January 2011

Wind, Wave, and Generative Metaphor in Greek

Hans Bork
Washington University in St. Louis

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Department of Classics

WIND, WAVE, AND GENERATIVE METAPHOR IN GREEK

by

Hans Bork

A thesis presented to the
Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
of Washington University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
degree of Master of Arts

August, 2011

St. Louis, Missouri

Acknowledgements

More than anyone, I want to thank my thesis advisor, Professor Ryan Platte, who has been remarkably patient and helpful in overseeing a paper whose premises and process of composition could be charitably described as 'idiosyncratic.' In the same spirit, I want to thank the other readers of my thesis committee, Professor Cathy Keane and Professor Robert Lamberton, for agreeing to participate in this project.

I also want to thank my wife, Rebecca, and my daughter, Ava, for the constant support and good cheer they maintained despite all the dinners and bedtimes that I missed while researching, writing, and revising this thesis project. I know that neither of them have much interest in my work, but they both unflinchingly support my efforts to do it, making each of them special indeed.

Contents

List of Tables

Bibliographical Note

The Greek texts quoted in this paper are taken from the following editions: Alcaeus quotations are from Denys L. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus: an Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry* (London: Oxford University Press, 1975), or Denys Lionel Page and Edward Lobel, *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta.* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1963). Any iambic or elegiac fragments are from M. L. West, *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1989). The occasional melic fragment is from Denys L. Page, *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1967). Citations from Homer are via Homer, *Homeri Opera, Tomi I-IV. Iliadis Libros I-XXIV et Odysseae Libros I-XXIV Continentes*, ed. Thomas W. Allen (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963). Citations of Hesiod are from Hesiod and M. L. West, *Works & Days* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978). References to Heraclitus are via Heraclitus, D. A. Russell, and David Konstan, *Heraclitus: Homeric problems* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005). All secondary scholarship is cited in place, with references collated in the Bibliography. Translations of poetic materials are my own, with the usual warning that they are intended more for utility than for beauty, but I have deferred to other translators for material from Aristotle and Heraclitus; these translations are cited in place. An *Index Locorum* for all cited poetic texts is included at the end of the paper as a convenience for the reader.

1 · Introduction

To study Archaic Greek lyric is to take on a frustrating task, insofar as Archaic Greek poetic texts present so many challenges to the critic: a fragmented manuscript tradition composed largely of preserved quotations, exciting but incomplete papyrus finds, dubious attribution of large corpora to single, semi-mythical authors, and a lexicographer's funhouse of hapax forms and dialectical oddities. These obvious philological problems are complicated by our own provisional understanding of the Archaic period's history and larger literary culture, critical conceptions of which often change with the tides of scholarly fashion. In consequence, diachronic study of early Greek poetic materials is quite difficult, as diachronic analysis relies on the notion that historical changes in language are continuous and interconnected. A fragmented corpus of contextless, historically displaced textual snippets makes most diachronic analysis highly theoretical and largely dependent on subjective reconstruction of the existing fragments. The diachronic study of thematic or conceptual material is similarly difficult, since thematic analysis explicitly relies on a causational model of change: theme X appears due to the presence of historical factor Y, which occurred at time Z. When the historical contexts of both a text and its author are poorly understood (or if the text itself cannot be historically placed), diachronic study of textual thematics becomes even more difficult.

The so-called *Ship of State* metaphor, first attested in the extant fragments of the Archaic Greek poets, has received little critical comment that does not emphasize either its imagistic

novelty, or its apparent relevance to the contemporary political situation of the poet who uses it.[1] This is not surprising, since at first blush the 'Ship of State'[2] concept seems like a natural microcosm of the era's politics as we understand them: a group of elite men (i.e., the ship's crew), working to 'guide' the *polis*-ship through a 'sea' of natural and manmade troubles. Such a conception of the metaphor might be sufficient if the condition of Archaic poetry were better, but due to the reasons I have just discussed, such a definition is in all likelihood too simplistic in that it assumes poetic evidence as historical fact. Consequently, the *SoS* metaphor—which occurs in only a handful of extant Archaic poems—is often contextualized by comparison to more plentiful post-Archaic *SoS* examples, apparently with the assumption that later and earlier forms of the metaphor have the same meaning. A ship-metaphor in Theognis or Alcaeus—the two poets where the trope is most common—will be made equivalent to that in Book VI of Plato's *Republic*, or that in Demosthenes' *de Corona*, or even that of Horace's *Ode* 1.iv, with the result that discrete metaphor iterations composed across centuries become glommed into one general 'political metaphor.' I do not think it is unfair to state that this type of thematic association is haphazard, and in general does not illustrate good critical practice. Agreeing with Page's warning that "prejudice may beget error when a critic makes it his business to hunt for allegories,"[3] I believe we need a subtler definition of what the metaphor means, something that can be best accomplished by a diachronic analysis of how it originated.

Before any work on the *SoS* metaphor can be done, however, we need an appropriate definition of what *metaphor itself* is. Despite their prominence in the Humanities, I believe that the metaphor theories of modern literary criticism are largely unhelpful, since their definitions are often unspecific or rely on the special application of a unique critical framework (e.g., reader-

1. For example, see N. Coffee, "The ΦΟΡΤΗΓΟΙ of Theognis 667-82," *The Classical Quarterly* 56, no. 01 (2006): 304–305 as well as Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus*, 182ff.
2. Hereafter abbreviated '*SoS*'.
3. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus*, 184.

response theory, deconstructionism, etc.) to the source material. Even 'neutral' metaphor theories like those of I.A. Richards or Max Black are not without controversy, and despite being widely accepted are based on subjective philosophical conceptions of how language functions. More significantly, nearly all literary theories of metaphor—both ancient and modern—use aesthetic or stylistic criteria for their taxonomic definitions: according to such criteria, metaphor is defined by its *rarity*, and is a variety of marked speech that augments other speech but does not exist independently, a position that generally echoes Aristotle's definition of metaphor in the *Poetics* and *Rhetoric*. A purely aesthetic account of metaphor is not terribly useful for diachronic study because aesthetic definitions necessarily rely on a critic's 'innate' sense of what is and what is not unfamiliar or rare; such definitions will always be fluid, and diachronic study needs stable, objective criteria for use in comparison.

Instead of an aesthetic theory, I will apply the *cognitive metaphor* theory of George Lakoff and Mark Johnson. Their framework is not only stable, specific, and well-defined, but has proven its durability in 30 years of critical vetting and experimental testing. When analyzed by this schema, the *SoS* metaphor emerges as a single constituent within a larger metaphorical system that generates Homeric *Wind and Wave* similes as well as the ship metaphor of Archaic Greek sympotic poetry. *Wind and Wave* similes in Homer broadly represent the concept of danger and opposition, and this generalized concept was later extended by sympotic lyricists through the addition of a ship-metaphor that represents both *general civic order* and the poetic *symposium*. Lexical items common to this large *SoS* metaphor-system[4] were 'captured' in its semantic field, and thereby retained a portion of its semantic content even when used innocuously or without deliberate allusion to the full *Wind and Wave* metaphor, as indicated by the generally negative depiction of the sea in Homer and early Greek literature as a whole.

4. e.g., πλέω, χειμών, κλύδων, κτλ.

In the following paper I will present evidence supporting such an analysis, beginning in *Chapter 2* with a brief but thorough précis of the cognitive theory and its relevance to literary study. This summary is intended not only to orient a reader by introducing the basic terminology of the cognitive theory that I will use throughout the remainder of this paper, but also to highlight the fundamental differences between the cognitive theory and the aesthetic approach that originated with Aristotle.

Chapter 3 begins with a survey of sea and storm imagery in Homer and Hesiod, and then proceeds to a discussion of how oral-poetic Homeric simile fits within the cognitive metaphor framework. The takeaway point of the chapter is my identification of a *Wind and Wave* conceptual metaphor that is used throughout Greek poetry to convey the abstract concept of opposition or disruption; the presence of this simile group determined the semantic valence of virtually every instance of sea and storm imagery in poetry, even when it was used non-figuratively.

Chapter 4 extends my examination of the *Wind and Wave* metaphor group to Archaic lyric poetry. I consider both figurative and non-figurative uses of sea and storm imagery, with the conclusion that throughout the lyric corpus sea and storm imagery maintains a general semantic kernel of disruption or force. This is further evidence that lyric and epic were informed by the same general poetic system, which itself must have been broadly informed by popular discourse.

Chapter 5, the final chapter of the paper, brings the various arguments together in proposing a plausible scenario for how the *Ship of State* metaphor may have developed within poetic symposia *as they are represented in the poetic record*. I first consider the few definite *SoS* instances that appear in Alcaeus and Theognis and create a catalog of their common mappings. I then examine the venue in which *SoS* poetry was likely composed—namely, the poetic syimposium—and consider the defining themes of the poetry associated with this institution. In my opinion, the ideas of *order* and *moderation* define most overtly sympotic poems, and I propose that these

ideas were a natural antithesis to the disruptive semantic core of the *Wind and Wave* simile group. The final portion of my argument examines evidence that sympotic participants deliberately adopted nautical personae, making the symposium a viable origin-point for the Ship of State metaphor.

2 · Cognitive Metaphor

2.1 · INTRODUCTION TO COGNITIVE METAPHOR

2.1.1 History of Cognitive Metaphor Theory

Though their work was informed by that of other linguists and theorists, George Lakoff and Mark Johnson are generally credited with being the first researchers to propose a coherent theory of *cognitive metaphor*. Their book *Metaphors We Live By* has become a classic of the field, and despite abundant Cognitive Linguistics research in the 30 years since the book's initial publication, it arguably remains the most important single text in the canon of cognitive metaphor studies. Nearly all subsequent metaphorical theory—even that not directly adhering to the cognitive approach—has adopted some, if not all, of the basic descriptive terminology developed in that first book, and an understanding of this terminology is necessary for any useful application of the cognitive theory. As my later analysis of metaphors in Homer and Archaic Greek lyric relies heavily upon the basic tenets of the cognitive approach, in the following chapter I will sketch out the basics of the Lakoffian approach, with special emphasis on both *how* and *why* the cognitive theory differs from the stylistic metaphor theories of traditional literary criticism.[1] From there I will briefly discuss the utility of the cognitive approach when studying

1. Unless otherwise cited, this introductory material can be considered to be a synthesis of the following sources: George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003); Zoltán Kövecses, *Metaphor: a Practical Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009); William Croft and D. A. Cruse, *Cognitive Linguistics* (Cambridge, U.K.; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Raymond W. Gibbs, ed., *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), Part II.

literature, with particular emphasis on how literary metaphors rely on cognitive structures to be effective. Lastly, I will discuss the pragmatic differences between metaphor and simile, with an eye toward a larger analysis of Homeric metaphor in the next chapter.

2.1.2 Core principles of the cognitive metaphor theory

As Lakoff and Johnson present it, the essential difference between cognitive and traditional stylistic notions of metaphor is not only descriptive, but epistemological: whereas traditional critics often characterize metaphor as a poetic or literary device intended to make writing more evocative, Lakoff and Johnson propose that metaphor is actually a *cognitive* function which is only occasionally realized through verbal means. Metaphor then is not a lexical ornament designed to elaborate a pre-existing concept, but a cognitive relationship *between* concepts. The stylistic tradition that the cognitive model rejects has a long pedigree in literary criticism, but the earliest formal declaration of the idea is in Aristotle's *Poetics*:

> σεμνὴ [λἐξις] δὲ καὶ ἐξαλλάττουσα τὸ ἰδιωτικὸν ἡ τοῖς ξενικοῖς κεχρημένη· ξενικὸν δὲ λέγω γλῶτταν καὶ μεταφορὰν καὶ ἐπέκτασιν καὶ πᾶν τὸ παρὰ τὸ κύριον. ἀλλ' ἄν τις ἅπαντα τοιαῦτα ποιήσῃ, ἢ αἴνιγμα ἔσται ἢ βαρβαρισμός· ἂν μὲν οὖν ἐκ μεταφορῶν, αἴνιγμα, ἐὰν δὲ ἐκ γλωττῶν, βαρβαρισμός....δεῖ ἄρα κεκρᾶσθαί πως τούτοις· τὸ μὲν γὰρ τὸ μὴ ἰδιωτικὸν ποιήσει μηδὲ ταπεινόν, οἷον ἡ γλῶττα καὶ ἡ μεταφορὰ καὶ ὁ κόσμος καὶ τἆλλα τὰ εἰρημένα εἴδη, τὸ δὲ κύριον τὴν σαφήνειαν. *(1458a 21-25, 30)*
>
> *The style that uses strange expressions is solemn and out of the ordinary; by 'strange expressions' I mean dialect terms, metaphor, lengthening, and everything over and above standard words. But if anyone made an entire poem like this, it would be either a riddle or gibberish, a riddle if it were entirely metaphorical, gibberish if all composed of dialect terms....So there ought to be a sort of admixture of these, as the one element will prevent the style from being ordinary or mean, that is, dialect, metaphor, decorative terms, and the other species I mentioned, while standard terms will make it clear.*[2]
>
> ἔστιν δὲ μέγα μὲν τὸ ἑκάστῳ τῶν εἰρημένων πρεπόντως χρῆσθαι, καὶ διπλοῖς ὀνόμασι καὶ γλώτταις, πολὺ δὲ μέγιστον τὸ μεταφορικὸν εἶναι. μόνον γὰρ τοῦτο

2. Translations of Aristotle are from D. A. Russell and Michael Winterbottom, *Classical Literary Criticism* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1989).

> οὔτε παρ᾽ ἄλλου ἔστι λαβεῖν εὐφυΐας τε σημεῖόν ἐστι: τὸ γὰρ εὖ μεταφέρειν τὸ τὸ ὅμοιον θεωρεῖν ἐστιν...
> *(1459a 4-8)*
>
> *It is extremely important to use in the proper place each of the kinds [of expression] I have mentioned, but by far the most important is to be good at metaphor. For this is the only one that cannot be learnt from anyone else, and it is a sign of natural genius, as to be good at metaphor is to perceive resemblances.*

Aristotle writes that metaphors are created through the application of a "strange term" to another term of different "genus or species" (*Poetics* 1457b9-22), but he does not imply that the transference of terms creates a novel semantic device; instead, metaphor is a compositional element to be used for *augmenting* the meaning that is itself created by "standard terms." An excess of metaphor obscures meaning (αἴνιγμα ἔσται), indicating, according to Aristotle, that metaphors are not meaningful in and of themselves. Moreover, Aristotle apparently considers metaphor to be an expression of pre-existing affinities between elements (τὸ γὰρ εὖ μεταφέρειν τὸ τὸ ὅμοιον θεωρεῖν ἐστιν), making the proper use of metaphor a matter of poetic genius rather than general cognitive or linguistic practice. From a strictly compositional viewpoint, Aristotle's taxonomy is largely valid: proper use of metaphors can make or break a piece of writing, and all composition depends upon a judicious application of compositional elements. Such compositional criteria are not the sum of metaphorical usage, though, and being entirely dependent on cultural aesthetic standards (that is, what is and what is not a 'standard' term), Aristotle's criteria are not of themselves valid data for tracking long-term thematic trends in literature.

Though it is surely an oversimplification to claim that *every* theory of metaphor from antiquity to Lakoff has hewed to Aristotle's definition, it is not too much to say that the Aristotelian model seems to be the norm. The notion of 'deviant' usage is embedded in most stylistic accounts of metaphor, even among scholars with a wide knowledge of literary theory. A recent

example of this position in mainstream Classical scholarship is Michael Silk's historical survey of metaphor theory; Silk bases his personal definition of metaphor on "the essential concept of *trope* [emphasis in original]…a deviant usage—that is, a known word or phrase used, in context, deviantly from any normal usage of that word or phrase."[3] According to this theory, a reader or auditor intuitively identifies metaphors according to their degree of 'deviance,' as "one can *feel* [emphasis in original] the difference between the deviant and the normal, irrespective of how interesting (or not) or how impressive (or not) the deviation may be."[4] I consider Silk's position to be typical of most modern aesthetic approaches to metaphor, and I would offer the same criticism of it as I do for Aristotle's theory: aesthetic criteria are unstable and highly subjective, making them poor data for use in macro-comparison of metaphors across time.

In contrast, the cognitive theory of metaphor does not use a purely aesthetic-stylistic benchmark of definition, but rather a *relational* benchmark. In the cognitive approach, metaphor is defined as the linkage between two concepts from different conceptual (that is, *ontological*) domains; this relationship is prototypically expressed in the formula X IS Y, where X and Y are both 'unlike' concepts.[5] The motivation for this linkage is cognition itself: metaphors almost always operate by pairing more-concrete concepts with less-concrete concepts, thus making the abstract concept accessible to thought. Abstract concepts (e.g., life, death, love, happiness), being largely non empirical quantities, are unavailable to direct thought.[6] They are understandable only when related to more basic, concrete entities that are used to partially describe the

3. Michael Silk, "Metaphor and Metonymy: Aristotle, Jakobson, Ricoeur, and Others.," in *Metaphor, Allegory, and the Classical Tradition*, ed. G.R. Boys-Stones (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 122.

4. Ibid., 123.

5. It is a convention of cognitive metaphor scholarship that basic metaphoric correspondences are written in small capitals; this is done in order to distinguish that the relational unit *as a whole* is being described, rather than just the metaphor's constituent domains.

6. That is, one cannot think abstractly about 'love' without the moderation of certain images or concepts that define it, e.g., physical intimacy, the conditions of a loving relationship, etc. In contrast, one can easily imagine a concrete concept (e.g., a tree, a car, etc.) without the need for auxiliary descriptor concepts.

abstraction. Lexical expressions only *reflect* this relationship, though, and the actual metaphorical linkage is made at a deeper cognitive level.

According to Lakoff and Johnson, three basic operators organize all metaphor: the *target domain* (an abstract concept to be described metaphorically), the *source domain* (a relatively concrete concept which will be applied to the *target*), and *mappings* (the relational correspondences between the two domains). In the conventional X IS Y formula, X is generally the target domain and Y is the source. To illustrate how these relationships come together, consider the metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY: the *target* domain of this metaphor is the concept of *love*, a famously abstract concept (and one that is the subject of many common metaphors), while the *source* domain of the LOVE IS A JOURNEY metaphor is, of course, the concept of a *journey*. This core metaphor is realized in expressions such as *Our relationship is on the wrong track*, *We are at a crossroads*, and *We are making progress in our relationship*. Table 2.1 lists several example mappings that can be derived from such expressions:[7]

Source	**Target**
travelers	lovers
a vehicle	the love relationship
a journey	events in the relationship
distance travelled	duration of the relationship
directions taken	decisions about what to do
mishaps during travel	periods of strife
etc.	etc.

TABLE 2.1: *Example* LOVE IS A JOURNEY *mappings*

Note that the examples in no way represent *all* of the generating metaphor's available mappings. Indeed, this particular metaphor is very common and quite productive in American English; the vagueness and semantic breadth of the source domain makes the number of possible mappings nearly limitless, but with all metaphors a certain number of core mappings will

7. Adapted from Kövecses, *Metaphor*, pp.6-7.

stand out, and it is these correspondences that tend to define the metaphor. The mappings listed in the table above are the core mappings of the LOVE IS A JOURNEY metaphor.

Taxonomically, the source domain and target domain of a cognitive metaphor are loosely equivalent to the *vehicle* and *tenor* constituents of I.A. Richards' metaphor theory, and critics will occasionally conflate the two sets of terms. It is crucial to recognize, however, that source and target mappings exist as part of a larger metaphorical system, and it this *system of metaphor* that creates meaning and licenses comprehension of abstract concepts. The source/target domains are significant only insofar as they are productive in creating semantic entailments.[8]

2.1.3 Consequences of a cognitive metaphor

One result of the LOVE IS A JOURNEY metaphor is that, by the nature of its *source domain*, it imparts a teleological nature to the conceived love-relationship. That is, if LOVE IS A JOURNEY, and journeys typically end at a certain destination, then the LOVE IS A JOURNEY metaphor necessarily implies that love-relationships have endpoints and that 'progress' in the relationship towards this end can somehow be measured. In contrast, the metaphors LOVE IS A UNITY and LOVE IS CLOSENESS describe love as a stative rather than a procedural concept, and so these metaphors—according to the cognitive theory—will entail different semantic conclusions for those accessing the *love*-concept via these metaphors.[9] These examples illustrate the most important premise of the cognitive metaphor theory, namely that *the source concepts applied to a target concept via metaphorical mappings influence the semantic interpretation of that mapped target*. Because abstract *target* concepts

8. This is not to say that those working in the Cognitive Linguistics field do not consider the discourse-pragmatics of metaphor, in the study of which the roles of constituent domains are more important. There is—and continues to be—abundant research on this topic. However, these questions are not terribly relevant to my argument in this paper; for a full discussion, see Gerard Steen, *Understanding Metaphor in Literature: an Empirical Approach* (London; New York: Longman, 1994).

9. The LOVE IS A UNITY and LOVE IS CLOSENESS metaphors, though sometimes found in speech (e.g., "We are inseparable," "When will we be together?") often appear in sculpture or painting as a means of signifying love (e.g., Madonna child representations, images of lovers embracing, etc.). That metaphors may have non-verbal iterations supports their status as *cognitive* rather than merely *verbal* phenomena. For research on non-verbal realizations of cognitive metaphor, see Part IV of Gibbs, *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*.

are apprehended through the moderation of less abstract intermediary mappings, the associated semantics of those mappings will necessarily influence the conception of the mapped target domain. Those mappings in turn are licensed by the *source* domain, and are consistent with it. This may seem like a controversial point, but it is an absolutely foundational tenet of the cognitive metaphor theory.[10] This result is possible for the reason that the mapped constituents of a source domain are *arbitrary* and have no 'natural' or inevitable relationship with the mapped target. For example, in the LOVE IS A JOURNEY metaphor, there is no natural affinity between the concepts of *love* and *travel*; the relationship is culturally imprinted and by no means 'natural' or 'inevitable.'

That metaphorical source- and target-domains are arbitrary is unintuitive, and the claim is sometimes disputed even by scholars who have otherwise adopted the general nomenclature of the cognitive linguistics literature.[11] This point will be considerably expanded upon in Chapter 3 through my discussion of how sea and storm imagery has an arbitrary, negative valence in Archaic Greek poetry, but it might be useful to briefly illustrate the principle now by comparing a number of contemporary English examples that employ common target domains but different source domains:

(1) AN ARGUMENT IS A JOURNEY/PATH: I *don't follow* your argument.
AN ARGUMENT IS A BUILDING: She *constructed a solid* argument.
AN ARGUMENT IS A CONTAINER: Your argument *lacks content*.
AN ARGUMENT IS WAR: He *defended his point* when she *attacked his position*.

10. As this paper is not itself a theoretical work on cognitive metaphor, I will not spend much time addressing the evidence for this claim. The question has been tested in a number of psychological studies, and as I understand it, is found to be generally true, with certain restrictions. For those interested, extensive discussion of this point can be found in Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, ch.12-15, Kövecses, *Metaphor*, ch. 9, 12, and 17, as well as the various articles in Gibbs, *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, in particular Glucksberg, "How metaphors create categories."

11. See, for example, Christoph G. Leidl, "The Harlot's Art: Metaphor and Literary Criticism," in *Metaphor, Allegory, and the Classical Tradition*, ed. G.R. Boys-Stones (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), p.35 infra, who proposes that a similarity between source and target is a prerequisite for their relationship.

(2) HAPPINESS IS UP: I am *on top of the world* today.
HAPPINESS IS LIGHT: She *lit up* when she heard the news.
HAPPINESS IS A FLUID IN A CONTAINER: The sight *filled them* with joy.
HAPPINESS IS A NATURAL FORCE: We were *carried away* with happiness.

(3) LOVE IS A JOURNEY: I don't know *where this relationship is going.*
LOVE IS FIRE: He was *burning with desire.*
LOVE IS A NUTRIENT/FOOD: He is *starved* for affection; His love *sustains* him.
LOVE IS AN ECONOMIC EXCHANGE: I am *putting more into this* than you are.

If the target domains of the above metaphor groups (e.g., argument, happiness, love) were necessarily related to each of their associated source domains (e.g., war, journey, light), it seems unlikely that each target concept would productively map to a number of different source concepts. After all, it is difficult to say what qualities *argument* shares with both *war* and *buildings*, or how *love* is like both *journeys* and *economic exchange*. Rather, the qualities that seem so inevitable in expressed metaphors are in fact *created by the metaphor itself*, and seem inevitable only because the connection between concepts is conditioned by an existing semantic linkage: the source domain guides one's apprehension of a mapped target concept. Moreover, the cognitive 'flow' is one-way, from source to target, as we would expect in a system meant to enable understanding of abstract concepts. For this reason, we rarely see metaphors—except in highly stylized writing—that describe a concrete term with an abstract one (e.g., FIRE IS LOVE, A FLOWER IS TIME, etc.). However, the fact that a metaphor's source domain is not *necessarily* objectively related to the target does not mean that it *cannot* be objectively related. To explain that distinction, it is necessary to briefly consider the different semantic levels that cognitive metaphors may operate on.

2.1.4 How metaphors originate

One of the more interesting claims of the cognitive metaphor theory is that metaphors are modular, and that nearly all cognitive metaphors are part of a larger system formed by constituent

metaphors of greater or lesser complexity. By examining these constituents we can get some insight into how metaphorical mappings arise and why some mappings are more productive than others. In most cognitive taxonomies, metaphor is classified into three broad categories of increasing complexity.[12] The simplest of these are *image schemas*, which represent concepts such as *containment*, *force*, *center/periphery*, *in/out*, etc. In their simplest formulations, image schemas are bodily concepts rooted in physical experience, and in English they are often lexically expressed with prepositions. Image schemas are not semantically complex in and of themselves, but give discrete meanings to more nebulous experiential concepts. Most importantly, image schemas are metaphorical primitives that provide the raw material for more complex metaphorical expressions.

Closely related to and sometimes included with the image schema classification are *orientational metaphors*, which also have only a minimum of cognitive mapping and are often used in evaluative statements. Examples include MORE IS UP, LESS IS DOWN (e.g., Speak *up* please; The stock market *is down* this week), HAPPY IS UP, SAD IS DOWN (e.g., I am feeling *down* today), VIRTUE IS UP, DEPRAVITY IS DOWN (e.g., She is an *upstanding citizen*; That was a very *low blow*), as well as others. Orientational metaphors, as the name would imply, are grounded on the orientation of the human body, resulting in the use of up/down, horizontal/vertical, and center/peripheral concepts as source domains for simple stative metaphors. Concepts described by orientational domains often generate thematic pairs (e.g., good/bad = up/down), reducing otherwise complex concepts to simple Manichean binaries.

