DEICTIC AMBIGUITY AND AUTO-REFERENTIALITY: SOME EXAMPLES FROM GREEK POETICS

CLAUDE CALAME
(Jenny Strauss Clay, translator)

The linguistic phenomenon of deixis renders possible verbal references to the space and time of, as well as to the participants in, the act of communication. Deixis thus is a process belonging to the "enactment into discourse" (*mise en discours*); it renders possible an extra-discursive reference that is conveyed by discursive means. The linguistic forms, mostly pronouns or adverbs, that facilitate such extra-discursive references correspond to what Émile Benveniste called "the formal apparatus of enunciation": spatial forms of "here," temporal forms of "now," and pronominal forms of "I" and "you." This means that, from the point of view of linguistics, deixis is related not only to the transition from the intra-discursive to the extra-discursive, but also to the distinction, also outlined by Benveniste, between *histoire* (or preferably *récit*) and *discours*. Thus while the use of forms of "I"/"you" and of "here" and "now" serves to mark *discours*, *récit*, by contrast, would be characterized by the presence of forms of "he"/"she," by "there," and by the aorist.[1] We will have to return later to the relevance of this second distinction. But extra-discursive reference via deictic forms can also

1 Benveniste 1974.79-88; see also Benveniste 1966.258–66 and 237–57 for the distinction between *histoire* and *récit*. Notice, however, from the outset, that the distinction between *histoire* (corresponding to narrative) and *discours* (characterized by markers like "I," "you," "here," and "now") requires some serious qualification: see Adam, Lugrin, and Revaz 1998.

Arethusa 37 (2004) 415–443 © 2004 by The Johns Hopkins University Press

have content; the pronominal designation may also be linked to indications related to the object of the enunciation itself, that is to say, the act of enunciation may be presented as a speech-act and thereby assume a programmatic character. This is the case in Greek literature, especially when a poem corresponds to an act of singing and when, as a consequence, poetic recitation corresponds to the function of the poem with its contents in the "performance" itself, within the situation of an "enactment into discourse" through its execution in a song of ritual or cultic character.

These strategies of enunciative auto-designation are not, however, limited exclusively to ritual poems (which are improperly classified as "lyric" poetry). In epic, for example, the introductory invocation to the Muse is frequently linked to certain auto-referential indications referring to the act of communication itself, in addition to the narrative contents communicated, as, for instance, in the opening of the *Iliad*: "Sing, goddess, the wrath of Achilles, son of Peleus, the cursed wrath that brought innumerable griefs upon the Achaeans." The description of the general theme of the bardic recitation (the wrath of Achilles, evidently to be the unifying subject of the story to come) is accompanied by an indication of its manner of communication through an allusion to the singing of the ἀοιδός, ἄειδε. Similarly, the beginning of Hesiod's *Theogony* ("Let us begin to sing the Muses who inhabit Helicon") describes the verbal action of singing at the very moment it is being realized. Through the coincidence of discourse and song, the invocation presents itself as a speech-act—or, rather, a song-act; it announces, through the reference to the Muses, the theme of the lengthy hymn to these goddesses. This hymn to the Muses itself forms the prelude to the theogonic poem that follows. The *incipit* of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* ("I will remember and not forget Apollo, the archer, who makes the gods tremble in fear") also constitutes a genuine speech-act. While announcing that the subject of the hymn is praise of Apollo, the "I" of the speaker-bard here adopts the function of poetic memory usually attributed to Mnemosyne, the mother of the Muses. Although it uses Homeric diction to introduce a number of important episodes from the biography of the god, this utterance is no less "performative" than the poetic and self-referential expression of the "I" in those compositions (improperly labeled "lyric") that belong to the genre of melic poetry.[2]

---

2 For the different types of openings in Homeric poetry, see Calame 1995.49–86. For the countless misunderstandings arising from the category of "lyric" poetry, see Calame 1998b.104–10.

I. PRELUDE: THE PRACTICAL DEIXIS OF HESIOD'S *WORKS AND DAYS*

This point concerning the performativity of programmatic deixis can be illustrated by an example that is more complex than it appears at first sight. In the beginning of the *Works and Days* of Hesiod, the narrator-speaker of the poem places the words he addresses to Perses under the patronage of the Muses and the straightening of crooked legal judgments under the control of Zeus; before addressing Perses directly, he calls on these divinities in the second person. He then abandons the mode of what Benveniste calls *discours* (where such addresses are required) and adopts the mode of *récit*. In this descriptive mode, he sketches a distinction between the Eris that one ought to praise and the blameworthy Eris that one must reject (11–26).[3] But through the evocation of a series of artisans engaged in a positive rivalry—which also embraces bards—the positive affirmation of the good Strife introduces a contrary verbal movement: from an assertion in the third person within a descriptive-narrative mode, to a direct address in an enunciative mode to the addressee of the poem, Perses (27).[4]

This new enunciative anchoring of the discourse sung by the poet links the question of Eris with the conflict that sets the narrator-speaker, probably Hesiod, in opposition to his addressee, Perses. Their quarrel must be resolved here and now (αὖθι, 35) by the two participants in the enunciation, who are linked by the "we" of the verb form in the imperative subjunctive: "let's decide our quarrel" (διακρινώμεθα, 35);[5] and they must resolve it through straight judgments directly inspired by the Zeus, who was evoked, then invoked, in the proem. The reference is to a situation in the past when, after the division of their inheritance between a "me" and a "you," the latter got more by flattering the kings who are always ready to "recognize this cause here" and to give their pronouncement (τήνδε δίκην ἐθέλουσι δικάσσαι, 39). In reference to that past situation, the issue is, for the time being at least, about settling a dispute through poetic speech. The deictic markers presented by the sequence of poetic statements reveal that this

3 For an enunciative analysis of the prelude to the *Works and Days*, see Calame 1996.

4 The generic character of the addressee of the *Works and Days*—although perhaps based on an historical and biographical reality—is demonstrated by Pucci 1996.200–06. Rousseau 1996.93–115, 133–42 recognizes the enunciative implications of the transitions indicated here.

5 The local sense of αὖθι is explained by West 1978.150. See also Rousseau 1996.149.

poetic speech of settlement corresponds to the present poem, sung *hic et nunc* in relation to a speaker "I" and an addressee "you."

With its performative value derived from the coincidence between the invitation to a judicial judgment and the poetic speech with which the speaker and his addressee are associated here and now, the poem itself represents that judgment. The direct presence and the active realization of this poetic pronouncement is reinforced by the opening invitation to the Muses to intervene "here" (δεῦτε, 2), a deictic marker involving a spatial presence, which is also found in the openings of many melic poems. In addition to the pragmatic dimension related to the practical and social effects that also play a role in narrative poems like epic, the specifically performative character of melic poems as acts of singing scarcely needs emphasis.[6] Given the fact that the speaker ends by directly addressing the kings in what follows, the speech produced by the poet—which coincides with the *Works and Days* itself—could offer a substitute for the judgment that the kings are supposed to pronounce. However that may be, the poem does constitute the necessary foundation for such a judgment.[7] Attached to the situation of enunciation by various deictic forms that define the "here," the "now," and the persons engaged in the exchange, the first part of the *Works and Days*, before the lengthy "myths," also points by means of deictic markers to its enunciative content: the performance of the poem. Its "utterance" corresponds to a δίκη and amounts to "pronouncing a verdict" (39).[8] The poetic function of the *Works and Days* thus fulfills itself in this (sung) juridical sentence.

Δίκη is modified by ὅδε (τήνδε δίκην); the function of this deictic marker is not limited to pointing to the poem itself as a juridical sentence corresponding to a judgment in the case at hand. In addition to this extra-discursive sense, there is also an intra-discursive reference through the use of anaphora: the demonstrative τήνδε also refers to the performative speech act of the verdict itself (διακρινώμεθα, 35), which is supposed to settle the dispute with one of the straight judgments inspired by Zeus. This mode of

---

6 For the deictic sense of δεῦτε and for its use in melic poetry, see Calame 1998a. We will here adhere to the strict definition of the "performative" elaborated, from the point of view of the "utterance," by Benveniste 1966.267–76; for Greek poetics, the reader can also refer to the additional remarks in Calame 1999.125–28.

7 See also the interpretations, in part divergent, in Nagy 1990a.63–67 and Rousseau 1996.149–50.

8 On this sense of τήνδε δίκην δικάσσαι, see West 1978.152.

reference within the discourse is already actualized at the beginning of the poem by the expression Ἔρις ἥδε (24); it refers to the good Strife, whose operation the poem has already described, and to the practical conditions for its realization. On the other hand, the reference through the use of ὧδε to the disputes and unjust acts that Perses will not be able to repeat (σοὶ δ' οὐκέτι δεύτερον ἔσται ὧδ' ἔρδειν, 34–35) evidently refers to a reality external to the one constructed within the text. Nevertheless, in a secondary sense, the deictic marker that modifies the good Eris also seems to refer to the positive rivalry—the good Eris—toward which Perses is urged in the situation of communication; and inversely, "to act in this manner here" refers to the description and reproaches that precede within the text itself.

