratees. Naming in itself is no indication that familiarity is presumed: Polybius commonly defines the location of named places in appositional participle phrases (e.g. 1.60.4: 'the island of Aegusa lying off Lilybaeum'), relative clauses (e.g. 4.3.6: 'the city of Phigalea, which is in the Peloponnese and lies near the Messenian border'), and new sentences (e.g. 3.17.2: 'this city [Saguntum] lies on the seaward foot of the range of hills connecting Iberia and Celtiberia, at a distance of about seven stades from the sea').[16] Nor do Polybius' overt comments offer much help: he assumes knowledge of Sestus and Abydus but not of Byzantium, which was both famous and nearby; and even then he proceeds to offer an account of the sites of Sestus and Abydus.

Polybius' geographical descriptions should not be narrowly viewed as clues to his notion of the narratee. Read in context, they do offer information important for understanding the narrative. But they also

---

[15] E.g. 1.66.6; 3.76.5; note *prosagoreuomenos* in successive clauses at 21.35.1. This type of qualification is also commonly found with speaking names (e.g. 1.29.2: 'a city called Aspis', i.e. Shield, Roman Clupea; 1.85.7); cf. e.g. 2.46.5; 9.18.1; 18.22.7; 23.8.5.

[16] Many other examples could be cited: e.g. 1.15.10; 2.11.16; 5.61.8 for participles; 1.29.2; 4.6.1; 16.37.5 for relative clauses; 3.66.11; 10.42.8; 16.12.1 for new sentences.

offer information of less immediate use—and taken together they form an impressive global inventory that is in itself an important part of Polybius' narratorial self-fashioning.

Polybius' inventory of cities has a number of notable characteristics. Often the location of cities is broadly defined by the narrator from a panoramic standpoint in relation to their surrounding areas: thus Ecbatana 'is situated in the northern part of Media and commands that portion of Asia which borders on the Maeotis and Euxine … It lies on the skirts of Mt Orontes' (10.27.4–6; a brief description of the famous palace follows). A particularly rich illustration of this tendency is offered by the description of Seleucia (5.59.4–11, following Antiochus' decision to try to regain a city he has been told is the 'hearth' of his empire, 5.58.4). The narrator first describes its general situation from a panoramic standpoint ('It lies on the sea between Cilicia and Phoenicia, and above it rises a very high mountain called Coryphaeum … Seleucia lies on its southern slope, separated from it by a deep and difficult ravine'); then slowly zooms in on the city itself ('The town descends in a series of broken terraces to the sea, and is surrounded on most sides by cliffs and precipitous rocks'), its man-made defences ('On the level ground at the foot of the slope which descends towards the sea lies the business quarter and a suburb defended by very strong walls. The whole of the main city is similarly fortified …'), and other attractions ('… and is splendidly adorned with temples and other fine buildings'). The account ends with a curiosity that reinforces the notion of its defensive qualities ('On the side looking to the sea it can only be approached by a flight of steps cut in the rock with frequent turns and twists') and a description of a neighbouring river.[17] On occasion, a city description may even be eclipsed by an account of the surrounding region: thus Polybius stresses the importance of the harbour at Taras (probably in the context of the Roman recapture of the city) by highlighting the lack of good harbours along the rest of the southern coast of Italy (10.1), and in his account of the First Punic War he prefaces the description of Lilybaeum with a sketch of Sicily as a whole (1.42.4–7)—appropriately enough given that he defines the war as being 'over Sicily'. The description of Lilybaeum is overtly motivated by narratees' presumed lack of knowledge, but that justification may

---

[17] Polybius elsewhere describes the courses of the Rhone (3.47.2–3), Euphrates (9.43), and Oxus (10.48); cf. also rivers described in relative clauses at 3.92.1, 110.9 (with further detail on the Aufidus as the only river to flow through the Apennines); 7.4.2.

be a tacit way of undermining the claim of the Sicilian Timaeus to be the true historian of the West—and so boosting the status of Polybius himself.[18]

As well as describing cities, Polybius includes a number of self-standing regional descriptions. He offers a short account of the location of Triphylia in the Peloponnese, including a list of the cities found within it (4.77.8–9). A longer narratorial description of Media (included when the governor Antiochus has set rebels in charge of the region) shows the same concern to relate a region to its surrounds that is found at a smaller scale in descriptions of cities. Polybius first locates the area in broad terms panoramically ('Media lies in central Asia, and looked at as a whole, is superior in size and in the height of its mountain-ranges to any other district in Asia'); then offers a lengthy summary of the tribes on its borders to the east, south, west, and north; and finally notes that 'Media itself has several mountain chains running across it from east to west between which lie plains full of towns and villages' (5.44.3–11). This regional description is later supplemented by the more specific account of Ecbatana. Even more detailed is the account of Cisalpine Gaul (2.14–17) placed at the start of the narrative of early relations between Rome and the Gauls; Polybius here lays particular stress on the fertility of the land, which is illustrated by unusual details about the costs of lodging to the traveller. These various spatial descriptions also serve, as we shall see, as means of expressing the control that is exercised by the narrator as well as by some of the leading generals whose strategies Polybius describes.

The Geographical Narrator

One of the most pronounced elements in Polybius' articulation of space is a concern for measurements. At a smaller scale, Polybius offers circumference figures for cities (4.65.3; 10.11.4; 16.12.2) and other areas,[19] though he also discusses the difficulty of assessing the overall size of a city by its circumference alone (9.26a). He also (as we know from Strabo) gave a number of larger measurements such as the distances between

---

[18] Other examples of city-descriptions include: 4.70.7–11 (Psophis), 56.5–6 (Sinope), 57.5 (Aegeira), 61.7 (Ambracus); 8.13 (Lissus); 9.27 (Agrigentum). Cf. Walbank 1948: 162–163; Pédech 1964: 534–535, who includes examples from Livy probably modelled on Polybius; another missing description is the account of Jerusalem promised at 16.39.5.

[19] For measurements of other circumferences, cf. e.g. 1.56.4; 2.14.12; 4.39.1, 83.4; 12.1.1; cf. Heraclides Criticus 1.12, 27; Dionysius son of Calliphron 94–95.

Epidamnus and Thessalonica and from Massalia and the Pyrenees to the Pillars of Heracles, and also the length of the Tagus (34.7); it is generally supposed (but not certain)[20] that these figures came from a general outline of the geography of Europe offered in book 34. His concern for precise measurements is in fact found not just in narrowly geographical contexts, but also in his narration of military movements. We have already seen that he gives measurements in stades for separate parts of Hannibal's march from Spain to Italy (3.39); one of these distances is supported by reference to later Roman milestones. Elsewhere too he measures distances using stades[21] or (less commonly) by the time a journey takes.[22] This wealth of precise detail fits his insistence on how important it is for a general to have geographical knowledge as well as a good sense of space.[23]

  Also typical of Polybius' treatment of space is a concern for the shapes of regions and places.[24] He claims that some spaces are triangular (Sicily, 1.42.3; Italy, 2.14.4; the plain to the north of Italy, 2.14.8), while others are circular (Sparta, 5.22.1; the Syrtis, 12.1.1). This interest in shapes extends to aetiologies (the city called 'Saw' 'received this name from its resemblance to that tool', 1.85.7; cf. 8.4.11) and military movements (a naval manoeuvre took the form of a wedge with an open apex and a compact base, 1.26.16). This diagrammatic interest (which can be found in other geographical writers)[25] does not seem to be closely tied to immediate causal needs.

  Geographical analogies and comparisons are another common element in Polybius. He claims, for instance, that Sicily is to Italy as the Peloponnese is to mainland Greece (1.42.1–2); that the place Hannibal reaches 'called the Island' is 'similar in size and shape to the Egyptian

---

[20] K.J. Clarke 1999: 104–105.

[21] E.g. in describing how far an army camps from the enemy or from a city (e.g. 1.19.5; 3.68.7, 110.2); such measurements are typical of what Rambaud 1974 (on Caesar) terms 'strategic' space (as opposed to 'tactical' and 'geographical' space, which could be illustrated by nn. 39 and 23 respectively).

[22] E.g. 2.25.2; 8.26.2; 10.7.5; 15.5.3 for distances apart; 5.51.6 for distance traversed.

[23] See 9.12.8–9, 13.8, 14.2; and note e.g. the admiring account of how Philopoemen calculated the distances of Achaean cities in order to gather their contingents without revealing his plan (16.36), and also the spatial aspects in his discussions of ladder-heights (9.18.5–9, 19.5–9), phalanxes (18.29–31), and military inventions (e.g. the injunction to imitate Roman stakes [18.18.18]; also 1.59.8; 8.4.3–11; 21.7, 28; 27.11; cf. 13.7 for intriguing torture-equipment).

[24] K.J. Clarke 1999: 103–104.

[25] As in other geographical writers: e.g. Heraclides Criticus 1.12; Dionysius Periegeta 5–7; Dueck 2005 on Strabo.

Delta' (3.49.5); and that the relationship between the Alps and Italy is like that between an acropolis and a city (3.54.2–3).[26] Later he applies a theatrical metaphor to the Campanian plain (3.91.10);[27] describes Chalcis, Corinth, and Demetrias as the 'fetters' of Greece—agreeing with a saying attributed to Philip V of Macedon (18.11.5, cf. 18.45.6); and again stresses Corinth's strategic significance through a spatial riddle uttered by Demetrius of Pharos: 'it is only by holding both his horns that you can keep the ox under'—'meaning by the horns Mt Ithome and the Acrocorinthus and by the ox the Peloponnese' (7.12.3).[28] Such comparisons occur at a number of different spatial levels: the passage through the Hellespont is compared with the Strait of Gibraltar (16.29.5–12);[29] the form of a Roman camp with a city (6.31.10); and a military formation with a tiled roof (28.11.2). Whatever the scale, these analogies help the narratee to understand the unfamiliar through the familiar;[30] they also boost Polybius' narratorial self-definition by recalling the style of (→) Herodotus.

Indications of relative orientation are another familiarizing technique common in Polybius' geographical descriptions. In keeping with his diagrammatic tendency, he often speaks of spaces as having 'sides' (*pleurai*) that are turned to particular directions (places or compass points).[31] He also exploits a wide range of co-ordinates: as well as using the rising and sinking of the sun to indicate east and west,[32] he also uses the 'summer rising', 'winter rising', and 'winter setting' (*therinai anatolai, kheimerinai anatolai, kheimerinai duseis*—i.e. south-east, north-east, and north-west).[33] While these orientation markers are most common in self-contained geographical descriptions, they are also used in the narrative:

---

[26] For the metaphor, cf. 5.8.6 (Thermus in relation to Aetolia); 18.40a (Ephesus in relation to Ionia and the Hellespont). De Foucault 1972: 308 discusses the lack of picturesqueness.

[27] Partly focalized by the Carthaginians, who want to make a spectacle (*ektheatriein*) of the Roman refusal to fight.

[28] For Corinth's strategic importance, cf. 2.51.6; 4.6.6. Similar analogies are found at 16.29.2 (Abydus as 'stepping-stone') and 16.29.11 (the Hellespont as 'gate'); cf. the proverbial phrase expressing a spatial idea at 12.23.7.

[29] This east/west modelling within the Mediterranean recalls Herodotus' north/south axis (K.J. Clarke 1999: 102–103; McGing 2010: 55).

[30] Walbank 1957–7979: I 104 notes that 1.42 assumes a Greek readership.

[31] Direction is often indicated through *neuōn, pherōn, tetrammenos, keklimenos*, and *estrammenos*. Cf. Heraclides Criticus 2.9 (*pleura* of a mountain, with direction).

[32] Polybius uses, for 'east', *anatolē/anatolai* or (more rarely) *heōs*; for 'west', *dusis/duseis, dusmai*, and (rarely) *hespera*; for north, *arktos/arktoi*; for south, *mesēmbria*.

[33] Cf. Pédech 1964: 536.

in his account of New Carthage (10.10), he notes that the gulf faces 'towards the south-west wind' (*pros anemon liba*), the city is surrounded by the sea 'to the east and south' (*ap' anatolōn kai mesēmbrias*), by a lagoon to the west (*apo … tōn duseōn*) and stretching to the north (*pros arkton*), and by a large hill to the east (*apo tēs anatolēs*) and another one opposite on the west (*apo tēs duseōs*), with three smaller hills to the north (*pros arkton*); the narrative of Scipio's attack then picks up on the eastern hill (10.12.2, 15.3) and the gate towards the isthmus (10.12.3, 14.14).[34]

Polybius' geographical descriptions also embed an absolute orientation. Like earlier historians such as (→) Herodotus, he takes the Mediterranean as a centre: thus he refers to the people of Oricus as first on the right 'as one sails' (*eispleonti*) into the Adriatic (7.14d).[35] He also repeatedly uses *epi tade* to indicate the region on 'this side' of Taurus, i.e. nearer to the Mediterranean, while sometimes the more distant side is indicated by *ta anō merē* ('the upper provinces', e.g. 5.40.7).[36] The same orientation is conveyed by his use of the Latin term *Transalpinoi* for the peoples to the north of the Alps (2.15.9, with an explanation that *trans* is Latin for 'across'); the southern side of the Alps, by contrast, is indicated by *epi tade* ('this side') even where Polybius recounts Hannibal's dispatch of messengers to Celtic chiefs in the Po valley (3.34.4). Greater complexity arises with the Ebro, which flows roughly from west to east: here Polybius adopts the perspective of someone approaching Spain by land from the north, using *epi tade* of the north side of the river even when speaking of the Carthaginian general commanding the country to the north (3.35.4; cf. 3.97.5, explicitly focalized by the Romans).[37]

---

[34] Cf. e.g. 3.47.1 (Hannibal marching 'in an easterly direction' along the Rhone, whose course is described); 4.57.7; 9.17.1; 11.11.4.

[35] Cf. 4.56.5; also Thucydides 1.24.1.

[36] 18 of the 27 uses of *epi tade* in the extant parts of Polybius mark the Taurus (seen as a 'broad mountain-spine running due east' [Walbank 1957–1979: II 236, quoting J.O. Thomson 1948]) as a boundary; the phrase is also used for rivers and promontories as well as other mountain ranges. Ma 1999: 125 (with n. 67) notes that *epi tade tou Taurou* is 'an official title' in Seleucid administration that was 'adapted to the geographical location': it becomes *epekeina* in a letter written in Iran (see 289 and 338 for the inscriptions); Polybius by contrast retains *epi tade* in a passage focalized by Seleucus when positioned in Syria (4.48.7).

[37] *entos Ibēros* or *tou potamou*, by contrast, is used equally of the north (3.76.6; 10.7.3, 35.3) or south (3.14.9, 76.11; 4.28.1) of the river, depending on the implicit focalization (or source?, so Walbank 1957–1979: I 319). Cf. the complex focalization at 2.52.8, where the Aetolians forbid an army to advance (from north to south) *entos Pulōn*, i.e. to the south of Thermopylae: *entos* is focalized by the Aetolians (a point obscured in Paton's translation 'beyond', which is focalized by the advancing army); similarly 10.41.5.

We have seen, then, a variety of ways in which the narrator shows a concern with the precise delineation of physical sites. It is time now to explore more fully how these descriptions are integrated in the narrative, particularly in relation to the vision of the general.

The General's Vision

Polybius' polemical comments on other historians' treatments of battle-fields (see above) presuppose an active engagement by the narratee in following complex accounts of military movements. This presupposition is also suggested by Polybius' own battle narratives: for the decisive battle of Zama, for instance, he offers an account of the initial troop positions (15.9.7–9, 11.1–3), some account of their subsequent movements (e.g. 15.12.7), as well as a brief scenic glimpse of 'the space which separated the two armies … covered with blood, slaughter, corpses' (15.14.1) that is offered not just for pathetic effect but also to explain how this bloody area affects the Romans' movements (15.14.2). This attention to soldiers' spatial activity is not accompanied by any other description of the space the soldiers traverse: before the battle Hannibal has been encamped by a hill no more than thirty stades from the Romans (15.6.2), but subsequently there is only mention of the 'open ground' (*eurukhōrias*) beyond the wings, though this area is not contrasted with any confined space on the field itself.[38] As a rule, spatial detail emerges when there is a departure from the cultural norm of battle on a level plain:[39] for the battle of the Metaurus, difficult ground (*duskhōria*) explains why the Roman consul on the right is unable to advance and retrospectively why Hasdrubal had concentrated his forces for an attack on the Roman left (11.1.5); the battle of Cynoscephalae, by contrast, is both preceded by a complex description of how the opposing armies almost stumble on each other (18.19–20) and itself marked itself by a richer attention to topographical detail (18.21–27).

The spatial detail that Polybius does offer is nonetheless often quite vague.[40] This vagueness is not a sign of ignorance or a disregard for the

---

[38] Cf. the battle of Raphia (5.82), narrated with similarly sparse topographical detail.

[39] See in general Pédech 1964: 538–540. This point holds of sea-battles too: contrast Polybius' account of Drepana (1.50–51), where open space is opposed to fighting close to the shore (with Thucydidean naval terminology) with the less specific account of the battle in more open sea off Chios (16.2–9).

[40] Cf. Horsfall 1985: 198, 204–205.

importance of space in determining the result of battles; rather, Polybius implicitly appeals to knowledge of the basics of military topography.[41] He often draws on the principle that success in battle is governed partly by a general's ability to seize the most appropriate space without offering a more detailed spatial description (e.g. 2.55.6: 'owing to the strength of his forces, and owing to his having had time to seize on the most advantageous positions, his project succeeded').[42] Elsewhere he alludes in general terms to 'level ground' as helpful for cavalry and elephants.[43] In a particularly striking sequence during the First Punic War, he shows how this elementary insight was neglected by the Carthaginians: 'by quitting the level country and shutting themselves up in a precipitous place, difficult of access, they were sure to instruct their adversaries how best to attack them, and this is exactly what did happen' (1.30.8). A Spartan expert then advised the Carthaginians to 'avail themselves of the level country' (1.32.4), and the Romans were in turn disturbed to see them 'marching through the flat country and pitching their camps on level ground' (1.33.1; cf. 1.39.12–13 for how the Romans subsequently avoid the level). Polybius' didactic message is more clearly conveyed by recourse to generic categories than by precise descriptions of spatial particularities.

Polybius' provision of spatial information is often closely related to the planning of generals. A negative example is provided by the battle of Cynoscephelae: Philip V is defeated when he fights in a position with which he is dissatisfied (18.22.9).[44] In the battle of Mantinea, by contrast, the positive effects of good planning are shown. Polybius first brings out how the Achaean phalanx is stationed along a ditch (11.11.6) into which their Spartan opponents later charge (11.15.7, with more detail focalized by the Spartans: 'they made light of the ditch as its descent was gentle and it had neither water nor bushes at the bottom'); he then stresses that it was precisely this rash move that the Achaean general Philopoemen had foreseen (11.16.4–9, with initial presentation through

---

[41] There are numerous exceptions (e.g. the 'strong white-rock' at 3.53.5 or the 'steep brow' at 36.8.3); my focus here, however, is on Polybius' general principles of intelligibility.

[42] Cf. e.g. 3.82.11 (Hannibal observes 'a position favourable for his purpose'; the next sentence has a description in a genitive absolute); 3.97.7 (a camp is chosen in 'a place well situated for security from the enemy and for supplies from the sea').

[43] E.g. 1.77.2, 84.4; 2.3.4–6; 3.50.2, 66.2, 92.6–7; 4.11.7–9; 9.3; 11.32.

[44] Cf. 3.112.2, where Aemilius Paullus does not want to fight in an unsatisfactory position near Cannae.

negation implicitly contradicting the view that the success was the result of chance). With an increase of spatial detail, he focuses on the Spartan general Machanidas, who has crossed the ditch but is unable to get back because the Achaeans hold the bridge over the ditch (11.17.6); Philopoemen then tracks Machanidas along the edge of the ditch on the other side until his opponent reaches a section where the ditch could be crossed, at which point he kills him in hand to hand combat (11.18.4). Here the scenic increase in precision matches the unusual focus on a *monomakhia*. The account as a whole serves as a heroic valorisation of Polybius' fellow Achaean.

Many further examples could be cited to show how Polybius' geographical descriptions interact with his focalizing technique. There is space here to glance only at three examples involving Hannibal.[45] Firstly, we may look at the battle of the Trebia, where Polybius has Hannibal focalize the site for an ambush: 'He had long ago noticed a place between the two camps, flat indeed and treeless, but well adapted for an ambuscade, as it was traversed by a water-course with steep banks densely overgrown with brambles and other thorny plants, and here he proposed to lay a stratagem to surprise the enemy. It was probable that he would easily elude their vigilance; for the Romans, while very suspicious of thickly-wooded ground, which the Celts usually chose for their ambuscades, were not at all afraid of flat and treeless places …' (3.71.1–2). As elsewhere, Polybius brings out how experienced generals are able to exploit the spatial perceptions of their opponents;[46] he also goes on to draw a direct lesson from the Romans' ignorance, introduced by presentation through negation ('not aware that …', 3.71.3–4).

The importance of Hannibal's spatial grasp is again shown in Polybius' account of events at Tarentum. Here, the Carthaginian general is able to recognise spatial possibilities that even the local inhabitants have failed to see:

> Hannibal explained to the Tarentines, that if the garrison of the citadel were cut off from the hope of succour by sea they would in a very short time give in of their own accord and abandoning the fortress would surrender the whole place. … The Tarentines were unable to conceive what Hannibal was leading up to in speaking to them on this subject, and when

---

[45] Philip V's campaigns are also rich in examples (e.g. 4.65.8–11, 70–71, 75.2–3; 5.3, 13.4–5; 8.13.3).
[46] Cf. Davidson 1991.

he went on to say that it was obvious that they themselves without the aid of the Carthaginians were very nearly in command of the sea at this moment, they were still more astonished, being quite unable to fathom his meaning. He had noticed that the street just within the cross wall, and leading parallel to this wall from the harbour to the outer sea, could easily be adapted to his purpose, and he designed to convey the ships across by this street from the harbour to the southern side.   (8.34.5–9)

The brilliance of Hannibal's insight is again highlighted through zooming in on the details he observes and through negative presentation of what other are unable to see; it is then positively focalized by the Tarentines' 'extraordinary admiration' for him (8.34.10).

The most striking example of Hannibal's spatial mastery is shown in his crossing of the Alps. Here Polybius criticises earlier writers for presenting elaborate rhetorical images of the difficulties posed by the Alps (3.47.7–48.11)—images that make Hannibal seem irrational for venturing to cross the mountains without adequate knowledge. Polybius stresses by contrast that Hannibal used locals as guides and also that he had enquired into the fertility of the country to the south of the mountains.[47] The narrator also mentions that he had himself crossed the Alps (3.48.12), implicitly conflating his own enquiries as historian with those of Hannibal as general.[48] Yet the possibility for a rational control of space is also problematized by the difficulties Hannibal does encounter. Polybius criticises the falsehood of earlier reports on the 'difficulty of the road' (*duskhōria*, 3.48.5), yet uses this same word both when mentioning that Hannibal used guides 'for the difficulties of the route' (3.48.11) and again in his account of Hannibal's crossing (3.50.3, 51.2, 10, 54.8; also 52.7, where Hannibal again uses guides). Polybius also notes that Celtic tribes are able to live in the Alps (3.48.7), yet in the event Hannibal is directly threatened by attacks from local tribes. And while the narrator claims that the Carthaginians would have been destroyed had they entered the Alps without prior knowledge (3.47.9), the subsequent narrative twice brings out (again with counterfactuals) how close they came to being destroyed (3.50.4, 53.1). Even the best plans, it emerges, can be disrupted.

---

[47] Cf. 3.34.6 for Hannibal's earlier contacts with the Celts.
[48] Cf. Levene 2010: 154.

Space and Power

It remains to explore how Polybius' treatment of space relates to his main
theme—the rise of Rome—and to the way earlier historians integrate
geography and imperialism. Polybius' technique seems at times to look
back to the (→) Herodotean model of spatial expansion. It was victory
over Carthage that led the Romans to reach out and grasp 'the rest'—
Greece and Asia (1.3.6). So too earlier victories over the Etruscans,
Samnites, and Italian Celts led the Romans to attack the rest of Italy 'as
if it rightfully belonged to them' (1.6.6). Like Herodotus, Polybius brings
out the dynamics of imperial expansion while also historicizing the
spatial perceptions of the imperial power.[49] The link with the Herodotean
model is strengthened by Polybius' frequent focus on 'crossings', at times
accompanied by overt allusions to Xerxes' crossings as a chronological
reference point (1.12.5; 2.2.1).[50]

The Herodotean model may also seem to be followed in Polybius' long
account of the Po valley placed at the start of Rome's war against the
Italian Celts (2.14–17). Yet this model is at the same time complicated
by the fact that this section is set in Polybius' introductory books, before
the fifty-three years of Rome's rise to global power, and also marked by
an explicit prolepsis of the use that the Carthaginians made of the area in
the Second Punic War ('it shows us who were the men and what was the
country on which Hannibal afterwards relied in his attempt to destroy
the Roman dominion', 2.14.2).

A further difference from Herodotean technique can be seen in the
way Polybius uses the introductory books to sketch the background
of the nations subsequently conquered by Rome as well as the earlier
history of Rome herself. His aim in these opening books is to fill in the
past history, not to offer lengthy geographical treatises: the narratee is
presumed to be familiar with the geography of Greece and Macedonia,
and indeed with the history (and by implication also the geography)
of Egypt and Asia Minor (2.37.6).[51] The only precision concerns the

---

[49] Cf. also 3.23.5–6.

[50] The vocabulary of crossing is particularly frequent in the account of Rome's war
against Antiochus III, in relation to both the Romans in Asia (21.4.4, 11.2, 13, 13.2, 15.8,
in a context where Europe is suggested as a possible limit to Rome's empire, 21.14.4–6)
and Antiochus in Europe (18.47.2, 50.8, 51.3); cf. K.J. Clarke 1999: 99–100 on Xerxes'
crossing as reference-point; Florus 1.24.13 for an Antiochus-Xerxes parallel.

[51] Though note 5.34 for a description of Ptolemaic imperial space.

formation of the Achaean League: Polybius explains that 'the whole Peloponnese only falls short of being a single city in the fact of its inhabitants not being enclosed by one wall', and then offers an account of how 'all the Peloponnesians came to be called Achaeans' (2.37.11–38.1). Here, however, it is not the geography of the Peloponnese that is at issue, but its political reconfiguration. As for Rome, Polybius both describes the early growth of Roman power within Italy and also pauses in his account of the war against the Italian Celts to offer an account of Roman resources—an account that is designed to show 'what a great power it was that Hannibal ventured to attack, and how mighty was that empire boldly confronting which he came so near his purpose as to bring great disasters on Rome' (2.24.1). By a striking prolepsis, Polybius offers an account of the spatial limits of Rome's manpower resources in 225 BC in order to stress the boldness of Hannibal's undertaking several years later.

Polybius also complicates the pattern of earlier historians in his treatment of the spatial scope of Carthaginian power. Though he often calls the First Punic War the 'war for Sicily', he does not follow Thucydides' technique of presenting a geographical sketch of Sicily (including the growth of Carthaginian power there) at the start of his account. Instead he emphasizes the Romans' resolution by postponing his sketch of the island until the 'fourteenth year of the war', when they resume their naval effort and begin a siege of Lilybaeum, 'thinking that if it fell into their possession it would be easy for them to transfer the war to Africa' (1.41.4). As for the spread of Carthaginian power, a summary is offered not in the introductory books, but when Hannibal is about to cross the Pyrenees (3.39.2–4)—a placement that brings out how much the Carthaginians have recovered from their earlier defeat, especially through conquests in Spain. Taken as a whole, Polybius' complex distribution of spatial material suggests that the conflict between Carthage and Rome is not a simple war of aggression by one imperial power against an innocent victim.

In dealing with more distant parts of the world in his later books, Polybius does seem to follow a more Herodotean model—albeit one mediated by earlier Hellenistic historians who dealt with Alexander's conquests.[52] As noted above, he includes a description of the region of Media when Antiochus' governor rebels. Other spatial details are introduced piecemeal in the context of Antiochus' campaigns—notably the

---

[52] Cf. O. Murray 1972 for Herodotus' influence on Hellenistic historiography.

unusual flow of the river Euphrates (explaining the sluggish progress of boats sailing down it) and the course of the Oxus (explaining how nomads are able to cross under a waterfall).[53] In recounting how Antiochus' troops adapt to fighting in mountainous terrain (10.30), moreover, Polybius' handling of space is similar to Xenophon's *Anabasis* (though here too Alexander historians may have been important intermediaries). By drawing on the techniques of earlier historians, Polybius further highlights the geographical spread of his own work—while also pointing up how this spread does not spring simply from the growth of Roman power.[54]

The fragmentary nature of Polybius' work makes it difficult to determine whether Roman contacts with the east were treated in a similar way. One of the fragments offers a brief geographical account of Cappadocia, including an intriguing analepsis on how it was first divided: a Persian who had saved the Persian king during a lion hunt 'ascending the highest mountain in the neighbourhood received as a gift from the king as much territory as the human eye could take in, looking east, west, north, and south' (fr. 54).[55] As the context of this passage is lost, it is impossible to know whether it was included when the Romans first had dealings with Cappadocia or in an earlier Seleucid context.

While Polybius' account of distant regions does not narrowly emphasize the progressive expansion of Roman power, it is nonetheless striking that his single book devoted to geography appears after the establishment of Roman rule over the *oikoumenē*.[56] The placement of this book at an era when Polybius himself was making enquiries into the geography of the far west (in part as an agent of Roman power)[57] instantiates the shift in the possibilities of geographical knowledge that Polybius sees arising from Roman power (3.59.3–4).[58] At the same time, like the geographical details introduced in the course of Antiochus' campaigns, this account concerns areas beyond the limits of Roman power.

---

[53] Cf. also 10.28.2–7 (on kanats); 13.9.2–3 (on Chattenia).

[54] Cf. Millar 1986: 6. Note also the stress on how Antiochus' great eastern expedition makes him seem 'worthy' (*axios*) of his power to those in Europe as well as in Asia (11.39.16).

[55] A striking anticipation of the 'monarch-of-all-I-survey' trope in modern imperial writing (analysed by Pratt 1992: 201–208). For another modern trope (woman as land), cf. 20.8.4 (Antiochus renaming his bride 'Euboea').

[56] Cf. van Paassen 1957: 310–312.

[57] Cf. Woolf 2011: 59–64.

[58] Cf. also 4.40.2–3 for temporal shifts in spatial knowledge.

We may conclude our discussion with a final instance of the influence of Roman power on Polybius' treatment of space—his account of embassies.[59] That the narration of embassies forms so large a part of the later sections of the work owes something to the accidents of survival, as noted earlier. Yet it is still revealing of the shifting spatial rhythms created by the growth of Roman power—and the imbalance of power is further underlined by the fact that Polybius' spatial ordering means that decisions made in Rome are often recounted before the decision to send an embassy. In addition, the new power dynamics also shape Polybius' account of how embassies are received. While he generally focuses on discussion with little spatial elaboration of its setting, Polybius does set meetings in private against discussion in the senate (30.1.9, 32.10), while also noting that some envoys are not admitted to private houses at all (32.6.5) or that others are ordered to stay across Tiber (35.2.4).[60] A further sign of Rome's new majesty emerges from the detail that the Bithynian king Prusias stops at the threshold before entering the senate wearing the costume of a *libertus* (30.18.3). But the most pregnant instance of how power shapes Polybius' account of diplomatic space is the famous meeting between Caius Popilius Laenas and Antiochus IV in 169/168 BC, near the end of the remarkable 53-year period of Roman expansion: without accepting Antiochus' offer of his hand, the Roman commander hands him a copy of a *senatus consultum*; then, when Antiochus asks permission to consult his retinue, Laenas 'was carrying a stick cut from a vine, and with this he drew a circle round Antiochus and told him he must remain inside this circle until he gave his decision about the contents of the letter' (29.27.5). The line Laenas draws in the sand around the Seleucid king stands by metonymy as an expression of Polybius' great theme—Rome's conquest of the inhabited world.

---

[59] These sections—and the work as a whole—also include numerous discussions about geopolitical spatial aspects (e.g. 10.25 [analogy with the battle-line]; 18.2, 51.2; 20.3.2, 26.3–4; cf. also the overt narratorial advice at 4.32), but there is no room to pursue this further here.

[60] The focus on internal space is thematic; detailed descriptions of dwellings are offered in more eastern and despotic contexts (esp. 15.25–33, the sensational account of Agathocles' downfall in Alexandria).

CHAPTER TEN

JOSEPHUS

L. Huitink and J.W. van Henten

Introduction

This chapter focuses on *The Jewish War*, one of the two major histories
written by Flavius Josephus. References to *The Jewish Antiquities*, Jose-
phus' other major historical work, are added where they are relevant for
our discussion of the *War*. Already at the outset of the *War*, Josephus-the-
narrator claims a special knowledge of his subject, the war between the
Jews and the Romans in 66–70 CE that ultimately led to the destruction
of the Jerusalem Temple. He refers to this knowledge by emphasising his
position as 'a Hebrew by birth and a priest from Jerusalem' and as one
who 'at the opening of the war myself fought against the Romans and
in the sequel was perforce an onlooker' (*BJ* 1.3).[1] The narrator's knowl-
edge extends to the actual theatres of war, a detailed description of which
is announced in the proem, together with the major battles and related
events in this work. Josephus promises his narratees a description of 'the
extent and nature of both parts of the Galilee [i.e. Upper and Lower
Galilee], the borders of Judaea, the special features of the country, its
lakes and springs' (1.22), and in particular Jerusalem, with its 'triple line
of walls and their dimensions; the defences of the city and the plan of the
Temple and sanctuary, the measurements of these buildings and the altar
being all precisely stated' (1.25–26).

The narrator does indeed offer descriptions, often detailed ones, of
locations in several extended passages of *The Jewish War* (likewise in
The Jewish Antiquities), which are usually clearly marked off because

---

[1] According to the reading of most of the manuscripts. Like Polybius and Strabo
Josephus emphasised the importance of eyewitness evidence; see Shahar 2004: 192–195.
All translations from *The Jewish War* are those by H.S.J. Thackeray (Loeb), with some
modifications.

they form a pause within the narrative.[2] Given the frequency and length of such passages, these set descriptions are the most obvious and most important way in which Josephus engages with the narratological category of space. They usually take a panoramic point of view and are focalised by himself as narrator, thus underscoring his claim to *akribeia*[3] and bringing out his special qualifications as a Jewish priest from Jerusalem and a former general of the Jews. The fact that they are often so clearly set apart from the main narrative may at first give the impression that they have been included for their own sake. The painstaking detail that characterizes the most elaborate description of all, that of Jerusalem and its Temple (5.136–247), can at least in part be explained by the assumption that Josephus nostalgically wanted to preserve the memory of a city and a monument which had, by the time of writing, been razed to the ground. However, a closer analysis of relevant passages suggests that his handling of space has important literary and thematic implications, so that the descriptions take on narrative functions well beyond the establishment of the narrator's apparent wish to display his knowledge. The set descriptions in Josephus' historiographical works exhibit a varied range of techniques and registers, while the narrator also devotes some attention to space outside the set descriptions. This chapter will explore a number of narrative techniques for handling space, and will link these to the functions of space within the larger context of Josephus' narrative.

Topographical Description and Narrative

As stated above, many of Josephus' descriptions are presented in separate blocks of the narrative. They are usually told in simultaneous narration,[4] thus creating a pause in the narrative. They are mostly focalised by the narrator, who takes a panoramic viewpoint. This applies, for example, to the descriptions of Jotapata/Yodfat (3.158–160), Joppa (3.419–421), the Lake of Gennesareth and the area surrounding it (3.506–521), Gamala

---

[2] Sometimes the distinction between narrative and description is difficult because Josephus combines narration with description (for example in the section about Herod's construction of Caesarea Maritima in *AJ* 15.331–341 and his renovation of the Temple in 15.380–425).

[3] See *SAGN* 2: 213–214.

[4] See *SAGN* 2: 218. The main exception is the description of Jerusalem in book 5 of the *War*, for reasons explained below.

(4.5–8), Jericho and its vicinity (4.451–485) and Masada (7.280–294).[5] However, despite the fact that these descriptions are clearly marked off from the surrounding narrative, they also interact with the narrative in interesting ways, which highlight some of Josephus' narrative goals in relating the war.[6]

The description of Gamala at the beginning of book 4 is a good example to subject to a more detailed analysis. It is embedded in war narrative and followed by further brief descriptive passages, as salient points of the initial description are taken up again in the narrative of the fighting (4.4–8, 54–55, 74; see below). In a brief survey of the cities around the Sea of Galilee, which took the side of the Romans and King Agrippa II (ca. 50–92/3 CE)[7] after the fall of Jotapata/Yodfat (4.1–4), Josephus notes that the town of Gamala deserted King Agrippa and joined the rebels together with the cities of Tiberias and Tarichaea. The description of Gamala in 4.4–8 links up with Josephus' explanation of Gamala's desertion: it is introduced by a sentence that mentions Gamala's refusal to surrender and artfully connects it with the main narrative indicating that the town relied upon its inhospitable location: 'But Gamala refused to surrender, relying even more confidently than Jotapata upon the natural difficulties of its position' (4.4).

Like most descriptions of towns in the *War*, the description also coincides with the moment the Roman troops, here led by Vespasian, are about to march on it. This presentation reminds one of (→) Herodotus, but there is at the same time an important difference: Herodotus usually takes a broad geographical interest in the locations which he describes, while Josephus here and often elsewhere focuses on the features which make Gamala easy to defend, a military focus which is closely connected

---

[5] There are, of course, exceptions: Josephus' passage about Caesarea Maritima in *AJ* 15.331–341 highlights the location of the Temple for Augustus in this city by taking the viewpoint of people on a boat sailing into Caesarea's harbour (15.339), which echoes (→) Herodotus' geographical style.

[6] Shahar 2004: 208–209. The interconnections with the narrative hold true for the *Antiquities* as well; see, for example, Josephus' elaborate description of the Herodian Temple in *AJ* 15.380–425, which forms the conclusion of book 15 and highlights the magnificence of the Temple as well as Herod the Great's role as a builder king.

[7] The Jewish King Agrippa II is an important character in the *War* narrative. He was appointed King of Chalcis by Claudius in 50 CE and also received the right to nominate and depose high priests. In 53 CE he received as replacement of the Kingdom of Chalcis the tetrarchy of Philip (Batanea, Trachonitis and Gaulanitis). Nero added the cities of Tiberias, Tarichea and Julias to his territory.

with Josephus' own status as a former general in this war.[8] The description starts as follows:

> From a lofty mountain there descends a rugged spur rising in the middle to a hump, the declivity from the summit of which is of the same length before as behind, so that in form the ridge resembles a camel.   (4.5)

The comparison of a camel in this description is adequate if one knows this location, but its point concerns those who do not: it enables those unfamiliar with the location to visualise the scene. The narrator uses this technique more often,[9] but here there is an additional motive for the simile. *Gāmāl* means 'camel' in Hebrew, so that the comprison also offers an aetiological explanation for the city's name. Having mentioned the broadest features of the landscape, the narrator gradually zooms in on the town itself: first to the ravines that surround it on all sides, partly made deeper by the besieged people themselves under the leadership of Josephus; then to the houses 'built against the steep mountain flank and astonishingly huddled together', and finally to the southern part of the city, which, by virtue of its greater height, forms a citadel. Then follows another awe-inspiring piece of figurative language: the city 'seems (*eoikuia*) to be suspended in air and to be falling headlong upon itself' (4.7). The narrator also reveals that there is a spring inside the town and, picking up the narrative with an analepsis, he rounds off with the statement that 'Josephus had fortified it with walls and secured it still further by mines and trenches' (4.10).

The description of Gamala is thus clearly selective, as it mainly focuses on the defences of the town and its ability to withstand a siege: since Josephus-the-narrator had himself been in charge of the defences, he looks at Gamala from a general's-eye perspective. At the same time, the narratees get a depiction of the city that may make them agree with Vespasian's assessment that 'the complete investment of the city in such a situation was impossible' (4.12). This observation closely follows

---

[8] Josephus is often selective in his topographical descriptions, which Shahar 2004: 227 connects with Polybius' and Strabo's descriptions.

[9] Cf. other comparisons: the Temple to a snow-clad mountain (*BJ* 5.223); the location of the Temple precinct in relation to the city of Jerusalem to the form of a theatre (*AJ* 15.410); the triumphal procession to a flowing river (*BJ* 7.134, below); the fortress of Herodium to a woman's breast (*AJ* 15.324); two hills close to each other near Baaras/Baaru east of the Dead Sea to the shape of female breasts (*BJ* 7.189).

upon the description. Although the description itself is not focalised by Vespasian, the Roman general and Josephus clearly notice the same features.[10]

Unsurprisingly, what follows after the description of Gamala in 4.4–8 is a drawn-out siege, in which both sides sustain considerable losses. At several points in the narrative of the siege features from the description are mentioned again. For example, when the Romans enter the lower quarter of the city, the inhabitants take refuge high up on the citadel, while the Romans have nowhere to go but to the rooftops of the houses, which after all were built so closely together and which now collapse under their weight (4.22–25). It is clear, then, that the narrator stresses exactly those elements of the topography of Gamala that facilitate the narratees' understanding of the subsequent narrative in military terms.[11] While Josephus partly attributes the Romans' initial failure to capture Gamala to a temporary loss of military discipline (4.17–30; cf. 4.33, 39), he also connects it explicitly with the town's topography (4.44). The end of the story (4.70–83) in particular highlights the military prowess of the Romans: they manage to overcome the impossible geography of the land, and the narratees should admire this feat.

Description, Drama, Message

One of the narrative functions of descriptions in Josephus concerns the articulation of the narrator's message for his narratees in dramatic terms. The back-references to elements from the initial description of Gamala in the subsequent narrative of the siege do not only serve to make sense of the Romans' strategic and military difficulties, but also contribute to the articulation of the motif of tragic reversal, which is a prominent theme in Josephus' narrative. Thus, when the siege begins to weigh heavily on the inhabitants, the earlier picture of a city in which the houses are huddled together is evoked again and contributes to the feeling of chaos in this part of the narrative, where the people 'ran hither and thither in great trepidation' (4.66). Things change even more dramatically when Roman discipline is restored after Titus' return from a visit to Syria

---

[10] Interestingly, in a number of descriptions, especially of locations where he was not present himself, Josephus explicitly takes the perspective of the Roman commanders; see Shahar 2004: 195–198.

[11] Shahar 2004: 215–219.

(4.70). Several elements in the finale of the report of Gamala's capture (4.70–83) cohere closely with the narrator's earlier description of its location and defensive features, in ways which now also give significance to the plight of the Jews. For what follows is a highly dramatic scene, which describes the wholesale slaughter following the capture of the town. First, the mountain flanks on which the houses are built are mentioned again, when the narrator describes how 'the whole city was deluged with blood pouring down the slopes' (*to haima pasan epekluze tēn polin kata pranous kheomenon*, 4.72). Josephus' phrase here can be associated with the image of a sacrificial altar,[12] which adds pathos as well as a symbolic meaning to the narrative. In another complete and bitterly ironic reversal of fortune, the ravines which, the narratees are once more reminded, 'had been excavated to a vast depth beneath the citadel' (4.79) in order to be able better to defend the town, now become a deadly trap and in fact cause the death of many inhabitants, when they plunge into them with their wives and children rather than surrender themselves. This collective suicide caused more than 5,000 casualties, which is actually more than the 4,000 victims that resulted from the fighting itself (4.79–80). The suicide is highlighted by a brief description of the top of the hill on which Gamala was located, which was stony and impassable, and 'towering to an immense height and surrounded with precipices' (4.74). Part of the vocabulary of the description returns in the dramatic brief report about the suicide and together they signal the utter despair of the defeated Jews at Gamala. Thus, the ingredients of the cool description of the advantageous position and defence works of Gamala, the conquering of which brought glory to the Romans, now forms the backdrop to the Jews' misfortune in a scene in which *akribeia* gives way to *enargeia*. No doubt every narratee will be moved by the shocking fate of the Jews, which matches the purpose of a narrator who had made it clear that he would not conceal his own feelings but asked 'indulgence for my compassion' (1.11) with his compatriots.

It has been argued that *The Jewish War* belongs to the 'dramatic', as opposed to a 'pragmatic', tradition of historiography, which can perhaps be traced back to Duris of Samos.[13] And Josephus' descriptions do more often resonate with his interest in dramatic and tragic reversals in ways which suggest that his handling of space is designed to underline this

---

[12] So Parente 2005: 46.

[13] Cf. Chapman 1998 and Parente 2005 on the importance of this tradition to Josephus.

motif. A further example which is worth considering in this context is the elaborate description of the Lake of Gennesareth and the surrounding district. Not only does this description help to glorify Vespasian's and Titus' achievement, but it also plays on the theme of reversal in an innovative way by combining Herodotean and Thucydidean ingredients. The initial description itself reminds one of (→) Herodotus' descriptions of exotic and strange countries or regions. Josephus draws attention to the unique species of fish that live in the lake and to the strange fact that the river Jordan runs straight through the middle of it (3.508–509). Josephus even includes a short excursus on the sources of the river Jordan at this point. The surrounding district, which is 'remarkable for its natural properties and beauty' (*thaumastē phusin te kai kallos*, 3.516), supplies all kinds of fruit for no less than ten months a year and is being watered by a spring which some hold to be a branch of the Nile (3.519–520). The appeal to marvels (*thaumata*) and the source-reference to the Nile may build on Herodotus' description of Egypt.[14]

The Herodotean flavour of the description of Lake Gennesareth, high-lighting its unique features, is especially relevant in connection with Vespasian's role in the pacification of the Jewish territory. It strengthens the impression that Vespasian managed, through an important war of conquest, to turn an exotic nation at the edge of the inhabited world into a well-ordered Roman province. Such a conquest considerably furthered Vespasian's claim on the imperial throne. The Flavian triumph celebrated afterwards in Rome is well-known from another passage in Josephus as well as other sources.[15] The erection of several buildings in Rome, including two triumphal arches and the Temple of Peace, made that the victory was commemorated by many up to the present day.

However, after this initial description, in which the lake is described in terms of a *locus amoenus* of sorts, the lake assumes an altogether different and contrasting significance, as it highlights the misery of the conquered Jews. For in the next section of the narrative a full-scale naval battle is fought on Lake Gennesareth (3.522–531), which is described in terms which are, perhaps, reminiscent of Thucydides. The lake now forms the backdrop to the greatest horrors (3.529–531) and an anonymous witness

---

[14] Josephus underpins this connection by referring to the coracin fish (*korakinos*), which was also found in the 'See of Alexandria' (i.e. Lake Mareotis; *BJ* 3.520; likewise Strabo 17.2.4). The Nile is prominent in the description of Egypt in Herodotus' book 2 (see especially 2.1–34; Egypt is 'the gift of the river', 2.5; cf. 2.14, 17).

[15] *BJ* 7.123–157; Suetonius *Vesp*. 8.1; *Tit*. 6.1; Cassius Dio 66.7.1. See Beard 2003 and Millar 2005.

is invoked to take in the scene: 'one could see (*ēn … idein*) the whole lake red with blood and covered with corpses, for not a man escaped' (3.529).[16] As in similar pathetic scenes, Josephus uses *opsis* and *thea* vocabulary to make his narrative as vivid as possible.[17]

What is noted of Lake Gennesareth is also true for the entirety of the Galilee: when Vespasian advances from Antioch to the Galilee at the beginning of the war, this district, and, less extensively, Peraea, Samaria, Judaea and the Kingdom of Agrippa are described (3.35–58). Josephus acknowledges that his description is 'as brief as possible' (*hōs enēn malista suntomōs*, 3.58), but from what he does include the narratees get the impression of a fertile land, abundant with crops and people. The narrator's sense of pity and loss is palpable when 'Galilee from end to end became a scene of fire and blood' during the war (3.63).

Contrasting Romans and Jews through Space

The preceding discussion has already suggested how Josephus as narrator often handles space in order to articulate the contrast between the two opposing sides in *The Jewish War*. One particular motif connected with space, Roman discipline, helps to underpin this contrast. Roman discipline, a running theme in the *War* together with the contrasting motif of civil discord among the Jews (e.g. *BJ* 1.10, 25, 27, 31),[18] strongly contributed to the final outcome of the war in Josephus' presentation. In a long excursus on the organization of the Roman army (*BJ* 3.64–109), Josephus elaborates on the set-up of the Roman camp. Its orderly appearance is emphasised more than anything else in this description and since Josephus is prone to deduce the character of people from what they have built, the passage clearly has a characterizing function:

> The interior of the camp is divided into rows of tents. The exterior circuit presents the appearance of a wall and is furnished with towers at regular intervals (*ex isou diastēmatos*) … In this surrounding walls are set four gates, one on each side … The camp is intersected by streets symmetrically (*eudiathetōs*) laid out; in the middle are the tents of the officers, and precisely in the centre (*mesaitaton*) the headquarters of the commander-in-chief.   (3.79–82)

---

[16] For naval battles in Thucydides, see e.g. Hirschfeld 1996. The narrative of the battle in the great harbour of Syracuse (Th. 7.69–72) is also partly focalized through witnesses, viz. the armies on shore (71).

[17] See Chapman 2005 for a thorough study of this aspect of *The Jewish War*.

[18] Price 1992: 1–27; S. Mason 2005: 76–78.

The orderly behaviour of the Romans also becomes apparent from the narrative itself, for example from the description of Titus' army as it marches on Jerusalem (5.47–50). From a fixed scenic standpoint, the narrator describes the train of the army as it passes by, each division in turn. Another glance of the Roman army in all its splendour is offered when Titus orders a review of the troops in order to intimidate the besieged inhabitants of Jerusalem:

> The area in front of the city gleamed far and wide with silver and gold, and nothing was more gratifying to the Romans or more awe-inspiring to the enemy than that spectacle (*tēs opseōs ekeinēs*). For the whole of the old wall and the north side of the Temple were thronged with spectators, the houses across the wall were to be seen (*ēn … huperidein*) packed with craning heads, and there was not a spot visible (*diephaineto*) in the whole city which was not covered by the crowd.   (5.351–352)

Again, the narratees are told what they could have seen, if they had been there and taken the narrator's panoramic view of the opposing sides on the plain and in the city. He does not have the description focalised by the people on the walls (cf. Homer's teichoscopia), but the dismay felt by the onlookers is mentioned immediately afterwards.

Contrasted with these displays of Roman military discipline is the factitiousness of the besieged inhabitants of Jerusalem.[19] One faction within Jerusalem, the Zealots, takes control of the Temple precinct as their base of operations. Josephus accuses them of 'turning the Temple of God into their stronghold and refuge from popular upheavals, and making the Holy Place the center of their tyranny' (4.151). In Josephus' eyes the improper use of the Temple is blasphemous and contributes to the downfall of Jerusalem. For during the civil strife, the Temple is 'defiled with carnage at every corner' (5.10) and the victims 'sprinkled the altar with their own blood' (5.17). Josephus even addresses Jerusalem directly in an indignant apostrophe in which he once again contrasts Romans and Jews:

> Most wretched city! What have you suffered from the Romans to compare with this, when they entered the gates to purify with fire the abominations of your sons? For you were no longer the dwelling place of God, nor could you continue after you became a cemetery for the bodies of your own sons and the Temple had been transformed into a burial ground for the victims of civil war! …   (5.19)

---

[19] See *SAGN* 2: 217.

Elsewhere, too, Josephus shows himself sensitive to the improper use of places, and associates this with the theme of civil discord.[20] The association of a central city with an army camp is also found in *BJ* 4.586, where Josephus notes that Vitellius 'turned the whole of Rome into an army camp and filled every house with armed men'. It can hardly be a coincidence that Vitellius is later murdered 'in the heart of Rome' (*epi mesēs tēs Rōmēs*, 4.652). An implicit parallel between the civil strife in Rome and Jerusalem is also drawn when Sabinus, Vespasian's brother, fights 'from the temple' on the Capitol—the only hill of Rome mentioned by Josephus—, only to lose the hill to Vitellius and his German soldiers (4.648). The mirror image of the Jews fighting the Romans from the Temple in Jerusalem is hardly auspicious. By contrast, Vespasian's rapturous reception in Rome, elicits a different and more favourable comparison from the narrator: 'The whole city was filled, like a temple, with garlands and incense' (7.71).

Perspective: The Centrality of Jerusalem

Let us return to Josephus' picture of Jerusalem as it used to be before the war broke out and before it was turned into 'a desolate no man's land' (5.25). The description of Jerusalem in book 5 of the *War* (5.136–247) is the most elaborate description in Josephus. As in the case of Gamala, it is presented when Titus and his army have advanced to the city. However, unlike other descriptions of cities in Josephus, the description of Jerusalem appears in the past tense. This tense is probably selected to indicate that the city described does not exist anymore at the time of narrating, but at the same time it enables us to interpret the passage as a frame, conveying a personal memory of Josephus himself (5.182).[21] This implies that Josephus' motivation for relating it goes beyond the aim to provide the narratees with the necessary background information about the upcoming battle, although it does fulfil that function too, especially its first part. The description starts in a way that can also be observed

---

[20] E.g. *BJ* 2.15, 42–44, 47–50; *AJ* 17.259–264. Other authors, too, emphasise the unnatural behaviour of space when the proper order is upset; cf. Hom. *Il.* 21.218–221, where the river Scamander complains about his lovely streams being defiled by corpses, or the messenger-speech on the murder of Neoptolemus in the temple of Delphi in E. *Andr.* 1085–1165.

[21] Similarly in Josephus' brief description of the Temple in *Against Apion* 2.102–109 (102–107). See also *SAGN* 2: 214 and cf. the use of the imperfect in (part of the) descriptions in (→) Homer, (→) Apollonius of Rhodes, (→) Herodotus.

elsewhere in Josephus: the narrator starts with the periphery and moves over to the centre.[22] Josephus first mentions the geographical setting of the city on two hills and a valley in between (5.136) and then continues to outline the circuit of its three walls.[23] This section stands out because the description is told in great detail. The first and oldest wall, for example, is described as follows:

> Beginning on the north (*kata borran*) at the tower called Hippicus, it extended to the Xystus, and then joining the council-chamber terminated at the western portico of the Temple. Beginning at the same point in the other direction, westward (*kata thatera … pros dusin*), it descended past the place called Bethso to the gate of the Essenes, then southwards (*pros noton*) above the fountain of Siloam; thence it again inclined to the east (*ekklinon pros anatolēn*) towards Solomon's pool and after passing a spot which they call Ophlas, finally joined the eastern portico of the Temple.
>
> (*BJ* 5.144–145)

One function of the wealth of details with which this wall is described is that it affords Josephus the possibility to introduce a number of topographical spots which will be the focal points of the fighting in the continuation of the narrative. The mention of such clearly recognizable spots from time to time gives a Homeric touch to the narrative. For example, when the Romans retreat after one of their assaults, 'the Jews still followed and kept them under fire as far as the tomb of Helena' (5.119). One may compare the retreat of the Trojans (*Il.* 11.166–168): 'The Trojans swept back over the middle of the plain, past the grave-mound made in the olden days for Ilus son of Dardanus and past the wild fig-tree'.

Upon this outline of the walls follows a description of the three biggest towers in the wall. Here, the rhetoric of the passage starts to become more obvious. The towers have been built by king Herod and they are 'for magnitude, beauty and strength … without equal in the world' (5.161).[24] Like the Roman army camp, the towers are indicative of their builder's character, who projected onto them 'his innate magnanimity and his pride in the city', and naming them after his brother, his wife and a friend, 'gratified his private feelings' by building them (5.162). The identification

---

[22] See the description of Gamala discussed above. Josephus' description of the Temple in *AJ* 15.380–425 displays a more complex technique, going from the centre to the periphery and vice versa. Cf. Shahar 2004: 232–235.

[23] The organization of the entire description closely matches (→) Herodotus' survey of Babylon.

[24] Cf. Josephus' claim that Caesarea's harbour was bigger than the harbour of Piraeus (*BJ* 1.410; see n. 30). For Herod as builder, see Roller 1998 and Netzer 2006.

between the buildings and the persons after whom they are named is made explicit in the case of the tower Mariamme, which Herod meant to 'surpass in decoration those named after men, as they outdid the woman's tower in strength' (5.170–171). More superlatives are used when the narrator moves to the buildings within the wall, first of all Herod's palace. In explicit comments we are told that 'it baffled all description' (*pantos logou kreissōn*, 5.176), that 'the interior fittings are indescribable' (5.178) and that 'it is impossible adequately to delineate the palace' (5.182), a forceful proliferation of the 'indescriptability' topos. When the narrator reflects how all this beauty was lost in a fire started by conspirators within the walls, 'the memory is harrowing' (*pherei basanon hē mnēmē*, 5.182).

Finally, the narrator turns his attention to the Temple itself and the attached fortress of Antonia, where the fire that destroys it will start. He describes it at the height of its splendour, as it appeared after Herod had rebuilt it.[25] Gradually zooming in, the narrator guides an anonymous witness (cf. 5.193 *proïontōn*, 'when people go in') from the outer courts through the inner courts and finally into the Temple itself. He ends with a description of the altar, the officiating priests and even the high priest's garments. Measures are given throughout, the functions of each part are clarified and the costly materials are mentioned time and again, with an emphasis on colour and the shining of metal surfaces. For example, the exterior of the Temple which 'wanted nothing that could astound either mind or eye' is said 'to have appeared to approaching strangers from a distance like a snow-clad mountain', while people close to it had to avert their eyes because they were blinded by the gleaming gold with which it was covered (5.222–223).

The function of the elaborate description of Jerusalem in book 5 is to enhance the narratees' awareness of the magnitude of the insurgents' crimes in defiling the Temple, of what is at stake when the siege of Jerusalem begins and of what was lost when the Temple burnt down because of a fire started by the Jews themselves. Josephus has at least preserved its memory. The final glimpse in *The Jewish War* that we get of the city, now razed to the ground by Titus, also contrasts its former grandeur with its pitiable present state. It is offered in a flashback of Titus (7.112–113), one of the few instances where space is focalised by a character in the *War*:

---

[25] Cf. Josephus' descriptions of the Temple in *AJ* 15.380–425 and *Against Apion* 2.102–109.

> On his way he [Titus] visited Jerusalem, and contrasting the sorry scene of desolation before his eyes with the former splendour of the city, and calling to mind the grandeur of its ruined buildings and their pristine beauty, he commiserated its destruction.   (7.112)

In this brief frame Titus sees the ruins, but also recalls Jerusalem's former splendour.

Obviously, Jerusalem is of central importance in Josephus' narrative for thematic reasons, but the city also forms the centre of Josephus' geographical system. Josephus underpins the centrality of Jerusalem by using space as a narratological tool and by differentiating between profane and sacred space. The description of the Temple in *AJ* 15.380–425 is a case in point. Josephus' description moves from the periphery to the centre and back, and indicates in this way that the area of the sanctuary of 'the greatest God' (15.385) within the Temple precinct is the most holy place in the world. First he takes a panoramic viewpoint on the Temple as if he was standing on one of the hills nearby and then he zooms in on the Temple's highlights, starting with the foundations of the sanctuary and a description of this building (15.391–395). Then he moves over to the outside of the complex with the double porticoes along the exterior walls, 'the greatest work heard about by humans' (15.396). In 15.397 he once again changes the perspective by focusing on Herod's adaptation of the Temple Mount in order to create several platforms, moving from the outside to the inside again, the area around the sanctuary (15.397–401). At 15.402–417 Josephus' focus is on the exterior Temple complex (note the switch in the vocabulary from *naos* to *hieron* in 402), describing the outside from various angles: the Antonia fortress at the northwest corner, the west side with its four gates as well as the south side with its two gates and Herod's magnificent Royal Portico, described in great detail (15.411–416). From 15.417 Josephus zooms in once again, moving from one precinct to the other towards the sanctuary at the centre, going from one concentric circle to another and ending with the Priestly Court in front of the sanctuary, where the sacrifices took place. This zooming-in by the narrator goes hand in hand with a differentiation of levels of holiness of the spaces referred to, which implies that the sanctuary itself was the most holy place (417–419): '… Further within this precinct [i.e. the area within the walls around the sanctuary] was the sacred area (*to hieron*), which was inaccessible to women. And deeper inside this precinct was a third precinct, into which only the priests were allowed to enter. The sanctuary was within this (precinct) and in front of it was an altar on which we used to bring the burnt-offerings to God.'

The notion that the sanctuary of Jerusalem's Temple was the most holy centre of a series of concentric circles of holiness is also reflected by other passages in Josephus. In *BJ* 5.207 Josephus indicates that the sanctuary was roughly in the middle of the Temple complex (*ho naos kata meson keimenos*) and in *Against Apion* 1.198 he notes that the Temple was 'roughly in the middle of the city' (*kata meson*), which must be taken symbolically.[26] The final part of the Temple section in *AJ* 15 expresses Josephus' theological claim implied by this geographical universe. Josephus reports that the sanctuary was rebuilt in one year and five months (15.421), an amazingly short time made possible because God prevented rainfall during the day (15.425). This ties in with the narrator's message, implicit in the *War* and explicit in the *Antiquities*, that God ultimately determines the course of events in Josephus' narrative. Jerusalem with God's Temple is the centre of Josephus' universe even after the city's actual destruction.

Rome in Judaea, Judaea in Rome

Disappointingly for modern historians, Josephus devotes only half a sentence to the formation of the Roman province Judaea in 6 CE (*BJ* 2.117).[27] But this does not mean that Josephus does not regard this moment as a crucial change in the history of the Jews; he devotes ample attention, for example, to the corrupt behaviour of several of the Roman governors of Judaea as a factor which contributed to the outbreak of the war. And it can indeed be argued that in the first book of the *War* Josephus has already told the story of the romanisation of Judaea in a much more evocative way than a detailed digression on its new legal status ever could—through space. Towards the end of the first book (1.401–428) Josephus surveys the realm of king Herod the Great. This passage is found when Herod is at the height of his power, after he has supposedly been installed as procurator of Syria by Augustus and has been assigned in addition all the territory between the Trachonitis and the Galilee.[28] The passage is introduced by a chronological marker referring to Herod's 15th year of reign, which is followed by a brief report

---

[26] See also *BJ* 5.227; *Against Apion* 2.102–104; also *Mishna Tractate Kelim* 1.6–8.

[27] Cf. *AJ* 17.355; 18.1–2, where Josephus states that Judaea became an annex to the province of Syria.

[28] Cf. *AJ* 15.360. Several scholars doubt the historicity of Herod having acted as a procurator.

about Herod's renovation of the Temple (1.401). At first sight, the passage, focalised by the narrator, takes us in a seemingly haphazard fashion from Jerusalem to other inland places in Judaea, Samaria and the Galilee, to the coastal towns and then to more remote places within Herod's realm, which reminds one of the description of the Persian empire that Herodotus offers after Darius has taken over the Persian throne (3.89 ff.), and Josephus' occasional switch into the present tense gives the passage the air of an excursus. It is significant, however, that the passage focuses not so much on the extent of the realm as on Herod's building activities. After the reference to the Temple, the centre of Josephus' geographic construction of the world, he continues by listing other building activities by Herod, mixing the narrative with descriptive elements. Josephus clearly lumps all of Herod's building activities together.[29] His purpose in doing so becomes clear when one realizes that the Herodian buildings to which Josephus devotes most attention are those that have clear Roman connotations: he mentions temples, theatres, the institution of athletic games and numerous buildings that are named after members of the Roman imperial household. The building of Caesarea Maritima, at the location of Straton's Tower, is a case in point (1.408–415). The largest tower of its hypermodern harbour was named Drusium after Augustus' stepson (1.412).[30] On a mound opposite the harbour was Augustus' temple located, remarkable for its beauty and size (1.414). The other building projects, comprising an amphitheatre, a theatre and market places, were built in 'a manner worthy of the city's name [i.e. Caesarea]' (1.415). 'In short', Josephus concludes, 'one can mention no suitable spot within his realm, which he [Herod] left destitute of some mark of homage to Caesar' (1.407). The narrative suggests in this way that already long before the Roman invasion of Vespasian and Titus typically Roman spaces had entered the Jewish territories.[31]

---

[29] This is very different from the Herod narrative in books 15–17 of the *Antiquities*, where Herod's building activities and descriptions of these buildings are interspersed among the narrative sections.

[30] Josephus compares the size of Caesarea's harbour with the harbour of Piraeus (*AJ* 15.332), which reflects an Aegean perspective, cf. (→) Herodotus. In *BJ* 1.410 he indicates there that Caesarea's harbour was even bigger than Piraeus, which is a gross overstatement.

[31] The question remains whether Herod's kingdom in its entirety was considered Jewish territory by Josephus. In *BJ* 1.407 Josephus notes that Herod filled his homeland with temples. In the *Antiquities* Josephus seems to have a more nuanced view on this, because in 15.328–329 he suggests that Caesarea and Banias were not part of the Jewish territories because the Jews would not have tolerated Herod building non-Jewish sanctuaries.

The narrator suggests in this way that the beginning of the war is in no small measure the follow-up of an ongoing romanisation started by Herod and carried through by later administrators. Pontius Pilate aroused the anger of his Jewish subjects by introducing Roman standards with effigies into Jerusalem, the most holy part of the Jewish territory (2.169–174; cf. *AJ* 18.55–59).[32] Caligula went even a step further by demanding that statues of himself be placed in the sanctuary of the Temple (*BJ* 2.185). The theme of the improper use of space returns here.

At the very end of the war, after the Jews had been defeated, the process is reversed and Judaea enters Rome. Nowhere is this clearer than in the elaborate description which perhaps more than any other passage earns Flavius Josephus a place in a history of the use of space in ancient Greek literature: the ekphrasis of the triumphal celebrations over the capture of Judaea by the newly installed Flavian dynasts—the most detailed description of a triumph to have survived from antiquity (7.123–157).[33] Except for the beginning and the end (123–130; 153–157), where the narrator directs his gaze to the starting and end point of the parade respectively, he takes his place among the crowds in 'the theatres' (*tōn theatrōn*), from where 'the view' (*hē thea*) is easiest (7.131). Even from this fixed scenic standpoint he finds it 'impossible to give a satisfactory account' (7.132) of all that passes before him, 'like a flowing river' (7.134). By far most space is devoted to the stages passing by and finally to the spoils of the Jerusalem Temple. The passage is worth to be quoted at length:

> For many [of the stages] were enveloped in tapestries interwoven with gold, and all had a framework of gold and wrought ivory. The war was shown by numerous representations (*mimēmatōn*), in separate sections, affording a very vivid picture (*enargestatēn opsin*) of its episodes. Here was to be seen (*ēn … horan*) a prosperous country devastated, there whole battalions of the enemy slaughtered; here a party in flight, there others led into captivity; walls of surpassing compass demolished by engines, strong fortresses overpowered, cities with well-manned defences completely mastered and an army pouring within the ramparts, an area all

---

[32] According to Josephus, the Jews were most sensitive to the introduction of foreign religious practices in Jerusalem, as the narrative about Herod's building of a theatre with trophies in honour of Augustus in Jerusalem suggests (*AJ* 15.267–291); see van Henten 2008.

[33] Cf. Eberhardt 2005; Millar 2005. Both consider the description in connection with what is known from other sources about the religious and topographical aspects of the ceremony.

deluged with blood, the hands of those incapable of resistance raised in supplication, temples set on fire, houses pulled down over their owners' heads, and, after general desolation and woe, rivers flowing, not over a cultivated land, nor supplying drink to man and beast, but across a country still on every side in flames. For to such sufferings were the Jews destined when they plunged into the war; and the art and magnificent workmanship of these structures now portrayed the incidents to those who had not witnessed them, as though they were happening before their eyes (*tois ouk idousi ginomena tot' edeiknuen hōs parousi*). … The spoils in general were borne in promiscuous heaps; but conspicuous above all stood out those captured in the Temple at Jerusalem: a golden table, many talents in weight, and a lampstand, likewise made of gold, but constructed on a different pattern of those we use in ordinary life. Affixed to a pedestal was a central shaft, from which there extended slender branches, arranged trident-fashion, a wrought lamp being attached to the extremity of each branch; of these there were seven, indicating the honour paid to that number among the Jews. After these, and last of the spoils, was carried a copy of the Jewish Law.   (*BJ* 7.141–150)

Part of the spoils of the Temple are then placed in the newly constructed Temple of Peace, alongside those from other conquered nations, so that at a single glance visitors can see objects for the sight of which they previously had to travel across the world. Another part of the spoils is taken to the palace for safekeeping (7.160–162). The placing of holy objects from the Temple in Jerusalem in a temple in Rome and in the palace marks the completion of the conquest with a poignant finality: the remnants of Jerusalem and its Temple from now on only exist in Rome itself,[34] just like Titus was the only character in *The Jewish War* to preserve the memory of Jerusalem apart from the narrator.

The *tableaux vivants* presented in the procession may be interpreted as the visual counterpart of Josephus' story: in a summary form, the narratees are reminded of all the walls, fortresses, cities and features of the conquered land about which they have just been reading. Specific references may perhaps be found in the tableau on which is depicted 'an area all deluged with blood' (*panta phonou plēthonta*), which may remind the narratees of Josephus' own graphic description of the conquest of Gamala.[35] And the 'country on every side in flames' is reminiscent of

---

[34] Cf. Eberhardt 2005 on the relevance of the statement that some of the Temple spoils were 'kept safe' in the palace.

[35] Cf. also *BJ* 6.259, where a stream of blood flows down from the steps of the sanctuary.

the way the narrator described the fate of the Galilee. The emphasis on spectacle and the use of vocabulary denoting visual sensation also return here, just like in crucial places in the narrative: the Roman spectators in the theatre may be emotionally affected by the *tableaux* to the same degree as the narratees by Josephus' narrative, 'as if they had been there themselves' (7.146).

Yet, despite these parallels between Josephus' own narrative and the description of the triumph, some readers have been struck more by the discrepancies between the two: the rather elated, indeed 'triumphal', tone dissonates with the pity for his fellow Jews and the fate of their Temple which Josephus musters elsewhere. While in administering blame Josephus is normally careful to differentiate between several groups of Jews, here the entire nation is blamed for plunging the country into war; Josephus even refers to the Jews collectively as 'the enemy' (*polemiōn*, 7.143).[36] However, a different interpretation of Josephus' apparently aloof attitude is also possible. According to this view, the narrator does not merely sit beside the Roman spectators, but has them focalise the objects carried during the triumphal procession. Not only his use of 'the enemy' is consistent with such a focalisation, but also the lack of specificity with which places in Judaea are singled out. We hear of 'a city' and of several 'temples', but nothing of Jotapata, Gamala or Jerusalem, or of *the* Temple: the Romans were perhaps not quite familiar enough with the topography of Judaea to see more clearly what exactly was depicted.[37] The focalisation by the Roman audience may also apply to the description of the spoils from the Temple. At least, the idea that the seven lamps branching off the menorah 'indicate the honour accorded to that number by the Jews' is vague enough to give the impression that this is the kind of rumour about 'strange' Jewish habits that may have been current among the Roman populace. At any rate, in Josephus' own description of the Temple, he is much more specific, and claims that the seven lamps of the Menorah 'symbolised the planets' (5.217). In turn, the descriptions of the Menorah focalised by the Roman populace and by the narrator both contrast with the description of the same object focalised by

---

[36] Cf. especially Rajak 2002: 218–219.

[37] The pictures themselves were presumably specific: cf. the depicted incidents of the civil war in Caesar's triumph as narrated by Appian: the Romans were capable of recognizing Caesar's Roman adversaries—and disapproved (App. *BC* 2.101). We see here, then, the return of the presentation of the war against the Jews as a war of foreign conquest.

Pompey, who more than a century before was the first Roman to lay eyes on it: he had entered the Temple and 'gazed' (*etheasato*) at what was inside: a lampstand and lamps, a table and vessels for libation and censers, all of solid gold, a mass of spices and of consecrated money amounting to two thousand talents' (1.152). The Roman general does not know at all how to interpret the objects.

We still need to explain why Josephus allows this hostile perception of the Jews to take up so much space in his narrative. Perhaps, Josephus-the-narrator wishes to suggest that the Romans have a lot to learn from his account of the war: his Roman narratees may—in that case—have grasped the significance of what happened and understood better what they may have seen during the triumph after reading Josephus' *Jewish War*. From this perspective, the description of the triumphal procession indirectly establishes Josephus' authority as narrator.

Conclusion

Josephus mainly engages with the narratological category of space in set descriptions, which are often set apart from the narrative, but sometimes Josephus intermingles narrative and description. By being selective in his descriptions and by applying several registers belonging to military and ethnographic historiography, he makes these descriptions relevant to the surrounding narrative. Descriptions are furthermore used to emphasise certain thematic strands of the narrative, like the military genius of the Romans, the civil discord among their Jewish adversaries, and the theme of tragic reversal. An interesting motif in this respect is that the character of people can be deduced from the spaces they are involved in or even create. The full significance of descriptions often becomes clear only as the narrative moves along and several details from the descriptions are picked up again. Josephus on the whole describes space from his own point of view, thus enhancing his authority, and he does this mostly from a panoramic standpoint. However, a small number of highly significant descriptions are focalised by characters, while at crucial moments in the narrative Josephus often takes trouble to invest his narrative with *enargeia*, using vocabulary related to visual perception and having recourse to figurative language and anonymous witnesses to describe places.

APPIAN

L.V. Pitcher

Introduction: A Very Big House in the Country

> As for Rufus, he possessed a handsome mansion near that of Fulvia, the wife of Antony, which she had wanted to buy, but he would not sell it, and although he now offered it to her as a free gift, he was proscribed. His head was brought to Antony, who said it did not concern him and sent it to his wife. She ordered that it be fastened to the front of his own house instead of the rostra. Another man had a very handsome and well-shaded country-place in which was a beautiful and deep grotto, on account of which probably he was proscribed. He was taking the air in this grotto when the murderers were observed by a slave, as they were coming towards him, but still some distance off. The slave conveyed him to the innermost recess of the grotto, dressed himself in his master's short tunic, pretended that he was the man and simulated alarm, and would have been killed on the spot had not one of his fellow slaves exposed the trick.[1]   (*BC* 4.29)

The passage above is taken from the account of the triumviral proscriptions in 43–42 BCE which dominates the fourth book of Appian's *Civil Wars*. The spaces of these two neighbouring anecdotes, brief as they are, invite attention. During these dark days for Rome, Rufus' 'handsome mansion' rewards its owner only with decapitation. In the next story, Appian characteristically escalates the contrasts. The identity of this victim is subordinate to the desirable space with which he is associated: 'another man had a very handsome and well-shaded country-place in which was a beautiful and deep grotto'.[2] The adjectives here, seemingly ornamental, are anything but. The beauty of the country-place

---

[1] The text and translations of Appian used throughout this chapter are based on those in H. White 1912–1913, but with substantial alterations at some points in the interests of exactitude. I use 'Appian' as shorthand for 'the Appian narrator'.

[2] For the culture of the estate, compare Griffin 1985: 6–7.

and mansion, high-lighted in the Greek,[3] damns their owner; the shade of the place and the depth of the grotto almost deliver him. We note that the description of the drama that follows, focalized by the loyal servant, looks out *from* this idyllic, threatened locale at the invading killers: 'the murderers were observed by a slave, as they were coming towards him, but still some distance off'. As often in his account of the proscriptions, Appian describes events from the perspective of the victims.

The thematic deployment of place and space here is striking enough in isolation. There is profit, however, in reading it against the background of Appian's wider treatment of these matters. In this regard, a particularly striking detail is the fate of Rufus' head. Antony cedes further responsibility for this to his wife, who orders that 'it be fastened to the front of his own house rather than the rostra'. This addition neatly wrong-foots the incautious narratee. The obvious implication is that Fulvia transgresses, here, against the propriety of place. The rostra, surely, are the correct spot on which to display the heads of the proscribed. The 'rather than …' clause makes this clear.

But matters are not so simple. In fact, Appian exposes here the speed with which one becomes habituated to horror. The sentence implies that there is a 'correct' place to hang the strange fruit of proscription. As Appian is careful to stress elsewhere, though, any notion of a correct place for such trophies is a pernicious fantasy. Consider the rhetoric he gives to Cassius just before the battles at Philippi: 'In the forum, where the head of an enemy was never carried, but only captured arms and the beaks of ships, the heads of those who were lately consuls, praetors, tribunes, aediles, and knights are exhibited' (*BC* 4.95). Fulvia, in displaying the head of Rufus outside Rufus' own home rather than in the forum, is transgressing against a norm which should not itself exist.

The subtleties do not end there. This is not the only time in Appian's account of this period's history when Antony and houses is accorded prominence. In fact, the repeated treatment of his domicile is unique in Appian's extant narrative. Where other private houses appear in the *Roman History*, they usually serve only as a backdrop for the death or danger of their owners. They are demolished to indicate the ascendancy

---

[3] According to Famerie 1993: 1080, Appian uses the superlative of the adjective *kalos* and its associated adverb only five times in all his extant oeuvre, including here.

of the tenant's rivals;[4] they are a place of refuge (successful or, more typically, otherwise) in the event of the owner's physical peril;[5] sometimes they are the site of that owner's death.[6] The house of Antonius is unusual in that it functions as a symbolic embodiment of its proprietor's secure power. The women of Rome are turned away from its doors when they seek succour there (*BC* 4.32);[7] and, where others may attempt to barricade themselves in their homes, Appian even, on occasion, characterizes Antonius' abode as more akin to a fortress: 'All citizens closed their doors and prepared for defence on their roofs; Antonius fortified (*ōkhurou*) his house' (*BC* 2.118).[8] The house symbolizes the situation that Appian announced before, in the introduction to the first book of his *Civil Wars*. The triumvirs have carved up Roman hegemony as if it belonged to them: 'the Roman empire was partitioned, as though it had been their private property, by these three men' (*BC* 1.5).

The proscriptions of Rufus and the nameless grotto-owner take up only a fleeting moment in Appian's account of Roman history. The historian's treatment of space in narrating them is instructive. Some of the effects Appian achieves work in isolation: one notes the adjectives he presses into service as he describes the fatal beauty of the grotto. But others, like the significance of Antonius' house, depend for their effect on iteration and development across the wider narrative. The handling of places and spaces is not just an unavoidable technical challenge for Appian, as it is for any other historiographer; it is key to the unique character of his *Roman History*. Nowhere is this clearer than in his general preface.

---

[4] *Mith.* 51; *BC* 1.73, 81 (Sulla); 2.15 (Cicero); 3.95 (Quintus Gallius). The orator Hortensia invokes the demolition of a rival's house as a characteristic act of political strife at *BC* 4.32.

[5] *BC* 2.15 (Domitius Ahenobarbus), 118 (Roman citizens after Caesar's assassination).

[6] *BC* 1.20 (Scipio Aemilianus), 95 (unnamed victims of the Sullan proscriptions); 4.6 (unnamed victims of the triumviral proscriptions).

[7] Compare also *BC* 4.14, where Antony makes a point about the political pecking order by taking his time before allowing Octavian entrance to his newly-acquired garden, once the property of Pompeius Magnus.

[8] Compare also *BC* 3.50, where Cicero and his supporters adduce this as evidence for the monarchic ambitions of Antonius.

Full Circle

> Intending to write the history of the Romans, I have deemed it necessary
> to draw up the boundaries of all the peoples whom they rule. They are
> as follows: in the Ocean they rule most of the Britons; to one that enters
> through the pillars of Heracles into this sea and that sails around again to
> the same Pillars they rule all islands, and all the main-lands that run down
> to the sea.   (*Praef.* 1)

The very first words of Appian's work declare a geographical survey of
the bounds of Roman rule to be necessary (*anagkaion*) to the historian's
enterprise. Appian does not spell out at once the grounds for this 'neces-
sity', and the narratee might be excused for not seeing it as self-evident.
Why is it so important for someone who intends to write about the past
of the Romans to begin with a survey of how large their dominion is at
the time of writing?

   The insistence is all the more puzzling because the specificities of
geography are not, in the subsequent work, matters which seem to have
an urgent hold on this narrator's attention. The catalogue of Appian's
apparent confusions and implausibilities in geography is a lengthy one,
even if some of them may be explained by corruption in his manuscripts
or propaganda in his sources. We may note as particularly striking his
conviction that Saguntum was located north, rather than south, of the
Ebro (*Hisp.* 7), and that the town was to be identified with Carthago
Nova (*Hisp.* 12);[9] his statement that Palmyra was located 'not far from
the Euphrates' (*BC* 5.9);[10] his misidentification of the Alor as the Apsus
in his account of the prelude to the battle of Pharsalus (*BC* 2.56); and
the peculiarities involved in his account of Philippi (*BC* 4.88).[11] By any
reckoning, this is no small haul of error.[12]

   An explanation for this opening geographical emphasis emerges only
after Appian's initial catalogue is complete. The magnitude of Rome's
present holdings validates the historian's enterprise: 'no empire down to
the present time ever attained to such size and duration' (*Praef.* 8). The
Roman empire is important because it has successfully been bigger for
longer than any other. Appian's insistence on its bounds thus might be

---

[9] See also J.S. Richardson 2000: 5–6.

[10] For an explanation of what may be going on here, see Hekster and Kaizer 2004.

[11] The likely route of Cassius and Brutus is reversed. See also Gowing 1992: appen-
dix 4.

[12] Janni 1984: 114.

mistaken for a simple instance of that *amplificatio* in which the classical historians abound;[13] 'the primary elements that Herodotus bequeathed to later historians were the use of superlatives, mostly of size and magnitude, and a comparison with previous events or deeds by which the unique greatness of the present history is brought out in relief'.[14]

However, there is more going on here than simple self-congratulation on the majesty of the narrator's subject. Once again, attention to the nuances of Appian's expression pays dividends. The very opening of the work is a case in point. The perspective on which we are being invited to rely in this sentence is not, in fact, that of the narrative voice. Rather, it is that of the anonymous traveller, existing only, as here, in the form of dative participles (*espleonti*—'for one that sails in'; *peripleonti*—'for one that sails round'), so familiar from the traditions of the *periplous* (→ Herodotus). Appian presses this venerable figure into service to put the mechanisms of the *periplous* at the service of his celebration of Rome's vast dominions. (We may note, too, that Appian takes the opportunity to locate his narrator and his narratees as creatures of the Mediterranean. The anonymous traveller is heading into 'this' sea (*tēnde tēn thalassan*) through the pillars of Heracles.)

But this familiar figure is not the only traveller of the preface. The dative singular participles persist into the beginning of Appian's catalogue. We find the historian speaking of one that 'turns his course' and 'passes round' when he starts his description of Syria and Palaestine (*Praef.* 2: *epistrephonti … periionti*). As the catalogue progresses, however, the perspective insensibly shifts from that of the anonymous individual traveller to that of the collective dominant Romans. A key moment here is the description of Roman authority around the Black Sea: 'Crossing from these coasts *they* rule other nations around the Euxine' (*Praef.* 3). The subject of the participle of motion, 'crossing' (*perasantes*), is no longer the anonymised traveller from earlier in the text but 'they', the Romans. The participle that denotes movement through space is no longer the present of the traveller who is simply observing what is happening as he goes by; it is now aorist. The Romans here, in contrast to the anonymous voyager, have done their travelling; in the present time, the name of their game is ruling (*arkhousi*) instead.

---

[13] Herkommer 1968: 165–171 and Marincola 1997: 34–43. See also Pitcher 2012.
[14] Marincola 1997: 34–35.

This small, but telling, shift in the presentation of the geography of empire heralds three important themes in Appian's treatment of space throughout the *Roman History*. The first is his deployment of spatial standpoint. Just as the proem dramatizes the impact of Rome's sway by initially focalizing it through a nameless traveller, so it can make a great deal of difference later in Appian's text *where* the observer of any given sequence of actions seems to be. The second, related to the first, is the way in which the spaces of Appian play out the tension in his narrative between a Greek historiographical tradition of presenting Rome and the Romans from the 'outside' and the relentless pull of the Romans towards making any text about them adopt their own perspective, which the *Proem* instantiates through the shift from an abstracted traveller's perspective to that of the expanding Romans. The third, almost inevitable in a historian, is the diachronic aspect of the treatment of space: the *Proem*'s exacting insistence on the fact that this is the space occupied by the empire *now* prepares us for a narrative where the fortunes of places and spaces across historical time is strongly thematized. It is worth looking at each of these themes in order.

Scipio on High

> Scipio witnessed this battle from a height, as one views a spectacle in a theatre.[15] He often said afterwards that he had been present at many contests, but never enjoyed any other so much, for here only had he seen at his ease 110,000 men join battle. He added with an air of solemnity that only two before him had seen such a spectacle: Jupiter from Mt Ida, and Neptune from Samothrace, in the Trojan War.[16]   (*Pun.* 71)

Appian's description of the young Scipio observing from aloft a confrontation between Masinissa and Hasdrubal nicely illustrates his sensitivity to the symbolic and ideological freight of spatial perspectives. Appian's Scipio reveals himself, by implication, to be a shrewd reader of Homer's gods, and the contribution which their exalted *viewpoint* makes to the way in which they regard human affairs. The note that he *enjoyed* this fight (very rarely stated as an emotional response to battle

---

[15] For war as spectacle elsewhere in Appian, compare *BC* 2.79 (the allies watching the Italians at the Battle of Pharsalus) and 3.68 (the raw troops watching the veterans at the Battle of Mutina).

[16] See also Pitcher 2009a: 205 n. 90.

in Appian, despite the celebrated blood-thirst of his protagonists) aligns him strongly with the Olympian standpoint of the gods in (→) Homer—which sets up a nice irony at the end of the book when the Iliadic character he quotes in a moment of high emotion is the very human Hector (*Pun.* 132).

As so often in Appian, this rich passage becomes even more rewarding when read in the context of the wider narrative. It may well be the case that this episode was unique in Scipio's career. Nonetheless, spatial elevation is a recurring motif in Appian's presentation of him: we see him taking possession of a hill (*Pun.* 103), mounting a high platform to reprimand soldiers (*Pun.* 115), and sitting down once again on a high place at the end of the book to overlook the final dissolution of Carthage (*Pun.* 130). Scipio is unusual amongst Appian's characters in the number of times that the historian portrays him as surveying (or admonishing) from above, much as he is unusual in being allowed anachronic handling here so that he can comment on his own career as it is unfolding ('he often said afterwards …').[17] Given Appian's willingness to thematize the ideological implications of elevation elsewhere in his work, such as when Marcius demands that the surrendering Celtiberians should come down to the plain 'because the high ground was not a suitable place for suppliants' (*Hisp.* 31), it is tempting to relate this to the consistent presentation of the Scipiones as individuals who like to stress their link with the numinous and slightly more than human. (The other named individual notable for looking at things from a height in Appian is Cassius the Liberator,[18] in whose case the historian seems less to be suggesting a semi-deliberate effort to associate oneself with deity than striking a contrast with the lack of vision from above that later helps to bring about his death.)[19]

The panoramic perspectives of Scipio (and Cassius) are a divergence from the norm in Appian's narrative—this is what lends them their impact. For the most part, the narrator himself discloses geographical and spatial information as and when it becomes relevant to the unfolding plot, without having that information focalized by a named individual.

---

[17] The other major character who receives this licence in Appian is Julius Caesar (*BC* 2.79), perhaps the only individual who rivals the Scipiones for general impact on Appian's narrative.

[18] *BC* 4.72.

[19] *BC* 4.113: Cassius hurries to a hill-top for a better view, cannot see the true situation for dust, and so commits suicide in despair.

The example of the proscription victim and his estate is pertinent again, here; Appian mentions the beauty and the shade because both are relevant to the plot. Ekphrasis and extended descriptions of locations are rare, unless the topography concerned is, or will shortly be, of relevance to the story. Thus, descriptions of the topography of a town usually mean that the town in question is about to be the target of a siege. Even these are usually very short.[20] The main exception to this rule of brevity is the lavish depiction of the lay-out of Carthage, appropriate for Rome's greatest city-level enemy: Appian orchestrates a description where an initial narratorial scenic standpoint ('It was separated from the mainland by an isthmus about three miles in width. From this isthmus a narrow and longish tongue of land, about 300 feet wide, extended towards the west between a lake and the sea …', *Pun.* 95) ultimately yields to the actorial panoramic standpoint of the Carthaginian admiral, as the narrative is brought back to the unfolding action: 'The island lay near the entrance to the harbour, and rose to a considerable height, so that the admiral could observe what was going on at sea' (*Pun.* 96).

Deviations from this pattern of disclosure at the initial point of thematic relevance often carry significance. Appian may, for example, delay the revelation of key facts about the geography of a region to evoke the uncertainty of the individuals who are crossing it. An instance of this technique occurs in the fourth book of the *Civil Wars*. Brutus and Cassius, at a loss in the vicinity of the Gulf of Melas as to their onward route, are told by the local worthy Rhascupolis that 'there was a circuitous route (along the very side of the Sapaean mountain) of three days' march, which had been impassable to men up to this time on account of rocks, scarcity of water, and dense forests' (*BC* 4.103). The narrator does not immediately commit himself as to the accuracy of Rhascupolis' assertions. This effectively puts the narratee in the same boat as the rudderless Liberators, and thus makes all the more effective the subsequent depiction of their paranoia and suspicion of a trap when the terrain does not seem to be matching up with their informant's description: 'On the fourth day, fatigued with labour and thirst, the water which they carried being nearly exhausted, they recollected that it had been said that they should be in a waterless region only three days. So they fell into a panic fearing that they were the victims of a stratagem' (*BC* 4.104). The

---

[20] Instances include Numantia (*Hisp.* 90) and Tarentum (*Hann.* 34).

dramatic reveal that Rhascupolis was in fact correct is then as surprising to the narratee as to the thirsting troops, and contributes nicely to the overall impact of a stretch of the narrative where the reticences of the narrator convey the tricksiness and multiple layers of paranoia and deception that afflict the Romans in Thrace. It is only at the very end of the story, after Philippi itself, that we discover Rhascupolis (while reliable in this respect) had feigned a split with his brother Rhascus to ensure that Thrace would weather the Roman incursion whichever side happened to win (*BC* 4.136). While this sequence is unusual in the extent to which Appian controls the release of spatial knowledge in the interests of drama, it is by no means unique. In his narrative of Seleucus' assassination, for example, the disclosure of oncoming terrain is focalized by the king himself: 'while he was advancing from the Hellespont to Lysimachea a great and splendid altar *presented itself to his view*' (*Syr*. 63).[21] The (literally) killer fact that this altar is called 'Argos' (and so potentially fulfils a prophecy about the site of Seleucus' demise) is one which the doomed king and the narratee learn simultaneously.

   Appian's policy on how much he has to say about places and spaces, as well as how and where he chooses to say it, can therefore be very helpful in illuminating the preoccupations of his narrative. Nowhere is this truer than in the case of the second great theme here under discussion. This is the relationship between Roman and non-Roman perspectives in the construction of Appianic space.

Crossing the Rubicon

> Accordingly he sent forward the centurions with a few of their bravest troops in peaceful garb to go inside the walls of Ariminum and take it by surprise. This is the first town in Italy after Gaul. Towards evening Caesar himself rose from a banquet on a plea of indisposition, leaving his friends who were still feasting. He mounted his chariot and rose towards Ariminum, his cavalry following at a short distance. When his course brought him to the river Rubicon, which forms the boundary line of Italy, he stopped and, while gazing at the stream, revolved in his mind the evils that would result, should he cross the river in arms.   (*BC* 2.35)

---

[21] Appian shows a fondness in this book for geographical death prophecies. Compare the prediction that 'Libyssan earth shall cover Hannibal's remains' (*Syr*. 11), where, as with Seleucus, there is an element of 'bait and switch' at work, and also the (correct) advice that Asia will be a healthier place for Seleucus than Europe (*Syr*. 56, 63).

Caesar's crossing of the Rubicon is obviously a key moment for the ideological importance of space in the work of any historian that covers it.[22] Appian, sensitive here as elsewhere to the symbolic freight of significant crossings,[23] does not disappoint. One aspect of this coverage, however, invites further attention, not so much for the way Appian handles the fact of the crossing, as for what his narrator seems to feel necessary to explain about the spaces involved, and how he does so.

In the first place, Appian does not here specify that he is talking in particular about *Cisalpine* Gaul. The historian does, it is true, show awareness at other points in his narrative that 'Gaul' (or *Galatia*, in Appian's Greek) is not a self-evident term.[24] But he is not doing so here. More interesting is the observation that Appian's elucidation of the status of Ariminum is not expressed in the past tense which one might expect (and which White, in his translation, duly delivers) from a simple reminder to the audience keyed to a particular moment in his narrative. Instead, he makes a general statement about the position of the town, couched in the present tense which he uses immediately afterwards to explain the significance of the Rubicon, 'which *forms* the boundary line of Italy'.

This may seem like splitting hairs. In fact, these issues of translation expose some interesting facets of how Appian constructs himself and his audience in relationship to Rome and the Romans, and also of how he portrays the relationship of the Romans themselves to the world which they now control. The present tenses in the description of Ariminum and the Rubicon effectively suggest that here at least Appian is constructing a readership which needs to be told, not reminded, where Italy starts. Distance from an internal Roman viewpoint is thereby artfully suggested. It is not coincidental that suggestions of a less than Romanocentric acquaintance with basic facts of Italy's geography tend

---

[22] Though not for Caesar himself: contrast his *Civ.* 1.8.1 with Plu. *Caes.* 32.4; Suet. *Iul.* 32; and the present passage of Appian. See also L. Morgan 2000: 58.

[23] Compare *Gall.* 1.5 (Caesar becomes the first of the Romans to cross the Rhine); *Hisp.* 10 (the importance of Hannibal's decision to cross the Ebro) and 72 (Sextus Junius Brutus becomes the first Roman to cross the Lethe); *Syr.* 10 (Hannibal's self-praise for his feat in crossing the Alps); and *Mith.* 102 (the plan of Mithradates to emulate Hannibal).

[24] Compare *Hann.* 4 ('the country of the Celts that is now called Gaul') and *BC* 1.29: 'the country now called Gaul by the Romans'. Appian also explicitly refers to 'the country on the right-hand side of the Apennines' as 'Italy proper' and the other as 'Gallic Italy' at *Hann.* 8.

to cluster around Appian's references to such liminal locales.[25] This view-point is, of course, hardly surprising. After all, from the very beginning of his history, Appian follows a practice not uncommon amongst historians of the Empire that write in Greek by referring to the Romans consistently in the third person (in contrast to the inclusive *nos* of a Tacitus).

Rather more interesting is the tension in Appian's narration between a construction of Roman space as something third-person and foreign that needs to be explained to his audience and Roman space as something familiar that can safely be taken for granted. We have already noted the telling shift in the proem from the perspective of an anonymous traveller to that of the expanding and conquering Romans—still third-person, but nevertheless the people whose viewpoint ends up being adopted. In later books this tension manifests in the differing positions and proportions of the explanatory matter which Appian devotes to each of the arenas of his attention. His book on Rome's wars in the Iberian peninsula, for example, opens with an extended description of the land's geography: 'The Pyrenees mountains extend from the Tyrrhenian sea to the Northern ocean. The eastern part is inhabited by Celts, who are now called Galatians or Gauls, the western part by the Iberians and Celtiberians, beginning at the Tyrrhenian sea and extending in a circle by way of the Pillars of Heracles to the Northern ocean. Thus the whole of Iberia is sea-girt, except the part bordered by the Pyrenees, the largest and perhaps the most precipitous mountains in Europe' (*Hisp*. 1).

It is striking to contrast what happens when the theatre of war shifts to Italy in the next book. This time, Appian does not launch upon geographical explanation until events are already well underway. It is only after the introduction of Flamininus that he launches into the same sort of disquisition, structuring the area that is his subject around mountain ranges, which we saw at the very beginning of the previous book.[26]

Other factors may well contribute to this decision, of course. It might plausibly be argued that it is only on the appearance of Flamininus and his troops that the geography of 'Italy proper' becomes sufficiently important for Appian to feel the need to describe it in more detail.

---

[25] Compare *BC* 3.46 (another present-tense note on where Ariminum is in relationship to Gaul) and 61 (where the gloss on the significance of the Rubicon sits very oddly in Cicero's decree to Antony's ambassadors, who presumably would not need to be told it, and seems to have been inserted for the sake of the narratees).

[26] *Hann*. 8: 'The Apennines extend from the centre of the Alpine range to the sea …'.

Moreover the fragmentary presentation of the *Roman History*'s earlier books means that we cannot be altogether sure whether the historian had not already dealt with such matters in greater depth during his books about the expansion of the early Republic. Nonetheless, it is not, perhaps, going too far to suggest that this half-way house between a full-blown opening excursus and no geographical explication at all is emblematic of the equivocal position of Rome and Italy in Appian's world-view—more remote and in need of explication than the realms of the Seleucids or the Ptolemies,[27] yet less so than Iberia or Illyria, both of which receive introductory surveys (*Hisp.* 1; *Ill.* 1). Appian's (un)willingness to explain the nature of the expanses across which his narrative moves can potentially speak volumes about the position which the narrator adopts for himself and his audience in relation to Roman space.

But such space is not necessarily unchanging in the *Roman History*. We have seen from the *Proem* how a spatial excursus can smuggle in an element of narrative sequence as well. Appian's explicit meditations on place and space not infrequently achieve much of their force from having such a diachronic aspect. This is the subject of the final section.

The Wandering Historian

> Being interested in it, and desiring to compare the Roman prowess care-fully with that of every other nation, my history has often led me from Carthage to Spain, from Spain to Sicily or to Macedonia, or to join some embassy to foreign countries, or some alliance formed with them; thence back to Carthage or Sicily, like a wanderer, and again elsewhere, while the work was still unfinished. (*Praef.* 12)

This passage introduces the final tourist of Appian's proem. We have already met the anonymous periegete of the opening, and the expansive Romans who succeed him. But there is also a last and most important voyager in this preface. After setting out the magnitude of the Roman empire, Appian notes how the wide area over which its key events have played out can whisk the historian from one locale to another. By figuring himself, therefore, as 'a wanderer', Appian brings it about that the ultimate traveller of the *Proem* is Appian himself.

---

[27] Appian's book on Rome's relations with the Seleucids has no introductory guide to the geography at all (*Syr.* 1).

Awareness of the difficulties involved in structuring a work of history that unfolds across multiple spatial arenas is nothing new in classical historiography.[28] Appian's solution to this problem in the first half of his work—telling the story of Roman involvement in the areas of the future empire region by region, rewinding each time to tell the story of each area in turn diachronically—is likely to have had antecedents of one sort or another in prior historiography as well. What is particularly notable about Appian's stance in the proem is the overriding reason he eventually gives for wanting to handle his material in this fashion. 'I have made this research also in respect to each of the other provinces, desiring to learn the Romans' relations to each, in order to understand the weaknesses of these nations or their power of endurance, as well as the bravery or good fortune of their conquerors or any other circumstance contributing to the result' (*Praef.* 12).

This desire is key to the understanding of one characteristic form of Appianic chronotope. Appian consistently wishes to convey a sense for the prowess (or lack thereof) associated with particular areas. His strategy of dealing with each significant locale of the Empire in turn, bunching its associated deeds of valour together, is aimed at achieving this with clarity.

It is hard to miss how the strategy works at the level of whole books. One should also note, however, the readiness with which Appian applies it at a more microscopic level as well. Places in Appian are haunted by the conspicuous virtue (or vice) that has been displayed there before. This extorts several synchronic surveys from the narrator: Troy's demolition at the hands of Fimbria elicits comment that 'so much worse was the city now treated by one of its own kin than it had been by Agamemnon' (*Mith.* 53); Xanthus perishes three times for love of liberty (*BC* 4.80); the destructions of Jerusalem across the ages are brought together (*Syr.* 50).

Even below the level of cities, the resonance of particular places lingers. This applies both for the narrator and for the agents within his text. Thus, Lucretius, during the triumviral proscriptions, is unnerved by the coincidence of finding himself at the spot where his father, a victim of Sulla's exercises in that vein decades before, had been captured (*BC* 4.44), while the narrator is careful to point out that Cicero's son will announce Antony's defeat at Actium from 'the rostra where formerly his father's

---

[28] See Pitcher 2009a: 127–137 on this passage and comparable material from Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Th.* 9 and Polybius 15.24a.

head had been exhibited' (*BC* 4.51). In line with the slipperiness of historical precedent elsewhere in Appian,[29] however, anyone in the *Roman History* who expects to trade too readily upon an area's previous associations is likely to be in for an unpleasant surprise. For example, Curio's decision to trade on historical glamour by adopting the same campsite that Scipio had used in his campaigns against Carthage backfires because his opponents anticipated this nostalgia and pre-emptively poisoned the local water supply (*BC* 2.44).

Conclusion

In the end, of course, the pre-eminent prowess on display in Appian's history will always be that of the Romans themselves. The viewpoint from which Appian's audience is invited to look back at the turbulent events of the *Roman History* is explicitly one where the wild spaces he delineates in the course of his narrative have been brought around to calm and profitable stability, 'to the present well-ordered condition' (*BC* 4.16): the final note on an area in Appian is, on several occasions, a reference to the fact that it now receives officials and/or pays regular tribute to Rome.[30] At the end of the first half of the *History*, this organizing strategy is made explicit. The notion of the *periodos*, introduced at the beginning of the *Proem*, makes a return of equal rhetorical effectiveness at the very end of his book on Mithradates of Pontus, to emphasize that the circle of empire is, at this point in his narrative, all but complete: 'as they [the Romans] held Africa also as far as Cyrene (for Apion, the king of that country, a bastard of the house of the Lagidae, left Cyrene itself to the Romans in his will) Egypt alone was lacking to complete the whole circuit of the Mediterranean' (*Mith.* 121).

Even here, however, we see a concluding reminder of the complexity of the perspectives which Appian, the Alexandrian Greek who refers to the Ptolemies as 'my kings', brings to his handling of space in the *Roman History*. The way in which the historian deploys the *periodos* here enables him to present *Egypt* as the coppice-stone on the Roman

---

[29] See Pitcher 2012.

[30] *Hisp.* 102 (the governance of Hispania); *Ill.* 6, 30 (pacification and tribute situation of the Illyrians to the time of Tiberius); *Syr.* 50 (taxes in Syria and Judaea to the reign of Hadrian); *Mith.* 105, 121 (disposition of the Pontic region). Appian claims that the reason most of Britannia and some other regions have been left outside the empire is that it would simply be unprofitable to incorporate them (*Praef.* 5).

achievement, the final acquisition that closes the great circle. This, too, is presaged in the *Proem*: in the opening paragraph, Carthage (despite the importance one might expect to be allotted to the antagonist of the Punic Wars) appears only to delimit the extent of Roman influence in Africa. Alexandria, by contrast, is introduced with ornate *antonomasia* as 'the great city founded by Alexander on the border of Egypt' (*Praef.* 1). The spaces of Appian's history are mostly destined to end up being 'Roman', in some sense of the word. But the twists and turns of his narrative continue to remind the narratees that that is not the only thing they have been.

PAUSANIAS

J. Akujärvi

> Greeks are given to regard foreign sights with greater marvel than those at
> home. For whereas it has occurred to distinguished historians to give the
> most accurate descriptions of the pyramids in Egypt, they have not made
> even short mention of Minyas' treasury or the wall of Tiryns, though these
> are no less marvellous. (9.36.5)

At this late point, near the end of book 9 (out of ten), the narratees of
the *Periegesis Hellados* (*Guide to* or *Description of Greece*) are likely to
have caught on to the almost exclusive interest in matters of the Greek
mainland—mainly its monuments and their history in a broad sense.
With this statement Pausanias distinguishes the focus of his project on
the sights of Greece from the interests of his predecessors in foreign mat-
ters. As Greek counterparts to the pyramids of Egypt, Pausanias chooses
the Cyclopean walls of Tiryns and what he calls Minyas' treasury in
Orchomenus. Like the pyramids, both are ancient impressive stone struc-
tures reminding of times gone by, both historical and mythological. Con-
sidering the extensive descriptions of foreign lands in (→) Herodotus'
Histories, among which the ethnography of Egypt stands out for its length
and detail, Herodotus is probably one of the historians Pausanias is criti-
cising here. However, apart from this piece of critique Pausanias appears
to have modelled his narratorial persona on the Herodotean 'I'.[1]

Unlike Herodotus before him, Pausanias does not explicitly promise to
describe both small and large cities (*Hist.* 1.5.3–4), but there is, nonethe-
less, a faint echo of this Herodotean declaration in his statement that
he will treat 'all things Greek', *panta ta Hellēnika* (1.26.4).[2] The hyper-
bolic language of Pausanias' statement is problematic; perhaps it is best
taken as a hurried narratorial comment cutting short an incipient

---

[1] Cf. Elsner 1994; Herodotean influence: Wernicke 1884; Pfundtner 1866; Akujärvi
2005: 28–30; Hutton 2005: *passim*, esp. 190–213.
[2] See Musti 1996.

narrative.[3] 'All things Greek' would literally not fit into any account, but most things Greek, both the Greece that is and the Greece that was, at least as much of either that caught Pausanias' interest and made it through his critical filter, are fitted into the *Periegesis*. In light of this, Pausanias' choice of Greek contenders to foreign marvels—the walls of Tiryns and Minyas' treasury—is significant. His description of the two monuments shows that they are mere shadows of their former selves, and reminders of times gone by. All that remains of Tiryns are its walls (2.25.8). Minyas' treasury is the first treasury ever built (9.36.4) and it presents 'a wonder second to none in Greece or elsewhere' (9.38.2), but now the wealth of Orchomenus could hardly rival that of a private person of moderate means (8.33.2).

Space is central to the *Periegesis* in a way that sets the work apart from the other texts treated in this volume. It has also been of great interest to students of the text, particularly to travellers and archaeologists.[4] The *Periegesis* continuously gestures and refers to an extra-textual reality. It provides descriptions that are by necessity, and explicitly, selective, yet detailed enough for some centres such as Athens, Olympia or Delphi, or some artwork such as the throne of Apollo at Amyclae, Zeus at Olympia, the chest of Cypselus, the paintings of Polygnotus in Delphi, to inspire attempts at reconstructing their appearance.[5] Even after extensive excavations it can be difficult to make the account of a site in the *Periegesis* agree with the results of those excavations, as is shown by the problems of identifying the sanctuaries on the Corinthian forum.[6] However, the issue of how the selective image of Greek places and sights in the *Periegesis* relates to the actual geography, topography or monumental record of Greece, falls outside of the domain of narratology. The following is a necessarily brief and selective study of space in the *Periegesis*, both that of the sights and of the stories triggered by those sights, discussing first organisation and granularity, then focalisation.

---

[3] In the absence of other declarations, 1.26.4 has been taken to give an idea of the intended geographical scope of the entire work; see, e.g., Habicht 1985: 6–7; Bearzot 1988; Hutton 2005: 55–58.

[4] Cf. e.g. Beard 2001; Jacquemin 2001; Sutton 2001; Wagstaff 2001; Pretzler 2007: 118–149.

[5] 1.2.4–29.2; 5.7.1–6.21.3; 10.5.5–32.1; 3.18.10–19.5; 5.11.1–11, 17.5–19.10; 10.25.1–31.12.

[6] E.g. Osanna 2001; Torelli 2001; Hutton 2005: 149–155.

The Structure of the Periegesis: Sights and Stories

> Such were in my opinion the most noteworthy of the Athenian stories
> (*logoi*) and sights (*theōrēmata*). From the beginning, my narrative has
> selected from the mass those that fit in a narrative account.   (1.39.3)

In the words of Pausanias, his work is composed of selected sights and
stories, *theōrēmata* and *logoi*. The *theōrēmata* are enumerated one after
the other in a topographical order describing a meandering itinerary
through Greece, an itinerary that is often difficult to follow and that at
times is abruptly broken off and resumed again without explanation.
A route is traced from Athens via the Piraeus (book 1) covering the
Peloponnese on a clockwise coastal tour from the Argolis to Achaea sav-
ing the landlocked Arcadia to last (books 2–8), turning next to Boeotia
(book 9) and Phocis (book 10); the account finishes in Ozolian Locris
(10.38) at the ruins of a temple of Asclepius in Naupactus (10.38.13).[7]
The *logoi* are regularly triggered by *theōrēmata* as descriptions or expla-
nations of their significance. *Logoi* of varying length may also appear at
the start of a book or precede the description of a city or site (mainly
religious centres), recounting as much of their background story as is
considered relevant in their specific context. As the stories have a direct
connection to an object on site or are preliminaries to the description of
sites, they usually have a particular local focus.[8] Since the work lacks any
introduction, whether by narratorial intent or by accident of transmis-
sion,[9] the narratees of the *Periegesis* are faced with the task of figuring
out for themselves the plan and organisation of the work, its geographi-
cal and historiographical scope, the relation between sights and stories,
what controls the selection, etc.[10]

From a statement marking the transition from one geographical focus
(Athens and Attica) to the next (Megara and the Megaris) it appears
that the sights and stories have been singled out owing to the fact that
they are, 'in my opinion', the most famous (*gnōrimōtata*) Athenian sights
and stories (1.39.3).[11] This statement confirms earlier indications of the

---

[7] On the structure and scope, cf. Hutton 2005: 54–82; on the ending, cf. Nörenberg
1973.

[8] On the interest in local material, cf. Pretzler 2005a; Pretzler 2005b; see also Akujärvi
2005: 181–205.

[9] On the problems of the beginning, cf., e.g. Gurlitt 1890: 2 with n. 13; Robert 1909:
261–265; Habicht 1985: 6–7; Bearzot 1988; E.L. Bowie 2001.

[10] Cf. Akujärvi fc.

