Helen Epigrammatopoios

DAVID F. ELMER

Helen *Epigrammatopoios*

Ancient commentators identify several passages in the *Iliad* as "epigrams." This paper explores the consequences of taking the scholia literally and understanding these passages in terms of inscription. Two tristichs spoken by Helen in the *teikhoskopia* are singled out for special attention. These lines can be construed not only as epigrams in the general sense, but more speci cally as captions appended to an image of the Achaeans encamped on the plain of Troy. Since Helen's lines to a certain extent correspond to the function and style of catalogic poetry, reading them speci cally as captions leads to a more nuanced understanding of both Homeric poetry and Homeric self-reference. By contrasting Helen's "epigrams" with those of Hektor, one can also discern a gender-based di erentiation of poetic functions.

No Greek literary genre is more inextricably linked to the technology of writing than the epigram, which derives its de ning characteristics from the exigencies of inscription. It may therefore seem somewhat incongruent to nd discernible gestures toward this most scriptural genre in the most thoroughly "oral" texts that survive from antiquity, the Homeric *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Nevertheless, even dedicated oralists allow for a certain Homeric awareness of or relation to written (inscribed) poetry. The canonical example is the sepulchral epigram which Hektor imagines for himself at *Il*. 7.89–90.[1] Ancient commentators, who, we hope, knew a great deal more about the conventions of epigram than we ourselves, likewise identify this passage as epigrammatic—along with several others, which have for

I would like to thank William G. Thalmann and the anonymous referees for *Classical Antiquity* for their many helpful suggestions, too numerous to indicate individually.

1. Nagy 1990: 19: "an internal cross reference to the genre of the epigram." Gentili and Giannini 1977: 24 note that the ancient scholia agree with the moderns in ascribing to this distich "un indubbio carattere epigrammatico." Lumpp 1963: 214 argues for a more or less direct intertext between Hektor's epitaph and the early sixth-century Arniadas inscription (*CEG* 145), an interpretation that Raubitschek 1968: 6 . endorses and develops.

Classical Antiquity. Vol. 24, Issue 1, pp. 1–39. ISSN 0278-6656(p); 1067-8344 (e).

the most part escaped the attention of modern critics. A notable exception to this critical ellipsis is Onofrio Vox's concise but penetrating article, "Epigrammi in Omero," which assembles and comments brie y on all the Iliadic passages de ned in ancient commentaries as "epigrams" or "epigrammatic."[2] Vox brings together ve passages from the *Iliad*, the diversity of which suggests that "Homer" indulges in a much more intimate contact with writing than moderns generally admit.

This paper will focus on two of these passages, a total of some six lines spoken by Helen to Priam as she points out to him the chief gures of the Achaean host, in a scene customarily known as the *teikhoskopia*. My argument will proceed, in the early stages, by the method of hypothesis, supposing that there might be some reason to take the scholia at face value and attribute some "inscriptional" quality to Helen's lines, and seeing what consequences can be drawn from this supposition. I use the term "inscriptional" with a special force: I mean to indicate a mode of linguistic reference that points more or less directly to some external object—without necessarily involving the use of writing. The de ning characteristic of the inscription in this sense is that it owes some part of its existence to an object of reference.[3] Helen's two epigrams, I will argue, correspond to a particular subclass of epigram. To the extent that Helen can be read as a gure for self-conscious re ection on the nature of poetry itself, her epigrams prove essential to an understanding of the way in which Homeric poetry understands its relation to other poetic genres and to poetry in general.[4]

By proposing an "inscriptional" mode of reference which is independent of any actual practice of writing, I am taking what could be called a grammatological approach, in the sense in which that term has been deployed (most famously) by Jacques Derrida.[5] From this perspective, the revolution of writing, the truly radical innovation in verbal expression, is not the actual moment of transcribing speech with graphic signs (transcription in itself does not necessarily alter the character of an utterance); rather, it is a particular mode of reference which destabilizes the *hic et nunc* of an utterance, often by positing or creating a gap, a discontinuity, between utterance and referent.[6] This is a revolution which *does not require the technology*

2. Vox 1975.

3. This is not intended as a universal de nition, nor is it meant to cover every instance of inscription even in the Greek world: there are obviously many kinds of inscription that do not fall into this category. Other commonly invoked notions of inscription focus on the materiality of the inscribed word, its permanence, etc.

4. The *teikhoskopia* is an essential component of Clader's interpretation of Helen as a poet-gure; see Clader 1976: 6–11, and esp. 33, which speaks of Helen's *pharmakon* (in the *Odyssey*) as "a brief symbol for Homer's extended self-conscious expression of the e ect of epic poetry." Cf. also Jenkins 1999: 220n.33 and 225n.48. Clader and Jenkins tend to assimilate Helen's poetic activity to the model of the epic singer. I shall argue the necessity for a much more subtle anatomy of the poetic craft.

5. Derrida 1997.

6. Cf. Spivak 1997: lxix on Derrida's "archi-écriture": "The usual notion of writing in the narrow sense does contain the elements of the structure of writing in general: the absence of the 'author' and of the 'subject-matter,' interpretability, *the deployment of a space and time that is not*

of writing in order to take place. I would therefore wish to avoid the implication, in the case of the observed correspondences between the Homeric text and certain speci c modes of inscription, that the Homeric text has necessarily used real inscriptions as models, and hence that the relevant portions of the text must be chronologically posterior to a real practice of inscription. I am perfectly happy to suppose, after Derrida, a "writing before the letter." From the grammatological point of view it becomes unnecessary to establish a strict chronology relating the Homeric text to an epigraphical practice which, to my knowledge, does not leave an unambiguous trace in the archeological record until ca. 400:[7] we may suppose that the epic incorporates modes of reference which enjoyed an existence in speech, as "writing in general," prior to their transcription as "writing in the narrow sense." But for readers who should feel that the correspondences I will outline here are rather more suggestive of an awareness of actual epigraphical practice (a position to which I have often been attracted during the writing of the following pages, but which I have refrained from embracing because it imposes unnecessary limitations on my argument), I would leave open the possibility that the passages I will discuss derive from a relatively later phase of Homeric tradition. Allowance for such a possibility is made by several accounts of the transmission and xation of the Homeric text, including that particular account to which I subscribe, namely, Nagy's "evolutionary" model, which allows for varying degrees of "recomposition" well into the historical period.[8] Indeed, in consideration of the possible Panathenaic overtones[9] of the weaving motifs I shall discuss later in this paper, I would be quite satis ed with a hypothesis situating the passages in question in Nagy's "de nitive" (extending from the mid-sixth to the late fourth century) or "standardizing" (late fourth to mid-second century) periods, both of which are "centralized in Athens."[10]

Let us begin with a survey of the ve epigrammatic passages singled out by Vox.[11] Numbers 2 and 3, Helen's lines, are the principal object of our interest:

'its own'" (emphasis mine). With this last phrase Spivak points to the destabilization of the *hic et nunc* characteristic of "writing in general."

7. *CEG* 105, discussed below. The other monument featuring in my discussion, the Chest of Kupselos, is supposed to have belonged to the sixth century.

8. Nagy 1996: 29–63 (esp. 41–43). At 99–100 Nagy gives references to several alternative models of a "'sixth-century recension"' or "'Panathenaic text,"' any of which would su ce for my purposes. See also Wilson 2002: 11 for documentation of the "growing body of scholarship that places the *textualization stage* of Homeric epic . . . well into the seventh and sixth centuries B.C.E."

9. Alluded to in the Appendix.

10. Nagy 1996: 42, who adds, "A context for the de nitive period . . . is a pan-Hellenic festival like the Panathenaia at Athens. . . ." Note the potentially Athenian resonances of *Il.* 3.201 (cf. LSJ s.v. *kranaos* on the use of *Kranaoi* to mean "the people of Attika"), and the fact that the Catalogue of Ships, which is implicated in my argument, shows signs of Athenian tampering (cf. the comments in West's *apparatus* ad *Il.* 2.558).

11. The scholia and ancient commentators who refer to these passages as "epigrams" or "epigrammatic" are as follows (all references to the scholia follow Erbse's edition): (1) AT 3.156–

1. οὐ νέμεσις Τρῶας καὶ ἐϋκνήμιδας Ἀχαιοὺς
τοιῇδ' ἀμφὶ γυναικὶ πολὺν χρόνον ἄλγεα πάσχειν·
αἰνῶς ἀθανάτῃσι θεῇς εἰς ὦπα ἔοικεν·

3.156–58

No cause for reproach that Trojans and well-greaved Achaeans
should for such a woman su er woes through the long years:
terribly is she like the immortal goddesses in appearance.[12]

2. οὗτός γ' Ἀτρεΐδης εὐρὺ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων,
ἀμφότερον βασιλεύς τ' ἀγαθὸς κρατερός τ' αἰχμητής·
δαὴρ αὖτ' ἐμὸς ἔσκε κυνώπιδος, εἴ ποτ' ἔην γε.

3.178–80

This is the son of Atreus, wide-ruling Agamemnon,
both a noble king and a valiant spearman;
and he was also husband's brother—if ever there was such a one—to dog-faced me.

3. οὗτος δ' αὖ Λαερτιάδης πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς,
ὃς τράφη ἐν δήμῳ Ἰθάκης κραναῆς περ ἐούσης
εἰδὼς παντοίους τε δόλους καὶ μήδεα πυκνά.

3.200–202

This again is the son of Laertes, Odysseus of many contrivances,
who was born in the deme of Ithaca, rocky though it be,
knowing tricks of all kinds and well-made counsels.

4. Ἕκτορος ἥδε γυνὴ ὃς ἀριστεύεσκε μάχεσθαι
Τρώων ἱπποδάμων ὅτε Ἴλιον ἀμφεμάχοντο.

6.460–61

This is the wife of Hektor, who was best at ghting
of the horse-taming Trojans when they fought about Ilion.

5. ἀνδρὸς μὲν τόδε σῆμα πάλαι κατατεθνηῶτος,
ὅν ποτ' ἀριστεύοντα κατέκτανε φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ.

7.89–90

This is the *sêma* of a man long dead,
whom once shining Hektor slew at the height of his glory.

58b; (2) T 3.178 (ἐπιγραμματικῶς), AbT 1.29d (which refers to 3.179 as τὸ ἐπίγραμμα); (3) AbT 3.200–202 (τὸ ἐπίγραμμα); (4) bT 6.460b and Ps.-Plutarch *De Homero* 2.215, which also mentions (5). These Homeric epigrams were evidently an established part of the scholiastic tradition, as represented above all by the bT-scholia. Van der Valk 1963: 133–34 discusses the value of "the great exegetical commentary on the *Iliad* which we indicate by the name of bT." The bT-scholia are generally regarded as free from the in uence of late sources (ibid. 414).

12. I have consulted the Loeb text and published commentaries for help with this and subsequent translations.

From this synopsis one can easily see that Vox's material reveals a number of internal divisions. There is rst of all the matter of the noticeably restricted distribution of these passages within the poem. Numbers 1 through 3 occur within some fty lines of each other, in connection with the same episode: the rst describes Helen's appearance to the assembled Trojan leaders, and thus belongs to the narrative frame of the *teikhoskopia*, while the latter two comprise Helen's rst two descriptions, of Agamemnon and Odysseus, respectively. Numbers 4 and 5 likewise occur within an integrated narrative unit centered on Hektor as he visits the city and returns to battle. The di erentiation of these lines on the basis of narrative distribution is to a certain extent re ected by their divergence in terms of theme and function. An overtly sepulchral character distinguishes the two epigrams of the "Hektorad"[13] —not by coincidence, since an anxiety over the death and burial of the hero de nes the thematics of the relationship between Hektor and Andromakhê, a relationship which receives its most sustained development precisely in this section of the poem. It is not immediately obvious whether the three epigrams of the *teikhoskopia* share any analogous feature which would make them similarly appropriate to their context; number 1 presents a particular problem, to which I shall later return. For the time being I would like simply to point out that the *teikhoskopia* is not an isolated unit, but constitutes a segment of a larger narrative movement. In theme and structure it stands in close relation to the Catalogue of Ships in Book 2 and the *epipôlêsis* of Book 4.[14] These architectonic connections situate the lines in question in a larger textual network that will prove especially signi cant when we consider the "catalogic" properties of Helen's lines.

Similar results can be obtained by the application of other criteria. Köchly had rst drawn attention to epigrams 1 and 3 as a result of his interest in strophic patterns of three lines, noting that the scholiast cites 3.156 . as the very founding instance of the *trigônon epigramma*.[15] A formal opposition in the number of lines thus reinforces the division based on distribution.[16] Syntax to a certain extent unites Hektor's distichs with Helen's tristichs, for 2 through 5 all utilize a demonstrative pronoun in the nominative and a relative clause.[17] At a more fundamental level, however, syntax divides the former group from the latter.

13. Lines 6.460–61, by which a living person is made to serve as the monument for a deceased hero, obviously represent a very signi cant manipulation of the common epitaph formula "this is the *sêma* of so-and-so," as we see it for instance in 7.89–90. See below for comments on one consequence of this very signi cant maneuver.

14. Clader 1976: 9 relates Helen's lines to the Catalogue of Ships. Köchly 1881: 73 also recognizes the *teikhoskopia*'s participation in a larger movement, speaking of the *teikhoskopia* and the *epipôlêsis* of Book 4 as "die doppelte Musterung."

15. Köchly 1881: 79–80.

16. For more on the *trigônon*, which was recognized in antiquity as a distinctive form, see below; the autonomy of the *distichon* needs no further proof than the extensive treatment of Lausberg 1982a.

17. Lausberg 1982a: 35 identi es the syntactic structure of our numbers 4 and 5 as "der charakteristische Grundaufbau des inschriftlichen Epigramms."

The distinction between a proper noun in the nominative, as in Helen's lines, and in the genitive, as in Hektor's, is no less signi cant in this regard than the tremendous di erence in emphasis (i.e. deixis) produced by the pronouns used in each case. Vox quite rightly draws attention to "il segnale οὗτος" which distinguishes Helen's tristichs from the "Hektorad" distichs and their use of "il segnale ὅδε, cosí come negli epigrammi reali."[18] I shall return to this point momentarily, and to Vox's problematic notion of what constitutes a "real" epigram. Finally, there is the complex matter of speaking voice. The *houtos*-epigrams present the simplest case, being spoken straightforwardly by Helen. The two quasi-epitaphs are both pronounced by Hektor himself, although he imagines them to be spoken by an anonymous speaker at some unidenti ed point in the future.[19] The rst tristich, exceptionally, is not uttered by a single, identi able person, but in the less distinctive, corporate voice of the Trojan elders. Aside from this apparent exception, the formal and syntactic divergences we have observed are thus reinforced, not only by a di erence in speaker, but by a di erence in the speaker's *gender* as well. It is worth considering what signi cance may lie behind the fact that the sepulchral epigrams are assigned to a male speaker (Hektor), while the female speaker pronounces epigrams which are, somehow, di erent. This paper hopes to assess in more precise terms just what makes Helen's epigrams peculiar.

