

sukcesów czy niepowodzeń Taborskiego przy tłumaczeniu określonego gatunku czy odmiany gatunkowej. Są nimi osobowość tłumacza, wpływ ówczesnych technik translatorskich oraz charakterystyczne cechy gatunków czy ich odmian. Jak wskazuje oryginalna twórczość Táborskiego, był on raczej epikiem niż lirykiem, miał przy tym skłonności do tworzenia satyry i liryki politycznej. Wychowywał się na ludowych tradycjach beskidzkich gór, przeto folklor był źródłem inspiracji jego poezji. W przypadku tłumaczeń z Lermontowa szczególnie wymagająca okazała się zwarta forma i prostota środków wyrazu jego liryki, z którą klócili się środki stylistyczne używane przez Táborskiego, charakterystyczne dla szkoły „lumirowskiej” (określenie używane przez twórców zgrupowanych wokół czasopisma „Lumir”): „wata” poetycka, używana dla rymu i rytmu, inwersje, neologizmy i niedokładności językowe, przesuwanie słów nieważnych na koniec wersu, co było wprost przeciwstawne do reprezentowanej przez Lermontowa zasady rymowania słów najważniejszych: spod wpływu tej szkoły Táborský się nie wyzwolił. Natomiast poematy Lermontowa dawały Táborskemu więcej swobody stylistycznej.

I tu osiągał lepsze efekty, gdy mógł wykorzystać swoją znajomość folkloru i znajomość rządzących nim praw. W takich przypadkach udawały mu się lepiej i inne tłumaczenia, jak pieśni dziecięce, baśnie Puszkina czy pewne partie poematu Błoka *Dvanáct*. Podobnie jak zwartość liryki Lermontowa, problemem nie do pokonania okazał się dla Táborskiego lapidarny styl komedii Gribojedowa, której dowcip i urok spoczywa przede wszystkim w mistrzostwie językowym. Táborský obdarzył ją poetycznością obcą Gribojedowowi. Fakt, iż jako całość najlepiej prezentują się przykłady utworów Puszkina, spowodowany był w znacznym stopniu tym, że podczas gdy Lermontowa usiłował zaprezentować bardzo bogato, z twórczości Puszkina przeważnie wybierał sobie tę część, która mu była najbliższa. Oprócz kilku przekładów jego liryków refleksyjnych i nastrojowych, najmocniej nacechowanych poetyką parnasistowską, oraz cyklu baśni, podejmował tłumaczenia na użytek przygotowywanej monografii *Puškín pěvec svobody* (1937). Miała ona przedstawić czeskiej publiczności twórcę nowoczesnej poezji rosyjskiej jako poetę politycznego, ośmieszającego des-

potyzm carski; złączyły się więc tutaj osobiste predyspozycje twórcze Táborskiego z pragnieniem poznania niezbyt do owego czasu znanego fragmentu twórczości wielkiego poety, przede wszystkim jego twórczości epigramatycznej oraz liryki politycznej. Również załączony przekład fragmentów dziesiątego rozdziału *Eugeniusza Oniegina* posiada walory równe niemal czołowemu współczesnemu tłumaczeniu Viléma Mathesiusa, a niektóre jego partie są nawet lepsze.

W pracy D. Kšicovej znajdziemy i inne uwagi dotyczące podejścia Táborskiego do problematyki gatunków uprawianych przez tłumaczonych poetów, których dzieła również w swych artykułach oceniał (np. już w roku 1891 w jubileuszowym artykule w piśmie „Čas” dopatruje się w burlesce Lermontowa rysów rodzącego się realizmu — podobnie jak to czyni dzisiejsza nauka o literaturze). Jednakże to, co zostało zasygnalizowane dotąd, świadczy już dostatecznie o tym, że autorka nie ograniczyła się do statystycznego opisu metody translatorskiej czy do pasywnej reprodukcji poglądów Táborskiego na poszczególne zjawiska literackie, ale poddała je starannej analizie, używając przy tym bogatego materiału porównawczego, wykazując szeroką znajomość literatury przedmiotu. Bogata podstawa faktograficzna pracy pozwoliła na wprowadzenie wniosków uogólniających, ważnych nie tylko z punktu widzenia historii czy teorii literatury i praktyki czeskich tłumaczeń z języków słowiańskich; książka zawiera wiele interesujących spostrzeżeń na temat problematyki przekładu, związanej ze specyfiką poszczególnych gatunków literackich.

