RITUALS IN STONE:
EARLY GREEK GRAVE EPIGRAMS AND MONUMENTS

THE goal of this paper is to increase our understanding of what archaic verse epitaphs meant to contemporary readers. Section I suggests their fundamental message was praise of the deceased, expressed in forms characteristic of poetic encomium in its broad, rhetorical sense, i.e., praise poetry. In section II, the conventions of encomium in the epitaphs are compared to the iconographic conventions of funerary art. I conclude that verse inscriptions and grave markers, not only communicate the same message of praise, but do so in a formally parallel manner. Section III, drawing on Pindar as a preserver of archaic thinking, attributes the parallelism between verse epitaph and grave marker to their common debt to funerary ritual. The epigrams will be seen to share with their monuments the goal of memorializing this ritual.

Sceptics will ask how we can interpret grave epigrams as we do poetry of more impeccable literary pedigree. While an undeniably wide variety of verbal and metrical parallels link the early inscribed epigram with epic and elegy, no consensus exists about its aesthetic quality or the depth of its meaning.[1] The epigrammatists' creativity was limited by the need to include the name of the deceased and other essential information in a very brief text, and by the demands of the prevailing meter for inscriptions in a given place and time. Not surprisingly, many epitaphs seem to be utterly uninspired versions of standard formulas. Still, within its severe constraints, the verse epitaph offered considerable opportunity for expansion and variety.[2] A limited number of unusually full, often older inscriptions, as well as several later ones with interesting variations on conventional wording, will necessarily bear most of the weight of the present interpretation. Nevertheless, simpler, later, and less adept examples contain fossilized echoes of earlier usage. If we know a formula's original intent, we can better understand the associations a reader might typically have made to fill out the brief text's message.[3]

I. THE EPITAPH AS ENCOMIUM

In archaic Greece, grave mounds, built tombs, stone or terracotta markers, and other features of conspicuous burials served primarily to bear public witness before the living to the

[1] For parallels, cf. P. Friedländer with H. B. Hoffleit, *Epigrammata: Greek inscriptions in verse* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1948), and B. Gentili, 'Epigramma ed elegia', *Fondation Hardt* xiv (1968) 39–90. Broad thematic studies of epigrammatic tradition offer little on the archaic material; cf. R. Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin epitaphs* (Urbana 1942); A.-M. Vérilhac, Παῖδες ἄωροι: *poésie funéraire* i, πραγματεῖαι τῆς Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθηνῶν xli (Athens 1978); and various issues of *Commentationes aenipontanae*. As a corrective, cf.

S. C. Humphreys, 'Family tombs and tomb cult in ancient Athens: tradition or traditionalism', *JHS* c (1980) 96–126. For the lack of consensus, contrast M. B. Wallace, 'The metres of early Greek epigrams', in D. E. Gerber (ed.), *Early Greek poetry and philosophy: studies in honour of Leonard Woodbury* (Chico 1984) 303–17, esp. 307 f., with M. Lausberg, *Das Einzeldistichon: Studien zum antiken Epigramm*, Studia et testimonia antiqua xix (Munich 1982), esp. 102–22.

[2] P. A. Hansen, 'DAA 374–5 and the early elegiac epigram', *Glotta* lvi (1978) 200 notes that the extant corpus lacks standard lines.

[3] P. A. Hansen, *Carmina epigraphica graeca saeculorum vii–v a. Chr. n.*, Texte und Kommentare xii (Berlin and New York 1983), hereafter *CEG* with his numbers, provides the corpus for this study. For addenda and corrigenda, cf. P. A. Hansen, *A list of Greek verse inscriptions, c. 400–300 B.C.*, Opuscula graecolatina xxviii (Copenhagen 1985) 11–13. On *CEG*'s comprehensiveness, cf. Wallace (n. 1) 303 with n. 1, 316 f., and J. W. Day, *AJPh* cvi (1985) 374–6. I occasionally augment *CEG* from D. L. Page, *Further Greek epigrams* (Cambridge Univ. 1981), hereafter *FGE* with his running line numbers.

status of the deceased as an ἀγαθός, one who had satisfied aristocratic society's highest standards.[4] Epitaphs in prose began to appear in the mid-seventh century, and the prominence they give to the dead person's name confirms that the memorialization of an important individual was the monument's central function. The simplest examples consist *only* in the name,[5] which is often joined by a patronymic and sometimes an ethnic, but rarely any other biographical detail. The name might also be incorporated into one of a few formulas, e.g., [μν]ἑμα 'Αλέχσο εἰμὶ τõ Δελίο, 'I am the memorial of Alexos the Delian'.[6] With remarkably few exceptions, however, such patterns exhaust the scope of the prose epitaph.

From the beginning, epitaphs could also be construed in meter, but many seem hardly more than versified prose, e.g., (Doric capital, Corcyra, c. 575–550, CEG 146),

στάλα Ξενϝάρεος τοῦ Μhείξιός εἰμ' ἐπὶ τύ|μοι.

I am the column of Xenwares, son of Meixis, on his tomb.

The hexameter ends with a Homeric echo, but its adherence to a prose recipe leaves us feeling the echo has been grafted on mechanically to supply an elegant flourish.[7] Still, it seems that verse was considered especially appropriate for the most important burials. Certainly in Attica, where our information is fullest, Peisistratos and his followers established the habit so firmly that epitaphs for people with any pretentions to greatness were predominantly in elegiac distichs.[8] The association of metrical epitaphs with the graves of ἀγαθοί was no accident. Their composers, while incorporating much that would be equally at home in prose, regularly succeeded in converting it into poetic encomium, the traditional medium for honoring ἀγαθοί.[9] They had as their model the old tradition of praise poetry with its treasury of ready-made, easily recognizable verbal strategies for presenting a *laudandus* as worthy of praise and emulation. Their command of this material was amateur, their efforts normally very humble and derivative; but what they did was formally parallel to Pindar's conversion of a victor's vital statistics into an epinician ode.[10]

The earliest surviving grave epigram from Attica provides a full paradigm (block from a stele base, Sepolia, c. 575–550, CEG 13):

[εἴτε ἀστό]ς τις ἀνὲρ εἴτε χσένος | ἄλοθεν ἐλθὸν
Τέτιχον οἰκτίρα|ς ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν παρίτο,
ἐν πολέμοι | φθίμενον, νεαρὰν hέβεν ὀλέσαν|τα.
ταῦτ' ἀποδυράμενοι νέσθε ἐπ|ὶ πρᾶγμ' ἀγαθόν.

Let each man, whether a citizen or foreigner coming from elsewhere, pass by only after pitying Tettichos, a good man, who perished in war and lost his fresh youthfulness. Once you have lamented this, move on to a good deed.

The modern reader focuses on the pathos of the young man's destruction in war and responds readily to the calls for pity and lamentation. Commentators reinforce these feelings by citing

[4] I. Morris, *Burial and ancient society* (Cambridge Univ. 1987) *passim*; D. C. Kurtz and J. Boardman, *Greek burial customs* (Ithaca 1971) 218, 260 f.; E. Vermeule, *Aspects of death in early Greek art and poetry* (Berkeley, etc. 1979) 60 f. *Cf.* Hom. *Il.* vii 85–91, xvi 456 f., xxiii 245–8, *Od.* xxiv 80–4; and, for the lack of a tomb, *Il.* xxi 316–23, *Od.* xxiv 24–34. Midas' epitaph (*A. Pal.* vii 153, etc.), not Simonides' sardonic comment on it (*PMG* 581), reflects archaic feeling.

