The Chest of Cypselus and the Temple of Apollonis at Cyzicus: Showing and Telling in Literary Inscriptions

Federica Scicolone

GREEK EPIGRAMS ON ARTWORKS express a tension between verbal and visual modes of communication, since they play on their liminal status as textual evocations of absent epigraphic realities.[1] Especially from the end of the fourth century B.C., epigrams of this sort started to be collected in literary anthologies,[2] occasionally arranged in sets and commenting on specific objects. Deictic indicators play an important role in bridging the divide between epigrammatic texts and their extra-textual contexts, for *deixis* "renders possible verbal references to the space and time of, as well as to the participants in, the act of communication."[3] Linguistic strategies for pointing to extra-textual visual referents, alongside allusive features, can be employed in Greek epigram to invoke lost referents (i.e. artefacts that originally existed, but disappeared with the passage of time) and imaginary referents, which never existed and are the pro-

---

[1] M. J. Squire, "Making Myron's Cow Moo? Ecphrastic Epigram and the Poetics of Simulation," *AJP* 131 (2010) 589–634, at 613–616.

[2] On epigram anthologies see, among others, K. J. Gutzwiller, *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigram in Context* (Berkeley 1998) 227–322; N. Krevans, "The Arrangement of Epigrams in Collections," in P. Bing et al. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram: Down to Philip* (Leiden 2007) 131–146.

[3] C. Calame, "Deictic Ambiguity and Auto-Referentiality: Some Examples from Greek Poetics," *Arethusa* 37 (2004) 415–443, at 415.

duct of the poet's and readers' fantasy.[4] This paper examines the way in which the language of reference and allusion is employed to point to lost and imaginary objects in selected literary inscriptions that comment on their visual apparatus.

By "literary inscriptions" I intend texts that can be interpreted either as originally epigraphic texts, which were later transmitted in literary form, or epigrams written *as if* they were originally inscribed, whereas they could be literary compositions from the start.[5] This paper revisits through a linguistic lens two groups of such epigrams: those originally inscribed on the Chest of Cypselus, from the sixth century B.C., which have reached us through Pausanias' account of this artwork (5.17.5–5.19.10); and selected cases from Book 3 of the *Palatine Anthology*, which collects the epigrams accompanying the reliefs in the otherwise un-attested temple of Apollonis at Cyzicus, possibly dating to the second century B.C., although scholars generally agree on a much later date for the epigrams.[6] The epigrams from these

---

[4] On literary epigrams guiding readers' imaginations in constructing a mental image of an inscribed object, see P. Bing, "Ergänzungsspiel in the Epigrams of Callimachus," *A&A* 41 (1995) 115–131 = *The Scroll and the Marble: Studies in Reading and Reception in Hellenistic Poetry* (Ann Arbor 2009) 85–105.

[5] Thus, literary epigrams that display a "simulated" epigraphic reality. Cf. A. Hartmann, "*Cui vetustas fidem faciat*: Inscriptions and Other Material Relics of the Past in Graeco-Roman Antiquity," in P. Liddel et al. (eds.), *Inscriptions and their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature* (Oxford 2013) 33–63, at 40; on the poetics of inscriptions that are "embedded" in a literary host-text, see in the same volume M. Dinter, "Inscriptional Intermediality in Latin Literature," 303–316, esp. 303–308, and A. V. Zadorojnyi, "Shuffling Surfaces: Epigraphy, Power, and Integrity in the Graeco-Roman Narratives," 365–386, at 367 n.8; B. Allgaier, *Embedded Inscriptions in Herodotus and Thucydides* (Wiesbaden 2022); P. Bing, "Embedded Epigrams in Callimachus," *Aevum(ant)* 22 (2022) 13–41.

[6] On the epigrams' chronology see K. Demoen, "The Date of the Cyzicene Epigrams: An Analysis of the Vocabulary and Metrical Technique of *AP*, III," *AntCl* 57 (1988) 231–248, who indicates the sixth century A.D. as the earliest possible date of these epigrams based on vocabulary and metrical analysis, following up on the philological analysis and conclusions of H.

---

series hint at and supplement the traditional material of myth allegedly represented on their material supports, weaving together intertextual references to literary precedents that elaborated on the same myths.

In the case of the Chest of Cypselus, much has been said on its poetics of allusion to the Homeric works: the use of narrative strategies and figurative modes of expression that are remarkably similar to those of poetry (e.g. allegorical personifications) denotes familiarity with the *Iliad* and an extensive knowledge of poetry, possibly also in written form.[7] The force of allusion emerges also from the epigrams of *AP* 3, introduced by prose lemmata independent of the poems, and of late date:[8] a tripartite

Meyer, *De Anthologiae Palatinae epigrammatis Cyzicensis* (Königsberg 1911). Cf. S. Goldhill, *Preposterous Poetics: The Politics and Aesthetics of Form in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge 2020), who observes (32−34) that there is no certain evidence that they are not coeval to the temple or do not refer to a later inscriptional event. On a second-century date, see F.-H. Massa Pairault, "Il problema degli 'stylopinakia' nel tempio di Apollonis a Cizico. Alcune considerazioni," *AFLPer(class)* 19 (1981/2) 147−219, and "L'interprétation des frises du Grand Autel de Pergame et des *stylopinakia* de Cyzique: Quelques problèmes," in *Images et modernité hellénistiques. Appropriation et représentation du monde d'Alexandre à César* (Rome 2007) 205−221. Further comments on the epigrams are in R. Merkelbach and J. Stauber, *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten* II (Munich 2001) 18−39.

[7] In contrast with vase painters from the Archaic period, who relied on their memory to illustrate particular episodes and myths, due to the oral nature of poems; see A. M. Snodgrass, *Homer and the Artists: Text and Picture in Early Greek Art* (Cambridge 1998), and "Pausanias and the Chest of Kypselos," in S. E. Alcock et al. (eds.), *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece* (Oxford 2001) 127−141; B. E. Borg, *Der Logos des Mythos. Allegorien und Personifikationen in der frühen griechischen Kunst* (Munich 2002), and "Epigrams in Archaic Art: The 'Chest of Kypselos'," in M. Baumbach et al. (eds.), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram* (Cambridge 2010) 81−99, at 97−99.

[8] Nothing more specific can be said on the exact date of the lemmata, which apparently were not by the composer of the epigrams. The epigrams-lemmata combination can be ascribed to a now lost source prior to *AP*. On this, and on the independence of the lemmata from the epigrams, see F.

relationship can be envisaged here between the purported epigraphic reality of the reliefs in Apollonis' temple, the epigrams, and their prose introductions, which expand on the traditional mythic narratives that inspired both the reliefs and the poems.

This paper explores the way in which *deixis*, especially verb tenses and demonstrative pronouns, and allusion are used in both series of epigrams to evoke a broader network of references to myth, thus stretching beyond the boundaries of the epigrams' (actual or make-believe) pictorial counterparts.[9] As to the function of demonstratives, the anaphoric οὗτος is used in texts to "refer back" to what is already shared information between the speaker and the reader, as it can be inferred while viewing the relief scene; the cataphoric ὅδε, by contrast, introduces new and "cognitively salient" pieces of information.[10] Deictics can point to extra-textual referents in two ways: on the one hand, they introduce elements that could supposedly be experienced through the senses, denoting different degrees of newness of these referents to readers. On the other hand, the referential function of *deixis* can be anchored in the story, pointing to characters who, at a specific narrative moment, enter the scene and can then be visualised by readers. In this second case, *deixis* is imagination-oriented, as it calls upon the audience's capacity to transcend the

Maltomini, "Osservazioni sugli epigrammi di Cizico (*AP* III)," *AnnPisa* SER. IV 7 (2002) 17–33, at 19 n.6; C. Ballestrazzi, "Gli *stylopinakia* e il tempio della regina Apollonide di Cizico. Una revisione letteraria e archeologica del terzo libro dell'*Anthologia Palatina*," *RivFil* 145 (2017) 126–158, esp. 132–134.

