

Alexandros KAMPAKOGLU, *Studies in the Reception of Pindar in Ptolemaic Poetry*, Berlin–Boston: De Gruyter, 2019 (Trends in Classics – Supplementary Volume 76), XIV + 454 pp., ISBN 978-3-11-064140-0, €159.95.

In this extensive monograph, Alexandros KAMPAKOGLU (= K.) undertakes the ambitious task of discussing Pindar’s influence on the work of four Alexandrian poets – Callimachus, Posidippus, Apollonius of Rhodes and Theocritus. Individual aspects have been studied and written about before, but no systematising analysis has been proposed so far which would take into consideration such a broad spectrum of source material.

The study is an edited and considerably expanded version of a 2011 doctoral dissertation. The book comprises three parts which are further divided into chapters, an “Introduction”, an “Afterword”, a list of “Works Cited”, and three indices: an “Index of Greek Words”, an “Index of Passages Discussed”, and an “Index of Subjects”.

The “Introduction”, theoretical and methodological in character, talks about the intertextual strategies employed in the reception study. K. declares his adherence to MARTINDALE’s and HINDS’s approach, which centres on the reader generating meanings based on the intertexts he or she perceives, but, contrary to that declaration, the discussion does occasionally point to the poet’s intentions, for instance: “Polyphony is certainly one of the effects Apollonius has in mind” (p. 127). Further on in the “Introduction”, K. justifies the two criteria fundamental to his discussion of intertextual connections between Hellenistic poems and Pindar, and notes that while for obvious reasons his work focuses on the reception of Pindar’s epinician poems, it will also present the influence of Pindar’s non-epinician poetry on Alexandrian poets.

Part One of the book (“Epinician Poetry and Discourse”) opens with a chapter on Callimachus’ epinician elegies for chariot race victories. Two fragmentary elegies are analysed, one for the courtier Sosibius, and the other for Berenice II. K. discusses Callimachus’ references to Archilochean κῶμος in the *Victoria Sosibii* in the context of Pindar’s *Isthmian* 6 and correctly interprets the *Victoria Berenices* as a wedding gift (ἔδνον) which is offered by the poet to Zeus and Nemea on behalf of the bride (Berenice). He succeeds in demonstrating the way Callimachus borrows and transforms traditional epinician motifs such as χάρις, χρέος, ξενία, κλέος, φθόνος and τεθμός, and uses marital imagery to metaphorically describe an athletic victory. Callimachus’ epinician discourse is aptly read as a “self-conscious and pointed game with Pindaric and epinician conventions” (p. 60).

In Chapter Two (“The Reception of Pindar in Posidippus’ *Hippika* (AB 71–88)”) K. analyses a group of eighteen epigrams by Posidippus, which commemorate victories in horseback-riding competitions and chariot races, convincingly demonstrating that the poems in question are a literary continuation of monumental inscriptions. However, it is doubtful whether one should see, as K. does, Posidippus referencing the notion of φυά, or using the terms δαπάνη and μνημα, as allusions to Pindar; rather, those ought to be interpreted in the epigraphic context. The interpretation put forward by K. of the final line of AB 77 is also somewhat unlikely. According to K., “The last line of the epigram, and especially the conditional clause (εἴ γ’ ἀ[ρ]κεῖ δόξα), seems to equate the victor’s expenses with the *kleos* he has won (λείπεται οὐ[δ]ὲν ἐμοί): actually the fame that the *laudandus* has won compensates for his expenses” (p. 77) – but in fact Posidippus clearly references Pindaric ideology here, that is he claims that fame won through chariot victories is a result of considerable expenses (οἰὺκ ὀλίγα δαπ[ά]να, l. 2) borne by the winner. Still, K. is right to point out that Posidippus’ epigrams contain references to important athletic figures of the past. The remarks found in Chapter Two on the reading context of Posidippus’ epigrams and their “transition from stone to papyrus” are hardly novel.

The most innovative and valuable material is surely to be found in the interpretations laid out in Chapter Three (“Epinician Echoes in Apollonius’ *Argonautica*: Heroic Foils and the Poetics of Immortality”), where K. identifies numerous themes, motifs and symbols to illustrate the way in which Apollonius combines epic and epinician discourses. He concentrates on demonstrating how Apollonius exploits the epinician imagery of Jason, Heracles and the Dioscuri, and he is correct in suggesting that we hear Pindaric echoes in the *Argonautica* as a metaphor of an athletic victory, successfully demonstrating that Apollonius’ image of Jason as a victorious athlete who completes ἀεθλος or πόνος is a borrowing from Pindar. There are also many valuable observations in K.’s discussion of the epinician profile of Heracles in Apollonius’ poem.

