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ABSTRACT

This study discusses the language, especially the communicative structures, of Greek dialogue epigrams. The central research questions include: Who are the speakers? How are they identified? How does the recipient know when the speaker changes? How is the turn-division implied? What are the functions of the speakers?

In the study, all the dialogue verse inscriptions are collected and divided according to typology that was created for this study and which is based on the pair structure. The most common adjacency pair of dialogue epigrams is a question–answer pair, and many of the elements studied here are features of question structures, but other pairs, such as greeting pairs, are also taken into account. The dialogues contain either one adjacency pair (type 1), several of them (type 2) or longer, often narrative units that form pair-like structures (type 3). The types, their variants and features of the language characteristic of each are discussed using examples. Elements such as addresses, imperatives and particles are central to my argument, and speaker roles and pair structure variants are also discussed. Non-inscriptional epigrams are given as parallels for each type, and the mutual influence between them and the verse inscriptions is discussed using examples. The reception situation and possible performance of the epigrams is also discussed, and on the basis of various examples, it is stated that the representation of the speakers often implies the complex reception situation, part of which was most probably reading the epigram aloud.

Epigraphic methods are used and combined, and the linguistic aspect brings a new perspective to epigraphic studies. The comparison of the verse inscriptions and the literary ones contributes to ongoing discussions on the epigram genre and its inscriptional counterparts. The material discussed is mainly from the Roman period, a phase less well discussed in recent epigram studies, and the study thus adds to our knowledge of the genre and the mutual influence between the post-Hellenistic verse inscriptions and non-inscriptional epigrams.
CONTENTS

Acknowledgements vii
List of tables x
Epigraphic conventions xi

1. INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 Subject and structure of this study 1
1.2 Epigrams: verse inscriptions and non-inscribed epigrams 3
1.3 The material 7
  1.3.1 Sources 7
  1.3.2 Dates 8
  1.3.3 Proveniences 9
  1.3.4 Composers 10
1.4 Previous studies 12
1.5 Methods 16

2. WHAT DIALOGUE? 19

2.1 Dialogue in epigrams 19
  2.1.1 Communication and terminology 19
  2.1.2 The cooperative principle 21
  2.1.3 Discourse types 23
2.2 The speakers and the speaker pairs 24
  2.2.1 The monument 26
  2.2.2 The passerby 28
  2.2.3 The deceased 33
  2.2.4 The relative 34
  2.2.5 The narrator 34
  2.2.6 Problems in defining the speaker(s) 35
  2.2.7 Speakers in non-inscribed epigrams 38
2.3 Readers and recipients 40
  2.3.1 The audience 40
  2.3.2 Reading and reception 42
  2.3.3 Reading and ritual 47
  2.3.4 Dialogues in context: prose parts, decoration and possible further epigrams in the monument 48
2.4 Conclusion 53

3. TYPE-1 EPIGRAMS 55

3.1 How the type-1 pairs were built 56
Acknowledgements

The study of epigraphy, especially during my PhD, provided me with many work and travel opportunities, and, more importantly, it introduced me to many people that I am honoured to call not only colleagues but also friends. If I were a poet, I would write an honorary epigram for every one of them (perhaps in dialogue form), but, as I am a mere Classicist, I hope these prose lines will do.

I am deeply grateful to my supervisors, Erkki Sironen and Martti Leiwo. In addition to reading and commenting on the numerous versions of the manuscript, they both influenced my academic views. Erkki (Eki) is responsible for my interest in epigraphic fieldwork and especially for my knowledge about hands-on epigraphy, which I gained on our several memorable field trips to Greece. I learned the ‘hardcore version’ of epigraphy, and I love it. Martti inspired me to see how interesting the linguistic aspects of the inscribed texts are and how to further build on the knowledge I gained through epigraphic groundwork. This has influenced my approach to a large extent. Also, I am grateful for the years we shared working together in Athens.

I would also like to express my gratitude to both pre-examiners of my thesis, Manuel Baumbach (Ruhr-Universität Bochum) and Joseph W. Day (Wabash College). Their insightful reports and comments helped me to polish my manuscript a great deal. I warmly thank Bridget Martin for correcting my English. Some minor changes were made after she read the manuscript, and it goes without saying that I take responsibility for any remaining errors.

I conducted my studies and this work at the Department of Classical Philology (now part of the Department of World Cultures) at the University of Helsinki, and I gained significantly from being surrounded by such bright and hard-working colleagues. Both of my supervisors were my teachers there, as were many other brilliant academics, and I owe a lot to all of them. I am especially indebted to Jaakko Frösén, who allowed me to be part of the project ‘Ancient Greek Written Sources’
under the umbrella of the Centre of Excellence. Being able to work on such a project has been truly inspirational.

My network of fellow PhD students has also been invaluable. I am very grateful to Martti Leiwo’s doctoral students Matias Buchholz, Sonja Dahlgren, Sanna-Illaria Kittelä, Kimmo Kovanen, Vesa Vahtikari and Marja Vierros. We sat together in classrooms, seminars and minivans in Greece, and in pubs in Helsinki, and our discussions were very beneficial and many of us became good friends. The same goes for Katariina Kankaanpää, whom I also thank for all the professional help she has given me. We travelled around Greece together, chasing verse inscriptions, and it was nothing but joyful. Sharing hotel rooms for weeks makes people either enemies or friends, and I am glad it was the latter in our case. This also applies to Päivi Lammi, with whom I studied ancient Greek from our first lesson onwards during my undergraduate years.

I worked for the Finnish Institute at Athens from 2011 to 2014, but even before that the institute was a safe haven for me. I would like to thank the entire staff of the institute, and especially Jari Pakkanen, who was the director during my last year in Athens. He strongly encouraged me to take research leave whenever possible and urged me to finish this book. Also, it was wonderful to have his dog Roki come in to the office regularly.

Before my institute years, my work was financially supported by the Center of Excellence, which was funded by the Academy of Finland, and, at the very beginning of my PhD work, by a scholarship granted by The Association of Friends (of the Finnish Institute).

I would never have finished this work without my wonderful friends in Finland, Greece and elsewhere. Thank you all! In addition to colleagues and friends, I am deeply grateful to my family for giving me the strength needed in this life. I lost my late father too early, but he left me a feeling of acceptance that has carried me far. My mother Elsi Winch has been nothing but supportive and loving. Her spouse, Mack Winch, has also always encouraged me. My brother, Sami Kauppinen, is not
only the best brother but his commitment, whether to learning a new language or to long-distance running, is a constant source of inspiration.

I dedicate this book to my Grandmother Irja Poutiainen, who did not have the opportunity to study as much as she would have liked, and has thus been equally proud of all of her grandchildren and their degrees, whichever career they have chosen. In a time of doubt, it was amazing to hear her say that this book is important. Kiitos mummo.

Finally, I am grateful beyond words to my dearest husband Pete Korhonen. His love and endless support have allowed me to follow my path, and thanks to him there is always joy in my life — even during the last phases of editing the PhD manuscript. Thank you, Pete; you are the sun in my sky.

Helsinki, November 2015

Saara Kauppinen
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1  Dates of the dialogue verse inscriptions
Table 2  Proveniences of the dialogue verse inscriptions
Table 3  Non-inscribed dialogue epigrams: number of dialogue epigrams per composer
Table 4  Type-1 epigrams in verse inscriptions according to their variants
Table 5  Particles in epigram no. 1 of Chapter 4
Table 6  Type-2 epigrams in verse inscriptions according to their variants
Table 7  Speakers and directions of speech in type-3 verse inscriptions
Table 8  Type-3 epigrams in verse inscriptions discussed in Chapter 5

Table A1  Dialogue verse inscriptions (with dates and proveniences)
Table B1  Dialogue epigrams in the Greek Anthology
Table B2  Dialogues (mostly Byzantine) in Cougny
Table B3  Speakers of the dialogues in the Greek Anthology
EPIGRAPHIC CONVENTIONS

The Leiden system is used in the editions of the inscriptions:

[abc] letters missing from the original text due to lacuna, restored by the editor
a(bc) abbreviation in the text, expanded by the editor
<ab> characters erroneously omitted by the ancient scribe, restored or corrected by the editor
(ab) letters in the text considered erroneous and superfluous by the editor
ab characters damaged or otherwise unclear in the text, ambiguous outside of their context
[...] a lacuna or gap in the original text, not restored by the editor (extent known, each dot = space for 1 letter)
[— — —] a lacuna or gap in the original text, not restored by the editor (extent unknown)
... traces of letters on the surface, insufficient for restoration by the editor
ABC clear but incomprehensible letters
[[abc]] letters deleted in antiquity (rasura)
v. / vac. space left empty (vacat) on the stone or page
/ vacat
1. INTRODUCTION

Dialogue epigrams are based on certain communication patterns that are formed by using certain elements of language. In this study, I discuss the linguistic features of these patterns and I provide a typology of dialogue epigrams as a framework for these analyses. I focus on the structure and language of the dialogue verse inscriptions, but I give non-inscribed\(^1\) parallels in order to discuss the development of the epigram genre.

1.1 Subject and structure of this study

The core element of this study is the dialogue epigram typology that I created. The typology is based on the turn division and on aspects of this division. I have divided the material into three categories, and I discuss the typical features of each type. What kinds of turns form the dialogues? How are the turns marked? What kind of adjacency pairs do the turns form?\(^2\) How are these turns (a) linked together with and (b) separated from other pairs in multi-pair epigrams? These are some of the main points of this study. The typology also helps to combine verse inscriptions and non-inscribed epigrams, and to detect the development towards more narrative-based epigrams. This material offers valuable information on the ways to communicate certain facts on monuments, but also about the mutual influence of the monumental and the fictive texts.

In order to make my analyses fully comprehensible, I proceed from the general to the specific. Firstly, I briefly discuss the history of epigrams and how dialogue epigrams are presented in this context (Section 1.2). Secondly, I give an overview of my material, dates, proveniences and composers, or what we know of them (Section 1.3), as well as a summary of relevant previous studies (Section 1.4). Finally, I explain the methodology which I used in this study (Section 1.5).

\(^1\) I will use the term non-inscribed epigram to denote the epigrams that were not written primarily for the monuments.

\(^2\) I will discuss the adjacency pairs and the turns, and explain the terms more closely in Section 1.5. Note that the word ‘Chapter’ is used to refer to the chapter as a whole and ‘Section’ is used to refer to the subsection within the chapter.
Before the detailed analysis of the typology and each type, I discuss terminology, speakers and speaker pairs, and also the possible performance and the reception of the epigrams in Chapter 2. What makes dialogue and what does the dialogue epigram mean? Who are the speakers in these epigrams? As the examples will show, there are fixed speaker roles that form a certain set of speaker pairs. Most of these epigrams are grave inscriptions, as is revealed in the speaker roles. On the basis of both structure and content, I suggest that these epigrams were possibly performed. I discuss the reading situation, the possible performance, the audience and what kind of evidence for these aspects my material offers. In Chapter 2, I also sum up the early stages of the dialogue form.

In Chapters 3–5, I analyse in detail the language and the structure of the dialogue epigrams within the framework of my typology. Each of the types is discussed in its own chapter (type 1 in Chapter 3, type 2 in Chapter 4 and type 3 in Chapter 5). At the beginning of each of these chapters, I give a paradigm of the type in question and explain my criteria for the division. After this, I analyse the basic structure of the type and the linguistic details characteristic of each, giving examples and discussing the variants of each type, and also the similarities and differences between these three types. At the end of each of these three chapters, I briefly discuss some fictive parallels.

Type-1 epigrams consist of one adjacency pair, and type-2 of several pairs, the amount of which varies. Type-3 epigrams are combinations of long units, for example whole stanzas as a turn each, and there are often three speakers in the epigram. In the analyses, features such as address, imperatives, interrogatives, particles and question structures are important. Some of the linguistic elements are repeated in every type: this is why features such as question structures are discussed in more detail in Chapter 3 and referred to briefly in the following chapters. In Chapter 4, I discuss the particles in detail. Although they occur in two other types as well, a certain kind of particle use is characteristic of type 2. In Chapter 5, I focus more on the shift from communication to narration than on linguistic details.

---

3 I thus agree with numerous other scholars: see Section 2.3.
When significant (and possible), I also discuss the wider context, such as possible prose sections or monologue epigrams on the same monument. Decoration, such as reliefs and statues, forms part of this wider context. My interest here is on the internal relationship of these parts (epigrams, prose and decoration): does the message change if we take the whole monument into account? In some cases, all of the parts are tightly combined – for example, the epigram can comment on a relief – whereas in some others, they do not have any internal references.

The epigraphical roots of the epigram genre is a subject that has been discussed in recent studies,⁴ so I will concentrate only on the aspects that dialogue material has to offer. My focus is on the inscribed material, but the non-inscriptional epigrams cannot be excluded if we want to understand their development. I discuss examples that have connections with, contain references to, or are implicitly influenced by the structures and features familiar from the verse inscriptions. In the general conclusion (Chapter 6), I sum up this development.

1.2 Epigrams: verse inscriptions and non-inscribed epigrams

European epigram tradition is influenced by the Latin and later epigram genre. Samuel Taylor Coleridge’s (1772–1834) epigram depicts one side of it:

\[
\text{What is an Epigram? A dwarfish whole;}
\]
\[
\text{Its body brevity, and wit its soul.}
\]

In ancient Greek monuments, however, there is variation. The Greek word behind our modern short poem, the epigram, is ἐπίγραμμα. It originally meant a short inscription on an object (carved on stone or written on, e.g., wax, parchment or papyrus; cf. ἐπιγραφή).⁵ They were short statements or informative lines, and, if written in verse, the earliest ones were dactylic hexameters.⁶ The earliest preserved

---

⁴ See Section 1.4.
⁶ See CEG 1.432, 740 BCE (date according to Coldstream: given by Hansen in CEG), the Dipylon oenochoe; CEG 1.454 (ca 750–700 BCE, dated by Hansen), the Pitheusae scyphos; the scyphos of
examples are on vessels that were used for example during symposia.\(^7\) During the Archaic period, short verse inscriptions on stone were common, mostly on grave markers and on dedicatory monuments. The witty aspect that is typical of later Greek epigrams (and later European epigrams) was still absent. This is also clear in my material, for the earliest preserved dialogue epigram\(^8\) is a rather informative dactylic fragment. Indeed, most of the verse inscriptions are informative and occasionally formulaic, even after the evolution of the Hellenistic (literary) epigram. On the other hand, some indications of the influence of literary epigrams do occur in Hellenistic and Roman period verse inscriptions. However, it is rather irrelevant whether the inscribed epigram influenced the literary epigram, or vice versa; they are both part of the same tradition and have concurrent developments and mutual influence.

The reason for producing inscriptions was e.g. to reveal the following information: the owner of the object or the monument in question; who made or dedicated the monument, and to which god; or who was in the grave.\(^9\) The word *epigramma* was used in this sense by Euripides (*Troad*. 1191), Herodotus (5.59, 7.228) and Thucydides (6.54), and this usage prevailed until the Hellenistic period.\(^10\) An epigram in elegiac distich would also be referred to by the word ἔλεγεν \(^.\) \(^11\)

By ca 500 BCE, the elegiac couplet had become the generic metre of verse inscriptions. Reasons for its dominance have been sought in the possibilities offered by the metre itself,\(^12\) but Fain points out that its success came first and the sophisticated way of using its possibilities only later.\(^13\) Then again, other metres aside from the elegiacs were still used, and, as regards the dialogue material, it is

---

\(^7\) Vases and drinking vessels, however, were mostly decorated with prose, although with words from songs or poetic expressions, thus functioning as ‘aides-mémoire to oral symptic performances, which would often be in verse, whether extemporised compositions or recitals or adaptions of earlier lyric or elegiac poetry’: see Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, 284.

\(^8\) GV/ 1831, discusued in Section 2.2 (no. 1), where I also discuss whether or not we can use this epigram as proof for early dialogue epigrams.

\(^9\) To name a few. For further, see OCD\(^7\) ([1996] 2003), s.v. ‘epigram, Greek’.

\(^10\) On the use of the terms, see, e.g., Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, 283 and Bruss 2005, 4–9.

\(^11\) Gentili 1968, 39. cf. Gentili also for, e.g., ὑπάρχων and further terminology. Also, Petrovic 2007, 55.

\(^12\) cf., e.g., Reitzenstein 1893, 105; Gentili 1968, 65; and Fain 2008, 76.

\(^13\) Fain 2008, 76.
noteworthy that variation in metre remains/reoccurs. The elegiac distich is by far the most common metre in the non-inscriptional dialogue epigrams, and it is also common in the verse inscriptions, although other metres also occur in the verse inscriptions. There are three purely iambic dialogues, three with hexameters only, and a further three in which hexameters are combined with iambic or trochaic verses, or both. Hexameters and pentameters can also be combined irregularly. In some examples, the metre is rather vague. Mistakes occur, probably due to problems caused by changes in phonology and, sometimes, possibly due to the fact that the writer was not necessarily a native Greek speaker, or even versed in poetry. This applies especially to the epigrams composed in Asia Minor. These factors may also be the reason for the irregular combinations of hexameter and pentameter. Such combinations often seem random and make one wonder whether the writer tried, but failed, to produce elegiacs. Examples of these appear in this study, and I discuss the metre briefly when needed.

The literary genre of epigram began to flourish during the Hellenistic period. This seems to be tied to the invention of poetry books, but, as Gutzwiller points out, there were probably ‘intermediate stages between elegiac verses contextually embedded on stone and the books of epigrams...’. By the 3rd century BCE, the term ἐπίγραμμα had been extended semantically. Dialogue form occurs in both verse inscriptions and non-inscribed epigrams. Although I suggest that the medium is not very relevant, I still separate the verse inscriptions from the literary epigrams. In a recent study, the verse inscriptions were studied as part of the epigram genre, as I do in this study. Hopefully it goes without saying that both are equally important parts of the tradition: all of these epigrams belong to the canon of literature, and must be studied together. The focus of this study is in the verse inscriptions, as I am

---

14 For the hexameter in verse inscriptions from Late Antiquity, see Agosti 2008, 198. As Agosti rightly points out, in late texts the prose and verse were often tied together and not kept rigidly separate, as in Archaic and Hellenistic epigraphy (Agosti 2008, 198–9).
16 Bing and Bruss 2007, 12. The scope of this study is on the communication structures, and I only briefly summarise some main points of the history of epigram. For further development of the genre, see e.g. Bettenworth 2007, 69 (and Puelma 1996 and Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, 283, to whom she refers), Meyer 2005, 25ff. and OCD3 ([1996] 2003), s.v. ‘epigram, Greek’.
especially interested in the communication structures in the monuments, but the influence of the non-inscribed epigram genre can not be excluded or ignored.

‘Ancient literature’ is of course a modern concept: in ancient Greek, there is no general term for literature.\(^\text{17}\) Therefore, the concept of ‘ancient literature’ encompasses a wide variety of text types, from epic to inscribed decrees, speeches and private letters, to mention but a few. The word ‘literature’ in its broadest meaning signifies any body of written texts (of a given language, period or culture), but it is often used for literary art. Not all the inscriptions are most accurately described as literary art, which is itself a difficult term. Today, a grocery receipt is not art, but when copied in the pages of a poetry collection, it becomes a work of art. Something similar occurs in the performance of the epigrams, since the performance gives the poems a different aspect; often the act of performing an epigram makes it part of the ritual.\(^\text{18}\)

During the initial stage, the inscriptions were ‘literature’ in the widest sense of the (modern) word. Even if one denotes literary art by the term ‘literature’, the question of verse inscriptions is not completely solved. Day accepts epigrams as poetry with the clause that poetry was a ‘traditional form of both effective social performance and verbal artistry’.\(^\text{19}\) Scholars have tried to define literature with, for example, the concept of ‘imaginative’. In verse inscriptions, the monument can have a voice, and that alone is ‘imaginative’. The passerby, a common role in the monumental verse inscriptions, is always, in a way, an imaginative character, an assumed person. The mere fact that the texts show interplay between the text and its recipient (i.e. awareness of reception) shows that there is a fictive level in the epigrams. The role of the verse inscriptions is significant in the development of something that was shaped as a literary genre. In order to understand the structure, the satirical humour and the play between the interlocutor roles of, for example, the

---

\(^{17}\) Terms existed for certain genres, e.g., ποίησις (poetry), λόγος (prose) and μουσική (τέχνη, as art, skill), but there was no such concept as our modern ‘literature’. In Latin, litteratura initially meant ‘writing’, the ‘alphabets’, ‘grammar’ and ‘scholarship’; the meaning of ‘literature’ was first introduced in the Middle Ages. Latin-based terms in modern languages (literature, Litteratur, littérature) still refer to groups of written text.

\(^{18}\) For the ritual, see Section 2.3.3.

\(^{19}\) Day 2007, 29–30.
funerary epigrams in the *Anthologia Graeca*, one must acquaint oneself with the patterns and conventions of the verse inscriptions. Even when the development of books provided a means of easy circulation for the epigrams and a breeding ground for a literary genre, epigrams were still cut into stone at the same time. Even the clumsiest verse inscriptions were *some kind of* literature.\(^\text{20}\) What began (literally) as scratches, developed into a genre.

1.3 The material

1.3.1 Sources

The research material consists of dialogue verse inscriptions that I collected from *CEG, GVI, SGO, IG, ICr, SEG* and other epigraphical sources. I also collected non-inscribed dialogues, mainly from the *Anthologia Graeca*, and I discuss some of them in this study, but non-inscribed epigrams are not included in my corpus – I use them to illustrate the development of the verse inscription dialogues and the genre in general. It is, of course, not easy to tell the difference between or to define which came first when we have both a verse inscription and a ‘book epigram’ version of the same epigram. However, in the tables included in the study, the epigrams depicted are verse inscriptions only, if not otherwise noted.

There are 108 verse inscriptions and more than 100 non-inscribed dialogue epigrams. The vast majority of the inscribed dialogues are funerary epigrams (ca 85% of the total). The non-funerary epigrams come from other categories such as dedications (1), honorary inscriptions (7), building inscriptions (4) and miscellaneous (3).\(^\text{21}\)

---

\(^{20}\) See also Kajava 2007, 753–4: ‘Se l’autore di un brano epigrafico era consapevole dei suoi talenti e inoltre sperava che il suo scritto fosse letto da altri, perché non considerare un tale prodotto esempio di letteratura antica? – se poi esso risulti buono, mediocre o cattivo come letteratura, questo è uno altro discorso.’

\(^{21}\) Dedication: *SGO* 1, 01/12/05. Honorary epigrams: *SGO* 1, 02/09/24; *Corinth* 8, 1, 89; *Olympia* V, 225; *SGO* 4, 20/06/01; *SGO* 4, 21/23/06; *IG X*, 2, 1, 148(B); *SGO* 1, 02/14/06; *SGO* 3, 16/08/01. Building epigrams: *SEG* 55, 775; *SGO* 4, 21/07/01; *SGO* 1, 05/01/18; *SGO* 1, 05/01/19. [Miscellaneous]: *SGO* 1, 01/12/02 (describes Halicarnassus); *SGO* 4, 21/09/01 (erotic); *SGO* 2, 11/07/05 (perhaps ecphrastic).
It is not always easy to tell whether a given inscription is a dialogue or not, usually due to the fragmentary state of the monument. In addition to the strictly dialogue-formed epigrams, there are epigrams in which the ties between the turns are vague, but some sort of connection is still discernible. I present several epigrams in which one of the speakers addresses the other, but the other addresses someone outside the poem. In these cases, however, there is a connection between the two turns, for example the second is initiated by the first turn, even though the speaker directs his/her speech to someone other than the first speaker. In cases where such connections occur, I include the text in my corpus.  

1.3.2 Dates

In the case of the verse inscriptions, the dates are rarely precise, as most of the epigrams come from private monuments that give no exact dates (although a few exceptions to this may be found). Often, the letterforms are the only way to date the inscriptions, and these give rough dates such as the 1st century BCE or the 2nd/3rd century CE. If I have personally seen the stone, I give my own estimated date, most often based on the letterforms. In other cases, I depend on the previous editors, and provide the date given in the edition I use, if not otherwise noted. If there are any factors that help to establish the date, I use and mention them.

Dialogue epigram started to flourish when the epigram in general was fashionable in the Graeco-Roman world. We have only a few pre-Hellenistic examples and fewer than 10 Hellenistic ones – all of the other dialogues are of a later date. Thus dialogue form was most common in the post-Hellenistic period; dialogue was clearly most common during the first centuries CE, as the bolded numbers in the table show. Later on, dialogues were still written, but they do not occur as frequently as in the peak period.

The table below contains the dates of the dialogue verse inscriptions. This is a summary: each epigram with its date is given in table A1 in the Appendices.

---

I am fully aware that this division is somewhat arbitrary. Diaphony in metric inscriptions is a phenomenon that cannot be adequately discussed in this study, but it deserves further study and more detailed discussion.
Table 1: Dates of the dialogue verse inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>early²³</th>
<th>1. CE</th>
<th>2. CE</th>
<th>3. CE</th>
<th>4. CE</th>
<th>5. CE</th>
<th>6. CE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2./1. BCE</td>
<td>1. BCE/1. CE</td>
<td>1./2. CE</td>
<td>2./3. CE</td>
<td>3./4. CE</td>
<td>4./5. CE</td>
<td>5./6. CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.3 Proveniences

Dialogue verse inscriptions are found in a vast area from the Apennines to eastern parts of Asia Minor. If we look at the geographical distribution, 31 dialogue epigrams come from continental Greece and the islands combined. Of these, 20 epigrams come from continental Greece. Six of them come from Athens, which is probably due to the fact that Athens was an epigraphic centre in general, where inscriptions were produced in large numbers. Outside of Attica, the following are places of provenience in continental Greece: Corinth, Piraeus, Argolis, Tegea, Olympia, Thessaly, Boeotia and Thessalonica.

Eleven dialogue epigrams come from the islands Amorgos, Astypalaia, Corfu,Crete, Cos, Cyprus, Parus and Rhodes. There are no such concentrations as in Athens; the islands produce a maximum of only 2–3 epigrams each. Furthermore, eight dialogue epigrams come from Egypt and five from modern Italy. In addition to these, one epigram comes from Pannonia (modern Austria), one from Thrace (modern Bulgaria) and one from Sveti Naum (modern Republic of Macedonia). The epigrams from all the aforementioned areas together form ca 43% (47 out of 108) of dialogue epigrams.

Fifty-seven of the same 108 dialogues come from different areas of Asia Minor and this weighs the focus eastwards. For example, ten dialogue epigrams come from Mysia and nine from Bithynia. Furthermore, ten dialogues come from Syria and Palestine (six from Palestine and four from Syria). Other areas include

²³ Early: 6th/5th century BCE: 1; 5th century BCE: 1; 4th century BCE: 2, 2nd century BCE: 2.
²⁴ u = unknown date (nine epigrams); v = vague (thirteen epigrams) – the dates given in editions are ‘Hellenistic’ (3), ‘Roman’ (1), ‘Imperial’ (8) and ‘late’ (1).
Caria, Chersonesus, Cilicia, Ionia, Lycia, Lydia, Lycaonia, Paphlagonia, Phrygia, Pisidia and Pontus. In four cases the provenience is unknown.

Despite the fact that the material comes from a vast area, certain similarities are evident in the texts. Possible reasons for this include: copying, using old inscriptions as models, using literary epigrams as models, repeating certain formulas and patterns, and perhaps even using pattern books. Due to the sporadic nature of the material (geographically speaking), local influences on the texts are difficult to detect, but I will discuss such elements when possible.

### Table 2: Proveniences of the dialogue verse inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provenience</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continental Greece</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islands</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Minor</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.4 Composers

Verse inscriptions are mostly anonymous. Some signatures do occur, but very seldomly. Most of the verse inscriptions were composed by amateurs, and this may partly explain the anonymity. According to Mitchell, in Asia Minor funerary texts were often composed by the peasant families themselves, ‘relying … on a repetitive repertoire of poetic expressions’. My material contains cases which support this view. This could also partly explain the metrical problems we occasionally come across in the epigrams from Asia Minor.

Not much is known about the early poets who composed epigrams (non-inscribed or verse inscriptions) besides their other literary output. Simonides, however, is attested to have written some epigrams, but the authenticity of most of those ascribed to him remains uncertain. It is most probable that he did not

---

25 For a more detailed table of proveniences, see the Appendices (table A1). Other = Carnuntum (Pannonia), Sveti Naum and Sandanski.
27 Or, at least, that the writers were perhaps not always professionals.
compose all of them; it is possible that he wrote only one of the ‘Simonidean’ epigrams. In the *Anthologia Graeca*, epigrams are attributed to other famous persons, such as Euripides and Socrates, but the authenticity of such poems/authors must, similarly, be questioned. According to Bowie, at least during the Archaic period epigrams were composed by amateurs, but later, towards the Hellenistic period, some level of professionalism occurs, and during the Hellenistic period, poets wrote epigrams along with their other works. Bowie states that the ‘true professionals’ composed poems for competitions at festivals, and sometimes sepulchral or dedicatory epigrams, while the semi-professionals are not known to have participated in competitions; their aim was, simply, to produce poetry. Perhaps professionalism is not very relevant when discussing the ancient inscribed epigrams, but I wanted to point out that, because the composers may be, for example, family members of the deceased, they do not necessarily have top-quality poetic skills or enough experience to produce flawless verses.

With regard to non-inscribed epigrams, the situation is of course different: some professional poets also wrote epigrams. The table below lists the composers of the dialogue epigrams alone, as they are found in the *Anthologia Graeca*. I give the names as they are attested in the *Anthologia Graeca*, even though it is likely that some epigrams attributed to famous writers are not genuine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dialogues per</th>
<th>epigram writer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Metrodorus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gregory of Nazianzus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Callimachus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agathias Scholasticus, Antiphilus of Byzantium, Julianus Prefect of Egypt, Antipater of Sidon, Meleager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Leonidas of Tarentum, Lucillius, Philippus of Thessalonica, Simonides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nicarchus, Palladas of Alexandria, Paulus Silentarius, Philippus, Strato</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 At least there are no signs of professionalism: see Bowie 1989, 199.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dialogues per</th>
<th>epigram writer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Antipater of Thessalonica, Anyte, Automedon, Claudius Claudianus, Cometas Chartularius, Diogenes Laertius, Dioscorides, Eratosthenes Scholasticus, Erycius, Gauradas, Glaucus, Leonidas of Alexandria, Macedonius Consul, Marcus Argentarius, Marianus Scholasticus, Musicius, Nilus Scholasticus, Nicias, Phalaecus, Philodemus the Epicurean, Posidippus, Socrates, St. Sophronius (Patriarch), Synesius Scholasticus, Theaetetus, Theodoridas, Troilus Grammaticus, Tullius Flaccus / Laureas, Tullius Geminus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>anonymous (various)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we can see, the authors range from Hellenistic poets such as Callimachus to the Late Antique Archbishop Gregory of Nazianzus, who wrote several dialogue epigrams. Only one piece is attributed to many of the poets on the list, but, as the list shows, many authors tried the dialogue form. Among the 29 anonymous dialogue epigrams are grave epigrams (real or pseudo-epitaphs) that were possibly written by amateur writers.

It is of course possible that at least some of the poets mentioned above also composed epigrams for monuments. 31 According to W. Hansen, some poets produced both epigraphic and ‘pseudoepigraphic’ epitaphs, i.e. not only inscriptions, but also non-inscribed epigrams that imitated the inscriptions. 32

1.4 Previous studies

The epigraphical and verse inscription corpora are naturally vital for my study: Inscriptiones Graecae, Carmina Epigraphica Graeca and Steinepigramme aus dem Griechischen Osten are among the most important of these, as well as Peek’s GVI.

The inscribed predecessors of the Hellenistic and later non-inscribed epigrams, as well as the relationship between the verse inscriptions and non-
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31 Some epigrams occur in both forms – e.g. if a monument text is copied in an anthology.
32 In, e.g., Anthologia Graeca, there are numerous such epigrams. See Hansen 1998.
inscribed epigrams, have been the objects of recent study. A notable recent publication is Brill’s Companion to Hellenistic Epigram (2007), which offers several articles on the subject, many of which are valuable for the context of this study. When discussing the interlocutor roles and the possible performance of the text, Doris Meyer’s ‘The Act of Reading and the Act of Writing in Hellenistic Epigram’ and Irmgard Männlein-Robert’s ‘Epigrams on Art: Voice and Voicelessness in Hellenistic Epigram’, in the same book, give background for my study, as does Michael Tueller’s monograph Look Who’s Talking: Innovations in Voice and Identity in Hellenistic Epigram (2008). Meyer’s monograph Inszeniertes Lesevergnügen: Das inschriftliche Epigramm und seine Rezeption bei Kallimachos (2005) is an excellent study of verse inscriptions, non-inscribed epigrams and, for example, speaker roles. Joseph W. Day also discusses the inscriptions and their performance in his recent Archaic Greek Epigram and Dedication: Representation and Reperformance (2010). Furthermore, several articles in Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram (2010, eds. M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic and I. Petrovic) give important background information for my study and for the wider context of epigrams in general.

The earlier studies, however, focus mainly on the early stages of the epigrams and the connections between the Archaic and Classical epigrams and the Hellenistic epigram genre. My study gives new information on the later phase of verse inscriptions and the mutual influence of the inscriptions and the literary epigrams, especially during the Roman period. Furthermore, I trace the early development of the dialogue epigram and analyse the relationship between the verse inscriptions and the non-inscribed epigrams and the different levels of influence. These points will also contribute to the current discussion on reading and performing the epigrams. In this respect, Joseph W. Day’s remarks on the performance of the early epigrams, for example, are useful.

Many of the texts have been briefly commented upon in various articles, but there is no systematic study of the Greek verse inscriptions in the Roman period.

---

33 For the inscriptions and literature, see also the recent Liddel and Low 2013.
34 E.g. articles by Tueller, Schmitz, Vestrheim and Wachter.
35 E.g. Day 1989 and 2010. Day concentrates on the early phases of the epigram, but his analyses are valuable to me for detecting the later reading and/or performing situations.
This study focuses on one aspect of it, namely dialogue verse inscriptions, but the development of the dialogue also reveals some general outlines of the verse inscriptions and the development of the speaker roles.

I further contribute to current research through my linguistic approach. Research on a dead language corpus is of course different from any analysis of the modern languages that we can record. N. E. Collinge has, however, discussed the features of language that can be seen from the pragmatics’ point of view. He states that Ancient Greek ‘possesses the usual range of speech acts in all registers’. The basic studies in this field are J. L. Austin’s *How to Do Things With Words*, J. R. Searle’s work on the speech act, and the Gricean maxims. Naturally, there are more current discussions in the field, but, in order to appreciate more recent scholarship, a brief introduction to the work of these authors from the perspective of the dialogue epigram is needed.

According to M. M. Bakhtin, the utterances of discussions form interplays between certain rules of conduct, behaviour and expectations. Likewise, when we analyse written dialogues, which were most probably read aloud, we have certain expectations of how the conversation will proceed. Analysis of spoken dialogues begins with understanding these rules and expectations. C. Jenks discusses three aspects of dialogue: organisation, intersubjectivity and social context. Of these, organisation is relevant when scrutinising the written dialogues: for example, the division of the turns and how the turn-taking (or -giving) functions. The other two are more so features of spoken live conversation that are the result of two ‘real-life’ counterparts which are, in theory, unpredictable but, in reality, comprise the socially and historically established rules, as Bakhtin pointed out. I would add that the analysis of written poetic dialogues similarly begins with understanding certain factors of the poems discussed in this study.

---

36 Collinge 1988, 7.
37 I will discuss these further in Section 2.1.2.
38 See Bakhtin 1986, 87–91.
39 Jenks 2012, 1.
Dialogue epigrams are full of speech acts. Austin’s work, especially the posthumously published *How to Do Things with Words*, has greatly influenced the use of the term ‘speech act’. Austin introduced locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. The locutionary act means the actual utterance, i.e. the performance of the utterance. The concept of the illocutionary act is more complex, and has been discussed widely, but the pragmatic 'illocutionary force', or the semantic force of the utterance, is essential. With perlocutionary acts, the speech act’s psychological consequences, such as persuading and convincing, are scrutinised. The effect on the reader or listener is important. Often ‘speech act’ refers to the same thing as what Austin means by ‘illocutionary act’, i.e. that by saying something we do something; for example, greeting, describing something, asking a question, making a request or giving an order are seen as typical speech acts or illocutionary acts. All of these are frequent in the dialogue epigrams: questions are central, but greetings and orders also common.

Searle developed the following classification for the illocutionary speech acts: assertives, directives, commissives, expressives and declarations. Of these, the directives are of especial interest in the dialogue epigrams. As my material will show, performativeness and the illocutionary acts occur in the epigrammatic conversations. If we think about, for example, the greetings in the epigrams, their function is most likely ritualistic: by uttering the greeting, one participates in (or performs) the ritual act. Likewise, when someone reads the stone which exhorts the reader to say the greetings, s/he has already done so if the text was read aloud.

Even though conversation analysis (CA) started with analysing casual conversations and everyday speech situations (and, hence, often the spoken language), it also offers tools for reading the inscribed epigrams. I study how, for example, the turn-division is marked in the inscribed epigram – the context certainly
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40 And, in a way, inscriptions themselves are speech acts in the public sphere.
41 After Austin 1962; e.g., Searle 1969 and 1979; Bach and Harnish 1979; and Schiffer 1972, 103.
42 Austin 1962, 109–18.
43 For the locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts, see also Ohmann 1972, 50–1.
45 See the examples in Chapter 3, for instance.
46 The groundbreaking work in the field belongs to Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974), but more recently, e.g., Psathas (1995) and Ten Have (1999) have contributed to the topic. However, I will not rely heavily on their work, but rather study similar issues.
affected it. My approach introduces linguistic methods into the field of epigraphy. This study shows how a pragmatic connection was built into the verse inscriptions and how the elements of dialogue were noted in the texts, which were most probably received by both reading and hearing.

An analysis of the structures of epigrams also leads to an analysis of the speaker roles, for which publications by, for example, Meyer and Tueller provide a useful framework. This study further increases our knowledge of the speaker pairs, especially in the post-Hellenistic period, and provides an analysis of the way these roles function and communicate in epigrams with two or more speakers.

1.5 Methods

I use editions based on autopsy of the monuments whenever possible. When I provide my own reading, I indicate this in the footnote. I read some of the epigrams from the squeezes in Berlin and Princeton. When neither of these options (autopsy of the stone/squeeze) was possible, as was often the case, especially with material from Asia Minor, I compared the editions and chose the one that to me seemed the most acceptable (this edition is mentioned first in the footnote listing the editions, date and provenience). I also provide English translations of the epigrams. The translations are my own, if not noted otherwise.

My overall approach is to be rather cautious with restorations. There are certain formulae by which restorations can be given, but some verses are impossible to restore with any certainty. Many restorations by, for example, Peek are fine poetry, but when I studied the stone and measured the letter sizes and spaces, it

48 In the archives of IG, Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, and in the Institute for Advanced Study’s squeeze collection in Princeton, NJ. I am grateful to the staff of both, and especially for the kind generosity of Professor A. Chaniotis, who allowed me to visit the IAS collection in May 2013 at short notice.
49 And also some of the Greek epigrams, as I did not have an opportunity for systematic fieldwork during this study. I did, however, read some of the epigrams earlier (2003–2007) as part of a verse-inscription project led by Erkki Sironen (Verse Inscriptions of Roman Greece; ongoing, corpus to be published). I was able to read some of the epigrams during the past few years in the museums of Greece and, e.g., in the Istanbul Archaeological Museum.
50 My translations serve research purposes and have no literary ambitions.
became clear that sometimes Peek’s restorations are, for example, too long or are otherwise implausible. I often give the edition with the previous restorations, but I would like to underline the fact that the restorations are just suggestions, as any epigraphist of course knows.\footnote{In cases where I have seen the stone, I accept the earlier restorations if they seem plausible.} It is also worth pointing out that in some dialogues the dialogic elements are in restored parts of the monument. If what remains has no clear elements of dialogue, one has to take into account the context. In such cases, I discuss the options. However, if the dialogue elements are clear, I treat fragmentary texts as equivalent to epigrams that have been preserved intact. I have also kept the layout of the stone instead of arranging the epigrams according to verses, as the original arrangement is often useful for analysing the text. Within the chapters and sections, the texts are not in chronological, but rather in thematic, order.

The early epigram tradition in general aids an understanding of the evolution of the phenomenon. The diaphonic material offers additional information for this understanding. I am aware of the fact that this distinction (dialogue/diaphonic) may have been irrelevant for the composers of the epigrams. Perhaps they just wanted to provide certain information and certain ideas via two (or more) speakers in the epigram, and whether or not these speakers communicated with each other may have been insignificant to them. Yet, as I am especially interested in the communicative structures of the epigrams, I focus on the dialogues, in which at least some level of communication between the speakers can be detected.

Epigraphic methods, such as editions and dating, are needed for the basic analysis of the material. I also discuss how the dialogue epigrams fit into the general development of the genre. Therefore, I not only compare verse inscriptions and non-inscribed epigrams, but also consult previous epigram studies.

Linguistic methods are essential. The smallest unit of any conversation, either spoken or written, is an adjacency pair.\footnote{For the adjacency pairs, see Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974).} It contains one turn by each of two speakers. In each turn, there may be one or several moves. The turns are functionally related; the first utterance provokes the responsive second utterance, and hence creates a conversation, i.e. communication. In conversations, the pairs...
can be, for example, greeting–greeting, offer–acceptance/rejection, request–acceptance/rejection, question–answer, complaint–excuse/remedy or greeting–degreeting. Dialogue epigrams consist of one or more adjacency pairs. Not all the pairs found in spoken conversation can be detected in the written dialogues, but some of them may be: in the dialogue epigrams, the question–answer pair (Q – A) is by far the most common. Three-quarters of the dialogues contain either one or several question–answer pairs, so we can say that this pair is the core element of the dialogue epigrams. In addition to these, greeting pairs are also common, as are greeting turns which do not receive a response. Statement–response pairs also occur, but they are not as common as the two aforementioned pairs.

It is characteristic of adjacency pairs that the two parts are uttered by a different speaker and the turns are not only related, but rather contiguous, i.e. the two parts are ordered: for example, questions must be asked before uttering the answer. This means that the turns are appropriately matched. In the dialogue epigram, this prevails: the pattern of ordered units is rarely broken. Some interruptions, however, do occur at the level of the maxims of speech.

Pragmatics offers tools for my typology and analysis. The aim of my typology is to help to analyse both the structure and the content of the dialogue epigrams; by scrutinising each type separately, I aim to give a set framework for this analysis. I aim to show the ways of organising the dialogues and the ways that this organisation is denoted in the texts. This also aids an understanding of how the audience received the text: if by hearing, how did the text help the audience to understand who was talking, when does the speaker change and how does the conversation progress, and also how was the reader able to follow the aforementioned aspects of the epigram?

---

53 A term used in pragmatics; the participants (of the conversation) agree to discountinue the conversation.
2. WHAT DIALOGUE?

2.1 Dialogue in epigrams

2.1.1 Communication and terminology

The word ‘dialogue’ derives from the Greek ὁ διάλογος, which was in use by Plato’s time at the latest (see below). Its roots are in διαλέγομαι, which is formed from the preposition διά and the verb λέγειν. Apart from conversation, it can also refer to speech or series of speeches and debate (cf. διάλεξις). Plato used the verb διαλέγομαι and the term οἱ διάλογοι in Protagoras 335d (Callias to Socrates):

Οὐκ ἀφήσομέν σε, ὦ Σώκρατες· έὰν γὰρ σὺ ἐξέλθῃς, οὔχ ὁμοίως ἡμῖν ἔσονται οἱ διάλογοι. δέομαι οὖν σου παραμεῖναι ήμῖν· ὡς ἐγὼ οὔδ᾽ ἂν ἔνος ἡδίων ἀκούσαιμι ἢ σοῦ τε καὶ Πρωταγόρου διαλεγομένων.

‘We will not let you go, Socrates; for if you leave us our discussions will not go so well. I beg you therefore to stay with us, for there is nothing I would rather hear than an argument between you and Protagoras.’

(Translation by Lamb)

The passage captures well the use of the word for both discussion and debate. Dialogus in Latin means a (philosophical) conversation and a dialogue – again we can see the philosophical tone. It was used by authors such as Cicero and
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54 LSJ 1869, s. v. ‘dialexis’.
55 Ca 380 BCE.
56 Philosophical dialogue is a genre in itself, but reflections of it can occasionally be seen in the content or style of the epigrams: cf., e.g., IG² II/III 12067, ca 365–340 BCE, with the formula φιλούντα ἀντφιλούσια τόν ἀνδρα (no. 3 in this chapter), which, according to Clairmont 1970, 118, was influenced by Plato. There is also a funerary epigram for a certain Dialogos (IG II² 11140, 2nd century CE, from Attica) in which Dialogos is told to become a sophist – hence his name refers to the philosophical use of the term. The name occurs only in this epigram; cf. LGPN II. A passage from the epigrams shows the philosophical aspect: ----Ενθάδε Διαλόγοιο σαϑφρονος ὅστεα κεύθ[ει], /γυμνά δς ἀμφε ἀρετὴν ἔπλετο καὶ σοφίην----.
Quintilianus. As in numerous other cases, the Greek word was transmitted into modern languages through Latin.

The basic meaning of the word ‘dialogue’ is ‘a conversation between two or more people’. The definition ‘a written composition in which two or more characters are represented as conversing’ applies to dialogue epigrams.

As the definitions show, dialogue includes, or rather is, communication, whether in spoken or in written form. Every piece of poetry communicates with its reader/listener, so there is a dialogic connection between the poem and its recipient(s). At the same time, the writer communicates with the audience. There are thus several levels of communication: between the author and the recipient, between the text and the recipient, and between the inner characters of the poem. My study focuses on the communication between the epigram’s inner actors. Each interlocutor has one or more turns, and in the dialogue epigrams, the turns of the speakers have a verbal interchange of thoughts. This means that they direct their speech to each other, or at least one of the speakers addresses the other and the second turn is somehow initiated by the first (I will provide examples of both). There are thus two options for two-person dialogues, the first and main one of which is:

a -> b
b -> a

This is the basic dialogue: a speaks to b, and b replies/responds to a. According to Aronsson, dialogues involve not only the turns – what a says to b, and what b says to a – but also a’s and b’s reflections. In inscribed dialogues, these reflections are difficult to see, but the responses are often easy to predict due to certain patterns used in the epigrams.

The second two-person dialogue option is either

a -> b
b -> c

---

57 Cic: Or. 44 fin. and Brut. 60 fin.; Quint. 5, 14, 27; 6, 3, 44 al. cf. Cic. Atr. 5, 5; 15,3; Quint. 9, 2, 31 (in the last passage, it is translated as ‘sermocinatio’, as mentioned in Lewis and Short).
or the other way around, whereby one of the speakers directs the speech to the other \((a \text{ and } b \text{ can both do this})\), and the other directs the speech to someone outside the poem. In the diaphonic epigrams, the situation is as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
  a & \rightarrow x \\
  b & \rightarrow x/y
\end{align*}
\]

In such epigrams, there are two speakers, but no dialogue communication, and both speak to someone outside the poem (not necessarily to the same character). As I am interested in the direct inner communication of the epigram, I have included only the material which has some level of the mentioned communication and have excluded the clearly diaphonic (but non-dialogical) material from my study.\(^{60}\) To put it simply: dialogue epigrams are poems with two (or more) speakers who interact.

### 2.1.2 The cooperative principle

As indicated above, the dialogue epigrams play with certain expectations. Grice pointed out that when we say something, we expect to get a certain kind of response, i.e. a clear and understandable answer to our question.\(^{61}\) Grice’s cooperative principle is: ‘Make your contribution such as it is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged’.\(^{62}\) The four basic maxims that Grice formulated are the maxims of quality, quantity, relation and manner.\(^{63}\)

Grice’s critics state that his theory contains too much of both wishful thinking and rationality, as the participants of communication do not necessarily have a

---

60 I will, however, discuss some examples that are not dialogue epigrams in the strictest definition but have elements that can illustrate the development of the dialogues.

61 Note, however, Bach 2005, 6: ‘They are not sociological generalizations about speech, nor they are moral prescriptions or prescriptions on what to say or communicate. Although Grice presented them in the form of guidelines for how to communicate successfully, I think they are better construed as presumptions about utterances, presumptions that we as listeners rely on and as speakers exploit’.


63 Of these, the maxim of quantity is perhaps the one most often broken in the dialogue epigrams, as more information may be given by speaker \(b\) than is required by speaker \(a\). The maxim of quantity is twofold: (1) make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange) and (2) do not make your contribution more informative than is required. This applies especially to some of my t1 dialogues. See Grice 1975, 26–31 for further details on maxims.
common goal/ambition.\textsuperscript{64} This is often true in real-life conversations, but when it comes to verse inscriptions, the Gricean maxims often prevail. This seems to be more typical of written than of spoken language. In his book on voice in the Hellenistic epigram, Michael Tueller addresses the question: what can the poems, although they are admittedly written, tell us about spoken word? As he points out, the speaking objects definitely provided awareness of the writing and its peculiarities.\textsuperscript{65} This is not only a Hellenistic phenomenon; even in the Archaic period, the epigrams were used as a form of written communication, even though poetry was generally received via performance.\textsuperscript{66} Many epigrams implicate an awareness of this situation.\textsuperscript{67} It is worth noting that the reception situation was even more complex, in a way, in the dialogue epigrams, as they contained more than one voice, but the turns of different speaker roles (/voices) were read by the same reader. The audience had to know the speaker roles and some general features in order to be able to follow the epigram, so it is very likely that the audience had certain expectations of the epigrams.\textsuperscript{68}

If we see the maxims not as how things should be, but as depicting what we often expect, the written dialogues are often similar to the situation that Grice depicts in his maxims – unpredictable turns seldom occur in the dialogue epigrams.\textsuperscript{69} The questions are most often about, for example, the deceased, his or her homeland, parents or family status, and the dedicator of the monument, and they are asked by the passerby and answered by either the monument or the deceased. We except to get an answer, and we do; the questions in the dialogue epigrams are seldom left unanswered. If they are, we can often see that the author is playing with the traditional dialogue conventions; for example, the dialogues between the relatives and the deceased offer the same information as the passerby–monument and passerby–deceased dialogues, even though they are constructed differently. The information is often given in the turn of the relative, when s/he addresses the

\textsuperscript{64} See Keenan 1976, 67–80.
\textsuperscript{65} cf. Tueller 2008, 141. This is also noted by many scholars researching the connections between Hellenistic epigrams and the verse inscriptions. cf., e.g., Walsh 1991, 83–5.
\textsuperscript{66} Schmitz 2010b, 25.
\textsuperscript{67} See examples in Section 2.3.3.
\textsuperscript{68} For speaker pairs, see Section 2.2, and for reading and reception, Section 2.3.
\textsuperscript{69} Exceptions of course do occur, as my examples will show.
deceased, and the name of the deceased is thus given in this address. The relatives also lament the deceased, and in this lamentation, they often also further describe the deceased. In such cases, the expectations of the audience are still met. There are, however, some adjacency pairs in which the maxims are not functioning; perhaps one could say that they aim towards a ‘real conversation’. At the same time, they are more ‘literary’, for they are expressed in a way that is not solely ‘functional’ or informative.

To sum up, dialogue is a convention of the epigrams, and one with which the audience was familiar.\(^{70}\) It is very probable that the audience expected the conversation to follow certain rules and logic. As my examples will show, cooperation is expected, but the epigrams occasionally play with these expectations.

### 2.1.3 Discourse types

As regards discourse types of dialogue epigrams, I rely on the terminology set by Kroon in her study on particle use in Latin. Kroon creates dialogic and dialogical discourse terminology, and according to her definition, ‘a dialogical discourse segment consists of alternating moves of distinct discourse partners, which are related by their corresponding interactional functions and together constitute an interactional exchange’.\(^{71}\) Kroon discusses the system of discourse types and makes a division on the basis of two parameters: monologal/dialogal and monological/dialogical.

Kroon’s theory is formed on the basis of Roulet et al.\(^{72}\), but it stems ultimately from Bakhtin. Put in a very simplified manner, the discourse-type system enunciates the communicative structures that are built with interlocutors and turns: in the dialogal type, there are at least two speakers who phrase the text and have structural and topical control, whereas the monological discourse type is phrased and controlled by one speaker only. The other pair is monological–dialogical.

---

\(^{70}\) As the examples later in this chapter will show, the convention was probably known already in the Archaic period.

\(^{71}\) Kroon 1995, 109.

\(^{72}\) Roulet et al. 1985: *L’articulation du discours en français contemporain.*
dialogical discourse segment contains alternating turns and interaction, whereas the monological discourse consists of one turn only. Discourse type may change several times within one text.

These two parameters produce combinations that are useful for explaining the situation of certain texts with two or more speakers. Most of the epigrams discussed in this study are the dialogical dialogal discourse type, but I have also included some examples which are perhaps better understood by looking at Kroon’s dialogical monologal discourse type. According to Kroon, ‘when a text is phrased by a central reporter..., but simulates or reports a conversational exchange, we may speak of a dialogical monologal discourse’. The text may show diaphonic elements and even describe a dialogue via the voice of a narrator, i.e. the narrator describes a dialogue or an imagined dialogue; for example ‘If you asked who this is, I would say...’, or something similar. There are also epigrams which contain dialogue between two speakers and a narrator as a third speaker. We find these variations in some Greek epigrams of the Roman period, and, in my opinion, this phenomenon indicates broader development of the epigram genre, from informative (early inscribed tradition) to narrative ones in the post-classical period.

We could say that the speech acts of the epigrams are fictional, but the language seems to be something in between spoken and written. The information mediated by the dialogues are facts, but the discussion in which the facts are given is fictional. This is also a feature that the later professional poets liked to emphasise, exploiting the old formulae, when developing the genre of epigrams.

2.2. The speakers and the speaker pairs

A certain set of speakers is repeated in the dialogue verse inscriptions. In this chapter, the roles are briefly introduced and the basic functions outlined, while the

---

73 Kroon 1995, 110. For the discourse structure of the funerary epigrams, see Díaz de Cerio 1999, 189–204.
74 For examples and further discussion, see Chapter 5.
75 See also Meyer 2005 for this.
examples used throughout this study will further illustrate the essence and use of
each speaker role.

The speaker roles are as listed below, and the first three speaker roles of the
list are the most commonly used:

the monument (MON)
the passerby (PB)
the deceased (DEC) (or honorand [HON])
the relative(s) (REL)
the narrator (N)

These speaker roles, when combined in one epigram, produce certain, fixed speaker
pairs. Some variation occurs, but the basic interlocutor pairs are:

passerby–monument (or the narrator) (PB – MON/N)
passerby–deceased/honorand (PB – DEC/HON)
relative–deceased (REL – DEC)

In the verse inscriptions, the passerby–monument pair is chronologically the first
type, but the other roles develop relatively early as well.\(^76\) Note that I draw a parallel
between the deceased and the honorand as speaker roles; of these two, the
deceased is far more common, and the honorand role (especially in the Roman
period) seems to follow the pattern set by the earlier grave epigrams.

In types 1 and 2, there are normally two speakers in each epigram. In type 3,
there are three: often, one of them is the narrator (a speaker role that does not
occur in dialogues outside type 3). Most often, the epigram is funerary, but it may
also be, for example, a building inscription. The passerby–monument pair occurs in

\(^{76}\) For the pre-Hellenistic speakers and the developments, see Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, (their)
Chapter 2.3. For early Greek epitaphs, see Sourvinou-Inwood 1995.
various kind of epigrams, whereas the passerby–deceased pairs and the deceased–relative pairs naturally appear only in the funerary epigrams. The narrator role occurs in dialogues only as a third speaker in addition to two other speaker roles that communicate with each other.

It is not always easy to tell who the speaker is in a turn of an epigram. Sometimes it is difficult to tell whether the monument or the deceased is speaking, and the narrator and monument roles are also occasionally difficult to separate and/or to identify. Even the relative’s turn and the monument’s turn may occasionally be very similar to each other, but often there is some kind of indicator that helps to detect the speaker during the course of reading the epigram.

2.2.1 The monument

The idea of a talking monument was a catalyst for the development of the dialogue form in the epigrams. Examples of the monument addressing its audience are found already in Archaic inscriptions: the address made visible the connection between the monument (i.e. the poem) and the reader. The grave as a speaker developed during the 7th and 6th centuries BCE. Sometimes there is a word that refers to a grave instead of a monument, but if another voice responds after such an address, I count that as a monument voice (the physical object did not speak anyway, so it is the idea of the grave/monument that this speaker represents).

In the early monologue epigrams, the monument already spoke in the first person, and also addressed the passerby before s/he had a voice. Schmitz discusses this development, and he adduces two later fictional epigrams, one by Callimachus and another by Simonides (both are dialogues), and justly states that the dialogic communication would have been familiar to the audience of these texts from the

---

77 But see the passerby–honorand pair, which is similar to the passerby–deceased pair.
78 With the exception of embedded dialogue; cf. Section 5.2.
79 cf. Schmitz 2010b, 32. I will present several examples of this in Chapters 3–5.
80 e.g. a particle; I discuss this subject further in the following chapters.
81 ’Speaking stones’ were a known feature by the Archaic period; cf. Tueller 2008, 150.
82 cf. Meyer 2005, 70. For the early speaking object, see also Christian 2015, 28-46, especially 32-40 for earlier discussion on *Ich-Rede*. For the development of the speaker roles, see also del Barrio Vega 1989, 191–2.
Archaic tradition.\textsuperscript{83} He gives several ‘speaking object’ examples, for instance the Mantiklos epigram, a dedicatory text from the 7\textsuperscript{th} century CE.\textsuperscript{84} This Archaic speaking-object tradition seems to be typical of dedications, as Wachter argues.\textsuperscript{85} It is interesting that we have only one dialogue dedication.\textsuperscript{86} Dialogue seems to be a phenomenon of the funerary context, and some honorary texts (similar to the funerary epigrams) and building inscriptions occur later. Why is that? Could the basic difference be that the dedications speak to gods, whereas the grave monuments (and other types of monuments mentioned above) attempt to talk to mortals who walk by?\textsuperscript{87} According to Burzachechi, it is the Archaic animism that breeds the speaking objects that are common in verse inscriptions.\textsuperscript{88} In my opinion, however, the situation is different. Meyer also discards the idea of animism; rather, she sees the influence of the speech acts here.\textsuperscript{89} The dedications include the aspect of communicating to the people who see the object, but the dedicatory epigrams are primarily communications with gods. In the funerary epigrams, the communication aims to make the deceased known to the audience, whereas in the dedicatory epigrams, the god cannot be the ones asking questions, and an extra speaker evoking speech that is directed to a god is not a very functional pattern.

