

Hearths and Doors, the Space of Cuisine

Donald Kunze

ABSTRACT: The popular-culture image of hearth as the center of the home has a curious past. The hearth was the primordial place of cooking. Yet, ancient Greeks and others sought above all to shield the hearth from the *view* of visitors. The hearth localized the spirits and voices of the dead. As European cultures evolved customs and spaces to accommodate strangers, the family home retained many vestiges of this worship of ancestors and household gods. The secular home opened itself to guests but its topography protected the hearth's sacred relations to wives and daughters and made cuisine and domestic space two parts of the same design.

What does cuisine have to do with architecture, and *vice versa*? In European languages, etymology seems to conflate taste, religion, and the defense of space.¹ One particularly curious example is “host,” whose origins included ideas of both hospitality and hostility. “Guest” reveals an equally bipolar history in roots such as *ghostis*, which suggests enemy as well as guest. Some words (ghost, *Geist*, ghastr) have no real shared origin but suggest provocatively that taste and the afterlife evolved in some common religio-poetic past.

Looking at the architectural side of this attempted equation, Sir James Frazer famously noted that the word for door, similar in all Indo-European languages, goes back to that most ambiguous deity, “Janus,” “Ianus,” or “Dianus,” the two-faced god of doorways and new years.² Around this lore of boundaries and calendars, Robert Graves weaves a fascinating account of Cardea, the goddess of the hinge, and Coronos, the bird/god of prophecy. Annual festivals, which are commonly conceived as “doors” of the calendar year and require the preparation of specific dishes and styles of feasting, enrich the speculation, particularly when they are connected to the idea that the dead must be fed as well as consulted.³

Visitors and death? Doors and prophecy? These resonant terms suggest that defending space, marking the annual cycle, admitting strangers into the city or home, and religious practices were somehow all tied together. Rather than pursue only strong causal

ties, we should pursue ambiguities, in full strength dosage, down to a possible point of origin. It is the “problem” that hospitality seems to involve both enemies and guests, ghosts and the living, defense and communion that makes this history tick.

For our particular quest, the real clues can be found in that nucleus of all ancient kitchens, the hearth. Vitruvius posited fire as the origin of civilization (Fig. 1), probably because even sophisticated Romans in the reign of Augustus regarded fire as essential in the foundation and maintenance of their own civil society. In addition to providing a means of cooking and conviviality, fire has been primary and central in the evolution of early religions and cultures. Fire purified the participants of ceremony, provided oracles, and sent the fat of sacrifices skyward. The first humans saw, in fire’s powers of transformation, what it was like to be a god.

Just as important as what fires did was the matter of who “lived” there. The hearth was the gateway and material manifestation of the family’s ancestral dead (*manes*), the specifically male ancestors who constituted the *psyche* or genius of the clan. The *animus* of this spirit was fire, tended by women who were, in effect, wedded to the flame. The Stoics held that *animus* was the same as *cælum*, the word for both “heaven” (æther) and “wedge,” revealing that *animus* was like *ingenium*, or wit. It penetrated matter and animated the breath-soul and bodies with the “acute” wit of *psyche*.⁴ The fire *located*, with the precision of a geodetic monument, a religiously fixed point which could not be moved without elaborate precautions and required defense to the point of death. The practices of families, and the collective civic versions of these practices, help explain the spatial and religious functions of the ancient city.

A biography of the hearth as the material locus of cuisine requires some initial insights into the structure of household space in Greek and Latin antiquity and the relation of the living to the dead.⁵ Today, electric light blurs the qualitative differences between night and day. When firelight was the only antidote to darkness, its links to eschatology and religion were clear. The Latin word for hearth, *focus*, confirms that centers defined by fire were necessarily local. Each family had a hearth to serve as its territorial and theological reference point. Cooking served the living, and ceremonial sacrifices fed the *manes*.

An important part of the hearth's religious history is its original relation to sound. The hearth returned the benefits of divination by being a "place of a voice," but this is a figure of speech. Understanding fire's original acousmatic⁶ nature requires a two-part consideration. Vico speculated that the "first humans" perceived thunder as a primordial word. In fright, they cleared circular openings in the forest to view signs in the sky.⁷ Subsequently, these first humans used fire to address this primordial authority and secure prophecies through divination. The "radically non-localizable voice" of Jove (the æther, blue sky) was just as radically located in the specific place of the clearing. What thunder dislocated, fire located, in equal and opposite measure. Thus, it is through the fact of its *fixed location* that the altar — which, records reveal, could not be moved without extensive precautions — could connect through some rule of opposites to the *unlimited plenum* of the voice of the god. The center-to-periphery logic of altar and sky had its logic: the fixed altar corresponded to the pivot, often the pivot of the heavens, against which movement could be measured. Quite naturally, cooking and eating became a means of bonding the particular to the universal through this ratio of fixed to unlimited. It is even more important to note that the polarity of thunder gave the hearth the power to tie the family to a place, to pin them to a *single location*. Even in popular culture, where national cuisines travel around the world freely, food is tied, poetically if not actually, to its point of origin, the soil and people who cultivated it.

A short word about method is necessary. The hearth, cuisine, and hospitality involve architectural space in multiple and curious ways, and we look to the past for genetic clues informing contemporary practices. Ancient customs are not easily digested by the modern mentality, which still suffers an Enlightenment heritage. The casual instrumentality of language, politics, and social customs cannot be relinquished voluntarily, for it permeates the flesh of culture. We "exclude the middle" and see things in "either-or" opposition out of cultural mandate rather than conscious choice. Hegel famously showed (in the passages on "the beautiful soul" in the *Phenomenology*) that attempts to escape this contamination by creating a meta-language are illusory and deceptive. There are important exceptions, however. Play, eroticism, jokes, art, and, most notably, cuisine can suspend or undermine the presuppositions of rationality. Cooking and eating constitute a *performative middle*, an "anti-categorical category." While

cuisine, like any other consumable, can be easily streamlined (*e. g.* Martha Stewart, Inc.), cooking and eating are too dynamic and sensual to be damaged for long.

Cuisine thus calls for the same “bracketing” of rationalism as required by myth and ancient custom. The inner logic of cuisine and ancient thought seems to be just that: regulations that answer first to the psyche’s ability to order the resources of desire amidst the needs for sustenance and safety — all in the context of a past shaped by language, family, and custom. Individuals pursue the same desires and demands in superficially different ways. Looking to past cultures is therefore a practical matter: early psyches wore thinner disguises. Their commonalty across cultures and geographical conditions, as evidenced by the ethnography of the past one hundred years, is readily apparent.