[9] Seeing the representation of a mythological scene and recalling other episodes of the same myth was apparently a standard interpretive process for ancient viewers, as discussed in R. Brilliant, *Visual Narratives: Storytelling in Etruscan and Roman Art* (Ithaca 1984). This paper focuses on the different ways in which *deixis* allowed ancient viewers to do this, by simultaneously pointing both to the ocular and to the imaginary in these representative contexts.

[10] This interpretation of demonstratives is informed by E. J. Bakker, "Pragmatics: Speech and Text," in *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language* (Chichester 2010) 151–167, esp. 153–161.

texts' (real or notional) epigraphic reality.[11]

Since this article focuses on literarily transmitted epigrams, it also considers the mediation respectively of Pausanias' explanatory comments and of the prose introductions later combined with the poems of *AP* 3.[12] It examines such diverse cases collectively, considering indexicals and other devices of presence and absence, such as narrative voices and poetic *personae*.[13] It considers similarities and differences in the use of deictics in both series, although these belong to different times and reading contexts, to direct the readers' understanding of perceivable sights and to invoke absent ones. This work does not aim to ascertain the epigraphic reality of the two monuments under discussion and the pictorial features of the reliefs. Its main focus is on the "epigrammatic perception" of the reliefs from the chest and from Apollonis' temple that both poetic series reflect.[14] This approach will allow me, first, to concentrate on whether both sets of epigrams used similar deictic and allusive strategies to interact with their related mythic episodes and generate their presence for readers; and second, to consider the different sorts of access to the epigrams' underlying narratives that the framing of Pau-

---

[11] On imaginary and ocular *deixis* see K. Bühler, *Theory of Language: The Representational Function of Language* (Amsterdam 1990) 137–157, esp. 140–143. On epigrammatic *deixis* see recent discussions in F. Licciardello, *Deixis and Frames of Reference in Hellenistic Dedicatory Epigrams* (Berlin 2022); F. Scicolone, *The Language of Objects: Deixis in Descriptive Greek Epigrams* (Leiden 2023).

[12] See Borg, in *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram* 82–86, esp. 84 on Pausanias as a trustworthy narrator in his detailed account of the *kypsele* and its reliefs. On the response of the "characters who become involved with inscriptions" (such as the narrator) when epigraphy is narrativised, see Zadorojnyi, in *Inscriptions and their Uses* 367 n.10.

[13] On epigrammatic voices see I. Männlein-Robert, *Stimme, Schrift und Bild: Zum Verhältnis der Künste in der hellenistischen Dichtung* (Heidelberg 2007), and "Epigrams on Art: Voice and Voicelessness in Ecphrastic Epigram," in *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram* 251–271; in *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, J. S. Bruss, "Ecphrasis in Fits and Starts? Down to 300 BC," 385–403, and M. A. Tueller, "The Passer-by in Archaic and Classical Epigram," 42–60.

[14] Quotation from Goldhill, *Preposterous Poetics* 34.

sanias and that of the *AP*'s prose lemmata provide to the reading audience.

The epigrams on the Chest of Cypselus

Looking at the artworks in the Heraion at Olympia, Pausanias comments upon the complex iconography of the chest, which is dated to around the 580–570.[15] His account represents the only available evidence of the existence of this artefact. As stated by the author himself, the κυψέλη was donated by the Corinthian descendants of Cypselus to the sanctuary at Olympia,[16] where it was still visible in the second century A.D. It is described as a wooden container (either square or round in shape) decorated all around with wood, gold, and ivory reliefs allocated in five friezes. After preliminary considerations on the history of the artefact, Pausanias moves to a description of its nine metrical inscriptions; these are carved all around the chest in an Archaic and boustrophedon style, and written in dactylic hexameter and in the Doric dialect.[17] They include the names of the carved

[15] See Borg, in *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram* 81 with n.3, for the most significant contributions on the chronology of the chest. This chronology, originally proposed by H. Payne, *Necrocorinthia. A Study of Corinthian Art in the Archaic Period* (Oxford 1931) 125 and 351 n.4, is now generally agreed on and was more recently supported by R. Splitter, *Die "Kypseloslade" in Olympia. Form, Funktion und Bildschmuck. Eine archäologische Rekonstruktion* (Mainz 2000). Cf. Snodgrass, in *Pausanias: Travel and Memory* 128. See also T. Cossu, "Il programma figurativo dell'arca di Cipselo e la propaganda politica di Periandro," in M. Giuman (ed.), *L'arca invisibile: Studi sull'arca di Cipselo* (Cagliari 2005) 81–163, esp. 154–155 on the chronology of the Cypselids and the chest in its historical and political context of production.

[16] Dio Chrys. *Or.* 11.45 differently refers to the chest as dedicated by Cypselus himself.

[17] H. S. Jones, "The Chest of Kypselos," *JHS* 14 (1894) 30–80, at 39–41. For a commentary of Pausanias' account of the chest and its inscriptions see J. G. Frazer, *Pausanias's Description of Greece* III (London 1898) 600–620; G. Maddoli and V. Saladino, *Pausania: Guida della Grecia* V, *L'Elide e Olimpia* (Milan 1995) 297–304; for a commentary and detailed analysis of the epigrams in Paus. 5.18.2–5.19.5 see C. Zizza, *Le iscrizioni nella Periegesi di Pausania: commento ai testi epigrafici* (Pisa 2006) 170–215.

figures, thus allowing for their recognition, and briefly identify the narrative in each scene.[18]

Since these epigrams are not strictly descriptive and are recorded by Pausanias for subsequent readers of his account, he often supplements them with additional explanations. None of the inscriptions seems to be a direct quotation from a preserved literary work,[19] but for some of these texts a relationship with specific lines of poetry can be established. As forms of "caption" inscriptions, they are characterised by a marked use of the anaphoric demonstrative οὗτος (5.18.4: Apollo and the Muses; Atlas holding heaven, which is examined below; 5.19.4: the fight between Coon and Agamemnon, also discussed below). By contrast, the cataphoric ὅδε occurs in only one inscription, on the judgement of Paris (5.19.5):

Ἑρμείας ὅδ' Ἀλεξάνδρῳ δείκνυσι διαιτῆν
τοῦ εἴδους Ἥραν καὶ Ἀθάναν καὶ Ἀφροδίταν.

This Hermes here shows to Alexander, to arbitrate on their beauty, Hera and Athena and Aphrodite.[20]

The presence of the first-person demonstrative ὅδε "this-here," which is conventionally associated with speaker-oriented *deixis*,[21] marks the arrival of prominent information about the narrative,

---

[18] The earliest name inscriptions referring to mythological narratives in pictorial art date as early as the mid-seventh century B.C. See the overview by G. Ahlberg-Cornell, *Myth and Epos in Early Greek Art: Representation and Interpretation* (Jonsered 1992) 176, and L. Giuliani, *Image and Myth: A History of Pictorial Narration in Greek Art* (Chicago 2013) 93.

[19] Borg, in *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram* 91.

[20] See Zizza, *Le iscrizioni nella Periegesi* 202–204. D. F. Elmer, "Helen *Epigrammatopoios*," *ClAnt* 24 (2005) 1–39, at 20 n.70, ascribes the use of ὅδε here and the name of Hermes in first position to metrical reasons.