In many of the aspects I have just pointed to—syntax, deixis, voice—the rst epigram stands apart from the rest. This tristich displays none of the typically epigrammatic features that distinguish the other lines. It is far from obvious why the scholiast should have felt these lines to be an exemplary, indeed *the* exemplary, instance of the *trigônon epigramma*. In fact these lines count as epigram for altogether di erent reasons. Although these reasons will prove to be emblematic of the function of epigram in the *teikhoskopia*, they must await exposition until the proper moment. For now, I shall x my attention on my primary object of interest, the lines spoken by Helen.

The scholiasts' attribution of an epigrammatic quality to these lines raises an initial question: do the scholia point merely to the formal features of the lines (asserting that they are simply *like* epigrams), or do they wish to attribute to them a properly epigrammatic *function*? It seems safer, and generally more likely, to assume that the scholiasts have stylistic features in mind. I will argue that the scholia are right to observe a formally epigrammatic character, and that these observations are con rmed by observable correspondences with real epigrams.

18. Vox 1975: 70.

19. The contrast between Hektor's epigrams, imagined as pronounced by an anonymous (presumably male) speaker, and those of Helen, which are rmly anchored to her own voice, should be viewed in light of the comments of Gutzwiller 2004: 383: "Verse inscriptions carved on stone were in the early period of Greek culture always anonymous . . . As a result, the voice heard in inscribed verse was unmarked and so gendered male. . . . if the voice in an epigram was marked as that of a woman, it had then to be heard as a personal voice, not an anonymous or generic one."

But I will make the further claim that, in addition to an epigrammatic form, these lines have as well an epigrammatic function (which may or may not lie in the background of the scholiasts' comments). My discussion will therefore move from consideration of the formal features of Helen's lines to their functional deployment in the poem; I hope to show that the Homeric text accommodates an awareness of more than the mere surface features of a particular mode of discourse.

The scholia provide, at best, only elliptical justi cations for their use of the term "epigram." With reference to our number 4, the scholion bT 6.460, ἐπιγραμματικὸν ἔχει τύπον ὁ στίχος ("the line has an epigrammatic character"), evidently refers to the observable formal features of the couplet. It is, however, unclear whether any such formal concerns lie in the background of the comment on number 3, ἐν βραχεῖ τὸ ἐπίγραμμα πάντα ἔχει ("the epigram comprises everything in brief"), or whether the scholiast has in mind only the compressed brevity of the lines. In the latter case, the scholiast would be in accord with Lausberg, who feels that the three tristichs of Book 3 are epigrammatic to the extent that in each "handelt es sich um kurze Personencharakterisierungen."[20] Nevertheless, a de nition of epigram only in terms of *Kürze und Umfang*, in Lausberg's terms, glosses over not only the marked style which distinguishes the latter four from the anomalous rst epigram, but also the syntactic divergences which oppose Hektor's epigrams to Helen's. In order, therefore, better to discern the speci c qualities of Helen's epigrammatic oeuvre, I will begin by contrasting them with Hektor's more straightforward epitaphs.

Helen's epigrams on Agamemnon and Odysseus present exactly the same structure. Following Vox (p. 69), we can schematize it as follows:

> οὗτος + patronymic + epithet + proper name + expansion (epithet or relative clause)

All the primary constituents are in the nominative; the copula is suppressed. Helen continues her identi cation of the Achaean leaders by pointing out Ajax: οὗτος δ' Αἴας ἐστὶ πελώριος, ἕρκος Ἀχαιῶν ("this is mighty Ajax, bulwark of the Achaeans," 3.229). This line repeats some features of the essential form, but omits the patronymic and adds the copula. Hektor's epigrams likewise share a common form, but it is one that di ers substantially from Helen's paradigm. Though it is more di cult to describe schematically, we might represent it thus:

> noun_1 (G) + ὅδε + noun_2 (N) + modi er$_1$

where "noun_1" designates the memorialized person, and "noun_2" the memorial itself. Characteristic of this epigrammatic form is its apparently indirect relation to the ultimate object of reference, the memorialized individual. (The text refers not to the individual but to the material object, the *sêma*, which in turn represents

20. Lausberg 1982a: 36: the concise description of an individual "für das inschriftliche Epigramm charakteristisch ist."

him/her. The "indirection" produced by the mediation of a material object between text and referent nevertheless proves only apparent, for in the case of such "egocentric" inscriptions, text and object are conceived of as a single entity—a point developed below.[21]) The patronymic and epithet are noticeably absent here. Surprisingly, although they have an honori c quality which would seem eminently appropriate to the memorializing epigram, these features seem less essential to Hektor's sepulchral mode than to Helen's merely descriptive one. The archaeological record tends to con rm this general characterization. The well-known Arniadas inscription (*CEG* 145, ca. 600?) likewise lacks a patronymic, an omission that might be explained by supposing an intertextual engagement with Hektor's imagined epitaph; the same cannot be said, however, for the famous Phrasikleia inscription (*CEG* 24, ca. 540?).[22] On the other hand, the correlation of a patronymic and heroic epithet with a proper name in the nominative does seem to be typical of a particular mode of epigram, for the only passage in the *Odyssey* designated by the scholia as an *epigramma* is the disguised Athena's pronouncement: Μέντης Ἀγχιάλοιο δαΐφρονος εὔχομαι εἶναι / υἱός ("I declare myself to be Mentês, the son of wise Ankhialos," 1.180–81).[23] This purely declarative statement is obviously not monumental, as Hektor's epitaphs; in fact, this line is a perfect analogue to Helen's tristichs, except for the minor di erence that in this case the speaker identi es himself rather than another.[24] Identi cation or speci cation seems to be the primary function of this type of epigram. These epigrams are tags or labels which the speaker attaches to a referent.

21. The "indirection" of the egocentric funerary *sêma* is thus indicative of the inseparability of text from monument. Sourvinou-Inwood 1995: 228 (focusing on the status of the monument rather than the status of the text, as here) ties this feature of grave inscriptions to the function of the *sêma* as metonymic signi er. She also notes the fact that, while "no grave statue is identi ed as the deceased by an inscription, but always as the *sêma* of the deceased," votive statues are often identi ed with the dedicator by an inscription naming him/her in the nominative. Syntactically, then, such dedicatory inscriptions are closer to Helen's model than Hektor's, a circumstance which I would explain by suggesting that dedicatory inscriptions by their very nature tend to function as *Beischriften* (in the sense developed below). Two of Sourvinou-Inwood's examples, the inscriptions naming Ornithê and Philippê in a group dedication, in fact function precisely as name-labels identifying the statues.

22. Lumpp 1963: 213–14, who adduces the Phrasikleia inscription in order to counter the view of those who felt a patronymic to be so wanting in the Arniadas text that Χάροπος (genitive < Χάροψ) should be read in place of χαροπός, an epithet naturally applied to Ares. Svenbro 1993, who invests a great deal in Phrasikleia's relation to the "paternal hearth," does not comment on the absence of the patronymic in this key text.

23. D-scholia ad loc.: ἐπίγραμμα τοῦτο λέγεται (perhaps with reference only to the rst three words?). For the formulation εὔχομαι εἶναι, see below on Aeschylus *Th.* 646, and cf. *CEG* 195 and esp. 413.

24. As shown by Muellner 1976: 74n.9, this "minor" di erence is nevertheless quite exceptional, since it violates the general prohibition against mentioning one's own name. Muellner cites three Homeric instances in which the violation of this prohibition coincides with the speaker's (purported) emergence from disguise. The poetic e ect of Athena-Mentês' statement thus depends on the powerful force of tradition in Homeric poetry: the hearer / reader sensitive to the conventions of disguise experiences a heightened sense of dramatic irony.

In Vox's analysis, the distinguishing characteristic of Helen's epigrams is the use of *houtos* in place of Hektor's *hode*. Yet, as Vox himself notes, *hode* maintains a kind of background presence in the *teikhoskopia* lines. Each of Helen's identi cations is o ered in response to a question from Priam. Priam always poses his question with the demonstrative *hode*. Thus:

> ὥς μοι καὶ τόνδ' ἄνδρα πελώριον ἐξονομήνῃς
> ὅς τις ὅδ' ἐστὶν Ἀχαιὸς ἀνὴρ ἠΰς τε μέγας τε.
> (3.166–67)
> . . . and that you may also name for me this mighty man,
> whoever is this Achaean man, valiant and great.
>
> εἶπ' ἄγε μοι καὶ τόνδε φίλον τέκος ὅς τις ὅδ' ἐστί·
> (3.192)
> And this one too, my child—come, tell me who this is.
>
> τίς τ' ἄρ' ὅδ' ἄλλος Ἀχαιὸς ἀνὴρ ἠΰς τε μέγας τε
> (3.226)
> Who then is this other Achaean man, valiant and great?

In each case Helen responds, οὗτος δ' (γ')…. It is as if *houtos* in Helen's answer simply marks the place for the *hode* supplied by Priam's question. The identi cation seems in a way to have been split between two interlocutors. This raises the question: if Priam had been able to pronounce the identi cations himself, without the mediation of Helen, would we nd *hode* in place of *houtos*? The question is to a certain extent misleading, since such a situation would di er fundamentally from the scene we are examining in at least two ways. Firstly, there would be no dialogue; an a rmative answer to our question might on that account be thought attributable simply to the lack of dialogism. But we must keep in mind that our situation involves not two but three terms (speaker, hearer, *and* object of reference), the relations among which are radically altered by the removal of one of the interlocutors. *Hode* in a direct identi cation by Priam might therefore signal a change in the relation to the object of reference just as much as the absence or presence of an interlocutor. Posing the question is nevertheless worthwhile, since it forces us to confront the decisive issue of whether the *houtos* in Helen's lines is determined by their situation in a dialogue or by their (still only hypothetical) "inscriptional" status. That is, our response to this question depends on whether we read Helen's lines simply as part of an exchange with Priam, and only metaphorically "epigrams," or whether we attribute to them a certain degree of autonomy, as *epigrammata* in their own right, de ned by a particular relation to an object. In formulating our response, we must be careful to distinguish two very di erent circumstances which might determine the operative force of deixis: on the one hand, a real, living speech situation in which two interlocutors are present

and interact with each other; and on the other, an inscriptional situation, in which the interlocutors are only notionally (virtually) present.

Vox opts for the former approach when he emphasizes the close connection between question and answer: " Οὗτος nelle risposte di Elena implica cioè una stretta dipendenza di queste dalle domande di Priamo: *i tristici descrittivi non possono essere autonomi, come accade per gli epigrammi reali*."[25] For Vox, the "dependent" nature of *houtos* gives Helen's lines their "dialogic" quality,[26] while their purely "descriptive" function seems to make them somehow unreal as epigrams. Bakker expresses a similar view, going even so far as to suggest that *houtos* is tied fundamentally to the structure of the dialogue: "Helen's answer acknowledges Priam's earlier perception. Helen's and Priam's joint seeing is in fact the very point of the use of οὗτος. We may say, then, that οὗτος is not only deictic, but also 'dialogic.'"[27]

Without question, Helen's epigrams appear as a response to Priam's questions; they are conceived and constructed as part of a dialogue, or better, an interrogation, in which the viewer demands the identi cation of the object he sees. We should remember, however, that epigrams are conventionally and implicitly understood to participate in dialogic situations; it is virtually their nature to answer the interrogation of a notional reader or viewer. Let us suppose for a moment that there is something "inscriptional" about Helen's words, that is, that they are determined primarily by their special relation to an object of reference rather than by their occurrence in dialogue. Under this assumption we can read Helen's interaction with Priam as a dramatization of the conventional interaction between the interrogating voice and the answering voice which becomes a virtual commonplace of later literary epigram.[28] In the context of inscription, however, mere dialogism is not su cient to control the deployment of *hode* / *houtos*, as we see from the following inscription from Halikarnassos (*CEG* 429, ca. 475?), which scripts an exchange identical to the one between Priam and Helen:[29]

αὐδὴ τεχνήεσσα λίθο, λέγε τίς τόδ' ἄ[γαλμα]
στῆσεν Ἀπόλλωνος βωμὸν ἐπαγλαΐ[σας].
Παναμύης υἱὸς Κασβώλλιος, εἴ μ' ἐπ[οτρύνεις]
ἐξειπῆν, δεκάτην τήνδ' ἀνέθηκε θε[ῶι].

25. Vox 1975: 69, my emphasis. Cf. the judgment of Lausberg 1982a: 36: "Syntaktisch sind allerdings hier die Verse durch Partikeln, anders als ein in sich selbständiges Epigramm, in den Kontext integriert." Lausberg makes a valid point; see below for the epigrammatic e ect of the lack of connecting particles in the rst tristich in our list. Notice, however, that the epigram "quoted" at Aesch. *Th.* 646–47 includes a δέ analogous to that in *Il.* 3.200.

26. Cf. Vox 1975: 70: "Il segnale οὗτος, e quindi la caratteristica *dialogica* di questi due tristici . . ." (emphasis original).

27. Bakker 1999: 7.

28. For an overview of these "dialogue" epigrams, see Barrio Vega 1989.

29. Discussed by Svenbro 1993: 56 . Compare ἐξειπῆν in the epigram to ἐξονομήνῃς in the request Priam makes of Helen (3.166).

> Cunning voice of the stone, tell me, who set up
> this monument, in adornment of the altar of Apollo?
> Panamuês, son of Kasbôllis, if you bid me
> speak, dedicated this tithe to the god.

The first interlocutor uses *hode* to indicate the object of reference, just as Priam does; but the answer is given using this same pronoun.[30] Other factors, besides the alternation of speaking voices, must be at work here to determine the use of pronouns. And if we suspect that similar factors might be at play in the context of Helen's exchange with Priam, it will not be sufficient to offer verbal exchange as an explanation for Helen's use of *houtos*. The properly inscriptional situation involves three terms, not two. We must examine more closely the consequences of Helen's deictic shift, paying special attention to the operation of deixis in inscriptional situations.

"In ancient Greek, *hode* is precisely a first-person demonstrative pronoun. Consequently, *hode* situates the object or person that it qualifies in the immediate sphere of the speaker as opposed to that of the person addressed."[31] *Houtos*, by contrast, is a "second-person" demonstrative, situating its referent with respect to the addressee.[32] Thus Priam's use of *hode* to point to Agamemnon seems quite natural, for he speaks from his own perspective, although one supposes he might have used *houtos* had he wished to empathize more with Helen's point of view.[33] But what about the use of *hode* in the Panamuês inscription—or in inscription in general, since Svenbro has shown that this pronoun is the premier indicator of the "egocentric" perspective characteristic of archaic Greek inscriptions?[34] The first interlocutor appears to utter *hode* for the same reason as Priam: he is interested in an object which *he* sees. But if the inscription refers to an object available to perception by one or another speaker, why does the second interlocutor not follow the rules of politeness and answer, as Helen, with *houtos*? If we were dealing with two distinct voices, two distinct perspectives, the double *hode* would present certain difficulties. But the simple fact is that both "voices" emanate *from the same stone*. We should not be misled by the illusion that the inscription transcribes a "real" dialogue between two subjective awarenesses, each of whom

30. One might object that the first interlocutor asks not about the monument itself, but about the dedicator, so that the deixis of τόδ' and τήνδ' lies outside the exchange of question and answer. But the epigram clearly conceives of the monument itself (the only thing a notional speaker could point to) as prompting the question.

