Transactions of the American Philological Association 108 (1978) 285–299

THE GRATITUDE OF THE LOCRIAN MAIDEN: PINDAR, *PYTH.* 2.18–20

LEONARD WOODBURY

University College, Toronto

The Second Pythian begins with a dozen lines on the power of Syracuse and the news of victories with the chariot whereby Hieron, by the grace of the gods, has conferred glory on the city. There follows a brief passage (13–14) of a kind familiar in the odes, which generalises the content of what is to come next: there is to be a variety of praises of kings in requital of their excellences.[1] The examples follow, the way being prepared by an explicative use of asyndeton. Cinyras is first to be mentioned, to the accompaniment of a sustaining μέν, which looks forward to the δέ that will give response when Hieron's name is invoked in 18. We are given two paradigms of praiseworthy kingship, in which the mythical king, in Pindaric fashion is placed side by side with the contemporary ruler. The myth of Ixion, linked to what precedes by another δέ, begins in 21, and will exhibit by its narrative the horror and the folly of grateful praise that is denied.

We do not well understand Pindar's choice of Cinyras as the model of the praiseworthy king.[2] Once, in another poem (*Nem.* 8.18), he is mentioned because of the heaven-sent prosperity by which great wealth was once conferred upon him on the island of Cyprus, and he was known to Homer (*Il.* 11.20) and to Tyrtaeus (fr. 12.6 *IEG*), apparently to the same point. In our passage Pindar adds that Cinyras was dear to Apollo and was Aphrodite's peculiar priest;[3] he may wish to say that the priest took the

[1] E. L. Bundy, "Studia Pindarica I: The Eleventh Olympian Ode," *CPCP* 18.1 (1962) 5 ff.

[2] W. H. Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* 2.1 (Leipzig 1890–1894) s.v. Kinyras.

[3] At 17 Cinyras is called ἱερέα κτίλον Ἀφροδίτας. The word's original meaning, "ram," is claimed to be the sense here by A. Morpurgo, "*Ktilos* (Pind. *Pyth.* II.17)," *RCCM* 2 (1960) 30–40, with reference to theriomorphic priesthoods and the use of rams in Cyprian cult. The interpretation is rejected, as inappropriate to Paphian cult, by H. Lloyd-Jones in *JHS* 93 (1973) 119, note 59, in favour of the second meaning, "pet" or "favourite." Whatever its precise significance in cult, the word appears to connote here a certain tenderness (cf. also Hom. *Od.* 9.447 ff.), for Cinyras was known for his beauty (Luc. *Rhet. Praec.* 11.2 and Hygin. *Fab.* 270)

dress and style of a ram in the sanctuary of Aphrodite of Paphos. It is a reasonable guess that the divine favour that he enjoyed was the cause of the eminent prosperity that was his lot and that he, unlike Ixion (26), knew how to bear the great burden of good fortune. If his subjects on Cyprus shared in their king's well-being, their city resembled in its condition that of the just law-giver of Hesiod (*Op.* 225–37), and they had good reason to bless the name of Cinyras. However that may be, the Scholiast (27a: 2.35 Drachmann) is able to report the existence on Cyprus of a college of Cinyrads dedicated to Aphrodite who might have kept the royal memory alive, and the poet himself speaks of φᾶμαι Κυπρίων by which the king is praised.[4] Praises of the mythical priest-king, from whatever source, there must have been, as Farnell points out,[5] and we may guess that the Paphian attendants of Aphrodite's temple are likely to have upheld the veneration of the hero in her precinct. If we do not know what form the praise took and can only guess at its cause, our understanding must be less precise than we should wish, but the form of the passage requires us to believe that grateful praise is offered to Cinyras for his benefactions (ἀρετᾶς 14, φίλων . . . ἔργων 17).

The contemporary parallel offered by the praise of Hieron now falls into place:

> σὲ δ', ὦ Δεινομένειε παῖ, Ζεφυρία πρὸ δόμων
> Λοκρὶς παρθένος ἀπύει,
> πολεμίων καμάτων ἐξ ἀμαχάνων
> διὰ τεὰν δύναμιν δρακεῖσ' ἀσφαλές ·

There can be no mistaking the presence of an historical allusion. What requires clarification is its object of reference. Here, in the history of Magna Graecia in the fifth century, we are more fortunate, I believe, than in the myth of Cyprus from the heroic age.

---

and said (Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* 2.56) to have been wooed by Aphrodite. Sir James Frazer, *Adonis Attis Osiris* (London 1906) 29–30, sees him as an Adonis-figure and suggests that the kings of Paphos claimed to be, not merely priests of Aphrodite, but her lovers as well. If Pindar here acknowledges this status, then Cinyras' fortune matches well the μακρὸν . . . ὄλβον that was given to Ixion (26), for to marry Aphrodite was proverbially a more-than-human blessing (cf., e.g., Alcm. fr. 1.16–17 *PMG*). With regard to the development of the word's meaning, it is suggestive to notice that the verb κτιλόω is used by Herodotus (4.113.3) in the sense, "to subdue sexually." Whatever the meaning borne in the fifth century by his epithet, it looks as if Cinyras himself was considered to be domesticated within the household of Aphrodite of Paphos. On the hero-worship of priest-kings, see M. L. West, *Hesiod: Theogony* (Oxford 1966) 428.

[4]In the fourth century Evagoras of Cyprus, it is reported by Pausanias (1.3.2), celebrated his descent from Cinyras.

[5]L. R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar: Critical Commentary* (London 1932) 121–22.

