Chapter 3, 'The Epic Cycle and Homer', points out that allegedly 'late' themes in the Cycle (e.g. immortality, the supernatural, Eros) are present to some degree also in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and could often be argued as early. Rather than being derivative and uninspired, the more straightforward 'Cyclic' style may express an aesthetic more like that of the *Homeric Hymns* and Hesiodic catalogue poetry. These stylistic features may suggest the 'norm or original nature' (p. 169) of the Trojan War tradition from which the Homeric poems evolved.

The negative results of this book are impressive, as Burgess demonstrates the multiple levels on which Homer worship has been built into scholarship, both ancient and modern. His trenchant dismantling of the claims for early Homeric influence shows the rare gift of handling texts and images in tandem and with equal acumen. His reconstructions of early poetic culture rely on some highly controversial theories of Nagy, but are theoretically sophisticated and hardly more speculative than the myth (of Homer) that they replace. He carries his point that not even the Homeric epics are well served by being praised, needlessly, at the expense of related traditions that have much yet to offer.

Amherst College FREDERICK T. GRIFFITHS

SOLON'S POLITICAL POEMS

C. MÜLKE: *Solons politische Elegien und Iamben (Fr. 1–13; 32–37 West). Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar.* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 177.) Pp. 414. Munich and Leipzig: K. G. Saur, 2002. Cased. ISBN: 3-598-77726-4.

Mülke's book is a revised Tübingen dissertation accepted in late 2000 and directed by Kannicht. Unlike many dissertations, which should not appear in book form so soon after completion, this one is fully deserving of publication. It combines thoroughness with sound critical judgement, and is a major contribution to the study of Solon's poetry.

For the most part, M. adopts West's text. I have noticed nine departures, but only a few are of any consequence. He rightly rejects West's daggering of ὠιδήν in fr. 1.2, retains Aristotle's ἀπαρκεῖ in fr. 5.1, prefers ἄτη over ἄτηι in fr. 13.13, and retains ἀρχὴ δ' ἐξ ὀλίγου in fr. 13.14. All these readings are defended with cogent arguments. Where the text of the *Ath. Pol.* is uncertain, he has examined the papyrus in person and recorded what can be deciphered.

There are few omissions in the bibliography, but it would have been more convenient if a number of references had been listed in the bibliography rather than cited only on a particular passage. In some instances a reference is cited in full several times but omitted in the bibliography. An extreme example is Demont's *La cité grecque . . .*, which appears with full title, including the series, three times on one page (p. 154).

I do not feel competent to pass judgement on the historical and political aspects of the commentary, but my impression is that in these areas he frequently goes on at greater length than is necessary. In his treatment of controversial passages I generally feel that he is right, or at least has given the most plausible explanation. There are, however, a few passages where I should like to take issue. One is fr. 13.73. After stating that no limit to wealth lies revealed and that those who have the greatest livelihood strive to double it, Solon asks: τίς ἂν κορέσειεν ἅπαντας; M. rejects the view held by

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

some, including myself, that τίς here means 'what' (wealth or livelihood), claiming that the 'emotionale Charakter der rhetorischen Frage legt es nicht nahe, nach einem konkreten Bezugswort für τίς zu suchen, etwa πλοῦτος bzw. βίος'. It seems to me that the 'emotionale Charakter' is just as strong either way. According to M., the answer to the question would presumably be, 'no one can satisfy everyone', but in the context it is surely more natural and logical to supply the answer, 'no wealth can satisfy everyone'. I remain unconvinced that any specific imagery is intended in ἐκ νεάτου πυθμένος ἐς κορυφήν (fr. 13.10). After listing the various identifications that have been proposed, M. argues for 'von tiefsten Meeresgrunde bis zum Gipfel'. I do not think that adequate support for this view is provided by the fact that κορυφή is often a mountain top and that πόντου . . . πυθμένα appears later in v. 20. Similarly, I doubt that in Γῆ μέλαινα (fr. 36.5) the adjective represents 'die Erde als nährerin' or has any specific reference. In any event, M. should have cited the discussion by E. Irwin, *Colour Terms in Greek Poetry* (Toronto, 1976), pp. 189–93.

Such objections are, however, of relatively minor significance. After an initial reading of his commentary on several other passages I felt uneasy about the conclusions he reached, but on reflection I found his arguments hard to refute. It should also be noted that where there is doubt M. is not afraid to admit that there is simply not enough evidence to support a particular position. Not only does he discuss all aspects of the passage in question, but he also provides a very thorough account of the meaning of such controversial words as ἄτη, ὕβρις, κόρος, δίκη, and εὐνομίη. Some might complain that too many parallel passages are cited in full, but it is a convenience to be able to see immediately how relevant the parallels are. The introduction is fairly brief (pp. 9–21), but given the nature of his commentary, greater length is unnecessary. In short, this is a book that deserves very high praise. I hope that M. now turns his attention to the remaining fragments of Solon's poetry.

University of Western Ontario DOUGLAS E. GERBER

WHAT IS IAMBIC?

A. Cavarzere, A. Aloni, A. Barchiesi (edd.): *Iambic Ideas. Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire*. Pp. xiv + 263. Lanham, Boulder, New York, and Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002. Paper, £20.95. ISBN: 0-7425-0817-X.

The volume under review collects twelve essays on Greek and Latin iambic poetry, based on papers presented at a 1988 conference hosted by the University of Trento. According to the editors, the project was occasioned by two lacks—first, the lack of a 'comprehensive and updated account of iambic poetry from its origins to late antiquity', and secondly, 'the lack of interaction and dialogue' among the various subdisciplines of classical studies (p. xi). I am not sure that the volume quite fills either of these lacks; it is nonetheless an interesting and welcome contribution.

The scope of the collection is extensive, covering a period of about 1400 years, with essays on early Greek iambic (Ewen Bowie), Sappho (Antonio Aloni), Alcaeus (Angela M. Andrisano), Aristophanes (Guiseppe Zanetto), Callimachus (Lowell Edmunds), Ennius (Alessandro Russo), Catullus (Stephen J. Heyworth), three on Horace (Alessandro Barchiesi, Stephen J. Harrison, and Lindsay Watson), Phaedrus (Alberto Cavarzere), and late antique iambic (Gianfranco Agosti). A few of the

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press