

«MORS IMMATURA» IN FUNERARY EPIGRAMS
A TYPOLOGICAL STUDY

*Άλκη Κυριακίδου-Νέστορος,
Μοιρών σίμον άμειβομένη

Until today, apart from the concern to uncover and preserve the inscriptions of the Graeco-Roman world and to establish trustworthy texts for them, it has been the so-called «Toposforschung» which, as a philological method, has claimed the lion's share in the literary study of inscriptions in general and of the funerary epigrams contained in some of them in particular; some progress has also been made in applying the *ars imitandi* approach to the study of the literary products («book»-epigrams) of this genre. «Toposforschung» has no doubt accumulated a wealth of always useful comparative material, and the *ars imitandi* approach has proven particularly suitable for the study of epigram «series»¹, both those preserved in the Anthology and on stone. Despite these efforts, however, the puzzling *variety* exhibited in the combination of moral topoi, formulae and poetic flourishes in the funerary epigram has yet to be reduced to a simple and comprehensive compositional technique. Instead, hypotheses have been forwarded about the existence, in antiquity, of manuals with collections of handy topoi, of ready-made popular verses, even of model epigrams at the free disposal of local workshops; the process allegedly implied some cooperation between the local schoolmasters, literati, and verse-makers on the one hand, and the provincial tomb-stone designers and actual carvers on the other. For all of them some evidence has already been adduced, which however is by no means concrete enough, sufficient or conclusive². This evidence, furthermore, has not been combined so far into a theoretical scheme capable of explaining coherently the process and the end product. This paper, based on a

1. On such a series of epigrams on stone examined by Thomas Drew-Bear (A Metrical Epitaph from Phrygia, *Arktouros*, FS B. Knox, Berlin/N. York 1979, 308-316).

2. Cf. R. Cagnat, *Rév. Phil.* 13 (1889) 51-65; R. Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*, Urbana 1962, p. 17 ff.; Th. Drew-Bear (note 1 above); E. Grissmair, *Das Motiv der Mors Immatura in den griechischen metrischen Grabinschriften*, Diss. Innsbruck 1966, 27; G. Susini, *The Roman Stonecutter* (Engl. tr.), Totowa, N. J. 1973, 50 ff.

subclass of the funerary epigram indicated by the title, takes seriously into consideration the subliterary character of the genre, attempts to provide a new description of its structure, and proposes a genetic interpretation thereof; above all, it is an attempt to understand the seemingly complicated and unmanageable composition process as a mechanism producing a finite number of comprehensive and economical patterns, each one of them yielding, in turn an open number of copies-ms to suit different customers and cover different death circumstances; such a mechanism must be governed by basic rules to be learnt by the ancient versifiers and be readily reproduced in composing funerary epigrams. Of course, a definitive structural study of the funerary epigram, in its entirety, is still far away: prior to that, separate similar studies (both synchronic and diachronic) need to be conducted for every single one of the recognizable subclasses of this class of epigrams.

This experiment started as a study of a single funerary epigram from Macedonia, whose text I cite in my own excription (omitting only many dots under letters, dotted letters, and quite uncertain vestiges of words)³:

Μοῖραι κ[αὶ Λ]ήθη με κα τήγα[γ]ον εἰς Ἄϊδαο,	1-2
οὔπω νυμφείου θαλάμου καὶ πασ τάδος ὥρης	3-5
γευσάμενον, ἀθιγῆς δ' ἔλιπον φάος ἡέλιιο.	6-8
Κουσ[πίδ]ιος	
[vacat]	
Κου[σπ]ιδίω	10
Πα[ρα]μόνω	
[--]ι[---]χάριν.	12

