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/53.2.279 Published online by Cambridge University Press

authors considered are somewhat marginal to the tradition of iambic poetry—Sappho, for example—but their inclusion here serves to put the discussion into a larger context. It is unfortunate, however, that a few more relevant authors—such as Martial—have been missed.

A persistent theme of the collection is the definition of iambic, and the collection as a whole can be seen as an exercise in generic criticism. It is perhaps odd therefore that the several of the essays show some lack of a general theoretical underpinning. The editors remark that they 'have invited the contributors to be constantly aware that the borders and perimeters of what counts as iambic in antiquity should be a dynamic problem, not the result of a definitive mapping' (p. xii). Their point is well taken, but the instability of the iambic genre is in no way unusual. One might almost say that the only stable genre is a dead genre. Iambic is hardly more stable than epic, say, or tragedy. The continuity of a genre's identity is a matter of history, tradition, and artistic practice—not a monofilament, but a rope made of a succession of intertwined fibers. The occasional lack of theoretical perspective may account for a tendency in some essays to extend the concept of iambic a bit far, as if any kind of invective, in lyric and even in prose, could legitimately be considered iambic.

Nonetheless, the discussion of particular works in the essays is at a very high level, as the authors explore the boundaries of iambic or the possible presence of iambic features in other genres. Bowie, for example, notes that invective seems to be absent from some early poetry written in iambic metres, and he argues that in early iambic, narrative is as much a generic characteristic as invective. Although the material he has to make his case is fragmentary, he adduces a good deal of evidence to support his case. The nature of the connection between iambic metre and iambic invective is a persistent problem, not only in the archaic period; and the relationship of form and content is a problem in the definition of many genres—perhaps most. Moreover, it is possible (as Bowie grants) that some of the narrative in early iambic is actually in the service of invective: how better to attack your target than to tell a discreditable story about him? If so, the narrative element might seem in some instances a secondary characteristic.

It would be a mistake, however, to limit iambic to invective. The iambic tradition, as Heyworth notes in his essay on Catullan iambics, includes not only invective, but also 'the use of anecdote; passion in friendship and enmity; frankness of expression (especially in sexual matters); the importance accorded to literary judgements' (p. 130). Although there is probably no single element which can unite all of these elements, it is possible to see them as forming an interlocking network of subjects.

In his discussion of Callimachean iambic, Edmunds considers generic changes occasioned by the change from orality to literacy. Because the audience is replaced by a reader, the immediate identification of the personae of the invective is no longer possible; oral invective must be concise and relatively simple, but a literary invective can extend its themes and complicate both its form and its style; and the context of literary invective can be the other poems in a book.

Generic change is often caused by the reaction of a later writer to the tradition or even to one specific earlier writer in the genre. Many of the essays in the collection discuss this process: Edmunds discusses the way Callimachus uses and redefines the iambic of Hipponax; Heyworth discusses the way Catullus uses and redefines the iambic of Callimachus and Archilochus; Barchiesi discusses the way Horace uses and redefines the iambic of Archilochus, Callimachus, and Catullus. The process of generic redefinition in theory and practice never stops.

Generic criticism is a central theme of the collection, but it is by no means its sole

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.279 Published online by Cambridge University Press

concern. It is not possible in a short review to do more than suggest the richness of critical comment in the various essays. Readers will turn to this volume not only for its overal account of the ancient iambic tradition, but also for discussion of particular poets and particular poems. The various authors employ a wide variety of critical strategies and methods: close reading of individual poems or fragments, philological discussion of particular programmatic words, historical and ideological analysis, comparison of the practice of two or more poets, survey of a group of poets in a period. I particularly enjoyed the essays on Horace and the survey of late antique iambic—a subject completely new to me—but each reader will find something worthwhile in this important collection.

York University, Toronto MATTHEW CLARK

TRAGIC VOICES

N. LORAUX: *The Mourning Voice. An Essay on Greek Tragedy. Translated by Elizabeth Trapnell Rawlings with a Foreword by Pietro Pucci*. (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 58.) Pp. xv + 127. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2002 (original French edition 1999). Cased, £23.50. ISBN: 0-8014-3830-6.

Much study of tragedy is still influenced by Nietzsche—or rather, by the tradition of which Nietzsche is the most notable proponent. Loraux's newly translated book—deriving from the Townsend lectures she delivered at Cornell University in 1993—is in this tradition, but unusual both in being explicitly Nietzschean and in being especially close to the specifics of Nietzsche's account in his *Birth of Tragedy*. She makes much of Nietzsche's notion of tragedy as a synthesis of the Dionysiac with the Apolline. For her, this duality is especially important in the expression of the voice in tragedy. Apollo is both incompatible in a sense with lamentation and yet in tragedy implicated in it (and consequently in the Dionysiac), a synthesis evident notably in the tragic figure of Cassandra. Irreducible contradiction is—again, as for Nietzsche—fundamental, so that the 'ultimate tragic figure' is the oxymoron, e.g. the hymn which becomes a lament at A. *Ag*. 709–11. She writes of 'the very ambiguity that constitutes tragedy itself' (p. 10).

And yet tragedy is for L. not 'apolitical' (as it is in effect for Nietzsche) but 'antipolitical', i.e. it embodies active opposition to the political. Behaviour is antipolitical if it 'diverts, rejects, or threatens, consciously or not, the obligations or prohibitions constituting the ideology of the city-state' (p. 26). Whereas the ideology of the city-state prizes clear discourse and restricts female lamentation, tragedy tends to subvert the former with the latter. Further, tragedy sets the 'always' of stubborn heroic emotion and of female lamentation against the 'always' that civic discourse embodies in the *polis*. In a section of great interest L. traces the tendency for the *aiei* ('always') of the tragic lament to be associated with the inarticulate *aiai* ('alas') that constitutes the extreme antithesis to the articulate clarity of civic discourse. The spectators of tragedy are being solicited less as members of a political body than as members of the 'race of mortals'.

L. regards her argument as 'a departure from the wholly political readings that have dominated studies of tragedy for several decades' (p. 14). Here one suspects confusion, between a reading that focuses on the relation of tragedy with the social and political

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.279 Published online by Cambridge University Press