

## **UC Davis**

### **Recent Work**

#### **Title**

A Poetic Possession: Pindar's Lives of the Poets

#### **Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/002054gd>

#### **Author**

Uhlig, Anna

#### **Publication Date**

2016

Peer reviewed

CHAPTER 5

A POETIC POSSESSION: PINDAR'S *LIVES*  
OF THE POETS

ANNA UHLIG

What does it mean to write a life? For most of us, our initial tendency is to conceive of biography in terms of genre. We look, with Momigliano, for 'an account of the life of a man from birth to death'.<sup>1</sup> But Aristotle's insight that the full span of a single life is not the only, or best, means of achieving a totality is no less relevant to the study of biography than to the epics about which the judgement was originally conceived.<sup>2</sup> The form of a biography is as important as the content narrated therein; it puts forth an implicit definition of the idea of a 'life'. In the creative spirit of this volume's title, we would do well to broaden the category of ancient biography to include less traditional forms of life writing. Here I present my case for doing so in the form of one very particular example: I propose the great fifth-century lyric poet Pindar for inclusion among the ranks of ancient biographers.

Recent years have seen a welcome broadening of our approach to life writing in the ancient world. As we have moved away from judgements based on rigid historical criteria, we have come to appreciate the creativity and literary insight that helped to shape the many poetic *bioi* that have been preserved alongside the texts from which they stem and which they were designed to illuminate.<sup>3</sup> Guided by the work of Fairweather, Lefkowitz and Graziosi, we have come to view the ancient *bioi* as records of a rich literary-critical history that has, for the most part, been lost to us. In presenting us with poetic lives, the writers of the *bioi* offer a special type of literary analysis: biographical interpretation. Modern students of Pindar have much to learn from the insightful analysis of his ancient biographers, and

Anna Uhlig

attention to the seemingly peculiar aspects of the tradition can serve as a welcome corrective to modern conventional wisdom. Pindar's early success in Athens, for instance, which is given great prominence in the *Ambrosian Vita*, does not figure into most modern accounts, whether explicitly or implicitly.<sup>4</sup> The stark contrast should serve as a healthy reminder that our contemporary assumptions about the stylistic (epinician), social (aristocratic) and geographic (Sicilian and Aeginetan) preferences of the lyric poet were not shared by an ancient audience who may have best known Pindar through his dithyrambic compositions. But rather than assess the ways that the authors of later biographies responded to Pindar's work, I would like to explore how Pindar himself is responding to the increasingly important role that poetic biography already played in his own lifetime. In making the case for Pindar the biographer, I will examine how the lyric poet skilfully constructs 'lives' for his poetic predecessors in a deliberate dialogue with the practice of *bios* writing that was then emerging. My analysis will also suggest ways in which the model of poetic biography can help us to rethink the much debated role of Pindar's first-person voice.

In exploring how thinking biographically can generate new ways of understanding ancient poetry, my focus on the work of Pindar is far from accidental. Pindar is an important figure in the realm of ancient life writing for a number of connected reasons. In the twentieth century, Pindaric scholarship, perhaps more than any other field, came to be dominated by biographical interpretations. It was in reaction to the great credence that scholars granted to the ancient accounts of Pindar's life that Lefkowitz first began to examine the *bios* tradition.<sup>5</sup> Even now that the 'fictional' nature of the *bioi* has been well established, it is hard to find a better example of how the ancient lives are shaped by a desire to graft the branches and boughs of a poet's work onto the firm trunk of biographical narrative. But Lefkowitz's interest in Pindar's life stems from a second, more fundamental aspect of Pindar's uniquely biographical character: the remarkable amount of his poetry

that is devoted to what looks to be autobiographical detail. There are few ancient poets more overtly invested in fashioning their own life story than Pindar, an author who consistently, almost haphazardly, places his first-person voice and experiences in the foreground of his poetry. Not only does Pindar regularly include descriptions of his own process of composition within his works, he often recounts the social and economic factors that have compelled him to produce a poem and even narrates aspects of his life which, at least at first blush, seem to have little or no connection to a poem's primary purpose.<sup>6</sup> Pindar suffuses his poetry with details of his life. So pervasive is his focus on his own first-person experience that it is hard to escape the conclusion that, as Giovan Battista D'Alessio has argued, the creative genesis behind the ancient *bios* (or *bioi*) of Pindar must ultimately be traced back to Pindar himself.<sup>7</sup> In other words, Pindar himself shared, indeed pre-empted, the biographers' desire to link his 'life' to his poetic work. Alongside whatever other function they may have served, Pindar deliberately crafted his verses to create his own self-image.

The complex, often paradoxical nature of the poetic identity that Pindar constructs for himself through his verses has been the subject of heated scholarly debate for decades.<sup>8</sup> In recent years we have, for the most part, come to view Pindar's first-person statements as elegant fictions, with no more basis in historical reality than the *bioi* which they later inspired.<sup>9</sup> Less agreed upon are the reasons why Pindar should have been so concerned with the fabrication of his poetic identity. In an effort to divorce our understanding of Pindar's first-person statements from the overly literal interpretations of past scholars, many have turned their attention to the context of Pindar's poetic performance, adopting the circumstances of reception, rather than composition, as determinant of content.<sup>10</sup> First-person declarations, such as Pindar's frequent claims to be a guest-friend (*xenos*) of his *laudandus*, are ascribed to encomiastic considerations and attributed to the *persona* created by Pindar to fit his poetic circumstances.<sup>11</sup> If, however, we take the model of ancient lives as our guide, we are presented with an

Anna Uhlig

alternative model for assessing the ‘fictionality’ of Pindar’s first-person statements. Just as we have learned to do with the *bioi* themselves, it is possible to acknowledge that Pindar’s first-person statements are indeed ‘biographical’ without imputing any historical veracity, literal or contextual, to the claims which they set forth. When Pindar speaks, for example, of his encounter with a dead hero (*Pythian* 8.56–60) or proudly claims that his grandmother is Theban Metope (*Olympian* 6.84–5), it is not wholly convincing to attribute these assertions to encomiast obligations alone. Pindar refers to personal experiences outside the laudatory context of his poetry, experiences that stem from (an idea of) the poet’s life, albeit experiences that may not have any basis in what we would consider historical reality. Such first-person statements are more than just the source of a rich biographical tradition. By including so much material about himself within his poems Pindar was, in essence, engaged in the project of writing his own poetic life. Pindar’s work as a biographer is not, however, exclusively self-referential.<sup>12</sup> In the course of fashioning his own *bios* he occasionally finds himself engaged in the broader project of narrating the lives of past poets.<sup>13</sup>

