

AMBRACIAN CRUCES (SEG 41.540A)

Introduction

Rescue excavations in Arta (anc. Ambracia) in the mid 1980s exposed a large, pi-shaped funerary enclosure outside the southwest gate of the ancient city and facing a major road connecting the city to its harbor, Ambrakos, on the Ambracian gulf. The upper-most course of blocks were inscribed with a lengthy boustrophedon elegiac epigram in the Corinthian alphabet that has been dated by letter form to the sixth century BCE, probably in its later decades.¹ At least five elegiac distichs were expressed in the three inscribed lines of the monument. Unfortunately, the southernmost blocks of this course have not been recovered, and there is thus a lacuna consisting of the end of one hexameter followed by a complete pentameter and a complete hexameter. Even in this fragmentary state, however, it is the lengthiest inscribed elegiac epigram yet known from the Archaic Greek world. I offer the following text and translation:

ἄνδρας [τ]ούσδ' [ἐ]σλοὺς ὀλοφύρομαι, ἠοῖσι	
Πυραιβὸν :	→
παῖδες ἐμετίσαντ' ἀ[λ]κινόνετα ² φόνον, :	
ἀνγε[λί]αν μετιόντας ἀπ' εὐρυχόροι[o ----?----]	
[-----?-----]	4
[----- -----?-----]	←
πατρὶδ' ἄν' ἡμερτὰν πένθος ἔθαλλε τότε :	
τῷδε δ' ἀπ' Ἀνπρακίας, Ναυσίστρατος ἀνὰ παῖδων τε, :	
Καλλίταν τ' Αἶδα δῶμα μέλαν κατέχει :	8
καὶ μὲν Ἀραθθίονα καὶ Εὐξενον ἴστε, πολῖται, ³ :	→
ἦος μετὰ τῶνδ' ἀνδρῶν Κὰρ ἔκικεν θανάτου. :	

1) SEG 41.540: 'ca. 550 B. C. or somewhat later'; cf. Bousquet 1992, 597–599: 'vers le milieu au plus tôt du VI^e siècle ou plus tard encore'.

2) For ἀ[λ]κινόνετα, 'i. e. ἀλγινόνετα (phonetical rendering or simple error, since gamma and kappa of the Corinthian script look very similar)' (SEG 44.463), see D'Alessio 1995, 23–24.

3) l. 8: κατέχει scripsi; KATEXE, lapis. l. 9: καὶ ... καὶ ... πολῖται scripsi; ΚΑΙΕ ... ΚΑΕ ... ΠΟΛΙΤΑΕ, lapis. Cf. L. Dubois, BÉ 1993, 218: 'L'inscription mo-

I mourn these good men, for whom the children of the Puraiboi plotted grievous murder, while they (these good men) were bringing a message (?) from ... of the wide fields⁴ ... then did sorrow flourish throughout the lovely fatherland. But/And these two are from Ambracia, Nausistratos who suffered the same things (?) and the black house of Hades holds down Kallitas. And indeed, citizens, you must know (or: you know) Arathion and Euxenos, that the Ker of death found them with these men.

The initial scholarly response to the publication of the Ambracia polyandron focused on establishing the text of the boustrophedon inscription that adorned its façade. The editio princeps of I. Andreou was prompt, but there were some misreadings and in general the Greek was poorly construed.⁵ Subsequent editions by Matthaïou and Bousquet made dramatic improvements.⁶ The following modest contribution returns to a pair of particularly nettlesome passages

numentale très soignée du polyandron d'Ambracie ... fournit un exemple parfait de l'alphabet corinthien archaïque. Le point le plus remarquable est la notation par epsilon qui sert à noter la vraie diphtongue ει, du second élément de la diphtongue -αι dans καί et πολίται l. 9.⁷ I normalize the spelling of these diphthongs here and elsewhere in this paper.

4) I follow Matthaïou 1990a in rejecting the association of SEG 41.540B with the polyandron, a position endorsed at Andreou 1986. SEG 41.540B, a fragmentary stele with letter forms approximately contemporary with the polyandron epigram, reads as follows: τῆδε Φορίνθιο[v----]στιονα[---] | ἠυῖὸν Φοῦν[ι]άδ[---] στεῦεν[---] | vacat | σῶφρονα κα[-----]ατου δι[---] | πολλοὶ δυσ[---]αν vacat. The mention of Φορίνθιο[v in line 1 encouraged Andreou 1986 and Bousquet 1992 to supplement εὐρυχώροι[o Κορίνθου] in line 3 of the polyandron epigram. The supplement fills out the hexameter nicely (as would many other place names), but there is no necessary physical relationship between stele and polyandron. The stele was discovered in front of the polyandron, among some blocks which had tumbled down from its façade, but this is not evidence that the stele was originally set up atop the polyandron. It plainly would not have fit the stele cutting atop the monument.

