

# The Prayers of the Corinthian Women (Simonides, *Ep.* 14 Page, *FGE*)

*Christopher G. Brown*

αἶδ' ὑπὲρ Ἑλλάνων τε καὶ ἀγχεμάχων πολιατᾶν  
ἔστασαν εὐχόμεναι Κύπριδι ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΑΙ·  
οὐ γὰρ τοξοφόροιςιν ἐβούλετο δι' Ἀφροδίτα  
Μήδοις Ἑλλάνων ἀκρόπολιν δόμεναι.

This short poem seems to derive from a Corinthian inscription commemorating the invocation of Aphrodite's aid against the Persians in 480.<sup>1</sup> We are fortunate in having a number of sources for the poem, but our good fortune brings with it a number of problems concerning the constitution of the text and the historical context.<sup>2</sup> The various questions surrounding the epigram have recently been discussed in detail by D. L. Page and B. M. Palumbo Stracca.<sup>3</sup> In the present paper I propose to discuss only one issue, namely the word that concludes the second line, although consideration of some of the larger questions will prove relevant.

What the MSS. transmit as ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΑΙ has regularly been construed as δαιμονία, dative singular modifying Κύπριδι.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> With one obvious exception, the text is cited from D. L. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge 1981). As the authors who preserve the epigram (see next note) make clear, this text was composed to accompany some object, either a painting or statue (or statues), set up in the temple of Aphrodite at Corinth.

<sup>2</sup> Σ Pind. *Ol.* 13.32b (I 364f Drachmann)=Theopompus *FGrHist* 115F285b; Plut. *Mor.* 871A-B; Ath. 573c=Theopompus *FGrHist* 115F285a, Timaeus *FGrHist* 566F10; Chamaeleon fr.31 Wehrli<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Page (*supra* n.1) 207-11; B. M. Palumbo Stracca, "Lettura critica di epigrammi (I)," *Bollettino dei Classici* 3.6 (1985) 58-65. See also *PLG*<sup>4</sup> fr.137; M. Boas, *De epigrammatis Simonideis* (Groningen 1905) 47ff; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, "Commentariolum grammaticum IV," *NAkG* (1889) 3-7 (=Kleine Schriften [Berlin 1935-1972] IV 660-66).

<sup>4</sup> Adducing Pind. *Ol.* 9.110, H. Novak, *Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Begriffs DAIMON: eine Untersuchung epigraphischer Zeugnisse von 5. Jh. v. Chr. bis zum 5. Jh.n. Chr.* (diss. Bonn 1960) 33ff, argues that the dative should

Contrary to the opinion of most editors, Page seems right in holding that the use of such an epithet for a deity is unlikely.<sup>5</sup> In its basic sense, δαίμωνιος denotes some connection with divinity (so LSJ *s.v.*), and so it is difficult to see how even an extended usage is appropriate to a deity.<sup>6</sup> In this light, Page has followed Bernardakis in emending to δαίμονια, which he construes as the object of εὐχόμεναι.<sup>7</sup> The phrase is understood

---

be taken independently with an adverbial force (*i.e.*, as though it could be synonymous with κατὰ δαίμονα *vel sim.*); but this is most unlikely. It is very difficult to separate δαίμονια from Κόπριδι in any natural reading of the line.

<sup>5</sup> Page (*supra* n.1) 211: "... no deity is, or could be, described as δαίμωνιος." This is something of an overstatement: *e.g.* Helen calls Aphrodite δαίμονια at *Il.* 3.399, but there the usage is heavily sarcastic (*cf.* G. S. Kirk, *The Iliad: A Commentary* I [Cambridge 1985] *ad loc.*); see also *Il.* 1.561 and U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*<sup>2</sup> (Basel 1956) I 359. An anonymous referee for this journal has offered another possible explanation of the dative: the goddess might have been called δαίμονια to distinguish Aphrodite οὐρανία from πάνδημος (for the cult-titles, see Farnell *Cults* II 558ff). If the women were the ιερόδουλοι (see below), it is suggested that they would normally have served the lower aspect of the goddess (for Aphr. πάνδημος and prostitutes, *cf.* Nicand. *FGrHist* 271/272F9), but may well have turned their prayers to Aphrodite οὐρανία in a time of crisis. This is an interesting proposal, but ultimately unconvincing. Pindar refers to the goddess in relation to the temple prostitutes at Corinth as ματέρ' ἐρώτων/ οὐρανίαν (fr. 122.4 Maehler), and this indicates that the Corinthian ιερόδουλοι were part of the worship of Aphrodite οὐρανία (the epithet, like temple prostitution, points to the goddess' eastern origin: see W. Burkert, *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche* [Stuttgart 1977] 238 [= *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*, tr. J. Raffan (Cambridge, Mass. 1985) 152] and n.25 *infra*). More important, it is difficult to see how the use of δαίμωνιος could help define the relevant aspect of the goddess; δαίμων and related words are used broadly of divinity.