[21] E. Schmolling, "Zum Gebrauch von οὗτος und ὅδε," *Jahresberichte des Philologischen Vereins zu Berlin* 42 (1916) 30–32; J. Svenbro, *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece* (Ithaca 1993) 33; J. S. Klein, " 'Sá-figé' and Indo-European Deixis," *HSF* 109 (1996) 21–39, at 26–27; E. J. Bakker, "Homeric ΟΥΤΟΣ and the Poetics of Deixis," *CP* 94 (1999) 1–19, at 6, and in *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language* 153.

namely the identification of the intermediary between Paris and the goddesses as Hermes. The scene, as introduced by Pausanias (ἄγει δὲ καὶ Ἑρμῆς παρ' Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν Πριάμου τὰς θεὰς κριθησο-μένας ὑπὲρ τοῦ κάλλους) and identified by the epigram, seems to recall Attic black-figure vase representations of the Judgement of Paris episode of Type B, where a procession of the three god-desses, led by Hermes, reaches the arbitrator, Paris.[22]

In the epigram's physical reality, where both the text and its relief could be experienced through sight, the viewer's physical proximity to the carved figure of Hermes played an important cognitive role.[23] Nevertheless, in the reading experience of the epigram, once the disjunction of the text from the object has occurred, the referential function of ὅδε has shifted: the first-person demonstrative no longer points to a fixed referent in time and space (the perceivable representation of Hermes on the chest), but it now performs the "presence" of myth in multiple ways, depending on the subjective viewpoint of the reader who impersonates the "I" of the epigram ("this Hermes *before me*") and visualises the referent. The polysyndeton in line 2 (Ἥραν καὶ Ἀθάναν καὶ Ἀφροδίταν) contributes to the *deixis* of the epigram, by guiding the gaze of (actual and imaginary) viewers as they iden-tify the goddesses in this processional scene. In the subsequent reading of the epigram in Pausanias' account, deictics continue to provide a context for the reader's imagined encounter with the chest by constructing "different orders of knowledge":[24] the

[22] On this type see A. G. Mitchell, *Greek Vase-Painting and the Origins of Visual Humour* (Cambridge 2009) 96–97 and 232, where he focuses on the parodic implications of this scene in some black-figure depictions.

[23] P. Bing, *The Well-Read Muse: Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets* (Göttingen 1988), and "The Un-Read Muse? Inscribed Epigram and Its Readers in Antiquity," in M. A. Harder et al. (eds.), *Hellenistic Epigrams* (Leuven 2002) 39–66, at 42–47.

[24] Thus Elmer, *ClAnt* 24 (2005) 27; cf. Bakker, in *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language* 153–157. On literarily transmitted epigrams as re-enacting the act of viewing a given artwork, see discussions in D. Meyer, "The Act of

proximal deictic introduces something about the judgement of Paris, viz. the identification of the intermediary as Hermes, which is no longer experienceable through sight (a *visual* order of knowledge), but can still be visualised through the audience's imagination and memory of earlier literary and artistic treatments of the episode.[25]

The poem on the return of Marpessa by Idas (5.18.2), the first in Pausanias' account and one of those without demonstratives, exemplifies the use of verbs to perform temporal *deixis*:

> Ἴδας Μάρπησσαν καλλίσφυρον, ἃν οἱ Ἀπόλλων
> ἅρπασε, τὰν Εὐανοῦ ἄγει πάλιν οὐκ ἀέκουσαν.

> Idas leads back, not unwilling, fair-ankled Marpessa, daughter of Evenus, whom Apollo snatched away.[26]

The aorist ἅρπασε in line 2 describes an action that is not contained within the temporal frame of the ongoing narrative, namely the one supposedly depicted on the chest and marked by the present tense ἄγει also in 2. A temporal sequence is thus inscribed into the scene: the speaker temporarily leaves the time-

---

Reading and the Act of Writing in Hellenistic Epigram," in *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram* 187–210; J. W. Day, *Archaic Greek Epigram and Dedication: Representation and Reperformance* (Cambridge 2010); T. Christian, *Gebildete Steine: Zur Rezeption literarischer Techniken in der Versinschriften seit dem Hellenismus* (Göttingen 2015).

[25] Interestingly, the only allusion to the judgement episode in the Homeric poems, *Il.* 24.27–30, follows a section (lines 22–24) in which Hermes also has a key role, as the gods almost unanimously urge him to steal Hector's body away from Achilles' fury. On *Il.* 24.27–30 see K. Reinhardt, "Das Parisurteil," in *Tradition und Geist: Gesammelte Essays zur Dichtung* (Göttingen 1960) 16–36; M. Davies, "The Judgement of Paris and *Iliad* Book XXIV," *JHS* 101 (1981) 56–62; K. Dowden, "Homer's Sense of Text," *JHS* 116 (1996) 47–61. See also C. J. Mackie, "*Iliad* 24 and the Judgement of Paris," *CQ* 63 (2013) 1–16, on this section as part of a wider pattern of allusion to traditional narratives of the Trojan saga in Book 24.

[26] See Zizza, *Le iscrizioni nella Periegesi* 170–174. On this episode see also Cossu, in *L'arca invisibile* 111–112.

line of the present and digresses on Apollo's earlier action.[27] By informing the reader about the background of the episode, the relative clause with the aorist adds narrative depth to the main sentence. Like Hermes' name in the Judgement epigram, here too the names of the two main characters portrayed, Idas and Marpessa, occur in first position in the epigram to allow for their unambiguous identification, even in the absence of deictic pointers. By contrast, the verbal elements describing their actions in the present of the relief (ἄγει πάλιν οὐκ ἀέκουσαν) are postponed to the end of the epigram; this implies a delay in deciphering the scene until the reader reaches the poem's conclusion.

The parenthetical remark about Marpessa's willingness to follow Idas, in the form of the double negative οὐκ ἀέκουσαν of Homeric provenance,[28] hints at the conclusion of the account reported by Apollodorus (1.7.9), where Zeus asked the girl to choose between the two contenders, Idas and Apollo, and she chose Idas. Thus, this epigram would provide the earliest attestation of such a version of the myth, by alluding to the fact that Marpessa is granted freedom of choice by the father of the

[27] Cf. Bakker, in *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language* 164–166, on Hdt. 7.207–225.

[28] The litotes recurs in Homer in a formulaic phrase about horses; with the feminine form of ἀέκων, it occurs in *Od.* 19.374, of Eurycleia; cf. the comments of M. Napolitano in E. Franchini, *Ferecrate, Krapataloi – Pseudherakles (frr. 85–163): introduzione, traduzione, commento* (Göttingen 2020) 252, on the same phrasing in Pherecr. fr.155.1 Kassel-Austin. The litotes later occurs in Mosch. *Eur.* 14 εἴρυεν οὐκ ἀέκουσαν, of Europa being dragged away "not against her will" by an unnamed woman in a dream, which is generally interpreted as in contrast with the forceful abduction of Persephone in *Hymn. Hom.Dem.* 19 ἁρπάξας δ' ἀέκουσαν (see also 72 and 124). On this, see discussion in J. Smart, "Intertextual Dynamics in Moschus's *Europa*," *Arethusa* 45 (2012) 43–55, at 48–53. It would be tempting to consider the inscription of Idas and Marpessa on Cypselus' chest a layer of mediation between these two accounts, gradually leading to the construction, through the figure of Marpessa, of a more explicit portrait of the female "willing" victim (as in the character of Europa).

gods.[29] At the same time, the use of καλλίσφυρος for Marpessa is evocative of the world of epic, as in the Homeric account of this episode (*Il.* 9.557–560) the epithet occurs twice to qualify the woman. Furthermore, Marpessa is also referred to as Evenus' daughter both in the Iliadic passage (Μαρπήσσης καλλισφύρου Εὐηνίνης, 557) and in the epigram reported by Pausanias (τὰν Εὐανοῦ, line 2). The epigram insists on the suspension of the narrative flow of the present, as signalled through the aorist form; lexical choices and syntax work in concert to evoke the mythic background of the carved relief and earlier literary treatments of the episode, which readers are thus prompted to recall.