Pavel Pešta, Brno

Alicja Szastyńska-Siemion, EPINIKION GRECKIE. MONOGRAFIA GATUNKU (THE GREEK EPINICION. A MONOGRAPH OF THE GENRE). Wrocław 1975, 164 pp. Series: Prace Wrocławskiego Towarzystwa Naukowego, No. 173.

Pindar, WYBÓR POEZJI (Pindar. A SELECTION OF POEMS), ed. and intr. by A. Szastyńska-Siemion, Wrocław 1981, pp. LXXIV + 167 (Biblioteka Narodowa, Series II, No. 199).

These two books are connected not only by the name of Author and Editor. A *Mono-*

graph, published six years prior to *A Selection of Pindar's Poems* with its comprehensive introduction by Alicja Szastyńska-Siemion, is devoted to a discussion of the epinicion, a literary form exemplified by Pindar's poems. It is therefore possible to deal with both these books here, as they make an important contribution to the study of ancient literary genres and place A. Szastyńska-Siemion among the most distinguished scholars of Pindar and the Greek lyric in general. Certain genological problems examined by the Author correspond with the range of interest of our periodical and shall be reviewed below. They occur particularly in the earlier *Monograph* which successfully combines the historical-literary and the theoretical approach. Thus, on the one hand, the development of the epinicion is viewed from a historical perspective while, on the other, special consideration is given to the relations between the genre and the literary conventions of the epoch, including their social and political background.

The epinicion (Gk. *epinikion*), an ode sung in honour of a victor in the Games, is a genre which can be examined from many sides thanks to a relatively large number of completely preserved poems by Pindar and Bacchylides (some 50 or more). Moreover, these poems come from the period in the first half of the 5th Century B.C., when the genre reached its apogee. This may account for the fact that research carried out hitherto concentrated mainly on the creativity of these two poets, particularly of Pindar. Regarded as "peripheral", the questions concerning the origin, early history and formation of the epinicion, as well as the subsequent attempts to revive it as a form, have clearly been neglected by scholars. One of the merits of A. Szastyńska-Siemion's study is her attempt to present the overall history of this genre, including hypotheses concerning the more obscure stages of its development and conclusions drawn from the analysis of preserved fragments of lesser-known poems. As a result, the monograph fills a serious gap in existing studies of the subject. Readers who up to now have only had access to the concise and in many respects outdated presentation of the topic by O. Crusius (*Epinikion*, entry in *Realencyclopädie* from 1907), will find a thorough study which includes both the

Author's own considerations and a critical survey of research into the subject.

From the point of view of genology, the most interesting is Chapter I, "Etymology and Definition of the Genre". The commonly used term *epinikion* (rarely *epinikos*) derives from the Greek adjectives "pertaining to victory" combined with "hymn" or "ode". The original application of the term was rather ambiguous. It was used to designate various forms of celebration, not only after victories at the Games, but after military or artistic victories as well. First used as a noun by Bacchylides, the term epinicion became more popular as late as the Alexandrian epoch when learned editors of ancient Greek poetry treated a large group of poems celebrating victors in terms of a separate genre. Until then the authors of early epinicia themselves had often described their works by means of synonymous terms, identical with those used in reference to other lyric poems. Such traditional terminology usually stressed the eulogistic tone of the epinicion and was in line with the opinions of ancient theoreticians, who regarded this genre as a form of eulogy (*enkomion*). However, since *enkomia* were written on different occasions, not necessarily connected with sport, nowadays a more accurate and precise term epinicion has become preferable.

