Iambic *Horror*: Shivers and Brokenness in Archilochus and Hipponax

Mario Telò*

Now, the letter *rho*, as I was saying, seemed to the name giver a good instrument for the representation of motion.... Through this letter, he imitates motion first of all in the words ῥεῖν (“to flow”) and ῥοή (“flow”), then in τρέμω (“trembling”) ... and in such verbs as κρούειν (“to strike”), θραύειν (“to crush”) ... θρύπτειν (“to break”).... He saw, I think, that the tongue in this [letter] was least at rest, and most shaken (σειομένην)....

Do you think we were right to say that the *rho* resembles motion, movement, and harshness (σκληρότητι)?

PLAT. *Crat.* 426d–e, 434c

The Romantic fetishization of feeling, as Gérard Genette has told us, was decisive in shaping the modern notion of lyric as a coherent and inclusive genre. While the obvious mimetic quality of epic and drama made them easy for Plato and Aristotle to categorize, the illusion of non-representational spontaneity created by the speaking “I,” *The Architext* suggests, prevented lyric from attaining autonomous, all-encompassing generic dignity in antiquity.¹ In order to claim a belated place beside epic and drama, ancient lyric, in the hands of the Romantics, had to be granted full mimetic status; it had to be conceptualized as

* I am very grateful to Meg Foster, Leslie Kurke, and Naomi Weiss for improving this chapter with their suggestions. Special thanks are owed to Leslie for encouraging me to participate in the conference on which this volume is based. Thanks also to all the participants for their illuminating comments, and to Emily Gowers, Mark Griffith, and Alex Press.

¹ Genette 1992: 60–67.

a “representation of feeling rather than as feeling itself”—to quote the editors of the recent *Lyric Theory Reader*.²

Although this schema and especially the notion of lyric as a unified category, in ancient as well as modern literature, are controversial, Genette’s narrative invites us to test how a renewed emphasis on feeling and its transmission—what social scientists and increasingly literary scholars call “affect”—may help us reconsider our understanding of Greek lyric forms in terms of genre. Sharing ancient literary criticism’s preoccupation with the affective power of literary mimesis, we can try to locate a sense of genre in the ways lyric’s representations of feeling achieve sensory immediacy, becoming embodiments and projections of “feeling itself.” We can heuristically identify genre with the distinctive energies that a lyric form arguably diffuses to its audiences through the materiality of language—the affective force of recurring imagery or sounds.³ Affect theory views emotion as a boundless exchange of feeling, circulating beyond bodily boundaries, blurring the distinction between subject and object, the source or producer and the target or receiver. Feeling, in this perspective, becomes a dispossessed, impersonal, contagious force.⁴ The “sensuous dimension of literary experience,”⁵ which the idea of affect helps us conceptualize, can contribute to a lyric text’s construction of the frame of reference that governs its reception—precisely what we call genre.⁶ While scholarship on archaic Greek lyric has usually emphasized the pragmatics of genre—how a poetic form communicates, socially and culturally, with an audience through its performative occasion—my emphasis is rather on physiology and psychology. Not just fixing the horizon of expectations through social context, ideology, themes, and style, genre can be viewed as a genuinely aesthetic category, a notional, if problematic, demarcation of the quality of intensities that pass between text and recipients, turning form into bodily and psychic engagement.⁷ Genre can also

2 Jackson and Prins 2014: 12. For the link between genre and mimesis in archaic Greek lyric, see esp. Nagy 1994–1995.

3 On poetic sound as feeling, see, among others, Stewart 2002: 100–101 and Gumbrecht 2012: 4, 13.

4 Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 257 have observed that “we know nothing about a body until we know what it can do ... what its affects are, how they can or cannot enter into composition with other affects.” Seigworth and Gregg 2010: 1 remark that affect “is found in those intensities that pass body to body ..., in those resonances that circulate about [and] between ... bodies” and “sometimes stick to [them].”

5 In the phrase of Altieri 2007.

6 For this definition of genre, see, e.g., Depew and Obbink 2000a: 6.

7 On embodiment, see Olsen and Estrin (this volume).

be seen as the material environment created by the unlimited circulation of lyric affect, inside and outside the poetic frame.⁸

Applying this interpretive framework to the case study of one particular Greek lyric genre (or subgenre), iambos, I will explore unfamiliar connections in the extant corpora of Archilochus and Hipponax and in selected expressions of their ancient reception, tying together topographical and bodily images that set up what I call the generic texture of iambos—the tactile experience that this lyric form appears to channel to its audience. The generic affect of Archilochus' and Hipponax's iambos amounts to hairy, bristly, prickly roughness—*horror* in the Latin sense of the word, with a sensual charge. In their treatment of the “affective fallacy,” Wimsatt and Beardsley famously stigmatized aesthetic responses such as the “shiver down the spine” and “tears, prickles, or other physiological symptoms.”⁹ I will be concerned precisely with how shivers and prickles shape iambos' generic affect in the physical perceptions that its archaic practitioners and their later followers have of it. Iambos' powers of *horror* emerge from the unexpected textural continuity of disparate objects and sensations—rocky landscapes, shaggy skin, spiny plants, teeth-chattering coldness—as well as from recurring sounds, such as *rho*, which, in line with the trembling and breaking ascribed to it in Plato's *Cratylus*, almost functions as a generic phonestheme.¹⁰ *Rho* and other broken sounds convert language into sensation, invective discourse into emotional, fleshy investment. Iambic *horror*, in fact, can produce an edgy feeling of pushing the boundaries of pain and pleasure in an audience that, while touching the iambic texture, identifies with the target of aggression and with the poet himself, whose relationship to his own abjection may be marked by queasy enjoyment as much as aversion.¹¹ A function of an ever-present and intrinsically ambiguous “you” (both target and audience), this mimetic dynamic realizes the lyric dimension of iambos and enables us to materialize its projected generic identity, to perceive such

8 Affect is what brings out, in Deleuze's words, “the atmospheric quality” of discourse (1994: 24). While affect has been identified with form itself (see Brinkema 2014), in my analysis I maintain a notional distinction between affect as emotional, psychosomatic content and lyric form as the conveyor of such content.

9 Wimsatt and Beardsley 1949: 43, 47.

10 Julia Kristeva's examples of texts with the “powers of horror” include Celine's *London Bridge*, with its descriptions of “piercing,” “quaking,” and “shaking”: see Kristeva 1982: 148. By phonestheme, Firth 1964 meant a pairing of phoneme and meaning such as, in English, the consonant cluster *gl-*, which tends to appear in words relating to light and vision.

11 On the reflexivity between the iambic poet and his target, see, among others, Miralles and Pòrtulas 1983, but this reflexivity involves the audience as well.

an identity as a manifestation of “feeling itself.”¹² Linda Williams has assimilated the experience of horror films—a “body genre” par excellence—to “a roller-coaster ride of sadomasochistic thrills.”¹³ Figuring an audience’s material experience of the genre, not just its roughness against satirical targets, the surfaces that we will touch upon here reveal the masochistic side of iambic thrills, teasing us with frissons, jolts, and spasms, titillating sensations of aestheticized abjection that disrupt corporeality yet expand its limits. Iambos’ distinctive projection toward a “you,” in its double valence of target and audience, produces a poetic frame predicated on a programmatic transgression of that frame (in the etymological sense of “stepping out or beyond” it).¹⁴ In its formal inclination to step outside of its own discursive frame, iambos is emblematic of lyric affect. As an impulse to push past the frame of the body, the masochistic thrills promised by iambos affectively realize the stepping beyond that is intrinsic to its discursive form.

A journey through the textures of iambos might begin with Archilochus’ programmatic description of Thasos, in which topographical and animal imagery figure the generic feel of iambos (fr. 21):

ἦδε δ' ὥστ' ὄνου ῥάχῃς
ἔστηκεν ὕλης ἀγρίης ἐπιστεφής

This [island] stands like the spine of a donkey, garlanded with a wild forest

Noting that Archilochus seems to efface Thasos’ abundance of fruit trees and vines, and dwell instead on “the roughness and unevenness” (τὸ τραχὺ καὶ ἀνώμαλον) of the landscape, Plutarch, the fragment’s source (*De exil.* 604c), sees this emphasis as satiric “slander” (διέβλεψε). The victim of Archilochean aggression, in Plutarch’s view, Thasos is itself cast as an aggressor, its Thracian wildness matching the iambographer’s verbal roughness, as showcased by the verbal res-

12 According to Culler 1977, 2015: 186–243, the apostrophe (the inscription of a “you” within a poem’s discursive framework) is an essential device for creating the impression of temporal presentness, a fundamental dimension of the “lyric event.” Waters 2003 has seen the apostrophe as tactile, a marker of lyric’s aspiration to direct feeling beyond the closed space of the poem, to establish an affective relation with its audience. Regarding the sensual implications of the overlap between satiric addressee and audience, I have found the analysis of the *Priapea* offered by Young 2015a particularly illuminating.