Ontological metaphors make up the second major class of cognitive metaphor types, though like orientational metaphors, ontological metaphors tend to be semantically unsophisticated. Ontological metaphors classify abstract existential events or states in terms of image schemas,

12. Extensive discussion of this and the following material may be found in Kövecses ch 6, as well as Cruse and Croft, ch 8.

permitting abstract entities to be quantified and conceptually handled as though they were everyday physical objects. The common target domains of orientational metaphors include *nonphysical abstractions* (e.g., the mind), *events or actions* (e.g., prayer, work), *undilineated physical objects* (e.g., a forest clearing, a section of a town), *physical and nonphysical surfaces* (e.g., the visual field), and *physical or emotional states* (e.g., love, anger). To give a few examples, love and other emotive states are often characterized as containers of one type or another: She is *in love*, They *fell out of* love. Non-physical abstractions tend to be made concrete: *The Government* is out to get us; *Fear* gripped them. Portions of non-quantifiable entities are conceived as discrete quantities: *The edge* of the forest; *The middle* of the ocean. At their most basic, ontological metaphors assign a physical reality to indistinct entities, though in practice the system is quite complex, and my brief discussion here does a disservice to this complexity. It is important to realize, however, that the source and target constituents of more complex metaphors are often themselves ontological metaphors; for example, *the state* in the *Ship of State* is an ontological abstraction expressed by the metaphor CIVIC ORGANIZATION IS AN OBJECT. That a culture would find it necessary to generate such a correspondence is significant in and of itself.

The third classification of metaphor, *structural metaphor*, is the richest in cognitive mappings, and provides the most material for raw cognition. Most of the metaphors discussed in Sections 2.1.3 and 2.1.4 above are structural metaphors. Examples include LOVE IS A JOURNEY, AN ARGUMENT IS WAR, HAPPINESS IS LIGHT, and others; though independent constructs, structural metaphors do use both ontological and orientational metaphors as compositional primitives, making them semantically and structurally complex. In fact, the three metaphor types rarely manifest in their discrete forms, but instead tend to appear in systems of greater or lesser sophistication. To illustrate, consider the LOVE IS A JOURNEY example that we have been working with throughout the chapter: the larger *structural* metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY is informed by

less complex constituent metaphors, namely the *ontological* metaphor A JOURNEY IS A THING and the image-schema concept of movement towards a goal. In turn, the LOVE IS A JOURNEY metaphor is part of a larger series of *journey*-mapped metaphors, which include LOVE IS A JOURNEY, LIFE IS A JOURNEY, DEATH IS A JOURNEY, and others. Technically speaking, *all* of these constituents are part of the 'cognitive metaphor' that has to do with the conceptual domains *love* and *journey*, making for an incredibly rich semantic system.

The complexity of cognitive metaphor systems is actually a tremendous benefit for anyone interested in analyzing metaphor, so long as specific boundaries are set on the breadth of one's inquiry. Metaphor iterations in literature or speech that employ parallel source concepts can be individually evaluated by their relationship to a central cognitive metaphor. The presence of a cognitive metaphor system can be determined by an examination of various cultural products, as well as linguistic corpora if they exist. Innovations in the metaphor system (e.g., by the addition of novel source/target mappings) in principle can be chronologically related to significant cultural or social events, allowing for diachronic analysis of a culture's metaphor system. This process could theoretically even be applied to ancient texts and material products, though the stylistic quirks that often define literature do make working with literary metaphor somewhat problematic. Literary corpora are unideal sources of evidence exactly because they often do not reflect standard linguistic usage: a writer striving for the compositional balance that Aristotle prizes necessarily values novel expressions over cliché, the ordered to the unordered, the exciting to the dull, etc., none of which is true of everyday speech. This does not mean that linguistic corpora are useless, however, so long as a critic understands the relationship between literary and cognitive metaphor.

2.2 · COGNITIVE METAPHOR AND LITERATURE

2.2.1 How Metaphors are innovated within literature

Another key premise of the cognitive metaphor theory is that metaphor iterations in casual speech do not necessarily weaken the underlying metaphorical mappings of the metaphor being used. Though some traditional theorists insist that novelty is an essential feature of effective metaphors, artists and poets rarely employ completely novel metaphors; if we understand the abstract world through concrete cognitive mappings then we can expect a culture or speech-community to have certain cognitive mappings in common, in order that concepts can be communicated within that community. If a writer or artist were to use only novel metaphors, little of their audience would understand their meaning.[13] Instead, skillful artists innovate within a given metaphor to "make it new" (hat-tip to Pound), and so partially extend its meaning by the remapping of old elements or the addition of new.[14] Even then, novel remappings of a metaphor are sterile until the new source/target associations are widely accepted.

An example of a successful remapping process from English poetry is Robert Frost's "The Road Not Taken," which relies on an understood LIFE IS A JOURNEY metaphor for its effect. If Frost had not chosen a well-established conceptual metaphor upon which to build his poem, then the lines "Two roads diverged in a wood...and I took the one less traveled by" would be incomprehensible. Frost partially remapped the metaphor by adding a 'fork' in the path of life's journey, and by creating 'smooth' and 'untrodden' roads, which have the novel mappings of common and uncommon life-decisions. Partial remapping of a metaphor can be quite powerful, if the remapping persists, and I believe that such was the case for Frost's poem, which has

13. Kövecses (p. 43) gives a textual example from Gabriel Garcia Marquez, in which Marquez describes how a cup of tea "tastes of window." Though interesting, such a description is nearly incomprehensible, due to its use of an unknown metaphorical frame.

14. Cf. Kövecses ch. 4 for a full discussion of this process

become so well-known as an anthology piece that it is now almost a cliché of American English to say of an unusual decision, "I took the road less travelled by..." Rather than using a 'tired' metaphor that everyone knows, Frost is clearly innovating within a familiar structural metaphor in order to effect literary meaning.

This process of adoption and adaptation is common to all literature, and will play a key role in my later analysis of how the Greek lyric poets innovated on established Homeric (that is, *oral-poetic*) poetic tropes.[15] As with the example from Frost, I will posit that the *Ship of State* metaphor was the result of innovation within a more general conceptual metaphor group that governs the semantics of sea and storm images in Greek. The later innovations became entrenched, and like Frost's productive 'two paths' metaphor, the *SoS* metaphor became a productive and independent metaphor variant.

2.2.2 Metaphor and simile

One of the most active areas in current metaphor research is *discourse-pragmatics*, particularly the subfield that studies how and why metaphors are used in speech.[16] A central question of this sub-field has to do with the distinction between metaphor and simile in linguistic expressions; in general, the traditional stylistic criteria that distinguish metaphor and simile are still valid when discussing the role of each in a cognitive framework, but metaphor researchers are divided as to whether similes should be classified as a subset of metaphor, or as a parallel phenomenon. The crux of the argument is the observation that metaphors tend to be presented as equivalences

15. Within the cognitive linguistics literature, scholars will sometimes make a distinction between *literary metaphors* and *cognitive metaphors*, with the understanding that the former is a specialized subset of the latter. Literary metaphors are also a subset of the available *linguistic metaphors*, which themselves are merely linguistic expressions of a cognitive structure. Further discussion can be found in Steen, *Understanding Metaphor in Literature*.

16. Most of the following is adapted from Glucksberg, "How metaphors create categories," and Croft and Cruse, *Cognitive Linguistics*, ch 8.

between concepts (X IS Y), while similes tend to express affinities between items (X IS LIKE Y). This distinction dates back to Aristotle's own classification of the two categories in his *Rhetoric*:

> τὸ γὰρ μανθάνειν ῥᾳδίως ἡδὺ φύσει πᾶσιν ἐστί, τὰ δὲ ὀνόματα σημαίνει τι, ὥστε ὅσα τῶν ὀνομάτων ποιεῖ ἡμῖν μάθησιν, ἥδιστα. αἱ μὲν οὖν γλῶτται ἀγνῶτες, τὰ δὲ κύρια ἴσμεν · ἡ δὲ μεταφορὰ ποιεῖ τοῦτο μάλιστα · ὅταν γὰρ εἴπῃ τὸ γῆρας καλάμην, ἐποίησεν μάθησιν καὶ γνῶσιν διὰ τοῦ γένους: ἄμφω γὰρ ἀπηνθηκότα. ποιοῦσιν μὲν οὖν καὶ αἱ τῶν ποιητῶν εἰκόνες τὸ αὐτό · διόπερ ἂν εὖ, ἀστεῖον φαίνεται. ἔστιν γὰρ ἡ εἰκών, καθάπερ εἴρηται πρότερον, μεταφορὰ διαφέρουσα προθέσει: διὸ ἧττον ἡδύ, ὅτι μακροτέρως · καὶ οὐ λέγει ὡς τοῦτο ἐκεῖνο · οὐκοῦν οὐδὲ ζητεῖ τοῦτο ἡ ψυχή.
> *(3.10.2-4)*
>
> *Easy learning is naturally pleasant to all, and words mean something, so that all words which make us learn something are most pleasant. Now we do not know the meaning of strange words, and proper terms we know already. It is metaphor, therefore, that above all produces this effect; for when [Homer] calls old age stubble, he teaches and informs us through the genus; for both have lost their bloom. The similes of the poets also have the same effect; wherefore, if they are well constructed, an impression of smartness is produced. For the simile, as we have said, is a metaphor differing only by the addition of a word, wherefore it is less pleasant because it is longer; it does not say that this is that, so that the mind does not even examine this.*

Aristotle's key point is that a simile (εἰκών) differs from a metaphor because οὐ λέγει ὡς τοῦτο ἐκεῖνο (*it does not say that this is that*), a distinction that is maintained in modern theory by classifying similes into two general categories: *category inclusion statements* and *feature comparison statements*. Category inclusion statements make a claim about the *conceptual* relationship between two concepts, whereas feature comparison statements merely identify points of similarity between two entities: exactly the difference between saying *X is Y* and *X is like Y*. Lexical metaphors are by definition category inclusion statements, and Aristotle's remark that similes are simply "longer" (μακροτέρως) than metaphors alludes to a significant pragmatic difference between the two kinds of expression: similes are lexically marked as figurative language (e.g., by adverbs, such as *like*, *as*, ὡς, ὥστε, etc.). This lexical marking makes similes problematic,

and it is sometimes difficult to determine what kind of statement a simile may be making.[17] To make the matter clearer, consider the following examples:

(4) a. John is like his brother.
b. John is like a lion.

(5) a. An apple is like an orange.
b. An apple is like the sun.

Examples (4a) and (5a) differ from (4b) and (5b) in the relationship each statement posits between its respective elements. The (a) examples are comparison statements, and so describe only the most obvious characterizing elements shared by the concepts present in each simile. For example, in (4a), we cannot immediately say whether John is like his brother in appearance, or character, temperament, etc., but we can be confident that an association of this type is intended. Similarly, in (5a), it is likely that the basic descriptors common to round fruits are being invoked, and not a deeper metaphysical meaning. These comparison statements make no deep relational claim, and do not reflect any cognitive mapping between the described concepts.

Contrast this with the associations developed in the (b) examples, which make statements that are more abstract, and thus more semantically rich than those of the (a) examples. While the feature characteristics of each (b) example are still important—primarily for establishing the aptness of each comparison—these basic characteristics are not what make the statements truly meaningful. Thus, to say *An apple is like the sun* is to make a statement about neither apples nor the sun, but (depending on context) the nature of life, or vegetal growth, or the seasons, or whatever. So with (4a), the semantic focus of the sentence is the ferocity or physical power that John possesses, not John's leonine physique. Thus, these similes make category-inclusion statements about their compositional constituents, and stake a claim as to what abstract concept both constituents represent. Similes of this variety (i.e., those that have dual reference)

17. Rich similes that make category inclusion statements may also make a less vigorous feature comparison statement, know as *dual reference*.

are generally classified as implicit metaphors, and can themselves be generated by cognitive metaphors active within a culture. Lexical similes and metaphors may also be generated by the same governing metaphor, making simile instances useful evidence for the existence of certain cognitive metaphors.

The distinction between comparison and inclusion statements will be relevant in the next chapter's discussion of Homeric simile and how it relates to non-figurative speech. Depending on one's disposition, Homeric simile could be classified as either of the two types; that is, when in *Iliad* xv Homer compares Hector to a sea wave, one could claim that he is making a feature comparison statement about the strength of both Hector and the wave, rather than a deeper metaphorical claim about the nature of strength itself. If, however, we can identify certain semantic trends in Homeric simile that restrict similes using certain elements like the *sea* or *fire* to certain narrative contexts, then we can surmise that the simile is in fact a category inclusion statement. Category inclusion statements are metaphors, and these in turn can be analyzed in an effort to determine the larger cognitive metaphor system that informs Homeric poetics.

The preceding discussion of the cognitive theory is meant to be a functional introduction only, and in many cases I have been forced to abbreviate otherwise subtle methodological issues. Despite significant research in the field, certain aspects of the cognitive metaphor theory still arouses considerable debate; I have made every effort to make my summary uncontroversial, but a few key assumptions (e.g., the longevity of semantic entailments) are unavoidably contentious. Moreover, I have not meant to imply that aesthetic theories of metaphor are without value, and that the cognitive approach is the only legitimate means of approaching metaphor. Rather, I believe that due to its independence from subjective aesthetic values it is the only viable means of doing *diachronic* analysis of metaphor, but for synchronic (or even comparative synchronic) work, aesthetic theories have clear value. I simply feel that the cognitive approach

is uniquely suited to working with fragmentary texts such as those in the Archaic Greek poetic canon, as the cognitive theory can help to mitigate the influence of the contextual lacunae that hinder thematic analysis of these texts. Establishing a baseline conceptual system against which to compare metaphor variants enables one to make credible statements about changes to the metaphor system as a whole, to identify new mappings that are introduced, and then to speculate on possible causes for the advent of these mappings. This is exactly the process I use when analyzing the *SoS* metaphor, beginning in the next chapter with my analysis of figurative language in Homer and Hesiod.

3 · Wind and Wave in Homeric Simile

3.1 · Origins of the 'Ship of State' Metaphor

3.1.1 Evolution of a metaphor

Despite its prominent reputation, the *Ship of State* metaphor appears only rarely in the corpus of Archaic Greek poetry, and *never* appears as a fully realized figure in the Homeric corpus.[1] This latter fact is interesting because so much of Greek poetry seems to echo 'Homeric' usage, whether because the lyric poets deliberately made allusion to Homer, or, as is more likely, because Archaic lyric and Homeric epic originated from chronologically and culturally parallel poetic traditions. In any case, tropes that appear in Archaic lyric often have Homeric analogues, and the absence of an *SoS* metaphor in Homer is all the more remarkable when we consider that the basic constituents of the figure (i.e., boats, wind, waves) themselves frequently occur in Homeric simile. I would suggest that the lack of a full *SoS* trope in Homer does not mean that the cognitive metaphors informing the figure are also absent in Homer; in fact, my argument in this paper is that a continuous metaphorical tradition generated the *SoS* and other sea metaphors in early Greek poetry as a whole. This can be demonstrated by a cognitive analysis of these metaphors, which will allow us to examine both the compositional elements that define them, as well as the semantic framework that consistently informs them.

1. I will give a more complete account of the metaphor's iterations in the following chapter.

Though I think my application of cognitive theory to this question is novel, I am certainly not the first to consider the matter of how the *SoS* metaphor originated. The best known prior theory comes from Denys Page, who in a discussion of Alcaeus' political poems noted the similarity between certain Homeric sea/storm similes and 'allegorical' storm descriptions in Archaic lyric, such as Archilochus fr.105:[2]

> Γλαῦχ', ὅρα · βαθὺς γὰρ ἤδη κύμασιν ταράσσεται
> πόντος, ἀμφὶ δ' ἄκρα Γυρέων ὀρθὸν ἵσταται νέφος,
> σῆμα χειμῶνος, κιχάνει δ' ἐξ ἀελπτίης φόβος.

Look, Glaucus! The deep sea is currently troubled with waves, and a cloud stands right around the heights of Gurae: the sign of a storm, and fear overtakes [me] suddenly.[3]

In turn, Page connects this to *Iliad* xv.381-84,

> οἳ δ', ὥς τε μέγα κῦμα θαλάσσης εὐρυπόροιο
> νηὸς ὑπὲρ τοίχων καταβήσεται, ὀππότ' ἐφείγηι
> ἵς ἀνέμου · ἡ γάρ μάλιστα γε κύματ' ὀφέλλει ·
> ὣς Τρῶες μεγάληι ἰαχῆι κατὰ τεῖχος ἔβαινον...κτλ.

And they, as a great wave of the wide-wandering sea will overwhelm the walls of a ship whenever the force of the wind drives [it], for it particularly aids the waves, so the Trojans rushed down on the wall with a great roar...

as well as to *Iliad* xv.623-629:

> αὐτάρ ὃ λαμπόμενος πυρὶ πάντοθεν ἔνθορ' ὁμίλῳ,
> ἐν δ' ἔπεσ', ὡς ὅτε κῦμα θοῇ ἐν νηὶ πέσῃσιν
> λάβρον ὑπὸ νεφέων ἀνεμοτρεφές · ἣ δέ τε πᾶσα
> ἄχνῃ ὑπεκρύφθη, ἀνέμοιο δὲ δεινὸς ἀήτης
> ἱστίῳ ἐμβρέμεται, τρομέουσι δέ τε φρένα ναῦται
> δειδιότες · τυτθὸν γὰρ ὑπὲκ θανάτοιο φέρονται ·
> ὣς ἐδαίζετο θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν Ἀχαιῶν.

But he shining with fire from all sides fell on the crowd, as when a raging wave falls on a fast ship, wind-fed by the clouds; the ship is entirely hidden by the foam, and the terrible gale of wind thunders against the sail. Fearing [in] their hearts, the sailors tremble, for they are only barely carried away from death. So the spirit in the breasts of the Achaeans was troubled.

2. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus*, p.181.
3. As mentioned in the Bibliographical Note, all translations from verse are my own.

Page explains the connection between the passages in this way:

> *The sea is among the commonest sources of imagery in Greek poetry from the earliest period to the latest. It is not a long step from a simile such as that in the fifteenth book of the* Iliad*...to the allegory in Archilochus, where the perils of war are described in terms of an impending storm at sea...And from this it is an easy progress to the Ship [sic] as a symbol for the State, or rather for a political party within the State...*[4]

While Page's point is broadly true—figurative and non-figurative descriptions of the sea clearly abound in Greek literature, and the thematic similarity between his chosen passages certainly suggests that they share some common theme between them—I am not convinced that the *SoS* trope developed in a linear fashion from Homer to Alcaeus. To be fair, Page's treatment of the metaphor is not extensive, and was likely not intended to comprise a complete analysis; regardless I would maintain that connecting the tropes based on similar compositional details only (e.g., boats, the sea) is not sufficient to tie them together thematically. Such a connection originates in the assumption that metaphorical mappings are plastic, and can be arbitrarily moved from one domain to another without disturbing a metaphor's core meaning, something we know to be false based on the data provided by cognitive linguists. As I discussed in Chapter 2, purely stylistic criteria are not sufficient grounds for positing a connection between metaphors; if the texts Page cites are all part of the same metaphor system, then we should be able to identify common thematic elements in each instance that would identify the metaphors as iterations of the same general cognitive metaphor.

A more immediate problem with the data that Page cites has to do with the semantic register of the various passages: whereas the Homeric similes compare entities with equal degrees of abstraction (i.e., Hector/the Trojans and sea-waves), the metaphor in Archilochus—if we assume it is a political or social metaphor—includes concepts that differ greatly in their general levels of abstraction (i.e., a gathering storm and civic unrest/a difficult civic situation). The theory

4. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus*, 181-182.

of simile presented in Section 2.2.2 makes clear that not all similes automatically correlate to a parallel metaphor, and so to not account for the disparate levels of abstraction in the source and target domains of the sea/storm passages Page cites is to not examine these passages (and their underlying metaphors) with any detail. The style of Homeric simile is so distinct, and so different in its composition from the type of metaphor seen in Archilochus 105, that it will be best to consider Homeric figurative language as a separate but parallel phenomenon to lyric metaphor. I will devote this chapter to an examination of Homeric simile, with an emphasis on figures that are possibly related to the *SoS* metaphor of Archaic lyric, while the next chapter will do the same for metaphors in Archaic lyric.

3.1.2 A non-metaphorical sea

Much of the difficulty in examining linguistic expressions of metaphor has to do with definition. The taxonomic rubrics of the cognitive theory assume that abstract and concrete (that is target and source) concepts will be apparent to a literary investigator, and while this assumption may be valid for critics working with corpora drawn from their own speech communities, its validity diminishes proportionately with a critic's temporal and epistemological distance from the culture of the texts in question. Redfield cautions that the assimilation of Classical texts into mainstream Western thought can cripple our understanding of those same texts due to their specious familiarity,[5] to which I would add that metaphoric statements are particularly difficult to assess, since a metaphor is by its nature semantically freer than a non-figurative statement. This is especially true when metaphors are considered in isolation, or by stylistic criteria only, because interpretation of discrete metaphor relies largely on cultural context. Relating individual metaphors to a larger cognitive schema can of course minimize this problem,

5. James M. Redfield, *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: the Tragedy of Hector* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975), xi.

because individual metaphors—rather than being compared to one another—are compared to an aggregate cognitive metaphor that provides a semantic baseline for their assessment.

At its most basic, a metaphoric statement is a speech act with a supra-literal semantic constituent, in that the meaning of the metaphoric phrase is richer than the literal sum of its constituent parts. An auditor who accurately comprehends an instance of the *SoS* metaphor (i.e., THE CIVIC GOVERNMENT IS A SHIP ON THE OCEAN) knows that the point of the trope is not boats or the ocean, or even civic government, but rather a specific viewpoint on civic government that insists on its instability and the need for it to be properly guided. The apprehension of such a complex concept, according to the cognitive theory, relies on the semantic *mappings* draw between the source and target concepts that comprise the metaphor. It should come as no surprise, then, that to understand a metaphor which originates outside of one's native culture (or even outside of one's indigenous speech community), it is necessary to consider the non-figurative semantics of the otherwise metaphorical vocabulary. Even seemingly non-figurative uses of concepts that occur in a certain cognitive metaphor system *may still be influenced by that system*, depending on how powerfully it has determined the semantics of its mapped terms.[6] For our investigation of the *SoS* metaphor, we need to consider how winds, waves, and the sea are generally treated in non-figurative description, in order to discern any semantic trends guiding the depiction of these terms.

The source domains of the *SoS* metaphor, and of the related figures that Page cites, are seafaring and the sea, entities that appear frequently throughout Greek literature. The larger question of how the Greeks conceived of the sea deserves more attention than I can devote to it in this paper, but I believe that a few clear examples of non-figurative wind and wave imagery will broadly illustrate any semantic trends that attend these elements in Archaic Greek texts.

6. So, using the examples from Chapter 2, the concept of *love* is never totally divorced from its various conditioning metaphors, and the idea will always bear the semantics of those metaphors with it.

Specifically, I believe that the sea has a largely negative connotation in early Greek literature, and that depictions of the sea in Greek poetry tend to dwell on the storminess and unpredictability of the ocean. There are several clear examples of this not only in Homer, which I will address in a moment, but also in Hesiod, whose poetry is often considered to be similar in age to Homer's, and like Homeric epic, was likely the product of an oral tradition.[7] If the works attributed to Homer and Hesiod were orally composed and performed for generally the same audiences, we can assume that the works of both poets share a common 'conceptual vocabulary' that expresses a similar set of underlying cognitive metaphors.

With these assumptions established, it is interesting to consider Hesiod's notorious advice on seafaring, which can be summarized as *Don't do it, and if you do, don't do it often.* Hesiod's remarks occur roughly in the middle of the *Works & Days* (during the so-called *Nautilia*, 618-694), and ends with the injunction (*Works and Days* 689-91):

μηδ᾽ ἐν νηυσὶν ἅπαντα βίον κοίλῃσι τίθεσθα,
ἀλλὰ πλέω λείπειν, τὰ δὲ μείονα φορτίζεσθαι.
δεινὸν γὰρ πόντου μετὰ κύμασι πήματι κύρσαι.

Do not put your livelihood in hollow ships, but leave most behind and load the smaller, for it is a terrible thing to find misery among the waves of the sea.

The final sentiment of this passage (δεινὸν γὰρ πόντου μετὰ κύμασι πήματι κύρσαι) informs all of Hesiod's statements on sailing (e.g., lines 645, 666, 670-676, etc.), as the capriciousness and menace of the ocean are at variance with the poem's nominal purpose of explaining how a knowledge of everything's 'proper season' (694) can partially mitigate life's difficulty. Broadly speaking, Hesiod believes that moderation, control, and restraint from strife are essential for a good life, (e.g., 27-29, 349-355, etc.), and the sea lacks all of these qualities. The sea's capriciousness defines it for Hesiod, and even during the καιρὸς ἄριστος for sailing (late summer), the sea is dangerous (663-677):

7. See Hesiod and West, *Works & Days*, in particular pp.25-33, for a discussion of PIE 'wisdom poetry' and Hesiodic oral poetics.

ἤματα πεντήκοντα μετὰ τροπὰς ἠελίοιο,
ἐς τέλος ἐλθόντος θέρεος καματώδεος ὥρης,
ὡραῖος πέλεται θνητοῖς πλόος· οὔτε κε νῆα
καυάξαις οὔτ᾽ ἄνδρας ἀποφθείσειε θάλασσα,
εἰ δὴ μὴ πρόφρων γε Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων
ἢ Ζεὺς ἀθανάτων βασιλεὺς ἐθέλῃσιν ὀλέσσαι·
ἐν τοῖς γὰρ τέλος ἐστὶν ὁμῶς ἀγαθῶν τε κακῶν τε.
τῆμος δ᾽ εὐκρινέες τ᾽ αὖραι καὶ πόντος ἀπήμων·
εὔκηλος τότε νῆα θοὴν ἀνέμοισι πιθήσας
ἑλκέμεν ἐς πόντον φόρτον τ᾽ ἐς πάντα τίθεσθαι,
σπεύδειν δ᾽ ὅττι τάχιστα πάλιν οἶκόνδε νέεσθαι·
μηδὲ μένειν οἶνόν τε νέον καὶ ὀπωρινὸν ὄμβρον
καὶ χειμῶν᾽ ἐπιόντα Νότοιό τε δεινὰς ἀήτας,
ὅστ᾽ ὤρινε θάλασσαν ὁμαρτήσας Διὸς ὄμβρῳ
πολλῷ ὀπωρινῷ, χαλεπὸν δέ τε πόντον ἔθηκεν.

Fifty days after the solstice of the sun, when the toilsome season of summer is come to a close, [that] is the appropriate sailing-time for mortals. Then you will not wreck your boat, nor will the sea destroy men, unless of course Poseidon the earthshaker is eager, or Zeus the king of the immortals should wish to destroy [them]; for these have the outcome of both good and evil things. But at that time the winds are well-ordered and the sea is kind, and then without care, trusting in the winds drag your swift ship into the sea and place all your cargo into it, but hurry as quick as is possible to return again home. Do not wait for the new wine or the late-summer rain, and the threatening storm and the terrible gales of Notos, who accompanies the great late-summer rain of Zeus and riles the sea, and makes the ocean treacherous.

