

REVIEW ARTICLES  
ARTÍCULOS RESEÑA



IN THE BORDERLANDS BETWEEN GENRES:  
NOTES ON A RECENT VOLUME OF STUDIES ON GREEK  
IAMBUS AND ELEGY

Laura Swift – Chris Carey (eds.). *Iambus and elegy: new approaches*, Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2016, x+383 pp., \$135.00, ISBN 978-0-19-968974-3.

The book, dedicated to Martin West's memory, whose cutting-edge works on Greek elegy and iambus have been of crucial importance for anyone who wants to understand the different aspects of early Greek poetry, is a collection of 16 essays originating in a conference held at UCL in July 2012. Laura Swift and Chris Carey begin the book's short introduction (pp. 1-11) by explaining the choice of topics for its chapters and the organization of the contributions around four main issues in studying Greek lyric poetry, also including iambus and elegy: performance (*Poetry and Performance*, pp. 15-98), genre concept (*Charting Genre, Creating Traditions*, pp. 101-189), 'dialogism' (*Cultural Interactions*, pp. 193-270), and reception (*Ancient Receptions and Intertexts*, pp. 273-339). The volume, comprising independent articles about iambic and elegiac poems, contributed by E. Bowie, C. Nobili, D. Boedeker, D. Lavinge, A. Rotstein, Ch. Carey, D. Sider, Antonio Aloni and Alessandro Ianucci, A. Nicolosi, L. Lulli, M. Alexandrou, T. Hawkins, L. Swift, Ch. G. Brown, P. da Cunha Corrêa, and J. Nelson Hawkins, displays certain overriding themes and focuses, in particular a preoccupation with genre. Although the contributors interchangeably use the term 'poetic forms' and 'poetic genres' with reference to iambus and elegy, they challenge us to understand them almost synonymously in terms of a 'genetic code' which includes the features from inside and outside of texts, distinctive of what we call either iambus or elegy. The authors draw attention in a satisfactory way to the flexibility and the elastic nature of genre in the ancient world, and show that 'the tales we tell about genres' – to use Alessandro Barchiesi's neat phrase<sup>1</sup> – sometimes are weakly connected with literary genres themselves.

The main aim of the book is to define iambus and elegy. And even if this goal has not been conclusively achieved and the serious scholars – having

<sup>1</sup> A. Barchiesi, "Palingenre: Death, Rebirth and Horatian Iambos", in M. Paschalis, ed., *Horace and Greek Lyric Poetry*, Rethymnon 2002, 47.

in mind Martin West's image of a man with a revolver requiring him to say plainly how much of what he has collected in *Iambi et Elegi* he believes to have been called *iamboi* at the time of its composition<sup>2</sup> – will be repeating for a long time: 'we are still working on that!', the lasting benefit of this book for the reader consists in a closer acquaintance with the dynamics of both genres as well as in gaining a better sense of some methodological approaches to the ancient iambic and elegiac corpus.

The book is a timely work, providing a stimulating guide to the major points of scholarly discussions on definitional questions, suggestively attempting to elucidate the disjuncture between later ancient definitions of both genres and their distinctive features in the archaic period when they were originally circulating. The authors succeeded in maintaining the balance between the general and the specific. The same should be said about how they had managed to merge old and new. However, the book raises more new questions and takes fresh approaches in the chapters concerned first of all with the interpretations of particular elegiac or iambic pieces, especially with the newly discovered texts (e.g. Simonides' Plataea elegy, Archilochus' Telephus elegy), whereas in the parts of the book which contain considerations of the nature of archaic lyric poetry in a wide sense the authors look back to approaches which slowly, but determinedly, are becoming traditional. Harvey's<sup>3</sup> clear awareness of the contexts being 'the only safe benchmark to label poems'<sup>4</sup> in the archaic epoch, which has undoubtedly stood the test of time and totally affected the modern study of Greek lyric, lies at the heart of this volume also.