5) Andreou 1986 (SEG 41.540A, which also takes account of Bousquet 1992 and Matthaïou 1990a and b).

6) Bousquet 1992 (SEG 41.540A; S. Follet, BÉ 1992, 19); Matthaïou 1990a and Matthaïou 1990b (SEG 41.540A; J. Bousquet / S. Follet, BÉ 1994, 38). Matthaïou's contributions occasioned a polemic from Andreou (Andreou / Andreou 1988 [SEG 45.661; P. Cabanes, BÉ 1996, 224]). For useful discussion of dialect and orthography, see Athanassoudi 1995 (SEG 46.676). The second wave of scholarship, ongoing, has attempted to situate this monument against the broader, generic background of Archaic elegy: cf., e.g., the fundamental studies of Cassio 1994 (SEG 44.463; P. Cabanes, BÉ 1996, 225) and D'Alessio 1995 (SEG 44.463; P. Cabanes, BÉ 1996, 224), together with recent commentary in Lougovaya 2004, 68–74; Day 2007, 30–31; and Bowie 2010, 361–362.

in the epigram, where some uncertainty remains about how the Greek is to be understood: the phrase τῶδε δ' ἀπ' Ἀνπρακίας in l. 7, where the case and number of both deictic pronoun and noun are in doubt, as are the referents of both words; and the phrase ἴστε, πολῖται in l. 9, where the mood of the verb is ambiguous, as is the mode of address to the audience. Consideration of these two Ambracian cruces opens onto a broader literary and historical reading of the monument that suggests partial parallels between the strategies of public commemoration deployed in the Ambracian polyandron and those at home in the monuments and rituals of Classical Athens, especially the casualty list and funeral oration.

Naming the Dead

Despite the excellent work of Bousquet and Matthaïou, a pressing textual issue remains in l. 7, with implications for the interpretation of that line and the following. I offer Bousquet's text and translation, followed by my English translation: τῶδε δ' ἀπ' Ἀνπρακίας, Νausίστρατος αὐτὰ παθόν τε, : / Καλλίταν τ' Αἴδα δῶμα μέλαν κατέχει : 'Et voici deux Ambraciotes: Nausistratos qui a subi le même sort, et Kallitas aussi qui est prisonnier dans la noire maison d'Hadès.'⁷ 'These two are from Ambracia, Nausistratos who suffered the same things, and the black house of Hades holds down Kallitas.' The Greek is difficult; the English (or French) little better.

Where to begin? With Bousquet, I regard αὐτά as equivalent to τὰ αὐτά.⁸ It is of course not impossible to translate simply as 'those things', vel sim., but such a rendering does not add anything to the meaning of the epigram. By contrast, in the currently fragmentary state of the inscription, 'the same things' immediately begs the question: The same as who or what? The answer, I suspect, occurred in the preceding lacuna, where it is probable that the catalogue of deceased began.

But the syntax of these two lines is in any case not immediately clear.⁹ I regard τῶδε as a nominative dual (τῶδε) which looks forward to the names Nausistratos and Kallitas and to which nom-

7) Bousquet 1992, 599.

8) Bousquet 1992, 599. Cf. LSJ s.v. αὐτός I 12.

9) Bousquet 1992, 602: 'légèrement asymétrique'.

inative Nausistratos stands in partial apposition. Nausistratos is then linked to the second individual by double $\tau\epsilon$, but the construction has shifted: instead of a second nominative, Kallitas has become accusative object of a new verb.¹⁰ One must admit a slight anacolouthon and an apparent nominative pendens. Yet the focus of the couplet remains clear, and while the coupling of Nausistratos and Kallitas and their association with the introductory deictic pronoun are problematical in terms of syntax, the thought which motivates the expression is plain. One could even argue that the shift in construction binds the couplet more closely with the following, concluding couplet, where the accusative names Arathion and Euxenos could both initially be construed as objects of $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota$ before the clarification of the new verb $\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon$ in line 9.