<sup>6</sup> For discussion of the adjective, see E. Brunius-Nilsson, *ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΑ: an Inquiry into a Mode of Apostrophe in Old Greek Literature* (Uppsala 1955) 139ff.

<sup>7</sup> It should also be noted that Lobeck and Bergk emended to δαίμοσια, which might recall Aphrodite Πάνδημος. One might also conjecture δαίμοσια, describing the ιερόδουλοι (see below), which would find an interesting parallel in Pind. fr.122.15 Maehler, ξυναίς γυναιξίν (δημόσιος may be used of prostitution as early as Sappho fr.209 Voigt, but is not found elsewhere in early literature; *cf.* however δήμος, Archil. fr.207 West<sup>2</sup>). But Page dismissed δαίμοσια as "a rough change," and it is very difficult to see how either of these conjectures could have been corrupted to the reading of the paradosis. Moreover, in view of the apparent tone of the passages in Sappho and Archilochus, it seems probable that a form of δημόσιος would carry a pejorative charge inappropriate to the context of the Simonidean epigram. In the past

as representing εὐχόμεναι δαιμόνιον εὐχήν. As Page concedes, this is an odd phrase. Its merit, according to Page, is that it reflects Plutarch's understanding of the epigram: εὔξαντο τὴν καλὴν καὶ δαιμόνιον εὐχήν. And yet does this in fact represent a close paraphrase? He is reproaching Herodotus for omitting this remarkable episode from his account of the Persian Wars: τὴν καλὴν καὶ δαιμόνιον underlines the extraordinary nature of the prayer with δαιμόνιος used in its common later meaning ('remarkable', 'marvellous'); it does not necessarily guarantee Bernardakis' emendation, which remains an unusual phrase.

An obvious way of interpreting ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΑΙ is as nominative plural, δαιμόνιαι, modifying the Corinthian women who are the subject of ἔστασαν (Κύπριδι remains the indirect object of εὐχόμεναι).<sup>8</sup> This text has in fact been printed by L. Pearson in his Loeb edition of Plutarch, but the translation attributes doubtful sense to the word.<sup>9</sup> Page, who makes no mention of Pearson's text, dismisses the nominative summarily: "Nor could the epithet possibly apply to Corinthian females, whether matrons or courtesans." It seems likely, however, that the nominative has some ancient authority. Page reports δαιμόνιαι as the Mss. reading of the three ancient sources.<sup>10</sup> Although

---

century bolder proposals were made: δαίμονι & K. F. Hermann, *Philologus* 10 (1855) 237; καδεμόνι A. Hecker, *Philologus* 4 (1889) 484; καμμονίαν H. Stadtmüller, *PhilWoch* 10 (1890) 302 (for the concept, cf. Erbse on Σ II. 22.257a); Bergk also records a rather wild rewriting of the line by M. Schmidt, τὴν στάθεν εὐχεσθαι Κύπρι λιλαιόμεναι. Although these proposals have rightly been ignored by commentators, they reflect the general disquiet concerning the dative singular commonly printed by editors.

<sup>8</sup> There are, of course, other examples of the ambiguity between the first declension nominative plural and dative singular. Perhaps the most striking instance in early poetry is Alc. fr.3.61 Calame=1.61 Davies, where both Ὀρθρία and ὄρθρια have been defended: see D. L. Page, *Alcman: the Partheneion* (Oxford 1951) 76ff; C. Calame, *Les chœurs de jeunes filles en Grèce archaïque* (Rome 1977) II 120f; M. Puelma, *MusHelv* 34 (1977) 20 n.40. In this case the dative is the form currently favoured by editors.

<sup>9</sup> He renders the first two lines as follows: "Here stand [reading ἔσταθεν] those ladies who to Cypris prayed for Greece and for our stalwart fighting men. The gods were with them...." This last phrase is clearly intended to represent δαιμόνιαι, but such a meaning is unparalleled for the adjective, especially in a text from the fifth century.

