



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Metalepsis and the Apostrophe of Heroes in Pindar

de Jong, I.J.F.

DOI

[10.1093/oso/9780198846987.003.0004](https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198846987.003.0004)

Publication date

2020

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Metalepsis

License

Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act (<https://www.openaccess.nl/en/in-the-netherlands/you-share-we-take-care>)

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

de Jong, I. J. F. (2020). Metalepsis and the Apostrophe of Heroes in Pindar. In S. Matzner, & G. Trimble (Eds.), *Metalepsis: Ancient Texts, New Perspectives* (pp. 79-97). (Classics in theory). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198846987.003.0004>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

4

Metalepsis and the Apostrophe of Heroes in Pindar

Irene J. F. de Jong

‘O mysterious apostrophe, teach us to understand your workings! Show us your varied talents here!’

(Culler 1981: 135)

Introduction

A clear case of metalepsis with a long and distinguished history in classical literature is the apostrophe in a narrative: when a narrator turns away from their default addressee, the narratee, and addresses one of the characters.¹ Narrator and characters in principle inhabit different universes since the narrator (*qua* narrator) belongs to a later moment in time and often to a different space, but when a narrator addresses a character the boundaries between these universes are blurred and the narrator ‘enters’ the world of the character.

Richardson in *The Homeric Narrator* was the first to analyse the apostrophes in Homer in terms of metalepsis and he defines the effect as follows:

The sympathy for the apostrophized characters in Homer comes not from the attitude expressed by the narrator but from the intimacy

¹ The definition is adapted from Quintilian *Inst.* 4.1.69, 9.2.38–9 (when an orator turns away from the judge and addresses a secondary addressee, which may consist of his opponent, an absent person, either dead or alive, or things, including personifications). For a definition of apostrophe in modern lyric texts, see Culler (1981: 138) (‘invocations which turn away from empirical listeners by addressing natural objects, artefacts, or abstractions’). See further Trimble in this volume, pp. 126–7.

effected by the metalepsis...By getting the narratee to cross the bridge that separates them into the second narrative level, the narrator engages the narratee's sympathy by establishing a close alliance between the narratee and the character who inspires the transgression.²

In my study on 'Metalepsis in Ancient Greek Literature' I suggested that:

the sum effect of the apostrophe is to add to that vital characteristic of Homeric epic, *enargeia*: the events are presented in such a way that they seem to take place before the eyes of the narratees. Addressing characters directly is as 'enargetic' as the many speeches, when the narratees seem to actually hear the characters, impersonated by the narrator.³

Connecting apostrophe with *enargeia* means that I take the movement to be from the narrator (and the external narratees) into the world of the characters. *Enargeia* is a form of what nowadays is known as 'immersion': the hearers/readers of a narrative are so strongly absorbed by a narrative that they feel as if they are present themselves at the events told. They are mentally transported into the narrative world and become spectators of the events from the past.⁴ Exactly the opposite movement, of character into the world of narrator, has been argued for by Bakker: Patroclus has an epiphany and 'literally *is* there, and the poet's addressing him creates, as well as presupposes, a maximum of presence in the epic performance.'⁵ However we analyse it (as a form of immersion or of epiphany), apostrophe is a marked way of presentation and hence often (though not always) is used at a crucial point of the narrative, the clearest example being the apostrophes of Patroclus that mark the (advent of) his death (*Iliad* 16.692–3 and 787):

² Richardson (1990: 170–4, quotation from 173–4). For a summary of the debate on the interpretation of the Homeric apostrophe (is it merely used to fit in metrically difficult names or does it (also) have an expressive function?) and bibliography, see e.g. De Jong (2009: 94), to which should be added Dubel 2011. See also Grethlein, Budelmann, and Trimble in this volume.

³ De Jong (2009: 93–7, quotation from 95). A similar analysis (without using the concept of metalepsis) in Asso (2008: 163, 167).

⁴ For *enargeia* and immersion in Homer, see Allan, De Jong, and De Jonge (2017) and Grethlein and Huitink (2017). For more on *enargeia* see also Grethlein in this volume.

⁵ Bakker (1993: 22–3). Cf. Fulkerson in this volume on metaleptic epiphany.

ἔνθα τίνα πρῶτον, τίνα δ' ὕστατον ἐξενάριξας,
Πατρόκλεις, ὅτε δῆ σε θεοὶ θάνατονδε κάλεσαν;

Then who was the first, who the last that you killed, Patroclus, when the gods called you to your death?

ἔνθ' ἄρα τοι, Πάτροκλε, φᾶνη βιότοιο τελευτή·

then the end of your life manifested itself to you, Patroclus.⁶

The Homeric narrator arguably was inspired to use apostrophes by the genre of the hymn and its 'Du-Stil' (he apostrophizes Apollo in *Il.* 15.365–6 and 20.152),⁷ and applying them not only to gods but also to the characters, who are after all 'semi-divine' heroes (cf. *ἡμιθέων γένος ἀνδρῶν*, 12.23), he set a trend: all later Greek and Roman epic narrators to a greater or lesser degree address their characters, with a multitude of effects.⁸

Apostrophe is also regularly found outside epic: in hymns, the choral lyrics of tragedy, bucolic poetry, didactic poetry, and Latin lyric.⁹ Prose narrative texts on the contrary, both ancient and modern, feature apostrophes more rarely. Two effective examples are: *tu uero felix, Agricola, non uitae tantum claritate, sed etiam opportunitate mortis*, 'You truly are fortunate, Agricola, not only in the lustre of your life, but also in the timeliness of your death' (Tacitus *Agricola* 45.3)¹⁰ and 'Arme Effi, du hattest zu den Himmelwundern zu lange hinaufgesehen und hatte darüber nachgedacht, und das Ende war, dass die Nachtluft und die Nebel, die vom Teich her aufstiegen, sie wieder aufs Krankenbett warfen...'. 'Poor Effi, you spent too long looking up at the wonders of the heavens and thinking about them, and the result was that the night air and the mist rising from the pond brought on a recurrence of her illness...' (Theodor Fontane *Effi Briest*, chapter 36, trans. Mitchell).¹¹

⁶ More on Homer's apostrophe of Patroclus in the contribution of Budelmann in this volume. Where no translator is indicated, translations in this chapter are my own.

