By the end of the archaic period, Greek sanctuaries were bursting with dedications, including many that bore epigrams. This study views dedications comprehensively as sites of ritual efficacy, and in particular it recovers epigrams’ reflections of and contributions to that efficacy and restores them to an important place in the panorama of Greek religious practice. In order to reconstruct the archaic experience of reading and viewing, the book draws on studies of traditional poetic language as resonant with immanent meaning, early Greek poetry as socially and religiously effective performance, and viewing art as an active response of aesthetic appreciation. It argues that reading epigrams while viewing dedications generated effects of religious ritual and poetic performance, and that visual and verbal representation of the dedicator’s act of offering associated that rite with similar effects, thereby framing the experiences of readers and viewers as reperformances of the earlier occasion.
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Together with sacrifice, prayer, and libation, the offering of dedications was one of the basic religious activities of the ancient Greeks. From the ninth century BCE, they began filling sanctuaries with lasting gifts in fabric, wood, terracotta, metal, and stone to accompany sacrifices and other transient offerings such as processions, competitions, and performances of hymns. By 700, donors had begun inscribing their dedications with metrical texts, or epigrams, this book’s chief focus. By the end of the archaic period, sanctuaries were bursting with dedications, many of which, especially finer objects like bronze and marble statues, bore epigrams.

Still, the corpus of extant epigrams is modest, around 250 physically surviving texts down to the end of the fifth century, plus a handful of genuine inscriptions preserved in literature. Most are brief, one or two hexameters, and after the middle of the sixth century, one or occasionally two elegiac couplets. Something over 500 verses are preserved, many very fragmentary. Dedications, the book’s secondary focus, can be associated with epigrams only in a few cases; more commonly, an inscribed stone base for a statue or other offering survives, but no specific object can be matched to it. The class of object can usually be determined, however, and surviving examples of its type allow us to reconstruct the general look of inscribed monuments.

This study’s scope is significantly determined by Hansen’s corpus of archaic and fifth-century metrical inscriptions, CEG 1, with additions and corrections in CEG 11 and the work of other scholars. Readers of this book will wish to have CEG to hand: I generally refer to epigrams with Hansen’s

1 Prose inscriptions, mostly gathered in Lazzarini’s DVA, provide a comparative corpus. Gallavotti 1979 construes in lyric meters many inscriptions treated as prose or faulty hexameters or pentameters by most scholars. Following Hansen (see 1984, also CEG 1, page xi, CEG 11, page xi), I categorize inscribed verse and prose in the traditional manner, and I note that phraseology supports Hansen: epigraphic words and motifs that most resemble poetry appear largely or exclusively in inscriptions conventionally labeled epigrams.
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numbers alone, supplying other corpus numbers and references to studies only when cited for specific information or if not given in CEG. I have not pursued dedicatory epigrams beyond the fifth century, because my chief interest lies in the earlier material, and in any case carrying such a broad effort at cultural contextualization further forward was not feasible.

As much as possible, arguments are made from surviving texts; but reasonably secure restorations are printed, and more heavily restored inscriptions are cited as parallels in the notes. When a restoration is printed in the main text in CEG or my other source, the item number is bracketed in my notes: e.g., in a discussion of δγαλμας, CEG [180] indicates that Hansen restores the word in his text. In the case of restorations suggested in Hansen’s or other commentaries but not printed in their texts, a question mark is added: e.g., CEG [?203], where Hansen mentions Raubitschek’s restored δγαλμας only in his note.

For the transliteration of Greek words, personal names and most other proper nouns in inscriptions, and less well-known authors and historical figures, I follow common epigraphical practice, with these options: ch for χι, ᵀ for ῆτα, ᵙ� for ωμεγα, u for υπσιλον. Thus, for example, Aiglatas, Alkman, Chêramuês, Lusôn, Mantiklos. Well-known ancient names and places appear in conventional English form (Apollo, Athena, Delphi, Pindar), though I prefer akropolis to acropolis. Translations of ancient authors and inscriptions are my own unless otherwise indicated.

This book has been long in the making. It began with an insight, hardly original to its author, that the archaic Greek epigram, together with the object on which it was written, stood in some relationship to an original ritual or ceremonial occasion: epitaph and grave marker memorialized the funeral; inscribed dedications recalled the rite of offering. Exploration of this idea has involved, at one level, analysis of epigraphic and iconographic representations of the original event and its effects; but already in my earlier work, the evidence was drawing me toward an hypothesis of reperformance, namely, that reading or hearing epigrams while viewing monuments, in their ancient physical, religious, and social contexts, reenacted the represented rites or occasions. Developing a mature concept of reperformance has progressed slowly, in part because of the need to attain a degree of proficiency in areas not previously central to my scholarship, specifically, in approaches to traditional poetic language as resonant with immanent, often metonymic meaning, to poetry and ritual as socially and religiously effective performance, and to viewing art as an active response of aesthetic appreciation and social or religious negotiation. The resulting argument of this book is twofold. First, reading and hearing epigrams
while viewing dedications generated effects of religious ritual and poetic performance such as emotional heightening, negotiation of social position, and perception of divine presence. And second, a dedication’s visual and verbal representation of the act of offering associated that rite with similar effects, thereby framing the immediate experience of readers, hearers, and viewers as repetitions of the earlier occasion. Epigram and dedication thus memorialized dedicatory ritual by generating its reperformance in people’s encounters with them.

In the course of this scholarly evolution, I have incurred a great many debts to generous colleagues and institutions. It gives me great pleasure to acknowledge major debts here and others in the notes, with the customary assertion that I alone bear responsibility for mistakes and excesses. I hope I have not overlooked too many kindnesses.