Such an understanding of the Greek has been condemned in the strongest terms by G. B. D'Alessio;¹¹ he offers the following text (normalized with Ionic spelling) and translation: $\tau\acute{\omega}\delta\epsilon\ \delta\prime\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\prime\ \acute{\Lambda}\nu\pi\rho\alpha\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma,\ \text{Ναυσίστρατον},\ \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \pi\alpha\theta\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\epsilon,\ / \text{Καλλίταν}\ \tau\prime\ \acute{\Lambda}\iota\delta\alpha\ \delta\acute{\omicron}\mu\alpha\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\nu\ \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota.$ 'È questi due Ambraciotti che hanno subito la medesima sorte (sc. la stessa sorte dei morti nominati ai versi precedenti), Nausistratos e Callitas, litrattiene la nera casa di Hades.¹² By changing the final sigma of nominative Ναυσίστρατος to nu, D'Alessio is able to harmonize the three troublesome substantives of the couplet: the deictic pronoun $\tau\acute{\omega}\delta\epsilon$ is understood as a dual accusative and thus in agreement with the following names, Nausistratos and Kallitas, now both accusative, the latter linked to the former by a single $\tau\epsilon$; now accusative and dual as well is the aorist participle, $\pi\alpha\theta\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\epsilon$. The new syntax is palatable to modern standards of taste, if somewhat bland in comparison with Bousquet's text. D'Alessio's new interpretation hinges entirely on the assumption of error in the inscribing of Nausistratos. And how an individual resolves this particular conundrum will ultimately come down to his or her tolerance of syntactic irregularity versus that of scribal

10) For similar appositions in epic, see, e.g., Hom. Il. 16.317–318, Od. 12.73–110.

11) D'Alessio 1995, 24: 'In realtà la sintassi, più che leggermente asimmetrica, è decisamente irregolare: il nominativo $\text{Ναυσίστρατος}\ \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \pi\alpha\theta\acute{\omicron}\nu$ rimane pendens: la frase continuerebbe, con un pesante anacoluto, con la sequenza "e la nera casa di Hades trattiene Callitas". In questo contesto la funzione, e soprattutto la posizione, del $\tau\epsilon$ alla fine del v. 7 mi risultano del tutto incomprensibili.'

12) D'Alessio 1995, 24–25.

error. No argument can be definitive in the current state of evidence. But given the otherwise extreme care displayed in the layout and cutting of this inscription and the fact that the anacoluthon in question may play into the overall poetics of the epigram, I choose to err on the side of the cutter and prefer to leave Nausistratos nominative.

Matthaiou has likewise been troubled by these lines, and he offers the following conservative text: ΤΟΔΕ Δ' ἄπ' Ἀνπρακίας, Ναυσίστρατος αὐτὰ ΠΑΘΟΝΤΕ : / Καλλίταν τ' Ἄϊδα δῶμα μέλαν κατέχει :.¹³ While Matthaiou's use of capital letters in line 7 is meant to reflect genuine uncertainty about how those letters are to be construed, the accent ἄπ' expresses confidence that ΤΟΔΕ represents a genitive singular. In his comments on this couplet, Matthaiou suggests: that ΤΟΔΕ is the equivalent of genitive singular τούδε (the intended referent, as Matthaiou admits, is unclear, but could be the funeral enclosure itself);¹⁴ that ἄπ' stands for ἄπεστι; that Ἀνπρακίας is nominative singular personal name and not a genitive singular name of the city; and that Nausistratos is coupled with Anprakias by a single τε.¹⁵ Matthaiou thus understands the text: τὸδε δ' ἄπ' Ἀνπρακίας, Ναυσίστρατος αὐτὰ παθὼν τε;¹⁶ and in English, we may translate lines 7–8: 'And Anprakias is absent from this, and Nausistratos who suffered the same things (is also absent), and the black house of Hades holds down Kallitas.'

Such a reconstruction yields intelligible Greek and demands serious consideration. What motivates such a construal is Matthaiou's powerful observation about Ἀνπρακίας, namely, that it would have been redundant for an Ambracian funerary monument to identify the deceased as Ambracian before an Ambracian audience.¹⁷ He cites plentiful comparanda from CEG I–II indicating

13) Matthaiou 1990a, 274.

14) Matthaiou 1990b, 310.

15) Matthaiou 1990a, 274; Matthaiou 1990b, 308–310.

16) Matthaiou 1990b, 310.