31. Svenbro 1993: 33. Bakker 1999: 6 schematizes the three Greek pronouns of deixis as follows: " ὅδε for speaker-oriented deixis . . . οὗτος for hearer-oriented deixis; and (ἐ)κεῖνος for the designation of what is more remote than the interlocutors in the current speech event."

32. Bakker 1999: 7.

33. An example cited by Bakker 1999: 7 shows that *houtos* is quite at home in direct questions, even where the speaker demands knowledge *for himself*: τίς δ' οὗτος κατὰ νῆας ἀνὰ στρατὸν ἔρχεαι οἶος (*Il.* 10.82).

34. Svenbro 1993: 26–43, especially 29: "[the earliest Greek inscriptions] assume the *egô* of the speech-act."

may perceive the object in question. The seemingly incongruous opposition of a double *hode* derives from the fact that the inscription, and the voice which utters it, are inevitably anchored to the object itself, the referent of *hode*. This incongruity arises from the very form of inscription, which unites an object and the text that refers to it. "For as long as the inscription can be read, the object will be there. No one could lay greater claim than the object itself to the Hierheit of the written speech-act."[35] Inscriptional deixis is determined primarily not by the relation between two virtual speakers, but by the relation of the utterance to a third term, the object of reference.[36]

Inscription thus alters somewhat the conditions of deixis as it operates in spoken discourse, for it serves in this case to indicate spatial contiguity (in fact, consubstantiality) between object and text, while it otherwise indexes the proximity of an object to the speaker or addressee. In fact, for true inscribed epigrams—*Aufschriften*, in Raubitschek's well-suited terminology—the notional unity of object and text is a *sine qua non*: the epigram as *Aufschrift* "eine Inschrift ist die eng und einzigartig mit einem Denkmal verbunden ist."[37] The persistent rst-personality of early inscriptions is symptomatic of their unique relationship with their monuments, corresponding not to the rst person of some unidenti ed speaker (who will not be persistently present before the object), but the rst person of the speech event itself, an event which necessarily involves the presence of the object or monument. In other words, the monument is the key, not the speaker. In fact, the egocentrism of the *Aufschrift* (the Panamuês inscription is a premier example) reveals a fundamental disregard or non-awareness of the speaker as a distinct subjectivity in his/her own right. These monuments do

35. Svenbro 1993: 42.

36. Bakker 1999: 7 ties the "explicit linkage of οὗτος with σύ that we nd in Attic dramatic discourse" to a "dialogic" use of *houtos*. I would argue, however, that we cannot fully account for the use of *houtos* in Attic drama without taking account of the relation between the audience and the dramatic spectacle. In addition to the "dialogic" relation between interlocutors on stage, the structure of theater also gives rise to a triangular system of relations, analogous to the "inscriptional" structure I have described, comprising a speaker (on stage), a hearer (the audience), and an object of reference (the theatrical spectacle). Cf. Peponi 2004: 300 on second-person deixis in Alcman 1 as a fundamentally theatrical gesture that marks the "viewing audience" as "an indispensable factor in the performance" (note also the discussion of Aristotle's formulation ὡς τοῦτο ἐκεῖνο on p. 310; Peponi's article is part of an *Arethusa* special issue on the poetics of deixis, much of which is of relevance). For examples of *houtos* which may involve a quasi-inscriptional force, see e.g. Aesch. *Ag*. 1404, 1523 and Soph. *Aj*. 970. For tragedy as *écriture*, see below.

37. Raubitschek 1968: 3. Note that the mere act of inscription is not su cient to establish the special relationship between epigram and object constitutive of the *Aufschrift*. In adopting Raubitschek's terminology, I must be very careful to distinguish it from the deceptively similar terminology of Haüsle 1979: 46–47, who adopts Janell's binary scheme of "die Auf- oder Beischriften und die eigentlichen Inschriften." Haüsle's terms have virtually the opposite value of the same words in Raubitschek. While the latter opposes *Aufschriften* to *Beischriften*, these two terms are nearly synonymous for Haüsle; *Inschrift*, which for Raubitschek denotes generally any text inscribed on some material, for Haüsle indicates that speci c form of writing which is indi erent to the material on which it is inscribed.

not look forward to some eventual moment of contact with a passerby; they recognize only a timeless, undi erentiated, and absolute present, which is voiced in the rst person quite simply because it does not acknowledge any other point of view.[38]

Such a perspective explains the curious use of *hode* in the Panamuês inscription, where deixis serves to indicate the contiguity of object and text. Now, it is clear that we cannot posit a similar contiguity for the *teikhoskopia*, neither for Helen's "epigrams" nor for Priam's *hode* cues. The *teikhoskopia* is constructed in such a way as to emphasize the gap between the words spoken on the walls and the Greeks on the plain below (the wall itself is the most concrete symbol of the radical divide between the Trojan and the Greek spheres). That does not mean, however, that the operation of deixis is here free from the in uence of inscriptional forces, i.e., forces oriented around the relation between language and referent.[39] There *is* a type of inscription which, although it functions without regard for contiguity, is nevertheless determined fundamentally by its relation to an object of reference: this is the *Beischrift* (again in Raubitschek's terms), the caption or legend, which has as its only goal the explanation or identi cation of an object.[40] No longer a necessary component of the object, without which the object cannot function, the *Beischrift* is merely a supplement which serves to specify, condense, or otherwise "capture" the meaning of an object: a *captio* in the true sense. The *Beischrift* can also be an *Inschrift*, of course, carved upon the object it describes. But it is characterized precisely by its indi erence to the place of inscription: as was often done with temple dedications, such identifying captions could be placed as easily on a plaque next to the dedica-

38. Contrast the anonymous rst-person of the passerby as mourner, which (though rare) begins to appear in the mid-sixth century—that is, contemporaneously with the destabilization of the monumental present (see below). Examples: *CEG* 43, 51 (with an important divergence from Hansen's text: see Lewis 1987: 188), 470, and *SEG* 41.540a, none of which is earlier than 550. Dedicatory inscriptions furnish an early and pronounced deviation from the purely monumental point of view, for many incorporate a second-person address to the god (e.g. *CEG* 326, ca. 700–675). In the rst place, however, one should note that the god's point of view is not con ned to human temporal and spatial limits, and that therefore this appeal to a second person does not necessarily undermine the absolute present of the monument. Secondly, many of these inscriptions negotiate the deictic shift with a strong syntactic boundary, which essentially insulates one sphere of reference from the other (cf. Day 2000: 53). For me, the "deviations" evidenced by dedicatory inscriptions indicate that they naturally tend to fall outside the class of *Aufschriften*; cf. above, n.21.

39. The *teikhoskopia* seems to me to be a more elaborate version of the theme "Trojan women speaking about Greek heroes" as attested by *Ilias Parva* fr. 2 Allen. That text, however, appears to have lacked the explicitly deictic element—the actual pointing to the Greek army—which gives the *teikhoskopia* its unique referential structure, with discourse on one side, and referent on the other, of the wall. It is this structure (the congruence with the structuralist opposition signi er / signi ed is readily apparent) which makes the scene eminently appropriate as a dramatization or theater of writing.

40. Raubitschek 1968: 21: "Beischriften haben den einzigen Zweck eine bildliche Darstellung zu erklären"; dedicatory inscriptions, for Raubitschek, generally fall into this category. Raubitschek draws special attention to the use of *Namensbeischriften* in archaic vase painting.

tion as on the dedication itself. The indi erence of the *Beischrift* arises from its relation to its referent: as supplement, the caption presumes an object which is notionally complete and su ers itself to be *extrinsic* to that object. We may contrast the form of the sepulchral monument, which cannot ful ll its function of procuring *kleos* without its inscription to evoke the name of the deceased.[41] Such monumental inscriptions are structurally (and often materially) one with their objects.

To the extent that the caption points to an extrinsic image, rather than to a monument with which it is consubstantial, we can say that the caption is characterized by a notional (even if not an actual) disjunction between the object and the text. This disjunction has linguistic consequences: once object and text are thus severed from one another, the object can no longer lay claim to the "Hierheit" of the speech event, which henceforth occurs in some other, unde ned place—unde ned because the speech event is not anchored to the object of reference. This immediately destabilizes the "monumental" rst person, since the basic condition for monumental "egocentrism"—the assumption that monument and text will always be co-present—is no longer met. Several alternatives remain to the inscription as *Beischrift*, unable as it is to link itself directly to the monument in an absolute present. Firstly, it can either link itself to the present of the viewer of the object; or it can eschew deixis altogether. In the former case, the text of the inscription can assimilate itself to the voice of the viewer, who will presumably be present whenever the inscription is activated—in which case the text may exhibit the rst-person *hode*, which now refers to the viewer's present. But this con guration is deceptive, in that the inscription poses as the pronouncement of a potential reader in a manner that obscures the true status of the words as a supplement to the object which confronts the reader / viewer from an indeterminate, intermediate space. A more honest posture—one that more accurately re ects the disposition of the three constituent parts of the speech event (the notional speaker, who is also the reader / viewer, the words transcribed by the inscription, and the object of reference)—is shown by inscriptions which appeal to the reader / viewer as a *second* person (using the pronoun *houtos*).[42] These inscriptions maintain a distinct (though inde nite) place for themselves, referencing the object while at the same time acknowledging the viewer as the subjectivity which determines the present of the speech event. Such a posture is

41. Cf. Svenbro 1993: 62: "The inscription is a machine designed to produce *kleos*." In the contrast between the speci cation achieved by the *Beischrift* and the pure activation of the name produced by the monumental *Aufschrift*, one can perhaps sense the factors that make the patronymic appropriate to contexts of identi cation, but less so to the sepulchral epigram.

42. An early, and interesting, example is *CEG* 13 (575–550?), the epitaph for Tettikhos, which combines an appeal to the viewer with the deictic ταῦτ'. The pronoun's antecedent might be thought to be Tettikhos' su erings, but cf. Sourvinou-Inwood 1995: 147 on the grave monument as the "point of reference for, and focus of, the action represented in . . . the epigram, and thus the focus of its reading."

even more honest than that of inscriptions which deploy no deixis whatsoever, for the latter o er no means of relating viewer, object, and text.[43]

For Svenbro, the shift away from "egocentrism" has a radical linguistic e ect, even on those inscriptions that continue to use the traditional *hode*: while the pronoun formerly referred to the *egô* (as "Hierheit") of the monument, it now refers to that of the reader (who pronounces *hode* with the meaning "this object before me").[44] (This, incidentally, is precisely the force with which Priam uses the word.) Thus, even in this less "honest" case of super cial similarity, a multiplicity of constituents has replaced a prior unity: where there was only one absolute entity, the monument, there are now two, the monument and the viewer / reader. This is at one and the same time a discovery of another person external to the object (the viewer), and of the object itself, which no longer appears as an absolute totality, but is isolated and focused by the viewer's gaze. In fact, the linguistic shift identi ed by Svenbro corresponds entirely to Marcel Detienne's notion of the discovery of the artistic image. Detienne argues that the discovery of the art object occurs at that very moment when the artist recognizes himself as a creative subject, and he identi es Simonides as the representative of this change.[45] A major sign of this discovery in Detienne's view is the widespread appearance of artists' signatures on statues and paintings. The signature, of course, is a premier example of a *Beischrift* in the sense developed here. We may compare the signature of Polugnôtos in the Delphic Leskhê, which Pausanias 10.27.4 attributes to Simonides, and note the absence of any sort of deixis: γράψε Πολύγνωτος, Θάσιος γένος, {δ'} Ἀγλαοφῶντος / υἱός, περθομένην Ἰλίου ἀκρόπολιν ("Polugnôtos, Thasian by birth, son of Aglaophôn, painted the sack of Ilion's acropolis").[46] As Svenbro's insights make clear, the artist's discovery of himself as a creative subject is also at the same time the viewer's discovery of himself as a *viewing* subject.[47]

43. Cf. *CEG* 19 (550–530?: reference to viewer with no deixis), 40 (530–520?), 193 (dedicatory, ca. 525–510?).

44. Svenbro 1993: 36–67, who dates the shift to around 550. This usage thus falls together with the anonymous rst-person mourner noted above, n.38.

45. Detienne 1996: 109: "the artist's discovery of himself was intimately associated with the invention of the image"; 197n.17: "Simonides seems to mark the moment when the Greeks discovered the image and seems to have been the rst to theorize it." Raubitschek 1968: 3 similarly places Simonides at the origin of non-monumental epigram: "Mit Simonides scheint das literarische Epigramm im eigentlichen Sinne anzufangen. . . ."

46. The ambivalence of deixis in artists' signatures from a very early date may be a sign of their natural "*Beischriftlichkeit*," their tendency to be cut o from the monumental present. Signatures which omit any form of deixis (and are often merely appended to verse inscriptions): *CEG* 14 (560–550?), 50, 52, 193, 198, 209, 419, etc. Signatures which maintain rst-person deixis: *CEG* 34 (ca. 530?), 42, 211, 396, etc. I note that the very early "signature" of Idameneus (*CEG* 459, ca. 600–575?) is altogether exceptional, and the nature of the monument unclear (cf. Hansen's remarks on why it cannot be a grave inscription). The explicitly monumental purpose of this text (ἵνα κλέος εἴῃ) appears to me to distinguish it sharply from other, later signatures.

47. This is a point brought across by Svenbro 1993: 36: "The reader of a nonegocentric *sêma* can occupy the position of the writer without clashing with another *egô* that the latter has staged." That is, the reader of such a *sêma* is allowed a new autonomy, even when his words have already been

Simonides, of course, is more a gurehead or culture hero for the new epigrammatic form than an actual instigator or practitioner, since the authenticity of the epigrams (as well as many of the other poems) ascribed to him is altogether questionable. But he has played a curious role in earlier discussions of the epigrammatic *houtos*. Fick used two Simonidean epigrams to support his claim that the use of *houtos* in the sense of *hode* was a distinctive feature of the Corinthian dialect.[48] Thus he erased the peculiar deictic force of *houtos* in these texts and replaced it with Simonides' sensitivity for local color: "Simonides besass das wunderbare talent, in der mundart aller griechischen stämme zu dichten."[49] One of two relevant Simonidean epigrams neglected by Fick—presumably because they undermined his Corinthian hypothesis[50] —nevertheless seems to me to exemplify perfectly the inscriptional force of *houtos* peculiar to the (non-monumental) *Beischrift*, while the anecdote contextualizing it could serve as an allegorical account of the transition from an unmediated monumental absolute to the more complex situation of a monument mediated by writing. According to legend[51] Simonides carved the following inscription on an unmarked funeral monument after the shade of the deceased saved him from a disastrous sea voyage:

> οὗτος ὁ τοῦ Κείοιο Σιμωνίδου ἐστὶ σαωτήρ,
> ὃς καὶ τεθνηὼς ζῶντι παρέσχε χάριν.
> (85 GP)

> This is the savior of Simonides of Keos,
> who even in death gave cause for gratitude
> to one who still lives.

