DEIXIS, PERFORMANCE, AND POETICS
IN PINDAR'S *FIRST OLYMPIAN ODE*

LUCIA ATHANASSAKI

More than any other choral genre, epinician poetry poses a special challenge. Simultaneous re-enactment of glorious achievements in the *hic et nunc* of reception and of divine and heroic deeds *in illo tempore* is the challenge of poets composing with an eye to performance. Almost all extant epinicians display a common pattern: they commemorate a specific historical victory in the light of memorable heroic and divine deeds in the remote past. Mythical narrative is, of course, an integral component of all choral lyric. What distinguishes epinician poems are the detailed references to the historical persons and events they commemorate. Epinician performative practices are forever lost to us, but we can explore, in the surviving texts, the various ways that epinician poets brought victorious athletes, heroes, and gods to life in performance through a nexus of deictic markers. Deictic markers were among the devices that enabled the chorus to bring before their audience's eyes distant events featuring distant characters, taking place in different places at different times.

Many epinician odes offer deictic indications that point to the place or places where epinician performance was either intended or, at least, suitable.[1] Study of epinician deixis can shed light upon the range of performative strategies inscribed in the texts and thus offer readers an idea

---

1 The deictic pattern of the *Fourteenth Olympian Ode*, for instance, indicates that the ode was composed to be performed at the temple of the Graces at Orchomenos and that the speaker addresses an exclusively divine audience. For representations of space and audience in the *Fourteenth Olympian* and other Pindaric odes, see Athanassaki 2003.

I wish to thank Nancy Felson, Egbert Bakker, and Thomas Hubbard for the valuable comments and suggestions.

317

of the pragmatics of epinician performance as well as insight into the spectrum of possibilities the poets saw as they endeavored to bring together in the intimate space of performance their contemporaries, the heroes of the remote past, and the gods.[2]

       "When?" "where?" and "who?" are the three general categories of questions that deixis addresses. In an everyday act of communication, a speaker of English who knows nothing about the particular social circumstances of the speech-act can make a number of safe inferences even from a minimal utterance such as "May we come in?," to use Charles Fillmore's test case sentence. It is evident that three beings are involved: the speaker (A), the addressee (B), and at least one companion of the speaker (C), who can, according to Fillmore, be either a person or a pet. A and C are in front of an enclosed space to which the addressee has authority to grant them permission to enter. The pronoun "we" is inclusive of more than one individual but exclusive of the addressee. The time of the event is the time of the utterance of the request by the speaker.[3] "May we come in?" is, therefore, a socially anchored sentence, whereas a message such as "Meet me here at noon tomorrow with a stick about this big," found in a bottle afloat on the ocean is an extreme example of a total absence of deictic anchorage (Fillmore 1997.60–61). These are, of course, simple sentences that illustrate the nature and function of linguistic deixis; once they form part of discourse, the time, the place, and the identity of the participants in the communicative act can be further specified. Clearly, time and place, as well as the identity and role of the participants, are cardinal concerns of the study of the pragmatics of the epinician performance as the poet envisions and constructs it.[4] Of particular interest are odes that have a high degree of dramatization in their mythical narratives. They display a double deictic anchorage—in the here and now of the festive occasion and in the mythical past.

---

2 Study of underlying performative strategies is only one interpretive angle among many others. For instance, Nancy Felson demonstrates the expertise and subtlety with which Pindar avails himself of the full potential of deixis in order to make the audience of the *Fourth Pythian* travel vicariously across space and time: Felson 1999. Richard Martin, on the other hand, points out the deictic devices whereby Pindar achieves a sense of powerful contiguities at work in a vast parallel space where gods, heroes, athletes, and poets communicate in the *Eighth Pythian*: Martin in this volume. For deixis in monodic and choral lyric, see Rösler 1983 and Danielewicz 1990.

3 This is the briefest possible summary of Fillmore's extensive discussion of the variety of inferences a native speaker may or may not make. See Fillmore 1997.5–26.

4 For useful remarks on the pragmatics of epinician performance, see Gentili 1990 and Calame 2000.98–100.

The *First Olympian Ode* is, deictically, Pindar's most intriguing composition. It represents an exception to the epinician practice of Pindar and Bacchylides, who frequently dramatize contemporary and mythical scenes successively in the course of the same performance, but do not blur the boundaries between the different spatio-temporal realms.[5] The *First Olympian* forms a remarkable exception to this practice: through a variety of deictic devices, the epinician speaker creates the illusion of stepping temporarily into mythical time and space, playing, in turn, the roles of Pelops's interlocutor and eyewitness to events that occurred at a remote time. In what follows, I examine the types of person deixis that exist between speakers and addressees of the communicative act (*laudator*, *laudandus*, heroes, and gods), their temporal and spatial localizations, and the interaction of these localizations in the course of the performance.

Before I turn to the study of the deictic patterns of the *First Olympian*, a preliminary remark on my approach is in order. Throughout my discussion, I treat the mythical and the encomiastic sections of the poem as two separate worlds. It is not my intention, however, to raise questions regarding the unity of the epinician odes, a unity that has been demonstrated by the ground-breaking work of Elroy Bundy and a substantial body of scholarly work following his lead.[6] Yet myth and encomium are clearly distinct narrative elements that constitute essentially different story worlds, as Felson has suggested (1984). Taking the *First Olympian* as a representative example, she argues that an epinician ode consists of three subworlds: the world of the encomium, the world of myth, and the timeless and idealized world of maxims. These worlds constantly interact but are ultimately self-contained. I, however, have opted for a bipartite distinction between the mythical and the encomiastic worlds instead of Felson's tripartite division. In the discussion that follows, I first examine separately the deictic strategies epinician and mythical speakers use to locate themselves in the epinician or mythical worlds respectively, and then discuss the ways in which epinician and mythical localizations interact in the course of the performance.

In Pindar's epinician odes, mythical and encomiastic themes are interwoven in a variety of ways, but in the *First Olympian,* the boundaries between myth and encomium are clearly demarcated. The encomiastic

---

5 For Pindar, see below, n. 23. For Bacchylides, see odes 3, 5, 13.
6 Bundy 1986 [1962]. See, for instance, Köhnken 1971, Thummer 1968/69, Race 1990.

world provides the outer frame in which the mythical world is embedded.[7] In the opening as well as at the conclusion of the ode, the epinician speaker, through a variety of pronominal and verbal deictics, situates himself at the palace of Hieron in Syracuse at the time of the performance of the ode, which, as is typical for the genre, he describes as being in progress. Significantly, whereas he explicitly states that he has arrived at Syracuse, he leaves his point of origin unclear. We cannot know whether the poet's presence in Syracuse and his leading role in the performance were real or fictive, but the number and variety of indications he uses to localize himself in Syracuse are certainly remarkable.[8]

The ode opens with the famous priamel concerning the superiority of the Olympic games and of encomia commemorating Olympic victories (1–7). Immediately afterwards, the speaker offers the first indication of his localization: he uses an afferent verb (ἱκομένους, "having arrived") and a prepositional phrase (ἐς ἀφνεὰν . . . μάκαιραν Ἱέρωνος ἑστίαν, "to the wealthy blessed hearth of Hieron," 10–11) to announce his arrival in Syracuse. In the opening of the ode, he does not address Hieron, but opts instead for third-person deixis, thus establishing an initial distance between speaker and addressee. Yet a number of textual indications suggest that the epinician speaker envisages Hieron as being present. Third-person reference to someone whose presence is stated or implied can produce a variety of effects, but in a laudatory context, the main effect is to make that individual stand out.[9] In light of the sustained effect of Hieron's presence throughout the encomiastic part of the ode, this use of third-person deixis indeed foregrounds Hieron.