[11] The affirmation is repeated in 3.11.1, with a reference to 1.39.3.

control exerted on the composition by the narratorial 'I' and of the particular importance of matters of local significance in any given section of the work. For instance, when a historical narrative about Sulla's conquest of Athens is about to develop into a general history of the Mithridatic war, the narrator steps in to explain that 'I will relate' as much as is relevant for the capture of Athens; those interested in knowing about other belligerents or the cause of the war are referred to other sources (1.20.4).[12]

Space of Sights and Space of Stories

Although *logoi* are usually closely connected to sights, they are not necessarily always set at the place where the *theōrēma* triggering them is located. The description of Athens, for example, includes also, apart from strictly Athenian matters, accounts of grasshoppers dying on Mt Sipylus in three different ways, Ethiopians, the wild inhabitants on the Satyrides Islands in the Atlantic Ocean, gigantic skeletons, the invasion of Greece by the Gauls (the action is mostly set in Thermopylae and Delphi), and biographies of a number of Ptolemies, Pyrrhus of Epirus, Lysimachus, Seleucus (in none of which Athens is the scene of action).[13] These narratives are not set in Athens, but they do have a tie to the description of Athens in so far as objects in Athens trigger them.

As sights trigger the myth-historical narratives, disquisitions into curious and strange phenomena, and accounts of beliefs and rituals, the organisation of the *Periegesis* is not chronological but spatial or topographical. This arrangement along a spatial axis allows for the juxtaposition of events from disparate periods and for a discontinuous and anachronic exploration of the Greek past and present through its monuments and remains.[14]

Throughout the *Periegesis* we find Pausanias skipping from any given site or object to something comparable in other places. In this way he points out similarities and agreements in various phenomena and practices and ties together different parts of Greece and other parts of the Roman Empire. For instance, the unusual practice of the Lacedaemonian ephebes to sacrifice a puppy to Enyalius in the Phoebeum is nearly unique, though paralleled by the custom in Colophon to sacrifice a black

---

[12] Cf. also 1.22.7, 23.4, 10, 24.5, 25.6, 27.3, 28.11.
[13] 1.24.8, 33.3–6, 23.5–6, 35.5–8, 4, 6.2–7.3, 9.1–3, 11.1–13.9, 9.5–10.5, 16.
[14] On this manner of telling the history of Greece, see Akujärvi 2005: 181–205.

puppy to Enodius (3.14.9). We are told that the land of Elis is particularly suited to flax; flax, however, Pausanias comments, is not a remarkable crop as it can be sown and reaped on any suitable land, whereas the thread the Seres use for clothes is something else, which is followed by a confused account of silkworms and their breeding (6.26.6–9). The island of Sphacteria has a name for itself due to the crushing defeat that the Lacedaemonians suffered at the hands of the Athenians, just as Cape Caphareus is known for the shipwreck that the Greeks suffered on their return from Troy and the small island of Psyttalea, off Attica, for the slaughter of Persians after the battle of Salamis (4.36.6). Apropos the ancient cult statue of Athena Alea and the tusks of the Calydonian boar that have been taken to Rome by Augustus, Pausanias lists other cult figures that have been carried off by Greeks and others (8.46).[15] Any site, object, ritual or narrative can trigger comments and narratives about similar events, phenomena and practices in wholly different settings. In this way the separate localities that are sometimes hard to reach by foot, mule, horse or cart, are tied together into a coherent textual web.

Historical narratives generally have a close tie to the place from which they are launched, as the person(s), the event(s) or the setting (s) of the narrative have a particular significance for that place or are presented as having such significance. Most narratives are short snippets relating, or even merely alluding to, single episodes in long and complex chains of events. Some of the longest narratives in the *Periegesis* recount events of the Hellenistic age from the death of Alexander down to the Roman defeat of the Achaean confederacy.[16] Among these the narratives in the first book (dealing with Attica) stand out, in that Athens is peculiarly absent from the narratives of power struggles and palace intrigues in the biographies of Hellenistic monarchs.[17] Why these events are narrated in the *Attica* is a puzzle, unless their purpose is to paint a picture of Athenian decline and dependence.[18] Athens is not the scene of action, it is of no concern for the characters, and Athenian affairs are not affected by their actions, at least not according to the stories as they are told in the *Periegesis*. The city formed alliances, though to no avail (1.7.3); it was the recipient of benefactions though they are not worth recording

---

[15] Cf. also, e.g. 3.20.4; 9.30.4–12; 10.17. For further examples, see Akujärvi 2005: 201–202.

[16] On the historical value, see e.g., Segre 1929; Bearzot 1992; Ameling 1996.

[17] 1.6.2–7.3, 9.1–3, 9.5–10.5, 11.1–13.9, 16.

[18] See Hutton 2005: 275–295 for another interpretation.

(1.9.3); it was dependent on the goodwill of others and had to flatter
and show deference to its superiors (1.9.4). This picture is confirmed by
narratives in later books and in the biography of Olympiodorus (1.25.2–
26.3). Though the statue of Olympiodorus on the acropolis is a reminder
of a successful rebellion against the Macedonian presence in the city,
it does not offset the picture of the weak and dependent Athens of the
earlier narratives.[19]

Other narratives are well integrated into their context, though not
necessarily by being set at the site of the triggering monument. The
biographies of Aratus and Philopoemen, two prominent leaders of the
Achaean Confederacy, are launched from monuments attesting to their
achievements; the long narrative of the many struggles of the Achaean
Confederacy is part of the historical introduction to book 7, *Achaica*;
spoils taken from the Gauls on the temple of Apollo in Delphi initiate a
second account of the invasion of Greece by the Gauls.[20] At the beginning
of the second narrative Pausanias reminds the narratees of the previous
account of the invasion in the *Attica* (1.4); but he explains that 'I wanted'
(*ēthelēsa*, 10.19.5) to give a fuller report of the events in the account of
Delphi since that was the scene of the Greeks' greatest achievements.
Delphi is, however, not the only scene of action as significant battles take
place in and around Thermopylae and in Aetolia.

The Description of Sights: Organisation

The organising principle of the work is, as mentioned above, the topo-
graphical order in which the sights are enumerated. The monuments are
often described along multiple routes from central hubs. This so-called
'radial plan' has been described by Frazer, Robert, Piérart and Hutton.[21]
The two latter scholars in particular have refined our understanding
of the complexities of the radial plan and of how unevenly the spokes
radiate from the centres in both cities and territories. Here we are only
interested in how the sights are presented textually. The linear movement,
which is indicated with frequent prepositional phrases and adverbs, and
intermittent verbal phrases, forms a minimal narrative of travel from

---

[19] See also 10.18.7, 34.3.
[20] 2.8.1–9.5; 8.49.1–52.6; 7.7.1–16.10; 10.19.5–23.14; shorter narratives of events in
this period, e.g. 3.6.3–9; 4.29.1–12; 5.5.1; 6.12.2–4; 8.8.11, 27.11–16; 9.7.2–4; 10.34.3–4.
[21] Frazer 1898: I xxiii–xxiv; Robert 1909: 69–200; Piérart 2001; Hutton 2005: 83–174.

place to place and object to object and creates a frame for describing objects and narrating stories. Thus a shifting scenic standpoint is mainly used in descriptions. Within this frame narrative two agents can be distinguished, an anonymous witness/traveller who is written into the text as a generic 'you' and functions as the narratees' stand-in, and the 'I' of the narrator; the role of these agents in the landscapes of the *Periegesis* is studied below. Depending on how closely the text zooms in on sights, three levels of description can be distinguished: territories, centres and objects.

Territories and Centres

> Of the Hellenic mainland in the region of the Cyclades Islands and the Aegean Sea, Cape Sunium juts out from the Attic land. When you have sailed past (*parapleusanti*) the promontory there is a harbour and on the peak of the promontory a temple of Athena Sunias. Sailing on (*pleonti de es to prosō*), there is Laurium, where the Athenians once had silver mines, and a small uninhabited island called the island of Patroclus.   (1.1.1)

The first sentences are a good starting point for studying how territories are described. The overall topic of the whole of the *Periegesis* (Greece) and that of its first part (Attica) frame a gradual zooming in on Cape Sunium, the starting point of the description, which quickly moves on to the next landmark, then on to the next and so on. The description of territories develops into descriptions of roads between sites; the description of roads in its turn generally transmutes into descriptions/mentions/enumerations—depending on the granularity—of a variable number of natural features or monuments along the road, unless the countryside is presented as a systematic catalogue of diverse units.[22] Roads are often treated unevenly, as for instance those two by which Athens is reached. On the road from Phalerum a temple for Hera is noticed (1.1.5); on the road from Piraeus the ruins of the long walls are mentioned and among the tombs lining the road a few are singled out (1.2.2–3). This manner of tackling roads is characteristic. A few objects are listed and a selection of these is sometimes given sketchy descriptions bringing out isolated

---

[22] On the linearity of description, see Snodgrass 1987: 67–92; Hutton 2005: 118–122 with a reminder not to expect of the text what it does not set out to deliver, and Akujärvi fc. Catalogues, e.g. in Attica: small demes (1.31.1–6), mountains (1.32.1–2), other demes about which more is told (1.32.3–34.5), and islands (1.35.1–36.2). Cf. Robert 1909: 76–99.

features. It results in fragmentary views of isolated objects, but it can also
create apparently comprehensive views of larger stretches when many
objects in close proximity are enumerated and/or described.

The approach is the same when Athens is left, first towards the Acad-
emy (1.29.2–16, a dense account of tombs lining the road), next along the
sacred road to Eleusis (1.36.3–38.5). On the latter road fewer tombs are
mentioned, many of which initiate stories; adverbial and prepositional
phrases clarify the position of one monument in relation to the preceding
one, 'after' (*meta* with accusative, *epi* with dative), 'near' (*plēsion*), 'in
the same place' (*autothi*). Their force, however, is vague and elastic.[23]
Eventually the tombs thin out, and larger structures begin to be noted
and stages of the journey are articulated with the crossings of two rivers,
the Cephisus and the Rheitoi.[24] Verbal phrases occur particularly at
the chief junctures of the stretch of road—at the start and crossings of
rivers.[25] Thus it looks as if a greater distance is covered and fewer objects
line the road.

As is the case with these roads to and from Athens, the centre of
interest in the *Periegesis* is almost exclusively on man-made products,
although there is the occasional intimation of natural scenery, particu-
larly in later books, when mention is made of the produce of the land
and natural phenomena, such as rivers, sources of water (the quality of
water is frequently commented upon) and mountains, which often serve
as landmarks.[26]

Panoramic views of territories, their size and lay, compass directions,
scenery and the overall layout of larger or smaller tracts are seldom
given.[27] There are occasional comments on the relation between terri-
tories. When borders between territories are crossed, this is generally
merely acknowledged.[28] But when introducing Arcadia, the last of the

---

[23] Robert 1909: 110.
[24] Similarly selective descriptions are devoted to, e.g., two roads from Eleusis, 1.38.8
and 39.1–3.
[25] 1.36.3, 37.3, 37.4, 38.2.
[26] E.g. 1.32.1; 2.36.6, 37.1; 3.20.4; 5.5.2; 6.26.6; 9.19.8, 41.7; 10.32.19, 33.7, 35.8, 36.1–
3, 36.7, 37.3, 37.5.
[27] Contrast e.g. Strabo's description of Attica, which differs from that in the *Periegesis*
not only in that Attica is approached from the Peloponnese rather than from (apparently)
Asia Minor, but also, and more significantly, in that it is preceded by an inquiry into the
place of Attica within Greece and the shape and orientation of its coastlines (9.1.1–3); cf.
Snodgrass 1987: 67–92 and Pretzler 2005c.
[28] Cf. 1.39.4; 2.1.1, 38.7–3.1.1; 4.1.1; 9.1.1. On borders, see Sonnabend 1994.

Peloponnesian territories, which unlike any of the other described ter-
ritories is completely landlocked, Pausanias presents an unusually clear
(clear, that is, for the *Periegesis*) panorama of the areas already described,
their relation to one another and to Arcadia, as he describes how the
separate districts of Arcadia border on other parts of the Peloponnese
(8.1.1–3).[29]

In descriptions of centres, panoramas are also rare, unless it is a
description of a place in ruins. When itemising the ruins of a site the
presenter seems to draw farther away from the object. For instance,
at the ruins of Eleutherae on the border between Attica and Boeotia,
when describing the remains of its walls and foundations of houses the
site appears to be viewed from a distance where it seems that the city
was situated above the plain on the slopes of Mt Cithaeron (1.38.9).
Again, detailing all that is missing in Panopeus (government offices,
gymnasium, theatre, agora, fountain) and concluding with a dismissive
remark on the poor quality of the houses—they look like mountain
cabins by a ravine—Pausanias creates a panoramic view of a nearly
deserted site where a few sheds remain inhabited (10.4.1).[30]

The selectivity permeating the whole of the *Periegesis* is most evi-
dent in descriptions of centres.[31] As to the organisation of the material,
the main difference between descriptions of centres—whether small or
large cities, or small or large sanctuaries—and descriptions of territo-
ries, is that in the former a larger number of objects are crammed into a
smaller space. The descriptions are variable and adaptable to the mate-
rial. The cities of the *Eleutherolakōnes*, for example, are presented in a
chain of short descriptions, none quite like the other (3.21.6–26.11). The
amount of detail on the various cities varies. The cities are strung together
on a clearly indicated itinerary: some monuments between centres are
mentioned and intermittently the distances between the sites and the
general direction of the movement are specified (inland, towards the sea
and, exceptionally, at sea).[32] Epidaurus Limera is described in detail: a

---

[29] Cf. also 7.1.1 and 10.1.2.

[30] Also e.g. 2.24.7, 25.8, 36.4; 3.10.7, 22.3, 9; 4.33.6, 7; 5.6.4; 6.21.6, 22.5; 7.23.1, 23.4,
24.13; 8.12.7, 13.2, 17.6, 23.9, 25.1, 28.7, 29.1, 34.6, 35.7, 36.8, 44.3; 9.2.1, 4.4, 8.1, 19.2;
10.33.1, 33.8; cf. also 8.38.1; 9.22.2; 10.4.7, 38.5.

[31] Akujärvi 2005: 44–58.

[32] 3.21.6, 22.4, 6, 8, 9, 23.6, 24.1, 3 (distance by sea), 24.6, 25.1, 4, 9 (distance by sea),
25.10, 26.1, 4, 11.

historical narrative explains the name of the city (3.23.6–7);[33] on the road there from Boeae a place called 'Ino's water' is noticed and the rite associated with it is described as well as a parallel to it mentioned (3.23.8–9); the position of the city on a height close to the sea is noted; the sanctuary of Aphrodite, the statue of Asclepius, the temple of Athena on the acropolis and Zeus Soter in front of the harbour are singled out as 'worth seeing' in the city (3.23.10); and the coast with a promontory and a bay with colourful pebbles is noticed (3.23.11). Of the next place, Zarax, however, the only things mentioned are a temple of Apollo and a statue of him holding a lyre (3.24.1). Sometimes the narratee is left wondering whether the city in question has been described at all. Las, for instance, appears only to be tangentially described: the ruins of old Las on the summit of Mt Asia attract Pausanias' interest, with its statue of Heracles in front of the city wall, and a trophy celebrating a victory over the Macedonians as well as the temple of Athena named Asia (3.24.6–7); but contemporary Las is described in passing, mentioning only a spring and a gymnasium outside the city (3.24.6). Significantly, as the account is divided between the description of the ruins of the ancient city and a non-description of the modern one, the story of the founder Las does not appear at the start of the account, but is connected with his tomb (3.24.10–11).

The present appearance of a site or an object does not necessarily correspond to its former glory, as is shown by Panopeus, and a city may have been moved from its former site, as is the case with Las. Since the focus of interest is at least equally on the past as on its present-day monuments, the length of a description does not always correspond to the size and condition of a site. Megalopolis in Arcadia is described as a recent foundation that emptied parts of the Arcadian countryside (8.27). The description of its remains is unusual for its production of an uncommonly clear idea of the layout of the city divided by the river Helisson, treating its northern and southern sides in turn (8.30.2–32.5). The account of Megalopolis is concluded with a reflection on the mutability of things, listing a number of Greek and foreign cities that have fallen from glory and others that have risen to distinction (8.33.1–4). Thebes, a city rich in history and traditions but with reduced circumstances, is also treated at length. Its old city wall with its famous seven ports becomes, more than any point in the present-day settlement,

---

[33] Other historical introductions: 3.21.8, 22.6, 11–12, 26.4, 8.

the point of departure for a description that blurs the boundary between city and surrounding territory, unlike most other descriptions (9.8.4–17.7, 23.1–4, 25.1–4).[34]

Larger centres entail larger quantities of sights and stories and greater challenges for organising the material. The material can be presented in topographical order organised along routes and itineraries, though not without jumps and stretches where it is unclear how one monument stands in relation to the next; in systematic lists ordered according to some specific criterion (though the constant interest in religious matters and the utter disinterest in dwellings and everyday life may give a false impression of grouping when a number of sanctuaries or statues of gods are listed); or in no apparent order.

For instance, the Athenian agora—always called *Kerameikos* in the *Periegesis*—is described beginning with the royal portico and ending with the statue (and biography) of Seleucus a short distance from the *stoā poikilē* and close to the point where the description of the agora started (1.3.1–16.3). The position of most objects is specified,[35] apparently with particular care when the topographical sequence has been interrupted by one of the many long biographical-historical narratives.[36] All narratives, none of which is set in Athens, are initiated from statues. The first ones stand unambiguously in the agora (1.5.1), but eventually the tie to Athenian topography seems to fade away. It is unclear whether the statue of Lysimachus is indeed on the agora in front of the Odeum or somewhere else in Athens and mentioned here by an association of ideas. Pausanias explains that Philip and Alexander are honoured with statues (these stand beside the statues of the Ptolemies) out of flattery; Lysimachus too was honoured since it was advantageous for the moment—but where is Lysimachus' statue (1.9.4)? When the statue and biography of Pyrrhus is reached, introduced with the words 'the Athenians have a statue of Pyrrhus, too' (1.11.1), it looks as if the topographical organisation has been replaced by a systematic one.

Later too, both in the description of Athens and in later books, the simple (dis)organised enumeration of objects is intermittently interrupted by shorter stretches where two or more objects are linked, either by an

---

[34] Cf. Hutton 2005: 88–89 and 132–138.

[35] Unspecified: Metroon (1.3.5), Odeum (1.8.6), statue of Pyrrhus (though possibly in front of the Odeum, 1.11.1); vague: temple for Hephaestus ('above', but there are several heights surrounding the agora, 1.14.6).

[36] 1.5.1 linking to 1.3.5; 1.8.2 to 1.5.5; 1.9.4 and 1.14.1 to 1.8.6; 1.14.4 to 1.14.1.

association of ideas or some systematic arrangement; sometimes this can be combined with topographical proximity. At the entrance to the acropolis, the transition from statues of the Charites made by Socrates to a statue of a lioness (*leaina*) is a particularly elaborate example of such an association. According to the Pythia, Socrates was wise (*sophos*); Greeks say that there were seven sages (*sophoi*), the tyrants Pittacus and Periander among others; however, the Athenian tyrants were wiser (*sophōteroi*) both in foreign and domestic affairs until Hippias lost self-control at the murder of his brother Hipparchus, when he arrested and tortured to her death a woman named Leaina who, he knew, was the mistress of Aristogiton; after Hippias' overthrow the Athenians erected a bronze lioness as a tribute to the woman (1.22.8–23.2).[37] It is not stated whether the lioness is near the Charites, but a statue of Aphrodite is noted near the lioness, thus resuming the topographical order. It is not uncommon that the topographical order gives way to, or is combined with, a systematic one. For instance, in the description of the acropolis three stories about Theseus are told in succession, while it is not clear whether the associated (two or three) statues stand close to one another (1.27.7–10).[38]

The Altis with its innumerable noteworthy objects (temples, statues, altars, etc.) crammed into a small space, presented a particular challenge to Pausanias. This is the longest description of a single site in the whole *Periegesis* (5.7.1–6.21.3), presenting a fairly clear and readable account of the layers of monuments accumulated in Olympia throughout the centuries by combining the topographical organisation with a systematic one. The material is sorted into categories and presented in four systematised tours of the Altis, starting with the description of the temple of Zeus (5.10.2–13.7), pausing at the temple of Hera (5.16.1–20.5), ending with the treasuries (6.19) and finally leaving the Altis (6.20.1–21.3). Organising comments articulate the joints where different sections meet, mark the complex structure of the description and clarify the principles of selection.[39] The statues of Zeus (5.21.2–25.1), gods other than Zeus (5.25.1–27.12) and a selection of statues of men, mainly Olympic victors (6.1.3–18.7) are covered in three separate topographically ordered tours. The first tour, that of the altars in the Altis beginning with the great ashen

---

[37] Also, e.g., 3.26.3; 6.13.3, 14.1–3; 7.27.7; 9.25.1; see Akujärvi 2005: 201–202 for further references.

[38] E.g. 1.18.9, 28.2, 8–11; cf. Robert 1909: 76–99. Pausanias' inclination for parallel narratives is another manifestation of this associative mode.

[39] 5.14.4, 10, 16.1, 21.1, 25.1; 6.1.1–2.

altar of Zeus Olympius (5.13.8–15.12), deviates from the predominant topographical principle and follows a ritual order, the order in which the Eleans sacrifice on them, as Pausanias explains on two occasions (5.14.4, 10).[40] In contrast, the description of Apollo's sanctuary in Delphi is simply organised along a topographical thread (10.5.5–32.1).

Objects

Objects are the smallest unit of description. These are treated in much the same way as territories and centres. For instance, approximately sixty man-made objects are mentioned in the approach to Athens (1.1.2–2.6). Of these the majority are merely identified, in which case we learn whom the statues depict and to whom the sanctuaries are dedicated. A few structures and objects are given brief introductions that emphasise isolated features. For example, in Piraeus the statues of Athena and Zeus are made of bronze; Athena is holding a javelin, whereas Zeus is holding Nike and a sceptre. The statues of Zeus and Demus are made by Leochares. The temple of Hera on the road from Munychia to Athens has neither roof nor doors, its damaged statue made by Alcamanes has allegedly been burnt by Mardonius. The long walls from Piraeus to Athens are in ruins. The tomb of an unknown, close to the gates of Athens, has a statue of a soldier standing beside a horse made by Praxiteles. The statue of Poseidon, close to a temple of Demeter, depicts him astride a horse throwing a javelin at Polybotes, though according to the inscription it represents someone else. This is characteristic of how most objects are treated in the *Periegesis*. The descriptions of statues and paintings seldom go beyond identifying who or what is depicted, the sculptor and the material that is used; the pose may be specified, particularly if a divinity is depicted. The statues that prove difficult to identify are treated in greatest length. This indifference to the appearance of monuments reflects Pausanias' unstated aim to explore the past through its remains in the present rather than to describe the appearance of the objects themselves. Pausanias, like (→) Homer or the narrators of (→) the Homeric Hymns, appears to think that the history of an object says more about its significance than its appearance.

---

[40] On this description, see Elsner 2001. For the ritual versus the topographical order, see Akujärvi fc.

While the appearance of a building is rarely described, its function is often clarified. And when buildings are elaborated upon, their history is generally at the centre of attention. Larger structures generally serve as bases for mentioning smaller objects in or near them. The enumeration and identification of objects clustering around a building may, however, give an idea of the building., as happens e.g. in the case of the sanctuary of Dionysus: it houses statues of Athena Paeonia, Zeus, Mnemosyne, the Muses and Apollo (made and dedicated by Eubulides) and there is the face of Acratus, one of Dionysus' attendants, worked into the wall (1.2.5).

When any attention is paid to a building itself, rather than the objects surrounding it, it is mostly a religious building. The description of the temple of Zeus in Olympia stands out for its detail. The account not only includes common information, like the origin of the temple and the motif of the pedimental sculptures, but also such rare pieces of information as its material (local stone), architectural order (Doric) and form (a peristyle). In addition, the account continues to record its height, width, length, the architect, marble tiles, roof decorations and, finally, is rounded off with a description of its frieze, pediments and reliefs above the front and back doors (5.10.2–9). The attention to such details of the appearance of a building is nearly unique for the *Periegesis*; only the description of the temple of Hera in Olympia is a match: Doric order, peristyle, columns of wood, and length (details on height and width have perhaps been lost in lacunae), information on the architect not obtainable.[41] However, this account conforms to common practice in the description of objects and sites, as the interest is focused on the history and the rituals associated with the temple more than on its appearance (5.16.1–8). More typical of building descriptions in the *Periegesis* are the accounts of the Parthenon with only a short note on the motifs on the pediments (1.24.5) or that of the temple of Apollo in Delphi with a report on its cultic and constructional history (10.5.1–13). One or a few details are singled out, just as in the descriptions of small centres.[42]

Most works of art (statues, paintings, reliefs) are also treated cursorily. To the extent that they are described at all, the interest is centred on who is depicted and that person's role in mythical past or history with

---

[41] Cf. also 8.45.5.

[42] Profane buildings do not figure in the *Periegesis* to an equal extent, and their appearance is rarely described, as in 6.24.2, 24.5; 10.5.2. On rare occasions the layout of such common structures as agoras is noticed, as in 6.24.2; 7.22.2; 10.32.10, 35.4, 35.6.

a particular local focus. In the long account of statues of athletes and ordinary people taking up nearly two thirds of book 6, the emphasis is on identifying the person and specifying his victory;[43] there is often a note on when the victory took place, who the sculptor is, and on the inscription. When a particular person/statue is treated at length, the note includes some reflection, anecdote or narrative from his personal biography or some historical event in which he or his place of origin was involved (6.1.3–18.7). Interestingly enough, while in other Greek narratives descriptions interrupt the main narrative, in Pausanias it is the other way around: narratives interrupt description.[44]

At times the motif, the moment of narrative frozen in the depiction, is identified, as in the pediments of the Parthenon (Athena's birth and Athena and Poseidon vying for Attica, 1.24.5) and of one of the treasuries in Olympia (the Gigantomachy, 6.19.13), and on the numerous panels decorating the throne and altar of Apollo in Amyclae (3.18.10–19.5) and the chest of Cypselus in the Heraeum (5.17.5–19.10). The account may go on to describe how the motif is realised, as in the depictions of the capture of Troy and the descent to Hades in the Cnidian Lesche in Delphi, the two longest descriptions of the *Periegesis* (10.25.1–31.12), or of the Calydonian boar hunt on the front pediment on the temple of Athena Alea (8.45.6–7).[45] Sometimes the failure to identify the persons depicted occasions a description of the scene, as in a painted funeral stele outside Tritea in Achaea (7.22.6–7).[46]

Phidias' statue of Zeus in Olympia is given one of the longest descriptions of a single statue in the *Periegesis*. It moves quickly from the representation of the god to the decorations on the throne, the rods between the feet of the throne, the screens preventing access to the inner part of the throne, Zeus' stool, the supporting pedestal, and the floor (5.11.1–11). Pausanias explicitly refuses to reveal the measurements of the statue; his motivation for doing so (bare measurements do not do justice to the impact of the statue on a spectator, 5.11.9) may also account for some of the characteristics of the descriptions in the *Periegesis* as a whole. Exact measurements do not do justice to the sights of Greece; a true and worthy exploration of them should not be confined to their appearance but

---

[43] Cf. 6.4.5, where the identification fails.
[44] E.g. 6.2.2–3, 5, 10–11; 3.2–3, 9–10, 12, 15–16; 4.6–7; 5.1–9; 6.4–11, etc.
[45] Also, e.g., 1.3.4, 15.3; 5.10.6–7.
[46] Also, e.g., 8.31.4, 11.

should rather attempt to penetrate the surface. It is probably this that Pausanias is trying to achieve by constantly aiming for the background stories of sights and sites.

Presentation: 'One'/'You' and 'I'

The space of the sights can be presented either through the (omniscient) vision of Pausanias the (primary) narrator-focaliser, or be filtered through either the focalisation of an anonymous traveller (a variant of 'the anonymous focalizer' device) or through that of Pausanias, the travelling researcher, whose autopsy is fundamental for the *Periegesis* as a whole and particularly for the frame narrative. The anonymous witness figures in the text mostly in the guise of an indefinite and elusive travelling persona, who is introduced as a convenient device to narrate movement between sights and is used not only to filter the account but also to enliven it by inviting the narratees to identify with him.[47] The focalisation is variable as the text fades in and out of the modes of presentation both in describing space and narrating stories.

In the first sentences of the *Periegesis*, for instance, the panoramically focalised first statement that locates Cape Sunium as a part of Attica and the Greek mainland in the region of the Cyclades and the Aegean is substituted by the slightly more restricted vision of the anonymous traveller in the next two sentences (1.1.1). The dative participles *parapleusanti* and *pleonti* indicate that the next landmarks (a harbour, a temple, the silver mines of Laurium and Patroclus' island) follow in that order only when sailing along the coast of Attica from Cape Sunium; with the explanatory note on who Patroclus was, the account returns to the narrator's focalisation. Here one of the points of vagueness in the *Periegesis* becomes evident: the direction of the movement is not specified. The participles also initiate movement along the route that is traced throughout the *Periegesis*. Similar participles are often used in *periploi* to give a sense of direction and structure the descriptions of the coasts; they also occur in (→) Herodotus, Thucydides, (→) Josephus, and, most notably, in (→) Appian's proem. Dative (and genitive) participles of verbs of movement—as soon as the description lands at Piraeus verbs of walking predominate—occur throughout the *Periegesis*.[48] They are most fre-

---

[47] See Akujärvi 2005: 145–166 and Akujärvi fc.
[48] See Akujärvi 2005: 164–166 for a complete list of verbs. The coast is rarely described

quent in descriptions of territories but are also found in city descriptions, particularly when longer distances are covered (or so it would seem), or when new topographical sequences or particularly significant monuments are introduced. For instance, describing the acropolis in Athens, the approach to the Parthenon is brought to the fore by introducing the traveller ('as one enters' the Parthenon, *esiousin*, 1.24.5) viewing the pedimental sculptures; the description of altars and other objects inside the Erechtheum is emphasised by letting the traveller explicitly enter the building ('as one has entered', *eselthousi*, 1.26.5).[49]

The movement of the anonymous traveller is mainly narrated with these formulaic participles as, for instance, in the account of the cities of the *Eleutherolakōnes*.[50] Another way of narrating movement in the frame is by substituting the formulaic and unobtrusive participles with fuller modes using finite verb forms.[51] In this case the anonymous and generic 'one' appears almost to be substituted with a possibly less generic but equally anonymous 'you', the narratee.[52] This is particularly common in book 8, where travel is narrated in second-person future tenses to a higher degree than in any other book. The landscape (the mountains, ravines, rivers, plains of Arcadia) is prominently present in this book, for example:

> After the sanctuary of Poseidon, a place full of oaks, called Pelagus, will receive you (*hypodexetai se*), and the road from Mantinea to Tegea leads through the oaks. The boundary between Mantinea and Tegea is the round altar in the road. If you want to turn off to the left from the sanctuary of Poseidon, you will arrive at the tombs of Pelias' daughters after going about five stadia (*ei … ektrapēnai thelēseias … hēxeis … aphixēi*).   (8.11.1)

As always, the control remains with the narrator. It is he who stages the movement of the 'you', and he can step in for explanations and narrations at any time.

It is not only for narrating movement that the anonymous traveller/ narratee is drawn into the frame; occasionally he is also engaged in

---

from the sea, e.g. 2.34.8 (cf. Hutton 2005: 122–125); 3.23.2; 7.22.10; 9.32.2, 32.4 (on the two last ones, cf. Snodgrass 1987: 83–84).

[49] See Akujärvi fc for more comparanda, further examples and references.

[50] 'Having advanced … having advanced … having advanced … walking … having walked inland … sailing … after doubling … having covered … having advanced … having advanced … having turned … having climbed … having advanced … having crossed … having descended … having covered …' (3.21.6–26.11).

[51] See Akujärvi 2005: 153–162.

[52] On the indefinite second person, see *SAGN* 1: index (sub 'narratorial devices').

viewing and interpreting artefacts, as in the description of Polygnotus'
paintings in the Lesche of the Cnidians in Delphi. Mostly the paintings
are viewed through the primary narrator's focalisation, but now and
again the anonymous traveller and the (generic) 'you' is drawn not only
into the viewing of the paintings ('turning the eyes to the lower part of the
painting', 'if you look again to the upper part of the painting'), but also
into the interpretation of the motifs ('you would guess … even before
reading the inscription', 'you will take them to be shadows rather than
fish').[53] Thus Pausanias pulls the narratee into the text and creates a vivid
narrative conveying to the narratee a sense of being taken to the sites and
participating in viewing the objects.[54]

The other filter through which space can be presented is the focali-
sation of the 'I', that is, Pausanias, the travelling researcher. Throughout
the *Periegesis*, 'I' is present in the text in countless narratorial comments
on the production of the text and on the collection and evaluation of the
material. In this respect the narratorial voice of the *Periegesis* resembles
that of Herodotus' *Histories*.[55] Pausanias also continuously links monu-
ments and rituals to the present, observing whether they have changed
or remained the same. Elsewhere I have called these comments on the
continuity or discontinuity of things 'dater comments'.[56] These dater com-
ments are remarks by which the state of the often ancient monuments
that are at the centre of Pausanias' interest are related to his present.
They are, in short, references to the narrator's own time by which Pau-
sanias not only limits and fixes the temporality of the account of the
sights to his 'now'—however imprecisely—but also focalises the account
through the (implied) experiences on site of 'I'. This at times creates a dis-
sonance to the narrator's focalisation, at least when the dater comments
are comments on discontinuity. En route to Athens, for instance, the
statue described as representing Poseidon astride on a horse and throw-
ing a javelin at Polybotes, has been rededicated and honours someone
else 'now', whom, Pausanias does not say (1.2.4), and the house that is
reported to have been the place where the Eleusinian mysteries were par-
odied on the eve of the Sicilian expedition, is 'now' sacred to Dionysus
(1.2.5).

---

[53] See 10.25.5, 28.1, 29.5, 7, 30.6, 31.1.

[54] Cf. *Subl.* 26.2 concerning Herodotus' use of second-person singulars in describing
the sailing up the Nile from Elephantine; see Lateiner 1989: 30–33. See further Akujärvi
fc.

[55] Cf. Akujärvi fc with references and (for Herodotus) *SAGN* 1: 102–106.

[56] Cf. Akujärvi 2005: 65–89.

More rare and also more interesting are those passages in which Pausanias tells about actual first person experiences on a site.[57] As has often been remarked upon, accounts of other kinds of experiences than seeing, discovering or not finding things on a site are rare.[58] Only once does Pausanias say how 'I' walked from one point to another (1.41.2); although there are many indications of locals providing information to or disagreeing with him, only once does Pausanias record in indirect speech a dispute that 'I' got involved in (7.23.7–8) and only rarely does he say that 'I' sacrificed in any of the numerous sanctuaries described (2.30.4; 8.42.11). Thus, the 'I' is most often introduced when viewing and interpreting artefacts. For example, when describing the chest of Cypselus, an ancient artefact that appears to have presented Pausanias with many problems of interpretation (for example, the motifs are identified by inscriptions, but the script is ancient and difficult to interpret, 5.17.6), the account is interspersed with brief episodes featuring the problems of the 'I' in interpreting the motifs of the panels. E.g., the first panel represented a woman sleeping in a cave with a man: 'we supposed' that they were Odysseus and Circe; 'we were utterly unable to guess' who the artist was, whereas 'we mostly suspected' that the poet was Eumelus of Corinth— the plurals can be a vestige of the collaborative effort of examining the chest.[59]

Space of the Narrator

There is one explicit reference to the narrator's own space as being separate from the Hellenic space of his work. The description of the Pelopeum in Olympia, which is centred upon its position in relation to Zeus' temple, the sacrifice performed there and the fate of Pelops' shoulder blade that was not to be seen 'in my time' (5.13.1–6), occasions a comment on traces of Pelops' and his father, Tantalus', residence in Lydia (5.13.7). Introduced with the words 'still today there are traces of Pelops' and Tantalus' occupancy of our country' (*par' hēmīn*), this space—the slopes of Mt Sipylus in Lydia—beyond the boundaries of Hellas, evidently constitutes a place that the narrator calls home and which he knows differently than Hellas. Furthermore, the conclusion to the enumeration of the

---

[57] Akujärvi 2005: 133–145.
[58] E.g. Habicht 1985: 141; Pretzler 2007: 32.
[59] 5.19.5–10. On this description, see Snodgrass 2001.

traces—'we know through tradition' (*pareilēphamen mnēmēi*) that the statue of Aphrodite made of myrtle wood in Temnos as one has crossed (*diabanti*) the river Hermus is a propitiatory dedication from Pelops hoping to marry Hippodamea—suggests that 'I' has privileged access to the traditions of this space and that he does not need to explore its geography and investigate its traditions as he does those of Hellas. There are a number of other references to this same area, which, though not worded in similar first-person style, suggests a more thorough familiarity with that space than any other place beyond Hellas referred to in the *Periegesis*.[60]

Conclusion

> On [a tripod in a cave above the theatre in Athens] are Apollo and Artemis killing the children of Niobe. I myself have seen this Niobe when I climbed Mt Sipylus. She is a rock and a crag not presenting any form of a woman mourning or otherwise when one is nearby (*plēsion … paronti*); but if you go farther away, you will be under the impression that you see a woman in tears and with downcast eyes (*ei … porrōterō genoio … doxeis horān*).
>
> (1.21.3)

This quote is representative of how space is described in the *Periegesis*. Single objects are mostly presented through the focalisation of the narrator. The immediate object of description holds the potential for introducing related subject matter, here it is Niobe in the rock on Mt Sipylus. Pausanias begins by stating that 'I myself' climbed Sipylus and saw her in the rock, suggesting a particular familiarity with this space but without elaborating upon that point. But it is difficult to make her out. When detailing the manoeuvres for seeing the weeping woman in the rock, Pausanias introduces the (generic) 'you', thus broadening the applicability of the statement by putting another focalising filter on the account than that of the narrator and avoiding restricting it to the one time experiences of the 'I'. Perhaps this hints at how Greece is to be approached: if one is not too close to the object of description, it stands out clearer, as does Niobe on Mt Sipylus. The presenter—whether Pausanias as narrator or travelling researcher, or the anonymous witness—is rarely far enough from what is described.[61] The objects embody (hi)stories that are as central to the *Periegesis* as the sights; narrating these (hi)stories produces another

---

[60] E.g. 1.20.5, 21.3, 24.8; 2.22.3; 7.24.13; 8.17.3. On Pausanias' Lydian identity, see Chr. Jones 2004; for a differing view, see Frateantonio 2009: 157–160.

[61] Though there are exceptions, e.g. the description of the stadium at Athens in 1.19.6.

sort of description, a description that brings out not only their appearance there and then but also (parts of) their historical dimensions and connections outside any one site. Instead of as a panorama, the *Periegesis* presents Greece—or *panta ta Hellēnika*—in bits and pieces, describing select details of its country, coasts, towns, sanctuaries, monuments, their parts and (hi)stories; how these combine into a whole is not clarified.

CASSIUS DIO

L.V. Pitcher

Getting to Know the Empire

> This I know not from hearsay or reading only, but I have learned it from
> actual experience as once their governor, for after my command in Africa
> and in Dalmatia (the latter position my father also held for a time) I was
> appointed to what is known as Upper Pannonia, and hence it is with exact
> knowledge of all conditions among them that I write.[1]   (49.46.4.)

In the passage above, Cassius Dio gives the grounds for the assertions
he has just made in a digression on the character and location of the
Pannonians. The basic patterns of this narrative should not surprise the
student of space in Imperial Greek historiography. The digression arises
from Dio's account of Octavian's expedition against the Pannonians in
35 BCE. It is perhaps predictable, then, that the narrator then slides
into a present-tense 'ethnographic' disquisition on this people, with
special attention to the well-worn theme of how the local lack of luxuries
contributes to their martial valour: 'they are considered the bravest of all
men of whom we have knowledge; for they are very high-spirited and
bloodthirsty, as men who possess nothing that makes an honourable life
worth living' (49.36.3).

Dio's emphasis on the *verification* of this account is rather more inter-
esting. Emphasis on the primacy of autopsy is not in itself surprising; one
remembers the celebrations of its importance in Dio's historiographical
predecessors.[2] More unusual for Dio, however, is the 'reference to the nar-
rator's own space' motif. Dio affords a momentary insight into his own
life-history through reference to his governorship of Pannonia Superior.[3]

---

[1] All references, unless otherwise indicated, are to Cassius Dio. The text and transla-
tions are from Cary 1914–1917. I use 'Dio' as a shorthand for 'the narrator Cassius Dio'.
[2] Schepens 1980; Marincola 1997: 63–86; Pitcher 2009a: 63–64.
[3] For Dio the man, see Millar 1964: 5–27; Rich 1990: 1–4.

Dio is not exactly shy about his achievements (his history, after all, concluded with the year of his own consulship) and the chance to speak from personal knowledge here is obviously too good to pass up. Nonetheless, the insistence on the reliability of his information at this point forms part of a wider pattern in his work. Like (→) Appian, the spatial extent of the Roman empire is something which Dio as a historian finds somewhat challenging. But the nature of how Dio views the historian's challenge is rather different. Appian sees the difficulty of writing history about an area so big as residing in the organization of material: how can one maintain a coherent story-line if one's attention keeps being whisked between far-flung places? Dio, by contrast, stresses not so much the problems of organizing a narrative across such magnitudes as the difficulty of amassing data about this vastness in the first place. A famous passage on the hardness of writing history about the Augustan principate is instructive here. This is usually cited as evidence for the control of information under Augustus' regime.[4] For our present purposes, however, the remarks that follow are more interesting:

> Furthermore, the very magnitude of the empire and the multitude of things that occur render accuracy in regard to them most difficult. In Rome, for example, much is going on, and much in the subject territory, while, as regards our enemies, there is something happening all the time, in fact, every day, and concerning these things no one except the participants can easily have correct information, and most people do not even hear of them at all.   (53.19.5)

For Dio, then, the spaces of the Roman empire pose an epistemological problem, to an extent hard to parallel from Appian. Figures within Dio's own narrative mirror this preoccupation. A recurring conceit in Dio's depiction of Julius Caesar, for example, is that the general reveals unknown regions to the Romans through the act of subjugating them: 'Dio's Caesar makes the world explicable as he conquers it: the general as historian'.[5]

This epistemological emphasis can be presented in satirical terms, as when the Roman people treat their new knowledge of Britannia as tantamount to actually conquering it. Nonetheless, in the same passage, the narrator remains insistent that 'the previously unknown had become

---

[4] On this aspect, see in particular Rich 1990: 152 ad loc. See also *SAGN* 1:193–194.
[5] Pitcher 2009b: 274.

certain and the once unheard-of accessible' (39.53.2),[6] and Dio is a little earlier notably disdainful of writers who have tried to describe Britannia without the benefit of autopsy or reliable information: 'To the very earliest of the Greeks and Romans it was not even known to exist, while to their descendants it was a matter of dispute whether it was a continent or an island; and accounts of it have been written from both points of view by many who know nothing about it' (39.50.3; it is tempting to see here a sly jab at Appian, who notably *does* describe Britannia as an *ēpeiros*). The *revelation* of space is a key concern for Dio, which sets up a nice subversion at the Battle of Pharsalus, an event so cosmic in its implications that prophets and seers across the Empire are presented as immediately having some inkling of what is happening: 'And so far did the effects of that contest extend to the rest of mankind that on the very day of the battle collisions of armies and the clash of arms occurred in many places' (41.61.3).[7]

This subtle shift in emphasis from what we see in Appian is emblematic of how Dio's spatial historiography compares to that of his predecessor. Dio and Appian are, in some ways, very similar historians. Both write expansive political histories of Roman conquest; both share, for at least some of their length, common sources to which they apparently remain quite faithful.[8] Yet the overall impact of their accounts can be, at times, quite different. This combination of similarity and difference is particularly evident in their deployment of space.

The Planes of Pharsalus

It is not hard to document similarities between Dio's handling of space and that which we find in earlier (or subsequent) historiography. Space in Dio, as in most political historians, can have a strongly symbolic meaning. This is especially clear in his account of the Roman Civil Wars. Here, the city of Rome itself is repeatedly presented as the prize for which the competing dynasts are vying. The reflections of Julius Caesar and Pompeius Magnus before the Battle of Pharsalus are an obvious example:

---

[6] Compare too Caesar's boasts on the subject: 38.38.4; 39.5.1. Antony also deftly alludes to this Caesarian preoccupation in Dio's version of the funeral oration at 44.42.2.

[7] Compare also Pitcher 2009a: 62.

[8] Pitcher 2009a: 83.

> As a result of these circumstances and of the very cause and purpose of the war a most notable struggle took place. For the city of Rome and its entire empire, even then great and mighty, lay before them as the prize, since it was clear to all that it would be the slave of him who then conquered.[9]
>
> (41.56.1)

This same passage also demonstrates, however, the complexities with which Dio can invest even a seemingly simple thematization of Rome as a prize. The narrator craftily suggests multiple temporal perspectives. Caesar and Pompeius, contemplating the spaces of Empire Present, quickly fall to pondering the spaces of Empire Past: 'when they reflected on this fact and furthermore thought of their former deeds—Pompeius of Africa, Sertorius, Mithridates, Tigranes and the sea, and Caesar of Gaul, Spain, the Rhine, and Britain, they were wrought up to the highest pitch of excitement, believing that those conquests too were at stake'. Pompeius' sense of his past achievements is partly, Caesar's totally, organized around the spaces of his successes. The contrast *may* also have a characterizing importance for the two dynasts, since Caesar's back-catalogue here lacks protagonists altogether (no Ariovistus, no Vercingetorix) in favour of the places he has conquered; Pompeius is at least partly defined by his adversaries (Sertorius, Mithridates, Tigranes).

In itself, this is hardly unexpected. Dio's text is replete with examples of competitive Romans using space to keep score of their accomplishments. Caesar's crossing of the Rhine, for example, which Dio explicitly attributes to his desire to do something unprecedented (39.48.4), occurs against a background of many other Romans making similarly significant first crossings.[10] These are duly noted by the narrator, even if Dio, like (→) Herodotus, also points out that the memorialisation of achievement was not always straightforward. (Note in particular 41.24.3, on Caesar's crossing of the Pyrenees: 'Thence he advanced across the Pyrenees, but did not set up any trophy on their summits, because he understood that Pompey had gained no good name for so doing; but he erected a great altar constructed of polished stones not far from his rival's trophies'. Caesar thus characteristically manages to compete with his rival *and* demonstrate that he is above such behaviour at the same time.) In this particular context, however, the litany of past conquests has a particular irony. Since those successes are part of what

---

[9] Compare also 41.10.1.
[10] Cf. 36.16; 37.5.2; 38.35.1; 40.18.1, 32.2; 41.30.2.

has made Rome's empire the prize it is—the space, as it were, to beat all spaces—these very achievements have now been subsumed into the stakes.

There is a further perspective, too, a further irony. The narrator smuggles this in with the seemingly artless aside that the Empire was '*even then* great and might'. The unspoken contrast here, of course, is with the yet greater and mightier empire of Dio's own day, of which Caesar and Pompeius are quite ignorant: the empire at which we will arrive when the history ends with the historian's own consulship.[11] This single passage, then, effectively heightens the importance of Pharsalus by juxtaposing three different time-frames of Roman space.

Far, Far Away

A like combination of adherence to historiographical tradition and individual subtlety of treatment characterizes Dio's handling of symbolic space. Of course, a goodly proportion of the symbolic deployment of space in Dio goes back to the historical actors whose actions he is documenting. Dio, for example, is hardly innovating when he uses the destruction of an individual's house as a mark of his deletion from the public consciousness; 'Augustus razed Pollio's house to the ground, on the pretext of preparing for the erection of the other structure, but really with the purpose that Pollio should have no monument in the city' (54.23.6).[12]

The same applies to the symbolic load of certain locales in Dio's conceptual geography. The narrative of Cleopatra is a good example of this. The odium which Julius Caesar reaps for his infatuation with the queen is presented as arising in no small part from the fact that it plays out in Rome itself: 'he incurred the greatest censure from all because of his passion for Cleopatra—not now the passion he had displayed in Egypt (for that was a matter of hearsay), but that which was displayed in Rome itself' (43.27.3). (Once again, we note, even if only in passing, the way in which the dissemination of knowledge is key to Dio's treatment of space: the tryst in Alexandria is, at Rome, only something 'that was a matter of hearsay', something *reported*, whereas passion on display in Rome itself is another matter.) The depiction of Antony's fall maps out

---

[11] See also *SAGN* 1: 197–198.

[12] Compare 39.11.1, where Cicero attempts to reclaim the site of his house after the machinations of his foes had it razed to the ground (38.17.6).

the triumvir's decline through the symbolic locations he comes to haunt: 'Antony himself returned from Italy to Greece and delayed there a long time, satisfying his desires and injuring the cities' (48.39.1). In Dio, as in other authors, Antony's sojourns in the East make him lose contact with his identity as a Roman.

On the other hand, not all of Dio's spatial deployments are quite so pre-dictable. It is not, perhaps, surprising in itself that he chooses to narrate the opening of the theatre of Pompeius (39.38.1–6). It was by no means inevitable that a history of this period should devote attention to the buildings of Rome, whatever their importance—Appian, for example, is notably vague about Roman buildings besides the senate-house and the homes of important people and only gets close to what Dio does here in a rather confusing remark about the theatre begun by Lucius Cassius, which Scipio Nasica demolished as likely to promote moral degradation (*BC* 1.28)—but this construction of Pompeius was long-established in the traditions of writing about the Civil War for its multiple symbolic sig-nificances.[13] Nor does it startle that Dio immediately, if briefly, switches to himself ('the theatre in which we take pride *even at the present time*'). The 'reference to the author's own time' motif is by no means singular. More unusual is the fact that Dio uses the opening of the theatre as a platform from which to launch a disquisition about the pitiful fate of the elephants slaughtered for the original festivities:

> For some of them, contrary to Pompey's wish, were pitied by the people when, after being wounded and ceasing to fight, they walked about with their trunks raised to heaven, lamenting so bitterly as to give rise to the report that they did not do so by mere chance, but were crying out against the oaths in which they had crossed when they crossed over from Africa, and were calling upon Heaven to avenge them. For it was said that they would not set foot upon the ships before they received a pledge under oath from their drivers that they should suffer no harm.   (39.37.2–4)

Much is going on in this passage. We note, first of all, Pompeius' slight loss of control over even his own space: the people pities the elephants 'contrary to his wishes'. One should not make too much of this, since the narrator does round off his account of the theatre with the assurance that 'at all events Pompey in these matters afforded the populace no little delight' (39.39.1). Nonetheless, this wobble in the control of space

---

[13] Cf. e.g., Lucan 1.133 (characterizing Pompeius' alleged desire to court the people): *plausuque sui gaudere theatri*, 'rejoicing in the applause of his own theatre'.

is characteristic of Pompeius. We may compare how Caesar pointedly avoids erecting the sort of lavish monument in the Pyrenees that brought odium upon his rival (41.24.3). The grand gestures of Pompeius do not always meet with quite the unadulterated adulation he desires.

Beyond the characterizing element here, however, we may perhaps note an element of foreshadowing. The elephants, after fighting, regret the faith in others they displayed in agreeing to cross by ship from Africa to Rome. It is not, perhaps, too fanciful to recall the reciprocal trajectory that will follow. Pompeius, the master of this theatre, will soon forsake Rome, fight until he is spent, end up, finally, in Africa, and be betrayed to his death after a sea voyage: 'Although he had subdued the entire Roman sea, he perished on it; and although he had once been, as the saying is, "master of a thousand ships", he was destroyed in a tiny boat near Egypt and in a sense by Ptolemy, whose father he had once restored from exile to that land and his kingdom' (42.5.3).[14] The spaces of Rome and Africa are knitted in a skein of destined slaughter.

This unexpectedness is just as characteristic of Dio's historiography as adherence to the familiar tropes that prior historiography deploys in handling space. Like (→) Appian, for example, Dio delights in exploiting the historical resonances of spaces where significant events have unfolded before: the resonance of Africa for the name of Scipio (42.57.5); the contrast between the former glories of Pompeius' travels in the East and the circumstances of his flight thither when retreating before Caesar (41.10.3); Augustus' honouring of the Spartan mess as the place to which Livia had formerly fled (54.7.2); even, in a more humdrum vein, the transformation of the site of Caesar's assassination into a privy (47.19.1). But here, too, individuality is evident: Dio, to a greater extent even than Appian, is interested in the discontinuities and contrasts between the events transpiring at different times in the same place, and regards attempts to recall past successes simply by revisiting where they happened with some suspicion. Those who expect Scipio always to be unconquered in Africa are soon disabused of that presumption; it is a squalid end, not further victories, that awaits Pompeius when he tries to revisit old glories.

---

[14] Once again (compare 41.56.1), the clearing of pirates from the Mediterranean is recalled as one of Pompeius' defining achievements.

Looking Down on Actium

We saw a contrast at the start of this chapter between the concerns that Dio and Appian evince about dealing with the magnitude of the Roman Empire. Appian, it emerged, sees his challenge as primarily narratological: the issue is one of organizing his material. Dio, by contrast, focuses more insistently on the epistemological challenges of *discovering* the material on which a reliable history of so wide an area must rest.

This contrast is reflected in the modes of narration which Appian and Dio deploy where issues of space are concerned. Where Appian is self-consciously unorthodox in his decision to use space rather than simple chronology as the organizing principle of his narrative, at least in the first half of his work, Dio tends to be more straightforward in his approach. The default centre from which the events are narrated is Rome. The narrative of Caesar and Cleopatra shows this technique in operation: what goes on in Alexandria is presented as a matter of hearsay; what happens in Rome itself is plain to see. In line with typical Roman constructions of space, 'beyond the Alps' for Dio means 'on the other side of the Alps from Rome', as becomes clear in his disquisition on the waxing arrogance of Labienus (41.4.3). It is, too, a recurring technique of his narration to announce breaking news from the Empire in terms of its reception at Rome.[15]

In other respects, too, Dio's practices in narrating space tend to be straightforward and consistent. Like (→) Appian, Dio usually supplies geographical detail beyond a bare minimum because the place he is describing is about to become important to his story. Unlike Appian, Dio himself actually draws attention to the fact that this is his practice. His handling of Parthia is a case in point. Dio launches upon an encapsulated history of the Parthian territory as soon as Crassus launches his ill-fated expedition against them (compare the similar strategy of (→) Herodotus in describing attempted imperialism) and makes the following instructive remarks:

> Now about their race and their country and their peculiar customs many have written, and I have no intention of describing them. But I will describe their equipment of arms and their method of warfare; for the examination of these details properly concerns the present narrative, since it has come to a point where this knowledge is needed.   (40.15.1)

---

[15] See 46.41.3; 47.1.1; 48.3.1, 5.1, 13.5; 49.15.1; 51.19.1; 52.30.1.

The emphases here are characteristic of Dio: the gesture towards the multitudes who have treated a subject before; the unwillingness to tread old ground. For our present purposes, however, his criteria for which details he includes, and where he has chosen to insert them, are particularly pertinent. Military detail is enjoined because it 'properly concerns the present narrative'; the narrative needs it at this point in particular because 'it has come to a point where this knowledge is needed'.

Dio's narrative manner is not, however, as unvaryingly utilitarian as this stated stance may suggest. Once Dio *does* start talking about points of local interest, it is not uncommon for his treatment to become more expansive. In particular, he shows a tendency to extend the history of interesting locations proleptically, to a point in time some distance beyond that which his main narrative has actually reached, before pulling himself up and returning to the main event.[16] The account of Octavian at Actium furnishes a good example of this: 'on the spot where he had had his tent, he laid a foundation of square stones, adorned it with the captured beaks, and erected on it, open to the sky, a shrine of Apollo. *But these things were done later. At the time he sent a part of the fleet* …' (51.1.3–4).[17] As we have already seen in his account of Pompeius and Caesar before Pharsalus, the weight of future accomplishments on Rome's unwinding history is not always, in Dio, entirely negligible.

The temporal element is not the only occasional deviation for Dio's quotidian modes of description. It is, on the whole, unusual for him strongly to have places focalized by characters. Nonetheless, he shows no aversion to variegating his standard practice when he can thereby achieve a significant effect. Such departures become particularly effective, of course, in the light of their comparative infrequency. Again, the depiction of Octavian at Actium is instructive:

> He then occupied the site where Nicopolis now stands, and took up a position on high ground there from which there is a view over all the outer sea around the Paxos islands, and over the inner, or Ambracian, gulf, as well as over the intervening waters, in which are the harbours of Nicopolis. This spot he fortified, and he constructed walls from it down to Comarus, the outer harbour, and consequently commanded Actium by land and sea, watching it from above with his army and blockading it with his fleet.
>
> (50.12.3–5)

---

[16] See *SAGN* 1: 193.
[17] For similar cases of proleptic overspill in the description of particular places, compare 49.37.2; 52.43.1; and 55.23.2.

The interplay between past and present in the description of Actium ('the site where Nicopolis *now stands*'; 'in which *are* the harbours of Nicopolis') we have already observed. What also stands out here, however, is the way in which Dio, very unusually for this text, employs an actorial panoramic standpoint, with Octavian as focalizer. Implied at first, this becomes overt with the comment that Octavian was 'watching … from above with his army'. The effect here is fairly obvious. Octavian's dominant position within Dio's text is being reinforced by the manner of the telling. Quite apart from all the conspicuous references to the present-day legacy of the battle he is about to win in the shape of Nicopolis, he is also here partaking in the well-established historiographical trope, originating with Xerxes' Chair in Herodotus (*Histories* 7.44), of having a powerful leader survey the situation from a symbolically lofty vantage-point. Dio's deployment of space around the person of Octavian promotes the impression that the Battle of Actium is won ever before it is undertaken.[18]

The Historian's Estate

> For if you will take my advice, you will be quite satisfied to pick out a little estate in some retired spot on the coast and there carry out at the same time farming and some historical writing, like Xenophon and like Thucydides. This form of learning is most enduring and best adapted to every man and to every state; and exile brings with it a kind of leisure that is more fruitful.
>
> (38.28.1–2)

The treatment of space in Dio owes much to what has gone before in classical historiography. For the most part, these debts are unavowed and unobtrusive. It is not unknown, however, for Dio to engage with the handling of space by his predecessors in more overt fashion. It is with a representative example of this strategy in action that this chapter concludes.

The passage above is taken from a speech by the otherwise unknown (and probably fictitious) philosopher Philiscus, aimed at consoling Cicero in his exile from Rome. Their conversation forms almost a fifth of book 38, a proportion which may surprise in view of its general failure to advance the plot.[19] Its thematic importance has therefore been the subject of much scrutiny.[20]

---

[18] For Actium as a deciding moment in Dio, see Rich 1990: 14.
[19] Pitcher 2009a: 103–104.
[20] Millar 1964: 49–51; Gowing 1998.

For our present purposes, however, what particularly holds the attention is Philiscus' delicate play in his speech on space, prior historiography, and the prior historiography of space. Central to Philiscus' argument is the contention that Cicero is irrational to pine for Rome as he does. As he remarks earlier in his speech: 'For surely it is not places that give either success or misfortune of any sort, but each man creates his own country and his own happiness always and everywhere' (38.26.2). This ties in nicely with Cicero's unenlightened behaviour immediately before the exchange of speeches. Dio depicts the broken orator as haunting the scenes of his past glories in Sicily, 'for he had once been governor there, and entertained a lively hope that he should be honoured among its towns and private citizens and by their governors' (38.17.5). This strategy is no more successful for Cicero than it will subsequently prove to be for Pompeius; Cicero reaps no benefit from visiting the sites he associates with his former successes.

In the light of this, Philiscus' advice to 'pick out a little estate in some retired spot on the coast' has an obvious force—as does Dio's rather self-serving emphasis, through him, on the delights of historiography in retirement. More subtle, however, is the point of his use of Xenophon as an *exemplum* of such retirement. Xenophon, to the one who knows his prior historiography, is not merely an instance of one who put his enforced retirement to productive use. He is also the man responsible for one of the most lyrical descriptions of the possible site of such an exile, in the form of the estate at Scillus that he lovingly and anachronically describes in the midst of his account of the expedition of the Younger Cyrus.[21] Philiscus' argument acquires heightened force from the educated reader's awareness of Xenophon on the fertile delights of his estate at Scillus. Moreover, this very awareness serves to strengthen Philiscus' point about the enduring application of historiography: if Xenophon had not written about the charms of his retreat, it would not now be available for the rhetorician's use. The estate at Scillus originally bloomed thanks to Xenophon the farmer; it blooms for Philiscus thanks to Xenophon the historian.

---

[21] X. *An.* 5.3.5. See also Ma 2004: 340–341.

Conclusion

Dio's treatment of space turns out to be of a piece with his historiography in general. The underlying structure is Romanocentric and preoccupied with notions of relevance, carefully excluding material that might be regarded as extraneous. At the same time, however, there is a subtlety of play between chronal perspectives and focalizations which makes the final effect by no means as simple as it first appears. And Dio's relations to the ways of writing about space in the historiography which he has inherited can be as much about fertile engagement and allusion as about simply staying within the canons of history-writing he has inherited.

HERODIAN

L.V. Pitcher

> Many historians and poets, who have made the life of Severus the theme
> of their entire work, have given more detailed treatment to the stages of
> his march, his speeches at each city, the frequent manifestations that were
> interpreted as signs of divine providence, the topography of each place,
> the disposition of the forces and the number of soldiers on either side that
> fell in battle. My aim is to write a systematic account of the events within
> a period of seventy years, covering the reign of several emperors, of which
> I have personal knowledge. I shall narrate only the most important and
> conclusive of Severus' actions separately, in chronological order.[1]
>
> (2.15.6–7)

The passage above appears about a quarter of the way into the history
in which Herodian describes the history of the Roman empire from the
last days of Marcus Aurelius to the accession of Gordian III. As a state-
ment of method, appearing at a point of strong closure within Herodian's
text—the end of its second book—this passage merits attention. Hero-
dian enunciates a policy of selectivity in narrating the actions of Septim-
ius Severus. The main emphases of this policy are temporal: 'a systematic
account of the events within a period of seventy years … in chronologi-
cal order'. However, the historian notes his willingness to be selective on
matters of space and topography as well. According to Herodian, other
authors, whose sole theme was the life of Severus, have already given
'more detailed treatment' to 'the stages of his march' and 'the topography
of each place'. Herodian, whose canvas is wider, will be more discrimi-
nating.

Herodian's selectivity in the handling of space within his narrative
is thus a matter of deliberate policy. This policy finds justification in
ancient theoretical works on the writing of history. Lucian's essay *How*

---

[1] All references are to Herodian, unless otherwise indicated. The text and translations
are from Whittaker 1969–1970. I use 'Herodian' as a shorthand for 'the Herodian
narrator'.

History Ought to Be Written castigates those imitators of Thucydides addicted to excessive topographical detail: 'you need especial discretion in descriptions of mountains, fortifications, and rivers' (*Hist.conscr.* 57).[2] This declaration of deliberate selectivity is worth remembering. Scholars have sometimes been too quick to attribute to inadvertence or incompetence on Herodian's part omissions on topographical matters which might more plausibly be seen as the historian's studied avoidance of stultifying or pedantic detail.[3]

Herodian's practice throughout his history is largely in line with what his statement of method on the reign of Severus would tend to suggest. His topographical descriptions tend to be brief, and appear where they are about to become directly relevant to the plot; in this Herodian follows e.g. (→) Homer and (→) Herodotus. Unlike some other historians of the Roman empire, Herodian does not begin his work with a survey of its geographical extent. There is nothing in Herodian analogous to (→) Appian's proem, or, in a different vein, to the summary of the *rerum Romanarum status* with which Tacitus opens his *Histories* (1.8–11).

This reticence applies on a smaller scale as well. Herodian is sparing with detail in his descriptions of places and buildings; there is very little in the way of extended ekphrasis. His disquisition on Byzantium, only two sentences long as it is, nevertheless qualifies as effusive by his standards: 'an enormous, strong wall surrounded the city, constructed out of mill-stone hewn into blocks and fitted together with such close mortises that one might think it was carved from a single block of stone rather than being jointed. Even when one sees the ruins of the wall as they are today, one has to admire the skill of the first builders and the power of those who later destroyed it' (3.1.6–7). The mode of narration here is mostly unsurprising, with Herodian deploying the scenic actorial standpoint of the anonymous focalizer ('one might think … even if one sees'), whom he turns, however, into a contemporary ('as they are today'), thus making the passage a variation of the 'reference to the narrator's own time' motif. Even this limited effusiveness, however, is strictly functional within its immediate narrative context. Herodian has just mentioned that Niger's desire to take Byzantium is motivated by the city's power and

---

[2] Translation of Kilburn 1959: 68. For Lucian's pr escriptions and the issue of proportionate coverage in historiography, cf. Pitcher 2009a: 86–87.

[3] Fuchs 1895: 250; Dopp 1912: 957. Contrast Whittaker 1969–1970: I xliv–xlv, citing Lucian *Hist.Conscr.* 57.

desirable location, which he is therefore expounding; the glance at 'the power of those who later destroyed it' also helps to establish the military efficiency of Severus, who will go on to do just that.[4]

On the other hand, Herodian's level of topographical detail does, on occasion, go some distance beyond what is strictly necessary for the narratees to understand the actions he is narrating. His description of the terrain and climate of Britannia at the end of book 3 is a case in point. Herodian begins with a simple explanation of the local complexities facing Severus' troops: 'A particular effort went into intersecting the marshy areas with pontoons to permit the troops to advance safely by crossing them' (3.14.5). This then expands, however, into a more general disquisition on Britannia and its inhabitants, in which Herodian uses descriptive present tenses throughout (3.14.6, 8).

Ultimately, Herodian is careful to tie this disquisition back in to his narrative, pointing out its implications for the Roman expedition: 'These, then, were the conditions for which Severus prepared the armaments likely to suit the Roman army and damage or frustrate a barbarian attack' (3.14.8). We may also note that the commentary on the places and spaces of Britannia is heavily subordinated to the discussion of the manners and customs of its inhabitants.[5] It would be difficult to claim, however, that the intricacy of detail here is all strictly relevant to the action. This is still more the case elsewhere in the narrative. For example, the fact of Alexander's crossing the Rhine prompts an extended, present-tense discussion of the great German rivers:

> In summer their depth and breadth provide a navigable channel, but in winter they are frozen over because of the low temperatures, and are used by horses as though they were firm ground. So hard and solid does the river, at one time a flowing current, now become that it does not just support the weight of horse's hooves and men's feet but, if anyone wants to draw water, they do not bring water-jugs and empty bowls but axes and mattocks to hack it out …   (6.7.6–8)

Alexander did not, in fact, cross the Rhine when it was frozen. According to Herodian, he proceeded by lashing boats together (6.7.6). The material about the river's behaviour in winter is thus an elaboration unwarranted by the dictates of the immediate plot.

---

[4] Compare the narrator's comments on the defensive wall of Aquilea at 8.2.4, which are motivated by the fact that the town is about to undergo a siege.

[5] Whittaker 1969–1970: I xliv notes that 'the geographic details of Britain are so vague as to be almost worthless'.

The classic reaction to such disquisitions has been to see them as rhetorical commonplaces, inserted to bring Herodian's text into line with the canons of history-writing during the so-called 'Second Sophistic'. Lucian shows familiarity with descriptions of rivers in his treatise on the subject, even if he counsels against their needless over-elaboration. One might also note the recognition of the 'digression' as a narrative strategy in earlier historiographers, e.g. Polybius: 'for hard workers find a sort of rest in change of the subjects which absorb and interest them. And this, I think, is why the most thoughtful of ancient writers were in the habit of giving their readers a rest in the way I say, some of them employing digressions dealing with myth or story and others digressions on matters of fact' (38.5.9). Hence the tendency for scholarship to regard these passages as embellishment aimed at tickling the palate of a sophisticated audience.[6]

There is more to Herodian's deployment of spatial and topographical detail than a string of commonplaces, however. The distribution of this detail often serves purposes beyond antiquarian amusement. In fact, the treatment of topography in Herodian goes to the heart of this historian's enterprise.

Objects in Space

The essential thematic importance of spaces and locations to a historian of upheavals in the Roman empire is obvious. Control of space is fundamental to military historiography. Herodian is no exception. Book 1 of the history opens at a border, where the dying Marcus Aurelius attempts to preserve the integrity of the empire's territory against the possibility of barbarian incursion (1.3.5). Elsewhere Herodian, in an analepsis, represents Augustus as having secured the empire against invasion not just by the deployment of camps, but by using the physical topography of the border regions themselves to keep out enemies: 'He also fortified the empire by hedging it round with major obstacles, rivers and trenches and mountains and deserted areas which were difficult to traverse' (2.11.5). Throughout the work, these borders generate significant plot activity, through the attempts of Romans to protect or (less frequently) expand them, and the efforts of barbarians to compromise them. One might

---

[6] Whittaker 1969–1970: I xxx–xxxi, II 128–129 n. 1.

instance here Commodus' attempt to bribe the Germans into staying on their own side of the frontier (1.6.8), Severus' first appearance in command at the Pannonian border (2.9.1–2), Artaxerxes' claim on all the territories of the old Achaemenids (6.2.1–2),[7] and Caracalla's disingenuous offer to unite Rome and Parthia through marriage: 'one invincible power no longer separated by a river' (4.10.2). Key rivers play a large part in the construction of these borders: Herodian defines the army of Severus, when it first appears, as 'the whole army lying on (*epikeimenon*) the banks of the Danube and the Rhine, keeping out (*apeirgon*) the barbarians' (2.9.1).[8]

Control of the physical borders between the Roman empire and its rivals, however, is only a part of Herodian's story. The contestation of space *within* the borders of the empire itself is likewise significant. Herodian makes it clear in his preface that his narrative is built on imperial usurpations: 'in a period of sixty years the Roman empire was shared by more rulers than the years warranted, so producing many strange phenomena' (1.1.5). The success and failure of the competing dynasts who throng his history often hinges upon their success or failure in controlling spaces within the empire against their adversaries.

The most significant of these spaces is the city of Rome itself. One of his councillors, Pompeianus, tries early in the narrative to convince Commodus to the contrary: 'Rome is where the Emperor is' (1.6.5). In keeping with his usual reticence on such matters, Herodian is sparing with detailed description of the city where the immediate narrative context does not demand it, despite his apparent assumption that his narratees are not necessarily familiar with all the Roman landmarks.[9]

The action of the books that follow, however, gainsays Pompeianus. Herodian's narrator twice identifies a failure to secure Rome as an element in the defeat of an aspirant to the imperial purple. Pescennius Niger, on the death of Commodus, 'neglected his departure for Rome, to which he ought to have been putting all his energies' (2.8.9). The

---

[7] The Tigris is explicitly described as 'the boundary of the Roman Empire'.

[8] Whittaker's translation slightly modified here in the interests of exactitude.

[9] Such is suggested by, for example, his careful explanation at 7.10.2 about the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus. See also Whittaker 1969–1970: I xxviii, who is, however, rightly cautious about inferring too much from such explanations as to the actual make-up of Herodian's narratees. We might recall that Sallust, whose narratees are explicitly Roman, still includes an ekphrasis on Rome's *carcer* at *BC* 55.

death of Macrinus, in flight after his final defeat, prompts the narrator to comment that 'the unhappy end he met was after he later decided to do what he should have done in the first place by returning to Rome' (5.4.12).

Herodian also, however, focuses upon other sites of strategic significance as well. Although areas across the empire receive this attention at key moments, one notes in particular the emphasis on the tactical importance of the Alps. When Julianus receives the news that his rival Severus is approaching, his advisors are quick to counsel the immediate capture of the Alpine passes, which the narrator goes on to highlight: 'The Alps are a very high range of mountains, far bigger than anything in our part of the world, and act as a barricade for the protection of Italy; this is another of the advantages which nature has given to Italy, an impregnable barrier cast up in their land as a fortification' (2.11.8). The defensive possibilities of the Alps later prey upon the minds of Maximinus' army, whom Herodian presents as rightfully leery of the area's potential hazards: 'In view of the type of terrain, their expectations and fears were real possibilities' (8.1.6).

Real possibilities, perhaps. But it is interesting to note that the 'expectations and fears' of Maximinus' men, however well-founded in principle, do not in fact amount to anything: 'they reached the other side without interference' (8.2.1). And while Julianus' advisors do indeed apprise him of the strategic significance of the Alps, the man himself conspicuously fails to make an appropriate response, pinning his hopes instead on a confrontation in the vicinity of Rome itself. Herodian ascribes this behaviour to Julianus' moral deficiencies: 'Julianus … did not *dare* to advance from the city' (2.11.9). For Herodian, Julianus' failure to command space is part and parcel of the flaws in his character. It both stems from these flaws and is emblematic of them.

This is a point worth stressing. In Herodian, the thematic, symbolic, and characterizing functions of space are often linked at a fundamental level. The failure to secure the Alps has an obvious thematic importance, since it is one of the factors which brings about the ascendancy of Severus. But that failure proceeds from the nature of Julianus himself, and so reveals his character. Moreover, it is the symbolic charge which Herodian imparts, through description and repetition, to certain spaces within his text—the city of Rome, above all, but others as well—that brings this delineation of character into focus. It is not just the fact that Julianus loiters that reveals exactly how Herodian views him. It is the place where he chooses to do it.

When in Rome

The city of Rome's thematic importance in Herodian's history is, then, obvious. Rome is the key to control of the empire. But the text invests the city with a strong symbolic importance as well. This goes beyond figuring it as a simple synecdoche for the empire. When Rome first makes a significant appearance in the narrative, the strategic significance of the city is not to the fore. Rather, it is the sensual delights that are associated with it, as explained by the hangers-on of the impressionable Commodus:

> They reminded Commodus of the soft life of Rome by telling him of the delightful pleasures to be seen and heard and recounting the great wealth of resources there. They were scathing about all seasons of the year on the banks of the Danube, a region which produced no fruits of harvest and was always cold and foggy, 'My Lord', they said, 'don't go drinking this icy, muddy water while others are enjoying the hot springs and cooling rivers, or the warm mists and clear air which are only to be found in Italy'.
>
> (1.6.1–2)

Commodus duly succumbs to these blandishments, and so begins his degeneration into frivolity and vice. This first portrait of Rome, as the abode of dubious delights, sets up an interesting tension within Herodian's text, which the narrative that follows amply explores. Herodian is insistent upon the importance of an emperor asserting his authority at the city of Rome itself. Niger and Macrinus err and doom themselves by putting off this duty until it is too late. At the same time, however, Rome is figured repeatedly as a site of sensual pleasures, which saps the moral rigour and dynamism that is essential to a successful emperor. Besides Commodus and Julianus, whose personal debauchery the narrator is at pains to stress (2.7.1), we may instance Septimius Severus' perception of the dangers the capital poses to the morals of his sons: 'he was anxious to get his sons out of Rome so they could return to their senses, leading a sober military life away from the luxurious delicacies of Rome' (3.14.2).[10] After Severus' death, Caracalla is successful for a time in winning general respect by leaving Rome and adopting such a military life on the banks of the Danube (4.7.2).

It should be stressed that Rome is by no means the *only* site associated with such possibilities in Herodian's narrative. Niger, for example, falls

---

[10] Cf. 3.10.3.

prey to similar temptations at Antioch (2.8.9).[11] Nonetheless, the contrastive moral geography that emerges in Herodian's text, where valour is proved at the frontiers and Rome, despite its central importance, carries the risk of slothful idleness, is clear.

While the city of Rome itself emerges as a particular locus for the propagation of an unwarlike character, the surrounding land of Italy is not immune to criticism on this front either. The advisors of Commodus in book 1 begin by extolling the 'soft life of Rome'. But before long they move on to 'the hot springs and cooling rivers, or the warm mists and clear air which are only to be found in Italy'. This temperate precipitation, one notes, is set in strong rhetorical antithesis to the frost and mud of the Danube. Herodian's insistence upon the freezing of the Rhine and the Danube later in the history thus has a point above and beyond the titillation of an erudite audience. The alien harshness of these great rivers, when seen from the perspective of Rome and its environs, is an important element in the ideological opposition between the manly ardours of the frontier and the unwarlike seductions of Italy.

Secure behind the defences, natural and military, provided by the planning of Augustus: 'the inhabitants of Italy had long ago abandoned armed warfare in favour of the peaceful occupation of farming' (2.11.3). 'After the extension of the Roman empire, the cities of Italy did not need walls or weapons anymore, and in place of war enjoyed complete peace and a share of Roman citizenship' (8.2.4). Threats to this peaceful existence are repeatedly presented as a spur to immediate action. 'The invasion of so large an army terrified the Italian cities when they heard the news' (2.11.6) of the approach of Severus, and prompts hasty diplomatic overtures; Alexander is forced back from the East on hearing that the Germans are on the march, because of the alleged territorial proximity that 'makes the Germans practically adjacent neighbours of the Italians' (6.7.4). Italy in Herodian is lush, but at once paradoxically cosseted and threatened by its geography. If the defensive wall of the Alps provides a measure of security, the nearness of potential foes instils paranoia: apart from the Germans, the possibility of assault from Britannia 'which was not a great distance away' from Rome, is enough to force a wary emperor to take appropriate precautions (2.15.2). The Vergilian *laus Italiae* (*Geor-*

---

[11] The delights of Antioch reappear in a more ambiguous light at 6.6.6; they serve to revive Alexander and his men after a gruelling campaign, but the emperor's sojourn there later gives rise to allegations of cowardice or apathy (6.7.3).

gics 2.136–176),[12] then, takes in this text a rather disconcerting twist. The very abundance and geographical advantages which have traditionally been praised are in Herodian's text an invitation to unwarlike pursuits and possible unmanliness.

Character Building(s)

Thus far, in considering Herodian's symbolic deployment of space, we have confined ourselves to the broadest of scales. We have observed the semantic charge that is carried by the large-scale antitheses at the heart of this historian's Imperial topography. Rome and Italy, fertile and strategically crucial but rife with incitements to vice and indolence, stand in opposition to the harsh frontiers where martial manhood and military capacity can be affirmed.

This picture needs to be modified, however, in two significant respects. On the one hand, these grand and simple contrasts are by no means as static as one might assume. We shall explore now how Herodian, in his final books, upsets the expectations which these earlier antitheses might lead the narratees to expect. On the other, we should note that Herodian's symbolic deployment of space also plays itself out on a scale much smaller than provinces and cities.

The career of Commodus is a case in point. In its broadest outlines the crucial point of spatial transition in the evolution of his character comes with his decision to leave the frontier in favour of the promised delights of Rome. In fact, however, his steady deterioration has more stages. Each of these is accompanied by a separate (or anticipated) change of location.

The initial move to Rome does ultimately lead to a descent into 'a life of pleasure and drunkenness' (1.8.1). Although this has unpleasant political consequences, however, it is not the end of the story. Successive plots against his life drive Commodus into yet greater detachment from his responsibilities; he 'rarely appeared in public, spending most of his time avoiding legal and imperial business away in the suburban districts or on his imperial estates far away from Rome' (1.11.5). Herodian brings out Commodus' symbolic detachment from his responsibilities through description of the place to which he retires at the threat of plague:

---

[12] See Mynors 1990: 119–125.

'Laurentinum, a cooler spot, shaded by huge laurel groves (which give the place its name). The doctors thought this place would be safe because it was reputed to be immune from infectious diseases in the atmosphere by virtue of the redolent fragrance of the laurels and the pleasant shade of the trees' (1.12.2). On the most basic level, the expansive description of the laurel groves explains the etymology of the name 'Laurentinum'. However, by endowing the site of Commodus' seclusion with some of the traditional characteristics of the *locus amoenus* (the cool and pleasant shade, the 'redolent fragrance of the laurels'), Herodian pursues his strategy, noted above, of presenting the idyllic landscape of Italy as the site of sensuous withdrawal from political and military realities; plague and famine rage at Rome while Commodus enjoys himself in these surroundings.

Events at Rome eventually force Commodus out of his spatial seclusion, first at Laurentinum, then 'on the outskirts of the city', 'in the secluded quarters of his palace without any idea of the commotion going on' (1.12.5–6). Their sequel, however, sees him returning to the city more bent on pleasure even than before (1.13.7–8). The nadir of his career comes with the threat of a further relocation, never carried out: 'his madness reached such a pitch that he even refused to stay in the palace any longer and was intending to go and live with the gladiators in their barracks' (1.15.8). Herodian, then, charts the decline of Commodus' character through the symbolic locations at which he comes to rest. Promising beginnings at the German border lead into debauchery at Rome, irresponsible seclusion at Laurentinum and the suburbs, a further spate of worse excess in Rome, and the final promise of residence with the gladiators.

The career of Commodus is perhaps the most extended exploration of the possibilities of symbolic geography in the text of Herodian. It is far, however, from being the only one. The Palace, a symbolically charged locale in Herodian as in other authors, figures near the end of Commodus' life as symbolic of the imperial responsibilities which he plans to abandon in favour of his gladiatorial fantasies. This is by no means the only use to which Herodian puts it within his text, however, and its varying deployments throughout the history are an interesting test case in the different values with which the historian is capable of endowing key points in his symbolic geography. The Palace is frequently, as one would expect, a synecdoche for imperial authority. A repeating motif within the text is the characteristic trajectory of an incoming emperor: he visits a temple, in a due display of piety, and then he

establishes himself at the palace.[13] Neither of these locales is described in detail.[14] But the iteration of this pattern conveys the sense of an efficient transmission of authority.

This is not all the Palace in Herodian can signify, though. Apart from anything else, Herodian can generate a sense of trepidation in the narratees when the pattern noted in the previous paragraph is compromised. Thus, Elagabalus, notably, is *not* described as visiting a temple and then setting up at the Palace on his accession to the purple. The point at which he might have been expected to do so is occupied by a description of him *building* a temple instead, to the Emesene god whose obsessive worship is one of the markers of his incapacity as an emperor (5.5.8). In the case of Elagabalus, the first explicit appearance of the palace comes not when he takes up his rightful place in it, but when he profanes the hidden image of Pallas (unmoved, as Herodian is careful to note, since its arrival from Troy) by transferring it thither (5.6.3).

The same sorts of locations replete with sacral and imperial authority, which can validate a reasonably smooth transition of power in the case of some of Herodian's emperors, can thus be brought into play to bring out the full transgressive horror that obtains when such a transition goes askew. Elagabalus besmirches the palace, and the authority it represents, by figuring it as the site for a bizarre experiment in theological coupling. The warring brothers Geta and Caracalla, by contrast, take a different, but equally pernicious tack. After a seemingly smooth transfer, their cold war converts the vast palace in which they both reside, 'a vast, spacious building that was bigger than any city' (4.1.2),[15] into a surrogate for the empire over which they vie: 'there they lived separate lives; the buildings were partitioned off, all the private connecting passages were bricked up and only the outer, public entrances were left in use' (4.1.5).

Space and place in Herodian are not, then, always immutable constants. The shifting ways in which they are constructed and perceived by the players within his text make a marked contribution to its evolution. It

---

[13] 2.14.2 (Septimius Severus); 4.1.4 (Geta and Caracalla).

[14] In line with his usual narrative practices, it is unusual for Herodian to describe the interiors of buildings unless these interiors have some immediate thematic or symbolic importance. In the case of Commodus' assassination, for example, the various palace rooms involved are brought in to emphasize the grisly mechanics of orchestrating the Emperor's demise (1.17.1, 4; 2.1.1).

[15] For this conceit, compare Martial *Liber spectaculorum* 2.4 (of Nero's *domus aurea*), with Coleman 2006: 30.

is this *diachronic* aspect to the handling of space in Herodian—the way in which what had seemed to be fixed and stable in earlier books is revealed as fluid and uncertain in the later, to which we turn in the final section.

Relative Dimensions in Space

The change and development in the treatment of space as Herodian's text progresses manifests in a number of forms. In some instances Herodian establishes a spatial pattern to make a point when that pattern does not obtain. The repeating temple-palace progression, for example, symbolically marks an initially smooth transition of imperial power in a number of cases and, through its subversion, a bumpy ride in others.

This is not the only such strategy which Herodian deploys. The historian brings into focus the differing characters of individuals within his text by setting up spatially similar scenes that unfold in significantly different ways. For instance, on three separate occasions the first glimpse which the narratees have of a claimant to the imperial purple takes place within that man's private house. This spatial concinnity, however, only brings out the profound differences that separate the characters of the three in question. When Pertinax's house is invaded by those seeking to make him emperor, he reacts with notable *sang froid*: 'Reports certainly say that he remained so calm he did not even get off his couch and never changed his expression' (2.1.6). Pertinax's calm refusal to rise contrasts him strongly and favourably with the excitable and bibulous Julianus: 'it was getting on towards evening as he was feasting when the news of the soldiers' offer reached him, while he was in a drunken stupor … His wife and daughter and a number of clients persuaded him to get up quickly from his couch and run to the camp wall to find out what was happening' (2.6.7). Gordian I lacks the drunkenness and unseemly enthusiasm of Julianus, but equally he cannot match the dignity and resolution of Pertinax. When he too is subjected to domestic invasion, his response is less than encouraging: 'he threw himself off the couch down at their feet and begged them to spare the life of an innocent old man' (7.5.4). The repeating spatial motif of the emperor (or pretender)-to-be at home on his couch illustrates, then, the diversity of possible responses.

The expectations which earlier treatments of space have put in place may likewise by subverted, to disturbing effect. Maximinus' unsuccessful invasion of Italy, in book 8, is perhaps the most notable example of this technique in operation. In attempting to march on Rome from the

north to secure power, Maximinus is (literally) following in the footsteps of his successful predecessor, Septimius Severus (2.11–12). This time, however, the old certainties which seemed to have been established about space in this text are unravelling, or unfold in unexpected ways. Maximinus' expectation of trouble at the defensive bulwark of the Alps, while reasonable, is unfounded. His attempt to impose himself upon Italy through that staple of historiography, a proper siege-narrative, descends into farce. The first city he tries to assault is entirely empty; at the second, the besiegers suffer more than the besieged.[16]

The old polarities, too, prove surprisingly treacherous. From the beginning of the text, Herodian has expressed a key antithesis between Italy and the frontiers in terms of hydrodynamics. The waters of Italy, as recommended by the advisors of Commodus in book 1, have been presented as temperate and appealing, though with the potential to be unmanning. The rivers and marshlands of the frontiers, by contrast, have appeared as harsh, icy, and perilous, but also as places where martial prowess may be expressed. One thinks of the forbidding Rhine and Danube or, further afield, of the wetlands of which in Herodian's account Britannia is largely constituted.

Book 8, however, springs a surprise. The waters of Italy, when put to the test, turn out to be less inviting than one might expect:

> Some Germans were unfamiliar with the swift, rushing currents of Italian rivers, which they thought flowed gently into the plain, as in their own country (it is this slow moving current, incidentally, that causes the rivers to freeze so easily). These men plunged into the river with their horses, which were used to swimming, but were swept away and lost.   (8.4.3)

The surprising potential swiftness of Mediterranean rivers is an observable fact.[17] But Herodian deploys it here to subtle effect. Focalized by Maximinus' German troops, it is *Italy*, not the frontiers, which is the threatening and alien landscape into which they venture on campaign, prey to their own ignorant assumptions about how terrain might be expected to function. At the same time, Herodian both continues his narrative strategy of presenting Maximinus' behaviour towards Rome and Italy as like a general laying waste to a hostile territory,[18] and hints at the

---

[16] 8.1.4 (the empty city); 8.5.3 (the unsuccessful siege).

[17] Horden and Purcell 2000: 61.

[18] Cf. 7.3.6, where 'spoils' (*skula*) are being conveyed *from* Rome itself to the camp of Maximinus.

disconcerting deliquescence of old certainties that helps to bring about the emperor's undoing.

Conclusion

The thematic significance of space and its control in Herodian's text is not unexpected in a historian who tells the story of the period which he covers. The treatment of such matters in Herodian, however, also has a marked symbolic register. Characters within his text are defined, at least in part, through their interaction with significant spaces, which, in turn, helps Herodian's explanation of why events unfold the way they do. Nor is the semantic charge which these significant spaces carry a reassuring constant. The thought-world of Herodian's text is a treacherous place, and not altogether predictable. It is not only the hapless Germans of book 8 who run the risk of being tripped up by their expectations.

PART THREE

CHORAL LYRIC

PINDAR AND BACCHYLIDES

B.G.F. Currie

General

On the whole space is of interest in epinician for what happens in it.[1] Epinician space serves primarily as the setting for events, the exercise of human *areta* at different times. Praise of the victor's hometown is an epinician topos (*O.* 13.18–23; 10.14–15; *N.* 1.13–18). Epinician is not very interested in the physical geography of localities (contrast Pi. *Pae.* 2.25–26, 4.21–27; S. *OC* 668–719), the focus is on the human achievement associated with the locality. Each locality has its hero(es) to commemorate (*I.* 5.30–35). On Aeginetan soil it is a requisite (*tethmion*) to celebrate the Aeacidae (*I.* 6.19–22). Certain localities breed heroic achievements, hence the catalogues of achievements boasted by Argos (*N.* 10.1–20) and Thebes (*I.* 7.1–14). The victor's hometown is a stage for excellence in mythical times and in the present (*P.* 8.21–34). Continuity of excellence in a place is an implied premise of the common use of locations to cue transitions from contemporary to mythical narrative or vice-versa, via a local relative pronoun, *entha* (*pote*), 'where (once)' (*O.* 7.34, etc.). Frequently the transition exploits an ambiguity of persons and places, especially eponymous nymphs ('to Pitana, who …', *O.* 6.27; 'of Cyrena, whom …', *P.* 9.4–5), but periphrastic local designations containing a personal name may function similarly ('in the colony of Lydian Pelops [sc. Olympia], whom …').

Space in epinician tends to be invisible. It is not necessary for the action of a mythical narrative to be explicitly located in any determinate space. When it is explicitly located in a determinate space, spatial details may receive next to no attention, in keeping with the poets' general

---

[1] This chapter deals only with epinician, as in *SAGN* 1 and 2, not the other genres in which Pindar and Bacchylides composed.

'economy' in 'forging the fabula into a story.'[2] Alternatively, a single significant object or feature may dominate the depiction of the space. Synoptic blocks of space description are extremely rare (an exception is the description of Aetna in *Pythian* 1). The rule is to include sporadic indications of spatial detail as and when the narrative calls for it. The five types of spatial location in which epinician is recurrently interested are: the site of the games, the athlete's hometown, the place of the ode's performance, the setting(s) of the mythical narrative, and the poet's hometown.

Types of Epinician Narrative

For the appreciation of the handling of space in epinician it is necessary to recognize three types of narrative in epinician: performance narrative, athletic narrative and mythical narrative.[3] This still excludes *gnomai*, victory data, victory catalogues, and prayers, as non-narrative elements.

Performance narrative: epinician poetry contains a good deal of narrative pertaining to the present performance of the victory ode and, sometimes, to other poetic performances, either of the current ode or of another song, which lie either in the future (*N.* 4.13–16, 89–90, reading *aeisetai*) or the past (*O.* 9.1–4).

Athletic narrative: a significant part of epinician narrative is devoted to the athletic victory and its circumstances.[4] With striking exceptions (*P.* 5.30–42; B. 5.37–49; 9.27–38) epinician athletic narratives are highly compressed. That fact is worth remarking, given the expansive narratives of athletic competition in epic (*Il.* 23.257–897; *Od.* 8.111–255), choral lyric (Stes. fr. 178–180 *PMG*), and tragedy (S. *El.* 681–756)—all, notably, mythical athletic contests. Athletic narrative can include previous victories and missed victories (*N.* 11.24–32), as well as actions of the athlete in the run-up to and aftermath of the victory.

Mythical narrative: by far the most extensive epinician narratives pertain to mythical events, where 'mythical' must be understood to include mythologized historical events, as the Battus-narrative in *Pythian* 5 and the Croesus-narrative in Bacchylides 3.

---

[2] *SAGN* 1: 220.
[3] A more inclusive definition of epinician narrative, therefore, than that adopted in *SAGN* 1 and 2.
[4] *SAGN* 1: 213, plus *P.* 5.27–42, 8.58–60; *O.* 5.4–7; B. 3.5–9, 9.27–38, 11.17–23.

The extreme compression of most performance and athletic narrative problematizes their status as narrative, but that is true of some Pindaric mythical narratives as well.[5] In practice scholarship often implicitly promotes discourse on performance and athletic competition to the status of narrative by calling the speaker in such sections a 'narrator'.[6] Strictly a speaker only becomes a narrator when s/he narrates. But much performance and athletic narrative fulfils a requirement of narrative by comprising a sequence of at least two events.[7] The main argument for recognizing performance, athletic and mythical narrative is that the interaction of all three types of narrative is often crucial to the poem's effect. This will become apparent below.

Space in Performance Narrative

Our interest here is not in the vexed question of where epinicians were actually performed, which belongs to the *Realien* of epinician, but in the presentation of performance space in text, a proper concern of narratology.

In some cases the ode's performative space may be made explicit. In such cases we may speak of explicit performance space. Examples are the performance of *Olympian* 5 in the grove of Athena in Camarina (10–14); of *Pythian* 5 'at Cyrene, around the sweet garden of Aphrodite' (24); of *Pythian* 10 in Ephyra, around R. Peneius (55–59); of *Nemean* 3 on Aegina, by R. Asopus (3–5); of *Nemean* 1 and 9 at the house of Chromius, in Aetna (*N.* 1.19–20, 9.3); of *Nemean* 11 at the *prytaneion* of Tenedos (3); of *Isthmian* 8 at the house of Telesarchus (2–3); of Bacchylides 11 at 'the city of Metapontum' (10–12). What appear to be quite specific details of performative space may often in fact be vaguer metonymic expressions. 'Around the sweet garden of Aphrodite' may mean nothing more specific than 'at Cyrene'; 'the city of Metapontum' may mean no more than 'Metapontum' (the city proper—i.e., *asty* in a marked sense—plus its outlying territory, *khōra*); and 'in city X, by the river Y' may mean just 'in city X, which lies on the river Y'. Details when given tend to be sketchy and to leave much to the imagination. *Olympian*

---

[5] *SAGN* 2: 234–235.
[6] Cf. Schmid 1998; Hutchinson 2001; Morrison 2007a.
[7] *SAGN* 1: 6.

5.10–14, an evocation of a sanctuary comparable in level of detail to Sappho frgs., 96 Voigt, is unusual for Pindar (this ode's authorship is sometimes questioned).

Often it may be tempting to infer that space mentioned or described in the ode is performative space even when not explicitly identified as such. Such a temptation arises when the (non-mythical) narrative of the ode devotes attention to extraneous-seeming spatial detail. In such cases it may be tempting to speak of implicit performance space. Examples are the altar of Ajax, Opus (*O.* 9.112); the 'hot bathing-places of the Nymphs', Himera (*O.* 12.19); the road for Apolline processions, agora and tomb of Battus (*P.* 5.90–93); the Ismenium, Thebes (*P.* 11.6); the Aeginetan Thearion (*N.* 3.70).

Special problems are posed by secondary (embedded) performances, which often have their own performance space, explicit or implicit. It is unclear (but was presumably not so to the first audience) whether such embedded performance narratives imply similarity or difference from the actual (primary) performance.[8] Examples are the Muses and Apollo singing of Peleus' exploits on Mt Pelion (*N.* 5.22 ff.); girls singing of the Aeacidae by the banks of a river—on Aegina? (*B.* 13.83 ff.); garland-wearing boys singing in the past of Cean victories—at Olympia? (*B.* 6.5–9); victory songs being sung in the Olympian sanctuary at the very first Olympic games (*O.* 10.76–77); Epharmostus and his companions performing after his victory an old song of Archilochus at Olympia (*O.* 9.1–4).

It is a question who the narratees are of performance narrative: for whose benefit are these localizations in the text? Many epinicians envisage both a première (most often, to an audience of the victor's townspeople, *I.* 8.8) and various subsequent receptions (by a panhellenic audience, *B.* 13.228–231; *O.* 9.21–26).[9] Some spatial details may work as 'ocular deixis'.[10] The narratees in such cases will be the audience of the première, for whom the spatial details in the narrative are present to see. But often spatial designations are at a higher level of generality than that communicative situation requires. It is hard to understand statements locating the performance 'on Aegina', 'in Cyrene', 'in Metapontum', etc., as being for the benefit of an audience of Aeginetans, Cyreneans, and Metapontians. The narratees of such performance narrative are natu-

---

[8] Cf. Power 2000.
[9] Currie 2004; Morrison 2007b.
[10] 'Ocular deixis': Felson 2004: 254.

rally understood to be non-local—panhellenic—audiences.[11] This is not to say that very general localizations of the 'on Aegina' type exclude local audiences as narratees. Rather, the suggestion that the ode is directed to a panhellenic audience is gratifying above all to a local audience, who will be pleased to be 'put on the map'. This is the spatial equivalent of 'inscriptional *pote*', by means of which the narrative indicates that recent or contemporary events are intended to be viewed from the perspective of future audiences.[12]

Epinician performance narrative is considerably enriched by its capacity to use 'frames', mostly of a metaphorical kind. The *kōmos* that travels from Sicyon to Aetna (*N*. 9.1–2) is manifestly a fictional construct. The narrator (as poet) may be airborne, like an eagle (*B*. 11.13–14; *N*. 5.21; 7.75–76). He may fire arrows from a position of elevation to transfix the (shifting) targets of his song (*O*. 9.5–12, cf. *O*. 2.83–85; *N*. 6.26–29). The poet has a multitude of possible 'roads of song' to travel (*I*. 4.1; *N*. 6.45; *B*. 5.31–33; 19.1), the preferred means of locomotion being chariot (*O*. 1.110–111; 6.22–28; *P*. 4.247–248; *N*. 6.53–54; *I*. 8.61, cf. *I*. 2.2, fr. 52h.11 Maehler; *B*. 5.177–178; 10.51–52) or boat (*P*. 10.51; 11.39–40; *N*. 3.26–27). The metaphorical journeys of performance narrative may complexly mirror the 'real' journeys of athletic narrative (as *O*. 6.22–27) or mythical narrative (as *N*. 3.20–28); this is discussed below in relation to *O*. 1.108–111.[13] These metapoetic metaphors of course become important later, especially in Alexandrian and Augustan poetry (e.g. Call. *Aet*. fr. 1.25–28 Massimilla; Verg. *G*. 2.41–45, 541–542). But their intricate interaction with other parts of the poem's narrative is a speciality of epinician.

Another important location in performance narrative is the home-town of the narrator (as poet), the epinician variant of the 'reference to the narrator's own space' motif: for Pindar, Thebes (*O*. 6.84–87, 90; 10.85; *P*. 4.299; *I*. 1.1–5; 6.74–75; 8.16, etc.); for Bacchylides, Ceos (3.98; 5.10–11; 10.10). The narrator's hometown tends (except *I*. 1.1–5) to be mentioned to emphasize its difference from that of the local narratees (the victor and his townspeople), to whom the narrator is a *xenos* (*N*. 7.61; *B*. 5.11, etc.). The narrator (as poet) often 'sends' the song: either by staying put and dispatching it to its destination or by personally escorting it (*O*. 7.8; 9.25; *P*. 2.68; *N*. 3.77; cf. *N*. 9.52; *B*. 5.12, 197).[14] The poet's

---

[11] Compare *SAGN* 1: 218–219.
[12] Young 1983.
[13] Hutchinson 2001: 385.
[14] Mullen 1982: 29–30.

hometown and victor's hometown constitute alternative 'real' locations of the narrator, as opposed to the unreal locations of metaphorical performance space. Yet together these 'real' locations combine to create notable unclarities or inconsistencies in the narrator's spatial position: is he here or there? The inconsistencies cannot entirely be resolved by referring some statements to the ode's 'coding time' (time of composition), others to its 'receiving time' (time of performance).[15] In one extended passage of performance narrative in *Olympian* 6 we must intuit an internal primary narrator personally participating in the present performance (22–28; note especially 28, where the metaphorical chariot is to come to Pitana 'today, in good season': i.e., this is performance, not just composition). In another extended passage of performance narrative in the same ode we must infer an external primary narrator absent from the present performance, whose execution he has entrusted to Aeneas (88–92).[16] Even when dealing with 'real' performance locations a strong element of fiction remains.

The poet-narrator's mobility is matched by that of the song itself which may travel independently of the poet. The song (*O.* 1.8–11; 3.9–10) or the *kōmos* (*N.* 9.1–2) may travel to the site of the poetic performance from the site of the athletic victory; or, when performed at the site of the victory, may travel to the victor's hometown (B. 2). Subsequent to its first performance in the victor's hometown it may be disseminated 'in all directions' (*O.* 9.21–26; *N.* 5.2–3; cf. *I.* 4.41–44; B. 13.231). The space of subsequent performances is unbounded.

Space in Athletic Narrative

The location of athletic narrative—the site of the games—is obvious, but rarely are topographical details furnished. An exception is Carrhotus' dedication of the intact winning chariot in Apollo's temple (*P.* 5.34–42). Similar is Hieron's dedication of golden tripods in the Delphic sanctuary (B. 3.17–21), not strictly athletic narrative, however, as the ode celebrates an Olympic victory.

The primary narratees may be mentally transported to the place of victory through the use of on-lookers: as it were, their 'stand-ins'. 'The crowd shouted' (B. 3.9); 'maidens saw you winning many victories' (*P.*

---

[15] D'Alessio 2004.

[16] Hutchinson 2001: 414–415; D'Alessio 2004: 289–290.

9.97–100); 'the Eleans welcomed him with a shout' (*I*. 2.25–27), 'voices celebrated him twice in the festival of the Athenians' (*N*. 10.33–35). The narrator himself may be the spectator: '[the son of Archestratus], whom I saw prevailing in the strength of his hand by the Olympian altar' (*O*. 10.100–105). The victory may be viewed from an aerial or divine stand-point: 'Eos (or, without personification: the dawn) saw him …' (B. 5.37–41), 'Helius (or: the sun) did not see him …' (B. 11.22), 'Apollo saw him …' (*I*. 2.18). Proto-athletic contests in mythical narrative also may have spectators: the nymph Nemea (or Athena) watches Heracles wrestle the Nemean lion (B. 13.46–54), Apollo watches the nymph Cyrene wrestle a lion (*P*. 9.26–28). The channelling of the athletic action through specta-tors' reactions is common to other texts (cf. *Il*. 23.448–498, 728, 766–767, 815, 847, 869, 881; S. *El*. 749) and even pictorial narrative (black-figure *dinos* of Sophilus: Athens, National Museum 15499).

Space in Mythical Narrative

Several questions may be asked of mythical narrative: what types of spatial location are found? How is space presented? How does space in mythical narrative interact with space in performative and/or athletic narrative?

We address first the question of the range of locations of Pindar's mythical narratives. Sometimes the choice of spatial setting of the myth-ical narrative takes its cue from the site of the games (e.g. *O*. 1, 3) or the victor's hometown (e.g. *O*. 7; B. 1). In Bacchylides 9 and 11 we find both: a mythical narrative concerned with the site of the games is fol-lowed by one connected with the victor's hometown. A shared spatial setting is one very immediate way of linking mythical with athletic or performance narrative.

In some cases the setting of the myth is connected indirectly with the victor's hometown. In Bacchylides 11, Arcadian Lousoi (the setting for the mythical narrative at its climax, 95–112) is linked with Italian Metapontum (the victor's hometown and performance setting) through the transferred cult of Artemis (113–117). Troy, the arena for excellence of the Aeacidae, is the near inevitable choice of mythical setting for Aeginetan odes (e.g. *O*. 8; *N*. 3; 4.25–30; 8; *I*. 5; 6; 8; B. 13).

In other cases the mythical narrative is set in a location quite un-connected with the victory; the mythical narrative then expands the ode's spatial horizons considerably. The underworld is the setting for

Bacchylides 5 and *Olympian* 2, the Hyperboreans in *Olympian* 3 and *Pythian* 10, Sardis in Bacchylides 3. The location of the mythical narrative seems quite independent of athletic or performance narrative in several odes (e.g. *P.* 2; 3; 6; 11; 12; *N.* 1; 10; *I.* 4).

With regard to how space is presented in epinician mythical narrative, an important general characteristic of Pindar's (to a lesser extent Bacchylides') mythical narratives is their highly uneven rhythm.[17] They fast-forward to the moments in which they are chiefly interested and then linger on these as stills or tableaux.[18] The effect is kaleidoscopic, a succession of brilliant images starkly juxtaposed. Significant spatial detail tends to come in such tableaux, if anywhere. Choral lyric narrative can in general be seen as being in self-conscious opposition to the 'flowing genres', especially epic.[19] This is captured in the metapoetic image of a bee going from flower to flower (*P.* 10.54). The handling of space within the narrative thus becomes a figure for the poem's narrative (dis)continuity. This pointed concentration on some spatial details (in tableaux) and neglect of other spatial details (ellipsis) can be best appreciated by a linear reading of an ode; this is attempted below for *Olympian* 1.

The reduction of a fabula to isolated impressive tableaux (with often only a perfunctory connection between them) is matched by concentration within the tableaux on a single dominant feature, an object or prop. An instance is the olive trees of Olympia in *Olympian* 3, whose mythical narrative contains noteworthy spatial descriptions of the sanctuary of Zeus at Olympia (19–24) and the land of the Hyperboreans (14, 31–32). Heracles is secondary focalizer for both spatial descriptions: '[the moon] burned in his face' (19–20), 'the grove appeared to him …' (24), 'he saw' (31), 'he marvelled' (32). The description of each locality is dominated by its (olive) trees: their presence in the case of the Hyperboreans, their absence at Olympia. There is nothing unusual in sanctuaries being distinguished by trees (*Od.* 6.162–167; Hdt. 8.55; S. *OC* 694–701), but the significance of the Olympian olive subtly pervades the narrative. An import from the Hyperboreans, who are associated with eternal bliss, the Olympian olive crown aptly conveys the lasting beatitude of the Olympic victor (cf. *O.* 1.97–99).[20] It was, moreover, the

---

[17] *SAGN* 2: 248–249.

[18] Cf. *SAGN* 2: 237–240, esp. 237.

[19] Cf. Fränkel 1975: 445; Burnett 1985: 9, 111; Braswell 1988: 160–161; Hutchinson 2001: 370.

[20] Krummen 1990: 258–259.

mention of the olive tree (this is the antecedent of the relative *tan pote*, 13) that motivates the mythical narrative, and it is important to notice how this (voluntary) quest of Heracles to bring the olive from the Hyperboreans to Olympia overshadows in the narrative his (enforced) labour of bringing the Ceryneian hind to Eurystheus; an ethical comment on the Olympic festival itself is implied. The olive tree casts its shadow far over the narrative (not just the Olympic sanctuary!). This elevation of a mythological *parergon* to the status of chief heroic exploit within a narrative anticipates Alexandrian poetics: Callimachus' *Hecale* or Theocritus' *Heracles the Lion-Slayer*.

In *Nemean* 10, the Apharetidae Idas and Lynceus make their last stand against Polydeuces at a pointedly specified place, the tomb of their father Aphareus (66–68). The tomb's location itself is not specified (unlike the location from which Lynceus descried the Dioscuri: Mt Taygetus, 61). Possibly the audience's knowledge of the myth (from the *Cypria*?) could be assumed to supplement the elliptical narrative, or perhaps the tomb's symbolic function in the narrative should be seen as supplanting interest in topographical detail. Tombs are frequent landmarks in literature, but there is here an ominous significance in a narrative which will hinge on the question of mortal versus divine parentage. Idas, Lynceus, and Castor all have mortal fathers and the encounter is to be fatal for all of them (commuted to a half-death in Castor's case). If the Apharetidae hoped to draw some kind of chthonian strength from rallying at their father's tomb, that hope is answered by the very real help that Zeus gives to *his* son Polydeuces (71). The tomb of Aphareus, symbol of the mortality of those born of a mortal, becomes proleptic of the outcome of the narrative.

A spatial prop *par excellence* is a piece of the locality itself, as the clod of Libyan soil passed from 'Eurypylus' (the disguised god Triton) to the Argonaut Euphamus in *Pythian* 4. This, the longest of extant epinicians, may be divided into two (related) mythical narratives: a 'Medea Argonautica' (10–58), told in typically Pindaric discontinuous style; and an 'Argonautica proper' (70–254), told in a more linear Stesichorean style.[21] The bulk of the 'Medea Argonautica' is narrated by Medea as secondary narrator. Her embedded narrative comprises: first, a simultaneous narration of events that are occurring, or have just occurred, at Thera (9–11,

---

[21] Cf. *SAGN* 1: 227.

38–40, 42–43); second, a subsequent narration of events that occurred at 'the waters of the Lake of Triton' (20–37); third, a counterfactual prior narration of events that might have happened at Taenarus (44); fourth, a prophetic prior narration of events to take place successively at Lemnos (implied; cf. 252–259), Thera, Delphi, and Cyrene (50–56). This secondary narrative presents a vertiginous gallop through time and space, a *tour de force* of Pindaric narrative style. What holds the narrative together is that piece of Libyan soil which (to reconstruct the *fabula*) was entrusted to Euphamus by Triton at the Lake of Triton in Libya (20–37), was washed ashore at Thera at the time of Medea's narration, might otherwise have been safely brought by Euphamus back to Taenarus (44, cf. 174), and at a later date (substantially posterior to Medea's secondary narrative and substantially anterior to the epinician narrator's primary narrative) will motivate Battus' colonizing voyage in the reverse direction, from Thera back to Cyrene in Libya (53–56; cf. in the primary narrative 4–8, 59–63). As a spatial prop in a charter myth of territorial possession the clod is comparable to the tripod entrusted to Triton by Iason, likewise at Lake Tritonis in Libya (Hdt. 4.179), but a piece of the land is a more quintessential expression of a territorial claim and unlike the tripod the clod is mobile, its vagaries offering a mirror-image of the vagaries of Euphamus' descendants (the Minyae will ultimately colonize Cyrene from Lemnos via Sparta and Thera). The theme of the clod's safe conveyance from Libya back to Greece in the 'Medea Argonautica' serves as a kind of narrative prolepsis (compare above on Aphareus' tomb in *N.* 1), and through a mythological *parergon* seemingly upstages the parallel quest to convey the golden fleece from Colchis back to Greece in the 'Argonautica proper' (70–254) (compare above on the Hyperborean olive and Ceryneian hind in *O.* 3).

