

EUTHYMOS OF LOCRI: A CASE STUDY IN HEROIZATION IN THE CLASSICAL PERIOD¹

Abstract: Euthymos was a real person, an Olympic victor from Locri Epizephyrii in the first half of the fifth century BC. Various sources attribute to him extraordinary achievements: he received cult in his own lifetime; he fought with and overcame the ‘Hero of Temesa’, a *daimon* who in ritual deflowered a virgin in the Italian city of Temesa every year; and he vanished into a local river instead of dying (extant iconography from Locri shows him as a river god receiving cult a century after his death). By taking an integrative approach to Euthymos’ legend and cult iconography, this article proposes a new interpretation of the complex. It is argued that Euthymos received cult already in his lifetime in consequence of his victory over the Hero and that he took over, in a modified form, the Hero’s cult. Various considerations, including the role of river gods as the recipients of brides’ virginity in prenuptial rites, point to an identification of the Hero as a river deity. In this light it is suggested that the contest between Euthymos and the Hero was conceived as a deliberate emulation of Herakles’ fight with Acheloos. The case of Euthymos at Locri, for all its peculiarities, draws our attention to some important aspects of the heroization of historical persons in the Classical period. First, the earliest attested cult of a living person in Greece is to be placed around the middle of the fifth century. Second, heroized persons in the Classical period were not always passive in the process of their heroization, but could actively promote it. And third, a common pattern in the heroization of contemporaries in the Classical period was to accommodate them into existing cults.

THE best introduction to Euthymos is his own *curriculum vitae*:

1. Euthymos was a son of Astykles and a citizen of Locri Epizephyrii.²
2. He won the Olympic crown for boxing three times, in 484, 476 and 472 BC, and was defeated once by Theogenes (Theagenes) of Thasos in 480 BC.³
3. He performed various feats of strength.⁴
4. He was locally reputed to be the son of the river god Kaikinos.⁵
5. He fought with the ‘Hero’ of Temesa, to whom the Temesans had of old brought their fairest maiden every year ‘to be his wife’; Euthymos defeated the Hero and married the maiden.⁶
6. His statues in Locri and Olympia were struck by lightning on the same day.⁷
7. He lived to a great age.⁸
8. Pythian Apollo ordered that sacrifices be made to him in his lifetime and after his death.⁹
9. Instead of dying he vanished into the river Kaikinos.¹⁰
10. By the second half of the fourth century BC, at the latest, he was receiving cult in Locri as a river god involved in prenuptial rites.¹¹

These episodes are preserved in various sources. It is uncertain whether they ever comprised a unified *logos*, and at what stage the different episodes took shape.¹² It is apparent that not all

¹ An oral version of this article was delivered at Reading University in February 2001; I am grateful to all who participated in that discussion. I would also like to thank Dr Armand D’Angour, Professor Robert Parker, Professor Peter Parsons and Dr Nicholas Richardson for valuable criticisms of the written version, and the anonymous referees of *JHS* for several helpful comments. The responsibility for the argument remains my own. I am grateful to Professor Felice Costabile and the Soprintendenza Archeologica della Calabria for permission to reproduce the photograph in Plate 1.

² Paus. 6.6.4; *CEG* 1.399.

³ Paus. 6.6.5–6. The inscription on his statue base in Olympia is extant (*CEG* 1.399) and his name can be restored on the Oxyrhynchus victor list (*POxy* 222 col. i.12, 25). Three-time Olympic victors enjoyed a special status: Plin. *Nat.* 34.16.

⁴ Ael. *VH* 8.18.

⁵ Paus. 6.6.4.

⁶ Call. *fr.* 98 Pf. and *Diegesis* 4.6–17; Strabo 6.1.5 255; Paus. 6.6.7–11; Ael. *VH* 8.18; Suda s.v. Εὐθύμος.

⁷ Plin. *Nat.* 7.152 = Call. *fr.* 99 Pf.

⁸ Paus. 6.6.10.

⁹ Call. *fr.* 99 Pf.

¹⁰ Ael. *VH* 8.18. Cf. Paus. 6.6.10.

¹¹ F. Costabile *et al.*, *I ninfei di Locri Epizefiri* (Catanzaro 1991) 195–238. *SEG* 42.906.

¹² A unified *logos* is assumed by, e.g., A. Mele, ‘L’eroe di Temesa tra Ausoni e Greci’, in E. Lepore and A. Mele, ‘Pratiche rituali e culti eroici in Magna Grecia’, in *Forme di contatto e processi di trasformazione nelle società antiche. Atti del Convegno di Cortona (24–30 maggio 1981)* (Pisa and Rome 1983) 848–88 at 860, 863.

episodes exhibit the same degree of reality: it is tempting to regard 1-2 as historical, 3-9 as legendary. However, this dichotomy may distort the fifth-century BC perspective. More important for this article than whether the events recorded were real is whether (and in what sense) they may have been believed to be real.¹³

Euthymos is an important person in the history of Greek religion. He is one of a handful of athletes of the fifth century BC who received cult.¹⁴ More than that, he is the earliest historical Greek claimed by an ancient author to have received cult in his lifetime (although modern scholars generally give this distinction to Lysander some decades later). Exceptionally for a heroized historical person of the fifth century BC, there is archaeological as well as textual evidence relating to Euthymos' cult. Moreover, our sources ascribe to Euthymos a legend as well as a cult. It is above all for the former that Euthymos has attracted attention: the legend describes an extraordinary rite performed at Temesa in the Archaic period, which has been interpreted variously as human sacrifice or religious prostitution, but either way of great interest to the historian of Greek religion. From several viewpoints, then, Euthymos merits attention. The present article has two, interconnected, objectives. First, to illuminate the peculiarities of the cult and legend of Euthymos. Second, to accommodate these data to our general picture of heroization of historical persons in the fifth century BC, an area that has received surprisingly little attention.¹⁵ Euthymos will thus serve here as a case study in heroization in the Classical period, a role for which the abundance of evidence of diverse kinds makes him especially suitable.

I. SOME TRENDS IN SCHOLARSHIP

The scholarship on Euthymos is too extensive to be passed fully under review; only certain themes can be mentioned which are important for what follows.¹⁶

Several scholars (especially in the first half of the twentieth century) focussed on the story of Euthymos' victory over the Hero, assuming that it preserved details of the history of Magna Graecia refracted through a mythological lens. Thus, the legend has been taken to reflect the conquest by Greek colonists of indigenous peoples.¹⁷ Or it has been taken to reflect changing power relations among the Greek colonists themselves: the conquest of Temesa by Locri, or successive conquests of Temesa either by Sybaris then Locri or by Metapontum then Sybaris.¹⁸ As the diversity of these interpretations itself suggests, the historical record is insufficient to con-

¹³ Cf. W. Burkert, *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism* (Cambridge, MA 1972) 120, 136-7, on the problems of separating out 'fact' and 'fiction' in the biographies of figures like Pythagoras. Below it will be suggested how the fight with the Hero could have been 'real' from the contemporary perspective.

¹⁴ See, e.g., J. Fontenrose, 'The hero as athlete', *CSCA* 1 (1968) 73-104; F. Bohringer, 'Cultes d'athlètes en Grèce classique: propos politiques, discours mythiques', *REA* 81 (1979) 5-18; L. Kurke, 'The economy of *kudos*', in C. Dougherty and L. Kurke (eds), *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece. Cult, Performance, Politics* (Cambridge 1993) 131-63.

¹⁵ Cf. D. Bohringer, 'Zur Heroisierung historischer Persönlichkeiten bei den Griechen', in M. Flashar, H.-J. Gehrke and E. Heinrich (eds), *Retrospektive. Konzepte von Vergangenheit in der griechisch-römischen Antike* (Munich 1996) 37-61 at 37. Some pertinent observations are also to be found in A. Connolly, 'Was Sophocles heroised as Dexion?', *JHS* 118 (1998) 1-21.

¹⁶ For a bibliography, see L. Lehnus, *Nuova bibliografia Callimachea 1489-1998* (Geneva 2000) 90-2. Add Costabile (n.11) 195-238; P. Müller, 'Sybaris II', *LIMC* 7.1 (1994) 824-5. A survey of scholarship up to 1991 is given by M. Visintin, *La vergine e l'eroe. Temesa e la leggenda di Euthymos di Locri* (Bari 1992) 41-58.

¹⁷ E. Maaß, 'Der Kampf um Temesa', *JDAI* 22 (1907) 18-53; G. De Sanctis, 'L'Eroe di Temesa', *Atti dell'Accademia delle Scienze di Torino* 45 (1909-10) 164-72; G. Giannelli, *Culti e miti della Magna Grecia* (Florence 1924) 261-71.

¹⁸ E. Pais, 'The legend of Euthymos of Locri', in *Ancient Italy* (Chicago and London 1908) 39-51 (= 'La leggenda di Eutimo di Locri e del Heroon di Temesa', in *Ricerche di storia e di geografia dell'Italia antica* (Turin 1908) 43-56 = *Italia antica. Ricerche di storia e geografia storica* 2 (Bologna 1922) 79-91); E. Ciacri, *Storia della Magna Grecia* (2nd edn, Rome 1928) 1.258-66; A. Peronaci, *Metaponto. Atti del XIII convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia* (Naples 1974) 269-74.

firm or refute any of them. These approaches are therefore unsatisfying. They also tend, paradoxically, to marginalize the legend's protagonist, Euthymos. The question of the legend's relation to 'history', however, is an important one: it will be posed in this article in a different way.

In 1932 Samson Eitrem signalled a problem that is a central concern of this article: how the historical fifth-century athlete Euthymos could feature in a legend in which he defeats a 'hero', that is, someone who was deemed to have lived in the Heroic Age and was subsequently the recipient of a cult at Temesa. Eitrem postulated a homonymous mythical Euthymos with whom the historical Euthymos had been confused.¹⁹ Although Eitrem's solution makes an unwarranted postulate, the problem he signals is genuine.²⁰ The question how the planes of myth and of contemporary history could interact in the case of Euthymos is a central concern of this article.

In 1979 François Bohringer considered Euthymos in the course of a study of heroized fifth-century athletes. According to Bohringer, Greek cities in the fifth century BC did not heroize athletes in recognition of their athletic services but in order to serve their own political interests. An Olympic victor was simultaneously an international celebrity and a politically marginal figure in his own city; the glorification of such a figure by means of a posthumous cult could enable the city to 'efface' inglorious episodes in its recent history.²¹ The heroizing of Euthymos by Locri is related by Bohringer to Locri's territorial conflicts throughout the fifth century, above all with Rhegion.²² The proposal to connect Euthymos' cult with Locrian expansionism in the fifth century is attractive.²³ But Bohringer also advanced the more general thesis that the heroization of athletes serves the interests of the city, not those of the athlete himself.²⁴ This in fact reflects an important and widely held assumption regarding the heroization of historical persons in general: that the perspective of the person who is heroized is subordinate to the perspective of the city which effects the heroization.²⁵ Although the community's role and the political circumstances were doubtless important factors, this article will argue that the heroized person's perspective must often also be taken into account.

The archaeologists Paolo Arias and Felice Costabile in 1941 and 1991 made important contributions to the understanding of the cult of Euthymos from the iconographical side.²⁶ In this article, however, further implications will be drawn from this iconographical evidence, in the

¹⁹ S. Eitrem, 'Sybaris', *RE* 5A (1932) 1002-5 at 1003.41-4: 'Wenn nicht schon ein anderer Euthymos den schwarzen temesäischen Dämon besiegt hätte, wäre es fast unbegreiflich, daß der Faustkämpfer ihn verdrängt hätte.'

²⁰ Compare Visintin (n.16) 10, 30.

²¹ Bohringer (n.14): 'ces cultes oblitérent des périodes de faiblesse et de division des cités, sauvant la face de la communauté en récupérant un représentant illustre mais contestable' (15); 'Le culte d'athlètes en Grèce classique efface... faiblesses, divisions, crises passées...' (18). For Bohringer it is crucial that such cults are posthumous. He is therefore (15) disinclined to accept Pliny's statement that sacrifices were made to Euthymos in his lifetime.

²² Bohringer (n.14) 11, 15. For the conflict between Locri and Rhegion, cf. schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 2.36c, 2.38, 1.99a (= Epicharmus 96 *PCG*); Justin 21.3.2.

²³ Cf. Costabile (n.11) 213-14.

²⁴ Bohringer (n.14) 18: 'Le culte d'athlètes en Grèce classique... affirme et affermit l'unité du groupe...'

