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 frr. 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."

In the first sentence of Herodotus' *Histories*, which Andrea L. Purvis has divided into two in her unpretentious translation for the Landmark edition,[1] we find the programme of a historiography that also and especially has a lot to say to us in our time.[2] Herodotus first gives his name. This can be seen pragmatically as a substitute for a title page or spine label, but it also contains a piece of the beginning of a specifically European conception of historiography. It is true that the *Iliad* had already vividly presented a great war of the past so that the glorious deeds of men (*kléa andrôn*) would be preserved, and the history books of the Old Testament describe in detail the efforts of Moses, the prophets, kings and judges to gain and secure the promised land for the people of Israel. But Homer gives himself as the mouthpiece of a higher power of the word; without the Muses he would be mute. And the historians of the Old Testament were nameless chroniclers of events emanating from Yahweh. But since the first sentence of the myth-critical work of Hecataeus of Miletus (c. 500 BCE), any speech about the past with a higher claim was inseparably linked to the authority and subjectivity of an author who called himself by name. At the same time, this was not merely a formal prerequisite for the discourse on history among the Greeks to be argumentative, controversial and competitive, at least on this level.

With "presents his enquiry" (in Greek nominally: *historíês apódexis*, "display of the enquiry"), Herodotus set the measure and standard for any meaningful historiography: when lacking an enquiry (*historíê*) that is as precise as possible, an activity of the intellect that gets to the bottom of things – we would say research today – it remains arbitrary talk about the past. Herodotus took up the efforts of the so-called Ionian natural philosophers to sound out phenomena more precisely in various fields of experience in order to be able to understand and explain the world better and more rationally – partly out of speculative curiosity, partly out of entirely practical needs. Empiricism – another insight that is still valid today – cannot do without theory, and so Herodotus made some of the reflections of the pre-Socratics, such as Anaximander and Heraclitus, fruitful.[3] But what is researched must also be presented publicly – this is the basic meaning of *apódexis* – i.e. proposed to an audience in a meaningful, convincing way, so that it becomes significant for action; otherwise it remains mere erudition. Thus three bridges were built for historiography for all times: one leads to politics as speech about community-relevant topics and procedures; as speech about correct behaviour,

[1] *The Landmark Herodotus: The Histories*. Edited by R.B. Strassler, translated by A.L. Purvis, with a new introduction by R. Thomas, New York 2007. All following translations are taken from this edition.

[2] Cf. P. Thoneman, "Not quite Cambridge", *Times Literary Supplement* No. 6241, Nov. 11, 2022, 8 (review of Dewald-Munson): "There, in a nutshell, is the credo of the western historiographic tradition: an 'enquiry' into past events (not a narrative born of poetic inspiration); a focus on the 'works of men' (not gods or heroes); and, above all, the 'reason why' things happened as they did."

[3] On this, U. Walter, "'Schlechte Zeugen sind für die Menschen Augen und Ohren derjenigen, die Barbaren-Seelen haben:' Heraklit und Herodot, zusammengedacht", in E. Fantino *et al.*, eds., *Heraklitus im Kontext*, Berlin-Boston 2017, 151-70.

another points to ethics; and by creating meaning with the means of language, a third points to rhetoric.

The objects of the work are then named threefold in funnel-like narrowing. On the one hand, "human events" grasp the subject matter conceivably broadly, but at the same time limit it strikingly: Admittedly, interventions of the gods or the deity in the form of dreams, oracles or punishing misfortunes play a central role in the *Histoires*. But at the centre of Herodotus' interest is man in his actions and suffering, his life and work, his knowledge and ability, while the epic is mainly about heroes and gods. Unobtrusively, this thematic focus is linked to a heuristic differentiation: Ancient and oldest narratives can at best be retold, but they are not a meaningful object of rationalising criticism (as in Hecataeus) or penetrating *historíê*. Therefore, although Herodotus refers to the stories of the theft of women between Hellenes and barbarians, including the Trojan War, he leaves them to their own devices. Rather, he knows (1.5.3-4) "who was the first man to begin unjust acts against the Hellenes. I shall describe him and then proceed with the rest of my story recounting cities both lesser and greater, since many of those that were great long ago have become inferior, and some that are great in my own time were inferior before. And so, resting on my knowledge that human prosperity never remains constant, I shall make mention of both without discrimination."

