ASPECTS OF THE “FICTIONAL I” IN PINDAR:
ADDRESS TO PSYCHIC ENTITIES
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First-person statements occur frequently in Pindar's odes and contribute to what is termed the “fictional I”. This paper adopts the view that the fictional I is a means used by Pindar. It discusses four passages where Pindar directly addresses psychic entities and assesses the contribution of these passages to the fictional I.
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1. Introduction

In recent scholarship on Pindar much debate has centred around the nature of performance¹. Did Pindar himself sing the odes or were they perfor-

med by a Chorus? A key issue in this debate is the interpretation of first-person references in the odes. Such references are very common, occurring in all odes except Nem. II and Isth. III. The interpretation of first-person statements poses serious challenges. Understanding what the “I” may mean in the epinician odes may suggest that these odes were performed in one manner rather than in another. Thus, for example, the interpretation given to this “I” by M.R. Lefkowitz and M. Heath has led them to suggest that some, if not all, of these odes were intended for solo performance. Other scholars, such as G.B. D’Alessio, J.M. Bremer, A. Burnett, and C. Carey, viewing the “I” differently, argue that the odes were intended primarily for choral performance, although this may not be true for all of the odes.

Certain important questions arise. How does Pindar use first-person references? Lefkowitz has argued persuasively that with these statements Pindar presents a “professional persona.” She assumes that this poetic “I” has a uniform dramatic nature within the odes. Pindar pictures himself in particular as a sort of “athlete” or “hero”, deserving to offer praise because of his poetic gifts.

Lefkowitz assumes that Pindar uses first-person references in a consistent way in the odes. In light of this assumption, she draws references about performance. The “I” in the odes is always the poet who presented these
Other scholars have suggested a wider interpretation of first-person statements in Pindar's odes. They speak of a “general” first person in Pindar. W.J. Slater refers to this “general” I when he speaks of the first person as «a vague combination of Pindar, Chorus, and Chorus-Leader». He thus suggests that the fictive I may be wide-ranging. It may, however, also lack the vagueness that Slater implies. D’Alessio, in his discussion of a fictive I with a wide range of meaning, suggests that in the context of praise the persona of the poet in all its aspects contributes to the importance of the person receiving praise. These aspects may include «the privileged inspiration of the poet, his superiority to his rivals, his social status, his deeper insight into human life, his closeness to the gods». We may assume, therefore, that the fictive I contains such elements. These may often reappear but may vary from one ode to the next. D’Alessio, therefore, argues for a complicated fictive persona that has certain definite features but may be different in different odes. The first-person references could be to Pindar, the Chorus, or the Chorus leader.

J.B. Lidov, in a review of Lefkowitz's *First-Person Fictions* and Race's *Style and Rhetoric*, suggests a valuable way of looking at the fictive I. If the fictive I is seen as «a means of expression, not the thing expressed», it would, like other means, «be subject to variation according to the situation». Each ode, characterised both by a “generic character” and by “individual quali-

---

6 See especially Lefkowitz (note 1), *BICS* 40, 1995, pp. 139-150.
8 Slater (note 1), p. 89.
9 See D’Alessio (note 1), p. 121 n. 13.
10 D’Alessio (note 1), especially pp. 126-129.
12 Others, like D’Alessio, suggest that the first-person within the odes may vary in meaning. See Gentili (note 1), pp. 20-21; Goldhill (note 1), p. 145; Tedeschi (note 1), pp. 33-34.
14 Lidov, p. 79.
ties”¹⁵, could present a dramatic persona of the poet suited not only to the conventional demands of the genre but also to the unique requirements of an ode that were related to the individual victor, his family and victory.

A. Miller has likewise discussed aspects of the fictive I that suggest a varied role for it in different odes¹⁶. He speaks of the differences between the “I” who appears as a character within the odes and the poet who presents this character. Miller suggests that we maintain «a clear-cut distinction between the fictional (or at least quasi-fictional) speaker whose spontaneous utterance the poem purports to be and the hard-working professional poet who actually crafted it with care and skill»¹⁷. This need to make such a distinction seems especially important in passages where Pindar appears to be composing on the spot or to be suddenly changing the direction of his ode. The utterances of the “fictional speaker” can lend an air of spontaneity to the odes. Composition and performance seem to occur at the same time. The apparent spontaneous utterances suggest the inspired nature of the poetry as it is being sung. The truth, of course, is quite the opposite. Pindar, under that same inspiration, has laboured long and hard to create an elaborate and intricately-constructed ode.