The title of Part Two (“Encomia and Hymns”) specifies the genres of the poems to be discussed in it. Part Two is certainly the least innovative section of the whole book, as the various aspects of its subject matter have already been analysed by earlier scholars. K. adds only a few new examples to the wealth of intertextual relationships that have been interpreted previously. The first two chapters deal with Theocritus. In Chapter Four, the image of Ptolemy II as the ideal king in Theocritus’ *Idyll* 17 is interpreted in the light of Pindar’s Sicilian odes and his representation of Theron in *Olympian* 2. Chapter Five analyses Theocritus’ *Idyll* 24 (*Herakliskos*); K. points out that this particular version of the myth of Heracles killing the two snakes sent by Hera is based more on fr. 52u SNELL–MAEHLER than on *Nemean* 1. He is right to emphasise that “Pindar’s and Theocritus’s passages convey the idea of mortal limitations and by contrast of human potential for achievement” (p. 199), and in the conclusions to the chapter he sets out to demonstrate that Pindar was the model for Alexandrian poets’ representations of divine and royal marriages which were a standard topic in Ptolemaic propaganda.

The next three chapters (Six to Eight) deal with Callimachus’ hymns to Zeus, Apollo and Delos, which perfectly imitate the Pindaric analogy between a divine addressee and a human *laudandus*. K. draws on other researchers’ earlier findings to conclude that for the most part, Callimachus’ hymns are based on the *Homeric Hymns* and hexametric poetry, with Pindar’s influence complementing their Homeric and Hesiodic intertexts. The interesting part here is his pointing to the “Pindaric flavour” in the address to the poet’s θυμὸς in the opening line of the *Hymn to Delos*, as well as reading it as a transition formula between two hymns. Also worth noting is his attempt at interpreting the *Hymn to Delos* in the light of *Isthmian* 1.

Part Three of the study (“Myth and Poetry”) has only one chapter (“The Poetics of Experimentation: Generic Hybridization and the Argonautic Myth”). In it, K. looks deeply into those aspects of *Pythian* 4, Pindar’s most epic victory ode, which display similarities to Hellenistic poets in technique or approach. He calls upon various narrative parallels between Apollonius’ *Argonautica* and Pindar’s *Pythian* 4, such as the double proems or the parallel lives of Jason and Pelops. He convincingly demonstrates that both Apollonius’ *Argonautica* and Pindar’s *Pythian* 4 “register an interest in the combination of epic extensiveness with lyric narrative mode” (p. 402).

The “Afterword” contains a historical outline of Alexander’s conquests and the reign of the Ptolemaic dynasty in Egypt. K. notes that the presence of Pindar’s image in the group of statues depicting Greek poets and philosophers – Homer, Hesiod, Plato, Thales, Heraclitus and others – which stood in front of the temple of Sarapis in Memphis, is proof of Pindar’s reception in Hellenistic Egypt. As he correctly remarks, “the reception of Pindar in Hellenistic Alexandria cannot be disjoined from any consideration of the Ptolemaic and Greco-Egyptian cultural contexts” (p. 408), a claim his book succeeds in demonstrating.

The study is a successful attempt at systematising research into the reception of Pindar’s poetry in the Hellenistic era. Its strength lies in the occasional attempts at applying a comparative approach to the treatment of epinician motifs in a number of Alexandrian poets, e.g. Apollonius and Callimachus.

The study is made difficult to read by the large amount of dense information and by digressions, which distract the reader from the main argument and make the primary point of reference – Pindar’s works – seem to recede into the background of the discussion. At times the argument lacks

coherence, with the individual pieces of information apparently poorly connected. One supposes K. intended to close each chapter with a more or less elaborate Conclusion section, but Chapter Five lacks one. A more extensive description of the cultural context of epinician poetry in Ptolemaic Alexandria would also have been useful.

K. falls victim to some substantive inaccuracies. Of Phalaris' and Bousiris' appearance in Callimachus' *Aetia* 2, he writes, "both were Egyptian kings who mistreated strangers and were punished by Heracles" (p. 116), but actually Phalaris was a tyrant of Acragas who was infamous for his cruelty and, unlike the mythical ruler Bousiris, he was a historical character, and as such cannot have been punished by Heracles.

Another flaw which makes the book difficult to read is certainly the author's inconsistency or perhaps economy in quoting the poems under discussion, whether in their totality or in excerpts. For example, texts only preserved in fragments or less widely known, such as Callimachus' *Victoria Sosibii* or Pindar's fr. 52u SNELL–MAEHLER, are not quoted in spite of very detailed references to them. The text of the book also contains occasional typographical errors, for instance: "discrouse" for "discourse" (p. 74); "Aegenitan" for "Aeginetan" (p. 83); "the games is" for "the games are" (p. 137); "explitic" for "explicit" (p. 236); and "Eurgetes" for "Euergetes" (p. 407).

Despite the drawbacks listed here, researchers of Pindar's poetry will find Alexandros KAMPAKOGLOU's book a valuable and inspiring reading; the author has offered us an important contribution to intertextual study of Hellenistic poetry.

Magdalena Stuligrosz
Institute of Classical Philology
Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań
magdalena.stuligrosz@amu.edu.pl

ORCID: 0000-0001-5205-0526