As soon as the speaker has singled out Hieron, he proceeds to integrate the Syracusan tyrant into the sympotic setting at which he, as poet, performs. The emphasis on singing in the opening of the ode culminates in a

---

7 This is not an uncommon pattern, but there are odes in which mythical and encomiastic themes are blended either at the opening or at the conclusion. See, for instance, *P*. 10.1–16 and *P*. 8.98–100. Other odes end with myth, as, for instance, *N*. 1 and 10.

8 Cf., for instance, *O*. 2 and 3 for Theron, composed at the same time, which offer no indications of the poet's localization during the performance. See also below, n. 24. For the conventional aspect of expressions indicating the poet's travel to Syracuse (10–11) and Olympia (111), see Gerber 1982.31 and 168.

9 For the effects of third-person reference on someone who is present, see Benveniste 1966.231.

brief description of the sympotic scene (16–23).[10] Hieron, says the poet at lines 14–17,[11]

> ἀγλαΐζεται δὲ καί
> μουσικᾶς ἐν ἀώτῳ,
> οἷα παίζομεν φίλαν
> ἄνδρες ἀμφὶ θαμὰ τράπεζαν.

> rejoices
> in the choicest of music,
> such as we men play
> frequently around his hospitable table.[12]

The diction is somewhat vague, but the combination of the use of first-person plural present tense (παίζομεν, 16) with an adverb expressing frequency (θαμὰ, 16) gives the scene an iterative quality, as if the present performance is yet another instance of the speaker's habitual performance in the company of Hieron. It is also possible that the iterative scene of singing in Hieron's court alludes to the suitability of the ode for future reperformances.[13] Having thus implied Hieron's presence, the epinician speaker urges himself to sing the victory of the horse Pherenicus at Olympia (17–24). The brief description of Pherenicus's *aristeia* concludes with a third-person statement that Hieron's glory shines in the Peloponnese (23–24), whereupon a relative pronoun (τοῦ, 25) immediately introduces the mythical narrative. In the opening of the ode, then, the speaker unambiguously situates himself in Syracuse at Hieron's court and alludes to Hieron's presence, but for encomiastic purposes, he opts for the distancing effect of third-person reference.

---

10 There is an impressive variety of expressions denoting musical activity in lines 3–4, 7, 8–9, 10, 16–17, 17–18.

11 All Pindaric quotations are taken from the Snell and Maehler edition (1987). All translations are mine unless otherwise noted.

12 If the verb ἀγλαΐζεται is used here in a passive sense, Hieron is the subject of the choicest of songs. For the possibility of deliberate ambiguity, see Gerber 1982.36–37 ad 14.

13 It is possible that Pindar envisions Hieron's participation in the singing; see Gerber 1982.38–39 ad 16. For the importance to reperformance of passages descriptive of performances, see Rutherford 2001.175–78.

After the conclusion of the mythical narrative, which extends over almost two thirds of the ode (25–89), and following some *gnomes*, the epinician speaker resumes praise of Hieron in the fourth antistrophe. Third-person reference, initially retained, soon gives way to an extended address. The speaker resumes his praise (100–03):

> ἐμὲ δὲ στεφανῶσαι
> κεῖνον ἱππίῳ νόμῳ
> Αἰοληΐδι μολπᾷ
> χρή·

> And I have a duty
> to crown that man with
> an equine song
> in Aeolic strain.

The combination of third-person reference with the distal demonstrative pronoun κεῖνον momentarily retains the sense of distance established in the opening of the ode, thus intensifying the effect of Hieron's outstanding presence.[14]

After singling out Hieron one more time, the epinician speaker abruptly shifts from third- to second-person reference by means of a statement that defines his relationship with the *laudandus* as a guest-friendship and establishes reciprocity between them (ξένον μή τιν᾽ . . ., 103ff.). The designation of their relationship as *xenia* prepares the ground for the shift to the second person, which then persists through the end of the ode.[15] The elaborate address to Hieron concludes with a self-referential statement that expresses the speaker's wish (115b–16):

> ἐμέ τε τοσσάδε νικαφόροις
> ὁμιλεῖν πρόφαντον σοφίᾳ καθ᾽ Ἑλ-
>   λανας ἐόντα παντᾷ.

> And may I, foremost in wisdom among Hellenes everywhere,
> be in the company of victorious athletes whenever they win.

---

14 Mullen 1982.174f. discusses Hieron's "lone splendor."
15 For the designation of the relationship between *laudator* and *laudandus* as *xenia,* see Kurke 1991.135–59.

The use of the plural νικαφόροις indicates that this is a general definition of the relationship between *laudator* and *laudandus*, which, of course, includes Hieron.[16] Calling that relationship *homilia* (116) in this particular case qualifies its initial definition as *xenia*, for unlike *xenia*, *homilia* entails companionship. Once established, *xenia* can be preserved without necessarily requiring the presence of the parties bound by the ties of guest-friendship. In contrast, *homilia* presupposes the presence of and contact between the parties involved.[17] The designation of the relationship between *laudator* and *laudandus* as *homilia,* therefore, enhances the effect of Hieron's presence, as well as Pindar's.[18]

The complementary definitions of the relationship between *laudator* and *laudandus* first as *xenia* and then as *homilia* frame the speaker's extended address to Hieron, which dominates the conclusion of the ode and is decisive in producing the special intimate effect of the speaker speaking in the presence of his addressee (106–14).[19]

> θεὸς ἐπίτροπος ἐὼν τεαῖσι μήδεται
> ἔχων τοῦτο κᾶδος Ἱέρων,
> μερίμναισιν· εἰ δὲ μὴ ταχὺ λίποι,
> ἔτι γλυκυτέραν κεν ἔλπομαι
> σὺν ἅρματι θοῷ κλεΐξειν ἐπίκουρον εὑρὼν ὁδὸν λόγων
> παρ᾽ εὐδείελον ἐλθὼν Κρόνιον. ἐμοὶ μὲν ὦν
> Μοῖσα καρτερώτατον βέλος ἀλκᾷ τρέφει·
> † ἄλλοισι δ᾽ ἄλλοι μεγάλοι· τὸ δ᾽ ἔ-
>   σχατον κορυφοῦται
> βασιλεῦσι. μηκέτι πάπταινε πόρσιον.

> A god acting as guardian makes this his concern:
> to devise means, Hieron, for your

---

16 See also Gerber 1982.177 ad 115b. Thomas Hubbard suggests to me that Pindar uses the verb ὁμιλεῖν at 115b–16 not with the dative pronoun σοι, as he could have done, but with the generic νικαφόροις, thereby placing Hieron in a pan-Hellenic perspective and, at the same time, avoiding the too intimate overtones that *homilia* could carry.