Later, when the discourse is again addressed directly to Perses after the three narratives, δίκη is viewed in more general terms as justice in opposition to immoderation (ὕβριν, 213): in some cases, this notion of moderation is left undefined (δίκη δ' ὑπὲρ ὕβριος ἴσχει, 217); in others, it corresponds to an anthropomorphic figure (τῆς δὲ Δίκης ῥόθος, 220); or, on occasion, it surfaces in the plural to represent straight (or crooked) judgments (σκολιῇς δὲ δίκῃς, 221); or, finally, it is reduced to an adjective, sometimes also in the neuter plural, that represents the concept (δικαίου, 226). So when the speaker's commands concerning the means of realizing δίκη are no longer addressed to Perses but to the kings, the deictic τήνδε, referring to the justice that they, too, must take into consideration (καταφράζεσθε, 248), refers intra-discursively to δίκη's just-described general functioning.

At the end of the discussion, however, after a fresh invitation to the kings to consider everything that has been said (ταῦτα, 263), the use of τήνδε (269) to designate the δίκη controlled by the omniscient gaze of Zeus can also refer to the present state of justice. The extra-discursive reference to the communicative situation, emphasized by the particularizing particle καί ("this justice here as well," 269), is rendered more likely by the speaker's forceful interruption in the first person, with a direct reference to the present situation (νῦν δὴ ἐγώ, 270). This is followed by a fresh appeal to Perses (274) summarizing the argument for justice, "by far the greatest good," and a lengthy discussion of its corollary: prosperity through work. The realization of justice has its proper place: the city (πόλις, 269), which is well represented by the return to "this justice here" in the *hic et nunc* of the enunciative communication.

With its double (intra- and extra-discursive) reference to what has been constructed within the poetic discourse and to the actual circumstances

of communication, the first section of the *Works and Days* is self-enclosed. Through the medium of poetry, the speech-act possesses a content: poetic speech promotes the realization of δίκη within the polis, specifically within the exact circumstances under which it is formulated. Within the dialectic between its effective realization as a concrete judgment in the present situation and the more general discussion concerning the realization of the justice of Zeus in the human city, the poem, despite its Homeric diction, nevertheless fully inscribes itself within the didactic genre.[9]

As we will see, because of such programmatic and self-referential deixis between intra- and extra-discursive levels, the traditional distinction between *histoire/récit* and *discours* will turn out to be especially porous.

II. SELF-REFERENCE AND PROGRAMMATIC DEIXIS

Actually, the essential distinction is not exactly between the "I/you*/hic/nunc*" of the *discours* and the "he/she/there/then" of the narrative, but between *demonstratio ad oculos* and *Deixis am Phantasma*. The distinction goes back to the German linguist Karl Bühler. If the first defines the *Zeigfeld* of language from the point of origin represented by "here," "now," and "I," (*das Hier-Jetz-Ich System*, apparently equivalent to *discours*), the second, in appealing psychologically to the inner eye and ear of the reader and hence to his imagination (*Phantasie*), defines the symbolic field (*das Symbolfeld*) of all language (apparently a more general equivalent of *histoire*). The phenomena of anaphora and cataphora, whereby a deictic marker may also refer to something already mentioned or about to be mentioned within an enunciation, however, adds the possibility of symbolic reference to the (extra-discursive) reality of the act of enunciation. Bühler notes that, in referring to what has already been mentioned within a discourse, the deictic pronouns used are generally those also employed in *demonstratio ad oculos*: "Ich kann ad oculos demonstrieren und in der situationsfernen Rede dieselben Zeigwörter anaphorisch gebrauchen."[10] This means that, especially in the Indo-European languages, the demonstratives appropriate to *demonstratio ad oculos* (in the domain of *discours*) can also refer to that which is internal

9 For the *Works and Days* as a didactic poem, see West 1978.33–40. One may note that, at line 276, for example, τόνδε νόμον has a cataphoric function.

10 Bühler 1965 [1934].79–82, 107–13, 121–40, and 385–92 (pages 80 and 286 for the quotations). For an application to Pindar's epinicians, see now Bonifazi 2001.29–57.

to the discourse, i.e., to that which the discourse itself constructs (especially in the field of *histoire/récit*): "Unser Ergebnis lautet, *der Kontext selbst werde zum Zeigfeld erhoben* in der Anaphora" (emphasis in original).

It is worth recalling here that, in the section of his *Syntax* that dealt with pronouns, the second century A.D. grammarian Apollonius Dyscolus already distinguished between pronouns with an anaphoric function and those with a deictic function. While the former resemble the article and are identified with pronominal forms of the third person, the latter tend especially to employ pronouns of the first and second person. Whether or not we are dealing here with a double assimilation that appears to anticipate the distinction between *histoire/récit* and *discours*, Apollonius does recognize that third-person pronouns like ἐκεῖνος, οὗτος, and ὅδε may have either an anaphoric or a deictic function. This fundamental distinction led the Greek grammarian to outline a clear separation between visual deixis or "deixis of sight" (δεῖξις τῆς ὄψεως) and mental deixis or "deixis of the mind" (δεῖξις τοῦ νοῦ).[11]

It is precisely this double possibility of external and internal reference that is exploited through the use of ὅδε in the first section of Hesiod's *Works and Days*. Even while pointing to what is external to the discourse, the process of *demonstratio ad oculos* can also refer both to what precedes in the discourse itself as well as to what follows, that is, to what has been constructed within the text, thanks to *Deixis am Phantasma*. Thus the distinction outlined by Benveniste between *histoire/récit* and *discours* has to be understood from the perspective of reference: that is, reference can be simultaneously intra- and extra-discursive for the *discours* as well as for the *histoire/récit*. Such ambiguity reveals the porousness of a distinction whose character is essentially operational.

Thus from the perspective of deixis and the use of deictic markers, the distinction between reference to the situation of enunciation and reference to the internal context becomes essential: the first involves a link to the extra-discursive situation of the communicative discourse, while the other offers the possibility of intra-discursive reference to the features presented within the utterance itself (whether in the category of *récit* or of *discours*). The anaphoric use of certain deictic forms situates the enunciation at the

11 Apollonius Dyscolus *Syntax* 1.96, 2.11–17, and the commentary of Mársico 2000.82–92. For Aristarchus's student Dionysius Thrax (*Grammatical Art* 12, 56, and 87), δεικτικὸν (ὄνομα) simply seems to be a synonym of ἀναφορικόν.

intersection of these two referential dimensions of discourse, between reference to the linguistic context (usually anterior) and reference to the present situation of enunciation.[12] But in the movement from "here" to "there" (in Greek, from ὅδε to ἐκεῖνος), the deictic marker can not only slide from a proximal extra-discursive situation to a situation distant from the *hic et nunc* of the communication; but, through its anaphoric force, deixis can also make the transition between the universe constructed within the text (the level of *récit*) and the universe of enunciation (the level of *discours*) referring to the extra-discursive and historical circumstances of the communication. Once again, we find that *discours* and *récit* constitute essentially permeable categories.

By means, moreover, of a deictic marker such as ὅδε in Greek that simultaneously embraces contextual proximity and situational reference, a speech-act may acquire a double referential function. Thus "these" words may refer anaphorically or cataphorically to the situation constructed within the text (whether oral or written); but "these" statements, whether a poem, a hymn, a choral song, or a judgment, insofar as they are performative statements, may also refer to the immediate performance situation—as is, in fact, the case in the first part of Hesiod's *Works and Days*. As the deictic of *Hierheit*, of nearness, ὅδε implies a focalization on the "I" of the speaker, that is, on the moment of enunciation as the point of transition between the intra- and extra-discursive.[13] Hence, when the poetic enunciation is undertaken by an "I," it constitutes an "auto-reference." But such self-referentiality also functions with regard to the enunciative sphere that is constructed within the discourse, i.e., *Deixis am Phantasma*, and in reference to the act of singing in the situation of the extra-discursive enunciation through *demonstratio ad oculos*.[14]

---

12 Nyckees 1998.242–50 carefully distinguishes the situational and the contextual references of a certain number of pronouns, depending on their deictic or anaphoric use. In these cases, Adam 1990.52–61 prefers to oppose the contextual use ("deictic referentialisation") to the co-textual use (demonstrative anaphora) of certain demonstratives.

