zu signalisieren. Ferner kann ein Versuch, allein aus der Telephos-Parodie das Verhältnis der Thesmophoriazusen zu Euripides zu erschließen, nur zu allgemeinen und vorläufigen Ergebnissen führen, wenn die weiteren Parodien und die Erscheinung des tragischen Dichters als komischer Person in der Komödie nicht ausreichend in Betracht gezogen werden. Schließlich wäre auch zum Verhältnis der Thesmophoriazusen zu den Acharnern mehr zu sagen, wenn die Telephos-Parodien im Zusammenhang mit den sie begleitenden, ebenfalls als Dubletten konzipierten Ekkyliema- und Verkleidungsszenen in beiden Stücken gewürdigt worden wären.

P.s Buch stellt trotz dieser Einwände eine bemerkenswerte Bereicherung unserer Aristophanesliteratur dar und ist sowohl für die gelehrteten und subtilen Einzelinterpretationen als auch für seinen gut ausgearbeiteten theoretischen Ansatz durchaus wichtig.

Nicosa

Antonis Tsakmakis


In the last paragraph of the conclusion to ‘Look who’s talking’, Michael A. Tueller (T.) sums up his work:

«I have, in the end, asked a set of very simple questions: Who is talking? To whom? About what? The answers to these questions, I hope, have illuminated a new path through the bewildering variety of hellenistic epigram.» (207)

This is an accurate description of T.’s project. He asks deceptively simple questions which open up for a systematic study that unravels one strand in the development of generic conventions in hellenistic epigram as compared to pre-hellenistic epigram. Though there are other axes along which these epigrams could be studied, as T. himself recognizes, the ones chosen in ‘Look who’s talking’ are, to this reviewer’s mind, chosen well as they go to the very core of any communicative situation and concern the components without which no act of communication, whether actual or fictitious, can take place. Moreover, T. investigates the question of ‘to whom?’ on two levels, studying it both intratextually – the explicit or implicit addressee of the epigram, the ‘passerby’, in T.’s terms, not, however, implied reader as T. suggests (14) – and extratextually – the ancient reader of the epigram in T.’s terms. Although this reviewer is not quite convinced that T.‘s analysis of the readerly responses and expectations actually steps beyond the text(s), the analyses of the separate epigrams and their play on the generic conventions are mostly convincing and always interesting.

The focus of T.’s study is the relationship between the speaker (the intratextual voice ‘heard’ in the epigram) and the actual ancient reader. ‘Reader’, rather than ‘hearer’, as epigram from the very start was written (inscribed) poetry. T.’s study of hellenistic epigrammatists’ innovative explorations of the generic traditions gains an additional dimension by his linking generic conventions not only to the author’s adherence to or manipulation of the literary tradition but also to the
reader’s horizon. A reader's understanding of a genre affects readerly expectations which in their turn influence authorial activities as authors are readers too. Since the speaker (the intratextual voice of the epigrams) and all epigrammatic characters – the inscribed object, the recipient divinity, the deceased, the dedicatee/erector/burier, and the passerby (these characters are defined on 12–15) – are studied on a strictly textual level, T.’s decision to focus on the relation between the speaker and the ancient reader can appear problematic for at least two reasons. Firstly, the whole study appears to have an unbalanced structure as its focus is on the relationship between intratextual and extratextual entities. Secondly, it can be questioned to what extent we today can examine «the ancient reader, that is, the person who visually perceives and attempts to make sense of the epigram, in whatever medium contains it – papyrus or stone» (9). However, these apprehensions are put to rest in the course of the study, the first one rather quickly as it becomes apparent that T.’s ancient reader is actually a modern construction on the basis of the epigrams themselves. T. is only interested in those few characteristics of the ancient reader that guide how he or she determines the questions 'who is talking? about what? to whom?' when reading the hellenistic literary epigrams.

These characteristics of the reader, or rather these readerly assumptions and expectations, are reconstructed in the first chapter, which is the foundation for the rest of the study. Here T. first describes the five above mentioned characters of pre-hellenistic epigrams that can perform the three functions of speaker, addressee and the object talked about, and next he sketches ten guidelines according to which «the ancient reader would have determined the speaker and addressee of an inscribed epigram» (15). Fig. 13 on p. 56 summarizes these guidelines for reading pre-hellenistic epigram. Readers of hellenistic epigrams were helped by their understanding of the guidelines that could be applied to pre-hellenistic epigram, as hellenistic literary epigram derives from pre-hellenistic inscribed epigram, as hellenistic epigrammatists are dependent on their pre-hellenistic predecessors, and as the epigrammatists continued to use the speech conventions established in epigrams inscribed on objects – the traditional meters continued to be used as well as deictic markers referring to monuments, objects and settings that were no longer at hand, and the familiar characters continued to speak, to be spoken about, and to be addressed. The remaining twelve chapters before the conclusion fall into three parts.