13 Williams 1991: 7.

14 As Leslie Kurke points out to me, this iambic “stepping out or beyond” previews, in a sense, the parabasis of Old Comedy.

onance of Archilochus' simile (ῥάχῑς), Plutarch's metadescription (τραχύς), and the place name (Θράκη).¹⁵ Whatever Archilochus might have thought of his second home—the place where his Parian father allegedly founded a colony—the exiled poet found in the island a reflection of iambic τραχύτης.¹⁶ Hipponax's birthplace, Ephesus, performs the same self-reflexive function. Its urban topography, as we see in fragment 50.2, includes a place situated “between Rough and Scabby Promontory” (μεταξὺ Τρηχέης τε καὶ Λεπρῆς ἀκτῆς).¹⁷ Ephesus appears to be an obstacle course through pointed surfaces like the rocks and forests of Thasos, as well as iambos' harmful sounds. In the Archilochean fragment, ῥάχῑς, which causes savage terrain to slip into animal physicality, contains a substantial phonemic portion of τραχύς, an aural reflection of the unity of Thasos' sharp edges and a donkey's bristly hide.¹⁸ Through this insistent combination of aspirated *rho* and velar consonants corresponding to Archilochus' and Hipponax's topographical and animal surfaces (Θράκη; ῥάχῑς; ἀγρίης; Τρηχέης), iambos' texture, its affect of harshness, thus emerges. In a fragment of Aristophanes, the “hardness” (σκληρότης) of Aeschylean tragedy is compared to the tough skin of pigs and cows.¹⁹ Almost a crypt word for τραχύς, the spine of the Archilochean donkey, isolated at the end of the line, similarly embodies a generic sensation, enabling us to experience, almost physically, the edgy quality of iambos, its character as a *locus horridus*, its Thracian position—on the fringes of literary pleasure.

The convergence of asinine body, *locus horridus*, and novelistic texture in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* can help us understand how, in the Archilochean fragment, the donkey's skin materializes the iambic persona's double role as an agent of abuse and an abject victim. Some of Apuleius' descriptions of

15 On τραχύς as a designation of an angry voice, see, e.g., [Aesch.] *PV* 311, 1048.

16 On the relation between the *persona loquens* and Archilochus' autobiography in this fragment, see Bowie 2009: 108–109; for a more skeptical approach, see Owen 2003. The reception of Archilochus takes his association with Thasos as a generic marker, as shown by Cratin. fr. 6 KA, on which see Telò 2014: 311–312. For τραχύς as a landscape quality that transfers virility to inhabitants in Hdt. 1.71.2, see Purves 2013b: 31–32. On landscape as a reflection of literary-critical categories, see esp. Worman 2015a, 2015b; on “generic topography” in Pindar, see Kurke 2013b: 120.

17 The Ephesian topography alluded to here is discussed by Strab. 14.1.4, the source of the fragment.

18 ῥάχῑς is almost an anagram of the Latin *acris*, feminine of *acer*, a common onomatopoeic designation of satiric roughness: see esp. Gowers 1993: 131–132. In discussing the aesthetics of πικρότης in Homeric narrative, Purves 2013a: 58 connects the thick bristliness of the boar's back in *Od.* 19.446 with “the thickly-charged environment” of the scene.

19 Ar. fr. 663 KA.

loci horridi—mountains, rocks, torrents, and thickets—are entangled with language used for the donkey's body.²⁰ In particular, Lucius' metamorphosis takes place through a thickening of hair, marked by the verb *horripilo*, into a virtual thicket, and a hardening of skin—both folding the human-turned-animal into the frightful landscape.²¹ Lucius' transformation equips him with the power to kick, but also makes him a slave, by definition subject to beating and flogging.²² The donkey's horrid landscape—the spiky rocks and craggy mountain paths—complements his abusers' sticks and whips.²³ As Jason König has observed, Apuleius' novel presents “an obsessive and gruesome fascination with the extreme vulnerability of human and asinine bodies to the physicality of landscape.”²⁴ The landscape, which victimizes the protagonist even after co-opting him, reifies not just the notorious asperity of Apuleius' style, but also his text's narrative texture.²⁵ Before the final redemption, the novel's ceaseless obstacles and travails are like rough edges whose abrasions accrue on the bristly skin of the novel's animal protagonist and victim. The horrid terrain of Archilochus' Thasos empathically connects his audience with the target of iambic invective, who is forced to pass through the cutting crags and prickly vegetation of his satire. However, Thasos' donkey-like bristliness also mimetically channels to the audience the downtrodden affect of the satirist, who, besides kicking, is himself a victim of blows, like the Apuleian Lucius.

This iambic abjection concentrated in Thasos also takes a human shape, a grotesque female figure emanating a prickly sensuality. Fragment 22 continues the portrait of Thasos by contrasting the island with the region of Siris—an icon of southern Italian abundance and fertility named after the first wife of King Metapontus.²⁶

20 On the *locus horridus* in Apuleius, see esp. Schiesaro 1993; König 2013.

21 Cf. 3.24, where *duratur*, which designates the hardening of Lucius' skin, echoes the description of petrified humans in 2.1.

22 For the connection between Lucius' donkey skin and slavery, see Fitzgerald 2000: 100.

23 See 7.17.4.

24 König 2013: 231.

25 Selden 2014: 239–245 has recognized distinctive Afro-Asiatic elements in Apuleius' style, whose harsh twists and turns could be viewed as a reflection of the rugged Libyan landscape. The horrid nature of Apuleius' *loci horridi* is enhanced by the concentration of moody sound effects, noted by De Biasi 1990: 14–15, including a prevalence of *r*.

26 This is the identification proposed by Athenaeus (12.523d), who cites the fragment. Against the tenuous hypothesis that Archilochus may refer instead to a river in the Propontis called Syros or Sirios, see Moscati Castelnovo 1989: 43–47. According to Σ Dion. Perieg. 461, when Metapontus replaced Siris with another woman, he sent her off into the eponymous region.

οὐ γάρ τι καλὸς χώρος οὐδ' ἐφίμερος
οὐδ' ἐρατός, οἶος ἀμφὶ Σίριος ῥόας.

For it is not at all a beautiful, desirable, or lovely land, like the one around Siris' stream.

The adjectives ἐφίμερος and ἐρατός signpost the aesthetics of *habrosune*, a quality proper to erotically charged bodies and *loci amoeni* but also to the soft poetic texture that several lyric voices, privileging these imagistically interchangeable subjects, claim for themselves.²⁷ In Sappho fragment 16 V, Anactoria's "lovely stride" (ἔρατον ... βᾶμα) points to the poem's own soft, rhythmic pace, as Yopie Prins has suggested.²⁸ Alcman indirectly maps the alluring topography of Cyprus—Aphrodite's body turned into an island (Κύπρον ἱμερτάν, fr. 55)—onto captivating (ἐρατῶν) verses of a song, on which desire (ἔμερος) is to be deposited as a quasi-tactile layer (fr. 27).²⁹ Archilochus irreverently purports to enter this generic landscape in the last section of the Cologne Epode, where the account of the sexual encounter proceeds through references to a *locus amoenus*, soft surfaces (of a female body and a cloak), and gentle touching—possibly deceptive flirtations with other lyric genres' sensoria, which are then overturned by the iambic coarseness of the final act.³⁰ Against this background, the comparison of Thasos with Siris, a counterpart of Alcman's Cyprus, invites us to view the

27 On the complex materiality of lyric *habrosune*, see Kurke 1992, 2007: 147–152; on the aesthetics of softness in Sappho and Alcman, expressed by the recurring adjectives μαλθακός and ἀπαλός, see also Burnett 1983: 299 and MacLachlan 1993: 63 n. 17. In Sappho, softness is one of the sensory domains where, as Prins 1999: 98 observes, "the language of place shades into the language of the body."

28 See Prins 1999: 128, who presents Anactoria as "a figure fleshed out by the rhythms of Sappho and bodied forth as rhythm itself."

29 Alcman, fr. 27: Μῶσ' ἄγε Καλλιόπα, θύγατερ Διὸς, / ἄρχ' ἐρατῶν Φεπέων, ἐπὶ δ' ἔμερον / ὕμνω καὶ χαρίεντα τίθη χορόν.

30 Cf. 196a.42–43 ἐν ἀνθε[σιν / τηλ]εθέασσι (a phrase that is resonant with Sapph. fr. 2.9–10 τέθαλεν / ... ἀνθεσιν); 44–45 μαλθακῇ ... / χλαί[ν]η; 48 ἡπίως ἐφηψάμην; 51 ἀμφαφώμενος; 53 ἐπιψαύ[ων] (in line 6, Archilochus refers to a καλὴ τέρεϊνα παρθένος). Burnett 1983: 89 observes in the poem "an astonishing confluence of abuse with ... sensual detail"—an aspect of its self-consciously "insidious" nature, in the words of Kurke 2000: 71. Even when infiltrating other lyric territories, the iambicist cannot entirely leave aside his innate roughness; conversely, ostensibly soft lyricists represent the violence, the "roughness" of love (see for example, Sappho fr. 31 V) and occasionally seem even to be able to assume an iambic guise (see Brown 1984 on Anacreon, and Rosenmeyer 2006 and Martin 2016 on Sappho). Besides the Archilochean poem's well-known engagement with epic seduction scenes (on which see Swift 2015), there is, thus, an intralyric dimension, a self-positioning that tries to negotiate the complex play of difference and similarity at the root of the notion of genre itself.

former as a female surface—a reading also suggested by the following passage from Semonides' misogynistic tirade (fr. 7.50–54):

τὴν δ' ἐκ γαλῆς, δύστηνον οἰζυρόν γένος·
 κείνη γάρ οὔ τι καλὸν οὐδ' ἐπίμερον
 πρόσσεστιν οὐδὲ τερπνὸν οὐδ' ἐράσμιον.
 εὐνῆς δ' ἀληνῆς ἐστιν ἀφροδισίης,
 τὸν δ' ἄνδρα τὸν περὼντα ναυσίῃ διδοί.³¹

Another woman is from the weasel, a wretched and woeful creature; she has nothing that is beautiful or desirable or pleasant or lovely. But she is mad for the sexual bed, and gives the man who penetrates her to nausea.

