III The Gendered 'I' in Choral Lyric and Tragedy

Emily Hauser
Making Men: Gender and the Poet in Pindar

Abstract: The identity of Pindar's "I" has long proven difficult to interpret. This chapter moves the focus away from the ἐγώ and the poet/chorus debate, onto the gendered terms which are used to construct the persona of the poet and his milieu. A close reading of the gendering of terms for "poet" in Pindar shows how a masculinizing image of the poet and his community is built up, from the mechanisms of inspiration between (female) goddess and (male) prophet-poet, to the valorizing "man-making" function of Pindar's songs. By using gender as a lens for the discussion of first-person statements, the aim is to shift the conversation from simplified dichotomies around the identity of the "I" in Pindar to the poetics of the discourse of masculinity which pervades Pindar's poetry and which crosses between poet, chorus, audience, and the subjects of song.

Keywords: choral 'I', choral community, poetics, authorship, subjects of song

1 The problem of Pindar's ἐγώ

Pindar is particularly well-known for the first-person statements which appear throughout his victory odes.[1] Take, for example, the opening of *Olympian* 2, line 2: "what god, what hero, what man shall we sing of?" (τίνα θεόν, τίν᾽ ἥρωα, τίνα δ᾽ ἄνδρα κελαδήσομεν;). This first-person verb ("we shall sing") clearly draws on the tradition of first-person statements by archaic bards (ἀοιδοί): compare "sing to me, Muse, of a man" (ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, μοῦσα, Hom. *Od.* 1.1) at the opening of the *Odyssey*. Pindar's first-person κελαδήσομεν in *Ol.* 2.2 aligns with Homer's μοι (*Od.* 1.1); even the topic – ἄνδρα – is the same. But in Pindar's second *Olympian*, Homer's singular pronoun ("sing to me") is transformed into a plural first-person verb ("we shall sing"). This gestures to a transition from Homer's lone bard (ἀοιδός) to the communal performance context of the victory ode, which saw a soloist performing with, or in response to, a wider chorus.[2] These first-person statements thus serve both to connect Pindar to the poetic tradition which looked back to Homer, and, at

---

1 There has been much controversy around the use of the first person in Pindar (see further below, n. 3). The debate flourished in the late 1980s and early 1990s in particular: see Anzai (1994), Bremer (1990), Burnett (1989), D'Alessio (1994), Gentili (1990), Goldhill (1991) 142–66, Lefkowitz (1963), (1991) and (1995), Morgan (1993), Pfeijffer (1999a). Pindar is quoted from the edition by Snell/Maehler (1980) throughout; translations are my own.
2 For a helpful overview of the available evidence for and bibliography on the performance context of Pindar's odes, see Carey (2007); see also Carey (1989) and (1991), Heath (1988), Heath/Lefkowitz (1991).

the same time, subtly to translate Pindar's poetry into the performance context of epinician.

Much of the scholarship around Pindar's first-person statements has focused on the extent to which we can take these first-person statements as referring to Pindar, or to the chorus with whom the soloist may have performed his odes.[3] The problem is compounded by the fact that we know very little for sure about the performance context of the victory odes: although the scholia tell us that the odes were performed by a chorus, we find a combination of different types of first-person statements in Pindar's poetry. Some seem to gesture to a communal performance, or at the very least other performers – as with the first-person plural κελαδήσομεν in *Ol.* 2.2, or the "celebration-band" (κῶμος) of young men at *Nem.* 3.5.[4] Others appear to emphasize the voice and authority of the poet, as at *Nem.* 9.54: "I pray to sing of this excellence" (εὔχομαι ταύταν ἀρετὰν κελαδῆσαι), or *Ol.* 1.17f., "take the Dorian lyre down from its hook" (Δωρίαν ἀπὸ φόρμιγγα πασσάλου / λάμβαν'). An additional issue is whether we can see any of these first-person statements as expressions of biographical fact, and – if not – how we might interpret the function of the intrusion of the authorial (or choral) "I" from a literary-critical perspective.[5]

As often, the answer is likely more complex than a simple straight reading would suggest: it is not a case of *either* a solo poet *or* a communal chorus. The most helpful analyses of Pindar in recent years have suggested that we can instead see the poet's voice shifting between his own and that of the chorus in ways that tie in the solo voice with that of the civic community, and performing a wide-ranging authorial persona which projects the poet's (as well as the victor's) achievements into the future through the anticipation of solo reperformances.[6] In particular, the move towards reading Pindar's first-person statements as complex and shifting constructions of a poetic persona engaging in different "communicative strategies" (following Giambattista D'Alessio)

---

3 For the choral hypothesis, see Carey (1989) and (1991), Stehle (1997) ch. 3. For the solo hypothesis, see Lefkowitz (1988) 3f. and (1991) ch. 9, Heath (1988), Heath/Lefkowitz (1991). For an argument for an oscillation between poet and chorus, see Currie (2013).

4 μελιγαρύων τέκτονες / κώμων νεανίαι, "young men, craftsmen of honey-voiced celebrations" (*Nem.* 3.4f.). On the κῶμος, see Agócs (2012), Eckerman (2010), Heath (1988), Morgan (1993).

5 Bowra (1964) represents the old school where Pindar's first-person statements were seen as instances of biographical fact; these are now typically understood to be motivated by genre, following Bundy (1962), and fictional/mimetic (Lefkowitz 1963; Lefkowitz 1980; Miller 1993).

6 Morgan (1993) 2 puts it particularly well: "a more complicated dynamic wherein the poet's voice is imposed upon a chorus of multiple voices that in turn draws the κῶμος into its orbit." Compare D'Alessio (1994) esp. 117 on "the image of the *persona loquens*" as "an authoritative voice speaking to and/or on behalf of a community to which he may or may not belong". See further Currie (2013), Goldhill (1991) 144f., Parmentier/Felson (2016); and, for an exploration of the different elements of the poet's persona, Gentili (1990) and Lidov (1993) 76. On the importance of reperformance for interpreting the opaque references to performance context, see Currie (2004), Hubbard (2004), Morgan (1993) 12, Morrison (2007) 42–5, Nagy (1989) 62, Phillips (2017).

has been particularly useful.[7] I intend here to pick up on this emphasis on persona, but transfer the focus onto a different aspect of the first-person statements in Pindar's odes in ways that refract back onto questions of male authorship and male community – by looking specifically at the *terminology* used for the persona of the poet, and the strategies these words use to reflect or create norms around gender and authorship.[8] The intention here is not to disassociate the poet from the chorus, or to argue for the poet's sole performance of the odes in the first instance, but rather to investigate what using the lens of gender on the nouns used to claim poetic identity might tell us about the constructed norms of epinician authorship in relation to gender. In a sense, then, we are investigating the (male) poet's strategy of self-creation in tandem with the (male) communal context of the odes' performance, as well as anticipating their reperformance by and for men as markers of the poet's subsequent fame. These statements, I suggest, then, work together with the original and subsequent performance contexts to build and shore up the persona of the male poet and his connection with his male-normative choral community, as well as the masculine subjects of his song.[9] By using gender as a lens for the discussion of these first-person statements of poetic identity, we can thus avoid simplified dichotomies between poet and chorus, and instead focus on the generalizing discourse of masculinity which pervades the odes and which crosses between poet, chorus, audience, and the subjects of song.

2 Words for (male) poets: From ἀοιδός to ποιητής

The most common noun to describe the male poet in the archaic period was ἀοιδός, "bard" – a term used by both Homer and Hesiod, as well as in the Homeric Hymns.[10] Moving into the fifth century BCE, new terms came to displace the old: in particular, a family of words for "making" poetry (ποιεῖν), pre-eminent among them the term

---

7 D'Alessio (1994) 117: "the image of the *persona loquens* is the result of a complex construction whose understanding involves the comprehension of the particular communicative strategy chosen each time by the poet."

8 For a survey of gender and performance in Pindar (with a focus on performance rather than authorship, and an emphasis on the choral nature of the odes), see Stehle (1997) ch. 3. I will be focusing on poetic authorship here, although it is worth noting that Pindar mentions prose-writers (λόγιοι) twice, at *Nem* 6.45 and *Pyth* 1.94. On the "professional" statements made by Pindar, see Lefkowitz (1963) 178f. and Morgan (1993).

9 I use "subject" here and throughout to mean "subject-matter", rather than in the grammatical sense ("subject" vs. "object").

