Introduction

Dreams of order

> It was, this "Guermantes," like the setting in a novel, an imaginary landscape I could picture to myself only with difficulty and thereby longed all the more to discover, set amid real lands and roads that would suddenly become immersed in heraldic details, a few miles from a railway station; I recalled the names of the places around it as if they had been situated at the foot of Parnassus or of Helicon, and they seemed precious to me as the physical conditions necessary – in topographical science – for the production of an inexplicable phenomenon.
>
> Marcel Proust, *The Guermantes Way*[1]

This is a book about metaphors of place and spaces of metaphor in ancient literary theory and criticism. It traces the power of figuration to shape, in Shakespeare's famous phrase, "a local habitation and a name" and demonstrates the ways in which rural landscapes emerge in ancient convention as central to literary judgment and theorizing.[2] Writers ranging from archaic poets to rhetorical theorists trace journeys to special places, stage scenes of viewing and appreciating the lay of the land, match inhabitants to their settings, discriminate among landscape features, and by means of imitation and emulation appropriate and reshape famous terrains. They engage in all of this elaborate spatial ordering primarily to delimit styles – first of poetry and later on of prose, predominantly oratory. But their discriminations also spring from and reinforce broader aesthetic and cultural hierarchies, so that their stylistic schemes have a more extensive reach than it may initially appear.

[1] "C'était, ce Guermantes, comme le cadre d'un roman, un paysage imaginaire que j'avais peine à me représenter et d'autant plus le désir de découvrir, enclavé au milieu de terres et de routes réelles qui tout à coup s'imprégneraient de particularités héraldiques, à deux lieues d'une gare; je me rappelais les noms des localités voisines comme si elles avaient été situées au pied du Parnasse ou de l'Hélicon, et elles me semblaient précieuses comme les conditions matérielles – en science topographique – de la production d'un phénomène mystérieux" (Proust [1922] 1987–89: II.314; tr. Treharne 2003: 8).

[2] "The poet's eye, in fine frenzy rolling, | Doth glance from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven; | And as imagination bodies forth | The forms of things unknown, the poet's pen | Turns them to shapes and gives to airy nothing | A local habitation and a name" (*A Midsummer Night's Dream*, 5.1.14–19). On Shakespeare's "habitation," see further below, section 2.

I have two primary contentions: first, that rural settings, as well as pilgrimages to them, are central to the development of ancient literary theory and criticism and coincide with a sense of metaphor as spatial and mobile. Ancient writers on rhetoric follow Aristotle in conceiving of metaphors as traversing and delimiting remote places – sometimes even as strangers crossing over from distant realms and bringing things from far away up close (e.g., *Po.* 1457b6–7; *Rhet.* 1405a8, 1411b23; cf. 1411a26–35).[3] My second and parallel contention is that representations of rural landscapes shape theory because the metaphorical spaces that they delimit are so deeply rooted in poetic convention and in famous places of pilgrimage and invention with many layers of cultural accretion. These places thus emerge in critical discourse as already received and represented, so that they serve the stylistic topographies as the provocative remnants in language of the real sites that they never can be and yet that always beckon as such.[4]

I want to propose as well that although scholars have tended to use the phrase "ancient literary criticism" to encompass the many different kinds of texts and arguments usually included under that rubric, in fact "theory and criticism" better captures its range – from, for example, the drama of critical judgment in Aristophanes' *Frogs* to Cicero's analyses of rhetorical invention and style.[5] In addition, for the purposes of this study in particular, "theorizing" in the sense of observing, reordering, and gaining conceptual ground captures a central aspect of the process by which landscapes and spaces of metaphor come to structure and be absorbed into critical-theoretical discourse.

Literary critical and theoretical discourse is thus shaped by shared conventions and framed from the outset as poetic and metaphorical. That is, "style in writing" (tenor, ground, target) takes shape *as* a figurative

[3] On Aristotle's use of metaphors for metaphor, see esp. Derrida [1972] 1982; also Ricoeur 1978a, [1975] 1978b, 1996, Lloyd 1996, and further below (section 1) and in ch. 1.2. I am using the term "metaphor" in the most expansive, Aristotelian sense, as coextensive with figuration more generally. The status of metaphor as the essential figure of thought vs. as one among many modes of ornamentation has a complicated history; see further in ch. 1 (introductory section).