If we follow the suggestions of Lidov and Miller, we see that the fictive I may function simply as a means that varies from ode to ode. It may be a conscious means adopted by Pindar to enable him best to fulfil the specific purpose at hand. Bundy points out that a principal function of an epinician ode is to offer praise¹⁸. We can certainly agree that praise, offered in multiple and diverse ways, forms a chief element of Pindar's odes. It may not, however, be the sole function of an epinician. Pindar, in his role as professional poet, also felt himself called to teach and sometimes to admonish the victor. The odes were also written to celebrate victories¹⁹. Each ode presented individual challenges. The fictive I, as a means to the poet's purpose, would be presented by Pindar to serve that purpose best.

The suggestion that the fictive I may vary from ode to ode does not tell us about the performance of the odes. Did Pindar speak the dramatic fiction that

---

¹⁵ Lidov, p. 76.
¹⁷ Miller, p. 22.
¹⁹ See Goldhill (note 1), p. 145.
he had composed? Did a Chorus perform it? We may suspect that sometimes the voice is that of Pindar, sometimes that of the Chorus. The odes themselves do not make the speaker clear. If the Chorus performs an ode, first-person references could be to the poet, the Chorus or the Chorus leader. Even if we cannot determine the nature of performance, isolating features of the fictive I may prove helpful in adding to our understanding of any particular ode and for increasing our appreciation of Pindar as a skilled poet.

In this paper I wish to study four passages where Pindar addresses a psychic entity directly. My plan is first to describe the nature of the psychic entities that are addressed and then to discuss what features, if any, these passages reveal about the fictive I. An understanding of these passages may, in some small way, contribute to our understanding of the role of the fictive I in the odes of Pindar in general.

All four passages to be discussed are “break-offs.” Pindar uses this the


21 The related and complex question of the nature of epinician performance lies outside the scope of this paper. The edition of Pindar used for this article is: Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis, post. B. Snell, ed. H. Maechler, Leipzig, 1987, repr. 1997. Translations are my own.

22 For the term see especially «Elements of Style in Break-Offs» in W. H. Race, Style
torical device to stop his odes, to mark points of climax, to change the direction of the poem or to turn to another topic. Break-offs, therefore, are conventional in epinician poetry, marking points of climax or transition. Carey has described this type of passage as “oral subterfuge”: «This oral subterfuge, by easing openings, transitions and finales, allows the poet to treat themes at a greater or lesser length according to his aims, to touch on tales or events without the need to develop than beyond his requirements». There are many instances of such break-offs in Pindar. The specific break-off technique that Pindar uses in the four passages I will discuss is an address to a psychic entity. These addresses I shall examine within the context of the odes as a whole.

2. Olympian II 89

This ode was written in praise of Theron, tyrant of Acragas. Celebr-
ting Theron’s win in the chariot race at Olympia, the ode contains a long description of the afterlife with different destinies awaiting people based on their behaviour on earth. People who “have kept their soul entirely from unjust deeds” (69) face the wonderful possibility of entering a realm of light, travelling to the “Tower of Kronos” (70). Pindar, probably presenting the beliefs of Theron in this passage, may wish to hold out to him the possibility of this brightest destiny.

After speaking of the afterlife, Pindar gradually turns his attention back to Theron himself. In so doing he speaks of himself (83-95):

\[\begin{align*}
\text{πολλά μοι ύπ’} \\
\text{ἀγκάνος ὡκεία βέλη} \\
\text{/vndον ἐντὶ φαρέτρας} \\
\phiναντα σωνετοίσην, ἐς δὲ τὸ πάν ἐρμανίων} \\
\text{χατίζει, σοφὸς ὁ πολλά εἰδίς φυῇ:} \\
\text{μαθήτες δὲ λάβροι} \\
\text{παγγλισσίη κόρακες ὡς ἄκραντα γαιρόντων Διὸς πρὸς ὄρνιχα θείων:} \\
\text{ἐπεξε νῦν σκοπῷ τόξον, ἅτρα θυμέ: τίνα βάλλομεν}
\end{align*}\]

Many swift arrows are under my arm within their quiver which speak to those with understanding but in general there is need of interpreters. Wise is he who knows many things by nature. Those who learn are impetuous in their babbling, just like a pair of crows crying things not to be fulfilled against the divine bird of Zeus.


