VICARIOUS TRANSPORT: FICTIVE DEIXIS IN PINDAR'S *PYTHIAN* FOUR

NANCY FELSON

Χάρις δ', ἅπερ ἅπαντα τεύχει τὰ μείλιχα θνατοῖς,
ἐπιφέροισα τιμὰν καὶ ἄπιστον ἐμήσατο πιστόν
ἔμμεναι τὸ πολλάκις·
ἀμέραι δ' ἐπίλοιποι
μάρτυρες σοφώτατοι.   *Olympian* 1.30–34

Charis, who fashions all things soothing for mortals,
adding honor besides, often designs the incredible to be credible;
and the days to come are wisest witnesses.[1]

$\mathbf{P}$OETRY, this maxim affirms, makes the incredible credible, just as Hesiod's Muses (*Theog.* 27–28) claim to know how to "speak many false things as though they were the truth." One device, in the vast arsenal of poetic devices, is the powerful linguistic tool of deixis, which can engage the emotions of persons listening to any sort of text and give them the illusion of participating in events and places and times that are far distant. Deixis pervades poetry, story telling, everyday conversation, and prayer. Derived from the Greek δείκνυμι, "point out," this fundamental category in language refers to words "whose interpretation depends on access (perceptual or indirect) to the situation in which the utterance is produced."[2] Its study belongs to the realm of

---

[1] Translations of Pindaric passages are my own. The text of Pindar is cited from B. Snell and H. Maehler, *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis, Pars I: Epinicia*[8] (Leipzig 1987).

[2] J. C. Kuipers, *Power in Performance: the Creation of Textual Authority in Weweya Ritual Speech* (Philadelphia 1990) 99. On deixis and Greek poetry, see J. Danielewicz, "*Deixis* in Greek Choral Lyric," *QUCC* N.S. 34 (1990) 7–17; W. Rösler, "Über Deixis und einige Aspekte mündlichen und schriftlichen Stils in antiker Lyrik," *WJA* 9 (1983) 7–28 and "Persona reale o persona poetica? L'interpretazione dell' io nella lirica greca

pragmatics, which examines the sign from the point of view of its users.[3] Deictic words are indexical signs, since they point to (or index) a referent outside the text or outside the utterance of the speaker.[4] Usually, they refer to what is external to the text; but in represented speech they point to the speech context *outside* the embedded structure but still *within* the text.[5]

Deictics, which lack a stable referential meaning, can only be deci-

---

arcaica," *QUCC* 48 (1985) 131–144; and C. Faraone, "The Wheel, the Whip, and Other Implements of Torture: Erotic Magic in Pindar's *Pythian* 4.213–19," *CJ* 89 (1993) 1–19.

E. J. Bakker has developed a rich interdisciplinary methodology for examining deictics in speeches and narratives in a number of ancient Greek authors; see his "Discourse and Performance: Involvement, Visualization and 'Presence' in Homeric Poetry," *CA* 12 (1993) 1–29; "Verbal Aspect and Mimetic Description in Thucydides," in *Grammar as Interpretation: Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts*, ed. E. J. Bakker (Leiden 1997 [*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 171]) 7–54; and "Homeric ΟΥΤΟΣ and the Poetics of Deixis," *CP* 94 (1999) 1–19.

[3] On pragmatics, as opposed to semantics, see J. A. Lucy, "Reflexive Language and the Human Disciplines," in *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics*, ed. J. A. Lucy (Cambridge 1993) 9–32, especially 17: "The pragmatic aspect of language is all the meaningfulness of signs connected with ongoing usage in contexts of communication (e.g., indexical meaning). The semantic aspect of language is that portion of the meaningfulness of signs which is constant across, and therefore independent of, specific contexts (e.g., form-class meaning)."

[4] For an indexical sign, the basis of the relation between sign and object is factual or natural contiguity—temporal, logical, or spatial. In contrast, for an iconic sign the relation is based on factual or natural similarity, and for a symbol on imputed contiguity or similarity. Peirce defines index as "essentially an affair of here and now, its office being to bring the thought to a particular experience, or series of experiences connected by dynamical relations." (*C. S. Peirce: Collected Papers*, ed. C. Hartshorn, P. Weiss, and A. W. Burks. 8 vols. [Cambridge, Mass. 1931–1938] 56). For an overview of Peirce's semiotics and pragmatics, see R. J. Parmentier, *Signs in Society* (Bloomington 1994) 3–22.

[5] In contrast, discourse indexicals—called, since antiquity, anaphora (or anaphora and cataphora, since they point backward [= up] and forward [= down], respectively, in a text)—are uniformly text-internal. Dionysus Thrax of the 2nd century B.C.E. is the first extant grammarian to use the word ἀναφορικῶς to mean "standing in relation" to what preceded (D.T. 636.12). For Stoic reflections on anaphora and deixis see P. Pachet, "La deixis selon Zénon et Chrysippe," *Phronesis* 20 (1975) 241–246. For a full discussion of the deictic field of language and deictic words, see K. Bühler, *Theory of Language: The Representational Function of Language*, trans. D. F. Goodwin (Amsterdam 1990) 91–166. For a lucid exposition of anaphora and deixis in Armenian, which has a more completely articulated deictic system than either Greek or Latin, see J. Klein, "'Sá–figé' and Indo-European Deixis," *Hist. Sprachforsch.* 109 (1996) 21–39 and *On Personal Deixis in Classical Armenian* (Dettelbach 1996).

phered once interpreters know the place and time of utterance and the identity of the speaker. When this information is lacking, deictics may serve as clues for reconstructing the original speech (or performance) situation. In Pindaric odes, opening and closing deictics tend to be more literally indexed to the performance site and thus more reliable as a basis for reconstruction; but this matter needs further investigation, ode by ode.[6]

In fictional narrative, according to E. M. Segal, "readers and authors shift their deictic center from the real-world situation to an image of themselves at a location within the story world."[7] This act of imagination brings them to what Bühler calls the *origo* of a speaker, a nexus of "here"/"now"/"I."[8] Under the impact of deictics, they imaginatively occupy the "deictic center" or orienting point. Their imaginative labor engages them, alongside the poet, in the act of creating meaning, as they respond to the poet's masterful manipulation of deixis for poetic effect. Deictics work with other forms of engaging the audience, including ellipsis,[9] focalization,[10] and the use of special particles.[11]

[6] In a number of Pindaric epinicia, e.g., references to "this city" or "this island," or to "these citizens" have stimulated scholarly debate as to which city, island, or citizens are being designated. P. Hummel, *La Syntaxe de Pindare* (Paris 1993) 190, lists instances of such demonstrative deictics in the Pindaric corpus, e.g., in *Ol.* 8 and *Py.* 9.

[7] E. M. Segal, "Narrative Comprehension and the Role of Deictic Shift Theory," in *Deixis in Narrative: A Cognitive Science Perspective*, ed. J. F. Duchan, G. A. Bruder, and L. E. Hewitt (Hillsdale, NJ 1995) 3–17, especially 14–16. The essays in this book use narratological and linguistic theory to address the poetics of involvement in narrative. While D. A. Zubin and L. E. Hewitt, "The Deictic Center: A Theory of Deixis in Narrative," (129–155), outline the linguistic foundations of deictic centering in narrative fiction in English, L. E. Hewitt, "Anaphor in Subjective Contexts in Narrative Fiction," (328), writes on subjectivity in narrative: "one vital component of the reader's experience of a story is the way in which it offers vicarious experience of others' lives."

[8] Bühler, *Theory of Language* 137–157, distinguishes literal deixis (*demonstratio ad oculos*) from figurative or imagination-oriented deixis (*deixis am phantasma*).

[9] On ellipsis, see G. Nagy, "Ellipsis in Homer," in *Written Voices, Spoken Signs: Tradition, Performance, and the Epic Text*, ed. E. J. Bakker and A. Kahane (Cambridge, Mass. 1999) 167–189, 253–257.

[10] On focalization, see M. Bal, *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*, trans. C. van Boheemen (Toronto 1985) 100–114; G. Genette, *Narrative Discourse*, trans. J. E. Lewin (Ithaca 1980) 185–211 and G. Genette, *Nouveau discours du récit* (Paris 1983) 48–52; and S. Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics* (London 1983) 71–85. On focalization in Homeric epic, see I. J. F. de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad* (Amsterdam 1987).

[11] On δή (and to a lesser extent δέ) as a particle that makes "even the most monologic discourse an implicit dialogue with a listener whose reactions . . . shape the verbalization

Ancient Greek, like other languages, expresses deixis through a variety of morphological features. These can be grouped under five categories that figure prominently in my study:

1) first and second person pronouns, which constitute proximal and intermediate deixis, respectively, in relation to the *origo* of the speaker;[12]
2) demonstrative pronouns and adjectives (especially ὅδε and [ἐ]κεῖνος, but also οὗτος, which is sometimes deictic in Pindar);[13]
3) fronted adverbials (transposed to the beginning of a sentence or clause):
   a) spatial and temporal adverbs;
   b) locative prepositional phrases;
   c) relative locative or temporal adverbials (e.g., ἵνα "where" and ὅτε "when");
4) deictic verbs, which lead toward or away from the *origo* (e.g.,

---

of the speaker's consciousness," see Bakker, *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse* (Ithaca 1997) 74–80; in his "Discourse and Performance," 1–29, especially 15–23, Bakker extends his study to other particles, including ἄρα, that function as discourse markers pointing to the speech or performance and indicating the anticipated involvement of the addressees.

[12] Drawing on Arabic grammarians who distinguished between first and second person, on the one hand (the one who speaks and the one who is addressed), and third person, on the other (the one who is absent), E. Benveniste, *Problems in General Linguistics*, trans. M. E. Meek (Coral Gables, FL 1971) 195–204 and 217–222, presents a linguistic theory of verbal person in which, in terms of roles, first and second person constitute a separate system from third, the former signifying presence, the latter absence.