### Catching sight of the glutton

Archilochus is likely to have been amongst the first poets after Homer and Hesiod to be incorporated into the tradition of poetic *bioi* and his status as a biographical figure was well established by the beginning of the fifth century.<sup>14</sup> Pindar mentions Archilochus by name twice in his extant works. In the opening of *Olympian* 9, he briefly refers to Archilochus’ traditional role in glorifying athletic achievement.<sup>15</sup> A fuller picture of the archaic poet is found midway through Pindar’s second *Pythian* ode, composed for the Syracusan tyrant Hieron. Pindar’s representation of Archilochus could hardly be called a *bios* in the traditional sense, but I would argue that it should nevertheless be considered ‘biographical’ insofar as it describes a living man, possessed of human attributes and engaged in a discrete life event or activity:

106

A poetic possession: Pindar's *Lives*

ἐμὲ δὲ χρεῶν  
φεύγειν δάκος ἄδινὸν καταγοριᾶν.  
εἶδον γὰρ ἑκάς ἐὼν τὰ πόλλ' ἐν ἀμαχανίᾳ  
ψογερόν Ἀρχίλοχον βαρυλόγοις ἔχθεσιν  
πταινόμενον·

Pindar, *Pythian* 2.52–6

But I must flee the persistent bite of censure, for standing  
at a distance I often saw Archilochus the blamer in  
difficulty<sup>16</sup> as he grew fat on dire words of hatred.

The passage has traditionally been interpreted as an expression of poetic rivalry.<sup>17</sup> Pindar may well be invoking distinctions of genre between his own epinician song of praise and the 'words of hatred' that comprise Archilochean iambic,<sup>18</sup> but the contrast is drawn in terms that are entirely and emphatically biographical. It is important to note that the main force of the description rests not on Archilochus' poetic verses (the defects of which are never explicitly defined) but on his behaviour as a man. Indeed the sharp appraisal contained in the final metaphor of fattening oneself on words (βαρυλόγοις ἔχθεσιν πταινόμενον) cannot but prompt reflection on the flesh-and-blood nature of the appetitive, ineffectual Archilochus that Pindar has chosen to include in his poem. Pindar's assessment of his predecessor's poetic legacy is expressed through the language of biography.

In offering this biographically charged vignette, Pindar embeds Archilochus, the autonomous poet of the past, within his own work and, in so doing, the epinician poet transforms his iambic predecessor into a character of his own devising. More broadly, the actions and attributes that Pindar ascribes to Archilochus shed light on the epinician poet's idea of a poetic life.<sup>19</sup> Pindar's Archilochus may be a negative exemplar, but this inverted image is nonetheless shaped by Pindar's broader notions of what matters in a poet's biography. When Pindar speaks of Archilochus in *Pythian* 2 he not only speaks of the dead poet as a man, but as a man whom he has *seen*.<sup>20</sup> By insisting on the visual nature of his encounter with Archilochus, Pindar ensures that we understand their meeting to be one of two bodies. The corporeal nature of the description,

emphasised by the focus on Archilochus' appetite, invokes the complex questions of embodiment and presence that are intrinsic to biographical thinking, particularly artistic biography. What is more, the insistence on autopsy renders the narrative doubly biographical, for it offers a glimpse of Pindar's poetic life at the same time as it relates the life of Archilochus. The lives of the two poets are interwoven, not through outright poetic competition or familial inheritance, as poets' lives so often are in the *bioi*, but through the mere fact of proximity and shared experience: Pindar has been witness to Archilochus' life. In constructing his unusual narrative of connection to Archilochus, Pindar's divergence from the standards of conventional biography is telling. The event can hardly be making a claim for historical veracity; Pindar and his audience would undoubtedly have thought of Archilochus as a long-dead predecessor. Thus the biographical connection between the two poets should be taken as a sign that Pindar's idea of a life, and more importantly, a poetic life, does not conform to ancient or modern notions of biographical truth.

Pindar can be seen to reflect on the unconventional nature of his relationship to Archilochus in his reference to the distance that separated the two poets during their encounter: he was able to see Archilochus, but only at a remove (εἶδον γὰρ ἑκάς ἔων).<sup>21</sup> The spatial detail brings the tension of the poets' relationship to the surface, asserting that the connection between the two men has not fully erased the temporal gulf that separates them. This paradoxical fusion of proximity and distance fits readily into a pattern of poetic self-expression that Pindar has already established for himself from the outset of the ode. In fact, we can view the Archilochus vignette as the concluding section of a ring-structure of poetic self-reflection that frames the first half of the poem.<sup>22</sup>

Pindar commences his great ode to the tyrant Hieron with an apostrophe to his city, Syracuse. The address reflects the stature of the victor for whom the ode was composed, but it also provides a geographical framework for the poet himself. It is in this respect that the victor's city will first be understood:

### A poetic possession: Pindar's *Lives*

Μεγαλοπόλιες ὦ Συράκοσαι, βαθυπολέμου  
τέμενος Ἄρεος, ἀνδρῶν ἵππων τε σιδαροχαρμᾶν δαιμόνιαι  
τροφοί,  
ὑμῖν τόδε τᾶν λιπαρᾶν ἀπὸ Θηβᾶν φέρων  
μέλος ἔρχομαι ἀγγελίαν τετραορίας ἐλελίχθονος . . .  
Pindar, *Pythian* 2.1–4

O great city of Syracuse, sanctuary of Ares mighty in  
war, divine nurse of men and horses delighting in steel,  
to you I come from shining Thebes bearing this song  
and its news of the four-horse chariot that shakes the  
earth . . .

