DEFLECTED ADDRESSES: APOSTROPHE AND SPACE (SOPHOCLES, AESCHINES, PLAUTUS, CICERO, VIRGIL AND OTHERS)*

I. APOSTROPHE, ETC.

This article seeks to show that an important feature of ancient poetry and prose has still more to offer than is perhaps recognized. That feature is address. The present piece will concentrate chiefly on more elaborate uses of address, in particular on apostrophe, where the speaker turns his utterance away (ἀποστρέφει) from his actual audience to another hearer. Such figures have been most considered in narrative hexameter poetry; but they run through a great deal of ancient literature. The prime aspects which this piece will bring to bear are suggested by the analysis in linguistics of non-literary discourse and its spatial settings. Our own scene, however, must first be set.

We may begin with some comments on ancient treatments of the subject, and on possible approaches. Ancient literary discussion is highly responsive to such figures. So the bT scholia at a climactic narratorial address to Patroclus (Hom. *Il*. 16.787) heap up considerations that one could 'bring into the apostrophe to see its intense emotion': σοὶ γάρ, ὦ Πάτροκλε, τῶι οὕτως ὑπ᾽ Ἀχιλλέως ἀγαπωμένωι, τῶι πᾶν εἰς σωτηρίαν τῶν Ἑλλήνων πραγματευσαμένωι κτλ. When the narrator says Τυδεΐδην οὐκ ἂν γνοίης ποτέροισι μετείη | ἠὲ μετὰ Τρώεσσιν ὁμιλέοι ἦ μετ᾽ Ἀχαιοῖς (*Il*. 5.85–6), the bT scholia find the apostrophe ἡδύ, and add ἡ δὲ τῆς ἑρμηνείας θερμότης τὸν βεβακχευμένον Διομηδέα δείκνυσιν; this comes quite close to the conception of embedded focalization (where a character's viewpoint comes through the narrator's words). Even the A scholia (Aristonicus) say that the apostrophe is part of the reason for Aristarchus' diple. The scholiasts' sensibility is notable, and their approaches are taken seriously by modern Homerists.[1]

The emphasis on emotion is characteristic. The *Ad Herennium* and Quintilian see the figure as expressing the speaker's strong feeling, and (if aptly used) as generating strong feeling in the listener (*Rhet. Her.* 4.22, Quint. *Inst.* 4.1.63–70,

---

[1] For apostrophe and emotion in Homer, cf. e.g. A. Parry, 'Language and characterization in Homer', *HSPh* (1972), 1–22, at 9–22; E. Block, 'The narrator speaks: apostrophe in Homer and Vergil', *TAPhA* 112 (1982), 7–22; R. Janko, *The Iliad: A Commentary* iv: *Books 13–16* (Cambridge, 1992), 120, 317–18, 411; I.J.F. de Jong, *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey* (Cambridge, 2001), 345 (cautious); tending against, e.g. V.J. Matthews, 'Metrical reasons for apostrophe in Homer', *LCM* 5 (1980), 93–9; N. Yamagata, 'The apostrophe in Homer as part of the oral technique', *BICS* 36 (1989), 91–103. For instances like 5.85–6, cf. I.J.F. de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the* Iliad[2] (London, 2004), 53–60.

9.2.38–9). An emotion particularly often associated with the device is vehemence (σφοδρότης): so [Aristid.] *Ars Rhet.* 1.5.2.2 ii. 494 Spengel, Hermog. *Id.* 1.8 pp. 262–3 Rabe. Sometimes subtlety can be added by feigned friendliness to the addressee (Hermog. *Id.* 1.10 pp. 271–2 Rabe, on Dem. 20.102). Completely different emotions from vehemence can be conveyed and aroused: so in declamation a rapist could show love for the girl by plentiful apostrophe to her; the jury would be helped to sympathy by such figures (Sopat. *Διαίρ. Ζητ.* viii. 365 Walz). Apostrophe can soften as well as stir the listeners' feelings (Alex. Rhet. π. σχημάτων iii. 23–4 Spengel).[2]

To this alert reading and intelligent analysis a classic modern discussion adds wider dimensions. J. Culler, *The Pursuit of Signs*[2] (London, 2001), ch. 7, rejects approaches which see apostrophe as merely conventional, and stresses the role of fiction: the power of the poet to enter into relation with the inanimate world and to escape time and narrative, and the concomitant realization that such power is only a literary construction. The transcendental element is particularly relevant to the poets he discusses, poets of the 'long' nineteenth century (from Blake to Rilke); but awareness of artifice is an essential point for much ancient literature, and one in fruitful tension with the idea of emotion. The metaliterary aspects have been extended, for example, by L. Enterline, *The Rhetoric of the Body from Ovid to Shakespeare* (Cambridge, 2000); she sees in the use of the figure complex relationships between authors, narrators and intertexts, and between narrators, characters and fantasy, in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* as well as in Shakespeare and other writers of his period (see e.g. pp. 51–2, 72–4, 181–7). Among work focussed on ancient hexameter narrative – we should perhaps avoid here the unsatisfactory term 'epic' – one may particularly mention S. Georgacopoulou, *Aux frontières du récit épique : l'emploi de l'apostrophe du narrateur dans la* Thébaïde *de Stace*, Collection *Latomus* 289 (Brussels, 2005) and F. D'Alessandro Behr, *Feeling History: Lucan, Stoicism, and the Poetics of Passion* (Columbus, 2007). One especially valuable aspect of the former book is its emphasis on the focalization through the addressee which apostrophe can produce.[3]

Some types of linguistics could profitably be exploited too; they have not, so far as I know, been much applied to this sort of address. The present piece will be particularly interested in the relation of apostrophe and other such forms to space,

---

[2] For the text of Sopater loc. cit., see D.C. Innes and M. Winterbottom, *Sopatros the Rhetor: Studies in the Text of the Διαίρεσις Ζητημάτων*, *BICS* Suppl. 48 (London, 1988), 287. For [Aelius Aristides] cf. now *P. Oxy.* 4854. Other relevant passages in Hermogenes: *Id.* 1.11 pp. 285–6, 2.1 pp. 313–14, 2.7 pp. 360–1 (cf. Syrian. *Comm. ad Hermog. Id.* i. 83 Rabe). Σ Pl. *Grg.* 489b p. 153 Greene presents Callicles' apostrophe as a demonstration of his θρασύτης: the presentation of emotion is turned into characterization.