3. Publications and treatments of this epigram: G. Dousa, *Itinerarium Constantinopolitanum*, Lugduno-Bataviae 1599, p. 105; Janus Gruterus, *Thesaurus inscriptionum antiquarum*, 2 vols., Heidelberg-Amsterdam 1609-1707, p. DCCCCXCXIII.9 (and Reinesius, apud Gruterum, *ibid.*); Fr. Jacobs, *Animadversiones in epigrammata Anthologiae Graecae*, Leipzig 1798-1814, v. III, pt. II, p. 288; *idem*, *Anthologiae Palatinae Appendix*, no. 248, p. 835; A. Boeckh, *CIG*, Berlin 1843, no. 1966; L. Heuzey, *Le mont Olympe et l'Acarnanie*, Paris 1860, p. 481; M. G. Demitsas, *Ἡ Μακεδονία ἐν λίθοις φθεγγόμενοις*, Athens 1896, p. 145; G. Kaibel, *Epigrammata graeca ex lapidibus conlecta*, Berlin 1878, no. 521; W. Peek, *Griechische Vers-Inschriften*, vol. 1: *Grab-Epigramme*, Berlin 1955, no. 935; Ch. Edson, *CP* 53 (1958) 115; J. M. R. Cormack, *Inscriptions from Pieria*, *Klio* 52 (1970) 56 ff.; D. Kanatsoulis, *Μακεδονικά* 14 (1974) 176; D. Pandermalis, *Inscriptions from Dion. Addenda et Corrigenda*, in *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson*, Thessaloniki 1981, p. 294. — Selection of general studies: B. Lier, *Topica carminum sepulchralium latinorum*, *Philologus* 62 (1903) 445 ff. and 63 (1904) 54 ff.; R. Lattimore (note 2 above); E. Griessmair (note 2 above), esp. p. 17; P. Giannini, *Espressioni formulari nell'elegia greca arcaica*, *Quaderni Urbinati* 16 (1973) 7 ff.; Anne-Marie Vérilhac, *Παίδες Ἄωποι. Poésie funéraire*, 2 vols., Athens 1978-82. See also F. Adrados et al., *Diccionario griego-español*, s.v. ἀθιγῆς (with reference to this inscription, «de una doncella!»).

The inscription was found in the cemetery of the Byzantine Church of the Panayia in the village Koundouriotissa (8.5 kilom. on the modern road from Katerini to Dion in Macedonia), where I inspected it in August, 1982⁴.

W. Peek, the editor of the *Grab-Epigramme*, includes this inscription under nr. 935 and, on the basis of its formal characteristics, classifies it under his category III [Bericht, «Der T o t e berichtet» (ἔθλον)] which he considers to be a form developed out of another category, I.1 in his edition, styled «Vorstellung des Toten». As his classification, however, programmatically takes into consideration only formal surface features of the material examined, this basis in itself is insufficient to suggest a method for a philological investigation of his epigrams. On the other hand, the fundamental studies on epigrams exhibiting the premature death-motif by Griessmair (1966) and Vérilhac (1978-82)⁵, while offering good comparative material treated in an *analytical* fashion, constitute no systematic *synthetic* approach, such as I intend to suggest in this paper. To devise such a synthetic model, I feel that one has to consider form and content not separately but

4. A summary description: The monument consists of a rectangular cippus of heavy dark marble, preserved complete save for part of the upper top and part of the lower left-hand basis. H. 1.42 m., W. 0.41 m., D. 0.42 m. Primary surface badly weathered and further darkened from exposure. Main body with recessed incised panel and inscription. The inscription itself is divided into a two-liner incised above panel and a ten-liner inside panel. Letters (H. 2 cm.) in clear lettering, neat in form and well-spaced; elegant, accurate incision of near monumental quality. Their forms distinctly remind one of (late Roman) Latin characters. Few, discrete serifs; O and Θ in the top 2 lines all-round, in the rest: O Θ Ψ Ε perfectly oval; K P Υ elongated; Δ, λ, Α; Μ, Ω cursive; Π Η Ν square. My estimated date, based on numerous parallels in this style: second, perhaps third c. A.D., whereas Peek suggests «I. c. AD?». — Curtailing here the discussion of common minor mistakes committed by previous editors of this inscription over the centuries (ranging from the incorrect reporting of its precise location, to the partial and faulty transcription of its text or to its inaccurate dating), I will insist only on a more interesting textual problem, namely the reading of γευσάμενον. Theodosius Zygomalas, providing the primary material to the first editor, Dousa (1599), reported the unmetrical participle γευσάμενον, which, however, was «corrected» into γευσάμενην by Reinesius (l. 1587-1667) — followed subsequently by Brunck (1794), Jacobs (1814), even A. Boeckh (1843), M. G. Demitsas (1896), D. Kanatsoulis, (1974)—; the reason was that the adjacent adjective ἀθιγγής («intact, virgin»), while understandably fit for a maiden, was deemed by modern scholars unsuitable for a young lad! Other editors: Gruterus (1609) printed the original -ον and Heuzey (1860) left vacuum; Kaibel (1878), who corrected the «correction», was followed by the four modern scholars: Peek (1955), Edson (1958), Cormack (1970), Panderimalis (1981). The stone preserves a clear masculine participle ending, *ut vidī ipsīs oculīs*. Therefore it is quite possible that this beautiful epigram, originally composed for a young maiden, was later converted with a minimal change for a young lad, probably at a time and by a scriptor unfamiliar with or insensitive to Greek (quantitative) metrics. Cf. parallels: ἄψαυστοι λέκτρων (701, 2), ἄψαυστος λέκτρων νυμφιδίων κατέδου (853, 6). (The bibliographical references are analysed in note 3 above).