The history and development of the epinicion is discussed in detail in Chapters II—III (pp. 14—75), partly in Chapter IV (pp. 76—135), and also in Chapter V (pp. 136—150); moreover, a concise summary of the Author's investigations is provided in the Final Conclusions (pp. 151—152). The starting-point for the Author's discussion is the fact that in ancient Greece there existed two kinds of choral odes celebrating a victor. The first was a short song, almost improvised, sung at the stadium immediately after a victory, in the solemn procession to the temple. The second was a long song, characterized by a definite structure, performed on the victor's return to his motherland, frequently during official or religious festivities. The Author rightly assumes that the origins of these two kinds of songs were probably different.

The first form seems to have begun much earlier. It was a short, improvised chant originating from the cheers raised by family, friends



and admirers of the athlete. It had existed outside the official literary current long before it was developed into a short song celebrating sports events. Its evolution must have spanned a long period, perhaps even several hundred years. The only surviving relic from that period is the Hymn devoted to Heracles, whose authorship is attributed to Archiloch. It consists of several cheers in honour of the hero and his companion Iolaos, which are separated by a refrain. For many centuries it had functioned as an epinicion sung immediately after a victory. With the addition of the apostrophe to Heracles to a joyous cry of victory (*ténella kallínike*), the hymn acquired a religious character and became closer to the Greek choral lyric (the aristocratic conception of Greek sport in the 6th and 5th c.B.C. was characterized by a sense of the relationship between a god and an athletic triumph).

The epinicion as a fully developed form of lyric poetry was created by Simonides of Ceos in the last decades of the 6th c.B.C. As can be inferred from the small fragments preserved, his epinicia were buoyant, festive pieces sung in a private circle at a banquet given by the family of the athlete. However, it is possible that the poet may also have written official, solemn epinicia of a more serious character. Still, Simonides seems to be far from the seriousness of his successor, Pindar. Employing myth, a traditional element of Greek lyric poetry, he is never intent on moral or religious purpose (he does not insert moralizing sentences), but acknowledges its purely literary function of glorifying the addressee. Similarly, the glorification of the victorious competitor is also achieved through an account of the Games provided in the central section of an ode, which was apparently less important to the followers of Simonides.

Pindar and Bacchylides, the poets a generation younger, produced an extensive number of epinicia which may be actually treated as the most representative of all the genres used by these poets. The structure of their epinicia is more elaborate and based on principles typical of all Greek choral lyrics. The ode structure has preserved such elements as invocations to gods, myths (occupying a central position), and gnomic sayings. The uniqueness of this kind of ode is due to the fact that it celebrates a single victory in sport and

the characteristic features of the athlete, his kin and country. All these elements are employed in order to compose a eulogistic song. Rather than to praise the victory itself, a primary function of the epinicion, especially in Pindar, is to extol different aristocratic virtues which, together with the favour of gods, accounted for the final triumph. The fact that these poets were often paid by rich patrons to write epinicia may have had considerable influence on the above concept of this genre. The history of the epinicion, a genre created by the aristocracy for the sake of glorifying the representatives of their class, may serve to illustrate how poetry in ancient Greece was conditioned by social life.

Apart from elaborate epinicia, there were simpler forms of ode which did not include a mythical development of the subject. They were short, improvised by the poet and sung at place of competition soon after a victory. Such songs were sometimes ordered by competitors who could not afford to pay for a more elaborate epinicion, and they were then performed on the return of the victor to his native town. In this case, the victory was seen to be related to the world of traditional aristocratic norms and, due to the limited length of the song, attention was focused on a selected trait or fact significant to the addressee.