17 ὁμιλέω is the verb *par excellence* to denote companionship. See, in particular, Pindar's use of the verb in a sympotic context at *P*. 6.52–53 (γλυκεῖα δὲ φρὴν καὶ συμπόταισιν ὁμιλεῖν / μελισσᾶν ἀμείβεται τρητὸν πόνον: "to his friends at the symposium, the charm of his mind and company surpasses in sweetness the bees' honeycomb"). See also *P*. 2.96 and n. 22 below.

18 For the deictic force of contact expressions, see Martin in this volume.

19 For an exhaustive account and typology of Pindaric addresses, see Kambylis 1964.

aspirations, and unless he should suddenly depart,
I hope to celebrate an even sweeter success

with a speeding chariot, having found
　　a helpful road of words
when coming to Kronos' sunny hill. And now for me
the Muse tends the strongest weapon in defense:
others are great in various ways, but
　　the summit is crowned
by kings. Look no further.　　　　　　　(trans. W. Race)

The most remarkable feature of the address is that it places equal emphasis on speaker and addressee through the alternation of self-referential statements and second-person reference. First the speaker addresses the *laudandus* by name and assures him of the divine protection of and interest in his endeavors (106–08). Although the pronoun σε is omitted, second-person reference is implied in the cautious epinician statement that follows concerning the instability of divine favor for mortals (108).[20] Immediately following is a shift to first-person self-referential deixis, as the speaker expresses his hope to return to Olympia and celebrate a future victory of Hieron, most probably in the chariot race (109–11).[21] This expression of hope leads into his assertion that the Muse is fostering his poetic talent (111–12). By means of the μὲν . . . δὲ structure, the lyric topos of vicissitudes (113), and a gnomic statement concerning the superiority of kings (113–14), the speaker once again shifts to second-person reference, this time by means of an imperative, "Look no further!" (114). After his admonition to Hieron not to look beyond the highest limits set for kings, the ode ends with a prayer for future success of speaker and addressee alike. Clearly, at the conclusion of the ode, form (εἴη σέ τε . . . ἐμέ τε, 115–115b) as well as content (νικαφόροις ὁμιλεῖν, 115b–16) work in tandem to emphasize the speaker's prominence at the performance in the presence of Hieron. Thus through sustained alternation of first- and second-person deixis, the speaker bridges the initial distance between *laudator* and *laudandus* effected through third-person deixis in the opening of the ode. The *laudandus*, initially

---

20　See Gerber 1982.163–64 ad 108.
21　For the possibility of a double reference to a victory with the chariot and to Pindar's chariot of song, see Gerber 1982.165 ad 110.

singled out through distal deixis, is reintegrated into the space of the performance and placed near the speaking "I."[22]

The number and variety of indications by the speaker of his position in the encomium contrast sharply with the mystery surrounding his self-localization as a narrator of mythical events. In odes that contain mythical narratives, the epinician speaker is ordinarily an external omniscient narrator vis-à-vis the myth. As an omniscient narrator external to the myth, he narrates mythical events either in his own persona from beginning to end, or partially in his own persona and partially through the reported discourse of mythical characters, or else as an external omniscient narrator in dramatized mythical narratives.[23] As an external omniscient narrator of mythical events,

---

22 All odes to Hieron contain rather long addresses and display a similar pattern of second- and third-person deixis. In *P*. 1, the address to Hieron extends over the concluding strophe and antistrophe (81–92); in *P*. 2, there is a short (18–20) and a long address to Hieron (57–72); in *P*. 3, the address to Hieron (80–86) is comparatively short. Yet in none of the Pythian odes does second-person deixis produce such a strong effect of presence and of participation in the celebration as in *O*. 1. Detailed study of the variety of effects of second-person deixis in the Hieronic odes goes far beyond the scope of this paper, but, in summary, the *First Olympian* and the three Pythian odes differ in their representations of their respective performances and in their respective localizations of *laudator* and *laudandus*. Like *O*. 1, *P*. 1 opens with the depiction of a performance (1–12), but as Segal 1998.13 points out, "the entire scene of the performance is transposed from earth to Olympus," and the "visible performance blends with its invisible archetype on Olympus." Moreover, the concluding reference to sympotic song (96–98) is made in connection not with Hieron but with the absence of song from the court of Phalaris. In *P*. 2, the initial sense of proximity (1–8) is undermined by the poet's later request to Hieron to heed his song being sent by boat (67–72). Interestingly enough, even though this ode concludes with the poet's wish to be in the company of noble people (96), this wish, coming last in a long series of *gnomes*, has none of the poignancy of the similar expression at the end of the *First Olympian*, where it crowns the extended alternation of first- and second-person deixis. Moreover, as Gundert 1935.94 observes, whereas in *O*. 1 the poet celebrates his personal elevation through his *homilia* with Hieron, in *P*. 2, he comments on the responsibility of aristocrats to associate with and please their equals. Although scholarly consensus with regard to Pindar's presence in Syracuse in *P*. 3.63–76 is lacking, the cluster of counterfactual conditions argues, in my view, against the speaker's localization in Syracuse. On the distancing effect of the combination of counterfactual conditions with third-person reference, see Gentili et al. 1995.416 ad 68–76.

23 With regard to the identity of the epinician speaker, I side with those who argue in favor of the poet. See, in particular, Lefkowitz 1991 and D'Alessio 1994. The epinician speaker in *O*. 7, *N*. 1 and 5 narrates partially in his own persona and partially in the reported speech of gods or mythical characters; in *O*. 1, 6, 8, and 13, *P*. 3, 4, 8, and 9, *N*. 10, and *I*. 6 and 8, partially in his own persona and partially through dramatized narratives. In all the other odes that contain mythical narratives or references, very short quotes excepted, the poet is the sole narrator.

the epinician speaker does not offer any indications that suggest a shift in his localization, which remains by implication at the *hic et nunc* of the epinician performance. An implicit spatial shift may take effect in cases of dramatized narratives, however, where the speaker adopts a role analogous to that of a tragic messenger, or in open-ended narratives in which the poetic voice imperceptibly joins the reported divine or mantic discourse.[24] Yet remarkably in the *First Olympian Ode,* the epinician speaker narrates a substantial part of the myth as an eyewitness, explicitly suspending, for a while, his localization in Syracuse.

As narrator of mythical events, the epinician speaker begins his narration of the story of Pelops in a conventional manner, namely by means of third-person narrative. Right at the beginning, the narrator presents his own version of the myth, namely that Poseidon fell in love with Pelops, who had an ivory shoulder from birth (25–27).[25] Having narrated the nucleus of his revised version of mythical events, an elaborate version of which is soon to follow, the speaker switches gear and comments in general about the deceptive aspect of poetry, the false rumors of mortals, the role of Charis, and time to come as the wisest witness; then he concludes by affirming the obligation of mortals to speak well of the gods (28–35).[26]

At this point, the speaker restarts the momentarily interrupted mythical narration by shifting from third- to second-person deixis. He begins with an apostrophe to Pelops, son of Tantalus (36), and proceeds to report to the mythical hero that his story will be different (36). The revised version first offers a temporal indication and a local specification of the time and place of Pelops's disappearance. Repeating once more that Poseidon fell in love with Pelops, the speaker asserts that the god abducted the youth from Sipylus and led him to Olympus at the time of a banquet that Tantalus offered to the gods (36–42):

> υἱὲ Ταντάλου, σὲ δ᾽ ἀντία προτέρων φθέγξομαι.
> ὁπότ᾽ ἐκάλεσε πατὴρ τὸν εὐνομώτατον

---

24 For his role as commentator in dramatized narratives, see, for instance, *P*. 4.57–58 and *P*. 9.38–39. Even more interesting is his localization in *N*. 10.89–90, where he does not return to the *hic et nunc* but concludes with a description of Polydeuces' response to Zeus's speech. In *O*. 7.32ff., the voice of the epinician speaker imperceptibly joins Apollo's command to Tlepolemus and, in *N*. 5.22ff., the song of the Muses. For the effect of the blurred voice, see Athanassaki 1990.130–38.