[3] See also F. D'Alessandro Behr, 'The narrator's voice: a narratological reappraisal of apostrophe in Virgil's *Aeneid*', *Arethusa* 38 (2005), 189–221. See further A. Bergren, 'Sacred apostrophe: re-presentation and imitation in the Homeric hymns', *Arethusa* 15 (1982), 83–108; L.A. Perraud, '*Amatores exclusi*: apostrophe and separation in the Pyramus and Thisbe episode', *CJ* 79 (1983/4), 135–9; M. Leigh, *Lucan: Spectacle and Engagement* (Oxford, 1997), 307–10. On apostrophe and address in other genres cf. e.g. W. Schadewaldt, *Monolog und Selbstgespräch. Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte der griechischen Tragödie* (Berlin, 1926), 118–35, etc.; E. Greene, 'Apostrophe and women's erotics in the poetry of Sappho', in E. Greene (ed.), *Reading Sappho: Contemporary Approaches* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1996), 233–47. Culler's new preface adds the idea (xxi–xxii) that the reader too speaks the lyric poem. The problems of using the word 'epic' become apparent when we integrate into it didactic and perhaps pastoral; 'didactic epic' carries over without question connotations from hexameter narrative.

and to the general conception of a 'ground' for a given utterance. A few points will supply some context, lightly sketched. Linguistics is increasingly concerned with the basic presuppositions of discourse, with its organization of space, and with the complexities of real conversations. Cognitive linguistics has developed the idea of the **ground**: that is, the basic situation in which the speech takes place (speaker, addressee, setting in time and space, etc.). For cognitive linguists, address is itself a special phenomenon: in it an aspect of the ground, the person addressed, is put 'onstage' and made the object of attention. The ground includes, it will be noticed, a spatial aspect; deixis is seen as creating a relation between a person or thing and the ground. Address, especially sudden address, has affinities with deixis on this view. While the complexity of visual deixis is increasingly acknowledged by linguists, more imaginary and imaginative uses of space and deixis have also been explored. Literary utterances have been included; this sort of extension from ordinary utterance is characteristic of cognitive poetics. In such a context, apostrophe presents an intriguing phenomenon. It produces a notional new ground, but most often within an underlying ground, which involves the original addressee. The new addressee may be located in the spatial setting for the underlying ground, or may be distant from that space. We can suspect, then, that in apostrophe and similar developments the use of space and ground will prove especially complex and rewarding.[4]

II. SOME FAMILY REUNIONS

We can begin from what seems a relatively simple set-up, that of drama. Here the spectator witnesses direct conversation placed in a clear physical space. The artifice of this conception tends to escape us; so we habitually give little thought to watching tragedies on past stories located in other places as if they were here and now. In any case, drama possesses ample scope for intricate exploitation of address, and refined exploitation of space. We will look at scenes of recognition. Here the fact of conscious address between members of families bears particular weight in itself: the ground becomes momentous.[5]

---

[4] Space: see e.g. W. Klein and K. Jungbluth (edd.), *Deixis* (*Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* [*LiLi*] 125) (Stuttgart, 2002); F. Lenz (ed.), *Deictic Conceptualization of Space, Time and Person* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia, 2003). Conversations: see e.g. G. Brown, *Speakers, Listeners and Communication: Explorations in Discourse Analysis* (Cambridge, 1995). Extensions from linguistics to literature, with reference to space: e.g. M.J. Bruhn, 'Place deixis and the schematics of imagined space: Milton to Keats', *Poetics Today* 26 (2005), 387–432; more generally, cf. e.g. E. Semino and J. Culpeper (edd.), *Cognitive Stylistics: Language and Cognition in Text Analysis* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia, 2002). On the ground and the second person, cf. R.W. Langacker, *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction* (New York and Oxford, 2008), 259, 262. Langacker's treatment of the second person brings it close to his conception of deixis: cf. his 'Deixis and subjectivity', in F. Brisard (ed.), *Grounding: The Epistemic Footing of Deixis and Reference*, Cognitive Linguistics Research 21 (Berlin and New York, 2002), 1–28, at 8. For apostrophe as deixis in classical texts, cf. L. Athanassaki, 'Deixis, performance, and poetics in Pindar's *First Olympian Ode*', *Arethusa* 37 (2004), 317–41, at 326. On attention, see e.g. L. Talmy, 'Attention phenomena', in D. Geerarts and H. Cuyckens (edd.), *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics* (Oxford, 2007), 264–93.

[5] For recognition scenes as a form see e.g. E. Cerbo, 'La scena di riconoscimento in Euripide: dall'amebeo alla monodia', *QUCC* 62 (1989) 39–47; W.S. Anderson, 'Resistance to recognition and privileged recognition in Terence', *CJ* 98 (2002/3), 1–8; L. Schaaf, 'Späteuripideische

We can approach the subject from a relatively straightforward instance with little apostrophe, in Menander's *Misoumenos*:

> Δη.   ὦ Ζεῦ, τίν' ὄψιν οὐδὲ προσδ[οκωμένην]
> ὁ[ρ]ῶ; Κρ. τί βούλει, τηθία; τί μοι λαλεῖς;
> πατὴρ ἐμὸς ποῦ; Δη. παιδίον, Κράτεια. [Κρ. τίς]
> καλεῖ με; πάππα, χαῖρε πολλά, φίλτατ[ε].
> Δη.   ἔχω σε, τέκνον. Κρ. ὦ ποθούμενος φαν[είς,]
> ὁρῶ σ', ὃν οὐκ ἂν ὠιόμην ἰδεῖν ἔτι.   (610–15 Arnott)

Demeas is initially at a distance from his daughter on stage, and does not address her as he wonders at the sight. If ὦ Ζεῦ has a touch of address, that only heightens the distance from communication with Crateia. Crateia initially talks to her nurse, and speaks of her father in the third person. He then calls her with the name which identifies her as his daughter, and a vocative, παιδίον, which expresses their relationship. When she sees him, she responds with a still more intimate vocative, πάππα. As they come together in language, so they do in space; they join bodies in the emotional and symbolic action of an embrace – an under-studied stage event.[6]

That scene prepares us for a more richly developed scene in Plautus' *Rudens*. In the stage space, characters' and audience's visual attention has narrowed to focus on a trunk, and inside the trunk a box; the box contains the tokens that will prove Palaestra is Daemones' daughter. The reluctant Gripus is to open the trunk:

> DAEM. aperi. uideo cistellam. haecinest?
> PAL. istaec est. o mei parentes, hic uos conclusos gero,
> huc opesque spesque uestrum cognoscendum condidi.
> GRIP. tum tibi hercle deos iratos esse oportet, quisquis es,
> quae parentis tam in angustum tuos locum compegeris.
> DAEM. Gripe, accede huc; tua res agitur. tu, puella, istinc procul
> dicito quid insit et qua facie; memorato omnia.   (1143–9)