Building on the seminal work of Benveniste, J. Klein, "Deixis in Language and Discourse," *CO* (forthcoming), points out that many languages align deictic markers with the role of person, associating degrees of distance from the speaker with first and second person pronouns. For the third person, who "may be present or absent, near me, in the distance, or irrelevantly positioned," languages universally specify degree of distance from the speaker by distinguishing *this* (near me: proximal deixis) from *that* (far from me: distal deixis). In some languages a third, intermediate degree of deixis is introduced, which may be associated with the second person or addressee (*that near you*). Such languages (e.g., Armenian and Latin) have a three-way deictic system.

[13] *S.v.* ὅδε, οὗτος, and [ἐ]κεῖνος in W. J. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin 1969). Bakker, "Homeric OYTOΣ and the Poetics of Deixis," 1–19, argues that in Homer οὗτος is always deictic rather than anaphoric, and as such is part of the system of "place deictics" in ancient Greek (6).

those meaning "go" and "come," "bring" and "take," "welcome,"
"receive," "leave," etc.);[14]

5) verbs that express an internal point of view (e.g., the imperfect)[15]

Deictics of the first and second person (type 1 above) point, respec-
tively, to the speaker(s) and the addressee(s). In everyday speech, so
long as there are two interlocutors, no ambiguity arises as to their
meaning, and an interpreter has only to witness the speech situation to
know to whom each pronoun refers. As soon, however, as the exchange
is decontextualized, or deprived of its situatedness, the reference for
these pronouns becomes problematic. In the case of texts once but no
longer performed, such pronominal deixis is especially elusive. More-
over, where there is more than one narrative level, in represented
speech, in represented speeches, the references of "I" and "you" are
particularly problematic.

Pindar uses deixis with expertise and subtlety, primarily to make his
audiences "travel" across space and time. First he locates them in the
text either at the site of victory or at the victor's hometown. Then he
transports them along carefully demarcated pathways, ultimately
returning them (again, in the text) to their place of origin. They experi-
ence vicarious travel through a vividness, or illusion of seeing
(*enargeia*),[16] that he linguistically creates. Their poetic journeys build

[14] On deictic verbs of motion as either afferent (= centripetal) or efferent (= centrifu-
gal) with reference to a designated *origo*, see F. Létoublon, "Le temps s'en va,"
Recherches sur la philosophie et le langage (Hommage à Henri Joly) 12 (Grenoble 1990)
357–372 and *Il allait, pareil à la nuit: Les verbes de mouvement en Grec* (Paris 1985);
also Bruder, "Psychological Evidence That Linguistic Devices are Used by Readers to
Understand Spatial Deixis in Narrative Text," in *Deixis in Narrative* (above, n. 7)
248–251.

[15] B. Gildersleeve, "Studies in Pindaric Syntax III," *AJP* 4 (1883) 158–165, especially
160, observes that "the imperfect has nothing to do with the absolute length of the action,
it has only to do with the vision of the narrator." Since the predominance of the aorist in
lyric is "the rule of the language" (162), imperfects are conspicuous, by contrast, and can
express the grammatical subject's internal viewpoint. Here, as elsewhere, Gildersleeve
anticipates the insights of modern narratology.

Bakker, "Verbal Aspect and Mimetic Description in Thucydides," 7–54, finds that
Thucydides uses the aorist to express the external point of view of the narrative, the
imperfect to present an internal point of view. This distinction can be observed in *Pythian*
4, especially in connection with send-offs and arrivals.

[16] On *enargeia*, "vividness," and orality, see Bakker, "Discourse and Performance,"
1–29; *Poetry in Speech*, 77–79; and "Verbal Aspect and Mimetic Discourse in Thucy-
dides," where he defines *enargeia* as "the power of language to create a vivid presence

on the movements of all the other "travelers" in his ode, who traverse
either objectively represented space, with certain fixed features that cor-
respond to reality independent of any subject, or (quite often) "subject-
centered" space. As these characters travel, Pindar enables his audience
to follow their pathways and imaginatively travel with them. They can
then affiliate with and even occupy the same subject position as the
victor himself—a character within the ode but one who has usually
traveled (in real time) to the site of his victory and, by the time of the
performance, come back. As a consequence of this specific affiliation,
every address to the victor radiates outward to these fellow travelers,
who thus become additional targets of poetic persuasion.

   The motif of the round-trip journey is just one among the many
structural links between mythic and epinician materials in a Pindaric
ode. In all but nine of his forty-four victory odes Pindar enhances the
signification of the athletic victory by making it the metaphoric near-
equivalent of heroic exploits. This semantic cohesion has been studied
extensively by Pindarists, often in a search for each poem's organic
unity.[17] Alongside and sometimes in false opposition to the quest for
thematic unity are studies, following Bundy (1962), that emphasize
epinician conventions and rhetorical strategies and the rhetorical argu-
ment the ode is setting forth. In these studies, the equivalences that

---

that is ultimately connected with the emotions of those perceiving it" (7). The term
enargeia was used for vivid, visualizable description by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Lys.*
7) in the first century B.C.E.

   [17] It is generally accepted that the choice and shaping of the myth contribute to the
epinician argument in individual odes, and that myth can provide positive and negative
paradigms for epinician figures—a function well known from epic. See, among others,
A. Köhnken, *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar* (Berlin 1971), with references, as well
as his "Narrative Peculiarities in Pindar's Fourth Pythian Ode," *SCI* 12 (1993) 26–35.

   For a review of Pindaric scholarship up to the 1960s, see D. C. Young, "Pindaric Crit-
icism," in *Pindaros und Bakchylides*, ed. W. M. Calder III and J. Stern (Darmstadt 1970
[Wege der Forschung 134]) 1–95, especially 86–88, who situates the work of E. L.
Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* (Berkeley 1962 [University of California Publications in Classi-
cal Philology 18.1–2]) in the context of the Pindaric criticism that preceded it. Still influ-
ential are the insights of J. H. Finley, *Pindar and Aeschylus* (Cambridge, Mass. 1955) and
H. Fränkel, *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy*, trans. M. Hadas and J. Willis, 2nd ed.
rev. (Oxford 1975), who sought to elucidate basic values in the epinicia. Since Young's
review article, many scholars have expanded Bundy's work, while others have critiqued
his single-minded focus on the conventions of the epinician genre. For a recent overview
of Pindaric scholarship in terms of the search for unity and of the tension between occa-
sional poetry and universal poetry, see L. Lehnus, *Pindaro, Olimpiche: traduzione, com-
mento, note e lettura* (Milan 1981) xxiii–xxvii.

develop become a platform for the epinician argument: if a certain
mythic hero did x and received y, then this victor too (or this victor all
the more) deserves a comparable outcome.

Frequently, Pindar represents the victor's journey as a doubly trans-
forming event. The athlete, like a boy initiated into manhood, com-
pletes his "ordeal," returns home, and receives a hearty welcome.[18]
From the perspective of the *oikos* and the *polis*, his journey out and
back accomplishes a transferral of goods.[19] When he comes home,
transformed, his victory becomes a conduit for channeling goods to his
oikos and *polis*. They experience a renewal and rejuvenation vicariously
by identifying with him and, synecdochically, as he rejoins them. More-
over, in cases where the hero is the victor's purported ancestor and
model, the mythic exploits doubly enhance his athletic feats—through
ties of lineage (metonymy) and structural parallels (metaphor). Then,
enriched by myth, the victor's story benefits all the more the hometown
community present, in person, at the ode's first performance.

Pindar represents mythic speakers using the same kinds of deictics
as the epinician speaker. Such represented speeches give the interpreter
a rich opportunity to study not only the complex constituents of deictics
in ancient Greek but, in addition, the workings of deixis on internal
audiences (what it makes them *do*).[20] Since deictic patterns at subordi-
nate levels of discourse mimic those of the higher level speaker-deixis,
we can expect these patterns to have a comparable impact on their
respective audiences. And indeed, when characters such as Chiron in
Pythian 9, Medea in *Pythian* 4, and Hippolyta in *Nemean* 5 use the lan-
guage of "here and now" to locate events with reference to where they
stand, these deictics literally situate their mythic addressees. On those
in the poet's live audience, who experience them vicariously as imagi-
nation-oriented deixis, they have additional poetic effects.[21]

[18] K. Crotty, *Song and Action: The Victory Odes of Pindar* (Baltimore 1982) 104–138.
In the case of the returning athlete, this initiatory structure, which underlies many tradi-
tional hero tales of departure and return, would be primarily figurative: victory at the
Games is *like* the initiatory ordeal which makes a boy a man.

[19] L. Kurke, *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy* (Ithaca
1991) 22.

[20] The narratological background for my study of deixis can be reviewed in Rimmon-
Kenan, *Narrative Fiction* and Bal, *Narratology*. On focalization that sustains a deictic
shift, see Zubin and Hewitt in *Deixis in Narrative* (above, n. 7) 131–132; on narratology
and deixis, E. M. Segal, ibid. 3–17.

[21] The distinction between literal and imaginative deixis made by Bühler (above, n. 5)
raises questions about the referent for these pronouns: do they have a double reference,

Some deictic forms were studied by Bundy and others as conven-
tions of the epinician genre. Such expressions as καὶ νῦν, "indeed
now," or νῦν δέ, "and now," regularly function as "shifters" from
mythic time to the epinician here and now.[22] Occasionally, in the odes,
these regular epinician features—which characterize Attic oratory as
well—also appear in myth, which then acquires an epinician hue. Inas-
much as Bundy emphasizes rhetoric and occasion, he is working within
a performance framework.[23] His functional model, which privileges the
live audience present at the ode's first performance, needs to be compli-
cated and expanded, however, as the interpretive focus shifts to the
impact of the ode on various audiences, including both "re-performance
audiences" and "posterity."[24]

Deictics lend poetry a dynamic quality. Not only do they attract
attention and contribute vividness (a sense of visual presence), but they
situate audiences in space and time. Indeed, no one hearing them can
easily refrain from imaginatively traveling along the pathways which
they designate: they contribute to a poetic enchantment, or θέλξις, that

---

depending on their intended audience? Can instances of "ambiguity" be clarified through
consideration of audience and poetic function?