⁷ De Jong (2009: 95–6). This suggestion is taken up and expanded by Klooster (2013). More on the hymnic Du-Stil in the next section on 'The Pindaric 'You' from a Literary Historical Perspective'.

⁸ See e.g. Endt (2005), Effe (2004), Georgacopoulou (2005), D'Alessandro Behr (2005), Asso (2008), and Cadau (2015: 234–45). I have not been able to consult Zyroff (1971).

⁹ For examples see Hampel (1908), Tränkle (1960: 147), Morrison (2007a (see index)), De Jong (2009: 97), and Klooster (2013).

¹⁰ Some other examples are Livy 9.1.7, Velleius Paterculus 2.66.3–5.

¹¹ I thus concur with Richardson (1990: 18) ('narratorial apostrophe of a character rarely occurs in modern narrative') rather than Fludernik (1994b: 474 n. 26) ('emphatic apostrophe to the character has been a fairly common device even in realist narrative; but she gives no examples). Narratologists hardly discuss apostrophe as such but focus on second-person

In this chapter I will discuss the apostrophe of heroes in Pindaric epinician odes. Before being able to do so, however, I need to clear the ground since the Pindaric 'I' actually addresses many 'you's.¹² If apostrophe means the 'turning away' by a speaker from their default addressee to address someone or something else, we will first have to establish who that default addressee is in a Pindaric ode. While there is a massive bibliography on the Pindaric 'I',¹³ the Pindaric 'you' has been much less explored.¹⁴

The Pindaric 'You' from a Literary Historical Perspective

The basic structure of the Pindaric victory ode consists of a combination of a *lyric frame in the present*, which contains praise of the victor, his family and home city, references to the games in which the victory was won and the celebration of that victory, and prayers or other forms of divine address, and a (*mythical or historical*) *narrative from the past*, which functions as a positive or negative paradigm for the victor, while the different elements of the ode are 'glued together' with the help of *omnitemporal gnomes*.

The voice that presents the odes is an 'I' (or 'we'), who for the sake of simplicity I take to be (in the majority of cases) a carefully stylized persona of the poet. The 'I' addresses a multitude of 'you's: the victor or members of his family, gods, Muses, geographical locations, heroes, and himself. I will shortly go into these 'you's in more detail, but first I want to establish a kind of hierarchy and decide who is the epinician speaker's default

fiction, which they explicitly (Kacandes 1994) or fleetingly (Fludernik 1994a: 288, 302) relate to apostrophe. For another study of modern second-person narration see e.g. the second chapter in Richardson (2006).

¹² On underdetermined personal pronouns and metalepsis see also Matzner and Grethlein in this volume.

¹³ For a recent overview of the discussion with full bibliography, see Currie (2013). He argues that references to the Pindaric 'I' can fluctuate from 'generic, rhetorical poses—a laudator, an *aidos* in the rhapsodic tradition... an Everyman...—to strongly individualized figures: the Theban poet Pindar, the chorus, the victor' (243). Schmid (1998) is also a highly commendable discussion of the many voices in the Pindaric ode.

¹⁴ There are Kambylis (1964) on Pindaric vocatives and the unpublished dissertation of Colwell (1993), both of which I have not been able to consult, and Griffith (1991). I am talking about the 'you' *inside* the text; for Pindar's *historical* audience(s), see e.g. Kurke (1991) and Morrison (2007b).

addressee, the receiver who corresponds to him as sender.¹⁵ In order to do so it may be instructive to look back briefly to two genres that arguably influenced the epinician genre: epic and the hymn.¹⁶

In the Homeric epics the main form of communication is that of an external narrator who addresses external narratees. Both are highly covert, the Homeric 'I' only surfacing in the proems and a handful of passages in the course of the narrative, the Homeric 'you' in a limited set of passages of the type 'there you would have seen.'¹⁷ The narrator also occasionally addresses the Muses or, as we already saw, apostrophizes his heroes. What is crucial here is that even though the narrator at such moments briefly turns away from his default addressee, the narratees, and addresses someone else, the narratees *remain his receiver*.¹⁸ The Muse-invocations and apostrophes are inserted to have a certain effect on the narratees, who are supposed to respond to them cognitively and emotionally: the Muse-invocations should ensure them of the narrator's professional status and authority, while the apostrophes, as we have already seen, should trigger their sympathy for certain heroes.

When we turn from epic to cultic hymn the situation is different: here we find 'I' and 'you' forms throughout, and the 'you' almost invariably is the god hymned. The hymnic speaker starts by invoking the god (mentioning his or her name, attributes, genealogy), then praises him/her (through lists of his/her powers, reminders of earlier benefits, descriptions of his/her person, haunts or actions, and narratives), and at the end prays to him/her.¹⁹ Although the typical 'Du-Stil'²⁰ is usually not maintained throughout the entire hymn, the hymned god from beginning to end clearly is the default addressee (receiver) of the hymnic speaker (sender).

¹⁵ I am using here the well-established terminology of Jakobson, who distinguishes six factors that are involved in communication: (1) context, (2) sender, (3) receiver, (4) contact, (5) common code, and (6) message. See Jakobson (1960).

¹⁶ For epic elements in the epinician genre, see e.g. Braswell (1988: *ad* 1–3), for hymnic elements, e.g. Bremer (2008).

¹⁷ See e.g. De Jong (2004: 45–60).

¹⁸ Cf. Kacandes (1994: 330) ('the apostrophe bears two "addresses". Overtly, a speaker sends a message to someone or something as if that being or thing could respond but will not. Covertly, an apostrophe is meant to provoke response through its reception in a second(ary) communicative circuit, received by the readers of a poem in the cases of lyric or the audience in the case of oratory') and Klooster (2013: 152).