In what follows I will make only brief mention of some papers included in this rich and deeply researched study. I single them out as facing ancient texts that do not conform to our standard images of either elegy or of iambus, and endeavour to explain the unexpected, as one could say, 'deviations' from what we have got used to calling elegy or iambus<sup>5</sup>. Corresponding to these questions, I will then reconsider the current orthodoxy concerning the boundaries between literary genres in the performance culture and among the Alexandrians. And I will finish my article with offering some

<sup>2</sup> M. L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, Berlin 1974, 3.

<sup>3</sup> A. E. Harvey, "The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry", *CQ* 5, 1955, 157-175.

<sup>4</sup> As Cecilia Nobili has caught the point on p. 33 of the volume.

<sup>5</sup> Others which I do not discuss in detail are: D. Boedeker, *Coarse Poetics: Listening to Hipponax*, pp. 56-73, D. Lavigne, *Archilochus and Homer in the Rhapsodic Context*, pp. 74-98, A. Rotstein, *The Ancient Literary History of Iambos*, pp. 101-121, A. Aloni, A. Ianucci, *Writing Solon*, pp. 155-173, M. Alexandrou, *Mythological Narratives in Hipponax*, pp. 210-228, T. Hawkins, *Bupalus in Scheria: Hipponax's Odyssean*, pp. 229-252, L. Swift, *Poetics and Precedents in Archilochus' Erotic Imagery*, pp. 253-270, Ch. G. Brown, *Warding off a Hailstorm of Blood: Pindar on Martial Elegy*, pp. 273-290, P. da Cunha Corrêa, *The 'Ship of Fools' in Euenus 8b and Plato's Republic 488a-489a*, pp. 291-309, J. Nelson Hawkins, *Anger, Bile, and the Poet's Body in Archilochean Tradition*, pp. 310-339.

remarks concerning the interpretation of Archil. Fr 1 W., intended to be supplementary to that presented by Anica Nicolosi on pp. 177-8 of the volume. Both points of debate, chosen here as an example only, are intended to show that the book is entirely successful in at least one of its projected aims: to stimulate the process of further research (see p. 11 of the volume).

Ewen Bowie and Cecilia Nobili in their carefully constructed essays substantially modify our relatively monolithic understanding of elegy as mostly sympotic and totally monodic poetry. Bowie's hypothesis of the existence of cultic space for performing elegiac poems with mythological narration (chapter *Cultic Contexts for Elegiac Performance*, pp. 15-32), suggested by him over 30 years ago<sup>6</sup>, is now developed and convincingly supported by the newly discovered material (Archilochus' 'Telephus' and Simonidean Plataea elegies). Although he modestly calls the results of his investigations 'fragile speculations' (p. 31), in fact his suggestions come as near to a solution of the problem of the occasion of performing long narrative elegies as seems possible at the moment. Nobili in her clearly written concise piece (*Choral Elegy: The Tyranny of the Handbook*, pp. 33-55) shows the importance of the *riuso* for shifting the mode of elegiac performance from monodic to choral, and argues that such shifts were generated by local (Messenian, Spartan) traditions. The important result of Bowie's and Nobili's papers is the emergence of elegy as a genre existing in the borderlands, between religious and 'secular' space as well as between solo and group production. This unifying thread (the inclination towards thinking with the idea of a borderland when trying to tackle elegy's and iambus' generic status) is also visible in the succinct chapters devoted to the connections between these genres and other poetic forms. David Sider (*Simonides' Personal Elegies*, pp. 140-154) gives a good discussion of the decrease of the distance between sympotic elegy and epigram. He is successful in arguing that Simonides' easy movement between elegy and epigram might have influenced the ancient scholarly confusion in attributing his poems to both categories. Sider insightfully discourses about Simonides' poems, but what he said has relevance also to other poets who composed in elegiacs. He adds supporting evidence to the view of 'friendly collaboration' between elegy and epigram, expressed over the last years by a number of scholars<sup>7</sup>. His attempts to shed light on the transmission history do justice to the varied nature of both poetic forms, but one should not, however, underrate the role of deep difference in communicative structure between them. I found myself very sympathetic to Antonio Aloni's diagnosis who says: "while much

<sup>6</sup> E. L. Bowie, "Early Greek Elegy, Symposium, and Public Festival", *JHS* 106, 1986, 13-35.