17) Matthaiou 1990b, 308–309: 'ὁ ἐμπρόθετος τῆς ἀπὸ + γενικῆ ὀνόματος τόπου, π.χ. ἀπ' Ἀθηνῶν, δηλώνει βεβαίως τὴν καταγωγὴν, ἀλλὰ χρησιμοποιεῖται, ὅταν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, στὸν ὁποῖο ἀναφέρεται, βρίσκεται ἢ ἔχει πεθάνει μακριὰ ἀπὸ τὸν τόπο του, δηλώνει δηλαδὴ τὴν προέλευση· ποτὲ δὲν χρησιμοποιεῖται γιὰ νὰ δηλωθεῖ ἡ καταγωγὴ κάποιου στὸν ἴδιο τὸν τόπο του. Ὡστε δὲν μπορεῖ νὰ δηλώνουν οἱ Ἀμβρακιῶται στὴν Ἀμβρακίαν τὴν καταγωγὴ τῶν πεσόντων συμπατριωτῶν τους μὲ τὸν ἐμπρόθετο ἀπ' Ἀνπρακίας.'

that an individual's civic descent is marked in Archaic and Classical epigram only when that person is represented as being at a distance from one's homeland. It is an important and stimulating insight, but in limiting himself to epigram alone, Matthaiou misses other potential comparanda. Chief among these are Classical Athenian casualty lists. Compare, for example, the headings for IG I³ 1162, tentatively dated to 447 BCE. The inscribed face of the stele is arranged in two columns, the first of which begins (ll. 1–3): ἐγ Χερρονέσοι | Ἀθηναίων : ἠοῖδε | ἀπέθανον 'At the Chersonese, the following Athenians died ...' There follows a list of the deceased, subdivided by tribe and lacking both demotics and father's names. The second column begins similarly (ll. 49–51): ἐμ Βυζαντίου | Ἀθηναίων : ἠοῖδ[ε] | ἀπέθανον 'At Byzantium, the following Athenians died ...' There follows again a list of the deceased, again lacking demotics and father's names. The inscription was discovered in Athens, where its initial locus of publication was most likely the demosion sema. It would thus appear that deceased Athenians were publicly described as Athenians to a predominantly Athenian audience. Further examples of this genre of inscription abound in fifth-century BCE Athens, and similar headings appear to have been quite common.¹⁸

In the case of Athens, the emphatic description of the dead Athenians as Athenians before a largely Athenian audience need not be considered redundant, but can be interpreted as an expression of the primary allegiance of the deceased to their home city, and the near total subsumption of the individual within the greater collective of the city in times of war, mediated not by deme or family, but by that most democratically neutral of units, the tribe.¹⁹ A similar reading may also obtain in the case of the Ambracia epigram, in which the ambassadors are in some sense claimed for the city through the expression ἀπ' Ἀνπρακίας. To be sure, this funer-

18) Cf. IG I³ 1191, 1193bis, and possibly 1179, 1181.

19) Cf. Loraux 1986, 23: 'On these [sc. casualty] lists, fallen citizens had no status other than that of Athenians, twice proclaimed: under the heading *Athenaion hoide apethanon* and in its political dimension by reference to the ten Cleisthenean tribes ... Freed of everyday attachments to social life, the dead man was now simply an Athenian. Thus the lists of the dead mention neither patronymic nor demotic ... In burying its dead, then, the Athenian community appropriated them forever, and at the demosion sema all distinctions, individual or familial, economic or social, that might divide Athenians even in their graves were abolished.'

ary epigram is no casualty list, although certain features would seem to presage it, especially the deployment of anticipatory deixis and the absence of father's names; and sixth-century Ambracia is a world away from fifth-century Athens, although, perhaps not as far as one might initially assume. One must admit, I think, that there may have been domestic contexts when it was advantageous, even necessary, for a city to identify itself exceptionally closely with its deceased representatives.

Citizen knowledge

Any reading of the elegy must address at some point both the first person ὀλοφύρομαι, 'I mourn', in line 1 and the dramatic shift to a second person plural address in line 9, ἴστε πολῖται, 'you must know (or: you know), citizens'. Direct address of an audience is a characteristic mode of elegy, and is not uncommon in inscribed funerary elegy of the Archaic and Classical period.²⁰ Compare, for example, CEG I 28 (IG I³ 1204), an Attic epitaph dated ca. 540–530 (?) BCE: ἀνθροπε ἡστέιχε[ι]ς : καθ' ὁδὸν : φρασὶν : ἄλλα μενοινῶν, : / στῆθι | καὶ οἴκτιρον : σῆμα Θράσωνος : ἰδὼν. 'Man, you who are going along the road seeking other things in your mind, stand and mourn as you look at the sema of Thrason'; or CEG I 13 (IG I³ 1194bis), an Attic epitaph tentatively dated ca. 575–550 (?) BCE: [εἴτε ἀστό]ς τις ἀνὲρ εἴτε χσένος | ἄλοθεν ἐλθὼν : / Τέτιχον οἰκτίρα[ι]ς ἀνδρ' ἀγαθὸν παρίτο, : / ἐν πολέμοι | φθίμενον, νεαρὰν ἠέβεν ὀλέσαν[ι]τα. : / ταῦτ' ἀποδυράμενοι νῆσθε ἐπὶ πρῶγμ' ἀγαθόν. 'Whether a man is an astos or xenos come from abroad, let him come and mourn Tetichos, a good man, who died in war and destroyed his youthful bloom. After mourning these things, go off to a good deed.' In this example an audience is imagined and addressed directly, but remains somehow indefinite: stranger or a local.