In the case of the episode of the duel between Agamemnon and Coon, the epigrams are fused together with the description offered by Pausanias (5.19.4):

Ἰφιδάμαντος δὲ τοῦ Ἀντήνορος κειμένου, μαχόμενος πρὸς Ἀγαμέμνονα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ Κόων ἐστί· Φόβος δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος τῇ ἀσπίδι ἔπεστιν, ἔχων τὴν κεφαλὴν λέοντος. ἐπιγράμματα δὲ ὑπὲρ μὲν τοῦ Ἰφιδάμαντος νεκροῦ·
    Ἰφιδάμας οὗτός τε Κόων περιμάρναται αὐτοῦ·
τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ ἀσπίδι·
    Οὗτος μὲν Φόβος ἐστὶ, βροτῶν ὁ δ' ἔχων Ἀγαμέμνων.

While Iphidamas, the son of Antenor, is lying, Coon is over him, fighting against Agamemnon; Phobos is on the shield of Agamemnon, having the head of a lion. The inscription over the corpse of Iphidamas:
    "This is Iphidamas and Coon fights for him."
And the one on the shield of Agamemnon:
    "This is Phobos, while Agamemnon is the one among mortals carrying (him)."[30]

---

[29] Zizza, *Le iscrizioni nella Periegesi* 173–174. According to schol. bT Hom. *Il.* 9.557 f., this was also Simonides' version of the story (Simon. *PMG* 563 = 353 Poltera), but O. Poltera, *Simonides lyricus* (Basel 2008) 587–588, finds it unlikely that Simonides was involved in the development of the myth. On this episode see also Bacchyl. fr.20A Maehler.

[30] Zizza, *Le iscrizioni nella Periegesi* 192–201. See also Maddoli and Saladino,

The carved scene represented the fight between Agamemnon and Coon over the corpse of Iphidamas, Coon's younger brother who has just been killed by Agamemnon. The account of the fight is part of Agamemnon's *aristeia* (*Il.* 11.218–263). The first hexameter, carved over the lying body, focuses on the two brothers, while the second refers to Agamemnon. In using the prepositional phrase ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ to describe Coon in the relief, Pausanias plays on the ambivalence of ὑπέρ to signify the person "for" whom and "above" whom Coon is fighting. If interpreted as an indicator of ocular *deixis* describing Coon's actual posture in his representation on the chest, the preposition evokes *Il.* 11.261 τοῖο δ᾽ ἐπ᾽ Ἰφιδάμαντι κάρη ἀπέκοψε παραστάς, which similarly emphasises Coon's position at the time of his death *over* the body of his brother.[31] Pausanias seems to elaborate further on this detail of the Iliadic account by using ὑπέρ also to describe the position of the epigrams in relation to the carved figures: Coon stands over his brother, in the same way as the inscription is "over the body of Iphidamas" (ἐπιγράμματα δὲ ὑπὲρ μὲν τοῦ Ἰφιδάμαντος νεκροῦ).

Furthermore, as Pausanias reports, the iconography of the chest triggered further Homeric allusions through the visual reference to Phobos on Agamemnon's shield in the form of a man with a lion's head: this element recalls the simile of the lion describing Agamemnon's fury in war in the same Homeric passage (11.239 ὥς τε λίς) and reveals prior knowledge of *Il.* 11.36–37, on Phobos' and Deimos' portrayal on the shield of

Pausania V 117 and 302. The compound περιμάρναμαι is rare (cf. *Il.* 16.497 ἐμεῦ πέρι μάρναο χαλκῷ, also with genitive; *Od.* 24.37–39 ἀμφὶ δέ σ᾽ ἄλλοι / κτείνοντο Τρώων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν υἷες ἄριστοι, / μαρνάμενοι περὶ σεῖο, in an analogous context, of those fighting for Achilles' dead body; cf. later Nonnus *Dion.* 43.118). On this episode see also Cossu, in *L'arca invisibile* 137–138.

[31] Pausanias' deictic reference to the position of Coon "over the body" of Iphidamas would be in keeping with the fact that in these lines he provides an exact description of the carved scene (rather than of the episode *represented* in the scene).

Agamemnon.[32] In the relief, both the position of Coon and the symbolic depiction of Phobos with leonine features would have allowed readers to grasp, on different levels, the Homeric allusions and recognise the episode depicted; the demonstrative οὗτος, occurring in both hexameters to qualify Iphidamas and Phobos as "this man (*whom I see and recognise*)," similarly alludes to the presumed familiarity of the audience with the characters, whose roles in the mythic narrative are shared material between reader and narrator.

The cultural complexity of this scene is further denoted by the fact that it elaborates on the well-established iconographic scheme of the duel over a corpse.[33] At the same time, in keeping with Agamemnon's frequent characterisation as a lion in *Iliad* 11, the mention of Phobos in the second hexameter qualifies, via allegorical personification, an attribute of Agamemnon who, via Phobos' depiction on his shield, is endowed with the ability to terrify his opponent. Pausanias explains this element for his readers in the interest of an exhaustive exegesis of the chest, providing the most suitable context to understand the hexameters and the scene, and this is characteristic of Pausanias' epigraphic habit in the *Description*.[34] While the epigram establishes the

[32] On the iconography of Phobos see H. A. Shapiro, *Personification in Greek Art. The Representation of Abstract Concepts. 600–400 B.C.* (Zürich 1993) 208–215, esp. 208–209; cf. Maddoli and Saladino, *Pausania V* 302; Zizza, *Le iscrizioni nella Periegesi* 195–201; Borg, in *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram* 89 n.36.

[33] Borg, in *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram* 87. See also Giuliani, *Image and Myth* 98–102, on the same pictorial motif on the seventh-century Rhodian plate (London, British Museum, inv. A749) portraying the combat between Menelaus and Hector over the body of Euphorbus (partly inspired by *Il.* 17.70–113). This motif recurs in decorative contexts about the duel between Achilles and Memnon over the corpse of a dead warrior, either Antilochus or Melanippus; see A. Kossatz-Deissmann, "Achilleus," *LIMC* I.1 (1981), nos. 727, 833, and possibly 825.

[34] H. Whittaker, "Pausanias and his Use of Inscriptions," *SymbOslo* 66 (1991) 171–186; Zizza, *Le iscrizioni nella Periegesi* 21–114 and 399–436; Y. Z. Tzifopoulos, "Inscriptions as Literature in Pausanias' *Exegesis* of Hellas," in

physical link between Phobos and Agamemnon, Pausanias adds an extra level of symbolic significance, informing the reader that Phobos takes the form of a lion-headed man and unveiling the lion's allusive meaning. In this way Pausanias composes a narrative unit that picks up on the iconographic element of the shield and expands on its relevance for the heroic characterisation of Agamemnon.[35] Pausanias' literary mediation aims not only to unpack the concise narrative in the epigram, but also to direct his readers towards the supplementation of the imagery on the chest by means of traditional literary accounts (such as *Iliad* Book 11) and common iconographic motifs.