<sup>7</sup> See B. Gentili, "Epigramma ed elegia", in *L'Épigramme grecque*, Entretiens sur L'Antiquité Classique, 14, 1968, 37-90, and – more recently – A. Aloni, A. Ianucci, *L'elegia greca e l'epigramma dalle origini al V secolo. Con un'appendice sulla 'nuova' elegia di Archiloco*, Firenze 2007.

of elegy has a dialogical structure and is open to reuse and continuation, epigram maintains a character of completeness and invites reflection and appreciation more than a reply”<sup>8</sup>. A sort of osmotic relationship, as Laura Lulli calls the character of the links between elegy and epic in her chapter *Elegy and Epic: A Complex Relationship* (pp. 193–209), presented here as the cross-fertilization between both genres, produces a fruitful perspective. Lulli offers clues about how elegies functioned in the ‘here and now’ of a literary environment dominated by epic. She is interested in the thematic (in)dependence of elegy in its relationship to epic rather than in the linguistic or metrical similarities of both genres, which gives a welcome fresh look at the important issue of poetic interactions in the archaic and classical period. Lulli’s essay is a worthy contribution to the on-going discussion of how ancient genres interact with and influence each other. She clearly puts emphasis on the use of epic tropes and themes by elegiac poets in their shaping a totally new kind of composition (as she calls elegy, p. 208), but also rightly treats purely metrical and linguistic features as tools employed by elegists to achieve the same goals (p. 208). Lulli obviously, and rightly, treats this employment as poets’ deliberate strategy, not being, however, the first to do so, as the editors seem to suggest in the *Introduction*, (see p. 8: “earlier scholarship tended to assume that this was done in an unreflective adherence to tradition”). The importance of epic formulaic practices in early elegy for creating new meaningful messages was already noticed, even by the scholars strongly focusing their attention on linguistic and metrical matters<sup>9</sup>. It would perhaps be interesting to address also the problem signalled by Pietro Giannini who, following Küllenberg<sup>10</sup>, states that “i poeti elegiaci nell’esametro seguono l’esempio omerico, e nell’elegiaco si imitano reciprocamente”<sup>11</sup>, since these ‘intra-elegiac’ interactions do not seem entirely without significance.

But let us shift the focus to iambus for a while (I certainly do not want to hear Xantias’ complains here) and another type of borderland. Chris Carey’s central concern (*Mapping Iambos: Mining the Minor Talents*, pp. 122–139) is defining the ‘core’ iambus through looking at minor iambists, i.e. those beyond the canon or moved to the borderlands. Examining the extant testimonia concerning the non-canonical authors<sup>12</sup>, he draws the

<sup>8</sup> A. Aloni, “Elegy: Forms, functions and communication”, in F. Budelmann, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*, Cambridge 2009, 182. I do not believe that Sider is unaware of his work, although he does not cite it in the footnotes.

<sup>9</sup> E.g. by R. Scott Garner, *Traditional Elegy. Tradition and Context in Early Greek Poetry*, Oxford 2011, 87–8, to mention only one.

<sup>10</sup> R. Küllenberg, *De imitatione theognidea*, Diss. Argentorati, 1877, 49.

<sup>11</sup> P. Giannini, “Espressioni formulari nell’elegia greca arcaica”, *QUCC* 16, 1973, 7–78; esp. 9.