²⁵ Boehringer (n.15) reduces the phenomenon of heroization to a purely political function of the city-state: '[In archaischer und klassischer Zeit] heroisierten die Griechen historische Personen... in Rollen, die eine politische Relevanz für die Gemeinschaft besaßen' (37);

'...Heroenkulte dienten dem individuellen Identifikationsgefühl einer Gemeinschaft und waren Ausdruck ihrer Solidarität' (47). (D. Boehringer (n.15) is not to be confused with F. Bohringer (n.14)!) E. Kearns, *The Heroes of Attica* (London 1989) 5-6, differs from Bohringer in granting hero cult an intrinsically religious dimension, but also emphasizes the perspective of those who perform the hero cult, rather than that of those who are heroized: 'The worship of former human beings can have two aspects: an essentially objective cultus in which they are approached like the gods, and a more subjective concentration on the fate of the dead, when the present state of the heroes is of interest as a possible reflexion of the worshipper's own future state... By and large, the hero was viewed objectively in the classical period... The important thing was the relation of the hero to the worshipper.' Kearns's 'objective' viewpoint is shared by W. Burkert, *Greek Religion* (Cambridge, MA 1985) 190: 'Ritual and belief are concerned almost exclusively with the death of others; one's own death remains in the dark.'

²⁶ P.E. Arias, *Cinquanta anni di ricerche archeologiche sulla Calabria (1937-1987)* (Rovito 1988) 121-30 (= 'Euthymos', *Siculorum Gymnasium* 1.2 (1941) 77-85) and 197-210 (= 'Euthymos di Locri', *ASNP* 17.1 (1987) 1-8). Costabile (n.11) 195-238.

belief that there is a closer link than has been recognized between the cult of Euthymos, as reflected in the iconography, and Euthymos' fight with the Hero, as recorded in the legend.²⁷

The longest treatment of the legend of Euthymos so far is Monica Visintin's monograph of 1992. Her treatment, however, is still selective. Visintin disavows the intention to discover the realia of the cults performed for either the Hero of Temesa or for Euthymos and concentrates instead on the legend.²⁸ Her main focus is the Hero of Temesa rather than Euthymos. The Hero is for Visintin one of the 'restless dead', a *revenant*.²⁹ Visintin interprets the rite performed for the Hero at Temesa as a rite of human sacrifice.³⁰ In this article a much closer link will be argued for between the legend of the Hero and the cult of Euthymos than Visintin allows. In the interpretation of both the cult and the legend a central role will be given to the iconographical evidence for Euthymos' cult, which Visintin virtually ignores.³¹ The view will, further, be challenged that the Hero's essential identity is that of a *revenant* and that the rite performed for him is one of human sacrifice.³² It will be argued here that the rite is better compared with so-called rites of 'sacred prostitution'.³³

II. THE EVIDENCE

The evidence for Euthymos' cult and legend is of three kinds: (i) literary accounts; (ii) a literary description of a lost painting; and (iii) extant iconography from Locri Epizephyrii.

(i) The literary evidence for Euthymos' legend is scattered across several authors.³⁴ It is unclear whether all depend on a single source, and if so what that was. All may ultimately depend on local oral tradition.³⁵ On the other hand, a single written source cannot be ruled out: then Timaeus especially comes into consideration.³⁶ The fullest of the extant literary versions of the legend of Euthymos and the Hero of Temesa is given by Pausanias, and may be summarized

²⁷ Cf. Arias (n.26) 200: 'La storia [sc. Euthymos' fight with the Hero] non interessa il nostro discorso.'

²⁸ Visintin (n.16) 39.

²⁹ Visintin (n.16) 55, 68, 71, 75, 105.

³⁰ Visintin (n.16) 79-80, 131-3, 148-53 interprets the 'marriage' of the Temesan virgin to the Hero as a 'marriage to Death', that is, as human sacrifice rather than ritual defloration.

³¹ Sole reference: Visintin (n.16) 27 n.37.

³² Noticeably, the sources for the ritual conspicuously avoid words meaning 'sacrifice', as emphasized by J. Pörtulas, *Emerita* 63.1 (1995) 168-9, and G. Cordiano, 'La saga dell'eroe di Temesa', *QUCC* 60 (1998) 177-83 at 180, in their reviews of Visintin (n.16). This point was recognized by Visintin herself: (n.16) 53, 132, 143.

³³ Cf. Cordiano (n.32) 180-2.

³⁴ Call. *frr.* 98-9 Pf.; Strabo 6.1.5 255; Paus. 6.6.4-11; Ael. *VH* 8.18; Suda s.v. Εὐθύμος.

³⁵ Note the phraseology of Paus. 6.6 'the locals say (φασίν)' (4); 'I heard (ἤκουσα) the following', 'I heard (ἤκουσα) from a man who sailed for the purpose of trade' (10); 'the foregoing I heard about (ἤκουσα)' (11). All these pertain to the stories either of Euthymos' divine birth or his death / disappearance. Does the use (twice) of ἤκουσα at 6.6.10 mean to suggest that the source for the legend of the combat with the Hero (6.6.7-10) was like these oral, or rather that unlike them it was written? For Pausanias' process of gathering information and his concept of hearsay (ἀκοή), see P. Veyne, *Did the Greeks Believe in their Myths?* (Chicago 1988) 3, 76, 132-3

nn.13-14, 148 n.159. On his use of oral sources, see C. Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1998) 144-5. On Callimachus' possible use of oral sources, see P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford 1972) 2.1072 n.343. E. Rohde, *Der griechische Roman* (Berlin 1876) 99 with n.3, suggests Callimachus may have travelled the Greek world collecting local legends.

³⁶ Visintin (n.16) 17, 43 assumes that Pausanias is dependent on Callimachus. Pausanias' written sources included poets and local historians: Habicht (n.35) 142-3 (but note 96: 'it is rare that [Pausanias' sources] can be securely identified'). Callimachus for his part used local historians (e.g. Xenomedes of Ceos, *frr.* 75.54 Pf.; Leandr(i)os of Miletus, *frr.* 88, 92.2 Pf.; Agias and Derkylos, schol. Flor. 35-6 on *frr.* 7), and seems to have had a source for Locri Epizephyrii (cf. *frr.* 98-9, 84-5, 615, 635, 669 Pf.; Rhegion: *frr.* 618 Pf.). Timaeus liked 'marvels' (cf. Polyb. 12.24.5), and was used by Callimachus: Fraser (n.35) 1.764-7 esp. 766 and 2.1072 n.353 (expressing doubt as to whether Callimachus was dependent on Timaeus for information about Euthymos). The story of the cicadas at the Halex was told by Timaeus (*FGH* 566 F43 = Antigon. *Hist. mir.* 1, Strabo 6.1.9 260; cf. Paus. 6.6.4). Pais (n.18) 50 and n.1 suggested that the legend was handled by 'a poet of the school of Stesichorus or Xenocritus of Locri'; he is followed by A.M. Biraschi, 'ΚΑΛΥΚΑ ΠΗΓΗ in Paus. VI 6,11? A proposito del dipinto di Temesa', *PP* 51 (1996) 442-56, esp. 443-4.

as follows. Returning from Troy, Odysseus put in at Temesa, where one of his crew got drunk, assaulted a local girl and was stoned to death by the locals. Odysseus took no heed of his death and sailed away.³⁷ However, the dead man's spirit devastated the Temesans' community until they were on the brink of leaving Italy. The Delphic oracle bade them remain, but appease 'the hero'³⁸ by apportioning him a τέμενος, building him a ναός, and bringing him the fairest virgin every year in Temesa 'to be his wife'. From then on the Temesans suffered nothing further from the hero. Then (and now the legend moves from the Heroic Age to historical times, about the middle of the fifth century BC) Euthymos came to Temesa on the very day on which a virgin was being brought to the hero. Euthymos desired to enter the hero's temple and see the girl, and on so doing he pitied and fell in love with her. She promised to marry him if he saved her, and Euthymos lay in wait for the hero, worsted him in battle, and drove him from the land. Euthymos married the virgin, and the Temesans were free of their tribute. 'The Hero of Temesa' was proverbial.³⁹

(ii) Distinct from the literary sources is a painting which is known only from Pausanias.⁴⁰ Pausanias' description, which concludes his account of Euthymos and the Hero summarized above, runs as follows:

The foregoing I heard about, but I know the following from having lighted on a painting. This was the likeness of an ancient painting. There was a youth Sybaris and a river Kalabros and a spring Lyka⁴¹ and, besides, Hera and the city Temesa. Among them was the spirit whom Euthymos expelled, terribly black in colour and most frightening in all his aspect. He was wearing the skin of a wolf for clothing. The inscription on the painting gave him the name Alybas.⁴²

The reading of Pausanias' text is uncertain at various points, and much otherwise in the interpretation of the painting is unclear. But it is clear that the painting fits problematically with the legend as Pausanias has just told it.⁴³ First, Euthymos did not feature in the painting: when Pausanias says 'the spirit whom Euthymos expelled' (ὄντινα ἐξέβαλεν ὁ Εὐθύμοσ), he is not describing something shown in the painting (when we would expect the imperfect ἐξέβαλλεν, not the aorist ἐξέβαλεν), but merely identifying, in an authorial aside, the *daimon* of the painting with the *daimon* of the legend which he has just narrated. Second, a maiden is absent from the painting. Third, the role of 'the young man Sybaris' is unclear. Is he combating the *daimon* (Euthymos' role in the legend)? Is he being offered to the *daimon* (the maiden's role in the legend)?⁴⁴ Or is he the river Sybaris personified (compare the 'river Kalabros' and 'spring Lyka' in the painting)?⁴⁵ The decision is complicated further by the fact that the name 'Sybaris' is given by Nicander in Book 4 of his *Heteroeumena* (*Metamorphoses*) to a *daimon* who is in several ways analogous to the Hero of Temesa.⁴⁶ Thus, although the painting surely relates in some way to the legend or the underlying ritual, it plainly does not illustrate the legend as we otherwise have it (Temesa and the malevolent spirit are all that are common to the legend and the painting). On the other hand, this very failure of fit seems to guarantee the fidelity of Pausanias'

³⁷ For the unburied companion, cf. Elpenor (*Od.* 11.51-83) and Palinurus (*Virg. Aen.* 6.337-83).

³⁸ This is the first point in Pausanias' narration where he is referred to as ἥρωσ; that is, once Delphi has sanctioned his cult.

³⁹ *CPG* 1.342 = *Ael. VH* 8.18; *Strabo* 6.1.5 255; *Eustath. ad Od.* 1.185.

⁴⁰ Where did Paus. see the painting? *Mele* (n.12) 866 and *Müller* (n.16) 825 assume Olympia.

⁴¹ Or 'Lykas' (see L. Gernet, 'Dolon the wolf', *The Anthropology of Ancient Greece* (Baltimore and London 1981) 138 n.81); or 'Kalyka' (see *Biraschi* (n.36)).

⁴² For discussion, see *Eitrem* (n.19) 1003.33-7; *Müller* (n.16) 825; *Mele* (n.12) 863-7, 881-6; *Visintin* (n.16) 14-15, 59-73.

⁴³ Cf. *Mele* (n.12) 863-4.

⁴⁴ Comparably, the victim offered Lamia/Sybaris by the Delphians according to Nicander, *Heteroeumena* 4 = *Antonin. Lib.* 8.2, was 'one boy from among the citizens' (ἓνα κούρον τῶν πολιτῶν).

⁴⁵ Analogously, an attested iconography of the river Akragas was as a 'boy in his prime' (παῖδι ὠραίῳ): *Ael. VH* 2.33.

⁴⁶ *Antonin. Lib.* 8. *Mele* (n.12) 868-73.

description of the painting. Pausanias' motive for describing it is presumably to show the 'reality' the *daimon* of Temesa had for the locals independently of the legend.⁴⁷ The age of the painting cannot be determined from Pausanias' designation of it as γραφῆς μίμημα ἀρχαίας: either 'a painting in the old style' or 'a copy of an ancient painting'.⁴⁸ It is possible that the painting relates to the Temesan cult-legend before Euthymos became associated with it.

(iii) The extant iconography pertaining to Euthymos' cult consists of (to date) five clay herms.⁴⁹ These were found (with one exception) in a sanctuary of the Nymphs, now known as Grotta Caruso, in Locri Epizephyrii.⁵⁰ They are dated to the latter half of the fourth century BC.⁵¹ They show a bull with the head of a young man with horns mounted on a pedestal. The man-bull is identified as Euthymos by an inscription on the pedestal reading (with insignificant variants) Εὐθύμου ἱερά.⁵² The form of the adjective is apparently feminine, not neuter plural.⁵³ This, together with the fact that the bull stands on a pedestal, suggests that a statue is being portrayed; the noun to be understood with ἱερά may then be εἰκόν.⁵⁴ The herms therefore seem to represent an actual free-standing statue, perhaps in bronze, which stood somewhere in the region and declared itself 'sacred to Euthymos'. To the left of the man-bull in one of the herms is shown an altar with a basin; on the ground to the right is a small knife. The herms permit some inferences about the realia of Euthymos' cult. Thus there was in the region a sanctuary of Euthymos housing a statue of him as a man-bull and an altar where he received sacrificial offerings.⁵⁵ Sacrifices to Euthymos find corroboration in one of our textual witnesses: Callimachus (as paraphrased by Pliny) mentioned that sacrifices were made to Euthymos both in his lifetime and after his death.

