A close reading of *Pythian* 1 opens the second chapter, 'Shared Experience', which addresses fundamental Pindaric questions, including what we should talk about when we talk about Pindar's audiences, the identity of the Pindaric 'I' and the importance of occasion, with an eye to how all of these contribute to the evocation of the sublime. Fowler's approaches to these questions are bound up with a recent turn in Pindaric scholarship which emphasizes Pindar's poetry as poetry, originating in but not confined by the contexts of the first performance, an angle recently argued by, among others, Boris Maslov, *Pindar and the Emergence of Literature* (Cambridge 2015), who appears as a frequent interlocutor. For Fowler, the indeterminacy of speaker, time, place and audience evoked by Pindar's poems creates the opportunity for the emergence of the sublime. To stick with his opening example of *Pythian* 1, the inexhaustible and layered referents of the ode's images (the evocation of the golden lyre which is at once Apollo's, the lyre heard by an ancient audience and the lyre imagined by a modern reader; the evocation of dancers who may or may not be present in performance; the vivid depiction of Etna so that even readers more than two thousand years later can see the eruption) create, as Fowler puts it, an 'excess of meaning' (69) which invites audiences (in the broadest sense) into the sublime.

The third chapter, 'Exceeding Limits', turns its attention to matters of myth, religion, language and time. Two orientations are provided early in the chapter, first, to the landscape of Greek religion and myth and then, glancing back to Hölderlin, a discussion of immanence and transcendence, concepts that will be fundamental to the following arguments. Coming back to Pindar, Fowler conceptualizes a vertical movement that invites mortals into a sort of divine experience and also invites gods down into the mortal world. As he puts it, 'These two movements up and down … meet on a transcendent level where meaning resides, both that which can and that which cannot be represented. In other words, these are potentially sublime moments' (147). Pindar's myths, he argues, construct boundaries in ways that create hesitation, for example, how to balance the ambition to be like the mythical heroes while recognizing human limitations. This uncertainty, the entry point to the sublime, also occurs at the level of language, an effect that Fowler highlights in Pindar's metaphors.

Pindar and the Sublime is both thought-provoking and challenging. I sometimes found myself wishing for further integration of the frameworks derived from the early modern thinkers in Chapter 1 with Fowler's Pindaric examples which are much more prominent in chapters 2 and 3. I suspect that readers with limited familiarity in either area will find themselves intermittently overwhelmed. But perhaps this is inevitable in a book of this sort: every page bursts with Fowler's palpable passion for his subject and demonstrates the invigorating possibilities of reading Pindar as a poet of the sublime and, more broadly, in conversation with both his early modern readers and the many contemporary theorists of lyric whom Fowler adduces throughout the book.

HANNE EISENFELD
Boston College
Email: eisenfel@bc.edu

GARSTAD (B.) **Bouttios and Late Antique Antioch: Reconstructing a Lost Historian** (Dumbarton Oaks Studies XLVIII). Washington DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2022. Pp. xiii + 436. €50. 978088424934.
doi:10.1017/S0075426923000770

The sixth-century chronicler John Malalas refers three times to an author called Bouttios. In one case, this reference finds a parallel in the *Chronicle* of Eusebius of Caesarea (325), which

mentions a certain Bruttius as a source for the persecution of Flavia Domitilla under Domitian. In this monograph, Benjamin Garstad argues that Bouttios was an Antiochene Christian writing in the middle of the fourth century, presumably in response to Julian the Apostate (361–63). His work, of unknown genre, was largely fiction and was used by the sixth-century Greek original of the so-called *Excerpta Latina Barbari* (*c.* 800). John Malalas accessed it via a possibly sixth-century historian called Domninus. Building on parallels in content, Garstad prints 35 fragments, drawn mainly from these two citing authorities. This reconstruction contrasts with those of *FRHist* 98 and *FHistLA* 21 (L. Van Hoof and P. Van Nuffelen, *The Fragmentary Latin Histories of Late Antiquity* (Cambridge 2020)). They call this author Bruttius, list three short fragments and question the authenticity of the references to Bouttios in John Malalas, except for the one that derives from the chronicle of Eusebius. A century ago, Felix Jacoby (*Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker 2A* (Berlin 1926), vii) warned against expansive collections of fragments and scholars' confidence in their abilities to reconstruct historians based on perceived thematic connections between passages in citing authorities: 'Diese Sicherheit wird meist überschätzt' ('This certainty is often overestimated').

The present book illustrates Jacoby's wisdom. Garstad's dating of Bouttios to the middle of the fourth century faces the problem that Bruttius is attested throughout the entire tradition of Eusebius' *Chronicle* (Greek, Armenian, Latin and Syriac), which renders it inevitable that he was in the now-lost original. Hence, Bruttius predates Eusebius. As a way out, Garstad suggests (55) that Bruttius' name was inserted in an interpolated version of Eusebius' chronicle. Of doubtful existence anyway, such an interpolated version was suggested only for the Greek and Armenian traditions, and was dated to *c.* 412 (A.A. Mosshammer, *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Lewisburg 1979), 77–78). As the name of Bruttius is already in Jerome's translation in 380, even on Mosshammer's hypothesis it was in the original Eusebius. Further, the Syriac witness (*Chronicle of 724*) has been shown by Richard Burgess (*Studies in Eusebian and Post-Eusebian Chronography* (Stuttgart 1999)) to depend on a continuation of Eusebius up to 350, thus dating its reference to Bruttius before the supposed date of Garstad's Bouttios. This is problematic for Garstad's fragment collection, as *frs* 33–35 describe events of 330 (and thus postdating the publication of Eusebius' *Chronicle*). One of these relates to a Tyche sacrifice, whereas a central argument of the book is that all accounts of such sacrifices in Malalas derive from Bouttios.