¹⁹ For the typical structure of cultic hymns, see Furley and Bremer (2001: 50–63).

²⁰ The instances of the 'Du-Stil' are regularly referred to as apostrophes, whereby it should be noted that apostrophe is here used in its more general sense of 'invocation' or 'address' rather than the more restricted sense of the turning away from a default addressee to another addressee (which is the sense adopted in this chapter).

Hymnic speakers also occasionally address the Muses and—a difference vis-à-vis the epic narrator—the geographical location where the hymn is performed or the chorus that performs it.²¹ The ‘you’ that is conspicuously lacking is that of the human addressees, the text-internal counterparts of the flesh-and-blood persons who attend the performance of the hymns. They may be briefly referred to,²² but are never addressed as ‘you’. Clearly, the religious nature of the hymn prescribed an exclusive focus on the god as its recipient.²³

Returning to the Pindaric epinician ode, we can now observe that the epinician speaker follows the example of epic speakers in addressing Muses and heroes, that of hymnic speakers in addressing gods and geographical locations, and adds as new categories of addressees the victor (and his family) and himself. Who of these many ‘you’s is the default addressee, the receiver corresponding to the epinician sender? The question has been hardly discussed, probably since most scholars simply assume that default addressee to be the victor.²⁴ This is also the position of one of the few scholars who does express an explicit opinion on the matter: ‘When the poets of victory odes use a second person in order to address an audience for their songs, this second person nearly always refers to an individual, most often the victor himself’ (Pfeijffer 2004: 219).²⁵ To take the victor as the main addressee is a priori plausible in view of the overriding encomiastic goal of victory odes. If we accept this analysis, as I am inclined to do, we may observe that the very fact that the victor occupies the honorific position of the default ‘you’ that in hymns is taken by the god adds to his elevation.²⁶ It also means that the victor hears all other

²¹ For Muses, see e.g. Pindar, *Paeon* 6.54–8 (Furley and Bremer number 2.2), *Limenius’ Paeon to Apollo* 1–6 (Furley and Bremer 2.6); for geographical locations, e.g. Pindar, *Paeon* 6.1–11 (Furley and Bremer 2.2); for the chorus, e.g. *Paeon to Asclepius* 1–2 (Furley and Bremer 6.1).

²² E.g. in Pindar, *Paeon* 6.64: ‘the sacrifice is on behalf of all Greece, inaugurated by the Delphic people [for deliverance] from famine’ (Furley and Bremer 2.2).

²³ The situation is more or less the same in the subgenre of the *Homeric Hymns*: cf. Nünlist (2004: 36): ‘the narratee of the hymn is the god to whom the hymn is dedicated... (Needless to say, the ultimate narratees of the hymns are, of course, the human audience, who, however, cannot be addressed, lest the *phthonos theōn* [envy of the gods] be roused.)’

²⁴ Or because they assume Pindar to simply switch between addressees without there being one default addressee; for this analysis, see e.g. Obbink (1993: 70–1), who speaks of a ‘progression of addressees’ in lyric.

²⁵ A different position is taken by Bremer (2008), who argues that ‘victory songs were addressed to the god who presides over the festival’ (Bremer 2008: 6).

²⁶ It is a matter of debate how far we should go in this alignment of mortal victor and god. Did (some of the) victors receive hero cult? For a positive answer, see Currie (2005), for a negative answer Bremer (2008: 12–17).

addresses by the epinician speaker, notably the prayers to the gods for his benefit.

I will now take a closer look at the many identities of the Pindaric ‘you’.²⁷

The Many Identities of the Pindaric ‘You’

The epinician speaker’s main or default addressee is the *victor*, including members of his family, his trainer, and his charioteer or mule driver, e.g. O. 11.11–15:

ἴσθι νῦν, Ἀρχεστράτου
παῖ, τεᾶς, Ἀγησίδαμε, πυγμαχίας ἔνεκεν
κόσμον ἐπὶ στεφάνῳ χρυσέας ἐλαίας
ἀδυμελῆ κελαδήσω...

Be assured now, *son of Arcestratos*, that because of *your* boxing, *Hagesidamos*, I shall adorn your crown of golden olive with my sweet song of celebration...²⁸

After the victor, *gods*, including personifications such as Fortune, are most frequently addressed, especially at the beginning or end of odes, e.g. O. 13.115–16:

Ζεῦ τέλει, αἰδῶ δίδου
καὶ τύχαν τερπνῶν γλυκεῖαν.

Zeus accomplisher, grant them respect and sweet attainment of success.²⁹

²⁷ The ‘you’ can take the form of a vocative and/or a second-person indicative and/or an imperative and/or a second-person pronoun. See the list in Griffith (1991: 32), which is not completely identical with my categories and lists.

²⁸ Throughout this chapter, I quote for Pindar the text and translation of Race (1997), with occasional adaptations. See O. 1.106–8, 114–15; 5.21–3; 6.12, 22–3, 77–9, 80–1; 8.15–16; 10.91–6; 11.16; 12.13–19; 13.43–5; P. 1.85–92; 2.18–20, 57–72; 3.80–4; 4.250, 255, 259–62, 263, 270–8, 298; 5.5–11, 14–31, 45–53; 6.14–20; 7.17–18; 8.32–8, 71–2, 78–82; 9.90–2 (if Hermann’s *εὐκλείεας* is read), 97–103; N. 1.29–30; 2.14–15; 3.76–80, 83–4; 4.13–14, 77–81, 89–90; 5.41–3, 48–9; 6.60–3; 7.58–60, 70, 75; 8.44–8; 10.37–8; I. 2.1, 12, 30–2; 4.2–5; 5.17–18; 7.31–6.

²⁹ See O. 2.12–15; 4.1–10; 5.9–11, 17–21; 6.103–5; 7.87–94; 12.1–5; 13.24–30; 14.1–7, 13–17, 20–4; P. 1.29–30, 39–40, 67–71; 5.78–81, 118–21; 6.50–1; 7.9–11; 8.1–13, 61–9; 10.10–11; 11.1–13, 62–4; N. 3.65–6; 7.1–8; 8.1–3, 35–7; 9.28–32, 53–5; 10.29–30; 11.1–7; I. 3.4–5; 5.1–6; 6.3–4; 7.49–51.