5. See note 3 above.

as a unit, and to look for ways of defining the elusive nature of this subliterary genre which is steeped (*qua* hexametric poetry) in the old epic language and, furthermore, utilizes the widely circulating conceptual and consolatory topoi of the times.

*Terminological and Typological Preliminaries:
Inscription, Epitaph and Epigram*

An «inscription» consists of whatever writing has been carved into the stone; «epitaph» and «epigram» are narrower terms, the former usually applying to the record-like factual elements inscribed on the tombstone of the deceased, whereas the latter is a self-contained piece of poetry sometimes attached to it. Whereas the second of the three, with the passage of time, turned out to be more at home in prose, the third was always metrical (and, to that extent, according to the ancient views, «poetic»). For the purpose of this study, after drawing on the published corpus of funerary inscriptions I would make the following distinction among inscription types:

(a) In most funerary inscriptions the purely factual elements are predominant; the whole virtually amounts to little more than a record of the event, simple and unadorned. (The rare and marginal «poetic» traits consist of trivial conventional formulae).

(b) When these «poetic» flourishes, in another number of inscriptions, appear growing in quantity and substance, then a dichotomy between epigram and epitaph becomes visible. (In many such cases—in our inscription too—the two parts are clearly marked off from each other even physically).

(c) In still fewer cases the poetic epigram, having absorbed most if not all traces of factual traits, tends to coincide completely with the inscription; poetry thus replaces prose and the stone inscription transforms into the literary epigram which modern editors usually treasure in collections.

To avoid oversimplification or misunderstandings, a reminder is in order here: in each one of these three inscription types, every single convention or detail should be individually scrutinized and weighted as far as its poetic merits or demerits go. For whereas not infrequently verses or verse segments are nothing but unbearable trivialities, some prose details, by dint of their hidden pathos or sheer referential power to the simple and fundamental aspects of life, may be unexpectedly fresh and touching. As so often, prose and prosaic, verse and poetical may not be synonymous, and the rediscovery of such gems often truly rewards the reader of humble inscriptions in abandoned ancient cemeteries or in forgotten museum corners.

I

Mors immatura

I will now proceed to the analysis of each element of this simple motif exemplified in our epigram: first, the general element *mors* and then the specific element *immatura*. The reader will notice that the entire three-liner exhausts only one motif with no unaccounted-for residues; the pure record elements are clearly marked off in the body of the inscription. My approach begins with the presupposition that, as already indicated, most stone epigrams are made up of prefabricated «thought formulae» or thought patterns invested by verbal formulae and are composed by unknown versifiers. If, accordingly, one views this epigram as a conglomerate of concrete allomorphs of these two motif-elements (their choice being dictated, as the case may be, by personal taste, religious ideas and cultural bias) one should not seriously err. Thus, if we examine the entire system of allomorphs realized in the known and already published specimens of this content class of funerary epigrams, we should be able to form a veritable stemma within which this one would fall into its appropriate place. In other words, contrary to the common practice of searching for the closest possible parallels for single epigrams members of the given class, I am looking for the entire class-system. I should like to propose that the further analysis of each one of these allomorphs and the investigation of their syntax into actual epigrams are procedures eminently suitable for showing, with something approaching mathematical clarity, the peculiar structural laws pertaining to these products and for helping us define their exact position, intermediate between «high» or personal literature on the one hand, and cultural cliché on the other in a fashion more concrete than has been hitherto achieved.