10 See the passage in *Odyssey* 17, in which Eumaeus lists the male bard (ἀοιδός, 385) amongst a list of "skilled craftsmen" (δημιοεργοί, 383). See also *Il.* 24.720, *Od.* 3.267, 3.270, 4.17, 8.87 etc., and Hes. *Theog.* 95, 99, *Op.* 26. On the epic bard, see Ford (1994) 90–130; on the semantics of the term ἄοιδος, see Maslov (2009). On terms for female poets, see Hauser (2016), and for a fuller discussion of the relationship between authorship terms and gender, Hauser (2023).

ποιητής ("poet, maker"). Andrew Ford provides an excellent overview of the changes which took place, and their significance for mapping shifts in attitudes to poetry, arguing that their derivation from the verb ποιεῖν suggests a move towards a more artisanal, craft-focused vision of poetry.[11] With the shift in the fifth and fourth centuries away from orality towards "a sense of songs as texts to be studied rather than performed",[12] the overwhelming preponderance of ποιητής and its cognates demonstrates, according to Ford, "an increasing awareness of the lasting powers of texts [which] supported the conception of song as a stable work rather than a performance."[13] This technical, formal visualization of poetry-making came from a reconceptualization of writing (and the function and dissemination of texts) as a technical skill and lasting artefact, like craftsmanship – mostly among writers who wanted to emphasize their technical expertise –, deriving from critics who were writing in the tradition of Ionian *historia*. This, in turn, enabled the increasing professionalization of literature and the continuation of a semantics for authorship rooted in -ποιός ("-maker") suffixes into the Hellenistic period.[14]

Where ἀοιδός continued to be used, it now had an archaizing flavor, referring back to the original discourse of male poetry initiated by Homer and Hesiod. Pindar demonstrates this at the opening of *Nemean* 2, where he refers to the Homeridae, the group of poets who claimed to be both literal (genealogical) and poetic descendants of Homer: Ὁμηρίδαι / ῥαπτῶν ἐπέων . . . ἀοιδοί ("the Homeridae, singers [ἀοιδοί] of stitched verses", *Nem.* 2.1f.).[15] The term ἀοιδοί here refers to a very specific genre and tradition: the poetic lineage that goes back to Homer, suggesting that ἀοιδός has already acquired a specialized sense of "male epic bard", most often with reference to Homer and those who claimed literal or poetic descent from him. The masculinity of this tradition is underlined by the use of Ὁμηρίδαι, a male patronymic – literally "sons of Homer" – figuring the lineage of ἀοιδοί descending from Homer as a male father-to-son relationship.

---

11 Ford (2002) ch. 6; see also Braun (1938), Graziosi (2002) 41–7, Svenbro (1984) 155–79.
12 Ford (2002) 154.
13 Ford (2002) 157.
14 Ford (2002) 134, 294.
15 See below p. 144. Pindar is giving an etymology of the term "rhapsode" (ῥαψῳδός) here: see Nagy (1989) 7, Pfeijffer (1999b) ad loc.

3 "Sung of" women, "singing" men: The male poet as singing prophet

The term ἀοιδός only occurs twice elsewhere in Pindar's victory odes, in *Pythian* 1.[16] In another ode, *Nemean* 3, however, we find an adjective – ἀοίδιμος ("sung of") – which is connected to ἀοιδός both through its etymology (both derive from the verb ἀείδειν) and its literary history. Towards the end of the ode, the poet moves into the first person to dedicate the song to his patron, Aristocleides of Aegina: χαῖρε, φίλος· ἐγὼ τόδε τοι / πέμπω . . . / πόμ᾿ ἀοίδιμον ("cheers, my friend: I send you this drink of song", *Nem* 3.76–9). The phrase "drink of song" clearly anticipates the context of a toast raised to the dedicatee (χαῖρε),[17] with the offering of the wine and the gift of the song conflated into the phrase "song-drink".[18] At the same time, the adjective ἀοίδιμος has a special literary resonance: it appears first in Greek literature in a markedly metapoetic, and gender-significant, passage in Homer's *Iliad*. In book 6, during Hector's visit to the women of Troy, Helen – a female character whose mimetic speech and metapoetic weaving often associates her problematically with the figure of the poet[19] – appears to look through the mechanism of her own creation in poetry: ὡς καὶ ὀπίσσω / ἀνθρώποισι πελώμεθ᾿ ἀοίδιμοι ἐσσομένοισι ("that in future we will be subjects of song for generations to come", *Il.* 6.357f.).[20] Where Helen uses ἀοίδιμος to mean "subject of song", however, here at *Nem.* 3.79 it is clearly not that the "drink" (πόμα) is the *subject-matter* of the song with which Pindar is presenting his patron, but rather that the drink itself, through metonymy, has come to *represent* song: a "song-drink". The passive force of Helen's ἀοίδιμος, "sung of", here becomes more active: "of song, singing". The change in the gender of the speaker, and their relation to song – Helen as sung-of female character, Pindar as male singer – almost seems to occasion a change in the agency and meaning of the word.

But there is even more going on here. The strange collocation of "song-drink", with the characteristically dense metaphor of the poet toasting his patron through the offering of a song that is compared to wine, draws attention to the phrase as a metonym for song. Apart from the thematic connection of the dedication of the song to toasting with wine, there is another, more linguistic, punning level to Pindar's choice of this phrase – in the similarity between the nouns πόμα, "drink", and

---

16 *Pyth* 1.3 πείθονται δ᾿ ἀοιδοὶ σάμασιν, *Pyth* 1.94 οἷον ἀποιχομένων ἀνδρῶν δίαιταν μανύει / καὶ λογίοις καὶ ἀοιδοῖς. See also *Pae*. 21 (= fr. 70, 249b (70)) where ἀοιδός is used adjectivally of the reed: τὸν ἀοιδότατον . . . κάλαμον.

17 See Instone (1996) ad. *Nem.* 2.76, Pfeijffer (1999b) 397f. with n. 380.

18 Agócs (2012) 203, Neer/Kurke (2019) 121, Pfeijffer (1999b) 398f. On the question of the performance of *Nem.* 3, see Eckerman (2014), and also Instone (1996) 168f.

19 Blondell (2010), Roisman (2006), Worman (2001).

20 Blondell (2010) 20.

ποίημα, "poem".[21] The attribution of the adjective ἀοίδιμος to the πόμα hints that Pindar is making a playful pun on the new vocabulary for "making" poetry here, linking the "singing πόμα" to the new word for poetry as a made object, a ποίημα. It is as if the addition of the adjective creates a false etymology or gloss for ποίημα, from a conflation of the sound of πόμα and the literary pedigree of ἀοίδιμος to gesture to the new word, ποίημα, to which Pindar's song-offering is compared. And this new type of ἀοίδιμος song is translated from Helen's awareness of her passivity as a female poetic character into a new, and markedly male, context of a toast shared between men – from male agentic poet to male (φίλος) patron.

The gendered aspect to ἀοίδιμος here is underlined by contrast with another instance of the term, this time in *Olympian* 14, again in a gendered context.[22] The ode, celebrating Asopichus of Orchomenus, opens with an address to the Graces: ὦ λιπαρᾶς ἀοίδιμοι βασίλειαι / Χάριτες Ἐρχομενοῦ ("Graces, shining sung-of queens of Orchomenus", lines 3f.). The Graces are called on to favor Pindar's prayer; in particular Thalia, who is addressed as ἐρασίμολπε ("lover of song", 16). The Graces had already been described together with the Muses in Hesiod (*Theog.* 64), the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (3.189–95) and Sappho (frr. 103, 128), and were depicted singing together with the Muses at the wedding of Cadmus by Theognis (15); as we will see, we also find them connected to the Muses elsewhere in Pindar's poetry, at the opening of *Paean* 6.[23] Thalia's identification with song, and the connection between Graces and Muses, suggests that we are meant to read ἀοίδιμος in the opening invocation to the Graces as not only "sung of" (i.e. subjects of song) but also "singing" (i.e. they are singers as well as "queens").[24] The Graces are renowned in song, but also connected to song, Pindar seems to suggest, making them ideal patrons for the opening of his ode –