The study of cuisine requires a topological approach that can describe actual practices of crossing, naming, and distinguishing. Topology can show how ambiguity works as an engine of culture. Cultures themselves use boundaries to shape their world in communicative ways, and topology therefore “uses like to know like.” Cultural boundaries can turn inside out, accommodate self-reference and contradiction, and establish the dimensionality of space through performance. Topology is in the best position to describe this simply and directly.⁸

This study concentrates on European culture not just because it is the usual home of our concerns but because it has, more than any other, suffered the influence of Cartesian streamlining. We can follow the cultural evolution of the West with a vividness that would be missing for cultures whose main “documents” we lack. Classical scholarship of a century ago had a knack for considering linguistic, cultural, archaeological, historic, and artistic evidence side by side. The scholars of this era, such as Francis Cornford, Jessie Weston, Jane Harrison, James Frazier, and others, made bold claims, but they stayed close to the available evidence of their subject and their propositions were testable. Many of their examples are valuable if we can invent new ways of reading them. Topology makes such a re-reading possible.

Basic Ingredients

Anyone looking for an architectural atom would do well to choose the “house,” meaning the “home” or “family house,” even where the shelter of the human family is minimalist, *ad hoc*, or ephemeral. The house is not so much a physical stereotype as it is a topology of relationships where threads of perception, behavior, physical materials, voids, etc. are intricately interwoven but logical categories blurred. Crucial to the idea of the house is *who* may enter, and *how*. Even family members must come and go conditionally, and running away or abandoning the home constitutes a serious crisis. Houses become homes when we focus on issues of admission and exclusion.

Homes are places that manage complex relationships governing center and periphery. The importance of any part has to do with the role it plays in this topology. The hearth, the putative and now nostalgic “heart” of the house, and the main entry (in most cases a front door, the point at which admission or exit is governed symbolically) are primary. Hearth and door are both vulnerable to romanticizing, but, looking past the clichés, these two elements are capable of revealing much about the evolution of the family and the origins of hospitality. The hearth, once the locus of the family gods and cooking center, is no longer regarded as the place for either. Cooking has been dispersed among the appliances that constitute the modern means of food preparation. It’s possible that the mysteries of the hearth have been displaced into these appliances, that their whirs and beeps constitute an imaginary language that plants the hearth idea into family life even more securely than if we believed that literal hearths were important.

The entryway, even when technology arms it with surveillance cameras and coded electronic locks, is more resistant to superficial change than the hearth. A door is the usual solution to problem of how the entryway can be, alternatively, sealed securely or invitingly open. “Door,” a word with Indo-Germanic roots, emphasizes the material solution, but the “portal” variants of Romance languages emphasize the act of carrying something *across* (L. *portare*). Dividing the door into an *active* agent and a *passive* cargo gets closer to the “problem” of how access can be granted for a space which must, *all the while*, nominally maintain a kind of perfect isolation. The boundary that is “neither active

nor passive” raises the issue of the linguistic phenomenon of the “middle voice,” in which a neutral, existential sense of action pervades without specifying a particular actor, agent, or object. The middle voice idea has an architectural counterpart in “intransitive” space, the status of “possibly in, possibly out.” Intransitive space is topologically coherent without being consistent in rational terms; it is the difference between a flip of a boundary that, alternatively, encloses one space or the complementary surrounding space. This simple operation can create folds and twists to accommodate a multiplicity of cultural and architectural conditions.⁹ For example, ancient Roman custom specified that it was paramount that a bride must not be shown to enter the husband's house voluntarily, for it would bring bad luck on the father's household, whose ancestral *manes* would resent such a defection. The bride was carried across the husband's threshold — the vestigial practice is common even today — to establish her non-culpability from one point of view but insure her new role as guardian of her husband's family spirits.

To see this phenomenon of intransitivity topologically, it's useful to consider some other incontestable “atoms” in the architectural periodic table: the city and the tomb. Although the city is larger and the tomb smaller than the house, both use the house's cosmic template. The two main opposed orders, sky and earth, create a horizon that complexly mediates their relationship. The horizon, a primordial *doorway*, is most typically represented by a monogram: the labyrinth, a meandering path that winds in and out alternatively (Fig. 2). The labyrinth suspends the certainty of what is inside and what is outside and, in so doing, makes a home for the middle-voice quality of *portal*. In the labyrinth, it is difficult to say whether a motion in any particular direction is going in or out. Even though the labyrinth is a meander and not a maze, the entrant can easily forget his direction of travel and “get lost” by not being able to distinguish forward from backward motion.

“Possibly in” and “possibly out” become the basis for the topology of the house. The more rational demand for an either/or condition (drawing a boundary that creates a “permanent” inside and outside) establishes continence at the expense of access. “Possibly in or possibly out” means that there is a space materially present where the either/or rule of excluded middle does not operate. Louis Kauffman shows that, in terms

of boundaries, a self-referential space makes any single boundary work like a double boundary.¹⁰ A graphic picture of this condition is the “square wave,” which oscillates directly between the two values of “possibly single” and “possibly double” — translated to “possibly open” and “possibly closed” in the Janusian language of doors. This is an important innovation, for it means that the house can be “continent” and still offer strangers temporary admission to a space of hospitality. This was not always the case.

Getting in and Getting out: Cyclopean Households

The first societies were, in various ways and degrees, “cyclopean,” a name taken from the Cyclopes of Homeric fame — a race of giants who did not tolerate strangers. The single eye of the Cyclops was most likely a metaphoric transposition of the “single eyes” or openings in the forest that were cleared to worship family *manes*. “Each Cyclops had a single eye” means that each family worshiped its own ancestral gods. For most ancient peoples, strangers meant contamination, both spiritual and sanitary. The first societies derived authority from auspices and extended their laws to family and clan. “Cyclopean” is a general term that may apply to the centralization of authority around the family alter or hearth, but connections to the Homeric myth that lends its name are also interesting, particularly if the Cyclops’ cave is taken to be a cousin of the more formalized Cretan labyrinth.¹¹

For each cyclopean family, the only true humans were close relations; all others were regarded as sub-human. But, even in this extreme xenophobic view, institutions developed to allow conditional contact with strangers. For example, “silent trade” allowed parties to exchange surplus goods without ever having to see each other. This stable form of trade, which still survives in parts of the world, depended on each party’s belief that the other was in some way “demonic” or “divine.” In ancient Greece, these points of trade were marked with piles of stones (*herms*) or stone markers. The connections of Hermes’ associations, as a god of boundaries and crossroads, god of thieves, and conductor of souls to Hades, and founder of the marketplace are easier to understand in this light.¹²

Where contact was necessary, the labyrinth was the model used to test potential visitors from a position of military security. British hill forts built interrogation into the design of enfilades, or narrow passageways, which forced entrants to navigate long trenches single-file (Fig. 3). All the while, the hosts took the opportunity to test their tentative guests with goads and taunts. The enfilade design maximized the topological difference between the “forced passive” space of the guest and the space of the host. The guest had to travel a long distance while the hosts occupied a plenum-like space above the winding path.