27 For an interpretation of the description of the afterlife see especially Woodbury (note 27). See also Lloyd-Jones (note 27) and Solmsen (note 27).
Direct now the bow to the mark, come, θημός. Whom are we trying to hit as this time we send our arrows of fame from a gentle φρήν? In fact, bending the bow at Acragas, I will utter a saying sealed by an oath with a truthful νόος, that within a hundred years no city has given birth to a man more beneficent to his friends in mind and more ungrudging in hand than Theron.

In these lines Pindar first describes himself. He is one with “many swift arrows”. When he sends these forth, “those with understanding” grasp them but “in general” these arrows need interpretation. Pindar uses “arrows” as a symbol of his poetry. He says that the person who “knows many things by nature is wise”, contrasting other persons who have only acquired learning. He then suggests that such persons cackle like crows against “the divine bird of Zeus”. He is probably referring to himself as a poet in this reference to the eagle.

Pindar then addresses his θημός directly. He calls on it to act like an archer aiming arrows accurately at a target. Pindar consults his θημός concerning the recipient of “arrows of fame”. Whoever receives the “arrows” will become famous. The source of “arrows” within is also mentioned: a “gentle φρήν”.

In the next lines Pindar makes a very strong assertion that is “sealed with an oath” and spoken from a “truthful νόος”. His announcement is immediately followed by its fulfilment. Theron is affirmed as the most beneficent and generous person in Acragas during a century.

In Olympian II Pindar has presented a picture of the afterlife. Some souls may be destined to dwell in a land of the equinox, with “equal nights and equal days” (61-62). Others may be able to move to a brighter realm where “flowers of gold blaze forth” (72). Pindar, we may suppose, probably wants to suggest that Theron deserves the highest destiny. He wishes to make very clear the grounds on which Theron could win such a destiny. In the lines translated above, therefore, we find Pindar leading up to a strong assertion about Theron: Acragas has produced no more kind and generous a person in

---

28 In the interpretation of ἐξ δῆκ τὸ πᾶν I follow here Gildersleeve (note 26), ad 93 and Kirkwood (note 26), ad 85. For a different interpretation see Most (note 27) and Race (note 27).
29 See also Ol. I 112, 9.8, and 13.95.
31 On this use of the future see Pfeijffer (note 1), p. 23.
a hundred years. His kindness and generosity may bring him, after death, to the highest realm of light.

Pindar leads up to this assertion first by speaking of himself as a poet (83-88). He has “swift arrows” understood easily by some (like Theron, we may imagine) and not by others. As a poet endowed with such arrows, he is “wise, knowing many things by nature” (86). In contrast to those with mere learning, he is like the “divine bird of Zeus” (88).

What credentials Pindar offers! In these lines we hear of his skill as a poet, the power that his “weapons” have, and the gift of fame that they endow. As an eagle soars, so will the reputation of the person celebrated in song by Pindar.

In line 89 Pindar then directly addresses his ἰδιότητα, calling upon this psychic entity to share in an activity that he is about to perform. ἰδιότητα in Pindar functions in particular as a seat of positive and negative emotions. It can also function as a centre of thought. More than any of the other psychic entities (φρήν, e.g., or νόος), ἰδιότητα is capable of independent activity within. It can be a psychic entity that a person can act with or need to oppose.

In Pindar we find four instances of ἰδιότητα addressed in the vocative. They occur in this passage of Ol. II, in Nem. III 26 (to be discussed below) and in frs. 123.1 and 127.4. Such direct address to ἰδιότητα does not occur in Homer, the Homeric Hymns or Hesiod but occurs once in Archilochus and Ibycus, and five times in Theognis. This usage suggests that ἰδιότητα within could act independently. A person recognises this capacity and acts with ἰδιότητα or resists it. In these direct addresses to ἰδιότητα, the lyric and elegiac poets suggest various modes of behaviour for it.

In Ol. II 89 Pindar calls on ἰδιότητα to become his ally in a particular acti-
vity\textsuperscript{36}. He addresses \(\theta\varphi\mu\varsigma\) directly and then uses the first-person plural: “whom are we trying to hit?” The “arrows” that Pindar had mentioned being in his quiver (83-84) are now drawn specifically from “a gentle \(\varphi\rho\eta\nu\)”. The psychic entity \(\varphi\rho\eta\nu\) is usually associated with deliberation and discursive thought in Pindar\textsuperscript{37}. In this case Pindar has “gentle” thoughts with regard to the object of his praise. \(\varphi\rho\eta\nu\) acts as a “quiver” from which Pindar draws ideas or thoughts. \(\Theta\mu\varphi\varsigma\) appears to provide the will to act and the accuracy of the performance while \(\varphi\rho\eta\nu\) provides the ideas.