Another factor of the speaking object is that the monuments competed for the attention of the audience. The Archaic graves lined the roadsides, and the dedications in the temples were surrounded by many others as well.\textsuperscript{90} This is probably the reason why the grave monuments started to address the passersby.\textsuperscript{91} Nevertheless, in the early dialogues, the monument is the addressee and is defined in the address. The monument may be, for example, a stele, sarcophagus, building, boundary stone, statue base or dedicated object. It may also be a sculpted figure

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{83} Schmitz 2010b, 28–29. The examples are: Call. Epigr. 34; Pfeiffer = 22 Gow; Page 1965 = AP 6.351: τίν με, λεοντάγχ' ὄνα συκότόνε, φήγινον δζον θῆκε ‘τίς;’ Ἀρχῖνος. ‘ποίος;’ ὁ Κρής. ‘δέχομαι’.
and Simonides APlan 23 = no. 36 Page 1981 (example no. 36 in Chapter 3).
\textsuperscript{84} Schmitz 2010b, 29. Also, Day 2010, 33–48 has recently discussed the epigram.
\textsuperscript{85} Wachter 2010, 250–60, especially 257ff.
\textsuperscript{86} SGO 1, 01/02/15 = CEG 429 (no. 2 in Chapter 2.2.2).
\textsuperscript{87} Tueller has speculated the same; see 2010, 54 and note 27.
\textsuperscript{88} cf. Burzachechi 1962, 3–54.
\textsuperscript{89} Meyer 2005, 72.
\textsuperscript{90} Schmitz 2010b, 35 and 30.
\textsuperscript{91} For the speaker roles, see also Rasche 1910 and Kassel 1983, 151–2.
guarding the tomb, for example a sphinx or a lion, or, finally, it may be the symbol of a divine creature related to the monument, for example Eros or Hermes. The monuments had value as memorials, but as a speaker role, the monument always has an informative aspect: its role is to tell certain facts about the deceased/ the person honoured/the dedicator, normally in the third person singular. The monument can refer to itself in the first person singular, but this is not necessary. Deictic elements are common, and they occur in the monument’s talk from the Archaic period onwards.

This ‘voice of the stone’ was problematized in Hellenistic non-inscribed epigrams, and the speaking object was even treated as a paradox. This problematization also appears in the verse inscriptions, especially in the Roman period.

2.2.2 The passerby

The development of the passerby role is as essential as the talking monument in the early stages of the dialogue epigrams. The passerby frequently figured in the Archaic epigrams as an addressee, but it is important for the dialogues that the passerby began to talk. In the early addresses, the passerby is asked to stop and lament at the grave. When the monument addressed the passerby, the turn was directed to the wider audience at the same time; passerby is a role, but it represents both the reader and the audience. The passerby could also be the only speaker in a monologue epigram, for example in polyandria, where the passerby greets the deceased.

---

92 cf. the following: for a stele: IG II/III 12794, IG XIV 1603, GVI 1845; a sarcophagus: GVI 1835 = SGO 3, 14/07/02; a lighthouse: SGO 1, 05/01/18 = AG 9.671; a wall: SGO 4, 21/07/01; a sphinx : GVI 1831; a lion: GVI 1834, SGO 4, 19/10/01, cf. Sironen 2015; Eros: SGO 2, 11/07/05 = AG 16.201; and Hermes: IG XIV 769 = GVI 1883.
93 For re-enactment, see Bakker 1993a, 10–12; cf. Svenbro 1993, 26–43.
94 Christian 2015, 76 and 83–5.
95 See e.g. no. 8 in Chapter 5.
96 For early development in 6th century BCE Attica and, later, elsewhere, see Tueller 2010, 42–4. Díaz de Cerio 1999, 200 also dates the passerby role to early 6th/5th century BCE. For the passerby as the addressee (in monologues), see also Tueller 2008, 32.
97 Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, 297, giving CEG 4 as an example.
The passerby role gives a new dimension to the communication between the monument and the recipient, and, more importantly, when there are two speakers in the epigram, the existence of a passerby creates communication within the poem. It enhances the speech of the monument, in a way, but also gives the composers new possibilities for telling the facts on stone.\footnote{As Meyer formulates, the passerby is simultaneously a speaker role and a fictive reader, someone who may be addressed in the epigram. But this is not the same as the actual reader, although the writers often had both in mind; see Meyer 2005, 12ff.}

The basic situation is that the passerby is an ignorant enquirer. Traditionally, s/he is also someone whom the deceased does not know.\footnote{Meyer 2007, 193.} As the material shows, in the early dialogues the passerby initiates the conversation, but later on, the monument may begin the passerby–monument dialogue, and the deceased can also initiate the dialogue with the passerby. The information that the monument wants to mediate is offered in the form of answers to the passerby's questions. Instead of a monument stating 'here lies NN', the passerby first asks 'Who lies here?', and by answering his/her questions, the monument/deceased gives the required information. In some epigrams, however, the passerby possesses some knowledge, especially in the greetings, such as the name of the deceased. The passerby may also wish the deceased or his/her family well, but this always happens after the conversation in which information has been exchanged. The fact that there was a speaker in the epigram asking a question/s may also have given the recipients more time to prepare for the most important information, such as the identity of the deceased.

Some scholars have discussed the so-called anonymous mourner, a speaker role that expresses grief in the first person.\footnote{Walsh 1991, 83; Page 1981, 295; Gutzwiller 1998, 60; and Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, 295. cf. Meyer 2007, 77–83. See also Vestrheim 2010, 67–71 on the ‘featureless voice’.} The pattern of the deceased who could be addressed in the second person by an anonymous speaker was common in the Classical period, but this is uncommon in the dialogues in which the speakers are often identified and, even if not, are usually detectable. However, in the dialogues, the passerby is such a default character that it is probable that the audience
identified even the possibly unidentified speakers as passersby rather than as anonymous mourners.\textsuperscript{101}

Ultimately, if a speaker addresses the passerby or the monument and cannot be identified as a relative or someone/something else, I identify the speaker as passerby. Very often, however, the speakers can be identified by way of the addresses. When the passerby is addressed, vocatives such as ὀδίτα, παροδίτα, ὀδοτόρε, παροδοτόρε, ξένε or φίλε are used.\textsuperscript{102}

In the earliest preserved dialogue example, the speakers are the passerby and a sphinx (i.e. the monument):\textsuperscript{103}

1.  ὁφίξ, ἡαῖδο [κ]ύον, τίν᾽ ἔχος᾽ ὁπιν [ἀε φυ]λάσεις  
    ἡμέν[ca. 3]ροφ[ίλο κα]δός [άπ]οφθιμ[ένο];  
    ξε[---]

Sphinx, you [d]og of Hades, whom are you...[guarding always], sitt[ing] [on the gr]ave of the deceas[ed]---? — Str[anger],---\textsuperscript{104}

The text is considerably fragmentary, but it seems to be a dialogue. It begins with an address to the sphinx (guardian of the tomb): ὁφίξ, ἡαῖδο[κ]ύον.\textsuperscript{105} The address at the beginning of the line is certain, so we can state that someone other than the monument itself is speaking. A remarkably fragmentary question follows, starting with an interrogative: τίν᾽ ἔ[--].\textsuperscript{106} It is damaged, but there are two vertical strokes in the Princeton squeeze, and the lower part of the nu is visible, so the interrogative

\textsuperscript{101} See Tueller 2008, 40–1, Tueller 2010, 45 and Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, 400–1 and 293–4. Tueller points out that discussion on CEG 470 = 16a has shed some light on the terminology/identification of the speaker role. See also the Ambracia cenotaph (SEG 41, S40a), further in Day 2007, 30–1 (cf. discussion cited in his notes).

\textsuperscript{102} For the development of ἔνος, see Tueller 2008, 45 and Tueller 2010, 51–4.

\textsuperscript{103} From Thessaly, Demetrias. The edition is my own, made on the basis of the Princeton squeeze, but very similar to GVI 1831. According to Friedländer, it probably originated in Iolkos: Friedländer 1987, no. 139A. The dates given in the previous edition vary from 6\textsuperscript{th} BCE to ca 450 BCE (the latter in CEG 120); on the basis of Princeton squeeze, 6\textsuperscript{th}/5\textsuperscript{th} BCE seems most probable.

\textsuperscript{104} The translation depends on the restoration; see my analysis below (in this chapter).

\textsuperscript{105} What comes next depends on edition: in my opinion, Peeks’s restoration must be read with a cautious mind, but in order to study the epigram, I give it here. Instead of [κ]ύον, Arvanitopoulos reads [ε]χονυμε, but it seems highly unlikely. In any case the word seems to be part of the address.

\textsuperscript{106} ἔχουσα: Friedländer; ἔχος: Peek in GVI.
τίν᾽ is very likely. The reading of the rest of the line is also dubious, but φυ]λάσεις seems probable, as does ἀπ[οθιμ[ένο (or, as in Friedländer, ἀπ[οθιμ[ένου), so this refers to the guarding of the tomb. The second turn begins with ξε[---. Here, the speaker is the sphinx addressed at the beginning of the first line. Either of the addresses ξε[ορ or ξε[ον (or, as in Friedländer, ξε[ον) θντες (which would answer the question in the first turn), are possible. In any case, xi and epsilon are clear.

The fact that the sphinx epigram is so badly damaged makes some scholars doubt its value as proof of dialogue-epigram development. In my opinion, the address and the interrogative (or the traces of it, which I find plausible enough) suggest that the sphinx epigram is most likely a dialogue, and the letterforms suggest a pre-Classical date. Also, if we compare the epigram with others in this chapter, it is highly likely that it contained a question–answer pair, beginning with the address in the first turn.

Another early example leaves no room for speculation. It is a dedicatory epigram from Halicarnassus, dated to the 5th century BCE, with a dialogue:

2. αὐ<δ>η τεχνήσασα λίθο, λέγε τίς τόδ᾽ ἄ[γαλμα] στήσει Ἀπόλλωνος βωμόν ἔπαγλαί[σας].

— Παναμύης υἱός Κασβόλλιος, εἰ με κ[ελεύεις] ἐξευπείν, δεκάτην τήνδ᾽ ἀνέθηκε θε[ῶι].

Engineered voice of the stone, say who set up this ad[ornment], honour[ing] the altar of Apollo.
— Panamyes the son of Casbollis, if you in[sist]

---

107 ξε[νοκράτες] suggested by Friedländer 1948.
108 e.g., del Barrio Vega (1989, 194) notes that the fragmentariness makes it questionable.
109 Tueller discusses the early examples and refers to del Barrio Vega and to Rasche 1910, 6, who assumed that dialogue epigrams first occurred in the Palatine Anthology, but, as Tueller points out, Rasche published before the following example (CEG 429) was found: Tueller 2008, 42. Taking into account the fact that these examples date to no later than the Classical period, it seems obvious to me that the development was not due solely to the literary genre (Page 1981, 245 discusses a Simonidean epigram and states that dialogue form is perhaps more likely in non-inscribed epigrams).
110 CEG 429, SGO 1, 01/12/05 (Halicarnassus, 5th century BCE).
that I speak out, dedicated this as a tithe to the god.

(Translation by Tueller)

The first speaker is obviously the passerby. First, there is the address, i.e. the passerby addresses the monument: αὐδὴ τεχνῆσα λίθῳ (Engineered voice of the stone—).\(^{111}\) Second, we find deictic elements in this turn. They refer to the particular monument: τὸδ᾽ ἄ[γαλμα]. Even though ἄ[γαλμα] is mainly restored, the deictic pronoun is clear. The initial verse is composed as if the speaker were standing beside the monument – as the reader of the monument was – and asking: ‘who lies here, under this monument that I am looking at?’ This is a common feature of the grave monuments.

Here, the idea of an object with a voice is depicted as a pattern, something artificial.\(^{112}\) The epigram creates an impression that the talking monument was already a convention. The stone represents Panamyês, who dedicated the statue to the god Apollo. In the answer turn, εἰ μὲ κ[ελεύεις] ἐξεπεῖν, if you insist that I speak out is embedded in the line.\(^{113}\) This addition to the otherwise strictly informative Παναμύης γιὸς Κασβόλλιος ---δεκάτην τὴνδ᾽ ἀνέθηκε θε[ῶι] underlines the fact that the speaker has changed; the passerby is no longer speaking, but rather the voice that the passerby requested to speak. This insertion also gives the audience time to prepare for the information. I include the reader and/or the listener in ‘audience’. S/he now knows to expect the information that is coming.

These two examples show that the dialogue form has its roots in the pre-Hellenistic verse inscription tradition, and, in my opinion, the dialogue is a rather obvious continuation of the talking-object tradition. Despite these early examples, it

\(^{111}\) As Tueller 2010, 55 points out, the question in this kind of epigrams corroborates the identification of the speaker as the passerby – it cannot be anyone else.

\(^{112}\) The word τεχνῆσα may also be translated as ‘skillful’ or ‘artful’; Petrovic 2007, 64 points out that: ‘Here, for the first time, the voice of an inscribed epigram is characterized as full of techne, i.e. artful’. In any case, the phrase αὐδὴ ---λίθῳ is a clear indication that the stone is talking on behalf of someone and that both the writer and recipient were aware of this convention. cf. Tueller 2008, 150 and Christian 2015, 53–4.

\(^{113}\) μ᾽ ἐπ[οτρύνεις] ? CEG.
is important to keep in mind that most of the dialogue epigrams have a much later date.

2.2.3 The deceased

The voice of the deceased is also a feature that was already known in the Archaic period. It could be an addressee, but it had also become prominent as a speaker by the 4th century. In the dialogues, the deceased has two different functions – informative or consoling – depending on the other speaker. When the deceased is conversing with the passerby, s/he adopts an informative role similar to that of the monument. These speaker roles can often be identical. The passerby asks the same questions from both: the basic facts about the deceased and/or his/her death. We know that the speaker is the deceased because s/he is addressed in the turn of the passerby. In addition to the reply turns (in which the deceased answers the passerby’s questions), there can be opening greetings and farewells, or wishes at the end of the epigram.

In the relative–deceased pairs, however, the role of the deceased is different. Usually the deceased comments on the lament of the relative, and the basic information about the deceased is given in that lament (or before it, in an eventual prose section), so that the deceased in his/her own turn then consoles the relative and often comments on mortality, for example by reminding the mourner that everyone must die. These turns can, however, also contain some information that is directed to the audience.

---

114 Concerning the roles during the Archaic period, see Degani 1997, 1108–14. Note also that according to Christian 2015, 42, the deceased did speak in some oriental inscriptions (Akkadian, Hittite) from the 8th century BCE on. For the early phase of the speaker role, see also Christian 2015, 162–176. In a couple of cases, Christian suggests a switch of a speaker where I do not necessarily see a need for it, but he also discusses several ‘clear’ dialogues.

115 Tueller 2008, 32 and figs. 3 and 4; also Tueller 2008, 112.
2.2.4 The relative

The family members begin to appear in the epigrams (also monologues) towards the end of the 4th century (BCE). The relative is a close family member who has a voice in the epigram: the mother, father, spouse or child of the deceased. The relative may be addressed, and s/he most often addresses the deceased in the second person. Lament is essential, but in the lament, the relative may also give information about the deceased (information the monument or the deceased would tell in the epigrams with other speaker pairs). Hence, the relative partly adopts the place and function of the passerby. As s/he possesses knowledge of the deceased (family members know the name of the deceased, etc.), they do not ask for information, but rather concentrate on their loss. This speaker pair provides the opportunity to express emotions such as yearning, consolation and reverence on a deeper and more intimate level than in the passerby–deceased epigrams. Many of the epigrams that contain a relative role are type 2 or type 3, and the lament can be rather long and produce long replies/comments. Yet, even with the lament, the turns of the relatives are not always only emotional: in addition to the facts about the deceased (information directed to the audience), they can also contain very practical communication with the deceased. The relative may, for example, report that s/he has done everything that the deceased ordered, or something similar that s/he wants the deceased (or the audience) to know. The relative–deceased speaker pair shows development towards narrative (from functional, informative speaker roles). This tendency seems to become stronger when the focus on personal matters was expanding in literature in general.

2.2.5 The narrator

Some epigrams have multiple speakers. In an epigram with three interlocutors (type 3), it might happen that two of them communicate with each other and the third comments on the speech of one of them, but does not get a reply. In some

---

116 Tueller 2008, 76.
117 For examples, see Chapters 4 and 5.
118 cf. nos. 1, 4, 5, 6 and 7 in Chapter 5.
cases, however, the third speaker is a neutral narrator. Note that I do not draw a parallel between the speaker role (narrator) and the author, but simply use the term to mark a character in a poem.\(^{119}\)

The narrator describes a situation (i.e. creates a narration) and introduces the turns of the dialogues. The narrator may also denote the identity of the speakers and the change between them. The narrator and the monument roles can be close to each other, and thus are sometimes difficult to define (i.e. it is difficult to determine whether the speaker is the monument or the narrator). However, the narrator is always unidentified in the text: whereas all other speaker roles can be addressed, the narrator never is. Neither does the narrator address any of the other speakers, but rather reports a dialogue from the outside. Also, the narrator speaks in the third person, never in the first or second, and may also refer to the dialogue using the past tense.

The epigrams with a narrator and other speakers are more common in the non-inscribed epigrams than in the verse inscriptions – there are only a few of the latter (discussed in Chapter 5). The communication structures in these are partly different from the (other) dialogue epigrams, but I wanted to include these more narrative-based examples in my corpus, as some connections to the other types and earlier, more strictly communicating speaker pairs can be detected.

2.2.6 Problems in defining the speaker(s)

The speakers are often clearly marked, but if not, it can prove difficult to identify the speakers, or at least one of them. The following epigram is an example of this.\(^{120}\)

3. χαίρε τάφος Μελίτης· χρηστ ἡ γυνὴ ἐνθάδε κεῖται·
φιλοῦντα ἃντιφιλοῦσα τὸν ἄνδρα Ὀνήσιμ | οὐ ἢσθα κρατίστῃ

\(^{119}\) For narrator(s), see also Morrison 2012, esp. 27–35.

Greetings, grave of Melite! A good wife lies here. You were the best of all, loving in return your loving husband Onesimos. And therefore he misses you now that you have died, for you were a good wife. — Farewell you too, dearest of men. But keep on loving my (children).\textsuperscript{121}

It is obvious that the last line belongs to the deceased who greets the relative, but the beginning of the epigram is less clear. The sentence partly looks like it was the monument’s and partly like the husband’s turn. The address could come from the husband, but after that the deceased is referred to in the third person: χρηστή γυνή ἐνθάδε κέιται. Next, the deceased is addressed in the second person: ἥσθα κρατίστη and ἥσθα γάρ χρηστή γυνή. The same speaker talks about the husband in the third person: φιλούντα ἀντιφιλούσα τὸν ἄνδρα Ὀνήσιμον—τοιγαροποιεῖν τὸν ἀνησυχόν σε. If the speaker is the husband, third person would not normally be used. The line of the deceased, however, is addressed to the husband, and καὶ σὺ, χαϊρε seems to be connected with the previous line. According to Walsh, since the deceased at the end of the poem addresses her husband directly, in light of this, the beginning likely belongs to the husband.\textsuperscript{122} I agree with Walsh about the end of the epigram; the greeting makes us think that it is the husband who has been speaking thus far. This, however, does not solve the problems we face in trying to interpret the beginning of the epigram. Vestrheim is opposed to reading the whole first turn as the husband’s voice.\textsuperscript{123} Certainly the speaker role or the voice in the first turn is wavering. The same happens with the direction of the speech: the speech is first directed to the

\textsuperscript{121} Translation is similar to that of Vestrheim 2010, 72, but with minor alterations.

\textsuperscript{122} Walsh, 1991, 86–7. He sums up: ‘Through a series of transitions almost unnoticeable because of their dependence upon conventional tropes (the dead person is her grave, the stone is its own dedicator, the dedicator is someone who visits and goes away), the two inanimate entities have been transformed and animated by feeling’. Meyer also reads this as the husband’s voice: see Meyer 2005, 86. For another equally puzzling example, see IG II/III\textsuperscript{2} 7711 (= GVI 1386) (example no. 18 in Chapter 3), Piraeus (ca 390–365 BC). Peek excludes both of these from his dialogue section (in GVI). I wanted to discuss them here as they show quite early development of dialogue and/or diaphonic verse inscriptions. For both of these, see also del Barrio Vega 1989, 194–5.

\textsuperscript{123} Vestrheim 2010, 72.
deceased, then to the passersby and then to the deceased again. Could it even be that the writer wanted to create a dialogue but was not completely familiar with the pattern and so hesitated in choosing which person to use?\textsuperscript{124} Perhaps this is too speculative – and it must be borne in mind that the relatives may occasionally speak about themselves in the third person, which could explain the first turn.

Another example of hazy speaker roles comes from an Orphic tablet.\textsuperscript{125}

4. δίψαι αὖς ἑγὼ καὶ ἀπόλλυμαι· ἀλλὰ πιέ μοι κράνας αἰειρῶ ἐπὶ δεξιά, τῇ κυφάρισσος.
   − τίς δ᾽ ἐσι; πῶ δ᾽ ἐσι; − Γάς ὦιός ἥμι καὶ Ὁρανῶ ἀστερόντος.

b.1 δίψαι αὖς ἑγὼ καὶ ἀπόλλυμαι· ἀλλὰ πιέ μοι κράνας αἰειρῶ ἐπὶ δεξιά, τῇ κυφάρισσος.
   − τίς δ᾽ ἐσι; πῶ δ᾽ ἐσι; − Γάς ὦιός ἥμι καὶ Ὁρανῶ ἀστερόντος.

b.1 δίψαι (αὖς) δ᾽ αὖς ἑγὼ καὶ ἀπόλλυμαι· ἀλλὰ πιέ μοι κράνας <αἰειρῶ> ἐπὶ δεξιά, τῇ κυφάρισσος.
   − τίς δ᾽ ἐσι; πῶ δ᾽ ἐσι; − Γάς ὦιός ἥμι καὶ Ὁρανῶ ἀστερόντος.

I am parched with thirst and dying; but grant me to drink from the ever-flowing spring from the right, where the cypress is. – ‘Who are you?’ – ‘Where are you from?’ – I am the son of Earth and the starry sky.’

The function of these inscriptions is not to preserve memory or to mediate information; rather, these texts have a ritualistic purpose. They are instructions for the deceased for the afterlife. Who are the speakers in such a text? Other Orphic tablets have variations of this wording in which the deceased is advised to utter the

\textsuperscript{124} Note also the metre here: there are two dactylic (with some problems) and two trochaic verses, which is a rather rare combination.

\textsuperscript{125} IC II, xii, 31; Eleutherna, Crete, 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE; three gold-leaf tablets found in the same cemetery.
formula Γᾶς υἱός ἣμι καὶ Ὑμανῶ ἀστερόεντος when entering Hades. The texts above are not dialogue epigrams; rather, they are verse inscriptions which include narrative: in this case, questions and a formulaic answer embedded in the text. The questions are asked by unnamed guards when the deceased begs for the water of Memory.126 The narrative is told by the deceased in the first person, and no ‘monumental context’ is visible.127 There are no addresses or identifications, and no communication of two speaker roles, as such. Owing to these differences, I exclude the Orphic texts from my corpus, but these texts show that dialogue was a pattern used not only in epigrams, but in other genres as well.

2.2.7 Speakers in non-inscribed epigrams

In the non-inscribed epigrams, the restrictions that the monumental context sets do not always apply, but the genre-expectations are strong, and we can find traces of the monumental context in numerous non-inscribed epigrams.128 In many cases, the speakers are completely free from this ‘monumental context’ or its resemblance: the speakers may be, for instance, Pan and the nymphs (AG 9.341), Abraham and King Melchizedek (AG 1.66), a customer and a courtesan (AG 5.46, AG 5.101) or just unidentified A and B. In six epigrams there is an unidentified speaker that resembles the passerby (or the speaker role can be equated to it)129, and a personification of some kind, for example an echo (AG 7.548).130

Nevertheless, the speaker pairs of the verse inscriptions also occur, especially the passerby–monument pairs, the passerby–deceased pairs and the passerby–dedicated object pairs. The monument is often either a statue guarding the tomb, or in the case of dedicatory epigrams, the dedicated object. The object also speaks in

---

127 Even when the speakers in the epigram are the deceased and the relative, there are some elements that show the monumental context, whereas here the epigram functions on a more abstract level. The examples in the following chapters will hopefully make this distinction clear.
128 For a list of speaker pairs in the non-inscribed epigrams, see the Appendices.
129 The passerby is usually not addressed in the non-inscribed epigrams, and we could often label the speaker as anonymous speaker X, but if the the structure or function resembles the verse inscriptions, I call the speaker passerby.
130 In addition to this, AG 9.37: a fountain; AG 9.164: justice; AG 9.192: books; AG 9.549: waters of a fountain; and AG 14.6: clocks (all conversing with a person very similar to PB).
the echprastic epigrams, and the passerby may converse with the deity that the monument (often a statue) represents, i.e., with the god.\footnote{e.g. AG 12.143 (anonymous): Ἐρμής, τοξευθεὶς ἔξησαι πικρὸν <οἴστόν>[-[-]ἐφήβῳ. – Κήγω τῇν αὐτῇν, ἔξεις, λέλογχα τύχην...\textit{O Hermes, when shot he extracted the bitter arrow...} – \textit{And I, a stranger, met the same fate...} (Paton). So, here, it is not ‘Hermes met the same fate’, but ‘I met the same fate’, etc. Note that, before ἐφήβῳ there are almost two verses missing.}

Like in many of their inscribed counterparts, the passerby often starts the conversation with the monument in non-inscribed epigrams. The trick is the content: some of them are thoroughly reminiscent of inscribed epigrams (as regards structure and content), and others only formally (structure), while the epigram discusses, for example, life after death or other more abstract phenomena. The setting is similar to the verse inscriptions, but the content differs. The following epigram is by Julianus (Prefect of Egypt), \textit{AG} 7.576:

\begin{quote}
5. κάθανες, ὦ Πύρρων; — ἐπέχω. — πυμάτην μετὰ μοῖραν

φής ἐπέχειν; — ἐπέχω. — σκέψιν ἔπαυσε τάφος.
\end{quote}

\textit{Did you die, Pyrrho?} — \textit{I doubt it.} — \textit{Even after your final portion, do you say you doubt?} — \textit{I doubt.} — \textit{The tomb put an end to doubt.}

Pyrrho\footnote{The sceptic philosopher. In a way also the passerby is a sceptic person – s/he ask a question not typical for a PB, and despite the last statement turn where the “tomb puts an end to doubt”, the passerby first asks whether Pyrrho is dead or not.} is dead, and the passerby (supposedly imagined on Pyrrho’s grave) is asking questions, but the roles are far from the traditional, inscribed model: the passerby already knows Pyrrho’s name, and while he asks if Pyrrho is dead, he already knows the answer. Pyrrho’s role is neither to give information nor to offer consolation. The point of the epigram is Pyrrho’s scepticism rather: he doubts even his own death.

The Hellenistic non-inscribed epigrams probably increased the popularity of the dialogue form in monumental context also. So, the influence seems to go both
ways (even simultaneously). Skilled poets were able to play with the expectations of the readers and recipients, and some, as Bettenworth puts it, ‘detached their poetry completely from any resemblance to monumental inscriptions’. ¹³³ At the same time, parts of the non-inscribed epigrams still looked like verse inscriptions, which the dialogue material clearly shows. It is worth remembering that sometimes it is difficult to say whether the text was originally inscribed or not: there are epigram collections with both, and even though verse inscription collections circulated already in antiquity, there were also epigrams that were initially written as literature and then later cut into stone (i.e. not the other way around).¹³⁴

2.3 Readers and recipients

2.3.1 The audience

A question that comes to mind when considering the recipients of the ancient texts is that of literacy – who read the texts, and who were capable of reading them? This, however, is a deceptive starting point. The level of literacy is only one part of the picture, and the topic has been discussed recently.¹³⁵ In a society in which not all could read, but in which songs, drama and recitals flourished, the function of reading was naturally different from that in modern societies. As regards epigrams, I am interested in the audience of the text. How did the audience receive the epigrams?

Dialogue epigrams, for their part, give reason to assume that the inscriptions were read, probably aloud.¹³⁶ Many of the epigrams – also dialogue ones – are combinations of both text and decoration (relief, statue, etc.). Often the reading/viewing situation is also implied in the text.¹³⁷ The texts were viewed and

¹³³ Bettenworth 2007, 71.
¹³⁴ Bing names these ‘quasi-inscriptional’ and notes that context shapes our reading: see Bing 2009, 209–10 (originally in Bing 1998).
¹³⁵ For analyses, see, e.g., Johnson and Parker 2009 and Thomas 1992. Probably not even all the stonemasons who carved inscriptions on stone could read. Harris 1989 introduced the concepts of scribal literacy (restricted to a certain social group) and craftsman’s literacy, meaning that the majority or near majority of the craftsmen were literate. Literacy may in this case mean the ability to read simple lines, but probably not longer texts.
¹³⁶ I agree with Day 2010, 30, who points out that the dichotomy between read/unread is actually irrelevant, and that we do not need to claim that the inscriptions were either all read or all ignored; as he says, both surely occurred. For reading aloud, see Agosti 2008, 198 (the issue is also discussed by Day 2010).
¹³⁷ For this, see Kaupinen (forthcoming).
read/heard in situ, and it was the context of other verse inscriptions and monuments that, for their part, shaped the epigrams from early on. The dedications were intended to be read at places rich with other, similar texts, and the same goes for the funerary epigrams; for example, ἀῆμα τόδε on funerary stelae refers to the very stele in question, which would have been surrounded by others.  

It is possible that the commissioner of the text was not able to read, but learned the verses by heart and was able to repeat them for others near the monument. This might also explain the inscriptions that are difficult to read: maybe it did not always matter that much whether the stone was readable or not.

Another aspect that was probably important concerning the inscription is, as Bing terms it, ‘the act itself of imagining the monument’s reception’. Monuments and the texts on them were part of the ritual. Making the monument or having it made was also a ritualistic act: the family sets up the private grave monument, the dedicator dedicates it and the society honours its distinguished members. It seems probable that the acts of the monument’s dedicators (and receivers), when the object was set up, were essential. Bing even suggests that these acts were more important than the actual reception. On the other hand, it is known that the text was thought to have power of its own – ritualistic power. Furthermore, many of the epigrams contain references to reading, hearing and receiving the poems.

---

138 Baumbach, Petrovic and Petrovic 2010, 12–14. For epigrams and their context: ‘Epigrams were chiseled on objects which could have an aesthetic value for their own, and they were supposed to be interpreted against their background’.

139 See Day 2010, 43 for a similar hypothesis considering the Mantiklos epigram: ‘Even if the artist alone knew how to write the inscription, the dedicator, having memorized the text that he perhaps composed, could recite it from memory to others in front of the statuette. Or he might have learned the grammata well enough to point proudly to the ones that matched the sounds being uttered.’ Earlier, Bing 2002, 42–5 questioned the reading of the monuments. Bing states that the monuments were often inconveniently located and texts on monument were sometimes even at unreadable altitudes, but, like Agosti, Day 2010, 48–59 also points out that there is often something to guide the reading on the monuments. cf. the case of CEG 195 (Day 2010, 50). According to Day: ‘When viewers positioned themselves to obtain the best view of the statue’s tilted face and leftward gaze ... they also gained the clearest view of the epigram’.

140 Bing 2002, 51–2 and 54.

141 This point of view is common in magic; see Merrifield 1987, 137, who discusses magic, and notes that when most of the citizens were illiterate, the power of the written word was strong and thus writing the words reasserted their magical power. Concerning the supposed reader and (re-)activating the original act (of ritual), see Depew 1997, 239 (and 245). cf. Day 1989, 26–8 and his later work (cf. 2010).
All these aspects were certainly important – the reception of the text, sending its message, executing the text and the plain existence of the inscription – but the audience also plays a role, and the audience was probably larger than the readership. Not all the passersby read the texts; considering literacy alone, this would have been impossible. Nevertheless, those who did read them often did so aloud, and hence the texts were received also by hearing.

2.3.2 Reading and reception

There are both direct and implicit references to the reception situation of the epigram in many of the epigrams. In the following examples, the focus is on hearing and listening – I include only the passages which contain references to them:

6.  λάρναξ αὐδήεσσα, τί τ[ῷδ᾽] υπὸ σήματι κεύθεις;---

*Urn, speaking in (human) voice, what do you cover under this tomb?*--- 142

7.  κλῡθι και ἀνπαύσας---

*Hearken and stop*--- 143

8.  ἐνθάδε τίς κεῖται; — παροδοίπορε μεῖνον, ἀκουσον---

*Who lies here? – Passerby, stay (where you are) and listen:*--- 144

In number 6, the urn is described as speaking: αὐδήεσσα (cf. the αὐδή τεχνήεσσα in no. 2). Here, the speaker refers to the monument and not to the voice itself: it says that the *larnax* is speaking. It is obvious that the audience is familiar with the concept of ‘speaking object’. In numbers 7 and 8, the reference to listening is essential. If the reader read the text aloud, s/he would also ‘listen’ to it, as anyone listening or overhearing the reading would naturally also do. The exhortation to listen also occurs in the following passage:

---

142 *GVI* 1835, Ikaonia (Lycaonia), 2nd century CE. This is the first verse, but there is another in the epigram. Also SGO 3, 14/07/02.

143 *GVI* 1867, Hermione, 3rd century CE. This is the beginning of the first verse.

144 *GVI* 1840 Berytus (Syria), late Roman period. I give only the first verse here.
9. ---ἡν ἑσακούσης, λέξω. — φράζε τάχιστα---.
---If you listen, I will tell. — Explain quickly. ---

The examples above indicate a reading situation being carried out near the stone, and the next epigram contains a direct reference to reading the text aloud:

10. στῆθι φίλον παρὰ τύμβον, ὀδοίπόρε. — τίς με κελεύει;
— φρουρὸς ἐγὼ σε λέων. — αὐτὸς ὁ λαίνεος; —
αὐτὸς. — φυνήεις πόθεν ἔπλεο; — δαίμονος αὐθήι
ἀνδρός ὑποχθονίου. — τίς γὰρ ὅδ᾽ ἐστιν ἄνήρ

All of this was of course read by the voice of the reader, which gives yet another dimension to the play between the speakers. In reality, the fact that the reader gave voice to the stone was naturally commonplace, and, as noted, the reader of the dialogue epigram lends his/her voice to more than one character.

Bing points out that, even though the monuments communicated with the reader as early as in the Archaic period, the authors rarely cite inscriptions during the 5th and 4th centuries BCE, and if they do, it is not by autopsy. He also cites Cicero (Tusc. Disp. 5.23), who writes about a particular sepulchral epigram which he

---

145 SGO 4, 21/24/02, Philadelphia, Palestine, 139/140 CE (in SGO). End of verse 3 and the beginning of verse 4 only. There is also a monologue inscription found in Italy with the line: ---who has read me, or has heard me being read... cf. Bing 2002, 41.

146 Bernand, Inscr. Métr. 68 = GVI 1843, Saqqara, Egypt, 1st/2nd century CE. Lines 1–6 only here; I discuss the whole epigram in Chapter 4 (no. 14).

147 Bing 2002, 54.
found, and about which the locals in Syracuse knew nothing. However, the grave Cicero found dates to the 3rd century BCE. Why should the Syracusans of Cicero’s time pay attention to a grave belonging to someone who died long ago, especially if he was not an exceptional member of their society? This does not necessarily mean that the text was not read at all.

Another reason for the absence of the inscriptions in the ancient authors’ texts is probably the informative nature of the epigrams. The facts that the epigrams tell about the dead/grieving/honoured person were not necessarily thought to be worthy of documentation. Yet, on the basis of the literary epigrams from the Hellenistic period onwards, it is quite obvious that the poets read epigrams, as the structural influence of the inscribed epigrams on the literary versions and vice versa is so strong.\(^\text{148}\) This does not necessarily mean that the poets were wandering around cemeteries, roadsides and public places reading the texts, with heads inclined and surrounded by bushes, as the verse inscriptions were available in collections which had begun to circulate at the time.\(^\text{149}\) The epigrams were also transmitted orally and being quoted long before the Hellenistic blooming of the genre.\(^\text{150}\) Considering, however, that cities were full of monuments with inscriptions, the poets had surely seen epigrams in situ as well. It is true that literature gives us few examples of reading situations of inscriptions, but perhaps we do not need such, for the primary material itself gives several references to reading and the physical letters on the monument:\(^\text{151}\)

11. στάλα μέ<ν> σύκ ἂσαμος, ἔμπνοος δ´ ἔτι
ρώμα φιλόπλου φωτός· ἵσχ´ ὀδουπόρε. —
st<άσ>αντες ἴχνος εἰσίδωμεν, ὅντια
κέκευθε τύμβος. γράμμα μανύει τόδε·

5 Λέπτωνος ἐσθλὸν κοὐρὸν Ἑπίγονον χυτά

148 Noted and stated also by Bing 2002, 62. On the other hand, see Petrovic, who states that inscriptions were ‘visible in written sources’: Petrovic 2007, 51–3.
149 For the collections, see Bing 2002, 62.
150 Petrovic 2007, 49.
151 The use of verbs such as μηνύω and ἀναγιγνώσκω in earlier epigram refers to the same phenomenon. Here, I present only the references to the reception that can be found in dialogue epigrams.
κούφα πάτρας ἀρωγὸν ἀμφέχει κόνις.

Stele, inarticulate, yet alive, the strength worth of an arm-loving man. Hold, traveller.

– Stopping at our footprints, let us see whom the grave covers. The inscription reveals this: (it is) of Lepton. The mound of light dust covers a brave young man, (who was) an Afterborn152, a helper of the fatherland.153

12. ---τὰς δὲ γραφὰς ἀνάγνωθι καὶ εἴση, πῶς μετάκειμαι.---

---Read the writings and you will learn, how I lie transposed.--- 154

13. ---τίς ἐντι; —

μουσών μανύει γράμματα· Μηνοφίλαν.-----

---(and) who is she, the verses indicate: Menophila.--- 155

In the first example, the identity of the speaker in the opening turn is uncertain, but it is probably the monument, following an old tradition of speaking stones. At any rate the imperative ἵσχ᾽ and the address ὁ δοιπόρε clearly belong to the voice of the monument. In the second turn, the passerby reacts: stopping at our footprints, let us see.... There is a subtle reference here to the reception situation, as ‘we’ is likely the reader and the audience combined (or the passersby collectively). The line the inscription reveals this... goes well with an assumption of recital: when someone is reading the lines, s/he reveals the information to the audience. Reading might have taken place during the funerary rituals.156 Numbers 12 and 13 both refer to the

152 Ἐπίγονοι = Afterborns: sons of the chiefs who fell in the first war against Thebes, or the successors to Alexander’s dominion; see LSJ.
154 GVI 1877 = BÉ 1953 = SGO 4, 20/02/01, 211, 2nd/3rd century CE, Marathus, Syria. Here, the final verse of the epigram only.
155 GVI 1881 = GG 433, 2nd/1st century BCE, Sardis, Ionia. Again, only a short passage of the epigram is given here (end of the first verse and the second verse). I will discuss this epigram in detail in Chapter 4 (no. 13).
physical text and to the fact that the information (that the passerby wants to know) is visible on the stone.\textsuperscript{157}

Yet another reference to a reading situation can be found in the following:\textsuperscript{158}


toúto tò σάμα τίνος; — su[vo]-
doutróre, pétroun ἀθρ[ήσας] |

5 — λέξον, ἐπὶ ταύταν εἰ[ς ὁδὸν]

ηλάσασθεν. | — σάμα Φιλούς, γ[ενέ]-

tas dé Φίλων. — μάτηρ δὲ τί[ς, εἰπέ] |

— εἰκ ἄρα ταῖ γλυπτάι τούτ[ο] πρό-

σεστὶ λίθῳ. ---

Philo’s, son of Philon, greetings.

Whose monument is this? – Fellow p[ass]erby, lo[ok] at the stone. – Say, we drove a[lo]ng this [road]. – Monument of Philo; his f[ath]er (was) Philon. – Wh[o] is the mother, [tell] (me). – It is [the]re, certainly, carved on the stone.---

This epigram plays with the idea that the inscription is on the stone, but still one needs to read it aloud, as the passerby here insists. If we think about the Gricean maxims,\textsuperscript{159} this epigram either breaks the expectations or fails to meet them: the monument does not reply as expected, but refers to itself instead, i.e. to the physical text that was carved on the stone. Later on in this epigram, however, the monument answers the questions, because the passerby still so insists.

It is possible that the inscriptions were read alone, solely for the benefit of the individual reader, from the Hellenistic period onwards. On the other hand, the non-inscribed epigrams were also performed at symposia at least from the

\textsuperscript{157} See also Christian 2015 187–9 for ‘speaking text’.

\textsuperscript{158} GVI 1882 = IC IV 372 Gortyn, Crete, 2\textsuperscript{nd} CE. Here, verses 1–4 only. My turn division differs from those in e.g. GVI and IC. See also Martínez Fernández 2006, no. 8 (87ff.) and Christian 2015, 190–1.

\textsuperscript{159} cf. the cooperative principle discussed in Section 2.1.2.
Hellenistic period onwards. Even though there is limited research on performing the texts, it seems that the epigrams by, for example, Nonnus (5th century CE) were still written to be performed. Whether done in silence or aloud, the reading affected the reception situation, as the examples above show. Schmitz states: ‘For my argument, it is of little importance whether the reader lend her or his physical voice to the text (s)he reads or whether this vocalization is purely interior’, and the same applies to this study.

2.3.3 Reading and ritual

Dialogue epigrams have inner speech acts, but they also communicate with the recipients outside the poem. In her Rezeptionsästhetik, Meyer states that written speech act reaches its importance through reading the text aloud. According to Meyer, the person whom the epigram addresses, namely the reader, may be a fictive reader, which is not necessarily the same as the actual reader. The fictive reader takes part in the fictive speech act, which contains both illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. However, the actual reader, the one near the stone, took part in the ritual by reading the text.

This goes well with the concept of the power of words which is known from magic rituals. It seems that words, text and reading have power in other rituals also; for example, with regard to the grave epigrams, the text itself and its performance, i.e. someone reading the text aloud, is probably part of the funerary ritual.

In the following epigram, the ritual context is visible:

15. Λεύκιε Λικίνιε
   χαϊρε.
   - [κ]έ σύ [γ]ε, [ὦ] παροδείτα, χάροις ὅτι
   τότο τὸ σεμνὸν | εἴπας ἐμοὶ χα<ἰ>ριν

---

160 e.g. Nisbet 2003, 5–6.
161 Agosti 2008, 206.
162 Schmitz 2010a, 373 and note 8 for the discussion of reading aloud/silently.
163 Meyer 2007, 191. See Section 1.4 for illocutionary and perlocutionary acts.
ἵνεκεν εὐσεβίης.

Lucius Licinius, greetings. – Greetings to you, [to]o, passerby, for saying this solemn greeting to me, [o]ut of piety.

This short epigram reflects the situation: someone comes to the tomb and utters the greetings, which is an important act, as the epigram shows. In the epigram, it is referred to as a ‘solemn greeting’, and this could refer to the ritual context as well.

Peek includes this in the dialogue section in GVI, but, to be exact, it is not dialogic, it is the combination of title and verses that makes the dialogue. I do not, however, want to exclude this kind of epigrams from my material if the dialogue is part of the epigram like here, where the title and the epigram form a unity and the dialogue is clearly intentional.165

2.3.4 Dialogues in context: prose parts, decoration and possible further epigrams in the monument

One monument could have several text units and/or other visual elements. This does not necessarily mean that there were visible connections between them. If there was a statue above the monument, the inscription could refer to it, but often it does not. Furthermore, two text units can give the same information in different forms, for example one in monologue and one in dialogue form. Sometimes, however, there are clear connections such as direct references to each other in the epigrams or a comment on the relief in the epigram. These connections also refer to a reception situation near the stone. Examples of this communication between different parts of the monument will appear in the following chapters, but I will briefly introduce some features here.

On a more general level, features such as deictic elements show that the recipient was thought to stand near the monument, as the line στ<άς>αντες ἵχνος

---

The inscription refers to words uttered by the monument; for similar, see: ---­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­…
εἰσίδωμεν in number 11 also shows.166 Some of the inscriptions comment on the size, shape, material or overall beauty of the stone167 – all of these are things that a recipient near the stone could also see. Some texts comment on the monument in detail, and, as we learned in Section 2.3.2, there are also several references to the contents and the physical letters of the monument in the epigrams.

Many of the monuments have a prose section above or below the epigram. The relationship between this title line and the epigram is complex. Sometimes the epigram shows ‘awareness’ of it: in number 15 above, there is some manner of dialogue between the title and the verse. Before that, in number 14, the monument even speaks ironically about this situation: the name of the deceased is revealed in the title, and, later on, when the passerby asks this name, the monument says it is certainly carved on stone.

Occasionally the epigram does not repeat the information but assumes that the reader already knows the details after s/he has read the title line. Most often, however, the information is repeated in the epigram, which in dialogue epigrams means that after, for example, the name and fatherland of the deceased is told in the prose section, those details are then asked for (and told again) in verses. For example, in the following epigram, the name and home city is first carved in the title line, but, nevertheless, the epigram begins with τίς πόθεν:

16. Κλαύδιος Χαρίτων Περίνθιος.

τίς πόθεν ὃν ἑνταῦθα ὑπὸ χθονὶ τῇδε τέθαψαι; — οὖνομα μὲν Χαρίτων,
πάτρη δὲ μοι ἐστὶ Πέρινθος.----

166 For deictics, see also a passage from a Parian epigram, 1st century CE (IG XII 5, 307 = GV/1860):
Τίς σε, γυναι, Παρίην ὑπὸ βώλακα θήκατο; Τίς σοι ξυνὸν ὑπὲρ τύμβου σάμα τόδ ἀγλάσεν;-----
‘Who has put you, woman, under the Parian ground? Who has prepared you this splendid monument upon grave?’----

167 I will discuss these elements in Chapters 3–5, whenever such references occur.
168 Based on autopsy, but my reading follows the previous edition. cf. IG II/III 10073 and GV/1864,
2nd/3rd century CE, Attica. Here, only verses 1–2 are given; for the whole epigram, see Chapter 4, no. 1.
Claudius Chariton, from Perinthus.

Who and from where are you, (you who are) buried here under the earth? — My name is Chariton, my fatherland Perinthus.

In the first turn, the use of the second person singular, ὑπὸ χθονὶ τῇ δὲ τέθαψαι, indicates that the addressee is the deceased, and the speaker here the passerby. The deceased replies to τίς πόθεν and gives the exact same information as that which was given above the epigram.

Sometimes, the relationship between the title line and the monument is indicated in more subtle ways, as in the following two epigrams:

17. Αἰλίῳ Νέπωτι

Αβάσκαντος καὶ Χάριτιν
τῷ τέκνῳ μνείας χάριν.

τίς πατρίς ἐστί σοι; — ἤδε. — Νέπως
όνομ' ἐστί σοι; — ἔστιν, |
pατρός Ἀβασκάντου, δωδεκέτης
γενόμαν.| 5 — τί στέφος ἐν τύμβοις; — νικηφόρον,
oὐκ ἀδαίρης γάρ |
pανκρατίων γενόμην οὐδὲ πά-
lῆς ἱερᾶς; |
στεφθεῖς δἐ ἐν πάτρῃ τόσσους
10 ἀνέθηκα τοκεύσι |
πρὶν στεφάνους, οὐς νῦν ἀντέ-
lαβον τεθνεώς.

For Aelius Nepos, Abascantus and Charition for their child, for the sake of memory.
What is your fatherland? — This (is). — Is your name Nepos? — It is; (I am) the son of Abascantus, (and) I got to be 12 years old. — What (is) the garland in the grave? — (It is) for bringing victory. I wasn’t unpracticed in pankration, nor in sacred wrestling. When I was crowned, I dedicated to my parents in my fatherland as many garlands as I have now received when I died. 

18.

For Diogenes, who also bears the name Apollonius, the son of the highly respected (parents), Marcus Aurelius Orthagorianus Apollonius and Sarpedonias that also bears the name Diogeneia; for the untimely dead young man, who was distinguished because of his worthiness and the excellence of his speech, (this monument has been erected) by decision of the People and the Council, for the sake of his memory, and for his parents’ comfort.

The epigram:


169 IG X 2, 1, 464 = GVI 1865, 2nd/3rd century CE, Thessalonica.

170 SGO 4, 17/06/05, 3rd century CE, Oinoanda, Lycia. I give the version given in the SGO, which is sufficient for the theme discussed here. However, for the uncertain letters, see Hall 1979, 163, no. 2.
In number 17, the speakers are the passerby and the deceased. The first adjacency pair ties the epigram to its physical environment: the passerby asks for the fatherland, and the reply is ‘ἡδε’, *this* - i.e. where you (the reader) stand and read this epigram. The passerby does not ask for the name, just confirmation for the name s/he already knows: Νέπως ὄνομ᾽ ἐστί σοι; The name was revealed in the title, but the passerby still wants be sure. In the reply turn, the deceased confirms the information and also tells the name of his father (which was also given in the title). After that, he tells how old he was when he died. The question τί στέφως ἐν τύμβοις; is a direct reference to the monument.

All the parts are connected on this monument, and the epigram shows awareness of both the title and of the decoration. The connection with the title is perhaps somewhat loose, but at least the epigram shows implicit awareness of it. On a broader scale, the epigram is also linked to the exact *locus* where the monument stands. The writer has taken all of these elements into account.

The speakers are the passerby and the deceased also in number 18. The epigram section is actually quite uninformative, but all the information requested in it is given in the long prose ‘title’ above the epigram. To the questions τίς, πόθεν; the deceased replies with only: ἔνθεν ἕφυν. The reader again of course knows where that is, namely where s/he is. To the first question, τίς; the deceased does not reply here at all. Later it is asked again, and then answered: τοῦ νομα; – Διογένης (which was revealed first and in more detail in the prose section). As the details about the parents are also given in the prose section, their names are not repeated in the epigram: the deceased only mentions that he is of famous blood that hails from his ancestors: εὐκλεὲς αἶμα ἐκ προγόνων πεύσε. When asked what his occupation was, he simply replies λογοί. It is revealed in the title that the people and the council have honoured him for *his worthiness and the excellence of his speech*, ἀξιώματι καὶ λόγων. At the end of the epigram, when asked who erected the

---

171 Labelled as an honorary inscription in *SEG* 44, 1198, it belongs to a group of inscriptions documenting festivals of Oinoanda (cf. Hall and Milner 1994 [esp. 41, no. 34]). The title shows that Diogenes is dead; thus, the speaker here is the deceased.

172 It is possible that the epigram is a later addition; see Hogarth 1887, 366.

173 As Hall 1979, 163 points out, this is in contrast to other statue bases which were erected mainly for athletes and are found in the same area.
monument, the deceased simply replies οἱ τοκέες. Their names, again, are given in the prose section. The epigram in a way repeats the information given in the prose section, not word for word, but rather on a general level and in a manner suitable for an orator. There are no direct references to the prose section in the epigram, but the two inscriptions work together implicitly.

Similarly, there are cases of several epigrams on a single stone in which the dialogue is just one part of the whole entity. In some such cases, there is communication or inner reference between these epigrams, comparable with the examples above, but sometimes there are not connections at all. ¹⁷⁴

2.4 Conclusion

In the case of dialogue epigrams, dialogue means written communication between two or more speaker roles. The inner communication of these roles and the interdependence of the turns within an epigram are essential.

The speaker of the epigrams, like speakers in real-life conversations, has certain expectations. Certain patterns, like speaking objects, were a known phenomenon among the audience of the texts. There are also conventions within the speaker roles: first of all, there is only a certain set of roles in the verse inscription dialogues. The monument, the passerby, the deceased/the honorand and the relative form the basic three speaker pairs, but some variation occurs. This speaker division has its roots in the Archaic speaking-monument tradition. The object can talk in the first person and/or it can address the audience.

Another essential feature of the dialogue epigram is the development of the passerby role. In the early epigrams, the passerby occurred as an addressee, but it is focally important that this developed into a speaker role, i.e. that the passerby began to speak. These two speaker roles – the monument and the passerby – chronologically form the first speaker pair. The first preserved dialogue epigram (my example no. 1) is fragmentary, which has lead some scholars to argue that it cannot be taken as proof for dialogue, but I suggest that there are enough elements of

¹⁷⁴ I will provide further examples of features mentioned in this chapter, e.g. between a dialogue epigram and a monologue epigram, in Chapters 3–5.
dialogue preserved in the text for such proof. Ultimately, pre-Hellenistic dialogues are admittedly few, but they show that dialogues were a known phenomenon in the verse inscriptions before the Hellenistic period; how common they were, however, we cannot tell.

The passerby can converse with either the monument or the deceased. In latter cases, the function of the deceased as a speaker role is very similar to that of the monument. The speaker role of the deceased, however, has an additional aspect: in the dialogues with the relative, the deceased role is not informative so much as consoling; it functions on a more abstract level. The relative as a speaker role occurs only with the deceased, and information similar to that which the monument or the deceased would give in a dialogue with the passerby is often given in the lament of the relative. In some epigrams, these speaker roles are accompanied by a narrator (mainly in type 3). This happens in a phase when a more narrative-heavy branch of epigrams had begun to develop.

On the basis of several examples, as well as previous studies, I argue that the texts were read, or at least that this possibility was taken into account by the composers of the epigrams. Reading the text aloud was also part of the ritual. Many of the epigrams bear indications of reading, seeing and/or hearing. I focus on the communication between the inner actors of the epigrams, but I also take into consideration the reception situation. It is highly likely that the audience of at least some of the texts was wider than just the individuals who happened to read the text.
3. TYPE-1 EPIGRAMS

Type 1 is chronologically the first dialogue epigram type, and more of the early type-1 epigrams exist than early epigrams of the other two types. However, ‘early’ is a relative concept; in the context of dialogue epigrams, all the epigrams dated to BCE are early. In total, there are nine such type-1 epigrams.\footnote{GVI 1831, 6\textsuperscript{th}/5\textsuperscript{th} BCE; SGO 1, 01/12/05, 5\textsuperscript{th} century BCE; IG II/III\textsuperscript{2} 7711 = GVI 1386, 390–365 BCE; GVI 1851 = SGO 2, 08/01/39, 2\textsuperscript{nd}/1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE; IG XII 3, 220 = GVI 1832, 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE; GVI 1834, 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE; GVI 1833, ca 88–86 BCE(?) and SGO 2, 09/07/09 and SGO 4, 21/09/01, both dated to the Hellenistic period.} By the same definition, any epigram from the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century CE onwards is ‘late’, and there are seven such examples.\footnote{SGO 1, 02/09/24, ca 450 CE; SGO 4, 21/07/01, 494–525 CE; SGO 1, 02/14/06, 470 CE; SGO 4, 20/16/03, 6\textsuperscript{th} century CE; SEG 55, 775, 6\textsuperscript{th} century CE; IG IG II/III\textsuperscript{2} 13166 = GVI 1880, 4\textsuperscript{th}/5\textsuperscript{th} century CE; SGO 2, 08/01/41, 4\textsuperscript{th}/5\textsuperscript{th} century CE.} Type 1 is most common, however, during the first three centuries CE.

There are 65 type-1 dialogue epigrams, i.e. ca 60% of all dialogue epigrams are type 1. Hence, this is the most common type; the basic dialogue epigram, we could perhaps say. There are, however, four variants of this type. Type-1 epigrams consist of one adjacency pair: X – Y (t1). The number of the moves in the two turns of the adjacency pair does not need to be equal. I also count three-turn unit epigrams (with one adjacency pair and one extra turn) as type-1 epigrams. The extra turn can be either at the beginning of the epigram or at the end, and it is part of the same unity as the adjacency pair and always connected to it. If the extra turn is at the beginning, it initiates the adjacency pair, and if at the end, it is often a reaction to the second turn of the pair (or the whole pair). Paradigms for type-1 epigrams with extra turns are 1 + X – Y (= 1 + t1) or X – Y + 1 (= t1 + 1). Yet, the epigrams with the extra turns are more of an exception: there are 58 type-1 epigrams with X – Y, and only seven with the pair and an extra turn.

When the epigrams are cut into stone, word division is rarely marked, and neither is the change of speaker. How is the division of the turns indicated, then? How does the reader know when the turn and the speaker changes, and how can s/he follow the epigram? The answer is of course the language. It guides the audience with patterns that are repeated in the epigrams. Another factor that makes
the reception easier is that, as noted above, the readers/audience were aware of certain epigrammatic features and conventions. Still, the writers of the poems often emphasised the change. For us, the speakers are not always easy to detect, or the identification we give them may change during the course of reading/hearing. This often seems to be a deliberate ploy by the authors, who knew that the text could cause confusion at first, but would make sense towards the end of the epigram.177

In this chapter, I will first discuss the details of type-1 epigrams. By this, I mean the features of language that made it easier for the reader/audience to follow the dialogue. All of these are elements of communication, and they are discussed in Section 3.1, where I present the linguistic features with examples.

In Section 3.2, I will analyse type-1 epigrams on the adjacency-pair level. I have divided the type-1 epigrams on the basis of the length of the turns and will discuss each variant separately. This means that I will give examples of different variants while discussing the structure of the turns and sometimes also examples of the moves within the turns. In Section 3.2, I also continue discussing the features presented in Section 3.1.

### 3.1 How the type-1 pairs were built

The core and repeated elements of type 1 are those that indicate the speakers and turns, and their connections and separation. These are addresses, imperatives, interrogatives (in question–answer pairs) and greetings (in greeting pairs). These elements can be found in the first turn of the type-1 epigrams; usually the turn contains either one or more of these. Address is one of the most frequently used features in opening turns: by using it to build up the conversation in type 1, the audience is made aware that there will be another speaker and also of the identity of the next speaker.

The adjacency pairs in type 1 are either question–answer pairs, greeting pairs or statement–response pairs. The most common of these is the question–answer pair: more than half of the type-1 epigrams are (or in the case of three-turn units,

---

177 However, deliberate play with the roles is not always the case. cf., e.g., no. 3 in Chapter 2.
contain) such a pair.\textsuperscript{178} Greeting pairs are also common (discussed in Section 3.1.2), and statement–response pairs occur as well (Section 3.1.3).

The question–answer epigrams encompass epigrams with interrogatives, and epigrams with interrogatives accompanied by certain question markers in the opening turns. These form various combinations: interrogative + address, interrogative + address + imperative or interrogative + imperative.

Some of these markers that we find in the opening turns can also occur in the response turn: addresses are often used, especially if the opening turn does not contain one. In this way, one of the speakers is identified – in these cases, the first speaker is identified by the second speaker in the address. When the address is used in the second turn, it also implies a change of speaker.

It is worth noting that almost all questions in dialogue epigrams are so-called question-word questions\textsuperscript{179}. Yes–no questions are very rare, and are always a variation of known question-word questions.\textsuperscript{180} If a name is asked for in a question, one way of emphasising the change of the turn and the speaker is to give the answer, i.e. the name, or some epithet + the name, at the beginning of the opening sentence of the response turn, i.e. at the beginning of the second turn. Another way to denote the change is to repeat a word, or sometimes to give a variant of a certain word that occurred in the first turn. It is also possible to repeat the idea expressed at the end of the first turn at the beginning of the second turn.