13 While affirming that ὅδε designates an object as *near* and forming part of the *"sphere of interest" of the speaker*, Humbert 1960.29–31 places more emphasis on the deictic character rather than on the anaphoric or cataphoric function of this demonstrative pronoun or adjective; see also Biraud 1991.190–92.

14 For the double dimension, contextual and situational, intra- and extra-discursive, of, for example, choral auto-reference, see Calame 1999.130–32 and Bierl 2001.37–64, after Henrichs 1994–95.56–73. In distinguishing "exophoric" reference (extra-linguistic) from "endophoric" reference (anaphoric), Danielewicz 1990.9–17 recognizes the deictic spatio-temporal role of ὅδε in choral "lyric." Felson 1999.1–5 gives a good summary of this issue.

It is this ambiguity of reference that I intend to explore in the programmatic and self-referential designation of poems that constitute communicative acts of song. I begin, then, with some examples drawn from the performative poetry par excellence, Greek melic poetry.

III. MELIC POEMS AND ELEGIAC COMPOSITIONS: "PERFORMATIVE" EFFECTS

Despite a problematic text, Alcman, fragment 39 (Page-Davies), can provide our first example of an apparent double reference—anaphoric (or cataphoric) and deictic—of the demonstrative ὅδε accompanied by a programmatic reference and hence performative.[15] In the famous "signature" where he presents himself with his name in the third person, the Spartan poet lays claim to inventing (εὗρε) two of the three traditional components of melic poetry in archaic Greece: song and music (to which one must add dance).[16] If the musical dimension of μέλος derives its mimetic source of inspiration in the song of the partridge, the verbal component is perhaps alluded to in the phrase ϝέπη τάδε, referring both to what has just been sung (or is about to be sung) and to its poetic enunciation as a speech-act: an act of singing, presumably choral singing. By joining the τάδε, which can function both anaphorically and deicticly, to the term ϝέπη, which designates rhythmic speech in general, Alcman asserts the poetic character of his "invention" in the performative mode. But the sentence containing that assertion is not only formulated in the third person but also in the aorist (εὗρε, "he found"), in accordance with the tradition of the σφρηγίς, "seal" or "signature." The gesture of "enactment into discourse" is uttered in the mode of *histoire/récit*—a first sign of the permeability of both of Benveniste's categories.

III.i. Theognis and Authorial Self-Designation

But this phenomenon can be more precisely defined. In a well-known sequence of elegiac couplets placed within the earlier sections that

---

15 In the light of ὅδε in both its ana- and cataphoric usage, I would be inclined to reconsider the reading I proposed in Calame 1983.480–81 and affirm the attractiveness of the correction τάδε proposed by Emperius in 1835 in place of γε δε (probably δέ γε) of MS A of Athenaeus. Cf. the ap. crit. of fragment 91 in Calame 1983.116–17.

16 On the use of σφρηγίς, see Van Groningen 1966.19 and 446–49; also Calame 1995.25 and 49–50.

make up the collection of the *Theognidea*, the Megarian poet explicitly demonstrates the functioning of the "signature." In turning to his young addressee and recipient Cyrnos, the elegiac poet not only demands—in an impersonal passive construction—that a seal (σφρηγίς, 19) be placed on the present verses (τοῖσδ' ἔπεσιν, 20) to prevent their modification; he also quotes the contents of the σφρηγίς itself so as to insert this text into the mouth of anyone who enunciates it. He thereby exploits a strategy reminiscent of those inscriptions that invite the passer-by to read their contents aloud:[17] "Thus (ὧδε) anyone can assert: 'Here are (ἔστιν, 22) the ἔπη, the rhythmic words, of Theognis of Megara, famous among all men.'"[18]

The controversy surrounding these lines, which are especially dense and complex from an enunciative perspective, has focused on the meaning and referent of the σφρηγίς. Readers have taken it to refer either to the name Cyrnos itself—whose name in the vocative would presumably guarantee authenticity—or to the whole eight-line passage that forms the context of the quotation identifying Theognis; or, more generally, to the elegiac style or the political teaching characteristic of the poet. But in any case, it has usually been taken as a reference to the name of the Megarian poet. He is, in fact, presented within the passage through his civic identity, that is, precisely by his name joined to his birthplace and city of residence. As a "seal of authenticity" and mark of "authorship," the σφρηγίς may, as has recently been suggested, refer to the book produced by the written transcription of Theognis' verses that were originally intended for oral performance at the symposium. Perhaps then the "signature" lays claim to ownership of the verses inscribed on the papyrus roll intended for publication, or it signals the dedication in a temple of a copy thus identified and, in some sense, transformed into a μνῆμα.[19]

Now in tracing the enunciative progress of this elegiac collection, we must first realize that the anaphoric and deictic ὅδε does not modify the verses (ἔπη, 22) mentioned in the σφρηγίς, but, instead, the verses (ἔπεσιν, 20) on which the seal is to be placed. Since the elegiac couplet in lines 19–20 represents the beginning of a poem, τοῖσδ' must, on the basis of context,

---

17 Cf. Svenbro 1988.13–33 and 53–73.

18 The expression ἔστιν simply indicates the presence, and hence the existence, of the verses of Theognis: cf. Kühner and Gerth 1898.I.3 and 38.

19 For these different interpretations, see Edmunds 1997.30–33; see, in addition, the references in Cerri 1991.21–22, who mentions several examples of poetic compositions consecrated at sanctuaries. Cf. also Ford 1985.92–95.

here have a cataphoric sense and thus designate the lines that immediately follow. These lines embrace not only the statement of the σφρηγίς (which would be tautological), but also the elegiac couplets that introduce and comment on it, including those that follow and formulate (in a fresh address to Cyrnos) the pedagogical mission of the speaker. By using the performative future, "I will teach you (the things I learned while still an adolescent") (ὑποθήσομαι, 27), the speaker offers a fresh indication of the programmatic contents of a poetic progression embraced by the term ἔπη, but from which nothing must be omitted or modified.[20]

In addition, however, to the cataphoric use of the expression τοῖσδ' ἔπεσιν, there is a possible deictic reference to the situation of enunciation. Such a usage frequently occurs at the beginning of other groups of lines within the same collection. For example, the city in which both the speaker and his addressee Cyrnos are located is designated by πόλις ἥδε ("this city here," 39), with a repetition in ring composition at the end of the section at line 52; it stands in opposition to κείνην πόλιν, "that city there," i.e., the unjust city of line 47. Similarly, line 53 (πόλει τῇδε, cf. 56) is taken up again by τῶνδε ἀστῶν, ("these citizens here," 61). The focus is more on the city that constitutes the political and pragmatic framework for the poetic and pedagogical advice of Theognis to Cyrnos (an extra-discursive reference) than on the polis that the lines describe (an intra-discursive reference).

From this perspective, it is worth emphasizing that the placing of a σφρηγίς generally serves the interests of the speaker: the speaker refers to himself in this present exercise of his poetic skill (σοφιζομένῳ ἐμοί, 19).[21] This actualization of the poetic skill of the speaker provides a pragmatic definition of "these verses" (τοῖσδ' ἔπεσιν, 20), while creating an opposition between the present moment of poetic activity and a future one when the verses could be modified. It is in that proximate future that "anyone" (and not only Cyrnos) will be obliged to pronounce the words of the σφρηγίς, introduced by the cataphoric and deictic ὅδε (22). At that point, the

---

20 For parallels for the use of ὑποθήσομαι, see Van Groningen 1966.21–22. The performative force of these auto-referential forms of the future in Pindar is noted by Slater 1969b; doubts about such a performative dimension are expressed by Pfeijffer 1999b.53–60.

21 Applied to the poetic skill of the Muses in Ibycus frag. S 151.23 Page-Davies, forms of σοφ- are used with this meaning before Pindar in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* 482–86 and Solon frag. 1.51–52 Gentili-Prato. Van Groningen 1966.18–19 correctly translates σοφίζεσθαι here by "to compose poetry," an action that corresponds to the present moment (oral, not written as Van Groningen assumes) of enunciation.

rhythmical lines of Theognis, expressed as existing in the present (ἔστιν, 22), will become nothing but the objectivized form (in the third person) of "these verses" that are now being performed. Spoken together in the present of a sung performance and rendered objective as text, these lines are the ones that will be able to confer on Theognis, henceforth identified extra-discursively, the fame among men that he deserves at each performance of the poem. The σφρηγίς gives the elegiac couplets the authority of a poet's voice and name.