Pausanias' mediation proves necessary also to understand the broader context of the scene of Atlas and Heracles (5.18.4):

Ἄτλας οὐρανὸν οὗτος ἔχει, τὰ δὲ μᾶλα μεθήσει.
This Atlas holds heaven, but he will drop the apples.[36]

And this is Pausanias' description of the scene, preceding his quotation of the epigram:

Ἄτλας δὲ ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν ὤμων κατὰ τὰ λεγόμενα οὐρανόν τε ἀνέχει καὶ γῆν, φέρει δὲ καὶ τὰ Ἑσπερίδων μῆλα. ὅστις δέ ἐστιν ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἔχων τὸ ξίφος καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἄτλαντα ἐρχόμενος, ἰδίᾳ μὲν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ

Inscriptions and their Uses 149–165, at 155 and 161; cf. J. Elsner, *Art and the Roman Viewer: The Transformation of Art from the Pagan World to Christianity* (Cambridge 1995) 125–155, with 316–317 n.30, and Snodgrass, in *Pausanias: Travel and Memory* 134–135, on the "Homerist hypothesis" in Roman Imperial interpretations of early Greek art and in Pausanias' work as well, i.e. the tendency to look for scenes of Homeric inspiration because of Homer's prestige in literary, political, and philosophical circles.

[35] Borg, in *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram* 87–89. The Agamemnon lion simile occurs in *Il.* 11.113–114, 129–130, 172–177, 239. See M. Clarke, "Between Lions and Men: Images of the Hero in the *Iliad*," *GRBS* 36 (1995) 137–159, on the lion similes in the *Iliad*.

[36] See Zizza, *Le iscrizioni nella Periegesi* 182–186. On the myth and iconography of Atlas in the Graeco-Roman world see B. de Griño, R. Olmos, J. Arce, and L. J. Balmaseda, "Atlas," *LIMC* III.1 (1986) 2–16; cf. Cossu, in *L'arca invisibile* 124–126.

γεγραμμένον ἐστὶν οὐδέν, δῆλα δὲ ἐς ἅπαντας Ἡρακλέα εἶναι. γέγραπται δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις …

And Atlas, in accordance with the account, on the one hand supports heaven and earth upon his shoulders, and on the other hand carries also the apples of the Hesperides. Whoever is the man holding a sword and coming towards Atlas, nothing is inscribed specifically upon him, but it is clear to everyone that this is Heracles. And on these figures, it is written …

Pausanias clarifies that the episode depicted concerns Heracles' quest for the golden apples from the garden of the Hesperides at the behest of Eurystheus, king of Argos. The scene refers to a specific version of the myth attested in Pherecydes,[37] in which Heracles persuades Atlas to get the apples for him from the Hesperides, on the advice of Prometheus.[38] Atlas, after fetching the apples for Heracles, who in the meantime is temporarily supporting the sky for him, is unwilling to take it back, but Heracles induces him to do so by using a trick that Prometheus had previously taught him—asking Atlas to hold the sky while Heracles is arranging a carrying-pad on his head.[39] The carver

[37] This version is first attested in schol. Ap. Rhod. 4.1396–1399b quoting as authority the mid-fifth-century Athenian logographer Pherecydes (fr.17 Fowler), and whose version is later reported by Apollodorus (2.5.11).

[38] On Heracles and Prometheus see Hes. *Theog.* 526–532, with M. L. West, *Hesiod. Theogony* (Oxford 1966) 313. At *Theog.* 517–519 Atlas (holding the sky only) is already located "in front of the clear-voiced Hesperides" (Ἄτλας δ' οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχει κρατερῆς ὑπ' ἀνάγκης, / πείρασιν ἐν γαίης πρόπαρ' Ἑσπερίδων λιγυφώνων / ἑστηώς, κεφαλῇ τε καὶ ἀκαμάτῃσι χέρεσσι); see also 746–748. Cf. Hom. *Od.* 1.53–54 on Atlas holding the "pillars" between earth and heaven (ἔχει δέ τε κίονας αὐτὸς / μακράς, αἳ γαῖάν τε καὶ οὐρανὸν ἀμφὶς ἔχουσιν).

[39] According to M. L. West, "The Prometheus Trilogy," in M. Lloyd (ed.), *Aeschylus* (Oxford 2007) 359–396, at 391, Pherecydes' narration of the trick of the carrying-pad may have been suggested by a metope of the temple of Zeus at Olympia (Paus. 5.10.9), completed just before the games of 456 B.C., in which Atlas brings the apples to Heracles, who supports the sky with the help of a padded cushion, in the presence of a female figure, either one of the Hesperides or Athena. See Frazer, *Pausanias's Description of Greece* III 524–525

of the Atlas relief may have already been aware of this version of the myth before Pherecydes reported it: the carved figure of Atlas, holding *both* heaven *and* the apples at the same time, as Pausanias reports (οὐρανόν τε ἀνέχει καὶ γῆν, φέρει δὲ καὶ τὰ Ἑσπερίδων μῆλα) and the epigram suggests, condenses the mythic narrative of the Titan's encounter with Heracles in all its constitutive phases. Indeed, the scene represents Atlas simultaneously in two different moments of the account (first holding heaven, and then with Heracles' apples) *before* he is induced to drop the apples against his will.[40] Based on Pausanias' description, the scene constructs a putative anterior episode to the traditional account, while the epigram anticipates its conclusion according to the mythic version later codified by Pherecydes, as signalled by the future tense μεθήσει at the end of the epigram.[41] In this respect, the carver of the scene is very similar to Archaic vase painters, whose recollection of a specific episode to illustrate would have been contaminated by different versions of the same

with fig. 68; H. V. Herrmann, *Olympia: Heiligtum und Wettkampfstätte* (Munich 1972), pl. 57; Maddoli and Saladino, *Pausania* V 236; J. Boardman, *Greek Art* (London 1996) 138, fig. 128. Cf. Paus. 5.11.5 on another depiction of the same episode inside the temple of Zeus on the barriers painted by Panaenus, with Atlas also holding both heaven and sky. On this passage and scene see Frazer 540–541; Maddoli and Saladino 241. See also Paus. 6.19.8 on another representation of this episode with the Hesperides, on the treasury of the Epidamnians.

[40] On such simultaneity of the actions, see also Frazer, *Pausanias's Description of Greece* III 614; de Griño et al., *LIMC* III.1 (1986) 13; Borg, in *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram* 91. As observed by D. Ogden, *Drakōn: Dragon Myth and Serpent Cult in the Greek and Roman Worlds* (Oxford 2013) 38–39, "the iconographic tradition that emerged in the fourth century elided Atlas' role and had Heracles prevailing upon the Hesperides directly."

[41] On a similar construction of a putative anterior episode to a traditional scene see Ogden, *Drakōn: Dragon Myth* 32. Cf. Zizza, *Le iscrizioni nella Periegesi* 185, on the ironic implications of this part of the line (τὰ δὲ μᾶλα μεθήσει), pointing to Atlas' paradoxical inability to hold the apples, despite his ability to hold the vault of heaven. On a similar mechanism of anticipation of future events in pictorial art see Giuliani, *Image and Myth* 104–105, about a (now lost) sixth-century Corinthian column crater.

narrative.[42] Furthermore, as already observed,[43] the epigram recalls the initial part of Hesiod *Theog.* 517 (Ἄτλας δ' οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχει) with the one, but substantial, difference that the epic adjective εὐρύν is replaced on the chest by the deictic οὗτος: as in the case of the two hexameters on Iphidamas and Phobos, here too the demonstrative suggests that the identification of the figure on the chest as Atlas was more easily inferable by readers. This was possibly due to the distinctive iconography of the episode in its mythic imagery, as the same Pausanias confirms about Heracles in the relief who, despite not being mentioned in the epigram, can be identified by any passer-by. The referential function of the epigram, thus, moves beyond the "hereness" of the inscription to delve into the related myth and its literary treatments.