It is no surprise that this solution to the problem of contact with strangers was connected to the idea of the underworld as a door incorporating the “middle voice” aspects of *portare*. Both hospitality customs and the presumed form of Hades were spiral, self-replicating forms. Self-similarity, the logic of fractals, was a perfect motif for a place where “know thyself” is the appropriate gloss of Dante’s doorway motto for Hell, “*Lasciate ogni speranza, voi ch’entrate*” (Abandon all hope, you who enter). The *Inferno* created a mirror of historical reality, attaching to it a precise formula for exchanging sins with punishments. Sins were organized “metonymically” as a contiguous system with gradations of severity. What is meant by this use of metonymy?

Social life, inasmuch as it is regulated a comprehensive order of signifiers upon which society depends, is experienced “metaphorically” in that each “viewpoint” or “way of life” fills out reality and hides other perspectives. But, any one experience, initially encountered with metaphoric totality, has multiple orthogonal associations that can lead or refer to remote or even imaginary experiences. These departures from the metaphoric totality that establishes reality have two aspects. First, they are “escapes,” in the sense that the totality of signification that is the social view of things constitutes a “prison.” The second aspect is that the escape involves a pursuit of whatever is “surplus” and an attempt to organize this surplus in metonymic ways (contiguity), such as a “series” of trials, a linear journey, or a search for something missing or lost.

Where metaphor could be said to favor sight, metonymy favors touch — blind travel. Metaphor and metonymy together offer a radically bifurcated way to approach the issue of significance.¹³ Dante’s poem could be read in the context of a metaphoric history

(who and how bad were the villains in Italian Medieval history) or a demonology (a metonymical exploration of the nature of sin).¹⁴ But, the crucial point is that once metonymy sorts out human sins using a spatial design, any specific location has both a demonological and societal-historic dimension. Add the element of heat and the result is that, to understand life, you must *kill it* and *cook it*, meaning that you must see how metonymy, a “demonology” of the Real, always shadows the socially compelling “reality” of metaphor as symbolic order.

The combination of the two “views,” societal (metaphor) and demonic (metonymy), into one suggests the artistic trick of the *anamorphic* image — an ordinary image with another image planted inside, in the form of a blur or distorted design that “pops up” when viewed from a certain angle (Fig. 4).¹⁵ Anamorphy suggests how a house may protectively seal itself off (the goal of continence) *and* permit selective entry and exit. A “fictional” zone, both an inside and an outside, is created to accommodate guests. “Fiction” is used here in an active sense of a socially perceived demand for an object structured by pleasure — Lacan’s famous *objet petit a*, the “small other.”¹⁶ Following the example of the anamorphic image, a certain “angle of view” must be found; a specific position must be located and occupied. The blur must “erect itself” into a recognizable form. Hospitality and, especially, festal architecture employs this phallic logic so commonly (decorations, displays that appear only for special occasions, fireworks, processions to find that certain “angle of view,” etc.) that we typically fail to notice their anamorphic nature.

Slavoj Žižek connects anamorphosis to the sequence of stages Freud specified in child development: oral, anal, and phallic. Citing Lacan, he notes that anamorphosis is naturally phallic because it is something that seems to inflate or pop into view or recognition. The relationship to the other stages is easier to see in film examples. The “oral” telling of the basic story is the sequence of shots that renders a sequence of events directly. “Anal” editing reorders events and scenes through *montage* to produce a thematic view. The tracking shot, which frequently distorts scale and/or temporality, *zooms in* on some previously unnoticed detail, whose significance restructures the story and the audience’s conception of the story. A good example would be the high shot in

Hitchcock's *Notorious*, one of many such used by Hitchcock throughout his films. Ingrid Bergman is shown holding the cellar key that will allow Cary Grant to search for contraband during a party at the house of a Nazi collaborator. The small key, almost invisible from the balcony, ends by filling the screen — and the imagination of the audience — after a slow zoom.¹⁷

This trick of a doubled space is perhaps easier to see at the scale of the town, whose portals in ancient times were guarded by passwords and interrogations that displaced labyrinth logic into verbal procedures. Such barriers have their formal literary beginnings in the Sphinx of Sophocles' *Ædipus Rex*. The guardian Sphinx, whose monstrous body combined a woman's head, lion's body, eagle's wings, and serpent's tail, demanded that any wishing to enter Thebes should answer a riddle. By guessing the correct answer, Ædipus gained entry and destroyed the monster. His famous riddle (what monster walks on four legs in morning, two at noon, and three in the evening) mimicked the metonymy of the Sphinx, whose lion-part and serpent-part represented the waxing and waning Theban year.¹⁸

The town solves the admission problem by producing an interior-exterior flipped space that has elements that serve both as door and hearth — the plaza or square — and it's useful to look for the cyclopean/labyrinthine elements. Plazas are places for natives and strangers. Anamorphy dominates, by miniaturizing some elements, enlarging others, and specifying favored angles of view. The plaza is an enlargement of the street that tends to a spherical geometry. Significant elements are located within a collective symbolic narrative. Formal parks and gardens play the role of surrounding farmland and wilderness. A collective "hearth" (monuments mark or refer to the graves of individuals who represent a larger mass of dead) serves as a vent to the underworld (Fig. 5). Vehicular and pedestrian motion is ritualized into the recursive form of traffic circles. Civic buildings miniaturize the themes of the city with towers, clocks, domes, and porticos.

Thus, it should not be surprising to say that the town is structured "like any underworld," providing metonymical and "demonic" access to small objects structured by pleasure while maintaining the "metaphoric" order of social symbols and forms. The

problems of ingress/egress are the same; the necessity to maintain a “cyclopean” civic order while accommodating the needs of hospitality are the same; the topological traits of self-similar, recursive form are the same. Seeing this logic in the structure of the domestic house requires a glimpse into the literal “land of the dead” — the real estate of the tomb — where the interests of the living were simplified into matters of entry, exit, and culinary practices.

