

‘some ancient and modern scholars’) as a rather negligible position, labelling it ‘unlikely, if not impossible’.¹² This is too unbalanced; both is possible.

ad 425: Schein points out the parallel between the eleven-days interval of the gods’ absence from Olympos and the same interval during which the gods supporting the Greeks refuse the burial of Hector’s dead body in 24.23-32. This is surely right and fits the general pattern of similarities between Book 1 and Book 24.¹³ But there is a caveat, which Schein does not mention: The interval of eleven days is convenient in the Homeric formula-system; there is even another one in Book 24: the truce for Hector’s burial envisaged by his father Priam (24.667). This makes the proposed parallel less likely.¹⁴

But these are minor criticisms. Overall, Schein has produced a reliable companion for reading the first Book of the *Iliad*, which in the future will not be missing from any desk on which Homer is studied. The extensive bibliography provides an excellent starting point for anyone wishing to delve into the relevant topics; the division into editions, commentaries and translations on the one hand and books and articles on the other seems to be more of a hindrance than helpful, especially since the former does not only contain books specific to Homer. Two excellent indices facilitate the accessibility.

HAUKE SCHNEIDER
Christian-Albrechts-Universität, Kiel
hschneider@email.uni-kiel.de

MARCUS RECCHIA, *Pindari et Bacchylidis Hyporchematum Fragmenta*, Romae: in aedibus Athenaei, 2022, 234 pp., €144.00, ISBN 978-88-8476-134-7.

This survey is a welcome contribution to the study of early classical lyric poetry. The author concentrates on a subgenre of lyric poetry that lacks extensive commentation although it has received considerable attention in previous scholarship. The originality of the enterprise lies in the fact that he ventures a subgeneric summation of what is transmitted as *hyporchema* [= song that works as a prime act of dance in connectural accompaniment of verse] and attributed to Pindar and Bacchylides (caution about authorship is expressed in a single case). The texts that are presented as *hyporchemata*, are characterised as fragments in accordance to how issues of form come to the fore with regard to extent and metre. Fragmentary poetry of lyric provenance has been endowed with a remarkable instrument for subgeneric acclaim and further exploration.

¹² In this he follows, even in the choice of words, M.M. Willcock, *The Iliad of Homer. Books i-xii*, London 1978, *ad loc.*

¹³ Cf. C.W. MacLeod, *Homer. Iliad Book xxiv*, Cambridge 1982, 32-3.

¹⁴ Cf. G.S. Kirk, *The Iliad. A Commentary*, vol. i: books 1-4, *ad* 1.493-4.

The survey is well structured in manner that is commensurate with how the production of a 'commentary' ordains pertinence and prefecture. It has six cardinal sections that allow pervasiveness in the way that it becomes accessible to readers: introduction, testimonia, text, metre, translation, commentary. The structuration of the ordinance has two privileges: [1] the division that is promulgated, is an advertiser of compartments that work in favour of gradual understanding; [2] the serialisation of concatenated sections have the advantage of why exhaustive coverage is extolled in a subgeneric situation that deserves meticulous investigation.

The introduction exhibits twelve points of interest for the formation of issues that are helpful in the contemplation of the particular subgenre: [1] the acknowledged position of *hyporchema* in the system of subgeneric classification that is ascribed to Proclus (Photius is supposed to be an inheritant), designates how seminal the condition of distinctivity can be for the impression of what a subgenre means; [2] the thorough examination of *Vita Ambrosiana* that is conducted for reasons of organisational capacity of literature in the form of books, leads to the inference that *hyporchema* is conceived as subgenre that is dedicated to divine veneration; [3] the Cretan origin of *hyporchema* is attested in several authors (Athenaeus, Sosibius, Anonymus Ambrosianus); [4] dance in mimetic disposition is the acclaimed descriptive feature of the subgenre; [5] there is a problem of the extent to which dance of hyporchematic performance is distinctively staged in the fragments that survive; [6] the reports of Athenaeus and Plutarch about the character of hyporchematic dance tag it as a category of movement that is suitable for men and is motivated through gentlety and vivacity; [7] the hyporchematic chorus is the outcome of pre-election that rests on selectivity; [8] the choreuts are presumably distinct from the singers in the hyporchematic performance; [9] the testimonies for the metrical constitution of *hyporchema* are basically threefold: cretic and paeonic, enoplion and ithyphallic, sotadean; [10] attestation of the lyre and primarily the pipe as musical instruments for the accompaniment of hyporchematic performers is registered; [11] the group of poets that composed *hyporchemata*, includes Pindar, Bacchylides, Thales, Xenodamus, Pratinas; [12] the case of Pratinas is exceptional because an *hyporchema* of his is critical of the underrated rank of the singer of verse in the performance. The introduction is very prone to the suppliance of information in manner that is cautious and respectful of earlier scholarship.

I need to make two statements about issues that are raised in the introduction. The first concerns a justification of the Cretan origin of *hyporchema* that is based on the myth of Zeus. The second focuses on a crucial technicality of performative nature for what the subgeneric term denotes. The issues merit reconsideration that is valuable for the extension of our knowledge about the subgenre.