These examples must suffice to indicate (what we would have expected anyway) that spatial details tend not to be included superfluously in mythical narrative. There remains the question how space in mythical narrative interacts with space in performative and/or athletic narrative. Frequently there is an analogical relationship between the mythical and the other narrative types. In particular there is an emphasis on connections between the site of victory and the site of the celebration. Of prime importance are journeys, especially arrivals. The 'arrival-motif' may be common to the choral narrator-performer (*O.* 7.13; *P.* 3.73; *Pae.* 6.13), to the athlete entering the contest (*P.* 11.49) or returning home from it (*O.* 7.13), and to heroes in the mythical narrative arriving at their destination (*P.* 4.55; *N.* 3.25).

First, the interaction of mythical with athletic narrative. In *Pythian* 4 it is Delphi where, in the mythical narrative, Apollo declared Battus founder of Cyrene through the Pythia's spontaneous salutation (4–8, 59–63, cf. 53–56) and where, in the athletic narrative, Apollo granted victory to Arcesilas (66–67, cf. 3). In *Pythian* 9 the mythical narrative focuses on the journey of Apollo and Cyrana from mainland Greece (three localities specified: Mt Pelion, 5; Mt Pindos, 15; R. Peneius, 16) to Libya (5–13, 52–58, 68–70); similarly the athletic narrative focuses on the parallel return-journey of Telesicrates from central Greece (Delphi) to Cyrene (73–75). Telesicrates will be 'received' (73) in his hometown by Cyrana, just as in the mists of time Aphrodite and Libya 'received' (9, 56) Apollo and Cyrana in the same location. Sometimes one component of the analogy may be left implicit. In the mythical narrative of *Isthmian* 4, Heracles goes 'from Thebes' (54) to Libya to wrestle with Antaeus; similarly, but implicitly, the victor Melissus departed from Thebes to wrestle at the Isthmian games.

Second, the interaction of mythical with performance narrative. In the performance narrative that opens *Isthmian* 6 it is apparent that the narrator, the Theban Pindar, has come to the house of his Aeginetan *xenos* Lampon on the occasion of their victory celebrations and prays through the epinician for the future success of Lampon's son Phylacidas (1–18); in the mythical narrative, the Theban Heracles comes to the house of his Aeginetan *xenos* Telamon while they are celebrating a feast and makes a prayer for the future success of his son Ajax (35–56). In Bacchylides 11, the mythical narrative culminates with the inaugural sacrifices made by Proetus at the sanctuary erected by him to Artemis at Lousoi (110–112); the ode ends with the evocation of Artemis' grove in Metapontum (118–119), founded from the sanctuary at Lousoi (113–117), and arguably the setting for the victory celebrations at Metapontum (implicit performance space). At the climax of the mythical narrative of *Nemean* 1, Amphitryon 'stood' (*esta de*, 55) dumbstruck on the threshold of the bed-chamber, comtemplating the wondrous scene within, Heracles strangling the two serpents; in the performance narrative, the narrator 'stood' (*estan d'*, 19) at the outer door of Chromius' house, by implication contemplating the victor within, hosting the victory celebrations.[22] It is not always a concrete locality (as Apollo's Delphic sanctuary), but sometimes generic

---

[22] Schmid 1998: 170.

space (the threshold of a house—any house) that creates the spatial correspondence between tableaux in the mythical and performance narratives. In *Nemean* 3, Heracles' voyage in mythical narrative to the limits of the world, his turning-point (22–26), mirrors the narrator's detouring 'voyage' in performance narrative (26–28). Here it is a metapoetic-metaphorical voyage in performance narrative that creates the correspondence.

Space and time are often used to contrast two events (*here and now* as opposed to *there and then*). But they can also be used to compare two events. Epinician is not interested in events occurring in different places at the same time (*here and now* opposed to *there and now*), it is profoundly interested in events occurring at different times in the same place (*here and now* opposed to *here and then*). In epinician, contemporary persons (athletic victors) characteristically tread the same ground as mythical heroes, though at a great chronological remove ('treading in the footsteps of' is of course a Pindaric metaphor: *O.* 6.8; *P.* 8.35; 10.13–15; *N.* 6.15–16).

Festivals and their associated sacred space (sanctuaries) frequently provide a transition between mythical heroes and contemporary athletes, and provide an even more concrete sense of athletes treading in heroes' footsteps. Festivals, of course, are celebrated over and over in the same place for a great stretch of time. Even the most recent celebration shares both a setting and a causal link with the foundational event (*aition*) that inaugurated the festival and established the sanctuary. Epinician mythical narrative is frequently aetiological, narrating the foundation of the sanctuary in which the athletic victory was won and/or of the sanctuary in which the victory ode is being performed. In such cases sacred space provides a vivid point of convergence for mythical and athletic and/or performance narrative. So in *Pythian* 5 Battus' establishment of the Carneia festival and temple of Apollo ('mythical' narrative: 77–81, 89–93) segues into the singing of the present ode apparently at Apollo's festival and in its associated sacred space (implicit performance narrative: 103–107, cf. 23). In *Olympian* 1 the establishment of Pelops' cult and the Olympic festival at the culmination of the mythical narrative segues into Hieron's recent victory at the Olympic games and its celebration in song (see below). In *Isthmian* 4 the establishment of Heracles' sanctuary and festival at the culmination of the mythical narrative (61–68) segues into celebration of Melissus' multiple past victories at the Heracleia (athletic narrative: 69–71b), where quite probably the current ode was also performed (implicit performance narra-

tive).²³ A similar but more complex progression may be traced in Bac-chylides 11: Proetus' founding of an Artemis sanctuary at Arcadian Lousoi (mythical narrative: 110–112) segues into celebration of Alexi-damus' victory in an Artemis sanctuary in Italian Metapontum, an off-shoot of the Arcadian cult (113–120).²⁴

Aetna in Pythian 1

The spatial location that most completely and most complexly dominates an ode is Aetna in *Pythian* 1. Here spatial location becomes a *Leitmotiv* on which the ode's performance, the athletic victory, and mythical nar-rative all depend.

A condensed mythical narrative (15–19) recounts Zeus' defeat of Typhos, one of those whom, in chilling litotes, 'Zeus does not love' (13). Typhos' life is encapsulated by a summary review of three (four?) localities with which he is associated: 'dread Tartarus' (15), in which he lies; the 'Cilician cave' (17), which nurtured him; 'the banks above Cumae and Sicily' (18–19), which now press upon his shaggy chest. The mention of Sicily is expanded in the next nine lines into an extended description of Aetna (20–28):

> … the heavenly pillar, snow-clad Aetna, all year round nurse of dazzling snow, confines him. Most pure springs of unapproachable fire are belched out from its recesses, and rivers pour forth a blazing stream of smoke by day; but in the night a revolving red flame bears rocks to the deep tract of the sea with a crash. That creature sends up most terrible springs of Hephaestus. It is a wonderous portent to look upon, and a wonder for people to hear when present, the thing that is confined in the dark-leafed peaks and soil of Aetna, while his bedding lashes his whole back, harrowing it as it reclines on it.

This is the closest epinician comes to a spatial (compare [A.] *Pr.* 363–372). Aural as well as visual impressions are conveyed: 'to look upon', 'to hear' (26), 'with a crash' (24). Lines 21–24 contain striking sound symbolism with a heavy concentration of (ex)plosive *p(h)-* (and *p(h)l-*) sounds. Aetna suggests the invisible lower and upper limits of the cos-mos: Typhos lies in Tartarus (15) and Aetna itself is a 'heavenly pillar' (19). The volcano displays the world's elements in all their physical states

---

²³ Krummen 1990, on *P.* 5; *O.* 1; *I.* 4.
²⁴ Currie 2010.

(solid, liquid, gas): cloud (20), snow (20), fire (21, 24, 25), smoke (22), rocks (23), sea (24). *Pythian* 1 thus anticipates Lucretius' intimation that Aetna inspired Empedocles' four-element theory (1.712–725; cf. Emp. 31 B6 Diels-Kranz). The scene includes implicit focalization by unspecified bystanders (26 'people when present'). Although the participle (*pareonton*) is generic, it is easily understood to include narrator and narratees, as being close to the mountain. The adjectives emphasize the subjective impression made by this physical environment on the human beholder: 'most pure' (21), 'most terrible' (26), 'wondrous' (27), 'a wonder' (27).

The description of Aetna cannot easily be assigned to either one of mythical narrative or performative narrative, it straddles both. Aetna's significance works on all three narrative levels. First, performative. The ode is evidently performed in the city of Aetna, in the vicinity of the homonymous mountain (cf. 31–32); 'this mountain' (30) will be ocular deixis. Second, athletic. The scholiast informs us (and we might have guessed anyway, 32–33) that 'of Aetna' was the ethnic with which Hieron had himself proclaimed victor at Delphi (contrast 'of Syracuse', *O.* 1.23, etc.). The proclamation will have taken the form *nika(i) Hieron Aitnaios harmati*: 'the winner is Hieron of Aetna in the chariot race'. *Pythian* 1 alludes to this proclamation in 32–33: 'the herald proclaimed it [sc. Aetna] when making his announcement by reason of Hieron glorious in victory with the chariot'. But the positions, and by implication the relative importance of, the victor's name and ethnic are inverted in the epinician's version of the proclamation: not 'the winner is Hieron of Aetna', but 'the winner is Aetna by reason of Hieron'. Though not unparalleled (*I.* 3.12–13), this encroaching of place on the athletic narrative is highly significant in a poem where Aetna's founding eclipses the athletic victory in importance. Third, mythological. A pre-existing myth probably connected Typhos with Aetna (cf. *O.* 4.6–7, [A.] *Pr.* 351–372), but the myth attached to the locality would prove very serviceable to Pindar's Aetnaean commission (see below). A fourth strand is geological: Pindar's description of the eruptions (21–26) presumably also draws on real heightened volcanic activity in the 470s BC (Th. 3.116; *FGrH* 239 A52), activity which probably partly occasioned the need to refound Catane-Aetna. A fifth strand is political: Aetna as the site of Hieron's new foundation offered him the prospect of a posthumous oikist cult (cf. 31), a stable dynastic succession (cf. 60–62), and a loyal (Dorian) powerbase (cf. 61–70; cf. D.S. 11.49).

A second significant locality in the ode, also uniting several strands, needs to be mentioned: Cumae (18, 72). There is the same mythological

strand: Cumae is another site where Typhos lies buried underground (18–19). And there is the same geological strand, for Cumae too was apparently the site of renewed volcanic activity in 470s BC (Str. 5.4.9 247–248). But there is a new political strand, for Cumae was the site of Hieron's naval victory against Etruscans (72–75).

The handling of these two locations, Aetna and Cumae, within the ode encourages the audience to make far-reaching ideological equations. Aetna and Cumae are equated in the first instance as sites where Typhos still visibly lies buried. In the second instance they are linked as venues of Hieron's recent twin triumphs: the (to our mind rather different) acts of founding a city (Aetna) and defeating an enemy at sea (Cumae) are presented as equivalent, culture-preserving, achievements—Dorian and Hellenic respectively. Both achievements of Hieron, at Aetna/Cumae, emerge as analogues of Zeus' defeat of Typhos, which did nothing less than secure Zeus' reign, and thus the Olympian order. The text intimates parallels and oppositions: Zeus and Hieron on the one side ranged against Typhos, the volcanic Aetna, and Etruscans on the other. Hieron emerges perhaps as a kind of earthly surrogate of Zeus (compare Hor. *Carm.* 3.5.1–4, for Jupiter and Augustus; and *P.* 4.291, for Zeus as mythical analogue for king Arcesilas), whose priest he was in Aetna (*O.* 6.96). Just as Zeus' rule is permanent, so the narrator prays for the permanence of Hieron's dynasty (67–68).

Aetna and Cumae together constitute a kind of spatial hub through which the main themes of the ode pass. The fact that Hieron has triumphed at precisely these two locations provides an eloquent if inexplicit comment on the nature of his achievements. Delphi, the site of the athletic victory, is a much less significant locale in the ode. Although the handling of space in this poem is evidently exceptional, it well indicates the possible functions of space in epinician narrative, extending well beyond mere description.

Olympian *1*

It will be useful to see how the spatial horizons of an ode are enlarged as it develops. *Olympian* 1 illustrates many of the themes touched on.

7   Olympia.
         The first locality mentioned in the ode, location of the finest of all athletic contests. A bare mention: not yet athletic narrative, or narrative at all.

8–18   Sicily.
        Performance narrative. 'Sicily' (8) is named as the location
        of Hieron's rule and a venue bustling with poetic activity.
        The generic localization (Hieron is not ruler of *all* Sicily; cf.
        the more precise 'Syracusan king' in 23) suggests here non-
        Sicilians as narratees.

18–24   Olympia.
        Athletic narrative. Hieron's horse Pherenicus has won at
        Olympia (by metonomy: 'Pisa', 18; 'by the Alpheus', 20; 'the
        colony of Lydian Pelops', 24).

25–27   Unspecified.
        Mythical narrative. The setting of Pelops' birth is not specified;
        however, it can easily be understood as Sipylus, the foreign set-
        ting being prepared for by the preceding epithet 'Lydian' (24).
        But the spatial setting seems unimportant to the narrative. In
        this tableau, as often, the spatial focus is exclusively on a sin-
        gle significant object: the *lebēs* out of which the newly-born
        Pelops was taken by Clotho (the Fate presiding over child-
        birth) miraculously endowed with an ivory shoulder (27–28).
        The primary narrator's compressed narrative implicitly negates
        an alternative: that Pelops was given his ivory shoulder when
        reconstituted in a cauldron after being dismembered by his
        father and served up to the gods and after Demeter had taken a
        chunk out of his shoulder (the version ascribed to a secondary
        narrator, 'one of [Tantalus'] envious neighbours', and rejected
        in 47–52).[25] The epithet 'pure' (26) and Clotho's presence indi-
        cate that the *lebēs* is a 'basin' for bathing a new-born, not a
        'cauldron' for boiling meats. The overriding narrative signifi-
        cance of the objects in this tableau negates any need for the
        tableau to be specifically located in space.

37–39   Sipylus.
        Mythical narrative continued. Tantalus invited the gods to a
        'well-ordered' (non-cannibalistic) banquet at Sipylus (38).

40–42   Earth (Sipylus) to Olympus.
        Mythical narrative continued. At the banquet at Sipylus Posei-
        don translated Pelops to Olympus. An implied vertical axis
        (Olympus—earth—Tartarus) is introduced into the ode.

---

[25] Cf. *SAGN* 1: 222–223.

47–51   Sipylus (implicitly).
         Mythical narrative continued. The false story of divine can-
         nibalism (an indirect embedded narrative) is not explicitly
         located in space, but must be understood to be Sipylus, the
         same occasion as Tantalus' banquet of the gods (37–39). Again
         the narrative focus is on the significant objects that populate
         the space rather than the space itself: boiling water (i.e., a caul-
         dron), a knife, and tables (48–50).

57–60   Hades/Tartarus (implicitly).
         Mythical narrative continued. The place where Tantalus en-
         dures his famous eternal punishment (cf. *Od.* 11.582–592)
         is not specified, but is plainly Hades/Tartarus—the lower ex-
         tremity on the vertical axis.

60   Olympus (implicitly).
         Mythical narrative continued. Likewise the place where Tan-
         talus stole ambrosia from the gods, although unspecified, can
         only be Olympus—the upper extremity on the vertical axis.

65–66   Olympus to earth (Sipylus?).
         Mythical narrative continued. The gods returned Pelops to
         earth, presumably at Sipylus.[26] Opposite movement along the
         vertical axis to that narrated in 40–42.

71–87   Unspecified.
         Mythical narrative continued. The site where Pelops ap-
         proaches the sea to pray to Poseidon is unspecified, and unlike
         the other unspecified locations in the ode not easily inferred—
         hence debate as to whether Lydia or the Peloponnese is the
         more likely.[27] Pindar's narrative seems unconcerned with the
         question, either because the audience's knowledge of the myth
         furnished them with a clear answer (I would hazard Lydia
         as more likely), or because Pindar's narrative is interested to
         depict Pelops not in any particular place but in a generic pose.
         This tableau of Pelops praying to the god before his chariot
         race evokes a typical situation of athletic narrative (B. 8.27–28;
         O. 8.8; P. fr. 122.(19)–(20) Maehler). By contrast, the specific
         spatial location of Pelops' prayer seems unimportant to this
         narrative, as it is not to prayers of Iamos (R. Alpheus, *O.* 6.58–
         63) or Proetus (R. Lousos, B. 11.95–97).

_____

[26] But cf. Gerber 1982: 135–136.
[27] Athanassaki 2004: 332 and nn. 34–36, after Gerber 1982: 135–136.

88–89   Olympia/Peloponnese (implicitly).
        Mythical narrative continued. Pelops overcomes Oenomaus,
        wins his bride, begets sons. The strikingly compressed narra-
        tive, sandwiched between tableaux, leaves no room for spatial
        or other embellishment.

90–96   Olympia.
        Mythical narrative concluded, shading into **athletic narrative**.
        The site of Pelops' tomb within the sanctuary of Olympian
        Zeus receives detailed spatial description (but 'by the stream
        of the Alpheus' should not be pressed too closely). Just as
        previously the athletic narrative of Hieron's Olympic victory
        segued into mythical narrative centred on Pelops (24–25),
        so now conversely mythical narrative centred on Pelops at
        Olympia segues into athletic narrative about Olympic victory
        (95–99). The mythical narrative concludes with details of the
        Olympic sanctuary (90–95: tomb of Pelops, altar of Zeus)
        and the institution of athletic contests there (95–96). In a
        sense, all victories in the sanctuary are iterations of the original
        victory of Pelops over Oenomaus; by winning at Olympia
        Hieron and Pherenicus tread in the footsteps of Pelops and his
        'winged' steeds. Note how Pelops' burial at Olympia represents
        a compromise position on the vertical axis (betwixt Olympus
        and Tartarus/Hades), just as his hero cult is a compromise
        between the immortality to which Tantalus aspired (60–64)
        and the mortality to which he resigned himself (82).

108–111 Olympia.
        Performance narrative, fused with **athletic narrative**. The nar-
        rator (as poet) envisages travelling to Olympia 'having discov-
        ered a road of words'. His mode of locomotion is understood
        to be the chariot (compare the similar, but more explicit, *N.*
        6.53–54: 'others before me have discovered the chariot road').
        The metaphorical chariot journey to Olympia merges with a
        hoped-for Olympic victory of Hieron 'with the swift chariot'
        (110). Olympia therefore here unites performance narrative
        (prior narration: a prospective victory ode) and athletic nar-
        rative (both subsequent and prior narration: Hieron's actual
        and his hoped-for victories); and both of these mirror myth-
        ical narrative (Pelops' chariot victory). The final mention of
        Olympia ('hill of Cronus', 111) establishes a ring-composition
        with the first (7).

116   'Everywhere.'
           Performance narrative. The ode ends by emphasizing the mo-
           bility of the poet-narrator 'everywhere' among the Hellenes
           (compare *h.Ap.* 174–175), although epinician more usually
           emphasizes the mobility of the poem than the poet. This is the
           ultimate expansion of the ode's spatial horizons and makes a
           fitting end to the ode (paradoxically, perhaps, the widening of
           spatial parameters can be closural; cf. B. 13.230–231).

Conclusion

Space is deployed subtly in Pindaric and Bacchylidean epinician. It is
seldom simply a descriptive ornament to the narrative. It tends to rein-
force explicit themes of the narrative or to intimate fresh themes of its
own. Spatial props and spatial locations may lend the narrative ethical
colour: the Aegina or the Thebes that bred so many mythical heroes was
bound to breed athletic victors; the Hyperborean olive is perfectly suited
to shade the Olympian *altis* and grace the temples of its victors; Aetna and
Cumae are almost predestined to stage Hieron's triumphs. Both props
and places often make a crucial conceptual contribution to the narra-
tive by intimating associations between events which the narrative does
not explicitly associate. Of quite fundamental importance is the inter-
play between the space of performance, athletic and mythical narrative,
which is variously and complexly realized in different odes. Performance
narrative often deploys metaphorical and fictional space, and this inter-
acts again in complex ways with the literal, real space of all three types
of epinician narrative.

PART FOUR

DRAMA

AESCHYLUS

R. Rehm

Given the performance realities of ancient literature, particularly dramatic literature, space was not simply referred to or evoked in texts. Tragedy unfolded in the spatial environment of an audience—not readers, narratees, or (simply) auditors, but spectators. Space is a proper value of the theater, because performance invariably *takes place*, utilizing bodies, gestures, movement, costumes, objects, scenic backdrop, the theater itself, and (for fifth-century tragedy) the natural and built environments that surrounded the theater, the elements of sun and sky, and the audience visibly present to one another. What characters and choruses in tragedy said and sang and pointed to and described constantly moved between the imaginary world of the play (both the setting and what lies out of sight) and the real space of those who had gathered to watch it (what I call reflexive space).[1] This chapter employs the categories referred to the Introduction—form (scenic, extra-scenic, and distanced space, to which I add reflexive space), distribution, description and its dynamization, presentation and motivation, and the function of space in narrative—to offer a spatial reading of Aeschylus' plays.[2]

Late in *Persians*, the Achaemenid king Xerxes arrives on stage, his clothing in tatters (*Pers.* 1017, 1030, also 465–468, 834–836). His disheveled person represents the defeated Persian expedition, a spatial synecdoche of present part for absent whole.[3] Until his arrival, however, the primary focus of every onstage narrator—the Chorus of elders, the Queen (mother of Xerxes), the Messenger from the front, even the Ghost

---

[1] Rehm 2002: 23–25.

[2] Both the authorship and the date of *Prometheus Bound* remain problematic (Griffith 1977); for the spatial aspects of the play, see Rehm 2002: 156–167.

[3] The word *stolai* ('robes', 1017) shares the same root as Xerxes' 'expedition' (*stolos*, 795), in particular the 'fleet' (*stolos*, 400) destroyed at Salamis, where the 'beak' (*stolos*, 408, 416) of the Persians ships ram one another in the narrow straits, an image of chaotic self-destruction.

of Darius—has been on the far-away Greece, where Xerxes' defeat took place. Although Greek tragedy depends on speakers describing non-present events (a narrator in one place creating the 'story-space' beyond), in no other tragedy does the action onstage rely so heavily on what happens elsewhere. In *Persians*, Aeschylus overwhelms the scenic space of Persia with the distanced space of Greece.

By using space in this way, Aeschylus contrasts the political hierarchy of the Achaemenids with that of democratic Athens. Narrative references to the play's setting suggest elements of the Persian capitals of Susa (*Pers.* 761) and Persepolis (15, 65), the latter historically proximate to the tomb of Darius.[4] The *skēnē* façade with its central door may have represented the outer gates of the palace complex, behind which lay the royal dwelling, the hall for the royal court, and the town itself. In spite of defeat abroad, the Persian dynasty manifests spatial control at home. We see this in the Queen's first entrance, via chariot, pre-empting the Chorus' withdrawal into the extra-scenic assembly rooms of 'this ancient compound' (140–143) and prompting them to genuflect (150–155). The pattern repeats at the raising of Darius' ghost at the royal tomb, probably located in the orchestra. The Chorus fear to address their former king and once again genuflect to royalty (694–706). Finally, at the close of the play, Xerxes re-asserts his leadership (1038–1077), ending any threat of popular rebellion (hinted at 585–593). In both narrative description and stage action, 'Persia' emerges clearly as the setting, under dynastic control, but the drama remains focused on what lies in the distance, 'Greece', a place free from autocratic rule.

The Persian Queen cannot believe that a country whose citizens 'are not called slaves or subjects to any man' (*Pers.* 241–245) could resist invasion. The free speech of its citizen navy soars over the sea itself, as the Messenger reports:

> From all of them [Greek sailors at Salamis] together one could hear
> a great cry: "Come on, sons of the Greeks,
> for the freedom of your homeland, for the freedom
> of your children, your wives, the temples of your fathers' gods,
> and the tombs of your ancestors. Now all is at stake."   (401–405)

---

[4] Seaford (fc), whose analysis of the staging of *Persians* and its political ramifications has greatly influenced my discussion. On the absence of a raised stage (allowing for a chariot exit into the palace complex), see Rehm 1992: 34–36; for the presence of the *skēnē* façade, see Rehm 2002: 239 (cf. Taplin 1977: 452–459).

Invoking the built world of temples and ancestral tombs as their common heritage, the Greeks implicitly contrast their sense of shared space with the dynastically determined setting outside the Achaemenid palace and at the royal tomb.

Aeschylus uses the spatial image of yoking to contrast these radically different political realms. Applied to chariots, peoples, and continents, the image recurs throughout the narrative, symbolizing Persia's ruling hierarchy and their imperial ambitions. The Persians invade with their yoked war chariots (*Pers.* 46–47, 84), and the Queen first arrives in such a vehicle (150). The Persian army is 'set on casting the yoke of slavery (*zugon doulion*) onto Greece' (49–50). With Xerxes' defeat, the elders worry that the local peoples will revolt against Persian rule, for 'the strong yoke (*zugos alkas*) has been removed' (585–593). Various aspects of the image come together in the Queen's dream, a spatial frame that allows her to envision Greece and Persia as sisters in conflict, yoked by Xerxes to his chariot. Tearing off the harness straps and smashing the yoke in the middle, the Greek sibling rebels and causes Xerxes to fall (181–200), a metaphor that predicts Xerxes' failure to conquer Hellas.

Yoking extends naturally from politics to geography. In his effort to subjugate Europe to Asia (*Pers.* 67–72, 128–131), Xerxes 'yoked the Hellespont' and 'closed up the great Bosporus' (722–723). His defeated army flees from Greece 'back over the bridge that yoked the two continents' (734–736), a metaphor that links scenic and distanced space even as it emphasizes their inimical differences. Xerxes was mad to think he could 'bind the sacred flowing Hellespont in shackles like a slave,/and alter the divine flow of the Bosporus with hammered links of chain,/.../a mortal who would master all the gods,/even Poseidon' (745–750). Narrative details emphasize the role that the natural elements, including the land of Greece, play in his defeat. 'The Greek earth herself fights by their side', dooming any invasion (790–792). Coastline, terrain, watersheds, climate—all of Greece works together to drive off the foreign army.

Changing his standpoint from panoramic to close-up, and then shifting scenic as he flees with the army, the Messenger narrates the Persian defeat at Salamis and the disastrous retreat that follows. Caught in the narrow straits off Salamis, the fleet falls to the Athenian navy (*Pers.* 353–442); Greeks mow down the Persian marines trapped on the small island of Psyttalea (447–464); in Boeotia, the retreating army perish for want of 'glittering spring water' (482–484); more die from hunger and thirst in Thessaly (488–491); Xerxes' bedraggled forces cross the frozen

river Strymon (495–507, a description that echoes the yoking of the Hellespont), but the sun melts the ice and the Persian troops drown. By yoking continents for imperial ends, Xerxes reaches too far and aims too high. The gods and the land of Greece join forces to ensure his catastrophic fall, so that 'the violator of natural boundaries has in the end found retribution from Nature herself'.[5]

In the area outside the theater of Dionysus stood material evidence of the Persian invasion of Attica, which ended only seven years before *Persians* played at the City Dionysia in 472 BC.[6] At that time, the theater overlooked a section of the 'new walls', thrown up hastily with rubble from the ruined temples, burnt public buildings, and smashed houses, powerful reminders of the Persian occupation. The Athenian audience could not help but view the environment outside the theater as they watched the play. Aeschylus uses the reflexive space of fifth-century Athens to bring home the significance of both the Messenger's narration of the Persian defeat and the disheveled appearance of the Persian king Xerxes. As the play ends, the Chorus follow their monarch through the central gate, singing out (twice in the last seven lines, at 1070 and 1074) 'Ah! Ah! The Persian earth is hard to tread'. But the Persians elders who made their exit were Athenian citizen-performers in disguise, crossing the beaten earth of their own city's orchestra. Theatrical, scenic, and distanced spaces merge with the real environment, exposing the disaster of imperial ambition and contrasting Persian rule with the free political space of Athens.[7]

An obverse spatial configuration informs *Seven Against Thebes*, set in a city preparing to *ward off* invasion. The characters who appear onstage—the king Eteocles, the terrified Chorus of Theban women, the Scout, the six Theban heroes (the seventh being Eteocles)—direct their thoughts, fears, and actions towards the offstage city walls that protect them. Each of its seven gates requires a defender to match an Argive invader. In a complex interplay of narration (alternating between the Scout and Eteocles), choral lyric, and stage action, the seven Theban

---

[5] Wilson 1986: 57. On the vertical axis in tragedy, see Wiles 1997: 175–186.

[6] Placing the city's safety in the 'wooden walls' of her navy, the Athenian general Themistocles evacuated the women and children to nearby islands (some of them visible from the theatre of Dionysus). See Herodotus (8.50–53, 109; 9.65.2) and Thucydides (1.89–90) for the havoc of the Persian occupation of Attica.

[7] For the application of the anti-imperial warnings in the play to Athens, see Rehm 2002: 247–248; more generally Meiggs 1975: 68–81; and Zoja 1995: 75, 81–84, and 109–112.

heroes head one-at-a-time for their specified gate and Argive opponent (*Th.* 375–652). This relentless draining of bodies culminates in Eteocles' exit for the last gate,[8] where he will combat the leader of the invasion—his own brother Polynices. After a messenger reports their mutual deaths, Aeschylus reverses the spatial pattern established in the previous scene. The corpses of the two sons of Oedipus are carried back into the theater, where lamentation over the fratricide competes with joy at the Theban victory.

As with *Persians*, *Seven Against Thebes* (produced at the City Dionysia in 467) evokes the memory of the Persian invasion. The narrative emphasizes the offstage space of the city's defenses, drawing parallels between the mythic Argive siege of Thebes and the historical assault of the Persians on Athens. In the prologue Eteocles appears alone, addressing the audience as if they were the assembled Theban *polis*, and he asks them to defend the motherland (*Th.* 9–23). Eteocles resembles an Athenian *polemarch*, the annually elected commander-in-chief of Athens' military.[9] The Chorus of Theban women view the Argives as 'an enemy with alien speech' (169–170), a fitting description of the Persians but hardly of the Greek-speaking Argives. Eteocles prays that the gods keep Thebes from being 'uprooted from Greece', the language suggesting an alien, *un-Greek* threat.[10] 'The free land and city of Cadmus must not wear the yoke of slavery' (an image repeated at 470–471 and 793), recalling Xerxes' desire to subjugate Athens in *Persians*. The verbal emphasis on the city's walls and gates had its real-world analogy in the gated walls of Athens visible from the theater of Dionysus, part of Aeschylus' spatial overlay of Thebes onto his own city.

The Chorus use nautical language to describe the imminent attack (*Th.* 691–692, 699, 706–708), imagining the invading Argives as 'a roaring wave'. Eteocles is compared to a ship's captain (2–3, 205–210), for the city must remain watertight against the oncoming storm (795–798). The Argives bring wave on wave of trouble against Thebes, breaking on the prow and deck of the city, whose walls provide its only protection (758–763). If the city hurls its cargo overboard, however, it can survive the storm (769–771). These metaphors seem odd for the landlocked city of

---

[8] I assume that the six Theban fighters enter with Eteocles at *Th.* 374 and depart after Eteocles posts each one (cf. Sommerstein 2008; Taplin 1977: 149–152).

[9] In the pre-performance ceremonies at the City Dionysia, the *polemarch*, along with the nine other annually elected *stratēgoi* (generals), offered libations to the gods in the theatre orchestra.

[10] Even the horses of the Argive Eteoclus snort 'a barbarian music' (*Th.* 463–464).

Thebes, but they would appear natural to an Athenian audience, with the Saronic Gulf visible in the distance and their vaunted navy (in which many would have served) in their minds. This spatial analogue re-occurs with the return of the corpses of Oedipus' sons, for the Chorus compare the pounding of their bodies in ritual lamentation to the rhythmical plying of a ship's oars (854–860). Their grieving also evokes the black-sailed ship that the Athenians sent annually with offerings to Apollo at Delos, a custom traced back to Theseus, the mythical founder of Athens. By highlighting the spatial similarities between the Thebes of the story and the historical Athens, Aeschylus frustrates what has become the current scholarly consensus that Thebes in tragedy represents the 'anti-Athens'.[11]

As in *Persians*, *Seven Against Thebes* dramatizes the relationship between horizontal expansion (invasion) and vertical fall (the punishment for over-reaching). The Argive Capaneus personifies this spatial paradigm. He boasts that he will sack the city regardless of the gods' will, and that not even Zeus with his thunderbolts can stop him (*Th.* 425–429). Capaneus bears a shield depicting a naked man carrying a blazing torch, with golden letters that proclaim, 'I will burn the city!' As Eteocles predicts (438–445), this image and language on the shield will redound on Capaneus, for Zeus will consume *him* with the flame of his lighting.

The long ekphrastic scene that matches Argive invader and shield device with Theban defender and shield device combines the 'static' description of an object, the physical mobility of a warrior, and the metaphorical use of spatial representation.[12] Here, the narrative functions symbolically rather than to provide ornament or atmosphere. For example, the Argive Eteoclus bears a shield showing a hoplite scaling a fortified city, with words boasting that not even Ares could hurl the invader down from the walls (*Th.* 466–469). But Eteoclus dies in the siege, another Capaneus or Xerxes-like figure, personifying the fall from high to low for those who challenge the gods or try to seize territory beyond their destiny. As in *Persians*, Aeschylus associates horizontal expansion with vertical descent, manifest in Eteocles' euphemistic prediction that the Argive invaders will 'march down a road [death] on which it takes a long journey to come back' (613).

---

[11] Zeitlin 1990, a polarized reading of space that makes for intriguing theory but uninteresting theater.

[12] For this scene, see Thalmann 1978: 105–135; Zeitlin 1982; Berman 2007: 33–86; Torrance 2007: 68–91.

Another complex spatial metaphor operates in *Seven Against Thebes*, one that compares city and land to a mother and father who engender and nurture their offspring. 'Motherland' and 'fatherland' (*Th.* 16–20, 416, 477, 584–586) provide apt figures of speech for a people who claim autochthonous origins.[13] At the first gate, the hero Melanippus, 'scion of the sown men', will fight and defeat the Argive Tydeus and so 'protect the mother who bore him' (412–416). At the third gate, Megareus will face the hubristic Eteoclus and 'pay his full debt of nurture to the land' of Thebes (477). The penetration of the city's walls implies the violation of its women, just as the fall of the city means the destruction of its fields, crops, and childbearing future (356–368). The Argive Hippomedon brandishes a great 'round threshing floor of a shield' (489–490), suggesting the harvest of death he would wreak on Thebes. The pillage of the city will be borne on the bodies of the women, forced to couple with their conquerors, a spatial synecdoche in which human physiognomy represents the *polis* and its territory. Terrified at this prospect, the Theban women spread panic through the city, leading Eteocles to reproach them as the 'enemy within'. By assuming the violation that the Theban champions strive to prevent (191–202, 236–256), the women already carry the conquerors 'inside' them, undermining the resolve of those who would protect the city's integrity.

The Argive prophet Amphiaraus advised Polynices against the invasion, and his speech (quoted by the Scout) brings home Aeschylus' symbolic use of space:

> Do gods really smile on one who brings /…/
> a foreign army to invade and devastate
> his fatherland and native gods?
> What claim of justice can quench the mother source?
> 585 Can you expect your fatherland, conquered
> by your spear, to be your ally?
> But I will enrich the land by becoming
> a prophet buried in the soil of the enemy.   (*Th.* 580–588)

Amphiaraus vows that his corpse, buried in Theban land, will prove productive and beneficial to the city. Significantly, his shield bears *no* image, for he 'harvests a deep furrow in his mind from which good counsel grows' (591–594). The 'empty space' of his shield offers a very different

---

[13] Part of Thebes' mythical tradition, autochthony was promoted as an originating myth in *Athens* after the foundation of democracy, circumventing the dominance of aristocratic families by claiming a common (earth-born) origin for all. See Loraux [1996] 2000.

legacy from that promised by the other Argive warriors and their respective shields. Amphiarus' presence on Theban soil will generate foresight and wisdom, lasting gifts for the land he unwillingly invaded.

Aeschylus contrasts the arrival of the non-native prophet to Thebes with the destructive homecoming of Polynices, a *nostos* that threatens to devastate rather than restore his community. In their fratricidal conflict, both he and Eteocles win only as much territory as will cover their corpses (*Th.* 816–818). The 'limitless wealth of land' they hold refers to the *depth* of the earth that lies underneath their graves (938–950). Amphiaraus' burial in Thebes, however, offers a release from the stark pessimism of the Oedipal curse and fratricidal war. As predicted by the narrative, his inclusion in the city will prove free from the violence of hubris, foreign expansion, and the violation of personal (women's bodies), civic (Thebes, its walls, its subjects), and natural (productive, generative) space.

Incorporating the outsider plays an even more important role in Aeschylus' *Supplices*, which deals with the protection and inclusion of suppliant women in Argos, where the play is set. The tragedy combines spatial aspects of *Persians* (a foreign army out to conquer Greece) and of *Seven Against Thebes* (a city defending itself against an invading army). The Egyptians threaten Argos with war if the city offers the Danaids asylum, and that conflict eventually takes place (with Argos the loser) in one of the lost plays of the trilogy.[14] Unlike either of its predecessors, however, *Supplices* is set in a (fictionalized) city made to share significant aspects of Athenian *political* life, a key component of its narrated space. The Argive king Pelasgus is a proto-democrat, whose city holds a popular assembly (*Supp.* 366–369) where the debate and voting resembles Athenian practice (600–624). Confronting the Egyptians who would force their cousins into marriage, Pelasgus uses the terminology of the Athenian law courts to justify his position (917–949, also 378–391 and 963–965). On receiving asylum, the Danaids pray that Argos continue in good governance (670–673) and in its protection of individual rights (698–703), issues of particular pride for democratic Athens. Their benedictions for the land and its people (630–636, 656–669, 674–697, 704–709) resemble the paean to Athens that the Furies sing at the end of Aeschylus' *Oresteia* (*Eu.* 922–926, 938–948, 956–967, 976–987).

---

[14] Garvie 2006: 163–233 on the *Danaid* trilogy, 177–179 on Pelasgus' probable defeat by the Egyptians.

Supplices takes place near the Argive coast, at an unnamed *temenos* dedicated to the city's gods. The distribution of its description remains scattered through the play, focalized by Danaus (*Supp.* 188–196, 222–223, 713–714), Pelasgus (241–242, 333–334, 354–355, 472–477), the Chorus (423–424, 429–430, 464–465, 884–885), and briefly by the Egyptians (852). With no façade required, narrative attention concentrates on the sanctuary setting and what lies in the near distance. One *eisodos* leads to the sea, from whence the suppliants arrive at the start of the play, and where their Egyptian cousins follow in pursuit. Aeschylus heightens the sense of danger by frequent references to the sea, ships, sailing, rowing, storm, and shipwreck, all foreshadowing the arrival of the Egyptians who would force the suppliants to sail back home with them.[15] The other *eisodos* leads to the town of Argos, a place of democratic decision-making and potential refuge.

In this spatial dyad, the two distant locations represent the best hopes and worst fears of the suppliant women and their leader Danaus. In a last ditch effort to persuade Pelasgus to help, the suppliants threaten suicide at the sanctuary altars. Pelasgus must choose between dishonoring the gods with pollution if he rejects their appeal or bringing war on his city if he grants them asylum. His decision reflects the power of the play's setting, mirrored by the distant altars of the city where Danaus eventually takes their supplication (480–503). Narrative space can serve to inform us about the characters (the shield ekphrasis in *Seven Against Thebes*) or to convey their mood or frame of mind (the Chorus' reaction at Darius' tomb in *Persians*). In *Suppliants*, however, the sacred space of the sanctuary *determines* Pelasgus' behavior, privileging the first term in Kenneth Burke's 'scene/agent ratio', which gauges the relative importance of setting versus dramatic agency.[16]

The Chorus and Danaus claim that their arrival in Argos represents less a flight from their native land than a homecoming, given their

---

[15] The sea as destroyer (*Th.* 34–37); Danaus as sea-captain (176–179); the Argive 'ship of state' (345); Pelasgus' thoughts 'run aground' (438) for Argos faces a 'bottomless sea of ruin' (470–471); Io's flight from Argos as if 'rowed' by the pursuing gadfly (541); Io's offspring providing needed 'ballast' to save the ship (580); Danaus' ekphrastic description of the Egyptian ships, which he sees in the distance (713–723, 764–774); and the Chorus' terrified reaction to the approach of the ships (734–738, 743–745, 764–774), which they wish had sunk (842–846) or would sink (866–884).

[16] Burke [1945] 1969: 3–20. Sacred space operates similarly in S. *OC* (set at the grove of the Eumenides) and to a lesser extent in E. *Supp.* (set at the *temenos* of Demeter at Eleusis).

kinship to the Argives through their forebear Io (*Supp.* 274–276).[17] Having wandered from Argos across the known world, a journey described on several occasions (15–22, 44–46, 163–175, 295–324, 531–599), Io eventually arrived in Egypt. There, impregnated by Zeus, she gave birth to the line of the Danaids. Aeschylus exploits the relationship between distance covered and time passed, and the spatialized lineage of Io turns the suppliants' narrative into a *nostos* play, the women's return to Argos reversing Io's flight to Egypt. The Danaids ask the Argive land to protect them as if it were their own (776–778), and they choose to honor Argos and its rivers rather than the great Nile from which they have fled (1018–1039). By the end of the play, Pelasgus offers the women secure housing in the land (957–965), welcoming them as metics or 'resident aliens', the (mortal) equivalent of the status granted the Furies at the end of *Eumenides*.[18]

At the end of *Supplices*, Pelasgus manifests the moral, political, and religious rights of the suppliants in spatial terms. He compels the Egyptian warriors to leave the sanctuary—'Get out of my sight at once' (*Supp.* 949)—and he accepts the Danaids into his city:

> Now, all of you take courage and go
> with a friendly escort, to our well fortified city …/…/
> I am your patron,
> as are all the citizens who have taken this vote.
> Why wait for anyone with more authority than these?
>
> (954–955, 963–965)

As we have seen elsewhere in Aeschylus, the scenic and distant spaces resonate reflexively with the city of the audience, which prided itself on its democracy and its acceptance of outsiders.

In its vast sweep, the *Oresteia* fully exploits the spatial manifold of the earlier plays. We find prominent the themes of war, invasion, and conquest, not only in the sack of Troy described in *Agamemnon*, but

---

[17] At other times, however, Danaus and the Chorus emphasize their *fugitive* status (*Th.* 74, 84, 202, 350, 395, 420), like Io on her flight *from* Argos. Where the suppliants *belong* is the question of the play: Egypt or Argos, the authoritarian space of the Egyptians or the free space of a democratic *polis*, the patriarchal space of forced marriage or a female space of Aphrodite (who helps resolve the issue in one of the trilogy's lost plays).

[18] Initially Pelasgus rejects the idea that the Danaids are Argives by blood; their dark skin suggests to him women of Libya, the Nile, India, Ethiopia, even the Amazons, all distinctly *non*-Greek. When leaving the sanctuary to take the suppliants' case to the Argive assembly, Danaus fears the Argives might kill him, because his 'form and appearance' differ so much from theirs (496–499).

also in the Chorus of *Choephori*, who are household slaves captured in Asia Minor, and in the war-like hostilities against Athens threatened by the Furies (*Eu.* 780–787, 810–817, 840, 873). The *nostos* pattern found in Aeschylus' earlier plays provides the dramatic structure for the trilogy: Agamemnon's triumphant, and Aegisthus' clandestine, return to Argos; Orestes' truncated homecoming; the domestication of the Furies in Athens at the end of *Eumenides*; and the return of Menelaus in the lost satyr-play *Proteus*. Topography, landscape, and nature as narrative subjects and as quasi-divine agents operate powerfully in the events at Aulis, and throughout Clytemnestra's speeches on the beacons spanning the Aegean, the Greek voyage home, and her final welcome to her husband. They also feature prominently in the Herald's account of the war at Troy and the god-sent storm that destroys the Greek fleet.

Aeschylus builds his spatial dramaturgy on a strong narrative foundation, establishing the house of Atreus as *the* setting of *Agamemnon*. The Watchman addresses the audience from the roof of the house, moving from his own situation (literally and figuratively) to the distant war at Troy (*A.* 1–21). He describes the trajectory of the stars overhead and hints at the political turmoil in Argos, but his attention ultimately returns to the scenic space: 'If this house could find a voice, / it might speak more clearly' (*A.* 37–38). In subsequent scenes of *Agamemnon*, that space does indeed find a voice, albeit through a range of speakers and perspectives.

Aeschylus makes consummate use of the façade and its entrance, which Clytemnestra controls. Her dominance over scenic and extra-scenic space emerges most dramatically in the tapestry scene, when the dark crimson path she has spread across the orchestra links the slaughter at Troy (personified by Agamemnon) with the bloody crimes within the house of Atreus. As Agamemnon tramples down the tapestries (*A.* 958–974), Clytemnestra avoids direct ekphrasis. Instead, she uses the rich cloth as a symbol of the boundless resources of the sea (from whence the fabric dyes originate) and also as the manifestation of the wealth of the house, which she is happy to waste if it 'weaves the strands that bring this life home' (965).[19] When Agamemnon enters the palace (974), attention shifts to the extra-scenic space of the interior, and events in the palace—both present and past—provide the narrative focus of the

---

[19] J. Jones 1962: 86–98 on the tapestries as symbolizing the wealth of the house; Seaford 2004: 166–168 on the connection between the 'limitless' dye and the 'infinite' circulation of money.

Cassandra scene. She asks Apollo 'to what [kind of] house' she has come (1087), and the prophetess provides her own answer, in effect 'making space speak'.[20]

Cassandra sees *through* the walls of the house into its past, disclosing the butchered children whom Atreus fed to their father Thyestes.[21] Shifting to the present, she describes what Clytemnestra is preparing within—Agamemnon's murder, and her own.[22] Looking to the future, Cassandra sees Orestes ('a fugitive, a wanderer, estranged from this land', *A.* 1282), gesturing towards his *nostos* in the next play. Given the focus on the palace façade ('I address this entrance as the gates of Hades', 1291), Cassandra's evocation of its future takes an appropriate architectural form. Orestes will 'put a coping-stone on these acts of ruin' (1283), as if the destructive past of the house were a wall that could be crowned with a final course.

The act of seeing through the house of Atreus leads Cassandra back in time and space to *her* home in Troy, which she saw destroyed: the fatal marriage of Paris and Helen (*A.* 1156), her childhood by the banks of the Scamander (1157–1161), her father's unsuccessful sacrifices for the city (1167–1171), his horrific death (1305), and her own failed prophecies (1210, 1270–1274). In both her physical presence and her spoken memories, Cassandra evokes the most prominent distanced space in the play, focalized by a survivor on the verge of death. Troy has entered the narrative before, in Clytemnestra's description of the city's fall and in the Herald's account of the Greek soldiers 'under the walls of an enemy city' (558–566). We also hear of Troy from the Chorus, who imagine Helen's arrival with Paris (403–408) and its devastating consequences (681–749). On his return, Agamemnon provides a horrific description of the city's obliteration (813–828), fleshing out the Herald's earlier account (524–537). The death of the Trojan Cassandra brings that story (at least as far as the trilogy is concerned) to a close.[23]

Let us consider the presentation of, and motivation for, the synoptic spatial narratives of Troy presented by Clytemnestra and the Herald. Clytemnestra uses the frame of imagination to recreate the fall of Troy (*A.* 320–350) and the relay of beacon fires that brings the news to Argos

---

[20] Ewans 1982: 5; Padel 1990.
[21] *A.* 1090–1097, 1184–1197, 1217–1222, 1242–1244.
[22] *A.* 1100–1118, 1125–1129, 1136–1139, 1172, 1226–1238, 1258–1263, 1275–1278, 1291–1294.
[23] More generally, see M.J. Anderson 1997: 107–132.

(281–316); the Herald relies on personal experience and autopsy for his report on the war and its aftermath (503–537, 555–582, 624–680). In the famous fire speech, Clytemnestra mentally accompanies each blaze as it 'travels' from outpost to outpost, kindling the next beacon in the sequence. In this way the Queen spans the distance between Troy and Greece, moving the message of victory across the Aegean to the palace in Argos. Clytemnestra demonstrates her narrative power over natural space, anticipating the control she exerts over the domestic space of the palace when her husband walks on the blood-red tapestries (930–949, 958–975).

To the events at Troy Clytemnestra brings a non-combatant's perspective, influenced by her life at home, where she was haunted by rumor, gossip, false news, and her own nightmares of the war (*A.* 858–876). She provides a vivid depiction of the sack of the city, which includes the embedded focalization of the conquered: 'Trojans fall on the bodies of their dead / husbands and brothers, and children / embrace their fallen fathers and grandfathers, / but their cries for the dead now come from the mouths of slaves' (326–329). Her sympathetic treatment of the Trojans contrasts with her description of the victorious Greeks running amok through the city (330–344). She exhorts her countrymen not to 'plunder what they should not, conquered by what they have won. / For they must face a long home stretch, doubling back / to make a safe return' (342–344). The spatial form of her warning seems particularly apt, given the destructive cycle of vengeance that runs through the trilogy, a pattern of violence that keeps turning back on itself even as the future unfolds.

Aeschylus provides a version of that cyclical process in the Herald first-hand account of the events at Troy and the Greek homecoming. He evokes a soldier's life at war in a distant land with a specificity unmatched in other Greek tragedies:[24]

> Then dry land, the greater horror—
> to sleep under the walls of an enemy city.
> From the sky, a steady drizzle worked on us,
> and the meadow dew, dank, eroding,
> filling our clothes with lice.
> And I could tell you of winter that slaughtered birds,
> the unbearable snow from Ida,
> and the heat in summer, when waves melted
> and calm seized the exhausted sea.   (*A.* 557–566)

---

[24] See Leakey 1974, who suggests that contemporary events inform this specificity.

Although he insists on the ultimate Greek triumph (*A.* 520–537, 567–582), the Herald also must report news of the storm that destroyed the fleet as it sailed home (648–680). Narrating events as if viewing them *in toto*, the Herald assumes a panoramic standpoint at the outset. He then shifts to his own fixed scenic viewpoint on Agamemnon's vessel, which survives the storm, and ends by imagining the perspective of some other, potential survivor.

> In the night harsh swells rolled against us.
> From Thrace, winds rose and dashed one ship on another,
> locked together in the storm's strength like rams.
> Gale and lightning, the driven rain, lashed us from sight
> like a shepherd turned betrayer.
> At dawn we saw the water flower with corpses,
> churning the timber of broken ships.
> Some god stole us from that storm,
> took the rudder in his hands
> and brought the ship through unharmed. …/…/…
> Now if any of them [from the other ships] still breathes,
> he must think that we are dead.
> So we must think the same of them.   (653–673)

That the Herald's point of view at the end can imagine the fatal outcome of others fits the larger narrative pattern in the trilogy, where the specific story being told opens up to include a realm far wider than that of the speaker.

Access to the realm of the dead features prominently elsewhere in the trilogy, as we see in the Chorus' reaction to Clytemnestra's murder, in the first half of *Choephori* (especially the *kommos* at Agamemnon's tomb, recalling the ghost-raising sequence in *Persians*), and in the appearance of Clytemnestra's ghost in *Eumenides*.[25] The tomb of Agamemnon constitutes sacred space, as does Apollo's temple at Delphi and Athena's sanctuary on the Acropolis in *Eumenides*, and characters fear for the pollution at these sites.[26] Aeschylus interweaves the spatially charged interaction between the living and the dead, and between the pure and the polluted, via shared imagery in the narrative and mirrored action on stage.

One other distanced space associated with both pollution and the dead features prominently, the port at Aulis. There Agamemnon sacrificed his daughter to enable the Greek army to embark for Troy, an event narrated

---

[25] *A.*1489–1496, 1513–1520, 1538–1550; *Ch.* 306–509; *Eu.* 94–139.
[26] *Ch.* 84–123, 514–521; *Eu.* 34–63, 179–197, 235–243; the theme is also prominent in *Supplices*, discussed above.

by the Chorus in the *parodos* (*A.* 105–159, 184–249). They describe and partially re-enact the sacrifice of Iphigenia, quoting *verbatim* the prophet Calchas (126–137, 140–155), who demands the offering, and Agamemnon (206–217), who must perform it, a unique example of choral lyric imitating a Messenger speech. On the point of Iphigenia's death, however, the Chorus stop short: 'What happened next, I did not see/will not say' (248–249). Clytemnestra resumes the story after the murder of her husband and Cassandra, returning the narration to Aulis and cursing her husband for 'sacrificing his own daughter to charm the winds of Thrace' (1414–1418). Clytemnestra's focalization of the sacrifice provides the most compelling reason for her revenge, but it cannot stop the momentum for retaliation against her and Aegisthus that generates the next play of the trilogy.

Whereas *Agamemnon* takes place solely before the palace façade, *Choephori* splits the scenic space between Agamemnon's tomb in the center of the orchestra (*Ch.* 1–651) and the house of Atreus (652-end), effectively occluding the palace for the first two-thirds of the play. Orestes enacts his homecoming at the liminal space of the tomb, where the living and dead converse, and it is to this spot that Clytemnestra sends Electra and the Chorus with conciliatory offerings for the dead. Focalized variously by this triad of narrators, the tomb setting proved memorable in fifth-century Athens, for more than fifty Attic vases (dated from after the *Oresteia*) depict the recognition scene of Electra and Orestes at Agamemnon's grave.[27]

When Orestes and Pylades appear at the central doorway (*Ch.* 652), the materiality of the palace comes into play. Unlike *Agamemnon*, where Clytemnestra controls the threshold, in *Choephori* the doorway seems permeable, with characters moving in and out with relative ease. Orestes expects Aegisthus to appear when he and Pylades approach the palace (*Ch.* 572–576, 666–667), but it is an offstage Servant and then Clytemnestra who greet the guests. After Orestes, Pylades, and Clytemnestra enter the palace, we witness an unprecedented sequence of entrances and exits: the appearance of the Nurse from within (732), sent by Clytemnestra to bring Aegisthus, and her eventual departure out an *eisodos* (782); the subsequent arrival of Aegisthus via an *eisodos* (838) and his exit into the palace (854), followed by his death-cries from within (869); the servant's exit from (875), and return to (889), the palace, announcing

---

[27] J.R. Green 1994: 54.

Aegisthus' death; the entrance of Clytemnestra from the palace (885); the subsequent appearance of Orestes and Pylades, also from within (892); the trio's exit *back* into the palace (930)—mirroring their first exit inside (718)—so that Orestes can kill his mother by the corpse of Aegisthus (904–907); Orestes' return to the stage with the two bodies on the *ekkuklēma* (973); and finally his flight from the theater towards Delphi (1063), followed by the Chorus' departure at the end of the play, presumably into the palace. By having the threshold crossed so frequently in both directions, Aeschylus establishes that the issues of the trilogy will find no resolution in the palace, evidenced by Orestes' terrified exit out an *eisodos* at the end of the play.

Apollo's temple of Delphi serves as the initial setting for *Eumenides*, but the scenic space later shifts to the Acropolis in Athens (*Eu.* 235), where Orestes takes refuge at the cult statue of Athena, and then moves to the open-air court on the neighboring hill of the Areopagus (566). The progressive flexibility of scenic space over the course of the three plays—from the solitary focus on the house in *Agamemnon*, to the twin settings of tomb and palace in *Choephori*, to the triple scenic locations in *Eumenides*—mirrors the trilogy's movement from a relatively fixed mythic past towards the more open-ended world of fifth-century Athens.

As well as changing the setting three times in the final play, Aeschylus manipulates the depiction of extra-scenic space in innovative ways. It appears likely that the interior of the temple of Apollo at the opening of *Eumenides* was represented not behind the façade but *in the orchestra*, with the *omphalos* ('navel') placed orchestra center.[28] This is precisely the relationship that obtains when the scene moves to Athens, where the orchestra represents the interior of Athena's temple and Athena's *bretas* ('cult statue') stands at the center. Placing this cult statue in the same place as the *omphalos* at Delphi emphasizes Orestes' shifting dependence from Apollo (and his oracle) to Athena (and Athens). If this staging is correct, then Aeschylus presents the temple of Apollo 'inside out', taking the façade—crucial to *Agamemnon*, less so in *Choephori*—and inverting it. In *Eumenides*, the trilogy goes beyond what lies hidden behind the *skēnē*, setting up the transformation to the open-air court on the Areopagus.

In a vast outdoor arena like the theater of Dionysus, to create a scenic space and then change it depends heavily on the narration. So, for example, the Pythia undertakes a long 'choral ekphrasis' when she describes

---

[28] Rehm 1988: 290–301.

the horrific appearance of the Furies asleep around Apollo's *omphalos* (*Eu.* 34–59). Her amazement and disgust reflect her outrage at their presence at the sacred 'navel of the earth'. More importantly, her description enabled the original audience to 'see' the Furies when they rose to pursue Orestes, even though their appearance as depicted would have been impossible to realize in the ancient theater and invisible to most of the audience. The Furies in turn help to create the next spatial transformation, leaving the theater to track down Orestes when he flees from Delphi, one of only five occasions in extant tragedy where the Chorus vacate the orchestra during the play. After the Furies' departure, we see Orestes running into the empty theater and embracing the cult image of Athena in the orchestra, emphasized in his narration: 'Lady Athena, I have come here … / … / crossing over sea and land alike … / … / I have arrived at your house and your image, goddess. / Here I shall keep vigil and await a final judgment' (*Eu.* 235–243).

After her arrival, Athena announces the formation of a new court to try Orestes, preparing for the next shift of scenic space from the Acropolis to the Areopagus. The re-entrance of Athena and arrival of the jurors and herald (566), the sound of the herald's trumpet (569), the appearance of Apollo (574), and the bringing on of the urns (and possibly benches for the jurors) establish this new, and final, setting. Returning the scenic space to the out-of-doors, Aeschylus reflects the fact that homicide trials in Athens were held in unroofed courts (like that on the Areopagus) to avoid placing the judges under the same roof as a possible murderer.

This spatial pattern fits perfectly with Aeschylus' practice of realizing physically onstage what previously had been described verbally, what we might call 'proleptic spatial narration'. For example, the ubiquitous legal and judicial language in the trilogy leads to a court setting and the trial of Orestes.[29] The spirits of vengeance referred to in *Agamemnon* and seen by Orestes at the end of *Choephori* become the Chorus of Furies in the final play. The oft-repeated net imagery takes physical shape in the robe that traps Agamemnon (displayed with his corpse, and spread out by Orestes, *Ch.* 980–1013), and then comes to life in the Furies' 'binding song' performed around Orestes (*Eu.* 299–396). Clytemnestra disparages dreams (*A.* 274, 491), invents them (*A.* 891–895), is haunted by one (*Ch.* 32–41), and finally appears onstage in *someone else's* nightmare, a visual

---

[29] Goldhill 1986: 33–56.

manifestation of the Furies' troubled sleep. The beacons from Troy in
Agamemnon and the firebrands that Clytemnestra lights (described by
the Chorus, *Ch.* 535–537) anticipate the actual torches carried in honor
of the Furies at the end of the trilogy (*Eu.* 1003–1005, 1022–1023, 1029–
1031, 1041–1042).

The *Oresteia* ends with a spectacular procession out of the theater. The
purple-robed Eumenides are escorted to their new homes by Athena, the
Priestess of Athena Polias, other female attendants to Athena's cult, the
twelve male citizens who served as jurors at Orestes' trial, and even a
sacrificial ox or two,[30] representing the offerings made to Athena at her
temple on the Acropolis. The procession cleverly conflates the journey
to the Furies' new home with the route of the Panathenaea, whose
destination was, in fact, the scenic space of the play's *first* scene in Athens,
the temple of Athena Polias. Aeschylus establishes the most important
space at the end of the trilogy as that of his audience, the place to which all
theatrical performance ultimately is aimed. With a spatial and narrative
coherence unmatched in later drama, the *Oresteia* ends by integrating
the visual setting and the narrative creation of scenic, extra-scenic, and
distanced space into the reflexive space of fifth-century Athens.

---

[30] Sommerstein 1989: ad 1021–1047.

SOPHOCLES

R. Rehm

> Space reaches out from us and translates the world.
>
> Rilke, 'The One Birds Plunge Through'

Forms and Distribution

Although audiences may imagine a wider spatial world for the tragic myths, the space of Greek tragedy—scenic, extra-scenic, distant, and reflexive spaces—provides the framework for the genre. That space usually involves setting the action in clear civic context—*Oedipus Tyrannus*, for example, takes place before the Theban palace, and *Electra* before the house of Atreus. However, three of Sophocles' seven extant plays depart from this standard practice. *Trachiniae* is set before the house where Deianira and her children live in exile, and the play makes no significant reference to the *polis* of Trachis. *Philoctetes* unfolds on the uninhabited island of Lemnos, before the cave of the marooned Philoctetes. The initial action of *Ajax* takes place in front of Ajax' tent on the beach at Troy, but the scene shifts (*Aj.* 815) to a desolate part of the same beach for Ajax' suicide. In terms of spatial flexibility, the posthumously produced *Oedipus at Colonus* takes place in the grove of the Furies in Athens, a location with strong civic and religious associations, but one that requires no built façade or extra-scenic space. This kind of spatial flexibility—non-civic settings, a change of scene, no immediate extra-scenic space—focuses dramatic interest on the protagonists and the role they play in making the space around them.

As for the distribution of spatial description, Sophoclean characters occasionally present an extended description, as in the opening of *Electra*, where the Old Man describes the temples and buildings of Mycenae, before 'zooming in' on the house of Atreus (*El.* 1–14). We find a

longer description of the setting in *Oedipus at Colonus*, beginning with the dialogue of Antigone and Oedipus (*OC* 1–27), followed by Oedipus' exchange with the local demesman (33–65), and culminating in the choral lyric praising Colonus (668–693). Characters and Chorus create the grove of the Furies in the mind's eye of the blind Oedipus, prescribing his precise movements in the *temenos*. More frequently, however, details about the scenic space occur in passing: comments about the *skēnē* façade (Ismene appears 'before the gates' of the palace, *Ant.* 526); the orchestra floor (Philoctetes falls to the ground in pain, crying 'O earth, receive me in death', *Ph.* 819); movement (Creon proposes to 'go inside' to discuss the response from Delphi, *OT* 92; Hyllus arrives quickly 'near the house', *Tr.* 58); and so on.

Sophocles often conjures extra-scenic space by expansive description, frequently through a Messenger who reports what has transpired behind the façade, just out of sight of the audience (e.g., *OT* 1237–1296 and *Tr.* 899–946). In three plays Sophocles physically exposes the interior via the *ekkuklēma*. In *Ajax*, the inside of the tent 'rolls out', showing the mad protagonist surrounded by the sheep he has slaughtered (*Aj.* 348), making visible and concrete what Athena and Tecmessa already have described. In *Electra*, the incognito Orestes and Pylades display a corpse to Aegisthus, who thinks the body is that of Orestes until he recognizes it as his murdered wife Clytemnestra. In keeping with the ritual perversions of *Antigone*, Eurydice's corpse is exposed on the household altar of Zeus *herkeios*,[1] her body 'balancing' that of her son Haemon, which Creon brings back from the tomb that holds Antigone (*Ant.* 1257–1260).

Characters frequently evoke distanced space via 'autopsy', as the Guard and Messenger do in *Antigone*, where each reports what he saw and experienced at the place where Polynices' corpse lies exposed (*Ant.* 245–277, 396–436, 1192–1204). The blind prophet Tiresias expands the reach of the body by imagining the carrion that spread pollution from the corpse throughout the city (998–1022). Chrysothemis describes the grave of Agamemnon after her visit there (*El.* 885–915), and Hyllus narrates Heracles' donning of the poisoned robe and subsequent murder of Lichas (*Tr.* 749–806), which he witnessed at the cape of Mt Cenaeum. Sophocles augments such first-person accounts with those that arise as distant memories of significant locales. Consider Oedipus' recollection

---

[1] Rehm 2002: 122–123 and 345 n. 29; cf. Griffith 1999: ad 1293.

of what transpired 'where the three roads meet' (*OT* 794–813) and the Shepherd's and Corinthian Messenger's memories of the events on Mt Cithaeron years before (1022–1044, 1123–1181).

Characters occasionally *anticipate* what a specific place might be like before they arrive, as Antigone does when she imagines the tomb ('O tomb, O bridal chamber, O always-guarded deep-dug home') where she will be buried alive (*Ant.* 810–816, 847–852, 876–882, 891–902). Her projective narration of this distant space joins Creon's straightforward description (773–780, 885–890), and it prepares for the Messenger's detailed narration of the underground cavern where Antigone and Haemon commit suicide (1204–1243). The Messenger adopts a scenic standpoint, which occasionally displays gaps (when he recounts things in the cavern he cannot have seen)[2] and effectively ends with the embedding of Creon's focalization.

We find little 'atemporal ekphrasis' in Sophocles, hardly surprising given the forward movement of action and the importance of the characters on which that action depends. In *Trachiniae*, Deianira describes the potion-imbued cloak that she sends to Heracles to restore his affections (*Tr.* 577–587), but she focuses on how Lichas should deliver the cloak to Heracles, emphasizing its ultimate destination (590–623). Later, she reports the horrible reaction of the wool she used to apply the potion once exposed to the sun, her narration resembling a messenger-speech in advance of the event, the inadvertent poisoning of her husband (*Tr.* 672–722). The Chorus in *Electra* compare Electra to Niobe, singing of the 'ever-weeping rocky outcrop' associated with the mythical Queen. But their emphasis lies on mutual human grief and suffering, not its physical location, which serves simply as an identifying marker of Niobe.

A more compelling example of the 'ekphrasis of place' occurs in the Old Man's extended account of the (false) death of Orestes in a chariot race at Delphi (*El.* 680–763), a model of the 'dynamization' of description. The sanctuary of Apollo and athletic contests come into clear view, as do the contestants and teams in the chariot race, the track on which they run, the stadium crowd, and other details. Although the narration involves pure fabrication of events in the recent past, it aims to operate on the characters who hear it, particularly Clytemnestra, who delights in the news, and Electra, who despairs at it. The specifics of place and material objects serve to persuade the onstage audience of the veracity of the

---

[2] For such gaps, see J. Barrett 2002: 190–222.

fictional event. Significantly, the Old Man's narration so affects Electra that her subsequent scene of mourning over the urn holding the ashes of 'Orestes' nearly derails her brother's revenge plot against their father's murderers, when the false power of the empty urn nearly displaces the physical presence of the true Orestes (1205–1229).

Presentation and Motivation

Regarding the presentation of, and motivation for, spatial description, we can compare the differing accounts of Philoctetes' cave, focalized by Odysseus, Neoptolemus, and by the title character. Odysseus describes the cave to Neoptolemus from memory, recalling his visit ten years before when the Greeks first marooned Philoctetes. He emphasizes the cave's salubrious qualities (*Ph.* 1–2, 16–21) 'like a house-agent, implying that its desirability mitigated his cruelty'.[3] He also draws attention to the cave's 'two-mouths' (*distomos*, 16), ironically suggesting his own euphemistic doublespeak and the deceptive speech he will employ later in the play.[4] Neoptolemus sees for himself the reality of Philoctetes' dwelling, describing the objects in the cave with pitiful disbelief. The interior is bare, save for a bed of leaves, a rough-hewn wooden cup, some kindling for a fire, and wound-infested rags drying in the sun (29–39). For his part, Philoctetes views his cave as both primitive hovel and welcome shelter, the environment in which he lives (*erlebte Raum*), as manifest in his extraordinary apostrophe to the surrounding landscape: 'You bays, you headlands, you mountain beasts / that share this dwelling-place, you jagged cliffs, / to you I call out, my habitual companions, / for I know no others to whom I can speak' (936–939). We witness the same relationship to his environment when Philoctetes bids farewell to the island (1453–1464), a poignant expression of the 'full interdependence of man and place'.[5]

Similarly, the scenic space of the house of Atreus in *Electra* offers a useful point for comparing the different perspectives of the characters and Chorus. For Electra, the house is anathema, the site of desecration, insult, humiliation, and torture (*El.* 92–99, 187–192, 257–304, 1190–1196). The more tractable Chrysothemis sees the house as a place of

---

[3] Webster 1970: ad 16.
[4] Rehm 2002: 142–155.
[5] J. Jones 1962: 222.

compromise, where one should bend to those who rule over it in order to survive (328–340, 997–1014, 1048–1057). For Orestes, it represents the patrimony and rule he has returned to secure (69–72). For the Old Man, the house holds bitter memories from the past (from here he helped the young Orestes escape, 10–14), and entry into within represents the goal of his deceptive speech (39–50), a step in the process of Orestes' revenge on Clytemnestra and Aegisthus. For the murderous pair, however, the house represents their home and future together, threatened by Electra's brooding presence and the possibility of Orestes' return (516–524, 648–654, 1458–1463).

Sophocles offers a microcosm of these spatial differences in *Electra* with conflicting prayers at the altar of Apollo, part of the scenic space tied to the palace but associated with the gods.[6] Bringing offerings for the altar, Clytemnestra engages in a vitriolic exchange with her daughter before making her prayer to the god:

> Hear me, Phoebus, our protector,
> hear my hidden words. /…/…/
> If some people are plotting to rob me
> of my present wealth, stop them.
> Grant that I may always live an unharmed life,
> holding rule and power in this house of Atreus,
> dwelling with the friends I have now
> in joyful prosperity, and with those children
> who bring me no pain or enmity.   (*El.* 637–654)

As if in answer to her prayers, the Old Man brings news of Orestes' death at Apollo's sanctuary at Delphi, unleashing jubilation in the Queen and despair in Electra. Once apprised of the true situation, Electra returns to the altar where Clytemnestra had prayed before and asks the god to help Orestes kill their mother (1376–1383). By setting these antithetical appeals in the same form and at the same location, Sophocles suggests the contentious nature of divine space, with humans competing for favor and praying for diametrically opposed outcomes.

The two prayers at Apollo's altar in *Electra* recall a similar scenario in *Oedipus Tyrannus*. Theban citizens gather at the altar of Apollo Lycaeus at the outset of the play (*OT* 16), praying for the god to end the plague. Later Jocasta emerges from the palace with offerings for Apollo Lycaeus and prays at the same altar for her husband's wellbeing (919–920). Apollo

---

6 Altars used as stage props probably were located in the orchestra; see Rehm 1988.

appears to answer Jocasta's prayers, when a Messenger from Corinth arrives with news of the death of Polybus, ostensibly freeing Oedipus from the fear that he will kill his father. In the event, Apollo favors the citizens' prayer to end the plague, rejecting Jocasta's private appeal that her husband find a way out of his fears. As in *Electra*, Apollo's altar bears a synechdochal relationship to the god's distant sanctuary at Delphi. In both plays scenic space reflects the antithetical desires of different characters, underlying the deeply ironic relationship between human aims and the overarching design of the gods.

In *Oedipus Tyrannus*, the gradual revelation of what the scenic space *means* for the protagonist accounts for much of the play's dramatic irony. What initially appears to Oedipus, Jocasta, Creon, and the Chorus as the palace of Thebes eventually emerges as the birthplace of Oedipus and the site of his incestuous marriage. Jocasta's recognition of this truth leads to the further revelation, of the palace interior, in particular the bedroom where she hangs herself in shame. Reported by a Messenger, Oedipus disrobes his wife as he did earlier in their marriage, but this time in order to blind himself with the pins that hold her *khitōn*. With the dead Jocasta before him, Oedipus finally 'sees' the palace for what it is, the site of primal pollution. At the play's end, Creon forces Oedipus back inside the palace to hide that pollution from the sun, returning him to the place that has wretchedly defined him, and from which he desperately wants to leave.

Sophocles extends the 'perspectival' presentation of scenic and extra-scenic spaces to distant and far-off spaces. In *Oedipus at Colonus* all the major characters refer to the distant city of Thebes, each evoking it in a different way. For Creon, it is the city *he* now rules, and he tries to persuade Oedipus (by argument and by force) to return and bring good things to Thebes on his death (*OC* 735–760, 849–852). To Polynices, the city represents his birthright, and he stands ready with a foreign (Argive) army to seize the throne from his brother Eteocles, who expelled him from Thebes (1292–1325). For Theseus, Thebes represents a city misled by its ruler Creon and thus a potential enemy of Athens (909–936). Finally, for Oedipus, Thebes stands for his own accursed past, a place he has left and to which he will not willingly return (765–793).

Mt Oeta in *Trachiniae* plays a similar role, providing a distant point of reference by which to measure the characters' attitudes toward the future. Heracles longs to find rest from his pain in the funeral pyre on the mountain, borne there by his unwilling son (*Tr.* 1191–1202). Hyllus, for his part, loathes undertaking the journey to the mountain (1203–

1215), much as he resists his father's command that he marry the war bride Iole. Deianira herself conjures Mt Oeta as place associated with Zeus (200, 436), and the Chorus invoke its heights as they celebrate Heracles' imminent homecoming (635). The mountain plays a crucial role in scholars' interpretations of the play's ending, for in *other* versions of the story (including Sophocles' *Philoctetes*) it represents the site of Heracles' apotheosis to Olympus.[7]

Functions

Space plays an essential role in Sophoclean tragedy, setting the scene, enabling the plot, providing context and motivation for dramatic characters and Chorus, and helping to create the desired ambiance and atmosphere. But perhaps more than in Aeschylus and Euripides, space in Sophocles also serves important thematic functions. Consider *Antigone*, a tragedy that, for all the deep philosophical interest it has generated, remains a simple drama of *misplacement*. The prophet Tiresias makes this basic point:

> You have sent below one who belongs above,
> lodging a living soul [Antigone] dishonorably in a tomb,
> and you have kept here one who belongs below, against
> the gods—a dispossessed, un-mourned, unholy corpse [Polynices].
> Neither you nor the gods above have any part in this …
>
> (*Ant.* 1068–1072)

The spatial inversions, highlighted by the juxtaposition of 'above' (*anō*, 1068, 1072) and 'below' (*katō*, 1068, *katōthen*, 1070), join the two most prominent distant places in the play, the dusty plain where Polynices' corpse lies exposed and the subterranean cave where Antigone is buried alive.

Thematically, these violations of the proper place of the living and the dead reflect other spatial dislocations in the play. The root of the tragedy lies in Oedipus and Jocasta's incestuous relationship, the wrongful proximity of son and mother that features prominently in the play's opening scene (*Ant.* 1–2, 49–54). Creon's decree results from Polynices having led a foreign invasion against the city he should have defended, a traitorous inversion of proper relationship to his fatherland. As noted

---

[7] See, e.g., Easterling 1981: 64–74.

above, Eurydice's suicide at the altar of Zeus *herkeios* pollutes the ritual core of Creon's home, a bloody manifestation of the spatial disorder that Creon inherited, and then magnified, as Thebes' new ruler.

Impurity and pollution arise when objects are removed from their proper location or moved to an inappropriate place, or when actions are performed in the wrong sequence or context.[8] As Tiresias insists, imprisoning a living person in a grave insults the gods, as does leaving a corpse to rot above ground. The Guard describes the place of Polynices' exposure: dry, hard, unbroken ground with no sign of human interference; the corpse bestrewn with dust, in violation of Creon's orders; the body as yet un-savaged by animals (*Ant*. 249–258), although Creon's desire to 'leave the body unburied, to be eaten and ravaged by birds and dogs' (205–206) will be fulfilled. Returning to the stage with the captive Antigone, the Guard indicates how expansive the corpse of Polynices is becoming. He describes the clammy remains along with the stench that he and the other guards tried to avoid by staying upwind (407–412). There they kept watch until 'the shining circle of the sun' reached its zenith and the mid-day temperature rose (415–417), increasing the audience's sense of a body decomposing in the heat. Suddenly a whirlwind sweeps across the plain, blotting out the sky, stripping the trees of their foliage, and forcing the guards to 'shut [their] eyes and keep out this god-sent plague' (421). When the wind drops, the Guards see Antigone scooping up dust from the dry earth, wailing over the corpse, and pouring funeral libations.

Marked by the vocabulary of visual and sense perception, the Guard's account conjoins natural, supernatural, and human elements, which indicate that the corpse will not 'stay put'. Antigone's presence on the plain suggests as much, but its diffusion takes on a more physical manifestation in Tiresias' narrative. The prophet hears the 'barbaric shrieking of birds' that 'tear at each other with murderous talons' (*Ant*. 1001–1004). Burnt offerings abort, and Tiresias understands that carrion from Polynices' body has polluted the altars of the city, spread by dogs and birds (1005–1019). Creon's guards may protect the corpse from further human intervention, but they are powerless to stop animals from spreading its putrefaction throughout the city. The pollution of Thebes' sacred places underlines the thematic importance of proper and improper placement, making a mockery of Creon's claim to control the space of the living and the dead.

---

[8] Douglas 1978.

If the spatial inversion of burial sets *Antigone* in motion, then the disruption of wedding ritual plays a similar role in *Trachiniae*, its spatial aspects used for thematic ends.[9] Events unfold before an otherwise unidentified house in Trachis, where Deianira and her children live in exile, and from which Heracles has been absent for 15 months (*Tr.* 38–45). The unsettled domestic situation hearkens back to Deianira's courtship by the bestial river-god Achelous, causing her to 'suffer from marriage' as no other girl. She describes how Heracles rescued her from the monster by combat and took her as his bride (6–28). The Chorus evoke the same event in lyric (503–530), emphasizing Deianira's spatial separation from her *natal* home and family: 'Suddenly she is gone from her mother, / like a calf that has wandered'. Following this chorus, Deianira embarks on an 'ambulant narration' of her journey with Heracles to their new home after the wedding (555–581), focusing on the traumatic encounter at the river Evenus. The centaur Nessus tried to rape her 'in the middle of the stream' (564), a space of betwixt-and-between that aligns with the transitional period of danger in a traditional rite of passage.[10] Heracles shoots the centaur with a poisoned arrow (action from a distance), but the dying Nessus gives Deianira a 'love potion', his blood mixed with the poison (action of close proximity). Deianira uses the potion in an attempt to regain her husband's affections, sending Heracles a tunic dyed with the incendiary mixture (again, action at a distance).

The plot depends on the physical separation of husband and wife, spatial distance reflecting their deep emotional divide. However, Sophocles symbolically closes the gap between the male and female worlds by the play's end. When Deianira learns the horrific consequences of her gift, she withdraws inside the house and kills herself 'in the middle of her marriage bed' (*Tr.* 912–931). In the original fifth-century production, Deianira's suicide allowed the same actor to perform the role of Heracles, who is carried on stage screaming in agony (971). Crying out 'like an unmarried girl', the hero derides himself for his unmanly response: 'Now I am found to be a woman' (1071–1075), which the actor had, in fact, just played. The dying Heracles extracts a formal vow from his son Hyllus to fulfill two rituals—to provide funeral rites for his father on Mt Oeta, and to marry to Iole, Heracles' captured concubine. The departure

---

[9] Rehm 1994: 72–83.

[10] Turner 1996: 94–97, 106–113, 165–203; note also dangerous 'middle ground' at *Tr.* 371–372, 514, and 918.

out of the theater resembles the ritual *ekphora* of an Athenian funeral, as Hyllus, attendants, and the Chorus of Trachinian women bear Heracles towards Mt Oeta. This communal exit momentarily integrates male and female worlds, and the promise of both funeral and marriage rites gives the play a sense of ritual—and spatial—closure.

The setting of *Trachiniae* may lack a strong civic context, but Sophocles goes much further in *Philoctetes*, where the scenic space abandons the *polis* community altogether. The Chorus describe the title character as 'a neighbor to himself alone …' (*Ph.* 691), and throughout the play 'the word *erēmos* ['desert', 'a place without people'] tolls like a bell'.[11] The play's setting offers a geographical correlative to the socially isolated Philoctetes, who dissociates himself from the corrupt values of the Greeks, as if 'exiling that society' from his island world.[12] Sophocles questions those values and that society by emphasizing that Troy, the most significant *polis* evoked in the play, is destined for destruction. The fact that Odysseus, Neoptolemus, and Philoctetes all perform significant roles in the sack of that distant city complicates the play's resolution, viewed by some critics as a celebration of Philoctetes' reintegration into the Greek society.[13]

Oedipus Tyrannus also exploits the thematic and symbolic importance of space, perhaps nowhere more powerfully than in the narrative interest in the place 'where three roads meet'. Jocasta introduces this detail by accident when she recounts Laius' death at the hands of robbers (*OT* 716, 730). However, it prompts Oedipus to recall his fatal encounter with an arrogant traveler 'near the junction of those three roads' (801–813). The spot carries enormous symbolic importance, representing a spatial version of the Sphinx's riddle of the three stages of man, where what is one is also three. The issue of the number of ostensible robbers (842–847) also replicates the paradox of how many can reduce to one. We may see a dramaturgical echo in the 'three-handed' scene with Oedipus, Creon, and Jocasta (634–677), and then the confrontation among Oedipus, the Corinthian Messenger, and the Shepherd (1119–1185). The latter recreates the 'primal' scene on the mountainside years earlier, where the baby Oedipus was not left on the Theban mountainside but handed over to be raised by Polybus and Merope in Corinth. Cithaeron, Thebes, Corinth, and Delphi prove in the end to be bound together, and the

[11] J. Jones 1962: 217.
[12] Vickers 1973: 279.
[13] Rehm 2002: 151–155.

ground that Oedipus has traversed in the past offers a spatial analogue for the extraordinary coincidences that make his tragedy.

Sophocles forcefully returns to these spatial connections at the end of the play, when the blind Oedipus yearns for exile on the mountain where his parents exposed him as an infant. However, the new ruler Creon insists that Oedipus return inside the palace, the place of his accursed birth and unwitting incest. Creon also sends an emissary to Delphi to consult the oracle about the course he should pursue. Creon himself first appeared on stage after returning from Delphi (*OT* 84), sent by Oedipus to learn the cause of the plague. On that trip, Creon replicated Laius' pilgrimage to the oracle years before, when he went to inquire about the curse of the Sphinx and met his death at the place where three roads meet. As the fifth-century audience in Athens considered this spatial interplay, they saw it reflected in the 'three roads' of the theater of Dionysus— the central doorway into the palace and the two *parodoi* connecting the distant spaces of Delphi, Corinth, and Cithaeron.

In *Oedipus Tyrannus*, theatrical, scenic, extra-scenic, and distanced spaces shape Oedipus' fate. *Ajax* operates differently, for Sophocles transforms the spatial givens to change the audience's perception of his protagonist and project a very different future. As noted above, *Ajax* is one of few extant tragedies that shift its setting during the play, from Ajax' tent to a desolate part of the Trojan beach. This change of scenic space plays a key role in converting Ajax from a shameful and polluted figure to a subject worthy of hero cult, one with particular purchase on the original Athenian audience.

Sophocles masterfully exploits the potential for concealment and revelation in the setting before Ajax' tent at Troy. Odysseus follows Ajax' tracks to his tent to determine if he is the perpetrator of the insane slaughter of Greek livestock (*Aj.* 1–8, 18–20, 31–33). Visible to the audience but not to Odysseus (14–17), the goddess Athena orders him to cease trying to look inside the tent (11), where the still-crazed Ajax has returned (9–10, 39, 53–65). Having 'cast baneful notions upon his eyes' (51–52), Athena eventually summons Ajax, and when he enters he can hear and see the goddess but not Odysseus, who can see and hear him. From their panoramic standpoint, only the audience sees and hears them all, aware of Ajax' blindness to Athena's game of cat and mouse and of Odysseus' discomfort at having to watch it (83–93).

Rarely in tragedy does extra-scenic space receive such attention— Odysseus tries to peer inside the tent (6–7, 11–12); Athena calls Ajax outside *twice* (71–73, 89–90); after he appears and speaks with the goddess,

he returns inside to torture his animal victims ('I go back to work!', 116–117). Ajax' wife Tecmessa leaves the tent to describe Ajax' comings and goings during the night and the horrific scene within (201–330). Following Ajax' offstage cries (333–343), focus shifts to the anguished response of the perpetrator himself. 'See now', Tecmessa announces, 'I open the tent. Now you can look / straight at what he did, and how he himself is' (346–347). Ajax rolls out on the *ekkuklēma*, surrounded by the animal carcasses he had mistaken for living Greeks. The extra-scenic interior remains exposed for nearly 250 lines (348–595), until Ajax returns to the scene of the crime, ordering Tecmessa to 'shut tight the dwelling, with no tears or lamentation / outside the tent … / Shut it closed, quickly!' (579–581).

When Ajax next emerges from the tent, he vows to make amends for his bloody rampage by bathing in the sea to remove his pollution. He will 'find a place where no one has ever stepped' (657) to bury the sword that the Trojan Hector had given him. Ajax' words suggest both a naturally deserted spot and a sacred place, off-limits to normal human activity,[14] anticipating the ritual-like suicide he will perform there. After he leaves the theater, a Messenger enters to report a disturbing prophecy that prompts Tecmessa and the Chorus to pursue Ajax, one of only five examples in extant tragedy where the Chorus leave the theater mid-play.[15] Their absence facilitates the change in setting from Ajax' encampment to the desolate beach where Ajax commits suicide 'in the presence of the audience only—a unique episode in extant Greek tragedy'.[16]

Having once acknowledged that 'Troy and this whole plain hates me' (*Aj.* 459), Ajax sees 'the hostile earth of Troy' as the proper place to take his own life, fixing in the soil the sword of the hated Hector (*Aj.* 818–819). Earlier on the *ekkuklēma*, Ajax bade farewell to the land of his enemy: 'The shore break, the sea caves, the coastal pastures have held me long, long, too long at Troy'; the streams of Scamander 'no more will see this man' (417–422). In his final speech, Ajax does so again, but only after his thoughts take in the expanse of the heavens and the distant space of his absent home (823–865). He asks Zeus, who sits over all, to help Teucer secure his burial; Hermes, who moves between Olympus and Hades, to ensure a quick death; the Furies, who dwell beneath the earth, to take vengeance on the Atreidae; and Helius, who daily travels across

---

[14] Stanford 1963: ad 657; March 1991–1993: 30–32.
[15] Also A. *Eu.* 231 and E. *Alc.* 746, *Hel.* 385, *Rh.* 564.
[16] Stanford 1963: lxii.

the sky, to convey news of his death to his parents. Ajax also addresses the sacred plain of his homeland Salamis and neighboring Athens (859–861), but he ends with the alien land he has made his own: 'And I call on these sacred springs and rivers, these plains/ of Troy—greetings, you that have sustained me!/This is the last word Ajax speaks to you' (862–864). Ajax gathers cosmic and terrestrial space and focuses it on the point of Hector's sword, fixed firmly in the Trojan earth. Then he impales himself on it.

The 'un-trodden' beach where Ajax takes his life provides the setting for the last 600 lines of the play. Like a magnet attracting friend and foe alike, the corpse on the deserted beach spreads its influence beyond the scenic space, drawing in the Chorus, Tecmessa, Teucer, Eurysaces, Menelaus, Agamemnon, and finally Odysseus. As Knox puts it, 'when Ajax moves, the whole play follows after him'.[17] Ajax' family gather to protect his body from the Atreidae, who wish to deny it burial, but the corpse also provides protection *against* the two Greek leaders.[18] At Teucer's suggestion (1168–1181), Tecmessa and Eurysaces sit as suppliants by the body, where they remain for over 200 lines until they join the procession bearing the corpse off for burial (1403–1417). The silent presence of Ajax' family—as suppliants, guardians, ritual observers of the dead, and guarantors of its curse (1168–1181)—adds to the aura of the body, anticipating Ajax' transformation from a traitor to a hero honored in Athenian cult.[19]

The many references in the play to far-off Athens and Salamis (Ajax' home) help prepare us for this transformation, as Sophocles draws on the reflexive space of the original audience. For example, Tecmessa identifies the Chorus of Ajax' crew as coming 'from the race of earth-born Erechtheus' (*Aj.* 201–202). At the end of their final ode, the Chorus sing of their desire for home, reflecting a sailor's-eye view of the Attic promontory of Sunium: 'Take me, take me/near that forest headland, approaching the sea-washed/crag of Sunium,/and let us greet again/holy Athens' (1216–1222). The cortège bearing Ajax' body out of the theater of Dionysus moved it from the Troy of myth into the realm of the audience.[20] Sophocles initiates this transformation by shifting the setting

---

[17] Knox 1961: 2.
[18] Burian 1972.
[19] Seaford 1994: 129–130 and 395–402; Henrichs 1993; Jebb [1896] 2004: xxviii–xxxii.
[20] Ajax also gave the name for one of the ten Attic tribes created by the Clisthenic reforms of 508/507. Herodotus (8.64, 8.21; 5.89) credits Ajax with helping the Athenian

to the un-trodden beach where Ajax in death takes on a power denied
him in life. From that point onwards, the space of the protagonist moves
expansively outwards, culminating in Ajax' future role as a civic hero of
fifth-century Athens.

Even more than in *Ajax*, in *Oedipus at Colonus*, the future status of the
protagonist as an Athenian cult hero provides the 'cornerstone of mod-
ern criticism' for the play.[21] To arrive at that future prospect, Sophocles
focuses on movement and placement of Oedipus from the outset. When
the Chorus come upon the blind man in the grove of the Eumenides, they
persuade him to move to the spot least offensive to the irascible god-
desses (*OC* 113–202) and later offer meticulous instructions regarding
the ritual purification he must perform to secure the goddesses' protec-
tion (466–506). The Chorus' concern for Oedipus' placement and purifi-
cation anticipates the attention paid to his death ritual and resting place
at the end of the play. As Segal observes, 'The problem of stationing this
wanderer in a fixed place or seat in the opening lines (*OC* 9, 11, 21) holds
the nucleus of the whole play: overcoming movement by rest, homeless-
ness by fixity, the conditions of the stranger or the city-less man by the
right to dwell among men'.[22]

Once settled in the grove, Oedipus withstands powerful attempts to
dislodge him from Athens and return him to Thebes. Theseus and the
Athenian army defeat Creon's violent effort to reclaim Oedipus for his
native land, and Oedipus brutally rejects his son Polynices' offer to
restore him to Thebes in exchange for father's support against his brother
Eteocles. After thunder and lighting signal Oedipus' impending death,
the old man rises and walks under his own power, leading his daughters
and Theseus offstage. Jebb captures the extraordinary theatrical impact
of his transformation:

> A more splendid dramatic effect than Sophocles has created here could
> hardly be conceived. Hitherto, throughout the play, Oedipus has been
> strongly characterized by that timidity in movement, and that sense of
> physical dependence, which are normal accompaniments of blindness.
> (Cp. 21, 173 ff., 495 ff., 1206, etc.) Now, suddenly inspired by the Unseen
> Power, which calls him, he becomes the guide of his guides.[23]

---

victory at Salamis in 480, prompting Athens to expand Ajax' festival (the Aiantea)
on Salamis. Fifth-century Athenian leaders (Miltiades, Cimon, Thucydides, Alcibiades)
traced their ancestry to him. See Kearns 1992: 65–78; Nilsson [1951] 1972: 29–36, 63–65.

   [21] Henrichs 1983: 94–95.

   [22] Segal 1981: 365.

   [23] Jebb [1900] 2004: ad 1542–1555 n.

No longer a pitiable beggar, Oedipus emerges as a prophet-like figure who foresees the future and helps guarantee it through his curses, benedictions, and enduring presence in the soil of Attica.

The site of Oedipus' grave holds no inherent power *until* the hero's body lies there, suggesting the Greek capacity for 'sacralizing' space via ritual activity.[24] In terms of spatial thematics, Sophocles exploits the possibility that a dramatic character like Oedipus (or Ajax in death) can 'make' the space around him, reversing the modern predilection for crediting the environment and context with that power. To use Kenneth Burke's 'scene/agent ratio',[25] instead of the setting or place controlling the agent or actor (the way a prison 'makes' someone a prisoner, for example), the dramatic character transforms the setting in which he finds himself. With Oedipus' departure, Sophocles privileges the mysterious space created by his presence over the theatrical and scenic space in which the play takes place. As narrated by the Messenger, Oedipus' death and burial demonstrates the thematic importance of space and its potential for narrative transformation, in Sophocles' last tragedy.

----

[24] Jameson 1999.
[25] Burke [1945] 1969: 3–20.

EURIPIDES

M. Lloyd

Setting

All Euripides' surviving plays are set in one place, which is identified in the prologue speech. Andromache thus describes the setting of *Andromache*:

> I live now in these lands that border on Phthia and the city of Pharsalus, lands where the sea goddess Thetis, far from the haunts of men and fleeing their company, lived as wife with Peleus. The people of Thessaly call the place Thetideion in honour of the goddess' marriage … I in fear have come and taken my seat at this shrine of Thetis near the house in the hope that it may save me from death[1]   (*Andr.* 16–20, 42–44).

Andromache identifies the part of Greece in which the play is set, the house of Neoptolemus in front of which the action takes place, and the shrine of Thetis at which she sits as a suppliant. Euripides sometimes specifies the precise location immediately, e.g. 'house of Admetus' (*Alc.* 1). More often, he identifies the country or city in which the action is set early in the prologue, and then specifies the actual building represented by the *skēnē* later, e.g. 'this land of the Chersonese' (*Hec.* 33), followed by 'the tent of Agamemnon' (*Hec.* 53–54), and 'this land of Delphi' (*Ion* 5), followed by 'this prophetic shrine of Apollo' (*Ion* 66).

Oliver Taplin contrasts this treatment of place with that in Shakespeare: 'an entry is an arrival, a positive journey to the place where the play is set, and an exit is a positive departure from that place. This contrasts with Shakespearean tragedy where frequent changes of scene and vague scene settings … often make entries and exits a matter of simply joining in and withdrawing from the action'.[2] This stability of setting is

---

[1] Passages from Euripides are cited, sometimes with slight adaptations, from the Loeb translation by David Kovacs.
[2] Taplin 1977: 103.

one of the most distinctive features of the treatment of scenic space in classical and neoclassical tragedy,[3] and contrasts with its labile nature in (→) Aristophanes. The only surviving play by Euripides in which there is a hint of unclarity in the setting is *Heraclidae*, where there is an indeterminacy of location which allows Marathon and Athens to merge together.[4]

Euripides does not usually go to great lengths to describe the location of a play in any detail at the beginning. His scene-setting is remarkably sparse even in plays with exotic locations (*Iphigenia in Tauris*, *Helen*).[5] *Ion* is exceptional in its evocation of Delphi in the first two hundred lines.[6] Hermes' prologue speech offers relatively little descriptive detail, but Ion's monody (82–183) gives a strong impression of the sanctuary, e.g. 'The trackless peaks of Parnassus gleam with light and receive for mortals the sun's chariot wheels. The smoke of dry incense rises up to Phoebus' rafters. Upon her holy tripod sits the Delphian priestess, who cries aloud to the Greeks whatever Apollo utters' (86–93).[7] Ion's focalization of the sanctuary also has a characterizing function, expressing his unworldly devotion to Apollo. The impressionable chorus of Creusa's Athenian maidservants then offers a vivid ekphrasis of the temple sculptures in the parodos (184–217).[8] There is a strong emphasis on the impact made by the sculptures on the members of the chorus as they move round, with many words for seeing, e.g. '—But see here the man upon the winged horse: he is slaying the fire-breathing three-bodied monster.— My eyes dart in all directions. Look at the rout of the Giants carved on the stonework!—I see them, my friends!—Do you see her, shaking over Enceladus her fierce-visaged shield … —I see Pallas, my goddess' (201– 211). Euripides is not so much enabling the spectator to construct the topography of Delphi as arousing wonder at this famous and holy place with its rich mythical and religious significance. Zeitlin (1994) associates

---

[3] Cf. McAuley 1999: 98.

[4] Cf. Zuntz 1955: 97–104; Wilkins 1993: xxvii, 32 n.; Allan 2001: 159, note on lines 340–343; Mendelsohn 2002: 63.

[5] Wright 2005: 176 observes: 'these locations are drawn neither precisely nor coherently, and there is an almost total absence of distinctive local detail'.

[6] See Kuntz 1993: 38–58 on 'the significance of setting for the thematic development of the play' (38) in *Ion*.

[7] Parnassus is also mentioned at lines 155, 714, 550, 1126–1127, 1267; cf. Lee 1997: 169, note on line 86; Hourmouziades 1965: 110–115.

[8] On the various issues concerning these sculptures, see Lee 1997: 177–179, note on lines 184–236.

the parodos of *Ion* with passages of ekphrasis near the beginnings of *Iphigenia in Aulis* (164–302) and *Phoenissae* (88–201), which are also focalized by naïve female spectators. Contrast the focalization by male heroes when Orestes draws Pylades' attention to the temple of Artemis at the beginning of *Iphigenia in Tauris*, e.g. 'You see that the walls on all sides are high. Shall we climb up on ladders? … Or shall we pry the bronze doors open with crowbars and thus enter the temple?' (*IT* 96–100). The temple here poses a practical challenge, and the earlier description of the blood-stained altar (72–75) shows the price of failure.

Euripides sometimes relates the location of a play systematically to a number of offstage places. *Electra* is a good example of this. It is set in front of the Farmer's cottage, a humble dwelling in the countryside (168, 207, 252, 306–307), close to the Argive border (96). The Farmer's fields and the stream from which Electra gets water are nearby (77–79). A little further away is Aegisthus' country estate, described as 'near to these fields' (623); it is close enough for Aegisthus' death-cry to be audible (751–754), and is therefore 'extra-scenic' rather than 'distanced' space. The messenger refers to the wagon track by which Orestes and Pylades made their way there (775; cf. 103). The countrywomen of the chorus live nearby (167–174, 298–299). Distanced places are systematically related to these extra-scenic places. The cottage is contrasted with the royal palace in Argos, from which Orestes and Electra have been exiled (314–322). A festive procession from Argos to the Heraion is also mentioned (173–174). Agamemnon's tomb is another offstage place, neglected by the usurpers (323–331) but honoured by those still loyal to him (508–523). The Old Man, Agamemnon's tutor, lives in a different part of the Argive borderland, by the R. Tanaus in the south (409–412). He comes via Agamemnon's tomb (509), and will go to the city via Aegisthus' estate (664–666). Clytemnestra visits Electra's cottage on her way to Aegisthus' estate (1133–1135). The innovative plot requires topographical clarity.[9] Mastronarde observes that Euripides, in comparison to Sophocles, 'aims for a stronger impression of particularity and verisimilitude' in his topography, and this contributes to establishing the realistic tone of *Electra*.[10]

---

[9] Cf. W.S. Barrett 1964: 15, 32–34 on *Hippolytus*.
[10] Mastronarde 1994: 647; cf. Lowe 1987: 134–135, on Menander's *Dyskolos*.

Scenic Space

The scenic space in Euripides is always located in front of a building represented by the *skēnē*. This space is never treated as private, as a room inside the house might have been. Euripides sometimes brings characters onto the stage when they might more naturally have remained indoors, but the result is that they are now in a position to interact with strangers. In *Alcestis*, for example, Alcestis comes out of the palace to die. This is explained in terms of her wish to see the sun for one last time (205–207), but it is not merely a matter of being in the open air, as she would have been in an inner courtyard. The door is the *auleios thura* (S. *Ant.* 18; E. *Hel.* 438) opening onto the street,[11] and her entrance serves to satisfy the sympathetic interest of the chorus which has built up since their entrance. There is a similar sequence of events in *Hippolytus*, where the chorus speculates about Phaedra's malady in the parodos (121–169; cf. 267–287). Her appearance is explained in terms of a desire for light and air (176–190), but she is now in some sense in public (213) and the chorus is shocked that she has 'exposed evils to the daylight' (368). In *Orestes*, the sick Orestes is outside from the start (35–36), and there is a protracted scene of sympathetic interest from the chorus while he sleeps.

We should not, however, exaggerate the degree to which events outside the *skēnē* are to be regarded as public. John Gould writes: 'Greek tragic drama is a theatre of public events, played both in reality and in imagination in the open air and depicting the words and actions of the public world. The chorus … is the constant visible symbol of this public world'.[12] P.E. Easterling queries this statement, arguing in particular that female choruses help to create a 'shared women's world' in which there is no sense that female protagonists are 'outside' in any transgressive sense.[13] She thus denies that the stage in Sophocles' *Trachiniae* is a civic space: '[t]he public life of the *polis* is firmly off-stage … and quite marginal'.[14] She is undoubtedly correct that the stage space is not 'public' in that sense. Both *Andromache* and *Electra* are set in remote places, far from the world of politics. There is clearly nothing transgressive about Electra going to the stream or talking to the female chorus, although the Farmer is shocked to find her talking to male strangers (*El.* 341–344).

---

[11] Cf. Dale 1969: 126–127; Lowe 2000: 169–170.
[12] Gould 1978: 49 = 2001: 89.
[13] Easterling 1987: 24 n. 32.
[14] Easterling 1987: 19.

The scenic space in Euripides is an intermediate zone between the privacy of the interior of the *skēnē* and the world of public affairs. He often has a nearby offstage place at which decisions are made in perhaps unpredictable ways about the characters onstage, and this displacement of political power from the scene of the action is a distinctive feature of his plays. A good example is *Orestes*, which may be set in front of the royal palace but where political power resides with the Argive assembly. Orestes cannot escape (427–447, 759–762), he depends on the vote of the city (48–49, 756–758), and the assembly itself is described at length by the messenger (866–956).[15] The assembly of the Greek army has a similar impact on the characters in *Hecuba*, *Troades*, and *Iphigenia in Aulis*. Both *Medea* and *Heracles* are set in front of private houses in cities, and the dramatic importance of the offstage royal palace is particularly notable in *Medea*. The royal palace of Thebes, in front of which the action of *Bacchae* is set, is displaced as the centre of power by events on the mountain. (→) Sophocles, by contrast, sets three of his seven surviving plays in front of the royal palace, and in *Oedipus at Colonus* the presence of Theseus makes Colonus temporarily the political centre of Athens. Only *Ajax* resembles Euripides' practice in constructing the scenic space through sharp contrasts both with the domestic interior of the *skēnē* and with a nearby political assembly.

Phoenissae is unusual for Euripides in being set at the political centre of the *polis*, where the main episodes of political decision and deliberation take place, e.g. the debate between Eteocles and Polynices, Eteocles' consultation with Creon, and Creon's discussion with Tiresias about how to save the city (858–864, 891–893, 898–900, 912, 918–919, 997, 1015–1018). Antigone's presence outside the *skēnē* is treated as transgressive (88–98, 193–201). On the other hand, Eteocles discusses private matters with Creon (692), and Tiresias' advice is treated by Creon as something not to be made public (925, 970). In *Ion*, the space in front of the temple of Apollo at Delphi is presented in quite domestic terms, although in reality it was one of the most public areas in the entire Greek world. The chorus of Creusa's serving women 'bring to Delphi the support which [she] would normally find at home'.[16] Xuthus swears the chorus to secrecy (666–667) without the slightest concern that anyone else is within earshot. The 'whole city' (1225) looks for Creusa, but it is

---

[15] Cf. Lloyd 1992: 126–128; Easterling 1997: 29–33. On the topography of Argos in tragedy, see Saïd 1993.

[16] Lee 1997: 177, note on lines 184–236.

unclear how many of the Delphians enter at line 1258. The playing space is constructed in more political terms in *Heraclidae* and *Supplices*, and the presence of women in it becomes correspondingly more problematic (*Heracl.* 474–483; *Supp.* 40–41, 297–300).[17]

One of the most important issues relating to Euripides' use of scenic space is the relationship between the actors and the chorus. It has usually been supposed that as a general rule the chorus danced and sang in the orchestra, while the actors stayed close to the front of the *skēnē*.[18] This spatial distinction would reflect the differences in their modes of performance and in the nature of their engagement with the action. On the other hand, there is regular interaction between chorus and actors, and if there was a raised stage (a controversial issue) then it would not have been very high. Six of Euripides' extant plays (*Heraclidae*, *Andromache*, *Heracles*, *Supplices*, *Ion*, and *Helen*) have an altar or tomb at which characters take refuge. Rush Rehm has challenged the traditional view that this structure was located near the *skēnē*, and argued convincingly that it was in the centre of the orchestra. He points in particular to the opening tableau of *Supplices*.[19] This has Aethra standing at the altar of Demeter surrounded by the chorus of fifteen suppliant women, and near the *skēnē* door Adrastus and the secondary chorus of sons of the fallen warriors (at least six and more probably fifteen to match the chorus of mothers). Rehm reasonably points out that it would have been intolerably congested to have as many as 32 performers in the narrow space in front of the *skēnē*. The dramatic articulation would be much clearer if the women were in the centre of the orchestra, emphasizing the distinction between male and female groups. This would also exploit the dramatic strength of the centre of the orchestra and of the line between it and the *skēnē* door.[20] Rehm's staging brings out the conflict in these plays between different 'zones of power'.[21] In *Andromache*, for example, the shrine of Thetis, revered by the Aeacids (45–46), is distinct from the house, which is controlled in the play by Hermione and Menelaus. It is a refuge from a house under hostile control, like the tomb of Proteus (*Helen*), the altar of Zeus (*Heracles*), and the tomb of Agamemnon (Aeschylus *Choephori*).

---

[17] See generally Mendelsohn 2002: 36–49.

[18] E. g. Hourmouziades 1965: 58–74; Taplin 1977: 441–442.

[19] Rehm 1988: 274–276, 283–290.

[20] Cf. Wiles 1997: 63–86; Storey 2008: 107–111.

[21] The phrase used by Lowe 2000: 173, distinguishing the altar both from the inside of the *skēnē* and from offstage political authority.

The vertical axis is a significant aspect of the topography of several plays, e.g. the *aether* in Helen, and the Underworld in *Heracles* (22–24, 37, 45–46, 145, 297, 516, 607–608).[22] In terms of performance, it is expressed in Euripides' theatre by actors appearing on the roof of the *skēnē*. Mastronarde argues that there was only one roof level, although some scholars accept the evidence of Pollux 4.127 that there was additionally a *theologeion* on which gods could appear at an even higher level.[23] It is not known whether the roof was accessed by a trapdoor in the *skēnē* roof or by a ladder or staircase behind the *skēnē*. Actors could also alight on the roof from the *mēkhanē* (crane). Gods probably or certainly appear on the roof of the *skēnē* in the final scene of several of Euripides' plays (the *deus ex machina*): *Hippolytus* (Artemis), *Andromache* (Thetis; cf. 1226–1230), *Supplices* (Athena), *Electra* (the Dioscuri), *Iphigenia in Tauris* (Athena), *Ion* (Athena), *Helen* (the Dioscuri), and *Bacchae* (Dionysus, who does however walk on the ground earlier in the play in human disguise). Iris and Lyssa also appear on the roof in the middle of *Heracles* (cf. 815–821). This position signifies the gods' superiority to, and detachment from, the human characters.[24] Medea's appearance on high at the end of *Medea* exploits the associations of gods appearing in this way, and suggests that the significance of the *mēkhanē* was established at least as early as 431 BC. Scholars are more divided in their views of where gods appear in prologues. Some think that they always appear at ground level, while Mastronarde argues for an appearance on high for gods in *Hippolytus* (Aphrodite) and *Troades* (Poseidon and Athena) and for the ghost of Polydorus in *Hecuba*.

Euripides uses the *skēnē* roof for human characters on three occasions, apart from the quasi-divine Medea (discussed above). The least problematic is *Phoenissae* 88–201, where Antigone and the Servant look out on the invading army. In terms of space, this is less interesting for its use of the vertical axis than for its incorporation of extra-scenic space and is thus discussed in that context below. Evadne's spectacular appearance at *Supplices* 980–1071 raises difficult questions about the relationship between the spaces occupied by her and later by Athena. She leaps onto the pyre of her husband Capaneus, echoing his fiery descent from the

---

[22] See Wiles 1997: 175–186; Burian 2007: 27–28 (on *Helen*); Saïd 1989: 113–114 (on *Heracles*).

[23] Mastronarde 1990: 255–259.

[24] Cf. Dunn 1996: 29–32 and Lowe 2000: 171.

walls of Thebes (497–498, 729–730).[25] There are three human characters on the roof at the end of *Orestes* (Orestes, Pylades, Hermione), raising similar problems to those in *Supplices* about their spatial relationship to the *deus ex machina* Apollo.

Extra-Scenic Space

In Euripides' extant plays, the *skēnē* can represent a royal palace (*Alcestis*, *Hippolytus*, *Helen*, *Phoenissae*, *Orestes*, *Bacchae*), a private dwelling (*Cyclops*, *Medea*, *Andromache*, *Electra*, *Heracles*), a tent in a military camp (*Hecuba*, *Troades*, *Iphigenia in Aulis*, *Rhesus*), or a temple (*Heraclidae*, *Supplices*, *Iphigenia in Tauris*, *Ion*). The interior of this building plays a crucial part in many of Euripides' plays, as it does also in (→) Sophocles and in (→) Aeschylus' *Oresteia*. This near but unseen space is a fundamental feature of the post-*skēnē* Greek theatre, with the *skēnē* door as the focal point of transition. There is no other way in or out: 'as in all Greek houses, there is no back door' (Taplin 1983: 158). Froma Zeitlin writes: 'The ordinary business of entrances and exits, of comings and goings through the door of the house, maintains a symbolic dialectic between public and private, seen and unseen, open and secret, even known and unknown' (1996: 353). The symbolic function of interiors is prominent in many genres and authors, many of them influenced by the construction of space in Attic drama, e.g. (→) Chariton.