The opening passage balances the poet between two geographic poles. On the one hand, the poet clearly sets his performance in Syracuse. The sense of proximity created by the poet's apostrophic address is substantiated by his claim of physical presence (ἔρχομαι).<sup>23</sup> Yet at the same time, the poet gestures towards the point of his departure, Thebes. The origin of both poet and song, Thebes stands in the background. It is not the location for the poem's glorious performance, but the place of its birth and composition.<sup>24</sup> The distance between these two geographic coordinates is doubly bridged: by the speaker who is himself in motion and by the song (the μέλος that is also an ἀγγελία) that has made the journey with him. The destination, we are told, is determined by the occasion; Hieron's victory, divinely sanctioned. The poet sets his audience's gaze firmly on Hieron and Syracuse, transforming his addressees (the city and its inhabitants) into the stage for his song. But even as his listeners are fused with the emphatically present scene of poetic performance, Pindar conjures another place in the distance, Thebes, the place from which the man and the song have come.<sup>25</sup> Beyond its name, we know almost nothing of this other geographic pole. We are told only that it is λιπαρός: rich, splendid, fruitful. Our attention is drawn to this distant land, but we are not invited to enter into the world behind the song. Thebes is a space occupied only by the poet. And in its marked spatial remove from the communal space of performance, it resembles the distant platform on which Pindar will glimpse the floundering Archilochus when the



Anna Uhlig

first-person voice of the poet again emerges after an extended mythical excursus. Where Archilochus fattened himself to negative result, Pindar draws his verses of praise from the fertile, shining land of Thebes. But both men allow themselves to be seen in a similar manner, coming into view through their compositions, albeit at a remove. And like Pindar contemplating Archilochus, we, the audience situated in the Syracuse of the poems' performance, are invited to observe how our ability to 'see' Pindar is conditional on the great distance between us.

This preliminary glimpse of Pindar the biographer hints at the powerful connections between poetic biography and the idea of authorship that, more than any other factor, motivate the lyric poet to compose his unconventional *bioi*. Indeed, the most fundamental assumption of a poetic biography, whatever its form, is that a specific man, identifiable and unique, was responsible for the production of a work of poetry. Viewed biographically, authors cannot be considered to exist wholly within their works, but rather must make some claim to extra-textual existence. Although in one respect Archilochus is simply a character in Pindar's poetry, his status as the author of his verses also preserves an external reality that cannot be reduced to any single performance occasion or biographical description. Hence we can read the spatial detail (*ἐκὰς ἑών*) in a second, slightly more theoretical fashion. Pindar may be able to 'see' Archilochus through his works, but the iambic poet will always remain at a distance inasmuch as he is not simply or fully a *persona* contained by his works. The biographical poet remains tethered to the moment of creation and stands outside of the subsequent history that his verses will then enjoy. Likewise, by locating his poetic creation in his Theban homeland Pindar seeks to establish a firm extra-poetic grounding for himself, and thereby to ensure that his own authorship is on clear display in his work.

In identifying this model of biographical authorship in Pindar, I am guided by a novel perspective put forth by Alexander Nehamas in a well-considered response to Foucault.<sup>26</sup> Recognising the many limitations of a world without

authorship, Nehamas challenges the Foucauldian view that authorship (particularly the kind of authorship that joins disparate texts into what we would call a corpus or an *oeuvre*) introduces a problematic claim of ownership and a commodification of the text as the property of the author.<sup>27</sup> Nehamas rejects outright the basic premise of Foucault's position, asserting that authors cannot, in fact, claim ownership of their works. Rather than possessors of their texts, Nehamas claims, true authors are in fact possessed by them. So defined, the author emerges when texts are subjected to literary interpretation by their readers, and only through a reader's critical engagement can a text become possessed of an author. Crucially, Nehamas' textually engendered author inhabits a special place, neither fully independent nor wholly contained by the work of which he is, in fact, the possession. In other words, such authors are distinct both from the historically living 'writer' of the text and from any fictional *persona* representing the 'author function' within the text.<sup>28</sup> As Nehamas explains:

The relation between authors and texts is much more complex than the relations between texts and fictional characters. The first cannot be reduced to the second; it is not, in particular, an immanent relation. Though an author too is a character, it is a character manifested or exemplified in a text and not depicted or described in it . . . The relation between author and text can be called, not simply because a better word is lacking, 'transcendental'. Unlike fictional characters, authors are not simply parts of texts; unlike actual writers, they are not straightforwardly outside them.<sup>29</sup>

This unique category of author, existing in a world neither fully inside nor outside of the text, is the product of the special condition generated by the critical engagement of the reader (or audience). The author is a manifestation of the text, but cannot be produced by the text alone. Interpretation unlocks the text's potential, allowing its author to transcend its limitations and emerge into the world beyond.

Nehamas would like his definition of authorship to define the nebulous category of 'literature': to identify those texts which are qualitatively distinct from and superior to their authorless comrades. As such, his interest is in universals and

Anna Uhlig

his picture is largely a timeless one. As classicists, by contrast, we can hardly do without a sense of history. On the one hand, our own distance from the ancient texts that we read causes us to posit far more (and far more baffling) interpretative questions, requiring a more robust textual 'author' to offer a response. It is perhaps for this reason that, as Richard Hunter has noted, anonymous texts fare so poorly in the scholarly tradition.<sup>30</sup> Once the *Prometheus Bound* no longer places us in dialogue with 'Aeschylus', we find our access to the text greatly diminished. This rather unattractive tendency of our scholarship might well be corrected by an open admission of our reliance on authors to guide our readings of certain texts. If we were willing to posit openly a 'Prometheus author' (a long-lost fourth voice of fifth-century tragedy) the interpretative spark might well be rekindled.

But this general question of ancient authorship is not my main concern. It may be that authorship emerges as the product of interpretative relationships, but it is also a historical phenomenon which changes over time. Even as each interpreter is able to draw an author from the work that he deems worthy of scrutiny, we should still expect that the parameters of authorship that a text will admit will be historical in nature, tied as closely to the circumstances of composition as to the moment of interpretation. As a result, not all texts will possess authors in the same way, and the kinds of authors that texts possess will be determined to a significant degree by the historical moment in which they were written.

For Pindar, composing his verses amidst a flurry of critical interest in how the events and circumstances of a poet's life might relate to his work, it is unsurprising that musings on authorship would emerge through the manipulation of insistently biographical narratives. Pindar's distant vision of Archilochus gestures towards the type of transcendent manifestation that Nehamas identifies as characteristic of authorship. In considering Archilochus' status as a poetic predecessor and negative exemplar, Pindar has turned a critical eye towards Archilochus' work and in so doing he has caused an author to emerge. This author is formed in distinctly

A poetic possession: Pindar's *Lives*

biographical terms. Pindar's Archilochus is not simply a disembodied crafter of words. He is a living man, characterised by his appetite and irascibility as much as by his verses. To see this transcendent figure, Pindar must construct a *Life*.