Pindar proceeds to describe himself as “bending the bow at Acragas” (91). He confirms that he will speak “with a truthful \(\nu\omicron\omicron\varsigma\)” (92). In Pindar \(\nu\omicron\omicron\varsigma\) is involved in particular with intellectual activity, especially that of inner vision leading to an accurate grasp of a situation\textsuperscript{38}. Often too it functions as a seat of someone’s character or disposition. In this case Pindar emphasises that his \(\nu\omicron\omicron\varsigma\) is truthful in the thought it expresses: Theron has been most kind and generous\textsuperscript{39}.

In this passage from \textit{Ol.} II we see features of the fictive I. Pindar gives his credentials as a poet. What he presents in song brings fame to the recipient. His “arrows” are readily accessible to those with understanding. Pindar then refers to parts of his inner being, his \(\theta\mu\mu\varsigma\), \(\varphi\rho\eta\nu\) and \(\nu\omicron\omicron\varsigma\). All these psychic entities become involved in his current enterprise of sending “arrows of fame” to Theron. \(\Theta\mu\mu\varsigma\) becomes his ally in choosing his target. \(\varphi\rho\eta\nu\), being “gentle”, acts as the source of his thoughts. \(\nu\omicron\omicron\varsigma\), being “truthful”, confirms the accuracy of his observations about Theron. With his whole inner being, we may say, Pindar wants to praise Theron. The intensity of his involvement in this act of praise emphasises the worth of its receiver.

If we see these references to a fictive I as a means that Pindar uses to offer praise, we see how effective his portrayal of himself as a poet can be. He draws into his picture three psychic entities, having similar functions, yet distinctive traits. The mention of these three psychic entities enhances the

\textsuperscript{36} Cf. Pelliccia (note 26), p. 297.
\textsuperscript{37} See my article, «A Study of \(\varphi\rho\epsilon\nu\varsigma\) in Pindar and Bacchylides», \textit{Glotta} 67, 1989, pp. 148-189.
\textsuperscript{38} See my article, «An Analysis of the Psychic Term \(\nu\omicron\omicron\varsigma\) in Pindar and Bacchylides», \textit{Glotta} 68, 1990, pp. 179-202.
\textsuperscript{39} For the connection of \(\nu\omicron\omicron\varsigma\) with truth see also Pyth. III 103 and fr. 213.4. Cf. also \textit{Pyth.} III 29.
picture Pindar presents of himself as a professional and skilled poet bestowing praise on a worthy individual.

2. Nemean III 26

Pindar wrote Nemean III to honour Aristokleidas of Aegina, who won in the pancratium. In this second triad of the ode he speaks of this victor in relation to Herakles. After a few lines, in a break-off passage, he stops this direction of his ode, turning his attention instead to Aeacus and his family, heroes close to home in Aegina. In the lines that follow Pindar proceeds to praise Peleus and Telamon, Aeginetan heroes.

If, being handsome and performing deeds to match his form, the son of Aristophanes has embarked on highest deeds of manly prowess, it is not easy to journey still further over the
uncrossable sea beyond the pillars of Herakles, which that hero-god set up as famed witnesses of the farthest limit of sailing. He subdued enormous beasts in the sea and on his own explored the streams of the shallows, where he reached the limit that sent him back home and he made known the land. My θυμός, to what foreign headland are you turning aside my voyage? I bid you to bring the Muse to Aiakos and his race. The flower of justice attends the saying: “praise the noble”, nor are longings for what belongs to others better for a man to bear. Search from home, for you have won a fitting adornment to sing in sweet song.

Lines 22-26 of Nemean III present details of the exploits of Herakles. This hero defined the limits of human achievement by setting up the “pillars, famed witnesses of the farthest limit of sailing” (22-23). Once this was done, he travelled home (25). At line 26 Pindar addresses his θυμός directly: “to what foreign headland are you turning aside my voyage?” He gives orders to his θυμός: “I bid you to bring the Muse to Aiakos and his race”. Pindar describes his ode as a ship on a voyage. The pilot of this ship is θυμός. The passenger on the ship or the cargo of the ship is the Muse. Pindar, it appears, has been sailing happily along but he then realises that his θυμός is choosing what may be a dangerous destination. The “headland” being selected is “foreign”: it is far from Aegina. Pindar checks his “pilot” and gives new directions. The ship is to travel homeward once more.