The interior of the *skēnē* is a space where things are concealed before being brought out into the open. Xuthus in *Ion* emerges from the temple with an oracle, and later the Priestess comes out with tokens (1320). The plot of *Iphigenia in Tauris* revolves around the need to bring out the statue of Artemis. Eteocles and Polynices confine Oedipus within the palace in *Phoenissae* (63–68, 872–877), and there is a *coup de théâtre* when he finally emerges (1539). Characters bring out their dreams (*Hec.* 68–97, *IT* 42–66) or worries (*Med.* 56–58). In *Hippolytus*, Phaedra initially conceals her malady (279, 394), but it will eventually be revealed (as Aphrodite predicts, 42). This process of revelation is associated with her emergence from the palace. The chorus speculates about Phaedra's behaviour inside the house (121–169), but the explanation is not immediately clear after she comes out (170) and the truth is only revealed at line 352. Hippolytus' anger is similarly brought out into the open, after the remarkable scene

---

[25] Cf. Wiles 1997: 184–186; Storey 2008: 116–120.

in which his shouting is heard within (565–600). The opening sequence of *Medea* suggests a contrast between Medea's grief and rage inside the house (1–213) and her controlled behaviour once she has come out.[26]

In *Alcestis*, the chorus tries to interpret what is happening inside the palace (77–111), before the Maidservant gives a detailed account of the intensely private events within (152–198). This speech, and the later speech by the Manservant (747–772), describe the internal articulation of the house in considerable detail.[27] Admetus promises to stop festivity in the house (343–356), describes the separate guest quarters (546–550), and asks Heracles where in the house the unknown woman could stay (1049–1059). The dominant spatial imagery in *Alcestis* is of death as a journey. This is especially clear in Alcestis' simultaneous lyric narrative of her death with its vision of Charon and Hades (252–271; cf. 435–444, 902).[28] 'She has gone' (392, 394), and will live in the house of Hades (436–437, 626–627). She will go down into the Underworld (25–26, 47, 73, 107, 163, 237, 379, 618–619); Admetus would go down to rescue or accompany her (360, 382), as would the chorus (455–459; cf. 985–986) and Heracles (850–854, 1072–1074). Death is conceptualized in spatial terms. The cognitive scientist Mark Turner writes, with reference to *Alcestis*: 'the spatial action-story of departure is projected onto the non-spatial event-story of death'.[29] There is also a literal journey outwards. Alcestis' *ekphora* (422, 716) is described as her last journey (610). Heracles follows this journey outwards to the grave (843–849), but does not in the event need to follow her down to Hades (850–854). There is a reverse journey back into the house when he brings her back ('receive her inside the house', 1097, 1110, 1114, 1147), repeating her arrival there as a bride. The door is a boundary marker both for death and marriage.[30]

Events within the *skēnē* are sometimes audible (e.g. *Hipp.* 565–600; *HF* 886–909), or made visible by the *ekkuklēma*.[31] This is a device which displays to the audience and characters onstage a tableau supposed to

---

[26] Padel 1990: 358 suggests that the *skēnē* is 'an image of the unseen interior of a human being'.

[27] Cf. Hourmouziades 1965: 85–88; Padel 1990: 343–344; Luschnig 1992: 19–34. Other plays in which the interior is articulated in particular detail are *Heracles*, *Orestes*, and *Bacchae*.

[28] Cf. *SAGN* 2: 303.

[29] Turner 1996: 31.

[30] Cf. Buxton 2003: 173–179; Rehm 1994: 84–96. On some ambiguities in Euripides' presentation of death in *Alcestis*, see Dale 1954: 54, 71–72, 115, notes on lines 24–26, 252 ff., 871.

[31] Cf. Taplin 1977: 442–443; Wiles 1997: 162–165.

be inside the *skēnē*. When Theseus is greeted by the news that Phaedra has hanged herself, he commands the servants to open the doors so that he might see the bitter sight of his wife's corpse (*Hipp.* 808–810). A.M. Dale observes: 'our texts vacillate with a curious ambiguity between the imagined scene and the actual mechanism visibly used to present it'.[32] In other words, a real person in Theseus' position would enter the house rather than calling for the body to be displayed. The tableau on the *ekkuklēma* tends to change in the course of the scene from something inside which is by convention visible to the audience to something which is actually outside. The bodies of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus thus appear on the *ekkuklēma* in *Electra* (1178), but are apparently outside when Electra and Orestes cover them (1227–1232). Heracles sees the sunlight when he recovers consciousness (*HF* 1090), and interacts with characters onstage. This to some extent blurs the usually clear distinction between inside and outside.

The interior of the *skēnē* is often regarded as a predominantly female space. Electra, playing the part of the good wife, contrasts her husband's work outside with her own within (*El.* 73–74). Hippolytus denounces women contriving evils within the house which their servants bring out (*Hipp.* 649–650; the text is corrupt, but the general sense is clear). In *Heraclidae*, the interior of a temple is constructed as a female space, and the Maiden feels the need to justify her exit from it (*Heracl.* 474–483). In *Hecuba*, the *skēnē* may represent the tent of Agamemnon (53–54; cf. *Tr.* 139), but he never goes into it and always enters from 'public' area of Greek camp. Hecuba seems to be based in the tent: she enters from it (59), goes in and out in the middle of the play (628, 665–666), and treats it as her space for the purposes of her plot against Polymestor (1014–1018).[33] In *Iphigenia in Aulis*, the *skēnē* is quite a substantial building, treated as 'home' by Clytemnestra and Iphigenia and a refuge from the threatening male world outside (678–679, 825–826, 913–915, 996, 1029–1031).[34] Contrast *Troades*, where nothing happens inside the *skēnē*, and there is no significant interior female space.[35] The *skēnē* door is used much more frequently by female than male characters. Euripides also seems to avoid having male characters, especially powerful ones, make their first

---

[32] Dale 1969: 121.
[33] Cf. Croally 1994: 185: 'the interior spaces of the tents (the *skēnē*) are still, as in a city, associated with women'.
[34] Cf. Michelakis 2006: 87–89.
[35] Cf. Croally 1994: 200–201.

entrance from the *skēnē*. The main exceptions are Admetus (*Alcestis*) and the Farmer (*Electra*), both dramatically subordinate to their wives, the youthful Ion (*Ion*), and the blind and aged Oedipus (*Phoenissae*). There is a contrast here with Sophocles, where Ajax (*Aj.* 91), Creon (*Ant.* 162), and Oedipus (*OT* 1) all make their first entrance from the *skēnē*.

Euripides occasionally exploits a 'contiguous offstage' other than that inside the *skēnē*.[36] Examples are the extended entrance announcement of Clytemnestra (*El.* 962–987), and Electra and the chorus keeping watch for possible arrivals by the *eisodoi* (*Or.* 1246–1310). The teichoscopia in *Phoenissae* describes Theban landmarks such as the rivers Ismenus and Dirce (101–102, 131), the tomb of Zethus (145), and the tomb of the Niobids (159–160).[37]

Distanced Space

Scholars generally agree that there was no fixed conventional distinction between the two *eisodoi* in the fifth century, as there was in later theatre between one entrance from the country and harbour and the other from the city.[38] It is, however, unlikely that the *eisodoi* were used randomly, and some distinction between them was doubtless established for each play. It seems plausible that in plays set near the sea (*Cyclops*, *Troades*, *Helen*, *Iphigenia in Tauris*) the *eisodoi* should distinguish inland and shore, and that in plays set in cities (*Medea*, *Phoenissae*, *Heracles*, *Orestes*, *Bacchae*) there should be a distinction between inside and outside the city, although in some cases this would mean one *eisodos* being used much more than the other. This is not merely a matter of topographical clarity. In suppliant plays such as *Heraclidae* and *Supplices*, for example, the distinction would have been thematic if one *eisodos* was associated with danger and the other with safety. In plays set near the sea, the sea is associated for some of the characters with escaping or returning home.[39] Matters become more complicated when there are more than two significant offstage places, e.g. in *Hecuba* (Greek camp, seashore, inland Thrace) and *Andromache* (Pharsalus, Phthia, Sparta, Delphi).

---

[36] Cf. McAuley 1999: 31.

[37] Saïd 1989: 115–121 argues that the topography of Thebes is presented in more detail in *Phoenissae* than in *Heracles* and *Bacchae*.

[38] Cf. Hourmouziades 1965: 128–136; Taplin 1977: 450–451; Wiles 1997: 133–160.

[39] On the importance of the sea in Euripides' escape tragedies, see Wright 2005: 203–225.

Most of Euripides' plays are set in transitional locations to which offstage places are related as stages of a journey. In *Medea*, for example, Corinth is a temporary residence for Medea between Colchis, Iolcus, and an uncertain future which turns out to be Athens. Space has a clear thematic function here. Life as a journey is a prominent metaphor in the play (768–771, 920–921, 1245), and it is a journey which cannot be reversed (502–508).[40] *Iphigenia in Aulis* is set in the Greek camp as the army is about to sail to Troy; in *Hecuba* and *Troades*, the army and the captives are on the point of return. Troy and Greece loom large in all three plays. *Cyclops*, *Electra*, *Iphigenia in Tauris*, *Ion*, and *Helen* end in return from prolonged exile. Theseus is displaced to Trozen (*Hippolytus*) and Amphitryon to Thebes (*Heracles*). Most characters in *Alcestis* enjoy stable lives, but they contrast with Heracles' travels, and his 'uphill' fate (479–506). The journey of the chorus in *Phoenissae* from Phoenicia to Thebes and then on to Delphi inspires elaborate contrasts between the three places. The *parodos* addresses Delphi in ecstatic terms, e.g. 'O holy cave of the serpent and mountain lookout of the goddesses, O sacred mount overspread with snow' (232–234). Delphi is evoked in lyrical and idealistic terms as a place of peace and harmony, in contrast to the violence in Thebes, where the play is set.[41]

In *Ion*, the topography of the Athenian acropolis is evoked in more detail than that of Delphi, where the play is actually set.[42] In particular, there are repeated references to the cave of Pan on the north side of the acropolis where Creusa was raped by Apollo. Hermes mentions it in the relatively unemotional and descriptive style appropriate to a prologue speech as 'the place where under Pallas' acropolis stand Athens' northern cliffs, the Long Cliffs as the Athenians call them' (11–13).[43] The tone is different when Ion mentions this place (283), and Creusa responds, 'I wish I had never seen it!' (286) and 'I know a disgraceful deed done in that cave' (288), a deed later attributed to an anonymous friend (338–352). It is evoked in an exalted lyric mode by the chorus: 'O resting

---

[40] On the widespread metaphor of life as a journey, see Turner 1996: 88–90; Budelmann 2010: 114–116. The concept of the 'conceptual metaphor' originated in Lakoff and Johnson 1980.

[41] Cf. Arthur 1977: 165–169.

[42] 'The scene is Delphi, but in a sense it is Athens' (Owen 1939: xxii). Cf. Loraux 1993: 195–198.

[43] Lee 1997: 162, note on line 13, cites Wilamowitz' observation that this name is in fact only used in this play, but it is difficult to imagine what purpose would have been served by Euripides inventing it.

place of Pan and cliff that lies near the Long Rocks full of caverns! There they tread the measure, Aglaurus' daughters three, over the grassy sward before the temple of Pallas and sing to the shimmering sound of piping when in your cave shaded from the sun, O Pan, you play your pipes' (492–502). Creusa recalls the rape in her monody: 'into the cave that was your bed you took me, divine ravisher' (892–895), and explains her anguish to the Old Man (936–941). The cave is recalled for the final time when Creusa recognizes Ion (1400). The play's obsession with this place resembles the recurrent references in (→) Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus* to 'the place where three roads meet'. The cave is distanced space in the context of the play, but is in reality close to where the Athenian audience sat watching the play. This is the most striking of the many references to Athens in Euripides, relating a story set in another place in the mythical past to the audience's own space. Another example is when Medea goes to Athens at the end of *Medea*. Euripides typically concludes his plays by relating the dramatic space to real locations accessible to his audience. He does this by means of aetiology, relating dramatic space to (e.g.) cults at Brauron and Halae Araphenides in Attica (*IT* 1446–1467), the sanctuary of Hera on Acrocorinth (*Med.* 1378–1383), the tomb of Eurystheus at Pallene (*Heracl.* 1030–1036), or the tomb of Neoptolemus at Delphi (*Andr.* 1239–1242). It may be stretching a point to relate this to the 'reference to the narrator's own space' motif, but there is certainly an oblique reference to the audience's space.

Messenger speeches are an obvious place to look for detailed description of distanced space in Euripides. The narratological aspects of these speeches have been well studied by Irene de Jong (1991) and James Barrett (2002). De Jong detects subtleties of characterization and focalization which serve to locate the messenger as an individual inside the drama. James Barrett reaffirms the objectivity and self-effacement of the messenger, and stresses his appropriation of the authority of the epic narrator, whose utterances are characterized by transparency, completeness, and veracity. There is much truth in both views, and Euripides often moves subtly from one kind of narrative to the other, or obscures the difference between them. In terms of the presentation of space, the speeches offer examples of the panoramic standpoint (e.g. *Supp.* 651–652, where the messenger stands at the Electran gate on a tower commanding a good view), the shifting scenic standpoint (the most common, e.g. in *Medea*, where the messenger follows in the footsteps of Jason and the children), and the close-up (e.g. *El.* 827–829, where the messenger zooms in on the ominous entrails of Aegisthus' sacrifice).

In some speeches, there is a bare minimum of scenic description. For example, *Helen* (1527, 1539) has only 'a rather nondescript shore' (de Jong 1991: 156), *Hecuba* offers no more than 'by the tomb' (522) and 'on top of the mound' (524), while the 'bridal house' (1137) in *Medea* includes nothing more specific than 'women's chambers' (1143) and 'father's chambers' (1177–1178). Heracles' palace has an altar of Zeus (*HF* 922, 974), men's quarters (954), and a column (973), and some landmarks are mentioned in his imaginary journey (Megara, 954; 'wooded plains of the Isthmus', 958; Mycenae, 963). The messenger speech in *Heraclidae* mentions a couple of landmarks (Pallene, 849–850; the Scironian rocks, 860),[44] but the battlefield itself is entirely featureless and has none of the detailed topography which appears in historians' battle narratives. The same is true of *Phoenissae*, where there is mention of Teumessus (1100) and a temple of Athena (1372–1373) but otherwise nothing very specific.

Some messenger speeches begin with brief descriptions to set the scene, but with little detail thereafter. The messenger speech in *Supplices* mentions the Electran gate (651), Ismenus' hill (655), Ares' spring (660), and the tomb of Amphion (663), but none of them is significant for the actual battle. The messenger speech of *Electra* sketches a peaceful rural scene (777–778), which some scholars have believed to contrast significantly with the violence which follows.[45] The temple of Apollo at Delphi is a semantically charged space in *Andromache*, with an explicit contrast between the holiness of the location and the events which take place there (e.g. 1144). The messenger also contrasts the innocent sightseeing of Neoptolemus' party with Orestes' sinister plotting (*Andr.* 1085–1095). On the other hand, there is no description of what they actually looked at, and it is assumed throughout that the audience is familiar with Delphi. It is notable that Euripides' messenger speeches contain a great deal of realistic description (e.g. the sacrifice in *Electra*, horsemanship in *Hippolytus*, fighting in *Phoenissae*), but that very little of it is topographical. The first messenger speech in *Iphigenia in Tauris* begins: 'We were putting our forest-grazing oxen into the sea that flows out through the Symplegades. There is a hollow cave there, made by the

---

[44] See *SAGN* 2: 294 for the chronological aspect of the movements of Eurystheus and his army; the Megarian border (278–279) and the plain of Marathon (389–397) were mentioned earlier in the play.

[45] The issues are well discussed by Cropp 1988: 154, note on lines 774–858.

constant beating of the waves, a place where murex-fishers take shelter'
(*IT* 260–263). This is quite memorable, but there is little topographical
description thereafter. Cropp (2000: 192–193, note on lines 260–264)
remarks 'content and phrasing are typical of epic scene-setting', and
indeed we are dealing with the 'there is a place X' motif, but it is striking
that his parallels (e.g. Hom. *Il.* 22.147–157) go into considerably more
detail.

The two messenger speeches in which description of the setting is
developed in the most detail are those in *Hippolytus* and *Bacchae*.[46] The
messenger in *Hippolytus* begins by locating the action 'by the shore'
(1173, 1179), which is already significant as the place where Hippolytus
exercized his horses (228–231, 1126, 1131–1134), and then telling that
they set out along 'the road that makes straight for Argos and Epidaurus'
(1197).[47] The description which follows is unusually detailed: 'When we
struck deserted country, there is a headland beyond our territory, lying
out towards what is at that point the Saronic gulf … When we turned our
eyes to the sea-beaten beach, we saw an unearthly wave, its peak fixed
in the heavens, so great that my eye was robbed of the sight of Sciron's
coast, and the Isthmus and Asclepius' cliff were hid from view' (1198–
1209). The scenic description is integral to the action, and the impact of
the miraculous is enhanced by the mention of familiar landmarks.

The two messenger speeches in *Bacchae* similarly set miraculous
events in the context of detailed description of landscape. The first begins
with an ekphrasis of the behaviour of the maenads (680–713), in which
explicit statement of the herdsman's vision ('I see', 680) yields first to
a slightly more generalized focalization ('a marvel of ordered calm to
look at', 693) and then to hypothetical vision by Pentheus ('if you had
been there and seen this', 712–713; cf. 737, 740, 747).[48] The latter part
of the speech adopts a more panoramic mode of description, which has
raised questions about what the herdsman himself could actually have
witnessed: 'They rose like birds and moved rapidly over the spreading
plains that near Asopus' waters produce abundant grain for the The-
bans and hurled themselves like enemy troops upon Hysiae and Ery-
thrae, which stand in the hill country of Cithaeron, in its lower reaches'

---

[46] These are also the two of Euripides' plays which give most prominence to the wild
countryside 'out there', which contrasts both with the *oikos* and the *polis*; see Carter 2006.

[47] A map is supplied by W.S. Barrett 1964: 383, note on lines 1198–1200. He suggests
that Euripides' 'descriptions seem … to be basically accurate'.

[48] See de Jong 1991: 20; J. Barrett 2002: 118–126.

(748–752). The second messenger speech sets the scene: 'First we halted in a grassy dale, keeping our footsteps and our tongues silent so that we might see without being seen. There was a mountain glen with steep sides, with a stream flowing through it and pine trees to shade it, and there the maenads sat employing their hands in pleasant tasks' (1048–1053). The contrast between a peaceful rural scene and the violence which follows is a central theme of the play, and we also need this description in order to understand Dionysus' miracle.

Distanced space is evoked in a different way in choral odes.[49] Choruses are licensed to range freely in their imaginations across the whole world, present and past, without being confined to locations to which they might realistically expect to travel. This emphasizes the disjunction between the confined lives of (often female) choruses and the uninhibited freedom of their imaginations. This is especially striking in escape odes (e.g. *Hipp*. 732–775; *Hel*. 1451–1511), which also relate back to the themes of the play.[50] The chorus of *Bacchae* evokes locations more sympathetic than Thebes to Dionysiac cult, including Crete, Cyprus, and Pieria (120–134, 402–416, 556–575, 862–876). The exiled chorus of *Iphigenia in Tauris* longs for Delos and Delphi (1089–1105, 1234–1258). Famous stories from myth are narrated, with their associated spatial contexts: the labours of Heracles (*HF* 359–429), the judgement of Paris (*Andr*. 274–292; *IA* 573–589), the exploits of Peleus (*Andr*. 790–801), the sack of Troy (*Hec*. 905–951; *Tr*. 511–567; cf. *Andr*. 1010–1027; *Tr*. 1060–1080; *IA* 751–800), the golden lamb (*El*. 699–746), the search of the Mother for her daughter (*Hel*. 1301–1337), and the marriage of Peleus and Thetis (*IA* 1036–1079). Euripides' decorative and pictorial style of choral narration is also suitable to the ekphrasis of the armour of Achilles (*El*. 452–477). Some choral descriptions are of locations more accessible to the characters, although transformed by the high lyric style: Athens (*Med*. 824–845; *Tr*. 799–803; *Ion* 492–509, 1074–1089), Admetus' kingdom (*Alc*. 569–596), the journey of Orestes and Pylades (*IT* 392–455), possible destinations in Greece (*Hec*. 444–483; cf. *Tr*. 197–229), and local washing-places (*Hipp*. 121–130; *Hel*. 179–183).

---

[49] Barlow [1971] 1986: 18 comments on 'the landscapes and fantasy worlds' in Euripides' choral odes', contrasting the narrower pictorial range of Sophocles' odes.

[50] See Padel 1974; Swift 2009 (examining the sexual implications of *locus amoenus* imagery in three odes).

Conclusion

Space in Euripides is predominantly symbolic. His plays are dominated by contrasts between inside and outside, high and low, domestic and public, city and countryside, Greece and abroad. These categories are sometimes given a bare minimum of descriptive detail (e.g. the interior of the house in *Alcestis*, or the familiar landmarks of Thebes and Delphi), but it is much sparser than that in the non-dramatic authors discussed elsewhere in this volume. The most elaborate scene-setting is in *Electra* and *Ion*. Messenger speeches contain much detailed description, but with the partial exceptions of *Hippolytus* and *Bacchae* it is rarely topographical. A distinctive feature of Euripides is that space is often thematic, with events treated as stages in a journey (e.g. in *Alcestis*, *Medea*, and *Hecuba*). His aetiologies connect the distanced heroic space of the plays to the audience's own space. The only examples in Euripides of spatial descriptions exceeding their thematic function and being indulged to some extent for their own sake are the fantasy locations evoked in some of his choral odes.

ARISTOPHANES

A.M. Bowie

The three most characteristic features of scenic space in Aristophanes[1] are its 'labile'[2] nature, its ability to be 'doubled' so that it simultaneously represents two different spaces, and its concentration on scenic as opposed to extra-scenic and distanced space. Where tragedy tends on the whole to leave the stage setting unchanged, comedy can use the stage to represent a wide variety of settings, even within a single play. There are plays where the scene does not change, such as *Wasps*, *Ecclesiazusae*, and *Wealth*, but in all of them other locations are evoked in one way or another.

Scenic Space: Change of Scene

The simplest manner in which the flexibility of comic space is achieved is by having a character state or imply that the scene is moving or has moved to a new location:[3] the likely minimalist nature of stage-scenery and painting would have given comedy a great flexibility here,

---

[1] A version of this chapter was given at a conference to mark the retirement of Penny Bulloch in Oxford. I am grateful to the participants for their comments.

[2] The loose manner in which Aristophanes handles space has been variously characterized and commented on for some time: 'mit Ort und Zeit und Handlung springt der Komiker um, wie's ihm paßt' (Wilamowitz 1935: 309); '[*Ecclesiazusae*] most definitely lacks Unity of Space, and rather shares the freedom and vagueness characteristic of Old Comedy in its classic form' (Fraenkel 1936: 260); 'comedy … allows the action to melt from one location to another' (Wiles 2000: 122). Lowe 2006 argues against this idea that the use of space in Aristophanes is anarchic and incoherent. There is a nuanced discussion of space and the way in which at times characters are 'not locatable anywhere that the given scenery could relate to' in Silk 2001 (quotation in 305). Cf. also Thiercy 1986: 121–129, 139–149 (on how the audience is brought into the play's action and spaces), 180–183; Jay-Robert 2009. For the differences between Old and New Comedy and the crucial breakdown in the latter of the unity of the fifth-century comic stage whereby the division between stage and orchestra was transgressable by the players, cf. Slater 1987.

[3] Longo 1989: 182 goes a little far however when he says: 'l'intera azione comica si espande dal movimento e dalla parola dell'attore'.

but such changes needed to be made clear to the audience.[4] In tragedy, the infrequency of scene-changes tends to mean that these can be elaborately prepared for, as in the move to the court-scene in Athens after the scene in the temple at Delphi in (→) Aeschylus *Eumenides* 566–573. Comedy tends to make much less of such changes, but an exception is the transformation of the courtyard of Philocleon's house into an Athenian law-court, with the elaborate sequence of household objects brought out to form the court (*Wasps* 760–834): the significance of this is discussed below.

Perhaps the simplest example of a change made through speech is *Knights* 749–751, where the shift from Demus' house to the Pnyx is motivated as follows. Paphlagon asks Demus to hold an Assembly and choose between himself and the Sausage-seller:

> SS: Yes, yes, choose between us, but not on the Pnyx.
> DEMUS: But I wouldn't sit anywhere else. Forward! You must attend at
>   the Pnyx!

The actors move to some other part of the stage, which we must now imagine as representing quite a different part of Athens. The shift is perhaps eased by the fact that Demus' house and the Pnyx are ideologically the same place.[5]

Such shifts can be done with minimal indications, as in *Lysistrata*, where the scene changes from an anonymous street to the space outside the Propylaea when Lysistrata says, 'let's go in and put the bolts across' (246) in response to the cry of the Old Women heard from the Acropolis. The change is done more gradually and intriguingly after the parabasis in *Birds*, where the two men, now transformed into birds, come out (801) and set about deciding on a name and patron deity for their city. That the scene has changed becomes clear only slowly: when Peisetaerus asks what name they should give, the Chorus suggest 'some airy name from the clouds and upper regions here' (817–819), and 'Nephelococcygia' is proposed. 'Here' is all that announces the change to the upper air, and this is subsequently reinforced when Peisetaerus issues instructions to Euelpides about the building of the city-walls, ending with the words: 'send one herald to the gods above and another down to the humans below, and then back to me' (843–845). The stage has thus, during the

---

[4] Cf. Lanza 2001.
[5] Cf. also Lowe 2006: 54. Demus is described as *Pyknites* in 42.

conversation, become the new city, which occupies a position mid-way between heaven and earth. This is then confirmed by the starting of a sacrifice for the 'new gods' (848) and the arrival of a priest, poet, oracle-monger, town-planner and various officials all of whom have an interest in the new city. The play continues in this location. That we have moved place is clear, though where exactly we are in Nephelococcygia is never made manifest.

This simple ability to change the scene by speaking enables a play like *Frogs* to depict a journey through a number of locations.[6] Like *Birds*, it begins with the two characters moving around the stage in an unspecified space,[7] which is then defined when they knock on the door and Heracles comes out of his house (35–37). Heracles will soon describe to Dionysus the features of the Underworld he will encounter and, since a good deal of this long description could not easily be represented on stage during the actual journey, the description serves to provide the audience with an imaginary landscape, which acts as a mental back-drop, as it were, for the subsequent scenes in Hades: verbal description of a kind of space precedes the actual representation of that space on stage. Dionysus and Xanthias then prepare to set off again, and the fact that we should imagine them moving to the Underworld is prepared for by Xanthias' suggestion that they hire someone from a funeral party to carry their baggage. Conveniently, just such a party comes on stage (170). After fruitless negotiations with the corpse, and with the Underworld having been established as the location, it is then natural for Dionysus to say, 'let's go the boat', and for Charon to appear (180). The boat then crosses the lake at the edge of the Underworld: the singing-competition with the Frogs (209–269) creates the imagined visual background, with its references to lakes, reeds, and the croaking, singing, and bubbling of the frogs. They proceed on their journey during the episode of the imagined Lamia, and the arrival of the Chorus of Initiates indicates their arrival at their destination.

At this point, the words of the Chorus fill out a scene by adding factors which are not actually represented (or representable) on stage. The kind of place we are to imagine is conveyed by the Chorus calling on Iacchus

---

[6] For the suggestion that Dionysus' journey in *Frogs* is meant to evoke actual places around Athens, cf. Hooker 1960, and the criticisms of Dover 1993: ad 218–219; Guarducci 1987; Saïd 1997: 344–350, 352–358.

[7] 'Even in comedies which otherwise observe a strict unity and specificity of location, prologues can be, and usually are, essentially *atopic*' (Lowe 2006: 52).

to 'come and dance in this meadow' (326; cf. 372–374, 442, 448–449); the description of how the god is to dance aids the Chorus and the audience to imagine he is there. No doubt torches were carried by at least some of the Chorus, which would suggest a night-time ritual, but the Chorus convey the picture of a more impressive sight, appealing to the 'light-bearing star of the nocturnal rite', and describing how 'the meadow is ablaze with light' (343–344). The stage-scene has thus represented successively the path from Heracles' house, the shore of the Stygian lake, the lake itself and the meadow where the blessed Initiates dance and sing. Dionysus then approaches the stage door, as he did at the start of the first part of the play, and we are now outside the palace of Pluto (460), where the action will remain for the rest of the play. Throughout people and objects on stage combine with the words of the characters to produce a rich impression of the different spaces the stage represents.

In these scenes, description of the stage-scene is integrated into the action, and indeed in Aristophanes there is generally no description (ekphrasis) of a stage-scene purely 'to set the scene' as it were. There is little like the start of Sophocles' *Electra*, where the Paedagogus points out the buildings which surround them as they enter the stage:

> Son of Agamemnon who once led our armies at Troy, now you can see what you have long wished to see. There is the ancient Argos you have missed, the grove of Inachus' daughter whom the gadfly stung; this is the Lycian Agora, of the wolf-slaying god; there, on the left, is Hera's famous temple; where we have come, consider (*phaskein*) that you see golden Mycenae, with the house of the Pelopidae there …   (1–10)

That 'consider that you see' seems almost addressed to the spectators.[8] The nearest we get to this is in *Knights* where, in order to persuade the Sausage-seller to oppose the Paphlagonian slave, 'Demosthenes' begins by getting him to look at the rows of spectators, then moves to the Agora, harbours and Pnyx of Athens, some of which may have been visible to some of the spectators, moves further afield to the islands, emporia and merchant-ships, before stretching his gaze from Caria to Carthage (162–174). This gradual widening of the scene into a panoramic view is less an ekphrasis than a means of emphasising the extent of the power which is in the Sausage-seller's grasp. Dicaeopolis' description of how his Rural

---

[8] The infinitive with *phaskein* in such constructions is used of deeming or asserting something to be the case which is truly so: cf. S. *OT* 462; *Ph.* 1411.

Dionysia is to be celebrated, even as it is actually being celebrated (*Ach.* 237–262), again comes close, but a silent celebration would have been very odd. It also provides indications to the actors of how to extract comedy from the scene.

Sometimes, things on stage are described, but in these cases it can be for humorous purposes, especially when they are likely to be incomprehensible to the spectators. In *Clouds*, Strepsiades asks the Student to open the doors of the *Phrontistērion* and is amazed at what he sees (184), students in curious postures engaged in various scientific activities, with a number of scientific objects, geometric and astronomic, and a map of the world.[9] Each provides the opportunity for Strepsiades to make jokes, but also to reveal his essential stupidity before such subtleties, a characteristic that will be much developed when Socrates undertakes his education (183–217). The scene thus has a characterizing function.

Scenic space: Doubling

After changes in the scenic space, we come to cases where that space contrives simultaneously to combine two locations: that is, the action continues in the same place as the preceding scene, but invokes in some way another location, so that it is as if we were in two places at once.[10]

The function of this doubling is sometimes to permit the representation of spaces which, for one reason or another, could not otherwise be easily shown. In the Assembly-scene in *Thesmophoriazusae* (295–573), we have acted before us what purports to be the actual assembly held by the women at the festival, but what we in fact see is a parody of the male Assemblies held on the Pnyx, with their proclamations, prayers, curses and speeches. The Thesmophoria was a secret religious festival so even if, as is likely, a certain amount was known about it, it would have been very problematic putting a version of the true activities onto the public stage. There was a political aspect to the Thesmophoria, in that the male political institutions were suspended and the women

---

[9] It is not entirely clear how this was staged, but it was possibly on the *ekkyklēma*. It seems unlikely that it was all invisible and so only described by the two men looking off-stage: the prevalence of deictics argues against this.

[10] For a comparable technique in Cratinus, cf. Bakola 2010: 246–250.

symbolically took control of the city under the auspices of their *Arkhou-sai*, the female equivalent of the *Arkhontes*, so that evocation of a male Assembly had a kind of appropriateness and avoided any religious impropriety.

In *Ecclesiazusae*, instead of showing what happened in the Assembly when the disguised women took control of the city, Aristophanes has them carry out a rehearsal of their plan before they go to the Pnyx: the need to do this is justified by the fact that they lack the experience of speaking (115–117). This rehearsal stands in proleptically for the actual Assembly where they take power, and allows for greater humour, because they can make fun of their male disguises, misunderstand the conventions of the Assembly, forget they are supposed to be men, make mistakes and generally act foolishly in a way that would have been impossible in an 'actual' Assembly. This thus gets round the problem of how to present such a take-over of power by women disguised as men and make it convincing. There is further distancing, when the actual Assembly is later described by Chremes to Blepyrus (380–477), even though he says that he was not able to get in (380–382).

This evocation of double space can also be used for analytical purposes. In *Wasps*, the doubling not only generates humour, but more significantly allows reflection on the main topic of the play, the Athenian law-courts. The domestic trial of the dog that stole the cheese is introduced by the transformation of the courtyard into a law-court, with all the accoutrements of an actual Athenian court represented by household objects brought from within (760–834). Through the doubling, the proceedings in this court not only depict a court ruled by one senile old man and all the problems that causes to the administration of justice, but also remind of the problems of rhetorical chicanery, corruption and deception which were claimed to characterize the city courts with their many jurors in the earlier discussion between father and son. The scene with its two superimposed and contrasting images of the alternative modes of justice thus allows the spectators to make a comparison between the democratic courts and this grotesque alternative, which might prompt the thought that there are worse ways of conducting justice than that found in the Athenian courts.

There are also two instances where Aristophanes exploits this flexibility of which space is being represented in a more complex fashion, which involves uncertainty about where exactly we are to imagine the stage representing. Again, this is not the result of uncontrolled use of theatrical space but part of the play's analysis of its subjects.

In *Acharnians*, there is a good deal of shifting of scene.[11] At the start, it is not immediately clear where the lone figure is sitting, though the discussion of artistic matters in 1–16 might lead us to imagine this scene is in a theatre, but eventually his complaints about the absence of other people reveals that we are in the Assembly. This is indeed a feature of Aristophanic prologues, which distinguishes them from their tragic equivalents: 'the place, time, and situation of the play are progressively constructed out of a Brookian empty space'.[12] Once the meeting is dissolved and Amphitheus has brought the treaty-wines, the scene changes to the courtyard of Dicaeopolis' house: the stage is emptied, and Dicaeopolis says, 'I shall go in and celebrate the Rural Dionysia' (202), thus marking his return home.[13] When he has to make a speech of self-justification in the face of the Acharnians' accusations, he betakes himself to Euripides' house to get some ragged clothes to increase sympathy for himself. This involves simply saying, 'Now I must go to Euripides', and knocking on a door. Where Euripides' house is in relation to his own is not made clear.[14] When he leaves Euripides, he speaks of how he must journey (*emporeutea*, 480), and he is soon back making his speech to the Acharnians at his own home (496–556). Here the scene remains, but later in the play, when the two Heralds come to summon Dicaeopolis and Lamachus to a party and to war respectively, and items are brought out of each man's house (1096–1143), Dicaeopolis' house is suddenly next to Lamachus'. This will remain true at the end, when the two men come out of their houses in very different physical conditions (1190–1234).

These changes pose the question of where exactly Dicaeopolis' residence is to be imagined to be. Is it for the purposes of the play a temporary residence in the city which he is occupying during the war, or is it back in his deme? The evidence is nicely contradictory.

---

[11] Cf. also Slater 1993; Saïd 1997: 341–343.

[12] Lowe 2006: 52.

[13] Cf. the similar simple shift from Agathon's house to the Thesmophorion in *Thesmophoriazusae*, where Mnesilochus walks across the stage and starts to describe the scene, summoning a slave-girl, remarking on the torches and crowds, praying to Demeter and Persephone, and seeking a good seat.

[14] On the use of a single door in the play, which belongs to Dicaeopolis, Euripides and Lamachus as required, cf. Thiercy 2001; Olson 2002: lxix–lxx; on the symbolic use of the door, cf. Mauduit 2001. For the collapsing of space in Dicaeopolis' travels, compare Amphitheus' journey to Sparta and back between lines 134 and 175.

From a 'realist' point of view, it would be much more convenient to imagine his house in Athens.[15] It would be conveniently situated near the Pnyx, so that he can enter it after the Assembly simply by going through a door. This idea would be supported by his complaint about 'lying in the rubbish by the ramparts' (72), if that is taken to mean that he was on guard-duty in the city. The Megarian's remark after the parabasis, 'Hail, the agora in Athens' (729), points in the same direction: this need not be *the* Agora since, as Olson suggests, 'to the Megarian any place to trade in the city is simply "the" agora in Athens', but it does suggest a place in the city.[16] A location in Athens would make unproblematic the scene with Euripides and the scenes at the end just mentioned. The shift from Euripides as a neighbour to Lamachus as neighbour can be accommodated without too much difficulty: the audience would make the adjustment very easily, in a theatre that used the door freely. At the end, the prominence of the party hosted by the Priest of Dionysus (who is of course in the theatre in 'reality') also suggests that we are in Athens itself.

On the other hand, one might think that it would be more satisfactory that Dicaeopolis' Rural Dionysia, and more importantly his new world, should be instituted back in his longed-for country deme, rather than in the alien city: his remark in 32–33, 'I look to the countryside and long for peace, hating the city and desiring to be in my deme', suggests that he is a countryman not a city-dweller.[17] If his complaint about lying in the rubbish is taken to mean he was a refugee in the city without accommodation, which is another possible interpretation of that line, then this too points to a country home. Most significantly, he says in his hymn to Phales, 'after six years I address you now that I have come happily to my deme' (266). The Chorus' encouragement to each other to 'ask every traveller about him' (204–205) points also to some sort of journey.[18]

---

[15] Cf. e.g. Thiercy 1986: 125.

[16] Olson 2002: ad loc.

[17] Slater 1993: 401 suggests that the three treaty-wines which Amphitheus brings (187–203) 'range further and further spatially from the city, from naval preparations at home, to embassies to the allies, to freedom to wander: the final transformation of the undefined theatre space into Dicaeopolis' country home is complete'.

[18] There is a slight further problem about the location of Dicaeopolis' deme. We learn at 406 that he is from Cholleidae, which belongs to the city *trittys* of the tribe of Leontis (cf. *IG* 2².1742.39; Olson 2002: ad loc.). However, the evidence above makes it plain that he is a countryman, and we do not know the identity of his deme earlier in the play. Olson plausibly suggests Cholleidae is chosen for some humorous purpose, though what that might be is unclear.

This apparent contradiction could be seen as a simple comic insou-
ciance about location imposed by the exigencies of the early theatre, but
it would be better to see it as productive. The contradiction in his house's
location maintains the city-country opposition which informs the play.
Dicaeopolis is as it were situated through the ambiguity in two places at
once: the 'bi-location' marks him as double, a countryman, but also a citi-
zen of Athens, both of which categories suffered in the war;[19] he relates to
both groups. The war forces a split between these two characterisations,
which is healed by Dicaeopolis' reintegration into the city at the end. The
double identity is reflected in the shifting 'position' of his house.[20] If this
is right, then the use of stage-space in this double manner points to a
considerable sophistication in its exploitation.

This might be thought to be unnecessarily complicated, when the
more simple explanation that no-one would have been bothered by the
contradictions is available. There is however a similar play with the dou-
bling of space in *Peace*, which also presents a more complex and sig-
nificant use of change of setting.[21] The play begins unproblematically
outside Trygaeus' house, but transfers to heaven through Trygaeus' ride
on his dung-beetle. The completion of the shift is then marked by Try-
gaeus' remark, 'I think I'm near the gods—indeed, I can see Zeus' little
place' (177–178). However, though we are now in heaven, aspects of the
action suggest that things are not that simple. When Trygaeus is to pull
Peace from the ground, he calls on the 'men of Greece' (292). Since the
stage is empty but for Trygaeus, the addressees can only be the audi-
ence. However, in response, the Chorus appear, describing themselves as
'the Panhellenes' (302) and representing the cities of Greece: earlier, as
Olson notes, the audience were addressed as 'Athenians', now the whole
of Greece is involved. This is important for the play, but one immedi-
ately asks, if we are in heaven, how did they all get there? Again, in 313,
when Trygaeus warns the Chorus of the danger that 'that Cerberus from
down below' (i.e. Cleon) might prevent them from releasing Peace, he
refers to his 'huffing and puffing and shouting when he was here', where

---

[19] Auger 1997: 365–366 writes that Dicaeopolis can arrive in the country immediately
after leaving his city house, 'parce que, lorsque le héro incarne la cité, sa maison représente
alors l'espace de l'*astu*, la ville d'où il sort pour se rendre dans une campagne désormais
vide d'ennemis'. I would replace 'alors' with 'aussi'.

[20] For this doubling, one might compare the way that Strepsiades and Philocleon
are both poor old men and yet part of households which are plainly wealthy and with
aristocratic connections.

[21] See Cassio 1985: 69–77; Thiercy 1986: 127–129, 141–144.

'here' can only mean 'on earth'. There are also other features which asso-
ciate Heaven specifically with Athens, such as the reference to the general
Phormion (348), the Lyceum (356), Peisander (395), the Panathenaea
and other Athenian festivals (418–420). Though the action takes place in
heaven, it is a heaven which, with its violence and its Athenian features,
bears a strong resemblance to earth, whose problems Trygaeus' journey
intends to solve.[22] Once again, the stage-space combines two spaces.

The return to the actual earth is simply handled. The beetle has gone
off to pull Zeus' chariot, but Trygaeus is to return simply by going past
the statue of Peace (726). Aristophanes then avoids any repetition of the
journey, by having the parabasis cover his return: when Trygaeus comes
out again, he re-establishes the stage as on earth by complaining of the
effect of the journey on his legs and remarking to the audience on how
small they looked 'from up there' (821).

That Aristophanes was not unique in using space in this way is sug-
gested for instance by Bakola's analysis of the start of Cratinus' *Plutoi*:[23]

> The early appearance of the chorus of Titans, their reference to the recent
> tyranny, and their statement that they are visiting their brother consti-
> tute a parody of the opening scene of *Prometheus Lyomenos*, and there-
> fore evoke the space and time of the myth dramatised in that play …
> Yet this space is immediately deconstructed by the Titan's metatheatrical
> acknowledgement that they are participating in a dramatic competition.
> This unavoidably draws attention to … the real physical space of the The-
> atre of Dionysus. At the same time, the references to Pericles' recent fall
> and the ascent of the *demos* … add a topical dimension, since they suggest
> that the dramatic space could in fact be the city of Athens.

Thesmophoriazusae provides a similar example to this blend of mythical
space and the space of contemporary Athens. The first scene is 'atopic',
and after that there is only one simple shift of scene, from Agathon's
house to the Thesmophorion. The doubling comes about through the
plays which Mnesilochus enacts in his attempt to escape from his impris-
onment at the hands of the women: the scenic space becomes double,
because it stands both for the festival site of the Thesmophorion and for
the location of the plays parodied. There is some variation in how Aristo-
phanes handles the space. In the case of the first play, the *Telephus*, there is
no doubling: the scene of the abduction of the child is simply imitated in

---

[22] Cf. Cassio 1985: 72: 'questa che chiamerei tensione irreversibile del cielo verso la
terra è sentita indubbiamente come fatto positivo in quanto recupero di una situazione
umana e concreta e allontanamento dal mondo negativo di Zeus e gli altri dèi'.
[23] Bakola 2010: 249.

Mnesilochus' seizure of the wine-skin child from Mikka (689–760): there is no overt reference to the parodied play and no confusion of locations. The other plays and their settings however are explicitly announced, and jokes are regularly made that draw attention to the fact that two locations are involved and to their incompatibility. Mnesilochus wonders how to get a message to Euripides and thinks of the 'trick from the Palamedes: like him, I'll write on oar-blades and throw them in the sea. But there aren't any oar-blades! Where can I get oar-blades?' (769–772). The artificiality of the stratagem in the tragedy is highlighted by the unlikelihood that oar-blades are likely to be lying around just anywhere where one happens to be. Mnesilochus tries again: 'What play am I going to use to get him here? I know, I'll do his recent *Helen*: at least I've got the women's clothing!' (849–851). His dialogue with his aged guardienne is then built around jokes about whether they are in Egypt or Athens (846–923).[24] This stratagem too fails, and in the next scene he notices that Euripides, flying by on the crane like Perseus, 'gave a sign that I should become Andromeda' (1011–1012). Once again, there is confusion between the two narratives and locations between Mnesilochus and the Scythian. This juxtaposition of tragic and 'real' comic space is just part of the on-going *syncrisis* of the two genres that runs through the play, which constantly demonstrates the superiority of comedy in all departments of dramaturgy, including the treatment of space.[25]

Extra-Scenic Space

In comedy, space immediately off-stage is in general much less important than in tragedy: description of distanced space is more common than description of extra-scenic space.[26] There are no terrible acts of violence committed there, and it is rare for sounds off-stage to be heard on-stage: an exception is *Peace* 62–63, where Trygaeus is heard addressing the beetle.[27] There is no sense of powers offstage which are in control of the onstage characters. The significant actions happen on stage.

---

[24] On the interplay between features of the actual theatre and the fictive world of the play here, cf. Saïd 1997: 351–352.

[25] Cf. A.M. Bowie 1993: 217–227.

[26] Cf. Revermann 2006: 126. The distinction between these two in comedy is not always firm.

[27] Dover 1987: 256–257 argues for Dicaeopolis being heard inside in *Ach.* 1000–1017 and 1037–1047.

The description of what is happening immediately off-stage is rare. In *Peace*, this is effected by someone looking from the stage inside: one of the slaves mixing the dung-beetle's food briefly looks inside to see how the beast is getting on. He describes the scene, indirectly in an address to the beetle and then directly to the audience (31–37): 'Go on, and don't stop eating until you surprise yourself by bursting! How the devil eats, bent over like a wrestler, working its teeth, and moving its head and hands around like the men who make the thick ropes for the ships!' This technique not only enables Aristophanes to intrigue the audience about what on earth is behind the stage-building, but also to hold back his trump-card of the actual appearance of the beetle on its grand entry with Trygaeus on its back. In *Lysistrata*, Lysistrata begins to describe what has been happening inside the Acropolis as the women's resolve falters (717–728), but the scene rapidly moves to the actual depiction of the problem on stage. What we do not find is characters coming out of the house speaking back to someone inside, as is common in New Comedy.

The link between the off-stage space and the stage is the *ekkyklēma*, but this need not detain us long. Though it is frequently used in tragedy, in comedy it is used much less, and it must be significant that the only two places where we can be fairly certain that it was used involve tragic poets, Euripides in *Ach.* 408–479 and Agathon in *Th.* 95–267.[28] It is also very likely that it was used for the 'bringing up' of Peace (458–728; esp. 508–520), and it has been suggested by some that Socrates' students come out on it with their instruments (*Clouds* 181–217). Perhaps it was seen as having less comic potential than the *mēkhanē*.[29]

Distanced Space

On-stage description of off-stage space beyond the interior of the stage-building is more common. It can be used to avoid having to represent things which it would be hard or even impossible to do on stage. The best example of this is in *Birds*, where reports are brought in about the skilled and elaborate construction of the walls (1122–1187). In practical

---

[28] Cf. *Ach.* 407 *ekkuklēthēt'*, 409 *ekkuklēsomai*; and *Th.* 97 *eiskuklēsatō*, 265; metaphorical use at *Wasps* 699, 1475. Cf. Dover 1987: 253–254. For discussion of other possibilities, cf. Thiercy 1986: 76–85.

[29] Neither Bakola 2010 on Cratinus nor Storey 2003 on Eupolis seem to make any mention of it.

terms, it would have been very hard to represent such things satisfactorily on stage, so the use of messengers allows the city to be as grand as can be without the need for visual proof. It also contributes to that curious sense one has that Nephelococcygia is both terrifyingly mighty and yet curiously insubstantial.

In general, in accordance with Old Comedy's reluctance to allow characters to narrate at length,[30] there are not many lengthy examples of large-scale accounts of offstage action. Two stand out. In *Knights*, the Sausage-seller himself recounts the scene in the Assembly at which he worsted the Paphlagon (624–682). It is notable in this passage that the spatial aspects of the scene receive very little attention. Cleon is 'within' (626) the area reserved for the *bouleutae*, and the Sausage-seller bursts through the gate (641) in the fence (675) that separated them from the general public, through which fence the *bouleutae* themselves will eventually break in their enthusiasm for what the Sausage-seller has to offer. The *bouleutērion* then becomes a chaotic market. The space of the *bouleutērion* is thus marked by mention of but two crucial features of its space.[31] In *Wealth*, Carion gives an even lengthier account of the scene in the temple of Asclepius where Wealth is cured of his blindness (653–747). Here too the space indicators are minimal: we hear of an altar and offerings (660) and the temple (733), the rest of the description being of the people and various props involving food and medicine.

Description of distanced space, like the use of doubled space, can also be used as a means of commentary. In *Ecclesiazusae* there are a number of descriptions of the off-stage feasts and revelry, which represent the new, communistic and sympotic condition which the women have wrought in the city. The long debate between Blepyrus and Praxagora gives a broad overview of the social and sexual changes and the dining arrangements (583–727); female attendants come in to describe the lavish fare on offer to everyone (834–852, 1112–1126); and, at the end, the feast is richly evoked by the enormous, sesquipedalian word of 1169–1175. Thus off-stage everyone is feasting and enjoying themselves in the new civic space. However, the on-stage action concentrates, not on the new state of the city, but rather on the problems that attend this

---

[30] Cf. *SAGN* 1: 281–295.
[31] Having this scene in the *bouleutērion* reported but not represented on stage, enables Aristophanes to keep the later on-stage portrayal of the Assembly scene for the climactic moments of the play.

supposedly ideal state: one man hopes to enjoy the new benefits without making any contribution from his own goods (746–876); and the sexual legislation is revealed to leave much to be desired, as is shown by the grim episode, spanning more than 200 lines, where a handsome young man is fought over by increasingly disagreeable old women (877–1111): a veritable 'land of Oedipuses' (1042) is created. Thus, as often in Aristophanes, whilst the main suggestion of the drama, conveyed here by the description of distanced space, is that what is happening is all a good thing, there are, counterpointing that notion, suggestions in the scenic space that one might want to think again.

Towards the end of *Birds*, there is an unusual use of the description of off-stage space, which does not relate to the action in quite the way the other examples do. In four lyric stanzas, the Chorus evoke four mysterious places where miraculous things may be seen, largely imagined as at the ends of the world, but also featuring aspects and personalities from Athens: the Cleonymus-tree that sheds shields not leaves (1470–1481), 'the wilderness of lamps' where heroes dine together but fear at night the mugger Orestes (1482–1493), the Sciapods where Socrates plies his trade as necromancer (1553–1564), and Phanae with its voracious rhetoricians (*englōttogastores*) such as Gorgias and Philippus (1694–1705). Tragic choruses in Aeschylus and above all (→) Sophocles often talk of far-off places which seem to be refuges from the troubles of the world,[32] but here the point is rather that however far one travels, there will be Athenian trouble-makers, which idea links up with the play's theme of the impossibility of escaping from involvement in affairs if one wishes to have one's freedom.

Finally, one big difference between tragedy and comedy is that in the former the city of Athens and its environs are rarely directly represented.[33] By contrast, the city is regularly the locus of comic drama. However, it is noticeable that Aristophanes gives very little description of the physical aspects of the spaces involved. Here again the scenes in the *boulē* in *Knights* and in Asclepius' shrine in *Ecclesiazusae* are in point. Of Nephelococcygia we learn only of its mightily defended walls and gates (1124–1162, 1173): that this aspect of it in particular should be emphasised is a sign of the oppressive nature of the city which will become clearer later in Peisetaerus' rule as a 'tyrant'. At the start of *Acharnians*, Dicaeopolis mentions the 'front seats' (25, 42) and we see the piglet create

---

[32] On the ambiguities in the tragic examples, cf. Swift 2009.
[33] But they are regularly *indirectly* evoked, see (→) Aeschylus and (→) Euripides.

the purified space, but other details of the Assembly on the Pnyx are not referred to. It is the same in the women's assembly in the Thesmophorion: the physical details of the shrine are not important, and when the women conduct their search of the shrine, all they mention are the 'tents and the passage-ways' (*Th.* 658), which is enough to conjure up the scene to the audience (if there were in fact no tents on stage).

The exceptions to this paucity of description are either the scenes set in fictitious versions of civic locations, such as the domestic law-court in *Wasps* with its numerous household items, and Dicaeopolis' agora with its 'boundary-markers', the thongs representing the market officials and its stele (*Ach.* 719–728); or the scenes where the civic location is transformed, as in *Ecclesiazusae*, when Praxagora describes proleptically the role of the various public buildings in the new sympotic world (673–688), with courts and stoas becoming dining halls, the *bēma* the place to put the craters and water-jars and so on. In that play however, in the later descriptions of what is now happening, there is again almost no description of the civic spaces themselves, and the emphasis is on the paraphernalia of dining. At times too, Aristophanes seems to be imprecise about where exactly the scene is: in *Knights*, the final debate is held on the Pnyx, but at the end, when he returns transformed by Agoracritus, Demus is said to come out of the Propylaea (1326), so we seem to have moved to the Acropolis for the last scenes.[34]

To sum up, comedy for the most part concentrates on the scenic space. This may be changed in a number of simple or complex ways, or doubled or rendered ambiguous to allow the representation of things otherwise hard to portray with the resources available, or to prosecute the argument of the play. By contrast, extra-scenic space is not much exploited. Distanced space is more common, but there is often little attempt to evoke in physical detail the spaces involved, even though these spaces are usually actual ones in Athens: a few details will be given, but the main description is of the characters and actions.

Old Comedy therefore took full advantage of the scope and flexibility offered by a stage which did not yet have developed stage-painting or scenery.

---

[34] More generally on Athens and Attica in Aristophanes, see Murphy 1964; López Eire 2001; and n. 7 above.

PART FIVE

ORATORY

LYSIAS

M.P. de Bakker

The 34 speeches that have come down to us under the name of Lysias have given us a moving insight into aspects of daily life in early fourth-century Athens, a period in which the Athenians struggled to cope with their recent past, the loss of the Peloponnesian War and the subsequent political upheaval during the violent reign of the Thirty and the counter-revolution by the democrats. A number of speeches within the *Corpus Lysiacum* (12, 13, 16, 18, 19, [20], 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32 and 34) are concerned with the aftermath of the lawlessness in this unruly period, most of them delivered by citizens who attempted to square their accounts with those who were in league with the Thirty.[1]

Whereas fictional narrative allows the narrator to introduce any spatial frame, Lysias' speeches are anchored in contemporary Athens, a world thoroughly familiar to himself, his clients and his audience. Thanks to the indefatigable efforts of historians, epigraphers and archaeologists, nowadays the contours of this world are familiar but caution is nonetheless needed when we study the spatial references in Lysias' oratory. We may be able to trace them on a map but can often only guess at the memories, emotions or other connotations they triggered among the members of the jury, which makes it difficult to gauge their rhetorical impact. An example of such a 'known unknown' is found in the short plea *Against Pankleon*, which concerns the citizenship status of a defendant who is being sued for another offence. Lysias makes his client present the results of an inquiry into Pankleon that led him past 'the barber in the street of the Hermae' (23.3). Although we are perfectly capable of locating this barber near the northern side of the Agora,[2] we can only

---

[1] As to the authenticity of the speeches, I will follow the traditional view that the authorship of 2 and 6 is disputed, whereas 8, 9 and 20 are probably not by Lysias. For in-depth discussion, stylistic and stylometric analysis, see Dover 1968 and Usher and Najock 1982, and the observations in Todd 2007: 26–32.

[2] Cf. Jebb [1888] 2005: 278.

speculate about the reason why Lysias names this particular shop in his narrative. All we can say is that its reputation as a source of information was well enough established so that it could be mentioned in the court of law.

In a similar way, we should be aware of conceptual differences in relation to the spatial environment. Whereas in the modern Western world it is felt to be merely incorrect to enter someone's property unannounced, in classical Athens such an act amounted to sacrilege, in particular when someone forced his way into the women's quarters as Simon is said to have done (3.6–7; 23; 29) or assaulted the master of the house when he was entertaining guests as happened when representatives of the Thirty raided Lysias' property (12.8).

In his essay *On Lysias*, Dionysius of Halicarnassus praised the orator for his clarity (*saphēneia*) and brevity (*suntomia*) of expression (13, cf. 4–5), especially in the narrative parts of his forensic speeches (18). 'It would appear', Dionysius claims, 'as if he even omits much information that would have helped his case' (5), which he puts down to the short amount of time that was available for the speakers to deliver their pleas. As I will show in this chapter, Lysias' handling of spatial references fits this picture in that he mostly confines himself to the bare essentials and avoids lengthy descriptions. As a rule of thumb, places are named and settings described in the narrative when they serve his argumentation or the characterization (*ethopoiia*) of the speaker. The same holds for the level of specification. The more detailed a spatial reference is presented, the greater its importance for the case. In this sense ancient forensic oratory differs from its modern counterpart where temporal and spatial references to all relevant incidents in a case are imperative. The *erōtēsis* of the defendants in the speech *Against the Corndealers* illustrates this difference, as temporal and spatial specifications are completely lacking:

> Tell me, sir, are you a resident alien? Yes. Do you reside as an alien to obey the city's laws, or to do just as you please? To obey. Must you not, then, expect to be put to death, if you have committed a breach of the laws for which death is the penalty? I must. Then answer me: do you acknowledge that you bought up corn in excess of the fifty measures which the law sets as the limit? I bought it up on an order from the magistrates.[3]   (22.5)

---

[3] Unless indicated otherwise I have used the translations of Lamb 1930 in the Loeb edition of Lysias' speeches, with minor alterations.

If an interrogation like this were held in a modern court, the day and place at which the excess of corn was bought up would be mentioned. In antiquity, however, the forensic value of the setting did not seem to be important unless it could be used in direct support of the case.[4]

The spatial references in the *Corpus Lysiacum* defy easy classification, which illustrates Lysias' versatility. A tendency that can be detected, however, is his heightening of rhetorical impact by referring to places of legal, religious or historical importance. Thus he makes Euphiletus in his plea *On the Murder of Eratosthenes* not only quote a law on justifiable homicide but also refer to the *stēlē* on the Areopagus on which the law is inscribed (1.30).[5] The connection between the law itself and its visual representation in the monumental context of the most respected legislative body of Athens reinforces the authority of its contents, which support Lysias in his strategy to make Euphiletus 'present the laws as Eratosthenes' prosecutor and himself as their agent'.[6] Lysias' practice of naming *lieux de mémoire* as a strategy of persuasion is the first path I wish to explore in this chapter. The second aspect I will discuss is Lysias' presentation and organisation of his spatial material. Pleas like the *On the Murder of Eratosthenes* or *Against Pankleon* allow us to have a valuable glimpse into daily life in early fourth-century Athens; but how did these passages function rhetorically?

Lysias' Spatial Realms: The Urban Space and Beyond

Within Lysias' speeches two major spatial realms can be distinguished. First, there is the *performative* space where the speech is delivered and its immediate surroundings: the urban space of the city that was visible from the place where the speech was held. Second, there is the *distanced* space: the places beyond the reach of sight to which Lysias makes his clients refer.[7] I will discuss these categories individually.

---

[4] Possibly this had to do with time restraints on the speakers. As the water-clock was not stopped, brevity was demanded also in the interrogation. See M.J. Edwards 1999: ad 22.5 and A.R.W. Harrison 1968: 138 n. 4 for further references.

[5] A similar practice is found in the speeches of (→) Demosthenes.

[6] Todd 2007: 52. Orators rarely refer to the provenance of laws, but this is an exception. See also Todd 1996: 129–130.

[7] This distinction of oratorical space resembles that made in drama, see (→) Introduction.

Performative Space

Lysias drafted his speeches with an eye on public performance and thereby presupposed the presence of a *performative* space. In this sense, his oratory resembles tragedy; but whereas playwrights had the liberty to create their own *mise-en-scène* within the theatre of Dionysus, Lysias was bound by the ceremonial settings of the Athenian *eliastic courts* (1, 5, 6, [8], [9], 10–15, 17–19, [20], 21–23, 25–30, 32), the Council of Five Hundred (16, 24, 31), the Areopagus (3, 4, 7), the Ceramicus (2), the festival at Olympia (33) and, perhaps, the Athenian Assembly (34). All these settings were solemn and in some of them the speakers were bound by oaths, whereas others had historical, even mythical, significance which a speaker could employ to add gravity to words that were spoken *in situ*.

In situ. Within the performative space, Lysias usually identifies the audience by forms of address (*passim*)[8] and points at the speaker's opponent(s) by the use of the deictic pronoun *houtos*, at times extended by *deictic -i*.[9] He sometimes implies the presence of the platform (*bēma*) by asking his witnesses or defendants to 'mount' (*anabainō*) for the purpose of giving testimony or interrogating.[10] In the plea *Against Pancleon* reference is made to the water-clock, which should be interrupted when testimony is given (*kai moi epilabe to hudōr*, 23.4, 8, 11, 14, 15). As a response to a special plea (*antigraphē*, 23.10) by the defendant before the polemarch, the speech has a unique juridical status within the corpus and the speaker's time is more confined than in the case of the other pleas which explains his insistence on the interruption of the flow of water.[11]

In some instances Lysias cleverly employs the performative space for rhetorical purposes. In the plea *Against Theomnestus* (10), Lysias' client prosecutes a certain Theomnestus on a charge of defamation (*kakēgoria*)

---

[8] On group address in Athenian oratory, see Dickey 1996: 177–182, Todd 2007: ad 1.1, and *SAGN* 1: 333–336.

[9] For an overview, see the *Index Lysiacus* of Holmes 1895. The frequency of deictic *-i* is exceptional in the speech *Against Agoratus* (13.1, 4, 17, 18, 26, 33, 38, 41, 56, 71, 73, 92, 93(2), 95), perhaps on account of the lengthy personal attacks against the defendant. Cf. Blass 1887: 560: 'der Angeklagte ist zu nichtswürdig, um etwas anderes als geringschätzigen kalten Hohn zu verdienen'.

[10] 1.29, 42; 12.24, 47; 13.64; 16.8, 13, 14, 17; 20.29; 22.5, cf. 14.16; 15.2.

[11] See Blass 1887: 618 and Gernet and Bizos 1955: 93–96. In (→) Demosthenes, the water-clock is used in *praeteritio*: 'there is not enough water left for me to discuss all the crimes of my opponent'.

for calling him a patricide. In a preliminary arbitration, Theomnestus has apparently defended himself by pointing out that he had not used the forbidden word 'murderer' (*androphonos*) but a different formulation, which exempted him from prosecution. In his attack against this line of reasoning, Lysias makes his client highlight Theomnestus' naivety in believing that he could exonerate himself by a simple play of words.[12] Uniquely, he makes the prosecutor apply a didactic tone in this speech (*boulomai … auton didaxai*, 10.15)[13] and thereby grants him authority and seniority, whereas it makes the defendant look young and unskilled. Mentioning the defendant on his *bēma* seems part of this strategy:

> … in the hope that even now, on the daïs (*bēma*), he may learn a lesson, and may henceforward cease from his vexatious proceedings against us.
>
> (10.15)

The explicit reference to the *bēma*—not mentioned elsewhere in Lysias' speeches—helps the speaker in humiliating his opponent who is, in full sight of the jury, being taught like a child. Its role within Lysias' rhetorical strategy emerges at the conclusion of the prosecutor's 'lesson', where he expects Theomnestus to 'leave the *bēma* in silence' (*apiōn apo tou bēmatos siōpēi*, 10.20), thereby admitting defeat.

Another speech that employs the *performative space* for rhetorical purposes is the plea *Against Philon* (31). Here, the orator accuses a man who is undergoing scrutiny (*dokimasia*) in order to become a member of the Council of Five Hundred (*bouleutēs*). This procedure was held in the *boulē* itself and this is the place where the speech was delivered. This time, Lysias refers to the *performative space* not to put the accused to shame—as in the above speech *Against Theomnestus*—but to enhance his client's moral prestige:

> But since he [Philon] is audacious, not in one instance only, but in many, and I have taken the oath before entering the Council that my counsel would be for the best advantage of the State, and as the terms of that oath require us to expose any person appointed by lot whom we know to be unsuitable for service on the Council, I shall deliver the accusation against this man Philon.
>
> (31.1–2)

---

12 For in-depth discussion of this case, see Hillgruber 1988 and Todd 2007: 625–640.

13 See Todd 2007: ad loc. and 636–637 for the other features of this didactic tone in the speech and its implications: 'Normally the Orators are extremely careful not to sound as if they possess expert legal knowledge, because of the risk that the jury will regard this as patronising. Here however the didactic tone is directed consistently and successfully against the defendant alone' (636).

In this *captatio benevolentiae*, Lysias draws a connection between the *boulē* where the speech is held and the oath that is related to it. He makes it appear as if his client speaks in the interest of the state, obliged by the setting in which he delivers his speech and not motivated by personal enmity. He also stresses the importance of keeping the *boulē* in the hands of those of impeccable repute and subtly points out to his audience that their status of *bouleutai* obliges them to act according to the oath and to the best advantage of the state as well. Thus he tries to win the audience over and to take distance from Philon, whom he portrays in the subsequent narrative as a ruthless opportunist who supported the Thirty and acted merely in his own interest.

In the epideictic *Epitaphios* the *performative space* plays a more substantial role than in all other extant speeches ascribed to Lysias.[14] It was drafted for those who had fallen in the Corinthian war in which Athens had supported Corinth against Sparta (395–386), with an eye on delivery at the *dēmosion sēma*, a public burial monument on the Ceramicus—Athens' *lieu de mémoire par excellence*—where many similar speeches had been held before. The opening words of the speech illustrate the awareness of this tradition:

> If I believed it possible, friends who are attending this burial (*epi tōide tōi taphōi*), to set forth in speech the valour of the men who lie here (*tōn enthade keimenōn*), I should have reproved those who gave me but a few days' notice of having to speak over them. But as all mankind would find all time insufficient for preparing a speech to match their deeds, the city itself therefore, as I think, taking forethought for those who speak here (*tōn enthade legontōn*), makes the appointment at short notice, in the belief that on such terms they will most readily obtain indulgence from their hearers.[15]   (2.1)

In these opening sentences, the valour of the fallen warriors and the tradition of speaking on their behalf are immediately linked to the solemn place of worship and remembrance where the speech is delivered.[16]

In the course of the *Epitaphios*, this glory is more specifically attached to landmarks that are part of the surrounding urban space, some of which

---

[14] The authorship of the speech is disputed. For a summary of the most important views on the issue, see Frangeskou 1999: 317 n. 10. She herself believes in its authenticity, as does Todd 2007: 157–164.

[15] A reference to the *performative space* in the opening phrases was topical within the genre of *epitaphioi*, as witness Th. 2.35.1 and D. 60.1.

[16] See Snell 1887: 10–12 for a discussion of the function of the Ceramicus in remembering Athens' past greatness.

can be seen from the Ceramicus. The mythical ancestors are praised for their successful battle against the Amazons (2.4–6), displayed on the west metopes of the Parthenon and on a painting that could be seen in the nearby *Stoa Poikilē*.[17] After the expedition of the Seven against Thebes, the Athenians buried the corpses of the Argives in the sanctuary of Eleusis (2.10), connected to Athens by a sacred road which ran across the Ceramicus and could be seen from the *dēmosion sēma*. Athens is praised for its democracy (2.18–19), of which the most important venue on the Pnyx was within sight.[18] The 'ancestors of the men who lie here' (*tōn enthade keimenōn*, 2.20) are evoked in their battles against the Persians, again immortalised in a painting in the *Stoa Poikilē*,[19] while the Parthenon and the statue of Athena on the Acropolis towered above the city as lasting monuments in memory of the Athenian victory over the Persians.[20] The *performative* space, the public burial monument on the Ceramicus, is named again in the context of waning Greek influence in the Aegean in the years after Athens' defeat in the Peloponnesian War (2.60) and the nearby tomb of the Lacedaemonians is pointed out (*toude tou mnēmatos*) in the context of their losses in the democratic counter-revolution of 403 (2.63). Reference is made to the walls that Conon rebuilt (2.63), a stretch of which bordered the Ceramicus, and to the grave of the *xenoi* who supported the counter-revolution of 403 (*tous xenous tous enthade keimenous*, 2.66). The speech ends on a note of praise for those who had just been buried (*hoi de nun thaptomenoi*, 2.67) before shifting to a lengthy consideration of the sorrow and pride of their relatives who attended the speech (2.71–76).

Thus we witness the strategy of the orator, which is designed to heighten the solemnity of his words by references to the immediate physical surroundings of the public burial memorial, the other monuments on the Ceramicus, and the major landmarks of the city. The acknowledgment of this strategy may help us in explaining the reference to Myronides and his Geranea-campaign of 458–457 at 2.48–53,[21]

---

[17] Pausanias 1.15.2.

[18] For a parallel to this strategy, see Aeschines' speech *Against Ctesiphon* 3.183–190, where the orator invites the jury to join him on an imaginative (note *tēi dianoiēi*, 186) perambulation around the Agora to study monuments and inscriptions that reflect the democratic spirit by which the Athenian collective performed some of its greatest feats. See Hobden 2007: 495–497.

[19] Pausanias 1.15.3.

[20] For the great battles of the Persian Wars as *lieux de mémoire*, see Jung 2006.

[21] Th. 1.105–106. See Gomme, Andrewes and Dover 1945–1981: ad loc. and Hornblower 1991–2008: ad loc.

which was famous for the fact that it was undertaken by the elderly and
the young, as most Athenian adult soldiers were abroad at that time.
Scholars have found it difficult to explain why, in a speech to commem-
orate those who had fallen in alliance with the Corinthians, reference is
made to a past battle in which their current allies were massacred by the
Athenians.[22] The possible presence of a monument nearby, however, may
account for the orator's choice of topic. Fourteen marble fragments have
been preserved from a pedimental *stēlē* that commemorates the Argives
who fell in the battle of Tanagra.[23] This battle was fought against the Boeo-
tians in the same year as the Geranea-campaign and under the same gen-
eral Myronides. Although Lysias does not refer to this later expedition,
there seems to be some evidence for a spatial context in the conjunction
of which Myronides, one of Athens' famous generals,[24] could be evoked.
Thus the *Epitaphios* was written by someone who had the topography of
the place of delivery in mind and who knew what the rhetorical effects
would be when he referred to entities within it.

Distanced Space

The spatial references in Lysias' speeches that lie beyond the perimeter
of the ceremonial setting can be divided into specific toponyms: the
Areopagus and less specific spatial concepts such as the 'walls' or the 'sea'.
Both can be used to attain clarity and brevity in a narrative, as brief spatial
references often suffice in the case of information that is already known.[25]
By way of the 'Piraeus'-party and the 'city (*astu*)'-party Lysias refers to
democrats and oligarchs respectively during the democratic counter-

---

[22] Blass 1887: 440: 'doch muss es befremden, sie gerade hier so ausführlich beschrie-
ben zu sehen, in einer Lobrede auf die, welche denselben Korinthiern Hülfe gebracht'.
Walz 1936: 18–19 suggests that the author of the *Epitaphios* wanted to highlight the
uncompromising nature of Athenian virtue, willing to fight on behalf of the party that
had a just cause, whatever its previous alliances. The uncertainty remains, however, as
witness Thomas 1989: 227–229 and Todd 2007: ad 2.52 ('I have no good explanation for
the mention of Myronides').

[23] Pausanias refers to their burial in the Ceramicus (1.29.8). See for a detailed discus-
sion of the inscription Meiggs-Lewis [1969] 1988: 35 and for the reconstruction of the
stēlē Bradeen 1974: 7–9.

[24] Cf. the overview of passages from comedy that confirm Myronides' fame in
Gomme, Andrewes and Dover 1945–1981: ad 1.105.4.

[25] Compare terms like 'Kyoto-targets' or 'Oslo-agreements' which make one think
immediately of climate-change and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

revolution of 403.[26] Space here has a symbolic function. The toponyms were ideologically rather than topographically loaded, since an adherent to the Piraeus-party could have lived in the city (*astu*):

> I shall prove that their words are nothing but lies, and that on my part I behaved as the best citizen in the Piraeus would have done, if he had remained in the city (*astu*).
>
> (*Defence Against a Charge of Subverting the Democracy* 25.2)

A second aspect of Lysias' spatial referencing that needs to be mentioned here is his avoidance of toponyms to which painful memories were attached. Given Lysias' pro-democratic views and his role as a *logographos* in a democratic system he is careful not to mention too explicitly the defeats in the previous century that were caused by excesses of democratic decision-making. Thus, unlike the contemporary historian (→) Xenophon, he does not indicate the defeat of the Athenian navy at Aegospotami in 405 BCE by an explicit spatial reference[27] but instead chooses shrouded terms such as '(greatest) disaster' (*sumphora* (*megistē*), 2.58; 6.46), 'the sea-battle and the disaster for the city' (*hē naumakhia kai hē sumphora tēi polei*, 12.43), 'the last sea-battle' (*hē teleutaia naumakhia*, 18.4; 21.9), 'the loss of the ships' (*apolomenōn tōn neōn*, 30.10, cf. 13.5). or just 'the sea-battle' (*hē naumakhia*, 14.39).[28] Lysias takes the same approach in the case of the Sicilian Expedition which he makes his client recall in his speech *On the Confiscation of the Property of Nicias' Brother*:

> … but in all that he [Nicias] was compelled to do, not of his own wish but against his will, he bore no slight part of the injuries himself, while the responsibility for the disaster (*tēs sumphoras*) ought in fairness to lie with those who persuaded you, …[29]   (18.2)

By this shrouded spatial referencing, Lysias tries to dissociate the Athenian democratic juries and councils that he seeks to persuade from their involvement in the more painful episodes of recent history, a rhetorical

---

[26] Piraeus: 2.61; 13.23; 19.19; city: 25.21, 29; city and Piraeus: 13.90; 25.2, 9, 28; 26.16–17; 29.12; 31.8; 32.8; 34.2.

[27] In 16.4 and 19.16 the wider environment of the Hellespont is mentioned as location, but the name Aegospotami itself is not used.

[28] A similar strategy in the *Epitaphios* has been recognised by Frangeskou 1999: 325: 'Lysias is careful not to remind Athenians of specific defeats and prefers instead to ignore them, or talk of them collectively as misfortunes'.

[29] In the speech *For Polystratus* (20), which is probably not by Lysias, we find a similar shrouded reference to the Spartan occupation of Decelea, a place that is not indicated explicitly but for its 'fortress' (*to teikhos*, 20.28).

ploy that comes to the surface again in the narrative of the reign of the Thirty in his speech *Against Philon*:

> For this man, gentlemen of the Council, in the midst of the city's disaster (*sumphora*), which I only touch upon so far as I am forced to do so, …
>
> (31.8)

When the Thirty and their allies are involved, however, Lysias takes the opposite strategy in that he confronts his audience with references that are as explicit as possible. An example is found in the speech *Against Agoratus*, in which Lysias recounts how the Thirty subverted the democratic procedures in the Council when they condemned a group of opponents to death. Although his audience knows all about the Council, he portrays this setting in detail:

> And the trial was conducted in a manner that you yourselves well know: the Thirty were seated on the benches (*bathrōn*) which are now the seats of the presiding magistrates; two tables (*trapezai*) were set before the Thirty, and the vote had to be deposited, not in urns (*kadiskous*), but openly on these tables …
>
> (13.36–37)

In a similar explicit way he refers to the promise of the Thirty to 'dismantle (*perielein*) the walls of Piraeus' (12.70) or 'raze' (*diaskapsai*) them to the ground (13.14, 34) together with the surrender of the remaining triremes and the destruction of the arsenals (13.46). He describes how the oligarchs, with Spartan commanders at their side, forced the Assembly to adopt a new constitution (12.72), and reminds the jury of the Spartans who were stationed on the Acropolis (12.94) and in the Academy (18.10, 22).[30]

A final aspect of Lysias' spatial referencing is his use of imagery that evokes a setting. In the speech *Against the Corndealers*, for instance, which the prosecutor delivers to stimulate action against price-fixing cartels of metics, he evokes the image of a city under siege (*poliorkoumetha*, 22.15) by a group of conspirators. In the *Epitaphios* this kind of imagery is found also for instance when Lysias describes the hubris of Xerxes:

> … he made him a road across the sea, and forced a passage for ships through the land, by spanning the Hellespont and trenching Athos.[31]
>
> (2.29)

---

[30] Not only the Thirty suffer from this exposure of their crimes. In his plea *Against Alcibiades*, Lysias blackens the reputation of the defendant by referring explicitly to the alleged misdeeds of his father, his advice to the Spartans to occupy Decelea (14.30; 35) and his role in the scandal of the Hermae and the mock-performance of the mysteries (14.42).

[31] Compare for these topoi A. *Pers.* 745–750.

Thus we can detect within Lysias' vast array of spatial references a tendency to choose spatial anchor-points that are familiar to his audience so that he can use them, in a metonymical way, to refer to information that was well known. In adapting his choice of words, he shows himself sensitive to his clients, to his audience, and to the nature of the case. A similar sensitivity will be revealed in Lysias' instances of spatial description which is the last category to be discussed.

The Distribution of Space

Within the *Corpus Lysiacum*, no examples are found of extended spatial description like Homer's Shield of Achilles or Herodotus' description of Babylon. On the contrary, Lysias aimed at conciseness and selectivity in his spatial descriptions and used them in general for two purposes; either to enlighten his argumentation or to create an image of the character of the speaker or his opponent (*ethopoiia*).

In general, spatial descriptions occur in the *Corpus Lysiacum* when they support the case. This happens when the *locus delicti* is at stake, which is exemplified by the speech *On the Olive-stump* delivered by a defendant who is charged for removing a sacred stump of an olive tree from his land. After producing witnesses saying that there were no olive-stumps on his plot of land (7.9–11, the *pistis atekhnos*), Lysias' client attacks the prosecutor by making his accusation look implausible in the light of his own character and the location of his land (7.12–29, the *pistis entekhnos*). Apparently, the prosecutor had portrayed the uprooting of the olive-stump in his narrative in detail:

> for he [the prosecutor] says I stood by while my domestics hewed down the stems and the wagoner loaded up the wood and took it right away.
> (7.19)

To counter the prosecutor's claim, the defendant inserts a similar detailed spatial description at the end of his plea where he leads his audience into a *reductio ad absurdum*, claiming that his plot of land was visible from every direction which made it impossible to secretly uproot the stump:

> And how—except in all the world I were my own most malignant enemy— could I have attempted, with you supervising as you do, to clear away the sacred olive from this plot; in which there is not a single tree, but there was, as he says, a stump of one olive; where a road skirts the plot all round, and neighbours live about it on both sides, and it is unfenced and open to view from every point (*pantakhothen*)?
> (7.28)

The fact that Lysias postpones the description of the *locus delicti* until the end of the argumentation shows its importance within his defensive strategy. The prosecutor has, if we believe the defendant (7.20–22), failed to produce witnesses who saw him uprooting the stump whereas this act could not have gone unnoticed given the location of his land.

A second case in which the *locus delicti* is disputed is the speech *Against Simon*, delivered by a client who is defending himself before the Areopagus court against a charge of wounding with intent to kill. The case was triggered by a row that had erupted out of erotic rivalry between the client and Simon on behalf of a certain Theodotus, a youngster from Plataea. As in the speech *On the Olive-stump*, Lysias argues in the strongest terms against the plausibility of the prosecutor's narrative whilst portraying his behaviour in the worst possible terms. Apparently, Simon had claimed that the defendant attacked and severely wounded him 'at the very doorstep of his house' (*epi tais hautou thurais*, 3.27), but Lysias, in a compelling narrative, gives an entirely different version of the course of events. According to the defendant, there were no fewer than three incidents of fighting, each of them taking place at a different location. In the first incident, Simon burst into the defendant's property, rushed into the women's quarters and when he did not find his rival at home, worked out where he was dining, called him out and beat him up (3.6–8). Thus the defendant decided to leave the city and take Theodotus with him (3.9–10). On his return, however, a second incident took place, when he had Theodotus lodged at the house of his friend Lysimachus who happened to live near the house that Simon had rented (3.11). The latter hatched a plot with his friends to assault the defendant and kidnap Theodotus when they came out of Lysimachus' house. However, the attempt failed as the youngster managed to get free and the defendant ran away in a different direction (3.12–14). Simon and his friends, however, pursued Theodotus until they caught him in the shop of the fuller Molon and, after beating up the fuller, they dragged Theodotus off (3.15–16). When the defendant met with them near the house of a man called Lampon, the third, most violent fighting incident developed in which all involved were injured (3.17–18). Of the last two incidents the defendant produces witnesses.

The concrete spatial references in this narrative, apart from those to the property-holders Molon and Lampon, are sparse, and the narrator moves rapidly from the one incident to the next. No exact location is given of where the first fight took place (3.6–8) and the defendant remains tacit about his destination when he decides to stay abroad

(3.9–10). Equally, the location of the property of Lysimachus and the house that Simon rented are left unspecified. We only gather that Simon's watchmen were able to spot Lysimachus' house from the roof (3.11). After the second incident, Theodotus and the defendant ran off in different directions but no explanation is given as to how they came to meet one another again near Lampon's place (3.17). All we are told, in the refutation, is that Simon and his friends pursued Theodotus for 'more than four stades from his house with no sign of injury' (3.27), which makes his claim that he was beaten up badly 'at the very doorstep of his house' unjustified.

One can only speculate about the reasons behind this sparseness of concrete spatial anchor-points. The locations that were mentioned were possibly familiar to the Athenians themselves so that there was no need to explain where they were.[32] Alternatively, they may have been mentioned at an earlier stage of the lawsuit or in a preliminary investigation. It could also be, however, that Lysias deliberately *chose* to give an impressionistic account of Athenian topography, which enabled him to suppress spatial details that could weaken the defendant's argumentation.[33] Whatever the answer, Lysias aims at convincing his audience by a narrative with rapidly shifting settings, preferring emotive details like Simon's intrusion into the women's quarters at his house (3.6–7, 23, 29) and the shouts and screams of Theodotus (3.15) over concrete spatial referencing.

The Characterizing Function of Space

Lysias was famous for his *ethopoiia* and the characterizing function of space therefore is of paramount importance in his work. A good instance is found in the speech *Against Eratosthenes*, Lysias' most personal plea about the crimes that were committed against his family by the Thirty. Eratosthenes was one of this group who sought to regain his full citizenship after the democratic counter-revolution on the basis of his moderate behaviour at the time of the Thirty. Lysias wanted to discredit him, however, as he held him responsible for the killing of his brother Polemarchus in the context of a raid on his family's property. The

---

[32] Thus Carey 1989: ad 3.16; 3.17.
[33] Todd 2007: 277: 'how far … was Lysias constructing a topography for his audience, and how far was he manipulating one which was already familiar for them?', with reference to Feraboli 1980.

narrative here includes spatial detail: Lysias reports how Peison, Eratosthenes' colleague, went into his bedroom (*eis to dōmation*, 12.10) to open his treasury and how his goods were carried off. At the door of his house (*pros autais tais thurais*, 12.12) they part ways, with Peison running to the house of Lysias' brother Polemarchus while his allies lead Lysias to the property of Damnippus (12.12), where they entrust him to another member of the group, Theognis. As Lysias knows that Damnippus' house has doors at the front and the back (*amphithuros*, 12.15), he decides to run away. Theognis and his friends stand guard at the front door (*epi tēi auleiōi thurai*, 12.16) so that Lysias passes through two doors within the property (dividing the front court from the inner court and the inner court from the garden) and escapes through the back door (12.16). He seeks refuge in the house of Archeneus from whom he gathers that Polemarchus has been arrested by Eratosthenes 'in the street' (*en tēi hodōi*, 12.16).

The spatial details in this narrative are used for the purpose of *ethopoiia* and illustrate the brutality of the Thirty, who in their looting had no scruples about entering private rooms. In a similar way, Lysias later tells how another member of the group, Melobius, took golden earrings from the ears of Polemarchus' wife (12.19). However, as a side-effect these spatial details raise suspense and give an authentic flavour to his narrative. In doing so, they pave the way for the most important piece of spatial evidence in the speech, Eratosthenes' arrest of Polemarchus 'in the street' (12.16).[34] This detail turns out to be significant in the argumentation of the speech where Lysias uses it to discredit Eratosthenes' defence that he opposed the raiding activities in the Council and only acted under strict orders:

> Besides, it was not in his [Polemarchus'] house, but in the street (*en tēi hodōi*), where he [Eratosthenes] was free to leave both him and the decrees of the Thirty intact, that he apprehended him and took him off to prison. (12.30)

The fact that Eratosthenes arrested Polemarchus 'in the street', where he could easily let go of him without defying the orders of the Thirty, is used as evidence that he cooperated freely with the Thirty and had no scruples about arresting an innocent victim and sending him to death. Inner and outer space here, additionally, acquire symbolic significance.

---

[34] Cf. Edwards and Usher 1985: ad loc.: 'The defendant is mentioned for the first time, together with the most damning piece of evidence against him'.

The most extensive use of spatial detail in a narrative is found in the speech *On the Killing of Eratosthenes*. Here, the narrator describes the events and encounters occurring in his house and outside, for instance on the Agora. Lysias again presents spatial details with an eye on *ethopoiia*; they also help him in heightening the credibility of a narrative in a case in which the *locus delicti* is an issue, as appears at the end of the narrative section:

> Thus it was, gentlemen, that this man [Eratosthenes] met the fate which the laws prescribe for those who do such things. He was not snatched in from the road, nor had he taken refuge at the hearth, as these men claim. How could he have done so? It was inside the bedroom (*en tōi dōmatiōi*) that he was struck, and he immediately fell down, and I bound his hands; moreover, there were so many men in the house that he could never have escaped; and he did not have a knife or a club or any other weapon with which to repel those who were coming at him.   (1.27, tr. Todd)

In the preceding narrative Euphiletus gradually builds up the picture of the *locus delicti*, describing it as a two-storey building (*oikidion … diploun*, 1.9) with men's and women's quarters of similar size on both floors. The house has a front door, a courtyard and a door that gives access to the rooms on the ground floor (1.17) and a staircase—possibly outside the house—that gives access to the top floor (1.9). When his wife has given birth to a child that she herself breastfeeds, he encourages her to live downstairs for practical reasons and he himself moves into a room on the top floor (1.22) where the couple has supper (1.11–13) and Euphiletus receives his friends (1.22). Apparently, the door to this floor can be locked (1.13) so that his wife can freely receive her lover in the rooms downstairs. By the detailed description of the spatial surroundings in which Eratosthenes' adultery took place, Lysias characterizes his client on the one hand as a man of modest means with an honest, naive character and on the other hand authenticates his version of the course of events in which Euphiletus stages himself, in killing the adulterer *in situ*, as a rightful executor of the Athenian laws.

Conclusion

The overview of the different ways in which Lysias employs spatial referencing in his oratory highlights his versatility as a narrator and shows that Dionysius' praise of his clarity (*saphēneia*) and brevity (*suntomia*) was justified. Lysias knows how to adapt every operative spatial realm to his aims of persuasion. He uses the performative space of the law courts,

the council, the Ceramicus and the surrounding city to characterize his speaker or opponent or to heighten the solemnity of his words, as his clever selection of examples in the *Epitaphios* indicates, most of which can be linked to a monument in the nearby surroundings. In presenting distanced space, he shows himself to be aware of his democratic audience, as he chooses shrouded terms to refer to unpleasant memories of battles, but makes an exception for the tyranny of the Thirty, which had made a huge impact upon his personal life and whose crimes he evokes through explicit spatial references. Lysias' spatial references are generally brief but neatly tailored to his argumentative or characterizing aims (*ethopoiia*). In sum, space in Lysias is a matter of a few but well-chosen and effective words.

DEMOSTHENES

M.P. de Bakker

> When there were many areas of politics to choose from, I chose Greek affairs (*tēn peri tas Hellēnikas praxeis*) as my province. Therefore I am justified in drawing my proofs (*apodeixeis*) from them.[1]
>
> (*On the Crown* 18.59)

Thus Demosthenes motivates his focus on supra-regional politics and diplomacy in his oration *On the Crown*, delivered in 330 BCE, eight years after his anti-Macedonian politics had foundered at Chaeronea. The words are indicative of the difference in the use of spatial references between Antiphon, Isaeus, and (→) Lysias, who almost exclusively deal with urban affairs, and Demosthenes, who often looks beyond the Attic borders, especially in his political speeches. This difference can be explained by their backgrounds. Lysias, for instance, wrote most of his speeches on behalf of Athenians who were involved in private lawsuits against fellow citizens. As a consequence, his spatial references tend to zoom in on the urban space of Athens which allows his narratees views into the Athenian streets or even into private houses. When Demosthenes deals with Athenian affairs, similar views are found, though on a less descriptive scale than in the *Corpus Lysiacum*.[2] His predominant spatial backdrop is the supra-regional world of foreign diplomacy and warfare between the Greek states and their northern neighbours in Macedonia and Thrace.

This wider, panoramic spatial setting helped Demosthenes in creating an image of a dedicated, reliable and patriotic statesman with a solid

---

[1] The translations of the Demosthenes passages are, with minor modifications, taken from the Loeb edition with the exception of the speech *On the Crown*, for which I used Usher's translation (1993), and the speech *Against Meidias*, for which I used MacDowell's translation (1990). Unless indicated otherwise, examples are taken from the speeches that Usher 1999 considers genuine.

[2] An example can be found in the second speech *Against Aphobus*, where Demosthenes graphically describes the decisions that his father took in his dying hours which included placing himself 'on the knees' of Therippides, one of the later guardians (28.16). The *emotive* function of this detail is evident.

knowledge of the events beyond the borders of Attica. He needed this image to make his audience trust the adequacy of his foresight.[3] It also posed a challenge to him, however, as he had to transfer the complex topography of the Hellenic world and beyond to the confinements of the Assembly and the law courts and bring it across in language that was brief and recognizable so that it could be understood by as many people as possible. As an intermediary between outer and inner space, he uses a variety of methods in his spatial referencing some of which I will return to in this chapter.

Like (→) Lysias, Demosthenes aims at conciseness in his narratives and often confines himself for the sake of clarity to the spatial essentials that are needed. This is exemplified by his speech *Against Zenothemis*, who had sued Demosthenes' uncle Demo regarding a cargo of grain. In the first part of the narrative (32.4–9), the orator describes Zenothemis' voyage from Syracuse to Massalia and then via Cephallenia back to Athens. A full description of the merchant vessel is lacking. Instead, Demosthenes only mentions the spatial aspects that play a crucial role in the narrative: the hold, the deck (32.5) and the lifeboat (32.6). The stations of the voyage he indicates by their toponyms, omitting further spatial specification of the kind that is often found in (→) Herodotus or adjectives relating to their appearance as are sometimes found in (→) Thucydides. Later, when he relates the arguments that had arisen between the parties concerned upon the return of the ship in Athens (vaguely referred to with *deuro*, 32.14), Demosthenes authenticates his narrative by the use of direct speech (32.15–16, 31–32) without referring to the Piraeus, where these conversations took place. Instead, he prefers a pun on the adjective *eisagōgimos* 'admissable/importable', pointing out to the jury that it would be a surprise if they admitted a case to court about a cargo of grain that Zenothemis had tried to prevent from being imported into Athens. Thus the speech *Against Zenothemis* shows Demosthenes' concise use of spatial information and his preference for leaving the spatial backdrop implicit. In the meantime, we also witness the technique of drawing links between the spatial confinements of the law court and the world that lies beyond by his pun on *eisagōgimos*, which can be

---

[3] In a similar way Demosthenes highlights the knowledgeability of his clients in cases that deal with events farther away from Athens. In the speech *Against Aristocrates*, for instance, Demosthenes makes the plaintiff Euthycles say in the proem that he 'sailed to the Hellespont as a trireme commander' (23.5), thus securing goodwill and authority for the speaker by presenting him as a man who was familiar with the area where the events that mattered in this speech had taken place.

conceptualised in both spatial and forensic terms. The deictic iotas that refer to his opponent (32.2, 4) function in a similar way, as they point out to the jury that it was this very Zenothemis, present in the court, who conspired to sink his ship during the voyage across the sea far away from Athens.

A key to the success of Demosthenes as an orator was his ability to draw links between the space outside the law courts and the Assembly and the space of those venues themselves where the speeches were delivered (as I call it, the performative space). In the forensic speeches, testimonies of eyewitnesses—the *pistis atekhnos*—were instrumental as they bridged these two worlds. The orator faced the task of accommodating their accounts into his narrative and argumentation—the *pistis entekhnos*—and enabling his audience to visualise the events that had happened outside the law court. The combination of narrative and testimony turned his speeches into vivid re-enactments of the crucial events within the performative space. Demosthenes refers to this method as *epideixis* or *apodeixis* as in the above example from the speech *On the Crown*.[4]

In this chapter I will discuss the ways in which Demosthenes presents the two spatial backdrops that figure in his speeches: the performative space of the political venues of the Assembly and the eliastic lawcourts that he addresses and the realms that lie beyond them. To the latter category belong references to the immediate surroundings of the venues, the urban space of Athens with its monuments, temples and inscriptions, and to the more distant Hellenic world, the Aegean, and beyond. The clever way in which Demosthenes makes these spatial realms interact heightens the persuasive impact of his words and helps him in characterizing both speaker and opponent, as will be exemplified by an analysis of his speech *Against Meidias* at the end of this chapter.

---

[4] For the orator's direct references to his own *epideixis* (or, in a few instances, the absence of it on the part of his opponent, on which see below) in the corpus, see 8.33; 18.95, 142; 19.177, 178, 180, 203, 212; 20.142; 21.7, 12; 22.11, 20, 22, 23, 24, 29; 23.3, 18, 22, 102, 144; 24.15, 152; 27.12, 18, 23, 24, 34, 35, 47, 51, 52; 28.2; 29.5, 6, 10, 14, 21, 22, 28, 44, 46, 55, 57; 30.14, 25; 33.4; 34.40; 35.9, 17; 36.2, 19, 42; 37.2, 17, 21, 47; 38.10, 14; 39.37, 39; 40.60; 42.4, 17; 43.2, 17, 18, 32, 73; 45.2, 5, 8, 9, 54; 47.1, 31, 67; 48.39; 51.3, 7; 54.6, 42; 55.21; 57.7, 19, 31, 35, 36, 40, 46, 59, 62, 66, 67, 69; for *apodeixis*, see 18.42, 300; 30.4, 25; 55.12; 58.7. All of these are forensic speeches but elements of *epideixis* are present in the political speeches as well. In the *First Philippic*, Demosthenes demands his audience to 'be judges' (*kritai … esesthe*, 4.15) of the anti-Macedonian policy which he advocates. Later in the speech he presents a 'list of resources' (*porou apodeixis*, 29).

The Performative Space

Demosthenes' political speeches were addressed to the Assembly on the Pnyx and his forensic speeches to various, mainly eliastic, law courts.[5] It is especially in the latter category that numerous deictic references to the ambience are found.[6] Second person pronouns, deictic iotas,[7] forms of address and the pronouns *hode* and *houtos* indicate that the orator addresses or points out individuals within this performative space. They include, in decreasing order, his opponent(s), witnesses, individual members of the audience, colleagues and individuals amongst the spectators.[8] References are also made to the audience as a whole, for instance when the orator asks them not to 'make a din' (e.g. *mē thorubēsēi*, 5.15).[9]

Within the law court, two categories of objects are mentioned. The first category is when the orator refers to documentary evidence such as testimonies, laws, decrees, treaties and agreements, inventories, letters, oracles and poems that are read out during the case.[10] These documents played an important role in the *epideixis* of the orator. This holds primarily for testimonies of witnesses which are read out and approved by the

---

[5] An exception is the speech *On the Trierarchic Crown* (51), which Demosthenes delivered for the *boulē*. I have not included the *Epitaphios* (60) here; it was held at the *dēmosion sēma* in the Ceramicus. The speech contains fewer references to its spatial environment than (→) Lysias' equivalent. The references to the Clisthenic tribes of Athens (60.27–31), their mythological origin included, evoke the tribal organisation of the Athenian democracy and military in a metaphorical rather than spatial way.

[6] The exact location of the law courts is unknown. Archaeological remains of fourth-century law courts have, however, been found on the northern and southern sides of the Agora (cf. Lang and Camp 2004), whereas the homicide courts of the Palladion and the Delphinion were located on the other side of the Acropolis near the Olympian Zeus temple.

[7] Deictic iotas need not necessarily refer to persons or objects within the law court. In the forensic speech *Against Aristocrates* a deictic iota refers to Philip, who is not present (*toutoni ton Makedona*, 23.111). Compare *For the People of Megalopolis* 16.4, where Demosthenes refers to the Thebans (*Thēbaious toutousi*).

[8] Opponent: *passim* in all forensic speeches; witnesses: 27.18; 41.7, 11; individual members of the audience/jury: 23.13; 37.48; 54.34; 55.2; colleagues: 18.15, 83; 36.2; individuals amongst the spectators (no jury): 18.196; 37.44.

[9] For references with a deictic iota to the audience as a whole, see 29.36, and to the Assembly as a place of venue, see 15.22. On *thorubos* in the Athenian law courts, see Bers 1985, and in the Assembly, see Tacon 2001.

[10] For instances of testimonies, see the string of seven *marturiai* in *Against Aphobus II* (28.10–13); for instances of laws, see 23.82, 86, 87; 24.19; 43.62; of decrees, see 8.6, 22, 35; 18.142, 222; 20.70; 34.16; 47.20; of treaties and agreements, see 19.61–62; 35.10–13; of inventories, see 41.28; 42.16; of letters, see 4.37; 18.221; 19.38, 51, 187; of oracles, see 19.297; of poems, see 19.243, 245, 247, 255.

witnesses themselves with a nod but it also applies to other documentary evidence. Reading out a law, for instance, is not a bureaucratic necessity that interrupts the argumentation but an integrated part of the theatre in the law court, as witness the following instances from the speeches *Against Leptines* (20) and *Against Aristocrates* (23):

> Turn now to the decree passed in honour of Chabrias. Just look and see (*hora dē kai skopei*); it must be somewhere there.   (20.84)

> Have we any statute left? Let me see it (*deixon*). Yes, that is the one (*houtosi*); read it.[11]   (23.82)

The orator found it useful to point out the documents that were part of the argumentation before they were read out and make them explicitly part of his *epideixis*. This reveals that he appeals to the power of making the evidence visible.[12] In a similar way, Demosthenes charges his opponents for failing to produce visual evidence. This is an important argument in his speeches against his guardians whom he accuses of lying as they fail to support their claim to have returned the estate to Demosthenes with evidence (*ouk ekhei epideixai*, 29.46).

In the second category, mention is made of specific instruments, like the water-clock (*klepsydra*), the sealed box with all the documents related to the evidence (*ekhinos*), and the speaker's platform (*bēma*). Given the fact that the presence of these objects during the case is self-evident, they are only mentioned for rhetorical purposes. The water-clock, to begin with, is typically referred to in *praeteritio* of the kind 'there is not enough water left to tell all the crimes'[13] or to underline that the orator has spoken properly within the allotted time so that the water left can be poured out (*exera to hudōr*, 36.62; cf. 38.28). The sealed box is mentioned when evidence is lacking on the part of the opponent (47.16 cf. 40.21) or to prove, when evidence is absent, that it has been tampered with. This is the

---

[11] Compare 20.84; 23.82, 87; 42.26–27. As for the political speeches, in *On the Chersonese* Demosthenes refers with a deictic iota to decrees that the Assembly had ratified (8.6), which suggests that he kept them in his hands during his speech.

[12] For this 'empirical' attitude that those in court are invited to maintain, see also the speech *Against Euboulides* 57.4, where Demosthenes blames his opponent's party for not stating 'things of which they have accurate knowledge' (*hos' isasin akribōs*) but relying on 'hearsay' (*akoēn*). Demosthenes is also keen to stress the presence of witnesses in the setting of his narratives. In the speech *Against Zenothemis*, for instance, he indicates their presence by mentioning 'one of the bystanders' (*tōn parontōn tis*, 32.15) but often enough he mentions them outright in his narratives with the phrase 'in the presence of witnesses' (*enantion marturōn*, 30.19, 27; 33.20; compare 33.12; 42.28).

[13] 27.12, cf. 40.38; 41.30; 43.8–9; 45.47, 86; 54.36, 44.

case in the speech *Against Stephanus I*, in which the plaintiff Apollodorus maintains that the defending party has forged the will of his father Pasio as it has not been deposited in the box (45.17, 20, 57–58; compare 54.31). Thus both water-clock and box are used for the purpose of *ethopoiia* of the speaker and of the opponent respectively.

The speaking-platform (*bēma*) is the only physical object mentioned that both the political and the forensic venues have in common. It too is mentioned for the sake of *ethopoiia*. Appealing to the sentiment that the place is solemn and those who mount it should respect proper rules of conduct,[14] Demosthenes refers to the platform to secure goodwill for himself, underlining his modesty with the 'I would not have mounted the *bēma* had I not been forced to' topos by which he opens his *First Philippic* (4.1) or in order to blacken his opponent, as in the case *Against Androtion*, who is told to 'bawl from the platform in the Assembly' (22.68).[15] Furthermore, the *bēma* is referred to as a *lieu de mémoire* to evoke previous political meetings in which crucial proposals were made. Thus a direct link between events in the past and the present is established. We find an example of this rhetorical technique in the *First Olynthiac*:

> When we returned from the Euboean expedition and Hierax and Strato-cles, the envoys of Amphipolis, mounted this platform (*touti to bēma*) and bade you sail and take over their city, if we had shown the same earnest-ness in our own case as in defence of the safety of Euboea, Amphipolis would have been yours at once and you would have been relieved of all your subsequent difficulties.   (1.8)

By indicating the *bēma* Demosthenes underlines his point that the response to the Amphipolitan ambassadors was inadequate. A better response is to be made this time to the ambassadors from Olynthus so as to prevent Philip from conquering the place.[16]

---

[14] See Plato (*Prt.* 319c) for the practice of interrupting unskilled speakers by shouting (*thorubos*) and by escorting them from the platform. Compare Aristophanes *Ach.* 45–54 for the mock-removal of Amphitheus.

[15] For the same strategy of blackening the opponent's behaviour at the speaking-platform, see *On the Crown* 18.123 and the (non-Demosthenic) *Against Aristogeiton* 25.9, 47, 64, and, in more generic terms, Aeschines *Against Ctesiphon* 3.2–4.

[16] Compare *First Philippic* 4.45, where Demosthenes refers to earlier, fruitless deci-sions that the Assembly took to secure Athenian interests against Philip as 'empty decrees and mere aspirations of this platform (*bēmatos*)' with *Second Philippic* 6.30, where Demosthenes refers to the speeches that were made on the *bēma* in which Philip's terri-torial aspirations were mitigated.

The Urban Space

From the law courts and the Assembly space on the Pnyx we move to their immediate urban environment, the political and religious centre of the city and its monuments. Whereas it was previously thought that this immediate urban environment played no obvious role in Greek oratory,[17] it was Fiona Hobden who recently pointed out that

> [i]n speeches composed by Demosthenes …, spaces, buildings, and monuments all become manifestations of the values, spirit, and character of the Athenian *polis*. (2007: 497)

As Demosthenes habitually refers to objects and monuments in this urban space, Hobden is justified in speaking of a 'forensic technique' that could be used for various purposes (2007: 497–498). As this part of the city was known to all politically active citizens, and therefore to the juries and assemblies, references to it had an *emotive* function and could be used to manipulate the feelings of the audience. The Agora, for instance, is a place of trade and free speech where Athenians and non-Athenians of all origins and ranks could mix and freely discuss politics.[18] Therefore arresting a citizen and dragging him away from it without good reason can be considered an attack upon Athenian democratic institutions. In this respect, Demosthenes mentions the Thirty—though less often than (→) Lysias—and their seizure of citizens in public spaces as a negative example (22.52; 24.164).

Within the Agora, there were numerous monuments that played an important role within the Athenian democratic ideology. One of them was the Altar of the Eponymous Heroes, where proposals for decrees, laws and prosecutions were advertised in advance of the decision by the jury or the Assembly. In the speech *Against Timocrates* Demosthenes makes the plaintiff accuse Timocrates of ignoring this rule when he submitted his proposal to change the laws on theft of state-property (24.18, 25). He thereby presents the plaintiff as a champion of democracy and hints at anti-democratic sympathies on the part of his opponent.

---

[17] Vasaly 1993: 26 argues that 'appeal to the visible milieu seems to have played practically no role in ancient Greek rhetorical practice' and appears to be a Roman invention.

[18] For a summary of the evidence of the Agora as a political centre in Athens, see Vlassopoulos 2007: 39–47.

A similar emotive function can be ascribed to Demosthenes' pointing at the monuments on the Acropolis above the Agora. As they represent Athenian power and greatness he encourages his audience to reflect upon the conditions that enabled the city to build them a century ago and to be proud and protective of the democratic stateform and ideology with which these monuments were closely associated.[19] In the *Philippics*, for instance, references to the Parthenon and the Propylaea of the Acropolis (3.25) are meant to evoke the maritime empirical policy of Pericles that brought wealth, power and prestige to the Athenians.[20] As *lieux de mémoire*, they acquire a protreptic function in Demosthenes' political speeches, instructing the Assembly to stop spending the state budget on domestic affairs and relying on underpaid mercenaries abroad and, instead, to embark on active naval resistance against the Macedonians. The same holds for the forensic speeches. In the speech *Against Androtion*, for instance, the plaintiff includes amongst past Athenian naval successes those undertaken by 'the men who built the Propylaea and the Parthenon' (22.13). The visible ambience of the speech is meant to encourage the jury to reflect upon the duty of the Athenian state and its officials to take care of the number and maintenance of their triremes. Androtion's proposal to award the parting *bouleutai* a honorific reward in spite of their proven negligence in this respect is presented as an unpatriotic act that undermines the collective state-interests that the members of the jury are supposed to protect.[21]

A different emotive function can be assigned to the state-prison (*desmōtērion*), a building (euphemistically indicated as an *oikēma*) in the vicinity of the Agora—and possibly within view from the law courts. In the speech *Against Timocrates* Demosthenes makes the plaintiff point at 'yonder building' (*oikēmati toutōi*, 24.131, 135), arguing that those who are charged with theft of state-property should be imprisoned until they

---

[19] References to the statues of Harmodius and Aristogeiton function in a similar way. See 20.70 and 21.170.

[20] Compare 13.14, 28; 22.13, 76; 24.184; 36.15–16. In the forensic speech *Against Aristocrates*, in many ways a precursor to the *Philippics*, Demosthenes makes his plaintiff Euthycles refer to the Propylaea (*propulaia tauta*) and the stoas along with Piraeus and the docks (23.207). For a similar evocation of the port with all its nautical facilities, see 8.45. In the speech *On the Crown* Demosthenes dramatically points at *touton ton hēlion* 'yonder sun' (18.270).

[21] The rhetorical strategy of making the opponents appear as if they act against the interests of the democratic institutions and laws is found elsewhere in the speech *Against Meidias* too. Cf. Aeschines *Against Ctesiphon* 3.1–8; Hobden 2007: 491–492.

repay their debts, a law that Timocrates proposed to abolish. This time, the orator does not evoke feelings of pride and patriotism but by pointing to the prison alludes to the law and order that are needed to uphold the integrity of the democratic institutions and to which every citizen, regardless of his origins and wealth, should obey.

In this context, mention should further be made of the inscriptions to which Demosthenes at times refers. They were erected both in the vicinity of the law court and elsewhere. By mentioning their existence in stone the orator again draws a link between the inner and outer space of the law court. This once more serves his *epideixis* but he also underlines the eternal value of the laws and decrees and endows them with gravity and authority. It is in particular in the speech *Against Leptines*, who had proposed a law to end exemption from taxes for benefactors, that inscriptions play an important role. One of the benefactors that Demosthenes mentions in this speech is Leucon, who had been instrumental in safeguarding Athenian trading interests in the Bosporus and was honoured as a benefactor of the state:

> Take and read … the decrees touching Leucon. … How reasonable and just was the immunity which Leucon has obtained from you, these decrees have informed you, gentlemen of the jury. Copies of all these decrees (*stēlas antigraphous*) on stone were set up by you and by Leucon in the Bosporus, in the Piraeus, and at Hierum. Just reflect to what depths of meanness you are dragged by this law, which makes the nation less trustworthy than an individual. For you must not imagine that the pillars (*stēlas*) standing there are anything else than the covenants (*sunthēkas*) of all that you have received or granted; and it will be made clear that Leucon observes them and is always eager to benefit you, but that you have repudiated them while they still stand (*hestōsas akurous*); and that is a far worse offence than to pull them down; for when men wish to traduce (*blasphēmein*) our city, there will stand the pillars to witness to the truth of their words.   (20.35–37)

As Vince notes in his translation, the feminine plural *hestōsas akurous* enables Demosthenes to fuse the spatial and the conceptual aspect of the honorific inscription on Leucon's behalf (*stēlas* vs. *sunthēkas*). Demosthenes points at the eternal value of these highly visible testimonies for the security of the city as they guarantee Leucon's commitment and make him an example. Altering the conditions attached to his honours is presented as an act of desecration (note *blasphēmein*) that will be monumentalised instantly by the same inscriptions and endanger the city. For the same purpose Demosthenes refers to *stēlai* that record the honorific decrees on behalf of the Thasian Ecphantus and the Byzantines

Archebius and Heracleides (20.63–64) for their services to the Athenians in the Hellespont. A variation is found in the case of Conon, who was instrumental in restoring the Athenian empire after expelling the Spartans from the Aegean in 394 BCE and rebuilding the walls. Demosthenes refers to his bronze statue on the Agora and quotes the inscription that celebrates him as the 'liberator of the allies of Athens' (20.69). Later in the speech he refers to honorific inscriptions in the portico of Hermes (20.112) and stresses the epigraphical nature of his evidence in his argumentation against Leptines' proposal (20.127–128) and in his peroration (20.159). Apparently, Demosthenes believed that a strategy that emphasised the perpetuity and sanctity of the honorific decrees would make the jury condemn his opponent for drafting an illicit decree.[22] His use of epigraphical material attests to the spatial conceptualisation of laws and decrees as they are presented as an integral part of the monumental urban space that surrounded Athens' political venues and could be seen and checked by all.[23]

Moving away from the immediate urban centre of Athens, Demosthenes refers to other places that represent the Athenian state and deserve protection, like the Lyceum, the Academy, the Cynosarges and other gymnasia (24.131). A more prominent role is played by the Piraeus, the port that connects the urban space of Athens to the overseas world. Here many contracts are sealed and negotiations are conducted that play a role in the narratives of Demosthenes' speeches (e.g. 19.209; 32.10; 34.37). Like (→) Lysias, Demosthenes refers at times to the Piraeus as a *lieu de mémoire* from where the Athenian democracy was restored after the overthrow of the Thirty. In the case of Thrasybulus, the plaintiff in the speech *Against Timocrates* claims that he was 'one of the heroes of the march from Phyle and Piraeus' (24.134) but despite his reputation was imprisoned for offences against the state.