25 With Kakridis 1930 and Köhnken 1983.

26 Note the emphasis on mortals: βροτῶν φάτις (28–28b), ἀνδρὶ (35).

ἐς ἔρανον φίλαν τε Σίπυλον,
ἀμοιβαῖα θεοῖσι δεῖπνα παρέχων,
τότ᾽ ᾽Αγλαοτρίαιναν ἁρπάσαι,
δαμέντα φρένας ἱμέρῳ, χρυσέαισί τ᾽ ἀν᾽ ἵπποις
ὕπατον εὐρυτίμου ποτὶ δῶμα Διὸς μεταβᾶσαι.

Son of Tantalus, contrary to those before, I shall say
    about you
that when your father invited the gods to the well-
    ordered feast
in his dear Sipylus,
offering them a banquet in return for theirs,
at that time Poseidon seized you,
his mind overcome by desire, and, on a golden chariot,
led you to the palace of widely honored Zeus.

Having revised the circumstances of Pelops's disappearance, the speaker
proceeds to cast his glance at Pelops's life on Olympus by adding the detail
of Ganymedes' arrival there at a later time (43–45). The mention of Pelops's
sojourn with Poseidon on Olympus provides the occasion to offer an expla-
nation for the rumors that followed the youth's disappearance.

　　The speaker's explanation of the origin of the false rumors con-
cerning Pelops's disappearance is noteworthy for a variety of reasons. First
and foremost, second-person reference is sustained throughout his account
of the rise of the false rumors. As in the case of Hieron, sustained second-
person deixis produces the effect of the speaker speaking in the presence of
Pelops. The use of the imperfect ἔπελες (46) for the description of events
during Pelops's absence is also significant. By calling attention to the
duration of Pelops's absence, the imperfect tense accounts for the rise of
false rumors and, more importantly, leaves the matter open while setting the
stage for the young hero's eventual appearance to speak in direct dis-
course.[27] Finally, the explanation proper of the source of the falsehood is
remarkable as well. According to the speaker, it was one of Pelops's neigh-
bors who spread the story of divine cannibalism when the intensive search
for the youth's whereabouts by his contemporaries proved futile (46): ὡς δ᾽
ἄφαντος ἔπελες, οὐδὲ ματρὶ πολλὰ μαιόμενοι φῶτες ἄγαγον, "when you

---

27 Note also the use of the present participle μαιόμενοι (46).

were nowhere to be seen, and, despite their intensive search, men did not bring you back to your mother." The speaker attributes the rise of the false story to an envious neighbor (ἔννεπε . . . τις . . . φθονερῶν γειτόνων, 47), but ignorance is certainly an equally important factor, for if Pelops's contemporaries had known his whereabouts, they would not have searched for him.

When and where does the speaker situate himself, then, during his long address to Pelops? In terms of spatial localization, second-person deixis, which produces the effect of proximity between speaker and addressee, excludes Syracuse, where the speaker had localized himself at the beginning of the performance.[28] Although his localization within mythical reality is never explicit, a number of indications point to Olympia. In his last encomiastic statement before the introduction of the myth, the speaker states that Hieron's glory shines in the colony of Lydian Pelops (ἐν εὐάνορι Λυδοῦ Πέλοπος ἀποικίᾳ, 24). The prepositional locative phrase is the first indication of his relocation to Olympia, whence his song has traveled in the opening of the ode (ὅθεν, 8). In the course of his speech to Pelops, the sustained second-person deixis, the use of the imperfect ἔπελες to describe Pelops's disappearance, and the description of Pelops's sojourn on Olympus as an ongoing event all suggest that, at this point of the narration, the speaker has mentally transported himself to a past time and adopted an internal perspective, but his localization remains a matter of inference. As an interlocutor of Pelops, the speaker can theoretically situate himself either at Sipylus, or on Olympus, or at Olympia. Yet of the three places, only Olympia is a viable candidate. The second-person deixis that evokes Pelops's presence excludes Sipylus as the main localization because the speaker makes it clear that he addresses Pelops at a time after his abduction. Olympus is not a viable solution either, for epinician and deictic considerations. It would be an act of *hybris* on the part of the epinician speaker to situate himself on Olympus in the company of gods.[29] Moreover, the locative expression ποτὶ δῶμα Διὸς μεταβᾶσαι (42) indicates a direction away from the position that the speaker occupies and toward the house of Zeus.

---

28 Under the normal circumstances of communication, the deictic center would have been Syracuse, since the speaker defines the spatio-temporal coordinates. The separation of the epinician speaker and Pelops in time and space results in a non-canonical situation-of-utterance that is subject to ambiguity or inderminacy. For such non-canonical situations in everyday speech, see Lyons 1977.2.637–38.

29 For the variety of inherent dangers of *hybris* in the epinician genre, see Burnett 1985.38–60.

Despite the sense of proximity between speaker and addressee produced by second-person deixis, the temporal localization of the speaker within any mythical reality is ambiguous. Yet his speech to Pelops is the first step in the process of drawing the past into the present, which is completed by Pelops's speech to Poseidon a little later. As Egbert Bakker, calling attention to the differences between performative and non-performative genres, observes (Bakker and Kahane 1997.24): "Unlike written fiction, the activity of the performer does not draw the audience into the past; rather, the past is, conversely, drawn into the present through the nonfictional activity of the performer." The effect of the speaker's speech to Pelops and of Pelops's speech to Poseidon is to draw the past gradually into the present and to foreground the "sacred presence" of the heroic founder of the Olympic games. William Mullen observes that if we imagine the performance of the epinician odes as a phenomenon that takes place in time and space, gods and heroes are no less present than the *laudandus* (1982.88):

> If we consider the ode strictly as a representation existing in time, which is what we do when we read it in a linear fashion on the page, it is unquestionably correct to say that the athlete's beginning and ending sections are grounded in the present, while the central mythical section consists of things that happened in the past. If, however, we insist on imagining the ode as a phenomenon in space as well, which is what we do in taking it seriously as dance, then the mythical section as it is being danced will be no less present to us than the beginning or the end, and there will be some sense in which the dancers transform the narrative from mere fictional representation into a mode of sacred presence that is complete in its own terms. This is not to say that the dancers need necessarily have mimed the actions their language portrays, as though the epinician were a drama manqué. It is only to say that the narratives have to do with gods and heroes whose consciousness has remained in existence from the time described by the myth to the time created by the dance, and who may therefore be summoned to presence by hearing and seeing a tale in which they are principals.