The three negated terms οὔ τι καλὸν οὐδ' ἐπίμερον ... οὐδ' ἐράσμιον establish an unexpected link between this presumably bristly weasel-woman and Archilochus' donkey-like Thasos, as does the onomatopoetic adjective οἰζυρόν, derived from the exclamation of grief οἶ. Archilochus calls Thasos a “three times woeful (τρισοιζυρήν) town” (fr. 228) and the place where “the woe (ὀϊζύς) of all Greeks has run together” (fr. 102). The textural kinship of the weasel with the Thasian donkey, in turn, alerts us to a possible identification between the Semonidean abuser and his target. In general, the iambicist shares with the weasel a trickster mind and sexual voraciousness; more importantly, in the passage above, Semonides makes his audience experience, even vocalize the sensation he attributes to the female/animal target's lover.³² The line that speaks of sexual nausea in the company of the weasel woman ends with διδοί, where the stress, grammatical and metrical, on the last syllable enacts the affective dynamic, exposing the listener/reader to the sound of the pain (οἶ) conveyed by οἰζυρός. It is as though listening or reading allowed one to feel the disagreeable conclusion of an intimate encounter that resembles a ramble through Thasos' craggy landscape. The grammatical structure of the last sentence, with the dative ναυσίῃ governed by διδοί, suggests that this sensory experience is tantamount to intercourse with nausea itself, personified and domineering.

31 In the text, I preserve the transmitted reading ἀληνῆς, meaning μαινόμενος, as suggested by Hesych. s.v.: see Bettini 2013: 162. Περὼντα is West's emendation of παρόντα, which other editors retain in the appropriate dialectal form παρεόντα. Regardless of the text, the line clearly describes sexual intimacy between the weasel-woman and τὸν ἄνδρα.

32 On the weasel as a sexually voracious trickster, see Bettini 2013: 162–163, who also points out the animal's foul smell. On “the iambic poet as a trickster,” see Miralles and Pòrtulas 1983: 11–50.

Conversely, in light of Semonides, Thasos' savage vegetation starts to resemble, as the adjective *ἐπιστεφής* suggests, the rough garland specifically of a woman.³³ The iambicist presents a hairy, uneven, masculine surface as female in lieu of conventional lyric softness—not unlike *ῆ νῆσος* itself, which bears the duality of feminine gender in a male form.³⁴ Although the iambicist often fantasizes about tender, fragrant female bodies or lovely tresses and may even seem to valorize Siris in comparison with the donkey-(or weasel-)-like Thasos, he ends up aestheticizing sensual edginess as generic difference, titillating his audience with coarse textures, perhaps even stimulating a queasy delight.³⁵

Bristly Thasos may lurk behind Archilochus' famous contrast of generals, suggesting another connection between iambic landscape and human surfaces. In his *First Tarsian Speech*, Dio Chrysostom (33.17) cites these lines, which have traditionally been read as an Archilochean intervention on the theme of epic heroism (fr. 114):³⁶

οὐ φιλέω μέγαν στρατηγὸν οὐδὲ διαπεπλεγμένον
οὐδὲ βοστρύχοισι γαῦρον οὐδ' ὑπεξυρημένον,
ἀλλὰ μοι μικρὸς τις εἴη καὶ περὶ κνήμας ἰδεῖν
ροϊκός, ἀσφαλέως βεβηκώς ποσσὶ, καρδίας πλέως.

33 For an example of *ἐπιστεφής* used of a woman, cf. Euphor. 94 P. Εὐμένιδες ναρκίσσου ἐπιστεφεές πλοκαμίδας. On the erotics of garlands in Sappho, see Burnett 1983: 296–297.

34 On the transgender dimension of the iambic persona in Horace, see most recently Gowers 2016, who mentions Lamia, a female figure with male genitals, among iambos' mythological ancestors.

35 In fr. 119 Hipponax expresses a desire for a “tender” *παρθένος*, as Archilochus does in the Cologne Epode (see n. 30). In frs. 30–31, Archilochus provides other snapshots of fantasized female *habrosune*, probably looking ahead to a scenario of iambic coarseness (see Swift 2016a: 255–259). In fr. 188, he opposes young, “tender skin” (*ἀπαλὸν χροῶ*) to the wrinkles of old age, which are imputed to wintry winds. The bodily and natural roughness apparently deplored here is precisely the generic feel of iambos that we are reconstructing (on coldness and shivers, see below). Horace's widely recognized appropriation of the Archilochean wrinkles in *Epod.* 8.3–4 belongs to a similar stew of miasmatic misogyny. Yet, as Richlin 1992: 113 observes, “Horace clearly enjoys ... a thorough stare at ugliness, wallowing in the foulness he creates and rejects.” Moreover, the decrepit female bodies so vividly detailed here are “uncomfortably” similar to that of the invective poet himself, as Oliensis 1998: 75 has noted. A generalized preference for the rough, uneven surface and sensation may well transcend gender divisions, as we will see in Archilochus' preference—sexual or otherwise—for the “bent” general over the smooth, shaved one, with his legs apart. Greek archaic iambos offers itself to its audience precisely as an ugly body pushing sensory experience to the edge.

36 See, for example, Toohey 1988.

I do not love a big general, with legs apart, proud of his curls, and partly shaved. Let me have one who is small, looks bent around the shins, stands firmly on his feet, and is full of heart.

Critics have noted the lack of parallelism in the portraits of the two *strategoi*—for example, the lack of an antonym for ὑπεξυργημένον (“shaved”). Dio himself, in his paraphrase, presents Archilochus’ preferred general, “mulish” or “perhaps even donkeylike,” in Mark Griffith’s words, as “hairy” (δασύς) on his shins.³⁷ Certainly, as Tom Hawkins observes, this added detail, playing on the classic opposition of effeminate smoothness and virile hairiness, fits the moralistic agenda shaping Dio’s reperformance of Archilochean iambs in Roman Cilicia.³⁸ Going a step further, we might detect in Dio’s invocation of Archilochus’ preferred general, wrapped in a critique of the unmanliness of the Tarsians, a residue of the original Thasian texture of iambs, which is similarly cast as a series of negatives (οὐ ... καλὸς ... οὐδ’ ἐφίμερος / οὐδ’ ἐρατός). Dio likens the two generals, one slick and the other hairy, to urban landscapes: the former to an imperial, sumptuous *locus amoenus*—rivers, baths, fountains, porticoes, and fancy houses; the latter to a small town built “on a rock” (ἐπὶ πέτρᾳ). This alignment of hairiness with a rugged landscape recreates Thasos’ iambic topography, the “unevenness” that Plutarch had criticized Archilochus for emphasizing—also expressed in the bent, though firmly planted, legs of the preferred general. The Archilochean phrase ἀσφαλέως βεβηκώς ποσσὶ would be apt for the stabilization of the originally floating Delos, for example, which both Pindar and Callimachus anthropomorphize, respectively assigning it “steely sandals” (ἄδαμαντοπέδιλοι fr. 33d8) and “roots of feet” (ποδῶν ... ῥίζας *Hymn* 4.54).³⁹ The unshakability goes along with the island’s rough, rocky geology, unsuitable for cultivation, like Thasos.⁴⁰

Discovering reflections of Thasos’ rockiness in the asperity of Archilochus’ description, we may supplement Dio’s moralistic take on the general’s shaggy body with an appreciation of its “powers of *horror*,” its scratchy (dis)pleasures. The smoothness of the freshly shaved general is matched by the glossy verbal and rhythmic surface of the first two lines, organized into symmetrical units of syntax and meter joined by polysyndeton and internal echo (στρατη-

37 Griffith 2006: 314. Some modern critics have tried to insert Dio’s δασύς in Archilochus’ text: see Pisani 1938.

38 See Hawkins 2014: 206–214.

39 On these two passages, see Nishimura-Jensen 2000: 289–292.

40 As emerges from Σ Call. *Hymn* 4.11a, b, which gloss ἄντροπος, said of Delos, as ἀκίνητος καὶ ἄσειστος, but also as ἀγεώργητος (“uncultivable”), explained in turn as τραχεῖα.

γόν ... γαῦρον; διαπεπλιγμένον ... ὑπεξυρημένον). Conversely, the portrait of the hairy one is a Thasian thicket of qualifiers, unevenly linked (first by καί and then with asyndeton), disrupting the previous lines' seamless continuity with a sharp enjambment. Closely resembling ῥάχης, the marker of the asinine feel of Archilochus' home, ῥοικός captures Thasian δασύτης. As an aspirated consonant, *rho* is, according to ancient grammarians, a quintessentially hairy sound, δασύ or *hispidum*. It is the so-called canine letter, which Genette included in his *Voyage en Cratylie*, following the lead of this passage of Persius (1.107–110):⁴¹

Sed quid opus teneras mordaci **radere** vero
auriculas? Vide sis ne maiorum tibi forte
limina **frigescant**: sonat hic de nare canina
littera.

But what is the need of scraping tender little ears with biting truth? See to it that the thresholds of your betters do not, by chance, become cold for you: here the snarl of a doggy *rrrr* sounds from the nose.

Bundles of rhotic energy, *radere* and *frigescant* render satiric invective's scratchiness and the shivers of the abject satirist.⁴² The initial *rho* of ῥοικός and ῥάχης in Archilochus affects both the iambicist and his targets, victims of his ῥιγηλόν ὄνειδος ("chilling insult"),⁴³ while releasing generic shivering on the audience. The sequence of aspiration in ῥάχης, besides reproducing the feel of asinine skin, may suggest the goosebumps caused by Thracian rigors, while ῥικνός, an alternative form of ῥοικός, can, in fact, mean πεφρικώς ("shriveled with cold").⁴⁴ Archilochus' celebration of his general's courage and "unshaken" temper is central to Dio's moralistic reading. Still, the texture of ῥοικός, which σμικρός anticipates, hints at a not-so-firm figure who perhaps, like the iambi-

41 Cf. Genette 1995: 37–38. On *rho* as *hispidum*, cf. Terent. Maur. GL VI 333, 262 K. In *De comp. verb.* 14, p. 54. 13 U.-R., Dionysus of Halicarnassus defines *rho* as the liquid sound that "roughens (τραχύνει) the ear." The canine *r* is also discussed in Lucil. 377 M., to which Persius alludes. Dionysius' treatment of "rough" sounds has been widely discussed; most recently, Purves forthcoming has called attention to the temporal dimension of such sounds, their effect of slowing down a text. Porter 2010: 371–397 offers an extensive discussion of the aesthetics of another notoriously "harsh" consonant, *sigma*.