The address of *geographical locations* can be considered a subtype of the address of gods, since they are mainly represented by their eponymous nymphs, e.g. *N.* 1.1–5:

ἄμπνευμα σεμνὸν Ἄλφειοῦ,
κλεινᾶν Συρακοσσᾶν θάλος Ὀρτυγία,
δέμνιον Ἀρτέμιδος,
Δάλου κασιγνήτα, σέθεν ἀδυεπής
ῥυμος ὀρμάται...

*Hallowed spout of Alpheos, Ortygia, offspring of famous Syracuse, couch of Artemis, and sister of Delos, from you a sweetly worded hymn issues forth...*³⁰

With the invocations of the *Muses* we are moving from the sphere of the victor to that of the epinician speaker, since they bear upon his poetic art, e.g. *N.* 6.27–8:

εὔ-
θυν' ἐπὶ τοῦτον, ἄγε, Μοῖσα,
οἶδρον ἐπέων
εὐκλέα·

*Come, Muse, direct to that house a glorious wind of verses.*³¹

Finally there is the *self-address*, when the epinician speaker, talking about his task as a poet, addresses his heart, lyre, song, or himself, e.g. *N.* 4.44–6:

ἔξύφαινε, γλυκεῖα, καὶ τόδ' αὐτίκα, φόρμιγξ,
Λυδία σὺν ἁρμονίᾳ μέλος πεφιλημένον
Οἰνώνα τε καὶ Κύπρω, ἔνθα...

Quickly now, *sweet lyre, weave out* this song too in Lydian harmony, one beloved by Oenona and Cyprus, where...³²

³⁰ See *O.* 5.1–8; 9.16–18; *P.* 8.98–100; 12.1–8; *N.* 1.1–6; 7.50–3; *I.* 1.1–3; 7.1–15. Even when a real physical place is addressed, it usually still has a numinous aspect in that it is pictured as a living being; *P.* 2.1–4; *O.* 8.1–10. Here lies the origin of the modern definition of apostrophe (quoted in n. 1), which concerns the invocation of natural objects.

³¹ See *O.* 10.1–6; 11.16–19; *P.* 1.58–9; 4.1–3; 11.41–5; *N.* 3.1–17; 9.1–3; 10.1–2 (Graces); *I.* 5.38–42; 6.57–8. For discussion, see Morrison (2007a: 76–7, 84–9) and Kantzios (2003).

³² See *O.* 1.3–6, 17–19; 2.1–2, 89; 9.1–16, 35–42, 47–9; *P.* 1.1–12, 81–4; 3.61–2; 10.51–2; *N.* 3.26–8, 31–2; 4.36–7, 69–70; 5.2–3, 50–4; 7.77, 80–2 (or the chorus leader); 9.1–2; *I.* 5.24, 51; 7.20; 8.7. For discussion, see Sullivan (2002) and Morrison (2007a: 151).

Such self-addresses are a novelty in comparison to the more covert style of epic and hymnic narrators and well suit the explicit self-promotion of lyric poets.³³

Taken together, second-person forms are all over the place in Pindaric odes, some being particularly full of them (e.g. *Pythian* 2) and few entirely lacking them (e.g. *Olympian* 3). A cluster of addresses at a particular point of an ode may serve a special purpose: thus the many references to Arcesilas at the end of *Pythian* 4 (263, 270, 275, 276, 278, 298) underscore the appealing nature of this section, in which Pindar urges him to allow his exiled compatriot Damophilus to come back.

All of the persons or entities addressed in 'you' form can also be referred to in the third person. The epinician speaker may, for instance, pray to a god in the traditional second-person form but he may also vary the pattern³⁴ and refer to that god in the third person, as he does e.g. in *O.* 8.84–5:

ἔσλὰ δ' ἐπ' ἔσλοῖς
ἔργα θέλοι δόμεν, ὀξείας δὲ νόσους ἀπαλάλκοι.

May he [Zeus] be willing to provide success upon success and ward off painful diseases.

Likewise he will commonly address the victor as 'you' at the moment he speaks about his victory but he may also refer to him, though present in his audience, in the third person, e.g. *O.* 3.1–3:

Τυνδαρίδαις τε φιλοξένοις ἀδεῖν
καλλιπλοκάμῳ θ' Ἑλένῃ
κλεινὰν Ἀκράγαντα γεραίρων εὔχομαι,
Θήρωνος Ὀλυμπιονίκαν
ἕμνον ὀρθώσαις...

³³ Some remaining minor categories of 'you's are: generic 'you' (*P.* 10.29–30; *O.* 13.112–14; *N.* 9.34–7), citizens (*O.* 13.14–17; *N.* 2.24–5; *I.* 3.15–17b; 4.35–6b), the chorus (*O.* 6.87–92; *I.* 8.1–3, and perhaps *N.* 7.80–2), and the unique case of a named person who is ordered by the epinician speaker to bring his poem to the victor (*I.* 2.47–8). Some debated passages are *N.* 1.13 *σπεῖρε* (if we read this imperative with Beck and the scholia) and *I.* 5.62–3 *λάμβανε, φέρε*: Muse-invocations or self-addresses?; *P.* 6.1 *ἀκούσατε*: the victor and his family or Akragan citizens?; *P.* 11.38 *ὦ φίλοι*: Theban citizens or the victor and his family?; *I.* 8.63 *γεραίρετ'* (if we read this imperative with Bothe and most editors): the chorus or the Muses?

³⁴ I use the word 'vary' on purpose here, since I think what is at play is indeed variation, Pindar's celebrated *poikilia*. For discussions of second-person and third-person deixis in Pindar, see Athanassaki (2004) and Bonifazi (2004: 395–407).