The end of the political influence of the aristocracy (about the 5th c.B.C.) led to the decline of the epinicion's golden age. During later periods epinicia were composed and performed only occasionally. Some fragments of the epinicion written by Euripides for Alcibiades have been preserved. According to ancient authors, Alcibiades' motives ordering an epinicion for himself were his political ambition and aristocratic pride. In the Alexandrian epoch Callimach tried to write experimental poems in honour of victors, adopting for his purpose the form of elegy and iamb, which were then very fashionable (this poetry, however, was no longer meant to be sung by a choir). His poems, though linked to the tradition of Pindar's epinicia, were already marked strongly by Alexandrian sophistication and courtly fashion.

One of the important achievements of A. Szastyńska-Siemion's monograph is her exhaustive historical presentation of the two controversial problems which have been

discussed since ancient times, namely the unity of the epinicion and the character of the I-speaker. In her analysis of the odes by Pindar and Bacchylides in Chapter IV, the Author emphasizes that the above problems should be treated as two aspects of the same problem. The former question is justly recognized as naive, arising from misunderstanding the specific conventions that had been prevailing in the Greek lyric since the archaic period. Inherited from Horace, the 18th-century concept of the Pindaric ode as an example of "beautiful disorder" (Boileau's *beau desordre*), rejected in the 19th c. by August Boeckh who insisted on the structural unity of the epinicion, was propagated again by A.B. Drachmann towards the end of the 19th c. He stated that Pindar's odes had no unity and this lack of unity was their characteristic feature. Controversies between different followers of this theory and their opponents had lasted for many decades. A. Szastyńska-Siemion surveys the history of these controversies with a penetrating insight and skilfully presents the views of the most famous experts, such as W. Schadewald, H. Fraenkel, G. Coppola, G. Perrott, G. Norwood, B. A. van Groningen, M. B. Bowra, E.L. Bundy and E. Thummer. Her own attitude is quite explicit: "If a poem has been composed as a whole and is, moreover, connected with a concrete occasion and a concrete hero, thus there must exist a semantic relation among its different parts. Therefore we should not ask whether the text possesses a 'unity', but how it is constructed or, in other words, by what conventions it is governed" (p. 92).

According to many earlier commentators of Pindar, one of the factors responsible for breaking the unity (or coherence) of text was the type of the I-speaker. Even the ancient scholiasts wondered if the "I" in the epinicion referred to the author-poet or to the choir performing the song. A. Szastyńska-Siemion adheres to the views of W. J. Slater (*Futures in Pindar*, CQ XIX 1969, p. 89) who eliminated the distinction between a poet and a choir. She assumes correctly that in this kind of lyric the "I" is collective: the audience of the Greek melic poetry had been undoubtedly aware that they were listening to a choir, even when the choir spoke in the 1st person singular. The choir can sometimes assume the

role of the author, simply represent him or play his part. It happens for example in such formulas as those introducing a new theme or a new structural element of the epinicion, where there is a sudden and seemingly arbitrary transition from one part of the poem to another. They may be understood only when confronted with the conventions of the Greek archaic lyric. It is known that the lyric "I", as the so-called bardic "I", revealed itself exactly at the moments when the theme was changed. Its function in the ode—surprising to us—was that of providing a unifying link. The audience of Pindar and Bacchylides was accustomed to the traditional methods of composition and did not feel any discrepancy in the coherence of the ode.

The convincing arguments of A. Szastyńska-Siemion could be supported at this point by some considerations of personal relations characterizing the literary communication model for lyric. I mean in particular the instances of the so-called transpositional use of personal forms (incidentally, the Author touches upon this subject while analyzing selected specimens; cf. p. 99) or the instances when the sex of the speaker is indicated in the text (cf. fragment 29 from Alcman: the authorial "I" excluded by the feminine form of the participle).