42 On this passage, see Bramble 1974: 151–152 and esp. Keane 2006: 93. On the shivering Hipponax, see below.

43 This is the characterization of Archilochean iambos that we find in an epigram by Dioscorides (*AP* 7.351.5–6), spoken in the voice of Lycambes' daughters.

44 Cf. Soph. fr. 1091 R².

cist, trembles while attacking. The iambic phonestheme *rho*, which growlingly initiates *ροικός* and *ράχης*, feels like an encounter with hispid body parts that slides into shudders, the generic sensation of *horror*.

Turning our attention to one of Archilochus' widely recognized animal alter egos, we can appreciate other ways in which iambic affect emerges from the friction of scratchy surfaces—a stick, a trap spring, or a fox's tail. Fragments 185–187 relate to the Aesopic tale of the fox who brings down a pompous monkey elected king of the animals.⁴⁵ The fable, deployed to attack a “herald's son” (ὦ Κηρυκίδη), is presented, in fragment 185, as the message on a leather strip wrapped around a herald's stick—a *σκυτάλη* that, like the iambicist, shouts in distress (ἀχνυμένη).⁴⁶ After luring his target into a trap, the fox scornfully points out his fall, from top to bottom (fr. 187):

τοιγῆνδε δ' ὦ πίθηκε, τὴν πυγὴν ἔχων.

monkey, with a tush like that

As has been observed, *πυγὴν* reconfigures *πυκνόν*, employed in fr. 185 to express the fox's (and satirist's) intellectual primacy (*πυκνὸν ἔχουσα νόον*).⁴⁷ But aside from signaling a mind-body opposition, the intratextual pun may point to a physical contrast—between the monkey's smooth *πυγή* and the fox's own *πυκνός* tail. Thus, the epic *μήδεα πυκνά*, first rendered as *πυκνὸν ... νόον*, devolves into a bodily extremity, coarse in both its register and materiality. The fox's tail is not just shaggy, but pointed, a stand-in for other sharp vulpine edges—tongue, teeth, claws, ears, snout, and, figuratively, mind. His base self-aggrandizement, then, helps us see the fox, whom Theocritus calls *δασυκέρκος* (“bushy-tailed”), as another bristly animal analogue for Thasos—like the shaggy general, who is similarly positioned against a shamefully smooth adversary.⁴⁸ We can tease out further implications by considering the trap that defeats the monkey (186):

45 On the place of this fable in the Aesopic tradition, see van Dijk 1997: 144–147; on Archilochus' treatment of this fable in relation to his satiric agenda, see esp. Rosen 1988: 17–18; Bowie 2008: 133–136; Steiner 2010: 99–100, 2012b: 19–29, 2014b, and 2016; Pappas 2014.

46 I take *ἀχνυμένη σκυτάλη* as a nominative. The classic discussion of the Archilochean *σκυτάλη* is West 1988. On the interpretation of *ἀχνυμένη*, see Pappas 2014. On the rich imagery of the *σκυτάλη* in Pindar's *Olympian* 6, see Neer and Kurke 2019, ch. 8.

47 See Pappas 2014: 28.

48 Cf. Theocr. 5.112 (Σ ad loc. glosses *δασυκέρκος* [Doric accusative plural] as *δασυπύγους*). The connection of the monkey with the “shaved” (*ὑπεξυρημένον*) general is perhaps reinforced by Aristophanes' appropriation of the Archilochean line in *Ach.* 119–120, in which an ambassador is addressed as “smooth-assed,” a “monkey, with a beard like that”: *πρωκτὸν*

ρόπτρῳ ἐρειδόμενον

pressing on the trap spring

A piece of bent wood that sets a trap in motion when touched, the *ρόπτρον* brings to mind the crooked legs ascribed to the *ροιός* Archilochean general.⁴⁹ The semantic connection corresponds with the textural consistency of the two words, which both incorporate the letter *rho* (*ρ*) itself, making palpable the contact of some body—monkey, satiric target, or listener/reader—with the rough and curved surface of *iambos*. In this moment of contact, triggering iambic *horror*, the *ρόπτρον*, in a way, realizes the generic affect of the similarly curved fox's tail and the *σκυτάλη*, the doleful stick that resembles the shaggy general's firmly planted legs.

The hedgehog (*ἐχῖνος*) supplies another embodiment of iambic *horror*, a further example of how this generic feel arises from animals' bodies and a corresponding rough sound. The apparent confrontation of fox and hedgehog in fragment 201 has caused much disagreement over which of the two has a stronger claim as an authorial alter ego.⁵⁰ Like the fox, the "rough hedgehog" (*τρηχὺς ἐχῖνος*)⁵¹ combines a thick, bristly hide with a thick, Odyssean, and thus Archilochean, mind;⁵² its spiky surface provides another bodily surrogate of Thasos' topography.⁵³ What modern interpreters see as a problem—the apt-

ἐξυρημένε. / τοιόνδε γ', ὃ πίθηκε, τὸν πάγων' ἔχων. The substitution of the surprisingly less-vulgar *πάγων'* for *πυγῆν*, referring here precisely to the *lack* of a beard, may be informed by the earlier contrast between the monkey's smoothness and the beard-like shagginess of the fox's tail. A self-aggrandizing allusion to vulpine bristliness may also be the point of one of the fragments that map the fable of the vixen and the eagle onto Archilochus' dispute with Lycambes. In fr. 178, the vixen is probably warning the hubristic eagle, white-rumped according to ancient interpreters, that punishment awaits him: *μή τευ μελαμπύγου τύχης*. The "black-rumped" (*μελαμπύγου*) punisher evoked here is, according to ancient and modern critics, a different type of eagle, proverbially braver than the vixen's enemy and an agent of Zeus himself. If we consider that Luc. *Pseudol.* 32 connects *μελάμπυγος* with *δασύς*, thus interpreting the epithet as "hairy-tailed," it becomes attractive to think that the "black-rumped" punisher may well be the "hairy-tailed" vixen herself.

49 The source of the fragment (*Et. Mag.* 715.44) glosses *ρόπτρον* as "the bent piece of wood in a trap."

50 For an account of the various positions, see Corrêa 2001: 85–89, who reacts against the prevailing identification of the Archilochean persona with the hedgehog; see also Bowra 1940 and, most recently, Swift 2019: 386.

51 Opp. *Hal.* 2.360.

52 On the Odyssean Archilochus, see esp. Seidensticker 1978. As Meg Foster points out to me, in *Od.* 13.242 Ithaca is described as *τρηχεῖα*.

53 An archipelago in the Ionian sea is called *Ἐχίνα* or *Ἐχινάδες*; see also Strab. 12.3.11, where

ness of both animals as iambic stand-ins—may be precisely the point of the poem, which could be considered a varied display of generic τραχύτης or a dramatization of iambos' boundary-crossing between aggressor and target.⁵⁴ The word ἐχῖνος, from the Indo-European root **heg^his*, is itself an expression of δασύτης in the sense of “aspiration,” the letter χ capturing the sensation of the animal's spines—but there is an additional relation with the idea of aspiration as iambic. In the fragment mentioned above, the hedgehog is said to know “one big thing” (ἐν μέγα) while the fox knows many (πολλά), an echo of fragment 126, where the poet, too, professes to know “one big thing” (ἐν δ' ἐπίσταμαι μέγα), how to repay attackers with harm. Whenever the hedgehog feels under attack, it rolls itself up into a ball—in Pliny's description, folding together multiple bodily parts into one.⁵⁵ With the posture that enables the hedgehog's spiky (passive) aggression, it not only knows one thing but becomes one thing (ἐν), and thus a prickly reflection of the sound of the word, which, like the rolling *rho*, sends forth an iambic intensity that threatens to scratch and tear the iambicist's enemies but is inevitably felt also on his audience's skin.⁵⁶

This double directionality of iambic feeling has implications for some of Hipponax's poems and their ancient reception. The powers of *horror* ostensibly mobilized against targets or the self-abusing iambicist appear to impinge on the readers of the Hipponactean corpus. We will see how iambos' sado-masochistic power, its ability to stimulate an audience's desire to push roughly against the human body's limits, contributes to creating a persistent sense of itself as a genre.

The *pharmakos* fragments, with their imagistic and phonic display of beating and flogging, seem to have shaped ancient readers' perception of the feel of Hipponactean iambos, of its affective legacy. Tzetzes, the main source of

Sinope is said to be inaccessible “because of the prickly (ἐχινώδη) surface of the rock.” In Archil. fr. 190 we find the adjective δυσπαίπαλος, a synonym of τραχύς and ἀνώμαλος, modifying βήσσας ὀρέων (“mountain glens”), which West 1974: 134 interprets as “rocky glens ... of the woman's body.” This adjective refers to the hedgehog's skin in Opp. *Hal.* 2.369.

54 Payne 2010: 30–31 is an exception, regarding the alleged problem as an expression of the shifting complexity of Archilochus' animal alignments.