I pray that I may please the hospitable Tyndaridai and Helen of the beautiful locks, as I honour famous Akragas, when, *for Theron*, I raise up an Olympic victory hymn...

The effect of this use of the third person to someone who is present is 'to make that individual stand out'.³⁵

An interesting in-between form of reference, less direct than 'you' but more direct than a third person, consists in the proximal deictic pronoun ὄδε,³⁶ e.g. *N.* 2.1–5:

ὄθεν περ καὶ Ὀμηρίδαι
 ῥαπτῶν ἐπέων τὰ πόλλ' ἀοιδοί
 ἄρχονται, Διὸς ἐκ προοιμίου, καὶ ὄδ' ἀνὴρ
 καταβολὰν ἱερῶν ἀγώ-
 νων νικαφορίας δέδεκται πρῶτον Νεμεαίου
 ἐν πολυμυνήτῳ Διὸς ἄλσει.

Just as the sons of Homer, those singers of verses stitched together, most often begin with a prelude to Zeus, so has *this man* received his first instalment of victory in the sacred games at the much-hymned sanctuary of Nemean Zeus.³⁷

The *first-time* listeners to the ode will have easily understood who 'this man' was, because they were present at the celebration of the victory of Timodemos of Acharnae (and would see him in their midst, probably sitting in one of the front-row seats). We may even hypothesize that the chorus in their performance somehow would have directed attention at Timodemus, reinforcing the zooming effect of ὄδ' ἀνὴρ through their body language. As for the *later* listeners and readers, the ode quickly goes on to record the name of the *laudandus* so as to allow them to identify 'the man' too: 'but you, O Timodemos, the stout-hearted strength of the pancratium exalts' (14–15).

I wrap up the first part of my argument. The Pindaric ode features a multitude of 'you's, of which the victor and his family are the epinician speaker's default addressee, and the Muses, the gods, geographical locations,

³⁵ Athanassaki (2004: 320).

³⁶ On deictics cf. Matzner in this volume, p. 23.

³⁷ Cf. further *O.* 2.36; 9.110; *I.* 1.34; 4.70. For discussions of deixis in Pindar, see Felson (1999) and the special issue of *Arethusa* 37.3 (2004).

and the poet himself various kinds of secondary addressees. I now turn to the last ‘you’, which I have so far left out of the discussion: heroes.

The (Metaleptic) Apostrophe of Heroes

The ‘you’-references discussed in the previous section all stem from the lyric frame of Pindaric odes. The narrative parts are almost completely devoid of them: Pindaric narratives are regularly interrupted by passages featuring the ‘I’, but the ‘you’s (victor, gods, Muses) disappear out of sight when the epinician speaker turns narrator.³⁸

What we do find, albeit only rarely (three times), is an apostrophe of one of the characters of the narrative. O. 1.36–51:

*υἱὲ Ταντάλου, σὲ δ' ἀντία προτέρων φθέγγομαι,
 ὅπότ' ἐκάλεσε πατὴρ τὸν εὐνομώτατον
 εἰς ἔρανον φίλαν τε Σίπυλον,
 ἀμοιβαῖα θεοῖσι δεῖπνα παρέχων,
 τότ' Ἀγλαοτρίαιναν ἀρπάσαι,
 δαμέντα φρένας ἰμέρω, χρυσεαῖσί τ' ἀν' ἵπποις
 ὕπατον εὐρυτίμου ποτὶ δῶμα Διὸς μεταβάσαι
 ...
 ὡς δ' ἄφαντος ἔπελες, οὐδὲ ματρὶ πολ-
 λὰ μαιόμενοι φῶτες ἄγαγον,
 ἔννεπε κρυφᾶ τις αὐτίκα φθονερῶν γειτόνων,
 ὕδατος ὅτι τε πυρὶ ζέοισαν εἰς ἀκμάν
 μαχαίρα τάμον κατὰ μέλη,
 τραπέζαισί τ' ἀμφὶ δεύτατα κρεῶν
 σέθεν διεδάσαντο καὶ φάγον.*

Son of Tantalus, of *you* I shall say, contrary to my predecessors, that when your father invited the gods to his most orderly feast and to his friendly Sipylos giving them a banquet in return for theirs, then it was

³⁸ The one exception is the three references to the victor Arcesilas and his family in one of the narrative parts of *Pythian* 4 (250, 255, 259), arguably because at this point the narrative touches the genealogy of the Euphemid Arcesilas (I owe this suggestion to Bruno Currie). An additional reason might be the exceptional length of this narrative, which would lead Pindar to bring back in focus his main addressee Arcesilas before the return to the lyric frame, where, as we have already seen (in the section on ‘The Many Identities of the Pindaric “You”’), he is addressed very frequently and urgently.

that the Lord of the Splendid Trident seized you, his mind overcome by desire, and with golden steeds conveyed you to the highest home of widely honored Zeus... But when *you* disappeared, and despite much searching no men returned you to your mother, one of the envious neighbours immediately said in secret that into water boiling rapidly on the fire they [the gods] cut up your limbs with a knife, and for the final course distributed *your* flesh around the table and ate it.

P. 4.59–63:

ὦ μάκαρ νιῒ Πολυμνάστου, σέ δ' ἐν τούτῳ λόγῳ
 χρησμὸς ὄρθωσεν μελίσσας
 Δελφίδος αὐτομάτῳ κελάδῳ·
 ἃ σε χαίρειν ἔστρις ἀδάσαισα πεπρωμένον
 βασιλῆ' ἄμφανευ Κυράνα,
 δυσθρόου φωνᾶς ἀνακρινόμενον ποι-
 νὰ τίς ἔσται πρὸς θεῶν.

O blessed son of Polymnastus [Battus], it was you whom the oracle, in accordance with that speech, exalted through the spontaneous cry of the Delphic Bee, who thrice bade you hail and revealed you to be the destined king of Cyrene, when you were asking what requital would come from the gods for your stammering voice.