[4] I.e., never real within language, since the settings are shaped and reshaped by layers of representation – cf. Jacques Derrida's influential formulation of these as "traces." It may be significant for my purposes that the French word can also mean "track," encompassing a sense of "footprint" and thus (past) movement; see Spivak's introduction to *Of Grammatology* (Derrida [1967] 1976: xvii).

[5] The term "critic" (*kritikos*) is apparently Hellenistic; the grammarian Crates may have laid claim to it as more encompassing than *grammatikos* (see Asmis 1992a; cf. Schenkeveld 1964). Scholars have also debated the relationship between rhetorical theory and literary criticism (e.g., Rhys Roberts 1963; Meijering 1987; Classen 1995).

discourse, as, say, a straight or winding "path" (vehicle, figure, source). Before it is analyzed in itself, it is expressed as metaphor.[6] Further, as ancient poets such as Pindar show so effectively, metaphors can render close and conspicuous ideas that are not easily accessible through the senses. The striking image achieves envisioning and insight, when the match made brings the metaphorical term into vivid proximity with its new ground, as with a phrase like the Homeric "path of song," an image picked up by Pindar and Aristophanes and developed by later ancient literary and rhetorical theorists. These poets and prose writers all clearly appreciate the visualizing capacity of metaphorical language and appropriate it accordingly, although the theorists often express concern about the dangers of metaphorical usage that is too poetic and outlandish.[7] Modern accounts of metaphor also tend to recognize as potentially problematic the "something extra" that metaphor imports and often take as given its powers of envisioning.[8]

This is certainly the case with the terrains of literary theory and criticism, where this visualizing capacity arises from the fact that so many of its tropes and images are deliberately situated in familiar topographies that beckon tantalizingly as if from a distance. Their aesthetic coordinates (e.g., springs, mountain paths, flowers), like Proust's "heraldic details," stand out as capturing essential aspects of familiar places, as they come to be in their envisioning and reordering. These places include, most notably, Delphi and Mount Parnassus, the springs on Hesiod's Helicon and the Valley of the Muses below, and the Ilissus and Cephisus rivers in Athens. The Boeotian mountains were celebrated as famous sites of pilgrimage, inspiration, and cultic activities, while sanctuaries (including one to the Muses) and parkland retreats such as the Academy graced the areas along

[6] This is true of any new field of knowledge, namely, that its discourse is initially shaped by means of metaphors, the vehicles of which fade in the course of its theorization (e.g., as Greek prose begins to define itself over and against poetic expression). See Harriott 1969: 62–63, who quotes William Empson (1947: 25) on dead metaphors. For the terminology, see Richards (1936) (tenor-vehicle), McLuhan (1967) (ground-figure), and Lakoff (1980) (target-source). See also Black (1962); Franke 2000.

[7] See further in ch. 1.2. Bad metaphors can result in stylistic "frigidity" (τὸ ψυχρόν, *Rhet.* 1406a32–34) or "crude and elaborate expressions" that make the language sound poetic (cf. τῶν φορτικῶν καὶ περιέργων αὐτὸν οἴεται ζηλωτὴν γενέσθαι λόγων καὶ τὸ ποιητικὸν διώκειν μᾶλλον τὸ ἀληθινόν, DH, *de Lysia* 14 [= test. Theophr. 692 F]; cf. Arist. *Rhet.* 1405b11).

[8] Moran (1996: 385) remarks, "The concept of the metaphorical is originally devised for application to the discourse of others. It is a rhetorical weapon." Cf. Leidl 2003: 53; also Davidson's prosaic "Metaphor makes us see one thing as another" (1978: 45). But cf. Todorov, who recognizes this visualizing as a special feature, as the "visibility of discourse" (Ricoeur's paraphrase, 1978a: 142). See Moran 1989: 90 on the traditional relation between metaphor (or figuration more generally) and seeing images.

Athenian rivers.[9] Hesiod and Pindar both orient their poetics by means of identifiable landscapes, which come to resonate as programmatic indicators in the literary critical geographies of Hellenistic and Roman poets. Plato's *Phaedrus* lays the groundwork for mapping rhetorical criticism as site-specific and ritually significant, tracing the interlocutors' progress along the banks of the Ilissus just outside the walls of Athens, where shrines to Pan, the river god Achelous, and the Nymphs were situated. Aristophanes' *Frogs* utilizes nearly the same lay of the land, although in a more adumbrated manner, to trace the path of literary judgment.