<sup>12</sup> Although Carey examines the evidence for early minor iambists belonging to the same tradition as Archilochus, Semonides, and Hipponax, the question of the character of Sappho’s

contours of the genre in both a literal (geographic) and a metaphorical sense. Starting from the view that classical Athenian comedy depicted, in a way, the popular perception of various poetical forms, he argues that comedy does much to reinforce the distinction between what was beyond the sideline and what was accepted as a typical iambic poem. The discussion on some key themes recurring in the remains of iambic, canonical and non-canonical, authors sharpens our understanding of the genre. Carey's study dealing with the dynamics of the iambic code shows that the divergences in the treatment of 'iambic' features must have been understood as a kind of sophistication by which the poet expresses his own skill within a framework recognizable and comprehensible by the audience<sup>13</sup>. At the end of his study Carey pays attention to a very close connection between the early iambus and its Hellenistic revival "in the sense of the return to particular readings of the roots of the form" (p. 139), which neatly harmonizes with modern approaches to the problem<sup>14</sup>. Carey's analysis also helpfully penetrates the relationship between the canonization and conservation of texts. Some readers, however, might regard as too extreme his suggestion that there is a necessary correlation between them. As Roberto Nicolai, on the margin of his recent considerations on the canon and its boundaries, has reminded<sup>15</sup>: "not all non-canonical works were lost, and not all canonical works were preserved".

The basis of the contributors' approach derives from the nowadays unquestionable view that in the archaic period the identifying of genres was associated with discerning the affinities of the occasion and the mode of performance of a set of poems whereas the recognition of genre in later epochs deals with tracing within the poems features prescribed for genres by postclassical taxonomists. Consequently, the structuring of certain generic

---

poems classified by some ancient authors (*Sud.* 107 Adler = test. 235 Voigt, *Jul. Epist.* 10) as *iamboi*, would be perhaps of relevance in his discussion on the 'core' iambus in the archaic and classical period. For this see E. Degani, *Studi su Ipponatte*, Bari 1984, 79.

<sup>13</sup> It would be perhaps worth noting that this substantial opinion on the character of the dynamics of genre was clearly expressed by Carey, in the wider context of archaic choral lyric, in his review of C. O. Pavese's book on motifs and themes of Greek choral poetry, see C. Carey, "Motif Index. C.O. Pavese, *I temi e motivi della lirica corale ellenica. Introduzione, analisi e indice semantematici, Alcmane, Simonide, Pindaro, Bacchilide*, Pisa 1997", *CR* 51, 2001, 232: "the dynamics of genre, which consists not of the poet's manipulation of a finite set of motifs, but of individual styles created out of shaped expectations through recurrent negotiations between poets and audiences in an environment of emulation and rivalry".

<sup>14</sup> See E. Lelli, *Callimaco. Giambi XIV-XVII*, Roma 2005, 22: "Pare (...) che la definizione ἱαμβοῖν indicasse già per Callimaco più un legame semantico e tematico con la (variegata) tradizione arcaica e classica del genere – dunque contenuti *personali* e *occasional* rispetto, ad es., alla solennità dell'*epos* – che una notazione rigidamente metrica".

<sup>15</sup> R. Nicolai, "The Canon and Its Boundaries", in G. Colesanti, M. Giordano, ed., *Submerged Literature in Ancient Culture. An Introduction*, Berlin 2014, 45.

