ΚΕΙΝΟΣ IN PINDAR:
BETWEEN GRAMMAR AND POETIC INTENTION

ANNA BONIFAZI

Leva su bela da quel cosineto
quatro parole poi ritorni a leto.

Come up, darling, from that little pillow;
a few words, then you'll go back to bed.
—Folksong, Italian Alps, early twentieth century

ALTHOUGH some linguistic elements of Archaic and late-Archaic Greek poetry seem, or are traditionally considered to be, of little importance (for instance, particles, personal pronouns, and demonstratives), they do reveal poetic and communicative intentions even more than other words. Pindaric language, in particular, conveys vividness through those elements, whose interpretation has to look beyond fixed grammatical meanings. This article is intended to be a contribution to Pindaric ἐνάργεια; it explores the usages of one of these seemingly unimportant words, namely the demonstrative (ἐ)κεῖνος. The proposed analysis does not embrace all the possible aspects of the use of such a demonstrative (for example, its metric position or its philological history), but focuses on its communicative functions and on the speaker's intentions conveyed by its utterance. In a word, it is a pragmatic analysis. Pragmatics is a necessary level of investigation for texts that are orally performed;[1] as we will see, in this perspective the meaning of every Pindaric κεῖνος (from now on, κ.) becomes more salient and specific. This kind of study privileges extralinguistic connections and cognitive implications; thus it contrasts with "abstract" taxonomic accounts by grammarians (especially those of the early twentieth century); yet, precisely because this contrast marks an evolution in the hermeneutic approaches to Archaic Greek texts, it makes sense to start from (traditional) grammar, on which, generally speaking, basic morphosyntactical and etymological notions of κ. rely.

A precious source on κ. and on the definition of its usages is Havers' extensive study of 1906, "Das Pronomen der Jener-Deixis im Griechischen." A fundamental distinction in Havers' view is between κ. as "rein Jener-deiktisch,"

Texts and translations are quoted as follows: Pindar, from Race 1997; Sappho, from Campbell 1982; Alcman, from Campbell 1988; Mimnermus, from Gerber 1999; Homer, from Murray and Dimock 1995.
1. On the relevance of pragmatic elements in Archaic poetry, see Gentili 1984; with particular reference to Pindar, see Bonifazi 2001.

as "anderseits-deiktisch," and as "dér-deiktisch," that is, between its meanings as "that" (*ad oculos / am Phantasma* use), "the other" ("what is on the other side," for example, enemies or dead people), and "he/she/it" (third-person pronoun). Anaphoric and cataphoric[2] usages can be evaluated only within this third category. The traditional link of κ. to what is far finds here a clear formulation;[3] from the idea of "far" related to the past, Havers derives the meaning of κ. as "well-known" (in a good as well as a bad sense).[4] These briefly outlined indications (and others[5]) mix spatio-temporal perceptions, co-textual references, and attitudes of the speaker altogether. Havers' description has remained essentially unchanged ever since. Kühner and Gerth underscore the exclusion from the utterance situation[6] and connect κ. as "well-known" to Latin *ille,* "that famous."[7] Humbert adds a note about the emphatic value of this kind of pronoun, related to the transition from the idea of "far in time" to that of venerability.[8]

On the etymology of κ. there is a general and unquestioned agreement about its two IE roots: *ke-/*ki- + *eno/*ono. The first element is identified as an *Ich-Deixis* particle, the second as a *Jener-Deixis* one.[9]

About the meaning of κ. in Pindar,[10] its main feature is that of a demonstrative "de l'objet éloigné," used as an emphatic anaphoric pronoun.[11] Hummel points out a couple of cataphoric uses of κ.[12] Slater (1969) divides the

2. Instead of a cataphoric function, Havers names a "präparative Gebrauch" of κ. (Havers 1906, 10).

3. "Reine Jener-Deixis liegt vor, wo ἐκεῖνος das im Raum oder in der Zeit Entfernte bezeichnet" (Havers 1906, 2); cf. *Etym. Magn.*: ἐκεῖνος· ἡ ἀντωνυμία παρὰ τὸ ἑκὰς ἐπίρρημα· τὴν γὰρ πόρρω δεῖξιν σημαίνει (Gaisford 1962 [1848], 29–30, 321).

4. "Der Redende setzt voraus, daß der Zuhörer schon bei früherer Gelegenheit mehr oder weniger oft in gutem oder in schlechtem Sinne von der betreffenden Person gehört hat" (Havers 1906, 4–5). This is to be connected both with the closeness of κ. to other demonstratives in colloquial speech ("τοῦτ᾽ ἐκεῖνο 'da haben wir's!'") and with reference to what is mentioned far above (the so-called "Fernanaphora"); cf. Havers 1906, 5.

5. Cf. Havers' remarks on the relationship between κ. and οὗτος, κ. and αὐτός (Havers 1906, 10–14) and a note about affective deixis in the utterance of κ. (Havers 1906, 16: " 'mit Affekt' gesagt ist").

6. "Es (κ.) einen Gegenstand bezeichnet, der nicht in dem Bereiche des Redenden liegt" (Kühner and Gerth 1955, 1:641).

7. "Wie das lateinische *ille,* so wird, jedoch seltener, ek. von bekannten Gegenständen, berühmten oder berüchtigten Personen gebraucht" (Kühner and Gerth 1955, 1:650).

8. Humbert 1945, 40.

9. Cf. Havers 1906, 94–95; Walde 1930, 452; Schwyzer 1969, 1:613; Pokorny 1959, 609, 319–20; Chantraine 1968, 329; Adrados 1975, 820. According to all of them, κεῖνος from *ke-/*ki- stem κεῖ, ἐκεῖ, κεῖθε and σήμερον (*κι(ο)+άμερον; Lat. *ce-do, ceterus, cis, hi-c, ec-ce;* Ir. *ce,* Got. *himma daga* As. *hiu-du,* Lit. *szis*). All recognize in *eno- (ono-, no-, -ne-) a *Jener-Deixis* and quote ἔνη (sc. ἡμέρα) "the day after tomorrow." Adrados adds that *ene-, in the forms with –i, is to be connected to νιν and Lat. *enim* (Adrados 1975, 821). About the different deictic components, Chantraine (1968, 329) argues: "Ce thème (*ke-), démonstratif rapproché à l'origine, est devenu en grec un thème de démonstratif éloigné sous l'influence de (ἐ)κεῖνος. . . . à l'élément -ke- se trouve ajouté un pronom démonstratif *eno- qui s'applique à l'objet éloigné et qui a imposé son sens à l'ensemble." Havers (1906, 93, 95) hypothesizes a neutral original meaning of κ. as "Andererseits-Deixis," because—he states—the prefix *ke- was in some cases "allgemein deiktisch," not always "Ich-deiktisch." The terms *Ich-Deixis* ("I"-deixis), *Du-Deixis* ("you"-deixis), and *Jener-Dexis* include personal pronouns, possessive and demonstrative adjectives or pronouns related respectively to the first-, second-, and third-person; cf. Brugmann 1904.

10. Cf. Des Places 1947, 65–68; Slater 1969, 273–74; Hummel 1993, 189.

11. A trace of this emphasis is the frequent position at the beginning of the proposition; cf. Des Places 1947, 67–68. Other κ. characteristics underscored by Des Places are a higher frequency with respect to οὗτος, unlike Homer (p. 66), and a "nuance d'opposition" imparted by καί close to κ. (p. 67).

12. I.e., *Pyth.* 4.19 and *Parth.* 2.16 (= frag. 94b.16); cf. Hummel 1993, 189.

meanings as follows: (1a) with prior reference (almost all occurrences); (1b) without prior reference (only *Pyth.* 2.89); (2) τοιοῦτος, "such a one as that" (in *Ol.* 6.7, *Isthm.* 4.43, *Parth.* 2.16). With respect to the general assumptions on κ. already mentioned, the new information added from Pindaric literature is a generic idea of emphasis, and κ. as τοιοῦτος (which presumably does not coincide either with cataphoric or with anaphoric use).

The translations of κ. in Pindaric odes show no consistency: it is possible to find κ. translated as "that," but also as "this," and as "he/she/it"; sometimes it simply has no translation, either as pronoun or as adjective. Despite the prior work of scholars, κ. seems to be considered a second-class word, without specific functions or characterizations.