This focus on landscapes and those who view and/or inhabit them may seem to constitute a narrow rubric with which to analyze the heterogeneous texts that modern scholars have treated as contributing to ancient literary criticism, but it is in fact a central means by which literary critical and theoretical ideas are formulated in the ancient discussions. We can witness already in Pindar's odes how the poet-performer celebrates ritual centers such as Olympia and Delphi as received landscapes laden with sensory pleasures, cultural pride, and economic evaluations, as well as how these settings shape his poetic program and ground his aristocratic affiliations.[10] Because of the embodied, place-specific quality of poetic invocation, this tradition develops originally in Greek literary contexts; but heavily accreted places in Boeotia and Attica also serve as settings in Greek and Roman reception for reviewing the aesthetic and cultural significance of certain landscapes and their features. Even less renowned areas such as the bank of the Ilissus river in Athens give this impression. In the *Phaedrus* Socrates appreciates the lay of the land like a man of leisure as well as a connoisseur of the conventions of the *locus amoenus*, wryly casting its beauties in terms that recall encomiastic rhetoric and engaging a long poetic tradition that associates such settings with divine inspiration.[11]

Centuries later theorists such as Cicero and Dionysius of Halicarnassus take up this same setting as a means of highlighting their control of Greek conceptual territories – that is, the conventions governing ideas

[9] On Boeotia see Schachter 1981; Berman 2004, 2007; Robinson 2012; on Athens see Wycherley 1978.

[10] On Pindar's Delphic coordinates, see Eckerman 2014.

[11] Although the phrase *locus amoenus* is Ciceronian in origin, there is little question that Plato appropriates this poetic commonplace when he has Socrates exclaim, as he looks upon the chosen spot beside the Ilissus, "By Hera, the resting place is certainly delightful [καλή γε ἡ καταγωγή]" (*Phdr.* 230b2) (cf. Cic. *Verr.* 6.80; *Mur.* 13; *de Fin.* 2.107 [=one among many pleasures of the body in a discussion of Epicureanism]; *Att.* 12.19.1; *de Orat.* 2.290; *Epist.* 7.20.2). On the *locus amoenus* more generally, see esp. Curtius 1953; also Hass 1998. On the way the passage tropes on the setting in wry emulation of poetic and rhetorical conventions, see ch. 4.2a.

about beauty, leisure, and sensory response pegged to features of famous terrains. They react to this imagery like the intellectual tourists they are, reordering celebrated topographies and recalibrating their symbolic references. Further, these two settings – one quite rural, the other more suburban – offer the tradition their familiar details as distinguishing coordinates. The mountainside of Helicon with its springs in later tradition evokes a poetic and critical mode (e.g., slight and refined), while garden and meadowland spaces along the Ilissus offer the critical remove, the flowering idyll, that writers oppose to more rigorous urban styles. These places thus have specific identities, organizing principles, local practices, and known denizens (e.g., poets on the mountain, philosophers in the garden); and they accumulate long-held aesthetic and ethical associations as such.[12]

The aesthetics of ancient landscapes, then, embraces contentious reevaluations of cultural settings as they are familiarly viewed, coordinating more urban compass points such as the Athenian Agora or the Roman Forum, or internationally celebrated sanctuaries like Delphi and Olympia, in relation or contrast to the rural locales that most centrally orient scenes of literary judgment. The sustained use of these famous spaces affords literary critical discourse a purposeful terrain, a layered reception of topographies that gives palpable shape to the emerging theoretical idiom. The flank of Helicon and the bank of the Ilissus, even as they are always "Helicon" and "Ilissus" in literary representation and critical accretion, retain their draw as sites of pilgrimage (or "pilgrimage") and invention: witness Propertius at the spring, Cicero in the grove.[13] This intellectual tourism itself reiterates the appropriation of rural settings and their celebrated features for use in literary critical and theoretical ventures.

I want to emphasize as well that my discussion is very far from a historical or archeological study of actual topographies, even as it frequently highlights the intersection of figurative space and real place (i.e., that staged as "real" within literary representation). In so doing it uncovers within the literary realm a mode parallel to the semiotics of landscape that has received such lively attention in art history and landscape architecture.[14] Just as artists in later traditions trace topographies whose classicizing lineaments refer most meaningfully beyond the actual lay of the land, so ancient poets and critics exploit the natural features of familiar

[12] See Leidl 2003; on latter-day pilgrimage and Pausanias, see Rutherford 2001, 2013.

[13] Prop. 3.3.1–16, which reproduces "up on Helicon"; Cic. *De orat.* 1.7.28; *De leg.* 1.4–7, which reproduces "down along the Ilissus." See further in chs. 6 and 7.