---

21 Especially with the short form πόμα, as opposed to the Attic πῶμα; see Pfeijffer (1999b) ad loc.
22 The other two instances of ἀοίδιμος in Pindar also show an interaction with gender and the same fluidity and tension between the active and passive senses of the term. *Pyth.* 8.59 describes Delphi as the ὀμφαλὸν . . . ἀοίδιμον ("singing/sung of navel"): on the one hand this is a description of Delphi's fame in song, on the other it must recall the voice of the (female) Pythia who prophesied in poetry; see further Markus Hafner's chapter in this volume on the Pythia's "I". The other example of ἀοίδιμος occurs at fr. 76, in praise of Athens, where the (female) city Ἀθᾶναι is described as λιπαραὶ καὶ ἰοστέφανοι καὶ ἀοίδιμοι ("shining and violet-crowned and sung-of/singing", line 1), again both a reference to Athens' "sung-of" fame, and to the well-known poets who made it "sing". For the different uses of ἀοίδιμος in Pindar, see Pfeijffer (1999b) 548.
23 See also *Hom. Hymn* 27.15. On the connection between Graces and Muses, see Lefkowitz (1963) 244 n. 54, Verdenius (1987) 104f.
24 Contra Verdenius (1987) ad loc., who acknowledges the active meaning of ἀοίδιμος at *Nem.* 3.79 and *Pae.* 6.6, but argues for a purely passive meaning "much sung of" here. It is important to note that I am not suggesting (as Bowra 1935, ad loc., Radt 1958, 107f.) that ἀοίδιμοι βασίλειαι should be taken as "queens of song" (with ἀοίδιμοι dependent on βασίλειαι), but rather that ἀοίδιμοι should be taken as an attribute of the Graces ("full of songs, singing"). See Florence Klein's chapter in this volume on how Catullus transforms Sappho from being an authoress to being 'sung of' and the object of song in his translation of fr. 31 in *c.* 51.

fitting replacements and counterparts for the Muses, the ultimate female inspirers of song.[25] But their active role only goes so far before the passive force of ἀοίδιμος in connection to female voices reinstates itself. After all, it is patently *not* the Graces who are singing here, but the male voice which is describing the Graces in song.[26] This is made explicit by the male speaking voice a few lines below, who claims that he has arrived ἀείδων ("singing", 18) this very ode. The masculinity of this act is ring-fenced by the masculine participle ἀείδων, contrasting with the feminine ἰδοῖσα ("having looked", 16) of one of the Graces two lines above. While the Graces may indeed be connected to singing, therefore, the re-appropriation of the verb ἀείδειν to the male voice means that the sense in which Helen had used ἀοίδιμος – "renowned in song, sung of" – rears its head again, to subvert the apparent praise of the Graces. The term ἀοίδιμος, with its connection to the activity of the male who "sings" (ἀείδων) about those who are "sung-of" (ἀοίδιμος), serves as a reminder that it is a male poet and his associates in song who have the real power as singers here – and it is these female figures who are ultimately shaped by them. This seems to show a very different dynamic to the use of ἀοίδιμος in *Nem.* 3, where the sense of the word was twisted to create a new vocabulary for Pindar's poetry in the context of active exchange between men.[27] Here, appearing to praise the Graces while simultaneously reminding that it is the male poet who constructs them in song, Pindar hints at the same unease with women's voices as in the portrayal of Helen in Homeric epic. As with Helen, it is the latent passive force of ἀοίδιμος, in connection with the performance by the ἀοιδός/poet of his song, which serves to put Helen (in Homer) and the Graces (here in *Ol.* 14) in their place – reminding them, and us, that it is the male poet who has sole control in poetry over the depiction of women and their voices.

This active re-assignment of ἀοίδιμος from female figures who – even though they are "singers" – are "sung of" in the male voice (the Graces in *Ol.* 14), to the male poet as "singing" (as in *Nem.* 3), is demonstrated again in *Paean* 6. This paean, performed at the Theoxenia at Delphi, opens with a similar request from the Graces – this time allied with Aphrodite – to welcome the poet and chorus to the Delphic festival (*Pae.* 6.1–6):

> Πρὸς Ὀλυμπίου Διός σε, χρυσέα
>   κλυτόμαντι Πυθοῖ,
> λίσσομαι Χαρίτεσ-
>   σίν τε καὶ σὺν Ἀφροδίτᾳ,

---

25 On the Muses in Pindar, see Kuhn-Treichel (2020), Maslov (2016), and see further more generally Spentzou/Fowler (2002).

26 For similar readings of the Muses as a figure for women's disempowerment through the transferral of inspiration to the male bard, see Gubar (1981) and Klindienst (2002). On Pindar's depiction of women, see Kyriakou (1994).

27 On the ideology of aristocratic exchange in Pindar, see Kurke (1991) ch. 4.

ἐν ζαθέῳ με δέξαι χρόνῳ
ἀοίδιμον Πιερίδων προφάταν·

By Olympian Zeus, I beg you, golden
Delphi famous for seers,
along with the Graces
and Aphrodite,
to welcome me – the singing prophet
of the Muses – at this sacred time

This passage has been a contentious one for arguments around the choral/solo hypothesis. Do we take the first person singular με who is asking to be welcomed here (5) – the ἀοίδιμος προφάτας (6) – to refer to Pindar alone, or as a self-reference by the chorus?[28] Mary Lefkowitz suggests that the invocation to the Graces here – given their close connection with the Muses and song – "seems to be a certain indication that these lines are addressed to [Pindar] himself".[29] Stefan Radt also takes Pindar as the speaker, though he reads this from the context given in the paean's opening lines (where the speaker claims to have come to Delphi to replace its chorus, lines 7–10).[30] And although some scholars still hold to a choral reading of the ἐγώ of *Pae.* 6.1–6,[31] Staffan Fogelmark has shown that the chorus is never referred to as προφάτας in Pindar and Bacchylides, while Giambattista D'Alessio argues convincingly that all the descriptors here – connection to the Muses and poetic production – point to the construction of the persona of a poet.[32] (This is not to say that the chorus' voice does not appear elsewhere in the paean, for example in the first person plural at line 128 εὐνάξομεν:[33] as I have said above (p. 131), part of the complexity of Pindar's use of the first-person is precisely the fluidity and slippage between the persona of the poet and the voice of the chorus, between self and community, the present of performance and the future of reperformance.)

---

28 For a summary of the debate, see Kurke (2005) 86–9.
29 Lefkowitz (1963) 244 n. 54; this note was excised from the version of the article printed in her 1991 book. This initial footnote acknowledging the voice of the poet in *Pae.* 6 is rather ironic, as Kurke (2005) 87 notes, given that Lefkowitz's major argument in her 1963 article is for a distinction between the voice of the poet in the epinician odes and that of the chorus in the paeans.
30 Radt (1958) 105–8.
31 Burnett (1998), Hoekstra (1962) 9–13, Stehle (1997) 139–47 and 139 n. 62 for further bibliography.
32 Fogelmark (1972) 119 n. 16, D'Alessio (1994) 125. See also Kurke (2005) 89. Stehle (1997) 140 gives the counterargument that "the Muses inspire not just poets but singers as well" (with examples given at her n. 66); but she cites Alcman fr. 3, where again we have to make the argument that this is the voice of the chorus invoking the Muses and not the poet; Eur. *Tro.* 511–14 is clearly a parody of the opening of Homer's *Iliad*, and therefore a parody of the *bardic* invocation of the Muses, not the chorus invoking them on their own account; the same can be said of the choral invocations at Ar. *Ach.* 665 and *Lys.* 1297, which are also clearly parodic of the epic bard.
33 As also Hoekstra (1962) 11.

This reading of the opening of *Pae.* 6 as a figuration of the persona of the poet is only underlined by the use of the adjective ἀοίδιμος, which, as we have seen, claims an etymological link with ἀοιδός, which indicates the bard-figure.[34] The phrase ἀοίδιμος Πιερίδων προφάτας here should therefore be interpreted as tying in with Pindar's self-presentation as poet in a line of bards who could claim inspiration by the Muses, stretching back to Homer (as we saw in the description of the Homeridae as ἀοιδοί at *Nem.* 2.2). Where, in *Olympian* 14, the Graces were invoked as ἀοίδιμοι only to be corralled into the male singers' voice, here the transfer and balance of power seems to be clear: the Graces (and Aphrodite) are being asked for inspiration, and it is their inspiration that will both enable Pindar to sing as a poet (ἀοίδιμος as "singing"), and to be renowned (ἀοίδιμος as "sung of"), through the vessel of his poetry.[35]

This relationship between female goddess-inspirer and male poet is underlined by the noun which accompanies the poetically resonant ἀοίδιμος: "prophet" or "spokesman" (προφάτας). We have seen that Pindar uses the term ἀοιδός elsewhere for the general tradition of male poets in *Nem.* 2 and *Pyth.* 1, but he never makes use of the noun to construct the persona of the speaking poet himself. The use of πόμ' ἀοίδιμον at *Nem.* 3.79 suggests an awareness of the new vocabulary for poetry, ποίημα/ποιητής – which, however, Pindar also avoids, just like ἀοιδός, in figurations of his own poetic persona (the noun ποιητής appears nowhere in Pindar's poetry, in spite of its increasing popularity). At *Pae.* 6.6, instead, he chooses a periphrastic construction and an unusual noun for his self-construction as a poet.[36] As with the πόμ' ἀοίδιμον in *Nem.* 3, the adjective ἀοίδιμος is appended to a term – προφάτας, "prophet", "announcer" – that might not immediately be connected with poetry,[37] specifically to designate its status as a metapoetic term.[38] ἀοίδιμος serves to link the poet-speaker to the tradition of male ἀοιδοί, while also enabling him to construct a new vocabulary of poetic authorship for himself by modifying and manipulating a different noun.