Here Palaestra, remarkably, locates her parents in the object which will help her find them. Her passionate interpretation of space is bound up with the intense address to her parents, in a sudden new ground. The intensity is mocked but not destroyed by Gripus (less striking is *Curc.* 605–6). The shift between *haecine*, *istaec*, and *hic* (1143–4) is not to be explained by Palaestra moving across the

---

Dramenformen und ihre Fortsetzung in der Neuen Komödie', *WJA* 26 (2002), 39–51; R. Raffaelli, '"Colle regole non va". Vere e false agnizioni nell'*Epidicus* di Plauto', *MD* 59 (2008), 167–73. For ancient critical discussion of recognition scenes see e.g. N.J. Richardson, 'Recognition scenes in the *Odyssey* and ancient literary criticism', *PLLS* 4 (1983), 219–35; T. Cave, *Recognitions: A Study in Poetics* (Oxford, 1988), especially 27–54; B. Simon, 'Recognition in Greek tragedy: psychoanalytic on Aristotelian perspectives', in P.L. Rudnystky and E.H. Spitz (edd.), *Freud and Forbidden Knowledge* (New York and London, 1994), 109–27.

⁶ The fullest treatment is in M. Kaimio, *Physical Contact in Greek Tragedy: A Study of Stage Conventions* (Helsinki, 1988), ch. 4. For embrace in supplication see M. Telò, 'Per una grammatica dei gesti nella tragedia greca (II): la supplica', *MD* 49 (2002), 9–51 (25 for *Rud.* 272–81). For photographs of *P. Oxy.* 2656 here see E.G. Turner, *New Fragments of the* Misoumenos *of Menander*, *BICS* Suppl. 17 (London, 1965), pls III and IV; the separate contributions of *P. Berol.* 13281 and *P. Oxy.* 2656 are not marked in the text above. On πάππα, used only in this play of extant Menander, cf. E. Dickey, *Greek Forms of Address: From Herodotus to Lucian* (Oxford, 1996), 81, 222–3, adding Philem. fr. 43 K–A. For the exclamation ὦ Ζεῦ in this context cf. also Longus 4.21.3. It should be said that elsewhere Menander offers many rewarding apostrophes: cf. *Asp.* 213, *Dysc.* 197, *Leuc.* 1–3 (*P. Oxy.* 4024), *Mis.* 1–5, *Sam.* 325–7.

stage: it is apparent from 1148–9 that she is still at a distance, and must remain so to describe the tokens without seeing them. Rather, the change to *hic* and *huc* provides an emotional deixis: Palaestra feels close to the object, which she says that she 'holds' (*gero*), though now not literally. Ironically, the interlocutor from whom she turns her speech away is her real father. The play must move her to addressing him as such, as it must move him from the mere address *puella* (1148); it must invest the ground of their exchange with a new meaning for them. It must also bring both of them spatially together.[7]

Here we may press the pause button, and survey another powerful scene of altering address and visual focus. Sophocles' Electra has her attention fixed on the urn which she holds; it contains, she believes, what remains of her brother. She has addressed him within the urn, and finally begged him to take her into 'this dwelling of yours' (τὸ σὸν τόδε στέγος, 1165–7) – not the palace. Her surprising and intimate treatment of space heightens the impact of the ground. Orestes, who realizes Electra's identity, is concerned with a different physical object: her body, the state of which shocks him. He must get her to put down the urn. His purpose, or rather the play's, is that she should shift her attention from the object where she wrongly locates her brother to her brother's real body; she should change from holding the urn to holding him.

Ορ.	μέθες τόδ᾽ ἄγγος νῦν, ὅπως τὸ πᾶν μάθηις ...	1205
Ηλ.	μή, πρὸς γενείου, μὴ ᾽ξέληι τὰ φίλτατα.	1208
Ορ.	οὔ φημ᾽ ἐάσειν. Ηλ. ὦ τάλαιν᾽ ἐγὼ σέθεν,	
	Ὀρέστα, τῆς σῆς εἰ στερήσομαι ταφῆς ...	
Ορ.	ἄτιμος οὐδενὸς σύ· τοῦτο δ᾽ οὐχὶ σόν.	1215
Ηλ.	εἴπερ γ᾽ Ὀρέστου σῶμα βαστάζω τόδε.	
Ορ.	ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ Ὀρέστου, πλὴν λόγωι γ᾽ ἠσκημένον ...	
Ηλ.	ἦ ζῆι γὰρ ἁνήρ; Ορ. εἴπερ ἔμψυχός γ᾽ ἐγώ.	1221
Ηλ.	ἦ γὰρ σὺ κεῖνος; ...	
Ηλ.	ὦ φθέγμ᾽, ἀφίκου; Ορ. μηκέτ᾽ ἄλλοθεν πύθηι.	1225
Ηλ.	ἔχω σε χερσίν; Ορ. ὡς τὰ λοίπ᾽ ἔχοις ἀεί.	
Ηλ.	ὦ φίλταται γυναῖκες, ὦ πολίτιδες,	
	ὁρᾶτ᾽ Ὀρέστην τόνδε ...	

---

[7] On Palaestra's supposed movement cf. F. Marx, *Plautus. Rudens. Text und Kommentar* (ASAW 38.5, Berlin, 1928), 200. For discussion of the scene, see e.g. E. Lefèvre, *Diphilos und Plautus. Der* Rudens *und sein Original* (AAWM Jg. 1984.10, Stuttgart, 1984), 18–21; M. Telò, 'La scena di riconoscimento nello *Ione* di Euripide e Plauto, *Rudens* 1134', *SCO* 46 (1998), 909–17; V.J. Rosivach, 'Plautus, *Rudens* 1114, and the power of discourse', *CW* 93 (1999/2000), 261–5, especially 264. For Plautus' exploitation of objects, cf. R.C. Ketterer, 'Stage properties in Plautine comedy I–III', *Semiotica* 58 (1986), 193–216, 59 (1986), 93–135, 60 (1986), 29–72, especially 40–4 for the *uidulus* in the *Rudens* (on which cf. Marx [above], 183–4; R. Calderan, *Tito Maccio Plauto.* Vidularia. *Introduzione, testo critico e commento* [Palermo, 1982], 137–8); D. Di Benedetto, 'La costruzione della trama dei *Menaechmi* di Plauto: la pazzia, gli occhi, il mantello', in G. Petrone (ed.), *Lo sperimentalismo di Plauto* (Palermo, 1999), 62–77, at 68–73; C.W. Marshall, *The Stagecraft and Performance of Roman Comedy* (Cambridge, 2006), 66–72, especially 71. For turning away in dialogue, cf. D.J. Mastronarde, *Contact and Discontinuity: Some Conventions of Speech and Action on the Greek Tragic Stage* (University of California Publications Classical Studies 21, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1979), especially 74–8. In the present case, as commonly in drama, there does not remain beneath the new ground a clear underlying ground (with the original addressee); the use of the device is in this respect simpler than in later Latin poetry.