There will be those who resist seeing the term “anamorphy,” literally a visual phenomenon, applied to emblems, riddles, phallic detail, civic entry, metonymy, trick entries, and the cleverness of fools. It is the best means, however, of combining techniques and traditions that aim for the same result. Finding the hidden object anamorphically concealed within a principal symbolic order implies a change of the viewer’s status. Even the most widely recognized example of painterly anamorphy, Holbein’s *The Ambassadors*, knowingly used the staircase in the banquet hall in which it was hung to connect the *memento mori* to the mortifying experience of climbing stairs after a heavy dinner. In Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night*, certainly a “calendar play,” the trick of “we three” is mentioned. A popular image of two clowns, one upside down, concealed the image of an ass that could be seen only from an oblique angle. The third of the three was the viewer who had been isolated by his desire to find what was hidden.¹⁹ Rotation of the viewer’s point of view carries with it the connotation of exile and initiation, the classic elements of the “rites of passage.” For these reasons, anamorphy must be construed in the broadest terms.

Getting in and Staying in: Cyclopean Tombs

Tombs in the ancient view were portals to godliness, means of transforming the dead into *manes*, ancestral spirits able to provide advice and luck but also capable of great harm. The sarcophagus’s relation to ingestion is suggested by its name, “flesh-eater.” Stone, metaphorically the “bones of the earth,” was believed to be especially effective in drawing off liquid and fleshy parts from the skeleton of the deceased. This suggests an answer to the question of why the labyrinth’s plan resembles the digestive tract. The city-wall, a testing device, incorporated an imagery of digestive mortification;

in the context of the tomb, this connection between a trial and being eaten is even more appropriate.²⁰ The period of mourning was originally based on the time it took for dead bodies to achieve a stable dry state, usually indicated by mummies or skeletons. The tempo of this passage from “just dead” to “at rest” was *forensic*: a trial, puzzle, or test, as in the Egyptian tradition of weighing the soul.

Another meaning behind the labyrinth’s winding lies in poetry. The dead had to be separated from the living through ritual formulae and procedures, a form of “cursing” that prevented contamination by hungry souls. The form of the passage was, as the word curse suggests to some, circular (self-referential) and fractal (self-similar). Etymologists relate curse to words for either crossing (*kors*) or running (*cursus*). The practice of cursing originally had to do with encirclement, as in the cursing of Jericho by parading around it and the Scottish expression, “running Widdershins,” where witches would encircle victims nine times. Samuel Taylor Coleridge’s “Kubla Kahn” suggests a survival of this idea into, at least, Nineteenth Century poetic culture.

Weave a circle ‘round him thrice,
And close your eyes with holy dread,
For he on honey-dew hath fed,
And drunk the milk of Paradise.

Curses (tropes, verses as “turns”) were fashioned into blessings of the funeral speech: panegyrics that, by praising the deceased poetically, installed hopefully a permanent distance between the living and the dead. Reversed curses were curses nonetheless. They established physical and spiritual distance between the living and the dead with a zig-zag *encirclement*.

This distances separating the living from the living incorporated the cosmic distances separating the living from the dead. What was true of the tomb was true of the house and the city. Laws specified an inviolable boundary between the defensive town walls and other interior buildings (the *pomærium*) — a single boundary made into a double boundary. Diverse cultures have forbidden houses to share walls. Family tombs could not be shared or even approached by non-family. Fustel de Coulanges reports that Romans originally placed the tomb in an agricultural field, protected from trespass by

severe laws. *Termini*, or upright boundary stones, were set up at the margins and fed offerings of wine, oil, and fat. Strangers were forbidden to even touch a terminus, and tilting it out of position was a capital crime. The offender was ritually sacrificed and his own house and fields were destroyed.²¹ Such religiously preserved spaces evidence the strength and survival of cyclopean customs into comparatively sophisticated times.

Again, we find a central connection between space and cuisine. The “manic” insulation of the wall and tomb preserved the integrity of the *manes*; but, to secure the prophecies so valuable to the living, it was necessary to feed them. Tombs provided stone bowls with drains that carried wine and oil underground. Families celebrated holidays at the family tomb, arranging picnics that metaphorically included the ancestors. Mexico’s famous “Day of the Dead” does as much at the usual family dinner table. The city collectivized this family practice with official festivals. Defending the city as well as the private space of the family required not just inviolable boundaries but ritualized meals and special dishes.²² Many modern civic celebrations contain remnants of this connection. Parades enact a virtual defensive labyrinth, “blessing” each crucial point and re-furrowing the imaginary lines between them. Civic and private banquets — with foods and recipes special to the occasion — broker the ancient ties connecting cuisine, the spaces of hospitality, and the dead.

Souls at both death and birth were thought to traverse a spiraled path connecting earth with elsewhere, and the labyrinth was, in effect, a materialization of this interval. Because the dead, collective or familial, had to be accessible, cities, houses, and tombs incorporated the labyrinth idea in one form or another. The link and key is the function of entry and exit that makes both into models of doors and — with exacting theological precision — paradigms of the hearth. The labyrinth’s most popular design in antiquity is called the “Labyrinth of Theseus” (Fig. 6). Walls enclosing the meander enclose a central space with seven folded corridors. Another way of writing this would be to say that “two extreme points plus a marker for a middle position make three points, with the intervals in between also divided into three,” a useful system for describing the annual motions of the sun between solstices (extreme points on the horizon), moving twice through the equinox. With the three intervals in between as months, a solar interpretation is attractive

although problematic for many scholars. A more cuisine-oriented labyrinth theory is ‘thin’ and ‘fat’ often correspond rather nicely to the waxing and waning of the sun in the sky — whether or not they can be modeled by the Thesean or any other labyrinth. With wine, a “winter product,” and fat, oil, or honey, produced and gathered mostly in summer, it is tempting to connect these traditional foods for the dead to some kind of calendar significance.²³

Does the house’s evolution of a space of hospitality — directly symbolized by a door — have anything to do with a transformation of the spaces that preserved the “cyclopean” interests of families and cities? In the city of Thebes, the hero who destroyed the cyclopean Sphynx had a double identity (king and husband; “lost” son of Laius and Jocaste). Do all strangers have this double nature, and — equally important for our purposes — do the *spaces* which accommodate strangers have a double nature?