[5] For the name alone as a signal honor at Sparta, *cf.* Plut. *Lyc.* 27.

[6] L. H. Jeffery, 'The inscribed gravestones of archaic Attica', *ABSA* lvii (1962), no. 6, *c.* 540–530. Non-Attic material offers a few additional formulas, but nothing substantially different.

[7] For the echo, *cf.* Friedländer (n. 1), no. 1. W. Peek, *Griechische Vers-Inschriften* i (Berlin 1955) summarizes the formula: μνῆμα (σῆμα) τόδ' ἐστὶν (εἰμὶ) τοῦ δεῖνος.

[8] *Cf.* Wallace (n. 1). Jeffery (n. 6) 115–53 catalogues 44 verse epitaphs and 25 in prose.

[9] The Romans with their prose *laudatio funebris* learned verse epitaphs from the Greeks; *cf.* J. Van Sickle, 'The *elogia* of the Cornelii Scipiones and the origin of the epigram at Rome', *AJPh* cviii (1987) 41–55.

[10] *Cf.* Gentili (n. 1) 54–6. Pl. *Leg.* xii 958e, calls epitaphs ἐγκώμια βίου. E. L. Bundy, *Studia pindarica*, U. Cal. Publ. Class. Phil. xviii (1962) remains essential on encomiastic form; *cf.* W. J. Slater, 'Doubts about Pindaric interpretation', *CJ* lxxii (1977) 193–208.

literary and inscriptional parallels for the pathetic combination of youth and death.[11] We too easily overlook the tone of emotional restraint in which the epitaph attempts to persuade us that Tettichos requires our *praise*; yet a contemporary reader probably perceived this demand as more important than that for sorrow or pity.[12] The epigram works its persuasion, first, by presenting Tettichos' death as archetypically noble; second, by employing language that praises by implication; and third, by using certain forms of direct argumentation. Fitting all this into two distichs was a great achievement of the art of *brevitas*; but it was only possible because the composer could rely on the reader to recognize various abbreviated conventions of literary encomium, which in fact appear throughout archaic epitaphs.[13]

The epigram supplies no specific biographical information about Tettichos besides his name. Even his youthfulness and death in battle are couched in conventional language, *viz*., the epithet ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός and the formulas of the second hexameter. The epitaph in effect gives the name Tettichos to the anonymous dead hero of Tyrtaeus' military elegy. It does not present Tettichos' death as a particular event in a particular battle, but rather makes it conform to the archetypal pattern of the warrior's death, the καλὸς θάνατος.[14] Tettichos is captured in this ideal state of death, forever young and beautiful. This is the kind of 'biography' that lies at the heart of archaic encomium, namely, brief formulaic expressions which cause the subject to conform to an archetype. We see it in the many epitaphs for warriors, but also in those for other praiseworthy types: physician, maiden, victorious athlete, respected *proxenos*. Some epitaphs fall back on even more general categories of praise like ἀγαθὸς καὶ σώφρων ἀνήρ;[15] but with very few exceptions,[16] death away from home and youthful death are the only biographical details not obviously belonging to an encomiastic type. The former often simply identifies the nationality of a person buried in a foreign land,[17] while the extremely common motif of youthful death may itself carry encomiastic force. I suspect the concept of the καλὸς θάνατος exerted so strong an influence that virtually any formula of youthful death conferred praise on the deceased, whether or not he died in battle or was even literally young.[18]

As is the case with apparently neutral biographical motifs, certain features of syntax can acquire implicit encomiastic force from frequent occurrence in praising contexts. In Pindar and elsewhere, for example, praiseworthy traits or actions so often appear in a relative clause describing the *laudandus*, we can consider the usage a distinct linguistic trait of encomium.[19] This

[11] A. Stecher, *Inschriftliche Grabgedichte auf Krieger und Athleten: eine Studie zu griechischen Wertprädikationen*, Commentationes aenipontanae xxvii (Innsbruck 1981) 28; A. D. Skiadas, Ἐπὶ τύμβῳ: συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν ἑρμηνείαν τῶν ἑλληνικῶν ἐπιτυμβίων ἐμμέτρων ἐπιγραφῶν, Ἑλληνικὴ Ἀνθρωπιστικὴ Ἑταιρεία, μελέται καὶ ἔρευναι, Second Series xiv (Athens 1967) 36–40; F. Willemsen, 'Archaische Grabmalbasen', *AthMitt* lviii (1963) 118–21; M. Guarducci in G. M. A. Richter, *The archaic gravestones of Attica* (London 1961) 158.

[12] *Cf.* Lausberg (n. 1) 116 with 534 n. 2; N. Loraux, trans. by A. Sheridan, *The invention of Athens* (Harvard 1986) acknowledges the dominance of praise in *CEG* 13 (366 n. 194), but she emphasizes more than I the epigrams' calls for pity and thus their character as lament rather than encomium (42–56).

[13] Wallace (n. 1) 312 emphasizes the exceptional quality of *CEG* 13, but Lausberg (n. 1) 116 perceives much in it that others imply.

[14] *Cf.* Tyrt. 10–12 W. For an epic rather than elegiac model in military epitaphs, cf. *CEG* 145 with Friedländer (n. 1), no. 25. D. C. Young, *Pindar Isthmian 7, myth and exempla*, Mnemosyne suppl. xv (Leiden 1971) 24 f., 46 compares a military death in Pindar with an epitaph (*CEG* 27, quoted below). For the καλὸς θάνατος, cf. J.-P. Vernant, 'La belle mort et le cadavre

outragé', in G. Gnoli and J.-P. Vernant (eds), *La mort, les morts dans les sociétés anciennes* (Cambridge, etc. 1982) 45–76; S. C. Humphreys and H. King, *Mortality and immortality: the anthropology and archaeology of death* (London, etc. 1981) 269, 285–7; Loraux (n. 12) 98–118.

[15] *CEG* 34, 36; *cf.* 41 and Wallace (n. 1) 311.

[16] *CEG* 58, 61, 151. Others are crude specimens: *CEG* 37, 47, 49.

[17] *CEG* 11, 52, 58, 66, 77, 80, 108, 130, 132, 143, 166, 170, 171, 173.

[18] For 'youth' as a social and moral, rather than a physiological, category, *cf.* A. M. D'Onofrio, 'Korai e kouroi funerari attici', *AION*, sez. Arch. e Stor., iv (1982) 164. Many formulas for youthful death are encomiastic in their own right, e.g., ὤλεσεν ἥβην by association, since it only occurs in military epitaphs; cf. *CEG* 4, 6, 13, 82, 136, 155. Elsewhere I shall argue that ὤλεσεν ἔλπ' ἀγαθήν (*CEG* 51), said of a παῖς, is also encomiastic. For a parent conducting a child's funeral, *cf.* below, p. 25.