In order to make these combinations clearer, I firstly discuss the question–answer pairs using examples of each, and then proceed to a discussion of the greeting pairs.

\textsuperscript{178} See Section 3.1.1.
\textsuperscript{179} Such questions are also called wh-questions in English.
\textsuperscript{180} cf. in IG IX 1, 878: \textemdash\textemdash\textemdash\textemdash \textit{εἶσο δὰ ' ὄν ἶμιθέων Δῆλος, ἔφερὲ θάλος; — κεῖνος,\textemdash\textemdash\textemdash\textemdash}\textemdash\textemdash\textemdash\textemdash\textit{Are you the one that Delos nourished, young man among the (other) youth? – (I am) that one\textemdash\textemdash\textemdash\textemdash.}
3.1.1 Type-1 question–answer pairs

3.1.1.1 Interrogative and address in the opening turn

In the earliest examples of dialogues, the questions comprised an address at the beginning of the turn, followed by an interrogative. This combination is used especially when the passerby first speaks to the monument. Due to the address, we know that the speaker is about to change, and also that the first speaker is the passerby. The address was of course also used in other dialogue types (which I will discuss in the following chapters), but it is essential in building the pair in type 1. The following epigram is fragmentary, but most likely type 1:

1. στήλη, τίνα ἐν κόλποις
   τυμβίω εἶχες; |
   — σεμνὸν Στρατόνε[ικον—]

*Stele, whom do you hold in the bosom of the grave? — The revered (man) Stratone[ikon—]*

The speakers are again the passerby and the monument. The passerby begins the first turn with an address, and the interrogative follows immediately after: στήλη, τίνα—. The answer turn begins with an epithet and the name: σεμνὸν Στρατόνε[ικον—]. It is possible that the name of Stratoneikos’ father and/or his fatherland was mentioned. We of course know that the second speaker is the monument, not only because of the address στήλη, but also because of the use of the accusative: whom *do you cover>*? τίνα— → σεμνὸν Στρατόνε[ικον—].

In the next epigram, the speakers are the deceased and the relative:

---

182 SGO 2, 10/02/31, 2nd century CE, Caesarea/Hadrianopolis, Paphlagonia.
183 The epigram was found in Deresamail Köyü with several other grave inscriptions, also epigrams. Most of them are rather short and basic (with one exception), and this one was likely the same, but we cannot tell with certainty. For other epigrams in the area, see Kaygusuz 1983, 111–45.
184 IG II/III² 13374, cf. IG II/III² 13166; GVI I 1880; Sironen 1997, 169, no. 100, Athens (Acropolis), 4th/5th century CE.
2. [-----?]  
  τίττε, πόσις, φωνείς; τι δὲ Τάρταρ’ ὀμευ-  
  νε, ’πικι[νείς];  
  — πώς κρυερή σιγή; τι β[αρύ σκότος ὀσσε κάλυψε];  
  ποῦ χάριτες φιλίης [πρότεραι κραδής γλυ]-  
  κεράς [τε]  
  ἤθος ν τῇ τε λύρῃ ν [συμμειξαμένη ποι’ ἀοιδή];  
  αἰαί, πάντα λέλους [άπων στυγερήν ύπό]  
  γαίαν·  
  γαῖ μὰ σέ, νῦν θ´ Ελι[κών, πρὶν τ´ Ἀίδης φθονερός].

...why in the world do you keep on ca[lling me], spouse? [Why do you] set [Tartarus in motion, o consort?] — Why (this) chilling silence? What h[eavy] darkness covered my eyes]? Where are the [previous?] charms [of love, the disposition of the?] swe[et heart?], and [the singing and the accompaniment?] of the lyre? Alas, you left everything [when you went under] the earth. Verily by you, now Heli[con, before the envious Hades?].

(Translation by Sironen)

The speakers are the deceased and the relative. As the stone is broken in the upper corners, it is not certain whether or not there was more text above it, but perhaps not – the epigram seems to be a type-1 epigram starting with the line of the deceased. Restorations are mostly by Peek, and if we follow him, the text is composed in hexameters, but, as Sironen points out, it is at least theoretically possible to restore all but the fifth verse in pentameters.  

Here, as often is the case with dialogues between the deceased and the relative, the epigram is not about information, but about expressing the family members’ feelings of loss; even the turn of the deceased refers to this, when the deceased asks why the spouse (still) calls upon the deceased.

---

185 Sironen 1997, 169.
The answer turn begins with a counter question in line 3. In the first turn (ll. 1–2), the deceased asked why the spouse called, and the spouse here (l. 3) replies by lamenting: πώς κρυερὴ σιγὴ; τί β[αρὺ σκότος δόσε κάλυψε]. The silence presumably refers to the deceased and her silence.

It is possible to read the first turn as continuing until line 6 (Ἠθος ν τῇ τε λύρη ν [συμμειξαμένη ποτ’ ἀοιδή]), in which case the speaker would change only after αἰαῖ. Yet, if we look at the content, (τίπτε, πόξι[ς], φων[είς, followed by πώς κρυερὴ σιγὴ) it seems probable that there is a change of speaker, even though it is not clearly indicated, because it would be peculiar to complain about both calling and silence in the same turn.

An epigram from Smyrna contains a prose title. In these lines, it is revealed that Ioulia Tyrannion had the monument made for her husband and son. Below it, we see the epigram:186

3. ᾽Ιουλία) Τυράννιον Τι(βερίῳ) Κλ(αυδίῳ) Ἀγαθόποδι τῷ | ἀνδρὶ καὶ Τι(βερίῳ) Κλ(αυδίῳ) ᾽Ιουλιανῷ τῷ τέκνῳ μνήσας | χάριν.

μήτερ, τί στενάχεις, τί δάκρυσι ένθάδε | μύρη;

ὡς ἐφάνη Μοίραις ἐμὲ τὸν νέον ὅδι ε κατελθεῖν

λείψαντι ζωῆν καὶ ὀμήλικας- ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ Λήθην

βῆ παθήρ σὺν ἐμοὶ- τοῦτο φιλοτεκνία. —

5 οὐκ ἐφάνην ψευστῆς ἐπὶ | σοί, τέκνον, ἀλλ’ υπὸ Λήθην

ἠλθον λιπὼν | ζωῆν καὶ φιλ[ί]αν γαμέτιν. |

χαίρειν πάσι φίλοις | κατακείμενος ἐνθα παραινῶ

καὶ μετέχειν | ζωῆς- ὧν γὰρ ἐστ’ Αἴδης. hedera

Ioulia Tyrannion, for the memory of her husband Tiberius Claudius Agathopous and son Tiberius Claudius Iulianus.

Mother, why do you groan, and tear your heart here in tears? Such was the decision of the Moiras that I, a youngster, go to the Underworld this way, leaving my life and

186 Smyrna 249, cf. SGO 1, 05/01/32 and GVI 1879, 2nd century CE (Peek).
my coevals behind. But my father came with me down here to the Oblivion. That is love for (your) child!

— My child, you were not mistaken about me, but I came down to Oblivion, leaving my life and my dear wife behind. Here I lie and advise all friends to rejoice and to participate in life, for Hades is so (cheerless).

The basic facts about the deceased are given in the prose section above the epigram, and the actual epigram concentrates more on the grief of the family and the idea of the afterlife. In this verse section, the speakers are the deceased and the relative. The first turn starts with an address, which immediately draws the reader’s attention. It also reveals that the first speaker is the deceased, as only the deceased could say the address ‘mother’ in this context. Therefore, the deceased son first addresses his mourning mother and asks why she is crying, using an interrogative and an address: μήτερ, τί στενάχεις, τί δάκρυσι ἐνθάδε μύρῃ; At the end of his turn, the deceased mentions that his father also came down to Oblivion: ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ Λήθην βῇ πατήρ σὺν ἐμοί.—.

The change of speaker is then easy to detect, as the father addresses the son at the beginning of the second turn: οὐκ ἐφάνην ψευστὴς ἐπί | σοί, τέκνον—. The repetition of φιλοτεκνία (in the first turn) with τέκνον (in the second) may also have helped in following the conversation. What is remarkable here is that both the interlocutors are dead. Normally, either the parent or the child is alive, but in this case, the mother, who is still alive, is not an inner actor in the epigram. She is addressed at the beginning of the poem, but does not have a turn of her own. Instead, the dead father converses with his dead son. The son in the first turn does not actually address his father, but rather talks about him in the third person singular: ὑπὸ Λήθην βῇ πατήρ σὺν ἐμοί. Despite the fact that the deceased does not address his father in his turn (turn 1), the father’s turn (turn 2) is a reaction to the

---

187 According to SGO, viele metrische Schnitzer: the first three verses are probably meant to be hexameter, the fourth perhaps pentameter, but there are mistakes throughout. Verses 5–8 are elegiacs without mistakes.
deceased’s turn, so there is a connection between the two. Moreover, the fact that the father addresses his son (ἐπὶ σοί, τέκνον---) connects the turns together.188

3.1.1.2 Interrogative, address and imperative in the opening turn

In some epigrams, the questions are emphasised by an imperative. Imperatives were characteristic of early sepulchral epigrams in which the passerby was told to do something, but in the dialogue epigrams, the passerby can also use the imperative.189 In such cases, the imperative is always hortatory; it is linked to the question and urges the second speaker to act. The imperative appears at the beginning of the sentence, after the interrogative, or at the end of the turn, after the question move. When the passerby addresses the monument (or the deceased), the verb is always one of saying, telling, revealing or something similar.190 At the end of the turn, it also marks the change of speaker. This epigram is from Thessaly.191

4. Λαμπίδος ἀρα τάφον παραμείβομαι;
   ἔννεπε, λᾶε. |
   — ναί, ξένε, τάς ὀσίας εἰς τέκνα καὶ γονέας. |
   ἀλλ’ ἵθι μοι χαῖρεν καὶ ἐπεύχεο
5   πολλὰ θεοίσι |
   σὺν τοιαίδε ἀλόχωι ἐυνὰ μολεῖν μέλαθρ[α].

_is this the tomb of Lampis that I am passing by? Tell, stone! — Yes, stranger, the funeral rites were due to children and parents. But go rejoicing and pray to the gods greatly so that you will go to the common house with such a noble spouse._

The speakers in this epigram are the passerby and the monument. The passerby also begins this poem, but instead of asking whose tomb this is, the passerby asks if the

---

188 For address + interrogative, see also SEG 18, 269 (τίς τίνος οὖσε γυνῆ σοὶ βαρῆ ὑβο κίσε---); GVI 1831 (fragmentary); GVI 1833; GVI 1834; GVI 1835 = SGO 3, 14/07/02; IG II/III 12794 = GVI 1836; GVI 1849 = SGO 2, 09/06/99; and no. 32 in this chapter (GVI 1883 = IG XIV 769).
190 For an extensive list for such verbs, see Mastrokostas 1964, 311 (note 3).
191 SEG 23, 434, 3rd century BCE, Thessaly, Phereae.
tomb belongs to Lampis (Ἀμπιδὸς ἄρα τάφον---), i.e. he already knows the name. After the question move, there is an imperative and an address before the switch of the turn: ἐννεπε, λάε. Note also that the passerby uses the verb ‘pass by’, παραμείβομαι, which clearly indicates that he, the one who speaks, is the passerby.

Due to the use of ἄρα in the first turn, the answer turn begins with ναί, so it is easy to follow the speakers, especially as ἔσεν comes immediately after ναί. τὰς ὀσίας εἰς τέκνα καὶ γονέας reveals that the deceased had children. After the reply move, a direct invitation to participate in the ritual follows in the second turn: ἀλλ᾽ ἵθι μοι χαίρων καὶ ἐπεύχεο--- (l. 4). Here, ἀλλ᾽ clearly indicates a new topic. Firstly, there was the answer at the beginning of the turn, but from ἀλλ᾽ onwards, there is an invitation to participate in the ritual.193

The following epigram is from a boundary stone:

5. ἰθι θηρῶν κράτιστε καὶ | θεῶν μύστα, λέων, |
   τίνος φυλάσσεις χῶρον | ύς γένος μακρόν; |
   τίς σῆς ὑπάρχει θνητὸς ὄν | τειμῆς, φράσον. |
   — ἀνδρών ἄριστος καὶ πάτρας| προὔχων ἄνηρ |
5 ἀρετής τε πάσης στέμμασιν | κοσμούμενος |
   Σανδαῖος, ὃς γῆς δεσπότης | ταύτης κυρεῖ. |

[Sandaios, ὃς γῆς δεσπότης ταύτης κυρεῖ]

Strongest of beasts and initiate to the gods, lion, whose land do you guard for long generations? Say, which mortal receives this honor from you?
— The best of men and he who is prominent in his hometown, adorned with wreaths of every honor, Sandaio, who rules as master over this land.

(Translation by Bettenworth)

The speakers are the passerby and the monument. The monument in this case is the figure of a lion. At the beginning of the epigram, the passerby addresses the monument (l. 1 as a whole), he then asks a question (τίνος φυλάσσεις χῶρον---) and

193 I will discuss the particles and their use in the dialogues in more detail in Chapter 4.
194 SGO 4, 19/10/01, 1st–3rd century CE, Canytelis, Cilicia.
after that exorts the monument to give information, using the imperative φράσον at the end of the first turn. The answer (Σανδάιος) comes relatively late (at the beginning of l. 6), but the epithets of Sandaios begin the turn: ἀνδρῶν ἄριστος καὶ πάτρας | προὐχων ἀνήρ—. The imperative φράσον reveals that these epithets are given by the second speaker. Both turns cover three lines, and it seems that the elements in the question and the answer turns are harmoniously matched: both turns begin with epithets and an address. Furthermore, τίς is asked at the beginning of the third line of the first turn, and the reply, the name Σανδάιος, comes at the beginning of the third line of the second turn. As noted above, this epigram is from a boundary stone, but it looks significantly like several grave epigrams, especially because of the lion motif.195

It is also possible to use the combination address + imperative in the answer turn. This epigram is from Beirut:196

6. ἐνθάδε τίς κεῖται; — παροδοπόρε μεῖνον, ἄκουσον·
χρηστός ἄνήρ ἔνδοξος ἀπλούς κοινός φιλέταιρος,
τέχνην καὶ πίστιν ἐπιδειξάμενος παρὰ πᾶσιν,
μηδένα λυπήσας, μὴ λυπηθεὶς ἐπὶ τέκνοις·
5 τοῦνομα δ᾽ ἔστι Παράτος ὀνομαζόμενος παρὰ πᾶσιν,
μήτε νόσῳ μακρᾷ κεκολασμένος, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπὶ μοῖραν
εἰνεκεν εὐσεβίης εὐθανάτως ἐμολέν.
Λούκιος Ἰούλιος Παράτος
ἐξῆ ἔτη μβ’, μῆνες νη’, ἡμέρας ιεʹ.

Who lies here? — Passerby, stop and listen here: he was an important man, held in honour, sincere, common, true to his comrades, exhibiting skill and trust among everyone, hurting nobody, not hurt for his children. His name is Paratos, that is how

195 Bettenworth discusses the shared characteristics of tomb and border stones, and suggests that the epigram perhaps reminded the reader of the epigram of Antipater (AG 7.426); see Bettenworth 2007, 90–1. Also SGO: Der Dichter dieses Epigramms hat Antipatros von Sidon, A.P. VII 426, gekannt—. See also Christian 2015, 21.
196 GVI 1840, late Imperial period, Beirut. For other imperative + address + interrogative combinations in the question turn, see SGO 1, 01/12/05 = CEG 429 (no. 2 in Chapter 2); GVI 1834 (no. 27 in this chapter); SGO 4, 20/06/01 (no. 25 in this chapter).
everyone calls him. He was not subdued by long disease, but rightly for his reverence towards the gods he passed away happily.

Lucius Iulius Paratus lived 42 years, 3 months, 15 days.

The speakers are the passerby and the monument. The passerby asks ἐνθάδε τίς κεῖται, and before actually replying, the monument says παροδοίπορε μεῖνον, ἀκουσον, and only then starts to tell about the deceased in a rather praiseful manner. This address + interrogative + interrogative structure separates the parts of the epigram. The first verse consists of the question turn and the interjection (at the beginning of the second turn), and the rest of the epigram (six verses) is the remainder of the reply turn. This interjection also gives the audience time to prepare for the actual information, and it helps to draw attention to the following sentences. In the reply turn, the deceased is firstly praised, then μὴ λυπηθεὶς ἐπὶ τέκνοις refers to his family status, and finally, in line/verse 5, his name is given (τοῦνομα δ᾽ ἐστί Παράτος—), after which the praise continues.

3.1.1.3 Interrogative only in the opening turn

Even though the questions with address and address + imperative are common, there are of course question turns that contain neither of these, and the questions which contain only question words are common. In the opening turn of these type-1 epigrams, interrogative(s) can be the only word(s) of the turn, but most often there is a complete sentence, the length of which varies, or several sentences. The two speakers and the change of speaker are marked subtly. One reason may be the fact that the audience already knew the dialogue pattern, and hence the fact that there are two different speakers did not need to be emphasised. The following two examples begin with interrogatives:

7. τίς πόθεν; — ἐκ Λυκίης μέν,
   ἀριστεύσας δ᾽ ἐνι θώκοις

---

197 In addition to the epigrams discussed in this section, see SGO 2, 09/07/09; GVI 1884; IC IV 391, no. 431; IG IV, 1603; GVI 1839; GVI 1841; GVI 1849 (although the interrogative is in the restored part); SGO 1, 05/01/18; SGO 1, 05/01/19; SGO 1, 05/01/57; GVI 1840; SGO 4, 21/07/01; SEG 55, 775; SGO 2, 11/07/05.
Τατιανὸς θεσμοὶς τε δίκης
πτολείθρα σαώσας— vacat

5 ἀλλὰ με πανδαμάτωρ χρόνος
ώλλυεν, εἰ μὴ ἐμὸς παῖς
ἐξ ἐμέθεν τρίτατος καὶ
ὁμώνυμος ἔργα τ᾽ ὁμοίος
ἐκ δαπέδων ἄνελὼν

10 στήλης ἐπὶ θηκεν ὀράσ[θα]ι
πάσιν ἀρίζηλον ναέταις
ξίνοισε θ᾽ ὁμοίως, vacat
Καρών ἐκ γέχας δς ἀπήλασε
λοίγον ἄτην, vacat

15 τὴν δὲ δίκην μερόπεσιν
ὁμέστιον ὡπας᾽ ἐπείναι
πεμφθεῖς ἐκ βασιλῆς
ἔθ᾽ ἀδομένοισιν ἀρωγός.

Who is this? From where? — (I am) Tatianus from Lycia, who held the highest offices, and by just laws saved cities. But all-conquering time would have destroyed me if my child, of the third generation, who has the same name and similar achievements, had not lifted me up from the ground and set me on a monument, to be seen and admired by all, local inhabitants and strangers alike. (It is) he who drove deadly ruin from the land of the Carians, and gave justice to dwell among men, when he had been sent from the emperor as a defender for the people, who still rejoice. 198

(Translation by Roueché)

8. [τ]ίς τύπον εἰμερόεντα ἱούνορος ἄνθυπάτοιο
 ἥρπασε, τις µορφήν τηδ᾽ ἐνέγλυψε λίθω; —
 µορφήν λαστόμος µὲν ἐῇ µειμήσατο τέχνη
 Ἑλλάδι κόσµον ολὸν µητρὶ χαριζόμενος,

5 [σ]τήσε δ᾽ ἀγασσάµενός µιν ἀµύµων Εὐτυχιανὸς

[Ἀ]ντὶ κασιγνήτου εὖ διεπων Ἐφύρην.

vacat

7 ψ(ηφίσματι) β(ουλῆς).

[W]ho has captured the pleasing figure of the proconsul Junior, who has carved his form in stone? — The stonemason has imitated his form with his craft, freely bestowing the whole ornament on mother [Greece], and blameless Eutychianos, admiring him, set him up, administering Ephyre instead of his brother.199

(Translation by Brown with some adjustments)

In example number 7, the speakers are the passerby and the monument. The question turn consists of two interrogatives: τίς and πόθεν; Nothing else is said, and the direction of speech is not indicated, nor is the next speaker identified (no address). The answer turn begins with ἐκ Λυκίης, and the use of the preposition also denotes that the answer turn begins. The two questions are answered here with a μέν–δέ structure: ἐκ Λυκίης με[ν],/ ἀριστεύσας δ᾽ ἐνι θώκοις / Τατιανός—. In the first four lines, the identity of the deceased is clarified, but after that, there is a shift of focus. This is again marked with ἀλλά, like in epigram number 4. From the fifth line onwards, the epigram tells about the grandchild of the deceased, and not the deceased anymore. This grandchild, also named Tatianos, restored the monument, and the epigram also praises his deeds. This is a rare combination: a posthumous honorary epigram (of an ancestor) and an honorary epigram (of a living descendant) in one monument.

Another option is to read this whole epigram as a monologue of the deceased with a self-reference in the beginning: You ask, who and from where the dead person is — I am Tatianus from Lycia—, but dialogue form is at least a valid option here and cannot be ruled out.200

199 Corinth, late 3rd century CE; for date, see Davenport 2013, 226, n. 11. Edition based on autopsy; cf. IG IV 1603 and Corinth VIII, 1, no. 89. cf. Brown 2012, 164. I added the mark for the change of speaker to Brown’s translation.

200 As also in SGO Rouché, cf. note 198.
Example number 8 is an honorary epigram. Who are the speakers? In the question turn (ll. 1–2), the speaker could be the passerby. If so, the speaker in the remainder of the epigram would be the monument. Brown, however, does not indicate a change of speaker in her translation. Self-referentiality is an option again, but certain elements here are similar with question–answer structures in dialogues. The question turn in this epigram is notably longer and more complex than in number 7, but there is still no address in the first turn, nor is there a question about the name of the honorand. Instead, the epigram begins with a question about who set up the statue of Junior (whose name the enquirer knows), and the epigram gives his name to the reader in this question move – a question that concerns the sculptor: [Τ]ίς τύπον εἰμερόντα Ιούνορος ἀνθυπάτοιο / ἡρπασε, τίς μορφὴν τῇ δ᾽ ἐνέγλυψε λίθῳ; In this opening turn, the same question is actually asked twice; the nucleus of the turn is who? (it occurs twice), but by asking the question in more elaborate sentences than, for example, ‘who sculpted this?’, the writer also gets a chance to praise the monument. The epigram is composed as if it were assumed that any passersby would recognise the person whom the statue depicts, as he was such a notable man in society. The first turn ends with τίς μορφὴν τῇ δ᾽ ἐνέγλυψε λίθῳ;, and the answer turn starts with a repetition: μορφὴν λαοτόμοις μὲν ἐῇ μειμήσατο τέχνη---. Another piece of information – the identity of the dedicatee – is given in the fifth verse, after δέ. I am inclined to read this text as a dialogue: repetition of the word μορφὴν and the use of the particle δέ prepare the audience for the change of speaker and for the information about the dedicatee – the name Eutychianos follows later, at the end of line 5. There are some monologue epigrams that contain rhetorical questions, but, as this epigram follows the question-answer pattern, it is possible to read it as a dialogue as well. Admittedly, the speaker in lines 3–6 is somewhat vague, but, as noted earlier, this is not unusual. Even though the speaker is rather impersonal, and in that sense draws close to the narrator role, its function is similar to the traditional monument role.

The text is cut into a statue base, and the epigram comments on the statue that once stood above it. There is also a kind of dialogue between the text and the
statue: the text comments on the figure of Junior, whereas the statue itself remains silent.\textsuperscript{202} This interplay between the question and the answer draws the attention of the reader/audience to the whole monument.\textsuperscript{203}

### 3.1.1.4 Other question structures

In addition to the structures presented above, there are epigrams which contain interrogative(s) and imperative(s) but do not have an address in the opening turn.\textsuperscript{204} The following epigram from a statue base in Olympia is an honorary epigram for an athlete:\textsuperscript{205}

9. Π(όπλιος) Κορνήλιος Εἰρηναίου υἱός
   Άριστων Εφέσιος, παῖς
   πανκρατιαστῆς νεικήσας
   Ὄλυμπιάδι σε’,
   Δι Ὄλυμπίωι.

   οὕτως ὁ παιδὸς ἀκμήν, ἀνδρός δ’ ἑπικείμενος ἀλκήν,
   οὕτως ἐφ’ οὖ τὸ καλὸν καὶ σθεναρὸν βλέπεται,
   τίς πόθεν εἶ; τίνος; εἴπε· τίνων ἐπινείκια μόχθων
   αὐχήσας ἔστης Ζηνὸς ὑπὸ προδόμους; —

10 Εἰρηναῖος ἐμοὶ γενέτης, ξένη, τούνομ’ Ἀριστῶν,
    πατρίς ἱωνογενῆς ἁμφοτέρων Ὑφεσος·
    ἐστέφθην ἀνέφεδρος Ὄλυμπια πανκρατίῳ παῖς

\textsuperscript{202} Granted, it is the monument talking at the end of the epigram, but there are no signs of the statue talking; rather, it seems the statue base is reporting the story.

\textsuperscript{203} Today, the statue base remains in Corinth, in situ by the Lechaion road on the archaeological site, but unfortunately, it no longer has its sculpture, which is usual.

\textsuperscript{204} In addition to no. 9 discussed here: IG VII 3110, cf. GVI 1838 (depends on the reading, however) and SGO 1, 05/01/57.

\textsuperscript{205} *Olympia* 5, 225, 49 CE (Olympia). Side a: the prose part (ll. 1–5); side b: ll. 6–13, side c: the epigram continues (ll. 14–23). I have read this stone myself in Olympia, but I have very few new readings: only the end of line 6 and beginning of line 13. The text is well enough preserved and leaves no space for speculations.
τρισσά κατ’ ἀντιπάλων άθλα κονεισάμενος.

Ἀσίδι μὲν πάση κηρύσσομαι, εἰμὶ δ’ Ἀρίστων

15 κεῖνος ὁ πανκρατίωι στεψάμενος κότινον,

Ἐλλὰς ὄν εἴπε τέλειον, ὅτ’ εἶδε με παιδὸς ἐν ἀκμῇ τὴν ἄνδρῶν ἀρετὴν χερσὶν ἐνενκάμενον.

οὐ γὰρ ἐν εὐτυχίηι κλήρου στέφος, ἀλλ’ ἐφεδρείης χωρὶς ἀπ’ Ἀλφειοῦ καὶ Διὸς ἡσπασάμην.

20 ἐπτά γὰρ ἐκ παίδων παλάμας μόνοις οὐκ ἄνέπαυσα,

ζευγνύμενος δ’ αἰεὶ πάντας ἀπεστεφάνουν.

τοιγὰρ κυδαίνω γενέτην ἐμὸν Εἰρηναῖον καὶ πάτρην Εὔφεσον στέμμασιν ἀθανάτους.

Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Θεσσαλοῦ Κῴου πλειστοείκου.

Publius Cornelius Ariston, son of Eirenaios from Ephesus, victor in boys’ pankration at the 207th Olympiad, to the Olympian Zeus.

You bloom of youth, becoming to the strength of a man, in whom one sees beauty and strength; who and from which country are you? Whose son? Tell, what victory sacrifices do you boast, standing under the hallways of Zeus? – My father was Eirenaios, o stranger, and my name Ariston, fatherland of us both the Ionian-born Ephesus. I, who was not ephedros, was crowned thrice in pankration in Olympia, having raised dust against competitors.

I am heralded in the whole of Asia; for I am Ariston, the one who was crowned with a wild-olive wreath in pankration, whom Hellas calls perfect, for that I brought men’s honour with my hands, even though I was still in the bloom of youth. For I got the wreath, not with luck of kleros, but without a bye, and, apart from Alpheius, Zeus also greeted me. I alone of seven boys did not stop from fights, but always paired, I won them all. Thus I give honour to my father Eirenaios, and for my fatherland Ephesus, with the immortal garlands. (Poem) of Tiberius Claudius Thessalos from Cos, victor in many contests.

The speakers in this epigram are the passerby and the honorand. The epigram begins with a virtual vocative addressing the honorand, οὗτος, repeated at the beginning of
the second verse. The question turn is four verses long, but the interrogatives do not occur before line 3. The first two are accompanied by an imperative: ---τίς πόθεν εἶ; τίνος; εἰπέ. The passerby directs the speech to the honorand, as the second person singular εἶ and the vocative show. After this, a further question follows at the end of the turn (ll. 8–9): τίνων ἐπινείκια μόχθων / αὐχήσας ἔστης Ζηνὸς ὑπὸ προδόμοις;

The questions are not answered in the same order as the interrogatives. In the question turn, the passerby asks who and from what country are you? Whose son?, but in the reply, the honorand begins by telling the name of his father, then his own name and his homeland: Εὐρηναῖος ἐμοί γενέτης, ξένε, τούνομ’ Ἀρίστων, / πατρίς ἰωνογενὴς ἀμφοτέρων Ἐφεσος—. The following two verses answer the last question, i.e. what he did he do to deserve a monument in Olympia. He was crowned as a winner in pankration three times: ---πανκρατίῳ παῖς/ τρισάκα κατ᾽ ἀντιπάλων ἄθλα κονεισάμενος.

The rest of the text (ll. 14 ff.) is about Ariston’s victorious career. This text unit is not cut on the same side as ll. 6–13, and both the placement and the fact that these lines are in first person only suggest that this is a parallel epigram and not an end of an epigram that started as a dialogue (ll. 1–13).

There is a signature under the epigram; this is the name of the author of the text (a victorius poet) and not the sculptor.206

The following epigram contains another variation of the question–answer structure:207

10. Μηνόδωρε Ἀπολλω-νίου, χαίρε.

φράζε τεήν πάτρην, τεόν όνομα και μόρον αὐδα,
καὶ ποσέτης, λίπεις δ᾽ εἰ τι παρ᾽ ἀμερίοις.

5 — πατρίς ἀλιστέφανός με γοναῖς ἔσπιρε Σινώπη,
οὖνομα δ᾽ οἰχομένου Μηνεόδωρος ἐφυ·
pολλά δὲ δυσμενέων ἐναρα βροτόντε να δαίξας
κείμαι δουριτυπῆς ἐν χθονὶ Βοσπορίδι·

206 Dittenberger 1878, 91.
207 GVI 1869, 1st century CE, Pantikapaion, Crimea.
Menodoros, son of Apollonios, greetings.

Tell your fatherland, your name, and tell about your death, and how old (were you), and if you leave something for (us) who last but a day. — Sea-crowned fatherland Sinope begot me as an offspring; the name of the one who is gone was Menodoros. After tearing many gory spoils of the enemies, I lie here struck by a spear in the land of Bosporus. The path of my life has completed six decades, and I leave children, and in a conjugal bed, my beloved wife. — May you dwell in the sacred house of the blessed. You were always very much longed for by everyone, both when gone and when alive.

The speakers are the passerby and the deceased. There is a greeting to the deceased above the epigram, thus the name of the deceased is given in the title, but it is asked for again in the epigram. Instead of building the questions with interrogatives, the composer of this epigram used imperatives. φράζε and αὐδα are used with accusative objects: φράζε τεὴν πάτρην instead of τίς πατρίς or πόθεν, and, likewise, τεὸν οὖνομα καὶ μόρον αὖδα καὶ ποσέτης, λίπεις δ᾽ εἰ τι παρ᾽ ἀμερίους instead of e.g. τίς; and τέκνα / παῖδα ἔλιπες;

Some of the words that occurred in the first turn are repeated at the beginning of the second turn:

1. turn: φράζε τεὴν πάτρην -› 2. turn: πατρίς ἀλιστέφανος— Σινώπη

1. turn: τεὸν οὖνομα καὶ μόρον αὖδα -› 2. turn: οὖνομα— Μηνεόδωρος—.

The question turn initiates a descriptive reply turn that is six verses long. The deceased mentions that he had children (a question which was asked in the first turn). References to children are more common on women’s grave monuments, where the number of the children is often told, but in the case of Menodoros, he simply states that he had children: τέκνα δὲ λίπω.
There is a third turn at the end of the epigram (from εὔσεβέων onwards). The speaker in the last turn is the passerby again, who wishes the deceased well and states that he will be missed.

### 3.1.2. Greeting pairs

In type 1, a funerary epigram may also consist of a greeting pair.\(^{208}\) The following two epigrams contain the greeting in the opening turn, and nothing else:

11. χαϊρε, Διομήδη Συμβρίτε. — χαϊρετε πάντες.

*Diomedes from Symbros, greetings. — Greetings to all.*\(^{209}\)

12. χαϊρετε. — Εὔφροσυνή καλούν νομε, χαϊρε πρόμοιρε·

σὸν γαμέ|την Καλόπουν | ἔννοικατέλειψε | [Ἀχει].

*Greetings. — Greetings to you, Euphrosyne, of beautiful name, who died untimely; you left your spouse Kalopu[s] in [sorrow].*\(^{210}\)

Example number 11 is a one-verse epigram consisting of a simple greeting pair. The speakers are the passerby and the deceased. The greeting directed to the deceased is uttered by the passerby role, and instead of asking the name of the deceased, s/he already knows it, which is the case in the greetings.\(^{211}\) In the reply turn, the deceased says *greetings to all* instead of addressing the passerby; so, is this a dialogue? Peek labels it as such in *GVI*, and I agree: the passerby can be thought to be included in ‘all’, as χαϊρετε πάντες is addressed to all persons who visit the grave, read the verse and hence participate in the epigram. The passerby who uttered the first greeting is part of πάντες, so the turns do form a loosely communicating pair.

---

\(^{208}\) Or a greeting pair + 1; see three-turn units in Chapter 3.2.4.

\(^{209}\) IC II xvi 27 = GVI 1852, Roman period, Lappa, Crete. cf. Pfohl 1967, 34.

\(^{210}\) IG XII 7, 490 = GVI 1856, ca 2\(^{nd}\) / 3\(^{rd}\) century CE, Aigiale, Amorgos. Restored by Peek.

\(^{211}\) According to Vestrheim 2010, 65 and 67–9, these kinds of addresses are by the ‘nameless voice’, but I put these voices under the passerby role. The greeting was supposed to be read aloud by the reader, and the actual reader and the passerby role are very close to each other.
In epigram number 12, the speakers once again are the deceased and the passerby. The deceased greets all the people in general, as the second person plural shows: χαίρετε. Therefore, there is no address in the greeting turn, which is exceptional, and it is unique in the dialogues. Like in number 11, here too the passerby can be identified as one of the people to whom the general greeting is addressed. In the second turn, a passerby returns the deceased’s greeting, but also tells that the husband was left in pain. If the speaker knows the name of the deceased and her husband, can we still interpret the speaker as a passerby? Here, the passerby role is close to a relative role. The relative is mentioned in the third person, and the first person is not used at all, but it is possible for the relative to talk about him-/herself in the third person. On the other hand, as the examples show, the passerby can already ‘know’ the name of the deceased, especially in greeting pairs. As we can see, the roles are not always unambiguous.

In the following epigram from Mysia, the title lines and the first greeting are followed by two verses: 212

13. [Ἀ]σκλαπ[ᾶ] [Μ]ενάνδ[ρου].

[Ἀ]σκληπ[ᾶ] Δημ[ητρίου]
[χ]αίρε· — καὶ ὃ[ῦ] ὑ[πὸ] [παροδέιτα]
[χ]αρῆς ὀ[τὶ τοῦ[το τὸ σεμνὸν] 213
[ε]ὔ[σεβίης.

Asklepas, son of Demetrios, be greeted. — Also you, [wanderer,] be greeted, for you [due to common piety] greeted me. 214

212 SGO 2, 08/04/05, ‘late’, Dascyleion?, Mysia.
213 For another option at the end of the line, see SGO.
214 For similar phrasing, see SGO 2, 08/01/49 and IG II/III 12607 = GVI 1387.
Here, the speakers are the passerby and the deceased. The opening greeting is simply the deceased’s name (in vocative) followed by χαϊρε. The response turn begins with the καὶ σὺ γε structure and an address that what heralds ὦ (παροδεῖτα is restored). The addressee must in this case be the passerby. This is a fragmentary epigram, but the restoration is quite secure because of the formulaic expressions. The second turn reveals again how greetings were part of the ritual and habitually uttered near the grave. According to Schmitz, for example, in an exhortation to mourn, the imperative may be seen as a performative verb. These invitations to utter the greetings may be seen in a similar light.

The following is another example of an opening greeting and response:

14. χαϊρε καλή σώφρων Κλεαρώ
    φιλότεκνε φί-
    λανδρέ — πᾶσι
    θεοῖς θύσασα
5 καὶ πᾶσι βρο-
    τοῖς ἀρέ-
    σασα ἵς μάκαρε-
    ς κεῖμαι εὕσε-
    βίης ἐνεκεν,
10 μητρὶ δὲ καὶ γεν-
    ἐτη πέν[θο]-
    ς [ἐδ]ω[κα βαρύ].

Beautiful and sound-minded Klearo, loving your children, loving your man, greetings.
—After offering to all gods and making good to all mortals, I lie here, (gone) among the blessed, because of the piety. [I gave] my mother and father heavy pain (by my death).

215 Schmitz 2010b, 35. He refers to CEG 27: Stop and lament at the site of the deceased Croesus’ tomb-
216 IG V 2, 182 = GVI 1857, 2nd/3rd century CE, Tegea, Arcadia.
The deceased is greeted in the first turn: χαίρε καλή σώφρων Κλεαρώ φιλότεκνε φιλανδρε. Who is the speaker here? It could be the passerby, but would s/he use such epithets as φιλότεκνε and φιλανδρε? Or, is it the relative? Both are possible, but nothing points directly to either of them.217

Owing to of the address used in the first turn, and of course the first person used in the second turn, we know that the speaker in the second turn is the deceased. The epithets of the deceased, καλή σώφρων, are embedded in the greeting. The commissioners of the stone are perhaps the parents, as they are mentioned at the end of the epigram (μητρὶ δὲ καὶ γεν/έτη πεν[θο]/ς [ἐδ]ω[κα βαρύ]), although it is of course possible that it is the husband, especially as she is also described as φιλανδρε. Perhaps the speaker in the first turn is one of the relatives?

In the following epigram, the greeting situation is the other way round:218

15. πατὴρ Φιλίνος,
   Φιλοκράτη δ’ ἐγεῖν[ατο], |
   δάμος δὲ Τύμν[ος].
   — χαίρε πολλά, Φιλόκρ[ατες].

*Father (was) Philinos, he be[got] Philocrates; demos was Tymn[os]. — Many greetings, Philocrates.*

Since the name is repeated in the epigram, it seems that the speaker changes. In the first turn, facts about the deceased are told in the third person. In my opinion, the speaker here is the monument. The facts revealed are such details that the monument would tell, as we have seen before, and, furthermore, there are no first person singulars, as there would be if the speaker was the deceased.

The second turn features a greeting to the deceased: χαίρε πολλά, Φιλόκρ[ατες. This must be a passerby’s turn (compare with, e.g., nos. 11 and 12 above). In this turn, the speech is directed to the deceased and not to the

217 Here the speaker role is close to the anonymous mourner mentioned in Chapter 2.
218 GVI 1850, 2nd century CE, Rhodes.
monument, but as this greeting is a response to the turn before it, I count this as a
dialogue epigram.

In the last example of the greetings, the response to the greeting differs from
what we have seen so far: 219

16. Δημητρία χαίρε. — Πῶς δύνομαι χαίρειν προλιπούσα φῶς
και γλυκυτάτους γονίς τετραέτην ζήσασα χρόνον;
και ἐνθάδε νέα οὖσα πρώτη τε ἐγὼ κατοικῶ
άλλ' ύμείς τὸ γλυκὸ φῶς μέχρι ποῦ τὸ ἰμαρμένον ἔλθη.

Demetria, farewell. — How can I fare well, having left the light
and my dearest parents after living my fourth year?
And I dwell here, being young and in my early life,
but you (dwell in) the sweet light until your fated day should come.

(Translation by Rife)

The speakers here are the passerby and the deceased. 220 The greeting turn
generates a response that combines information about the age of the deceased
(τετραέτην ζήσασα χρόνον) with a lament for her untimely death in the voice of the
deceased Demetria herself. Hence, in this example, the opening turn is a short
greeting, followed by a longer turn that is not exactly a reply to the greeting, but a
lament that is initiated by the greeting (and verb χαίρειν). 221 To the greeting,
Demetria replies Πῶς δύνομαι χαίρειν, because she has died young. This of course
reflects the sorrow of her parents, as is often also the case in the turns of the

220 Or, according to Rife, the parents and the deceased. In the previous examples, however, we saw
simple greetings (name + χαῖρε) that are replied to with ‘to you too, passerby’, and as there is nothing
specific to identify the speaker as a relative – it can also be the passerby. This case, however, shows
once again how, especially in the greetings, the speaker roles can be wavering.
221 Other τ1 greetings: GVI 1854 (fragmentary; the first turn is missing, but as the preserved part is
clearly a reply [καὶ οὐ γε ὦ παροδέετα, χάροις—], this must be a greeting pair); SGO 2, 08/01/44 = GVI
1855 (no. 15 in Chapter 2); SGO 2, 08/01/49; IG II/III 12607 = GVI 1387; SGO 2, 08/04/98
(fragmentary; again, only the reply turn remains, and even this is fragmentary, but the greeting is
certain), SGO 4, 18/01/24, SGO 2, 09/04/06, SGO 1, 01/12/20 and SGO 1, 04/24/16.
deceased. The last verse (άλλ’ ύμεῖς τὸ γλυκὺ φῶς μέχρι που τὸ ἵμαρμένον ἔλθη) urges the reader, even if indirectly, to enjoy life for as long as it lasts.

3.1.3. Statement–response pairs

The vast majority of type-1 epigrams are composed of the structures discussed above, but there are also some statement–response pairs. The same elements that are examined above are used in statement–response pairs, for example the address. In the following example, the address occurs in the response turn:

   ὅν Μο[ϊ]ρ´ ὕκυκέ-
   λευθ[ο]ν ἀπήγα-
   γεν εἰς [Ἀ]ίδαο, | [μν]η[μ]
5 Μαρκελλ[ε]ῖνος ἐγὼ
   τῶδ´ ὑπὸ[κειμε λίθ]ψ· | ίουλιανός με [πατήρ]
   θάπτει μὸν[ον] ὑ[ον] ἔ]-
   ὄντα, | ἐξηκον[τούτης]

[Mo]nu[m]ent.

I, Marcellinus, whom Moira led away to [H]ades, completing life’s journey too quickly, lie under this stone. [My father] Iulianos, 60 [years old], buried me, his on[ly], 25-[year-old], [son]. — Be brave, Marcellinus, and [have good fortune for ever]; many youngsters have died before you. Philos sketched this.

222 SEG 7, 329; SGO 4, 20/16/02 = GVI 1878. SEG and Peek give 3rd/4th century CE for the date, SGO simply Kaiserzeit. Caesarea Philippi. I follow the edition printed in SEG.
Here, the deceased begins the epigram. He states his name (Μαρκελλ[ε]ῖνος ἐγὼ), his father’s name, both of their ages and that he died prematurely. He also explains that his father Ioulianos buried him – πατήρ is restored, but very likely. At the beginning of the second turn, the deceased is addressed with a vocative and an imperative: θάρσε, Μαρκελλ[ε]ῖν[ε]---. Who is the speaker in this turn? It could be the passerby (cf. the greetings in the previous examples), but, on the other hand, the consoling aspect could refer to a parent who encourages his/her son. Then again, the deceased does not address his father who dedicated the stone, but rather talks about him in the third person singular (Ιουλιανός με [πατήρ] / θάπτει μόνιον υἱὸν ἐ] / ὄντα). It seems more probable that the speaker is the passerby, as SGO also suggests, and the previous examples in this chapter support this view.\textsuperscript{223}

The deceased says he is ὤκυκε/λευ[θ]ος, and in the second turn, he is exhorted to be brave (and to have good fortune), even though he died prematurely: καὶ εἰς αἰῶν’ ἐμοίρει. This is badly fragmented, but we can be certain that the end of the epigram states πολλοὶ σου πρότεροι κάθθανον ἠθεο[ι], so the restoration would fit in with the idea of the preceding sentence. Note also the signature line under the epigram: Φίλος ὑπέγραψε, \textit{Philos (or: a friend) sketched this}.\textsuperscript{224}

In another type-1 statement–response pair, the deceased is addressed in the second person at the beginning of the epigram:\textsuperscript{225}

\begin{align*}
18. & \quad \text{Tηλέμαχος} \\
& \quad \text{Σπουδοκράτος} \\
& \quad \text{Φλυεύς}. \\
& \quad \text{vac.} \\
& \quad ὥ τὸν ἀειμνήστου σ’ ἀρετάς παρὰ πάσι πολίταις \\
5 & \quad κλεινὸν ἐπαινὸν ἔχοντ’ ἀνδρα ποθεινότατον παίσι φίλει τε γυναικι· — τάφο δ’ ἐπὶ δεξιά, μήτερ, κείμαι σής φιλίας οὐκ ἀπολειπόμενος.
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{223} But the speaker could also be, e.g., the father or the mother of the deceased.
\textsuperscript{224} cf. no. 12 in Chapter 4.
\textsuperscript{225} IG II/III\textsuperscript{2} 7711 = GVI 1386 = GG 86 = CEG 512, 390–365 BCE, Piraeus. CEG 512.
νας.
Ἱερόκλεια
Ὀψιάδου
10 ἐξ Οἰου.

Telemachus, son of Spudocrates from Phyla.
O you, who have the famous praise of virtue ever to be remembered among all the citizens, you (who are) a man eagerly longed for by (your) children and by (your) dear wife.
— I lie right of your grave, mother, not without your love.
Hierocleia, daughter of Opsiades from Oios.

The speakers are the passerby and the deceased. The name of the deceased is given in the prose title. The epigram thus begins with ὥ τὸν... σ᾽... ἔπαινον ἔχοντ᾽ ἄνδρα. The passerby does not directly ask the name of, or address, the deceased. In this turn, the deceased is described in a praiseful manner, but information is still given: ποθεινότατον παισ ἕλει τε γυνακί reveals that he has a wife and children who long for him. When the deceased speaks in the second turn, he does not direct his speech to the passerby, but to his mother, who is also dead: τάφο δ᾽ ἐπὶ δεξιά, μήτερ, κεῖμαι—.²²⁶ Both the particle δ᾽ and the address μήτερ help to indicate the change.

Once again, the passerby addresses the deceased, but the deceased does not answer the passerby; instead of replying, he speaks to a third person, his mother. The mother here is an addressee without a voice (or turn) in the epigram. The direction of the speech in the first turn is passerby -> deceased, and in the second turn, deceased -> relative. The first turn seems to initiate the second: the deceased probably would not address his (also dead) mother if he was not addressed first, so we can still detect a loose pragmatic connection here.

The following epigram begins with an imperative and an address:²²⁷

²²⁶ Hierocleia, whose name is written under the epigram, is the widow. The epitaphs of Telemachus’ parents were also found in Piraeus. Michel 1927, 180.
²²⁷ SGO 4, 20/02/01 = GVI 1877. SGO gives Kaiserzeit; Peek dates this to 2nd/3rd century CE, giving Marathus, Syria as the provenience. Also Garulli 2014, 80–2.
Be of good cheer, Tryphera; all that you ordered in your testament, o blessed one, I, your husband Philon, have made.

—I adjure you, o blessed one, by Pluto and by the land of the dead, o dear (stranger), do not touch me, for I do not lie rich in blessings. Read the writings and you will learn how I am put in a new bed.

The epigram opens with an address to the deceased: εὐθύμει, Τρυφέρα. The speaker here is not completely clear – is it a passerby or a relative? If it is a passerby, should s/he not ask the name first? Not necessarily, as we have seen in other examples in this chapter. The rest of the turn, however, makes it clear that the speaker is a relative and not a passerby: πάντ’ ἐπόησα Φίλων, γαμέτης ὁ σός—. The relative talks about himself in the first person, and this makes it very probable that the first two words are also by the husband.

In the second turn, however, the deceased addresses the passersby generally. The direction of the speech is once again not to the previous speaker, but to someone outside the epigram. The deceased refers to writings, τὰς δὲ γραφὰς, but are they the same writings mentioned in the husband’s comment (τὰ δεδομένα σαίσι γραφαίσιν)? That seems unlikely – the husband refers to her testament, but here, she probably means writing on the monument.228

She also forbids the touching of her grave, which of course is a warning to all the passersby, found in other grave markers as well, and is not directed to her husband. Overall, Tryphera does not communicate with her husband per se, but he does address her in the first turn, and her turn is a logical continuation of the first

228 See also Seyrig 1951, 223 for the same conclusion.
turn, like in the previous example.\textsuperscript{229} Yet the turn of Tryphera remains somewhat mysterious – why ὀρκίζω σε μάκαρ, if the addressee is the (random) passerby? Garulli translates this Ti scongiuro, mio adorato, but it would be equally odd to direct these words to the husband. However we choose to interpret the second turn, Garulli states that dialogue form here emphasizes the connection between the deceased and her spouse.\textsuperscript{230}

3.2 X – Y and its variants

As seen above, many of the type-1 epigrams share common features. However, on the level of the turn structure, they can be divided into four different subcategories. They differ from each other in the length of the turns and in their combinations. The four variants are:

1) Two short turns
2) A short question turn producing a longer answer turn
3) Two longer turns
4) Three-turn units (t1 + 1 or 1 + t1)

I will give examples of each variant and discuss them briefly.\textsuperscript{231}

3.2.1 Two short turns

In the first variant, the pairs are either short greetings (a greeting pair) or a question and answer turn wherein they are no longer than one verse each. We had examples of the short greeting pairs in the previous chapter; the following is a question–answer pair.\textsuperscript{232}

\textsuperscript{229} The following are also S–R pairs: GVI 1876; IG XIV 1514a = GVI 1886; SGO 4, 17/09/01; GVI 1885; GVI 1837 (if following Peek; cf. Robinson 1905, 319–22 for monologue interpretation).

\textsuperscript{230} Garulli 2014, 82.

\textsuperscript{231} All of the t1 epigrams are given according to their variant in a table at the end of subchapter 3.4. \textsuperscript{232} GVI 1841, cf. IG II/III\textsuperscript{2} 11606a (p. 887), Athens. I give the edition according to Peek, which in my opinion is more plausible. Peek dates it to the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century or later, Sironen 2\textsuperscript{nd} century CE. Oliver gives Peek’s edition and states that, ‘with this arrangement the epitaph consists of two senarii, the second
20. οἰκὶ τίς ὡδε; | — Ἡράκλιος | ύδροπότης, |
ζῶν τῶν φί<λων> | φλός, δουκά|τορ, θανών | οὐδείς.

Who lives here? — Heraclius, the water-drinker, who when living was the bloom of his friends, a captain, and (now) when dead, nobody.

In this epigram, both the content and the dialogue/non-dialogue form depend on the interpretation. If we read οἰκὶ τίς ὡδε, as Peek does, the words form a question turn by the passerby: who (lives) in this house? If this interpretation is correct, the answer turn then starts with Heraclius..., and the speaker here is the monument. Another possible reading, however, is oikitícs, as given in IG. In this case, the epigram would be a monologue that states: inhabitant here is Heraclius, the water-drinker.... I examined the stone myself in Athens, but the letters are the same in both cases: ΟΙΚΙΤΙΣΩΔƎ can be analysed either as οἰκὶ τίς or οικιτίς, so autopsy does not help this time. Both interpretations are possible, but Tod points out the difficulties in reading oikitícs. Tod gives οἰκὶ τις ὡδε | Ἡράκλιος--- with the translation Here dwells one Heraclius instead of reading τίς (which would make this a question). According to Tod, oikí tîς is also possible, but less likely. However, on the basis of the question structures we know from type 1, oikí tîς, in my opinion, is indeed more probable. Thus, we also avoid the indefinite τις, which, as Tod also mentions, is very rare in epitaphs.

The following epigram from Iconion, Lycaonia is a more unambiguous example of the first variant of type 1.

---

233 Tod 1951, 20–1. He concludes: ‘... ὡδε requires a finite verb, and none such occurs here. That, φλός = flos I cannot believe, and neither explanation suggested for the enigmatic φι of l. 4 strikes me as at all probable’ (p. 21), with which I agree.

234 Threatte 1980, 170 also favours Tod’s reading instead of oikitícs.

235 Oliver 1981, 217–21 also gives this.

236 SGÖ 3, 14/07/02 = GVI 1835, 2nd century CE. A short passage of this epigram was discussed in Chapter 2 (no. 6).
Greetings to all.

_Urn with a voice, what do you cover under this grave marker? — A slave of Thalamus, who once was the servant of the Muses._

The speakers in this epigram are the passerby and the monument (the urn). The master of the deceased slave, Thalamus, is said to be a servant of the Muses himself (i.e. a poet), so perhaps he (the master) wrote the epigram. The prose text below the epigram may also point to this possibility. It states that Thalamos made this for himself and his wife Theodora——:

> αὐτὸς Θάλαμος ἑαυτῷ
> καὶ τῇ συμβίῳ αὐτοῦ Θεο-
> δώρα. ἐὰν δέ τις ἐπεισβι-
> ἄσηται, δώσει τῷ ταμεῖῳ

The rest of the text is as follows: _if someone else buries here by force, must he pay for the fiscus._ It is interesting that the epigram is for the slave; for Thalamus himself and his wife, even though he was _a servant of the Muses_, a short prose note is sufficient. The name of the slave is not mentioned, but Thalamus himself figures both in the prose and in the verse. According to SGO, the prose section for Thalamus and his wife was cut later – it seems that Thalamus did not compose an epigram for himself.

There is also one line above the epigram, which simply states: _χαίρετε πάντες._ I stated when discussing example 11 (this chapter) that this ‘all’ could refer to both the audience and the inner actors of the epigram. Yet, who says it here, i.e. whose turn is it? In this case, perhaps the speaker is the monument rather than the

---

237 About the speakers, see no. 6 in Chapter 2.
238 Das Distichon stammt gewiss von ihm selbst in SGO, and I agree. The poet Thalamus is otherwise unknown; see Calder 1912, 68.
deceased, as the deceased, unlike the monument, does not have any other lines in this epitaph.239

3.2.2 One short turn and one longer turn

The second variant of type 1 also consists of an adjacency pair, but in this variant, the turns are of unequal length. For example, if the epigram is a question–answer pair, there are either one or several short questions in the first turn, and the answer turn typically replies to the question(s) asked, but it also provides some extra information after that, as in the following epigram:240

22. Ἕκαταίος Ἕκαταιο

χαίρε.

τίς κατὰ γάς; — Ἕκαταιο ὁμώνυμος ὦ ἐξεν πατρὶ

οὕτω ἐφειβήνθη θηκάμενος χλαμῦδα,

5 τῶι σοφία μεμέλητο καὶ εὐμόχθων ἀπ’ ἄγωνων

νίκη καὶ γλυκεροῖ Πιερίδων κάματοι·

ὀκτωκαίδεχτης δ’ ἐλιπεν φάος· ἀ γάρ ἄδεκτος[

Μοίρα που μερόπων ἀνιχνευσε βίους.

Hecataeus, son of Hecataeus, greetings.
Who (is) under the ground? — O stranger, he carried the same name as his father, Hecataeus; he had not taken off the ephebe’s mantel yet; he was interested in wisdom and in victory in competition of laborious efforts, and in sweet labours of the Muses. As an 18-year-old, he left the light of day. The cr[uel] Moira steers the life’s course of the humans.

This epigram has been edited and translated as a monologue.241 If we read it as such, the monument voice first presents a question that it then answers itself, but on the basis of the question structures presented in the previous subchapters, I would

239 Title line; speaker unidentified, but could be seen as part of the monument’s talk.
240 SGO 2, 09/07/09, Hellenistic period (given in SGO and also by Asgari and Firatlı 1978), Calchedon, Bithynia.
241 Asgari and Firatlı 1978, 63–5 and SGO. At least there are no notations of the speaker change marked, not even in the translation. Line 7 restoration is by Bousquet.
rather interpret this as a dialogue. There is a question in the first turn and an address to ξένε in the reply. As noted above, such a question alone is sufficient to imply that it is uttered by the passerby voice, and since we have the address as well, I find it clear that the speaker changes. The speakers are thus the passerby and the monument. Despite the fact that the title reveals the name of the deceased (Hecataeus) and his father (also Hecataeus), the name of the deceased is asked for again in the first turn of the epigram: τίς κατὰ γάς; That is all that the passerby says.

The answer turn is significantly longer. It begins with the name, or actually by indicating that the deceased had the same name as his father Hecataeus (Ἑκαταίου ὁμώνυμος ὦ ξένε πατρί), so the change is evident. Note also the address in the first sentence of the response: the passerby is here addressed as ξένε. After identifying the deceased, the monument concentrates on describing him, so the three-words-long question turn produces a reply that is altogether five and a half verses long. As we can see, a simple question (who buried the deceased? who lies here? etc.) can produce an answer turn that offers further details and praises the deceased. This is a common pattern in the type-1 epigrams, perhaps against the Gricean maxims. The short question presented by the passerby initiates and ‘justifies’ all the information that needs to be given in the epigram.

There is a relief of a young man on the stele. He wears a himation (οὐπω ἐφειβήην θηκάμενος χλαμύδα) and holds two spears in his right hand. To his right, there is a herm, a servant, an amphora and a palm-branch, all symbols of his life, which the epigram depicts as follows: τῶι σοφία μεμέλητο καὶ εὐμόχθθον ἀπ’ ἀγώνοιν / νίκη καὶ γλυκεροὶ Πιερίδων κάματο[ι].

In the following epigram from Athens, a verse-long question opens the inscription:

23. στήλη, τίς σ’ ἐστησεν ἀριπρεπέως ἐσοφάσθαι;
   — μήτηρ | Τειμοκράτους, ἵν’ ἐχη παραμύθιοι αὐτῆ,
μνήσκει σθαί ζώσα έοι τέκνοιο πρόσωπων,
ένκεχαρα γμένον οόνομα ἡδ’ ἐτέων ἀριθμόν.
ἐίχε γάρ εἰκοστόν τε καὶ ἐνατον όρθογραφών τὸ πάρος folium

Stele, who erected you, splendid for our eyes? — Mother of Timocrates (did), for consolation to herself, so that she would remember her child’s face as long as she lives, (and) the name and the number of the years engraved upon the stone. Well, he was 29, and he was previously an orthographos.

The speakers here are the passerby and the monument (stele). The first verse forms the question turn, and the stele is addressed at the outset. The answer turn is four verses long. The passerby asks who erected the stone, and the monument replies. By saying μήτηρ Τειμοκράτους, the monument also reveals the name of the deceased. After that, it also tells the reason why, using ἵν’ ἔχῃ— (for [that she would have]...).