So what can Pindar's use of the noun προφάτας tell us about the male poetics being forecasted here? What "particular communicative strategy" does it play in terms of poetics and gender?[39] In the first instance, the poet as prophet is a trope of early Greek poetry, connecting to the poet's divine inspiration by the Muse.[40] But

---

34 On ἀοίδιμος here as active "singing", not passive "sung of", see Radt (1958) 105–8; D'Alessio (1994) 125 sees it as having both meanings.

35 D'Alessio (1994) 125 also identifies both these meanings to ἀοίδιμος here.

36 See, for example, Maslov (2015) 201: "This is not a case of appropriation of religious authority, but an improvised metapoetic term that marks the professionalization of poetic discourse."

37 Cf. e.g. *Nem.* 9.50 on a crater of wine as the κώμου προφάταν ("announcer of the celebration").

38 Though note the comparable use of the term "prophet of the Muses" in Bacchylides: Μουσᾶν γε ἰοβλεφάρων θεῖος προφ[άτ]ας, Bacchyl. 9.3.

39 D'Alessio (1994) 117.

40 Nagy (1989) 23–9, who suggests that the term μάντις ("prophet") "could once have been [an] appropriate designation for an undifferentiated poet/prophet" (p. 23); see also Radt (1958) 108.

the προφάτας actually had a very specific role, particularly in relation to the oracle at Delphi where Pindar is positioning himself: we must remember that the paean opens with an invocation not only to the Graces and Aphrodite, but to Delphi itself, "famous for seers" (κλυτόμαντι, 2). This adjective, κλυτόμαντις, contains within it two elements: the adjective κλυτός ("famed"), and the noun μάντις, "seer". This noun, used to describe oracles and seers, was also applied to the most famous oracle of them all, the female Pythia at Delphi, who was inspired by the god Apollo to utter divinely-inspired prophecies.[41] If we were not already primed to think of the Pythia through the adjective κλυτόμαντις, the fact that Pindar calls Delphi by the name Πυθώ – from which the Pythia derived her title – surely acts as a stimulus to make the connection between Delphi and the female oracle. In relation to the divine oracle at Delphi (the μάντις or "seer"), the προφάτας (literally "speaker-for", i.e. "interpreter") was the middle man who interpreted the gods' words, as relayed by the oracle, into poetry. He was, in other words, as Gregory Nagy succinctly puts it, a "recomposer of the inspired message in poetic form".[42]

What Pindar does here is to transfer the role of the προφάτας from the interpreter of the Delphic oracle to the poet as the προφάτας of the Muses. The comparison is set up not only in terms of the similarity of the roles they carry out (mortal interpreter into poetry of a divine message), but also in the alignment of their gender roles. The male προφάτας (indicated for us by the masculine noun) interprets the female oracle (the μάντις of κλυτόμαντις); similarly, the male poet-προφάτας channels the inspiration of the female Muses, the "goddesses of Pieria" (Πιερίδες), to produce his poetry. So when Pindar claims to be the "singing prophet of the Muses", what he is actually doing is comparing the relationship between the (female) god-inspired μάντις at Delphi and her (male) prophet-interpreter προφάτας, to that between the (female) goddess-Muses and the (male) poet.

We see this happening explicitly elsewhere in Pindar's poetry at fr. 150, where the Muse is told to "be a μάντις, Muse, and I will be a προφάτας": μαντεύεο, Μοῖσα, προφατεύσω δ᾽ ἐγώ. Again, there has been debate over the identity of the ἐγώ, and whether it belongs to the poet or the chorus.[43] To me, however, it seems that the opposition drawn here between the male speaking voice and the female Muse is of more significance than that between the (male) poet or the (male) chorus, who are in fact both united in the discourse of their masculinity (even if not in their roles in performance).[44] The point of the line is surely the contrast between the roles of female

---

41 E.g. Aesch. *Eum.* 29. On the figure of the seer, see Bremmer (1996), Griffith (2009) 475–82, and for a survey of the μάντις in Pindar, Maslov (2015) 188–201. Again, see also Hafner in this volume (cf. above n. 22).

42 Nagy (1989) 26; see also Fontenrose (1978) 215–19.

43 See, for example, Nagy (1989) 27 for the poet, Maslov (2015) 197 for the chorus.

44 On the chorus of the victory odes as male, see Carey (2007) 207; for examples, see *Pyth* 5.22 κῶμον ἀνέρων, *Nem.* 3.4f. μελιγαρύων τέκτονες / κώμων νεανίαι; cf. also *Pyth.* 10.6 on the

Muse, on the one hand, as mantic inspirer, and male speaker on the other (whether poet or chorus) as poetic interpreter. Both the opposition and interrelationship between μάντις and προφάτας, female Muse and male poetic voice, are made explicit – and again, the vocabulary of προφάτας is used to delineate the male poetic voice.[45]

By calling himself an ἀοίδιμος Πιερίδων προφάτας at *Pae.* 6.6, then, Pindar is rewriting the relationship between Muse-poet into the μάντις-προφάτας interaction to lay claim to a very specific gendered relationship, between female goddesses of inspiration and the male interpreter who claims the woman's inspired voice and words as his own, and uses them as a vehicle for creating his poetry. This reading of *Pae.* 6 also clarifies the use of ἀοίδιμοι for the Graces in *Ol.* 14, because *Pae.* 6 opens with a proliferation of female divine figures who might inspire the poet and provide him with the substance for his poetry, including, once again, the Graces. The Graces' connection to song in *Ol.* 14 can thus be seen as twofold, in that a) they provide the subject for the male singer through his opening invocation to the female goddesses for inspiration; and b) their powers of song are invoked in order to be exploited and re-interpreted into poetry by the male poet-prophet, to enable him to sing poetry and thus to be renowned through his song. In other words, it is by reading the poetry through the lens of this gendered relationship that we can see that it is the appropriation of female powers of song (the Graces as ἀοίδιμοι in *Ol.* 14) and divine inspiration (the Muses' mantic properties in *Pae.* 6 and fr. 150) which enable the male poet to become ἀοιδός-like, and to channel women's association with song to interpret into his poetry: to be an ἀοίδιμος Πιερίδων προφάτας.

4 Making men: The male poet as craftsman

Pindar's self-construction as a poet-prophet who assimilates the female voice is not the only gendered construct he adduces to shape the persona of the poet. Another metaphor which threads through Pindar's poetry (and has often been commented on) is that of craftsmanship – the "poet-as-craftsman".[46] Both Homer and Hesiod group the ἀοιδός together with other "artisans" (δημιοεργοί): Homer lists the seer (μάντις), doctor (ἰητήρ), carpenter (τέκτων) and bard (ἀοιδός) among a group of

---

ἐπικωμίαν ἀνδρῶν κλυτὰν ὄπα. Snell/Maehler (1980) ascribe this fragment to the lost sections of *Isthm.* 9, which if correct would indicate an epinician chorus.

45 Cf. fr. 94a.5f. μάντις ὡς τελέσσω / ἱεραπόλος ("that I, a prophet priest, may fulfil"), where μάντις and ἱεραπόλος ("priest") are placed in apposition. This has previously been read as a *partheneion* (Burnett 1998, 495 n. 5), but this is unlikely as the masculine participle at line 11 (φιλέων) identifies the speaker as male; it may be another instance of the male first-person voice appropriating the mantic properties of the *partheneion* chorus. See Klinck (2001) 276, Kurke (2005) 88 n. 24.