Reappropriating the conventions of traditional monumental inscription in the direction of the *Beischrift*, Simonides' rewriting of the blank funeral monument does everything in its power to undermine the monumental absolute. In the rst place, *houtos* opens up a gulf between the monument and the external viewer,

---

scripted by the monument. Svenbro's entire analysis develops around the interrelation of writer and reader, which we may generalize to include also the artist and viewer. For an attested link between acknowledgment of the artist and acknowledgment of the viewer in the context of inscription, see *CEG* 150 (early fth century), in which the artist's signature accompanies an injunction to the viewer to behold the object.

48. Fick 1886: vii. Fick used Simonides 10 and 13 GP, but the inscriptions on the Kupselos Chest provided the weightier part of his evidence. The Kupselos Chest texts are a crucial part of my own discussion, below.

49. Ibid. vi.

50. Simonides 67 and 85 GP exhibit the tell-tale *houtos*, but lack any Corinthian associations. The attribution for both epigrams is at least as questionable as it is for the texts cited by Fick. Gow and Page reject Simonidean authorship for both (Gow and Page 1965: 2.518 and Page 1981: 300)—as they do for 10 GP (Page 1981: 201). But once again, I am concerned less with the authenticity of these texts than with the fact that Greek tradition associated them with the particular historical moment represented by Simonides.

51. The story is given by the scholion BD 160.14 to Aristides' *Huper tôn tettarôn* (3.533 Dindorf).

thus dissolving the illusion of an absolute present in time and space. This effect is reinforced by the fact that the monument's power to memorialize has been usurped and placed in the service of one who is unavoidably elsewhere.[52] In a traditional sepulchral epitaph, the genitival proper name would indicate the person memorialized, with whom the monument is "isonymous,"[53] and whom the monument metonymically signifies.[54] Now, however, the name indicates one who is absent—in fact, still alive, while the dummy subject of the monument, the person whom the monument represents metonymically, remains anonymously dead. More than just a clever oxymoron in the context of a sepulchral inscription, ζῶντι leaves the story of Simonides' encounter with the deceased open-ended and permanently defers any kind of monumental closure. The blank monument, by contrast with Simonides' disruptive and destabilizing inscription, corresponds to the primordial unity of monument and text. The story stages the unwritten space of the monumental present giving way to the deferral (in Derrida's language, *différance*) engendered by writing.

Simonides is not a master of dialects—he is a master of writing, and of the new form of the epigram as *Beischrift*.[55] A certain dialogism is implicit in such epigrams, which no longer exist solely for the sake of the monument, but reach out to the viewer / reader, shattering the absolute monumental present. Thus they seem to speak to the reader, and to answer his inquisitive gaze. Nevertheless, this dialogism is less the result of a real or imagined conversation than a consequence of the distinctive structure of an epigram that no longer has a definitive place, except somewhere between the object and the viewer, as mediator between the two. These epigrams participate in a dialogue not so much because they answer any real demand for knowledge, but because, cut off from the absolute presence of the monument, they must position themselves vis-à-vis someone else, a second person.

It would be a mistake to look for a decisive moment of transition, a single chronological point when inscriptions shift suddenly from cooperation in the monumental absolute to a more disjunctive relation. By force of tradition, *hode* maintains an enduring position in the genre of epigram; nor should we discount the relevance of local conventions to particular instances.[56] In point of fact, we find many inscriptions after the mid-sixth century which appear to mix *hode* and *houtos* indiscriminately in the same referential context (e.g. *CEG* 139). This ambivalence,

52. In this respect the Simonidean epigram is prefigured by Hektor's own inscriptional *coup de grâce* at 7.89–90 (no. 5 above).

53. Svenbro 1993: 37.

54. The function of the grave monument as metonymic signifier, by virtue of the presence (in most cases) of the deceased's remains, is developed at length by Sourvinou-Inwood 1995.

55. Although it would be a topic for another paper, I believe one could argue that the Simonidean dictum ἡ ποιητικὴ ζωγραφία λαλοῦσα, ἡ δὲ ζωγραφία ποιητικὴ σιωπῶσα (as cited by Ps.-Plu. *De Hom.* 2.216) depends on the structure of the captioned image.

56. Cf. Sourvinou-Inwood 1995: 152–60 on the exceptional conventions of Selinous.

however, may itself be indicative of the destabilization of the monumental present. Furthermore the alternation is sometimes deployed in suggestive ways which do not, on second glance, seem so ambivalent after all. I nd two instances in which the shift from *hode* to *houtos* marks the shift from reference to the monument as memorial (of the deceased or of the dedicator) to reference to the monument as an object crafted by the artisan.[57] *Houtos* in these examples is distinctive of the mode of signature, and distinguishes the crafted object from the object in its true monumental function, in accordance with Detienne's notion of the "invention of the image." We see in this usage of *houtos* a tendency to cut o or isolate the object of reference from its surrounding context,[58] a tendency which gives the pronoun an inherent a nity for the mode of captions or labels, insofar as the latter often identify and pick out particular gures from larger scenes.[59] It is with this force in mind that we should read what is perhaps the most striking example of inscriptional *houtos* in a sepulchral epigram:

οὗτος ὃς ἐνθάδε κεῖται|ἔχει μὲν τὄνομα κριῦ,|
φωτὸς δὲ ψυχὴν ἔσχε|δικαιοτάτο.
(*CEG* 105, ca. 400?)

This one who lies here has the name of "ram,"
but he had the soul of a man most just.

This text is added beneath the name of the deceased, Κρῖος, which is inscribed on the *stêlê* in signi cantly larger letters. It is precisely the relation of the epigram to this name that, I suggest, explains this signal use of *houtos*. The epigram, which exploits a pun as the mainspring of its rhetorical structure, must point to the name as something distinct from the monument as a whole. *Houtos* calls the reader's attention to the name itself as a distinct object of interest, isolating it from its context in much the same way as the labels identifying Dermys and Kitylos (see previous note). Even the visual arrangement of the *stêlê* suggests the relation of a caption to an image.[60] *Hode*, with its potential evocation of a monumental present, would be out of place here. Instead we nd a

57. *CEG* 26 (sepulchral, ca. 540–530?): τόδ' Ἀρχίο 'στι σᾶμα· κἀδελφᾶς φίλες, : Εὐκον|σμίδες: δὲ τοῦτ' ἐποί|εσεν καλόν . . .; *CEG* 418 (dedicatory, end of the sixth century?): παῖ Διός, Ἐκπιάντοι δέκσαι τόδ' ἀμενπιὲς ἄγαλμα· |σοὶ γὰρ ἐπευκιόμενος τοῦτ' ἐτέλεσσε Γρόπιον (see Hansen's comments for the interpretation that makes Grophos the sculptor, and perhaps also a co-dedicator).

58. We nd this force in another inscription with mixed deixis, *CEG* 167 (ca. 400?), in which τῶτο . . . τὸ σῆμα contrasts with ὁδὸν πάρα τήνδε. *Hode* here deploys a kind of "choric" deixis (reference to the space that encompasses the speech event) which should remind us of phrases such as *hâde gâ* in choral lyric, esp. in Attic drama (cf. Danielewicz 1990: 12–13).

59. Cf. the remarks of Sourvinou-Inwood 1995: 164–65 on the names (in the nominative) inscribed on the *stêlê* for Dermys and Kitylos; she contrasts the function of these labels and the gures they identify with the function of the monument as a whole. For *houtos* in a label identifying a gure in a vase-painting, see Immerwahr 1990: no. 229 (ταῦρος h⟨o⟩ῦτος, ca. 550–530).

60. Cf. Peek 601 (rst century), appended to a relief representing the deceased: Διφίλου οὗτος ὅδ' ἐστὶ τύπος. . . .

houtos which, by means of its particularizing or isolating force, demonstrates the capability of the *Beischrift* (especially as caption) to undermine the monumental absolute.

These lengthy remarks have been necessary by way of answer to Vox's accusation that Helen's lines "non possono essere autonomi, come accade per gli epigrammi reali." I have endeavored to show that *houtos* in Helen's epigrams need not indicate their "strict dependence" on Priam's words (Helen could just as easily have spoken these lines unprompted), but is rather characteristic of a particular mode of inscription, the *Beischrift*, which mediates between a viewer and an object. Such inscriptions are not "autonomous" to the extent that they do not speak from any privileged position of subjectivity: the only subjectivity they recognize is that of the reader / viewer.[61] But they are "autonomous" to the extent that they do not require the prior formulation of a demand or request; they are quite happy to stand on their own. And they undoubtedly conform to a very real form of epigram. In fact, a work of sculpture essential to the history of Corinthian art (despite the fact that it is no longer extant) demonstrates the "reality" and "autonomy" of such second-person *Beischriften*. I mean the sixth-century Chest of Kupselos, a carved cedar box with ivory and gold appliqué dedicated at Olympia by the Kupselidai of Corinth, which Pausanias describes in detail (5.17.5 .).[62] The *larnax* bore a series of sculpted friezes in which most of the gures were labeled.[63] In some cases, scenes were labeled by whole verses or distichs, which Pausanias meticulously copies out.[64] I do not think one could nd anywhere a closer parallel for Helen's tristichs than this couplet, which accompanied an image of Apollo leading the chorus of the Muses:

> Λατοΐδας οὗτος τάχ' ἄναξ ἑκάεργος Ἀπόλλων·
> Μοῦσαι δ' ἀμφ' αὐτόν, χαρίεις χορός, αἷσι κατάρχει.[65]
> (5.18.4)

> This is the son of Leto, far-shooting lord Apollo,
> and the Muses about him, graceful chorus, whom he leads.

61. Of course, not even the monumental *Aufschrift* is aware of anything similar to our notion of subjectivity. Only the non-egocentric *hode* ("this object before me") betokens such an awareness. Those who wish to valorize Helen in the *teikhoskopia* by nding in her an example of an exceptionally independent, public woman's voice (see, above all, Suzuki 1989: 16, 19, and 39 .) must take account of the fact that her words—at least those analyzed here—make no claims of autonomous subjectivity.

62. *Der Neue Pauly* (s.v. *Kupseloslade*, pp. 997–98) describes Pausanias' description as "eine wichtige Quelle für die Erforschung der archa. Bilderwelt." For the date, see Bowra 1963: 147 and Robertson 1975: 140–41. According to this chronology, the Kupselos Chest would be roughly contemporary with the shift we have examined from the perspective of both Svenbro and Detienne.

63. Pausanias 5.17.6: τῶν δὲ (sc. ζῳδίων) ἐπὶ τῇ λάρνακι ἐπιγράμματα ἔπεστι τοῖς πλείοσι. . . .

64. Raubitschek 1968: 23: "Zweifellos hat sich also Pausanias sehr für die Inschriften interessiert und sie so gut er konnte abgezeichnet."

65. Robert 1888: 436, following Haupt 1876: 466, suggests emending to Λατοίδας οὗτός γα ϝάναξ, which would parallel *Il.* 3.178 . even on the level of particles.

This distich contains all the elements identi ed by Vox in Helen's Odysseus-epigram: demonstrative *houtos* modifying a noun phrase composed of proper name, epithet, and patronymic, and a nal relative clause. Similar phraseology appears in the caption to an image of Herakles stealing the apples of the Hesperides,[66] in a line identifying Agamemnon's opponent in a ght over the corpse of Iphidamas,[67] and in the very interesting caption on Agamemnon's shield in this scene, which serves as a simultaneous *Bildzeichnung* for the shield device, and for the gure as a whole: οὗτος μὲν Φόβος ἐστὶ βροτῶν ὁ δ' ἔχων Ἀγαμέμνων ("this is the Fear of mortals; the one holding him, Agamemnon," 5.19.4.).[68] Of nine stichic captions read on the Kupselos Chest by Pausanias, four show the distinctive *houtos* characteristic of the "caption" mode; four have no deixis whatsoever, which itself indicates the gap between inscription and referent;[69] one, exceptionally, uses *hode*.[70]

Raubitschek suggestively proposes that the mode of description deployed by these inscriptions in some way pre gures that of Hellenistic epideictic epigram: "wir in fast allen Fällen bewusst beschreibende und erklärende Sprüche vor uns haben; das wird dadurch angedeutet, dass in fünf Fällen die Haupt gur

66. Ἄτλας οὐρανὸν οὗτος ἔχει, τὰ δὲ μᾶλα μεθήσει, ibid.

67. Ἰφιδάμας οὗτός τε Κόων περιμάρναται αὐτοῦ, 5.19.4.

68. The sophisticated *mise-en-abîme* should remind us of the *diploun sêma* carried by Poluneikês in Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes* (the other famous *teikhoskopia*), which likewise refers both to the gures on the shield and the person bearing it: Δίκη δ' ἄρ' εἶναί φησιν, ὡς τὰ γράμματα / λέγει· "Κατάξω δ' ἄνδρα τόνδε . . ." (646–47). Space does not permit me to explore the complicated play of image and reality, which is above all a problem of referentiality focused by the inscriptional deictic *tonde* (does it refer to the image of a man on the shield, or to Poluneikês himself?), produced by this instance of inscription. This uniquely equivocal *Bildzeichnung* will lead to a crisis concerning the identi cation of Dikê: ἦ δῆτ' ἂν εἴη πανδίκως ψευδώνυμος / Δίκη (670–71). The formulation Δίκη δ' ἄρ' εἶναί φησιν should be compared to the "epigram" pronounced by Athena, likewise a self-identi cation: Μέντης . . . εὔχομαι εἶναι (*Od.* 1.180); but note that εἶναί φησιν is an unmarked form of expression, while εὔχομαι is "by polar contrast a *literally* egocentric word" (Muellner 1976: 78). Aeschylus' wording suggests to me that we are meant to envision a shield with two distinct inscriptions: a *Namensbeischrift* a xed to the gure of Dikê and an inscription transcribing the words "spoken" by the gure. (For the use of the latter on Athenian vases, cf. Kretschmer 1894: 86 .). Aeschylus' text remains purposefully ambiguous, however, precisely so that Eteoklês can call the identity of the gure into question. The playful use of a shield as a place of inscription is attested archeologically as well: on the Siphnian treasury at Delphi the artist has signed the reliefs on the border of a sculpted shield carried by one of the gures (*CEG* 449).

69. One of these (Μήδειαν Ἰάσων γαμέει, κέλεται δ' Ἀφροδίτα, 5.18.3) bears a certain resemblance, syntactically and metrically, to *CEG* 452 (ca. 580–575), a very interesting example of an early stichic caption: Πυρ ίας προχορευόμενος· αὐτῶ δέ οι ὅλπα. Even at this early date, I suggest that the lack of deixis is indicative of the tendency of the caption to undermine the monumental present. Note that the double reference of this inscription (which designates both the painted gure and the owner of the ask) is similar to the *mise-en-abîme* described in the previous note, while the use of *autos* as the "hinge" connecting two referents recalls the epigram labeling Iphidamas (above, n.67).