[14] E.g., Hunt and Willis (eds.) 1988; Pugh (ed.) 1990; Hirsch and O'Hanlon 1995; Roskill 1997.

settings in order to shape an evolving stylistic vocabulary (e.g., purity [mountain springs], fluidity [smooth-running rivers], roughness [mountain paths], decoration [flowering idylls]). They thereby contribute to the crafting of a shared set of place references that not only map distinctions of vocabulary and usage in literary composition but also attach to hierarchies of taste and attitude within the social realm. The resulting stylistic vocabularies thus have cultural and socio-political import, insofar as they conjoin ideas about particular spaces and places with claims to power and authority as well as civic attitudes and behaviors. That said, the emerging critical discourse does not depend on real artifacts or spaces for its significance and impact so much as on their reproduction within literary representation.[15] As such it crafts a rigorously drawn and increasingly influential emblematic topography that effectively partitions the world and its inhabitants by taste and inclination.

Scholars of ancient literature have studied the cultural molding and representation of Greek and Roman landscapes, and there have been many distinctive studies on various aspects of landscape imagery, largely as they occur in poetry. Some of these focus on settings in relation to poets' scenes of divine inspiration and initiation, others attempt to characterize and categorize the different features symbolically.[16] Discrete studies also treat path and road metaphors and/or springs and water imagery.[17] A few scholars have looked explicitly at river imagery; others at Greek landscapes more generally; and still others at the topos of the *locus amoenus* in particular.[18] Again, most of these studies focus on poetry and/or the ancient novel; and although some do make reference to imagery in theoretical treatises, they usually treat it as secondary.[19] The one exception to this privileging of poetic landscapes is the ever-evolving treatment of the setting of Plato's *Phaedrus*, which most recently includes that of Richard

[15] Cf. *lieux de mémoire* ("sites of memory") and their cultural accretions in studies such as those of Pierre Nora (e.g., 1989) and Simon Schama (1995).

[16] On *Dichterweihe* see Kambylis 1965; Harriott 1969; also Sperduti 1950; Murray 1981, 1992, 1996.

[17] E.g., Becker 1937 (paths in poetry); Crowther 1979 (springs and drinking in Alexandrian and Roman poetry); Steiner 1986 (paths and gardens in Pindar); Asper 1997 (paths and waters in Callimachus); Nünlist 1998 (paths and "flow" imagery in early poetry).

[18] E.g., Fenno 2005 (sea and river in the *Iliad*), Jones 2005 (rivers in Roman literature); Snell 1955 (ch. 16), Parry 1957, and Elliger 1975 (landscapes in Greek poetry); Buxton 1992, 1994, Romm 1992, Thalmann 2011 (literary geographies); Curtius 1953 (ch. 10), Schönbeck 1962, and Hass 1998 (the *locus amoenus*); Saïd 1997 (landscapes in bucolic poetry); Forehand 1976, Zeitlin 1990, Alpers 2001, Calame 2007 (gardens in Longus).

[19] Asper (1997: 23 and n. 8), for instance, claims (following Van Hook 1905) that paths imagery is largely restricted to poetry.

Hunter, whose extensive work on ancient literary programs and criticism stands out for repeatedly drawing attention to significant poetic landscapes and their connections to critical traditions.[20]

No one, however, has pursued the means by which certain inhabited landscapes become central to ancient literary practices that range from programmatic and critical gestures in poetry to more fully developed stylistic theories in rhetoric, or recognized the enduring impact of this widespread orientation.[21] And yet the coordinating of bodies and topographies in the staging of literary judgment extends not only from archaic poetry through to Attic comedy, but also from Platonic dialogue to Ciceronian oratory, Roman poetry, and the novel, as well as to the writings of literary theorists such as Demetrius, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and "Longinus."[22] Since these schemes have their roots in Greek literary conventions, my discussion concentrates for the most part on the Greek beginnings and various elaborations of these topographies, while also indicating and occasionally discussing at some length their most influential Roman developments.