One gains a better appreciation of the biographical nature of the depiction of Archilochus in *Pythian 2* through contrast with other modes in which Pindar represents his poetic predecessors. Pindar does not think of past poets in exclusively biographical terms. He is equally content to adopt a citation-based style of reference, pairing a quotation of allusion to a poet's proper name.<sup>31</sup> Thus, for instance, when Archilochus' victory refrain is invoked in *Olympian 9*, the past poet does not emerge as a fully embodied biographical figure, but rather as a much more hazy presence, little more than a name linked to a song.<sup>32</sup>

The contrast between Pindar's biographical and citational references to past poets need not signal a divergence of approach. Indeed, the use of proper names in poetic citation stems from the same critical discourse that produced much of the biographical scholarship in the late sixth and early fifth centuries. Both habits reflect the general desire to identify the distinctive outlines and attributes of past poets and thus to step away from the more amorphous figures of poetic tradition.<sup>33</sup> The harmony of outlook is nicely illustrated in Pindar's single explicit mention of Hesiod at the close of *Isthmian 6* when he praises the victor's father, Lampon, for his adherence to the wisdom of the epic poet:<sup>34</sup>

Λάμπων δὲ μελέταν  
ἔργοις ὀπάζων Ἡσιόδου μάλα τιμᾶ τοῦτ' ἔπος,  
υἱοῖσί τε φράζων παραινεῖ  
Pindar, *Isthmian* 6.66–9

Taking care in his deeds, Lampon truly honours the verse  
of Hesiod, and speaking it out, recommends it to his  
sons.

The reference is a clear example of the citational style, with the technical specification τοῦτ' ἔπος underlining the fact that the lyric poet has a specific Hesiodic line in mind (i.e. *Works*

Anna Uhlig

and *Days* 412; μελέτη δέ τοι ἔργον ὀφέλλει). Yet the poetic citation is situated within a biographical frame, albeit a moment from the life of the victor and his family rather than that of the poet himself. As D'Alessio has noted, 'Pindar is not simply quoting a sentence; he is making his patron quote it'.<sup>35</sup> The lyric poet presents us with an example of how Hesiod's verses are being put to use in the lives of Pindar's contemporaries who continue to give voice to the dead poet's words. But the language of the citation also invites us to draw an overt parallel between the lived experience of Pindar's patrons and the poetic ἔργα of Hesiod (a connection which is further encouraged by the possible pun on the title of Hesiod's great poem).<sup>36</sup> The endeavours of Lampon and his sons are analogised to Hesiod's own labours in the past, implicitly asserting that the poet lived a life that was similar, at least in certain respects, to that of the men for whom Pindar is now singing. Pindar embeds his citation in such a way that Hesiod's verse is unavoidably entangled in biographical circumstance.

Pindar's brief treatment of Hesiod in *Isthmian* 6 does not offer a biographical sketch of the dead poet, but it does allow us to see the essential harmony of the two modes of poetic reference. Whereas simply naming a poet allows Pindar to demonstrate his sophisticated appreciation of that poet's work,<sup>37</sup> the biographical approach permits a meditation on the status of the man above and beyond the significance of any single passage or work he may have composed. When the past poet becomes a character within the text, Pindar presents us with an author whom we come to see as more than the sum of his speech. As an author possessed of a *Life*, the model of Archilochus helps us to see how Pindar intends to use his own *bios* to transform the *persona loquens* of his verse into an author able to transcend what is immanent in the text.

### The blind poet looks to the future

More than any other poet, Homer serves as companion and foil to Pindar. Homer furnishes the fifth-century lyric poet with

A poetic possession: Pindar's *Lives*

a model for his own verses and an exemplar against which to measure his status as poet.<sup>38</sup> Pindar's approach to Homer's poetic legacy is marked by such subtle complexity and imaginative variety that it nearly rivals his thinking about his own lyric compositions.<sup>39</sup> In mapping Pindar's relationship to the epic poet, two programmatic passages, from *Isthmian* 3/4 and *Nemean* 7, provide a foundation for thinking about biographical authorship. As with the description of Archilochus discussed above, these two passages cannot be called biography in any strict sense. But both poems offer a vignette of the living poet and by so doing invite us to consider the relationship between Homer's life and his work.

In *Isthmian* 3/4, mention of Homer's praise of Ajax occasions a description of the epic poet's compositional practice and the lasting fame that his words have achieved. The passage, Briand notes, has received less critical attention than its counterparts,<sup>40</sup> perhaps due to the fact that the deferential stance that Pindar adopts towards his epic predecessor does not excite the imagination of many modern scholars. Homer's praise of Ajax here is a positive model for the epinician poet who concludes the passage with a prayer that he be able to light the same fire of song that has brought the bard eternal fame:

ἀλλ' Ὀμηρός τοι τετίμακεν δι' ἀνθρώπων, ὃς αὐτοῦ  
πᾶσαν ὀρθώσας ἀρετὰν κατὰ ῥάβδον ἔφρασεν  
θεσπεσίων ἐπέων λοιποῖς ἀθύρειν.  
τοῦτο γὰρ ἀθάνατον φωνᾶεν ἔρπει,  
εἴ τις εὖ εἴπη τι· καὶ πάγκαρπον ἐπὶ χθόνα καὶ διὰ πόντον  
βέβοκεν  
ἐργμάτων ἀκτὶς καλῶν ἄσβεστος αἰεὶ.  
προφρόνων Μοισᾶν τύχοιμεν, κείνον ἄψαι πυρσὸν ὕμνων  
καὶ Μελίσσω, παγκρατίου στεφάνωμ' ἐπάξιον, . . .  
Pindar, *Isthmian* 3/4.55–63

But Homer honoured him amongst mortals,  
straightening the entire tale of his virtue when leaning  
upon his staff of divine verses he spoke it out for future  
men to sing. For a thing goes forth with an immortal  
voice, if someone speaks it well. And over the all-fertile  
land and sea the flame of his noble deeds travelled

Anna Uhlig

unquenchable for all time. May we meet with  
favourable Muses and light the same fire of songs for  
Melissos as well, a worthy crown for his boxing . . .

Through Pindar's account of how Homer composed his epic narrative of Ajax's great deeds we are treated to a vision of the living poet as he fashions his verses.<sup>41</sup> The main verb *ἔφρασεν* marks the composition as oral in nature. This picture of extemporaneous composition is further emphasised by the staff on which the poet rests as he plies his craft. By highlighting the epic poet's characteristic appurtenance, Pindar ensures that we treat this Homer as a man. Leaning on his staff, speaking out his immortal verses as he crafts them, Pindar shows us a moment in the poet's life. Mention of the *ῥάβδος* would also have evoked the tradition of rhapsodic performance of the Homeric epics, a tradition with which Pindar reveals his familiarity at the opening of *Nemean 2*.<sup>42</sup> The poet's staff is thus both a connection to the biographical author's single, inalienable moment of creation and a symbol of the continued performances that his verses enjoy after Homer's own life has come to an end, a theme that will emerge as a significant aspect of this depiction.