[22] Cf. S. C. Caton, "The Importance of Reflexive Language in George H. Mead's
Theory of Self and Communication," in *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and
Metapragmatics*, ed. J. A. Lucy (Cambridge 1993) 330: "the 'shifter' is a category which
refers to or picks out some entity in the real world, whose reference *necessarily* 'shifts'
according to the speaker who is using that particular category in his her or discourse." On
shifters, see also R. Jakobson, "Shifters, Verbal Categories, and the Russian Verb," in
Selected Writings II: Word and Language (The Hague 1971) 130–147 and M. Silverstein,
"Shifters, Linguistic Categories, and Cultural Description," in *Meaning and Anthropol-
ogy*, ed. K. H. Basso and H. A. Selby (Albuquerque 1976) 11–55. On pronouns as
shifters, the *locus classicus* is Benveniste (above, n. 12) 217–222 ("On the Nature of Pro-
nouns"): first and second person are "empty" signs that are non-referential with respect to
"reality" and that become "full" only in a speaker's discourse. On how an epic or lyric
poet may specify the meaning of "I" in the context of the enunciation and clarify the rela-
tion between the uttered enunciation and the real historical circumstances, see C. Calame,
The Craft of Poetic Speech in Ancient Greece, trans. J. Orion (Ithaca 1995) 3–57.

[23] On performance theory, see especially the work of D. Hymes, "Breakthrough into
Performance," in *Folklore: Performance and Communication*, ed. D. Ben-Amos and K.
Goldstein (The Hague 1975) 11–74; R. Bauman, *Verbal Art as Performance* (Prospect
Heights, IL 1977); and R. Bauman and C. Briggs, "Poetics and performance as critical
perspectives on language and social life," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19 (1990)
59–88, with extensive references.

[24] On "re-performance," see C. J. Herington, *Poetry into Drama: Early Tragedy and
the Greek Poetic Tradition* (Berkeley 1985) 28 and 48–50.

is impossible to resist. Reimagining the circumstances of the first utterance or first performance, partly on the basis of a study of the deictic language that points to that event, enriches our own capacity, as remote readers today, to undertake the vicarious travel that Pindaric poetry both demands and makes possible.

How can the presence of deictic forms that continue to express their presupposed contextualization help us to visualize a plausible historical scenario for the performed, multimedia epinician event? The music and choreography, now vanished, cannot be reconstructed. Nevertheless, as West puts it,

> We can claim knowledge of the rhythms of ancient music because there is good reason to believe that they are reflected with reasonable fidelity in the metres of those verse texts which we know to have been sung (and in many cases danced). The metres are quantitative, based on patterns of long and short syllables which must correspond to patterns of long and short notes. The repetitive nature of these patterns usually makes their rhythmical character obvious; and when we find them built up into extended complex sequences which are repeated entire from one strophe to another, this can only be understood as a discipline imposed by the rhythm of music that was itself repeated.[25]

A full performance analysis of a victory ode would involve sketching out the location of each player, among them the poet-creator and the choreographer (probably often one and the same person) and either the poet-performer or the solo or choral performers. Using a performance theory approach, but in the absence of external contemporaneous documentation, we may entertain in turn several possible kinds of performance and, for each, evaluate the imagined impact on first performance audiences, paying special attention to the elusive deictic pronouns "I" and "you." Given our insubstantial evidence, it is best to envision multiple, hypothetical performance scenarios, evaluating each for its imagined efficacy and aesthetic power.

One question about the re-imagined first performance is who was actually performing each ode. I list below all the options that seem

---

[25] M. L. West, *Greek Music* (Oxford 1992) 130. W. Mullen, *Choreia: Pindar and the Dance* (Princeton 1982), attempts to re-imagine the choreography on the basis of the metrical forms of strophe, antistrophe, and epode.

remotely possible to me. In each case, the performer(s) may imperson-
ate the poet at the moment of poetic composition, thus mimetically
enacting his part.[26]

1). Pindar performs solo (sg.)
2). A surrogate performs solo (sg.)
3). Pindar, as chorus leader, leads a trained chorus (sg./pl.)
4). A surrogate, as chorus leader, leads a trained chorus (sg./pl.)
5). A chorus performs (with no leader) (pl.)

Within a performance by any of the above, ἐγώ expresses two kinds of
signification. It is a "shifting" indexical sign of whoever (sg. or pl.) is
performing (speaking), based on contiguity between sign and object;
but it refers iconically to a (sg.) author "then and there" being treated *as
if* he were the performer "here and now," based on similarity.[27] Since
ἐγώ is doubly indexical *and* iconic, it has a "plenitude" of meanings
and resists being stripped of any of its dimensions, even in
performance.[28] Hence the ongoing debate about who is performing can-
not be resolved by determining the *reference* of first person pronouns.[29]
To avoid committing myself to one or another referent, I use the term

[26] For a discussion of mimesis as "reenactment" or "impersonation," see G. Nagy, *Pin-
dar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past* (Baltimore 1990), especially 42–45.
In his "Genre and Occasion," *Métis* 9–10 (1994–1995) 11–25 Nagy treats occasion as a
kind of performative frame—an "absolutized occasion that cannot be duplicated by any
single actual occasion."

[27] In semiotic terms, the pronoun refers indexically (as a *dicent*) to the performer(s) but
produces an iconic linkage (= *iconic rheme*) between performer and original author (but
only as a semiotic construction). For a presentation of these Peircean terms, see Parmen-
tier (above, n. 4) 3–22, especially 16–18.

[28] See Silverstein (above, n. 22) 11–55; also G. Urban, "Entextualization, Replication,
and Power," in *Natural Histories of Discourse*, ed. M. Silverstein and G. Urban (Chicago
1996) 21–44.

[29] Because of their plenitude, first- and second-person pronouns do not provide reliable
clues as to the whereabouts of Pindar, nor do they reveal whether the performance is solo
or choral. Like other deictic constructions, they can refer literally and indexically to the
performer and his interlocutor, or figuratively and iconically to entities being *imperson-
ated* by that speaking subject. Impersonation may occur in epinician choral poetry as it
does, greatly expanded with masks and costumes, in Greek tragedy. See H. Bacon, "The
Chorus in Greek Life and Drama," *Arion* 3 (1994/1995) 6–24; G. Nagy, "Transformations
of Choral Lyric Traditions in the Context of Athenian State Theater," *Arion* 3
(1994/1995) 41–55; and C. Calame, "From Choral Poetry to Tragic Stasimon: The Enact-
ment of Women's Song," *Arion* 3 (1994/1995) 136–154. In epinician poetry as in tragedy,
the audience would experience the chorally performed first person pronoun as polysemic.

epinician speaker (speaker, for short) throughout this essay to designate the ἐγώ of primary narrative.

As for any "number discrepancy" in cases 3–5 above, this is, in my view, a non-problem. A chorus of singers, literally plural, can metaphorically impersonate the creator of its lyrics, crossing a number boundary as well as a spatio-temporal one. Indeed such boundary-crossing seems to be an epinician convention. Once this premise is granted, then the argument in favor of solo performance crumbles: points scored on both sides of the controversy as to whether the odes were performed solo or by a chorus pertain only to the iconic (and not the indexical) referent for the first-person pronouns. Such first-person pronouns thus do not necessarily illuminate a particular enactment taking place. Scholars who try to pin these deictics down overlook the widespread practice of troping personal pronouns for poetic effect.[30]

[30] Herington, *Poetry into Drama* 27–31 and 181–191, reviews the textual evidence in the epinicia having to do with performance. Arguing for solo performance, based on the use of pronouns and of the word κῶμος (rather than χορός) to designate the ensemble that celebrates the victory, are: M. R. Lefkowitz, "Τῷ καὶ ἐγώ: The First Person in Pindar," *HSCP* 67 (1963) 177–253, "Who Sang Pindar's Victory Odes?," *AJP* 109 (1988) 1–11 (revised and reprinted in *First-Person Fictions: Pindar's Poetic "I"* [Oxford 1991] 173–191), and "The First Person in Pindar Reconsidered—Again," *BICS* 40 (1995) 139–150; M. Heath, "Receiving the κῶμος: The Context and Performance of the Epinician," *AJP* 109 (1988) 180–195; and M. Heath and M. R. Lefkowitz, "Epinician Performance," *CP* 86 (1991) 173–191. Rebuttals of their thesis come from C. Carey, "The Performance of the Victory Ode," *AJP* 110 (1989) 545–565 and "The Victory Ode in Performance: The Case for the Chorus," *CP* 86 (1991) 192–200; A. P. Burnett, "Performing Pindar's Odes," *CP* 84 (1989) 283–293; K. A. Morgan, "Pindar the Professional and the Rhetoric of the κῶμος," *CP* 88 (1993) 1–15; and G. B. D'Alessio, "First-Person Problems in Pindar," *BICS* 39 (1994) 117–139. Lefkowitz, even in her 1995 response to D'Alessio's important critique, does not allow for fictional and poetic possibilities of first- and second-person pronouns (nor for figurative or conventional use of comiastic language). Compelling points on this topic are made by Bacon (above, n. 29) 6–24, who cites parallels from other cultures to illustrate the fluidity of singular for plural, and by Nagy, "Genre and Occasion," 11–25, who posits a "re-enacting I" (in place of either an "autobiographical I" or a "fictional I"): "the typical Pindaric victory song can overload, as it were, references to its own occasion, so that all the given self-references could not possibly fit any one time and any one place of performance." Nagy's diachronic formulation allows for a chorus to re-enact the solo role of the *laudator* as well as a group role, "in which case the 'I' plays the part of an exuberant ensemble of spontaneously celebrating youths, a *kômos*." On number as a function of mimesis and of generic conventions for choral tragic lyric, see M. Kaimio, *The Chorus of Greek Drama within the Light of the Persona and Number Used* (Helsinki 1970 [Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 46]) 9–17.