Impersonation, inherent in the recital of speeches of gods and heroes, is naturally the most effective device for establishing divine and heroic presence. Thus as the performance of the ode unfolds, the celebration of Hieron's victory at Syracuse recedes into the background and the members of the audience of the performance witness the two speeches, the speaker's to Pelops and, a little later, Pelops's to Poseidon. When the speaker turns and apostrophizes Pelops early in this exchange at the performance (36–51), is the audience asked to imagine that he addresses the hero during his lifetime or after his death?[30] As we shall see, neither the narrative structure nor the deictic apparatus of this ode provides a definitive answer and, therefore, the ambiguity concerning the temporal localization of the speaker is never really resolved.[31]

The scene of Tantalus's ordeal in the Underworld, which follows the narrator's speech to Pelops, has multiple narrative functions.[32] In the linear development of the narrative, the scene of Pelops's invocation of Poseidon follows the narration of Tantalus's offense against the gods and his subsequent predicament in the Underworld, which serves as an explanation

---

30 A crucial difference between an epic and an epinician apostrophe to a heroic figure is that the epic narrator/performer is immersed in the heroic world he is singing of in a way that an epinician speaker, hindered by the *hic et nunc*, can never be. For instance, in apostrophizing Patroclus concerning his imminent death (*Il*. 16.787–88), "Homer himself sees the death through the eyes of Achilles, his alter ego," as Martin 1989.236 suggests. Homer can identify with Achilles or Odysseus but, unlike Pindar, he need never step out of heroic reality in order to address a contemporary, and, therefore, his temporal localization is not problematized. Moreover, the Pindaric apostrophe to Pelops is long not only by lyric but by epic standards as well: the length of Homeric apostrophies does not exceed two lines. For the function of Homeric apostrophies, see Edwards 1987.37–38.

31 Comparison of the speaker's apostrophe to Pelops with his apostrophe to Battus in *P*. 4.59–63 is instructive. Like Pelops, Battus enjoyed a founder hero cult and was, therefore, thought of as being present during honorary rites. Yet the speaker's apostrophe to him creates no ambiguity with regard to the speaker's temporal localization, because the narrative of the scene in Delphi is carried out by aorists (σέ δ᾽ . . . ὤρθωσεν . . . αὐδάσαισ᾽ . . . ἄμφανεν) and, more important, Battus does not subsequently appear on stage.

32 In the Nekyia, Odysseus reports seeing Tantalus, along with Tityus and Sisyphus, in the Underworld (11.582–92). In contrast, in the *First Olympian,* Tantalus's spatial localization in the Underworld is not explicit. As a consequence, in addition to Hades, various alternative places for his punishment have been proposed, namely Olympus, Sipylus, or a place somewhere between heaven and earth. For a survey of the various views, see Drew-Griffith 1986. Of these places, Hades seems to me the best alternative, whereas Olympus must be excluded, for as Gerber 1982.99 observes, it is hard to think of the gods deriving pleasure from the constant sight of Tantalus at their feasts. For further arguments in favor of Hades, see Mullen 1982.253 n. 27.

for Pelops's return to the world of mortals (54–64). The transition from the contemporaneous scenes of Pelops's sojourn on Olympus, the futile search for him, and the ensuing slander at Sipylus is effected by a self-referential statement whereby the speaker asserts his own piety by stating his inability to call any of the gods a glutton (52): ἐμοὶ δ᾽ ἄπορα γαστρίμαργον μακάρων τιν᾽ εἰπεῖν· ἀφίσταμαι, "But for my part, I am unable to call any of the gods a glutton. I stay away." Thus he asserts his own piety and differentiates himself from slanderous mortals. A gnomic statement warning against slander follows, whereupon the speaker resumes his third-person guise to narrate the story of Tantalus. Shift to third-person deixis enables the speaker to regain the necessary spatial and temporal distance from the new scene he is in the process of narrating. He tells the story of Tantalus in reverse order: first he narrates his predicament in the Underworld and then the offense against the gods that led to his downfall. The description of Tantalus's punishment, carried mainly by present tenses, is an iterative scene showing an event that has recurred ever since the downfall. The story concludes with a causal link between Tantalus's crime and Pelops's return to earth, which sets the stage for Pelops's dramatized monologue (65–66):

> τοὔνεκα προῆκαν υἱὸν ἀθάνατοι οἱ πάλιν
> μετὰ τὸ ταχύποτμον αὖτις ἀνέρων ἔθνος.

> And for this reason, the immortals cast his son back
> again to the short-lived race of mortals.

Up to this point, the speaker has caught glimpses of events taking place at Sipylus, Olympus, and Tartarus. Through his long speech to Pelops and his programmatic statement that he will tell a different story, he has created expectations in his audience, which are only partially fulfilled at the conclusion of the story of Tantalus's ordeal in the Underworld and Pelops's return to earth.[33] The fortunes of Pelops on earth are the last missing part of the story that the audience is led to expect, and the speaker fulfils their expectation by taking them to yet another place. In order to orient his audience to the new place, which they must envision, he chooses an adjective denoting origin (Πισάτα . . . πατρὸς, 70) and proceeds to describe in pictorial detail the particular setting and time: Pelops, coming alone to the

---

33 For epinician suspense, see Pfeijffer 1999b.41–45.

sea at night, invokes Poseidon, who, the speaker informs his audience, appears to him and stands by (71–74). By means of a τῷ μὲν εἶπε formula, the speaker yields the floor to Pelops, who delivers to Poseidon a speech almost as long as the one the epinician speaker delivered to him a little earlier.

Pelops's speech to Poseidon is localized temporally at the time when Pelops reached adolescence (67–68). The temporal clause offers the first specific chronological indication in the story of Pelops. Up to this point, the speaker has oriented his audience by means of relative chronology. Poseidon abducted Pelops at a banquet that Tantalus offered to the gods. By the end of the speaker's address to Pelops, long by lyric standards, the audience of the revised version of the story of Pelops knows that, while Pelops resides on Olympus with Poseidon, an envious mortal has already spread the rumor that he fell victim to divine cannibalism. The story of Tantalus's crime and punishment provides a causal link but not a specific temporal indication of Pelops's return to earth.

From the pictorial description of the time and setting of the nocturnal scene a crucial detail is nevertheless missing. Is Pelops, when he invokes Poseidon, situated in the Peloponnese or in Lydia?[34] From Pelops's speech to Poseidon, it is clear that Elis is his destination (ἐμὲ δ᾽ . . . πόρευσον . . . / ἐς ῏Αλιν, 77–78), but his point of origin is unspecified. All the epinician speaker tells his audience concerning Pelops's return is that the gods sent him back to the short-lived race of mortals (65–66). The possibility of Pelops's travel to the Peloponnese from Lydia cannot be excluded, but it is made less likely by the absence of any reference or even allusion to such a trip, and also by the narrative's exclusive focus on the Peloponnese in the last part of the story.[35] Certainty is impossible, but the enigmatic description of Pelops's return to the world of mortals points, in my view, to the Peloponnese, where he was destined to cause the death of his opponent, rule, and himself die in due course. On this hypothesis, Pelops's encounter with Poseidon can be localized at any Peloponnesian shore on his way to Pisa.[36]

---

34 Howie 1991.71–72 suggests that Pelops returns to Lydia and from there he travels to Elis on the winged-horse chariot.

35 Πισάτα παρὰ (70), ἐς ῏Αλιν (78), ᾽Αλφεοῦ πόρῳ κλιθεὶς (92). Howie's point is based on the association of the epithet Λυδοῦ (24) and his request to Poseidon to take him to Elis. Yet this epithet is an immutable characteristic of his identity and, therefore, not particularly helpful in indicating his point of origin for his trip to Elis.

