ASPECTS OF THE "FICTIVE I" IN PINDAR: ADDRESS TO PSYCHIC ENTITIES

SHIRLEY DARCUS SULLIVAN

En las *Odas* de Píndaro se encuentran a menudo manifestaciones en primera persona que contribuyen a constituir lo que se ha dado en llamar "yo fingido". Este artículo lo contempla como uno de los recursos poéticos de Píndaro, analizando cuatro pasajes en los que Píndaro se dirige a entidades psíquicas, y valorando su aportación a la constitución del "yo fingido".

First-person statements occur frequently in Pindar's odes and contribute to what is termed the "fictive I". This paper adopts the view that the fictive 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 fictive I.

Palabras-clave: Píndaro, primera persona, entidades psíquicas, θυμός, ἦτορ, ψυχή, pasajes de ruptura

Key-words: Pindar, first-person, psychic entities, θυμός, ἦτορ, ψυχή, break-off passages

1. *Introduction*

In recent scholarship on Pindar much debate has centred around the nature of performance[1]. 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, occuring in all odes except *Nem*. II and *Isth*. III[2]. 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[3]. 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[4].

Certain important questions arise. How does Pindar use first-person references? Lefkowitz has argued persuasively that with these statements Pindar presents a "professional persona"[5]. 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

---

pp. 142-166; M. Heath, «Receiving the *Komos*: The Context and Performance of the Epinician», *AJPh* 109, 1988, pp. 180-195; M. Heath and M.R. Lefkowitz, «Epinician Performance», *CPh* 85, 1991, pp. 173-191; M. Lefkowitz, «Autobiographical Fiction in Pindar», *HSCPh* 84, 1980, pp. 24-49; *First-Person Fictions* Oxford 1991; «The First Person in Pindar Reconsidered - Again», *BICS* 40, 1995, pp. 139-150; «The Poet as Athlete», *SIFC* 77, 1984, pp. 5-12; «The Poet as Hero», *CQ* 28, 1978, pp. 459-469; «Who Sang Pindar's Victory Odes?», *AJPh* 109, 1988, pp. 1-11; K.A. Morgan, «Pindar the Professional and the Rhetoric of the κῶμος», *CPh* 87, 1993, pp. 1-15; I.L. Pfeijffer, *First Person Futures in Pindar*, Stuttgart, 1991; W. Rösler, «Persona reale o persona poetica? L'interpretazione dell' io nella lirica greca arcaica», *QUCC* 48, 1985, pp. 131-144; M.J. Schmid, «Speaking "personae" in Pindar's *Epinicia*», *CFC (G)* 8, 1998, pp. 147-184; W.J. Slater, «Futures in Pindar», *CQ* 19, 1969, pp. 86-94; A. Tedeschi, «L'invio del carme nella poesia lirica arcaia: Pindaro e Bacchylide», *SIFC* 78, 1985, pp. 29-54.

[2]   See D'Alessio (note 1), p. 117, n. 1.

[3]   See references in note 1.

[4]   Some odes may have been performed at the site of the victory, as, for example, *Ol*. 4, 11; *Pyth*. 7; *Nem*. 2. See T. Gelzer, «Μοῦσα αὐθιγενής», *MH* 42, 1985, pp. 95-120.

[5]   Lefkowitz, *First-Person Fictions*, p. 113 (in chapter 4, «The Poet as Hero»). See also her articles listed in note 1.

odes in solo performance[6].

Other scholars have suggested a wider interpretation of first-person statements in Pindar's odes. They speak of a "general" first person in Pindar[7]. 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»[8]. He thus suggests that the fictive I may be wide-ranging. It may, however, also lack the vagueness that Slater implies[9]. 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[10]. 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»[11]. We may assume, therefore, that the fictive I contains such elements. These may often reappear but may vary from ode to ode. D'Alessio, therefore, argues for a complicated fictive persona that has certain definite features but may be different in different odes[12]. 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[13]. 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»[14]. Each ode, characterised both by a "generic character" and by "individual quali-

---

[6]   See especially Lefkowitz (note 1), *BICS* 40, 1995, pp. 139-150.