The Hypothesis of a Visual Strategy

Some of the proposals I have introduced about the definitions of κ. are not clear. The first is about the generic idea of "emphasis": there must be some communicative intentions that characterize the use of κ. for it to be perceived as "emphatic." What are these? The second is about the anaphoric use: Havers coins the beautiful expression "Fernanaphora," but in Pindar, as Des Places has pointed out,[13] κ. as pronoun is often close (sometimes very close) to its antecedent.[14] Why? What is its specific function in recalling somebody/something? The third point is about the cataphoric use: there is no consensus on the possibility that κ. sometimes anticipates its referents. Hummel quotes *Pythian* 4.19 and *Parthenia* 2.16;[15] Slater does not mention any cataphoric κ., but only one case "without prior reference" (though this instance is questionable[16]). I could add *Olympian* 8.62, for example, in which the two instances of κ. are strongly projected forward.[17] Another interesting passage shows how it is significant to interpret backward referents, forward referents, or even missing referents for κ. as pronoun: *Nemean* 5.22, where κείνοις is very controversial. For some scholars it is anaphoric (with Peleus and Telamon as referents), for some cataphoric (with Peleus and Thetis as referents), and for others, the referents are, as in a vision, completely outside the ode—that is, Cadmus and Harmonia![18] The fourth point is about κ. as a third-person pronoun: Pindar's language contemplates a variety of words as third-person pronouns, νιν (μιν), ὁ, ὅδε, οὗτος, αὐτός and κεῖνος. It is

13. Des Places 1947, 67–68.

14. Cf., for example, *Pyth.* 4.121–25: κ. at line 125 and its antecedent at line 123; *Pyth.* 9.123: κ. at line 123 and its antecedent at the same line; *Nem.* 6.17: κ. at line 17 and its antecedent at line 15; *Nem.* 10.61: κ. at line 62 and its antecedent at line 61; finally, *Isthm.* 1.15: κ. at line 15 and its antecedent at line 14.

15. *Pyth.* 4.19: κεῖνος ὄρνις ἐκτελευτάσει / . . . τόν ποτε . . . (presage of Eurypylus to Euphemus, which is reported immediately thereafter); *Parth.* 2.16: σειρῆνα δὲ κόμπον / αὐλίσκον ὑπὸ λωτίνων / μιμήσομ' ἀοιδαῖς / κεῖνον, ὃς Ζεφύρου τε σιγάζει πνοὰς / αἰψηράς. . . .

16. See the case of *Pyth.* 2.89 discussed in n. 53 below (in "In Blame Contexts").

17. Cf. *Ol.* 8. 62–64: κεῖνα δὲ κεῖνος ἂν εἴποι / ἔργα περαίτερον ἄλλων, τίς τρόπος ἄνδρα προβάσει / ἐξ ἱερῶν ἀέθλων μέλλοντα ποθεινοτάταν δόξαν φέρειν ("But he, beyond all others, could tell / of such feats and what maneuver will advance a man / who from the sacred games is bent upon winning the fame he most desires").

18. Fogelmark writes a whole article on καὶ κείνοις—without any discussion of κ. in Pindar—to prove that at *Nem.* 5.22 Pindar has in mind Cadmus and Harmonia's wedding, in agreement with other scholars like Dissen, Fennell, and Cerrato (Fogelmark 1979, p. 80, n. 24).

difficult to believe that the choices between them depended only on metrical reasons. All of them are anaphoric (*qua* pronouns); ὅδε and οὗτος are certainly prospective (cataphoric) as well;[19] yet, ὅδε and οὗτος, because of their "traditional" sphere of affiliation (respectively, "I"-sphere and "you"-sphere), are used both endophorically and exophorically—that is, with an exclusively internal reference to the text and with an external reference to the text.[20] What about αὐτός and κεῖνος being exophoric? What distinguishes their usage with respect to each other and to the other third-person pronouns? The last point is the curious combination of the *Ich-Deixis*-mark (IE root *ke) and the *Jener-Deixis*-mark (IE root *eno); although etymological explanations strive to minimize the contrast, this is actually a troublesome feature.

I propose to consider the communicative function of κ. starting from its cognitive implications. I do not deny the existence of anaphoric (and cataphoric) references through κ.; I simply state that something else is added to this endophoric usage (endophoric includes both anaphoric and cataphoric). Both anaphoric retrieval and cataphoric anticipation serve a cognitive activity requested by the listeners/readers—namely, mental representations of people or objects. Two arguments in Emmott 1997[21] help to focus on the function of κ. The first is the idea of "priming" and "focusing." In short, for every narrative the reader reconstructs the context of the narrated events and until there is contextual continuity he presupposes the presence of characters even though they are not mentioned linguistically ("priming"); conversely, in a frame modification the reader is directed to focus on a character or an object—and the related new information about them—linguistically recalled by a pronoun ("focusing").[22] In Emmott's second argument, focusing on somebody or something through their pronouns corresponds to giving a demonstrative value to those pronouns.[23] These arguments first suggest that the pronoun κ. in Pindar has a focusing function. Indeed, κ. draws the attention of both listeners and readers to a person or an object about which something new is going to be said. Secondly, κ.'s anaphoric value overlaps with a deictic intention, which—I argue—is not to displace persons or objects in a specific place (as one would expect from a "standard" deictic word), but to visualize them as momentarily present to one's own eyes. This visualizing function includes two parts, corresponding to the two etymological components of κ. I see a double δεῖξις conveyed by the utterance of κ.: the first, according to the *eno- root, is to point out something or somebody far

---

19. Slater 1969, 373 and 401, respectively.
20. About exo- and endophora, cf. Halliday and Hasan 1976, 57–76.
21. Emmott 1997 is a work on the comprehension and the function of pronouns in modern and contemporary narrative style. The traditional terms, according to which anaphoric resolution consists of recovering an acceptable antecedent, are here revised.
22. Cf. Emmott 1997, 216–35.
23. "[The] dividing line between anaphora and deixis begins to break down" (Emmott 1997, 212).

from or outside of the "I, here and now";[24] the second one, according to the
*ke- root,[25] is to relate that thing or person "to me," as "appearing to me."[26]
The latter corresponds to a specific speech act, namely something like "There
he/she/it is! Do you see?"[27]

Κεῖνος in Pindar occurs sixty-five times;[28] in thirteen cases as adjective,
in the remaining fifty-two as pronoun. For the sake of brevity I do not speak
of each one extensively, but limit myself to presenting a possible grouping
and to commenting on some illustrative cases.

WITHIN MYTHICAL NARRATIVES

It is interesting, as well as unrecognized, that Pindar chooses κ. as adjective
or, more often, as pronoun, to give prominence to characters and objects
during mythical narratives. These cases permit an investigation of which
persons or objects are highlighted by κ. and what the attitude of the poet (by
means of the performer) toward those persons or objects is. In the next five
Pindaric passages visual verbal expressions are explicit.[29] The reader can
always attribute to κ. a speech act such as "There he/she/it is! Do you see?"
In *Pythian* 1.25, for example, the referent of κ. is Typhon, the dreadful dragon
that is the topic of the mythical section of *Pythian* 1 (*Pyth.* 1.25–26):[30]

> κεῖνο δ' Ἀφαίστοιο κρουνοὺς ἑρπετὸν
> δεινοτάτους ἀναπέμπει· τέρας μὲν
>   θαυμάσιον προσιδέσθαι,
>   θαῦμα δὲ καὶ παρεόντων ἀκοῦσαι

> That monster sends up most terrible springs
> of Hephaistos' fire—a portent
>   wondrous to behold,
>   a wonder even to hear of from those present.

24. The reference is to the coordinates of the utterance's *origo;* cf. Bühler 1965, chap. 2 "Das Zeigfeld der Sprache und die Zeigwörter."

25. "Démonstrativ rapproché á l'origine" (Chantraine 1968, 329).

26. Waanders indirectly lends support to this interpretation: "One element of the PIE value of *ke/o must have been *ego*-deixis. . . . If I am not mistaken, *ke/o also expresses 'togetherness,' perhaps originally, given its *ego*-deixis, 'here-with-me-ness,' '*ego*-proximity' " (Waanders 1997, 271). Some Latin derivative words containing *ke-, such as *hi-c, illi-c, cis-* (vs. *trans-*), *ce-teri* (*Andererseits-Deixis*), and *ec-ce,* confirm this value.