As to the danger from which the maidens of Locri gave thanks for their city's deliverance, our chief sources are three notices in the scholia on the Pythian odes (*Pyth.* 1.99a and 2.36 and 38: 2.18 and 37–38 Drachmann). Because of their agreement they appear to have a common origin, but it is not known what this was.

The fullest of these accounts (*Pyth.* 2.36c) states that, when Anaxilas, the tyrant of Messana and Rhegium, made war on Locri, Hieron despatched Chromius, his relative-by-marriage, to threaten that he would march against Rhegium, unless Anaxilas desisted from his campaign against the Locrians. After Anaxilas submitted to the threat the Locrians enjoyed peace.

> Ἀναξίλα τοῦ Μεσσήνης καὶ Ῥηγίου τυράννου πολεμοῦντος Λοκροῖς Ἱέρων πέμψας Χρόμιον τὸν κηδεστὴν διηπείλησεν αὐτῷ, εἰ μὴ καταλύσαιτο τὸν πρὸς αὐτοὺς πόλεμον, αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸ Ῥήγιον στρατεύειν · οὗπερ δὴ πρὸς τὴν ἀπειλὴν ἐνδόντος ἐν εἰρήνῃ διήγαγον οἱ Λοκροί.

A second version (*Pyth.* 2.38), commenting on the same passage, adds interesting details: Anaxilas is said only to have threatened war, and the third scholion (*Pyth.* 1.99a) may agree, for it speaks of his wishing either to reduce the Locrians (βουληθέντα Λοκροὺς καταπολεμῆσαι) or to destroy them utterly (Λοκροὺς ἠθέλησεν ἄρδην ἀπολέσαι), adding that this threat was mentioned by the comic poet Epicharmus in the *Islands* (fr. 98 Kaibel). Anaxilas is also associated with his son "Cleophron" in the second scholion; both men are called "tyrants" and the one, evidently Anaxilas himself, is said to have his seat at Messana, while the other was at Rhegium. There is no good reason to doubt the existence of a joint tyranny that was shared, on whatever terms, by father and son, and it must have seemed tactically advantageous for the *régime* to have its forces established, under a reliable command, on both sides of the strait that separates the two cities.

This judgment receives some support from an anecdote related by Athenaeus (1.3e). It records that, apparently on an occasion when Anaxilas won a victory with a mule-team at Olympia,[6] Leophron (as the son is named here and elsewhere) offered a banquet to the spectators in celebration. Further evidence to a somewhat similar conclusion is offered by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 20.7), who says that Anaxilas seized the acropolis of the Rhegians and occupied it until his death, when he bequeathed it to his son, Leophron. Although the passage does not

[6]Simonides fr. 10: 515 *PMG*; Arist. *Rhet.* 3.2.14: 1405b23 ff.; Heracl. Pont. *Pol.* 25: *FHG* 2.219; G. Vallet, *Rhégion et Zancle* (Paris 1958) 366 and note 5, follows earlier authorities in fixing the probable date as 480.

speak of a joint tyranny, it appears to cast Leophron in the rôle of heir apparent, who may thus have been fitted to serve as second-in-command. If this was the state of affairs under the tyranny, it is understandable that two of our other Pindaric scholia speak of Anaxilas alone as making, or threatening, war and that Dionysius thinks of the tyranny as being transferred to Leophron only at his father's death.

It is now appropriate to consider an unjustly-neglected passage of Justin (21.3), who says that the Locrians, being pressed in war by "Leophron, tyrant of Rhegium," vowed that, if they were to be victorious, they would prostitute their maidens on the festal day of Venus; but the vow, he says, was suspended. (*Cum Reginorum tyranni Leophronis bello Locrenses premerentur, voverent, si victores forent, ut die festo Veneris virgines suas prostituerent. Quo voto intermisso . . .*)

It is economical to believe that this occasion is the same as that on which Hieron, by the intervention of Chromius' embassy, deterred Anaxilas from his attack and that Locri was saved only once by a Syracusan intervention.[7] This assumption may also seem consistent with the evidence already considered, if we note that in the postulated source of the scholia "Cleophron" was based at Rhegium on the Italian side of the strait. In any military operations, or preparations for operations, against Locri, his forces are more likely to have been engaged than those under the command of his father over on the Sicilian shore. Hence Justin might speak, especially when relating a story concerning Locri, of a war waged by Leophron. In the same way, the Greeks of Ionia and the mainland might speak of wars waged by Harpagus or Mardonius, without mention of the Great King who sent them. Finally, it is worth noting that in the second scholion (*Pyth.* 2.38) Hieron is said to make his *démarche* to both tyrants, so that Leophron is in the military picture there as well as in Justin.

According to Diodorus (11.48.2) Anaxilas died in 476 and was succeeded by the regency of Micythus, who ruled during the minority of the "children of Anaxilas."[8] According to the same source the children were invited by Hieron, upon their coming of age in 467, to take power in Rhegium, when Micythus gracefully withdrew to a respected retirement at Tegea in Arcadia.[9]

[7]Vallet 367 and A. Schenk, Graf von Stauffenberg, *Trinakria: Sizilien und Grossgriechenland in archaischer und frühklassischer Zeit* (Munich and Vienna 1963) 215.

[8]Cf. Paus. 5.26.4 and Justin 4.2.

[9]Hdt. 7.170.3 talks of a great military disaster suffered by Micythus and seems to imply that he was forced out (ἐκπεσών) of Rhegium. His account seems likely to be nearer the truth than Diodorus' story.