Whether or not the labyrinth’s paths mimic the sun’s waxing and waning across the sky or “count” the crucial intersections with the horizon, the importance of the calendar and its relation to food is crucial in answering this question. First, it may offer us the best clues about how domestic space is structured. Second, it could answer many questions about the history and development of the house and city as places of hospitality. Consider this definition of the labyrinth: “two (antinomous) systems connected with a twist.” Whether or not labyrinths and calendars are related historically, the Romans put a twist in their calendar at a solstice: originally, at the gap between the wheat and corn harvests, the traditional time of transition between the old and new “oak king.” The name for oak in the poetic alphabet of the Druids was “duir,” and the curious connection to words for “door” leads us to the Goidelic *dorus*, Latin *foris*, Greet *thura*, and German *tiir*, and Sanscrit *Dwr*.²⁴ Oak was not just the traditional wood used for door-posts; poetic and religious traditions connected it to the functions of the months as well as to architectural spaces. The most famous reference is the thesis of Sir James Frazer concerning the archeological remains at Lake Nemi, Italy. Many tribes of Italy were said to offer tribute to the woodland divinities celebrated by the priesthood at Nemi. Here and elsewhere, the oak figured prominently. In Greek and Roman theology, the oak was prominent because of its association with lightning and thunder. Zeus was believed to

have been an onomatopoetic rendition of a lightning-strike, and even the word “god” in general was held to come from the same place (“deus” as, originally, “zdeus”).

Turning from the summer to the winter solstice, another calendar twist is evident. The festival of Saturnalia inverted the social order as well as time. Slaves and masters exchanged places. Clowning and prank-playing were rife. The later official beginning of the year came in the month of January, named for Janus, *Ianus*, or *Dianus*, the son of Cardea, the goddess of hinges. It is interesting to find that, in both solstice observances, the role of a “fool” was central. Scholars of the fool tradition emphasize the fool’s use of doors as emblematic of the fool’s mastery of spatial twists, cosmic and mundane.²⁵ In one memorable scene, Charlie Chaplin’s famous tramp eluded a policeman by running around a short fence equipped with one board that flipped out of place. The policeman could use only the ends to get from one side to the other, but the Tramp could slip through the faulty board, the illicit “twisted” connection between the two sides. Even here, we find the simple topological formula of the labyrinth (and, hence, the house, city, and tomb), “two systems connected by a twist.” When the Tramp is confronted with Cartesian schemes, such as the famous eating machine in *Modern Times*, he wrecks the mechanism almost as much as it wrecks him. More in keeping the fool’s playful, anti-Cartesian relation to food is the unforgettable ballet of the potatoes, stuck on forks like feet, in *Klondike Bill*, or the exquisite wars of flying food in several other films.

Even the door-tending Theban Sphinx used calendar magic in combining the forms of a lion and serpent — mascots of the waxing and waning year. To guess the riddle was also to guess the structure of the Sphinx, which is, not surprisingly, labyrinthine: two parts, one inward (old year) one outward (new year) with a Saturnine flip in between. Calendar rituals demonstrate the fundamental temporality of passage, but the narratives that derive from ritual are more difficult to interpret. Is there a “spatial logic” that supports the wide range of multiple cultural origins and subsequent displacements of customs?

A Topology of Hearth and Door

The labyrinth yields many apocryphal stories but little hard evidence, because it has been a device with so many different kinds of applications — rituals, games, toys, and symbol for nearly every culture. The labyrinth is not an artifact in the material sense but, rather, a motif of the imagination. Even so, the common structural features of house, tomb, city, labyrinth, and calendars, plus the congruence of customs of cuisine, funeral and other practices relating to the collective dead of families and cities provide compelling parallels and links that guide speculation further. Space and cuisine are two aspects of the relationship between the souls of the dead and their living counterpart, the stranger or guest. The paths of the Thesean labyrinth — two sets of cyclic motions connected by an inverting motion — make this all-purpose emblem of household, underworld, and tomb in every sense an “anamorph,” or double image, capable of mediating the two distinctively different “logics” of gods and guests.

The abstract nature of this relationship can be materialized if we consider the place of the hearth in antiquity. Fustel de Coulange reports that the hearth, the *location* of the ancestral spirits (*manes*), was shielded from the view of visitors. The notion that a look could contaminate is ancient and widespread. In some cultures, it was forbidden to look directly at the king, holy objects, or certain ceremonies. Even in contemporary societies wealth, beauty, and pride attract the “evil eye,” which corrects uneven distributions of fortune. Why was it necessary to protect the hearth from *the view of strangers*? The key lies in the putative sexuality of the hearth fire and its assigned attendant, the wife but preferably the virgin daughter of the family. Ancient Greeks and Romans believed that the fire, a collective spirit of the family *genius*, retained its procreative powers. In a sense, the woman who tended the fire was married to it. When the fire collectivized the spiritual genii of a whole city, it was essential that those who tended it, like the Vestals at Rome, be not only virginal but shielded from public contact (Fig. 7).

Contamination of the hearth meant pollution of the genius of the family or city. How did this cyclopean principle of segregation tolerate the development of hospitality, which required opening the household and city to strangers? A topological approach to this question focuses on boundary behavior. The two fundamental structures, cyclopean

and hospitable, *must have the same essential topology*. The only thing that may vary is the “point of view,” which sees alternative meanings in any given situation. Hospitality is then “anamorphic” by incorporating cyclopean elements in the process of evolving new and transformative social institutions.

This is, in fact, a most productive approach to the problem of cultural change. In the *Odyssey*, we find an episode that deals directly with the issues of hospitality, cyclopean resistance to hospitality, and anamorphy. In fact, we find many of these elements in literal form. It is Odysseus’s visit to the cave of the Cyclops Polyphemus. Henry Johnstone notes that Odysseus makes this unlikely call simply to test whether or not the fabled Cyclopes, like the Greeks, will comply with the pan-Mediterranean customs requiring hosts to provide guests with gifts and banquets.²⁶ The giant Cyclopes, Robert Graves claims, are not just an image of primitive mankind’s devotion to the *manes* of the family, embodied in the hearth fire, but also a reminder of the practice of sacrifice linked to the solar cycle. (Odysseus’s crew numbered a canonical twelve.) Penetration of the Cyclops’ eye by a sharpened olive stake means the violation of the rites of human sacrifice. The Greeks had their own customs, which required devoting a part of the household to hospitality. The prohibition against looking at the hearth-fire was retained, but strangers could now “look at the king” without fear of death. Rather it was now the king who might more prudently be afraid of democratic movements. The doubled space, implicit in the labyrinth’s two-part design, was an all-purpose idea useful even in the disguise Odysseus and his crew used to escape: an “anamorphic” composition of man and sheep.²⁷

The presence of a complete set of topologically required elements in such a short tale is remarkable and instructive. The Cyclops’ cave was, like the labyrinth, a meander — the “single eye” of the cave metaphorically mirrored Polyphemus’s single eye. The central fire and the theme of sacrifice were implicit. Anamorphy was the key to escape, and in addition to the use of disguise, there was an additional *auditory* form of anamorphy. Odysseus gave Polyphemus the name, “Nohbdy.” The literalistic giant, used to specifics but not generalities, could not comprehend the pronoun, “nobody.” Odysseus, in the “hospitality system,” was two people.