[19] *Cf.* Lausberg (n. 1) 35 f., 104; Bundy (n. 10) 8; D. C. Young, 'Pindar Pythians 2 and 3: inscriptional ποτέ and the poetic epistle', *HSCPh* lxxxvii (1983) 31–48, esp. 41 with n. 30. *N.b.* Pind. *O*. 5.4, *I*. 8.63, and Bacch. 10.15, with n. 60 below.

laudatory relative occurs very frequently in epitaphs. *CEG* contains twenty-five relative clauses with the deceased as the antecedent, and at least sixteen explicitly justify the rendering of praise.[20] The relative would subliminally reinforce a contemporary reader's feeling that the epitaph was encomium, and thus that the dead had become the subject of praise poetry. Often ποτέ, which reflects the viewpoint of commemorative poetry about a hero of the distant past, enhances this feeling.[21] *CEG* 27, on the base block associated with the Anavyssos kouros, provides a striking example (Phoinikia in Attica, *c.* 540–530):

στέθι καὶ οἴκτιρον Κροίσο | παρὰ σέμα θανόντος
hόν | ποτ' ἐνὶ προμάχοις ὄλεσε | θõρος Ἄρες.

Halt and show pity beside the marker of dead Kroisos, whom raging Ares once destroyed in the front rank of battle.

The phrase ἐνὶ προμάχοις belongs to the language of the military archetype,[22] while ποτέ and the mention of Ares give Kroisos' death the timeless value Pindar confers on his victor's successes by associating them with mythical exempla taken from traditional praise poetry. The impression that Kroisos has found a place in such poetry would be slightly reinforced by the prominent relative, which separates the introductory hexameter from the pentameter. The third line of Tettichos' epitaph creates a similar effect, and in fact the participial construction used twice there may be a variant of the laudatory relative.[23]

Apart from simply describing the *laudandus* in praising language, an encomiastic poet assumed a conventional role of advocate, presenting arguments to convince the audience to render praise.[24] Four well-attested motifs of argumentation appear in the elaborate addresses to the passer-by in Tettichos' epitaph. (1) The two imperatives and their accompanying participles (οἰκτίρας . . . παρίτω, ἀποδυράμενοι νεῖσθε) make direct demands on the reader in the manner of literary encomium. Although pity and lamentation rather than praise seem to be all that are required, in funerary contexts such expressions of emotion are closely associated with, even subordinated to, praising the deceased.[25] (2) The conventional doublet, ἀστός . . . ξένος, extends the force of the imperatives to every possible passer-by. Encomium regularly universalizes the demand for praise with such motifs.[26] (3) The epitaph hints at a potential hindrance to the fulfilment of this requirement. Readers are envisaged as moving along both before (*cf.* ἄλλοθεν ἐλθών) and after (*cf.* παρίτω, νεῖσθε) lamenting Tettichos, a reasonable expectation given the frequent siting of monuments beside roads.[27] They might, therefore, have passed by (*cf.* παρίτω) without stopping to read or respond to the epitaph. The idea is comparable to the literary motif of reciting hindrances faced and overcome by the *laudator*. It increases the value of the praise and therefore the glory of the *laudandus*.[28] (4) The last line urges readers to pursue the same ἀρετή Tettichos did.[29] Literary encomium frequently contains such rhetorically astute exhortations. In effect, they argue that anyone striving to attain society's highest moral standard should honor the *laudandus* for having achieved it, and conversely that whoever does not honor the *laudandus* fails to uphold social norms.[30]

---

[20] *CEG* 4*, 10.11, 12*, 27*, 47, 51 (*cf.* n. 18), 58.3, 68, 83.5, 87, 93, 103, 112*, 118, 123, 142. We should add 43 and 61, if the erection of a monument implies praise; *cf.* also 42 and 46, and below, p. 24. Further examples may have existed in 33, 91, and 148, and cf. *FGE* 702 ff.*, 786 ff., 1536 ff.* Examples marked with an asterisk contain ποτέ (see below); *cf.* also 148 and 431.

[21] *Cf.* Young (n. 19).

[22] *Cf.* Young (n. 14) *passim.*

[23] Cf. *CEG* 2iii, 4, 24 (below, p. 26), 69, 82, possibly 114, 127, 136.3 (=13.3); also *FGE* 776 f.

[24] Slater (above, n. 10).

[25] *Cf.* below, p. 27. On the imperative expressing the χρέος motif, *cf.* Bundy (n. 10) 55. For the subordination of lament, *cf.* Thuc. ii 46.2 (ἀπολοφυρά-

μενοι . . . ἄπιτε), with Loraux (n. 12) 368 n. 219.

[26] *Cf.* Bundy (n. 10) 24; C. Carey, *A commentary on five odes of Pindar* (New York 1981) 96; Friedländer (n. 1), no. 70 (=*CEG* 112).

[27] *Cf.* below, p. 22. Dr. J. P. Binder suggested *privatim* that Tettichos' monument, found at Sepolia, might have stood beside a road leading north out of Athens.

[28] *Cf.* Bundy (n. 10) 40 f.

[29] *N.b.* the repetition of ἀγαθόν; *cf.* Friedländer (n. 1), no. 135. However, Humphreys (n. 1) 103 translates, '. . . and go on your way with good fortune'; cf. *CEG* 110.

[30] For the motif in Pindar, *cf.* Slater (n. 10) 197.

Parallels for these motifs occur widely in *CEG*. An imperative of οἰκτίρω or some other verb of grieving features prominently in several epitaphs.[31] Variant forms of the doublet, 'foreigner . . . citizen', appear in *CEG* 112 and 123, and in 117 a simple 'everyone' replaces the formula but keeps its essential meaning.[32] The occurrence of στῆθι in *CEG* 27 and 28 suggests the motif of hindrance, and the latter expressly mentions the preoccupations that could prevent a wayfarer from stopping to observe a marker (stele base, Kerameikos, *c.* 540–530):[33]

ἄνθροπε hὸστείχε[ι]ς καθ'ὁδὸ|ν φρασὶν ἄλα μενοινõν,
στε͂θι | καὶ οἴκτιρον σε͂μα Θράσονος ἰδόν.

You there, who move along the road with mind intent on other matters, halt and pity, having looked on the marker of Thrason.

Finally, although no explicit exhortation reappears in *CEG*, epitaphs are implicitly prescriptive, as is praise poetry generally. After all, we expect the presentation of moral archetypes to be edifying.[34]

Many epitaphs, though not Tettichos', echo a fifth poetic motif of argumentation, namely, the poets' praising their own songs. The underlying argument is that an encomium which itself deserves praise reflects additional honor onto the *laudandus*. Pindar often enlivens the motif by portraying his ode's performance figuratively as an athletic contest; in effect, he equates his own qualities as *laudator* with those of his *laudandus*.[35] The many epigrams which casually mention the monument or the road beside it reflect the motif implicitly;[36] but such extensions of the idea as that in *CEG* 18 are more truly parallel to Pindar's idiom (kore base, Attica, *c.* 550–540):[37]

[−∪∪−] . ι . [(∪)−] | με φίλες παιδὸς ννννν(ν) | κατέθεκεν
καλὸν ἰδε͂ν | αϝὐτὰρ Φαίδιμος ἐργάσα|το.

[. . . ? a parent] set up, for his/her dear child,. me (the marker) beautiful to behold. And Phaidimos fashioned (me).