[7]   See C. Carey, *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar*, New York, 1981, pp. 4-7, 57 and H. Lloyd-Jones, «Modern Interpretation of Pindar: the Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes», *JHS* 93, 1973, p. 124. Cf. also D.C. Young, *Three Odes of Pindar, A Literary Study of Pythian 11, Pythian 3, and Olympian 7*, Leiden, 1968, pp. 58-60, who speaks of a "first person indefinite". See especially D'Alessio (note 1), pp. 126-129, who argues for a wide meaning of first-person statements. See the response to him of Lefkowitz (note 1), *BICS* 40, 1995, pp. 144-149. She uses the term "all-purpose" I on p. 144.

[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.

[11] D'Alessio (note 1), p. 127.

[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.

[13] J.B. Lidov, «What am I? What am I not?: Three Recent Pindars», *CJ* 89, 1993-94, pp. 69-79. For Lefkowitz, see note 1; for Race, see note 20.

[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 odes[16]. 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 praise[18]. 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 victories[19]. 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.
[16] A. Miller, «Pindaric Mimesis: the Associative Mode», *CJ* 89, 1993-94, pp. 21-53.
[17] Miller, p. 22.
[18] E.L. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica*, Berkeley, 1962, reprint 1986.
[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[20]. 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[21].

All four passages to be discussed are "break-offs"[22]. Pindar uses this rhe

---

[20]   General works consulted for this article include the following: R.W. Burton, *Pindar's Pythian Odes*, Oxford, 1962; J. B. Bury, *The Nemean Odes of Pindar*, London, 1890; Carey (note 7); D. S. Carne-Ross, *Pindar,* New Haven and London, 1985; T. Cole, *Pindar's Feast or the Music of Power*, New Haven and Urbino, 1992, *Filologia e Critica* 69; K. Crotty, *Song and Action: Odes of Pindar,* Baltimore, 1982; J. Duchemin, *Pindare, Pythiques, III, IX, IV, V,* Paris, 1967; L.R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar,* London, 1932, repr. Amsterdam 1961, vol. 2; C.A.M. Fennell, *Pindar: the Nemean and Isthmian Odes,* Cambridge, 1899; B.L. Gildersleeve, *Pindar, The Olympian and Pythian Odes*, London, 1892; B. Gentili and P. Giannini, *Pindaro, Le Pitiche*, Rome, 1995; C. Greengard, *The Structure of Pindar's Epinician Odes*, Amsterdam, 1980; R. Hamilton, *Epinikion: General Form in the Odes of Pindar,* The Hague, 1974; T.K. Hubbard, *The Pindaric Mind,* Leiden, 1985; S. Instone, *Pindar, Selected Odes*, Warminster, 1996; G. Kirkwood, *Selections from Pindar,* Chico, CA, 1982; L. Kurke, *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*, Ithaca, 1991; M. R. Lefkowitz, *The Victory Ode: An Introduction*, Park Ridge, N.J., 1976; L. Lehnus, *Pindaro, Olimpiche: Traduzione, commento, note et lettura critica*, Milan, 1981; F. Mezger, *Pindars Siegeslieder,* Leiden, 1880; H. Pelliccia, *Mind, Body and Speech in Homer and Pindar,* Göttingen, 1995, *Hypomnemata* 107; W.H. Race, *Pindar,* Boston, 1986; *Pindar* (note 21); *Style and Rhetoric* (note 20); O. Schroeder, *Pindars Pythien,* Leipzig, 1922; W. J. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar,* Berlin, 1969; E. Thummer, *Die Religiosität Pindars*, Innsbruck, 1957; W. J. Verdenius, *Commentaries on Pindar,* Leiden, 1988, *Mn. Suppl.* 101, vol. 2; M. Willcock, *Pindar: Victory Odes*, Cambridge, 1995; Young (note 7). References to these works will be by author's name or author's name and short title.