The theme of blindness is the key, not just to the Cyclops story but to the transformation of cyclopean space to the space of hospitality. A blind traveler crossing a boundary twice can be the result of two topologically equivalent situations (Fig. 8). The cyclopean model requires a boundary to be continent, and the diagram on the left describes this rule. Entry implies exit. To seal off a space requires an absolute seal, a single entry, as in the Cyclops' cave. The model on the right shows how a blind traveler would not be able distinguish between crossing one boundary twice from crossing two concentric boundaries. One thinks of the labyrinth's two similar structures, each of which goes both in and out. Crossing the outer boundary does not require crossing the inner boundary. It seems that this is the "solution" of hospitality: the division of the domestic space into two parts, one for the admission of guests, another for the hearth, protected from the guest's view.

The Homeric tale tells us something more interesting about the space of hospitality. Anamorphosis requires the blindness of the *manes*, not the guests. Fustel de Coulange correctly cites the modern Greek interpretation of the shielded hearth — that the *manes*, like the kings of primitive cultures, needed to be shielded from public view. However, marriage custom's use of disguise and ruse suggest that it is the *view of the manes* that needs to be blocked. Believing that their virginal attendant has died is preferable to the truth that she has left the family hearth to tend her new husbands' ancestors. Inverting the reason for shielding the hearth could be viewed as a part of the ruse.²⁸ The correct reading would be that the spirits of the hearth *must not see* strangers. Blindness can be effected by direct shielding, as was the custom in Greek houses, or it can involve disguise (the theme of the sheep-escape) and ambiguous (mannered) language. Topology tells us the rest. The double boundary may be written in two different forms without changing the value of the spaces (Fig. 9).

The drawing on the left is the "cyclopean" state, with two hearths, two sets of *manes*, two rules of authority. The drawing on the right shows how hospitality can be created by flipping the boundary of one hearth to enclose another hearth.

The "flipped" space of hospitality says that a single cross is equal to a double cross.²⁹ George Spencer-Brown, the inventor of a "calculus of boundaries," discovered

this paradox when he drew boundaries on a closed, curved surface of the earth. The calculus works for every point of view except one taken *inside* a bounded surface that is “turned inside out” to frame all spaces outside it. Significantly, this point of view reverses the relationship between figure and ground. The space of hospitality, created by a flip of a boundary, mandates that a space *other* than figure or ground must exist. This flip and consequent surplus is the essence of the “inside frame,” or Lacanian *objet petit a* (the “little other”) — a missing signifier that is permeated with enjoyment (*jouissance*), anamorphically contained as a blur or stain within the “normal” symbolic system that constrains the subject. The inside frame can take many forms, and in the language of hospitality, there seems to be no limit to the expressive forms directed by strategies of miniaturization, commodification, anamorphosis, or fetishization (to name a few).³⁰

This second drawing is the view from the *inside* of any one cyclopean island; the space of hospitality, formerly “hostile,” is now bounded by itself. This is the inside-out world of the traveler, the tourist, the guest. The topological implications are clear from the actual applications of this spatial transformation. The traveler becomes a “stranger” whose dedication to his family’s *manes* is problematic because *his* status as someone really living is not determined. In cultural terms, the stranger is akin to a dead person (*hero*), a representative of Hades, and this status permitted a transition between cyclopean and hospitable institutions. “The guest as dead” sounds too strange in most contexts, but a crucial hint is given by Euripides’ play, *Alcestis*. Admetus, in the middle of conducting funeral observances for his wife, who has agreed to die in his stead, wishes simultaneously to entertain the famous Herakles, a “hero.” In ancient Greece, the word *hero* originally meant simply “the dead.” This meaning was carried over into the tradition that heroes were permitted to visit Hades and return.³¹

The space of the household is divided into a space for hospitality and, shielded from this, a space devoted to traditional family observances. As in the case of Greek households, where hearts were shielded from the view of strangers, the *manes* must not be profaned by the gaze of a stranger. The simple topology of the flip tells us a lot about the role of the gaze in the evolution of hospitality. In Homeric terms, there is originally one boundary, that of the Cyclops’ cave. Odysseus, by *blinding* the Cyclops, creates a

space within this space, a pocket dominated by doubles: his doubled name and the sheep-man disguise. The role of blinding in the “flip” that brings about a surplus of meaning is a common theme, as suggested by Greek mythology. Œdipus’s act of self-blinding, a late addition to the story, is added to emphasize the conceptual blindness that led to his tragedy. Literal blindness corrected the metaphoric blindness to the actions of fate. The blindness of Tiresius, the prophet, accentuated his power to see into the future and past. The creation of this space tells us more about the new personification of the human psyche, the visitor, who takes up “where the hero left off,” both in terms of literary history and cultural role-playing.

Conclusions

Hearth and door generate the topology of hospitality because they are able, like the surface/s of a Möbius strip, to be simultaneously the same and different. The boundary originally enclosing the household *manes* of the stranger in a cyclopean condition of mutual isolation is “flipped” to enclose a domestic space, making a space of conditional entry. This topographical description is borne out by traditions that link the lore of doors to the lore of hearths. But, in often surprising ways, the topological details (“blind counting,” “flips,” and “conditional spaces”) intersect precisely with ancient rituals and traditional narratives. It seems “as if” the minds of antiquity were concerned with some rather precise points of topographical procedure, and topography seems equally concerned to develop its terms as if it were concerned with ancient religious beliefs.

A Semiotic Observation

The subject creates distance between itself and the Other (= a network of symbolic relationships) through a series of symbolic structures that rely on metonymical chains. Each structure, each chain, has *metaphoric* relationships with other structures, just as the sky (appearance of meteorology) can appear to be menacing (human expression) or the garden (botany, etc.) like paradise (theology). Distances are like veils — each conspires to disguise an increasingly larger, more inclusive Other, ultimately leading to a

totalizing symbolic regime, borne from and sustained within language and symbolic systems.