These case studies exemplify different forms of access to the underlying mythological narratives that the epigrams on the Chest of Cypselus, together with Pausanias' explanations, provide to the readers. As to the deictic ὅδε in the Judgement epigram, pointing to newly introduced and prominent information about Hermes' role in the relief, its referential function shifts from pointing to a fixed perceivable moment on the original monument-cum-epigram to pointing to Hermes in relation to the subjective *here and now* of subsequent readers. Forms of the deictic οὗτος suggest a higher degree of inferability of their referents on the part of the reading audience, pointing to shared narrative material and acknowledging the centrality of readers in determining the present of the utterance. Verbal *deixis* inscribes temporal sequences of the past and the future, reflecting the narrative depth of the mythic episode that inspired the epigram-relief ensemble. Pausanias' descriptive remarks make up for the absence of the chest, bringing the sensible features of the reliefs before the readers' eyes. The encounter with the chest is made into a meaningful experience both for ancient viewers and for subsequent readers, each provided with the most suitable

[42] Borg, in *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram* 98.
[43] Jones, *JHS* 14 (1894) 51; Elmer, *ClAnt* 24 (2005) 21.

frame of reference to decipher the artefact. The following section, on the epigrams from *AP* 3, will explore whether similar representational strategies are deployed to engage with the epigrams' visual apparatuses and their mythic past.

The epigrams from the temple of Queen Apollonis at Cyzicus

The illusion of mediation between traditional myths, their purported rendering in epigraphic form, and their literary transmission (and re-reading) is at stake also in the nineteen epigrams of the third book of the *Palatine Anthology*.[44] According to the introductory lemma of the book, the poems were engraved on the *stylopinakia* of a temple dedicated to Queen Apollonis at Cyzicus, erected by her sons Eumenes II and Attalus II:

> ἐν Κυζίκῳ εἰς τὸν ναὸν Ἀπολλωνίδος τῆς μητρὸς Ἀττάλου καὶ Εὐμενοῦς ἐπιγράμματα ἃ εἰς τὰ στυλοπινάκια ἐγέγραπτο περιέχοντα ἀναγλύφους ἱστορίας ὡς ὑποτέτακται.

> At Cyzicus, in the temple of Apollonis the mother of Attalus and Eumenes, the epigrams inscribed on the *stylopinakia* containing stories wrought in relief, as follows.

Apart from this lemma, no other evidence exists of a temple for Queen Apollonis in her hometown, although it can be assumed that she received such honour as part of the Attalid propaganda following her union with Attalus I in the third century B.C.[45] As

---

[44] They occur in *Pal.gr.* 23, fol. 76–81. *AP* 3.17 is almost entirely missing from the series (only the first three words πυρὸς καὶ γαίης are transmitted, followed by a blank space), but its lemma is in the manuscript; this element suggests that neither the epigrams nor the lemmata were composed and put together by the Palatine scribes; on this see A. Cameron, *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes* (Oxford 1993) 148; Maltomini, *AnnPisa* IV 7 (2002) 19 n.6, who also observes that the *lemmata in textu* can be ascribed directly to the same source used for the epigrams, using the case of *AP* 13 as a parallel.

[45] Ballestrazzi, *RivFil* 145 (2017) 128–130. See also B. Virgilio, *Gli Attalidi di Pergamo. Fama, eredità, memoria* (Pisa 1993) 44–52, on the praise of Apollonis' excellence during her life and on the cult of the deified queen, and *Lancia, diadema e porpora. Il re e la regalità ellenistica* (Pisa 2003) 104–106 and 243–245, on second-century B.C. epigraphic evidence of such cult, especially from Teos and Hierapolis.

---

to the epigrams, these are generally regarded as later additions or creations, produced not earlier than the sixth century A.D.[46] There is no reason to doubt that the reliefs existed and that the composer of the epigrams had some sort of access to them, probably through a written source prior to *AP* describing the monument. The texts comment on episodes of filial devotion and family relationships,[47] and have prompted scholarly interest over time for a series of partially solved issues. Among them, there is the interpretation of the *stylopinakia*, since the word is an absolute *hapax*:[48] this term would identify small tablets carved in relief and attached to each column of the temple, as the *lemmata in textu* and their epigraphic terminology seem to confirm (cf. the lemmata to *AP* 3.2 Ὁ βʹ κίων ἔχει …, "The second pillar has …"; 3.9 Ἐν τῷ θʹ Πελίας καὶ Νηλεὺς ἐλλελάξευνται, "On the ninth

---

[46] Demoen, *AntCl* 57 (1988) 237, 245, 248; Maltomini, *AnnPisa* IV 7 (2002) 19; cf. Goldhill, *Preposterous Poetics* 32–34.

[47] Thus, revolving around a unitary theme, see by contrast Brilliant, *Visual Narratives* 37–38, on the "visual discontinuity" of Pausanias' account of the Chest of Cypselus, as in his description he moves around from panel to panel by addition, without following (or *failing* to identify) a specific narrative thread.

[48] H. Van Looy and K. Demoen, "Le temple en l'honneur de la reine Apollonis à Cyzique et l'énigme des stylopinakia," *EpigAnat* 8 (1986) 133–144, esp. 137; Maltomini, *AnnPisa* IV 7 (2002) 21–24. See also C. Picard, "Notes d'archéologie grecque," *REA* 29 (1927) 241–285, at 255–275, and 267–272 on the parallel with the decorative system of the *columnae caelatae*, which is particularly attested in Asia Minor; F.-H. Massa Pairault, *AFLPer(class)* 19 (1981/2) 161, for the parallel between the *stylopinakia* and the representation of small columns and decorative candlesticks with little *pinakes* in Third Style Pompeian painting, e.g. in the House of M. Lucretius Fronto, cf. G. Pugliese Carratelli and I. Baldassarre, *Pompei: pitture e mosaici* III (Rome 1990) 1006–1017, esp. no. 83a–b. For another Third Style example of small column with *pinax* portrayed in a wall painting from Villa Imperiali, in the Civita Giuliana area, see G. Stefani, *Pompei, vecchi scavi sconosciuti: la villa rinvenuta dal marchese Giovanni Imperiali in località Civita* (Rome 1994) 78–80, pl. 5.1. A further parallel is provided by Paus. (5.20.7), who quotes the verses inscribed on the πινάκιον χαλκοῦν in front of the last standing στυλίς of the house of Oenomaus at Olympia.

Pelias and Neleus are hewn in stone"; 3.10 Ἐν δὲ τῷ κατὰ δύσιν πλευρῷ ἐστιν ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ ι΄ πίνακος Εὔνοος γεγλυμμένος καὶ Θόας, "On the western side, on the initial part of the tenth panel, Eunoos and Thoas are engraved").

If, on the one hand, the epigrams and their lemmata do not shed full light on the temple's architecture, on the other hand their reading suggests an attempt to construct an "architecture of myth" through engagement with episodes from the mythic and literary tradition that readers are prompted to recall in a fictional journey through the carved panels. The practice of juxtaposing scenes from myth in visual form on a single monument, as a form of distributed narrative, has been related to the artistic production of the Hellenistic period, which the epigrams on the Cyzicene *stylopinakia* may recall.[49] Indeed, the epigrams in *AP* 3 are independent poems that claim to engage with the accompanying images (of which also the prose lemmata reveal autonomous knowledge) but were conceived as a unitary poetic work.[50] They denote mastery of the Greek mythic tradition and represent a later development of the synergy between visual and verbal media, of which Cypselus' chest represents a significant example among Archaic artworks.[51]

---

[49] Such a practice of allusion could be related to similar combinations and meaningful associations of myths in Classical architectural and sculptural production. See Brilliant, *Visual Narratives* 35–37 (about the epigrams from *AP* 3), 66, and 37–38 (on Cypselus' chest); K. Lorenz, "Distributed Narrative: A Very Short History of Juxtaposing Myths on Pompeian Walls," in L. Audley-Miller et al. (eds.), *Wandering Myths: Transcultural Uses of Myth in the Ancient World* (Berlin 2018) 143–167, at 144.