Although he is long dead, Pindar's Homer, like his Archilochus, is not contained within an idealised past. His verses may be the product of extemporaneous composition, but like the staff on which the poet supports himself, they also look forward to a rich future of reperformance. Pindar offers no description of Homer's original audience, rather, he turns his attention immediately to the future performers (*λοιπτοί*) of the newly crafted song.<sup>43</sup> The importance of the temporal extension of this single moment of composition is made clear in the gnomic statement that caps this brief biographical sketch: *If someone speaks well, his words travel with an immortal voice*. The lack of specificity in the reference engenders thoughts of a whole poem, or even an *oeuvre*, rather than any particular lines.<sup>44</sup> The aim of the depiction is biography, not citation. Pindar does more than simply hear Homer's voice in reperformance. As with Archilochus, Pindar can also see the poet as he

A poetic possession: Pindar's *Lives*

was when he first 'straightened' his verses. The poetic future through which Homer foresaw his poem would travel stands as a vast gulf separating the epic poet and his lyric 'biographer'. And yet, looking back at Homer's life, Pindar can still discern the flesh-and-blood poet through all of the subsequent mediating voices. Homer's corporeal frame, supported on the staff that would become a symbol of his immortality, retains its integrity. Pindar too looks forward to such poetic success, and in so doing makes his own claim for a biographical permanence, a support for his immortal song that, like Homer's *rhabdos*, will simultaneously define the unique bond between the poet and his work and allow that work to be shared with future performers and audiences.

In *Nemean 7* Pindar's depiction of Homer is couched in the language of censure, though it is of a milder strain than that directed against Archilochus in *Pythian 2*. The criticism at first seems to be levelled at Homer's epic verses, but it is no less biographically focused than the positive vignette of *Isthmian 3/4*. Again Ajax is the subject of Homer's epic narrative, now focusing on his suicide following the judgement of the arms, and once again Homer's poetic skill is the subject of consideration:

ἔγώ δ' ἐπὶ πλέον' ἔλπομαι  
λόγον Ὀδυσσεύος ἢ πάθαν διὰ τὸν ἄδυεπῆ γενέσθ' Ὀμηρον·  
ἐπεὶ ψεύδεσσι οἱ ποτανᾶ τε μαχανᾶ  
σεμνὸν ἔπεστί τι· σοφία δ' ἐκλέπτει παράγοισα μύθοις. τυφλὸν  
δ' ἔχει  
ἦτορ ὄμιλος ἀνδρῶν ὁ πλεῖστος. εἰ γὰρ ἦν  
ἔ τὰν ἀλάθειαν ἰδέμεν, οὐ κεν ὄπλων χολωθεῖς  
ὁ καρτερός Αἴας ἔπαξε διὰ φρενῶν  
λευρὸν ζῆφος·

Pindar, *Nemean 7.20–7*

I believe that Odysseus' story has become greater than his actual suffering because of Homer's sweet verse, for upon his falsehoods and soaring craft rests great majesty, and his skill deceives with misleading tales. The great majority of men have a blind heart, for if they could have seen the truth, mighty Ajax, in anger over the arms, would not have planted in his chest the smooth sword.



Much debate over these lines has centred on the difficulties that attend the relationship between Homer and the characters of his poems. The knottiest interpretative challenge arises regarding the false speech that leads to Ajax's death (the ψεύδεσι οἱ ποτανᾶ τε μαχανᾶ of line 22). Is this speech to be attributed to the poet, Homer, or to his character, Odysseus? A conservative reading would attribute all of the falsehood and error to characters within Homer's poems.<sup>45</sup> On this model, Odysseus tricked the blind masses of the Argive troops with his *pseudea*, convincing them to award him Achilles' armour and causing Ajax to kill himself. Homer is guilty only of repeating Odysseus' speech. Any confusion with Homer is due to the great scope afforded to Odysseus' first-person speech in the four books of the *apologoi*.<sup>46</sup> This reading provides a satisfactory account of these lines. But we are left to wonder why the fate of Ajax should be linked to sweet-versed Homer's misleading picture of Odysseus. In light of the biographical perspective that we have found elsewhere in Pindar's treatment of past poets, it is noteworthy that Pindar describes the soaring craft (ποτανᾶ τε μαχανᾶ) that accompanies the powerful fictions with terminology similar to that which attended his description of Archilochus in *Pythian 2* (τὰ πόλλ' ἐν ἀμαχανίᾳ).<sup>47</sup> To account for Homer's presence in the passage adequately, we must allow for a more porous boundary between Pindar's figuration of the poet and his characters.

Undoubtedly there is a certain affinity, to use Segal's term, which links Homer's speech to the deceptive *muthoi* of Odysseus.<sup>48</sup> But there is also, as Kromer has noted, a real sense that the poet is 'somehow responsible for the downfall of Ajax'.<sup>49</sup> Indeed, Pindar seems to be suggesting that the lack of clarity and adherence to the truth attributed to Homer in the passage's introduction is to blame for the error in judgement that led to the great hero's suicide. The Achaean masses are blind (τυφλὸν δ' ἔχει ἦτορ ὄμιλος ἀνδρῶν ὁ πλεῖστος), but so too is Homer. Indeed the bard's blindness is one of the most stable features of his biographical tradition. As Graziosi has noted, the popularity of Homer's blindness in the biographical tradition stems, at least in part, from the great variety of

interpretations that it permits.<sup>50</sup> Here then we find the blind poet enmeshed in the struggles of his own verses, unable to see clearly what narrative choices he should make. It is through Ajax's death that Pindar can discern the poet's blindness, and thus the epic song becomes a vehicle through which to access the poet's life. Homer's life, represented in this passage by his most characteristic biographical trait, exemplifies Nehamas' idea of an author possessed by his work. The epic poet is manifest, though not immanent, in his poem; he shares in the lives of his characters without himself becoming a character. Pindar plays on the ambiguity of this relationship between author and text as he recounts the parallel events in the lives of Homer, Odysseus and Ajax.