[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. Maehler, 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[23]. 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»[24]. There are many instances of such break-offs in Pindar[25]. 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[26]. Celebra-

---

and Rhetoric in Pindar's Odes, Atlanta, GA, 1990, pp. 41-57. See too «The Fictional Mimesis of Ex Tempore Speech» in J.L. Pfeijffer, *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar. A Commentary on Nemean V, Nemean VII and Pythian VIII*, Leiden, 1999, *Mn. Suppl.* 197, pp. 34-37.

    [23] W.H. Race, *Pindar*, Cambridge, MA, 1997, 2 vols., p. 47 n. 1.

    [24] Carey, *Five Odes* (note 7), p. 5.

    [25] See, e.g. *Ol.* II.46-52, 2.81-85; *Pyth.* I 75-81, 8.21-32; *Nem.* IV 24-35, V 9-16, *Is.* V 46-54, VI 31-36.

    [26] On *Olympian* II see in particular, B. M. Benavente, «La ambigüedad múltiple de las Olímpicas de Píndaro», *EFG* 2, 1986, pp. 45-52; N. Demand, «Pindar's *Olympian* 2, Theron's Faith, and Empedocles' *Katharmoi*», *GBRS* 10, 1975, pp. 347-357; W. Fitzgerald, «Pindar's Second Olympian», *Helios* 10, 1983, pp. 49-70; G.F. Gianotti, «Sull' *Olimpica* seconda di Pindaro», *RFIC* 99, 1971, pp. 26-52; R. Hampe, «Zur Eschatologie in Pindars zweiter Olympischer Ode» in *Hermeneia (Festschrift Regenbogen)*, Heidelberg 1952, pp. 46-65; A. Hurst, «Aspects du temps chez Pindare» in *Pindare, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique* 31, Vandoeuvres-Geneva 1985, pp. 170-176; A. Impellizzeri, «La II Olimpica e i frammenti di Threnoi di Pindaro», *SIFC* 16, 1939, pp. 105-110; G.L. Koniaris, «On Pindar's Olympian 2», *Hellenica* 39, 1988, pp. 237-269; «Again on Pindar's *O.* 2.1. Major Points of Interpretation», *Hellenica* 47, 1997, pp. 7-34; «Again in Pindar's *O.* 2.2. Points "minoris momenti"», *Hellenica* 47, 1997, pp. 217-240; H. Lloyd-Jones, «Pindar and the After-Life» in *Pindare, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique* 31, Vandoeuvres-Geneva 1985, pp. 245-279; J. van Leeuwen, *Pindarus' Tweede Olympische Ode*, Assen 1964, 2 vols.; G.W. Most, «Pindar, *O.* 2.83-90», *CQ* 36, 1986, pp. 304-316; F.J. Nisetich, «Immortality in Acragas. Poetry and Religion in Pindar's Second Olympian Ode», *CPh* 83, 1988, pp. 1-19; *Pindar and Homer*, Baltimore 1989, pp. 28-72; J. Pòrtulas, «La condition héroïque et le statut religieux de la louange» in *Pindare, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique* 31, Vandoeuvres-Geneva 1985, pp.

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)[27]. 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):

<div style="text-align:center">

πολλά μοι ὑπ᾽

ἀγκῶνος ὠκέα βέλη

ἔνδον ἐντὶ φαρέτρας

85 φωνάεντα συνετοῖσιν, ἐς δὲ τὸ πὰν ἑρμανέων

χατίζει. σοφὸς ὁ πολλὰ εἰδὼς φυᾷ·

μαθόντες δὲ λάβροι

παγγλωσσίᾳ κόρακες ὣς ἄκραντα γαρυέτων Διὸς πρὸς ὄρνιχα θεῖον·

ἔπεχε νῦν σκοπῷ τόξον, ἄγε θυμέ· τίνα βάλλομεν

90 ἐκ μαλθακᾶς αὖτε φρενὸς εὐκλέας ὀ-

ιστοὺς ἱέντες· ἐπὶ τοι

Ἀκράγαντι τανύσαις

αὐδάσομαι ἐνόρκιον λόγον ἀλαθεῖ νόῳ,

τεκεῖν μή τιν᾽ ἑκατόν γε ἐτέων πόλιν

φίλοις ἄνδρα μᾶλλον

εὐεργέταν πραπίσιν ἀφθονέστερόν τε ξέρα

95 Θήρωνος.