20) I assume in this essay that the 'I' of ὀλοφύρομαι represents the voice of the monument and the 'you' of ἴστε represents the reader(s) of the monument. For the anonymous, first-person mourner of the Ambracia epigram, see the important study of Cassio 1994. For a rich and nuanced treatment of the dynamics of reading Archaic inscribed dedicatory epigram, which has much applicable to funerary epigram, see Day 2010, 1–84.

Such epitaphs offer a useful contrast to the Ambracia epigram, where the audience appears at first sight to be constructed in a much more meaningful fashion as πολῖται, ‘citizens’. But a translation of this sort immediately begs a more fundamental question: What did it mean to be a ‘citizen’ in sixth-century BCE Ambracia? J. H. Blok and J. K. Davies have each recently posed similar questions, and it will be useful to summarize briefly the results of their research; both are rightly critical of the Aristotelian model of citizenship. Blok argues that πολίτης always occurs in the plural in the Archaic period and that it is virtually indistinguishable in meaning from, and much less popular than, ἀστός: “inhabitants of a polis”, where polis itself has the loose meaning of “society in an identifiable area, with some kind of urban center”.²¹ A clear semantic shift took place in Athens about the middle of the fifth century BCE whereby πολίτης began to be used in the singular and acquired concrete connotations of ‘active citizen’ or ‘having rights and duties within the polis’.²² Blok associates this shift in Athens with the reforms of Ephialtes in 462/1 BCE, the Periclean citizenship law of 451/0 BCE, and the rising power of individual Athenians within the Delian League.²³ In a more inchoate and exploratory paper drawing on a wider range of source material, Davies suggests that ideas of citizenship varied considerably from place to place and time to time in the Archaic and early Classical world, facts which are reflected in the diverse range of words that seem to connote ‘citizen’.²⁴ He concludes that the benefits and rights of citizenship were ‘expedients devised by ruling oligarchies, who lived in an increasingly competitive world, in order to consolidate control of a landscape, to maximise the number of fighting men, to dominate or annex weaker neighbours, and to mount prestige projects.’²⁵

Blok’s and especially Davies’ findings thus caution against assuming that there was anything fixed in conceptions of Archaic citizenship, which was, rather, fluid and contingent upon local circumstance. From such a perspective, it is therefore striking to see so strong a claim on one aspect of being a ‘citizen’ expressed in

21) Blok 2005, 11.

22) Blok 2005, 30, 36.

23) Blok, 2005, 29–31.

24) Davies 2004, *passim*.

25) Davies 2004, 26.

the polyandron epigram: ‘And indeed you must know (or: you know), citizens, Arathion and Euxenos, whom the demon of death discovered with these men.’ The epigram equates one’s status as citizen with one’s knowledge of what was experienced as a presumably major event in the history of the city. Citizenship here acquires a cognitive dimension.

The mood of ἴστε is ambiguous: it may be either imperative or indicative. Most commentators have felt compelled to choose one or the other, but I would suggest that when the monument is viewed diachronically, both moods have force. In the immediate aftermath of this disaster, the epigram may have simply reminded its audience what it knew by other means: ‘you know’. At a remove of a generation or more, after the shock of the disaster had receded, it is possible to imagine a more commanding tone – ‘you must know’ – that could retreat into the indicative on subsequent encounters, when the reader would be reminded (‘you know’) of what the monument had previously commanded.

The claim is ambitious, more so than might initially appear. Against the broader backdrop of Archaic epic and elegy, knowledge about the past could be selectively imputed to audiences by the Muses via the mediation of a singer (e. g., Hom. *Il.* 2.484–487; Hes. *Theog.* 26–28), although, as S. Halliwell has observed: ‘... the Muse-sponsored memory and retelling of the past in epic is more a matter of retaining a sense of essential contact with events of permanent significance than an unquestioning belief in accurate reportage.’²⁶ Even the narrator of events in the comparatively recent past, like that of the recently-published Plataea elegy of Simonides, could see a need for an auxiliary Muse.²⁷ The rhetoric of the Ambracia epigram, however, suggests that the monument itself can offer its audience such a connection to a critical event in the city’s past and, insofar as citizenship has been made contingent upon knowledge of and connection with just such an event, citizenship has been made by extension contingent upon this monument as well. As indicative, ἴστε may only supplement popular memory; as im-

26) Halliwell 2011, 62, who further observes at 91 that ‘the narrative, memorializing functions of song transform and reorganize the unique particulars of lived experiences into highly charged but renewable patterns of meaning and feeling, turning them into all-engrossing, soul-changing experiences in their own right’.