The words of the σφρηγίς itself, however, situated between *histoire/récit* and *discours*, give no indication of the written or oral status of the ἔπη of Theognis. We only know that the statement's realization—and hence the fame of the poet—will depend on who pronounces it.[22] For now, in his renewed address to Cyrnos-Polypaides and by referring to the particular situation it implies, the speaker begins again (οὔπω δύναμαι, 24) by indicating that, like Zeus with his rain, he, too, cannot "please all the citizens." The movement from the universal—mankind in general (πάντας κατ' ἀνθρώπους, 23)—to particular citizens (ἀστοῖσιν πᾶσιν, 24; cf. οὔθ' . . . πάντεσσ', 26) indicates a return from an ideal (imagined?) future to the reality of the present political situation.

Under these special enunciative and deictic conditions, the σφρηγίς seems to entail a poetic strategy that is, in the final analysis, quite different from the one that endows funerary monuments or votive dedications with speech. But the metaphoric character of the σφρηγίς does not preclude the possibility that, in opposition to the enunciative situation of the lines that cite it at the very beginning of the *Theognidea*, a concrete realization may be assigned to it *a posteriori* through the written transcription of the collection and its ritual dedication in a sanctuary. Just like the end of the poetic encomium of Polycrates (frag. S 151.46–48 Page-Davies), where the song praising the glorious beauty of the tyrant of Samos guarantees the glory of the poet Ibycus himself, so, too, the ideal oral performance intends to transmit the fame of Theognis of Megara. But through writing, the elegaic poem can become realized as a true memorial. Contrary to what has been stated by others, such a double deictic reference, implying both *deixis ad*

22 Pace Pratt 1995.173–82. We may note in this connection that the forms of the σφρηγίς that we find in Hesiod *Theogony* 22–23, Alcman frag. 39 Page-Davies, Bacchylides 3.95–99, and Timotheus frag. 791.229–36 Page (cf. the proem to Herodotus) are all integrated into texts that presuppose an oral (sung) presentation. See above, n. 17.

oculos and *Deixis am Phantasma*, is also possible in a poem that depends on an oral tradition.[23]

III.ii. Pindar and the Choral Performance of the *Komos*

At the end of the opening strophe of *Olympian* 4 celebrating the Olympic victory of Psaumis of Camarina in Sicily, the speaker asks Zeus, who was invoked at the beginning of the ode, to receive "this procession" (τόνδε κῶμον, 9): the victorious procession at Olympia, "venerable light of mighty exploits." This statement sets up the programmatic content of the poem. Through the use of the deictic ὅδε, this festive procession is linked not only to the song of *Olympian* 4 in the *hic et nunc* of the communicative situation, but also, by means of anaphora, to the speaker who presents himself as the messenger and witness to the greatest rewards of victory (μ' ἔπεμψαν / ὑψηλοτάτων μάρτυρ' ἀέθλων, 2–3).[24]

There is an obvious contradiction between a poem that is presented enunciatively as a processional song enacted in the *hic et nunc* of its performance by a group of dancers with the accompaniment of the Charites and one in which a speaker presents himself in the singular as witness and messenger of the Hours, whom Zeus has roused to action. This remarkable enunciative polyphony is situated between intra- and extra-discursive discourse. The linking of the Hours to the Graces in the celebration of a processional and, apparently, choral song is not surprising to a reader of archaic Greek poetry. The daughters of Zeus and Themis, who represent the seasons, collaborate with their cousins, the Graces, in the retinue of Aphrodite in order to deck out Hesiod's Pandora or to create the seductive garments worn by Aphrodite herself in the *Cypria*. Moreover, in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, they, along with Harmonia, Hebe, and Aphrodite, take part in the choral dances (ὀρχεῦντ', "they dance," 196) that accompany the songs of the Muses.[25]

---

23 Pace Rösler 1983.

24 For the different modes of the reception of the κῶμος presented by Pindar, cf. Mullen 1982.27–31, who concluded: "There is, then, a kind of centripetal force drawing everything into the absolute present of the ode."

25 Cf. Hesiod *Works and Days* 72–76 (also *Theogony* 901–11), *Cypria* frag. 4 Bernabé, and the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 189–96 (see also the much later *Orphic Hymn* 43.5–9: κυκλίοισι χοροῖς). On the number of the Horai and the Charites as well as their association in different cults, see Pausanias 9.35.1–3 and the discussion of Pirenne-Delforge 1996.198–201.

The interpretation of the word κῶμος, however, which through the use of ὅδε refers both to the enunciative "here-ness" of the speaker and to the situational *Hierheit* of the occasion of the poem's performance (presumably a ritual celebration in honor of Zeus), draws us into the heart of the recent controversy concerning the epinicians of Pindar: solo or choral? Sung by the poet himself (or his local representative), or by a group of young men or girls of the city of the victor?

Without getting involved in the details of this complex issue, we note that those who support the solo performance of the Pindaric ode generally invoke the meaning of κῶμος in the classical period. Iconography, the texts of comedy, and Plato's *Symposium* offer numerous examples of the different forms adopted by the nocturnal processions where the citizen-guests, more or less inebriated, concluded their ritual gatherings at the symposium with music and satyr-like dancing. By means of an apparent parallel with, for example, the elegiac couplet of Theognis that states that "one of these" (τις τῶνδε, 1045, i.e., one of the guests to whom these lines are addressed) will receive "our procession" (ἡμέτερον κῶμον δέξεται, 1046), even if he should be fast asleep, the speaker of *Olympian* 4 is presumed to be inviting Zeus to receive the present κῶμος.[26] According to this hypothesis, while performing *Olympian* 4 solo, the speaker, whom the supporters of monodic performance generally identify with the poet, becomes the spokesman to Zeus of the wishes of a group of youths, perhaps the companions of Psaumis of Camarina, eager to participate in an impromptu manner in the celebration signaled by the more formal song of the ode itself.

By taking the vocabulary and the syntax of Pindar literally, such a hypothesis ignores several features related to the fictional effects of all forms of poetry, more particularly to the nature of the double reference—*demonstratio ad oculos* and *Deixis am Phantasma*—of deictic markers like ὅδε. First, those who advocate solo performance, generally by the poet himself who would evoke a κῶμος for the most part external to the performance of the epinician under discussion, are inclined to ignore—even while mentioning it—the use of the κῶμος in contexts that are not sympotic but

26 Cf. especially Eubulus frag. 93 Kassel-Austin, Plato *Symposi*um 176a–e, 212c–e, and 223b, and the references in Heath 1988.180–82; for *Olympian* 4, cf. 189–90. Significantly, the special situation of this ode is not discussed in the restatement by Heath and Lefkowitz 1991.

ritual. For example, at the beginning of Euripides' *Hippolytos*, Aphrodite herself identifies the famous processional song of invocation that Hippolytos and his companions dedicate to Artemis as a κῶμος. Adopting the part of choregos, Hippolytos sings the prelude, directing his companions (ἕπεσθ' ἄιδοντες . . . Ἄρτεμιν, "follow, while celebrating . . . Artemis," 58–60) to join in a song, accompanied by dance, and performed by the "we" of the collective group (μελόμεσθα, 60). Marked by the choral "I," and in a complex Aeolic rhythm that is surely not improvised, this short ritual hymn accompanies the ritual gesture of a dedication of a garland of flowers to Artemis (τόνδε πλεκτόν, 73).[27] At the end of the *Bacchae*, however, it is the chorus itself, while hymning Dionysos in unison (ἀναχορεύσωμεν Βάκχιον, 1153), that invites its own members—with a self-referential gesture common to the choral songs of tragedy—to receive the κῶμος of the god of εὐοῖ. In a performative mode signaled by the use of the future, the followers of Dionysos do, in fact, receive (δέξομαι, 1172) Agave, who, as a participant in the κῶμος (σύγκωμον, 1172), divides her lines, sung in dochmiacs, between an "I" and a "we."[28]

With its parody of a most accomplished hymnic choral song, the *Thesmophoriazousai* provides corroborating evidence from comedy. In Aristophanes' staging, the tragic author of this ritual choral song of praise for Apollo, Artemis, and their mother Leto performs the role of *chorodidaskalos*. Disguised as a woman, Agathon urges the young χορευταί to sing and dance as a chorus (χορεύσασθε, 103) "this" hymn, which he designates by the Homeric deictic ὁ, as a κῶμος (104). Then in the role of κορυφαῖος, he sings, along with the young Trojan women, a hymnic song that he is supposed to have composed in choriambic rhythm. Finally, the Muses are invoked to lend their voices to the execution of this hymn before the χορευταί themselves take up the song, alternating between forms of "I" and "we."[29] In this parody of a ritual song, the comic genre may invite us to discern the most unbridled development of the *sympotic* κῶμος, to which the choral songs of comedy are often assimilated. Nevertheless, the same term

---

27 See the relevant comments of Barrett 1964.167–71, who expresses no doubts about the choral character of the hymn for which Hippolytus plays the role of ἔξαρχων.