46 E.g. Fearn (2017), Ford (2002) ch. 5, Segal (1998) ch. 8, Shapiro (1994) 72–98, Steiner (1986) 41–52.

δημιοεργοί at *Od.* 17.383–5, and Hesiod juxtaposes the ἀοιδός with the carpenter (τέκτων) and the potter (κεραμεύς) at *Op.* 25f.[47] With Pindar and his contemporary Bacchylides, however, we find a proliferation of craft metaphors for the poet. Ford has shown how these craft metaphors both amplify specific aspects of song – its monumentalization of glory, its ability to endure – and yet, at the same time, emphasize that sung poetry is more than a made artefact.[48] Here, I am interested not only in metaphors of craft for poetry but, more specifically, their application to name the poet, and how that interacts with the gendering of poetic authorship.

In their ability to fashion and piece together words, the poet and the chorus-members are compared directly to "craftsmen" (τέκτονες) twice in Pindar's odes: first at *Nem.* 3.4f., where the young men of the chorus are called μελιγαρύων τέκτονες / κώμων νεανίαι ("craftsmen of the honey-sounding celebrations"),[49] and again at *Pyth.* 3.113, where the poets of tales of men like Nestor and Sarpedon are called ἐπέων . . . τέκτονες σοφοί ("wise craftsmen of words").[50] τέκτονες appeared in Homer – as we saw above, in close conjunction with ἀοιδοί in *Od.* 17 – but never for the figure of the poet.[51] In *Pythian* 3, however, Pindar speaks of the "wise craftsmen" (τέκτονες) of "words" (ἐπέων) about Nestor and Sarpedon – a not-so-veiled reference to Homer, whose *Iliad* tells of both heroes and whose epics had already come to be referred to as ἔπεα by the fifth century BCE.[52] Both these instances of terms of craftsmanship for singers at *Nem.* 3 and *Pyth.* 3 contain implicit or explicit gendered undertones: the νεανίαι ("young men") of the chorus at *Nem.* 3.5 specifically designates these τέκτονες as male; while the τέκτονες referred to in *Pyth.* 3 are valorized for the stories they tell of men like Nestor and Sarpedon, linking into Homer's subject as the κλέα ἀνδρῶν ("glorious deeds of men").[53] This may be drawing directly on a Homeric paradigm for connecting τέκτονες and men: a quarter of all occurrences of τέκτων in Homer give it in apposition to ἀνήρ (τέκτονες ἄνδρες, "craftsmen-men").[54] In Homer, then, the craftsman is doubly underlined as a man through the gender of the word and its frequent juxtaposition with ἀνήρ; and he is associated with the ἀοιδός through the list of δημιοεργοί in *Od.* 17. Pindar takes the final step, drawing on the craft metaphor for song, to make the association between

47 See Nagy (1989) 19, (1990) 56.

48 Ford (2002) ch. 4; cf. Fearn (2017) 19–23, 34.

49 See Instone (1996) ad loc., Neer/Kurke (2019) 113f., Pfeijffer (1999b) ad loc.

50 Other examples of τέκτων in Pindar (not referring to the poet/chorus) occur at *Pyth.* 3.6, *Pyth.* 5.36, *Nem.* 5.49.

51 Svenbro (1984) 156–79. There are twelve instances of τέκτων in Homer, all of carpenters: *Il.* 4.110, 5.59, 6.315, 13.390, 15.411, 16.483, 23.712; *Od.* 9.126, 17.340, 17.384, 19.56, 21.43.

52 Ford (1981) 137–52, Martin (1989) 13. For an example of ἔπος as epic in Pindar, see *Isthm.* 6.67 on the Ἡσιόδου . . . ἔπος ("word/epic of Hesiod"); Nagy (1999) 238.

53 Nagy (1990) 196f.

54 Hom. *Il.* 6.315, 16.483, *Od.* 9.126.

the male τέκτων-singer, the male chorus (*Nem.* 3), and their male subjects (Nestor and Sarpedon, *Pyth.* 3).

There is another interesting instance of the craft metaphor for the poet-persona interacting with gender – but here it is in the negative, a definition by what he is *not*. *Nemean* 5, composed for Pytheas of Aegina, opens with a famously blunt statement of self-definition (*Nem.* 5.1f.):

> Οὐκ ἀνδριαντοποιός εἰμ’, ὥστ’ ἐλινύσοντα ἐργά-
> ζεσθαι ἀγάλματ’ ἐπ’ αὐτᾶς βαθμίδος
> ἑσταότ’·

> I am not a statue-maker who fashions statues
> that stand still on the same
> bases

The poet then goes on to describe what his song does, flying on the ships and boats from Aegina to spread Pytheas’ fame.[55] Charles Segal identifies a tension here “between song (poetry) on the one hand and monumentalization in statuary”. Other critics – including Andrew Ford – follow his lead to read this passage as contrasting (and criticizing) statuary as static, against the ability of song to travel and spread fame.[56] Yet – as David Fearn has recently pointed out – the opposition is not so clear-cut as this.[57] The statues fashioned by the sculptor are called ἀγάλματα (*Nem.* 5.1), from ἄγαλμα, a noun whose meaning stretched from “glory, honor” to “delight, ornament”, “gift”, and thus “statue” dedicated to a god.[58] The epinician ode as an ἄγαλμα is a central aspect of the depiction of song as craft:[59] *Nem.* 8, for example, has Pindar specifically define the gift of his poetry as a Νεμεαῖον ἄγαλμα, and we see the same metaphor being applied in Bacchylides.[60]

In this sense, we can read Pindar’s claim not to be an ἀνδριαντοποιός here in multiple ways: as an outright rejection of the role of artisan (as Segal, Ford and others); an implicit foregrounding of the role of statuary as a representation of song (as Deborah Steiner); a “wry, hyperbolical statement” that serves provocatively to

---

55 ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ πάσας ὁλκάδος ἔν τ’ ἀκάτῳ, γλυκεῖ’ ἀοιδά, / στεῖχ’ ἀπ’ Αἰγίνας διαγγέλλοισ’ (*Nem.* 5.2f.). On the proem to *Nem.* 5, see Fearn (2017) 17–28, Ford (2002) 119–23, Pavlou (2010), Pfeijffer (1999b) 62f. and 99–108, Segal (1974), Steiner (1993).

56 Segal (1986) 156, see also Segal (1974); Ford (2002) 119f., who sees it as following a Simonidean emphasis on the power of song over craft. See also Smith (2007) 92 on Pindar’s “clearly hostile” attitude to statuary, Svenbro (1984) 187–212.

57 Fearn (2017) 17–28 (though note that Fearn does not read this, as I do, as an act of displacement, but rather suggests simply that there is more nuance to Pindar’s critique of statuary than is usually assumed); see also Steiner (1993), (2001) 251–65.

58 On ἀγάλματα in Pindar, see Kurke (1991) 163–94, Steiner (1993) 161–7.

59 Ford (2002) 115–19, though Ford suggests a different usage of ἄγαλμα here: “such passages present songs as signs of rank and mutuality rather than as products of craft” (p. 117).

60 Bacchyl. 5.3–6, 10.11.

draw attention to issues around object value and memorialization (as Fearn);[61] or, I would suggest, as a displacement and replacement of the one-dimensional artisan who can only produce static objects, with a new kind of craftsman whose songs are supple and mobile. This reading deals with the problem that Pindar does not provide any nominal term following the negative statement, "I am not a statue-maker", to describe the activity of the poet, to create a contrast with the vivid craft term which opens the ode: it is, instead, the *song*, ἀοιδά (and not the singer, ἀοιδός) which becomes the subject of the next line.[62] By my reading, the contrast is not between the ἀνδριαντοποιός and the ἀοιδά, but the kind of ἀνδριαντοποιός who produces static ἀγάλματα – a statue-maker – and a craftsman like Pindar, who produces the mobile ἄγαλμα of song. The statement "I am not a statue-maker" is therefore not rejecting the category of artisan outright – it is superceding the kind of ἀνδριαντοποιός who fashions static ἀγάλματα, with a new sort of ἀνδριαντοποιός: Pindar.