27) Stehle 2001.

perative, it positively structures it; and the monument is effectively present not just in the physical landscape of the city, but inscribed within civic memory as well.

Nor will this be a solitary act, but a collective one. Indeed, there is no room for the individual wayfarer who is imagined mourning Thrason. The Tetichos epigram comes closer to the dynamic of the Ambracia epigram – ‘Let him approach ... now go (all of you)’ – inviting as it does individual readers to ponder the monument, constructing them as collecting before dismissing them as a group. But there are potential distinctions within the audience of Tetichos’ mourners between locals (citizens, perhaps) and strangers. At Ambracia, the audience cannot be solitary (even if it is) and can only be citizens (even if they are not).²⁸

One could be forgiven for wondering what the fuss was about. Nausistratos, Kallitas, Arathion, and Euxenos were killed, presumably while conducting state business; such diplomatic travel in Greek antiquity, overland or by sea, was never without substantial hazard. But the poetics of this elegy give equal, if not greater, prominence to the ambassadors’ murderers: the ‘children of the Puraiboi’.²⁹ While the use of *παῖδες* is well-attested in expressions where, for example, ‘children of the Athenians’ is simply equivalent to

28) The relationship between monument and reader acquires additional complexity if one assumes that the epigram would have been read aloud by literate passers-by. In such a case the reader’s voice would have merged with that of the monument and both perpetuated the act of grieving for the dead ambassadors (‘I mourn’) and enabled the reader’s public address of an audience (‘you must know’, or: ‘you know’) that is imagined, but, since the road would have often been busy, some such ‘audience’ may have been physically present. An opportunity to engage, however temporarily, in public address of an audience of ‘citizens’ may thus have been made available to all who could read, irrespective of status, gender, or ethnicity. Cf. Cassio 1994, 114: ‘... l’autore dell’epigramma di Ambracia è arrivato a creare una composizione che riproduce movenze di allocuzione pubblica ... e in cui la ricreazione di un’atmosfera “ceremoniale” è di grande importanza.’

29) The Puraiboi are otherwise unknown. Cf. Bousquet 1992, 600–601. Cassio 1994, 104–105, observing the alternation of epsilon and upsilon in words like *πτέον* / *πτύον*, *ἀγεριμός* / *ἀγυριμός*, and *σέρφος* / *σύρφος*, has attractively suggested that the Puraiboi of this inscription are really Peraiboi; while *Περ(ρ)αῖβοι* are well-attested in the upland region of Perrhaibia, north of Thessalian Larisa and bordering Macedonia (cf. Graninger 2011, 32, with further references), Sophocles (fr. 271 Radt) and Homer (Il. 2.749–750: τῷ δ’ Ἐνιήνες ἔποντο μενεπτόλεμοί τε Περαιβοί | οἱ περὶ Δωδώνην δυσχείμερον οἰκί’ ἔθεντο) both associate this ethnos with territory in Epirus as well.

‘Athenians’ (e. g., Hdt. 5.77; IG I³ 501), the enjambment Πυραϊβὼν / παῖδες and emphatic contrast of ἄνδρας and παῖδες at the beginning of each verse in the elegy’s opening couplet encourage a more expansive reading. By imputing youth to the Puraiboi and opposing it to the maturity of the Ambracians, the epigrammatic trope of representing those deceased in battle as young (compare Tetichos’ ‘youthful bloom’) is subverted. It is an additional habit of such epigrams to present death in war as somehow voluntary: Tetichos ‘destroyed his youthful bloom’ in battle – he was the responsible party, no other. In Ambracia it is the Puraiboi who have made a choice: ἐμετίσαντ’ ἀλκινόεντα φόνον ‘they plotted grievous murder’.³⁰ Their encounter with the Ambracian ambassadors does not appear as the accidental product of raiding, piracy, or the like, but as the deliberate act of a dangerous, metis-possessing enemy.

While the driving contrast of the first couplet is between these Puraiboi and the deceased ambassadors, a more profound contrast emerges in the final couplet. As A. C. Cassio perceptively observed, the first and last couplets are metrical doublets of one another.³¹ Such metrical resonance between the beginning and end of the elegy encourages readers to look for thematic resonance as well. The correspondence of Πυραϊβὼν and πολῖται at the end of lines 1 and 9 helps to develop the opposition between Puraiboi and Ambracian ambassadors into an opposition between Puraiboi and Ambracians, broadly construed. The extension of this comparison acquires a temporal dimension, from the emphatic past of the ambassadors’ death to an always present knowledge of that event on the part of Ambracian citizens. The Puraiboi are thereby presented as a persistent, even eternal, threat.