Secondly, by foregrounding "the great and wonderful deeds-some brought forth by the Hellenes, others by the barbarians", Herodotus, who had spent his childhood as a subject of the Persian Great King, keeps himself free of the anti-Persian chauvinism that was beginning to emerge in his time. In contrast, he later demonstrates in a concise episode, using the example of burial practices of the Hellenes and the Indian Callatians, that a certain *nómos*, a custom that has become law, prevails among all peoples and deserves unconditional respect (3.38). At the same time, the *nómos* could not be shaped arbitrarily, man was not – as Protagoras proclaimed – "the measure of all things", but shaped by climate and national nature, ancestry and tradition. Individuality and creative power, however, had plenty of room in this historically evolved enclosure and expressed themselves in "deeds" (érga): These could be buildings such as the pyramids, the city of Babylon or the water conduit tunnel of Eupalinos, technologies such as the invention of iron soldering (1.25.2), bravery in war, but also the establishment of a stable community order, as Lycurgus succeeded in doing in Sparta (1.65.2-5) and Deiokes among the Medes (1.96-101), and later Kleisthenes in Athens or Demonax in Cyrene. At the same time, Herodotus, with his accentuation, gave any future historiography the mandate to carefully select what is reported and to give reasons why this is taken into account and that omitted. The third, most narrowly defined theme appears to be the question of the responsibility or cause (*aitía*) for the war of the Hellenes and Barbarians against each other, which is the focus of books 5-9 of Herodotus' work.

In the series of three increasingly narrowly defined themes, Herodotus further weaves in the anthropological precondition for all historiography: Individuals

forget, with their death a large piece of knowledge about the past also fades away, and even social communities with their claim to continuity are affected by this erosion, even if they may have more means to slow down the process and preserve a socially anchored memory. In any case, as the first sentence once again says, events can "fade with time", which is why great achievements then "go unsung" (*akléa génêtai*) with posterity. Herodotus saw it as his task to counteract this, and the fight against forgetting as well as against too selective remembering has been the task of historians ever since. If Herodotus hardly reformulated the local oral traditions he had heard from his informants as such, but rather reproduced them with a "the Corinthians say", "as told by the Athenians" or "in Arcadia they say", this reflects a deep respect for the memories of the respective collectives. The intellectual autonomy of the historian remained unaffected by this; thus, as is well known, in the case of a dispute in which the truth could not be ascertained (7.152.3), he notes: "I may be obliged to tell what is said, but I am not at all obliged to believe it. And you may consider this statement to be valid for my entire work."

Carolyn Dewald and Rosaria Vignolo Munson, in their commentary, discuss Herodotus' first sentence in detail, of course (pp. 179-81). Thus ἀπόδεξις denotes "a display of the material that has resulted from his research and also a demonstration of the process of investigation". ἱστορίη was used by medical authors, but also refers (via the ἵστωρ in Homer) to the judge or arbitrator, "including the interrogation of witnesses and evaluation of evidence in adjudication disputes between parties". To ἀποδεχθέντα is finely noted the echo to ἀπόδεξις, "suggesting a parallel between the remarkable achievement H. celebrates in his narrative and his own performance or demonstration of his autorial skills". On the Homer reference in ἀκλέα, they add, as succinctly as aptly, "Part of his job as a narrator is to decide what is worthy of inclusion (...)." They rightly refer the loosely connected τά τε ἄλλα καὶ to a "principle of radical inclusiveness, conveying the results of his research (1.5.4n ἐπιμνήσομαι)"; the further evidence for an anticipatory use of ἄλλος can be found listed in the "Index of Greek words and phrases" at the end of the book. It becomes clear: Even those who are well acquainted with Herodotus' work and have thought deeply about individual or larger passages will in this commentary repeatedly find good observations and references to illuminating parallel passages that are worth pursuing.

It should be noted that the commentary, which runs to more than three hundred pages (179-482), is the fruit of almost two decades of work and cooperation (preface, ix); the list of books and essays on Herodotus presented by Dewald and Munson takes up one and a half pages in the bibliography. The "Introduction" alone covers 91 pages; it deals with the expected topics, starting with "Life of Herodotus" (pp. 1-10). Under "Form and Thought in Herodotus' Histories" (pp. 10-33), narratological questions, the author's view of history and the special features of the first book are discussed, among other things. The reviewer, who is admittedly an ancient historian, finds the problem of Herodotus' sources (cf.

pp. 22-4) dealt with somewhat scarce and stepmotherly, even though it certainly makes sense not to discuss this in isolation from the narrative organisation of the work. The long chapter on "Ethnographies" (pp. 33-84) focuses more on the historical context; it compares the Herodotean picture of the various peoples and regions with what we know elsewhere. Lydians and Phrygians, Persians and Medes, Ionians, Mesopotamians and Northeastern Peoples are discussed in turn. A brief overview of Herodotean Greek (pp. 84-8) and the design of Text and Critical Apparatus (pp. 88-91) conclude the introduction.