[50] Maltomini, *AnnPisa* IV 7 (2002) 30–33, who draws a parallel between these epigrams and the ecphrasis on the statues of the Baths of Zeuxippus by Christodorus of Coptos, transmitted in *AP* 2, namely a unitary poem that could be read as an assemblage of descriptions. See also Goldhill, *Preposterous Poetics* 96.

[51] This synergy will increase from the seventh century B.C. onwards, when writing develops a symbiotic relationship with narrative and visual culture; see R. Osborne and A. Pappas, "Writing on Archaic Greek Pottery," in

---

This analysis of cases from *AP* 3 suggests that the deictic efficacy of the epigrams is enhanced by the alternation of different narrative voices, allowing the readers to engage with the characters and scenes with varying degrees of proximity. The epigrams are mostly uttered in the third- (*AP* 3.1, 3, 4, 6, 12, 13, 15, 18) and second-person voices (3.5, 7–11, 14, 16, 19). In the latter group, epigrams 7 and 10 use imperative forms for further emphasis: through the reader's voice, the speaker "instructs" the portrayed characters to perform the actions that they are expected to execute, based on the related mythic narrative (3.7: line 2 κτείνατε, line 5 καθάπτετε; 3.10: line 1 φαῖνε, line 5 στεῖχε … σύ). Two cases that slightly diverge from this pattern are 3.15 and 3.18: here the third-person voice emphatically shifts in the final couplet to a second-person address to the poems' main characters (Glaucus in 3.15, Cleobis and Biton in 3.18). Only *AP* 3.2, discussed below, is uttered through the first-person perspective of the protagonist, Telephus (line 2 ἐπέβην, line 4 ἀγάγω), which enhances the liveliness of the account and furthers the reader's capacity to impersonate the main character. As for the demonstratives, in contrast with the widespread use of the anaphoric deictic οὗτος in the epigrams from the Chest of Cypselus, *AP* 3 features only very few forms of the proximal ὅδε:[52] as in the case of the Judgement epigram from the chest examined above, this deictic introduces the referents to the reader as new and salient pieces of information, as if these were not easily inferable from the reliefs.

Epigram *AP* 3.1 is uttered from the third-person perspective and displays verbal *deixis* to mark the divide between the mythic

Z. Newby et al. (eds.), *Art and Inscriptions in the Ancient World* (Cambridge 2007) 131–155; Giuliani, *Image and Myth* 89–130; J. Whitley, "The Material Entanglements of Writing Things Down," in L. C. Nevett (ed.), *Theoretical Approaches to the Archaeology of Ancient Greece: Manipulating Material Culture* (Ann Arbor 2017) 71–103.

[52] *AP* 3.1.1, 3.7.2 and 6, 3.9.2, 3.10.1, 3.12.1, 3.13.1, 3.19.1—except for ἐκεῖνος qualifying Amyntor in 3.3.5, which picks up on his initial mention in line 1.

episode and its representation:

> Τάνδε Διὸς δμαθεῖσαν ἐν ὠδίνεσσι κεραυνῷ,
>   καλλίκομον Κάδμου παῖδα καὶ Ἁρμονίης,
> ματέρα θυρσοχαρὴς ἀνάγει γόνος ἐξ Ἀχέροντος,
>   τὰν ἄθεον Πενθεῦς ὕβριν ἀμειβόμενος.

> This woman here, overcome in childbirth by the thunderbolt of
> Zeus, the fair-haired daughter of Cadmus and Harmonia, as a
> mother the thyrsus-loving son leads up from Acheron, he who
> responds to the godless insolence of Pentheus.

As in the case of the aorist ἅρπασε in the Marpessa epigram (297
above), here the aorist participle δμαθεῖσαν in line 1 inscribes a
sequence of anteriority into the scene, thus performing temporal
deixis.[53] This aorist form contrasts not only with the present
tenses following it (ἀνάγει … ἀμειβόμενος, 3–4), but also with the
proximal deictic τάνδε preceding it. On the one hand, the
demonstrative points to the arrival of new information to the
readers, guiding them to identify the main female character in
the episode as Semele; the fact that she is not named in the
epigram furthers the impression that her identification on the
part of the panel's imaginary viewers was not immediately ap-
parent. On the other hand, the aorist describes a "timeless"
event (namely her death by Zeus' lightning), which would not
have been portrayed in the relief scene.[54] The sequence of char-
acters in the epigram (this woman here – Zeus – Cadmus –
Harmonia – thyrsus-loving son – Pentheus) provides the reader
with further clues, beyond the deictic τάνδε, to identify and
visualise the two characters who lack explicit naming, Semele
and Dionysus.[55] At the same time, the use of an external
narrative voice, located in the third-person verbs throughout the

[53] The phrase δμαθεῖσαν … κεραυνῷ evokes Pind. *Pyth.* 8.17 δμᾶθεν δὲ
κεραυνῷ, of Zeus' victory over Typhoeus.

[54] Bakker, in *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language* 165.

[55] Note the genitive Πενθεῦς in the epigram's last line: its circumflex accent
would not have been marked in the inscription, thus creating confusion be-
tween Pentheus and Dionysus as the subject of ἀμειβόμενος.

epigram, depersonalises the account and increases the distance between the supposed poem-*pinakion* pairing and the background of Semele's myth.

By contrast, in *AP* 3.7 the divide between mythic narrative and its perceivable manifestations is bridged through the dialogic mode of narration, which stages the illusion that the reader may "direct" the characters' actions:

> Ἀμφίων καὶ Ζῆθε, Διὸς σκυλακεύματα, Δίρκην
>   κτείνατε τάνδ' ὀλέτιν ματέρος Ἀντιόπας,
> δέσμιον ἣν πάρος εἶχε διὰ ζηλήμονα μῆνιν·
>   νῦν δ' ἱκέτις αὐτὴ λίσσετ' ὀδυρομένη·
> ᾇ γε καὶ ἐκ ταύροιο καθάπτετε δίπλακα σειρήν,
>   ὄφρα δέμας σύρῃ τῆσδε κατὰ ξυλόχου.

Amphion and Zethus, whelps of Zeus, kill this Dirce here, who intended to slay your mother Antiope, whom formerly she held captive because of her jealous spite. But now she herself is suppliant and begs lamenting. Tie her to a bull with a double rope, so that it may drag her body through this thicket here.

According to the lemma, the scene purportedly represented Amphion and Zethus tying Dirce to a bull (προσάπτοντες ταύρῳ τὴν Δίρκην), but in the epigram this action is presented as a direct command uttered by the speaker to the characters as the story unfolds. Such narrative development is exemplified by the shift in Dirce's characterisation, through homeoteleuton, from ὀλέτις in line 2 to ἱκέτις in 4, marking the woman's sudden change of attitude. Furthermore, a temporal shift emerges from the juxtaposition of πάρος and νῦν in 3 and 4, pointing respectively to the narrative background of the episode and its present representation on the relief. The forward-pointing demonstratives τάνδε (2, of Dirce) and τῆσδε (6, of the thicket) fulfil a twofold deictic function: on the one hand, they foster the illusion that the viewer's gaze is guided through the sequence of elements as they appear on the *pinakion*, as if the deictics provided the audience with imaginary "stage directions"; on the other hand, they introduce new and cognitively salient elements of the narrative to the reader who, giving voice to the "I" of the epigram and uttering

the direct commands κτείνατε and καθάπτετε (2 and 5), enacts the mythic episode in the present of the speech act.