The remarks included in A. Szastyńska-Siemion's Introduction to the second book (Pindar. *A Selection of Poems*) must necessarily overlap with the problems presented in the monograph discussed above. The Author introduces the reader to a variety of problems, such as the historical background, literary tradition, and sport in Greece. Chapter V (pp. XXXVII—LI) is devoted to a presentation of the poetic form of Pindar's epinicia and includes also Pindar's views on poetry and some observations concerning structural characteristics of the epinicion, as well as the function of gnomic sayings and myths. It is worth noticing that certain questions (e.g. the function of gnomes and myths) are elucidated here in a more systematic and intelligible way than in the monograph. Pindar's gnomes (maxims, sentences) had a double function: on the one hand, they provided a suitable link between one part of the ode and another (e.g. in passing from the praise of a victor to the mythical story); on the other



hand, they provided a crisp formulation of the moral sense. Whereas myths in epinicia reinforced the idea of continuity between the heroic epoch and the poet's contemporary times. Identifying the protagonists with mythical heroes, the myths also fulfilled a laudatory function. Additionally, they performed a moralizing function.

Very interesting from the point of view of historical poetics are the Author's observations on later followers of Pindar, included in Chapter VI (pp. LII—LXIII). She explains how the concept of Pindarics was adopted by West-European and Polish poets. For example, an Italian poet Luigi Alamanni (*Hymns*, 1532), and after him Minturno and Lampridio, employed in their imitations long, irregularly constructed stanzas which they preferred to rather short Horatian stanzas that had been used before then. Attempts to achieve loftiness by means of pathetic invocations, extravagant metaphors and other stylistic figures resulted in turgid rhetoric which had little in common with the original spirit of Pindar's poetry. Pindarics of P. Ronsard (*Odes*, 1550) were rarely written to commemorate important occasions (e.g. the epinicion on war in Book IV), but were mostly eulogies of court personages, similar to encomia. In the Elizabethan England the term ode denoted a love poem; the first odes modelled on Pindar were written by J. Southern (*Pandora*, 1584) who drew inspiration from Ronsard. But it was A. Cowley (1618—1667) who regarded himself the father of English genuine Pindarics. He abandoned regular stanzas and rhymes in favour of irregular metres and free rhythmical patterns. In the Baroque time the ode became again, like in the ancient times, a musical composition. Ceremonial odes were composed to celebrate important events from a court life, such as births, marriages, jubilees, coronations, and deaths. These odes were remote and pompous, devoid of any essential artistic values. In Classicism the ode functioned in a similar way. Skilful imitations

of Pindar were produced by great romantic poets (V. Hugo, P.B. Shelley, J.W. Goethe, F. Hölderlin, or F. Schiller). This period may be actually called a great renaissance of Pindarics in Europe. In Poland Pindarics were written in the 16th c. by Jan Kochanowski (some of his Latin poems) and, in the first place, by Szymon Szymonowicz who gained fame in Europe as the best imitator of Pindar and was even called Pindarus Polonus.

The texts included in the selection may be of great value especially for a Polish reader. They make it possible to confront the Author's theoretical observations with the reader's individual perception of this difficult poetry. All translations are preceded by illuminating introductions written by A. Szastyńska-Siemion, providing information about the time of composition, the protagonist of the poem, its theme and construction, the manner of performing, the meaning of particular parts of the ode and of the whole poem. The Author has also elaborated the footnotes to translations. It should be noted that the Selection edited by A. Szastyńska-Siemion is the first Polish publication of Pindar's poems prepared on a large scale. It comprises 18 translations by A. Szastyńska-Siemion and 15 selected earlier translations of 10 epinicia done by other writers.

The above remarks, though necessarily brief and confined to one group of problems, allow to conclude that both books by A. Szastyńska-Siemion may be regarded as valuable and useful. The monograph of the epinicion may be read with interest by both a specialist in Greek and Latin studies and a student of theory of literature who wants to examine the origins of one of the most popular ancient genres. Whereas the selection of poems may serve a wide group of educated readers as an excellent presentation of Pindar's output as well as an important supplement to the monograph.

*Jerzy Danielewicz, Poznań*

*Translated by E. Chrzanowska-Karpińska*