A final spatial concept that Demosthenes uses in the context of urban space is the opposition between public and private space. Both are in

---

[22] For a parallel to this strategy, see Aeschines *Against Ctesiphon* 3.183–190, where the orator invites the jury to join him on an imaginative (note *tēi dianoiēi*, 186) perambulation around the Agora to study monuments and inscriptions that reflect the democratic spirit by which the Athenian collective performed some of its greatest feats. See Hobden 2007: 495–497.

[23] For parallels, see 9.41–42; 19.270–272; 20.127. Connected to this is the spatial conceptualisation of a mortgage upon a property indicated by the erecting of *horoi* (31.1; 41.5, 6, 16, 19). Tampering with inscriptions—an accusation made against Aristogeiton (22.72–73)—is considered a grave sin.

their own ways sacred and require specific rules of behaviour of which the transgression reflects badly upon the character of the opponent. Breaking into someone's house, especially into women's quarters, is considered a violent crime.[24] According to Demosthenes it was Meidias' incursion into his house that laid the foundations for their long-standing enmity which explains his detailed narrative:

> His brother and he burst (*eisepēdēsan*) into my house because they were proposing an exchange for a trierarchy … First they broke down (*kateskhisan*) the doors of the rooms … next, in the presence of my sister, who was still at home then and was a young girl, they used bad language … and hurled abuse, decent and indecent, at my mother and me and all of us.
>
> (21.78–79)

Whereas this is an example of Demosthenes' *deinotēs*, he uses the motif in a more frivolous manner in the speech *Against Androtion*. The way in which Androtion handled his duties as a tax-commissioner is presented as too intrusive and Demosthenes makes his plaintiff Diodorus describe the consequences of his actions in terms that resemble slapstick:

> What if a poor man, or a rich man for that matter who has spent much money and is naturally perhaps rather short of cash, should have to climb over the roof to a neighbour's house or creep under the bed, to avoid being caught and dragged off to gaol … or should be seen thus acting by his wife, whom he espoused as a freeman and a citizen of our state?[25]   (22.53)

Distanced Space

Demosthenes presented himself as a *connoisseur* of the non-Athenian world and especially of those places that belonged to the Athenian 'alliance'. In his speeches, and especially in his *Philippics*, he often focuses upon the north of the Aegean and the Hellespont, an area of great economical interest for the city as it imported its grain from the Black Sea area and possessed estates, allies and trading colonies along the Thracian and Macedonian coasts. Furthermore, he is concerned with the central Greek states Thessaly, Thebes and Phocis and with Euboea, the crown colony of the Athenians where their interests clashed with those of Philip.

---

[24] See also (→) Lysias, who uses this topic more often.
[25] For other examples of the topos of breaking into someone's privacy, see 18.132; 21.78–79, 118–119; 24.162; 37.45–46; 47.52–59, 81–82.

   In general, Demosthenes offers hardly any spatial orientation when he
mentions toponyms in these areas but simply lists their names often in
rapid succession without further specifications:

> First he seized Amphipolis, next Pydna, then Potidaea, after that Methone,
> lastly he invaded Thessaly. Then having settled Pherae, Pagasae, Magnesia,
> and the rest of that country to suit his purposes, off he went to Thrace, …
>
> (*First Olynthiac* 1.12–13)

Possibly, Demosthenes assumed that his audience was familiar enough
with these places so that they needed no further explanation.[26] A rhetor-
ical reason, however, can not be denied. More spatial orientation could
have interrupted the flow of his argumentation and forced him into
digressions that would have distracted his audience from the essence
of the case. But the rapid succession of these names also adds to his
image of a matter-of-fact statesman who exactly knew which places in
the area were of interest to the Athenians and listed them without much
ado as if he was reading them out from a tribute list or from a map.[27]
Most importantly, however, Demosthenes heightens the rhythm of his
narrative here as much as possible in order to present Philip as an immi-
nent danger to Athens. In the above example, we move from Amphipolis
(north of the Chalcidice) approximately 180 km west to Pydna, on the
east coast of the Gulf of Therme, then return eastwards, to Potidaea on
the other side of the gulf, next back westwards to Methone near Pydna
and then further south, deep into Thessaly, before returning to the far
northeast in Thrace. With this random order, Demosthenes underlines
Philip's ability to strike wherever he wants at any time. His war is pre-
sented as a *Blitz* and is contrasted with the slow response on the part of
the Athenians whom Demosthenes urges on to organise an apt military
response. It is a narrative technique that Demosthenes uses through-
out his career in his *Philippics* and, ultimately, also in his speech *On the
Crown*:

---

[26] Though in the *First Philippic* he encourages his audience to study the topography
of the northern Aegean (4.31). In his *Fourth Philippic* he concedes that not all Athenians
may have heard of Serrium and Doriscus (10.8).

[27] In this sense Demosthenes presents the Aegean world from a cartographic per-
spective and thus differs from (→) Herodotus, (→) Thucydides and (→) Xenophon, who
prefer to make temporal and spatial progression go hand in hand and often topograph-
ically orientate themselves in the guise of a wandering or seafaring traveller. On this
so-called *hodological* perspective, see Janni 1984 and Purves 2010.

> I put the question to you, Aeschines, dismissing for the moment every-
> thing else—Amphipolis, Pydna, Potidaea, Halonnesus. I have no recollec-
> tion of those places. Serrium, Doriscus, the sack of Perapethus, and all
> other injuries of our city—I ignore them utterly.[28]   (18.69–70)

Apart from his habit of curtly referring and listing, Demosthenes also
uses other techniques, especially in his *Philippics*, to present the outer
Athenian world to his local audience. One of these is to avoid toponyms
altogether and choose deliberately vague anaphoric adverbs like 'here'
(Athens) versus 'there' (anywhere in the area that is under threat from
Philip). This is part of his strategy in the *First Olynthiac* oration where
he stresses that Athenian negligence of their overseas allies 'will bring
the war from there to here' (*ton ekeithen polemon deur' hēxonta*, 1.15,
cf. 1.25, 27).[29] Another technique is the use of metaphors like the 'circle'
(*kuklos*) that Philip has cast like a net around the city, which is found in
the *First Philippic*:

> he is always taking in more, everywhere casting his net round us (*kuklōi
> pantakhēi … peristoikhizetai*), while we sit idle and do nothing.   (4.9)

In this particular case the circle metaphor with its military associations[30]
gains saliency as Demosthenes has just previously used it to describe the
circular form of the possessions that Athens once held around the Gulf
of Therme:

> we too, men of Athens, once held Pydna, Potidaea, and Methone and had
> in our own hands that entire territory in a circle (*kuklōi*) …   (4.4)

Demosthenes uses a metaphor with spatial connotations to highlight the
dramatic reversal in Athenian fortune, previously a powerful stakeholder
in the northern Aegean but now under threat from invasion herself.[31]

---

[28] For other instances, see 1.9; 4.48; 5.10; 6.30; 8.18, 64–66; 9.17–18, 26–27; 10.8–10;
18.79; 19.204, 334. In the Speech *On the Crown* Demosthenes applies the technique to
his own diplomatic successes, summarising asyndetically every city that allied itself with
Athens thanks to his efforts (18.237, cf. 244).

[29] For instances in other speeches, see 3.9; 4.50; 5.8; 8.44–45; 9.53.

[30] We can think of the circle here as a metaphor for the walls that protect a city (see
On the Crown 18.300) or, in Thucydides' case, the Athenian camp in Syracuse (6.98–
99). Compare Demosthenes' description of cities as *epiteikhismata* 'forts', 'outposts' (4.5;
14.12; 18.71, cf. 18.299) and of deceit as *toikhōrukhein* 'dig through a wall' (35.9, 47).

[31] For a variation of the metaphor, see *Second Philippic* 6.27 'you are ensnared' (*peritei-
khizesthe*) and *Third Philippic* 9.29, where Demosthenes compares Philip to a 'recurrence
(*periodos*) or attack of a fever or some other disease'.

In the case of the Macedons, Demosthenes tends to avoid their name or their region in his speeches and concentrates instead upon its leader Philip. In the Olynthiac orations and the first, second and third *Philippics*, Philip is named 86 times and Macedonia and its inhabitants eight times.[32] As a consequence, Demosthenes' speeches come across as personal invectives against an individual who threatens the Greek states—either indicated by the name of their cities or by the name of their inhabitants—in a similar way as the Persian King once had done. Philip is compared to a tyrant intent on ending the freedom of the Greek states (*Second Philippic* 6.25) and, worse, eager to establish tyrannies in subject cities at the expense of the *dēmos*. This is exemplified by his overthrow of the Euboean democracies, which Demosthenes spins out in his *Third Philippic* (9.17, 27, 33, 58; cf. 8.36) so as to uphold Philip as an imminent threat to the Athenian constitution.[33]

Demosthenes knew that his audience was sensitive about the Waterloos in Athenian history such as the battle of Aegospotami, which sealed the fate of the city in the Peloponnesian War, and the battle of Chaeronea, which ended her ambitions against the growing Macedonian power. As a consequence, like (→) Lysias, he avoided naming them explicitly, choosing shrouded terms instead like *sumphora* (18.287; 20.42) and *atukhēma* (22.15). In his speech *Against Androtion* he makes the plaintiff Diodorus reflect upon this shrouded referencing explicitly, for the purpose of *ethopoiia*:

> For I suppose no one would deny that all that has happened to our city, in the past or in the present, whether good or otherwise—I avoid an unpleasant term (*hina mēden eipō phlauron*)—has resulted in the one case from the possession, and in the other from the want, of war-ships.
>
> (22.12)

By avoiding explicit references to lost sea-battles in the past the plaintiff creates an impression of himself as a man who understands the sen-

---

[32] That Demosthenes uses the name 'Macedon' with a negative connotation is proven by a passage in the *First Philippic*: 'could anything be worse than a Macedonian man who defeats the Athenians and rules Greek affairs?' (4.10); cf. *Third Philippic* 9.31: 'cursed Macedon'.

[33] In his speech *For the Liberty of the Rhodians* (15) Demosthenes employs the same technique, referring to the powers that threaten Rhodes by the names of their leaders Mausolus, Artemisia, the Persian King and Philip. The opposite happens in the case of the speech *On the Symmories* (14), in which Demosthenes tends to avoid naming toponyms within Attica and thus stresses the unity of the *polis*.

sitivities of his audience and remains discrete about painful events in Athenian history.

Ultimately, Demosthenes' reluctance to convey topographical information and his habit of confining himself to toponyms, anaphoric adverbs or metaphors may be explained as the result of adapting his speeches to his democratic audience, the Athenian juries drawn by lot and the Assembly on the Pnyx. It is hardly imaginable that all these Athenians had a similar grasp of the topographical details in the northern Aegean. In fact, many of them may never have been abroad at all and may have listened to the toponyms that Demosthenes mentioned without any sense of their whereabouts. In order to keep his audience involved and attentive he had to rely on a high rhythm in his narrative and avoid any kind of distraction such as topographical digressions. Meanwhile, he had to bring his message across in an understandable manner so as to attain clarity (*saphēneia*). He probably selected toponyms that were well-known to the Athenians and ones that mattered to them for empirical, military, historical or religious reasons.[34] Alternatively, he sought refuge in metaphors or anaphoric adverbs so as to present the world in easily understandable bipolar terms like 'there' and 'here'.

An exception to this narrative habit is the early speech *Against Aristocrates* (352 or 351 BCE) which Demosthenes drafted for Euthycles, who was involved in a lawsuit against the man who had proposed to render Charidemus (a mercenary commander in the north Aegean) inviolable. Euthycles describes the opposition which he met from Charidemus when he tried to restore Athenian interests in the Chersonese:

> we went to Alopeconnesus, and that is in the Chersonese and used to belong to you—a headland running out towards Imbros, a long way from Thrace; a place swarming with robbers and pirates—when we got there and were besieging these gentry, he marched right across the Chersonese—your property, every yard of it—attacked us, and tried to rescue the robbers and pirates.   (23.166–167)

The brief topographical description may have been inserted to make the narrative appear as authentic as possible and thereby forestall the argument of the defendant that Euthycles and his Athenian ships were

---

[34] Instances of places of empirical interest are Olynthus (4.17; 9.56; 23.107–109), Potidaea (18.61–62; 23.107–109), the Chersonese (4.17; 23.1), Euboea (9.57–58); of prime military interest: Thermopylae (4.41; 6.7; 19.77, 180); of historical interest: Marathon (4.34; 14.30), Plataea (6.30; 16.4), Pylos (40.25); of religious interest: Delphi (9.32; 19.65), Nemea (21.115).

a threat to Charidemus' employer Chersobleptes, the king of Thrace. But the orator may also have wished to familiarize his jury with a less familiar area in the Chersonese. This didactic approach is visible in other parts of this speech, for instance in the lengthy summary of the statutes concerning homicides and Athenian lawcourts where these cases were brought to trial (resp. 23.22–65 and 23.66–81) and in the comparison of Cardia on the Chersonese with Chalcis on Euboea, a place closer to Athens and probably better known:

> Indeed by its situation the city of the Cardians occupies a position in the Chersonese in relation to Thrace analogous to the position of Chalcis in Euboea in relation to Boeotia. Those of you who know its situation cannot be unaware of the advantage for the sake of which he [Chersobleptes] has acquired it for himself …[35]   (23.182)

These topographical explanations are exceptional within Demosthenes' speeches. It may have been the orator's wish to characterize Euthycles as a knowledgeable and authoritative commander that explains their presence[36] or he decided to omit topographical explanations in his later speeches as he found them rhetorically ineffective.

The Characterizing Function of Space: The Case of Meidias

Like in (→) Lysias, space often acquires a characterizing function and furthers *ethopoiia*. We have already seen some examples above, but Demosthenes' technique is better illustrated by a more extensive treatment of one of his speeches. For this purpose I have selected the impressive speech *Against Meidias* (21), part of a long-standing feud dating back to Demosthenes' early manhood when Meidias and his brother had broken into his house and used abusive language in the presence of his mother and sister. In 348 BCE, their hostility surfaced at the city's Dionysia where Demosthenes acted as *khorēgos* on behalf of his tribe. Meidias attempted to sabotage his production and punched him in the face in the theatre on the day of the performance.[37] Demosthenes

---

[35] For a similar example of enlightening the less familiar by a comparison to the more familiar, see 23.102–103, where Euthycles describes a successful strategy in Thrace by drawing a comparison to Athens' politics in relation to Thebes and Sparta.

[36] Compare the proem of this speech, where Euthycles emphasises his personal experiences in the north of the Aegean (23.5).

[37] The punch is also attested by Aeschines in his *Against Ctesiphon* 3.52.

charged him with offences related to the festival and secured a vote of condemnation in the Assembly before drafting a speech that was to be held at an eliastic court in the subsequent year, 347 or 346 BCE.[38]

The speech focuses entirely upon the character of Meidias whose violent crimes and obnoxious scheming are spun out far beyond the incidents at the Dionysia. Step by step Demosthenes reveals a link between Meidias' offences against him and the city as a whole so that an image emerges of a man who poses an imminent danger to the democratic constitution. During his portrayal of Meidias Demosthenes makes use of spatial backdrops that enable the jury to visualise and evaluate his opponent's behaviour.

The first backdrop is the political and religious centre of Athens. In the proem of the speech, Demosthenes claims that

> the more men he has annoyed by canvassing (I saw what he was doing in front of the courts this morning), the more I expect him to get his deserts.
>
> (21.4)

By referring to Meidias' lobby in front of the law court, Demosthenes anticipates his account of the bullying that he and his chorus suffered in the theatre of Dionysus the previous year. This he describes in much detail, evoking the theatre as a backdrop and thereby enabling his jury to visualise the incidents as if they are sitting in the audience:

> he shouted, he threatened, he stood beside the judges while they were taking the oath, he blocked and nailed up the side-scenes (*paraskēnia*), though they are public property (*dēmosia*) and he held no official position (*idiōtēs*)—I can't tell you how much harm and trouble (*kaka kai pragmata amuthēta*) he caused me, continually. And as far as concerns the incidents … before the judges in the theatre all of you are my witnesses, men of the jury. Indeed the most reliable statements are those whose truth the audience can attest for the speaker. (21.17–18)

To underscore the trustworthiness of his detailed account, Demosthenes appeals to the members of the jury that have witnessed the incident. In making it seem as if they have all watched the spectacle unfold and have shared his focalisation, he draws them into his camp. This is all the more important as this passage contains the motif on which Demosthenes'

---

[38] Aeschines' version of the conflict in his *Against Ctesiphon* (3.51–52) has led to the belief that the speech was not delivered and that the conflict was settled after arbitration, but conclusive evidence is lacking. See the discussion in MacDowell 1990: 23–28.

argumentation is built. In his lobby against his enemies, Meidias has shown no regard for the sanctity of public property—not even at a religious festival—and does not refrain from assaulting a state-official, for it was in his capacity of *khorēgos* that Demosthenes was acting.

The image of Meidias as an obnoxious schemer in Athens' public and sacred democratic space runs through the remaining part of the speech as a theme. Demosthenes tells how he hired Euctemon, a notorious sycophant, to charge the orator publicly with desertion and to write it on the *pinakes* on the Altar of the Eponymous Heroes (21.103). At the time of the murder inquiry against Aristarchus, Meidias 'hovered around the agora' (*periiōn kata tēn agoran*, 21.104) to lobby against Demosthenes, even addressing the victim's relatives to point them into the orator's direction. When this plot faltered, he tried to intimidate the Athenian *boulē*, urging them to arrest Aristarchus and thereby weaken Demosthenes' position. Quoting Meidias' words in direct speech, Demosthenes again enables his jury to visualise his opponent's interruption:

> Are you still delaying and investigating? Are you out of your minds? Won't you put him to death? Won't you go to his house and arrest him?
>
>   (21.117)

Later, it is related that he 'cleared his path' (*sobei*, 21.158) across the agora accompanied by an escort of 'three or four slaves'. Meidias, Demosthenes claims, is so big that 'the city can not hold him' (*hē polis auton ou khōrei*, 21.200).[39] Thus the image arises of Meidias as a danger to the Athenian *dēmos*. For this purpose, Demosthenes inserts a reference to Harmodius and Aristogeiton and the *stēlē* that accompanied their statues on the Agora (21.170). As champions of the *dēmos* and 'killers of insolent tyrants', they behaved exactly the opposite to Meidias, whose gang of sycophants are described as his 'mercenaries' (21.139) who threaten the stability of Athens' democracy.

The second, less obvious, spatial backdrop that Demosthenes uses is the world of Greek interstate diplomacy and warfare. Demosthenes presents himself as a staunch representative of the *dēmos* in referring to

---

[39] For parallels of unusual behaviour on the Agora, compare Demosthenes' description of Aeschines in the speech *On the False Embassy* (19.314) and the (non-Demosthenic) speech *Against Aristogeiton* where the plaintiff describes how the accused 'makes his way through the market-place like a snake or a scorpion with sting erect, darting hither and tither, on the look-out for someone on whom he can call down disaster or calumny or mischief of some sort, or whom he can terrify till he extorts money from him' (25.52).

his activities as leader of the *theōroi* in Nemea (21.115) and as a sponsor of the campaigns to Euboea and Olynthus (21.161), whereas he claims that Meidias made a shambles of his cavalry duties (21.132–135), tried to evade his trierarchy (21.163–167) and damaged the diplomatic relations with Cyzicus (21.173). In holding up, as it were, the map of Athenian foreign interests as a backdrop to his argumentation, Demosthenes attempts to make his audience aware of the delicate relationships that Athens entertains with various cities to which Meidias poses an imminent threat.

As in other cases, the key to Demosthenes' strategy of persuasion in the speech *Against Meidias* lies in the connection between the spatial backdrops that help him in portraying Meidias' crimes and the here and now of the setting of the speech in the eliastic law court. Thus he links visualisation with visibility and makes it seem plausible that Meidias poses a threat to the state. To underline this, he points out the arbitrator Strato whom Meidias had disfranchised on illegal grounds and who was, despite his services to the Athenian state, not allowed to speak in court but only to stand up and be seen (21.95–96). Furthermore, he anticipates his opponent's apology, predicts more false charges on the part of Meidias against individuals (21.193) and the Athenian *dēmos* as a whole (21.196) and addresses the wealthy supporters of Meidias that are members of the jury and whom he fears to be the victim of his bullying and lobbying (21.208, 213). Thus Demosthenes uses the performative space of the law court as a theatre to re-enact the crimes of Meidias and to incriminate him on the spot.[40]

Conclusion

Whereas the influence of Thucydides is generally assumed within Demosthenes' style, the orator took a wholly different approach in his presentation of spatial material. Evidently the fact that his texts served a direct, rhetorical aim within the political and forensic arenas of Athens overrode any inclination to include elaborate spatial or topographical descriptions such as are found in the historians. Demosthenes' main purpose was to enable his public to visualise the events that had happened elsewhere against the visible backdrop of the performative space itself, linking the two worlds, in his *epideixis*, by way of testimonies, references

---

[40] Cf. MacDowell 1990: 36 on this theatrical effect.

M.P. DE BAKKER

to monuments and inscriptions in the nearby urban space and by cleverly employing the objects within the performative space for the purpose of *ethopoiia*. Demosthenes' summary spatial references to the non-Athenian world (evoked in his speeches on a much wider scale than in those of other orators like Lysias) are generally meant to clarify his argumentation, to create an image of himself as a knowledgeable statesman or to characterize political and military developments. Repeating, in quick succession, names of fallen cities like Olynthus, Amphipolis, Pydna and Potidaea, he presents them as soundbytes, reminding his audience time and again of the imminent danger of Philip. Thus he comes across as a populist orator *avant-la-lettre*, in the guise of a staunch democrat who knows how to manipulate his audience.

PART SIX

PHILOSOPHY

PLATO

K.A. Morgan

Introduction

Platonic dialogues are set almost exclusively in Athens and take their life from the vibrant intellectual culture active there in the late fifth and early fourth century. A crucial factor is the dominance of Socrates as chief interlocutor—a character who notoriously almost never left Athens. Only one dialogue, the *Laws*, does not have its main action set in or near the city, and even there the dominant speaker is an Athenian Stranger who brings the world of Athens into the dialogue even as he engages in comparative analysis of the cultures of Crete, Sparta, Persia and his own utopian construction of an idealized city. Other dialogues also have a broad geographic compass; even if they are generated by an encounter in Athens, they can refer for comparative purposes to other locations in the Greek world, and even extend their reach to imaginary landscapes like the Underworld, the island of Atlantis, utopian cities, and realms beyond the physical altogether (the world of the Forms). The project of philosophy is thus set in the broadest possible context: specific encounters in specific locations give rise to wide-ranging conclusions.[1] The importance of the ethical aspect of the soul and the primacy of the intellectual over the material mean that details of physical setting are, for the most part, brief and generic except when they serve a symbolic or thematic function.

---

[1] See Gill 2002: 153 on the 'distinctively Platonic combination of an aspiration towards systematic, total understanding and a sense of the necessarily localized nature of any such aspiration'.

Settings

In the five dialogues with a narrative frame where Socrates acts as narrator (*Euthydemus*, *Protagoras*, *Charmides*, *Lysis*, and *Republic*), the setting of this frame is indeterminate, as is the identity of his narratee (except in the case of *Euthydemus*, where it is his friend Crito).[2] This reticence deemphasizes the significance of frame setting and narratee and thus generalizes the encounter. We are made aware that we are presented merely with a sample conversation: one particular, exemplary instance of the iterative world of Socratic dialectic.[3]

When disciples narrate past Socratic conversations the frame is sometimes similarly indeterminate (as in the case of the *Symposium* and *Parmenides*), and sometimes broadly specified: the *Theaetetus* is set in Megara and the *Phaedo* frame in Phlius. All these 'disciple narratives', however, reveal a certain implicit stress on travel and the transmission of Socratic narratives throughout Greece. The opening of the *Phaedo* (57a–b) has Echecrates asking Phaedo for a report of Socrates' execution because 'no one at all from Phlius visits Athens nowadays, and no visitor from there has arrived for a long time who could make a clear report about these matters'. Phaedo, himself not a native Athenian, thus transports the narrative beyond Athens to the northeast Peloponnese. In the *Theaetetus*, Euclides has just accompanied the wounded Theaetetus to Erineum on the way to Athens. The encounter with Theaetetus reminds him of a prior conversation with Socrates, who had recounted to him an exchange he had once had with Theaetetus as a boy, and which Euclides had memorized and subsequently written down, checking the details with Socrates on his visits to Athens.[4] Although the complex framing elements of the *Symposium* do not evoke any settings beyond Athens, the *Parmenides* opens with Cephalus, in an unspecified setting, reporting how he left his home in Clazomenae (in Ionia), arrived at Athens, met Glaucon and Adeimantus in the marketplace there, and then travelled with them to the house of Antiphon in Melite (a deme in the western part

---

[2] For the assumption that all Platonic dialogues may be treated as narratives, told by an invisible and suppressed narrator, and also for the distinction between Plato's framed and dramatic dialogues, see *SAGN* 1: 357–359.

[3] Cf. *SAGN* 2: 348–355.

[4] Nails 2002: 145 points out that Euclides was noted for his long walks. Besides his trips back and forth to Athens to see Socrates, his escort of Theaetetus to Erineum involved a roundtrip of 30km.

of the city), to hear the story of the discussion between Parmenides and Socrates. Three of these four disciple narratives, therefore, feature narrators who have travelled to and from Athens in order to record and transmit Socratic narrative. Even in the *Symposium*, the narrator Apollodorus recounts in a second framing narrative how he was coming into the city of Athens from his house in the port town of Phaleron when he was hailed by Glaucon and persuaded to tell the story of Agathon's dinner party. Thus, although the setting of the frame narration is not in itself important, it underlines the panhellenic diffusion of Socratic narrative and introduces the important motifs of travel and the journey.

Socrates' World

In the dramatic dialogues a precise setting is often specified by the inter-locutors, but must sometimes be inferred. These settings overlap with those of the conversations reported in the framed dialogues, so we may treat them as a group. With one major exception (the *Phaedrus*) the main action is located in urban space, in or close to the city of Athens (although the *Republic* takes place in its major port, the Piraeus).[5] Even the *Phaedrus* draws its meaning from juxtaposition with this urban space. Within this broad category we may distinguish several subcategories, which vary according to how public a location is. At one end of the spectrum, stoa, lawcourt, and prison mark Socrates' interaction with the appara-tus of civic government. The *Euthyphro* is set near the entrance to the Royal Stoa in the marketplace, where Socrates meets Euthyphro on his way to answer the indictment for impiety. Next comes the lawcourt of the *Apology*, where Socrates is on trial for his life. Closely associated with this space is the setting for the *Phaedo* and *Crito*, the state prison where Socrates will shortly drink the hemlock. Although the prison is not public in the sense that it is open to the multitude of the Atheni-ans, and indeed, is in one sense an intimate space, the location of the last encounters between Socrates and his family and friends, it is still a place where Socrates is subject to physical constraint and state control (in the time before he will, paradoxically, shake off these constraints for-ever).

---

[5] For a useful listing of the settings of the dialogues, see Nails 2002: 308–329. See also Montiglio 2000: 92 on Plato's characters walking in civilized space.

Next we may isolate the important category of the gymnasium/
palaestra. It is clear from the frame narrative of the *Charmides* that
Socrates is often to be found in such locations. He has recently, he tells
us, returned from campaign at Potidaea and because he had been gone
for a while 'was gladly visiting my accustomed haunts. In particular, I
entered the palaestra of Taureas opposite the shrine of Basilē' (*Chrm.*
153a). Socrates takes his seat on a bench and enters into conversation.
This bench will soon be the site of considerable slapstick, when the beau-
tiful Charmides enters, is induced to sit down next to Socrates, and then
occasions huge confusion as everyone makes room for him and tries to
sit near him, until the two spectators at the end of the bench are pushed
off (155c). The action of *Lysis* takes place as Socrates is walking from
one public gymnasium to another (travelling from the Academy to the
Lyceum), meets with a group of young men, and is persuaded to go and
talk with them in another recently-opened palaestra. Some boys are play-
ing games in the courtyard, others in the changing room, and it is in a
corner of the latter that Socrates takes his seat and conducts his exami-
nation of Lysis. The *Theaetetus* is set in a similar location, for we hear that
the young men have just finished oiling themselves in the racetrack and
will soon come inside. We are told explicitly that the setting of the main
action in the *Euthydemus* is the Lyceum, where Socrates and his young
friend Cleinias take on the sophists Euthydemus and Dionysodorus,
again in the changing room, and again surrounded by a great crowd (this
time due to the verbal pyrotechnics of the sophists rather than the beauty
of the interlocutor). Since the action of the *Laches* takes place immedi-
ately after a display of fighting in armor, we may infer that the setting is
again a gymnasium.

The palaestra setting serves multiple functions. It characterizes Socra-
tes as attractive to and attracted by the youth of Athens (whom, in the
indictment that led to his trial and death, he was accused of corrupt-
ing). The palaestra was a standard setting for pederastic courtship and
seduction (as we see especially in the *Charmides* and *Lysis*), and Socrates'
presence there both confirms his role as an expert in erotics and decon-
structs the erotic paradigm wherein the older male loses control due to
the force of his desire.[6] Socrates overcomes this danger at the beginning
of the *Charmides* and educates against it in the *Lysis*. The connection
(at least in ideology) between pedagogy and pederasty also makes the

---

[6] On the palaestra as an erotic space, see Fisher 1998: 94–104.

palaestra an ideal locus for Socratic conversation, as he sets young men on the path to self-knowledge by exposing their intellectual pretensions (and those of their lovers). Finally the palaestra setting serves a symbolic function, since physical exercise has an intellectual counterpart. The former is a precursor to (but cannot replace) the latter (cf. *Republic* 403c–e), and dialectic in the palaestra foregrounds the relationship between the two.

This brief survey of the palaestra setting illustrates one significant aspect of interaction in the Socratic dialogue: its sometime location in a space that mediates between the public and the private. As we have seen, Socrates' appearance in the civic space of court and prison marks the breakdown of his philosophical mission. Several passages in the corpus are concerned to isolate philosophical space and distinguish it from its civic counterpart. Thus Socrates in the *Republic* (492b–c) speaks of corrupt civic education as occurring when the citizens sit in 'assemblies or law courts or theatres or camps or some other public assembly of the multitude'. Philosophers on the other hand, as we learn in the *Theaetetus*, 'from the time that they are young don't know the way to the marketplace, nor where the law court or the council-chamber is, or any other public meeting-place of the city' (173c–d). This is an extreme formulation and it is clear that Socrates does know the way to the agora and has served on the Council. Indeed, Xenophon (*Mem.* 1.1.10) reports that he was always in the open: in the morning on the public walks and at gymnasia, at noon in the marketplace, and during the rest of the day he went wherever conversation was to be had. Xenophon's list overlaps with the Platonic settings we are considering, but it still seems interesting that Plato's Socrates is not explicitly seen in the marketplace, except when going to answer his indictment. Nor do we ever, with the exception of his trial, see him in any of the public meeting places depreciated in these passages. The palaestra serves as a kind of mediating space between these public gatherings and private space, devoted as it is to the training of the body and conducive to the examination of the mind and pedagogic erotics. Yet it is notable that the least successful conversation associated with these palaestra settings is that of the *Euthydemus* in the Lyceum, the only explicitly public gymnasium where we see Socrates interact. Here, the conversation ends not just in *aporia* but breaks down entirely under the influence of sophistic display, although the sizeable crowd claps and cheers until the very columns of the Lyceum make an uproar (303b). Socrates' ironic response is to advise the sophists that their cleverness is not suitable for public performance. Thus they should not 'speak in front

of many people in case they learn quickly and are ungrateful. Rather you should talk only to each other' (304a). The more public the venue, the less chance there is of making progress in the conversation.

Socrates' encounters with sophists often take place in similar quasi-public settings. When intellectual experts visited Athens, they stayed in the private houses of elite individuals, sometimes performing and teaching there, but sometimes in larger and more open venues.[7] Thus at the beginning of the *Gorgias*, a dramatic dialogue, Socrates and Chaerephon arrive at the place where Gorgias has just been giving an *epideixis*. Although we soon learn that he is staying at the house of the Athenian Callicles, and would be happy to give another performance there, it seems that the main action of the dialogue takes place in the space previously devoted to the *epideixis* and in front of the same audience.[8] This may well have been a palaestra, but we are given no explicit information to settle the question. The same goes for the setting of the *Hippias Minor*, which is also indoors. Hippias has just given an *epideixis* on Homer, and most of the audience has now departed. Socrates has a question that he did not ask during the display because 'there was a great crowd inside and I did not want to get in the way of your performance by asking my question. But now we are fewer …' (364b). The venue must then be large enough for a great crowd, although Socrates clearly considers such a place to be unconducive to discussion; both the *Gorgias* and *Hippias Minor* (and indeed, the *Laches*) take place after an *epideixis*, though in the same space—an indication of the transitional nature of such spaces between public and private. The danger of such locations is that discussion may give way to display. This is a constant concern and is reflected, as we saw, in the *Euthydemus*, where the space for *epideixis* and discussion has become thoroughly confused.

This brings us to the *Protagoras* and other dialogues set explicitly in private houses. The conversations taking place in such settings are sometimes private, sometimes quasi-public. The *Protagoras* is a good transitional case because the main action of the dialogue, although set in a private house, also blurs the boundaries between exhibition space and

---

[7] The setting of the *Meno* is uncertain. Meno is visiting Athens from Thessaly, and is used to speaking in public, but the conversation remains small-scale. The chance intervention of Anytus (later Socrates' accuser; 89e–90a), however, shows that the dialogue must take place in a public space.

[8] Dodds 1959: 189. Rutherford 2002: 252–253 has further comments on the 'vagueness' of the location here.

private space. The frame of the dialogue has, as we have noted, an indeterminate setting as Socrates converses with an unknown acquaintance, but the main narrative moves from Socrates' own house (the only time in the corpus the narratees access this most intimate space) to the house of the wealthy Callias, who is hosting several of the most renowned sophists of the day; the occasion of the dialogue is the visit of Protagoras of Abdera to Athens, which causes huge excitement. The young Hippocrates, Socrates narrates, knocks on Socrates' door just before first light, sits on his bed, persuades Socrates to accompany and introduce him to Protagoras, and the two of them have a discussion in the courtyard of the house until it is time to set out. Upon arrival at Callias' house, they are at first refused entrance by the porter, and then enter, with Socrates describing the picture before them from a fixed scenic standpoint and through allusion to Odysseus' *katabasis* in the *Odyssey* (314e–316a).[9] First he sees Protagoras and his 'chorus' of admirers walking in formation in one courtyard portico, then Hippias seated with his audience in the opposite one, and then Prodicus in a storage room that had been transformed into a guest room. The detail of the comically cantankerous porter at the door ensures that we realize this is an elite scene, and there is some possibility that the conversation with Protagoras will remain a private matter, but Socrates realizes that Protagoras wants to 'make a display to Prodicus and Hippias' and thus the entire company gathers around, dragging up benches and couches (317c–d). Protagoras, then, wants to make a public display of his wisdom, an impulse that Socrates resists at several points in the dialogue (so, e.g., 334c–335c). Sophistic space for Plato is always a quasi-public display space, and the very nature of this space militates against successful philosophical conversation.

The dining room of the tragic poet Agathon, setting for the main action of the *Symposium*, is another elite space. In this instance, the host tries to give the conversation an intellectual turn, but this is still not truthful and philosophical enough for Socrates, who complains that the various speeches in praise of love are merely flattering eulogies, an elite display performance parallel to sophistic *epideixis* (198d–199b). The dining room is a private space, but has been penetrated by superficial modes of thought and speech. This space does, however, influence the narrative, since the order of speeches is determined (for the most part)

---

[9] For the *katabasis* allusions and their implications, see Klär 1969: 256–258 and Denyer 2008: 82, 84.

by the order in which the guests are seated on the dining couches.[10] With the arrival of Alcibiades at the end of the dialogue the placement of the participants again becomes crucial as Socrates, Agathon, and Alcibiades play out an erotic comedy of jealousy concerning who sits next to whom (213a–e). These details of erotic proximity perform a characterizing function.

Yet two discussions of substance definitely do take place in private houses. The main action of the *Parmenides* presents an intense conversation between Parmenides and the young Socrates at the house of Pythodorus (where both Parmenides and Zeno were staying) outside the city walls in the Ceramicus (127b–c). The narrative of the *Republic* begins, famously, with Socrates' descent to the port of Piraeus to see the festival of Bendis, and his meeting, as he attempts to return to the city, with a group of young friends who compel him to go back down to the house of Cephalus. There the company take their seats on stools and discuss justice and the ideal state. These important discussions take place outside the city of Athens proper, and this may be some indication of the difficulty in making philosophical progress in the city. Yet as Burnyeat (1997) realized, the opening sentence of the *Republic* (and in particular its first word: *katebēn*, 'I went down') also presents Socrates' trip to the Piraeus as a *katabasis*, a journey to the underworld. As was the case with the *Protagoras* (mentioned above), where the entry into the sophistic realm conjures comparisons with Odysseus' trip to the land of the dead, the theme of *katabasis* resonates within the *Republic*, comprehending both Socrates' physical journey and the descent of the enlightened philosopher back into the 'cave' of life in the city in order to educate the citizens, as well as the eschatological myth of Er at the end of the dialogue, which involves a trip to and observation of travels within the underworld.[11] The location of and the journey to the house of Cephalus, the setting of the main action, is thus an excellent example of the symbolic function of setting.

Finally, two dialogues are set in the countryside. The *Laws* (in which Socrates does not appear) is set during a walk through the Cretan countryside from Knossos to the shrine of Zeus on Mt. Ida. The Athenian Stranger and his companions encourage themselves with the prospect of frequent stops along the way among the 'marvellously beautiful and

---

[10] 214b–c: 'we decided that each of us in turn should make a speech about Love, moving from left to right'.
[11] Burnyeat 1997: 4–8.

lofty cypresses in the groves and … meadows' (625b–c). We are to imagine that the conversation occurs in an alternation of rest and motion, although once the beginning of the dialogue is past there is no reference to environment. More detailed description of locale comes in the *Phaedrus*, the dialogue that takes Socrates, unusually, into the countryside, and is famed as presenting one of the first instances of the literary *locus amoenus*.[12] The dialogue is, as Ferrari has observed, 'rich in references to its own setting', and these references have characterizing, thematic, and symbolic functions: 'by considering how Socrates and Phaedrus orient themselves in their physical environment, and by recognizing what this reveals of their characters, the reader is oriented to the dialogue's major concerns'.[13]

The dialogue opens with a pregnant question from Socrates, 'Dear Phaedrus, where have you come from and where are you going?' (227a). Phaedrus is going for a walk outside the city walls on the advice of a doctor friend. The two of them turn off to walk 'along the Ilissus' and make towards a tall plane tree. When they arrive, Socrates is overcome by admiration of the spot and speaks a little panegyric from a shifting actorial scenic standpoint:[14]

> By Hera, what a beautiful resting place! This plane tree is very tall and spreading, and the height and shadiness of the chasteberry tree is absolutely fine. It's at the height of its flowering and so makes the place very sweet-smelling. And then the spring of very cool water flows most delightfully under the plane tree—or at least that's the evidence of my feet! It appears from the images of maidens and other statues that it's sacred to Achelous and some of the nymphs. And again, if you please, see how lovely and extremely sweet is the airiness of the place. It resounds with a chorus of cicadas—the shrill sound of summer. But the most exquisite thing of all is the quality of the grass. It's sufficiently abundant for someone reclining slightly up the bank to keep his head in a very comfortable position. Dear Phaedrus, you have been an outstanding guide.   (230b–c)

We infer from this description that Socrates is moving as he speaks, that just as he can tell the coolness of the water because he is wading in it, so he can report on the comfort of the bank for one's head because

---

[12] Schönbeck 1962: 102–111. For an attempt to connect the *locus amoenus* here with the dialogue's theme of love and rhetoric, as well as for the influence of this passage on Cicero and others, see Hass 1998: 31–34, 142.

[13] Ferrari 1987: 1–2. Cf. also 'topography becomes the topic of conversation in a highly obtrusive manner' (3).

[14] Ferrari 1987: 16, with notes 21 and 22.

he is reclining himself. His praise leads Phaedrus to comment on his strangeness; he is, literally, 'extremely out of place' (*atopōtatos*, 230c), like a stranger rather than a native, someone who almost never ventures outside the walls. Setting and philosophic action in this dialogue are connected: we may note that the walk of Phaedrus and Socrates *outside* the walls of Athens, with its beautiful trees, grass, and water, foreshadows the myth of the charioteer in Socrates' second speech, where the soul-chariots of the gods mount to the summit of heaven and then pass *outside*, stand on the back of heaven, and are carried around by its revolution to gaze upon the world of the Forms (247b–c), an activity in which non-divine souls may partly share.[15] This 'place beyond the heavens' (247c) is the home of true beauty and real nourishment for the soul. Indeed, several parts of the dialogue meditate on what it means for the soul to be out of place.

This brief survey of settings confirms that Plato almost never elaborates details of place for their own sake; evocation of place serves a thematic/symbolic purpose. Even his use of props is limited. We are told of the benches and couches that enable conversation, of cloaks (used to cover the head in shame or in death, to emphasize the glory of a young man's body under a covering, or to serve as a makeshift blanket and screen for potential sexual activity), occasionally of beds, of Socrates' chains in prison (removed on the morning of his death and thus again symbolic, as well as providing the springboard for thoughts on pleasure and pain) and the famous cup of hemlock, the ribbons with which Alcibiades crowns Agathon and Socrates (again symbolic), and the book-roll containing Lysias' speech that Phaedrus hides beneath his cloak as he tries to channel the orator's expertise.[16] This list is of course not exhaustive but underlines the point above: details of setting and props are minimal or symbolic. This need not surprise. Platonic dialogues are concentrated samplings of philosophical conversation, stripped of extraneous details. As was the case with temporal markers, precise indications create particular effects. If no indication of place is given, the narratees will simply assume that Socrates or one of his disciples has met an

---

[15] K.A. Morgan 2000: 228.
[16] Benches: *Chrm.* 155c (implicitly), *Prt.* 317d–e; couches: *Smp.* 174e–175a, 213a–e, 217d; cloaks: *Phdr.* 228d, 237a (implicitly); *Phd.* 118a (implicitly); *Chrm.* 155d, *Smp.* 219b–c; beds: *Prt.* 310c; *Phd.* 60b; chains: *Phd.* 59e–60c; ribbons: *Smp.* 213a–e; cup of hemlock: *Phd.* 117a–c; book-roll: *Phdr.* 228d–e.

interested/interesting person on no street in particular and that they will divert to the most convenient place for conversation or talk as they walk. The focus is on the topic at hand.

Socrates and Athens

Yet even if narratees can seldom create a mental picture of the immediate setting of a dialogue, one thing is clear: the main setting of every dialogue is Athens and its periphery. Socrates, the unique philosopher, is uniquely Athenian. Like other citizens, he served in the army, and we hear of his participation in the campaigns at Potidaea and Delium, but this was the extent of his travels. When Cephalus greets Socrates at the beginning of the *Republic*, he complains that 'You don't often come down to visit us in the Piraeus—but you should … you must come here more frequently' (328c–d). Not only this, but, as we saw Phaedrus remark (230c–d), Socrates only rarely even ventures outside the walls, and this is seen as constitutive of his strangeness: he is out of place in the countryside. Socrates' response to Phaedrus is noteworthy, clarifying as it does why there is so little description of landscape or even of setting in the Platonic corpus: 'I am a lover of learning. Places and trees can't teach me anything, but men in the city do' (230d).[17] When the personified Laws of the *Crito* try to persuade Socrates not to escape from prison, they point out that any Athenian who is dissatisfied with the Athenian way of life can emigrate from the city (51d). Socrates in particular has been satisfied with his home: 'for you would not have spent time in it more than all the other Athenians if it did not please you especially. Never yet have you left the city to attend a festival, except for once to the Isthmus, nor to any other place unless to serve in the army, nor have you ever engaged in any other travel as other men do, nor have you ever been seized by a desire to know another city or other laws' (52b). During the penalty phase of his trial, Socrates refused exile (52c). If he now went to a well-ordered state like Thebes or Megara he would come as a lawbreaker and enemy to the constitution, if to a disordered place like Thessaly he would be a laughing-stock (53b–54a). Socrates may well be impervious to his physical surroundings—we hear in the *Symposium* (220a–b) that during

---

[17] Montiglio 2000: 98 perceptively suggests that Socrates' statement (*Ap*. 22a–e) that he wandered all over Athens in his philosophic quest is a mockery of the wanderings of Presocratic sages, given his notorious stay-at-home propensities.

the bitter winter campaign at Potidaea he was impervious to the cold, walking on the icy ground in bare feet and clothed only in a threadbare mantle—but his mission, as we learn in the *Apology*, is to Athens. It was, perhaps, the only place in Greece that would have given him a license to be as annoying as he was for as long as he was.

Spatial Ellipsis and Socratic Stillness

Just as acceleration in time can occur when Plato moves rapidly over parts of the action deemed to have only marginal philosophical interest, so too we find spatial ellipsis, where the text makes it clear that movement through space is occurring although it is not described.[18] This is particularly frequent at the beginning of a dialogue. Thus the *Gorgias* starts (probably) outside the location where Gorgias has been performing. It is clear that the interlocutors are not close to the sophist, but then approach and address him. We meet a similar situation in the *Laches*, where the four initial speakers start at some distance from Socrates and then walk over to him. In the *Phaedrus* Socrates declares his attention to cross the river and leave (242a), but only a few lines later (242b–c) he reports that 'when I was about to cross the river, my divine and accustomed sign happened, the one that always holds me back when I'm about to do something, and I seemed to hear some voice right there, which didn't let me depart'. Evidently Socrates has tried to leave and then returned to the scene. Such implicit indications of movement within a scene are familiar to the narratee because of his or her experience of Greek drama, in which there were similarly no stage directions.[19] The dramatic format of many of Plato's dialogues entails that we must imagine movement through space based on inferences from the text. Yet there is a difference: Greek drama was intended for stage performance, while a Platonic dialogue was probably intended to be read to its audience rather than performed by a cast of characters. Whereas a performance of drama will make movement through space explicit, the performance of a Platonic dialogue will not. A good reader who knows the dialogue might pause at an appropriate moment, but generally we are left to supply the action as we realize its importance, or otherwise take it for granted as we focus on people rather than space.

---

[18] For acceleration in Plato, see *SAGN* 2: 364–367.

[19] As Taplin 1978: 17 has argued, '*all* the action *necessary* for a viable and comprehensible production of a Greek tragedy is, as a matter of fact, included in the words'.

Corresponding to ellipsis of motion in the dialogues is the narration (twice) of Socratic motionlessness as the embodiment of his philosophical focus. Early on in the main narration of the *Symposium* we are told how Socrates begins to lag behind his companion because he is lost in his own thoughts; by the time his friend arrives at the house of Agathon Socrates is no longer with him. A servant reports that Socrates 'has retreated into the neighbours' porch and is standing there. Although I called him he won't come in' (175a). Agathon thinks that this is strange (or 'out of place', *atopon*), but the companion explains that 'this is a custom of his: sometimes he stands apart wherever he happens to be' (175b). Later on (220c–d), Alcibiades tells a similar tale, how on campaign Socrates 'having conceived of some problem stood there on the spot thinking it over from dawn onwards, and when he was having no success with it, he didn't let it go but stood there searching it out'. Midday comes and goes, and then the following night, until at daybreak Socrates says his prayers and moves on. This freezing into motionlessness signifies the most intense mental activity and motion.[20] In some sense, Socrates is no longer in this world; like the philosopher in the *Phaedrus*, he retreats from mortal concerns to be close to the divine, and is therefore considered by the many to be disturbed (*parakinōn*, 249c–d). These two small episodes remove Socrates from normal space-time.

Eschatology and Beyond

So far, this chapter has examined Socrates and Socratic conversation as embedded in the world of Athens. We have noted how Socrates avoids straightforwardly public assemblies and meetings, inhabiting instead (when we can tell) the mediating space of the palaestra and various rooms of private houses. Socrates' moments of philosophic rapture considered in the previous section point us towards a fundamental truth: the philosopher is not at home in this world. Indeed, the *Phaedo* tells us that the philosopher's life is really a practice for death, that the body and the physical world it inhabits are a burden and a distraction (66b–67e). Several dialogues (*Gorgias*, *Phaedo*, *Republic*, *Phaedrus*) present us with a vision of the soul freed from this earthly space and travelling through

---

[20] Compare also how, in the *Protagoras*, the entry of Socrates and Hippocrates into the house of Protagoras is delayed as the two of them stand in the porch to carry a piece of discussion through to its conclusion (314c). For the connection of Socrates' 'standing withdrawal' with walking as a frame for philosophic inquiry, see Montiglio 2000: 94–95.

the afterlife and another realm. Even though the soul is not a physical entity, this other realm is still presented in terms of a landscape. We are thus faced with the paradox of a symbolic yet real landscape through which souls travel and in which they experience pain and joy as if they were embodied and could eat and drink. How are we to characterize this space? Nightingale has usefully introduced the notion of the Bakhtinian chronotope (→ Introduction) to this discussion. She examines briefly Bakhtin's development of the chronotope of eschatology, 'which is said to "drain" and "bleed" the present by measuring human life according to an otherwordly standard', before exploring how this chronotope functions in the works of Plato.[21] The chronotope fuses 'spatial and temporal indicators … into one carefully thought-out, concrete whole. Time, as it were, thickens, takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible, likewise space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot, and history.'[22] Plato's myths of the afterlife evidently inhabit this chronotope; in these symbolic narratives the ethics of individuals become concrete, gain quasi-physical expression in a landscape, and are transposed to a very different time-scale. Ordinary scales of time, place, and ethics are devalued.

In the *Gorgias* we are presented with a picture of the world of the dead that has Hades in control and features prominent post-mortem judgment, where righteous souls depart to the Isles of the Blest while the wicked are dispatched to Tartarus for punishment (523a–526d). This 'underworld' has a meadow and a crossroads and a prison house, but there is no detailed description; it is merely a symbolic sketch. We know from the 'Orphic' gold tablets that by the fifth century a detailed geography of the underworld had developed in some circles, rooted in the descriptions of the underworld found in epic and lyric. The tablets feature springs, lakes, paths, trees, and are mnemonic devices to remind the initiated soul of the route it should take in the land of the dead. Plato's topography reflects these traditions (and others) selectively, though he transforms them to express his own ethical vision.[23] Matters become even

---

[21] Nightingale 2002a; quote is at 220. Nightingale's larger purpose in this paper is to expand Bakhtin's chronotope to include the chronotope Bakhtin labels as 'historical inversion', the privileging of a blissful and lost prehistoric past (223), and to suggest the possibility of an 'ecological' eschatology focused on the physical as opposed to metaphysical world (240). Rutherford 2002: 252 also considers Plato's works in terms of the chronotope.

[22] Bakhtin 1981: 84, quoted in Nightingale 2002a: 221.

[23] As Annas observes, in all Plato's myths of judgment, the judging takes place at a

more complex in the *Phaedo*. Annas has observed how the eschatological myth in this dialogue presents a 'long chunk of fanciful cosmology' (to such an extent that Aristotle objected that the geography of the myth was impossible), and how, importantly, 'Heaven and hell are no longer places outside our world; rather they are parts of our world when that is seen for what it really is rather than from our present limited viewpoint'.[24] The myth certainly involves a vertiginous change of perspective:

> There are many marvellous places on the earth, and the earth itself is neither of the quality or size that is supposed by those who are accustomed to speak about the earth … It is absolutely huge, and we who live between the Phasis and the Pillars of Heracles inhabit only a small part of it, living around the sea like ants or frogs around a pond, and many other beings live elsewhere in many such places. For there are many hollows of all sorts—both in shape and size—everywhere around the earth, into which water and air and mist flow together, but the earth itself is pure and lies in pure heaven, where the stars also are, which the majority of those who are accustomed to talk about such things call the aether.   (108c, 109a–c)

We mistakenly imagine that we live on the surface of the earth, whereas we inhabit a murky hollow. The surface of the real earth is like a variegated ball, where colours are more vivid; trees, plants, mountains, gems are more beautiful; the weather is more temperate. Inhabitants of these realms have superior faculties, and their temples really are inhabited by the gods (110b–111c). The underneath of the earth is honeycombed by rivers of water, fire, mud, and lava, seething to and fro and all meeting in Tartarus. After death, the soul is judged and either expiates its sins in the underworld or is rewarded by being allowed to live on the earth's true surface (111d–114c). Those purified by philosophy 'live in the future entirely without bodies and arrive at habitations even more beautiful than these, which it is not easy to make clear, nor is the present time sufficient to do so' (114c)—note the indescribabilty motif here, underlining the incapacity of the embodied soul to control the details of post-mortem existence.[25]

---

crossroads (1982: 131). For the geography of the underworld in the gold tablets and its relationship to previous tradition (as well as to Plato), see Graf and Johnston 2007: 96–121. For possible connections with Pythagorean underworld geography in the *Gorgias*, see Kingsley 1995: 104–105.

[24] Annas 1982: 119–120, 126.

[25] Cf. *Phd.* 114d and K.A. Morgan 2000: 199. It is significant that the description breaks down when Socrates reaches the point where he must talk about the habitations of those who will live without bodies forever: how would they inhabit a physical cosmos? No wonder these places are difficult to make clear.

This fascinating description deserves fuller treatment than it can receive in the present context. Sedley has suggested that the wealth of description may answer to Socrates' demand earlier in the dialogue for a teleological ordering of the cosmos, and this seems entirely plausible.[26] We should also note that the description takes place from a panoramic standpoint through the eyes of a hypothetical focalizer:[27] if *someone* 'should come to its [the world's] summit or grow wings and fly up he would poke his head out and see—just like the fish here who poke their heads out of the sea and observe what's here, just so someone would also see what's there, and if his nature were strong enough to bear the sight, he would recognize that this is the true heaven and the true light and the true earth' (109e–110a). The eschatology attempts to sketch a rationally ordered cosmos that provides an appropriate context for the travails of the soul. Individual details all serve to clarify the consequences of justice or injustice for the fate of the soul or the fatally flawed perspective we now use when we talk about the world and our place in it. This is an attempt to change the narratees' ethical and cosmological perspective.[28] There may be connections between the *Phaedo* and Pythagorean accounts of the underworld, but this stress on radical changes of perspective is surely Plato's own.[29]

The Myth of Er in the final book of the *Republic* again combines a cosmic vision with post-mortem judgment, this time from an actorial scenic standpoint, relating the experiences of Er in the afterlife and his return to life on his funeral pyre to report after being commanded to 'look at and listen to everything in the place' (614d).[30] The tale begins with judgment, after which good souls travel through heavenly openings and return, and bad souls pass beneath the earth, meeting in a meadow. Er does not make the heavenly or subterranean journey himself, but tells at second hand the tales of bliss and punishment he hears in the meadow. Again,

[26] Sedley 1989.

[27] Cf. Nightingale 2002b: 240–242. For the anonymous witness device, see also *SAGN* 1: index.

[28] On the importance of viewpoint and the change in perspective here, see also Nightingale 2002b.

[29] Kingsley 1995: 88–111 argues that a developed Pythagorean tradition of lakes of boiling mud, rivers of fire, and descents into the underworld through volcanoes was an important source for the eschatological myth of Plato's *Phaedo* and played an important part in a Pythagorean eschatology of afterworld punishment, expiation, and reincarnation. Cf. also Edmonds 2004: 164–165, 196–198 for a skeptical approach, and one that is more concerned to identify traditional elements in the myth of judgment.

[30] Cf. Rutherford 2002: 256–259 on the extension of the *Republic* in time and space.

then, we have the standard judgment topography of crossroads, meadow, and Tartarus, but a cosmic perspective is provided when the time comes for souls to be reincarnated.[31] Er sees the 'spindle of necessity' running through the orbits of the heavenly bodies, with Sirens and Fates stationed on the orbits, and the revolutions generating a concordant harmony (616b–617d). After choosing a new life, the souls journey to the 'Plain of Forgetfulness' and drink from the 'River of Heedlessness' before shooting up like stars to be reincarnated (621a–b). This is clearly a symbolic landscape, as we see from the presiding figure of Necessity (617b, 621a). It may owe something to contemporary astronomical theory and probably has close connections with Orphic/Pythagorean accounts of the underworld and cosmos.[32] Like the myth of *Phaedo*, it sets the fate of the soul within a cosmic structure that binds both soul and cosmos into a teleologically ordered whole.

Soul and cosmos are again intimately bound in the charioteer myth of the *Phaedrus*. Here, it is the job of the soul (defined as a self-mover) to direct the material operations of the universe, and this picture is combined with the story of the fate of the mortal soul as it attempts to follow its patron god towards the summit of the universe and gaze upon the 'place beyond the heavens' and the Forms. Judgement, although present, is not so prominent as in the dialogues previously considered. The soul's failure to see the place beyond the heavens results in embodiment, and after each embodiment the soul is judged and receives either a heavenly reward or an earthly chastisement (248e–249b—a summary version of what we have seen in the *Republic* and *Phaedo*) and subsequent reincarnation for a given number of lives (although philosophical souls may escape earlier). A major focus of the myth, however, is the place beyond the heavens, characterized by a version of the indescribability motif: 'None of our earthly poets has ever yet hymned the place beyond the heavens, nor will ever do so worthily, but it is like this—for we must dare to speak the truth, especially when we are speaking about the truth—for colourless, shapeless, intangible reality that really exists, visible only to the steersman of the soul, that which true knowledge has as its object, is in this place' (247c). This use of indescribability is pointed. The place cannot be described in terms of anything physical—colour, shape, or

---

[31] There has been considerable scholarly disagreement on precisely where in the universe Er and the souls are located when they see the spindle. Adam 1902: II 445 concludes that the scene takes place at the center of the earth, but see Schils 1993.

[32] Adam 1902: II 442.

touch—nor is it even 'visible' except in a metaphorical sense. One can speak the truth about it, but not really describe it. Indeed, this place cannot properly be defined in terms of eschatology, since it is beyond the boundaries that form the temporal and spatial *eskhata* of the cosmos. Yet if any place were the true *locus amoenus*, this would be it.

This is the metaphysical realm, a space that can be described only by metaphors or negatives.[33] With the 'place beyond the heavens' of the *Phaedrus* we may associate the metaphorical landscape of the cave from the *Republic* (514a–520e). In this famous sequence Socrates constructs a symbolic landscape to express the conversion of the soul from contemplating the world of becoming to contemplating true being. Humans are prisoners chained facing a wall in a cave, seeing only the shadows of objects carried behind them and created by the light of a fire. If one were to release a prisoner and make him turn round to face the light, he would be dazzled and confused. Even more pain would follow if he were forced to leave the cave and go into the open air. At first he could only bear to look at shadows and reflections, but finally he would be able to see the sky and the sun (the image of the Good). This landscape, then, exists not for its own sake, but for the sake of what it represents. It is an image (*eikōn*, 517a).

Metaphysical space is conceptual space, existing beyond the cosmos. It generates a language of image and indescribability; this reaches its acme in the *Timaeus*' description of the 'receptacle' during an account of the creation and nature of the cosmos. The creator of the cosmos, the Demiurge, looked to an intelligible pattern when he created the material universe, but this account is insufficient (48e–49a). The argument demands that Timaeus 'try to make apparent in words a difficult and indistinct form … the very receptacle of all becoming and, as it were, its nurse' (49a). This is the 'category of space, which does not admit destruction and provides a seating for all things that come into being, but is itself graspable by a kind of bastard reasoning and without sense-perception' (52a–b). We have arrived at a place that is, literally, fundamental, but which cannot really be described at all.[34]

---

[33] A metaphysical chronotope? Cf. Nightingale 2002b: 242–243 for the important point that in the *Phaedrus* different chronotopes (civic, psychic, the place beyond the heavens) interpenetrate.

[34] For a detailed consideration of the problems associated with the receptacle, space, and matter, see Algra 1995: 72–120.

Political Geographies

Descriptions of place in Plato are, as we have seen, included for their thematic and symbolic heft. Locations such as Crete and Sparta (*Laws*, *Crito*), Thebes and Megara (*Crito*) are mentioned as exemplars of good government but never described in detail. When the Eleatic Stranger in the *Statesman* talks of life in the Age of Cronus (271e–272a), he recounts the consequences of the divine governance that obtained in that time: mortals did not cultivate the earth but plants gave forth abundant fruits of their own accord, and mortals spent their time in the open on the soft grass (for there were no seasons). Yet this golden age environment was apolitical, and therefore irrelevant to present concerns. Of greater interest are the political landscapes that we meet in the *Laws* and *Timaeus*/*Critias*. *Laws* book 4 spends a little time discussing the benefits and disadvantages of an inland or maritime location for a city, and book 5.745d–e describes the prospective arrangement of property lots for the citizens. Yet the fullest description of place in the Platonic corpus occurs as a pendant to the abstract and somewhat frustrating account of the cosmos and space given by Timaeus. The dialogue *Timaeus* begins with a summary account of a prehistoric conflict between the island empire of Atlantis and ancient Athens, and its companion dialogue *Critias* opens with a detailed scene-setting description of ancient Athens and Atlantis before breaking off, significantly, at a quasi-epic council of the gods that would have started a war narrative.

The landscapes of Athens and Atlantis are both politically significant. The ekphrases of both states are characterized by dynamic description wherein is narrated not only the physical layout of city and countryside, but how that layout, and indeed, the land itself, changed over generations as the result of human and divine intervention and natural forces. The ekphrasis of Attica is broadly divided into two parts: we are presented first with the countryside and then the city. The territory of Attica was more extensive than it is now and also more fertile. The periodic deluges that destroy civilization in this version of history washed away huge amounts of soil, so that 'in comparison with what existed then, the present territory left behind is like the bones of a sick body. The earth that was rich and soft has flowed away, and only a slender body of land was left behind. But then it was unharmed and had mountains that were lofty hills' (111b–c). Water was stored in the soil in layers of impermeable clay so that there were many springs and rivers (111d). The Acropolis was

larger and had a level surface covered in soil, and there the military class lived, while farmers and craftsmen lived further down (112a–d). These ancient Athenians were very virtuous, corresponding, by a mysterious historical coincidence, to the stratified society described by Socrates in a *Republic*-like discussion the previous day (*Ti.* 17c–19a, 26c–d). Thus the description of territory is intimately connected with the way of life of the inhabitants.

Plato reserves the full force of his creative power for the ekphrasis of the island of Atlantis, which takes up over five Stephanus pages (113c–118e) and is narrated by Critias from a panoramic standpoint. The organization of the ekphrasis is, broadly speaking, spatial (though extremely complex), but once again the description is narratively dynamic, befitting the focus on stability (in the case of Athens) or degeneration (in the case of Atlantis) through time. Critias first describes the island at the time when the god Poseidon founded the dynasty of Atlantean kings. He starts with the centre of the island, the place where Poseidon slept with a mortal woman and then modified the topography by 'fortifying' the mountain in the middle of the central plan by rings of sea and land and creating springs of warm and cold water in the central island. After listing the children who resulted from the union of Poseidon and the mortal, Critias lists the natural resources of the island: mineral resources, forests, pasture, fruits and other crops. The first section of the description ends here at 115b with a summary sentence ('All these beautiful, marvellous, and abundant products the sacred island once bore …') before turning to the improvements made to the island ('taking all of these products from the earth, they built … in the following arrangement'). This second section moves again from a focus on the central city to a description of the whole island. The royal family further modified the landscape, bridging the rings of sea around the central island, creating a canal from there to the sea, and ornamenting the rings of land with walls and buildings, all of variegated colours and materials. Critias then describes the acropolis of the central island with its palace and its impressive temple of Poseidon, which was:

> a stade in length, three hundred feet broad, and of a height commensurate with these, but having a certain barbarian look about it. They coated the entire outside of the temple with silver, except for the roof finials, which were of gold. As for the interior, the entire roof was ivory, embellished (*pepoikilmenēn*) with gold and silver and orichalch, and all the rest of the walls and columns and flooring they surrounded with orichalch. They set golden statues inside, one of the god standing on his chariot as a charioteer

of six winged horses—he touched the peak of the roof because of his size—
and a hundred Nereids on dolphins in a circle around him (for in those
days they thought there were that many of them). There were many other
statues inside, offerings from private citizens.   (116c–e)

He then moves out from the city centre to the surrounding rings of
land, with their orchards, gymnasia, racetracks, dockyards and barracks.
Finally, Critias dismisses the capital (117e–118a) and returns to the
central plain and mountain surrounding it, narrating its villages, lakes,
meadows, canals and irrigation systems. At the end of this account he
explains the way the land was organized to provide manpower for the
army. Yet, he stresses, 'the military dispositions of the royal city were
arranged in this way, but the arrangements of the nine other districts
were conducted differently and it would take a long time to tell them'
(119b)—a narrative move akin to the indescribability motif, underlining
how, in spite of the fullness of the account we have already received, we
have only scratched the surface of the complexity of ancient Atlantean
society and its environment.[35]

    This is a relentless bombardment of physical detail, unprecedented in
Plato, and we may fairly ask what its function is. Gill speculates about
an increased interest in prehistory and history—and thus presumably
in contingent detail—in Plato's later work,[36] but this is probably not
the whole story. As Gill again puts it, 'The description of Atlantis—
its topography, flora, and fauna, engineering and architecture (all of
them fabulous and other-worldly)—is given with remarkably graphic
and detailed realism. These details may all have relevance to Plato's
underlying themes; but their significance is by no means on the surface.'[37]
The sheer richness of the portrayal contrasts with the shorter and simpler
description of ancient Attica, and the contrast surely has to do with the
political character of the two lands involved. Recent scholarship on the
myth of Athens and Atlantis has concluded that ancient Atlantis has
been designed by Plato to recall Athens as an imperial society in the late
fifth and early fourth centuries (characterized by greed for conquest and

---

[35] Cf. *Phd.* 114c: 'they come to habitations still more beautiful than these, which it is
not easy to make clear, *nor does the present time suffice*'.

[36] Gill 1977: 299.

[37] Gill 1979: 74. Gill further imagines that Plato's purpose may have been 'to create a
philosophical fable which was more realistic than any of his previous myths, which went
further towards creating its own phantasm-world'.

gain and an extensive maritime empire).[38] The description of Atlantis is entrancing—so much so that it has entranced and convinced generations of future readers—but its very seductions set off philosophical warning bells. We would do well to remember from our reading of the *Republic* that lovers of sights and sounds are not true philosophers (476a–b), that democracy 'like a variegated (*poikilon*) mantle embroidered (*pepoikilmenon*) with all sorts of bright colours … would appear very beautiful, embroidered (*pepoikilmenē*) with all sorts of characters' (557c) and that the disordered democratic man is 'of all sorts and full of very many characters, and beautiful and variegated (*poikilon*)' (561e). The Atlanteans' propensity for richness, colour, and variety and their active intervention in their environment identify them as problematic for the attentive reader. If they generate thick geographical description, this is none to the good.[39] The account of Atlantis was influential for later writers such as Euhemerus and Theopompus who, as Gill has remarked, 'created stories that are, roughly, in the same genre as the Atlantis story: that is, stories of fantastic constitutions and climates set in remote and undiscoverable places',[40] but for Plato it was a problematic—and self-consciously abortive—experiment.

Conclusion

The most important setting for the soul in Platonic dialogues is not Athens nor any place in the sensible realm. The goal of the philosophic project is to get in touch with realities that have little to do with either marketplace or countryside. The essence of the human soul (as we learn from *Phdr.* 245c–246b) is eternal self-motion; it moves forever through a cosmic landscape that intersects only incidentally with the settings of the dialogues. Its journey through mortal life is a journey through the world of matter, from which it will, if it has aspirations to wisdom, attempt to distance itself. This tension between soul and setting plays out in the dialogues, where environments are conjured not for their intrinsic interest, but for how they enable reflection and for what they

---

[38] K.A. Morgan 1998 (with review of previous scholarship). For connections between Athens and the fifth-century context, Vidal-Naquet 1964 is fundamental.

[39] Cf. Janaway 1995: 100–102, 131 on the *Republic*'s banning of mimetic poetry where such poetry is 'mimetic' in its motivation. For the problems with the 'lovers of sights and sounds' and their fixation on multiple sensible properties, see 108–109.

[40] Gill 1979: 77.

may teach us about the interaction between the soul and the physical world. At the same time, the descriptions of Athenian settings in the dialogues do provide an implicit system of spatial classification for the aspirant to philosophy, where public spaces are locations of intellectual danger and potential corruption and the most important and productive conversations occur in intimate and quasi-private groups.

PART SEVEN

BIOGRAPHY

PLUTARCH

M. Beck

The study of time in *SAGN* 2 indicated that Plutarch[1] often disrupts the chronological flow of his narrative to better present aspects of an individual's character. Without question characterization is his primary aim and dictates the selection, organization, and representation of events in the composition of his biographies.[2] If Plutarch exploits the temporal arrangement of events to enhance the representation of his subject's character, then one would expect him to take the same liberties with the representation of space. This appears to be true. Until recently this question remained unexplored. Now, initial research conducted by Jason Banta on the *Lives of Romulus and Numa* appears to confirm that Plutarch recreates the landscape and buildings of Rome for this purpose.[3] Banta has adopted a Bahktinian reading of these *Lives*, using this scholar's notion of the chronotope (→ Introduction).

In this chapter I will explore the form and function of the chronotope as well as other manifestations of space employed by Plutarch in his narrative strategies in the *Lives*. In so doing I will summarize and expand upon Banta's research to arrive at a more comprehensive analysis of space in the *Lives*. I will limit my discussion to those key elements that are of the greatest significance narratologically and those key *Lives* that most strongly reflect Plutarch's awareness of space. Since Plutarch was a writer of political biographies, many of the statesmen and military figures whose lives he recounts unavoidably travelled to different locations or campaigned abroad. Such expected occurrences of spatial translocation recorded in the biographies of Plutarch's various protagonists are only

---

[1] I cite Plutarch according to the Loeb Classical Library edition of Bernadotte Perrin; translations are either from this edition or from Waterfield's (1998b–c) translations of the *Lives*.

[2] See, e.g., Pelling 1988: 11; Moles 1988: 9; and Stadter 1989: lii.

[3] Banta 2006; Banta 2007a; Banta 2007b.

deemed noteworthy by me in so far as they have greater representational or functional significance in the narrative. This also applies to physical structures that occupy space (buildings, temples, monuments, etc.).

Generally all discussions pertaining to the representation of objects and spatial locations in the *Lives* have undertaken to evaluate Plutarch as an historical source. The most comprehensive recent study of this type is that of the ancient historian John Buckler entitled 'Plutarch and Autopsy'.[4] Buckler clearly demonstrated that Plutarch very often was on site and strove to collect data for his *Lives* whenever his travels took him to those locations. By leaving Chaeronea he also was able to gain access to the holdings of libraries and archives in large cities on these journeys and during his years as a student. We know that he lived in Athens for a time, and visited Sparta, Rome, Africa, and Asia Minor. His association with Delphi as priest at that sanctuary availed him of various important documents and inscriptions.[5] In the proem to the *Life of Demosthenes* (1–2), Plutarch himself acknowledges that his trips to Italy enabled him to experience firsthand monuments and battle sites and thus facilitated comprehension of his Roman sources.[6] The narrator's own space in the case of Plutarch thus is of great importance; his travels influenced his composition of the *Lives* in a significant and positive way. The question we have before us now concerns Plutarch's literary presentation of space and its role in biographical portraiture.

Plutarch's Conception of the Significance of Space

One necessary key to understanding Plutarch's conception of the importance of space is his own narratorial statement regarding the psychological impact on the narratees of space and literary representations of space.

---

[4] Buckler 1992: 4788–4830.

[5] See Buckler 1992: 4792; Stadter 2002: 1–26; Stadter 2004: 19–31.

[6] 'But as for me, I live in a small city, and I prefer to dwell there that it may not become smaller still; and during the time when I was in Rome and various parts of Italy I had no leisure to practice myself in the Roman language, owing to my public duties and the number of my pupils in philosophy. It was therefore late and when I was well on in years that I began to study Roman literature. And here my experience was an astonishing thing, but true. For it was not so much that by means of words I came to a complete understanding of things, as that from things I somehow had an experience which enabled me to follow the meaning of words.' See also his comments on the inconvenience of living in a small city in *De E apud Delphi* 384E.

His viewpoint is articulated in the allusive and complex prologue to the *Lives of Pericles and Fabius Maximus* (*Per.* 1–2).[7] It prepares the narratees for an enhanced appreciation of Pericles' accomplishments, foremost of which is the construction of the buildings on the Athenian Acropolis. In the prologue instances of the verb *theōrein* and the noun *theama* are especially prevalent, which turns the narratees into spectators. The individual who views the proper objects of contemplation and studies them may become inspired by them. The inspirational force of these objects of contemplation in turn evokes a certain 'active desire to imitate them' (*Per.* 1.4). Plutarch maintains that these objects of contemplation are to be encountered 'in the deeds deriving from virtue' (*en tois ap' aretēs ergois*), but not all deeds that evoke our admiration stimulate the desire to act, as Plutarch goes on to make clear in the second half of the prologue (*Per.* 1.4). There is a certain ambiguity inherent in the word *ergon*.[8] The *locus classicus* for this ambiguous usage is Herodotus in his proem.[9] On the one hand it alludes to an action performed, on the other it indicates the resulting physical object produced by that action. Plutarch thus suggests that both deeds and monuments that commemorate deeds can exert an inspirational force upon those who view them, and that this force is capable of altering behavior in a positive way in those who are capable of being moved to informed and intelligent emulation and imitation (*mimesis*). This prologue then presents the intersection between character formation and space. Space in the form of buildings and foundations inspires emulation, valor, and *aretē*, because the deeds are fixed in the commemorative monuments and the monuments support cultural memory and ritual. Proximally it serves to introduce the Periclean building project on the Acropolis that confirms the reading of *erga* as deeds and monuments:

> For all the wonderful size, inimitable beauty and exceptional charm of the buildings (*erga*) that then began to arise, and for all the fine workmanship of the craftsmen, who were striving to surpass the limits of their craft, the most wondrous thing of all was the speed of progress.   (*Per.* 13.1–2)

The speed at which they were completed and their durability, as evidenced by their intact state in Plutarch's own day, inspires admiration:

---

[7] On this prologue, see especially Duff 1999: 34–45; Duff 2001: 351–363.

[8] The double meaning of *ergon* in this prologue is noted by Beck 1998: 90–99 and Duff 2001: 353–355.

[9] See Immerwahr 1960.

> This is what makes Pericles' works (*erga*) even more amazing, because they have durability despite having been completed quickly.   (*Per.* 13.6–7)

In this section of the *Life* we have one of Plutarch's rare detailed descriptions of buildings (Parthenon, Odeum, Propylaea) interwoven with a discussion of the architects and artists who were involved in various aspects of their planning, construction, and adornment. His description betrays an intimate familiarity with the architectural wonders of Athens that he derived from firsthand experience. They excite the sense of wonder and amazement that Plutarch referred to in the prologue, the admiration that prompts emulation (*Per.* 2.2). Plutarch's assessment of the magnitude of Pericles' achievement in the *sunkrisis* of the *Pericles/Fabius Maximus* is glowing:

> By the side of the great public works (*erga*), the temples, and the stately edifices, with which Pericles adorned Athens, all Rome's attempts at splendor down to the times of the Caesars, taken together, are not worthy to be considered, nay, the one had a towering pre-eminence above the other, both in grandeur of design, and grandeur of execution, which precludes comparison.   (*Per./Fab. comp.* 3)

Plutarch uses the adornment of public space to make an ideologically charged statement based upon his own viewing of monuments in Athens and Rome.

The chronotope of buildings and monuments serves a twofold purpose in Plutarch's *Lives*. A physical structure such as the Parthenon represents on one level the enduring legacy of Pericles' virtue (and not that of Phidias or any other artisan or craftsman working on that building).[10] Space here has its common characterizing function. On another level the monument (or deed) has didactic significance for the narratee, who derives inspiration and moral guidance from the representation (mimesis) of superlative achievements and is then moved to thoughtful and considered acts of emulation and imitation (mimesis). The bivalent nature of both of the Greek words *erga* and *mimēsis*, adumbrated in the prologue, are thus realized in the text.[11] The survival of the monuments intact to Plutarch's own day allows the narrator to make a comparative statement that reflects not just on the physical appearance of the

---

[10] This is made abundantly clear in the prologue (*Per.* 1.4–2.1).

[11] The bivalent nature of these two words employed in the prologue is well discussed by Duff 2001: 351–363.

monuments but on the powerful statesmen who are principally responsible for their erection. This explains why the chronotope in Plutarch functions often as the locus of ideological tension and conflict. A building is the tangible physical legacy and embodiment of virtue.

Theseus, Romulus and Numa: Space and Rulers

The *Romulus* is the representation of a life that derives much of its significance and meaning from contemporary Rome and the foundational acts that served to constitute the city. A comprehensive analysis must take into account the *Life of Theseus*, however, that is paired with the *Romulus*. The prologue to the paired *Lives of Theseus and Romulus* addresses the problems of writing biographical accounts of semi-mythological figures (*Thes.* 1.1).[12] In a highly metaphorical passage Plutarch alludes to the desolate and unreliable sources confronting biographers in such situations, whom he likens to geographers who 'crowd on the outer edges of their maps the parts of the earth which elude their knowledge', with explanatory notes indicating that 'what lies beyond is sandy desert without water and full of wild beasts' or 'blind marsh' or 'Scythian cold' or 'frozen sea'. Continuing the metaphor he states that he has now 'traversed' those periods of time affording sufficient factual sources from which to construct even a marginally reliable historical account. Of the earlier periods, the time of Theseus and Romulus, in contrast, he says: 'Those regions beyond, inhabited by poets and mythographers, are full of marvels and unreality and devoid of credibility and truth'. The use of spatial metaphors here is reflective of the increase in epistemological uncertainty as remote geographical distance is compared with remote temporal distance. On the one hand this introduces the theme of historical uncertainty because of the wide temporal gulf separating Plutarch from the lifetimes of Romulus and Theseus. This is surely the more salient meaning of this section of the prologue. On the other hand, however, another (overlooked) theme is introduced that is related to space itself.

---

[12] Banta 2007a: 26; Banta 2007b: 242–243 mentions this prologue but does not fully explore its thematic significance for the two *Lives* in question. He perceives that Plutarch is alluding to the element of historical uncertainty introduced by wide temporal gulfs only.

In the *Life of Theseus* there exists a correlation between distance or remoteness of location with reference to Athens and historical uncertainty. The chronotope in this *Life* functions to anchor those few historical events whose historicity Plutarch is confident enough to vouchsafe without feeling compelled to present alternate accounts in the manner of Herodotus. The desire to emulate the famous deeds of another hero, in this case Heracles, guides Theseus' decision-making in his early years (*Thes.* 6.2–7). Against the advice of those closest to him (Aethra and Pittheus), he elects to travel from the Peloponnese to Athens via the treacherous land route rather than the safer sea route, thus retracing the hazardous journey of Heracles. In choosing the more dangerous route Theseus also chooses the path of virtue. His character is revealed in the deeds he accomplishes and the challenges he overcomes (*Thes.* 7.2). Plutarch undoubtedly relates this episode in detail for this very reason (*Thes.* 8–11). Here again we are confronted by the characterizing function of space, the intersection of space with emulation, imitation, and the representation of character. In eliminating the dangerous individuals from the same terrain that Heracles had successfully traversed, Theseus is imitating Heracles' deeds (*erga* and *praxeis*), and is thereby assimilating his own *aretē* to Heracles' then famous *aretē*.

Athens is of course a key location in the *Life of Theseus*. Promptly upon his arrival in that city follows his narrow brush with death at the hands of Medea, whose attempt to poison Theseus is foiled at the last moment by Aegeus. The vial of poison which Aegeus dashed from Theseus' hand fell, we are told, in what is 'today' the Delphinium (*Thes.* 12.3). In this and numerous other examples the activities of Theseus in and about the city are brought into relation with existing topographical indicators (*Thes.* 17.6, 18; 24.3), and we are dealing with instances of the 'reference to the narrator's own space' motif. Theseus' erection of a famous pillar on the Isthmus and his foundation of the Isthmian games are also recounted (*Thes.* 25.3–5). As Plutarch narrates some of the rather far flung undertakings of his protagonist, however, his own uncertainty is revealed.

The narrative of the voyage to Crete and back, the different accounts of the Labyrinth and of just what exactly the Minotaur was, and the confusing and conflicting accounts of the Ariadne-saga all exhibit this problem (*Thes.* 16; 19).[13] Perhaps most illustrative of this principle is Plutarch's

---

[13] Plutarch does not conceal his exasperation but states that 'there are many stories about these matters and also about Ariadne but they do not agree at all' (*Thes.* 20.1).

account of Theseus' expedition against the Amazons in the vicinity of the Black Sea (*Thes.* 26.1–4). When the scene of the battle is transferred to Athens Plutarch is once again on sure ground when he reports that Theseus battled with the Amazons who drew their battle lines between the Pynx and the Amazoneum (*Thes.* 27.2–5). The difference proximity makes is brought home by the following statement:

> Whether, now, as Hellanicus writes, they came round by the Cimmerian Bosporus, which they crossed on the ice, may be doubted; but the fact that they encamped almost in the heart of the city is attested both by the names of the localities there and by the graves of those who fell in battle.
>
> (*Thes.* 27.2)

In the same way as in the *Theseus*, Plutarch emphasizes in the *Lives of Romulus and Numa* the visible and tangible traces of lives lived evident in the Rome that he visited and took in with his own eyes. The *Romulus* is perhaps Plutarch's most topographical *Life*. For Plutarch, the best indicator of a tradition's accuracy is a physical landmark or festival associated with it, and in this *Life* Plutarch is compelled to sift through multiple traditions (*Rom.* 1–2). He finally appears to settle on the tradition established by Diocles of Peparethus and Fabius Pictor as being the most credible (*Rom.* 3). At the heart of Plutarch's approach is the eminently chronotopic mode of visualizing an individual in relation to their location in space as well as time. Banta discerns a tension between two seemingly antagonistic chronotopes that is seized upon by Plutarch:

> Plutarch exploits this tension, between the destructive and consumptive Romulean *chronotope* and the exclusive, delineating Numean *chronotope*, in order to generate a higher level *chronotope*.[14]

In what follows we will examine Plutarch's use of the chronotope in these *Lives* and determine to what extent Banta is correct in his interpretation.

Of the many chronotopes that Banta explores in the *Life of Romulus* several stand out. The first notable one identifies the location in Rome where the twins were exposed in a trough on the bank of the Tiber (*Rom.* 3.4–4.1). Plutarch reports that Faustulus took the boys down to a 'swollen and violent' section of the Tiber. The river transported them to a 'smooth spot' named today Cermalus, formerly Germanus, perhaps because brothers are called *germani*, near the wild fig tree which they called *Ruminalis* (*Rom.* 3.4–4.1). This is where they were allegedly nursed by the she-wolf. The discussion of the derivation of the word *ruminalis*

---

[14] Banta 2007b: 240.

brings to light additional circumstances and associations surrounding this event. Banta comments on this early story:

> As we can see, from the very outset, Plutarch is using Romulus as tool to inscribe meaning upon the landscape of Italy in order to create a coherent topography of Archaic Rome. Plutarch's close association of Romulus with the landscape invests it with order, meaning, and even a sense of personality. Romulus himself has a relatively simple personality, his entire existence in Plutarch being predicated upon the foundation of the city. It follows then that whatever characteristics Romulus exhibits will likewise be shared with his foundation. The river [Tiber] is calmed by Romulus, in the same manner that the unruly population will later be mollified by the ruler. The river, almost personified, then leads the infant to the tree which receives definition from his arrival, both ideological and nominative. The city itself will become personified on some level throughout the narrative, but the question that remains to be answered is upon whom, if anyone does Rome's personification lie?   (2007b: 250)

I have quoted this passage in full because Banta articulates herein some fascinating aspects of the intersection between character (or personality as he terms it) and space in the story of Rome's foundation. He is clearly right in discerning the linking of Romulus with the spatial organization of Rome in Plutarch's narrative. The question is whether or not Romulus is the mollifying entity of the 'unruly population' that Banta claims he is. Initial events recorded by Plutarch do not seem to point in that direction.

The foundation of Rome itself is perhaps the most compelling of these episodes (*Rom.* 9–11). After describing how Romulus and Remus decided to resolve by augury the dispute as to whether Roma Quadrata or the Aventine would be the site of the new city, Plutarch inserts a digression on vultures, characterized as the least harmful of all creatures. He notes that vultures do 'not kill or maltreat anything that has life, and as for birds, it will not touch them even when they are dead, since they are of its own species'. It is 'eagles and owls, and hawks', he continues, who 'smite their own kind when alive and kill them'. At this point Plutarch cites Aeschylus' *Suppliants* 226: 'How shall a bird that preys on a fellow bird be clean?' The reference is to hawks who 'fatefully pollute their very blood' (225). Plutarch then promptly resumes the narrative with an account of the murder of Remus by his brother Romulus (*Rom.* 10.1). The thrust of the digression is revealed and strengthened in the course of the narrative as Romulus' militaristic (one might say rapacious) expansion of Rome's boundaries is narrated in detail.[15]

---

[15] This is observed by Banta 2007b: 263: 'Romulus' fratricide, while a necessary step

The *Life of Numa* is the counterpoise to the *Romulus*. Numa's birth falls fortuitously on the very day Rome is founded (*Num.* 3.4–5). If Romulus symbolizes a certain ruthless lack of restraint, then Numa's reign comes to symbolize the setting of boundaries on the Roman juggernaut. He is responsible for policies which serve to mollify the Romans somewhat.[16] His character differs strongly from Romulus: he rejects the base passions of the soul, violence, and rapacity (*Num.* 3.5); he comes to epitomize the Platonic ideal of the philosopher king, whose character and example serve to inspire his fellow citizens to lead their lives in a like manner (*Num.* 20.7–8); he is a deeply religious man who is rumored to have entered into a celestial marriage with the goddess Egeria (*Num.* 3.5–4.2). Upon his assumption of the throne Numa receives an authentic sign, unlike the one manufactured by Romulus (*Num.* 7.1).[17] He immediately attempts to 'soften the city' and 'change its harsh and warlike temper into one of greater gentleness and justice' (*Num.* 8.1). The central foundations that symbolize Numa's program include the temples to Terminus and Fides. He associates Terminus, the god of boundaries, with peace and justice (*Num.* 16.1). He discerns that the setting of boundaries 'fetters lawless power' and convicts injustice (*Num.* 16.2). He places a heavy emphasis on agriculture as a 'peace potion' in his program of social reform (*Num.* 16.4).[18] In other words, according to Plutarch, Numa's reforms focus the attention of the Romans on developing the territory they were now in possession of and away from engaging in the endless wars of conquest that characterized the reign of Romulus. The idea that civic and political concerns should take precedence over martial ones is reflected in Numa's honoring of the god Janus (*Num.* 19.6). Notably under Numa the gates to the temple of Janus, which are left open in

---

in the establishment of the city, foreshadows the sanguinary and oppressive character of Rome's founder that will emerge later in his kingship'. For other chronotopes, cf. the construction of the *pomerium* by Romulus (*Rom.* 11.2–3); Romulus' discovery of the altar to Consus (*Rom.* 14); the story of Tarpeia and her burial place on the Capitoline Hill and the Tarpeian rock from which criminals are thrown (*Rom.* 17–18); the story of Curtius and the naming of the *lacus Curtius* (*Rom.* 18); the origin of the sacred cornel tree and its inadvertent destruction later during the reign of the emperor Gaius (*Rom.* 20.4–5); Romulus bringing the body of Tatius home and interring it in the so-called Armilustrum on the Aventine hill (*Rom.* 23.3); Romulus' successful defense of Fidenae against the Veii (*Rom.* 25), which is still commemorated annually in Rome.

[16] Pace Banta 2007b: 250. See above.

[17] Banta 2007b: 257–258.

[18] See Banta 2007b: 264–265.

times of war and remain closed in peacetime, were closed for the entire duration of his reign of forty-three years, 'so complete and universal was the cessation of war', as Plutarch remarks (*Num*. 20.1–2).

The *Romulus* and the *Numa* are thus complementary *Lives* in that Numa rights the wrongs and excesses of Romulus. The greatest excess he sets out to curb is the continuous expansion of Rome's boundaries. Numa wants to restrict the growth of Rome to improve the morals of her citizens who were being corrupted by Romulus' expansionist policies. With Romulus Rome's space, so to speak, increases. With Numa Rome's space does not contract but is kept in check principally by the employment of religion as a means to modify (i.e. mollify) social behavior. With Numa the ominous fratricidal inception of Rome is somehow atoned for. The interplay in these *Lives* between space, morality, and character is fascinating. Just as Romulus personally does not display restraint in his dealing with others, so too his political and military ventures betray an egregious lack of restraint that eventually catches up with him, as Plutarch would lead us to believe.[19] Numa's personal self restraint, by contrast, is successfully transmitted to his people, who love him for it. The Numan chronotope is the corrective to the Romulan chronotope.[20]

Solon and Lycurgus: Space and Lawgivers

Solon and Lycurgus are two statesmen whose actions left an indelible impression on their respective cities. Both men left monuments to commemorate their activities. We are informed, for example, that Solon founded a temple to commemorate a victory over Megara, a victory that continued to be reenacted by the Athenians:

> There is also a dramatic reenactment of events which seems to corroborate this version. An Athenian ship used to sail up to the island, with the crew initially keeping quiet, but then charging into the attack yelling and

---

[19] Plutarch mentions Romulus' growing unpopularity and recounts the tradition that Romulus' supposed apotheosis was a political ruse designed to conceal his assassination (*Rom*. 26–28).

[20] Banta 2007b: 269. I am not sure that I follow Banta here in locating this higher level concept or 'meta-chronotope', as he terms it, in contemporary Rome. I think the implied meta-chronotope is too utopian and that the Romulan element comes to predominate after the short-lived Numan reforms. See, e.g., his account of how often after Numa's reign the gates to the Janus temple were closed in Roman history (*Num*. 20).

> screaming, while one man in full armor used to run to cape Sciradium
> and fetch the men on land. Also nearby is a temple to Enyalius founded by
> Solon to commemorate his defeat of the Megarians.   (*Sol.* 9.4)

The continued reenactment of this victory in the same spatial location
in which it took place is important. It functions as a dynamic memo-
rial.

Plutarch also reports that Lycurgus founded a temple (*Lyc.* 11). The
story of how this came about is related in an anecdote that records how
Lycurgus, owing to the unpopular nature of one of his reforms, the *sus-
sitia*, among the wealthy, is forced by an angry mob of fellow citizens
in the agora to flee for his life (*Lyc.* 11). One of his pursuers, a certain
Alcander, succeeds in overtaking him and knocks out his eye with his
staff. Alcander is punished for this by being placed in Lycurgus' personal
custody, where domestic servitude and his close association with the
Spartan lawgiver are meant to encourage Alcander to reform his future
behavior. In terms of the education of the youth an important interre-
lationship between the domestic sphere and civic behavior is alluded
to in this anecdote. Plutarch concludes his narrative of these events by
recording that Lycurgus founded a sanctuary in honor of Athena with the
epithet of Optilletis to commemorate his loss. Plutarch obviously found
this anecdote to be a useful vehicle for portrayal of Lycurgus' humane
and gentle temperament, a central theme in the *Lycurgus/Numa* pair.
He also demonstrates how Lycurgus was capable of turning a horrible
event into a didactic lesson that had an impact not only on his attacker,
Alcander, but on all the Spartans who witnessed the event and on all
future Spartans who would hear the story told when they inquired about
the details concerning the foundation of the sanctuary of Athena Optil-
letis.

Lycurgus is a fascinating and paradoxical figure in many respects.
While he undertakes journeys abroad to widen his knowledge and
encourages Thales to go on a mission to Sparta (*Lyc.* 3–4), he attempts
to keep foreigners away from Sparta and takes measures to prevent for-
eigners from settling in the city to prevent the possible bad influence of
their customs, etc., from harming the purity of the Spartan state (*Lyc.* 9;
27). He distributes land among *perioikoi* (*Lyc.* 8); regulates the interior
furnishings of Spartan homes and warns against too frequent external
expeditions against enemies (*Lyc.* 13). The agora in Sparta is repeatedly
the scene of civic strife and public humiliation (*Lyc.* 5; 11; 15). It is also
the place from which younger and older men are excluded (*Lyc.* 25).

Lycurgus may be behind the brutal custom of examining infants at Lesche and then the exposing of the deformed ones at Apothetae, a chasm at the foot of Mt Taygetus (*Lyc.* 16). In his final act that resembles an apotheosis, Lycurgus departs for Delphi never to return (*Lyc.* 29). His legislative activity thus strongly impacts both the living space of the Spartans and the way they live.

The control of space notable in the *Life of Lycurgus* is also paralleled in the *Life of Solon*. Like Lycurgus, Solon was best remembered by the Athenians as a lawgiver who wrought fundamental social change with his laws, some of which impacted the utilization of space. He prohibited with his legislation the public display of certain behaviors in proximity to important buildings and functions such as festivals and competitions:

> He also made it an offence to slander a living person in or near temples, law courts, and government offices, and during publically attended games and competitions …   (*Sol.* 21)

Solon also regulated access to the water supply (*Sol.* 23). He imposed constraints upon land use and planting:

> He showed a great deal of expert knowledge in prescribing the distances to be followed when planting trees as well. He stated that no one was to plant a tree in a field within five feet of his neighbor's land, or nine feet in the case of fig trees and olive trees, whose roots extend further, and which damage some plants by their proximity, in the sense that they might even deny them nourishment, and they emit a secretion which can be harmful. He also fixed the gap between a pit or a ditch and someone else's land as equal to the depth of excavation, and a bee-hive was to be set at least 300 feet away from the site of hives previously established by someone else.
>
> (*Sol.* 23)

What is eminently discernable in all of this legislative activity is the fact that Solon endeavored to impose almost minute control over space. These laws framed by Solon were put on public display in Athens on revolving wooden tables in the City Hall (*Sol.* 25), remnants of which were still visible in Plutarch's time. We may imagine to ourselves the youthful Plutarch in his student days poring over the most likely illegible fragments being emotionally moved in contemplation of their significance for Athenian social history and the Greek world in general. This public display of the slight remnants of Solon's wooden tablets is every bit a chronotope in Plutarch's narration, as the Parthenon is, albeit more humble.

Themistocles, Camillus, Cimon,
Cato the Elder, Alcibiades: Space and Generals

In Plutarch's other biographies the use of abundant historical sources usually precludes the need to refer to space. Occasionally, however, the past presence of a notable individual is inextricably tied to physical space. One example of this occurs in the *Life of Themistocles*. Themistocles' mother was not Athenian born, but from either Thrace or Caria (Halicarnassus; *Them.* 1). His mixed descent was considered by the Athenians to be a form of illegitimacy and Themistocles displayed early on his resourcefulness in dealing with this issue that, under normal circumstances, would have necessitated his segregation from those youths deemed 'legitimate' by the city:

> Now, Athenians considered to be illegitimate used to be enrolled in Cynosarges, a gymnasium outside the city gates which is dedicated to Heracles because he was not fully legitimate either, compared to his fellow deities, but had the taint of mixed descent thanks to his mother, who was mortal. But Themistocles set about persuading some well-born youths to go out to Cynosarges and exercise there with him, which they did— thereby earning him the reputation of having used his cunning to abolish the distinction between the illegitimate and legitimate members of Athenian society.   (*Them.* 1)

This anecdote presages or foreshadows Themistocles' later ability to lure his opponents into the physical space of his choosing in the naval battles of Artemisium and Salamis. He is forever a man sensitive to and aware of the significance of space.

Themistocles' involvement in the Second Persian War is subjected to a lengthy treatment in the *Life* (*Them.* 7–18). Plutarch presents detailed information about important locations in the war that may not be familiar to all of his narratees, but which were visited by himself. The most vivid example of this, containing both visual and olfactory sensory information, is his description of Artemisium and a temple of Artemis located there:

> Artemisium is a north-facing beach in Euboea, past Hestiaea; it lies more or less opposite Olizon, which is in the land once ruled by Philoctetes. There is at Artemisium a small temple of 'east-looking' Artemis, as she was known there, which stands in a grove of trees, surrounded by blocks of white marble fixed on the ground. Rubbing this marble on one's hands yields a saffron-like color and smell. One of the blocks of stone has been inscribed with the following elegiac poem:

> There was a time when on this stretch of sea the sons of Athens
> In battle overcame a varied host of men of Asian stock;
> To mark their destruction of the army of the Medes,
> They erected these tokens in honor of the maiden Artemis.
>
> One is shown a part of the beach where in the middle of all the surrounding
> sand the depths throw up a dark, ash-like dust which looks as though it
> is the result of fire; it is believed that the wrecked ships and bodies of the
> dead were burnt on this spot.   (*Them.* 8)

The description of this temple is one of the most striking chronotopes in
all of Plutarch. There can be no doubt that Plutarch was there and was
guided by someone among the ruins. The naval battle of Artemisium
and the defense of the pass at Thermopylae were part of a two-pronged
strategy to stop or delay the Persian invasion and Themistocles was the
author of this strategy. Plutarch knew this and his description of this
place honors the man and commemorates his achievement.

Themistocles' role in the planning and designing of Athens' defensive
fortifications that connected the Piraeus harbor to the city was truly sig-
nificant. As Plutarch reports, it involved a reorientation of the traditional
outlook with considerable political ramifications:

> Afterwards he began to work on the Piraeus, since he had noticed the
> quality of its harbors and wanted to join the city as a whole to the sea.
> In a sense, then, the policy he was pursuing ran counter to that of the old
> kings of Athens, because it had been their concern, we are told, to tear their
> subjects away from the sea and get them used to cultivating the land rather
> than living a seafaring life … Themistocles, however, while he fell short of
> 'cementing the Piraeus' on to the city, as the comic poet Aristophanes puts
> it, did nevertheless make Athens depend on the Piraeus and the land on the
> sea. This also enabled him to increase the power of the common people,
> to the detriment of the aristocratic party, until they became filled with
> presumptuousness, since power now rested with the crews of the ships,
> those who called the time for the rowers, and the helmsmen. And this also
> explains why the platform in the Pynx, which has been built so as to face
> towards the sea, was later turned inland by the Thirty: to their minds, the
> origins of democracy lay with Athens' maritime empire, while oligarchy
> was more to the liking of those who worked the land.   (*Them.* 19)

Space in and around the city also plays an important role in the *Life
of Camillus*, the parallel Roman *Life* to the *Themistocles*. Camillus is
Rome's savior and, like Themistocles, he displays a developed awareness
of the significance of space. He is charged with the rebuilding of Roman
sanctuaries in the wake of the devastation wrought by Brennus and the
Gauls:

> After Camillus had made sacrifices to the gods and purified the city, in
> the manner prescribed by those who were versed in such rites, he restored
> the existing temples, and erected a new one to Rumor and Voice, having
> sought out carefully the spot where by night the voice from Heaven,
> announcing the coming of the Barbarian host, had fallen upon the ears
> of Marcus Caedicius.   (*Cam.* 30.3)

Camillus shows his sensitivity to sacred space in this act.[21] Through his
agency, in part, the city of Rome remains in its original location and the
sacred places in the city are recovered and marked out again (*Cam.* 32).
During the performance of this latter task the augural staff of Romulus
was recovered from the ashes of the temple of Mars (*Cam.* 32.4). This
event was interpreted as a positive omen for the city, as Plutarch informs
us. Camillus played an instrumental role in the reestablishment of Rome
after the Gaulic invasions and the Romans deeply mourned his passing
(*Cam.* 43).

Cimon, like Camillus, was regarded as a benefactor of his city. The *Life
of Cimon* contains some interesting references to his impact on Athens.
He is younger than Themistocles and Aristides and his participation in
the Persian War is less significant. Plutarch narrates his most impor-
tant single action: his inspirational march to the Acropolis in support of
Themistocles' proposal that the Athenians abandon their city and con-
centrate their forces on the defense of Salamis by sea:

> Most people were terrified at such a radical proposal, but Cimon could be
> seen leading a group of his companions up to the Acropolis with a smile
> on his face and a horse's bridle in his hands to dedicate to the goddess,
> realizing that in the present crisis the city needed to fight at sea rather than
> from horseback. He dedicated the bridle, took down one of the shields
> which was hanging on the walls of the temple, and, after a prayer to the
> goddess, made his way down to the coast—all of which put heart into quite
> a large number of people.   (*Cim.* 5)

This is an action laden with spatial symbolism. By turning his back on the
Acropolis and by turning to the sea he wordlessly confirms for onlookers
the plan that will save the Athenians and eventually convert Athens into
a maritime power. Cimon is also a great philanthropist and his acts of
euergetism benefit the Athenian populace and modify the appearance of
the city:

---

[21] The importance of deciphering and understanding omens is also represented in the
portent of the freshly severed head found when the foundations of the Capitol are dug
(*Cam.* 31.4).

> He was also the first to embellish the city with the so-called cultivated and refined haunts, which would before long become so extremely popular. He planted plane trees in the city square, and transformed the Academy from a dry, unirrigated spot into a well-watered grove, which he equipped with obstacle-free racing tracks and shady walks.   (*Cim*. 13)

The Persian Wars cast a long shadow in Greek consciousness. The *Lives of Themistocles*, *Aristides*, and *Cimon* are full of references to it that include spatial details. It is well-known that Plutarch, had he lived to complete it, would have written a *Life of Leonidas*. The Spartan stand at Thermopylae under the heroic leadership of the Spartan king would have undoubtedly served as the dramatic focal point of this *Life*.

We do however possess an account of a battle that took place at this location between the forces of Antiochus and the Romans in the *Life of Cato the Elder* (13–14). In his account of Cato's prominent role in this engagement, Plutarch reveals his first-hand knowledge of Thermopylae in his descriptions of the topography and vegetation, thus giving us a preview of what his more elaborate account in the *Leonidas* would have been like. It is clear that Plutarch does not rank this military achievement of Cato's high. In the *sunkrisis* he clearly elevates Aristides' participation in the major battles of Marathon, Salamis, and Plataea above Cato's actions as military tribune in Thermoplyae (*Aris./Cat.Ma. comp.* 5). Plutarch does want to indicate one important underlying cause of Cato's success, however. The lengthy and elaborate narrative of this battle follows a section in the *Life* that presents Cato's anti-Hellenic tendencies (*Cat.Ma.* 12. 4–5). Plutarch is quick to point out that Cato, in recalling the 'famous compass and circuit of the pass which the Persians had once made', adopted the strategy that proved successful. The implication is, and this is reflected elsewhere in the *Life*, that, while Cato may openly deprecate Greek literature and accomplishments, he nevertheless profits from his knowledge of Greek literature, in this case Herodotus.

Another aspect of Plutarch's thought that is forcefully brought out in the *Life of Cato the Elder* is the contrast between the domestic and public spheres (symbolic function of space). Plutarch regards the *oikos* as the microcosm of the *polis*, with the city being the 'organized sum total of households' (*Aris./Cat.Mi. comp.* 3). Domestic order and prosperity finds its reflection in civic order and prosperity. Cato the Elder's behavior in the domestic space comes under critical scrutiny in the *Life* and Plutarch discloses problems. Cato is harsh, sometimes brutally so, towards his slaves. In outlining the punishment of slaves at symposia, Plutarch describes a transformation in his behavior over time:

> Now, at first, when Cato was still poor and serving in the army, he was not at all fastidious about his meals. Instead, he made it clear that it was singularly reprehensible to bicker with a slave for the sake of one's belly. Later however, as his circumstances improved, when he entertained friends and colleagues, no sooner was dinner over than he would punish those who had been the slightest bit negligent in any aspect of the service or preparation of the feast by beating them with a leather strap.
>
> (*Cat.Ma.* 21.3–4)

The symposium, as is well known, was a social institution in which an individual's 'civilized behavior patterns' or lack thereof could be scrutinized behind 'a pretence of entertainment'.[22] Cato's failings at home are paralleled by his overly harsh treatment of his colleagues in the political sphere (*Cat.Ma.* 15–19). In this *Life* then there exists a disturbing congruity between behavior in the private and public sectors that Plutarch is critical of as being excessive.

The *Alcibiades* is notable for its complex characterization of the rather ambiguous protagonist. Plutarch depicts the Athenians' desire for the conquest of Sicily as a long-term one that was simply brought to a pitch by Alcibiades, who, it is alleged, dreamed of Alexander-like expeditions and conquests in pre-Alexander era and infected the general populace with his far-flung ambitions:

> … he regarded Sicily as the initial objective in a campaign which would fulfill his aspirations, not, as everyone else did, as an end in itself. So while Nicias was trying to persuade the Athenian people not to go, on the grounds that the capture of Syracuse would prove too much for them, Alcibiades was dreaming of Carthage and Libya, and then, after the annexation of these places, of taking over Italy and the Peloponnese. He tended to think of Sicily as little more than an entry-point into the war. The young men of the city were immediately carried away by these hopes of his, while their elders filled their ears with plenty of wonderful tales about the expedition; the upshot was that in the wrestling-schools and alcoves people could commonly be seen sitting and mapping out the shape of Sicily and the position of Libya and Carthage. (*Alc.* 17)

Space here, as so often in Plutarch, has a characterizing function: the unrestrained desire for the expansion of empire represents excessive personal ambition (*philotimia*) that Plutarch frequently refers to as the cause of debilitating political discord in societies.[23] In Alcibiades' case *philotimia* is aligned with *pleonexia* so that the conquest of space implies the acquisition of riches.

---

[22] Whitmarsh 2005: 32.

[23] See especially the *Lives of Lysander and Agesilaus*.

Alexander the Great

In terms of extent of space traveled the ancient world's greatest conqueror was undoubtedly Alexander the Great. He served as the paradigmatic figure for later historical figures such as Demetrius, Pompey, Caesar, and Mark Antony. Initially we will therefore examine the role of space in the *Life of Alexander the Great*, prior to investigating the influence his life and accomplishments had on one of his less successful imitators.

The *Alexander* is one of Plutarch's most compelling biographical achievements. He descends into the psychological realm without demythologizing his subject. Unlike our other surviving ancient sources Plutarch's account begins at the beginning and there is much in the early stages of Alexander's *Life* that is of interest. Multiple spatial references foreshadow later circumstances and events.

In the prelude to the expedition to conquer the Persian Empire, two anecdotes reveal aspects of the future conqueror's personality (*Alex.* 14). The first recounts his meeting with the philosopher Diogenes of Sinope during the occasion of the Panhellenic Assembly at the Isthmus that conferred upon Alexander the leadership of the expedition against Persia. While many statesmen and philosophers came to Alexander to pay him honor, Alexander was compelled to go to Diogenes, who we are told was in Craneion, a suburb of Corinth. When Alexander approached and asked if he wanted anything Diogenes responded: 'Yes, stand a little out of my sun'. In contrast to his followers who voiced nothing but scorn for Diogenes, Alexander expressed his admiration with the remark: 'Indeed if I were not Alexander I would be Diogenes'. The second anecdote reports his consultation of the oracle at Delphi. When he arrived on an inauspicious day when it was deemed unlawful to deliver oracles he sent a summons to the prophetess and when she did not respond he attempted to physically drag her to the temple to force her to perform her duty. The Pythia, overcome by his intensity, exclaimed: 'You are invincible, my son'. To which Alexander responded that he had the oracle he wanted and desired no further prophecy. Both anecdotes relate incidents that show Alexander proactively shifting his location.

In his narrative of Alexander's campaigns and conquests, Plutarch largely omits mention of marches or other technical details of the journey and description of scenery. He also rarely describes the battlefield or the spatial disposition of armies on the battlefield. A clear conceptual-

ization and reconstruction of these military events with only Plutarch as our guide would therefore be impossible. Following his assumption of the throne Alexander is forced to put down various uprisings among the neighboring tribes of barbarians and Thebes. The narrative of this expedition is abbreviated considerably (*Alex.* 11). We are informed that he proceeded as far as the river Danube and defeated the king of the Triballi, Syrmus. He then arrived at Thebes via the pass at Thermopylae and eventually captured and raided the city (*Alex.* 11–12). His crossing of the Hellespont is mentioned but not described (*Alex.* 15). His visit to Ilium and the tomb of Achilles is the next landmark of note (*Alex.* 15). The battle at the Granicus is narrated for dramatic effect, the river's depth and rough and uneven banks are mentioned almost incidentally (*Alex.* 16). The successive submissions of Sardis, Halicarnassus, and Miletus are reported in two sentences with no accompanying descriptive detail (*Alex.* 17). In contrast Plutarch gives greater attention to two natural phenomenon presaging Alexander's fortune: a spring in Lycia that cast up a bronze tablet bearing an inscription that prophesied the destruction of the Persian Empire, and the unusual behavior of the sea along the coastline of Pamphylia (*Alex.* 17).

Plutarch's accounts of the great battles at Issus (*Alex.* 20) and Gaugamela (*Alex.* 31–34) are rather brief and devoid of detail; he only notes some of the topographical features that make Issus an ideal place of battle for Alexander (*Alex.* 20). Clearly his main interest is in showing how Alexander responded to the victory and how opulently his enemy had lived. We view the spoils of war and enter Darius' tent with Alexander:

> When Alexander saw the bowls, pitchers, wash-basins, and perfume-jars, all of gold and elaborately wrought, when he smelt how marvelously the forechamber was scented with aromatic herbs and spices, and when he passed from there into a tent which was quite remarkable for its height and size, and for its gorgeous couch and tables, not to mention the actual food served upon them, he looked at his companions and said, 'This, I suppose, is what it was to be king'.   (*Alex.* 20)

His capture of Susa also contains a brief list of riches (*Alex.* 36). Plutarch fails to give an account of the enormous suffering and loss of life that Achilles' army needlessly sustained on the trek though the Gedrosian desert (*Alex.* 66). This he leaves to the historians.