27. In Italian this act has a precise linguistic correspondent in the interjection "ecco!" or "eccolo/ eccola!," from Lat. *ecce:* "ècco, dal lat. *eccum* = *ecce,* che sta per *ence,* composto del prefisso EN e di CE, che ha un rapporto etimologico col sanscrito CI, antico sassone KI, antico slavo SI, 'questo.' Avverbio che dimostra persona o cosa che ad un tratto sopravvenga o apparisca sia allo sguardo, sia alla mente, e serve a richiamare sopra di essa l'attenzione altrui" (Panigiani 1991, 452); cf. also Battisti and Alessio 1968, 1413; Harris 1978, 72–74 on old French *cest* and *cel;* Diessel 1999, 150: "Vulgar Latin *ecce,* 'behold' . . . which strengthened the weakened demonstrative *ille*." Bazzanella (1995, 247) characterizes *ecco* as a metatextual discourse marker; often it works as a focalizer, namely it directs or governs the elaboration of information. This cognitive function of *ecco* focuses very well the communicative intentions I see under the part κε- of κ.

28. Against 73 occurrences of αὐτός, 85 of οὗτος, and 50 of ὅδε.

29. For ἰδ- verbs see *Ol.* 3.31, 10.102; *Pyth.* 1.25; 4.125; *Nem.* 8.10, 10.14, 62. I add frag. 137.1: ὄλβιος ὅστις ἰδὼν κεῖν' εἶσ' ὑπὸ χθόν' (about the Eleusinian Mysteries).

30. In frag. 92 (κείνῳ μὲν Αἴτνα δεσμὸς ὑπερφίαλος / ἀμφίκειται), κ. indicates Typhon as well (according to Strabo 13.4.6.26).

In the following occurrence, κ. visualizes the Hyperboreans' land, a far and venerated place par excellence. It focuses the place of the central mythical action of Heracles in *Olympian* 3, the discovery of olive trees (*Ol.* 3.31):[31]

> τὰν μεθέπων ἴδε καὶ κείναν χθόνα

> In pursuit of her he saw, among other places, that land.

Pythian 5.57 is a particularly important example, because here κ. marks the passage from the praise of the present to the mythical narrative (probably the first performance of the ode was not far from Battus' grave in Cyrene). The visual characterization of the famous king is clear (*Pyth.* 5.55–58):

> ὁ Βάττου . . . ὄλβος . . .
> πύργος ἄστεος ὄμμα τε φαεννότατον
> ξένοισι. κεῖνόν γε καὶ βαρύκομποι
> λέοντες περὶ δείματι φύγον

> . . . the ancient prosperity of Battos continues, . . .
> bastion for the city and most splendid light
> for foreigners. Even loudly roaring lions
> fled in fear from that man.[32]

In *Nemean* 10.62 the listeners hear about the crucial moment in which Lynceus sees Castor and Polydeukes, and Idas wounds Castor. To the sight of Lynceus that of the listeners is added, as they visualize his eye (*Nem.* 10.61–63):

> ἀπὸ Ταϋγέτου πεδαυγάζων ἴδεν Λυγκεὺς δρυὸς ἐν
>   στελέχει
> ἡμένους. κείνου γὰρ ἐπιχθονίων πάντων γένετ᾽ ὀξύτατον
> ὄμμα. . . .

> Watching from Taygetos, Lynkeus had seen them
>   sitting in the hollow trunk of an oak tree,
> for of all mortals he had the sharpest
> eyesight.

The next passage reveals a frequent strategy in Pindar's narrative technique— the progressive focalization (and visualization) of a character (*Nem.* 10.11–16).[33]

> Ζεὺς . . .
> . . .
> θρέψε δ᾽ αἰχμὰν Ἀμφιτρύωνος. ὁ δ᾽ ὄλβῳ φέρτατος

---

31. Cf. *Ol.* 3.32–34.

32. About φαεννότατον, line 56: not infrequently κ. is associated with the semantic sphere of light or splendor: cf. frag. 133.1–3: οἶσι δὲ Φερσεφόνα ποινὰν παλαιοῦ πένθεος / δέξεται, ἐς τὸν ὕπερθεν ἅλιον κείνων ἐνάτῳ ἔτεϊ / ἀνδιδοῖ ψυχὰς πάλιν . . . ; *Pyth.* 4.143–45: . . . τρίταισιν δ᾽ ἐν γοναῖς / ἄμμες αὖ κείνων φυτευθέντες σθένος ἀελίου χρύσεον / λεύσσομεν . . . ; *Pae.* 2.68–69: κείνοις δ᾽ ὑπέρτατον ἦλθε φέγγος / ἄντα δ[υ]σμενέων Μελαμφύλλου προπάροιθεν; *Pyth.* 3.75–76: . . . φαμὶ τηλαυγέστερον κείνῳ φάος / ἐξικόμαν κε βαθὺν πόντον περάσαις; *Nem.* 1.68–69: βελέων ὑπὸ ῥιπαῖσι κείνου φαιδίμαν γαίᾳ πεφύρσεσθαι κόμαν / ἔνεπεν᾽. . . . This lends supports for interpreting κ. as a visual mark.

33. Scholars disagree about the subject of θρέψε; like others do, I take Zeus as subject (differently from Race, whose translation has "it raised," "it" being intended to be the city of Argos). On the progressive focalization of a character, cf. Bonifazi 2001, 173–87, about Heracles in the mythical section of *Isthmian* 6.

ἵκετ᾽ ἐς κείνου γενεάν, ἐπεὶ ἐν χαλκέοις ὅπλοις
Τηλεβόας ἔναρεν· τῷ ὄψιν ἐειδόμενος
ἀθανάτων βασιλεὺς αὐλὰν ἐσῆλθεν,

Zeus . . .

. . . .

raised the spearman Amphitryon. He had the supreme good fortune
to become that god's kin, when, in his bronze armor,
he had slain the Teleboai; for, taking on his likeness,
the king of the immortals entered his hall

Pindar starts the ode by telling about legendary prominent people of Argos;
he then names Alcmene and Danaë, upon whom Zeus had bestowed his
favors. At this point, the circumstances of Heracles' birth are introduced
(Zeus' union with Alcmene under the guise of Amphitryon). As Pindar men-
tions Amphitryon, the song gets to the heart of the epic narrative (cf. ὁ δέ,
line 13).[34] K., at line 14, has the function of presenting Zeus as *ille* ("such
a person") while Amphitryon is still the grammatical subject of the sentence,
so that the focus of the audience's attention is fixed on Zeus, the active
subject of the sentence that follows. This sentence is purely visual, not only
because it tells about Zeus entering the palace (cf. αὐλὰν ἐσῆλθεν, line 16),
but also because Zeus looks like Amphitryon (τῷ ὄψιν ἐειδόμενος, line 15).

Other examples, even without *verba videndi,* show that a specific moment
of the narrative is visually focused by κ.; it becomes the hallmark of the
subjects to which the attention of the spectators is drawn.[35] Here, I mention
also a group of occurrences in which κ. refers to the victor or to his ances-
tors. These occurrences belong to the praise of the present, but the descrip-
tion of glorious actions is made in the mythical narrative style.[36]