28 Cf. Henrichs 1994–95.73–85 for additional examples of a tragic chorus using an auto-referential designation to indicate the activity of the cult song in which the chorus members are engaged.

29 See Bierl 2001.162–74 for a detailed analysis of this parodic song, as well as Bierl 2001.140–50 for lines 969–1000, and 311–14, on the comic κῶμος.

κῶμος reappears at the end of the play, in the mouth of the chorus of women celebrating the Thesmophoria, to designate, in a self-referential and performative manner, their own choral dances in honor of Dionysos (ἐγὼ δὲ κώμοις / σε φιλοχόροισι μέλψω, 987–88).

It is thus not at all surprising to see the Alexandrian commentators, and consequently the scholiasts to Pindar, regularly gloss the term κῶμος and its compounds by the term χορός and its derivatives. Such a definition is particularly relevant to *Nemean* 9, which begins with a request to the Muses to come from Sicyon to Etna and join the speaker, designated as "we." The latter is identical to the choral processional group that arrives at the house of the victor to perform a "sweet hymn" (ἐπέων γλυκὺν ὕμνον πράσσετε, 3). As a result, presumably because it links the Muses in the act of singing to the performative future in the first-person plural, the form κωμάσομεν that begins the ode (1) is interpreted by the ancient commentators as a synonym of χορεύσωμεν and ὑμνεύσωμεν. Moreover, even in *Olympian* 4, the reception in Camarina (or perhaps still in Olympia?) of the messenger-poet by the "better men" (ἐσλοί, 5) on the occasion of the victory of the athlete (who has become the host of the speaker), is interpreted by the scholiast in terms of a choral celebration (χορῷ ἥδεται). "This komos here," which Zeus himself is asked to receive, corresponds to this same celebration.[30]

The most decisive argument, however, against solo performance as far as *Olympian* 4 is concerned can doubtlessly be made on the basis of the double reference implied by the use of the deictic τόνδε modifying κῶμον in *Olympian* 4.9. From an extra-discursive perspective, the situational reference of this deictic marker can only be the song composed by Pindar and performed in the *hic et nunc* of the victory celebration at Camarina (or perhaps Olympia).[31] But on the intra-discursive level, the anaphoric and hence contextual usage of the same phrase, τόνδε κῶμον, can refer to the processional aspect of the present κῶμος via two convergent trajectories: the journey of the speaker, sent (μ᾽ ἔπεμψαν, 2; note the aorist) by the Hours, daughters of Zeus, as a witness to accompany the Graces to Zeus himself, the host par excellence (δέξαι, 9, in the present imperative); and the arrival

30 Cf. scholia ad Pindar *Nemean* 9.1ab (III.150 Drachmann) and ad *Olympian* 4.7b (I.131 Drachmann). Despite their skepticism about the equivalence of κῶμος and χορός, Heath and Lefkowitz 1991.175 cite the corresponding passages from the scholia. For the "performative" character of forms of the auto-referential future, see Slater 1969b.

31 For the controversial question concerning the place of performance of *Olympian* 4, see Gerber 1987.7–9; for the metrical structure of the poem, see Lomiento 1999.

(ἵκει, 10, in the present) of the victor, crowned at Olympia (στεφανωθείς, 11, aorist participle) and now eager (σπεύδει, 12, in the present) to deck the city of Camarina with glory. Because of the confluence of this double trajectory, the κῶμος can transform itself into the truthful praise of both the great accomplishment and the hospitality of the victor.[32]

To refer the performatives of the first-person singular of this second strophe of *Olympian* 4 not only to a solo performance but also to the biographic and historical Pindar himself would entail ignoring the enunciative density that poetic creativity constructs through its own fictional capacities. Endowed with an existence that is at first glance textual, the "I" of the performative "I praise" (αἰνέω, 14) and "I will not tinge my praise with falsehood" (οὐ ψεύδεϊ τέγξω λόγον, 17–18) corresponds first and foremost to an idealized textual figure. This moment of enunciation is activated by a poetic and polyphonic voice through which the voices of the Hours, the Graces, and, also, the voice of the κῶμος in its collective character converge. This moment is prior to the extra-discursive reference to the person of the poet, who presumably does not himself make the journey to Camarina to sing the song he has composed. In ascribing the textual fiction constructed around the moment of enunciation directly to the person of the poet while, at the same time, identifying him with the performance of his composition, we overlook the subtle play of "choral delegation." This complex interplay constitutes the defining characteristic of the enunciation uttered in the various genres of melic poetry as well as its transference to the tragic stage, both in reference to the discursive and enunciative reality of a poem and in the social reality of its "performance."[33]

III.iii. Some Additional Examples

Additional evidence is provided by the second epinician composed by Pindar for the same Sicilian athlete, probably on the occasion of a second Olympic victory in the mule race (this one certainly celebrated at Camarina).

---

32 For the complex interactions of hospitality in Pindar's epinicians, see Kurke 1991.135–59 and 203–11; also the parallels in Mader 1990.35–41. For a detailed analysis of *Olympian* 6 along the same line, see Bonifazi 2001.103–49.

33 On this subject, see especially Gentili 1990.14–17 ("eine mehrdeutige semiotische Verfassung") and Goldhill 1991.142–46 ("generalizing *ego* and inclusive 'we'"), as well as Bremer 1990.44–50. On "choral delegation," see Calame 1999.148–53 and Nagy 1994–95.20–25 ("re-enacting I").

In *Olympian* 5, the eponymous Nymph of Camarina is asked to receive the victorious Psaumis into the city before the victor, on his return from Olympia, himself celebrates in song (ἀείδει, 10) the sacred wood of Pallas Athena, the patron goddess of this small colonial city. Through the dual function of ὅδε, it is first the citizen body (τόνδε δᾶμον ἄστων, 14) that Athena, invoked in the vocative, will engulf with the light emanating from the praise sung on the heights of the city. Secondly, with the help of Zeus Soter, the city itself (πόλιν . . . τάνδε, 20) will be adorned by the presence of glorious men. The deictic ὅδε, simultaneously anaphoric and referential, involves the whole of the city in the effects of the song with which, in the *hic et nunc* of its enunciation, the victor himself is linked. To hear only the single voice of Pindar in his identity as a Theban poet, adopting the role of a suppliant of Zeus to the accompaniment of Lydian flutes (ἱκέτας σέθεν ἔρχομαι Λυδίοις ἀπύων ἐν αὐλοῖς, 19), is to miss the complex enunciative polyphony whereby Psaumis appears simultaneously (indirectly) in the role of the speaker and (directly) in the role of addressee.[34]

Used, then, like a genuine formula in the manner of Homer, the invitation, "receive this κῶμος," can even be addressed to the site of Olympia itself, transformed into "the mother of games" (Μᾶτερ . . . ἀέθλων, Οὐλυμπία . . . τόνδε κώμον . . . δέξαι, 1–10) in *Olympian* 8. But despite this opening, the progress of the ode, composed for an Aeginetan wrestler, distances us from the sanctuary by the Alpheus and transports us to the island of Aegina, designated deictically on two occasions (τάνδ' . . . χώραν, "this place," 25; δεῦρ', "here," 51). Offered to Olympia in exchange for the prize of victory and hence for the glory conferred by this "mistress of truth," the ode, accompanied by a στεφανοφορία and probably by a chorus, is performed at the victor's homeland.[35] Similarly, in *Pythian* 5, the addressee of the poem, King Arcesilas IV of Cyrene, who financed the victorious chariot, receives the processional song in Cyrene; here, the κῶμος includes the group of men who perform it (δέδεξαι τόνδε κῶμον ἀνέρων, "receive this κῶμος of men," 22). Performing at Cyrene itself, beside the garden of Aphrodite, the young men (ἐν ἀοιδᾷ νέων, 103) celebrate the legendary history of their prosperous colony. The poem itself turns out to be dedicated to Apollo, worshiped both in Delphi and at Cyrene, probably on the occa-

34 Cf. Danielewicz 1990.13–14. The authenticity of this poem, which to some extent seems to be a doublet of *Olympian* 4, has been disputed since antiquity; cf. Mader 1990.13–14 and 109–13.