Furthermore, the monument tells the age and the occupation of the deceased. The beauty of the monument is referred to in the question turn — it is ἀριπρεπέως ἐσοράθη. There is a relief below the text depicting a man who holds writing instruments (a reference to his occupation). There are scrolls to his right-hand side, and to the left, an amphora.244 The reference to the text itself is also noteworthy: ἐνκεχαραγμένον οόνομα ἡδ’ ἐτέων ἀριθμόν (in the fourth verse, see ll. 3–4 in the edition).245

Compare the previous example (no. 23) with the following epigram from Tabala:246

24. τίς με τὸν ἐξ ἀγέλης πέ-
δων ἐξήγαγε κούρον; |
— νήπιον ἐξαέτη Αντέ-
λίον κακός ἦπτασε δέ-
5 μων· ἐρχόμενον φωτός |
ἐτέλεσε με Μῦρα· τίμησάν |

244 For a detailed analysis of the decorations, see Lambros 1905, 267–9.
245 The metre: two hexameters, one catalectic dactylic hexapod and a heptapod; cf. Birt 1911, 148.
246 SGO 1, 04/16/03, Tabala, Lydia, 270/1 CE.
με γονίς Ἀλέξανδρος κὲ
Παπιανῆ, ἔτος τνὲ', μ(ηνός) Γορ-πι[αί]οι γ'.

Who took me, the youngster, away from the herd of boys? — An ill-willed divinity snatched away Ampelius, a six-year-old small child. Moira set an end of light to me, who was coming (up).

The parents Alexander and Papiane gave this in my honour. In year 355 (of Sullan era), on the third of the month Gorpiaios.

This epigram uses the medium of passerby–monument or passerby–deceased dialogue, but it is actually a monologue by the deceased. At the beginning, the dead Ampelius himself, rather than a passerby, asks about his fate. He does not reveal his name in the question turn, but uses a noun (κούρον) instead. As we can see, he asks a question similar to the passerby questions above, and answers them himself. His name is given in the second turn, in the form of an answer: νήπιον ἔξεστι Ἀνπέλιον κακὸς ἠρπασε δέμων. The age of the deceased is also given in this answer turn. Until here, this turn looks like a turn of the monument, but the end of the epigram makes it clear that the speaker is still the deceased: ἐρχόμενον φωτὸς ἐτέλεσε μὲ Μῦρα. In the prose section, the donators’ names (Ampelius’ parents, Alexander and Papiane) are followed by the date. The deceased is still the speaker (τίμησάν με [...in my honour]), which is also exceptional. It would be more conventional to say that the parents gave this in honour of Ampelius, using the third person, and not to use the first person singular. This epigram is a good example of known patterns being used in a different way, but despite the similarities in structure between this epigram and the dialogues, I have omitted it from my corpus, as the epigram is told in one voice only.

247 The speaker in a monologue may ask questions and then answer them, especially in ‘later’, i.e. post-Hellenistic, epigrams. For example, in a bath dedication inscription from Syria, the structure is similar to the epigram from Tabala: This bath, I, Thomas, (acting) again for sake of all, have given to all property-holders, presenting this remembrance. What is the name of the bath? Health. Through this entering, Christ hath opened for us the bath of healing. cf. SGO 4, 20/22/01.
The following piece is an honorary epigram from the 6th century CE:\(^{248}\)

25. ἃνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, κοὐρε· τίς | ἐπέτεο οὐτος ἄριστος; |
— ἐξεῖνε φίλ’, Ἡλίαν μιν ἐπάξια | τείσαν ἄνακτες· |
στεινόμενον γὰρ ἔτευξεν ἑοίζ | κτεάτεσσι λοετρόν |
χειμερινὸν πλατύνας, πτόλιος δ’ | ἑλέαιρε πένητας, |
τέχνης οἳ τὰ ἕκαστα δαήμονε[ς] | ἀμφιπένονται, |
ἐκ σφετέρης παρέχων τὰ | τελέσματα ὑσίας αὐτός. |

hederae

Young man, tell me of (this) man; who was this member of elite? — Dear stranger, he was Elias. He was honoured by the rulers in a deserving way. For he extended the confined winter bath with his own money, and he had compassion for the city’s poor, of whom everyone follows the handicraft each is skilled in, so he paid himself the wages from his own possessions.

The speakers are the passerby and the monument. It is obvious that, despite the Homeric reminiscence directed to a young man (is κοὐρε referring to the monument decoration?), ἃνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, κο Üye\(^{249}\) is addressed to the monument by the passerby, asking about the person in whose honour it is set up. Or, at least we know that the monument is speaking in the answer turn because it refers to the deceased in the third person singular. The second question in the question turn, τίς | ἐπέτεο οὐτος ἄριστος; is also typical question asked by a passerby. The epithet ἄριστος possibly referst to member of elite (as I have translated).

The Homeric reminiscence is an introduction to the actual question: it provides an imperative and a slightly peculiar address\(^{250}\), after which follows the question sentence (starting with the interrogative τίς). Homeric line in a late monument does not seem peculiar when we remember that Homer was fashionable throughout antiquity, and even more so in Late Antiquity.

\(^{248}\) SGO 4, 20/06/01, Epiphaneia (Orontes), Syria, 6th century CE. cf. SEG 17, 756.
\(^{249}\) Hom. Od. 1.1: ἃνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, μοῦσα—.
\(^{250}\) Who is the young man addressed here? Someone depicted on the monument? cf. Busch 1999, 211: “Knaben’, der aber kaum mehr ist als eine Hilfskonstruktion, um das Homerzitat dem Zweck anzupassen’. This formula would also fit grave monuments, e.g., ἃνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, τύμβε.
The answer turn, however, begins with an address (ἐξείνε φίλ᾽), and the name of the deceased is given straight after that: Ἦλιαν μὲν ἐπάξια | τείσοις ἀνακτεῖς. The reward mentioned here was that he was granted a statue in a public place.\(^{251}\)

The second variant of type 1 may also be a greeting pair:\(^{252}\)

26. Διονυσοδώρου τοῦ
Πυθέου.
Διονυσόδωρος χαῖρε—καὶ σὺ γε, ὦ φίλε.
tὸ νῦν ἔχον γείνωσκέ με ὡδέ κείμενον,
5 καλὸν καὶ ἁγαθὸν καὶ καλῶς ἐξωκότα,
Λιμναγενῆ γεγονότα, πᾶσι προσφιλῆ.

Of Dionysodoros, son of Pytheas. Dionysodoros, greetings. — To you too, friend. As it stands now, know that I lie here, an excellent and good man who has lived in good way, (and) who was born in Limnai, (and) beloved to everyone.

The speakers are the passerby and the deceased. Before the discussion, the name of the deceased is mentioned in the title and is then repeated in the opening greeting: Διονυσόδωρος χαῖρε. Then, the deceased replies to the passerby: καὶ σὺ γε, ὦ φίλε (φίλε may also be used to denote the passerby). Following this, the deceased continues to speak. The excellence of the deceased is verbalised in the first person singular turn, as well as his birthplace: γείνωσκέ με ὡδέ κείμενον /καλὸν καὶ ἁγαθὸν καὶ καλῶς ἐξωκότα Λιμναγενῆ γεγονότα /πᾶσι προσφιλῆ. In the fourth line, γείνωσκέ most likely refers to the reception situation again.

To the right and partly under the text there is a sketch of a ship. Above the text there is also a relief in a niche. The relief contains a table with food on it, and three men and two women sit by the table.\(^{253}\) The ship sketch probably refers to the

---

\(^{251}\) SGO 4, 20/06/01.

\(^{252}\) GVI 1851 = SGO 2, 08/01/39, Cyzicus, Mysia, 2\(^{nd}\)/1\(^{st}\) century BCE. cf. Garulli 2014, 63–4.

\(^{253}\) For a photo, see, e.g., the SGO edition.
deceased person’s birthplace – Λιμναγενῆ γεγονότα – and the scene depicted in the relief is obviously the commemoration banquet.\textsuperscript{254}

3.2.3 Two longer turns

The third variant of type 1 is an adjacency pair with two longer turns. ‘Longer’ here means that both of the turns are more than one verse long (but the turns within one epigram do not need to be of equal length). There can be multiple moves in either one or in both of the turns, for example two question sentences in a row and a reply turn. In the following epigram, there are two question moves in the first turn: \textsuperscript{255}

27. εἰπέ, λέον, φθιμένοιο τίνος τάφον ἀμφιβέβηκας, 
μοιφάγε; τίς τάς σάς ἄξιος Ὦν ἀρετᾶς;
— υἱὸς Θευδώρου Τελευτίας, ὃς μέγα πάντων 
φέρτερος ἦν, θηρῶν ὀσσον ἐγὼ κέκριμαι.
5 οὐχὶ μάταν ἔστακα, φέρω δὲ τι σύμβολον ἄλκας 
ἀνέρος, ἦν γὰρ δὴ δυσμενέεσσι λέων.

Tell, lion ox-eater, whose tomb do you guard? Who was your worth in excellence? — Teleutias, son of Theodorus, who was by far the bravest of all men, as far as I have assessed beasts. I do not stand for nothing, as I bear a symbol of the strength of a man; he was namely a lion to his enemies.

The speakers here are the passerby and the monument; the monument, more specifically, is a lion statue on the monument. The passerby begins with a question turn. Here, the imperative is at the beginning of the turn: εἰπέ, λέον---. As one can see, the two questions are practically the same. Owing to the address (λέον...βουφάγε), it is obvious that the lion statue is the speaker in the second turn. The reply turn is descriptive; it firstly reveals the identity of the deceased (υἱὸς

\textsuperscript{254} For further explanations and depiction of the decoration, see Smith 1892, 342 (no. 736); Marshall 1916, no. 1009; CIG 3648; and Kaibel 245. Banquet in a relief is a motif found in other grave markers as well.

\textsuperscript{255} GV I 1834, after ca 88–86 BCE; cf. AG 7.426, Antipater of Sidon.
Θευδώροιο Τελευτίας), and after that praises his excellence and bravery, so that the audience is convinced that the lion is indeed a suitable symbol for such a man.²⁵⁶ It is stated that the monument is σύμβολον ἀλκας / ἀνέρος, ἦν γὰρ δὴ δυσμενέσσι λέων, but his deeds are not depicted in detail.

In another example of this variant, there are several questions in the opening turn:²⁵⁷

28. [τίς εὔπρεπέ]σιν γλυφαῖσιν εἴδρυσεν τά[φον,]
tίς τά τέχνα τό κάλλος ἠγλαίσατο,
tίς ἀ περισσόμορφος ἐν τύποις γυνά,
μάνως θνατάν ἢ Κύπριν δέδορκα σε;
5 — θνατάν με Πῶλλαν, οὐχὶ τάν θεαν Κύπριν
λεύσεις γλυφαῖσιν ἠγλαίσμεναν, ἐξεν,
κάλλους δὲ νείκαν στέφανον εὔανθῆ κρατῶ,
[γλύψαν]τος ἀμὰς Βίκτορος ξυνευνέτα.

[Who] has put up (the grave) with [beautiful] reliefs? Who has made the beauty splendid with art? Who is the eminently beautiful woman in the relief? Reveal it! Are you, whom I see, a mortal or Cypris? — You see me, the mortal Paulla, and not goddess Cypris, in brilliantly pictured reliefs, a stranger; in my hand I hold a beautiful-flowered garland as a victory token of my beauty. Victor, my husband, [represent]ed us (in reliefs).

This epigram is iambic, and the speakers are the passerby (ll. 1–4) and the deceased, Paulla (ll. 5–8).²⁵⁸ This is from a monument with an epigram on each of the four

²⁵⁶ For Teleutias and speculation for the reasons of his excellence, see Hicks 1887, 112 and further discussions in Preuner 1894, 550–2 and Gow and Page 1965, 59–60. According to Hicks, the composer of the epigram, Antipater of Sidon, would have been a contemporary ‘and perhaps a friend’ of Teleutias. If Teleutias did promote the revolt under Mithridates, as Hicks suggests, the lion symbol is apt, as it was often used on soldiers’ graves.
²⁵⁷ SGO 1, 05/01/57, 3rd century CE, Smyrna. There is an elegiac monologue of the deceased on the stone (on another side of the stone). Text on two other sides has been destroyed. See Fontrier 1900, 253–5 (who gives the date). In the SGO edition, the dialogue begins at verse 25, as the elegiac monologue is given first.
²⁵⁸ In SGO, Die Statue antwortet is given, but clearly it is the deceased (whom the statue depicts): cf., e.g., θνατάν με Πῶλλαν (l. 1) and στέφανον εὔανθῆ κρατῶ (l. 3). For the other inscriptions of this monument, see SGO and Fontrier 1900, 253–4. According to Fontrier, Πῶλλα = Paulla, a Roman name, like the husband’s name, Victor.
sides, but two of them are now destroyed. The dialogue epigram is on one of the narrow sides, and on the other one, the deceased speaks alone. In the monologue epigram, the deceased states her name, her fatherland and the name of her husband, i.e. the information also requested and mentioned in this dialogue epigram.

The first turn in the dialogue is spoken by the passerby, who asks several questions in a row, and so three interrogatives are included. Here too, repetition helps in following the conversation. Following the third question, there is an exhortative imperative μάνε, and in the last question (l. 4), the passerby asks whether s/he sees the deceased or the goddess Aphrodite herself (for whom Cypris is an epithet; θνατάν ἢ Κύπριν δέδορκά σε;), to which the deceased replies: θνατάν με Πύλλαν, οὐχί τάν θεάν Κύπριν——. Hence, both θνατάν and Κύπριν are repeated in the answer turn. There is also an address embedded in this turn: ξένε in line 6.

This epigram is yet another example of references to the physical context, i.e. the decoration of the stone: the phrases εὔπρεπέ]σιν γλυφαῖσιν, τά τέχνα το κάλλος ἠγιαίσατο and ἀ περισσόμορφος ἐν τύποις γυνά in the questions all refer to the monument, as well as γλυφαῖσιν ἠγιαίσμεναν in the answer turn. The deceased also describes the relief in which she is depicted: στέφανοι εὐανθή κρατῶ.

The question in the open turn is also repeated in the following epigram:

259 GVI 1833, Salamis, Cyprus, 2nd century BCE. In the previous examples (nos 27 and 28) the question and answer turn were of a more equal length than in the epigram in question. However, the question turn includes several question sentences, and is more than one verse long, so I categorised it here, even though it could perhaps go under the second variant as well.
O tomb, whose grave is this? Tell (me), who lies under your smooth cliff, and (who) suffered the most pitiable destiny. — Demonax, whom Salamis brought up, best of the children, went to bitter Acheron, with commerce on the salt-surging sea, leaving his much-lamented mother and his father in gloomy tears. For the bridal torches were not lit, neither was wedding song sung aloud, only wailings for the 28-year-old. Hades is not evil; pass by, o stranger, and utter additional greetings, since the sailing voyage to the place where the dead dwell is common for all the mortals.

The speakers are the passerby and the monument. The passerby begins with the address τύμβε — he speaks about the grave mound, but the epigram is on a grave marker. After the address, there follows a question turn built with the interrogative τίνος and the deictic τόδε σήμα. Another question follows, accompanied by an imperative in the centre of the sentence: ----τίς, φράσον----. The reader is well guided to note that the speaker is going to change, and in the beginning of the answer turn, the change is emphasised by revealing the name of the deceased as the first word of the turn. The monument then goes on to report about the deceased (his fatherland, his age at death and the fact that he did not yet have a family of his own). At the end of the epigram, there is once again an invitation to participate in the ritual (πάριθι, ξένε, ‘χαίρε’ προσείπας), and the common fate of all mortals is brought to mind in a rather beautiful manner: κοινὸν ἐπεί θνατοῖς ὁ πλόος εἰς φθιμένους.

The epigrams tended to get more complex as regards both the content and the structure during the later period. As these long-turned examples show, there was also some variation within the types; for instance, the last example is far more narrative-based and provides more versatile information than the early type-1 epigrams discussed in Chapter 2.260

---

260 Nos. 1 and 2 in Chapter 2.
3.2.4 Three-turn units

Seven type-1 epigrams include an adjacency pair that is accompanied by a third turn. Together, these turns form a three-turn unit. The third turn may be, for example, a reaction to a reply turn, or an opening turn after which a greeting pair follows. In the following example, the latter is the case:

30. [οὐ γάμον οὐδ’] ύμέναιον ιδ-
[ὡν οὐ νῦ]νφια λέκτρα,
[κείμαι] π<ρ>δς στήλη κεκλι-
[μέν]ος παρ′ ὀδῷ. | — χαίρε
[Φλ]ῶρε. — χαίρε καὶ σύ,
tῖς ποτ’ εἶ, ξένε.

[I did not see the wedding], or [hear] a wedding song, [or (have) bridal beds; I lie] near the stone by the road. — Greetings, [Fl]orus. — Greetings to you too, o stranger, whoever you are.

The speakers are the deceased and the passerby. The deceased begins the poem and states that he was unmarried (if the restoration is correct). A greeting pair follows this. The passerby addressed the deceased by his name, χαίρε [Φλ]ῶρε, and the deceased replies: χαίρε καὶ σύ, τῖς ποτ’ εἶ, ξένε. Once again the monumental context is visible in the text: greetings to you, whoever you are, i.e. whoever happens to pass by the stone and read the epigram. The greeting turn of the passerby is a reaction to the lament of the deceased, and the other greeting is of course connected to the first one, so these three turns form a unit. The first turn forms an elegiac distich, after which the greeting pair follows. The greeting pair is trochaic. This text is badly preserved, but, because of the greeting pair, the turn division is easy to follow.

---

261 IGPannonia 8. cf. GVI 1853. According to Peek, this dates to mid-1st century CE. The following is carved below the epigram: Florus P(ubli) Vedi P(ubli) f(iii) Fab(iii) Germani ser(vus) an(norum) XXVI h(ic) s(itus) e(st). [domi]nus ob meritis [eius] fecit.
In the next epigram, the speakers are also the passerby and the deceased, and the passerby opens the epigram (after the prose section, which gives the name of the deceased and his father, and, rather exceptionally, the date): \(^{262}\)

31. Μηνογέ-
νης
Ἀπολλώ-
νίου Λόλου υίός.

ρκς', μ(ηνός)
'Υπερβερε-
ταίου γ'.

5 νήπιος ἐν τύμβῳ τίς ἄρ’ ἑσθ’ ὁ-
δε; ώς ἀταλαίσι | χείροιν
γλακτοπαγεῖ μαστῷ ἐπι-
κέκλιτε. | — οὖνομα Μηνο-
γένης μοι, ἐτέκνωσέν
10 δέ με Λόλους, | {νε} ὁν πέν-
θει στυγρῷ προύλιτον
ἐν μελάθρῳ. | — φεῦ, Μοίρης
εἰκαία κριτήμα· ὡς ἀλογίστω[ς]
Αὐγή[ς] ἐκτίνας
15 καὶ πατρός θεμέγου.

Menogenes, son of Apollonius Lolous. On the 3rd of Hyperberetaios, year 126.
Who is this infant in the grave? Oh how he has reached out for the breast full of milk with his tender hands! — My name is Menogenes; Lolous, whom I left with hateful

\(^{262}\) GVI 1884, GG 435 = SGO 1, 05/01/65; from Smyrna, but originally possibly from Lydia, 41/2 CE, as the date given above the epigram shows. Cf. Fontrier 1900, 359–60. Vérilhac 1978–1982, no. 147 and Moysey 1988, 89–92. End of the epigram badly damaged, translation depends on restoration. Peek suggests πατρὸς ἄχν<ὑ>θεμένου l. 15 (the end would hence be "...to the grief of (mother) Auge and of the father.

sorrow in the house, begot me. — Ah, (how) random are the judgements of Moira!
How senselessly you ---!

In the first turn, there is a basic type-1 question, although its structure is uncommon:
νήπιος ἐν τῷ μβω· τίς ἄρ’ ἔσθ’.
The passerby knows that the deceased was an infant, because the relief on the monument depicts a baby at his mother’s breast. Instead of asking who lies here, the passerby starts with the substantive νήπιος and then asks: τίς ἄρ’ ἔσθ’;
The other move in this turn refers directly to the relief and the baby reaching out for the breast:

ὡς ἀταλαῖσι χειρσὶν /

γλακτοπαγεῖ μαστῷ ἐπικέκλιτε.

The passerby does not address the deceased, but rather talks about him in the third person singular. In the answer turn, the name (with the substantive οὔνομα) is given at the beginning: οὔνομα Μηνογένης.
The deceased reveals his father’s name too, and how the father is left in heavy pain. The last turn of the passerby is a reaction to this:

φεῦ, Μοίρης / εἰκαία κριτήρια—;

the passerby bewails Moira’s judgements and the untimely death of the baby Menogenes.

In our last example of this variant, taken from the end (the final iambic part) of the inscription, the speakers are the deceased and a relative.263

32. Ἀγγελε Φερσεφόνης, Ἐρμη, τίνα τόνδε προπονπείς
eἰς τὸν ἁμείδητον Τάρταρον Ἀίδεω; —

μοῖρα τις ἀεικέλιος τὸν Ἀριστων’ ἥρπασ’ ἀπ’ αὐγῆς ἐπταετ[i]· μέσσος δ’ ἐστίν ὁ παῖς γενετῶν. —

δικρυχαρής Πλούτων, οὐ πνεῦμα πάντα βρότεια
σοι νέμεται; τί τρυγάς ὀμφακας ἡλικίης;

Messenger of Persephone, Hermes, whom are you conducting to joyless Tartarus of Hades? — A shameful Moira snatched Ariston away from the sunlight when he was seven years old; now the boy is among his ancestors. — Pluton, delighting in tears, aren’t all the mortal spirits dealt to you? Why do you gather in/reap the unripe grapes of youth?

263 GVI 1883; IG XIV 769, Neapel, 1st/2nd century CE. For other three-turn unit epigrams, see table 4 (in Section 3.4). See also Rasche 1910, 33.
This epigram comments on a relief. The passerby begins the epigram, but addresses Hermes instead of the deceased or the monument (Hermes was most likely depicted in the relief). The function of the role of Hermes is, however, quite identical to that of the monument. Hermes/the monument replies, and tells about the deceased. After this, the passerby has an extra turn. This is not addressed to Hermes anymore, but to Pluton, i.e. a character outside the epigram. The third turn is, however, initiated by the adjacency pair that precedes it; the last turn is a reaction to what Hermes says in the question–answer pair.

As the examples show, the extra turn may be either at the beginning or at the end of the turn, but, in any case, there has to be a pragmatic connection between this turn and the adjacency pair to make it a three-turn unit. There are two speakers in these examples, and one of them has two turns. Furthermore, the extra turn is always connected with the pair. That is why I put this variant under the type-1 category, even though the nucleus of type 1 is one adjacency pair.

3.3. Type 1 in non-inscribed epigrams

In some of the non-inscribed epigrams the monumental context is imitated, or the speaker situations are similar to the ones we know from verse inscriptions. There are of course dialogue epigrams that have no traces of the monument inscriptions, but I am interested in the possible similarities between the communication structures of these texts and the verse inscriptions, so I will briefly discuss some examples where these similarities may be detected.

---

264 a -> b, b -> a, a -> c.

265 cf. SGO 1, 02/14/06 for a statement–question–response epigram (speakers MON – PB – MON). IG VII 3110 = GVI 1838 is also a three-turn t1 epigram if we read it according to Peek’s suggestion (GVI). In this case, there would be interrogative + imperative in the opening turn (question), then a reply to Q, and the third turn would be a reaction to the reply turn (the epigram is about the deceased), and in the last turn, the passerby says: ‘he lies in the grave nevertheless’.

266 Compare with t3 comprising three speakers that often have a turn each. Also, the length of the turns determines the t3 epigrams. In the rest of the t1 three-turn unit epigrams, not discussed here, the extra turns are: a closing salutation/wish after a Q – A pair in GVI 1869, reaction to the answer turn after a Q – A pair in GVI 1883, and, in the case of IG VII 3110 = GVI 1838, it depends on the reading: if we follow Peek, there is a response turn to a Q – A pair in this epigram too, but the reading in IG is much more fragmentary and unclear, and the turn structure remains somewhat obscure. In the erotic inscription SGO 4, 21/09/01, the third turn is a reaction to the second turn.
The ‘wavering’ identity of the first person speaker and the fact that the pragmatic rules did not necessarily apply to the epigrams – features we have seen in the type-1 epigrams – were alluring to Hellenistic poets.\textsuperscript{267}

The following epigram looks very similar to many of the type-1 verse inscriptions we have seen so far:\textsuperscript{268}

33. — αἰετέ, τίπτε βέβηκας ύπερ τάφον; ἢ τίνος, εἰπέ, ἀστερόεντα θεῶν οἶκον ἀποσκοπέεις;
   — ψυχής εἰμὶ Πλάτωνος ἀποπταμένης ἐς Ὀλυμπον εἰκών· σῶμα δὲ γῆ γηγενές Ἀτθίς ἔχει.

_Eagle, why do you guard the tomb? And whose tomb is it, tell me, and why do you gaze at the starry home of the gods? — I am the image of Plato’s soul, which had flown away to Olympus, but his earthly body is here in Attic soil._

The speakers here are the passerby and the monument (an eagle figure on the tomb). In the opening turn, the passerby asks whose tomb the eagle guards, and why.\textsuperscript{269} Address (αἰετέ), interrogatives (τίπτε, τίνος) and imperative (εἰπέ) are used in the first turn. These are all familiar features from the verse inscriptions. Even the eagle theme is used in verse inscriptions. Similarly to the lion theme, it symbolises the courage and virtues of a man.

The reply turn begins with ψυχής εἰμὶ Πλάτωνος...εἰκών, which answers the questions which the passerby asks.

In the next example, the situation is somewhat different:\textsuperscript{270}

34. πολλὰ πιῶν τέθνηκας, Ἀνάκρεον. — ἀλλὰ τρυφήσας·
   καὶ σὺ δὲ μὴ πίνων ἱξεαι εἰς Αἰδήν.

\textsuperscript{267} Schmitz 2010a, 327 (especially note 6) and 388–9.
\textsuperscript{268} AG 7.62, anonymous.
\textsuperscript{269} Compare with, e.g., no. 1 in Chapter 2: σφίξ, ἡαίδαο [κ]ύον, τίν’ ἐ[χοσ’]…
\textsuperscript{270} AG 7.33, Julianus, Prefect of Egypt.
You died because of drinking too much, Anacreon. — Yes, but enjoying it. You, although you do not drink, will come to Hades too.

(Translation following Paton)

The speakers in this epigram are the passerby (of an imagined monument) and the deceased. The passerby addresses the deceased, Ἀνάκρεον, at the end of his turn. Like in the opening greetings, here too the passerby already knows the name of the deceased. This is a statement–response pair, and there are no traces of informativeness. Instead, the epigram plays with the idea that Anacreon, who wrote drinking songs, died from drinking. The second turn again starts with the particle ἀλλὰ (as in nos. 4 and 7 earlier in this chapter). The turn of the deceased opposes the sentiment in the first turn, but the particle also divides the turns. ἵξεαι εἰς Ἀἴδην is reminiscent of grave inscriptions, wherein the deceased often gives a reminder that everyone must go to Hades (like εἰς κοινὸν Ἀἴδην πάντες ἥξουσι βροτοί in the same no. 32 mentioned above). The speaker pair alone makes the epigram look like funerary grave inscriptions, and the details discussed here are also similar.

The next epigram is by Callimachus.271

35. Τίμων (οὗ γὰρ ἔτι ἔσσι), τί τοι, σκότος ἢ φάος, ἐχθρόν;
— τὸ σκότος: ὑμέων γὰρ πλείονες εἰν Αἰδῆ.

Timon (for you are not alive anymore), which is most hateful to you, darkness or light? — Darkness; there are more of your kind in Hades.

(Translation according to Paton, but with a couple of minor alterations)

Again, the speakers are the passerby and the deceased. Like in example number 1, the passerby knows the name of the deceased. The passerby does not ask for facts about the deceased, but for something different: τί τοι, σκότος ἢ φάος, ἐχθρόν. The reply turn starts with τὸ σκότος, so there is repetition, just like in some verse

271 AG 7.317, Callimachus. For other dialogues by Callimachus, see table B1 in the Appendices.
inscriptions. The joke in this epigram is that Timon was a known misanthrope to whom Hades is painful because there are more people there than in the light. Callimachus is playing with the speaker roles familiar from the verse inscription, as well as speech and dialogue, as he often did.\footnote{272 See Tueller 2008, 113–15 and Schmitz 2010a, 376.}

As the last two examples show, the context of grave epigrams was denoted by speaker pairs, but instead of giving information (even ‘imagined information’), the funerary context was sometimes used in a playful way to discuss other themes, or just as a frame for a witty discussion.

The following epigram is an epinikion:\footnote{273 This is AG 16.23, Simonides; for similar, see 16.55 by Troilus Grammaticus. According to Page 1981, 245, this may be a copy from an inscription, but not necessarily. Tueller 2010, 56, argues that the text is possibly (or probably) earlier than Simonides; see Tueller. cf. Schmitz 2010a, 377 (especially note 19).}

36. εἰπόν, τίς, τίνος ἔσσι, τίνος πατρίδος, τί δὲ νικής;
— Κασμύλος, Εὐαγόρου, Πύθια πύξ, Ῥόδιος.

Say, who you are, whose son, from which country, and in what a winner. — Casmylus, son of Evagoras, a Rhodian, victor in boxing at the Pythian games.

(Translation according to Paton)

The speakers are the passerby and the athlete honoured in the epigram. There is an epinikion in the material (no. 10), but this epigram is also similar to many of the funerary epigrams, as is also the case with example number 10. In the opening turn, the passerby asks questions, but begins the whole turn with an imperative (as in no. 26): εἰπόν, τίς, τίνος ἔσσι, τίνος πατρίδος, τί δὲ νικής; These questions are also asked in number 10 (although not with the exact same wording), but the first three questions are also common in funerary verse inscriptions. The second speaker replies to every question briefly: Κασμύλος, Εὐαγόρου, Πύθια πύξ, Ῥόδιος. Each question is thus answered in the shortest possible way.

The speakers in these epigrams are like the speakers familiar to us from verse inscriptions. Thus, when a text is not cut into a real monument, can we say that the
speaker in the epigram is the monument? What about the passerby? There is still someone, often unidentified, asking questions in the epigrams in the same way as the passerby does. The information is then given, in the same ways as it would be given by the monument speaker. Hence the speaker pairs are ostensibly similar to those in the monument texts, but the reception situation is different. Despite this, I think that the play with the monumental speaker roles is intentional, as is also the case in example number 36. The writers could use this discrepancy to make the fictional situations lively.

In an epigram by Leonidas of Tarentum, it is implied that the passerby/reader should actually give up the old traditions:

37. τὴν ἐπ’ ἐμεῖ στήλην παραμείβεο, μήτε με χαίρειν εἰπών, μήθ’ ὅστις, μή τίνος ἔξετάσας· ἢ μή τὴν ἀνύεις τελέσαις ὁδὸν· ἢν δὲ παρέλθης σιγῇ, μηδ’ οὔτως ἢν ἀνύεις τελέσαις.

Pass by the pillar upon me, and don’t greet me. Don’t ask ‘who and whose son are you?’ Don’t inquire of my parentage. If you do, may you never reach the end of your road. But if you go by in silence, even so may you not reach the end of your road.

(Translation by Tueller with minor amendments)

In this monologue, the deceased refers to a typical dialogue situation, but tells the passerby not to ask greet him/her, and not to make enquiries. The last two verses, which do not particularly wish the passerby well, are also somewhat different from the verse inscription conventions, and this is of course intentional.

3.4 Conclusion

Type 1 is chronologically the first and also the most common of the dialogue epigram types. These epigrams consist of on adjacency pair: X – Y. There are always two

---

speakers, and in most cases, they have one turn each, but, occasionally, one of them has an extra turn either at the beginning \((1 + X – Y)\) or at the end of the epigram \((X – Y + 1)\). The pairs can be question–answer pairs (the most common pair), greeting pairs or statement–response pairs. The function of the question–answer pairs is to offer facts about the deceased or the honorand: who has died or e.g. set up a building, why, and so on. With a question, the passerby can motivate a reply that reveals these facts. Similar facts can be told in the turn of a relative, if the deceased first asks e.g. ‘why do you cry’. More abstract questions, such as we find in the non-inscribed epigrams, e.g. the question about life after death in Timon epigram (no. 35), are not prominent in the verse inscriptions.

All the speaker pairs are found in the type-1 epigrams. That being said, most of the type-1 epigrams are either passerby–monument or passerby–deceased dialogues, while relative–deceased pairs are remarkably less common in type-1 epigrams. In some cases, however, the speaker roles cause confusion. This is the case in some epigrams with a possible relative role (is it the monument or the relative speaking?), and in some cases, it is difficult to say whether the speaker is the monument or the passerby (for example, greetings addressed to the deceased), but usually there are factors in each epigram that can help in the identification of the speakers. Our interpretation of the speaker may change during the course of reading the epigram.

The turns and the speakers, as well as the change of both, are indicated by features such as address, imperative, interrogatives and repetition. These are combined in various ways, for example interrogative + address and interrogative + address + imperative. These are most common in the first turn (often a question), but are also possible in the reply/response turn. Greetings are also common. There are either greeting pairs or epigrams with a greeting that produces a response or a statement followed by a greeting. In the statement–response pairs, features such as address are used to denote the speakers, just as in question–answer pairs, for instance.

\(^{276}\) PB – MON, PB – DEC, REL – DEC. The narrator role, mentioned in Chapter 2, is absent in the t1 epigrams.
All of these features are visible in the four main variants of type 1. Variants 1–3 are adjacency pairs in which the turns are either both short (variant 1), one turn is short and one longer (variant 2) or both turns are long (variant 3). Short and long are of course relative concepts, but the rule of thumb is that, in a long turn, there are several moves, and these turns are several verses long. Variant 2 can contain, for example, a short question that is given a reply, and, after that, the second speaker offers additional information on the subject, or talks on a more general level; therefore, the epigram consists of a short question and a broad reply. This variant can also be found in greeting pairs, where a name + χαῖρε can produce a response turn with information or a lament about the deceased. Variant 3 can contain, for example, several questions in the first turn and replies to all of them in the second. The number of the moves in the first and second turns or verses does not have to be identical, however. In variant 4, there is an extra turn that belongs to the adjacency pair, so that these three turns form a three-turn unit. The third turn is a reaction to the pair or one turn of the pair (in the end of the epigram), or it is the initiative that causes a clear adjacency pair (when the extra turn is at the beginning of the epigram). In both cases, the extra turn is clearly linked to an adjacency pair. The variation of moves is the factor that causes these four different combinations of type 1.

The division of the turns is not always unproblematic: in some cases, there are several options. Some controversial cases of, for example, speaker roles, are also discussed, and I offer explanations for my suggestions. It is also noteworthy that title lines and prose lines with additional information tend to become common, as the examples in this chapter show, and, furthermore, that the ambiguity of the speaker roles was often intentional.

Type-1 epigrams are frequent in the non-inscribed epigrams as well, in which the fictionality of the speech acts is often emphasised. The few examples I offer in this chapter show that they share similarities with the verse inscriptions, but also differences. The same general themes (e.g. ‘grave inscriptions’) can be used, but in the non-inscribed epigrams, the treatment of the theme is often different from in the monumental texts. The roles and the reception situation are also inevitably different from those in the verse inscriptions, despite the similarities. The satirical
twist, known so well from the later European epigram tradition, can already be seen, as in the epigram by Callimachus (no. 35 in this chapter) that plays with the misanthrope Timon in the form of a funerary epigram. Non-inscribed epigrams no doubt affected the post-classical monumental texts, but they also bear some patterns familiar from the earlier monument verse inscriptions.

Table 4: Type-1 epigrams in verse inscriptions according to their variants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variant 1</th>
<th>IG II/III² 7711 = GVI 1386 = SEG 36, 269 = SEG 37, 192</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GVI 1835 = SGO 3, 14/07/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GVI 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGO 2, 10/02/31 = SEG 33, 1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IG XII 7, 490 = GVI 1856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IG II/III² 11606a = GVI 1841 = SEG 30, 268 = SEG 31, 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IC II xiv 27 = GVI 1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGO 2, 08/04/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GVI 1831 (frgm.) = SEG 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGO 1, 01/12/05 = CEG 429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGO 2, 08/01/44 = GVI 1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GVI 1854 = SGO 2, 08/04/06 = SEG 42, 926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IG XIV, 1514a = GVI 1886 = SEG 42, 926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGO 2, 08/01/49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGO 1, 03/02/198 (‘halbmetrisch’ (SGO))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGO 1, 05/01/18 = AG 9.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGO 2, 09/11/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IC IV 391, no. 432 = SEG 28, 739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GVI 1878 = SGO 4, 20/16/02 = SEG 7, 329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGO 1, 02/09/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGO 2, 09/07/09 = SEG 28, 995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GVI 1851 = SGO 2, 08/01/39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IG II/III² 12794 = GVI 1836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corinth 8, 1, no. 89 = IG IV 1603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[SGO 1, 04/16/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEG 23, 434 = GG 429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IG II/III² 13166 = GVI 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GVI 1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGO 4, 20/06/01 = SEG 17, 756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IG XII 3, 220 = GVI 1832 = SEG 60, 894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rife 2008, 132 = SEG 58, 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GVI 1867 (frgm.) = SEG 11, 383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGO 1, 04/24/16 = SEG 57, 1206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGO 2, 08/04/98 (frgm.,)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGO 3, 14/04/02 = GVI 1839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 21 (2; 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ch. 2; 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ch. 2; 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ch. 2; 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 6 (2; 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ch. 2; 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ch. 2; 7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

277 The variants are: 1 = two short turns; 2 = one short and one longer turn; 3 = two longer turns; 4 = a three-turn unit.

278 Possibly; very fragmentary, so even the type is not certain, but t1 is perhaps most probable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variant 3</th>
<th>variant 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GVI 1834</strong></td>
<td><strong>IGPannonia 8 = GVI 1853</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GVI 1833</strong></td>
<td><strong>GVI 1869</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smyrna 249 = SGO 1, 05/01/32 = GVI 1879 = SEG 49, 1478</strong></td>
<td><strong>Smyrna 225 = GVI 1884 = SGO 1, 05/01/65 = SEG 38, 1224 = SEG 58, 1742</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SGO 4, 20/02/01 = GVI 1877 = BÉ 1953</strong></td>
<td><strong>IG XIV 769 = GVI 1883 = SEG 37, 784-786 = SEG 44, 817</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SGO 4, 19/10/01 = AG 7.426 = SEG 30, 1562 = SEG 57, 2092</strong></td>
<td><strong>SGO 1, 02/14/06</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SGO 1, 05/01/57</strong></td>
<td><strong>IG VII 3110 = GVI 1838 = SEG 49, 2440</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Olympia 5, 225</strong></td>
<td><strong>GVI 1876</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IG II/III 12067 = GVI 1387 = GG 101 = CEG 530 = SEG 29, 259 GVI 1885</strong></td>
<td><strong>SGO 4, 18/01/26</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SGO 4, 21/07/01 = SEG 58, 1743 &amp; 1885 = SEG 60, 1927(3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SGO 2, 11/07/05 = AG 16.201</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GVI 1876</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SGO 1, 16/06/01 = SEG 6, 210</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SGO 4, 17/09/01 = SEG 56, 1111</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEG 55, 775 (= SEG 35, 763)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GVI 1849 = SGO 2, 09/06/99</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SGO 1, 05/01/19 = AG 9.670</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEG 18, 269</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SGO 4, 18/01/24</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SGO 4, 20/27/01 = SEG 44, 1566 = SEG 57, 2172</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SGO 2, 09/04/06 = SEG 51, 1707</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SGO 1, 01/12/20</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>no. 27</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>no. 29</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>no. 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>no. 19 (2; 12)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>no. 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>no. 28</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>no. 9</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ch. 2; 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

279 If we read following Peek; Robinson 1905, 320 reads as a monologue.
4. TYPE-2 EPIGRAMS

The earliest type-2 verse inscriptions date to the 1st or 2nd centuries BCE. The vast majority of them, however, date to the 1st, 2nd and 3rd centuries CE. The latest example, on the other hand, dates to the 6th century CE. It is clear that, in the period when type 2 was popular, the literary epigram was already a steady and blooming phenomenon, and type 2 seems to exhibit some literary influence on verse inscriptions. Thirtyone of the epigrams in this dialogue epigram corpus are type 2 (28%). Type-2 epigrams consist of several adjacency pairs: X – Y n. The minimum amount of pairs is naturally two, but in most of the type-2 epigrams, there are more. In the paradigm above, n marks the varying number of pairs.

There may also be extra turns in addition to the pairs. These extra turns occur in 11 type-2 epigrams. In nine of these, there is one extra turn in each, either at the beginning (three cases) or at the end of the epigram (six cases). In addition to this, two epigrams contain two extra turns each. The extra turns are, for example, an opening statement, an opening greeting, a closing greeting without a response or a closing wish without a response. There may also be a closing greeting pair, a wish pair or a statement–response pair after a question–answer structure. These are more frequent than, for example, opening greetings.

I will discuss all of these variants of pair structure and provide examples in Section 4.2., but before that I will analyse the language use of type 2 in Section 4.1. First, I will discuss the core elements of the type and sum up the similarities of their structure to that of type-1 epigrams. I will then proceed to examine the use of particles (4.1.1), since this is particularly characteristic of the structure of type-2 epigrams and essential for the cohesion of the texts; this section is quite brief. Following this, I will discuss other features of language, present examples and analyse the language, including the use of particles in further examples (4.1.2).

---

280 The earliest ones are IG IX 1, 878, dated to 199–150 BCE; GVI 1859 from 2nd/1st century BCE; and GVI 1862 from 1st century BCE/1st century CE. Of the late ones, GVI 1887 is dated to 3rd/4th century CE and SGO 4, 21/23/06 to 6th century CE. In addition to these, GVI 1848, GVI 1858 and SGO 3, 16/08/01 are undated.

281 For comparison: ca 38% of fictive dialogue epigrams are t2.

282 cf. the table at the end of Section 4.4.
After discussing type-2 verse inscriptions, I will scrutinise the connections between type-2 verse inscriptions and non-inscribed epigrams (4.3). The division into fictional and non-fictional epigrams is of course somewhat arbitrary; for example, an epigram written by Antipater Sidon (AG 7.164) was also cut into stone (GVI 1843, Saqqarah, Egypt; no. 14 in this chapter). In many epigrams, certain patterns and wordings are repeated (more so than in type 1), which has its roots in the earlier verse-inscription tradition. These repeated patterns are visible in both verse inscriptions and non-inscribed epigrams, and the similarities between them show a mutual influence.

4.1 Building conversations in the multiple-turn epigrams

The core element of type-2 epigrams is the question–answer pair. Each type-2 epigram has at least one question–answer pair, most of them several, and approximately half of the type-2 epigrams consist solely of question–answer pairs. Other adjacency pairs frequently found are pairs of wishes at the end of epigrams. In addition to the pairs, a sole greeting turn or a sole wish turn attached to the multi-pair epigram (i.e. +1) can also occur.

The length of the turns in type 2 varies. Some epigrams contain, for example, 6–8 short and succinct adjacency pairs and some contain 2–3 pairs consisting of longer turns. It is not unusual to have a turn that does not form a whole sentence, but is just one word or a little more. On the other hand, turns that are several verses long also occur, and in some examples, all the turns of the epigram contain many verses. Of course, variation may occur within an epigram: there might be, for example, several pairs with short turns and then one long reply turn to a short question. In other words, all of the combinations of pair structures we saw in type 1 are possible in type-2 epigrams, and several of them may occur within one epigram.

As the examples in the following section will show, many features used in type-1 epigrams may also be seen in type 2, especially in the opening turns:

283 Variants in Section 3.2.
interrogative pronouns, imperatives and addresses occur frequently. In the following turns also, especially in question turns, the structures are often similar to certain type-1 structures. It is a characteristic of type-2 epigrams that particles are used both to separate certain units (and parts within the units) and to link larger units together.

4.1.1 Particles

In the dialogue consisting of several adjacency pairs, particles are used to link the units to one other. They can connect turns, for example a reply to a statement, or a question turn to previous questions. On the other hand, they separate units, for example a wish pair from a series of question–answer pairs, or a cluster of new information following the previous information within a turn. Hence, particles guide the audience.

In Greek inscriptions, a certain set of particles is commonly used. In other words, certain particles are frequent, but the variety is not large. Morpurgo Davies points out that, prior to 400 BCE, only καί, δέ, τε and τε... καί combinations occur frequently in inscriptions. In addition to these, ἀλλά and μέν occur relatively often, and the rest of the particles less so.284 Dialogue epigrams show similar tendencies. Morpurgo Davies’ data consists of Arcadian texts, whereas the present material comes from a wide area, and most of it, especially in type 2, is several centuries later than hers, but the basic situation is the same: only a few particles are frequent, and connectors are essential.

In type 2, the particles are abundant in number, but the same particles are repeated, while others are rare. The most frequent particles in the data are δέ and καί – they may occur several times even within one epigram. Others that occur more than once or twice are ἀλλά, γάρ and γέ, along with the prohibitives μή and οὐκ. Certain particles may have several usages, for example δέ can be a connector, it can be adversative or it can introduce a question about a new topic, and so on. While connectives are frequent, each of them may have other functions as well.

I would also like to point out that, because certain particles and patterns are frequent, the particles for their part make it easier to mark, for example, a change of speaker. Particles do not necessarily mark the change itself, but the patterns formed with them made it easier for the reader or listener to distinguish the speakers and the units of each speaker (both the turns and the units within the turns).

When discussing type-1 examples, I briefly mentioned the use of particles in some cases.\textsuperscript{285} In those epigrams, δὲλα occurred several times, and we find similar use in some type-2 epigrams.\textsuperscript{286} In the dialogue, it very often separates clusters of information within one turn, as we have seen,\textsuperscript{287} but it may also introduce a new pair type, as the examples will show. The most frequent particle in type 2, however, is δέ. It is a connective with both continuative and adversative functions.\textsuperscript{288} The main use of δέ in type-2 epigrams concerns the question turns, and it is most often accompanied by an interrogative.\textsuperscript{289} In such cases, the particle links the question turn to a chain of questions, i.e. it introduces a new question connected with the previous ones.\textsuperscript{290} In each epigram, it first occurs in the second or third question turn, and from there on it can vary: it may be used in every question turn or in every other one. The closest semantic meaning of δέ in such contexts is: ‘what about…’ Hence, it both connects the discourse units and, as Bakker states, works as a boundary.\textsuperscript{291}

In reply turns, δέ is used, for example, in cases where several questions have been asked in one turn, and they are all replied to in one turn; for example:

\textsuperscript{285} See nos. 4, 7, 8 and 18 in Chapter 3.
\textsuperscript{286} There are also particles in t1, but they are more frequent in t2. Within the turns, the use of particles is similar to t2 (e.g. δέ is used to mark the transition to a new question, but in t1, this happens in one turn, whereas in t2 the questions are spread over several question turns [in several adjacency pairs]). In t2, the particles have a more significant role in connecting the turns and the pairs together, and because of that I chose to discuss the particles in more detail in this chapter and to mention only briefly the few particle examples in Chapter 3.
\textsuperscript{287} It takes the first place in the sentence, and it has a strong adversative tone, although it may also be progressive, as we saw in the t1 epigrams.
\textsuperscript{288} Denniston 1951, 162. Bakker 1993b, 277 points out that the term ‘connective particle’ is a traditional grammatical term, and he concentrates more on its function in the structure of discourse. For postpositives (e.g. particles like ὡς, ἦ, and ἤδε, among others), see Dik 1995, 32–4.
\textsuperscript{289} ‘The speaker proceeds from the known to the unknown, and δέ denotes that the information he already possesses is inadequate’: Denniston 1951, 173.
\textsuperscript{290} Denniston 1951, 171: ‘In dialogue, when one question has been answered, and a second question asked (introduced by δὲ or some other connecting particle), the second answer is sometimes introduced by δέ. The use of a connective in such a case, though not necessary, is natural enough, in Greek as in English’.
\textsuperscript{291} Bakker 1993b, 277. For the connectivity between the units, see Blakemoore 2004, 232 and 221–2.
Q: τίς; πόθεν; — A: οὔνομα Χ, πατρίς δέ Υ.

In such cases, δέ shifts the focus from one (new) fact to another. Ruijgh calls this ‘transitive’.\(^{292}\) Similarly, there is a transitional contrast in μέν–δέ structures.\(^{293}\) In dialogue epigrams, this structure is used in response turns, and it also marks a shift from one part of the answer to another.

Another frequent particle is the connective καί, especially in greeting and wish pairs, as the first word of the second (response) turn:

NN χαῖρε.— χαῖρε καί σύ—

/ — καί σύ γε—

While δέ connects the discourse units to the preceding one(s), καί functions within the unit as a continuative.\(^{294}\) On the level of the pairs, καί often connects, for example, information segments to one other within a certain turn, but it may also link the parts of the adjacency pair, as in the example of the greetings above.

The particles ἀλλά, γάρ and γε also occur in dialogue epigrams, but less frequently than the two mentioned above. Other particles aside from the ones mentioned in this chapter occur sporadically.

The following rather long epigram from Athens is an excellent example of particle use.\(^{295}\) In this epigram, the particles are frequent, and not only δέ, but also other particles, are used to organise the text:

1. Κλαύδιος Χαρίτων Περίνθιος.
   τίς πόθεν ὦν ἐνταῦθα ὑπὸ χθονὶ τῇ δε τέθαψαι; —
   οὔνομα μὲν Χαρίτων, πάτρη δὲ μοι ἐστι Περίνθιος. —

---

\(^{292}\) Ruijgh 1971, 128–30. For descriptive approaches to δέ, see Ruijgh and also Kühner and Gerth 1904, 261–3.

\(^{293}\) Bakker 1993b, 303.

\(^{294}\) Bakker 1993b, 277 and 288.

\(^{295}\) I read the squeeze in Berlin (archive of IG), but I present no new readings. cf. IG II/III\(^2\) 10073, GV/1 1864, Athens, 2\(^{nd}/3\(^{rd}\) century CE. The beginning of this epigram is discussed in Chapter 2 (no. 16), but there I present only the first lines and discuss them from the perspective of connections between the title and the epigram. cf. Sayar 1998.
πώς δὲ καὶ ἐνταῦθ᾽ ἡλθες ἐπὶ πτολείθρον Ἀθήνης; —

εἰνεκέν εὐνοίας ἐκτρόφῳ ἐσπόμενος. —

τίς δὲ σε ὕκυμόροιο φάσος ἀπενόσφισε νοῦσος; —
αἰφνίδιον φρεῖκος καὶ κρατερὸς πυρετός. —
pόσσων δ᾽ ἢς ἔτεων, ὃτ᾽ ἀπέφθισο τῇδ᾽ ἐνι γαίῃ; —
pέμπτω κείκοστώ μοῖραν ἔτην στυγερήν. —

ἀ δεῖλ᾽, σοῦ ἐφθος ἢν πατρίδα γαῖαν ἰκέσθαι; —
tῇδε γὰρ ἐν γαίῃ μοῖραν ἔχρην τελέσαι. —
σήμα δὲ σοι τίς ἐτευξέ ἐκαὶ τάρχυσέν σε θανόντα; —
ξύντροφος, ὡς ἐπόμην ἐνθάδε ἐρχομένω. —
tίς δὲ σοι ἐν ζωοίσι γένους ἀπολείπεται σώος; —

μοῦνος ἄδελφος μοι λείπεται ἐγ γενεης. —
ἀλλ᾽ οὖν κὰν κεῖνόν γε θεοὶ σώζοιεν ἐς ἀεί. —
και σὺ φιληγορίης ᾃξια δώρα λάβοις.

Claudius Chariton from Perinthus.

Who and from where are you, (you who are) buried here under the earth? — My name is Chariton, my fatherland Perinthus. — And how did you come here, to the city of Athena, then? — Because out of good will I followed my companion. — Which disease robbed you of the light, prematurely? — A sudden shivering and severe fever.
 — How old were you when you died (and went) here under the ground? — In my 25th year I suffered the miserable lot. — Poor wretch, did you not reach your fatherland before that? — It was my fate to face the end of my life in this land. — And who built this monument for you and buried you solemnly when you had died?
 — A companion whom I followed when he was coming here. — And who of your family is left behind alive? — Of my family only a brother is left. — Well, then, may the gods save at least him forever. — And may you receive gifts worthy of your friendly attitude.

The speakers here are the passerby and the deceased. Throughout the epigram, both questions and answers are rather simple, and are one verse each. The metre and conversation are hence synchronised (stichomythic): each turn consists of one verse,
so one pair is always two verses long – Q: hexameter, A: pentameter. The same applies to the last pair, which is a pair of wishes. Hence, each adjacency pair (eight in total) forms an elegiac distich.

After the title line, the epigram begins with a question turn in line 2: τίς πόθεν ὡν---. The question is asked by the passerby. There are two interrogatives in a row in this turn, and, as in many type-1 epigrams, these two questions are replied to in one answer turn, i.e. all this information is given within one adjacency pair. In this opening turn, the interrogatives are accompanied by the participle ὡν, i.e. τίς πόθεν ὡν, followed by the deictic ἐναὖθα ὑπὸ χθονί τῆς, after which follows the verb τέθαψαι. The use of the second person singular (τέθαψαι) indicates that the addressee is the deceased. The deceased then replies to τίς πόθεν (the second turn), and in this turn the μὲν−δὲ structure is used to separate the information clusters of this reply: οὗνομα μὲν Χαρίτων, πάτρη δέ μοι ἔστι Πέρινθος.

The particles are also used in the second question turn (l. 4): πῶς<ς δ>έ καί---. Here, δέ introduces another question, and καί links this unit with the previous adjacency pair. The reply to this begins with εἶνεκεν in line 5: εἶνεκεν εὔνοιάς ἐξυπνόφω ἐσπόμενος. This makes it easy to note the beginning of the reply: the question is why or how the deceased is buried in this land, and the answer turn begins with because, and then gives the explanation.

The next two questions (ll. 6 and 8) comprise an interrogative + δέ: in line 6, τίς δέ σε --- ἀπενόσφαι---; and in line 8, πόσοσιν δ᾽ ἡς ἐτέων---. In both of these verses, δέ introduces a new question turn. After these two pairs, the question in line 10 begins with ἃ δεῖλ᾽ οὐδ᾽---. The exclamation and address ἃ + δεῖλ᾽ shows the direction of the speech (PB -> DEC), and οὐδ᾽ links this turn to the chain of questions. In the reply turn, γὰρ is used when the deceased explains the situation: τῇδε γὰρ ἐν γαῖῃ μοῖραν ἔχρην τελέσαι – It was my fate....[and that is why]. The particle marks this passage as an explanation which differs from the main story line. In the last two questions, δέ is still used: in line 12, αῆμα δέ σοι τί<ς> ἐτευξέ---, and in line 14, τίς δέ σοι---ἀπολείπεται. There is also some kind of repetition here:

---

296 As noted by, e.g., Wakker 2009, 63, ‘it is generally agreed that (connective) particles play an important role in marking the transition from one discourse unit to another...’.  
297 cf. Bakker, 2009, 41. In other words, γὰρ is used to introduce further explanation.
The core element of the information is given directly at the beginning of the answer turns: τίς---\(\rightarrow\) ξύντροφος (l. 13) and τίς---\(\rightarrow\) μοῦνος ἀδελφός (l. 15). It is hence easy to follow the change of speaker.

After seven question–answer pairs (ll. 1–15), there is a pair of wishes, and the passerby directs the recipient’s attention towards the wish pair with particles that link the turn to the previous (l. 16): ἀλλ’ οὖν καν κεῖνον γε---. The wish that follows is in the optative, as usual: θεοί σώζοιεν ἐς ἄει.298 In the previous turn, the deceased stated that he left behind a brother, and here the passerby wishes that the brother of the deceased would live forever (symbolically). The deceased replies by hoping that the passerby would get a reward for such kindness to his brother, καὶ σὺ φιληγορίας ἄξια δῶρα λάβοις. This begins with a particle (καὶ σὺ structure) and ends with an optative, λάβοις. As a whole, the wish pair consists of: ἀλλ’ οὖν καν κεῖνον γε θεοί σώζοιεν ἐς ἄει – καὶ σὺ φιληγορίας ἄξια δῶρα λάβοις.

To sum up, the particles used in this epigram are:299

| Table 5: Particles in epigram no. 1 of Chapter 4 |
|----------------------------------|---|
| δέ                    | lines 3, 4, 6, 8, 12, 14 | either marks the information clusters within a turn (l. 3, μέν–δέ structure) or marks a new question turn (the rest of the occurrences) |
| μεν                    | line 3                       | see above |
| καὶ                    | lines 4, 7, 12, 16, 17       | connects the turns to the previous one (ll. 4, 12 [within the transition to new type of pair] and 17) or information within a turn (ll. 7, 12) |
| οὐδέ                   | line 10                      | cf. δέ introducing a new question |
| γάρ                   | line 11                      | explanatory in answer |
| ἀλλά                   | line 16                      | marks the transition to the wish pair (from the Q–A pairs) |

298 Optative is the most commonly used mood in wishes.
299 I have collected all of them in this table in order to make the usage clear; I will not, however, provide particle tables for each epigram in this chapter, but I will analyse the particles in the text.
In the following epigram, the length of the verses varies from half a verse to several verses each, and particles are frequent in this one as well.\(^{300}\)

2.

Αἴθαλος Ἐλάτη τῇ | ἑαυτοῦ γυναικὶ φιλοσ| τοργίας καὶ μνήμης | αἰώνιοι χάριν.

φράζε, γυναίκι, γενεήν, ὄνομα, χθόνα, πῶς δὲ θανούσα

ήλθες δειλαία δύσγαμος εἰς Αἴδαν,

ὅπως οἱ παράγοντες ἀναγνώσουν ὀδεῖται

τὸν σὴν οἰκτροτάτην δύσμορον ἡλικίνην. —

5 εἰμί μὲν ἐκ [Λυδῶν], γενεή δὲ μοὶ ἐστι Θυάτειρα,

οὖνομά [μοι δ᾽ Ἐλάτη[ι]], τὸ φίλοι διέθεντο τροφής. —

σῆμα δὲ [τίς] τὸ[δ᾽ ἐχωσ]εν; — ἐμὸς πόσις ὁ πρὶν ἀθικτὰ

ἡμετέρης λύσας[ας] ἀμμιατα παρθενίης,

ὡλεσε δ᾽ ό τοκετός με λυγρός, Μοῖραι δὲ ῥοπῆ μοι

10 εἰς νόσον, εἰς πένθη[ι] καὶ μόρον ἠντίσασαν. —

ὅ καὶ ἅπας; — οὔ, ἥξειν. λέλουτα γὰρ ἐν νεότητι

τ[ρι]σσούς ἀρτιγενεῖς παιδὰς ἐν ὀρφανίη. —

ἐἐν ἐν ὀλβίστη πολιή τριχ. hēdena —καὶ σὸν, ὀδεῖτα,

εὐδιον εὐθύνοι πάντα τύχη[ι] βίοτον.

15 ὅστις ἐμεῖς στήλλαν βαλέει λίθον οὐκ ἀδικηθεῖς,

οὗτος τὰν αὐτὰν μοῖραν ἐμοὶ λαχέτω.