34. On the epic narrative rhythm marked by ὁ δὲ-pronouns, see Bakker 1997, 63–67.
35. Cf. *Nem.* 8.8–10: . . . πολλὰ νιν πολλοὶ λιτάνευον ἰδεῖν· ἀβοατὶ γὰρ ἡρώων ἄωτοι περιναιεταόντων / ἤθελον κείνου γε πείθεσθ᾽ ἀναξίαις ἑκόντες, where the vision of local heroes requesting to serve king Aeacus (κείνου) is introduced by ἰδεῖν in the sentence at line 8; cf. also *Ol.* 7.49–50: . . . κείνοισι μὲν ξανθὰν ἀγαγὼν νεφέλαν {Ζεύς} / πολὺν ὗσε χρυσόν, where the referents of κ. are the ancient citizens of Rhodes. To these, I add five occurrences in *Pythian* 4 where κ. focuses different entities in different crucial stages: line 125, where the referent of κ. is Jason; line 134, where the referents are Jason's relatives; line 210, where κ. indicates the Argonaut voyage; lines 69 and 243, where κ. highlights the golden fleece.
36. Cf. *Isthm.* 8.64–65: . . . ἐπεὶ περικτίονας / ἐνίκασε δή ποτε καὶ κεῖνος ἄνδρας ἀφύκτα χερὶ κλονέων. As in *Nem.* 10.14, there is a progressive focalization on one character, in this case Nicocles, the victor's cousin (who was dead at the time of the composition of the ode). From νιν (line 62 "honor him!") Pindar goes to ὅς + aorist (line 63 "who won . . ."), and finally to κ. (line 65). Privitera underscores a visual em-phasis in these lines: "L'ultima strofe, con Nicocle incoronato di apio che rotea il pugno e abbatte gli atleti dei paesi vicini . . . è piena di luce e di gioia, come se Nicocle non fosse mai morto" (Privitera 1982, 123); cf. also *Nem.* 9.36–37 οὕνεκεν ἐν πολέμῳ κείνα θεὸς ἔντυεν αὐτοῦ / θυμὸν αἰχματὰν ἀμύνειν λοιγὸν Ἐνυ-αλίου. Here κ. refers to Aidos (cf. line 33), but the warrior is the victor Chromius, who participated in the historical battle between Hippocrates and the Syracusans on the Helorus river (492 ʙ.ᴄ.ᴇ.). In *Pyth.* 1.61–62 (τῷ πόλιν κείναν θεοδμάτῳ σὺν ἐλευθερίᾳ / Ὑλλίδος στάθμας Ἱέρων ἐν νόμοις ἔκτισσε), κ. refers to the city of Aetna. In *Nem.* 6.17–18 (κεῖνος γὰρ Ὀλυμπιόνικος ἐὼν Αἰακίδαις / ἔρνεα πρῶτος ⟨ἔνεικεν⟩ ἀπ᾽ Ἀλφεοῦ), κ. refers to Praxidamas, the victor's ancestor. In *Pyth.* 9.123–24 (. . . πολλὰ μὲν κεῖνοι δίκον / φύλλ᾽ ἔπι καὶ στεφάνους), κ. refers to the pastoralists of Lybia (nomad horsemen, line 123); here there is an allusion to the φυλλοβολία for Alexidamus, the victor's ancestor. In *Pyth.* 2.8 (κείνας ἀγαναῖσιν ἐν χερσὶ ποικιλανίους ἐδάμασσε πώλους), κ. points out the foals with which Hieron won the race. On relative pro-nouns and aorists as typical initial features of mythical narratives in Pindar, cf. Bonifazi 2004.

Some general characteristics of κ. can now be outlined. First, the attitude of the poet toward the people or the objects indicated by κ. is absolutely favorable (the connection with the semantic area of light/splendor is a confirmation of that). Furthermore, κ. in mythical narratives is almost always accompanied by an aorist verb. This fact strongly confirms the visual involvement of the public through the performance, as analyzed by Bakker about Homeric epic.[37] Finally, the visualizing power of κ. harmonizes with its anticipatory role, even when it is anaphoric. One of the functions of κ. is a sort of "präparative Gebrauch,"[38] not in the syntactic sense, but in the pragmatic one: κ. lets the listeners visually retrieve the mental representation of a character or an object so that attention remains upon that character or object, of which something new is to be said shortly.

CLOSE TO "I" SPEECH ACTS IN THE PRAISE OF THE PRESENT

In this section κ. is analyzed in relation to the explicit or indirect speech-acts of the performer(s). The different pragmatic positions of "I" and of "κ." are made close, to underscore at the same time the physical—or symbolic—distance between the two, and the possibly common frame shared by them. In a first group κ. refers to the victor celebrated in the ode. In the following example, the referent of κ. is Hieron (*Ol.* 1.100–103).[39]

. . . ἐμὲ δὲ στεφανῶσαι
κεῖνον ἱππίῳ νόμῳ
Αἰοληΐδι μολπᾷ
χρή . . .

. . . My duty is to crown
that man with an equestrian tune
in Aeolic song.

In a second group, κ. is explicitly autoreferential: its referents are realities belonging to the extralinguistic context, separated in principle from the song activity; but Pindar takes possession of these realities (as "κ."-realities, i.e., "famous," "esteemed," "admired"), in order to exalt his own

---

37. Aorist forms, in Bakker's view, have a pragmatic value: they are a specialized means to convey immediacy in mythical narratives. Rather than a tense indication, they make the deeds close to the *hic et nunc* experience of the performance, as a mark of their reenactment; cf. Bakker 1997, 2001, 2002. Further Pindaric occurrences of κ. with an aorist verb during mythical narratives are *Ol.* 13.87, *Pyth.* 4.105, and *Isthm.* 6.31.

38. Quotation from Havers (cf. n. 2 above).

39. Cf. also *Pyth.* 1.42–43: ἄνδρα δ᾽ ἐγὼ κεῖνον / αἰνῆσαι μενοινῶν ἔλπομαι (κ. = Hieron); *Nem.* 1.7–9: ἅρμα δ᾽ ὀτρύνει Χρομίου Νεμέα τ᾽ ἔργμασιν νικαφόροις ἐγκώμιον ζεῦξαι μέλος. / ἀρχαὶ δὲ βέβληνται θεῶν / κείνου σὺν ἀνδρὸς δαιμονίαις ἀρεταῖς (κ. = Chromius); *Pyth.* 5.106–8: τὸ καλλίνικον λυτήριον δαπανᾶν / μέλος χαρίεν. ἄνδρα κεῖνον ἐπαινέοντι συνετοί· / λεγόμενον ἐρέω (κ. = Arcesilas); *Ol.* 6.6–7: τίνα κεν φύγοι ὕμνον / κεῖνος ἀνήρ, ἐπικύρσαις ἀφθόνων ἀστῶν ἐν ἱμερταῖς ἀοιδαῖς (κ. = Hagesias); *Pyth.* 3.75 (see n. 32 above); to this list I add *Ol.* 10.99–104: παῖδ᾽ ἐρατὸν ⟨δ᾽⟩ Ἀρχεστράτου / αἴνησα, τὸν εἶδον κρατέοντα χερὸς ἀλκᾷ / βωμὸν παρ᾽ Ὀλύμπιον / κεῖνον κατὰ χρόνον / ἰδέᾳ τε καλόν / ὥρᾳ τε κεκραμένον. Although the "official" referent of κ. is χρόνον, Pindar creates a conscious grammatical ambiguity: κ., at the beginning of the line, could be referred also to βωμόν and to τόν (that is, the victor himself). The presence of an –ἰδ- verb (εἶδον) in this context is remarkable.

praise song, his own fame. In addition to other significant cases, [40] I quote *Isthmian* 4.43–44:

προφρόνων Μοισᾶν τύχοιμεν, κεῖνον ἅψαι πυρσὸν ὕμνων
καὶ Μελίσσῳ, . . .

May I find the favor of the Muses to light such a beacon-fire of hymns
for Melissos too, . . .

Here κ. as adjective visually points out a very special fire.[41] In other cases too, Pindar uses the syntagma of a metaphoric substantive + a song word in the genitive (usually ὕμνων or ἀοιδᾶν) to indicate—deictically—the ongoing performance.[42]

A third group contains κ. used to underscore the relationship between the Pindaric song and other persons far from the "I, here and now" of the performance. In *Nemean* 4.85–86 the referent of κ. is a dead relative of the victor (Callicles, the victor's uncle, cf. line 80); in *Isthmian* 1.15–18 κ. is a pivot-word: it highlights the famous characters to whom the poet explicitly addresses his praise and, at the same time, it begins a short mythical narrative about them (*Nem.* 4.85–86):[43]

. . . κεῖνος ἀμφ᾽ Ἀχέροντι ναιετάων ἐμάν
γλῶσσαν εὑρέτω κελαδῆτιν . . .

. . . let him who dwells by the Acheron
find my voice ringing out.