This interpretation of the ἀνδριαντοποιός of *Nem*. 5 as a displacement and replacement of the statue-maker with a new kind of ἀνδριαντοποιός is shored up by the etymology of the term. It is made up of two parts: a nominal stem from ἀνδριάς ("statue, image of a man"), itself derived from ἀνήρ ("man"),[63] and the suffix -ποιός, meaning "maker" and cognate with ποιητής ("maker, poet"). This is the only time in the entirety of Pindar's corpus where he uses the suffix -ποιός to create a noun, which, as we have seen, was becoming increasingly popular in the fifth century BCE as conceptions of poetic "making" led to a new family of terms around ποιεῖν (ἐποποιός, τραγῳδοποιός and so on).[64] I have already suggested that Pindar's use of πόμ᾽ ἀοίδιμον in *Nem*. 3 demonstrates an awareness of the new vocabulary for poetry as ποίημα (see above, pp. 133f). Here, I think, he goes further, building on the new fashion for forming craftsmen's names from -ποιός to come up with a new term that subtly elucidates both what he does not do – fashioning static statues – and what he does: crafting poetic images of men which are mobile enough to spread their glory abroad. He might not be a statue-maker in the literal sense, but with ἀνδριαντοποιός suggesting "man-fashioning" and -ποιός associated with poetic making, he is, surely, a "poet-fashioner of men".

This connects to many other passages in Pindar's odes where he describes his task as one of building up men's status and manhood through his poetry. We have seen how the poet, chorus and subject of poetry are tied into the same metaphorical

---

61 Fearn (2017) 19.

62 γλυκεῖ᾽ ἀοιδά, / στεῖχ᾽ ("go, sweet song", *Nem*. 5.2f.).

63 Note that ἀνδριάς normally means "statue of a man"; Pfeijffer (1999b) ad loc. notes that it is only occasionally (and much later) used of statues of women (Ath. 10.425f.). Fearn (2017) 24–7 demonstrates that we should understand the types of statue referenced here as more than simply athletic statues.

64 The only other instance of -ποιός in Pindar occurs to form an adjective at *Nem*. 8.33, κακοποιὸν ὄνειδος ("ill-doing disgrace").

language and simultaneously delineated as male through the image of the male τέκτων. Gregory Nagy has argued for close links between the hero of Homeric epic and the athlete of epinician, both of whom undergo trials and are reintegrated into the male community through the medium of poetry.[65] In both the κλέα ἀνδρῶν of epic and the recitation of the past and present achievements of men in victory odes, "there is a presupposition of an unbroken succession extending from the men of the past to the men of the present, both those men who are the subjects of the glory and those men who perpetuate the glory through song."[66]

Pindar's continuation of Homer's theme of κλέα ἀνδρῶν is highlighted throughout the odes – perhaps most clearly at the opening of *Isthmian* 8, a celebration of Kleandros of Aegina, which opens with the resonant Kleandros' name, itself a combination of κλέα and ἀνδρῶν ("he who has the glories of men").[67] The glory of men is a theme which often recurs: *Olympian* 2, for example, opens with a request as to the poem's subject with three masculine nouns, one of which is ἀνήρ itself: τίνα θεόν, τίν᾽ ἥρωα, τίνα δ᾽ ἄνδρα κελαδήσομεν; ("what [male] god, what [male] hero, what man shall we celebrate?", *Ol.* 2.2). Meanwhile, *Olympian* 1 contains the noun ἀνήρ six times in the space of just over a hundred lines (and this is by no means unusual). Men (ἄνδρες) are defined again and again as the subject of Pindar's poetry: *Ol.* 6, *Ol.* 9, *Pyth.* 1, *Pyth.* 5, *Nem.* 1, *Nem.* 2, *Isthm.* 1 and *Isthm.* 4 all announce their subject as "that/this man",[68] *Ol.* 7 honors a "mighty man" (πελώριον ἄνδρα, line 15), *Pyth.* 4 a "beloved man" (ἀνδρὶ φίλῳ, line 1), *Pyth.* 9 a "blessed man" (ὄλβιον ἄνδρα, line 4) and so on. It is up to "writers and singers" (καὶ λογίοις καὶ ἀοιδοῖς), the poet tells us in *Pyth.* 1, to tell the tales "of men gone by" (ἀποιχομένων ἀνδρῶν, lines 93f.), and in *Pyth.* 10 it is only a prize-winning "man" (ἀνὴρ) who is "told of in song" (ὑμνητὸς, line 22); meanwhile, *Nem.* 7 tells us that the poet will "bring genuine κλέος to a man who is dear to him" (φίλον ἐς ἄνδρ᾽ ἄγων κλέος / ἐτήτυμον, lines 62f.), and *Isthm.* 2 announces the poet's job as bringing the Muses' honors "to the homes of famous men" (εὐδόξων ἐς ἀνδρῶν, line 34). Men are also the poet's audience and arbiters of fame and glory: excellence is honored "among men" (παρ᾽ ἀνδράσιν, *Ol.* 6.10), and is won "as a man among men" (ἐν ἀνδράσιν ἀνήρ, *Nem.* 3.72), celebrated among the "men's" festival (κῶμον ἀνέρων, *Pyth.* 5.22), dancing (ἀνδρῶν χορεύσιος, *Pae.* 6.8) and symposium (ἀνδρῶν . . . συμποσίου, *Isthm.* 6.1). Often these different categories of men – the man as the subject of poetry, the reveler, and audience – are blurred to create a male-normative society of male poets, male victors and male audience. Thus, when Pindar claims to be "weaving a many-colored song for warrior men" (ἀνδράσιν αἰχματαῖσι

---

65 Nagy (1990) 136–45; see also Currie (2005).

66 Nagy (1990) 201.

67 Nagy (1990) 204–6.

68 κεῖνος ἀνήρ, *Ol.* 6.7; ἀνδρὸς / τόνδ᾽ ἀνέρα, *Ol.* 9.13, 110; ἄνδρα . . . κεῖνον, *Pyth.* 1.42; ἄνδρα κεῖνον, *Pyth.* 5.107; κείνου . . . ἀνδρός, *Nem.* 1.9; ὅδ᾽ ἀνήρ, *Nem.* 2.3; τοῦδ᾽ ἀνδρός, *Isthm.* 1.34; ὅδ᾽ ἀνήρ, *Isthm.* 4.70. On κεῖνος in Pindar, see Bonifazi (2004).

πλέκων / ποικίλον ὕμνον, *Ol.* 6.86f.), the dative "for men" (ἀνδράσιν) works loosely to encompass *all* men – both patrons, subjects, and audience of his song.[69]

Many of these statements stating the subject of the odes as "a man" come at the poems' openings: for example, *Pyth.* 4 composed for a "beloved man" which has ἀνδρὶ in line 1; or *Nem.* 6, which opens with the "race of men" (ἓν ἀνδρῶν . . . γένος, line 1). As I observed at the beginning of this chapter, opening with the subject of "a man" unavoidably recalls the beginning of Homer's *Odyssey*, with its first word ἄνδρα (*Od.* 1.1). *Nemean* 2 opens, as we have seen (see above, p. 132), with a reflection on the usual practice of the Homeridae ("singers of stitched verses", ῥαπτῶν ἐπέων . . . ἀοιδοί, *Nem.* 2.2) to begin with a prelude to Zeus (προοιμίου, line 3). By way of comparison, the ode continues, "this man" (ὅδ᾽ ἀνὴρ, line 3) has won a hymn in his honor for his victory in the Nemean Games.[70] The epic proemion to Zeus sung by the ἀοιδοί and the epinician's opening with the man (ἀνήρ) are balanced opposite each other in the same line,[71] thus explicitly linking the praise of the ἀνήρ in Pindar's epinician to the proemia of epic, and to the male ἀοιδός. If we compare this to the opening of *Nemean* 5, then, with its ἀνήρ-cognate in ἀνδριαντοποιός, we can see that ἀνδριαντοποιός in that context thus similarly draws on not only the masculinity of epinician's subject, but also a poetic tradition of opening with the praise of men.

The prevalence of words for men (ἄνδρες) in Pindar's poetry, and the connection of ἀνήρ to conventions of poetic openings stretching back to the *Odyssey*, thus suggests that there is a more complex subtext to the negative in the opening lines of *Nemean* 5. It argues for a reading of Pindar's relationship to the ἀνδριαντοποιός as one of competition and replacement with his own poetic vision of "man-image-making", rather than outright rejection. The performance of men's praise through the medium of victory odes, stressed through the continual deployment of ἀνήρ, means that the performative context of the statement "I am not a man-image-maker" counters its own meaning, and instead asks us to define what *kind* of man-image-maker Pindar is. This is underlined by the occurrence of ἀνήρ and its derivatives several more times during the ode: first at line 9, where the celebrant's native Aegina is praised as "having good men" (εὔανδρον) – a reflection on the young man who is being celebrated, as well as the function of the ode in drawing out the gendered praise of his (female) home (ματρόπολιν, line 8) as a nurse of "good men". Two heroic examples of these kinds of men are given, Peleus and Telamon – not mentioned by name, but denoted as "brave men" (ἄνδρας ἀλκίμους, line 15). Again, as with the *recusatio* of the opening statement, Pindar makes as if to shrink from telling their

---

69 Compare *Ol* 7.7f. on Pindar sending his poetry ἀεθλοφόροις / ἀνδράσιν ("to victorious men").

70 Note that it is not simply the victor's achievement which is being compared to the poetic practice of the Homeridae, as Instone (1996) 145 suggests (although of course this is the main force of the comparison): it is also a self-reflexive commentary on the ode itself, whose proemion begins with the praise of the victor.