55 Plin. *NH* 8.133 *ubi vero sensere venantem, contracto ore pedibusque ac parti omne inferiore ... convolvuntur in formam pilae, ne quid comprehendere possit praeter aculeos.*

56 In Hor. *Ep.* 5.27–28 the bristly hair of an iambic witch, Sagana, is compared to the hedgehog's spiny skin: *horret capillis ut marinus asperis / echinus aut currens aper*. In these lines, the *echinus*, probably appropriated from the Archilochian fable, becomes an objective correlative of sonic roughness amid a host of *r*'s, including the geminated *r*'s of *horret* and *currens*.

the *pharmakos* cycle, informs us that the ritual included the use of squills, wild fig branches, and “other wild plants” (ἄλλοις τῶν ἀγρίων) against the scapegoat (*Chil.* 5.736). We find a glimpse of this practice and its effects in two short fragments, where an iambic victim or the iambographer himself may lie behind the beaten *pharmakos*—the uncertainty reflects iambos’ distinctively mimetic violence (frs. 6, 10):⁵⁷

βάλλοντες ἐν χειμῶνι καὶ ῥαπίζοντες
κράδησι καὶ σκίλλησιν ὥσπερ φαρμακόν.

In the winter, hitting and flogging [him] with fig branches and onions like a scapegoat.

λιμῶ γένηται ξηρός· ἐν δὲ τῷ θύμῳ
φαρμακὸς ἀχθεὶς ἐπτάκις ῥαπισθείη.

In order for him to become withered with starvation; and having been led off, a scapegoat, may he be flogged seven times on his penis.

With its rhotic force, the verb ῥαπίζω materializes flogging as an aspirated vibration, which, in the first fragment, is prolonged and intensified through the initial sounds of the word for fig branches, κράδησι. Here the programmatic force of this painful vibration is underscored by the word’s occurrence at the end of the line—the point where a rupture occurs, which is suggestive of the bodily laceration caused by flogging: the marked breaking of the rhythmic flow caused by the choliambic meter.⁵⁸ In the second fragment, ῥαπισθείη—the culmination of a sequence of aspirated sounds (θύμῳ, φαρμακός, ἀχθεὶς)—intimates the withering effects of genital flagellation, merging the dryness (ξηρός) of a starving mouth with the dryness of impotence, a typical iambic punishment.⁵⁹

57 See Miralles and Pòrtulas 1988: 136.

58 In [Demetr.] *De eloc.* 301, we read that Hipponax “broke” (ἔθραυσεν) the meter in order to slander his enemies (θραύω is another onomatopoetic verb cited by Plato in *Cratylus*: see the epigraph of this chapter). West 1974: 30 refers to the choliamb as “a deliberate crashing incorrectness”: see also Boedeker 2016a: 58. A more extreme form of the meter, with a concentration of long syllables before the final spondee, was referred to in antiquity as ἰσχιορρωγικόν (“hip-breaking”): see below.

59 In fr. 84.21, ῥ]υδόν (“wrinkled”), describing a flaccid penis during intercourse, looks back to line 17, ἐπ’ ἄκρον ἔλκ[ων ὥσπερ] ῥ ἀλλὰ[ντα ψύχων (“pulling out to the tip as though drying a sausage”), where ψύχω means ξηραίνω (Hesych. ψ 274); according to Hephaest. *Ench.* 5.4, as a result of the spondaic foot that precedes ψύχων, the line becomes “rougher” (τραχύ-

This iambic violence is in the background of a Hellenistic epigram by Alcaeus of Messene (*AP* 7.536 = *HE* 76–81), where Hipponax's tomb site, covered with brambles and prickly pears, resembles Thasos, Archilochus' *locus horridus*:⁶⁰

οὐδὲ θανῶν ὁ πρέσβυς ἐὼ ἐπιτέτροφε τύμβῳ
 βότρυν ἀπ' οἰνάνθης ἡμερον, ἀλλὰ βάτον
 καὶ πνιγόεσσαν ἄχερδον ἀποστύφουσιν ὀδιτῶν
 χεῖλεα καὶ δίψει καρφαλέον φάρυγα.

And not even in death does the old man rear upon his tomb a cultivated grape cluster from a tender vine, but a bramble bush and a choking wild pear that constricts travelers' lips and throats, withered with thirst.

The passers-by—images of future readers of Hipponax—are in the same physical condition as the scapegoat, as they approach the iambic thicket with throats that are “withered with thirst” (δίψει καρφαλέον), while he is “withered with starvation” (λιμῶ ... ξηρός), and end up suffering the constricting, choking astringency of the prickly pear (ἄχερδος)—not just a variant of the plants employed in the ritual, but also a “transgender” female like Thasos (πνιγόεσσαν ἄχερδον) and a counterpart of the hedgehog (ἐχῖνος), even in terms of aspirated phonetics.⁶¹ The verb used to describe the effect of the wild pear, ἀποστύφω, strikingly resembles the rare Archilochean verb ἀποστυπάζω, “to drive away with a stick”⁶²—as though the blows of a wooden stick, as on the scapegoat's genitals, related in some way to a rough oral sensation, the same constriction of the lips that would be caused by the shift in pronunciation from π to φ.⁶³ The

τερον), an effect enhanced by the sequence of *psi* and *chi*. The representation of a genital rupture also produces rhotic roughness in Archil. fr. 252: ἀλλ' ἀπερρώγασι μύκωα τένοντες.

60 For a general discussion of the Hellenistic epigrams on Archilochus and Hipponax, see Rosen 2007.

61 In Hor. *Epod.* 14.4, we find the phrase *arente fauce* in a context that emphasizes sexual and poetic impotence (see Oliensis 1998: 89–91), perhaps refashioning the Hipponactean nexus of dryness in the genitals and throat. The hissing viper that we see in Hippon. fr. 79.11 (ἐχιδνα συρίζει), at the end of a choliamb, corresponds to the Archilochean hedgehog.

62 Cf. Archil. fr. 47.]ε παρθέγοι / θυρέων ἀπεστύπαζον (“the maidens drove [me/you?] away from the doors with cudgels”). The source of the fragment glosses ἀποστυπάζειν as στύπει παίειν and ξυλοκοπεῖν.

63 The epigram's correlative οὐδέ ... ἀλλά recalls the priamels of Archilochus' island and general fragments, the resemblance to the latter reinforced by βότρυς (line 2), which is cognate with βόστρυχος (“curl,” a distinctive element of the στρατηγός whom Archilochus rejects). In Callimachus' *Iamb.* 4, based on a botanical fable, Hipponax is allegorized as thorny flora and dry wood. A bramble, “the roughness (τὸ τρηχύ 96) of the walls,” which is able to “suf-

articulatory strain imposed on the reader mimics the violence of the text, as in Hipponax fragment 22, where a representation of torture entails the jugular spasm of a tight, virtually unpronounceable sequence of *xi*'s: τὴν ῥίνα καὶ τὴν μύξαν ἐξαράξασα ("shattering the nose and the mucus").⁶⁴ The travails of the *pharmakos* are deeply implicated in Hipponactean readers' iambic experience, modeling the material feel of the genre's contact with its audiences across space and time. The verb ῥαπίζω appears again at the end of a choliambic line in a rather obscure fragment (fr. 40), in which a mysterious speaker begs Athena to stop his master from flogging him: καί με δεσπότην βεβροῦ / λαχόντα λίσσομαι σε μὴ ῥαπίζεσθαι ("since I have been allotted a crazy master, I beg you that I not be flogged"). Through the rhotic force of the verb ῥαπίζω, the prayer actualizes the flagellation it seeks to avert, displacing it phonically onto readers, *pharmakos*-like victims of iambos' powers of *horror*.

The mismatch between the iambicist's request for mercy and its effects within and outside the lyric frame is evident in Hipponax's self-presentation as a shivering beggar, which as we will see, looms large in iambos' generic legacy as an affective experience. Hipponax's shivering image emerges in the following addresses to Hermes—first a prayer for help and then a reproach (32 and 34):

Ἐρμῆ, φίλ' Ἐρμῆ, Μαιαδεῦ, Κυλλήνιε,
ἐπεύχομαι τοι, κάρτα γὰρ κακῶς ῥιγῶ
καὶ βαμβαλύζω ...
δὸς χλαῖναν Ἰππώνακτι καὶ κυπασσίσκον
καὶ σαμβάλισκα κάσκερίσκα καὶ χρυσοῦ
στατήρας ἐξήχοντα τοὔτέρου τοίχου.

Hermes, dear Hermes, son of Maia, Cyllenian, I entreat you, for I am shivering fiercely, badly, and my teeth are chattering ... give Hipponax a cloak

focate," is one of two alter egos of the Hipponactean persona: see D'Alessio 1996: 17–18. From the *Diegesis* we know that the bramble stands for the addressee of the poem, the son of Charitades (Χαριτάδew) from Thrace. This identification with a Thracian, whose name starts with an aspirated consonant, recreates the pun between τραχύς and Θράξ, Θρακός that we found in Archilochus' island fragment. The other iambic alter ego, a "sun-struck" olive tree, which recalls the wooden stick used in the *pharmakos* ritual and the withered *pharmakos* himself, declares: "I do not mutter (γρύζω) anything harsh against you" (60–61)—circulating, notwithstanding the negation, the harsh energy of γρύζω, at the end of the choliamb.

64 West 1974: 143 interprets τὴν ῥίνα and τὴν μύξαν as metaphors for the male sexual organ, but see the reservations of Degani 1983: 43.

and a little tunic and little sandals and little felt shoes, and 60 gold staters from the other side of the wall.

ἐμοὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἔδωκας οὔτε κω χλαῖναν
 δασεῖαν ἐν χειμῶνι φάρμακον ῥίγους,
 οὔτ' ἀσκέρησι τοὺς πόδας δασεῖησι
 ἔκρυψας, ὥς μοι μὴ χίμετλα ῥήγνυται.

For you haven't given me a shaggy cloak yet as a remedy against cold in winter, nor did you cover my feet in shaggy felt shoes, so that chilblains might not break for me.

Although as a modifier of χλαῖναν and ἀσκέρησι in the second fragment, δασύς suggests, according to commentators, a protective, healing “thickness” for the shivering speaker, its technical meaning of “aspirated” alerts us to the possibility that Hipponax may, on some level, be looking to augment his shivers and *horror*—the physiological analogs of phonetic aspiration, as we have seen.⁶⁵ Though the grammatical sense of the adjective postdates Hipponax, δασύς (chosen instead of πυκνός, the modifier of χλαῖνα in the *Odyssey*) indicates a “shaggy” version of a customarily “soft” cloak—something between the conventional urbane garment and an animal skin.⁶⁶ The χλαῖνα δασεῖα that the iambicist wishes for might thus be a *pharmakon* in the full, contradictory sense—a Derridean drug that is not “simply beneficial” but “can worsen the ill instead of remedy[ing] it.”⁶⁷ The prayer and the reproach themselves, while pleading for relief from cold, supply a *pharmakon* to the audience, engendering shudders through the harsh sibilant and velar sounds of κυπασσίσκον, σαμβάλισκα, and κάσκερίσκα (in the former) and through the sequences (in the latter) of words

65 On the therapeutic materiality of the χλαῖνα, see Telò 2016.

66 See Hom. *Od.* 14.521, 529. The χλαῖνα requested by Hipponax is usually identified with the typical prize at the Hermaia, the athletic games of Pellene: see Degani 1971: 103. This textile is qualified as soft in Pind. *Nem.* 10.44–45; see also Archil. fr. 196a.44–45 (see in n. 23). In asking for a “shaggy” χλαῖνα, perhaps Hipponax is playing with his audience's textual expectations and imagining something vaguely similar to the χιτῶν δασύς listed as the costume of satyrs in Poll. 4.118—although, as Mark Griffith points out to me, there is countervailing imagery in satyr drama of the creatures' smooth bodies and bald heads that goes along with their tendency to settle back into infantile pleasure taking and comfort seeking.

67 See Derrida 1981: 97, 99, in which he refers to the discussion of relieving an itch in Plato's *Philebus* as “a painful pleasure, linked as much to the malady as to its treatment” and thus “a *pharmakon* in itself.” See also Peponi 2002: 145–155 and 2012: 116–117.

beginning with aspirated consonants: χεῖμωνι φάρμακον ῥίγεις; χίμετλα ῥήγνυται. In particular, ῥίγεις, which, together with ῥιγῶ in the prayer, brings us back to *frigescunt* in Persius' discussion of the canine *r*, has a quasi-programmatic force. We find it, arguably, in encrypted form in fragment 54 as κριγῆ, a word that seems to conflate an owl's shriek with the teeth-chattering chills it provokes (κριγῆ δὲ νεκρῶν ἄγγελός τε καὶ κήρυξ).⁶⁸ Together, ῥίγεις and ῥήγνυται—both located where the choliamb breaks—capture the rough iambic energy of Hipponax's poem, a request for a *pharmakon* that is itself capable of extending the *pharmakos*-like sensations it apparently seeks to suppress.

The convergence of ῥίγες and ῥήγνυται is central to the first Strasbourg epode (fr. 115), attributed by most scholars to Hipponax. Here all the elements of the generic texture we have sampled so far congeal around the velar and rhotic sounds in ἄκρος (Latin *acer*, related to ἀκίς “pointed object”), creating a sense of lyric materiality, scratchy and shuddering intensities that cut across thematic and imagistic boundaries:

.[
 η[
 π.[]ν[...]. . . .[
 κύμ[ατι] πλα[ζόμε]νος·
 5 καὶ Σαλμυδ[ησσ]ῳ γυμνὸν εὐφρονέσ[τα]
 Θρήϊκες ἀκρό[κ]ομοι
 λάβοιεν—ἐνθ(α πόλλ') ἀναπλήσει κακὰ
 δούλιον ἄρτον ἔδων—
 ῥίγει πεπηγότ' αὐτόν· ἐκ δὲ τοῦ χν<ό>ου
 10 φυκία πόλλ' ἐπιχ(έ)οι,
 κροτέοι δ' ὀδόντας, ὥς [κ]ύων ἐπὶ στόμα
 κείμενος ἀκρασίῃ
 ἄκρον παρὰ ῥηγμῖνα κυμα[.....]:
 ταῦτ' ἐθέλοιμ' ἂν ιδεῖν,
 15 ὅς μ' ἠδίκησε, λ[ι]ξ δ' ἐφ' ὀρκίοισ' ἔβη,
 τὸ πρὶν ἐταῖρος [ἐ]ών.⁶⁹

68 See Degani 1982: 257 for the distinction between κρήνη, “screech owl” and κρηγή, defined by Σ Ar. Av. 1521 as “the shrill produced by the teeth of the dead.” This dental sound is similar to the chattering teeth described by βαμβάλυζω in Hipponax’s prayer to Hermes. In Hor. *Ep.* 5 a *strix*, a screech owl, with a name phonically reminiscent of κρήνη, appears in a packed catalogue of the iambic images and sounds we have discussed: *trementi ... ore* (11); *Thracum* (14); *horret capillis ... asperis / echinus* (27–28), on which see n. 56.

69 The text here follows Degani 1983.

5 εὐφρονέσ[ατα] Diels 7 ἀναπλήσει Π: ἀναπλήσαι West 10 ἐπιχ(έ)οι
Masson: ἐπέχοι West

... struck by the waves. And at Salmydessus may Thracians with hair standing up on end most merrily take him while he's naked—there he will have a full share of many evils, eating slavish bread—stiffened from cold. And out of the foam, may he shed much seaweed and may his teeth chatter as he lies face down, dog-like, at the very breaking of the wave, depleted.... I would wish to see these things [happen to the one] who wronged me and trod his oaths underfoot, though formerly a comrade.

Standing on end and making the sea shudder, the waves that will crash on the curse victim express the same material *horror* as the hair of the ἀκρό[χ]ομοι Thracians—inhabitants of the cold land where Hipponax's enemy will be shipwrecked, near Archilochus' Thasos.⁷⁰ Ἀκρόκομοι indicates upright hair, similar to bristly, trembling stalks or a lion's shaggy mane—perhaps also sexual arousal, an impression reinforced by the nakedness and proneness of the victim.⁷¹ The image converges with another hint of iambic texture: the castaway's emergence from the sea, “shedding” (ἐπιχ(έ)οι) a salty crust of seaweed (9–10), a kind of marine fur comparable to a fox's coat or a δασεῖα χλαῖνα.⁷² The phrase ἄκρον παρὰ ῥηγμῖνα merges the landscape with human bodies: not just with ἀκρό[χ]ομοι Thracians, but—through the related ῥηγμῖν/ῥήγνυμι—also with the shipwrecked man's skin, beaten, like Odysseus, by waves and “broken,” like Hipponax's, by shivers.⁷³ Hipponax's own symptoms, epitomized, as we have seen, by ῥίγος/ῥήγνυται in fragment 34, are, in fact, conjured by the shared sounds of ῥηγμῖνα and ῥίγει (9), as well as the chattering teeth conveyed by κροτέοι—an onomatopoeic verb that incorporates ἄκρος. The scratchy sounds (κ and ρ)

70 In *Il.* 4.424–426 a simile presents a wave that “rises to a crest,” breaks on the shore (χέρσῳ ῥηγνύμενον), and, striking against a cliff (ἄκρας), “comes to a head”; on the personification of these waves, which “get their crests up,” see Martin 1997: 154–156. In *Hor. Epod.* 10, whose intertextual debt to Hipponax's poem is widely acknowledged, the vehicle of iambic retaliation is “rough waves” (*horridis ... fluctibus* 3–4); see also *Epod.* 2.6 and 13.1–3. I owe these references to Emily Gowers.

71 For trembling stalks, see Nonn. *Dion.* 11.502 στάχυν ἀκροκόμοισι περιφρίσσοντα κορύμβοις; Aristotle uses the adjectives εὐθύτριξ and εὐθύτριχος, synonyms of ἀκρόκομος, both for Thracians and lions: see *GA* 782b34 and *HA* 629b35.