70. Ἑρμείας ὅδ' Ἀλεξάνδρῳ δείκνυσι διαιτῆν / τοῦ εἴδους Ἥραν καὶ Ἀθανᾶν καὶ Ἀφροδίταν, 5.19.5. The need, for metrical reasons, to place Hermes' name in line-initial position may have contributed to this use of *hode*: cf. the position of τόδε at *Il*. 7.89.

mit dem hinweisenden Fürwort οὗτος oder ὅδε bezeichnet wird, was zwangslos zu den berühmten beschreibenden Epigrammen der hellenistischen und der späteren Zeit überleitet."[71] We may take his comments as an indication of the transitional quality of these lines, which still betray a strong connection to an underlying epic tradition, but seem somehow to move beyond it. Pausanias appears to react to this same quality when he hesitates over the authorship of the epigrams: he ascribes their content to the epic poetry of Eumêlos, but is forced to admit that "some other" is likely responsible for the text as it stands on the Chest.[72] The progressive tendency foregrounded by Pausanias and theorized by Raubitschek derives from a tiny change, a minimal divergence from traditional epic diction exempli ed by the label identifying Atlas (Ἄτλας οὐρανὸν οὗτος ἔχει ...). As noted by Jones and others, the inscription reproduces *almost* exactly (Jones terms it a "parody") the rst hemistich of Hesiod *Theogony* 518: Ἄτλας οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχει κρατερῆς ὑπ' ἀνάγκης ("Atlas holds the wide heavens by harsh necessity").[73] This is a change of a single word, so inconspicuous, so natural, even, that we might hesitate to see it as a true divergence from the traditional narrative medium: the ornamental epithet (the hallmark of epic style) is replaced by the pronoun which links the text to its object of reference. But this minimal divergence, with the link it establishes between two very di erent orders of expression, verbal and visual, marks a sea change in the representational status of language. Modern critics will recognize in this shift the inaugural move of what has come to be known as *écriture*—that is, the epistemological system which accounts for language not as a self-contained mode of direct expression deriving its coherence from a single moment of communication, but as the complex interaction of diacritical signs whose reference necessarily carries beyond the moment of utterance in a manner which dissolves any notional unity of time or place. The Kupselos Chest thus responds very well to the apparatus elaborated by Segal, whose analysis of tragic *écriture* develops precisely through an examination of "la coexistence d'une représentation verbale et d'une représentation visuelle."[74]

Viewed from this perspective, the captions on the Kupselos Chest lie somewhere between epic poetry and later literary forms—the forms of *écriture*. The peculiar binary form of an image and its attached caption provides, as it were, the

71. Raubitschek 1968: 24.

72. 5.19.10: τὰ ἐπιγράμματα δὲ τὰ ἐπ' αὐτῆς τάχα μέν που καὶ ἄλλος τις ἂν εἴη πεποιηκώς, τῆς δὲ ὑπονοίας τὸ πολὺ ἐς Εὔμηλον τὸν Κορίνθιον εἶχεν ἡμῖν. ...

73. Jones 1894: 51, who also notes correspondences between the label identifying *Kêr* on the Chest and Hes. *Sc.* 249 . Cf. Robert 1888: 440n.3, "wohl das älteste Hesiodcitat."

74. Segal 1988: 334. The crisis of identi cation provoked by the inscription on Poluneikês' shield, noted above, is the perfect example of how the coexistence of verbal and visual representation typical of tragic *écriture* "entraîne, presque sur tous les points, une sorte de dichotomie, de contradiction ou de paradoxe dans l'existence de la vérité" (ibid.).

missing link between the two.[75] In fact, I would suggest that in this binary form we nd a convenient theoretical tool for conceptualizing the relation between epic diegesis and epideictic or ekphrastic genres: the epic narratives are like a vast tableau comprised of many gures and actions, with a narrative content expressed in its own particular medium; each of its details at the same time elicits a response expressed in a di erent medium, and tied to a vision which is inclined to circumscribe and select elements that epic has woven into a continuous fabric. Naturally, this conceptual model has no historical or genetic force: it cannot account for the evolution of genres. It is simply a way of thinking about the relation between (oral) epic and (written) smaller forms that brings this relation into line with the notion of *écriture* as the coexistence of disparate orders of representation. Or, to construct the model in the terms of a di erent, but entirely congruent, theory, we might invoke Havelock's notion of Socratic dialectic as the "rephrasing" of oral tradition which provided the impetus for the written revolution in Greece. Havelock describes this dialectic in words that could apply just as easily to the relation between epigrammatic captions and their imagistic referents: "This rephrasing will substitute for a poetised image of act or event . . . a paraphrase thereof, which will yield a descriptive statement or proposition of some kind, which then becomes the basis of . . . 'Socrates' primary questions,' namely, 'is X Y?' or 'What is X?"'[76] It is important to note that the seeds of this mentality—whether we call it " *écriture*" or "dialectic"— rst germinate within the traditional medium itself (Socrates was notoriously averse to writing). Indeed, I believe that just such a mentality underlies the Homeric representation of Helen as epigrammatist.[77]

Jenkins voices a popular conception of Helen's role in the *teikhoskopia* when he writes, "Helen can be seen as a poetess in her own right, singing her own catalogue of warriors.... For the space of the *teikhoskopia*, Helen *is* a singer, responding to the audience of Priam."[78] Yet, if my hypothesis is

75. Raubitschek 1968: 25 suggests something of the intermediary status of this form when he relates Pausanias' attribution to "die bezeugte Verbindung der Epik des 8. und 7. Jh. mit der Epigrammatik des 7. und 6. Jh."

76. Havelock 1963: 214n.29.

77. What I have here described as a theoretical model is in other cultures realized not as a mere metaphor but as actual practice. In the Rajasthani epic of Pâbûjî, singers perform before a large painted story-cloth (*par*) which portrays the entirety of the epic cycle in one synthetic tableau. As the singer performs selected episodes, he points to the appropriate sections of the *par*—which nevertheless does not consist of separate scenes but rather represents "a sweeping geographic continuum," an indivisible whole (Smith 1991: 64–65). Yet, despite the impossibility of dividing the *par* into component scenes, the painted cloth is not intended to be viewable in its entirety by the audience directly. The singer, who "reads the *par*," is responsible for mediating between this total vision and his listeners. This mediation involves a considerable amount of selection from and segmentation of a notional whole, since the epic is never performed in its entirety (Smith 1986: 53). The tension between a notional whole and its segmented parts—a tension articulated in terms of an opposition of visual and verbal—corresponds precisely to the model I have suggested for the relation between "total" epic narratives and certain "smaller" genres.

78. Jenkins 1999: 220n.33. Clader 1976: 9 has the classic statement: Helen in the *teikhoskopia* "is the author of what is essentially a second catalogue, almost immediately following the rst."

correct, Helen's hexameters are quite far from oral epic song. They belong to an altogether di erent class of poetry, that of epigram; they furthermore distinguish themselves from other Iliadic epigrams in that they adopt the explicit form of the *Beischrift* or caption. While Helen's lines do have certain catalogic properties, they comprise a very special kind of catalogue, one that selects speci c items out of a continuous, notional whole.[79] That said, however, it must be admitted that the *Iliad* by virtue of its structure seems to endorse Helen's epigrams as a kind of catalogue, for it places them quite precisely between the initial catalogue of forces in Book 2 and the *epipôlêsis* of Book 4.

Jenkins' view is an appealing one: if true, it would mean that Helen, performing as an epic singer before the council of Trojan elders, has bridged the traditional gender gap of Greek culture, which generally con nes women to the private sphere and leaves the public sphere (including the performance of martial epic) to men. While it may be true that Helen's epigrams are in some important respects analogous to the catalogue of the epic poet, we must nevertheless treat this analogy very carefully. In any case, we must stop short of concluding summarily from this analogy that Helen in fact adopts the role of the epic poet. Jenkins' view holds only if it can be shown that Helen interacts with Priam directly, that she serves as the immediate contact between him and the battle eld below. Only in this case can we suppose that Helen has truly left behind the private sphere of domestic interiority. Once again the problem of the "autonomy" of Helen's verses—the degree to which they depend on direct interaction with Priam—becomes all-important, as does the imperative not to be misled by the fact that the epic narrative dramatizes (by necessity) a con guration that could be understood as archetypally inscriptional.

Helen does not, in fact, describe the battle eld in a direct, unmediated way. Her own view, and viewing, of the Achaeans is structured in advance by an artifact of her own creation. When Iris goes to summon Helen to the walls, she nds her engaged in a signal act of artistic production:

> τὴν δ' εὗρ' ἐν μεγάρῳ· ἡ δὲ μέγαν ἱστὸν ὕφαινε,
> δίπλακα πορφυρέην, πολέας δ' ἐνέπασσεν ἀέθλους
> Τρώων θ' ἱπποδάμων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων
> οὓς ἕθεν εἵνεκ' ἔπασχον ὑπ' Ἄρηος παλαμάων·
>
> (3.125–28)

> She found her in the *megaron*; and she was weaving a great web,
> crimson with double fold, and she interspersed the many ordeals
> of horse-taming Trojans and bronze-clad Achaeans,
> which they were su ering at the hands of Ares on her account.

79. Cf. Vox 1975: 69, who describes Helen's words as "un catalogo *selettivo* espresso in forma diretta" (my emphasis), and note the force of *ge* in the "epigram" on Agamemnon, which underlines the "isolating" force of *houtos* described above.

Modern critics are not alone in recognizing that Helen's tapestry depicts precisely the ordeals of the heroes on the plains of Troy, thus corresponding in general terms to the content of the *Iliad* itself.[80] Ancient commentators likewise saw in Helen's web the very "paradigm" for the *Iliad*: in the scholiast's words, ἀξιόχρεων ἀρχέτυπον ἀνέπλασεν ὁ ποιητὴς τῆς ἰδίας ποιήσεως ("the poet has fashioned a noteworthy paradigm for his own poetry," bT 126–27).[81] There is, however, more than just a general, thematic correspondence. Iris, the divine spokeswoman, invites Helen to the Skaian Gates in words that equate the woven images speci cally with the spectacle which Helen is about to see from the walls:

> δεῦρ' ἴθι, νύμφα φίλη, ἵνα θέσκελα ἔργα ἴδηαι
> Τρώων θ' ἱπποδάμων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων·
>
> (3.130–31)
>
> Come hither, dear bride, that you may behold the marvelous deeds
> of horse-taming Trojans and bronze-clad Achaeans.

The very line which had described the subject of Helen's tapestry refers a mere four verses later to the battle eld vista.[82] Iris refers to the spectacle of the Achaean host as θέσκελα ἔργα; these words too signal the correspondence of crafted image and epic "event." The formula occurs on only two other occasions in Homer, both in the *Nekuia*. Alkinoos asks Odysseus to continue narrating his encounters with the ghosts of heroes with the request σὺ δέ μοι λέγε θέσκελα ἔργα ("but you tell me the marvelous deeds," 11.374). After telling of Agamemnon, Achilles, and others, Odysseus closes his tale with a description of Herakles, who wore a sword-belt ἵνα θέσκελα ἔργα τέτυκτο ("where his marvelous deeds were g-ured," 11.610): Odysseus delivers the goods requested by Alkinoos precisely in the form of a sculpted image.[83] The compositional ring—which also creates a kind of *mise-en-abîme*—establishes an equivalence between Odysseus' narration and

80. Clader 1976: 6–9, esp. 8: "She is working in designs of struggling warriors, weaving the very fabric of heroic epic." Nagy 1990: 138 glosses ἀέθλους as a reference to "the martial e orts, all considered together, of Achaeans and Trojans alike in the Trojan War"; at Nagy 1979: 295 he notes the "connotations of poetic theme."

81. See Lausberg 1982b: 117 ., who argues that the tapestries of Arachne and Minerva in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* actualize the scholiast's interpretation. Lausberg's emphasis on the catalogic properties of Arachne's weaving in relation to the style of the *Metamorphoses* as a whole has important implications for my own reading of Helen and her relation to the catalogue form.

82. Cf. Alden 2000: 52–53. Note too the repeated reference to Ares in 128 and 132. Homeric tradition associates Helen in a very marked way with her weaving. At *Od.* 15.126, she presents Telemachus with a *peplos* as a μνῆμ' Ἑλένης χειρῶν. Many of the formulae used in this latter passage recall the presentation of a *peplos* to Athena in *Il.* 6.

83. The belt itself receives a short two-line ekphrasis, making it a kind of micro-version of the *Aspis*. Gri n 1987: 102 o ers an interpretation of the belt as a gure for speci cally Iliadic epic poetry.

the crafted artifact.[84] Similarly, in Iris' speech the phrase θέσκελα ἔργα indicates the correspondence between the epic narrative and Helen's handiwork.

Iris thus calls Helen to witness what she has already visualized and pictured on her web. When she mounts the Trojan walls, she hardly needs to look out in order to identify the gures; she can simply "read," or pronounce, the captions she might have applied to her gural representation.[85] In other words, as much as they appear to refer to the vista observed by Priam and the others, her epigrams could as easily refer to her own construction of that scene, a crafted object in its own right. They stand in the same relation to her tapestry as the lines of "Eumêlos" to the Kupselos Chest. In any case, the accuracy of Helen's words—her quali cation to identify authoritatively the Greek heroes—is guaranteed by an object which is kept safely in the private space of the *megaron*, apart from the public space where the Trojan elders deliberate. This guarantee is at the same time, however, a pre-determination of Helen's words; she is in a way denied the situational exibility required by those who participate in public deliberation. We must be sensitive here to the implications of the correlation between Helen's words on the walls and her woven tapestry, which tends to reduce Helen to a mere object interrogated by the male gaze.[86] (This is the same reduction accomplished by one of the *Iliad*'s other "inscriptions," Hektor's auto-epitaph at 6.460–61 [no. 4 above], by which he transforms Andromakhê into his funeral monument—a *stêlê*, that is, the place of writing.) From one point of view the poem, by connecting the tapestry to Helen's appearance on the walls, does everything it can to keep Helen from interacting directly in a male context. The "dialogue" between Priam and Helen then becomes only a kind of dramatic explication of the convention according to which a monument's inscription answers the questions of a passerby. By the same token, Priam's questions are only super cially necessary as a dramatic prompt or cue for the activation in speech of epigrams with a prior, autonomous existence. In this respect, his questions function precisely as the interrogatives in the earliest dialogue epigrams, which serve as mere "pretexts" for a description of an object, a statue, or a person.[87]

84. The correspondence between the two occurrences of θέσκελα ἔργα is noted by Pache 1999: 32. Note that Alkinoos asks for (and receives) a catalogue-style narration (ἀτρεκέως κατάλεξον, 11.370). The catalogue form may be tied to the fact that Odysseus is asked to report *as an eyewitness* (εἴ τινας . . . ἴδες, 11.371); cf. n.96, below. It is just possible that the use of the formula θέσκελα ἔργα here is tied to the fact that Odysseus is describing the *eidôla* of heroes; the only other occurrence of the adjective *theskelos* in Homer is at *Il.* 23.107, with reference to the *eidôlon* of Patroklos.