According to Hesiod, during periods when the sea by itself will not destroy those sailors who venture out (681), it is possible that πρόφρων γε Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων/ἢ Ζεὺς ἀθανάτων βασιλεὺς ἐθέλῃσιν ὀλέσσαι (667-78). Poseidon's general domain is water, and among his many other roles, Zeus is often associated with storms and violent weather events (e.g., thunder, lightning), and the combined power of the two gods in this passage represents the combined, treacherous potential of the sea and sea storms.[8] Hesiod's warning against this power, even during times of natural calm, indicates his deep unease at the destructive potential of the sea and wind together; anyone taking advantage of the sailing season must be hasty or else the

8. There are numerous examples in Greek literature of each god operating in these domains; for Poseidon and a violent sea, see Odysseus' 'fight' with Poseidon in Bk.v of the *Odyssey*. For another poet's invocation of Zeus' power to control storms, see Solon 13.

winds and storms will overtake him (675-77), and Hesiod's concern for such an eventuality further reinforces the sense that the sea is fickle and untrustworthy. As we shall see, fear of the wind/wave combination is common in Greek poetry, and I believe that the frequent literary expression of this fear is good evidence for some kind of cognitive metaphor that uses sea and storm imagery in its source domains.[9]

Hesiod's warning against seafaring and his fear of the sea's violent nature appears to be literal and not metaphorical; indeed, it is difficult to find a Greek text with less overt metaphor than the *Works and Days*, a didactic poem whose advice—whether valid or no—is at least framed as being intended for practical application.[10] We might expect that the literalness of Hesiod's language would perhaps place the *Works & Days* on a different semantic register than the proverbially heroic and elevated Homeric epics, and it is conceivable that Hesiod's poem, being from a more 'practical' poetic genre, might characterize the sea differently from how it is characterized in Homer.[11] Such is not the case, however, and the general conception of the ocean as a destructive, capricious force is also maintained in the *Odyssey*, where the sea's violence is a major plot device. The most famous intrusion of the sea into the story occurs when Poseidon raises a storm to delay Odysseus' return home, shortly after his departure from Calypso's island. Being caught in the tempest, Odysseus laments a fate that—in his judgement—is far worse than that of his comrades who died at Troy (*Odyssey* v.295-312):

295 σὺν δ᾽ Εὖρός τε Νότος τ᾽ ἔπεσον Ζέφυρός τε δυσαὴς

9. One could object to this argument, at least in reference to the *Works and Days*, by pointing out that Hesiod maintains a generally pessimistic view of nearly everything that he writes about, making his depiction of the sea nothing but a 'commonplace.' Such commonplaces are impossible, however, without some kind of supporting conceptual structure; Hesiod's opinions are implicitly shaped by the values of the community for which he is writing.

10. I should note that the scarcity of obvious metaphorical figures in Hesiod has not stopped critics from finding metaphor and allegory in the text. For a figurative reading of the *Nautilia*, see Ralph M. Rosen, "Poetry and Sailing in Hesiod's 'Works and Days'," *Classical Antiquity* 9, no. 1 (1990): pp. 99–113.

11. This genre distinction is overly reductive, and makes little or no account of how the Hesiodic and Homeric oral-poetic traditions may have been related. While I am aware that significant work has been done in this area, consideration of space force me to bypass these questions, as interesting as they may be. My analysis assumes that the poetry of Hesiod and Homer was created by a common oral poetic tradition.

καὶ Βορέης αἰθρηγενέτης, μέγα κῦμα κυλίνδων.
καὶ τότ᾽ Ὀδυσσῆος λύτο γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ,
ὀχθήσας δ᾽ ἄρα εἶπε πρὸς ὃν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν·
"ὤ μοι ἐγὼ δειλός, τί νύ μοι μήκιστα γένηται;
δείδω μὴ δὴ πάντα θεὰ νημερτέα εἶπεν,
ἥ μ᾽ ἔφατ᾽ ἐν πόντῳ, πρὶν πατρίδα γαῖαν ἱκέσθαι,
ἄλγε᾽ ἀναπλήσειν· τὰ δὲ δὴ νῦν πάντα τελεῖται.
οἷοισιν νεφέεσσι περιστέφει οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν
Ζεύς, ἐτάραξε δὲ πόντον, ἐπισπέρχουσι δ᾽ ἄελλαι
παντοίων ἀνέμων. νῦν μοι σῶς αἰπὺς ὄλεθρος.
τρὶς μάκαρες Δαναοὶ καὶ τετράκις, οἳ τότ᾽ ὄλοντο
Τροίῃ ἐν εὐρείῃ χάριν Ἀτρεΐδῃσι φέροντες.
ὡς δὴ ἐγώ γ᾽ ὄφελον θανέειν καὶ πότμον ἐπισπεῖν
ἤματι τῷ ὅτε μοι πλεῖστοι χαλκήρεα δοῦρα
Τρῶες ἐπέρριψαν περὶ Πηλεΐωνι θανόντι.
τῷ κ᾽ ἔλαχον κτερέων, καί μευ κλέος ἦγον Ἀχαιοί·
νῦν δέ λευγαλέῳ θανάτῳ εἵμαρτο ἁλῶναι."

The East, and the South winds, the ill-blowing West and the heaven-born North winds rushed together roiling a great wave, and then Odysseus went weak in his knees and his dear heart. Terrified, he spoke to his own heroic spirit: 'Ah for me, a wretched man—what will happen to me? I fear all that the infallible goddess said, she who claimed that before I reached my homeland by sea I would have my fill of misery; now it all is happening. Zeus wreaths the broad sky with such clouds, he's disturbed the sea, and the storm winds of all the clouds are raging: now my destruction is certain. The Danaans who died on Troy's broad plain doing service to Atreus' sons are three and four times blessed; if only I had died and met my fate on that day when so many Trojans hurled their bronze spears at me, around the dead son of Peleus. Then I would have gotten funeral gifts, and the Achaeans would have celebrated my honor. But now it is decreed [that I] be taken by a wretched death."

There are several things to note in this passage. The first is Odysseus' reaction to Poseidon's attack, for if we accept his words literally, this moment in the poem is the worst for him since leaving for the war, in that it brings him to such a pitch of despair that he would prefer an early death to death at sea. The ignominy of dying at sea and losing *kleos* is exacerbated by the ferocity of the storm and Odysseus' complete inability to counter it; normally so resourceful, Odysseus is reduced to bitterly complaining about his fate. In fact, his claim ὡς δὴ ἐγώ γ᾽ ὄφελον θανέειν καὶ πότμον ἐπισπεῖν (*that I would rather have died and met my fate*, v.308) is

nearly the opposite of Achilles' in Book XI that he "would rather be a servant of another man of small means" than to "rule over all the perished dead" (XI.489-91), in that both comments define the heroic world of the *Odyssey* in comparison to that of the *Iliad*.[12] The narrative engine of the *Odyssey* is Odysseus' *nostos*, and thus to have the poem's hero abjure his return home is to have him refute the logic of the poem as a whole. The scene, through Odysseus' despair, amply illustrates the tremendous power of the wind and sea, and the horrible drowning death that Odysseus laments (V.312) is the same fate which Hesiod warns against in the *Works and Days*.

Both Hesiod and Homer express a horror for death by drowning, and if we assume that this thematic concern reflects a fear common to the *audience* of the poems, then I do not think it is too much to claim that the sea was an object of fear for many Greeks. Lindenlauf supports this claim with a certain amount of material evidence, adducing that the sea's use as a final dumping ground for dangerous or polluted objects defines the sea as an 'Other' place that was regarded with fear or concern.[13] Specifically, she proposes that the Greeks considered the sea a sinister 'nether domain,' separate and inaccessible from the land, and though much of her evidence is circumstantial, or based on textual interpretation of material finds, in combination with the literary evidence already mentioned Lindenlauf's findings offer good support for the theory that the sea was an object of fear for most Greeks. If true, then it seems likely that this fear was part of a cognitive mapping that equated the sea (and sea storms) with danger and disruption.

This mapping can be further demonstrated by examining another significant moment in the *Odyssey* passage quoted above: when Poseidon raises a storm against Odysseus *despite* the "favorable breeze" Calypso provided for the hero as he was departing her island (V.268), a

12. This conclusion, though no doubt mentioned elsewhere, is famously discussed in Gregory Nagy, *The best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979).

13. Astrid Lindenlauf, "The Sea as a Place of No Return in Ancient Greece," *World Archaeology* 35, no. 3 (2003): 416–433.

situation that reminds us of Hesiod's warning against Zeus and Poseidon's power to disturb the sea at will (*W&D* 667-8). Poseidon's intervention reinforces the impression that the sea is dangerous and not to be trusted; the god's anger (that is, the power of sea and storm) is not only powerful enough to overcome Calypso's magic, it seems nearly powerful enough to stymie Odysseus' prophesied return home. Furthermore, when the storm first begins to rage, Odysseus blames Zeus rather than Poseidon for "covering the broad sky with clouds…and disturbing the sea" (v.304-5). Though we could dismiss this as a textual error or even the result of an oral formula, we should remember that Hesiod also characterizes Zeus as a deity with the power to suddenly change the temper of an otherwise calm sea. It is the power of Zeus and Poseidon together in their roles as elemental deities that is most frightening and dangerous for Hesiod and Homer.

That Zeus and Poseidon—representing storm and sea—each possess such power in Greek myth and literature suggests that Greek anxiety over seafaring and sea storms was not restricted to these natural domains individually, but also to their power when acting in concert. This observation is crucial to my later reconstruction of how wind and sea images influenced the development of the *SoS* metaphor, and I will return to it frequently, always with the conclusion that both figurative and non-figurative conceptions of wind and wave in early Greek poetry presuppose a certain menace or danger. As Hesiod makes clear, seafaring was a risky, somewhat unnatural business, and anxiety over storm conditions was no doubt ever present in the minds of those early Greeks who depended upon the sea for sustenance and material support. Even individuals living inland would have been familiar with the sea, if only by reputation, and engagement with pan-Hellenic artistic and linguistic traditions would have transmitted any cognitive metaphors involving maritime semantic domains to people who had seen the sea only rarely or not at all.

I do not mean to imply, however, that the above analysis describes the totality of Greek conceptions regarding wind and wave; these common concepts were certainly polysemous, a trait inherent to most productive source domain concepts. It is enough for my subsequent argument to note the apprehension and fear that wind and wave scenes elicit, even in non-figurative descriptions.[14] I would suggest that the consistently negative depiction of the sea in Greek poetry—particularly in its association with the worst qualities of two elemental deities—indicates the presence of *some* kind of cognitive metaphor. This is not to say that the sea was never positively depicted, or that Greeks could not love sailing, but the extreme horror that Homer and Hesiod express when they describe drowning and being caught in a sea storm has a certain semantic continuity that is inexplicable if not anchored to some deeper semantic frame. That this frame is indeed a cognitive metaphor will become apparent during my examination of Homeric *Wind and Wave* similes.

3.2 · ASPECTS OF HOMERIC SIMILE

3.2.1 The cognitive theory and Homeric simile

As was discussed in Section 2.2.2, the cognitive theory distinguishes two broad categories of simile: those that make category inclusion statements, and those that make feature comparison statements. Category inclusion similes are equivalent to lexical expressions of a cognitive metaphor (that is, literary metaphors), thus the statement *Love is like a journey* would be functionally equivalent to the metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY, while the statement *Love is like anger* would not necessarily be equivalent to the metaphor LOVE IS ANGER. The first example establishes a categorical equivalence between two concepts and implies a series of metaphorical mappings necessary for maintaining that equivalence, all of them governed by a definable metaphor system.

14. For an extensive, non-cognitive examination of wind (not wave) imagery in Homer, see Alex C. Purves, "Wind and Time in Homeric Epic," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 140, no. 2 (2010): 323–350.

In the second example, the comparison *Love is like anger* establishes only a superficial relationship between two concepts, namely, that each is an emotion.[15] The implied metaphor (LOVE IS ANGER), on the other hand, makes a much more profound, albeit abstract, statement concerning the *nature* of love, one that significantly affects a person's understanding of the metaphor's target domain. The two statements are not functionally equivalent in the way that category inclusion similes and their implied metaphors are. The majority of similes in literature are of the category inclusion type, meaning that metaphors derived from them should have the same general meaning even when rephrased and fitted into a larger framework of conceptual metaphor; so long as a Homeric simile is of the category inclusion type (and nearly all of them are), it can be analyzed according the cognitive model.

To demonstrate this process, consider the simile from *Iliad* xv.381-84, which I discussed briefly in 3.1.1, and reprint here for convenience:

> οἳ δ', ὥς τε μέγα κῦμα θαλάσσης εὐρυπόροιο
> νηὸς ὑπὲρ τοίχων καταβήσεται, ὀππότ' ἐφείγηι
> ἶς ἀνέμου · ἦ γάρ μάλιστα γε κύματ' ὀφέλλει ·
> ὣς Τρῶες μεγάληι ἰαχῆι κατὰ τεῖχος ἔβαινον.
>
> *And they, as a great wave of the wide-wandering sea will overwhelm the walls of a ship whenever the force of the wind drives [it], for it particularly aids the waves, so the Trojans rushed down on the wall with a great roar...*

In this passage, the Trojans are compared to a 'great wave' that crashes over a ship, but a perceptive reader knows implicitly that it is not the weight or wetness of the wave to which the Trojans are being compared, but the destructive potential and incredible force of the sea and wind. According to the cognitive theory, this simile makes a category inclusion statement rather than a comparison statement, and the underlying metaphor could be categorized as THE ATTACK OF THE TROJANS IS A SEA STORM, which itself relies on the conceptual metaphor WIND AND SEA ARE A

15. Even if the comparison were extended to shared features of each emotion—e.g., that each can be sudden, that each can change one's behavior or compel irrational behavior—these features are still predicated by the dominant feature of *emotion*.

DESTRUCTIVE FORCE. The internal details of the simile can be construed as the structural mappings of the controlling metaphor: the 'great cry' of the Trojans is equivalent to the pounding of surf, the Trojans are the crashing wave, etc. Less transparent is what the force of the wind (ἶς ἀνέμου, XV.383) maps to, as this detail appears not so much a constituent mapping of the established metaphor and more an illustrating detail included to fill out the narrative of the simile. It could be argued that the 'force' compelling the wind is somehow equivalent to the anger or battle lust driving the Trojans, but the allusion to wind is embedded within the narrative of the simile, and does more to describe the source domain concept of the wave than the target domain concept of the attacking Trojans. It is difficult to justify the detail without appealing to a narratological or performative rationale, and it is clear that this simile (and others like it) are not readily described by the simplistic version of the cognitive theory that I have presented thus far. To better account for the peculiarities of Homeric simile and its relationship with the *SoS*, we need to further refine our understanding of how similes and metaphors are realized lexically, particularly in the unique context of oral poetry.

3.2.2 Oral-poetic theory and Homeric simile

The simile example in *Iliad* XV.381-4 illustrates the most notable problem encountered when applying the cognitive theory to real world metaphors: extraneous, unmappable narrative detail. Croft and Cruse have observed that, in general, productive cognitive metaphors avoid mappings or conceptual domains with rich imagistic detail, as such detail makes a given metaphor more specific and therefore less available for interpretation.[16] I mentioned in Section 2.1.4 that sophisticated conceptual metaphors are composed of progressively less complex *orientational metaphors* and *image schemas*, which themselves are nearly devoid of imagistic detail, and thus

16. Croft and Cruse, *Cognitive Linguistics*, ch 8. This can be illustrated by considering the differences between the metaphors LIFE IS A JOURNEY and LIFE IS A JOURNEY DOWN A RUTTED COUNTRY ROAD LINED WITH FLOWERS THAT ULTIMATELY LEADS TO A NICE PICNIC SPOT. Though silly, the latter example is unarguably less productive than the former.

more semantically available. Literary similes and metaphors, on the other hand, abound with detail and as a result their core mappings are sometimes difficult to determine. This is particularly true of Homer, whose similes sometimes use so many imagistic and narrative details that the trope's figurative frame will be obscured and the simile itself will become a parallel, embedded narrative. The famous simile of the Cranes and the Pygmies from *Iliad* III.1-9 is an example of this phenomenon:[17]

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κόσμηθεν ἅμ᾽ ἡγεμόνεσσιν ἕκαστοι,
Τρῶες μὲν κλαγγῇ τ᾽ ἐνοπῇ τ᾽ ἴσαν ὄρνιθες ὡς
ἠΰτε περ κλαγγὴ γεράνων πέλει οὐρανόθι πρό·
αἵ τ᾽ ἐπεὶ οὖν χειμῶνα φύγον καὶ ἀθέσφατον ὄμβρον,
κλαγγῇ ταί γε πέτονται ἐπ᾽ ὠκεανοῖο ῥοάων,
ἀνδράσι Πυγμαίοισι φόνον καὶ κῆρα φέρουσαι·
ἠέριαι δ᾽ ἄρα ταί γε κακὴν ἔριδα προφέρονται.
οἳ δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἴσαν σιγῇ μένεα πνείοντες Ἀχαιοὶ
ἐν θυμῷ μεμαῶτες ἀλεξέμεν ἀλλήλοισιν.

But when each man had been arranged together with their leaders, the Trojans advanced with a clamor and a cry, like birds, as when the shriek of cranes rises skyward after they flee the winter and the incredible rains, and with a cry they fly to the streams of the ocean. They bring death and destruction to the Pygmy Men, and in the morning they carry before themselves ruinous battle. But the Achaeans, breathing strength, went in silence, eager in their hearts to defend one-another.

Muellner asks, "What does such a simile signify?",[18] an apt question if ever there was one. Though the richness of the simile's detail allows for a variety of interpretations and certainly makes for an entertaining picture of the Trojan host, the complex parallel narrative can easily displace a reader's attention from the main narrative of the poem, prompting us to question the value of including such a disruptive figure. Moreover, the source and target mappings of the simile are difficult to puzzle out: the most obvious association is something like *The Trojans are like cranes attacking Pygmies, the Achaeans are like the Pygmies being attacked*; this interpretation

17. For a discussion of how imagistic detail restricts metaphorical meaning, see, again, Croft and Cruse, ch 8. For a more philological viewpoint, see Minchin's discussion in Minchin, ch 4.

18. Leonard Muellner, "The Simile of the Cranes and Pygmies: a Study of Homeric Metaphor," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 93 (1990): 59.

is belied, however, by the final two lines (III.8-9), which describe the Achaeans as 'breathing strength' while they advance to battle, 'eager in their hearts to defend one-another.' Of course, we could just as well assume that the Pygmies, like the Achaeans, were steadfast when attacked by the cranes, though this detail is absent in the simile. The figure as a whole displays little internal logic, especially when compared with the more unified *Wind and Wave* examples cited at the beginning of this chapter.

Purely philological opinions of problem similes like *Iliad* III.1-9 tend to break along the question of how much importance to give to the extraneous details of the simile. Those who consider the details important often rationalize the opacity of a simile's difficult mappings, as Muellner does:

> *[n]o special pleading is necessary to excuse or explain away the putative irrelevance of epic metaphors. It is the by-product of our distance from an expressive language that was just a given, just a tacit conspiracy of thought and expression entered into by poet and society from which neither could or would escape. In fact, the clearest token of the traditionality [sic] of the epic metaphors is that the relation between tenor and vehicle in them is not always transparent. Not only is it fruitful to assume that no detail of a given simile is irrelevant, but it is also plain that a narrative sequence at least as long as a book can be ruled by a consistent set of metaphors and figure.*[19]

I readily concede that as modern readers some aspect of Homeric (that is, oral-poetic) aesthetics may escape us, but even so it is not the obscurity of certain Homeric figures that I find puzzling, but their *specificity*. Explaining away the difficulty of such images as being the result of cultural ignorance feels like a dodge, and one that I think is incompatible with the larger aim of Classical study. If a metaphor system is to be productive, it has to be consistent and pervasive (though not necessarily *logical*), and even obscure similes should have mappings that can be found in other similes of similar type. This is not to say that the Homeric corpus is perfect and necessarily includes an example of every possible simile from every cognitive metaphor that

19. Muellner, "The Simile of the Cranes and the Pygmies," 98.

existed when the poems were composed; it would be an extraordinary coincidence if this were true. We can expect a few statistical outliers with no known parallels—indeed, the Cranes and Pygmies may be such a case—but it is very likely that the demotic roots of 'Homeric' poetry would have acted to level the semantics of the figures used in oral compositions in order that it be broadly intelligible to a Greek audience.[20] Moreover, and as I will discuss in the next section, the Cranes and Pygmies simile is *not* that different from other similes in Homer, insofar as birds are a common subject of Homeric simile. Moreover, it is a slippery slope to begin dismissing unaccountable details due to cultural ignorance, and one could just as easily claim that critics have misunderstood *all* of the simile's mappings. While Muellner's point may have some validity, it cannot be applied methodically, and thus does more harm than good.

In her study of memory and oral poetic technique, Minchin argues against Muellner's approach and instead favors another common technique for dealing with problem mappings: to simply ignore them. Minchin emphasizes the pragmatics of oral-poetic composition and performance, and gives particular attention to the physical and cognitive challenges attendant to long-form oral composition. Minchin believes that the pragmatic circumstances of an oral performance would have limited an oral poet's ability to produce internally consistent compositions:[21]

> *[w]hen the poet extends his simile through narrative, what he offers is, as it were, a commentary on the scene which runs in the cinema of his mind's eye. The words and phrases he requires for his song will be stimulated by the images themselves as the small scene he is viewing unfolds...The storyteller, furthermore, may choose whether he will compress his narrative, alluding only to the principal elements of the story from which the simile is drawn, or whether he will expand it with detail...*[22]

20. Remember the example from Frost in Section 2.2.1. The details of Frost's 'new' metaphor would not have been intelligible if they did not square with an extant system of cognitive metaphors.

21. Elizabeth Minchin, *Homer and the resources of memory* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), ch 4.

22. Ibid., 151.

Minchin's argument depends upon several key assumptions about the nature of oral-poetic practice, which, to save time, I will summarize: similes are functional units designed to explicate the narrative into which they are inserted, and similes in Homer are shaped by traditional oral-poetic usage. Repetition of certain figures in the Homeric corpus suggests that, as with common epithets and phrasal constituents, the composition of similes was to some degree predetermined, but a poet's skill in manipulating and integrating such elements would have determined the artistic success of a poetic composition.[23] Most importantly, Minchin believes that extended narrative similes like the Cranes and Pygmies story, or the account of Menelaos' wound in *Iliad* IV.141-47, are "similes which overshoot the mark," in that they are possible examples of a moment when an embedded narrative got away from an oral compositor. She speculates that "it may happen on occasion that [the poet] takes the narrative of his simile beyond the point which he has reached in the narrative proper, with the result that simile ceases to be relevant...confusing the audience and overshadowing the action of the main narrative."[24] Minchin's argument is exactly the opposite of Muellner's, and rather than classifying a simile's inexplicable details as inaccessible cultural ephemera, she believes that they are inconsequential artifacts of narrative abandon.

In some ways, Minchin's explanation is no more satisfying than Muellner's, since she relies on a similarly arbitrary mechanism to explain certain difficult similes. Her explanation also implies that Homer (or oral poets in general) strove for some unity of artistic effect on par with that achieved in later *literary* compositions. Such a conclusion is vigorously contested by a

23. Such a position is promoted to varying degrees in: William C. Scott, *The Artistry of the Homeric Simile* (Hanover, N.H.: Dartmouth College Library / Dartmouth College Press ; Published by University Press of New England, 2009); John Miles Foley, *Homer's Traditional Art* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999); M. N. Nagler, *Spontaneity and tradition: a study in the oral art of Homer* (University of California Press, 1974); and Minchin, *Homer and the resources of memory*, as well as others. For a brief but comprehensive overview of the Oral-Poetic Theory's development, see John Miles Foley, *The Theory of Oral Composition: History and Methodology* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988).

24. Minchin, *Homer and the resources of memory*, 151.

number of scholars, Bakker and Foley most notably, and perhaps undervalues the skill of an oral poet by assuming that any inaccessible detail must be the result of a lapse in his performance.[25] To her credit, however, Minchin's theory humanizes the process of oral composition, and strictly speaking, her theory is no less credible than Muellner's supposition that the oral poet of the Homeric epics maintained explicit control over his entire poem. Minchin's theory also licenses us to pare away confusing details from an extended simile in order to consider the essential structure of the underlying trope, whereas Muellner's position demands that every simile be considered as a whole, regardless of inexplicable detail. Muellner's position—if I understand it correctly—is incompatible with the cognitive theory of metaphor, in that cognitive metaphors are necessarily composed of smaller, more abstract metaphors, and need not always be internally consistent. Because I consider the cognitive theory to be valid and necessary for any real diachronic explanation of metaphor, I prefer the methodological flexibility of Minchin's approach for its tendency to favor larger thematic issues over the interpretation of smaller details.

The real value of the cognitive theory then is not in explaining the confusing details of simile usage, but in defining how simile and metaphor iterations demonstrate the broader semantic trends of a culture or speech community. Once a general mapping is established, obscure details in a simile can be integrated or discarded as is needed, and on a case-by-case basis. While the reason that simile mappings are obscure is no doubt an interesting pragmatic question, it is not wholly relevant to a diachronic examination of metaphor evolution that I am attempting in this paper. Indeed, it may be that the explanations of both Minchin and Muellner are correct: we can't possibly know every nuance of an ancient culture, and so some simile details must

25. See Egbert J. Bakker and Ahuvia Kahane, *Written Voices, Spoken Signs: Tradition, Performance, and the Epic Text* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997) and John Miles Foley, *Immanent Art: from Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991), respectively.

be obscure to us because of our ignorance. Similarly, the pragmatic conditions of oral performance must have had some effect on the integrity of orally composed works, again leading to obscure simile mappings. Either solution is likely and each yields essentially the same result, but analyzing a simile with the cognitive theory permits a critic to move beyond this debate and connect a problem simile with other figures that use similar source and target domains; in the Cranes and Pygmies example, one would need to look at other similes that have birds as subject (whether the birds are cranes may or may not be important, depending on the data), and then posit a general mapping for that entity when used as a source domain. This allows one to establish a semantic baseline for a simile group, and mapping variants can then be evaluated based on their deviance from this.[26] This is exactly the process that I have used so far in my examination of sea and storm similes, and I am fortunate that a good amount of scholarly work has already been done on the thematic classification of similes in Homer.

3.3 · COGNITIVE METAPHOR AND HOMERIC SIMILE

3.3.1 Simile families

Due to the ornate specificity of many Homeric similes, the easiest way to analyze them is by analyzing their larger thematic features. If we wish to determine what relationship wind and sea imagery in Homer has to the Archaic-era *Ship of State* metaphor, we must define the essential cognitive metaphor(s) underlying the Homeric usage of sea and storm similes, which can be accomplished only via a macro-level analysis of simile themes. That the similes of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* may be classified into thematic categories is not a new idea, and there is a considerable

26. So, in a theoretical analysis of Homeric bird similes we would need to consider what the usual mappings are (i.e., are they always the same birds? Do they always indicate warriors?), and then consider what *target* domains these mappings might be related to (i.e., birds are not inherently menacing, so why are they used to describe warriors? Does it emphasize speed and agility, or is there some peculiarly Greek idea that birds are aggressive?). Once these questions are considered, bird metaphors in other poetry can be worked into the system, etc.

body of scholarship in this area.[27] Every critic's approach is unique, though all tend to look for trends in the source and target domains of Homeric simile. For example, one might observe that the Cranes and Pygmies simile resembles the 'flocking forces' simile at *Iliad* II.459-68, and if other similes of this type are found, then one might propose a 'Bird and Battle' simile family which maps the image of a flock of birds onto a gathered military host. By analogy, the simile from *Iliad* XV.381-84 (the Trojans as crashing waves) might be considered a Wind and Wave simile, because it is thematically similar to the other nautical simile mentioned by Page (*Iliad* XV.624-629, Hector as sea-wave), and both together have features in common with a number of other Homeric sea and storm figures. The definitional criteria for such simile categories are necessarily general, and the discussion from the last section should make clear the difficulty of being too specific when determining the salient features of a simile classification. The process would work better if applied to a broader textual corpus, in which the statistical prominence or obscurity of an entity determines its probability of being a productive metaphor constituent. It is for this reason that the Cranes and the Pygmies simile is a Bird simile, rather than, say, a Pygmy simile: the number of similes in Homer having to do with birds is exponentially greater than the number having to do with Pygmies, and so 'bird' becomes the significant taxonomic element. It is possible, however, albeit unlikely, that Pygmy similes were exceedingly popular in early epic, and that Homer just happened to not use many of them. Cognitive analysis can help to mitigate the method's errors, however, because the dominant conceptual metaphors of a culture will determine what metaphor domains are productive and what are not. Productive similes should appear not only in literature but in everyday speech as well, and though we

27. For a brief discussion of prior theories, see William C. Scott, *The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile*. (Leiden: Brill, 1974), ch 1. For an attempted catalog of metaphor and simile types in all of Greek poetry, see Arthur Leslie Keith, "Simile and Metaphor in Greek Poetry: from Homer to Æschylus" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1914).

obviously cannot verify what 'everyday Greeks' talked about, we can examine metaphors across literary genres and authors, as I am trying to do with sea and storm similes.