<sup>10</sup> In his earlier Oxford text, *Epigrammata Graeca* (1975), however, Page gives δαιμονία as the reading of the paradosis. It is difficult to know what to make of this discrepancy. It is possible that the later edition offers a tacit correction of the OCT, but it is equally possible that the nominative is a slip.

accentuation in manuscripts is hardly probative in every case, this is suggestive. Moreover, the variant εὔχεσθαι for εὐχομεναι, which is transmitted by Athenaeus, seems intended to explain δαιμόνιαι (*i.e.*, as though the construction could be analogous to δειναὶ εὐχεσθαι: see Page *ad loc.*). If this is correct, it appears that Athenaeus or his source understood the final word of the line as an epithet modifying the Corinthian women. In this light, Page is probably correct in *FGE* to record δαιμόνιαι as the reading of the paradosis. Was he right to dismiss it?

In answering this question much depends on the identity of the women. The Pindaric scholiast treats them as though they were the wives of the Corinthian warriors (οἱ Κορίνθιοι ... καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας αὐτῶν), and this seems to be the reference of Plutarch as well (αἱ Κορίνθιαι γυναῖκες). Chamaeleon, however, informs us that these women are ἑταῖραι, and this appears to be more plausible, especially if we follow Wilamowitz in seeing these ἑταῖραι as the ἱερόδουλοι who served Aphrodite's temple in Corinth.<sup>11</sup> Chamaeleon treated the epigram in his work *Περὶ Πινδάρου*, and it is almost certainly in the course of his discussion of Pindar fr.122 Maehler, quoted by

---

*FGE* was a posthumous publication and, as such, contains a large number of errors, which the author undoubtedly would have corrected: see H. Lloyd-Jones, *CR* 32 (1982) 139–44 (= *Academic Papers: Greek Comedy, etc.* [Oxford 1990] 223–30); D. M. Lewis, *JHS* 104 (1984) 179f; O. Masson, *RPhil* 58 (1984) 97f.

<sup>11</sup> Wilamowitz (*supra* n.3) 4ff=662ff. This raises the difficult issue of sacred prostitution, which has been studied with reference to earlier literature by B. C. MacLachlan, "Sacred Prostitution and Aphrodite," *Studies in Religion/Sciences religieuses* (1992, forthcoming), and "Sacred Prostitution in Mediterranean Antiquity," in E. Lacelle, ed., *Femmes, Religions et Prostitution* (= *Collection Femmes et Religion* III [Montreal, forthcoming]). Cf. also the discussion in H. Herter, "Die Soziologie der antiken Prostitution im Lichte des heidnischen und christlichen Schrifttums," *JAC* 3 (1960) 70–111 at 72f; L. Woodbury, "The Gratitude of the Locrian Maiden: Pindar, *Pyth.* 2.18ff," *TAPA* 108 (1978) 285–99 at 292 n.18 (= *Collected Writings* [Atlanta 1991] 271–85 at 277 n.18); C. Calame, "Entre rapports de parenté et relations civiques: Aphrodite l'hétaïre au banquet politique des hetaïroi," *Aux sources de la puissance: sociabilité et parenté* (Rouen 1989) 101–11 at 106f. On the fame of Corinthian prostitutes in general see R. Kassel and C. Austin, *Poetae Comici Graeci* III.2 (Berlin 1984) *ad Ar.* fr. 928; Herter 71 n.8. Wilamowitz's identification of the women is supported by C. Turano, "La prostituzione sacra a Locri Epizefiri," *ArchCl* 4 (1952) 248–52 at 248, and L. Pearson in his Loeb edition of Plut. *Malign. Her.* (*Moralia* XI) at 110f n.b.

Athenaeus (573F) shortly after our passage, that the Simonidean epigram was adduced (Wehrli in fact prints the whole passage as fr.31 in his edition of Chamaeleon). Of our sources Chamaeleon alone is interested in the identity of the women, since he is discussing Xenophon's extraordinary dedication of a large number of girls, which Pindar celebrates in fr.122; the other sources appear interested in the event, not the identity of the worshippers. It is, however, suggestive to note that Theopompus, one of our sources for the epigram, is quoted by a scholiast on *Ol.* 13 (*cf.* n.2), the epinician composed in honor of the victory that prompted Xenophon's dedication.