</div>

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.

223-230; W.H. Race, «The End of *Olympia* 2: Pindar and the *Vulgus*», *CSCA* 12, 1981, pp. 251-267; M. Simpson, «The Chariot and the Bow as Metaphors for Poetry in Pindar's Odes», *TAPhA* 100, 1969, pp. 437-473; F. Solmsen, «Two Pindaric Passages on the Hereafter», *Hermes* 96, 1968, pp. 503-506; R. Stoneman, «The "Theban Eagle"», *CQ* 26, 1976, pp. 188-197; Thummer, *Religiosität* (note 26), pp. 121-130; W.J. Verdenius, «Pindar, *Ol.* 2.83-86», *Mnemosyne* 42, 1989, pp. 79-82; Willcock, *Victory Odes* (note 26), pp. 123-166; L. Woodbury, «Equinox at Acragas: Pindar, *Ol.* 2.61-62», *TAPhA* 97, 1966, pp. 597-616.

[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, θυμός. 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[28]. Pindar uses "arrows" as a
symbol of his poetry[29]. 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[30].

Pindar then addresses his θυμός directly. He calls on it to act like an archer
aiming arrows accurately at a target. Pindar consults his θυμός 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 immedia-
tely followed by its fulfilment[31]. 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 ἐς δὲ τὸ πὰν I follow here Gildersleeve (note 26), *ad* 93 and Kirk-
wood (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.

[30]   Cf. *Nem*. V 20-21. See also P.A. Bernardini, «L' "aquila tebana" vola ancora», *QUCC*
26, 1977, pp. 121-126. Contrast R. Stoneman, «Ploughing a Garland: Metaphor and Metony-
my in Pindar», *Maia* 33, 1981, pp. 125-138, who denies that the eagle is a symbol of Pindar
as a poet.

[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 θυμός, calling upon this psychic entity to share in an activity that he is about to perform. Θυμός in Pindar functions in particular as a seat of positive and negative emotions[32]. It can also function as a centre of thought. More than any of the other psychic entities (φρήν, e.g., or νόος), θυμός 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 θυμός addressed in the vocative[33]. They occur in this passage of *Ol.* II, in *Nem.* III 26 (to be discussed below) and in frs. 123.1 and 127.4[34]. Such direct address to θυμός does not occur in Homer, the *Homeric Hymns* or Hesiod but occurs once in Archilochus and Ibycus, and five times in Theognis[35]. This usage suggests that θυμός within could act independently. A person recognises this capacity and acts with θυμός or resists it. In these direct addresses to θυμός, the lyric and elegiac poets suggest various modes of behaviour for it.

In Ol. II 89 Pindar calls on θυμός to become his ally in a particular acti-

---

[32] For a full treatment of θυμός, see my article «The Role of Person and θυμός in Pindar and Bacchylides», *RBPh* 71, 1993, pp. 46-68.

[33] As we treat instances of psychic terms, we must always recall the fragmentary nature of the evidence. The generalisations we offer are made in light of the evidence.

[34] In both these fragments θυμός is associated with love. See Sullivan (note 33), p. 51.

[35] Arch. 128W; Iby. 317b; Theognis 213 (?), 695, 877, 1029, and 1070a. For a discussion of these passages see my articles, «The Relationship of Person and θυμός in the Greek Lyric and Elegiac Poets (excluding Pindar and Bacchylides), Parts One and Two», *SIFC* 12, 1994, pp. 12-37 and 149-174.

vity[36]. He addresses θυμός 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 φρήν". The psychic entity φρήν is usually associated with deliberation and discursive thought in Pindar[37]. In this case Pindar has "gentle" thoughts with regard to the object of his praise. Φρήν acts as a "quiver" from which Pindar draws ideas or thoughts. Θυμός appears to provide the will to act and the accuracy of the performance while φρήν provides the ideas.