36 Mullen 1982.174 thinks that Pindar localizes the event at a beach near Pisa; see also Gerber 1982.135–36. The striking similarities in the depiction of Pelops in *O*. 1 and Iamus

Form and content in the speech of Pelops are artfully chosen so as to corroborate the truthfulness of the Pindaric version and establish its authority. In terms of content, Pelops's speech echoes the most crucial point made by the epinician speaker himself in his earlier speech to the hero. Pelops's request to Poseidon is based on the favor one may expect from a lover (75–76):

> τῷ μὲν εἶπε· "Φίλια δῶρα Κυπρίας
>   ἄγ᾽ εἴ τι, Ποσείδαον, ἐς χάριν
> τέλλεται . . ."

> To him he said: "If in any way the friendly gifts of
>   Aphrodite
> can lead to a favor, come, Poseidon . . ."

Pelops's reminder to Poseidon of their past ἔρως at once confirms the truthfulness of the speaker's twice stated explanation for the youth's disappearance and tacitly contradicts the story of the envious and ignorant neighbor.[37] The reminder also indirectly confirms the speaker's explanation for Tantalus's punishment by the gods, since it replaces and thus discredits the traditional story according to which Tantalus was punished for the cannibalistic feast.[38] In terms of form, Pindar's choice of first-person deixis enables his audience to witness Pelops's personal testimony up close, thus capitalizing on the immediacy of performance and its powerful effect.

Although the epinician speaker's temporal and spatial localization within mythical reality is never clearly stated, the role he chooses to play as mythical narrator provides his audience with some useful clues. Initially, through second-person deixis, he casts himself in the role of Pelops's interlocutor and reveals to him what happened during his absence. The scene of Tantalus's ordeal in the Underworld describes an event eternally recurrent ever since his punishment and, for this reason, does not advance

---

in *O*. 6 (on which see Kakridis 1928) suggest that, in all likelihood, Pindar had the area of Pisa in mind.

37 The speaker has already stated twice that Poseidon fell in love with Pelops: τοῦ μεγασθενὴς ἐράσσατο Γαιάοχος / Ποσειδάν, 25–26 and τότ᾽ Ἀγλαοτρίαιναν ἁρπάσαι, / δαμέντα φρένας ἱμέρῳ, 40–41.

38 Krummen 1990.168–84 demonstrates that Pindar retains the structure of the traditional story, but substitutes the theme of ἔρως for the false story of cannibalism.

the narrative in terms of time. It enables the speaker to distance himself from his interlocutor while setting the stage for the youth's appearance. For the description of Pelops's prayer and Poseidon's epiphany, the speaker resorts to third-person deixis and lets his audience hear Pelops's *ipsissima verba*. Throughout this scene, he adopts the role of a commentator on events before and after Pelops's invocation of Poseidon. The description of the nocturnal scene concludes with the speaker's assertion that Poseidon granted Pelops's wish (86–87).

Had the mythical narrative concluded with this assertion at the end of the third triad, the temporal localization of the speaker within mythical reality would have been far less ambiguous. The pattern of alternation of second- and third-person deixis in the mythical narrative, reinforced by the use of the same deictic pattern—in reverse order—in the encomium, would suggest that the speaker casts himself in the role of Pelops's interlocutor during the hero's lifetime and acts as an eyewitness to the events in dispute. At the beginning of the fourth triad, however, the speaker swiftly distances himself from the nocturnal scene in order to situate the last part of the story within a totally different time frame, which he introduces after the briefest possible reference to Pelops's victory, marriage, and progeny. This new time is represented as the present, "and now" (νῦν δ᾽, 90), but the perfect μέμικται, "he has a share of" (91), as well as the periodicity of the Olympic games and of the sacrifices offered at Pelops's tomb suggest a broad time span covering the period from Pelops's death to the most recent Olympic games in which Hieron's horse was victorious.

While Pelops's speech to Poseidon is the decisive deictic device for anchoring the nocturnal scene between hero and god in mythical time and space, the epinician speaker's earlier speech to Pelops is the first step in this gradual process. The effect of the extensive second-person deixis in the mythical narrative is to eclipse for a while the *hic et nunc* of the festive occasion and to establish, "on stage," the remote heroic time and space to which Pelops's speech to Poseidon unquestionably belongs. The speaker's temporal localization within mythical reality is problematized, as we have seen, by the juxtaposition of two distinct time frames, the period of Pelops's lifetime and the long period extending from his death to the time of the festive occasion. Does the speaker as mythical narrator initially situate himself at a time when Pelops was physically present or at a time when he was believed to be present? In other words, the speaker either casts himself in the role of an eyewitness, a contemporary of Pelops, or else imagines himself at Olympia addressing Pelops at a time when the hero receives

libations at his tomb.[39] The temporal ambiguity, most probably deliberate, is never resolved, for Pelops's death is mentioned in association with the hero cult he has been enjoying ever since. The audience of the ode, however, is required to transport itself vicariously to Olympia during Pelops's lifetime and after Pelops's death.

Whether the epinician speaker situates himself within Pelops's lifetime, or at the time of Hieron's participation in these particular games, or, most probably, at both times consecutively, is impossible to ascertain, but his spatial localization at Olympia is a safer assumption. The sense of proximity to Pelops conveyed by the initial extended apostrophe suggests that the speaker imagines himself at Olympia or in its vicinity. Indeed Pelops's request to Poseidon, its fulfillment, and the posthumous honor he receives, define Olympia as the deictic center of the mythical section. Furthermore, the expression at the conclusion of the ode of the speaker's wish for yet another journey to Olympia to celebrate a future victory by Hieron (108–11) alludes to his previous visits to the site of the games and reinforces the impression that he is situated at Olympia throughout the mythical narrative. Yet his spatio-temporal transition from Syracuse to Olympia in the mythical narrative is not to be understood as a journey but rather as an abrupt shift in role-playing in two consecutive but different acts that, with the exception of the epinician speaker, feature different characters and take place at different locales. In performative terms, the high degree of dramatization in the mythical section was probably the only means available to the choral poet to indicate the shift of scene from the symposium in Syracuse to the embedded scene at the Alpheus, but modern stage practice can illustrate the nature of the speaker's transition. A fairly simple yet effective way to signal the shift to a new spatio-temporal realm on a modern stage would be to resort to light effects.