The conventional first-person pronoun makes the epigram literally the voice of the kore, but the pentameter transforms this apparently ordinary hexametric formula. By calling herself καλὸν ἰδεῖν and naming her famous sculptor, the kore praises herself and thus articulates a viewer's admiration for what must have been a fine statue.[38] Add to this the natural feeling that a kore's value reflects that of the deceased, and we see how poem and statue communicated the same message: 'this valuable statue, sculpted by a famous maker of statues, requires praise of this young woman for her value'. To appreciate more fully this kind of parallelism between epitaph and portrait, we must turn to the monuments themselves.

II. The Epitaph and its Monument

Attempts to discover a regular correlation between epitaphs and grave markers have not met with notable success. When, as often, discussion is limited to superficial similarities between

---

[31] *CEG* 27, 28, 68, 148, 174; *cf.* 34, 117, 159, *FGE* 776 f. (ὦ ξεῖν', ἀγγέλλειν . . .). *Cf.* below, p. 27. D. M. Lewis *apud* A. P. Matthaiou, 'Δύο ἀρχαϊκὲς ἀττικὲς ἐπιτύμβιες στῆλες', *Horos* iv (1986) 31–4 restores (e.g.) a newly found fragment, [στε͂θι καὶ οἴκ]τιρ[ον. The first-person ἀνιõμαι in the other new piece weakens Willemsen's emendation, οἴκτιρο⟨ν⟩, in *CEG* 51; *cf.* P. A. Hansen, *apud* D. M. Lewis, 'Bowie on elegy: a footnote', *JHS* cvii (1987) 188.

[32] For the *memento mori* as a similar universalizing motif ('we *all* die'), *cf.* *CEG* 34 and 28 (with Skiadas [n. 11] 28).

[33] The siting of monuments (*cf.* below, p. 22) explains another hindrance motif in epitaphs, *viz.*, the assumption that readers would be strangers to the

deceased; *cf.* Humphreys (n. 1) 103 f.

[34] For a public Athenian commemorative epigram of the 470's that is explicit on the point, *cf.* *FGE* 851 f.: . . . μᾶλλόν τις τάδ' ἰδὼν καὶ ἐπεσσομένων ἐθελή- σει | ἀμφὶ περὶ ξυνοῖς πράγμασι δῆριν ἔχειν.

[35] In general, *cf.* Slater (n. 10) 197; and for Pindar, C. Segal, 'Messages to the underworld', *AJPh* cvi (1985) 211.

[36] E.g., *CEG* 28, σῆμα . . . ἰδών. For the road, *cf.* Wallace (n. 1) 310 with n. 24.

[37] *Cf.* *CEG* 19, 26, 31, 161.

[38] D'Onofrio (n. 18) 157–63 argues that κατατίθημι connotes the offering of a valuable prize of honor (γέρας) in exchange for the dead person's excellence. For my emphasis on value, *cf.* below, n. 70.

portraits on classical relief stelai and specific biographical data in the epigrams, little evidence of meaningful correlation comes to light.[39] Students of the archaic material have probed more deeply into the appearance of the inscription and its location on the monument, the economy and directness of its message, and its oral character as a text meant to be read aloud by passers-by.[40] They have demonstrated that epigrams were integral parts of their monuments, as *CEG* 18 illustrates clearly. Too often, however, such observations remain so vague and superficial they can be applied to prose as well as verse inscriptions. We can achieve better results by comparing epigrams and monuments at a still deeper level. The conventional iconography of funerary art and the conventions of encomium in the inscriptions can be shown to exhibit a high degree of formal parallelism. Marker and epitaph could convey the same message in much the same way.

Tettichos' marker can again serve as a paradigm, even though the inscribed stone is the only surviving fragment of a complex piece and shows no artistic embellishment beyond the inscription itself. The typologies of Attic gravestones are well enough established to allow us to reconstruct the monument's general appearance. The inscribed block probably rested atop two or three steps, thus capping a steep, three- or four-tiered base, perhaps 1·00 m high. Above this, a stele would stand 2·00 to 3·00 m high, with its wide surface (*c.* 0·40 m at the base) facing the same direction as the inscription and tapering inwardly a bit toward the top.[41] On this surface a roughly life-sized male figure representing Tettichos would be painted or more likely sculpted in low relief. He would appear either as a naked, long-haired, beardless youth holding a lance, or as a bearded man in full or partial armor. Both types adopt the same pose, standing in profile to the right with the left leg advanced. Armor, hair, some parts of the body, and the figure's undecorated background would be brightly painted. Above Tettichos' head a finial would cap the stele,[42] and below his feet there might be a roughly square panel portraying in paint or relief a gorgon, a horse with rider, or a chariot scene.

The regularity of canonical Attic stelai from which we can reconstruct Tettichos' marker also provides a key to their meaning. The portraits of the dead are generic images that belong to the same category as the kouros, itself normally used as a gravestone in Attica. Stelai essentially depict the right profiles of kouroi, sharing with them a canon of proportions for the body and the use of conventional *schemata* and patterns for rendering hair, anatomical detail, motion, etc.[43] It is not clear to what extent artists worked this way because they were incapable of realistic portraiture or were attempting mass production. It *is* certain that they intended to portray the deceased as the embodiment of a well-established type, in which viewers could recognize a visualization of the ethical archetypes found in literary encomium. The images' most striking characteristics, youthfulness, strength, beauty, striding pace, etc., are idealizations, sometimes at odds with strict verisimilitude. For example, warriors would not have worn their hair so long or gone naked. These are features of heroic youthfulness, and they and the other idealized characteristics have clear parallels in the ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός of epic and elegy, who retains his youth and beauty even in death.[44]

[39] C. W. Clairmont, *Gravestone and epigram* (Mainz 1970) xvii–xviii concludes: 'in the majority of the monuments there is little or no correlation of epigram and figured scene'. *Cf.* B. Schmaltz, *Griechische Grabreliefs*, Erträge der Forschung cxcii (Darmstadt 1983) 119; G. Daux, 'Stèles funéraires et épigrammes', *BCH* xcvi (1972) 505 f.; but A. G. Woodhead, *JHS* xcii (1972) 236 f.

[40] *Cf.* H. Häusle, *Einfache und frühe Formen des griechischen Epigramms*, Commentationes aenipontanae xxv (Innsbruck 1979) 89–105. A. E. Raubitschek, 'Das Denkmal-Epigramm', *Fondation Hardt* xiv (1968) 1–26 has especially influenced my thinking with his emphasis on epigrams as texts meant to be performed orally.

[41] *Cf.* Jeffery (n. 6), no. 34 with pl. 38.a; Richter (n. 11), no. 36 with fig. 203; and, for more comparanda, Schmaltz (n. 39) 149–89. Discussion here is limited to

types appropriate to Tettichos, i.e., youths and warriors, far the most common types in any case.

[42] Richter (n. 11), no. 36 assumes a lyre-shaped capital with a sphinx.

[43] B. S. Ridgway, *The archaic style in Greek sculpture* (Princeton 1977) 12 f., 164 f.; J. J. Pollitt, *The ancient view of Greek art* (Yale 1974) 12–23, 218–28.