85. Some readers may be surprised to learn of the archeologically attested practice of weaving captions into tapestries. I include a short discussion of this practice in the Appendix, below.

86. As I attempt to show below, Zeuxis' *Helen* (which I believe plays on the Stesichorean tradition of Helen's *eidôlon*) makes the same reduction of Helen to a crafted object—and to a certain extent con rms my reading of this scene.

87. Barrio Vega 1989: 193: ". . . otro tipo de epigramas, aparentemente dialogados, pero en el fondo descriptivos, en los que las preguntas del viandante . . . son sólo un pretexto para hacer una descripción. . . ."

When she has nished her identi cations, Helen suggests that she could go on to give a full- edged catalogue:

> νῦν δ' ἄλλους μὲν πάντας ὁρῶ ἑλίκωπας Ἀχαιούς,
> οὕς κεν ἐὺ γνοίην καί τ' οὔνομα μυθησαίμην. . . .
> (3.234–35)

> And now I see all the other quick-glancing Achaeans,
> whom well I could recognize and their names tell. . . .

As Jenkins observes, the wording here implies the catalogic mode (as does the rhetorical *recusatio*).[88] We may compare the famous invocation of the Muses which opens the Catalogue of Ships:

> ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι–
> ὑμεῖς γὰρ θεαί ἐστε, πάρεστέ τε, ἴστέ τε πάντα,
> ἡμεῖς δὲ κλέος οἷον ἀκούομεν, οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν–
> οἵ τινες ἡγεμόνες Δαναῶν καὶ κοίρανοι ἦσαν.
> πληθὺν δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω. . . .
> (2.484–88)

> Now tell me, Muses who dwell on Olympus—
> for you are goddesses, and you are present and know all,
> while we hear only the *kleos*, and know nothing for certain—
> who were the leaders and chiefs of the Danaans?
> I could not tell nor name the throng. . . .

More striking, however, than the parallel rhetoric and phrasing of these passages is the parallel manner in which the speaker in each case references the catalogued objects. Bakker draws attention to the exceptional use of *houtos* in the direct voice of the narrator to summarize the content of the Catalogue: οὗτοι ἄρ' ἡγεμόνες Δαναῶν καὶ κοίρανοι ἦσαν ("These, then, were the leaders and chiefs of the Danaans," 2.760). For Bakker, this is yet another instance of "dialogic" *houtos*, entirely analogous to Helen's use of the pronoun: it answers the question posed by the poet in 2.487.[89] Once again we are confronted with the same question: does *houtos* signal dependence on a rst interlocutor's demand for knowledge, or does it function independently, as an initiator in its own right of a particular mode of reference? The question is perhaps even more important here than it was previously. In formulating an answer we should be aware that we are supposing a fundamental analogy between Helen's lines and the Catalogue of Ships. But rather than force the conclusion that Helen in the *teikhoskopia* adopts the role of an epic poet, this analogy should compel us to question the homogeneity of the Homeric text; that is, it should lead to speculation as to what might di erentiate

88. Jenkins 1999: 220n.33.

89. Bakker 1999: 8 and esp. 9, "the closing formula has to be taken in close connection with the famous invocation of the Muses," with n.24, which emphasizes the dialogic exchange with the Muses.

the Catalogue and catalogic poetry from epic narrative proper. The question is not "what makes the *teikhoskopia* like a catalogue?" but "what makes the Catalogue like the *teikhoskopia*?"

One might be tempted to understand the exchange between the poet and the Muses as the demand for knowledge by one who is ignorant. However, the inequality between the Muses and the poet is not at all one of knowledge or ignorance, but rather one of *different orders of knowledge*. We must remember that οἶδα derives from the root **wid-* "see," and therefore means not "I know" but "'I have seen: therefore I know.'"[90] The poet knows only the *kleos*, the "acoustic renown," of heroes, and has seen nothing (οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν)—this does not mean, however, that he *knows* nothing.[91] The Muses on the other hand are present as eyewitnesses to the whole of history. This is precisely the difference between visual and aural (or verbal) knowledge, as indeed the ancient commentators recognized: Eustathius comments on the poet's request, λεχθείη ἂν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκοῇ τι παρειληφότων πρὸς τοὺς εἰδήμονας καὶ αὐτόπτας τοῦ πράγματος ("[such a thing] would be said by those who have received an oral report of something to those with first-hand knowledge as eyewitnesses of the event," 261). The Muses have seen what the poet has only heard. The entirety of the epic tradition, represented by the Muses, is conceived as a *visual* order of knowledge. The Catalogue of Ships represents the most sustained attempt to translate the Muses' total vision into the language of the oral poet. Far from being the *Muses*' answer to the poet's question, the οὗτοι of line 760, pronounced in the poet's voice (but not truly the poet's *words*, just as the words pronounced by the reader of an epigram are not truly his[92]), acknowledges the epic vision of the Muses, and places the poet's words in the same relation to this vision as that of Helen's epigrams vis-à-vis her tapestry. At this moment, the poet speaks with the voice of inscription, just as Helen in the *teikhoskopia*.[93] With this final caption the

90. Nagy 1990: 250, who discusses the root in the context of juridical terms such as *histôr,* "eyewitness."

91. For *kleos* as "acoustic renown," see Svenbro 1993: 164 and passim.

92. Svenbro 1993 presents the most rigorous working out of this problem.

93. The Muses' vision thus guarantees the accuracy of the Catalogue in the same way that Helen's prior visualization guarantees the authority of the identifications she pronounces to Priam. Much remains to be said about the cultural paradigm that entrusts to women, as holders of privileged access to an order that is notionally fixed (here, vision), the guarantee that assures the value of what is transacted in a flexible register (that of discourse, for instance of the epic poet or of the Trojan elders) among men. Especially interesting in the context of oral epic traditions is the articulation of this paradigm in terms of the opposition writing / speech (performance). For Helen as epigrammatist I would offer as comparandum the legend propagated among certain 19th-century singers of Bosnian epic who claimed that the ultimate source for many of their songs was a book originally owned by a Turkish girl known as "white-faced Ajka" (Marjanović 1998: 102; I am grateful to Peter McMurray for sharing with me this discovery). In a future project I hope to relate this phenomenon not to a specific anthropology of writing, but to a more general anthropology of exchange (as outlined for Pacific societies by Weiner 1992 and Godelier 1999) in cultures which exclude women from the exchange circuits generating relations of (political and social) power among men. This analysis

poet gestures toward the vast tableau embodied in tradition. Bakker himself is sensitive to the referential function of οὗτοι here, which gestures toward an object (the epic tableau) suddenly conjured before the audience: "Instead of being 'contained' within the narrative, the past becomes now the real thing, a reality before everyone's eyes at which the poet can point."[94] If Helen's parallel usage were not enough to establish that the poet here conceives the object of reference as a speci cally visual reality, we could point also to the signi cant use of *ar(a)* in this line, for this "evidentiary" particle functions precisely as a marker "of *visual evidence in the here and now of the speaker*; more precisely [it marks] the *interpretation* of such visual evidence."[95] That is, *ar(a)* marks the linguistic response to or rephrasing of a visual spectacle. The essential structure of the caption is thus fundamental to the way in which Homeric epic conceptualizes the non-mimetic mode of the catalogue, as a distinctive sub-component of the broader epic fabric.[96]

What I have described is not merely the implicit or latent structure of the Homeric text; in fact, this conceptualization of catalogue poetry as the captioning of an implied image was actualized in ancient art. Discussing Athenian achievements in painting, Plutarch recalls the story of Euphranôr's *Theseus*, situated in the Stoa Eleutherios with a *Dêmokratia* and a *Dêmos*.[97] This remarkable painting once elicited from an anonymous viewer a kind of spontaneous caption: τὸν δ' Εὐφράνορος ἰδών τις εἶπεν οὐκ ἀφυῶς "δῆμον Ἐρεχθῆος μεγαλήτορος, ὅν ποτ' Ἀθήνη / θρέψε Διὸς θυγάτηρ" ("on seeing Euphranôr's painting, someone said quite elegantly, '*dêmos* of great-hearted Erekhtheus, reared of old by Athena, daughter of Zeus,'" *De gloria Ath.* 346a-b).[98] The sight of Euphranôr's master-

views oral tradition as one of the most important circuits of exchange in traditional societies, and oral texts as objects of exchange.

94. Bakker 1999: 8; the similarities to the Pâbûjî epic are remarkable.

95. Bakker 1997: 17–18; italics original.

96. I emphasize the non-mimetic nature of the catalogue in order to distance myself from Vox, who believes the Iliadic epigrams to be fundamentally "dramatic." Bakker 1999: 9n.23 notes another instance of οὗτοι ἄρ' at *Il.* 16.351 and comments, "the narrative section to which this statement refers has clear catalogic properties." Homeric poetics consistently associate the catalogic style with the narration of visual experience. Thus Nestor's tale in *Od.* 3, an eye-witness account (3.97), concludes a catalogue of fallen warriors with the *recusatio* which conventionally marks the style (3.113 .). Helen's tale in *Od.* 4—her most "epic" speech outside the *teikhoskopia*—is an eye-witness account (the *pharmakon* associates her narration with visual experience by antithesis: 4.226), and is likewise marked as "catalogic" by a formulaic *recusatio* (4.240 ∼ 11.328, *Il.* 2.488; cf. *Il.* 3.235 and n.88 above). The eyewitness accounts of Books 3 and 4 are linked by another formula, expressive of the connection between vision and catalogic narration, which connects them also to Telemachus' narration of his own adventures on his return to Ithaca (κατάλεξον ὅπως ἤντησας ὀπωπῆς, 3.97 ∼ 4.327, 17.44). Thus Telemachus achieves the goal set for him by Athena (1.94–95): by going in search of tales of his father, he acquires material for his own tale.

97. Paus. 1.3.3. These three gures appear to have been part of a single composition; Pausanias' words imply that they were read as a single work: δηλοῖ δὲ ἡ γραφὴ Θησέα εἶναι τὸν καταστήσαντα Ἀθηναίοις ἐξ ἴσου πολιτεύεσθαι.

98. Nachstädt's *apparatus* records the judgment of Pohlenz, that the viewer's remark applies not to the *Theseus* but to the *Dêmos* beside it; see previous note. Note that the constituents of this

piece compels the anonymous viewer to recite two verses from the Catalogue of Ships (2.547–48). That the viewer's experience of the painted image should be programmed, so to speak, by the Homeric Catalogue is surprising, to say the least; even more so is the fact that Plutarch feels this act of reception to be οὐκ ἀφυῶς. But our surprise subsides somewhat when we realize that, already in Homer, the Catalogue functions as the translation into words of a notional visual totality. In light of what has been said about the implicit visualization of the Catalogue, it is not surprising that Plutarch judges this coupling of word and image as elegant—as it were, almost natural. The entries of the Catalogue are born captions.[99]

The virtual caption of the *Theseus* leads me back, at last, to the one Iliadic epigram which has so far been left out of the discussion, 3.156–58 (no. 1 above). I suggested at the beginning of this paper that the scholiast's reasons for declaring this tristich to be the very founding instance of the *trigônon epigramma* were far from obvious. The lines reveal none of the epigrammatic features we have noted so far, and even according to the classic de nition of the *trigônon* (that the lines may be read in any order) they are less than a success.[100] So unconvincing are these lines as an example of epigrammatic form that one wonders whether they did not originally receive the designation "epigram" for other reasons. In fact, these lines had famously been used as a caption or legend to a work that occupied a premier place in ancient histories of art: Zeuxis' *Helen*. The scandalous story of Zeuxis' boldness (Aristides calls him ὁ ὑβριστής) in subscribing Homer's words to his own image of the nude Helen is repeated several times in antiquity; this historical use of the Homeric text as a genuine epigram most likely lies at the root of the scholiastic tradition.[101] The case of Euphranôr's *Theseus* shows that a caption

"caption" are perfectly analogous to those of Helen's epigrams: a substantive, a kind of patronymic (Ἐρεχθῆος), a heroic epithet, and expansion through a relative clause.

99. The tristich on Asios in the catalogue of Trojan allies (*Il.* 2.837–39) presents another interesting case: τῶν αὖθ' Ὑρτακίδης ἦρχ' Ἄσιος, ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν, / Ἄσιος Ὑρτακίδης, ὃν Ἀρίσβηθεν φέρον ἵπποι / αἴθωνες μεγάλοι, ποταμοῦ ἄπο Σελλήεντος. Eustathius describes the epanalêpsis of the name metaphorically as a kind of "inscription" that imprints Asios on the reader's mind, and goes on to cite one of the heroic epigrams attributed to the Aristotelian *Peplos* (cf. Wendling 1891: 564 .). The metaphor of inscription may seem merely incidental—but note that the last two lines of this tristich follow *exactly* the "epigrammatic" pattern of Helen's tristichs (proper name + patronymic + relative clause), except for the omission of the demonstrative and the displacement of the epithet to the preceding line.

100. This is the justi cation o ered by the scholiast: ἀφ' οἵου γὰρ τῶν τριῶν στίχων ἀρξόμεθα, ἀδιάφορον. But reading in the order 2–3–1, for instance, produces very poor results. The scholiast's explanation is partly ameliorated by the complete lack of any connecting particles. This makes it at least *theoretically* possible to read the lines in any order. The Midas epigram, also attributed to Homer, is usually o ered as the founding instance of the *trigônon* (cf. Pl. *Phdr.* 264c-d, with Hermias' scholion ad loc. [p. 231 Couvreur]; also the anonymous scholion on Arist. *SE* 171a6–7). Philost. *Her*. 55.5 has a nice example of this most "archaic" form, again without connecting particles, suitably attributed to Herakles.