The significance of the representation of Euthymos as a man-bull is clear: the iconography is typical for river gods, especially Acheloos.⁵⁶ This detail too has a correlate in the legend: Euthymos was rumoured not to have died but to have 'disappeared' into the waters of the Kaikinos, suggesting a river metamorphosis.⁵⁷

The herms suggest a further dimension to Euthymos' cult. They come from a sanctuary of the nymphs at Locri: depicted at the top of the herms are the heads of three nymphs. The association with nymphs suggests that the heroized Euthymos may have had a role in prenuptial rites. Two other clay herms, slightly earlier in date, from the same sanctuary of the nymphs show Acheloos as a bull with a mature man's face, horned and bearded, standing by a *louterion*.⁵⁸ Here we are even more clearly in the context of prenuptial rites.⁵⁹ A role for Euthymos in

⁴⁷ This does not imply that Pausanias himself believes what he reports. Cf. Veyne (n.35) 11, 95-102.

⁴⁸ Müller (n.16) 825: 'Kopie eines älteren Gemäldes (wenn γραφῆς μίμημα ἀρχαίας nicht ein bloßes Stilurteil ist)'.

⁴⁹ See Costabile (n.11) 195-238, after Arias (n.26). See PLATE 1 = Arias (n.26) 122 fig. 1, 204 fig. = Costabile (n.11) 199 fig. 321.

⁵⁰ One of the herms comes from the Locrian *apoikia* Medma: Costabile (n.11) 231.

⁵¹ Costabile (n.11) 228. The letter-forms find parallels at Locri of 4th-3rd c. BC: Costabile (n.11) 207.

⁵² H.P. Isler, *Acheloos* (Bern 1970) 34 with 195 n.103, took the inscription to be Εὐθύμ[ος] (sc. ἀνέθηκε) or Εὐθύμ[ου] (sc. ἀνάθημα), i.e. a dedication to Acheloos by a Euthymos of the 4th c. BC, distinct from our Olympic victor. But the taumorphic bull must be seen as the personification, in the form of a river deity, of the 5th-c. Olympic victor Euthymos. See Costabile (n.11) 209.

⁵³ [ι]ερά has been read on one of the herms, which would rule out a neuter plural ('rites of Euthymos').

However, the Ionic form is surprising: confirmation of the reading would be welcome.

⁵⁴ Costabile (n.11) 208.

⁵⁵ The location of this sanctuary of Euthymos is open to doubt. Below (p. 40) it will be suggested that it may be identical with the sanctuary of the Hero in Temesa.

⁵⁶ On the iconography of river gods, cf. Ael. *VH* 2.33; C. Weiß, *Griechische Flußgottheiten in vorhellenistischer Zeit. Ikonographie und Bedeutung* (Würzburg 1984); ead. 'Fluvii', *LIMC* 4.1 (1988) 139-48.

⁵⁷ Ael. *VH* 8.18; cf. Paus. 6.6.10 (cited above). He was also a son of the river Kaikinos: Paus. 6.6.4.

⁵⁸ Costabile (n.11) 223, figs. 349-50.

⁵⁹ Costabile (n.11) 224-6, esp. 224. Compare a red-figure vase from Nola, showing Acheloos as a bearded horned man-faced bull with a *louterion*, in an unmistakably nuptial context: Costabile (n.11) fig. 352. For Acheloos and nymphs in Attica, see: H.P. Isler, 'Acheloos' *LIMC* 1.2 fig. 180; Costabile (n.11) 223, figs. 17, 351; J. von Protz and L. Ziehen, *Leges Graecorum sacrae e titulis collectae* (Leipzig 1896-1906) 2.44.

pre-nuptial rites has another correlate of sorts in the legend, for Euthymos married the Temesan maiden whom he rescued.⁶⁰

III. THE HERO OF TEMESA: A RIVER DEITY?

Returning to the Hero, it is important to note that he is presented to us in the legend not just as a figure of myth but as the object of a real cult. This cult purports to have been practised from the Heroic Age into the historical period before being abolished through Euthymos' intervention around the middle of the fifth century BC. The realia of this cult may be summarized as follows.

(a) The Hero had a sanctuary (τέμενος, ἥρωιον, ἱερὸν... ἄβατον... τοῖς πολλοῖς) in Temesa which contained a cult building (ναός).⁶¹ Recently, excavations in the area of Temesa have uncovered a late Archaic temple which it has been tentatively suggested was the sanctuary of the Hero.⁶²

(b) Implicit in Pausanias' phrase 'the most beautiful of the maidens' (παρθένων καλλίστην, 6.6.8) seems to be a beauty contest of marriageable girls (compare κόρην ἐπίγαμον in the *Diegesis* to Callimachus, *Aetia* 4.9) which took place annually at Temesa.

(c) The parents of the girl judged 'most beautiful' took her to the Hero's sanctuary, where a couch had been prepared (in the cult building, ναός?) and brought her back the following morning a woman not a maiden.⁶³

On the other hand, the following realia pertaining to Euthymos' cult can be inferred from the Locrian herms.

(a*) Euthymos had a cult statue showing him as a bull with a young man's face on whose pedestal was inscribed Εὐθύμου ἱερά.

(b*) Close by the statue stood a basin-formed altar and, apparently, a *naiskos*; the knife shown in one of the herms probably points to ritual acts (animal sacrifices? hair offerings?) which were performed there.

(c*) This cult of Euthymos occurred in the context of pre-nuptial rites.

The realia of the cults of the Hero and Euthymos permit comparison in two significant respects.

First, both the Hero and Euthymos were involved in pre-nuptial rites. Euthymos' connection with pre-nuptial rites has already been indicated (see p. 29). As regards the Hero, the practice of bringing a maiden each year to be ritually deflowered looks like a pre-nuptial rite.⁶⁴ The probable presence of Hera in the painting further suggests a premarital ritual: Hera (*teleia*) was goddess of marriage.⁶⁵ Beauty contests too were often part of premarital ritual.⁶⁶

Second, both Euthymos and the Hero have an apparent association with rivers. For Euthymos this association is obvious: there is the taumorphic statue and the traditions that he was a son of the river Kaikinos and that he disappeared into the same river. The Hero's association with rivers is less obvious, but suggestive. On being expelled by Euthymos he disappeared into the sea – an occurrence which invites comparison with Euthymos' disappearance into the river

⁶⁰ Paus. 6.6.10.

⁶¹ Paus. 6.6.8; Str. 6.1.5 255; Ael. *VH* 8.18.

⁶² G.F. La Torre, 'Il sacello tardi-arcaico di Campora S. Giovanni (CS): relazione preliminare', in 35° *Convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia – Taranto 1995* (Taranto 1996) 703-22, with the plan on p. 686; the same author in 36° *Convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia – Taranto 1996* (Taranto 1997) 366-72, with Pl. IX.1. I am grateful to Prof. Richard Buxton for pointing me to these references.

⁶³ Paus. 6.6.8; *Dieg. Call. Aet.* 4.8-12.

⁶⁴ Cf. Müller (n.16) 824 'ein Deflorationsritus oder ein Relikt davon'; Cordiano (n.32) 180-1, 182.

⁶⁵ The manuscripts of Paus. 6.6.11 have ἥρα, i.e. "Ἡρα, which is defended by Maaß, Eitrem, Mele, Müller. Most editors of Paus. have instead followed Clavier in reading ἥρωιον: cf. Strabo 6.1.5 255, 'near Temesa there is a hero shrine (ἥρωιον)'. For the role of Hera in initiatory ritual, cf. C. Calame, *Choruses of Young Women in Ancient Greece. Their Morphology, Religious Role, and Social Functions* (Lanham 1997) 113-23.

⁶⁶ Alc. 130b.17-20 V.; Theophrastus *ap.* Athen. 13.609e-610a. J. Bremmer, *Greek Religion* (Oxford 1994) 70; Calame (n.65) 122-3, 199, 262.

Kaikinos.⁶⁷ In the painting, moreover, he appears alongside aquatic features: at least one river and a spring.⁶⁸ Finally, the temple recently excavated at Campora S. Giovanni and identified hypothetically with the sanctuary of the Hero is situated in the immediate vicinity of a river.⁶⁹

These shared features between Euthymos and the Hero suggest a close correspondence between their cults. In the legend Euthymos supplants the Hero by marrying the virgin the latter was to deflower. This raises the question whether Euthymos was substituted for the Hero in the cult too.⁷⁰ If so, Euthymos' fluvial characteristics as portrayed on the Grotta Caruso herms would be explicable as inherited from the Hero. The hypothesis that the Hero was a river deity therefore needs further testing.

The involvement of a river deity in the ritual defloration of maidens calls first for comment. Occasionally in ancient Greece and the Near East we hear of the sacrifice of girls' virginity as a prenuptial rite (προτέλεια) performed for a female deity: Aphrodite or a congener of hers.⁷¹ This practice is often subsumed in modern discussions under the (unsatisfactory) catch-all of 'sacred prostitution'.⁷² Herodotus attests the practice apparently for Babylon.⁷³ Lucian attests it for Syrian Byblos.⁷⁴ In the Greek world we hear of it most unambiguously for Cyprus.⁷⁵ But most significantly for our purposes it is attested (in connection with the cult of Aphrodite) for Locri Epizephyrii in the first half of the fifth century BC.⁷⁶ A more widespread rite of προτέλεια than the sacrifice of a girl's virginity is hair sacrifice, which might be offered to various divinities.⁷⁷ Hair sacrifice could be regarded as 'equivalent' to the sacrifice of a girl's virginity: they feature as alternatives at an Adonis festival at Byblos.⁷⁸

What place is there here for river gods? River gods could certainly receive hair sacrifices from youths (*kouroi*) and were seen as *kourotrophoi*, responsible for the safe passage of adolescents to adulthood.⁷⁹ But as well as receiving hair offerings, river gods could receive the sacri-

⁶⁷ Paus. 6.6.10: 'the Hero sank into the sea and disappeared (ἀφανίζεται)'. Compare Euthymos: Ael. *VH* 8.18: 'they say that the same Euthymos descended into the river Kaikinos and disappeared (ἀφανισθῆναι)'.

⁶⁸ The river Kalabros and the spring Lyka. 'The youth Sybaris' may also be a personification of the river Sybaris: note that in Nicander, *Heteroeumena* Book 4 (= Antonin. Lib. 8.7) 'Sybaris' (who is a *daimon* comparable to the Hero of Temesa) is identified by locals with a spring near Krisa: 'from that rock [where Sybaris fell to her death] a spring appeared and the locals call it Sybaris'.

⁶⁹ La Torre (n.62, 1997) 368: 'nelle immediate vicinanze della foce dell'Oliva'.

⁷⁰ Fontenrose (n.14) 81: 'Euthymos, *hērōs* of Locri, complements Heros of Temesa and takes on identical traits. At some point the Temesians... identified their ancient hero-*daimōn* with Euthymos: he became the Heros of Temesa.' Cf. Bohringer (n.14) 16.

⁷¹ Cf. F. Graf, 'The Locrian maidens', in R.G.A. Buxton (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion* (Oxford 2000) 250-70 (= 'Die lokrischen Mädchen', *Studi storico-religiosi* 2 (1978) 61-79) at 264 and nn.85-6; B. MacLachlan, 'Sacred prostitution and Aphrodite', *Studies in Religion* 21 (1992) 145-62 at 146-55.

⁷² The term fails to distinguish between one-off sexual intercourse performed without degradation by free daughters of citizens as a religious act (n.b. Clearchus *fr.* 43 Wehrli: τῶν ἐταιρισμῶ τὰς ἑαυτῶν κόρας ἀφοσιούντων, 'those communities who make their own daughters ritually pure by prostituting them') and the servile condition of permanent temple prostitutes who were 'sacred' (ιεραί, ιεροδουλοί) to the goddess.

⁷³ 1.199.1-5. Hdt. does not specify that the women are virgins ready for marriage. This is, however, stipulated by Justin for Cyprus, to which Hdt. compares the Babylonian practice. Cf. MacLachlan (n.71) 149. Cf. Lydia: Hdt. 1.93.

⁷⁴ *On the Syrian Goddess* 6. Cf. H. Seyrig, 'Antiquités syriennes', *Syria* 49 (1972) 97-125 at 99, 'un rite d'origine initiatique, que ces femmes accomplissaient au cours de la fête une fois dans leur vie'; B. Soyez, *Byblos et la fête des Adonies* (Leiden 1977) 40-1.