Dewald and Munson have tailored Text and Apparatus (pp. 93-175) to the needs of non-specialists: orthographic deviations and dialect variants are not recorded; in the constitution of the text they have generally "chosen a conservative course, staying as close as possible to readings found in the best MSS". Rosén's controversial Teubneriana was consulted less frequently in this sense than the editions by Hude, Legrand, Asheri and Wilson. The table of contents (pp. 176-8) immediately precedes the commentary; it gives the "narrative sections as identified here". The major and minor narrative sections are each preceded by an introduction that discusses the context and aspects of narrative technique. The commentary takes into account the fact that it is (also) intended for reading Herodotus in Greek classes: lexis and semantics of individual words are explained as well as grammatical issues, regularly with reference to standard English-language grammars and reference works. The research literature is comprehensively considered; the list of "Works Cited" covers more than thirty pages (pp. 483-514). However, Dewald and Munson refer to the views and controversies of the research literature much less extensively than, for example, Simon Hornblower in his three-volume commentary on Thucydides.

The detailed indexes (General pp. 515-36) are to be particularly commended: Reading the index alone reveals the immense richness of Herodotus' work, with long entries on groups of actors such as "children" and "women" or on factual topics such as "burials", "constitutions/governmental arrangements" and "disability/disease".

In the course of time, the green-yellow volumes of the "Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics" have increasingly become fully-fledged full-scale commentaries which, in terms of ambition, attention to detail and quality, hardly differ from the orange-red series of the "Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries". In the reviewer's opinion, however, it is now anachronistic not to include a translation. Dewald and Munson usually translate the quoted lemma in the commentary, they also repeatedly translate individual words, phrases or entire sentences in order to make their own understanding of the text as concise and clear as possible. Thus it is certainly possible for a student without Greek to use the commentary despite the Greek lemmata, but a certain threshold remains. Conversely, the blue "Clarandon Ancient History Series" with its recently extensive commentaries, which also often represent significant research achievements, has been rightly criticised for lacking the original Greek or Latin text, but this shortcoming is

easily cured by placing a critical edition alongside it. This is of course equally true of the green-yellow series mutatis mutandis, but here the chosen translation may be at odds with the editors' understanding of the text.

The commentary on Book 1 is now the fifth in the series of green-yellow commentaries on Herodotus (on Hornblower-Pelling on Book VI, see Jan. P. Stronk, *ExClass* 23, 2019, 277-80), no doubt a particularly important one because of the outstanding importance of the first book for Herodotus' work as a whole. Nevertheless, this reviewer's mantra remains: The gap of the seventh book urgently needs to be filled![4] If this happens on the high level of the present work, it would be all the more gratifying.

Uwe Walter
Universität Bielefeld
uwe.walter@uni-bielefeld.de

Leonardo Fiorentini, *Cratino* Seriphioi – Horai *(frr. 218–298)*, Traduzione e commento, Fragmenta Comica 3.5, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2022, 304 pp., ISBN 978-3-949189-60-9.

Quello uscito per le cure di Leonardo Fiorentini (d'ora in avanti, F.) è il quarto (in ordine di pubblicazione, il quinto nel progetto editoriale) dei sei tomi in cui risulta articolato il terzo volume della prestigiosa serie "Fragmenta Comica (FrC)"[1], edita nell'àmbito del progetto internazionale "Kommentierung der Fragmente der Griechischen Komödie (KomFrag)" diretto da Bernhard Zimmermann e finanziato dalla Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Oggetto di analisi, commento e traduzione sono i frammenti di cinque commedie di Cratino (*Seriphioi*, *Trophōnios*, *Cheimazomenoi*, *Cheirōnes*, *Hōrai*), per la cui numerazione e per il cui testo, in linea con i criteri editoriali della serie, F. si è attenuto all'edizione di Rudolf Kassel e Colin Austin[2], pur con qualche piccola modifica, debitamente rendicontata e giustificata nel commento[3].

[4] Unfortunately, the English translation and editing of the Italian commentary of the Fondazione Lorenzo Valla at Montadori (books i-iv, Oxford 2007), undertaken by O. Murray and A. Moreno, has not yet been completed.

[1] Cf. https://www.komfrag.uni-freiburg.de/baende_liste.

[2] Cf. *Poetae Comici Graeci*, IV, Berlin-New York 1983, 233-67, con i relativi *Addenda et corrigenda* in *Poetae Comici Graeci*, III.2, Berlin-New York 1984, 444, nonché in *Poetae Comici Graeci*, V, Berlin-New York 1986, 640, e in *Poetae Comici Graeci*, VIII, Berlin-New York 1995, 524.

[3] Ad es., nel fr. 223.1, diversamente da Kassel–Austin, i quali, con L. Holstein (*Notae et castigationes postumae in Stephani Byzantii* Ἐθνικά, Lugduni Batavorum 1684, 103), leggevano Σάβας, F. preferisce stampare Σάκας, che è la lezione offerta dalla tradizione manoscritta di Stefano di Bisanzio (δ 117 Billerbeck–Zubler), testimone dei vv. 1-2 del frammento cratineo.