In these lines we encounter Pindar using a carefully constructed fictive I as a means to bestow praise on Aristokleidas. First, we learn that Aristokleidas resembles Herakles. Aristokleidas laboured as a solo competitor, struggled physically, and returned home in victory. In achievement he has travelled to the pillars of Herakles. Second, we encounter Pindar cutting short this comparison of Herakles and Aristokleidas. Herakles became a god but this destiny is not open to Aristokleidas.

As Pindar makes the transition to the Aeacids, he tells us that “the flower” (or epitome) of justice is “to praise the noble” (29). Certainly he has

---

41 Cf. Ol. 3.41-45; Nem. 4.69-72; and Is. 4.9-12 for similar references to the pillars of Herakles as the limits of human achievement.

42 On the address to θυμός as an “order”, see Pelliecia (note 26), p. 344. See also on this passage pp. 279, 305-306.

43 For the implications of “headland”, see Pfeijffer (note 41), p. 302.

44 On “foreign”, see Pfeijffer (note 41), p. 302.

45 For the interpretation of the myth of Herakles offered here see especially Carey (note 41) and Instone (note 41), Eranos 91, 1993, pp. 18-20. Both argue for the relevance of lines 22-26. Contrast the interpretation of Erbse, Privitera and Ruck (all in note 41).
done that in praising Herakles. But “longings for what belongs to others” are to be resisted (30). Herakles achieved what is not in the capacity of Aristokleidas to long for: the status of a god. Enough, however, is available “at home”46. The heroes of Aegina, less in stature perhaps than Herakles, are nonetheless great and to them Aristokleidas can be fittingly compared.

In this break-off passage Pindar presents the image of himself as journeying in song to the pillars of Herakles at Gibraltar. It is a long voyage! But his θυμός, the seat of his desires and will, guides his voyage and apparently urges him on. After he has journeyed, like Herakles, to “the farthest limit of sailing” (22-23), he checks his θυμός. He restrains his desire and will and turns his voyage home again to Aegina. Like Herakles, Pindar has gone as far as possible. “It is not easy to journey still further over the uncrossable sea beyond the pillars of Herakles” (20-21). In describing this voyage, Pindar has likened the achievements of Aristokleidas to those of Herakles. Both Herakles and Aristokleidas, in a way, travelled to Gibraltar and back47. In telling the story of Herakles, Pindar has thus highly praised Aristokleidas48.

Pindar breaks off his voyage, saying that his θυμός is taking him to a “foreign” destination. Pindar cannot hold out the possibility of becoming a god to Aristokleidas. Such a possibility would be, perhaps, like sailing beyond the pillars of Herakles.

In Nem. III 26 we see Pindar construct an elaborate fictive I. As a poet, he stops himself in stride and turns to a different topic. He gives the impression that he has made an inappropriate digression in speaking of Herakles. But, in fact, in the ode there is no true digression that is at all inappropriate. Pindar uses a rhetorical device to introduce two comparisons that he wishes to make. He wants to compare Aristokleidas first with Herakles and then with Aeginetan heroes. The comparison with Herakles is in no way irrelevant. Rather, it both establishes and enhances the position of Aristokleidas.

Pindar has constructed the whole passage to offer elaborate praise to Aristokleidas. He has also set limits to that praise with regard to Herakles and subsequently turned to sources of praise among heroes from Aegina. For

46 Note the occurrence of οἶκος θεοῦ in Ol. 3.44 and Is. 4.12 in passages referring to the “pillars of Herakles”. See above note 42.
47 On the image of “return” in these lines see Kurke (note 26), pp. 49-50.
48 Carey describes this myth of Herakles as a «substitution for direct praise». See Carey (note 41), p. 157. See also pp. 160-161.
the fictive I in this poem “home” is Aegina. Θυμός adds to the picture of this fictive I. With eagerness and enthusiasm, as a pilot of a ship, θυμός has engaged in the “voyage”, the writing of lines in praise of Herakles. But in its travels it suddenly seems to be taking a dangerous course. Pindar checks it and summons it back to Aegina. This psychic entity, directly addressed, illustrates first of all Pindar's enthusiasm and zeal to offer praise to Aristokleidas. Pindar sees this victor as similar to Herakles. Θυμός secondly suggests an enthusiasm that could prove excessive. We humans cannot go beyond the pillars of Herakles. Pindar bids his θυμός obey: he halts the voyage he was taking and hastens, as Herakles also did, home.