If anyone other than Pindar performed an ode, then the whereabouts of the flesh-and-blood Pindar matters too: was he in the audience? seated or standing? Was he lurking "behind the scenes" around the performance arena? Was he back in Thebes, not having accompanied his ode to its destination?

What about the first performance audience? Where was it situated, in relation to the performance? Were all the spectators seated in an orderly fashion, like an audience at tragedy around the orchestra of a formal outdoor theater, or did they sit on the ground? Did some of them stand on the margins, like those who watch a parade, or were they milling about as at a festival or seated indoors around a banquet table in the tyrant's palace? (What was in their line of vision, as they experienced the performance of the ode? How many of them had been to Olympia or Delphi, Nemea or the Isthmus? How many had witnessed their compatriot's victory?) Were they a large or small audience? Were they relatives and friends, and were strangers also present? Were they female as well as male? Were they of all ages? Were they silent and respectful or rowdy and intrusive? Did they arrive in time and stay for the whole performance, which, in the case of *Pythian* 4, the longest ode, might have lasted approximately 45 minutes, but, for most other odes, perhaps one-third or one-half that time? These questions are worth raising if only to encourage us to imagine a more stimulating and detailed performance-context than a "cold" reading of the remnant-text would ever allow.

PYTHIAN 4

Pindar's fourth *Pythian*, which celebrates the victory of Arcesilas in the chariot race of 462 B.C.E., opens with the epinician speaker's injunction to σε, "you," to "stand beside a dear man" as he celebrates the κῶμος at Cyrene. The referent of the deictic second-person singular pronoun is not immediately intelligible; it might designate Arcesilas, the land Cyrene, you singular (in the audience), the Muse, or another entity addressed as a source of inspiration. Similarly, the combination "you beside a dear man" could point to Arcesilas beside Damophilus, the land Cyrene beside Arcesilas, the Muse beside Arcesilas, the Muse beside Damophilus, or other pairs. By line 2, with the phrase "king of equestrian Cyrene," following the infinitive στᾶμεν, "to stand," the identity of the "dear man" is disambiguated and assigned to Arcesilas, who is thus disqualified as σε. At the beginning of line 3, σε, stripped

of its plenitude, is reduced to Μοῖσα, the Muse, whom the speaker obligates to stand beside the Cyrenean king.

The ode ends with a plea for reconciliation between the Cyreneans and an aristocratic compatriot, Damophilus, who had been exiled from Cyrene during a period of political unrest.[31] His anticipated return absorbs the generic motifs of departure and return, as the victor Arcesilas, already back from Delphi and thus in a position to reintegrate the exile, anomalously assumes the role of welcomer. The last two triads focus not on reintegrating Arcesilas into the community but rather on his taking the initiative to heal the rift with and welcome home Damophilus. Thus the ode functions at least doubly, as a contribution to the ongoing victory celebration in Cyrene and as a petition from the exile Damophilus, that Arcesilas grant him amnesty and allow him to return to his native land.[32] A third and related function, as I shall argue, is to win over the Cyrenean compatriots of the exile, who should, like their monarch, exhibit wisdom and help him do the right thing.

Scholars invariably situate the performance of *Pythian* 4 at Arcesilas' palace in Cyrene, during a banquet or festival celebrating his chariot victory.[33] Its audience might consist of relatives and retainers of the

[31] See Hdt. 4.162–67; F. Chamoux, *Cyrène sous la monarchie des Battiades* (Paris 1952) 144–201, and B. K. Braswell, *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar* (Berlin 1988). For an analysis of the foundation stories of Cyrene, told from diverse (Cyrenean and Theran) perspectives and with divergent purposes, see R. Osborne, *Greece in the Making: 1200–479 BC* (London 1996) 8–17.

[32] Some scholars (e.g., P. Giannini, "Interpretazione della Pitica 4 di Pindaro," *QUCC* N.S. 31 [1979] 35–63) argue that, since *Pythian* 4 celebrates the very same victory as *Pythian* 5, its encomiastic function is superfluous and hence subordinate to other functions, such as legitimating the Cyrenean kingship or restoring Damophilus, the exiled aristocrat. The appeal to restore the exile does emerge as the dominant function by the end of the ode, which begins at a festival celebrating the victor. The encomiastic function never disappears altogether, but it leads into and even becomes the basis for the rhetorical appeal for clemency. See C. Carey, "The Epilogue of Pindar's Fourth Pythian," *Maia* 32 (1980) 143–152, who seeks to explain why the plea for the recall of Damophilus is substituted for praise. He sees Pindar as having skillfully adapted the generic convention (praise) to an unusual situation both because a direct statement is flat, whereas a plea has life and tension, and because the request form avoids the appearance of servility.

[33] Cf. B. Gildersleeve, *Pindar, The Olympian and Pythian Odes* (New York 1885) 278–281; C. M. Bowra, *Pindar* (Oxford 1964) 139–140, 397–398; Giannini (above, n. 32) 35–63; C. Segal, *Pindar's Mythmaking: The Fourth Pythian Ode* (Princeton 1986) 12–14; and C. Calame, "Narrating the Foundations of a City: The Symbolic Birth of Cyrene," in *Approaches to Greek Myth*, ed. L. Edmunds (Baltimore 1990) 277–341, especially 278. If the first performance were anywhere but at the victor's homeland, the opening and closing deictic would make no sense.

victorious king and possibly additional townsfolk as well. The occasion would be primarily for aristocrats, with servants perhaps present on the fringes.

The deictic vocabulary that opens and closes the ode points literally to Cyrene, the victor's homeland in North Africa, as the site of first performance. This literal deixis collaborates with Cyrenean place names and proper names to set the geographical boundaries for the ode: within this frame, the first-performance audience would experience "as-if" journeys away from and ultimately back to their hometown, as they accompany traveling subjects on their journeys. When the traveler is ἐγώ, the pathway of song becomes their pathway as well.[34]

The deictic adverb σάμερον which opens the ode emphatically locates the time as "today." The first three lines refer to the κῶμος at Cyrene, especially the present participle κωμάζοντι, modifying the victor Arcesilas.[35] Then, as early in the poem as line 4, a deictic shift takes place—from the original locus at Cyrene to Delphi—site of the Delphic oracle and, not incidently, of the Pythian Games. The Cyreneans celebrating the victory at Cyrene travel imaginatively to Delphi (4–11b):

> ἔνθα ποτὲ χρυσέων Διὸς αἰετῶν πάρεδρος
> οὐκ ἀποδάμου Ἀπόλλωνος τυχόντος ἱέρεα
> χρῆσεν οἰκιστῆρα Βάττον καρποφόρου Λιβύας, ἱεράν
> νᾶσον ὡς ἤδη λιπὼν κτίσσειεν εὐάρματον
> πόλιν ἐν ἀργινόεντι μαστῷ

[34] See especially Kurke, *Traffic in Praise* 22 ff., who, instead of identifying and labeling the different roads, as in O. Becker, *Das Bild des Weges und verwandte Vorstellungen im frühgriechischen Denken* (Berlin 1937 [*Hermes* Einzelschriften 4]) 54–100, seeks to establish "the landscape they occupy and the circuit they trace." Kurke examines Pindar's poetic paths as a single system and asks where these paths lead. A. Thornton, *Homer's Iliad: Its Composition and the Motif of Supplication* (Göttingen 1984 [Hypomnemata 81]) 149, ascribes a dynamic dimension to οἶμος: "'path' implies 'moving along it'"; see P. Giannisi, "Chant et Cheminement en Grèce Archaique," *QS* 46 (1997) 133–141, for a full discussion of this term. Cf. also D. Steiner, *The Crown of Song* (London 1985) 76–86: "The poet is the man who lays down the road along which he travels, creating an actual path of words" (78) and "The poet's task is to repeat the athlete's course, and to follow in his track" (79).

[35] On the convention, in the victory songs of Pindar, "which allows the *khoros* or chorus, an ensemble of performers who ostensibly sing and dance such a song, to be described as a *kômos*, an ensemble of revelers," see Nagy, "Genre and Occasion" 22. He is responding to the controversy inaugurated by Heath, "Receiving the κῶμος," and Heath and Lefkowitz, "Epinician Performance" (see note 30 above for other citations).

καὶ τὸ Μηδείας ἔπος ἀγκομίσαι
ἑβδόμᾳ καὶ σὺν δεκάτᾳ γενεᾷ Θήραιον, Αἰήτα τό ποτε ζαμενής
παῖς ἀπέπνευσ᾽ ἀθανάτου στόματος, δέσποινα Κόλχων.

where once, when Apollo happened not to be away from his land,
the priestess, seated beside the golden eagles of Zeus,
prophetically declared Battus the founder of fruit-bearing Libya,
saying that now, leaving the holy island [Thera], he would found
a city of lovely chariots on the shiny breast of land
and bring to completion in the seventeenth generation
Medea's prophetic utterance at Thera, which once
the divine child of Aeetes breathed forth from
her immortal mouth, the mistress of the Colchians.