101. V. Max. 3.7 ext. 3; Aristid. *Peri tou para.* 386. Note that both authors give only the rst two lines (3.156–57), i.e., they do not consider this an example of the *trigônon*. I suspect that the scholiast has come across an abbreviated reference to these lines as an *epigramma* and has attempted

could be meant to represent or specify the viewer's response. Zeuxis could not have found a more appropriate text for this purpose, for in Homer, too, the lines serve as a kind of caption: they represent the linguistic response to the spectacle of Helen's appearance—they are a spontaneous legend provided by the Trojan elders. As the *teikhoskopia* dramatizes the conventional epigrammatic dialogue, the scene of Helen's appearance dramatizes the structure of Zeuxis' work, which consists of a visual and a verbal component; or, conversely, Zeuxis' painting recapitulates the structure inherent already in the *Iliad*. The lines subscribed by Zeuxis thus doubly refer to an act of reception. While they serve as the spontaneous expression of an aesthetic response to Helen in the *Iliad*, they program the response of the viewer of the *Helen*. The implication is that we are meant to respond to Zeuxis' painted image of Helen just as the Trojan elders reacted to the "real thing" in Homer. The artist's presumption that his own work could equal the "real" Helen is precisely what quali es Zeuxis' action as "outrageous" in Aristides' view, ὥσπερ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦν εἰκόνα τε Ἑλένης ποιῆσαι καὶ τὸν Δία Ἑλένην αὐτὴν γεννῆσαι ("as though Zeuxis were doing the same thing in making an image of Helen as Zeus in fathering Helen herself," 386). But one should consider the subtle irony of Aristides' remark in light of the Stesichorean tradition, of which he was undoubtedly aware, that it was not the "real" Helen who went to Troy (and hence appeared at the Skaian Gates), but an *eidôlon*, an image crafted by the gods. That is, from the Stesichorean point of view, the Trojan elders are themselves reacting to a work of art. Zeuxis has found not only the perfect text to script the moment of artistic reception, but the perfect subject to display his mimetic art: Helen, the Helen of Stesichorus' Troy, is *the* subject for *mimêsis*, since she is herself a *mimêsis* of the "real" Helen.[102]

looseness=1The tradition of Helen's *eidôlon* lessens somewhat the o ence of the equivalence implied by Zeuxis' painting, which does not, after all, equate an image with the inimitable original, but only with another image. The crucial link in this chain of equivalences is the text of the caption itself, which in fact facilitates the equation by means of its particular mode of reference. I have argued that the text appropriated by Zeuxis functions essentially as a caption even in its original Iliadic context. True to this function, the text gestures toward its object of reference with a deictic pronoun—not, however, with one that we have already encountered, but with the qualitative *toiosde* (τοιῇδ' ἀμφὶ γυναικὶ, 3.157). This

to come up with an explanation. This is not the only point at which the scholia re ect an awareness of "real" epigrams. The reference at AbT 1.29 to the phrase βασιλεύς τ' ἀγαθὸς κρατερός τ' αἰχμητής as *the* epigram on Agamemnon should probably be seen against the use of this same hemistich in "real" epigrams: see the attestations gathered by Sternbach 1886: 185–86. For further references on Zeuxis' *Helen*, see *RE* suppl. 15, s.v. *Zeuxis*, 1484.14–32.

102. In the *Odyssey* as well Helen has an uncanny a nity for *mimêsis*: she is able to imitate the voices of all the Argive wives (4.279). It is no coincidence that Gorgias' great manifesto of *écriture* also takes Helen as its subject. His *Encomium of Helen* is analogous to Zeuxis' own project: it constructs an extended parallel between the power of visual images and that of the written word. See Segal 1988: 340 and 343.

word has the peculiar e ect of making Helen "stand for" something else—namely the sort of beauty which would justify a war. "It's no wonder we fought a war over such a beautiful woman," say the Trojan elders, not "over this beautiful woman."[103] The wonderful thing about Zeuxis' caption is that it remains just as true when applied to his painted Helen as it was when applied to the "original" Helen of Troy—both can be understood equally well as representatives or signs of beauty. The Trojan elders speak of Helen precisely as of an image, a representative—almost as though they would not be surprised to nd that what they saw was only an *eidôlon*.

Now, it is this epiphany of an image and its evocation of a caption which separates Helen's woven representation of the heroes from her epigrammatic legends. The *Bildzeichnung* pronounced by the Trojan elders intercedes precisely between Helen at the loom and the *teikhoskopia* proper. If one were prepared to ascribe some signi cance to the disposition of episodes in the epic, one might say that it is this epiphany which rmly establishes image and text as two di erent orders of representation. For Gotthold Lessing, one of the great theorists of epigram, Zeuxis' *Helen* is the classic example of the unbridgeable gap between verbal and visual art, a divide which he elsewhere formulates speci cally in terms of the caption;[104] in the *Iliad*, the epigrammatic utterance which served Zeuxis as caption very concretely divides the image (Helen's tapestry) from its legend.

In the theoretical portions of this paper, I have argued that the peculiar form of the *Beischrift* or caption arises from the dissolution of the unity of inscription and monument characteristic of archaic "egocentric" inscriptions. I have also suggested that the dialogism which appears in later epigrammatic forms is not, originally, a dramatic function, but merely a consequence of the gap between object and *Beischrift*: after the unity of the monument has been dissolved, the inscription comes to occupy a separate (though inde nite) space; from this space of writing, the inscription "answers" the interrogation of the viewer. On the other hand, dialogue is impossible when object and epigram are one, for it is a

103. I am aware that a more precise rendering of τοιῇδ' ἀμφὶ γυναικὶ might be "over this woman, so beautiful as she is." That is, the demonstrative *toiosde* points to the quality in respect to which the assertion is true. This does not, however, a ect my basic point, since even according to this reading Helen is made to be the particular representative of a quality which is not equivalent to her, which is distinct from her—i.e., she still "stands for" beauty. The declaration which closes the Trojan elders' remark—"terribly is she like (ἔοικεν) . . ."—has the same e ect of pointing to Helen's *qualities*, rather than the woman herself.

104. Lessing 1984: 115: "Zeuxis painted a Helen and had the courage to write at the bottom of his picture those famous lines of Homer in which the delighted elders confess their feelings. Never were painting and poetry engaged in a more even contest. The victory remained undecided, and both deserved a crown." Cf. p. 72 for the gap between poetry and painting expressed in terms of the caption. Lessing's essay "Zerstreute Anmerkungen über das Epigramm und einige der vornehmsten Epigrammatisten" begins with a valuable meditation on the translation of Greek *epigramma*. Lessing's list of possible renderings looks forward to Raubitschek's more scienti c classi cation: *Überschrift, Aufschrift, Inschrift, Sinnschrift, Sinngedicht* (Lessing 1970: 118).

characteristic of such absolute monuments that they recognize only one place, one speaker, one moment in time.

I hope to have established in a more concrete fashion, however, the need to reevaluate our view of Helen as a poet- gure. The *communis opinio* has it that Helen in the *teikhoskopia* adopts the role of an epic singer. Scholarship has in general handled the delicate question of poetic re ection with a blunt instrument: any poetic self-reference is taken to be a reference to Homeric poetry conceived (wrongly) as a univocally "epic" medium and to Homer as the prototypical epic poet. Thus Helen, if she displays any poetic qualities, becomes a gure for the epic poet; no regard is given to the speci c nature of Helen's poetry, especially in contrast to the activity of such (male) gures as Dêmodokos or Phêmios. On closer inspection, Helen behaves in some fairly idiosyncratic ways, extremely uncharacteristic of the epic poet in his public domain: in an intimate, private setting she recalls an Odyssean anecdote; she sings an elaborate lament for her brother-in-law; and she gives "epigrammatic" descriptions of the Achaean leaders. In no case does she produce a straightforward epic diegesis. What is needed here is a considerably more subtle di erentiation of "self-reference": just as the Homeric text can accommodate or incorporate diverse genres, it can accommodate diverse re ections on the nature of poetic creation. Helen is quite far from a gure for the epic poet. It is signi cant, however, that this *female* gure accommodates re ections on several genres, while *male* poet- gures are decidedly less multi-faceted.

The possibility of discerning a gender-based di erentiation of poetic functions leads me to one nal consideration in connection with Helen's role as epigrammatist. In the public setting of the *teikhoskopia*, Helen does not speak, but *writes*. Antiquity knows many women who, deprived of a public voice, must express themselves in writing. Philomela's woven *grammata* are only the most famous example.[105] Svenbro has shown that the gure of Sappho is inextricably bound to the written word;[106] she, too, was an epigrammatist.[107] Indeed, Stehle nds discernibly inscriptional techniques in Sappho's poetry.[108] Signi cantly, her analysis depends on an observation of the "split" opened up by Sappho's text between

105. Cf. Apollod. 3.14.8: ἡ δὲ ὑφήνασα ἐν πέπλῳ γράμματα διὰ τούτων ἐμήνυσε Πρόκνῃ τὰς ἰδίας συμφοράς. Guarducci 1967–1978: 1.441 is uncertain whether these *grammata* should be understood as pictures or letters.

106. Svenbro 1993: 145–59.

107. Nossis consciously projects Sappho as a model for her own epigrams (Skinner 1991: 34). The debate surrounding the epithet θῆλυν Ὅμηρον in Antipater of Thessalonika's epigram on the nine canonical poetesses (*AP* 9.26, l. 3) is likewise indicative of Sappho's epigrammatic tendencies: the phrase is placed between the epigrammatist Anyte and Sappho, and seems intended to be taken *apo koinou* (cf. Skiadas 1965: 130 .). I have chosen to use the rare word *epigrammatopoios* in my title because of its occurrence at Phld. *Po*. 5.37 (in Mangoni's edition): καὶ τῶν ἐπιγραμματοποιῶν καὶ Σαπφοῦς.

108. Stehle 1997: 262–318. Note esp. 311: "women could represent themselves in writing, where they were not bodily present. Authoritative speaking was taken up by the inscribed object, so the woman's own voice was not represented, but in this displaced form women put their names and

the voice of the performer and the voice of the speaker[109]—an observation, that is, of the destabilizing e ect central to the grammatological approach I described at the beginning of this paper. The comic poet Antiphanes exploits this view of Sappho when he has her relate the riddle of a φύσις θήλεια ("feminine nature"), which turns out to be none other than *epistolê*, the epistle, whose *grammata,* "letters," speak despite the fact that they are *aphôna,* "voiceless."[110] Inscribed letters traditionally compensate women for the congenital condition of being *aphônoi*, as is playfully suggested by the following inscription from Galatia:[111]

> γαῖά με τίκ[τ]εν ἄφων|ο[ν] ἐν οὔρεσιν παρθέν[ο]|ν ἁγνήν,
> ἡσύχιον τὸ [π]|άροιθεν, νῦν αὐδήε[σ]|σαν ἅπασιν,
> σμιλιγλύ|φοις τέχνῃσιν κῆρ' εἰ|ποῦσα θανόντος·|
>
> The earth brought me forth voiceless in the mountains, a chaste maiden,
> silent before but now speaking to all,
> declaring the fate of the deceased by the contrivances of the chisel.

Considering that Greek culture persistently denies a voice to women except in the medium of writing, it is perhaps not surprising to nd that women—invisible through so much of literary history—dominate the early stages of literary epigram (Erinna, Moero, Anyte, and Nossis play important roles in the development of the genre). In this way, Helen *epigrammatopoios* might tell us not only how "Homer" conceives his relation to other poetic genres, but how Greek culture in general conceived the poetic potential of women.

APPENDIX

Some readers may be surprised by the suggestion that Helen's tapestry may be thought to contain even notional *Beischriften*. While the captions accompany-

---

actions before the public." Stehle believes that Sappho "may have drawn from inscriptional practice a way of lending herself authority" (ibid.).

109. Stehle 1997: 290, who also acknowledges a debt to Derrida on the rst page of her Preface. At 312–14, Stehle develops the notion of a progressive "autonomy" of inscriptions vis-à-vis their monuments, a notion that has much in common with the shift from *Aufschrift* to *Beischrift* I have suggested here.

110. Discussed by Svenbro 1993: 158–59.

111. Peek 1184, discussed by Rose 1923: 163, who asks, "Has the writer distorted the phraseology to mean, not a statue of a virgin, but a virgin or unwrought stone?" As I read it, the epigram plays on the fact that the stone, *aphônos* in its natural state "in the mountains" but now speaking by virtue of the inscription, has been carved to represent a *parthenos*—who is also voiceless according to cultural norms, able to speak (as Philomela) only through writing. Note that the inscription refers to a *korê* standing over the grave of a male corpse.

ing painted and sculpted images are generally well represented in primary and secondary literature, relatively little information is available about the weaving of gural textiles, let alone the inclusion of written letters in the design.[112]

The practice of weaving pictured story-cloths is well attested in both the literary and archaeological remains of the classical period; in Barber's view the Greek technique stems from the Bronze Age.[113] Evidence for the application of captions or legends to such textiles requires a bit more synthesis. Ancient textiles are naturally only sparsely represented in the archaeological record; nevertheless, a few surviving Egyptian examples suggest that the technique of weaving inscriptions or labels into gural designs was widespread in antiquity. One outstanding third- or fourth-century AD specimen, now in Boston's Museum of Fine Arts, shows a female and a male gure, and labels them respectively [A]PIAΔNH and ΔEIONΥΣOΣ.[114] Signi cantly, in this case the labels are *inwoven* into the fabric, and not applied subsequently by embroidery or appliqué; hence they were created with the fabric, as an integral part of the design. Guarducci sees nothing exceptional in this practice, even by earlier Greek standards: "l'uso d'intessere inscrizioni nelle sto e è da considerarsi molte più antico."[115] Indeed, several anecdotes about famous garments would seem to retroject the technique into the fth century . The elder Pliny recalls a story about Zeuxis—by all accounts a pioneer in the use of captions—who acquired so much wealth *ut in ostentatione earum Olympiae aureis litteris in palliorum tesseris intextum nomen suum ostentaret* ("that in order to display it at Olympia he showed his own name woven into the *tesserae* of his cloak in golden letters," NH 35.62).[116] Although "Aristotle" (*Mir.* 838a) does not make speci c mention of text or labels, Jacobsthal felt that the wonderful *himation* of the Sybarite Alkisthenes—"an autobiography in pictures," probably a fth-century work—must have contained labels throughout.[117] Slightly more reliable is the reference to ἱερὰ ἱμάτια ἐφ'

112. For *Beischriften* on vases, see Kretschmer 1894: 84 ., Immerwahr 1990; coins: Guarducci 1967–1978: 2.655 .; sculpture: ibid.: 3.393 . Cf. the Stoa Poikilê, so called after the paintings of Polugnôtos, who was distinguished by his habitual use of labels (cf. *Suda* s.v. *stôikoi*; Diog. Laert. 7.5; *RE* s.v. *stoa*, 18.36–37).

113. Barber 1992: passim, with references to literary and archaeological evidence.

114. Wace 1952: 117, with photograph (and cf., of course, Catul. 64.50 .). On p. 113, Wace asserts that labels occur "often in the decorated textiles found in Egypt"; he considers such Egyptian pieces to be representative of Hellenistic practice. The MFA piece is discussed also by Guarducci 1967–1978: 1.440–41, who mentions as well a sixth-century Egyptian tapestry. Jacobsthal 1938: 208n.20 refers to "one inscribed textile of pre-Roman date," but I have been unable to con rm this reference.

115. Guarducci 1967–1978: 1.441.

116. See Wace 1952: 114 for a discussion of the meaning of *tessera* as a "rectangular ornament interwoven into the garment." These ornaments could be added later to a completed cloth, but they should be seen as complete fabrics in themselves.

117. Jacobsthal 1938: 206: Alkisthenes' "citizenship was indicated by his association with the town-goddess on the garment and by the inscriptions on it." And again on p. 208: "how else should people have identi ed Sybaris or the cities of Susa and Persepolis?"

οἷς καὶ χρυσᾶ γράμματα ἦν δηλοῦντα τοὺς ἀναθέντας in the *hypothesis* to Demosthenes' 25th oration. These are not necessarily inwoven inscriptions, but the context makes it clear that they were rmly attached to the garments in question.