⁷⁵ Hdt. 1.199.5; Clearchus *fr.* 43 Wehrli; Justin 18.5.4; Lactantius, *divin. instit.* 1.17.10.

⁷⁶ Clearchus *fr.* 43 Wehrli. Cf. the controversial vow(s) of 478-476 BC and the 350s BC: Justin 21.3.2-8. See Graf (n.71) 263-4; MacLachlan (n.71) 161-2 esp. n.51; Cordiano (n.32) 181.

⁷⁷ Cf. W. Burkert, *Homo Necans. The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1983) 63 n.20.

⁷⁸ Lucian, *On the Syrian Goddess* 6. Hair offerings as 'equivalent' to religious prostitution: J.G. Frazer, *Adonis Attis Osiris. Studies in the History of Oriental Religion* (3rd edn, London 1927) 1.38; cf. K. Dowden, *Death and the Maiden. Girls' Initiation Rites in Greek Mythology* (London 1989) 3 (on Paus. 1.43.4).

⁷⁹ Hair offerings to rivers: *Il.* 23.141-51; Paus. 1.37.3, 8.41.3, 8.20.3. S. Eitrem, *Opferfritus und Voropfer der Griechen und Römer* (Kristiania 1915) 364-7. Rivers as kourotrophoi: Hes. *Th.* 346-8; Aesch. *Cho.* 6. Dowden (n.78) 123; Weiß (n.56, 1988) 139-40.

fice of the virginity of marriageable girls. This is described most vividly in an epistle of perhaps the first or second century AD, but transmitted as the work of 'Aeschines'.⁸⁰ The epistle describes a collective prenuptial ritual undergone by the girls of Troy who bathed in the river Skamandros and uttered the ritual formula λαβέ μου, Σκάμανδρε, τὴν παρθενίαν ('take, Skamandros, my virginity').⁸¹ The epistle subsequently seems to assume a similar ritual for Magnesia in Asia Minor at the river Maiandros.⁸² Collective prenuptial lustration in a local river, as the epistle describes, must have been a fairly widespread event in Archaic Greece. It is likely to have been an important occasion for the community. The epistle describes it as observable, at a discrete distance, by crowds of locals and tourists.⁸³ This may also be the kind of occasion which is presupposed in fragments of Alcaeus and Alcman: that it could be a theme for these poets suggests both the ritual's antiquity and its social importance.⁸⁴ Several Archaic myths tell of women being wooed or impregnated by river gods, and it has been argued that these reflect the kind of ritual described by the epistle.⁸⁵ There are, besides, numerous references to the use in Archaic premarital ritual of river water, which was accredited with procreative powers.⁸⁶ It is relevant to note too that personal names frequently designated a person as the 'gift of' a river: Asopodoros, Ismenodoros, Kaystrodoros, Kephisodoros, Potamodoros, Strymodoros.⁸⁷ River names could also be taken over as personal names without change.⁸⁸

In the kind of ritual we are interested in the responsibility of divesting a nubile girl of her virginity is devolved onto a river god. In this way the trauma and guilt typically associated with a

⁸⁰ Ps.-Aeschin. *Ep.* 10. On the novelistic character of this epistle, cf. C. Stöcker, 'Der 10. Aischines-Brief. Eine Kimon-Novelle', *Mnemosyne* 33 (1980) 307-12. Its novelistic character notwithstanding, it may draw on real practices: so V. Martin and G. de Budé, *Aeschines* (Paris 1952) 2.134-6 'L'auteur paraît bien au courant des choses d'Ilion. Il n'est pas douteux en effet que les rites qui sont à la base de l'épisode ne soient authentiques.'

⁸¹ Ps.-Aeschin. *Ep.* 10.2-3: 'The day arrived on which most people try to bring about a marriage for those of their daughters whose age bids it be done; and so the women assembled. It is an established custom in the region of Troy for maidens who are to get married to go to the Skamandros, and after they have washed themselves in it to pronounce this saying as a ritual formula (τὸ ἔπος τοῦτο ὡσπερ ἱερὸν τι ἐπιλέγειν): "Take, Skamandros, my virginity".'

⁸² Ps.-Aeschin. *Ep.* 10.8.

⁸³ Ps.-Aeschin. *Ep.* 10.4.

⁸⁴ Cf. Alc. 45 V. (Hebros, Thrace): 'Hebros, you flow, the most beautiful of rivers, past Aenus into the turbid sea, surging through the land of Thrace... and many maidens visit you (to bathe?) their (lovely) thighs with tender hands; they are enchanted (as they handle?) your marvellous water (θή[ιο]ν ὕδωρ) like unguent...' (trans. Campbell). Alcman 4A.14-17 Campbell (Loeb): 'and when they [feminine] had prayed to the fair-flowing river that they achieve lovely wedlock and experience those things that are (dearest) to women and men and find a lawful marriage-bed' (trans. Campbell). For a similar ritual occasion, cf. perhaps 'Hdt.' *Vit. Hom.* 3 p. 194 Allen = p. 4 Wilamowitz: 'Kretheïs went out with the other women for a festival (πρὸς ἑορτήν τινα) to the river called Meles when she was already with child and gave birth to Homer... and she gave the child the name Melesigenes, taking this appellation from the river'; cf. *Arist. fr.* 76 Rose.

⁸⁵ L.R. Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States* (Oxford 1909) 5.423: 'The many early myths concerning heroines and princesses being made pregnant by river-gods suggests that the ritual [*sc.* girls' sacrifice of their virginity to river gods] was once prevalent in primitive Greece; for such myths could arise naturally from such a custom.' Cf. O. Waser, 'Flußgötter', *RE* 6.2778.66-7: 'Nicht selten sind F(lüsse) in Sagen erotischen Inhaltes verflochten.' For such erotic tales, cf. Spercheios and Polydore (*Il.* 16.174-8); Enipeus and Tyro (*Od.* 11.235-57); Alpheios and Artemis (Telesilla 717 *PMG*, Paus. 6.22.9); Alpheios and Arethousa (Paus. 5.7.2-3); Selemnos and Argyra (Paus. 7.23.1); Acheloos and Deianeira (Soph. *Trach.* 6-17), etc.

⁸⁶ Thuc. 2.15.5: 'it is still now the custom from ancient times (ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχαίου) to use the water [*sc.* from the Athenian spring Kallirrhoe / Enneakrounos] before marriage and for other rites'; Eur. *Phoen.* 347-8 with scholia; Eustath. *ad Il.* 23.141; Suda, Harpocr., Photius *s.v.* λουτροφόρος καὶ λουτροφορεῖν; Pollux 3.43; Artemid. 2.38. R. Ginouvès, *Balaneutikè. Recherches sur le bain dans l'antiquité grecque* (Paris 1962) 267-8, 421-2; R. Parker, 'Theophoric names and the history of Greek religion', in S. Hornblower and E. Matthews (eds), *Greek Personal Names: Their Value as Evidence* (PBA 105, Oxford 2000) 53-79 at 60 n.26.

⁸⁷ See Parker (n.86) 59-60; cf. Waser (n.85) 2778.61-5. Cf. 'Hdt.' *Vit. Hom.* 3: Homer was called Melesigenes ('born of the river Meles'); he was also regarded as a 'son of Meles': 'Alcaeus', *AP* 7.5.3 ὁ Μέλητος. In myth: Eteokles/Eteoklos, a son of the river Kephisos: Paus. 9.34.9, cf. *Hes. fr.* 71 M-W; Phoroneus son of the river Inachos: Paus. 2.15.5; Andreus son of the river Peneios: Paus. 9.34.6.

⁸⁸ L. Preller and C. Robert, *Griechische Mythologie* (4th edn, Berlin 1894-1926) 1.546-7 n.4.

bride's first intercourse could be circumvented.⁸⁹ The ritual must have suggested to a vivid imagination the possibility of the river god literally taking the girl's virginity. A mythical example is Tyro in the *Odyssey* (where, however, Poseidon finally steps in for the river Enipeus): '[Tyro] fell in love with the divine river Enipeus, who runs over the land much the most beautiful of rivers; so she frequented the beautiful streams of Enipeus. But the earth-holder, the earth-shaker likened himself to him and lay beside her at the mouth of the eddying river... He untied her maiden girdle, and shed sleep upon her.'⁹⁰ Real (physical) intercourse is imagined here: the fruit of the union is Pelias and Neleus. The Pseudo-Aeschinean epistle presents two cynical abuses of the belief that river gods could deflower virgins purportedly drawn from real life. First, the unscrupulous Kimon, an unwelcome associate of the writer, disguised himself as the god Skamandros by covering himself with reeds and deflowered a local girl, who in her naivety believed that the river god had actually taken her virginity (this ruse of Kimon is actually paralleled in myth).⁹¹ Second, when taken to task, Kimon alleged a historical precedent for his action: the father of one Attalos of Magnesia, an athlete, claimed that Attalos was no son of his, but of the river Maiandros, accounting in this way for Attalos' prodigious strength.

The rite of prenuptial defloration performed in Archaic times at Temesa could thus make sense on the hypothesis that its recipient was a river deity. The Temesan girl is also imagined to lose her virginity in the ritual: according to the Callimachean *Diegesis* the girl's parents brought her back the day after she had been visited by the Hero 'a woman, no longer a virgin'.⁹² It is suggestive that the impregnation of a woman by a river god is attested elsewhere in the Euthymos legend: Euthymos was rumoured to be the son of the river Kaikinos. The rite of deflowering maidens seems to have been an activity with which river gods were particularly concerned.⁹³

On the hypothesis that the recipient of the rite of prenuptial defloration at Temesa was a river deity the rite cannot have been a collective ritual, like that described for Troy in the Pseudo-Aeschinean epistle and as suggested by the fragments of Alcaeus and Alcman. Instead, the Temesan rite was undertaken by the 'most beautiful' Temesan maiden each year.⁹⁴ The Temesan rite was thus probably confined to girls of aristocratic families who were 'regarded as representatives of their entire age group'.⁹⁵

The Temesan rite was centred on a sanctuary: Pausanias calls this a τέμενος and ναός, Strabo a ἡρώιον ἀγριελαίοις συνηρηφές, Aelian a ἱερὸν... ἄβατον... τοῖς πολλοῖς.⁹⁶ Such realia are consistent with the hypothesis that the recipient of the rite was a river deity. Spercheios has a τέμενος βωμός τε θυήεις in the *Iliad*, and Erymanthos had a ναός and an ἄγαλμα at Psophis in Arcadia by the banks of his river.⁹⁷

The hypothesis that the Temesan rite was performed for a river deity is, however, harder to reconcile with certain aspects of the Hero's presentation. In Pausanias' version of the legend the Hero is a member of Odysseus' crew, and in the tradition that Strabo follows he is named as 'Polites'.⁹⁸ Thus the Hero who features in the legend is fully human, not an elemental river deity. But not only could river gods receive human iconography in art, they could also acquire personal legends. In various traditions pertaining to Acheloos, the river god *par excellence* begins life as

⁸⁹ On the trauma and guilt of defloration, cf. Burkert (n.77) 62-3.

⁹⁰ *Od.* 11.235-57, esp. 238-45.

⁹¹ Ps.-Aeschin. *Ep.* 10.4-6. The mythical parallel: the giant Pelor fell in love with Polydore and waited for her to bathe in the Spercheios; pretending to be the river Spercheios, he then had intercourse with her; the child of the union was Menesthios: schol. *Il.* 16.176b Erbse.

⁹² *Dieg.* 4.11-12.

⁹³ Cf. J.G. Frazer, *Lectures on the Early History of the Kingship* (London 1905) 179-81, esp. 179 'the deity who

is... provided with a human bride is often a water-spirit'.

⁹⁴ Paus. 6.6.8.

⁹⁵ Cf. Graf (n.71) 261-2. That the Temesan maiden in the rite is of aristocratic origin was inferred by Mele (n.12) 874.

⁹⁶ Paus. 6.6.8; Strabo 6.1.5 255; Ael. *VH* 8.18.

⁹⁷ *Il.* 23.148. Paus. 8.24.12. Cf. Farnell (n.85) 5.424 a.