Direct address to a psychic entity, therefore, has contributed to the fictive I that Pindar presents in Nem. 3. Θυμός seems to be capable of independent action. It needs to be checked. By referring to θυμός, Pindar can picture himself as carried in one direction, as stopping and as moving back in another direction. He has to stop something within that may carry him in a dangerous direction. During this whole process, however, Pindar skilfully offers Aristokleidas exactly the praise his victory has merited.

4. Olympian I 4

"Αριστον μὲν ύδωρ, ὁ δὲ χρυσὸς αἰθόμενον πῦρ
ἄτε διαπρέπει νοκτὶ μεγάνορος ἐξογα πλοῦτου
εὶ δ’ ἀειθλα γαρῶν
ἐλέκαι, φιλον ἤτορ,

5 μηκέτ’ ἀειλίον σκόπει
ἀλλ’ θαλπούτερον ἐν ἀμέρη φαιν—
νὸν ἀστερὸν ἐρήμιας δι’ αἰθέρος,
μηθ’ Ὀλυμπίαι ἄγονα φέρτερον αὐδόσαμεν—

Best is water but then gold, like fire blazing in the night, shines pre-eminent amid lordly wealth. But, if, dear heart, you wish to sing of athletic games, do not look further than the sun for another daytime star shining more warmly through the empty sky, nor let us proclaim a contest greater than Olympia.

In this famous opening of Olympian I, written for Hieron of Syracuse, Pindar introduces a priamel.⁴⁹ The three principal elements are water, gold,
and Olympia. He also brings in references to “fire, blazing in the night” and a “daytime star”, the sun. Pindar himself makes the first two statements: “best is water”, “gold shines pre-eminent”. Then he addresses his ἤτοι directly: “If, dear heart, you wish to sing of athletic games”. He tells ἤτοι to look only to the sun for the brightest daytime star. Then, using a first-plural, Pindar says: “nor let us proclaim a contest greater than Olympia”.

If we examine these lines carefully, we see Pindar suggesting that the desire to sing is coming from his ἤτοι. He gives it directions and then, joining with ἤτοι, suggests that they speak of Olympia. In Ol. 2.89, we saw that Pindar first addressed θημωκός and then asked: “whom are we trying to hit?” He moved from a direct address to θημωκός to the use of the first-plural. Here, in a similar way, we find a direct address to ἤτοι followed by a first-plural reference.

"Ἡτοῖ in Pindar, as also in earlier authors, functions primarily as the “heart”. It acts as a seat of various emotions, especially joy, pain and courage. In this passage we see that it is a seat of desire. Pindar addressed ἤτοι as “dear” (φιλοκό). Ἳτοῖ is commonly called “dear” in Homer and this adjective should probably be taken in a literal sense and not, as often assumed, as a possessive expression. In this passage the adjective suggests that Pindar approves of the desires ἤτοι has.

---

50 On the structure of these lines see especially Gerber (note 50), pp. 1-24; Instone (note 26), pp. 93-94; Race, Style (note 21), pp. 9-11.
51 For the verb form see Gerber (note 50), p. 24 and Instone (note 26), p. 95. Gerber suggests that the plural is a “generic plural”. Instone suggests that the plural includes poets coming to praise Hieron. Gerber does not see a reference to the Chorus in the plural. Contrast Fisker (note 50), pp. 15-16, who sees a reference to the Chorus in the plural verb.
52 See my article, «Κραδίθ, ἰτοῖ, and Κυρο in Poetry after Homer», RBPh 73, 1995, pp. 13-34.
This direct address to ήτορο is the first that we find in early extant Greek poetry. One direct address to kradie occurs in Homer at Od. 20.18. Kradie and ήτορο are close in meaning and later in this passage, at 20.22, Homer describes Odysseus as addressing his ήτορο, not his kradie. Thus in these lines of Homer the two are synonymous. Elsewhere Pindar does not address kradia/kardia directly nor ήτορο again. What we can say, therefore, is that in Of I we have a usage similar to that in Homer.