Genus Mors

According to my model, based on the relevant material in Peek's comprehensive collection of epigrams supplemented, with caution, by the *Anthologia Palatina*, the scheme realizing this motif element breaks down to the following components:

Verb(s), classified under three categories (A, B, C)

Subject(s)

Whence/whither movement of the Subject

Circumstances of Death

Particulars such as genealogical information, personal history of the Subject, effect on survivors, and aretology or laudatio

Consolation elements

Apostrophe to the living, passersby etc.

The seven categories of components appear in a great variety of actual linguistic dress; some belong to the very core, others to supplemental parts of the epigram. Of course, not all seven categories of components occur in every single inscription specimen, and their order within it may vary. Next to the basic componential analysis, one should proceed to detecting the «syntactical» laws governing these seven components. As a sample I will offer a detailed analysis for three of these components.

1. For the Verbs:

	A	B	C
Ia	ἔλαβε τις τινα ἤρπασε εἶλε ᾤλεσε κτάνε ἐδάμασσε ἐπέδησε σβέσε	θῆκεν ἐν τάφῳ	κεῖμαι
Ib	ἔθανον etc.		
IIa	ἤγαγεν τίς τινα (to Hades)		
IIb	ἤλυθον (to Hades)		

Each one of the verbs cited in this schema represents a group of similia and composita; placed next to each other, they reveal a concept and image panorama. As can be seen, Ia and IIa are 3rd person narratives; Ib and IIb, 1st person narratives; some verbs are literal expressions, others metaphorical or even euphemistic; some of the metaphors are not simply «poetic» devices, but can easily be proven to be culturally bound and/or religiously significant. Here is an indicative (by no means exhaustive) list of variations for each one the three verb categories:

A	Ia	ἔλαβε, λάβε, ἔλλαβε, ἄρπασεν, συνήρπασαν, ἀνήρπασε, ἤρπαξεν, ἀφαρπάξας, ἐξήρπαξε, ἀφαρπασθεῖς etc.; καθεῖλε, ἔλε, εἶλε, ἐλοῦσα, ἴλε etc.; ᾤλεσε, ᾤλεσαν, κτάνε/ἐδάμασσε, ἐπέδησε, σβέσε, etc.
	Ib	ἔθανον, ἔθνησκον, θνήσκω, θνάσκω, κάτθανον, τέθνηκα, θανών, ἀποθανοῦσαν, θανοῦσαν, θανάτου τυχεῖν, θανάτου τέλος ἦλθεν, θανόντα, ἐθνήσκω, θνήσκομεν; ἐξανύσας βίοντον, βίοντον ἐξετέλεσσα, τέρμα ἰκόμην βιοτᾶς, βίου τέλος ἴσκον, τέρμα λαχών βιότου; οὐκ ἔφυγον θάνατον, ἀποφθίμενος
	IIa	ἤγαγεν, κατάγαγεν, ἀπήγαγεν, ἤλασεν, ἔλασσε
	IIb	ἤλυθον, ἤλυθα, ἐλθών, ἦλθα, ἐσῆλθον, ἰκέσθαι, ἔστιχον, ᾧλισθον, ἔσπετο, ὄδον στέλλομαι, μεμαρμένον οἶτον ἐπισπεῖν etc.; κατέβην, κατέβαν, ἔβην, βάς, ἄγέ με ... βάμεναι, ἔμολον etc.
B		θῆκεν ἐν τάφῳ, τάφον ᾧπασε, ὑπέθηκε νέκυν, θάψε etc.

C κείμαι, πρόκειμαι, κείμενος, κέκλιμαι etc.; 'Αίδην έσορω, οίκεϊ μακάρων ... πεδίον etc.

Note that in the actual inscriptions one may find one of these verbs, or more; if more, one may be literal and the other(s) metaphorical or euphemistic (e.g. single ώλεσεν —Ia— Peek 950, vs. ήρπασεν and νόσφισεν ήελίου —Ia+Ia— Peek 956).