The garments referred to in this last case are temple dedications, in all likelihood associated with the cult of Artemis.[118] And in fact, the temple inventories of the Athenian cult of Artemis Brauronia—perhaps the very scene of the Demosthenic crime—provide the clearest evidence for the use of captions on textiles of the classical period.[119] Zeuxis' garment was obviously a prestige piece, but the temple records indicate that the technique was actually quite widespread. Numerous items are described as "having" (ἔχοντα) inscriptions, some of them in gold;[120] the frequently repeated terms *anepigraphos* / *agraphos* suggest that it was not an exception but the norm for garments to have some kind of label. Linders expresses some caution as to the manner in which these labels were executed: since they seem most often to have indicated donors' names, she has reasonably suggested that they were either embroidered on the fabric or otherwise attached as separate tags.[121] In some cases the inventories seem to refer to more or less complete dedicatory inscriptions, of the type "so-and-so dedicated to Artemis"; these must also have been added to complete garments at the time of dedication.[122] There can be no doubt, however, about the letters on Kallipê's dedication, singled out with special emphasis: χιθωνίσκο[ς κτεν]|[ωτ]ὸς περιποίκιλος, Καλλίπη· οὗτος ἔχει γράμ[ματ]|[α ἐ]νυφασμένα (*IG* II–III^2 1514.7–9). *Peripoikilos*—which distinguishes this item from many others described as simply *poikilos*—likely indicates that the *khithôniskos* was decorated with gured scenes, like the *epiblêma* of Nikoboulê.[123] As the letters were explicitly woven into the fabric, they probably

118. Linders 1972: 13: the defendant claimed that the priestess had ordered him to carry the garments πρὸς τὸ ἱερὸν κυνηγέσιον.

119. See Linders 1972 for an overview. The inscriptions describe dedications made in the mid-fourth century. Other fth-century inscriptions have also been attributed to the same series, but they cannot be positively associated with the Brauronion (ibid., p. 3).

120. Cf. *IG* II–III^2 1529.14.

121. Linders 1972: 13.

122. Linders 1972: 13 renders *IG* II–III^2 1514.40–41, παιδίου χλανίσκιον λευκὸν καρτόν, ἱερὸν ἐπιγ[εγ]|ραπται Ἀρτέμιδος as "with the inscription 'Sacred to Artemis.' " One should compare the inscribed textiles used as temple dedications at Apul. *Met*. 6.3: *videt dona pretiosa et lacinias auro litteratas ramis arborum postibusque suffixas, quae cum gratia facti nomen deae, cui fuerant dicata, testabantur.*

123. *IG* II–III^2 1514.31–32: σημεῖον ἔ[χ]ει [ἐ]μ μέσῳ, Διόνυσος σπένδων καὶ γυνὴ οἰνοχοοῦσα. One suspects that this garment likewise contained labels, like the fourth-century Egyptian fabric mentioned above. To the designation *peripoikilos* I would compare the wording of the scholion to Arist. *Aves* 827, which describes the Panathenaic *peplos*: τῆι ἀθηνα πολιάδι οὔση πέπλος ἐγίνετο παμποίκιλος ὃν ἀνέφερον ἐν τῇ πομπη τῶν ἀθηναίων (text as given in White's edition). In the great *supplicatio* of Athena in *Iliad* 6, Hekabê chooses the most outstanding *peplos* out of many παμποίκιλα ἔργα γυναικῶν (6.289); this passage likely has connections to the Panathenaia (Nagy 2002: 93–94).

did not comprise a dedicatory inscription; the most likely inference is that they labeled the gures in the design.[124]

It may not be inopportune at this point to mention an epigram associated with the rst professional weavers of the Panathenaic *peplos*, Akesâs and Helikôn.[125] According to Athenaeus 48b, an example of their work in Delphi displayed an epigram testifying to their connection to Pallas:

> ἤκμασε δ' ἡ τῶν ποικίλων ὑφὴ μάλιστα ἐντέχνων περὶ αὐτὰ γενομένων Ἀκεσᾶ καὶ Ἑλικῶνος τῶν Κυπρίων.... ἐν Πυθοῖ γοῦν ἐπί τινος ἔργου ἐπιγέγραπται·
>
> τεῦξ' Ἑλικὼν Ἀκεσᾶ Σαλαμίνιος, ᾧ ἐνὶ χερσὶ
> πότνια θεσπεσίην Παλλὰς ἔπνευσε χάριν.[126]
>
> The weaving of decorated fabrics ourished at the time of the Cyprians Akesâs and Helikôn, who were especially skilled at such works.... Indeed, at Delphi there is a certain work with the inscription:
>
> The Saliminian Helikôn, son of Akesâs, crafted [it], in whose hands
> mistress Pallas infused divine grace.

Mans eld feels that a di erent Helikôn must be meant;[127] but that ancient tradition associated this Pythian fabric with the Panathenaic weavers is suggested by Eustathius, who repeats Athenaeus nearly word for word in his discussion of the term λῖτα in *Od.* 1.130 (αὐτὴν δ' ἐς θρόνον εἶσεν ἄγων, ὑπὸ λῖτα πετάσσας)—a line referring to the chair that Telemachus places before Mentês-Athena. It is hard to see why Eustathius would bring Akesâs and his son into the discussion if scholarly tradition had not connected this scene with the ritual presentation of textiles (above all the Panathenaic *peplos*) to the goddess. Preger doubted that the inscription could have been an original part of the fabric in Delphi,[128] nor can we judge from the text of Athenaeus whether the epigram was attached to the garment or merely placed next to it. The nature of the actual artifact, however,

124. A possibility entertained by Wace 1952: 112–13. Strangely, Linders 1972: 9 writes that "the phrase ... probably implies that these letters did not convey a meaning to those who wrote the inventory." At n.13, however, she considers the possibility that the maker of the fabric wove her own name as signature.

125. Zen. *Ep.* 1.56: οὗτοι γὰρ πρῶτοι τὸν τῆς Πολιάδος Ἀθηνᾶς πέπλον ἐδημιούργησαν. Mans eld 1985 has established that the *peplos* presented at the quadrennial Great Panathenaia was made by professional weavers (as Zenobius' use of *dêmiourgein*, incidentally, indicates), being woven in other years by Attic girls.

126. Reading this epigram, one thinks of Ovid's lines on Arachne: *sive levi teretem versabat pollice fusum, / seu pingebat acu; scires a Pallade doctam* (6.22–23). This description of the weaver's art corresponds remarkably well to the etymological meanings of the names Akesâs ("needle") and Helikôn ("twister"), noted by Barber 1992: 113n.28.

127. Mans eld 1985: 54.

128. Preger 1891: 138: "dissimillimum est pervestustis temporibus, septimo vel sexto saeculo, disticho textorem vestem exornasse neque satis habuisse suum nomen dedicandique verbum acu inscribere." He does not consider the possibility of an inwoven inscription.

is ultimately less important for our purposes than the simple fact that tradition acknowledged the first great *peplos* craftsman as an epigrammatist.

Harvard University
delmer@fas.harvard.edu

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations

CEG *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca, saeculorum VIII–V a. Chr. n.* Hansen, P. A., ed. Berlin and New York. 1983.

SEG *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*. Amsterdam–

Alden, M. 2000. *Homer Beside Himself: Para-Narratives in the Iliad*. Oxford.

Bakker, E. 1997. "Storytelling in the Future: Truth, Time, and Tense in Homeric Epic." In E. Bakker and A. Kahane, eds., *Written Voices, Spoken Signs: Tradition, Performance, and the Epic Text*, 11–36. Cambridge, Mass.

———. 1999. "Homeric ΟΥΤΟΣ and the Poetics of Deixis." *CP* 94: 1–19.

Barber, E. J. W. 1992. "The Peplos of Athena." In J. Neils, ed., *Goddess and Polis: The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens*, 103–17. Princeton.

Barrio Vega, M. L. del. 1989. "Epigramas dialogados: Orígenes y estructura." *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica* 23: 189–201.

Bowra, C. M. 1963. "Two Lines of Eumelus." *CQ* 13: 145–53.

Clader, L. L. 1976. *Helen: The Evolution from Divine to Heroic in Greek Epic Tradition*. Mnemosyne, Supplementum 42. Leiden

Danielewicz, J. 1990. " *Deixis* in Greek Choral Lyric. " *QUCC* 34: 7–17.

Day, J. W. 2000. "Epigram and Reader: Generic Force as (Re-)Activation of Ritual." In M. Depew and D. Obbink, eds., *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*, 37–57. Cambridge, Mass.

Derrida, J. 1997. *Of Grammatology*. Corrected edition. Trans. G. Spivak. Baltimore.

Detienne, M. 1996. *The Masters of Truth in Archaic Greece*. Trans. J. Lloyd. New York.

Fick, A. 1886. *Die homerische* Ilias*, nach ihrer Entstehung betrachtet und in der ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt*. Göttingen.

Gentili, B., and P. Giannini. 1977. "Preistoria e formazione dell'esametro." *QUCC* 26: 7–51.

Godelier, M. 1999. *The Enigma of the Gift*. Trans. N. Scott. Chicago.

Gow, A. S. F., and D. L. Page. 1965. *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*. Cambridge.

Gri n, J. 1987. "Homer and Excess." In J. M. Bremer, I. J. F. de Jong, and J. Kal , eds., *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry: Recent Trends in Homeric Interpretation*, 85–104. Amsterdam.

Guarducci, M. 1967–1978. *Epigrafia greca*. Rome.

Gutzwiller, K. 2004. "Gender and Inscribed Epigram: Herennia Procula and the Thespian Eros." *TAPA* 134: 383–418.

Haupt, M. 1876. *Opuscula* 3. Leipzig.

Haüsle, H. 1979. *Einfache und frühe Formen des griechischen Epigramms*. Commentationes Aenipontanae 25. Innsbruck.

Havelock, E. A. 1963. *Preface to Plato*. Cambridge, Mass.
Immerwahr, H. R. 1990. *Attic Script: A Survey*. Oxford.
Jacobsthal, P. 1938. "A Sybarite Himation." *JHS* 58: 205–16.
Jenkins, T. E. 1999. " *Homêros ekainopoiêse*: Theseus, Aithra, and Variation in Homeric Myth-Making." In M. Carlisle and O. Levaniouk, eds., *Nine Essays on Homer*, 207–26. Lanham.
Jones, H. S. 1894. "The Chest of Kypselos." *JHS* 14: 30–80.
Köchly, H. 1881. "De Iliadis carminibus dissertatio IV." In *Gesammelte kleine philologische Schriften*, 69–88. Leipzig.
Kretschmer, P. 1894. *Die griechischen Vaseninschriften ihrer Sprache nach untersucht*. Gütersloh.
Lausberg, M. 1982a. *Das Einzeldistichon: Studien zum antiken Epigramm*. Studia et testimonia antiqua 19. Munich.
———. 1982b. " Ἀρχέτυπον τῆς ἰδίας ποιήσεως: Zur Bildbeschreibung bei Ovid." *Boreas* 5: 112–23.
Lessing, G. E. 1970. "Zerstreute Anmerkungen über das Epigramm und einige der vornehmsten Epigrammatisten." In J. Petersen and W. von Olshausen, eds., *Werke*, 118–209. Hildesheim.
———. 1984. *Laocoön: An Essay on the Limits of Painting and Poetry*.Trans. E. A. McCormick. Baltimore.
Lewis, D. M. 1987. "Bowie on Elegy: A Footnote." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 107: 188.
Linders, T. 1972. *Studies in the Treasure Records of Artemis Brauronia Found in Athens*. Lund.
Lumpp, H.-M. 1963. "Die Arniadas-Inschrift aus Korkyra: Homerisches im Epigramm–Epigrammatisches im Homer." *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 37: 212–15.
Mans eld, J. M. 1985. *The Robe of Athena and the Panathenaic "Peplos*." Diss. Berkeley.
Marjanović, L. 1998. " Same pjesme." In Đ. Buturović and M. Maglajlić, eds., *Bošnjačka književnost u književnoj kritici* 2, 101–16. Sarajevo.
Muellner, L. C. 1976. *The Meaning of Homeric* ΕΥΧΟΜΑΙ *through its Formulas*. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 13. Innsbruck.
Nagy, G. 1979. *The Best of the Achaeans*. Baltimore.
———. 1990. *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore.
———. 1996. *Homeric Questions*. Austin.
———. 2002. *Plato's Rhapsody and Homer's Music: The Poetics of the Panathenaic Festival in Classical Athens*. Washington, D.C.
Pache, C. O. 1999. "Odysseus and the Phaeacians." In M. Carlisle and O. Levaniouk, eds., *Nine Essays on Homer*, 21–33. Lanham.
Page, D. L. 1981. *Further Greek Epigrams*. Cambridge.
Peek, W. 1955. *Griechische Vers-Inschriften*. Berlin.
Peponi, A.-E. 2004. "Initiating the Viewer: Deixis and Visual Perception in Alcman's Lyric Drama." *Arethusa* 37: 295–316.
Preger, T. 1891. *Inscriptiones Graecae metricae, ex scriptoribus praeter Anthologiam collectae*. Leipzig.
Raubitschek, A. E. 1968. "Das Denkmal-Epigramm." In *L'Épigramme grecque*, Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique 14, 1–26. Geneva.
Robert, C. 1888. "Olympische Glosse." *Hermes* 23: 424–53.

Robertson, M. 1975. *A History of Greek Art*. Cambridge.
Rose, H. J. 1923. "The Speaking Stone." *CR* 37: 162–63.
Segal, C. 1988. "Vérité, tragédie et écriture." In M. Detienne, ed., *Les savoirs de l'écriture en Grèce ancienne*, 330–58. Villeneuve-d'Ascq.
Skiadas, A. D. 1965. *Homer im griechischen Epigramm*. Athens.
Skinner, M. B. 1991. "Nossis *Thêlyglôssos*: The Private Text and the Public Book." In S. B. Pomeroy, ed., *Women's History and Ancient History*, 20–47. Chapel Hill.
Smith, J. D. 1986. "Where the Plot Thickens: Epic Moments in Pâbûjî." *South Asian Studies* 2: 53–64.
———. 1991. *The Epic of Pâbûjî: A Study, Transcription and Translation*. Cambridge.
Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1995. "*Reading*" *Greek Death*. Oxford.
Spivak, G. C. 1997. "Introduction." In Derrida, 1997.
Stehle, E. 1997. *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece: Nondramatic Poetry in its Setting*. Princeton.
Sternbach, S. L. 1886. *Meletemata Graeca*. Vienna.
Suzuki, M. 1989. *Metamorphoses of Helen: Authority, Difference, and the Epic*. Ithaca.
Svenbro, J. 1993. *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece*. Trans. J. Lloyd. Ithaca.
Van der Valk, M. 1963. *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad, Part I*. Leiden.
Vox, O. 1975. "Epigrammi in Omero." *Belfagor* 30: 67–70.
Wace, A. J. B. 1952. "The Cloaks of Zeuxis and Demetrius." *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes in Wien* 39: 111–18.
Weiner, A. 1992. *Inalienable Possessions: The Paradox of Keeping-While-Giving*. Berkeley.
Wendling, A. 1891. *De Peplo aristotelico quaestiones selectae*. Strasbourg.
Wilson, D. 2002. *Ransom, Revenge, and Heroic Identity in the Iliad*. Cambridge.