\(^{300}\) SGO 3, 16/55/03; cf. GVI 1870 = GG 431, Philomelion (Phrygia), 1\(^{st}\) century CE. SGO follows the turn division given by Anderson 1898, 112, which is the one I give here. The edition by Peek is slightly different (his reading of the seventh verse also differs from this). See also Calder 1932, 455–6, esp. for line 11 (v. 7). There are similarities to this epigram in AG 7.164 by Antipater of Sidon, e.g. the first verse up until χθόνα, the entirety of verse 11 and some verses and phrases throughout the epigram. See Gow and Page for a detailed analysis.
Aithalos for his wife Elate for her affectionateness, and for the sake of eternal memory.

Tell, woman, your family, name, country, how did you die, and how did you, wretched and ill-wedded, come to Hades – so that the wanderers who pass by would read (about) your most sorrowful, pitiful young age. – I am from [Lydia], but my family is from Thyateira, and [my] name given by my beloved rearers is [E]late. – [Who erect]ed this monument? – My husband, who once loosened the untouched tie of my virginity. Baneful delivery did not kill me; the Moiras turned me violently in disease, sorrow and death. – Were you also childless? – No, stranger; I have left three young children orphans. – May those three (live) happily (and) get gray hair. – And may fate guide you straight for (your) whole life. – Whoever throws a stone on my stele, if he was not an object of wrong-doing, may he have the same destiny as I did.

The speakers in this epigram are the passerby and the deceased. The first turn is by the passerby, and it is four verses long. It begins with the imperative φράξε and the address γύναι. After that, everything the deceased woman should tell is listed in the accusative. This is similar to the opening turn of one type-1 epigram (see no. 10 in Chapter 3) — instead of the interrogatives, the question comprises an imperative and accusatives. Note that δέ is used in this first: φράξε, γύναι, γενεήν, ὀνομα, χθόνα, πῶς δὲ θανοῦσα .... Here, δέ links together the parts of the question: Tell abc, (and) how you did you die--.

The deceased answers these multiple questions with one reply turn, starting from line 5. Again, the particles are used to structure the turn: μέν–δέ in εἰμί μὲν ἐκ [Λυδῶν], γενεή δέ μοί ἐστι Θυάτειρα. After this, the particle δέ is used on its own when the deceased proceeds to tell her own name (οὔνομά [μοι δ´ Ελά]τη), but this of course is a restoration.301 This question turn, as well as the following two verses, shows how δέ especially is used to structure the sentences and to organise the turns – line 7: σῆμα δέ, and line 9: ὀλεσε δ´. In these cases, it introduces the new question turn, as in example number 1 in this chapter. When used in this way, δέ is typically the second word of the sentence.

301 By Calder 1932. cf. Calder (idem), 452–64 for the curses common in inscriptions from Phrygia (cf. ll. 15–16).
In line 11, the question is connected to the previous ones by καί instead of δέ: ἦ καί ἂπας; The answer turn also begins in line 11, and the passerby is addressed (ξεῖνε). The recipient knows by now who the speakers are, so there is no need to identify them, but with the address, the change of speaker is easier to recognise. This reply turn begins with οὐ, and γάρ is then used: οὐ, ξεῖνε λέλοιπον γάρ ἐν νεότητι /τρισσοῦς ἄρτιγενεῖς παῖδας ἐν ὀρφανίῃ (no stranger, for I have left three young children orphans).

The last adjacency pair of this epigram is a pair of wishes, composed once again of optatives. In the first wish, the optative is εἰεν---. The response turn begins with a particle and an address (καὶ σῶν, ὁδεῖτα), as in the previous epigram and the wishes (cf. καὶ σῶ γε structure in the greetings) and optative follow: καὶ σῶν, ὁδεῖτα, / εὐδιον εὐθύνοι πάντα τύχη βίοτον. After thus returning the wish, the deceased continues (same turn; II. 15–16), but he directs these last verses to the passersby on a more general level: ὁστις ἐμεῖ θῃλλαν βαλέει λίθον --- τὰν αὐτὰν μοῦραν ἐμοὶ λαχέτω. The text is mostly composed of elegiac distichs, but the end of verse 5 is not metrically correct and the next (i.e. v. 6) is a hexameter.

In the following epigram, the same patterns are used as above, but a variation of the question–answer structure occurs in the first verse:

3. τίς τίνος ἦν εἰρή, Κλάδος οὖνο-μα· καὶ τίς ὁ θρέψας; | Μηνόφιλος.
θνήσκω δ᾽ ἐκ τίνος; — ἐκ πυρε-τοῦ. | — κάπῳ πόσων ἑτέων; — τρισ-
καίδεκα. — ᾗρά γ᾽ ἄμουσος; | — οὐ τέ-λεον, Μοῦσας δ᾽ οὐ μέγα φει-
λάμενος, | ἔσοχα δ᾽ ἔρμεια με-
μελημένος· ἐν γάρ ἀγῶσιν | πολλάκις αἴνητὸν στέμμα

---

302 These kinds of curses on grave monuments were common in Phrygia.
303 Anderson 1898, 112. As Anderson also points out, ‘such irregularities sometimes occur in these epigrams’. This applies especially to the epigrams from Asia Minor.
304 IMT Olympe 2691 = GVI 1862 = SGO 2, 08/08/10, 1st century BCE/ 1st century CE, or 1st/2nd century CE (IMT, Peek).
If you ask, ‘Who and whose’, Klados was the name. ‘And who was the rearer?’ — Menophilus. — ‘And what caused my death?’ — Fever. — ‘How old were you?’ — Thirteen. — ‘And were you unartistic?’ — Not completely, but the Muses did not like me especially; instead, I was taken care of by Hermes particularly. In competitions, I often obtained a praiseworthy garland in wrestling. Apphia, who buried me, was my rearer; she erected (this) portrait for me and set this memorial on the grave.

What about the speakers in this epigram? At the beginning, the deceased says if you ask who and whose son [I’ll tell]: Klados was the name. This is arranged with ή εἰρη and the interrogatives: τίς τίνος ἢν εἰρη, Κλάδος οὐνομα. The addressee here is the passerby, and we know that the speaker is the deceased because he uses the first person singular, θνήσκω. The opening sentence includes both the question turn and the reply, embedded in the sentence with the help of the verbal forms. After this turn, the epigram seemingly continues like a ‘normal’ passerby–deceased epigram with four adjacency pairs. Throughout the poem, however, the thought of ‘if you ask me’ is linked to the questions, even though it is not repeated after the initial line. This is especially obvious in line 3, where the first person singular is used: θνήσκω δ’ ἐκ τίνος; — and (if you ask) how did I die——.

In this epigram, the question turns are short and the particles play a significant role in them. In the first question, the opening turn by the deceased, there is simply a double interrogative question (τίς τίνος), but after that, a variety of particles are used to build up the question turns — line 2: καὶ τίς——; line 3: θνήσκω δ’——; line 4: κἀπο πόσων ἔτέων; and line 5: ἄρα γ’; In other words, every question turn is introduced by a particle, and not only with δέ, but with a variety of particles. Also, particles are used for continuation in the last reply turn, which is five verses long — line 6: Μοῦσαις δ’ οὐ——; line 7: ἔξοχα δ’ Ἔρμεία——; line 8: ἐν γάρ ἀγώσιν——; line 11:

303 For a different turn division, see Peek GVI 1862. cf. Rasche 1910, 33.
Ἀπφία ἦ θάψασα δ᾽---; and line 12: καὶ τύμβω σῆμ᾽---. In this passage, δὲ introduces new information within the turn, γάρ is connected to οὐ (not...but) and καὶ connects the two parallel information units.

The speaker throughout the epigram is the deceased, who refers to an imaginary, potential conversation. Yet, that conversation is the one which the reader is having with the epitaph, and, as the structure, except for verse 1, is identical to the type-2 dialogue epigrams, I wanted to include the epigram here. The epigram is clearly an adaption of, and heavily influenced by, dialogue-form epigrams.

These three examples show some basic ways of using the particles in type-2 epigrams. As certain particles are frequent, I will discuss further examples in the following section, where I will also address the other features of language in type 2.

4.1.2 Language of type-2 epigrams

As briefly noted already, there are many similarities between type-1 and type-2 epigrams as regards the language. In question structures, such features as interrogative-only questions naturally occur, but questions with address and imperatives are also frequent. In fact, imperatives are more frequently used in the question turns in type 2 than in type 1. In type 2, different kinds of question structures are applied, i.e. there may be variation within one epigram, which also helps to follow the conversation. There can be, for example, a question without a marker, followed by a question with an address. On the level of the whole epigram, we may thus see several structures that are familiar from the type-1 epigrams.

---

306 For the structure of this turn, see the third variant of t1 with answer turns that offer additional information.
307 Peek indeed includes this in his dialogue section: GVI 1862.
308 Compare also to the embedded dialogues of t3; see Chapter 5.
309 For particles in a shorter epigram, see, e.g., GVI 1848 and AG 7.734 (anonymous):
Μή, ἔνεν ὄδηςα, σπεῦδε. — τί γάρ; — νέκυς, ὥ ποτε παῖδων τῶν ἄναθῶν τὰ φιλ᾽ ἔν, Ἀρχις ἔγων ὁ γέρων. — ἀλλὰ φίλος γ᾽ ὦ πρέσβυ, γένοιτό τοι ὁλίγια τέκνα ἐλθεῖν καὶ λευκῆς ἐς δρόμον ἡλικίας. In this epigram, γάρ reacts to the opening of the monument and introduces the question, whereas ἀλλὰ φίλος γ᾽ introduces the closing wish after the Q – As.
In our next example, there are only two question–answer pairs, which form three verses.\(^{310}\)

4. τεῦ σ᾽ ἐνέπειν χρήν τύμβον; — ἀγακλειτοῖο Νέπ[ωτος].

— καὶ τίς Κεκροπιδῶν γείνατο τόνδε; φράσον.

— οὐκ ἦν ἐκ γαίης Κεκροπηίδος, ἀλλ᾽ ἀπὸ Θρῆ[κης].

*Whose tomb should you say this is? — Of the very famous Nep[os].— And who of the sons of Cecrops begot him? Tell. — He was not from the Cecropean land, but from Thrace.*

The speakers are the passerby and the monument. The monument is the addressee in the first turn, wherein the identity of the deceased is requested. The monument then answers in the reply turn: ἀγακλειτοῖο Νέπ[ωτος]. The second question turn begins with the particle καὶ and ends with an imperative: καὶ τίς Κεκροπιδῶν γείνατο τόνδε; φράσον. The particle links the question with the previous one, and it is clear that the speaker changes again after the imperative at the end of the verse. In the reply turn to this (the third verse), the third person singular is used for telling about the deceased. This of course means that the speaker cannot be the deceased. In the answer turn, the question (τίς Κεκροπιδῶν) elicits the response that he was not from the Cecropean land (οὐκ ἦν ἐκ γαίης Κεκροπηίδος) but from Thrace: ἀλλ᾽ ἀπὸ Θρῆ[κης]. The passerby has assumed that the deceased, buried in Athens, is an Athenian, but the monument then tells he was not. Even though the word referring to the Cercopids is not exactly the same, there is some sort of repetition: the noun Κεκροπιδῶν in the second verse (turn of the passerby) and the adjective referring to the land of the Cercopids, Κεκροπηίδος in the third verse (turn of the monument). Perhaps this also helped to mark the change of speaker.

It is also noteworthy that there are several epic forms in the first sentence: τεῦ, the verb ἐνέπειν and the genitive ἀγακλειτοῖο. The particular verb ἐνέπειν is

---

\(^{310}\) My own edition, based on autopsy; Athens. cf. IG II/III\(^2\) 8918 and GVI 1847, Athens. On the basis of the letterforms, I date it to the 1\(^{st}\) century CE. (Peek/IG 2\(^{nd}\)–3\(^{rd}\) century CE). cf. Rasche 1910, 33.
used in the opening line of the *Odyssey*: ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, μούσα ἡν, but whether
the verb here is a deliberate hint to it we cannot tell.

Another type-2 epigram, this one dating to the 6th century CE, also contains
three verses.312

5. ψηφίς, τίς ο’ ἀνέθηκεν; — ὁ δώματα ταῦτα τελέσας.
— τίς δ’ ὁ γραφεῖς ποιμήν; τίνος εἴνεκα ἔργα πιφαύσκει;

*Pebble mosaic, who dedicated you? — The one who completed this building. — And
who is the shepherd (= bishop) pictured here? For what is the building declared? —
The name is Anastasios, the town is [P]etra, the object of p[rey]ayer is the Saviour.*

The speakers are the passerby and the monument; the monument is the dedicated
mosaic. There are two question–answer pairs: one pair in the first verse, another
question turn (two question moves) in the second verse and a reply turn in the third
verse.313 The passerby begins with a simple address and an interrogative question:
ψηφίς, τίς ο’ ἀνέθηκεν; No name is given in the reply turn, just: ὁ δώματα ταῦτα
teleσας, i.e. the builder (or commissioner) in participle form. The second question
is built with τίς δ’, and τίνος εἴνεκα follows: τίς δ’ ὁ γραφεῖς ποιμήν; τίνος εἴνεκα
ἔργα πιφαύσκει; The question is asked here twice, but with different wording.314 The
answer to the question(s) is given in the second turn, which is also the final verse:
Anastasios was the bishop who founded the church where this mosaic was found.315

Particles could have been used to segment the reply turn, but were not.

311 Epic forms are naturally not uncommon in the epigrams of the Roman period either. Furthermore,
the reference to the beginning of the *Odyssey* can be found at least in no. 25 in Chapter 3: ἄνδρα μοι
ἔννεπε, κοῦρο—. Tell + address is a combination that easily raises this connotation.
312 SGO 4, 21/23/06, 6th century CE, Gerasa, Palestine. This and no. 4 consist of hexameters. For yet
another three-pair epigram, see IG X 2, 1, 464 = GVI 1865 which has two short pairs and a third pair
with a longer (3.5 verses) reply turn.
313 Verse 1: Q – A; verse 2: Q; verse 3: A.
314 cf. nos. 2, 3, 5, 27 and 29 in Chapter 3.
315 The Church of Peter and Paul in Gerasa. The picture of Anastasius was painted on the wall of the
church, and the mosaic was on the floor below it: see Mango 1986, 29. Instead of [Π]ετρὰ πτόλις, the
first editors give τι[ε]τρα πτόλις. See Welles (following A. H. M. Jones) 1938, no. 330. The restoration
here follows SGO, based on Feissel.
The following is yet another short type-2 epigram, this time an honorary one: 316

6. Ἀττίνα. τίς σε ἄνστησε; hedera — Μακηδόνες. — ἀνθ᾽ ὅτου φράζαι.
— ἀνθ᾽ ὑγιοὺς γνώ|μης καὶ χερὸς | ἄγνοιάτης. hedera


The speakers in this dialogue are the passerby and the honoured man who is depicted in the statue. The same monument also contains a prose text (A). 317 The prose section reveals that the monument is for M. Aurelius Attinas, and also reveals by whom it was dedicated and why it was set up.

The name of Aurelius Attinas is given in the vocative at the beginning of the epigram, but after that, the addressee is the monument: τίς σε ἄνστησε. How should we approach the first word, Ἀττίνα, then? Does this belong to the turn of a passerby? Probably, as after the first word, Ἀττίνα, the speaker is most likely the passerby. 318 In this turn, the question comprises an interrogative + σε + verb: τίς σε ἄνστησε; The idea is to ask who has erected the monument to Attinas, but the direction of the speech is slightly vague (speech is directed to Attinas/the monument). The answer turn consists of one word only: Μακηδόνες. The next turn is also a question turn, and it begins with the preposition ἀνθ᾽. A direct question would be ἀντὶ τίνος, but here, ἀνθ᾽ ὅτου is used, and there is an imperative at the end of the sentence: ἀνθ᾽ ὅτου, φράζαι. The answer begins with the same preposition, ἀνθ’: ἀνθ’ ὑγιοὺς γνώμης— (For what? — For sound judgement—).

316 IG X 2, 1, 148 (B), ca mid-3rd century CE, Thessalonica.
318 cf. the Egyptian epigrams nos. 14, 15, 17 and 18 in Section 4.2.2 (this goes under the same 1 + X–Y n category, but serves here as an example of a short t2 structure).
Repetition is used to mark the change again, or to give something to orient the reader.

The following epigram is from Rome. The turns are short, but there are now five adjacency pairs.\(^{319}\)

7. τίς ἦν σε ὁ θρέψας; — ἦν Κιλίξ Ἀθήναιος. — χρηστὸν τὸ θρέμμα· τίς καλῆ; — Νουμήνιος. πόσων δ᾽ ἐθνησικές τῶν ἔτων; — δίς εἰκοσιν. ἐξρῆν σ᾽ ἐτι ζῆν. — ἀλλὰ καὶ θανεῖν ἐξρῆν. —
5 γενναία σου καὶ χαϊρε. — καὶ σὺ γ᾽, ὃς ξένε· σοὶ γὰρ μέτεστιν ἔτι χαρᾶς, Ἦμιν δ᾽ ἄλις.

Who was it that raised you? — It was a Cilician, Athenaios. — Fine result. What is your name? — Numenios. — How old were you when you died? — Twice 20. — You should still be alive. — But I had to die too. — Best wishes, goodbye. — To you too, o stranger. Because for you there is still joy, but for me it is over.

The metre in this epigram is iambic, and the speakers are the passerby and the deceased, once again. The first three verses have three question–answer pairs. After these, there is one statement–response pair and one greeting pair. Each verse consists of one adjacency pair, except for the last pair which covers two verses, and the last response turn is one and a half verses long.

The first question is built with the interrogative τίς, and the verb ἦν is repeated in the reply: τίς ἦν σε ὁ θρέψας; — ἦν Κιλίξ Ἀθήναιος. The beginning of the third turn is a reply to this (i.e. to the Cilician Athenaios): χρηστὸν τὸ θρέμμα. A simple interrogative question – what is your name? – then follows in the same turn (τίς καλῆ;). The name is given in the reply: Νουμήνιος. In the third question turn (l. 3), δέ is used, like in so many similar cases, to introduce a new question: πόσων δ᾽ ἐθνησικές τῶν ἔτων; The answer to this is given at the end of the same verse: δίς εἰκοσιν. This is the end of the question–answer part of the epigram. The next

(fourth) verse consists of a statement–response pair. The passerby says that the deceased should be alive (ἔχρην σ’ ἔτι ζήν), to which the deceased replies that he had to die too: ἀλλὰ καὶ θανεῖν ἔχρην. Here, ἀλλὰ is used in an adversative function. The verb ἔχρην is repeated in two different usages.

There is a greeting pair in the fifth verse, and the last verse (in the deceased’s voice) continues after the reply greeting (καὶ σὺ γ’, ὦ ἔνευ) with a sentiment directed to the passerby and, of course, to the passersby in general: for you there is still joy, for me it is over, σοι γάρ μέτεστιν ἔτι χαρᾶς, ἡμῖν δ’ ἀλίς.320

The lengths of the type-2 epigrams and their adjacency pairs, as noted, vary. In the following epigram, there are three adjacency pairs that are longer than, for example, the previous two type-2 examples:321

8. τίς σε, γύναι, Παρίην ύπο βώλακα θήκατο; τίς σο[ι]
ξυνὸν ὑπὲρ τύμβου σάμα τόδ’ ἀγλάισεν; —
συνγαμέτας Αύλος Βαβύλλιος εἰσέ με δίξας
στοργάν ἀένασον. — τίς, τίνος; εἰπὲ πάτραν. —

5 οὖνομ’ Ἐπαρχίδα μοι θέτο Σώστρατος ἢ Θ’ ὁμολεκτρός
Ἀρχίππη κλεινάν δόξαν ἐνεγκάμενοι,
ἀν Μύκονο[c] μὲν ἔθρεψε πάτρα, πολιήτιν Αθηνῶν
Κέκροπος αὐτόχθων δάμος ἀναγράφεται. —
χαίρε, γύναι, τοιοῦδ’ ὁμοσυγγενέτασ γεγώσα.—
10 καὶ σὺ χαρείς, ὄνθρωπε, ἔρπε σὺν εὐτυχίᾳ.

Who has put you, woman, under the Parian ground? Who adorned your grave with this common monument? — My spouse, Aulos Babyllios, buried me, showing his ever-flowing love. — Who are you, whose daughter? Tell your fatherland. — Sostratos and his spouse, Archippe, bearers of a famous glory, gave me the name Eparkhis; fatherland Mykonos raised me, but I am named as a citizen of Athens, by

320 For other multi-paired epigrams, see ICr IV 372 = GVI 1882 and SGO 4, 17/06/05.
321 IG XII 5, 307, GVI 1860 = GG 428, 1st century CE, Paros. The epigram was carved on a sarcophagus; for the decoration, see Löwy 1887, 180–1.
the city of Cecrops, sprung from the land itself. — Greetings, woman, (you) who have descended from such a father. — Greetings to you too, o human, and walk with luck.

The speakers are the passerby and the monument. First, there are two question–answer pairs, and a greeting pair then follows. In the first turn, we see familiar elements again: interrogatives (τίς twice, in two different question moves), address (γύναι) and deictic (σάμα τόδ᾿). The whole turn goes as follows: τίς σε, γύναι, Παρίην ὑπὸ βώλακα θήκατο; τίς σο[ι] / ξυνὸν ὑπέρ τύμβου σάμα τόδ᾿ ἀγλάϊσεν,322 The reply turn begins with a reply to τίς, and the answer thus is συνγαμέτας Αὐλος Βαβύλλιος. In the second question turn, three questions are expressed by two plain interrogatives and an imperative + accusative object structure: τίς; τίνος; εἰπὲ πάτραν. The reply turn is four verses long, but the core informative element is again given directly at the beginning of the turn, in line 5: οὔνομ᾽ Ἐπαρχίδα μοι θέτο Ἔστρατος ἢ θ’ ὀμόλεκτρος / Αρχίππη. This turn also gives the answer to τίνος; — the names of the parents are Sostratos and Archippe. Later in the turn, the fatherland Mykonos is also mentioned (l. 7). After this rather long reply turn, there is a closing greeting pair that is two verses long: χαίρε, γύναι— and καὶ σὺ χαρείς ὄνθρωπε---. Once again, καὶ links the turns of the greeting pair together.

The following honorific epigram starts with a question turn as well, but there is a short introduction before the actual question:323

9. εἰπὲ μοι εἰρομένῳ,
tίνος εἰκών. — Λουκί-
ου εἰμί. | — στῇσε δὲ
tίς σε, φράσες; — Τη-
5 μενιδῶν γενεή. |
| — ἀντὶ δὲ τεῦ, λέξεις;
— πανσόφου ἂντ᾽ ἄ-
ρετῆς. |

322 cf. GVI 1858 = AG 7.163: τίς τίνος εὔσα, γύναι, Παρίην ὑπὸ κίονα κείσαι; etc. (cf. Rasche 1910, 5).
323 SGO 3, 16/08/01, Temenuthyrai, no date given; cf. Buresch 1898 (Aus Lydien) 164, and AG 7.470.
Tell me, for I am asking, whose statue are you? — Of Lucius, I am. — Who erected you, will you tell? — The family of Temenidae. — For what, tell? — For the virtue of this very wise man.

The children erected this to their child, Lucius Pufidius, by the decision of noble Temenidae.

The speakers are the passerby and the monument. In most of the epigrams, the imperative is placed after the interrogative or at the end of the question turn (sometimes these are one and the same thing). In this epigram, however, the imperative begins the first question turn and, hence, is the first word of the whole epigram. The imperative εἰπέ is accompanied by an embedded participle (object to εἰπέ): μοι εἰρομένῳ, after which follows the question: τίνος εἰκών; The answer is simple, name + verb: Λουκίου εἰμί. In the second question, δέ denotes the new pair: στήσε δὲ τίς σε, φράσεις; Note that at the end of the turn, there is a question (future indicative: φράσεις;) instead of the imperative φράξε. A short answer follows: Τημενίδων γενεῆ. The previous question structure is repeated in the next question (ἀντὶ δὲ τεῦ, λέξεις;) instead of the imperative form. In this third question, the particle δέ is used again, this time to mark the next question pair: ἀντὶ δὲ τεῦ. It is answered simply by ἀντὶ + genitive. There are two more verses with information about the deceased’s honours beneath the dialogue. The voice here is rather impersonal; it could be either the monument or a narrator, but I am inclined to read

---

324 This is from a statue base: for dialogues with statues, see Kassel 1983, 140–53.
325 Compare with GVI 1868 = AG 7.470 (Meleager): εἶπον ἄνειρομένῳ τίς καὶ τίνος ἔσοι—
326 I have translated these questions with an imperative, since it is closer to the function of these words than ‘would you/will you tell, who…’.
327 For ἀντὶ cf. no. 6 in this chapter.
it as the monument giving more particular information after the dialogue.\textsuperscript{328}

However, the direction of the speech seems to change: before these verses, the monument speaks to the passerby, but the last verses are directed to passersby in general, i.e. to a wider audience.\textsuperscript{329}

\section*{4.2 $X - Y n$ and its variants}

As with type-1 epigrams, my division of type-2 epigrams into subcategories is based on the adjacency pair structures. The four type-2 epigram variants, put into paradigms, are as follows:

1. Several adjacency pairs: $X - Y n$ (e.g. $Q - A n$ or $Q - A n + S - R$, etc.)
2. Extra turn at the beginning of the epigram: $1 + X - Y n$
3. Extra turn at the end of the epigram: $X - Y n + 1$
4. Two extra turns: $1 + X - Y n + 1$\textsuperscript{330}

Variant 1 is a type-2 epigram with two or several adjacency pairs; the number of the pairs varies. Variant 2 is an epigram with an extra turn at the beginning, for example a statement which then initiates the question–answer pair structure that follows. If the extra turn is at the beginning of the epigram (in any of the variants), it is most often the monument that starts speaking. After that, a question turn follows, and this question turn is a reaction to the first turn. The first three turns ($S + Q - A$) thus form a three-turn unit, in a way. Variant 3 is an epigram with an extra turn at the end. This extra turn can be a greeting, a wish turn or some other kind of statement. Variant 4 is an epigram that has an extra turn at the beginning, the end or in the middle of the epigram; however, there are only two of these epigrams.

In the following sections, I will give examples of these variants, analysing their pairs and also the features of language in each. This means that I will continue

\textsuperscript{328} In Chapter 5, I will provide examples of a narrator role, but, as stated in Chapter 2, these two roles are occasionally rather similar, and the neutral, impersonal monument is not uncommon at all.

\textsuperscript{329} This is why I count this as variant 3; see Section 4.2. For the list of t2 epigrams according to the variants, see Table 6 at the end of Section 4.4.

\textsuperscript{330} Or $X - Y n + 2$; there are only two of these variants, and in the other one, the second extra turn is in the middle of the epigram: see no. 18 in this chapter.
the analysis that I began in Section 4.1, while also considering the pair structure as well.

Nineteen type-2 epigrams contain no extra turns. This means that more than half of the epigrams of this type are of variant 1. Owing to this, I will discuss variant 1 in one section (4.2.1) and the rest of the type-2 epigrams (i.e. variants 2–4) in another section (4.2.2).

### 4.2.1 Several adjacency pairs

The following epigram is dated to the 2nd or 1st century BCE, which makes it an early example of the type. A title line with two greetings is given first, and the epigram follows this:

10.

[Σαρ]απιάς Λεωφάντου, | φύσει δὲ Ἑροστράτου, | χρηστὴ χαῖρε. | Ἑροστάτε

Φιλώτου χρηστὲ χαῖρε.

τίς ἦ ῥα τύμβῳ τῷ δ᾽ ὑπεσσ᾽; — Ἑρόστρατος. —

πατρός; — Φιλώτεω. — τίς δὲ τεῦ πάτρα; — Τέως. —

tέχνα; — θαλασσόεργος. — ἐντί τεῦ δόμοις

παῖς; — ὁν Τύχαγε τερπνόν ἐς βίου τέλος

5 γέρας ποδαγετεύσα. — ποτὶ δ᾽ ἐτέων ἔβας

ἀριθμόν; — ἐξάκοντα λειπόμαν τρισίν. —

κούφα κόνις τοι. — τίν δ᾽, οδεῖτ’, ὀλβος πέλοι.

[Sar]apias of Leophantos, really of Herostratos, greetings. Herostratos of Philotas

**greetings.**

---

331 SGO 1, 03/06/06, 2nd/1st century BCE, Teos (Asia Minor). cf. GVI 1859 for a different turn division. (Peek vv. 1–2: τίς ἦ ῥα τύμβῳ τῷ δ᾽ ὑπεσσ᾽; — Ἑρόστρατος πατρός Φιλώτεω; and 5–6: ποτὶ δ᾽ ἐτέων ἔβας ἀριθμόν ἐξάκοντα; — λειπόμαν τρισίν). I find the question structure given in SGO for verses 5–6 more likely for the ignorant passerby than Peek’s suggestion. In verses 1–2, Peek’s division is of course possible. See also Garulli 2014, 76–8 (who follows the division given in GVI).
Well, who are you under this tomb? — Herostratos. — Whose son? — Of Philotas. — What was your fatherland? — Teos. — Profession? — Fisherman. — Did you have a child (in your) home? — (Yes), the one that Tyche gave as a gift for my last years’ delight. — Up to how many years did you walk (=live)? — Sixty minus three. — May the earth be light upon you. — And for you, wayfarer, may there be bliss.

The speakers in this grave epigram are the passerby and the deceased. Here, all the information is given in seven short adjacency pairs. The first six pairs are question–answer pairs, and a greeting pair ends the poem. Some of the turns – both questions and answers – in this epigram consist of one word only. The first question is formed by an interrogative + ὃ ὁ, and there is also a deictic (τὸ μβω τῷ δ’), hence: τίς ὁ ὁ τῷ μβω τῷ δ’ ὑπεσσ’.332 The reply to this first question is the name of the deceased: Ἡρόστρατος. After that, the second question is simply: πατρός; Again, only a name (of the father this time) is given in the reply: Φιλώτεω. In the third question, the particle δέ is used to mark a new question: τίς δέ τεῦ πάτρα; i.e. And what was your homeland? Yet another one-word reply follows: Τέως. The fourth pair is also short, and notably has no markers at all: τέχνα; — θαλασσόεργος. The fifth question is longer and contains a verb at the beginning of the turn: ἐντὶ τεῦ δόμυς παῖς; The sixth question has a particle again: ποτὶ δ’ ἐτέων—-. The last pair is a pair of wishes. The first turn of this pair is the common formula κούφα κόνις τοι, and in the reply, a particle is used together with the address to connect the turn to the previous one: τίν δ’, ὅδεῖτ’, ὅλβος τέλοι. On this monument, the stone cutting helps the reader to see the change of the turns: they are marked by vacat.333

The following epigram consists of five short question–answer pairs:334


— Παυλείνα. — τίνος, [ε][ιπέ], [γ]υνή; — Φιλομ[ήτ]ορος, ὃς με

332 In these rather short Q – A pairs, the speakers are often clear, but a previously unpublished epigram (to be included in the imminent fascicle of the Coan corpus: IG XII 4, 3, 2147) begins with λιτός γ’ ὁ τύμβος· τίς δ’ ὁ δεσπότης· τίς· — Πρώταρχος: αἰα δὲ Ὀξυ [γρήγος πάτρα, and only after this the deceased is addressed in the second person singular: ἐλεύθερος] δ’ ἐθνικὰς ὢ ἀρίστης κεφάλας. | --- |

333 See the drawn copy of the text in Le Bas-Waddington 1870, no. 115. cf. SGO 1, 03/06/06 commentary for differences to Peek.

334 Marek 1993, no. 38 = GVI 1863 = SGO 2, 10/03/04, 2nd century CE, Amastris, Bithynia.
λοιμῷ τῇ δε πέτρῃ [Θάψεν [Ἀπίσθημέννη.
— τίς δε σοι ἦν γενέτης; — Χρύσης ἐμὲ γείνετο πρόσθεν.
5 — ἄρσενα παῖδ᾽ ἐλιπὲς θαλάμους; — ἕνα [νυμφεύθημεν.
— πόστοι δ᾽ ἔσχες ἐξυπος βιότου τέλος [άθράσσασα;
— ὅγδω [ε]ϊκοστῷ μοίραν ἐτήν βιότου.

Who and whose child are you, who lie under [this] stone? Tell your [name]. — Paulina. — Whose wife were you, tell. — Of Philom[et]or, who [b]uried me under this stone when I had [died] of plague. — Who was your father? — Khryses begot me earlier. — Did you leave a male child at home? — One, after I had got [married]. — How old were you when you [saw] the end of life? — In my 28th year I suffered the fateful end of my life.

The speakers here are the passerby and the deceased. There are two interrogatives in a row opening the sentence (τίς τίνος). Furthermore, there is a deictic reference to the monument and a second person singular: ἀμφὶ πέτρῃ κέκλησα[ί τῇ δ᾽]. The last word of the sentence (and this whole turn) is the imperative φράζε. This verse is partly fragmentary, but the interrogatives are intact, as is the imperative at the end of the verse.

In the reply turn, the deceased tells her name in a one-word turn: Παυλ[ε]ίνα. The next pair begins with a question turn with an interrogative and an imperative: τίνος, [ε]ιπέ, [γ]υνή. This was asked already in the first question turn, but, as the deceased told only her name in the first adjacency pair, the passerby repeats the question here, perhaps to emphasise the message. The deceased replies, and tells not only the name of her husband but also that he buried her after she had died of plague: Φιλομ[ήτ]ορος, δς με λοιμῷ τῇ δε πέτρῃ [Θάψεν [Ἀπισθήμέννη]. All this information is thus woven into one sentence. After these two adjacency pairs, the third one uses a particle again in the question turn: (and) who was your father, τίς δὲ σοι ἦν γενέτης; and the reply turn begins with a name: Χρύσης—. The fourth question is formed using a verb and an object: ἄρσενα παῖδ᾽ ἐλιπὲς (word order: OV). The last begins with an adjective and δὲ – the adjective has an interrogative function here: πόστοι δ᾽ ἔσχες ἐξυπος βιότου—. In this epigram, the interlocutors are
easy to define: the second person singular is used from the beginning, so we know that it is the deceased herself who replies. The metre is hexameter, except for verse 3, which is pentameter.

In the following epigram, 16 verses form two pairs.\textsuperscript{335}

12. φράζε, τίνος γονέως, σέο τ’ οὐνομα καὶ πόσιν αὐτά
καὶ χρόνον εἰπέ, γώναι, καὶ πόλεως ὅθεν εἰ. —
Νεικανδρὸς γενέτωρ, πατρὶς Πάρος, οὐνομα δὲ ἦν μοι
Σωκράτεα, φθιμένην Παρμενίων δὲ ἔθετο
5 σύνελκτος τύμβῳ με, χάριν δὲ μοι ὑπάσα τήνδε,
eὐδόξου ζωᾶς μνήμα καὶ ἑσσομένοις;
καὶ μὲ πικρὰν νεαρόϊ βρέφους ἀφύλακτος ἔρεινύς
αἰμορύτοιο νόσιν τερπνὸν ἐλυσε βίον·
oὐθ’ ὑπ’ ἑμαῖς ἐδείσο τὸ νήπιον εἰς φάσος ἦγον,
10 ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ γαστρὶ φίλαι κεῦθεται ἐμ φθιμένοις·
τρισάζε ἐκ δεκάδος δে πρός ἔτεων χρόνον ἔλθον,
ἀνδρὶ λυποῦσα τέκνων ἀρσενόπαιδα γονάν·
dισάδε πατρὶ λυποῦσα καὶ ἱμερτώι συνομεύνωι
αὐτὰ ὑπὸ τριτάτῳ τόνδε λέλονχα τόπον. —
15 ἀλλὰ σὺ, παμβασίλια θεά, πολυώνυμε κούρα,
τήνδε ἅγε ἐπ’ εὐσεβείων χῶρον ἐχουσα χερός. —
τοῖς δὲ παρερχομένοις θεὸς τέρψιν τινὰ δύσι
ἐίτασιν χαίρειν Σωκράτεαν κατὰ γῆς.

Διονύσιος Μάγνης ποιητῆς ἔγραψεν.

Tell whose child you are, and your name, and say who was your husband, and tell the time (= how old were you when you died), woman, and which town you are from. — Nicander was my begetter, Paros my hometown, my name Socratea, and when I died, my husband Parmenion buried me (and) granted me this (gift) as monument of my glorious life, also for those to come. Eriny, against whom one is unguarded,

\textsuperscript{335} IG XII, 5, 310 = GVI 1871 = GG 432, 2\textsuperscript{nd} century CE, Paros.
ended my delightful life, to my bitterness, with a bleeding disease. I had a young baby in womb; I did not bring the baby to the light by pangs of my labour, but it (is) still inside my stomach, and is now among the dead. After three times a decade I still reached a number of six years, and I left my husband male descendants; two (of them) I leave to (their) father, (my) lovely bed-fellow, by the birth of the third one I myself am fated to this place. — But you, goddess, queen of all, maiden with many names, lead her by the hand to the place of the blessed. — May god give some delight to them who, when passing by, say their greetings to Socratea (who is) under the ground.

Poet Dionysius from Magnesia wrote this.

The speakers here are the passerby and the deceased. There are 18 verses in this epigram, and yet only four turns. These four turns form two adjacency pairs. The first one of them is a question–answer pair, and the second is a kind of a wish, or a statement–response pair similar to a pair of wishes.\(^{336}\) The last turn is a wish turn, in any case.

The epigram begins with a question turn. This starts with the imperative φράζε, and what the deceased must tell is listed after the imperative. Two more imperatives follow after the initial one (αύδα at the end of the first verse and εἰπέ in the second verse), and they are accompanied by accusative objects linked to one other by particles: φράζε, τίνος γονέως, σέο τ΄ οόνομα καί πόσιν αύδα, καί χρόνον εἰπέ, γύναναι, καί πόλεως ὠδεν εἶ. Note also the address (γύναι). In this turn, καί links units that, if divided in several turns, would be separated by δέ, as indeed happens in the reply turn. It begins with the name of the father, which is the first fact asked for in the question turn. The list of the answers then continues, and the third, fourth and fifth items in the list are given with δέ, and the last one with καί: --- οόνομα δέ ἦν μοι | Σωκράτεα φθιμένην Παρμενίων δέ ἔθετο | σύνλεκτρος τύμβῳ με, χάριν δέ μοι ὡπάσε τὴνδε| εὐδόδου ζωᾶς μνήμα καί ἔσσομένοις. Here, the particle δέ creates continuity and, at the end of the list, καί brings everything together. This shows how δέ functions in between units, i.e. it links certain topics together and marks the boundaries of the pairs, whereas καί functions within the turn.

\(^{336}\) cf. no. 2 in this chapter.
After this, **καὶ** μ[ε] ἰπικράν in line 7 starts a new information unit. This further information is also arranged with particles: at the beginning of line 7, **καὶ** connects the unit to the previous ones, but it also marks the fact that additional information is now given here. The same goes for lines 9–10 with **οūθ´---άλλ´**, and the next one (ll. 11–12), which is arranged with **δέ**, as well as the last information unit of the turn (ll. 13–14), where **καὶ** is also used.

---**οūθ´** ὑπ´ ἐμαῖς ὤδεεις τὸ νήπιον εἰς φάος ἦγον,

**10 ** **άλλ´** ὑπὸ γαστρὶ φίλαι κεύθεται ἐμὶ φθιμένοις;

τρισάς ἐκ δεκάδος **δέ** πρὸς ἐξ ἐτέων χρόνον ἤλθον

ἀνδρὶ λιποῦσα τέκνων ἀρσενόπαιδα γονάν·

δισσά **δέ** πατρὶ λιποῦσα **καὶ** ἰμερτῶι ἱνομεύνωι---

This long turn of the deceased first gives answers to several previously asked questions, and after that offers additional information. The particles help us to piece together the text, and they also give the recipient an opportunity to recognise the units.

After line and verse 14, the speaker changes; it is the passerby again in lines 15–16. The turn begins with a particle and an address: **άλλα** σὺ, παμβασίληα θεά, πολυώνυμε κούρα---. The addressee is not the deceased anymore, but a goddess, and **άλλα** helps to mark the change, which the address then makes clear. The direction of speech has changed. After the passerby has addressed the goddess, there is no clear addressee: τοῖς **δὲ** παρερχομένοις θεός τέρψιν τινὰ διόη / ἐὔτασιν χαίρειν Σωκράτεαν κατὰ γῆς. Thus, the direction of speech goes as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>PB → DEC</th>
<th>DEC → PB</th>
<th>PB → Goddess</th>
<th>DEC → No Clear Addressee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The last adjacency pair (ll. 15–16) is similar to the pairs of wishes we have seen in this chapter, but instead of the optatives (which would be used if the passerby addressed the deceased directly), the passerby uses the imperative ἄγε. Similarly,

---

337 Persephone. cf. Guarducci 1942, 44.
the deceased uses the subjunctive δῶῃ instead of the optative. Beneath the epigram is the signature of the poet: Διονύσιος Μάγνης ποιητής ἔγραψεν.338

In the last example of this subtype, the speakers are clear, yet the identification of the speaker roles depends on the interpretation of turn division.339

13. ὁ δῆμος Μηνοφίλαν Ερμαγένου.

(wreath)

(niche)

κομψὰ καὶ χαρίεσσα πέτρος δείκνυσι. τίς ἔντι
Μουσών μανύει γράμματα· Μηνοφίλαν.
— τεῦ δ΄ ἐνεκ’ ἐν στάλα γλυπτόν κρίνον ἡδὲ καὶ ἀλφα
βύβλος καὶ τάλαρος τοῖς δ’ ἔπι καὶ στέφανος;
5 — ἡ σοφία μὲν βίβλος, ὁ δ’ αὖ περὶ κρατὶ φορηθεῖς
ἀρχὰν μανύει, μουσικὸν δὲ τό ἐν,
εὐτάκτου δ’ ἀρετὰς τάλαρος μάνυμα, τὸ δ’ ἀνθὸς
tάν ἀκμᾶν, δαίμων ἀντὶν’ ἐληίσατο. —
κού[φ]α τοι τόν ἡμοῖς ἀμφιπέλοι τοῖς ἔλπις βαινοῦση,
10 αἱ, ἄγονοι δὲ γονεῖς, τοῖς ἔλπις δάκρυα.

The people honoured Menophila, the daughter of Hermagenes.

Also the beautiful stone declares her fairness, and who she is, the verses tell us: Menophila. — Why are there carved on a stele a lily and an A, a book, a basket, and above, a wreath? — The book signifies wisdom, the wreath worn around her head, public office, and the number One (= A), an only child. The basket symbolises well-ordered virtue, and the flower, that bloom which fate stole away. — May the earth be lig[h]t upon you, who have thus died. Oh! you left your parents, now without a child, in tears.

338 cf. Guarducci above.
339 GVI 1881, Sardis, mid-2nd century BCE. cf. Sardis 7, 1, 111. V. 10 Herzog 1936, 339 ἄγονοι, Peek ἄτοκοι (but every letter is unsure). I saw the stone myself in the Istanbul Archaeological Museum. I find Herzog’s reading of the last verses (9–10 mentioned above) more probable than κού[φ]α τοι τὸν κόνις εἰμί, which is given in the Sardis edition (Buckler – Robinson).
The speakers are the monument and the passerby. At the beginning of the epigram, the deceased is referred to in the third person (no addresses here), and so is the monument: πέτρος δείκνυσι (v. 1) and μανύει γράμματα (v. 2). In the Sardis edition, verses 1–2 form the first turn, verses 3–4 the second, verses 5–8 the third and verses 9–10 the fourth and last turn. In the Greek text, there is no stroke δέ, whereas the division given here is PB = MON + PB − MON (t2). If we read verses 1–4 as one turn (as the edition, but not the translation in the Sardis edition, seems to be), the speakers would be PB + MON + PB, i.e. type 1 + 1, but I find this unlikely as the passerby would first say ‘read’ the verses 1–2 and then ask ‘but why...?’ τεῦ δ’ ἐνέκ’---, which does not fit into patterns of dialogue epigrams.

However we interpret the turn division, the speakers are the passerby and the monument. The third verse begins with a question turn (by the passerby): τεῦ δ’ ἐν στάλα γλυπτόν κρίνον ἦδε---. The particle δέ (in the combination interrogative + δέ) seems to indicate a change of speaker here. The voice asking the questions must be the passerby – I see no other option, as the monument or the narrator would not ask such questions after a narrative section, especially not with δέ, which introduces the question. The passerby, however, does not address the monument directly (but τεῦ δ’ ἐν στάλα γλυπτόν--- instead). This goes well with the previous two verses, in which the monument is spoken about in the third

340 In the Greek text, there is no stroke to signify the change of speaker after the second verse, but in the English translation given in the edition, the change of speaker is clear, and whether or not this is intentional, I find 1–2 + 3–4 + 5–8 + 9–10 the most probable turn division. 341 Peek GVI 1881. cf. Pfuhl – Möbius 1979, no. 418. For an analysis, see Ferrandini Troisi 2000, no. 4.3 (pp. 63ff.). 342 δέ can be used in monologue as well of course, but in dialogues, and especially in a question turn, it suggests a new turn (and hence a new speaker here).
person, and, as we have seen, this is by no means exceptional. It is possible to find references to the monument in an epigram in which the monument is also one of the speakers.\(^{343}\)

The decoration of the monument is described in the text, and its symbolism is even decoded.\(^{344}\) Menophila herself is in the centre of the relief, and the decoration described in the epigram is also clearly visible: an alpha is carved on her left-hand side, and the basket, book roll and lily are in the upper part of the relief, near her head. The wreath is carved at the top of the relief, above everything else.\(^{345}\) The last turn, in verses 9–10 after the decoding of the decoration, is by the passerby again, who addresses the deceased and talks to her in the second person.\(^{346}\)

We can read this epigram as a type-3 epigram (especially if the first speaker is a narrator and not the monument), i.e. narrator + passerby + deceased + passerby again. Yet, it is more likely that it is a type-2 epigram with monument–passerby pairs.\(^{347}\) As this speculation shows, the category of an epigram may sometimes depend on the reading, but this is precisely the reason I wanted to discuss this last example in this section. Fortunately, the arguable cases are ultimately few.

**4.2.2 Several adjacency pairs + extra turn(s)**

The extra turns are either at the beginning, at the end or, in one case, in the middle of the epigram. In this chapter, I will discuss all of these variations (i.e. variants 2–4).

In three of the type-2 epigrams, the extra turn opens the epigram, which means that there is a turn at the beginning of the epigram, which then initiates the

---

\(^{343}\) i.e. epigrams that begin with PB asking who is in this grave (deictic), and the monument then answers.

\(^{344}\) Concerning the text and the decoration, the inter-referentiality, see Kauppinen, *forthcoming*.

\(^{345}\) Männlein-Robert 2007, 262 points out that this epigram can be seen as an ecphrastic epigram, influenced by the Hellenistic (or later) literary epigrams. It is perhaps worth pointing out that, as Bruss 2010, 385 notes, ‘almost all pre-Hellenistic inscribed epigrams contain at least one characteristic of ecphrasis...’, i.e. by identifying the object. It is very probable that there is some influence within the inscriptional genre, but especially the longer references, which depict the decoration of the monument, seem to have been influenced by the ecphrastic non-inscribed epigrams as well.

\(^{346}\) \(κού[φ]α \tauοι \kappaονις \epsilonιμι\) (in Sardis) seems improbable. \(κούφα \kappaονις \tauοι\) is a common phrase at the end of the epigram, and an optative after that also fits the patterns we have seen so far.

\(^{347}\) Read also as non-dialogue, Masséglia 2015, 123.
 adjacency pair structure. In an epigram from Saqqarah, the opening turn is followed by six adjacency pairs.348

14. στήθι φίλον παρὰ τύμβων, ὀδουπόρε. — τίς με κελεύει; — 
   φρουρός ἐγώ σε λέων. — αὐτός ὁ λαίνεος; — 
   αὐτός. — φωνήεις πόθεν ἐπλεο; — δαίμονος αὐδήι 
   ἀνδρός ὑποχθονίου. — τίς γάρ ὃδ´ ἐστιν ἀνήρ

5 ἀθανάτοισι θεοίσι τετιμένος, ὡστε δύνασθαι 
   καὶ φωνήν τεύχειν ὃδε λίθωι βροτέιν; — 
   Ἡρᾶς Μεμφίτης οὕτος, φίλε, κύδιμος ἥρως, 
   ὁ σθεναρός, πολλοῖς ἔξοχος, εὐρυβίς, 
   γνώριμος ἐνδαπίοις καὶ ἀνδράς τηλεδαπόισιν

10 εἰνεκ´ ἐυφροσύνης, εἰνεκεν ἀγλαίς, 
   ὑκύμορος, τὸν ἐκλαυσε πόλις, τὸν ἔθαψαν ἐταϊροί- 
   ἦ γάρ ἐγν πάτρῃς ἀνθος ἐυστεφάνου. — 
   δακρύω, μὰ σὲ, δαίμων, ἔπει κλύον ὄσο´ ἄγορεύει 
   θήρ ὃδε. —μὴ πηοῖς, ὡ ἕνε, δακρυχέοις. — 

15 ἐλθοὶ ἐς αἰώνα κλυτὸν οὖνομα. — καὶ σὲ φυλάξει 
   δαίμων καὶ σώσει πάντα Ἰύχη βίοτον.

Wayfarer, stop by my tomb. — Who is commanding me? — I, lion, a guard, 
command you. — Yourself of stone? — Yes. — How did you become able to speak? — 
By the voice of a daimon, of a subterranean man. — Well, who is such a man, 
honoured by the immortal gods so that he can produce also a mortal voice here to 
the stone? — He is, dear friend, the famous hero Heras from Memphis, the strong, 
eminent among many, well-known among the natives and among the men from 
distant lands (as well), because of his good cheer and his splendour. He died early, 
and the city lamented him, and he was buried by his comrades; he really was the 
flower of his well-crowned fatherland. — I weep, by you, daimon, since I heard that 
this beast speaks so great things. — O stranger, I hope you will not cry for relatives. 
— May your famous name continue to eternity. — And the daimon will guard you 
and Tyche will save you for all your life.

348 Bernand, Inscr.Metr. 68, GVI 1843 = GG 427, 1st/2nd century CE, Saqqara, Egypt. Also Hansen 1998, 
337. cf. Chapter 3, no. 27 and Garulli 2014, 70–2.
The first speaker is the monument. It opens the epigram with an extra turn, exhorting the passerby to stop by the tomb: στήθι φίλον παρὰ τύμβον, ὀδοιπόρε. Both an imperative (στήθι) and an address (ὁδοιπόρε) are used. After this, there are six adjacency pairs: four question-answer pairs and two statement-response pairs. In the first question (second turn of the whole epigram, end of line 1), the passerby asks who is commanding him: τίς με κελεύει; The question is built with the interrogative τίς. The use of με–σε in this question-answer pair is also noteworthy: the passerby asks who commands him, and the monument states that I, a guarding lion, (command) you, τίς με κελεύει; — φρουρός ἐγὼ σε λέων. This repetition links the turns together. These three turns (opening turn + this pair) form a unit: the first turn initiates the dialogue, and the question-answer structure begins in the second turn, which is reaction to this first turn (cf. three-turn units in type 1):
1. στήθι φίλον παρὰ τύμβον, ὀδοιπόρε.
2. — τίς με κελεύει;
3. — φρουρός ἐγὼ σε λέων.

The following question-answer pair (ll. 2–3) also concerns the monument: αὐτὸς ὁ λαΐνεος; — αὐτὸς. After this, the focus shifts to the voice (which reflects the reception situation): — φωνήεις πόθεν ἐπλεο; — δαίμονος αὐδὴι ἀνδρός ύποχθονίο. Next, the fourth question (at the end of line 4) focuses on the deceased: a particle is used again, this time together with an interrogative: τίς γὰρ ὄδ’ ἐστιν——. The particle does not introduce a new topic, but asks about the deceased and how he deserves this mortal voice – the passage could rather be translated: but who is such a man...? Consequently, γὰρ instead of δέ is a fitting choice in this context.

The reply turn to this begins with a name, and the speaker then goes on to tell more about the deceased in question. Up until this point, the epigram is a dialogue between the monument (the lion) and the passerby, as this turn also shows. However, the next turn of the passerby (from l. 13 onwards) has a new addressee: δακρύω, μὰ σε, δαίμον——. The monument says in lines 3–4 that it is δαίμονος αὐδήι ἀνδρός ύποχθονίου, and instead of speaking to the monument, the passerby now speaks directly to this daimon (= the deceased): ὅσο’ ἀγορεύει θήρ
ὅδε – **of whom this beast speaks so great things.** The beast is of course the lion. The deceased then replies, and begins the turn with an imperative and an address: μή πηοῖς, ὦ ξένε---.

The last pair is a pair of wishes. The optative, as expected, is used in both turns: ἐλθοῖ in the statement, and φυλάξει and σώσει in the response turn. The response turn begins with a particle, καί, which links the turns together: ἐλθοι ἐς αἰῶνα κλυτὸν οὖνομα. — καί σὲ φυλάξει/ δαίμων καὶ σώσει πάντα Τύχη βίοτον.

There are many details in the carving on this monument that help the reader to follow the conversation; a double dot (:) is even used as a colon to mark the speakers (i.e. the place where the speaker changes). Other than that, there are, for example, diacritical dots, medial dots indicating the pauses, and the verses are ruled by guidelines.349

In the following example, there is also a separate turn or move before the first question:350

15. στάλα μανύτειρα.— τίς ἐν
κυαναυγέι τύμβωι |
κεῖσαι; καὶ πάτραν καὶ γενέ-
την ἐνεπε. | — |

5 Ἀρσινόα, κούρα δ᾽ Ἀλίνης
καὶ Θηδοσίοιο, |
φαμισθὰ δ᾽ Ὄνιου γὰ τρο-
φὸς ἄμετέρα. — | |
pοσσαέτης δ᾽ ἠλισθας ὑ-

10 πὸ σκοτόεν κλίμα Λάθας; | — |
ικοσέτης γοερὸν χῶρον
ἐβην νεκύων. | — |
ζευγίσθης δὲ γάμους; — <ἀ>εύ-
χθην. — κατελίπανες αὖ-

349 For more details, see Edgar 1927, 31–2 and Bernand 1969, 68.
350 GVI 1861 = GG 429 = SEG 8, 482, 1st century CE, Leontopolis, Egypt. For the dating of the text, see Momigliano 1932, 171–2. Below the epigram: (ἔτους) ἰς', Παῦνι κα'.
15 τῷ | τέκνον; — ἀτεκνὸς ἑ-  
βαν εἰς Ἀίδαο δόμους. | —  
 הפי κούφα χθών ἀ φθι-  
μένοιο φυλάκτωρ. | —  
καὶ σοί, ἕξεινε, φέροι καρπόν  
20 ἀπὸ σταχύων. |

(I am an) informing stele. — Who are you, (who) lie in the dark-gleaming tomb? Tell both your fatherland and your parent(s). — I am Arsinoe, daughter of Aline and The(o)dosios, and praiseworthy land of Onias was my rearer. — With how many years did you go under the dark slope of Lethe (=Oblivion)? — I was 20 years old when I came to the mournful land of the dead. — Were you bound in marriage? — Yes, I was. — Did you leave him a child? — I was childless when I stepped into the house of Hades. — May the earth, the guardian of the deceased (body), be light upon you. — And to you, stranger, may the earth bring fruit from the ears of corn.

The speakers are again the passerby and the deceased, but who utters the opening of the epigram: στάλα μανύτειρα? It is not addressed to the passerby like in the previous example (no. 14). Does this belong to the passerby’s turn? It seems that it cannot be a vocative351 or, at least, the direction of the speech changes immediately after these two words. Could it be just a neutral ‘declaration’ that is directed to no one specifically,352 before the passerby starts to talk directly to the deceased? Is it the monument itself? It seems so. This first ‘declaration’ draws the attention to the monument, and after that, the question–answer structure follows. The first question is clearly directed to the deceased, as the second person singular κεῖσαι (line 3) shows. After the opening turn, there are four question–answer pairs, and a pair of wishes at the end of the epigram. In my opinion, the first turn either belongs to the

351 cf. Norsa 1931, 245. In the previous editions, the speaker of στάλα μανύτειρα was left unidentified, and, from the first question onwards, they were marked as the passerby and the deceased.
352 The idea in this case is that the reader, in the voice of the passerby role, announces to the audience (or gets to know himself) that the stele is revealing facts that will now follow.
monument\textsuperscript{353} or it is an anonymous declaration before the dialogue that makes the speaker roles easier to define.

The first question turn, from the end of line 1 onwards, includes two question moves. The first is built with an interrogative and a verb: τίς ἐν κυαναυγεῖ τύμβωι \( | \) κεῖσαι; The second is arranged with an imperative and an accusative: καὶ πάτραν καὶ γενέτην ἔσσετε. Note also the repetition of the particle. In the reply turn (ll. 5–8), δὲ (used twice) separates the information units: κούρα δ᾽ (l. 5) and φαμισθαὶ δ᾽ (l. 7). The second question turn (ll. 9–10) is introduced by an interrogative and δὲ (ποοσαέτης δ᾽ ἔλισθας---), and the third by a verb and δὲ: ζευγίσθης δὲ γάμους. The fourth and the fifth questions are formed without markers.

In the pair of wishes, the first one opens with the formulaic expression ἵνα σοὶ κούφα χθὼν--- (ll. 17–18), while an optative is used in the last turn (ll. 19–20): καὶ σοί, ξεῖνε, φέροι καρπὸν / ἀπὸ σταχών. Again, καὶ links the two wishes together, but also marks the change of the turn (and speaker).

In this epigram, like in the previous one, the function of the extra turn at the beginning of the epigram is to draw the attention of the recipient, and the adjacency pair structure then follows.\textsuperscript{354} In the following epigram, the extra turn is not at the beginning, but at the end of the poem.\textsuperscript{355}

16. τίς θάνεν; — Ἦρωις. — πώς καὶ πότε; — γαστρὸς ἔχουσα ὄγκον ἐν ὥδεισιν θηκαμένη τὸ βάρος·
μήτηρ δ᾽ ἦν πρὸς μικρόν· ἀπώλετο καὶ βρέφος εὐθῦ.
— ἦν δὲ πόσων ἐτέων δύσμορος; — ἐννέα δίς
5 ἡλικίης ἄνδους Ἦρωιδος. — ἀλλὰ κόνιν σοι κούφην καὶ δοῖη ψυχρόν Ὄσειρις ύδωρ.
ζήτι.

Who died? — Herois. — How and when? — She had a baby in her womb, and she laid down the burden in the pangs of childbirth. But she was mother for a short while

\textsuperscript{353} Or if it belongs to the passerby, we should perhaps edit στάλα μανύτειρα· τίς---.

\textsuperscript{354} In a way, no. 3 in this chapter is also 1 + t2 (if we follow the turn division I give [following SGO]).