The *First Olympian* features a speaker who, in the course of the

---

39 As Mullen 1982.183 aptly remarks, "The final strophe, again as in *N.* 5, makes the transition from the mythical moment of favor back to the athlete's present by dwelling briefly in rites that have recurred cyclically ever since heroic times, the 'bright satiations with blood' by which the dead Pelops' spirit is honored and the trials of speed and strength over which he presides. The logic by which these cult practices are seen as making the hero ever present through perpetually imitating his trial of strength and his ensuing good fortune is spelled out by the progression of the strophe itself." Krummen 1990.163–66 identifies the symposium imagery underlying the description of the blood sacrifices in honor of Pelops (90–93).

performance, situates himself initially at Syracuse at the time of the performance, then at Olympia at an enigmatic time, and finally back at Syracuse. The adverb τηλόθεν (94) is the first clear marker of his transition from Olympia back to Syracuse, where he brings the encomium to a climax by his address to the *laudandus*.[40] In the speaker's eyes, what binds Syracuse and Olympia together and smooths his path back and forth is the high visibility of Olympic fame from both locations. His initial transition from Syracuse to Olympia is effected through the observation that Hieron's glory shines in the Peloponnese (λάμπει δέ οἱ κλέος ἐν εὐάνορι Λυδοῦ Πέλοπος ἀποικίᾳ, 23–24). After the conclusion of the mythical narrative, as the speaker relocates himself in Syracuse in order to address Hieron, he calls attention to the high visibility of Olympic fame from far away (93–95):

> τὸ δὲ κλέος
> τηλόθεν δέδορκε τᾶν Ὀλυμπιάδων ἐν δρόμοις
> Πέλοπος,
>
> And the glory of the Olympiads
> in Pelops's racecourses
> shines from far away.

The ode displays a symmetrical pattern of alternation of second- and third-person deixis in the mythical and the encomiastic sections in reverse order.[41] As in the case of Hieron, the speaker's shift from second- to third-person deixis in the mythical narrative is an encomiastic device to single out Pelops and his archetypal victory in the Olympic games. In contrast, the extensive use of second-person deixis produces the effect of proximity, real or imagined: whereas, in the case of Pelops, proximity between speaker and addressee can only be imagined, in the case of Hieron, proximity could have been real as well. Proximity with the addressee, in turn, determines localization, and second-person deixis in the mythical narrative and the encomium results in an interplay of localizations, an interplay between Syracuse and Olympia.

---

40 Note Mezger's remark cited by Gerber 1982.146 ad 94: "der Grieche bezeichnet Entfernungen nicht wie wir vom Standpunkt des Messenden aus, sondern von dem diesem entgegensetzten."

41 The encomium of Hieron opens with third- and concludes with second-person deixis, whereas the encomium of Pelops begins with second- and ends with third-person deixis.

This interplay of localizations raises questions concerning the locus of the performance of this ode. Did Pindar compose it for an original performance at Olympia to be followed by a reperformance in Syracuse in the presence of Hieron? The setting of the mythical narrative certainly allows for performance in the vicinity of Pelops's tomb. Such a scenario would have made it necessary for Pindar to compose the ode at short notice. The *Eighth Olympian*, composed in all likelihood for an original performance at Olympia, shows that Pindar could easily compose an ode of comparable length and elaboration upon urgent commission.[42] Yet the possibility of composition for an original performance in Syracuse with an eye to reperformance at Olympia cannot be excluded. Pindar belongs to the last generation of poets of a highly developed "song culture," to use John Herington's description of the archaic cultural milieu.[43] Within this song culture, a good poet did not compose for a single performance only but expected his work to become known throughout the Hellenic world, whether through private channels or solemn reperformance at the great religious festivals.[44] A poet of Pindar's prominence and aspirations could reasonably hope for reperformance of his odes at both symposia and religious festivals. In a recent article, Thomas Hubbard makes a strong case for the practice of reperfomance of epinician odes on site at the next convocation of the festival where the victory was won.[45] In the case of the *First Olympian*, structure and theme render the ode particularly suitable for reperformance at Olympia. In

---

42 Arguments for performance at Olympia are based on the poet's opening prayer to the grove of Pisa to receive τόνδε κῶμον καὶ στεφαναφορίαν (9–10). See, for instance, Gildersleeve 1890.192 and Farnell 1932.59. Performance at Olympia was challenged early on by Wilamowitz 1922.403, on the grounds that τὰνδ᾽ . . . χώραν at v. 25 can only refer to Aegina, and more recently by Race 1990.144–46, who supplies further arguments. Although I agree with Race that Farnell's view of performance at Olympia has led him to consider the ode a hasty and, therefore, inferior composition, I interpret the contradictory signs of localization as an indication of an intended double performance. See Mullen 1982.26, who suggests that *O*. 6.98–102 registers itself as destined to be performed two times, once in Stymphalos and once in Sicily.

43 Herington 1985.3–76. See also Nagy 1990b.82–115 for the pan-Hellenization of oral traditions.

44 See Herington 1985.60–61, Nagy 1990b.382–413, Hubbard 2004, and Currie 2004.

45 Hubbard 2004 accounts for the wide dissemination of epinician poetry, especially of the poems commissioned by powerful and wealthy patrons, through reperformance at the pan-Hellenic festivals and also through distribution of written copies by *proxenoi* of the cities of those patrons. For the possibility of choral reperformances organized by the victors' families or even by the poleis, see Currie 2004.

addition to its setting at Olympia and high degree of dramatization, the myth of Pelops is an αἴτιον for the foundation of the Olympic games in general and the chariot race in particular.[46] Not only does Pelops's archetypal victory in the chariot race echo Pindar's final wish to Hieron for a future victory in the same contest; it also invites attention to the suitability of the ode for reperformance at Olympia as well as in Syracuse.

Whether and to what extent Pindar drew inspiration from sculptural artifacts in the vicinity of the Pelopion that might have contributed to his vivid depiction of Pelops's presence is impossible to know. According to Pausanias's testimony (5.13), statues and other offerings stood in the intervening space between the temple of Zeus and the tomb of Pelops. Moreover, some years after the composition of the *First Olympian,* Pelops and Oenomaus preparing for the chariot race were commemorated on the east pediment of the temple of Zeus. In an attempt to see a closer relation between this majestic depiction of Pelops and Oenomaus, dated to the years between c. 472 and 458, and the *First Olympian*, Eveline Krummen suggests (1990.160–61) that Pindar composed the *First Olympian* for Hieron's Olympic victory in the horse race in 472, or, alternatively, that he might have seen the sculptures at the sculptor's workshop near the temple. Krummen's suggestion is attractive, but postulates a very early date for the completion of the sculptures of the east pediment. Yet even if viewed as a later and independent development, the new architectural and sculptural project could offer an ideal occasion for reperformance of the ode at Olympia, provided, of course, that the completion of the temple fell within Hieron's lifetime.

The deictic pattern of the *First Olympian* and, specifically, the extensive use of second-person deixis in this ode raise questions concerning the nature of the original performance and possible reperfomances. Did Pindar compose this ode for choral execution or did he perform it himself solo in Hieron's imposing presence, as Wilamowitz has suggested?[47] The scholarly controversy over the solo vs. choral performance of the epinicians has shown that it is impossible to reconstruct the original performance on

---

46 For the aetiological function of the myth, see Nagy 1990b.116–35.

47 Wilamowitz 1922.233. For an impressive visualization of a choral performance, see Mullen 1982.169–84. For more on the choral hypothesis, see Burnett 1989, Carey 1989 and 1991, and Morgan 1993, and for the solo hypothesis, see Heath 1988, Lefkowitz 1991.191–201, Heath and Lefkowitz 1991, and Lefkowitz 1995. Clay 1999 argues in favor of the coexistence of both modes of performance. For other reconstructions of the choral performance of the epinicians, see Burnett 1985.5–14 and 38–47, and Stehle 1997.160–69.