Pindar also reflects here upon the double gaze of the biographer who sees the author through his work. By assimilating the distinct biographical narratives of Homer and Ajax, the lyric poet compels us to recognise Homer's dependency on his verses; the poet must rely on his characters to reveal the contours of his own life. The depiction of Homer in *Nemean 7* is demonstrative of Pindar's approach to biographical narrative. In his conflation of poet and text, Pindar employs one of the central techniques of ancient biography to his own poetic ends. The transposition of author and character that Pindar engineers in *Nemean 7* is the very operation through which the writers of *bioi* fashion a poet's life so as to suit the stories in his texts.<sup>51</sup> Homer's blindness, a defining (though not universally accepted) trait relayed through his biographical tradition, is lyrically re-imagined as a property of his authorship, something that emerges from the text as the life of the poet is formed. Pindar exploits the biographical resonances of the bard's characteristic blindness in order to blend the role of author and character. In so doing he capitalises on, but more importantly exposes, the narrative mechanics that will come to typify classical literary *bioi*. It is this same biographical alchemy that Pindar employs in the creation of his own poetic life.

Nowhere is the affinity between Pindar's life of Homer and his own poetic *bios* more richly explored than in *Isthmian 8*,

Anna Uhlig

where the epic poet permeates the central narrative. The ode, composed for the Aeginetan Cleandros, is primarily comprised of an extended meditation on the deeds of Achilles (lines 27–60). The narrative, unlike most of Pindar’s other mythical accounts, tells a complete life of the hero from birth to death.<sup>52</sup> The structure is complex. The tale begins as a proleptic narrative in the form of a prophetic speech (Themis instructs the Olympians how to avoid generational strife by marrying Thetis to Peleus, to whom Achilles will be born), and only after the goddess has sketched the broad strokes of Achilles’ life does Pindar himself take up the task of recounting the hero’s great exploits at Troy. Pindar never explicitly names Homer, the poet whose name is tied to Achilles and Troy, yet his condensed narrative demonstrates an abiding concern with the poetic qualities of Achilles’ life. The arc of the hero’s biography is framed at beginning and end by meditations on the relationship between his life and the verses that enable and record it.

Themis’ extended speech, first presented in a loose *oratio obliqua* (27–36) before abruptly shifting to *oratio recta* (36–45), lays the groundwork for the poetic preoccupation of the narrative. Even before his birth, Achilles’ life is embedded in the speech of others. His death and great speed, but also his childhood and education at the hands of Chiron, subjects of the various epic treatments of his life, are all foretold (36a–41). Through her words Themis takes control over what Burnett calls the poem’s ‘cosmic order’,<sup>53</sup> adeptly orchestrating the actions of the Olympian gods, but also importing the language and spirit of Trojan epic. At the same time, Themis’ speech evinces a generative force, bringing the majestic Achilles into the world of the poem before he has even been conceived:

ὥς φάτο Κρονίδαις  
ἐννέποισα θεά· τοῖ δ’ ἐπὶ γλεφάροις  
νεῦσαν ἀθανάτοισιν· ἐπέων δὲ καρπὸς  
οὐ κατέφθινε· φαντὶ γὰρ ξύν’ ἀλέγειν  
καὶ γάμον Θέτιος ἀνακτα, καὶ νεαρὰν ἔδειξαν σοφῶν  
στόματ’ ἀπείροισιν ἀρετὰν Ἀχιλλεύς·  
Pindar, *Isthmian* 8.45–8

### A poetic possession: Pindar's *Lives*

Thus spoke the goddess to the sons of Kronos, and they  
nodded agreement with their immortal eyes. And the  
fruit of her words did not perish, for they say that the  
lord joined the others in favouring that marriage of  
Thetis, and the mouths of the wise have revealed  
Achilles' youthful excellence to those unaware of it.

Themis' words bear fruit (ἐπέων δὲ καρπός). Just as Homer did in *Isthmian* 3/4, Themis gives life to a poetic tradition through her speech, providing a subject for the mouths of poets (σοφῶν στόματα). But this poetic tradition is inseparable from the life of the child, Achilles, whose great deeds have already been narrated in the goddess's prophecy. In effect it is Themis, as much as Thetis, who gives Achilles life.

If Themis' words are doubly generative of Achilles' life and song, Pindar nevertheless underlines the asymmetrical relationship between the hero and his poetic legacy, drawing our attention to the finitude of the mortal's life in contrast with poetry's unbounded continuation. The basic notion is hardly unprecedented. But his perspective on this foundational tenet of archaic poetics is lent freshness and vitality by the creative approach to biographical narrative:

τὸν μὲν οὐδὲ θανόντ' αἰοδαί ἐπέλιπον,  
ἀλλὰ οἱ παρά τε πυρὰν τάφον θ' Ἑλικώνια παρθένοι  
στάν, ἐπὶ θρῆνόν τε πολύφαιμον ἔχεσαν.  
Pindar, *Isthmian* 8.56–8

Not even when he died did songs abandon him, but the  
Heliconian maidens stood beside his pyre and his tomb  
and poured over him their dirge of many voices.

The tradition that places the Muses at Achilles' funeral undoubtedly predates the earliest surviving mention of it, in the final book of the *Odyssey*.<sup>54</sup> Nevertheless, Pindar is able to imbue the event with a sense of novelty through his striking use of litotes. The construction implies, though one knows it not to have been the case, that Achilles might have been abandoned by song at his death. The implication has a two-fold resonance. On the one hand, we are faced with the prospect of a truly mortal Achilles, a man left unsung in

death. On the other, the formulation of the Muses' behaviour as a possible cessation reminds us that the whole of Achilles' mortal life has already been attended by the divine singers.<sup>55</sup> We are returned, that is, to Themis' prophecy and the role that song has played in the creation of the hero. In death as in birth, Achilles lives a poetic life, and as such he serves as a model for the poets who sing him. As we are invited to contemplate the special nature of Achilles' life-in-song, the inseparability of his *bios* from the enchanting voices of the Muses gestures to another biographical beneficiary of this mutually-reinforcing fecundity: Homer himself. The life of the bard, no less than that of his greatest subject, is delineated by the ceaseless singing of the Muses who inspire his song. As with the *pseudea* that he told about Odysseus, the distinction between the two figures dissolves under close scrutiny. And so too Pindar, by engaging in the double biographical project – telling the life of Achilles and of Homer – implicates himself in the process of poetic biogenesis. In crafting his *bios* of Achilles, Pindar has fashioned three lives: for the hero, for Homer and for himself.