The relative adverbial locative "where" (ἔνθα) and the indefinite adverb "once" (ποτε) of line 4 create the space for the first deictic shift, while the adjectival πάρεδρος, "seated beside," which locates the priestess at Delphi beside Zeus' eagles, draws the Cyrenean listeners, if fleetingly, to that very spot.[36]

Mention of the "prophetic utterance at Thera" (10, ἔπος ... Θήραιον) ushers in a second deictic shift that brings the Cyreneans instantaneously to Thera, alongside Medea and her sailor-audience. Postponement of the modifier Θήραιον until after the temporal phrase ("in the seventeenth generation"), so that it is separated from the noun it modifies, ἔπος, gives emphasis to the new location. The relative "which" (τό) and the indefinite adverb "once" (ποτε) of line 10b create space for the second deictic shift, from Delphi to Thera. In Thera, with the sailors, the Cyreneans "hear" Medea utter her prophecy about the future founding of their city.

These two successive deictic shifts entail fictive dislocations in time as well as space. The first, from Cyrene to Delphi, takes the Cyreneans from "today" (1, σάμερον) back to the time of Battus; the second, from Delphi to Thera, takes them further back, to the age of the heroic

---

[36] Cf. how, by addressing the Muse, the speaker first invokes her presence at the victory celebration and then situates her right beside the victor (παρ᾽ ἀνδρὶ φίλῳ, 1) in Cyrene. Thus he simultaneously locates his ode at the occasion. (On this gesture as a traditional appeal for poetic inspiration, see B. Gentili et al., *Pindaro: Le Pitiche* [Rome 1995] 426.)

Argonauts, among them Euphamus. In both cases, the indefinite adverb ποτε opposes past time, "once," to the realistic present of "today."[37]

The speaker introduces Medea's speech by reporting how Apollo's priestess once prophesied to Battus that, leaving the holy island of Thera, he would found a city (7, ὡς ἤδη ... κτίσσειεν). The efferent participle λιπών, "leaving," re-locates Battus at his homeland, from which he is to embark on his colonizing venture after he returns from his pilgrimage to Delphi. The speaker elides that return, creating an empty narrative slot, to be filled in some sense by the Cyreneans' vicarious journey with the Argonauts to Thera.[38] Such narrative ellipsis, in conjunction with deixis, involves the listeners in constructing meaning.

Medea's Speech (14–56)

Medea's speech takes place on Thera in mythic time (ποτε, "once"), sixteen generations before Battus' departure to found Cyrene (9–10). Her addressees are "the half-divine sailors of the spearman Jason" (12), who cowered motionless, in silence, after listening to her wise counsel (57–58).

Frequently, in her forty-three-line speech, Medea engages the Argonauts at Thera through her use of deictics. She employs the demonstrative deictic ἥδε ("this here, this before you, this present") three times to designate the island on which they stand and κείνη ("that there") once to designate the distant Cyrene; perhaps we are to imagine her gesturing as she speaks. In the first occurrence of the deictic demonstrative, at line 14, Medea foretells that one day (future ποτε) "from this sea-washed land here (τᾶσδ' ἐξ ἁλιπλάκτου ... γᾶς), Cyrene will have

---

[37] On cosmogonic or mythic time as the *illud tempus* in which the world has first come into existence, see M. Eliade, *Cosmos and History or The Myth of the Eternal Return*, trans. W. R. Trask (Princeton 1954) 68–113, especially 80–91. He proposes that almost all rituals invoke the mythical beginning, the mythical *illud tempus*, when the world was not yet made.

[38] A similar jumping of levels occurs in the opening lines of *Py.* 9: διωξίππου στεφάνωμα Κυράνας, "garland of chariot-driving Cyrene," in apposition with ὄλβιον ἄνδρα (4), functions not only as a figure of speech but also as a narrative unit; it gives closure, proleptically, to the otherwise unfinished narrative of Cyrene's bouts with wild animals. Telesicrates, in that ode, is Cyrene's metaphoric victory-prize; see N. Felson (titled under N. F. Rubin), "Narrative Structure in Pindar's Ninth *Pythian* Ode," *CW* 71 (1978) 365.

implanted in her the root of cities dear to mortals."[39] In the second, she describes the wanderings of the clod of earth (38–41) down to its arrival at Thera (42): "even now (καί νυν) it has washed ashore at this island here (ἐν τᾷδ' ... νάσῳ)." She also uses verbs having a deictic orientation first to situate the Argonauts in Libya and then to chart the movement of the clod of Libyan earth with reference to Thera, where they all stand. Thus the Argonauts first imaginatively relive their own recent literal sojourn at Libya (20–37), where Euphamus receives the clod; then, as the clod travels, they experience its arrival "even now" (42) as if it were their own arrival at Thera, which is never told.

Medea's use of proximal deictics situates the Cyrenean listeners imaginatively at their mother city. Remarkably, this trope enables them to re-experience their own foundation—as it were, their own insemination—in the very place where it all began. The seminal clod is the undying seed that will bring about future Cyrenean generations: where it lands determines who will be obligated to return it to Libya, colonize Cyrene, and establishes the royal line.[40] Euphamus' union at sea with a woman of Lemnos (50–53 and 251–256) accomplishes, on a human plane, what the clod's destiny predicts or mandates on the divine.

For both the Argonauts and Pindar's Cyrenean audience, the relative τόν ποτε (20) initiates a deictic shift to the place where and the time when Euphamus received his gift—"that bird of omen" (19, κεῖνος ὄρνις), the clod of Libyan earth. Fronting the locative prepositional phrase Τριτωνίδος ἐν προχοαῖς λίμνας reinforces the shift,[41] while the conative present participle at line 21 (διδόντι) makes the vignette all the more vivid. The Cyreneans experience the gift exchange as it is

---

[39] The adverbial ποτε occurs five times in speaker's discourse (4, 10, 152, 266, 293), four in Medea's speech (14, 20, 46, 53). It can refer to the indefinite past (4, 10, 20, 46, 152) or the remote or hypothetical future (14, 53, 266, 293).

[40] See Braswell, *A Commentary* (*ad loc.* 21–22), for other occurrences of the motif of receiving a clod of earth (βώλακα) as a symbol of sovereignty over the land. At lines 42–43, Medea conflates the clod with the undying seed (ἄφθιτον ... σπέρμα) of Battus. Later, in primary discourse, the clod is again called σπέρμα (255), and the ensuing phrase—γένος Εὐφάμου φυτευθέν (256, "the planted race of Euphamus")—sustains the imagery of fertility and birth; see C. Segal, *Pindar's Mythmaking* 68–71, on parallels between marriage and agriculture in the ode. On the metaphorical link in Greek society between agricultural production, foundation of a family and the development of civic life, see Calame (above, n. 33) 288–291, and on autochthony 292–294.

[41] Fronted locative adverbials often introduce deictic verbs of motion and shift the "where" of the deictic center; see Bruder in *Deixis in Narrative* (above, n. 7) 246–248.

happening, on Libyan soil, to their ancestor. The afferent δέξατ' (23), repeated by δέξατο (37b), rounds off the clause and sustains the deictic shift to Libya, long ago.[42]

In the extended past counterfactual of lines 43–49 Medea spells out an alternative foundation story—a Lacedaemonian insemination and colonization of Cyrene as a hypothetical alternative to what in fact took place.[43] Bracketing it, as a digression, allows the deictic expressions καί νυν ἐν τᾷδ' ... νάσῳ (42) and νῦν γε μὲν ... τάνδε ... νᾶσον (50–52) to merge: both designate a single "when" and "where" in the story, namely, now at Thera. Medea urges the sailors to think of Thera now as the critical place and time, when Euphamus will inseminate the Cyrenean dynasty and his descendant, Battus, will bring to completion Medea's prophetic word. Today, the Argonauts' predicted future has already become Cyrenean history.

As Medea's speech concludes (56) and the Argonauts react in silent wonder (57–58), the speaker closes the ring opened at lines 4–10 (cf. 60, χρησμός, and 6, χρῆσεν) by apostrophizing Battus (59, "o blessed son of Polymastus") as he whom the Delphic priestess (6b, ἱεράν) raised up (ὤρθωσεν) in her prophecy. In his sudden intimacy with Battus the speaker impersonates the priestess even as he interprets her message for Cyrene's "future" founder. This in turn suggests that the

[42] Like English "receive" and French "reçevoir," δέχομαι is always afferent. It appears in the aorist at lines 23 and 37b and as an epic aorist participle, δέγμενος, at line 128 for Jason welcoming his relatives.

On the arrival motif as a conventional feature of the epinician genre, see Bundy, *Studia Pindarica*: "the 'arrival' motive.... brings the song, or a divine projection of the song, to the scene of the celebration" (23) and "The arrival motive always refers to the arrival of the *current* song at its contractual destination or in imagination at some scene invoked by the song itself in pursuance of its χρέος" (27).

[43] Dismissing this unrealized tale, Medea predicts what will occur, now that the clod of earth has in fact washed up on "this island here" (τάνδε ... νᾶσον) of Thera: "As it is (νῦν γε μέν), Euphamus will found a choice race in the beds of foreign (Lemnian) women, who in honor toward the gods, having come (ἐλθόντες) to this island here, will bear a mortal (Battus) as master of the dark-clouded plains." The afferent aorist participle, "having come," presupposes an *origo* at Thera, where the Argonauts literally hear Medea speak and where Pindar's audience imaginatively stand as auditors. Medea's use of καί νυν (42) and νῦν γε μέν (50) in conjunction with the deictic ἥδε dramatizes insemination as the transforming event—an analogue of the victory; it also lends her account of the voyage of the clod a distinctly epinician tonality. Normally, Pindar reserves such deictics for the victory itself, and especially for the moment when he resumes the task of praising the victor.

priestess is still addressing Battus at Delphi up until the apostrophe—
i.e., throughout Medea's speech! Indeed, the anaphoric τούτῳ of line 59
("in this speech") makes this retrospectively clear, since it designates
all that precedes (from lines 4–58) and follows (61–63) as the λόγος of
the priestess. Even though the use of *oratio recta* for Medea's speech
made it *feel* only one level removed from the external auditors, the
Cyreneans can now understand the speech as part of what the priestess
said in Delphi to their founder and first king. Moreover, adding another
layer of audience, Battus at Delphi, to those overhearing the word spo-
ken by Medea to the Argonauts at Thera, means that, already before his
voyage, Battus has imaginatively traveled to Libya and that his colo-
nization of Cyrene in Libya is indeed itself a return. But has the poem,
once Medea's tale concludes, returned Pindar's audience to the victor's
homeland, and do the activities of lines 59–67, from the apostrophe to
the beginning of the Argonautica, take place there? Where, in particu-
lar, does the speaker's dialogue with Battus occur?