In what follows I first offer in brief some modern theoretical coordinates for orienting the landscape dynamics that form the core of my discussion, as well as their mimetic and metaphorical underpinnings. These dynamics, which the second section surveys in the longer tradition, often initiate in scenes of viewing and reproducing aesthetic topographies, and as such engage in actions central to ancient critical practices: theorizing (i.e., observing and contemplating, *theōrein*) and emulating (i.e., mimesis, *mimeisthai*). These actions drive the aesthetic practices as a whole; they are most prominently worked out in Plato, whose ideas about viewing beauty in and out of rural settings influence later theory. In the third section I focus in more detail on particular landscape features and those who transform them, highlighting the various angles from which

[20] Hunter 2012: 10–18 and ch. 4; cf. Hunter 2003, 2006, 2008b. On the *Phaedrus* setting, see (e.g.) Wilamowitz 1919: 450–88; Murley 1940; Lebeck 1972; Elliger 1975: 289–94; Nussbaum 1986: 203–29; Ferrari 1987 *passim*.

[21] Until recently scholarship on ancient literary criticism has been dominated by work on the analytical categories and arguments that ancient theorists employed. But, following Ford's important book (*The Origins of Ancient Literary Criticism*, Princeton 2002), scholars are beginning now to explore the complexities and significance of the images used by these writers, with the result that critical texts are being read with the philological precision and sensitivity to language that has so enriched studies of the literature they analyze. See also the introductory section to ch. 6.

[22] This extends to later literary landscapes as well, many of which have literary theoretical/critical turns (as in, e.g., Shakespeare, the Romantic and Parnassian poets, and modernists such as Proust and Virginia Woolf).

individual chapters of my study address both. These features and their transformations are internal to the given setting and sometimes follow on the initial viewing, as the poet or theorist enters the scene and makes use of its resources by mimesis and reordering.

1. Overview: theorizing landscapes

This study encompasses notions of place, space, and landscape, the theoretical framing of which centers on an understanding of metaphor as spatial and mobile. Let me address the latter first, precisely because it underpins and motivates the sustaining of space and landscape as central to critical discourse about styles. Jacques Derrida is perhaps the most prominent theorist to pursue Aristotle's conceptualization of metaphor as movement, recognizing it not only as *transport* (his French translation of Aristotle's ἐπιφορά, *Po.* 1457b7) but also as the way around, as marking "the moment of the turn or of the detour (*du tour ou du détour*)."[23] As I discuss in detail in Chapter 1, this spatialization of metaphor constitutes a crucial aspect of its double role in the ancient imagery, since landscape metaphors both serve as indicators of style and are themselves envisioned as creating spaces and moving from one place to another. Further, because in ancient theory metaphor, mimesis, and style all work by means of likeness – that is, by matching, emulating, and imitating – poets and prose writers tend to connect all three, sometimes themselves working at their intersections.[24]

Thus (for instance) a rhetorician may emulate landscape metaphors prominent in poetry to distinguish oratorical styles and in so doing engage in what I am calling mimetic theorizing. This theorizing happens when the rhetorician's argument takes its shape from reformulating mimetic landscapes by reorienting their metaphors to match writers' styles.[25] Indeed, one of the most curious phenomena in ancient literary theory and criticism, and one that modern scholars are well positioned to misunderstand or dismiss, is the mode of analysis that exploits similarity, the pursuit of likeness that lies at the heart of figurative expression.[26] Despite the scruples about mimetic effects expressed repeatedly by Plato and to a lesser extent

[23] Derrida [1972] 1982: 231, 241. See also Ricoeur 1978a, [1975] 1978b.
[24] Derrida emphasizes this falling together of metaphor, mimesis, and style in Aristotle's thought ([1972] 1982: esp. 237–41.
[25] Again, see further in ch. 1.
[26] Not so Derrida, however, whose own critical modes engage similar tactics; see further in ch. 1.

by Aristotle, ancient literary theorists often use explanatory styles that exploit likeness. They imitate the effects they analyze, adopting and adapting poetic imagery as metaphors for invention and style. Mimesis, metaphor, style: all interrelated, all operating, insofar as they work at all, by means of likeness, matches made in the mind's eye. From this angle as well we can see that the term "theory" (in the sense of observing and contemplating, *theōrein*) comes closer than "criticism" (i.e., judgment, *krinein*) to capturing the process of discernment and reordering of conceptual coordinates that I argue fosters literary and rhetorical analysis.