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

In this passage from *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 θυμός, φρήν and νόος. All these psychic entities become involved in his current enterprise of sending "arrows of fame" to Theron. Θυμός becomes his ally in choosing his target. Φρήν, being "gentle", acts as the source of his thoughts. Νόος, 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

---

[36] Cf. Pelliccia (note 26), p. 297.

[37] See my article, «A Study of φρένες in Pindar and Bacchylides», *Glotta* 67, 1989, pp. 148-189.

[38] See my article, «An Analysis of the Psychic Term νόος in Pindar and Bacchylides», *Glotta* 68, 1990, pp. 179-202.

[39] For the connection of νόος with truth see also Pyth. III 103 and fr. 213.4. Cf. also *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[40]. 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.

εἰ δ' ἐὼν καλὸς ἔρδων τ' ἐοικότα μορφᾷ
20   ἀνορέαις ὑπερτάταις ἐπέβα παῖς Ἀτιστοφάνεος, οὐκέτι πρόσω
ἀβάταν ἅλα κιόνων ὕπερ ῾Ηρακλέος περᾶν εὐμαρές,
ἥρως θεὸς ἃς ἔθηκε ναυτιλίας ἐσχάτας
μάρτυρας κλυτάς· δάμασε δὲ θῆρας ἐν πελάγει
ὑπερόχους, ἰδίᾳ τ' ἐρεύνασε τεναγέων
25   ῥοάς, ὁπᾷ πόμπιμον κατέβαινε νόστου τέλος,
καὶ γᾶν φράδασε. θυμέ, τίνα πρὸς ἀλλοδαπάν
ἄκραν ἐμὸν πλόον παραμείβεαι·
Αἰακῷ σε φαμὶ γένει τε Μοῖσαν φέρειν.
ἕπεται δὲ λόγῳ δίκας ἄωτος, "ἐσλὸν αἰνεῖν",
30   οὐδ' ἀλλοτρίων ἔρωτες ἀνδρὶ φέρειν κρέσσονες·
οἴκοθεν μάτευε. ποτίφορον δὲ κόσμον ἔλαχες
γλυκύ τι γαρυέμεν.   (19-32)

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

---

[40] On *Nemean* III see C. Carey, «Three Myths in Pindar: N. 4, O. 9, N.3». *Eranos* 78,
1980, pp. 143-162; H. Erbse, «Pindars dritte nemeische Ode», *Hermes* 97, 1969, pp. 272-291;
F. Ferrari, «La regia del canto: osservazioni sulla Nemea III di Pindaro», *RFIC* 118, 1990, pp.
5-23; G.F. Gianotti, «Il terzo Carme Nemeo di Pindaro», *AAT* 109, 1975, pp. 29-65; S.
Instone, «Problems in Pindar's Third Nemean», *Eranos* 91, 1993, pp. 13-31; *Selected Odes*
(note 26), pp. 152-169; Kurke, *Traffic* (note 26), pp. 49-56; Pelliccia, *Mind* (note 26), pp.
296-297, 305-306; I.N. Perysinakis, «Pindar's Imagery of Poetry: The Nemean Odes»,
Dodone (philol.) 26, 1997, pp. 93-125 and 27, 1998, pp. 17-68; Pfeijffer, *Aeginetan Odes*
(note 21), pp. 197-421; G.A. Privitera, «Eracle e gli Eacidi nella terza Nemea», *GIF* 8, 1977,
pp. 249-273; W.H. Race, «Pindaric Encomium and Isokrates' *Evagoras*», *TAPhA* 117, 1987,
pp. 151-153; *Style* (note 21), pp. 111-113; C.A.P. Ruck, «Marginalia Pindarica», *Hermes* 100,
1972, pp. 153-158; R. Stoneman, «Pindar and the Mythological Tradition», *Philologus* 125,
1981, pp. 44-63.