The critic who has made the greatest effort to categorize Homeric simile in this way is William Scott, and his work is significant for its integration of thematic classification into the larger apparatus of the Oral Poetic Theory.[28] In essence, Scott postulates that oral poets had a stock of modular semantic constituents to complement the modular narrative, lexical, and phrasal components used in oral poetic composition. Like Minchin, Scott believes that the extended simile was an amalgam of individual artistry and received tradition, as revealed by the use of generic and specific elements in Homeric simile; Scott's work somewhat resembles that of Nagler and others who have examined the semantic circumstances of Homeric type-scenes and other constructs, but it differs in that Scott proposes that every class of Homeric simile had a distinct semantic identity. According to Scott, an oral poet introduced appropriate similes to his composition only when the constructed narrative demanded a specific emotional response from the audience, and all similes in Homer (and other oral-poetic narrative) were constructed around recurring, identifiable 'simile families' of known semantic value. The poet's skill and the familiar nature of the oral-poetic material enabled such a process, and the simile families proposed by Scott would have generated any number of appropriate iterations from a single 'head' metaphor. The head metaphors of each simile family would necessarily be drawn from the store of conceptual metaphors common to the speech-community of the poet's audience, and artistic meaning would be created in the tension between a simile's cognitive grounding and the iteration used by the poet.

Scott's analytical model focuses almost exclusively on usage, and to get around the problem of classifying complex similes involving many elements he proposes that thematic classification

28. The following is drawn jointly from Scott, *The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile*. and Scott, *Artistry of the Homeric Simile*.

rely in part on analysis of the narrative contexts in which simile types are found. For example, in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* tree similes "appear only in contexts describing a warrior who is either dead...about to die...or unmoving."[29] Thus according to Scott an oral poet would have used a tree simile only when the narrative called for an image of immobility, and for similar reasons, a tree simile would not be used to describe the ferocity of a warrior during his aristeia, or the quickness of a charioteer's horses. Scott ultimately coins the term *simileme* to describe the "mental structure underlying each simile," a structure that "in itself [is] not fully expressible, but [is] composed of repeated actions and objects and alternative modes of expression, all of which have become associated through frequent usage."[30] In the case of the tree simile, the 'simileme' underlying each simile variant is the notion of complete immobility, and it is this semantic concept that the poet composes with. The final composition of the simile is a pragmatic issue having to do with whatever sugar the poet can bring to it through a combination of his own poetic skill and phraseology he has inherited via the oral tradition, an idea not unlike Minchin's.

If Scott's theory sounds familiar, there is a reason: his proposed simile families (and the *simileme* concept in particular) are equivalent to Lakoff and Johnson's notion of cognitive metaphor. Both theories propose a foundational class of metaphors (or, in Scott's terminology, semantic concepts) that generate metaphoric variants of varying complexity and uniform core meaning. Scott is largely interested in the pragmatics of how similes were deployed and interpreted during a performance by an oral poet, but the generating concepts that his theory relies on perform the same function as Lakoff's conceptual metaphors. To illustrate, consider the previously mentioned family of tree-simile family: one might characterize the metaphor underlying this group of similes as TREES ARE IMMOVEABLE OBJECTS, and though such a mapping may seem

29. Scott, *Artistry of the Homeric Simile*, 23.

30. The term is made on analogy with other linguistic jargon that describes discrete compositional elements: lexeme, phoneme, morpheme, enthymeme, etc.

obvious—trees very rarely get up and walk about, after all—they do in fact *move*, as is noted in the many poems and songs that mention the swaying of trees in the wind. The mapping of trees to absolute immobility in the Homeric simile class is arbitrary, exactly as conceptual metaphors in the cognitive theory are thought to be arbitrary.[31] Although Scott himself does not relate his theory of simile families to the cognitive metaphor theory, he is aware of Lakoff's work, and I suspect his conclusions were to some degree shaped by the cognitive theory.[32] Regardless, I will consider the simile families that Scott identifies to be functionally equivalent to conceptual metaphors, and I will use Scott's data to establish the basic semantics of sea and storm similes in Homer. We can then compare these findings with those from the earlier discussion of non-figurative semantics of sea/storm imagery in Homer and Hesiod.

3.3.2 'Wind and Wave' similes in Homer

In his thematic catalogue of Homeric simile, Scott groups wind similes and wave similes together in a common *Wind and Wave* simile family, for reasons similar to those that I posited in Section 3.1.2. In that section's discussion of non-metaphorical wind/wave images in Hesiod and Homer, I observed that the concept of wind and the concept of sea were often semantically entangled, and that the one frequently influences the other. Indeed, it could be argued that the power of the sea is limited without the ἴς ἀνέμου to propel it, and the combined power of the two elements is showcased in a number of Homeric similes. Similarly, the apparent involvement of both Zeus and Poseidon in creating dangerous sea conditions suggests that wind and wave *in conjunction* form one conceptual domain in their simile family.[33] Based on these observations,

31. Interestingly, the TREES ARE IMMOVEABLE OBJECTS metaphor exists in English as well, generating expressions like *He was rooted to the spot* and *She slept like a log*.

32. Scott, *Artistry of the Homeric Simile*, n 6.

33. This is not to say that wind or wave elements cannot appear separately in metaphors/similes generated from the *Wind and Wave* simile family. Clearly, there are a number of Homeric similes that use only one of the two elements. I do believe, however, that even when they appear separately these elements to some degree imply the mapping common to them both, namely *disruption* or *danger*.

and after examining a number of these wind and wave instances in Homer, it seems clear that the common factor in wind and wave imagery is *destruction*, *disruption* or *danger*, and I propose a provisional mapping for the *Wind and Wave* simile family of WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE. I will consider further evidence for this mapping in a moment, but first I should point out that the cognitive theory of metaphor explicitly allows for combined and partial mappings. Current theory holds that cognitive metaphors, even very common ones, do not preclude new metaphors *related to an already described target domain* from being created, even if the mappings of those new metaphors contradict concepts in the pre-existing metaphors.[34] Therefore, it is theoretically possible for wind and wave metaphors to share a common target domain, even when realized in figures that exclude one or the other domain.[35] The upshot of all this is that wind and wave figures need not always include both wind and wave, and moreover, that *every* depiction of the sea need not be entirely negative. The negative semantic frame will be statistically significant, and its marked use in poetry and literature will also work to distinguish it.

A piece of circumstantial evidence supporting the WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE mapping is the metaphor's broad attestation in Western cultures. A related metaphor in English generates the expressions *There are dark clouds on the horizon*, *Don't let it rain on your parade*, and *Weathering the storm*. In his cross-cultural analysis of prominent conceptual metaphors, Lakoff has classified such expressions in a broader metaphorical category *external conditions are climate*, and suggests that these kinds of weather metaphors are exceedingly common.[36] Of course, these examples exclude the maritime element that is so common in the Greek examples, but I would

34. This principle was alluded to in section 2.1.3, during the discussion of various love metaphors. For more on incomplete mapping in metaphors, see Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, ch 11.

35. This is, of course, a general rule, which applies only to similes whose essential meaning is consistent with the WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE mapping. For discussions of wind and sea metaphors that with possible other mappings, see Purves, "Wind and Time in Homeric Epic" and Keith, "Simile and Metaphor in Greek Poetry," 25-26, 30-31, and infra.

36. George Lakoff, *Master Metaphor List* (Berkeley, Calif: University of California, 1994), 74.

maintain that the two groups are related, based on their generally negative semantic range and the prominence of poor weather as a conceptual domain; the *sea* mapping may very well be unique to the conceptual system of Ancient Greece.[37] Although the existence of the metaphor in modern speech communities does little to prove its existence in Archaic Greece 2800 years ago, we can perhaps take something from the fact that the metaphor is reasonably common in a variety of cultures, which gives strong *statistical* support for its possible existence in ancient Greek.

More convincing evidence for the metaphor's existence is found in Homer, though, and in closing this chapter I will examine a few passages that clearly demonstrate the WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE mapping.[38] The simile in the first example passage combines both sea and storm imagery (*Iliad* XI.304-9):

τοὺς ἄρ' ὅ γ' ἡγεμόνας Δαναῶν ἕλεν, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
πληθύν, ὡς ὁπότε νέφεα Ζέφυρος στυφελίξῃ
ἀργεστᾶο Νότοιο βαθείῃ λαίλαπι τύπτων·
πολλὸν δὲ τρόφι κῦμα κυλίνδεται, ὑψόσε δ' ἄχνη
σκίδναται ἐξ ἀνέμοιο πολυπλάγκτοιο ἰωῆς·
ὣς ἄρα πυκνὰ καρήαθ' ὑφ' Ἕκτορι δάμνατο λαῶν.

He killed those leaders of the Danaans, and after that the masses, as when the west wind strikes the clouds, battering [them] in the deep windstorm of the south wind: the great, well-fed wave rolls about, and the foam is scattered from on high from the blast of the rattling wind. In this way the close-packed heads of the soldiery were mowed down by Hector.

Though superficially similar to the simile in *Iliad* XV.624 (i.e., both similes describe Hector with wind and wave language, both depict Trojan domination of Greek forces, etc.), the above simile differs from the *Iliad* XV example in its oblique mapping of elements. Most significantly the focus of this simile is Ζέφυρος, the wind, and not κῦμα, though the wind accomplishes a similar, destructive end. Moreover, in the above example the wind does not directly animate

37. One of the avenues for expanding this project in the future would be analysis of Roman-era and Byzantine-era Greek texts for *Wind and Wave* tropes, and also to look for combined wind/wave figures in Sanskrit poetry.

38. The following are just a sample; for further detail, refer to Appendix A.1.

the waves, but instead batters the clouds (νέφεα...τύπτων) and it is only by inference that we recognize its influence on the sea. Even more interestingly, in this simile Hector is not mapped directly to either the wind or the sea, but we understand this mapping by its apposition to the relationship of lopped Achaean heads to drops of sea spray (307-9). In general, the mappings of this simile are quite oblique, particularly when compared to the more straightforward example in xv.381-4. What remains clear, though, is the power and disruptive force of the wind and the sea; I would argue that the only absolutely *clear* image in the simile is that of a chaotic ocean storm, and that if the WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE mapping were not active, no meaning could be inferred from the simile, as the mappings are too oblique.

In comparison, consider the simile from *Iliad* iv.422-28, which describes the Greek forces as they are marshaling for an attack:

> Ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἐν αἰγιαλῷ πολυηχέϊ κῦμα θαλάσσης
> ὄρνυτ' ἐπασσύτερον Ζεφύρου ὕπο κινήσαντος·
> πόντῳ μέν τε πρῶτα κορύσσεται, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
> χέρσῳ ῥηγνύμενον μεγάλα βρέμει, ἀμφὶ δέ τ' ἄκρας
> κυρτὸν ἐὸν κορυφοῦται, ἀποπτύει δ' ἁλὸς ἄχνην·
> ὣς τότ' ἐπασσύτεραι Δαναῶν κίνυντο φάλαγγες
> νωλεμέως πόλεμονδέ...

Like when the sea wave beats over and over on the thundering shore while the west wind urges it on, it is first marshaled in the sea, but then breaking on the shore it thunders loudly and then arching up crests around the headlands while the sea sputters out foam. So the phalanxes of the Danaans marched unceasingly one after the other to war...

This simile again shows the action of the wind on the wave, though in this instance the resulting impression is not of destruction but of the *menace* the Greek phalanxes convey when advancing against the Trojans. The image of the pounding, thundering surf in 425-26 clearly demonstrates the power of the sea and the wind acting together, and amply illustrates the threat that the Greek forces pose as they march into battle. If the WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE mapping were not operating, such a threat would effectively be empty, because there

would be no consequence to the Greek advance. The waves—driven by the wind!—break apart on the shore, spewing foam, and then presumably retreat into the ocean; if the image were not informed by a stable conceptual metaphor/simile class that implied destruction or danger, the threat implied in the simile would be as ephemeral as the breaking waves. It is not the literal mappings that convey the sense of menace, but the underlying semantics of the *Wind and Wave* metaphor system. Indeed, the Greek threat is confirmed by a simile that comes shortly afterwards, in which the Trojans are contrastingly described as "bleating ewes" (approx. IV.433-38) whom the Greeks are preparing to slaughter. Though the sea does not cause any actual damage in this simile, its potential to do so is apparent, just as it was to Hesiod when he advised against trusting one's life to the sea. The semantic system of the simile is wide ranging, and implies a number of compatible, but diverse, meanings.

In the final two examples, I will examine similes that mention wind or wave individually in an effort to consider how these discrete instances fit into the larger Wind and Wave mapping. First is a short simile from *Iliad* II.144-49:

κινήθη δ' ἀγορὴ φὴ κύματα μακρὰ θαλάσσης
πόντου Ἰκαρίοιο, τὰ μέν τ' Εὖρός τε Νότος τε
ὄρορ' ἐπαΐξας πατρὸς Διὸς ἐκ νεφελάων.
ὡς δ' ὅτε κινήσῃ Ζέφυρος βαθὺ λήϊον ἐλθὼν
λάβρος ἐπαιγίζων, ἐπί τ' ἠμύει ἀσταχύεσσιν,
ὣς τῶν πᾶσ' ἀγορὴ κινήθη...

[He spoke] and the gathering was moved like the great ocean waves of the Ikarian sea, which the south and east winds stir up after rushing down from the clouds of father Zeus. As when the turbulent west wind, advancing, rushing furiously, shakes the tall grain, and bows down the stalks, in this way the whole gathering of men was moved...

The gathering in question is the Greek host, which is reacting to Agamemnon's suggestion that they abandon the siege of Troy. The first portion of the simile is fairly unremarkable: a simple image of Euros and Notos ruffling the waves of the Ikarian sea (144-145), with the assembled Greeks mapped to the waves, and Agamemnon's speech (presumably) mapped to

the wind. The WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE mapping is once more on display when Agamemon "disturbs" the army with the "wind" of his words. The second part of the speech is more interesting, as it presents a complementary image of wind bending down stalks of grain (148), with Agamemnon's words again mapped to the wind, but now with the Greek army mapped to the flattened grain. Both halves of the simile emphasize the power of wind to affect stationary objects, with the inference that Agamemnon's power over the Greek host is equivalent to the tremendous power of the wind. The first image is without question a *Wind and Wave* simile, and conforms to the pattern established in my discussion of the previous examples. I would maintain that the second image *also* demonstrates the WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE mapping, and that it also falls within the *Wind and Wave* family, on the grounds that it clearly demonstrates the wind's ability to disrupt and disturb other entities.[39] Wind and wave elements appear together often enough to suggest a general *Wind and Wave* family group, but as I have mentioned several times, the semantic entanglement of the two concepts allows them to be used independently as well, so long as they maintain the core semantic concept of the larger simile family.

My final example comes from *Odyssey* v.365-70:

365 εἶος ὁ ταῦθ' ὥρμαινε κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν,
ὦρσε δ' ἐπὶ μέγα κῦμα Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων,
δεινόν τ' ἀργαλέον τε, κατηρεφές, ἤλασε δ' αὐτόν.
ὡς δ' ἄνεμος ζαὴς ἴῃων θημῶνα τινάξῃ
καρφαλέων, τὰ μὲν ἄρ τε διεσκέδασ' ἄλλυδις ἄλλῃ,
370 ὣς τῆς δούρατα μακρὰ διεσκέδασ'....

As he set these things in his breast, Poseidon the earthshaker raised a great wave against him, curved up, terrible and fearsome, it drove him down: like when a strong-blowing wind scatters a heap of dry chaff, then scatters it here and there, so it scattered the great timbers of his ship...

39. One could argue that the wave is still implicitly present due to its existence in the first part of the simile. To this I would counter that wind and/or wave concepts are likely implicit in *all* Wind and Wave similes, whether overt or not.

For a number of reasons, this simile is the most interesting *Wind and Wave* reflex that I have looked at so far. In the first place, the example is drawn from the *Odyssey*, and—according to Scott's chart—is one of only three Wind and Wave similes in that poem. It is generally recognized that the *Odyssey* contains far fewer similes than the *Iliad* does, though there are different opinions as to why this is so. The debate is not relevant for my own discussion, except to note that the different themes of the two poems (collective warfare and individual return, respectively) may bias the distribution of available similes and simile families. Without a larger corpus of epic texts to analyze, we cannot say whether the *Odyssey* contains fewer similes because of its more complex narrative structure, or because it is not a martial poem in the same mode as the *Iliad*; indeed, it is likely that the similes catalogued in both poems represent only a fraction of the conceptual metaphors present in the speech community contemporary to Homer. This is a pragmatic matter that bears more on Scott's later analysis than it does on mine, so long as I demonstrate that the evidence that we *do* have attests for the presence of a *Wind and Wave* metaphor system. Because I am working with a very general chronology, my argument stands as long as we can fix Homeric epic somewhere in the early Archaic period, with the assumption that both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are part of a shared oral tradition that refers to a common stock of generating cognitive metaphors.

That being the case, the *Odyssey* example is remarkable in that it occurs just after the non-figurative *Wind and Wave* scene that I discussed in section 3.1.2, and describes the very instant when Poseidon smashes Odysseus' raft. It is a peculiar moment, particularly in how the simile actually maps *wind onto wave*, using wind as the target and wave as the source domain. Even stranger, the simile ornaments a scene that, as previously discussed, Odysseus himself has already is the worst of his life due to the ferocity of the storm that is attacking him. While the WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE mapping is undoubtably in play, it is difficult to deter-

mine exactly what simile elements are meant to be metaphorical and what are not. The wave that Poseidon raises (366) does destroy Odysseus' raft, scattering its timbers (370) and nearly drowning Odysseus. This non-metaphorical sea wave is capable of significant destruction, and despite being a non-figurative image, its action readily demonstrates the WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE mapping. The metaphorical image of the wind scattering a pile of straw emphasizes how readily the wave crushes the raft, augmenting the impression of power already present in the literal image. The addition of this metaphor is almost excessive, and it may be a meta-poetic technique used by the poet to deliberately cross-map source and target domains. Whatever the intent, the figure powerfully conveys the incredible power of the wind and the sea, and is perhaps the ultimate expression of a Wind and Wave trope.

3.3.3 *Oral-poetic simile and cognitive metaphor*

All of the examples examined in the previous section make a clear semantic connection between *Wind and Wave* imagery and concepts of *destruction* or *disruption*. Based on an analysis of how sea and storm imagery is treated in both figurative and non-figurative poetic scenes, I am comfortable identifying a distinct *Wind and Wave* cognitive metaphor group in Greek. This group in all likelihood generated expressions in the same way that Scott's proposed 'simileme' families generated simile variants in oral poetry, and the *Wind and Wave* conceptual metaphor appears to have been so widespread as to generate an overwhelmingly negative conception of the sea in early Greek poetry. While it is impossible to say whether this negative semantic frame extended throughout the Greek speech community (e.g., into conversational Greek, vernacular poetry, etc.), there is some material evidence—gathered by Lindenlauf—which suggests that this was the case. The oral nature of Homeric and Hesiodic poetry further supports this theory, as it is unlikely that oral compositions would become popular if the cognitive metaphors used by

poet-composers were wholly unfamiliar to a poem's target audience. In fact, it seems very plausible that the core WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE mapping of the *Wind and Wave* metaphor group was pervasive in early Greek language and literature. This being the case, we should be able to evaluate all nautical metaphors in Greek poetry according to their relationship with this one metaphor, and thus gauge metaphorical development by the addition or subtraction of persistent, novel mappings to the system.

The question of how the *Wind and Wave* system relates to the *Ship of State* metaphor is the next matter that I will consider, beginning with an examination of how *Wind and Wave* metaphors are realized in Archaic lyric. Being a nautical metaphor, the *SoS* figure must at some level be informed by the same WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE mapping that we find in Homer and Hesiod. I will reserve to a later time discussion of how the chronological relationship between Archaic lyric and early epic might affect the development of the *SoS* metaphor, except to note that all genres of Greek poetry must have, at some level, been informed by the same essential cognitive metaphor system. If this were not so, then cross-genre thematic criticism would be useless, even if one chose to examine only stylistic criteria. Rather, I believe that the *Wind and Wave* system and its associated semantic frame were widely available in the Greek poetic tradition; exactly how this metaphor was realized in Archaic lyric is the subject of my next chapter.

4 · Wind and Wave in Archaic Poetry

4.1 · FINDING THE 'SHIP OF STATE' METAPHOR

4.1.1 The Ship of State *in Homer*

In the last chapter I proposed that depictions of sea and storm imagery in Homer and Hesiod are overwhelmingly negative and tend to express the metaphor WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE. I also proposed that these negative depictions were the result of a larger cognitive metaphor, which itself would have influenced the depiction of the sea in Greek thought as a whole. If we accept as notionally true that Homeric *Wind and Wave* similes were systematically generated by identifiable groups of cognitive metaphors—whether we choose to call these groups *simile classes*, *similemes*, *conceptual metaphors*, or anything else—we can then construct a theory for how the *Ship of State* metaphor was generated in later poetry. If a pervasive *Wind and Wave* metaphor family did exist in Homer and other early poets, then the *SoS* metaphor—using maritime language as it does and occurring in the work of lyric poets working in a poetic tradition with the same conceptual vocabulary as that used by Hesiod and Homer—would have been an innovation on the earlier set of sea and storm tropes.

I remarked earlier that the full *SoS* metaphor never appears in Homer, and though there must be some thematic connection between Homeric *Wind and Wave* metaphors and the later lyric pieces cited by Page, we must remember that the two Homeric *SoS* analogues which Page mentions (*Iliad* xv.381-4 and xv.624-9) are the *only* instances of strict 'boat and wave' similes in

Homer. Scott catalogs around 30 total instances of *Wind and Wave* metaphors in the Homeric epic corpus,[1] and only two of these include both boats and sea/storm elements in the same scene; I consider this scarcity to be evidence that this combination of domain mappings was not terribly productive in the oral tradition that produced the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.[2] While I would not go so far as to assert that the *SoS* metaphor was totally unknown at the time the Homeric epics we have were recorded, it is clear that the trope as such is not present in the Homeric corpus that we possess. Without a larger sample of epic poetry to examine, we cannot make definite claims about the existence of the *SoS* metaphor prior to its appearance in Greek lyric, but if we examine how *Wind and Wave* metaphors are handled in lyric poetry, we *can* speculate on how maritime imagery in lyric is thematically related to that in epic.

In undertaking such a theoretical analysis, the most pressing question to answer is how the A BOAT IS A POLITICAL ENTITY mapping of the *SoS* metaphor originated when its compositional elements (e.g., boats, wind, wave) appear so infrequently in the conceptual domains of Homeric simile. The combination of elements that define later *SoS* examples—a dangerous sea, a boat, sailors—appear frequently in Homeric narrative and Archaic lyric description, but (according to the extant evidence) are mapped to a political target domain only in a few lyric fragments, and never in Homer. The cognitive theory postulates that linguistic metaphorical expressions indicate conceptual relationships between semantic entities; therefore, if a novel ship mapping was layered onto the existing WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE metaphor, we can deduce that a new cognitive structure that required a novel ship mapping must have been created within the speech community. Close reading and historical analysis of existing early Greek suggest several reasons why such an innovation could have occurred and why it may have been initially

1. Constituting the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, but excluding the *Hymns* and assorted fragments. Scott occasionally will split larger metaphors and then count each half separately, leading the vagueness of my number. For more information, see Appendix A.2.

2. The *Odyssey* example cited at the end of the last chapter, *Od*.v.365-70, is a marginal instance, as the boat mapping is a target domain, not a source domain.

restricted to use in lyric poetry, and I will examine these potential reasons in the next chapter. Prior to that, however, we need to establish the general semantics of *Wind and Wave* imagery in Greek lyric, in order to determine the relationship between lyric and epic sea and storm tropes. I believe that the two genres use a fundamentally similar conceptual vocabulary, and if this is true, then we can more firmly identify the WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE metaphor as a pan-genre, culturally dominant phenomenon, which in turn will make my later speculation on the origins of the *SoS* metaphor more persuasive. The thematic relationship between Greek lyric and epic involves a number of methodological and technical assumptions that must be clarified as well, and I will briefly discuss these in the next section, before moving on to a broader thematic analysis of *Wind and Wave* metaphors.

4.1.2 The frustrating realities of Greek lyric

Generally speaking, there are three key methodological questions that will affect my later analysis of Archaic lyric: 1) What is the thematic relationship of the early Greek poetic genres, 2) How does the condition of lyric texts affect their use as evidence, and 3) How does the chronology of ancient epic and lyric affect my analysis. Beginning with the first question, the thematic relationship of early epic and early lyric, I would remark that to even ask the question *How was Homeric metaphor received in Greek lyric?*, we necessarily assume a continuity between ancient Greek epic and the lyric poetry composed during the Archaic period.[3] Debate on the relationship between early Greek poetic genres is ongoing, but the mainstream of scholarship now appears to oppose the 'individual genius' model proposed by Bruno Snell and others in

3. Throughout this and the later chapters, I use the term *lyric* in what Budelmann calls the "broad sense" to indicate not only Greek melic poetry, but also *iambos* and *elegy*. This usage, though untechnical, is efficient, and I see no problem with it. My working corpus is defined by the standard editions cited at the beginning of this paper and in the bibliography; for introductory remarks on genre classification in the early Greek poetic corpus, see Felix Budelmann, ed., *The Cambridge companion to Greek Lyric* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), esp. Introduction

favor of a generally oral-poetic and pan-Hellenic model of corporate authorship. This is not to say that individual poets *working within a poetic tradition* could not maintain an individual identity in their poems, but a received, traditional poetic tradition could also have *predicated* a certain poetic identity on a poet, as may have been the case with the Theognidea.