If the women are indeed the *ιερόδουλοι*, I suggest that *δαιμόνιαι* is the correct text and here refers to the women's status as servants of the goddess, that is to say that *δαιμόνιαι* means something like 'the goddess' women', referring to the important fact that they have been dedicated to Aphrodite.<sup>12</sup> *δαιμόνιος* is thus used in a way that is similar to the usage of *ιερός*.<sup>13</sup> Pindar's use of the word provides some helpful parallels. Most striking is the opening of the *Second Pythian*:

μεγαλοπόλιες ὦ Συράκοσαι, βαθυπολέμου  
τέμενος Ἄρεος, ἀνδρῶν ἵππων τε σιδαροχαρ-  
μᾶν δαιμόνιαι τροφοί....

The poet invokes Syracuse in hymnic style,<sup>14</sup> and, as often, the portrait of the city stands on the threshold of personification, especially with the striking use of *τροφοί*. The city is envisaged as one great *τέμενος* of the war-god, fostering the martial might of the Syracusans. *δαιμόνιαι* describes *τροφοί* because the *τέμενος* belongs to the god (*cf.* the passages in n.13). In the *Sixth Olympian* (8ff) Pindar says of the victor in his present success:

ἴστω γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ πεδί-  
λω δαιμόνιον πόδ' ἔχων  
Σωστράτου υἱός.

<sup>12</sup> *Cf.* Pind. fr.122.17-20: ὦ Κύπρου δέσποινα, τεὸν δεῦτ' ἐς ἄλλος φορβάδων κορᾶν ἀγέλαν ἐκατόγγυιον Ξενοφῶν τελέαις ἐπάγαγ' εὐχωλαῖς ἰανθείς.

<sup>13</sup> Pind. *Paeon* 18.1f: ἐν ... ἱερῷ τεμένει (*cf.* *Paeon* 6.120: τεμένει φίλῳ).

<sup>14</sup> S. L. Radt, *Pindars zweiter und sechster Paian* (Amsterdam 1958) 103, notes that Pindar is the earliest extant poet to treat cities in this way.

δαιμόνιον is regularly seen here as possessing a quasi-adverbial force (e.g. by Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar s.v.*, “by divine grace”), suggesting divine support of Hegesias’ victory; but it is noteworthy that the victor seems to be a priest (cf. line 5, βωμῶ τε μαντείῳ ταμίας Διὸς ἐν Πίσσῃ, with the scholia *ad loc.* [7c: I 156 Drachmann]); and, consequently, the adjective may refer to his status as a servant of Zeus.<sup>15</sup> Another useful passage is *Ol.* 8.25ff:

τεθμός δέ τις ἀθανάτων καὶ  
τάνδ’ ἀλιερκέα χώραν  
παντοδαποῖσιν ὑπέστασε ξένοις  
κίονα δαιμονίαν.

A τεθμός of the gods established Aegina as a pillar for strangers of all kinds, and so the island is described as κίων δαιμονία with the adjective underlining its ties with the gods.<sup>16</sup> Similarly, that the acropolis of Athens is sacred ground allows Pindar to call it δαιμόνιον πτολίεθρον (fr. 76.2; cf. *Od.* 11.323, ἐς γουνὸν Ἀθηναίων ἱεράων). In these passages δαιμόνιος, like the more common use of words such as ἱερός, seems to attest to a connection with divinity; and this appears to be the essential force of the adjective in the fifth century.<sup>17</sup>

If we are correct in understanding the Corinthian women as ἱερόδουλοι, it may well be appropriate to ask why they are described as δαιμόνιαι in relation to the goddess and not ἱεραί or some other such term. It is possible that the word was chosen because it stands farther removed from Greek notions of purity and the sacred than ἱερός. Human sexuality was believed to be polluting; it is likely that sex with a prostitute was regarded as more so, perhaps especially when associated with the τέμενος of a deity.<sup>18</sup> The poet may have wished to avoid striking a potentially discordant note by appearing to align

<sup>15</sup> In this passage πούς is probably synecdoche for the victor, however the imagery of 8f is understood. For further examples see R. Kühner and B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* (Hannover/Leipzig 1898) I 280.

<sup>16</sup> The scholiasts gloss δαιμονίαν with θεῖον: cf. Σ Pind. *Ol.* 8.33c–d (I 244 Drachmann).

<sup>17</sup> See Brunius-Nilsson (*supra* n.6) 139ff; cf. Braswell’s note on Pind. *Pyth.* 4.37(e).