72 On the interpretation of ἐπιχ(έ)οι, see Nicolosi 2007: 68–69 and Swift 2019, 427.

73 Odysseus' shipwreck is the main subtext of Hipponax's description. The iambic target's frozen body (ῥίγει πεπηγότ', 9) absorbs the wave that hits Odysseus in *Od.* 5.388–389 κύματι πηγῷ / πλάζετο (ψυχρός is among the glosses suggested by Σ ad loc. for πηγός, which is cognate with πήγνυμι).

of this word, whose Latin counterpart, *acer*, is used by Horace to describe Hipponax himself,⁷⁴ are pervasive throughout the poem: see Θρήϊκες (6), ὀρκίοισ' (15), and ἀκρασίη—which the line break separates from ἄκρον (12–13).⁷⁵ Denoting the weariness of Hipponax's enemy, ἀκράσια puns on ἀκράσια, a synonym of ἀνωμαλία, meaning “unevenness,” a feature of the iambographer's shaking skin or, as we have previously seen, of Archilochus' Thracian island.⁷⁶ While delivering his curse and vocalizing the sounds that spread its harming power, the poet/performer (re-)experiences his own iambic pathology, eliding again the distance between aggressor and victim. It is as though the somatic *horror*, the vibrations of Hipponax's body, were directed outward, exposing the listeners/readers to a quasi-physical force similar to the waves' flogging the target (πλα[ζόμε]νος, 4), to incessant blows of barbed plants on the *pharmakos*' genitals, or to the prick of pointed objects.⁷⁷

We can see the diachronic reach of Hipponax's shudders in a passage of Plutarch, where a hypocritical Stoic who vaunts his *autarkeia* is seen at people's doors invoking the iambographer: “Give Hipponax a cloak, for I'm shivering fiercely, badly, and my teeth are chattering” (δὸς χλαῖναν Ἰππώνακτι, κάρτα γὰρ κακῶς ῥιγῶ καὶ βαμβαλύζω).⁷⁸ The Stoic's odd request for a cloak for Hipponax, rather than himself, is not simply a matter of theatrical impersonation.⁷⁹ The pompous philosopher's formulation suggests that his hypothermia depends on Hipponax's chills—as though they have been transmitted by contagion. Far from indicating citational “confusion” or an attempt to involve interlocutors and audience in a decoding game, the inversion of the original Hipponactean order—“I'm shivering fiercely, badly, and my teeth are chattering” followed by “give Hipponax a cloak”—may underline this transmissibility: “give Hipponax a cloak because *I'm* shivering fiercely, badly, and *my* teeth are chattering.”⁸⁰ In another Hellenistic epigram warning passersby about the dangers of Hip-

74 Hor. *Epod.* 6.14.

75 On the phonic symbolism of *cr* as indicating “brokenness” in English, see Genette 1995: 37.

76 Cf. Hesych. α 2543 ἀκρασίας ἀνωμαλίας. παρὰ τὸ μὴ συγκεκραῖσθαι.

77 On the equivalence between πλάζω and πλῆττω, see Nicolosi 2007: 43–44. Commenting on *Epod.* 10.3–4, which translates the beginning of Hipponax's poem (see n. 70), Oliensis 1998: 92 n. 70 suggests that the resemblance between *verberes* and *verba* brings together Horace's own “tongue-lashing” and the lashing of wind and waves. On whipping produced by sound in Catullus' iambics, see esp. Young 2015b: 69–70. For a parallel outside classical literature, cf. Prins 2013: 106–108, where she observes that in A.J. Swinburne's poem *On the Flogging Block*, “the beating of the body is performed in the beat of the poem.”

78 Plut. *Stoic. Parad.* 6.1058d.

79 Cf. Hawkins 2014: 216–219, who sees in the Stoic's impersonation of Hipponax a dramatization of the iambographer's own programmatic assumption of a mask.

80 In the edition of West the adverb *confuse* introduces the Plutarch passage as a testimo-

ponax's final resting place (*AP* 7.405 = *GP* 2861–2866), including the poet-as-wasp (4), the tomb is qualified as φορικτός—"frightful" in Gerber's translation,⁸¹ but also, more specifically, "making one's skin shiver."⁸² Like this tomb, Hipponax's poem perpetuates a generic tradition through affect—that is to say, by converting the poet's own staged abjection, his shivers and shudders materialized by formal δασύτης, into a *pharmakon* for readers-as-targets.

A comparable dynamic of generic affect is observable in one of Catullus' iambic experiments, in which the poet feels on his own skin and spreads Hipponactean shivers, closely aligning them with their *pharmakon*. In poem 44, written in choliambics, Catullus oddly addresses his own farm (*o funde noster*, 1), thanking it (as though it were a god) for helping him overcome a recent illness—a cough, whose origins and consequences are detailed in these lines:

- 10 nam, Sestianus dum volo esse conviva,
orationem in Antium petitozem
plenam veneni et pestilentiae legi.
hic me gravedo frigida et frequens tussis
quassavit usque, dum in tuum sinum fugi,
15 et me recuravi otioque et urtica.
quare refectus maximas tibi grates
ago, meum quod non es ulta peccatum.
nec deprecor iam, si nefaria scripta
Sesti receps, quin gravedinem et tussim
20 non mihi, sed ipsi Sestio ferat frigus,
qui tunc vocat me, cum malum librum legi.

For since I wished to be Sestius' dinner guest, I read his oration against the candidate Antius, full of poison and plague. At that point, a chilling head cold and a constant cough shook me, until finally I fled to your bosom, and cured myself with leisure and nettle. Therefore, restored, I thank you enormously because you did not punish my mistake. Now, if I ever shall have accepted again Sestius' foul scripts, I offer no prayer to prevent the

nium. Hawkins 2014: 218 observes that the Stoic's "Hipponactean display throws the onus of connecting the dots onto the audience."

81 Gerber 1999.

82 This reading is supported by the surrounding language—τὸν χαλαζεπὴ τάφον / τὸν φορικτὸν Ἰππώνακτος, οὗ τε χά τέφρα / ἱαμβιάζει (1–3)—in which the adjective χαλαζεπὴ ("hurling abuse as thick as hail" LSJ), together with the proliferation of aspirated sounds, recreates the texture of Hipponactean shivering, casting the tomb, and the iambic tradition, as an archive of shudders.

chill from bringing a head cold and cough not to me, but to Sestius himself, since he invites me only when I have read a baneful book.

Brent Vine has recognized in *ferat frigus* at the end of line 20 “a faint but clear lexical and metrical echo of the *mot clé*”⁸³ of Hipponax’s shivering addresses to Hermes, which, as we have seen, present lines closing with ῥίγος and ῥιγῶ, cognates with *frigus*. In triggering the rhythmical breach distinctive of the choliamb, *frigus* like *tussis* bodies forth the cough that provides the poem’s generative conceit. Although cough and chills are said to have been caused by the frigid orator Sestius’ speech “full of *venenum*,” this narrative may playfully cover up the real culprit—the venomous Hipponax. The lyric influence of Hipponax, whose beggarly persona is already reflected in Catullus’ self-presentation as a parasite enslaved to his belly (*venter*, 8), may have made Catullus catch a cold, realizing the threat raised by Hipponax’s φρικτός tomb, an archive of shivers. The appropriation of a generic form, then, has physiological consequences.⁸⁴ The feel of iambos is passed on to Catullus’ readers through *tussis*, used three times in a final trochee (the rhythmical cough),⁸⁵ the rhotic, fricative, and guttural sounds that rework and extend the Hipponactean tag *ferat frigus* (*gravedo/gravedinem*, *frigida*, *frequens*);⁸⁶ and *quassavit*. The last of these, a shaking, possibly reminiscent of the Hipponactean ῥήγνυται in fragment 34, translates the shiver roughening Hipponax’s skin into fractured syntax, the sharp enjambment that separates the verb in line 14 from the subject *tussis* (possibly etymologically connected with *tundo*, “thrust, knock”).⁸⁷ Allied with the salubrious *fundus*—the poem’s Hermes-like addressee—the remedy for Catullus’ illness, “nettle” (*urtica*), equally contributes to this materialization of generic sensation. Like Hipponax’s δασεῖα χλαῖνα, the *urtica* exemplifies the duplicity of a φάρμακον (or, the Latin equivalent, *venenum*) as both drug and

83 Vine 2009: 215.

84 Young 2015b: 116–120 has viewed Catullus’ translation of Sapph. fr. 31 V in poem 51 as a “virulently contagious” experience whereby the Roman poet “allow[s] the form of erotic selfhood [Sappho] modeled to seep under his skin and into his own poem.” In poem 36 Catullus uses the phrase *truces vibrare iambos* (5), which is usually taken as an allusion to the possible derivation of ἰαμβος from ἰάπτειν. One may also see a subliminal reference to the bodily vibrations, the *horrores* produced by the genre.

85 In line 7, as well as lines 13 and 19.

86 *Gravedo* is glossed as κατάρρους in *GL* s.v.

87 In Sen. *Ep.* 95.17 fevers are described as accompanied “by much shaking (*quassatione*) of limbs.” In English, the phoneme *qu-* has been judged a phonestheme of the idea of “shaking” (*quake*, *quiver*, *quaver*, *quash*): see Marchand 1959: 258. The iterative verb *quassavit* could also render βαμβάλῳ in fr. 32, where the reduplication (βαμβα-) onomatopoeitically expresses the continuous movement of chattering teeth.

poison—delivering therapeutically burning stings that, along with the shivers themselves, channel iambic affect.⁸⁸ Sensually akin to the hedgehog, the nettle belongs among Hipponax's prickly flora. Indeed, the appearance of *urtica* in the same marked metrical position as *frigus* and *tussis* underscores this collapsing of remedy and illness, which may potentially turn the wholesome *fundus* into a Hipponactean thorny garden, if we consider the medicinal plant, as much as the *otium*, a product of the farm. We can see something similar in the proximity of *refectus* (preceded by *quare*) and *recuravi* (15–16), which, through the repetition of *re*, emphasize recovery while diffusing a rhotic sensation (cf. *frequens tussis* 13) that perhaps evocatively reaches back to the Hipponactean ῥήγνυται. At the formal level, it is through sound that the vitality of Catullus' ostensibly cured illness lingers and remains transmissible to other victims (Sestius as well as listeners/readers). There is, in a sense, a homology between the sounds and the *urtica*, which, in its own way, keeps the illness alive, redoubling it by applying an iambic sting to iambic chills. The correspondence between *urtica* and *frigus*, burning remedy and chilly illness, in turn, invites us to consider a further aspect of aesthetic duplicity. Not only can the curative *pharmakon* act as a prickly venom, but shivers, pungent sensations, bodily lacerations, and aspirated intensities can themselves be thought of as healing, a cleansing *through* and *as* pain that would cast iambos' feel—its “attractive aversion[s]”⁸⁹—as a quasi-cathartic force.