(*Isthm.* 1.15–18):

. . . ἐθέλω
ἢ Καστορείῳ ἢ Ἰολάοι᾽ ἐναρμόξαι νιν ὕμνῳ.
κεῖνοι γὰρ ἡρώων διφρηλάται Λακεδαίμονι καὶ
Θήβαις ἐτέκνωθεν κράτιστοι·

. . . I wish
to include him in a hymn to Kastor or Iolaos,
for they were the mightiest charioteers of the heroes,
    one born in Lakedaimon, the other in Thebes;

---

40. See *Ol.* 9.28: κεῖναι γὰρ ὤπασαν τὰ τέρπν᾽ (κ. = Charites); *Parth.* 2.13–17: σειρῆνα δὲ κόμπον / αὐλίσκον ὑπὸ λωτίνων / μιμήσομ᾽ ἀοιδαῖς / κεῖνον, ὃς Ζεφύρου τε σιγάζει πνοὰς / αἰψεράς . . . (on the symbolic meaning of the sounds in this passage, cf. Lehnus 1984, 80–82); *Ol.* 6.22–26: ὦ Φίντις, ἀλλὰ ζεῦξον ἤδη μοι σθένος ἡμιόνων, / ᾇ τάχος, ὄφρα κελεύθῳ τ᾽ ἐν καθαρᾷ / βάσομεν ὄκχον, ἵκωμαί τε πρὸς ἀνδρῶν / καὶ γένος· κεῖναι γὰρ ἐξ ἀλλᾶν ὁδὸν ἁγεμονεῦσαι / ταύταν ἐπίστανται . . . , where the referents of κ. are the mules of the winner's mule-cart, and ὁδὸν ταύταν is the way of the song; *Nem.* 3.11–12: ἐγὼ δὲ κείνων τέ νιν ὀάροις / λύρᾳ τε κοινάσομαι . . . , where the referents of κ. are the young men involved in the performance (cf. line 4).

41. Cf. Krummen (1991, 55–56), who analyzes extensively the links between *Isthm.* 4 and the night festivals in honor of Heracles' dead sons (Pannychis) as the best performative setting for the ode.

42. Cf. Bonifazi 2001, 110–11, 157.

43. *Isthm.* 5.46–48: πολλὰ μὲν ἀρτιεπὴς / γλῶσσά μοι τοξεύματ᾽ ἔχει περὶ κείνων / κελαδέσαι, where the referents of κ. are the Aeacides, with a probable reference to contemporary Aeginetan sailors as well, combatants in Salamina (cf. lines 48–50); *Ol.* 9.53–54: κείνων δ᾽ ἔσαν χαλκάσπιδες ὑμέτεροι πρόγονοι / ἀρχᾶθεν, where the relationship between the Rhodian listeners and their ancient progenitors is stressed.

In summary, the victor as referent of κ. in these groups represents the best "other" and the best subject for the poet's praise. Κεῖνος and "I"-deixis are not infrequently placed side by side.[44] Their shared frame is presumably demonstrative (in the etymological sense, perhaps accompanied by a deictic visual gesture). Finally, κ. often begins the line.[45] The communicative strategies underlying the signaled emphasis are increasingly clear.

<div align="center">IN BLAME CONTEXTS</div>

Hitherto, the referents of κ. have been seen and pointed out by Pindar with a positive attitude. However, κ. is used also in blame contexts, in order to affirm equilibrium of lots in two kinds of situations: either a respectable person does something that incurs blame or a person who is not respectable is punished, and therefore justice is re-established. It is difficult to define with certainty a specific and unambiguous meaning of κ. in these passages; sometimes a negative judgment seems to be clear; sometimes the judgment appears to be suspended. Probably the poet in the latter case consciously uses κ. as an ambivalent deictic word, to shift the focus of attention onto a person who can be rescued from blame through Pindaric words. Κεῖνος becomes a linguistic sign of "politeness";[46] its utterance has indirect effects, such as defending some respectable people in front of the audience (for example, Damophilos in *Pyth.* 4), calling to mind negative episodes of the lives of the heroes mentioned in a certain poem, without telling them explicitly (because of the commissioning of the poem itself by patrons whose praise has to be linked to the glory of those heroes and not, of course, to inconvenient stories about them). Pindaric words themselves risk blame, especially when the poet introduces novelties in the content of narratives, novelties that incur the audience's displeasure. The only verbal trace of κ. connected to a blame context is the particle καί before κ. Already, Des Places mentioned occurrences of καί κ., where καί is a contrastive mark.[47] Καί could be considered a pragmatic sign of a change of attitude toward the narrated event, from a praise context to a blame context (*Nem.* 5.22–23):[48]

---

44. See also *Pyth.* 1.42, *Isthm.* 4.43, *Nem.* 3.11; I add *Pae.* 10.19: ἐμὶν δὲ πὰ[ρ] κείνοι[ς].

45. See (quoted in this section) *Ol.* 1.101, 6.7, 9.28, 10.102; *Isthm.* 1.17; *Nem.* 1.9; *Parth.* 2.16; see also *Ol.* 2.99, 10.41, 13.87; *Pyth.* 1.25, 2.8, 4.19, 9.95; *Nem.* 8.23; *Pae.* 2.68; frag. 92, 122.2, 143.

46. Politeness is here a technical term of a whole branch of Pragmatics that holds much interest with respect to the linguistic strategies of committed praise poetry, such as the epinician one; cf. Bonifazi 2001, 24–26.

47. Cf. n. 11 above.

48. In addition to *Nem.* 5.22–23, other occurrences with καὶ κ. are: *Ol.* 10.41–42: καὶ κεῖνος ἀβουλίᾳ ὕστατος / ἁλώσιος ἀντάσαις θάνατον αἰπὺν οὐκ ἐξέφυγεν (κ. = Augeas, who did injustice to Heracles); *Ol.* 10.30–31: λόχμαισι δὲ δοκεύσαις ὑπὸ Κλεωνᾶν / δάμασε καὶ κείνους Ἡρακλέης ἐφ' ὁδῷ (κ. = the Moliones, Cteatus and Eurytus, allied with the king Augeas); *Pyth.* 4.289–90: καὶ μὰν κεῖνος Ἄτλας οὐρανῷ / προσπαλαίει νῦν . . . (κ. = Damophilos, "defended" by Pindar); *Pyth.* 4.281–85: κεῖνος γὰρ ἐν παισὶν νέος, / ἐν δὲ βουλαῖς πρέσβυς ἐγκύρσαις ἑκατοετεῖ βιοτᾷ. / . . . / οὐκ ἐρίζων ἀντία τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς (another κ. for the same Damophilos); *Ol.* 2.92–100: αὐδάσομαι ἐνόρκιον λόγον ἀλαθεῖ νόῳ / τεκεῖν μή τιν' . . . πόλιν / . . . ἄνδρα μᾶλλον / . . . ἀφθονέστερον . . . / Θήρωνος. ἀλλ' αἶνον ἐπέβα κόρος / οὐ δίκᾳ συναντόμενος, ἀλλὰ μάργων ὑπ' ἀνδρῶν, / τὸ λαλαγγῆσαι θέλον κρυφὸν τιθέμεν ἐσλῶν καλοῖς / ἔργοις, ἐπεὶ ψάμμος ἀριθμὸν περιπέφευγεν, / καὶ κεῖνος ὅσα χάρματ' ἄλλοις ἔθηκεν, / τίς ἂν φράσαι δύναιτο; (κ. = Theron, the victor); *Pyth.* 3. 55:

πρόφρων δὲ <u>καὶ κείνοις</u> ἄειδ’ ἐν Παλίῳ
Μοισᾶν ὁ κάλλιστος χορός . . .

Gladly did that fairest chorus of the Muses
sing for those men on Pelion . . .

I already remarked that κ. is here particularly ambiguous. Peleus as Aeacid
is included in both interpretations of the referents of κείνοις, as denoting the
Aeacids present at the wedding and as denoting Peleus and Thetis. The
blame nuance comes from the allusion to the improper killing of Phocus by
Peleus and Telamon (cf. *Nem.* 5.16–18). Underlying the interpretation of
κείνοις as a pronoun for Peleus and Thetis is κ. as a mark of visual antici-
pation. Indeed, it is followed by a descriptive flashback about the famous
wedding feast of the two characters, in the presence of all the Muses and
Apollo with the seven-string lyre; the names Peleus and Thetis appear only
at line 25. In this perspective, κ. is a visual cataphora, as can also be argued
at *Nemean* 8.20–23:

. . . νεαρὰ δ’ <u>ἐξευρόντα</u> <u>δόμεν</u> <u>βασάνῳ</u>
ἐς ἔλεγχον, ἅπας κίνδυνος· <u>ὄψον δὲ λόγοι φθονεροῖσιν</u>,
<u>ἅπτεται</u> δ’ ἐσλῶν ἀεί, χειρόνεσσι δ’ οὐκ <u>ἐρίζει</u>.
<u>κεῖνος</u> καὶ Τελαμῶνα <u>δάψεν</u> υἱόν, φασγάνῳ ἀμφικυλίσαις.