The urn is or contains τὰ φίλτατα (1208). Electra impulsively addresses Orestes (1209–10), as someone quite distinct from the brutal stranger. She again uses his name (1216), not realizing that the name belongs to her interlocutor. The second and third persons are wonderingly juxtaposed as the truth dawns (1221–2); she unites the person she is hearing and speaking to with the brother she has long awaited (1225). Then her body and his come together in an amazed embrace (1226). She can finally turn to address the chorus (1227), bid them share the sight (1228), and locate the name in its rightful place: Ὀρέστην τόνδε.[8]

With that handling of address and space in view, we can return to the scene in the *Rudens*. The truth is elaborately unfolded, at Plautine pace. When Palaestra actually gives her father's name, inscribed on one of the tokens, as 'Daemones', Daemones does not address her as daughter, but breaks off: *di immortales, ubi loci sunt spes meae?* (1161). His spatial language relates to hers earlier (*huc opesque* **spes**que uestrum cognoscendum condidi*, 1145); he remains in uncertainty. His growing conviction that this is his daughter is still expressed in the third person, to Gripus (*filiam meam esse hanc oportet, Gripe*, 1165). Finally, emotion impels him to the second person, to *filia mea* as an address, to an equation of himself with *pater* and the name *Daemones*, and to an embrace:

> DAEM. ea est profecto. contineri quin complectar non queo.
> filia mea, salue. ego is sum qui te produxi pater,
> ego sum Daemones, et mater tua eccam hic intus Daedalis.
> PAL. salue, mi pater insperate. DAEM. salue. ut te amplector libens!
>
> (1172–5)

The stage space acquires new meaning for Palaestra; she can now link her mother and the name on another token (1163–4) to one of the stage buildings. The most important object on stage is now her father; the use of *pater* with *mi* and *insperate* is full of meaning and changed mental orientation (cf. for example *Cur.* 641, 657–8, *Men.* 1125, 1132, *Poen.* 1259–61). She will later embrace her mother in the house; that moment will be presented only through the words of Daemones, who will with a nice twist find his wife's recognition scene irritating and tasteless (1202–4). As Palaestra addresses and is embraced by her father, her earlier apostrophe has been superseded, and her conception of the spatial situation altered; her parents are no longer carried by her *hic … conclusos* (1144). Ground and space now express the union; the apostrophe was part of a distinctive development in both.[9]

III. AESCHINES VS DEMOSTHENES

We may turn now to oratory. This form of discourse is further from conversation than drama is; but Greek rhetoric is aware of the potential of address from an

---

[8] P.J. Finglass in his excellent new commentary (*Sophocles,* Electra*: Edited with Introduction and Commentary* [Cambridge, 2007], 456–7) sees in the dispute only the symbolism of abandoning a belief in Orestes' death, and Orestes' attempt to break the news gently. See also L. MacLeod, Dolos *and* Dike *in Sophocles'* Electra, *Mnemosyne* Suppl. 219 (Leiden, Boston, Cologne, 2001), 158–9, with literature. The urn is well discussed by C. Segal, *Tragedy and Civilization: An Interpretation of Sophocles* (Cambridge, MA, and London, 1981), 278–80.

[9] For the spatial setting of the recognition with Daedalis cf. N.E. Andrews, 'Tragic re-presentation and the semantics of space in Plautus' *Casina*', *Mnemosyne* 57 (2004), 445–64.

early stage. An illustration may be provided from historiographical rhetoric: the speech of the Thebans at Thucydides 3.62–7. Discussion of this speech has not sufficiently stressed that, while the beginning and end of the speech (62 and 67) are addressed to the Spartan judges whom the speech must persuade, the main part of it (63–6) is addressed to the Plataeans whom they want destroyed. This structure conveys, on the speakers' level, the Thebans' passionate desire for justice and their rebuttal of Plataean slander; on the historian's level, it conveys the bitter feud between the two peoples.

πῶς οὐ δεινὰ εἴργασθε; … ὅμως φατὲ ἡμᾶς παρανομῆσαι καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀξιοῦτε μὴ ἀντιδοῦναι δίκην. οὔκ, ἤν γε οὗτοι τὰ ὀρθὰ γιγνώσκωσιν· πάντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἕνεκα κολασθήσεσθε.   (66.3)

The un-Thucydidean simplicity of syntax displays the Thebans' hate-filled vehemence. Emotion is expressed and exposed through a ground which is formally secondary but in a sense fundamental: speech with the enemy.[10]

   Much exploitation of address is presented by the encounter of Aeschines and Demosthenes over Ctesiphon's proposal that Demosthenes should receive a golden garland. Some version of these speeches was actually delivered. The use of apostrophe in Demosthenes' *On the Crown* receives careful discussion in ancient criticism; we may progress further by looking instead at Aeschines' matching speech, and in the main at extensions of address other than apostrophe. Demosthenes addresses Aeschines more than Aeschines addresses either Demosthenes (who had not yet been called to speak) or Ctesiphon. But Aeschines' speech displays much arresting use of address; we shall look at some of its last part.[11]

   Aeschines uses apostrophe straightforwardly in dissuading Ctesiphon from calling Demosthenes to speak. … καὶ τί δεῖ σε Δημοσθένην παρακαλεῖν; ὅταν δ᾽ … παρακαλῇις κακοῦργον ἄνθρωπον καὶ τεχνίτην λόγων, κλέπτεις τὴν ἀκρόασιν, βλάπτεις τὴν πόλιν, καταλύεις τὴν δημοκρατίαν (200). Through this new ground he is seeking to avert a future ground within the same space of the court, and the physical movement of Demosthenes to the defendant's platform. The point is strengthened, and address complicated, when he turns to whoever the first person

---

[10] Address to someone other than the jury early in oratory: cf. Gorg. B 11a.22–7 D–K, and e.g. Andoc. *Myst.* 95, 99; S.C. Todd, *A Commentary on Lysias, Speeches 1–11* (Oxford, 2007), 470, 636. Discussions of the Thebans' speech: e.g. C. Macleod, *Collected Essays* (Oxford, 1983), 237–42; S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides* i: *Books I–III* (Oxford, 1991), 444–5; C. Orwin, *The Humanity of Thucydides* (Princeton, 1994), 70–5.