In the opening lines of this ode, Pindar presents a picture of himself as filled with desire to celebrate Olympia. As the ode continues, he will direct his praise to Hieron (11). At line 4 he asks his ήτορο if it wishes to sing of athletic games and directs its gaze to Olympia. He asks it to join with him in proclaiming Olympia as the greatest contest (7). In terms of the fictive I, we see that the mention of ήτορο contributes to the picture of Pindar as a poet eager to bring praise to what is best or brightest. As he looks at kings, Hieron will fall into this category (12-17). Pindar's "heart" (ήτορο) within wants to sing. Pindar gently directs it view to what is most worthy of song.

5. Pythian III 61

Pythian III is an unusual ode and seems best interpreted as poem of consolation for Hieron of Syracuse, who is ill. Particularly prominent in
the ode are first-person statements which seem best understood as referring to Pindar as the fictive I57.

Lines 1-79 of the ode describe Pindar’s heart-felt wishes for Hieron58. He begins with the impossible wish that Cheiron the Centaur was still living (1-7). He then tells two stories of people who sought what was beyond human bounds, namely Koronis (8-40) and Asklepios (40-58). Pindar then addresses his ψυχή, urging it not to strive for what it cannot attain (59-62). Pindar proceeds to utter further impossible wishes. If Cheiron were living and could be charmed to provide another Asklepios, Pindar could have come to Syracuse with health and a celebration of victory as in the past (62-76). At line 77 Pindar returns to the present reality and says that he will pray to the Mother Goddess (77-79).

Koronis foolishly slept with another man although she was pregnant with Apollo’s son (8-20, 24-40). She was one who “scorns what is near at hand and gazes at things far away, hunting down vain things with hopes not to be fulfilled” (21-23). Apollo saved his son Asklepios whom Cheiron trained in the arts of healing. But Asklepios also erred:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{άλλα κέρδει καὶ σοφία δέδεται,} \\
\text{έτεραν καὶ κέλνον ἀγάνορι μυσθῷ} \\
\text{χρυσός ἐν ξεραῖν φανείς} \\
\text{ἀνήρ’ ἐκ θανάτου κομίσαι} \\
\text{ἡδὴ ἀλοκότα: χερσὶ δ’ ἀρα Κρονίων} \\
\text{ῥήγας δὲ ἁμφοῖν ἁμπναίαν στέρην κάθελεν} \\
\text{ἀκέκως, ἄθεον δὲ κεραυνὸς ἐνάππιμηκεν μορόν.} \\
\text{χρὴ τὰ ἐοικότα πάρ} \\
\text{δαιμόνων μαστεύμεν θνατὰς φρασίν} \\
\text{γνώντα τὸ πάρ ποδός, οἷας εἶμιν αἵσας.} \\
\text{μὴ, φίλα γογχ, βίσον ἀβάνατον} \\
\text{σπείδε, τὰν δ’ ἐμπρακτὸν ἀντέλε μαχανάν.}
\end{align*}
\]

But even wisdom is fastened to gain. Gold appearing in his hands turned even him with its lordly fee to bring back from death a man already carried off. Then the son of Kronos, having cast

---

Slater (note 56) and Young (note 56, both entries), who argue that the ode is a typical epinician.

57 See Lefkowitz, First-Person Fictions (note 1), pp. 50-55; Carey (note 1), AJPh 110, 1989, p. 561 n. 41; Carey (note 7), p. 16 n. 37; D’Alessio (note 1), pp. 138-139.

58 On the structure and interpretation of these lines see especially Pelliccia (note 56), Race, Style (note 21), pp. 37-39, and Robbins (note 56).
with his hands through both, swiftly took away the breath from their breasts and the blazing lightning bolt hurled down death.

It is necessary to seek what is proper from the gods with mortal phrenes, knowing what lies at our feet, of what sort of destiny we are. Do not, dear ψυχή, hasten after immortal life but exhaust the means at your disposal.

Asklepios, for the sake of money, misused his healing skills. He brought back to life someone who had died. According to the early Greek view, the death of this man would have been attended by the departure of his ψυχή. Somehow Asklepios caused that ψυχή to return and to enliven this man once again. But not for long. Zeus blasted both with his thunderbolt. Their experience leads Pindar to offer a gnomic statement about human beings in general. Using our “mortal phrenes”, we should search for “what is proper from the gods” (59). “What is proper” will be in accord with our identity as human beings. It is our “destiny” to be such. Best then to look for “what is at our feet”, that is, for what is readily available. Later in this ode Pindar will say of himself: “I will be small among the small, great among the great. I will honour the daimôn that follows my phrenes, and keep it according to my means (μαξανά)” (107-109).