Chapters 2–7 examine issues related to speaker and addressee and explore the epigrammatists’ creative play with the conventions by manipulating the generic conventions and testing the limits and functions of the epigrammatic characters. Starting with a survey of how the conventions described in the first chapter are used in hellenistic epigram to establish the epigrammatic genre in the new medium by using explicit references to and descriptions of the ‘inscribed’ monuments etc. to overcompensate for the lost inscriptionsal context (chapter 2), each chapter explores one theme in a roughly chronological order. The passerby as addressee, as speaker and in other situations (chapter 3), innovations in dedicatory epigram by introducing conventions from sepulchral epigram, unusual dedications and attitudes of the recipient deity (chapter 4), other innovations in se-
pulchral epigram (chapter 5), dedicatory and sepulchral conventions in erotic epigram (chapter 6), and innovations in epigram of ritual instruction and epigram of advertisement (chapter 7). In these chapters T. brings out the hellenistic epigrammatists’ habit of introducing traditional characters performing new functions and of confusing the subgenres by mixing their markers. T.’s analysis of these themes constantly brings to the fore the ties between the hellenistic innovations and the pre-hellenistic form of the epigram and shows how the presence of multiple markers in one epigram would trigger contradictory expectations in readers.

Chapter 8, on ‘writtenness’ and ‘spokenness’ in epigram, treats an issue that has been at the very core of the genre from its beginning: the fact of its being written words communicating – speaking? – with a reader – hearer? Pre-hellenistic epigrammatists showed an awareness of the puzzling communicative situation of the epigram: written speech answering the questions of the reader/hearer. T. examines how their hellenistic successors continue to explore and bring out the paradoxes of the voiceless (statue/stone) speaking with a tireless voice when spoken to (cf. Sapph. 1 Gow-Page = AP 6.269, cited on p. 151). This chapter forms a transition to the next major part of the study.

Finally, after the exploration of the questions ‘who’s talking?’ and ‘to whom?’ in chapters 2–8, chapters 9–13 turn to the final question of this study: ‘about what?’. Hellenistic epigram, no longer inscribed though still written poetry, had shed its connection to the object at hand, present then and there, that would have been the subject ‘about which’ of a pre-hellenistic epigram. Nevertheless, literary hellenistic epigram, particularly the dedicatory and sepulchral one, had retained the conceit of being attached to an object that is spoken about. The deictic markers are the same in literary epigram as in the inscribed one, though they lack (visible) extratextual references. In these chapters T. looks into the various ways in which hellenistic epigrammatists explore the boundaries between object and the thing the object represents playing on the referentiality, the representationality and reality of the object spoken about. This part begins with epigrams that suggest that the thing spoken about is not a representation but the real thing – in the same way as pre-hellenistic epigram could fail to uphold the distinction between a statue and the person it represented (chapter 9). Next, T. turns to study a number of epigrams that in their several ways do uphold the distinction between representation and reality – like René Magritte’s ‘The treachery of images’ with its realistic representation of a pipe and its well known statement «Ceci n’est pas une pipe» painted under the pipe reminding of the difference between representation and reality – but that test the theme of representationality and exploit it to the extreme. The chapters focus on separate themes on this broader issue: resemblance that is so exact that statue can hardly be distinguished from person (chapter 10), statue described as a statue but in terms that apply to a person (chapter 11), Callimachus’ ironic acceptance of the pre-hellenistic notion of equating representation with reality only to push the equation too far and thereby show that there is no equation (chapter 12), and slippage between identification and representation in epigrammatic aetiologies (chapter 13).
In the course of the book, T. presents his readers with many close readings and analyses of both hellenistic and pre-hellenistic epigrams; these are always suggestive even on those few occasions when this reviewer jotted a question mark in the margins as the analysis did not quite convince. In fact, the explorations of the separate themes are based on close readings of individual epigrams; these readings could be used as a literary commentary to complement other commentaries. The authors that feature most prominently throughout are Callimachus, Theocritus, Asclepiades, and Posidippus. But the exploration of a theme often begins with the first (revolutionary) steps of Moero, Nossis, and Anyte among others. This review cannot go into the details of T.’s analyses of the individual epigrams, other than to point out that the persistent application of a readerly perspective in approaching the epigrams is their main merit. By adhering to what can be called linear reading – reading the epigram as if it is for the first time, as if the reader does not jump ahead in the text at hand, and as if he or she is familiar with the conventions of the epigrammatic genre – T. shows repeatedly that many of the innovations and effects of surprise in hellenistic epigram are due to the epigrammatists toying with readerly expectations and not following through along that path that was suggested at the beginning of an epigram. One example to illustrate this point. Callimachus 34 Gow–Page = Epigr. 2 Pfeiffer = AP 7.80 is an epigram that has been deemed to be lacking any epigrammatic features and viewed as a final stage in the development of epigram from inscription to literature (cf. pp. 200f with refs.). Indeed, today the epigram almost has to be read that way: Εἶπε τίς, Ἡράκλειτε, τεὸν μόρον, ἐς δέ με δάκρυ ἔγαγεν κτλ. ‘Someone, Heraclitus, mentioned your fate, and brought a tear to my eye’. The most natural reading is to view this as the beginning of a conversation. T., however, shows that there are a number of sepulchral features in the epigram, and – most importantly – that it at the beginning is far more ambiguous than it appears in modern printed editions of the text. The ancient reader would not have the diacritics that guide the modern reader to his or her immediate and apparently clear understanding of the epigram. Take away the accents, and the epigram could just as easily – and perhaps even more easily – be read as just another sepulchral epigram: Εἰπὲ τίς κτλ. ‘Tell me who’. This, too, is the beginning of a conversation, but it suggests a far more traditional type of dialogue in the context of (literary) sepulchral epigrams: that between the passerby and the gravestone. However, as the reading progresses, the reader is forced to return to the beginning, to reread the text, and to reassess the initial understanding of the first few words of the epigram and to take them as a complete statement rather than as an exhortation and invitation to dialogue. The full extent of the witty play on readerly expectations appears only through linear reading from the horizon of the ancient reader.
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