An oral model of Archaic lyric also makes sense from a pragmatic point of view, as so much of Greek lyric appears to engage with 'Homeric' themes, and for this to be the case we must suppose either that Homeric traditions originated with a single source and spread throughout Greece, or that non-epic song and poetry was parallel with epic and shared thematic material with it. By accepting that both traditions were oral and pan-Hellenic, we can postulate a common pan-Hellenic metaphor system as well, which in turn would have ensured that the generative metaphor classes found in Homer were widely comprehensible to a lyric audience.[4]

My own argument presupposes that the poets who produced Greek lyric were using material that was either inherited from, or produced in common with, what is recorded in Greek epic.[5] It also presupposes that the two genres had a common audience that was fully conversant in both the conventionalized language and the common metaphorical vocabulary used in the two genres. This is not to say that certain poets with a distinctly local flavor (e.g., Corinna, Alcman, etc.) must be understood only as pan-Hellenic writers; local poetic production no doubt took place, and some of our preserved fragments may be genuine examples of such production. Rather, I contend that for any poetic tradition to be regionally popular it must operate within a *conceptual framework* that is broadly accessible to a regional speech community. Thus, while the dialectical forms or even the compositional syntax of certain poets may be unusual, the cognitive relationships informing their poetic output should be consistent with a pan-Hellenic

4. E.g., a pan-Hellenic model provides good support for my theory that the *SoS* was grounded in a general *Wind and Wave* conceptual metaphor family that informed all of early Greek poetry.

5. By *epic* I include most early hexameter, such as Hesiod and Homer, as well as ambiguous later material like the *Homeric Hymns*. I use the term for its convenience, and in the loosest possible sense.

semantic system, provided that such poets were in fact broadly popular or are representative of a regionally popular style. The upshot of this is that a *Wind and Wave* metaphor found in one poet should generally represent the cognitive metaphor system that guided similar tropes in other early Greek poetry. Even if one does not accept the pan-Hellenic theory in its entirety, it must be true to at least some degree for there to be any true division of early poetic genres. After all, how else could formal literary traditions have been maintained except through widespread agreement?[6]

The next methodological concern that needs consideration is the condition of the Greek lyric corpus. The paucity of complete lyric texts is of course well known, and the difficulty of discovering the poetic context of the few texts which chance has preserved is apparent to any Classical scholar. An atomized textual corpus makes the semantic analysis of the type I am attempting particularly challenging, since the poetic fragments that *are* preserved cannot always be securely placed in a particular thematic or metaphoric tradition. For example, two Alcaeus poems (A6 and Z2) are both often considered to contain *Ship of State* metaphors, but the language used in each fragment is innocuous enough that it could easily be non-figurative.[7] The anthologist who preserved the poems provides a limited background to each, leading to their identification as *SoS* examples, but this situation is nearly as problematic as if the poems were provided no context at all: assuming that the reading a commentator supplies is valid, quoted selections are suspect for the very reason that they *were chosen to demonstrate some notable quality*, or to illustrate a larger point of the quoting author.

6. The above assumptions are necessary for my argument, but I will not spend much additional time arguing for them, deferring instead to the work of more knowledgeable scholars. For discussion of pan-Hellenisim and performative context, see Bruno Gentili, *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece: from Homer to the Fifth Century* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988) and Ian Rutherford, ed., *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality and Pan-Hellenism* (Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009). For the issue of Homeric reception in lyric and non-epic oral poetics, the standard introduction to the issues is Gregory Nagy, *Pindar's Homer: the Lyric Possession of an Epic Past* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990).

7. See Page's discussion of the issues involved, Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus*, 187-9. I will consider both of these poems at length in Section 5.1.2.

We have little means of discriminating to what degree the metaphors in preserved lyric fragments represent the cognitive metaphors common in Greek literature as a whole, and though we can infer such to be the case if a poet is frequently quoted or otherwise has the reputation of being popular, this inference is little more than an act of faith. To note that the *SoS* metaphor is preserved in a handful of poems has little significance without knowing how broadly popular the figure was at any given time, as one can never prove that the cited poem is statistically significant, or even that the preserved metaphor was at all common. One reason I chose the *SoS* metaphor as a subject of study is that the figure appears in several Classical-era prose works (Plato, Demosthenes, etc.), as well as Archaic and Classical poetry, a distribution that indicates the cognitive mappings informing the metaphor may have been widespread. I would suggest, though, that without establishing the *SoS* metaphor in a larger cognitive metaphor system my conclusions would be provisional at best. In fact, I think that the application of the cognitive theory can do a great deal to minimize the impediment a fragmentary corpus poses to thematic analysis, so long as there is enough extant material to establish a few key semantic relationships against which to judge individual metaphors.

The final methodological point to consider when studying Archaic lyric is how lyric and epic texts relate to each other chronologically. The debate over when Homer 'wrote' is well-known and apparently insoluble, but the question of when various lyric works were produced is equally divisive and is further complicated by the debate over single versus corporate authorship. If, for example, we suppose that Archilochus was a historical personality who wrote semi-autobiographical poetry at some point during the Archaic period, we can use historical details of poems attributed to him to approximately date his artistic *floruit*.[8] Objections aside, this process could *conceivably* be used to loosely date poets who enjoy a supporting biographical

8. E.g., Archilochus 122, the description of an eclipse, and Archilochus 19, the reference to King Gyges of Lydia.

tradition (e.g., Archilochus, Alcaeus, etc.). The method falls apart when applied to the poetry of the the Theognidea or Anacreonta, however, as these texts show clear signs of corporate authorship (extended chronologies, confusing detail, etc.), and there is no guarantee that details included in them are at all relevant, or even true.[9] If neither Homer nor individual Archaic authors can be securely dated, even in relation to one another, then diachronic analysis of how Archaic lyric relates to Homer (let alone other Archaic lyricists) becomes exceedingly difficult, though the use of cognitive theory and other methodological niceties can work to make the problem easier by proposing relative thematic chronologies in parallel to material chronologies.

My theory of how the *SoS* metaphor developed in Greek depends to a certain degree on the Homeric texts being chronologically anterior to those of the Archaic lyricists. If the *SoS* metaphor was generated by the *Wind and Wave* cognitive metaphor via the addition of a novel source domain, then one would expect that there was some period of development between 'Homer,' in whose work the *SoS* metaphor does not appear, and the Archaic poets, in whose work it does. An interstitial period for the metaphor's development is the simplest explanation, but it is also theoretically possible that the metaphor had developed by the time that the Homeric epics were recorded and by chance was preserved only in the our extant fragments of lyric. Somewhat less credibly, one could suppose that the Homeric poems and those of certain early lyric 'authors' were actually contemporary, again eliminating a development period for the metaphor and again ascribing its appearance in lyric to pure chance. I would propose the same objection to both of these theories: given the great amount of epic that remains for us, and the relatively scarce amount of lyric, it would be absolutely extraordinary if the *SoS* was contemporary to both genres but appeared only in the smaller corpus. While not inconceivable,

9. Of course, many corporate-authorship advocates would claim that the same is true for Archilochus and Alcaeus as well; my point is merely to illustrate the difficulty of specifically dating Archaic poetry. Note too that biographical dating is much more credible for later poets such as Pindar, whose poetry is so thematically oriented to individual historical events.

it is certainly unlikely, particularly when one can specifically tie the development of the *SoS* to a specific performance venue associated with the lyric mode, as I do in the next chapter.

Although I acknowledge the statistical possibility that the *SoS* could have been contemporary to both Homer and the Archaic lyricists, as well as the possibility that there was no intervening time for the metaphor to develop, I am comfortable making the general claim that while Archaic epic and lyric no doubt existed as parallel traditions, an abundance of circumstantial data suggests that most of our preserved lyric fragments are chronologically later than the Homeric epics. This is not to say that Archaic lyric does not preserve older forms, or that the lyric oral tradition had any less of a pedigree than the epic tradition did, but at least regarding the *Wind and Wave* simile and its development into the *SoS* metaphor, we can assume a generally later composition date than that of Homeric epic.

4.2 · ARCHAIC WIND AND WAVE

4.2.1 The Wind and Wave metaphor in lyric

With the methodological considerations out of the way, we can proceed to analyze whether the vanilla WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE mapping occurs in the corpus of Archaic lyric. As with the Homeric material discussed in Chapter 3, I will consider both figurative and non-figurative uses of wind and wave imagery in order to establish as much as is possible a basic context for interpreting *Wind and Wave* metaphors in lyric. That being the case, we may as well begin with Archilochus 105, the fragment cited by Page in his discussion of how the *SoS* trope developed:

> Γλαῦχ', ὄρα · βαθὺς γὰρ ἤδη κύμασιν ταράσσεται
> πόντος, ἀμφὶ δ' ἄκρα Γυρέων ὀρθὸν ἵσταται νέφος,
> σῆμα χειμῶνος, κιχάνει δ' ἐξ ἀελπτίης φόβος.
>
> *Look, Glaucus! The deep sea is currently troubled with waves, and a cloud stands right around the heights of Gurae: the sign of a storm, and fear overtakes [me] suddenly.*

This three line poem perfectly illustrates the interpretive dilemmas I outlined in section 4.1.2 above: a reader unacquainted with the WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE mapping (and lacking the context likely provided by the poem's missing lines) could easily interpret these lines as pure imagery, namely a vivid description of an impending storm. The metaphoric background of the image is supplied by Heraclitus, the author who preserved the passage and cites it as an example of ἀλληγορία.[10] If the poem is in fact a metaphor, then it exhibits the following mappings: the 'upright cloud...sign of a storm' is the marker of trouble, as is the 'deep sea...troubled by waves'; both of these images are *Wind and Wave* entities, and Archilochus overtly marks them as dangerous (why else the fear?). The 'heights of Gyrae' apparently stand for an imperiled civic entity, under threat from the menacing *Wind and Wave* elements just discussed. The 'abrupt fear' of the speaker is likely non-metaphorical, but can take a valid literal meaning in both figurative or non-figurative contexts. If the image is figurative, the implied metaphor is nearly identical to the conceptual metaphor that informs Homeric *Wind and Wave* similes, mapping both wind and sea images to a dangerous or adverse force. West claims that the 'heights of Gyrae' are a geographical feature "some 25 miles north of Paros,"[11] and perhaps these can be understood as metonymy for Paros itself, the putative birthplace of Archilochus. The inclusion of a possible civic entity is interesting and perhaps novel, though the mapping is not explicit (i.e., it is not an actual *polis* that is endangered) and there is considerable

10. From West: ὁ γὰρ ἄλλα μὲν ἀγορεύων τρόπος, ἕτερα δὲ ὧν λέγει σημαίνων, ἐπωνύμως ἀλληγορία καλεῖται· καθάπερ Ἀρχίλοχος μὲν ἐν τοῖς Θρᾳκικοῖς ἀπειλημμένος δεινοῖς τὸν πόλεμον εἰκάζει θαλαττίῳ κλύδωνι, λέγων ὥδέ πως...κτλ. Supporting scholia are also cited, but Page's comment is instructive: "The statement that the picture is allegorical can be neither confirmed nor contradicted."Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus*, 181 n4

11. M. L. West, *Greek Lyric Poetry: the poems and fragments of the Greek iambic, elegiac, and melic poets.* (Oxford [England]; New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1993), 199, n2.

interpretive wiggle-room for determining the metaphor's target domain. Though Archilochus 105 is certainly parallel to the *SoS* metaphor in its image of a civic entity menaced by *Wind and Wave* elements, there is no natural connection between this poem and later *SoS* metaphors that would predicate that this poem directly inspired the *SoS* metaphor itself. The poem does, however, clearly demonstrate the WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE mapping, suggesting that the metaphor had a cross-genre continuity.

As further evidence, consider Solon 9, which is thematically similar:

ἐκ νεφέλης πέλεται χιόνος μένος ἠδὲ χαλάζης,
βροντὴ δ' ἐκ λαμπρῆς γίγνεται ἀστεροπῆς ·
ἀνδρῶν δ' ἐκ μεγάλων πόλις ὄλλυται, ἐς δὲ μονάρχου
δῆμος ἀϊδρίηι δουλοσύνην ἔπεσεν.
λίην δ' ἐξάραντ' <οὐ> ῥάιδιόν ἐστι κατασχεῖν
ὕστερον, ἀλλ' ἤδη χρὴ <καλὰ> πάντα νοεῖν.

The strength of the snow or the hail comes out of a cloud, and the thunder originates from the bright flash of lightning. The city is ruined by great men, and from ignorance the populace has fallen into the slavery of monarchy. After they are raised too high, it is not easy to check [them] later—but it is necessary to consider everything well.

Though the term 'wind' is not specifically mentioned by the poet, I still consider this to be a *Wind and Wave* poem on the understanding that the phrase ἐκ νεφέλης πέλεται χιόνος μένος ἠδὲ χαλάζης implies wind. West's included scholia remark that Solon composed the poem for the Athenians as a metaphorical warning of the coming Pisistratid tyranny, but in this case a scholastic explication of the metaphor is less necessary than it was with Archilochus 105.[12] Though not overtly marked by a comparative adverb as is common in Homer (e.g., ὥς or ὥστε), Solon's quick narrative transition from the storm image to the city scene implies a metaphorical connection between the two. The connection is not an explicit correlation, however (e.g., the coming monarchy *is a storm* that destroys the city), and I expect that a reader previously

12. As cited in West: λέγεται δὲ Σόλων καὶ προειπεῖν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις τὴν ἐσομένην τυραννίδα δι' ἐλεγείων...κτλ. Additional scholia corroborate this reading.

unfamiliar with the *Wind and Wave* mapping would be uncertain of the exact metaphorical correlation between the *storm* and *city* images. Because the cognitive domains of the poem (storm and city-destruction) are mapped only by their sequential apposition, when being interpreted they require extrinsic semantic data for full validation as metaphorical constituents; if the theory that I have outlined so far is correct, contemporary Greek readers would have been naturally inclined to associate the storm and city concepts due to their familiarity with the *Wind and Wave* metaphor family, which would have implicitly conveyed the disruptive qualities of Solon's storm to the image of the *polis*.[13] While a real, physical storm may be a genuine threat to a city if it were strong enough, Solon's storm is dangerous due to the WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE concept that the *Wind and Wave* images in the poem's first lines express.

Another lyric poem with similarly oblique mappings that express a *Wind and Wave* metaphor is Archilochus 13:

κήδεα μὲν στονόεντα Περίκλεες οὔτέ τις ἀστῶν
μεμφόμενος θαλίῃς τέρψεται οὐδὲ πόλις.
τοίους γὰρ κατὰ κῦμα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης
ἔκλυσεν, οἰδαλέους δ' ἀμφ' ὀδύνῃς ἔχομεν
πνεύμονας. ἀλλὰ θεοὶ γὰρ ἀνηκέστοισι κακοῖσιν
ὦ φίλ' ἐπὶ κρατερὴν τλημοσύνην ἔθεσαν
φάρμακον. ἄλλοτε ἄλλος ἔχει τόδε · νῦν μὲν ἐς ἡμέας
ἐτράπεθ', αἱματόεν δ' ἕλκος ἀναστένομεν,
ἐξαῦτις δ' ἑτέρους ἐπαμείψεται. ἀλλὰ τάχιστα
τλῆτε, γυναικεῖον πένθος ἀπωσάμενοι.

No one from the city, Perikles, no town, faults our woeful pain, they will not delight in festivals, for a wave of the roaring sea has covered over such men and we have lungs swollen in pain. But the gods, my friend, have made great endurance the cure for incurable ills. At different times other men suffer the same, but now it has turned against us and we groan over our bloody wound, but in turn it will come to others. But quick, bear up, after dispensing with womanish mourning.

13. It occurs to me that I may seem to be implying that the *Wind and Wave* conceptual metaphor originated with Homer, which is not at all my contention. I expect that many of the metaphorical concepts demonstrated in Homer and other early poets to be inheritances from the Indo-European poetic tradition, but I do not know if there is any evidence to support this claim. This is certainly a topic for future research.

This poem does not describe a storm, but rather a shipwreck—a theme that is within the bounds of the *Wind and Wave* simile group (cf. the previously discussed examples from *Iliad* xv, as well as the discussion of *Odyssey* v.365)—though otherwise the poem is thematically similar to Solon 9: both pieces mention the condition of a *polis*, and both describe an apparent misfortune which has befallen its citizens (in Solon, the elevation of a tyrant; in Archilochus, the loss of notable men to shipwreck), while making a semantic connection between the sea/sea imagery and an unpleasant situation. Moreover, in Archilochus 13 the lines ἀλλὰ θεοὶ γὰρ ἀνηκέστοισι κακοῖσιν/ ὦ φίλ' ἐπὶ κρατερὴν τλημοσύνην ἔθεσαν/ φάρμακον make a clear metaphorical correlation, since they cannot *reasonably* have a literal meaning, which means that the poem is to some degree figurative. What is uncertain is whether the shipwreck of Archilochus 13 is metaphorical in the same way that the storm of Solon 9 appears to be. In many ways, the description of the shipwreck in Archilochus 13 is no more abstract than the image of a threatening storm in Archilochus 105, but even with guidance from the scholia the metaphor in Archilochus 105 would be doubtful if not for implicit knowledge of the *Wind and Wave* conceptual metaphor. In Archilochus 13, that same metaphorical grounding invites a reader to interpret the shipwreck as figurative, with perhaps a meaning similar to Solon 9; e.g., "a wave [*of misfortune*] has overcome such men...that the *polis* mourns for them, etc." Furthermore, within its clause κῦμα is the subject of an active, transitive verb, a structure which frames the wave as a disruptive agency, echoing the kernel meaning of the *Wind and Wave* metaphor as I have defined it.[14] All of these elements indicate that the WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE mapping is at the heart of the poem's meaning.

In translating the poem West gives a literal meaning to ship-image, and makes no allusion to its possible metaphorical value,[15] a decision that is unsurprising since no translation could

14. That is, WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE.
15. West, *Greek Lyric Poetry*.

elegantly render the ambiguity of the implied *Wind and Wave* metaphor. Luckily for us reading the poem in its original Greek, we are not obligated to make a similar concession. Rather, I propose that the shipwreck passage does not need to be construed as either strictly literal or strictly figurative: it can be both. A poet schooled in the oral tradition would surely have recognized the metaphorical flavor that *Wind and Wave* imagery imparted to a poetic passage, even if the action of that passage was generally non-figurative, as may be the case of Archilochus 13. This would be true even if simile-families ('similemes') were not manipulated in the way that Scott claims that they were; cognitive mappings are embedded in a language, and appear unconsciously in speech the constructions of everyday discourse. Even if 'the shipwreck is just a shipwreck,' the poet made a conscious choice to compose about this topic, and chose to make the connection between the *Wind and Wave* elements and a melancholy emotion. With all of the many ways to frame such a situation, the reappearance of the same images and concepts (e.g., overwhelming waves, overpowering winds, the power of the sea) strongly imply that poetic depictions of the sea are guided by a distinct cognitive metaphor. Glucksberg tested exactly this phenomenon in a series of psychological experiments designed to test how subjects apprehend metaphoric language. At the conclusion of his study, he writes that "there is no priority of the literal...[w]e apprehend metaphorical meanings as quickly and as automatically as we apprehend literal meanings." This semantic entanglement occurs because "[w]ith continued use, once-novel metaphors become conventionalized, and their metaphorical senses enter into our dictionaries."[16] Such was the case in early Greek poetry (and in all likelihood, the Greek speech community as a whole), where *Wind and Wave* language—figurative or not—maintains a distinct semantic valence.

16. For more information, including the various experimental criteria, see Sam Glucksberg, "The psycholinguistics of metaphor," *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 7, no. 2 (2003): 92–96 and Glucksberg, "How metaphors create categories."

An audience deeply familiar with poetic idiom would likely not have made binary distinctions between the metaphorical and non-metaphorical meanings of familiar poetic themes, and we perhaps would be better served by an interpretive model that classifies metaphorical meaning as a *spectrum*. Repeated, metaphorically suggestive imagery would have been a semantic marker that a poet would have inserted, deliberately or not, into a composition to elicit an emotional response. Such a marker would have been effective semantic trigger even if an audience did not grasp the poet's larger meaning, a situation that must have been reasonably common. An audience listening to an oral recitation would not have been able to review the composition of a poem in the same way that a literate reader can a written one; in the case of epic material, which is largely narrative, this inability to review a text would not have been much of a concern, but lyric material—even that produced by a singer working in a less sophisticated oral tradition—makes greater demands on an audience's attention. If a singer were to be understood (and therefore successful), I believe he would have needed to include recognizable semantic cues in order to subtly guide his audience's emotional responses. Deploying lexical formulae that adumbrated significant metaphorical concepts would have worked as a signalling mechanism, particularly if these were used throughout oral genres and worked within the metaphoric 'spectrum' that I have proposed. Metaphor markers like *Wind and Wave* imagery would have served to connect a poem to a broader poetic tradition, making any metaphoric statement using that imagery all the more meaningful. An audience's familiarity with the established metaphor tradition would have ensured that novel innovations in that system (such as the *SoS* metaphor) were immediately noticed and artistically significant. Even within an apparently rigid oral-poetic system there would have been significant room for creative innovation, and innovated mappings and sub-metaphors would have spread and become internalized, as eventually occurred with the *SoS* metaphor.

4.2.2 Further adventures in maritime semantics

A 'spectrum' model of metaphor requires a slight readjustment in how I have so far analyzed lyric texts, but has the reward of a richer interpretive field to play in. To illustrate this (and to allay lingering doubts over the model's viability), it might be useful to work through another set of examples. In keeping with the method of comparing figurative and non-figurative uses of *Wind and Wave* language, an interesting pair of texts to consider are Semonides 1.11-19 and Semonides 7.27-42. The first passage includes several episodes from Semonides 1—a fatalistic account of mankind's place in the world—and describes the many horrible deaths that can befall a person:

φθάνει δὲ τὸν μὲν γῆρας ἄζηλον λαβὸν
πρὶν τέρμ᾽ ἵκηται, τοὺς δὲ δύστηνοι βροτῶν
φθείρουσι νοῦσοι, τοὺς δ᾽ Ἄρει δεδμημένους
πέμπει μελαίνης Ἀΐδης ὑπὸ χθονός·
οἱ δ᾽ἐν θαλάσσηι λαίλαπι κλονεόμενοι
καὶ κύμασιν πολλοῖσι πορφυρῆς ἁλὸς
θνήσκουσιν, εὖτ᾽ ἂν μὴ δυνήσωνται ζόειν·
οἱ δ᾽ἀγχόνην ἅψαντο δυστήνωι μόρωι
καὐτάγρετοι λείπουσιν ἠλίου φάος.

This one dreary old age takes before he arrives at his goal, and those the horrible diseases of mortals ruin, while others, overcome in war, Hades sends below the dark earth. Some men die at sea, battered by a storm and many waves of the purple ocean, whenever they can no longer hold on to life. But others fasten a noose, and by their own hand leave the light of the sun for a wretched death...

Though short, the *Wind and Wave* section of the passage conforms perfectly with the non-figurative semantic model discussed in section 3.1.2, demonstrating in two and a half lines all of the expected *Wind and Wave* constituents: death or harm (θνήσκουσιν), a combined force of ocean and wind (κύμασιν πολλοῖσι πορφυρῆς ἁλὸς), and the physical power of the elements (θαλάσσηι λαίλαπι κλονεόμενοι). The resulting image is meant to be terrifying and menacing, while the context of the other mortal situations described in the poem make it clear

that the *Wind and Wave* portion is non-figurative. By making it one alternative in a list of generally horrible options (e.g., disease, war, suicide), Semonides forcefully demonstrates the Greek apprehension for the sea. His use of language found so often in other *Wind and Wave* connects his description with that of innumerable other poets.

A *figurative* example from Semonides occurs from the notorious misogynistic priamel, Semonides 7; the selection in question (27-42) uses the sea as a grounding metaphor to viciously describe a stereotypically unstable type of wife:

τὴν δ' ἐκ θαλάσσης, ἣ δύ' ἐν φρεσὶν νοεῖ·
τὴν μὲν γελᾶι τε καὶ γέγηθεν ἡμέρην·
ἐπαινέσει μιν ξεῖνος ἐν δόμοις ἰδών·
"οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλη τῆσδε λωΐων γυνὴ
ἐν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποισιν οὐδὲ καλλίων" ·
τὴν δ' οὐκ ἀνεκτὸς οὐδ' ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἰδεῖν
οὔτ' ἄσσον ἐλθεῖν, ἀλλὰ μαίνεται τότε
ἄπλητον ὥσπερ ἀμφὶ τέκνοισιν κύων,
ἀμείλιχος δὲ πᾶσι κἀποθυμίη
ἐχθροῖσιν ἴσα καὶ φίλοισι γίνεται·
ὥσπερ θάλασσα πολλάκις μὲν ἀτρεμὴς
ἔστηκ', ἀπήμων, χάρμα ναύτῃσιν μέγα,
θέρεος ἐν ὥρῃι, πολλάκις δὲ μαίνεται
βαρυκτύποισι κύμασιν φορεομένη.
ταύτῃι μάλιστ' ἔοικε τοιαύτη γυνὴ
ὀργήν· φυὴν δὲ πόντος ἀλλοίην ἔχει.

...another woman is of the sea, and she thinks with two minds; one day she jokes and rejoices, and seeing her in her home, a guest will praise her: "There is no woman in all mankind more desirable, nor more beautiful, than this woman." But on another day she's impossible to look at in the eyes or to go near, and then she rages unceasingly like a bitch around her pups, unappeasable, becoming hateful to enemy and friend alike. Just as the sea in the summer season very often stands gentle, a great delight to sailors, and many times it rages borne about with heavy-striking waves. Such a woman is very much like this in her passions, and she has the changeable nature of the sea.

The central conceit of this passage is the supposed dual nature of 'the woman of the sea,' who according to the poet exhibits the same divided temper as that which Hesiod warned against in

the *Works & Days* (see Section 3.1.2). In fact, Semonides echoes *Works and Days* almost exactly in his description of the sea's change from calm to storm (ll.37-42), though unlike Hesiod (and Homer) he characterizes the sea as an independent entity rather than the tool of Zeus and Poseidon.[17] Regardless, his description again includes all of the standard *Wind and Wave* concepts that we have found in other maritime descriptions: dangerous force (πολλάκις δὲ μαίνεται/βαρυκτύποισι κύμασιν φορεομένη), instability (φυὴν...ἀλλοίην ἔχει), anger (ὀργήν), and menace (τὴν δ' οὐκ ἀνεκτὸς οὐδ' ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἰδεῖν). These phrases are all clear markers of the WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE concept, with the implication—as demonstrated literally in Semonides 1—that any who is 'like the sea' is necessarily dangerous.

Curiously, Semonides embeds a second, divergent, simile within the larger *Wind and Wave* trope, writing that during her 'stormy' phase the sea-woman μαίνεται τότε/ἅπλητον ὥσπερ ἀμφὶ τέκνοισιν κύων (34-35), an apparent double-mapping of the woman target domain.[18] The image of a dog protecting her pups conveys a similar semantic concept as that of the *Wind and Wave* metaphor group, namely ferocity and aggressive anger. The sea imagery that is then used to reinforce this point (37-40) is typical, almost banal, and if the passage were not introduced by the simile-marker ὥσπερ it would be nearly interchangeable with the non-figurative passage from Semonides 1. Neither of the above *Wind and Wave* passages is terribly long (though the selection from Semonides 7 is more complex), and each uses fairly generic language similar to that of other Greek poetry. Both, however, are demonstrable instances of the *Wind and Wave* metaphor group, and convey the exact semantic core that we have seen in all the other metaphors generated from this group.