35 Cf. Mullen 1982.79–82.

sion of the celebration of the Carneia. With its enunciative shift from an "I" to a "we" that unites the voice of the poet, in his Theban identity, with the voices of the young men celebrating Apollo Carneios at a feast held in Cyrene itself, *Pythian* 5 provides one of the most subtle examples of the lyric, and subsequently tragic, phenomenon of "choral delegation."[36]

It is, however, *Olympian* 14 that offers the most convincing example of the phrase τόνδε κῶμον in what is apparently a choral context. Composed for the victory in the footrace of an athlete from Orchomenos, this poem has the form of a prayer spoken by a speaker "I" (εὔχομαι, 5) and addressed to the Graces. These three "much-sung queens" (ἀοίδιμοι βασίλειαι, 3) were venerated in this small town with its famous cult.[37] With the tri-partite structure (*invocatio, epica laus, preces*) characteristic of every cult hymn, the poem emphasizes the musical character of the three sisters, whose *redende Namen* are linked to two epithets containing μελπ- (φιλησίμολπε, 14; ἐρασίμολπε, 16). Without their presence, the gods could not conduct their feasts or their choral dances (χορούς, 9). It is within this context that, in the transition from epic praise to the prayer itself, the present poem, designated as τόνδε κῶμον, is offered to the sight and hearing of the Graces. Although it refers to the epinician—probably sung by a chorus on the occasion of one of the festivals for the local Graces—the term encapsulates the musical skills of the daughters of Zeus even as it endows the performative act of singing with a processional character. This is confirmed by the expression, "I have come to sing" (ἀείδων ἔμολον, 18), that seems to unite both the poet and the performers in a single choral voice.

The programmatic dimension of the act of singing, in conjunction with the deictic gesture implied by the use of ὅδε, draws attention to the topos of "choral preparation," especially when the poem designated by ὅδε forms the object of an invitation to receive (δέξαι, etc.) the chorus. As early as Alcman, the chorus frequently situates the performance of its song in the

---

36 The cultic occasion of the performance of *Pythian* 5 can be reconstructed with reasonable certainty: cf. Gentili, Angeli-Bernardini, Cingano, and Giannini 1995.59–64, 517–18, and 521–23, with bibliography concerning the identity of the "I"/"we" speaker of this epinician. For *Pythian* 4 (κωμάζοντι, 14), see Felson 1999.13–16, and for *Pythian* 9, Felson, in this volume.

37 See also Pindar *Pythian* 12.25–27 (in a clearly choral context) and frag. 333(a).8–14 (involving μέλος and a girl's voice), as well as Pausanias 9.35.1–3 and 38.1. For further references, especially to cultic activity devoted to the Graces at Orchomenos, see Schachter 1981.140–44. For a "choral" interpretation of *Olympian* 14, see Morgan 1993.9–10.

"performative future," that is, at a time that is supposed to follow immediately upon the *hic et nunc* of the enunciation.[38] By means of the formulaic phrase τόνδε κῶμον (with its double reference, at once anaphoric and deictic), the reception of "this" κῶμος alludes to the processional form of the choral song. But it also constitutes a means of indicating both the preparations for, and the destination of, the epinician ode. As for the poet himself, he evidently did not on every occasion have the opportunity to travel in order to assume in person—as *chorodidaskalos* or choregos—the rehearsal and direction of the chorus. Even though it is incorrect to refer the "I" of the speaker to Pindar in a biographical sense, the supporters of solo performance are to a certain extent justified in drawing attention to the possibilities of the execution of the song by the equivalent of a choregos or κορυφαῖος accompanied by a chorus in the manner, for example, of a κιθαρῳδία.[39] The essential point is to distinguish the enunciative figures constructed within the text, especially through an implied analogy, from historical characters taking on, in the plural and in its different phases, the sung performance of the ritual.

IV. INTERLUDE: CHORAL DEIXIS AND TRAGEDY

From Alcman to the tragedians—but especially in Anacreon and Sappho—the activation of programmatic deixis, linked to a self-referential or performative verbal gesture, refers to the contents of the poem itself. This is particularly true when the composition begins with an expression like δηῦτε. In its deictic function, the δή anchors the poetic speech act—usually self-referential—in the *hic et nunc* of the performance, while the αὖτε, for its part, refers anaphorically to a repeated situation. The gesture of enunciative auto-referentiality is a double one, a double movement of extra-discursive

38 In addition to the passages mentioned, see also Pindar *Olympian* 6.98 and 13.29, *Pythian* 8.18–20 (cf. Martin in this volume), and *Nemean* 4.11. For the Pindaric sense of compounds of κῶμος, see Heath 1988.187, along with the remarks of Bremer 1990.50–57, who argues for an overall choral interpretation of the epinicians.

39 Cf. Heath 1988.197: "Commissioned processionals may have been sung on occasion, sometimes solo, and sometimes perhaps by the *kômos* as a whole"; and Lefkowitz 1995.149: "But Pindar uses the language of the games to describe his own poetic skill . . . For that reason he can seem at times to be a member of the victory *kômos* or virtually a citizen of communities." Note, however, the much more emphatic position expressed by Heath and Lefkowitz in their joint statement of 1991.191: "The victory ode is sung by the poet to the lyre." For the odes of Bacchylides, see D'Alessio in this volume.

reference and of intra-discursive anaphora. This repetition, in the sense of a "re-enactment," usually refers to the intervention of Eros with his frequently contradictory effects upon the speaking "I." This deictic and anaphoric usage gives the poem that is being sung its programmatic function; simultaneously, through this double verbal gesture, the poem assumes a pragmatic dimension, often achieved in the performative act of singing that its execution represents. Thus one of the choral groups taught by the Spartan poet Alcman sings: "Once again, here and now, Eros, by the will of the Cyprian, warms my heart that he softly penetrates."[40]

In the choral parts of tragedy, when different kinds of μέλος are enacted and dramatized on the skene of the theater of Dionysos, the combinations of anaphora/cataphora and deictic markers become more complex insofar as the sphere of reference is doubled. In effect, deictic forms can refer to the action enacted on the stage and the space and time of the historic ritual performance involving both author and audience. Thus in the *Eumenides* of Aeschylus, the use of ὅδε to refer cataphorically and programmatically to the hymn intended to bind Orestes (ὕμνον δ' ἀκούσῃ τόνδε δέσμιον σέθεν, 306) is immediately followed by a performative act: the choral song that is intended to function as a spell is introduced by the performative phrase, "come now, let's form the chorus" (ἄγε δὴ χορὸν ἄψωμεν, 307). This deictic gesture, simultaneously contextual and situational, is enacted on the stage in the *hic et nunc* of the dramatic action. Addressed to the mother of the goddesses of revenge, this "magic hymn" (cf. ὕμνος . . . δέσμιος, 331–32 = 343–44) becomes in its very performance "this song" (τόδε μέλος, 329 = 341) that, as an expiatory offering to Night, offers a substitute for Orestes himself, who is under Apollo's protection.[41] In this instance, the situational reference is completely subsumed in the action dramatized on stage. In the *Oedipus at Colonus* of Sophocles, however, the chorus chants the famous hymn to the flourishing fertility of Attica with a deictic reference that shifts from Colonus (a place represented within the drama: τῶσδε χώρας, 668) of the chorus's song to the territory of Attica, which is also the space containing the spectators. From a spatial perspective, the whole play from start to finish is characterized by this deictic movement from the named locations of

40 See in this connection the examples in Calame 1998a.216–22, especially Alcman frag. 59(a) Page-Davies.

41 Cf. Faraone 1985 and Prins 1991. See also the discussion in Henrichs 1994–95.60–65.

the tragic action to the civic spaces pointed to by the extra-dramatic and extra-discursive references.[42]

When, however, in the same Athens of the fifth century, the mimetic mediation of ritualized drama no longer constitutes the foundation of discourse, spatial deixis plays a less important role. To be sure, the funeral speech reworked by Thucydides and placed in the mouth of Pericles at the end of the first year of the Peloponnesian war contains a prelude whose enunciative mode is completely centered on the "I" of the speaker. Confronting the "you" of the audience viewed as each individual who makes up the whole (ὑμῶν τῆς ἑκάστου βουλήσεώς τε καὶ δόξης τυχεῖν, "to satisfy the wishes and opinions of each of you," 2.35.3), the "I" situates itself "here" (ἐνθάδε, 2.35.1) on the podium described within the introduction to the speech, at a precise time (μέχρι . . . τοῦδε, 2.35.2): "I, too, must respect the custom and try to satisfy the wishes and opinions of each of you as best I can" (ὑμῶν τῆς ἑκάστου βουλήσεώς τε καὶ δόξης τυχεῖν, 2.35.3). The present speech is programmatically linked to the kind of speech that *custom* demands in these circumstances (τὸν προσθέντα τῷ νόμῳ τὸν λόγον τόνδε, "this speech here presented in accordance with the custom," cf. καὶ ἐμὲ ἑπόμενον τῷ νόμῳ, "and for me following the custom," 2.35.1 and 3). The performative effect is immediate and similar to the proem of the *Theogony*, but here without an invocation to the Muses: "I will begin first of all with the ancestors" (ἄρξομαι δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν προγόνων πρῶτον, 2.36.1). The use of the performative future with the verb that traditionally indicates an invocation in poetry recalls the introductory utterances of epic mentioned earlier. To be sure, in the sequel to the speech, the ancestors turn into "our fathers" (οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν, 2.36.2 and 4), in an expression that is related deictically and temporally to "we here, who are now alive" (αὐτοὶ ἡμεῖς οἵδε οἱ νῦν ἔτι ὄντες, 2.36.3). In these utterances, however, the space of the enunciation is simply designated as "the city" (τὴν πόλιν, 2.36.3).[43]

---

42 τῆσδ' ἕδρας (36) or τόδ' ἄλσος (98) at the beginning of the play designate the places on stage where Oedipus hopes to find refuge, but τῆσδε γῆς (294) or τῆσδε τῆς χώρας (296) designate Attica with its ἄστυ (297), that is, Athens where the play is being presented. M. Vamvouri-Ruffy, in a forthcoming article, gives other examples of deictic ambivalence in the *Persians*.