2. For the Subjects. The accompanying numbers refer to Peek's edition: Μοῖραι καὶ Λήθη, Κλωθώ (940), Μίνως (942), Μοῖραι (945, 961, 966, 976), Μοῖρα/μοῖρα (947, 960, 962, 969, 973), ἄ νεκῶν ἄκατος (946), δαίμων (948, 953, 954, 955, 963, 967, 971, 975 (+ 'Αΐδας), 978, 980), 'Αΐδης (949, 956, 957, 958, 963), Μοῖρα νόσφ (950), Νύμφαι κρηναῖται (952), νηδὺς καὶ δαίμων (959) [In composite subjects, the one is often the actual cause of death and the other the conventional attribution], Μοῖρα καὶ 'Αμάραντος (981), Μοιράων μίτος (964), μίτος Μοιρῶν ἢ δαίμονος ὄργη (965), νοῦσος ἐδάμνα (970), νοῦσος ἔπαυσε βίου (972), 'Αχέρων (977), Νέμεσις (982), 'Αΐδης σὺν 'Ερεινύσιν (984), Τύχη (985), Μοιράων νῆμα τὸ κλωθόμενον (993).

3. For the movement Whence/whither (this is often among the most colorful elements in the scheme): Whither: τὸν ἄφυκτον ... Ξανθῆς Φερσεφόνης θάλαμον (926), δόμον εἰς 'Αχέροντος (932), τὴν ἀμέτρητον ὁδὸν ἐς 'Αΐδαν (933), εὐσεβέων χώρων ... ἀντέχομαι (934), εἰς 'Αΐδαο (our epigr.), πολυδάκρυον εἰς 'Αχέροντα (942), εἰς μακάρων νήσους (943), εὐσεβέων λειμώνια νῦν ὑπὸ βένη (944), πρὸς θαλάμους ... Φερσεφόνας + εἰς 'Αΐδαν (945), ἐς μακάρων δέ με χῶρον (946), ὑπὸ κεῦθη κείμαι Φερσεφόνας ἐν νυχίῳ θαλάμῳ (958), Πλουτέος ἐμ μελάθροις + εἰς 'Αΐδεω (967), γαίης ἐν κόλποισι (983), ἐν φθιμένοις (988), etc. — Whence: In most cases not mentioned; otherwise, we may discern literal expressions (πατρίς, δόμος etc.) or metaphorical ones (esp. φῶς etc.).

Comparable lists of variations may be compiled for the other components in order to make apparent the variety on the one hand, and the limits on the other of the means of expression under this category.

The most decisive reason which allows us to speak of patterning in creating such funerary epigrams is perhaps the syntax of these motif elements in all their variations into «strings».

In the following I will delineate the syntactical rules which I have observed so far regarding this content-class of epigrams:

A precedes or may precede —in time— B, C	[0]
Ia/Ib precede in time or may precede IIa/IIb by pair	[1]
A +/- B +/- C	[2]
i.e.: A{=[Ia +/- Ib] +/- [IIa +/- IIb]} +/- B +/- C	[2.1]

Combinations of simple forms:

(Ia + IIb) +/- B +/- C [3.1]

(Ib + IIa/b) +/- B +/- C [3.2]

The sequences [3.1] and [3.2] may be further analysed as follows:

if x = Ia + IIb then x + B [3.1.1]

x + C [3.1.2]

x + B + C [3.1.3]

if y = Ib + IIb then y + B [3.2.1]

y + C [3.2.2]

y + B + C [3.2.3]

if w = Ib + IIa then w + B [3.3.1]

w + C [3.3.2]

w + B + C [3.3.3]

In [3.1.3], [3.2.3], and [3.3.3] the order may not be fixed exactly as shown by the formula.

Species immatura

Some synonyms occurring in this class of epigrams for ἄωρος are: πρόμοιρος, ἀκύμοιρος, ταχύμοιρος, ἀωρόμορος, ὠκυκέλευθος, βαιόχρονος.

The deceased may appear under one of the following terms: adjectiva: τύτθος, νήπιος, μινυνθάδιος, παῖς, ἀνηβος, πρωθήβης, νεοθαλής, νέος, παρθένος, νύμφη, κοῦρος/κούρη, ἡίθεος; abstracta: ἐφηβεία, ἥβη, ὦρα, ἡλικία, νεότης, ἀκμή.

From the sample it becomes obvious what is subsumed under the blanket term «mors immatura» in funerary epigrams: the death of infants, of little children, of youngsters before marriage age, or of adults before or even during their *acme*.

One may distinguish (with Griessmair, *op. cit.*, 16-18) several preferred syntactical versions of this motif-element:

First Group: Before a specific age landmark.

1. ἔτι-construction: the deceased stood still away from his τέλος when he lost his life (ἐπταέτης Ξενοφῶν ἔτι νήπιος ἐνθάδε κεῖται (382), 911, 1944).