17. Cf. *W&D* 663-668.

18. I have mentioned previously that the cognitive theory easily accounts for compound mappings, even when contradictory. Their occurrence is always pragmatically interesting, however, and should be noted.

4.2.3 The Wind and Wave simile group in Archaic lyric

Figurative usage, non-figurative usage, simile, metaphor—every poetic description of sea and storm that we have considered so far has expressed the same core mapping: WIND AND WAVE ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE. There are a few additional passages in which the mapping can be found,[19] and though the available texts do not comprise a scientifically valid linguistic corpus, when considered in combination with the examples in Homer and Hesiod I believe that my argument is quite credible. At least within a poetic context, *Wind and Wave* figures in Greek are overwhelmingly pejorative, and depict the sea and sea elements as dangerous, capricious, and menacing. These attributes are arbitrary, and do not square with the tremendous benefits that the sea conveyed in terms of commerce, food production, and transportation; rather, the negative depiction of the sea in Greek poetry originates with a cognitive-level semantic correlation between the concepts of *danger* or *disruption* and the sea. This correlation controlled not only Greek perception of the sea, but all also the literary treatment of it; due to discourse-pragmatic factors of oral-poetic performance and composition, imagistic descriptions of sea and storm scenes became generalized poetic markers conveyed the idea WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE.

The question that remains is how the basic mapping of the *Wind and Wave* metaphor group was innovated to include the new, productive boat and sailor mappings typically found in the *SoS* metaphor while still remaining productive in and of itself. Because *Wind and Wave* metaphors were apparently so common, the audience of Archaic poetry (both epic and lyric) would have been uniquely attuned to innovations or additions to the general *Wind and Wave* metaphor mappings. The *SoS* metaphor is a fairly radical revision of the basic *Wind and Wave*

19. E.g., consider the literal/figurative *Wind and Wave* usages in Bacchylides 17 (the sea as a place of no return), Solon 13 (Zeus' power over storms), Hipponax 115 (a drowned enemy washing ashore), Anacreon 347 (the sea as a place of no return), etc. See Appendix A.1 for a combined list of selected fragments that employ *Wind and Wave* imagery in various capacities.

template (e.g., the sea and wind attack something), in that the novel mappings of the *SoS* metaphor become the narrative focus of the trope, marginalizing the sea and storm elements that had previously been so dominant. For such radical new mappings to originate *and then persist*, they must have correlated to a significant source-domain concept that itself was persistent in Greek culture. What this concept was and how it became semantically entangled with the *Wind and Wave* metaphor group is the subject of my next chapter.

5 · Ship, State, and Symposium

5.1 · THE SHIP OF STATE

5.1.1 Summary of the argument so far

To summarize my argument so far: I believe that sea and storm (wind and wave) images in Archaic poetry are metaphorically informed by generative metaphor classes, which are sometimes referred to as *simile families* in the vernacular of the Oral Poetic Theory.[1] These metaphor classes are broadly equivalent to certain cognitive metaphors proposed by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, and structure the interpretation of the lexical metaphors they generate, particularly when these lexical metaphors are used in formulaic contexts established by oral-poetic practice. The class of *Wind and Wave* metaphors has a kernel semantic value of WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE, which can be observed in epic and lyric passages that describe winds or ocean waves as dangerous or disruptive elements. The basic metaphor of *Wind and Wave* imagery likely originated in the general discourse of the Greek speech community, and then migrated into oral literature via the oral tradition; widespread cultural familiarity with the *Wind and Wave* simile family and its poetic iterations would have ensured that the basic semantics of maritime tropes were retained during the transition from oral to literate poetic composition. The relationship of Archaic lyric with oral poetry—particularly epic—at a compositional level is difficult to determine, but no matter how 'Homeric' language came to be used in Archaic

1. The term Scott coins is 'simileme,' by analogy to linguistic terms such as morpheme, phoneme, lexeme, etc.

lyric, the structuring metaphors of both poetries originated *within the Greek speech community* and existed *outside of purely literary usage*. Specific, marked usages of *Wind and Wave* imagery in literature creates metaphors of greater interpretive richness, but unmarked *Wind and Wave* language has subtle, latent metaphorical meaning, due to the prominence of its associated mappings.

5.1.2 Analyzing the Ship of State

With the above argument established, we can at last begin to examine the *Ship of State* metaphor itself and propose a cause for its sudden appearance in Greek lyric. The *SoS* metaphor, being a nautical figure, is constructed from the *Wind and Wave* simile family; the generic *Wind and Wave* simile-type uses a core set of mappings that describe the action of wind(s), storm, wave(s), or a combination of all these elements, which are generally ranged against an indeterminate metaphorical mapping that represents the 'patient' constituent from the non-metaphorical frame.[2] So, in the example from *Odyssey* v.365-70 (discussed in section 3.3.2) Odysseus' raft is the object affected by the *Wind and Wave* imagery, which is grammatically and logically active within the figure. All of the *Wind and Wave* tropes considered so far feature wind/wave elements as primary subjects that act against other elements, a relationship that tends to shift narrative focus away from the elements *initiating* the similes to the *Wind and Wave* entities illustrating them.[3]

Interestingly, the *SoS* trope disturbs this trend, and (as the name indicates) makes a *ship* image the center of the metaphoric figure. As a result, in our extant lyric *SoS* examples, narrative emphasis tends to rest largely on the *ship and sailor* images rather than on the sea and storm

2. That is, the semantic role of sea and storm elements tends to be *actor/agent*, while the entities affected are *patients/themes*.

3. I.e., in the *Odyssey* example just considered, Odysseus and his raft lose focus in favor of the *Wind and Wave*-mapped element, in this case Poseidon and the storm he raises.

elements of the surrounding metaphor.[4] This change in narrative focus suggests that the *SoS* metaphor is a new productive variant of the parent *Wind and Wave* metaphor, rather than a mere iterative variant of the same. The point may seem trivial, but remember that according to the cognitive theory, metaphorical constructs represent very real semantic relationships. If we can establish that the *SoS* metaphor achieved some degree of autonomy from its generating class, then we can more credibly claim that the semantic relationships the metaphor implies were common within the speech community of Greek poetry.[5] This in turn makes the very addition of a novel element more significant, and suggests that the novel concept associated with the ship mapping was of consequence to poets who developed the full *SoS* metaphor.

The major difficulty of discussing the *SoS* metaphor is the scarcity of the figure in the Greek poetic record, but unique similarities between the few secure instances from Alcaeus and Theognis do still permit some interesting observations. Modern conceptions of the trope tend to be shaped by post-Archaic examples, particularly those from Plato and Horace, both of which differ significantly from the few examples found in Archaic poetry. The most canonical Archaic *SoS* examples, found in Alcaeus, are in some ways also the most problematic insofar as the Alcaean corpus is very lacunose, making the interpretive context of Alcaeus' *SoS* instances dependent on commentaries and scholia. Alcaeus A6 and Z2 are the most complete Alcaean *SoS* examples, and so I will examine each of these in the following discussion.[6] There are several possible *SoS* instances in Archilochus, most notably fr.106, but again, the fragment is damaged and inconclusive (though not so much as to prevent some critics from identifying it as a companion to fr.105 which I discussed at length in 4.2.1). Another possible *SoS* example from Archilochus,

4. In linguistic pragmatic terms, the *ship* becomes the *topic* of the discourse, and the *Wind and Wave* elements become the *comment*.

5. Further evidence that the *SoS* trope was established and productive is that the figure was later modified by Plato in *Republic* Bk.VI, in which the trope appears *without overt sea and storm imagery*. How could this be possible, if the *SoS* metaphor itself were not established within the speech community?

6. Alcaeus D15 and X14 more fragmentary and less certain examples; for details, see Page 182ff. Several other small Alcaean fragments hint at further use of the trope, but I will disregard these due to their contextual difficulty.

fragment 4, does not contain overt sea and storm imagery, for which reason I do not consider it a primary example of the form, though others do.[7] The only remaining *significant SoS* instances occur in the Theognidea (667-82 and 855-56), and of these only one is well developed. I will consider both of these, beginning with the longer example because of its complexity and textual integrity. Fortunately, it also contains an extended and semantically rich *SoS* metaphor, which will be the benchmark for all other instances (667-82):[8]

εἰ μὲν χρήματ' ἔχοιμι Σιμωνίδη, οἷά περ ἤδη,
οὐκ ἂν ἀνιώιμην τοῖς ἀγαθοῖσι συνών.
νῦν δέ με γινώσκοντα περέρχεται, εἰμὶ δ' ἄφωνος
χρημοσύνηι, πολλῶν γνοὺς ἂν ἄμεινον ἔτι,
οὕνεκα νῦν φερόμεσθα καθ' ἱστία λευκὰ βαλόντες
Μηλίου ἐκ πόντου νύκτα διὰ δνοφερήν·
ἀντλεῖν δ' οὐκ ἐθέλουσιν, ὑπερβάλλει δὲ θαλάσσα
ἀμφοτέρων τοίχων. ἦ μάλα τις χαλεπῶς
σώιζεται, οἱ δ' ἔρδουσι · κυβερνήτην μὲν ἔπαυσαν
ἐσθλόν, ὅτις φυλακὴν εἶχεν ἐπισταμένως·
χρήματα δ' ἁρπάζουσι βίηι, κόσμος δ' ἀπόλωλεν,
δασμὸς δ' οὐκέτ' ἴσος γίνεται ἐς τὸ μέσον·
φορτηγοὶ δ' ἄρχουσι, κακοὶ δ' ἀγαθῶν καθύπερθεν.
δειμαίνω, μή πως ναῦν κατὰ κῦμα πίηι.
ταῦτα μοι ἠινίχθω κεκρυμμένα τοῖς ἀγαθοῖσιν ·
γινώσκοι δ' ἄν τις καὶ κακός, ἂν σοφὸς ἦι.

If I had wealth, Simonides, like I used to, I would not be distressed [while] consorting with worthy men. But now it passes by me, knowing, and I am voiceless with want. Moreover, I would have recognized better than many that we are now adrift through the dark night of the Melian sea, because [we] threw down our white sails. They are unwilling to bail, and the sea overwhelms both walls. One could scarcely be saved, the way they are acting. They have restrained the brave helmsman, who was skillfully keeping watch. They take wealth by force, order is ruined, and there is no longer an equal distribution in common. Laborers rule, and evil men are above the good; I fear that a wave may swallow down the ship. Let these things be my riddle, hidden for good men, though even an evil man might recognize [them], if he is wise.

Unlike the lyric *Wind and Wave* examples in Archilochus 105 and Solon 9, the power of wind and wave in Theognis 667-682 is described obliquely. The sea (θαλάσσα 673, κῦμα 680) is the

7. Gentili, most notably.
8. Texts for all of the above citations can be found in Appendix A.3.

subject of two active clauses, but is otherwise present only by inference. Theognis' description instead emphasizes the crew of the ship as they reef their sails (671), obstruct the navigator (675), or fall overboard in the swell (673), and if we read only the nautical terms from the passage (e.g., sails, wave, sea, *kubernetes*, etc.), it might pass as a description from Homer.[9] Nevertheless, the bulk of the poem's content is not nautical imagery; rather, Theognis makes equal room for generalized pronouncements on wealth or property (ll.667-70, 677-79) and gnomic moral statements (ibid, 680-82). Though it is unclear what specific χρήματα Theognis is speaking about, when placed in apposition to the nautical vocabulary, his material language definitely suggests some type of metaphorical correlation: as I understand it, the property imagery serves to implicate the *Wind and Wave* imagery in a demonstration of how natural order is destroyed by greed (677), while good men are suborned to bad (679). Even without the metaphoric texture added by the *Wind and Wave* imagery, the apposition of concrete and abstract elements in the poem mark the passage as figurative. The sea and storm images are the logical and grammatical subjects in their clauses, but the ship is clearly the narrative subject of the metaphor and the relationship of the poetic narrator to the boat and its crew is the poem's main theme.

The contrast between the specificity of the nautical terms and the vagueness of the gnomic terms in Theognis 667-82 is striking, and demands some scrutiny.[10] Of particular interest are lines 677-679, which invoke the concepts of κόσμος and δασμὸς ἴσος—perhaps the most abstract notions of the entire passage. To define κόσμος is always tricky; it is of course a political notion,[11] and sometimes occurs in Archaic poems that have a political message.[12] The phrase δασμὸς ἴσος implies a similar notion of proper proportion or propriety, and is likely

9. In particular, cf. *Odyssey* xii.410-425.
10. For further discussion of reconciling specific details to a metaphorical frame, cf. Page, p. 188ff.
11. Daniel B. Levine, "Symposium and the Polis," in *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis*, ed. Thomas J. Figueira and Gregory Nagy (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985), p. 180.
12. E.g., Solon 1, 4, and 13; Theognis 947-48.

a quasi-political concept similar to κόσμος. The poem deploys its wind and wave imagery in opposition to conventional political language that implies order and restraint (δασμὸς ἴσος, κόσμος, τὸ μέσον), with the result that guidance of the ship is lost (675), and the good sailors perish (679). The abstract terms found throughout the poem enhance the metaphoric valence of the text, and make clear that Theognis is in no way describing a simple trip at sea, though there is considerable debate over what exactly the associated mappings might indicate.[13]

The clear metaphor in Theognis 667-82 contrasts with the *SoS* examples found in Alcaeus, which are more imagistic and consequently less overtly metaphorical, but still demonstrate the same general metaphor schema. The best preserved Alcaeus example is Z2, part of which was preserved by Heraclitus as an example of nautical 'allegory.'[14] The intact portion of the text runs as follows:

ἀσυννέτημμι τὼν ἀνέμων στάσιν,
τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἔνθεν κῦμα κυλίνδεται,
τὸ δ' ἔνθεν, ἄμμες δ' ὂν τὸ μέσσον
νᾶϊ φορήμμεθα σὺν μελαίναι
χείμωνι μόχθεντες μεγάλωι μάλα·
πὲρ μὲν γὰρ ἄντλος ἰστοπέδαν ἔχει,
λαῖφος δὲ πὰν ζάδηλον ἤδη,
καὶ λάκιδες μέγαλαι κὰτ αὔτο,
χόλαισι δ' ἄγκυρραι...

I cannot gauge the lay of the winds—a wave rolls here and then there—and we are borne along in the middle with our dark ship, greatly wearied by the great storm. The bilge has the mast-hole (?), the sail is pierced through—there are great tears along it—and the anchors are slack (?)...

Heraclitus remarks on the ambiguous valence of the piece, saying

> Τίς οὐκ ἂν εὐθὺς ἐκ τῆς προτρεχούσης περὶ τὸν πόντον εἰκασίας ἀνδρῶν πλωιζομένων θαλάττιον εἶναι νομίσειε φόβον; ἀλλ' οὐχ οὕτως ἔχει· Μύρσιλος γὰρ ὁ

13. Representative theories can be found in Gentili, *Poetry and its Public*, 200-205 and Coffee, "The ΦΟΡΤΗΓΟΙ of Theognis 667-82."

14. The passage is used in parallel with Archilochus 105. Heraclitus, Russell, and Konstan, *Heraclitus: Homeric problems*, 5.6

> δηλούμενος ἐστι καὶ τυραννικὴ κατὰ Μυτιληναίων ἐγειρομένη σύστασις.
> *Homeric Problems*, 5.5
>
> *Who would not conclude, from the image of the sea preceding this passage, that what was meant was the fear of the sea felt by a party of sailors? But it is not so. What is meant is Myrsilus and the conspiracy of tyranny being formed against the people of Mytilene.*

Alcaeus Z2 and Theognis 667-82 differ significantly in style, composition and tone, nearly to the point that one might question whether the two poems illustrate the same basic metaphor. Alcaeus Z2 can be understood only in the most general terms unless we supply extrinsic interpretive data concerning Alcaeus' political activities in Mytilene. As long as Heraclitus is correct that Alcaeus Z2 is a *SoS* example, we must admit that the poem's core metaphor is at least generally related to that observed in Theognis 667-82, though it is difficult to completely square Alcaeus' specific imagery with Theognis' gnomic pronouncements. The beginning of the poem is easy enough to reconcile, being a familiar description of the confusion caused by the storm (1-3) that disturbs those sailing on the 'boat' (4-5). Heraclitus comments that [κ]ατακόρως ἐν ταῖς ἀλληγορίαις ὁ νησιώτης θαλαττεύει καὶ τὰ πλεῖστα τῶν διὰ τοὺς τυράννους ἐπεχόντων κακῶν πελαγείοις χειμῶσιν εἰκάζει,[15] which if true implies that at least for examples from Alcaeus, we can assume the mapping SEA STORMS ARE MYTILINEAN POLITICAL STRIFE. Like the poem itself, this mapping is very specific, much more so than the *SoS* example in Theognis, but the underlying metaphor of the imagery is possibly marked by the word στάσιν in the poem's first line. Read literally, the term of course means something like *position* or *arrangement* and takes ἀνέμων as a specifying modifier, but the στάσις lexeme also has the distinct parallel meaning of *political faction* or *political revolution*. This usage is fairly common in the semi-political poetry of aristocratic symposia, and so its presence here may be a significant allusion to Alcaeus' own political activities, and to metaphorical political poetry as a whole.

15. "Indeed, our island poet loves being at sea in his allegories, and compares most of the troubles due to the tyrants to storms at sea." Heraclitus, Russell, and Konstan, *Heraclitus: Homeric problems*, 5.9

The specific detail in lines 6-9 of Alcaeus Z2 is more difficult to map convincingly. We know that the ship in question has been upset by waves (4-5), and so the image of the ship's upturned hold (6) may be a mere ancillary detail illustrating this disruption. This same explanation perhaps could apply to the ship's tattered, hole-ridden sails (7-8), but the closing image of the loosened (?) anchor/rope is nearly impenetrable (9).[16] One could perhaps argue that the various details are meant to figuratively illustrate the ship's devastated state, as each image is [presumably] an inversion of the ship's usual order: i.e., the hold, normally down, is now up; intact sails are needed to catch the wind, but these are now full of holes; sailors must know the condition of the sea and the wind's direction in order to sail, but these elements are now obscure. If interpreted this way, the larger theme in the Alcaeus example—order versus disorder—is roughly equivalent to the thematic illustration of κόσμος in Theognis 667-82. If such a reading is correct, the familiar WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE mapping is easy to place in the Alcaeus poem, and I would suggest that Alcaeus Z2 be interpreted broadly as an intricate expression of a general metaphor rather than as a point-by-point allegory. That is, not every detail of the poem fits neatly into the metaphorical frame, but the macro-elements of the trope are consistent with the *SoS* metaphor already observed in Theognis. A strictly allegorical hermeneutic model perhaps can accommodate the narrative details that we have already considered, but some fragmentary papyrus additions to the poem suggest additional details (not included in the above text), including possible images of the sailor's feet being entangled in the sheets (12-13) and cargo being carried off (13-15).

Even without the full poem to guide us, I believe that the broad cognitive model I have developed deals with the Alcaeus and Theognis *SoS* poems more neatly, insofar as it plausibly explains how a single core metaphor generates parallel iterations in two stylistically distinct

16. Page has replaced the MSS. ἄγκυραι with ἄνκονναι, for various reasons. For his discussion, see Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus*, 187. Either reading is equally problematic for my purposes due to the specificity of the image.

poems, even when the generated metaphors in question exhibit seemingly incompatible mappings. It is a core premise of the cognitive theory that metaphors need not be logically consistent so long as they are defined by parallel sets of core mappings; this allows for tremendous flexibility both in examining and in composing metaphor, as stylistic concerns and semantic concerns can be separated and individually considered. The Alcaeus and Theognis poems, despite their extreme differences, clearly exhibit certain fundamental similarities, and it is to these that I will now turn my attention.

5.1.3 Mapping the Ship of State

Both Alcaeus and Theognis provide an additional, shorter *SoS* example, each of which maintains the general compositional style identified in the longer examples considered above. I will consider these briefly before setting out a general schema for the *SoS* metaphor's core mappings.

The first example is from Theognis 855-56:

855 πολλάκις ἡ πόλις ἥδε δι' ἡγεμόνων κακότητα
ὥσπερ κεκλιμένη ναῦς παρὰ γῆν ἔδραμεν.

Many times this city, like a ship, has run listing along the shore due to the wickedness of its leaders.

This short fragment—questions of authorship aside—establishes in two lines the same basic mappings that govern the much longer Theognis 667-82.[17] Although the ship is more firmly correlated with the *polis* in this example than in 667-82, we still understand that the ship is endangered more through the mismanagement of its crew than through the action of sea or storm. In Theognis 667-82, the poet implies that while wind and wave may initially imperil the ship (673-4), the actions of the crew are what doom the boat (673, 674-79). Similarly, in Theognis 855-56 the ship is crippled by the poor quality of its leaders (the crew), causing it to list and founder. Compare this to the incipit of Alcaeus A6 (6):

17. West does not consider this fragment to 'genuine' Theognis, if there is such a thing. See the introduction to Theognis in West, *IEG* for his rationale.

τόδ᾽ αὖτε κῦμα τὼ προτέρω †νέμω
στείχει, παρέξει δ᾽ ἄμμι πόνον πόλυν
ἄντλην, ἐπεί κε νᾶος ἐμβαι...κτλ.[18]

Again, this wave comes [like? greater than?] the previous. It will give is much trouble to bail, when it overwhelms the ship...

Just as with the paired examples from Theognis, this short Alcaeus poem displays the same metaphorical schema as its parallel text, Alcaeus Z2. The *Wind and Wave* elements in Alcaeus A6 are more prominent than in the Theognis pieces, a phenomenon already noted in Alcaeus Z2, and like its companion poem, Alcaeus A6 establishes an imagistic *scene* informed by the WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE metaphor. Interestingly, the image of men bailing water from a swamped boat was also seen in Theognis (673), albeit in less specific terms, which perhaps suggests that a water-bailing mapping was fundamental to the *SoS* metaphor. In Alcaeus A6, the concise bailing image echoes the specific nautical vocabulary that distinguished Alcaeus Z2, supporting my claim that Alcaeus uses imagistic detail to fill out a generic *SoS* template. The imagistic, specific qualities of both the Alcaeus poems contrast with the more overtly metaphorical Theognis pieces, and again, if not for Heraclitus' intervention, the core metaphor of Alcaeus A6 would be less than obvious. Nevertheless, I would maintain that the *Wind and Wave* imagery of the Alcaeus poem works to mark the [extant] lines as figurative, particularly in combination with the bailing imagery commented on above. The lexical root ἀντλ- and its associated concept appear to be parallel markers, and are all the more significant for appearing in most of the *SoS* examples considered thus far.[19]

18. These lines are also preserved in Heraclitus, but have been supplemented by papyrus finds. The poem's additional lines are, as expected, quite fragmentary, and not totally relevant to my discussion of core *SoS* mappings. Moreover, there is a significant gap between the incipit and the restored later lines, which makes the metaphoric connection between the two segments difficult to assess. For comparison see Page and Lobel, *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta.*, 116-7, and Heraclitus, Russell, and Konstan, *Heraclitus: Homeric problems*, 5.8

19. Though more oblique, an ἀντλ- lexeme is in Alcaeus Z2 as well, in line 6: πὲρ μὲν γὰρ ἄντλος ἰστοπέδαν ἔχει, leaving Theognis 855-56 as the only example without the lexeme.

The texts discussed in the preceding two sections are the best preserved Archaic *SoS* exempla that I can find. These few, fragmentary texts of course are an insufficient corpus for any conclusive study of the metaphor, but we can still derive a number of credible observations from them, including a basic catalog of the mappings that define the *SoS* metaphor. Table 5.1 illustrates the basic mappings that are common to the Alcaeus and Theognis examples.

Source	**Target**
citizens/elite men	sailors
the boat	the *polis*/civic state
storm/wind/wave	political/social strife
the ship's tackle	rules & proper custom (?)
bailing water	efforts for 'proper' action
overwhelming wave	political/civic opposition
swamped craft	disrupted group/civic state

TABLE 5.1: *Provisional Ship of State mappings*

The limited poetic evidence makes exacting semantic identification difficult, and several of the listed correlations could be disputed. The political elements of the table obviously favor mappings found in the Theognis poems, a bias necessitated by the subtlety of Alcaeus' political imagery. The mapping THE POLIS IS A BOAT is problematic, insofar as the term *polis* appears only once, and then in a doubtful fragment of the Theognidea. Heraclitus does mention Mytilene by name in his explication of Alcaeus' *SoS* fragments, but again, the word *polis* is not explicit in Alcaeus' poetic record, at least that which relates to the *SoS*; for all these reasons I prefer the mapping THE BOAT IS A CIVIC STATE, which seems more catholic in its definition of the appropriate source-domain mapping. One could no doubt raise similar objections to the proposed mappings, but I would caution that the listed terms are intended to be more suggestive than absolute. Because metaphors are correlations between *concepts* rather than between *linguistic expressions*, efforts to codify the conceptual relationship with simple linguistic markers will necessarily be imprecise. To refine our correlated mappings further, we will need to consider possible reasons why the *ship* mapping arose in the *Wind and Wave* simile group, but with the

available *SoS* evidence exhausted, we will need to look to more circumstantial evidence, particularly that surrounding the poetic venue and performative context that underpinned our extant *SoS* examples.

5.2 · THE SYMPOSIUM

5.2.1 The venue of Archaic poetry

There is no question that a fragmentary textual record hinders our understanding of Archaic Greek lyric, but less attention is given to the impediment posed by our incomplete understanding of Archaic *performative* context, particularly with regard to genre. The relationship between poetic genre and performative context in the Classical period, though still patchy, is better understood, particularly in the case of public art such as drama or comedy. The situation is much less clear for pre-Classical materials: analogy to parallel oral-poetic traditions in non-Greek cultures has provided a decent theoretical model for understanding oral epic and lyric performance (I have already briefly discussed the likelihood that epic and lyric shared a common oral foundation, see section 4.2.1), from which we can make certain inferences about the performance of Archaic Greek lyric. The question of performance becomes doubly complicated for material composed in the late 7th to mid-6th centuries, during which time literacy became more common and traditionally oral literatures were increasingly retooled for private or semi-private audiences.[20] So far as we know, this is the period when the *SoS* trope first appears in the poetic record, itself the product of any number of possible literary influences.

20. A situation evident in the rise of the made-to-order poetry produced by poets such as Pindar, Bacchylides, and Simonides. Though still notionally public poetries in that the celebratory poems of these poets often commemorate public events, the focus on distinct, individual subjects is a break from the more general topics found in earlier vernacular poetry.

The question of Archaic poetic performance is, of course, very complicated, and is not something that I will address broadly.[21] My main concern is with the performative context of the surviving *SoS* examples, for which the limited evidence is usefully self-selecting: the two poets (Alcaeus and Theognis) in whose works we find *SoS* metaphors are also closely identified with aristocratic poetic *symposia*, the ritualized drinking party of Greek men. A number of sympotic poems are ascribed to both Alcaeus and Theognis, and the two are often presented as canonical examples of Greek sympotic poets.[22] More importantly, each poet appears to work within an established poetic style that—whether inspired by genuine symposia or not—certainly prizes the ideology conventionally associated with aristocratic symposia.[23] It is too much of a coincidence to ignore that the two poets in whose works the *SoS* metaphor appears most prominently are also the two poets most often associated with a certain ritualized poetic venue; combine this fact with the strong historical connection between sympotic participation and early Greek politics, and the symposium becomes an attractive candidate for the venue in which the *SoS* concept developed.

