

Landscape and Monument as Rhetorical Phenomena in Pindar's *Olympian 1*

In this paper, I examine Pindar's first *Olympian* ode to show that Pindar used Olympia's landscape and monuments as tools to further the ideological needs of his patron, Hieron of Syracuse. I seek to move the status quo of epinician studies forward by pushing past the old debate, frequently revived, of Bundyist formalism vs. new-historicist approaches to epinician odes. It has become a *topos* of contemporary epinician criticism to use E. Bundy as a straw man and to argue that his methodology was inadequate. But the new-historicist stance of much current epinician criticism will presumably soon be viewed as equally inadequate. One next logical step for epinician criticism is to merge Bundyist formalism with new-historicist methodologies (e.g., Kurke, Burnett, Hornblower and Morgan, Morrison). As a first step toward this suggested hybrid approach, I look at the physical environment at Olympia and examine how Pindar manipulates it, in Bundy's terms, to enhance the importance of the *laudandus* and to allow the audience to connect to the rich heritage of Olympia.

Pindar used two elements of the physical landscape of Olympia in *Olympian 1* to evoke vividly the setting of the sanctuary and to connect the sanctuary to his patron: Alpheios (l.20) and the hill of Kronos (l.111). In myth, Olympia's river-god, Alpheios, dips under the Ionian sea and reappears in the spring of Arethusa at Syracuse. The myth of Alpheios and Arethusa thus allowed colonial Syracusans such as Hieron to fashion a close bond with Olympia. Moreover, the hill of Kronos, protruding immediately north of the sanctuary at Olympia, was crowned with an altar to Kronos in antiquity. Immediately after mentioning the hill of Kronos in the ode, Pindar says that summits are crowned by kings; the gnome develops its force after the reference to Kronos' hill. Since Kronos was a primordial king, Hieron, via association, appropriates Kronos' kingly prestige. I thus show that Pindar manipulated multiple, previously-overlooked elements of the landscape of Olympia in the interest of Hieron's power.

Finally, Pindar used myths in many of his odes to create historical places discursively (for a geographic approach, cf. Tuan 1991). In the case of *Olympian 1*, Pindar used the myth of Pelops to construct an early history of Olympia: he created a history of Olympia that linked his patron's equestrian victory with Olympia's etiological myth. Criticism on this myth has focused on its famed revisionism and temporal problems rather than on the rhetorical and ideological power of the myth (cf. Davidson, Köhnken). I move beyond this approach to the myth by considering the myth's ideological force through its connection to Olympia's landscape. There was perhaps no better way for Pindar to construct his patron's *arete* and god-granted power than

to write a myth that linked Hieron closely with Greece's most prestigious Panhellenic sanctuary (cf. Eckerman).

This paper links more broadly with contemporary interests in landscape and ideology: as Cosgrove points out, landscapes only come into being once individuals have perceived particular parts of the earth's surface and molded them to suit their needs. And, as Bender argues, these constructed places are manipulated to fulfill various ideological needs. Using *O. 1* as a case study, then, this paper shows that one of Pindar's most powerful rhetorical and ideological tools was the landscape of Olympia.

Authors Cited

- Bender, B. 1993. Introduction: Landscape-Meaning and Action. In *Landscape: Politics and Perspectives*, ed. B. Bender, 1-17. Providence, RI: Berg.
- Bundy, E. L. 1962. *Studia Pindarica*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Burnett, A. P. 2005. *Pindar's Songs for Young Athletes of Aigina*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Cosgrove, D. 1985. Prospect, Perspective and the Evolution of the Landscape Idea. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 10:45-62.
- Davidson, J. 2003. Olympia and the Chariot Race of Pelops. In *Sport and Festival in the Ancient Greek World*, eds. D. Phillips and D. Pritchard, 101-122. Oakville, CT: The David Brown Book Co.
- Eckerman, C. 2008. Pindar's *koinos logos* and Panhellenism in *Olympian 10*. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 151: 37-48.
- Hornblower, S. and C. Morgan (edd.) 2007. *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons and Festivals* Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Köhnken, A. 1983. Time and Event in Pindar *O. 1*. 25-53. *Classical Antiquity* 2:66-76.
- Kurke, L. 1991. *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*. Ithaca: Cornell UP.
- Morrison, A. D. 2007. *Performances and Audiences in Pindar's Sicilian Victory Odes*. London: Institute of Classical Studies.
- Tuan, Y.-F. 1991. Language and the Making of Place: A Narrative-Descriptive Approach. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 81:684-696.