[11] Both speeches were later much admired, cf. e.g. Cic. *Opt. Gen.* 14; J.F. Kindstrand, *The Stylistic Evaluation of Aeschines in Antiquity* (Uppsala, 1982). The unusually negative approach to Aeschines at Hermog. *Id.* 2.11 p. 399 Rabe is probably influenced by Demosthenes; cf. G. Martino, 'Lo stile di Eschine tra ΣΕΜΝΟΤΗΣ e ΤΡΑΧΥΤΗΣ. Due guidizi antichi: Demostene e Ermogene', *SIFC* 3ᵃ ser. 18 (2000), 209–24. For the situation of the speech see e.g. H. Wankel, *Demosthenes. Rede für Ktesiphon über den Kranz* (2 vols., Heidelberg, 1976), 1. 8–41; E.M. Harris, *Aeschines and Athenian Politics* (New York and Oxford, 1995), 138–48; C. Carey, *Aeschines* (Austin, 2000), 159–62; H. Yunis, *Demosthenes:* On the Crown (Cambridge, 2001), 7–12. Aeschines' other speeches have received more treatment: cf. especially N. Fisher, *Aeschines, Against Timarchos: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (Oxford, 2001); Th. Paulsen, *Die Parapresbeia-Reden des Demosthenes und des Aeschines. Kommentar und Interpretationen zu Demosthenes, or. XIX, und Aeschines, or. II*, Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium Bd. 40 (Trier, 1999). Hyperides apostrophizes Diondas only at p. 8.3–9 of the new fragments: C. Carey et al., 'Fragments of Hyperides' *Against Diondas* from the Archimedes Palimpsest', *ZPE* 165 (2008), 1–19, at 11.

might be that approves Ctesiphon's request to call Demosthenes. After graphically presenting that speaker's hypothetical shout ʿκάλει, κάλειʾ, Aeschines rounds on him: ἐπὶ σαυτὸν καλεῖς, ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμους καλεῖς, ἐπὶ τὴν δημοκρατίαν καλεῖς (202). The tricolon is strengthened from that in 200 (cf. Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 9). Between the ground in which Aeschines addresses the jury and the future ground in which Demosthenes addresses them, the imagined speaker's shout creates a new ground; Aeschines vigorously interrupts this through a ground of his own. The new addressee is drawn as if from the real addressees; but turning him into an individual enables a fierce rebuke, which should deter the actual listeners. This rebuke adds a metaphorically spatial dimension to the imagined speaker's act of calling: Demosthenes will move against laws and democracy.[12]

Aeschines then hypothesizes that Demosthenes will be called, and tries to organize that future ground. He wishes the jury to talk back, to fight unremittingly with Demosthenes as if they were boxers (206, cf. Polyb. 1.57.1). He gives them replies to make to Demosthenes (208–10): they are Aeschines' addressees in the underlying ground of the speech, but they become speakers in the future ground.

περὶ δὲ τῶν δακρύων καὶ τοῦ τόνου τῆς φωνῆς, ὅταν ὑμᾶς ἐπερωτᾶι ʿποῖ φύγω, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι; περιεγράψατέ με ἐκ τῆς πολιτείας· οὐκ ἔστιν ὅποι ἀναπτήσομαιʾ, ἀνθυποβάλλετε αὐτῶι ʿὁ δὲ δῆμος ὁ Ἀθηναίων ποῖ καταφύγηι, Δημόσθενες; πρὸς ποίαν συμμάχων παρασκευήν; πρὸς ποῖα χρήματα; ἐκλιπὼν μὲν τὸ ἄστυ οὐκ οἰκεῖς, ὡς δοκεῖς, ἐν Πειραιεῖ, ἀλλ᾽ ἐξορμεῖς ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, ἐφόδια δὲ πεπόρισαι τῆι σαυτοῦ ἀνανδρίαι τὸ βασιλικὸν χρυσίον καὶ τὰ δημόσια δωροδοκήματα. [210] ὅλως δὲ τί τὰ δάκρυα; τίς ἡ κραυγή; τίς ὁ τόνος τῆς φωνῆς; οὐχ ὁ μὲν τὴν γραφὴν φεύγων ἐστὶ Κτησίφων ... ; σὺ δ᾽ οὔτε περὶ τῆς οὐσίας οὔτε περὶ τοῦ σώματος οὔτε περὶ τῆς ἐπιτιμίας ἀγωνίζηι.ʾ ἀλλὰ περὶ τίνος ἐστὶν αὐτῶι ἡ σπουδή; ...   (209–10)

The device of suggesting replies is found before (Apollod. [Dem.] 49.63, Dem. 21.204); what makes this passage particularly striking is the use of space. Within the space of the court, the setting of the present and future ground, Demosthenes will claim he has no other space to flee to (cf. Din. 1.102). The jury are to convert this standard rhetoric into metaphorical space: where can the Athenian people flee to? Aeschines also conjures up graphically the physicality of Demosthenes' future speech; his characteristic tears, shouting, and high pitch are assailed as he in his speech assails Aeschines' actorly delivery. Aeschines will shortly present an image of Demosthenes' very head, the head which is to be crowned, covered with the marks of cuts and punches – all part of Demosthenes' legal scheming (212).[13]

---

[12] In these speeches the jury is nearly always addressed by both Aeschines and Demosthenes as ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, to emphasize the civic nature of the trial: see G. Martin, 'Forms of address in Athenian courts', *MH* 63 (2006), 75–88, at 82, and also A.O. Wolpert, 'Addresses to the jury in the Attic orators', *AJPh* 124 (2003), 537–55, at 547–8; A. Kurihara, 'Personal enmity as a motivation in forensic speeches', *CQ* 53 (2003), 464–77, at 471–3.