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)[41]. 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"[42]. 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[43]. The "headland" being selected is "foreign": it is far from Aegina[44]. 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[45]. 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 (22) 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 Pelliccia (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 back[47]. In telling the story of Herakles, Pindar has thus highly praised Aristokleidas[48].

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 οἴκοθεν 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 «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

> Ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ, ὁ δὲ χρυσὸς αἰθόμενον πῦρ
> ἅτε διαπρέπει νυκτὶ μεγάνορος ἔξοχα πλούτου·
> εἰ δ᾽ ἄεθλα γαρύεν
> ἔλδεαι, φίλον ἦτορ,
> 5 μηκέτ᾽ ἀελίου σκόπει
> ἄλλο θαλπνότερον ἐν ἁμέρᾳ φαεν-
>   νὸν ἄστρον ἐρήμας δι᾽ αἰθέρος,
> μηδ᾽ Ὀλυμπίας ἀγῶνα φέρτερον αὐδάσομεν·

> 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,

---

[49] On Olympian I1 see D. Fisker, *Pindars Erste Olympische Ode*, Odense, 1990; D.E. Gerber, *Pindar's Olympian One: A Commentary*, Toronto, 1982; Instone, *Selected Odes* (note 26), pp. 89-116; A. Köhnken, «Wortlaut, Wortstellung und Textzusammenhang: Pindar, O. 1

and Olympia[50]. 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 ἦτορ directly: "If, dear heart, you wish to sing of athletic games". He tells ἦτορ 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"[51].

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

Ἦτορ in Pindar, as also in earlier authors, functions primarily as the "heart"[52]. 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 ἦτορ as "dear" (φίλος). Ἦτορ 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[53]. In this passage the adjective suggests that Pindar approves of the desires ἦτορ has.

---

und P. 12», *Collectanea Philologica II, Studies M. Komornicka*, Łódź, 1995, pp. 149-158; Lefkowitz, *Victory Ode* (note 26), pp. 77-79; A. Luppino, «Il proemio dell' *Olimp.* I di Pindaro. Polisemia e ambiguità», *Vichiana* 13, 1984, pp. 265-273; Pelliccia, *Mind* (note 26), pp. 292, 300; W.H. Race, «Pindar's "Best is Water": Best of What?», *GBRS* 22, 1981, pp. 119-124; *Style* (note 21), pp. 9-11; W.J. Slater, «Doubts about Pindaric Interpretation», *CJ* 72, 1976-77, pp. 193-208; Verdenius (note 26), vol. 2, pp. 1-52; Young, *Three Odes* (note 7), App. Two, pp. 121-123.

[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, «Κραδίη, Ἦτορ, and Κῆρ in Poetry after Homer», *RBPh* 73, 1995, pp. 13-34.

[53]   Cf. Pindar's reference to a "dear ἦτορ" in *Pae.* 6.12 (fr. 52f). See especially D. Robinson, «Homeric φίλος. Love of Life and Limbs and Friendship with One's θυμός» in *Owls to Athens, Studies Dover*, Oxford, 1992, pp. 97-108. See also E. Benveniste, *Indo-European Language and Society*, London, 1973, pp. 273-288 and Gerber (note 50), p. 17.

This direct address to ἦτορ is the first that we find in early extant Greek poetry. One direct address to *kradiē* occurs in Homer at *Od.* 20.18[54]. *Kradiē* and ἦτορ are close in meaning and later in this passage, at 20.22, Homer describes Odysseus as addressing his ἦτορ, not his *kradiē*. Thus in these lines of Homer the two are synonymous. Elsewhere Pindar does not address *kradia/kardia* directly nor ἦτορ again. What we can say, therefore, is that in *Ol.* 1 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 ἦτορ 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 ἦτορ 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" (ἦτορ) 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[55] and seems best interpreted as poem of consolation for Hieron of Syracuse, who is ill[56]. Particularly prominent in

---

[54] See my articles, «What's There in a Heart? *Kradiē* in Homer and the *Homeric Hymns*», *Euphrosyne* 23, 1995, pp. 9-25 and «The Psychic Term ἦτορ: Its Nature and Relation to Person in Homer and the *Homeric Hymns*», EMERITA 64, 1996, pp. 11-29.