5.2.2 The poetics of the symposium

The mainstream of scholarly opinion holds that symposia were a venue for both the composition and the performance of poetry, particularly elegy and iambos. If true, the sympotic poems in Alcaeus and Theognis (as well as other Archaic poets) not only record details of how symposia

21. There is abundant secondary literature on the topic, some of which I have already mentioned. My research on Archaic performance has depended largely on the following: Gentili, *Poetry and its Public*; Rutherford, *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality and Pan-Hellenism*; Budelmann, *The Cambridge companion to Greek Lyric*; Andrew Laughlin Ford, *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2002); E. L. Bowie, "Early Greek Elegy, Symposium, and Public Festival," *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 106 (1986): 13–35.

22. For example, see Levine, "Symposium and the Polis" and Dimitrios Yatromanolakis, "Alcaeus and Sappho," in *The Cambridge companion to Greek lyric*, ed. Felix Budelmann (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

23. I would maintain that the question of corporate vs. individual authorship in Alcaeus and Theognis is immaterial here. Comparative oral poetic data demonstrate that corporate *poetic traditions* produce works as stylistically distinct as that produced by individual poets, suggesting that stylistic analysis can appropriately be applied to oral poetry as well.

were conducted, but are themselves artifacts of the very venues they describe—a situation that can be both problematic and tremendously useful for any critic attempting to understand the aesthetics of sympotic poetry. For my own discussion, the demography and logistics of symposia are less important than are sympotic poetic ideals, and because I am attempting to explain a thematic issue common to poetry I will accept as sufficient the evidence of poetry itself, while restricting my examination of the symposium to the thematic and aesthetic concerns that informed the poetry produced for that venue. Practical questions of how the symposium figured in Greek civic life will of course be relevant to this, but only insofar as they impact the aesthetic and metaphorical principles in question.[24]

Despite critical consensus that the symposium was a key venue for Archaic lyric performance, we still do not know to what degree lyric performance and composition in the Archaic period was restricted to symposia. It is true that apparent allusions to symposia occur throughout the lyric corpus, with higher concentrations in Alcaeus, the Theognidea, the Anacreonta, Archilochus, and Pindar, but much of the incidental evidence describing symposia is post-Archaic, or even post-Classical.[25] This of course does not immediately disqualify the apparent poetic evidence, but the significant chronological gap between developmental periods leaves ample room for innovation in both the material and philosophical accoutrements of the symposium.[26] I have attempted thus far (and as much as is possible) to make my argument ideologically neutral, so that my model might be useful for both traditional and radical theories of Archaic poetic production. I intend to maintain the same kind of agnosticism even while

24. For a nuts-and-bolts overview of the symposium, see the various articles in William J. Slater, ed., *Dining in a Classical Context* (Univ.Michigan P., 1992). For a more sociological overview, see Oswyn Murray, ed., in *Sympotica: a Symposium on the Symposium* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999).

25. Oswyn Murray, "Sympotic History," in *Sympotica: a Symposium on the Symposium*, ed. Oswyn Murray (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999).

26. For a case study of this type, examining how the material furniture of the symposium changed in the Hellenistic period, see Susan Rotroff, *The Missing Krater and the Hellenistic Symposium: Drinking in the Age of Alexander the Great*, Christchurch, N.Z., 1996.

including sympotic evidence, insofar as the symposium—whatever its demographic composition—is an acknowledged phenomenon in Greek society from at least the late Archaic period through the Hellenistic and into the Roman periods. There certainly *seems* to be a considerable body of poetry associated with sympotic ritual, as well, and the establishment of these two basic facts (i.e., the existence of both symposia and a sympotic poetics) is sufficient grounds for my argument. Whether the principles expressed in Archaic poetry are 'genuine' or not is immaterial, since the poetic system appears to be well-developed and consistent across various authors. If the *Ship of State* metaphor developed within this poetic system, then finding its real-world analog is not essential to understanding the internal logic of the poetry produced by it.

I would argue that *order*, expressed through moderation and restraint, is the foundational concept of sympotic poetry, and by extension, sympotic poetics, based on how often 'ordering' language appears in poetry associated with the symposium. We have already seen examples of this type of language in the discussion of Theognis 667-82 (see section 5.1.2), in which poem Theognis thematically juxtaposes the disruptive *Wind and Wave* elements with abstract concerns for κόσμος and δασμὸς ἴσος, but a similar concern for order is also found in the poetic descriptions of symposium proceedings. Perhaps the best example of this type is Xenophanes B1, which begins with the following:

νῦν γὰρ δὴ ζάπεδον καθαρὸν καὶ χεῖρες ἁπάντων
καὶ κύλικες · πλεκτοὺς δ' ἀμφιτιθεῖ στεφάνους,
ἄλλος δ' εὐῶδες μύρον ἐν φιάληι παρατείνει·
κρητὴρ δ' ἕστηκεν μεστὸς εὐφροσύνης·
ἄλλος δ' οἶνος ἑτοῖμος, ὃς οὔποτέ φησι προδώσειν,
μείλιχος ἐν κεράμοις, ἄνθεος ὀζόμενος·
ἐν δὲ μέσοις ἁγνὴν ὀδμὴν λιβανωτὸς ἵησιν,
ψυχρὸν δ' ἐστὶν ὕδωρ καὶ γλυκὺ καὶ καθαρόν·
παρκέαται δ' ἄρτοι ξανθοὶ γεραρή τε τράπεζα
τυροῦ καὶ μέλιτος πίονος ἀχθομένη·
βωμὸς δ'ἄνθεσιν ἀν τὸ μέσον πάντηι πεπύκασται,
μολπὴ δ' ἀμφὶς ἔχει δώματα καὶ θαλίη...κτλ.

> *For indeed now a table is clean, and everyone's hands, and cups—[this one] puts around [us] woven crowns, another applies sweet-smelling perfume in a bowl. The krater stands full of good cheer, and other wine is ready, which says it will never fail, soothing in its jar, smelling of bloom[s]. Frankincense sends its holy scent among everyone, and the water is cold, and sweet, and pure. Tawny bread lies close by, as well as a great table loaded with cheese and rich honey. The altar in the middle has been covered entirely in flowers, dance and cheer are all around the house...*

Xenophanes is describing the ideal sympotic scene, one that is defined by cleanliness (1-2, 8), ceremony (3-5, infra), sensual delight (3, 5-8, 10, etc.), and order (1-2, 11-12). The careful arrangement of the symposium's physical space in this poem illustrates the sympotic idealization of moderation and order, an idea made explicit in the poem's later observation that excessive drinking leads to immoderate thought and speech. Immoderate behavior must be avoided, because straying beyond the limits of good conduct may lead one to telling violent stories of war or politics, in which "there is nothing useful for the gods" (23-4),[27], and this injunction might remind us of the violence Theognis laments in his *SoS* poem when the wicked take their property by force and thereby eliminate order and equitable sharing (667-8). Xenophanes also emphasizes reverence for the gods (11-16), whose worship is presumably essential to maintaining the ritual order necessary for a successful symposium. Whatever its relationship to the historical conduct of 'real' symposia, Xenophanes B1 is programmatic for the ideals of sympotic poetry, particularly in its emphasis on correct speech and moderate drinking behavior. The warning against drunkenness is repeated in other sympotic poems, for example Theognis 467-496, which predicts dire consequences for a man who becomes too drunk (ll.479-483):

> αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ, μέτρον γὰρ ἔχω μελιηδέος οἴνου,
> ὕπνου λυσικάκου μνήσομαι οἴκαδ' ἰών.
> ἥκω δ' ὡς οἶνος χαριέστατος ἀνδρὶ πεπόσθαι·
> οὔτέ τι γὰρ νήφων οὔτε λίην μεθύων·
> ὃς δ' ἂν ὑπερβάλλει πόσιος μέτρον, οὐκέτι κείνος

27. In particular, Xenophanes warns against στάσιας σφεδανάς, 'fierce seditions,' using the same political term as appears in the first line of Alcaeus Z2.

480 τῆς αὐτοῦ γλώσσης καρτερὸς οὐδὲ νόου,
μυθεῖται δ' ἀπάλαμνα, τὰ νήφοσι γίνεται αἰσχρά,
αἰδεῖται δ' ἔρδων οὐδὲν ὅταν μεθύηι,
τὸ πρὶν ἐὼν σώφρων, τότε νήπιος...κτλ.[28]

But I, I have my measure of honey-sweet wine, and going homeward I will be mindful of care-releasing sleep: I have come [to the point where] wine is most pleasant for a man to drink, being neither entirely sober, nor excessively drunk. But whoever exceeds the measure of his drink, that man is no longer master of his own tongue, nor his mind, but says reckless things, things shameful to the sober. Whenever drunk he no long feels shame in his behavior: although previously wise, then he is a fool...

Notice that the poet does not warn against intoxication as such but only its *excess*, with the implication that moderate behavior defines the σώφρων man.[29] Such moderation is somewhat paradoxical, though, insofar as the only benchmark for proper behavior is a relative judgement of where one's mind is in the spectrum between σωφροσύνη and νηπία, but the more one drinks, one is less and less able to make such a judgement. Good judgment and proper behavior, then, are by implication innate characteristics of those wise individuals who can make the judgement without guidance.[30] We can thereby understand that good judgement is essential to practicing moderation and that moderation is a characteristic of proper self-governance, which in turn is a marker of wisdom. The wise (σώφρων) man is another *topos* of sympotic poetry, often with the implication that the symposium and sympotic poetry are suited only for a person with a certain degree of wisdom.[31]

Levine maintains that poetic imprecations against excess also promote general principles of good citizenship, since the man in control of himself is εὔφρων and reasonable, while the

28. West provisionally ascribes this poem to Euenus, making the poem Classical rather than Archaic. Regardless, the poem's sentiment resembles that of other Theognis poems, making its general illustration of sympotic values still valid.

29. The admonition against excessive drunkenness is a *topos* of the sympotic genre, and appears in a number of poems, for example Anacreon 356, Theognis 837-40, Alcaeus D12, etc.

30. Also, compare the emphasis on self-sufficiency with lines 17-18 in Xenophanes B1, which warn against drinking so much that one cannot return home without assistance.

31. Cf. the final lines of Theognis 667-82: ταῦτά μοι ἠνίχθω κεκρυμμένα τοῖσ' ἀγαθοῖσιν·/γινώσκοι δ' ἄν τις καὶ κακόν, ἂν σοφὸς ἦι.

excessive man is κακός and unreasonable.[32] To this we can add our conclusions about moderate behavior: a man in control of himself will likely be a responsible citizen as well. Just as fellows in the symposium should avoid discussion of wars and political factions,[33] men of good sense "speak in moderation" (εἰς τὸ μέσον φωνεῦντες, Theognis 495), and presumably deal fairly with their fellow citizens and symposiasts. Although such poetic recommendations likely existed more as ideal goals than as realized behavior, we should not automatically discount the influence of such ideals, even if they were frequently violated in practice. The conversation and communion venerated in the sympotic poetic tradition would not have been possible if the symposium were merely a rowdy drinking party; if drunkenness and disorder were the defining features of symposia, it seems unlikely that the symposium *as an institution* would have developed as a respected model of functional civic life.[34] In fact, the communal spirit of the symposium is also present in the poetic record, most notably in *Frag. Adesp. 27*:

χαίρετε συμπόται ἄνδρες ὁμήλικες · ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ γὰρ
ἀρξάμενος τελέω τὸν λόγον ἐς ἀγαθόν.
χρὴ, δ', ὅταν εἰς τοιοῦτο συνέλθωμεν φίλοι ἄνδρες
πρᾶγμα, γελᾶν παίζειν χρησαμένους ἀρετῆι,
ἥδεσθαί τε συνόντας, ἐς ἀλλήλους τε φλύαρεῖν
καὶ σκώπτειν τοιαῦθ' οἷα γέλωτα φέρειν.
ἡ δὲ σπουδὴ ἐπέσθω, ἀκούωμέν τε λεγόντων
ἐν μέρει · ἥδ' ἀρετὴ συμποσίου πέλεται.
τοῦ δὲ ποταρχοῦντος πειθώμεθα · ταῦτα γάρ ἐστιν
ἔργ' ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν, εὐλογίαν τε φέρειν.

Greetings symposiasts, companions! Having begun from a good [beginning?] I will bring this speech to a good end. It is necessary, however, whenever we dear friends should convene for such an occasion, to joke and play respectfully, to delight in our being together, to chat playfully with one-another, and to look to such things as bring laughter. Then let seriousness follow, and

32. Levine, "Symposium and the Polis," 182.
33. Xenophanes B1.22-23
34. For a contrary view, which stresses the frequent drunkenness of symposiasts, see William J. Slater, "Symposium at Sea," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 80 (1976): 161–170. Note, however, that Slater does not necessarily address the disconnect between the idealization of order in symposium poetry and the apparently excessive drunkenness of real symposia.

> *let us listen to those speaking in their turn: this is the virtue of the symposium. Let us obey the toastmaster, for these are the deeds of good men, and to bring good speech.*

Frag. Adesp. 27, in addition to being one of the few poems to explicitly name the *symposium* as its performative venue,[35] also makes clear that the fundamental rationale of the event is the pleasure its participants derive from each other's company.[36] Lines 5-6 emphasize this point, while lines 7-8 illustrate the genial cooperation that, under ideal conditions at least, should characterize conversation and debate in the symposium. The final lines of the poem extend the ideals of sympotic behavior into the real world, making a nearly political statement about the 'works of good men,' which involve speaking well and obeying the toastmaster/symposiarch. While certainly reminiscent of Xenophanes B1 in its general depiction of the symposium as an ordered affair, *Frag. Adesp. 27* is significant for its concern with human interaction during the symposium, and the poem includes none of the ritualistic and material details that occur in Xenophanes B1. The mild behavior *Frag. 27* promotes could just as easily describe the ideal behavior of a conscientious *polis* citizen, who might speak out during his turn but ultimately obeys the city's ruler. While the setting of the poem is indisputably a symposium, the general behavioral ideals expressed by the poem are applicable to civic life in general, perhaps with the implication that the symposium is a model of responsible civic activity.

5.2.3 Poetic expression of civic ideals

The abstract, moralizing language of *Frag. Adesp. 27* (e.g., ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν, ἀρετή, etc.) fits with that already seen in Theognis 667-82 and Xenophanes B1, and possibly also reflects generic ideals of civic participation. Counsels for moderation occur throughout the Archaic canon, even in poems that do not have an obvious connection to the world of the symposium. Language that

35. Another significant example is Alcaeus D12
36. Of course, συμπόσιον literally means 'drinking together.'

invokes moderation is particularly common in Solon, nearly all of whose poetry is transparently political and not necessarily sympotic.[37] A representative example from Solon is fr.6:

> δῆμος δ᾽ ὥδ᾽ ἂν ἄριστα σὺν ἡγεμόνεσσιν ἕποιτο,
> μήτε λίην ἀνεθεὶς μήτε βιαζόμενος·
> τίκτει γὰρ κόρος ὕβριν, ὅταν πολὺς ὄλβος ἕπηται
> ἀνθρώποις ὁπόσοις μὴ νόος ἄρτιος ᾖ.
>
> *In this way would the demos best follow along with its leaders, neither being excessively released nor restrained. Surfeit births insolence, whenever much fortune attends such men as have no suitable wit.*

Solon's conception of ideal political behavior (1-2) is functionally identical to the ideal sympotic behavior promoted in *Frag. Adesp. 27* and Xenophanes B1, particularly in its focus on moderation and rule-governed behavior. The *demos* of Solon 6 is clearly under the dominion of certain ἡγεμόνες, just as the symposiasts of *Adesp. 27* appear to be, and the 'middle way' Solon proposes—in which the citizenry has neither too little nor too much freedom—resembles the temperance promoted in Theognis 467-496. True, the Theognis and Xenophanes poems suggest that participants in a symposium are obligated to govern themselves, whereas the *demos* of fr.6 is likely not afforded the same license, but I am inclined to view the question of agency as more a pragmatic aspect of each poem's guiding frame than an absolute condition of the sentiments each poem proffers. I believe the similarity in ideals is the most important factor, particularly if the poems are considered to be part of the same general poetic culture.

The sympotic poems of Xenophanes and Theognis are likely informed by the same generative concept that underlies Solon 6, but express the core idea differently. In the case of sympotic poetry, the metaphorical frame generates the metaphor MODERATE BEHAVIOR IS NOT DRINKING TOO MUCH, whereas Solon's political poetry frames it as MODERATE BEHAVIOR IS A BALANCE OF POWER BETWEEN POLITICAL ENTITIES. The same essential mapping, but with slightly different implications, also appears in Solon fr.5:

37. Insofar as very little of the extant poetry attributed to Solon invokes the *topoi* common to overtly sympotic poetry.

δήμωι μὲν γὰρ ἔδωκα τόσον γέρας ὅσσον ἐπαρκεῖν,
τιμῆς οὔτ' ἀφελὼν οὔτ' ἐπορεξάμενος·
οἳ δ' εἶχον δύναμιν καὶ χρήμασιν ἦσαν ἀγητοί,
καὶ τοῖς ἐφρασάμην μηδὲν ἀεικὲς ἔχειν·
ἕστην δ' ἀμφιβαλὼν κρατερὸν σάκος ἀμφοτέροισι,
νικᾶν δ' οὐκ εἴασ' οὐδετέρους ἀδίκως.

To the demos I gave so much prerogative as to be sufficient, neither withdrawing honor nor conferring more; and also for those who were remarkable for the wealth and power I declared nothing inappropriate. I stood, having thrown my strong shield over both, allowing neither to unjustly prevail.

The entire point of this fragment is Solon's forceful moderation of two different parties while he simultaneously 'covers both with his shield' (5), protecting each faction not only from external threats but from, we can imagine, each other. This poem is likely an allusion to Solon's quasi-historical arbitration between the commons and the aristocrats in Athens, and the poem's theme again shows an overwhelming concern with balance and moderation, by which principle Solon grants equal concessions (2) to either party. The structuring metaphor of the poem is again MODERATE BEHAVIOR IS A BALANCE OF POWER BETWEEN POLITICAL ENTITIES, but unlike in fr.6, the implication here is that both parties—not just the commons—need to be restrained, and that such restraint can be accomplished (we assume) by the guidance of someone inherently σώφρων.

Moderation (and the wisdom of those who practice it) is not restricted to the political sphere, though, as seen in the discussion of sympotic poetry, and in both sympotic and political poetry the idea of moderation is necessarily linked to an implicit idea of order. In the case of symposia, moderation is necessary for the proper enjoyment of the event, and for the proper conduct of the symposium itself. The wise man regulates his drinking and retains a clear mind, demonstrating a commitment to order. In the political examples from Solon and Theognis, moderation is apparently necessary for the proper functioning of the state or civic group. In both types of poetry, the consequence of immoderate behavior is disorder through excess: either the assump-

tion of too much power by one political faction, or the deterioration of the sympotic festival into drunken revelry. Order and moderation are linked concepts, and it is therefore possible to remodel the core metaphor of the above poems to use a more general mapping, perhaps ORDER IS BALANCE BETWEEN OPPOSITES.[38]

The notions of moderation and order are primary themes not only in the generic sympotic poetry of Theognis and Xenophanes, but also in the general political poetry of Solon and the *SoS* poetry of Theognis. The moderation theme is less obvious in Alcaeus' *SoS* poetry, but I believe it is nonetheless implicitly present in the image of the boat being overturned by the onrushing storm waves. After all, the 'natural' position of a boat is upright, and as I have already remarked, a sea storm can disturb this order to the point that the boat overturns and its top and bottom switch places.[39] This image illustrates not only the disruptive force at the heart of the *Wind and Wave* mapping, but also the power of *Wind and Wave* to disturb ordered entities.

The *Wind and Wave* metaphor was present in Greek poetry from Homer onward, and there is no reason to think that the trope's embedded conceptual metaphor (realized in the core WIND AND SEA ARE A DISRUPTIVE FORCE mapping) would not have been dispersed through the various poetic traditions. The *Wind and Wave* mapping is naturally antithetical to the general ORDER IS BALANCE BETWEEN OPPOSITES mapping I just proposed, and the poetic evidence suggests that the *order* mapping was also widespread throughout the Archaic speech community, or at the very least, the audience of Archaic poetry. It is only natural, then, that a poet would at some point deliberately use the metaphors in concert, thereby creating the template seen in Archilochus

38. Though a bit abstract, this metaphor adheres to all of the general principles governing the composition of conceptual metaphors: it pairs an abstract principle (order) with a more concrete analogue (balance between opposites), it generates a variety of more specific lexical iterations, and it creates its own set of cognitive implicatures; it is an arbitrary connection between concepts.

39. Of course, the orientational metaphor GOOD IS UP, BAD IS DOWN reinforces one's aversion to the boat being overturned.

105 and Solon 9, and eventually, the full *Ship of State* metaphor.[40] To become widespread, the metaphor would have eventually dispersed into the wider speech community, but the symposium was very likely its origin point, or at the very least the venue in which the metaphor was most vigorously promoted. Even if the general order versus disorder juxtaposition was not developed in the symposium *per se*, the idea became so entangled in the poetic standards of the symposia as to make it nearly synonymous with sympotic poetry. This being the case, the symposium and the poetry surrounding it is the most plausible venue for the development of the *Ship of State* metaphor.

A deliberate thematic juxtaposition of order and disorder concepts in poetic symposia explains the interesting blend of abstract and specific language in Theo. 667-82, and generally makes a plausible claim for how lyric *SoS* instances relate to Homeric *Wind and Wave* language. It even provides a plausible explanation for how the *SoS* metaphor became an embedded lyric cliché of Classical and post-Classical Greek literature, appearing in Aeschylus, Sophocles, Plato, Demosthenes, and others, eventually making its way even to Roman poetry by way of Horace. Unfortunately, the elemental juxtaposition of the two opposing metaphors does not necessarily explain how the ship mapping developed in the system, but rather only creates a plausible context in which such a mapping might occur. Virtually all of the mappings documented in Table 5.1 have more to do with the ship mapping than with *Wind and Wave* imagery alone, suggesting that the ship element is the mapping most integral to the metaphor. The final section of this paper will be an investigation of how this mapping may have originated in the sympotic *Wind and Wave* system.

40. It is possible that the oppositional idea was already present in *Wind and Wave* similes of *Iliad* xv; such a reading naturally depends on how much agency one assigns to Homer as an author, and how much one believes that Homer presents κοσμός as a political or civic ideal.

5.3 · SYMPOTIC SAILORS

5.3.1 Origin of the 'ship' mapping

Based upon the evidence we have examined so far, we can propose two basic templates for how *Wind and Wave* imagery was deployed in Greek lyric. The first is the type demonstrated by Archilochus 105 and Solon 9 (as well as other poems), in which *Wind and Wave* imagery is either arrayed directly against a civic entity (e.g., as a storm attacking a city) or indirectly via an oblique non-nautical image (e.g., as a storm attacking the headlands). Implicit in these civic images is the notion of order, insofar as poetic treatments of political ideals seem to organize around images of order and moderation. The second major template is that in which *Wind and Wave* imagery is opposed to a group of sailors on a boat, which together represent a civic entity (i.e., the *SoS* metaphor). Again, the fundamental thematic idea is order against disorder, expressed when the disruptive *Wind and Wave* elements impinge upon the ordered condition of the ship and the sailors that maintain it.

It is possible to argue, as Page seems to, that the *SoS* metaphor is a further refinement of the *Wind and Wave against a civic entity* template, on the grounds that it demonstrates the same metaphorical frame as the more general metaphors seen in Archilochus 105 and Solon 9: *Wind and Wave* imagery ranged against an ordered civic state. To this I would object that outside of the basic thematic similarity and a common use of *Wind and Wave* imagery, there is no direct, necessary connection between the two metaphor types; that is, there is no *textual* evidence to predicate that the *SoS* developed from the other metaphor type. If the chronology of Greek lyric were better known, the diachronic relationship of the two metaphors would no doubt be easier to determine and this theory might be more plausible, but the evidence being what it is, the two metaphor types can just as easily be viewed as parallel phenomena. Indeed, I

believe that this was exactly the case, and that the two metaphorical templates were generated from a single conceptual juxtaposition of the *order* and *disorder* concepts which uses *Wind and Wave* imagery as its source domain. I say this on the grounds that, as has been discussed, the full *SoS* metaphor was not used by Homer, and the figure most likely developed in the milieu of the poetic symposium. Nevertheless, the *sailor* and *ship* mappings which fundamentally define the *SoS* metaphor existed as literal, non-marked constituents in Homer and other early poets, suggesting that although compositionally available they were metaphorically unattached until used in the *SoS* metaphor. Any theory of how the *SoS* metaphor developed must account for how these elements became part of the larger *Wind and Wave* system, and a development from an earlier metaphor type fails to do this. Instead, I would suggest that the new mappings were generated in the same venue that made the *SoS* system *conceptually* possible, namely the symposium.

If two metaphors representing order and disorder were deliberately juxtaposed by a sympotic poet, then there must have been a specific compositional need to do so. If the ship and sailor concepts truly were semantically independent prior to being used in the *SoS* metaphor, these mappings would have been added to the *Wind and Wave* system only if the WIND AND WAVE ARE A DISRUPTIVE force mapping were to be applied to some new entity representing order and moderation. That is, without a prior metaphorical valence to semantically link them to another concept, there would be no need for the ship and sailor elements to become part of the *Wind and Wave* system. A novel target entity must have been introduced first, one that was not already metaphorically mapped in the poetic record, to which the ship and sailor concepts could be applied. Due to the prominence of the order/disorder concept in its poetic system, the *symposium* itself was very likely the target domain which the *SoS* metaphor first described. As discussed already, sympotic poetry often idealizes order and moderation as core principles,

and the conceptual underpinnings of the symposium *as represented in poetry* suggest that sympotic ritual was conceived of in the same ways; thus, the symposium would have been a natural opposite to general *Wind and Wave* imagery. Moreover, the poetry that is associated with the symposium is often self-referential, discussing the venue and ritual of its own performance, which indicates a willingness by sympotic poets to innovate and make meta-poetic statements about their medium. Both of these factors make the symposium an ideal candidate for the initial *SoS* target domain, a supposition that is supported by several pieces of textual evidence.

5.3.2 Generating a 'ship' mapping

While the symposium group is a perfect *conceptual* opposite to the disruptive concepts embedded in *Wind and Wave* imagery, unlike a town or other civic entity the symposium gathering cannot reasonably be assaulted by a sea storm or other *Wind and Wave* element. It would have been natural then for symposiast poets interested in juxtaposing *Wind and Wave* concepts with sympotic ideals to find a suitable metaphorical symbol to use when representing the symposium-group, and it does not take much effort to see why a *ship* would have appealed to them as a source domain: ships were prestige-items, already associated with the state by trade and naval warfare; ships were manned by groups of men who worked at a common purpose; life on a ship would have demanded the same discipline and order that was notionally at the heart of both the symposium and city politics; non-figurative sea and storm imagery was not already mapped to any specific metaphor. Most importantly, the identification of the symposium with a ship would have allowed convenient access to a continuous tradition of oppositional *Wind and Wave* imagery, and the abundant non-figurative nautical imagery used throughout Greek literature would have ensured that virtually any poetic audience would already be familiar with the basic nomenclature of the new metaphor.