Yet, each veil is a composite of metaphor and metonym, a structure that is transparent in the way that a picture made of marks on a surface (which themselves obey metonymic rules of composition) “projects” a scene lying beyond. In effect, the relationship of metaphor and metonym is self-referential and self-replicating. This is why the Other behind the veils is usually a monster, like the Sphynx of Thebes, a form that is a puzzle of parts seemingly unable to constitute a whole. It is *that it is*: “the Real,” as Lacan would put it. We can overlook this tautology ordinarily because we purposefully leave out the frame, the initial boundary that establishes the *point of enunciation* (“Regard!”). Once this point can be located, the stability of the symbolic is shaken, because it is always the Cretan who asserts that all Cretans are liars, and even asserting that Cretans are truthful only delays the *point* at which the Möbius band representing this curious topology twists before joining. The subject is no longer “frozen in position” before the masks of metaphoric appearances. The stranger is no longer waiting to be admitted to Thebes. Another subject (Œdipus-like) takes his place, a subject able to “descend” into the signifier itself — or one of the cellars, underworlds, or labyrinths that so adequately represent the interests of metonymy in popular culture — to “take a look inside.”

The juncture (always a *re-joinder*) can be adjusted so that its full contradiction shows, and this happens with anamorphosis and miniaturization (toys, models, drawings, etc.). In the anamorphic image, the blur or stain gives access to the excess left over by the symbolic system — a “little other” (*objet petit a*), as Lacan put it. This “access to excess” is characterized by effects that appear over and over in popular culture and artistic experience: fascination, circular forms or movement, glimmers, the “ambiguity of jewels.” Fascination (etymology reveals) is derived from the phallic transformation that gives the small object unexpected prominence; circularity has to do with the small object’s use of synecdoche, the metaphor of microcosms and fractals.

A Final Note about Cuisine

Taking into account the relationship of specially prepared foods to festivals of the annual cycle and the idea of the need to feed the dead, cuisine's most important function is to "feed the Other." This definition immediately explains the relationship of cuisine to the *space of hospitality*, the doubly encoded, "flipped" zone that solves the problem of cyclopean space. Cuisine as topology makes sense, especially if one closes the circle to return cuisine to its role as the expression of need which, Lacan and others remind us, can be resolved only within a "topology" of relationships linking drive, desire, and the Other.

Architecture has always reserved its most sympathetic responses to the spaces of cuisine. "Festal architecture" is not a minor category but, rather, architecture in its phallic aspect.³² Formal approaches to architecture avoid this cyclic and scale-disruptive aspect of architecture in favor of the stable plan, section, and elevation, but none of these exist apart from the dynamics of human thought and behavior. Cuisine returns architecture to its essence, its topology of taste and sense.

Endnotes

¹ See Walter W. Skeat, *Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968, pp. 278.

² Sir James George Frazer, *The Magic Art and the Evolution of Kings*, London: Macmillan & Company, Ltd., 1955, pp. 380-387).

³ Robert Graves, in *The White Goddess, A Historical Grammar of Poetic Myth*, London: Faber and Faber, Ltd., 1952, pp. 67-69. Also see Joseph Rykwert, *The Idea of a Town: The Anthropology of Urban Form in Rome, Italy and the Ancient World*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1988, pp. 58-59 and elsewhere.

⁴ Parts of this web of relations is revealed by Giambattista Vico in his *Autobiography*, but Vico was working from the commonplaces of the Latin poetic tradition of *ingenium*, which had developed into a poetic topos by the 17th Century through the efforts of scholars such as Graciàn, Tesaurò, and Sforza-Pallavicino. The image of metaphor as an acute, or “argute” wedge able to penetrate to the center of things contributed to Vico’s own vision of a “master metaphor,” the *universale fantastico* which, Vico held, had propelled thought into its first truly human forms. See Donald Kunze, *Thought and Place: The Architecture of Eternal Places in the Philosophy of Giambattista Vico*, Emory Vico Studies, Vol. 2. New York: Peter Lang, 1987, pp. 169-206.

⁵ Fustel de Coulanges’ well known work, *The Ancient City*, has been a primary source for this study. This work compares the written evidence of ancient authors to find many common features in the customs in ancient Greece and Rome. Fustel de Coulanges’ comparative literary method still offers a valuable resource, even in the face of a wealth of other archaeological and ethnographic evidence. This study is primarily an act of re-interpretation: a review of some basic details, made new by adopting an entirely different point of view. Although the popularity of this work has waned in the last 50 years, the main problem is the lack of interpretive strategies able to take its initial observations further. Numa Denis Fustel de Coulanges, *The Ancient City, A Study on the Religion, Laws, and Institutions of Greece and Rome*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980.

⁶ Pierre Schaeffer has admirably resuscitated the term “acousmatics,” which indicates a voice that cannot be *located*. Michel Chion gives the credit but not the bibliographic source in his

lengthy footnote in “The Impossible Embodiment,” in Slavoj Žižek, ed., *Everything You Wanted to Know about Lacan but Were Afraid to Ask Hitchcock*, New York: Verso, 1997, pp. 205-207. Also see Giambattista Vico, *The New Science of Giambattista Vico*, trans. Thomas Goddard Bergin and Max Harold Fisch, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 1975, §549, §550).

⁷ Vico, *op. cit.*, §712. For a review of thunder in relation to the imaginative universal, see Donald Phillip Verene, *Vico’s Science of Imagination*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1981, pp. 87-91.

⁸ As a resource, I would advocate the “laws of form” developed by George Spencer-Brown. This non-numerical calculus includes but goes beyond conventional Boolean logic. Curiously, Spencer-Brown’s notation system does not work for spaces on a sphere, but Louis Kauffman has shown how “corrections” of the calculus to accommodate a closed curved surface link it to problems of recursion, self-reference, and self-similar (“fractal”) patterns — all common in cultural phenomena. The main topological transformation involves a “flip” between “transitive” (evident) and “intransitive” (elemental) relationships. George Spencer-Brown, *Laws of Form*, Portland, OR: Cognizer Company, 1994 (limited edition); see, especially, pp. 28-41. Louis Kauffman, “Imaginary Values in Mathematical Logic,” *Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Symposium on Multiple-Valued Logic*, Boston, MA: May 26-28, 1987.