⁹⁸ Strabo 6.1.5 255. In the *Odyssey*, Polites is only mentioned at 10.224-5 as 'the dearest and most cherished of my [Odysseus'] companions'.

a human who is metamorphosed on his death into the river which bears his name.⁹⁹ In the Pseudo-Plutarchan treatise *On Rivers*, twenty-five rivers are catalogued with a brief summary of their mythology: in each case a river undergoes a change of name (there may be as many as three name-changes for a single river) as different persons, each with a personal tragedy, plunge into the river and are identified with it.¹⁰⁰ This feature of mythology means that there is a crucial overlap between heroes and rivers.¹⁰¹ Accordingly it is possible to suppose that the figure who received the offering of girls' virginity at Temesa was a river deity whose identity was elaborated in legend: the legend ascribed to him a human incarnation prior to river metamorphosis and cult as a river deity (in the form of receiving the annual offering of a girl's virginity). The 'Hero's' human identity would then be supervenient on his identity as a river god. This supposition is reconcilable with the fluidity of his human identity: he is called variously 'Polites', 'Alybas' and, most often, just ἄνθρωπος, δαίμων or ἥρωας. The Pseudo-Plutarchan *On Rivers* shows that such superimposition of one identity on another is typical for river deities: the Alpheios, for instance, had once been Stymphalos and before that Nyktimos.¹⁰² While we do not explicitly hear of a river metamorphosis for the Hero-Polites-Alybas, it is significant that a river metamorphosis is attested within the same myth complex for Euthymos and that the Hero-Alybas has a strong association with water (see pp. 30-1).¹⁰³ It is interesting to note that the river which flows close by the sanctuary of Campora S. Giovanni, which has tentatively been identified with the sanctuary of the Hero, bears the modern name Oliva, a name which it has been suggested may derive from Alybas.¹⁰⁴

Another apparently recalcitrant detail in the legend and in the painting is the Hero's link with the dead.¹⁰⁵ In Pausanias' version, when stoned by the people of Temesa and left unburied by Odysseus, the Hero becomes one of the restless, angry dead: a *revenant*. The demon's name Ἀλύβας in the painting recalls the noun ἀλίβας, 'dead body, corpse'.¹⁰⁶ The black colour of the demon in the painting also suits a spirit of the dead.¹⁰⁷ A link with the dead thus seems granted: for Visintin this gives the essence of the Hero. But the link with the dead may not be primary. The conception of the Hero as βιαιοθάνατος – that is, as angry beyond the grave for his violent death (Strabo 6.1.5 255 δολοφονηθέντα... γενέσθαι βαρύμηνιν, '(they say that) he was murdered and became deeply wrathful') – enables the aetiological legend to present the annual rite of defloration as an atonement for an ancient crime. This is a standard pattern for aetiological

⁹⁹ Cephalion (1st half 2nd c. BC) *FGrHist* 93 F7 = Malalas, *Chron.* 6.20 pp. 164-5 Dindorf; Tzetzes on Lyc. *Alex.* 671; Serv. on Virg. *Geo.* 1.8; Ps.-Plut. *On Rivers* 22.1.

¹⁰⁰ Ps.-Plut. *On Rivers* (ed. G.N. Bernardakis, *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia* 7 (Leipzig 1896) 282-328). Further examples: Akis (*Ov. Met.* 13.878-97); Marsyas (*Ov. Met.* 6.391-400, Paus. 10.30.9, Ps.-Plut. *On Rivers* 10.1); Adonis (Lucian, *On the Syrian Goddess* 8); Pelor and the Spercheios (schol. *Il.* 16.176a Erbse); Alpheios (Paus. 5.7.2); Selemnos (Paus. 7.23.2); Sangas (Hermog. *FGrHist* 795 F1). There are also several Roman examples: see L. Preller, *Römische Mythologie* (3rd edn, Berlin 1881-3) 1.95, 2.141-4. Compare the metamorphosis of persons into seas: Αἰγεύς ~ Αἰγαῖος πόντος (Hygin. *fab.* 43.2, etc.); Ἑλλη ~ Ἑλλήσποντος (Hygin. *fab.* 3.2, etc.). See J. Toutain, 'Le culte des fleuves, sa forme primitive et ses principaux rites chez les peuples de l'antiquité classique', *L'Ethnographie* n.s. 13/14 (1926) 1-7; A. Hermann, 'Ertrinken', *RAC* 6 (1966) 370-409 at 396; Weiß (n.56, 1984) 68; P.M.C. Forbes Irving, *Metamorphosis in Greek Myths* (Oxford 1990) 299-307, esp. 302-5.

¹⁰¹ J. Larson, *Greek Heroine Cults* (Madison and London 1995): 'Sometimes the existence of nature spirits was rationalized, so that a spring or river nymph was later understood as a mortal who *became* a spring. These stories of transformation are analogous to heroization stories and use the same themes and motifs' (19); 'The concepts of heroization or deification and metamorphosis into a natural feature are indeed parallel' (20).

¹⁰² Ps.-Plut. *On Rivers* 19.1.

¹⁰³ River metamorphosis could follow a death by stoning: compare Acis, *Ov. Met.* 13.879-97 (this lover of Galatea is crushed by the mountain-top which a jealous Polyphemus throws on him, but is metamorphosed into a river god).

¹⁰⁴ La Torre (n.62, 1997) 368.

¹⁰⁵ Visintin (n.16) 68, 71, 75 (the Hero is one of a group of 'morti che ritornano'), 105.

¹⁰⁶ *LSJ* s.v.

¹⁰⁷ Visintin (n.16) 68, 71, 75, 105. Cf. Thanatos: Eur. *Alc.* 843-4; Eurynomos in Polygnotos' *Nekyia*: Paus. 10.28.7. Cf. E. Rohde, *Psyche. The Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality among the Greeks* (London 1925) 250 n.25.

myths.¹⁰⁸ The wolf-skin clothing of the demon in the painting may also point, not to a human sacrifice exacted by a spirit of death (*pace* Visintin), but to young people's rites.¹⁰⁹

It may thus be possible that the characterization of the Hero in the legend as both human and βιαιοθάνατος stems from an original identity as a river deity involved in prenuptial rites. The myth-making process which fastened on a river deity who received the offering of a girl's virginity every year will have been influenced by two mythological trends: first, the tendency to provide rivers with a human prehistory; second, the tendency for aetiological myths of young persons' rites to explain these as the expiation of an ancient crime. An anonymous (or a named but inconsequential) companion of Odysseus would be a natural choice as one of the river's human pre-incarnations, for aetiological myths typically reached back to the Heroic Age, and a tradition already put Odysseus on the shores of Italy.¹¹⁰ The story of that sailor's violent death at the hands of Bronze Age Temesans served to motivate an enduring μῆνις, so that the prenuptial rite could be presented as the necessary atonement of an ancient wrong. In answer to the question why the Bronze Age Temesans stoned the sailor in the first place, the myth-making process would naturally suppose that he had given them prior offence, and what offence was more natural to ascribe to the human pre-incarnation of the river who in ritual received the offering of girls' virginity than the attempt to violate a local girl?

The hypothesis that the Hero of Temesa is a river deity seems able to explain various aspects of the rite and legend at Temesa. Moreover, it now makes a new interpretation of Euthymos' cult and legend possible.

IV. EUTHYMOS AND HERAKLES

On the assumption that the Hero of Temesa is a river deity, there is one myth which would be strongly echoed by the legend of Euthymos' fight with the Hero for the hand of the Temesan maiden. That is Herakles' fight with Acheloos for the hand of Deianeira. In Sophocles' *Trachiniae*, the earliest extant literary telling of this myth, Deianeira describes her terror of the river god's advances:

I had a river as a suitor, Acheloos, who asked my father for my hand in three shapes, coming now as a bull plain to see, now as a slithering, coiling serpent, now bull-faced with a man's body; and streams of fresh water poured from his shaggy beard. Anticipating such a suitor I, wretch, prayed continually to die, before I ever drew near such a marriage bed.¹¹¹

This mood – helpless apprehension in the face of the lustful river god – is exactly that conjured up for the victim of the Hero of Temesa by the Callimachean *Diegesis*, Pausanias' narrative and the painting. (It was not inevitable that union with a river god be traumatic for the maiden: Tyro actively desired it.) Sophocles' version continues, of course, with Herakles arriving in the nick of time to defeat the river god, rescue and marry the maiden: 'At the last moment and to my joy came the famous son of Zeus and Alkmene, who contended with him in battle and released me'.¹¹² This finale – joyful deliverance and marriage to the heroic deliverer – is again exactly what we find at Temesa.¹¹³

¹⁰⁸ Clearchus (*fr.* 43a Wehrli) calls rites of defloration παλαιῶς τινος ὑβρεως...ἀπόμνημα καὶ τιμωρία, 'a reminder and atonement for some ancient offence'. See further Graf (n.71) 263 n.77; Calame (n.65) 94-5, 99, 101, 117, 121.

¹⁰⁹ For the wolf-skin and young people's rites, see J. Bremmer, 'Romulus, Remus and the foundation of Rome', in J. Bremmer and N. Horsfall (eds), *Roman Myth and Mythography* (London 1987) 25-48 at 43 with n.73. Contrast Visintin (n.16) 109-29.

¹¹⁰ For Odysseus in Italy, see I. Malkin, *The Returns of Odysseus. Colonization and Ethnicity* (Berkeley and London 1998) 178-209; E.D. Phillips, 'Odysseus in Italy', *JHS* 73 (1953) 53-67. Odysseus founded a temple to Athena in Bruttium: Solinus 2.8.

¹¹¹ Soph. *Trach.* 9-17; *cf.* 507-25.

¹¹² Soph. *Trach.* 18-21.

¹¹³ *Cf.* Paus. 6.6.9: 'the girl swore to marry him [Euthymos] if he saved her'.

Direct influence of the *Trachiniae* on the Euthymos legend or vice versa seems unlikely. However, there is every chance that the Herakles-Acheloos myth in a pre-Sophoclean form (not necessarily a literary one) influenced events at Temesa. The Herakles-Acheloos myth was popular in the fifth century: apart from Sophocles' *Trachiniae*, it was told in a Pindaric dithyramb.¹¹⁴ Most significantly, however, the struggle between Herakles and Acheloos is represented on two extant *arulae* from Locri Epizephyrii dated to c. 500 and c. 480-460 BC.¹¹⁵ It is therefore hard to see how the encounter between Euthymos and the Hero, granted that the latter is a river deity, could have been conceived in Locri in the fifth century BC without the paradigm of Herakles and Acheloos in mind.

The fight of a hero with a monster is a commonplace theme.¹¹⁶ The fight of a hero with a river deity is a variation on this.¹¹⁷ An example from Hebrew tradition is Jacob's supernatural encounter at the Jabboq: Old Testament scholars are agreed in identifying Jacob's attacker here as a river spirit.¹¹⁸ Like the battle between Jacob and the river spirit, the battle between Euthymos and the Hero occurs at night.¹¹⁹ Another famous Greek example is Achilles' fight with Skamandros in the *Iliad*.¹²⁰ A hero may, alternatively, wrestle with a deity of the sea, as Menelaos does with Proteus or Peleus with Thetis. To fight with an aquatic deity is a typical *Heldentat*: the person of whom such a tale is told (who invariably prevails) takes heroic credentials from the encounter. To attach such a myth to Euthymos is a means of conferring on him heroic credentials: historical persons were no less amenable to this kind of treatment than mythical ones.¹²¹ Given, moreover, that the Temesan river deity was identified in legend with the metamorphosed ghost of a βιαιοθάνατος, Euthymos' exploit evokes another hagiographic motif: the expulsion of a malevolent spirit from a water source.¹²²

In Euthymos' case, this 'prestige myth' consists more particularly in emulation of Herakles. This is an important conclusion, one which we might have reached even without identifying the Hero as a river deity. For, if the Hero is identified as a 'spirit of death', we might have thought of Herakles' fight with Thanatos to save Alkestis' life.¹²³ However, the myth of Acheloos seems closer on several counts. First, the Hero's victim is not a married woman, but a virgin of marriageable age. Second, she is not to lose her life at the hands of the Hero, but only her maidenhood. Third, it has been argued above that certain aspects of the Hero's characterization suit better the identification of the Hero as a river deity rather than as a spirit of death. So, Euthymos in combating the Hero was apparently emulating Herakles combating Acheloos. Here, despite the undoubted peculiarities of the situation at Temesa, Euthymos is seen to have been conforming to a general pattern in the heroization of historical persons. Herakles was frequently a model

¹¹⁴ Pind. *Dith.* 2 = fr. 249a Maehler. Cf. too Archil. 286-7 IEG.

¹¹⁵ Weiß (n.56, 1984) 68 and n.398; Costabile (n.11) 221-6; Isler (n.59) 1.1 nos 224-5; M. Barra Bagnasco (ed.), *Locri Epizefiri 3: Cultura materiale e vita quotidiana* (Florence 1989) 134-7 and Tav. xxviii.

¹¹⁶ Cf. J. Fontenrose, *Python. A Study of Delphic Myth and its Origins* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1959), *passim*; Visintin (n.16) 13.

¹¹⁷ Cf. M.L. West, *The East Face of Helicon. West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry* (Oxford 1997) 482-3.