71 ῥαπτῶν ἐπέων τὰ πόλλ᾽ ἀοιδοί / ἄρχονται, Διὸς ἐκ προοιμίου, καὶ ὅδ᾽ ἀνήρ . . . (*Nem.* 2.2f.).

tale.[72] Yet Peleus' and Telamon's designation as "heroes" (ἥρωας, line 7), "warriors" (αἰχματὰς, line 7) and "brave men" (ἄνδρας ἀλκίμους, line 15) constructs a discourse of praise of masculinity which runs against the poet's self-avowed silence.

The final link between masculinity, man-making and the poet comes towards the end of the ode (lines 48f.), in the praise of Pytheas' trainer Menander – a name which literally means "man-strength" (formed of μένος, "strength, courage", and ἀνήρ).[73] Pytheas' homeland Aegina is εὔανδρος, and has produced two mythical warrior-ἄνδρες, Peleus and Telamon; Pytheas' trainer, "Man-strength", acts as the final connection that ensures that Aegina's legendary manliness will be continued in the present-day victor, and which cements the praise of masculinity as a theme which runs through the ode. But there is more to it than this. Menander is termed, not a trainer, but a "craftsman of athletes" (τέκτον᾽ ἀθληταῖσιν, line 49) – echoing the metaphor of craftsmanship with which the ode started, and linking in to the discourse of poet-as-τέκτων which we have seen elsewhere in Pindar's poetry. If Menander has crafted the man Pytheas' victory in the games through his sculpting of his athletic body, then the τέκτων-metaphor forms the last link in the chain to draw the parallel to Pindar as ἀνδριαντοποιός, as "man-maker" – for Pindar, in the end, is the one who has crafted his fame as a man through song (ἀείδειν, line 50).

5 Conclusion

Focusing on the construction of the poetic persona in Pindar through authorship terms and its interaction with gender provides one way into the difficult territory of interpreting the first-person statements in Pindar's poetry. Reading these terms as concerted constructions of the persona of the male poet and his chorus within a normative masculine community, celebrating and building up the male subjects of his song, enables us to see them as a series of attempts to draw the audience into a poetic world which centred around the construction of men. As in the case of the earlier poets, this masculine poetic construction often takes place at the site of con-tested gender relations – as in *Olympian* 14, for example, where the application of ἀοίδιμος to the Graces is countered by its use in *Paean* 6 to indicate the poet's ap-propriation of the female voice. Rather than drawing on old terms for poetic author-ship, like ἀοιδός, or the new family of words around ποιητής and -ποιός, Pindar generates new metaphors for the persona of the poet which root it deeply in a gen-dered context. The προφάτας of *Paean* 6 demonstrates the channeling of the female

---

72 αἰδέομαι μέγα εἰπεῖν ἐν δίκᾳ τε μὴ κεκινδυνευμένον ("I hesitate to tell of a great deed, unjustly done", line 14).

73 On the apparently negative treatment of Menander here, see Pfeijffer (1999b) 81–4; he does not note the etymology of the name.

voice as the man ventriloquizes the inspired woman's words and turns them into his own poetry. Meanwhile, the ἀνδριαντοποιός of *Nemean* 5 sets Pindar up as a new kind of "man-image-maker", programmatically setting up poetry over other kinds of masculinizing to make the poet the pre-eminent maker of men.

The poetic persona which emerges is vibrantly new, generating a novel vocabulary to describe his identity as a poet that departs from traditional terms. Yet, despite the newness of the words, the gender paradigms and constructs which both frame the persona of the poet and generate his poetry mean that we are still in a very familiar world. Women who attempt to lay claim to their voices, just like Helen in the *Iliad*, are subverted from singers to the subject-matter of song, and are relegated to the backdrop of men's tales. Male poets draw on divine women's inspiration, like Homer's and Hesiod's Muses, to generate their own poetry. And finally, men come together in the context of poetic creation, performance and celebration, to generate images of men in the male voice, together as men, for an audience of men and male future generations. The dichotomy of solo poet and communal chorus is not, then, after all, the most nuanced way of reading the first-person statements of the odes; another dichotomy – that of gender – can be seen as a different, and no less important, structuring principle to Pindar's poems. In the end, it is deeply ironic that it is the one term which Pindar says he is not which best describes the poetic persona which runs through his poetry. This poet is, truly, a maker of men.

Bibliography

Texts and translations

Pindari *Carmina*, ed. C. M. Bowra, Oxford 1935.
Pindar, *Selected Odes: Olympian One, Pythian Nine, Nemeans Two & Three, Isthmian One*, ed. Stephen Instone, Liverpool 1996.
Pindari *Carmina Cum Fragmentis*, ed. Bruno Snell and Herwig Maehler, t. 1 and 2, Leipzig 1980.

Books and articles

Agócs (2012): Peter Agócs, "Performance and Genre: Reading Pindar's κῶμοι", in: Peter Agócs, Christopher Carey and Richard Rawles (eds.), *Reading the Victory Ode*, Cambridge, 191–223.
Anzai (1994): Makoto Anzai, "First-Person Forms in Pindar: A Re-Examination", *BICS* 39, 141–150.
Blondell (2010): Ruby Blondell, "'Bitch That I Am': Self-Blame and Self-Assertion in the *Iliad*", *TAPhA* 140 (1), 1–32.
Bonifazi (2004): Anna Bonifazi, "ΚΕΙΝΟΣ in Pindar: Between Grammar and Poetic Intention", *CP* 99, 283–299.
Bowra (1964): Cecil M. Bowra, *Pindar*, Oxford.

Braun (1938): Alfonsina Braun, "I verbi del fare nel greco", *SIFC* 15, 242–296.

Bremer (1990): Jan M. Bremer, "Pindar's Paradoxical Ἐγώ and a Recent Controversy About the Performance of His Epinicia", in: Simon Slings (ed.), *The Poet's 'I' in Archaic Greek Lyric*, Amsterdam, 41–58.

Bremmer (1996): Jan N. Bremmer, "The Status and Symbolic Capital of the Seer", in: Robin Hägg (ed.), *The Role of Religion in the Early Greek Polis*, Stockholm, 97–109.

Bundy (1962): Elroy Bundy, *Studia Pindarica*, Berkeley/Los Angeles.

Burnett (1989): Anne Pippin Burnett, "Performing Pindar's Odes", *CP* 84, 283–293.

Burnett (1998): Anne Pippin Burnett, "Spontaneity, Savaging, and Praise in Pindar's Sixth Paean", *AJP* 119, 493–520.

Carey (1989): Christopher Carey, "The performance of the victory ode", *AJP* 110, 545–565.

Carey (1991): Christopher Carey, "The victory ode in performance", *CP* 86, 192–200.

Carey (2007): Christopher Carey, "Pindar, place, and performance", in: Simon Hornblower and Catherine Morgan (eds.), *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals*, Oxford, 199–210.

Currie (2004): Bruno Currie, "Reperformance scenarios for Pindar's odes", in: Christopher J. Mackie (ed.), *Oral Performance and Its Context*, Leiden, 49–69.

Currie (2005): Bruno Currie, *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*, Oxford.

Currie (2013): Bruno Currie, "The Pindaric First Person in Flux", *ClAnt* 32, 243–282.

D'Alessio (1994): Giambattista B. D'Alessio, "First-person problems in Pindar", *BICS* 41, 117–139.

Eckerman (2010): Chris Eckerman, "The Κῶμος of Pindar and Bacchylides and the Semantics of Celebration", *CQ* 60, 302–312.

Eckerman (2014): Chris Eckerman, "On the Performance of Pindar's *Nemean* 3", *Mnemosyne* 67, 289–292.

Fearn (2017): David Fearn, *Pindar's Eyes: Visual and Material Culture in Epinician Poetry*, Oxford.