[44] *Cf.* Hom. *Il.* xxii 52–76 (with Tyrt. 10 W); above, n. 14; D'Onofrio (n. 18) 165; Humphreys (n. 1) 104; J. M. Hurwit, *The art and culture of early Greece, 1100–480 BC* (Ithaca and London 1985) 197–202, 253–5; Ridgway (n. 43) 49–59; J.-P. Vernant, 'Étude comparée des religions antiques', *Annuaire du Collège de France* lxxvii (1977) 423–43, esp. 436–41; 'πάντα καλά d' Homère a Simonide', *Proc. viith congr. Internat. Fed. Soc. Class. St.* i (Budapest 1984) 167–73.

Stele portraits, unlike kouroi, exhibit indications of age and achievement that seem genuinely biographical. However, only two ages are represented, *viz.*, the prime of life and youth, differentiated by the presence or absence of a beard and perhaps also by clothing, armor, and hairstyle. Moreover, while various attributes might point to the dead man's achievements, they nearly all belong to either an athlete (discus, boxing thong, oil flask, floral crown) or a warrior (spear, sword, chiton, shield, armor).[45] Although they are perhaps more truly biographical, then, stelai also represent the deceased as a type.

Some of a monument's secondary decoration would explicitly reinforce the portrayal of the deceased as a praiseworthy type. Horsemen and chariots on the lower panel of a stele or the faces of a base block, for example, would recall typical pursuits of ἀγαθοί and suggest the dead man had participated in them.[46] Much of a grave marker's decoration, however, seems only to have created an ostentatious framework for the portrait. Still, these abstract floral designs, elaborate finials, sphinxes, bulls, lions, and other beasts, and unusually complex arrangements all betray a desire to capture the eyes of wayfarers and overawe them with an impression of wealth and power.[47] The same can be said of a monument's siting.[48] Markers lined the roads in cemeteries outside the gates of Athens, and in the Attic countryside sepulchral kouroi and korai proliferated along the road east and south from Athens to Sounion. Kroisos' monument, for instance, stood beside this route, overlooking it from an elevated position at the edge of a tumulus.[49] By a kind of visual assertiveness, then, a monument's siting and decoration could present the deceased as an ἀγαθός.

To return to Tettichos' monument and summarize our results: both the gravestone and epitaph described him as an ideal warrior, an ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός, and asserted his right to that status. This did not involve the depiction of Tettichos as he had been in life, or even the creation of a living man's image at all. The man was dead and gone, but the marker and epitaph provided a substitute for him; that is, they reduced the complexity of a man to a simple, permanent, monumental form that represented to the community of the living what he had now become, i.e., one of their ideal dead.[50] This state of idealized death could not be portrayed as a biographical moment like actual death in battle.[51] It was a state of moral and physical perfection, artificially created by verbal and visual motifs any contemporary would recognize from previous acquaintance with literary encomium and commemorative art. However, contemporaries would also bring to the monuments a sense of social occasion to which we must now turn.

III. THE EPITAPH AND THE FUNERAL

The parallelism between grave monuments and epitaphs would not be considered an accident in archaic thought, but rather evidence for the importance of funerary ritual in the

---

[45] Ridgway (n. 43) 167–9 notes that depictions of activity on a few stelai also fall into types. D'Onofrio (n. 18) 167 distinguishes kouroi (images of epic heroism) from stelai (civic virtues, e.g., hoplites and athletes).

[46] For horses on stelai, *cf.* Richter (n. 11) 33 (no. 45), and figs 68, 126 and 128, 154, 159 f., 163 f.; on bases, Willemsen (n. 11) 105–9, no. 1; Ridgway (n. 43) 167; A. M. D'Onofrio, 'Un 'Programma' figurativo tardo arcaico', *AION*, sez. Arch. e Stor., viii (1986) 175–93. However, *cf.* below, p. 24. For the main image as equestrian, cf. *CEG* 50.

[47] For ornamentation as a prized quality in archaic art as in poetry, *cf.* Hurwit (n. 44) 23. For the monument as an aristocratic manifesto, *cf.* M. B. Wallace, 'Early Greek grave epigrams', *Phoenix* xxiv (1970) 98; Humphreys (n. 1) 99 f.; Hurwit (n. 44) 69, 198 f. The aristocrats' desire for ostentation triggered legal limits on funerary display; *cf.* R. Stupperich, *Staatsbegräbnis*

und Privatgrabmal im klassischen Athen (Diss. Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität 1977) 71–86.

[48] *Cf.* Jeffery (n. 6); D'Onofrio (n. 18) 148–57.

[49] E. Mastrokostas, 'Εἰς ἀναζήτησιν ἐλλειπόντων μελῶν ἐπιτυμβίων ἀρχαϊκῶν γλυπτῶν παρὰ τὴν 'Ανάβυσσον', *AAA* vii (1974) 215–28.

[50] For art as substitution, *cf.* E. M. Gombrich, *Meditations on a hobby horse* (London 1963) 1–11. For the grave marker as substitute, *cf.* Vernant (n. 44), 'Étude comparée', *ibid.* and lxxvi (1976) 367–76, lxxviii (1978) 451–66, with the warnings of D'Onofrio (n. 18) 136–8.

[51] Exceptions in art would be the Hoplite relief in the unlikely event it portrays a wounded warrior (*cf.* Ridgway [n. 43] 166 n. 23; D. U. Schilardi, 'New evidence about the hoplite relief', *ABSA* lxxxii [1987] 266 f.), and the Getty relief (J. Frel, *Death of a hero* [Malibu 1984]), if it is genuine.

commemoration of dead ἀγαθοί. The elaborate process of the funeral first defined in the public's eye the substitute for the deceased that existed also in the monument and epitaph. Physically, the cleansing and laying out of the corpse restored its beauty and the pyre reduced it to a permanent state. Morally, the dead were held up as social paradigms through obsequies that advertised their status and achievements. The ceremony might include both the singing of praise poetry as part of the θρῆνος and, in literature at least, the piling up of a tumulus and erecting of a marker.[52] Thus, an encomium for the dead might literally echo funerary praise poetry, and a marker could serve as a memorial of the funeral. However, the funeral also had so powerful a hold on the archaic mind, that other forms of commemoration were often conceived of imaginatively as records, repetitions, or continuations of it. The cult of the dead is an obvious example: a stele might be bathed and annointed just as the corpse had been, and offerings of food and drink could be given as in the funeral.[53] I shall argue below that epitaphs were likewise regularly structured to memorialize the funeral, but for strangers who had not been present and would not participate in the family's cult. First, however, we must look at a virtual compendium of archaic thought on these matters in Pindar and then briefly at the monuments.

Poets frequently associated their work with ritual and social occasions, either as a narrative of them or an imaginary script of the songs performed.[54] Funerary ritual often appears in these ways in praise poets, since it was considered the due only of ἀγαθοί and a guarantor of κλέος.[55] For example, it shapes Pindar's conception of the last third of *Isthmian* 8. The ode's myth ends with the Muses singing a dirge (θρῆνον) over the pyre of Achilles. Their song is imagined as perpetuating the praises which were first sung during Achilles' lifetime and are reproduced in the preceding lines of the ode (46–56).[56] Pindar gives us the text of this mythical, praising dirge partly to establish a precedent for his corresponding praise of Nikokles, a dead relative of the poem's main *laudandus* (59–65):

> ἔδοξ᾿ ἦρα καὶ ἀθανάτοις,
> ἐσλόν γε φῶτα καὶ φθίμενον ὕμνοις θεᾶν διδόμεν.
> τὸ καὶ νῦν φέρει λόγον,[57] ἔσσυταί τε Μοισαῖον ἅρμα Νικοκλέος
> μνᾶμα πυγμάχου κελαδῆσαι. γεραίρετέ μιν,
> ὃς Ἴσθμιον ἂν νάπος
> Δωρίων ἔλαχεν σελίνων· ἐπεὶ περικτίονας
> ἐνίκασε δή ποτε καὶ κεῖνος ἄνδρας ἀφύκτᾳ χερὶ κλονέων.