Such strategies depend on the relationship between metaphor and mimesis, and may originate in ancient ideas that both are lodged in nature and thus mirror the order of things. The metaphorical terrains with which I am concerned here tend to combine notions of natural correspondences with spatial orientations (e.g., inside/outside, urban/rural, on and off stage), and specifically designated places, both "concrete" and symbolic (e.g., the Theater of Dionysus, the *locus amoenus*), with particular landscapes, typological and "real" (esp. up the mountain [Helicon], down along the river [Ilissus]). In the past half century or so theorists have thought and rethought the parameters of such terms (especially space as opposed to place), the underlying assumptions of which emerged over the decades as confrontations opposing (e.g.) an abstract sense of space and a focus on embodied practices. A central transformation occurred when the post-structuralist dismantling of space as abstract and objective confronted and in some cases converged with notions of place inspired by the rise of identity politics.[27] The representative strategies with which I am concerned here sit at the intersection of this apparent conflict, frequently conjoining famous places and more abstract schemes.

The notion of landscape, which is in many ways most useful for capturing a sense of place as received terrain, has a somewhat different history. Modern scholars of art and literature have emphasized that the term is freighted with historical, cultural, and aesthetic meaning. Landscape is never mere topography. Rather, it marks the layered accretion of social, political, and artistic perspectives onto spaces viewed from a particular vantage point and as such helps to orient the history of aesthetics and representation. It is also a form of evaluative negotiation, as W. J. T. Mitchell has emphasized. In the introduction to his influential edited volume, *Landscape and*

[27] E.g., Lefebvre [1974] 1991; Tuan 1975; de Certeau 1984; vs. Harvey 2001; Cresswell 2004. See also Olwig 2002. I am more sympathetic to and influenced by the work of post-structuralists, because their treatment of space as both embodied and oriented by abstract coordinates often better captures the types of literary patterns and strategies on which I focus.

Power, Mitchell urges the need to address the ways in which, as he phrases it, "landscape *circulates* as a medium of exchange, a site of visual appropriation, a focus for the formation of identity."[28] Such formulations suggest contention and struggle, not so much over the territory itself as over a way of seeing, an organizing scheme that is aesthetic and value-laden and that carries enough force to appear to be reality rather than interpretation.[29]

Cultural geographers have also helped to further an understanding of the conceptual layers that impose aesthetic contours on the lay of the land. From this angle it emerges that the actual landscapes in which poets claim that literary judgment initiated shape and are themselves shaped by emblematic topographies that organize ethical attitudes in relation to beauty and pleasure. As Stephen Daniels and Denis Cosgrove observe, "A landscape is a cultural image, a pictorial way of representing, structuring, or symbolizing surroundings."[30] Such "iconographical" readings of topographical or geographical phenomena emphasize that landscape is a constructed entity, one shaped by its representation as a meaningful organization of elements that symbolize political and aesthetic values.[31] Prominent denizens of landscapes invoke such values as they inhabit significant spaces in ancient cities and their surrounding countrysides.

These fantasies of imposing order on an unruly world achieve an artistic dream (like Ashbery's "gardens") if not a social or political reality. Indeed, the one usually exceeds or overturns the other, since aesthetic elaborations calibrate and recalibrate social hierarchies, while political engagements demand action and actuality.[32] In this critical discourse there is no aesthetics without ethics, which is to say that social and economic forces

[28] Mitchell describes this dynamic as follows: "Landscape as a cultural medium . . . has a double role with respect to something like ideology: it naturalizes a cultural and social construction, representing an artificial world as if it were simply given and inevitable, and it also makes that representation operational by interpellating its beholder in some more or less determinate relation to its givenness as sight and site" ([1994] 2002: 2).

[29] Cf. Cosgrove on Ruskin in Cosgrove and Daniels [1988] 2002: 5; also Cosgrove 1985, 1998. Cf. again Nora 1989, whose influential work on "places of memory" (*lieux de mémoire*) advances a sense of how significant settings accrete associations that formulate identities and thereby distinctions of style, lifestyle, and socio-political orientation.

[30] Cosgrove and Daniels [1988] 2002: 1.

[31] Cosgrove and Daniels discuss Ernst Panofsky as the inspiration for the layered effect of reading "iconographically" ([1988] 2002: 1–7). Cf. Williams (1973: 128): "Like the landscaped parks, where every device was employed to produce a natural effect, the wild regions of mountain and forest were for the most part objects of conspicuous aesthetic consumption."

[32] See, e.g., Rancière [2000] 2004: 17–19. He remarks, "the tragic stage . . . simultaneously carries with it, according to Plato, the syndrome of democracy and the power of illusion." But Rancière also repeatedly emphasizes the intersection of ethics and aesthetics, since from his perspective art is not isolated as such before the modern period (2004: 20–24).