The Life of Antony: imitatio Alexandri

Mark Antony is Alexander's least successful imitator. Unlike Pompey and Caesar, who celebrated numerous victories and conquests, Antony seemed to lack the resolve to get the job done. His preoccupation with Cleopatra appeared to exert a debilitating influence on a man already prone to revelry and carousing.[24] The Parthian expedition is Antony's proving ground and he fails miserably (*Ant.* 37–52). Antony's army suffers from extreme famine, as Plutarch notes in a richly descriptive passage that incorporates many spatial elements:

> The men turned to vegetables and roots, but they found few with which they were familiar and were forced to experiment also with some they had never tasted before. There was one particular herb they tried which induced madness and ultimately death; anyone who ate it became fixated on the single task of moving and overturning every stone, as if he were achieving something of great importance. The plain was filled with men hunched over close to the ground, digging up and removing stones. Eventually they would vomit bile and die, since they had run out of the only antidote, wine. Many men died in this way, and the Parthians kept harassing them, until Antony—so the story goes—would often cry out loud, 'Oh the ten thousand!', in awe at Xenophon's men, whose march back from Babylon to the sea had been even longer and who had won their way to safety fighting far greater numbers of enemies.   (*Ant.* 45)

Never mind Alexander! Antony cannot even rival the exploits of Xenophon as commander. The ideological thrust is clear. Space conquers Antony, he is no conqueror of space.

Conclusion

In conclusion it is apparent that Plutarch employs descriptions of places, buildings, monuments, and other objects in the *Lives* for multiple purposes. Chronotopes reflect strongly on the character and achievement of the biographical subject. The representation of character is Plutarch's foremost aim and space derives its significance from its intersection with the biographical subject's character and actions. The chronotope is the most overt sign of this narrative strategy. Some chronotopes are

---

[24] Plutarch's motives may in part be personal, based on Antony's harsh treatment of Chaeronea (*Ant.* 68).

employed to present ideologically-charged viewpoints. We know that Plutarch travelled widely and is known to have visited many sites and cities in Greece and Italy. His travels and service as priest at Delphi near Chaeronea enabled him to amass a great deal of first-hand experience and information that he used to augment his accounts of the lives of significant individuals. His accounts of the *Lives of Romulus and Numa* were certainly influenced by his visit(s) to Rome.

From Plutarch's perspective the appropriate task of politicians in leadership positions is to act as patron of the arts. The beautification of Athens is therefore an achievement that reflects on Pericles more so than on Phidias. The *Lives* are meant to serve as behavioral paradigms and their students are to become active patrons themselves in their own communities. Cimon's philanthropic acts and beautification of Athens also deserves mention here; even if done on a more modest scale than Pericles', they were directly funded by his own resources. The significance of foundational figures is discernable from the monuments they left behind or the ones erected to commemorate their service to the city. Control of the space of the *polis* is a strong theme in the *Lives of Solon and Lycurgus* and their legislative activity imposes significant restrictions on the use of space by citizens and non-citizens.

Philanthropic gestures leave traces. Excessive ambition, in contrast, imperils communities and can engender disastrous consequences. It too is tied to space. Alcibiades is a case in point. His desire to continuously expand the Athenian empire to include Sicily, Italy, Carthage, Libya, and eventually the Peloponnese spells doom for Athens. Alexander seems to be an exception to this rule of avoiding hybristic excess. Here the Greek pride in their great conquering hero is evident. In the *Life of Alexander* Plutarch mounts a defense against the Roman Stoic tendency to fault Alexander's character. His restraint in the face of overwhelming temptation and luxury is represented in several scenes. Alexander not only conquers space, he masters himself, or so Plutarch would have us believe through much of the *Life*. Finally Plutarch's depiction of Antony is a harshly negative comparison. While highlighting the points of similarity between Antony and Alexander, Antony, in the final analysis, is no conqueror of the great spatial dimensions in the way Alexander was; instead he is conquered by Cleopatra. Wherever Cleopatra goes, there too goes Antony. Plutarch's extended narrative of the Parthian expedition graphically demonstrates his weakness as a commander and the unsuitability of any comparisons with Alexander the Great. While my discussion of Plutarch's use of space in the *Lives* is by no means

exhaustive, it does show that descriptions and discussions of space, especially man-made space, is a significant component of Plutarch's biographical technique.

PHILOSTRATUS

T.J.G. Whitmarsh

Philostratus' *In honour of Apollonius of Tyana* (*Apollonius*) is an enco-miastic biography of a philosopher-cum-holy man, Apollonius of Tyana, written by Flavius Philostratus, one of the literary giants of the early third century CE. Although it shows a family resemblance to other forms of spiritual hagiography (including the Christian gospels), it is ultimately quite unlike anything else from antiquity: an intricate, knowing and generically experimental text, in this respect like much of this author's production.[1] What distinguishes *Apollonius*, however, is its scale and ambition. Commissioned (so the narrator tells us, 1.3.1) by the empress Julia Domna to add polish and sophistication to the account contained in the crude notebooks of one Damis of Ninos, Philostratus composed his largest and most influential work to the glory of a philosopher who would in generations to come be seen as a 'pagan' rival to Christ.

As befits a work of this magnitude, *Apollonius* works with a huge spatial canvas, from India in the east to Pillars of Heracles in the west, and down to the deep south of Ethiopia; its final two books are set in Rome, the symbolic hub of empire.[2] The narrative as a whole represents a philosophical *voyage initiatique*, a rewriting on a global scale of Socrates' quest for knowledge as described in Plato's *Apology* (and similarly culminating in a courtroom). Alongside this interest in geographical plotting at the macro-level, Philostratus also shows a repeated interest in the description of locales, particularly sacred ones. What is most interesting, however, is that (as we shall discover in the course of this chapter) *Apollonius* works self-reflexively with a set of theories about space and how it should be narrated. Space is for Philostratus not an inert narratological category but a, perhaps the, central vehicle for thinking through the knotty problem of what constitutes a *theios anēr*, a 'godlike man'.

---

[1] See Bowie and Elsner 2009.
[2] On the symbolic geography of *Apollonius*, see Elsner 1997.

Space and (Greek) Cultural Memory

The first point to make is that the space described by our narrator is fundamentally intertextual. Particularly on his travels, Apollonius follows in the footsteps of famous predecessors. This is most obviously the case in the East and in Egypt, where Herodotus and the Alexander historians in particular offer ever-present hypotexts. Indeed, Apollonius is on several occasions implicitly correlated with Alexander, passing a number of sites where (we are informed) events in the Macedonian conquest occurred (e.g. 2.9.3, 10, 20–21; 3.53). Most striking is the *stēlē* marking the extent of Alexander's conquests:

> When they had crossed that Hydraotes and passed several tribes, they came to the Hyphasis. About thirty stades further on they found altars with this inscription: 'To my father Ammon, my brother Heracles, Athena of Forethought, Olympian Zeus, the Cabiri of Samothrace, the Sun of India, and Apollo of Delphi'. They say there was also a bronze pillar (*stēlē*) dedicated there with the legend 'Alexander stopped here'. We must suppose that the altars were set up by Alexander to honour the limit (*terma*) of his empire, while the Indians across the Hyphasis dedicated the pillar, presumably in order to boast that Alexander had advanced no further.[3]
>
> (2.43)

The *terma* or 'limit' of Alexander's empire is marked doubly, both naturally by the river Hyphasis (there is an echo here of Herodotus' identification of the Araxes as the border of Cyrus' territory) and artefactually by the altars and the pillars.[4] The latter are particularly interesting, in that they are (according to the narrator) not only pre-interpreted, but also conflicting in their pre-interpretation: the altars are understood to be an imperialist celebration of Alexander's achievements, a message that is then subverted by the alternative, indigenous perspective presented by the pillar. The crucial point, however, is that this Alexandrian boundary-marker is then transgressed by Apollonius: the philosopher outbids the ruler. This ostentatious trumping of the Alexander tradition is shared by Philostratus' own text: this 'limit' (*terma*) also marks the end of the second book, but Apollonius and Philostratus alike proceed further into India.

---

[3] Translations are adapted from C.P. Jones 2005–2006.
[4] The Alexander tradition makes abundant use of such monumental markers: see Stoneman 1995.

These eastern spaces also display mnemonic traces of travels by Diony-
sus (2.8; 3.13)[5] and Heracles, whose liberation of Prometheus (2.3) and
teamwork with Dionysus (3.13; cf. 2.33.2) are both marked on the land-
scape. Such allusions serve as (provisional) models for analysing Apol-
lonius' own practice, templates against which his similarities and differ-
ences are marked. In one particularly suggestive passage, it is said that
the Egyptian Heracles (to be distinguished, we are told, from his Greek
namesake) was 'the surveyor (*horistēs*) of the world' (2.33.2)—a descrip-
tion that fits not only Apollonius but also the Philostratean narrator, who
is (as we shall see in more detail presently) ever keen to display his mas-
tery of global geography and culture.

Although this phenomenon is largely limited to the eastern travels of
the earlier books, there is an extraordinary case of hypotextual overde-
termination in books 7 and 8. Prior to his arrest and trial, Apollonius
meets with Damis (his constant companion) and the Cynic philoso-
pher Demetrius in Puteoli. 'Here they say', Demetrius claims, 'Odysseus
lived with Calypso' (7.10.2; cf. 8.11). This Odyssean location thus com-
pletes the set of associations between Apollonius and famous travellers.[6]
(Apollonius later (7.28.3) compares his visit to Domitian's Rome to the
Homeric episode in the Cyclops' cave; there may be a reminiscence of
the cyclopic sculpture group in Domitian's villa at Castel Gandolfo.) But
overlain onto this Homeric topography is a second allusive stratum. The
initial debate occurs, we are told, in Cicero's villa (7.11.1). When they
arrive, the pastoral description adds another layer of reference: 'as they
sat under a plane tree, the cicadas were singing away, softly accompa-
nied by the breeze …' (7.11.1). The model here, it goes without saying,
is the *Phaedrus*, the most widely used Platonic passage for this period.[7]
Once again, these spatial allusions key us into different models for think-
ing about Apollonius: how like Socrates is he, and how unlike? (And
does this mean that the Philostratean narrator is to be thought of as
Plato to Apollonius' Socrates?) Did Cicero count as a successful 'Roman
Socrates'? Are we to see Apollonius as a blend of the Odyssean brave
traveller, the Socratic philosopher, and the Ciceronian elite rhetorician?

---

[5] Closely linked with Alexander in imperial Greece: see e.g. Bowersock 1994a.

[6] On Odyssean themes in *Apollonius*, see van Dijk 2009, with 187–189 on this section.

[7] Pl. *Phdr*. 229b–230b. The cliché status of the passage is already noted by Plutarch
(*Amat.* 749a); see the list of references at Trapp 1990, who uncharacteristically misses the
present allusion (cf. p. 171).

These questions are raised but not answered. The wider point, however, is that the space through which Apollonius voyages is always inhabited by literary presences from the past; here as elsewhere Philostratus uses space as a metaphor for cultural memory.[8]

Even the ways in which space is described tend to be shaped by literary models. Ekphrastic descriptions like the Platonising *locus amoenus* referred to above are obvious examples. Another conspicuous variety is the ethnographic mode. For example (one of numerous possible examples): 'about the Hyphasis, its size as it crosses India and what is marvellous (*thauma*) about it, one should know the following …' (3.1.1). Perhaps subtler is his adoption of the jejune, list-like style of a *periplous*.[9] For example, at 3.52 we learn that the Hyphasis 'at its end debouches into rocky, narrow places and cliffs, and breaks through these into the sea in a single estuary'. As if to emphasise the generic allegiance at this point, the narrator follows this passage with an account of the city called Patala, where 'Alexander's fleet came under the command of Nearchus, who was very experienced in naval discipline' (3.53). Nearchus was also the author of a *periplous* detailing his voyage from India to the Persian Gulf (see *FGrH* 133: a central source for Arrian's *Indica*), and so the Philostratean reference is doubly allusive: not just to Apollonius' arrival at the same physical space as Nearchus, but also to the narrator's own adoption of a comparable literary voice. A more complex example of the periplotic voice comes at 5.1, with the description of the Pillars of Heracles:

> About the Pillars (*stēlai*) which Heracles is said to have set up as boundary markers (*horia*) of the world, I pass over the fanciful stories (*muthōdē*), preferring to point out those worth hearing and telling. The promontories of Europe and Africa are divided by a strait sixty stades wide, through which they admit the Ocean into the inner waters. On the African promontory, by name the Abinna, lions roam the ridges of the mountains that appear (*huperphainetai*) on the horizon. It connects to the Gaetuli and the Tingae, both of which are savage African tribes, and you follow it as you sail into the Ocean for nine hundred stades as far as the mouth of the Salex. One could not reckon the distance further than that, since

---

[8] I am thinking particularly of the *Heroicus*, with its revelation that the contemporary landscape is still inhabited by presences from the heroic past (discussion of this theme at Whitmarsh 2009b).

[9] Pseudo-Scylax is 'völlig kunstlos … auch vorliterarisch und außerliterarisch (Güngerich 1950: 11–12)'; even the sophisticated Arrian writes his *Indica* in a style that is 'im allgemeinen schlicht, manchmal gesucht naiv' (20).

beyond that river Africa is deserted and humans are not found. The European promontory, called Calpis, is on the right of the strait, with a length of six hundred stades, ending at Old Gadira.

There are several points to note about this passage. Once again we see that physical boundary-markers (*horia*) in real space also serve to segment textual space: just as book 2 closed with the *stēlai* marking the edge of Alexander's empire, so here, at the beginning of book 5 (the exact mid-point of the work) the *stēlai* of Heracles, that other great adventurer, mark the edge of the Mediterranean. The second point to make here relates to the construction of narratorial identity. In rejecting 'fanciful stories' (*muthōdē*), the Philostratean narrator aligns himself with Thucydidean rationality; and all the language of measurement and quantification suggests both that space in general exists primarily to be *determined*, to be known intellectually, and that this specific narrator is the intellectual master of that process.

There are, however, limits to this knowability. Indeed, the claim that 'one could not reckon' the distance beyond the (unidentified) river Salex[10] because it is uninhabited seems at first sight striking and bizarre: why should the absence of habitation make the coast unmeasurable? But the point, I think, is that the narrator's spatial mapping is second-hand, dependent on the researches of others, and so the limits of human habitation are intuitively taken to mark the limits of the knowable.[11] This interpretation bears on the question of the presentation of space in this passage. Initially, one might assume that this is a shifting, scenic description focalised by a *periplous* narrator: hence the mountain ridges 'appear', and more tellingly 'you follow [the African promontory] as you

---

[10] The only other mention of the Salex revealed by *TLG* comes at *Suda* Σ55, which offers the helpful gloss 'name of a river'! 900 stades is approximately 170 km, which would just about bring a traveller along the Moroccan coast to the Merja Zerga lagoon, which is fed by the river Oued Drader. It is possible that this is Philostratus' Salex, but this is almost certainly too literalistic a reading (see the following note for reasons to be sceptical about his knowledge of West Africa).

[11] For all his confidence, Philostratus seems at odds with the ancient tradition that was aware of human habitation much further down the coast. The western litoral of Africa was explored in the fifth century BCE by Hanno 'the navigator' (and suffete of Carthage), the Greek translation of whose brief work survives and was known already by the Hellenistic period (Ps.-Arist. *Mir.* 833a). Hanno's supplies lasted as far as the bay of *Notou keras* ('the horn of the south wind'), where he encountered humans (in the notorious episode with the Gorillae); it is not exactly certain where this was, but it must have been much further than 900 stades away (given that the expedition southwards took more than 32 days of sailing from the Pillars).

sail (*espleonti*)[12] into the Ocean for nine hundred stades'. Yet this is all generic ventriloquism. That we are not to imagine the Philostratean narrator as *literally* conducting or having conducted this sailing trip is made clear by the following sentence: 'I myself when I was in the Celtic region saw the tides …' (5.1); the phrasing makes it clear that he is moving here from an imagined reconstruction of the view from the sea, based (apparently) on periplotic sources, to drawing on his own, land-based experience of the region.

In other words, not only does space in *Apollonius* regularly seem to be intertextually overburdened, but also the *narration* of space is filtered through the archival resources of the Greek literary tradition. To write about space is to participate in an already-rehearsed script. This, after all, is a culture that is in general hyperaware of the prior boundedness of knowledge, and devoted primarily to its ordering rather than its discovery.[13] From one perspective, this cancels the need for a 'narrator's own space', since the archive in principle contains all space mapped out, and the narrator imagines himself as master of the archive. Despite this, however, there is a recurrent ethnocentrism in the description of non-Greek spaces, which requires that the narrator should measure exotic features and architecture against criteria drawn from, if not always Greece itself, then the world familiar to the Greeks (a technique that is, of course, familiar from (→) Herodotus, and arguably already found in the *Odyssey*).[14] Thus Taxila is like Ninos in size, symmetrically fortified like a Greek city (2.20.2); it is divided into orderly rows of houses 'like Athens' (2.23); the Hyphasis is 'like the Danube' (3.1.1); Indian beans grow 'three times larger than the Egyptian kind' (3.5.1), albeit their vines are small, 'like those in Lydia and Maeonia' (3.5.2); Damis compares a spring to Theban Dirce (3.17.1); there is a statue of Tantalus wearing his cloak 'like the Thessalians' (3.25.3); Indians do not have seating plans 'like the Greeks' (3.27.3); the Gadirans are 'Greek-like' (*Hellēnikous*) and educated 'in our manner' (*ton hēmeteron tropon*, 5.4); an Egyptian mountain is said to be no smaller than the Marsyas and

---

[12] This form of phrasing, with a dative participle marking the imagined traveller, a variant of the 'anonymous witness' device, is found in (→) Herodotus, (→) Thucydides, (→) Appian and (→) Pausanias; see Güngerich 1950.

[13] On the sense of knowledge in the imperial period as bounded, 'archived', see König and Whitmarsh 2007: 29–30.

[14] See esp. 9.106–115, where the Cyclopes are described in terms of what they lack relative to the Greeks.

the Maeander (6.26.1). Here, as so often in *Apollonius*, we are often left wondering whether these comparisons are focalised by the narrator or his source, Damis (the passage cited above from 3.17.1 is exceptionally explicit).[15] Ultimately, however, it matters little for our purposes: even where the focalisation *is* Damis', it is not contested by the narrator, so that it becomes his too.

But even the 'narrator's own space' motif, however, represents more than mere parochialism. These reference points do not simply serve to exemplify the narrator's own world-view (as e.g. do those of Nick Carraway, the midwestern narrator of *The Great Gatsby* discussed in the Introduction). For a start, the pedagogic persona adopted by the narrator raises the question of whether these comparisons exist more for our benefit than his own. But even so, they are not all exactly obvious, mainstream allusions. The city of Ninos, the Danube, Egyptian beans, Anatolian vines and rivers, Thessalian representations of Tantalus: these comparanda suggest a narrator with an impressively broad cultural competence. Indeed, one of the dominant themes of *Apollonius* is the need specifically to *avoid* ethnocentrism. Both the Indians (e.g. 2.29.2; 3.19.1) and the Egyptians (6.19.5–21.6) critique Greek values. The narrator adverts to the existence of different cultures' traditions on, for example, Dionysus (2.9.1–2) and Heracles (2.3, 33.2).

In sum, while we can certainly detect a Hellenocentric drift, the Philostratean narrator seems at pains also to demonstrate his worldliness, his grasp of wider cultural modalities. So while it remains generally true that the presentation of space in *Apollonius* suggests a narrator who is ever aware of and responsive to Greek literary precedent (at the levels both of space described and the very processes of description), we can detect too a contrary resistance to that phenomenon, an unwillingness to be constrained by tradition.

Cosmic and Terrestrial Visions

Let us turn now to consider in more detail the play between the local and the cosmic. As we have already begun to see, the Philostratean narrator shows a marked interest in demonstrating his omnicompetent understanding of geography all over the world; but at the same time as he describes locales, he signals their subservience to a wider cosmic order.

---

[15] *SAGN* 1: 427–428.

A powerful contrast is thus enforced between the immediate setting of the narrative and the noumenal space of the universe, contemplated by the philosopher.

This ambivalence is primarily triggered by Apollonius' focalisation. He in general refuses to be impressed by local architecture and features, playing the *nil admirari* card ('wisdom renders awe-struck that which meets with it, but itself is awestruck by nothing', 7.22.3).[16] This contrast seems particularly important in the context of the built environment.[17] In Babylon (which is, of course, famously lavish in its construction), it is brought out in the clash of interpretations between the narrator and Apollonius himself. The former offers a rich, ekphrastic account of the city, modelled on Herodotus (1.25 ~ Hdt. 1.179–186). Despite a contemptuous reference to the 'Median woman' (i.e. Semiramis) who built the city, the narrator's overall impression is awestruck: 'the palaces are roofed with bronze, which dazzles (*astraptei*) from them; the bedchambers, men's quarters and colonnades are beautified with silver, golden tapestries or gold itself in the form of pictures …' (1.25.2). Apollonius himself, by contrast, 'did not look at any of the marvels (*thaumazomenōn*), but passed them by as if he were on a highway' (1.30). A similar effect is achieved in a different way, when the king shows him the 'marvel' (*thauma*) of the tunnel under the Euphrates, only to have Apollonius dismiss it; when the king shows him the walls of Ecbatana and claims they are the 'dwelling of the gods', Apollonius observes that the Spartans need no fortifications (1.39.1). The scene as a whole is replaying the Herodotean topos of Solon and Croesus, but the emphasis is now on built space rather than on wealth in general.[18] The palace at Babylon serves as a reference point for later discussions of the built environment: the Indian palace at Taxila, for example, is favourably contrasted for its lack of ostentation (*ogkos*, 2.25); Domitian's palace is implicitly likened to it (Apollonius sniffily compares it to a bathhouse, 7.31.2). It is a general (if not universal)[19]

---

[16] See further *SAGN 1*: 433–434.

[17] Similarly in (→) Herodian.

[18] Cf. esp. Hdt. 1.30.1 for Croesus displaying his treasure-chambers (*thēsauroi*) to an unimpressed Solon.

[19] E.g. when they travel up the Nile, Apollonius and company view the pyramids and pause at each *polis*, shrine and sanctuary (5.43.3). Here, however, the objects are reverend because of their age and religious significance, not because of their status as symbols of human power (even though, as Philostratus must have known, there are traditions going back at least to Herodotus that present the pyramids as royal follies).

rule that human artefacts are viewed in *Apollonius* as follies, symptoms of vain grandiosity of power. Such artificial spaces are testing-sites for moral behaviour, whether in terms of their design, execution and display by kings—characterizing function—or in terms of their interpretation by Apollonius, also a form of characterizing function (but with elements of psychologizing too).

We might also improvise another category, the *philosophising function*. Apollonius' response to and narration of built space is steered not just by his personality and his moods but also by his theoretical convictions, and in particular by his adherence to the Stoic-Cynic philosophical principle of cosmopolitanism. The wise man can be happy anywhere in the world, since he makes the *cosmos* his *polis*. Apollonius makes a number of comments along these lines: 'to the wise man Greece is everywhere' (1.35.2); 'I have concern for no political constitution (*politeia*), since I live under the gods' (5.35.2). In this text, the cosmos has a mind (*nous*, 3.34.3), and the 'earth' (*gē*) is anthropomorphically credited with decision-making powers (it can 'receive' visitors, 3.33.1; and, more strikingly, choose to separate the Egyptians from the Indians, 6.13). The Indians promote a kind of pantheism, which sees the natural world as consistently divine: 'there are many gods in heaven, in sea, in fountains and streams, on the earth and below it' (3.35.2).[20] We seem to return to the ingenuous personification of (→) Homer and (→) the Homeric Hymns. This philosophical interest in universalism directly impacts on the narrative handling of specific places, since the wise man always pans out from the local to the universal. This again has consequences for the narrative focalisation of space, since individual perspectives are bound to be limited by human identity. Only gods, or godlike men, can see the whole.

In one passage, Apollonius engages in a discussion with Damis on the question of whether viewing the firmament from a mountain gives a better perspective:

> Such vantages (*periōpai*) show the heaven more brilliant, the stars bigger, and the sun rising after the night—but such things are obvious to shepherds and goatherds too. But how the divine cares for the human race, and how it rejoices in receiving worship from it, what virtue is and justice and self-control, all this Athos will not reveal to those who climb it, nor will Olympus that is so marvelled at (*thaumazomenos*) by the poets, unless the soul sees them. (2.5.3)

---

[20] A theme also in the *Heroicus*: Whitmarsh 2009b: 211–219, with further references.

Behind the banal truisms (abstract truths are invisible to the naked eye, philosophy sees with the 'inner eye') lies a sophisticated metanarratological point, which exploits a *glissage* between narrative and literal 'point of view'. The quality of one's focalisation of space is dependent not on where one physically stands, but on the nature of one's soul (which Apollonius evaluates in moral terms). In other words, ways of seeing are more important than what one sees; and the philosopher always sees in every local space the bigger, cosmic picture.

The Narrator and Space

The Philostratean narrator, indeed, is keen to present himself too as gifted with such powers of insight, describing space in ways that transcend the immediately visible. One such technique we have already described: in emphasising the cultural memory that attaches to particular places, the narrator asserts his claim to a transtemporal insight that goes beyond the immediate visual impact of the characters, the actorial standpoint. This sense of superior vision also emerges from the narratorial pose as a rewriter of the notebooks of the naive Damis.[21] Time and again, he supplements (or claims to supplement) Damis' descriptions of space with his own higher wisdom. An excellent example is 5.1–2, where, as we have already seen, the account of Gadira (Cadiz) is filled out with the narrator's own observations on the African and European promontories, presented as an imaginary *periplous*. He follows this with a brief disquisition on the tides and the conditions, based on observations that (we are told) derive from his own autopsy, speculation, reading and empiricism:

> I myself when I was in the Celtic region saw [AUTOPSY] the tides of the Ocean just as they are described. After many guesses [SPECULATION] as to why so huge a body of water advances and retreats, I conclude [READING] that Apollonius perceived the answer. In one of his letters to the Indians[22] he says that Ocean is pushed by underwater exhalations coming from the many crevices that are situated both below and around the earth, and goes forwards and retreats as the breathlike exhalation dies away. This is corroborated by [EMPIRICISM] sick persons in the Gadira region ...   (5.2)

---

[21] On which see *SAGN* 1: 429–430.

[22] Otherwise unknown. Even if the letter once existed, one would be surprised if Philostratus had not also read the writings on hydrology of Posidonius, who also claims to have visited Cadiz (fr. 217–219 Kidd).

The narrator may not claim superhuman powers of mystical insight, but his deep learning gives him a profound insight, an ability to see beyond the superficial, that is comparable with Apollonius'. As so often in this text, the primary narrator's intellectual authority is shared with that of its subject. Elsewhere we encounter Apollonius too offering scientifically informed explanations of physical phenomena that are hidden from the eye (notably in his volcanological account of Etna, which is contrasted with the locals' mythological explanations (5.14.1, 5.16–17), just as the narrator rejected *muthōdē* in his treatment of the Pillars (5.1)).

It is notable that the narrator's claim to insight in the Cadiz passage just cited is predicated on a literal but also a figurative ability to apperceive what goes on beneath the surface: he approves Apollonius' theory of 'underwater' movements through subterranean crevices. This trope recurs throughout *Apollonius*: we read of underground space (1.20.2), caverns (3.14.2, 46.1), minerals (the magnet, 3.46.1), animals (gold-digging ants, 3.48); and of oyster-diving in water of unfathomable depth (3.57.1). All of these suggest a knowledge that is—as our metaphor would put it—*profound*. The narrator also discusses the deep-lying properties of soil (wormwood in Babylon, 1.21.3; asphalt in Cissia, 1.24.1; realgar in India, 3.14.1), often explaining vegetal growth on the surface by this means (1.21.3, 24.1; 3.5.1–2). There is an emphasis upon scents (2.1; 3.1.1–2, 4.1), implying a more than visual grasp of the landscape; at one point (the site of the Nile cataracts), we are also told of intolerable noise (6.26). Taken together, these suggest an approach to landscape that is not just panoramic, but panaesthetic: too diverse and stimulating to be captured by mere scenic description.[23]

It is in this context of hypersensory description that we should read the massive panoramic sweeps that come near the beginnings of books 2 (the Taurus mountain ranges) and 3 (the river Hyphasis). Let us take the first as an example:

> As they approached the Caucasus, they say that they perceived the soil to be more fragrant. Let us say that this mountain is the starting-point (*arkhē*) of the Taurus, which runs through Armenia and Cilicia to Pamphylia and Mycale, where it terminates (*teleutōsa*) in the sea next to which the Carians live. This should be considered the end (*terma*) of the Caucasus not, as some say, its beginning (*arkhē*). The height of Mycale is not particularly

---

23 An early model was (→) Homer's description of the cave of Calypso.

> great, but the passes of the Caucasus are so high that they bisect the sun. By
> means of a second Taurus, the Caucasus surrounds all of Scythia bordering
> on India, and is about twenty thousand stades in length …   (2.2.1)

The passage begins with actorial focalisation ('they say that they per-
ceived …'), but suddenly marks a switch of focalisation to the external,
primary narrator, through the address to the external narratee ('let us
say that …'). In what follows, much emphasis is placed on the magni-
tude of the description, the beginnings and ends of the range, as well as
the height of the mountains: this is description that exceeds the power
of the naked eye. In the following section (after alluding to a second
massive Taurus range, encompassing all of Scythia), the narrator asserts
his own intellectual authority in making these claims: the idea that the
Taurus stretches beyond Armenia was, he says, for a long time disbe-
lieved, but the panthers trapped in Pamphylia 'confirm' (*pistountai*) it,
'as I know' (*oida*). The power to zoom out from actorial focalisation
to panoramic description, then, is predicated on the primary narrator's
self-presentation as the bearer of both autoptic evidence and intellectual
acuity.

   This characterization of the primary narrator as possessed of supe-
rior powers of vision explains the recurrent emphasis upon borders,
demarcation, geophysical and political beginnings and ends (which we
have already encountered towards the beginning of this chapter). The
Caucasus 'represents the border of' (*horizei*) Indian and Median ter-
ritory (2.2.2); they are 'crossed over' (cf. *huperbantes*) by the company
(cf. 3.5.1). As well as mountains, we find rivers cited as boundaries: Cis-
sia is surrounded by a river (1.24.1); the Hydraotes serves as a border
(*horizei*, 2.17.3); the Indus requires crossing (2.17.1, 18.1), as does the
Taygetus (4.31.2); the Hyphasis marks the limit of the Brahmans' terri-
tory (2.30.1, 32.1, 33.1); the Indians also use ditches as boundaries (*horia*,
3.5.1). The cataracts are the *horia* of Egypt and Ethiopia (6.2.1). Much
emphasis is placed on the Pillars of Heracles as the 'boundaries of the
world' (*horia tēs gēs*, 5.1), and Gadira as the 'limit' (*terma*) of Europe
(5.4); we have already met Heracles as the 'surveyor' or 'border-definer'
(*horistēs*) of the world, 'bounding' (*horizōn*) Gadira by turning its moun-
tains into pillars (2.33.2). This repeated concern with defining geophys-
ical limits serves to define the Philostratean narrator as possessed of the
near-godlike power to survey panoramically the world from an elevated
vantage. This kind of fantasy of panoptic viewing no doubt derives from
the culture of the map, 'one of the symbolic mechanisms that compensate

for the limits of human perception and impose on space an organizational grid in which things that can be thought, seemed and named are intimately linked'.[24]

There is a sense, indeed, in which the textual space of *Apollonius* is equivalent to physical space. The narrator makes consistent use of the 'narrative as journey' motif, rooted ultimately in Homer's 'paths of song',[25] encouraging his narratees to join him on a voyage ('let us go to the courtroom', 8.1), or refusing to 'pass by' (*pareinai, parerkhesthai*) features in the text (1.9; 2.21; 3.6.1, 57.1), just as Apollonius refuses to pass by important people and sites (1.32; 5.43.3; 6.22.1). The structure of the text as a whole reflects the zones of the *oikoumenē*: book 1 focuses on his journey and his visit to Babylon; books 2–3 on India; book 4 on his return to Greece; book 5 on the voyage west and Alexandria; book 6 on Ethiopia and return; books 7–8 on Rome. On a striking number of occasions, indeed, book divisions correspond to descriptions of geophysical barriers: book 2 begins with the Caucasus and ends with the Hyphasis, book 5 with the Pillars of Heracles, book 6 with the arrival at Ethiopia.[26]

If the narrative structure suggests a correspondence between textual geography and the geophysical integrity of the world, then human boundaries are contrastively inefficacious. Apollonius has no problem with border officials, whom he treats with characteristic superciliousness (1.21, 27). Particularly notable is his reply when asked to declare his exports: 'Self-control, justice, virtue, temperance, manliness, discipline'—an uncanny ancient precursor of Wilde's 'I have nothing to declare but my genius' (1.20.1). Most important of all is the *stēlē*, which we have already discussed, inscribed 'Alexander stopped here', set up next to the altars marking the 'limit' (*terma*) of his empire (2.43). Apollonius, needless to say, passes beyond this boundary without comment. Similarly, there is a (hinted at rather than explicit) critique of the global aspirations of Roman imperial power: although Rome is the centre of world (4.38.2), the hub of a global network that sends out governors 'to the provinces' (*ethnē*, 5.36.5), Apollonius can easily step beyond its limits into Parthia (1.21.1). Like the philosophical writers on

---

[24] Jacob 2006: 275.
[25] See O. Becker 1937: 36–37, with 68–85 on the Pindaric development of this idea (and 100–133 on Herodotus).
[26] Whitmarsh 2009a: 43–44.

cosmopolitanism,[27] Apollonius sees human borders as arbitrary and irrelevant. This downplaying of artificial limits serves, by contrast, to point up both the narrator's and Apollonius' powerful comprehension of real, natural space.

Natural Landscapes

As we have seen on a number of occasions, *Apollonius* privileges natural over cultural means of demarcating space. When humans intervene in the landscape, it is usually a sign of destructive vanity. The paradigm case is Nero's digging of the Isthmus (4.24.2; 5.7.4; the subject of another (probably) Philostratean dialogue, *Nero*).[28] Apollonius compares this (failed) act to Xerxes' bridging of the Hellespont, thus associating it with the well-known Herodotean trope linking tyrannical acquisitiveness with the transgression of natural boundaries. Indeed, human building in general occupies a problematic place in the Philostratean moral economy. In the midst of a discussion of festivals at Olympia, Apollonius distinguishes between 'gymnasia, colonnades, springs, buildings', which 'are made by human skill (*tekhnēi*)'; in contrast, 'the Alpheus here, the racetrack, the stadium, the groves came about before human beings' (8.18.3). The inclination here is not towards an eighteenth-century aesthetic of spaces unspoiled by human society, but towards the complementarity of civilised and natural spaces. Apollonius immediately follows up with a discussion of the human uses to which such natural spaces can be put: the Alpheus provides water for drinking and bathing, the racetrack 'a broad space for horses to compete in', and so on. What gives Olympia its magnetism is the alignment of human practice with natural space: this is civilised life 'in accordance with nature' (*kata phusin*), as Stoics and Cynics would put it.[29]

---

[27] See esp. Favorinus *On exile* 11.3: 'Now birds and fish preserve the allotment that they inherited from Zeus, as do all the other animals that go on the ground; but humans have divided up the earth out of greed, chopping up the god's gift. They separate Asia, Europe and Libya from one another with rivers; neighbouring peoples with mountains; local inhabitants with city walls; fellow citizens with houses; co-habitants with doors; and even those who share the same ceiling with coffers and boxes'. Philostratus by contrast would (like Herodotus) see mountains and rivers as natural boundaries.

[28] Whitmarsh 1999a.

[29] This ideal dovetails with the principle we find expressed in the little treatise *On nature and culture* (which I believe to be by the same Philostratus), i.e. that the two are interdependent. See the translation and brief discussion at Swain 2009: 41–44.

This philosophical belief shapes the presentation of the numerous ekphrases of landscapes and shrines that we find throughout *Apollonius*. These include: the meadow (*leimōn*) where Apollonius was born, where a temple 'now' stands (1.5); the temple of Apollo at Daphne, where huge cypress trees grow (1.16); the sanctuary of Dionysus in India, where laurel trees grow all around, and ivy and vines make a roof (2.8); and the sanctuary of Heracles at Geryon's grave, where trees unparalleled elsewhere in the world grow, which drip blood (5.7.1). In all of these cases, nature and culture interpenetrate; the sanctity seems to emerge out of the harmony between human construction and natural beauty. These descriptions are primarily symbolic, conveying the religious sanctity of the place.

There is, however, also an element of psychologizing function, since it takes a cultured viewer to perceive beauty (as numerous texts of the period tell us, from Lucian's *On the Hall* to Pausanias). An excellent example comes in the description of the temple of Apollo at Daphne. The landscape here is presented as conventionally beautiful, in the standard Platonic-pastoral mode: tall trees and gentle springs (1.16.1). We are immediately told, however, that 'Apollonius saw that the place was attractive (*kharien*), but that there was no serious activity (*spoudēn*) undertaken in it—the people were semibarbaric and uncultured' (1.16.2). The beautiful ekphrasis, then, is (at least in part) focalised by Apollonius, whose civilised response stands in stark contrast with the apathy of the uncultured inhabitants.

It would be misleading, however, to suggest that Philostratus—the author also of the *Imagines*, celebrations of the power of pictorial representation—is interested in artistic beauty only as an excrescence of nature. *Apollonius*, indeed, contains celebrated art-theoretical discourses, which have received considerable attention.[30] The most famous of these comes at 2.22, where Apollonius argues that representation involves more than just mimesis of things; it also involves the imagination (*phantasia*) of both artist and viewer. What is less often noted is that this discussion is importantly set within an ekphrastically described space, a huge temple (to an unidentified deity) at Taxila:[31]

---

[30] The classic discussion is Birmelin 1933; see most recently Schirren 2005: 272–285 and Platt 2009.

[31] Note too that the discussion of *phantasia* is immediately followed by another temple ekphrasis, this time of the shrine of Helius (2.24).

> They say they saw a temple in front of the walls a little smaller than hundred-foot ones in length and built with shell stone. Inside it there was a shrine comparatively small for such a large, many-columned temple, but worthy of wonder. Into every wall there are nailed bronze panels illustrating the deeds of Porus and Alexander. On them, in brass, silver, gold, and dark bronze, there are depicted elephants, horses, soldiers, helmets and shields, with spears, javelins, and swords all in iron. Just as they say of a famous painting, for example one by Zeuxis, Polygnotus or Euphranor, that the artists liked shadow, verisimilitude and perspective, the same effects, so they say, are visible here too, and the materials are blended like colours.   (2.20.2)

This temple ekphrasis puts into practice the theory of *phantasia*: although the narrator is at this point dependent on Damis, he imagines himself there, decreeing in Pausanian fashion that the temple is 'worthy of wonder' (*thaumasai … axion*). This impression that the description is focalized by the external narrator is reinforced by the shift to the present tense, as is conventional for Greek literature. What is more, just as the narrator conjures the illusion of his own presence, so the paintings on the wall are themselves illusory: the colours of the material act, in a kind of *trompe-l'œil* at one remove, as a substitute for paint; the material constitution of the artwork blends harmoniously into its mimetic content. The whole effect is one of verisimilitude, or *to empnoun*,[32] literally 'life-likeness', 'animatedness', 'possession of the breath of life'. The gap between mimesis and reality is foreclosed by superior craftsmanship. Or should we say superior viewing? Is it the narrator's connoisseurship that fantasises this sophisticated trick of representation? After all, Damis cannot have remarked on it (can he?). In other words, what we seem to have here is the narrator's imaginary construction of a hyper-verisimilar artwork: two distinct but analogous stages of plausible fantasy.

This lifelike depiction of Porus and Alexander leads the narrator into a disquisition on the 'character' (*ēthos*) of the image, which he takes to reflect the deep friendship between Porus and Alexander (since although dedicated by the former it depicts the latter's victory). Here the narrator's imagination allows him to transcend the brute limitations of visual stimuli and access (what he takes to be) Porus' original intention in dedicating it. As much as nature, then, art can guide a cultivated viewer from the local to the general, from the quotidian to the universal. Once again, then, the description of spaces of exceptional beauty can be seen

---

[32] *To empnoun* is Jacobs' (credible) emendation for MSS *to eupnoun*.

in terms of a psychologizing function, since they are (at least partly) focalised by Apollonius; but there is also a strong theoretical dimension to these issues.

Conclusion

The narration of space in *Apollonius* might be said to mediate between a number of polarities: past and present, local and global, superficial perception and deep truth, nature and culture. All these aspects are united in the philosophical personae of Apollonius and the narrator, who share (or so it is claimed) an ability to see beyond the immediate confines of space and time; to access the distant, the opaque, the otherwise unknowable. It is for this reason that I have spoken of a 'philosophising function' in the presentation of space: for although Philostratus is no neoplatonist positing a gulf between the phenomenal and the noumenal worlds, the epistemological model presumed in *Apollonius* suggests that the philosophically enlightened see in real space truths that others cannot. At times, this model tends towards an elevation of nature over culture, belittling (like so much cosmopolitan thought) the petty constructions of human beings; but at other times it is sublime art, with its capacity to transform raw materials into indices of higher and greater truths, that dominates. The form of human construction that seems to harmonise best with the natural world is religious building; indeed, it is no coincidence that the acceptably 'artificial' spaces discussed above are holy places. Religion is thus presented as the ideal conjuncture of the natural and the cultural, the human and the divine.

PART EIGHT

THE NOVEL

CHARITON

K. de Temmerman

Narrator's Space and Frames

Chariton's *Callirhoe* is the oldest extant novel in the European literary tradition. Its opening sentence is at once its most conspicuous reference to the narrator's own space: he presents himself as 'Chariton of Aphrodisias', which recalls Herodotus' self-presentation in his Proem, and is, given its obvious thematic appropriateness to the narrator of a narrative identified in the same paragraph as a love story (*pathos erōtikon*, 1.1.1), possibly a pseudonym ('Mister Charming from the City of Aphrodite').[1] Since this narrator at several other occasions fictitiously depicts himself as contemporary to the events narrated (the period before Alexander's conquest of Asia, that is), the identification of his home town is anachronistic (it was founded about two centuries later).[2] Similarly, the narrator's presentation of the Euphrates as the border of the Persian empire (5.1.3) reflects the reality of Chariton's own day (first century AD).[3] Other instances where the narrator's space is perceptible are equally intrusive, albeit not in terms of chronology but rather in terms of identity. For example, the narrator compares an ongoing trial in Babylon with famous festivals of panhellenic proportions, such as the Eleusinian nights and the Olympic games (5.4.4; 6.2.1), to convey the impatience and excitement of *Persian* onlookers. Such *comparantia* are conspicuous narratorial markers of Greekness and emphatic intrusions of the narrator's space upon the setting. They are instances of a broader tendency in Chariton, as well

---

[1] *Pace* Tilg 2010: 19, 26, 31, 50, who simply discards the possibility of a pseudonym or literary pose in Chariton's self-introduction (but accepts such a possibility in Xenophon of Ephesus, 87).

[2] See *SAGN* 1: 480.

[3] Baslez 1992: 203. On other anachronisms in Chariton, see Billault 1989: 547.

as in other narrative fiction of the imperial period (such as (→) Philo-stratus' *Life of Apollonius*), to use Greek reference points to comment on non-Greek phenomena, a technique well-known from historiography).[4]

Apart from such narratorial intrusions, Chariton's novel contains a number of other references to places that do not act as setting for the plot (e.g. Acragas, 1.2.4; Epirus, 1.1.2; Libya, 3.3.8; China, 6.4.2). All of these are stray references scattered throughout the narrative (a distribution of space that opposes Chariton's novel to (→) Achilles Tatius', where such spaces are often given elaborate descriptions). The space that most conspicuously does not act as setting for the plot is Athens, whose famous defeat by the Syracusans is often evoked.[5] The presence of Athens as non-setting becomes tangible when Callirhoe's kidnappers reach the coast of Attica (1.11.4) and consider the possibility of taking her to Athens but finally decide not to do so and set sail to Miletus instead (1.11.5–7). This tantalizing marginalization of Athens is put into relief all the more by, and can plausibly be taken to interact with, the pervasive presence of Athenian discourse in the literary texture of the novel.[6] It is also conspicuous in other novelistic literature (such as Heliodorus),[7] but inverses common practice in other authors more or less contemporary to Chariton (such as (→) Plutarch), where Athens is a location of supreme importance.

Some frames evoked are famous places recalling Athenian and Spartan victories over the Persians. Such spaces often occur in speeches. Callirhoe, for example, evokes a contrast between Chaereas and Arta-xerxes (and the Persians in general) by drawing attention to the fact that Syracuse could not be beaten even by the Athenians, who *did* beat the Persian king at Marathon and Salamis (6.7.10). Chaereas, for his part, reminds three hundred Dorian soldiers whom he has selected to capture Tyre that an equal number of Spartans at Thermopylae confronted an enemy far more numerous than the current Tyrian enemy (7.3.9). This famous paradigm of Hellenic bravery is echoed a little later and simul-taneously supplemented with another such paradigm when Chaereas

---

[4] See (→) Herodotus. Connections between Chariton's novel and historiography have been well documented (W. Bartsch 1934; Laplace 1997: 39–53, Trzaskoma 2011). On historiography and novelistic fiction in general, see J.R. Morgan 2007a.

[5] See 1.11.2; 2.6.3; 3.4.18, 10.8; 5.8.8; 6.7.10; 7.2.3, 3.7, 5.8; 8.2.12. On Syracuse and Athens in Chariton's novel, see Laplace 1997: 53–62.

[6] See S.D. Smith 2007: 99–198.

[7] See, for example, J.R. Morgan 1989. On the depiction of Athens in the novels, see also Oudot 1992.

associates himself explicitly not only with Leonidas but also with Oth-
ryades[8] (7.3.11), another Spartan hero and leader of 300 soldiers at the
battle of Thyrea. As these two examples indicate, such *lieux de mémoire*
are typically evoked by characters as part of rhetorical strategies. This
use of frames inscribes itself in a long-standing literary tradition (e.g.
(→) Lysias) and is particularly reminiscent of historiography. Chaereas'
speech even seems to be a reworking of a speech delivered by Xenophon
in the *Anabasis* (3.2.8–39): like Chaereas' speech, this speech is addressed
by a commander to army troops in militarily difficult times. And like
Chaereas' speech, it meets with unanimous approval, develops the theme
of Spartan origin, addresses the problem of being outnumbered and the
question of whether or not to return home and, finally, evokes Marathon,
Salamis and Plataea (albeit implicitly; 3.2.11, 13) as part of an argumen-
tative strategy.[9]

Forms of Setting

Setting accounts for the majority of references to geographical space in
Chariton. Although the narrator explicitly presents his narrative as 'a
story that happened in Syracuse' (1.1.1),[10] geographical setting in the
novel mainly gravitates towards three cities consecutively (Syracuse,
Miletus, Babylon).[11] Books 1 to 4 are set in Syracuse and Miletus (with
short episodes on the Ionian sea, Miletus' harbour Docimus, the city
of Priene, Lydia and Caria). Books 5 and 6 are set mainly in Babylon
(characters are said to pass through Armenia, 5.2.1, and Cilicia, 5.1.3,
on their way there). Books 7 and 8, finally, come full circle by taking
the setting back to the west of the Euphrates (Egypt, Syria, Phoenicia,
Aradus, Chios and Cyprus) and ultimately to Syracuse. As this overview
indicates, Chariton is no exception to the overall rule that routes in
the novels are easy to follow and that narrators are concerned with

---

[8] I here follow d'Orville's (1750) *editio princeps*, which corrects the manuscript (L)
reading of *Mithridatou* and is followed by Molinié [1979] 2002 and Goold 1995. However,
Blake 1938 and Reardon 2004 read *Miltiadou*.
[9] See Trzaskoma 2011: 26–27 (with further references) on some of these similarities.
[10] Translations of Chariton's text are taken from Reardon [1989] ²2008, slightly adapt-
ed where appropriate or necessary.
[11] On the depiction of specific geographical areas in novelistic literature, see Bompaire
1977; Bonneau 1992 and Ruiz-Montero 1994a: 1028–1029.

sketching a plausibly realistic geography.[12] This tendency is also found in earlier Greek narrative, such as (→) Apollonius of Rhodes' *Argonautica*, and reminiscent of the historiographical concern of evoking or pretending geographical precision. In addition, the historiographical dimension in Chariton's handling of setting is also evident in his preference for regions at the periphery of the Greek world rather than at its centre. This preference is shared by other novelists,[13] but Chariton centres on Achaemenid Persia in particular, the same realm adopted by Herodotus.[14]

Another historiographical feature of the handling of space in most Greek novels, including Chariton's, informs the transitions between settings. When episodes at different places are presented as happening simultaneously, the transition between them is often constructed from a narratorial, panoramic perspective. After having related events in Miletus, for example, the narrator overtly intervenes to announce that he will now 'relate what happened in Syracuse' in the meantime (3.2.17).[15] Such overt narratorial interventions to change setting usually take the syntactical form of *men … de* constructions, the device *par excellence* since Homer.[16] On the other hand, when events in different settings are presented as happening consecutively, the narrator often constructs transition between these settings by adopting a shifting scenic actorial standpoint: the physical movements of characters are instrumental in introducing new areas into the story and generating transitions between them.[17] In other instances, the transition between settings follows the movements of letters rather than persons.[18]

---

[12] Alvares 1996 shows maps that outline the movements of the protagonists in the novels.

[13] Bierl 2006: 75–76.

[14] Lowe 2000: 112–113.

[15] Other examples are 7.4.11, 6.1; 8.6.1.

[16] Hägg 1971: 186, 314–316; Konstan 2002: 9. For Homer, see *SAGN* 2: 31.

[17] This type of transition is what Konstan 2002: 2 calls a 'trail'. When, for example, we are told that Hermocrates inspects Sicily and others are sent to the Italian mainland, these places never act as setting because we are following Chaereas as he sails the Ionian sea, where he finds Theron's ship, which eventually leads him to Miletus (3.3.8–4.1). More examples are 1.11.1, 8; 3.4.1–5.9; 3.6.1–4.1.12; 4.2.1–5.3; 5.3–6; 7.2.2–9, 3.1–4.10 and 4.13.

[18] Setting shifts from Priene to Miletus, for example, when letters are intercepted by a magistrate who has them sent to Miletus (4.5.6), where the subsequent scene unfolds (4.5.7–6.4).

It is well known that Chariton's narrator does not give much detailed information about setting.[19] Landscapes are hardly depicted at all and, as in most of the other Greek novels, the countryside is associated with general notions of retreat and quiet reminiscent of those thematized in rhetorical textbook descriptions.[20] When episodes are set in cities, space is likewise usually determined by and limited to rhetorical standard *topoi* (like those seen at work in Menander Rhetor) of urban description, such as streets, temples, theatres, town squares, harbours and gymnasia.[21] Moreover, details are often limited to what is functional to the immediate narrative context. Attention is paid, for example, to the strong geographical position of Tyre and its walls and gates because the entire episode is geared towards demonstrating Chaereas' success in capturing this city (7.2.8–9).[22] Such a strictly functional use of spatial detail may be read not so much as a marker of idealization (as suggested by Saïd 1994: 224–225), but rather as the adoption of a technique reaching back to (→) Homer, found also in most of (→) Herodotus' accounts of cities and picked up by Lucian in *How History Ought to Be Written* (57).

Most spaces are referred to by short indications, while longer ekphrases of settings are rare; one of the few examples concerns the courtroom in the royal palace in Babylon.[23]

> There is a special room in the palace (*en tois basileiois*) which is designated a law court (*dikastērion*), an unusually big and beautiful room. In the middle stands the king's throne; on each side are places for the king's friends, those who in rank and ability count among the very first in the land. Around the throne stand captains and commanders and the most distinguished of the king's freedmen—one could well say of such an assembly,
>
> The gods, sitting at Zeus' side, held debate.
> Those involved in the case are brought in in silence and trepidation.
>
> (5.4.5–7)

This description, which opens with the 'there is a place X' motif reaching back to (→) Homer, is interwoven with the themes of authority, hierarchy and dominance so central to Chariton's novel. The organization of the description is instrumental in developing these themes. It is spatial and

---

[19] See, for example, Cuny 2005: 220, 223.
[20] Saïd 1987: 156.
[21] Saïd 1994: 219.
[22] Saïd 1994: 225.
[23] Other examples are an ekphrasis of a funeral procession (1.5.2–3) and one of Tyre (7.2.8–9).

hierarchical at the same time: after characterizing the room in its totality ('big and beautiful'), the narrator focuses on its centre, where the throne of the king stands. Then, the focus gradually moves from the centre to the periphery (first the king's friends on each side of the throne, then the captains and commanders around the throne, and finally the people involved in the case, whose physical position in the room is literally marginal, as they are just being brought in). This movement mirrors the hierarchical relations between the people in the room: the king, in the centre, is the highest judicial authority in the room and is surrounded by inferiors (friends, captains and commanders).[24] The physically marginalized people entering the courtroom belong to the lowest hierarchical level, as they are the object of the trial. Moreover, the hierarchical levels and the unidirectional power relations enacted by this description are echoed by the quotation of the Homeric verse which in the *Iliad* opens the famous deliberation of the gods in the fourth book; it evokes the Olympian assembly room as a frame, thereby casting the courtroom as the setting of the exercise of omnipotent, divine power. The connection between spatial description and the thematization of power is in itself reminiscent enough of historiography and biography (→ Herodian, Plutarch). In addition, the fact that the courtroom in Chariton is part of the *palace* presents this description as a variation upon a well-known *topos* in Greek historiography from the imperial period, where the space of the palace is frequently a synecdoche for imperial authority.[25]

Thematic and Symbolic Functions of Space

Since travel is one of the main ingredients of the ancient novelistic genre, the plot is immediately connected with changes in geographical setting;[26] in other words, space has a thematic function. Space is, of course, instrumental in generating the separation and reunion of the protagonists, which are often felt to constitute the thematic core of the novels.[27] As a place of storms, shipwrecks and pirates, the sea is

---

[24] See also S.D. Smith 2007: 82.
[25] See, for example, (→) Herodian.
[26] See Romm 2008.
[27] See, for example, Konstan 1994: 48–59; Konstan 2002: 1 (separation tests mutual and symmetrical passion and narrativizes the evolution of love); Cuny 2005: 227 (succession of spaces thematizes the unparalleled beauty of heroines).

particularly frequent as a topos inducing separation.[28] At times, space is also instrumental in enhancing dramatic effect: whereas Chariton's omniscient[29] primary narrator regularly communicates to the narratee where characters are, the characters themselves often do not know where others are—a situation played out memorably when Chaereas enters the Babylonian courtroom to the complete surprise of all but the narratee (5.8.1).

In Chariton, the thematic function of space is further underlined by a remark made by Aphrodite at the end of the story: she judges that Chaereas has made 'honorable amends to Love', which consist precisely in wandering the world: 'having harassed by land and sea the handsome couple she had originally brought together, she decided now to reunite them' (8.1.3). Thus, the totality of the physical movements of the protagonists through space is cast as a prerequisite of the novel's happy ending and, in a metaliterarily self-conscious way, as one of the topical elements constituting its subject matter.

Foreign places where the adventures take place are opposed to the closed realm of the house from which the protagonists set out in the beginning of the story and to which they return at the end.[30] This opposition is first established in the beginning of the novel and taken up at the very end. In both instances, it articulates space as gender-specific. Whereas Chaereas in the opening lines of the novel is depicted in public spaces such as the gymnasium (1.1.5) and the palaestra (1.4.3), Callirhoe, when taken by her mother to the temple of Aphrodite on the occasion of a religious festival, has not yet ever been in public (1.1.5). Her repeated depiction within the confines of her own bedroom (*epi tēs koitēs*, 1.1.14; *ton thalamon*, 1.3.4) in the initial paragraphs of the novel underlines her social isolation, which is also clear from the fact that she does not know anything (1.1.14) about preparations being made for her own marriage (initiated in the public setting of the theatre).[31] As a device highlighting her socially secluded position, the confinement of her social space to the

---

[28] Although this motif reaches back, of course, to the *Odyssey*, it also deviates from maritime representations in epic and historiography, where the sea can also be read as a marker of cohesion and unity rather than separation (see (→) Homer).

[29] See *SAGN* 1: 479.

[30] See Létoublon 1993: 61 and Lowe 2000: 228.

[31] A similar connection between female seclusion and isolation from public knowledge occurs in 8.3.4 (Statira is in the hold of the ship and knows nothing of what happens outside).

house not only rehearses a traditional spatial constellation known from other literary genres (see, for example, (→) Euripides) but also constructs a ring composition within the novel, which concludes with her prayer in Aphrodite's temple 'before she enters the house' (8.8.15). Here, as in the first episode, her presence in the house is opposed to public space, evoked by Chaereas' and the people's presence in the theatre (*tōi theatrōi*, 8.8.15).[32] Moreover, her progression from the temple to the house recalls and reverses her movement from the house to the temple in the opening episode. The conclusion to the novel thus literally brings her back to the protective, closed and isolated realm which she left at its beginning.[33] The narratee is invited to view the entire story between those two episodes as consisting of 'outer spaces' opposed to and separated from the familiar, closed space of the house.[34]

Outer, public space is also thematically functional in Chariton in that characters are shown to exploit the spatial dynamics of social (self-)positioning and control. As one would expect, such control is often indicative of a desire to establish or reaffirm power on political and military levels. Artaxerxes, for example, rides out to war and stations himself 'in a conspicuous position in the front ranks of the by no means negligible company that accompanies him' (6.9.2), whereupon the narrator evokes epic heroism by commenting that it was clear he would distinguish himself (*aristeias*, 6.9.3). In other words, Artaxerxes consciously uses space as a tool to articulate relationships of power.[35] Furthermore, control over public space is also instrumental in establishing *emotional* control. When Callirhoe expresses a desire to erect a tomb for Chaereas near Aphrodite's temple so that posterity would be reminded of their love, Dionysius disagrees because he wants to keep that spot for himself. He therefore suggests a place in the city and adduces its visibility as an argument (4.1.5). This passage clearly imagines buildings as

---

[32] See also Hermocrates' presence in public space (the main square, *tēs agoras*, 8.6.3) at the time of the protagonists' arrival.

[33] On the security of the home city in particular, as opposed to the dangers elsewhere, see Perkins 2001: 124.

[34] On the space in which the adventures occur ('adventure space') as opposed to the protagonists' home space ('biographical space'), see Bakhtin 1981: 86–101; Beaton 2000: 182.

[35] Another example is 1.6.2–5 (Hermocrates adopts spatial organization in Callirhoe's funeral procession and Theron's crucifixion to reaffirm his position as first man of the city; see S.D. Smith 2007: 57–58, 73–75). Examples involving division and distribution of land: 7.5.7; 8.8.14.

partaking in a rhetoric of space. Control over space is staged in function of a rhetorical agenda envisaging both future commemoration and also instantaneous visibility and renown (as in the case of Callirhoe's tomb in Syracuse, 1.6.5).

Bakhtin famously highlights the inextricable connection between space and plot when he argues that space in the ancient novelistic genre is interchangeable: 'For a shipwreck one must have a sea, but which particular sea […] makes no difference at all'.[36] This emphasis on the exclusively thematic function of space has been challenged on several occasions. It is well known, for example, that geographical settings in the novels are often semantically charged. Achaemenid Persia, for example, was regarded as a setting perfectly suited to erotic intrigue since Herodotus and Xenophon.[37] Moreover, the novels are spatially constructed around thematically opposed geographical zones (Greece vs. barbary, city and country, Europe and/or Asia and/or Africa) and around regions of contrasting political or civic order (democracy vs. tyranny, urban order vs. piratical anarchy).[38] In Chariton, the protagonists' peregrinations unmistakably follow a political trajectory from Syracuse, with its prominent democratic institutions such as the *stratēgia* and the *ekklēsia* (1.1.1, 11, etc.), over liminal Miletus to the despotic Persian empire.[39] This contrast between east and west contributes to the construction of a number of major themes, such as *paideia* as a marker of Greekness, the incompatibility of Greek intelligence, autonomy and *eugeneia* with barbarian, slavish obedience and the contrast between democracy and tyranny (all emblematized by a confrontration between Callirhoe and the Persian eunuch Artaxates, 6.4.10–7.13, to name just one episode).[40] But Chariton does not simply stage the contrast between east and west as a clear-cut rehearsal of a well-known literary tradition. Rather, the opposition is frequently destabilized by elements that implicitly *align* Syracuse with Babylon (such as parallel depictions of Artaxerxes and Hermocrates in their respective hierarchies)[41] and thus constitute a rhetoric of association that is also found in historiographers contemporary to Chariton (for example (→) Josephus' *Jewish War*). Moreover, the possible, implicit

---

[36] Bakhtin 1981: 100.
[37] Romm 2008: 113.
[38] Lowe 2000: 228–229.
[39] See Lowe 2000: 228–230; Cuny 2005: 223–226.
[40] See, among others, Bowersock 1994b: 40–43.
[41] S.D. Smith 2007: 80–86.

depiction of Syracuse as a locus for the thematization of Roman imperial politics[42] further deconstructs the boundaries of political ideology between west and east.

Another type of space that has a symbolic function in Chariton is domestic space. In the beginning of the novel, Chaereas' and Callirhoe's house is semantically charged as emblematic of the marital union of the protagonists—and its vulnerability. The protagonists' adventures throughout the eight books of the novel ultimately result from the plotting of the suitors, who adopt a conspicuously spatial mode of behaviour. It is specifically by intruding and discrediting the closed and secure space of Chaereas' and Callirhoe's house that they aim to destroy the protagonists' marital happiness: they secretly approach this house and hang wreaths about its porch, sprinkle it with scent, soak the ground with wine and scatter half-burnt torches around (1.3.2). Moreover, it is precisely the inviolability of the space of the house that is the focus of the ensuing discussion between Chaereas and Callirhoe. She refutes his accusation of having forgotten him and states that 'there has been no riotous party *at my father's house*. Perhaps *your porch* is used to parties, and your lovers are upset at your marriage' (1.3.6). Callirhoe herself, that is, adopts the spatial imagery established by the acts of the suitors to proclaim her own innocence. The suitors' next attempt, their effort to drive a wedge between Chaereas and Callirhoe again takes on, quite literally, a spatial dimension: an accomplice of theirs fools Chaereas into believing that Callirhoe is unfaithful and promises to show him the adulterer if he makes his wife believe that he has gone 'off to the country' (*eis agron*, 1.4.8). Moreover, the narrator is explicit that Chaereas sends a message to inform Callirhoe of his departure because 'he cannot bear to go into the house himself' (1.4.8). Again, then, the house is conceived of as an inviolable, clean space which does not tolerate transgression. In addition, domestic space is clearly articulated as a locus of isolation and the preservation of female chastity but at the same time highlights the fragility and vulnerability of this social boundary. This concept of domestic space not only echoes traditional, male concerns with female segregation and preservation of the citizen body as a whole,[43] but also has clear literary resonances (see e.g. (→) Euripides). In the novel, such usage is combined with the image of the house as a synecdoche for marital union.

---

[42] As argued by Connors 2002.
[43] See, for example, Nevett 2010: 145.

Perkins is right to point out that later novelistic texts such as the *Apocryphal Acts* adopt domestic space to convey precisely the disruption of the social institution of marriage so prominently foregrounded in these texts.[44] I would add that this trope in the *Acts*, which inscribes itself in a long tradition exploring the entanglement of domestic space and civic institutions, rehearses specific imagery already present in the novels: the depiction of domestic space as a locus thematizing both the established order and its possible disruption is operative in Chariton.

The symbolic function of space in Chariton is, of course, not limited to geographical settings or the protagonists' house. Temples are also semantically charged. Their importance is underlined by the fact that a series of events crucial to the plot development are all set in temples of Aphrodite at various locations (mainly Syracuse and Miletus).[45] Temples are also imagined as standing midway between the secluded space of the house and open, public space (in this respect, sacred space in Chariton resembles the space of the palaestra in (→) Plato). On a structural level, firstly, Callirhoe's transition from the house to the temple in the beginning of the story, and from the temple to the house at the end literally places the temple between the house and the outer spaces where the adventures take place. Such depiction of sacred space as transitional may be read as reminiscent of sanctuaries in (→) Pindar, which frequently provide temporal transitions between mythical heroes and contemporary athletes. In Chariton, the transition generated by sacred space is not of a temporal but of a spatial kind.

Secondly, temples of Aphrodite are permeable zones of contact, simultaneously secluded and open. On the one hand, they traditionally offer protective secludedness to people addressing the gods. Callirhoe, for example, prays to Aphrodite in her temple only after asking everyone to leave (3.2.12, 8.6). As places of worship, on the other hand, temples have a public character and are more open and accessible than the setting of the house. Plangon, for example, casts Aphrodite's temple in Miletus as a zone of fusion between people from nearby (*hoi geitones*) and people from the city (*ex asteos*), who all go there to make sacrifice (2.2.5).

---

44 Perkins 2002: 122.
45 Callirhoe meets Chaereas on her way to Aphrodite's temple in Syracuse (1.1.6; see also 4.4.9) and Dionysius, her second husband, in the shrine of Aphrodite in Miletus (2.3.5–6; see also 2.4.3; 5.5.5). In the same shrine she later realizes that Chaereas is in Miletus (3.9.1) and it is there that Chaereas, in turn, discovers that Callirhoe has married Dionysius (3.6.5). See also Cuny 2005: 228–230.

Moreover, various episodes in temples thematize the protagonists' belief in the ability of Aphrodite to *show* or reveal people. This ability establishes a ring composition in Callirhoe's final prayer to Aphrodite in the temple in Syracuse (8.8.15–16), where she consciously recalls and verbally echoes her first prayer to the goddess at the same place. Whereas she asks in the beginning of the story to 'give me the man whom you have just shown (*edeixas*) to me' (1.1.7), she thanks the goddess at the end of the story 'for showing (*edeixas*) Chaereas to me once more in Syracuse, where I saw him as a maiden at your desire' (8.8.16).[46] This attention paid to showing interacts with Aphrodite's ability to show *herself* in an epiphany—an ability often addressed in these temple episodes (2.2.5, 3.6, 6.4). This emphasis on (human and divine) appearances characterizes the temples in the story as zones of contact, not only between the divine and the human but also between people and, in particular, the protagonists in search of each other.

A fourth type of symbolically functional space deals with the semantics involved in the public or private character of settings (compare e.g. (→) Plato). As recent archaeological research suggests, the construction of private and public spaces was not constant in Antiquity but open to redefinition and negotiation.[47] In Chariton's novel, semiotics of secluded vs. open space, inside vs. outside, seen vs. unseen inform two main thematic realms: those of secrecy vs. publicity and emotionality vs. rationality. Secret or private information, and its communication, firstly, are often staged in secluded or remote settings, whose isolation often highlights the vulnerability of one of the characters involved.[48] When an accomplice of one of the suitors, for example, sets out to fool Chaereas into believing that Callirhoe is unfaithful, he takes him to a *remote* spot (*khōrion ēremaion*, 1.4.5), where he promises to tell him 'something important which affects your whole life'.[49] One type of space recurrently embodying this idea of secludedness and therefore appropriate for the

---

[46] This act of showing is repeatedly evoked throughout the novel (2.2.7; 3.2.12, 6.3).

[47] Nevett 2010: 143–145.

[48] Such vulnerability is clearly conveyed in 3.7.2 (where a garrison is encouraged to attack an enemy trireme because it is lying at anchor *in a secluded spot*; *lanthanei*), 6.5.1–6 (where Artaxates decides not to approach Callirhoe until she is all by herself; *monēs, monēn, monoi*).

[49] Moreover, once Chaereas has been led to believe that Callirhoe is unfaithful, he 'shuts himself up all night (*apokleisas heauton*, 1.5.1), trying to extort information from the maids'. More examples are 4.6.1 and 3.9.6–10.

contemplation as well as the communication of secret information is the *bedroom*. For example, Artaxerxes and his wife Statira are in bed at night, occupied with different thoughts kept secret from each other (6.1.6).[50]

Just as with geographical settings, the semantic charging of public and private spaces is not straightforward. Another type of remoteness, equally suitable for secret activities and the exchange of secret information is the countryside, despite the fact that this space is, of course, public rather than private. As a locus of secrecy, it is typically opposed to the city, which involves visibility and transparancy. The sale of Callirhoe by Theron is a good example.[51] When Theron arrives in Miletus, he does not judge it prudent to look for a buyer openly (*phanerōs*, 1.12.1) but rather tries to make a quick sale privately (*krupha kai dia kheiros*, 1.12.1). Leonas is interested and suggests they go to Dionysius' estate in the *countryside* (*ton agron*, 1.13.5; *eis agron*, 2.1.3) to arrange the sale. Theron welcomes this idea because he prefers this remote location (*en erēmiai*) to the marketplace (*en agorai*, 1.13.6). In the country house, Callirhoe is sold to Leonas, but the absence of a contract leaves the sale incomplete. The transparancy and legal correctness represented by this contract is clearly presented as belonging to the realm of the city: Theron suggests that Leonas 'go into town (*eis astu*, 1.14.3) and get the legal documents made out', and Dionysius advises him to go to the marketplace (*eis tēn agoran*, 2.1.6), where the legal documents will be taken care of. When he realizes that Theron has disappeared, he concludes that Theron has illegally sold someone else's slave and that this is why he did so in 'a lonely spot' (*ep' erēmias*, 2.1.8).

The spatial dynamics involved in hiding and communicating secret information also have a visual pendant: space is also instrumental in hiding and revealing female beauty in general, Callirhoe's in particular. As is well known, the novel recurrently stages a tension between Callirhoe's presentation as the object of public admiration (her beauty is said to be renowned in the whole of Sicily and Italy in the first lines of the novel)[52] and the efforts (of herself and others) to hide her beauty from the public gaze. It has been shown that the dynamics of veiling and unveiling play an important role in generating this tension,[53] but spatial

---

[50] Another example is 8.2.1–2.

[51] Another example is 3.2.7–10 (*en erēmiai* vs. *eis tēn polin*).

[52] Cf. 1.1.1–2. For public admiration for the protagonists, see 1.1.12–13, 5.3; 3.2.17; 4.1.11; 5.5.8; 6.2.1; 8.1.11, 12, 6.10.

[53] Whitmarsh 2004: 194.

organization is no less important. Dionysius' repeated attempts to hide Callirhoe's beauty from the public gaze provide a good example. He does not want to take her to his home in the city but uses the seclusion of his estate in the countryside (2.7.1). When he does travel to the city, he again takes care not to show her to the crowd (3.2.11) by having her taken by boat in the evening 'straight to his house'. While travelling to Babylon, he invites her to make the journey in a wagon whose canvas he closes to hide her from the lustful gaze of onlookers. The narratee is invited to see the canvas as a metaphorical veil by the narrator's use of the same verb to refer to Dionysius' action and the actual action of veiling earlier in the story (*sunekalupse tēn skēnēn*, 5.2.9; *sugkalupsamenē*, 1.3.6, 13.10; *sugkekalummenos*, 3.3.14). The narrator addresses, again in spatial terms, both Callirhoe's tendency to hide herself and Dionysius' intention to hide his wife in their confrontation with the Persian woman Rhodogyne, who challenges Callirhoe to a beauty contest and takes up her position 'in full public view' (*en tōi periphanestatōi*, 5.3.6). Consequently, Callirhoe cannot stay hidden (*kekalummenēn*, 5.3.8) and Dionysius reluctantly asks her to come out of the carriage (*proelthein*, 5.3.8). But as soon as the contest is over, she re-enters the carriage and the canvas is closed again (*sugkekalummenē*, 5.3.10).

Spatial semiotics also thematize emotionality and rationality. As is well known, characters often withdraw from public interaction into private and familiar space to hide or handle discretely intense emotions such as shame, grief or love. Houses, bedrooms and gardens act as such secluded spaces.[54] Dionysius explicitly aligns his heart, the seat of his love for Callirhoe, with his house when reproaching Leonas for having 'brought fire into my house (*tēn oikian*)—or rather, into my own heart (*tēn emēn psukhēn*)' (2.4.7), an image emblematic of the characterization of inner, domestic space as appropriate for the negotiation of the emotion of love. Correspondingly, any *rational* attempt to deal with the emotion of love is usually anchored in *public* space, which can be instrumental in achieving contact with the beloved (as when Pharnaces, being in love with Callirhoe, invites her and her husband to his banquets, 4.6.2) or consolation (as when Leonas suggests to Dionysius that his grief over his deceased wife will be easier to bear in the country because of its distractions, 2.3.2).[55]

---

[54] E.g. 1.4.11; 2.1.1, 3.8; 3.3.14, 10.3; 4.2.8.

[55] See also 6.3.9–4.9 (a hunting party as an attempt to make Artaxerxes forget Callirhoe) and 8.5.15 (Dionysius' public position as a means of consolation).

Again, however, the opposition between secluded, emotional space and public, rational space is complicated in a number of instances. In such cases, secluded space is presented as suitable for intensified *mental* activity, such as decision-making and, in some cases, plotting. An example is Callirhoe's deliberation about whether or not to have an abortion. When Plangon has discovered that Callirhoe is pregnant, each of them follows her own line of reasoning (*logismous*, 2.9.1) when on their own (*kath' heautēn*, 2.9.1). Plangon repeatedly comes to Callirhoe's quarters to talk about the matter (2.10.1, 11.4), but for the final decision Callirhoe goes up to her room (*to huperōion*, 2.11.1) and shuts the door (*sugkleisasa tas thuras*, 2.11.1).[56]

Characterizing and Psychologizing Functions of Space

Space in Chariton also has a characterizing function. Indeed, this function is often made explicit by narrators and characters alike. The people chosen by Theron to rob Callirhoe's tomb, for example, are depicted in harbours (1.7.1, 3; 3.4.11) and spend their time in brothels and taverns (1.7.3). The narrator is explicit that their presence in these environments makes them 'an army fit for such a commander' (1.7.3). Similarly, the tyrant of Acragas argues that Callirhoe does not know what malice and suspicion are, whereas Chaereas has been brought up in gymnasiums (1.2.6) and therefore is 'experienced in the misbehaviour of young people'. This comment plays upon the traditional characterization of the gymnasium as a standard setting for pederastic courtship and seduction (see, for example, (→) Plato), a notion picked up also in other novels (X.Eph. 3.2.2; Ach.Tat. 8.9.4) and rehearsed by Callirhoe when she refers to Chaereas' lovers (1.3.6). As these examples indicate, setting is not only considered to be metonymically relevant to the characterization of those who appear in them; the narrator as well as the characters repeatedly make this function explicit (as in (→) Herodianus and (→) Josephus).

Less emphatically communicated by the narrator, but equally significant for the characterization of a few characters, is the psychologizing function of space. Characters themselves experience different settings in a number of ways and are defined, at least in part, through their interaction with significant spaces. At times they adjust their behaviour or

---

[56] Other examples are 1.7.1, 12.2; 2.4.3; 4.4.6; 5.2.3, 10.6.

speech to the space where they find themselves, and which they invariably consider hostile. Callirhoe, for example, feigns consent to share the king's bed when approached by Artaxates because she 'quickly realizes where she is, who she is and who her interlocutor is' (6.5.8).[57] At other occasions characters experience changes in geographical space as alienating and threatening. Callirhoe's sense of uprootedness and alienation, for example, is fleshed out by the presence in her speeches of what the narratee recognizes to be topical places in the novelistic genre.[58] Courtrooms and prison cells often figure in her soliloquies as markers of previous misfortunes (5.5.2; 6.6.3, 7.8). More specifically, she repeatedly associates the tomb in which she has been buried in Syracuse with new spaces. When she is given the most beautiful room of Dionysius' house in Miletus, for example, she defines it as 'another tomb' (*allos taphos*, 1.14.6).[59] Whereas in (→) Homer or (→) Pindar tombs are used as landmarks, in Chariton this topical space is staged as a recurrent *psychological* landmark.

The way characters experience space, now, is not fixed or static but subject to evolution. When Callirhoe, for example, has been abducted from Syracuse, the recurrent references in her speeches to foreign territory (*xenēn gēn*, 1.11.3), the loss of her country (*patridos ... esterēmai*, 3.1.6) and her status as a foreigner in Miletus (2.5.7) convey her awareness of being uprooted. When she arrives in Dionysius' house, Plangon immediately reassures her that she has come to a good house, where 'it will be like living in your own land' (*hōste en patridi*, 2.2.1). In this passage, Plangon installs an alignment between Syracuse and Miletus that will later inform Callirhoe's own discourse. When pregnant by Chaereas and deliberating whether or not to marry Dionysius in order to raise the child as *his* son, she identifies the two fathers of the child as 'one the first man in Sicily, the other in Ionia' and imagines that her son will 'sail in triumph in a Milesian warship and Hermocrates will welcome a grandson already fit for command' (2.11.2). In other words, Callirhoe casts her unborn child as an embodiment of the conflation between the Syracusan and Milesian spheres, between home and foreignness, thus proving

---

[57] On rhetorical guidelines on the importance of the setting of a speech or conversation, see Brethes 2007: 131–132. Similar examples of characters' awareness of this importance are 7.1.9 and 8.1.9.

[58] On some of such topical places, see Létoublon 1993: 61–80.

[59] Other examples are 5.1.7 and 7.6.8.

Plangon's prediction true. Moreover, her acts correspond to her gradual experience of Milesian space as familiar rather than threatening. For example, she hides herself from the public gaze in Miletus by going off to the quarters that she focalizes as *familiar* (*tēn oikēsin tēn sunēthē*, 2.4.1) and, when informed about Chaereas' (alleged) death, she 'runs into the house (*ton oikon*, 3.10.3) that she had first entered when she was sold'. In both instances, then, Milesian space in Callirhoe's focalization becomes familiar and protective.

Later, when she is about to leave Miletus for Babylon, the alignment between Syracuse and Miletus resurfaces explicitly: she is 'distressed to be taken far from the Greek sea; as long as she could see the harbours of Miletus, she had the impression that Syracuse was not far away' (4.7.8). Whereas, at the beginning of her stay, Miletus represents foreignness and otherness for Callirhoe, she gradually appropriates this space by associating it with her old, original, space. The narrator is explicit, for example, that she finds her journey easy to bear as long as she hears Greek spoken and can see 'the sea that leads to Syracuse', but that she longs for her country and despairs of ever returning when crossing the Euphrates (5.1.3). In the soliloquy that marks her entrance into the Persian empire, the association of Syracuse and Miletus and its opposition to Babylon are conspicuous:

> Now it is not Ionia where you keep me exiled; the land you allotted me up to now was admittedly a foreign country, but it was Greek, and there I could take great comfort in the thought that I was living by the sea. Now you are hurling me from my familiar world—I am at the other end of the earth from my own country. This time it is Miletus you have taken from me; before, it was Syracuse. (5.1.5–6)

The crossing of rivers is traditionally a symbolic moment in narratives of journeys (→ Herodotus). When crossing the Euphrates, then, Babylon becomes for Callirhoe the new geographical space that is the paradigm of otherness. But even the otherness embodied by Babylon is temporary and not absolute. When she later arrives on the island of Aradus, she not only contrasts (the size of) the island to Sicily but also opposes her present condition (in a warzone and surrounded by strangers and foreigners, 7.5.5) to her situation in Babylon: 'even Babylon was charitable (*philanthrōpos*) to me'. Throughout the narrative, then, Callirhoe's experience of individual geographical settings changes; simultaneously, a constant feeling of uprootedness underlies her perception of her own physical movements and the succession of settings in which she is placed, whereby she experiences the place that she has left as more favourable

than the place in which she finds herself. While it is true, as common opinion has it, that the Greek novels are about displacement and the dangers inherent in it,[60] Callirhoe's perceptions of and interactions with new spaces suggest that Chariton's novel at least is also about the ability of characters to deal with the consequences of such displacement and to adapt to new situations.

Dionysius' experience of different geographical settings as threatening is informed by a relativism similar to Callirhoe's. In Miletus, he fears that 'someone is hiding on the estate plotting to seduce his wife' (3.9.4). As soon as he leaves for Babylon, however, his fear increases and he repeatedly compares the danger of the seduction of his wife in this city to that in Miletus, which he *now*, in retrospect, characterizes as relatively small. He realizes, for example, that keeping watch over Callirhoe in Miletus was easier than doing so in the whole of Asia (4.7.7) and becomes aware of the fact that Babylon 'is no longer Miletus, and even there you were constantly on the alert for plots against you' (5.2.8; see also 5.10.3; 6.2.6). Dionysius' experience of space, then, like Callirhoe's, is not absolute. Miletus is initially experienced as threatening both by Callirhoe and Dionysius, but this experience evolves in function of new settings being introduced into their lives. As such, Miletus is more than simply a liminal or transitional space between Europe and Asia.[61] Rather, its liminal character is the object of shifting and evolving perceptions and negotiations from the characters involved. The notion that space is a relative concept was, of course, not new.[62] (→) Homer had already shown that spaces can have different values for different characters. Chariton, now, highlights that the way space is viewed and experienced by *one* character individually does not need to be static or absolute. Such perceptions, rather, are fluid, evolving and measured against other settings.

Conclusion

The construction of space in Chariton's novel is interwoven with different literary traditions. Modes of writing reminiscent of (both classical and imperial) historiography are most prominent (intrusive narrator-space, plausibly realistic geography, etc.), but a number of forms and

---

[60] See, for example, Perkins 2001: 125.
[61] As Lowe 2000: 229 and Cuny 2005: 224–225 have it.
[62] On other but comparable types of relativism in Chariton, see S.D. Smith 2007: 155–163 and de Temmerman 2010.

functions of space are also informed by spatial constellations reaching back to Homer (functional use of spatial detail, 'there is a place X' motif), Pindar (sacred, transitional space), Lysias (*lieux de mémoire* as rhetorical strategies), Plato (sacred space, gymnasium), tragedy (domestic space) and the rhetorical tradition (standard *topoi*).

On a thematic level, space is particularly instrumental in Chariton's thematization of power (a connection itself reminiscent of historiography): the narrator interweaves spatial depiction with themes of authority, hierarchy and dominance (e.g. Babylonian courtroom); characters use setting to enhance their own (political or military) self-positioning (e.g. Artaxerxes) or to establish (emotional or social) dominance (e.g. Dionysius), while others adopt frames as rhetorical tools (e.g. Chaereas). Four types of space are semantically charged throughout the novel: geographical settings (erotic and political resonances), domestic space (emblematic of established, marital order and its possible disruption), sacred space (transitional and permeable) and secluded vs. open spaces (documenting the communicability of hidden or secret information—and of female beauty as its visual pendant—and the tension between emotionality and rationality). Furthermore, the narrator as well as characters are often explicit about the characterizing function of space, whereas its psychologizing function is addressed more subtly. Not only is space in Chariton a relative concept, but individual experiences of space are also subject to psychological negotiation.

XENOPHON OF EPHESUS

K. de Temmerman

Forms of Space

Xenophon of Ephesus' narrator is hardly visible at all.[1] Accordingly, and unlike the other Greek novels, references to the narrator's own space are absent in this novel. The huge majority of spaces function as setting. Most of the geographical locations are part of a vast territory covered by the travels of various characters,[2] the main story lines of which roughly describe a clockwise trajectory from Asia Minor (Ephesus) via Mediterranean islands such as Samos, Cos, Cnidus and Rhodes to Phoenicia (Tyre), Cilicia (Tarsus) and Cappadocia (Mazacus), to Africa (Egypt), to Europe (Sicily and Italy) and back to Asia Minor via Mediterranean islands such as Crete, Cyprus and, again, Rhodes.[3]

Frames are limited to a few places that do not function as setting, for example references to India (3.11.2; 4.1.5), Thrace (3.2.1) and Babylon (1.8.2; 2.7.3).[4] A striking difference from the other novels is the absence of any frames constructed by intertextuality or the evocation of famous *lieux de mémoire*, as we see, for example, in (→) Chariton. The absence in Xenophon of spaces evoked through metaphor (or analogy) is, of course, entailed in Scobie's observation that comparisons and metaphors

---

[1] See *SAGN* 1: 489.

[2] The boundaries of this area are Perinthus (3.2.1) and Byzantium (3.2.5) to the north, Sicily (Syracuse, 5.1.1; Tauromenium, 5.6.1) and southern Italy (Tarentum, 5.5.7; Nuceria, 5.8.1) to the west, Mazacus (in Cappadocia; 3.1.1), Antioch (2.9.1), Laodicea (4.1.1), Tyre (1.14.6) and Pelusium (3.12.2) to the east and Coptus (4.1.4) and the Ethiopian heights (4.1.5, 3.1) to the south.

[3] See also Lowe 2000: 230–231.

[4] Possibly, we should also include the Nabataean ostriches which, according to Papanikolaou 1973, are depicted on the tapestries above Habrocomes' and Anthia's bed (1.8.2). However, Giangrande 1964 reads *Arabikais* ('Arabic') rather than *Nabataiais* and our only manuscript of this text reads *anabatai* ('mounted').

in general are almost absent from this novel.[5] It is also in line with the widely-acknowledged dearth of literariness in the novel. As J.R. Morgan points out, narrative fiction is an interplay between techniques evoking fictional belief in the narratee on the one hand (such as, for example, a recognizable setting) and, on the other hand, techniques aiming at drawing the narratee's attention to the fictionality, literariness or artfulness of the textual surface of the narrative, such as, for example, through intertextual resonances.[6] In Kytzler's view, the low number of comparisons in Xenophon's novel is an indication that Xenophon is unwilling rather than unable to adopt figurative language.[7] I would add that the low frequency of metaphors in general and of metaphorically evoked frame space in particular may also be read as a marker of Xenophon's style as an example of *apheleia* or 'simple discourse', one of the main stylistic categories (*ideai*) in Greek literature of the first few centuries of the Common Era.[8] Ancient treatises state explicitly that *apheleia* should avoid metaphors altogether (which, according to Ps.-Aristides and Hermogenes, contribute to creating solemn discourse, the traditional opposite of *apheleia*).[9] Demetrius, for example, is explicit that the most important characteristic of simple discourse is clarity (*saphē lexin*, *Eloc.* 191), which is traditionally opposed to metaphorical language[10] and which, as he points out, is maintained by words in their proper sense (*en tois kuriois*, *Eloc.* 192), as opposed to their figurative use. The absence of metaphorically evoked frames in Xenophon, then, may be in line with this broader tendency of *apheleia* to favour literal discourse over the use of metaphors.

Turning now to the construction of settings, Xenophon's handling of space, like (→) Chariton's, is often marked by a historiographical mode of writing. Just as in Chariton, the protagonists' separation (2.8.1)

---

[5] Scobie 1973: 1 gives the numbers (Xenophon uses only 4 similes, whereas Heliodorus uses 120, Achilles Tatius 110, Longus 107 and Chariton 49). It is telling that the *Ephesiaca* is the only extant novel that hardly occurs in Morales' 2005 discussion of metaphor in this genre.

[6] J.R. Morgan 1982: 222; J.R. Morgan 1993: 197–224.

[7] Kytzler 1996: 350.

[8] See, among others, Ruiz-Montero 1982: 306–321; Ruiz-Montero 1994b: 1115–1116; Ruiz-Montero 2003: 222–228; González García 1986: 9–46; González García 1989: 225–228; and Turasiewicz 1995: 178–180.

[9] Ps.-Aristid. *Rh.* 1.30; Hermog. *Id.* 248.9–10.

[10] See, for example, Arist. *Po.* 22.1–9, where metaphor is opposed to clarity (*saphē*) and associated with riddles. See also Lausberg [1960] 1998: §§ 1239–1240 on tropes as means of alienation.

establishes two different story lines that are kept apart for most of the novel. The narrator freely and very frequently switches between these lines.[11] Again as in (→) Chariton, this alternation is usually panoramic; the narrator stops narrating about one protagonist and moves on to the other. In most cases, there is no organic connection between the strands and the alternation is abrupt, although in some cases the narrator tries to facilitate the transition by verbal echoes connecting two settings— a technique, again, found in historiography too.[12] After the narrator has recounted Anthia's presence in the Syrian countryside, for example, he switches to Habrocomes' storyline at the moment when Anthia is thinking about the latter:

> So she [Anthia] was in the country with the goatherd, always weeping for Habrocomes. Meanwhile, Apsyrtus, searching the cramped quarters where Habrocomes had been living before his punishment, came across Manto's note to Habrocomes.[13]   (2.10.1)

Xenophon is innovative in comparison to Chariton in his construction of not just two but *four* independent story-lines (as well as those of Habrocomes and Anthia, there are those of Hippothous and of Leucon and Rhode), all of which involve travelling, form a complex and dense narrative web and come together only at the very end of the novel.[14] To make these story-lines interact, Xenophon's narrator at times uses a 'smoothing' technique comparable to the above-mentioned technique of verbal echoing. When two story-lines meet, as regularly happens, the narratorial standpoint is shifting, scenic, actorial rather than panoramic: the narrator follows one character to one particular location, where there happens to be a character with whom the subsequent section of the narrative deals (see also (→) Chariton and (→) Achilles Tatius). When Polyidus, for example, sails up the Nile in search of Hippothous, he arrives in Coptus, where he intercepts Anthia. The story-line of Anthia is then picked up as part of the story-line of Hippothous rather than as a result of an abrupt ('panoramical') switch to another setting.[15]

---

[11] Xenophon's alternation technique is discussed at length by Hägg 1971: 154–177. See also *SAGN* 2: 464–465.

[12] See Konstan 2002: 9.

[13] Translations are taken from G. Anderson [1989] 2008 and slightly modified where needed.

[14] For a detailed overview of all four story-lines, see Bierl 2006: 94–97, Anhang 2.

[15] The same shifting, scenic, actorial presentation structures the protagonists' reunion (5.13.2): the narrator recounts Habrocomes' presence on Rhodes, where Anthia arrives

As a rule, the setting is represented by stray indications that create a plausible background anchoring the plot in 'real' space.[16] The novel's opening line, for example, firmly anchors the protagonists in their home city Ephesus ('Among the most influential citizens of Ephesus was a man …', 1.1.1). The only places where many geographical indications are concentrated are overviews of travel routes. Here too, the creation of a sense of realism seems the narrator's main concern. The most elaborate example is the route followed by Hippothous' band of brigands from Tarsus in Cilicia to Coptus near Ethiopia:

> … Hippothous' band moved off from Tarsus and made their way to Syria forcing any opposition in their path to submit. They burned villages and slaughtered large numbers. In this way they reached Laodicea in Syria, and there they took lodgings, not as pirates this time, but posing as tourists. There Hippothous made repeated inquiries in the hope of somehow finding Habrocomes. When he drew a blank, they took a rest and then made for Phoenicia, and from there to Egypt, for their plan was to overrun the country. They gathered a large band of robbers and made for Pelusium; sailing on the Nile to the Egyptian Hermopolis and Schedia, they put in to Menelaus' canal and missed Alexandria. They arrived at Memphis, the shrine of Isis, and from there travelled to Mendes. And they recruited natives to serve in their band and act as guides. Going through Tawa, they reached Leontopolis, and passing a number of towns, most of them of little note, they came to Coptus, which is close to Ethiopia. There they decided to do their robbing, for there was a great crowd of merchants passing through for Ethiopia and India.   (4.1.1–5)

Although the narrator does not cede focalization to Hippothous or his brigands, the depiction of space in this passage is shifting, scenic and actorial: the narrator accompanies Hippothous on his route. The passage as a whole may serve to highlight the wide geographical range of Hippothous' activities as a leader of brigands and the care with which he recruits members for his band, but another function of Hippothous' movements is plot-related: the whole itinerary leads up to Coptus, where he intercepts Anthia, the heroine of the novel, who is being held there. It is difficult to see any clear relevance of the many specific places mentioned other than a pretended geographical precision, offering stepping

---

and finds him. A similar example is the reunion of Habrocomes with Leucon and Rhode (5.10.9–11).
    [16] See E.L. Bowie 1977: 94 on plausibility in the depiction of the coutryside in particular.

stones that allow us to trace Hippothous' route that leads him to rescue Anthia.[17] Even if, as scholars have observed, Xenophon's actual geographical precision in this passage (and elsewhere) is limited,[18] the pretence of geographical accuracy (however vague or factually incorrect) can be read as a pose aligning Xenophon's narrative with historiography. The presence of this genre becomes tangible in another passage where the narrator pays attention to such geographical detail: he mentions that the distance between Ephesus and Artemis' sanctuary is seven stades (1.2.2), which is a detail taken from Herodotus (1.26.2).[19] Other than that, detailed information is virtually absent and places within geographical settings are usually indicated vaguely. After Habrocomes and Anthia, for example, have been imprisoned by Phoenician pirates, they are taken not to the city of Tyre, but 'to a place nearby' (1.14.7).[20]

Xenophon's novel also resembles (→) Chariton's in that there is a lack of detailed description of space. Landscapes are hardly described at all and settings are generally limited to standard novelistic venues such as a brothel (5.7.1), a prison (2.7.1), quarries (5.8.2), caves (2.14.1) and a cliff on the banks of the Nile (4.2.2), about none of which is any spatial detail given. Synoptic descriptions are limited to the opening chapters of the first book.[21] The first such description is that of the procession in honour of Artemis in Ephesus:

> All the local girls had to march in procession, richly dressed, as well as all the young men of Habrocomes' age—he was around sixteen, already a member of the Ephebes, and took first place in the procession. There was a great crowd of Ephesians and visitors alike to see the festival, for it was the

---

[17] Similar (but shorter) overviews of places on travel routes are found at 3.2.11–14 (Hippothous' route from Byzantium to Cilicia); 5.1.8 (Aegialeus' route from Sparta to Syracuse); and 3.1–3 (Hippothous' route from Area to Alexandria, and then on to Sicily). See also Saïd 1994: 218, for whom cities in the novels are above all landmarks that allow the reader to root the heroes' travels in the real world.

[18] See, for example, G. Anderson [1989] 2008: 155 n. 18.

[19] See Lavagnini 1950: 153–155.

[20] There are many other examples: Xanthus is said to be 'a town some distance from the sea' (2.10.4); Habrocomes meets Hippothous 'not far from the robbers' cave' in Cilicia (2.14.1); their lodgings in Mazacus are 'near the gates' (3.1.3); after her death, Anthia is taken to 'the tombs near the city' (3.7.4); both Aegialeus and Althaea live 'near the sea' (5.2.2, 11.2); Habrocomes takes lodgings 'near the harbour' on Rhodes (5.10.4).

[21] This observation roughly reflects the observation by other scholars of a puzzling discrepancy between the abundance of detail in some passages at the beginning of the story and a narrative 'skeleton' stripped of all detail in other passages ('auffällige Kürze und Trockenheit der Darstellung', Bürger 1892: 36; see also Rohde [1876] 1914: 430).

custom at this festival to find husbands for the girls and wives for the young men. So the procession filed past—first the sacred objects, the torches, the baskets, and the incense; then horses, dogs, hunting equipment … some for war, most for peace. And each of the girls was dressed as if to receive a lover. Anthia led the line of girls. … When the crowd of girls came past, no one said anything but 'Anthia!'. But when Habrocomes came in turn with the Ephebes, then, although the spectacle of the women had been a lovely sight, everyone forgot about them and transferred their gaze to him and was smitten at the sight.   (1.2.2–9)

In this description, the presentation is fixed, scenic and actorial: the narrator imagines himself as being positioned among the spectators, to whom he explicitly draws attention ('a great crowd of Ephesians and visitors alike to see the festival'). We may even argue that the procession is depicted not through the eyes of the primary narrator but through those of the bystanders, whose reactions are elaborately monitored at the end of the description. The narrator, that is, describes the procession as the crowd sees it pass before their eyes. Consequently, the organization of the ekphrasis is temporal: *first* (*prōta*) come the sacred objects, and *then* (*epi toutois*) the horses and dogs. This mode of description suits well the dynamic aspect of a procession (compare the description of a procession in (→) Josephus). This description complicates traditional characterizations of description as a pause in the progression of time (as opposed to narration, to which time progression is intrinsic): here, we have a description in which the narrator discusses people and objects that appear consecutively over time.

The second synoptic description is that of Habrocomes' and Anthia's bridal chamber:

The chamber (*thalamos*) had been prepared: a golden couch (*klinē*) had been spread with purple sheets, and above it hung an awning with an embroidered Babylonian tapestry (*skēnē*). Cupids were playing, some attending Aphrodite, who was also represented, some riding on Nabataean ostriches, some weaving garlands, others bringing flowers. These were on one half of the canopy (*skēnēs*); on the other was Ares, not in armour, but dressed in a cloak and wearing a garland, adorned for his lover Aphrodite. Eros was leading the way, with a lighted torch. Under this canopy they brought Anthia to Habrocomes and put her to bed, then shut the doors.
                                                                         (1.8.1–3)

Like that of the procession above, this description is dynamic. It briefly mentions the room but immediately zooms in on the couch and quickly moves on to the embroidered tapestry. The organization of the ekphrasis of the depiction on this tapestry is spatial: it first deals with the Cupids

on one half of the tapestry, and then with Ares on the other half. Its function is clearly thematic. It echoes the famous description of the bed of Ares' and Aphrodite's adultery in the *Odyssey* (8.266–332) and therefore highlights, by contrast, the notoriously central role played by marital fidelity in the story.[22] The evocation of adultery in the ekphrasis of the marriage bed contrasts sharply with the story of the two protagonists, whose love is sanctioned from the beginning onwards by lawful marriage and whose marital fidelity will be repeatedly threatened until the end of the novel but will ultimately be victorious.[23]

Functions of Space

Turning now to the functions of space, we may start with its thematic function. As in most Greek novels, space is closely connected with the theme of travelling.[24] In Xenophon, this function is even thematized to an extreme degree. We have already seen that Xenophon doubles the number of story-lines in Chariton and that space is instrumental to all of them.[25] Indeed, scholars have not been slow to observe that this short novel covers a bewildering number of settings following each other at a frenetic pace.[26] Attention is drawn to the thematic function of space at times when space and action become even more closely interconnected than usual, for example when part of the setting (a panoply dedicated by Habrocomes and Anthia earlier in the story) becomes instrumental in effecting a recognition leading to the novel's happy ending—a technique well known since Odysseus' recognition in the (→) *Odyssey*.

---

[22] See Shea 1998: 65–67. The depiction of the divine but adulterous love pair has surprised scholars. See, for example, Schmeling 1980: 28: 'Why put such a scene over the marriage bed of especially chaste lovers? Does Xenophon know what he is doing? Do dirty scenes produce fertility? Passion? Or is a little humor intended?'

[23] On the importance of *sōphrosunē* as a central theme in Xenophon's novel, see Schmeling 1980: 38, 116 and Brethes 2007: 154–163.

[24] For details, see the chapter on (→) Chariton. On spatial representation as instrumental for the depiction of love and longing in Xenophon's novel in particular, see Bierl 2006: 75, 85–93.

[25] Although Hägg 1971: 157 is surely right to claim that, even when Habrocomes and Anthia pass through the same cities, 'this nearness in space is never used dramatically and only seldom even alluded to at the transitions'.

[26] See, for example, Hägg 1971: 296–297. Of course, since the extant text as we have it may be an epitome of a longer version (see *SAGN* 1: 489 n. 1 and *SAGN* 2: 453), we might speculate that the alternation of settings may originally have been less rapid.

Moreover, at the beginning of the novel, space is announced almost explicitly as a thematic marker by the fact that an oracle predicts the adventures of the protagonists in conspicuously spatial terms:

> … for them I see terrible sufferings and toils that are endless;
> both will flee over the sea (*hupeir hala*) pursued by madness;
> they will suffer chains at the hands of men who mingle with the seas
>   (*mixothalassois*);
> and a tomb (*taphos*) shall be the bridal chamber (*thalamos*) for both, and
>   fire the destroyer;
> and besides the waters of the river Nile, to holy Isis
> the saviour you will afterwards offer rich gifts   (1.6.2)

Even if some details of this prediction do not correspond with the ensuing events,[27] it introduces a number of spaces that function as settings throughout the novel (Egypt, for example, is the primary setting of the plot in books 3 and 4). Moreover, it anticipates a number of spaces that not only act as setting in this particular narrative, but, more broadly, are easily recognized as topical settings in the novelistic genre: abduction by pirates at sea (as happens to the protagonists at 1.12.3) and burial in a tomb (as happens to Anthia at 3.8.1). The metaphor aligning tombs with bridal chambers foreshadows Perilaus' use of this metaphor when he thinks Anthia dead ('what kind of bridal suite (*thalamos*) will I take you to—a tomb (*taphos*)', 3.7.2) and, as a novelistic topos,[28] inscribes itself in a rich literary tradition on the conflation of images of marriage and death.[29] The idea that the oracle can be read as a spatial blueprint for the narrative to come is further supported by the emphasis on space in the motivation of the protagonists' parents to send them away from the city: following the oracle (*kata ta bebouleumena*), they want them to see 'some other land and other cities' (*allēn … gēn kai allas poleis*, 1.10.3). If the sequence of different spaces throughout the novel is bewildering, Xenophon's narrator at least makes clear at the beginning of the story that space will play a thematically crucial role.

---

[27] Anthia, for example, repeatedly visits sanctuaries of Isis in Memphis (4.3.3; 5.4.6) but never offers gifts to this goddess. She and Habrocomes do make a dedication in the sanctuary of Helius on Rhodes (1.12.2–3). See also Schmeling 1980: 89–90 and *SAGN* 2: 460–461.

[28] On tombs as novelistic topoi, see Létoublon 1993: 74–78. On the conflation of marriage and death in the novel, see Wesseling 1993.

[29] See, for example, Rehm 1994 on this motif in tragedy.

Space also has symbolic functions. First of all, there is the opposition between public and private space, which is occasionally thematized in this novel (but much less than in (→) Chariton). The secludedness of home thematizes the usual topics of emotional introspection[30] and confidential conversation.[31] It also functions as a marker of care for others and safety. Hippothous, for example, when he recognizes Anthia, takes her to his house (*pros heauton*, 5.9.9) and tries to console her. When he discovers that she is also the wife of his friend Habrocomes, he keeps her there (*tēs oikias*, 5.9.13) and lavishes every attention on her.[32] The connection between secludedness, in particular home space, and safety is common in novels.

The second type of symbolic function of space concerns religious space, which is prominent in Xenophon's as well as other novels. This is usually shaped by famous sanctuaries of various gods and goddesses across the Mediterranean. In most cases, these locations echo broad themes of the novel. The temple of the goddess-virgin Artemis (1.3.1), for example, provides the setting for the protagonists' first encounter. This setting, like the tapestry discussed above, highlights chastity as a central theme. In addition, Anthia is repeatedly depicted in sanctuaries of Isis (in Memphis, 4.3.3; in Coptus, 5.4.6), who was, among other things, the protector of women and marriage in Hellenistic and Roman times. Furthermore, the first stage of the protagonists' journey ends at Samos, which is explicitly identified as 'the sacred island of Hera' (1.11.2), another goddess fostering marriage and family values. Next stops on the route are Cnidus and Cos (1.11.6), which are, of course, important cult centres of Aphrodite and Asclepius respectively, the former being emblematic of the erotic subject matter of the novelistic genre.

For the characters, religious space acts as a place suitable for taking oaths (Manto takes Rhode before the family shrine and asks her to swear not to betray her, 2.3.4), as a setting of oracles predicting the future

---

[30] Habrocomes and Anthia, for example, fall in love at a public procession, but their emotions are discussed only after they have arrived home (1.3.4).

[31] Corymbus and Euxenus, for example, speak to Anthia and Habrocomes in private (*idiai*, 1.16.2) and let them return to their usual quarters afterwards (2.1.1). Similarly, Anthia takes Eudoxus to a private room (*oikēma ti ēremaion*, 3.5.5) to ask him for a potion that will allow her to commit suicide. The confidentiality of the scene is made explicit by Anthia's request that he report none of their conversation to anyone (3.5.5).

[32] Similarly, when Anthia has simulated an epileptic fit in order to escape prostitution, the brothel keeper takes her home (*eis tēn oikian*, 5.7.5), makes her lie down and looks after her.

(Apollo's oracle at Colophon, 1.6.1; the Apis temple in Memphis, 5.4.8), as a place to pray for a good outcome of adventures (Anthia's prayer in Isis' temple in Memphis) and as a guarantee of safety and inviolability (Anthia's refuge as a suppliant in Isis' temple in Coptus, which she leaves only when Polyidus has promised not to use force). For the narratees, on the other hand, religious spaces at the beginning and the end of the novel roughly construct a ring composition (as in (→) Chariton). After the protagonists' first encounter in the famous temple of Artemis outside Ephesus (1.3.1), their parents request an oracle at the equally famous temple of Apollo in Colophon (1.6.1). Subsequently, the protagonists reach Rhodes, where they make a dedication to Helius in his famous temple (1.11.6). Some of these sanctuaries visited at the beginning of the trip also act as settings at the end of the narrative. Leucon and Rhode are reunited with Habrocomes in the temple of Helius at Rhodes (5.10.6) and Habrocomes and Anthia are reunited with each other in front of the temple of Isis on the same island (5.13.3). Afterwards, they all return to Ephesus, where they first visit Artemis' temple (5.15.2) and only then go to the city (5.15.3). The ring composition, then, looks as follows: city of Ephesus—temple of Artemis outside the city—temple of Helius at Rhodes—adventures—temple(s) of Helius (and Isis) at Rhodes—temple of Artemis outside the city of Ephesus—city of Ephesus.[33] This progression recalls the image of temples as transitional zones as thematized in (→) Chariton's novel and in other genres (see, for example, (→) Pindar).

In some instances, symbolic functions of space overlap with characterizing functions. To some extent, space 'out there' (as opposed to the protagonists' home city) is instrumental in all novels as a stage for danger and subversion of civic law.[34] In Xenophon's novel, such non-urban space is represented by the countryside in general but especially by forests and the Nile Delta. These places are all semantically charged as spaces of lawlessness, disruption of civic order, danger and death. As Saïd observes, Anthia is forced, as a punishment, to live in the countryside with a

---

[33] There are other markers of ring composition in this episode. The fact that Anthia puts her arms around Habrocomes and addresses a speech to him (5.14.1–3) recalls embraces and speeches during their wedding night (1.9.1–9). And the narrator's comment that the rest of their lives together resembles one long festival (5.15.3) recalls the festival where they first met.

[34] See Saïd 1987: 151–154. On the marshes of the Nile delta in particular as a locus of disorder, brigandage and defiance of state authority in the novels of Xenophon, Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus, see Romm 2008: 117–118.

supposedly evil slave (2.9.2), whereas various forests act as the settings of her near-execution (2.11.3), her kidnapping by pirates (2.11.11), and her near-death as a human sacrifice (2.13.1–3).[35] These non-urban spaces flesh out Anthia's vulnerability to disruptions of civic order (and it is significant that Anthia's sacrifice is prevented at the last minute by the armed forces of Perilaus, who, as the eirenarch of Cilicia (2.13.4), for a moment imposes civic order on this wild place). I would add that they also serve to characterize Hippothous and his band of brigands as enemies of civic institutions. In fact, space is functional in marking Hippothous' personal development from being part of the civic establishment to becoming an outlaw and back again.[36] As a member of the local elite (3.2.1) in Perinthus, he is initially depicted in typically urban civic spaces such as the gymnasium (3.2.2) of his home city and in Byzantium, where the social setting is, again, that of the local elite (3.2.5). The part of his name referring to horses (hippo-) is traditionally associated with wealth and the upper class.[37] His transition to a life of brigandage is clearly aligned with his rejection of his urban environment: after having buried his beloved, he decides not to return to Perinthus (3.2.14) but to travel to Phrygia Magna and Pamphylia, where he takes to brigandage. From that point onwards, he roams in a thick wood (hulē daseia, 2.11.11) and is repeatedly located in caves (tou antrou, 2.14.1; also 2.14.5; 3.3.4; 4.3.6, 4.1, 5.1, etc.). Significantly, his life in these environments is concomitant with his conscious efforts to destroy civic space: he attacks and burns villages and houses (4.1.1; 5.2.2). His transition back to civic life is similarly marked by a change in setting: when his band of brigands has been annihilated, he travels to Sicily and in the city of Tauromenium marries a rich, old woman. Once he inherits her fortune (5.9.1), he lives the life of a rich man (5.9.2) and is depicted almost exclusively in urban settings (Tauromenium, Tarentum, Ephesus). The fact that Hippothous' marriage is the direct result of the necessity to support himself (aporiai … tēn aporian, 5.9.1) verbally echoes the reason why he took to brigandage in the first place (aporia biou, 3.2.14) and suggests that this episode is constructed as the counterpart of this earlier transition. Whereas first he responds to this necessity by rejecting urban environments and, indeed,

---

[35] Saïd 1987: 153–154.
[36] On this development (but not so much on its spatial configuration), see Alvares 1995 and Watanabe 2003.
[37] See M. Jones 2006: 558 on a character named Aristippus in Heliodorus.

destroying civic space, he now responds to it by returning to an urban environment and embracing one of the most important civic institutions.

This distinction between city and countryside resonates with other passages in the novel where urban space is associated with wealth and therefore experienced to be a place of civilization, opportunity, cultural sophistication and beauty. Babylon, for example, is the place of origin of embroidered tapestries (*epepoikilto skēnē*, 1.8.2) and of clothes sent as presents (*dōrōn*) together with 'plenty of gold and silver' (*khruson aphthonon kai arguron*, 2.7.3). And Hippothous goes round the city of Tarentum in the hope of buying something elegant (5.9.5). Broadly speaking, then, the countryside is firmly opposed to the city in terms of acceptance and rejection of societal norms and values.

Below the surface, however, things may be a bit less clear-cut.[38] The whole island of Sicily, firstly, is aligned with urban space in that it is also associated with wealth and opportunity. Hippothous goes there because he has heard that the island is large and prosperous and therefore thinks that he is most likely to escape detection there and make a living (5.3.3; see also 5.1.1).[39] As brigands, moreover, Hippothous and his band at times adapt themselves to urban, civilized settings. As centres of wealth, cities of course form a pole of attraction to the brigands. The centripetal force exercised by cities upon spatially and socially marginalized figures such as them is visualized when the narrator mentions that it is 'not far from the robbers' cave' (*ou pro pollou tou antrou*, 2.14.1) that Hippothous decides to leave Cilicia and make for Pontus, 'for they tell me that wealthy men live there' (2.14.3). Similarly, he thinks of Mazacus, another Cappadocian city, as a fine, large town from which he intends to recruit 'able-bodied young men to reconstitute his band' (3.1.1). Moreover, Hippothous and his band consciously adopt a cultivated form of behaviour in order to merge temporarily into an urban environment. When they arrive in the city of Laodicea (4.1.1), for example, they pose as tourists (4.1.1). For a moment, then, the country-dwelling brigands transform

---

[38] See also Sluiter's and Rosen's (2006: 3–4) observation that binary oppositions between city and countryside in other literary genres often turn out to be problematic rather than clear-cut.