expectations, as I elsewhere called<sup>16</sup> the process of formulation genre rules, must have appealed, in these two epochs, to different types of recipients' awareness. So it is obvious that the performance-oriented thinking about genres in the oral phase of Greek culture does not match the way of thinking about genres by readers in the textual phase of it<sup>17</sup>. No wonder either, that the generic laws astutely subsumed by Rossi under the label *leggi non scritte, ma rispettate* often happen to be divergent from those 'written, but not respected'<sup>18</sup>. The current research on the questions around ancient genres' conceptualizations in ancient Greece, is providing, with dozens of books and papers published on this subject every year all over the world, more and more precise contextualization of the idea of genre in the culture of the archaic face-to-face society<sup>19</sup> and the post-classical culture dominated by the contact with the texts. However, it appears that in the on-going discussions on this important topic a relatively little attention has been paid to the distinction between 'flexibility' and 'rigidity' as characteristics of the process of categorizing genres in the real-life situations of the archaic period and later, in times of textual, rhetorical, readers' experiences<sup>20</sup>. Although Chris Carey, summarizing what has hitherto been said about the nature of genres in the earliest period, pointed out that "the boundaries [between genres] are not fixed but elastic, porous, negotiable and provisional" and that "literary genres are best seen not as fixed categories but as tendencies"<sup>21</sup>, showing a path to be followed in order to deepen our understanding of ancient conceptualization of genres, some expansion of the topic is needed. It appears that the flexibility of features recognizable as characteristic of a certain generic form or – let us say – the adaptability of some features recognized typical of a certain generic category for another poetic type was less lower where the context of performance remained similar<sup>22</sup>. By contrast, generic change in the Hellenistic epoch – when the prescriptive generic rules were relatively rigid – was bigger

<sup>16</sup> K. Bartol, "Structuring the Genre: the 5<sup>th</sup>- and 4<sup>th</sup>-Century Authors on Elegy and Elegiac Poets", in B. Currie, I. Rutherford, eds., *The Reception and Transmission of Greek Lyric Poetry, 600 BC – 400 AD*, (forthcoming).

<sup>17</sup> As we are reminded by Depew's, Obbink's and others' enquiry into matrices of genre, see M. Depew, D. Obbink, *Introduction*, in M. Depew, D. Obbink, eds., *Matrices of Genre. Authors, Canons, and Society*, Cambridge (Mass.)-London 2000, 1-6. See also A. Ercolani, "Defining the Indefinable: Greek Submerging Literature and Some Problems of Terminology", in Colesanti, Giordano, *Submerged Literature*, 12, 16.

<sup>18</sup> L. Rossi, "I generi letterari e le loro leggi scritte e non scritte", *BICS* 18, 1971, 52-71.

<sup>19</sup> See Nicolai's remarks on the application of this term to the archaic Greece, Nicolai, "The Canon", 35-6.

<sup>20</sup> See Cairns' distinction of generic categories, F. Cairns, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*, revised edition Ann Arbor 2007, 70-71.

<sup>21</sup> Ch.Carey, "Genre, occasion and performance", in Budelmann, *The Cambridge Companion*, 22; 21-38.

<sup>22</sup> See M. Fantuzzi, R. Hunter, *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*, Cambridge 2004, 21.



and more spectacular in the unitary reading milieu. This resulted in different types of 'interactions' of generic features. In the case of the archaic flexibility we have to do with genre bending, whereas to the Hellenistic presupposed rigidity the idea of genre blending seems more applicable. The first happens when one genre spontaneously, in a certain reality of its performance, includes non-standard features which change it, but not fundamentally transform it. The second goes a step further, and the incorporated elements are mixed and inseparably joined with the typical ones. Genre bending smoothly turns a genre in a particular new direction, and genre blending leads to obtaining a new quality. Both processes vary in the character of the poets' intentions and the recipients' judgments of these two types of contamination<sup>23</sup>. The artists introduced changes according to the demands of a specific occasion they are composing for, and the audience in the oral/aural culture recognize them as confronted with the rules of traditional poetic practice<sup>24</sup>. In the book culture the poets blended genres in order to show off their own intellect, erudition and taste for experimentation<sup>25</sup>, whereas the readers eagerly sought for the discovery of these experimentations, since such a discovery was treated as a confirmation of their knowledge and the exhibition of an astute understanding of the nexus between old and new<sup>26</sup>. We can say that 'patterns of bending' and 'patterns of blending' are crucial for recognizing the efficacy of genre's conceptualizations at different periods of antiquity. Its essence in the archaic epoch lies in the yielding of adaptability to the infinite particular situations in which poets actually use some generic features, whereas the efficacy of the *modus operandi* of genres rooted in the community of scholars in the postclassical times is determined by the rules of taxonomy and classification. Anyway, the idea of ceaseless change decisively has an important status as a basis for defining genres in ancient Greece. It seems that the emphasis on the dynamics<sup>27</sup> rather than looking for what was fixed should be a welcome direction for the development of further studies on genre. The contributors of the volume *Iambus and Elegy* evidently have taken this direction.