If Leophron shared power during his father's lifetime, was his heir apparent and military commander in operations against Locri, and entertained in his father's honour after the latter's victory at Olympia, it is impossible to believe that he was one of the "children of Anaxilas" whom Hieron invited to assume power in 467, nine years after their father's death.[10] Micythus, Diodorus states, governed during their minority and was invited to relinquish his guardianship when they came of age. His position would have been superfluous, if Leophron had been alive as his father's heir and Hieron's brother-in-law. It would have been dangerous as well, if contested by that eminent and experienced leader.

If, as Diodorus says, Micythus governed in Locri from the death of Anaxilas in 476 until 467, we must believe either that Dionysius is mistaken (Leophron did not survive his father or possibly has been grossly confused with one of the "children of Anaxilas" who did), or that the heir survived, or remained in power, for only a very short time, amounting to a few months.[11] It is easy to imagine that Hieron had a part in the arrangements for the transfer of power at the death of Anaxilas. He had already intervened at Rhegium on behalf of the Locrians and entered into a political marriage with a daughter of Anaxilas (Schol. *Pyth.* 1.112: 2.20 Drachmann); at the end of his life he was to intervene again on behalf of the "children of Anaxilas." The institution of the regency of Micythus is likely to have been of his devising, as its ending was brought about by his command. If Leophron was still alive when Anaxilas died, he may have seemed to Hieron, as an old adversary, a less accommodating figure than Micythus gave promise of being and in time, by Diodorus' account, proved to be; if Leophron was dead, it was prudent to ensure a government friendly to himself. This hypothesis rests on the assumption, which is in itself probable, that Hieron, by his successful intervention at Rhegium on behalf of Locri, made himself the dominant power in north-eastern Sicily, or re-asserted the power that the Syracusan tyranny had exercised in that quarter since the battle of the Himeras.[12]

[10]K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte* 2 (Strassburg 1914–16²) 1.131 and 2.176, who was followed by W. A. Oldfather in *RE* 13.2 (1927) 1330–31, rejects the evidence that makes Leophron a partner or lieutenant of Anaxilas, accepts him as one of the "children of Anaxilas," and dates his campaign against Locri in 461/0.

[11]Schenk von Stauffenberg, *Trinakria* 216 and Vallet 370.

[12]The hypothesis is supported by two more pieces of evidence. First Diodorus (11.66.1), in his account of the events of 467, has Hieron remind the "children of Anaxilas" of the gifts that Gelon had made to their father. This seems to indicate a time before Gelon's death in 478 when Syracusan influence was felt in Rhegium. Secondly, Pausanias (6.13.1) knows of a Crotoniate who made himself unpopular at home by having himself proclaimed a Syracusan on the occasion of a victory. The story argues for the reception, as well as the rejection, by differing factions, of Hieron's influence at Croton.

The "children of Anaxilas," it has been persuasively argued,[13] are likely to be the issue of his marriage to Cydippe, daughter of Terillus, tyrant of Himera (Hdt. 7.165.2). The marriage, which presumably had a political aim, is best understood if it took place before Terillus was driven from power by Theron of Acragas (Hdt. 7.165.1). This event, in turn, was said to have occurred three years before the Carthaginians, acting in support of Terillus, fought and lost the battle of the Himeras (Diod. Sic. 11.1). We have then a date earlier than 483 as probable for the marriage. But if Hieron in 467 invited the "children of Anaxilas" to take power in Rhegium because they had then just reached their majority, we obtain a more precise date, *c.* 485.[14] In 476, when Anaxilas died, the children would have been young minors, incapable of ruling themselves and vulnerable to the influence of a guardian. The implications of Hieron's dynastic marriages and imperial policies required that their interests be safeguarded, and Leophron was presumably either unavailable or unreliable. The virtuous and unambitious Micythus was conscripted to fill the breach.

On this reading of the evidence, Justin's story of the Locrians, hard-pressed in war by "Leophron, tyrant of Rhegium," refers to events that occurred before the death of Anaxilas in 476.[15] This conclusion is of some importance, as the events of Justin's story are, it seems clear, the reference of Pindar in the Second Pythian (18–20) and, though the connection has been noticed by some historians,[16] it appears to have escaped the notice of Pindarists. If the maidens of Locri raised their voices in praise of Hieron, in celebration of the deliverance that his power had given to them, they had good reason, private as well as public, for their gratitude.[17] The coincidence of these two references is sufficiently powerful to remove doubts about the

[13]As by Vallet 370 and H. Berve, *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen* 1 (Munich 1967) 156–57.

[14]The age of majority at Athens in classical times was 17 or 18: see A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens: The Family and Property* (Oxford 1968) 74, note 3. Cf. Vallet 369–70.

[15]Cf. D. S. Robertson in *PCPS* 127–29 (1925) 35, who argues for a campaign by Leophron as late as 471 or 470. Cf. also Beloch (above, note 10) 2.2.176. These views assume that Leophron survived his father by several years (contrary to the implications of Diodorus) and that he was free to conduct independent military adventures (in spite of the dominance of Hieron).

[16]See, e.g., Schenk von Stauffenberg, *Trinakria* 215, Vallet 367, and C. Sourvinou-Inwood, "The Votum of 477/6 B.C. and the Foundation Legend of Locri Epizephyrii," *CQ* 24 (1974) 186–98, especially 186–87.