[55] On *Pythian* III see J.H. Barkhuizen, «A Note on Pindar *Pyth.* III 8-60», *AClass* 13, 1970, pp. 137-139; A.M. Buongiovanni, «Sulla composizione della III Pitica», *Athenaeum* 73, 1985, pp. 327-336; «Marginalia Pindarica», *SIFC* 8, 1990, pp. 133-136; B.H. Fowler, «Constellations in Pindar», *C&M* 37, 1986, pp. 21-46; Gentili and Giannini, *Pitiche*, pp. 75-101, 407-425; Lefkowitz, *First-Person Fictions*, p. 51-55; *Victory Ode* (note 26), pp. 142-157; E. Medda, «Ἥρατο τῶν ἀπεόντων: prosperità e limitatezza umana in una gnome pindarica (*Pyth.* III 19 sgg)» in *Scritti in ricordo di Giorgio Buratti*, Pisa, 1981, pp. 295-309; W. Mullen, «Place in Pindar», *Arion* 6, 1967, pp. 462-491; H. Pelliccia, «Pindarus Homericus: *Pythian* 3.1-80», *HSCPh* 91, 1987, pp. 39-63; Race, *Style* (note 21), pp. 37-46; E. Robbins, «The Gifts of the Gods: Pindar's Third Pythian», *CQ* 40, 1990, pp. 307-318; W.J. Slater, «Pindar's *Pythian* 3: Structure and Purpose», *QUCC* 58, 1988, pp. 51-61; C.V. Verde Castro, «Comentario a la Pítica III», *AFC* 10, 1966-67, pp. 69-112; D.C. Young, «Pindar Pythians 2 and 3: Inscriptional ποτέ and the "Poetic Epistle"», *HSCPh* 87, 1983, pp. 31-42; *Three Odes* (note 7), pp. 27-68.

[56] This interpretation of *Pythian* 3 has been well accepted by Robbins (note 56). Contrast

the ode are first-person statements which seem best understood as referring to Pindar as the fictive I[57].

Lines 1-79 of the ode describe Pindar's heart-felt wishes for Hieron[58]. 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:

> ἀλλὰ κέρδει καὶ σοφία δέδεται.
> 55   ἕτεραν καὶ κεῖνον ἀγάνορι μισθῷ
>   χρυσὸς ἐν χερσὶν φανείς
>   ἄνδρ' ἐκ θανάτου κομίσαι
>   ἤδη ἁλωκότα· χερσὶ δ' ἄρα Κρονίων
>   ῥίψαις δι' ἀμφοῖν ἀμπνοὰν στέρνων κάθελεν
>   ὠκέως, αἴθων δὲ κεραυνὸς ἐνέσκιμψεν μόρον.
>   χρὴ τὰ ἐοικότα πὰρ
>   δαιμόνων μαστευέμεν θναταῖς φρασίν
> 60   γνόντα τὸ πὰρ ποδός, οἵας εἰμὲν αἴσας.
>   μή, φίλα ψυχά, βίον ἀθάνατον
>   σπεῦδε, τὰν δ' ἔμπρακτον ἄντλει μαχανάν.

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 (μαχανά)" (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 (μαχανά) 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" (φίλος)[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" (μαχανά) which he will repeat later in the ode when

---

[59] On ψυχή in Pindar see my article, «The Wider Meaning of Ψυχή in Pindar and Bacchylides», *SIFC* 9, 1991, pp. 163-183.

[60] Cf. the address to ἦτορ as "dear" (φίλον) 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 valuable[62]. 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 φρήν 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 ἦτορ to celebrate athletic games. Pindar is able to direct his ἦτορ 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.