\textsuperscript{355} GVI 1842 = GG 426; cf. SEG 8, 802, 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} century CE, Egypt. Above the epigram: (ἔτους) μ᾽, Θῶθ ᾦ.\footnote{141}
In this epigram, the speakers are the passerby and the monument. The first two questions are simple interrogative ones: τίς θάνεν (1st question turn) and πώς καὶ πότε (2nd question turn). The first reply turn is also simple: only the name Ἱρωῖς. In the second reply turn (ll. 1–2, from γαστρός ἔχουσα onwards), it is first reported that the deceased died in childbirth and that she was a mother for a short while only, as the baby also died. This additional information is introduced with δὲ (l. 3): μήτηρ δ᾽ ἦν πρὸς μικρόν. In the third question turn, δὲ is used to ask further information about the deceased (how old was she when she died: ἦν δὲ πόσων ἐτέων δύσμορος). The question–answer structure is followed by a wish turn. The passerby begins this turn with ἀλλά, which shifts the conversation from the question–answer part and information to a final wish of the epigram: ἀλλὰ κόνιν σοι κούφην καὶ δοίη ψυχρὸν Ὀσεωρὶς ὑδῶρ. This is of course directed to the deceased and not to the monument anymore; thus, the addressee changes. We have seen the epigrams with pair of wishes in this chapter, but here the deceased does not reply. The extra turn closes the epigram, and ἀλλὰ marks the shift from the pair structure to this last turn. Below the epigram is the word ζητεῖ, which does not belong to the epigram unity.

In two cases, there are two extra turns in each. In the following example, they are at the beginning and at the end of the epigram:

(only), (for) the new-born baby died immediately also. — How old was she, the ill-fated? — The flower of Heroid’s age was twice nine (years). — But let Osiris give you light earth and cold water.

Live!

In two cases, there are two extra turns in each. In the following example, they are at the beginning and at the end of the epigram:
17. ἄφθιτος, οὐ θνητή. — θαυμᾷ[ζω],
tίς δ’; — ἵσιδώρα. — |
tίς πόλις; — αἱ μεγάλαι Θήβαι.
— τίς ἀνήρ; — Θεόδωρος. — |

5 ὦ στήλη, μικρά γε, λέγεις δ’
δότι παντός ἄριστον |
ἀνδρῶν, θηλειῶν, πόλεων,
όσον ἄχθος ύπέστης.

Imperishable, not mortal. — I wonder, who then? — Isidora. — Which (was her) town? — The great Theba. — Who (was her) husband? — Theodoros. — O stele, though you are small, you say that you laid yourself open to such a load of grief, of the very best of men, of women, of cities!

The speakers are the monument and the passerby. The first turn, ἄφθιτος, οὐ θνητή resembles number 15: στάλα μανύτειρα. Here, it is most likely the monument that says this — it is unlikely that such a declaration would be made by the passerby, and the speaker cannot be the deceased either, as she is talked about in the third person.

The passerby reacts to the opening with θαυμᾷ[ζω], τίς δ’; The passerby does not often use the first person singular, but here the first person introduces the question that follows: τίς δ’; This turn is a reaction to the first statement (and hence δέ can be used as early as in the first question. In that sense, this question is a response to the first sentence, but this also starts a series of question–answer pairs (three of them). Hence, the beginning is a three-unit turn again. The epigram forms four monument–passerby pairs, but if we look at the turns, the structure could be defined as $1 + 3 \times Q - A + 1$.

At the end of the epigram (the +1 turn), the passerby has a longer turn. It is not a closing salutation or an optative wish, but rather an acclamation. This, again, is

359 The case ending is restored, but I find it plausible, if the uncertain mu and alpha are correct (-ζω restored by Peek). See Peek 1932, 53–4 for the reading.
a reaction to the information given by the monument – the passerby admires the fact that the small stele holds such a burden of grief: ὦ στήλη, μικρά γε, λέγεις δ᾽ / ὃτι παντὸς ἀριστον / ἀνδρῶν, θηλείων, πόλεων, /όσον ἄχθο[ς ύπ]έστης.

The metre of this epigram is hexameter, and the end of each verse is marked on the stone by <. 360 This does not help to determine or separate the speakers and turns, as the turns are shorter than a verse, 361 but it emphasises the metre, as is often the case in the Imperial period.

The following epigram also contains extra turns that are linked to the adjacency pairs: 362

18. Ἀρπάλου εἰμὶ τάφος. — τίνος Ἀρπάλου; — Ἄρπαλον ἴσθι δαιδαλέης σοφίς τὸν πολυτεχνότατον. — ἔγνων, ὥ Μοῖραι· πολυμήχανος ὠλετο τέχνη· τίς τούτῳ ζῴτων ἄλλος ὄμιος ἀνήρ;
5 — οὖτος ο ὀσμέθασα περιμήκεα τείχεα νηῶν, στήσας αἰθούσσας κίόνας υψορόφους πολλάκι και κορυφάς ὀρέων ἵσα κάρφεοι κόροι ἔγαγε πειθομένας λεπταλέουσι κάλους.
— οὖτως Ἀμφείων, οὔτως Ὀρφεύς ποτε πέτραις μολπῇ θελγόνας ἦγον ἀνευ καμάτων.
10 μολπῆ θελγομένας ἦγον ἀνευ καμάτων.
— ἴσθι καὶ Ἀρπάλου υἱόν Ἀχιλλέα κείμενον ὑδε, κοινή δ᾽ ἄμφοτέρους ἀμφεκάλυψε σοφός.
— ἀλλ᾽ οὗ θαυμάζων κρατερῶτερα νήματα Μοίρων, πρὸς θάνατον δ᾽ οὐδεὶς μάγγανον εὕρε σοφῶν.

I am the tomb of Harpalos. — Of which Harpalos? — That Harpalos, you must know, who was highly skilled in the many arts of cunning wisdom. — I understand, ye Fates: inventive Art is passed away. What other living man was like unto Harpalos? — It was he who adorned the lofty walls of temples, supported colonnades with pillars high as the roof, and oftentimes led the crests of mountains, as it were splinters from a

360 Peek 1932, 53–4 and Künzle 1933, 76.
361 Except for the third and the last turn, but this does not change the situation.
362 GVI 1846 = BE 1944, 199a, early 3rd century CE, Hermoupolis Magna, Egypt.
log, by the persuasive force of slender ropes. — So once Amphion, so Orpheus by the charm of their minstrelsy led rocks without effort. — Achilles, too, son of Harpalos, you must know, lies here: a common urn hides the dust of both. — Nay, but I marvel not: the threads spun by the Fates are strong, and against death no sage has invented a charm.

(Translation by Waddell)\textsuperscript{363}

The speakers are the passerby and the monument. As in numbers 14, 15 and 17, the monument starts the epigram with a statement. Here, no speculation about the speaker is needed (compare with no. 14), as the monument speaks in the first person: Ἀρπάλοι εἰμὶ τάφος. The response to this is a question: τίνος Ἀρπάλοι; This question is replied to in the third turn. Like in the previous examples, here too this question turns begins a question–answer structure. This epigram is also from Egypt (as are examples 14, 15 and 17), and perhaps the rather impersonal opening sentence was a local habit. We have only these three examples, but if we read them one after another, it seems plausible that the first speaker in all three is the monument (in this epigram it is clearly indicated).\textsuperscript{364}

The fourth turn in this epigram is a reaction to the previous reply: ἔγνων, ὡ Μοῖραι... At the end of the fourth turn, there is another question: τίς τούτων ἄλλος ὁμοίως ἀνήρ; In his commentary, Waddell speculates about the division of the turns and suggests that it is possible that the speaker in verses 5–10 is also the passerby,\textsuperscript{365} but I find this unlikely. In my opinion, the division presented here (also by Waddell) follows the conventions of type 2 more closely (cf. other epigrams presented in this chapter with an extra turn at the beginning). After the question in verse 4 (τίς τούτων ἄλλος ὁμοίως ἀνήρ;), it is very likely that the next verses, from οὗτος ὁ κοσμήσας περμή<κ>εα τείχεα νηών onwards, belong to a different speaker. This reply turn is four verses long (starting from the beginning of the fifth verse), and in this turn, the good deeds of the deceased Harpalus are explained. After this (ll. 9–10), the passerby comments only on the response. The

\textsuperscript{363} Waddell 1941, 107. For an alternative translation for line 8, see Skeat 1941, 69, who suggests ‘with poles thin as matchsticks’ and explains his interpretation of the construction technique.

\textsuperscript{364} These are from Egypt, as noted; for a parallel from Thessalonica, see no. 6 in Section 4.2.1 (Attinas).

\textsuperscript{365} Waddell 1941, 108.
turn is clearly connected to the previous turn, as it begins with a reference to it: ὁδὸς Ἀμφείων, ὁδὸς Ὅρφεὺς ποτε---. In the context of the epigram, this is actually another ‘extra turn’ in addition to the opening turn. This ‘extra turn’ is the third turn, which is connected to a question–answer pair that precedes it. After this turn, the last adjacency pair of the epigram follows. This is a statement–response pair (ll. 11ff.): ἴσθι καὶ Ἀρπάλου υἱὸν Ἀχιλλέα κείμενον ὠδε, / κοινὴ δ᾽ ἀμφοτέρους ἀμφεκάλυψε σοφός. /— ἀλλ᾽ οὐ θαυμάζω· κρατερώτερα νήματα Μοιρῶν, /πρὸς θάνατον δ᾽ οὐδείς μάγγανον εὑρε / σοφῶν. In the statement turn, the speaker is the monument again, and the sentence starts with an imperative and a particle: ἴσθι καὶ Ἀρπάλου υἱὸν Ἀχιλλέα κείμενον ὠδε---. The response to this turn begins with a particle: ἀλλ᾽ οὗ θαυμάζω----. As in the previous epigram (no. 16), here the passerby also uses the rather exceptional first person (θαυμάζω).

There are four monument–passerby pairs in this epigram, but on the level of the pairs, the epigram is formed as follows: 1 + 2 x Q – A + 1 + S – R.

4.3 Type 2 and the non-inscribed epigram tradition

When the epigram became a literary genre, the poets not only composed epigrams but also imitated one another. In the earlier verse-inscription tradition (and in inscription tradition in general), it was common to use certain phrases and canonical formulas. It is not surprising that the renowned poets also ‘recycled’ certain elements or even whole epigrams: if the audience was already familiar with the text in one way or another, it was perhaps likely to favour the piece more. In the examples we have seen so far, certain elements that are visible in type 1 are used perhaps in an even more formulistic way in type 2 (question formulas especially). This is also evident in the fictive-epigram tradition – some of the non-inscribed epigrams are very similar to the inscribed ones. Often it is difficult, and sometimes impossible, to tell the difference. It may also be difficult to tell whether the text

---

366 In this section, I will concentrate more on the thematic similarities and differences than on the structure, which I believe is discussed in such detail by now that the reader can detect the similarities in, e.g., question structures or in imperatives as the marker of the switch of speaker.

367 Thomas 1998, 205 pointed out that: ‘the fiction of functionality is part of the essence of the developing epigrammatic genre’. In this study, there are also some epigrams that can be found both in AG and in a verse inscription corpus such as GVI or SGO.
was first inscribed and then later copied and hence found its way to the anthologies, or whether it was purely fictive.\textsuperscript{368} It seems that epigrammatists also wrote some monument texts.\textsuperscript{369} The verse inscription tradition shows in the literary genre, but the non-inscribed epigrams also influenced the inscriptions, and both ways have to be taken into account.

One example of a possible re-use of a text is the grave epigram composed by Leonidas, which was included in Peek’s Vers-Inschriften, but is now lost.\textsuperscript{370}

19. τίς τίνος εὗσα, γύναι, Παρίην ὑπὸ κίονα κείσαι;
   — Πρηξὼ Καλλιτέλευς, — καὶ ποδαπή; — Σαμίη.
   — τίς δὲ σε καὶ κτερέιζε; — Θεόκριτος ὃ με γονής ἐξέδοσαν. — θυήσκεις δ᾽ ἐκ τίνος; — ἐκ τοκετοῦ.
   5 — εὗσα πόσων ἔτεων; — δύο κεικοσιν. — ἤ ῥα γʹ ἀτεκνός;
   — οὔκ, ἄλλα τριετῇ Καλλιτέλην ἐλιπον.
   — ζώοι σοι κεῖσθαι γε, καὶ ἐς βαθὺ γήρας ἵκοιο.
   — καὶ σοί, ξείνε, πόροι πάντα Τύχη τὰ καλά.

Who and whose daughter are you, woman, lying under a pillar of Parian marble? — Prexo, daughter of Kalliteles. — And from where? — From Samos. — And who buried you (with due honours)? — Theocritus, to whom my parents gave me in marriage. — What caused your death? — Childbirth. — How old were you? — Twenty-two. — Were you then childless? — No, I left behind Calliteles, who is three years old. — May he live and reach old age. — And to you, stranger, may Fortune give everything good.

The speakers in this epigram are the passerby and the deceased.\textsuperscript{371} The epigram resembles many of the type-2 epigrams discussed in the previous sections.\textsuperscript{372} The

\textsuperscript{368} Bettenworth 2007, 75 rightly mentions that some poems of the Anthology were surely inscribed first. She also points out that: ‘Greek (and Roman) epigrammatists did not develop neatly identifiable characteristics of ‘literary’ inscriptions’ (and that it is thus sometimes difficult to tell if some phenomena of literary epigrams have their roots in inscribed ones or not); cf. p. 85.

\textsuperscript{369} On the other hand, not all of the verse inscriptions were written by professional poets.

\textsuperscript{370} GVI 1858 = AG 7.163, 3\textsuperscript{rd} century CE, provenience unknown (now lost). According to Page 1981, 6–7, this was possibly a ‘literary exercise’ that became popular and was later used as a model for inscribed epitaphs. There are many imitations of this epigram: see Gow and Page 1965, 50.

\textsuperscript{371} cf. Rasche 1910, 5.
elements that constitute the dialogue are very similar to what we have seen so far: the first question begins with a double interrogative (τίς τίνος), and an address is also used (γύναι). The deceased replies with her name. The second question is linked to the previous pair by καί, and the third question contains are δέ, an interrogative and καί (l. 2): τίς δέ σε καί κτερέιξε; In the fourth question turn, δέ is used again (l. 4): θυήσκεις δ’ ἐκ τίνος; In the fifth adjacency pair, the question is formed with a participle: εὗσα πόσων ἐτέων. The sixth question begins with an ἦ ὅα structure: ἦ ὅα γ’ ἀτεκνος (l. 5).373 Here, γε emphasises the question and ἦ ὅα γ’ marks the shift to another information unit: Were you childless then? The question is replied to with οὐκ, ἀλλά…, and ἀλλά is used in an adversative sense here (l. 6). This pair is used to inform the recipient about the family of the deceased: (Were you childless then?) – No, (but) I left Kalliteles who is three years old. At the end of the epigram, after five Q – A pairs, there is a pair of wishes (ll. 7–8). The change of speaker is easy to identify because the optative mood is used again. The passerby begins, and the deceased replies, starting with καί σοι, ξείνε. As in many cases we have seen so far, καί is used at the beginning of a reply wish.

Two epigrams imitate this poem.374 Rather than plagiarism, however, it was seen as something positive if one could replicate an appreciated poem375; and why not? Even though the text was carved on stone, as apparently was the case with Leonidas’ epigram (although now lost), the writers knew that their texts would probably be circulated in book form also, and that they would probably be read for an audience. Now, if the audience knew the piece the epigram imitated or varied, perhaps they were rather delighted by this literary play.

By the first centuries BCE/CE, it seems that the medium of the epigram was not that relevant anymore: each epigram could have different kinds of audiences and reception situations. If we think about, for example, number 19, there had

---

372 e.g. nos. 1 and 2 in Chapter 4.
373 Compare with no. 10 in this chapter: τίς ἦ ὅα τύμβῳ τῷδ᾽ ὅπεσσο';
374 AG 7.164 by Antipater of Sidon and 7.165, either by Antipatrer or possibly Archias. cf. Gow and Page 1968, 441.
375 cf. Gutzwiller 2007, 118: ‘Although the very similar versions by Antipater and Archias are hardly improvements, the poets apparently prided themselves on their ability to replicate a much-admired epigram’. For Archias, see Gow and Page 1968, 441 (cf. Antipater of Sidon, ibid.). Amyntas also used the model: Page 1981, 6–7.
probably been reception of the epigram near the monument in the funerary ritual the epigram had probably been read aloud near the monument during the funeral ritual, and hence the family had heard the poem. After that, random passersby may have read it. However, as it was written by a known epigrammatist, the text had probably also been read outside the funeral context, at the latest after it was included in the *Anthologia*.

At a quick glance, the following epigram is also reminiscent of the verse inscriptions, but a closer look reveals some differences:  

20. ὦ ξένε, τί κλαίεις; — διὰ σὸν μόρον. — οἴσαθα τίς εἶμι;
— οὐ μὰ τὸν, ἀλλʼ ἔμπης οἰκτρὸν ὃρῳ τὸ τέλος.
ἐσσὶ δὲ τίς; — Περίκλεια. — γυνὴ τίνος; — ἀνδρὸς ἄριστου,
ῥήτορος, ἐξ Ἀσίης, οὐνόμα Μεμνονίου.
— πώς δὲ σε Βοσπορίη κατέχει κόνις; — εἰρεο Μοϊραν,
NavigationView η μοι τὴλε ζωὴ την ξένον ἐξωκε τάφου.
— παῖδα λίπες; — τριέτηρον, ὃς ἐν μεγάροισιν ἀλύων
ἐκδέχεται μαζῖ ἡμετέρων σταγάνα.
— αἰθε καλός ζώς; — ναί, ναι, φίλος, εὐχεο κεῖνοι,
ὅφρα μοι ἡβήσας δάκρυ φίλον σταλάοι.

*Stranger, why do you cry? — For your fate. — Do you know who I am? — No, by ----! But still I see your end was pitiable; who are you? — Periclea. — Whose wife? — Of a noble man, a rhetor from Asia, whose name is Memnonius. — And how is it that you lie in Bosporian dust? — Ask Fate, who gave me a strange tomb far away from my country. — Did you leave a child? — One of three years old, who wanders around the house seeking the milk of my breasts. — May he live and have it all well. — Yes, yes, friend, pray for him, that he may grow up and shed dear tears for me.*

(Translation following Paton, but with my own minor alterations)

The speakers in the epigram are the passerby and the deceased. The epigram begins with a question turn that uses an address and an interrogative, but instead of the

---

376 Agathias Scholasticus, AG 7.552
passerby (who would ask the deceased some questions), it is the deceased who speaks in the opening turn. She addresses the passerby: ὦ ξένε, τί κλαίεις; In verse inscriptions, we do not often have this kind of references to the mourning passerby.377 Some sort of a lament was probably part of the ritual, but still the passerby role is most often emotionally neutral, or the lament follows the information; in other words, it is implied that the passerby laments the deceased after s/he has learned the miserable fate of the deceased.

Here, however, the passerby declares that s/he mourns for the deceased, even though s/he does not know anything about her yet. To the question τί κλαίεις:, the reply is διὰ σὸν μόρον, for your fate. To this, the deceased wonders if the passerby even knows who she is: οἶσθα τίς εἰμι; The passerby does not know, but says s/he can see that the deceased has met a wretched end: οὐ μὰ τὸν ἀλλ᾽ ἐμπῆς οἰκτρὸν ὁρῶ τὸ τέλος. After this, the passerby asks ἔσσι δὲ τίς;378 Up until this point, the questions have been asked by the deceased and answered by the passerby, but this turn reverses the situation. The passerby first replies to a question, but then proceeds to also ask a question. From here onwards (l. 3), the epigram looks like a funerary verse inscription. Several question–answer pairs about the deceased and her family follow, and at the end of the epigram, there is a pair of wishes. The passerby hopes the son of the deceased will live on: αἴθε καλῶς ζῶοι. The reply to this (ναί, ναί, φίλος, εὐχέο κείνω, ὁφρα μοι ἡβῆςας δάκρυ φίλον σταλάοι) is also something we do not usually see in verse inscriptions. It is more common for the deceased to wish the passerby well, not to comment on what s/he has said in this manner.

Non-inscribed epigrams often feature passerby–monument and passerby–deceased pairs, but their contents differ from the monumental epigrams. Some of the fictive dialogues are thoroughly reminiscent of inscribed epigrams, but some, despite the similar structures, discuss, for example, life after death or other more abstract phenomena, and do not imitate the structure of verse inscriptions. Hence, the speaker pairs familiar from the inscriptions function as a set framework for new,
often death-related, themes. The following epigram, for example, borrows the theme and the pair structure of the funerary verse inscriptions, but does not imitate the content at all.\textsuperscript{379}

21. ἄγριός ἐστι Χάρων. — πλέον ἦπιος. — ἦρπασεν Ἦδη
tὸν νέον. — ἀλλὰ νόῳ τοῖς πολιοίσιν ἴσον.
— τερπιλῆς δ᾽ ἀπέπαυσεν. — ἀπεστυφέλιξε δὲ μόχθων.
— οὐκ ἐνόησε γάμους. — οὐδὲ γάμων ὀδύνας.

Charon is savage. — Kind, rather. — He carried off the young man so soon. — But in mind he was the equal of greybeards. — He cut him off from pleasure. — But he thrust him out of the way of trouble. — He knew not wedlock. — Nor the pains of wedlock.

(Translation by Paton)

The theme of untimely death is common in verse inscriptions, and is also visible in the type-2 epigrams, but the whole idea is played with in this example. In the grave inscriptions, the fate of the deceased is presented as something mournful, but here the second speaker states that Charon is \textit{kind, rather}. The deceased’s death is illustrated as something good. Also, the fact that the deceased was not married is presented, not as tragic (as in grave inscriptions), but as a relief to the deceased: οὕκ ἐνόησε γάμους. — οὐδὲ γάμων ὀδύνας. There are elements in this epigram that are common in the inscribed texts, but the speakers are not identifiable anymore, and the epigram functions on a rather fictitious, abstract level.

The grave verse inscriptions are clearly ‘visible’ in the non-inscribed epigrams, but other monument types have influenced them as well. An epigram about Hippocrates’ portrait bears a resemblance to honorary epigrams.\textsuperscript{380}

\begin{footnotes}
\footnoteref{379} AG 7.603, Julianus, Prefect of Egypt.
\footnoteref{380} AG 16.267, Synesius Scholasticus.
\end{footnotes}
22. εἰς εἰκόνα Ἱπποκράτους
ὅπποθεν ὁ στῆσας; — Βυζάντιος. — οὖνομα δὴ τίς;
— Εὐσέβιος. — σὺ δὲ τίς; — Κώιος Ἱπποκράτης.
— τοῦ δ’ ἐνεκεν γέγραφέν σε; — λόγων χάριν ἡ πόλις αὐτῶ
τῶν ἐς ἑμὲ γραφίδων ἀντιδέδωκε γέρας.
— καὶ τί μὴ αὐτὸς ἐδν τῦπον ἐγραφεν; — ὅτι, γεραίρων
ἡμέας ἀνθ’ αὐτοῦ, κρέσσονα δόξαν ἔχει.

From where was he who placed this here? — From Byzantium. — And his name? —
Eusebius. — And who are you? — Hippocrates of Cos. — And why has he painted
you? — In return for his discourses the city gave him the privilege of making my
picture. — And why did he not paint his own portrait? — Because by honoring me
instead of himself, he gains greater glory.

(Translation following Paton, but with my own minor alterations)

The speakers of this epigram are clearly the passerby and the monument381, as the
second person singular (in the passerby’s turn) and the general context show. The
epigram is based on question–answer pairs, and interrogatives are given with the
particles δέ and καί. The questions are familiar: who dedicated the monument, who
is the person celebrated in the monument and for what reason is the monument set
up? In the last question–answer pair, the passerby asks why the painter did not paint
his own picture, and to this the honorand replies that the person who commissioned
the portrait would gain greater glory by honouring the person depicted than by
setting up his own portrait: καὶ τί μὴ αὐτὸς ἐδν τῦπον ἐγραφεν; — ὅτι, γεραίρων /
ἡμέας ἀνθ’ αὐτοῦ, κρέσσονα δόξαν ἔχει.

Dialogue was also used in the following ecphrastic epigram.382

23. τίς, πόθεν ὁ πλάστης; — Σικυώνιος. — οὖνομα δὴ τίς;
— Λύσιππος. — σὺ δὲ τίς; — καιρὸς ὁ πανδαμάτωρ.

381 Monument as a speaker role obviously represents the honored person – these roles are partly
mixed here.
382 AG 16.275 = Posidippus 19, Gow and Page.
Who and from where is the sculptor? — From Sicyon. — And his name? — Lysippus. — And who are you? — Kairos the all-subduer. — Why do you stand on tip-toe? — I am always running. — Why do you have a pair of wings on your feet? — I fly with the wind. — Why do you hold a razor in your right hand? — As a sign to men that I am sharper than any edge. — And why is there hair over your face? — For the one who meets me to grasp at. — And by Zeus, why is the back of your head bald? — Because none whom I have once raced by on my winged feet will now, though he wishes it, take hold of me from behind. — Why did the artist fashion you? — For your sake, stranger, and he set me up in the portico as a lesson.

(Translation in Männlein-Robert, after Austin and Bastianini)\(^{383}\)

In this epigram, the monument describes itself via two speakers, namely the passerby and the monument. At the same time, however, the epigram is a description of time, of the fleeing moments that we cannot depict in a bronze statue.\(^{384}\) With the question–answer structure, information such as the identity of the sculptor is given, and the sculpture is then described within the further pair structure. The dialogue is hence used to describe a statue (in place of the deceased), and the facts about the sculptor are also told at the beginning (his name and his fatherland, in place of facts about the deceased again), and the monument even

---


\(^{384}\) For an interpretation of the epigram, see Männlein-Robert 2007, 260–2. Concerning dialogues with statues, see Rasche 1910 and Kassel 1983. Also Burzachechi 1962, even though I do not agree with him on animism: see Chapter 2.
addresses the passerby with ξεῖνε (l. 12). The passerby-monument pair, familiar from
the grave inscriptions, is common in fictive ecphrastic epigrams. Thus the speaker
roles and the structure look similar to the ones we know from the inscriptions, but
the content is different. We can find some self-referentiality in verse inscriptions as
well, but the thematic variation makes this epigram different from its inscribed
counterparts.

In the following example, the writer plays with the expectations connected to
the question–answer structures:

24. Χῖος ἕφυς; — οὐ φημι. — τί δαί, Σμυρναῖος; — ἀπαυδῶ.
   — Κύμη δ’ ἢ Κολοφών πατρίς, Ὄμηρε, σέθεν;
   — Οὐδετέρη. — Σαλαμίς δὲ τεῇ πόλις; — οὐδ’ ἀπὸ ταύτης
      ἐξέφυν. — ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς λέξον, ὅπῃ γέγονας.
   — οὐκ ἔρεω. — τίνος ἤρα; — πέπεισμ’ ὅτι τάτρεκές εἰπὼν
      ἔξω τὰς ἄλλας ἄμιν ἄπεχθομένας.

Were you raised on Chios? — I say, no. — What then, a Smyrnian? — I deny it. —
Was Cyme or Colophon your homeland, Homer? — Neither. — Was Salamis your
city? — No, I am not from there either. — But tell me yourself where you were born.
— I will not. — Wherefore? — I know for sure that if I tell the truth, I shall make the
other cities my enemies.

(Translation following Paton, but with minor alterations)

Of the five question–answer pairs in this epigram, four concentrate on the same
question: where was Homer, who is addressed in the epigram, from? The other
speaker role is not identified, but due to the question structure, it resembles the
passerby role, and the questions are similar to the ones that the passerby asks.
Details such as δέ attached to questions and ἀλλ’ after the chain of questions when a
new viewpoint is adapted (you tell, then, after the passerby has tried to guess the
fatherland) are also familiar from the verse inscriptions. Yet, the content, especially

385 cf. Chapter 2, esp. 2.3.1 and 2.3.2.
386 AG 16.299, anonymous.
the twist at the end (πέπεισμ’, ὅτι τάτρεκές εἰπὼν /ἔξω τὰς ἀλλὰς ἂμων ἀπεχθομένας – I know for sure that if I tell the truth, I shall make the other cities my enemies), is of course different from the verse inscriptions’ context.

Another epigram also plays with the expectations that a recipient familiar with the funerary epigrams would have: 387

25. οὖνομά μοι — τί δὲ τούτο; — πατρίς δὲ μοι — ἐς τί δὲ τούτο;
 — κλεινοῦ δ᾽ εἰμὶ γένους. — εἰ γὰρ ἀφαυροτάτου;
 — ζήσας δ᾽ ἐνδόξως ἔλυσον βίον. — εἰ γὰρ ἀδόξως;
 — κείμαι δ᾽ ἐνθάδε νῦν. — τίς τίνι ταῦτα λέγεις;

My name is... — What does it matter? — My country is... — And what does that matter? — I am of noble race. — And if you were of the very dregs? — I quitted life with a good reputation. — And had it been a bad one? — And I now lie here. — Who are you and to whom are you telling this?

(Translation by Paton)

In this epigram, the deceased tries to tell all the facts that the passerby would normally want to know: his name, his fatherland and his reputation. However, the passerby reacts to this with a set of arrogant questions; the message of all of them is basically ‘so what’? Hence, instead of an enquirer, the passerby here is indifferent (τί δὲ τούτο;), and his other questions are haughty refusals to take in the information. At the end of the epigram, the passerby even asks who are you and why do you tell me all this? τίς τίνι ταῦτα λέγεις; This epigram mocks the traditions of the funerary dialogue epigrams. 388 The point is not to ask who you are, but indeed to indicate ‘why are you telling me this?’ The expectations are not met, and the Gricean maxims are not functioning here.

As in the case of type-1 epigrams, there are also type-2 epigrams which do not have any ‘monumental context’, meaning that they do not imitate the verse inscriptions. The dialogue was used in different kinds of texts, for example in

amatory epigrams and Christian morals, which are not fixed to a monumental context.\textsuperscript{389} An isopsephic epigram by Leonidas of Alexandria contains an interesting combination of an abstract theme and references to monument epigram structures.\textsuperscript{390}

26. τὶς Δάμων Ἀργεῖος ἔτ’ ἡρίω; ἃρα σύναιμος
   ἐστὶ Δικαιοτέλους; — ἐστὶ Δικαιοτέλους.
   Ἡχὼ τοῦτ’ ἐλάλησε πανύστατον ἢ τόδ’ ἀληθές,
   κείνος δέ’ ἐστιν ἀνήρ; — κείνος δο’ ἐστιν ἀνήρ.

Who is the Argive Damon on the tomb?\textsuperscript{391} Is he a brother of Dicaeoteles? — A brother of Dicaeoteles. — Did Echo speak the last words, or is it true that this is the man? — This is the man.

(Translation by Paton)

At first glance, this looks like a passerby–monument or passerby–deceased epigram. The first turn consists of two question sentences. The first one uses the interrogative τίς, and the second begins with ἃρα. The reply turn repeats the last two words of the latter question. The same happens in the second adjacency pair: the reply turn consists of the last word of the question turn. Both these repetitions form a verse (pentameter) each: (---) ἐστὶ Δικαιοτέλους; ἐστὶ Δικαιοτέλους and (---) κείνος δό’ ἐστιν ἀνήρ; κείνος δο’ ἐστιν ἀνήρ.

Here, the passerby opens the poem with his questions. The echo answers, as the passerby suspects in his second turn. The traditional frame of dialogue is used here for literary purposes, which the echo clearly shows. The epigram is playing with the conventions of talking and listening, the change of speaker, and even with the speaker roles: instead of the deceased, the the echo is talking (despite what the last line says), and the passerby expresses his confusion concerning the matter when he asks whether it was the echo or the man who spoke. This is perhaps also a reference

\textsuperscript{389} For other themes, see del Barrio Vega 1989, 198–201.
\textsuperscript{391} The name Δάμων instead of δαίμων was first suggested by Radiger: see Page 1981, 520. For isopsephic, see ibid., 508–10.
to the speaker role of the deceased in the monuments, i.e. to the artificial situation where the deceased ‘speaks’.

4.4 Conclusion

Type-2 epigrams are the second largest group of dialogue epigrams. Both in structure and in themes, we can see the influence of the fictive epigram genre, or their parallel development. Adoption and imitation can be seen both in the verse inscriptions and in the non-inscribed epigrams that use the patterns familiar from their inscribed counterparts. In the fictive type-2 epigrams, the speaker roles and the themes of the epigrams are varied. There are epigrams that follow or imitate, for example, grave epigrams and other monument texts, but also epigrams that are completely free from monumental contexts, and epigrams that twist the old conventions.\(^{392}\)

On the level of the pair structure, there is variation in type 2 from compact, short-turned epigrams to lengthy conversations. The length of type-2 epigrams thus varies, as does the length and the number of the turns. The minimum is two short pairs (cf. nos. 4–6 in this chapter), but a two-pair epigram can also be a longer entity, if each of the turns is several verses long (cf. no. 12). There are also type-2 epigrams with several pairs (e.g. no. 7), and their length varies as well. In some epigrams, the turns follow the verse structure (e.g. one verse each), but not always; for example, in number 10, the verses and the turns do not match at all. There are also question–answer structures that resemble the type-1 epigrams, for example number 5, which has two adjacency pairs. All the variants of type-1 pairs occur in type 2, and either one adjacency pair type is repeated several times or different combinations of the pair structures occur within one epigram.

The core element of these epigrams is a question–answer pair, even more so than in type 1. Also, wish pairs at the end of the epigram are common. Some greeting pairs and other statement–response pairs also occur. In addition to these

\(^{392}\) The same of course applies to t1, but the phenomenon is perhaps even more prominent in t2.
pairs, there are extra turns either at the beginning, end or in the middle of the epigram in 11 type-2 epigrams. The most common of these options is the end of the epigram. The speaker of the extra turn at the beginning of the epigram is not always easy to identify, but on the basis of examples that I have discussed, I suggest that the speaker in such cases is the monument. As for the extra turn at the end of the epigram, it is the passerby voice that often either comments on the deceased’s destiny or wishes him/her well.

Primarily in the question turns, many structures and features are familiar from the type-1 epigrams, such as addresses, especially at the beginning of the epigram (first turn or first pair), and imperatives, likewise at the beginning. Interrogative-only questions also occur, as one might expect. In the epigrams with several pairs, there may be several kinds of question structures in one epigram. Particles are widely used, but only a certain set of particles is repeated. The most frequent particles are δέ, καὶ and ἀλλὰ, while γάρ and γε also occur. These particles have certain functions that recur in the epigrams. They can, for example, denote the change of an adjancy pair, as δέ in particular introduces a new question turn. καὶ functions on a sentence level, linking parts together, but it can also link the reply/response turn to the opening turn, especially in the case of the wish pair at the end (or a greeting pair), while ἀλλὰ marks the shift from one kind of pair (Q – A pairs) to another pair (e.g. a wish pair). Thus, the particle also make it easier for the recipient to follow the information about the deceased / the person honoured in the monument.

The fact that most type-2 epigrams date to between the 1st and 3rd century CE means that the elegiac distich had become well established as the metre of the epigram. In type 2, there is very little variation of this. We have only one iambic and a few epigrams with irregular variation of hexameter and pentameter, or with hexameter only. All of these dactylic variations come from Asia Minor or Egypt.

393 Six cases; see Section 4.2.2 and table 6 in this Section.
394 Iambic: no. 7, hexameter with one pentameter verse (v. 3) no.11, hexameter: nos. 5 and 16 + SGO 4, 21/24/02, not separately discussed in this chapter.
Like in type 1, most of the type-2 epigrams are either passerby–monument or passerby–deceased epigrams. The latter is more common: 53% of the type-2 epigrams are passerby–deceased epigrams and 40% are passerby–monument epigrams.\footnote{\textsuperscript{395}}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Type-2 epigrams in verse inscriptions according to their variants:}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
$X - Y n$ & $IG$ II/III$^2$ 8918 = GVI 1847 & no. 4 \\
& GVI 1848 & \\
& GVI 1858 = AG 7.163 & no. 19 \\
& SGO 1, 03/06/08 = GVI 1859 & no. 10 \\
& IG XII 5, 307 = GVI 1860 = GG 428 = SEG 45, 2251 & no. 8 \\
& Marek 1993, no. 38 = SGO 2, 10/03/04 = GVI 1863 & no. 11 \\
& IG II/III$^2$ 10073 = GVI 1864 1863 = SEG 48, 906 & no. 1 (2; 16) \\
& IG X 2, 1, 464 = GVI 1865 = SEG 52, 620 & (ch. 2; 17) \\
& IG XIV 1883 = GVI 1866 = GG 430 & no. 7 \\
& SGO 3, 16/55/03 = GVI 1870 = GG 431 & no. 2 \\
& IG XII 5, 310 = GVI 1871 = GG 432 = SEG 30, 1063 = SEG 58, 1885 = SEG 59, 1971 & no. 12 \\
& 1879 & no. 13 (2; 13) \\
& Sardis 7, 1, 111 = GVI 1881 = SGO 1, 04/02/11 = SEG 49, 1678; SEG 50, 1762; SEG 58, 1981; SEG 59, 1945 & \\
& ICr IV 372f., 372 Abb. = GVI 1882 = SEG 3, 781 & (ch. 2; 14) \\
& IG X, 2, 1, 148(B) = SEG 50, 1194 app. cr. = SEG 52, 620 & no. 6 \\
& SGO 4, 17/06/05 = SEG 29, 1442 & (ch. 2; 17) \\
& SGO 4, 21/23/06 = SEG 58, 1743 = SEG 60, 1927(2) & no. 5 \\
& SGO 4, 21/24/02 = SEG 37, 1538 = SEG 52, 1587 = SEG 58, 1743 & (ch. 2; 9) \\
& SGO 2, 08/01/41\textsuperscript{396} & no. 9 \\
& SGO 3, 16/08/01 & \\
& IG XII 4, 3, 2147 & \\
\hline
$1 + X - Y n$ & Bernand, Inscr. Métr. 68 = GVI 1843 = GG 427 = SEG 8, 530 & no. 14 (2; 10) \\
& GVI 1861 = SEG 8, 482 = GG 429 & no. 15 \\
& IMT Olympe 2691 = GVI 1862 = SGO 2, 08/08/10 = SEG 54, 1833 & no. 3 \\
\hline
$X - Y n + 1$ & $IG$ XIV, 1063 = GVI 1844 & no. 16 \\
& GVI 1868 & \\
& $IG$ II/III$^2$ 10118 = GVI 1872 = SEG 52, 1991 & \\
& IG IX 1, 878 = SEG 51, 1009 & \\
& SGO 4, 21/09/01 = SEG 49, 2069\textsuperscript{397} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{395} Other than these, there is one REL – DEC epigram and one other (NN – NN).
\textsuperscript{396} A long turn of DEC (could be seen as a monologue part) followed by REL – DEC – REL turns.
\textsuperscript{397} If read as Peters (in Peters and Thiersch 1905), 75. This text is different from most of the monumental epigrams: it is from a painted tomb, but it is an erotic inscription; the speakers are a man and a woman.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1 + X - Y n$</td>
<td>Bernand, <em>Inscr. Métr.</em> 49 = GVI 1845 = SEG 8, 371</td>
<td>no. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$+ 1$</td>
<td>GVI 1846 = BÉ 1944, 199a</td>
<td>no. 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. TYPE-3 EPIGRAMS

Type-3 epigrams comprise a small but heterogeneous group of poems. The development towards narrative is characteristic of type 3. There are only 12 type-3 epigrams in verse inscriptions, but they are more common in non-inscribed epigrams. In type-3 epigrams, the adjacency pair is not as central as in type 1 and type 2. However, many of these are X – Y variants, for example epigrams with three speakers (X – Y – Z) or X – Y arrangements with two speakers, but they are different from the types (1 and 2) discussed in the previous two chapters. The earliest of these epigrams dates to the 2nd/1st century BCE, and the latest to ca the 4th century CE.

Five type-3 verse inscriptions contain a neutral narrator (N) in addition to two other speakers (X – Y – N). In two of the verse inscriptions containing a narrator, the dialogue is embedded in a description told by this narrator. The paradigm for such an epigram is N – X – N – Y, although the turns are not necessarily in this order. In such epigrams, the narrator is an outside reporter of the dialogue, for example the narrator voice says ‘to this he replied’ (third person), and the turn of X or Y then follows. Another option is that the narrator both narrates (outside the dialogue) and participates in the dialogue: N – X – N – N2, where N2 marks the communicative turn of the narrator in the dialogue (‘and I said: xxx...’) (first person), but the turns can also occur in a different order (N – N2 – N – X, and so on). In other words, the narrator is also an inner actor of the dialogue. I call this ‘embedded dialogue’. It is more common in the non-inscribed epigrams than in the verse inscriptions, but I will discuss both.

If we take the strictest definition of a dialogue epigram, the embedded dialogues are not dialogue epigrams as such, as the communication is part of the narrative, but, in some cases, the communicative sections have elements that are familiar from type 1 and type 2. All in all, the communication in these epigrams makes them well worth discussing under the (broad) umbrella of ‘dialogue epigrams’. To use Kroon’s terminology, these epigrams are dialogical monologal: they are phrased by a central reporter, but the reporter also simulates or reports a

---

398 See Table 8 in Section 5.4.
conversational exchange. 399 Most of the type-3 verse inscriptions, however, are not embedded dialogues, but rather other X–Y variations, even if there is a narrator voice in the epigram. 400

In many cases of type-3 epigrams, one or more turns of the epigram are several verses long. Sometimes whole stanzas form turns. Also, one turn of a certain speaker may be two stanzas long. In the epigrams in which stanzas form a turn, the speaker obviously changes with the beginning of a new stanza, or one speaker has two stanzas, and the third stanza is by someone else.

In some epigrams, as the examples will show, the narrative part is clearly separate from the communicative part, but the narrative segment is still an integral part of the epigram unity. The other two turns before/after the narrative in a three-turn epigram can then form a structure similar to an adjacency pair, but the three turns together do not form a solid three-turn unit.

In this chapter, I will discuss the type-3 epigrams on the basis of the division presented above: first the X–Y variants in Section 5.1, and then the embedded dialogues in Section 5.2. I will provide the epigrams and discuss both the structure and the language of these epigrams. In these sections, I will also discuss some type-3 parallels in non-inscribed epigrams. In Section 5.3, I give some examples of texts that can hardly be called epigrams anymore, but which have similar elements of communication to the dialogue epigrams, especially type-3 ones.

5.1 Type-3 speakers (X–Y–Z and others)

In type-1 and type-2 epigrams, the basic situation is that the direction of the speech moves from speaker a to speaker b, and from b back to a (i.e. a -> b -> a). Occasionally, there is some variation, 401 but reciprocity is essential for these two types. In type-3 epigrams, the direction of the speech is more varied. In the following

---

400 cf. Section 5.1.
401 e.g. speaker X is addressing someone outside the poem, i.e. someone who does not speak in the epigram, or the speech is directed to a wider audience and not a specific speaker role. These, however, are mostly small segments of the epigram in question.
table, I present the speakers and their addressees in all of the type-3 verse inscriptions of this chapter:

Table 7: Speakers and directions of speech in type-3 verse inscriptions discussed in Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epigram</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no. 1</td>
<td>1–10 11–17 19–26</td>
<td>monument relative deceased</td>
<td>passerby deceased relative</td>
<td>latter half of 2nd CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 2</td>
<td>1–10 11–14 15–20</td>
<td>relative deceased relative?</td>
<td>deceased + daimon relative deceased?</td>
<td>2nd/1st BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 3</td>
<td>1–23 24–31</td>
<td>deceased relative</td>
<td>chthonic gods deceased</td>
<td>1st BCE/1st CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 4</td>
<td>1–6 7 8</td>
<td>narrator deceased passerby</td>
<td>— (passersby/?) deceased</td>
<td>ca 2nd CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 5</td>
<td>1–6 7–10 11–20</td>
<td>relative narrator deceased</td>
<td>deceased relative</td>
<td>ca 300–350CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 6</td>
<td>1–6 7–11 12–18</td>
<td>narrator passerby monument</td>
<td>— monument passerby</td>
<td>2nd/3rd CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 7</td>
<td>1–8 9 10 11–15</td>
<td>narrator relative narrator deceased</td>
<td>— deceased relative</td>
<td>after 312 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 8</td>
<td>1–6 7 beginning 7 end 8 9 10</td>
<td>narrator/MON passerby narrator/MON passerby</td>
<td>— monument — passerby</td>
<td>3rd/4th CE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

402 The turns of the narrator are not specifically directed, i.e. the ‘addressee’ is the whole audience. There is no addressee in the epigram for the narrator turns.
As we can see, these epigrams contain either two or three speakers, and in five cases, the narrator is one of the speakers. In order to better understand all of these, I will now discuss each epigram in more detail.

At the beginning of our first example, the deceased is described in the third person:

1. ἀστήν Ναυκράτεως Μενελάου πατρός, ὀδίτα,
   ἐξείνη εὕξεινος χθῶν ἔχει Ἠρακλέους,
   ὑμοτόκοις ὑδίσι πανυστατίοι λοχείης
   δῆμθείσαν, Μοιρέων νήμασι οἴκτροτάοις,
   5 εἴκοσι καὶ τρῖς πέντε' ἐτέων· χείρεσι δ` ὀμενυνος
   Ἀρμόδιος κτερίσας τῶιδ` ἐπέκρυψε τάφωι,
   Ἀραινόν Μάτρινα, Θεμιστώ τέκνα λιποῦσαν,
   οὐς εἶπ ουπαροῦ γήρας ἄχρι μολείν.
   ἀλλά σο ἀρχατή, χαῷ, Ἀμμωνία` ώς ἔθος, εἰπόν
   10 σώζου τὸν σαυτὸ πρὸς δόμον ἄβλαβεώς.

   ἀλλο
   — πάτρης καὶ γονέων σ` οὐμός πόθος ἠλλοτρίωσεν.
   σοῦ δ` ἐμὲ τῆς μελέης ἐστέρεσαν θάνατος,
   πένθος ἐμοίσα δόμοις καὶ δάκρυα λυγρὰ λυπεύσεις>

   15 τέκνων τ` ὀρφανικῶν νήπιον ἡλίκιν.
   λυπρὸν ἀεὶ βιοτὰς, Ἀμμωνία, ἔστι τὸ λουπὸν
   Ἀρμοδίων· τ` δ` ἐγὼ σοῦ δίχα φῶς ἐθ` ὀρῷ;

   ἀλλο
   — λήξον στερνότυποι γόου, παῦσαι μὲ δακρύων,

   20 ὡ πόσι· μὴ κωφῶι τῦμβῳ ἐπιστενάχει.
   σῶν φαῦσαι λεχέων Ἀμμωνίαι οὐκέτ` ἐφικτῶν,
   Ἀρμόδιε· στυγερός γάρ με κέκευθ` Ἀίδης;

403 Or in four cases if we read the speaker in no. 8 as monument rather than narrator. It is also possible to read the other speaker as either the monument or the narrator in the case of SG0 2, 08/01/51.
οἰκία μοι νεκύων· ἀνεπίστροφα πρὸς φάος Ἡοὺς.
tαῦτα· μάτην λυπροῖς πένθεσιν ἐνδέδεσαι
25 στέργε τὰ μέχρι τέλους μοίρας δόσιν οὔτιν φυκτόν
ἀνθρώπων· πάσιν δ᾽ ἦδ᾽ ὑπόκειται ὀδός.
 Ἀμμωνία χρηστή, χαίρε.
  (έτους) γ', Ἐπείφ ἰα'.

A citizen of Naucratis, daughter of Menelaos, o wanderer, a stranger, lies under the hospitable ground of Heracles. She was forced to untimely labours for the very last time due to the most pitiable spun of the Moiras, at the age of 35 years. The husband Harmodios buried her with his (own) hands and covered in this grave; she left behind (children) Arsinoe, Matron and Themisto, may they live until the old age utterly comes. But you, say as the habit is, ‘be greeted, goodly Ammonia’, and (may you) without harm be saved to your own house.

— My love estranged you from your fatherland and the house of your parents, and death has bereaved me of you, poor thing: you left my house in grief and mournful tears, and the orphaned children, in the age of not yet speaking. The rest of the life will always be wretched to Harmodios, Ammonia; why should I still see light, without you?

— Stop the beating of your breast, and the lament, cease from shedding tears for me, oh husband, do not groan by the dumb grave. Ammonia can no longer touch your bed, Harmodios, for the hateful Hades hides me; I have my home among the dead; one cannot turn towards the morning light (from here). This is it all. In vain you have been bound in poor pains; be content with what will there be (for you), until the end; what destiny gives, no man can avoid: this road awaits everyone.

There are three speakers in this epigram. In the first stanza, the speaker is the monument. It describes both the deceased and her husband Harmodios in the third person. The fact that there is an address (ὁδίτα; l. 1) and an exhortation to participate in the rites at the end of the stanza (ll. 9–10) makes it clear that this is the voice of the monument and not of a narrator. The narrator voice is descriptive and

---

405 Metre, as it is easy to detect, is dactylic. For a more detailed analysis, see Zucker 1954, 121.
neutral and does not usually address any other speakers in the epigram. Also, the facts told in this turn are details which the monument traditionally tells about the deceased: here, her name, her fatherland, the name of her husband, the fact that they had children and the cause of her death. This first stanza is clearly directed to the passerby and not to any of the inner actors of this poem. The passerby is the σὺ of l. 9 (ἀλλὰ σὺ χρηστῇ χαῖρ᾽—), but s/he is only an addressee in this epigram and does not have a voice of his/her own.

Thus, the passerby is told to recite greetings, as is the habit: ἄλλα σὺ χρηστῇ χαῖρ᾽, Ἀμμωνία, ὡς ἔθος, εἰπὼν σώιζου τὸν σαυτοῦ πρὸς δόμον ἀβλαβέως. This section (the exhortation), as in previous examples, begins with ἄλλα; after a cluster of information, the focus shifts to the idea of rites, thus ἄλλα again shifts the focus from one thing to another. In type-1 and type-2 epigrams, such exhortations normally appear at the end of the epigram, but in this case, it appears at the end of the first stanza. However, in this instance the exhortation brings the turn of this voice to an end.

In the second stanza, the speaker is a relative who addresses the deceased. In this case, the relative is the husband mourning his late wife. He repeats the fact, told in the first stanza, that his wife left her fatherland and parents (in order to live with him). In his lament, he says that the house is now sorrowful, and that their infants are left orphans. His grief culminates in his declaration that the rest of his life is ruined (λυπρόν ἀεὶ βιοτάς, Ἀμμωνία, ἔστι τὸ λοιπὸν Αρμοδίῳ, l. 16) because there is no light for him without her: τί δ᾽ ἐγὼ σοῦ δίχα φῶς ἔθ᾽ ὀρῶ (l. 17). In this turn, the husband speaks about himself both in the first person (most of the time) and in the third person, for example in line 16. Nevertheless, the speaker role is clear, and so is the addressee: he addresses his wife and talks about his own loss (REL – > DEC).

In the third stanza, the late wife consoles her husband (DEC – > REL). At the beginning of the turn, she addresses him and tells him not to mourn (addresses + imperative): λῆξον στερνότυποι γόου, παῦσαι μὲ δακρύων, / ὦ πόσι. μὴ κωφῶι τύμβῳ ἐπιστενάχει. Her grave is dumb, and she now lives in Hades. She then explains that she has accepted her death and her new home among the dead. She
also expresses the sentiment that it is useless for the husband to grieve endlessly, and closes both the turn and the entire poem with a reminder of universal mortality:

---μοίρης δόσιν οὗτη φυκτὸν ἀνθρώπον· πᾶσιν δ’ ἡδ’ ύπόκειται ὁδος. This inevitability of death is a theme that occurs in turns of the deceased, especially in the dialogues with the relative.

The first stanza of this epigram is like any other grave monument in which the voice of the monument addresses the passerby and gives information about the deceased. It is the second and third stanzas that form the dialogue between the relative (widower) and the deceased. In the turn of the husband, some of the previous information is repeated, but the conversation between the married couple mostly concentrates on the sorrow of the one left behind and the consolation and acceptance of death expressed by the deceased, which ends in a reminder of mortality. All of these elements are typical of relative–deceased epigrams.

There is a short greeting below the epigram: Ἀμμωνία χρηστή, χαίρε. By reading this (aloud), the reader of the epigram did what s/he was told to do at the end of the first stanza, namely to utter the greeting, as is the habit (cf. ll. 9–10, i.e. the end of the first stanza).

There are three stanzas but only two speakers in the following X – Y variant:

2. λάινα σοι τύμβων δωμήματα Θείος ἐτευξα,
   Ἀθίς, ὁ δίς τῆς σης ἡλυκίης προγέρων,
   εὐχάμενος χειρῶν ἀπὸ σῶν κόνιν· ἀκριτε δαίμον,
   ἀμφότερος ἡμῖν ἐσβεσας ἠέλιον.

5 Ἀθίς, ἐμοὶ ζήσασα καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ πνεύμα λιποῦσα,
   ώς πάρος εὐφροσύνης, νῦν δακρύων πρόφασι,
   ἄγνά, πουλυγότε, τί πένθιμον ὕπνον ἰαύεις,

---

\[406\] GVI 1874 = GG 438 = SGO 1, 01/01/07, 2nd/1st century BCE, Cnidus. Hanink 2010, 20 gives 2nd BCE–1st AD. See also SGO 4, 17/06/02, which is mostly in the voice of the deceased but the relative addresses the deceased in the middle of the epigram.
ἀνδρός ἀπὸ στέρνων οὔποτε θείσα κάρα,
Θείον ἐρημώσασα τὸν οὐκέτι; σοὶ γὰρ ἐς Ἀδαν

10 ἡλθον ὦμοι ἰωάς ἐλπίδες ἀμετέρας.

— οὐκ ἔπιον Λήθης Λιδωνίδος ἔσχατον ὕδωρ,
ὡς σε παρηγορίην κὰν φθιμένοισιν ἐχω,
Θείε πλέον δύστηνε, γάμων ὅτι τῶν ἀμιάντων
νοσφισθεὶς κλαίεις χηροσύνην θαλάμων.

15 — τοῦτο σαοφροσύνας γέρας Ατθίδι ταί πολυκλάτωι
οὐκ ἴσιον οὐδὲ ἄρετὰς ἄξιον, ἀλλ᾽ ἐθέμαν
μνάμαιν εἰς αἰῶνα φερώνυμον αὐτὸς ἀνάγκαι
Θείος νηπιάχωι πνεύμα χαριζόμενος.

— οἰσω γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο χάριν σέο καὶ τὸν ἀπηνὴ

20 ὁμμασι τοῖς στυγνοῖς ὄψοµαι ἡλίον.

Atthis; I, Theios, built you a tomb building, having prayed that your hands would
have put dust on me who am twice your age; daemon of no-good judgement, you put
out the sun for both of us.

Atthis, you who lived for me and left your soul to me; as you earlier were the cause of
my merriment, you now are the cause of my tears, (you) chaste, much lamented, why
are you sleeping a sorrowful sleep, you who never placed your head away from (your)
husband’s chest, now leaving Theios alone, who is no more (himself). With you, all
hopes for my life are gone to Hades.

— I did not drink the last water of the Lethe of Hades, because even among the
deceased I have you as my consolation, Theios, you more unfortunate (than I). For
deprived of an undefiled marriage, you are now crying for the widowed (bed)room.

— This is for much-lamented Atthis not a gift equal to her chastity and not worthy of
her virtue, but I set up (the monument) to bear her name for ever, I, Theios, myself. I
had to save (my) life, obliging (our) child. I bring also this to you and with gloomy
eyes I look at the sun.
The speakers are the relative and the deceased. In the first two stanzas, the speaker is the relative (ll. 1–4 and 5–10). In the third stanza, the speaker is the deceased (ll. 11–14), and at the end of the epigram (ll. 15–20), the relative again. The speakers are easy to detect: in the first stanza, the relative, Theios, addresses his wife (in bold) and gives his own name (underlined) in the same sentence: λάινά σοι τύμβων δωμήματα Θείος ἔτευξα, / Ατθίς... In this first verse, the relative (Theios) speaks about himself in the third person, but at the end of the epigram, when addressing the daimon, he uses the first person plural: ἀκρίτε δαίμων, / ἀμφοτέροις ἥμιν ἔσβεσας ἡμῖν. By using ἥμιν he indicates that both he and Atthis as affected by Atthis’ death. The direction of speech is first Theios -> deceased, and then Theios -> daimon.

In the next stanza, the relative uses the first person for himself and continues to address the deceased in the second person: Ατθίς, ἐμοὶ ζήσασα καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ πνεῦμα λυποῦσα---ιαύεις---. The speakers are easy to detect, and the same goes for the third stanza in which the deceased addresses her husband, Θείε (l. 13). In the last stanza, Ατθίδι (l. 15), Θείος (l. 8) and χάρων σέο (l. 19) reveal the direction of the speech (REL – DEC). The speaker pair is familiar from types 1 and 2, as are the themes of the epigram, but the arrangement differs. The turns form whole stanzas, and this rather long poem is also more descriptive (in wording and style) than its counterparts in the other types.

In her own turn (ll. 11-14), Atthis strengthens the bond between the couple by telling that she did not drink from the fountain of Lethe (Oblivion) as she wanted to have the memory of her husband as her consolation – a thought that is consoling for the husband as well (ll. 11-13): οὐκ ἔπιον Λήθης Αἰδώνιδος ἑσχατον ὠδωρ, /ὡς σε παρηγορίην κἀν φθιμένοισιν ἐχω, /Θείε πλέον δύστηνε---. She also grieves for Theios who is now left alone to mourn (ll. 13-14): γάμων ὁτι τῶν ἁμάντων / νοσφισθεὶς κλαίεις χηροσύνην θαλάμων.

Hanink compares this and Ammonia epigram (my no. 1 in this Chapter) and points out that on the basis of the similarities of both form and content of these two epigrams, as well as the separation of the stanzas, ---it is tempting to think that the developed dialogue form of the epitaphs represents a certain evolution of...
Konkurrenzgedichte into longer single poems consisting of multiple stanzas.\footnote{Hanink 2010, 20–22.} It is also worth pointing out that in the epigrams that have this speaker pair (REL – DEC, as in this and in the previous example), afterlife is referred to more often and in more detail than in PB – MON/DEC epigrams. Such references are perhaps easier to include in epigrams between the family members: emotions are expressed, and the references to Hades and life in there have also consoling aspects. In these expressions of afterlife, there is probably thematic influence of non-inscribed epigrams as well.