2. πρίν-construction: before attaining x or y the youth lost his life (231, 937, 1057); πρίν με μνηθῆναι κακίης ἔτι νήπιον οὔσαν (956).

3. οὔπω/μήπω-construction: variation of the previous class (1083, 1799); μήπω γευσάμενος ἥβης ὤλισθον ἐς Ἄιδου (974).

Second Group: During the high point, the creative period in one's life or career.

4. ἤδη-construction: the catastrophe came just as the young person arrived at x high point or as he was enjoying x or y fruit of life (868, 1511 δοιαὶ μὲν δεκάδες

σε τελειοτόκων ένιαυτῶν | ἤδη καὶ τριτάτου κύκλος ἐπεῖχεν ἔτευσ, | ... άνίκα πένθος | ματρί ... κάλλιπες, and ἤδη δ' εὐδοκιμῶν ἐξέλιπον βιοτάν (1156).

5. ἄρτι-construction: as preceding class (975, 976); ἄρτι δ' ἐφηβείαις θάλλων Διονύσιος ἀκμαῖς (945). [Cf. the many appropriate compounds: ἀρτιφυής, ἀρτιγάλακτος, ἀρτίχρους, ἀρτιθαλής, ἀρτίγαμος, ἀρτίτοκος etc.].

Third Group: A more general category utilizing elements from the two preceding groups.

6. ἀντί-construction: instead of life (or goods of life), the deceased met with death: ἀντί δ' ἐμοὶ θαλάμου τάφον ὤπασεν (977), ἀντί γάμων οἰκτροὺς <ἐκλαγ>ε Μοῦσα γόους (1006). Cf. parallel constructions like οὐκ ... ἀλλὰ / οὐ ... δὲ (in *A.P.* 7.182, οὐ γάμον, ἀλλ' Ἄιδαν ἐπιθυμίδιον Κλεαρίστα | δέξατο).

Note that these motif elements admit of either synoptic or expanded treatment.

From the preceding description it becomes obvious that the composers of these epigrams lament the loss of several fundamental goods of life in these formulae. Hence, in Griessmair's comprehensive listing (*op. cit.*, 47 ff.), the particular emphasis on (a) Childhood (τὸν ὄντα παῖδα τοῖς νοήμασιν πρέσβυν), (b) Palaestra, gymnasium (τὸν οὐκ ἐφιδόντα παλαιίστραν), (c) Epheby (οὐδ' ἔφθη χλαμύδας περὶ χρωτὶ βαλέσθαι), (d) The first beard (οὐ γενύων κεράσας ἱερὸν στάχυν; πρὶν ἀνθήσαντας ἰούλους), (e) Marriage (ἀντί τοι εὐλεχέος θαλάμοιο ... μάτηρ στήσε τάφω), (f) Childlessness (μὴ τέκνων σπορᾶς), (g) The dead was μονογενής (ἐπεὶ μοῦνος γένετ' αὐτοῖς [= γονεῦσι]), (h) Consciousness of Family and Relatives (Λύσανδρον προγόνοισι τεκμαίρομαι).

It should be stressed that, again, the expression of the loss suffered may be synoptic (in a nominal construction, denoted, e.g., by a simple adjective — θνήσκω ἄγαμος, 958, elsewhere παρθένος or ἀθιγής as in our epigram) or expanded (usually into a participial phrase, sometimes into a secondary clause). In some cases only one good of life is mentioned; at other times more than one — in various combinations and with ever-varying emphasis.

Death Before Marriage

Analysis of point (e) above into its segments: only one segment (in any one of its variations) may be present, the resulting *pars pro toto* being a well-known device effective in both rhetoric and poetry.

As already indicated, one word often suggests the motif-trait under examination (ἀγαμία), or a nominal phrase (θαλάμων ἀμύητος, 982). From such cases we must set apart the verbal constructions where a verbal and a nominal component should be clearly distinguished: a verb, meaning «to enjoy», and a nomen, denoting «γάμος».

Variations of the nomen: λέκτρα/λέχη, θάλαμος (-οι), ὑμέναιος, πεύκη/δά-
δαι/λαμπάδες, παστός/παστάς (all dictated obviously by ritual); they may be
accompanied by adjectiva ornantia (ήμερός θάλαμος); they may be indicated by
poetic compounds (μελλυμέναιος).