[17]Sourvinou-Inwood 186–87, though finding a reference to Hieron's intervention against Anaxilas, rejects any allusion to the vow of prostitution in *Pyth.* 2.18–20 and denies the existence of sacred prostitution at Locri so early as the fifth century. Her grounds are not strong. First, "according to the terms of the *votum, since the city was saved,* the virgins ought to have been prostituted" (my italics), and the virgins were therefore saved, not by Hieron's action, but by the decision of the Locrians not to fulfil the vow. But "the terms of the *votum,*"

existence of temple-prostitution at Locri.[18] This certainly existed at Corinth, as Pindar was well aware (fr. 122 Snell-Maehler) and may have been more common in the Greek world than we know. In any case, we must assume that the means existed whereby the citizens of Locri might have kept their vow, if external circumstances had not been thought to relieve them of that necessity.

---

if these are to be decisive, stipulated the victory of the Locrians (*si victores forent*), and Locrian casuistry had ample scope for arguing that the power of Anaxilas had not been defeated, but deterred without recourse to arms. Hieron's *démarche*, it might be held, had prevented the occurrence of the condition required for the fulfilment of the vow. Secondly, the Pindaric lines "refer to the relief of the Locrians at having been saved from the Rhegian danger and their gratitude to Hieron for this salvation exemplified in the persons of the virgins of the city in a kind of *pars pro toto*." The first half of this argument is sound enough, but the second half fails to take account of the relevance of the theme of the gratitude of the Locrian maiden and her position "in front of the house." Why, on this interpretation, should it be *her* gratitude that is expressed and why should a maiden πρὸ δόμων represent the citizenry at large? Thirdly, she is doubtful that Pindar might have known of the vow made at Locri, though it is surprising that, if the tradition was strong enough to descend through the centuries to Justin, it did not reach the court of Hieron at Syracuse, across the narrow sea, in the contemporary world.

[18]Cf. the doubts of H. Herter in *JbAC* 3 (1960) 73, S. Pembroke in *Annales (ESC)* 25 (1970) 1269–70, G. Zuntz, *Persephone* (Oxford 1971) 169 and note 5, and Sourvinou-Inwood 186–87 (with bibliography) with the acceptance of temple-prostitution at Locri by W. A. Oldfather in *RE* 13.2 (1927) 1350, G. Giannelli, *Culti e miti della Magna Graecia* (Florence 1963²) 197–204, and A. de Franciscis in *Klearchos* 35–36 (1967) 172–76 and in *Stato e società in Locri Epizefiri* (Naples 1972) nos. 23, 30, 31 and pp. 151–55. Though rare in Greece, sacred prostitution was known (e.g.) at Eryx in Sicily and at Comana in Pontus as well as at Corinth: see K. Schroeder in *RE* 8 (1913) 1333–34 and Hepding, *ibid.* 1459–68. In addition to Justin and Pindar, the evidence for Locri includes a fragment of Clearchus (*ap.* Athen. 12.515e: fr. 43 Wehrli: οὐ μόνον δὲ Λυδῶν γυναῖκες ἄφετοι οὖσαι τοῖς ἐντυχοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ Λοκρῶν Ἐπιζεφυρίων) and the occurrence of the words *hιαρᾶν μίστωμα* in an inscription from the temple of Zeus at Locri. Justin writes as if the practice were feasible at Locri, though without stating that it was a regular custom. Clearchus, who does write as of a common occurrence, may, it has been thought, be generalising from a single alleged instance, or he may be reporting the practice of the fourth century, but his testimony is compatible with that of Pindar and Justin and should not be simply dismissed. The meaning of the epigraphical evidence is disputed, being rendered as "mercede delle sacerdotesse" by its Italian editor, whereas others find a reference to other income. Cf. also Clearchus fr. 44 *ap.* Athen. 12.540e ff. on Polycrates of Samos. A sensible interpretation that is compatible with all our evidence is attributed in *CQ* 24 (1974) 196, note 1, to B. Ashmole. It suggests that, although sacred prostitution may have existed at Locri before the crisis, it had been restricted to *hierodouloi*; what was devised to meet the emergency was the proposal that the virgin daughters of free citizens should be devoted to the divinity. In any case, whatever the dates and extent of the practice at Locri, the idea must have been conceivable and its putting into practice possible.

It is a remarkable coincidence that there may be two allusions to this rare Greek practice in *Pyth.* 2.15–20, for Cinyras is said, by Christian sources, to have established the custom at

In this connection it is worth pointing out that Locrian women appear to have enjoyed a position in society that was unusually prominent.[19] It is reported by Polybius (12.5.6–7), on the basis of his own observations, that the Epizephyrian Locrians derived all their nobility from women, those of the "hundred houses." Whether this practice was brought by the colonists to Magna Graecia or was a local development is debated;[20] but it is a curiosity of Greek religion and of Greek society that the old Locris, in Greece proper, sent each year, or at longer intervals, to Athena of Ilium a tribute, normally of two maidens, in expiation of the crime of Ajax, the son of Oileus.[21] The tribute lasted, it was said (Apollod. *Epit.* 6.22), for a thousand years. Gildersleeve, who is the most sympathetic of Pindar's commentators, thought that his poet showed "a special interest in Locrians" and that "the prominence of women among the Locrians generally is a significant fact."[22] Pindar's mention, in the Second Pythian, of the grateful cry of the Locrian maidens may then be thought to exhibit a truth about Locrian society as well as another concerning the poet himself.