P. 4.172–5:

...δοιοὶ δ' ὕψιχαῖται
 ἄνδρες, Ἐννοσίδα γένος, αἰδεσθέντες ἄλκάν,
 ἔκ τε Πύλου καὶ ἀπ' ἄκρας Ταινάρου τῶν μὲν κλέος
 ἔσλὸν Εὐφάμου τ' ἐκράνθη
 σὸν τε, Περικλύμεν' εὐρυβία.

[Swiftly came] the two men with hair piled on high, offspring of Earthshaker, out of respect for their valor, from Pylos and the headland of Taenarus, whose glory was fulfilled, that of Euphemus and *yours*, mighty *Periclymenus*.

What is the effect of these apostrophes? I do not think it can be upheld, with Braswell (1988: *ad* 59a), that the apostrophe's 'main function in epinikia is doubtless that of emphasis'.³⁹ For one thing, I do not see why

³⁹ His corpus consists of N. 8.44 (the address of the deceased Megas, which I include in my category of 'addresses of the victor and his family'; see above, n. 33); P. 4.89 and 11.61–2 (see next note).

Periclymenus in *P.* 4.175 would be in need of more emphasis than Euphemus. And what exactly does Braswell mean by ‘emphasis’ in the first place? More reflection clearly is asked for.

Where the apostrophe of Periclymenus is concerned, I contend that we are dealing with stylistic variation. Pindar regularly alternates between direct address and third-person reference when dealing with a pair of persons or places, cf. e.g. *O.* 9.16–18:

θάλλει δ' ἀρεταῖσιν
 σὸν τε, **Κασταλία**, πάρα
 Ἀλφειοῦ τε ῥέεθρον·

It [the city of Opous] flourishes with achievements by *your* stream, *Castalia*, and that of Alpheus.⁴⁰

The apostrophes of Pelops in *O.* 1 and Battus in *P.* 4 are more intriguing and in demand of a longer argument.

Let us start with Pelops.⁴¹ The passage 36–51 forms part of one of three mythical sections which together tell the story of how young Pelops was abducted by Poseidon to Olympus, rather than, as earlier poets sang, cooked by his father Tantalus (26–51), how Tantalus lost his divine favour and was punished by the gods (54–64), and how Pelops, sharing in his father’s fall from grace, had to return to mortal life and defeated Oenomaus in the first Olympic chariot race with the help of his former lover Poseidon (65–93). The whole story is carefully tailored by Pindar to mirror Hieron’s Olympic victory. Why does he address his character Pelops in the second person?

First, second-person narration instead of the default third-person narration is, as we have already seen in connection with the apostrophes of Patroclus in the *Iliad*, a marked form of presentation⁴² that directs extra attention to what is recounted. The you-narration underscores the force of the Pindaric narrator’s emotional claim: Pelops was *never* boiled by his father and the gods *never* ate him (cf. his ensuing remark, ‘But for my part,

⁴⁰ Cf. Gerber (2002: *ad* 17–18), who lists as parallels (in a speech embedded in the narrative) *P.* 4.89; (in the lyric frame) 11.61–2; *N.* 7.84–6; and *I.* 1.52–7.

⁴¹ The myth of *O.* 1 has been the subject of many studies (Segal 1974, Köhnken 1974, 1983, Krischer 1981, Gerber 1982, Sicking 1983, Howie 1983, Hubbard 1987, Morrison 2007b: 57–65), but without discussion of the second-person forms. For the second-person (and third-person) forms in the entire ode, see Athanassaki (2004).

⁴² I think ‘marked form of presentation’ is probably what Braswell means by ‘emphasis’, and taken this way I agree that this is one of the effects of the apostrophe. See also below on the jolting effect of the apostrophe of Battus.

I cannot call any of the gods a glutton' 52). Second, the you-narration flags Pindar's innovation of myth since it is found exactly at the point where he departs from the version of his predecessors.⁴³ One could fruitfully compare here Stesichorus fr. 192 = 91a Davies and Finglass (trans. Campbell):

οὐκ ἔστ' ἔτυμος λόγος οὗτος,
οὐδ' ἔβας ἐν ναυσὶν ἐυσσέλμοις
οὐδ' ἵκεο πέργαμα Τροίας...

That story is not true, and *you* [Helen] did not go on the well-benched ships and *you* did not reach the citadel of Troy...

Here too the poet turns to second-person forms, engaging in some kind of dialogue with a mythical character, at the very moment when he changes the literary tradition about that character.

But I think more is involved in the use of the apostrophe of Pelops, and here its analysis in terms of metalepsis, a blurring of the temporal or spatial differences between the world of the characters and the world of the narrator and the narratees, becomes relevant. My suggestion is that the apostrophe also hints at the character Pelops' *future* status as a *hērōs* with a cult,⁴⁴ a status which he has in the time of the narrator Pindar and his narratee Hieron, as becomes explicitly clear at the end of the poem, *O.* 1.90–3:

νῦν δ' ἐν αἵμακουρίαις
ἀγλααῖσι μέμκται,
Ἄλφειοῦ πόρῳ κλιθείς,
τύμβον ἀμφίπολον ἔχων πολυξενω-
τάτῳ παρὰ βωμῶ·

And now he [Pelops] partakes of splendid blood sacrifices as he reclines by the course of the Alpheus, having his much-attended tomb beside the altar thronged by visiting strangers.⁴⁵

⁴³ Pindar's corrections of myth have been much discussed; for a recent discussion, see e.g. Vöhler (2005).

⁴⁴ For the different uses of the word *hērōs* in Pindar, see Currie (2005: 60–1).

⁴⁵ See Currie (2005: 57, 75, 301). Pindar again refers to the tomb of Pelops in *O.* 4.24–5 and its existence is confirmed by Pausanias 5.13.1 and excavations.

This interpretation can be backed up by comparing places *in the lyric frame* of odes where the epinician speaker apostrophizes heroes with a hero cult, e.g. *O.* 9.112:

... *Αἴαν, τεόν τ' ἐν δαιτί, Ἰλιάδα,*
νικῶν ἐπεστεφάνωσε βωμόν.