In this ode both Koronis and Asklepios desired what they could not have. They failed to remember their human limitations or to show regard for the “means” at their disposal. Asklepios, in particular, in restoring to life someone already destined for death, exceeded the bounds of appropriate human behaviour.

At lines 61-62 Pindar addresses his own ψυχή: “do not, dear ψυχή, hasten after immortal life but exhaust the means (μαξανά) at your disposal”. This direct address to ψυχή is the only one we find in the extant poems of Pindar ⁵⁹. It is also the only time from Homer to Pindar that ψυχή is called “dear” (φιλός).⁶⁰ Within the context of the ode we can see Pindar telling us of a person unnaturally revived. He would have received back his ψυχή. Pindar then directs his attention to his own ψυχή within, urging it not to “hasten after” what it cannot have but to “exhaust” what is available. Here he uses the term “means” (μαξανά) which he will repeat later in the ode when

---


⁶⁰ Cf. the address to ἀρπος as “dear” (φιλος) in Ol. I 4 (discussed above) and Pae. 6.12 (fr. 52 f).
he describes himself as keeping “the daimôn that follows his phrenes according to his means” (109).

In his use of ψυχή here Pindar exploits the richness of the word. In terms of its traditional meaning ψυχή, to some decree, already has a form of “immortal life”. Only ψυχή survives a person after death and never ceases to exist. But the “immortal life” that Pindar refers to here lies ever outside the range of this ψυχή. It is “immortal life”, with all its attendant privileges, that the gods alone can have. It is totally inappropriate for human beings to “hasten after” such a life.

Ψυχή in these lines appears to be capable of independent activity within Pindar. He gives it two directives, restraining it from one action and encouraging another. Rather like θυμός in Ol. II 89 and Nem. III 26, ψυχή acts within. Here in Pyth. III 61 it can express desire. It can apparently aim at what would be outside its reach. In so doing, Pindar suggests, it could do him great harm.

In calling his ψυχή “dear”61, Pindar appears to regard it with affection. He may consider it valuable62. But even if it has this nature, he may perhaps need to check it if it “hastens after” a dangerous object.

This direct address to ψυχή contributes to the fictive I that Pindar presents in Pyth. III. Pindar depicts himself in the ode as one zealously concerned about Hieron and his welfare. He allows himself some wishful thinking but perceives great dangers for human beings who fix their eyes on “vain things with hopes not to be fulfilled” (23) or on “what is not proper” (59). As he describes Koronis and Asklepios, he makes clear that they both forgot their human limitations. Pindar feels called on to address his own ψυχή. He wants to check within the source of any inappropriate desires and to direct his inner energies appropriately. In directing his own ψυχή, Pindar also gives advice to the recipient of his ode. This direct address to ψυχή, therefore, contributes to Pindar’s use of the fictive I as a means to exhort and to teach.

---

61 On the meaning of the adjective “dear” see above note 54.
62 Cf. Il. 9.401 where Achilles says that “all the wealth of Troy and Pytho” is not “worth” his ψυχή.
6. Conclusion

This paper has presented an examination of four passages in Pindar in which a psychic entity is addressed. Our focus was to consider, in particular, what contribution, if any, these passages made to Pindar’s use of the fictive I. Adopting the view that Pindar uses the fictive I as a means within his odes of fulfilling his purposes as a poet, we saw that each passage contributed to his usage of this means.

In *Ol.* 2.89-95 θυμός is Pindar’s ally in bringing fame to Theron. Involved too are φήν and νόος, both taking part with θυμός in praising the victor. In *Nem.* 3.26-29 θυμός needs to be checked from carrying Pindar’s Muse in a dangerous direction. In his direct address to θυμός Pindar illustrates his enthusiasm for comparing Aristokleidas to Herakles and his awareness of the limits of that comparison.

In *Ol.* 1.4-7 Pindar speaks of the desire of his ἴτορ to celebrate athletic games. Pindar is able to direct his ἴτορ to Olympia and to share in its proclamation. The direct address illustrates Pindar as one eager to celebrate what most deserves praise. In *Pyth.* 3.61-62 Pindar checks his ψυχή from “hastening after” inappropriate goals. The direct address allows Pindar to present himself as a teacher of behaviour most appropriate for human beings.

All four passages function as “break-offs” within the odes. With them Pindar stops the flow of his poetry, presenting a climax or changing the direction of the ode. In each case the fictive I, as presented in the ode, is enriched.