It should come as little surprise, then, that *Isthmian* 8 is amongst the most autobiographical of Pindar's extant works.<sup>56</sup> The poem opens with a series of rapid-fire first-person statements that are remarkable for the degree of focus that they place on the poet's life. Pindar speaks of his recent troubles, of his grief and the suffering from which he has been freed. But these personal woes cannot sever his connection to the world of song (τῷ καὶ ἐγὼ, καίπερ ἀχνύμενος / θυμόν, αἰτέομαι χρυσέαν καλέσαι Μοῖσαν – *Thus I, although I am grieving in my heart, am called upon to summon the golden Muses*, 5–7). Pindar's life is inextricably linked to the Muses, an analogue to the life of the great hero, Achilles, which will soon be the subject of the ode. Achilles' life is fully circumscribed by the song that will grant him poetic immortality; the song of Themis precedes his birth while that of the Muses outlasts him. But Pindar here stakes claim to an existence beyond his poetic pursuits. His authorship transcends the bounds of his work.

A poetic possession: Pindar's *Lives*

As the author of his text Pindar inhabits the boundary between song and life. If his strong first-person statements point to the world beyond the text, Pindar's subsequent, more measured self-references establish the symbiosis of author and song. The transition in biographical tone is marked by a shift from the bold first-person to an impersonal third-person construction just as the poet prepares to declare that most personal of details, the name of his homeland:

χρή δ' ἀγαθὰν ἐλπίδ' ἀνδρὶ μέλειν.  
χρή δ' ἐν ἑπταπύλοισι Θήβαις τραφέντα  
Αἰγίνα Χαρίτων ἄωτον προνέμειν . . .  
Pindar, *Isthmian* 8.15a–16a

It is necessary for a man to cherish good hope. And it is necessary for one raised in seven-gated Thebes to offer the choicest gift of the Graces to Aegina . . .

As we saw with *Pythian* 2, Thebes is Pindar's coding space, the source of his poetic expression and the foundational seat of his poetic *bios*. The importance of the location takes on even greater resonance when we recall the debates, perhaps already raging in the fifth century, over Homer's birthplace.<sup>57</sup> The poet's birthplace is the essential detail that defines his life. Yet Achilles' birth through words offers a contrasting model of a poetically generated *bios*. As he travels deeper into the narrative of his own life, Pindar seeks to marry his externally referenced life with a sense of textual dependence. The marked anaphora (χρή δ' ἀγαθὰν . . . χρή δ' ἐν) reinforces the impersonal construction.<sup>58</sup> But the generalizing tone of the gnomic first statement (ἀγαθὰν ἐλπίδ' ἀνδρὶ μέλειν) stands as an odd parallel for the far more personal details of the second (ἐν ἑπταπύλοισι Θήβαις τραφέντα etc.). Pindar is making a transition from the forceful first-person presence of the poem's opening strophe to the shadowy life that fully inhabits, and like Achilles is born from, his poem. He is also modelling his voice on the subtle understatement that characterises Homer's epic narration, seamlessly embedded within the very fabric of song.

The final stage of Pindar's transition from first-person biographer to silently present author occurs just after this shift to

the impersonal voice. As he begins to recount his mythical narrative, Pindar addresses the nymph Aegina, eponym of the victor's homeland.<sup>59</sup> The subtle apostrophe stands in contrast to the dynamic second-person addresses with which Pindar frames the poem, calling first on the young men of Aegina to rouse the *komos* for their victorious comrade (lines 1–5) and then to an unidentified group, possibly the same band of youth from the poem's opening lines, to grant the victor's uncle Nicocles his due honour (γεράριετέ νιν 62). In both instances the poet speaks in the boldly deictic fashion that we have come to call Pindar's 'oral subterfuge', creating a sense that the song's composition and performance are spontaneous expressions of the poet's mind.<sup>60</sup> By contrast, the address to Aegina is concerned not with the circumstances of the ode's composition or performance, but with the world of its embedded mythical narrative. Adopting the nymph as his interlocutor, Pindar incorporates himself into the lives of his characters, stepping into a world that is wholly contained by his song. This type of apostrophe to figures *within* a mythic narrative is rare in Pindar,<sup>61</sup> but is found with notable frequency in Homer's epics.<sup>62</sup> Echoing a markedly epic precedent, Pindar's address to Aegina is perfectly suited to achieve the poet's twin aims: to embed the lyric poet within his song while at the same time adopting the poetic *persona* of the epic bard who has successfully done so in the past.

Pindar's pointed meditations on the *bioi* of poets of the past allow us to see the lyric poet thinking about the nature of his own poetic authorship. Biographical vignettes of Homer and Archilochus expose a cautious and understated strain in Pindar's poetic self-fashioning. His dynamic first-person statements set out a clear claim for authorship, but we cannot properly grasp what type of poetic life, and hence what type of authorship, Pindar aspires to without an appreciation of the biographical imagination that shapes his judgement of his poetic predecessors. In reading a life of Pindar through the lives that he constructs for other poets, the categories of genre and tradition become entwined with the vision of a living poet, a man to whom verses can be ascribed and whose presence is

conjured by the words composed in his voice. As the poet himself recedes from the physical space of performance, the figure of the author as a living man behind his song becomes a necessary possession of his poetry. Pindar is himself aware of the transcendent life which the songs of past poets confer on them, and he makes use of their model in constructing the life that will be his own poetic possession.

### Notes

- 1 Momigliano (1971) 11.
- 2 Arist. *Poetics* c. 8, on the 'unity of plot'.
- 3 Fairweather (1974); (1984); Lefkowitz (1981; 2nd edn 2012); and Graziosi (2002).
- 4 *Vita Ambrosiana* 1.11–2.1. On the *vitae* of Pindar, see Daude *et al.* (2013).
- 5 See Lefkowitz (1975); (1978); (1980); (1981).
- 6 Lefkowitz (1963); Bowra (1964).
- 7 'Pindar is undoubtedly the first creator of the biographical legend later developed around his figure': so D'Alessio (1994) 138.
- 8 For an overview see Patten (2009) 187–90.
- 9 See recently Calame (2010), with bibliography.
- 10 Following Kurke (1991) many scholars have connected Pindar's *persona* to the role played by epinician poetry in re-integrating the victor to his community.
- 11 So Lefkowitz (1981) 135–46, 154–9. Recently Pelliccia (2009) 245–7 and Bowie (2012) have argued for a return to a more literal interpretation of such biographical claims.
- 12 Though see Irwin (2006) for how poets (in this case Solon) manipulated the reception of their own poetic *personae*.
- 13 These glimpses of past poets fit into the broader retrospective thematisation of Pindar's epinician poetry, which consistently places narrative emphasis on the exploits of the heroes of generations past. See Mackie (2003) ch. 2.
- 14 Irwin (1998); Clay (2004); and Kivilo (2010) 90–1.
- 15 The customary refrain, τήνελλα καλλίνικε, is attributed to Archilochus in a scholion to this passage. For discussion, see Gentili *et al.* (2013) 523.
- 16 The meaning of τὰ πόλλ' ἐν ἀμαχανίᾳ in this passage is debated. For my present purposes, it makes little difference what precise type of difficulty is implied by ἐν ἀμαχανίᾳ, though I am generally persuaded that the distress is primarily of a poetic and creative, rather than pecuniary, nature; so Carey (1981) *ad loc.* More