...and at *your* feast, *Ajax, son of Iles*, the victor has placed a crown upon *your* altar.

or *I.* 6.19–28:

ἔμμε τ', ὦ χρυσάρματοι Αἰακίδαι,
 τέθμιόν μοι φαμί σαφέστατον ἔμμεν
 τάνδ' ἐπιστείχοντα νᾶσον ραινέμεν εὐλογίαις.
 ...
 οὐδ' ἔστιν οὕτω βάρβαρος
 οὔτε παλίγλωσσος πόλις,
 ἄτις οὐ Πηλέος ἄτει κλέος ἤ-
 ρως, εὐδαίμονος γαμβροῦ θεῶν,
 οὐδ' ἄτις Αἴαντος Τελαμωνιάδα
 καὶ πατρός·

And as for *you, O Aeacidæ with your golden chariots*, I declare that I have the clearest mandate, when coming to this island, to shower *you* with praises... and there is no city so alien or of such backward speech that it does not hear tell of the fame of the hero Peleus, the blessed son-in-law of the gods, or of Telamonian Ajax, or of his father.⁴⁶

In passages such as these the lyric speaker employs the hymnic 'Du-Stil' for (semi-divine) heroes with a cult. An interesting parallel is offered by Simonides' Plataea elegy, where Achilles is apostrophized in the

⁴⁶ For hero cult of the Aeacidae on Aegina, cf. *I.* 5.34–5. See Bonifazi (2004: 400): 'the poet chooses a "you"-deixis, presumably pointing to a physical presence, but it is not clear which kind of physical presence. At least three possibilities are to be considered: an *am Phantasma* reference to the Aeginetan ancestors, an ocular reference to some artistic representation of the Aeacids, or an ocular reference to the Aeginetan clan, metaphorically indicated by the address to their ancestors.' Other examples: *N.* 7.86 (Heracles); for his divine status, see *I.* 4.55–60); *I.* 1.32 (hymnic farewell to the heroes Castor and Iolaus; for the hero status of Castor, cf. *O.* 3.39–41; of Iolaus: *I.* 5.32), 55–6 (Heracles and Iolaus), 58–9 (Protesilaus, who, as Pindar himself tells, has a precinct at Phylaka and is honoured with athletic contests).

hymnic proem (κούρης εἰν)αλίης ἀγλαόφρη[με πάϊ, 'glorious [son] of the sea-dwelling [girl]', fr. 10.5; ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲ]ν νῦν χαίρει, θεας ἐρικυ[δέος υἱέ κούρης εἰν]αλίου Νηρέος, '[but] fare you well now, famous [son] of the goddess [daughter] of sea-dwelling Nereus', fr. 11.19–20). The apostrophes are generally taken by commentators as suggesting his status as a cultic *hērōs*;⁴⁷ one may note especially the presence of hymnic χαίρει.

Returning to Pindar apostrophizing Pelops in *O.* 1.36–51, I suggest that he blends the epic use of the apostrophe of a character in a narrative with the hymnic 'Du-Stil' that suits a *hērōs*. The effect is that Pelops' future heroic status is as it were adumbrated at the very start of his life story. Addressing him as hero the narrator marks the vital moment when Poseidon becomes his lover and the basis for Pelops' future success in the race with Oenomaus and hence future hero cult is laid.⁴⁸

As in the case of Homer's apostrophe of his heroes, we may ask ourselves what the direction of the metalepsis is: does the epinician narrator (and his narratee) mentally enter the world of the past and become a kind of eyewitness of the mythical events recounted (immersion) or is Pelops qua (present-day) hero somehow present at the performance of the ode (epiphany)? The second position is defended by Athanassaki: 'the effect of the speaker's speech to Pelops... is to draw the past gradually into the present and to foreground the "sacred presence" of the heroic founder of the Olympic games'. Pelops, thus, would be present in a kind of epiphany, an experience which the re-enactment of the story by the chorus performing the ode of course greatly facilitated.⁴⁹ Here I am more inclined than in the case of the Homeric apostrophe to accept a movement of past character into present world of narrator and narratee, and thus to concur with Athanassaki in opting for the second interpretation.⁵⁰

⁴⁷ See different scholars in Boedeker and Sider (2001: 93, 156–7, 164–81).

⁴⁸ A rather 'odd' interpretation of the apostrophe is given by Griffith (1991: 33): he starts by claiming that the second person in general indicates a 'wished-for presence' and then continues 'Since the infant Pelops... was not actually present when the ode was performed, Pindar's second-person narration must denote wished-for presence. The object par excellence of wished-for presence is the beloved. Does the narrator love Pelops?... it would be odd that he should love a character in a story in which... he was not himself also a character. Odd though it is, we are driven to this conclusion.'

⁴⁹ Athanassaki (2004: 329, 334). She is not entirely consistent in her analysis, however, for on p. 341 she writes: 'The speaker creates the illusion of stepping for a while into a mythical time and setting in order to play the role of an eyewitness', which is the exact opposite of her earlier analysis.

⁵⁰ For another interpretation, see Pavlou (2012: 103), who suggests that here and at *N.* 4.46–53 (no apostrophe) and *I.* 6.19 'Pindar invokes mythical heroes as if they were still alive'. See also Budelmann in this volume, pp. 61–5.

I now turn to the apostrophe of Battus in *Pythian* 4. Its presence can be explained in the first place in connection with the very conscious epic colouring of this exceptionally long ode; see, for example, its Muse-invocation (1–3) and the question starting off the (second) narrative ('what beginning took them on their voyage, and what danger bound them with strong nails of adamant?', 70–1). Apostrophes of characters are a traditional element of epic, and as such the apostrophe is likely to have been inserted by Pindar to add to the epic hue of this ode. But again more seems to be at play, and for this we must take a closer look at the apostrophe's position and context.