So the gods too thought it right to give a good mortal (i.e., Achilles), even after death, to the goddesses' songs. In the present time as well, this holds true, as the Muses' chariot rushes to sing the μνᾶμα of Nikokles the boxer. Do honor to him, who won the Dorian parsley in the Isthmian valley; for in the past the man defeated local competitors, driving them into confusion with inescapable hand.

By means of a metaphor, Pindar expresses the archaic idea that encomium for a dead man

---

[52] *Cf.* Humphreys and King (n. 14) 262–70, 285 f.; Vernant 1977 (n. 44). For the poorly attested genre of funerary praise poetry, *cf.* M. Alexiou, *The ritual lament in the Greek tradition* (Cambridge Univ. 1974) 11 f., 102–8; Loraux (n. 12) 43–6. For the mound and marker, *cf.*, e.g., *Il.* xxiii and *Od.* xxiv.

[53] *Cf.* Humphreys (n. 1) 99–104; R. Garland, *The Greek way of death* (Ithaca 1985), chapter 7. For stelai treated as corpses, *cf.* W. Burkert, *Homo necans*, trans. by P. Bing (Berkeley, etc. 1983) 56–8. For such rites too as analogies for praise poetry, *cf.* L. V. Kurke, *Pindar's* OIKONOMIA: *the house as organizing metaphor in the odes of Pindar* (Diss. Princeton 1987) 45–51.

[54] E.g., *Hym. Ap.* 146–55 and Pindar's sense of an

ode's performance as κῶμος. For social events as conventional analogies for poetry, *cf.* Kurke (n. 53) 6 f.

[55] Cf. *Il.* xxiii, *Od.* xxiv, and R. S. J. Garland, 'Γέρας θανόντων: an investigation into the claims of the Homeric dead', *AncSoc* xv–xvii (1984–6) 5–22. *Cf.* Tyrt. 12.27–32 W. For the exclusion of 'κακοί' from elaborate burial, *cf.* Morris (n. 4) *passim*.

[56] *Cf.* Carey (n. 26) 199–202. G. Nagy, *The best of the Achaeans* (Baltimore and London 1979) 175–7 compares Hom. *Od.* xxiv 58–64 and suggests Pindar reflects epic tradition's self-consciousness of the *Iliad*'s origin in the Muses' lament for Achilles.

[57] On the significance of this expression, *cf.* Carey (n. 26) 202.

and his grave monument are analogous means of recording, even reiterating, his funeral.[58] The compact epinician ode for Nikokles (lines 62–5) is presented as his dirge.[59] A chorus, singing this passage, would not simply narrate Nikokles' funeral, it would perform a dramatic mimesis of his dirge, just as it had earlier for Achilles. Significantly, Pindar calls the dirge a μνᾶμα. Nikokles' eulogy, set off as a discrete unit in Pindar's ode, is his grave marker.[60] Furthermore, this poetic 'monument' contains encomiastic forms commonly found in epitaphs. Besides its brevity and content, one notes an imperative commanding praise (γεραίρετε, cf. γέρας θανόντων), a relative clause narrating great achievement, and ποτέ. If Pindar were thinking of epigrams here,[61] he would in fact be reflecting the reality of the archaic milieu. Although monuments could themselves recall the funeral, epitaphs could provide them with a poetic voice that perpetuates it verbally just as Pindar does in giving Nikokles' marker a voice in his song.

Grave monuments supplied visible evidence of the full execution of the γέρας θανόντων, the due of dead ἀγαθοί, which in the first place involved a funeral.[62] Thus, a more ostentatious monument would betoken a more impressive funeral; but many markers were also decorated with explicitly funerary motifs, e.g., mourners with their hands raised to their heads in grief.[63] Athenians of Tettichos' time might attach to a built-tomb plaques depicting mourners gesturing in this way and lamenting. Such mourners also appear on the sides of a stele capital, while horsemen and chariots on other stelai or bases may represent the *ekphora* or funeral games.[64]

The epitaphs, however, are our main concern. Some are stylized narratives of funerary ritual, and others are a kind of script of funerary lament or eulogy. CEG 143 is an early example of the narrative type (circular built-tomb, Corcyra, c. 625–600):

hυιοῦ Τλασίαϝο Μενεκράτεος τόδε σᾶμα
Οἰανθέος γενεάν, τόδε δ' αὐτõι δᾶμος ἐποίει.
ἔς γὰρ πρόξενϝος δάμου φίλος· ἀλλ' ἐνὶ πόντοι
ὄλετο, δαμόσιον δὲ καϙὸν ϸο[(⏑) – ⏑ ⏑ – –].
Πραξιμένες δ' αὐτõι γ[αία]ς ἀπο πατρίδος ἐνθὸν
σὺν δάμ[ο]ι τόδε σᾶμα κασιγνέτοιο πονέθε.

This is the tomb of Menekrates, Tlasias' son, an Oianthean by birth. The people made it for him, for he was revered *proxenos* of the people. But in the sea he perished, a public calamity [– – –]. Praximenes, coming here from his fatherland, built this tomb of his brother together with the people.

The emphasis on the monument's construction does justice to its impressive architecture, but it also calls to mind a Homeric funeral, with many men struggling to raise a huge mound over a hero's grave. In this context, the two central verses take on the character of the more restrained part of ritual lament, the θρῆνος. A reader could envisage the builders also as dirge singers,

[58] For Pindar as a gauge of archaic traditions, cf. B. H. Fowler, 'The centaur's smile: Pindar and the archaic aesthetic', in W. G. Moon (ed.), Ancient Greek art and iconography (Wisconsin 1983) 159–70. For a similar juxtaposition of concepts, cf. Simonides, PMG 531.3: βωμὸς δ' ὁ τάφος, πρὸ γόων δὲ μνᾶστις, ὁ δ' οἶκτος ἔπαινος. I interpret the last phrase, 'their ritual lament is a song of praise', but cf. Loraux (n. 12) 44 with 366 n. 186.

[59] Cf. E. Thummer, Pindar: die isthmischen Gedichte ii (Heidelberg 1969) 140.

[60] Thummer (n. 59) takes μνᾶμα literally as a grave marker, but cf. A. Köhnken, 'Gods and descendants of Aiakos in Pindar's eighth Isthmian ode', BICS xxii (1975) 36 n. 30. Other metaphors of songs as monuments that memorialize ritual support Thummer. N. 4.79–88 contains a grave monument; cf. N. 8.13–16 (with 46–50) and Bacch. 1.181–4. For dedications, cf.

O. 5.3, 7 f.; N. 3.13; Bacch. 5.4; 10.11; Enc. 20 B 5.

[61] Cf. above, pp. 18–9. Pindar quotes an epigram at P. 1.73 f. (cf. CEG 2) and envisages an inscription at O. 7.86 f. For Theognis' poetry as a μνῆμα meant to be read as an epitaph, cf. A. L. Ford, in T. J. Figueira and G. Nagy (eds), Theognis of Megara (Baltimore and London 1985) 89–95.