The upshot of this discussion for our understanding of Pindar is the identification of the reference of *Pyth.* 2.18–20 with the story related by Justin and the dating of the events not later than the death of Anaxilas in 476.[23] On the other side, these cannot be earlier than Hieron's accession to

---

Paphos and prescribed it for his daughters: Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* 2.13, Arnob. *Adv. Nat.* 5.19, Firm. Mat. *De err. prof. relig.* 10; Frazer, *Adonis Attis Osiris* 25. For the existence of the practice on Cyprus, see Hdt. 1.199.5, Clearchus fr. 43 Wehrli, and Justin 18.5. It is possible to conceive that the praises of Cinyras were the subject of the φᾶμαι of the *hierodouloi* of the temple of Aphrodite at Paphos; if this was the case, there is a symmetrical contrast with the praise offered by the Locrian maiden. If there is a deeper explanation of the coincidence in this passage, I relinquish to the Freudians the privilege of revealing it. I shall say only that, if Pindar knew the story told by the Christians, he celebrates the praise of a benefactor who freely instituted the pious dedication, which was in keeping with his favoured status (cf. note 3 above), as well as that of one who averted a forced dedication. If so, he praises the differing νόμοι of Paphos and Locri. Cf. fr. 215 Snell-Maehler. The Scholiast (2.35 Drachmann) seeks to relate Hieron to Cinyras by attributing to the former a Cyprian ancestry or the introduction into Sicily of Cyprian cult.

[19]W.A. Oldfather in *RE* 13.2 (1927) 1345–46.

[20]L. Lerat, *Les Locriens de l'ouest* (Paris 1952) 138–39. Cf., however, S. Pembroke in *Annales (ESC)* 25 (1970) 1253–54.

[21]G. L. Huxley, "Troy VIII and the Locrian Maidens" in *Athenian Society and Institutions* (Oxford 1966) 147–64. For further bibliography, see Sourvinou-Inwood 187, note 6.

[22]B. L. Gildersleeve, *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes* (New York 1885) 201–2, 204, 206, 207.

[23]The lack of any mention in the First Olympian of 476 of the Locrian intervention might be taken to indicate that this occurred after the performance of the poem, later in the same year. If so, the disappearance of Leophron is likely to have been a result, late in the year, of the

power in Syracuse in 478. The period 478–476 is therefore a *terminus post quem* for the Second Pythian.[24]

We notice next that it is "in front of the house(s)" (πρὸ δόμων) that the maidens invoke in gratitude the name of Hieron. The sense conveyed by the phrase is not altogether clear, no more than that of a similar expression (πρὸ δωμάτων) that is found in a passage in the Fifth Pythian (96), where the tombs of the kings of Cyrene are said to be found, apart from the tomb of the founder, "in front of the house(s)." It is obscure whether we are to see the tombs close together in front of the royal palace though at a distance from that of Battus, or at separate sites, each king lying before his own house. General probabilities perhaps favour the former alternative, which requires only a single royal house, but the excavations of Cyrene have revealed that the roads were lined with tombs.[25]

Songs in front of the house are described in a much-debated passage of the Third Pythian (78–79):

> Ματρί, τὰν κοῦραι παρ' ἐμὸν πρόθυρον σὺν
> Πανὶ μέλπονται θαμά
> σεμνὰν θεὸν ἐννύχιαι . . .

No matter where the scene is conceived to be,[26] it seems that we must form a picture of a chorus of girls singing in praise of the Mother and Pan in front of a doorway, probably before a sacred shrine. If so, we have a communal ceremony, performed in public, near to the house. At Epizephyrian Locri, however, there was no royal house and our passage has nothing to say or to imply about public shrines or public worship there, wherever situated.

At the beginning of the Eighth Isthmian one of the young men is bidden to go to the splendid porch of Telesarchus and rouse the *kômos* in quittance of the victor's labours in the contest and in requital of his victories at the Isthmus and at Nemea. Here, as in Bacch. 6.14 Snell, we have the convention of the band of revellers who visit the house of the victor in order to celebrate his victory. Again the parallel fails, for Hieron had no house at Locri and his victory was not celebrated by a *kômos* made up of the virgins

---

situation created by the death of Anaxilas within a few months of his humiliation by Syracusan power.

[24]H. Lloyd-Jones in *JHS* 93 (1973) 120 considers the possibility of a reference to Hieron's victory at Cumae in 474, which would then become a new and lower *terminus post quem*. But it seems less appropriate that the Locrian maidens should be shown to praise the defeat of Etruscans than that they should celebrate their own release from the sacred prostitution mentioned by Justin.

[25]F. Chamoux, *Cyrène sous la monarchie des Battiades* (Paris 1953) 285 ff.

[26]For the latest view of this question, see W. J. Slater, "Pindar's House," *GRBS* 12 (1971) 141–52.

of the place.[27] Similarly in a passage from the First Nemean (19–22), where the poet speaks of standing at the street-door of the hospitable man and singing his glories, the details are different, though the place is the same.

The parallels show that a position "in front of the house" was suitable for a variety of manifestations, whether funerary, worshipful, or celebratory, and we find this appropriate when we reflect that the street-door is the focus of the relations between the household within and the public without. They show also that singing might be in place there on such occasions. But the details of the occasions do not match those described at Locri. For there we are to imagine not a chorus of girls, a band of revellers, or a laudatory poet, but a Locrian maiden; the ownership of the house is left unspecified, as if this were as self-evident as that of the houses of the kings of Cyrene; and there is no unambiguous mention of song.

