

BERND LORENZ, *Griechische Grabgedichte Thessaliens. Beispiele für poetische Kleinkunst der Antike*, Kalliope – Studien zur griechischen und lateinischen Poesie, 16. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2019, 294 pp., €58,00, ISBN 978-3-8253-6941-5.

The publication of a book on inscribed Thessalian funerary epigrams attests to the growing interest in the study of Greek inscribed epigrams, which stand at the crossroads of distinct disciplines pertaining to the study of the ancient world, such as history and epigraphy on the one hand and literary analysis on the other. This collection by Bernd Lorenz includes 117 sepulchral epigrams ranging from the 6th century BC to the 4th century AD and offers Greek text, bibliographical references to previous bibliography, translation(s), and very short notes on each and every epigram. In this light, it may be used as a guide for future research on Thessalian and Greek epigram at large.

Having said this, it is fair to say that one would have welcomed a commentary on these 117 funerary inscribed epigrams. Their sheer number almost necessitates such an undertaking, since they allow for drawing conclusions with respect to a number of intriguing questions (e.g. Are we allowed to speak of a local, Thessalian coloring in this corpus of epigrams? What can we learn about the cultural level in this part of Central Greece? Are these metrical inscriptions a source for Thessalian society at large? What conclusions can we draw if we compare this corpus with the corpus, say, of Attic funerary epigrams?). The gathering of Thessalian epigrams in a single volume (Inscriptiones Graecae IX, 2: 40; Peek, *Griechische Versinschriften*: 64; McDevitt¹: 35; Cairon²: 32; *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*: 25) is undoubtedly a positive outcome which justifies Lorenz's effort, though it could have been used by the author as the basis for a full-scale analysis of the historical context, epigraphical problems, themes, and diction. For the time being, this remains a *desideratum*.

A second point concerns the fact that the author offers the reader with a wealth of translations for each epigram, which are taken from previous editions in different European languages. This method, pertaining to *Rezeptionsgeschichte* (as stated in the back-cover of the book), is sadly not exploited. The author could have used the different translations as a starting

¹ A S. McDevitt, *Inscriptions from Thessaly. An Analytical Handlist and Bibliography*, Hildesheim 1970.

² E. Cairon, *Les épitaphes métriques hellénistiques du Péloponnèse à la Thessalie*, Budapest 2009.

point for the analysis and discussion of several aspects of the syntax, diction, and style of the relevant epigram. As things stand now, such an attempt is not made. I strongly recommend that this aspect of the book should be exploited by any scholar who will undertake the task of writing a commentary on this substantial corpus of inscribed Thessalian sepulchral epigrams.

A third point concerns the lack of attention as far as the printing of Greek is concerned. There are numerous typos, almost in every other epigram, which is rather disappointing for a book whose basic purpose is to offer a collection of metrical inscriptions with reliable text: I hereby offer a list of some examples (which are simply too many to be quoted in full)³:

P. 55, l. 7: [ου μό] > [οὐ μό]; P. 55 l. 9: [οὐκ ἦν] > [οὐκ ἦν]; P. 55 l. 10: ἦδε > ἦδε; P. 57 l. 4: [μελάθοις ?] > [μελάθοις ?]; P. 59 l. 6: οἴκτρα > οἴκτρα; P. 59 l. 6: Κινυρομένη > κινυρομένη; P. 61 l. 2: ἐτι > ἔτι; P. 61 l. 3: ῥ > ῥ'; P. 61 l. 4 (Notiz): Ἀιδην > Ἀιδην; P. 62, l. 3: νέκους > νέκυος; P. 62, l. 4: πατρί[[δε > πατρί[[δι; P. 64, l. 3: εὐκαλεέστατον > εὐκλεέστατον; P. 66 l. 8: ὥσπερ > ὥσπερ; P. 66 l. 9: κ<λ>αίοντα > κ<λ>αίοντα; P. 68. l. 1: καί > καί; P. 68. l. 4: ἥρπασες > ἥρπασες; P. 68. l. 4: οὔτω > οὔτω; P. 68, l. 5: χαῖρειν > χαίρειν; P. 183, l. 2: ἀνθρώ|πουσιν > ἀνθρώ|ποισιν

I also append a list of further mistakes and inaccuracies: (1) p. 61, l. 1 of Greek text: ἔρηθ]α > ἔρηθα. (2) p. 62, l. 1 of Greek text: τάφ[ον > τάφ[[ον. (3) p. 62, l. 2 of Greek text: [ἔργοισι]. No mention is made of [ἐξ ἡβης] in IG IX, 2: 185. (4) p. 62, l. 3 of Greek text: [Κλεον]ίκου, but see [Πολυ]νίκου in IG IX, 2: 185 (see SEG 30: 534). (5) P. 66 l. 6: δῆ[ρα]ς (συμ)βίω μου > δῆ [τῇ] <συμ>βίω μου (6) τὰ μοιρ(έα) καπάντ' ἐτέλεσσα > τὰ μοιρ<έ>α πάντ' ἐτέλεσσα. (7) p. 67 (French translation): laisse > laissée, épouse > épouse destinée > destinée. (8) p. 68 l. 3 of Greek text: Lorenze prints τοῦτ'ῶν, Αἶδα, θνή|σκω which gives us pause because of the neuter τοῦτ'. The author should have at least cited Peek's emendation (*Griechische Versinschriften* 1071): <πρίν> τούτων, Αἶδα, θνή|σκω <δεκαῆξ ἐνιαυτῶν>, the more so since the German translation 'Vor diesen sechzehn Jahren, Hades, sterbe ich' refers to Peek's text. (9) There is a continuous inconsistency in printing the iota either as subscript (e.g. p. 134, l. 6: νηπίω; p. 174, l. 5: τῇ ιδία; p. 190, ll. 1-2: κασιγνήτω ... ᾧ καὶ φθιμένω) or as adscript (e.g. p. 77, l. 4: τῶιδε τάφωι; p. 204, l. 2: τῶιδε τ[άφωι; p. 210, l. 2: ὦιχετ').

All in all, Lorenz has offered a handy collection of inscribed sepulchral epigrams from Thessaly that should be used by scholars as the basis for a future commentary on such a theme- and region- coherent corpus. This is the book's principal contribution to the field. However, readers and researchers alike will find it indispensable to consult and compare the *editiones primae*

³ All references refer to pages and line-numbers of the Greek text.

because of the book's various typos in the Greek text and other inaccuracies. The notes are at times helpful, some of them may even be used for further reflection on innovative tropes found in an epigram or other points of thematical and dictional interest that should be incorporated into a study of the entire corpus of Thessalian funerary epigrams that is yet to come.

CHRISTOS TSAGALIS
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
ctsagal@lit.auth.gr