In the following epigram, the text units are also lengthy:\footnote{GVI 1875 = GG 439, 1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE/ 1\textsuperscript{st} century CE, Alexandria, Egypt. See also Bernand, Insc. Métr. 46 and Robert 1936, 120–3.}

3. Θέρμιν χρηστή, χαῖρε.
χθονίων ἐνερθε δαιμόνων ἀνάκτορες
σεμνή τε Φερσέφασσα, Δήμητρος κόρη,
δέχεσθε τὴν ναυαγόν ἄθλιαν ἔνην,

5 πατρός γεγώσαν Λυσανίου, Θέρμιν ἐμέ,
ἔσθλὴν δ᾽ ἀκοίτην Σιμάλου ἔξυνάρον.
eἪ τις δ᾽ ἐμοῖς σπλανχνοίσσιν ἢ βίω ποτὲ
οίκτρας Ἐρινὺς φαρμάκων ἐπήγαγεν,
μὴ πώποτ᾽ ἄλλην μοῖραν, ἄφθιτοι θεοί,

10 πέμψηθ᾽, ὀμοίαν θ᾽ ἢν ἐγὼ κεκτημένη.
ἐνερθε ναίο, τριττύχους μὴνας φθίσι
βιότου λυπούσα καρπόν, ὁν γὴ πανκράτωρ
βροτοῖς δίδωσι, τοῦδ᾽ ἀπεστερημέ[ν]ή
tέκνων τε, ἀνακτε, κάνδρος· οὐ ψυχὴ [μία]

15 ὑπήρξέ μοι σὺν ἀνδρὶ καὶ βίος γλυκώς;
tούτων ἀπάντων ἀθλία λελημένη
ἀρὰς τίθημι, τοῖς ἔχουσα πήματα,
αὐτοῖς καὶ τέκεσ<σ>ι παρρίζους μολὼν
Ἅδου μέγαν κευ[θ]μῶνα καὶ σκότου πύλας,
20 τέκνων δ’ ἐμῶν ἀθραυστον ὀλβιον βίον
πάντων ἰκέσθαι κάνδρος ἵς γήρως χρόνον,
eἰ γ’ ἐστ’ ἐν Ἀδου βαιός εὐχωλῆς λόγος,
ἀράς τελήας οίς ἐπεύχομαι τελίν.
— Μουσών άοιδήν συνβίώσεως σέθεν
25 τερπνήν τε καὶ λυπηρόν ἐνπαλιν διδούς,
Θέρμιν, ἐμὴ ξύνευνε, τοῖαδ’ ἐννέπω·
θρέψω <θ’> ὅσους ἐφύσας εξ ἐμοῦ γόνους
τῆς πρός σε φιλίας ἀξίως, εὐνάορε,
Λυσάν τε τὸν πρὶν τοῖς ἐμοῖς ὀμόρροπον
30 παισίν συνέξω, σὴν χάριν ταύτην τιθίς,
ἀμενπτον ἐν βίῳ γὰρ ἐσχηκας τρόπον.
(ἔτους) ζ’, Παῦνι κς’

Rulers of the underground spirits beneath, and you, holy Persephone, maiden of Demeter, accept me, Thermion, a stranded miserable stranger, daughter of Lysanias, good wedded wife of Simalos. And if someone has ever brought miserable furies of poisons to my heart or life, do not ever send him any other lot, you immortal gods, than similar to the one I have now.

I live underground, three full months I have decayed after having left the fruit of life which all-powerful earth gives to the mortals; I am robbed of this, of my children, you masters, and of my husband. Was I not one soul with my husband, (did I not enjoy) sweet life with him? Now, I, miserable have to forget all that; I curse having such suffering; they (the murderers) must leave their children and all and go to the great abyss of Hades, to the gates of darkness, but may all my children and my husband live a happy life, unhurt, and reach old age. And if there is any account of praying in Hades, the prayers I have prayed should come true.

— In return for your poetic song of our life together, delightful and sorrowful, Thermion, my wife, I say this: my dear wife, I will bring up the children we had together in such a way that is worthy of my love for you, and embrace also Lysas, the child you had had before, and treat him like our own children, doing a favour for you, for you lived your life in blameless manner.
There are two speakers in this epigram and technically only two turns (ll. 1–23 and 24–32). However, the ‘turns’ do not form an adjacency pair as such, so I do not count this as a type-1 epigram, although some elements are similar to type 1 or type 2.

The speakers are the deceased and the relative, a wife and her husband. Even though the deceased begins the epigram, she does not direct her speech to her husband, but instead to the chthonic gods; lines 2–10 form this passage: χθονίων ἐνερβε δαμόνων ἀνάκτορες / σεμνή τε Φερσέφασσα, Δήμητρος κόρη---. In this section, the deceased reveals her marital status and family situation (ll. 2–6), and then curses anyone who may have hurt her (ll. 7–10). After that, she laments her fate (ll. 11–21), and at the end of the lament (ll. 20–21), she wishes her family well: τέκνων δ’ ἐμῶν ἀθραυστὸν ὀλβίον βίον / πάωτων ἱκέσθαι κάνδρος ἢ γῆρως χρόνον. Here the deceased does not approach her death and her life in Hades in such accepting way than the deceased in the previous two examples: Thermion even curses her fate and expresses a wish for revenge. Interestingly this comes out in her own turn, whereas in the husband’s turn there is no reference to her wretched fate but only consoling elements in turn.

At the end of her turn, she refers to the prayers mentioned at the end of the first section (ll. 7–10): εἰ γ’ ἔστ’ ἐν Ἀδοὺ βαιὸς εὐχωλῆς λόγος, / ἀράς τελῆς οἷς ἐπεύχομαι τελίν (ll. 22–23). Her reserved attitude towards Hades also shows in εἰ γ’ ἔστ’ ἐν Ἀδοὺ βαιὸς εὐχωλῆς λόγος---.

Overall, this turn of the deceased consists of two segments: verses 2–10 form a petition to the gods, and verses 11–23 are a lament. Often the lament is expressed by a relative, but here it is by the deceased herself.

The rest of the epigram is the voice of the relative, this time the husband. We know this because he addresses his wife: Θέρμων, ἐμὴ ξύνευνε (l. 26). The address is part of a sentence in which the relative refers to the previous verses of the deceased: Μουσῶν ἀοιδὴν συνβιώσεως σέθεν / τερπνή τε καὶ λυπηρὸν ἐνπαλν διδοὺς, /Θέρμων, ἐμὴ ξύνευνε, τοῖαδ᾽ ἐννέπω, In return for your poetic song of our life together, delightful and sorrowful, Thermion, my wife, I say this---. In the

---

409 In my analysis, I will concentrate mainly on the turns, the speakers and some features of language. Concerning the content and the persons mentioned in these verses, see Robert 1936, no. 77 (120–3) and Wilhelm 1949, 38.
previous turn, the deceased did not direct her speech to her husband, but this turn of the husband is clearly connected with her dirge. Despite the descriptive nature of the epigram, the communicative elements between the speakers (e.g. the addresses) are familiar from other types of dialogue epigrams.

In the following example, there are three speakers again, but the dialogue section is only two verses long.\footnote{IG X 2, 1, 368, from 2nd century CE, Thessalonica.}

4. Moïra píkrē, Lήθης Ἀχερουσίδος ἐντροφε, λυγρόν θρῆνον ἐναψαμένη | Μάγνον ἀγ' εἰς Αἴδεω·
παῖδα δυσδε | χέτη πατρί μὲν γόον · ἄλγεα μητρί·
ηδὲ κασιγνήτῳ πένθεα λυγρότατα· |
5. ἄρτι γὰρ ἦν γονέεσσι μέριμνα μὲν, | αὐτάρ ἀδελφῷ
κόσμος· χ' ἥ πικρή | Μοϊρ' ἀπενοσφίσατο·
— ἄλλω<π> τὸν πάντα| τεσσαρτοῖς μόνον οἶκον έσοιχνω· |
— Μάγν' ἐπὶ τυμβιδίοις χάρε καὶ εἰνὶ τάφοις.

_Bitter Moira, living in the oblivion of Acheron, led Magnos to Hades, hence kindling a baneful lament. The child (was) 12 years old, (his death brought) wailing to his father, pains to his mother, and most mournful sorrow to his brother. Just a while ago he was an object of care for his parents, decoration for his brother, and the bitter Moira robbed him (from them)._

— _For nothing I go to the only house that is common to all the mortals._

— _Magnus, be greeted also among tombs and graves._

There are three speakers in this epigram. The first speaker reports about the deceased (ll. 7–8), then the deceased speaks, and finally, the passerby. It is not easy to tell whether the first speaker is the monument or the narrator. The monument can of course give information about the deceased in the third person, but nothing in this section refers to the monument or the location. The description is given in a neutral voice, and the monument is not addressed later in the epigram; thus, I am
inclined to interpret the speaker as the narrator instead of the monument, even though the identification is, admittedly, difficult to make: the monument/narrator division is somewhat ambiguous. This description segment is more narrative than communicative in nature – in type-1 or type-2 dialogue epigrams, the information that is given in this section (ll. 1–6) would be given via a communicative structure. The dialogue section (ll. 7–8) is not directly linked to the previous verses.

The communicative section of the epigram consists of only two verses: the last two verses of the final elegiac couplet of the epigram. In line 7, the speaker is the deceased, Magnus, and in the last verse, the passerby. The turn of the deceased (ἂλλω<› τὸν πάντεςα βροτοῖς μόνον οἶκον ἐσοιχνῶ) is not directed to anyone specifically, i.e. the direction of the speech is not marked; it is a remark to the audience in general: *For nothing I go to the one house that is common to all the mortals*. We know that the speaker here is Magnus because the facts about him have been reported already, and the first person singular is used in this verse: --- ἐσοιχνῶ. No one but the deceased could use the first person singular in this context. The frustration of his untimely death expressed here naturally reflects the frustration and loss that the parents feel, but the writer has put it in the mouth of the deceased, just as in the previous example.

In the last verse, the passerby addresses the deceased. As we saw in Chapters 3 and 4, the passerby could know the name of the deceased even without the narrator – this was a convention in the greeting pairs. Here, the name is also told in the second verse of the epigram, and it is thus understandable that the passerby (in l. 8) uses the name of the deceased in the address: Μάγν’ ἐπὶ τυμβίδιοις χαίρε καὶ εἰνὶ τάφοις. After the narrative section (ll. 1–6), these last two verses (ll. 7–8) form an adjacency pair similar to type-1 epigrams in which the speakers are the deceased and the passerby. This epigram thus has both narrative and ‘traditional’ dialogue epigram elements.

In the following example, stanzas form turns.411

---

411SGO 3, 16/31/93D, ca 300–350 CE, Appia/Soa, Phrygia. On this monument, the text has been cut into each side of the stone, ca 60 verses altogether. This rather long passage here is part D, cut into
— Ἀμμία, θυγάτηρ πινυτή, πῶς | θάνες ἡδή;
τί σπεύδουσ᾽ ἐπὶ θάνες, ἢ τίς σ’ ἐκιχήσατο Μοῖρῶν;
πρὸν σὲ νυνψικὸν ἵστεφα | νον κοσμήσαμεν ἢν θαλά | μοισιν,
πάτηρθι σὲ λυπεῖν πενθαλέους δὲ τοκήας. |

κλή σε πατήρ κὲ πᾶσα πάτρη | κἐ πότνια μήτηρ
τὴν σὴν | ἀωρότηταν κὲ ἄθαλαμευ[τον] | ἥλικίν.

η ἠποφθεγξαμένης ψυχὴ Ἀμμίαο θανούσης |
δύσι θερμα χέους σαρίστο πατρὶ | τὸ πάσι ἄθανος

μὴ κλῆ, πάτερ[ρ] | πολυώδυρνε, μηδὲ σὺ, μήτηρ—
ἐν τέλος ἔστιν τὸ πᾶσιν ὄφιλός μενον.

δάκρυα πάτρης ἐλαβον | συνηλικίς τε ἀπάσης,
δῶρ | [ά] τ’ ἄλεγινῶν κὲ πενθαλέου θαν[ά]τοιο—


[πατὴρ] | γὰρ ἐμὸς πολυκόνος ἀγνοίς τε | μήτηρ

κλαύσεις μὲ | κασιγνήτη Νόνα βαρυπένθας | ἐκίνη

ἡν χήραν ἐξέλιπτο γα[μ]βρὸς Κυριακὸς ἐμῖο,

ζευκτόν γαμετεὶς | [ἡ]ν προλιπὸν δὲν Μοῖραι ---

the back. I give only this dialogue part here; for the rest of the monument, see SGO. For the orthography of the epigram, see Perrot, Guillaume and Delbet 1872, 132.
— Ammia, wise daughter, how is it (possible) that you died already? Why did you die so soon? Which of the Moiras did meet you? Before we got to decorate the chamber with bridal garland for you, you left your fatherland and your grieving parents! Your father is wailing for you, and so is the whole community, and your revered mother. They grieve for your young age, your untimely death without the bridal chamber.

Then answered the soul of deceased Ammia, shedding warm tears, showing herself (in dream) near her father and mother. Deadly fever had taken her; in nine days she was dead. She uttered in dream this consolation for her death:

— Do not cry, much-grieving father, nor you, mother; the one and the same end is due to (us) all. I have received gifts from my community and from all the comrades of my age, gifts after my painful and sad death. But my [sav]i[our Je]su[S Chr]ist has been fair: today I [receiv]ed [eternal] fame and profit, the baptism, the righteous wage for virginity, from the [hands] of a presbyter. I went as a pure maiden, seeing the holy faith, and having the ever-flowing light, (I have) become one of the holy Novatians. My hesitating father and my idle mother murmured and heard my voice. When I gave Christ my maidenhood, I set insufferable pain (to my parents).

My sister Nonna, the deep-grieving, has cried for me, whom my brother-in-law Kyriakos had left as a widow, leaving behind the wedlock, when the Moiras…. 

The speakers in this epigram are the relative, the narrator and the deceased (X – Y – Z = REL – N – DEC). The relative is the father, and his deceased daughter consoles him when he is mourning. They address each other with clear vocatives. The father speaks first; his turn opens the epigram: Ἀμμία, θυγάτηρ πινυτή, πῶς ἦδη. Two further questions follow this (arranged with plain interrogatives). Following the questions, in the same turn, the father laments his daughter and her untimely death. The second person singular is used throughout this turn (ll. 1–6).

The deceased replies to this turn, but before this happens, a narrator intervenes (ll. 7–10). In this section, the course of the events is told in the third person singular. The narrator also describes Ammia on the moment she replies to her father, shedding tears – this is something none of the other speaker roles could do. The passage begins with: τῆς δ’ ἀναφθεγξάμην Αμμίαο θανούσην[τ]… The narrator also indicates the change of speaker. When a narrator steps in between the turns, the dynamics of dialogue change, because certain linguistic features are
no longer necessary. In this epigram, however, the communicative turns at the beginning and at the end are very similar to type-1 or type-2 turns, which becomes even clearer if we read them without the intervening narrative passage. Features such as addresses (at the beginning of the epigram: Ἀμμία, θυγάτηρ πινυτή; and then in l. 11: πάτε[ρ]| πολυώδυρνε; and μήτηρ at the beginning of the turn of the deceased), imperative (in the turn of the deceased: μὴ κλῆξε) and a set of plain interrogative questions (at the beginning of the epigram, in the relative’s turn: πῶς θάνες ήδη; τί σπεύδουσ’ ἔθανες, ἢ τίς σ’ ἐκιχήσατο Μοι|ρῶν;) are used. Without the narrator in the centre, the turns of the relative and the deceased would form an adjacency pair.

Ammia’s reply follows the narrative section, and this turn forms the remainder of the epigram (ll. 15–25). First, (l. 15) she addresses her father and asks him not to cry: μὴ κλῆξε, πάτε[ρ]| πολυώδυρνε, and then continues with μηδὲ σύ, μήτηρ. Here, Ammia also addresses her mother, who does not have a voice in this epigram, but who is mentioned in the first turn. 412 This section in which the deceased consoles her parents is four verses long. As in many relative–deceased epigrams, part of the consolation is to remind the people left behind that the same fate awaits us all: ἐν τέλος ἔστὶν τὸ πᾶσιν ὁφιλ[ό]|μενον.

From line 15 onwards, the deceased offers a very Christian viewpoint of life after death and her own acceptance of her fate. Her purity is also given as a kind of consolation: she did not have a family, but she had her faith and she became one of the Novatians. This semantic part is introduced by ἀλλά; as in several cases in the previous chapters, here too it marks a new topic (here ἀλλ’ ἐμ’ ἔδικε[ως]ε [σω]τή[ρ]|μ[ικ] ὀς ἱη]|σα[ύζε]|κρ[αστ]|ό]ϲ, after which follows further explanation.

In this epigram, the dialogue is ‘interrupted’ by a narrator who describes the situation, but this dialogue is not embedded in a narration. Parts of it could function as an independent relative–deceased epigram, but the writer has chosen to also use the narrator voice.

The beginning of the next epigram is quite narrative in nature, and the communicative section follows after this narrative passage (cf. no. 4 in this chapter).

6. ἔσχατα μερόπων δώματα καὶ τείχεα | τύμβοι
πιστότερα δόμων σώμασιν | δακρύων παραβῆκαι,
ἄφθορα νεκύων | κτήματα τὰ μόνα παραμένοντα,
σειγῆς | πόλις, οἶκος ἰδιὸς ἢ μένουσα
καὶ οὐκέτι | μεθ᾽ ὑπνούς ἀπέλαβε, ἀλλὰ γέγονε γυμνή.
— τὶς πέλασις ὁ τάφος, καὶ τίνα κατέχει νέκυν ἔνοικον;
[σ]τυγνα τροπαία βίου, λελυμένα πηγνυμένων
σημεία, νεκύων στήλαι, ῥήματα θανόντων,
τοῖς ἀλάλουσι λαλήσατε γράμμασι· τίς βροτὸς
ioxidονεμομιατα βαυμάσας καὶ δοξάσας ὁ κόσμος
ἄνθος χρύσεον τῶν ἱδίων ἐϊδε θεάτρων·
όο λαμπομένην [τ]ήν χάριν ἐσβεσεν ἀδοκήτως
ὁ τρισίν δεκάσιν πληρουμένας λιπῶν ἐνιαυτός.

The last house and the last walls of humans are the graves: they are more faithful places than the houses, reservoirs where the tears fall over the dead ones; the graves are non-decaying possessions of the deceased ones, and the only things that remain.
A city of silence, the steadfast resting place is an own house, where the body is placed with its beauty, and after the death sleep, s/he does not get it back, but has become naked.

---

413 IK Heraclea Pont. 9 = SGO 2, 09/11/02, 2nd/3rd century CE, Heraclea Pontica, Bithynia. Also Christian 2015, 206–8. For other X – Y variations in T3, see SGO 1, 06/02/32 (= SEG 50, 1762; SEG 53, 2191; SEG 60, 1930); SGO 2, 08/01/51 (= SEG 60, 1999) and SEG 4, 17/06/02 (= SEG 44, 1833; SEG 52, 1918). The speakers in these epigrams are the deceased and the relative (06/02/32), the monument (or narrator) and deceased (08/01/51), and the deceased and the relative (17/06/02).
— What kind of a grave is this here, and who is the deceased that lives here? Oh hated victory monuments of those who have left life, dissolving markers of the stiffening (corpses), gravestones of the dead, speak with silent letters the words of the dead. Which mortal man left here his name after he had worn out his body?

— The deceased Crispus, citizen of the Pharian land and corn-giving Nile, is hidden under this grave monument, (he) who won the first victory garland of the rhythmic tragedy. The world admired (his) pantomime, and praised it, and saw his theatre as a golden flowering. His 30th year faded unexpectedly and left his shiny grace.

In this epigram the first speaker is the narrator (ll. 1–6), followed by the passerby (ll. 7–11), and then the monument (ll. 12–18).414 The first turn (voice of the narrator) is not directed to anyone specifically, whereas the rest of the epigram consists of a question turn and an answer turn. The beginning of the epigram, told in the narrator voice, is general in nature; in this section, the graves are called the last houses of the humans415, for that is all that they have after their death. The communicative section follows this. This section is not about the deceased in question: no information about him is given at all. It is only in the dialogue that the epigram focuses on a particular deceased individual.

The communicative section begins with questions aimed at acquiring information about the deceased. The first ones are plain interrogative questions: τίς πέλας ὁ τάφος, καὶ τίνα κατέχει νέκυν ἔνοικον; The next question is introduced with a slightly complex structure. The addresses are given first ([σ]τυγνα τροπαῖα βίου λελυμένα πηγυμένων / σημεία, νεκύων στήλαι, ρήματα θανόντων), and after this list, the passerby exhorts these monuments to speak with silent letters (an imperative is used): τοῖς ἀλάλοισι λαλήσατε γράμμασι. Only after this is there an actual question: τίς βροτός / ὃδε κατέλιπεν---.

Even though the addresses in the second turn are plural (and hence create an illusion that distracts from the monumental context – it is as if the recipient was not near a certain monument, but was reading the grave monuments in general), the

414 Note that in verses 1–6 the line division differs from the verse division. The metre is Sotadean; the metric scheme is given in SGO; see also West 1982, 144–5.
415 There is a house-like structure on the monument; see SGO for photo.
final speaker voice must be the monument.\textsuperscript{416} The turn begins with Κρίσπος Φαρίς γῆς σταχυτρόφου τε Νείλου / ύπο σήματι τῶδε κρύπτεται θανών πολείτης, wherein the deictic ύπο σήματι τῶδε clearly refers to the monument in question. It is stated that the deceased was a pantomime actor, which of course gives a new dimension to the words τοῖς ἀλάλοισι λαλήσατε γράμμασι, speak with silent letters, but perhaps this also refers to the physical letters on the monument. Even though the letters were read aloud, the text itself does not speak, but is ‘silent’. The author of the poem most probably played with this double meaning of this expression, i.e. the pantomime actor and the reception situation of the epigram (read aloud).

Some literary influence is visible in the epigrams discussed in this section. It shows in references to Hades and afterlife, also discussed in non-inscribed epigrams. In addition to that, there are certain elements in structure that indicate influence of other genres: for example narrative parts (in nos. 3, 4, 5 and 6) and invocations of the chthonic gods (no. 3) are elements familiar from e.g. hymns. The thoughtful description of graves as human’s last houses in no. 6 and the Christian tones in no. 5 also clearly draw from elsewhere than verse inscription tradition.

5.2 Embedded dialogue

The speakers in the epigrams with embedded dialogue are either narrator + 2 or narrator + 1. Narrator + 2 type can be depicted as N – X – N – Y, where N = the narrator, X = the first speaker of dialogue and Y = the second speaker. The order of the turns can vary. The paradigm for the N + 1 epigrams is N – X – N – N2, and this type is otherwise similar to the first version, but N2 is the turn uttered by the narrator himself in the conversation about which he later reports in the past tense (or which he imagines).\textsuperscript{417} In the X, Y and N2 turns, the elements may be similar to the adjacency pairs, but the conversation is always part of the narrative, which is

\textsuperscript{416} Monument rather than the narrator, because the narrator does not participate the conversation, see section 2.2.5.

\textsuperscript{417} According to the definitions of Bal 1997, 22, the narrator in the narrator + 1 type is a ‘character-bound narrator’, whereas a narrator reporting the conversation in which he does not partake is ‘an external narrator’.
told in an ‘Χ said this and Υ said that’ frame. Hence, the texts are dialogical monologal rather than dialogal.⁴¹⁸

In the examples in Section 5.1, the narrator either depicted the situation first, and the communicative part followed, or the narrator interrupted the dialogue between the other two speakers. The epigrams with an ‘interrupting’ narrator are closer to the epigrams with embedded dialogue.

This so-called embedded dialogue is far more frequent in the non-inscribed epigrams than in the verse inscriptions. Fictive poetry is (relatively) free from the conventions of inscribed poetry. Many of the non-inscribed epigrams bear traces of monumental context either in the structure or in the themes, but it is by no means ubiquitous. There are dialogues with speakers other than the monument or the deceased, and there are narratives that offer communicative sections that are not related to monuments. The influence goes both ways: the non-inscribed epigrams of this type have also influenced some verse inscriptions. In this section, I will first give two verse inscription examples, and then discuss different kinds of non-inscribed epigrams with embedded dialogue. Even though many of the examples in this chapter are non-inscribed, it is important to discuss these examples, as they, for their part, show one (rather late) trend of communicative structures in the epigrams.

5.2.1 Embedded dialogue in verse inscriptions

In most of the dialogue epigrams that we have seen so far, the speakers are denoted by means other than using the narrator voice. Not surprisingly, however, the narrative development is also evident in some verse inscriptions. The first example is an epigram from Kissia, Lycaonia:⁴¹⁹

7. ἐξ ἀγαθῆς ρίζης ἔρνος κλυτὸν ἐξε[φ]ανθη
Μένανδρος πανάριστος, ἐπὶ μέ[γ]α οὖνο<υ> έσχε
πρεσβ(ύτερος) γεγούς πανυπέρτατος ἢδὲ δίκαιος.

---

⁴¹⁹ SGO 3, 14/04/03, funerary, dated after 312 CE on the basis of the monogram of Constantines which is cut into the stone.
From a good root, a famous sprout has appeared, Menandros, the best of all, because he received a great name. He has become a very high and righteous presbyter: his relics lie under the all-nourishing earth, but his soul is where the immortal God is; it rests in Abraham’s lap, since it belongs to one of the blessed ones. His fatherland praises him, the people sing praise (to him). To him wife Kleousa said, weeping:

—How could you leave me alone, I am suffering [---] miseries!

From on high (above), [her] [o]wn good husband replied to her:

—Oh my wife, don’t cry, and [do] not stir up the souls of (Christian) brothers, for they also mour[n]ed for me, rejoicing in the living God, when that pleased him. Address[s] your prayers to God [t]o be released from grief more quickly, (so) you may give me a be[a]utiful name in return.

The speakers are the narrator, the relative and the deceased. The turns are divided as follows: N – X – N – Y, i.e. narrator – relative – narrator – deceased.

At the beginning of the epigram, in lines 1–8, the narrator gives information about the deceased, and the rest of the poem consists of a dialogue between the mourning spouse, Kleousa (l. 9), and the consoling deceased, Menandros (ll. 11–15). Between their turns, however, the narrator voice is used again (l. 10). The first part
told in the narrator voice is actually eight verses long, and in line 8, the narrator introduces the following turn of the relative (the wife). In this sentence, δὲ is used to connect the following turn to the larger text unit, and the speaker change is revealed: τῷ δ’ ἄλοχος Κλεοῦσα προσέβης μυρομένη περ’, to him the wife Kleousa said ---.

In line 9, Kleousa addresses the deceased. She mourns the fact that he has left her alone to suffer miseries. The second person singular is used: πῶς μούγην μ’ ἔλιπες καὶ [---]α πήματα πάσχω; The deceased could reply to this directly, but the narrator steps in again and states that the sound of the deceased came from high above (l. 10): πιρόθεν [δ’ α]ύτήν ἀπαμιβέτ [έ]ς πόσις ἔσθλος. After this, the deceased speaks and consoles his mourning wife; he begins with an address and imperatives (ll. 11–12): ὃμοι ἐμὴ ἄλοχε μὴ δάκρυε [μ]ηδ’ ὀρόθυνε / ψυχάς κασιγνήτων---. The turn of the deceased combines the consolation and a Christian sentiment — the epigram ends with an exhortation to pray to God (ll. 15–16): εὐχωλᾶς δὲ Θεῷ ἀποτίνυ[ε·]ώς κε σε θάσσον / ρύσετ’ ἐξ ἀχέων καὶ μοι κ[αλόν] οὖνομα λίπος. This is similar to the exhortations to participate in the ritual, but here they are adapted to Christian practice.

The next example is a verse inscription beginning with a narrative section. It is a good example of the similarities between the narrator and monument voices:

8. μητρὶ δέμας γαίῃ προλιπὼν θεοίκελος ἀνήρ πάτρης ἐν ζαθέοις ὅρειν τυκτῷ ὑπὸ τύμβῳ οὐλόμενον γήρας προφυγὼν μεσάτη ἐνὶ ἤβη αἰθερίας ἁψίδος ἐβή μακάρων μεθ’ ὀμείλον,
5 πάτρην κυδήνας γέραςιν στεφάνοισί τε πολλ[οῖς], οὖς ἀναδησάμενος πρῷτος παρέδωκε τέκεσσι.
— τίς δ’ ὃδ’ ἀνήρ; φησεί τις οὐδετάων παριόντων,
— τίς μάκαρ οὕτως ἔστι, τίς ὀλβιός, οὐ τε σὺ κεύθεις;
τὸν δὲ ἐγὼ σειγῆ τε καὶ οὐ λαλέουσα διδάξω·

10 — ὘ριγένους ἔρνος γλυκερόν, Κάσιος μυροπώλης.

A god-like man left his body to mother earth, he (went) under the sacred heap of his fatherland’s man-made tomb; he fled the unhappy old age in the middle of the bloom of youth, and went among the blessed, high in the air; he, who adorned his fatherland with many gifts of honour and garlands, which he bound and gave first to his children. ‘Who is this man?’, one of the travellers passing by may say. ‘Who is so happy, who is blessed, whom you hide?’ Then I will keep silent, and inform this one without speaking: ‘Sweet sprout of Origenes, Cassius the perfumer’.

In lines 1–6, the deceased is described in the third person. Who is the speaker? Is it a narrator or the monument? It could be either one. There are no direct references to a particular monument; for example, τυκτῷ ὑπὸ τύμβῳ does not contain deictics or anything else that would help to identify the monument as the speaker. While the monument could talk about the deceased in the third person, the content is not very informative, and the speaker is somewhat vague. Up until the end of the epigram, the speaker appears to be a neutral, outsider reporter, but at the end (l. 9: τὸν δὲ ἐγὼ σειγῆ τε καὶ οὐ λαλέουσα διδάξω), it seems to be the monument. This makes it more probable that the monument is the speaker in the whole epigram.

There is ‘a potential passerby’ in lines 7–8: ‘τίς δ’ ὃδ’ ἄνερ’, φησει τις ὀδειτάων παριόντων, / ‘τίς μάκαρ οὕτως ἔστι, τίς ὀλβιός οὐ τε σὺ κεύθεις’; The speaker who states φησει τις ὀδειτάων παριόντων is the same one as in the first six verses. This speaker expresses the idea ‘if someone should ask’, and then gives the possible questions that a passerby (τις ὀδειτάων παριόντων) could ask. The last two lines (9–10) unambiguously reveal the identity of the speaker of the whole epigram: τὸν δὲ ἐγὼ σειγῆ τε καὶ οὐ λαλέουσα διδάξω· / ‘Ὀριγένους ἔρνος γλυκερόν, Κάσιος μυροπώλης’. It is the monument that keeps silent and informs without speaking, i.e. through the inscription, the identity of the deceased. The end of the epigram indicates that ἐγὼ (l. 9) is the monument, and, as the context shows, has been from start. The speaker paradigm is thus N – X – N – N2, although X is a ‘hypothetical
speaker’. The narrator does not report a past conversation, but offers a possible one, and the situation is revealed through the morphology: see φήσει (l. 7) and σειγῇ τε καὶ οὐ λαλέουσα διδάξω (l. 9). In other words, the epigram offers a potential scene with a passerby who will come and wonder who lies here, and then read the text. In this epigram, the fictive pattern and inscription traditions are combined. The passerby role is used to depict an ‘imaginary’ conversation, which, once again, is a narrative pattern.423

5.2.2 Embedded dialogue in non-inscribed epigrams

In the non-inscribed epigrams, the theme and the speaker roles are free to vary more than in the inscribed monuments. In the following example, the theme is love:424

9. ὡς εἶδον Μελίτην, ὧν τὸν ἀκόητην
κεῖνη ἐφωμάρτει· τοία δ’ ἔλεξα τρέμων·
toῦ σοῦ ἀνακρούσαι δύναμαι πυλεύνον ὁχήσας,
dυκλίδος ύμετέρης τὴν βάλανον χαλάσας,
5 καὶ δισσῶν προθύρων πλαδαρὴν κρηπίδα περήσαι,
ἀκρον ἐπιβλήτος μεσοθύ πηξάμενος;
ἡ δὲ λέγει γελάσασα, καὶ ἀνέρα λοξὸν ἰδούσα·
tῶν προθύρων ἀπέχου, μή σε κύσεν ὀλέσῃ.

When I saw Melite, I grew pale, for her husband was with her, but I said to her trembling, ‘May I push back the bolts of your door, loosening the bolt-pin, and fixing in the middle the tip of my key, pierce the damp base of the folding door?’ But she, laughing and glancing at her husband, said, ‘You had better keep away from my door, or the dog may worry you.’

(Translation by Paton)

423 For the paradox of speaking stone here see also Christian 2015, 84.
424 Eratosthenes Scholasticus, AG 5.242. cf. Strato, AG 12.8 for a similar erotic epigram with an embedded dialogue.
The speakers are the anonymous narrator and his lover Melite. The narrator is the inner-self of the epigram, and he depicts a past conversation. The use of the past tense (εἶδον, ἔλε, ἐφωμάρτει and ἔλεξα) to describe the discussion shows that the conversation does not take place here and now, but that it happened in the past. The inner-self of the epigram states that seeing his lover Melite made him feel uncomfortable, as her husband was with her, but he spoke to her nonetheless. The speech is introduced with δέ: τοῖα δ’ ἔλεξα τρέμων (l. 2). The narrator’s turn follows, and he addresses Melite, the other speaker of the poem, in the second person singular. The narrator-self then introduces Melite’s turn, and δέ is used again: ἢ δὲ λέγει γελάσασα, καὶ ἀνέρα λοξόν ἱδούσα (l. 7). After this, Melite responds to the narrator (concerning what he told her in ll. 3–6): τῶν προθύρων ἀπέχου, μή σε κύων ὀλέση (l. 8). The communicative section of the epigram is thus:

**Narrator:** τοῦ σοῦ ἀνακρούσαι δύναμαι πυλεώνος όχηας, δικλίδος ὑμετέρης τὴν βάλανον χαλάσας καὶ δισσῶν προθύρων πλαδαρήν κρηπίδα περῆσαι, ἀκρον ἐπιβλήτος μεσόθι πηξάμενος;

**Melite:** — τῶν προθύρων ἀπέχου, μή σε κύων ὀλέση.

Before the turns, however, the narrator depicts the situation and denotes the next speaker. His own turn is introduced by ώς εἶδον Μελίτην— τοῖα δ’ ἔλεξα τρέμων, and Melite’s turn by ἢ δὲ λέγει γελάσασα—. The structure is N — N2 — N — X, i.e. narrator (descriptive) — narrator (communicative) — narrator (descriptive) — Melite.

The following epigram, which is attributed to Socrates, has a structure similar to that of the previous example, but this epigram presents an arithmetic problem:

10. ἀ Κύπρις τὸν Ἔρωτα κατηφιόωντα προσηύδα·
tύπτε τοι, ὦ τέκος, ἄλγος ἐπέχραεν; δός δ’ ἀπάμευπτο·

---

425 i.e. narrator as a participant in the dialogue (as an active speaker who does have a turn in the conversation).
426 AG 14.3.
Cypris addressed the downcast Eros: ‘Why, my child, has sorrow fallen on you?’ And he answered: ‘The Muses stole and divided among themselves, in different proportions, the apples I was bringing from Helicon, snatching them from my bosom. Clio got the fifth part, and Euterpe the twelfth, but divine Thalia the eighth. Melpomene carried off the twentieth part, and Terpsichore the fourth, and Erato the seventh; Polyhymnia robbed me of thirty apples, and Urania of a hundred and twenty, and Calliope went off with a load of three hundred apples. So I come to you with lighter hands, bringing these fifty apples that the goddesses left me.’

(Translation according to Paton, but with minor changes at the beginning of the epigram)

The speakers are the narrator and the gods Cypris (Aphrodite) and Eros. The narrator begins the epigram by stating who talked to whom (a -> b): ἅ Κύπρις (a) τὸν Ἐρωτα (b) κατηφιόωντα προσηύδα (l. 1). After this, the speaker is Aphrodite. Her turn is a question turn with an address: τίπτε τοι, ὦ τέκος, ἀλγος ἐπέχραεν (l. 2, the first half). Following this, the narrator cuts in again and states, using the third person, that Eros answered: δς δ᾽ ἀπάμειπτο (l. 2, the second half). Once again, δε progresses the conversation. In verses 3–13, Eros replies. The speakers are N – X – N

---

427 Solution: 3360 (672 + 280 + 420 +168 + 840 + 480 + 30 + 120 +300 + 50); see Paton.
428 cf. no. 2 in Chapter 5 = IG II/III 13166: τίπτε, πόσι[ς], φων[εῖς;---.
– Y, i.e. narrator – Aphrodite – narrator – Eros. The communicative turns of the epigram (turns of Aphrodite and Eros) resemble the type-1 epigrams, variant 2. The reply turn (by Eros) is the core of the epigram, but the dialogue structure serves as an introduction to the turn. The speakers are not easily recognisable (as they would be on a monument), so they need to be clearly marked by the narrator before each turn.429

The following epigram is similar to the previous two, except for the end, which is slightly different: 430

11. Αἰαντος παρὰ τύμβουν ἀταρβήτου παραστάς
Φρύξ ἦρωι κακής ἦρχεν ἐπεσβολής·
Αῖας δ᾽ οὐκέτ᾿ ἐξιμμεν· ὁ δ᾽ ἀντεγέωνεν ἐνερβεν·
μίμεν· ὁ δ᾽ οὐκέτ’ ἐτηλ ζωὸς ἀποφθίμενον.

A Phrygian, halting by the tomb of fearless Ajax, began to insult the hero: ‘But Ajax no longer stood firm’.431 But he cried as an answer from underground: ‘He stood firm’. And the living man could no longer bear the dead (i.e. he fled).

(Translation loosely follows Paton’s translation)

The speakers in this epigram are narrator + 2, i.e. narrator – the Phrygian – narrator – Ajax, N – X – N – Y. The narrator tells a story in which the Phrygian insults Ajax at his grave, and Ajax replies from the underground and frightens off the Phrygian. The narrator is used to mark the speakers: ---Φρύξ ἦρωι κακής ἦρχεν ἐπεσβολής (l. 2) and ὁ δ᾽ ἀντεγέωνεν ἐνερβεν (l. 3). Note that δέ is used when introducing the second speaker of the dialogue (third voice of the epigram): ὁ δ᾽---, before the turn of Ajax.432 After the narrator, the Phrygian, the narrator and Ajax have spoken, the narrator closes the poem by telling the consequence: the Phrygian fled the tomb: ὁ

429 cf. AG 14.129 by Metrodorus for similar structure. This epigram is also an arithmetic problem.
430 Anonymous, AG 9.177.
431 Hom. il. 15.717; pointed out by Paton. For introducing the speakers with δέ, cf. no 7 in this chapter.
432 For introducing the speakers with δέ, cf. nos. 7 (although restored), 9 and 10 of the epigrams in this chapter.
δ᾽ οὐκέτ᾽ ἔτλη ζωὸς ἀποφθίμενον. As a result of this last note, the exact structure of this epigram is N – X – N – Y – N.

The idea of ghostly Ajax crying from the underground is an interesting variation: surely the audience was familiar with the idea of the talking monument, and also the voice of the deceased in the (monument) epigrams, and yet the voice of Ajax is here depicted as something unexpected – this epigram clearly plays with the usual speaker traditions and expectations. Despite the speaker roles and the rather ironic tone, this epigram resembles the grave epigrams in which the passerby (here the Phrygian) comes near the grave, and either the monument or the deceased (here Ajax) replies to his/her turn.

The next epigram plays with Spartan ideals:433

12. ἐπέ ποκ᾽ Εὐρώτας ποτὶ τάν Κύπριν· ἦ λάβε τεύχη,
    ἦ ἣξιθι τᾶς Σπάρτας· ἀ πόλις ὀπλομανεῖ.
    ἀ δ᾽ ἀπαλὸν γελάσασα, καὶ ἔσσομαι αἰὲν ἀτευχῆς,
    εἶπε, καὶ οἴκησω τᾶν Λακεδαίμονιαν.

5 χάμιν Κύπρις ἀνοπλος· ἀναιδεῖς οἴδε λέγουσιν
    ἰστορες, ώς ἀμῖν χά θεός ὀπλοφορεῖ.

Eurotas once said to Cypris, ‘Either arm yourself or go out of Sparta. This town is crazy for war’. She smiled gently and replied, ‘I will both remain always unarmed and continue to live in the land of Lacedaemon’. Our Cypris is unarmed as elsewhere, and these are shameless writers who declare that with us even the goddess bears arms.

(Translation according to Paton, but with minor alterations)

In the first verse, ποκ’ emphasises the past tense and thus the fact that the dialogue took place earlier. In line 1, the narrator only mentions the speakers: εἶπε---Εὐρώτας---τᾶν Κύπριν (VSO). This reveals both speakers of the dialogue, Eurotas and Aphrodite (Cypris). Eurotas’s turn follows this narrative introduction (ll. 1–2), and after that, the narrator reports that ἀ δ᾽ ἀπαλὸν γελάσασα (l. 3). Here, ἀ refers to

433 AG 9.320, Leonidas of Tarentum.
Aphrodite, and her turn follows. Once more, δέ introduces the second speaker of the dialogue and hence the reply turn.\textsuperscript{434} Aphrodite’s turn is interrupted by one explanatory ἐπεις by the narrator voice: καὶ ἐςσομαι αἰὲν ἀτευχής, ἐπεις, καὶ οἰκήσω τὰν Λακεδαμονίαν.

After that, the narrator is the speaker for the remainder of the epigram (ll. 5–6: the last elegiac couplet of the epigram). The speaker structure is thus similar to no. 11: N – X – N – Y + N. If we want to be strict, the structure of this epigram is as follows: N – X (Eurotas) – N – Y (Aphrodite) – N (with ἐπεις only) – Y (the end of Aphrodite’s turn) – N. In neither one of these epigrams (nos. 11 and 12) is the narrator an inner actor, but rather s/he reports the conversation of X and Y from the outside.

The fictive ‘narrator epigrams’, similar to the ones presented above, are numerous.\textsuperscript{435} There is no need to discuss all of them, but, before moving on to the conclusions, I will consider two examples: \textsuperscript{436}

13. ἧδυ, φίλοι, μείδημα τὸ Λαίδος· ἦδυ κατ’ αὗ τῶν
ἡπιοδινήτων δάκρυ χέει βλεφάρων.
ξηθιά μοι ἀπροφάσιστον ἐπέστενεν, ἐγκλιδὼν ὠμῷ
ἡμετέρῳ κεφαλῆν δηρὸν ἐρεισαμένῃ·
μυρομένην δ᾽ ἐφίλησα· τὰ δ᾽ ὡς δροσερῆς ἀπὸ πηγῆς
dάκρυα μυγνυμένων πῦπτε κατὰ στομάτων.

\textsuperscript{434} The narrator tells how Eurotas told Aphrodite to either arm herself or get out of Sparta, but the goddess says no to both – she will stay in Sparta, but unarmed, as she states in her turn. For the meaning and obscurity of the text, see Gow and Page 1965, 334. Paton (in AG) states that ‘there undoubtedly was an armed Aphrodite at Sparta and it is difficult to see the exact point of this epigram’, but perhaps this discrepancy indeed is its point. Hartigan 1979, 56 states that Leonidas points out that Aphrodite needed no arms, because she was able to disarm Ares without them, and that Leonidas is ‘laughing at the Spartan code of arms’: see Hartigan (this applies, as Hartigan also says, if no text is missing [see Gow and Page 1965, 335 for a suggestion for the missing text]).

\textsuperscript{435} cf. Palladas of Alexandria, AP 7.686; anonymous, AP 9.108; Musicius AP 9.39; and Gregorius of Nazianzus 8.128 for similar structures. When the narrator denotes the next speaker, a verb is not needed; in the epigram of Musicius, the lines of the narrator are: Α Κύπρων Μούσαιοι καί Μούσαιοι ποτὶ Κύπρων, and in the epigram of Gregorius of Nazianzus: Αὶ Χάριτες Μούσαιοι καί Μούσαιοι Χαρίτεσσοι. In these cases the ‘narrator’ does not actually narrate much, but a neutral voice is used to tell who speaks and when the switch of the speaker takes place. cf. Gow and Page 1968, 165–6 and 421, and Page 1981, 165–6 (the latter on 9.39 and the connection between these epigrams).

\textsuperscript{436} 13: Paulus Silentianius, AG 5.250. 14: Macedonius the Consul, AG 5.233.
εἶπε δ᾽ ἀνειρομένω· τίνος εἶνεκα δάκρυα λείβεις;

δείδια μή με λίπης· ἐστε γὰρ ὀρκαπάται.

Sweet, my friends, is Lais’ smile, and sweet again the tears she sheds from her gently waving eyes. Yesterday, after long resting her head on my shoulder, she sighed without a cause. She wept as I kissed her, and the tears flowing as from a cool fountain fell on our united lips. When I questioned her, ‘Why are you crying?’, she said, ‘I am afraid of your leaving me, for all you men are forsworn’.

(Translation by Paton)

14. Αὔριον ἀθρήσω σε. τὸ δ᾽ οὐ ποτὲ γίνεται ἡμῖν,

ηθάδος ἀμβολίης αἰὲν ἀεξομένης.

ταῦτα μοι ιμείροντι χαρίζει· ἄλλα δ᾽ ἐς ἄλλους

dῶρα φέρεις, ἐμέθεν πίστιν ἀπειπαμένη.

ὁμομει ἐσπερίη σε. τὶ δ᾽ ἔσπερος ἐστὶ γυναικῶν;

γῆρας ἀμετρήτω πληθόμενον ῥυτίδι.

‘Tomorrow, I will see you.’ But tomorrow never comes, but ever, as your way is, deferment is heaped upon deferment. That is all you grant to me who love you; for others you have many gifts, for me only perfidy. ‘I will see you in the evening’. But what is the evening of women? Old age full of wrinkles.

(Translation according to Paton, but with a few alterations)

In both of these epigrams, the speakers are the narrator (who is the inner-self of the epigram) + 1. In the epigram of Paulus Silentiarius (no. 13), the narrator/inner-self first describes his beloved Lais: her smile, her tears and her eyes. This is all directed to the audience: φίλοι (see l. 1). In lines 1–6, the narrator tells about Lais and describes a scene involving her. It is only in lines 7–8 that the narrative embeds the dialogue. At the beginning of line 7, εἶπε δ᾽ ἀνειρομένω refers to both of the turns that follow.437 ἀνειρομένω belongs with ‘τίνος εἶνεκα δάκρυα λείβεις;’ (when I asked

437 Compare with no. 9 in Chapter 4: εἶπε μοι εἰρομένω, τίνος εἰκών;
‘why are you crying?’), and the speaker is still the narrator/inner-self of the epigram. The reply to this is not marked by the narrator, but it follows immediately after, as εἶχε denotes. The speaker Lais is the lover of the narrator. The turns of the lovers form an adjacency pair: ‘τίνος εἶνεκα δάκρυα λείβεις;’ (N) – ‘δείδια μή με λίπης· ἐστὲ γὰρ ὅρκαπάται’ (Lais). The structure of this epigram is similar to some X – Y – Z epigrams in the previous section. The difference is that here, the other speaker of the adjacency pair at the end of the epigram is also the narrator at the beginning of the epigram. Hence, the speaker structure is N – N2 – X.

In the epigram of Macedonius the Consul (no. 14), the narrator/inner-self is once again conversating with his lover, in a manner of speaking. The narrator does not report a dialogue he had with his lover previously; instead, he states what she said in the past, and what he thinks of it now (in the present tense). In his comments, the narrator opposes her words, and particles are used to structure this. Note that the first line begins with a turn of the lover, to which the narrator comments: ‘Αὖριον ἀθρήσω σε.’ τὸ δὲ ὅϋ ποτε γίνεται ἡμῖν—(...) yet tomorrow never comes). In line 3, the narrator-self says ταῦτα μοι ἰμείροντι χαρίζαι· ἄλλα δ᾽ εἰς ἄλλους / δώρα φέρεις—, and here too, δὲ is adversative: the idea is that ‘for me this vs. the other gifts for other people’, ταῦτα μοι vs. ἄλλα δ᾽ εἰς ἄλλους. The same happens again in the last ‘pair’ which comprises the woman’s line first and then the man’s opposing words, introduced by δὲ: ‘δύσομαι ἐσπερή σε.’ τὶ δὲ ἐσπερός ἐστι γυναικών.438 In this epigram, the structure is X – N – X – N. The narrator does not present any past speech of his own, but only comments (in the present tense) on the earlier speech of his lover (X).

5.3. Two narrative extras

As the type-3 epigrams show, there can be communicative elements in poems that are not necessarily strictly dialogical. Furthermore, many of these narrative poems are so lengthy that even if we interpret ‘epigram’ in a broad sense of the word, we could perhaps ask whether or not it is reasonable to call these examples epigrams. In

the original meaning of the word, they are of course epigrams, but a very different kind of epigram than most of the rather coherent type-1 and type-2 epigrams.

To conclude this chapter, I want to discuss two more metric texts that contain communicative elements, whether or not they belong under the title ‘dialogue epigrams’. One is a verse inscription, the other a dithyramb. I do not aim to compare them with each other so much as to compare them with the epigrams presented in this study and to briefly discuss some of the similarities of their structure to that of the dialogue epigrams.

The verse inscription comes from Halicarnassus:439

1 Ἔννεπέ μοι, Σχοινίτι, φίλον τιθάσε[υμα φέρουσα]
Κύρι, μυροπνεύστων ἐμπελάτειρα πο[...],
tῆς Ἀλικαρνασσοῦ τί τό τίμιον; οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε
ἐκλυν ἢ τί θροεῖ γαῦρα φρυασσομένη;
5 Γηγενέων μεγάλαυχον ἐτέκνωσε στάχυν ἀνδρ[ῶν]
λακραίου πάρεδρον κυδαλίμοιο Διός,
οἱ πρώτοι κοίλην ὑπὸ δειράδα θέντο νεογνόν
παῖδα Ἐρίς κρύφιον Ζῆν ἀτιταλλόμην
Γαίης ἀμφὶ ἀδύτοισιν, ὥτε Κρόνος ἀγκυλομῆτης
10 οὐκ ἔφτη λαίμωι θέσθαι ὑποβρύχιον.
Ζεῦς δὲ πατήρ Γῆς ύιας ἀγακλέας ὀργειῶνας
θήκεν, οἱ ἄρρητων πρόσπολοι εἰσὶ δόμων.
οὐδ’ ἄχαριν μόχθοι παραὶ Διὸς ἐ[σ]χον ἀμοιβήν
ἐργῶν ἀντ’ ἀγαθῶν ἐσθλὰ κομιζόμενοι.
15 τόν τ’ ἐρατὸν μακάρεσσιν ἀειδόμενον πάρα χεῦμα
Σαλμάκιδος γλυκερὸν νασσαμένη σκόπελον
νόμφης ἱμερτὸν κατέχει δόμον, ὥς ποτὲ κοῦρον
ἦμέτερον τερπναῖς δεξαμένη παλάμαις
Ἐρμαφρόδιτου θρέψε πανέξοχον, ὡς γάμον εὑρεν

439 SGO 1, 01/12/02, 2nd century CE (mid-century or the latter half), Halicarnassus (Salmakis).
20 ἀνδράσι καὶ λέχεα πρῶτος ἔδησε νόμων·
αὐτὴ τε σταγόνων ιεροῖς ὑπὸ νάμασιν ἄντρου
πρηύνει φώτων ἀγριοέντα νόον.
Πάλλας τε ππερόεντος ἐπηρίον δαματήρα
Πηγάσου οἰκίστην ἐσθόλον ἐπηγάγετο.

25 ἐνθ᾽ ὅτε δὴ στείϕασα μετ᾽ ἱχνεις Βελλεροφόντεως
Πηδασίδος γαῖς τέρμονας ἰδρύεται:
ναὶ μὴν καὶ Κραναοῖο μέγα σθένος ἐκτισ᾽ ἄριστους
Κεκροπίδας ἱερῆς ἐν χρονὶ Σαλμακίδος.
Ἐνδυμίων τ᾽ αἰχμῆι βασιληίδι κύδιμος ἥρως

30 λέκτους ἐκ γαῖς Ἀπιδος ἠγάγετο
[Ἀνθης τ᾽ ἐκ Τροιζῆνος ἕων Ποσιδίὼνιος υιός
— — — ἥρο]σεν Ἀνθεάδας
— — — Ἰνθυος Ἰσα κορυσθεῖς
— — — Ἰων ἔθετο
35 — — — ]Φοιβήσιος ἰνις
 — — — νε]οκτισίην
— — — ἀπὸ χ]θονὸς ἤ Ἄριάδνην
— — — ] παίδ᾽ ἐλιπεν
— — — ἐνιρρίζωσεν ἀποικον

40 — — — ἀτιτι[αλλόμενος
— — — ]κ]αι σταφάνην χερὶ Δωρικὸν αὐτῆν
— — — ]ει [——]ζει Φοίβου ἐφημοσύναις.
Ηρόδοτον τὸν πεζὸν ἐν ἱστορίαισιν Ὁμηρον
ἤροσεν, Ἀνδρωνος θρέψε κλυτὴν δύναμιν,
45 ἔσπειρεν Πανύασσιν ἐτῶν ἀρισήμον᾽ ἄνακτα,
Ἰλιακῶν Κυπρίαν τίκτεν ἀοιδοθέτην.

ηδὲ τὸν ἐμ Μουσαϊς Μενεσθέα κεδνὸν ἀνήκεν
ηδὲ Θεαιτήτου πνεῦμ᾽ ἐλοχευσ᾽ ἱερὸν,
κωμικὸν ὑμνοθέτην Διονύσιον ὡς τεκνοῦται,

50 Ζηνόδοτον τραγικῶν ἱδρὶν ἔτευξ᾽ ἐπέων
δημὼ Διονύσου Φανόστρατον ἔσχεν ἀοιδόν
Κεκροπιδών ἱεροῖς ἀβρόν ἐνι στεφάνοις,
Νόσσον ἐν ἱστορίαις χρόνων σημάντορα τεῦξεν,
Τιμοκράτην πινυτ᾽ ἀοιδοθέτην·

55 ἄλλους τ᾽ εξ ἐσθλῶν ἐσθλοὺς τῇκε μυρίος αἰών·
οὐ τελέσει δόξης πείρατα πάντ᾽ ἐνέπειν,
πολλὰ μὲν ἐν χέρσῳ κάμεν ἀγλαά,

60 ἔργοις κυδίστων ἀντέχεται στεφάνως.

column I

Tell me, Schoinitis, you [provider of] cherished balm,
Kypris, who brings near the myrrh-breathing [- - - -]
What is so honourable about Halikarnassos? I for my part
never heard of it. What is she proudly boasting of?

5 She brought forth a grand crop of Earth-born men,
assistants of mighty Zeus of the Height.
It was they who first under a hollowed crest placed Zeus, newborn,
the son of Rhea, so that he was hidden, and who fostered him
in the innermost recesses of Earth, when Kronos, crooked of counsel,

10 was too late to place him far down in his throat.
Father Zeus made the sons of Earth famous ritual attendants
who guard the secret dwelling
Nor was the reward they got in return for their toil one of ingratitude:
They received good things for their good deeds:

15 Having settled the lovely promontory sung of as dear to the immortals
by the sweet stream of Salmakis, she (Halikarnassos) controls
the beautiful dwelling of the nymph who once received
our boy, Hermaphroditos, in her kindly arms
and bred him to become an extraordinary man, who invented matrimony
for mankind and was the first to fasten the matrimonial bed by law.
She in her turn under the sacred streams dripping in
the cave tempers the savage minds of men.
And Pallas brought hither riding through the air the tamer
of the winged Pegasos, a good colonizer,

20 where she, treading the footsteps of Bellerophonites,
places the boundaries of the land of Pedasa.
Indeed the mighty force of Kranaos also installed the best among the Kekropidai, in the ground of holy Salmakis.

The valiant hero, Endymion with his regal spear led chosen men from Apis’ land.

column II

Passid]on’s son,
the Antheadai equipped like [Rhadamanthys put

son of Phoibos foundation
led Ariadne from the land of . . . left a child
away from home

- - - - - -
- with the hand - - Doric -
- - on Phoibos’ command
she sowed Herodotos, the Homer of history in prose,
reared the famous art of Andron,

made Panyassis shoot forth to command the epic so outstandingly and gave birth to Kyprias who composed the Iliaka.
She also brought forth Menestheus loved by the Muses and delivered the divine inspiration of Theaitetos.

The writer of comedy Dionysios she bears as her son
and she produced Zenodotos, the expert writer of tragedies.
She had the singer Phanostratos, the servant of Dionysos, glistening in the sacred crowns of the Kekropidai.
And she produced Nossos, a leading chronologist in history.
She made Timokrates a wise poet

and bore other good men to succeed the good; the unending future will never finish enumerating all the proofs of her fame:
Many glorious things she achieved on land
and she carries off many good things at sea with the leaders of the Hellenes.
Halikarnassos has had an all-honourable gift in reward for her pious acts, and

when it comes to goodly deeds she lays claim to the most honoured crowns.

(Translation by Isager⁴⁴⁰)

⁴⁴⁰Isager 1998, 8–9. For another translation, see Lloyd-Jones 1999, 2–3. For detailed analyses, see both.
This long text unit starts with a question turn (ll. 1–4). The metre is elegiac, as in most epigrams. The question turn starts with an address: Ἐννεπέ μοι, Σχοινίτι, Tell me, Schoinitis, which has a familiar epic tone. The first question of the turn follows the imperative + address + interrogative formula, but the following one is formed with an interrogative. They both ask the same thing, namely what is great about Halicarnassus. Between these questions, the passerby says that s/he has never heard of it (ll. 3–4): τῆς Ἀλικαρνάσσου τί τὸ τίμιον; οὔ γάρ ἔγωγε / ἕκλυν· ἧ, τί θροεῖ γαύρα φρυασσομένη; What is so honourable about Halikarnassos? I for my part / never heard of it. What is she proudly boasting of?

The answer to this begins in line 5 and continues until the end of the epigram (l. 60). The point of this narrative text is to tell why the Halicarnassians are proud of their city. At the end of the inscription, lines 55–60, there is a summary of the reasons. This verse inscription is thus very different from the early monumental epigrams and, interestingly, there are several reminiscences of Hellenistic (fictive) epigrams and other texts. In the question turn, the elements are familiar from dialogue epigrams, but the answer turn is descriptive and narrative, and it travels far from the adjacency pair structure. The question is addressed to Aphrodite, who may have been depicted by a statue (and perhaps had a temple) close to the wall where the text was incised, but the text is not, for example, ecphrastic – it does not describe the statue, but rather the city. Note that, as Lloyd-Jones also points out, one of the first dialogue epigrams comes from Halicarnassus, and whether or not the writer of this epigram, several hundred years later, was aware of this or not, the link is fascinating.