- recently Morgan (2015) 189–90 has shown that the two interpretations can, in fact, be understood as complementary.
- 17 See the bibliographical overview in Gentili and Bernardini (1995) 385–8. Beginning with the scholia, interpreters have even sought to identify a contemporary rival (most often Bacchylides) for whom Archilochus stands as proxy, so Grimm (1962).
- 18 Most (1985) 89–90; Brown (2006); Steiner (2001); (2002); and (2011); for a different view see Rankin (1975). Miller (1981) links the contrasting tones to the poem’s internal division between blame of Ixion and praise of Hieron, a position that Morgan (2008) 43–8 synthesises with questions of genre.
- 19 Lefkowitz (1978) 462.
- 20 My attention was drawn to the visual nature of Pindar’s engagement with Archilochus by a paper that Christopher Brown delivered in Delphi in 2009, entitled ‘Pindar’s Vision of Archilochus’.
- 21 So Gildersleeve (1885) *ad loc.*
- 22 A different ring structure is identified by Most (1985) 69–70.
- 23 Though of course this claim need not denote historical truth, cf. Felson (1999).
- 24 Its ‘coding’ location, in the terminology of D’Alessio (2004). It has been suggested that Hieron’s victory was in fact won at Thebes (for discussion, see Young (1983) 42–7). It seems more likely that the poet refers here, as he regularly does elsewhere, to the city as the place of his birth, so Gentili and Bernardini (1995) 47. But even if Thebes was the site of Hieron’s victory, mention of the location by the Theban poet would not preclude personal resonances.
- 25 Such bifurcated geography is regularly associated with the poet, as Pindar often uses first-person speech to draw attention to his ability to move through space and time; see e.g. Lefkowitz (1963) 199; Felson (1999).
- 26 Nehamas (1987).
- 27 The radical reconfigurations of the idea of authorship introduced in the last half century, above all the theories of Barthes and Foucault, have had an impact on our present discussion that can hardly be overstated. For an overview, see Compagnon (2004) 29–68.
- 28 The idea of the ‘author function’ is set out in Foucault (1979).
- 29 Nehamas (1987) 273.
- 30 Hunter (2002) 91.
- 31 The popularity of the citational style is discussed by Ford (1997).
- 32 Pind. *Ol.* 9.1–2: Τὸ μὲν Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος φωνᾶεν Ὀλυμπία, καλλίνικος ὁ τριπλῶς κεχλαδῶς.

- 33 Ford (1997); Morgan (2000) 46–67; Ford (2002) chs. 2 and 3; and Struck (2004) 26–9.
- 34 The broader implications of Hesiod's strong influence on Pindar are well discussed by Kurke (1990), D'Alessio (2005) and Stamatopoulou (2008).
- 35 D'Alessio (2005) 331.
- 36 Kurke (1990) 89, n. 18 first suggested the pun, explaining that ἔργοις in this passage can be taken in two ways: to refer to Lampon's own works' and 'to refer explicitly to the Hesiodic *Erga*'.
- 37 Ford (1997) 92.
- 38 Briand (2001) 43.
- 39 Sotiriou (1998); Briand (2001) 42–4.
- 40 Briand (2001) 35.
- 41 I follow Privitera (1982) *ad loc.* in understanding the verb ὀρθόω here to denote the initial act of composition, and not, as some have suggested, the correction of an earlier version, a suggestion which seems to have been unduly influenced by the more antagonistic tone of *Nem.* 7.
- 42 Graziosi (2002) 30–1.
- 43 'Homer did not wish his verses to be a model for future poets, be they epic or lyric, because they too would praise Ajax. He wished to provide a song of praise that rhapsodes would be able to repeat forever, wherever they were': so Privitera (1982) 180 (my translation).
- 44 Pindar's broad definition of Homer's *oeuvre* was not limited to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*; Nisetich (1989) 1; Ford (1997) 88; and Lloyd-Jones (2002) 2–3.
- 45 Most (1985) 148–54.
- 46 Most (1985) 150–1.
- 47 For poetic resonances of the word *μοχλανά* and related terminology in Pindar see Martin (1983) 43–58.
- 48 Segal (1967) 442–3.
- 49 Kromer (1975).
- 50 Graziosi (2002) 160.
- 51 For Homer in particular, fifth-century critics rarely drew a distinction between the poet's first-person speech and that of his embedded characters, especially when offering the types of allegorical interpretation that Pindar may be alluding to here. See e.g. Ford (1999) 42–6.
- 52 A similarly totalising prophetic *bios* is found in *Pi. Nem.* 1.61–72, where Tiresias foretells the destiny of the infant Heracles. Koehnken (1975) 29, n. 27 notes that this is Pindar's only reference to the death of Achilles.

- 53 Burnett (2005) 114.  
54 Burgess (2009) 40–2.  
55 Carey (1981) 201.  
56 Lefkowitz's important discussions of the 'autobiographical' nature of the opening of *Isthmian* 8, (1963) 210–15 and (1980) 31–4, actually demonstrate clear affinities with her pioneering work on ancient biography, a connection that is most clearly articulated in her analysis of the ways in which fifth-century poetic self-presentations are mirrored in later biographical narratives.  
57 Graziosi (2002) 62–89.  
58 Carey (1981) 193 comments: 'Pindar is fond of anaphora, but the present example is unparalleled'.  
59 Pind. *Isth.* 8.21–3: σὲ δ' ἐς νᾶσον Οἰνοπίαν ἐνεγκὼν κοιμᾶτο, δῖον ἔνθα τέκες Αἰακὸν βαρυσφάργγῳ πατρὶ κεδνότατον ἐπιχθονίων.  
60 The term was coined by Carey (1981) 5.  
61 Examples at Pind. *Ol.* 1.36, 45, 51; *Pyth.* 4.59, 175; *Ith.* 6.19 (anticipated); *Pae.* 2.1–4, 104–5 and fr. 81. A striking example of Homeric-style apostrophe within a speech in *oratio recta* appears at *P.* 4.89.  
62 Parry (1972).