[13] The speech of the jury is finished at the end of 209 in all editions that I have seen. However, the question about the tears and shouting, which would fit well into the jury's future objections, makes much less sense when they have not actually been witnessed yet; the use of the article is particularly odd. Besides this, ancient speeches of any substance are usually followed by a mention of the speaking; the sharp question with ἀλλά after ἀγωνίζηι would explain the absence of such a mention, as the start of 210 would not. For the role of ὅλως δέ cf. e.g. 1.17. On Demosthenes' exclamation here, cf. R.L. Fowler, 'The rhetoric of desperation', *HSPh* 91 (1987), 5–38, esp. 35. For Aeschines' and Demosthenes' attack on each other's speaking cf. N. Worman, *Abusive Mouths in Classical Athens* (Cambridge, 2008), ch. 5, esp. 260–72; see also P. Easterling, 'Actors and voices: reading between the lines in Aeschines and Demosthenes', in

Thus oratory too, though in its set-up more remote than drama from ordinary speech, can show powerful deployment of ground and space in its elaborate treatment of address.

IV. MILO

To turn to Latin oratory: Cicero's speech *Pro Milone* offers a still more complicated basic set-up than Aeschines', and one still further removed from conversation. The reader of the speech which Cicero circulated is acutely conscious that this is not what Cicero actually said: this is a fictional version, and is to be set against the actual trial, at which Cicero was forced by circumstances to fail. The situation of the writer is sharply distinguished from that of the speaker within the speech; hence apostrophe in the speech is, on one level, a fiction within a fiction.[14]

The passages that we will consider show the use of address to further the religious, philosophical, patriotic and personal elements in the speech as a whole. The first passage, 85, is one mentioned by Quintilian in talking of apostrophe (*Inst.* 9.2.38). Cicero is arguing that the gods, not Milo, purposed Clodius' death. His invocation of Jupiter Latiaris thus forms part of an argument directed to the *iudices*; it underlines that the divine (*illa uis*, 84) exists and acts, and that he and the jury share in this belief. Hence the new ground of address to the god is underlain by the original ground of address to the jury; the relative clauses are part of the argument directed to them.

tuque ex tuo edito monte Latiari, | sancte Iuppiter, | cuius ille lacus, nemora finisque | saepe omni nefario stupro | et scelere macularat, | aliquando ad eum puniendum | oculos aperuisti. |

At the same time, the address confers religious solemnity on the event, and so makes part of a subterranean argument that Milo should be acquitted because the event is to be welcomed. The all-present god and the absent place of his cult are drawn together in the medium of address to a deity.[15]

S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (edd.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge, 1999), 154–66, and (on Demosthenes 19 and Aeschines 2) C.J. Classen, 'The speeches in the courts of law: a three-cornered dialogue', *Rhetorica* 9 (1991), 195–207.

[14] On Cicero's failure and the other version of the speech see nn. 15, 18 and 19 below. It may be suspected that Cicero's show of (uncharacteristic) alarm conveniently extracted him from a dilemma: he had to defend Milo, but a successful defence would have greatly displeased Pompey. Cic. *Att.* 9.7.3 is interesting, however we interpret it. As he seems unlikely to be disapproving of Milo's *causa* (so D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero's Letters to Atticus* iv [Cambridge, 1968], 368), he perhaps means that he reluctantly followed his benefactor Pompey in the case of Milo.

[15] On the theodicy see A.R. Dyck, 'Narrative obfuscation, philosophical *topoi*, and tragic patterning in Cicero's *Pro Milone*', *HSPh* 98 (1998), 219–41, at 233–9; A.M. Riggsby, 'The *post reditum* speeches', in J.M. May (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric* (Leiden, Boston, Cologne, 2002), 159–95, at 188–9. Cf. also on the passage J.M. May, 'The *ethica digressio* and Cicero's *Pro Milone*: a progression of intensity from *logos* to *ethos* to *pathos*', *CJ* 74 (1978/9), 240–6, at 242–3. On the role of 72–91 in the speech see J. Wisse, 'The riddle of the *Pro Milone*', in J. Powell (ed.), Logos*: Rational Argument in Classical Rhetoric*, *BICS* Suppl. 96 (London, 2007), 35–68, at 50–1 and 66. In my view, the extant speech is a coherent piece of persuasion; otherwise, A.M. Stone, '*Pro Milone*; Cicero's second thoughts', *Antichthon* 14 (1980), 88–111; D.H. Berry, 'Pompey's legal knowledge – or lack of it: Cic.

This climactic address to Jupiter is preceded by a more fantastic address to the sacred places of Alba. The idea of their participation, embodied in the address, forms on one level an *a fortiori* argument (if even the places were involved, how great the divine concern!). On another level, the fantasy of the address (cf. Quint. *Inst*. 11.1.33–4) shows the speaker's extreme emotion, and draws the listener into a heady amalgam of fiction, religion and impassioned feeling:

uos enim iam, | Albani tumuli atque luci, | uos, inquam, imploro atque testor, | uosque, Albanorum obrutae arae, | sacrorum populi Romani sociae et aequales, | quas ille praeceps amentia | caesis prostratisque sanctissimis lucis | substructionum insanis molibus oppresserat | …

The repeated *atque* + consonant demonstrates the stylistic elevation. The speaker and audience are taken into an imagined spatial situation separate from the 'actual' situation of the speech; this imagined situation the address keeps present even while the pluperfects mark the event of the death as past. And with so exalted a passage the peroration has not yet been reached.[16]

In the peroration Cicero aims to surmount even heights already achieved, in a supreme conquest of emotional extremity. The passage is filled with addresses. These include a spatially and personally close address: to Milo himself. Cicero's defence speeches normally avoid address to the client, not to the prosecution: the *patronus*' authority would be impeded by too personal a note of involvement with the client, except at extreme moments. Here Cicero reports his intimate conversations with Milo, and then:

haec tu mecum saepe his absentibus, | sed isdem audientibus | haec ego tecum, Milo: | 'te quidem, cum isto animo sis, satis laudare non possum, | sed, quo est ista magis diuina uirtus, | eo maiore a te dolore diuellor. | nec uero, si mihi eriperis, | reliqua est illa saltem ad consolandum querela | ut eis irasci possim a quibus tantum uolnus accepero. | non enim inimici mei | te mihi eripient, | sed amicissimi, | non male aliquando | de me meriti, sed semper optime.' |

(99)

The basic ground of the speech is reorganized in this passage: the addressees are included in the ground, but as a third-person object of attention. The device is less challenging than direct address, but more embarrassing. The listeners see themselves from a different viewpoint. The significance of space is sharpened: speaker and addressee, still together in this part of the forum, will be removed from each other by the jury's decision. Speaker and addressee have a divergent attitude to space, mirrored in their physical stance (imagined by the reader): Cicero

weeping, Milo impassive. Cicero sees Milo's exile from Rome as appalling; Milo, with philosophical and heroic sublimity, sees it as irrelevant.[17]