The second example comes from a different text type – it is a dithyramb (no. 18) by Bacchylides. It is an interesting ‘combination’ of drama and epigram. In addition to the inner development of the epigram genre, it certainly contains some

---

441 cf. no. 25 in Chapter 3 and no. 4 in Chapter 4.
442 The beginning of the text is fragmentary, but the first lines with the address and the imperative must belong with the first question: What is so honourable about Halikarnassos?
443 Isager 1998, 11, also with more detailed analysis of the narrative (ll. 5–54).
444 cf. the analyses of both Lloyd-Jones and Isager. For another translation, see also Lloyd-Jones.
influences from other literary genres. Drama, lyric and elegy have influenced both the structures of the epigrams and their performance tradition. In the following dithyramb, both drama and communication structures familiar from epigrams are presented:

Χορός
βασιλεὺ τὰν ἱερὰν Ἀθανάν,
tών ἀβροβίων ἀναξ ἱώνων,
tί νέον ἐκλαγε χαλκοκώδων
σάλπιγξ πολεμῆταν ἀοιδάν;

5 ἦ τις ἀμετέρας χθονὸς
dυσμενής ὡρί· ἀμφιβάλλει
στραταγέτας ἀνήρ;

ή λησταὶ κακομάχανοι

ποιμένων ἀékατι μήλων

10 σεύοντ’ ἀγέλας βία;

ή τι τοι κραδίαν ἀμύσσει;

φθέγγει· ὑπερίω γάρ εἴ τινι βροτῶν

ἀλκίμων ἐπικουρίαν

καὶ τίν ἐμμεναί νέων,

15 ὡ Πανδίσινος υἱὲ καὶ Κρεούσας.

Αἰγεύς
νέ]ον ἡθεν δολιχὰν ἀμείψας
κάρυς ποσὶν θομίαν κέλευθον·

ἀφατα δ’ ἔργα λέγει κραταιοῦ

φιώτος· τὸν ὑπέρβιον τ’ ἔπεφνεν

20 Σίνιν, ὡς ἱσχύι φέρτατος

θνατῶν ἦν, Κρονίδα Λυταῖο

σεισίχθονος τέκος·

446 There is a fictive dialogue epigram by Dioscorides commenting on theatre, AG 7.37 = Gow and Page 22, and Fantuzzi 2007, 488–9. Drama in general is discussed and referred to in non-inscribed epigrams; cf. Fantuzzi, ibid.
σὺν τ´ ἀνδροκτόνον ἐν νάπαις
Κρεμμυώνος, ἀτάσθαλόν τε

25 Σκίρωνα κατέκτανεν·
tάν τε Κρεμμύνος παλαίστραν
ἔσχεν, Πολυπήμονός τε καρτεράν
σφῦραν εξέβαλεν Προκό-πτας, ἀρείονος τυχών

30 φωτός, ταύτα δέδοιχ´ ὡς τελείται.
tίνα δ´ ἐμμεν πόθεν ἀνδρα τούτον
λέγει, τίνα τε στολάν ἔχοντα;
πότερα σὺν πολεμήίοις ὁ-
πλοισι στρατιάν ἄγοντα πολλάν;

35 ἡ μοῦνον σὺν ὁπάσιν
στείχεν ἔμπορον οἳ ἄλαταν
ἐπ´ ἀλλοδαμίαν,
ἰσχυρόν τε καὶ ἀλκιμὸν
ὡδε καὶ θρασύν, ὃς τε τοῦτων

40 ἄνδρῶν κρατερὸν σθένος
ἔσχεν; ἦ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὀρμῇ,
δίκας ἀδίκουσιν ὥφρα μῆσται·
οὐ γὰρ ράδιον αἱὲν ἔρ-
dοντα μὴ ἑντυχεῖν κακῷ.

45 πάντ´ ἐν τῷ δολιχῷ χρόνῳ τελείται.

Αἰγεῦς
δύο ροι φώτε μόνους ἀμαρτεῖν
λέγει, περὶ φαιδίμοισι δ´ ὤμοις
ξίφος ἔχειν ἐλεφαντόκωπον·
ξεστούς δὲ δῦ´ ἐν χέρεσι´ ἀκοντας

50 κητυκτὸν κυνέαν Λάκαί-
ναν κρατός πέρι πυρσοχαίτου·
στέρνοις τε πορφύρεον
χιτών· ἀμφὶ, καὶ οὐλιον
Θεσσαλάν χλαμύδ’· ὀμμάτων δὲ
55 στίλβειν ἀπὸ Λαμνίαν
φοίνισσαν φλόγα· παῖδα δ’ ἔμεν
πρώθηβον, ἀρηίων δ’ ἀθυρμάτων
μεμνᾶσθαι πολέμου τε καὶ
χαλκοκτύπου μάχας·
60 δίζησθαι δὲ φιλαγλάους Ἀθάνας.

[Chorus:]

King of sacred Athens, lord of the luxuriously-living Ionians, why has the bronze-bellded trumpet just now sounded a war song?

[5] Does some enemy of our land beset our borders, leading an army? Or are evil-plottting robbers, against the will of the shepherds, [10] rustling our flocks of sheep by force? What is it that tears your heart? Speak; for I think that you of all mortals have the aid of valiant young men at your disposal, [15] son of Pandion and Creusa.

[Aegeus:]

Just now a herald arrived, having come by foot on the long road from the Isthmus. He tells of the indescribable deeds of a mighty man. That man killed overweening

[20] Sinis, who was the greatest of mortals in strength; he is the son of Lytaeus the Earthshaker, son of Cronus. And he has slain the man-killing boar in the valleys of Cremmyon, and reckless [25] Sciron. He has closed the wrestling school of Cercyon; Procoptes has met a better man and dropped the powerful hammer of Polypemon. [30] I fear how this will end.

[Chorus:]

Who is the man said to be, and from where? How is he equipped? Is he leading a great army with weapons of war?

[35] Or does he come alone with only his attendants, like a traveller wandering among foreign people, this man who is so strong, valiant, and bold, who has
overcome the powerful strength [40] of such great men? Indeed a god impels him, so that he can bring justice down on the unjust; for it is not easy to accomplish deed after deed and not meet with evil. [45] In the long course of time all things come to an end.

[Aegeus:]
The herald says that only two men accompany him, and that he has a sword slung over his bright shoulders

... and two polished javelins in his hands, [50] and a well-made Laconian hat on his head with its fire-red hair. A purple tunic covers his chest, and a woolen Thessalian cloak. [55] Bright red Lemnian fire flashes from his eyes. He is a boy in the prime of youth, intent on the playthings of Ares: war and battles of clashing bronze. [60] He is on his way to splendor-loving Athens.

(Translation by Arnson Svarlien)

The speakers are the Chorus (representing citizens of Athens) and Aigeus. The role of Aigeus was probably read by the Chorus leader, to whom the Chorus answers. Taplin notices the influence of tragedy on choral song, which tended to be more traditional, in this composition.\(^{447}\) What I find of special interest here is the role division of Aigeus and the Chorus. The Chorus is similar to the passerby of verse inscriptions; it is like an ignorant asker: it asks questions, wants information and motivates Aigeus to tell information to the audience. The role of Aigeus is not only communicative, but also narrative. The dithyramb begins with a question turn presented by the Chorus. The first question goes as follows (ll. 1–4): βασιλεῦ τὰν ἱερὰν Ἀθηνᾶν, / τῶν ἀβροβίων ἀναξ ἱώνων, / τί νέον ἔκλαγε χαλκοκώδων /σάλπιγξ πολεμηΐαν ἀοιδάν; King of sacred Athens, lord of the luxuriously-living Ionians, why has the bronze-belled trumpet just now sounded a war song? Three other questions follow, and after them, the Chorus exhorts Aigeus to speak, using the imperative φθέγγευ (l. 11), Speak. After this follows the explanatory for I think that you of all mortals have the aid of valiant young men at your disposal, son of Pandion and Creusa. In lines 20–30, Aigeus describes a man about whom the herald has spoken, a mighty man who performed valiant deeds. This section resembles honorary inscriptions.

\(^{447}\) Kurke 2000, 81–2.
Another series of questions begins in line 31, again presented by the Chorus: 

τίνα δ’ ἔμενεν πόθεν ἄνδρα τοῦτον / λέγει, τίνα τε στολὰν ἔχοντα; Who is the man said to be, and from where? How is he equipped? Here, the particle δ’ links this turn to the previous dialogue between the Chorus and Aigeus (the man about whom the Chorus asks has been talked about before). More questions follow, but in this question turn (within one question), the Chorus also describes the man (from l. 35 onwards): ἢ μοῦνον σὺν ὅπ. ἀσιν / στείχειν ἐμπορον ὅ γ’ ἀλάταν / ἔπ’ ἄλλομήμαν, / ἱσχυρόν τε καὶ ἀλκίμον / ὃ δέ καὶ θρασύν, ὅς τε τούτων / ἄνδρων κρατερὸν σθένος ἔσχεν; Or does he come alone with only his attendants, like a traveller wandering among foreign people, this man who is so strong, valiant, and bold, who has overcome the powerful strength of such great men? In the reply turn, the habitus of the man is described. The question–answer structure resembles the old monument texts, for example the grave epigrams, but the text is thematically close to both honorary and ecphrastic epigrams (the latter reply of Aigeus), even though it describe a man and not a statue.

These two examples show influence within and between the literary genres. In the Halicarnassus epigram there are some elements of hymns, as there were in the examples of Section 5.1. In addition to that, drama and oratory figure here – the traces of oral communication can be detected. Communicative and narrative structures intertwine, creating a variety of expressions, some of which are similar with type-3 epigrams, but often rather far from the other two types.

5.4 Conclusion

In type-3 epigrams, one can see how the dialogue form in verse inscriptions, which was initially an informative pattern (roughly speaking) used for mediating facts in the monuments, has been applied to a narrative and more ‘literary’ use. This quite heterogeneous group of epigrams has in common a certain descriptiveness; they tell stories more than they capture communication. Some elements of language are still similar to type-1 and type-2 epigrams, but the communicative elements are mixed with the narrative, or are embedded in narration. Some type-3 X – Y variants,
especially those with two speakers, bear resemblances to the epigrams with clear adjacency pair structures, but also show differences; for example the text units may be a few stanzas long, and the direction of the speech is not always a -> b -> a. In addition to X – Y variants, there are epigrams with three speakers, either X – Y – Z (for example the monument, the deceased and the relative) or X – Y – N, where N refers to the narrator. In such an epigram, the narrator is a neutral character who reports the course of events. The narrator can be the first speaker, after which an adjacency pair or a dialogue consisting of, for example, two stanzas follows (N – X – Y). Another option is that the narrator cuts in between the two turns of the dialogue: X – N – Y. The narrator can also mark the speakers of the dialogue, especially in the latter case (‘then spoke NN’).

The communicative turns can also be parts of a narration. I call these cases ‘embedded dialogues’. In the epigrams with embedded dialogues, the central reporter is always the narrator, and, in addition, there are + 1 or + 2 speakers. In the first option, the narrator also has a turn in the dialogue s/he describes in the epigram, for example N – X – N – N2, but the order of the speakers varies. Such dialogues are composed in the past tense, as part of a narration. The same applies to N + 2 epigrams, in which the narrator describes a dialogue in which s/he does not partake, i.e. a dialogue of X and Y: N – X – N – Y. Again, however, the order of the turns may vary, and there can be a fifth turn as well (which would be the turn of the narrator). The embedded dialogues are more common in non-inscribed epigrams than in the verse inscriptions.

Type-3 epigrams show the development from the communicative towards the narrative; or more precisely, the communicative elements and patterns of the dialogue form (especially the question structures) are applied in the narratives. When the narrator notes the change of speaker and identifies them, these features do not necessarily need to be visible in the dialogue section (e.g. in addresses). This, however, does not mean that they cannot be — type-1 and type-2 linguistic features such as addresses, imperatives and certain ways of using particles do occur. As regards particles, δέ is common in type-3 also; here it is used, for example, in the turns of the narrator when the narrator introduces the next speaker (cf. introducing
a new question in type 1 and type 2). The role of the narrator has been discussed in this chapter, but it is noteworthy that the relative is perhaps the most focal speaker role in type 3: it figures in seven type-3 verse inscriptions.448

The last two texts discussed in this chapter are long text units that could largely be described or defined as narrative, but they do still include communication and elements of language that we know from the adjacency pairs. This of course does not mean that all the communication in literature derives from the dialogue verse inscriptions, but rather that when epigrams (and other genres) do have communicative elements, the patterns used in the adjacency pairs are often similar to the ones used in the dialogue epigrams, and mutual influence is likely. Type-3 verse inscriptions indicate literary influence of e.g. hymns, drama, and non-inscribed epigram.

Table 8: Type-3 epigrams in verse inscriptions

| X – Y variations/ | Bernand, Inscr. Métr. 33 = GVI 1873 = GG 437 = SEG 50, 1600 = SEG 60, 1122 GVI 1874 = SGO 1, 01/01/07 = GG 438 Bernand, Insc. Métr. 46 = GVI 1875 = GG 439 = SEG 60, 1930 & 2022 IG X 2,1, 368 SGO 3, 16/31/93D = SEG 6, 140 IK Heraclea Pont. 9 = SGO 2, 09/11/02 = SEG 31, 1072 SGO 1, 06/02/32 = SEG 50, 1762, SEG 53, 2191, SEG 60, 1930 SGO 2, 08/01/51 = SEG 60, 1999 SGO 4, 17/06/02 = SEG 44, 1833 = SEG 52, 1918 | no. 1 |
| X – Y – Z | no. 2 no. 3 no. 4 no. 5 no. 6 |
| Embedded | SGO 3, 14/04/03 = SEG 52, 1918 = SEG 58, 1885 Bernand, Inscr. Métr. 27 = GVI 1887 SGO 3, 14/12/01 = SEG 6, 488 (fragmentary) | no. 7 no. 8 |

448 See nos. 1, 2, 3, 5 and 7 and also SGO 1, 06/02/32 and SGO 4, 17/06/02.
6. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

This study discusses the language of dialogue epigrams. Questions such as how the speakers are marked and identified, how the change of speaker is denoted, what kind of turns the epigrams contain, and how the turns are connected/separated were the starting point of the study.

In the typology I have created, the dialogue epigrams are divided into three different types on the basis of their communication structures. The foundation of this division is the adjacency-pair structure. Dialogue epigrams vary from succinct and informative one-pair epigrams to descriptive narrations that consist of several stanzas. Length does not necessarily define the epigram’s type, but type-3 epigrams tend to be longer than the other types that are clearly based on adjacency pairs. The examples show that the question–answer pair is the most prominent adjacency pair, but greeting pairs are also frequent and some statement–response pairs occur. A wish turn or a wish pair (wishing either the deceased or the passerby well) at the end of the epigram is especially common, but there are also some opening turns that initiate the pair structure that follows.

There is also variation within each type. The epigrams are analysed both on the level of pairs and on the level of turns. On the level of pairs, the variants of each type are analysed and discussed with examples. The chronologically first and also the most common of the types is type 1 (X – Y), and epigrams in this category can vary from a mere greeting pair or simple question–answer pair to epigrams with a meandering response turn or three-turn unities. Type-2 epigrams (X – Y n) offer similar combinations for multi-paired epigrams and type-3 epigrams contain either two- or three-speaker stanzas (X – Y – Z/N) or embedded dialogues in a narration. The structure of type-3 epigrams thus differs from the other two, but some elements familiar from the adjacency pairs can be detected. The examples show that certain linguistic patterns are repeated and adapted in all types.

With regard to turns and (especially) pairs, features such as question structures, addresses, imperatives, repetition (of a word, a phrase or a part of it) and particles are central. These are the main elements of which communication is
comprised the dialogue verse inscriptions. As analysed in the typology chapters, these features are used to denote the turns, to introduce a new turn, to tie the turns or adjacency pairs together, to imply the speaker and the change of speaker, and also to separate the semantic segments from one other.

As question–answer pairs are the most common units of dialogue epigrams, the interrogatives are frequent (in question-word questions), and they can be accompanied by addresses and interrogatives. Addresses also function as identifiers of the speakers (and can occur either in the opening turn or later). Imperatives, when addressed to a passerby, ask him/her to stop, read or listen, and sometimes to utter the rites – they are all connected to the reception of the monument. If addressed to the monument or deceased, verbs in the imperative are, for example, ‘tell’, ‘reveal’ or something similar, all of which request information. If addressed to a relative, they are used to tell the relative not to cry, not to mourn, or to enjoy life while it lasts.

Particles are especially prominent in type 2, but are used in other types as well. Connectives are used particularly often in the communication. In dialogues, certain functions for δέ, ἀλλά and καί are frequent: δέ introduces new questions (especially in t2, in second question turns and/or later ones), new speakers (especially in t3, implied with narrator voice) or new clusters of information in reply turns (t1 and t2 most often). ἀλλά is used when the focus shifts from one semantic unit to another, for example within a turn to highlight the change from an information segment to an end wish or a prayer to the gods. At the beginning of an adjacency pair, ἀλλά marks the new kind of pair; for example, after several question–answer pairs, a pair of wishes is introduced with ἀλλά. καί joins the pairs together, but also, in greetings, it connects the two turns of a pair (the second one beginning with καί σύ γε or similar). Generally speaking, δέ functions more on the level of turns, while καί shows the links between the pairs.

This study concentrates on the verse inscriptions, but some fictive parallels are also discussed, and some similarities in speaker roles and certain communication structures are pointed out. In the verse inscriptions, the monumental context and
the writer’s knowledge of the reception situation creates certain patterns and conventions. These are even more clearly visible in the dialogue epigrams than in the monologues. This complex play with voices, reader(s) and audience intrigued the Hellenistic and later poets, and the dialogue form is played with, and sometimes parodied, in the non-inscribed epigrams; however, the same can also be seen in some of the verse inscriptions. In the patterns occurring in both, we can see how the conventions of the verse inscriptions were used and modified in the fictive genre, but also how the development of the fictive genre brings variation and, for example, narrative elements to verse inscriptions.

As the epigrams discussed strongly suggest, the audience was aware of a certain set of speakers in verse inscriptions. These roles were adapted to non-inscribed epigrams as well, but often for new functions. The voices are not always clear, and sometimes our perception of the voice changes during the course of reading. On the other hand, as the audience was probably well acquainted with the patterns of dialogue epigrams, it was able to follow the epigrams even when the speakers were not clearly marked. The ‘wavering’ speaker roles / voices are often deliberate on the author’s part and can make the epigram multidimensional, and sometimes funny.

This study brings linguistic and epigraphic methods together, and by combining these, offers a new viewpoint on the epigram genre, and thus adds to our understanding of the mutual influence of the verse inscriptions and the non-inscribed epigrams. Pragmatics and the study of features such as adjacency pairs and their communicative structures offer a new perspective on the study of epigraphic patterns.

The material discussed dates mainly to the Roman period, and the study thus contributes to the ongoing discussion on epigrams and verse inscriptions. Current research concentrates on Hellenistic epigrams and their predecessors, but later phases are less well represented. In this study, the early examples are taken into account, and the first stages of dialogue thus plotted, but pre-Hellenistic examples are few, and the focus of the study is on the later material: the apex of the dialogue
form occurred around the first three centuries CE, but we have some (fewer) examples from the later centuries as well.

The monumental context is also noted in the analysis. There are monuments with several epigrams, of which the dialogue is just a small section, and there are also monuments with prose sections in addition to the epigram. There is communication between these different parts, as well as the text(s) and the reliefs/statues on the monument. Sometimes these are commented on in the texts, as is the text itself (references to the verses and/or to the physical letters on the monument). This adds to the reception: the text are seen and heard as part of a complex unity comprising the monument as a whole and its message—there is always communication between the monument and its recipient(s) as well.

This study highlights the need for further research on diaphonic texts. In this study, the elements of communication are in focus, but many ‘almost dialogical’ texts indicate that these definitions were not always significant for the writers of the epigrams. It was not possible to discuss all such examples in this study, but it would be highly interesting to collect such epigrams systematically and study them further.

Another aspect worthy of further discussion is the phenomenon of the monument or the deceased voice speaking a monologue and asking questions which it then proceeds to answer itself. This seems to be more frequent after the first centuries CE. By collecting and comparing such epigrams, the development of the speaker roles in both verse inscriptions and non-inscribed epigrams could be further studied, and the influence of certain dialogue patterns could perhaps also be detected.

For literary studies, further overall analysis and comparison of verse inscriptions and non-inscribed epigrams could prove fruitful, as well as more detailed analysis of other literary influence on epigram. This has of course been done to a certain extent in recent studies, but much less so as regards the Roman period. It was possible to discuss elements such as speaker roles in non-inscribed epigrams only very briefly in this study (this is an aspect noted in the Hellenistic epigram study), but I believe the later epigrams have more to offer on the topic.
For more ‘material’ aspects, a broader study that plots epigrams with reference to the monument or the text itself (both dialogue and monologue) has the potential to uncover new information. The best results would be achieved through a collaboration of epigraphists and art historians. Such a study should concentrate on the material from a certain place and analyse factors such as cross-references between the text and the monument / decoration, their joint message to the audience and the ways of communicating this message and arresting the interest of the audience. Such material should then be compared to similar data from different areas in order to see if the textual and decorative communication strategies vary.
### APPENDIX A: Table A1, Dialogue verse inscriptions (with dates and proveniences)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epigram (chapter in which it was discussed in and number)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Provenience</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GVI 1831 = CEG 120 (2; 1)</td>
<td>(6th)/5th BCE</td>
<td>Demetrias, Thessaly</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEG 429 = SGO 1, 01/12/05 (2; 2)</td>
<td>5th BCE</td>
<td>Halicarnassus, Caria</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG II/I 12067 = GVI 1387 = GG 101 = CEG 530 = SEG 29, 259 (2; 3)</td>
<td>4th BCE</td>
<td>Piraeus, Attica</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVI 1835 = SGO 3, 14/07/02 (2; 6 and 3; 21)</td>
<td>2nd CE</td>
<td>Iconion, Lycaonia</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVI 1867 = SEG 11, 383 (2; 7)</td>
<td>3rd CE</td>
<td>Hermione, Argolis</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVI 1840 (2; 8 and 3; 6)</td>
<td>late Imperial</td>
<td>Berytus, Syria (Lebanon)</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 4, 21/24/02 = SEG 37, 1538 = SEG 52, 1587 = SEG 58, 1743 (2; 9)</td>
<td>2nd CE</td>
<td>Philadelphia, Palestine (Amman)</td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard, Inscr. Mét. 68 = GVI 1843 = GG 427 = SEG 8, 530 (2; 10 and 4; 14)</td>
<td>1st/2nd CE</td>
<td>Saqqarah, Egypt</td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG XII 3, 220 = GVI 1832 = SEG 60, 894 (2; 11)</td>
<td>2nd CE</td>
<td>Astypalaia</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVI 1877 = BÉ 1953, 211 = SGO 4, 20/02/01 (2; 12 and 3; 19)</td>
<td>2nd/3rd CE</td>
<td>Marathus, Syria</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardis 7, 1, 111 = GVI 1881 = GG 433 = SGO 1, 04/02/11 = SEG 49, 1678, SEG 50, 1762, SEG 58, 1981, SEG 59, 1945 (2; 13 and 4; 13)</td>
<td>2nd/1st BCE</td>
<td>Sardis, Ioania</td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVI 1882 = IC IV 372 = SEG 3, 781 (2; 14)</td>
<td>2nd CE</td>
<td>Gortyn, Crete</td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVI 1855 = SGO 2, 08/01/44 (2; 15)</td>
<td>2nd CE</td>
<td>Aphthonios, Mysia</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG II/I 10073 = GVI 1864 = SEG 48, 906 (2; 16 and 4; 1)</td>
<td>2nd/3rd CE</td>
<td>Attica</td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG X 2, 1, 464 = GVI 1865 = SEG 52, 620 (2; 17)</td>
<td>2nd/3rd CE</td>
<td>Thessalonica, Macedonia</td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 4, 17/06/05 = SEG 29, 1442 (2; 18)</td>
<td>3rd CE</td>
<td>Oinoanda, Lycia</td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 2, 10/02/31 = SEG 33, 1111 (3; 1)</td>
<td>2nd CE</td>
<td>Caesarea/Hadrianopolis, Paphlagonia</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG II/I 13166 = GVI 1880 (3; 2)</td>
<td>4th/5th CE</td>
<td>Athens, Attica</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 1, 05/01/32 = GVI 1879 = SEG 49, 1478 (3; 3)</td>
<td>2nd CE</td>
<td>Smyrna, Ionia</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG 23, 434 = GG 429 (3; 4)</td>
<td>3rd CE</td>
<td>Pherai, Thessaly</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 4, 19/10/01 = AG 7.426 = SEG 30, 1562 = SEG 57, 2092 (3; 5)</td>
<td>1st/2nd/3rd CE</td>
<td>Canytelis, Cilicia</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 1, 02/09/24 (3; 7)</td>
<td>ca. 450 CE</td>
<td>Aphrodisias, Caria</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinth 8, 1, no. 89 = IC IV 1603 (3; 8)</td>
<td>late 3rd CE</td>
<td>Corinth, Corinthia</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia 5, 225 (3; 9)</td>
<td>1st CE</td>
<td>Olympia, Elis</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVI 1869 (3; 10)</td>
<td>1st CE</td>
<td>Panticapaeum, Crimea</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG II xiv 27 = GVI 1852 (3; 11)</td>
<td>‘Roman’</td>
<td>Lappa, Crete</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG XII 7, 490 = GVI 1856 (3; 12)</td>
<td>2nd/3rd CE</td>
<td>Aigiale, Amorgos</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 2, 08/04/05 (3; 13)</td>
<td>‘late’</td>
<td>Dascyleion, Mysia</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>IG V 2, 182 = GVI 1857 (3; 14)</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd}/3\textsuperscript{rd} CE</td>
<td>Tegea, Arcadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GVI 1850 (3; 15)</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} CE</td>
<td>Rhodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rife 2008, 132 = SEG 58, 311 (3; 16)</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd}/3\textsuperscript{rd} CE</td>
<td>Steiri, Corinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GVI 1878 = SGO 4, 20/16/02 = SEG 7, 329 (3; 17)</td>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd}/4\textsuperscript{th} CE?</td>
<td>Caesarea Philippi, Palestine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IG II/III\textsuperscript{t} 7711 = GVI 1386 = SEG 36, 269 = SEG 37, 192 (3; 18)</td>
<td>4\textsuperscript{th} CE</td>
<td>Piraeus, Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IG II/III\textsuperscript{t} 11606a = GVI 1841 = SEG 30, 268 = SEG 31, 238 (3; 20)</td>
<td>later than 3\textsuperscript{rd} CE</td>
<td>Athens, Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGO 2, 09/07/09 = SEG 28, 995 (3; 22)</td>
<td>‘Hellenistic’</td>
<td>Calchedon, Bithynia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IG II/III\textsuperscript{t} 12794 = GVI 1836 (3; 23)</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} CE</td>
<td>Athens, Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGO 4, 20/06/01 = SEG 17, 756 (3; 25)</td>
<td>6\textsuperscript{th} CE</td>
<td>Epiphaneia, Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GVI 1851 = SGO 2, 08/01/39 (3; 26)</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd}/1\textsuperscript{st} BCE</td>
<td>Cyzicus, Mysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GVI 1834 (3; 27)</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} CE</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGO 1, 05/01/57 (3; 28)</td>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd} CE</td>
<td>Smyrna, Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GVI 1833 (3; 29)</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} BCE</td>
<td>Salamis, Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IG Pannonia 8 = GVI 1853 (3; 30)</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} CE</td>
<td>Carnuntum, Pannonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smyrna 225 = GVI 1884 = SGO 1, 05/01/65 = SEG 38, 1224 = SEG 58, 1742 (3; 31)</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} CE</td>
<td>Smyrna, Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGO 2, 08/01/41</td>
<td>4\textsuperscript{th}/5\textsuperscript{th} CE</td>
<td>Cyzicus, Mysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGO 3, 16/55/03, cf. GVI 1870 = GG 431 (4; 2)</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} CE</td>
<td>Philomelion, Phrygia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IMT Olympene 2691 = GVI 1862 = SGO 2, 08/08/10 = SEG 54, 1833 (4; 3)</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} BCE/1\textsuperscript{st} CE</td>
<td>Hadrianoi, Mysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IG II/III\textsuperscript{t} 8918 = GVI 1847 (4; 4)</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} CE</td>
<td>Athens, Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGO 4, 21/23/06 = SEG 58, 1743 = SEG 60, 1927 (2; 4; 5)</td>
<td>6\textsuperscript{th} CE</td>
<td>Gerasa, Palestine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IG X 2, 1, 148(B) = SEG 50, 1194 app. cr. = SEG 52, 620 (4; 6)</td>
<td>mid-3\textsuperscript{rd} CE</td>
<td>Thessalonica, Macedonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IG XIV 1883, GVI 1866 = GG 430 (4; 7)</td>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd} CE</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IG XII 5, 307, GVI 1860 = GG 428 = SEG 45, 2251 (4; 8)</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} CE</td>
<td>Paros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGO 3, 16/08/01 (4; 9)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Temenuthyrai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGO 1, 03/06/06 = GVI 1859 (4; 10)</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd}/1\textsuperscript{st} BCE</td>
<td>Teos, Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marek 1993, no. 38 = GVI 1863 = SGO 2, 10/03/04 (4; 11)</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} CE</td>
<td>Amastris, Bithynia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IG XII, 5, 310 = GVI 1871 = GG 432 = SEG 30, 1063 = SEG 58, 1885 = SEG 59, 1971 &amp; 2079 (4; 12)</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} CE</td>
<td>Parus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GVI 1861 = GG 429 = SEG 8, 482 (4; 15)</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} CE</td>
<td>Leontopolis, Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GVI 1842 = GG 426, cf. SEG 8, 802 = SEG 53, 2176 (4; 16)</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} CE</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bernand, <em>Inscr. Métr.</em> 49 = GVI 1845</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd}/3\textsuperscript{rd} CE</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Date/Location</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVI 1846 = BÉ 1944, 199a (4; 18)</td>
<td>early 3rd CE</td>
<td>Hermopolis Magna, Egypt</td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVI 1858 = AG 7.163 (4; 19)</td>
<td>3rd CE</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard, Inscr. Métr. 33 = GVI 1873 = GG 437 = SEG 50, 1600 = SEG 60, 1122 (5; 1)</td>
<td>latter half of 2nd CE</td>
<td>Heracleopolis, Egypt</td>
<td>t3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVI 1874 = GG 438 = SGO 1, 01/01/07 (5; 2)</td>
<td>2nd/1st BCE</td>
<td>Cnidus, Caria</td>
<td>t3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard, Inscr. Métr. 46 = GVI 1875 = GG 439 = SEG 60, 1930 &amp; 2022 (5; 3)</td>
<td>1st BCE/1st CE</td>
<td>Alexandria, Egypt</td>
<td>t3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG X 2, 1, 368 (5; 4)</td>
<td>2nd CE</td>
<td>Thessalonica, Macedonia</td>
<td>t3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 3, 16/31/93D = SEG 6, 140 (5; 5)</td>
<td>4th CE</td>
<td>Appia/Soa, Phrygia</td>
<td>t3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IK Heraclea Pont. 9 = SGO 2, 09/11/02 = SEG 31, 1072 (5; 6)</td>
<td>2nd/3rd CE</td>
<td>Heraclea Pontice, Bithynia</td>
<td>t3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 3, 14/04/03 = SEG 52, 1918 = SEG 58, 1885 (5; 7)</td>
<td>4th CE</td>
<td>Kissia, Lycaonia</td>
<td>t3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVI 1887, cf. Bernand, Inscr. Métr. 27 (5; 8)</td>
<td>3rd/4th CE</td>
<td>Saqqarah, Egypt</td>
<td>t3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 2, 08/04/98</td>
<td>2nd CE</td>
<td>Dascyleion, Mysia</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 3, 14/04/02 = GVI 1839</td>
<td>3rd CE/later</td>
<td>Kissia, Lycaonia</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 3, 16/06/01 = SEG 6, 210</td>
<td>3rd CE</td>
<td>Eumenia</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 4, 17/09/01 = SEG 56, 1111</td>
<td>‘Imperial’</td>
<td>Patara, Lycia</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG 55, 775 (= SEG 35, 763)</td>
<td>6th CE</td>
<td>Sandansk, Thrace</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVI 1854 = SGO 2, 08/04/06 = SEG 42, 926</td>
<td>1st/2nd CE</td>
<td>Panderma, Mysia</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG XIV, 1514a = GVI 1886 = SEG 42, 926</td>
<td>2nd/3rd CE</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 2, 08/01/49</td>
<td>‘Imperial’</td>
<td>Cyzicus, Mysia</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVI 1885</td>
<td>2nd CE</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 2, 09/11/03</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Heraclea Pontice, Bithynia</td>
<td>t1449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 4, 21/07/01 = SEG 58, 1743 &amp; 1885 = SEG 60, 1927(3)</td>
<td>5th/6th CE</td>
<td>Berosaba, Palestine</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 1, 02/14/06</td>
<td>5th CE</td>
<td>Laodicea, Caria</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 4, 21/09/01 = SEG 49, 2069</td>
<td>‘Hellenistic’</td>
<td>Marissa, Palestine</td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG XIV 769 = GVI 1883 = SEG 37, 784-786 = SEG 44, 817 (3; 32)</td>
<td>1st/2nd CE</td>
<td>Neapel</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG VII 3110 = GVI 1838 = SEG 49, 2440</td>
<td>3rd CE</td>
<td>Lebadeia, Boeotia</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC IV 391, no. 432 = SEG 28, 739</td>
<td>1st CE</td>
<td>Gortyn, Crete</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 2, 09/06/99 = GVI 1849</td>
<td>2nd/3rd CE</td>
<td>Nicomedia, Bithynia</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVI 1837 = SEG 49, 2452</td>
<td>2nd/3rd CE</td>
<td>Attica</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVI 1876</td>
<td>2nd CE</td>
<td>Temessus, Pisidia</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 1, 03/02/198</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Ephesus, Ionia</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 1, 05/01/18</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Smyrna, Ionia</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 1, 05/01/19</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Smyrna, Ionia</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

449 But very fragmentary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place/Region</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SGO 2, 11/07/05 = AG 16.201</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Amaseia, Pontos</td>
<td></td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG 18, 269</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Sveti Naum, Macedonia</td>
<td></td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVI 1848</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVI 1844 = IG XIV, 1603</td>
<td>2nd CE</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td></td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVI 1868</td>
<td>2nd CE</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVI 1872 = IG II/III 10118 = SEG 52, 1991</td>
<td>2nd/3rd CE</td>
<td>Athens, Attica</td>
<td></td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG IX 1, 878 = SEG 51, 1009</td>
<td>2nd BCE</td>
<td>Corfu</td>
<td></td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 3, 14/12/01 = SEG 6, 488</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Lycaonia, Isauria</td>
<td></td>
<td>t3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 1, 01/12/20</td>
<td>‘Hellenistic’</td>
<td>Halicarnassus, Caria</td>
<td></td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 4, 17/06/02 = SEG 44, 1833 = SEG 52, 1918</td>
<td>3rd CE</td>
<td>Oinoanda, Lycia</td>
<td></td>
<td>t3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 4, 18/01/24</td>
<td>‘Imperial’</td>
<td>Termessos, Pisidia</td>
<td></td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 4, 18/01/26</td>
<td>‘Imperial’</td>
<td>Termessos, Pisidia</td>
<td></td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 4, 20/27/01 = SEG 44, 1566 = SEG 57, 2172</td>
<td>‘Imperial’</td>
<td>Nisibis, Syria</td>
<td></td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 2, 08/01/51 = SEG 60, 1999</td>
<td>‘early Imperial’</td>
<td>Cyzicus, Mysia</td>
<td></td>
<td>t3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 2, 09/04/06 = SEG 51, 1707</td>
<td>3rd CE</td>
<td>Prusa ad Olympum</td>
<td></td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 1, 04/24/16 = SEG 57, 1206</td>
<td>2nd CE</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td></td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO 1, 06/02/32 = SEG 50, 1762, SEG 53, 2191, SEG 60, 1930</td>
<td>‘Imperial’</td>
<td>Pergamon</td>
<td></td>
<td>t3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG XII 4, 3, 2147 (to be published)</td>
<td>2nd BCE</td>
<td>Cos</td>
<td></td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B: Non-inscribed dialogue epigrams

**Table B1: Dialogue epigrams in the Greek Anthology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epigram (no.)</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Dialogue type</th>
<th>Chapter / number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AG 1.43</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td>(2.2.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>Philodemus</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td>(2.2.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.101</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td>(2.2.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.233</td>
<td>Macedonius the Consul</td>
<td>t3</td>
<td>5; 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.242</td>
<td>Eratosthenes Scholasticus</td>
<td>t3</td>
<td>5; 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.250</td>
<td>Paulus Silentiarius</td>
<td>t3</td>
<td>5; 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.267</td>
<td>Agathias Scholasticus</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.122</td>
<td>Nicias</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.224</td>
<td>Theodoridas</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.259</td>
<td>Philippus</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.351</td>
<td>Callimachus</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td>2; fn. 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.357</td>
<td>Theaetetus</td>
<td>t3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>Julianus, Prefect of Egypt</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td>3; 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>Dioscorides</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td>3; 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>Meleager</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>Callimachus</td>
<td>t3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.116</td>
<td>Diogenes Laertius</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.161</td>
<td>Antipater of Sidon</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.163</td>
<td>Leonidas of Tarentum</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td>4; 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.164</td>
<td>Antipater of Sidon</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td>4; fn. 374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.165</td>
<td>Archias</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td>4; fn. 374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.307</td>
<td>Paulus Silentiarius</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td>4; 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.317</td>
<td>Callimachus</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td>3; 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.335</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.379</td>
<td>Antiphilus of Byzantium</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.424</td>
<td>Antipater of Sidon</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.426</td>
<td>Antipater of Sidon</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td>3; fn. 195 and fn. 255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.470</td>
<td>Meleager</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td>4; fn. 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.503</td>
<td>Leonidas of Tarentum</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.524</td>
<td>Callimachus</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.548</td>
<td>Leonidas of Alexandria</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td>4; 26 (+2.2.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.552</td>
<td>Agathias Scholasticus</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td>4; 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.576</td>
<td>Julianus, Prefect of Egypt</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td>2; 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

450 This and others marked with (2.2.7) were mentioned at the beginning of section 2.2.7 but were not further analysed in this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.590</td>
<td>Julianus, Prefect of Egypt</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.603</td>
<td>Julianus, Prefect of Egypt</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td>4; 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.679</td>
<td>Saint Sophronius, Patriarch</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.686</td>
<td>Palladas</td>
<td>t3</td>
<td>5; fn. 435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.725</td>
<td>Callimachus</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.734</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td>4; fn. 309</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>Gregory of Nazianzus</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.126</td>
<td>Gregory of Nazianzus</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.128</td>
<td>Gregory of Nazianzus</td>
<td>t3</td>
<td>5; fn. 435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.167</td>
<td>Gregory of Nazianzus</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.187</td>
<td>Gregory of Nazianzus</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.192</td>
<td>Gregory of Nazianzus</td>
<td>t3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>Tullius Flaccus</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td>2; fn. 130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>Musicius</td>
<td>t3</td>
<td>5; fn. 435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.108</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t3</td>
<td>5; fn. 435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.164</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td>2; fn. 130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.177</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t3</td>
<td>5; 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.192</td>
<td>Antiphilus of Byzantium</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td>2; fn. 130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.237</td>
<td>Erycius</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.294</td>
<td>Antiphilus of Byzantium</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.317</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.320</td>
<td>Leonidas of Tarentum</td>
<td>t3</td>
<td>5; 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.330</td>
<td>Nicarchus</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.341</td>
<td>Glaucus</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td>(2.2.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.480</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.549</td>
<td>Antiphilus</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td>2; fn. 130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.586</td>
<td>Cometas Chartarius</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.670</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.671</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.754</td>
<td>Claudius Claudianus</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.124</td>
<td>Nicarchus</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.155</td>
<td>Lucilius</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.297</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.298</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.324</td>
<td>Automedon</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.354</td>
<td>Agathias Scholasticus</td>
<td>t3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.376</td>
<td>Agathias Scholasticus</td>
<td>t3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.386</td>
<td>Palladas</td>
<td>t3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.388</td>
<td>Lucilius</td>
<td>t3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.391</td>
<td>Lucilius</td>
<td>t3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>Strato</td>
<td>t3</td>
<td>5; fn. 424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.101</td>
<td>Meleager</td>
<td>t3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.117</td>
<td>Meleager</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.143</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td>2; fn. 131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.155</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.206</td>
<td>Strato</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>Phalaecus</td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.11</td>
<td>Simonides</td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>Socrates</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.51</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.117</td>
<td>Metrodorus</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.129</td>
<td>Metrodorus</td>
<td>t3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.139</td>
<td>Metrodorus</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.141</td>
<td>Metrodorus</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.144</td>
<td>Metrodorus</td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.145</td>
<td>Metrodorus</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.146</td>
<td>Metrodorus</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.15a</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.23</td>
<td>Simonides</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.55</td>
<td>Troilus Grammaticus</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>Simonides</td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.103</td>
<td>Tullius Geminus</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.152</td>
<td>Gauradas</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.174</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.183</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.184</td>
<td>Antipater of Thessalonica</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.193</td>
<td>Philippus</td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.201</td>
<td>Marianus Scholasticus</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.231</td>
<td>Anyte</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.240</td>
<td>Philippus</td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.241</td>
<td>Marcus Argentarius</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.247</td>
<td>Nilus Scholasticus</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.253</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.267</td>
<td>Synesius Scholasticus</td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.275</td>
<td>Posidippus</td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.299</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.313</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.344</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See also 3; no. 73, AG 7.316 by Leonidas of Tarentum and 4; fn. 358, AG 7.522 by Callimachus.
Table B2: Dialogues (mostly Byzantine) in Cougny

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cougny</th>
<th>752</th>
<th>755</th>
<th>758</th>
<th>764</th>
<th>771</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table B3: Speakers of the dialogues in the Greek Anthology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Epigram (number in the Anthology)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X – Y – Z /N</td>
<td>7.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N – X – Y – Z</td>
<td>7.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB – HON</td>
<td>16.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

451 Here, only the epigrams in Cougny that are not mentioned in Tables A1 and B1 are listed.
### APPENDIX C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initia</th>
<th>Chapter; number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀ Κύπρις τὸν Ἐρωτα κατηφιόντα προσηύδα...</td>
<td>5; 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγγελε Φερσεφόνης, Ἐρμή</td>
<td>3; 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄγριος ἔστι Χάριων. — πλέον ἧπιος</td>
<td>4; 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αἰάντος παρὰ τύμβον ἄρακητοι</td>
<td>5; 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἰετέ, τίπτε βέβηκας ὑπὲρ τάφον;</td>
<td>3; 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀμμία, θυγάτηρ πινυτῆ, πῶς</td>
<td>5; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνδρα μοι ἐννεπε, κούρε</td>
<td>3; 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἁρπάλου εἰμὶ τάφος. — τίνος Ἁρπάλου;</td>
<td>4; 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ἀ]σκληπᾶ Δημητρίου Ἑρμῆ</td>
<td>3; 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀστή ναυκράτεως Μενελάου</td>
<td>5; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀττίνα· τίς σε ἄνστησε;</td>
<td>4; 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὐ&lt;δ&gt;ή τεχνήεσσα λίθο, λέγε τίς</td>
<td>2; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὐριον ἀθρήσω σε. τὸ δ´ οὖ</td>
<td>5; 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄφθους, οῦ θυνητή. — θαυμάζω</td>
<td>4; 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλεῦ τὰν ιερὰν Αθανάν,</td>
<td>5 (5.3: extras)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δημητρία χαίρε. — Πῶς δύνομαι χαίρειν</td>
<td>3; 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Διονυσόδωρε, χαίρε. — καὶ σύ γε</td>
<td>3; 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δίψαι αὖος ἐγὼ</td>
<td>2; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰπέ, λέον, φθιμένοι τίνος τάφον</td>
<td>3; 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰπέ μοι εἰρομένω, τίνος εἰκόν</td>
<td>4; 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰπέ ποῦ Εὐρώτας ποτὶ τὰν Κύπριν</td>
<td>5; 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἶπον ἄνειρομένω, τίς καὶ τίνος ἔσσι</td>
<td>4; fn. 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἶπον, τίς, τίνος ἔσσι, τίνος πατρίδος</td>
<td>3; 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐνθάδε Διάλογος καθαρῆς πῦρ γυία καθήρας</td>
<td>2; fn. 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐνθάδε τίς κεῖται; παροδοπόρε</td>
<td>2; 8, 3; 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐννεπε μοι, Σχοινῖτι</td>
<td>5 (5.3: extras)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐξ ἀγαθῆς ρίζης ἔρνος κλυτόν</td>
<td>5; 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἐρμή, τοξευθεῖς ἐξέσπασα πικρόν ἑφήβῳ</td>
<td>2; fn. 131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ἔσχατα μερότων δώματα 5; 6
εὐθύμει, Τρυφέρα· τὰ δεδομένα 3; 19
ηδὺ, φίλοι, μειδήμα τὸ Λαίδος· 5; 13
θηρῶν κράτιστε καὶ θεῶν μῦστα 3; 5
[k]ὲ σύ [γ]ε [ὡ] παροδείτα 2; 15
κάθανες, ὡ Πύρρων. — Ἐπέχω. 2; 5
κλύθι καὶ ἀνταύσα[ς 2; 7
κομψὰν καὶ χαρίεσα πέτρος δείκνυσι 4; 13
λάινὰ σοι τύμβον δωμήματα Θείος 5; 2
Λαμπίδος ἄρα/ἡρα τάφον παραμείβομαι 3; 4
λάρναξ αὐδήςσα, τί τ[δ]’ ύπο σήματι 2; 6, 3; 21
λιτός γ’ ὁ τύμβος· τίς δ’ ὁ δεσπότης 4; fn. 332
Μή, ξέν’ ὀδίτα, σπεύδε. — τί γάρ; 4; fn. 309
μήτερ, τί στενάχεις, τί <δ>ὲ δάκρυσι 3; 3
μητρὶ δέμας γαίη προλυπών 5; 8
Μοῦρα πικρή, Λήθης Ἀχερουσίδος 5; 4
νηπίος ἐν τύμβῳ τίς ἁρ’ ἐσθ’ 3; 31
οἰκὶ τίς ὃδε; — Ἡράκλιος 3; 20
ὁν Μο[ή]ρ’ ὑκυκέλευθο[ν] 3; 17
ὁππόθεν ὁ στήσας; — Βυζάντιος 4; 22
[ο]ύ γάμον οὐχ ὑμέναιον 3; 30
οὐνομά μο... — τί δὲ τοῦτο; 4; 25
οὔτος ὁ παιδὸς ἀκμήν, ἀνδρὸς 3; 9
πατήρ Φιλίνος, Φιλοκράτη 3; 15
πολλὰ πιὼν τέθνηκας, Άνάκρεον 3; 34
στάλη μανύτειρα. — τίς ἐν 4; 15
στάλα μὲ<ν> οὐκ ἀσσαμος 2; 11
στήθι φίλον παρὰ τύμβον 2; 10, 4; 14
στήλη, τίνα ἐν κόλ[ποις] 3; 1
στήλη, τίς σ’ ἔστησεν ἀρυπρεπέως 3; 23
σφίξ, ἡαῖδαιο [κ]ῦον, 2; 1
tεῦ σ’ ἐνέπειν χρῆν τύμβον 4; 3
τὴν ἐπ’ ἐμεῦ στήλην παραμείβεο

Τίμων οὐ γάρ ἔτ’ ἔσσι, τί τοι

τίν με, λεοντάγχ’ ὄνα συοκτόνε

τίπτε, πόσι[ς], φων[είς];—

τίς Δάμων Ἀργείος ἐπ’ ἥριω;

τίς εὐπρεπέ]σιν γλυφαίσιν εἰδρυσεν

τίς ἤ ῥα τύμβῳ τῶδ’ ὑπεσσ’;

τίς ἦν σε ὁ θρέψας; — ἦν Κίλιξ

τίς θάνεν; — Ἡρωίς. — πῶς καὶ πότε;

τίς κατὰ γᾶς; — Εκαταίου ὁμώνυμος

τίς με τὸν ἐξ ἀγέλης πέδων

τίς πατρίς ἐστί σοι; — ἦδε

τίς; πόθεν; — ἐκ Λυκίης μέν

τίς, πόθεν; — ἔνθεν ἐφυν

τίς, πόθεν ὁ πλάστης; — Σικυώνιος

τίς πόθεν ὃν ἐνταύθα υπὸ χθονί

τίς σε, γύναι, Παρίην υπὸ βώλακα

τίς τίνος ἀμφί π[έτρη κέκ[λισα]]

τίς τίνος εὖσα, γύναι, Παρίην υπὸ κίονα

τίς τίνος; ἢν εἰρη, Κλάδος οἶνομα

[τ]ίς τύπον εἰμερόεντα ἵουνορος

τοῦτο τὸ σάμα τίνος;

τὐμβε, τίνος τόδε σήμα;

φράζε, γύναι, γενεὴν, ὄνομα, χθόνα

φράζε τείν πάτρην, τεὸν οἶνομα

φράζε τίνος γονέως, σέο τ’ οἶνομα

χαίρε, Διομήδῃ Συμβρίτε

χαίρε καλὴ σώφρων Κλεαρὼ

χαίρε, τάφος Μελίτης· χρηστὴ γυνή

χαίρετε. — Εὐφροσύνε καλοούνομε

χθονίων ἐνερθε δαμόνων ἀνάκτορες

Χίος έφυς; — οὖ φημι. — τί δαί
ψηφίς, τίς σ᾿ ἀνέθηκεν; — ὁ δώματα 4; 5
ὦ ξένε, τί κλαίεις; — διὰ σὸν 4; 20
ὦ τὸν άειμνήστου σ᾿ ἀρετᾶς 3; 18
ὡς εἶδον Μελίτην, ὁχρός μ᾿ ἐλε 5; 9
APPENDIX D

Concordance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AG</th>
<th>chp. and no.</th>
<th>AG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.233</td>
<td>5; 14</td>
<td>16.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.242</td>
<td>5; 9</td>
<td>16.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.250</td>
<td>5; 13</td>
<td>16.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.351</td>
<td>2; fn. 83</td>
<td>16.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>3; 34</td>
<td>16.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3; 33</td>
<td>16.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.163</td>
<td>4; 19</td>
<td>Bernand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.164</td>
<td>4; fn. 374</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.165</td>
<td>4; fn. 374</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.307</td>
<td>4; 25</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.317</td>
<td>3; 35</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.426</td>
<td>3; fns. 195, 255</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.470</td>
<td>4; fn. 325</td>
<td>CEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.548</td>
<td>4; 26</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.552</td>
<td>4; 20</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.576</td>
<td>2; 5</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.603</td>
<td>4; 21</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.686</td>
<td>5; fn. 435</td>
<td>Corinth 8, 1, 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.734</td>
<td>4; fn. 309</td>
<td>3; 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.128</td>
<td>5; fn. 435</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>2; fn. 130</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>5; fn. 435</td>
<td>2.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.108</td>
<td>5; fn. 435</td>
<td>2.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.164</td>
<td>2; fn. 130</td>
<td>2.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.177</td>
<td>5; 11</td>
<td>2.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.192</td>
<td>2; fn. 130</td>
<td>2.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.320</td>
<td>5; 20</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.549</td>
<td>2; fn. 120</td>
<td>3.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>5; fn. 424</td>
<td>3.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.143</td>
<td>2; fn. 131</td>
<td>3.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5; 10</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>2; fn. 130</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.129</td>
<td>5; fn. 429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

452 For non-inscribed dialogue epigrams not analysed/referred to in this study, see table B1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cougny</th>
<th>GVI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.141</td>
<td>1847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>(1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>(1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>(1854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427</td>
<td>1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428</td>
<td>1856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>1857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>1858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>1859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>(1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td>1862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>1863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVI</td>
<td>1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1386</td>
<td>(1871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1387</td>
<td>(1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>1874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>(1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>(1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1837</td>
<td>1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1838</td>
<td>1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1839</td>
<td>1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1844</td>
<td>(1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>(1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>1887</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IC
II, xii 31 2; 4
II, xvi 27 3; 11
IV, 372 2; 14

IC
(IV 391 3; table 4)

IG
II/III² 7711 3; 18
II/III² 8918 4; 4
II/III² 10073 2; 16, 4; 1
(II/III² 10118 4; table 6)
II/III² 11606a 3; 20
II/III² 12067 2; 3
II/III² 12794 3; 23
II/III² 13166 3; 2
II/III² 13374 3; 2

V 2, 182 3; 14
(VII 3110 3; table 4)
(IX 1, 878 4; table 6)
X 2, 1, 148(B) 4; 6
X 2, 1, 368 5; 4
X 2, 1, 464 2; 17
XII 3, 220 2; 11
(XII 4, 3, 2147 4; table 6)
XII 5, 307 4; 8
XII 5, 310 4; 12
XII 7, 490 3; 12
(XIV 769 3; table 4)
(XIV 1514a 3; table 4)
(XIV 1603 3; table 4)
(XIV 1883 4; 7

IGPannonia 8 3; 30
IK Heraclea Pont. 9 5; 6
IMT Olympene 2691 4; 3
Marek 1993, 38 4; 11
Olympia 5, 225 3; 9
Rife 2008, 132 3; 16

SEG
3, 781 2; 14, 5; 7
6, 140 5; 5
(6, 210 3; table 4)
(6, 488 5; table 8)
7, 329 3; 17
8, 482 4; 15
8, 530 2; 10, 4; 14
8, 802 4; 16
11, 383 2; 7
17, 756 3; 25
(18, 269 3; table 4)
23, 434 3; 4
(28, 739 3; table 4)
28, 995 3; 22
29, 259 2; 3, 3; 3
29, 1442 2; 18
30, 268 3; 20
30, 1063 4; 12
30, 1562 3; 5
31, 238 3; 20
31, 1072 5; 6
33, 1111 3; 1
(35, 763 3; table 4)
36, 269 3; 18
37, 192 3; 18
37, 784-786 3; 32
37, 1583 2; 9
38, 1224 3; 31
39, 1673 2; 9
(42, 926 3; table 4)
SEG
44, 817  3; 32
(44, 1566)  3; table 4
44, 1833  2; 18
+ 5; table 8
45, 2251  4; 8
48, 906  2; 16, 4, 1
49, 1478  3; 3
49, 1678  2; 13, 4; 13
(49, 1760)  3; table 4
(49, 2069)  4; table 6
(49, 2440)  3; table 4
(49, 2452)  3; table 4
50, 1600  5; 1
50, 1194 app. cr.  4; 6
50, 1762  2; 13, 4; 13,
(50, 1762)  5; table 8
(51, 1009)  4; table 6
(51, 1707)  3; table 4
52, 620  2; 17, 4; 16
52, 1245  4; 2
52, 1587  2; 9
(52, 1991)  4; table 6
52, 1918  5; 7
+ 5 (chapter 5.3)
+ 5; table 8
53, 2176  4; 16
(53, 2191)  5; table 6
(53, 2191)  5; table 8
54, 1833  4; 3
55, 775  3; table 4
(56, 1111)  3; table 4
57, 1206  3; table 4
57, 2092  3; 5
(57, 2172)  3; table 4
58, 311  3; 16
58, 1742  3; 31
58, 1743  2; 9, 4; 5
+ 3; table 4
58, 1885  4; 12
+ 3; table 4

SGO
1, 01/12/02  5; 2
1, 01/12/20  3; table 4
1, 02/09/24  3; 7
(1, 03/02/198)  3; table 4
1, 04/02/11  2; 13, 4; 13
1, 04/16/03  3; 24 (excluded from corpus)
(1, 04/24/16)  3; table 4
(1, 05/01/18)  3; table 4
(1, 05/01/19)  3; table 4
1, 05/01/32  3; 3
1, 05/01/57  3; 28
1, 05/01/65  3; 31
(1, 06/02/32)  5; table 8
58, 1981  2; 13, 4; 13
59, 1971  4; 12
59, 1999  5; 3 + table 8
59, 2079  4; 12
60, 894  2; 11
60, 1122  5; 1
60, 1927(2)  4; 5
(60, 1927(3))  3; table 4
60, 1930  5; 3 + table 8
60, 1999  5; table 8
60, 2022  5; 3
1, 01/01/07  5; 2
1, 01/01/07 (chapter 5.3)
1, 01/12/05  2; 2
(1, 01/12/20)  3; table 4
(1, 02/09/24)  3; 7
(1, 03/06/06)  4; 10
(1, 04/02/11)  2; 13, 4; 13
(1, 04/16/03)  3; 24 (excluded from corpus)
(1, 04/24/16)  3; table 4
(1, 05/01/18)  3; table 4
(1, 05/01/19)  3; table 4
1, 05/01/32  3; 3
1, 05/01/57  3; 28
1, 05/01/65  3; 31
(1, 06/02/32)  5; table 8
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number1</th>
<th>Number2</th>
<th>Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2, 08/04/98</td>
<td>3; table 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 08/08/10</td>
<td>4; 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 09/04/06</td>
<td>3; table 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 09/06/99</td>
<td>4; table 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 09/07/09</td>
<td>3; 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 09/11/02</td>
<td>5; 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 09/11/03</td>
<td>3; table 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 10/02/31</td>
<td>3; 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 10/03/04</td>
<td>4; 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 11/07/05</td>
<td>3; table 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 14/04/02</td>
<td>3; table 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 14/04/03</td>
<td>5; 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 16/06/01</td>
<td>3; table 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 14/07/02</td>
<td>2; 6; 3; 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 14/12/01</td>
<td>5; table 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 16/08/01</td>
<td>4; 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 16/31/93D</td>
<td>5; 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 16/55/03</td>
<td>4; 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 17/06/02</td>
<td>5; table 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 17/06/05</td>
<td>2; 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 17/09/01</td>
<td>3; table 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 18/01/24</td>
<td>3; table 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 18/01/26</td>
<td>3; table 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 19/10/01</td>
<td>3; 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 20/02/01</td>
<td>2; 12, 3; 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 20/06/01</td>
<td>3; 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 20/16/02</td>
<td>3; 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 20/27/01</td>
<td>3; table 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 21/07/01</td>
<td>3; table 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 21/09/01</td>
<td>4; table 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 21/23/06</td>
<td>4; 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 21/24/02</td>
<td>2; 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Ancient authors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agathias Scholasticus</td>
<td>AG 7.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacchylides</td>
<td><em>Dithyramb</em> 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callimachus</td>
<td>AG 7.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eratosthenes Scholasticus</td>
<td>AG 5.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td><em>Odyssey</em> 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julianus, Prefect of Egypt</td>
<td>AG 7.33, AG 7.576, AG 7.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonidas of Alexandria</td>
<td>AG 7.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonidas of Tarentum</td>
<td>AG 7.316, AG 9.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonius the Consul</td>
<td>AG 5.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulus Silentiusarius</td>
<td>AG 7.307, AG 5.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato</td>
<td><em>Protagoras</em> 335d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posidippus</td>
<td>AG 16.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simonides</td>
<td>AG 16.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socrates (pseudo-)</td>
<td>AG 14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synesius Scholasticus</td>
<td>AG 16.267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I refer to the authors in AG with the AG number. For other dialogue epigrams of AG (not further discussed in this study), see Appendix B.