Fogelmark (1972): Staffan Fogelmark, *Studies in Pindar with Particular Reference to Paean VI and Nemean VII*, Lund.

Fontenrose (1978): Joseph Fontenrose, *The Delphic Oracle: Its Responses and Operations with a Catalogue of Responses*, Berkeley.

Ford (1981): Andrew Ford, *A Study of Early Greek Terms for Poetry: 'Aoide', 'Epos' and 'Poiesis'*, Ph.D. Diss., Yale University.

Ford (1994): Andrew Ford, *Homer: The Poetry of the Past*, Ithaca.

Ford (2002): Andrew Ford, *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece*, Princeton.

Gentili (1990): Bruno Gentili, "L' 'io' nella poesia lirica greca", in: *A.I.O.N. Sez. Filologico-Letteraria* 12, 20–22.

Goldhill (1991): Simon Goldhill, *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature*, Cambridge.

Graziosi (2002): Barbara Graziosi, *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of Epic*, Cambridge.

Griffith (2009): Mark Griffith, "Apollo, Teiresias, and the Politics of Tragic Prophecy", in: Lukia Athanassaki, Richard P. Martin and John F. Miller (eds.), *Apolline Politics and Poetics*, Athens, 473–500.

Gubar (1981): Susan Gubar, "'The Blank Page' and the Issues of Female Creativity", *Critical Inquiry* 8, 243–263.

Hauser (2016): Emily Hauser, "In Her Own Words: The Semantics of Female Authorship in Ancient Greece, From Sappho to Nossis", *Ramus* 45, 133–164.

Hauser (2023): Emily Hauser, *How Women Became Poets: A Gender History of Greek Literature*, Princeton.

Heath (1988): Malcolm Heath, "Receiving the *komos*: the context and performance of epinician", *AJP* 109, 180–195.

Heath/Lefkowitz (1991): Malcolm Heath and Mary Lefkowitz, "Epinician performance", *CP* 85, 173–191.

Hoekstra (1962): A. Hoekstra, "The Absence of the Aeginetans: On the Interpretation of Pindar's Sixth Paean", *Mnemosyne* 15, 1–14.

Hubbard (2004): Thomas K. Hubbard, "The dissemination of epinician lyric: Pan-Hellenism, reperformance, written texts", in: Christopher J. Mackie (ed.), *Oral Performance and Its Context*, Leiden, 71–93.

Klinck (2001): Anne Klinck, "Male Poets and Maiden Voices: Gender and Genre in Pindar and Alcman", *Hermes* 129, 276–279.

Klindienst (2002): Patricia Klindienst, "The Voice of the Shuttle Is Ours", in: Laura McClure (ed.), *Sexuality and Gender in the Ancient World*, Oxford, 259–286.

Kuhn-Treichel (2020): Thomas Kuhn-Treichel, "Pindar's Poetic 'I' and the Muses: Metaphorical Role Characterization in Different Genres", *CJ* 116, 152–171.

Kurke (1991): Leslie Kurke, *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*, Ithaca.

Kurke (2005): Leslie Kurke, "Choral Lyric as 'Ritualization': Poetic Sacrifice and Poetic *Ego* in Pindar's Sixth Paian", *ClAnt* 24, 81–130.

Kyriakou (1994): Poulheria Kyriakou, "Images of Women in Pindar", *MD* 32, 31–54.

Lefkowitz (1963): Mary Lefkowitz, "ΤΩ ΚΑΙ ΕΓΩ: The first person in Pindar", *HSCPh* 67, 177–253.

Lefkowitz (1980): Mary Lefkowitz, "Autobiographical Fiction in Pindar", *HSCPh* 84, 29–49.

Lefkowitz (1988): Mary Lefkowitz, "Who sang Pindar's victory odes?", *AJP* 109, 1–11.

Lefkowitz (1991): Mary Lefkowitz, *First-person Fictions: Pindar's Poetic "I"*, Oxford.

Lefkowitz (1995): Mary Lefkowitz, "The first person in Pindar reconsidered – again", *BICS* 40, 139–150.

Lidov (1993): Joel Lidov, "What Am I? What Am I Not?: Three Recent Pindars", *CJ* 89, 69–79.

Martin (1989): Richard P. Martin, *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad*, Ithaca.

Maslov (2009): Boris Maslov, "The Semantics of Ἀοιδός and Related Compounds: Towards a Historical Poetics of Solo Performance in Archaic Greece", *ClAnt* 28, 1–38.

Maslov (2015): Boris Maslov, *Pindar and the Emergence of Literature*, Cambridge.

Maslov (2016): Boris Maslov, "The Children of Mnemosyne: A Contrastive Metapoetics of Pindar and Bacchylides", *Philologia Classica* 11, 223–243.

Miller (1993): Andrew Miller, "Pindaric Mimesis: The Associative Mode", *CJ* 89, 21–53.

Morgan (1993): Kathryn Morgan, "Pindar the Professional and the Rhetoric of the ΚΩΜΟΣ", *CPh* 88, 1–15.

Morrison (2007): Andrew Morrison, *The Narrator in Archaic Greek and Hellenistic Poetry*, Cambridge.

Nagy (1989): Gregory Nagy, "Early Greek Views of Poets and Poetry", in: George A. Kennedy (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: Volume 1, Classical Criticism*, Cambridge, 1–77.

Nagy (1990): Gregory Nagy, *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*, Baltimore.

Nagy (1999): Gregory Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*, 2nd ed., Baltimore.

Neer/Kurke (2019): Richard Neer and Leslie Kurke, *Pindar, Song, and Space: Towards a Lyric Archaeology*, Baltimore.

Parmentier/Felson (2016): Richard Parmentier and Nancy Felson, "The 'Savvy Interpreter': Performance and Interpretation in Pindar's Victory Odes", in: Richard Parmentier (ed.), *Signs and Society: Further Studies in Semiotic Anthropology*, Bloomington, 208–238.

Pavlou (2010): Maria Pavlou, "Pindar *Nemean* 5: Real and Poetic Statues", *Phoenix* 64, 1–17.

Pfeijffer (1999a): Ilja Leonard Pfeijffer, *First Person Futures in Pindar*, Stuttgart.

Pfeijffer (1999b): Ilja Leonard Pfeijffer, *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar: A Commentary on Nemean V, Nemean III, and Pythian VIII*, Leiden.

Phillips (2017): Tom Phillips, "Pindar's Voices: Music, Ethics and Reperformance", *JHS* 137, 142–162.

Radt (1958): Stefan Radt, *Pindars Zweiter und Sechster Paian*, Amsterdam.

Roisman (2006): Hanna Roisman, "Helen in the *Iliad*: 'Causa Belli' and Victim of War: From Silent Weaver to Public Speaker", *AJP* 127, 1–36.

Segal (1974): Charles Segal, "Arrest and Movement: Pindar's Fifth Nemean", *Hermes* 102, 397–411.

Segal (1986): Charles Segal, *Pindar's Mythmaking: The Fourth Pythian Ode*, Princeton.

Segal (1998): Charles Segal, *Aglaia: The Poetry of Alcman, Sappho, Pindar, Bacchylides, and Corinna*, London.

Shapiro (1994): H. Alan Shapiro, *Myth Into Art: Poet and Painter in Classical Greece*, London.

Smith (2007): R. R. R. Smith, "Pindar, Athletes, and the Early Greek Statue Habit", in: Simon Hornblower and Catherine Morgan (eds.), *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals: From Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire*, Oxford, 83–139.

Spentzou/Fowler (2002): Efi Spentzou and Don Fowler (eds.), *Cultivating the Muse: Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical Literature*, Oxford.

Stehle (1997): Eva Stehle, *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece: Nondramatic Poetry in its Setting*, Princeton.

Steiner (1986): Deborah Steiner, *The Crown of Song: Metaphor in Pindar*, London.

Steiner (1993): Deborah Steiner, "Pindar's 'Oggetti Parlanti'", *HSCPh* 95, 159–180.

Steiner (2001): Deborah Steiner, *Images in Mind: Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought*, Princeton.

Svenbro (1984): Jesper Svenbro, *La parola e il marmo: Alle origini della poetica greca*, Torino.

Verdenius (1987): Willem Jacob Verdenius, *Commentaries on Pindar: Volume 1, Olympian Odes 3, 7, 12, 14*, Leiden.

Worman (2001): Nancy Worman, "This Voice Which Is Not One: Helen's Verbal Guises in Homeric Epic", in: André Lardinois and Laura McClure (eds.), *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society*, Princeton, 19–37.