30) The verb μητίομαι does not occur outside of epic in Archaic poetry and always has a strongly negative valence. Thus Aphrodite threatens Helen at Iliad 3.416–7: μέσσω δ’ ἀμφοτέρων μητίομαι ἔχθρα λυγρὰ / Τρώων καὶ Δαναῶν, σὺ δέ κεν κακὸν οἶτον ὄληαι. In a passage with uncanny relevance to the situation of the Ambracian ambassadors, Hektor threatens to deprive slain enemies of appropriate funeral rites (Hom. Il. 15.348–351): ὄν δ’ ἂν ἐγὼν ἀπάνευθε νεῶν ἐτέρωθι νοήσω, / αὐτοῦ οἱ θάνατον μητίομαι, οὐδέ νυ τὸν γε / γνωτοί τε γνωταί τε πυρὸς λελάχωσι θανόντα, / ἀλλὰ κύνες ἐρούουσι πρὸ ἄστεος ἡμετέροιο. Cf. Hom. Od. 12.371–373; 18.26–31. Cf. LfgrE s. v. μητιάομαι.

31) Cassio 1994, 105–106; he regards the fact as indicative of the extraordinary energy and care put into monument and epigram. Faraone 2008, 134 n. 46 suggests that this strategy is ‘similar perhaps to the occasional use of rhyming pentameters at the start and finish of elegiac stanzas’.

No formal authority for the construction of the monument or the cutting of the epigram is preserved. The identification of the deceased ambassadors with the city of Ambracia in line 7 and the direct address to an audience of *πολιται* in line 9 both suggest that this was an official product of the Ambracian polis. Such a reconstruction raises the further possibility that a public narrative about the history of Ambracia was developing that reflected the city's position on the margins of northwestern Greece and that this narrative was further associated with emerging ideas of citizenship. Such entwining of civic identity and historical memory in a context of lamentation³² has some basic, if essential, parallels with state funerals in Classical Athens and, above all, the funeral oration, where those killed on campaign were assimilated to a grand and egregiously chauvinistic narrative of Athenian history. While the funeral oration is often regarded as a quintessentially Athenian institution,³³ the evidence of the polyandron epigram suggests that Athens was not alone in utilizing public commemoration of the dead as an opportunity for communal self-definition.

Conclusion

Although the resolutions of the two Ambracian cruces offered above can only be tentative, both point toward those complementary forms of public commemoration of war dead so well known from Classical Athens: the physical monument consisting of a stele or series of stelai with casualty list and commemorative epigram and the equally lapidary, if more ephemeral in performance, funeral oration delivered to the crowd of assembled mourners. These rhetorics of remembrance in Athens are typicall

32) It is significant that *ὀλοφύρομαι* and its compounds are used with quasi-technical specificity to describe the type of mourning appropriate to the audience of the Athenian funeral oration: cf., e. g., Thucyd. 2.46.2: *νῦν δὲ ἀπολοφυράμενοι ὄν προσήκει ἐκάστῳ ἅπιτε*; [Pl.] Menex. 249c6–8: *νῦν δὲ ἤδη ὑμεῖς τε καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες κοινῇ κατὰ τὸν νόμον τοὺς τετελευτηκότας ἀπολοφυράμενοι ἅπιτε*; Lys. 2.81: *ὅμως δ' ἀνάγκη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ἐθεσι χρῆσθαι, καὶ θεραπεύοντας τὸν πάτριον νόμον ὀλοφύρεσθαι τοὺς θάπτομένους*.

33) E. g., Demosth. 20.141, on the basis of which Loraux 1986, 1 comments: 'So the funeral oration is Athenian and only Athenian.' Cf. Ael. Ar. Panath. 368; Thucydides' 'ethnographic' presentation of Athenian public burial customs at 2.34.

regarded as developments of the radically democratic city; later testimonia that Ambracia experienced constitutional development toward an increasingly liberal, possibly democratic, franchise during the Archaic and early Classical period are thus all the more intriguing.³⁴ But the Ambracia-Athens relationship sketched in the preceding need not be considered teleological; it may rather suggest that commemorative strategies of this sort had a much broader purchase in the Archaic and Classical polis.