¹¹⁸ Genesis 32.22-32. See S. Niditch, *Ancient Israelite Religion* (New York and Oxford 1997) 42-3; C. Westermann, *Genesis 12-36. A Commentary*, trans. J.J. Scullion S.J. (London and Minneapolis 1985) 512-21. I am grateful to Dr Richard Rutherford for first alerting me to this parallel.

¹¹⁹ Suda s.v. Εὐθύμος: 'he [Euthymos] overcame the *daimon* who came him at night (νύκτωρ)'. *Diegesis* to Call. *Aet.*, 4.10-11: 'at dawn' (ἔωθε[ν]). Spirits depart at night: cf. Plaut. *Amphitr.* 532-3; Shakespeare, *Hamlet* 1.i.153-69. Cf. S. Thompson, *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature* (Indiana 1932-6) 3.94 F420.3.4.2 ('water-spirits must be in water before dawn').

¹²⁰ *Il.* 21.211-382.

¹²¹ Cf. Visintin (n.16) 38 n.63.

¹²² The Neoplatonist Porphyry claimed to have expelled a spirit from a bathing-place: Eunapius, *Lives of the Sophists* 4.1.12: '[Porphyry] says also that he chased some supernatural being (δαίμόνιον τινα φύσιν) from a bathing-place and expelled him; the locals called it Kausathas'. Cf. Thompson (n.119) 2.398 D2176.3.3.2: 'saint purifies spring by driving out demon', cf. 2.428-9 E278, E285: ghosts haunt a spring or well.

¹²³ Eur. *Alc.* 840-9, 1025-32. So Fontenrose (n.14) 81; Gernet (n.41) 132; Visintin (n.16) 105.

for Olympic victors in the combat sports: boxing, wrestling and pankration.¹²⁴ The wrestler Milon of Kroton entered into battle against the Sybarites dressed like Herakles with lion-skin and club.¹²⁵ The pankratiast Poulydamas of Skotoussa wrestled bare-handed with a lion on Mount Olympos in emulation (Pausanias tells us) of Herakles and the Nemean lion.¹²⁶ The pankratiast Timanthes of Kleonai immolated himself on a pyre once he could no longer draw his bow: his self-immolation recalls Herakles' death on Oita and the bow is another attribute of Herakles.¹²⁷ Theogenes of Thasos claimed Herakles as his father.¹²⁸ Herakles' labours were, moreover, illustrated on the metopes of the temple of Zeus at Olympia, and Herakles' feats – and apotheosis – often feature as an *exemplum* for the *laudandus* in Pindar's victory odes.¹²⁹ The pattern of Herakles' life, comprising labours (ἄθλα, πόννοι, κάματοι – all buzz-words of athletic training or competition) followed by apotheosis and cult, was thus a paradigm for top athletes. But not just for them: numerous historical figures throughout antiquity took Herakles as a model in the quest for immortality or cult.¹³⁰

To emulate Herakles was a way of expressing – in one's lifetime – the aspiration to the status of hero or god and to the corresponding cult honours. The tendency has already been observed for newly heroized historical persons to be treated posthumously as the equals of established heroes.¹³¹ What needs to be emphasized here is that historical persons' emulation of heroes (pre-eminently Herakles) constitutes a bid *in those persons' lifetime* and *on their initiative* to be regarded as the equals of established heroes. Historical persons who emulated heroes were proactive in the process of their own heroization. This calls for a revision of the common view of heroization (see n.25) that regards heroization as the exclusive concern of the community, taking the community to heroize solely for its own purposes and to do so only after the person heroized is dead. We have now reason to insist on the 'subjective' as well as the 'objective' point of view.¹³² Euthymos occupies a unique place here. Not only was his aspiration to heroic status expressed in his lifetime, it was met, if we are to believe Callimachus as reported by Pliny, by the decree of a cult in his lifetime. In that case Euthymos will have anticipated Lysander.¹³³

¹²⁴ Cf. U. Sinn (ed.), *Sport in der Antike. Wettkampf, Spiel und Erziehung im Altertum* (Würzburg 1996) 88-9.

¹²⁵ Diod. 12.9.6.

¹²⁶ Paus. 6.5.5. For lions in Macedonia in the historical period, cf. Hdt. 7.125; Arist. *Hist. Anim.* 579b5-8.

¹²⁷ Paus. 6.8.4.

¹²⁸ Paus. 6.11.2.

¹²⁹ Esp. Pind. *Nem.* 1.60-72, *Isth.* 4.55-60, *Ol.* 3.36.

¹³⁰ This is a large theme, of which only a few examples can be given. Thus, Nikostratos, 4th c. BC (Diod. 16.44.3, Athen. 7.289b); Alexander, 4th c. BC (Arr. *Anab.* 4.10.7, 5.26.5, Plut. *Sayings of Kings and Commanders: Alexander* 27 = *Mor.* 181d; cf. coins: M.J. Price, *The Coinage in the Name of Alexander the Great and Philip Arrhidaeus* (Zurich and London 1991) 33); Sostratos/Agathon, 2nd c. AD (Lucian, *Demon.* 1; Philostr. *Lives of the Sophists* 552); Augustus, 1st c. BC–1st c. AD (Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.5-17, Virg. *Aen.* 6.791-807; cf. Cic. *On the Nature of the Gods* 2.62). Note especially the Cynics: Antisthenes, 5th–4th c. BC (Diog. Laert. 6.2); Diogenes, 4th c. BC (Diog. Laert. 6.71); Peregrinus, 2nd c. AD (Lucian, *On the Death of Peregrinus* 4-5, 21, 24, 29, 33). In general, Cic. *On Duties* 3.25. Of modern scholarship, the following can be mentioned: W.K.C. Guthrie, *The Greeks and their Gods* (London 1950) 239-41; L.R. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality* (Oxford 1921) 154; Burkert (n.25) 211.

¹³¹ F. Graf, *Nordionische Kulte. Religionsgeschichtliche und epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den Kulturen von*

Chios, Erythrai, Klazomenai und Phokaia (Rome 1985) 130; D.D. Hughes, 'Hero cult, heroic honors, heroic dead: some developments in the Hellenistic and Roman periods', in R. Hägg (ed.), *Ancient Greek Hero Cult* (Stockholm 1999) 167-75 at 173. Cf. Peek, *GV* 768.10: ἴσος ἦρῶσι, 'equal to the heroes'; Theocr. 16.80 (of the living Hieron II): προτέροις ἴσος ἠρώεσσι, 'equal to the former heroes'. The use of ἦρῶς was in the 5th c. BC not confined solely to the heroes of the epic (pace N. Loraux, *L'invention d'Athènes* (2nd edn, Paris 1993) 63, and R.C.T. Parker, *Athenian Religion. A History* (Oxford 1996) 136-7 with n.56). It could be used of heroized historical persons. Cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 5.95, fr. 133.5 Maehler; oracle (of 5th c. BC?) ap. Paus. 6.9.8; cf. Orphic gold leaf B1.11 Zuntz: 'with the other [n.b.] heroes'. The expression τῷ δεῖνι ὡς ἦρῶι θθεῖν and its variants, often applied to historical persons (e.g. Brasidas, Thuc. 5.11.1), is generally taken to mean 'to sacrifice to somebody as if he were a hero' – implying that he was not in fact one. There is, however, no good reason not to take it as 'to sacrifice to somebody as a hero' – implying that those who sacrificed, at least, regarded him as one.

¹³² Contrast Kearns (n.25) 6.

¹³³ Lysander was the first Greek to receive cult as a god in his lifetime on Samos in 404/3 BC, according to Duris, *FGrHist* 76 F71 (= Plut. *Lys.* 18.2-4), cf. F26. See C. Habicht, *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte* (2nd edn, Munich 1970) 244-5, 271. See J.K. Davies, *Democracy and Classical Greece* (2nd edn, London

But we need not shrink from this conclusion: scholars have been prepared for some time to admit Hagnon as a forerunner of Lysander, and there is no reason why Euthymos should not have anticipated him.¹³⁴ It does not, however, follow from the fact that cult was paid in Euthymos' lifetime that it was divine rather than heroic in character. Living persons might apparently receive either heroic or divine cult.¹³⁵

Recognition of Euthymos' encounter with the Hero as emulation of Herakles permits further speculation about events at Temesa. Pausanias' phrase ὁ Εὐθύμος ἐνεσκευασμένος ἔμενε τὴν ἔφοδον τοῦ δαίμονος has been taken to mean 'Euthymos awaited the arrival of the Hero *in arms*'.¹³⁶ But ἐνσκευάζειν need mean nothing more precise than 'prepare, get ready'.¹³⁷ It may mean 'dress up, disguise', oneself or someone else, as something they are not.¹³⁸ Hence Euthymos has sometimes been supposed to have disguised himself as the virgin who was about to be deflowered!¹³⁹ In Aristophanes' *Frogs*, however, the verb is used of Dionysos dressing up Xanthias as Herakles.¹⁴⁰ We might therefore think of Euthymos donning the garb of Herakles, as Milon did when entering battle with the Sybarites; Milon's example was close enough in time and space to have served as a specific model for Euthymos.¹⁴¹

Emulation of Herakles is attested for various fifth-century BC athletes and for several important persons throughout antiquity. It is a very plausible conduit to take Euthymos, a historical and still-living person, onto the plane of legend and cult. Emulation of Herakles would provide a solution to the problem signalled by Eitrem (above, n.19), of how the historical Euthymos could feature in a legend involving a hero of the mythical past and of ongoing cult.

Here another important question arises. How are we to conceive of this clash of Euthymos, a living historical person of the fifth century BC, with a hero-*daimon* long established in myth and cult? On the one hand this problem may be addressed solely on a narratological level: how a historical person might be integrated into a story of mythical type.¹⁴² On the other hand we may attempt to penetrate beyond the narrative and enquire into what real-life events (if any) lie behind it. Strabo, at least, associates Euthymos' arrival in Temesa with a historical event: the Locrians' capture of Temesa around the middle of the fifth century BC.¹⁴³ Did the legend of

1993) 167-8 for an assessment of the significance of Lysander's cult.

¹³⁴ A cult of Hagnon as a *hero* in his lifetime at Amphipolis in the period 437-422 BC is implied by Thuc. 5.11.1. See I. Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece* (Leiden 1987) 230; S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides* (Oxford 1996) 2.454-5.

¹³⁵ Note especially Dion in the mid 4th c. BC: Diod. 16.20.6. Cf. too Diod. 20.102.3; Demochares *FGrHist* 75 F1. In general, see Habicht (n.133) 203-4; E. Badian, 'Alexander the Great between two thrones and heaven: variations on an old theme', in A. Small (ed.), *Subject and Ruler: The Cult of the Ruling Power in Classical Antiquity* (JRA Suppl. 17, Ann Arbor 1996) 11-26 at 14-15; Hornblower (n.134) 454. For ἥρωες of living persons, cf. Hughes (n.131) 172 n.32.

¹³⁶ Paus. 6.6.9; cf. Suda s.v. Εὐθύμος: ἐνεσκεύασατο ὡς πολεμίσων τῷ δαίμονι. For the translation 'with his armour on', cf. W.H.S. Jones, *Pausanias. Description of Greece* (Cambridge, MA and London 1933, Loeb) 3.41; Mele (n.12) 873; Costabile (n.11) 214-15.

¹³⁷ Thus Euthymos 'got ready', according to P. Levi, *Pausanias. Guide to Greece* (London 1971) 2.303.

¹³⁸ Ar. *Acharn.* 384, *Frogs* 523; Plat. *Crit.* 53d6-7.

¹³⁹ Visintin (n.16) 144, following Delcourt; the supposed justification for this is Eurybatos assuming the

sacrificial garlands of Alkyoneus in Nicander's tale at Anton. Lib. 8.6.

¹⁴⁰ Ar. *Frogs* 522-3: οὐ τί που σπουδὴν ποεῖ, ἰότητι σε παίζων Ἡρακλέα ἄνεσκεύασα; 'surely you're not making earnest of the fact that in jest I dressed you up as Herakles?'

¹⁴¹ In general on dressing up as a divinity, see W.R. Connor, 'Tribes, festivals, and processions: civic ceremonial and political manipulation in Archaic Greece', in Buxton (n.71) 56-75 (= *JHS* 107 (1987) 40-50) at 64-5.

¹⁴² This is the approach of Visintin (n.16) 39, *et alibi*.

¹⁴³ Strabo 6.1.5 255: 'when the Western Locrians captured the city (Λοκρῶν δὲ τῶν Ἐπιζεφυρίων ἐλόντων τὴν πόλιν)'. Contrast Pausanias' casual formulation: '(Euthymos) came to Temesa, and apparently at that time the custom was being performed for the *daimon* (ἀφίκετο γὰρ ἐς τὴν Τεμέσαν καὶ πῶς τηνικαῦτα τὸ ἔθος ἐποιεῖτο τῷ δαίμονι)' (6.6.9). Temesa was under Locrian control by the middle of the 5th c. BC (formerly it was under Croton's influence), see G. Maddoli (ed.), *Temesa e il suo territorio. Atti del colloquio di Perugia e Trevi* (Taranto 1982) 93-101 (A. Stazio), 103-118 (N. Parise); cf. T.J. Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks. The History of Sicily and South Italy from the Foundation of the Greek Colonies to 480 BC* (Oxford 1948) 367. La Torre (n.62, 1997) 370 argues for an earlier date, 480-470 BC.