[39] Although not thematized to any extent, we may infer that a motivation similar to Hippothous' lies behind Aegialeus' and Thelxinoe's flight from Sparta to Sicily: since they are lovers and Thelxinoe has been given in marriage to someone else, their flight to Sicily (5.1.4–8) aims at escaping detection and making a living elsewhere.

themselves to fit into the urban environment. These passages show the permeability between and shapeability of the categories of city and countryside. As such they resonate with the overall tendency of Hippothous to choose consciously the settings in which he operates and consequently to adapt his way of life to them.

Psychologizing functions of space are rare. Probably the only such case is the alienating effect that changes in geographical settings have on the protagonists. Anthia, for example, laments her fate in front of the temple of Isis in Memphis, when she is about to be taken to India by Psammis:

> until now I have remained chaste, since I was regarded as sacred to you, and I have preserved my marriage to Habrocomes undefiled. But from this point I go to India, far from the land of Ephesus, far from the remains of Habrocomes.   (4.3.3)

Anthia clearly imagines her future transfer from Egypt to India as a liminal moment. As such, her conceptualization is comparable to that of Callirhoe of her own transfer to Babylon in (→) Chariton. This desperate rehearsal by the heroine of her position is contrasted by the deliberate adoption of space by the protagonists' captors as an argument in persuasive strategy. Whereas the protagonists themselves lament the fact that they are in 'a savage land' (*en gēi barbarōn*, 2.1.2), the Phoenician pirate Euxinus explicitly refers to the strangeness of this land (*gē xenē*, 1.16.5) in order to underline to Habrocomes his defencelessness and to convince him to submit to another pirate's sexual advances. Place is not only experienced by the protagonists as hostile to them, but also exploited by their enemies as such. This employment of space is instrumental in the depiction of the dynamics of control of characters over each other, which is a concern much more elaborately explored in other novels, such as (→) Chariton's and (→) Achilles Tatius'.

Conclusion

The construction of space in Xenophon's *Ephesiaca* deviates from that in other novels in a number of ways: the narrator's own space in this novel is invisible and there is a conspicuous absence of interaction with the literary tradition and, accordingly, of metaphorically evoked frames (an absence, I argue, in line with his aphelic writing style). Moreover, Xenophon is innovative in comparison to Chariton in his construction of not just two but *four* independent story-lines.

On the other hand, Xenophon's construction of space is also reminiscent of Chariton's. Just like Chariton (but unlike novelists from Achilles Tatius onwards), he presents space mainly through stray indications. Moreover, he does not provide much spatial detail, constructs a ring composition through the deliberate alternation of domestic and sacred space at the beginning and the end of the novel and often adopts historiographical modes of writing (the particular attention paid to travel routes evokes the presence of geographic precision; alternation between different story-lines is often panoramic, but in some instances smoothed).

Xenophon differs from the other novelists in that by far the most important function of space in his novel is thematic: whereas other novelists widely explore other functions of space too, the act of travelling is of central importance; just as in the *Odyssey*, space is instrumental in effecting a recognition; and spatial descriptions mainly provide analogies to major themes, such as love, chastity and marriage. Religious spaces in particular are symbolically charged to act as such instantiations (which forms a contrast with Chariton's subtler and richer adoption of this type of space).

Occasionally (but more rarely than in the other novels), space also has characterizing and psychologizing functions. Examples are the depiction of the coutryside, forests and caves as spaces of disruption of civic order (which is instrumental in marking Hippothous' personal development from being part of the civic establishment to becoming an outlaw and back again) and Anthia's experience of leaving Egypt for India (which is reminiscent of Callirhoe's experience of crossing the Euphrates) respectively.

ACHILLES TATIUS

K. de Temmerman

The Prologue

Achilles Tatius' is the oldest of the extant novels that emphatically draws attention to the importance of an elaborate representation of space. The prologue (1.1.1–2.3) prominently establishes this concern. It evokes three different spaces, two of which consecutively function as setting. Sidon's bay and harbour act as the initial setting. There, an anonymous narrator beholds a painting of Europa's abduction by Zeus. The space in this painting acts as frame and is dealt with in a lengthy description (1.1.2–13). The painting is simultaneously viewed by a young man who turns out to be Clitophon, the hero of the novel, and the two men begin a conversation about the power of *erōs*. The primary narrator then changes the setting by taking Clitophon to a nearby grove (*alsous geitonos*, 1.2.3), where he invites him to recount his own experiences with *erōs*. Once Clitophon has started his narration (1.3.1), the primary narrator never intervenes, and the frame narrative in Sidon is never resumed.[1] This is the only extant novel, then, where we have a minutely defined space of the narrator of the main narrative: the grove.

Whereas the description of the painting of Europa is traditionally interpreted as playing a foreshadowing role in relation to Clitophon's ensuing narrative,[2] scholars disagree about the extent to which the space represented in this painting is associated with—or dissociated from—the settings in the prologue (Sidon's harbour and the grove).[3] On the one

---

[1] See *SAGN* 1: 494.

[2] S. Bartsch 1989: 50–55; Nakatani 2003: 68–74; Morales 2004: 37–48; Cueva 2006; Reeves 2007.

[3] Morales 2004: 37 contrasts the sensuality and vividness of the ekphrasis of the painting with the economical and verbless sentences in the description of Sidon. S. Bartsch 1989: 168–169, on the other hand, points to similarities between the two descriptions, such as their formulaic style with short, asyndetic statements.

hand, these two spaces are fundamentally different. As S. Bartsch rightly
observes, within the fictional setting of the prologue the painting of
Europa is 'not a natural and geographic feature like the "real" harbour but
a contrived and artificial work'.[4] Moreover, as Martin (2002: 148) points
out, the meadow (*leimōn*) in the painting parades itself as a 'lover space',
whereas the grove is constructed to be read as a 'speaker space', which is
a 'much cooler, less erotically charged place, a location where Eros is put
into the properly distanced perspective'. But Achilles Tatius is notorious
for transgressing boundaries and blurring clear-cut distinctions,[5] and
this prologue offers a good illustration. Despite differences, the two
spaces are also similar to each other in certain respects. Indeed, the
narrator is explicit that the setting where the abduction of Europa is
imagined to take place is identical to that of the prologue itself: both are
Sidon (*Sidōn*, 1.1.1, and *Sidōnos*, 1.1.2).[6] This observation immediately
destabilizes any fixed boundary between the setting and the frame space
evoked in the painting. And it is not the only instance of 'leakage'
between the two different universes. The two spaces are also represented
through similar techniques. Both are depicted from a scenic, actorial
standpoint. Although at first it appears as if the Sidonean setting is
presented from a panoramic standpoint by an external narrator, the
narrator ultimately introduces himself at the scene ('It was there that I
arrived'), which leads the narratee to realize that the description is the
direct result of the internal narrator's own observations at the time of his
arrival. The description of the painting also adopts a scenic standpoint:
the primary narrator notices (*horō*, 1.1.2) the painting as he walks around
Sidon and describes the various scenes depicted on it as he sees them
while standing before it, although he occasionally cedes focalization to a
hypothetical observer constituted by a second person verb ('You might
have said …', 1.1.13).

   The two descriptions are similarly organized too. Both revolve around
land and sea and their intermingling and interpenetration. The two
harbours of Sidon are said to 'enclose' (*kleiōn*) the sea and the bay 'bellies
out' (*koilainetai*) down the flank of the coast, thus creating a channel
for the influx (*eisrhei*) of tidal waters. Likewise, the painting of Europa

---

[4] S. Bartsch 1989: 169.
[5] See de Temmerman 2009: 668 (with references).
[6] See also S. Bartsch 1989: 168–169. Reeves 2007: 92 incorrectly states that Europa
in this painting is abducted from *Tyre*.

underlines the fuzziness of the boundary between the meadow (*leimōn*, 1.1.3–8) and the sea (1.1.8–13). The scene on the painting is announced as 'a landscape and a seascape in one' (*gēs hama kai thalassēs*, 1.1.2) and a group of maidens are positioned 'at the edge of the meadow, on the parts of the land that jutted out into the sea' (1.1.6).[7] They are 'stepping into the edge of the sea, enough for the waves to lap over their feet a little'. This spatial representation blurs the border between land and sea and gives physical form to the ambiguity of the maidens' emotional disposition, as the narrator is explicit that their mien betrays 'at once terror and pleasure' and they seem 'both to desire to pursue the bull and to fear to enter the sea' (1.1.8).[8]

In sum, the prologue stages two universes that are ontologically different on the one hand (a setting that is a verbal representation of a 'real' space vs. a frame space that is a verbal representation of an iconic representation of space) but on the other hand similar, interconnected and, indeed, identical (both are Sidon). This blurred distinction within the prologue foreshadows a similar dynamic between space in the prologue as a whole and space in the rest of the novel. Again, we have a verbal depiction of a 'real' space (the grove) in which an artificial, contrived work of art is represented. This time, the work is not an iconic, but a verbal representation: Clitophon's narrative, which occupies the remainder of the novel (and we will return to the implications of the contrivance involved in the representation of space).

Forms of Space in Clitophon's Narrative

Let us now consider the most important forms of space in Clitophon's narration. Just as in (→) Chariton, space is structured around three geographical areas, and three urban centres in particular. In Achilles Tatius these areas are Phoenicia (1.3–2.31; especially Tyre),[9] Egypt (3.5–5.15;

---

[7] Translations are taken from Whitmarsh 2001 and slightly modified where needed.

[8] This rhetoric of intermingled emotions is part of a rhetoric of blending in this novel (see also S. Bartsch 1989: 53–54). Indeed, such rhetoric informs other descriptions of space throughout the novel, such as the description of a storm which intermingles various noises (*summigēs*, 3.2.8) and various spaces (the sea is represented in terms typical of *landscape*: crests of waves are compared with mountain peaks, and troughs with chasms, 3.2.5 and 3.2.7).

[9] The Phoenician episode is interrupted by one brief episode set in Byzantium (2.13–15).

especially Alexandria) and Asia Minor (Ephesus exclusively; 5.17–8.19), all connected by sea voyages (2.31–3.5 and 5.15–17). Unlike the novels of Chariton and Xenophon, however, space in Achilles Tatius' novel does not (really) describe a circle: the story ends with protagonists' arrival at Byzantium (8.19.3), Leucippe's home city, rather than with their return to Tyre.[10]

A number of settings are represented by stray indications only. Parts of the house of Clitophon's father (1.4), for example, which is the scene of substantial parts of the first two books, are not described at all and merely mentioned in passing (for example 'the room where I generally passed the night', 1.6.2; 'the inner parts of the house', 1.6.6; 'the *peripatos*', 2.10.2). Nevertheless, Achilles Tatius' most prominent innovation over (→) Chariton and (→) Xenophon of Ephesus in terms of space representation is his frequent adoption of descriptions of not only setting (see below) but also objects (paintings at 1.1.2–13; 3.6.3–8.7; 5.3.4–8; a mixing-bowl at 2.3.1–2, etc.), animals (a hippopotamus at 4.2.1–3; a crocodile at 4.19.1–6, etc.), persons (Leucippe at 1.4.2–5; Melite at 5.13.1–3, etc.) and events (a procession at 2.15.2–4; a storm at sea at 3.1.1–4.6, etc.). Some of these descriptions show a clear paradoxographical interest reminiscent of historiography (see, for example, Herodotus' descriptions of exotic and strange lands) and ethnography,[11] a mode of writing aligning Achilles Tatius' novel with (→) Philostratus and (→) Josephus.

Most of the descriptions adopt the same representational technique as the prologue: they are inserted by Clitophon-narrator but usually adopt a scenic, actorial mode that re-enacts the gaze of Clitophon-the-character.[12] Such re-enactment is sometimes made explicit, as, for example, in the descriptions of a painting representing the rape of Philomela by Tereus (*parestōs … horō*, 5.3.4) and paintings of Andromeda and Prometheus (*horōmen*, 3.6.3). Moreover, spatial descriptions are often introduced into the narrative when a specific location becomes rele-

---

[10] In the final paragraphs of the novel (8.19.2–3), attention is drawn to the fact that Byzantium, and not Tyre, is the final destination.

[11] Rommel 1923.

[12] This mode of presentation is given special prominence by the fact that characters within Clitophon's story only give synoptic descriptions of space that do *not* act as setting in the story at the time (but rather as frame space): examples are descriptions of the city of Tyre and an olive tree and fire there (2.14.2–6), a Sicilian spring (2.14.7), a river in Spain (2.14.8), a lake in Libya (2.14.9–10), a Phoenix bird (3.25.1–7) and panpipes (8.6.1–7).

vant for Clitophon-the-character and is about to function as setting—a device well known from (→) Homer onwards (see also (→) Chariton). The description of the women's quarters in Clitophon's house (2.19.3–5) is a case in point.

The scenic, actorial mode of presentation often goes together with a fixed standpoint (e.g. the garden of Clitophon's house, 1.15.1–8).[13] In other cases, the standpoint is shifting, which affects the organization of the ekphrasis. Clitophon's description of Alexandria (5.1–2), for example, is focalized by Clitophon-character as he *walks through* the city. Consequently, its organization is both temporal (as it follows Clitophon's movement through the city) and spatial (as it discusses various aspects of the setting from each vantage point). The first few lines are dedicated to what he sees upon his arrival ('as I entered', 5.1.1) and cover several objects (the so-called 'gates of the Sun', rows of columns and the open part of the city extending between these columns). Subsequently, Clitophon describes the view after he 'has advanced a few stades into the city' and again lists several objects seen from this new vantage point (a festival, a procession and the temple of Zeus *ouranios*).

In some cases, Clitophon's representation of space exceeds the scenic mode and adopts more overtly narratorial techniques. These instances often thematize the knowability and (more or less overt degrees of) communicability of space. In some cases, for example, Clitophon adopts a panoramic standpoint rather than a scenic one. The description of the Nile delta is a case in point:

> The Nile flows down from Egyptian Thebes, and continues to flow as before as far as Memphis (and a little way beyond: the name of the village that lies at the point where the great river ceases is Cercasorus). Thereupon it fragments around the land and three rivers are born from one, two of which spread out on either side, while the remaining one continues to flow as it did before it was divided, forming the land into deltoid shapes. Not even each of these rivers manages to flow all the way to the sea: they bifurcate variously around cities (…). Although the water is everywhere diffused, it does not lose its capacity to be sailed on, drunk and farmed.
>
> (4.11.3–5)

Although the description is inserted into the story when Clitophon is himself in the Nile Delta, it is not scenic: it covers the entire area between Thebes and the sea, providing a schematic, panoramic overview of the

---

13 Other examples are descriptions of a storm at sea (3.1–2) and a lighthouse on Pharos (5.6.3).

river's many bifurcations as visible from, say, the air or a map (for example, 'deltoid shapes', 'bifurcate variously', 'everywhere diffused') rather than from autopsy anywhere in the delta itself. Rather than having this region focalized by Clitophon-character, then, Clitophon-narrator draws upon his (bookish?) knowledge of the geographical characteristics of the Nile delta. This technique is reminiscent of (→) Apollonius Rhodius' (2.970–984) description of the Thermodon Delta, depicted not as the Argonauts could have seen it but depicted 'from above'. As so often in Greek narrative, the description adopts the present tense throughout, which suggests that it represents general truth or common knowledge rather than personal observation and hence confirms the analysis in terms of focalization by the narrator rather than a character.

Another marker of distance between Clitophon's observation of space as a character and his representation of it as a narrator is found in the way he presents his own awe at novelties. A prominent tool to convey such disposition is the rhetorical figure of antithesis.[14] The description of Alexandria is a case in point:

> I saw two extraordinary novelties, grandeur competing with splendour and the populace striving to exceed their city. Both sides won: the city was bigger than a continent and the people more numerous than an entire race. When I considered the city, I could not believe that it could be filled with people; when I beheld the people, I was amazed that a city could hold them. The scales were that finely balanced.   (5.1.6)

This description employs rhetorical strategies located more, it would seem, with Clitophon-narrator than with Clitophon-character. It contains opposites through which Clitophon-narrator processes and structures his earlier perception of the surrounding space: grandeur vs. splendour, populace vs. city, city vs. continent and populace vs. race. This conspicuously rhetorical arrangement of space suggests some distance between Clitophon-character on the one hand (awe-struck and bedazzled), and Clitophon-narrator on the other (rhetorically narrativizing his earlier awe and bedazzlement).[15] Another indication of such distance, I argue, is the fact that the description lacks specific details.[16] Its

---

[14] See Saïd 1994: 230 on Achilles Tatius' descriptions paying attention to the unusual and paradoxical rather than to precision. On paradox as a stock trait of rhetorical writing in general, see S. Bartsch 1989: 138.

[15] Morales 2004: 100–106, on the other hand, reads this description as a 'psychotic' type of autopsy.

[16] See Morales 2004: 100–106 on the 'impressionistic' character of the description. S.

vagueness resonates with the fact that it seems to be drawn, like many other ekphrases in this novel, from cultural imagination: Alexandria was a well-known stock subject of description in schoolbooks of rhetorical exercises (*progumnasmata*).[17] Also a popular subject in cultural imagination during this period (particularly in painting) was another of Clitophon's descriptions: that of the Nile delta. The description below induces a distance between observer and narrator similar to that found in the description of Alexandria above:

> The mighty Nile is everything to the locals: river, land, sea, and lake. What a novel spectacle (*theama kainon*)! A ship serves as a mattock, an oar as a plough, a rudder as a sickle! This is the habitat of sailors and farmers alike, of fish and oxen alike. You sow where once you sailed, and the land you sow is cultivated sea, for the river comes and goes. … It is also possible to see river and land competing (*philoneikian*): the one strives (*erizeton*) with the other, the water to deluge such an area of land and the land to absorb such an expanse of sweet sea. The two share victory between them (*nikōsi … nikēn*); the vanquished party (*nikōmenon*) is nowhere to be seen, and the water merges into the land.   (4.12.1–4)

This description is again built around antithetical poles to convey awe at the novelty of the spectacle: this time the central antithesis, land vs. water (which echoes the intermingling of land and sea established as early as the novel's prologue), is made specific in a series of sub-antitheses such as land vs. sea, land vs. rivers, sailors vs. farmers, fish vs. oxen, sowing vs. sailing and deluge vs. absorption. Moreover, both this description and that of Alexandria consciously adopt a rhetoric of competition, strife, and victory. This rhetoric of competition (and the conscious humanization of space it implies) is part, as are the frequent antitheses, of the rhetorical contrivance that contributes to creating distance between Clitophon-character's bewilderment and Clitophon-narrator's narrativized and rhetorically organized communication of this bewilderment. In these instances, then, space is the object of rhetorical, narratorial construction at least as much as it is re-construction of personal observation.

The prominence of Clitophon's narratorial activity as a driving force behind the representation of space is taken to an extreme degree in a number of instances where Clitophon's representation of space not

---

Bartsch 1989: 159–161, on the other hand, reads this and other descriptions as devices to 'lend realism' to the novel.
  [17] S. Bartsch 1989: 10–12, 165.

only exceeds the scenic, actorial mode typical of Clitophon-character, but also transgresses the boundaries of hermeneutical possibility. Being internal, Clitophon's narration, like the novel's prologue, is (or should be) subject to certain restrictions. Unlike an omniscient, external narrator, Clitophon does not know *by default* what happens at different places. Consequently, settings mostly correspond to the movements of Clitophon-character. However, there are notable exceptions, especially from the middle of the fifth book onwards, where the settings shift to places where Clitophon, as a character, is not present at the time.[18] Calligone's abduction by Callisthenes, for example, is recounted only after the setting has been moved to Sarapta, a village on the Tyrian shore, where Callisthenes secretly makes preparations, and to a small harbour where his accomplice lies in ambush for Calligone before kidnapping her on the seashore in Clitophon's presence (2.17.2–3). Such temporary excursions create hermeneutical difficulties, since they beg the question of *how* Clitophon, as a narrator, knows what was happening at one place while he himself was elsewhere.[19] Of course, as a narrator he can sometimes draw upon information gathered between the occurrence of events in the story and the act of narrating them in Sidon (*ex eventu* knowledge),[20] but sometimes even this option is logically impossible. When, for example, Clitophon has been smuggled out of an Ephesian prison cell, we are told that Melite, who had remained there, explains to the guard why she helped Clitophon escape (6.2.2–6). Since Clitophon does not know the guard and has no further contact with Melite after this episode, it is hard to see how he knows what happens in the cell after he has left.

Logical inconsistencies such as these have been explained as technical incompetence on the part of the author,[21] who, it appears, is unable to live up to the strict limitations imposed by internal narration. More recently, they have been interpreted as indications of narratorial unreliability.[22] The question of whether we are to read such hermeneutical transgressions as the author's or Clitophon's may well be one of the deliberately insoluble ambiguities so typical of this novel, but both readings agree that

---

[18] Hägg 1971: 130–135.
[19] *SAGN* 1: 496–497.
[20] Melite, for example, discovers a letter in Clitophon's absence (5.24.1) but later produces this letter in front of him (5.25.4). In other cases (e.g. 2.20.3–22.7), we are left to assume that Clitophon has been informed by someone who was present at the scene.
[21] Reardon 1994.
[22] J.R. Morgan 2007b.

Clitophon at times behaves as an omniscient, external narrator. It is possible to read this behaviour as the adoption of a narratorial pose that takes to an extreme the above-mentioned tendency to privilege narratorial construction over straightforward communication of observations. In some cases, that is, Clitophon's narratorial construction of space may be read as going beyond the hermeneutically possible and thus moving into the realm of fictionalization. This observation, in turn, resonates with the very beginning of Clitophon's narration, where he informs the narratee that his story is true but 'resembles fiction' (*muthois eoike*, 1.2.2).[23] It also resonates with (more or less) contemporary fiction, such as (→) Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius*, where, according to Whitmarsh in this volume, the construction of space as determinate and knowable plays to the portrayal of the narrator as a figure of intellectual authority, a *pepaideumenos* such as the historical period typically demands. In Achilles Tatius, Clitophon's representation of space highlights his concern not only with the knowability of space (as foregrounded by his panoramic description of the Nile Delta), but also with its communicability and the distance between the observing and the narrating selves that such communicability involves (such as in the rhetorically moulded descriptions of Alexandria and the Nile).

Functions of Space in Clitophon's Narrative

The main functions of space in Achilles Tatius bridge the prologue and Clitophon's narrative. One such function is thematic, not simply because travel (present as early as the first lines of the prologue, when the setting is said to be a *harbour* and the anonymous narrator presents himself as the victim of a severe storm at sea, 1.1.1–2) is one of the main ingredients, as in (→) Chariton, (→) Xenophon and (→) Heliodorus, but also because descriptions of space sometimes drive the plot. In the prologue, it is precisely the erotic theme of the painting of Europa that triggers the conversation between Clitophon and the primary narrator about the power of *erōs* and, ultimately, Clitophon's own narration about his own erotic adventures, which is referred to as an erotic story (1.2.3) and constitutes the rest of the novel. Such a protreptic (the term is S. Bartsch's) function

---

[23] See, among others, Marincic 2007: 189–200.

of description frequently resurfaces in Clitophon's narrative, for example when Sostratus' description of the island-city of Tyre results in the decision to send an embassy there.[24]

Secondly, the thematically relevant erotic function of space is intimately interwoven with a symbolic dimension of spatial representation: several spaces (again, both in the prologue and Clitophon's narrative) are semantically charged as erotic spaces.[25] The description of the meadow (*leimōn*, 1.1.3–6) on the painting of Europa, firstly, writes itself into a long tradition in Greek literature of descriptions of meadows as well-known literary *topoi* in contexts of eroticism,[26] which, notably, are often associated with the abduction of marriageable girls.[27] The flowery meadow in the painting is particularly reminiscent of that in Moschus' *Europa*. In this poem too, Europa's abduction is repeatedly said to take place in a meadow (*leimōn*, 32, 63, 67, 89) and some of the flowers populating it are the same as those in the novel.[28] Just as in the novel, Moschus' meadow too is staged as an erotic space: the narrator is explicit, for example, that the bovine Zeus is struck by the arrows of Aphrodite when abducting Europa (*Kupridos*, 76), while Zeus in Achilles Tatius is being guided by *erōs* himself (1.1.13, 2.1). In line with this erotization, space in the painting in Achilles Tatius is depicted in words bearing sexual connotations and possibly hinting at the impending intercourse between Europa and Zeus: trees intermingle (*anememikto*, 1.1.3) with flowers, branches unite (*sunēpton*, 1.1.3) their leaves, which embrace (*sumplokē*, 1.1.3) each other.[29]

---

[24] S. Bartsch 1989: 148–151.

[25] On the erotics of space in Achilles Tatius, see S. Bartsch 1989: 48–49, 53; G. Anderson 1984: 79; and Martin 2002: 144–154.

[26] See, among others, Motte 1971: 9–10, Bremer 1975: 268–274; D.L. Cairns 1997: 60–65.

[27] Martin 2002: 148.

[28] These flowers are roses (Mosch. 36, 70; Ach.Tat. 1.1.5) and narcissi (Mosch. 65; Ach.Tat. 1.1.5). There are a number of other similarities between the two passages: both meadows are explicitly said to be flowery (Mosch. *anthemoentas*, 63; *anthesi*, 64, 72; Ach.Tat. *antheōn, anthesi*, 1.1.5), in both scenes the onlooking girls form a *khoros* (Mosch. 30; Ach.Tat. 1.1.3), Europa takes the bull by its horn (Mosch. 113, 117; Ach.Tat. 1.1.10), the bull in the sea is surrounded by dolphins (Mosch. 113, 117; Ach.Tat. 1.1.13) and Europa's cloak is compared to the sail of a ship (Mosch. 130; Ach.Tat. 1.1.12). Other ancient accounts give only one or two of these details at the same time (e.g. meadow flowers in Hor. *Carm.* 3.27; the girl taking the bull's horn in Ov. *Met.* 2.833–3.9 and Lucian *DMar.* 15.2; dolphins in Lucian *DMar* 15.3). See Reeves 2003 on ancient accounts of this myth. See Mignogna 1993: 180–181 on similarities and Whitmarsh 2011: 89–90 n. 98 for verbal echoes.

[29] See also S. Bartsch 1989: 50; Reeves 2007: 89 n. 8.

Both the erotic theme and the concomitant erotization of space are yet further instances of leakage between the two universes evoked in the prologue, as they are prominent not only in the painting, but also in the description of the grove (1.2.3). As has often been noted, this setting verbally recalls the famous *locus amoenus* that acts as the setting of the act of narration in Plato's *Phaedrus* (238b–c).[30] This resonance is not only programmatic of the recurrent Platonic intertextuality that informs the ensuing novel,[31] but also thematically significant, as *Phaedrus* famously deals with *erōs*—a connection made explicit when the primary narrator urges Clitophon to tell his story since 'a setting such as this (*ho toioutos topos*) is delightful and just right for erotic fiction' (1.2.3).

Spatial erotization bridges not only the setting and frame space within the prologue, but also these two different spaces and space in Clitophon's narrative. An example of such erotization by Clitophon-narrator, firstly, occurs in his lengthy description of Alexandria, in which he describes himself as an 'unsatisfied viewer' (*akorestos theatēs*), which applies a word common in sexual discourse to his relation with the overwhelming surroundings.[32] He also recounts his own love for Leucippe and his encounter with her in a garden (1.15.1–19.3), another place of lush vegetation traditionally associated with eroticism and female sexuality. Clitophon also eroticizes this setting. Firstly, he casts the interlocking and intermingling plants in terms of sexual union which are reminiscent of spatial representation in the prologue:[33] 'leaf caressed leaf (*periplokai*), beside frond embracing frond (*peribolai*), beside fruit coiling around fruit (*sumplokai*), so intimate was this kind of mingling of trees (*homilia*)' (1.15.2). Secondly, he adduces a number of elements from this setting as *comparantia* to convey Leucippe's beauty:[34]

> the beauty of her form was vying with the flowers of the meadow: her face gleamed with the complexion of narcissus, the rose bloomed forth from her cheeks, violet was the radiance that shone from her eyes, the clusters of her locks coiled more than ivy. Thus was the brilliant meadow that lay on Leucippe's face.   (1.19.1–2)

---

[30] See, among others, Morales 2004: 51.

[31] On the use of Plato in Achilles Tatius, see Repath 2002.

[32] Morales 2004: 105–106.

[33] See Martin 2002: 151 on reading this 'loving landscape' as part of a series starting with the spatial descriptions (meadow and grove) in the prologue. On the similarities between these spaces, see also S. Bartsch 1989: 50–55 and Morales 2004: 39, 138.

[34] On the accommodation of spatial terms to depict Leucippe in this passage, see Martin 2002: 153–154; S. Bartsch 1989: 52; Littlewood 1979: 107.

The various *comparantia* in this series of comparisons take up elements discussed by Clitophon in the preceding description of the garden ('ivy', 1.15.3; 'violet, narcissus, rose', 1.15.5)[35] and may also recall the description of the painting of Europa in the prologue ('meadow', 1.1.3–6).[36]

A number of other instances of spatial erotization by Clitophon-narrator seem to playfully eroticize spatial configurations familiar from the novelistic tradition. Whereas in (→) Xenophon of Ephesus caves are spaces of outlaws and brigands, in Achilles Tatius they act as the setting of Leucippe's chastity test (8.6.12) and Melite's fidelity test (8.12.7). Whereas in (→) Chariton open and closed spaces serve to flesh out the themes of secrecy, self-control and control over others, in Achilles Tatius they constitute a potent sexual metaphor.[37] Regions and cities also have strong erotic connotations: Phoenicia, for example, is traditionally associated with lecherous behaviour and lust[38] and even Ephesus, the city of Artemis, whose sanctuary acts as setting (7.13–8.14), is strongly marked as a place of sexual activity: whereas in (→) Xenophon it is a closural space celebrating reunion and chastity, in Achilles Tatius it is home to Thersander (a sexual predator who insists on having sex with Leucippe) and it is there that Clitophon finally has (adulterous) sex with Melite (after having repeatedly associated this city with the consummation of their love: 5.12.2, 14.3).[39]

As a character too, Clitophon repeatedly eroticizes space. When finding himself in the garden with Leucippe, he embarks on a speech about the power of *erōs*. Since this speech is aimed at seducing her, it overtly illustrates the rhetorical purpose of digressions in an erotic context.[40] The connection between flowers and feathers, to which Clitophon-narrator draws attention at the end of the preceding garden description ('the spectacle of the flowers gleamed in rivalry with the plumage of the birds—a garland of feathers (*anthē pterōn*)'), resurfaces in this speech: he twice refers metaphorically to the beauty of a peacock, whose tail is said to have 'a meadow of flowers in his feathers' (*leimōna pterōn*, 1.16.3; *ho tou taō*

---

[35] S. Bartsch 1989: 52.

[36] De Temmerman 2009.

[37] Guez fc a.

[38] Morales 2004: 191–192.

[39] See also Guez fc b.

[40] Other such speeches are Charmides' description of the habits of the hippopotamus and Indian elephant (4.2; 4.4.2–8; S. Bartsch 1989: 155) and Clitophon's excursus on palms (1.17.3–5; Martin 2002: 152).

leimōn, 1.16.3) that blossoms more richly than the peahen's. Since these words are part of Clitophon's speech on the erotic behaviour of peacocks, intended to assimilate his own love for Leucippe with the peacock's love for the peahen (as is explicitly pointed out in 1.16.1),[41] this metaphor clearly appropriates the term *leimōn* for erotic discourse and prepares the ground for the narrator's comparison of Leucippe herself with a *leimōn* shortly after (1.19.1).[42] As noted above, the connection between a flowery meadow and *erōs* enacts a well-known literary *topos*, but it also complicates Leucippe's association with the peahen by aligning her with the peacock through the common imagery of the meadow. Since the peacock is traditionally regarded as an animal of Hera, the goddess of, among other things, marriage,[43] this twofold association further highlights the transition of the term *leimōn* from the purely spatial to the erotic realm.

Other characters also appropriate space for rhetorical purposes—mostly, again, in contexts of erotic persuasion. Clinias, for example, draws upon spatial imagery to condemn marriage, characterized as it is, he argues, by 'the cacophony of the flutes, the crashing of doors, the waving of torches' (1.8.3). In his discussion with Clitophon about whether homosexual or heterosexual love is to be preferred, Menelaus adduces the well-known Platonic spatial metaphor of heavenly (*ouranion*) beauty to associate it with the beauty of boys (2.36.2–3). Clitophon, for his part, aptly supplants this metaphor with equally explicit spatial imagery by adducing a number of female *exempla* (such as Europa, Antiope and Danaë) that demonstrate that female beauty brought Zeus himself down from heaven (*katēgagen ex ouranou*, 2.37.2).

A character for whom space becomes a particularly important rhetorical resource is Melite. She repeatedly eroticizes space and rhetorically appropriates it to persuade Clitophon to have sex with her. On the voyage from Egypt to Ephesus, she argues that the sea is appropriate for Eros and Aphrodite because the latter is the daughter of the sea (5.16.3) and the sea god, Poseidon, married his wife Amphitrite at sea. She corroborates this point by metaphorically connecting various parts of the ship with female fertility and marriage:[44]

---

[41] On Clitophon's association with the peacock, see also Morales 2004: 185, 190.

[42] On this passage, see also de Temmerman 2009.

[43] See *LIMC* s.v. Io (I), 662 for the myth behind the association.

[44] See also Morales 2004: 224–226 on Melite's 'formidable command of language'.

> It seems to me that our surroundings are symbols (*sumbola*) of marriage, this yoke (*zugos*) dangling above our heads and the bonds taut around the yardarm. The omens are good, my master: a bridal suite lying under a yoke and ropes bound tight. Even the rudder is close to the bridal suite: see, Fortune is piloting our marriage. … See how the sail billows out like a pregnant belly.   (5.16.4–6)

Clitophon, who refuses to have sex with Melite, responds by systematically *de-eroticizing* the setting, and thereby rejecting Melite's reading of it. He argues that the sea is not a suitable place for sex and apologetically deconstructs Melite's carefully eroticized spatial construction:[45]

> Does this seem to you a suitable place for conjugals? A marriage on the wave, a marriage tossed around by the sea? Do you want us to have a mobile bridal suite? … the sea has its laws. I have often heard it from those of a nautical inclination that boats should be undefiled by Aphrodite's acts, perhaps because they are hallowed ground, or perhaps to prevent anyone relaxing in the midst of such great danger.   (5.16.2, 7–8)

Melite characterizes this speech as sophistry (5.16.3), a concept taken up and again connected with eroticized space when Clitophon finally agrees to have sex with her in his prison cell in Ephesus: 'we needed no bed … Eros is a resourceful, improvising sophist, who can make any place (*panta topon*) suitable for his mysteries (*mustērion*)' (5.27.3–4). Clitophon-narrator here relegates to Eros the sophist's qualities that Melite has earlier attributed to Clitophon-character. In both cases, the characterization is closely connected with the ability to eroticize or de-eroticize space. But in fact, the point made by Clitophon-narrator about *erōs*' ability to facilitate sex in *any* place inverses Melite's preceding speech, where she foregrounds precisely the *specificity* of the environment as an argument to persuade Clitophon, arguing that, thanks to her, Clitophon has found Leucippe back in Ephesus (the evocations of sacred space connect the two speeches):

> A man who comes across a treasure trove pays honour to the place (*ton topon*) where he finds it, building an altar (*bōmon*), performing a sacrifice (*thusian*), and garlanding the ground. You found the trove of your love in me, yet you pay no honour to these benefactions.   (5.26.9)

---

[45] A similar case for the inappropriateness of a particular place for sex is made by Leucippe when she has been taken prisoner by Thersander in Ephesus, city of Artemis, the virgin goddess (6.21.2).

Whereas Clitophon, then, repeatedly tries to discourage Melite from having sex with him by de-eroticizing the setting, he is ultimately persuaded by yet another of Melite's spatial erotizations. He portrays himself as finally understanding that Eros does not pay attention to setting as he does: Eros is the greater sophist. Or, we may wonder, is Melite?

The observation that space is in several instances appropriated by characters as a rhetorical tool resonates, firstly, with the traditional notion of space as a means to control people.[46] Moreover, the attention paid in this novel to the characters' rhetorical, verbal imaginations and representations of space as tools to establish such control is reminiscent of the use of spatial configurations as rhetorical tools known from (→) Lysias, (→) Plutarch and (→) Chariton. But given the context of erotic persuasion in which these episodes occur, they are no simple rehearsals of this tradition; like other aspects of spatial representation in this novel, they can be read as a deliberate erotization of it.

The interconnections between space and control also resonate with another important theme in the novel. This theme, which again is present in both the prologue and Clitophon's narrative, is fairly well-known from other literary genres (e.g. (→) Apollonius of Rhodes and (→) Herodian): the human controllability of space (see also the chapters on (→) Apollonius of Rhodes and (→) Herodian). Here the question is no longer how space is used by characters to control others, but how space itself is subjected to human control. The notion of human control over space is omnipresent from the prologue onwards. Although the meadow of the painting of Europa is imagined to be a natural space, there are several markers of its cultivated, and therefore controlled, status. Trees and plants are said to constitute a *phalanx* (1.1.3) and the foliage is said to form a vault (*orophos*) over the flowers. Moreover, attention is drawn to the painter (1.1.4, 6) and to the figure of a ditch-digger (1.1.6). The emphasis on the human construction of space is only one instance of a broader concern with the controllability of space throughout the novel. In the main narrative, this theme is taken up in different instances and at different levels. Firstly, the garden (*paradeisos*) of Clitophon's house echoes the notion of human cultivation.[47] It is surrounded on all sides

---

[46] About Achilles Tatius' novel in particular, see Perkins 2001: 119–120 (on domestic space as mapping male authority over females) and Whitmarsh 2010 (on domestic space as a site of tension between paternal control and its subversion).

[47] S. Bartsch 1989: 52, on the contrary, defines this garden as 'nature'.

by a wall (*teikhion*) and by columns (*khionōn*). Moreover, it harbours vines (*ampeloi*) supported by canes (*kalamois*), a fountain (*pēgē*) and even a square conduit for its stream which has been traced around it by human hand. The columns are even emphatically humanized by the fact that they are said to constitute a 'troupe' (*khorōi*), which echoes the human *khoros* of girls in the painting of Europa (1.1.3). Finally, the cultural organization of the description of the birds, divided into tame (*kheiroētheis*, 1.15.7) and wild, further contributes to the garden's cultivated status. Significantly, some of the animals are even imagined to be performing cultural acts based upon their mythological aetiology: the cicadas and swallows are said to be singing of the Love of Eos and the feast of Tereus respectively.

Secondly, on a metatextual level, attention is drawn to the shapeability of space by aligning it with language and, therefore, the text itself. A collapse between text and space is found in the prologue, where the Phaedran setting of Clitophon's narration contains profound markers of the novel's self-reflexiveness.[48] Another instance of such collapse occurs in an episode foregrounding the importance of spatial disposition. When Clitophon has fallen in love with Leucippe, he has supper with her and the rest of the family:

> My father had arranged it (*etaxen*) so that we were drinking together on couches that had been allotted in twos: he and I on the middle couch, the two mothers on the left, and the maidens on the right. When I heard about this splendid arrangement (*tēn eutaxian*), I almost ran up to my father and kissed him for placing the maiden on the couch under my eyes.   (1.5)

In this passage, emphasis is put on the advantages of a specific spatial disposition or arrangement. The repeated use of derivatives of *taxis*, which can also refer to the rhetorical disposition of a speech, draws attention to the shapeability of space and to the effect of such moulding. Although Clitophon's father is not shown to have a specific reason in mind in placing the couches as he does, the disposition does facilitate Clitophon's visual contact with Leucippe.[49] The dynamics of space and those of the text constructing this space overlap. Space, like language, can be moulded to achieve certain effects.

---

[48] Ní Mheallaigh 2007; S. Bartsch 1989: 44.
[49] See Whitmarsh 2010: 330–332 on Clitophon's erotization of the normative domestic order in this episode.

A third area in which human control is prominent is constituted by episodes where characters actively try to establish control over space. Part of the description of a storm, for example, deals with a battle between the sailors and the passengers for the limited number of places in a lifeboat (3.3.1–4.6). Here, then, space is the object of human control in a very strong way (on such control, see also (→) Chariton). Often, characters go further than merely controlling space and actively try to manipulate it. Egyptian swamp dwellers, for example, entice their opponents onto a narrow causeway and then break the river dykes to unleash the water of the Nile onto them (4.14.3). This ability to manipulate the surrounding spatial constellation is cast as a result of their knowledge of and competence in dealing with the environment. Their ability to navigate the area where others fail is explicitly addressed and their relation with the Nile is even phrased in terms of trust (the Egyptians await the deluges, for 'the Nile never cheats') and abundance (the Nile 'is always plentiful among the Herdsmen').[50]

Next to its thematic and symbolic functions, space also has a characterizing function. In some cases, this function is rather straightforward. The fact that Melite's house, for example, is 'huge, the pre-eminent one in the city' and extravagantly furnished (5.17.1) and that she owns a country estate that contains orchard avenues (5.17.2–3) recalls her introduction into the story by Satyrus, who emphasizes her wealth (5.11.5) as a rhetorical stratagem to persuade Clitophon to marry her.

In other cases, the characterizing function of space is more subtle. The depiction of Leucippe's bedroom at the moment when Clitophon is about to enter it to have sex with her for the first time is a case in point. This room is implicitly aligned with the famous cave of the Cyclops, which therefore briefly acts as a frame against which the evolving plot can be read.[51] Satyrus informs Clitophon that Conops, the guard, has been knocked out by a sleeping potion: 'Conops is lying fast asleep: over to you! See to it that you play the part of Odysseus well' (2.23.2). For the characters, Satyrus' association of Clitophon with Odysseus is part of a word-play drawing upon the phonetic resemblances between 'Conops' and 'Cyclops'. The two figures, indeed, display thematic resemblances. Both represent obstacles that are eventually overcome by sleep.

---

[50] Another example is 3.1.1–4.6, where efforts to control a ship in a tumultuous sea also involve conscious efforts to reshape a given spatial constellation.

[51] See also de Temmerman and Demoen 2011: 8–9

As all readers of Homer know, the Cyclops falls asleep after drinking (*Od.* 9.371–374). It is, therefore, no coincidence that Conops is also put to sleep by a sleeping potion put in his drink (2.13.2). For the narratees, on the other hand, Satyrus' wordplay evokes significant *differences* between Clitophon and his paradigm. The spatial organization of this episode is significant. Whereas Odysseus puts the Cyclops to sleep in order to *escape* from a cave, Conops is put to sleep to allow Clitophon to *enter* Leucippe's room and, given the explicitly sexual purpose of his visit, Leucippe herself. This inversion of the spatial dynamic inherent to the intertextual frame can easily be read as a characterizing device. The evocation of the Homeric episode, indeed, characterizes Clitophon as a non-Odysseus. Unlike Odysseus' escape, Clitophon's entrance is not successful in that he does not attain his goal of sexual union with Leucippe. He is discovered by her mother and escapes at the last moment. This forced escape further subverts the Odyssean paradigm of the meticulously devised escape: Clitophon admits to being afraid (2.23.3) and trembles both before and after his visit (2.23.3, 6), which characterizes him, together with his flight, as a coward rather than as a courageous Odysseus.

Conclusion

Achilles Tatius was the first of the novelists to emphatically draw attention to the importance of an elaborate representation of space. This is evident not only in his innovative, pervasive use of synoptic descriptions, but also in the extent to which different spatial realms are playfully (and often ambiguously) associated with or dissociated from each other. This dynamic often entails a radical blurring of the boundaries between these spaces. The border between land and sea in the initial ekphrasis, for example, is blurred, like that between the setting and frame within the prologue: the two spaces are interconnected, similar and indeed identical. Moreover, different thematic functions of space as well as its erotization, its overlap with language and the Platonic imagery informing both space and text all bridge the prologue's two settings, the prologue's frame space and various settings in Clitophon's narrative.

Within Clitophon's narrative, spatial depictions often create distance between his observations as a character and his representations as a narrator. Many depictions are characterized by topical modes of description rather than specific detail. Moreover, they often exceed the scenic,

actorial mode that re-enacts the gaze of Clitophon-the-character and privilege more overtly narratorial techniques, such as a prominently rhetorical, antithetical mode of narrativizing. Thirdly, the prominence of narratorial activity is taken to an extreme degree when the representation of space transgresses boundaries of hermeneutical possibility, as a result of which the distinction between internal and external, omniscient narrator becomes just another instance of blurred boundaries in this novel.

In addition to the traditional thematic and characterizing functions of space known from Chariton and Xenophon, the symbolic prominence of different spaces as erotic settings is striking. Space is eroticized not only by the narrator (often for reasons of thematic resonance), but also by characters in the story (Clitophon, Clinias, Melite) as part of rhetorical strategies. On both levels, the novel can be seen to reconfigure in an erotic key spatial configurations from the literary tradition. Moreover, this rhetorical erotization is part of a broader concern with the interconnections between space and power, which, in turn, aligns Achilles Tatius with Apollonius of Rhodes and Herodian. Next to the adoption of spatial configurations to control others, human control over space *itself* is thematized through different images, such as the shapeability of space and its human cultivation and manipulation.

LONGUS

J.R. Morgan

Settings

In comparison with the other Greek novels, Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* operates within a closely restricted spatial framework. Rather than moving from location to location and using the act of travel as a means of driving the plot, the action of the novel is confined to the island of Lesbos. It mostly takes place on the estate of a rich Mytilenian landowner, Dionysophanes, located at a precisely specified distance from the city.[1] This seems to set the story in recognisable real geography, on the coast to the north of Mytilene.[2] The city is described at the very beginning of the narrative, with details drawn from reality, but thereafter remains out of sight (though not out of mind) for most of the novel. It is not described again when the action moves to Mytilene itself for a few scenes towards the end of the last book (4.33.3–36.3). The setting here is domestic rather than civic, the action being located entirely in the house of Dionysophanes, about which we are told nothing other than it has a door (outside which a crowd gathers) and a large room, in which a banquet for the leading men of the city can be held. There is a very brief excursion to the rival city of Methymna (2.19.1–3; 3.1.2–5), which is characterized not by its physical structure but by its civic institutions, in particular a deliberative assembly. The narrative also includes the journey between Mytilene and Methymna, both by sea and by land, with a rough sense of distance (3.1.2) and some description of landscape (2.12.2, 25.2). This is the full

---

[1] Unfortunately obscured by a textual variant at 1.1.2: F reads 200 stades, V (less plausibly, given that the journey takes a day of travelling) 20.

[2] Scarcella 1968; Kontis 1972; H.J. Mason 1979; E.L. Bowie 1985; Kloft 1989; H.J. Mason 1995. The dissenting voice is P. Green 1982, who opts for a site on the south of the island, on the Gulf of Kalloni.

extent of the novel's story-space: the other cities of Lesbos, even those lying between Mytilene and Methymna, do not exist in this fiction.[3]

Geographical space outside Lesbos is acknowledged only four times. In the second book Lamon tells the story of Pan and Syrinx, which he says he heard from a Sicilian goatherd (2.33.3). This is a patent allusion to Longus' primary intertext, the *Idylls* of Theocritus. In the first book there is a raid by pirates whose origins are obscured by a textual variant,[4] but who are sailing in a Carian vessel to disguise themselves as barbarians (1.28.1). The other two references, however, occur in comments by the narrator and concern places which are not within the plot at all. In a brief excursus on cows' excellence as swimmers, the narrator adduces the existence of places called Bosporus (1.30.6). As Daphnis makes his way to Chloe's house through deep snow, the narrator remarks, 'For love all ways are passable, though fire, water and the snows of Scythia' (3.5.4). These are the sole examples of clearly demarcated narrator-space in this text. In the prologue, the primary narrator represents himself as a visitor to the very location in which the story he tells took place, and thus his own origins and movements fall within the story-space.

Within Lesbos, space is fundamentally divided into country and city. These categories, of course, are, by definition and by literary tradition, ethically charged and thematically functional. The countryside is further divided. On the one hand, there is domestic and cultivated space, with scenes set in gardens, vineyards, threshing-floors, and interior domestic space. On the other, there is the natural, uncultivated wilderness, where the protagonists spend much of their time. This uncultivated space primarily consists of the pastures where Daphnis and Chloe graze their flocks, but also includes mountains, a forest, and the seashore. It is marked by a number of specific landmarks, which acquire symbolic or thematic functions: the cave of the Nymphs, an oak tree beneath which Daphnis and Chloe like to kiss and cuddle, a pine-tree with an adjacent image of Pan, a spring where the flocks are taken to drink. This division again is thematically functional, particularly in separating realistic and non-ideal peasant life from the idealised literary conventions of pastoral.

---

[3] With the possible exception of Pyrrha, which by an emendation of a textual variant at 1.28.1 might be the origin of the pirates mentioned below.

[4] According to V they are Tyrian; the other manuscript F has Pyrrhian, hinting that they might be from the Lesbian city of Pyrrha; neither makes wholly satisfactory sense.

Form

The novel begins with a prologue in which the narrator tells of his discovery of a picture:

> On Lesbos, while hunting, in a grove of the Nymphs, I saw the most beautiful sight I have ever seen, a depiction of an image, a history of love. The grove was beautiful too, thick with trees, brilliant with flowers, irrigated by running water; a single spring sustained everything, flowers and trees alike. But the picture was more delightful still …[5]   (*pr.* 1)

In this section of the text, the narrator is himself an actor. He describes the grove from a fixed scenic standpoint. The organisation of his description twice re-enacts the movement of his gaze in that first encounter, from the grove itself to the image within it, first announcing the theme in the barest terms, then repeating the movement with descriptive detail. The second description of the grove tracks his gaze from trees to flowers to spring, and then in reverse, before settling on the image. This mode is continued in the ekphrasis of the picture following the quoted extract: here the description suppresses information that the narrator acquired later, and re-enacts his incomprehension, listing the separate panels of what is clearly a narrative painting, with no sense of how the images cohere into a narrative.[6] The narrator even fails to connect the painting he describes in the prologue with the dedicatory offering that Daphnis and Chloe make at the end of the novel (4.39.2), or the grove where he sees it with the shrine of the Nymphs, which figures so largely in his narrative. The register of his description, using the most banal terms of approbation, further serves to characterize him.

Once past the prologue the narrator becomes an external one. The main narrative begins with a panoramic view of the relevant areas of Lesbos, which at first sight is focalised simply by the narrator, but into which he quickly introduces second-person verbs, involving his narratees as eyewitnesses:

> There is a city on Lesbos called Mytilene, of great size and beauty; it is transected by channels which bring the sea right into the city, and graced by bridges of polished marble. It will give you the impression of an island rather than a city. About two hundred stades distant from this

---

[5] Translations are taken from J.R. Morgan 2004.
[6] Fuller discussion in J.R. Morgan 2004: 145–150.

> city of Mytilene was a country estate of a wealthy man, a most beautiful
> possession: mountains where wild animals lived, plains where corn grew,
> slopes planted with vineyards, pastures where flocks grazed, and the sea
> lapped on the soft sand of an expanse of beach.   (1.1.1–2)

The movement of this panoramic view already establishes the novel's
thematic division of 'city and country', to which we shall return. In
this case, the division is marked by physical distance and a transition
from present tense verbs describing the city to past tense relating to the
country estate. Although it is part of the story-space, Mytilene has an
existence outside the fiction, continuing into the time of the narrator
and his narratees. This is part of the reality effect, anchoring the story
to a shared knowledge of actual geography. The reaction of the narratee
is described, oddly, in the future tense ('it will give you the impression').[7]
It is unclear whether the unvoiced temporal clause is 'when you visit it',
or 'when you read my description of it': this very equivocation plays with
the idea that reading the novel is a sort of imaginary tourism, presenting
an experience so vivid as to equate to actuality. The transition to the past
tense marks the movement from setting to narrative proper, and from
real to fictional time and space.

The action opens with a symmetrical pair of episodes in which the
exposed infants, Daphnis and Chloe, are discovered by their respective
foster-fathers, Lamon and Dryas. In both cases, the pastoral setting is
presented in the actorial scenic mode, with the narrator following the
gaze of the characters. The fuller example is the second:

> Two years later, a shepherd grazing from an adjoining farm, Dryas by
> name, also happened on similar sights and discoveries. There was a cave
> of the Nymphs, a huge rock hollow inside and dome-shaped outside. The
> statues of the Nymphs themselves were made of stones: their feet were
> shoeless, their arms bare to the shoulders, their hair hung loose to their
> necks; they wore a belt round their waist and a smile on their face. The
> whole effect was of a dance. At the precise centre of the cave, the huge
> rock, water bubbling up from a spring made a running brook, so that in
> front of the cave extended a velvety meadow of lush, soft grass nourished
> by the moisture. There were dedications of milking-pails, transverse flutes,
> panpipes and single reeds, offerings made by shepherds of the past.
>   (1.4.1–2)

---

[7] There is a textual variant here, unfortunately. F reads an aorist optative meaning
'you would think'—presumably understanding 'if you were to see it'.

The organisation of this exhibits a twofold movement. Firstly, it tracks Dryas' gaze as he follows a straying ewe to the place where she is suckling the exposed baby. Once he is inside the cave, the description follows the course of the water back to the outside, stressing its nourishing effect (and thus mirroring the ewe's feeding of the child). Finally, the list of dedications adds a temporal dimension to the ekphrasis, underlining the continuity of the worship of the countryside deities, and their connection with nourishment and music (both of which are thematically important in the novel).

The actorial scenic mode is also used in the descriptions of the countryside that articulate the narrative into its seasonal progression, mirroring the affective state of the protagonists.[8] This is how the first of them begins:

> It was the start of spring. The flowers were all abloom, in hedgerow, meadow and mountain. Now there was buzzing of bees, music of songbirds, skipping of newborn sheep; the lambs skipped on the mountains, the bees buzzed in the meadows, the birds filled the thickets with song. Everything was so full of the joy of spring that they [Daphnis and Chloe], being young and innocent, copied what they saw and heard. Hearing the birds singing they sang; seeing the lambs skipping, they leaped lightly, and copying the bees they gathered the flowers.   (1.9.1–2)

At first, it seems that the description is focalised by the narrator, but as it proceeds, it becomes clear that the true focalisation is that of the characters and that in fact the point of the paragraph is less with the description of the countryside than with the effect that the protagonists' perception of the countryside has on them. The arrangement of the description is elaborately artificial, and based on rhetorical principles. The landscape is divided into three elements, each associated with a different species of the local fauna, whose activities are in turn mimicked by Daphnis and Chloe. These elements are repeated, expanded and varied, to produce an intricate pattern of chiasmi and tricola. Every motif of this description has its original in literary pastoral.[9] In the description of the first summer, the narrator introduces an imaginary observer, a *tis*

---

[8] First spring: 1.9.1–2; first summer: 1.23.1–2; first autumn: 2.1.1–4; winter: 3.3.1–4; second spring: 3.12.1–3; second summer: 3.24.1–2; the description of the second autumn is replaced by the ekphrasis of Dionysophanes' ornamental garden at 4.2.1–3.2.

[9] Fuller analysis in J.R. Morgan 2004: 156–157.

(an instance of the 'anonymous focalizer' device), through whose eyes he presents a distanced interpretation of the scene:

> One might have thought the rivers were softly singing as they flowed, the winds were piping as they blew through the pines, the apples were dropping to the ground from love, and the sun was making everyone take their clothes off because it loved beauty so   (1.23.2)

There is an unusual variation on this format in the description of the second spring, where the narrator anaphorically employs the particle *pou*, which, if I understand it correctly, denotes an ironically feigned diffidence:

> No doubt sheep bleated, no doubt lambs skipped, then knelt under their mothers and pulled on their dugs.   (3.13.1)

The mode of presentation here is almost the exact inverse of both actorial and narratorial. It is as if the narrator is telling something that the protagonists did not notice and for which he affects to have no authority, beyond the fact that it *must* have occurred, because it is the sort of thing that one takes for granted in such a scene.

Two important scenic ekphrases deal with gardens: the *kēpos* of Philetas (2.3.3–5), and the *paradeisos* (a formal, oriental-style garden) of the landowner Dionysophanes, tended by Daphnis' foster-father Lamon (4.2.1–3.2). Philetas' garden is described in an embedded narrative told by Philetas himself to Daphnis and Chloe. In the course of the description, he introduces the subordinate focalisation of a hypothetical observer, again marked by *tis* (2.3.5). The organisation of the description moves from panorama to close-up on the plants that grow in the garden, listed according to their season. The description is thus temporally synoptic, not describing the garden as it is at the moment of speaking, but in its annual totality (the rotation of the seasons is thematically important in this text). These plants have a plot-function in that Philetas is afraid that the child Eros (whose epiphany he is describing) might break them, and also in that they enable Eros to climb a tree and disappear into the leaf-canopy. The description then moves on to the garden's feathered denizens, and in the course of talking of them Philetas incidentally mentions something of his garden's lay-out:

> I have a garden, my own handiwork, which I have laboured hard to create from the day I retired from being a herdsman. Everything the seasons produce is there in due season: in spring roses, lilies, hyacinths and both sorts of violet; in summer poppies and wild-pears and all types of apples; and at present [in the autumn] vines, figs, pomegranates and green myrtle-berries. Flocks of birds gather in my garden every morning, some to feed,

and some to sing, because it is shady and sheltered and watered by three springs. If one took the wall away, one would think one was looking at a temple-grove. (2.3.3–5)

The *paradeisos*, whose description is symmetrically placed in the second autumn, is presented, after an introductory panorama, from a shifting scenic standpoint by the primary narrator, with the now familiar hypothetical observer (*tis*) to distance a subjective comparison.[10] The description is arranged like a guided tour, walking us past first the cultivated trees, then the wild ones, then the flowerbeds, then the view, and finally bringing us to the temple of Dionysus, which stands at the very centre of the park, and its interior decorated with thematically significant images. As with the secondary narrator Philetas, the primary narrator's description is seasonally synoptic. His concern is not to give a picture of what the park looked like at the moment when it becomes important in the action, but to express its totality.

Other elements in the spatial setting are introduced without a lengthy description, when they become necessary for the action. For example, an oak tree, whose precise location in the pastoral landscape is left indeterminate, provides the setting for some of Daphnis and Chloe's most intimate scenes. It is first introduced after Daphnis' tumble into a wolf-trap, in the simplest way possible, as the setting for Chloe's inspection of his injuries:

> They sat beneath the trunk of an oak tree and looked to make sure that Daphnis had not drawn blood anywhere on his body when he fell.
>
> (1.12.5)

There is no description of the oak as such, but on its next appearance what is presumably the same tree has become their usual (*sunēthēs*) oak (1.13.4),[11] and is later referred to simply as 'the oak' (as at 2.38.3). At other times (as 2.11.1) even the article is omitted, leaving the narratee in some doubt as to whether this is fact the same tree. No distinguishing adjective is ever applied to it. This is typical: other features of the countryside are also introduced as and when needed with little specificity or individualisation.

---

[10] 4.2.1, 'one might have said it was like a long plain'.
[11] This may be proleptic, a compact way of saying, 'the oak that was to become their usual trysting place'.

Functions

Longus' novel is a tightly organised thematic unity.[12] This makes it next to impossible to assign any given example of narrative space to a single category of function. It is easy enough, for example, to find descriptions of space whose details are symbolic; but these details almost always relate to important themes of the novel, so that it is unrealistic to attempt to separate the symbolic and thematic functions. Lush vegetation can obviously function as a symbol of sex and fertility, but love and the succession of generations are central to the novel's thematic. Much the same goes for the psychologizing function: the feelings and thoughts exhibited in the focalisation of space by characters again relate to the themes of the text, and examples of the pathetic fallacy projected into nature by characters and primary narrator again express ideas central to the novel's meaning. In what follows, therefore, I shall begin with passages exemplifying each of these three functions, but then proceed to analyses demonstrating the intricate interconnection of the functions.

a) *Symbolic function*: when Dorcon is thwarted in his attempts to woo Chloe, and his proposal of marriage is rejected by her foster-father, he decides to take her by force. Disguised in a wolf-skin he hides himself near a spring where he has observed that Daphnis and Chloe water their flocks at midday.

> The spring was in a deep hollow, and the whole area around it was covered with fierce thorns, brambles, stunted juniper bushes and thistles; even a real wolf could easily have lurked there unseen. Here Dorcon concealed himself and waited for drinking-time.   (1.20.3)

From the prologue, springs have been marked out as sources of life and fertility. This one gives both shepherds and beasts relief from the thirst and heat of noon, and its position in a deep hollow further suggests an enclosing place of safe refuge. However, the fierce vegetation that surrounds it qualifies the pastoral idyll, suggesting that the countryside contains hostile as well benevolent forces. This much is obviously symbolic, in that the details carry a semantic charge beyond simple description.[13] However, the symbols immediately become thematic mirrors of the

---

[12] This is not the place to offer an interpretation of the novel in its entirety; for an attempt to do, see J.R. Morgan 2004: 10–20.

[13] Cusset 2005: 174.

surrounding action, as the thorns and prickles of the bushes reflect the claws and teeth of the animal predator that Dorcon is pretending to be. The word used to describe the junipers, *tapeinos*, can denote physical size, social status and moral level. In the first sense, it is a realistic detail. In the second and third senses, Dorcon's position in the bushes associates their attributes to him, mirroring, respectively, the social disparity between himself and Chloe—the reason for Dryas' rejection of his suit—and the inhumanity of his attempted rape—figured also by the wolf-skin he is wearing.

Another example of symbolic function of space occurs in the third book when Daphnis' lustful but kindly neighbour, Lycaenion, wants to seduce him, or help him acquire sexual knowledge. She takes him to the thickest part of the wood, beside another spring (3.17.1–2). Apart from possible *double entendres* in the vocabulary of this section,[14] the symbolism of penetration to a secret place, with a life giving spring and thick growth of vegetation, is palpably sexual, and again the symbols engage thematically with the immediately surrounding narrative. The deceptive story that Lycaenion tells Daphnis about an eagle having seized one of her geese and taken it to the place where she takes him confirms the sexual connotations of the place. We are reminded of the incident with Lycaenion at the very end of the novel, when, on their wedding night, Daphnis teaches Chloe some of the things he had learned from Lycaenion, and she realises that 'what had happened at the edge of the wood had been shepherds' games' (4.40.3). This has caused critics some problems, because the fumbling pubescent games referred to took place in the pastures, and not at the edge of the wood. However, since Daphnis' tuition from Lycaenion, the forest has come to symbolise completed sex. The pastures, in the thematic geography of the novel, stand for innocence and childhood, and the protagonists' non-penetrative games represent a movement towards, but not a consummation of, mature sexuality.

b) *psychologizing function*: this is when the way a character looks at space conveys his or her thoughts and emotions. A good example of this occurs in the description of the second spring:

> No doubt sheep bleated, no doubt lambs skipped, then knelt under their mothers and pulled on their dugs. The rams were chasing the ewes that had not yet lambed, each covering and mounting a different one. There

---

[14] O'Connor 1991, to be read with some scepticism.

> was chasing by the billy goats too and some rather amorous leaping on
> to the nannies. They fought over the nannies; each had his own ones and
> took care that there was no adultery behind his back. Such sights would
> have turned even old men's thoughts to sex as they watched, but as they
> [Daphnis and Chloe] were young and lusty, and had been in search of love
> for a long time already, they were inflamed by what they heard and melted
> by what they saw.   (3.13.1–3)

We have already discussed the peculiar presentation of the first sentence
of this description, which almost tells us what Daphnis and Chloe did *not*
see; the implication of this negative focalisation is that they have eyes
only for each other. The next section appears at first to be focalized by
the narrator, but as it culminates in a statement of their response to what
they have been watching, we realise that the description has slipped into
the focalisation of Daphnis and Chloe. This presentation reflects their
emotional trajectory, tearing their eyes away from each other as they
become interested in, and sexually aroused by, their surroundings. Here
again it is unproductive to seek a clear differentiation of functions. The
eroticisation of the landscape mirrors thematically the stage of affective
development that Daphnis and Chloe have attained by this point. In this
instance, it is particularly striking that the description disregards the
physical rural space as such, and concentrates on the activities of the
animals within it. There is no mention of the scenery, or the vegetation,
in contrast to the first spring (1.9.1–2), where meadows, mountains and
thickets provide the structuring principles of the ekphrasis. Here they are
substituted by a set of anthropomorphic mini-narratives about animals
and their mating.

   This passage introduces the pathetic fallacy through the focalisation
of characters. In the description of the first summer, the focalisation of
the pathetic fallacy is that of a hypothetical observer, inserted into the
rural landscape as a *locum tenens* for the reader:

> One might have thought the rivers were softly singing as they flowed,
> the winds were piping as they blew through the pines, the apples were
> dropping to the ground from love, and the sun was making everyone take
> their clothes off because it loved beauty so.   (1.23.2)

Again, the psychologizing function of the pathetic fallacy allows the
thematic eroticisation of nature. Its displacement on to a subsidiary
focaliser emphasises that the protagonists are still unable to articulate
thoughts about love and sexual desire, through their incomprehension
of their own emotions.

c) *Thematic functions*: very little of the story of *Daphnis and Chloe* concerns travelling in the physical sense, though the plot does involve a metaphorical journey from childhood innocence to sexual maturity and social integration. However, Longus consistently uses the settings of his novel in a thematic way, mirroring the issues and concerns of the narrative.

Of particular importance are the descriptions of the countryside that articulate the seasonal progression of the narrative: each of the novel's seven seasons is introduced by a presentation of the countryside that proleptically mirrors the affective development of the protagonists. The description of the first spring (1.9.1–2) stresses the beauty of nature, to which Daphnis and Chloe respond with youthful innocence, showing their oneness with the natural world by imitating the sights and sounds. In the landscape of the first summer (1.23.1–2), nature has become eroticised, the pathetic fallacy being employed to attach an amatory interpretation to the details of the setting. The power of love in nature is underlined by the suggestion that the sun loves the beauty of naked bodies, mirroring Chloe's desire to see Daphnis naked, and the dropping of apples to plant their seeds in the ground in a metaphorical act of intercourse. All this reflects the burgeoning but still not comprehended sexuality of the young couple, as their friendship turns to love. The first of the novel's two autumns is introduced by a description of the wine-vintage (2.1–2). The flirtatious behaviour of the other country people makes both lovers experience feelings of jealousy, making them understand that their emotions are not just reciprocal but exclusive, and preparing for the first didactic episode of the novel, in which Philetas instructs them on the name and nature of Eros.

The story's only winter is a period of stasis in the plot, both caused by and reflected in the freezing of the landscape beneath a heavy fall of snow (3.3–4). Herding in the wilderness being impossible, the setting of such action as there is concentrates in domestic spaces, bringing to the fore the more realistic and practical aspects of rural life associated with them. Winter is succeeded by the second spring, bringing the rebirth of nature and love alike (3.13). As we have seen, the presentation of the countryside is contrasted with that of the first spring, mirroring the protagonists' awareness of love and their search for the means to cure it, though they still lack knowledge of the mechanics of sex. Even the straightforward description of the snow melting and the baring of the earth recall common erotic metaphors that have already been articulated in the narrative. The final season, the second autumn, is introduced

by the lengthy description of Dionysophanes' ornamental garden, to which we shall return shortly, in preparation for the recognition of the protagonists by their true parents and their transition to urban life. Taken as a sequence, then, these prominently marked seasonal ekphrases essentially re-inscribe the story of the growth of love and desire as natural and instinctual forces on to the spatial setting.

Some of the novel's spatial markers acquire thematic significance also through their recurrent association with important moments in the plot. The cave of the Nymphs, for example, is described near the beginning of the novel, as the setting for Dryas' discovery of the infant Chloe. Its hollow rounded shape, as well as the life-giving source within it, identifies it appropriately with the female principle of the plot. It is a place of refuge and nurturing, associated with the goddesses' protective care of the protagonists, particularly Chloe, but also with the divine promotion of their love. The 'Nymphs from the cave' appear to the foster-fathers in a dream and hand over the young children to Eros (1.7.1); the old men then visit the Nymphs' shrine to make an offering to the god of Love on their children's behalf (1.8.2). In the first spring, the children take the daisy chains they have woven in imitation of nature to the Nymphs (1.9.2), but shortly afterwards the same location and its resident deities sponsor the commencement of erotic feelings, when Daphnis takes a bathe in the spring in the Nymphs' shrine after falling into a wolf-trap (1.13.1–2). After Daphnis is rescued from the pirates, they go together to bath in the Nymphs' spring, and this is the first occasion that Chloe shows Daphnis her naked body (1.32.1). After the vintage in the first autumn, and the unpleasant feelings that it has aroused, their first thought is to visit the Nymphs' cave (2.2.4), and it is here that Philetas finds them, and initiates them into some of the truths of Eros (2.3.2). After Daphnis is beaten up by the tourists from Methymna, Chloe takes him again to the Nymphs' cave and in a moment of great tenderness and intimacy tends his injuries, above all with a kiss (2.18). Methymna sends an expedition to take reprisals: Chloe is dragged away from the Nymphs' shrine where she has sought refuge (2.20.3), and then the distraught Daphnis goes there to accuse the goddesses of not protecting their charge, falls into a supernatural sleep and is visited by the Nymphs, who promise her safe return (2.21.3–23). After their recognition by their true parents, Daphnis and Chloe both make offerings in the cave, Chloe's specifically 'because she had been nursed beside it and had often bathed in it' (4.32.3). Finally, the cave is the setting for the formal betrothal of the couple and the rustic celebration in which the rural community is reintegrated (4.37.2–38). In

a prolepsis at the very end of the novel, we are told that after the birth of their children, Daphnis and Chloe set up images in the cave, and are left to connect those images with the one seen by the novel's narrator in the *proem* (4.39.2). If we make the connection, it becomes clear that Nymphs have overseen the gestation of the novel in the same way that they oversaw the gestation of the love it narrates, and that love and text are in some sense analogous.

If the Nymphs represent the female principle in the novel's vision of Eros, their masculine counterpart, Pan, is similarly associated with a particular location. In his case, this is a pine tree, close to which stands a statue of him. This is first mentioned by the Nymphs themselves, and its entry into the story is an important marker in the emergence of gender difference between the protagonists. The phallic shape of the pine-tree (*pitys*), and its connection with one of Pan's erotic victims, the Nymph Pitys, construct an apt symbol of masculinity. The most important scene set by Pan's pine is the one at the end of the second book. The story of Pan and Syrinx is told by Lamon, and then mimed by Daphnis and Chloe: in the most graphic way, the protagonists take upon themselves a story paradigmatic of aggressive and destructive male sexuality, an important step in their understanding of gender roles (2.31.2–37.3). The thematic sense as gender markers of these two landmarks (which are visible the one from the other, but whose spatial relationship is not more precisely specified) emerges clearly from the exchange of oaths between Daphnis and Chloe:

> Daphnis went to the pine and swore by Pan that he would not live alone without Chloe, not for the space of a single day, while Chloe went into the cave and swore by the Nymphs that all she wanted was to die the same death and live the same life as Daphnis. But so great was Chloe's girlish artlessness that when she came out of the cave she asked Daphnis to give her a second oath, saying, 'Daphnis, Pan is an amorous god and not to be trusted. He fell in love with Pitys, and he fell in love with Syrinx, and he never stops bothering the Wood Nymphs …'.   (2.3.91–93)

The thematic use of space in a broader sense structures the meaning of the entire novel. We have already seen how the panoramic spatial presentation of Lesbos at the beginning of the narrative inscribes a distinction between city and country. This opposition is part of the patrimony of pastoral literature and is inescapably value-laden. Pastoral generically presents a countryside that is not a representation of reality but is constructed as the antithesis of the town. Underlying the whole premise is the implication that the countryside constitutes an ideal of peace,

simplicity and harmony antithetically opposed to the noise, corruption and materialism of the city. To put it in its most basic form: city bad, country good. This thematic opposition comes with the territory and can be assumed as soon as a pastoral affiliation is recognised, but Longus exploits it in significant and interesting ways. On the one hand, it is not hard to find ways in which Longus' vision of Lesbos is an ideal, intertextually constructed from allusion to pastoral poetry, most explicitly Theocritus.[15] This is a countryside where the sun always shines (except for a picturesque snowfall which inconveniences only lovers), where rivers never dry up even in mid-summer, where shepherds have plenty of leisure to play and sing, sufficient simple food never to be hungry, and resources enough to give one another frequent and generous gifts. Threats to the rustic idyll come from the city: the arrival of some hooray-henries from Methymna with more money than sense causes disruption and leads, through a comic chain of events, to a brief war in which Chloe is abducted. The casually promiscuous and sexually predatory Lycaenion has been imported from the city by her partner Chromis, and remains peripheral to and unhappy with the rustic community. When the absentee urban property owner Dionysophanes comes to celebrate the vintage in the second autumn, his retinue includes a homosexual parasite, whose unnatural perversions are incomprehensible to the child of nature Daphnis, but who threatens to remove him to the city to serve his perverted desires there. When the true parentage of the protagonists is discovered, we learn that these affluent urbanites exposed their inconvenient children from motives that can easily be categorised as selfish and mercenary.

Longus, however, qualifies the simple antithesis, and this is where his division of the countryside into the intertextually pastoral and the realistically rustic becomes important. The elements of this subsidiary antithesis are already present in the panorama just mentioned, but the division becomes explicit in the foster-fathers' dream, when they are instructed to send the young pair out to tend the sheep and goats in the pastures, away from the relative civilisation of the homestead where they have been taught to read and write. Lamon and Dryas are dismayed

---

[15] Longus' representation of the countryside, its literary sources, and its interpretation are much discussed: the views expressed in the following generally summarise positions argued more fully in J.R. Morgan 2004. For further discussions (not noted in detail hereafter), see Alaux and Létoublon 2005; Billault 1996; Cozzoli 2000; Cresci 1981; Cusset 2005; Effe 1982; Elliger 1975; Longo 1978; Pandiri 1985; Scarcella 1970.

at this, seeing it as the end to their hopes for the future advancement of the children, whom they know to be of noble birth (1.8.1). Daphnis and Chloe, on the other hand, see things more truly and are delighted. The quasi-poetic description of the first spring, full of intertextual echoes of Theocritus, follows almost immediately, and thereafter the idealistic colouring clings specifically to the pastoral environment. It is in this completely natural space that the story can rehearse its vision of love as a natural force. Daphnis and Chloe are ignorant of cultural convention, and their first stirrings of love and desire are pure and instinctual. This aspect of love is articulated by their predecessor in Eros' elite, the retired herdsman Philetas, who shares a name with another important Hellenistic poet, Theocritus' master, Philitas of Cos.

The rest of the rustic cast operates in space that is more realistic. In these settings, the text acknowledges the grinding poverty and subsistence-level existence of real-life agriculture, which pastoral literature affects to ignore. In a metaliterary way, Longus draws attention to the artificiality of the conventions governing his genre. It is in these less idealised spaces that are set episodes like the cosy winter dinner party in Chloe's house, predicated on a realistic relief that bad weather closes down the countryside, and including comic details such as Daphnis stopping over and sharing a bed with Chloe's foster-father. The sequence of scenes at the end of the third book, when realistic concerns about money seem set to thwart the union of Daphnis and Chloe, is set in the family cottages and in particular on the threshing and winnowing floors. Chloe's foster-mother advocates marrying her off to a yeoman suitor before she casually loses her virginity and value; Daphnis' foster-father on the other hand is against wasting his assets by letting Daphnis marry a shepherd's daughter when there might be rich pickings to be had from his natural parents. Eventually, guided to hidden treasure by the Nymphs, Daphnis accosts Dryas on the threshing-floor. The old man hastens off to find Daphnis' family, who are winnowing barley. After an opening gambit about the bad harvest, the two foster-fathers settle down to an elaborate poker game, each trying to maximise the financial benefit to be accrued from the fostering of a noble child, and each concealing the strength of his hand from the other. It is striking that in these chapters, the idea of *erōs*, the novel's highest form of love, is absent.

This awareness of the realities of rural life throws into relief the literary artificiality of the ideal pastoral world, and hints at an awareness of that artificiality. If at first sight, the city appears to be the source of everything bad, it also, in the person of Lycaenion, supplies the knowledge, the

tekhnē, by which Daphnis and Chloe are able to achieve the consummation of their love. It is only when subjected to urban cosmetics that Chloe attains her true beauty (4.32.1). Even the unnatural Gnathon ultimately serves a benevolent purpose in bringing the couple together. By contrast, the insufficiency of nature without knowledge to bring human love to a successful conclusion is demonstrated by unsuccessful attempts to imitate the animals. In terms of the novel's agenda of erotic education, the pastoral countryside represents the sterile innocence of childhood, from which nature and instinct alone cannot liberate Daphnis and Chloe. At the end of the novel, they leave the countryside for the first time, and find their true identities in the city. That journey along the road from country to city inscribes the irreversible movement from childhood to adulthood in spatial terms.

Metaliterary Space

The differentiation of the countryside into idealised pastoral and realistic rustic allows *Daphnis and Chloe* to expose the fantasy behind the pastoral genre. Within the text, this is figured by a series of holidaymakers from the city, who visit the countryside for pleasure, and ignore its realities. The young men from Methymna, for example, act out a fantasy of the simple life and are happy to pay over the odds for anything they purchase from the countryside's realistically mercenary inhabitants, rather than disturb the pastoral idyll by haggling (2.12.2–4). When Dionysophanes and his party arrive for the festivities of the vintage, the countryside has to be specially sanitised for them: dung-heaps are carted away (4.1.3), and a few choice bunches of grapes have to be left on the vines so that the urbanites can 'participate in an image of a grape harvest and its pleasures' (4.5.2). The narrator himself is hunting in the countryside when he sees the picture that gives rise to the narrative. The modality of unreality underlying the represented relations of city and country within the fiction mirrors the way in which a reader of pastoral visits a pastoral text. This is even more the case since the ideal country in the novel is constructed from a mosaic of intertextual references, primarily to the pastoral poetry of Theocritus, but also to the Lesbos represented in the poetry of Sappho and Alcaeus.[16] The space is poetic and textual, and the

---

[16] Sappho is particularly prominent in the episode where Daphnis picks an apple (3.33–34), reflecting famous lines from an epithalamium of Sappho (fr. 105 LP); see

recognition of the idyllic fantasies of the urban characters in the novel alerts the narratees to the artificiality of the attitudes that the generic protocols assume.

The analogy between text and rural space is underlined by verbal echoes. In the prologue the narrator gives voice to his wish that his novel should be 'a delightful property' (*ktēma terpnon*), for all men (*pr.* 3). In the first sentence of the narrative, this phrase is resumed in the description of the estate where the action is set as 'a most beautiful property' (*ktēma kalliston*). The implication is that to read the text is to visit imaginatively the space in which it is set. Even more striking is the verbal connection between the garden of Philetas and the text of the novel. Again in the prologue, the narrator says that he has laboured hard (*exeponēsamēn*) to produce the four books of the novel; the same form of this unusual verb recurs when Philetas says that he has laboured hard to produce his garden (2.3.3). When we remember that this same verb is used of literary production by Theocritus in the very poem where he refers to Philetas' namesake, the poet Philitas of Cos, as his poetic master, and that it encapsulates the essence of Alexandrian poetics, it seems inevitable that we should read the garden as in some sense standing for the novel. Philetas' garden is produced by artistic labour, and fertilised by Eros, who comes to bath in its spring; within its confines the god manifests himself to a chosen few. The novel similarly is the product of artistic labour, prompted by a visit to a grove and a cave (associated with Philitas as a site of artistic inspiration),[17] within which the nature of Eros is revealed to its readers. The seasonal rotation of the flowers and plants in Philetas' garden reflects the seasonal structure of the narrative itself.

A garden, furthermore, is a space that combines nature and art, or in which art imitates and improves upon nature. The beauty of the garden reflects the Alexandrian beauty of the text, but equally distances it from reality or nature. The impulse underlying the creation of a garden is thus analogous to that underlying all pastoral poetry: to produce a version of nature from which ugliness and nastiness can be purged, and which offers its owner or reader the pleasures of the countryside with the amenities of the city. In these respect, the garden provides an analogy not

---

J.R. Morgan 2004: 220–223 for detailed analysis. The description of winter on Lesbos at the beginning of book 3 shares precise details with Horace, *Carm.* 1.9, a poem based on Alcaeus; the coincidences are best explained as independent exploitation of the same Alcaeic model; see J.R. Morgan 2004: 201 on this.

[17] Cf. Propertius 3.1.1–3 (where Philitas is associated with a grove, *nemus*), 3.52.

only to the text but also to the nature of Love itself. Just as the garden's fertility is enhanced by human labour, so the story demonstrates that nature by herself cannot bring human love to fruition, but that nature requires the intervention of art. The gardener Philetas, with his revelation of Eros, and the urban seductress/instructress Lycaenion are both characterized as teachers of Love, whose indispensable interventions assist the protagonists to the next stage of the process of erotic maturity.

The metaliterary dialectic of the garden is continued with the description of Dionysophanes' *paradeisos*, which is worth quoting in full:

> The park was absolutely superb, comparable to the parks of kings. It extended a stade in length, occupied an elevated situation, and was four plethra wide. One might have said it was like a long plain. There were all sorts of trees in it: apples, myrtles and pears, pomegranates, figs and olives. On one side there was a tall vine, which clambered over the apple and pear trees with its grapes ripening, as if challenging them to a contest for the best fruit. Those were the cultivated trees. There were also cypresses, bays, planes and pines. Instead of the vine there was ivy clambering over all of these, whose big, black berries mimicked bunches of grapes. The fruit trees were on the inside as if under protection, and on the outside the non-fruiting trees stood around them like an artificial fence, and around them in their turn ran a slim encircling wall. Everything was divided and separate, with plenty of space between the tree-trunks, but overhead the branches met and entwined their foliage. Even their natural growth seemed the product of art. There were beds of flowers too, some of which the earth bore, some of which art made. Roses, hyacinths and lilies were the work of human hand, while the earth bore violets, daffodils and pimpernels. There was shade in summer, in spring flowers, in autumn grapes to pick, and fruit in every season. From the park, there was a fine view over the plain, where you could see the herdsmen grazing their flocks, and a fine view over the sea, where the sailors sailing along the coast were in sight, so that these objects became part of the park's abundance. At the park's very centre, by length and width, was a temple and altar of Dionysus. The altar was covered with ivy, the temple with vines. And inside the temple had paintings on Dionysiac themes: Semele giving birth, Ariadne asleep, Lycurgus in chains, Pentheus being torn limb from limb. There were also Indians being defeated, and Tyrrhenians being transformed. Everywhere there were satyrs treading grapes, everywhere there were maenads dancing. Pan was not forgotten: there he was, sitting on a rock, playing his pipes, as if providing the music simultaneously for the male treaders and the female dancers.   (4.2.1–3.2)

The very fact that this garden is designated as a *paradeisos* already marks it out as a more elaborate, formal and luxurious space than Philetas' *kēpos*: its purpose is ornamental rather than productive. As the property of an urban landowner, it presents an urban view of the country,

and prepares for the transition in the fourth book towards the discovery of the protagonists' urban origins. Despite the repeated stress on its beauty, which might make it appear as the acme of the pastoral world, it is an ambiguous space. The structural parallelism with Philetas' garden, the description of which also introduces the season of autumn, invites comparison between the two. But the comparison leads us to see that Dionysophanes' *paradeisos* is a silent and sterile place, lacking the music of the birds, which is replaced by paintings on violent and martial subjects. Rather than being fertilised by the presence of Eros, it depends on the dung that has to be removed to avoid offending its owner's delicate nostrils. In antithesis to the care that Philetas lavishes on his garden, it is neglected in its owner's absence, and emergency repairs have to be made when the master's visit is imminent. And whereas Philetas' garden is invaded by the fertilising divinity to whom the whole novel is consecrated, Dionysophanes' *paradeisos* is wrecked by a jealous lover of Chloe's, demonstrating the destructive potential of improperly conducted love. If the garden of Philetas represents a kind of ideal combination of nature and art, in a metaliterary as well as a purely horticultural sense, then the *paradeisos* embodies the dangers of Alexandrian poetics carried to an extreme, of the primacy of art over nature, explicitly reducing nature to an imitation of art.[18]

The use of the garden as a metaliterary space in narrative appears to be an innovation of Longus. Previously, narrative tended to be represented as a road or a journey (e.g. (→) Pindar). Longus' affiliation may be rather with Hellenistic epigram: we know of collections of epigrams by Meleager and Philip called 'Garlands', and terms such as *Anthologia* or *Florilegium*, both denoting the gathering of flowers, are routinely applied to such collections. It is only a short step to conceiving the text as a garden in which the flowers grow.

---

[18] See J.R. Morgan 2011. My contention is that Longus is using his character Philetas to 'correct' the poetics of Philitas. The congruence of garden imagery with Propertius' vehement support for natural beauty over cosmetics, which are associated with Philitas through a reference to Coan silk, suggests that a manifesto of Alexandrian poetics by Philitas underlies both texts. Among other points, note the occurrence of the Callimachean buzz-word *leptos* 'slender' in connection with the wall surrounding the *paradeisos*.

HELIODORUS

J.R. Morgan

Settings

Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* begins *in medias res*, which results not only in a radical disjunction of fabula and story,[1] but also to a comparable separation of story-space and fabula-space.

The story begins with a scene at the Heracleotic mouth of the Nile and ends in Meroe, the capital of Ethiopia. Story-space is thus in effect arranged along the course of the Nile, from its mouth southwards towards its source. The action of the story is distributed over a relatively small number of extended episodes, each with a separate setting, and linked by summarily narrated travel. The scene on the beach (1.1–4) is succeeded by an extended sequence in the stronghold of the brigands, the *Boukoloi* ('cowboys'), who infest the marshes near the Nile Delta (1.5–2.19; returned to analeptically at 5.4–9). Here the captured protagonists, Theagenes and Chariclea, meet the Athenian Cnemon and listen to his story. An important part of this section is set in a secret cave, where Chariclea is concealed by the infatuated robber-chief, Thyamis, and twice confused with Thisbe, the antagonist of Cnemon's narrative. The story then follows one of the characters, Cnemon, to the village of Chemmis, where he meets the important secondary narrator, Calasiris, and listens to his narration of the earlier part of the fabula in the house of the merchant Nausicles, and is reunited with Chariclea (2.19–5.4; 5.10–6.11). From there Calasiris and Chariclea journey on alone towards the city of Memphis, where they have learned that Theagenes has been taken, so that the Persian satrap, Orondates, can send him as a gift to the Great King. Just outside the city, they stumble across a battlefield, where they witness a scene of necromancy (6.11–15). An elaborate scene

---

[1] *SAGN* 2: 483–504.

of reunion and recognition is staged outside the walls of Memphis, in which the satrap's wife Arsace sees and is infatuated with Theagenes. For two books the intrigue centres on the satrapal palace, including scenes in Arsace's bedchamber, the guest rooms where the protagonists are lodged for a while, the quarters where the aged servant Cybele lives with her son Achaemenes, the satrapal dining-room, where Theagenes is forced to wait at table, and a dungeon where Theagenes is tortured (7.1–8.13). Most graphically in this sequence, Chariclea is brought before a court of Persian dignitaries, then miraculously saved from a public burning at the stake before being returned to the dungeon-cells where she and Theagenes play out an important scene of proleptic dreams. From Memphis the pair is summoned to the satrap, who is assembling his army at Thebes for a war against Ethiopia, but before they reach him they are captured by Ethiopian soldiers (8.14–17). The ninth book concerns military operations around the city of Syene, on the frontier between Egypt and Ethiopia, including the escape of the besieged Persians to Philae and a full-scale battle, and culminating in the ceremonial entry of the Ethiopian king, Hydaspes, into the city of Syene. Theagenes and Chariclea are taken to Ethiopia, to be victims in a thanks-giving ritual of human sacrifice, but in a lengthy recognition scene set outside the city Chariclea is recognised as the king's daughter, and her marriage to Theagenes given parental approval. In the very last sentence of the narrative the action moves inside the city of Meroe (10.1–41).

Story-space therefore concentrates around the Nile Delta (Bucolia), Chemmis, Memphis, Syene and Meroe. Within the story, however, vital parts of the fabula are supplied in secondary (and even tertiary and fourth-level narratives) by Cnemon, in Bucolia, and by Calasiris in Nausicles' house at Chemmis.

Cnemon's story (one of sexual deviance and selfish intrigue) is set principally in Athens. The earliest scenes play out in the domestic spaces of his father's house, but the action broadens out to include the house of the courtesan Arsinoe, and, at its climax, the public spaces of Athens, including recognisable landmarks such as the Garden of the Epicureans (1.16.5), and the Academy and the pit where the polemarchs sacrifice to the heroes (1.17.5). Part of Cnemon's story is set on the island of Aegina, where he is exiled and receives news of events in Athens from two tertiary narrators.

The narrative of Calasiris to Cnemon in Chemmis is more extensive, both in its length, and in its spatial scope. Calasiris' story begins in Memphis, where he was high-priest of Isis, but the majority of it is set

in Delphi, whither he makes his way in self-imposed exile, and where
he witnesses the beginning of the protagonists' love. The Delphic setting
includes religious, athletic, domestic, public and civic spaces, all carefully
but unobtrusively designated to make the action realistically concrete. In
one scene with Chariclea he claims to have visited Ethiopia and met her
mother, who commissioned him to find her daughter in Delphi.[2] After
his departure from Delphi with the lovers, Calasiris briefly narrates a
sea voyage past various landmarks[3] to the island of Zacynthus, where
they pass the winter in the house of the deaf fisherman Tyrrhenus. There
are scenes in public space (the harbour where Calasiris first meets his
future host), and domestic space (inside Tyrrhenus' house), and on a
secret headland (where Tyrrhenus tells Calasiris of a pirate plot). Just
before leaving Zacynthus, Calasiris has a dream vision of Odysseus,
as a result of which he asks Tyrrhenus to go to Ithaca and make an
appeasement offering on his behalf.[4] After leaving Zacynthus, the ship
on which Calasiris and his companions are travelling puts into Crete for
repairs (5.22.7), before being attacked by pirates and running aground in
a storm at the mouth of the Nile—the scene with which the story begins.

Tertiary narratives embedded in Calasiris' secondary narration extend
the fabula-space even further. Charicles, the priest of Delphic Apollo,
tells Calasiris of his meeting in the Egyptian town of Catadupi with an
Ethiopian who entrusted him with the infant Chariclea.[5] This Ethiopian
was an ambassador to the Persian satrap, negotiating about the owner-
ship of the emerald mines—a repeatedly named and functionally impor-
tant frame.[6] In a further embedded narrative, the Ethiopian tells Char-
icles of his discovery of Chariclea as a baby, and his rearing of her
in a country estate away from Meroe, of which no further details are
given. Later Calasiris is able to read the embroidered narrative of Char-
iclea's conception and birth, which her mother exposed with her as a

---

[2] 4.8. It is not clear whether Calasiris is telling the truth about this; see *SAGN* 2: 534–
535.

[3] 5.1.2; he mentions the Gulf of Cirrha, Mount Parnassus, the cliff of Aetolia and
Calydon, and the Pointed Islands, the Oxeiae.

[4] 5.22. Ithaca and Cephallenia here are frames. None of the fabula is actually located
there, but they are referred to within it.

[5] 2.29.5–33.1. The episode includes public space (the market where Charicles is
buying herbs, and the temple of Isis) and private space (his own and the Ethiopian's
lodgings).

[6] 2.32.2; at 8.1.3 they are named as one of the objectives of the Ethiopian expedition;
and at 9.6.5 after his surrender the Persian satrap renounces his claim on them.

recognition-token (4.8). This includes a description of the private quarters of the royal residence in Meroe, where the king and queen made love, and its decoration. Later still, when looking for a way to escape from Delphi with the two lovers, Calasiris encounters some Phoenician merchants from Tyre, one of whom has won the wrestling competition at the Pythian Games after receiving instructions from Heracles in a dream. They tell him of their journey past Cape Malea and Cephallenia to Delphi (4.16.6–7).

This short episode also introduces more frames, mentioning Carthage in Libya as the intended destination of their aborted voyage, and detailing their merchandise as the product of India and Ethiopia; Calasiris hitches a lift with them by inventing a business appointment in Sicily and saying their route to Libya will take them close to that island. When Charicles is in Catadupi he is observed buying herbs from India, Ethiopia and Egypt (2.30.2). Other new frames include the lands of origin of various figures in the narrative. Theagenes is given a Thessalian background; he heads a theoric mission of the Aenianes, the etymology of whose capital, Hypata, is explained by Charicles as deriving from the fact that it is sited at the foot of Mt Oete (2.34.2). Hydaspes' army includes contingents from the Troglodytes,[7] from the so-called Cinnamomophorus, the Blemmyes, Arabia Felix, and even China (the Seres). Of particular thematic importance are the Persian satrap and his court. Although none of the fabula is set in Persia, their mere existence implies the existence of Persia as a frame; and there is one specific reference when the Persian captain Mitranes contemplates sending the captured Theagenes to the Great King in Babylon (5.8.6).

Other explicit references to frames are made directly by the narrator. These can take the form of passing allusions, as when an Ethiopian amethyst given to Nausicles by Calasiris is compared to stones from Iberia and Britain.[8] On other occasions, the narrator offers a more extended geographical description to contextualise the action of the fabula. So when the Troglodytes first appear in the plot, the narrator inserts an ethnographical digression about them, in a present tense which gives them an existence outside the fiction, including a few bare statements about their homeland.

---

[7] See below for the narrator's excursus on them at 8.16.4.

[8] 5.13.3; the narrator goes on to describe these Iberian and British stones in the present tense, as part of his and his narratee's world.

> The Troglodytes form one of the constituent parts of Ethiopia. They are a
> nomadic people whose lands are adjacent to those of the Arabs. Naturally
> swift runners, they cultivate this gift by training from childhood. They
> have never learned to use heavy armour but in battle employ slings, which
> they use at long range …[9]   (8.16.4)

At greater length is a narratorial contextualising description (quoted
below for its form) of the Island of Meroe, with authentic names for the
rivers that enclose it. The action is limited to the environs of Meroe itself,
but this description extends the frame to include the entire Ethiopian
state. Again it is couched in a present tense that tends to identify the
world of the fabula with that inhabited by the narrator (space of the
narrator).

Of a completely different status is the revelation in the final sentence
of the text (10.41.4) of the name and background of the narrator: he is a
Phoenician from Emesa. This is the novel's only explicit reference to the
space of the narrator, but it is more than a simple identification; by trac-
ing his own descent to the Sun, Heliodorus creates an analogy between
himself and the Ethiopian royal house, and thus between Emesa, as the
centre of a Sun cult, and the Ethiopia of his fiction. The world of the story
is in effect put into an allegorical relationship with the narrator's reality.[10]

Two final points need to be made about the settings of the novel.
Firstly, they are without exception real places, correctly located in an
accurate geography. Stretching from Britain to China, and from northern
Greece to Ethiopia, the space covered by the fabula and its frame is
pretty well coterminous with the whole known world, and realistically
represents it. Secondly, the geography of the fabula itself is broadly
organised into three zones: Greece, Egypt (with its Persian occupiers),
and Ethiopia. As we shall see, these zones are ideologically charged and
cohere with the novel's big themes.

Forms of Presentation

It would be perverse not to begin with the novel's famous opening
description of the scene on the beach:

> The smile of daybreak was just beginning to brighten the sky, the sunlight
> to catch the hilltops, when a group of men in brigand gear peered over

---

[9] Translations are from J.R. Morgan in Reardon [1989] [2]2008.
[10] On this, see J.R. Morgan 2009.

> the mountain that overlooks the place where the Nile flows into the sea at
> the mouth that men call the Heracleotic. They stood there for a moment,
> scanning the expanse of sea beneath them: first they gazed out over the
> ocean, but as there was nothing sailing there that held out hope of spoil
> and plunder, their eyes were drawn to the beach nearby. This is what they
> saw: a merchant ship was riding there, moored by her stern, empty of crew,
> but laden with freight. This much could be surmised even from a distance,
> for the weight of her cargo forced the water up to the third line of boards
> on the ship's side. But the beach!—a mass of newly slain bodies, some of
> them quite dead, others half-alive and still twitching, testimony that the
> fighting had only just ended …   (1.1.1–2)

The description continues in this vein for most of the first chapter. It is
obvious that most of it is presented through the focalisation of the bandits
looking at the scene: what we read is not a description of the scene but
a description of what they saw. This is a classic example then of actorial
presentation.[11] The organisation of the description follows their gaze: as it
moves over the sea, to the land and the ship, the presentation shifts from
panorama to close-up, culminating in a minutely detailed description of
the bodies and the wreckage of a feast among which they lie. We will
return to this passage later to note its psychologizing functions.

  This is a deliberately virtuoso piece of writing, startlingly innova-
tive within its tradition, but it is not altogether untypical of Heliodorus'
set-pieces. At the beginning of the third book, for example, Calasiris
describes to Cnemon the ritual procession at Delphi which was the occa-
sion of the lovers' first meeting and inamoration. The basic strategy
of this lengthy section is for Calasiris to take up a fixed scenic stand-
point as a member of the crowd, watching as the procession makes its
way past him. The movement of the procession thus imparts a tem-
poral dimension to the description. As each section of the procession
passes—sacrificial animals, dancing girls, young horseman, Theagenes,
Chariclea—Calasiris begins with a long-range panorama, followed by
increasing close-up on details. The description is too long to quote in
its entirety, but the opening section will make the point:

> At the head of the procession came the sacrificial animals, led on the halter
> by the men who were to perform the holy rites, country folk in country
> costume. Each wore a white tunic, caught up to knee length by a belt. Their

---

[11] Even the opening sentence, which introduces the bandits, is not really presented
through the focalisation of a narrator. The fact that they are called 'men in brigand gear'
rather than 'brigands' implies an anonymous witness who can only report what is visible,
rather than an omniscient narrator.

right arms were bare to the shoulder and breast, and in their right hands they each brandished a double-headed axe. Each and every one of the oxen was black: they carried their heads proudly on powerful necks that thickened to a hump of perfect proportions; their horns were flawlessly straight and pointed, on some gilded, on others wreathed with garlands of flowers; their legs were stocky, their dewlaps so deep that they brushed their knees. (3.1.3–4)

This structure re-enacts the process of watching, with a general view from a distance, more details as the participants in the procession come closer, and then a shifting gaze as the eyes move from one significant detail to another. Calasiris gradually merges his own focalization with that of the crowd in general, adopting first-person plural forms to register the effect of the sight on the onlookers:

But splendid though they were, Cnemon, the crowd hardly spared them a second glance. Every eye was turned towards their captain—my beloved Theagenes; it was as if a flash of lightning had cast all they had seen before into darkness, so radiant he was in our eyes … But when rosy-fingered Dawn, the child of morning, appeared … when from the temple of Artemis rode forth my wise and beautiful Chariclea, then we realised that even Theagenes could be eclipsed … (3.3.4, 4.1)

This contributes to the psychologizing function of the description. It is as if at first Calasiris, as an outsider in Delphi, stands somehow alone in the crowd, but is gradually drawn into a communion with them by the sensational beauty and grandeur of the spectacle. We are told before the procession begins that the crowd is gathered in the precinct of the temple, but there is virtually no detail of the physical surroundings, until at the very end Calasiris mentions the tomb of Neoptolemus and an enormous altar on which the sacrifices are to be performed. The effect is to mirror the exclusive focus of attention on the procession itself.

Heliodorus varies his mode of presentation to suit the circumstances. On occasion the narrator will present a very wide scale panoramic view to contextualise and locate the action, often bringing in space (and even time) which is not actually part of the fabula. The first such example occurs early in the narrative, when Theagenes and Chariclea are taken to the settlement of the bandits.

After a stiff climb they passed over the crest of the hill and pressed on down towards a lake that lay outspread below them on the other side of the mountain. Its nature was as follows: the Egyptians call the whole area the Land of Herds; there is a natural bowl into which the floodwater from the Nile pours; thus a lake has formed, immeasurably deep at the centre but shallowing off at the edges into a marsh, for as beaches are to seas, so

marshes are to lakes. This is the home of the entire bandit community of Egypt, some of them building huts on what little land there is above water, others living on boats that serve them as both transport and dwelling. On these boats their women-folk work at their weaving; on these boats their children are born. Any child born there is fed at first on its mother's milk, later on fish from the lake dried in the sun. If they see a child trying to crawl, they tie a cord to its ankles just long enough to allow it to reach the edge of the boat or the door of the hut. A strange way to keep children in hand, to tie them by the feet! (1.5.1–3)

This is an important location, where they will meet Cnemon and listen to his narration, but the overview is full of non-functional detail. Another, even more widely focused example of this is at the beginning of book 8, when the narrator explains the location of the city of Philae, and its relevance to the border dispute between Persia and Ethiopia. Perhaps the most striking case is the entire chapter devoted to the Island of Meroe (10.5), presented from a standpoint so distant and panoramic as to be cartographic:

Meroe is the capital of Ethiopia. In form it is a triangular island bounded on all three sides by navigable rivers: the Nile, the Astaborrhas, and the Asasobas. The first of these, the Nile, breaks upon the apex of the triangle, where it splits into two; the other two rivers run along either side of the island until they rejoin to form one river, the Nile, which subsumes their names as well as their waters. In size Meroe is so vast that, despite being an island, it presents the impression of being a continent: its length comprises 3,000 stades; its breadth 1,000. It provides a habitat where enormous animals, including elephants, can flourish, and is so fertile that it produces the tallest trees in the world. Apart from gigantic palm trees that bear massive, succulent dates, the ears of corn and barley grow so high there that they can completely conceal even the tallest man on horseback—or even, occasionally, on camel-back—and are so prolific that the seed sown is increased 300-fold. (10.5.1–2)

It hardly needs saying perhaps that the manner of this ekphrasis is as important as its matter, if not more so. It imitates similar geographical and ethnographical excursuses in historical writers, and the surplus of authentic detail contributes to the effect of the real.[12]

Such extended narratorial panoramic presentations of space are the exception, however, in keeping with the prevailing narrative mode of the novel. More often descriptions of space are not separated from the narrative, and are focalised by one of the characters. A good example

---

[12] For the 'historiographical pose' and Heliodorus' cultivation of historiographical mannerisms, see J.R. Morgan 1982.

is provided by the episode centred on the siege of Syene in book 9. The layout of the terrain is left to emerge as the siege develops: so, for instance, the spatial relationship between the river and the city walls is part of the narrative of Hydaspes' stratagem to divert the river and undermine the foundations of the walls, which is presented as witnessed, but not fully understood, by the besieged people of Syene (9.3–4). The city's public gardens are mentioned only as the people need to think of a place to dump the spoil from a counter-mine. Other features of the city are presented in a literally ambulant description as the victorious Ethiopian king is given a guided tour of Syene by its priests:

> They took him to see the well that measures the Nile, which is almost identical to the one at Memphis: it is constructed of close-fitting blocks of polished stone and has an engraved scale marked in cubits; the river water seeps underground into the well, where its level against the markings registers the rise and fall in the level of the Nile for the benefit of the inhabitants of the area, who are able to gauge the degree of inundation or shortage of water by the number of divisions covered or exposed. They also showed him the sundials that cast no shadow at noon, for in the latitude of Syene the light of the sun is perpendicularly overhead at the summer solstice and thus throws equal illumination on all sides of an object precluding the casting of a shadow. Likewise the water at the bottom of wells is directly illuminated. Hydaspes, however, was not much impressed by these sights, which were already familiar to him: exactly the same occurred, he said, at Meroe in Ethiopia. (9.22.3–4)

In a way which is difficult to reproduce in translation, the syntax of the Greek here includes the commentary on each of the sights in the guided tour given to the king. These are not comments added by the primary narrator, but, implicitly, part of the priests' discourse. These *paradoxa* are widely known and attested in ancient writers, but even they are described from within the world of the fiction.

Another ambulant description, but on a smaller scale, occurs when Calasiris enters Delphi. It is interesting that, as elsewhere, we are given hardly any specific detail of the appearance and topography of the town and its buildings, though the temple of Apollo and the stadium in particular will feature largely in his ensuing narrative. Sparse though the description of Delphi is, Calasiris' narratee, Cnemon, is made to respond to it as if it encapsulates the essence of the place, even before a bare list of its amenities:

> 'I sailed along the Crisaean Gulf and to anchor at Cirrhaea, where I left my ship and hastened up to the city. As I entered the town, the place's own oracular voice sang in my ears in tones that truly were heaven-sent. The

city seemed like an abode fit for the lords of heaven, especially as regards the nature of its surroundings: Parnassus towers above the city exactly like a fortress or a natural citadel, enfolding the town in the fond embrace of its foothills.'

'An excellent description!' exclaimed Cnemon …

'After admiring the town with its streets, squares, and fountains, and visiting the famous spring of Castalia, with whose waters I performed the ritual of ablution, I hastened to the temple in a state of high excitement, for the crowd was abuzz with the rumour that it was time for the prophetess to awake.'   (2.26.1–3, 4)

After this introduction, Calasiris virtually allows the space of Delphi to look after itself. He tells us where various encounters took place, of visits to the lodgings of Chariclea, of visits to his own lodgings by Theagenes, of chance meetings in the street with Charicles, but the most important thing about Delphi, for him and for his narratee is the ethos rather than the structure of the place.

Functions

As was the case with Longus, it is virtually impossible to separate the functions of spatial descriptions in this novel. It is not difficult to find examples of the symbolic, characterizing or psychologizing functions of space, but it is difficult not to connect these examples directly with the major themes of the novel. As was not the case with Longus, space, in the sense of travel and the articulation of the world, is central both to the mechanisms of the plot and to its meaning. This section will therefore begin by demonstrating that Heliodorus utilises narrative space in a wide variety of ways, and then will move on to a necessarily brief and incomplete analysis of the ways in which space both is a major element of the novel's thematic in itself, and underpins its philosophical, religious and ethical views of life, love and the world.

a) *Ornamental function*: this can be quickly dealt with. The idea is that descriptive details are realistic in themselves and can be used to anchor the narrative in perceptions of the 'real' world.[13] We have already mentioned the lengthy narratorial digression on the Island of Meroe. Some of

---

[13] Explored at length by J.R. Morgan 1982.

the details of this, the extraordinary plants and animals that grow there, for instance, characterize the Ethiopian nation as in some ways superhuman and close to the divine. On the other hand, detailed measurement of distances and the dropping in of exotic river-names have no plot-function, beyond the creation of a quasi-historical plausibility. Calasiris' description of the Delphic procession also abounds in details which go nowhere in plot terms, but add to the 'reality-effect'. Here the secondary narratee, Cnemon, is made to voice the idea of a narrative so vivid that it gives the illusion of presence at the event being described:

> 'It's them!' exclaimed Cnemon. 'It's Chariclea and Theagenes! … They are not here, Father … but your description portrayed them so vividly (*enargōs*), so exactly as I know them from my own experience, that they seemed to be before my eyes.' (3.4.7)

This is the classic rhetorical idea of *enargeia*, and the abundance of visual (and in this case aural and olfactory) detail is an important element in the creation of the effect.

b) *Symbolic functions*: this is when space is semantically charged so as to acquire a significance beyond its scene-setting function. In the Greek novels in general, and especially in this one, the semantic charge is often intertextual. For instance Heliodorus offers us an exotically coloured version of the *locus amoenus* when Theagenes and Chariclea are allowed to rest after being extracted from Arsace's grasp.

> There was a sort of promontory in the bank of the Nile, where the water, prevented from flowing straight ahead, meandered through a semicircle, until it returned to a point in line with the place where the detour began. The area thus enclosed formed, as it were, an inland bay, which, the whole tract being well watered, was covered in lush meadows and produced, unworked by human hand, a rich profusion of grass and herbiage, where animals could graze to their hearts' content beneath a shady canopy of persea-trees, sycamores, and other plants whose natural habitat is the banks of the Nile. (8.14.3)

This is the location where the protagonists receive the news of Arsace's death, and its symbolic resonances are multiple. As a recognisable *locus amoenus* it is generically a refuge of natural peace, tranquillity and fertility. Rather than merely a place where one can escape the cares of the workaday world, it is a haven opposed to the torture and imprisonment from which the lovers have just been liberated. Its natural simplicity similarly stands in contrast to the Persian luxury which they have just left. But most interestingly, the location with running water, thick grass

and trees immediately recalls the setting of Plato's *Phaedrus*, except that the plane trees canonical in such evocations have been replaced by the persea, evocative of an exotic setting and connected in Egyptian mythology with the sun and the re-born phoenix.[14] The Platonic connotations are underlined by the presence of the horses which are allowed to rest and graze in the *locus amoenus*. We are thus primed to recall the erotic mythology of the *Phaedrus*, and to interpret Arsace's deviant sexuality in the light of the Phaedran myth of the soul's chariot. Another location with Platonic connotations is the cave in which Chariclea is hidden by Thyamis when the bandit camp comes under attack.[15] Here Thyamis later kills Thisbe in the belief that she is Chariclea, and then Theagenes and Cnemon mistake Thisbe's body for that of Chariclea. A cave where appearances are misleading can scarcely fail to recall the *Republic* and acquire a serious semantic charge thereby.