Hipponax's shaggy χλαῖνα and Catullus' *urtica*, which roughens his *villa*'s comforting (and seductive) bosom (*in tuum sinum* 14),⁹⁰ are emblematic of iambos' masochistic asperity, the way this genre projects the painful pleasures of edgy experiences. The iambographer's request for bodily protection in the form of an “aspirated” textile reinscribes pain within pleasure. As shown by the outburst of aspirated sounds—materializations of somatic *horror* on the page—it also feels theatrically insincere, a masochist's disingenuous plea to end the game. If the iambographer's own chilly shudders ceased reverberating on the reader, the poem would be depleted of its generic vitality. Coldness, which, as we have seen, is central to the iambic imaginary (of Hipponax as well as Archilochus) and to the symbolism of *rho/r*, is the feeling of social exclusion, bringing pockets of death into our bodies.⁹¹ This impulse may underlie the

88 The presence of *recuravi* and *urtica* in the same line (15) makes us see in the former's phonetic configuration the latter's burning force, captured by its etymological link with *uro*.

89 I borrow this phrase from Kormeyer 2011.

90 In line 17 *es ulta* signals a shift of address from the *fundus* to the *villa* (see Fordyce 1961: 201), eroticized by *in tuum sinum fugi* (14).

91 See Clare 2013: 176: “[Coldness] is the bit of death inside of me that I struggle to guard

pushing of aesthetic boundaries fostered by the imaginary contact with iambic surfaces—brambles and wood, Thasos' craggy landscape, bushy or spiny animals, frigid temperatures. At the same time, since the iambographer is always positioned on the line between attacker and victim, sadistic and masochistic impulses, the audience's absorption of the sensations he generates and ostensibly feels may result in something comparable to the Freudian notion of reflexive masochism. Such a notion is predicated on "two contrary images of self—the image of the one who pleurably inflicts pain ... and that of the one who pleurably suffers that pain."⁹² Kaja Silverman has seen this dynamic at work in T.E. Lawrence's *Seven Pillars of Wisdom*, an account of his experience as a member of the British Forces of North Africa during the Arab revolt of 1916–1918. In this book, physical pain often feels like eroticized pleasure, one that "is compatible with—indeed, perhaps a requisite for—extreme virility."⁹³ A sharp crust of snow that gashes wrists and ankles until they bleed, "harsh stalks of wormwood stabbing into wounded" feet, skin torn away in "ragged sheets" by burning rocks, a body kicked by nailed boots, and genitals exposed to "the full length of [the] whip";⁹⁴ these images, which recall the spiky surfaces of iambos' generic imaginary (brambles and wood, craggy landscapes, frigid temperatures), articulate a corporeal model of subjectivity, whereby sexually charged physical pain, enervating flagellation, paradoxically entails a self-aggrandizing sense of dominance, "the illusion of a contained and autonomous self."⁹⁵ This notion is captured in the feel of the R.A.F. uniform, described by Lawrence in another novel—"tightly ... [gripping] the flesh," causing a form of sexual pleasure while impounding and constricting.⁹⁶ A similar dynamic lurks behind Hipponax's request for a $\chi\lambda\alpha\iota\nu\alpha$ whose scratchiness, in this case, subjects the iambicist to a kind of self-inflicted, perhaps self-fortifying, discomfort.⁹⁷

myself from." Deleuze 1991: 52 sees coldness as the programmatic antisensual, frozen condition of the masochist, who, although he feels, is constantly engaged in "the disavowal of sensuality." The characters we see in Leopold Von Sacher-Masoch's *Venus in Furs* are frequently cold, especially the women, "so chilled that they must be wrapped in furs and set before the fire" (MacKendrick 1999: 59).

92 Silverman 1992: 325. Reflexive masochism is elaborated by Freud 1915, who sees it as a defense against the castrating power of so-called feminine masochism.

93 Silverman 1992: 327. In a fable preserved by Babrius (95.74) but probably containing much older Aesopic material, a fox—an emblem of iambic bristliness, as we have seen—blames a deer for not being able to "endure the scratch" of a lion's paw: see Kurke 2011: 154–155.

94 Lawrence 1962: 509, 454, 487, 308.

95 Silverman 1992: 326.

96 Lawrence 1955: 56.

97 Iambos' generic imaginary includes other hints of masochism. In *Pythian* 2, which polemically engages with Archilochus (see esp. Brown 2006), Pindar refers to abusers, probably

An alternative to this paradigm—equally suitable to iambos' sympotic male homosociality, but conceivable for other readerly contexts across time, space, and gender—is Leo Bersani's idea of "sexuality as productive masochism."⁹⁸ Programmatically contesting the ideal of the unified self, the masochistic "self-shattering" that Bersani sees as intrinsic to the experience of sexuality could exemplify an equation between "self-divestiture" and "self-expansiveness, ... something like ego-dissemination rather than ego-annihilation."⁹⁹ "Shattering," expressed by the root of the verb *ρήγνυμι* (**rheg-* or **rhog-*), is the imagistic domain that connects iambos' form, its distinctive sounds and rhythm, with its vision of a body exposed to "sodomasochistic thrills"—a vision not altogether different from the representation of love travails in Sappho fragment 31, where the body trembles and the tongue is splintered.¹⁰⁰ An extreme variant of the choliamb called by ancient grammarians *ισχιορρωγικόν* ("broken-hipped")¹⁰¹ seems a metrical expression of the shivering Hipponax's chillblain-wracked feet (fr. 34.4 *χίμετλα ῥήγνυται*), the broken neck in one of his tumultuous sexual scenes (fr. 104.39 *λοφορρῶγας*),¹⁰² or the ruptured genitals of Archilochus himself or of one of his targets (fr. 252 *ἀλλ' ἀπερρώγασι μύκew τένοντες*). In these shattered corporealities we can perceive, as disabilities studies have shown us, the potential for an expansive disruption, that is to say, the possibility of an

the iambographers, as inflicting upon themselves a piercing wound (91): *ἐνέπαξαν ἑλκος ὀδυναρόν*. The verb *ἐμπήγνυμι* suggests penetrating spikes or, in any case, a contact with the pointed surfaces we have examined above. In fr. 193, Archilochus presents himself as "pierced (*πεπαρμένος*) in his bones" by longing.

98 Bersani 1986: 63.

99 Bersani and Phillips 2008: 57. The notion of "self-shattering" is discussed in Bersani's famous essay "Is the Rectum a Grave?" (Bersani 2009: 3–30). For a feminist critique of the notion of "productive masochism," see Booth 2014.

100 Fr. 31.9 *γλώσσα ἔαγε*; 13–14 *τρόμος δέ / παῖσαν ἄγρει*. These elements in Sappho's symptomology are discussed at length by Bonanno 1993, O'Higgins 1990, and esp. Prins 1999: 27–51. On the poem as a whole, see esp. Carson 1998: 12–17. Cf. also fr. 47 for the image of Eros as a shaking force (*ἐτίναξε*). On iambos and soft lyric genres, see n. 30.

101 The extant Hipponactean corpus presents thirteen certain examples of this version of the meter, marked by the presence of five long syllables from the fourth foot to the end. If the usual version of the choliamb displays "formlessness and incapacity" (Payne 2010: 38), the ischiorrhagic pushes further in the direction of self-imposed disability (and self-overcoming).

102 In the same poem (104 W = 107 Deg.), we find *ῥρήσων* (line 7), most likely a form of *ῥήσσω*, cognate with *ῥήγνυμι*; in the following line, we read, in the same metrical position, *ῥαῖξε*, probably a form of *ἐξαράσσω*, the verb that indicates "shattering" in fragment 22. We thus find a metrically recursive concentration of *r* sounds to represent bodily roughness (the same metrical position in line 11 is occupied by *ῥύδην*).

enhanced notion of embodiment,¹⁰³ the idea of “a body ... that opens itself up rather than seals itself”¹⁰⁴ or “attempts to escape from itself,” in Deleuze’s theorization of the spasm.¹⁰⁵ This self-divestiture is the physical counterpart of the formal trespassing that defines iambos, with its constant projection toward a “you,” its inbuilt temptation to break the frame. The *rho* itself, the sound that, as I have argued, captures iambos’ *horror*, rests upon a shaking (σειομένην in Plato’s account), a breaking of vocal bounds, that results in enhancement or, we might say, phonic prosthesis.¹⁰⁶ Appreciating its programmatic force, heeding its masochistic texture, we can sense iambos’ generic affect—a “remapping and reintensifying”¹⁰⁷ of feeling itself through the obtrusion of piercing pleasures that break through the fourth wall of the performance and the page of the text.

103 See esp. Braidotti 2013: 146 and Goodley et al. 2014: 348, who observe that “disability *crips* what it means to be a human being ... [calling] for new ... ways of relating, living, and dying.” In this perspective, disability is central to theorizations of human enhancement.

104 The citation is from Grosz 1994: 201.

105 Deleuze 2003: 16, analyzing the spasms represented in Francis Bacon’s work as an “approximation of horror or abjection,” where “the body exerts itself ... or waits to escape from itself.”

106 In Archil. fr. 128 we find the first occurrence in Greek literature of the term ῥυσμός, referring to the vicissitudes of human life. According to Benveniste 1971: 285–286, the pre-Platonic use of this term exhibits a tension between the etymological meaning—“flowing”—and the idea of a fixed, regular, patterned form, which still permeates contemporary accounts of rhythm (see Ristani 2016). The *rho* that launches ῥυσμός could itself be seen as an image of the body in flux.

107 I borrow this phrase from Sweetman 1999: 179, who considers the expansion of bodily faculties afforded by piercing and tattooing.