<sup>18</sup> See R. Parker, *Miasma* (Oxford 1983) 74f with n.4 on Sokolowski, *LSAM* 29.7 and *LSCG* 91.18.

sacred prostitutes too closely with what is generally designated as τὰ ἱερά. In his poem for Xenophon (fr.122) Pindar's discomfort is plain, and it is correspondingly difficult to establish the tone of the passage.<sup>19</sup> However much sacred prostitution was found in cities like Corinth, it is probable that it made many Greeks uneasy: Herodotus calls the Babylonian practice νόμος αἴσχιστος (1.199.1).

It is also possible that δαυμόνιαι was a regular title at Corinth, and this may in fact be more likely. Such a view, however, cannot be proved without firmer evidence, but a passage from the end of Hesiod's *Theogony* is suggestive in this regard. Here the poet describes Phaethon, the son born to Cephalus by Eos (986–91):

αὐτάρ τοι Κεφάλω φιλύσατο φαίδιμον υἱόν,  
ἴφθιμον Φαέθοντα, θεοῖς ἐπιείκελον ἄνδρα·  
τόν ῥα νέον τέρεν ἄνθος ἔχοντ' ἔρικυδέος ἥβης  
παῖδ' ἀταλά φρονέοντα φιλομειδῆς Ἀφροδίτῃ  
ᾧρτ' ἀνερειψαμένη, καί μιν ζαθείοις ἐνὶ νηοῖς  
νηοπόλον μύχιον ποιήσατο, δαίμονα δῖον.

Although not the usual version of the story of Phaethon, this is a myth of a familiar sort: the handsome youth arouses the interest of the goddess, who carries him off.<sup>20</sup> What is of interest for the present discussion is Phaethon's fate. West (*ad* 991) argues that implicit in this passage is Phaethon's condition as ἥρωσ, suggesting that we have a reminiscence of the practice of burying the priest-king in the temple of his god. This view is certainly possible, and there are instances of the word δαίμων used of the powerful dead;<sup>21</sup> but Hesiod says nothing of Phaethon's death, and, as Wilamowitz saw, this passage indicates that the πάρεδροι of the gods can be termed δαίμονες.<sup>22</sup> In the

<sup>19</sup> See B. A. van Groningen, *Pindare au banquet* (Amsterdam 1960) 46ff; H. Schmitz, *Hypsos und Bios* (Bern 1970) 30ff.

<sup>20</sup> For the myth see West *ad* Hes. *Th.* 991; J. Diggle, *Euripides: Phaethon* (Cambridge 1970) 10–15. This version is attested elsewhere only at Paus. 1.3.1 (conveniently quoted by Diggle 11).

<sup>21</sup> Of the passages cited by West, Hes. *Erga* 122 and Aesch. *Pers.* 620 are the best examples. The description of Alcestis as μάκαιρα δαίμων in Euripides' play (1003) may be germane as well.

<sup>22</sup> Wilamowitz (*supra* n.5) I 360: "Das [*i.e.* *Th.* 991] setzt voraus, daß πάρεδροι großer Götter als Dämonen bezeichnet werden."

Hesiodic passage δαίμονα δῖον stands in apposition to νηοπόλον μύχιον, and this suggests that the term δαίμων reflects Phaethon's position as an intimate subordinate of the goddess.<sup>23</sup> That this usage of δαίμων carries some special significance may be suggested by the occurrence of the apparent formula δαίμονα δῖον only here in Greek literature; it cannot be viewed as an empty formula (though it is clearly modelled on phrases like Ἐκτορα δῖον). This view finds some support in a passage from the *Theognidea* (2.1345–48):

παιδοφιλεῖν δέ τι τερπνόν, ἐπεὶ ποτε καὶ Γανυμήδους  
ἦρατο καὶ Κρονίδης ἀθανάτων βασιλεύς,  
ἀρπάξας δ' ἐς Ὀλυμπον ἀνήγαγε καὶ μιν ἔθηκεν  
δαίμονα, παιδείης ἄνθος ἔχοντ' ἐρατόν.

As in the case of Phaethon, there is an erotic coloring to the myth.<sup>24</sup> The god abducts the youth and give him a privileged position as his subordinate; this status is reflected in the use of δαίμων.

At some level these myths describe the relationship that obtains between a god and a mortal who in some sense belongs to that deity. It is probable that figures like Phaethon served as paradigms of the rôle of the priest in relation to his god in

<sup>23</sup> Pindar's description of Cinyras as ἱερέα κτίλον Ἀφροδίτας (*Pyth.* 2.17) probably has similar implications: see H. Lloyd-Jones, *JHS* 93 (1973) 119 n.59 (= *Academic Papers: Epic, etc.* [Oxford 1990] 126 n.59); Woodbury (*supra* n.11) 285 n.3 (= *Collected Writings* 271 n.3); E. Dettori, *MusCrit* 23/24 (1988/89) 95–98.