Still, though the parallels fail to give complete illumination, speculation is possible and preferable to despair. Granted that the situation "in front of the house" is appropriate, what are we to suppose took place there? To begin, *πρὸ δόμων*, when combined with *Ζεφυρία . . . Λοκρὶς παρθένος ἀπύει*, is hostile to the notion of a choral song. We are encouraged to imagine either a single girl standing in front of her house, or many such girls, each at her own address. For what could "the house" be, and why is it left unspecified, if we are to conceive a chorus singing in front of it? The house must surely be one from which she has emerged because it is her own (*προελθοῦσα . . . τῶν οἴκων* says the Scholiast).[28] And why is the verb *ἀπύω* used, which has no specific musical connotation, unless she raises her voice in praise, but not in song?[29] In the matching passage on Cinyras, just before, the language describing the praise of the Cyprians (*κελαδέοντι*[30] *. . . φᾶμαι*[31] *Κυπρίων*) is similarly unspecific, and both passages

[27]I take it that no one any longer holds the view, which is attributed to Hartung, that Locri sent a chorus of maidens to Syracuse to celebrate Hieron there.

[28]Lloyd-Jones in *JHS* 93 (1973) 119 has the maiden singing "before her house," but in note 61 he envisages "some kind of religious procession, perhaps resembling the performance of one of Pindar's own poems."

[29]The sense, "sing of," is recognized by W. J. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin 1969) 66, who cites also *Ol.* 5.19. But there the addition of *Λυδίοις . . . ἐν αὐλοῖς* specifies music. Cf. the similar specification at Hom. *Od.* 17.271, achieved by making *φόρμιγξ* subject of the verb. Gildersleeve, *Pindar* 258, apparently rejecting the notion of an official or musical occasion, writes: "here we have simply an expression of popular joy."

[30]Slater, *Lexicon* 274–75, renders *κέλαδος* correctly as "clear sound," but *κελαδεννός* as both "ringing" and "melodious," while most of the instances of *κελαδέω* are translated as "hymn" or "sing." What the passages appear to show is that, while *κελαδέω* is commonly used by Pindar of a pleasing sound in a context of song (as might be expected of an epinician poet), its meaning is not essentially limited in that way. This is shown at once for Pindar by *Isth.* 4.8,

contrast with the singing (μέλπονται) of the chorus of girls in the Third Pythian.[32]

But if there is nothing in lines 15–20 that requires a reference to song, it is true that, in the summarising passage by which these lines are introduced, Pindar had said that different men (ἄλλος ἀνήρ) offer to different kings resounding songs of praise (εὐαχέα . . . ὕμνον) in requital of their excellence. ὕμνος, in the poetic tradition, means "song of praise" or "song of lamentation" and has regularly the former sense in Pindar. It might then be thought that the word must have the same meaning here and that the praises of the Cyprians and the Locrian maiden must be instances of this class and so be understood as songs. That Pindar's logic is not so conceptually sharp is made at once clear to any one who compares his use of ἀνήρ here with that of ὕμνος. In what precedes the generalisation Pindar speaks as the poet who brings his song (μέλος) to celebrate the victory by which Hieron has brought glory to Syracuse. Following on this context, the next pair of lines is naturally taken to refer to other men and other songs. But in what follows we find mention of praise in place of song and of maidens in place of men. ἀνήρ may be supposed to have taken, against the preceding context, its broader meaning of "human being" and ὕμνος to have widened to signify praise in general. The summary, in a word, does not offer a definition for the following instances. The relation is rather one of analogy: "As it is true that princes receive from different men differing

---

κελαδεννᾶς ὀρφανοὶ ὕβριος, for the clamorous cry of *hybris* can be neither pleasing nor musical. In other poets the word and its congeners are used (e.g.) of the din of a quarrel, the sounds of winds and streams, of shouts of applause, etc.: see LSJ s.vv. Words from this root appear to signify (in the case of human utterances) the sound of the raised voice. On the Greek preference for the high, clear, ringing note, see my remarks in *TAPA* 86 (1955) 37.

[31]φάμα is "utterance," "pronouncement," "report," or the like, with an implication of articulated speech. It is used of public disapproval at (e.g.) Hes. *Op.* 763–64, φήμη δ' οὔ τις πάμπαν ἀπόλλυται, ἥν τινα πολλοὶ / λαοὶ φημίξουσι, and at Aesch. *Agam.* 456, βαρεῖα δ' ἀστῶν φάτις σὺν κότῳ, and 938, φήμη γε μέντοι δημόθρους μέγα σθένει. The word may be used in a musical context, as in Aesch. *Suppl.* 697, φάμα φιλοφόρμιγξ, but where that is lacking, as in the three preceding passages and in Pindar's φᾶμαι Κυπρίων, we expect to have to do with an expression of opinion. The parallels offered by λαοί, ἀστῶν, and δημόθρους may suggest that Pindar's phrase signifies the expression of an opinion by a society or class. So Pindar (*Ol.* 7.10) can speak quite generally of publicly-expressed opinion, ὄλβιος ὃν φᾶμαι κατέχουτ' ἀγαθαί. A prose counterpart is offered by Antiphon's (fr. B 105) ἐπώνυμος ἐν φήμαις βροτῶν.

[32]It is noticeable that elsewhere, as at *Pyth.* 3.18–19, 10.38–49, *Paeans* 6.15–18, and fr. 333a.12 ff. Snell-Maehler, when Pindar mentions choruses of maidens, he says explicitly that they form a chorus, dance, and sing. At Bacch. 13.84–90 Snell, τις ὑψαυχὴς κόρα, in her praise of Aegina, is attended σὺν ἀγχιδόμοις . . . ἀγακλείταις ἑταίραις.

hymns of praise, so the name of Cinyras is made to resound (in praise), when bruited abroad by the Cyprians, and the Locrian maiden in the west (similarly) calls upon the name of Hieron in thanks for her deliverance."