The idea of blending naturally has a broad range of references and might successfully be employed, as an exegetical tool, also in the detailed interpretation of some earlier pieces. In the volume which I am reflecting

<sup>23</sup> For the discussion of various aspects of this conceptual tool see A. Barchiesi, "The Crossing", in S. J. Harrison, ed., *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics. Scholarship, Theory, and Classical Literature*, Oxford 2001, 142-163.

<sup>24</sup> See R. Palmisciano, "Submerged Literature in an Oral Culture", in Colesanti, Giordano, *Submerged Literature*, 19-32, esp. 23-25 where he speaks about "the occasion as a moment of environmental learning".

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Fantuzzi, Hunter, *Tradition*, 18.

<sup>26</sup> I.e. a part of *paideia*, competitive performance of education, as T. Whitmarsh, *Ancient Greek Literature*, Malden 2004, 142, 158, calls the phenomenon.

<sup>27</sup> Tracing the trajectory of features' movement, to refer to Kantzios' terminology, I. Kantzios, *The Trajectory of Archaic Greek Trimeters*, Leiden 2005.

on here, the chapter written by Anica Nicolosi witnesses to the liveliness of this approach (*Archilochus' Elegiac Fragments: Textual and Exegetical Notes*, pp. 174-189). She summarizes her understanding of Archil. Fr. 1 W.: "(...) he [Archilochus] uses the traditional elements to create a distinctive identity which both blends the literary with the actual and unites disparate but complementary strands in the epic tradition" (p. 178). Nicolosi tries to trace Archilochus' way of creating dynamic effects by the deployment of Homeric terminology and offers a range of thought-provoking insights drawn from an impressive analysis of elegiac body of Archilochean output. She judiciously avoided the trap of discovering too many literary allusions or rhetorical juggling, when suggesting 'a consistent degree of sophistication and subtlety in form and content' (p. 189) in the surviving elegies of the Parian poet. However, in the case of fr. 1 W. she seems to fail to note the chiasmic order of the phrases which characterize Archilochus' experiences within this elegant distich, which might have formed a complete poem. The chiasmus appears to be, apart from using the epic language, a key to our understanding of the couplet. 'I am the servant' (A) 'of the lord Enyalios' (B) and 'in the lovely gift of the Muses' (B) '[I am] skilled' (A) forms a kind of antithesis. The emphasis, however, does not lie on opposing or evaluating<sup>28</sup> the professions themselves (B-B), but on contrasting the nature of both of them (A-A). The opposition: soldiering – practicing poetry indicates some introductory points which are referred to in the second, more important, contrast, namely between the meaning of *θεράπων* and *ἐπιστάμενος*. The first opposition stresses the soldier's and poet's different emotional attitudes towards their activities (soldiering intimidates, composing poems gives pleasure<sup>29</sup>); the second describes the kind of involvement in exercising both professions or required competences. The noun *θεράπων* points to a person who executes others' commands whereas the participle *ἐπιστάμενος* refers to someone who possesses a skill of his own and is able to make decisions and choices<sup>30</sup>. It seems that the chiasmus, consciously used by the poet here, is intended to lead to Archilochus' self-presentation as a poet. And this self-presentation,

<sup>28</sup> See D. A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric Poetry. A Selection of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac, and Iambic Poetry*, Bristol 1982, 140: "The fact that he mentions his soldiering before his poetry is quite unimportant", E. Degani, G. Burzacchini, *Lirici greci*, Firenze 1977, 22: "Archiloco si proclama ad un tempo soldato e poeta (senza privilegiare ... la prima attività alla seconda)". So Nicolosi is right when saying (p. 178 of the volume): "the latter represents a necessary completion of the first"; but see G. F. Gianotti, *Il canto dei Greci. Antologia della lirica*, Torino 1978, 113: "Archiloco si presenta di duplice veste, di soldato e di poeta (e primaria sembra essere la sua qualità di soldato)"

<sup>29</sup> See J. Verdenius, "The Principle of Greek Literary Criticism", *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 46-50.