Some particularly notable addressees are the very soldiers who surround the trial. They are a significant part of the alarming situation which Cicero presents at the beginning (1–5); that passage will be designed to point to the actual circumstances which made Cicero fail in his defence.[18]

uos, uos appello, fortissimi uiri, | qui multum pro re publica sanguinem | effudistis; uos, inquam, in ciuis inuicti | periculo appello, | centuriones, | uosque, milites: | uobis non modo inspectantibus sed etiam armatis | et huic iudicio praesidentibus | haec tanta uirtus | ex hac urbe expelletur, exterminabitur, proicietur? |

A reinterpretation of space and ground takes place. The soldiers are no longer external and extraneous to the theatre of communication which they ring; they themselves are made part of Cicero's appeal. They are to see their special similarity to Milo, another brave and patriotic fighter. *uirtus* has modulated from the preceding sentences (*exsilium ibi esse putat ubi uirtuti non sit locus* | etc.): it now has military rather than philosophical resonance, to suit the new addressees – and affect the 'real' ones. The inventiveness and force of this oratory is not at all inhibited by the intricate fiction of the whole speech; space is not employed any the less potently.[19]

V. THE MOON

This brings us, finally, to Latin non-dramatic poetry. Here the use of such figures is particularly complex; but, especially outside hexameter narrative, appreciation is hampered by scholarly convention. Apostrophe is frequently underinterpreted, since it is thought to be frequently a mere metrical convenience. To avoid objection on this basis, we may briefly mention one passage where the view has been voiced. At Ovid, *Heroides* 16.265–8, Paris, writing to Helen, wishes for more straightforward circumstances:

---

[17] Cf. 98, 101. Fonteius is addressed at *Font*. 49. On Milo's unmoved bearing and refusal to show grief cf. Plut. *Cic*. 35.5. For Cicero's visual exploitations cf. V. Pöschl, 'Zur Einbeziehung anwesender Personen und sichtbarer Objekte in Ciceros Reden', in A. Michel and R. Verdière (edd.), *Ciceroniana : hommages à Kazimierz Kumaniecki* (Leiden, 1975), 206–26. For philosophical (Stoic) argument that exile is no evil cf. e.g. Cic. *Parad*. 2.18, Sen. *Helv*. 6–10.

[18] Note the importance of the soldiers at *Opt. Gen*. 10, Asc. *Mil*. 36 Clark, Luc. 1.319–23, 2.479–80, Quint. *Inst*. 2.20.8, Plut. *Cic*. 35.5, Dio Cass. 40.54.2. Cic. *Att*. 9.14.2 indicates how soon Pompey could be presented as using force to ensure Milo's exile. The benign interpretation at Cic. *Mil*. 3 should not too readily be assumed as Cicero's real interpretation at the time, or later.

[19] On the opening of the *Pro Milone* cf. L. Fotheringham, 'Cicero's fear: multiple readings of *pro Milone* 1–4', *MD* 57 (2006), 63–83. Plutarch and Dio will draw on earlier sources, such as Livy (cf. *Per*. 107). Even if they are based purely on Cicero (cf. A.R. Dyck, 'The "other" *Pro Milone* reconsidered', *Philologus* 146 [2002], 182–5, at 182–3; C. Steel, *Reading Cicero: Genre and Performance in Late Republican Rome* [London, 2005], 117–18), Cicero's failure and his delivery of something significantly different from the extant version must be regarded as historical (otherwise on the latter J.N. Settle, 'The trial of Milo and the other *Pro Milone*', *TAPhA* 94 [1963], 268–80).

> di facerent pretium magni certaminis esses,
>   teque suo posset uictor habere toro! –
> ut tulit Hippomenes Schoeneida praemia cursus,
>   uenit ut in Phrygios Hippodamia sinus,
> ut ferus Alcides Acheloia cornua fregit,
>   dum petit amplexus, Deianira, tuos.   (263–8)[20]

Even if Ovid were motivated only by the need to include the word *Deianira*, the apostrophe in 268 would hardly have no effect on the reader. This final example is climactic, and occupies a whole couplet. Line 268 is taken up three lines later, with address to Helen: *nunc mihi nil superest nisi te, formosa, precari | amplectique tuos, si patiare, pedes*. *Alcides* and *Deianira, tuos* are argumentatively opposed to *nostra* (Paris) and *teque* (Helen), at the beginnings of 269 and 270. *tuos* 268 at the end of the sentence will seem a striking rather than an unnoticed turn away from the second persons at the beginning of the sentence, with an emphatic *te* at the beginning of 264. We may suppose there is a point to the apostrophe that goes beyond lively variation.[21]

The address in 268 mimics Hercules' ardour; note *Σ* Hom. *Il.* 5.85 in § I above, Verg. *G.* 3.392–3 below, and cf. for example Cat. 64.69–70 *toto ex te pectore, Theseu, | toto animo, tota pendebat perdita mente*, 253 *te quaerens, Ariadna, tuoque incensus amore*. The new ground artificially engages Paris' emotion in Hercules' fierce action to win Deianira's embrace. It thus heightens the contrast with Paris' nervous embrace of Helen's feet in the real world, which is all he could attempt – if Helen allowed it. The free and the inhibited used of space are bound up with the contrasted grounds. This comes in a poem elaborately distanced from speech: Paris is writing, and Ovid is writing his writing.[22]

Another example will show more of the intricacy which these figures can attain in Latin poetry. They are no less important in Virgil's didactic hexameter than in his narrative hexameter, though much less discussed. At *Georgics* 3.387–93 the didactic narrator is dwelling on the importance of breeding white sheep:

> illum autem, quamuis aries sit candidus ipse,
> nigra subest udo tantum cui lingua palato
> reice, ne maculis infuscet uellera pullis
> nascentum, plenoque alium circumspice campo.
> munere sic niueo lanae, si credere dignum est,
> Pan deus Arcadiae captam te, Luna, fefellit
> in nemora alta uocans; nec tu aspernata uocantem.

The ground formally shifts for the last three lines, where Luna is addressed. At the same time, those lines are an argument directed to the addressee in the underlying ground, the pupil: white is best, as its effect on the goddess proves. The apostrophe can be seen as a means of drawing attention which is more extreme than ordinary

---

[20] E.J. Kenney in his fine commentary writes here 'in O. it [such an address] is often used for purely technical reasons' (*Ovid: Heroides XVI–XXI* [Cambridge, 1996], 114, cf. 263); A.N. Michalopoulos, *Ovid, Heroides 16 and 17: Introduction, Text and Commentary* (Cambridge, 2006), 228, is somewhat less austere.