Praise in fact, rather than song, is the poet's theme in the passage, in regard to Cinyras, Hieron, and Ixion, for it is precisely praise, and not song, that is the reward of excellence. Song is important because Pindar is a poet producing a poem of praise for an occasion of celebration, and it comes in when the occasion of the poem is uppermost. But his subject is the obligation of praise and it is significant that song has no part to play in the myth of Ixion, which illustrates this type. In Pindar's usage ὕμνος is regularly "song of praise" and his practice in this passage reveals the potentiality of a semantic development towards the sense, "praise."[33] This potential is realised in Attic tragedy and in later Greek, both prose and verse, which develops also a pejorative meaning, "harp on," "repeat (tiresomely)." In the passage from the Pythian the word's ambiguity makes it a convenient transition from the poet's own praise of Hieron in this poem to the theme of the obligation of praise itself.

A parallel is offered by a passage from the First Isthmian (47–51):

μισθὸς γὰρ ἄλλοις ἄλλος ἐπ' ἔργμασιν ἀνθρώποις
γλυκύς,
μηλοβότᾳ τ' ἀρότᾳ τ' ὀρ-
νιχολόχῳ τε καὶ ὃν πόντος τράφει.
γαστρὶ δὲ πᾶς τις ἀμύνων λιμὸν αἰανῆ τέταται·
ὃς δ' ἀμφ' ἀέθλοις ἢ πολεμίζων ἄρηται κῦδος ἀβρόν,
εὐαγορηθεὶς κέρδος ὕψιστον δέκεται, πολια-
τᾶν καὶ ξένων γλώσσας ἄωτον.

It is natural to take μισθός in its basic sense of "hire," "wage," "fee," or the like, and this seems satisfactory for the examples that follow immediately: the shepherd, the ploughman, the fowler, and the fisherman. This understanding has to be somewhat altered in 49, as the sense shifts from something like "wages" to something like "livelihood," and it undergoes a major change in the next lines, where we hear of glory, praise, and profit.[34] This is in fact the climax of the passage, and the point must have been

[33]The capacity of "poetic praise" to develop into "public opinion" is well exhibited by *Pyth.* 3.112–14, in which Nestor and Sarpedon, who are the ἀνθρώπων φάτις, are said to be known from poetry. Similarly, at *Pyth.* 1.92 ff. it is the raised voice of fame among later men (ὀπιθόμβροτον αὔχημα δόξας) that reveals, after a man's death, his course of life to tellers of tales and singers of songs (καὶ λογίοις καὶ ἀοιδοῖς), whereas infamy (ἐχθρὰ . . . φάτις) takes possession of the name of the tyrant Phalaris and no songs are heard to greet him.

[34]On the gradations of the sense of "profit" in Pindar, see my remarks in *TAPA* 99 (1968) 539.

present potentially since the mention of μισθός in 47. The parallel with *Pyth.* 2.13–20 is close and becomes more appropriate when we notice that the highest profit of the victor is, not exclusively song, but πολιατᾶν καὶ ξένων γλώσσας ἄωτον.

It is most suggestive to notice at this point that, in the description of the shield of Achilles in the *Iliad* (18.495–97), the women of the city are said to stand each in front of her house (ἐπὶ προθύροισιν ἑκάστη), while the men (λαοί) are gathered in the place of assembly. The difference drawn between the sexes is significant of the respective rôles of men and women in Greek society, and for us it conveys the message that, when a poet, or another artist, wished to represent women as publicly exhibiting their attitudes, he imagined them individually rather than collectively, each standing at her house-door. This is the picture, it seems, that Pindar wished to paint for us, and it may be thought to be a picture that might often be seen in a Greek street. If so, the picture seems to represent something that comes as close as was generally possible to a public demonstration by women. In Greek usage, for a woman to appear "in front of the house" was equivalent to appearing "publicly."[35]

[35]The door is the boundary of the οἶκος, so that θυραῖος comes to mean "public" as opposed to "private." For a good example, see Eur. *Med.* 216–17, where τοὺς ἐν θυραίοις are contrasted with τοὺς . . . ὀμμάτων ἄπο ("those who are out of sight"); but cf. K. J. Reckford in *TAPA* 99 (1968) 347–48 and 353 for other interpretations. At Soph. *Ant.* 18–19 Antigone says that she has brought Ismene out beyond the street-door in order to gain privacy from the attentions of the household. Here the door serves the same purpose, but, because women are involved, they must seek privacy outside, by emerging from their world. The two worlds, male and female, divided by the door, are clearly described by Xen. *Oec.* 7.30. Cf. also passages like Aesch. *Suppl.* 200–201 and 232, Soph. *Ant.* 577–79 and *El.* 516–18, and Eur. *Andr.* 950–53 and fr. 521 Nauck[2]. Especially appropriate to our Pindaric passage is Ps.-Phocylides 215–16, παρθενικὴν δὲ φύλασσε πολυκλείστοις θαλάμοισιν, / μὴ δέ μιν ἄχρι γάμων πρὸ δόμων ὀφθῆμεν ἐάσῃς. Another example is offered by a passage from Lycurgus's speech, *Against Leocrates* (40), concerning the panic that occurred in Athens after the defeat at Chaeronea in 338. (I owe this reference to Anne Giacomelli.) Free women, says the orator, were to be seen crouching fearfully in doorways, seeking information concerning the fate of husbands, fathers, or brothers, and in so doing provided a spectacle unworthy of themselves and of their city (ἀναξίως αὑτῶν καὶ τῆς πόλεως ὁρωμένας). The orator is full of a righteous indignation at the impropriety of free women addressing questions, from their doorways, to passers-by in the street. By advancing to the doorways the women had gone as far as propriety allowed, and by asking questions of those who passed in the street they had overstepped the line, doubtless acting in a way that, in other circumstances, only prostitutes permitted themselves. Somewhat similar stories, concerning the disorder caused by the presence of women in the streets of Rome after the news of defeats at Trasumene and Cannae were received in the city, are told by Livy (22.7, 11–13 and 45.6). In a fragment of Menander (fr. 592 Koerte) a married woman is reproached for overstepping her bounds (τοὺς τῆς γαμετῆς ὅρους ὑπερβαίνεις) by being so shameless as to carry her abuse into the street (πέρας γὰρ αὔλειος θύρα / ἐλευθέρᾳ γυναικὶ