Two locations lay claim to the exchange between the speaker and
Battus, which replicates in speech structure the oracular session at Del-
phi. The apostrophe at line 59 and the twice repeated second person
address (σε in lines 59 and 61) promote the illusion that the speaker is
right at Delphi addressing Battus (before his voyage to found Cyrene)
at the same time that he is literally performing at Cyrene, perhaps
invoking Battus at his very grave on Battus Street.[44] The speaker "res-
urrects" Battus, so to speak, at the first performance by hailing him as
the one whom the Delphic priestess raised up. Again, he makes the ses-
sion at Delphi so vividly present before his Cyrenean audience that they
virtually witness the earlier exchange, when Battus asked the Delphic
Bee, "What requital will there be from the gods for my stammering?"
(63) and she replied, "I bid you three times 'Hail!' and make you mani-
fest as destined king of Cyrene" (61–62). Her designation of Battus as
the future king of Cyrene, echoing εὐίππου βασιλῆϊ Κυράνας (2),
which referred to King Arcesilas, aligns past and current monarchs,
ancestor and descendant.

The epinician καὶ νῦν, "and now," effects a deictic shift to present
time and to the topic of the victor and his Pythian victory (64–67):

---

[44] On Battus' grave and Battus Street in historical Cyrene, see E. Krummen, *Pyrsos
Hymnon* (Berlin 1990) 98–151, especially 100–102.

ἦ μάλα δὴ μετὰ καὶ νῦν, ὥτε φοινικανθέμου ἦρος ἀκμᾷ
παισὶ τούτοις ὄγδοον θάλλει μέρος Ἀρκεσίλας·
τῷ μὲν Ἀπόλλων ἅ τε Πυθὼ κῦδος ἐξ ἀμφικτιόνων ἔπορεν
ἱπποδρομίας.

And now, as if in the peak of crimson-flowering spring,
Arcesilas, eighth descendant, flourishes for Battus' line.
To him, from those who dwell around, Apollo and Pytho gave
        glory
for his chariot race.

As the poem shuttles back and forth between Battus' Delphi and
Arcesilas' (and Battus') Cyrene, some skillful blending of place is
clearly underway. At line 63, Battus is at Delphi petitioning the priest-
ess, and only in the ensuing line does the theme revert to Cyrene, where
Arcesilas flourishes as the eighth in the line of sons. Subsequent lines
(66–67) reinforce the coalescence of place: the κῦδος that Apollo and
Pytho gave Arcesilas at Delphi (namely, victory at the Pythian Games)
not only resembles but even re-enacts the oracle that Apollo and his
priestess once gave Battus, also at Delphi (Λατοΐδαισιν . . . Πυθῶνί
τ[ε], 3). Mythic (or heroic) time absorbs the here-and-now; the sacred
place, Delphi, envelops Cyrene.[45] In the last lines of the epode, the
speaker offers the Muses (now plural) his double theme of Arcesilas
(αὐτόν, 67) and the golden fleece, in pursuit of which the Argonauts
will win god-sent honors, in part, through this poem. Moreover, their
story, the Argonautica, will enhance and embellish Arcesilas' exploits
in turn. As the ode embarks on an Argonautic voyage of its own, the
need for a fair breeze of songs (οὖρος ὕμνων, 3) from the Muse
becomes transparent.

Argonautica (70–246, 249–250)

The central myth of the poem is especially rich in deictic shifts
through scenes of arrival and departure.[46] After the geographical shift

[45] See B. van Groningen, *In the Grip of the Past* (Leiden 1953) 93–108, on two ancient
Greek conceptions of the past: simple historical and mythical. In mythic time, an event
"remains as it has become" (98) and events never repeat themselves (96: "Daphne's meta-
morphosis is unique"); moreover, there is no tie to historical sequence. In historic time,
however, events occur in their right order in an uninterrupted sequence (as an actual seed
leads, again and again, to the production of a laurel tree).

[46] Told in primary narration and including several represented speeches, this central

to Colchis for the encounter between Jason and Medea, Pindar intro-
duces a sharp deictic shift with Aphrodite's bringing of the wryneck to
humankind (213–217):

πότνια δ' ὀξυτάτων βελέων
ποικίλαν ἴϋγγα τετράκναμον Οὐλυμπόθεν
ἐν ἀλύτῳ ζεύξαισα κύκλῳ
μαινάδ' ὄρνιν Κυπρογένεια φέρεν
πρῶτον ἀνθρώποισι λιτάς τ' ἐπαοιδὰς ἐκδιδάσκησεν σοφὸν
        Αἰσονίδαν·

And the mistress of the swiftest darts, Cyprogeneia,
from Olympus yoking the dappled wryneck, four-spoked,
to an indissoluble wheel, first brought the human race
the maddening bird and she taught to be wise in supplicatory
        charms
the son of Aeson.

The afferent φέρεν sustains the shift to Colchis, the locus of Jason's
two "athletic" labors and the place to which the love goddess first
brought her gift.[47] But Pindar, with an epinician twist, shapes the inno-
vation so that it both anticipates and reduplicates the goddess' other gift
to Jason of "supplicatory charms" (217). As Chiron guided Jason
through his childhood up to his maturation, now Aphrodite takes over

---

myth exhibits deixis that is not static but dynamic. The action begins at Iolcus, which
remains the deictic center until the Argonauts, having assembled there, depart for
Colchis. Afferent verbs describe successive arrivals, as the deictic center shifts (at Iolcus)
from the marketplace (where Pelias and Jason converse) to Aeson's halls (where Jason
entertains his kinsmen) to Pelias' palace (where the second exchange of speeches
between Jason and Pelias takes place). Finally, the Argonauts arrive and assemble at the
Iolcan shores, where Jason receives a favorable omen from Zeus. During the arrivals first
of Jason's kinsmen and then the Argonauts, as individuals depart from or are sent away
from distant locations to Iolcus, the deictic center shifts fleetingly to their site of depar-
ture (with the imperfect verbs expressing the internal experience usually of a parent send-
ing off his son[s]), only to return once more to Iolcus.

[47] A shift of temporal and spatial perspective is implicit in the notion of bringing the
"first" gift from Olympus to all of humankind; this introduces the topos of the inventor
(πρῶτος εὑρετής) and teacher (διδάσκαλος), as in the case of Prometheus' gifts to
humankind in Hes. *Theog.* 535–557 and Aesch. *PV* 437–471. At *Py.* 4.102, using similar
language, Jason identifies the centaur Chiron as the source of his education: Φαμὶ
διδασκαλίαν Χίρωνος οἴσειν.

and instructs him in the wooing of Medea,[48] teaching him to be clever,
even poetic (σοφόν). It is as if the bird, caught and tamed, prefigures
Medea's *eros*, which Jason will tame and channel to his own ends.[49]
Cyprogeneia, as Jason's Muse, teaches him how to use words to get the
desired results.

All this preparation leads up to the first contest—Jason's yoking of
the fire-breathing oxen and his ploughing of the field—an event which
the external Cyrenean audience most vividly "attends."[50] Along with
the Argonauts, they first watch Aeetes yoke the oxen, plough the field,
and demand that Jason do the same; then they witness Jason accom-
plishing this feat. When he succeeds, Aeetes is stunned but the Argo-
nauts, as his audience, shower him with garlands and good cheer
(239–241), as if celebrating an athletic contest at a κῶμος. Through this
scene, the Cyreneans get to witness a mythic triumph, at Colchis, in
lieu of their king's at Delphi, which (at least in the poem) they do not
"attend." Meanwhile, the actual retrieval of the golden fleece—Jason's
culminating feat—is left largely to their imagination, as the speaker
presents it in summary form.

The Cyreneans have traveled to Iolcus (with young Jason) and on to
Colchis (with Jason and the Argonauts) in search of the golden fleece.
Finally, at line 250, they return to Cyrene. The figurative round-trip
experience offered to them re-enacts the literal round-trip journey, or
"loop of νόστος," taken by the real-life victor, King Arcesilas.[51]
Through the trope of the round-trip journey the entire hometown audi-
ence metaphorically re-enacts the journey of Arcesilas to the Pythian
Games and back. Curiously, "return" (as a narrative event) is repre-
sented only by the *anticipated* return of the king's exiled rival, who
prays "someday to see his home" (293–294). Bringing Damophilus
home becomes a metaphoric stand-in, in this anomalous epinikion, for
the already completed return of Arcesilas and his charioteer, which
itself echoes the "return" of Battus, descendant of an Argonaut, to

[48] Aphrodite the instructor (διδασκάλη) seems to anticipate the *praeceptor amoris* of
Latin elegiac poetry; she resembles Chiron at *Py.* 9.38–51, who offers his advice (μῆτις)
to the infatuated god of prophecy.

[49] For competing interpretations of the magic of the wryneck or iunx in *Py.* 4, see
Faraone (above, n. 2) and S. I. Johnston, "The Song of the Iynx: Magic and Rhetoric in
Pythian 4," *TAPA* 125 (1995) 177–206.

[50] Here Jason emulates his *praeceptor amoris*: as Cyprogeneia yoked the wryneck, so
he, fortified by Medea's drugs, yokes the oxen.