the basis of the evidence we have. Yet the analysis of deixis sheds light upon another side of the epinician odes, namely the variety of potential performances inscribed in the text of the odes, regardless of the nature of the original performance. The extensive use of second-person deixis in the *First Olympian*, for instance, would allow for a high degree of mimesis in both monodic and choral executions. A dramatic performance of the three speeches to Pelops, to Poseidon, and to Hieron is equally possible for a solo singer and for a chorus. The *First Olympian* also allows for a combination of solo and choral song. In the course of a choral performance, the leader of the chorus can come forward and address monodically another member of the chorus (36–52), who can, in turn, separate himself from the group, play the part of Pelops, and immediately go offstage (75–85). The concluding address to Hieron (106–16) can also be performed monodically by the leader of the chorus. Another powerful combination is a choral performance with a soloist in Pelops's role. Finally, the extensive use of second-person deixis renders this ode particularly suitable for solo execution, which must have been a common practice in epinician reperformances.[48] Whether Pindar entertained the idea of reperformances that explore the range of the inscribed variations is an unanswerable question. Yet it is precisely the range of inscribed variations that lies at the heart of our inability to reconstruct the original performance.[49]

Questions concerning the range of potential performances, which second-person deixis allows and Pindar may or may not have entertained, belong, of course, to the realm of speculation, but the significance of the extensive use of second-person deixis in the mythical narrative for Pindaric poetics can be more safely assessed. In the *First Olympian,* the poet presents a different version of the story of Pelops, rejects the tradition of divine cannibalism as false and slanderous, and attributes the popularity of the old story to the deceptive power of poetry and, more specifically, to the power of Charis to make the incredible seem credible (27–35). Here Pindar probably enters into a dialogue with the Hesiodic description of the Muses in the proem of the *Theogony* (27–28). Yet the two passages differ in important ways. In the proem of the *Theogony*, the origin of both truth and falsehood

---

48 For solo reperformances of epinicians at symposia, see Nagy 1990b.107–15.

49 Burnett 1985.5–6 suggests that choral groups sang in unison and never split, but for a combination of solo and choral parts, see Barker 1984.54 and Rutherford 2001.66. For mixed modes of performance in choral poetry in general, see Cingano 2003.

lies with the Muses.[50] In the *First Olympian,* it is Charis, not the Muses, who makes the incredible seem credible. Unlike Hesiod, Pindar never places the truthfulness of his own Muse in jeopardy.[51] Yet even Charis is not the originator of false stories. Pindar attributes to the goddess the appeal— definitely not the origin—of such stories. As Bowra aptly remarks, "The Graces do not begin to work until wisdom or beauty or fame is already established."[52] Thus Pindar's emphasis on the mortal origin of falsehood is unmistakable: in his general statement about the deceptive power of poetry, it is clearly mortals (βροτῶν φάτις, 28–28b), not the gods, who introduce falsehoods, an argument that he proceeds to substantiate by attributing the origin of the false stories about Pelops to one of his mortal neighbors.[53]

How does Pindar relate to the poetic tradition that propagated the story of divine cannibalism? To the extent that ἀντία προτέρων at verse 36 refers to previous poets, he implies that those poets simply repeated stories of mortal origin. In other words, Pindar concedes that such poets were favored by Charis, who is responsible for the charm of their poetry, but since their stories display a limited, human perspective, clearly they did not have access to the privileged perspective of the Muses. In contrast, narrative structure and content indicate that the epinician singer assigns himself to the

---

50 There is much literature on this enigmatic passage. See, in particular, Pucci 1977.44, Stroh 1976.85–112 (with a thorough survey of scholarly opinion), Pratt 1993.106–13, and Ledbetter 2003.42–48.

51 For the differences between the Hesiodic and the Pindaric Muse, see Ledbetter 2003.72– 74, also Krummen 1990.208–11.

52 Bowra 1964.30, Verdenius 1987.105.

53 The attribution of the origin of poetic falsehood to mortals, and not to deities, is certainly not a unique characteristic of the *First Olympian*. In *N*. 7.20–30, Pindar allows for a certain majesty in falsehood, but blames Ajax's contemporaries and, subsequently, Homer, not a deity, for overrating Odysseus's deeds. Similarly, in *N*. 8.23–34, he attributes the injustice against Ajax to the Danaans and, implicitly, to Odysseus's power of persuasion. It is notable that, in *O*. 1, *N*. 7, and *N*. 8, the motive for falsehood is envy; for Pindar's systematic attribution of the origin of poetic falsehood to mortals, see Athanassaki 1990.146–49. Cf. Pratt 1993.123–29, who, on the basis of these three odes, suggests that Pindar prefers to assert the truth of his praise for the *laudandus*, but is relatively unconcerned with the truth-value of his mythological narratives. But this relative lack of concern would certainly undermine his authority as *laudator*. As D'Alessio 1994.139 aptly remarks, Pindar and his patrons lived in a world that had not only literary but social traditions as well; in that world, the poet's authority rested both on his poetic excellence and on his patron's belief in his closeness to the gods. Against Pratt's view of truth as appropriateness, see Ledbetter 2003.69–70, who argues that Pindar conceives of poetic truth as historical accuracy.

tradition of poets who, like Demodocus, were favored by the Muse (*Od.* 8.63) and shared her omniscient perspective. The accuracy of Demodocus's song of Odysseus's past quarrel with Achilles passes the ultimate test. Demodocus sings in the presence of Odysseus, who compliments him both on the divine origin of his art and on the eyewitness quality of his account.[54] *Mutatis mutandis,* the epinician speaker undergoes a comparable test in Pelops's presence. The poet sings of Poseidon's ἔρως for Pelops, but the confirmation of the accuracy of his account takes the form not of a compliment but of Pelops's personal testimony, in his quoted prayer to Poseidon, to the internal and external audience of the *First Olympian*.

   The Pindaric statement that the days to come are the wisest witness (ἀμέραι δ' ἐπίλοιποι, μάρτυρες σοφώτατοι, 33–34) offers a key to the speaker's exceptional spatio-temporal transition *in illo tempore*.[55] 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. Unlike the neighbor of Pelops who speculated on the reasons behind Pelops's disappearance from Sipylus, the speaker witnessed, at a different place and at a later time, as it were, Pelops's request to Poseidon, the god's epiphany, and the fulfillment of Pelops's wish. Interestingly enough, it is not only the epinician speaker who later witnesses what really once happened, but his audience as well.[56] At a still later time, at the time of the performance of the *First Olympian*, Pindar's audience has the opportunity to hear and see before their eyes Pelops conversing with Poseidon and giving his personal testimony of what really happened. Clearly, in composing the *First Olympian,* Pindar availed himself of the dramatic potential of deixis in order to advance his claim to be a master of truth.

University of Crete

---

54 See the discussion in Ford 1992.120–24. For the similarities between the Odyssean episode and the Pindaric account of the true story of Pelops, see also Krummen 1990.209.
55 See also Gerber 1982.67–69 ad 33–34, who suggests that the sentence does not have a purely gnomic character, but reflects also the poet's perception of himself as a true "witness" and a σοφός.
56 Bakker's cinematic metaphor to illustrate the effect of epic apostrophies sheds light upon Pindar's strategy as well (Bakker and Kahane 1997.25): "It is as if the poet is watching a movie, together with the character, who is both 'near,' in the performance, and 'distant,' in the movie. But the very presence of the character in our here and now turns the narrative into 'truth,' a re-experience characterized by an understanding that was not available in the original experience."