The two narrative parts of the ode (4–63 and 70–262) together recount the story of the Argonauts and their quest for the Golden Fleece. The epic narrator starts with an incident on the way back (Medea predicts to the Argonauts that a descendant of Euphemus, one of the Argonauts, will one day found Cyrene), while recounting in the second narrative the story from beginning (the oracle given to Pelias concerning the man with one sandal) to end (the recovery of the fleece and the return via Lemnos) and even beyond that end (the founding of Cyrene by the descendants of Euphemus).

The apostrophe of Battus occurs in the first narrative. In a riddling prophetic speech Medea predicts that Euphemus 'will find in the beds of foreign women a chosen race, who will...beget a man to be ruler of the plains with dark clouds. And when, at a later time, he enters the temple of Pytho...Phoebus will admonish him through oracles to convey many people in ships to the fertile domain of Kronos' son on the Nile' (50–6). Explaining this prophecy, the narrator says that 'it was you, Battus', who was this man who received the oracle and was thereby divinely appointed to found Cyrene. He thus repeats in 'you' form what he had earlier recounted in 'he'-form: 'Pytho, where long ago the priestess...prophesied... that *Battus* would be the colonizer of fruit-bearing Libya' (4–6).

The apostrophe of Battus has a rather jolting effect and draws attention to the narrator making a leap in time (skipping seventeen generations, 10) and shifting briefly from the (main) Argonaut story to the 'Battus and his stammer' story, only alluded to in the well-known elliptic manner of lyric narrative.⁵¹ Apart from this structural function, the apostrophe has an extra significance similar to that of the apostrophe of Pelops in *O.* 1.

⁵¹ For a fuller version, see Hdt. 4.155.

Through it the epinician narrator hints at the future status of Battus as a *hērōs* with a hero cult, about which we hear in another ode, *P.* 5.93–5:

... ἔνθα πρυ-
μοῖς ἀγορᾶς ἔπι δίχα κεῖται θανών.
μάκαρ μὲν ἀνδρῶν μέτα
ἔναιεν, ἦρωσ δ' ἔπειτα λαοσεβῆς.

And there, at the end of the agora, he [Battus] has lain apart since his death. He was blessed while he lived, and afterwards a *hērōs* worshipped by his people.⁵²

Battus' future status as hero is advertised in *P.* 4 even more explicitly than in the case of Pelops in *O.* 1, since the narrator calls him *μάκαρ* and the Pythia says *χαίρειν* to him, two words with cultic associations.⁵³ As Currie writes, 'Applied by Pindar to the living Battos, the word *μάκαρ* may approximate him *already* to the heroes' (my italics). The metaleptic apostrophe thus may have been chosen by Pindar again both for its epic and its hymnic associations.⁵⁴

There is in this particular case an additional reason for Pindar's apostrophe of Battus. At the time he composed this ode for Arcesilas, king of Cyrene, the latter's political position was threatened.⁵⁵ One of the purposes of the ode was therefore to emphasize Arcesilas' divinely authorized right to the throne. The apostrophe of Battus, the founder of the city, 'emphasizes his importance as a link between Euphemus, the argonaut, and Arcesilas, the reigning (Euphemid-Battid) king of Cyrene,'⁵⁶ and, I would add, capitalizes on Battus' status as the main cult hero of Cyrene.

⁵² His tomb has been found by archaeologists, see Currie (2005: 229 n. 20).

⁵³ Cf. Braswell (1988: *ad* 59 (b)): 'Battus receives the epithet by virtue of being the founder of Cyrene. (The oecist of a successful Greek colony was normally regarded, like Battus, as a *ἦρωσ* who deserved special honours after his death)' and Currie (2005: 231).

⁵⁴ Two other interpretations of the apostrophe have been given. (1) Segal (1982: 147–8) sees a parallel between Battus being freed from his stammer and addressing the Pythia (in 63) and the poet, who 'breaks free of the "dense craft" of Medea's embedded prophecy when he moves from this complicated speech-in-the-speech to a direct second-person address to Battus' and suggests that this 'paradigmatically lifts Pindar's own poetry closer to the penetrating communication of divine speech'. I am not sure I understand what Segal wants to say. (2) Felson (1999: 18–19) suggests that 'in his sudden intimacy with Battus the speaker impersonates the priestess even as he interprets her message for' Battus and that in fact the whole passage 6–58 was spoken by the priestess, i.e. is the content of *χρησεν* (6). Though Pindar is well capable of such merging of voices, I am not convinced of it here.

⁵⁵ For particulars, see Braswell (1988: 1–6).

⁵⁶ Braswell (1988: *ad* 59–63).

Conclusion

The two metaleptic apostrophes of heroes in Pindaric narratives are an effective blend of the epic and hymnic uses of the apostrophe. As a marked way of narration they draw attention to important points in the narrative (the epic use) and as an echo of the hymnic 'Du-Stil' they anticipate a (mythical or historical) character's status as a *hērōs* enjoying hero cult (the hymnic use). The worlds of the past and of the present for a moment merge, not only in the sense that the epinician narrator addressing characters from his narrative 'enters' their world (or vice versa, those characters are imagined to be present at the performance), but also in that the characters are looked at both in their past and in their future (from the point of view of the narrator and his narratee: present) status. We are thus, quintessentially, dealing with metalepsis, and this use of the metaleptic apostrophe, rare though it is, can be added to the other metaleptic devices employed in the epinician ode (fade out at the end of narrative parts; the merging of the voice of the epinician speaker and of a character quoted; and the double relevance of words spoken by mythical characters, for addressees both in the past and in the present), which makes it 'the metaleptic genre par excellence'.⁵⁷

⁵⁷ The other forms of metalepsis in Pindar are discussed in De Jong (2009 and 2013); the quotation is found in (2013: 118). See also Currie (2013: 269–74), who speaks of 'leaps' or 'zooms'. Cognitive psychologists refer to more or less the same phenomenon as 'blending'; for an application to Pindar, see Kirchenko (2016). One could also connect metalepsis with the concept of the eternal return of sacred time of Mircea Eliade (1967). In general on the collapsing of past and present in Pindar, see Pavlou (2012).