[51] Kurke, *Traffic in Praise* 15–34.

found Cyrene. The poem implicates the Cyreneans in the decision to bring Damophilus home, after allowing them to experience the royal insemination and their city's colonization. In the end, this audience is transformed (through a kind of aesthetic pedagogy) to a loftier plane. And the victor's goods, including this epinikion, are shared with the assembled crowd of citizens.

Deictic Closure

The last two triads of the ode, from line 247 to the end, illustrate the principle of deixis in the service of rhetorical and poetic argumentation.[52] After he returns his Cyrenean audience to their homeland, the speaker elicits their support, indirectly and subtly, as he appeals to King Arcesilas to bring Damophilus home. Their presence as an audience is felt throughout his one-on-one address to Arcesilas and, because of their previous and extensive "travels," which replicate those of their victorious king, they affiliate with him and occupy his subject position. Using a variety of poetic ploys and strategies, in these final triads, the speaker engages the Cyreneans, along with Arcesilas, on Damophilus' behalf.

A "break-off formula" that interrupts the narrative of the Argonautic venture returns the Cyreneans abruptly to Cyrene (247–248):

μακρά μοι νεῖσθαι κατ' ἀμαξιτόν· ὥρα γὰρ συνάπτει καί τινα
οἶμον ἴσαμι βραχύν· πολλοῖσι δ' ἅγημαι σοφίας ἑτέροις.

It is long for me to travel the road by chariot; for time presses and
I know a certain shortcut. I lead many others in the poetic art.

Naming the shortcut in fact performs it: from far-off Colchis south of the Caucasus Mountains the poet, and those he leads, return within the line to Cyrene in North Africa. At the same time, the choice of a word

[52] Parmentier (above, n. 4) 70–97 analyzes this very phenomenon, showing how the context of a speech can lessen its political effectiveness. (In his example, a Belau chief was forced to ask permission to get the floor, and his speech interrupted a meeting of elders.) Pindar already has the floor, but if he caters too much to the local crowd, he might put himself at a disadvantage with later audiences, who do not have the same stake in local details.

οἶμος that can also mean "the course or strain of song" calls attention to the discourse structure of *Pythian* 4.[53] And finally, in these two lines, the speaker, *qua* poet, claims authority for himself as a leader. Thus these verses simultaneously achieve three distinct enactments.

First-person deictics in the break-off formula (μοι, ἴσαμι, ἄγημαι) prepare for the apostrophe to Arcesilas which the speaker dramatically inserts when he resumes narrating the finale of the Argonautica (249–250):

> κτεῖνε μὲν γλαυκῶπα τέχναις ποικιλόνωτον ὄφιν,
> ὦ 'Αρκεσίλα, κλέψεν τε Μήδειαν σὺν αὐτᾷ, τὰν Πελίαο φονόν·

> By skill he killed the bright-eyed, dapple-backed serpent,
> o Arcesilas, and he stole Medea, herself willing, murderess of
>   Pelias.

This proleptic mention of Pelias' murder and of Medea as its agent provides thematic closure to the earlier unresolved combat over the Iolcan kingship.[54] Jason's dangerous voyage and pursuit of the golden fleece were to have resolved that conflict, but Pelias must have reneged on his promise to hand over the kingship upon Jason's return (165–166). The inserted apostrophe, which (in the Greek) precedes the two rapid-fire unaugmented aorists (κτεῖνε and κλέψεν) that tell how Jason "killed the serpent and stole Medea," brings both the culminating events at Colchis and the future murder of Pelias into the here and now of the κῶμος taking place σάμερον, "today."[55]

Manipulation of second person pronouns characterizes the portion of the ode sandwiched between the first apostrophe (250) and the second

[53] LSJ, *s.v.* οἶμος 4. metaph., οἶμος ἀοιδῆς (pathway of song), citing *H. Merc.* 451 and Pi. *Ol.* 9.47. (On this metaphor, see above, n. 34).

[54] See T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* (Baltimore 1993) 365–368, for ancient accounts of Medea's role in Pelias' death and of the dispute over the Iolcan throne.

[55] On the association of the aorist augment in Homeric epic with aspect—in particular with a sense of "temporal deixis in which the idea of 'closer' or 'farther' is more important than that of 'past' and 'present',"—there is now a paper by E. J. Bakker, "Homeric Performance and the Deixis of Time and Space" (presented at CAMWS, April 1999). He finds that the augmented aorist—statistically associated with similes and (less overwhelmingly) with character-speeches—suggests vividness more than time. This distinction may be helpful in refining my designation of deictic shifts in *Py.* 4, where unaugmented aorists seem to dominate epic-style narratives.

(298). Throughout, Arcesilas remains prominent, as the addressee of "ἐγώ." The intimate "I"–"you singular" exchange is sustained by a series of second-person singular imperatives (γνῶθι νῦν at 263; τλᾶθι at 276, and πόρσυν' at 278), one second-person singular indicative (ἐσσι at 270), and two second-person singular pronouns (τοι = σοι at 270, τὶν δέ at 275). Superimposed upon this dyadic relation is another one, between "I" and "you plural" (ὑμετέρας 255 and ὕμμι, 259): the second-person plural adjective and pronoun designate all the Cyreneans, to whom Apollo once gave the plain of Libya. So on the one hand, the speaker is simply telling Arcesilas and these gathered Cyreneans: "This is your history! This is how you got here!" At the same time, he is using the twice elaborated aetiology of Cyrene's foundation as the platform for his rhetorical pitch for Arcesilas *and the Cyreneans* to show clemency toward the exile.

In a transitional passage (251–262) within the apostrophes, a sprinkling of distal deictic adverbs indicates distance from the *origo* at Cyrene. These include the temporal adverbs τουτάκις, "then" (255), and τόθι, "there, in that place" (256), ποτε, "once" + aorist (258), and the relative adverb ἔνθεν, "from there, thence" (259), which refers to the distant Kallista (Thera), where Apollo gave Libya to the colonists who would settle Cyrene. But these deictics are interspersed among first- and second-person pronouns, so that events distant in space and time continue to invade the present occasion (251–257):

ἔν τ' Ὠκεανοῦ πελάγεσσι μίγεν πόντῳ τ' ἐρυθρῷ
Λαμνιᾶν τ' ἔθνει γυναικῶν ἀνδροφόνων·
ἔνθα καὶ γυίων ἀέθλοις ἐπεδείξαντο κρίσιν ἐσθᾶτος ἀμφίς,

καὶ συνεύνασθεν. καὶ ἐν ἀλλοδαπαῖς
σπέρμ' ἀρούραις τουτάκις ὑμετέρας ἀκτῖνος ὄλβου δέξατο
    μοιρίδιον
ἆμαρ ἢ νύκτες· τόθι γὰρ γένος Εὐφάμου φυτευθὲν λοιπὸν αἰεὶ
τέλλετο·

On the expanses of Ocean and in the Red Sea
they mingled with the race of man-slaying Lemnian women;
there indeed in trials of limbs they showed their skill
in combat for the prize of a cloak,

and they slept with them. And in foreign fields at that time
the fated day or nights received the seed of your ray of
    good fortune;
for there the race of Euphamus, planted, was established remaining
    forever.

The fronted locative prepositional phrases ("on the expanses," 251, and "in foreign furrows," 254–255) lead one to expect a deictic shift, but it never takes place. Two deictic adverbs—τουτάκις ("at that time") followed shortly by τόθι ("there, in that place")—locate the seed's reception at a distance from the here and now of the κῶμος; so do the third-person plural verbs ἐπεδείξαντο and συνεύνασθεν, whose subjects, the Argonauts, are remote from Cyrene now in place and time. Yet these forebears planted the seed (*there*) "of your ray of good fortune" (*now*) (ὑμετέρας ἀκτῖνος ὄλβου, 255): the fated day or nights received the seed of your line of kings. Through the use of ὑμετέρας, "your," Battus and his history (which brought him to Cyrene) are absorbed into the present occasion. Curiously, the expression translated "remaining forever" is not deictic at all, but comes to mark the here and now by force of the aetiological history which it culminates.

As the ode moves toward its conclusion, the speaker links up distant events to the Cyrene of today's performance (257–262):

> καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων μιχθέντες ἀνδρῶν
> ἤθεσιν ἔν ποτε Καλλίσταν ἀπῴκησαν χρόνῳ
> νᾶσον· ἔνθεν δ' ὔμμι Λατοίδας ἔπορεν Λιβύας πεδίον
> σὺν θεῶν τιμαῖς ὀφέλλειν, ἄστυ χρυσοθρόνου
> διανέμειν θεῖον Κυράνας
>
> ὀρθόβουλον μῆτιν ἐφευρομένοις.

And mingling in the haunts of Spartan men
in time they settled the island Kallista. There to
[all of] you Apollo gave the plain of Libya to develop,
with honors from the gods, a godly citadel
of gold-throned Cyrene for you to govern,

you who have devised righteous counsel.

These lines offer the Cyreneans two foundation legends—the Lacedae-monian settling once of the island of Thera/Kallista (ἔν ποτε ... νᾶσον) and the Theran founding of Cyrene. No proximal deictic demonstratives ("this ... here") delimit Thera, as they do, three times, in Medea's speech at Thera. The distal adverb ἔνθεν, "from there, thence," confirms distance from the *origo* at Cyrene, but movement toward her is impending and is especially felt in the juxtaposition ἔνθεν δ' ὕμμι (259), "from there ... to you (gathered here)." The delayed (and enjambed) aorist participle ἐφευφομένοις (262), which modifies ὕμμι, foregrounds the Cyrenean addressees, recipients of Apollo's munificence. They continue actively to witness the personal exchanges between the speaker and their king.