It may even be that elsewhere Pindar himself gives us, by indirection, some sense of this social fact, at least in one of its aspects. Near the end of the Eighth Pythian (81–87), before a celebrated passage on the nature of man, there is a brief and bitter description of the return home of defeated athletes. No pleasant laughter, we are told, makes their home-coming glad and we guess that they are greeted by laughter of a very different kind. The defeated pick their way home through the back-alleys, cowering out of the way of their enemies, stung by the pain of defeat. We infer that the street, which ran "in front of the houses," was a gauntlet too cruel to run.[36]

There are few themes more common in Greek poetry than the praise and blame of the neighbours and the theme represents a characteristic of Greek society, for which all values, it seems, must find expression in public judgments. Nausicaa in the *Odyssey* (6.258 ff.) shows herself well aware of the risk of adverse comment that she will run if Odysseus accompanies her from the country into the streets of the town. Hesiod warns (*Op.* 699–705) against the imprudent choice of a wife, who may provoke the laughter of the neighbours, and the same consideration is advanced by Semonides (fr. 7.74, 79, 110–13 *IEG*). A culmination of the theme may perhaps be seen in Euripides' Medea (*Med.* 1049–51), who finds a sufficient ground for the murder of her children in her fear of the derision of her enemies, which she must otherwise suffer. She must fear a public and authoritative judgment that is heard up and down the streets of the town, as well as in the *agora*.[37] But in the former, more often than in the latter, it found expression in the voices of women as well as of men.

The image of the girl who stands in her doorway calling upon the name of Hieron may remind us of a passage in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* (408–10), in which there is mention of the frequent lamentation of the δόμων προφῆται, who cry, ἰὼ ἰὼ δῶμα δῶμα. These are spokesmen or interpreters who give voice to the mood and condition of the house. A more

---

νενόμισται οἰκίας). Finally, in the tale of Demodocus concerning Ares and Aphrodite the gods answer the ribald invitation of Hephaestus to witness the spectacle of the captive lovers, but each of the goddesses remains at home out of *aidôs* (*Od.* 8.325).

[36]Cf. also *Ol.* 8.67–69, especially νόστον ἔχθιστον καὶ ἀτιμοτέραν γλῶσσαν καὶ ἐπίκρυφον οἶμον. An example of a happy exchange between a watcher at the door and a passer-by in front of the house is offered by Herodotus' story (6.35.2) of Miltiades, sitting on the porch of his house and noticing strangers passing by; he hailed them and offered hospitality.

[37]Cf. also passages like Theogn. 611, οὐ χαλεπὸν ψέξαι τὸν πλήσιον, Aesch. *Agam.* 456 and 938, and Admetus' dread of public reprobation at Eur. *Alc.* 954 ff. Pindar often touches on the topic, as in regard to the μῶμος that besets victors (*Ol.* 6.74) or poets (*Pyth.* 1.82) and to his wish to go through life ἀστοῖς ἀδών (*Nem.* 8.38; cf. *Pyth.* 2.96).

sinister and obscure kind of spokesman appears to be signified by Pindar's διαβολιᾶν ὑποφάτιες, from the enigmatic epilogue of the Second Pythian (76), who speak for slander and deceit in society. The Locrian maiden may be thought to play this rôle of spokesman in our Pindaric lines,[38] but in a glad and grateful spirit rather than for the sake of lamentation or denigration. Greek society, like the epinician poetry of Pindar, was a battle-ground in which envy was pitted against the grace of praise. These passages from the poets give us some means of imagining the ways in which the battle was conducted.

As for the "houses," it would be rash to exclude the possibility of an allusion to the "hundred houses," from whose women the Locrian nobility was descended. That women should be conceived as the spokesmen of their houses cannot seem strange in a city that maintained such a practice. When we recall that it seems to have been the "hundred houses" of old Locri that bore the burden of supplying for so long the tribute of the maidens to Athena of Ilium, the thought occurs readily that these houses may also have incurred, or have undertaken, in Magna Graecia the responsibility of providing the virgins who were to be dedicated "on the festal day of Venus" in order to avert the onslaught of Anaxilas.[39] If this was the case, the maidens who celebrated Hieron at their house-doors gave thanks, not only for the deliverance of their city from the hopeless woes of war, but also for the integrity of their houses. In any case, the maidens must have felt gratitude personally, on their own behalf, resembling in this way the women who conducted the lamentation for Patroclus (*Il.* 19.301–02), for though all gave expression to their public concerns, it might be said, each took thought for herself.

[38]So also the Scholiast perhaps, in speaking of the maiden as προελθοῦσα . . . τῶν οἴκων, for if she is said to come out of her own house, she may be assumed to speak for it.

[39]It is worth noticing that Justin (21.3.4), in his account of the ostensible fulfilment of the Locrians' vow by the tyrant, Dionysius II, in the next century, states that a group of just 100 women was chosen to perform this service.