<sup>24</sup> The degree to which the erotic element is central to this myth remains controversial. K. J. Dover, *Greek Homosexuality* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1978) 196ff, argues that it reflects a secondary re-interpretation; but, pointing to passages like Ephorus *FGrHist* 70F149, it is possible to argue that Greek homosexuality is a reflection of initiatory ritual, which may have its roots in Indo-European society: see J. Bremmer, *Arethusa* 13 (1980) 279–98; P. A. Cartledge, *PCPS* 207 (1981) 17–36; H. Patzer, *Die griechische Knabenliebe* (Wiesbaden 1982) esp. 99ff; B. Sergent, *L'Homosexualité dans la mythologie grecque* (Paris 1984) 237ff. In this light myths like that of the abduction of Ganymede would have some basis in social practice. Dover, however, has pointed out the weaknesses of this position in "Greek Homosexuality and Initiation," *The Greeks and their Legacy* (Oxford 1988) 115–34; cf. T. Figueira, *AJP* 107 (1986) 426–32.



certain cults;<sup>25</sup> but it is unlikely that the term δαίμων would be applied to ordinary priests. They would probably stand at one remove from the model presented by myth; and so δαιμόνιος, the adjective derived from δαίμων, would be a suitable term. This sort of view well suits the Simonidean epigram. The ιερόδουλοι, like Phaethon in the *Theogony*, serve the temple of Aphrodite; they belong to the goddess and so they are δαιμόνια.

The nominative is also supported by structural considerations. The arrangement of εὐχόμεναι ... δαιμόνια gives us a common form of pentameter, in which words in agreement end each of the hemiepe that constitute the line.<sup>26</sup> Moreover, δαιμόνια gives special point to the telling final position of the verse (neither δαιμονία nor δαιμόνια seems to contribute anything of significance).<sup>27</sup> The vague αἶδε in the first line is balanced by δαιμόνια that defines the demonstrative.<sup>28</sup> As it stands in current editions, the epigram is unusual in offering no identifications of the women. On the usual view, we must assume that the reference of αἶδε was inferred from the painting or statue(s) upon which the poem was inscribed. But by reading δαιμόνια in the way proposed here the women are in fact

<sup>25</sup> It is clear that the sort of priesthoods that concern us are not typical of most Greek cults, in which the ιερέυς has a more casual association with his god: see Burkert (*supra* n.5) 95–98, who says that “In Griechenland ist das Priestertum nicht Lebensform, sondern Neben- und Ehrenamt” (97). Those cults in which priests (and other followers) are bound closely to the deity tend to be those cults that reflect oriental elements (Burkert 97). Sacred prostitution was an infamous feature of the worship of Ishtar/Astarte, the eastern prototype of Aphrodite: see Burkert 153 and *Die orientalisierende Epoche in der griechischen Religion und Literatur* (Heidelberg 1984) 92–95; cf. A. D. Nock, *HTHR* 45 (1952) 244 (= *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World* [Oxford 1972] II 783f).

<sup>26</sup> This is a common pattern (occurring as early as Archil. fr.4.7 West<sup>2</sup>) and requires little illustration; I simply cite some examples from the Simonidean epigrams: 18.2; 48.2; 59.2, 8; 66.8, 10; 68.6; 71.2; 72.2 FGE. For the combination of an adjective and a participle, cf. (e.g.) Anyte 8.4 (695) Gow and Page: ποτιφθεγκτὰ ... φθιμένα.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Demetr. *Eloc.* 39.4–7 (Roberts): πάντες γοῦν ἰδίως τῶν τε πρώτων μνημονεύομεν καὶ τῶν ὑστάτων, καὶ ὑπὸ τούτων κινούμεθα, ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν μεταξύ ἔλαττον ὥσπερ ἐγκρυπτομένων ἢ ἐναφανιζομένων.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Sim. *Ep.* 65.1f FGE, in which οἶδε, the first word, comes sharply into focus with μαχεσσάμενοι at the end of the pentameter.

identified, possibly by a special term for the *ιερόδουλοι* at Corinth.<sup>29</sup>

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO

*July, 1991*

<sup>29</sup> For comment and advice in the writing of this paper I am grateful to Professors R. L. Fowler, D. E. Gerber, B. C. MacLachlan, and E. Robbins.