[21] For the clash of addressees (cf. Michalopoulos in n. 20 above), note J.F. Miller, 'Apostrophe, aside and the didactic addressee: poetic strategies in *Ars Amatoria* III', *MD* 31 (1993), 231–41, at 236–8.

[22] Note also the connection of 268 with 216: Menelaus *te tenet, amplexu perfruiturque tuo*.

address, and can also be seen as a form of deixis, within the new ground. To add
to the complications, even the underlying ground of teaching is an artifice; and *si
credere dignum est* calls the argument into question.[23]

The spatial aspects of the lines are linked with the grounds. The original ground
uses space vividly, in a situation which is itself for the pupil hypothetical and
imaginary: he would have to look round the field full of sheep for an alternative.
The last lines mimic Pan calling Luna, in another vividly spatial scene. There is
a contrast of place between the two scenes: between the open field and the deep
woods. *Pan deus Arcadiae* (cf. *Ecl*. 10.26) lends the second scene and ground a
generic significance: pastoral against didactic hexameters. The white of wool and
moon and the implicit dark of the woods have a more entangled relation.[24]

The address itself is made more complicated by its religious dimension; the
complications include the god's local presence or absence. The religious resonance
confers a sly disrespect on mentioning the embarrassing tale to the goddess: she
was not only subjected to love but deceived by Pan's crude covering (D. Serv.
G. 3.391, Macr. *Sat*. 5.229–10, Nic. fr. 115 Schneider = Gow–Scholfield). In Ap.
Rhod. 4.54–65 the moon apostrophizes Medea back, tauntingly returning the witch's
invocations which have so interfered with the goddess's love life. That passage
brings out the humorous distortion in this passage of the most obvious contexts
for addresses to the Moon: when women in love and others call on the Moon, or
call her down. The learned and incredulous poet-narrator is contrasted with such
speakers, as with the cunning rustic god. Since the paragraph ends at 393, the
reader is encouraged to linger on the wit and imaginative scope of the passage.[25]

---

[23] The apostrophe here is not discussed in any of the commentaries or discussions that I
have seen, save briefly but wittily by T.C.W. Stinton, *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy*
(Oxford, 1990), 243 (he adds the element to R. Heinze, *Virgil's Epic Technique* [tr. H. and D.
Harvey, London, 1993], 212, whom he cites). Discussions include: W. Frentz, *Mythologisches in
Vergils Georgica*, Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 21 (Meisenheim am Glan, 1967), 129–30;
F. Klingner, *Virgil. Bucolica, Georgica, Aeneis* (Zurich and Stuttgart, 1967), 294; L.P. Wilkinson,
The Georgics *of Virgil* (Cambridge, 1969), 147–8; M.C.J. Putnam, *Virgil's Poem of the Earth:
Studies in the* Georgics (Princeton, 1979), 211–12; M.R. Gale, *Virgil on the Nature of Things:
The* Georgics*, Lucretius and the Didactic Tradition* (Cambridge, 2000), 135. It may enhance the
deixis in this specific passage that the moon is so often seen by writer and reader. Compare the
use of the moon to join writer and addressee at Walahfr. *Mon. Germ. Hist*. Poetae 2.403 no. 59.

[24] *munere* too evokes a pastoral world (cf. *Ecl*. 2.40–4, Prop. 3.13.25–34), with some distor-
tion of the story; see next note. Address to the Moon connects with Theocritus 2, reworked
in Verg. *Ecl*. 8.64–108 (note line 69). On the vividness of the use of space with the pupil, cf.
M. Erren, *Vergils Georgica. Herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert* (2 vols., Heidelberg,
1983–2003), 2.721.

[25] Calling of moon: cf. e.g. (women in love) Eur. *Hipp. Kal*. T iv c Kannicht (σύνηθες),
Theoc. *Id*. 2 (in *Σ* 2.10c p. 271 Wendel the Moon's own amorous experience is one explana-
tion for the practice); (others) Ar. *Nub*. 749–50, *PGM* iv (Paris, BN suppl. gr. 574, 4th c. A.D.)
2242–358 (see M. Smith, 'The hymn to the moon, PGM IV 2242–2355', *Proceedings of the
XVI International Congress of Papyrology* [Chico, 1981], 643–54). Even Nisus' prayer at Verg.
Aen. 9.404–9 may play on magic; note *labori* 404, cf. e.g. Ov. *Am*. 2.5.38. The notion that
Pan metamorphoses himself into a ram is not demanded by D. Serv. *G*. 3.391 *niueis uelleri-
bus se circumdedit*, and is incompatible with *uocans*. How much deceit is involved in *fefellit*
could be disputed, cf. Verg. *Aen*. 4.17 *postquam primus amor deceptam morte fefellit*. Ps.-
Probus' story (Servius 3.383 Thilo) of Pan dividing a flock, not connected with Nicander, is less
likely to be relevant and may be a desperate invention (cf. Servius on 3.391 and Macrobius,
loc. cit.). F. della Corte, *Le* Georgiche *di Virgilio commentate e tradotte*[2] (2 vols., Florence,
1986), 2.60, observantly speaks of 'una tenue nota di malizia' in the passage. On the rela-

Even in a type of poem which seems particularly far from the situations of speech, the poetry exploits the spatial and personal possibilities of diverted address. Sophistication and play are at a height; but the use of place and ground is as animated as ever.

So across a wide range of genres we see fresh possibilities in interpreting address: possibilities suggested by linguistics. Passages with an elaborate treatment of address are – if we may abuse the *Rudens* – like boxes waiting to be opened, full of significance. Each passage is distinct, but connections emerge between them. We have seen the importance of space, actual, recreated or imaginary, in staging addresses, literally or figuratively. We have seen the importance of relating the ground in apostrophe to the basic ground, and other grounds of the passage. Different sorts of literature have shown scope for the elaborate exploitation of address; a set-up distant from real conversation is no obstacle to lively treatment, nor kinship with conversation to complexity. Not that actual conversation itself should be thought devoid of scope for complexities. Linguistics has brought out the complications of apparently simple phenomena; and not many parties need be attended to perceive the actual frequency of intricate situations – as when one person addresses a second partly for a third to hear. The potential of such intricacy is developed still further by the formalized and intensified types of discourse which we might call literature, and developed with constant inventiveness. Surprising recognitions await.

Exeter College, University of Oxford   G.O. HUTCHINSON
gregory.hutchinson@exeter.ox.ac.uk

---

tion of religious address to normal speech situations, cf. B.A. Uspenskij, *Ego loquens*. Язык и коммуникационное пространство (Moscow, 2007), 32–3.