Euthymos' encounter with the Hero correspond to real-life events, and if so, in what sense did Euthymos and his contemporaries take these for 'real'? Here a different approach to the historicity of the legend is envisaged than that of Pais and Maaß on the one hand or Bohringer on the other (see above, pp. 25 and 26). A model proposed by W.R. Connor suggests itself here. Connor considered various cases in Archaic Greece where historical persons availed themselves of existing forms of ritual to make public political statements: for instance, Peisistratos' re-entrance into Athens by chariot in the 550s BC with Phye beside him posing as 'Athena'.¹⁴⁴ Connor's model explains how such events could actually take place without those involved being duped or naïvely believing in them: they participated rather in the spirit of complicit spectators at a show. On this model Euthymos' fight with the Hero could be seen as a consciously staged 'communal drama', a 'histrionic' articulation of Euthymos' claim to heroic status which was understood by both protagonist and public alike as 'play'.¹⁴⁵ While not requiring us to impute any literal belief to the Temesans that Euthymos fought the Hero, this model admits a sense in which the events of the legend 'actually occurred'.

However, there may also be a case for imputing the literal belief to the Temesans. In the Late Archaic and Early Classical periods various stories were told of clashes between historical persons and heroes. In fifth-century Athens, one Epizelos, a veteran of Marathon, told how a hero – a great man attired as a hoplite, whose beard cast a shadow over the whole of his shield – had opposed him in battle and killed the man standing next to him.¹⁴⁶ A second is especially interesting for us in view of its location: the battle of the Sagra between Kroton and Locri Epizephyrii in the second half of the sixth century BC. There, the Krotonian commander, Leonymos or Autoleon, was gravely wounded by the Locrian hero Aias (and had to be healed by that hero).¹⁴⁷ The 'reality' of these encounters for their fifth-century public is indicated by their physical consequences: killing, blinding and wounding. This was, we should remember, a culture in which heroic and divine epiphanies were reasonably widely believed in.¹⁴⁸ It is interesting to note in this connection that the river god Acheloos was especially given to epiphany.¹⁴⁹ Kimon's ruse described in the Pseudo-Aeschinean epistle and Attalos' alleged siring by the river Maiandros seem to attest a readiness to believe in epiphanies of river gods (at least among parts of the population). If the Hero could be imagined capable of literally deflowering a virgin (who left the sanctuary 'a woman, not a virgin'), Euthymos might be imagined capable of literally fighting the Hero. On this view Euthymos will have pitted himself against the Hero in the spirit in which Leonymos pitted himself against Aias, but, significantly, with a more successful outcome. Euthymos' encounter with the Hero will then be neither simply a fictional narrative (as it is for Visintin) nor a historical 'communal drama' (on Connor's model), but an event which (enough of) the Temesan population could believe to have actually occurred. (What Euthymos himself knew or believed to have occurred and what did occur are separate, and in this context less crucial, questions.)

Whether the Temesans saw Euthymos' victory over the Hero as 'communal drama' or as the issue of a real, physical encounter, the defeat of the Hero must have portended the end both to the Temesans' tribute and to the Hero's cult. The prenuptial ritual performed for the Hero will

¹⁴⁴ Connor (n.141).

¹⁴⁵ Cf. Connor (n.141) 64: 'The populace joins in a shared drama, not foolishly, duped by some manipulator, but playfully, participating in a cultural pattern they all share', cf. 67: 'The citizens are not naive bumpkins... but participants in a theatricality whose rules and roles they understand and enjoy.'

¹⁴⁶ Hdt. 6.117.3. Cf. U. Kron, 'Patriotic heroes', in Hägg (n.131) 61-83 at 65 with n.12.

¹⁴⁷ Paus. 3.19.12, Conon *FGrHist* 26 F1.xviii.

¹⁴⁸ See, e.g., Hes. *Th.* 22-34; Pind. *Pyth.* 8.58-60; Hdt. 6.105.1. Divine and heroic epiphanies were common especially in war: see (apart from Epizelos and Leonymos) Hdt. 8.38-39.1; Plut. *Thes.* 35.5; Paus. 1.4.4, 1.32.5; W.K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War* 3 (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London 1979) 11-46; T. Harrison, *Divinity and History. The Religion of Herodotus* (Oxford 2000) 82-92. In general, cf. Max. Tyr. 9.7.

¹⁴⁹ R. Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians* (London 1986) 118-19.

reasonably have been transferred to Euthymos who, by virtue of his successful emulation of Herakles, had shown himself a worthy object of cult. This theory can explain how Euthymos received cult in his lifetime and why Euthymos was conceived in his cult (as the Grotta Caruso herms show in the late fourth century BC) as a fluvial deity concerned with prenuptial rites. The propriety of this cult transfer would have been confirmed by the Delphic oracle, reinforced by the omen of Zeus's thunderbolts.¹⁵⁰ The hypothesis of a cult transfer may seem at odds with the legend's insistence that Euthymos 'put an end to the tribute' exacted by the Hero.¹⁵¹ But it would not be if the sacrifice was at the time of its transfer to Euthymos commuted to a less drastic form of *προτέλεια*: hair sacrifice, for instance, or animal sacrifice, rather than the sacrifice of a girl's virginity. Either of these would fit with the knife represented in one of the Grotta Caruso herms. The rite may also at this time have ceased to be a purely aristocratic one: the evidence from Grotta Caruso suggests that Euthymos' cult appealed to a broad base of the Locrian population towards the end of the fourth century BC.¹⁵² At any rate, to assume that the Temesans needed literally to be 'liberated' from a tribute imposed by the Hero is to understand the aetiological language too literally.¹⁵³ The aetiological myth presents the initiatory rite as an externally imposed obligation whereas it was in truth dictated by the community's own needs. The real function of Euthymos' fight with the Hero was to imbue him with superhuman status; it was not really an expedient for getting rid of a malevolent supernatural being.

The assumption that a cult performed for the Hero was transferred, with modification, to Euthymos points up another important feature in the heroization of historical persons. Transferrals of cult were fairly common in the Archaic and Classical periods. They could involve two mythical figures, two heroized historical persons, or a deity and a recently deified historical person. Thus in the early sixth century BC the Sikyonian tyrant Kleisthenes had Adrastos' cult transferred to Melanippos and Dionysos.¹⁵⁴ The Amphipolitans in 422 BC transferred the cult of their Athenian κτίστης Hagnon to their Spartan σωτήρ Brasidas.¹⁵⁵ In 404/3 BC the Samians transferred their Hera festival to Lysander, calling it 'Lysandreia' instead of Heraia.¹⁵⁶ At the end of the fourth century BC the Athenians are said similarly to have renamed their Dionysia 'Demetria' in honour of Demetrios Poliorketes.¹⁵⁷ The last two examples show how such transferrals might serve to express the equivalence between newly heroized (or deified) historical persons and established figures of cult. A similar scenario may be assumed for Euthymos and the Hero. It is conceivable that the Hero's sanctuary became Euthymos' sanctuary, and that this was the site of the taumorphic statue and the altar shown on the Grotta Caruso herms: it is otherwise hard to imagine what may have become of this sacred real estate after the expulsion of the Hero. In this case, Euthymos' cult centre would have been in the vicinity of Temesa, but that would not preclude his receiving cult in Locri also.¹⁵⁸

On the view taken here, the prime mover of Euthymos' cult was emulation of Herakles. It would then be a small irony that in the cult itself Euthymos, on being substituted for the Hero, came to be modelled on Herakles' adversary, taking on in his iconography the fluvial character-

¹⁵⁰ Call. *fr.* 99 Pf. = Plin. *Nat.* 7.152.

¹⁵¹ *Diegesis* to Call. *Aet.* 4.12-13; Ael. *VH* 8.18; Strabo 6.1.5 255; cf. Paus. 6.6.10.

¹⁵² Costabile (n.11) 228.

¹⁵³ *Pace* Burkert (n.25) 207: 'there are... heroes whose wrath is implacable and who wreak havoc until some way is found of getting rid of them. Such was the case in Temesa...'

¹⁵⁴ Hdt. 5.67.1-5.

¹⁵⁵ Thuc. 5.11.1.

¹⁵⁶ See above.

¹⁵⁷ Plut. *Dem.* 12.2 τὰ Διονύσια μετωνόμασαν Δημήτρια. But see Parker (n.131) 259 n.13; J.D. Mikalson, *Religion in Hellenistic Athens* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London 1998) 93.

¹⁵⁸ For heroized historical persons receiving cult in more than one location, see F. Pfister, *Der Reliquienkult im Altertum* (Giessen 1909-12) 230-8. For views on the location of Euthymos' *herōon*, see Rohde (n.107) 154 n.116; Costabile (n.11) 227-8.

istics that are typical of Acheloos.¹⁵⁹ The ‘opposition’ between Euthymos and the Hero has here become ‘identification’.¹⁶⁰ The role of river deity concerned with prenuptial rites which was inherited by Euthymos from the Hero seems to have been bolstered by two further stories about Euthymos: that he was a son of the river Kaikinos, and that he disappeared into the Kaikinos at the end of his earthly life. These stories now need a brief consideration.

V. SON OF A RIVER GOD

Divine birth was claimed for various historical Greeks, but particularly for athletes of the fifth century BC.¹⁶¹ Much later, in perhaps the second century AD, we hear of the athlete Attalos of Magnesia claiming the river god Maiandros as his father.¹⁶² The claim of having a divine father was typically made on behalf of someone who had shown superhuman qualities. Thus Priam can say of Hektor οὐδὲ ἐώκει | ἀνδρός γε θνητοῦ πάϊς ἔμμεναι, ἀλλὰ θεοῖο, ‘nor did he seem to be the son of a mortal man, but of a god’, cited by Aristotle in his discussion of the ‘godlike man’.¹⁶³ Stories of divine birth underpin a person’s claim to superhuman status, hence such stories arise late in a person’s career (or even posthumously).¹⁶⁴ In the case of Euthymos it is likely that the story of his divine birth arose once the movement to make him a hero was well under way. It is likely then that it postdated his fight with the Hero.¹⁶⁵

VI. METAMORPHOSIS INTO A RIVER GOD

Euthymos, according to a tradition preserved by Aelian, disappeared at the end of his life into the Kaikinos.¹⁶⁶ Metamorphosis into a river deity was one means by which a historical person could be claimed to have entered the world of the gods.¹⁶⁷ Euthymos is the earliest historical person for whom such river metamorphosis is attested. However, a good Italian parallel comes from Nuceria (in Campania) in the person of one Epidius, of perhaps the third century BC. According to Suetonius, Epidius ‘long ago plunged into the source of the river Sarnus and shortly afterwards emerged with the horns of a bull(?); immediately thereafter he disappeared, and was held to have joined the company of the gods’.¹⁶⁸ A hostile account of Alexander the Great’s last days preserved by Arrian similarly attributes to Alexander the scheme of throwing himself into the Euphrates once he knew he was going to die, so that having disappeared from men’s sight he

¹⁵⁹ Contrast both Isler (n.59) 35, ‘[Euthymos ist] als Heros mit Acheloos verschmolzen’, and Weiß (n.56, 1984) 68, ‘Wenn... eine Verschmelzung zwischen Euthymos und einem Flußgott ausgedrückt werden sollte, dann sicher nicht mit Acheloos, sondern mit Kaikinos.’

¹⁶⁰ Bohringer (n.14) 16: ‘L’opposition est ici identification’.

¹⁶¹ Diagoras was allegedly fathered by Hermes (schol. Pind. *Ol.* 7 Inscr. a) and Theogenes by Herakles (Paus. 6.11.2). See F. Taeger, *Charisma. Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Herrscherkultes* (Stuttgart 1957) 84-5. Cf. Glaukos, Paus. 6.10.1. Of non-athletes, cf. Demaratos and Astrabakos (Hdt. 6.69.1-3), Plato and Apollo (Diog. Laert. 3.2).

¹⁶² Ps.-Aeschin. *Ep.* 10.8.

¹⁶³ *Il.* 24.258-9; Arist. *EN* 1145a21-2.

¹⁶⁴ In the case of Astrabakos’ siring of Demaratos (Hdt. 6.69.1-3) we are informed of the specific crisis in Demaratos’ life which led to the creation of the story.