<sup>30</sup> For epic examples of such a meaning of the first word see *Il.* 1.321, *Od.* 4.23; 13.253; 16.253, of the second *Il.* 7.317; 24.623; *Od.* 2.611; 4.231; 5.245; 11.368; 17.341; 19.422; 20.159, 161; 21.406.

new and in a way provocative (it deliberately teases the audience with the apparent epic loan<sup>31</sup>), made with the ‘Homeric’ tools, is the clue of the poem. Noting the chiasmus in Archilochus Fr. 1 W.<sup>32</sup> has the exegetical consequences since it artfully shifts the poet’s concern from traditionally epic ideal to the lyric experience of an individual. The ability of Archilochus to organize his thoughts by employment of such devices like a chiasmus should not surprise anyone any more. As Robert Fowler has impressively shown, the logical organization of archaic lyric poems was gained by using simple devices (ring-composition, antithesis, parallelism, etc.), not requiring, when used in oral environment, a great degree of sophistication<sup>33</sup>. Archilochus’ Fr. 1 W. is only one from among a great number of archaic examples of such an employment.

To conclude, let us come back to the volume edited by Laura Swift and Chris Carey as a whole and ask: what do the core value of this book consist in? First, in providing the reader with an informative and thoroughgoing account of interactivity between iambus and elegy and other kinds of early Greek poetry. Second, in presenting sensitive readings of elegiac and iambic poems, especially of the new material which still deserves further attention from various points of view. The book is not aimed at the uninitiated reader. The contributors assume much prior familiarity with the subject. The volume adds very much that is original to the current scholarship on iambus and elegy. Nevertheless if one would try (why not?!) to judge its value also by the genre-reflecting advisory series’ standards<sup>34</sup>, the book appears – perhaps surprisingly – equally useful as a reference tool, which helps readers looking for a lucid treatment of Greek iambic and elegiac poetry to find what will satisfy them. Finally, I would like to say that the best closing sentence of this note would be the confession that I agree with Malcolm Heath’s succinct answer to the question of the volume’s value: “Overall, this is a rewarding collection”<sup>35</sup>.

KRYSTYNA BARTOL

Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań  
krbartol@amu.edu.pl

<sup>31</sup> Campbell, *Greek Lyric Poetry*, 141 was fooled by that saying: “Μουσέων is to be taken with θεράπων” and recalling Hesiod’s *Theogony* 99-100, *Margites*, 2 and *Hymn.Sel.* 20.

<sup>32</sup> I made the chiasmus a major topic of the article devoted to Archil. Fr. 1 W., K. Bartol, “Metaliterackie treści we fr. 1 W. Archilocha”, *Symbolae Philologorum Posnaniensium* 11, 1997, pp. 3-11 (in Polish, with English abstract and Latin summary, “Archilochus in fr. 1 W. de artis poeticae natura quid dixerit”, 10-11).

<sup>33</sup> See R. Fowler, *The Nature of Early Greek Lyric: Three Preliminary Studies*, Toronto 1987, 53-85, esp. 55.

<sup>34</sup> This activity, originated in the readers’ advisory librarian service, is becoming hot stuff now, see a list of *Guides to Reading Interests*, a series edited by Diana Tixier Herald, published by the American company Libraries Unlimited.

<sup>35</sup> M. Heath, “Subject Reviews. Greek Literature” *Greece and Rome* 64, 2017, 67.