Bibliography

- E. Andreou / I. Andreou, *Τὰ ἐπιγράμματα τῆς Ἀμβρακίας καὶ τὰ ἀπαράδεκτα μίας ἐρμηνείας*, AD 43A, 1988, 109–113.
- , *La stèle funéraire des Ambraciotes*, in: D. Berranger-Auserve (ed.), *Épire, Illyrie, Macédoine. Mélanges offerts au Professeur Pierre Cabanes*, Clermont-Ferrand 2007, 235–246.
- I. Andreou, *Τὰ ἐπιγράμματα τοῦ πολυανδρίου τῆς Ἀμβρακίας*, AD 41A, 1986, 425–445.
- N. Arrington, *Topographic Semantics: The Location of the Athenian Public Cemetery and its Significance for the Nascent Democracy*, *Hesperia* 79, 2010, 499–539.
- I. Athanassoudi, *Du bon usage d'un texte poétique par le dialectologue: le cas des distiques du polyandron*, *Verbum* 18, 1995, 217–225.
- J. H. Blok, *Becoming Citizens. Some Notes on the Semantics of 'Citizen' in Archaic Greece and Classical Athens*, *Klio* 87, 2005, 7–40.
- J. Bousquet, *Deux épigrammes grecques (Delphes, Ambracie)*, *BCH* 116, 1992, 585–606.
- E. Bowie, *Epigram as narration*, in: M. Baumbach / A. Petrovic / I. Petrovic (eds.), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, Cambridge 2010, 313–377.
- A. C. Cassio, *I distici del «polyandron» di Ambracia e l'«io anonimo» nell'epigramma greco*, *SMEA* 33, 1994, 101–117.

34) For citation of the evidence, the earliest of which is fourth-century BCE, and discussion, see Robinson 1997, 80–82; he does not discuss Ambracia at Robinson 2011. Cf. Gehrke and Wirbelauer 2004, 354–356. The Athenian parallel may even be productively extended to considerations of topography: Ambracia's southwest cemetery has also produced a fragmentary stele (ed. pr. Andreou and Andreou 2007), tentatively dated to the early Hellenistic period, consisting of a heading [-----]ΩΤΑΙ, possibly to be supplemented [Ἀμβρακί]ῶται, followed by a list of names and father's names in smaller, more closely-spaced letters; the inscription, plausibly interpreted as a casualty list, points to state burial in the cemetery at that time and raises the possibility that Ambracia's southwest cemetery, or some area within it, functioned as the equivalent of the Athenian demosion sema. For the location and function of the Athenian demosion sema, see now Arrington 2010.

- G. B. D'Alessio, Sull'epigramma dal polyandrion di Ambracia, ZPE 106, 1995, 22–26.
- J. K. Davies, The concept of the 'citizen', in: S. Cataldi (ed.), *Poleis e Politeiai. Esperienze politiche, Tradizioni letterarie, Progetti costituzionali*, Alessandria 2004, 19–30.
- J. W. Day, Poems on stone: The Inscribed Antecedents of Hellenistic Epigram, in: P. Bing / J. S. Bruss (eds.), *Brill's companion to Hellenistic epigram*, Leiden 2007, 29–47.
- , *Archaic Greek epigram and dedication: representation and reperformance*, Cambridge 2010.
- C. Faraone, *The Stanzaic Architecture of Early Greek Elegy*, Oxford 2008.
- H.-J. Gehrke / E. Wirbelauer, Akarnania and Adjacent Areas, in: M. H. Hansen / T. H. Nielsen (eds.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oxford 2004, 351–378.
- D. Graninger, *Cult and Koinon in Hellenistic Thessaly*, Leiden / Boston 2011.
- S. Halliwell, *Between Ecstasy and Truth: Interpretations of Greek Poetics from Homer to Longinus*, Oxford 2011.
- N. Loraux, *The Invention of Athens. The Funeral Oration in the Classical City*, Cambridge, MA 1986.
- J. Lougovaya, *An historical study of Athenian verse epitaphs from the sixth through the fourth centuries BC*, Ph.D. diss., Toronto 2004.
- A. Matthaïou, *Ἀμβρακίας ἐλεγείον, ἥρος 8–9*, 1990a, 271–277.
- , *Ἀμβρακίας ἐλεγείον. Δευτερολογία, ἥρος 8–9*, 1990b, 303–310.
- E. W. Robinson, *The First Democracies: Early Popular Government Outside Athens*, Stuttgart 1997.
- , *Democracy Beyond Athens: Popular Government in the Greek Classical Age*, Cambridge 2011.
- E. Stehle, A bard of the Iron Age and his auxiliary muse, in: D. Boedeker / D. Sider (eds.), *The new Simonides: contexts of praise and desire*, Oxford 2001, 106–119.

Riverside, CA

Denver Graninger