[62] Cf. above, n. 55; Hom. Il. xvi 456 f.; Morris (n. 4) 8 f., 44–54, 151–4, and passim.

[63] D. C. Kurtz, 'Vases for the dead, an Attic selection, 750–400 BC', in H. A. G. Brijder (ed.), Ancient Greek and related pottery, Allard Pierson series v (Amsterdam 1984) 314–28.

[64] For the plaques, cf. Kurtz and Boardman (n. 4) 83 with pl. 33; for the capital, Richter (n. 11), fig. 66 f.; and for the sphinx as a perpetual mourner, Vermeule (n. 4) 205. However, for equestrian scenes, cf. above, n. 46.

praising Menekrates' public service and lamenting his loss at sea.[65] *CEG* 139 from Troezen offers a parallel (column for ?statue, *c.* 500):

... [τ]οῦτο δ' ἐταῖροι | σᾶμα χέαν βαρέα στενάχοντες
Ϝέργον ἀντ' ἀγ[α]θὸν κἐπάμερον | ἐξετέλεσα[ν].

... and his companions piled up this mound, moaning heavily, in exchange for his good deeds; and they completed it in one day.

CEG 53 illustrates the most common of all formulas, which is in effect an abbreviated narrative of one aspect of the funeral (base with painted stele, Attica, *c.* 510–500):[66]

Λυσέαι ἐνθάδε σε͂|μα πατὲρ Σέμον ἐ|πέθεκεν.

Here (over) Lyseas his father Semon set up (*sc.* this *or* me as a) marker.

Just as the monument symbolizes the rendering of the γέρας θανόντων to a deserving man, the inscription records Semon's performance of a vital part of the γέρας for Lyseas.[67] Even if the composer copied the formula mechanically from other epitaphs, it contains a fossilized echo of the funeral, which the addition of a Homeric tag in *CEG* 40 brings back to life (stele base, Attica, *c.* 530–520):[68]

τὸπικλέος παιδὸς Δαμα|σιστράτο ἐνθάδε σε͂μα |
Πεισιάναχς κατέθεκε· τὸ | γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ θανόντο[ς].

Peisianax set down here the marker of Epikles' son Damasistratos, for this is the due of (him) dead.

An earlier elegiac version of the formula makes its original funerary connotation even clearer (base for stele or kouros, Attica, *c.* 560–550, *CEG* 14):

Χαιρεδέμο τόδε σε͂μα πατὲρ ἔστε[σε | θ]ανόντος
'Ανφιχάρ⟨ε⟩ς ἀγαθὸν παῖδα ὀ|λοφυρόμενο[ς.

His father Amphichares set up this marker of the dead Chairedemos, mourning his good boy.

ὀλοφύρομαι may mean 'mourn' in general, but it also describes ritual lament.[69] Chairedemos is praised for his goodness and youthfulness. With its careful choice of words, then, the epigram recalls the three typical features of funerals found in *CEG* 139 and 143, *viz.*, lamentation, encomium, and the erection of a marker. Whoever reads it narrates the funeral Amphichares performed for Chairedemos, not in historical detail of course, but reduced to its bare essentials. Similarly, *CEG* 117 records a mother's lament (base, Thessaly, *c.* 480–450):

[μνᾶμα τό]δ' ἁ μάτερ Διοκλέαι ἔσστασ' 'Εχεναῖς |
[πολλὰ γο]ο͂σα ὅτ' ἀνόρος ὄλετο ὸν ἀγαθός, κτλ.

His mother Echenaïs put up this monument for Diokleas, lamenting greatly that he died prematurely, a good man. . . .

These epitaphs achieved the effect produced by, say, an early dipylon vase with its sketchy, typical scenes of *prothesis* and funeral games.

[65] *Cf.* Friedländer (n. 1), no. 26 with 29. For death at sea in consolations *cf.* Archil. 8–13 W; in epitaphs, *CEG* 132, 166. For a passage ascribed to Anacreon, possibly an epitaph, which also describes a civic funeral and seems to quote a praising dirge, *cf.* *FGE* 484–7.

[66] Peek (n. 7) summarizes the type: μνῆμα (σῆμα) τόδ' ἔστησεν (ἔστησα) ὁ δεῖνα τῶι δεῖνι (ἐμοί), or the like.

[67] The stele depicts Lyseas' special status; *cf.* Richter (n. 11), fig. 159 f.

[68] *Cf.* *Il.* xvi 457. For the connotation of κατατίθημι, *cf.* above, n. 38.

[69] Hom. *Od.* xxiv 59 (compare Pind. *I.* 8.57 f.); Eurip. *Rh.* 896; *cf.* Tyrt. 12.27 W; below, pp. 26–7. For πένθος taken similarly, *cf.* Nagy (n. 56) 95; *CEG* 114 (θ]ρε͂νον ἔθεκα). For κῆδος, *cf.* *CEG* 9, 17, 120.

All praising epitaphs are in a sense mimetic; whoever reads one aloud plays the role of a praise poet. Some, however, emphasize this mimetic quality with first-person forms. In the simplest, the tomb or marker is the complement of εἰμί or referent of μέ, but in others first-person verbs help create an echo of funerary song. *CEG* 24 may be an example (base with kore, Merenda in Attica, *c.* 540–530):

σῆμα Φρασικλείας. | κόρε κεκλέσομαι | αἰεί,
ἀντὶ γάμο | παρὰ θεῶν τοῦτο | λαχōσ' ὄνομα.

(I am *or* this is the) marker of Phrasikleia. I shall always be called a maiden, having received this name instead of marriage as my lot from the gods.

Readers play the role of Phrasikleia, brought to life in the kore that seems to utter her own lament and eulogy. Death in exchange for marriage is a motif of ritual lament; and in aristocratic thought, youthful marriageability is a woman's most valuable quality. The words ὄνομα and κεκλήσομαι show that Phrasikleia's worth and her lament are preserved for the future in oral praise poetry (κλέος) as they are in her statue.[70] Her epitaph is that poetry.

The farther a first-person form moves from the primitive *objet parlant*, the more it can reflect funerary song, e.g., in *CEG* 136 (Doric capital, Argos, *c.* 525–500):

Ϙοσίνα hυσεμάταν θάψα [π]|έλας hιπποδρόμοιο
ἄνδρα ἀ|[γα]θ[ό]ν, πολοῖς μνᾶμα καὶ | [ἐσ]ομένοις. . . .

I, Kosina, buried Hysematas, a good man, beside the race track, a memorial for many even in the future. . . .

The first person transforms a narrative into a dramatic text: a reader assumes Kosina's role as she recalls the funeral she performed and seems to quote the praises sung in the dirge.[71] Elsewhere, the reader is allowed to speak the dirge *in propria persona*. *CEG* 43 is clearly an example, although only the ends of the hexameters remain of three distichs (base for columns and stele, Kerameikos, *c.* 525):[72]

– – –π]οτ' Ὀλυνπιόνικος ἐ[– –]
– – –]κλε͂ς hō τόδε μέτερ
– – –ὀλο]φύρομαι hόνεκ' ἄho[ρος]

. . . once an Olympic victor . . . -kles, whose [marker] here his mother [erected] . . . I lament because before his time. . . .