43 Cf. Thucydides 2.38.2, 41.1, 42.2, etc. up to 46.1. See also the phrasing at 2.36.1. The self-referential praise of Athens and of the "we" of her citizens is ultimately conceived as a hymn sung by an "I" (ἃ γὰρ τὴν πόλιν ὕμνησα, in the aorist, 2.42.2).

The funeral speech and the political juridical speech are so focused on Athens that, from a spatial perspective, whoever adopts the authoritative voice within them can dispense with deictic indicators and hence, paradoxically, with the *demonstratio ad oculos*.

V. ALEXANDRIAN POETIC AND FICTIONAL PRACTICES

But let us return to the programmatic and self-referential aspect of poetic deixis. In this respect, the direction—simultaneously mimetic and fictional in its form—taken by the compositions of the ποιηταί ἅμα καὶ κριτικοί of the Alexandrian period has a defining impact.

V.i. Theocritus: Pastoral Self-Reference

In *Idyll* 18, Theocritus presents a poem whose title assigns it to the melic and ritual genre of the epithalamium, here understood in the general sense of a *hymenaios*, wedding song. Nevertheless, this title along with its variants (e.g., Ἑλένης ἐπιθαλάμιος, ἐπιθαλάμιος Ἑλένης καὶ Μενελάου, Ἐγκώμιον Ἑλένης) links this composition to the legendary wedding of Helen and Menelaos. In fact, despite its coloring of Doric dialect, Theocritus's epithalamium is narrative and descriptive in character, as its composition in dactylic hexameters confirms. More precisely, first addressed to "the beloved and happy groom" (ὦ φίλε γαμβρέ, ὄλβιε γάμβρ', 9 and 16) who turns out to be named Menelaos, and then to the charming young girl, Helen (38), the text of the epithalamium itself becomes the object of an introductory narrative: once upon a time (ποκ', 1) in Sparta, in the house of Menelaos, twelve young Spartan girls, the flower of the city, formed a chorus (χορὸν ἐστάσαντο, in the aorist, 3) to dance and sing in unison (ἐς ἓν μέλος, 7) the marriage song, traditionally called the *hymenaios*. With respect to the descriptive and narrative setting, beginning with the speaker "we," the deictic ὅδε brings about a shift in the focalization from the young groom, whose deep sleep the young girls mock, to their former companion, Helen: "Menelaos, she is yours, this young bride" (τεὰ νυὸς ἅδε, 15). And here again the self-designated speaker "we" employs a deictic marker inspired by Homeric diction at the very moment when the praise of Helen, the daughter of Zeus, is transformed into an aetiological tale. This transformation is accomplished through a shift from the past, when the choristers, "all of us age-mates" (ἄμμες δ'αἱ πᾶσαι συνομάλικες, 22), competed in speed and grace by the banks of the Eurotas, to a moment in the proximate

future when these same young girls will celebrate in ritual the adolescence of their former companion at the Platanistas, where the bark of a tree will be inscribed with Helen's name (in Doric! ἐρψεῦμες, "we shall go," 40; σταξεῦμες, "we will pour," 46, etc.).

It is not until the very end of the young girls' song that they invoke the eponymous patron of marriage with the phrase (Ὑμὴν ὦ Ὑμέναιε, 58) that normally punctuates the genre of the *hymenaios* like a refrain. With this line that also concludes the *Idyll*, the χορευταί invoke the presence of the youthful marriage-hero "upon this marriage" (γάμῳ ἐπὶ τῷδε).[44] While referring anaphorically to the union that the χορευταί of Theocritus's imagination have just praised, the deictic ὅδε retains its use as the self-referential designation of the context. But it has lost its pragmatic extra-discursive dimension; through the creation within the poem itself of a scene incorporating enunciative acts, the referential relation of the deictic marker ὅδε to the communicative situation of the composition as a whole is henceforth sundered. More precisely, the extra-discursive situation has become the reality represented within the discourse, presented *am Phantasma* and no longer *ad oculos*.

The absence of a deictic shift, particularly of a programmatic order that points to the enunciative situation of the poem, is even more palpable in those compositions in which Theocritus does not exploit hetero-diegetic and anonymous narration to signal the distance between the fiction constructed within the poem and its performance context. For instance, in *Idyll* 7, the poet, by choosing a homo-diegetic and hence autobiographical narrative, situates himself and his companion in an indeterminate moment in the past (ἦς χρόνος ἀνίκ' ἐγών, 1) leaving a city which is not named (εἴρπομες ἐκ πόλιος, 2) in the direction of a supposed place that the scholia set on Cos. In other cases, as in *Idyll* 3 entitled "Komos," the speaker refers in the present to the musical activity in which he is engaged as he makes his way to the lovely Amaryllis (κωμάσδω ποτὶ τὰν Ἀμαρυλλίδα, 1), while his goats, tended by Tityrus, graze near a nameless spring on an equally nameless mountain. Or again, in *Idyll* 6 addressed to Aratus, the bucolic setting of the dramatic dialogue with its amoebaean singing situates the two shepherd poets in a totally indeterminate place and time (εἰς ἕνα χώρον . . . ποκ', 1–2), while the single deictic marker (τοιάδ', 4) refers internally to their alternat-

44 See the discussion of Hunter 1996.149–66, which includes references to the wedding songs of Sappho.

ing songs.[45] Finally, in a completely dramatic and mimetic composition such as *Idyll* 1, the two shepherds who are the protagonists in the pastoral exchange refer—via demonstratives denoting distance—to the rustling of the pine tree (ἁ πίτυς . . . τήνα . . . μελίσδεται, 1–2) and the sound of the water (τὸ καταχές τῆν' . . . ὕδωρ, 7–8) while metaphorically referring to their own songs (τύ συρίσδες, τὸ τεὸν μέλος, 2–3, 7). It is only later that the place and time of the action are referred to anaphorically by deictic markers (τεῖδε, 12; ἐν τῷδε, 14; δεῦρ', 21, etc.) after the spatial framework has been constructed and represented within the discourse.[46] The *demonstratio ad oculos* has been transformed into *Deixis am Phantasma.*

V.ii. Callimachus: Intra-Discursive Deixis

The poetic shift toward a self-enclosed fictional construct through the dramatic creation within the discourse itself of its own conditions of enunciation seems to become even more marked in the extant remains of the varied poetic output of Callimachus. In at least four of the six hymnic compositions whose complete text has come down to us, the voice of the bard appears to sing in a polyphony adopted successively by different speakers—all of them choral in character. Such subtle enunciative games involve the construction through poetic mimesis of a complex communicative situation at once completely representational and fictive.[47]

This development also marks some other poems for which we have complete texts. Thus, for example, *Epigram* 47 adopts the strategies of narrative in order to recount, in the metaphoric guise of an adventure at sea, the rescue of the dedicatee who was up to his ears in debt. Instead of referring extra-discursively to the object dedicated to the gods of Samothrace for their favor in rescuing the speaker from shipwreck, the deictic ὅδε refers to the vow (τήνδε κατ' εὐχήν, 3) pronounced by the man at the moment of

---

45 For an analysis of the openings of *Idylls* 7, 3, and 6, see Hunter 1999.151–54, 110, and 248–50; see also Goldhill 1991.225–58, who nicely describes the air of "remoteness" that hangs over the spatial framework contructed in *Idyll* 7, despite the presence of place names.