Sometimes the composer reverts to the direct method, i.e. the employment of
adjective + noun (= genus + species): νύμφια λέκτρα, νυμφίδιοι παστοί etc., or of
combinations such as οὐ γάμον οὐδ' ὑμέναιον ἐμοί ... (This is the place to
remember the parallel constructions freely alternating in this class of epigrams:
ἀντί-construction (ἀντί θαλάμου τάφον ὤπασε (977), ἀντί γάμων (1006)), ἄρτι-
construction, μήπω/οὔπω-construction, πρίν-construction etc.).

The variations on the verb may range from literal (οὐθ' ὑπὸ μητρὸς χειρῶν ἡ
μελέη νυμφίδιον θάλαμον ἤλυθον (947); ἄρτι κλυτῶν ... ἀψάμενον θαλάμων
(961)) to metaphorical (e.g., γευόμενος παστάδος ὄρης). The use of γεύομαι in
such epigrams can be followed, as it was progressively crystallized into the unique
use appearing in our epigram, through formations as the following actually
occurring in epigrams: (1) literal expression for «knowing life»: τὸν βίον οὐκ ἐδάην;
(2) metaphor for «enjoying life» (becomes possible through the collocation: ὁ
γλυκεροῦ βιότοιο τρυφῆς πάσης ἀπολαύσας⁶): μήπω τοῦ γλυκεροῦ γευσαμένην
βιότοιο, οὔπω γευσάμενον βιότου (2003,13), καὶ γλυκεροῦ μερόπων γευσαμένην
βιότου (878,4), μήπω γευομένην γλυκεροῦ βιότοιο (976,1), ἄρτι γε γευσόμενον
ζωᾶς and μήπως γευσάμενος ἤβης (974,1). The final step was the striking
catachresis in our epigram: οὔπω νυμφείου θαλάμου καὶ παστάδος ὄρης γευσάμε-
νον. Thus readjusted for the needs of this epigram the γεύομαι-expression received
as objects those traits which make up the marriage motif in funerary epigram
composition.

Thus in the verbal phrase employed here for the motif-trait «marriage» there
are combined a metaphor (γευσάμενος) and a participial οὔπω-construction. In
addition, it should be noted that the immature motif-element, which often is placed
right at the opening of such an epigram (cf. the following initia: ἄρτι γενειάζοντα;
ἄρτι με γενομένην; ἄρτι με γενόμενον; ἄρτι με νηπιάχοις; ἄρτι με νυμφιδίων; ἄρτι
μὲν ἐν θαλάμοις; ἄρτι σέ τοι θάλλοντα; ἀρτίγαμος, σῶφρων; οὐ γάμον, ἀλλ' Ἄι-
δαν; οὐ γάμων οὐδ' ὑμέναιον ἐσέδρακον; οὐ γάμον οὐδ' ὑμέναιον ἰδῶν etc.), comes
after the mors-element (i.e., *species* follows *genus*).

The resulting comprehensive schema for the entire system may now be drawn
as follows:

6. For γλυκὺς/γλυκερὸς in such contexts cf. the following attested substitutes: ἡδύς,
ήμερός, ποθητός, εὐτερπής et sim.

(α)	(β)	(γ)
MORS	IMMATURA	
verb(s)	1. ἔτι- c.	a b c d e f g h
subject(s)	2. πρίν- c.	(: γάμος)
supplements:	3. οὐπω- c.	
consolatio	4. ἦδη- c.	
apostrophe	5. ἄρτι- c.	
laudatio	6. ἀντί- c.	
(various)		

In *each* of these columns (α, β, γ) there may be one or more options in combination (one option in the «simpler» forms; more options in the «composite» ones). In the *third* column synoptic or expanded versions may occur. In *all* columns the expressions range from literal to metaphorical.

To save space I do not intend to analyse other epigrams of this class contained in Peek's edition; the verification is easy. Parts of these epigrams which at first sight do not conform to the pattern can be understood when we take into account that the ordering of the elements is free, that the constitution of each element is flexible, that doubling and expansion, contraction of any component and mixing of any two of them are common patterning procedures. Thus the size possibilities: epigrams of this class (sometimes full inscriptions) may range from two lines (926) to eight (950), ten (967), twelve (943), fourteen (973), or sixteen (1029). Of these, the more expanded ones may seem to deviate from the pattern delineated above; yet a closer look will always reveal that they are mere variations, not distinct species.