. . . but to discover new ones and put them to the touchstone
for testing is sheer danger, since words are dessert to the envious,
and envy fastens always on the good, but has no quarrel with lesser men.
It was that which feasted on the son of Telamon when it rolled him onto his sword.

The interpretation of this passage is complicated because of some indirect
references to the song and because of Pindar’s evaluation of the figure of
Odysseus. Through the references to the song,[49] the poet speaks of his own
professional activity, which is exposed to the risks of blame; his praise words
are to be defended, since the poet is always on the side of ἐσλοί, and never
on the side of χείρονες (this could be the meaning of line 22, where λόγος
can be interpreted as subject of ἅπτηται). Furthermore, the official referent
of κ., *ad sensum* from line 21, is φθόνος, but this solution is not totally con-
vincing: on one hand, up to this point in the investigation no κ. has referred
to an abstract entity; on the other, κ. begins a small epic section, strongly
visual (cf. lines 23–24). It makes more sense to assume that the referent is
a person. Nagy argues that κ. here is Odysseus,[50] whose name is revealed
some lines afterwards (at line 26). On the basis of *Nemean* 5.22 as a possible
parallel, Odysseus seems to be a good suggestion. Κεῖνος could correspond

---

ἔτραπεν καὶ κεῖνον ἀγάνορι μισθῷ χρυσὸς ἐν χερσὶν φανείς (the referent of κ. is not clear in commentaries;
in any case it is a person who has fallen into lust for gain).

49. νεαρὰ δ’ ἐξευρόντα, for example, refers to music (for εὑρίσκω as a technical musical verb—as well
as ἅπτομαι—cf. at last Imperio 2000, who narrows the metaphorical meaning of βάσανος to that of a poetic
ability to be proven).

50. Nagy 1999, 225.

to a specific strategy, which is to point the finger at Odysseus, who is contrasted with the "good" Ajax[51] even without an explicit judge. Perhaps this is a case of καὶ κ. with postponed καί.[52]

Other examples of κ. in blame contexts are not accompanied by καί. The referents are people whose reputation is made safe from φθόνος or blame.[53]

BEFORE PINDAR

The "oldest" κ. is in the Nestor cup's inscription: Νέστορός : ε[ἰμ]ι : εὔ-ποτ[ον] : ποτέριον : / ἡὸς δ᾽ ἂν τδδε πίεσι : ποτερί[ο] : αὐτίκα <u>κ ῆνον</u> / ἥμερος ηαιρέσει : καλλιστε [φά] γο : Ἀφροδίτες ("I am the cup of Nestor good for drinking. Whoever drinks from this cup, desire for beautifully crowned Aphrodite will seize him instantly").[54] The second part of the inscription seems to be linked to magic incantation.[55] The adverb αὐτίκα side by side with κ ῆνον linguistically underscores the drinker's "magic" transformation. Although the grammatical subject of the sentence is ἵμερος, the pragmatic one—visually focused by κ.—is the drinker, to whom such an event happens.

Beside the oldest κ., I quote the most famous one, in Sappho frag. 31.1–2 φαίνεταί μοι <u>κῆνος</u> ἴσος θέοισιν / ἔμμεν᾽ ὤνηρ, ὅττις ("He seems as fortunate as the gods to me, the man who sits opposite you"). As a point apart from the abundant literature about this *incipit,* I note that κ. is accompanied by almost all the typical features just analyzed: a visual verb (φαίνεται), the "I"-deixis side by side with κ. (which highlights at the same time the distance and the closeness between the two subjects—imaginative or *ad oculos,* it is of little importance), and a cataphoric use with visual anticipation (cf.

---

51. About this opposition and the opposition between Odysseus' λόγοι and the Pindaric λόγος, cf. Calabrese de Feo 1984.

52. Incidentally, I note that the only other occurrence of δάπτειν in Pindar is close to κ. in frag. 222.1–2 (Διὸς παῖς ὁ χρυσός· / <u>κεῖνον</u> οὐ σὴς οὐδὲ κὶς <u>δάπτει</u>).

53. Cf. *Nem.* 5.29–31: <u>ψεύσταν</u> δὲ ποιητὸν συνέπαξε <u>λόγον</u> / ὡς ἦρα νυμφείας ἐπείρα <u>κεῖνος</u> ἐν λέκτροις Ἀκάστου / εὐνᾶς· τὸ δ᾽ ἐναντίον ἔσκεν: (κ. = Peleus, falsely charged with having seduced Hippolyta, Akastus' wife); *Ol.* 8.54–64: εἰ δ᾽ ἐγὼ Μελησία ἐξ ἀγενείων κῦδος ἀνέδραμον ὕμνῳ, / μὴ βαλέτω με λίθῳ τραχεῖ <u>φθόνος</u> / . . . <u>κεῖνα δὲ κεῖνος</u> ἂν εἴποι / ἔργα περαίτερον ἄλλων, τίς τρόπος ἄνδρα προβάσει / ἐξ ἱερῶν ἀέθλων μέλλοντα ποθεινοτάταν δόξαν φέρειν. Although the referent of κ. remains undefined owing to the cataphoric structure (κεῖνος . . . τίς . . .), the intention of the poet is, in my view, to refer to a specific man and to specific activities (i.e., trainings for races). He is praising the qualities of Melesias, the Athenian trainer of the Aeginetan victor Alcimedon, but with caution, because of the political tensions between Athens and Aegina. Finally, I add a controversial passage: *Pyth.* 2.88–90: χρὴ δὲ πρὸς θεὸν <u>οὐκ ἐρίζειν</u>, / ὃς ἀνέχει τοτὲ μὲν τὰ <u>κείνων</u>, τότ᾽ αὖθ᾽ ἑτέροις / ἔδωκεν μέγα κῦδος. ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ ταῦτα νόον / ἰαίνει <u>φθονερῶν</u>. Although it is generally unrecognized by commentators (who are much more focused on the previous and the following sentences), the contrast between κ. and ἑτέροις is curious: it is not between "the ones" and "to the others," but between "to those" and "to the others." This is the only case of κ. that Slater classifies as "without prior reference." In my opinion both κ. and ἕτερος refer to specific people, even though it is difficult to state who they are. The pronoun ἕτερος appears four other times in *Pyth.* 2; and at line 52 a reference to Hieron and Cinyra is generally recognized. As it could be a parallelism between τοτέ . . . τοτ᾽ (line 89) and χὦπόταν . . . χῶταν (lines 87–88), so it could be a parallelism between the persons being respectively named: κείνων (line 89) referring to λάβρος στρατός (line 87) and ἑτέροις (line 89) referring to οἱ σοφοί (line 88). According to this interpretation, the negative connotation of λάβρος is balanced by the positiveness of the verb ἀνέχει (line 89). In any case, the final value of κ. rests on subtle references consciously indicated but not clarified by the poet, which are now inaccessible to us.

54. *SEG* 14 (1957): 604; translation by Faraone.

55. See Faraone 1996.

ὅττις).[56] Moreover, from the emotional point of view, κ. probably summarizes a wonderful, highly poetic ambiguity, between a depreciative feeling and the enduring charm of beauty. The affective attitude of the speaker toward somebody or something both in a positive and in a negative sense through κ. is traceable in other texts, depending on the discourse mode.[57] Particularly interesting is the visual characterization of narrated events or, directly, the presence of *verba videndi.* Some examples from Alcman can be cited: frag. 15: καὶ κῆνος ἐν σάλεσσι πολλοῖς ἥμενος μάκαρς ἀνήρ ("and he, sitting, blessed man, amid much good cheer)," where κ. supports a definitely positive attitude; frag. 3.79–81]α ἴδοιμ' αἴ πως με..ον φιλοῖ / ᾶσ]σον [ἰο]ῖσ' ἀπαλᾶς χηρὸς λάβοι / αἶψά κ' [ἐγὼν ἱ]κέτις κήνας γενοίμαν ("I were to see whether perchance she were to love me. If only she came nearer and took my soft hand, immediately I would become her suppliant"), which is a clear statement of the special relationship between the speakers and Astymeloisa (referent of κ.). Mimnermus frag. 14.1–3 οὐ μὲν δὴ κείνου γε μένος καὶ ἀγήνορα θυμὸν / τοῖον ἐμέο προτέρων πεύθομαι, / οἵ μιν ἴδον / . . . πυκινὰς κλονέοντα φάλαγγας . . . ("That man's strength and heroic spirit were not such [as yours], as I learn from my elders who saw him . . . routing the thick ranks . . .") is another good comparandum for the present investigation: there is an ἰδ-verb, there is a relationship established between κ. and the "I," and, above all, κ. has the function of anticipating the (visual) focus of the next clause: the mysterious warrior is visually pointed out and isolated before describing the stage upon which he is seen in combat (μιν . . . κλονέοντα).[58] Finally, a note on Bacchylides texts: κ. occurs only five times. This fact confirms that the use of κ. in Pindar—relatively frequent and always significant—is intentional, is a feature of Pindaric style.