The SYMPOSIASTS ARE SAILORS ON A SHIP concept is appears enough in the in the poetic record that some work has already been done on it. Though his evidence dates largely from the Classical period, Slater convincingly argues that symposiasts often adopted the personae of sailors, perhaps in connection with the 'ship of Dionysus' concept and ritual Dionysian worship.[41] He cites several texts as evidence, most notably the anecdote from Timotheus (via Athenaeus) concerning the 'Trireme of Acragas,' which describes the actions of certain obstreperous symposiasts who, rather notoriously, acted like sailors while drunk, even complaining at length that they were stuck in a violent squall.[42] If true, and if the conceit of the 'sailors' was informed by a genuine cognitive mapping and not by impulsive drunken mania, the story would be a remarkable parallel for the proposed SYMPOSIASTS ARE SAILORS mapping. The Timotheus anecdote is not conclusive evidence for this, however, as one could just as easily claim that the drinkers involved were merely delusional, and that no real mapping has guided their delusion; the anecdote is suggestive but inconclusive in its demonstration of a real metaphorical correlation between symposiasts and sailors.

A relevant example from the Archaic period, and one that Slater curiously neglects to cite, is Archilochus 4:

φρα[
ξεινοι..[
δεῖπνον δ' ου[
οὔτ' ἐμοὶ ωσαῖ[
ἀλλ' ἄγε σὺν κώθωνι θοῆς διὰ σέλματα νηὸς
φοίτα καὶ κοίλων πώματ' ἄφελκε κάδων,
ἄγρει δ' οἶνον ἐρυθρὸν ἀπὸ τρυγὸς · οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡμεῖς
νηφέμεν ἐν φυλακῇι τῆιδε δυνησόμεθα.

...guests...dinner and...nor for me...but go with the cup through the benches of the swift ship, come and drag off the covers of the hollow jars. Take the ruddy wine from the lees! For we will not be able to stay sober on this watch.

41. Slater, "Symposium at Sea."
42. Athenaeus and S. Douglas Olson, *The Learned Banqueters* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; Loeb Classical Library, 2006), 2.5.37.

The poem's beginning is fragmentary beyond reconstruction, but the last four lines are clear, and in context with the readable words ξεινοι and δεῖπνον from the preceding lines, we can interpret the 'rowers' on the benches as symposiasts at a gathering. The poem's speaker is presumably the *symposiarch*, who commands the steward to bring wine to the other symposiasts as they 'row' the party along. This interpretation is contested by some critics, and I concede that without further corroboration the SYMPOSIASTS ARE SAILORS ON A SHIP mapping might be untenable.[43] The fragmentary condition of the poem certainly is a problem, and lacking any direct *Wind and Wave* imagery, there is nothing overt that puts the poem into a known metaphorical frame. However, this very unfamiliarity might be evidence that the poem represents a new metaphorical mapping, insofar as the mapping SYMPOSIASTS ARE ROWERS ON A BOAT would at one time have been a novel metaphor without extensive poetic precedent to inform it. If it does genuinely demonstrate this mapping, then Archilochus 4 could represent an intermediate stage in the development of *Wind and Wave* imagery as it transitions from a primary role in the oral similes of the Homerica to a supporting role in the *SoS* metaphor of later Greek literature. This is pure speculation of course, but if examined objectively the alternative readings of the metaphor are no less problematic.[44]

Given the metaphorical framework that I have developed to explain the *SoS*, I think Archilochus 4 very likely exhibits the SYMPOSIASTS ARE ROWERS ON A BOAT metaphor, but a more convincing piece of evidence comes from Dionysius Chalcus, whom Slater does cite (5d):

καί τινες οἶνον ἄγοντες ἐν εἰρεσίαι Διονύσου,
συμποσίου ναῦται καὶ κυλίκων ἐρέται,
< > περὶ τοὐδε · τὸ γὰρ φίλον οὐκ ἀπόλωλε.

And some bringing wine to the rowers of Dionysus, the sailors of the symposium and the rowers of cups...concerning this: for friendship is not ruined.

43. See Bowie, "Early Greek Elegy," p. 16 for a summary of views, and his own argument for the sympotic interpretation.

44. Moreover, can one take the image literally (i.e., that the speaker is actually *on a boat drinking*)? I find this interpretation less credible than any of its figurative alternatives.

This small fragment, again without context, makes an overt connection between symposiasts and sailors or rowers. The phrase συμποσίου ναῦται is particularly interesting, and is nearly as clear a mapping between sailors and symposiasts as could be wished for. Of course, one could still debate whether Archilochus 4 displays the same mappings, particularly as the Dionysius Chalcus fragment is from the Classical period and the Archilochus is likely from much earlier. I would maintain that given the apparent affinity between male camaraderie in the symposium and that among sailors, combined with the predisposition of sympotic poetics to incorporate the *Wind and Wave* semantic system as an oppositional foil, the chain of inference connecting symposiasts with sailors does not strain credibility; when combined with my previous argument regarding the aptness of the symposium as a target domain, the identification becomes increasingly attractive.

There are a few more fragments of textual evidence that reinforce the SYMPOSIASTS ARE SAILORS ON A SHIP mapping,[45] none of which are any more compelling than Chalcus 5D, and all of which are post-Archaic. The abundance of supporting evidence from the Classical period (excluding Archilochus 4) might suggest that the symposiasts/sailors mapping actually originated after the Archaic era. I would counter this by pointing out that the SYMPOSIASTS ARE SAILORS ON A SHIP mapping could just as easily have originated in the Archaic period, but stayed exclusive to sympotic usage for an indeterminate period, dispersing into the general speech community only at a later, Classical date.[46] It was only through its increasingly widespread adoption in poetry that the mapping was propagated, and eventually became so widespread that it occasionally eclipsed the original *Wind and Wave* component of the metaphor, as occurs in the *SoS* metaphor of Plato's *Republic*, which makes little or no account of *Wind and Wave* elements. Such a chronology of

45. As cited in Slater. He also mentions Choerilus Samius and a Pindar fragment (124a). I have consistently avoided using Pindaric evidence in this paper due to the difficulty and speciality of Pindaric studies, but a future expansion of this topic would certainly need to consider Pindar.

46. It is also possible, after all, that Archilochus 4 is from a longer Ship of State poem. So far as I know, the scholia do not speak to this issue.

course predicates that the institution of the symposium—and its attendant poetic system—was well established by the Archaic period, a supposition that I think is reasonable given the current evidence. My theory is catholic in its conception of the symposium, however, and applies equally well to exclusive and inclusive models of sympotic participation. In any case, I believe that I have shown as much as the available evidence allows that the *SoS* metaphor originated from a more basic SYMPOSIASTS ARE SAILORS ON A SHIP metaphor, from which it was innovated into a more complete independent trope.

Once the *SoS* metaphor had been generated as a target domain for the poetic symposium, there was likely a period of semantic drift that affected the involved mappings. Conventional accounts of the symposium tend to identify it as a quasi-political organization, one that is not easily separable from the political factions that seem to have characterized the civic politics of the Archaic period.[47] The conceptual mappings of the *SoS* metaphor would have eventually migrated along with the larger conceptual systems of the men who constituted the symposium group, and more politically active groups would have more forcefully applied the metaphor to their own political factions. In the *SoS* examples from Theognis and Alcaeus, considered in Section 5.1.2, it is not all clear what political or social entity each poet is mapping the ship image to, and indeed, it may be that the referent was unclear even for the poet. It is quite likely, however, that the ship domain mapped to all the many nebulous political and social facets of the symposium, and like our conceptual metaphors that defy lexical expression, the symposium concept itself no doubt had a polysemous definition even in the minds of those who took part in it.

47. Levine, "Symposium and the Polis."

5.4 · CONCLUSIONS

Given the progression of mappings surrounding the *SoS* metaphor and the likelihood that it developed in a sympotic milieu, there would have been a period during which the various mappings later associated with the figure were in flux. As the *SoS* metaphor was increasingly used in poetry and other literature, all the while gradually migrating into everyday discourse, the orientation of the various mappings would have solidified and become somewhat standardized. The SYMPOSIASTS ARE SAILORS ON A SHIP sub-metaphor appears to have persisted as an independent variant throughout the Classical period, and perhaps eventually was independent enough that it lost any political or social connotation, retaining only the *Wind and Wave* oppositional mappings that informed Greek maritime metaphors. During the period when the metaphor was still developing and unstable, the source mappings of the *ship* and *symposium* domains would have overlapped semantically, and we might do better to classify the metaphor of that period as a duplex figure, rather than as a single, monolithic semantic system. Table 5.2 lists some of the possible source-domain overlaps that likely occurred while the *SoS* metaphor was still in development.

Source		**Target**
Sympotic	*Nautical*	
symposiasts	sailors	citizens/elites
sympotic venue	the ship	*polis*/ordered state
sympotic furniture	ship's tackle	rules & proper custom
symposiarch	gubernator	political leader
moderation/sobriety	steady sailing	political order
drunkenness	waves, wind	social strife/revolution
disrupted symposium	swamped craft	ruined state/natural order
?	bailing water	efforts for 'proper' action
etc.	etc.	etc.

TABLE 5.2: *Duplex Ship of State mappings*

Cognitive metaphors need not be internally consistent, or even maintain logically compatible mappings, which explains the singularity of the 'bailing' image and its lack of a sympotic analogue. I would also mention that the listed mappings are not meant to be comprehensive, but instead are only the most obvious source and target sets that occur in the *SoS* metaphor of Theognis and Alcaeus. Similarly, the duplex metaphor of the sympotic period continued to develop through its use in Classical poetry and prose, something that I have not accounted for in the above mappings.

In my account of how the *SoS* metaphor developed I have made very little effort to speculate on how *Wind and Wave* elements would have been handled outside of poetry, except to note that the *Wind and Wave* cognitive metaphors evident in poetry would naturally have originated in the general discourse of the Greek speech community. Similarly, the *SoS* metaphor itself no doubt had a more complex genesis than I have presented, insofar as its generating elements were not restricted only to poetic usage, and no doubt interacted (in the symposium and otherwise) at varying registers of discourse, from conversational speech to poetic performance. Regardless, the *poetic system* of the symposium was a crucial influence on the development of the full *SoS* metaphor, and that it was through the general activity of communal dining and poetry recital that the metaphor was disseminated into literary culture. The progress of this dissemination is something I have yet to examine, but intend to consider in the future; in particular, a great deal of interesting and profitable work remains to be done on the *SoS* in early Classical poetry, especially in Aeschylus and Pindar.[48]

The complexity and idiosyncrasy of both Pindar and Aeschylus disbars them from being used in my current study (in truth, each poet would merit his own monograph), but the posi-

48. Interestingly, some work on *Wind and Wave* elements in Aeschylus has already been done , though not within the model I have proposed. See William C. Scott, "Wind Imagery in the Oresteia," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 97 (1966): pp. 459–471, and Jean Dumortier, *Les Images dans la poésie d'Eschyle* (Paris: les Belles lettres, 1975), esp. Ch 3, "Le navire dans la tempete."

tion of both poets as transitional figures from the late Archaic to early Classical periods makes them both ideal subjects for future study. Aeschylus in particular makes considerable use of the *SoS* figure, as well as general *Wind and Wave* language, suggesting that by the early Classical period the figure had become widespread enough to be used in broadly popular dramatic productions. The later tragedians also use the *SoS* metaphor to greater or lesser degree, though neither to the same extent as Aeschylus. During the Classical era we also begin to have enough prose in which to look for *SoS* examples. I have yet to identify any *SoS* instances in Herodotus or Thucydides, but I believe that there is evidence for widespread, conceptual-level nautical metaphors in both writers. Though dated considerably later, the Attic orators (and Demosthenes in particular) make frequent use of the trope, often with the conventional mappings first developed in Archaic lyric.[49] This continuity suggests that the metaphor was quite stable and productive, while compositional innovations like that in *Republic* VI speak to the ability of the metaphor to generate new variants.

At its heart, my paper proposes that a single metaphorical kernel underlies all instances of a relatively common literary metaphor. The cognitive framework is a convenient tool for this in that it provides—or at least suggests—clear answers as to how a metaphorical mapping may arise in a speech community, and why that metaphor may persist through literary history. Regardless, my advocacy of the cognitive approach should not be perceived as an evangelical promotion of the theory to the exclusion of all others; in the first place, there is a considerable bibliography of literature that supports the validity and practical application of the cognitive method, to which I would refer any reader with doubts or questions. Secondly, I would suggest that the cognitive approach is uniquely suited to the diachronic study of metaphor, and rather than supplanting traditional thematic analysis it can provide a stable foundation for more tra-

49. See, for example, *De Corona* 194.7 and *Philippics* III.69

ditional philological and thematic techniques. Though surely not applicable to every situation, I believe that in the case of the model developed in this paper the cognitive theory provides a useful heuristic for evaluating the relationship between the various genres of early Greek poetry; moreover, if the goal of Classical study is not only to illuminate ancient texts, but also to understand the culture of those who produced those texts, then this model is a useful addition to the field.

A · Appendices

A.1 · LYRIC TEXTS WITH WIND AND WAVE SIMILES

The following is not a list of *every* Archaic lyric text that includes a reference to the sea, but only those that I think best illustrate the *Wind and Wave* concept discussed in the body of the paper.

Text	**Wind/Wave situation**	**sea/storm elements**
Alcaeus A6	a wave overwhelming a ship	ship, waves
Alcaeus Z2	a ship foundering at sea	ship, wave, wind
Anacreon 347	the sea as a place of death	sea, wave
Archilochus fr.13	mourning those drowned at sea	sea
Archilochus fr.105	a threatening storm	storm, waves
Archilochus fr.106	a ship in a storm(?)	storm(?)
Bacchylides 17	plumbing the depths of the sea	sea, ship
Hipponax 115	an enemy drowned in the waves	sea, wave
Semonides fr.1	the sea as a place of death	wind, wave, storm
Semonides fr.7	the sea as mercurial entity	wind, wave, storm
Solon fr.9	a threatening storm	wind, storm
Solon fr.13	Zeus' wrath is like a windstorm	ravaging wind
Theognis 667-82	a ship foundering at sea	ship, wave, wind
Theognis 855-56	a ship listing along shore	ship, the sea

TABLE A.1: *Archaic texts containing* Wind and Wave *imagery*

A.2 · Homeric wind and wave metaphors

The following tables list instances of *Wind and Wave* simile in Homer, as determined by Scott. My tables are a significantly simplified version of those found in Scott, *Artistry of the Homeric Simile*, 190-205 and Scott, *The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile.*, 191-205. Scott's original tables include other details relating to his taxonomic system, including the type-scene, the principal other principal actors in the image, location, gods involved, etc., all of which material I have omitted. The remarkable disparity between the abundance of *Wind and Wave* similes in the *Iliad* and their scarcity in the *Odyssey* is highlighted by the tabular data.

Reference	**sea/storm elements**
5.328	wind
5.368	wind
6.20	wind

Table A.2: Wind and Wave *similes in the* Odyssey

Reference	**sea/storm elements**
2.144	winds, waves
2.147	wind
2.209	waves
2.394a	wave
2.394b	wind
4.422	wind, wave
5.499	wind
5.522	windless
7.4	wind
7.63	wind
9.4a	wind
9.4b	wave
10.437	wind
11.297	wind
11.305a	wind
11.305b	wind, waves
11.747	wind
12.40	wind
12.375	wind
13.39	wind
13.334	wind
13.795a	wind
13.795b	waves
14.16	windless, wave
14.394	wave
14.398	wind
15.381	wind, wave
15.618	wind, wave
15.624	wind, wave
16.765	wind
17.263	wave
20.51	wind
21.346	wind
23.266	wind

TABLE A.3: Wind and Wave *similes in the* Iliad

A.3 · LYRIC SHIP OF STATE EXAMPLES

The following are all of the Archaic fragments mentioned Section 5.1.2 which may contain *Ship of State* metaphors.

Examples from Alcaeus:

1. Alcaeus A6 (6a):

τόδ' αὖ]τε κῦμα τὼ π[ρ]οτέρ̣[ω †νέμω
στείχει,] παρέξει δ' ἄ[μμι πόνον π]όλυν
ἄντλην ἐπ]εί κε νᾶ[ος ἔμβαι
[ ].όμεθ' ἐ[
[ ]..[..]·[
[ ]
φαρξώμεθ' ὡς ὤκιστα̣[
ες δ' ἔχυρον λίμενα δρό[μωμεν,
καὶ μή τιν' ὄκνος μόλθ[ακος
λάχηι· πρόδηλον γάρ· μεγ[
μνάσθητε τὼ πάροιθα ν̣[
νῦν τις ἄνηρ δόκιμος γε[
καὶ μὴ καταισχύνωμεν[
ἔσλοις τόκηας γᾶς ὕπα κε̣[ιμένοις
..] τᾶνδ[
τὰν πο[
ἔοντε[ς
τὼν σφ[
ἔοικε[
ταῖ[ς
ἀλλ.[
..].[
[
π̣[..].[
μ[η]δ' ἄμμ[.]λω[
γε̣[.]ος μενέ[
μοναρχίαν δ.[
μ]ηδὲ δεκωμ̣[
[ ]..ιδημφ.[
[].οισί τ' ὔποπ̣[
[ ]αίνων· ἐκ[

2. Alcaeus Z2 (326):

ἀσυννέτημμι τὼν ἀνέμων στάσιν,
τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἔνθεν κῦμα κυλίνδεται,
τὸ δ' ἔνθεν, ἄμμες δ' ὂν τὸ μέσσον
νᾶϊ φορήμμεθα σὺν μελαίναι
χείμωνι μόχθεντες μεγάλωι μάλα·
πὲρ μὲν γὰρ ἄντλος ἰστοπέδαν ἔχει,
λαῖφος δὲ πὰν ζάδηλον ἤδη,
καὶ λάκιδες μέγαλαι κὰτ αὖτο,
χόλαισι δ' ἄγκυρραι, τὰ δ' ὀή[ϊα
[ ]
.[...].[ ]
-τοι πόδες ἀμφότεροι μενο[
ἐν βιμβλίδεσσι· τοῦτό με καὶ σ[άοι
μόνον· τὰ δ' ἄχματ' ἐκπεπ[.].άχμενα
..]μεν φ[ό]ρηντ' ἔπερθα, των[...].
]ενοισ.[
]νεπαγ[
]πανδ[
]βολη[

Examples from Archilochus:

1. Archilochus 4:

φρα[
ξεινοι.[
δεῖπνον δ' ου[
οὔτ' ἐμοὶ ωσαῖ[
ἀλλ' ἄγε σὺν κώθωνι θοῆς διὰ σέλματα νηὸς
φοίτα καὶ κοίλων πώματ' ἄφελκε κάδων,
ἄγρει δ' οἶνον ἐρυθρὸν ἀπὸ τρυγός· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡμεῖς
νηφέμεν ἐν φυλακῆι τῆιδε δυνησόμεθα.

2. Archilochus 106:

[ ]νται νῆες ἐν πόντωι θοαί
[π]ϱολλὸν δ' ἱστίων ὑφώμεθα
λύσαν]τες ὅπλα νηός· οὐρίην δ' ἔχε
[ ]ρους, ὄφρα σεο μεμνεώμεθα
[ ]ἄπισχε, μηδὲ τοῦτον ἐμβάληις
[ ]ν ἵσταται κυκώμενον
[ ]χης· ἀλλὰ σὺ προμήθεσαι
[ ]υμος

Examples from Theognis:

1. Theognis 667-82

Εἰ μὲν χρήματ' ἔχοιμι, Σιμωνίδη, οἷά περ ἤδη
οὐκ ἂν ἀνιώιμην τοῖσ' ἀγαθοῖσι συνών.
νῦν δέ με γινώσκοντα παρέρχεται, εἰμὶ δ' ἄφωνος
χρημοσύνηι, πολλῶν † γνοῦσαν † ἄμεινον ἔτι
οὕνεκα νῦν φερόμεσθα καθ' ἱστία λευκὰ βαλόντες
Μηλίου ἐκ πόντου νύκτα διὰ δνοφερήν·
ἀντλεῖν δ' οὐκ ἐθέλουσιν· ὑπερβάλλει δὲ θάλασσα
ἀμφοτέρων τοίχων. ἦ μάλα τις χαλεπῶς
σώιζεται. οἱ δ' ἔρδουσι· κυβερνήτην μὲν ἔπαυσαν
ἐσθλόν, ὅτις φυλακὴν εἶχεν ἐπισταμένως·
χρήματα δ' ἁρπάζουσι βίηι, κόσμος δ' ἀπόλωλεν,
δασμὸς δ' οὐκέτ' ἴσος γίνεται ἐς τὸ μέσον·
φορτηγοὶ δ' ἄρχουσι, κακοὶ δ' ἀγαθῶν καθύπερθεν.
δειμαίνω, μή πως ναῦν κατὰ κῦμα πίηι.
ταῦτά μοι ἠνίχθω κεκρυμμένα τοῖσ' ἀγαθοῖσιν·
γινώσκοι δ' ἄν τις καὶ κακόν, ἂν σοφὸς ἦι.

2. Theognis 855-56

πολλάκις ἡ πόλις ἥδε δι' ἡγεμόνων κακότητα
ὥσπερ κεκλιμένη ναῦς παρὰ γῆν ἔδραμεν.

2

Bibliography

Acosta-Hughes, Benjamin. *Arion's Lyre: Archaic lyric into Hellenistic poetry*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Aristotle and Donald William Lucas. *Poetics. Introduction, Commentary and Appendixes*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.

Athenaeus and S. Douglas Olson. *The Learned Banqueters*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; Loeb Classical Library, 2006.

Bakker, Egbert J., and Ahuvia Kahane. *Written Voices, Spoken Signs: Tradition, Performance, and the Epic Text*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Bowie, E. L. "Early Greek Elegy, Symposium, and Public Festival." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 106 (1986): 13–35.

Budelmann, Felix, ed. *The Cambridge companion to Greek Lyric*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Coffee, N. "The ΦΟΡΤΗΓΟΙ of Theognis 667-82." *The Classical Quarterly* 56, no. 01 (2006): 304–305.

Croft, William, and D. A. Cruse. *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge, U.K.; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Dumortier, Jean. *Les Images dans la poésie d'Eschyle*. Paris: les Belles lettres, 1975.

Foley, John Miles. *Homer's Traditional Art*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999.

———. *Immanent Art: from Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991.

———. *The Theory of Oral Composition: History and Methodology*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988.

Ford, Andrew Laughlin. *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Gentili, Bruno. *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece: from Homer to the Fifth Century*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988.

Gibbs, Raymond W., ed. *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Glucksberg, Sam. "How metaphors create categories." In *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought*, edited by Raymond W. Gibbs. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

———. "The psycholinguistics of metaphor." *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 7, no. 2 (2003): 92–96.

Hall, Jonathan M. *A history of the archaic Greek world, ca. 1200-479 BCE*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., 2007.

Heraclitus, D. A. Russell, and David Konstan. *Heraclitus: Homeric problems*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.

Hesiod and M. L. West. *Works & Days*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.

Homer. *Homeri Opera, Tomi I-IV. Iliadis Libros I-XXIV et Odysseae Libros I-XXIV Continentes*. Edited by Thomas W. Allen. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.

Keith, Arthur Leslie. "Simile and Metaphor in Greek Poetry: from Homer to Æschylus." PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1914.

Kövecses, Zoltán. *Metaphor: a Practical Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Lakoff, George. *Master Metaphor List*. Berkeley, Calif: University of California, 1994.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Leidl, Christoph G. "The Harlot's Art: Metaphor and Literary Criticism." In *Metaphor, Allegory, and the Classical Tradition*, edited by G.R. Boys-Stones. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Levine, Daniel B. "Symposium and the Polis." In *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis*, edited by Thomas J. Figueira and Gregory Nagy, 176. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.

Lindenlauf, Astrid. "The Sea as a Place of No Return in Ancient Greece." *World Archaeology* 35, no. 3 (2003): 416–433.

Minchin, Elizabeth. *Homer and the resources of memory*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Moulton, Carroll. "Homeric Metaphor." *Classical Philology* 74, no. 4 (1979): 279–293.

Muellner, Leonard. "The Simile of the Cranes and Pygmies: a Study of Homeric Metaphor." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 93 (1990): pp. 59–101.

Murray, Oswyn, ed. In *Sympotica: a Symposium on the Symposium*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

———. "Sympotic History." In *Sympotica: a Symposium on the Symposium*, edited by Oswyn Murray. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

Nagler, M. N. *Spontaneity and tradition: a study in the oral art of Homer*. University of California Press, 1974.

Nagy, Gregory. *Pindar's Homer: the Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.

———. *The best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.

Ortony, Andrew, ed. *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1994.

Osborne, Robin. *Greece in the Making 1200-479 BC*. Routledge, 2010.

Page, Denys L. *Poetae Melici Graeci*. Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1967.

———. *Sappho and Alcaeus: an Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry*. London: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Page, Denys Lionel, and Edward Lobel. *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta*. Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1963.

Pellizer, Ezio. "Outlines of a Morphology of Sympotic Entertainment." In *Sympotica: a Symposium on the Symposium*, edited by Oswyn Murray. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

Purves, Alex C. "Wind and Time in Homeric Epic." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 140, no. 2 (2010): 323–350.

Redfield, James M. *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: the Tragedy of Hector*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Rosen, Ralph M. "Poetry and Sailing in Hesiod's 'Works and Days'." *Classical Antiquity* 9, no. 1 (1990): pp. 99–113.

Rösler, Wolfgang. "Mnemosyne in the Symposion." In *Sympotica: a Symposium on the Symposium*, edited by Oswyn Murray. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

Rotroff, Susan. *The Missing Krater and the Hellenistic Symposium: Drinking in the Age of Alexander the Great*. Christchurch, N.Z., 1996.

Russell, D. A., and Michael Winterbottom. *Classical Literary Criticism*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Rutherford, Ian, ed. *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality and Pan-Hellenism*. Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Scott, William C. *The Artistry of the Homeric Simile*. Hanover, N.H.: Dartmouth College Library / Dartmouth College Press ; Published by University Press of New England, 2009.

———. *The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile*. Leiden: Brill, 1974.

———. "Wind Imagery in the Oresteia." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 97 (1966): pp. 459–471.

Silk, Michael. "Metaphor and Metonymy: Aristotle, Jakobson, Ricoeur, and Others." In *Metaphor, Allegory, and the Classical Tradition*, edited by G.R. Boys-Stones. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Slater, William J., ed. *Dining in a Classical Context*. Univ.Michigan P., 1992.

———. "Symposium at Sea." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 80 (1976): 161–170.

Steen, Gerard. *Understanding Metaphor in Literature: an Empirical Approach*. London; New York: Longman, 1994.

West, M. L. *Greek Lyric Poetry: the poems and fragments of the Greek iambic, elegiac, and melic poets.* Oxford [England]; New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1993.

———. *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Yatromanolakis, Dimitrios. "Alcaeus and Sappho." In *The Cambridge companion to Greek lyric*, edited by Felix Budelmann. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Index Locorum