At a rather more literal level, the Athens in which Cnemon's story is set contains two philosophically marked landmarks. The Garden of the Epicureans is the place where Thisbe arranges to meet Cnemon's father so that he can catch his wife *in flagrante delicto* with an adulterer. Although the location of this is apparently authentic, it is seriously anachronistic for the novel's dramatic date in the sixth or fifth century BCE. The sterile hedonism which Cnemon's Athens embodies is thus associated with the school of philosophy which might have condoned such a life. After being apprehended, the wife throws herself to her death in the pit in the Academia. This is another symbolic location: the centre of Platonism is the philosophically appropriate place for perverted Epicureanism to meet its come-uppance.[16]

c) *characterizing functions*: we have already mentioned the extended description of the Island of Meroe (quoted above in the section on forms). The purely cartographic details contribute to the reality-effect and are ornamental, but the description goes on to extol the marvellous fertility of the Island of Meroe, and the abnormally huge flora and fauna it produces. This information is not directly relevant to the story, but adds to the thematic characterization of Ethiopia as a land favoured by

---

[14] For the popularity of the *Phaedrus* among writers of the Second Sophistic, see Trapp 1990.

[15] For this and other caves in the novels, see the conspectus given by Cheyns 2005.

[16] The argument is developed in J.R. Morgan 2007c: 39–42.

divine providence and superior to the normal run of humanity. Many of Heliodorus' settings and spatial descriptions function in the same way. The excursus of the stronghold of the bandits, for example, (quoted above in the section on forms) contains details of their dwelling places, food and childcare, which mark them out as 'other', living outside the normal conventions of civilisation, and thus re-inforcing their double function in the plot as violent threat and untainted counter-culture, or noble savage, whose values of loyalty, community and honesty are paradoxically truer than those of 'civilisation', as typified by, for example, the Persian governors, from whom Thyamis has sought refuge among the bandits. Delphi is characterized by its temples, rituals and theatre (used for a deliberative citizen assembly) as the epitome of Greek polis culture.

A nicely explicit characterizing use of space occurs with the description of the satrap's palace in Memphis, focalised by Theagenes and Chariclea:

> But had they had any inkling of the fatal pride that dwelt in the palace and of the harm it would cause them, they surely would never have entered it … On reaching the satrapal residence, they were immediately confronted by an impressive gateway of a grandeur far exceeding that of a private dwelling, lined with a magnificent array of guardsmen and teeming with a pretentious retinue of other household servants. (7.12.1, 3)

This is very much part of the depiction of the Persians in the novel, as luxurious, arrogant and cruel. The description of the palace also draws attention to the Persian inequalities of power and status, and their foundation in servile obedience and military strength. This, of course, chimes with, and is activated by, stereotypical representations of Persians from Herodotus onwards. The dining-hall where Theagenes is made to serve at Arsace's table is not described, but the clothes that he is made to wear further characterize Persian luxury and servility:

> He changed into the sumptuous Persian apparel she had sent him and, with a mixture of delight and disgust, bedecked himself with bangles of gold and collars studded with precious gems. (7.27.1)

And, of course, the very fact of a proudly free Greek being forced into the role of choreographed wine-waiter already defines the setting and the actions that take place within it.

d) *psychologizing functions*: this same example also illustrates how the focalisation of space can tell us about the feelings of the focaliser, in this case the two protagonists. The narrator immediately makes it explicit how their first sight of the Persian palace affects Theagenes and Chariclea:

> They were filled with a mixture of awe and dismay at the sight of this palace
> that was in such marked contrast to their own present condition.
>
> (7.12.3)

The way in which the description quoted above is focalised makes it clear
that this reaction is in response to the grandeur, display and magnificence
of the palace, but also to the way in which its organisation visibly enforces
hierarchies of power and status, and their awareness of their own vulner-
ability in such a situation.

We have already looked at the very opening of the novel, as a prime
example of the actorial presentation of space. The way in which the
bandits focalise the scene on the beach also tells us a lot about their
characters, thoughts and feelings. We have seen that the description
follows their gaze, but the way that gaze is directed is determined by their
character as bandits: its movement enacts their desire and search, as they
look out over the water for ships to raid, and then turn their attention to
the shore. As they look closely at the ship, details about her which are
not visible are presented as the product of their intellectual deductions;
we know that the ship is fully freighted by the fact that she observably
sits low in the water. But the very fact that this detail is singled out for
scrutiny is because their prime concern at this moment is with finding
something to plunder. As their gaze tracks systematically from the ship
to the beach, they suddenly become aware of the scene of carnage there.
At this point the grammar of the Greek sentence breaks off, leaving the
nominative noun *aigialos* ('beach') suspended with no predicate (1.1.3).
This conveys their astonishment and sudden quickening of interest, as a
routine scanning of the landscape develops into something dramatic and
hopeful. The protracted description that ensues continues to follow their
gaze around a series of cameos of the slaughter, emphasising both the
paradoxical and enigmatic nature of events and the potentially valuable
material objects involved:

> There were tables still set with food, and others upset upon the ground,
> held in dead men's hands; in the fray they had served some as weapons,
> for this had been an impromptu conflict; beneath other tables men had
> crawled in the vain hope of hiding there. There were wine bowls upturned,
> and some slipping from the hands that held them; some had been drinking
> from them, others using them like stones, for the suddenness of the
> catastrophe had caused objects to be put to strange new uses and taught
> men to use drinking vessels as missiles. There they lay, here a man felled
> by an axe, there another struck down by a stone picked up then and there
> from the shingly beach; here a man battered to death with a club, there
> another burned to death with a brand from the fire. Various were the forms

of their deaths, but most were the victims of arrows and archery. In that small space the deity had contrived an infinitely varied spectacle, defiling wine with blood and unleashing war at the party, combining wining and dying, pouring of drink and shedding of blood, and staging this tragic show for the Egyptian bandits.   (1.1.4–6)

A final example of the psychologizing function is supplied by Cnemon's night-time peregrinations of Nausicles' house, after he fears that Thisbe has come back to life to haunt him; in fact this is one more case of the identities of Chariclea and Thisbe being confused. Our knowledge of the extent and arrangement of the house comes only through his focalisation, which reflects his confused and panicky cognitive and emotional state:

> Cnemon left the room and, considering that he was lost in a strange house at night, with no light, had exactly the kind of experience one might have expected … Eventually, after spending some time wandering round and round in circles in the mistaken belief that he was all the time exploring new places, he heard the sound of a woman's voice, softly and sadly sorrowing in the darkness … Her lamentations guided his steps to her room, where he put his ear to the crack between the doors and listened … He very nearly fell into a swoon right there by the door. With a great effort he clung to consciousness, and, terrified that someone might find him there, for the cocks were already crowing for the second time, he took to his heels, tripping and stumbling, blundering into walls and cracking his head time and again against door-beams or such objects as were hanging from the roof, until, after taking many wrong turnings, he reached the room where he and Calasiris were staying and there collapsed on his bed, shaking all over uncontrollably, his teeth chattering loudly.
>
> (5.2.5–6, 3.1–3)

e) *Thematic functions*: even from a cursory survey it is clear that this novel organises its representation of space into complex semiotic systems. In this respect its treatment of narrative space is just one element in the text's thematic repertoire, and cannot be separated from plot, action and characterization. In arguing that Heliodorus' treatment of space coheres with the large-scale themes of his novel, it will be necessary to make summary statements of what those themes are, without going into detailed argumentation which is not connected with narrative space.

In reviewing the settings of the novel, I noted that in broad terms the action of the fabula is spread over three geographical zones (Greece, Egypt and Ethiopia), through which the protagonists move.[17] Their story

---

[17] The following paragraph covers well-trodden territory; see J.R. Morgan 2007d: 150–156, and the further bibliography given there.

is, basically, one of multiple and intertwining journeys. Chariclea is born in Ethiopia, taken to Egypt, then to Delphi, and in the story makes her way back to the land of her birth; Theagenes travels from northern Greece to Delphi, and accompanies Chariclea to Ethiopia; Calasiris exiles himself from Egypt, claims to have visited Ethiopia and certainly goes to Delphi, whence he abets the elopement of Theagenes and Chariclea, returning to his home in Memphis, where he dies; Cnemon is exiled from Athens, follows Thisbe to Egypt, but returns to Greece rather than continuing the journey to Ethiopia.

But the zones are not simply geographical locations: each of them is distinctively characterized, and in broad terms the journey from Greece to Ethiopia is one of a moral and spiritual ascent. Athens is characterized through the New Comedy intrigue of Cnemon's story as a place of selfish sexuality, the antithesis of the true love of Theagenes and Chariclea; Delphi is an exalted place, the centre of Greek culture, but its wisdom is limited: Charicles is a nice enough guy but not the brightest bulb in the chandelier, and he fails to understand the nature of true love. Egypt is an ambiguous and liminal place, typified by the figure of Calasiris, who has some access to divine wisdom, but is also prepared to play the charlatan; his son Thyamis alternates in the roles of high-priest (or heir apparent to that office) and bandit-captain. Its ambivalence is incarnated in the two forms of Egyptian wisdom, individuated in the novel as ascetic piety and necromancy, which form the moral and philosophical poles of its discourse.[18] Egypt is also the location of the corrupt and immoral Persian court, connected to Cnemon's Athens by a shared use of Euripides' *Hippolytus* as intertext. Ethiopia is coloured by motifs from Herodotus and other classical writers as an ideal state, with a king who is like a father to his people, and magnanimous to his defeated enemies. The boundaries of Ethiopia are set by nature (the cataracts and the tropic) and the king has no materialistic ambitions to exceed them, though convention still demands human sacrifice in celebration of victory.

Each of the three zones is thus presented in its positive and negative aspects, but distinctly characterized. The journey southward is one from a worldly Hellenism, through a spiritually more enlightened but morally compromised Egypt, where appearances may be decep-

---

[18] 3.16.2–4, for the implications of which see M. Jones 2006.

tive, to a state of solar perfection in Ethiopia, where the protagonists' arrival aetiologically abolishes the one barbaric practice of human sacrifice and ushers in an ideal combination of Greek culture and solar spirituality. Each of the novel's three priests, Charicles, Calasiris and Sisimithres, encapsulates the positive character of his country; two of them act as foster-father to the heroine, while the third, Sisimithres, was responsible for saving her life as a child and plays a central role in the process of recognition whereby she is reunited with her true parents.

The travels of the main characters should be read against this schema. Chariclea has fallen from an ideal spiritual state into a flawed world, and her story is a circular one of awakening to and recovering her true identity, in the form of an Odyssean *nostos*. Theagenes' is different: he is leaving, not returning home. He makes the journey because he loves Chariclea so much that he is prepared to resign his ethnic, cultural and social identities in order to be with her forever. Neither Calasiris nor Cnemon makes it all the way to Ethiopia. Calasiris is ultimately too Egyptian (in the figurative as well as the literal sense) to finish his days in Ethiopia, while Cnemon, after travelling part of the way to Ethiopia, is lured back to his materialistic world by the promise of a lucrative marriage into a mercantile house. If we can read Heliodorus' world as an elaborate moral and spiritual metaphor, travel in this novel is not just a matter of driving the plot in the mechanical sense, but coheres with its deepest and most serious themes. Geographical space articulates morality, religion and philosophy.

In previous sections, I have commented on symbolic, characterizing and psychologizing functions of narrative space in the *Aethiopica*. It should be clear that virtually every instance has also a thematic function. The Platonic *locus amoenus* and the cave of partial perception cohere with a deep-level reading of Chariclea's story as a romantic version of the Platonic myth of the soul. The characterizing spaces of each of the novel's zones are part of the means by which the narrative and philosophical hierarchies are constructed. Ultimately, it is clear that, decorative detail apart, Heliodorus conceives of space in ethical rather than pictorial terms: we really know nothing of what the satrap's palace in Memphis looks like, for example, but it is almost personified to reflect the moral characters of the people who inhabit it. The same goes for Delphi, Athens, Bucolia and Meroe. Likewise, the psychological focalisation of space constitutes a commentary on the action, located within the narrative and not imposed by the primary narrator.

Metaliterary Space

The pervasive use of theatrical metaphors and terminology in the *Aethiopica* has been much commented upon and discussed.[19] Repeatedly the action and the space in which it takes place is conceived as and compared to that of the theatre by the narrator. This is partly a device to promote visual *enargeia*, but also to draw attention to the literariness and artificiality of the novel. This trope is present from the novel's opening pages where the bandits are assimilated to a theatrical audience on a hillside, gazing at the spectacle on the beach:

> In that small space the deity had contrived an intricately varied spectacle … staging this tragic show (*theatron*) for the Egyptian bandits. They stood on the mountainside like the audience in a theatre (*theōroi*), unable to comprehend the scene (*skēnē*).   (1.1.6–7)

Similarly the situation at Syene when the besieged are trying to open negotiations with the Ethiopians is imagined in terms of a tragic scene and a theatrical audience:

> Finally they stretched out their hands towards the enemy, who were standing on the earthworks watching their distress like an audience watching a play (*theatron*).   (9.5)

The most elaborate and sustained example of this theatricality comes in the scene at Memphis, where first Thyamis pursues his brother around the walls, 'with the entire population of the city lining the walls, watching like the presiding judges in a theatre' (*hōsper ek theatrou … ēthlothetei tēn thean*, 7.6.4), then fate makes the drama (*drama*) take an new and tragic turn (*kainon epeisodion epetragōdei*), producing Calasiris by 'a miracle of stagecraft' (*hōsper ek mēchanēs*)[20] in the nick of time to prevent the fratricide. Even when the theatrical metaphor is not explicit, theatrical modalities of acting and watching are preserved:

> Some of those on the walls were impressed by the way he sought to interpose himself between two armed men with such selfless courage, but others thought he must be deranged and laughed at such irrational exertions.   (7.7.1)

---

[19] Walden 1894 is still the fundamental resource for a catalogue of Heliodoran theatre; more recent interpretations in Marino 1990 and Montes Cala 1992.

[20] A reference to the crane-like device in the Attic theatre, used to stage the appearance of gods (*deus ex machina*).

And then finally Chariclea makes another dramatic entrance (*paren-kyklēma*),[21] and a recognition scene is staged, which the audience later recognises as 'the high point of the drama' (*to erōtikon meros tou dram-atos … epēkmazen*, 7.8.2).

Novelists may use space as a cipher for their narratives. In (→) Longus, the prevailing spatial metaphor for the novel is the garden. Heliodorus is equally self-reflexive, though perhaps less insistently so. In keeping with the thematic of travel in this novel, the master metaphor for the text is that of the journey. This functions at both micro and macro levels.

On the micro level Heliodorus constructs images of convolution and complexity. The first of these concerns the cave whose Platonic symbolism we have already seen:

> Beyond the opening was a maze of irregularly winding tunnels. The shafts and passages leading to the heart of the cave in some places ran separately, with cunning twists and turns; at others they met and crisscrossed like roots, until in the nethermost depths they merged and opened into a broad gallery lit by a feeble shaft of light from a fissure near the lake's edge.
>
> (1.29.1–2)

The maze-like cave is itself situated at the centre of another maze of paths which the *Boukoloi* have cut through the reed-beds of the marsh:

> The water encircles the entire settlement like a wall, and instead of a palisade they are protected by the vast quantities of reeds growing in the marsh. By cutting devious and intricately winding paths through the reeds, and so constructing passages that are easy enough for themselves, as they know the way through, but quite impossible for anyone else, they have contrived for themselves an impregnable fastness against any attack.
>
> (1.6.1–2)

The concentric maze reflects the narrative structure of the novel, with its narratives within narratives, and at the vary centre is placed Chariclea, illuminated. Her antitype and *Doppelganger*, Thisbe, is also hidden in the cave, in darkness. Chariclea will live and emerge from the cave, and reach the land of the sun, which she will enter into a carriage drawn by white oxen, while Thisbe will die in the subterranean gloom. Chariclea is the true beauty and beautiful truth hidden at the heart of the textual labyrinth for those who know how to find their way to her. At the end

---

[21] The exact meaning of this word is not clear, but it is connected in some way with the *ekkyklēma*, a sort of trolley used to 'wheel out' interior scenes into the view of the theatre audience.

of the description she is described as *to phaidrotaton tōn en anthrōpois*:
literally 'the brightest thing among humans' (1.29.4), but the superlative
adjective makes clear the Platonic issues which she embodies.

A similar image is presented when Cnemon is blundering around
Nausicles' house in the middle of the night. The metaliterary nature of
this scene is underlined by the fact that Cnemon's major role is as an
internal narratee, and possible a less than entirely satisfactory one. In his
attempts to find Chariclea at the end of the labyrinth, he loses his way,
mistakes her for her antithesis, and then runs back in panic, just as he
fails to reach Ethiopia at the end of the novel.

At the macro level, the story begins at the mouth of the Nile, and ends
in Meroe. Meroe is not exactly the source of the Nile, but, as we have seen,
it does stand at the confluence of the Astaborrhas and the Asasobas, the
point from where the Nile flows as a single river to the sea. The events
of the story essentially track the course of the Nile southwards: Delta,
Memphis, Syene, Meroe, from the familiar Mediterranean sea-board to
unknown, exotic and spiritually exalted lands. The southward journey
from coast is an ascent from Lower Egypt to Upper Egypt; at 9.22.5
the Nile is divinised as the saviour of Upper Egypt, and the father and
demiurge of Lower. The starting point of the story near the Heracleotic
mouth of the Nile is carefully chosen. This is the site of the future city
of Alexandria, whose absence fixes the narrative at a pre-Alexandrian
dramatic date.

The novel too takes its narratees on an upward journey from the famil-
iar to a place where deeper mysteries are revealed or at least hinted at. The
starting point of the literary journey is Alexandria, the *locus classicus* of
literary sophistication and learning, but this is not where salvation is to
be found. Like the Nile, the novel takes us through places where appear-
ances are deceptive, but ultimately abandons the slippery complexities of
the Calasiris section of the story (so beloved of modern interpreters) for
a narratologically simpler but for that reason philosophically truer repre-
sentation of its protagonist's Phaedran return through love to lost origins
and union with the gods. Towards the end of the novel, the river becomes
increasingly laden with solar imagery, culminating in its mathemati-
cal identification with the solar year.[22] When the priests of Syene show
Hydaspes the solar miracles of their city, the king replies with a phrase

---

[22] 9.22.6: if the letters of the word *Neilos* are read as numerals, they total 365.

that employs the title of the novel in such a way as to identify it with the solar religion which they embody: 'these solemnities' are Ethiopian (*Aithiopika ta semnologēmata*).[23] Only in the narrator's *sphragis* is the connection finally made between the fabula-space of Ethiopia and the narrator's own space of Emesa, and we realise that the journey on which the Nile and the novel have taken us is one towards the neoplatonic truths of solar religion.

---

[23] This was first noticed by Whitmarsh 1999b: 27. The whole argument adumbrated here is worked in a fuller form by J.R. Morgan fc, where full bibliography is given.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adam, J. (ed.), *The Republic of Plato*, I–II (Cambridge 1902).

Akujärvi, J., *Researcher, Traveller, Narrator. Studies in Pausanias'* Periegesis (Lund 2005).

——, 'One and "I" in the Frame (Narrative). Authorial Voice, Travelling Persona, and Addressee in Pausanias' *Periegesis*', *CQ* (fc).

Alaux, J., Létoublon, F., 'La grotte et la source. Paysage naturel et artifice dans *Daphnis et Chloé* et *Leucippé et Clitophon*', in B. Pouderon (ed.), *Lieux, décors et paysages de l'ancien roman des origines à Byzance* (Lyon 2005) 57–74.

d'Alessio, G.B., 'Past Future and Present Past: Temporal Deixis in Greek Archaic Lyric', in N. Felson (ed.), *The Poetics of Deixis in Alcman, Pindar, and Other Lyric* (Baltimore 2004) 267–294.

Algra, K., *Concepts of Space in Greek Thought* (Leiden 1995).

Allan, W. (ed.), *Euripides*: The Children of Heracles (Warminster 2001).

Allen, T.W., Halliday, W.R., Sikes, E.E., *The Homeric Hymns* (Oxford 1936).

Alvares, J., 'The Drama of Hippothous in Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesiaca*', *CJ* 90 (1995) 393–404.

——, 'Maps of Travels in the Ancient Novels, and of Other Famous Journeys', in G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden 1996) 801–814.

Ameling, W., 'Pausanias und die hellenistische Geschichte', in J. Bingen (ed.), *Pausanias historien* (Vandœuvres-Genève 1996) 117–166.

Andersen, O., 'Some Thoughts on the Shield of Achilles', *SO* 51 (1976) 5–18.

Anderson, G., *Ancient Fiction. The Novel in the Graeco-Roman World* (London/Sydney 1984).

——, 'Xenophon of Ephesus. An Ephesian Tale', in B.P. Reardon (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Berkeley/Los Angeles [1989] ²2008) 125–169.

Anderson, M.J., *The Fall of Troy in Early Greek Poetry and Art* (Oxford 1997).

Andersson, T.M., *Early Epic Scenery (Homer, Vergil, and the Medieval Legacy)* (Ithaca, NY/London 1976).

Annas, J., 'Plato's Myths of Judgement', *Phronesis* 27 (1982) 119–143.

Arthur, M., 'The Curse of Civilization: The Choral Odes of *Phoenissae*', *HSCP* 81 (1977) 163–185.

Asheri, D., Lloyd, A., Corcella, A. (eds.), *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I–IV*, ed. by O. Murray, A. Moreno (Oxford 2007).

Athanassaki, L., 'Deixis, Performance, and Poetics in Pindar's *First Olympian Ode*', in N. Felson (ed.), *The Poetics of Deixis in Alcman, Pindar, and Other Lyric* (Baltimore 2004) 317–341.

Auger, D., 'Figures et représentation de la cité et du politique sur la scène d'Aristophane', in P. Thiercy, M. Menu (eds.), *Aristophane: la langue, la scène, la cité* (Bari 1997) 361–377.

Baak, J.J. van, *The Place of Space in Narration* (Amsterdam 1983).

Bachelard, G., *La poétique de l'espace* (Paris 1957).

Bakhtin, M.M., 'Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel', in M. Holquist (ed.), *The Dialogic Imagination* (Austin TX 1981) 84–258 (original from 1938–1973).

Bakola, E., *Cratinus and the Art of Comedy* (Oxford 2010).

Bal, M., 'On Meanings and Descriptions', *Studies in Twentieth Century Literature* 6 (1981–1982) 100–148.

——, *Narratology. Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* ([1985] Toronto 1997).

Baltes, M., 'Die Kataloge im homerischen Apollonhymnus', *Philologus* 125 (1981) 25–43.

Banta, J., Imperium cum finibus: *Plutarch's Archaic Rome* (diss. SUNY-Buffalo 2006).

——, '"Who Gives a Fig (Tree a Name)?": Chronotopic Conflicts in Plutarch's *Romulus*', *Intertexts* 11 (2007a) 25–41.

——, 'The Gates of Janus: Bakhtin and Plutarch's Roman *meta-chronotope*', in D.H.J. Larmour, D. Spencer (eds.), *The Sites of Rome: Time, Space, Memory* (Oxford 2007b) 238–270.

Barlow, S.A., *The Imagery of Euripides* ([London 1971] Bristol 1986).

Barrett, J., *Staged Narrative. Poetics and the Messenger in Greek Tragedy* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 2002).

Barrett, W.S. (ed.), *Euripides*: Hippolytos (Oxford 1964).

Barthes, R., 'The Reality Effect', in *The Rustle of Language* ([Paris 1968] Berkeley 1989) 141–148.

Bartsch, S., *Decoding the Ancient Novel: The Reader and the Role of Description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius* (Princeton 1989).

Bartsch, W., *Der Charitonroman und die Historiographie* (Leipzig 1934).

Baschmakoff, A., *La synthese des périples pontiques* (Paris 1948).

Baslez, M.F., 'De l'histoire au roman: la *Perse* de Chariton', in M.F. Baslez, P. Hoffman, M. Trédé (eds.), *Le monde du roman grec* (Paris 1992) 199–212.

Bassett, S.E., *The Poetry of Homer* (Berkeley 1938).

Beard, M., '"Pausanias in Petticoats," or *The Blue Jane*', in S.E. Alcock, J.F. Cherrie, J. Elsner (eds.), *Pausanias. Travel and Memory in Roman Greece* (Oxford 2001) 224–239.

——, 'The Triumph of Flavius Josephus', in A.J. Boyle, W.J. Dominik (eds.), *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text* (Leiden 2003) 543–558.

Bearzot, C., 'La Grecia di Pausania. Geografia e cultura nella definizione del concetta di Ἑλλάς', in M. Sordi (ed.), *Geografia e storiografia nel mondo classico* (Milano 1988) 90–112.

——, *Storia e storiografia ellenistica in Pausania il Periegeta* (Venezia 1992).

Beaton, R., 'The World of Fiction and the World 'Out There': The Case of the Byzantine Novel', in D.C. Smythe (ed.), *From Strangers to Themselves: The Byzantine Outsider* (Hampshire 2000) 179–188.

Beck, M., *Plutarch's Use of Anecdotes in the* Lives (diss. Chapel Hill NC 1998).

Becker, A.S., *The Shield of Achilles and the Poetics of Ekphrasis* (London 1995).

Becker, O., *Das Bild des Weges und Verwandte Vorstellungen im frühgriechischen Denken* (Berlin 1937).

Berman, D.W., *Myth and Culture in Aeschylus'* Seven Against Thebes (Roma 2007).

Bers, V., 'Dikastic "Thorubos"', in P.A. Cartledge, F.D. Harvey (eds.), *Crux* (London 1985) 1–15.

Bétant, E.A., *Lexicon Thucydideum*, I–II (Geneva 1843–1847).

Beye, C.R., *Epic and Romance in the* Argonautica *of Apollonius* (Carbondale/ Edwardsville 1982).

Bichler, R., *Herodots Welt. Die Aufbau der Historie am Bilder der fremden Länder und Völker, ihrer Zivilisation und ihrer Geschichte* (Berlin 2000).

——, 'Herodots *Historien* unter dem Aspekt der Raumerfassung', in M. Rathmann (ed.), *Wahrnehmung und Erfassung geographischer Räume in der Antike* (Mainz am Rhein 2007) 67–80.

Bierl, A., 'Räume im Anderen und der griechische Liebesroman des Xenophon von Ephesos. Träume?', in A. Loprieno (ed.), *Mensch und Raum von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart* (München 2006) 71–103.

Billault, A., 'De l'histoire au roman: Hermocrate de Syracuse', *REG* 102 (1989) 540–548.

——, 'La nature dans *Daphnis et Chloé*', *REG* 109 (1996) 506–526.

Birmelin, E., 'Die kunsttheoretischen Gedanken in *Philostrats Apollonius*', *Philologus* 88 (1933) 149–180.

Blake, W.E., *Charitonis Aphrodisiensis de Chaerea et Callirhoe amatoriarum narrationum libri octo* (London 1938).

Blass, F., *Die attische Beredsamkeit*, I (Leipzig ²1887).

Bloomer, W.M., 'The Superlative *nomoi* of Herodotus' *Histories*', *CSCA* 12 (1993) 30–50.

Bompaire, J., 'Le décor sicilien dans le roman grec et la littérature contemporaine', *REG* 90 (1977) 55–68.

Bonneau, D., 'Les realia du paysage égyptien dans le roman grec: remarques lexicographiques', in M.F. Baslez, P. Hoffman, M. Trédé (eds.), *Le monde du roman grec* (Paris 1992) 213–219.

Bosworth, A.B., 'Athens' First Intervention in Sicily: Thucydides and the Sicilian Tradition', *CQ* 42 (1992) 46–55.

Bouvier, D., 'La tempête de la guerre. Remarques sur l'heure et le lieu du combat dans l'*Iliade*', *Metis* 1 (1986) 237–257.

Bowersock, G.W., 'Dionysus as an Epic Hero', in N. Hopkinson (ed.), *Studies in the Dionysiaca of Nonnos* (Cambridge 1994a) 156–166.

——, *Fiction as History. Nero to Julian* (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1994b).

Bowie, A.M., *Aristophanes: Myth, Ritual and Comedy* (Cambridge 1993).

——, 'Herodotus on Survival: City or Countryside?', in R.M. Rosen, I. Sluiter (eds.), *City, Countryside, and the Spatial Organization of Value in Classical Antiquity* (Leiden/Boston 2006) 119–137.

Bowie, E.L., 'The Novels and the Real World', in B.P. Reardon (ed.), *Erotica antiqua* (Bangor 1977) 91–96.

——, 'Theocritus' Seventh *Idyll*, Philetas and Longus', *CQ* 35 (1985) 67–91.

——, 'Inspiration and Aspiration: Date, Genre, and Readership', in S.E. Alcock, J.F. Cherrie, J. Elsner (eds.), *Pausanias. Travel and Memory in Roman Greece* (Oxford 2001) 21–32.

——, Elsner, J. (eds.), *Philostratus* (Cambridge 2009).

Bowra, C.M., *Heroic Poetry* (London/New York 1952).

——, 'Homeric Epithets for Troy', *JHS* 80 (1960) 16–23.

Bradeen, D.W., *The Athenian Agora. Inscriptions and the Funerary Monuments*, XVII (Princeton 1974).

Braswell, B.K., *A Commentary on the Fourth* Pythian Ode *of Pindar* (Berlin/New York 1987).

Bremer, J.M., 'The Meadow of Love and Two Passages in Euripides' *Hippolytus*', *Mnemosyne* 28 (1975) 268–280.

Brethes, R., *De l'idéalisme au réalisme. Une étude du comique dans le roman grec* (Salerno 2007).

Brock, R., 'Political Imagery in Herodotus', in V. Karageorghis, I. Taifacos (eds.), *The World of Herodotus* (Nicosia 2004) 169–177.

Buchholz, S., Jahn, M., 'Space in Narrative', in D. Herman, M. Jahn, M.-L. Ryan (eds.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory* (London/New York 2005) 551–555.

Buckler, J., 'Plutarch and Autopsy', *ANRW* II.33.6 (Berlin/New York 1992) 4788–4830.

Budelmann, F., 'Bringing Together Nature and Culture: On the Uses and Limits of Cognitive Science for the Study of Performance Reception', in E. Hall, S. Harrop (eds.), *Theorising Performance: Greek Drama, Cultural History and Critical Practice* (London 2010) 108–122.

Bulloch, A.W., *Callimachus: The Fifth Hymn* (Cambridge 1985).

——, 'Jason's Cloak', *Hermes* 134 (2006) 44–68.

——, 'Hymns and Encomia', in J.J. Clauss, M. Cuypers (eds.), *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature* (Chichester 2010) 166–180.

Bürger, K., 'Zu Xenophon von Ephesus', *Hermes* 27 (1892) 36–67.

Burian, P., 'Supplication and Hero Cult in Sophocles' *Ajax*', *GRBS* 13 (1972) 151–156.

Burian, P. (ed.), *Euripides*: Helen (Oxford 2007).

Burke, K., *A Grammar of Motives* (Berkeley [1945] 1969).

Burnett, A.P., *The Art of Bacchylides* (Cambridge MA/London 1985).

Burnyeat, M.F. 'First Words: A Valedictory Lecture', *PCPS* 43 (1997) 1–20.

Buxton, R.G.A., 'Euripides' *Alkestis*: Five Aspects of an Interpretation', in J. Mossman (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Euripides* (Oxford 2003) 170–186 (revised version of an article first published in 1985).

Cairns, D.L. 'The Meadow of Artemis and the Character of the Euripidean Hippolytus', *QUCC* 57 (1997) 51–75.

Cairns, F., 'Theocritus' First *Idyll*: The Literary Programme', *Wiener Studien* 97 (1984) 89–113.

Carey, C., *Lysias: Selected Speeches* (Cambridge 1989).

Carter, D.M., 'At Home, Round Here, Out There: The City and Tragic Space', in R.M. Rosen, I. Sluiter (eds.), *City, Countryside, and the Spatial Organization of Value in Classical Antiquity* (Leiden 2006) 139–172.

Cary, E., *Dio's Roman History*, III–VI (London/Cambridge MA 1914–1917).

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

Cawkwell, G.L, 'Introduction', in R. Warner (tr.), *Xenophon: The Persian Expedition* (Harmondsworth 1972) 9–48.

——, 'Introduction', in R. Warner (tr.), *Xenophon: A History of My Times* (Harmondsworth 1979) 7–48.

Chapman, H.H., *Spectacle and Theater in Josephus's* Bellum Judaicum (diss. Stanford 1998). http://pace.mcmaster.ca/york/york/dissert.htm.

——, 'Spectacle in Josephus' *Jewish War*', in J. Edmondson, S. Mason, J. Rives (eds.), *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome* (Oxford 2005) 289–313.

Chappell, M., 'Delphi and the Homeric Hymn to Apollo', *CQ* 56 (2006) 331–348.

Chatman, S., *Story and Discourse. Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca NY/London 1978).

——, *Coming to Terms. The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca NY/London 1990).

Cheyns, A., 'Prisons et cavernes dans les romans d'amour grecs. Remarques sur un stéréotype et ses variantes', in B. Pouderon (ed.), *Lieux, décors et paysages de l'ancien roman des origins à Byzance* (Lyons 2005) 265–287.

Christ, M., 'Herodotean Kings and Historical Inquiry', *CA* 13 (1994) 167–202.

Clare, R.J., 'Epic Itineraries: The Sea and Sea-faring in the *Odyssey* of Homer and the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius', in G.J. Oliver, R. Brock, T.J. Cornell, S. Hodkinson (eds.), *The Sea in Antiquity* (Oxford 2000) 1–11.

——, *The Path of the Argo: Language, Imagery and Narrative in the* Argonautica *of Apollonius Rhodius* (Cambridge 2002).

Clarke, K.J., *Between Geography and History: Hellenistic Constructions of the Roman World* (Oxford 1999).

Clarke, M., 'Gods and Mountains in Greek Myth and Poetry', in A.B. Lloyd (ed.), *What is a God?* (London 1997) 65–80.

Clauss, J.J., 'Cosmos without *imperium*', in M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit, G.C. Wakker (eds.), *Apollonius Rhodius* (Leuven 2000) 11–32.

Clay, J., *The Politics of Olympus: Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns* (London [1989] 2006).

Cole, S.G., '"I know the number of the sand and the measure of the sea": Geography and Difference in the Early Greek World', in K.A. Raaflaub, R.J.A. Talbert, *Geography and Ethnography: Perceptions of the World in Pre-Modern Societies* (Chichester/Malden MA 2010) 197–214.

Coleman, K., *M. Valerii Martialis Liber spectaculorum* (Oxford 2006).

Compernolle, R. van, *Étude de chronologie et d'historiographie siciliotes: recherches sur le système chronologique des sources de Thucydide concernant la fondation des colonies siciliotes* (Brussels 1960).

Connor, W.R., *Thucydides* (Princeton 1984).

Connors, C., 'Chariton's Syracuse and Its Histories of Empire', in M. Paschalis, S. Frangoulidis (eds.), *Space in the Ancient Novel* (Groningen 2002) 12–26.

Constantakopoulou, C., *The Dance of the Islands: Insularity, Networks, the Athenian Empire and the Aegean World* (Oxford 2007).

Copley, F.O., 'The Pathetic Fallacy in Early Greek Poetry', *AJPh* 58 (1937) 194–209.

Cozzoli, A.T., 'Dalla poesia al romanzo: motive poetici nella rielaborazione narrative di Longo Sofista', *SemRom* 3 (2000) 295–312.

Crane, G., *The Blinded Eye: Thucydides and the New Written Word* (Lanham MD/ London 1996).

Cresci, L.R., 'Il romanzo di Longo Sofista e la tradizione bucolica', *Atene e Roma* 26 (1981) 1–25.

Crielaard, J.P., 'Past or Present? Epic Poetry, Aristocratic Self-Representation and the Concept of Time in the Eight and Seventh Centuries B.C.', in F. Montanari (ed.), *Omero tremila anni dopo* (Roma 2002) 239–295.

Croally, N.T., *Euripidean Polemic: The* Trojan Women *and the Function of Tragedy* (Cambridge 1994).

Cropp, M.J. (ed.), *Euripides*: Electra (Warminster 1988).

Cropp, M.J. (ed.), *Euripides*: Iphigenia in Tauris (Warminster 2000).

Cueva, E.P., 'Who's the Woman on the Bull?: Achilles Tatius 1.4.3', in S.N. Byrne, E.P. Cueva, J. Alvares (eds.), *Authors, Authority and Interpreters in the Ancient Novel* (Groningen 2006) 131–146.

Cuillandre, J., *La droite et la gauche dans les poèmes homériques* (Paris 1944).

Cuny, D., 'Lieux et beauté dans *Chairéas et Callirhoe*', in B. Pouderon (ed.), *Lieux, décors et paysages de l'ancien roman des origines à Byzance* (Lyon 2005) 219–233.

Currie, B.G.F., 'Reperformance Scenarios for Pindar's Odes', in C. Mackie (ed.), *Oral Performance and Its Context. Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece*, V (Leiden/Boston/Cologne 2004) 49–69.

——, 'L'*Ode* 11 di Bacchilide: il mito delle Pretidi nella lirica corale, nella poesia epica, e nella mitografia', in: E. Cingano (ed.), *Tra panellenismo e tradizioni locali. Generi poetici e storiografia* (Alessandria 2010) 211–253.

Cusset, C., 'Fonctions du décor bucolique dans les *Pastorales* de Longus', in B. Pouderon (ed.), *Lieux, décors et paysages de l'ancien roman des origines à Byzance* (Lyon 2005) 163–178.

Cusset, C. (ed.), *La nature et ses représentations dans l'Antiquité* (Paris 1999).

Dale, A.M. (ed.), *Euripides*: Alcestis (Oxford 1954).

Dale, A.M. (ed.), 'Seen and Unseen on the Greek Stage', in *Collected Papers* (Cambridge 1969) 119–129 (reprinted from *WS* 69 (1956) 96–106).

Dällenbach, L., *The Mirror in the Text* ([Paris 1977] Chicago 1989).

Danek, G., 'Apollonius as an (Anti-)Homeric Narrator: Time and Space in the *Argonautica*', in J. Grethlein, A. Rengakos (eds.), *Narratology and Interpretation* (Berlin 2009) 275–293.

Davidson, J., 'The Gaze in Polybius' *Histories*', *JRS* 81 (1991) 10–24.

Davies, M., 'Description by Negation: History of a Thought-Pattern in Ancient Accounts of Blissful Life', *Prometheus* 13 (1987) 265–284.

Delage, E., *La géographie dans les* Argonautiques *de Apollonios* (Paris 1930).

Dennerlein, K., *Narratologie des Raumes* (Berlin 2009).

Denyer, N., *Plato*: Protagoras (Cambridge 2008).

Depew, M., 'Gender, Power and Poetics in Callimachus' Book of *Hymns*', in M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit, G.C. Wakker (eds.), *Callimachus*, II (Leuven/Paris/ Dudley MA 2004) 117–137.

Dewald, C., 'Explanatory Notes', in R. Waterfield (tr.), *Herodotus*: The Histories (Oxford 1998) 594–735.

Dickey, E., *Greek Forms of Address, from Herodotus to Lucian* (Oxford 1996).

Dijk, G.-J. van, 'The *Odyssey* of Apollonius: An Intertextual Paradigm', in E. Bowie, J. Elsner (eds.), *Philostratus* (Cambridge 2009) 176–202.

Dillery, J., 'Cambyses and the Egyptian *Chaosbeschreibung* Tradition', *CQ* 55 (2005) 387–406.

Dodds, E.R., *Plato*: Gorgias (Oxford 1959).

Dopp, E., 'Herodianus', in *RE* 8.1 (1912) 954–959.

Dougherty, C., *The Raft of Odysseus. The Ethnographic Imagination of Homer's* Odyssey (Oxford 2001).

Douglas, M., *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London 1978).

——, *Lysias and the Corpus Lysiacum* (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1968).

Dover, K.J., *Greek and the Greeks. Collected papers*, I: *Language, Poetry, Drama* (Oxford 1987).

Dover, K.J., *Aristophanes'* Frogs (Oxford 1993).

Dueck, D., 'The Parallelogram and the Pinecone', *Ancient Society* 35 (2005) 19–57.

Duff, T., *Plutarch's* Lives: *Exploring Virtue and Vice* (Oxford 1999).

——, 'The Prologue to the *Lives of Perikles and Fabius*', in A. Pérez Jiménez, F. Casadesús Bordoy (eds.), *Estudios sobre Plutarco: misticismo y religiones mistéricas en la obra de Plutarco* (Madrid/Málaga 2001) 351–363.

Dunn, F.M., *Tragedy's End. Closure and Innovation in Euripidean Drama* ((New York/Oxford 1996).

Easterling, P.E., 'The End of the *Trachiniae*', *ICS* 6 (1981) 56–74.

——, 'Women in Tragic Space', *BICS* 34 (1987) 15–26.

——, 'Agamemnon's *skēptron* in the *Iliad*', in M.M. Mackenzie, C. Roueché (eds.), *Images of Authority* (Cambridge 1989) 104–121.

——, 'Constructing the Heroic', in C.B.R. Pelling (ed.), *Greek Tragedy and the Historian* (Oxford 1997) 21–37.

Eberhardt, B., 'Wer dient wem? Die Darstellungen des Flavischen Triumphzuges auf dem Titusbogen und bei Josephus', in J. Sievers, G. Lembi (eds.), *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond* (Leiden 2005) 257–277.

Edmonds, R., *Myths of the Underworld Journey: Plato, Aristophanes, and the 'Orphic' Gold Tablets* (New York 2004).

Edmunds, L., *Theatrical Space and Historical Place in Sophocles'* Oedipus at Colonus (Lanham MD 1996).

Edwards, A.T., 'Homer's Ethical Geography. Country and City in the *Odyssey*', *TAPA* 123 (1993) 27–78.

Edwards, M.J., *Lysias: Five Speeches* (London 1999).

Edwards, M.J., Usher, S., *Greek Orators*, I: *Antiphon and Lysias* (Warminster 1985).

Effe, B., 'Longos. Zur Funktionsgeschichte der Bukolik in der römischen Kaiserzeit', *Hermes* 110 (1982) 65–84.

Elliger, W., *Die Darstellung der Landschaft in der griechischen Dichtung* (Berlin/New York 1975).

Elsner, J., 'From the Pyramids to Pausanias and Piglet: Monuments, Travel and Writing', in S. Goldhill, R. Osborn (eds.), *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture* (Cambridge 1994) 224–254.

——, 'Hagiographic Geography: Travel and Allegory in the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*', *JHS* 117 (1997) 22–37.

——, 'Structuring "Greece": Pausanias's *Periegesis* as a Literary Construct', in S.E. Alcock, J.F. Cherrie, J. Elsner (eds.), *Pausanias. Travel and Memory in Roman Greece* (Oxford 2001) 3–20.

——, 'The Genres of Ekphrasis', *Ramus* 31 (2002) 1–18.

Erbse, H., *Studien zum Verständnis Herodots* (Berlin/New York 1992).

Ewans, M., 'The Dramatic Structure of *Agamemnon*', *Ramus* 11 (1982) 1–15.

Famerie, E., *Concordantia in Appianum* (Hildesheim 1993).

Fehling, D., *Herodotus and his 'Sources': Citation, Invention, and Narrative Art*, tr. by J.G. Howie (Leeds 1989).

——, 'The Art of Herodotus and the Margins of the World', in Z.R.W.M. von Martels (ed.), *Travel Fact and Travel Fiction: Studies on Fiction, Literary Tradition, Scholarly Discovery, and Observation in Travel Writing* (Leiden 1994) 1–15.

Felson, N., 'Introduction', in N. Felson (ed.), *The Poetics of Deixis in Alcman, Pindar, and Other Lyric* (Baltimore 2004) 253–266.

Feraboli, S., *Lisia avvocato* (Padua 1980).

Ferrari, G.R.F., *Listening to the Cicadas. A Study of Plato's* Phaedrus (Cambridge 1987).

Fisher, N., 'Gymnasia and the Democratic Values of Leisure', in P. Cartledge, P. Millett, S. von Reden (eds.), *Kosmos. Essays on Order, Conflict, and Community in Classical Athens* (Cambridge 1998) 84–104.

Flower, M.A., 'From Simonides to Isocrates: The Fifth-Century Origins of Fourth-Century Panhellenism', *CA* 19 (2000) 65–101.

Ford, A., *Homer. The Poetry of the Past* (Ithaca/London 1992).

Förstel, K., *Untersuchungen zum homerischen Apollonhymnos* (Bochum 1979).

Forster, R., 'Geographical Dissertation', in E. Spelman (tr.), *The Expedition of Cyrus*, II (London 1740–1742) iv–lxxix.

Foucault, J.A. de, *Recherches sur la langue et le style de Polybe* (Paris 1972).

Fowler, D., 'Narrate and Describe. The Problem of Ekphrasis', in *Roman Constructions. Readings in Postmodern Latin* ([1991] Oxford 2000) 64–85.

Fowler, R.L., 'Herodotos and His Contemporaries', *JHS* 116 (1996) 62–87.

Fraenkel, E., 'Dramaturgical Problems in the *Ecclesiazusae*', in *Greek Poetry and Life* (Oxford 1936) 257–276.

Frangeskou, V., 'Tradition and Originality in Some Attic Funeral Orations', *CW* 92 (1999) 315–336.

Fränkel, H., *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy* (New York 1975), tr. of *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums* (New York 1951).

Fränkel, H., *Noten zu den* Argonautika *des Apollonius Rhodius* (Munich 1968).

Frateantonio, C., *Religion und Städtekonkurrenz. Zum politischen und kulturellen Kontext von Pausanias'* Periegese (Berlin 2009).

Frazer, J.G., *Pausanias's* Description of Greece, I–VI (London 1898 [1965]).

Friedemann, K., *Die Rolle des Erzählers in der Epik* ([1910] Frankfurt am Main 1969).

Fröhder, D., *Die dichterische Form der homerischen Hymnen: untersucht am Typus der mittelgrossen Preislieder* (Hildesheim 1994).

Fuchs, K., 'Beiträge zur Kritik der ersten drei Bücher Herodians', *Wiener Studien* 17 (1895) 222–252.

Funke, P., Haake, M., 'Theatres of War: Thucydidean Topography', in A. Tsakmakis, A. Rengakos (eds.), *The Brill Companion to Thucydides* (Leiden/Boston 2006) 369–384.

Fusillo, M., *Il tempo delle* Argonautiche. *Un analisi del racconto in Apollonio Rodio* (Rome 1985).

Fusillo, M., Paduano, G., *Apollonio Rodio: Le* Argonautiche (Milano 1986).

Gallavotti, C., 'Le coppe istoriate di Teocrito e di Virgilio', *La parola del passato* 21 (1966) 421–436.

Garcia, J.F., 'Symbolic Action in the Homeric Hymns: The Theme of Recognition', *CA* 21 (2002) 5–39.

Garland, R., *The Greek Way of Life: From Conception to Old Age* (London 1990).

Garvie, A.F., *Aeschylus'* Supplices: *Play and Trilogy* (Exeter ²2006).

Gehrke, H.J., 'Die Raumwahrnehmung im archaischen Griechenland', in M. Rathmann (ed.), *Wahrnehmung und Erfassung geographischer Räume in der Antike* (Mainz 2007) 17–30.

Genette, G., 'Frontières du récit', in *Figures*, II (Paris 1969) 49–69.

——, *Narrative Discourse. An Essay in Method* ([Paris 1972] Ithaca NY 1980).

Georges, P., *Barbarian Asia and the Greek Experience* (Baltimore/London 1994).

Gerber, D.E., *Pindar's* Olympian One: *A Commentary* (Toronto 1982).

Gernet, L., Bizos, M., *Lysias: Discours* (Paris 1955).

Giangrande, G., 'Konjekturen zu Longos, Xenophon Ephesios und Achilleus Tatios', *Miscellanea critica* 1 (1964) 97–118.

——, 'Théocrite, Simichidas et les Thalysies', *AC* 37 (1968) 491–533.

Giesecke, A., *The Epic City: Urbanism, Utopia, and the Garden in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Boston 2007).

Gill, C., 'The Genre of the Atlantis Story', *CP* 72 (1977) 287–304.

——, 'Plato's Atlantis Story and the Birth of Fiction', *Ph&Lit* 3 (1979) 64–78.

——, 'Dialectic and the Dialogue Form', in J. Annas, C. Rowe (eds.), *New Perspectives on Plato, Modern and Ancient* (Cambridge MA 2002) 145–171.

Goldhill, S., *Reading Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge 1986).

——, 'The Naive and Knowing Eye: Ecphrasis and the Culture of Viewing in the Hellenistic World', in S. Goldhill, R. Osborne (eds.), *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture* (Cambridge 1994) 197–223.

Gomme, A.W., Andrewes, A., Dover, K.J., *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, I–V (Oxford 1945–1981).

González García, J., *Estudios sobre el estilo de Jenofonte de Efeso* (Murcia 1986).

——, 'Los conceptos retóricos de *apheleia* y *glukutēs* en Jenofonte de Efeso', in *Actas del VII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos*, II (Madrid 1989) 225–231.

Goold, G.P. (ed.), *Chariton*: Callirhoe (Cambridge MA 1995).

Gould, J., *Herodotus* (London 1989).

——, 'Dramatic Character and "Human Intelligibility" in Greek Tragedy', *PCPS* 24 (1978) 43–67 (repr. in *Myth, Ritual, Memory, and Exchange: Essays in Greek Literature and Culture* (Oxford 2001) 78–111).

Gow, A.S.F., *Theocritus*, I: *Text*, II: *Commentary* (Oxford 1952).

Gowing, A.M., *The Triumviral Narratives of Appian and Cassius Dio* (Ann Arbor 1992).

——, 'Greek Advice for a Roman Senator: Cassius Dio and the Dialogue between Philiscus and Cicero (38.18–29)', in F. Cairns, M. Heath (eds.), *Proceedings of the Leeds Latin Seminar*, 10 (Leeds 1998) 373–390.

Graf, F., Johnston, S.I. *Ritual Texts for the Afterlife. Orpheus and the Bacchic Gold Tablets* (Abingdon 2007).

Green, J.R., *Theatre in Ancient Greek Society* (London 1994).

Green, P., 'Longus, Antiphon and the Topography of Lesbos', *JHS* 102 (1982) 210–214.

Grethlein, J., 'Memory and Material Objects in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*', *JHS* 128 (2008) 27–51.

Griffin, J., *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford 1980).

——, *Latin Poets and Roman Life* (London 1985).

Griffith, M., *The Authenticity of* Prometheus Bound (Cambridge 1977).

Griffith, M. (ed.), *Sophocles*: Antigone (Cambridge 1999).

Grote, G., *A History of Greece*, I–XII (London 1846–1856).

Guarducci, M., 'Le *Rane* di Aristofane e la topografia ateniese', in D. Calazzo (ed.), Italica ars. *Studi in onore di Aristide Colonna per il premio i Sanniti* (Perugia 1982) 167–172.

Guez, J.P., 'Portes ouvertes ou fermées: frontières et intrusions chez Achille Tatius', in P.L. Malosse (ed.), *Eschyle / Achille* (Montpellier fc a).

——, 'Le royaume d'Aphrodite et la grotte d'Artémis: amour et chasteté chez Achille Tatius', in B. Pouderon (ed.), *Les hommes et les dieux dans l'ancien roman* (Lyon fc b).

Güngerich, R., *Die Küstenbeschreibung in der griechischen Literatur* (Münster 1950).

Gurlitt, W., *Über Pausanias. Untersuchungen* (Graz 1890).

Gutzwiller, K.J., *Studies in the Hellenistic Epyllion* (Meisenheim am Glan 1981).

——, *Theocritus' Pastoral Analogies: The Formation of a Genre* (Madison WI/ London 1991).

Haag-Wackernagel, D., *Die Taube: vom heiligen Vogel der Liebesgöttin zur Strassentaube* (Basel 1998).

Habicht, Ch., *Pausanias'* Guide to Ancient Greece (Berkeley 1985).

Hägg, T., *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances. Studies of Chariton, Xenophon Ephesius, and Achilles Tatius* (Stockholm 1971).

Hallet, W., Neumann, B. (eds.), *Raum und Bewegung in der Literatur; die Literaturwissenschaften und der Spatial Turn* (Bielefeld 2009).

Hammond, M. (tr.), *Thucydides*: The Peloponnesian War (Oxford 2009).

Hammond, N.G.L., *Epirus: The Geography, the Ancient Remains, the History and the Topography of Epirus and Adjacent Areas* (Oxford 1967).

Hamon, P., *Du descriptif* ([1981] Paris 1993).

Harder, M.A., 'Euripides' Temenos and Temenidai', in M.A. Harder, H. Hofmann (eds.), *Fragmenta dramatica* (Göttingen 1991) 117–135.

——, 'Insubstantial Voices', *CQ* 42 (1992) 384–394.

——, 'Travel Descriptions in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius', in Z.R.W.M. von Martels (ed.), *Travel Fact and Travel Fiction. Studies on Fiction,*

Literary Tradition, Scholarly Discoveries, and Observation in Travel Writing (Leiden 1994) 18–29.

———, 'Intertextuality in Callimachus' *Aetia*', *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique* 48 (2002) 189–233.

———, *Callimachus:* Aetia. *Introduction, Text and Commentary* (Oxford 2012).

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

Harrison, T., 'The Place of Geography in Herodotus' *Histories*', in C.E.P. Adams, J. Roy (eds.), *Travel, Geography and Culture in Ancient Greece, Egypt and the Near East* (Oxford 2007) 44–65.

Hartog, F., *The Mirror of Herodotus*, tr. by J. Lloyd ([Paris 1980] Berkeley 1988).

———, *Memories of Odysseus. Frontier Tales from Ancient Greece*, tr. by J. Lloyd ([1996] Edinburgh 2001).

Hass, P., *Der* locus amoenus *in der antiken Literatur: zu Theorie und Geschichte eines literarischen Motivs* (Bamberg 1998).

Haziza, T., *Le kaléidoscope hérodotéen: images, imaginaire et représentations de l'Egypte à travers le livre II d'Hérodote* (Paris 2009).

Heffernan, J.A.W., *Museum of Words: The Poetics of Ekphrasis from Homer to Ashery* (Chicago 1993).

Hekster, O., Kaizer, T., 'Mark Antony and the Raid on Palmyra: Reflections on Appian, *Bella Civilia* V.9', *Latomus* 63 (2004) 70–80.

Henrichs, A., 'The "Sobriety" of Oedipus: Sophocles *OC* 100 Misunderstood', *HSCP* 87 (1983) 87–100.

———, 'The Tomb of Aias and the Prospect of Hero Cult in Sophocles', *CA* 12 (1993) 165–180.

Henten, J.W. van, 'The Panegyris in Jerusalem: Responses to Herod's Initiative (Josephus, *Antiquities* 15.268–291)', in A. Houtman, A. de Jong, M. Misset-van de Weg (eds), Empsychoi logoi—*Religious Innovations in Antiquity* (Leiden 2008) 151–173.

Herkommer, E., *Die* topoi *in den Proömien der römischen Geschichtswerke* (Tübingen 1968).

Hillebrand, B., *Mensch und Raum im Roman. Studien zu Keller, Stifter, Fontane. Mit einem einführenden Essay zur europäischen Literatur* (München 1971).

Hillgruber, M., *Die zehnte Rede des Lysias* (Berlin/New York 1988).

Hirschfeld, N., 'Trireme Warfare in Thucydides', in R.B. Strassler (ed.), *The Landmark Thucydides: A Comprehensive Guide to the Peloponnesian War* (New York 1996) 408–413.

Hobden, F., 'Imagining Past and Present: A Rhetorical Strategy in Aeschines 3 *Against Ctesiphon*', *CQ* 57 (2007) 490–501.

Hoffmann, G., *Raum, Situation, erzählte Wirklichkeit. Poetologische und historische Studien zum englischen und amerikanischen Roman* (Stuttgart 1978).

Holmes, D.H., *Index Lysiacus* (Bonn 1895).

Hooker, G.T.W., 'The Topography of the *Frogs*', *JHS* 80 (1960) 112–117.

Hopkinson, N., *Callimachus*: Hymn to Demeter (Cambridge 1984).

Horden, P., Purcell, N., *The Corrupting Sea. A Study of Mediterranean History* (Oxford 2000).

Hornblower, S., *A Commentary on Thucydides*, I–III (Oxford 1991–2008).

Horsfall, N., 'Illusion and Reality in Latin Topographical Writing', *G&R* 32 (1985) 197–208.

Hourmouziades, N.C., *Production and Imagination in Euripides* (Athens 1965).

Hunter, R., *Theocritus: A Selection* (Cambridge 1999).

Hurwit, J.M., 'Palm Trees and the Pathetic Fallacy in Archaic Greek Poetry and Art', *CJ* 77 (1982) 193–199.

Hutchinson, G.O., *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces* (Oxford 2001).

Hutton, W., *Describing Greece. Landscape and Literature in the* Periegesis *of Pausanias* (Cambridge 2005).

Immerwahr, H., '*Ergon*: History as a Monument in Herodotus and Thucydides', *AJP* 81 (1960) 261–290.

Irwin, E., *Colour Terms in Greek Poetry* (Toronto 1974).

——, 'Herodotus and Samos: Personal or Political?', *CW* 102 (2009) 395–416.

Issacharoff, M., *L'espace et la nouvelle: Flaubert, Huysmans, Ionesco, Sartre, Camus* (Paris 1976).

Jacob, C., *Géographie et ethnographie en Grèce ancienne* (Paris 1991).

——, *The Sovereign Map: Theoretical Approaches in Cartography throughout History*, ed. by T. Dahl, tr. by T. Conley (Chicago 2006).

Jacoby, F., *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (Berlin 1923–1958).

Jacquemin, A., 'Pausanias, le sanctuaire d'Olympie et les archéologues', in D. Knoepfler, M. Piérart (eds.), *Éditer, traduire, commenter Pausanias en l'an 2000* (Genève 2001) 283–300.

Jameson, M.J., 'The Spectacular and the Obscure in Athenian Religion', in S. Goldhill, R. Osborne (eds.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge 1999) 321–340.

Janaway, C., *Images of Excellence. Plato's Critique of the Arts* (Oxford 1995).

Janni, P., *La mappa e il periplo: cartografia antica e spazio odologico* (Roma 1984).

——, 'La cartografia di Polibio', in J.S. Yanguas, E.T. Pagola (eds.), *Polibio y la península ibérica* (Vitoria 2003) 89–102.

Jay-Robert, G., *L'invention comique: enquête sur la poétique d'Aristophane* (Franche-Comté 2009).

Jebb, R.C. (ed.), *Sophocles: Plays*, Ajax (1896 [London 2004]).

Jebb, R.C. (ed.), *Sophocles: Plays*, Oedipus Coloneus ([1900] London 2004).

Jebb, R.C., *Selections from the Attic Orators* ([1888] Exeter 2005).

Jenkyns, R., *Virgil's Experience. Nature and History: Times, Names, and Places* (Oxford 1998).

Johnston, S.I., 'Myth, Festival, and Poet: The Homeric Hymn to Hermes and Its Performative Context', *CPh* 97 (2002) 109–152.

Jones, C.P., *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World* (Cambridge MA/London 1999).

——, *Philostratus*: Apollonius of Tyana (Cambridge MA 2005–2006).

Jones, Chr., 'Multiple Identities in the Age of the Second Sophistic', in B.E. Borg (ed.), Paideia: *The World of the Second Sophistic* (Berlin/New York 2004) 13–21.

Jones, J., *On Aristotle and Greek Tragedy* (New York 1962).

Jones, M., 'Heavenly and Pandemic Names in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*', *CQ* 56 (2006) 548–562.

Jong, I.J.F. de, *Narrative in Drama: The Art of the Euripidean Messenger-Speech* (Leiden 1991).

——, *A Narratological Commentary on the* Odyssey (Cambridge 2001a).

——, 'The Anachronical Structure of Herodotus' *Histories*', in S.J. Harrison (ed.), *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics: Scholarship, Theory, and Classical Literature* (Oxford 2001b) 93–116.

——, 'Metalepsis in Ancient Greek Literature', in J. Grethlein, A. Rengakos (eds.), *Narratology and Interpretation. The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature* (Berlin 2009) 87–115.

——, 'The Shield of Achilles: From Metalepsis to Mise en Abyme', *Ramus* 40 (2011) 1–14.

Jong, I.J.F. de, Nünlist, R., 'From Bird's Eye View to Close Up: The Standpoint of the Narrator in the Homeric Epics', in A. Bierl, A. Schmidt, A. Willi (eds.), *Antike Literatur in neuer Deutung* (Leipzig 2004) 63–83.

Jung, M., *Marathon und Plataiai. Zwei Perserschlachten als 'lieux de mémoire' im Antiken Griechenland* (Göttingen 2006).

Kearns, E., 'Between God and Man: Status and Function of Heroes and Their Sanctuaries', in A. Schachter, E. Kearns, B. Bergquist, F. Graf (eds.), *Le sanctuaire grec* (Geneva 1992) 65–107.

——, 'The Gods in the Homeric Epics', in R. Fowler (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Homer* (Cambridge 2004) 59–73.

Kerschensteiner, J., 'Zum Gebrauch der Parenthese bei Herodot', *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 17 (1964) 29–50.

Kilburn, K., *Lucian*, VI (London/Cambridge, MA 1959).

Kingsley, P., *Ancient Philosophy, Mystery, and Magic: Empedocles and Pythagorean Tradition* (Oxford 1995).

Klär, I., 'Die Schatten im Höhlengleichnis und die Sophisten im Homerischen Hades', *AGPh* 51 (1969) 225–259.

Kloft, H., 'Imagination und Realität. Überlegungen zur Wirtschaftstruktur des Romans *Daphnis und Chloe*', *GCN* 2 (1989) 45–61.

Klooster, J.J.H., *Poetry as Window and Mirror. Positioning the Poet in Hellenistic Poetry* (Leiden 2011).

Knox, B.M.W., 'The *Ajax* of Sophocles', *HSCP* 65 (1961) 1–38.

König, J., Whitmarsh, T., 'Ordering Knowledge', in J. König, T. Whitmarsh (eds.), *Ordering Knowledge in the Roman Empire* (Cambridge 2007) 3–39.

Konstan, D., 'Persians, Greeks and Empire', *Arethusa* 20 (1987) 59–73.

——, *Sexual Symmetry. Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres* (Princeton 1994).

——, 'Narrative Spaces', in M. Paschalis, S. Frangoulidis (eds.), *Space in the Ancient Novel* (Groningen 2002) 1–11.

Kontis, G., 'Τὰ κατὰ Δάφνιν καὶ Χλόην τοῦ Λόγγου καὶ ἡ Λέσβος', Αἰολικὰ Γράμματα 2 (1972) 217–223.

Krevans, N., 'Geography and the Literary Tradition in Theocritus', *TAPA* 113 (1983) 201–220.

Kroon, C.H.M., 'Discourse Modes and the Use of Tenses in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*', in R.J. Allan, M. Buijs (eds.), *The Language of Literature. Linguistic Approaches to Classical Texts* (Leiden 2007) 65–92.

Krummen, E., Pyros hymnon: *Festliche Gegenwart und mythisch-traditionelle Tradition als Voraussetzung einer Pindarinterpretation* (Berlin/New York 1990).

Kullmann, W., *Das Wirken der Götter in der Ilias* (Berlin 1956).

——, 'Die poetische Funktion des Palastes des Odysseus in der *Odyssee*', in W. Kullmann, *Homerische Motive. Beiträge zur Entstehung, Eigenart und Wirkung von* Ilias *und* Odyssee (Stuttgart 1992) 305–316.

Kuntz, M., *Narrative Setting and Dramatic Poetry* (Leiden 1993).

Kytzler, B., 'Xenophon of Ephesus', in G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden 1996) 336–360.

L' Allier, L., 'Le domaine de Scillonte: Xénophon et l'exemple Perse', *Phoenix* 52 (1998) 1–14.

Lakoff, G., Johnson, M., *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago/London 1980).

Lamb, W.R.M., *Lysias* (Cambridge 1930).

Lang, M.L., Camp, J.M., *The Athenian Agora: A Guide to the Excavation and Museum* (Athens 2004).

Lanza, D., 'Entrelacement des espaces chez Aristophane (l'example des *Acharniens*)', in C. Cusset et al. (eds.), *Où courir? Organisation et symbolique de l'espace dans la comédie antique*, *Pallas* 54 (Toulouse 2001) 133–139.

Lanzillotta, E., 'Geografia e storia da Ecateo a Tucidide', in M. Sordi (ed.), *Geografia e storiografia nel mondo classico* (Milano 1988) 19–31.

Laplace, M.M.J., 'Le roman de Chariton et la tradition de l'éloquence et de la rhétorique: constitution d'un discours panégyrique', *RhM* 140 (1997) 38–71.

Lateiner, D., *The Historical Method of Herodotus* (Toronto 1989).

Lausberg, H., *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric. A Foundation for Literary Study*, tr. by M.T. Bliss, A. Jansen, D.A. Orton, ed. by D.A. Orton, R.D. Anderson ([München 1960] Leiden 1998).

Lavagnini, B., *Studi sul romanzo greco* (Messina/Firenze 1950).

Lawall, G., 'Apollonius' *Argonautica*. Jason as Anti-hero', *YCIS* 19 (1966) 119–169.

Leakey, D.M., 'The Representation of the Trojan War in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*', *AJP* 95 (1974) 1–23.

Lee, K.H. (ed.), *Euripides*: Ion (Warminster 1997).

Lembach, K., *Die Pflanzen bei Theokrit* (Heidelberg 1970).

Lendle, O., *Kommentar zu Xenophons* Anabasis *(Bücher 1–7)* (Darmstadt 1995).

Lenfant, D., 'Polybe et les "fragments" des historiens de Rhodes Zénon et Antisthène (XVI 14–20)', in G. Schepens, J. Bollansée (eds.), *The Shadow of Polybius: Intertextuality as a Research Tool in Greek Historiography* (Leuven 2005) 183–204.

Lesky, A., Thalatta. *Der Weg der Griechen zum Meer* (Wien 1947).

Létoublon, F., *Les lieux communs du roman. Stéréotypes grecs d'aventure et d'amour* (Leiden 1993).

Levene, D.S., *Livy on the Hannibalic War* (Oxford 2010).

Lindsell, A., 'Was Theocritus a Botanist?', *G&R* 6 (1936–1937) 78–93.

Littlewood, A.R., 'The Romantic Paradise: The Role of the Garden in the Byzantine Romance', *BMGS* 5 (1979) 95–114.

Lloyd, M.A., *The agon in Euripides* (Oxford 1992).

Longo, O., 'Peasaggio di Longo Sofista', *QS* 4 (1978) 99–120.

——, 'La scena della città: strutture architettoniche e spazi politici nel teatro greco', in L. de Finis (ed.), *Scena e spettacolo nell'antiquità* (Florence 1989) 23–41.

Lopes, J.M., *Foregrounded Description in Prose Fiction. Five Cross-Literary Studies* (Toronto 1995).

López Eire, A., 'Sobre los "espacios públicos" o "espacios de comunicación" en la comedia aristofánica', in C. Cusset et al. (eds.), *Où courir? Organisation et symbolique de l' espace dans la comédie antique*, *Pallas* 54 (Toulouse 2001) 141–189.

Loraux, N., *The Children of Athena* (Princeton 1993).

——, *Born of the Earth: Myth and Politics in Athens* (Ithaca NY 2000; tr. of French original from 1996).

Lotman, J.M., *Die Struktur literarischer Texte* ([1970] München 1972).

Lowe, N.J., 'Tragic Space and Comic Timing in Menander's *Dyskolos*', *BICS* 34 (1987) 126–138.

——, *The Classical Plot and the Invention of Western Narrative* (Cambridge 2000).

——, 'Aristophanes' Spacecraft', in L. Kozak, J. Rich (eds.), *Playing around Aristophanes* (Oxford 2006) 48–64.

Lukacs, G., 'Narrate or Describe?' in *Writer and Critic and Other Essays* ([1936] London 1978) 110–148.

Luschnig, C.A.E., 'Interiors: Imaginary Spaces in *Alcestis* and *Medea*', *Mnemosyne* 45 (1992) 19–44.

Ma, J., *Antiochus III and the Cities of Asia Minor* (Oxford 1999).

——, 'You Can't Go Home Again: Displacement and Identity in Xenophon's *Anabasis*', in R. Lane Fox (ed.), *The Long March: Xenophon and the Ten Thousand* (London 2004) 330–345.

MacDowell, D.M., *Demosthenes*: Against Meidias (Oxford 1990).

Maier, F., '"… zu vertrauten Vorstellungen führen": Die Funktion der Geographie im didaktischen Geschichtskonzept des Polybios', *Geographia Antiqua* 19 (fc).

Manakidou, F., *Beschreibung von Kunstwerken in der hellenistischen Dichtung* (Stuttgart 1992).

March, J.R., 'Sophocles' Ajax: The Death and Burial of a Hero', *BICS* 38 (1991–1993) 1–36.

Marincic, M., 'Advertising One's Own Story. Text and Speech in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*', in V. Rimell (ed.), *Seeing Tongues, Hearing Scripts: Orality and Representation in the Ancient Novel* (Groningen 2007) 168–200.

Marincola, J., *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge 1997).

——, 'Odysseus and the Historians', *Syllecta Classica* 18 (2007) 1–79.

Marino, E., 'Il teatro nel romanzo: Eliodoro e il codice spettacolare', *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 25 (1990) 203–218.

Martin, R.P., 'A Good Place to Talk: Discourse and Topos in Achilles Tatius and Philostratus', in M. Paschalis, S. Frangoulidis (eds.), *Space in the Ancient Novel* (Groningen 2002) 143–160.

Mason, H.J., 'Longus and the Topography of Lesbos', *TAPA* 109 (1979) 149–163.

——, 'Romance in a Limestone Landscape', *CP* 90 (1995) 263–266.

Mason, S., 'Of Audience and Meaning: Reading Josephus's *Bellum Iudaicum* in the Context of a Flavian Audience', in J. Sievers, G. Lembi (eds.), *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond* (Leiden 2005) 71–100.

Mastronarde, D.J., 'Theocritus *Idyll* 13: Love and the Hero', *TAPA* 99 (1968) 273–290.

——, 'Actors on High: The Skene Roof, the Crane and the Gods in Attic Drama', *ClAnt* 9 (1990) 247–294.

Mastronarde, D.J. (ed.), *Euripides*: Phoenissae (Cambridge 1994).

Mauduit, C., 'A la porte de la comédie', in C. Cusset et al. (eds.), *Où courir? Organisation et symbolique de l'espace dans la comédie antique*, *Pallas* 54 (Toulouse 2001) 25–40.

McAuley, G., *Space in Performance: Making Meaning in the Theatre* (Ann Arbor 1999).

McGing, B., *Polybius' Histories* (Oxford 2010).

Meiggs, R., *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford 1975).

Meiggs, R., Lewis, D.M., *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century BC* ([1969] Oxford ²1988).

Mendelsohn, D., *Gender and the City in Euripides' Political Plays* (Oxford 2002).

Meyer, D., 'Apollonius Rhodius as a Hellenistic Geographer', in T.D. Papanghelis, A. Rengakos (eds.), *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius* (Leiden 2001) 217–235.

Meyer, H., 'Raumgestaltung und Raumsymbolik in der Erzählkunst', in A. Ritter (ed.), *Landschaft und Raum in der Erzählkunst* ([1963] Darmstadt 1975) 208–231.

Michelakis, P., *Euripides*: Iphigenia at Aulis (London 2006).

Mignogna, E., 'Europa o Selene? Achille Tazio e Mosco o il ritorno dell' "inversione"', *Maia* 43 (1993) 177–183.

Millar, F., *A Study of Cassius Dio* (Oxford 1964).

——, 'Polybius between Greece and Rome', in J.T.A. Koumoulides (ed.), *Greek Connections: Essays on Culture and Diplomacy* (Notre Dame IN 1986) 1–18.

——, 'Last Year in Jerusalem: Monuments of the Jewish War in Rome', in J. Edmondson, S. Mason, J. Rives (eds.), *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome* (Oxford 2005) 101–128.

Miller, A.M., *From Delos to Delphi: A Literary Study of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (Leiden 1986).

Minchin, E., *Homer and the Resources of Memory. Some Applications of Cognitive Theory to the* Iliad *and the* Odyssey (Oxford 2001).

Moles, J.L., *Plutarch*: The Life of Cicero (Warminster 1988).

Molinié, G. (ed.), *Chariton. Le roman de Chairéas et Callirhoé* (Paris [1979] ³2002).

Molino, J., Lafhail-Molino, R., Homo fabulator. *Théorie et analyse du récit* (Paris 2003).

Montes Cala, J.G., 'En torno a la impostura dramática en la novela griega. Comentario à una écfrasis de espectáculo en Heliodoro', *Habis* 23 (1992) 217–235.

Montiglio, S., 'Wandering Philosophers in Classical Greece', *JHS* 120 (2000) 86–105.

Morales, H., *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius'* Leucippe and Clitophon (Cambridge 2004).

——, 'Metaphor, Gender and the Ancient Greek Novel', in S. Harrison, M. Paschalis, S. Frangoulidis (eds.), *Metaphor and the Ancient Novel* (Groningen 2005) 1–22.

Morgan, J.R., 'History, Romance and Realism in the *Aithiopika* of Heliodorus', *CA* 1 (1982) 221–265.

——, 'The Story of Knemon in Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*', *JHS* 109 (1989) 99–113.

——, 'Make-Believe and Make Believe: The Fictionality of the Greek Novels', in C. Gill, T.P. Wiseman (eds.), *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World* (Exeter 1993) 175–229.

——, *Longus*: Daphnis and Chloe (Oxford 2004).

——, 'Fiction and History: Historiography and the Novel', in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* (Malden MA/Oxford 2007a) 553–564.

——, 'Kleitophon and Encolpius: Achilleus Tatius as Hidden Author', in M. Paschalis, S. Frangoulidis, S.J. Harrison, M. Zimmerman (eds.), *The Greek and the Roman Novel: Parallel Readings* (Groningen 2007b) 105–120.

——, 'The Representation of Philosophers in Greek Fiction', in J.R. Morgan, M. Jones (eds.), *Philosophical Presences in the Ancient Novel* (Groningen 2007c) 23–51.

——, 'Travel in the Greek Novels: Function and Interpretation', in A. Colin, J. Roy (eds.), *Travel, Geography and Culture in Ancient Greece, Egypt and the Near East* (Oxford 2007d) 139–160.

——, 'The Emesan Connection: Philostratus and Heliodorus', in K. Demoen, D. Praet (eds.), Theios sophistes. *Essays on Flavius Philostratus'* Vita Apollonii (Leiden/Boston 2009) 263–281.

——, 'Poets and Shepherds: Philetas and Longus', in K. Doulamis (ed.), *Echoing Narratives: Studies of Intertextuality in Greek and Roman Prose Fiction* (Groningen 2011) 139–160.

——, 'La culte du Nil chez Héliodore', in B. Pouderon (ed.), *Les hommes et les dieux dans l'ancien roman* (Lyons fc).

Morgan, K.A., 'Designer History: Plato's Atlantis Story and Fourth-Century Ideology', *JHS* 118 (1998) 101–118.

——, *Myth and Philosophy from the Presocratics to Plato* (Cambridge 2000).

Morgan, L., 'The Autopsy of Gaius Asinius Pollio', *JRS* 90 (2000) 51–69.

Mori, A., *The Politics of Apollonius Rhodius'* Argonautica (Cambridge 2008).

Morrison, A.D., *The Narrator in Archaic Greek and Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge 2007a).

——, *Performance and Audience in Pindar's Sicilian Victory Odes* (London 2007b).

Motte, A., *Prairies et jardins de la Grèce antique. De la religion à la philosophie* (Brussels 1971).

Mullen, W., Choreia: *Pindar and Dance* (Princeton 1982).

Müller, C.F.W., *Geographi Graeci minores*, I–III (Paris 1855–1861).

Munson, R.V., *Telling Wonders: Ethnographic and Political Discourse in the Work of Herodotus* (Ann Arbor 2001).

Murphy, C.T., 'Aristophanes, Athens and Attica', *CJ* 59 (1964) 306–323.

Murray, J., 'The Metamorphoses of Erysichthon: Callimachus, Apollonius, and Ovid', in M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit, G.C. Wakker (eds.), *Callimachus*, II (Leuven/Paris/Dudley MA 2004) 207–242.

Murray, O., 'Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture', *CQ* 22 (1972) 200–213.

Musti, D., 'La struttura del discorso storico in Pausania', in J. Bingen (ed.), *Pausanias historien* (Vandœuvres-Genève 1996) 9–43.

Mynors, R.A.B., *Virgil*: Georgics (Oxford 1990).

Nails, D., *The People of Plato* (Indianapolis 2002).

Nakatani, S., 'A Re-Examination of Some Structural Problems in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*', *Ancient Narrative* 3 (2003) 63–81.

Nesselrath, H.G., 'Herodot und die Enden der Welt', *MH* 52 (1995) 20–44.

Netzer, E., *The Architecture of Herod, the Great Builder* (Tübingen 2006).

Nevett, L.C., *Domestic Space in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge 2010).

Ní Mheallaigh, K., 'Philosophical Framing: The Phaedran Setting in *Leucippe and Clitophon*', in J.R. Morgan, M. Jones (eds.), *Philosophical Presences in the Ancient Novel* (Groningen 2007) 231–244.

——, 'Toward an Ecological Eschatology: Plato and Bakhtin on Other Worlds and Times', in R.B. Branham (ed.), *Bakhtin and the Classics* (Evanston IL 2002a) 221–249.

Nightingale, A., 'Distant Views: Realistic and Fantastic Mimesis in Plato', in J. Annas, C. Rowe (eds.), *New Perspectives on Plato, Modern and Ancient* (Cambridge MA 2002b) 227–247.

Nilsson, M.P., *Cults, Myths, Oracles, and Politics in Ancient Greece* ([1951] New York 1972).

Nishimura-Jensen, J., 'Unstable Geographies', *TAPA* 130 (2000) 287–317.

Nörenberg, H.-W., 'Untersuchungen zum Schluss der Περιήγησις τῆς Ἑλλάδος des Pausanias', *Hermes* 101 (1973) 235–252.

Nünlist, R., *The Ancient Critic at Work: Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia* (Cambridge 2009).

O'Connor, E.M., '"A Bird in the Bush". The Erotic and Literary Implications of Bucolic and Avian Imagery in Two Related Episodes of Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*', *RhM* 134 (1991) 393–401.

Olson, S.D., *Aristophanes*: Acharnians (Oxford 2002).

d'Orville, J.P., Χαρίτωνος Ἀφροδισιέως τῶν περὶ Χαιρέαν καὶ Καλλιρρόην Ἐρωτικῶν Διηγημάτων λόγοι ἡ (Amsterdam 1750).

Osanna, M., 'Tra monumenti, *agalmata* e *mirabilia*: organizzazione del percorso urbano di Corinto nella *Periegesi* di Pausania', in D. Knoepfler, M. Piérart

(eds.), *Éditer, traduire, commenter Pausanias en l'an 2000* (Genève 2001) 185–202.

Osborne, R., 'Homer's Society', in R. Fowler (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Homer* (Cambridge 2004) 206–219.

Otto, N., Enargeia. *Untersuchung zur Charakteristik Alexandrinischer Dichtung* (Stuttgart 2009).

Oudot, E., 'Images d'Athènes dans le roman grec', in M.F. Baslez, P. Hoffman, M. Trédé (eds.), *Le monde du roman grec* (Paris 1992) 101–108.

Owen, A.S. (ed.), *Euripides*: Ion (Oxford 1939).

Paassen, C. van, *The Classical Tradition of Geography* (Groningen 1957).

Padel, R., ' "Imagery of the Elsewhere": Two Choral Odes of Euripides', *CQ* 24 (1974) 227–241.

——, 'Making Space Speak', in F.I. Zeitlin, J.J. Winkler (eds.), *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in Its Social Context* (Princeton 1990) 336–365.

Pandiri, T.A., '*Daphnis and Chloe*: The Art of Pastoral Play', *Ramus* 14 (1985) 116–141.

Papanikolaou, A.D., *Xenophontis Ephesii Ephesiacorum libri V* (Leipzig 1973).

Parente, F., 'The Impotence of Titus, or Flavius Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum* as an Example of "Pathetic" Historiography', in J. Sievers, G. Lembi (eds.), *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond* (Leiden 2005) 45–69.

Parker, R., 'The Hymn to Demeter and the Homeric Hymns', *G&R* 38 (1991) 1–17.

Parry, A., 'Landscape in Greek Poetry', *YClS* 15 (1957) 1–29.

Paschalis, M., Frangoulidis, S. (eds.), *Space in the Ancient Novel* (Groningen 2002).

Payen, P., 'Comment résister à la conquête? Temps, espace et récit chez Hérodote', *REG* 108 (1995) 308–338.

Payne, M., *Theocritus and the Invention of Fiction* (Cambridge 2007).

Pearson, L., *Early Ionian Historians* (Oxford 1939).

Pédech, P., *La méthode historique de Polybe* (Paris 1964).

Pelling, C.B.R., *Plutarch's* Life of Antony (Cambridge 1988).

——, 'Aristagoras (5.49–55, 97)', in E. Irwin, E. Greenwood (eds.), *Reading Herodotus: A Study of the* logoi *in Book 5 of Herodotus'* Histories (Cambridge 2007) 179–201.

Pendergraft, M.L., '*Eros ludens*. Apollonius *Argonautica* 3.332–341', *MD* 26 (1991) 95–102.

Perkins, J., 'Space, Place, Voice in the Acts of the Martyrs and the Greek Romance', in D. MacDonald (ed.), *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity* (Harrisburg PA 2001) 117–137.

——, 'Social Geography in the Apocryphal *Acts of the Apostles*', in M. Paschalis, S. Frangoulidis (eds.), *Space in the Ancient Novel* (Groningen 2002) 118–131.

Petsch, R., 'Zeit und Raum in der Erzählung', in A. Ritter (ed.), *Landschaft und Raum in der Erzählkunst* ([1934] Darmstadt 1975) 36–44.

Pfundtner, O., *Pausanias Periegeta imitator Herodoti* (Regimonti 1866).

Piérart, M., 'Observations sur la structure du livre II de la *Périégèse*. Argos, l'Argolide et la Thyréatide', in D. Knoepfler, M. Piérart (eds.), *Éditer, traduire, commenter Pausanias en l'an 2000* (Genève 2001) 203–221.

Pitcher, L.V., *Writing Ancient History. An Introduction to Classical Historiography* (London 2009a).

——, 'The Roman Historians after Livy', in M.T. Griffin (ed.), *A Companion to Julius Caesar* (Oxford 2009b) 268–276.

Pitcher, L.V., 'War Stories: The Uses of the Plupast in Appian', in J. Grethlein, C. Krebs (eds.), *The Historian's Plupast* (Cambridge 2012) forthc.

Platt, V., 'Virtual Visions: *phantasia* and the Perception of the Divine in *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana*', in E. Bowie, J. Elsner (eds.), *Philostratus* (Cambridge 2009) 131–154.

Powell, J.E., *A Lexicon to Herodotus* (Cambridge 1938).

Power, T., 'The *parthenoi* of Bacchylides 13', *HSCP* 100 (2000) 67–81.

Prandi, L., 'Polibio e Callistene: una polemica non personale?', in G. Schepens, J. Bollansée (eds.), *The Shadow of Polybius: Intertextuality as a Research Tool in Greek Historiography* (Leuven 2005) 73–87.

Pratt, M.L., *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (London/New York 1992).

Pretzler, M., 'Pausanias and Oral Tradition', *CQ* 55 (2005a) 235–249.

——, 'Pausanias at Mantinea. Invention and Manipulation of Local History', *PCPhS* 51 (2005b) 21–34.

——, 'Comparing Strabo with Pausanias: Greece in Context vs. Greece in Depth', in D. Dueck, H. Lindsay, S. Pothecary (eds.), *Strabo's Cultural Geography. The Making of a Kolossourgia* (Cambridge 2005c) 144–160.

——, *Pausanias. Travel Writing in Ancient Greece* (Duckworth 2007).

Price, J.J., *Jerusalem under Siege: The Collapse of the Jewish State* (Leiden 1992).

Prontera, F., 'La geografia di Polibio: tradizione e innovazione', in J.S. Yanguas, E.T. Pagola (eds.), *Polibio y la península ibérica* (Vitoria 2003) 103–111.

Purves, A.C., 'The Plot Unravels: Darius's Numbered Days in Scythia (Herodotus 4.98)', *Helios* 33 (2006) 1–26.

——, *Space and Time in Ancient Greek Narrative* (Cambridge 2010).

Rabau, S., 'Narration et description: l'exigence de détails', *Lalies* 15 (1995) 273–290.

Race, W.H., *Apollonius Rhodius* Argonautica (Cambridge MA 2008).

Rackham, O., 'Ancient Landscapes', in O. Murray, S. Price (eds.), *The Greek City. From Homer to Alexander* (Oxford 1990) 85–112.

Rajak, T., *Josephus* (London ²2002).

Rambaud, M., 'L'espace dans le récit césarien', in R. Chevallier (ed.), *Littérature gréco-romaine et géographie historique* (Paris 1974) 111–129.

Reardon, B.P., *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London [1989] ²2008).

——, 'Achilles Tatius and Ego-Narrative', in J.R. Morgan, R. Stoneman (eds.), *Greek Fiction. The Greek Novel in Context* (London 1994) 80–96.

——, *Chariton Aphrodisiensis: De Callirhoe narrationes amatoriae* (München 2004).

Redfield, J., 'Herodotus the Tourist', *CP* 90 (1985) 97–118.

Reeves, B.T., *The Rape of Europa in Ancient Literature* (Hamilton ON 2003).

——, 'The Role of Ekphrasis in Plot Development: The Painting of Europa and

the Bull in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*', *Mnemosyne* 60 (2007) 87–101.

Rehm, R., 'The Staging of Suppliant Plays', *GRBS* 29 (1988) 263–307.

——, *Greek Tragic Theatre* (London 1992).

——, *Marriage to Death: The Conflation of Wedding and Funeral Rituals in Greek Tragedy* (Princeton 1994).

——, *The Play of Space: Spatial Transformation in Greek Tragedy* (Princeton 2002).

Reinhardt, T., *Die Darstellung der Bereiche Stadt und Land bei Theokrit* (Bonn 1988).

Rennell, J., *Illustrations (Chiefly Geographical) of the History of the Expedition of Cyrus, from Sardis to Babylonia, and the Retreat of the Ten Thousand Greeks, from Thence to Trebisonde and Lydia* (London 1816).

Repath, I.D., *Some Uses of Plato in Achilles Tatius'* Leucippe and Cleitophon (Warwick 2002).

Revermann, M., *Comic Business: Theatricality, Dramatic Technique, and Performance Contexts of Aristophanic Comedy* (Oxford 2006).

Rhodes, P.J., '"Epidamnus is a City": On not Overinterpreting Thucydides', *Histos* 2 (1998).

Rhodes, P.J., Osborne, R., *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 403–323 BC* (Oxford 2003).

Ricardou, J., *Nouveaux problèmes du roman* (Paris 1978).

Rich, J.W., *Cassius Dio: The Augustan Settlement* (Roman History *53–55.9)* (Warminster 1990).

Richardson, J.S., *Appian*: Wars of the Romans in Iberia (Warminster 2000).

Richardson, N.J., *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford 1974).

——, *Three Homeric Hymns: to Apollo, Hermes, and Aphrodite* (Cambridge 2010).

Richardson, S., *The Homeric Narrator* (Nashville 1990).

——, 'Truth in the Tales of the *Odyssey*', *Mnemosyne* 49 (1996) 393–402.

Ridley, R.T., 'Exegesis and Audience in Thucydides', *Hermes* 109 (1981) 25–46.

Robert, C., *Pausanias als Schriftsteller. Studien und Beobachtungen* (Berlin 1909).

Rohde, E., *Der Griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer* (Leipzig [1876] ³1914).

Roller, D.W., *The Building Program of Herod the Great* (Berkeley 1998).

Rollinger, R., *Herodots Babylonischer* logos. *Eine kritische Untersuchung der Glaubwürdigkeitsdiskussion an Hand ausgewählter Beispiele* (Innsbruck 1993).

Romm, J., 'Travel', in T. Whitmarsh (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel* (Cambridge 2008) 109–126.

Rommel, H., *Die naturwissenschaftlich-paradoxographischen Exkurse bei Philostratus, Heliodorus und Achilleus Tatios* (Stuttgart 1923).

Ronen, R., 'Space in Fiction', *Poetics Today* 7 (1986) 421–438.

Rood, T.C.B., *Thucydides: Narrative and Explanation* (Oxford 1998a).

——, 'Thucydides and His Predecessors', *Histos* 2 (1998b).

——, 'Herodotus and Foreign Peoples', in J. Marincola, C. Dewald (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (Cambridge 2006a) 290–305.

———, 'Objectivity and Authority: Thucydides' Historical Method', in A. Tsak-makis, A. Rengakos (eds.), *The Brill Companion to Thucydides* (Leiden/Boston 2006b) 225–249.

———, 'Herodotus' Proem: Space, Time, and the Origins of International Rela-tions', *Ariadne* 16 (2010a) 43–74.

———, 'Xenophon's Parasangs', *JHS* 120 (2010b) 51–66.

Rosenmeyer, T.G., *The Green Cabinet: Theocritus and the European Pastoral Lyric* (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1969).

Rougier-Blanc, S., 'Le vocabulaire architectural dans les hymnes Homériques', *Gaia* 9 (2005) 25–48.

Ruiz-Montero, C., 'Una interpretación del "estilo kai" de Jenofonte de Éphesus', *Emerita* 50 (1982) 305–323.

———, 'Chariton von Aphrodisias: ein Überblick', *ANRW* II.34.2 (1994a) 1006–1054.

———, 'Xenophon of Ephesus: ein Überblick', *ANRW* II.34.2 (1994b) 1088–1138.

———, 'Text and Context in Plutarch's *Amatoriae narrationes* and Xenophon of Ephesus's *Ephesiaca*', *Invigilata Lucernis* 25 (2003) 221–233.

Rutherford, R., 'Comments on Nightingale', in J. Annas, C. Rowe (eds.), *New Perspectives on Plato, Modern and Ancient* (Cambridge MA 2002) 249–262.

Sacks, K., *Polybius on the Writing of History* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 1981).

SAGN 1: Jong, I.J.F. de, Nünlist, R., Bowie, A (eds.), *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden/Boston 2004).

SAGN 2: Jong, I.J.F. de, Nünlist, R (eds.), *Time in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden/Boston 2007).

Saïd, S., 'La société rurale dans le roman grec ou la campagne vue de la ville' in E. Frézouls (ed.), *Sociétés urbaines, sociétés rurales dans l'Asie mineure et la Syrie hellénistiques et romaines* (Strasbourg 1987) 149–171.

———, 'L'espace d'Euripide', *Dioniso* 59 (1989) 107–136.

———, 'Tragic Argos', in A.H. Sommerstein, S. Halliwell, J. Henderson, B. Zim-mermann (eds.), *Tragedy, Comedy, and the Polis* (Bari 1993) 167–189.

———, 'The City in the Greek Novel', in J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel* (Baltimore/London 1994) 216–236.

———, 'L'espace d'Athènes dans les comédies d'Aristophane', in P. Thiercy, M. Menu (eds.), *Aristophane: la langue, la scène, la cité* (Bari 1997) 339–359.

Scarcella, A.M., *La Lesbo di Longo Sofista* (Rome 1968).

———, 'Realtà e letteratura nel paesaggio sociale ed economico del romanzo di Longo Sofista', *Maia* 22 (1970) 103–131.

Schepens, G., *L'"autopsie" dans la méthode des historiens grecs du V xiècle avant J.-C.* (Brussels 1980).

Schils, G.J., 'Plato's Myth of Er: The Light and the Spindle', *AC* 62 (1993) 101–114.

Schirren, T., Philosophos Bios: *Die antike Philosophenbiographie als symbolische Form: Studien zur* Vita Apollonii *des Philostrat* (Heidelberg 2005).

Schmeling, G., *Xenophon of Ephesus* (Boston 1980).

Schmid, M.J., 'Speaking *personae* in Pindar's *Epinikia*', *CFC* 8 (1998) 147–184.

Schönbeck, G., *Der* locus amoenus *von Homer bis Horaz* (diss. Heidelberg 1962).

Scobie, A., *More Essays on the Ancient Romance and Its Heritage* (Meisenheim am Glan 1973).

Scully, S., *Homer and the Sacred City* (Ithaca/London 1990).

Seaford, R., *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City-State* (Oxford 1994).

——, *Money and the Early Greek Mind* (Cambridge 2004).

——, *Aeschylus, Polis and Cosmology* (fc).

Sedley, D., 'Teleology and Myth in the *Phaedo*', *BACAP* 5 (1989) 359–383.

Segal, C.P., 'Since Daphnis Dies: The Meaning of Theocritus *Idyll* 1', *MH* (1974) 1–22.

——, 'Landscape into Myth: Theocritus' Bucolic Poetry', *Ramus* 4 (1975) 210–234.

——, *Tragedy and Civilization: An Interpretation of Sophocles* (Cambridge MA 1981).

Segre, M., 'Note storiche su Pausania Periegeta', *Athenaeum* 7 (1929) 457–488.

Shahar, Y., *Josephus* geographicus: *The Classical Context of Geography in Josephus* (Tübingen 2004).

Shaw, B.D., '"Eaters of Flesh, Drinkers of Milk": The Ancient Mediterranean Ideology of the Pastoral Nomad', *Ancient Society* 13–14 (1982–1983) 5–31.

Shea, C., 'Setting the Stage for Romances: Xenophon of Ephesus and the Ecphrasis', in R.F. Hock, J.B. Chance, J. Perkins (eds.), *Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Narrative* (Atlanta 1998) 61–76.

Sieveking, F., 'Die Funktion geographischer Mitteilungen im Geschichtswerk des Thukydides', *Klio* 42 (1964) 73–179.

Silk, M.S., 'Space and Solitude in Aristophanes', in C. Cusset et al. (eds.), *Où courir? Organisation et symbolique de l'espace dans la comédie antique*, *Pallas* 54 (Toulouse 2001) 303–312.

Slater, N.W., 'Transformations of Space in New Comedy', in J. Redmond (ed.), *Themes in Drama*, 9: *The Theatrical Space* (Cambridge 1987) 1–10.

——, 'Space, Character, and *apatē*: Transformation and Transvaluation in the *Acharnians*', in A.H. Sommerstein, S. Halliwell, J. Henderson, B. Zimmermann (eds.), *Tragedy, Comedy, and the Polis* (Bari 1993) 397–415.

Sluiter, I., Rosen, R.M., 'General Introduction', in R.M. Rosen, I. Sluiter (eds.), *City, Countryside, and the Spatial Organization of Value in Classical Antiquity* (Leiden/Boston 2006) 1–12.

Smith, C.S., *Modes of Discourse. The Local Structure of Texts* (Cambridge 2003).

Smith, S.D., *Greek Identity and the Athenian Past in Chariton: The Romance of Empire* (Groningen 2007).

Snell, F.J., *Lysias*: Epitaphios (Oxford 1887).

Snodgrass, A.M., *An Archaeology of Greece. The Present State and the Future Scope of a Discipline* (Berkeley 1987).

——, 'Pausanias and the Chest of Kypselos', in S.E. Alcock, J.F. Cherrie, J. Elsner (eds.), *Pausanias. Travel and Memory in Roman Greece* (Oxford 2001) 127–141.

Sommerstein, A. (ed.), *Aeschylus*: Eumenides (Cambridge 1989).

Sommerstein, A. (ed.), *Aeschylus*, I–II (Cambridge MA/London 2008).

Sonnabend, H., 'Die Wahrnehmung von Grenzen bei Pausanias', in E. Olshausen, H. Sonnabend (eds.), *Stuttgarter Kolloquium zur historischen Geographie des Altertums* 4 (Amsterdam 1994) 291–302.

Sowa, C.A., *Traditional Themes and the Homeric Hymns* (Chicago 1984).

Spanoudakis, K., *Philitas* (Leiden 2001).

Stadter, P.A., *A Commentary on Plutarch's* Pericles (Chapel Hill/London 1989).

——, 'Introduction: Plutarch in His Greek and Roman Context', in P.A. Stadter, L. van der Stockt (eds.), *Sage and Emperor. Plutarch, Greek Intellectuals, and Roman Power in the Time of Trajan (98–117 A.D.)* (Leuven 2002) 1–26.

——, 'Plutarch: Diplomat for Delphi?', in L. de Blois et al. (eds.), *The Statesman in Plutarch's Works (Leiden 2004)* 19–31.

Stanford, W.B. (ed.), *Sophocles*: Ajax (London 1963).

Stanzel, F., *A Theory of Narrative* ([Göttingen 1979] Cambridge/New York 1984).

Stephens, S.A., 'Writing Epic for the Ptolemaic Court', in M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit, G.C. Wakker (eds.), *Apollonius Rhodius* (Leuven 2000) 195–215.

——, *Seeing Double: Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Berkeley 2003).

Sternberg, M., 'Ordering the Unordered: Time, Space, and Descriptive Coherence', *Yale French Studies* 61 (1981) 60–88.

Stoneman, R., 'Riddles in Bronze and Stone: Monuments and Their Interpretation in the *Alexander Romance*', in H. Hofmann (ed.), *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 6 (Groningen 1995) 159–170.

Storey, I.C., *Eupolis: Poet of Old Comedy* (Oxford 2003).

——, *Euripides*: Suppliant Women (London 2008).

Strassler, R.B. (ed.), *The Landmark Xenophon's* Hellenika (New York 2009).

Sutton, S.B., 'A Temple Worth Seeing: Pausanias, Travelers, and the Narrative Landscape at Nemea', in S.E. Alcock, J.F. Cherrie, J. Elsner (eds.), *Pausanias. Travel and Memory in Roman Greece* (Oxford 2001) 175–189.

Svenbro, J., *Phrasikleia* (Paris 1988).

Swain, S., 'Culture and Nature in Philostratus,' in E. Bowie, J. Elsner (eds.), *Philostratus* (Cambridge 2009) 33–46.

Swift, L.A., 'The Symbolism of Space in Euripidean Choral Fantasy (*Hipp.* 732–775, *Med.* 824–865, *Bacch.* 370–433)', *CQ* 59 (2009) 364–382.

Tacon, J., 'Ecclesiastic *thorubos*: Interventions, Interruptions, and Popular Involvement in the Athenian Assembly', *G&R* 48 (2001) 173–191.

Taplin, O., *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus: The Dramatic Use of Exits and Entrances in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford 1977).

——, *Greek Tragedy in Action* (Berkeley 1978).

——, 'Sophocles in His Theatre', in J. de Romilly (ed.), *Sophocle* (Geneva 1983) 155–174.

Taylor, M.C., *Thucydides, Pericles and the Idea of Athens in the Peloponnesian War* (Cambridge 2010).

Temmerman, K. de, 'A Flowery Meadow and a Hidden *metalepsis* in Achilles Tatius', *CQ* 59 (2009) 667–670.

——, '"How Ideal is the Oldest Ideal Greek Novel?" Review article of Smith, S.D. *Greek Identity and the Athenian Past in Chariton: The Romance of Empire*', *Mnemosyne* 63 (2010) 465–478.

——, Demoen, K., 'Less than Ideal Paradigms in the Ancient Greek Novel', in K. Doulamis (ed.), *Echoing Narratives: Studies of Intertextuality in Greek and Roman Prose Fiction* (Groningen 2011) 1–20.

Texier, J.-G., 'Polybe géographe', *DHA* 2 (1976) 395–411.

Thalmann, W.G., *Dramatic Art in Aeschylus'* Seven Against Thebes (New Haven/ London 1978).

——, *Apollonius of Rhodes and the Spaces of Hellenism* (Oxford 2011).

Thiercy, P., *Aristophane: fiction et dramaturgie* (Paris 1986).

——, 'L'unité de lieu chez Aristophane', in C. Cusset et al. (eds.), *Où courir? Organisation et symbolique de l'espace dans la comédie antique*, *Pallas* 54 (Toulouse 2001) 15–23.

Thomas, R., *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge 1989).

——, *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science and the Art of Persuasion* (Cambridge 2000).

Thomson, J.A.K., *The Art of the* logos (London 1935).

Thomson, J.O., *History of Ancient Geography* (Cambridge 1948).

Thornton, A., *Homer's* Iliad: *Its Composition and the Motif of Supplication* (Göttingen 1984).

Tilg, S., *Chariton of Aphrodisias and the Invention of the Greek Love Novel* (Oxford 2010).

Todd, S.C., 'Lysias against Nikomakhos: The Fate of the Expert in Athenian Law', in L. Foxhall, A.D.E. Lewis (eds.), *Justifications not Justice: Greek Law in Its Political Setting* (Oxford 1996) 101–131.

——, *A Commentary on Lysias, Speeches 1–11* (Oxford 2007).

Torelli, M., 'Pausania a Corinto. Un intellettuale greco del secondo secolo e la propaganda imperiale romana', in D. Knoepfler, M. Piérart (eds.), *Éditer, traduire, commenter Pausanias en l'an 2000* (Genève 2001) 135–184.

Torrance, I., *Aeschylus*: Seven Against Thebes (London 2007).

Trachsel, A., *La Troade: un paysage et son héritage littéraire. Les commentaires antiques sur la Troade, leur genèse, et leur influence* (Basel 2007).

Tränkle, H., 'Das Graslager der Argonauten bei Theokrit und Apollonius', *Hermes* 91 (1963) 503–505.

Trapp, M.B., 'Plato's *Phaedrus* in Second-Century Greek Literature', in D.A. Russell (ed.), *Antonine Literature* (Oxford 1990) 141–173.

Trzaskoma, S.M., 'The *Anabasis* of Chaereas and Callirhoe', *Ancient Narrative* 9 (2011) 1–36.

Tuplin, C.J., *The Failings of Empire: A Reading of Xenophon* Hellenica *2.3.11– 7.5.27* (Stuttgart 1993).

——, 'On the Track of the Ten Thousand', *REA* 101 (1999) 331–366.

——, 'Xenophon, Artemis and Scillus', in T.J. Figueira (ed.), *Spartan Society* (Swansea 2004) 258–281.

——, 'Herodotus on Persia and the Persian Empire', in R. Strassler (ed.), *The Landmark Herodotus* (New York 2007) 792–797.

Turasiewicz, R. 'Zum Stil des Romanciers Xenophon von Ephesos', *GB* 21 (1995) 175–188.

Turner, M., *The Literary Mind* (Oxford 1996).

Usher, S., *Demosthenes*: On the Crown (Warminster 1993).

——, *Greek Oratory: Tradition and Originality* (Oxford 1999).

——, Najock, D., 'A Statistical Study of Authorship in the Corpus Lysiacum', *Computers and Humanities* 16 (1982) 85–105.

Vasaly, A., *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory* (Berkeley 1993).

Vetta, M., Catenacci, C. (eds.), *I luoghi e la poesia nella Grecia antica* (Alessandria 2006).

Vickers, B., *Towards Greek Tragedy* (London 1973).

Vidal-Naquet, P., 'Athènes et l'Atlantide. Structure et signification d'un mythe platonicien', *REG* 77 (1964) 420–444.

Visser, E., *Homers Katalog der Schiffe* (Stuttgart 1997).

Vlassopoulos, K., 'Free Spaces: Identity, Experience and Democracy in Classical Athens', *CQ* 57 (2007) 33–52.

Wagstaff, J.M., 'Pausanias and the Topographers: The Case of Colonel Leake', in S.E. Alcock, J.F. Cherrie, J. Elsner (eds.), *Pausanias. Travel and Memory in Roman Greece* (Oxford 2001) 190–206.

Walbank, F.W., 'The Geography of Polybius', *C&M* 9 (1948) 155–182.

——, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, I–III (Oxford 1957–1979).

——, *Polybius* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 1972).

Walden, J.W.H., 'Stage-terms in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*', *HSCP* 5 (1894) 1–43.

Walz, J., *Der lysianische Epitaphios* (Leipzig 1936).

Warf, B., Arias, S. (eds.), *The Spatial Turn. Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (New York 2009).

Warner, R. (tr.), *Xenophon: The Persian Expedition* (Harmondsworth 1972).

Warner, R. (tr.), *Xenophon: A History of My Times* (Harmondsworth 1979).

Watanabe, A. 'The Masculinity of Hippothoos', *Ancient Narrative* 3 (2003) 1–42.

Waterfield, R. (tr.), *Herodotus*: The Histories (Oxford 1998a).

Waterfield, R. (tr.), *Plutarch*: Greek Lives, with introduction and notes by Philip Stadter (Oxford 1998b).

Waterfield, R. (tr.), *Plutarch*: Roman Lives, with introduction and notes by Philip Stadter (Oxford 1998c).

Waterfield, R. (tr.), *Xenophon*: Expedition of Cyrus (Oxford 2005).

Webb, R., *Ekphrasis, Imagination, and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice* (Farnham/Burlington 2009).

Webster, T.B.L., 'Personification as a Mode of Greek Thought', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 17 (1954) 10–21.

Webster, T.B.L. (ed.), *Sophocles*: Philoctetes (Cambridge 1970).

Weigel, S., 'On the 'Topografical Turn': Concepts of Space in Cultural Studies and Kulturwissenschaften. A Cartographic Feud', *European Review* 17 (2009) 197–208.

Wernicke, C., *De Pausaniae Periegetae studiis Herodoteis* (Berlin 1884).

Wesseling, B., *Leven, liefde en dood. Motieven in de antieke romans* (Groningen 1993).

West, M.L., *Homeric Hymns, Homeric Apocrypha, Lives of Homer* (Cambridge MA/London 2003).

White, H., *Appian's* Roman History, I–IV (Cambridge MA/London 1912–1913).

White, J.J., 'The Semiotics of the Mise-en-abyme', in O. Fischer, M. Nänning (eds.), *The Motivated Sign: Iconicity in Language and Literature* 2 (Amsterdam 2001) 29–54.

Whitmarsh, T., 'Greek and Roman in Dialogue: The Pseudo-Lucianic Nero' *JHS* 119 (1999a) 142–160.

——, 'The Writes of Passage. Cultural Initiation in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*', in R. Miles (ed.), *Constructing Identities in Late Antiquity* (London/New York 1999b) 16–40.

——, *Ancient Greek Literature. Cultural History of Literature Series* (Cambridge/Malden MA 2004).

——, *The Second Sophistic* (Oxford 2005).

——, 'Divide and Rule: Segmenting *Callirhoe* and Related Works' in M. Paschalis, G. Schmeling (eds.), *Readers and Writers in the Ancient Novel* (Groningen 2009a) 36–50.

——, 'Performing Heroics: Language, Landscape and Identity in Philostratus's *Heroicus*', in E. Bowie, J. Elsner (eds.), *Philostratus* (Cambridge 2009b) 205–229.

——, 'Domestic Poetics: Hippias' House in Achilles Tatius', *CA* 29 (2010) 327–348.

——, *Narrative and Identity in the Ancient Greek Novel. Returning Romance.* (Cambridge 2011).

——, Morales, H. (eds.), *Achilles Tatius*: Leucippe and Clitophon (Oxford 2001).

Whittaker, C.R., *Herodian*, I–II (London/Cambridge MA 1969–1970).

Wilamowitz, U. von, *Kleine Schriften*, I: *Klassische griechische Poesie* (Berlin 1935).

Wiles, D., *Tragedy in Athens: Performance Space and Theatrical Meaning* (Cambridge 1997).

——, *Greek Theatre Performance: An Introduction* (Cambridge 2000).

Wilkins, J. (ed.), *Euripides*: Heraclidae (Oxford 1993).

Wille, G., Akroasis: *der akustische Sinnesbereich in der griechischen Literatur bis zum Ende der klassischen Zeit* (Tübingen 2001).

Williams, M.F., *Landscape in the* Argonautica *of Apollonius Rhodius* (Frankfurt am Main 1991).

Williams, F., *Callimachus: Hymn to Apollo. A Commentary* (Oxford 1978).

Wilson, J.R., 'Territoriality and Its Violation in the *Persians* of Aeschylus', in M.J. Cropp, E. Fantham, S.E. Scully (eds.), *Greek Tragedy and Its Legacy* (Calgary 1986) 51–57.

Wolf, W., 'Description as a Transmedial Mode of Representation: General Features and Possibilities of Realization in Painting, Fiction, and Music', in W. Wolf, W. Bernhart (eds.), *Description in Literature and Other Media* (Amsterdam/New York 2007) 1–87.

Woolf, G., *Tales of the Barbarians: Ethnography and Empire in the Roman West* (Malden MA/Oxford 2011).

Wright, M., *Euripides' Escape-Tragedies: A Study of* Helen, Andromeda, *and* Iphigenia among the Taurians (Oxford 2005).

Yalichev, S., *Mercenaries of the Ancient World* (London 1997).

Young, D.C., *Three Odes of Pindar: A Literary Study of* Pythian *11,* Pythian *3, and* Olympian *7* (Leiden 1968).

——, 'Pindar *Pythians* 2 and 3: Inscriptional ποτέ and the "Poetic Epistle"', *HSPh* 87 (1983) 30–48.

Zanker, G., *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry. A Literature and Its Audience* (London 1987).

——, *Modes of Viewing in Hellenistic Poetry and Art* (Madison WI 2004).

Zecchini, G., 'Teoria e prassi del viaggio in Polibio', in G. Camassa, S. Fasce (eds.), *Idea e realtà del viaggio: il viaggio nel mondo antico* (Genova 1991) 111–141.

Zeitlin, F.I., *Under the Sign of the Shield*: *Semiotics and Aeschylus'* Seven Against Thebes (Rome 1982).

——, 'Thebes: Theater of Self and Society in Athenian Drama', in F.I. Zeitlin, J.J. Winkler (eds.), *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in Its Social Context* (Princeton 1990) 130–167.

——, 'The Artful Eye: Vision, Ecphrasis and Spectacle in Euripidean Theatre', in S. Goldhill, R. Osborne (eds.), *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture* (Cambridge 1994) 138–196.

——, *Playing the Other: Gender and Society in Classical Greek Literature* (Chicago/London 1996).

Zoja, L., *Growth and Guilt: Psychology and the Limits of Development* (London 1995).

Zoran, G., 'Towards a Theory of Space in Narrative', *Poetics Today* 5 (1984) 309–335.

Zuntz, G., *The Political Plays of Euripides* (Manchester 1955).

INDEX