¹⁶⁵ Astykses (not Kaikinos) is given as Euthymos’ father in the epigram on the victor statue at Olympia. But the choice of patronymic here may say more about what was felt to be appropriate in an epigram at Olympia than

about the date at which the Locrian tradition concerning Euthymos’ divine birth arose.

¹⁶⁶ *VH* 8.18.

¹⁶⁷ Antinoos, favourite of the Emperor Hadrian, drowned in the Nile in AD 132 and was deified: Weiß (n.56, 1984) 132 and nn.857-60, 222 n.816. Of mythical persons, cf. L. Preller, *Römische Mythologie* (3rd edn, 1881-3) 1.95-7, 2.141-4; Weiß (n.56, 1984) 68 and n.399. Aeneas: Liv. 1.2.6, etc. Cf. Tiberinus: Liv. 1.3.8; Dion. Hal. *Rom. Ant.* 1.71. There are many examples in Ps.-Plut. *On Rivers*. See Hermann (n.100), esp. 392-6.

¹⁶⁸ Suet. *Gramm.* 28.2: (sc. *C. Epidium Nucerinum*) *ferunt olim praecipitatum in fontem fluminis Sarni paulo post cum cornibus taureis† (taureis Jahn, arietis Robinson) extitisse, ac statim non comparuisse in numeroque deorum habitum*. See *LIMC* 3.1 (1986) 803 s.v. ‘Epidius’; M.-C. Vacher, *Suétone. Grammairiens et rhéteurs* (Paris 1993) 230-4, esp. 232-4; Pais (n.18) 49; Costabile (n.11) 211. The case of Epidius may actually have been modelled on that of Euthymos. For the possible influence of Greek historians of Magna Graecia on early Roman history, cf. Dunbabin (n.143) 372.

could bolster the belief of future generations that he had been born of a god and was going to join the gods.¹⁶⁹ The same themes recur in connection with the Emperor Julian in the fourth century AD.¹⁷⁰ Empedokles' disappearance into the volcanic craters of Mount Etna in the fifth century BC shows the same themes: again a hostile source reports that 'Empedokles got up and walked to Etna, then when he had got there he jumped into the craters of fire and disappeared, wanting to confirm the report about himself that he had become a god.'¹⁷¹ The disappearance (ἀφάνισις) of a person could thus be employed as an argument that he had been admitted among the gods or heroes.¹⁷² Often, however, our sources show a sceptical or hostile attitude to that argument.

Acceptance of the story of Euthymos' disappearance into the Kaikinos (implying his river metamorphosis) must be presupposed by the fluvial-taurine iconography of Euthymos' cult statue as reflected on the Grotta Caruso herms.¹⁷³ However, acceptance of the tradition of Euthymos' river metamorphosis apparently cannot have been responsible for the institution of Euthymos' cult. There is, rather, reason for thinking that it was Euthymos' victory over the Hero that led to the institution of his cult. This is suggested by two aspects of Callimachus' handling of the Euthymos story.

First, Callimachus seems to presuppose a causal relation between Euthymos' victory over the Hero and the institution of his cult. He relates both: *fr.* 98 and 99 Pf. respectively. It is possible to question whether both these fragments derive from the same narrative of the *Aetia*.¹⁷⁴ But it is hard to see what the story of Euthymos and the Hero in *fr.* 98 was the αἴτιον for, if not for the institution of Euthymos' cult. A parallel from Book 3 of the *Aetia* seems decisive: the story of Euthykles (another athlete from Locri Epizephyrii) is capped with the institution of Euthykles' cult.¹⁷⁵ Thus although we are missing the seven crucial lines (15-21) of the *Diegesis*' résumé of the Euthymos-αἴτιον it is reasonable to assume that they passed from Euthymos' victory over the Hero to the institution of Euthymos' cult. In that case Pliny did indeed cite *fr.* 99 from the Euthymos-αἴτιον in Book 4 of the *Aetia*. The fact that Callimachus narrated Euthymos' victory over the Hero and the institution of Euthymos' cult in the course of the same αἴτιον may not prove that he saw the former as the cause of the latter, but it creates a strong *prima facie* assumption that this was so.¹⁷⁶

Second, the view that Callimachus saw Euthymos' cult as motivated by his victory over the Hero is supported by the fact that Pliny tells us that Callimachus 'marvelled' at Euthymos' receiving cult in his lifetime: *quod et vivo factitatum et mortuo*.¹⁷⁷ A cult which Euthymos received in his lifetime cannot have been motivated by the river metamorphosis, which occurred at the very end of his life: it must have been motivated by an exploit accomplished by Euthymos in his lifetime. Surely only Euthymos' victory over the Hero comes into question.

It thus seems that it was the fight with the Hero that conferred cult status on Euthymos. Granting that the Hero was a river deity, it will have been the transferral of the Hero's cult to

¹⁶⁹ Arr. *Anab.* 7.27.3.

¹⁷⁰ Greg. *Naz. Or.* 5.14.

¹⁷¹ Hippobotos *ap.* Diog. Laert. 8.69.

¹⁷² A mythical example is Herakles (Diod. 4.38.5). Historical examples include Aristetas (Hdt. 4.14-15), Kleomedes (Paus. 6.9.7) and Hamilkar (Hdt. 7.166-7). See L. Lacroix, 'Quelques exemples de disparitions miraculeuses dans les traditions de la Grèce ancienne', *Mélanges Pierre Lévêque* (Paris 1988) 1.183-98 at 189-90. Conversely the physical evidence of death could be used to refute a person's claim to superhuman status: the argument that 'death refuted (him)', ὁ θάνατος ἤλεγε: Habicht (n.133) 198 n.34.

¹⁷³ Costabile (n.11) 211-12.

¹⁷⁴ Cf. R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus* (Oxford 1949) 1.104:

'Fort(asse) Call. huius miraculi [i.e. *fr.* 99] alio loco [*sc.* than in *Aetia* 4] mentionem fecit'; cf. Visintin (n.16) 29-30. Call. *fr.* 635 Pf. (of uncertain location and uncertain metre) may also have referred to Euthymos.

¹⁷⁵ Call. *Aet. fr.* 84-5 Pf. with *Diegesis* 1.37-2.8.

¹⁷⁶ So Mele (n.12) 858: 'Ne deriva l'impressione fondata che Callimaco conservasse una tradizione sull'atleta, le sue geste sportive, lo scontro con l'eroe, la natura divina che gli era stata riconosciuta e il culto che gli era stato tributato.' On the other hand, Visintin (n.16) 17 supposes 'che l'episodio [*sc.* the Euthymos-*aition*] si concludesse... con le splendide nozze del coraggioso pugile con la fanciulla da lui liberata'.

¹⁷⁷ *Fr.* 99 Pf.

Euthymos, occurring within the latter's lifetime, that created the willingness to style Euthymos himself as a river deity. The stories that the Kaikinos was Euthymos' father and that Euthymos vanished into the Kaikinos will have succeeded this transferral and will have facilitated the formation of the taurine-fluvial iconography in Euthymos' cult. A further complication, however, is to be noted: while the river with which the Hero was associated must have been close to Temesa, the Kaikinos, with which Euthymos was associated, was near to Locri.¹⁷⁸ Perhaps the known facts of Euthymos' life ruled out situating the moments of his conception and passing away in the region of Temesa, or perhaps political reasons were decisive in the Locrians' linking their heroized Olympic victor with a river which was an important territorial boundary.¹⁷⁹ Or, if Locrian control of Temesa was short-lived, it may simply have proved necessary to relocate the cult of the Locrian athlete to an area under Locrian control.¹⁸⁰

CONCLUSION

A new interpretation has been offered here of the rite performed for the Hero at Temesa in the Archaic period, based on identifying the Hero as a river deity. A new interpretation has also been offered of Euthymos' fight with Hero, seeing this as a deliberate emulation of Herakles in his contest with Acheloos for Deianeira. Despite the evident peculiarities of Euthymos' cult, our case study has given opportunity to suggest modifications to the established view of heroization in the Classical period. First, Euthymos is to be recognized as the earliest historical person for whom a cult in his lifetime is recorded: the first attested cult of a living Greek is therefore to be dated to the middle of the fifth century, not to the end of that century (Lysander) or to the 430s (Hagnon). Second, we should accept that an initiative in the process of heroization could emanate from the individual in his own lifetime, not just from the city after the individual's death (the 'subjective' point of view is reinstated): the individual's own initiative frequently finds expression in his emulation of heroes, especially Herakles. Third, another general phenomenon which this case study has emphasized is the tendency for cults of historical persons to be integrated into, or substituted for, existing cults of gods or heroes: here, too, Euthymos may have anticipated Lysander. If emulation of heroes was a way in which individuals themselves could lay claim to heroic status, then the insertion of their cults into existing heroic or divine cults was a way in which the community itself recognized and acceded to those individuals' claims.

¹⁷⁸ On the location of the Kaikinos, see Paus. 6.6.4: 'dividing the territory of Locri from that of Rhegion'; Ael. *VH* 8.18: 'the river Kaikinos, which is situated at a distance from the city of the Locrians' (πρὸ τῆς τῶν Λοκρῶν πόλεως; see Costabile (n.11) 218). Cf. Thuc. 3.103.3. See Oldfather, 'Kaikinos, 2', *RE* 10 (1919) 1500-1; G. Nenci and G. Vallet (eds), *Bibliografia topografica della colonizzazione greca in Italia e nelle isole tirreniche* (Pisa and Rome 1985) 4.238-43; F. Costabile (ed.), *Polis ed Olympeion a Locri Epizefiri* (Catanazaro 1992) 166. For the respective positions of the rivers Halex and Kaikinos, see Costabile (n.11) 218 fig. 336 and (differently) *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman Worlds* (Princeton and Oxford 2000) map 46 5C. For its part, Temesa lay on a homonymous river: Steph. Byz. s.v. Τάμασος, 'Tamasos: it is both a city in Italy – Tamese [*sic*] – and a river.'

¹⁷⁹ For the political importance of the Kaikinos, see Thuc. 3.99, 3.103.3, 3.115.5; *FGrHist* 577 F2.9. The legend of the cicadas relates to the Halex, not to the Kaikinos (despite Paus. 6.6.4): see Tim. *FGrHist* 566

F43. Rhegion apparently employed Herakles for myth-propaganda purposes in their territorial disputes with Locri. See Tim. *FGrHist* 566 F43 = Antigon. *Hist. mir.* 2: 'and the following mythical episode too is recorded among the Rhegians, that Herakles bedded down in some part of the territory and, being bothered by the cicadas, prayed that they might lose their voice'. A Ἡρακλῆς Ῥηγίνος ('Herakles of Rhegion') is also attested in the Archaic period: Costabile (n.11) 217. In that case it may have been natural for Locri to use Euthymos, their own δεύτερος Ἡρακλῆς, to counteract the Rhegian Herakles.

¹⁸⁰ The temple of Campora S. Giovanni seems to have been violently destroyed around 480-470 BC (La Torre (n.62, 1997) 368). If that temple is correctly identified as the sanctuary of the Hero, then its destruction may have marked Locri's loss of control over Temesa. On the other hand, La Torre (n.62, 1997) 370 relates the temple's destruction to the Locrian conquest of Temesa, when the Temesans were liberated from the supposedly unwelcome tribute to the Hero which had been enforced by the Achaian cities, Sybaris and Kroton.

Needless to say, the community's goodwill was a necessary condition of any person's heroization, and that goodwill was shaped by political considerations and by the community's own self-interest. In Euthymos' case the community's goodwill is demonstrated by the construction of the legend itself, which does not begrudge Euthymos motifs that are elsewhere attached only ambivalently, or with downright hostility, to historical persons. Emulation of a god or hero, for instance, could meet with derision or with an imputation of insanity, as in the cases of Menekrates and Nikostratos.¹⁸¹ The attempt to pit oneself against a god or hero could likewise rebound, as with Leonymos. The attempt to contrive one's own ἀφάνισις also lent itself easily to hostile presentation, as with Empedokles, Alexander and the Emperor Julian. The Euthymos legend, however, applies all these motifs affirmatively to its hero. In this regard the Euthymos legend contrasts with the other legends of heroized athletes, which make a much more controversial figure out of their protagonist.¹⁸² The Locrian three-time Olympic victor clearly managed to marry his own interests extremely successfully with popular opinion. Only so could his cult have been instituted in his lifetime and could have flourished for a century, at least, after his death.

BRUNO CURRIE
Christ Church, Oxford

¹⁸¹ M.P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* (3rd edn, Munich 1974) 2.138.

¹⁸² Compare Kleomedes, Theogenes and Euthykses: Fontenrose (n.14) *passim*.



Herm from Grotta Caruso, Locri
(from F. Costabile *et al.*, *I ninfei di Locri Epizefiri*
(Catanzaro 1991) 199 fig. 321)