The first statement is related to the aetiological myth of the hyporchematic dance that justifies the invention of the subgenre. The Cretan origin of the subgenre of *hyporchema* is pertinently acknowledged as valid due to a plethora of

testimonies (pp. 18-20; cf. 51, 55-6, 59-60). What is missing is a true *aetion* for the emergence of the specific sort of dance that gave birth to the song. I propose the myth of Curetes who played a significant role in the story of Zeus' birth at Mt. Ide. My proposition is based on two indications that enliven the idea of how dance is of prime importance: [1] the first is an explicit reference in the Pindaric scholia (Schol. ad P. Py. 2.127 Drachmann) to the fact that the Curetes are responsible for the invention of enarmoured dance and its performance (cf. T 31 = p. 59; Phot. *Bibl.* 239.320b Henry); [2] the second is inferred through the function of Curetes in the story of the god's birth because they are a group of young men, who dance in warlike manner so that they may keep the infant son of Cronus drawn away from him (Str. 10.3.11 ὑποσπᾶσαντες) [the participle denotes the act of how somebody detracts something from its entity or position *under* certain circumstance]. In accordance to these indications Curetes are the prototypical chorus of what is considered as *hyporchema* because they are thought to both sing and dance (Str. 10.3.11 μετὰ τυμπάνων καὶ τοιούτων ἄλλων ψόφων καὶ ἐνοπλίου χορείας καὶ θορύβου [θόρυβος can mean the clamour or sound of voices]) in an attempt to detract the child of Cronus from his father the swallower. The *aetion* for the protection of Zeus through Curetes must have given vent to the development of *hyporchema*.

The second statement has to do with the connotations of the prefix ὑπο- that are resident in hyporchematic performance. There is a lack of explicitness in respect of what the preposition denotes in the compound ὑπόρχημα. Scholars are unanimous about versification that works on the condition of accompaniable dance. Performance of *hyporchema* is in coherence with the aforementioned belief based on how the chorus of this song extols dance in mimesis of the vocal part. The preposition conveys the idea of how the dancer is very attentive of what the verse ordains, so that he translates it in movement of special rank in rendition. At a further level the choreuts are a formation of performatonal enaction that pays tribute to the words of an *exarchon* who refrains from the act of dance. I contend that the view of a choreutic formation with particular importance, which acts under the overwhelming influence of musical composition, is pertinent in reference to what the prefix is meant to regard.

The textual section of the survey that comprises presentation of the Greek text with critical apparatus, metrical constitution and Italian translation, is in impressively attuned order. The adducement of critical notes to the subterminal part of a fragment that does not differ from the editions of Snell & Maehler at individual points, is ample and postponed through conspection of sources in which it is attested. Metrical analysis is the outcome of assiduous scholarship that lays emphasis on the syntheticity of lyric verse. The translation that the author provides, is close to the original text because it is diligently made to provide information about content.

The part in which the commentary appears, consists in occasional sections on the transmission of the text in tradition, context of execution, date, and in the

actual commentary. The latter exhibits three qualities that need to be commented upon: [1] selection of characteristic passages for discussion or mention; [2] precarious features are reduced to a minimum of occurrence; [3] concentration on relevant issues for the history and function of the subgenre. The part in question is not exhaustive from the perspective of its potential turning-points toward interpretational amendments, but insists in propriety of commentation through lack of extension and precision.

There are two remarks that concern the potential inclusion of fragments in the group of *hyporchemata*. The first is in support of the inclusion of Bacchylides fr. 16 Blass in the subgenre of *hyporchema* for reasons of mimetic representation of circular dance and expression that focuses on performance (see M. Skempis, “Bacchylides’ ὑπόρχημα fr. 16 Blass”, *Lexis* 35, 2017, 90-8, here 95-6). The second takes issue with the attribution of fr. 13a-b to an uncertified poet (presumably Pindar) instead of Simonides (cf. O. Poltera, *Simonides lyricus: Testimonia und Fragmente. Einleitung, kritische Ausgabe, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Basel 2008, 194-7 [= F 255]) because of how the discussion of Plutarch (*Quaest. conv.* 248a-b; cf. T 11 = p. 51) sets the problem of the reception and connection of dance with poetry in line with Simonides’ view of how dance is pictorial in essence, and *hyporchema*. The question of dubious fragments and how one deals with them, is a matter of judgement that springs from estimation of conditions that determine the transmission of ancient texts.

The book of Recchia constitutes an attempt to re-appraise the knowledge that we have about the subgenre of *hyporchema*, that is crowned with considerable success in two respects: [1] it classifies fragments through the summational criterion of subgenre in assistance of authorial designation; [2] it furnishes a detailed commentary that has the advantage of presentation and adequate clarification of issues that adhere to the particular subgenre. It is a contribution that claims good status in the renowned series that it represents due to aspirate erudition and scholarly commitment.

MARIOS SKEMPIS
Independent Scholar
marios.skempis@gmail.com

CAROLYN DEWALD, ROSARIA VIGNOLO MUNSON, *Herodotus. Histories: Book I*, Cambridge Greek and Latin classics, Cambridge-New York: Cambridge University Press, 2022, xix+536 pp., 5 maps, €116.70, ISBN 978-0-521-69270-0 (hb); €38.50, ISBN 978-0-521-87173-0 (pb).

“Herodotus of Halicarnassus here presents his research so that human events do not fade with time. May the great and wonderful deeds—some brought forth by the Hellenes, others by the barbarians—not go unsung; as well as the causes that led them to make war on each other.”