At this point, the speaker invokes the wisdom of the expert solver of riddles (263–269):

γνῶθι νῦν τὰν Οἰδιπόδα σοφίαν· εἰ γάρ τις ὄζους ὀξυτόμῳ
    πελέκει
ἐξερείψειεν μεγάλας δρυός, αἰσχύνοι δέ οἱ θαητὸν εἶδος,
καὶ φθινόκαρπος ἐοῖσα διδοῖ ψᾶφον περ' αὐτᾶς,
εἴ ποτε χειμέριον πῦρ ἐξίκηται λοίσθιον,
ἢ σὺν ὀρθαῖς κιόνεσσιν δεσποσύναισιν ἐρειδομένα
μόχθον ἄλλοις ἀμφέπει δύστανον ἐν τείχεσιν,
ἐὸν ἐφημώσαισα χῶρον.

Now come to know the wisdom of Oedipus: for if someone
with sharp-cutting axe should slash away the branches
from a great oak tree and defile its wondrous form, even though
its fruit wither, the tree attests to its value if ever it comes at the
    end
to the wintry fire or if, lending support with upright lordly pillars,
it performs lowly toil in foreign halls, leaving its own place
    forlorn.

According to Gildersleeve, in only hinting at the coincidences between the oak, the exiled Oedipus, and the exiled Damophilus, but then, for fear of making the correspondence too close, breaking off before he drives the analogy home, Pindar "acquits himself of a delicate task

delicately."[56] Thus he can make his point—bring the exile home!—without offending Arcesilas.

The riddle, and Oedipus' wisdom in solving it, have an aesthetic as well as rhetorical function. They constitute a narrative syntagm that is a microcosm for the "riddling" *Pythian* 4 and its decipherment. Pindar's creation of a type of character—an exile who retains his virtue though in a foreign setting—challenges his audience to solve the larger riddle of his poem by completing his unspoken thought. Though he directs his request to understand Oedipus' wisdom and thus decode the poem's meaning to Arcesilas (γνῶθι νῦν τὰν Οἰδιπόδα σοφίαν, 263), the Cyrenean witnesses, by their very presence, become additional targets of the poet's appeal.

The rest of the ode, lines 270–299, is geared entirely toward building up the γνῶσις, "understanding," and the σοφία, "wisdom," of Arcesilas and, indirectly, of the Cyreneans who are present. In a rhetorical *tour de force*, "ἐγώ" enjoins "σε" (Arcesilas) to be generous and, through generosity, to heal Cyrene.[57] A string of second person singular imperatives, as cited above (γνῶθι, τλᾶθι, πόρσυν'), culminates with the second apostrophe (298, Ἀρκεσίλα) which forms a ring with the earlier ὦ Ἀρκεσίλα (250). Encased within this forty-eight-line address to the Cyrenean king is a twenty-two-line encomium to Damophilus, itself framed by expressions that signify a positive message or report: ἄγγελον (278) and ἀγγελίας (279) at one end of the ring correspond semantically to μυθήσαιθ' (298) at the other. Now Homer is the authority for the generic praise of the good messenger and the righteous message (277–279):

> τῶν δ' Ὁμήρου καὶ τόδε συνθέμενος
> ῥῆμα πόρσυν' · ἄγγελον ἐσλὸν ἔφα τιμὰν μέγισταν πράγματι
>   παντὶ φέρειν ·
> αὔξεται καὶ Μοῖσα δι' ἀγγελίας ὀρθᾶς.

---

[56] Cf. Gildersleeve (above, n. 33) 302: "Like the oak, O. has lost his branches, his sons (ὄζους, who, acc. to one version . . . , perished before their father), his comeliness has been marred (θαητὸν εἶδος), the place that knew him knows him no more . . . , and yet, though his fruit perish . . . , he can render services to an alien state, such . . . as are set forth in the *O. at Kolonos* of Sophokles."

[57] So Carey (above, n. 32) 151: "In 270ff. Arcesilas' task is to heal a state torn by internal strife. But by applying the same image to Damophilus Pindar indicates how Arcesilas can heal Cyrene. A single act, the recall of the exile, will make Cyrene whole and cure the misery of Damophilus."

Of what belongs to Homer, lay this word to heart and heed it. He
said
that a noble messenger bears the most honor in every matter; even
the Muse will grow through a righteous message.

Scholars have engaged in a lively debate over the identity of the
noble messenger that the speaker commends to Arcesilas in this wise
saying; but a generic statement such as this need not, in fact should not,
be restricted in its application. Pindar is cagey about the messenger's
identity. His diction clearly suggests self-reference: both καὶ Μοῖσα
and αὔξεται hearken back to the poem's opening, where the speaker
enjoins the Muse to stand at the victor's side as he celebrates, so that
she may enhance (αὔξῃς) the fair breeze of songs (1–4). Moreover, the
details of the ensuing encomium to Damophilus emphasize the righ-
teousness of the exile. In principle, to praise the one acting in justice is
the obligation of the epinician poet. So the first hypothesis, that the
messenger refers to the poet, as many have argued, has considerable
textual support. A listener would readily make this association.

Nevertheless, as the poem moves toward its destination, the applica-
tion of the maxim expands. The category "messenger" acquires a
second identity—that of Damophilus, who, should he return home, will
certify "what sort of spring of ambrosial words he found . . . when he
was lately entertained at Thebes" (καί κε μυθήσαιθ᾽, ὁποίαν . . . / εὗρε
παγὰν ἀμβροσίων ἐπέων, πρόσφατον Θήβᾳ ξενωθείς, 298–299).[58]
The spring of ambrosial words whose quality Damophilus will certify
is *Pythian* 4.

In his comments on this passage, Gildersleeve hypothesizes that a
pact has already been reached between Arcesilas and Damophilus.[59]
Carey then speculates that Damophilus may be the literal bearer of Pin-
dar's ode.[60] In support of Gildersleeve's suggestion that a private accord

---

[58] For a different view, which restricts the application of the saying to either the poet or
Damophilus (the two possible candidates for the role of ἄγγελος), see Carey (above,
n. 32) especially 147–148. Arguing against the obvious choice, Pindar, Carey concludes
that lines 279–281 "establish Damophilus' right to be called ἄγγελος ὀρθός."

[59] Gildersleeve (above, n. 33) 303 *ad* 279: "Everything points to a private understand-
ing between P. and Arkesilas as to the restoration of Damophilos. D. paid for the ode, and
one is reminded of the Delphic oracle and the banished Alkmaionidai. It would be very
innocent to suppose that P. was really pleading for a man whose pardon was not assured."

[60] According to Carey (above, n. 32) 148: "We may if we choose suppose that
Damophilus arrived in Libya unannounced bearing the ode as a peace offering."

had already been reached before the ode was written, Carey sees the
ode as aiming (148) to "seal the reconciliation between D. and A., not
to procure it" and observes (152) that "recognition of the excellence of
Pindar's song depends on the success of his 'suit'."

What inferences would members of Pindar's Cyrenean audience be
likely to make about this matter? I suggest that they would be perplexed
by the pithy allusion to *Iliad* 15.207, where Iris mediates a quarrel
between Poseidon and Zeus, and would encounter it as a riddle, inas-
much as the identity of the messenger, who parallels Iris, would be a
puzzle for them to solve. They would first take Pindar as a messenger
from Damophilus, exhorting the angry Arcesilas to bring the exile
home. Only with the verb μυθήσαιθ' will they realize that Damophilus
is in fact himself a potential messenger of Pindar's song, who will bring
it to Cyrene if Arcesilas yields to the argument of the poem. But that
poetic argument is made so persuasive that the Cyreneans would feel
that this eventuality is as good as true.

The gist of the poetic argument emerges in its richness only in these
last two lines of the ode.[61] Damophilus is excellent in all respects. He
knows, understands, observes the καιρός, is political and even plays
the lyre. Arcesilas is a healer who knows straight council, has wisdom,
and even (like Oedipus) understands riddles. These facts combine to
produce an inevitable outcome: *Arcesilas will bring Damophilus home.*
To clinch his point, the speaker (here *qua* poet) has offered one last
paradigm for Arcesilas to emulate: his own hospitable entertainment of
the exile at Thebes. The substance of his Theban hospitality—his gift
exchange to Damophilus—was a performance of *Pythian* 4; if the
deserving exile comes home, he will relate this song (that they have just
witnessed) to Arcesilas and the Cyreneans. He will then become the
messenger who brings home the good report and fulfills the generic
word of Homer (277–279). Furthermore, if Damophilus in fact com-
missioned the ode, as some scholars think, by the laws of hospitality he
is entitled to come home.

In his concluding two lines, then, the poet produces the illusion that
Damophilus is already home, having accompanied this ode. He exploits
the "coincidence" that Damophilus' trip home has the same trajectory
as the victory ode, which has come from Thebes to Cyrene. He makes

---

[61] We can not know the stage of the negotiations for Damophilus' return; but we can
know that, as the ode is being performed in Cyrene, the poet boldly perpetrates an *illusion*
of its earlier historical performance "lately" in Thebes.

the Cyreneans *feel* that the petition to Arcesilas to bring Damophilus home is as good as fulfilled and that the distant event of clemency coalesces with the here-and-now of the ode's performance. Future does not actually collapse into present but is only felt to do so.[62]

Such a "double performance" of *Pythian* 4 makes the ode a double gift—first to Damophilus in Thebes and second to Arcesilas in Cyrene. Both receive the poet's bounty. The ode itself is thus revealed as a "shifter," like the traveling clod of earth: it is indexed to its current recipient in its current performance context, but in the recent past it was indexed to Damophilus at Thebes. And so a further rhetorical argument emerges, reaching beyond the poem. If *Pythian* 4 can be transferred so readily from Thebes (site of its fictional first performance) to Cyrene, it can also have future recipients—ourselves—and thus remain a "spermatic logos" that endures through time.[63]

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

[62] Cf. W. J. Slater, "Futures in Pindar," *CQ* N.S. 19 (1969) 86–94, for the general insight that actual events (such as Damophilus' arrival) may be conventionally represented in future time.