As far as the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are concerned, I have to contradict Magnien's words: "ἐκεῖνος, ou κεῖνος,[59] ne sert jamais à désigner une personne ou une chose aperçues au loin. Il s'applique le plus souvent à une personne absente, à une chose placée hors de la vue."[60] Actually, visual verbs close to κ. are quite common, and very illustrative of the function of κ. I hypothesize.[61] Also κ. and "I"-deixis side by side are not rare.[62] I would

56. Aloni underscores the presence of the article ὁ (ὤνηρ), which consolidates, in his opinion, a strongly deictic meaning (Aloni 1997, 63).

57. Cf. the following examples of a negative attitude conveyed by κ.: Hipponax frag. 117.10 W, where ἐκεῖνος points out a presumable adversary; Archilochus frag. 200 W, frag. 176.1, where κ. is used adjectivally of πάγος, thereafter defined as hostile, frag. 130.4: κεῖνοις . . . πολλὰ γίνεται κακά and the famous frag. 5.3: τί μοι μέλει ἀσπὶς ἐκείνη; Alcaeus frag. 283.14 V: ἔννεκα κήνας (Helen), frag. 70.6 and frag. 72.7, both with κ. = Pittacus (it is remarkable that in frag. 70 κ. is connected with δάπτω: κῆνος . . . δαπτέτω πόλιν); Stesichorus frag. 223.3 Page, where κείνα = Cypris, angry at Tyndarus' daughters.

58. Nagy connects κ. in this fragment to the appearance of the hero: ". . . deictic pronoun ἐκεῖνος ('that one'), which is conventionally used to refer to a hero who appears in an epiphany"; it stresses "the gap between superhuman and human" (Nagy 2001, p. xxvii, n. 20).

59. Incidentally, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* count 18 cases with ἐκεῖνος against 184 with κεῖνος. In Pindar there is no ἐκεῖνος.

60. Magnien 1922, 157–58.

61. Cf. *Od.* 1.212: ἐκ τοῦ δ' οὔτ' Ὀδυσῆα ἐγὼν ἴδον οὔτ' ἐμὲ κεῖνος, 11.390 (= 11.615): ἔγνω δ' αἶψ' ἐμὲ κεῖνος, ἐπεὶ ἴδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσι, 11.522: κεῖνον δὴ κάλλιστον ἴδον μετὰ Μέμνονα δῖον; cf. also *Il.* 5.604, 6.284, *Od.* 1.163, 1.209, 3.222, 4.149, 6.166, 11.418, 11.528.

62. Cf., for example, *Od.* 17.110 and 112, 23.76, *Il.* 1.271, 7.77, 9.312, 9.646, 10.126, 15.45, 1.201.

draw the attention of the reader to a couple of examples that reveal an un-suspected communicative role of κ. in dialogue. The passages correspond to two crucial moments of the narrative and are delightfully visual. The first is *Odyssey* 24.321 κεῖνος μέν τοι ὅδ᾽ αὐτὸς ἐγώ, πάτερ, ὃν σὺ μεταλλᾷς ("That man am I, father, myself, standing here, of whom you ask"), where the vi-brant revelation of Odysseus in front of his father includes several deictic elements. Among them κ. is not a mark of space deixis (ὅδε does it already), but the mark of his visual appearance ("Look here!"). My second example is even more impressive: in *Odyssey* 14.144–57, during the dialogue between Eumaeus and Odysseus as a beggar, κ. becomes a keyword for the involve-ment of the audience. Initially (149–50), the beggar resumes Eumaeus' words saying ὦ φίλ᾽, ἐπειδὴ πάμπαν ἀναίνεαι, οὐδ᾽ ἔτι φῇσθα / κεῖνον ἐλεύ-σεσθαι . . . ("Friend, since you utterly make denial, and declare that he will never come again . . . "), where κ. is referred to the "far" Odysseus,[63] who actually is hidden under the guise of a beggar. Then, at line 153, another κ., uttered by Eumaeus, refers to the same theoretically "far" and actually close Odysseus: ἐπεί κεν κεῖνος ἰὼν τὰ ἃ δώμαθ᾽ ἵκηται ("as soon as he shall come, and reach his home"). Finally (156–57), Odysseus-beggar comments ἐχ-θρὸς γάρ μοι κεῖνος ὁμῶς Ἀΐδαο πύλῃσι / γίγνεται, ὃς πενίῃ εἴκων ἀπατήλια βάζει ("for hateful in my eyes as the gates of Hades is that man, who, yield-ing to the stress of poverty, tells a deceitful tale"). From the point of view of the listeners, μοι and κεῖνος refer to the same person! Κεῖνος is the visual "bridge"-word between the *demonstratio* (denoting a negative attitude) of a lying beggar and the presence of *the* lying beggar, *that* beggar, that is, Odysseus himself. A last point: in Homer κ. expresses the negative attitude of the speaker toward other people in sentences that contain curses;[64] in these cases κ. is always "cataphoric," namely projected forward.

CONCLUSION

Within the meaning components of κ. I do not discuss either the idea of dis-tance, in terms of exclusion from the "I"-sphere,[65] or the idea of famous-ness, for persons or objects who occupy an important place in the memory of the past or in the praise of the present (which makes κ. close to Lat. *ille*).[66] Also, there are no doubts about its syntactic role, either anaphoric or cataphoric. Rather, I state that κ. is characterized by its own pragmatic force,[67] which is simply added to the ideas mentioned above. This force consists of

---

63. According to de Jong 2001, 25, 59 out of 89 cases of κ. in the *Odyssey* are referred to Odysseus as an absent person.

64. Cf. *Od*. 3.197 (καὶ κεῖνος), 8.209 (+ ἔριδα, line 210), 14.156, *Il*. 9.63, 13.232, 23.404 (+ ἐριζέμεν).

65. See for example *Pyth*. 9.68: κεῖνο κεῖν᾽ ἆμαρ διαίτασεν, where each κ. refers to the event of Apollo and Cyrene's wedding; this is a beautiful example of the emphasis on the temporal distance between past and present.

66. Cf. the cases with κείνου as a genitive of affiliation: *Ol*. 13.75, *Pyth*. 4.144, *Nem*. 1.68, 5.43, 10.14 and 62.

67. "Force," as a concept connected to an utterance (already in Frege 1918), becomes a keyword in Aus-tin 1962; from then on, it connotes "the action side of every speech-act" (Verschueren 1999, 23).

the *demonstratio* by which κ. visually points out—either *ad oculos*[68] or in the listeners' imagination—and of the speaker's speech act underlying its utterance. More than indicating a specific place in space or in time, the pragmatic function of κ. is to permit somebody—mostly—or something to appear that is in principle "far away," but is now suddenly close to the eyes of the public in a specific moment of the performance. This explains the significance of κ. close to the "I"-sphere or to the "you"-sphere,[69] and this is what distinguishes the different kinds of third-person pronouns.[70] With respect to the anaphoric/cataphoric use of κ., I underscore that every time κ. resumes or anticipates, it retrieves visual mental representations and works as a "forward call"; also in the anaphoric cases, the focalization of somebody through κ. is functional to what is coming immediately thereafter.[71] The visual presentation of a mythical event, a current performer's act, and the indication of a person linked to blame are often mixed in a single passage. All these functions show the same basic intention, that is, to use κ. as a keyword of the praise and as a metatextual (metapoetic) way to demonstrate the power of Pindaric song. Some disagreements—or misunderstandings—about the referents of κ. prove that Pindar himself probably consciously exploits κ. to keep a margin of ambiguity: κ. fixes an image, but specific (occasional) inferences and judgments are left to the audience. In this context, κ. becomes a sign of politeness.