⁹ Spatial intransitivity is discussed at length in *Things, Four Metabletic Reflections* by J. H. van den Berg, Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1970. Fustel de Coulanges, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-40.

¹⁰ Louis Kauffman, *ibid.*

¹¹ Vico, *op. cit.*, §191, §243, §296, §338, §503, §516, §522, §547, §564, §584.

¹² The classic treatise on Hermes’ many roles is Norman O. Brown, *Hermes the Thief, the Evolution of a Myth*, Great Barrington, ME: Lindisfarne Press, 1990.

¹³ The reader is very probably aware of the large glacier of literature, from Roman Jakobson onward, on the presumed fundamental differences between metaphor and metonymy in linguistics and culture. My approach differs from that body of theoretical work in I go back to a fundamental difference between the two forms of metaphor that could be attributed to Vico in his theory about the “imaginative universal” of mythic thought. This universal carried with it the distinction Vico elsewhere played out as the contrast between the true (*il vero*) and the certain (*il certo*). This is, roughly, a distinction between what is understood as the “intended, meaningful content” and the artifacts by which that content is materialized in cultures, through institutions, objects, images,

ideas, or practices. Working forward from this distinction to Lacan's distinction of "reality" from "the Real" adds the informative insight into the role of a semiotic surplus that constitutes the "*objet petit a*," or "small other," an "object-cause of desire" that is related to *jouissance*, pleasure. Again, the literature on this is voluminous and beyond the scope of this essay. See Giambattista Vico, *On the Most Ancient Wisdom of the Italians, Unearthed from the Origins of the Latin Language*, trans. L. M. Palmer. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988, pp. 45-47, 96-104.

¹⁴ I use "demon" and "demonology" in sense in which Paul Friedländer discusses Plato's use of it in describing Socrates' peculiar reliance on inspiration and chance. *Plato*, Vol. 1: *An Introduction*, Bollingen Series 59. New York: Pantheon Books, 1958, pp. 32-58.

¹⁵ Slavoj Žižek, *Looking Awry: An Introduction to Jacques Lacan through Popular Culture*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1997.

¹⁶ See Michael Riffaterre, *Fictional Truth*, Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990. Also see Slavoj Žižek, "The Undergrowth of Enjoyment: How Popular Culture can Serve as an Introduction to Lacan," *New Formations* 9 (1989): 7-29; republished in Elizabeth Wright and Edmond Wright, eds., *The Žižek Reader*, Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1999, pp. 11-36.

¹⁷ See Slavoj Žižek, *Looking Awry*, pp. 94-99. *Notorious* is replete with themes of hospitality, cyclopean resistance to hospitality, and the radical use of signs in the retrieval of a "Eudydice" by an "Orpheus." Hitchcock's use of filmic space was canonical and could be regarded as an encyclopedia of intransitivity. In some cases, references to technical details are direct, as in the doubled boundary of screen and window in the opening credits of *Rear Window*.

¹⁸ Graves suggests that the Sphinx was a civic emblem. The wings would have indicated divine legality (relation to *æther*, the blue sky) and the woman's face would have indicated that the regulating priesthood was female. The lion and serpent, for the waxing and waning of the year, indicated that the priestesses controlled the auspices (oracular laws) based on calendar rituals. One view of Œdipus "answering the riddle and thereby destroying the Sphinx, allowing strangers entry to Thebes" is that it is a popularization of an older account of the usurpation of the auspices by a male-dominant regime. Robert Graves, *The Greek Myths*, Vol. 2. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1955, pp. 9-15. For a discussion on the metonymical logic of emblems, see the seminal short work, "The Theory of Figurative Expression in Italian Treatises on the *Impresa*," in

Robert Klein, *Form and Meaning, Essays on the Renaissance and Modern Art*, trans. M. Jay nad L. Wieseltier. New York: The Viking Press, 1970, pp. 3-24.

¹⁹ William Shakespeare, *Twelfth Night*, ed. M. Mahood. New York: Viking Penguin, Inc., 1987, II.3.2 and note on p. 150.

²⁰ Accounts by and of the French author and mystic, Simone Weil, juxtapose ideas of ingestion with progressive assimilation by God. Weil, an anorexic who periodically starved herself, reportedly reasoned that the less she herself ate, the more of herself would be available to God. See Simone Weil, *Waiting for God*, trans. Emma Craufurd, New York : Harper & Row, 1973. For interesting cases of Medieval women with similar situations, see Caroline Walker Bynum, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.

²¹ Fustel de Coulanges, *op. cit.*, pp. 58-62,

²² For an interesting compendium of Italian festivals and their special foods, see Carol Field, *Celebrating Italy: The Tastes and Traditions of Italy as Revealed through its Feasts, Festivals, and Sumptuous Food*, New York : HarperCollins Publishers, 1990.

²³ The practical origins and ritual connections of major foods are covered admirably in Maguelonne Toussaint-Samat's *A History of Food*, trans. Anthea Bell, Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1992.

²⁴ Robert Graves, *The White Goddess*, p. 175. The poetic "Beth-Luis-Nion" alphabet was a mnemonic device that collated social customs, theology, and calendar magic to trees and other selected plants. Graves cites Roderick O'Flaherty's *Ogygia* as the source of this originally oral lore.

²⁵ William Willeford, *The Fool and His Scepter, A Study in Clowns and Jesters and Their Audience*, Evanston, IN: Northwestern University Press, 1969.

²⁶ Henry W. Johnstone, Jr., "The Categories of Travel," in *Categories: A Colloquium*, ed. H. W. Johnstone, Jr., University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Department of Philosophy, 1978.

²⁷ Robert Graves, *The Greek Myths*, Vol. 2, New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1957, pp.366-67.

²⁸ Fustel de Coulange, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

²⁹ This equation (two adjacent boundaries = two concentric boundaries by “flipping” one of the boundaries) seemingly contradicts Spencer-Brown’s fundamental axioms. In his calculus, two concentric boundaries are read as “crosses”; two crosses (back and forth) equal “no cross” — the ideal of “continence.” Two adjacent boundaries are read as “calls” and are equivalent to a single call. See Spencer-Brown, *op. cit.*, pp. 12, 102-06.

³⁰ For a popular culture approach to these themes, see Slavoj Žižek, *op. cit.*, footnote 15.

³¹ See *Euripides: Alcestis and Other Plays*, trans. John Davie, London: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1996.

³² See Werner Oechslin and Anja Buschow, *Festarchitektur, der Architekt als Inszenierungskünstler*, Stuttgart: G. Hatje, 1984.