The treatment delineated above does not exclude a straight historical method such as the one adopted by VÉrilhac; indeed, the two methods may be shown to supplement each other in a meaningful way. Let me give only one example of how VÉrilhac's approach adds to my understanding of the epigram under study. She has noticed a valuable detail: for young girls the mors-before-marriage motif-element occurs already in the Archaic Period; for young boys it starts only in Hellenistic times, and the known examples for the latter are by far fewer than those for the former (she was able to collect only seven of these rare examples). Her basically historical investigation thus confirms what we have discovered: namely that, despite the traditional line followed in composing this epigram, it exhibits features which are rare, perhaps even more individualized than is commonly expected in this genre.

II

Conclusions (General)

1. The composition is by thought (not merely verbal) formulae.
2. These thought formulae receive verbal formulae which utilize not so much known literary topoi as circulating clichés, to which one might compare stereotypical printed death announcements in Modern Greece. No significant dependency on contemporary literature is deemed necessary although the echo from *Od.* 11,164 is certainly not accidental. The pattern is complete and its productive mechanism self-sufficient. On the contrary, tracing the history of these clichés is important for the history of the genre and the history of the culture under study.
3. The make-up of the mors immatura funerary epigrams: the possibilities for components participating are finite in number, and their syntax by and large predictable and definable. In this genre, style emerges from such preferences.
4. A margin for personal touches —despite the rigid form, cf. previous point 3— does exist. It is particularly visible in cases where the epigram is commissioned to a better or personally more involved versifier and is influenced by factors such as the social status of the commissioning family, the size and luxus of the monument etc.
5. The mix of prose and poetry varies greatly from case to case; preferable treatments can be discerned, but fixed rules have not been detected so far.
6. This typology helps us to take a closer look at the final product. On the basis of this description the complicated and tantalizing questions may be answered perhaps more successfully than has been possible hitherto, namely questions of «authorship» (schools of rhetoric, local or peripheral workshops, women poets), «relative date» of epigrams, etc.

Conclusions (Specific to the epigram at hand)

1. Our inscription contains both epitaph and epigram.
2. The epigram is clearly analysable into a mors-element and an immatura-element.
 - 2.1. The mors-element is here realized by a paratactic combination of allomorphs coming from two different classes: (1) descent to Hades class (Μοῖραι καὶ Λήθη με κατήγαγον εἰς Ἄϊδαο, of obvious religious overtones analysable into: double divine subject, literal verb, whither-movement indicated), and (2) leaving the light of the sun/life (ἔλιπον φάος ἡελίοιο, a very productive class within the genre fraught with cultural connotations, analysable into: verb and noun phrase, here functioning metaphorically). It is clear that this is not a case of tautology, or of a hendiadys. The two allomorphs encircle the immatura element (the one preceding,

the other following it), an arrangement which, though not without precedents or unaccounted for in the typology described (it reoccurs, e.g., in Peek 1013), betrays a good perception of artistic form. The combination of a literal and a metaphorical allomorph of the same class is a technique not uncommon in the genre.

2.2. The immatura-element is also realized in an interesting double way (a) expanded (with a verbal construction; double and symmetrical nominal expression [νόμφειος θάλαμος, παστάδος ὄρη] capturing two ritual aspects of the marriage ceremony —furthermore, παστάδος ὄρη is a new *iunctura verborum*— the two being placed in a cyclical order in the center of the motif; and a verb (γευσάμενος, another striking metaphor, analysed above), and (b) synoptic (ἀθιγής, applied to a young lad). It is beyond doubt that the «doublet» betrays concern for symmetry of arrangement, for elegant simplicity. Two metaphors are placed next to each other, again a convention not uncommon in this genre.

The linguistic guise is also an indication of care: the expression παστάδος ὄρη is unparalleled in the Greek language; actually, whereas the cognate word παστοί, alone, reoccurs in such epigrams (e.g. in 790, οὐτ' ἐπ' ἐμοῖς παστοῖς —the singular παστός appears first in Hellenistic times) the combination is entirely new. It becomes understandable now why such an epigram, originally composed for a young girl (certainly not before the Hellenistic era), according to the traditional technique delineated in this paper, was transferred to the case of a young boy so many centuries thereafter thanks to the persistence of this humble and powerful art: ours was a «model» epigram.