In summary, the emphasis of κ. comes from its communicative properties: it is a strong means of intentionality by the poet and of visual involvement by the audience; moreover, Pindar makes it a keyword of his mode of discourse (the praise) and of his strategies of politeness. In the study of Pindaric texts, κ. cannot be considered as an accessory word at all; conversely, it deserves specific attention and its translation should reflect as much as possible its meaningfulness.[72]

Center for Hellenic Studies, Washington D.C.
University of Trento

68. Beyond *Isthm*. 4.43 and other examples of κ. "in presence" of the speaker (cf. the examples in "Close to 'I' Speech Acts," pp. 290–92 above), I cite *Ol*. 6.80–81 (κεῖνος, ὦ παῖ Σωστράτου, / σὺν βαρυγδούπῳ πατρὶ κραίνει σέθεν εὐτυχίαν), where κ. = Hermes Kyllenius. In the perspective of a Stymphalian performance, this κ. should sound apparently deictic: the stately Mount Kyllenius was perfectly visible from the Stymphalian plain, as I have had the opportunity to see myself.

69. In addition to Havers, Kühner and Gerth (1:650) paid attention to the colloquial use of κ. with other demonstratives such as οὗτος; cf. all the examples cited above in "Close to 'I' Speech Acts" and *Ol*. 6.80, 9.53, *Pyth*. 4.144, *Nem*. 5.43; cf. also *Od*. 24.225 (see "Before Pindar" above) and Soph. *OC* 138: ὅδ' ἐκεῖνος ἐγώ.

70. Such as, for example, αὐτός, νιν, ὁ; cf. *Pyth*. 4.69, 125, 210; *Nem*. 3.11, 8.10, 10.14; *Isthm*. 1.17.

71. Visual anticipation overlaps with syntactic cataphora in *Ol*. 8.62, *Pyth*. 4.19, *Parth*. 2.16; even without syntactic cataphora, κ. represents the visual anticipation of its referents also in *Ol*. 6.7, *Nem*. 5.22, 8.23, 10.14, *Isthm*. 5.47; this happens likewise with κ. as adjective, as it is separated from its referent by several words; cf. *Pyth*. 1.25, 2.8, 4.48.

LITERATURE CITED

Adrados, F. R. 1975. *Lingüística Indoeuropea.* Vol. 2. Madrid.

Aloni, A., ed. 1997. *Saffo: Frammenti.* Florence.

Austin, J. L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words.* Oxford.

Bakker, E. J. 1997. *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse.* Ithaca, N.Y., and London.

⸻. 2001. Similes, Augment, and the Language of Immediacy. In *Speaking Volumes: Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World,* ed. J. Watson, 1–23. Mnemosyne Suppl. 218. Leiden.

⸻. 2002. Remembering the God's Arrival. *Arethusa* 35:63–81.

Battisti, C., and G. Alessio. 1968. *Dizionario etimologico italiano.* Florence.

Bazzanella, C. 1995. I segnali discorsivi. In *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione,* ed. L. Renzi, G. Salvi, and A. Cardinaletti, 3:225–57. Bologna.

Bonifazi, A. 2001. *Mescolare un cratere di canti: Pragmatica della poesia epinicia in Pindaro.* Alessandria.

⸻. 2005. Relative Pronouns and Memory: Pindar beyond Syntax. *HSCP* (forthcoming).

Brugmann, K. 1904. *Die Demonstrativpronomina der indogermanischen Sprachen.* Sächs. Abhandlungen 22.6. Leipzig.

Bühler, K. 1965. *Sprachtheorie: Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache.*[2] Stuttgart.

Calabrese De Feo, M. R. 1984. La figura di Aiace in Pindaro. *PP* 39 (215):120–32.

Campbell, D. A., ed. and trans. 1982. *Greek Lyric.* Vol. 1. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.

⸻, ed. and trans. 1988. *Greek Lyric.* Vol. 2. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.

Chantraine, P. 1968. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque.* Paris.

Des Places, E. 1947. *Le pronom chez Pindare.* Paris.

Diessel, H. 1999. *Demonstratives: Form, Function, and Grammaticalization.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia.

Emmott, C. 1997. *Narrative Comprehension: A Discourse Perspective.* Oxford.

Faraone, C. A. 1996. Taking the "Nestor's Cup Inscription" Seriously: Erotic Magic and Conditional Curses in the Earliest Inscribed Hexameters. *ClAnt* 15:77–112.

Fogelmark, S. 1979. καὶ κείνοις: Pindar, *Nemean* 5.22. In *Arktouros: Hellenic Studies Presented to Bernard M. W. Knox on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday,* ed. G. W. Bowersock, W. Burkert, and M. C. J. Putnam, 71–80. Berlin and New York.

Frege, G. 1918. Der Gedanke: Eine logische Untersuchung. In *Beiträge zur Philosophie des deutschen Idealismus,* ed. A. Hoffman and H. Engert, 1:58–77. Erfurt.

Gaisford, T. [1848] 1962. *Etymologicum Magnum.* Reprint, Amsterdam.

Gentili, B. 1984. *Poesia e pubblico nell'antica Grecia.* Rome and Bari.

Gerber, D. E., ed. and trans. 1999. *Greek Elegiac Poetry from the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC.* Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.

Halliday, M. A. K., and R. Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English.* London.

Harris, M. 1978. *The Evolution of French Syntax: A Comparative Approach.* London and New York.

Havers, W. 1906. Das Pronom der Jener-Deixis im Griechischen. *IGForsch* 19:1–98.

Humbert, J. 1945. *Syntaxe grecque.* Paris.

Hummel, P. 1993. *La syntaxe de Pindare.* Louvain and Paris.

Imperio, O. 2000. Pindaro e la pietra di paragone: una metafora poetologica. *Eikasmos* 11:59–70.

Jong, I. J. F. de. 2001. *A Narratological Commentary on the "Odyssey."* Cambridge.

Krummen, E. 1991. *Pyrsos Hymnon: Festliche Gegenwart und mythischen-rituelle Tradition als Voraussetzung einer Pindarinterpretation.* Berlin and New York.

Kühner, R., and B. Gerth. 1955. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache.*[4] Leverkusen.

Lehnus, L. 1984. Pindaro: il *Dafneforico per Agasicle* (Fr. 94b Sn.-M.). *BICS* 31:61–92.

Magnien, V. 1922. Emploi des démonstratifs chez Homère. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguis-tique de Paris* 23:156–83.

Murray, A. T., and G. E. Dimock, ed. and trans. 1995. *Homer: The "Odyssey."* Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.

Nagy, G. 1999. *The Best of the Achaeans*. Rev. ed. Baltimore, Md., and London.

————. 2001. The Sign of the Hero: A Prologue. In *Flavius Philostratus: "Heroikos,"* ed. J. K. Berenson Maclean and E. Bradshaw Aitken, xv–xxxv. Atlanta.

Panigiani, O. 1991. *Vocabolario etimologico della lingua italiana.*[4] La Spezia.

Pokorny, J. 1959. *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch.* Vol. 1. Bern and Munich.

Privitera, G. A. 1982. *Pindaro. Le "Istmiche."* Milan.

Race, W. H., ed. and trans. 1997. *Pindar.* Vol. 1, *"Olympian Odes," "Pythian Odes."* Vol. 2, *"Nemean Odes," "Isthmian Odes," Fragments*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.

Schwyzer, E. 1977. *Griechische Grammatik.*[5] Munich.

Slater, W. J. 1969. *Lexicon to Pindar.* Berlin.

Verschueren, J. 1999. *Understanding Pragmatics.* London, New York, Sydney, and Auckland.

Waanders, F. M. J. 1997. Particulars of Some Proto-Indo-European Particles. In *New Approaches to Greek Particles*, ed. A. Rijksbaron, 269–74. Amsterdam.

Walde, A. 1930. *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der Indogermanischen Sprachen herausgegeben und bearbeitet von Julius Pokorny.* Berlin and Leipzig.