First come three fundamental debts. The late A. E. Raubitschek, my mentor at Stanford, originally suggested epigram to me as a topic of study and supported me in that project over many years in countless ways, always insisting that the texts be considered in their archaeological and literary contexts. Peter Hansen supplied amazingly detailed, sensible, constructive responses to drafts of articles, generous recommendations for funding, and personal hospitality in Oxford. My most persistent but patient critic, with whom I shared many pleasant working lunches in Athens, sadly not to be repeated, was the late Malcolm Wallace of Toronto.

I thank Ronald Stroud for generous sharing of his prodigious epigraphical experience, letters of recommendation to grant-giving institutions, and a careful reading of Chapter 2, also read by Alan Boegehold with his customary acuity and good sense. Eva Stehle commented helpfully on many matters and produced an extraordinary dissection of a draft of Chapter 6, which Anne Stewart also read, offering special insight on divine images. Catherine Keesling shared freely and often of her remarkable perceptiveness about Athenian Akropolis dedications and wrote several recommendations. Mary Depew (who also wrote recommendations), Nancy Felson, Leslie Kurke, and Michael Martin provided guidance for a rapid immersion in cultural studies and theories of discourse, performance, practice, and pragmatics. The late Marleen Flory, sorely missed, discussed the project at an early stage and supplied recommendations. I acknowledge others only by naming them: Judith Barringer, John Fischer, Greta Ham, Jeremy Harnett, David Jordan, Nancy Klein, Robert Lamberton, Julia Lougovaya, Elizabeth Meyer, Paula Perlman, Andrej Petrovic, Molly Richardson, Kent Rigsby, Alan Shapiro, James Sickinger, Andrew Stewart, Stephen Tracy, Christos Tsagalis, William West, Bronwen Wickkiser.
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No part of this book reproduces any of my earlier publications or papers or substantial portions of them; but ideas, examples, and arguments developed there have found their way here, and I thank those who offered me a podium (or a press) and my wonderfully responsive audiences. David Mitten invited me to deliver a James Loeb Classical Lecture at Harvard in 1992 (revised as Day 1994), effectively an early outline of parts of this book. Peter Bing organized a symposium on Greek epigram at Emory in 1993, where I spoke on dedications; his comments and those of my respondent, William Race, challenged me to clarify my approach. Later, Prof. Bing and Jon Bruss asked me to contribute to Brill’s Companion to Hellenistic Epigram an article that, with their assistance, became Day 2007, which contains part of this volume’s Chapter 3 in nuce. Mary Depew and Dirk Obbink welcomed me into the 1996 colloquium on genre at the Center for Hellenic Studies; much improved by their suggestions and those of other participants (especially Glenn Most, Ian Rutherford, and Stephanie West), that talk appeared as Day 2000. At the kind invitation of Peter Liddel and Polly Low, I joined their stimulating conference on inscriptions in literature at the University of Manchester in 2009, which I wish had occurred earlier in this project.


Heartfelt thanks go to Robert Bridges, the staff of the Blegen Library, and the other employees and administrators of the American School, where much of my research and writing has taken place. I am also grateful to the School for appointing me NEH Senior Research Fellow for work on this monograph in 2000–01. The National Endowment for the Humanities supported me with an earlier fellowship as well, also spent at the School, for a study of inscribed epitaphs (1984–85). Wabash College has been a stalwart supporter, providing sabbaticals (1990–91, 1997–98, 2005–06), summer travel courtesy of the Coss Faculty Development Fund, a McClain-McTurnan-Arnold Research Scholarship (spring 1994), and Mitchell Brown as a most helpful research assistant (2008). Sabbatical and fellowship income was augmented by grants from the American Council of Learned Societies (1990–91), the American Philosophical Society (1997–98), and the Wabash Center for the Teaching of Religion and Theology (2000–01).
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I thank the Greek Archaeological Service for permission to study, photograph, and publish objects in the Akropolis Museum (with the help of Christina Vlassopoulou), Epigraphical Museum (Dina Peppa-Delmousou and Chara Karapa-Molisani), and Sparta Museum (Adamantia Vasilogambrou). Maria Pilali, Assistant to the Director of the American School, secured permits for museum study and photography. For other help with images, I thank Charles Crowther (Centre for the Study of Ancient Documents, Oxford), Hans Goette and Joachim Heiden (Deutsches archäologisches Institut), Klaus Hallof (Inscriptiones Graecae), Erin Schleigh (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston), and Kristen Wenger (British Museum), as well as Pierre Aupert, Erin Babnik, Melissa Eaby, Catherine Keesling, Olga Palagia, John Raubitschek for the family of A. E. Raubitschek, Andrew Stewart, Robert Sutton and Susan Sutton, and Natalia Vogeikoff-Brogan.

At Cambridge University Press, Michael Sharp has been a most patient, responsive, and helpful editor, and his assistant editor Elizabeth Hanlon has rescued me repeatedly. The comments of the Press’s anonymous readers proved immensely useful in my efforts to revise and enhance several arguments and to make the final version more “user-friendly” than the first.

Leslie Preston Day, to whom this volume is affectionately dedicated, has provided the constant support of a loving spouse over the whole period of the book’s genesis; and she has unstintingly shared her professional expertise in countless discussions about epigrams, their monuments, and my work on both, always with the rigor and concision of an astonishingly perceptive field archaeologist and scholar of Aegean and Greek material culture.

Crawfordsville, Indiana
23 November 2009
Abbreviations
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