Once considered impossible in an inscribed epitaph, the anonymous first person is now confirmed by ἀνιῶμαι in a new piece and by *CEG* 51 (stele base, Kerameikos, *c.* 510):[73]

οἰκτίρο προσορō[ν] | παιδὸς τόδε σῆμα | θανόντος
Σμικύθ[ο] | hός τε φίλον ὄλεσε|ν ἔλπ' ἀγαθέν.

I lament as I behold this marker of the dead youth Smikythos, who destroyed his friends' good hope.

Even if the mother is the subject of ὀλοφύρομαι in *CEG* 43, it and the first persons that are definitely anonymous may echo threnodic elegy.[74] Certainly the content and emotional

[70] For lament, *cf.* Alexiou (n. 52) 120–2; for Phrasikleia's worth, D'Onofrio (n. 18) 166 f.; for κλέος, Thgn. 245 f., and *CEG* 116, 142 (τόδε σᾶμα κεκλήσε-ται), with 106 (if Homeric parallels [*CEG*, ad loc.] suggest σῆμα τέτυκται is equally assertive).

[71] Cf. *CEG* 64 and 134. The formula καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι can be used of epic poetry (*Il.* xxii 305, cf. *Od.* viii 580) or a grave monument (*Od.* xi 76; cf. *FGE* 851). Cf. *CEG* 356; *Il.* vii 87, . . . καὶ ὀψιγόνων ἀνθρώπων, with n. 78, below.

[72] P. A. Hansen, 'An Olympic victor by the name of "-kles" ', *Kadmos* xiii (1974) 160.

[73] Above, notes 18 and 31.

[74] Cf. Lewis (n. 31), *pace* E. L. Bowie, 'Early Greek elegy, symposium, and public festival', *JHS* cvi (1986) 22–7, who denies the existence of threnodic elegy. *Cf.* also Friedländer (n. 1) 65–70; A. E. Harvey, 'The classification of Greek lyric poetry', *CQ* n.s. 5 (1955) 168–72; Raubitschek (n. 40).

restraint of the epitaphs are appropriate to θρῆνος. Anyone reading these inscriptions takes on the role of one singing the dirge, and so a mimesis of funerary ritual is performed.

Verbs of grieving more often appear as second-person commands like οἴκτιρον in *CEG* 27 and 28. They seem to create an especially strong impression of the epigram as a mimesis of song, perhaps because an audience rather than a speaker is envisaged. Since pity, sorrow, lamentation, etc., are requested, most critics interpret these epitaphs as straightforward expressions of πόθος for the deceased.[75] The hearer is invited to join in that πόθος, but presumably only with some response external to the text, perhaps χαῖρε or οἴμοι and the name of the deceased.[76] However, it seems more reasonable to interpret οἴκτιρον and the rest with reference to the θρῆνος.[77] Each of these epitaphs presents, in a tone of emotional restraint, significant encomiastic motifs. Anyone reading them aloud plays the role of praise singer, just as Pindar's chorus did as it sang the θρῆνοι for Achilles and Nikokles in *Isthmian* 8. Nothing external to the text of the epigram is demanded, only that it be heard and repeated. The vocal aspect of funerary ritual is thus imagined as continuing into the future as oral praise poetry for the deceased.

CONCLUSION

In Homer, a tomb the Achaeans build for a fallen comrade might stir passers-by to recite his praises (*Il.* vii 87, 89 f.):

> καί ποτέ τις εἴπῃσι καὶ ὀψιγόνων ἀνθρώπων ...
> 'ἀνδρὸς μὲν τόδε σῆμα πάλαι κατατεθνηῶτος,
> ὅν ποτ' ἀριστεύοντα κατέκτανε φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ.'

Thus sometime a person, even of a later generation, might say . . .: 'This is the tomb of a man who died of old, whom once, as he fought heroically, shining Hector slew'.

Homer's association of the tomb of an ἀγαθός with oral encomium reflects the way both memorialized the dead by creating archetypal substitutes for them. Many epitaphs are miniature encomia that do the same. When read aloud, they become the praise song which the uninscribed σῆμα evokes spontaneously in Homer.[78] If *Isthmian* 8 is any indication, a consciousness of their praising function remained alive, even after encomiastic motifs in private epitaphs tended to fossilize as the inscribing of gravestones in verse spread beyond the aristocracy from the later sixth century.[79]

The fact that epitaphs also recall funerary ritual suggests some of them might contain quotations of genuine threnody.[80] The idea has merit but is unlikely to be literally true, as *CEG* 159 seems to indicate (Thasos, *c.* 500):

> [ὅ]στις μὴ παρ[ε|τ]ύνχαν' ὅτ' ἐ[χσ]|ἔφερόν με θ[αν]|όντα,
> νῦν μ' ὀ[λο]|φυράσθω· μν[ῆμ]|α δὲ Τηλεφ[άνε]|ος.

Whoever was not present when they carried me out in death, let him now lament me. (This is *or* I am the) memorial of Telephanes.

The funeral, here represented by the *ekphora*, belongs to the past. Passers-by are asked to reiterate

---

[75] Cf. *CEG* 13, 27, 28, 34, 68, 148; above, n. 11; Vernant 1976 (n. 50), 1977 (n. 44); Loraux (n. 12) 42–56.

[76] For this as a prototype of the dialogue epigram (e.g., *CEG* 120), cf. Skiadas (n. 11) 27 ff.; Friedländer (n. 1), *s.v.* no. 84; but the warnings of R. Kassel, 'Dialoge mit Statuen', *ZPE* li (1983) 10 f.

[77] At *Od.* xxiv 59 οἴκτρ' ὀλοφυρόμεναι seems to apply to those singing the emotional γόος; but for the confusion of terms for lament, cf. above, Harvey (n. 74);

Alexiou (n. 52).

[78] For *Il.* vii 89 f. as an epigram, cf. Ps.-Plut. *vit. et poes. Hom.* 2.215, with Lausberg (n. 1) 532 n. 4, and Young (n. 19) 39 n. 24; but Raubitschek (n. 40) 5 f., and Nagy (n. 56) 28, 175–7, 340–2.

[79] For the democratization of burial practices in Athens, cf. Morris (n. 4) *passim.*

[80] Cf. Raubitschek (n. 40); Vermeule (n. 4) 22; but Gentili (n. 1) 54–6.

the ritual lament in the present, but they cannot fulfill their obligation literally. They can, however, read an epitaph that narrates aspects of funerary ritual or one that becomes a mimesis of funeral song. These are not factual reports of funerals or quotations of threnodies. Narration and mimesis are processes, not of recreating something in detail, but of substituting for it a selection of typical features of the class to which it belongs. These epigrams are the artificial creations of an archaic way of thinking that shaped memorializations of dead ἀγαθοί as funerary ritual, but did not destroy the integrity of the thing it shaped. *Isthmian* 8 imitates a dirge but remains an epinician. Tettichos' epitaph likewise substitutes for a dirge, but it remains very much an epigram. For example, it adopts the elegiac form that was already becoming entrenched as *the* meter for monuments in Attica.

JOSEPH W. DAY

Wabash College
Crawfordsville Indiana 47933