Regarding the name Bouttios, the Eusebius tradition attests that his name contained an *r* (*Brettios* and *Bruttius*), which has dropped out only in John Malalas. Garstad's privileging of John Malalas for the name (118–37) reflects insufficient attention to the complexities of the Malalas tradition. We only possess an abridged Greek original and the text regularly garbles names (for example, *Herodotus* instead of *Herodorus*). Malalas attributes information to sources from which it cannot have been drawn (for instance, Flavius Josephus, Irenaeus) and many source references are second-hand and distorted (see E. Jeffreys, 'Malalas' Sources', in E. Jeffreys (ed.), *Studies in Malalas* (Melbourne 1990), 167–216). Garstad prefers to understand Malalas as an accurate reporter of Bouttios' text, for example, when refusing (161) to believe that the reference to Christians exiled to the *Pontus* under Domitian (Joh. Mal. 10.48) is a misunderstanding of *Pontia*, the place of exile for Domitilla as given by the entire parallel tradition.

Based on thematic connections in Malalas, Garstad's collection of fragments skirts the issue that we cannot decide if these narrative links are due to Bouttios, Domninus or Malalas. His fragments sometimes leave out the source references given by Malalas to sources other than Bouttios, crucially, in two instances, references to Eusebius of Caesarea (*frs* 10 and 14). For *fr.* 12 (Malalas 7.17) and *fr.* 17 (*Excerpta latina barbari* 1.8.4), there is evidence that they derive from a later expansion of Eusebius, as attested in the seventh-century Armenian chronicle attributed to Philo of Tirak (§296: A. Hakobyan, *Philon Tirakacʻi, žamanakagrutʻiwn Ē daru*, in Matenagirkʻ Hayocʻ 5 (Yerevan 2005), 903–69). This conflicts with Garstad's view of Bouttios as separate from the

Eusebius tradition and the author of a more prolix text. Readers interested in contexts for passages of John Malalas may draw profit from this book, which otherwise demonstrates the wisdom of the founding father of the modern study of fragmentary Greek historians.

Peter Van Nuffelen
Ghent University
Email: peter.vannuffelen@ugent.be

Choreonarratives is a seminal incident in the recent proliferation of ancient dance studies. Seminal, because it illuminates some rarely addressed but fundamental pillars of Graeco-Roman choreo-dramatic performance: dance movements (rather than dance formations or routines); solo performance; the physiological and psychological channels of spectatorship; and the configurations and transfigurations of the (Hellenized) pantomime as a 'world dance' under the universality granted to the French ballet. Incident, because of its groundbreaking focus on the existing choreologic material in classics.

Part 1 ('Dance as Medium of Narration') starts with a literature review immediately adherent to the promised centrality of practical choreology. Holding no longer to the myopic cliché of limiting *choros/kinēsis/orchēsis* to the chorus' activities, Bernhard Zimmermann identifies four types of choreologic hints (*didaskaliai*) in Aristophanes' comedies, found in stage directions, dialogues, 'outsiders' comments' and dance interludes. He gives us a vivid picture of the multi-semiotic functionality offered by different solo and choral dance formations, while taking us through the development of societal expression of civic individualism thriving in late fifth-century Athens.

The centrality of dance movement continues with a second spotlight on choreologic material in texts. Sophie M. Bocksberger incarnates her hands-on experience as a dancer in her performative-philological study of the core element of dance, the rhythmic and stylistic movement of the body(parts), termed 'schema'. Drawing on classical writers' presentations of the word, Bocksberger demonstrates how schema, as a key choreologic concept, ambitiously targets implications far beyond 'dance step', 'movement' and 'gesture', while opening up a systematic method for narrating a persona (*ēthos*) through the re-embodiment of affections and emotional responses (*pathos*).

Concentrating on representational mimesis, a yet another hyper-classical perspective emerges in Karin Schlapbach's essay on non-representational, non-dramatized dances of Late Antiquity beyond the overarching picture of the Graeco-Roman pantomime (*orchēsis*). Watching a dance routine can trigger the audience's decipherment of its individual and specific schemata, but then, by recalling the underflowing experience of myths, the decipherment may invoke unsettlement, excitement and even ecstasy.

Lucia Ruprecht's decipherment of Noé Soulier's choreographed rendition of Virginia Woolf's *The Waves* (2018) juxtaposes the writer's compressed conceptualization of human movements with the dancer's multi-sensory choreography of interpersonal and meta-personal/societal discourses.

The next three chapters, those comprising Part 2, centring on the dances of Io, Neoptolemus and Salome, underline the interactive triangle of actor-spectator-recounter