46 Only the σφρηγίς that Thyrsis affixes to his song (Θύρσις ὅδ' ὠξ Αἴτνας, "this here Thyrsis from Etna," 65) has the possibility of providing an extra-discursive localization to this poetic space. Cf. Calame 1992.77–85 for a study of the spaces constructed in this poem with its complex enunciative structure.

47 See the important study of Falivene 1990.

danger. By using indirect discourse, which subordinates the act of dedication (ὥδε ἔθετο, 4) to the speech of the dedicatee, all the while addressing that speech to the passers-by and the devotees of the Cabiroi, this vow, through the force of its anaphoric reference, corresponds, in fact, to the text of the story that explains the causes and results of the rescue.[48] The use of indirect discourse thus has the purpose of cutting τήνδε and ὥδε off from any extra-discursive deictic reference. And in *Epigram* 58, while the spatial reference refers to the tomb that covers the dead man found "here" (ἐνθάδε, 1), and which is also directly indicated (τῷδε τάφῳ, 2), it addresses a nameless shipwrecked sailor found on the shore by a passer-by who only mourns his own fate like a gull adrift.

Elsewhere, the Hellenistic poet exploits the "crossing of genres" in praising the panhellenic victories won by Sosibius (later an official under Ptolemy IV) in elegiac couplets. This fragmentary poem (384 Pfeiffer) presents the song celebrating the victory of the young athlete from Alexandria in a wrestling contest at the Panathenaia as an opportunity for the choral group performing the processional song (κῶμον ἄγοντι χορῷ, 38) to sing the famous victory refrain (νικαῖον ἐφύμνιον, 39) composed by Archilochus (frag. 324 West) and quoted by Pindar himself at the beginning of *Olympian* 9.[49] In addition to offering an unexpected confirmation of the choral character of the κῶμος and an example of the embedded literary allusions characteristic of Alexandrian poetics, the poem describes the various nocturnal festivals organized to celebrate in private the athletic victories of Sosibius, which are designated both anaphoracally and deictically by the use of ὅδε (τῶνδε πανηγυρίων, 30). But if the allusion to the choral κῶμος is, in all probability, put in the mouth of Sosibius, the reference to the festivities are spoken by the Nile, who, in his role as nurse of the young athlete, expresses himself in the poem through direct discourse. This means that the deictic designation of the celebrations in which Sosibius participated refers intradiscursively to the victories that have just been mentioned in the narrative mode, within the diegesis itself.

Finally, while Callimachus combines multiple formulas appropriate to the invocations in prayer form that conclude the *Homeric Hymns*, only

---

48 Compare with the text of the "real" epigram (*OGIS* 69 Dittenberger): θεοῖς μεγάλοις, Σαμοθρᾷξι Ἀπολλώνιος Σωσιβίου Θηραῖος ἡγεμὼν τῶν ἔξω τάξεων σωθεὶς ἐγ μεγάλων κινδύνων ἐκπλεύσας ἐκ τῆς Ἐρυθρᾶς θαλάσσης εὐχήν.

49 Concerning this learned allusion and the debate it already provoked in antiquity, cf. the scholia to Pindar *Ol.* 9.1k and 3g–l (I.268–69 Drachmann) and Fuhrer 1993.83–89.

the close of his *Hymn to Demeter* seems to offer an example of extra-discursive deixis and hence of *demonstratio ad oculos*. With essentially the same phrasing that concludes the short *Homeric Hymn* 13 (also addressed to Demeter), the goddess is asked to take pleasure (in the present song) before being asked to ensure the safety of "this" city (χαῖρε, θεά, καὶ τάνδε σαώ πόλιν, 134). If, however, we attribute an extra-discursive sense to this gesture of deictic monstration, it means ignoring its basis in the enunciative focalization. The body of the poem is, in fact, conceived as a sequence of utterances addressed to the young girls imagined to be celebrating Demeter through their songs (ἐπιφθέγξασθε, γυναῖκες, 1; παρθενικαί, καὶ ἐπιφθέγξασθε, 118). But by a subtle assimilation of the choristers to the speaker through a generalizing "we" (ἁμίν, 121), the address to Demeter, while placed in the mouth of this chorus of young girls, finally becomes an invitation to the goddess to be propitious spoken by the speaker himself, on his own behalf (ἵλαθί μοι, 138).[50] This appropriation of the voice of the chorus by the poet is a self-conscious move that distances the text from any situational reference. Moreover, unlike the *Homeric Hymns*, the Hymn to Demeter does not culminate in a performative introduction to another song: the hymnic compositions of the critic-poet are not προοίμια: they do not form preludes to the rhapsodic and ritual recitation of the Homeric poems on the occasion of a particular cultic celebration. Henceforth, they are literary productions, constituted by *Deixis am Phantasma* even in their deployment of the strategies of *demonstratio ad oculos*.

On the basis of the foregoing, the ἔπη making up the *Hymn to Pan*, included in "this" learned and written text (γραφῇ τῇδε, 3) composed by Castorion of Soloi (*Suppl. Hell.* 310), scarcely require further commentary:

> σὲ τὸν βολαῖς νιφοκτύποις δυσχείμερον
> ναίονθ' ἕδραν, θηρονόμε Πάν, χθόν' Ἀρκάδων,
> κλήσω γραφῇ τῇδ'εν σοφῇ πάγκλειτ' ἔπη
> συνθείς, ἄναξ, δύσγνωστα μὴ σοφῷ κλύειν,
> μωσοπόλε θήρ, κηρόχυτον ὃς μείλιγμ' ἰεῖς.
>
> You who inhabit a wintry, snow gust-beaten
> place, herdsman Pan, the Arcadians' land,
> I will celebrate in this learned text, having composed

50 Cf. Falivene 1990.122–25.

a poem of all-renown, lord, hard for one not learned to
understand,
O serving-beast of the Muses, who utters a melody
molded of wax.[51]

VI. CONCLUSION: CODA

If the learned poets of Alexandria at the court of the Ptolemies continued to employ forms of the deictic marker of presence ὅδε—all the while mixing the traditional inherited genres—they generally did so only by using them as intra-discursive references of an anaphoric or cataphoric kind. Tied to their focalization on the speaking "I" and the formal framework of enunciation, these forms of ὅδε lost their deictic function, particularly their programmatic reference to the present poem in relation to its preparation and the actual process of its performance. Stripped of its reference to an extra-discursive *hic et nunc* through the medium of writing, a poem could now be composed for the distant actualization represented by reading.

Henceforth, poetic self-referentiality appears entirely limited to *Deixis am Phantasma* and to the possibilities of fictional realization characteristic of that poetic mode: the fictional becomes "fictive." In turn, stripped of its anchor in the performative dimension of poetic practice, the *demonstratio ad oculos* is placed in the service of a purely rhetorical ἐνάργεια, as is the case in most kinds of modern poetry, but as is also true of Homeric narrative poetry, however "archaic" it may be. Thus, despite appearances, the appeal to *Deixis am Phantasma* does not depend on the shift from oral to written; likewise *demonstratio ad oculos* should not be considered an "innovation" introduced by the "lyric" poets.[52] The different configurations arising from the combinations of these two phenomena are based on generic rules that may vary according to historical and institutional circumstances. As the fictional character of heroic Homeric poetry demonstrates, the use of writing plays only a secondary role in these variations. What is essential is the part played by the pragmatic function of their respective poetic genres.

---

51 Translation by Bing 1988.23; see also his comments on this text.

52 As maintained by Rösler 1983.26–28 and Danielewicz 1990.16–17, respectively. There is, then, no one-to-one relation between the movement from the mode of *demonstratio ad oculos* to that of *Deixis am Phantasma* and the change between an oral tradition to a culture of writing. See the discussion in Bakker 1998.65–77 and Calame 1995.25–26.

Thus the pragmatic element in a discourse altogether focused on producing a result (e.g., a forensic speech), entails the diminution of some of the indications of deixis found particularly in melic poetry. Doubtless, by way of conclusion, the distinction made by Aristotle between poetry and rhetoric should be mentioned here. If the latter is connected to practice, the former arises from mimesis. As representation, and hence as fabrication, poetry can only fulfill its ritual function enunciatively through *demonstratio ad oculos*. But to the extent that such indispensable deictic markers cannot themselves be divorced from *Deixis am Phantasma*, *discours* cannot be separated from *récit*. Hence, without dispensing with its pragmatic utility, the initial distinction between *histoire/récit* and *discours* outlined by Benveniste according to precise linguistic criteria turns out to be completely porous with respect to the practical analysis of Greek discourse. Which brings us back, appropriately enough, to reflect on the applications of linguistic theory and the concepts that may be able to restore texts in their anthropological dimensions to literary analysis.

University of Lausanne and EHESS, Paris
University of Virginia