AP 3.2 is uttered from the first-person perspective of its protagonist, Telephus; this narrative mode allows readers, who lend their voice to the speaking hero, to identify with him:[56]

> Τὸν βαθὺν Ἀρκαδίης προλιπὼν πάτον εἴνεκα ματρὸς
>   Αὔγης τᾶσδ' ἐπέβην γᾶς Τευθραντιάδος,
> Τήλεφος, Ἡρακλέους φίλος γόνος αὐτὸς ὑπάρχων,
>   ὄφρα μιν ἂψ ἀγάγω ἐς πέδον Ἀρκαδίης.

Leaving the deep path of Arcadia for the sake of my mother Auge, I, Telephus, being myself the beloved descendant of Heracles, set foot on this Teuthranian land, in order to lead her back to Arcadia.

The epigram alludes to the version of Telephus' myth related in Sophocles' lost *Mysians*. From Hyginus' *Fab.* 100[57] we infer that this play was concerned with Telephus' departure from Arcadia to Mysia (the "Teuthranian land" in the epigram) to find his mother.[58] Hyginus also reports that, after the mother-son recognition (to which the epigram's lemma refers), Telephus takes his mother back to Arcadia (*in patriam suam reduxit*), as also reported in the epigram (ὄφρα μιν ἂψ ἀγάγω ἐς πέδον Ἀρκαδίης). The hero relates the episode in the first person (ἐπέβην, ἀγάγω): the appositive phrase in line 3, in which the speaker identifies himself as Telephus, is in keeping with the characterisation of the relief as a scene of recognition, which is confirmed by the lemma of the epigram (Ὁ β΄ κίων ἔχει Τήλεφον ἀνεγνωρισμένον τῇ ἑαυτοῦ μητρί, "The second pillar has Telephus recognised by his mother"). The deictic τᾶσδε in 2, allowing for the identification of the setting as the Teuthranian land, is pronounced by the reader as "this one *before me*" and therefore recreates the fiction

---

[56] For a discussion of this case see Goldhill, *Preposterous Poetics* 33–34.

[57] P. K. Marshall, *Hyginus: Fabulae*[2] (Munich 2002) 92–93.

[58] *TrGF* IV frr.409–418; A. H. Sommerstein, "Fragments and Lost Tragedies," in A. Markantonatos (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Sophocles* (Leiden 2012) 191–209, at 201 and 205–207.

that the reading audience is an integral part of it.[59] As is often the case in the poems in *AP* 3, the lemma and the epigram provide different forms of access to the mythic episode, while complementing each other:[60] the speaker of the poem puts in a nutshell the full account of Telephus and Auge, while the lemma identifies the scene on the panel as a scene of recognition. The mentions of Heracles in 3 and of the king of Mysia, Teuthras (through the toponym γᾶς Τευθραντιάδος, 2) further allow the reader to visualise the mythic narrative and to integrate it into the (imagined) experience of the panel.

Thus the epigrams from *AP* 3 analysed here exemplify the use of different strategies respectively for bridging the divide between traditional myths and readership, by way of textual and (imagined) pictorial representation, namely the epigrams and their *stylopinakia*. In *AP* 3.1 the third-person narrative voice, in addition to aorist tenses inscribing temporal sequences of the past, marks the distance between the *realia* of representation and the remoteness of myth. Such a divide is reduced in *AP* 3.7 where, through second-person utterances and imperatives, the readers of the epigram are involved in the enactment of the represented scene. The readers' involvement is further heightened in *AP* 3.2: through the first-person voice of the narrative's protagonist, Telephus, they are drawn into the myth that inspired the epigram.

This paper has focused on two illustrative series of "literary

---

[59] This function of deictics, contributing to the fictional stage setting, is commonly used in Euripidean prologues to define the setting of the tragedy; see I. J. F. de Jong, "Sophocles *Trachiniae* 1–48, Euripidean Prologues, and their Audiences," in R. J. Allan et al. (eds.), *The Language of Literature: Linguistic Approaches to Classical Texts* (Leiden 2007) 7–28, at 19–28; S. Scullion, "Problems in the Prologue and Parodos of *Bacchae*," in P. J. Finglass et al. (eds.), *Hesperos: Studies in Ancient Greek Poetry Presented to M. L. West* (Oxford 2007) 239–258, at 247–250.

[60] See also the lemma to *AP* 3.14, on Tityus shot by Apollo and Artemis, whereas the epigram suggests that the giant was killed by Zeus, following Hyginus' version of the myth (*Fab.* 55, *a Iove fulmine est interfectus*).

inscriptions" that play with the ambiguity between their literary status and their absent epigraphic reality. Neither series is descriptive in a strict sense: the epigrams from the chest conform to the type of explanatory *Beischriften* (i.e. captions-style texts),[61] identifying the narratives and characters that enable Pausanias' description. The epigrams from *AP* 3 seem the product of a late erudite with an interest in mythography and the poetics of ecphrasis, as denoted by the emphasis on the scenes' content and by the lack of engagement with their materiality.[62] In both sequences, the *epigrammatopoioi* toyed with the idea of using the epigrams to engage with a broader repertoire of literary antecedents and myths by evoking, condensing, and modifying specific aspects of them. In order to do so, *deixis* is employed to elaborate on the dialectics between visual and verbal communication.[63] The literary mediation performed by Pausanias' explanatory remarks and by the prose lemmata in *AP* 3 contributes to enhance the *Deixis am Phantasma* of the epigrams: Pausanias employs the epigraphic evidence observed at Olympia to expand on aspects of the portrayed narratives that transcend the boundaries of their epigraphic reality, with the main aim of enriching his exegesis and instructing his readers about the main sites, monuments, and literary traditions of Greece.[64] Likewise the lemmata in *AP* 3 reveal awareness of the practice of pairing

[61] A. E. Raubitschek, "Das Denkmal-Epigramm," in A. Dihle (ed.), *L'Épigramme grecque* (Geneva 1968) 3–26; Elmer, *ClAnt* 24 (2005) 13–14, 19.

[62] As observed also by Maltomini, *AnnPisa* IV 7 (2002) 30–32.

[63] See discussion in É. Prioux, *Regards alexandrins: histoire et théorie des arts dans l'épigramme hellénistique* (Leuven 2007), and *Petits musées en vers: épigramme et discours sur les collections antiques* (Paris 2008) 29–121; M. J. Squire, *Image and Text in Graeco-Roman Antiquity* (Cambridge 2009) 176–189 and 239–288, and "Reading a View: Poem and Picture in the Greek Anthology," *Ramus* 39 (2010) 73–103.

[64] Tzifopoulos, in *Inscriptions and their Uses* 161; see also F. Chamoux, "Les épigrammes dans Pausanias," in D. Knoepfler et al. (eds.), *Éditer, traduire, commenter Pausanias en l'an 2000* (Geneva 2001) 79–91, at 80 and 89–90; Snodgrass, in *Pausanias: Travel and Memory* 136–137; Zizza, *Le iscrizioni nella Periegesi* 439–443.

images with poems in real-life reading contexts,[65] and expand on the episodes that the epigrams describe to relate them to the wider mythic tradition. The information provided by Pausanias and the lemmata of Book 3 bridge the gap between the epigrams' literary status and their (purported) epigraphic contexts, thus inviting the readers to transcend questions of monumental reality and embrace the epigrams' "poetics of simulation."[66]

February, 2024   Scuola Superiore Meridionale, Naples
                                  f.scicolone@ssmeridionale.it

[65] On which practice see Prioux, *Petits musées* 141–340.
[66] Squire, *AJP* 131 (2010) 589–634.